

# A Statistical Hypothesis Testing Framework for Data Misappropriation Detection in Large Language Models

YINPENG CAI<sup>†</sup>, LEXIN LI<sup>‡1</sup>, AND LINJUN ZHANG<sup>\*1</sup>

<sup>†</sup>*Peking University*, <sup>‡</sup>*University of California at Berkeley*, <sup>\*</sup>*Rutgers University*

## Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) are rapidly gaining enormous popularity in recent years. However, the training of LLMs has raised significant privacy and legal concerns, particularly regarding the inclusion of copyrighted materials in their training data without proper attribution or licensing, which falls under the broader issue of data misappropriation. In this article, we focus on a specific problem of data misappropriation detection, namely, to determine whether a given LLM has incorporated data generated by another LLM. To address this issue, we propose embedding watermarks into the copyrighted training data and formulating the detection of data misappropriation as a hypothesis testing problem. We develop a general statistical testing framework, construct a pivotal statistic, determine the optimal rejection threshold, and explicitly control the type I and type II errors. Furthermore, we establish the asymptotic optimality properties of the proposed tests, and demonstrate its empirical effectiveness through intensive numerical experiments.

---

<sup>1</sup>co-corresponding authors

# 1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) are rapidly gaining enormous popularity in the past couple of years, thanks to their transformative ability to process and generate human-like text. The versatility and scalability of LLMs are driving widespread adoption, and are revolutionizing fields such as healthcare, education, and finance with applications in content generation, data analysis, customer support, and research automation [20]. However, alongside their vast potential, the training of LLMs has raised significant privacy and legal concerns, particularly regarding the inclusion of copyrighted materials in their training data without proper attribution or licensing [19, 28]. These concerns fall under the broader issue of *data misappropriation*, namely, the unauthorized use, access, or exploitation of data by individuals or entities for unintended or unpermitted purposes, often in violation of governing regulations. Data misappropriation has been central to several high-profile debates. One example is the lawsuit between the New York Times and OpenAI [26]. Another example lies in OpenAI’s Terms of Service, which explicitly prohibits using ChatGPT’s output to develop competing models, raising the need for a mechanism to detect whether a newly trained LLM has incorporated data generated from ChatGPT. Detection of such data misappropriation is challenging though, especially when the probabilistic nature of LLMs generates content that may resemble, but does not directly copy, original works [24, 12]. Such challenges underscore the importance of developing methods to identify and trace machine-generated text, and have recently generated considerable research interest in this area [23, 15, 18, 22, 14, 33, 31]. In this article, we aim to address a crucial question in data misappropriation detection in LLMs, i.e., *How can one determine whether a given LLM has used data generated by another LLM as part of its training corpus?*

Watermarking is a technique used to embed identifiable patterns into the generated text, enabling traceability to distinguish AI-generated content from human-authored text [3]. This is typically achieved by subtly modifying token generation probabilities to favor specific words or patterns without compromising text coherence. There have been numerous watermarking techniques developed for LLMs in recent years, which can be broadly categorized as biased techniques [2, 30, 16], and unbiased techniques [1, 11, 8, 13, 32, 29]. The former explicitly alters token probabilities, favoring a predefined set of tokens to embed traceable patterns, and often introducing detectable statistical biases in the text. The latter ensures the watermark signal is embedded without introducing noticeable deviations from the model’s natural token distribution, preserving the text’s statistical properties.

In this article, we focus on a specific problem of data misappropriation detection, i.e., to determine whether a given LLM has incorporated data generated by another LLM. To address this issue, we propose embedding watermarks into the copyrighted training data and formulating the detection of data misappropriation as a hypothesis testing problem. We develop a general statistical testing framework, construct a pivotal statistic, determine the optimal rejection threshold, and explicitly control the type I and type II errors. Furthermore, we establish the asymptotic optimality properties of the proposed test, and demonstrate its empirical effectiveness through intensive numerical experiments. Our proposal introduces a number of novel components and makes several unique contributions to the field.

First, we develop a formal statistical hypothesis testing framework for data misappropriation detection. The core of our method lies in assessing the relationship between the tokens and secret keys. Under the null hypothesis  $\mathcal{H}_0$ , an LLM is not trained on watermarked data, and the secret keys derived from its outputs are independent of the tokens. Conversely, under the alternative hypothesis  $\mathcal{H}_1$ , the tokens and secret keys exhibit dependency. For each generation step  $t$ , given the *next-token prediction* (NTP) distribution  $\mathbf{P}_t$ , the null hypothesis assumes that the token generation adheres to the multinomial distribution  $\mathbf{P}_t$ . However, under  $\mathcal{H}_1$ , the distribution of token  $\omega_t$  also depends on the secret key  $\zeta_t$ , deviating from  $\mathbf{P}_t$ . To capture this dependence, we construct a pivotal statistic comprising  $\omega_t$  and  $\zeta_t$  satisfying that: under  $\mathcal{H}_0$ , the statistic follows a fixed distribution independent of the NTP mechanism, whereas under  $\mathcal{H}_1$ , the statistic follows a distribution depending on the NTP. Finding the rejection threshold for the proposed pivotal statistic, however, is highly nontrivial. To overcome this challenge, we employ the large deviation theory to evaluate the asymptotic rates of the type I and type II errors, and employ the class-dependent efficiency to account for variations in NTP distributions. We then transform the detection problem into a solvable minimax optimization problem, and derive the optimal rejection threshold accordingly.

Second, we consider two types of dependency relations between the LLMs. Specifically, for an unwatermarked LLM, the tokens are sampled from a multinomial distribution conditioned on preceding tokens. In contrast, for a watermarked LLM, a secret key is introduced that perturbs this multinomial distribution, generating tokens from a modified distribution. For any text, these secret keys can be computed at each generation step. In models unrelated to the watermarking process, these keys remain independent of the token sequences. However, when an LLM has been trained on watermarked data, its token generation process depends, at least partially, on these keys. We consider two settings for such dependency: the *complete inheritance* where the new LLM trained on the data from a watermarked LLM fully inherits the same watermarking distribution, and the *partial inheritance* where the newly trained LLM generates outputs with distributions close to, but not identical to, the watermarked distribution. We quantify the difference between the two inheritance settings using the total variation distance, which serves as a bounded and computationally convenient metric for comparing multinomial distributions, while other distance metrics can be incorporated too. We derive a separate rejection threshold for each inheritance setting. We also remark that we are the first to establish the optimality guarantees for data misappropriation detection under partial inheritance, while the existing literature only studies complete inheritance.

Third, we also consider two types of rejection rule designs, and establish the optimality guarantees of the corresponding tests. Specifically, we consider the traditional setting where we fix the type I error at a predefined level and seek to maximize the asymptotic efficiency in the minimax sense. Additionally, we also consider the setting where we aim to asymptotically minimize the sum of the type I and type II errors in the minimax sense. For the first setting, we show that our proposed test is asymptotically optimal in the sense that it achieves the largest power compared to *all* other testing methods. For the second setting, we show that our test is minimax optimal in that it achieves the smallest sum of type I and type II errors among *all* possible testing methods. Achieving such an optimality requires two key steps: deriving

the optimal testing scheme based on the selected pivotal statistic, and demonstrating that its asymptotic efficiency serves as an upper bound for the asymptotic efficiency of any alternative testing scheme. In cases where the minimax optimization problem derived from the chosen pivotal statistic is convex, the solution is relatively straightforward. However, convexity is not always guaranteed in the partial inheritance setting, where the bounded total variation distance introduces additional uncertainty. Addressing this involves fully characterizing the equality conditions of the underlying inequalities to ensure their validity throughout the estimation process. In the context of minimax-type inequalities, relying on a single equality condition is often insufficient. Instead, it is necessary to consider combinations of multiple cases. Evaluating the efficiency of these combined cases adds another layer of complexity, as it requires careful analysis of interdependencies and potential deviations. Our approach rigorously handles such challenging scenarios, ensuring robust detection performance even under non-convexity.

Finally, we develop the testing procedures for two commonly used, highly representative watermarking techniques. Specifically, we consider the Gumbel-max watermark [1], which adds structured noise derived from Gumbel distributions into the sampling process. We then consider the red-green-list watermark [16], which randomly divides the vocabulary tokens into the red list and the green list, and biases token selection toward the green list. The former represents an unbiased watermarking technique, whereas the latter a biased one. For each watermarking technique, we derive the corresponding optimal detection rule and demonstrate its efficacy through numerical experiments.

Our proposal is related to but also clearly distinctive of some existing literature. The line of research most closely related to ours is watermarking detection, where the goal is to distinguish between human-authored text and machine-generated text [18, 27, 17]. While most existing work did not establish the optimality of the testing methods, [17] was the first to propose a formal statistical framework for watermark detection, and rigorously studied the statistical efficiency of the testing methods with numerous watermarking techniques. Nevertheless, our work, while related, differs from [17] in several ways. First of all, we study a different and actually more general problem. The two tasks share a similar underlying principle, i.e., examining the token relations to detect watermark signals. However, unlike the binary detection of watermark presence versus absence, our task requires detecting partial watermarking, where the output of one LLM retains only certain traces of data generation patterns of another LLM. In a sense, the binary detection task can be viewed as a special case of ours. Moreover, [17] only considered the complete inheritance setting, and established the minimax optimal power over a particular class of testing methods for the fixed type I error setting. In addition to those settings, however, we also study the partial inheritance setting, which is more challenging but more realistic, and we establish the minimax optimality over *all* testing methods for the sum of type I and type II errors setting. These distinctions introduce additional challenges and necessitate new techniques and solutions. Another line of relevant research is membership inference attacks, where the goal is to determine whether a specific data point was part of the training dataset used to train a machine learning model [25, 7, 9, 5]. These attacks exploit overfitting or unintended information leakage, where the model exhibits differing behaviors for training versus non-training data. They pose privacy risks, as they can reveal information about indi-

viduals in the training data, and have been an important topic in differential privacy research [10, 4]. Nevertheless, our work is different. Instead of detecting the presence of specific data points in the training set, we aim to determine whether an LLM has incorporated data generated by another LLM into its training corpus. This shifts the focus from individual data points to identifying certain patterns in token generation that indicate dependencies between the models. Our problem requires a distinct analytical framework, as it involves detecting subtle traces of data generation patterns rather than individual-level overfitting or leakage.

In summary, we are among the first to conceptualize data misappropriation detection in LLMs as a statistical hypothesis testing problem. We develop a general testing framework incorporating different inheritance settings, different rejection rule designs, and different watermarking techniques. We establish the minimax optimality guarantees for the proposed tests. Our proposal offers a valuable integration of statistical principles and large language models, and provides meaningful statistical insights into the rapidly evolving field of generative AI.

The rest of the article is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the background and problem setup. Section 3 develops the statistical hypothesis testing framework. Sections 4 and 5 study the Gumbel-max watermarking and the red-green-list watermarking in detail. Section 6 presents the numerical studies. The supplementary appendix collects all technical proofs.

## 2 Problem Setup

In this section, we introduce the background and problem setup.

Language models are equipped with a vocabulary  $\mathcal{W}$ , which consists of words or word fragments called *tokens*. Typically, a vocabulary contains  $|\mathcal{W}| = 50,000$  tokens or more. In this article, we denote the number of tokens in the vocabulary by  $|\mathcal{W}| = m$ . For the simplicity of presentation, we simply assume  $\mathcal{W} = [m]$  in this article. To generate text, a language model requires a sequence of tokens that constitutes a *prompt*. In the generated text, the entries with nonpositive indices,  $\omega_{-L_p}, \omega_{-L_p+1}, \dots, \omega_0$ , represent the prompt, with a length of  $L_p + 1$ . The entries with positive indices,  $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_T$ , are tokens generated by the language model in response to the prompt. A language model for next-token prediction (NTP) is a function  $f$ , often parameterized by a neural network, which takes as input a sequence of known tokens,  $\omega_{-N_p}, \omega_{-N_p+1}, \dots, \omega_{t-1}$ , comprising the prompt and the first  $t - 1$  tokens generated by the model. The output is an  $m$ -dimensional multinomial distribution, which represents the probability distribution for the next token. Formally, let  $\mathbf{P}_t := (P_{t,1}, P_{t,2}, \dots, P_{t,m})$  denote this multinomial distribution at step  $t$ , conditioned on the prompt and previously generated tokens. As a valid probability distribution,  $\mathbf{P}_t$  satisfies that  $\sum_{i=1}^m P_{t,i} = 1$ .

Watermarking is a technique for adjusting the NTP distribution so that the generated text exhibits specific statistical properties, which can then be leveraged for detection. The key insight is that the text generated by a watermarked LLM adheres to the watermarking generation rules, whereas the human-written text does not follow these patterns. In this way, watermarks function as markers of an LLM’s generation rules, inspiring a method for distinguishing a watermarked LLM from an unwatermarked one based on a given text. This principle forms the

foundation of our research.

More specifically, a watermarked LLM generates the next token through a process jointly determined by a secret key and the NTP distribution. Let  $\zeta_t$  denote the secret key at step  $t$ , which is known only to the owner of the LLM. Formally, the generation rule of the watermarked LLM is  $\omega_t \sim \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{P}_t, \zeta_t)$ , where  $\mathcal{S}$  is a decoding function that outputs an  $m$ -dimensional multinomial distribution. In watermarking, a fundamental requirement is that averaging over the randomness in  $\zeta_t$ , the difference between the watermarked and unwatermarked generation rules should not be too large. In other words, the NTP distribution conditioned on previous tokens should not vary significantly between the watermarked and unwatermarked LLMs. For instance, for an *unbiased watermarking* technique, the watermarked NTP distribution averaged over the randomness in  $\zeta_t$  matches the unwatermarked NTP distribution, conditioned on previous tokens. Consequently, from a user’s perspective, there is no noticeable difference between the text generated by a watermarked LLM and that produced by an unwatermarked LLM.

Nevertheless, the secret keys possess statistical properties that enable effective detection. Typically, the secret keys are generated using hash functions. Hash functions map data of arbitrary size to fixed-sized values, with specific forms varying across different watermarking techniques. In many hashing-based watermarks, the distribution of watermarked text is biased towards certain  $k$ -grams by hashing a sliding window of the previous  $k - 1$  tokens to determine the next token pseudorandomly. In practice,  $\zeta_t$  can be computed using a hash function  $\mathcal{A}$  that depends only on, for instance, the last five tokens  $\omega_{t-5}, \dots, \omega_{t-1}$  [1].

We next quickly review two commonly used watermarking techniques, the Gumbel-max watermark [1], and the red-green-list watermark [16]. For the Gumbel-max watermarking, let  $\zeta = (U_{t,\omega})_{\omega \in \mathcal{W}}$  consist of  $|\mathcal{W}| = m$  i.i.d. copies of  $U(0, 1)$ . Note that  $\arg \max_{\omega \in \mathcal{W}} \log U_{t,\omega} / P_\omega$  follows the NTP distribution  $\mathbf{P} := (P_1, P_2, \dots, P_m)$ . Recognizing this fact, it considers the following unbiased watermarking generation rule,

$$\omega_t = \arg \max_{\omega \in \mathcal{W}} \frac{\log U_{t,\omega}}{P_\omega}.$$

For the red-green-list watermarking, at each step, it randomly divides the vocabulary into two parts, designated as the red list and the green list, respectively. It then selects the next token from the green list. The resulting watermarking generation process is nondeterministic, conditional on  $\mathbf{P}_t$  and  $\zeta_t$ . The secret key  $\zeta_t$  can be represented as a set  $D$ , such that  $|D| = m/2$  and  $D \subset \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ , assuming  $m$  is even. The distribution of  $\omega_t$ , given  $\mathbf{P}_t$  and  $\zeta_t$ , can then be written as,

$$\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{P}_t, \zeta_t) = \left( p_{t,1} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{1}\{1 \in D_t\}}{\sum_{i \in D_t} p_{t,i}}, p_{t,2} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{1}\{2 \in D_t\}}{\sum_{i \in D_t} p_{t,i}}, \dots, p_{t,m} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{1}\{m \in D_t\}}{\sum_{i \in D_t} p_{t,i}} \right).$$

That is, given  $\mathbf{P}_t$  and  $\zeta_t$ ,  $\omega_t$  follows the multinomial distribution,

$$\mathbb{P}(\omega_t = k | \mathbf{P}_t, \zeta_t) = p_{t,k} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{1}\{k \in D_t\}}{\sum_{i \in D_t} p_{t,i}}.$$

Formally, we consider the following setup for our data misappropriation detection problem. Suppose there are three roles. A *victim* is the owner of an LLM who has used plentiful resources to train an LLM, has added some type of watermark in their LLM, and has the knowledge of the secret keys that correspond to the knowledge of the hash functions. A *suspect* is the owner of another LLM, and is suspected to have used data generated by the victim’s LLM as part of the training data for their own LLM. The suspect has no knowledge of the secret keys of the victim’s LLM. A *detector* is a trusted third party, such as law enforcement, who cooperates with the victim. The detector has the knowledge of both the secret keys and the of the NTP distribution of the victim’s LLM, but does not know the NTP distribution of the suspect’s LLM. The detector is to determine whether the suspect has used the data generated by the victim’s LLM to train their LLM.

Throughout this article, we adopt the following notation. For an event  $A$ , let  $\mathbf{1}\{A\}$  denote the indicator function on  $A$ . Let  $g(n) = O(f(n))$ ,  $g(n) = \omega(f(n))$  denote that there exists numerical constant  $c_1, c_2$ , such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(n)/f(n) < c_1$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(n)/f(n) = \infty$ , respectively. Let  $TV(\mu|\nu)$  denote the total variation (TV) distance between two probability measures  $\mu, \nu$ . In particular, for the case that  $\mu = (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_m), \nu = (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_m)$ , we can calculate their TV distance by  $TV(\mu|\nu) = 1/2 \sum_{i=1}^m |p_i - q_i|$ . Let  $TV_{|\zeta}(\mu|\nu)$  denote the TV distance between two probability measures  $\mu, \nu$  conditional on a random variable  $\zeta$ .

### 3 A Statistical Framework

In this section, we formally introduce our statistical framework, including the hypotheses, the pivotal statistic, and the derivation of the rejection threshold.

#### 3.1 Hypotheses and Pivotal Statistics

Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  denote the text length. Let  $\omega_{1:n} := \omega_1 \cdots \omega_n$  and  $\zeta_{1:n} := \zeta_1 \cdots \zeta_n$  denote the generated text and the secret keys, respectively. Given a prompt  $\omega_{-N_p:0}$  and a text  $\omega_{1:n}$  generated by the LLM under investigation, we target the problem of whether this LLM utilizes the data generated by another watermarked LLM, in the form of hypotheses:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_0 &: \omega_{1:n} \text{ is generated by the LLM without data misappropriation;} \\ \mathcal{H}_1 &: \omega_{1:n} \text{ is generated by the LLM with data misappropriation.} \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

In addition, the secret keys are generated using the hash function  $\mathcal{A}$ , in that  $\zeta_t = \mathcal{A}(\omega_{-N_p:(t-1)})$ . The knowledge of  $\mathcal{A}$  is only available to the victim and the detector, but not the suspect. As such,  $\zeta_{1:n}$  are regarded as random variables by the suspect, but are viewed deterministic by the victim and the detector, since they can be calculated by previous tokens plus the knowledge of the hash function. Meanwhile, the watermarked LLM generates the next token according to the rule,  $\omega_t \sim \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{P}_t, \zeta_t)$ , for some decoding function  $\mathcal{S}$ , and  $\mathbf{P}_t$  represents the NTP distribution of the unwatermarked LLM given the prompt and previous tokens.

Next, we mathematically formulate complete inheritance and partial inheritance.

**Definition 1 (Complete inheritance).** *The suspect’s LLM follows the same generation rule as the victim’s LLM, in that the hash function  $\mathcal{A}$  and the decoding function  $\mathcal{S}$  of both LLMs are the same if data misappropriation occurs.*

Under the complete inheritance setting, the hypotheses in (1) become

$$\mathcal{H}_0 : \omega_t | \zeta_t \sim \mathbf{P}_t, \quad \mathcal{H}_1 : \omega_t | \zeta_t \sim \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{P}_t, \zeta_t), \quad (2)$$

for  $t = 1, 2, \dots, n$ .

In practice, a newly trained LLM that incorporates data generated by a watermarked LLM produces outputs with a distribution that preserves certain patterns of the watermarked distribution, but not identical. This scenario is captured by the following partial inheritance setting.

**Definition 2 (Partial inheritance).** *There exists an upper bound for the total variation (TV) distance between the probability distribution of data generated by the suspect’s LLM under data misappropriation, and the probability distribution of data generated by the victim’s watermarked LLM, in that  $TV_{|\zeta_t}(\omega_t, \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{P}_t, \zeta_t)) \leq 1 - \theta$ , where  $1 - \theta$  quantifies the upper bound on the allowable difference between the two distributions.*

Under the partial inheritance setting, the hypotheses in (1) become

$$\mathcal{H}_0 : \omega_t | \zeta_t \sim \mathbf{P}_t; \quad \mathcal{H}_1 : TV_{|\zeta_t}(\omega_t, \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{P}_t, \zeta_t)) \leq 1 - \theta, \quad (3)$$

for  $t = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . We also briefly remark that, for the detection task to be feasible, the constant  $\theta$  cannot be too small, as an overly small  $\theta$  would imply that the two distributions are too similar to differentiate.

Next, we describe the distribution of  $\omega | \zeta$  under  $\mathcal{H}_1$ . In commonly used watermarking techniques,  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{P}, \zeta)$  can only take finitely many values. We provide further discussion in later sections when applying this framework to specific watermarking techniques. Let  $k$  denote the total possible values of  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{P}, \zeta)$ , and partition the space of  $(\mathbf{P}, \zeta)$  into multiple regions,  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_k$ , such that in each region  $A_i$ , the corresponding multinomial distribution  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{P}, \zeta)$  is identical, and is represented by a multinomial probability vector  $(s_{i1}, s_{i2}, \dots, s_{im})$ , for  $i \in [k]$ . We further assume that, for any  $t \in [n]$ , and all  $(\mathbf{P}, \zeta) \in A_i$ , the distribution of  $\omega$  in the partial inheritance setting is the same, which is represented by  $(q_{t,i1}, q_{t,i2}, \dots, q_{t,im})$ , regardless of the exact values of  $(\mathbf{P}, \zeta)$ . This assumption simplifies the theoretical discussion and allows us to represent the extreme points using a feature matrix. Notably, this assumption can be relaxed without compromising the validity of our theoretical results; see a more detailed discussion in Remark 1. Now, we formally define the feature matrix, whose rows describe different possible distributions of  $\omega | \zeta$ .

**Definition 3.** *Define the feature matrix under the null  $\mathcal{H}_0$  as  $\mathbf{S} = (s_{ij})_{k \times m}$ , and the feature matrix under the alternative  $\mathcal{H}_1$  at token  $t$  as  $\mathbf{Q}_t = (q_{t,ij})_{k \times m}$ .*

The feature matrix allows us to directly derive the distribution of pivotal statistics under the null and alternative hypotheses. Additionally, the use of the feature matrix helps the representation of extreme points, and provides a more efficient framework for analysis. Importantly, we note that the order of rows in the feature matrix is arbitrary and does not affect the results.



Next, we derive the test statistic for our hypotheses. We note that, in our setting, the likelihood may not be computable. Therefore, we construct a pivotal statistic,

$$Y_t := Y(\omega_t, \zeta_t),$$

such that, under the null hypothesis, its distribution is invariant to  $\mathbf{P}_t$ , and under the alternative hypothesis, its distribution depends on  $\mathbf{P}_t$  and is denoted as  $\mu_{1, \mathbf{P}_t}$ . We then have the following rejection rule,

$$T_h(Y_{1:n}) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \sum_{t=1}^n h(Y_t) \geq \gamma_n, \\ 0 & \text{if } \sum_{t=1}^n h(Y_t) < \gamma_n. \end{cases}$$

where  $h(\cdot)$  is the score function that we derive later. That is, we reject  $\mathcal{H}_0$  if  $T_h(Y_{1:n}) = 1$ .

We also remark that, for complete inheritance, our testing problem reduces to the problem of determining whether a text is generated by an unwatermarked LLM or by a watermarked LLM, whose NTP distributions are the same, which has been studied in [17]. However, our problem is more general, in that we also consider partial inheritance, different rejection rule designs, and obtain tighter optimality guarantees.

### 3.2 Rejection threshold

For our testing method, it is crucial to choose an appropriate score function  $h(\cdot)$  and the threshold  $\gamma_n$  to ensure the optimality of the test. Next, we consider two rejection rule designs separately. We first fix the type I error at a predefined level and seek to maximize the asymptotic efficiency. We then aim to asymptotically minimize the sum of the type I and type II errors.

We first consider the setting of the fixed type I error, where we choose the threshold  $\gamma_n$ , such that  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}_0}(T_h(Y_{1:n}) = 1) = \alpha$  for a pre-specified significance level  $\alpha$ , while we will choose an optimal score function  $h(\cdot)$  later to maximize the asymptotic power of the test. Our key idea is to turn the hypothesis testing problem to a minimax optimization problem. Toward that end, we have the following theoretical results.

**Theorem 1 (Fixed type I error).** *We consider the complete inheritance setting and the partial inheritance setting, respectively.*

- (a) **(Complete inheritance).** *Suppose  $\mathbf{P}_t \in \mathcal{P}$  for all  $t$ . For any  $h$  satisfying  $\mathbb{E}_0|h| < \infty$ , where  $\mathbb{E}_0$  denotes the expectation under  $\mathcal{H}_0$ , the type II error of the rejection rule  $T_h$  satisfies that*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}_1}(T_h(Y_{1:n}) = 0)^{1/n} \leq e^{-R_{\mathcal{P}}(h)}, \quad (4)$$

where  $R_{\mathcal{P}}(h) = -\inf_{\theta \geq 0} \sup_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}} \{\theta \mathbb{E}_0 h(Y) + \log \phi_{\mathbf{P}, h}(\theta)\} = -\inf_{\theta \geq 0} \{\theta \mathbb{E}_0 h(Y) + \sup_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}} \log \phi_{\mathbf{P}, h}(\theta)\}$ ,  $\phi_{\mathbf{P}, h}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{1, \mathbf{P}} e^{-\theta h(Y)}$ , and  $\mathbb{E}_{1, \mathbf{P}}$  denotes the expectation under  $\mathcal{H}_1$  that depends on  $\mathbf{P}$ . Here  $\mathcal{P}$  is a distribution class whose specific form is specified

later for specific watermarking techniques. In addition, the inequality in (4) is tight, in that there exist  $\mathbf{P}^*$ , such that, if  $\mathbf{P}_t = \mathbf{P}^*$  for all  $t$ , then

$$(\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}_1}(T_h(Y_{1:n}) = 0))^{1/n} \geq e^{-(R_{\mathcal{P}}(h)+\epsilon)}$$

for any positive  $\epsilon$  and a sufficiently large  $n$ .

(b) (**Partial inheritance**). Suppose  $\mathbf{P}_t \in \mathcal{P}$ ,  $\mathbf{Q}_t \in \mathcal{Q}$  for all  $t$ . For any  $h$  satisfying  $\mathbb{E}_0|h| < \infty$ , the type II error of the rejection rule  $T_h$  satisfies that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}_1}(T_h(Y_{1:n}) = 0)^{1/n} \leq e^{-R_{\mathcal{P},\mathcal{Q}}(h)}, \quad (5)$$

where  $R_{\mathcal{P},\mathcal{Q}}(h) = -\inf_{\theta \geq 0} \sup_{\mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}} \sup_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}} \{\theta \mathbb{E}_0 h(Y) + \log \phi_{\mathbf{P},\mathbf{Q},h}(\theta)\}$ ,  $\phi_{\mathbf{P},\mathbf{Q},h}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{1,\mathbf{P},\mathbf{Q}} e^{-\theta h(Y)}$ , and  $\mathbb{E}_{1,\mathbf{P},\mathbf{Q}}$  denotes the expectation under  $\mathcal{H}_1$  that depends on both  $\mathbf{P}$  and  $\mathbf{Q}$ . Here  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}$  are some distribution classes whose specific forms are specified later for specific watermarking techniques. In addition, the inequality in (5) is tight, in that there exist  $\mathbf{P}^*$  and  $\mathbf{Q}^*$ , such that, if  $\mathbf{P}_t = \mathbf{P}^*$ ,  $\mathbf{Q}_t = \mathbf{Q}^*$  for all  $t$ , then

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}_1}(T_h(Y_{1:n}) = 0)^{1/n} \geq e^{-(R_{\mathcal{P},\mathcal{Q}}(h)+\epsilon)},$$

for any positive  $\epsilon$  and a sufficiently large  $n$ .

Theorem 1 essentially transforms the hypothesis testing problem into a minimax optimization problem, by showing that the two problems are equivalent under the worst case of NTP distribution  $\mathbf{P}_1, \mathbf{P}_2, \dots, \mathbf{P}_n$ . The restriction we put on the NTP distributions is rather general, which only needs  $\mathbf{P}_t \in \mathcal{P}$  for all  $t$  for some distribution class. Consequently, we turn to the following optimization problems for complete and partial inheritance, respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_h R_{\mathcal{P}}(h) &= -\inf_h \inf_{\theta \geq 0} \sup_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}} \{\theta \mathbb{E}_0 h(Y) + \log \phi_{\mathbf{P},h}(\theta)\} \\ &= -\inf_{h, \theta \geq 0} \sup_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}} \{\mathbb{E}_0 \theta h(Y) + \log \mathbb{E}_{1,\mathbf{P}} e^{-\theta h(Y)}\}; \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_h R_{\mathcal{P},\mathcal{Q}}(h) &= -\inf_h \inf_{\theta \geq 0} \sup_{\mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}} \sup_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}} \{\theta \mathbb{E}_0 h(Y) + \log \phi_{\mathbf{P},\mathbf{Q},h}(\theta)\} \\ &= -\inf_{h, \theta \geq 0} \sup_{\mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}} \sup_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}} \{\mathbb{E}_0 \theta h(Y) + \log \mathbb{E}_{1,\mathbf{P},\mathbf{Q}} e^{-\theta h(Y)}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

We provide the detailed solutions to these minimax optimization problems later in Sections 4 and 5 for specific watermarking techniques.

We next consider the setting of minimizing the sum of type I and type II errors,

$$\inf_h \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[ \inf_{\gamma} \{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}_0}(T_h(Y_{1:n}) = 1) + \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}_1}(T_h(Y_{1:n}) = 0)\} \right]^{\frac{1}{n}}.$$

Again, we turn the hypothesis testing problem to a minimax optimization problem. We have the following theoretical results. We also briefly comment that we can consider minimizing any linear combination of type I and type II errors.

**Theorem 2 (Sum of type I and type II errors).** *We consider the complete inheritance setting and the partial inheritance setting, respectively.*

(a) **(Complete inheritance).** *Suppose  $\mathbf{P}_t \in \mathcal{P}$  for all  $t$ . For any  $h$  satisfying  $\mathbb{E}_0|h| < \infty$ , the type II error of the rejection rule  $T_h$  satisfies that*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}_0}(T_h(Y_{1:n}) = 1) + \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}_1}(T_h(Y_{1:n}) = 0)\}^{1/n} \leq e^{-S_{\mathcal{P}}(h)},$$

where  $S_{\mathcal{P}}(h) = -\inf_{\theta_1, \theta_2 > 0} \{\theta_2(\theta_1 + \theta_2)^{-1} \log \mathbb{E}_0 [\exp\{\theta_1 h(Y)\}] + \theta_1(\theta_1 + \theta_2)^{-1} \log \sup_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_{1, \mathbf{P}} [\exp\{-\theta_2 h(Y)\}]\}$ . *In addition, this inequality is tight, in that there exists  $\mathbf{P}^*$ , such that if  $\mathbf{P}_t = \mathbf{P}^*$  for all  $t$ , then*

$$\inf_{\gamma} \{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}_0}(T_h(Y_{1:n}) = 1) + \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}_1}(T_h(Y_{1:n}) = 0)\}^{1/n} \geq b \cdot e^{-S_{\mathcal{P}}(h)},$$

for any  $0 < b < 1$  and a sufficiently large  $n$ .

(b) **(Partial inheritance).** *Suppose  $\mathbf{P}_t \in \mathcal{P}$ ,  $\mathbf{Q}_t \in \mathcal{Q}$  for all  $t$ . For any  $h$  satisfying  $\mathbb{E}_0|h| < \infty$ , the type II error of the rejection rule  $T_h$  satisfies that*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}_0}(T_h(Y_{1:n}) = 1) + \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}_1}(T_h(Y_{1:n}) = 0)\}^{1/n} \leq e^{-S_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}}(h)},$$

where  $S_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}}(h) = -\inf_{\theta_1, \theta_2 > 0} \{\theta_2(\theta_1 + \theta_2)^{-1} \log \mathbb{E}_0 [\exp\{\theta_1 h(Y)\}] + \theta_1(\theta_1 + \theta_2)^{-1} \log \sup_{\mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}} \sup_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_{1, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}} [\exp(-\theta_2 h(Y))]\}$ . *In addition, this inequality is tight, in that there exists  $\mathbf{P}^*$  and  $\mathbf{Q}^*$ , such that if  $\mathbf{P}_t = \mathbf{P}^*$ ,  $\mathbf{Q}_t = \mathbf{Q}^*$  for all  $t$ , then*

$$\inf_{\gamma} \{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}_0}(T_h(Y_{1:n}) = 1) + \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}_1}(T_h(Y_{1:n}) = 0)\}^{1/n} \geq b \cdot e^{-S_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}}(h)},$$

for any  $0 < b < 1$  and a sufficiently large  $n$ .

Following Theorem 2, we turn to the following optimization problems for complete and partial inheritance, respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_h S_{\mathcal{P}}(h) &= \inf_h \inf_{\theta_1, \theta_2 > 0} \frac{\theta_2}{\theta_1 + \theta_2} \log \mathbb{E}_0 \exp(\theta_1 h(Y)) \\ &\quad + \frac{\theta_1}{\theta_1 + \theta_2} \log \sup_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_{1, \mathbf{P}} \exp(-\theta_2 h(Y)); \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_h S_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}}(h) &= \inf_h \inf_{\theta_1, \theta_2 > 0} \frac{\theta_2}{\theta_1 + \theta_2} \log \mathbb{E}_0 \exp(\theta_1 h(Y)) \\ &\quad + \frac{\theta_1}{\theta_1 + \theta_2} \log \sup_{\mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}} \sup_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_{1, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}} \exp(-\theta_2 h(Y)). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

**Remark 1.** *In this remark, we explain why it is reasonable to assume that the distribution of  $\omega|\zeta$  is identical whenever  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{P}, \zeta)$  is the same in the partial inheritance setting. In fact, in the minimax problems for the partial inheritance case, (9) (and similarly in (7)), the only*

term that depends on the distribution of  $Y$  under  $\mathcal{H}_1$  is  $\mathbb{E}_{1, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}} e^{-\theta_2 h(Y)}$ . To address this, we focus on optimizing  $\sup_{\mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}} \sup_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_{1, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}} e^{-\theta_2 h(Y)}$  given  $\theta_2$  and  $h$ . For this optimization, it is sufficient to consider the optimal  $\mathbf{Q}$  given  $\mathbf{P}$ . By definition,  $\mathbf{Q}$  imposes an upper bound on the total variation distance between  $\omega|\zeta$  and  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{P}, \zeta)$ . Consequently, the worst-case scenario can be reduced to the case where the distribution of  $\omega|\zeta$  is identical whenever  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{P}, \zeta)$  is the same. This reduction justifies the introduction of the feature matrix, which provides a well-defined and structured representation of the relationship between  $\omega|\zeta$  and  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{P}, \zeta)$ . The feature matrix simplifies the analysis by capturing all the relevant information in a systematic manner, facilitating the solution of the optimization problem.

**Remark 2.** The choice of the distribution class  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}$  determines the form of the optimization problems derived from the hypothesis testing problems. Specifically, the distribution class  $\mathcal{P}$  needs to exclude the singleton distributions (e.g.,  $(1, 0, 0, \dots, 0)$ ), because in such cases, the joint distribution of  $(\omega_t, \zeta_t)$  would be identical under  $\mathcal{H}_0$  and  $\mathcal{H}_1$ , making the two hypotheses indistinguishable. In the partial inheritance setting, the distribution class  $\mathcal{Q}$  must satisfy the condition  $TV_{|\zeta_t}(\omega_t, \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{P}_t, \zeta_t)) \leq 1 - \theta$  for all  $t \in [n]$ , ensuring the consistency with the bounded total variation condition. Beyond these requirements, our framework is flexible and can, in principle, analyze any distribution classes. Nevertheless, we follow the literature [17, 6, 14], and primarily focus on the following distribution class for  $\Delta, \theta \in (0, 1)$ :

$$\mathcal{P}_\Delta := \left\{ \mathbf{P} : \max_{i \in [m]} P_i \leq 1 - \Delta \right\}, \quad \mathcal{Q}_\theta := \{ \omega|\zeta : TV_{|\zeta}(\omega, \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{P}, \zeta)) \leq 1 - \theta \}.$$

## 4 Analysis of the Gumbel-max Watermark

In this section, we apply the general results from our framework to a specific watermarking scheme: the Gumbel-max watermark. We analyze the problem separately for the complete inheritance and partial inheritance settings. First, we derive the feature matrix for the Gumbel-max watermark and characterize the distribution of the test statistics under the null and alternative hypotheses. Additionally, we determine the optimal score function  $h(\cdot)$  for both the fixed type I error setting and the setting that minimizes the sum of type I and type II errors. Finally, we establish the optimality of our proposed tests.

### 4.1 Feature Matrix

We first derive the feature matrix for the Gumbel-max watermark. Recall that, for the Gumbel-max watermark, the secret key  $\zeta_t$  consists of  $|\mathcal{W}|$  i.i.d. copies  $(U_{t,\omega})_{\omega \in \mathcal{W}} \sim U(0, 1)$ , while the tokens are generated by the rule  $\omega_t = \arg \max_{\omega \in \mathcal{W}} \log U_{t,\omega} / P_\omega$ . As the detector has the knowledge of the hash function, the generating process becomes a deterministic process. In other words, if the detector knows the value of  $\zeta_t$  as well as the NTP distribution  $\mathbf{P}_t$ , one can directly determine what the next token is. As a result, the corresponding multinomial distribution  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{P}_t, \zeta_t)$  can at most take  $|\mathcal{W}| = m$  possible choices, implying that  $k = m$  in Definition 3. We now derive the feature matrix in the Gumbel-max watermarking case.

Recall that in both the complete inheritance and partial inheritance settings, the feature matrix represents the conditional probabilities of token generation under  $\mathcal{H}_0$  and  $\mathcal{H}_1$ . Under  $\mathcal{H}_0$ , the generation of  $\omega_t$  is independent of  $\zeta_t$ , and  $\omega_t$  follows the unwatermarked NTP distribution  $\mathbf{P}_t$ . Under the  $\mathcal{H}_1$ , the generation rule differs depending on the inheritance setting. In the complete inheritance setting with Gumbel-max watermarking, we have  $\omega_t = \arg \max_{i \in [m]} \frac{\log U_{t,i}}{P_{t,i}}$ . Let  $\omega^{(i)}$  denote the  $i$ -th token in the vocabulary  $\mathcal{W}$ . The probability that  $\omega_t = \omega^{(i)}$  is 1, given that  $\frac{\log U_{t,i}}{P_{t,i}}$  is the largest value among the sequence  $\{\frac{\log U_{t,i'}}{P_{t,i'}}\}_{i' \in [m]}$ . In contrast, in the partial inheritance problem, the generation rule differs slightly. As described in the problem setup, under  $\mathcal{H}_1$ , the generated tokens satisfy  $TV(\omega_t | \zeta_t, \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{P}_t, \zeta_t)) \leq 1 - \theta$ , for all  $t$ . In Gumbel-max watermarking,  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{P}_t, \zeta_t)$  is deterministic, so the corresponding probability distribution must be  $(1, 0, \dots, 0)$  or one of its permutations. Therefore, under the partial inheritance assumption, given that  $\frac{\log U_{t,i}}{P_{t,i}}$  is the largest value among  $\frac{\log U_{t,i'}}{P_{t,i'}}$  for  $i' \in [m]$ , the probability that  $\omega_t = \omega^{(i)}$  is greater than or equal to  $\theta$ .

We now formally present the feature matrices for both the complete and partial inheritance settings. Recall that  $\mathbf{P}_t$  represents the row vector of the NTP distribution at step  $t$ .

**Proposition 1.** *Following Definition 3, for  $t \in [n]$ , the feature matrices at token  $t$  under the*

*null and alternative hypotheses are as follows. Let  $\mathbf{M}_P = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{P}_t \\ \mathbf{P}_t \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{P}_t \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ .*

- (a) **(Complete inheritance).** *Under  $\mathcal{H}_0$ , the feature matrix is  $\mathbf{M}_P$ . Under  $\mathcal{H}_1$ , the feature matrix is an identity matrix  $I_{m \times m}$ .*
- (b) **(Partial inheritance).** *Under  $\mathcal{H}_0$ , the feature matrix is  $\mathbf{M}_P$ . Under  $\mathcal{H}_1$ , the  $t$ -th feature matrix belongs to the class  $\{\mathbf{Q}_{t, m \times m} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m} : q_{t,ii} \geq \theta\}$ , where  $q_{t,ii}$  is the  $i$ -th diagonal entry of the matrix  $\mathbf{Q}_{t, m \times m}$ . In other words, feature matrices under  $\mathcal{H}_1$  belongs to a class of matrices whose diagonal elements are all greater than or equal to  $\theta$ .*

## 4.2 Complete Inheritance

In the complete inheritance, we choose the pivotal statistic  $Y_t$  as the random number  $U_{t, \omega_t}$ , which corresponds to the selected token  $\omega_t$  at step  $t$ . We derive the distribution of  $Y_t$ . It is worth noting that the distribution results for  $Y_t$  in the complete inheritance setting are already established in the prior literature.

**Theorem 3.** *(adapted from [21]) Under the null hypothesis  $\mathcal{H}_0$ , we have  $Y_t \sim U(0, 1)$ , and  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}_0}(Y_t \leq r | \mathbf{P}_t) = r$ , for  $r \in [0, 1]$ . Under the alternative hypothesis  $\mathcal{H}_1$ , we have  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}_1}(Y_t \leq r | \mathbf{P}_t) = \sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{W}} P_{t, \omega} r^{\frac{1}{P_{t, \omega}}}$ , for  $r \in [0, 1]$ .*

Next, we obtain the optimal score function for the fixed type I error setting and the sum of type I and type II errors setting, respectively. We choose the distribution class as  $\mathcal{P}_\Delta := \{\mathbf{P} : \max_{i \in [m]} P_i \leq 1 - \Delta\}$  for  $\Delta \in [0, 1 - m^{-1}]$ .

**Theorem 4.** We consider the fixed type I error setting and the sum of type I and type II errors setting, respectively.

(a) (**Optimal score function**) For both settings, the optimal score function is

$$h_{\Delta}^*(r) = \log \left( \left\lfloor \frac{1}{1-\Delta} \right\rfloor r^{\frac{\Delta}{1-\Delta}} + r^{\frac{\tilde{\Delta}}{1-\tilde{\Delta}}} \right),$$

where  $\tilde{\Delta} = (1-\Delta) \cdot \lfloor \frac{1}{1-\Delta} \rfloor$ . Moreover, the worst case in the minimax problem is attained at the following least-favorable NTP distribution in  $\mathcal{P}_{\Delta}$ ,

$$\mathbf{P}^* = \left( 1-\Delta, \dots, 1-\Delta, 1-(1-\Delta) \cdot \left\lfloor \frac{1}{1-\Delta} \right\rfloor, 0, \dots \right).$$

(b) (**Threshold value**) In the setting of fixed type I error with  $\alpha$ , the threshold value  $\gamma_n = n \cdot \mathbb{E}_0 h_{\Delta}^*(Y) + \Phi^{-1}(1-\alpha) \sqrt{n \cdot \text{Var}_0(h_{\Delta}^*(Y))}$ . In the setting of minimizing the sum of type I and type II errors, the optimal threshold is chosen as  $\gamma_n = \log \alpha^* / (1-\alpha^*)$ , where  $\alpha^*$  is the solution to the following problem,

$$\inf_{\alpha^* \in (0,1)} \int_0^1 \left( \left\lfloor \frac{1}{1-\Delta} \right\rfloor r^{\frac{\Delta}{1-\Delta}} + r^{\frac{\tilde{\Delta}}{1-\tilde{\Delta}}} \right)^{\alpha^*} dr.$$

Finally, we establish the optimality for our proposed tests. The following theorem demonstrates that the asymptotic sum of type I and type II errors for our tests matches the lower bound across all possible tests, confirming their optimality.

**Theorem 5.** For a given test  $\psi$ , define the asymptotic type II error and the asymptotic sum of type I error and type II error respectively:  $f(\psi) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} e_{\psi,2}^{\frac{1}{n}}$ ,  $g(\psi) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (e_{\psi,1} + e_{\psi,2})^{\frac{1}{n}}$ . Denote the test in Theorem 4.(a) by  $\psi_1$  and the test in Theorem 4.(b) by  $\psi_2$ . The asymptotic errors of the tests satisfy:

(a) (**Fixed Type I Error**) Denote the class of all tests whose type I error are lower than  $\alpha$  by  $\Psi_{\alpha}$ . When either  $\frac{1}{1-\Delta}$  is an integer, with the condition that  $m = \Omega(n)$ ,  $m = o(\exp \sqrt{n})$ , or  $\Delta$  is a function of  $n$ , with the condition that the function satisfies that  $\frac{1}{\Delta(n)} = \Omega(n^{\frac{1}{m-1}})$ , we have

$$\inf_{\psi \in \Psi_{\alpha}} f(\psi) = f(\psi_1) - O\left(\frac{1}{m}\right).$$

(b) (**Minimizing the Sum of Type I and Type II Errors**) For both the case that  $\frac{1}{1-\Delta}$  is an integer and the case that  $\Delta$  is a function of  $n$ , with the condition that the function satisfies that  $\frac{1}{\Delta(n)} = \Omega(n^{\frac{1}{m-1}})$ , we have

$$\inf_{\psi} g(\psi) = g(\psi_2) - O\left(\frac{1}{m}\right).$$

We now provide some interpretations for this theorem. Result (a) indicates that among all tests with type I error not exceeding  $\alpha$ , our proposed test  $\psi_1$  is asymptotically optimal in terms of worst-case efficiency. The gap between the asymptotic type II error of  $\psi_1$  and the optimal testing scheme is  $O\left(\frac{1}{m}\right)$ . Given that  $m$  is typically very large, our test is effectively optimal in practice. Result (b) suggests that among all testing methods, our proposed test  $\psi_2$  based on the derived score function and an appropriate threshold, minimizes the asymptotic sum of type I and type II errors. The gap between  $g(\psi_2)$  and the theoretical minimum  $\inf_{\psi} g(\psi)$  is also  $O\left(\frac{1}{m}\right)$ .

It is also worth noting that the complete inheritance case in our problem is mathematically equivalent to the original watermarking problem of detecting whether a given text was generated by an LLM or produced by a human. While [17] also explore the optimality of detection in this context with fixed type I error, their approach establishes class-dependent optimality, that is, their detection procedure is shown to be optimal within a specific class of testing methods. In contrast, our result in (a) establishes a stronger form of optimality: our test is proven to be optimal among all possible testing procedures, independent of any specific class.

In the proof of both cases (a) and (b), the primary challenge lies in characterizing the terms  $\inf_{\psi \in \Psi_{\alpha}} f(\psi)$  and  $\inf_{\psi} g(\psi)$ . Since the approaches for addressing both are similar, without loss of generality, we focus on  $\inf_{\psi \in \Psi_{\alpha}} f(\psi)$  for explanation. By definition,  $\inf_{\psi \in \Psi_{\alpha}} f(\psi)$  can be expressed in a minimax form:  $\inf_{\psi} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\mathbf{P}_{1:n}} e_{\psi,2}^{\frac{1}{n}}$ . A tight analysis of this form requires finding the least-favorable NTP distributions. However, setting all  $\mathbf{P}_i$  to  $\mathbf{P}^*$  as described in Theorem 4.(a) leads to a significant gap between the evaluated quantity and  $f(\psi_1)$ . To resolve this, we select each  $\mathbf{P}_i$  as a mixture of least-favorable NTP distributions, which complicates likelihood calculations under both hypotheses and is highly nontrivial. After careful analysis, we show that the gap between the evaluated term and  $f(\psi_1)$  is manageable.

### 4.3 Partial Inheritance

Similar to the complete inheritance setting, we choose the pivotal statistic  $Y_t$  as the random number  $U_{t,\omega_t}$ , and first derive the distribution of  $Y_t$ .

**Theorem 6.** *Under the null hypothesis  $\mathcal{H}_0$ , we have  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}_0}(Y_t \leq r | \mathbf{P}_t, \mathbf{Q}_t) = r$ , for  $r \in [0, 1]$ . Under the alternative hypothesis  $\mathcal{H}_1$ , we have  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}_1}(Y_t \leq r | \mathbf{P}_t, \mathbf{Q}_t) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{p_i}{1-p_j} (r - r^{\frac{1}{p_j}} \cdot p_j) \cdot q_{ij} + \sum_{i=1}^n p_i r^{\frac{1}{p_i}} \cdot q_{ii}$ , for  $r \in [0, 1]$ . Moreover, it holds that  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}_1}(Y_t \leq r | \mathbf{P}_t, \mathbf{Q}_t) \leq r$ .*

Next, we derive the optimal score function for both the fixed type I error setting and the setting that minimizes the sum of type I and type II errors. While the approach for deriving the optimal score function under the partial inheritance setting shares similarities with that of the complete inheritance setting, it introduces several new technical challenges, with convexity being the most significant.

In the complete inheritance setting, convexity plays a key role in simplifying the problem. Specifically, the problem can be reduced to considering only the extreme points due to the convexity of the objective function. This convexity can be directly demonstrated by the positive

definiteness of the Hessian matrix. However, in the partial inheritance setting, convexity is not guaranteed and requires a more nuanced analysis. To address this challenge, we adopt a two-step approach. First, we fix the largest element of the multivariable function and analyze the convexity of the function with respect to the remaining  $n - 1$  variables. By characterizing the behavior of these remaining  $n - 1$  elements, we ensure that the function maintains the desired properties. Next, we remove the restriction on the largest element, reducing the original problem to a univariate function. This reduction allows us to handle the lack of global convexity while maintaining the validity of the solution.

For this analysis, we define the distribution classes as follows:  $\mathcal{P}_\Delta := \{\mathbf{P} : \max_{\omega \in \mathcal{W}} P_\omega \leq 1 - \Delta\}$ ,  $\Delta \in (0, 1)$ , and  $\mathcal{Q}_\theta := \{\mathbf{Q} : q_{ii} \geq \theta\}$ , for  $\theta \in (1/2, 1)$ .

**Theorem 7.** *We consider the fixed type I error setting and the sum of type I and type II errors setting, respectively.*

(a) (**Optimal score function**). *For both settings, the optimal score function is,*

$$h_\Delta^*(r) = \begin{cases} \log \left( \frac{1-\theta}{\Delta} + \left( \lfloor \frac{1}{1-\Delta} \rfloor \theta + \frac{1}{\Delta} \theta - \frac{1}{\Delta} \right) r^{\frac{\Delta}{1-\Delta}} + \theta r^{\frac{\tilde{\Delta}}{1-\Delta}} \right) & \text{if } \Delta \geq \frac{1}{2}, \\ \log \left( 2(1-\theta) + (2\theta-1) \left( r^{\frac{1-\Delta}{\Delta}} + r^{\frac{\tilde{\Delta}}{1-\Delta}} \right) \right) & \text{if } \Delta < \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

Moreover,  $R_{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}_\Delta}(h_\Delta^*)$  is attained at the following least-favorable NTP distribution in  $\mathcal{P}_\Delta$  and the feature matrix,

$$\mathbf{P}^* = \left( 1 - \Delta, \dots, 1 - \Delta, 1 - (1 - \Delta) \left\lfloor \frac{1}{1 - \Delta} \right\rfloor, 0, \dots \right), \quad \mathbf{Q}^* = \begin{pmatrix} \theta & 1 - \theta & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 1 - \theta & \theta & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 1 - \theta & 0 & \theta & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 - \theta & 0 & 0 & \dots & \theta \end{pmatrix}.$$

(b) (**Threshold value**) *In the setting of fixed type I error with  $\alpha$ , the threshold value  $\gamma_n = n \cdot \mathbb{E}_0 h_\Delta^*(Y) + \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha) \sqrt{n \cdot \text{Var}_0(h_\Delta^*(Y))}$ . In the setting where we aim to minimize the sum of type I and type II errors, the optimal threshold is chosen as:*

$$\gamma_n = \begin{cases} \log \frac{\alpha^*}{1 - \alpha^*} & \text{if } \Delta \geq \frac{1}{2}, \\ \log \frac{\beta^*}{1 - \beta^*} & \text{if } \Delta < \frac{1}{2}, \end{cases}$$

where  $\alpha^*, \beta^*$  are the solutions to the following problems:

$$\inf_{\alpha^* \in (0, 1)} \int_0^1 \left( \frac{1-\theta}{\Delta} + \left( \left\lfloor \frac{1}{1-\Delta} \right\rfloor \theta + \frac{1}{\Delta} \theta - \frac{1}{\Delta} \right) r^{\frac{\Delta}{1-\Delta}} + \theta r^{\frac{\tilde{\Delta}}{1-\Delta}} \right)^{\alpha^*} dr$$

$$\inf_{\beta^* \in (0, 1)} \int_0^1 \left( 2(1-\theta) + (2\theta-1) \left( r^{\frac{1-\Delta}{\Delta}} + r^{\frac{\tilde{\Delta}}{1-\Delta}} \right) \right)^{\beta^*} dr.$$



We would like to remark that in part (a), the least-favorable point  $\mathbf{Q}^*$  is not unique. In fact, all feature matrices  $\mathbf{Q}$  that achieve the worst-case efficiency satisfy the following conditions: (a)  $q_{ii} = \theta$ ; (b) For  $i \leq \lfloor \frac{1}{1-\Delta} \rfloor$ ,  $\sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \frac{1}{1-\Delta} \rfloor} q_{ij} = 1$ ; (c) For  $i > \lfloor \frac{1}{1-\Delta} \rfloor$ ,  $\sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \frac{1}{1-\Delta} \rfloor} q_{ij} = 1 - \theta$ ; (d) For  $j > \lfloor \frac{1}{1-\Delta} \rfloor$ ,  $q_{ij} = 0$ .

Finally, we establish the optimality for our proposed test. The optimality results of the partial inheritance problem are similar to those of the complete inheritance problem.

**Theorem 8.** *For a given test  $\psi$ , recall that the asymptotic type II error and the asymptotic sum of type I error and type II error:  $f(\psi) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} e_{2,\psi}^{\frac{1}{n}}$ ,  $g(\psi) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (e_{\psi,1} + e_{\psi,2})^{\frac{1}{n}}$ . Denote the test in Theorem 7.(a) by  $\tilde{\psi}_1$  and the test in Theorem 7.(b) by  $\tilde{\psi}_2$ . The asymptotic errors of these tests satisfy:*

- (a) **(Fixed Type I Error)** *Recall that the class of all tests whose type I error are lower than  $\alpha$  is  $\Psi_\alpha$ . When either  $\frac{1}{1-\Delta}$  is an integer,  $m = \Omega(n)$ ,  $m = o(\exp \sqrt{n})$ , or  $\Delta$  is a function of  $n$ , with the condition that the function satisfies that  $\frac{1}{\Delta(n)} = \Omega(n^{\frac{1}{m-1}})$ , we have*

$$\inf_{\psi \in \Psi_\alpha} f(\psi) = f(\tilde{\psi}_1) - O\left(\frac{1}{m}\right).$$

- (b) **(Minimizing the Sum of Type I and Type II Errors)** *For both the case that  $\frac{1}{1-\Delta}$  is an integer and the case that  $\Delta$  is a function of  $n$ , with the condition that the function satisfies that  $\frac{1}{\Delta(n)} = \Omega(n^{\frac{1}{m-1}})$ , we have*

$$\inf_{\psi} g(\psi) = g(\tilde{\psi}_2) - O\left(\frac{1}{m}\right).$$

These results demonstrate that the optimality of our tests in the partial inheritance setting mirrors that of the complete inheritance case.

An important point to emphasize is that our results can also be used for robust watermark detection in the original watermarking problem in detecting if a given text was generated by an LLM or written by a human [3, 1]. While their methods perform well when the text strictly adheres to the watermarking scheme, they may fail when modifications such as text editing and paraphrasing are applied to the generated text [31]. In contrast, the detection methods we propose are inherently robust to such modifications. Our approach explains the robustness of watermarking schemes by demonstrating that, even when generated paragraphs are altered, our methods can reliably and optimally detect the presence of the watermark. This robustness ensures the practical utility of our detection techniques in real-world scenarios.

## 5 Analysis of the Red-green-list Watermark

In this section, we apply our general framework to analyze the red-green-list watermark and derive the optimal tests for detecting data misappropriation under both the complete inheritance and partial inheritance settings.

## 5.1 Feature Matrix

Recall that, for the red-green-list watermark, the secret key  $\zeta_t$  is a subset  $D \subset \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$  satisfying that  $|D| = \gamma \cdot m$  for some  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ . In partial inheritance case, the distribution of  $\omega_t$  conditional on  $\mathbf{P}_t$  and  $\zeta_t$  is given by,

$$\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{P}_t, \zeta_t) = \left( p_{t,1} \frac{\mathbf{1}\{1 \in \zeta_t\}}{\sum_{i \in \zeta_t} p_{t,i}}, p_{t,2} \frac{\mathbf{1}\{2 \in \zeta_t\}}{\sum_{i \in \zeta_t} p_{t,i}}, \dots, p_{t,m} \frac{\mathbf{1}\{m \in \zeta_t\}}{\sum_{i \in \zeta_t} p_{t,i}} \right).$$

Under this scheme,  $\omega_t | \mathbf{P}_t, \zeta_t$  follows a multinomial distribution,

$$\mathbb{P}(\omega_t = k | \mathbf{P}_t, \zeta_t) = p_{t,k} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{1}\{k \in \zeta_t\}}{\sum_{i \in \zeta_t} p_{t,i}}.$$

Unlike the Gumbel-max watermarking technique, the red-green-list watermarking technique is not deterministic, even when conditioned on  $\mathbf{P}_t$  and  $\zeta_t$ .

**Proposition 2.** Let  $k = \binom{m}{\gamma \cdot m}$ , and  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_k, k = \binom{m}{\gamma \cdot m}$  denote all subsets of  $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$  containing  $\gamma \cdot m$  elements. Then, for for  $t \in [n]$ , the feature matrices at token  $t$  under the null and alternative hypotheses are as follows.

(a) **(Complete inheritance).** Under  $\mathcal{H}_0$ , the feature matrix is  $M_P = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{P}_t \\ \mathbf{P}_t \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{P}_t \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times m}$ . Under

$\mathcal{H}_1$ , the feature matrix is  $\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{S}_{t,1} \\ \mathbf{S}_{t,2} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{S}_{t,k} \end{pmatrix}$ , where  $\mathbf{S}_{t,i} = \left( p_{t,1} \frac{\mathbf{1}\{1 \in A_i\}}{\sum_{i \in A_i} p_{t,i}}, p_{t,2} \frac{\mathbf{1}\{2 \in A_i\}}{\sum_{i \in A_i} p_{t,i}}, \dots, p_{t,m} \frac{\mathbf{1}\{m \in A_i\}}{\sum_{i \in A_i} p_{t,i}} \right)$ .

(b) **(Partial inheritance).** Under  $\mathcal{H}_0$ , the feature matrix is  $M_P$ . Under  $\mathcal{H}_1$ , the  $t$ -th feature

matrix belongs to the class  $\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Q}_{t,1} \\ \mathbf{Q}_{t,2} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{Q}_{t,k} \end{pmatrix} : TV(\mathbf{Q}_{t,i}, \mathbf{S}_{t,i}) \leq 1 - \theta \right\}$ .

In the following, we analyze the complete inheritance and partial inheritance settings separately. In both cases, the pivotal statistic is  $Y_t = \mathbf{1}\{\omega_t \in \zeta_t\}$ . Since  $Y_t$  can only take the value 0 or 1, any score function  $h(\cdot)$  will yield a test statistic equivalent to counting the number of times  $Y_t = 1$ . Specifically, the test statistic  $\sum_{t=1}^n h(Y_t)$  corresponds to counting the occurrences of  $\{\omega_t \in \zeta_t\}$ . Thus, for this watermarking technique, the specific form of the score function  $h(\cdot)$  does not affect the outcome of the hypothesis testing. As a result, the testing procedure is determined by the number of instances where  $\omega_t \in \zeta_t$ .

## 5.2 Complete Inheritance

In the case of complete inheritance, the distribution of the pivotal statistic  $Y_t$  under the null and alternative hypotheses is as follows.

**Theorem 9.** *For  $t \in [n]$ , under the null hypothesis  $\mathcal{H}_0$ , we have  $\mathbb{P}(Y_t = 0) = 1 - \gamma$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(Y_t = 1) = \gamma$ ; under the alternative hypothesis,  $\mathcal{H}_1$ , we have  $\mathbb{P}(Y_t = 1) = 1$ .*

This result highlights the distinct behavior of  $Y_t$  under the two hypotheses. Under  $\mathcal{H}_0$ ,  $Y_t$  is a Bernoulli random variable with parameter  $\gamma$ , reflecting the random selection process for subsets in the red-green-list watermarking scheme. In contrast, under  $\mathcal{H}_1$ ,  $Y_t$  always equals 1, as the complete inheritance ensures that every token  $\omega_t$  is fully aligned with the watermarking process.

Denote the rejection set as  $R = \{(\omega_{1:n}, \zeta_{1:n}) : \sum_{t=1}^n Y_t \geq \gamma_n\}$ . We can change the value of the threshold  $\gamma_n$  to determine the rejection rule.

**Theorem 10.** *We consider the fixed type I error setting and the sum of type I and type II errors setting, respectively.*

(a) *In the setting of fixed type I error with  $\alpha$ , the optimal threshold value is given by*

$$\gamma_n = n \cdot \gamma + \sqrt{n\gamma(1-\gamma)}\Phi^{-1}(1-\alpha).$$

(b) *In the setting where we aim to minimize the sum of type I and type II errors, the optimal threshold is  $\gamma_n = n$ .*

We then establish the optimality for our proposed tests.

**Theorem 11.** *For a given test  $\psi$ , recall that we define the asymptotic type II error and the asymptotic sum of type I error and type II error respectively by:  $f(\psi) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} e_{\psi,2}^{\frac{1}{n}}$ ,  $g(\psi) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (e_{\psi,1} + e_{\psi,2})^{\frac{1}{n}}$ . Denote the test in Theorem 10.(a) by  $\psi'_1$ , and the test in Theorem 10.(b) as  $\psi'_2$ . The asymptotic errors of these tests are as follows:*

(a) **(Fixed Type I Error)** *For any test  $\psi$  whose Type I error is lower than  $\alpha$ , we have*

$$\inf_{\psi \in \Psi_\alpha} f(\psi) = f(\psi'_1).$$

(b) **(Minimizing the Sum of Type I and Type II Errors)** *For any test  $\psi$ , we have*

$$\inf_{\psi} g(\psi) = g(\psi'_2).$$

This theorem establishes the optimality of our proposed testing methods in both settings of fixed type I error and minimizing the sum of type I and type II errors. The proof of this result is considerably simpler than that of the Gumbel-max scheme. Specifically, it suffices to focus

on the case where each  $\mathbf{P}_i$  is  $(1/m, 1/m, \dots, 1/m)$ . Once the NTP distributions are fixed, deriving the optimal testing scheme reduces to analyzing a Bernoulli process under  $\mathcal{H}_0$  and a deterministic sequence under  $\mathcal{H}_1$ . This structure ensures that the test procedure is determined entirely by the number of occurrences of  $\{\omega_t \in \zeta_t\}$ , namely,  $\sum_{t=1}^n Y_t$ . This special structure eliminates the  $O(\frac{1}{m})$  term that is present in the Gumbel-max case, resulting the value of  $f(\psi'_1)$  (or  $g(\psi'_2)$ ) precisely matches the theoretical infimum  $\inf_{\psi} f(\psi)$  (or  $\inf_{\psi} g(\psi)$ ).

### 5.3 Partial Inheritance

In the partial inheritance setting, the token  $\omega_t$  conditional on  $\zeta_i$  follows a multinomial distribution with parameter  $Q_t = (q_{t,i1}, \dots, q_{t,im})$ . The distribution of  $Y_t$  is as follows.

**Theorem 12.** *Under the null hypothesis  $\mathcal{H}_0$ , we have  $\mathbb{P}(Y_t = 0) = 1 - \gamma$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(Y_t = 1) = \gamma$ . Under the alternative hypothesis  $\mathcal{H}_1$ , we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_t = 1) = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\binom{m}{\gamma \cdot m}}{\binom{m}{\gamma \cdot m}} \sum_{j \in \xi_i} q_{ij} \geq \theta, \quad \mathbb{P}(Y_t = 0) \leq 1 - \theta.$$

This result reflects the additional complexity of the partial inheritance setting. Under  $\mathcal{H}_0$ ,  $Y_t$  remains a Bernoulli random variable with parameter  $\gamma$ . However, under  $\mathcal{H}_1$ , the probability  $\mathbb{P}(Y_t = 1)$  is influenced by the distributions  $Q_t$  and the constraint  $TV(\omega_t | \zeta_t, \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{P}_t, \zeta_t)) \leq 1 - \theta$ .

We now introduce our proposed optimal test scheme by specifying the optimal rejection region.

**Theorem 13.** *We consider the fixed type I error setting and the sum of type I and type II errors setting, respectively. Given  $\theta \geq \gamma$ .*

(a) *In the setting of fixed type I error with  $\alpha$ , the optimal threshold value is given by*

$$\gamma_n = n \cdot \gamma + \sqrt{n\gamma(1-\gamma)}\Phi^{-1}(1-\alpha).$$

(b) *In the setting where we aim to minimize the sum of type I and type II errors, the optimal threshold is given by*

$$\gamma_n = \lceil n \cdot \frac{\log(1-\gamma) - \log(1-\theta)}{\log \theta + \log(1-\gamma) - \log \gamma - \log(1-\theta)} \rceil. \quad (10)$$

Next, we establish the optimality for our proposed tests.

**Theorem 14.** *For a test  $\psi$ , recall that the asymptotic type II error and the asymptotic sum of type I error and type II error respectively:  $f(\psi) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} e_{\psi,2}^{\frac{1}{n}}$ ,  $g(\psi) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (e_{\psi,1} + e_{\psi,2})^{\frac{1}{n}}$ . Denote the test in Theorem 13.(a) by  $\tilde{\psi}'_1$ , and the test in Theorem 13.(b) by  $\tilde{\psi}'_2$ . The asymptotic errors of these tests satisfy:*

(a) (**Fixed Type I Error**) For any test  $\psi$  whose Type I error is lower than  $\alpha$ , we have

$$\inf_{\psi \in \Psi_\alpha} f(\psi) = f(\tilde{\psi}'_1).$$

(b) (**Minimizing the Sum of Type I and Type II Errors**) For any test  $\psi$ , we have

$$\inf_{\psi} g(\psi) = g(\tilde{\psi}'_2).$$

This theorem establishes that our proposed tests achieve the infimum of both the asymptotic type II error and the asymptotic sum of type I and type II errors respectively, confirming its optimality in the partial inheritance setting. The key to proving these results lies in analyzing the worst-case scenario for  $\mathcal{H}_1$ . After fixing  $\mathbf{P}_i$  and  $\mathbf{Q}_i$ , the optimal test can be derived by considering the constraints on the TV distance  $TV(\omega_t | \zeta_t, \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{P}_t, \zeta_t)) \leq 1 - \theta$ . This leads to a feasible determination of the test statistic  $\sum_{t=1}^n Y_t$  and its corresponding rejection region. It can also be readily verified that the asymptotic type II error equals  $f(\tilde{\psi}'_1)$  the asymptotic sum of type I and type II errors equals  $g(\tilde{\psi}'_2)$ . The analysis of the partial inheritance case complements the complete inheritance setting by addressing more realistic scenarios where the watermark signal may be diluted, demonstrating the robustness and adaptability of our proposed test.

## 6 Numerical Studies

In this section, we numerically investigate the detection of data misappropriation with two watermarking schemes: Gumbel-max and red-green-list. For the Gumbel-max watermarking scheme, we compare the performance of our proposed testing method with baseline testing methods. First, we fix the type I error at a constant level and compare the type II error across all methods. Next, we evaluate the sum of type I and type II errors for each testing scheme. These evaluations are conducted for both the complete inheritance case and the partial inheritance case, corresponding to two distinct datasets.

### 6.1 Gumbel-max Watermark

In our simulation, we generate a vocabulary  $\mathcal{W}$  of size 1,000 and evaluate the type I and type II errors in watermark detection methods for generated token sequences. We compare our proposed method with baseline methods with other score functions  $h_{\text{ars}}(r) = -\log(1 - r)$  and  $h_{\text{log}} = \log r$ . Here, we note that  $h_{\text{ars}}$  is the score function proposed by Aaronson that was considered at OpenAI [1]. Recall that our proposed optimal score function is  $h_{\text{opt},\Delta} = \log \left( \lfloor \frac{1}{1-\Delta} \rfloor r^{\frac{\Delta}{1-\Delta}} + r^{\frac{\tilde{\Delta}}{1-\tilde{\Delta}}} \right)$ , where  $\tilde{\Delta} = (1 - \Delta) \lfloor \frac{1}{1-\Delta} \rfloor$ , as we developed in Theorem 4.

For a given text length  $T$ , we first generate 5,000 samples of unwatermarked word token sequences. Each unwatermarked token is uniformly sampled from the vocabulary  $\mathcal{W}$ . Throughout these 5,000 repeated experiments, we compute the average type I error. Similarly,

for the complete inheritance problem, we generate 5,000 samples of watermarked word token sequences to simulate type II error. When generating the watermarked texts, we first randomly select a prompt, then generate the subsequent tokens based on the values of the previous five tokens, which serve as a random seed. The NTP distribution satisfies that the largest term of the multinomial distribution is  $1 - \Delta$ , and the remaining terms are uniformly distributed such that their sum equals  $\Delta$ . In each generation process,  $\Delta$  is randomly sampled from the interval  $[0.001, 0.5]$ . Specifically, the NTP distribution can be represented by  $(P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{1000})$ , with the largest term equal to  $1 - \Delta$ . In the complete inheritance problem, at each step, we generate 1,000 i.i.d. random variables  $U_i$  that follow uniform distributions. Then, the watermarked texts are generated by the rule  $\omega = \arg \max_{\omega \in \mathcal{W}} \frac{\log U_\omega}{P_\omega}$ .

In the partial inheritance problem, the token generation process differs slightly from that of the complete inheritance setting. The generation process must be fine-tuned to ensure that the total variation distance between the adjusted probability distribution and the original one remains within a specified bound. Specifically, we calculate the value of  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{P}, \zeta)$  at each step. It is easy to observe that the distribution of  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{P}, \zeta)$  has the form  $(1, 0, 0, \dots, 0)$  or its permutations. Thus, we need only control the value of the term corresponding to the “1” in  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{P}, \zeta)$ . In our simulation, we first determine the value of  $1 - \theta$ , which corresponds to the upper bound of the TV distance. At each step, we randomly select  $\theta'$  from the interval  $[\theta, 1]$ , and the corresponding distribution of  $\omega|\zeta$  satisfies that the term corresponding to the “1” is  $\theta'$ , with the sum of the remaining terms equal to  $1 - \theta'$ . For this numerical simulation, we set  $\theta = 0.8$  and  $\Delta = 0.005$ . These parameters ensure that the generated distributions adhere to the constraints of the partial inheritance setting while maintaining the desired level of randomness and compliance with the TV distance bound.

For the fixed type I case, we set the confidence level  $\alpha = 0.05$  for both the complete and partial inheritance problems. The optimal threshold in the proposed rejection region is evaluated following our previous derivation, and is given by the formula:

$$\hat{\gamma}_{n,\alpha} = n \cdot \mathbb{E}_0[h(Y)] + \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha) \cdot \sqrt{n \cdot \text{Var}_0[h(Y)]}.$$

We compute this threshold through numerical calculations by directly plugging in the distribution of  $Y$  under the null hypothesis  $\mathcal{H}_0$ .

Throughout these 5,000 repetitions, we calculate the average type I and type II errors, with the findings presented in Figures 1 and 2. The results indicate that, empirically, the type I errors generally align with the nominal level of 0.05 and become increasingly closer to 0.05 as the text length increases. This behavior aligns with our theoretical expectations regarding the asymptotic control of type I error. Additionally, we compute the average type II error over these 5,000 experiments and present the results on the right columns of Figures 1 and 2. The figures demonstrate that, in both the complete and partial inheritance settings, our proposed test achieves consistently lower type II error compared to other baseline methods. These findings highlight the effectiveness of our approach in minimizing type II errors while maintaining type I error control.




Figure 1: Average type I and type II errors vs. text length for Gumbel-max watermarking in the complete inheritance case, under the setting of fixed type I error.




Figure 2: Average type I and type II errors vs. text length for Gumbel-max watermarking in the partial inheritance case, under the setting of fixed type I error.

For the case where we aim to minimize the sum of type I and type II errors, the computation of the optimal threshold in the proposed rejection region is more complicated than the fixed type I error case. Due to space constraints, we defer the details to the Section D.1 in the appendix. The findings of our numerical simulation are presented in Figure 3. The testing method proposed by us outperforms others in both the complete and partial inheritance cases, with the sum of type I and type II errors smaller than the other methods.




Figure 3: Average sum of type I and type II errors vs. text length for Gumbel-max watermarking in the complete inheritance (left) and partial (right) inheritance cases respectively, under the setting of minimizing the sum of type I and type II errors error.

## 6.2 Red-Green-list Watermark

In this section, we present numerical studies for the red-green-list watermarking scheme. Following a similar setup to the Gumbel-max watermark experiments, we generate a vocabulary  $\mathcal{W}$  of size 1,000 and evaluate the Type I and Type II errors in watermark detection methods for generated token sequences. The NTP distributions in both the complete inheritance and partial inheritance cases are 1,000-dimensional multinomial distributions. No restrictions are imposed on these distributions, and the parameter  $\gamma$  used for simulation is set to 0.5, meaning that we have green and red lists with equal length.

In the complete inheritance case, each secret key  $\zeta_t$  is a subset of  $\{1, 2, \dots, 1000\}$  containing 500 elements. The secret keys are selected randomly based on a random seed determined by the previous five tokens. Conceptually, this process divides the vocabulary into two groups, with half of the tokens designated as the green list and the other half as the red list.

Given NTP distribution  $\mathbf{P}_t = (p_{t,1}, p_{t,2}, \dots, p_{t,1000})$  and the secret key  $\zeta_t$ , the adjusted distribution is calculated as:

$$\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{P}_t, \zeta_t) = \left( p_{t,1} \frac{\mathbf{1}\{1 \in \zeta_t\}}{\sum_{i \in \zeta_t} p_{t,i}}, p_{t,2} \frac{\mathbf{1}\{2 \in \zeta_t\}}{\sum_{i \in \zeta_t} p_{t,i}}, \dots, p_{t,1000} \frac{\mathbf{1}\{1000 \in \zeta_t\}}{\sum_{i \in \zeta_t} p_{t,i}} \right).$$

This process effectively samples tokens exclusively from the green list at each step. For unwatermarked texts, tokens are randomly sampled from  $\{1, 2, \dots, 1000\}$ , and secret keys are chosen independently.

In the partial inheritance case, the adjusted distribution  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{P}_t, \zeta_t)$  needs to satisfy the TV distance constraint. We set the parameter  $\theta = 0.8$ , and the TV distance constraint between  $\omega|\zeta$  and  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{P}_t, \zeta_t)$  is set to  $1 - \theta$ . To satisfy this constraint, we adjust the probabilities for the green and red tokens as follows: the sum of probabilities for the green list is set to  $1 - \theta$ , while the sum for the red list is set to  $\theta$ . The resulting probability distribution  $\mathbf{q}_t = (q_{t,1}, q_{t,2}, \dots, q_{t,1000})$



is

$$q_{t,i} = \frac{p_{t,i} \mathbf{1}\{i \in \zeta_t\}}{\sum_{i \in \zeta_t} p_{t,i}} \cdot (1 - \theta) + \frac{p_{t,i} \mathbf{1}\{i \notin \zeta_t\}}{\sum_{i \notin \zeta_t} p_{t,i}} \cdot \theta.$$

As derived in the optimal tests for red-green-list watermarking, the specific form of the score function  $h(\cdot)$  does not influence the hypothesis testing outcome. Any score function will yield a test statistic equivalent to counting the number of instances where  $Y_t = 1$ . Consequently, in the fixed type I error setting, all test procedures based on different score functions are effectively identical, eliminating the need to compare different score functions. In the following, we present numerical evaluations of our method under both the fixed type I error setting and the setting aimed at minimizing the sum of type I and type II errors.

In the fixed Type I error setting, Figure 4 demonstrates that the Type I errors empirically align closely with the nominal level of 0.05, converging as the text length increases in both the complete and partial inheritance settings. This behavior aligns with our theoretical guarantees for asymptotic Type I error control. Additionally, in both settings, the Type II errors decrease rapidly to 0. In fact, in our theoretical derivation, it is easy to compute the Type II error of our optimal test, given by  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z} < \frac{\sqrt{n}(\gamma - \theta)}{\sqrt{\theta(1 - \theta)}} + \sqrt{\frac{\gamma(1 - \gamma)}{\theta(1 - \theta)}} \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha))$ , where  $\mathcal{Z}$  is a standard normal random variable. When  $\theta$  is close to 1,  $\frac{\theta - \gamma}{\sqrt{\theta(1 - \theta)}}$  becomes large, leading to a rapid decay of the Type II error. This behavior highlights the efficiency of our testing method, particularly for cases where the TV distance constraint is tight.




Figure 4: Average type I and type II errors vs. text length for Green-red-list watermarking in the complete and partial inheritance settings

We now consider the case of minimizing the sum of type I and type II errors. In the setting of complete inheritance, again, we can see the sum of type I and type II errors drop quickly to 0. In the setting of partial inheritance, recall that we generate the data with  $\theta = 0.8$ . To construct different testing procedures, we vary the values of  $\theta$  used for the rejection region threshold in (10). Figure 5 (right) shows the comparison for different testing procedures with  $\theta \in \{0.7, 0.8, 0.9, 0.95\}$ . As shown in the right figure, the optimal sum of Type I and Type II errors is achieved when the chosen  $\theta$  matches the true value used for data generation.




Figure 5: Average sum of type I and type II errors vs. text length for red-green-list watermarking in the complete inheritance (left) and partial (right) inheritance cases respectively, under the setting of minimizing the sum of type I and type II errors error.

## References

- [1] Scott Aaronson. Talk on “watermarking of large language models”, available at YouTube, 2023. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2Kx9jbSMZqA>.
- [2] Mikhail J Atallah, Victor Raskin, Michael Crogan, Christian Hempelmann, Florian Kerschbaum, Dina Mohamed, and Sanket Naik. Natural language watermarking: Design, analysis, and a proof-of-concept implementation. In *Information Hiding: 4th International Workshop, IH 2001 Pittsburgh, PA, USA, April 25–27, 2001 Proceedings 4*, pages 185–200. Springer, 2001.
- [3] Franziska Boenisch. A systematic review on model watermarking for neural networks. *Frontiers in Big Data*, 4, November 2021.
- [4] T Tony Cai, Yichen Wang, and Linjun Zhang. The cost of privacy: Optimal rates of convergence for parameter estimation with differential privacy. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(5):2825–2850, 2021.
- [5] T Tony Cai, Yichen Wang, and Linjun Zhang. Score attack: A lower bound technique for optimal differentially private learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.07152*, 2023.
- [6] Zhongze Cai, Shang Liu, Hanzhao Wang, Huaiyang Zhong, and Xiaocheng Li. Towards better statistical understanding of watermarking llms, 2024.
- [7] Nicholas Carlini, Steve Chien, Milad Nasr, Shuang Song, Andreas Terzis, and Florian Tramèr. Membership inference attacks from first principles, 2022.
- [8] Miranda Christ, Sam Gunn, and Or Zamir. Undetectable watermarks for language models, 2023.

- [9] Haonan Duan, Adam Dziedzic, Nicolas Papernot, and Franziska Boenisch. Flocks of stochastic parrots: Differentially private prompt learning for large language models, 2023.
- [10] Cynthia Dwork, Frank McSherry, Kobbi Nissim, and Adam Smith. Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis. In *Theory of Cryptography: Third Theory of Cryptography Conference, TCC 2006, New York, NY, USA, March 4-7, 2006. Proceedings 3*, pages 265–284. Springer, 2006.
- [11] Pierre Fernandez, Antoine Chaffin, Karim Tit, Vivien Chappelier, and Teddy Furon. Three bricks to consolidate watermarks for large language models, 2023.
- [12] Lee Gesmer. Copyright and the challenge of large language models. <https://www.masslawblog.com/copyright/copyright-and-the-challenge-of-large-language-models-part-2-2/>, 10 2024. America.
- [13] Zhengmian Hu, Lichang Chen, Xidong Wu, Yihan Wu, Hongyang Zhang, and Heng Huang. Unbiased watermark for large language models, 2023.
- [14] Baihe Huang, Hanlin Zhu, Banghua Zhu, Kannan Ramchandran, Michael I. Jordan, Jason D. Lee, and Jiantao Jiao. Towards optimal statistical watermarking, 2024.
- [15] Zhengyuan Jiang, Jinghuai Zhang, and Neil Zhenqiang Gong. Evading watermark based detection of ai-generated content. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 1168–1181, 2023.
- [16] John Kirchenbauer, Jonas Geiping, Yuxin Wen, Jonathan Katz, Ian Miers, and Tom Goldstein. A watermark for large language models, 2024.
- [17] Xiang Li, Feng Ruan, Huiyuan Wang, Qi Long, and Weijie J. Su. A statistical framework of watermarks for large language models: Pivot, detection efficiency and optimal rules, 2024.
- [18] Eric Mitchell, Yoonho Lee, Alexander Khazatsky, Christopher D. Manning, and Chelsea Finn. Detectgpt: Zero-shot machine-generated text detection using probability curvature, 2023.
- [19] Eduardo Santacana Noorjahan Rahman. Beyond fair use: Legal risk evaluation for training llms on copyrighted text. <https://blog.genlaw.org/CameraReady/57.pdf>, 7 2023. America.
- [20] OpenAI, Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, Red Avila, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Valerie Balcom, Paul Baltescu, Haiming Bao, Mohammad Bavarian, Jeff Belgum, Irwan Bello, Jake Berdine, Gabriel Bernadett-Shapiro, Christopher Berner, Lenny Bogdonoff, Oleg Boiko, Madelaine Boyd, Anna-Luisa Brakman, Greg Brockman, Tim Brooks, Miles Brundage, Kevin Button, Trevor

Cai, Rosie Campbell, Andrew Cann, Brittany Carey, Chelsea Carlson, Rory Carmichael, Brooke Chan, Che Chang, Fotis Chantzis, Derek Chen, Sully Chen, Ruby Chen, Jason Chen, Mark Chen, Ben Chess, Chester Cho, Casey Chu, Hyung Won Chung, Dave Cummings, Jeremiah Currier, Yunxing Dai, Cory Decareaux, Thomas Degry, Noah Deutsch, Damien Deville, Arka Dhar, David Dohan, Steve Dowling, Sheila Dunning, Adrien Ecoffet, Atty Eleti, Tyna Eloundou, David Farhi, Liam Fedus, Niko Felix, Simón Posada Fishman, Juston Forte, Isabella Fulford, Leo Gao, Elie Georges, Christian Gibson, Vik Goel, Tarun Gogineni, Gabriel Goh, Rapha Gontijo-Lopes, Jonathan Gordon, Morgan Grafstein, Scott Gray, Ryan Greene, Joshua Gross, Shixiang Shane Gu, Yufei Guo, Chris Hallacy, Jesse Han, Jeff Harris, Yuchen He, Mike Heaton, Johannes Heidecke, Chris Hesse, Alan Hickey, Wade Hickey, Peter Hoeschele, Brandon Houghton, Kenny Hsu, Shengli Hu, Xin Hu, Joost Huizinga, Shantanu Jain, Shawn Jain, Joanne Jang, Angela Jiang, Roger Jiang, Haozhun Jin, Denny Jin, Shino Jomoto, Billie Jonn, Heewoo Jun, Tomer Kaftan, Łukasz Kaiser, Ali Kamali, Ingmar Kanitscheider, Nitish Shirish Keskar, Tabarak Khan, Logan Kilpatrick, Jong Wook Kim, Christina Kim, Yongjik Kim, Jan Hendrik Kirchner, Jamie Kiros, Matt Knight, Daniel Kokotajlo, Łukasz Kondraciuk, Andrew Kondrich, Aris Konstantinidis, Kyle Kosic, Gretchen Krueger, Vishal Kuo, Michael Lampe, Ikai Lan, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, Jade Leung, Daniel Levy, Chak Ming Li, Rachel Lim, Molly Lin, Stephanie Lin, Mateusz Litwin, Theresa Lopez, Ryan Lowe, Patricia Lue, Anna Makanju, Kim Malfacini, Sam Manning, Todor Markov, Yaniv Markovski, Bianca Martin, Katie Mayer, Andrew Mayne, Bob McGrew, Scott Mayer McKinney, Christine McLeavey, Paul McMillan, Jake McNeil, David Medina, Aalok Mehta, Jacob Menick, Luke Metz, Andrey Mishchenko, Pamela Mishkin, Vinnie Monaco, Evan Morikawa, Daniel Mossing, Tong Mu, Mira Murati, Oleg Murk, David Mély, Ashvin Nair, Reiichiro Nakano, Rajeef Nayak, Arvind Neelakantan, Richard Ngo, Hyeonwoo Noh, Long Ouyang, Cullen O’Keefe, Jakub Pachocki, Alex Paino, Joe Palermo, Ashley Pantuliano, Giambattista Parascandolo, Joel Parish, Emy Parparita, Alex Passos, Mikhail Pavlov, Andrew Peng, Adam Perelman, Filipe de Avila Belbute Peres, Michael Petrov, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Michael, Pokorny, Michelle Pokrass, Vitchyr H. Pong, Tolly Powell, Alethea Power, Boris Power, Elizabeth Proehl, Raul Puri, Alec Radford, Jack Rae, Aditya Ramesh, Cameron Raymond, Francis Real, Kendra Rimbach, Carl Ross, Bob Rotsted, Henri Roussez, Nick Ryder, Mario Saltarelli, Ted Sanders, Shibani Santurkar, Girish Sastry, Heather Schmidt, David Schnurr, John Schulman, Daniel Selsam, Kyla Sheppard, Toki Sherbakov, Jessica Shieh, Sarah Shoker, Pranav Shyam, Szymon Sidor, Eric Sigler, Maddie Simens, Jordan Sitkin, Katarina Slama, Ian Sohl, Benjamin Sokolowsky, Yang Song, Natalie Staudacher, Felipe Petroski Such, Natalie Summers, Ilya Sutskever, Jie Tang, Nikolas Tezak, Madeleine B. Thompson, Phil Tillet, Amin Tootoonchian, Elizabeth Tseng, Preston Tuggle, Nick Turley, Jerry Tworek, Juan Felipe Cerón Uribe, Andrea Vallone, Arun Vijayvergiya, Chelsea Voss, Carroll Wainwright, Justin Jay Wang, Alvin Wang, Ben Wang, Jonathan Ward, Jason Wei, CJ Weinmann, Akila Welihinda, Peter Welinder, Jiayi Weng, Lilian Weng, Matt Wiethoff, Dave Willner, Clemens Winter, Samuel Wolrich, Hannah Wong, Lauren Workman, Sherwin Wu,

Jeff Wu, Michael Wu, Kai Xiao, Tao Xu, Sarah Yoo, Kevin Yu, Qiming Yuan, Wojciech Zaremba, Rowan Zellers, Chong Zhang, Marvin Zhang, Shengjia Zhao, Tianhao Zheng, Juntang Zhuang, William Zhuk, and Barret Zoph. Gpt-4 technical report, 2024.

- [21] Julien Piet, Chawin Sitawarin, Vivian Fang, Norman Mu, and David Wagner. Mark my words: Analyzing and evaluating language model watermarks, 2024.
- [22] Jie Ren, Han Xu, Pengfei He, Yingqian Cui, Shenglai Zeng, Jiankun Zhang, Hongzhi Wen, Jiayuan Ding, Pei Huang, Lingjuan Lyu, et al. Copyright protection in generative ai: A technical perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.02333*, 2024.
- [23] Vinu Sankar Sadasivan, Aounon Kumar, Sriram Balasubramanian, Wenxiao Wang, and Soheil Feizi. Can ai-generated text be reliably detected? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.11156*, 2023.
- [24] Matthew Sag. Copyright safety for generative AI. <https://houstonlawreview.org/article/92126>, 12 2023. America.
- [25] Reza Shokri, Marco Stronati, Congzheng Song, and Vitaly Shmatikov. Membership inference attacks against machine learning models, 2017.
- [26] The New York Times. The times sues openai and microsoft over a.i. use of copyrighted work. <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/12/27/business/media/new-york-times-open-ai-microsoft-lawsuit.html>, 12 2023. America.
- [27] Debora Weber-Wulff, Alla Anohina-Naumeca, Sonja Bjelobaba, Tomáš Foltýnek, Jean Guerrero-Dib, Olumide Popoola, Petr Šigut, and Lorna Waddington. Testing of detection tools for ai-generated text. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 19(1), December 2023.
- [28] Xiaodong Wu, Ran Duan, and Jianbing Ni. Unveiling security, privacy, and ethical concerns of chatgpt, 2023.
- [29] Yihan Wu, Zhengmian Hu, Hongyang Zhang, and Heng Huang. Dipmark: A stealthy, efficient and resilient watermark for large language models, 2024.
- [30] Xi Yang, Kejiang Chen, Weiming Zhang, Chang Liu, Yuang Qi, Jie Zhang, Han Fang, and Nenghai Yu. Watermarking text generated by black-box language models, 2023.
- [31] Xuandong Zhao, Prabhanjan Ananth, Lei Li, and Yu-Xiang Wang. Provable robust watermarking for ai-generated text, 2023.
- [32] Xuandong Zhao, Lei Li, and Yu-Xiang Wang. Permute-and-flip: An optimally robust and watermarkable decoder for llms, 2024.
- [33] Xuandong Zhao, Yu-Xiang Wang, and Lei Li. Protecting language generation models via invisible watermarking. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 42187–42199. PMLR, 2023.