
Adaptive Pre-training Data Detection for Large Language Models via Surprising Tokens

Anqi Zhang

Chaofeng Wu

Abstract

While large language models (LLMs) are extensively used, there are raising concerns regarding privacy, security, and copyright due to their opaque training data, which brings the problem of detecting pre-training data on the table. Current solutions to this problem leverage techniques explored in machine learning privacy such as Membership Inference Attacks (MIAs), which heavily depend on LLMs' capability of verbatim memorization. However, this reliance presents challenges, especially given the vast amount of training data and the restricted number of effective training epochs. In this paper, we propose an adaptive pre-training data detection method which alleviates this reliance and effectively amplify the identification. Our method adaptively locates *surprising tokens* of the input. A token is surprising to a LLM if the prediction on the token is "certain but wrong", which refers to low Shannon entropy of the probability distribution and low probability of the ground truth token at the same time. By using the prediction probability of surprising tokens to measure *surprising*, the detection method is achieved based on the simple hypothesis that seeing seen data is less surprising for the model compared with seeing unseen data. The method can be applied without any access to the the pre-training data corpus or additional training like reference models. Our approach exhibits a consistent enhancement compared to existing methods in diverse experiments conducted on various benchmarks and models, achieving a maximum improvement of 29.5%. We also introduce a new benchmark Dolma-Book developed upon a novel framework, which employs book data collected both before and after model training to provide further evaluation.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) are experiencing immense success, with their remarkable performance and widespread popularity driving their research and deployment across a multitude of applications [29, 30, 16, 1, 45, 24, 43]. Alongside this, concerns regarding the potential negative impacts on privacy [38, 6, 28, 50], security [48, 36, 8, 39] and copyright [13, 27, 46] of LLMs are also gathering widespread attention. Lacking of transparency regarding training data [41], as one significant challenge, leads to difficulty in model evaluation [37, 32], and a series of problems including potential leaks of personal privacy data [26, 31] and infringements upon copyrighted data [11, 22].

In tackling this challenge, a group of works is delving into the problem of pre-training data detection, which aims to determine whether the target LLM was pre-trained on a given input without prior knowledge of the pre-training data and only with black-box access to it. This is in line with Membership Inference Attacks (MIAs) [23], a problem extensively studied in machine learning privacy and gaining attention under LLMs domain. MIAs exploit the model's tendency to overfit the training data, resulting in low loss values for that data. Typically, prevalent strategies for pre-training data detection based on MIAs heavily rely on the *verbatim memorization* [21] capabilities of LLMs. However, this reliance poses significant challenges [17], especially given the current scenario where




Figure 1: Overview of SURP. The left part illustrates surprising token (bottom left) and unsurprising token (upper left). The x-axis represents words in vocabulary (token candidates), the y-axis represents the probability that the model assigns to each word. A *surprising token* should satisfy both (a) the probability distribution is not flat (low entropy) and (b) the probability of ground truth token (GT prob in figure) is relatively low. The right part shows the flow of SURP. Given an input, we can get the entropy and ground truth probability at each index. Then we use the average ground truth probability of surprising tokens as the score of the input, to determine whether it is seen or not.

pre-trained LLMs generally have dramatically large scale training sets and are only trained on the data for around one epoch.

In this work, we aim to exploring the issue from a different perspective: if the verbatim memorization of arbitrary pre-training data is unreliable for the model, is it possible for people to automatically locate representative places of the input, which effectively amplify the distinctions between the model’s *seen* data (i.e., pre-training data) and *unseen* data (i.e., non-training data)? Distinguished from prior works, our method wants to fill in this gap and to conduct detection through method that alleviates the reliance on the plain input memory as much as possible.

We propose an adaptive pre-training data detection method SURP, which locate *surprising tokens* of a given input and achieve detection based on the hypothesis that seeing seen data is less *surprising* for model when compared with seeing unseen data. For the input, we first adaptively locate *surprising tokens*. The surprising tokens are inspired by Shannon Entropy[40] in information theory, empirical observations(Figure 2), and the nature of surprise. Surprising happens when people are sure about the answer of a question, but the revealed true answer is different from the answer in mind. We transfer this definition of surprise to LLMs, and define *surprising token* as tokens in the input where the LLM is sure about what the prediction should be, but the probability that the LLM assigned to the ground truth token is low. We use Shannon entropy to measure how sure the LLMs think of what the next token is, as it measures the uncertainty of a distribution. Lower entropy means the probability distribution is more concentrated, and there’s less uncertainty about the outcome. Thus, *surprising tokens* refers to low Shannon entropy of the probability distribution and low probability of the ground truth token at the same time. Further, to measure how *surprising* the LLM is, we use the average prediction probability of surprising tokens: the lower the average probability, the more surprising the LLM. Based on the hypothesis, LLM will have higher average probability on seen data compared with on unseen data. To summarize the process, given an input, our method first adaptively locates the surprising token of input, then calculate the average probability that the LLM assigned to the surprising tokens, finally detect whether the input is seen or not based on the average probability. Our approach can be applied without any prior knowledge about the pre-training data corpus or additional training like reference models.

We construct a new benchmark Dolma-Book, to enlarge the limited number of datasets for pre-training data detection problem. Dolma-Book is developed upon a novel LLM framework – Open Language Model (OLMo) [20]. We employs book data from Project Gutenberg collected before and after model training(i.e., based on a cutoff date) to provide further evaluation of the detection methods. Since the considerable length of the raw book data, we collect and category three datasets from the *head*, *middle* and *tail* segmentations of the book to serve for a better evaluation of detection performance across various text positions within the long-context book data. Procedure of data collection and categorization is automatic and convenient to extend for future studies. We empirically evaluate the performance of our approach across various language models and data benchmarks. Our approach consistently outperforms existing methods across three benchmarks and different families of LLMs. Further analysis demonstrate our method maintains advantages on deduplicated model and inputs of different length variations. Code and benchmark are available here: make public after acceptance.

We summarize our contributions below:

- We propose to identify surprising tokens (§ 4.1) instead of blindly believing in the model’s memory of each individual token, due to the challenges and unreliability of verbatim memorization (§ 2).
- We construct an improved pre-training data detection approach (§ 4.2) through adaptively surprising tokens identification and designed score computation.
- We construct a book data benchmark for further pre-training detection problem (§ 5.1) and provide extensive empirical demonstration of black-box detections for various LLMs and benchmarks (§ 5).

2 Related Work

We discuss related works on pre-training data detection for large language models. The problem of detecting pre-training data aims to determine whether a language model was trained on the given text input when black-box access to the LLM without knowing the pre-training data. Its necessity has received increasing attention from various aspects.

In the field of traditional machine learning privacy, there has been well explored research on membership inference [42, 23, 49, 35, 9, 12]. Since the current problem is in line with it, some prior works use MIA technologies to solve detection problem in LLM domain. A simple and frequently employed method is the LOSS attack [49], which utilizes the model’s computed loss and classifies the inputs as part of the training set if their loss values fall below a specific threshold. Some work [9, 47] claims this kind of attacks have high false positive rate (i.e., non-member samples are often erroneously predicted as members), and *difficulty calibration* [47] is proposed to overcome this. Since then, other reference-based methods [8, 34] are proposed to consider the intrinsic complexity of the target data by calibrating the loss of target model with another reference model. These methods have to train other models on the same dataset or data from same distribution. Instead of training reference models, [33] craft textual *neighboring samples* through data augmentation and leverages an estimation of the loss curvature to detect membership. More recently, [41] selects tokens which have the lowest likelihood to compute the score for detection.

Applying MIAs in detecting pre-training data of LLMs has its own challenges. Since traditional MIAs exploit the model’s overfitting on the training data (i.e., model tends to obtain low loss values on training data), basically, the commonly-used methods heavily rely on LLMs’ capabilities of *verbatim memorization* [10, 25, 21, 44]. However, existing work [17] claims challenges in solving data detection problem simply based on memorization of input, as the standard practice of training LLMs is training model for one epoch with massive training corpus, which makes overfitting impractical. Not relying on memorizing each word input but uses some narrow concepts to screen, [11] proposes *name cloze* for data archaeology to infer books that are known to ChatGPT/GPT-4. Although insightful design, the scenario is very limited. Usually, inferring membership based on named-entity is not robust due to the unsure information rarity.

In parallel to pre-training data detection, there are some related but not completely overlapping issues. [37, 19, 32, 5, 15] study the data contamination problem, where the pre-training dataset contains various evaluation benchmarks. [7, 22, 51] work on the data extraction problem, which aim to recover individual training examples through prompting attacks, especially the personally identifiable information (PII) [31]. These methods have limited use in pre-training data detection problem, as they require the specific dataset structure or data types.

3 Preliminary

We first define the terminology we use, formalize the problem, and state our assumptions about the knowledge and capabilities. We follow the standard definition of the existing pre-training data detection in LLMs:

Autoregressive language models. We focus on the autoregressive language models \mathcal{M} , which are trained to predict the next text token based on the input sequence of previous tokens (i.e., different from bidirectional masked language models such as BERT [14]). We use $p(\cdot | x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1})$ to represent the probability distribution of an model \mathcal{M} on generating next token when given an input sequence x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1} . This probability distribution is among a token vocabulary, denoted as \mathcal{V} , and for each $v_j \in \mathcal{V}$, denote $p(v_j | x_1, \dots, x_{i-1})$ as the probability of next token to be v_j .

Clarify names and definitions. We want to clarify the following names used in paper for better understanding. Given an input sequence x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N , each of x_i is called *token* (i.e., ground-truth token); *index* (i.e., 1, 2, ..N) is used to state the location of x_i . We call the possible generated tokens (i.e., $\forall v_j \in \mathcal{V}$) at a specific index as *token candidates*.

Problem definition. Given a data point $\mathbf{x} = x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N$ and a pre-trained language model \mathcal{M} , the goal of pre-training data detection problem is to infer whether \mathbf{x} belongs to the training dataset \mathcal{D} for this model \mathcal{M} . The detection process \mathcal{F} is achieved by computing a score $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{M})$ and decided through a case-dependent threshold λ . Formally, $\mathbf{x} : \mathcal{F}(f(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{M}); \lambda) \mapsto \{0, 1\}$. Following previous works, people care about the threshold-independent metric, area under the ROC curve, for the aggregate measure of performance.

Knowledge and capabilities. We assume the detector can access to the output statistics of the model \mathcal{M} , i.e., probabilities, but no access to model parameters, gradients as well as the pre-training data \mathcal{D} . Also, we assume no access to the pre-training data distribution \mathbb{D} for any training of calibration model.

4 Adaptive Pre-training Data Detection through Surprising Tokens

In this section, we provide the motivation and detailed description of our adaptive pre-training data detection method SURP, that using token probabilities at representative index for detection.

Since current state-of-art pre-trained LLMs are trained with billions and trillions of data corpus but pre-train for very limited (i.e., only near-one) epoch, believing in the model’s memory of each individual token is not practical. Even the size of today’s large models is far from enough to memorize verbatim. Because of the black-box, we don’t know exactly what the model remembers, however we can try to get clues from some details displayed by the model itself.

4.1 Surprising Tokens Identification

Language models determine what the current token should be based on the preceding text, and *entropy* reveals the model’s certainty in deciding the current token should be which one among the entire vocabulary.

Shannon Entropy[40] is widely used as a measurement for the uncertainty within a distribution. Specifically, it is defined as $H(P_X) = -\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_X(x) \log P_X(x)$, where P_X represents a discrete probability distribution across the outcome space \mathcal{X} , and its value falls between 0 and $\log |\mathcal{X}|$ (i.e., occurs when all outcomes are equally like). Generally, lower entropy means the probability distribution is more concentrated, and there’s less uncertainty about the outcome; whereas higher entropy indicates a more spread-out distribution with greater uncertainty. Thus in context of language models, Shannon entropy can be used to evaluate the predictability or uncertainty of the text sequences. That is, a *low entropy* distribution in language models implies that there are not so much possible choices, leading to *model’s great certain* for the current token.

Based on these, we define *surprising tokens* as the tokens that 1) model is confident with the prediction of the current token location, which can be reflected from the low entropy value at the index; 2) the model has low probability for predicting this token to be the ground truth one. When these two conditions achieve at the same time, the model is confident that the ground truth token is not the current token. As a result, upon revealing the ground truth, the model will be surprising. Note that if the model itself is not very certain about what this position should be (i.e., it has a high entropy distribution), the low probability prediction of the ground truth token doesn’t signify much, regardless of whether the data has been seen before or not.

4.2 Adaptive Pre-training Data Detection

We introduce an adaptive pre-training data detection method **SURP** that using token probabilities at adaptively selected representative index (aka. *surprising tokens*) of a given input for detection. SURP is based on the hypothesis that the seeing *seen* data will *not be that surprising* for the model when compared with seeing *unseen* data.

Our inspiration is derived from the observations about the *surprising tokens*: we found that when select representative tokens based on the requirements described in §4.1, the average probability




Figure 2: The calculated token entropy values and model’s prediction log-probability on ground truth tokens for (a) all input tokens (b) tokens have low entropy and low ground truth probability, using GPT-Neo-2.7B on DM Math dataset.

of ground truth tokens at the selected indexes of a seen data is higher than it of a unseen data. We empirically demonstrate this phenomenon in Figure 2 using an example of GPT-Neo-2.7B model and the DM Math dataset. Figure 2a shows the token entropy and ground truth token log probability for all tokens within given inputs, where we are hard to tell the difference between unseen inputs and seen inputs. We notice that in the left bottom part of the figure, which is the range for the *surprising tokens*, tokens from seen inputs and tokens from unseen inputs are more separable. Figure 2b is drawn by limiting the token entropy and ground truth probability(i.e., the left bottom part of Figure 2a). We can clearly see that the tokens from seen inputs have a larger prediction probability compared with tokens from unseen inputs. Therefore, we focus on *surprising tokens* and design SURP.

SURP is formulated as following. Denote a sequence of tokens, which is the input, as $\mathbf{x} = x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_N$. Denote a language model as \mathcal{M} , which takes some of the token sequence x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1} as input and predict the probability of the next token among the set of vocabulary \mathcal{V} at location i . We denote x_i as the ground truth token at position i . The probability distribution of each token position as a $1 \times |\mathcal{V}|$ vector P_i , where i indicates the index in the input sequence \mathbf{x} . Each entry of the probability vector P_i , which represents the model’s predicted probability on a specific token candidate, is calculated as $P_{i,v_j} = p(v_j | x_{<i}; \mathcal{M}), \forall v_j \in \mathcal{V}$. Denote the ground truth token’s log probability as L_i , with the probability vector, it can be calculate as $L_i = \log P_{i,x_i}$. We first obtain the entropy E_i at each index i , then select a subset of indexes where entropy is smaller than a certain value ε_e :

$$E_i = - \sum_{v_j \in \mathcal{V}} P_{i,v_j} \log P_{i,v_j}, \quad (1)$$

$$S_e = \{i \mid E_i < \varepsilon_e, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\}\} \quad (2)$$

We further restrict set S_e by choosing indexes with low prediction probability for the ground truth token x_i , i.e., P_{i,x_i} is low. We define low probability in terms of k -th-percentile of log probabilities L_1, L_2, \dots, L_N . The k -th percentile is the value $k/100$ of the way from the minimum to the maximum. Denote this value as L^k , we have

$$S_p = \{i \mid L_i < L^k, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\}\} \quad (3)$$

Finally, for each given input sequence \mathbf{x} we adaptively locate the set of *surprising tokens* as $S_e \cap S_p$, and calculate the average log probability of the tokens in the joint of these two:

$$\text{SURP}(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{M}) = \frac{1}{|S_e \cap S_p|} \sum_{i \in S_e \cap S_p} L_i \quad (4)$$

To detect whether a piece of text \mathbf{x} is part of the pre-training data, we simply thresholding the value $\text{SURP}(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{M})$:

$$\mathcal{F}(\text{SURP}(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{M}); \lambda) = \mathbb{1}[\text{SURP}(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{M}) \geq \lambda] \quad (5)$$

where λ is a case-dependent threshold. We care about the threshold-independent metric in §5 same as previous works. The algorithm is summarized in Algorithm ?? in Appendix ??.

5 Experiments

We evaluate the performance of the proposed SURP as well as prior detection baseline methods against large autoregressive models over three benchmarks targeting pre-training data detection. We start by describing the datasets, models and baselines used in our experiments.

5.1 Setups

Datasets. We perform experiments on three benchmarks, including two existing benchmarks **WikiMIA** [41] and **MIMIR** [17], as well as a new benchmark **Dolma-Book** that we developed upon a novel framework. WikiMIA [41] is a dataset that collect event pages from Wikipedia and distinguish training and non-training data based on a specific cutoff date. Moreover, WikiMIA¹ provides categorized data based on different sentence lengths (i.e., 32, 64, 128, 256 words in one input separately), aiming to offer a detailed evaluation of varying input lengths. MIMIR [17] is benchmark that built based on seven diverse data sources in the Pile dataset [18]. Training and non-training data in this benchmark are directly sampled from the train and test sets of the Pile respectively. Moreover, MIMIR² provides data in different source domains with different n -gram overlap between the training and non-training data, and we keep all methods to use the $\leq 20\%$ 7-gram overlap data groups in our evaluation since baseline methods show better performance.

Dolma-Book Benchmark Construction. We construct a new benchmark **Dolma-Book**, which is developed upon a novel LLM framework – Open Language Model (OLMo) [20], to provide further evaluation of our method. Since it releases full pre-training data (i.e., Dolma) for the OLMo models, we could easily sample training data from the released data. However, we still need to collect non-training data for the detection problem. Therefore, to construct our Dolma-Book benchmark: **Step 1.** Collect non-training book data from Project Gutenberg, which is a repository of over 70 thousand public domain books that are not protected under U.S. copyright law. Since Dolma collected this archive in April 2023, we set January 1, 2024 as the cutoff date and extract all books after this date directly from the website [gutenberg.org](http://www.gutenberg.org)³. There are 978 books in total. **Step 2.** For the pre-training data, we randomly sample from the groups of book data within Dolma⁴ for the same number of books with the non-training ones. **Step 3.** The raw books are too long to be inputs for a benchmark, so we need to select parts of them. In order to further compare the detection performance of different text positions within the long-context raw book, we collect and category three datasets for both the training and non-training, called *Dolma-Book-head*, *Dolma-Book-middle* and *Dolma-Book-tail*. We first split each book into segmentations (i.e., after discarding the headers of the book) according to a fixed number of words (i.e., do 1024 and 512). Then we take the first segmentation, middle segmentation (i.e., $length//2$) and the last two segmentations into the datasets of *head*, *middle* and *tail* respectively. The procedure is conducted for both training and non-training data creation for further evaluations. The data construction pipeline including new data collection and categorization is automatic and is convenient to extend for future time.

Models. We conduct various experiments on eight large language models among four families. Given that Wikipedia often serves as part of the training corpus for multiple models, we evaluate the performance on WikiMIA against the suite of LLaMA [45] (7B, 13B), Pythia [3] (2.8B, 6.9B, 12B) and GPT-Neo [4] (2.7B) models. For Dolma-Book, we use the two different-size models (1B, 7B) provided by OLMo framework [20]. Then we use the suite of Pythia and GPT-Neo models for the MIMIR, since these models are trained on the Pile. We also evaluate on the deduped-Pythia model (Table. ??) to compare the performance.

Evaluation Metrics. Consistent with previous works, we primarily report the AUC-ROC score (the area under ROC curve) for performance evaluation, and show the TPR@low% FPR scores.

Baselines. We consider six baselines including the standard reference-free and reference-based methods to compare the performance. The LOSS Attack method (**PPL**) [49] uses the model’s

¹WikiMIA from HuggingFace. <https://huggingface.co/datasets/swj0419/WikiMIA>

²MIMIR from HuggingFace. <https://huggingface.co/datasets/iamgroot42/mimir>

³Use GutenbergPy [2] to extract books.

⁴Dolma from HuggingFace. <https://huggingface.co/datasets/allenai/dolma>

Table 1: AUC-ROC scores for pre-training data detection on WikiMIA and various models across SURP and baseline methods. Show results of the input length 32 and 128 respectively, with highlighting best results as bold.

Method	LLaMA-7B		LLaMA-13B		Pythia-2.8B		Pythia-6.9B		Pythia-12B		GPT-neo-2.7B	
	32	128	32	128	32	128	32	128	32	128	32	128
PPL	0.661	0.666	0.675	0.678	0.614	0.628	0.638	0.651	0.654	0.658	0.620	0.640
Ref	0.595	0.581	0.608	0.594	0.613	0.596	0.636	0.633	0.651	0.639	0.605	0.594
Lower	0.604	0.591	0.640	0.606	0.609	0.595	0.622	0.605	0.647	0.614	0.611	0.614
Zlib	0.667	0.683	0.678	0.697	0.622	0.650	0.643	0.676	0.658	0.678	0.625	0.662
Neighbor	0.629	0.616	0.642	0.652	0.599	0.619	0.625	0.634	0.630	0.634	0.605	0.629
MinK	0.651	0.697	0.668	0.715	0.617	0.668	0.663	0.695	0.681	0.707	0.639	0.683
SURP	0.864	0.832	0.868	0.830	0.633	0.671	0.681	0.698	0.698	0.710	0.662	0.694

Table 2: AUC-ROC results for pre-training data detection on three datasets (*head*, *middle*, *tail*) in Dolma-Book, using different sizes of OLMo models across SURP and baseline methods. Each input text has the word length to be 1024. Highlight best results as bold.

Method ^a	Dolma-Book-head		Dolma-Book-middle		Dolma-Book-tail	
	OLMo-1B	OLMo-7B	OLMo-1B	OLMo-7B	OLMo-1B	OLMo-7B
PPL	0.609	0.596	0.618	0.616	0.575	0.576
Ref ^b	-	0.337	-	0.434	-	0.447
Lower	0.471	0.469	0.504	0.497	0.473	0.469
Zlib	0.741	0.739	0.472	0.475	0.526	0.527
MinK	0.579	0.586	0.583	0.589	0.564	0.571
SURP	0.634	0.627	0.640	0.649	0.602	0.608

^aWe skip neighbor method due to out-of-memory.

^bOLMo-1B is the smallest model in OLMo framework, so we skip reference method for OLMo-1B.

computed loss of an input as the perplexity to predict the membership. Neighbor method (**Neighbor**) [33] leverages an estimation of the loss curvature to detect membership. Min-K% Prob method (**MinK**) [41] selects $k\%$ tokens which have the lowest likelihood to compute the score for detection. Reference-based method (**Ref**) proposed in [8] trains a small reference language model on the same data and uses the perplexity obtained from the reference model for calibration. In evaluation, we use the smaller version of each family as their reference model, i.e., LLaMA-160M for LLaMA models, Pythia-70M for Pythia models, GPT-Neo-125M for GPT-Neo-2.8B and OLMo-1B for OLMo-7B. Similar to reference-based method, **Zlib** method [8] uses zlib compression entropy as reference, and **Lowercase** [8] uses lowercased example perplexity as the reference.

5.2 Evaluation Results

Table. 1, 2, 3 show the results of our method across three benchmarks on various models and the comparisons with the baseline methods. For all experiments in evaluation, we apply grid search for the best hyperparameters, i.e., ε_e is from 0.5 to 10 with step size 0.5, and k is from 10 to 100 with step size 10. Same with the baseline MinK, the hyperparameter can be determined by a held-out validation set. We show more analysis about our hyperparameters in §5.3. For each of the baseline, we basically apply setups according to their papers and implementations. And for MinK, we report the results under the best parameter value for a fair comparison.

The AUC-ROC results for **WikiMIA** benchmark is shown in Table. 1. In addition to different kinds of LLMs, we also evaluate the detection performance on various length of the input. Results of 32 and 128 words length are displayed here, and the results of the input length to be 64 and 256 are in Appendix. ?? . As shown in the table, our method can achieve a huge enhancement with maximum of 29.5%, and consistently outperform baselines across different input lengths (average improvement of 11.4% for length-32 and average 6.4% for length-128). In general, the performance increases as

Table 3: AUC-ROC results for pre-training data detection on seven datasets in MIMIR, using various models across SURP and baseline methods. Highlight best results as bold.

Method	Wikipedia				Github				Pile CC				PubMed Central			
	Pythia-2.8B	Pythia-6.9B	Pythia-12B	Neo-2.7B	Pythia-2.8B	Pythia-6.9B	Pythia-12B	Neo-2.7B	Pythia-2.8B	Pythia-6.9B	Pythia-12B	Neo-2.7B	Pythia-2.8B	Pythia-6.9B	Pythia-12B	Neo-2.7B
PPL	0.663	0.679	0.690	0.657	0.880	0.889	0.895	0.873	0.549	0.561	0.565	0.553	0.781	0.782	0.781	0.798
Ref	0.561	0.582	0.593	0.546	0.418	0.426	0.430	0.416	0.530	0.540	0.545	0.544	0.392	0.396	0.397	0.351
Lower	0.648	0.669	0.676	0.660	0.869	0.881	0.889	0.881	0.548	0.561	0.572	0.545	0.724	0.728	0.725	0.734
Zlib	0.630	0.649	0.661	0.623	0.907	0.914	0.917	0.899	0.537	0.548	0.551	0.540	0.771	0.773	0.772	0.786
Neighbor	0.572	0.567	0.607	0.567	0.868	0.872	0.881	0.866	0.480	0.491	0.482	0.483	0.617	0.624	0.611	0.625
MinK	0.657	0.679	0.695	0.649	0.879	0.889	0.895	0.872	0.547	0.562	0.563	0.549	0.781	0.786	0.787	0.796
SURP	0.669	0.688	0.702	0.660	0.881	0.890	0.896	0.874	0.553	0.564	0.571	0.556	0.789	0.793	0.793	0.805

Method	ArXiv				DM Math				HackerNews			
	Pythia-2.8B	Pythia-6.9B	Pythia-12B	Neo-2.7B	Pythia-2.8B	Pythia-6.9B	Pythia-12B	Neo-2.7B	Pythia-2.8B	Pythia-6.9B	Pythia-12B	Neo-2.7B
PPL	0.780	0.791	0.795	0.790	0.919	0.920	0.919	0.930	0.606	0.613	0.621	0.592
Ref	0.565	0.586	0.596	0.548	0.377	0.365	0.363	0.419	0.522	0.532	0.550	0.517
Lower	0.737	0.746	0.753	0.736	0.928	0.928	0.902	0.839	0.540	0.541	0.547	0.539
Zlib	0.775	0.784	0.787	0.784	0.811	0.813	0.812	0.812	0.594	0.598	0.604	0.587
Neighbor	0.664	0.670	0.662	0.653	0.752	0.775	0.770	0.763	0.538	0.531	0.570	0.545
MinK	0.752	0.767	0.778	0.760	0.926	0.925	0.924	0.933	0.582	0.592	0.605	0.572
SURP	0.784	0.793	0.798	0.791	0.942	0.942	0.936	0.945	0.606	0.614	0.624	0.594

the input text length increases, except for LLaMA models which display a dramatic advantage in shorter inputs. Also, according to the results from the suite of Pythia models, the performance will get improved with larger size of models regardless of the input length.

Table. 2 shows the AUC-ROC results for our **Dolma-Book** benchmark. Given the considerable length of the raw book, we conduct separate comparisons of input data from the *head*, *middle* and *tail* segmentations(details in §5.1) of the book to show a better evaluation of detection performance across different text positions within the long-context book data. As shown in Table. 2, our method outperforms other baseline methods on both *Dolma-Book-middle* and *Dolma-Book-tail* with an improvement of 5.2% and 5.6% from the best baseline AUC scores respectively. For *Dolma-Book-head*, Our method performs the best except for Zlib. The *head* segmentation of a book could contains a certain degree of garbled characters (including formatting, list of names, table of contents, etc.), which is likely to make Zlib compression calibration effective. Moreover, basically for all methods, the *middle* of book as input can obtain best detection performance, and *tail* gets the worst. Appendix. ?? show more results about 512 word-length of inputs.

Table. 3 shows the results of using **MIMIR** benchmark. Among seven different datasets, our method basically outperforms other baselines or reach a comparable results (second best beyond Zlib for Github). For some datasets like DM Math, our method achieves an enhancement from the best previous method’s (Lowercase) 92.8% to 94.2%, but we may also obtain modest improvement on some datasets such as HackerNews.

TPR@lower FPR. Following prior works, we additionally report the detection performance in terms of the true positive rates (TPR) under low false positive rates (FPR). Figure. 3 shows the ROC curve of WiKIMIA data and LLaMA-13B model across various methods. Our method significantly improve existing approaches through varying threshold, e.g., we improve TPR from 0.275 to 0.431 at 5% FPR, and from 0.196 to 0.412 at 1% FPR. Table. ?? - ?? in Appendix. ?? display the values of TPR@low% FPRs (i.e., 1%, 5% and 10%) for different benchmarks and LLMs.

5.3 Ablation Studies

Analysis about the hyperparameters. We have two parameters, one is the entropy threshold ε_e , one is the low probability threshold k -percentile. For giving more analysis, we show the heatmap of AUC scores in Figure 4. Figure 4 shows the AUC score when using different entropy threshold and percentile pairs, with OLMo-7B model and Dolma-Book-middle dataset. We can find that the best AUC score happens when the $\varepsilon_e = 2.5$ and the $k = 40$. We can see clearly that both entropy threshold and low ground truth probability are important: if only use low entropy threshold ε_e (the




Figure 3: The ROC curve for LLaMA-13B on WikiMIA length-64 dataset.




Figure 4: Heatmap to show the AUC scores of different hyperparameters, using OLMo-7B on Dolma-Book-middle dataset.

top row in figure), the AUC score could as low as 0.52 (with $\varepsilon_e = 2.5$ and $k = 100$); if only use small k (the right most column), the AUC score is around 0.56 (with $\varepsilon_e = 10.0$ and $k = 10$). Similar phenomena is shown from Figure ?? in Appendix ?? using Dolma-Book-tail dataset, which achieves best AUC when entropy threshold is low ($\varepsilon_e = 2.0$) and $k = 30$.

Deduped model cannot decrease the advantage. To see the influence of duplicates in training data, we compare the performance of model trained on regular dataset and deduplicate dataset. We evaluate the performance of our method and baselines using Pythia-2.8B and deduped-Pythia-2.8B, see Table. ?? in Appendix ?. For using the deduped model, our method also achieve the best results comparing with other baselines over various datasets (except for Github as second best after Zlib). Also, our method achieve similar performance on the original model and deduplicate model (i.e., non-deduped slightly higher in Wikipedia, ArXiv and DM Math).

Influence of data distribution shifts. Data distribution shifts could occur in current dataset for pre-training detection, as in many datasets, the unseen data consists of newly added data after the trained model was released. This brings a potential data distribution shifts. To see the influence of data distribution shifts, we evaluate the performance on temporal datasets of Wikipedia and ArXiv using the datasets provided by [17]. The temporal datasets contain data distribution shifts between training data and non-training data, as they are created with texts in different time periods. When comparing the results between with-distribution-shifts (i.e., temporal Wikipedia/ArXiv) and without-distribution-shifts (i.e., original Wikipedia/ArXiv), as shown in Table ?? in Appendix ??, we see no consistent performance improvement on the temporal datasets compared with common ones, as Wikipedia-temporal improves a lot from 68.8% to 75.6% while ArXiv-temporal performs a negative impact from 79.3% to 73.4%.

6 Conclusion

We provide an adaptive pre-training data detection method, which alleviate the reliance of verbatim memorization and effectively amplify the identification. Our method adaptively identify surprising tokens of the input, and detect whether the input is seen or not based on the hypothesis that seen data is less surprising for the model compared with unseen data. We construct data benchmark Dolma-Book, and evaluate our method on our benchmark and other existing benchmarks. Our work further suggests the impractical of simple application of traditional MIAs for pre-training data detection in LLMs, and we encourage the development of new strategies considering completely outside the verbatim memorization for achieving effective and robust pre-training data detection. We expect to see the positive social impact of our method and other work in line, especially in protecting private and copyright data.

References

- [1] J. Achiam, S. Adler, S. Agarwal, L. Ahmad, I. Akkaya, F. L. Aleman, D. Almeida, J. Altenschmidt, S. Altman, S. Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [2] R. Angelescu. Gutenbergpy. Version 0.3.5, 2013. URL <https://github.com/raduangelescu/gutenbergpy>.
- [3] S. Biderman, H. Schoelkopf, Q. G. Anthony, H. Bradley, K. O’Brien, E. Hallahan, M. A. Khan, S. Purohit, U. S. Prashanth, E. Raff, et al. Pythia: A suite for analyzing large language models across training and scaling. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2397–2430. PMLR, 2023.
- [4] S. Black, G. Leo, P. Wang, C. Leahy, and S. Biderman. GPT-Neo: Large Scale Autoregressive Language Modeling with Mesh-Tensorflow, Mar. 2021. URL <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5297715>.
- [5] T. Blevins and L. Zettlemoyer. Language contamination helps explains the cross-lingual capabilities of english pretrained models. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2022. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:252780005>.
- [6] H. Brown, K. Lee, F. Mireshghallah, R. Shokri, and F. Tramèr. What does it mean for a language model to preserve privacy? *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 2022. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:246823897>.
- [7] N. Carlini, F. Tramèr, E. Wallace, M. Jagielski, A. Herbert-Voss, K. Lee, A. Roberts, T. Brown, D. Song, Ú. Erlingsson, A. Oprea, and C. Raffel. Extracting training data from large language models. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*, pages 2633–2650. USENIX Association, Aug. 2021. ISBN 978-1-939133-24-3. URL <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity21/presentation/carlini-extracting>.
- [8] N. Carlini, F. Tramer, E. Wallace, M. Jagielski, A. Herbert-Voss, K. Lee, A. Roberts, T. Brown, D. Song, U. Erlingsson, et al. Extracting training data from large language models. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*, pages 2633–2650, 2021.
- [9] N. Carlini, S. Chien, M. Nasr, S. Song, A. Terzis, and F. Tramer. Membership inference attacks from first principles. In *2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 1897–1914. IEEE, 2022.
- [10] N. Carlini, D. Ippolito, M. Jagielski, K. Lee, F. Tramer, and C. Zhang. Quantifying memorization across neural language models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id=TatRHT_1cK.
- [11] K. K. Chang, M. H. Cramer, S. Soni, and D. Bamman. Speak, memory: An archaeology of books known to chatGPT/GPT-4. In *The 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Z65Wq2dvxB>.
- [12] C. A. Choquette-Choo, F. Tramer, N. Carlini, and N. Papernot. Label-only membership inference attacks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1964–1974. PMLR, 2021.
- [13] T. Chu, Z. Song, and C. Yang. How to protect copyright data in optimization of large language models? In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 17871–17879, 2024.
- [14] J. Devlin, M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In J. Burstein, C. Doran, and T. Solorio, editors, *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, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/N19-1423. URL <https://aclanthology.org/N19-1423>.

- [15] J. Dodge, A. Marasovic, G. Ilharco, D. Groeneveld, M. Mitchell, and M. Gardner. Documenting large webtext corpora: A case study on the colossal clean crawled corpus. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2021. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:237568724>.
- [16] X. L. Dong, S. Moon, Y. E. Xu, K. Malik, and Z. Yu. Towards next-generation intelligent assistants leveraging llm techniques. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 5792–5793, 2023.
- [17] M. Duan, A. Suri, N. Mireshghallah, S. Min, W. Shi, L. Zettlemoyer, Y. Tsvetkov, Y. Choi, D. Evans, and H. Hajishirzi. Do membership inference attacks work on large language models? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07841*, 2024.
- [18] L. Gao, S. Biderman, S. Black, L. Golding, T. Hoppe, C. Foster, J. Phang, H. He, A. Thite, N. Nabeshima, et al. The pile: An 800gb dataset of diverse text for language modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00027*, 2020.
- [19] S. Golchin and M. Surdeanu. Time travel in LLMs: Tracing data contamination in large language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=2Rwq6c3tvr>.
- [20] D. Groeneveld, I. Beltagy, P. Walsh, A. Bhagia, R. Kinney, O. Tafjord, A. Jha, H. Ivison, I. Mognusson, Y. Wang, S. Arora, D. Atkinson, R. Authur, K. R. Chandu, A. Cohan, J. Dumas, Y. Elazar, Y. Gu, J. Hessel, T. Khot, W. Merrill, J. D. Morrison, N. Muennighoff, A. Naik, C. Nam, M. E. Peters, V. Pyatkin, A. Ravichander, D. Schwenk, S. Shah, W. Smith, E. Strubell, N. Subramani, M. Wortsman, P. Dasigi, N. Lambert, K. Richardson, L. Zettlemoyer, J. Dodge, K. Lo, L. Soldaini, N. A. Smith, and H. Hajishirzi. Olmo: Accelerating the science of language models. *arXiv preprint*, 2024. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:267365485>.
- [21] V. Hartmann, A. Suri, V. Bindschaedler, D. Evans, S. Tople, and R. West. Sok: Memorization in general-purpose large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.18362*, 2023.
- [22] P. Henderson, X. Li, D. Jurafsky, T. Hashimoto, M. A. Lemley, and P. Liang. Foundation models and fair use, 2023.
- [23] H. Hu, Z. Salcic, L. Sun, G. Dobbie, P. S. Yu, and X. Zhang. Membership inference attacks on machine learning: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 54(11s):1–37, 2022.
- [24] H. Huang, Y. Feng, C. Shi, L. Xu, J. Yu, and S. Yang. Free-bloom: Zero-shot text-to-video generator with llm director and ldm animator. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [25] D. Ippolito, F. Tramèr, M. Nasr, C. Zhang, M. Jagielski, K. Lee, C. A. Choquette-Choo, and N. Carlini. Preventing verbatim memorization in language models gives a false sense of privacy, 2023.
- [26] S. Kim, S. Yun, H. Lee, M. Gubri, S. Yoon, and S. J. Oh. Propile: Probing privacy leakage in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [27] J. Kirchenbauer, J. Geiping, Y. Wen, J. Katz, I. Miers, and T. Goldstein. A watermark for large language models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 17061–17084. PMLR, 2023.
- [28] H. Li, D. Guo, W. Fan, M. Xu, J. Huang, F. Meng, and Y. Song. Multi-step jailbreaking privacy attacks on chatgpt. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05197*, 2023.
- [29] J. Li, T. Tang, W. X. Zhao, J.-Y. Nie, and J.-R. Wen. Pre-trained language models for text generation: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 56(9):1–39, 2024.
- [30] Z. Li, S. Fan, Y. Gu, X. Li, Z. Duan, B. Dong, N. Liu, and J. Wang. Flexkbqa: A flexible llm-powered framework for few-shot knowledge base question answering. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 18608–18616, 2024.

- [31] N. Lukas, A. Salem, R. Sim, S. Tople, L. Wutschitz, and S. Zanella-Beguelin. Analyzing leakage of personally identifiable information in language models. In *2023 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 346–363, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, may 2023. IEEE Computer Society. doi: 10.1109/SP46215.2023.10179300. URL <https://doi.ieeecomputersociety.org/10.1109/SP46215.2023.10179300>.
- [32] I. Magar and R. Schwartz. Data contamination: From memorization to exploitation. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 157–165, Dublin, Ireland, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2022.acl-short.18. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.acl-short.18>.
- [33] J. Mattern, F. Mireshghallah, Z. Jin, B. Schoelkopf, M. Sachan, and T. Berg-Kirkpatrick. Membership inference attacks against language models via neighbourhood comparison. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 11330–11343, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-acl.719>.
- [34] F. Mireshghallah, K. Goyal, A. Uniyal, T. Berg-Kirkpatrick, and R. Shokri. Quantifying privacy risks of masked language models using membership inference attacks. In Y. Goldberg, Z. Kozareva, and Y. Zhang, editors, *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 8332–8347, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, Dec. 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2022.emnlp-main.570. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.emnlp-main.570>.
- [35] F. Mireshghallah, K. Goyal, A. Uniyal, T. Berg-Kirkpatrick, and R. Shokri. Quantifying privacy risks of masked language models using membership inference attacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.03929*, 2022.
- [36] M. Mozes, X. He, B. Kleinberg, and L. D. Griffin. Use of llms for illicit purposes: Threats, prevention measures, and vulnerabilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12833*, 2023.
- [37] Y. Oren, N. Meister, N. S. Chatterji, F. Ladhak, and T. Hashimoto. Proving test set contamination in black-box language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=KS8mIvetg2>.
- [38] X. Pan, M. Zhang, S. Ji, and M. Yang. Privacy risks of general-purpose language models. In *2020 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 1314–1331. IEEE, 2020.
- [39] X. Qi, K. Huang, A. Panda, P. Henderson, M. Wang, and P. Mittal. Visual adversarial examples jailbreak aligned large language models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 21527–21536, 2024.
- [40] C. E. Shannon. A mathematical theory of communication. *The Bell system technical journal*, 27(3):379–423, 1948.
- [41] W. Shi, A. Ajith, M. Xia, Y. Huang, D. Liu, T. Blevins, D. Chen, and L. Zettlemoyer. Detecting pretraining data from large language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=zWqr3MQUNs>.
- [42] R. Shokri, M. Stronati, C. Song, and V. Shmatikov. Membership inference attacks against machine learning models. In *2017 IEEE symposium on security and privacy (SP)*, pages 3–18. IEEE, 2017.
- [43] R. Thoppilan, D. De Freitas, J. Hall, N. Shazeer, A. Kulshreshtha, H.-T. Cheng, A. Jin, T. Bos, L. Baker, Y. Du, et al. Lamda: Language models for dialog applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.08239*, 2022.
- [44] K. Tirumala, A. Markosyan, L. Zettlemoyer, and A. Aghajanyan. Memorization without overfitting: Analyzing the training dynamics of large language models. In S. Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 38274–38290. Curran Associates, Inc., 2022. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/file/fa0509f4dab6807e2cb465715bf2d249-Paper-Conference.pdf.

- [45] H. Touvron, T. Lavril, G. Izacard, X. Martinet, M.-A. Lachaux, T. Lacroix, B. Rozière, N. Goyal, E. Hambro, F. Azhar, A. Rodriguez, A. Joulin, E. Grave, and G. Lample. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models, 2023.
- [46] N. Vyas, S. M. Kakade, and B. Barak. On provable copyright protection for generative models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 35277–35299. PMLR, 2023.
- [47] L. Watson, C. Guo, G. Cormode, and A. Sablayrolles. On the importance of difficulty calibration in membership inference attacks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=3eIrl10TwQ>.
- [48] Y. Yao, J. Duan, K. Xu, Y. Cai, Z. Sun, and Y. Zhang. A survey on large language model (llm) security and privacy: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *High-Confidence Computing*, page 100211, 2024.
- [49] S. Yeom, I. Giacomelli, M. Fredrikson, and S. Jha. Privacy risk in machine learning: Analyzing the connection to overfitting. In *2018 IEEE 31st computer security foundations symposium (CSF)*, pages 268–282. IEEE, 2018.
- [50] D. Yu, S. Naik, A. Backurs, S. Gopi, H. A. Inan, G. Kamath, J. Kulkarni, Y. T. Lee, A. Manoel, L. Wutschitz, et al. Differentially private fine-tuning of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.06500*, 2021.
- [51] Z. Yu, Y. Wu, N. Zhang, C. Wang, Y. Vorobeychik, and C. Xiao. CodeIPPrompt: Intellectual property infringement assessment of code language models. In A. Krause, E. Brunskill, K. Cho, B. Engelhardt, S. Sabato, and J. Scarlett, editors, *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 40373–40389. PMLR, 23–29 Jul 2023. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v202/yu23g.html>.