

On the Generalization Ability of Machine-Generated Text Detectors

Yule Liu^{1*} Zhiyuan Zhong^{1,2*} Yifan Liao³ Zhen Sun¹ Jingyi Zheng¹

Jiaheng Wei¹ Qingyuan Gong⁴ Fenghua Tong⁵ Yang Chen⁴ Yang Zhang⁶ Xinlei He^{1†}

¹*The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (Guangzhou)*

²*Southern University of Science and Technology*

³*National University of Singapore (Chongqing Research Institute)*

⁴*Fudan University* ⁵*Qilu University of Technology* ⁶*CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security*

Abstract

The rise of large language models (LLMs) has raised concerns about machine-generated text (MGT), including ethical and practical issues like plagiarism and misinformation. Building a robust and highly generalizable MGT detection system has become increasingly important. This work investigates the generalization capabilities of MGT detectors in three aspects: First, we construct MGT-Academic, a large-scale dataset focused on academic writing, featuring human-written texts (HWTs) and MGTs across STEM, Humanities, and Social Sciences, paired with an extensible code framework for efficient benchmarking. Second, we investigate the transferability of detectors across domains and LLMs, leveraging fine-grained datasets to reveal insights into domain transferring and implementing few-shot techniques to improve the performance by roughly 13.2%. Third, we introduce a novel attribution task where models must adapt to new classes over time without (or with very limited) access to prior training data and benchmark detectors. We implement several adapting techniques to improve the performance by roughly 10% and highlight the inherent complexity of the task. Our findings provide insights into the generalization ability of MGT detectors across diverse scenarios and lay the foundation for building robust, adaptive detection systems. The code framework is available at <https://github.com/Y-L-LIU/MGTBench-2.0>.

1 Introduction

Recent advancements in large language models (LLMs) showcase their strong ability in tackling a wide range of natural language processing (NLP) tasks [30, 22, 21]. Its versatility and superiority across numerous domains unlock remarkable real-world applications, e.g., education, idea crafting, and context refinement [38]. However, the ease and convenience have opened the door to abuse, particularly in aca-

demically writing and creative industries, leading to severe ethical and practical challenges [32]. Recent efforts [18, 2] have focused on developing techniques to distinguish machine-generated text (MGT) from human-written text (HWT) and benchmarking their performance [8], primarily in binary classification tasks, where the goal is to determine whether a given text is MGT or HWT. Besides binary classification, the text attribution task, which aims to identify the specific source LLM that generated the text, presents additional challenges and remains under-explored.

In this work, we conduct an in-depth investigation of the generalization ability of MGT detectors in the following aspects: First, we construct a large-scale MGT dataset named MGT-Academic focused on academic writing, comprising over 20M tokens and 73K samples across three academic domains: STEM, Humanities, and Social Sciences. Within each domain, we collect HWT data from Wikipedia and academic texts sourced including Arxiv or Project Gutenberg, depending on the scenario. Each HWT has corresponding MGTs generated by five popular LLMs. Further, we build a publicly available, extendable, and user-friendly code framework for the community, which enables fast and effective benchmarking for existing methods in binary classification and text attribution tasks.

Second, leveraging the MGT-Academic, we perform an in-depth investigation of the transferability of detectors, focusing on enhancing the generalization capabilities of detectors across diverse data distributions. Specifically, we conduct extensive experiments to explore how detectors adapt to specific domains, such as STEM, Humanity, and Social Science, as well as leading LLMs like GPT-4o-mini and Llama-3.1-70b. This dataset enables fine-grained analysis of MGT detectors' transferability. Additionally, we adopt techniques to improve the transferability by adding few-shot examples from the target domains or LLMs to investigate how to adapt the detectors effectively.

Third, since new LLMs are continuously released, each with different characteristics and unique stylistics, we con-

*Equal contribution.

†Corresponding author (xinleihe@hkust-gz.edu.cn).




Figure 1: Overview of our work. The left side shows the data source and splitted domains of MGT-Academic. The right side shows the experiments we conducted in this work.

consider a new attribution task, where a model would adapt to the new class introduced over time without (or with very limited) access to the original training data for earlier classes. This task is crucial for real-world applications where MGTs from new LLMs become available in stages and retraining the model from scratch is impractical due to computational or data storage constraints. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to discuss how the detectors adapt to new MGTs in detection. We benchmark the performance of detectors when adapting to new LLMs and equip the detector with five different techniques to improve the performance. In summary, our contributions can be listed as follows:

- We introduce MGT-Academic, a large-scale MGT dataset focused on academic writing, encompassing over 20M tokens and 73K samples across three academic domains: STEM, Humanities, and Social Sciences. We additionally provide an extensible code framework, which will be made publicly available, to efficiently benchmark existing MGT detectors in different tasks.
- We conduct extensive experiments to reveal insights into the transferability of detectors across different domains (e.g., STEM, Humanities, and Social Sciences) and LLMs like GPT-4o-mini and Llama-3.1-70b. We further evaluate the few-shot domain adaptation technique and find that it can achieve a 13.2% improvement in target domains/LLMs and a 3.7% improvement in the attribution task, offering a promising strategy to enhance transferability.
- We introduce a new text attribution task where models adapt to new classes over time without (or with very limited) access to prior training data. We benchmark various detectors and implement several adaptation techniques, achieving approximately a 10% improvement in performance. Nevertheless, the remaining performance gap highlights the complexity of this task, underscoring the need for further investigation in the future.

2 Related Work

MGT Detection. Recent advancements in LLMs have empowered users to tackle a wide range of NLP tasks, demonstrating their versatility and superiority across numerous domains [30, 22, 21]. Exploiting LLMs is especially convenient in academic writing [38, 16], such as generating ideas, drafting articles, or refining content. However, the ease and convenience can be significantly abused, raising concerns about authenticity, as well as ethical questions regarding originality and over-dependence on AI-generated content [37, 3]. To prevent the misuse of MGT data, recent studies [1, 4, 6, 18, 8] have developed a variety of MGT detectors, which can be broadly categorized into metric-based and model-based methods. Metric-based methods [4, 18, 29] leverage proxy LLMs to extract features from processed text and train an additional classifier to model the relationship between features and labels. In contrast, model-based methods [10, 6] typically integrate a classification head into a BERT model and fine-tune the augmented model on supervised datasets. The detectors benchmarked in this paper are listed in Appendix E.

Several efforts have aimed to benchmark the performance of MGT detectors. For example, MGTBench [8] provided a comprehensive evaluation framework for these detectors, which utilizes existing HWT datasets, including Essay, WP, and Reuters. M4GTBench [32] extended this by benchmarking performance on multilingual and multi-source datasets. Additionally, DetectRL [34] assessed detectors’ robustness and generalization capabilities in the face of adversarial attacks. While existing studies emphasize transferability across datasets and LLMs in binary classification, they pay less attention to the generalization ability of detectors in attribution tasks.

Class Incremental Learning. Class Incremental Learning (CIL) is a subset of continual learning and is critical for real-world applications where data becomes available in stages

Table 1: Experiment Result for In-distribution Binary Classification. We train and test the detectors on the same data domain. The results are reported using F1 score. ST. represents STEM, Hu. represents Humanity, and So. represents Social Science. The larger values with blue colors indicate better performance and lower values with red colors indicate weaker performance. For the abnormal results, we use “-” as the replace holder.

Method	Llama-3.1-70b			Mixtral-8×7b			MoonShot-8k			GPT-4o-mini			GPT-3.5		
	ST.	Hu.	So.	ST.	Hu.	So.	ST.	Hu.	So.	ST.	Hu.	So.	ST.	Hu.	So.
LL	0.714	0.794	0.803	0.662	0.749	0.809	0.711	0.760	0.806	0.638	0.689	0.765	0.481	0.606	0.709
Entropy	0.759	0.707	0.829	0.688	0.659	0.795	0.723	0.662	0.780	0.683	0.686	0.763	0.679	0.640	0.700
Rank	0.618	0.697	0.713	0.617	0.695	0.719	0.685	0.750	0.817	0.643	0.651	0.627	0.678	-	0.571
Log-Rank	0.736	0.709	0.795	0.655	0.596	0.732	0.688	0.650	0.773	0.639	0.615	0.704	0.648	0.591	0.708
Rank-GLTR	0.720	0.759	0.802	0.655	0.701	0.808	0.600	0.734	0.795	0.658	0.693	0.713	0.620	0.679	0.694
Fast-DetectGPT	0.817	0.817	0.887	0.760	0.759	0.842	0.842	0.801	0.899	0.688	0.718	0.752	0.677	0.713	0.756
Binoculars	0.881	0.897	0.911	0.833	0.845	0.890	0.923	0.867	0.916	0.710	0.772	0.800	0.680	0.803	0.792
RADAR	0.470	0.524	0.574	0.396	0.530	0.603	0.427	0.564	0.597	0.426	0.609	0.672	0.547	0.793	0.736
ChatGPT-D	0.557	0.552	0.712	0.452	0.526	0.642	0.531	0.643	0.743	0.280	0.320	0.454	0.458	0.679	0.625
DistillBert-F	0.987	0.983	0.971	0.977	0.983	0.976	0.988	0.991	0.990	0.983	0.988	0.982	0.983	0.979	0.966
Roberta-F	0.987	0.994	0.994	0.992	0.997	0.995	0.993	0.992	0.997	0.987	0.993	0.994	0.986	0.986	0.981

Table 2: Experiment Result for In-distribution Text Attribution. We train and test the model on the same data domain. The results are reported using F1 score. The larger values with blue colors indicate better performance and lower values with red colors indicate weaker performance.

	LL	Entropy	Rank	LRR	Rank-GLTR	Fast-Detect	Binoculars	DistillBert-F	RoBERTa-F
STEM	0.1661	0.1941	0.1392	0.1581	0.1412	0.2137	0.2188	0.8444	0.8881
Humanities	0.1806	0.1422	0.1481	0.1182	0.1334	0.2251	0.1483	0.7835	0.8151
Social Science	0.2151	0.2282	0.1624	0.1894	0.1912	0.2849	0.2141	0.8174	0.8177

and retraining the model from scratch is impractical due to computational or data storage constraints [15, 39]. A primary challenge in CIL is preventing the model from forgetting previously learned classes when updated with new data, known as catastrophic forgetting [12, 11]. One way to prevent catastrophic forgetting is to incorporate a distillation loss or regularization term to transfer knowledge from the old model to the updated one, thus reducing forgetting [13, 27]. Another way is to store a small subset of past representative data to enable the model to rehearse earlier tasks [25]. Additionally, some other work explores calibrating the output layer of the classification head to improve the performance [35].

Adapting the detector to new LLM data is a simplified version of CIL, since there is only one new stage and class. Some efforts have discussed the CIL in classification tasks such as entailment or intent classification [36, 23]. To the best of our knowledge, our work is the first to adapt existing detectors to new LLMs in the MGT attribution task.

3 Construction of MGT-Academic

3.1 MGT-Academic Collection

In this section, we describe the sources and principles for collecting both human and machine data.

Human Data. Since exploiting LLMs brings great convenience to academic usage, e.g., generating ideas, drafting articles, or refining content, we collect data in three academic

domains, i.e., STEM, Social Science, and Humanity, where each domain contains different fine-grained fields. Each field consists of Wikipedia and academic texts, with the academic content collected from Arxiv (pre-print papers) or Project Gutenberg (published e-books), depending on the scenario. The details are shown in Table A1. For Wikipedia data, we collect content from two-level sub-topics within each field. For Project Gutenberg data, we randomly sample paragraphs from books within each field, excluding tables of contents. For Arxiv data, we sample abstracts, introductions, and conclusions from papers in each field, ensuring they were submitted before 2023, which is earlier than the release of mainstream LLMs such as ChatGPT. Specifically, the content is written in latex code and may include formulas. We keep the latex format as it can increase the diversity of the dataset in academic writing scenarios.

Machine Data. We select five widely used LLMs, including Llama-3.1-70b-Instruct [30], Mixtral-8×7b-Instruct [17], KimiChat [19], ChatGPT, GPT-4omini [20] to generate the MGTs. Llama-3.1-70b-Instruct and Mixtral-8×7b-Instruct are two commonly used open-source LLMs that exploit dense and MoE architecture respectively. Moonshot, ChatGPT, and GPT-4omini are popular proprietary models, with Moonshot known for its long-context understanding and the GPT family recognized for its comprehensive capabilities. We prompt the LLM to be a wiki/paper/book editor and polish the given human text, which is consistent with the previ-

ous dataset [18, 32]. The prompts for generating MGT data are listed in Appendix A. Other details of dataset construction are listed in Appendix B.

3.2 MGT-Academic Analysis

We conduct further analysis of text length, embeddings, and keywords on MGT-Academic to provide more insights into understanding the MGT detection task, which is shown in Appendix C. We find that data from different domains and LLMs exhibit distinct distributions across all these aspects. These differences highlight the importance of studying the generalization ability of MGT detectors.

3.3 Code Framework

Our framework follows the factory design pattern and implements *AutoDetector* and *AutoExperiment* for abstraction, which is aligned with the approach used in Huggingface Transformers [33], the most widely used library in NLP community. It provides an easy-to-use and extendable code framework for the community and is publicly available. More design details are in Appendix D.

4 Benchmarking MGT Detectors

We benchmark the performance of detectors in binary classification tasks, which predicts binary labels (human or machine) for the setting where training and testing data are in the same domain. Then, we benchmark the performance in text attribution tasks, which aims to tell whether the input text is human-written or generated by a specific LLM. Compared to the binary task, the text attribution task appears to be a more challenging multi-class classification task.

4.1 In-distribution Performance

Experiment Settings. For each domain, we first sample the same number of HWTs and MGTs from the corresponding domains, then randomly split them into the train/test dataset with a 80%/20% ratio. For the evaluation metric, we select the F1 score, which balances precision and recall and is robust against class imbalance. The experimental details are shown in Appendix F. Regarding the detectors, we benchmark various detectors on MGT-Academic, covering both metric-based and model-based approaches.

For metric-based detectors, we evaluate Log-Likelihood, Entropy, Rank, Rank-GLTR [4], LRR [29], Fast-DetectGPT [2], and Binoculars [7]. We use Llama-2-7B as the default white-box model, determining an optimal threshold to maximize the F1-score for binary classification or training a logistic regression classifier for text attribution. For model-based detectors, we include RADAR [9], ChatGPT-D [6], DistillBERT [28], and RoBERTa [14]. RADAR and ChatGPT-D use their officially released model weights, while DistillBERT and RoBERTa are fine-tuned with classification heads on MGT-Academic. Further details are provided in Appendix E.

Binary Classification Task. The performance of the binary classification task are shown in Table 1. First, we observe

that supervised model-based detectors consistently outperform other methods, achieving F1 scores above 0.98. This advantage is largely due to the availability of extensive supervised training data, enabling these detectors to learn highly effective classification boundaries. Second, model-based detectors using released weights show comparatively weaker performance, as they were trained on smaller and less diverse datasets. Previous study [8] has demonstrated that these detectors can achieve comparable performance to supervised models after fine-tuning with a dedicated training dataset. This highlights the inherent challenges in the generalization ability of model-based detectors. Third, metric-based detectors show notable improvement over time, with state-of-the-art (SOTA) methods like Fast-DetectGPT and Binoculars approaching the performance of supervised model-based detectors. Despite their advancements, these state-of-the-art metric-based detectors show only moderate performance on outputs from GPT-4o-mini and GPT-3.5. This may stem from the inability of the metric generators to effectively extract distinguishing features from these datasets.

Attribution Task. Since RADAR and ChatGPT-D are not designed for the attribution task, they are excluded from this evaluation. The remaining results for the attribution task are presented in Table 2. As the attribution task is more challenging, the performance is overall lower than that of binary classification. The metric-based detectors show almost no capability for text attribution, performing at a level close to random guessing. The performance of model-based detectors is better but there is still space to improve. These findings highlight that text attribution is a critical yet underexplored task. The poor performance, particularly of zero-shot metric-based detectors, underscores the need for further research and development to address this significant gap in detection capabilities.

Additionally, we conduct an ablation study for two important factors in metric-based detectors, i.e., LLM metric generator and the classifier, and the results are shown in Appendix G.

4.2 On the Generalization Ability in Domain Transferring

We conduct comprehensive experiments under domain-transferring settings to show the generalization ability of different kinds of detectors. First, for the binary classification task, we consider two cases where the domain or LLM during training and testing data are different. Second, for the attribution tasks, we only consider that the data domains during training and testing are different. Third, we implement a few-shot domain adaptation technique to mitigate the performance drop.

Experiment Settings. For each domain, we first select the same number of HWTs and MGTs from the corresponding domains or LLMs, then randomly split them into the train/test dataset with an 80%/20% ratio. During training, the detectors get an optimal threshold on the data of the source domain/LLM, which will be used in the testing stage to predict the data of target domain/LLM.

Specifically, we only choose the representative detec-

Table 3: Experiment Result for Transferring Across Different Domains in Binary Classification. We train the model on one domain and test the model on the other domain. ST. represents STEM, Hu. represents Humanity, and So. represents Social Science. The results are reported using F1 score. The larger values with blue colors indicate better performance and lower values with red colors indicate weaker performance.

Method	Target Topic →	LLama3			Mixtral			Moonshot			GPT-4o-mini			GPT-3.5		
	Source Topic ↓	Hu.	ST.	So.	Hu.	ST.	So.	Hu.	ST.	So.	Hu.	ST.	So.	Hu.	ST.	So.
log-likelihood	Hu.	0.794	0.736	0.805	0.749	0.688	0.815	0.760	0.723	0.816	0.689	0.683	0.759	0.606	0.535	0.656
	ST.	0.682	0.714	0.790	0.671	0.662	0.805	0.740	0.711	0.818	0.569	0.638	0.696	0.546	0.481	0.592
	So.	0.743	0.732	0.803	0.682	0.666	0.809	0.703	0.683	0.806	0.709	0.682	0.765	0.691	0.598	0.709
Rank GLTR	Hu.	0.759	0.749	0.810	0.701	0.701	0.815	0.734	0.726	0.799	0.693	0.671	0.747	0.679	0.619	0.719
	ST.	0.617	0.720	0.784	0.611	0.655	0.772	0.562	0.600	0.701	0.598	0.658	0.711	0.680	0.620	0.721
	So.	0.684	0.748	0.802	0.662	0.680	0.808	0.686	0.709	0.795	0.592	0.660	0.713	0.644	0.586	0.694
Binoculars	Hu.	0.897	0.879	0.887	0.845	0.836	0.873	0.867	0.899	0.883	0.772	0.700	0.802	0.803	0.663	0.792
	ST.	0.899	0.881	0.903	0.854	0.833	0.880	0.854	0.923	0.908	0.748	0.710	0.748	0.694	0.680	0.658
	So.	0.877	0.883	0.911	0.813	0.824	0.890	0.834	0.924	0.916	0.738	0.639	0.800	0.801	0.670	0.792
Fast-DetectGPT	Hu.	0.817	0.799	0.868	0.759	0.761	0.840	0.801	0.842	0.895	0.718	0.688	0.740	0.713	0.672	0.758
	ST.	0.819	0.817	0.878	0.765	0.760	0.843	0.801	0.842	0.897	0.723	0.688	0.754	0.702	0.677	0.689
	So.	0.815	0.816	0.887	0.769	0.755	0.842	0.802	0.837	0.899	0.725	0.689	0.752	0.695	0.656	0.756
DistillBert-F	Hu.	0.978	0.876	0.930	0.985	0.870	0.941	0.992	0.890	0.963	0.987	0.915	0.958	0.977	0.810	0.918
	ST.	0.840	0.987	0.967	0.932	0.980	0.958	0.946	0.989	0.986	0.919	0.981	0.971	0.942	0.985	0.946
	So.	0.938	0.940	0.957	0.963	0.957	0.975	0.972	0.976	0.987	0.982	0.978	0.982	0.964	0.943	0.960
Roberta-F	Hu.	0.995	0.984	0.995	0.997	0.993	0.994	0.994	0.987	0.996	0.994	0.991	0.996	0.986	0.907	0.959
	ST.	0.992	0.987	0.995	0.997	0.993	0.993	0.989	0.994	0.998	0.988	0.987	0.993	0.975	0.986	0.973
	So.	0.993	0.985	0.995	0.998	0.995	0.996	0.988	0.988	0.997	0.993	0.994	0.995	0.980	0.988	0.983

Table 4: Experiment Result for Transferring Across Different LLMs in Binary Classification. We train the model on data generated by one LLM and test the model on the data generated by another LLM. ST. represents STEM, Hu. represents Humanity, and So. represents Social Science. The results are reported using F1 score and averaged across three domains. The larger values with blue colors indicate better performance and lower values with red colors indicate worse performance.

	Target Topic →	Llama3.1					Mixtral					Moonshot					GPT-4omini					GPT-3.5				
	Source Topic ↓	Llama3.1	Mixtral	Moonshot	GPT-4omini	GPT-3.5	Llama3.1	Mixtral	Moonshot	GPT-4omini	GPT-3.5	Llama3.1	Mixtral	Moonshot	GPT-4omini	GPT-3.5	Llama3.1	Mixtral	Moonshot	GPT-4omini	GPT-3.5	Llama3.1	Mixtral	Moonshot	GPT-4omini	GPT-3.5
log-likelihood	Llama3.1	0.770	0.735	0.734	0.647	0.618	Fast-DetectGPT	Llama3.1	0.840	0.777	0.847	0.535	0.620													
	Mixtral	0.775	0.740	0.748	0.658	0.627		Mixtral	0.837	0.787	0.845	0.630	0.672													
	Moonshot	0.781	0.745	0.759	0.675	0.637		Moonshot	0.842	0.783	0.847	0.568	0.642													
	GPT-4omini	0.775	0.745	0.758	0.697	0.647		GPT-4omini	0.755	0.755	0.765	0.719	0.713													
	GPT-3.5	0.735	0.706	0.707	0.612	0.599		GPT-3.5	0.768	0.764	0.772	0.714	0.715													
Rank GLTR	Llama3.1	0.760	0.719	0.707	0.602	0.626	DistillBert-F	Llama3.1	0.974	0.941	0.983	0.899	0.837													
	Mixtral	0.765	0.721	0.714	0.614	0.636		Mixtral	0.965	0.980	0.988	0.867	0.824													
	Moonshot	0.762	0.723	0.710	0.615	0.632		Moonshot	0.916	0.906	0.989	0.887	0.720													
	GPT-4omini	0.778	0.749	0.752	0.688	0.680		GPT-4omini	0.898	0.853	0.975	0.983	0.680													
	GPT-3.5	0.771	0.739	0.740	0.650	0.664		GPT-3.5	0.602	0.616	0.673	0.552	0.974													
Binoculars	Llama3.1	0.896	0.858	0.901	0.694	0.743	Roberta-F	Llama3.1	0.992	0.991	0.992	0.989	0.891													
	Mixtral	0.893	0.856	0.900	0.717	0.746		Mixtral	0.982	0.995	0.991	0.990	0.892													
	Moonshot	0.894	0.856	0.902	0.707	0.742		Moonshot	0.988	0.989	0.995	0.985	0.884													
	GPT-4omini	0.832	0.819	0.832	0.761	0.756		GPT-4omini	0.986	0.994	0.991	0.992	0.897													
	GPT-3.5	0.818	0.802	0.806	0.725	0.758		GPT-3.5	0.910	0.935	0.938	0.879	0.985													

Table 5: Experiment Result for Transferring Across Different Domains in Text Attribution. We train the model on data in one domain and test the model on another domain. The results are reported using F1 score. The larger values with blue colors indicate better performance and lower values with red colors indicate weaker performance.

		Humanity			STEM			Social Science					Humanity			STEM			Social Science		
		Humanity	STEM	Social Science	Humanity	STEM	Social Science	Humanity	STEM	Social Science			Humanity	STEM	Social Science	Humanity	STEM	Social Science			
LL	Humanity	0.181	0.160	0.204	Binoculars	Humanity	0.148	0.155	0.182	FastDetectGPT	Humanity	0.225	0.221	0.250							
	STEM	0.158	0.166	0.186		STEM	0.195	0.219	0.244		STEM	0.213	0.214	0.247							
	Social Science	0.176	0.185	0.215		Social Science	0.178	0.191	0.214		Social Science	0.251	0.241	0.285							
Rank GLTR	Humanity	0.133	0.128	0.167	DistillBert-F	Humanity	0.784	0.592	0.715	Roberta-F	Humanity	0.815	0.674	0.762							
	STEM	0.125	0.141	0.158		STEM	0.651	0.844	0.781		STEM	0.727	0.883	0.814							
	Social Science	0.153	0.167	0.191		Social Science	0.718	0.828	0.817		Social Science	0.727	0.827	0.818							

tors of different kinds, i.e., LL, RankGLTR, FastDetectGPT, Binoculars in metric-based detectors, and DistilBert, RoBERTa in supervised model-based detectors. We report the results using F1 score and the training hyperparameters are shown in Appendix F.

Transferring in Binary Classification Task. The domain transferring performance in binary tasks across different domains and LLMs is summarized in Table 3 and Table 4, respectively. We observe that, regarding domain transferring, zero-shot metric-based detectors exhibit limited robustness in domain adaptation. The threshold values for distinguishing between MGT and HWT vary significantly across domains, making consistent performance difficult to achieve. Interestingly, we find that the optimal threshold derived from the training data of one domain often performs competitively in others. Additionally, supervised model-based detectors demonstrate promising domain adaptation capabilities, maintaining high performance across different domains. This robustness underscores their potential for broad applications.

Regarding LLM transferring, fine-grained results for each domain are detailed in Appendix H, and the average performance is reported in Table 4. Zero-shot metric-based detectors struggle notably when predicting results for texts generated by the GPT family of LLMs, highlighting a specific area for improvement. While supervised model-based detectors continue to lead overall, domain adaptation across different LLMs is a more challenging task. Similarly, we conduct the ablation study for two important factors in metric-based detectors, and the results are shown in Appendix H.

Transferring in Attribution Task. The domain transferring performance in attribution tasks across different domains is summarized in Table 5. We have several observations. First, the metric-based detectors still perform poorly, while the model-based detectors show acceptable performance. Second, the supervised model-based detectors show worse transferability than binary classification tasks. Since attribution tasks require the representations to capture more sophisticated features, it is harder for detectors to generate embeddings for transferring.




Figure 2: Mitigation Result for Domain Transferring. The left figure shows the result of transferring to Llama-3.1’s outputs in binary classification. The right figure shows the result of transferring to the Social Science domain in the attribution task.

Mitigating Techniques. To enhance detector transferability, We incorporate limited labeled examples from the target domain. Figure 2 reports the average performance for binary

classification when transferring to Llama-3.1’s outputs (left) and model attribution when transferring to the Social Science domain (right). Full results are provided in Appendix H. The results demonstrate that adding labeled samples from the target domain improves the performance of supervised model-based detectors. For the binary classification (attribution), the performance improves by 13.2% (3.7%) on average. Interestingly, zero-shot metric-based detectors also show enhanced performance, suggesting that the derived threshold may be domain-specific.

4.3 On the Generalization to New LLMs

Since new LLMs with different characteristics are continuously released, we study a new attribution task where the detector would adapt to the new class introduced over time without (or with very limited) access to the original training data for earlier classes. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to introduce this task into MGT detection.

Experiment Settings. For simplicity, we mainly study the scenario where only one new LLM is introduced to the original detector (trained with HWT and four types of MGTs). We also consider the case where the two latest LLMs are introduced to the original detector (see Appendix J for more details). The objective of the original detector is to learn a five-class classifier. During the update stage, the training data only consists of MGTs from one new LLM and (optionally) with limited budgets of samples from previous LLMs and humans, while the testing data includes balanced data from all six classes. The new learning objective is to extend the previous five-class classifier into a six-class classifier.

Since the metric-based detectors generally show poor performance close to random guess in attribution tasks, our study mainly focuses on the two supervised model-based detectors, i.e., DistilBert and RoBERTa, for this more challenging setting. At the update stage, we lower the learning rate to 1/4 of the original value and initialize a new classification head with one extra dimension to adapt to the newly introduced class. This approach is widely used by previous work [13] and ensures the detector incrementally adapts to new classes. We evaluate the performance of detectors using several widely-used adapting techniques, i.e., LwF [13], iCaRL [25], BiC [35], and combination. The training details and techniques are provided in Appendix F.

Results. The results are shown in Table 6. First, we evaluate the performance of two supervised models equipped with five different techniques during the update stage. The results reveal a performance drop compared to the standard six-class attribution task, primarily due to catastrophic forgetting [13] as we mentioned in Section 2. Among the models, RoBERTa consistently outperforms the other, reflecting its stronger context-understanding ability. Second, employing different techniques can effectively mitigate performance degradation. For instance, the performance of RoBERTa improves by 1%, 10.75%, 10.59%, and 10.63% respectively, using the four shown techniques. Techniques such as iCaRL and BiC demonstrate competitive results, with each excelling in specific domains or LLMs. Despite these improvements, the results remain below the upper-bound performance ob-

Table 6: Experiment Result for Adapting to new LLM in Text Attribution. We split the data into two parts: one part consists of five classes of data to train the original model and the other consists of one new class of data for adaptation, which is indicated by Last Model. The results are reported using the F1 score. The larger values with blue colors indicate better performance and lower values with red colors indicate weaker performance.

Domain	Last Model	DistilBert					Attribution	RoBERTa					Attribution
		Normal	LwF	iCaRL	BiC	Combine		Normal	LwF	iCaRL	BiC	Combine	
Social Science	GPT-3.5	0.5459	0.545	0.6013	0.5923	0.5923	0.8174	0.5380	0.5114	0.5985	0.5960	0.5966	0.8177
	Mixtral	0.6099	0.6099	0.6253	0.6341	0.6341		0.6168	0.6164	0.6604	0.6588	0.6566	
	Moonshot	0.5401	0.5401	0.6214	0.6215	0.6215		0.5844	0.5849	0.6580	0.6383	0.6383	
	Llama3	0.6595	0.6591	0.6500	0.6585	0.6581		0.6108	0.6105	0.6638	0.6686	0.6695	
	GPT-4omini	0.5793	0.5798	0.5881	0.5906	0.5906		0.5951	0.5946	0.6014	0.6121	0.6117	
	Average	0.5869	0.5868	0.6172	0.6194	0.6193		0.5890	0.5835	0.6364	0.6348	0.6345	
STEM	GPT-3.5	0.6077	0.5999	0.6319	0.6355	0.6348	0.8444	0.6151	0.6595	0.6555	0.6579	0.6585	0.8881
	Mixtral	0.6258	0.6262	0.6742	0.6651	0.6668		0.6290	0.6286	0.6862	0.6896	0.6894	
	Moonshot	0.6459	0.6455	0.7569	0.7255	0.7309		0.7526	0.753	0.7975	0.7898	0.7905	
	Llama3	0.6055	0.6055	0.6710	0.6666	0.6667		0.5225	0.5246	0.6920	0.6934	0.6935	
	GPT-4omini	0.6219	0.6221	0.6447	0.6498	0.6503		0.6124	0.6099	0.6529	0.6692	0.6699	
	Average	0.6214	0.6198	0.6757	0.6685	0.6699		0.6263	0.6351	0.6968	0.7000	0.7003	
Humanity	GPT-3.5	0.5742	0.5742	0.5707	0.5805	0.5809	0.7835	0.5355	0.5351	0.5913	0.5843	0.5860	0.8151
	Mixtral	0.5738	0.5744	0.6558	0.6583	0.6583		0.5367	0.5369	0.6733	0.6542	0.6561	
	Moonshot	0.5946	0.5945	0.7328	0.7303	0.7291		0.6634	0.6609	0.7431	0.7586	0.7586	
	Llama3	0.5343	0.5346	0.6437	0.6347	0.6352		0.5852	0.5842	0.6602	0.6695	0.6683	
	GPT-4omini	0.5713	0.5714	0.6004	0.6042	0.6042		0.5839	0.5837	0.6132	0.5935	0.5932	
	Average	0.5697	0.5698	0.6407	0.6416	0.6415		0.5809	0.5802	0.6562	0.6520	0.6524	
Overall Average		0.5927	0.5921	0.6445	0.6432	0.6436	0.8151	0.5988	0.5996	0.6632	0.6623	0.6624	0.8403

served in standard attribution tasks, underscoring the challenges of adapting to new LLMs.

Furthermore, we extend the evaluation to the scenario where two new LLMs are introduced. Specifically, since exhausting all possible cases is resource-consuming and brings limited insights, we only consider a practical case where the two LLMs are the latest released models. The results presented in Table A7 indicate that adding more LLMs rapidly increases the complexity. These findings highlight the inherent challenges in adapting detectors to new LLMs and emphasize the need for the exploration of scalable techniques.

5 Conclusion

In this work, we introduce MGT-Academic, a large-scale academic writing dataset comprising over 20M tokens and 73K samples across STEM, Humanities, and Social Sciences HWTs and MGTs generated by five different LLMs. We also build up an extensible code framework to benchmark MGT detectors in various tasks efficiently. Based on MGT-Academic and our code framework, we investigate the performance and generalization ability of MGT detectors and have several observations. First, we find that for binary classification tasks, the supervised model-based detectors generally outperform the metric-based detectors in both the in-distribution and domain-transferring settings. The superiority continues in the text attribution task in both training settings as well, in which they show more advantages. Second, we are the first to introduce a task in MGT detection, that adapts the detector to new LLMs, and benchmark the effect of several techniques. Despite the improvement, the results remain below the upper-bound performance. We hope our work can provide more insights into understanding the generalization ability of MGT detectors.

Limitation

Datasets and Methods. On the one hand, despite the collected data is from multiple resources, some specific subject such as Education or Chemistry only covers Wiki data. And the generation models cover only 5 popular LLMs, which limits the diversity of the dataset. On the other hand, we do not cover all different detectors. However, we try our best to benchmark the representative detectors in the community. We leave these limitations for the future continuous development of our open-source code framework and dataset.

Metric-based Detectors for Text Attribution. Our results show that the metric-based detectors for text attribution only show performance slightly above random guesses but do not provide a solution to poor performance. This is an important yet underexplored topic in developing robust and comprehensive MGT detectors. We leave it as our future work for further exploration.

Adapting Detectors to New LLMs. We are the first to introduce this setting in the MGT detection task and evaluate the result on detectors equipped with several adapting techniques. However, our evaluation shows that there is still a large performance gap between the current method and the performance upper bound (attribution task with full training data for all classes). We leave it as our future work for further exploration.

Ethic Consideration

This work focuses on MGT detection, which has significant ethical implications, particularly in combating the misuse of generative AI. The development of robust MGT detectors could mitigate ethical concerns such as plagiarism, misinformation, and unauthorized usage of generative AI, partic-

ularly in academia, creative industries, and journalism. Additionally, data used in this study are collected from publicly available datasets with appropriate attribution. No private or sensitive data is used to train or evaluate the models.

References

- [1] Sameer Badaskar, Sachin Agarwal, and Shilpa Arora. Identifying Real or Fake Articles: Towards better Language Modeling. In *International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (IJCNLP)*, pages 817–822. ACL, 2008. 2
- [2] Guangsheng Bao, Yanbin Zhao, Zhiyang Teng, Linyi Yang, and Yue Zhang. Fast-detectgpt: Efficient zero-shot detection of machine-generated text via conditional probability curvature. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 7-11, 2024*. 1, 4, 12
- [3] Yuyou Gan, Yong Yang, Zhe Ma, Ping He, Rui Zeng, Yiming Wang, Qingming Li, Chunyi Zhou, Songze Li, Ting Wang, Yunjun Gao, Yingcai Wu, and Shouling Ji. Navigating the risks: A survey of security, privacy, and ethics threats in llm-based agents, 2024. 2
- [4] Sebastian Gehrmann, Hendrik Strobelt, and Alexander M. Rush. GLTR: Statistical Detection and Visualization of Generated Text. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, pages 111–116. ACL, 2019. 2, 4, 12
- [5] Mingmeng Geng, Caixi Chen, Yanru Wu, Dongping Chen, Yao Wan, and Pan Zhou. The impact of large language models in academia: from writing to speaking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.13686*, 2024. 11
- [6] Biyang Guo, Xin Zhang, Ziyuan Wang, Minqi Jiang, Jinran Nie, Yuxuan Ding, Jianwei Yue, and Yupeng Wu. How Close is ChatGPT to Human Experts? Comparison Corpus, Evaluation, and Detection. *CoRR abs/2301.07597*, 2023. 2, 4, 12
- [7] Abhimanyu Hans, Avi Schwarzschild, Valeriia Cherepanova, Hamid Kazemi, Aniruddha Saha, Micah Goldblum, Jonas Geiping, and Tom Goldstein. Spotting LLMs with binoculars: Zero-shot detection of machine-generated text. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2024. 4, 12
- [8] Xinlei He, Xinyue Shen, Zeyuan Chen, Michael Backes, and Yang Zhang. MGTBench: Benchmarking Machine-Generated Text Detection. *CoRR abs/2303.14822*, 2023. 1, 2, 4, 11
- [9] Xiaomeng Hu, Pin-Yu Chen, and Tsung-Yi Ho. RADAR: Robust AI-text detection via adversarial learning. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. 4, 12
- [10] Daphne Ippolito, Daniel Duckworth, Chris Callison-Burch, and Douglas Eck. Automatic Detection of Generated Text is Easiest when Humans are Fooled. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, pages 1808–1822. ACL, 2020. 2
- [11] Ronald Kemker, Marc McClure, Angelina Abitino, Tyler Hayes, and Christopher Kanan. Measuring catastrophic forgetting in neural networks. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 32, 2018. 3
- [12] James Kirkpatrick, Razvan Pascanu, Neil Rabinowitz, Joel Veness, Guillaume Desjardins, Andrei A Rusu, Kieran Milan, John Quan, Tiago Ramalho, Agnieszka Grabska-Barwinska, et al. Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 114(13):3521–3526, 2017. 3
- [13] Zhizhong Li and Derek Hoiem. Learning without forgetting. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 40(12):2935–2947, 2017. 3, 6, 13
- [14] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. Roberta: A robustly optimized BERT pretraining approach. *CoRR*, abs/1907.11692, 2019. 4, 13
- [15] Marc Masana, Xialei Liu, Bartłomiej Twardowski, Mikel Menta, Andrew D Bagdanov, and Joost Van De Weijer. Class-incremental learning: survey and performance evaluation on image classification. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 45(5):5513–5533, 2022. 3
- [16] Shervin Minaee, Tomas Mikolov, Narjes Nikzad, Meysam Chenaghlu, Richard Socher, Xavier Amatriain, and Jianfeng Gao. Large language models: A survey, 2024. 2
- [17] MistralAI. <https://mistral.ai/>. 3
- [18] Eric Mitchell, Yoonho Lee, Alexander Khazatsky, Christopher D. Manning, and Chelsea Finn. DetectGPT: Zero-Shot Machine-Generated Text Detection using Probability Curvature. *CoRR abs/2301.11305*, 2023. 1, 2, 4, 12
- [19] Moonshot. <https://www.moonshot.cn>. 3
- [20] OpenAI. <https://chat.openai.com/chat>. 3
- [21] OpenAI. GPT-4 Technical Report. *CoRR abs/2303.08774*, 2023. 1, 2
- [22] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L. Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul F. Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*. NeurIPS, 2022. 1, 2
- [23] Debjit Paul, Daniil Sorokin, and Judith Gaspers. Class incremental learning for intent classification with limited or no old data. In Francesco Barbieri, Jose

- Camacho-Collados, Bhuwan Dhingra, Luis Espinosa-Anke, Elena Gribovskaya, Angeliki Lazaridou, Daniel Loureiro, and Leonardo Neves, editors, *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Ever Evolving NLP (EvoNLP)*, pages 16–25, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates (Hybrid), December 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. 3
- [24] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. Language Models are Unsupervised Multitask Learners. *OpenAI blog*, 2019. 13
- [25] Sylvestre-Alvise Rebuffi, Alexander Kolesnikov, Georg Sperl, and Christoph H Lampert. icarl: Incremental classifier and representation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 2001–2010, 2017. 3, 6, 17
- [26] N Reimers. Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.10084*, 2019. 10
- [27] Matthew Riemer, Ignacio Cases, Robert Ajemian, Miao Liu, Irina Rish, Yuhai Tu, and Gerald Tesauro. Learning to learn without forgetting by maximizing transfer and minimizing interference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.11910*, 2018. 3
- [28] Victor Sanh, Lysandre Debut, Julien Chaumond, and Thomas Wolf. Distilbert, a distilled version of BERT: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter. *CoRR*, abs/1910.01108, 2019. 4, 13
- [29] Jinyan Su, Terry Yue Zhuo, Di Wang, and Preslav Nakov. Detectllm: Leveraging log rank information for zero-shot detection of machine-generated text. *CoRR abs/2306.05540*, 2023. 2, 4, 12
- [30] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton-Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurélien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. Llama 2: Open Foundation and Fine-Tuned Chat Models. *CoRR abs/2307.09288*, 2023. 1, 2, 3, 12, 13
- [31] Laurens Van der Maaten and Geoffrey Hinton. Visualizing data using t-sne. *Journal of machine learning research*, 9(11), 2008. 10
- [32] Yuxia Wang, Jonibek Mansurov, Petar Ivanov, Jinyan Su, Artem Shelmanov, Akim Tsvigun, Osama Mohammed Afzal, Tarek Mahmoud, Giovanni Puccetti, Thomas Arnold, et al. M4GT-Bench: Evaluation Benchmark for Black-Box Machine-Generated Text Detection. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, 2024. 1, 2, 4
- [33] Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Rémi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, and Jamie Brew. HuggingFace’s Transformers: State-of-the-art Natural Language Processing. *CoRR abs/1910.03771*, 2019. 4, 11
- [34] Junchao Wu, Runzhe Zhan, Derek F. Wong, Shu Yang, Xinyi Yang, Yulin Yuan, and Lidia S. Chao. Detectrl: Benchmarking llm-generated text detection in real-world scenarios. *CoRR*, abs/2410.23746, 2024. 2
- [35] Yue Wu, Yinpeng Chen, Lijuan Wang, Yuancheng Ye, Zicheng Liu, Yandong Guo, and Yun Fu. Large scale incremental learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 374–382, 2019. 3, 6, 17
- [36] Congying Xia, Wenpeng Yin, Yihao Feng, and Philip S. Yu. Incremental few-shot text classification with multi-round new classes: Formulation, dataset and system. In Kristina Toutanova, Anna Rumshisky, Luke Zettlemoyer, Dilek Hakkani-Tür, Iz Beltagy, Steven Bethard, Ryan Cotterell, Tanmoy Chakraborty, and Yichao Zhou, editors, *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2021, Online, June 6-11, 2021*, pages 1351–1360. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2021. 3
- [37] Siboy Yi, Yule Liu, Zhen Sun, Tianshuo Cong, Xinlei He, Jiaying Song, Ke Xu, and Qi Li. Jailbreak attacks and defenses against large language models: A survey, 2024. 2
- [38] Wayne Xin 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. A survey of large language models, 2024. 1, 2
- [39] Da-Wei Zhou, Zi-Wen Cai, Han-Jia Ye, De-Chuan Zhan, and Ziwei Liu. Revisiting class-incremental learning with pre-trained models: Generalizability and adaptivity are all you need. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.07338*, 2023. 3

A Generation Prompts

Prompt Template for Arxiv Text

<Background>:

Please act as an expert paper editor and revise a section of the paper to make it more fluent and elegant. Please only include the revised section in your answer. Here are the specific requirements:

1. Enable readers to grasp the main points or essence of the paper quickly.
2. Allow readers to understand the important information, analysis, and arguments throughout the entire paper.
3. Help readers remember the key points of the paper.
4. Please clearly state the innovative aspects of your research in the section, emphasizing your contributions.
5. Use concise and clear language to describe your findings and results, making it easier for reviewers to understand the paper. Here is the original section of the paper:

<text>: //to-be-polished text

Prompt Template for Arxiv Text

<Background>:

Please act as an expert paper editor and revise a section of the paper to make it more fluent and elegant. Please only include the revised section in your answer. Here are the specific requirements:

1. Enable readers to grasp the main points or essence of the paper quickly.
2. Allow readers to understand the important information, analysis, and arguments throughout the entire paper.
3. Help readers remember the key points of the paper.
4. Please clearly state the innovative aspects of your research in the section, emphasizing your contributions.
5. Use concise and clear language to describe your findings and results, making it easier for reviewers to understand the paper. Here is the original section of the paper:

<text>: //to-be-polished text

Prompt Template for Gutendex Text

<Background>:

Please act as an expert book editor and revise the book content from the perspective of a book editor to make it fluent and elegant.

1. Clarity: Ensure that your writing is clear and easy to understand. Avoid jargon and complex language that may confuse the reader.
2. Relevance: Make sure that the content you are writing is relevant to the topic at hand. Do not deviate from the main subject.
3. Accuracy: Ensure that all the information you provide is accurate and up-to-date. This includes statistics, facts, and theories.
4. Brevity: Keep your writing concise. Avoid unnecessary words or phrases that do not add value to the content. Here is the original book content:

<text>: //to-be-polished text

B Data Moderation Policy

In this section, we will introduce the data moderation policy for both *Human* and *Machine* splits to remove the data of poor quality and obvious identifiers.

Human Split. To ensure data quality, we apply a rigorous cleaning process to remove noise and irrelevant content. We discard texts with fewer than 50 tokens and ensure that all entries start and end with complete sentences, preserving their coherence and clarity. For wiki data, entries containing terms like "ISBN," "PMID," "doi," "vol.," "p.," URLs, "References," and "External links" are excluded, as these could act as identifiers (Table A2). For book data, texts containing Project Gutenberg license information are removed to avoid duplication. For arXiv data, we filtered out entries with excessive formatting symbols, specifically those with more than 500 instances of "\$\$", 150 "&", or 1000 "\ (Table A2), to maintain readability.

Machine Split. To moderate the machine generated data, we focus on removing the obvious identifiers for text detection. First, we remove the text of short length below 50 words (splited by space), which is usually produced by failed or incomplete API queries. Second, since every text is truncated to 2048 tokens, we start back-tracing from the last token until a period appears and then drop all content after the period to ensure the completeness of the text and avoid easy detection. Third, we customize different filtering rules for the keywords (Table A2) featuring machine generation. For generation identifiers ("The revised content is:."), we find the closest colon and remove all content before the colon. For special keywords, we drop the entire text if any of the listed keywords appears after removing the generation identifiers. For format symbols, we drop the entire text if there are more than 50 tabs (&) or equation (\$). The remaining format symbols such as "*" and "#" are markdown tags so we drop the entire text if any of them appears.

C Full MGT-Academic Analysis

Embedding Distribution. In this part, we investigate the data distribution of MGT-Academic from the domain and LLM aspects. We utilize SentenceBert [26] to get the embeddings of each data and further adopt TSNE [31] to project the high-dimensional representations into two dimensions. Regarding the domain aspect, we fix the source LLM and project the data from different domains into Figure A1. As the projection result shows, we find that the distribution of data from different domains and LLMs varies a lot, which shows the necessity of studying the generalization ability of the MGT detectors.




Figure A1: 2D Projection of Art Embeddings Across Models

Table A1: Sources of Data for Machine Generated Text: This table lists the primary paper sources (such as Arxiv and Project Gutenberg) and supplementary resources (Wiki) available for different STEM, Social Science, and Humanity subfields, along with notes on the availability of paper sources where applicable.

Domain	Subfield	Source	Human	GPT-4o-mini	GPT-3.5	Mixtral-8x7b	Llama-3.1-70b	Moonshot-8k
STEM	Physics	Arxiv & Wiki	10.8K / 11,926.6K	9.1K / 5,485.9K	8.4K / 2,106.2K	8.7K / 3,291.4K	3.5K / 1,059.1K	2.5K / 891.9K
	Math		14.1K / 12,338.5K	12.0K / 5,717.0K	13.6K / 3,444.1K	10.3K / 3,425.9K	6.4K / 1,836.8K	2.4K / 808.8K
	CS		14.7K / 12,275.5K	11.9K / 4,989.4K	14.2K / 3,415.4K	9.4K / 3,277.9K	3.5K / 934.2K	2.9K / 983.6K
	Biology		15.7K / 11,485.3K	13.6K / 5,704.5K	14.9K / 3,508.6K	10.9K / 3,716.7K	3.5K / 924.9K	3.5K / 1,159.3K
	EE		19.7K / 13,346.2K	16.9K / 6,129.3K	18.6K / 4,378.4K	13.0K / 4,384.9K	4.2K / 1,130.5K	4.1K / 1,350.1K
	Statistics		9.7K / 11,491.9K	7.6K / 4,339.8K	9.5K / 2,545.2K	6.8K / 2,610.7K	2.9K / 832.4K	2.0K / 694.1K
Social Science	Chemistry	Wiki	2.4K / 415.4K	2.2K / 425.2K	2.8K / 536.8K	1.6K / 438.6K	1.0K / 148.6K	0.5K / 141.2K
	Medicine		8.7K / 1,668.3K	8.1K / 1,662.6K	7.8K / 1,470.6K	5.1K / 1,419.3K	2.0K / 454.8K	1.8K / 528.9K
	Education		14.2K / 3,831.0K	13.0K / 2,833.9K	12.5K / 2,377.2K	9.2K / 2,704.2K	3.1K / 925.6K	2.8K / 905.9K
Social Science	Economy	Arxiv & Wiki	12.6K / 6,807.5K	11.3K / 3,663.5K	11.7K / 2,531.4K	6.1K / 2,025.1K	2.4K / 655.6K	1.9K / 621.5K
	Management		3.5K / 648.5K	3.3K / 618.0K	3.3K / 739.4K	2.1K / 589.0K	0.6K / 132.5K	0.7K / 190.9K
Humanities	Literature	Gutenberg & Wiki	18.7K / 13,276.7K	13.6K / 5,306.9K	11.4K / 2,077.9K	13.5K / 5,306.9K	9.3K / 4,439.6K	3.9K / 1,823.6K
	Law		7.5K / 2,695.6K	6.5K / 1,639.1K	6.1K / 1,106.6K	5.2K / 1,727.3K	2.3K / 780.2K	1.5K / 522.0K
	Art		8.4K / 5,899.5K	6.4K / 2,576.2K	5.7K / 1,110.1K	6.0K / 2,411.3K	4.2K / 2,040.1K	1.8K / 816.4K
	History		30.0K / 33,517.6K	18.4K / 12,848.3K	14.5K / 3,505.5K	23.6K / 11,572.2K	18.4K / 11,019.4K	6.1K / 3,644.4K
	Philosophy		3.5K / 1,998.4K	2.7K / 776.5K	2.3K / 407.8K	2.6K / 937.0K	1.5K / 598.6K	0.7K / 280.6K




Figure A2: Text Length Distribution Across Models and Domains

Data Source and Length. In this section, we present the length distribution of data across different domains and LLMs in Table A1. Generally, we collect 73,100 samples with 20,305,400 tokens. Notably, we observe that the token length of human-written text (HWT) is generally longer than that of machine-generated text (MGT). This disparity arises because some LLMs are less proficient at generating extended content. Additionally, within the STEM domain, certain subfields exhibit longer token lengths. This can be attributed to our data collection methodology, which primarily focuses on the main sections of research papers. These sections often include formulas and technical content, contributing to the increased token count.

Keyword Analysis. Based on the findings of [5], this study highlighted several critical keywords, such as *significant*, *comprehensive*, and *enhance*, which exhibit notable patterns in their usage across different sources. Following the approach, we organized these keywords and analyzed their weights under our specific task settings, comparing human-written text with outputs generated by models such as GPT-3.5, Llama-3, Mixtral, and Moonshot. The resulting pie charts, as shown in Figure A3, illustrate the distribution of these keywords for each source. We observe that human-

written text heavily emphasizes impactful terms like *significant* and *enhance*, reflecting a formal academic style. GPT-3.5 and Llama-3 prioritize similar terms but exhibit a more balanced keyword usage. While Mixtral and Moonshot are closer to the human pattern in certain aspects, they have a relatively high proportion of descriptive terms such as *effectively*, which emphasises their practical tone.

D Code Framework

Despite the increasing number of benchmarks for MGT detection, there is no extensible standard library that offers out-of-the-box functionality. Most existing benchmark code framework require additional configuration and have inefficient architectures, which increase the cost of further development and limit broader adoption. To address these issues, we introduce a newly refactored code framework based on MGTBench [8]. Our framework follows the factory design pattern and implements *AutoDetector* and *AutoExperiment* for abstraction. This design is aligned with the approach used in Huggingface Transformers [33], which is the most widely used library in NLP community. Note that during the implementation, we leverage ChatGPT to assist the development of the framework and manually check the generated code to ensure the correctness.

Detector. All the detectors follow the same hierarchy of abstraction that base class implements the detecting process. The base class follows the detectors’ original implementation enabling the flexibility to easily inspect the inner workflow of each individual detector. Furthermore, we implement a unified API, i.e., *AutoDetector*, to automatically instantiate the user-specified detector and enable convenient detector loading and switching.

Experiment. The experiment is designed to reflect the standard MGT detection pipeline: data processing, feature extraction (if any), and prediction making. We adopt a similar abstraction strategy as the detector that the base class implements the data processing and prediction analysis, leaving the specific predictions to different sub-classes. The unified API, *AutoExperiment*, is provided as well.




Figure A3: Distribution of keyword weights across human-written text and various LLM outputs. Each pie chart shows the proportion of critical keywords in different sources under the given task settings.

E Detectors

For zero-shot detectors, metrics were obtained from the white-box model Llama2-7B-Instruct [30], unless stated otherwise. Fast-DetectGPT and Binoculars were evaluated using the optimal settings specified in their respective papers. For model-based detectors, DistilBERT and RoBERTa were fine-tuned with a learning rate of $5e-6$, batch size of 64, 3 epochs, and a random seed of 3407. RADAR and ChatGPT-D used their officially released weights without additional fine-tuning. Details of detectors in binary classification and text attribution are provided in Appendix F.

Log-Likelihood [4]. A zero-shot method uses a language model to compute the log probability of each token in a text. A higher average log-likelihood suggests the text is more likely generated by an LLM.

Rank [4]. A zero-shot method calculates the absolute rank of each token in a text based on its previous context and determines the text's score by averaging these rank values. A smaller average rank score indicates a higher likelihood that the text is machine-generated.

Rank GLTR [4]. GLTR is designed to assist in labeling machine-generated text. We uses Test-2 features as suggested by Guo et al. [6], evaluating the fraction of words ranked within 10, 100, 1,000, and beyond.

LRR [29]. The Log-Likelihood Log-Rank Ratio (LRR)

combines Log-Likelihood and Log-Rank, with a higher LRR indicating a greater likelihood of text being machine-generated.

Entropy [4]. A zero-shot method uses entropy to measure text randomness, with lower entropy indicating a higher likelihood of being LLM-generated, as human-written text shows greater unpredictability.

Fast-DetectGPT [2]. An optimized zero-shot detector improves DetectGPT [18] by replacing perturbation with efficient sampling. We followed the authors' optimal settings, using GPT-Neo-2.7b as the scoring model and GPT-J-6b as the reference model.

Binoculars [7]. A zero-shot detection method uses two LLMs to compute the perplexity-to-cross-perplexity ratio. A lower score indicates the text is likely machine-generated. Following the authors' optimal settings, we used Falcon-7B-Instruct for PPL and Falcon-7B with Falcon-7B-Instruct for X-PPL.

RADAR [9]. RADAR uses adversarial training between a paraphraser and a detector. We used the pre-trained RoBERTa detector from Hugging Face without additional training.

ChatGPT-D [6]. ChatGPT Detector distinguishes human-written from ChatGPT-generated texts by fine-tuning a RoBERTa model on the HC3 [6] dataset.

Table A2: Detailed Data Moderation Policy

Machine Split	Generation Identifier	‘revised book’, ‘revised content’, ‘revised version’, ‘title’, ‘after editing’, ‘revised section’
	Special Keywords	‘book editor’, ‘clarity’, ‘revisions’, ‘I apologize’, ‘I am sorry’, ‘Unfortunately’, ‘complex language’, ‘revised content’, ‘revised version’, ‘language model’, ‘revised content’, ‘revised version’, ‘accuracy of’, ‘project gutenber’, ‘reliable information’, ‘ISBN’, ‘PMID’, ‘doi:’, ‘Sure,’ ‘Retrieved from’, ‘Category’, ‘http’, ‘As an editor’, ‘As an expert’
	Format Symbols	‘&’, ‘\$’, ‘====’, ‘—’, ‘**’, ‘##’,
Human Split	Special Keywords	‘ISBN’, ‘PMID’, ‘doi’, ‘vol.’, ‘p.’, ‘https:’, ‘http:’, ‘References External links’
	Format Symbols	‘\n—’, ‘\n====’, ‘**’, ‘##’, ‘\$’ (> 500), ‘&’ (> 150), ‘\’ (> 1000)

DistilBERT [28]. The detector is built by fine-tuning a pre-trained DistilBERT model with an additional classification layer.

RoBERTa [14]. The detector is built by fine-tuning a pre-trained RoBERTa model with an additional classification layer.

F Experimental Settings

In-distribution Experiment. For zero-shot detectors, we randomly selected 1,000 training samples to predict the metrics. The classification threshold was set to maximize the F1 score on the training set, and a classifier was trained using the same data. Note that GLTR produces vectors of four rank values and thus threshold-based classification is not applicable. For model-based detectors, we fine-tuned the model using at most 10,000 training samples. We used 2000 randomly selected data points for the testing set. Zero-shot detectors employ threshold-based classification and logistic regression for binary human-machine classification tasks.

Model attribution tasks use SVM and logistic regression classifiers with default sklearn implementations and a linear kernel for SVM. Model-based detectors have their classification heads adjusted to match the number of classes. Fine-tuning was done with a learning rate of 5e-6, batch size of 64, 3 epochs, and a random seed of 3407.

Domains and LLMs Transfer Experiment. For zero-shot detectors, we applied the threshold and classifier from the source domain directly to the target domain. For model-based detectors, we used models fine-tuned on the source domain and evaluated them on the target domain test data.

Class Incremental Experiment. To train the original model, we use a similar setting as that in the model attribution task. We train the model for 2 epochs in this stage and set the learning rate to 5e-6, and the batch size to 64. To train the updated model, training data has the same number of data as each class had in the previous stage. We train the model for 1

epoch in this stage and set the learning rate to 2.5e-7 (1/4 of the original one), and the batch size to 64. For the LwF technique, the regularization parameter is set to 0.2. To maintain the exemplar in iCaRL, we set the cache size for each class to 100. The validation set in BiC is constructed by combining the data in exemplar together. Specifically, since a small amount of old data is introduced in the training process of iCaRL and BiC, we adopt weighted cross entropy to avoid the side effect of data imbalance.

G Ablation Study of Zero-shot Detectors in In-distribution Experiment

We use GPT-2-medium [24] and Llama-2-7B-Instruct [30] as the metric-generator model for zero-shot detectors. Results are shown in Table A3. Full results of zero-shot detectors in model attribution are provided in Table A4.

H Results of Domains and LLMs Transfer

Domain Transfer. Table A5 presents the full results of detector generalization across different domains.

LLM Transfer. Table A6 presents the full results of detector generalization across different LLM generations.

Full Mitigation Result. Figure A4, A5, and A6 illustrate the mitigation effects when transferring across domain topics. Similarly, Figure A7 shows the effects when transferring across different LLMs.

I Class Incremental Techniques

LwF [13]. LwF is a regularization-based method that relieves CF by distilling the logits from the previous model into the new one. The key idea is to preserve the logits of the previous model on old tasks during new tasks by adding a regularization term to the loss function:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{new}}(x, y) + \lambda \mathcal{L}_{\text{distill}}(x), \quad (1)$$

Table A3: In-Distribution Performance of Zero-shot Detectors with GPT-2 and LLama-2

	Llama-3.1-70b			Mixtral-8×7b			MoonShot-8k			GPT-4o-mini			GPT-3.5		
	ST.	Hu.	So.	ST.	Hu.	So.	ST.	Hu.	So.	ST.	Hu.	So.	ST.	Hu.	So.
LL (GPT-2, threshold)	0.713	0.795	0.786	0.651	0.740	0.792	0.709	0.766	0.774	0.669	0.642	0.747	0.574	0.689	0.709
LL (GPT-2, logistic)	0.672	0.796	0.782	0.606	0.737	0.789	0.533	0.775	0.772	0.617	0.692	0.706	0.615	0.703	0.714
LL (Llama-2, threshold)	0.714	0.794	0.803	0.662	0.749	0.809	0.711	0.760	0.806	0.638	0.689	0.765	0.481	0.606	0.709
LL (Llama-2, logistic)	0.708	0.785	0.806	0.656	0.735	0.811	0.635	0.759	0.802	0.654	0.714	0.723	0.589	0.682	0.694
Entropy (GPT-2, threshold)	0.637	0.670	0.657	0.665	0.663	0.703	-	0.631	0.680	0.619	0.640	0.691	0.586	0.617	0.631
Entropy (GPT-2, logistic)	0.540	0.585	0.634	0.442	0.587	0.690	0.398	0.642	0.608	0.583	0.632	0.603	0.641	0.620	0.584
Entropy (Llama-2, threshold)	0.759	0.707	0.829	0.688	0.659	0.795	0.723	0.662	0.780	0.683	0.686	0.763	0.679	0.640	0.700
Entropy (Llama-2, logistic)	0.757	0.712	0.821	0.677	0.686	0.798	0.638	0.688	0.775	0.633	0.689	0.739	0.627	0.695	0.697
Rank (GPT-2, threshold)	0.590	0.698	0.710	0.509	0.583	0.622	0.612	0.716	0.725	0.635	0.547	0.608	0.414	0.485	0.580
Rank (GPT-2, logistic)	0.650	0.698	0.697	0.313	0.657	0.666	0.636	0.726	0.733	0.643	0.666	0.671	0.679	0.642	0.681
Rank (Llama-2, threshold)	0.618	0.697	0.713	0.617	0.695	0.719	0.685	0.750	0.817	0.643	0.651	0.627	0.678	-	0.571
Rank (Llama-2, logistic)	0.583	0.722	0.706	0.591	0.688	0.719	0.635	0.755	0.818	0.655	0.675	0.644	0.549	0.452	-
LRR (GPT-2, threshold)	0.709	0.719	0.762	0.628	0.662	0.728	0.698	0.699	0.770	0.627	0.643	0.642	0.545	0.593	0.653
LRR (GPT-2, logistic)	0.686	0.714	0.755	0.615	0.667	0.744	0.576	0.717	0.764	0.617	0.632	0.624	0.604	0.638	0.688
LRR (Llama-2, threshold)	0.736	0.709	0.795	0.655	0.596	0.732	0.688	0.650	0.773	0.639	0.615	0.704	0.648	0.591	0.708
LRR (Llama-2, logistic)	0.692	0.703	0.757	0.591	0.624	0.755	0.544	0.675	0.760	0.590	0.635	0.667	0.617	0.640	0.671
Rank-GLTR (GPT-2, logistic)	0.687	0.787	0.776	0.619	0.712	0.777	0.508	0.758	0.774	0.633	0.669	0.665	0.635	0.699	0.701
Rank-GLTR (Llama-2, logistic)	0.720	0.759	0.802	0.655	0.701	0.808	0.600	0.734	0.795	0.658	0.693	0.713	0.620	0.679	0.694
Fast-DetectGPT (threshold)	0.817	0.817	0.887	0.760	0.759	0.842	0.842	0.801	0.899	0.688	0.718	0.752	0.677	0.713	0.756
Fast-DetectGPT (logistic)	0.806	0.800	0.884	0.752	0.737	0.841	0.844	0.796	0.897	0.653	0.653	0.739	0.642	0.640	0.736
Binoculars (threshold)	0.881	0.897	0.911	0.833	0.845	0.890	0.923	0.867	0.916	0.710	0.772	0.800	0.680	0.803	0.792
Binoculars (logistic)	0.880	0.876	0.898	0.831	0.821	0.886	0.918	0.853	0.914	0.695	0.761	0.794	0.682	0.789	0.784

Table A4: Full Results of Zero-shot Detectors using Different Classifier in Model Attribution

Logistic Regression	STEM	Humanities	Social_sci.	SVM	STEM	Humanities	Social_sci.
LL (Llama-2)	0.1661	0.1806	0.2151	LL (Llama-2)	0.1519	0.1736	0.2225
Rank (Llama-2)	0.1392	0.1481	0.1624	Rank (Llama-2)	0.1021	0.1702	0.1978
LRR (Llama-2)	0.1581	0.1182	0.1894	LRR (Llama-2)	0.1499	0.1198	0.1852
Rank-GLTR (Llama-2)	0.1412	0.1334	0.1912	Rank-GLTR (Llama-2)	0.105	0.1095	0.1899
Entropy (Llama-2)	0.1941	0.1422	0.2282	Entropy (Llama-2)	0.2089	0.1299	0.237
Fast-DetectGPT	0.2137	0.2251	0.2849	Fast-DetectGPT	0.1848	0.2289	0.299
Binoculars	0.2188	0.1483	0.2141	Binoculars	0.1864	0.1429	0.2385

Table A5: Transferring Results Across Different Domains

Domain transfer	Classifier	LLama3			Mixtral			Moonshot			GPT-4o-mini			GPT-3.5			
		Hu.	ST.	So.	Hu.	ST.	So.	Hu.	ST.	So.	Hu.	ST.	So.	Hu.	ST.	So.	
Binoculars	logistic	Hu.	0.876	0.885	0.912	0.821	0.828	0.892	0.853	0.926	0.911	0.761	0.655	0.805	0.789	0.634	0.787
		ST.	0.868	0.880	0.905	0.826	0.831	0.890	0.822	0.918	0.921	0.773	0.695	0.803	0.795	0.682	0.785
		So.	0.852	0.875	0.898	0.805	0.819	0.886	0.800	0.904	0.914	0.713	0.622	0.794	0.788	0.629	0.784
	threshold	Hu.	0.897	0.879	0.887	0.845	0.836	0.873	0.867	0.899	0.883	0.772	0.700	0.802	0.803	0.663	0.792
		ST.	0.899	0.881	0.903	0.854	0.833	0.880	0.854	0.923	0.908	0.748	0.710	0.748	0.694	0.680	0.658
		So.	0.877	0.883	0.911	0.813	0.824	0.890	0.834	0.924	0.916	0.738	0.639	0.800	0.801	0.670	0.792
LRR	logistic	Hu.	0.703	0.737	0.803	0.624	0.698	0.772	0.675	0.727	0.793	0.635	0.662	0.724	0.640	0.653	0.718
		ST.	0.421	0.692	0.682	0.406	0.591	0.622	0.418	0.544	0.563	0.465	0.590	0.638	0.568	0.617	0.647
		So.	0.570	0.735	0.757	0.575	0.687	0.755	0.618	0.693	0.760	0.510	0.608	0.667	0.585	0.631	0.671
	threshold	Hu.	0.709	0.733	0.798	0.596	0.692	0.765	0.650	0.721	0.778	0.615	0.657	0.715	0.591	0.632	0.677
		ST.	0.572	0.736	0.756	0.516	0.655	0.706	0.604	0.688	0.752	0.578	0.639	0.704	0.633	0.648	0.707
		So.	0.642	0.750	0.795	0.549	0.668	0.732	0.646	0.716	0.773	0.581	0.640	0.704	0.636	0.651	0.708
Entropy	logistic	Hu.	0.712	0.751	0.816	0.686	0.727	0.802	0.688	0.727	0.795	0.689	0.684	0.767	0.695	0.680	0.720
		ST.	0.516	0.757	0.752	0.534	0.677	0.715	0.540	0.638	0.639	0.547	0.633	0.687	0.631	0.627	0.658
		So.	0.626	0.769	0.821	0.633	0.710	0.798	0.660	0.736	0.775	0.627	0.668	0.739	0.662	0.661	0.697
	threshold	Hu.	0.707	0.752	0.816	0.659	0.722	0.807	0.662	0.733	0.778	0.686	0.679	0.769	0.640	0.635	0.667
		ST.	0.541	0.759	0.779	0.559	0.688	0.746	0.643	0.723	0.763	0.686	0.683	0.765	0.692	0.679	0.721
		So.	0.664	0.773	0.829	0.629	0.712	0.795	0.667	0.734	0.780	0.674	0.680	0.763	0.667	0.663	0.700
Fast-DetectGPT	logistic	Hu.	0.800	0.768	0.818	0.737	0.730	0.803	0.796	0.845	0.893	0.653	0.634	0.682	0.640	0.591	0.706
		ST.	0.820	0.806	0.876	0.748	0.752	0.832	0.794	0.844	0.887	0.676	0.653	0.707	0.682	0.642	0.748
		So.	0.820	0.819	0.884	0.760	0.762	0.841	0.800	0.845	0.897	0.692	0.660	0.739	0.668	0.629	0.736
	threshold	Hu.	0.817	0.799	0.868	0.759	0.761	0.840	0.801	0.842	0.895	0.718	0.688	0.740	0.713	0.672	0.758
		ST.	0.819	0.817	0.878	0.765	0.760	0.843	0.801	0.842	0.897	0.723	0.688	0.754	0.702	0.677	0.689
		So.	0.815	0.816	0.887	0.769	0.755	0.842	0.802	0.837	0.899	0.725	0.689	0.752	0.695	0.656	0.756
log-likelihood	logistic	Hu.	0.785	0.740	0.816	0.735	0.686	0.816	0.759	0.723	0.817	0.714	0.682	0.766	0.682	0.585	0.701
		ST.	0.676	0.708	0.784	0.653	0.656	0.793	0.659	0.635	0.759	0.607	0.654	0.713	0.685	0.589	0.704
		So.	0.723	0.725	0.806	0.680	0.671	0.811	0.716	0.702	0.802	0.643	0.671	0.723	0.647	0.571	0.694
	threshold	Hu.	0.794	0.736	0.805	0.749	0.688	0.815	0.760	0.723	0.816	0.689	0.683	0.759	0.606	0.535	0.656
		ST.	0.682	0.714	0.790	0.671	0.662	0.805	0.740	0.711	0.818	0.569	0.638	0.696	0.546	0.481	0.592
		So.	0.743	0.732	0.803	0.682	0.666	0.809	0.703	0.683	0.806	0.709	0.682	0.765	0.691	0.598	0.709
Rank	logistic	Hu.	0.722	0.582	0.667	0.688	0.599	0.717	0.755	0.698	0.817	0.675	0.639	0.645	0.452	0.381	0.339
		ST.	0.722	0.583	0.667	0.678	0.591	0.709	0.712	0.635	0.754	0.671	0.655	0.670	0.575	0.549	0.428
		So.	0.727	0.620	0.706	0.698	0.642	0.719	0.754	0.699	0.818	0.631	0.639	0.644	0.104	0.056	0.090
	threshold	Hu.	0.697	0.554	0.622	0.695	0.619	0.730	0.750	0.719	0.813	0.651	0.654	0.658	0.009	0.011	0.022
		ST.	0.729	0.618	0.711	0.694	0.617	0.731	0.746	0.685	0.807	0.646	0.643	0.648	0.693	0.678	0.655
		So.	0.727	0.619	0.713	0.691	0.602	0.719	0.755	0.701	0.817	0.612	0.630	0.627	0.461	0.476	0.571
rank_GLTR	logistic	Hu.	0.759	0.749	0.810	0.701	0.701	0.815	0.734	0.726	0.799	0.693	0.671	0.747	0.679	0.619	0.719
		ST.	0.617	0.720	0.784	0.611	0.655	0.772	0.562	0.600	0.701	0.598	0.658	0.711	0.680	0.620	0.721
		So.	0.684	0.748	0.802	0.662	0.680	0.808	0.686	0.709	0.795	0.592	0.660	0.713	0.644	0.586	0.694
DistilBert	MLP	Hu.	0.978	0.876	0.930	0.985	0.870	0.941	0.992	0.890	0.963	0.987	0.915	0.958	0.977	0.810	0.918
		ST.	0.840	0.987	0.967	0.932	0.980	0.958	0.946	0.989	0.986	0.919	0.981	0.971	0.942	0.985	0.946
		So.	0.938	0.940	0.957	0.963	0.957	0.975	0.972	0.976	0.987	0.982	0.978	0.982	0.964	0.943	0.960
RoBERTa	MLP	Hu.	0.995	0.984	0.995	0.997	0.993	0.994	0.994	0.987	0.996	0.994	0.991	0.996	0.986	0.907	0.959
		ST.	0.992	0.987	0.995	0.997	0.993	0.993	0.989	0.994	0.998	0.988	0.987	0.993	0.975	0.986	0.973
		So.	0.993	0.985	0.995	0.998	0.995	0.996	0.988	0.988	0.997	0.993	0.994	0.995	0.980	0.988	0.983

Table A6: Full LLM Transfer Results

	Classifier		Humanities					STEM					Social Sciences				
			Llama3	Mixtral	Moonshot	GPT-4o-mini	GPT-3.5	Llama3	Mixtral	Moonshot	GPT-4o-mini	GPT-3.5	Llama3	Mixtral	Moonshot	GPT-4o-mini	GPT-3.5
Binoculars	logistic	Llama3	0.876	0.811	0.832	0.645	0.782	0.880	0.813	0.918	0.540	0.654	0.898	0.868	0.913	0.711	0.759
		Mixtral	0.881	0.821	0.839	0.661	0.788	0.882	0.831	0.924	0.583	0.635	0.909	0.886	0.921	0.747	0.771
		Moonshot	0.897	0.835	0.853	0.694	0.800	0.880	0.813	0.918	0.539	0.614	0.899	0.869	0.914	0.712	0.758
		GPT-4o-mini	0.883	0.846	0.866	0.761	0.794	0.853	0.827	0.872	0.695	0.693	0.897	0.885	0.906	0.794	0.793
		GPT-3.5	0.883	0.822	0.840	0.670	0.789	0.867	0.835	0.892	0.658	0.682	0.915	0.890	0.920	0.770	0.784
	threshold	Llama3	0.897	0.854	0.858	0.729	0.803	0.881	0.832	0.924	0.605	0.654	0.911	0.886	0.920	0.749	0.772
		Mixtral	0.886	0.845	0.868	0.757	0.795	0.879	0.833	0.915	0.634	0.667	0.914	0.890	0.916	0.758	0.776
		Moonshot	0.886	0.846	0.867	0.758	0.797	0.881	0.833	0.923	0.605	0.654	0.914	0.890	0.916	0.759	0.777
		GPT-4o-mini	0.862	0.831	0.844	0.772	0.798	0.752	0.747	0.759	0.710	0.679	0.881	0.878	0.894	0.800	0.792
		GPT-3.5	0.896	0.846	0.854	0.711	0.803	0.677	0.681	0.669	0.661	0.680	0.881	0.878	0.894	0.803	0.792
LRR	logistic	Llama3	0.703	0.622	0.661	0.555	0.647	0.692	0.589	0.577	0.439	0.524	0.757	0.700	0.733	0.561	0.621
		Mixtral	0.706	0.624	0.663	0.564	0.648	0.698	0.591	0.594	0.453	0.534	0.802	0.755	0.770	0.658	0.695
		Moonshot	0.715	0.643	0.675	0.588	0.653	0.678	0.574	0.544	0.410	0.502	0.795	0.736	0.760	0.631	0.675
		GPT-4o-mini	0.722	0.665	0.685	0.635	0.658	0.748	0.678	0.705	0.590	0.636	0.806	0.766	0.773	0.667	0.701
		GPT-3.5	0.698	0.618	0.654	0.541	0.640	0.746	0.662	0.682	0.563	0.617	0.796	0.736	0.760	0.632	0.671
	threshold	Llama3	0.709	0.628	0.669	0.575	0.653	0.736	0.652	0.669	0.541	0.591	0.795	0.736	0.760	0.631	0.673
		Mixtral	0.681	0.596	0.646	0.508	0.623	0.740	0.655	0.672	0.549	0.600	0.793	0.732	0.756	0.621	0.663
		Moonshot	0.692	0.611	0.650	0.527	0.636	0.749	0.667	0.688	0.577	0.624	0.804	0.764	0.773	0.666	0.702
		GPT-4o-mini	0.721	0.663	0.683	0.615	0.660	0.733	0.698	0.724	0.639	0.658	0.801	0.776	0.793	0.704	0.725
		GPT-3.5	0.649	0.560	0.623	0.449	0.591	0.741	0.692	0.719	0.613	0.648	0.808	0.772	0.778	0.673	0.708
Entropy	logistic	Llama3	0.712	0.684	0.689	0.681	0.698	0.757	0.645	0.610	0.505	0.522	0.821	0.771	0.745	0.649	0.629
		Mixtral	0.712	0.686	0.690	0.682	0.697	0.760	0.677	0.659	0.540	0.550	0.829	0.798	0.774	0.716	0.676
		Moonshot	0.730	0.697	0.688	0.688	0.698	0.758	0.664	0.638	0.535	0.543	0.827	0.799	0.775	0.721	0.684
		GPT-4o-mini	0.725	0.693	0.689	0.689	0.696	0.770	0.705	0.722	0.633	0.621	0.825	0.806	0.780	0.739	0.698
		GPT-3.5	0.706	0.678	0.686	0.673	0.695	0.771	0.707	0.721	0.638	0.627	0.825	0.806	0.778	0.739	0.697
	threshold	Llama3	0.707	0.679	0.688	0.673	0.697	0.759	0.663	0.636	0.532	0.542	0.829	0.791	0.769	0.702	0.663
		Mixtral	0.699	0.659	0.667	0.631	0.666	0.766	0.688	0.694	0.569	0.574	0.829	0.795	0.770	0.710	0.665
		Moonshot	0.694	0.657	0.662	0.618	0.661	0.772	0.708	0.723	0.640	0.628	0.825	0.804	0.770	0.738	0.698
		GPT-4o-mini	0.714	0.692	0.688	0.686	0.700	0.739	0.723	0.727	0.683	0.684	0.816	0.803	0.789	0.763	0.721
		GPT-3.5	0.670	0.630	0.649	0.571	0.640	0.754	0.729	0.733	0.680	0.679	0.824	0.807	0.781	0.744	0.700
Fast-DetectGPT	logistic	Llama3	0.800	0.697	0.766	0.345	0.508	0.806	0.740	0.845	0.463	0.547	0.884	0.833	0.898	0.537	0.692
		Mixtral	0.814	0.737	0.794	0.453	0.558	0.817	0.752	0.842	0.513	0.577	0.887	0.841	0.901	0.625	0.717
		Moonshot	0.817	0.742	0.796	0.474	0.573	0.800	0.734	0.844	0.425	0.543	0.880	0.828	0.897	0.513	0.679
		GPT-4o-mini	0.804	0.769	0.796	0.653	0.668	0.807	0.754	0.826	0.653	0.643	0.855	0.839	0.874	0.739	0.751
		GPT-3.5	0.817	0.752	0.804	0.569	0.640	0.807	0.754	0.826	0.653	0.642	0.884	0.843	0.897	0.675	0.736
	threshold	Llama3	0.817	0.738	0.796	0.467	0.570	0.817	0.751	0.843	0.509	0.574	0.887	0.841	0.901	0.628	0.716
		Mixtral	0.814	0.759	0.803	0.595	0.652	0.814	0.760	0.834	0.616	0.623	0.883	0.842	0.898	0.679	0.740
		Moonshot	0.819	0.754	0.801	0.554	0.623	0.818	0.755	0.842	0.516	0.582	0.888	0.841	0.899	0.633	0.719
		GPT-4o-mini	0.714	0.724	0.718	0.718	0.713	0.755	0.740	0.769	0.688	0.672	0.794	0.800	0.809	0.752	0.755
		GPT-3.5	0.672	0.759	0.762	0.717	0.713	0.690	0.697	0.692	0.676	0.677	0.843	0.837	0.862	0.748	0.756
Log-Likelihood	logistic	Llama3	0.785	0.730	0.751	0.657	0.663	0.708	0.651	0.636	0.572	0.501	0.806	0.804	0.806	0.670	0.659
		Mixtral	0.786	0.735	0.753	0.663	0.669	0.715	0.656	0.647	0.585	0.512	0.806	0.811	0.805	0.695	0.668
		Moonshot	0.793	0.751	0.759	0.681	0.684	0.708	0.650	0.635	0.571	0.500	0.808	0.810	0.802	0.700	0.671
		GPT-4o-mini	0.788	0.765	0.766	0.714	0.692	0.741	0.677	0.699	0.654	0.558	0.820	0.817	0.818	0.723	0.698
		GPT-3.5	0.795	0.748	0.759	0.675	0.682	0.733	0.690	0.723	0.681	0.589	0.819	0.815	0.817	0.718	0.694
	threshold	Llama3	0.794	0.745	0.756	0.672	0.678	0.714	0.652	0.642	0.578	0.510	0.803	0.808	0.804	0.691	0.667
		Mixtral	0.795	0.749	0.759	0.675	0.682	0.725	0.662	0.677	0.614	0.535	0.806	0.809	0.809	0.686	0.665
		Moonshot	0.793	0.751	0.760	0.680	0.684	0.744	0.682	0.711	0.672	0.567	0.806	0.803	0.806	0.673	0.661
		GPT-4o-mini	0.793	0.757	0.766	0.689	0.687	0.733	0.670	0.698	0.638	0.545	0.800	0.809	0.811	0.765	0.709
		GPT-3.5	0.719	0.667	0.698	0.522	0.606	0.688	0.642	0.612	0.550	0.481	0.799	0.809	0.811	0.764	0.709
Rank	logistic	Llama3	0.722	0.693	0.751	0.528	0.382	0.583	0.601	0.687	0.571	0.375	0.706	0.739	0.818	0.620	0.566
		Mixtral	0.721	0.688	0.748	0.524	0.381	0.576	0.591	0.682	0.553	0.360	0.708	0.719	0.770	0.656	0.596
		Moonshot	0.726	0.692	0.755	0.552	0.399	0.548	0.554	0.635	0.510	0.308	0.688	0.731	0.818	0.571	0.515
		GPT-4o-mini	0.579	0.617	0.602	0.675	0.688	0.651	0.669	0.693	0.655	0.623	0.713	0.732	0.805	0.644	0.592
		GPT-3.5	0.091	0.139	0.018	0.215	0.452	0.339	0.337	0.142	0.307	0.549	0.018	0.040	0.003	0.010	0.090
	threshold	Llama3	0.697	0.652	0.716	0.471	0.320	0.618	0.624	0.713	0.616	0.440	0.713	0.734	0.822	0.609	0.551
		Mixtral	0.730	0.695	0.757	0.568	0.417	0.604	0.617	0.699	0.596	0.408	0.669	0.719	0.811	0.538	0.489
		Moonshot	0.723	0.706	0.750	0.616	0.470	0.579	0.600	0.685	0.563	0.368	0.694	0.730	0.817	0.575	0.521
		GPT-4o-mini	0.716	0.699	0.737	0.651	0.525	0.629	0.636	0.717	0.643	0.521	0.706	0.739	0.815	0.627	0.571
		GPT-3.5	0.053	0.044	0.029	0.019	0.009	0.675	0.680	0.668	0.660	0.678	0.706	0.739	0.815	0.627	0.571
Rank GLTR	logistic	Llama3	0.759	0.708	0.712	0.614	0.678	0.720	0.647	0.634	0.544	0.530	0.802	0.800	0.775	0.649	0.670
		Mixtral	0.755	0.701	0.709	0.603	0.676	0.727	0.655	0.645	0.559	0.535	0.812	0.808	0.788	0.679	0.696
		Moonshot	0.768	0.731	0.734	0.660	0.688	0.708	0.629	0.600	0.504	0.508	0.809	0.808	0.795	0.681	0.699
		GPT-4o-mini	0.767	0.737	0.739	0.693	0.701	0.750	0.696	0.717	0.658	0.616	0.815	0.813	0.800	0.713	0.721
		GPT-3.5	0.757	0.706	0.710	0.610	0.679	0.744	0.702	0.722	0.662	0.620	0.812	0.809	0.787	0.676	0.694
Distilbert	MLP	Llama3	0.978	0.955	0.983	0.944											




Figure A4: Transfer to Social Sciences Domain

where \mathcal{L}_{new} is the classification loss for new tasks, $\mathcal{L}_{\text{distill}}$ is the distillation loss to keep the results for old tasks, and λ balances the two terms. This encourages the model to learn new knowledge while retaining old information.

iCaRL [25]. iCaRL introduces a rehearsal-based approach to CIL. The method addresses forgetting by memory replaying. It maintains a fixed memory buffer to store a subset of examples from previous tasks, which are replayed during training to retain knowledge. To balance old and new knowledge, iCaRL uses a knowledge distillation loss similar to LwF. The exemplars allow iCaRL to replay old class information effectively, thus mitigating forgetting.

BiC [35]. BiC focuses on addressing the bias towards new classes that arise in CIL. When new classes are added, the model tends to favor these classes due to their dominance in the learning process. BiC first trains the model on the data (n old classes and m new classes) without any correction. Then, it adds a bias correction layer that adjusts the logits of new classes:

$$q_k = \begin{cases} o_k, & \text{if } 1 \leq k \leq n, \\ \alpha o_k + \beta, & \text{if } n+1 \leq k \leq n+m, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where q_k is the new logit for class k , o_k is the original logit, and α, β are one-dimensional learnable parameters. The bias correction layer ensures that the model's predictions remain balanced across old and new classes.

Combine. We integrate the knowledge distillation loss, memory replayer, and logit calibration techniques to produce a combined method to see if the performance can be different.

J Class Incremental Experiments

Table A7 shows the performance of introducing two LLMs in the update stage. The results drop rapidly as the number of new LLMs increases.




Figure A5: Transfer to Humanities Domain




Figure A6: Transfer to STEM Domain




Figure A7: Transfer to Different Target LLMs

Table A7: Results for Introducing Two New LLMs in the Update Stage.

Domain	Last Model	DistilBert					RoBERTa				
		Normal	LwF	iCaRL	BiC	Attribution	Normal	LwF	iCaRL	BiC	Attribution
Social Science	GPT-4omini	0.4529	0.4791	0.4788	0.4792	0.8174	0.4407	0.4187	0.4891	0.4891	0.8177
STEM	+	0.4540	0.4712	0.4698	0.4703	0.8444	0.4857	0.5098	0.5000	0.5005	0.8881
Humanity	Llama3	0.4313	0.4327	0.4657	0.4657	0.7835	0.4538	0.4521	0.4821	0.4833	0.8151