

# FDLLM: A Text Fingerprint Detection Method for LLMs in Multi-Language, Multi-Domain Black-Box Environments

Zhiyuan Fu<sup>1,4</sup>, Junfan Chen<sup>1,4</sup>, Hongyu Sun<sup>1</sup>, Ting Yang<sup>3,4</sup>, Ruidong Li<sup>4</sup>, Yuqing Zhang<sup>\*1,2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>College of Cyberspace Security, Hainan University

<sup>2</sup>National Computer Network Intrusion Protection Center, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences

<sup>3</sup>School of Cyber Engineering, Xidian University

<sup>4</sup>Kanazawa University

zhiyuan.fu.cs@gmail.com, {chenjf,yangt}@nipc.org.cn, sunhy@hainanu.edu.cn, liruidong@ieee.org, zhangyq@ucas.ac.cn

## Abstract

Using large language models (LLMs) integration platforms without transparency about which LLM is being invoked can lead to potential security risks. Specifically, attackers may exploit this black-box scenario to deploy malicious models and embed viruses in the code provided to users. In this context, it is increasingly urgent for users to clearly identify the LLM they are interacting with, in order to avoid unknowingly becoming victims of malicious models. However, existing studies primarily focus on mixed classification of human and machine-generated text, with limited attention to classifying texts generated solely by different models. Current research also faces dual bottlenecks: poor quality of LLM-generated text (LLMGT) datasets and limited coverage of detectable LLMs, resulting in poor detection performance for various LLMGT in black-box scenarios. We propose the first LLMGT fingerprint detection model, **FDLLM**, based on Qwen2.5-7B and fine-tuned using LoRA to address these challenges. FDLLM can more efficiently handle detection tasks across multilingual and multi-domain scenarios. Furthermore, we constructed a dataset named **FD-Datasets**, consisting of 90,000 samples that span multiple languages and domains, covering 20 different LLMs. Experimental results demonstrate that FDLLM achieves a macro F1 score 16.7% higher than the best baseline method, LM-D.

## 1 Introduction

With the emergence of outstanding large language models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT 4, 4o [Achiam *et al.*, 2023], Claude 3.5 [Anthropic, 2024], and Gemini1.5 [Gemini *et al.*, 2024], the capabilities of LLM-generated text (LLMGT) have been further enhanced. Using meticulously crafted prompts, LLMs can now generate text that closely emulates human writing styles.

**Motivation.** Earlier research primarily centered on distinguishing between human-written and machine-generated text [Russovich and Salem, 2024; Xu *et al.*, 2024; Yu *et al.*, 2024; Abdali *et al.*, 2024], driven largely by the need to address issues such as academic misconduct [Mozes *et al.*, 2023]. However, with the continuous advancement of LLMs, it has become increasingly challenging to distinguish between outputs from different models in a manner that is intuitive and comprehensible to humans. Reviewing existing approaches in detecting LLM identities in black-box scenarios, we discovered a notable gap: no detection-oriented LLM has been explicitly designed for this purpose. Furthermore, including human-written text in current studies introduces additional complexity, thereby exacerbating the difficulty of accurate discrimination. Additionally, the limited diversity of detection models in existing research results in inadequate coverage of the wide range of LLMs currently in widespread use. This underscores the urgent need for more comprehensive and specialized approaches to LLM detection. **In addition, when users access services from LLM providers such as Cloudflare [Cloudflare, 2024] and Volcengine [Volcengine, 2024], some providers encrypt model names, which poses security risks. Attackers could deploy malicious models on these platforms and attract users with phrases like “free” or “the most powerful”, potentially leading to unpredictable consequences. In such scenarios, users are more concerned with explicitly knowing which LLM they use.**

**Challenge.** Current studies face the following challenges: (1) As a detection method for black-box scenarios, the texts to be detected are diverse in both content and language, making it impossible to exhaust all possibilities. Therefore, how to construct a dataset that covers multiple domains and captures the intrinsic features of LLMs, similar to a fingerprint database for humans. (2) Current LLMs are not specifically designed to distinguish outputs from various LLMGTs. Training new models from scratch or fully fine-tuning existing ones is costly and resource-intensive. Prompt-based methods, while effective, often depend on powerful commercial models, making them expensive and impractical for everyday use. This challenge calls for efficient approaches to identify and differentiate the

<sup>1</sup>\*Corresponding author

unique fingerprints of different LLMGTs.

**Solutions.** To address these challenges, we propose a targeted solution leveraging LLMs to learn complex relationships across diverse knowledge domains. Trained on vast, varied data, these models can detect subtle patterns and contextual cues that might otherwise remain hidden. As the cost of model inference continues to decline, acquiring LLMGT data at lower costs has become increasingly feasible. Capitalizing on this trend, we collected and preprocessed data from various publicly available Chinese and English corpora spanning a wide range of domains, such as social media, cultural values, finance, healthcare, and technology. From this data, we constructed a comprehensive Chinese-English raw vocabulary, which served as the foundational seed for creating a robust and diverse dataset, named FD-Datasets. This dataset includes 90,000 entries, covering multiple categories, various LLMs, and multiple languages, providing extensive coverage for analysis and detection. Building on the FD-Datasets, we fine-tuned the Qwen2.5-7B LLM to create a specialized fingerprint detection model, referred to as FDLLM. This model is explicitly designed for the task of detecting and distinguishing between outputs from different LLMs and categories. By leveraging the power of fine-tuning and a well-curated dataset, FDLLM achieves efficient and effective LLM fingerprint detection while mitigating the resource and deployment constraints associated with traditional approaches.

By tailoring feature extraction mechanisms to the text characteristics of LLMs and using advanced Qwen2.5 LLM as classifiers, our approach achieved superior accuracy and robustness in distinguishing multi-category generated text. It outperformed traditional methods across 20 LLMs while maintaining stable performance. Experimental results show that for each of the 20 model categories, collecting only 100 Chinese and English samples can achieve up to 100% prediction accuracy for individual models, with a macro F1 score of 91.1%.

To further evaluate the performance of FDLLM, we designed a multilevel testing scheme that includes domain-specific detection, cross-domain detection, and robustness testing. Our approach is entirely designed for black-box scenarios, with each step, from raw data collection to prompt construction, fine-tuning, and inference, being conducted randomly.

This further validates the effectiveness and practicality of our approach in real-world black-box scenarios, highlighting its broad application potential. It provides reliable technical support for tracing and detecting LLMGT. Our contributions are as follows:

- We propose the first dedicated method for LLMGT fingerprint detection, leveraging LoRA fine-tuning on LLMs to learn implicit text features. Experiments show that our approach maintains robust detection performance even with a limited number of samples.
- We introduce FD-Datasets, the first large-scale LLMGT fingerprint dataset containing 90,000 samples from 20 widely used LLMs, covering texts in two languages.
- We have uploaded the related codes and experimental data of FDLLM to Supplementary Material, and we will

open-source them after the paper’s publication.

## 2 Related Work

In previous research, the academic community has primarily focused on the problem of Authorship Attribution (AA) [Uchendu *et al.*, 2020; Abdali *et al.*, 2024]. However, the study by Uchendu *et al.* [Uchendu *et al.*, 2023] provides an in-depth analysis of the limitations of traditional AA research in the current context and shifts the focus to addressing Authorship Attribution for Neural Text Generators (NTGAA). This work categorizes existing AA techniques into four approaches: Stylometric, Deep Learning, Statistical, and Hybrid. The authors conclude that deep learning-based methods achieve the best results for NTGAA tasks.

However, specific data sets and generation strategies constrain existing deep learning methods, resulting in limited robustness. Moreover, the LLMs studied in current research are relatively narrow in scope. Presently, AA research for LLMs can be broadly divided into two approaches: one based on white-box scenarios involving modification of model parameters or outputs, and the other based on black-box scenarios that analyze only the text output.

**White-Box Techniques.** In white-box scenarios, LLM identities are primarily detected using watermarking techniques, a form of linguistic steganography that embeds identity information in text through algorithmic word substitutions [Bahri *et al.*, 2024]. Xu *et al.* [Xu *et al.*, 2024] introduced a method using periodic signals for embedding and detecting watermarks. Google’s SynthID-Text [Dathathri *et al.*, 2024] employs a scalable approach that modifies only the sampling process, preserving high generation quality while enabling efficient detection. However, these methods have limitations: embedding watermarks often requires modifying model parameters, potentially degrading performance, while altering the sampling process can affect output quality, impacting user experience.

**Black-Box Techniques.** For detecting LLMs in black-box scenarios, existing research can be categorized into two main approaches: metric-based methods and model-based methods. Metric-based methods distinguish model outputs by designing specific statistical indicators or features. In contrast, model-based methods leverage machine learning or deep learning models to learn complex output characteristics from large-scale data, enabling the detection of sophisticated models. Below, we will detail these studies to elucidate the characteristics and applicable scenarios of different approaches.

**Metric-Based Methods.** With the widespread adoption of deep learning models like BERT [Devlin, 2018] and GPT-2 [Radford *et al.*, 2019] in text generation, early academic research primarily relied on mathematical metrics to distinguish the generated text. These studies typically focused on binary classification problems, aiming to differentiate between human-authored and machine-generated texts. For example, Gehrman *et al.* [Gehrman *et al.*, 2019] introduced GLTR, which utilizes statistical features such as generation probabilities, word rankings, and entropy distributions to detect generation traces in text. Similarly, Solaiman *et al.* [Solaiman *et al.*, 2019] proposed the Log-Likelihood method, which involves




Figure 1: The overall framework of the article. Given an LLM, **FDLLM** operates through three steps: 1) **Data Construction**: Construct a list of  $N$  Chinese and English triplets from a seed dictionary. 2) **Feature Extraction**: Fill the seeds into a Generation Prompt to form the input and make requests to the target model. Save the obtained outputs. Then, pass the prepared FD Datasets to Qwen2.5 for LoRA fine-tuning to obtain FDLLM. 3) **Inference**: Combine any LLMGT with an Inference Prompt and pass it to FDLLM for Inference. FDLLM will directly output the predicted model.

computing the log-probability of individual words in a given text using a language model. The log probability of each word is calculated and averaged to generate a score, where a higher score indicates a higher likelihood that the text was machine-generated. **Model-Based Methods.** As model capabilities advance and many models emerge, traditional metric-based methods have become increasingly insufficient. Researchers have gradually turned their attention to leveraging the models, utilizing their powerful learning abilities to determine model identities [Yang *et al.*, 2023]. For instance, Zeng *et al.* [Zeng *et al.*, 2023] employed CNNs to learn invariants in model parameters and used StyleGAN2 to generate human-recognizable natural images. Similarly, Li *et al.* [Li *et al.*, 2024] evaluated four main detection methods, including supervised approaches (e.g., classifiers based on pre-trained language models [Beltagy *et al.*, 2020]) and unsupervised approaches (e.g., DetectGPT [Mitchell *et al.*, 2023]) to distinguish between human- and machine-generated text. Their findings demonstrated that detection methods based on deep learning models perform well in binary classification tasks. Shi *et al.* [Shi *et al.*, 2024] proposed a method for detecting LLMs by repeatedly resampling to extract text features, simulating white-box detection in a black-box environment.

### 3 FDLLM Framework

According to Figure 1, the overview of the framework consists of three stages: Given an LLM, **FDLLM** operates through three steps: 1) **Data Construction** 2) **Feature Extraction** and 3) **Inference**

#### 3.1 Dataset Construction

Considering that there is currently no dataset specifically collected for comparing responses of LLMs to the same ques-




Figure 2: Prompt example. As shown in Figure a, we designed a Generation Prompt that is as simple as possible. To guide large models in outputting predictions, we also constructed an Interface Prompt, as shown in Figure b. (en: English, zh: Chinese)

tion, this paper plans to create a new dataset, **FD-Datasets**. **Dataset Overview.** Given that the data scale used in training LLMs is extraordinarily vast and that most mainstream datasets have been widely used for pretraining, using these already trained datasets during the fine-tuning phase may lead to model output becoming overly similar. This damages the model’s ability to learn and distinguish differences among various models. To achieve multilingual detection, we chose words or phrases as text seeds. This strategy accommodates multiple languages and guides LLMs to generate texts cover-

ing multiple domains. For English seeds, we used the English word dataset [Grant Ward, 2018], which contains 370,100 entries. However, since a complete Chinese word dataset is currently unavailable, this approach is not directly applicable to Chinese contexts. To obtain sufficiently rich Chinese text seeds, we decided to use the dataset Chinese fineweb edu [Yu *et al.*, 2025], which contains up to 300GB of Chinese text. During the word segmentation of this text, we used the open-source library LAC [Jiao *et al.*, 2018], resulting in 75,192,054 segmented entries after deduplication. When generating data, we randomly selected three different words to form a group, thereby constructing diverse text inputs.

**Prompt Design.** With advancements in model capabilities, many simple tasks no longer require intricate, prompt engineering. However, overly detailed prompts can lead to more uniform outputs, reducing the ability to differentiate between models. Conversely, excessively brief prompts may produce unstable responses, complicating data collection. A balanced approach to prompt design is crucial, as illustrated in Figure 2.

**Models Under Detection.** Existing studies on LLMs identity detection [Zeng *et al.*, 2023; He *et al.*, 2023; Shi *et al.*, 2024] have selected only a limited variety of models and have not covered the mainstream LLMs currently in use.

This paper selects 20 mainstream LLMs encompassing open-source and commercial models to address this. The open-source models include *Qwen2.5-14B* [Yang *et al.*, 2024], *Llama3.1-8B* [Dubey *et al.*, 2024], *Llama2-7B* [Touvron *et al.*, 2023], *Gemma2-9B* [Gemma *et al.*, 2024], *GLM4-9B* [GLM *et al.*, 2024], *InternLM2-7B* [Cai *et al.*, 2024], *Mistral-7B* [Jiang *et al.*, 2023], and *Yi* [Young *et al.*, 2024]. The commercial models include *GPT-3.5*, *GPT-4o*, *GPT-4o-mini* [Achiam *et al.*, 2023], *Gemini-1.5* [Gemini *et al.*, 2024], *Claude3.5-haiku* [Anthropic, 2024], *Qwen-turbo* [Yang *et al.*, 2024], *Deepseek* [Liu *et al.*, 2024], *Moonshot* [Moonshot, 2024], *Doubao* [Doubao, 2024], *Baichuan4* [BaichuanAI, 2024], *GLM4-Flash*, and *GLM4-Plus* [GLM *et al.*, 2024].

This paper uses API requests to collect outputs for LLMGT. Open-source models are inferred using OLLAMA [Ollama, 2023], while official APIs are used for commercial models. To improve feasibility and control time and cost, the maximum token limit is set to 512. Random word selection may include prohibited words. For commercial models unable to return results, rejection outputs are included in the training set to ensure robustness. A total of 90,000 entries were collected via APIs, as shown in Table 1.

### 3.2 Feature Extraction

In a black-box environment, LLMGT is the most critical data for analysis. For LLMs, the Temperature parameter ( $T$ ) used during generation directly affects the randomness and diversity of the outputs.

$$p(x_i) = \frac{\exp(z_i/T)}{\sum_j \exp(z_j/T)} \quad (1)$$

Here,  $z_i$  is the raw logits score calculated by the model for the token  $x_i$ . As the formula shows, when  $T \rightarrow 0$ , the model assigns higher weights to high-probability tokens, resulting in more deterministic and concentrated outputs. Conversely,

Language	Temperature					Total
	0	0.3	0.5	0.7	1	
en	13,000	3,000	13,000	3,000	13,000	<b>45,000</b>
zh	13,000	3,000	13,000	3,000	13,000	<b>45,000</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>26,000</b>	<b>6,000</b>	<b>26,000</b>	<b>6,000</b>	<b>26,000</b>	<b>90,000</b>

Table 1: Data Distribution by Language and Temperature. The table summarizes the distribution of data samples across two languages and five different temperature settings used when querying an LLM. The “temperature” parameter controls the randomness of the model’s output, with lower values (e.g., 0) producing more deterministic responses and higher values (e.g., 1) generating more diverse and creative outputs.

when  $T \rightarrow 1$ , low-probability tokens have a higher chance of being sampled, increasing the diversity of the LLMGT.

To address this, we leverage LoRA technology [Hu *et al.*, 2021] for lightweight fine-tuning of the Qwen2.5-7B LLM ( $M$ ). The fine-tuned model ( $M'$ ) can directly output predictions about the target model. In the LoRA method, the parameter update formula is:

$$\text{LoRA}(\mathbf{W}) = \mathbf{W} + \Delta\mathbf{W}, \quad (2)$$

where the update matrix  $\Delta\mathbf{W}$  is defined as:

$$\Delta\mathbf{W} = \frac{\alpha}{r} \mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}, \quad (3)$$

with  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}$  and  $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times k}$ . It is evident that the choices of  $r$  and  $\alpha$  are critical for model performance. A larger  $r$  provides a higher parameter capacity, allowing the capture of more complex features, while  $\alpha$  controls the contribution strength of the low-rank update matrix  $\Delta\mathbf{W}$ . Therefore, by selecting appropriate values for  $r$  and  $\alpha$ , we can achieve effective fine-tuning of the model while keeping hardware costs manageable, meeting the requirements for multicate-gory LLMGT detection.

### 3.3 Inference

During the inference stage of FDLLM, an input LLMGT is provided. By utilizing the LoRA weights fine-tuned in the earlier stage, FDLLM accurately detects the generating model under zero-shot conditions. This approach allows FDLLM to determine the source model of the text without needing additional samples or further training, significantly improving the flexibility and efficiency of model detection.

## 4 Experiment

**Experimental Setup.** For simplicity, we use  $T_t$  to represent the Temperature used during model data collection and  $T_i$  to represent the Temperature used during model inference. Both Chinese and English language environments were considered. Based on the data obtained in Section 3.1, we randomly selected 500 samples for each of 20 different models under  $T_t \in \{0, 0.5, 1\}$ , resulting in a total of 60,000 samples. The data was then divided into a training set and a test set in a 4:1 ratio without creating a validation set.

The FDLLM parameters were set as follows: epoch = 3, batch size = 2, learning rate =  $1 \times 10^{-4}$ , and dropout = 0.1.

All parameters except for epoch remained as originally configured for nine other methods. All experiments were conducted on two Geforce GTX 3090 GPUs, CPU AMD (R) EPYC 7542, running Ubuntu 20.04 LTS.

To investigate the practical efficiency of the method, we tested the performance under different test set sizes. This allowed us to better understand the behavior of the method with varying data scales. Additionally, we reconstructed the test set to evaluate FDLLM during training to explore the maximum performance of the model. The new test set was composed of data collected from FD-Datasets using the same Chinese and English prompts but with different  $T_t \in \{0, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 1\}$ , totaling 10,000 samples. This experiment evaluated the model ability to detect LLMGT under unknown distributions. The training dataset included both the training and test sets from the previous experiment, with a total of 60,000 samples.

We also studied the model performance under different LoRA parameter settings to evaluate its adaptability and performance variation. Specifically, we adjusted key LoRA parameters such as  $r$  and  $\alpha$  to analyze their effects on model fine-tuning. This study covered a wide range of parameter combinations, from low-rank to high-rank settings, to validate the applicability and stability of LoRA. Other parameters remain consistent with the previous experiment. To find the FDLLM that performs the best, we selected 20,000 samples for this part of the experiment as a validation set.

**Baseline.** To evaluate the effectiveness and performance of our method, we select the following baseline methods: **Metric-based methods.** Generally, metric-based methods utilize pre-trained LLMs to analyze text and extract distinguishable features, such as the rank or entropy of each word in a text based on its preceding context. In this paper, we consider five metric-based detection methods, including Entropy [Gehrmann *et al.*, 2019], Rank [Gehrmann *et al.*, 2019], Log-Likelihood [Solaiman *et al.*, 2019], Log-Rank [Mitchell *et al.*, 2023], LPR [Su *et al.*, 2023]. **Model-based methods.** For model-based methods, a classification model is typically trained on an LLMGT corpus. This approach equips the classification model with the ability to distinguish MGTs within a given corpus. We consider five model-based detection methods, including DetectGPT [Mitchell *et al.*, 2023], GLTR [Gehrmann *et al.*, 2019], Chatgpt-D [Guo *et al.*, 2023], OpenAI-D [Solaiman *et al.*, 2019], and LM-D [Ippolito *et al.*, 2019]. These methods come from MGTBench [He *et al.*, 2023].

**Metrics.** We defined four evaluation metrics: Accuracy (Acc), Macro Precision (MacP), Macro Recall (MacR), and Macro F1 (MacF1).

**Research Questions.** FDLLM is evaluated based on the following research questions (RQs):

- **RQ1:** Is the performance of FDLLM improved compared to other baseline methods on FD-datasets?
- **RQ2:** How do the size of the training set and the temperature parameters in text generation and inference processes affect the accuracy of FDLLM detection?
- **RQ3:** The impact of different LoRA parameter configurations on the detection performance of FDLLM?

## 4.1 RQ1: Performance Improvement

We conducted experiments with FDLLM and 10 other baseline methods on the same dataset. Based on Table 2, we have the following observations: Traditional methods (e.g., Entropy, Rank, and DetectGPT) performed poorly in classification tasks, with Macro F1 scores mostly below 4%. This indicates they cannot effectively distinguish samples. Intermediate-performance methods (e.g., GLTR and Log-Likelihood) showed slight improvements. However, their scores, around 7%, still fall short of practical requirements. Advanced baseline methods (e.g., ChatGPT-D and OpenAI-D) achieved significant improvements but still lagged behind FDLLM. This highlights FDLLM’s superior capability in such tasks. FDLLM outperformed all other methods in every performance metric. Its Macro F1 score reached 91.1%, demonstrating its ability to achieve a good balance between generation stability and classification accuracy. In contrast, traditional methods (e.g., Entropy and Rank) and intermediate-performance methods (e.g., GLTR and Log-Likelihood) generally had much lower metric values and could not compete with FDLLM’s performance.

Method	Acc(%)	MacP(%)	MacR(%)	MacF1(%)
Entropy	6.3	4.3	6.3	2.6
Rank	6.4	4.8	6.4	2.7
DetectGPT	9.0	5.8	9.0	3.1
LRR	9.7	6.7	9.7	6.5
GLTR	11.1	6.7	11.1	6.7
Log-Likelihood	10.4	7.6	10.4	7.5
Log-Rank	11.2	8.8	11.2	8.3
ChatGPT-D	46.2	46.6	46.2	44.5
OpenAI-D	73.8	75.8	73.8	73.9
LM-D	74.5	75.7	74.5	74.4
<b>FDLLM</b>	<b>90.4</b>	<b>93.1</b>	<b>90.4</b>	<b>91.1</b>

Table 2: Comparison of the average prediction metrics for LLMGT under three different  $T_t$  ( $T_t \in \{0, 0.5, 1\}$ ) settings, evaluating FDLLM alongside baseline approaches.

**Finding 1:** FDLLM consistently outperformed traditional and intermediate methods, demonstrating that fine-tuned models are crucial for achieving competitive classification performance.

## 4.2 RQ2: Impact of Training and Inference Parameters

Considering that collecting 400 training samples for each model to achieve high performance may hinder the practical application of this method, we explored the performance of models trained under different training set sizes. The results are shown in Table 3. We found that even if the training set size is reduced by half, the model still achieves excellent results. Surprisingly, the Macro F1 score was 2 percentage points higher than the model trained on the full dataset. When the training set size was further reduced to one-fourth of the original, the Macro F1 score decreased by about 4 % points. Even with a training-to-testing ratio of 1:1, FDLLM




Figure 3: Variation of FDLLM performance metrics, under different  $T_i$  and  $T_t$ . Subplots (a), (b), (c), and (d) correspond to the metrics Acc, MacP, MacR, and MacF1, respectively. Each line represents a different  $T_i$  ( $T_i \in \{0, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 1\}$ ), illustrating the performance trends as  $T_t$  varies from 0 to 1, with **All** denoting the combined evaluation scenario.

Train(%)	FDLLM	Acc(%)	MacP(%)	MacR(%)	MacF1(%)
<b>25</b>	$T_t=0$	<b>90.6</b>	<b>91.7</b>	<b>90.6</b>	<b>90.8</b>
	$T_t=0.5$	89.6	91.1	89.6	89.9
	$T_t=1$	88.6	90.3	88.6	88.8
	<b>All</b>	89.6	90.9	89.6	89.8
<b>50</b>	$T_t=0$	<b>93.2</b>	<b>93.6</b>	<b>93.2</b>	<b>93.2</b>
	$T_t=0.5$	92.8	93.3	92.8	92.9
	$T_t=1$	92.1	92.8	92.1	92.2
	<b>All</b>	92.7	93.2	92.7	92.7
<b>100</b>	$T_t=0$	<b>91.3</b>	<b>93.5</b>	<b>91.3</b>	<b>91.8</b>
	$T_t=0.5$	90.4	93.3	90.4	91.1
	$T_t=1$	89.5	92.8	89.5	90.3
	<b>All</b>	90.4	93.1	90.4	91.1

Table 3: FDLLM Performance Across Different Training Data Proportions. The table evaluates the performance of FDLLM using varying percentages of the dataset for training (*Train* column). Results are reported across three temperature settings ( $T_t \in \{0, 0.5, 1\}$ ) as well as the combined scenario (*All*). The best results in each row are highlighted in **bold**.

still outperformed other methods. This significantly reduces the LLMGT collection and training cost of FDLLM, improving its practicality.

**Finding 2:** FDLLM consistently demonstrated robustness and practicality, showing that the model achieves competitive classification performance even with significantly reduced training set sizes while minimizing data collection and training costs.

At the same time, we found that the model’s temperature parameters can affect its prediction results. Therefore, we further investigated the impact of the  $T_t$  and  $T_i$  parameters on model training and inference, respectively. Based on the data from Figure 3 and Table 3, we observed the following: The variation in  $T_t$  has a certain impact on the performance of FDLLM. Lower temperatures (e.g.,  $T_t = 0$ ) make the model generate more deterministic outputs, improving classification performance. In contrast, higher temperatures (e.g.,  $T_t = 1$ ) may introduce more randomness, slightly reducing classification performance. As shown in Table 3, when  $T_t$  increases from 0 to 1, the Macro F1 score decreases from 91.8% to 90.3%. However, the overall performance still outperforms

all other methods. This indicates that in practical applications, adjusting the  $T_t$  parameter can balance classification performance and generation flexibility. By comparing the results obtained using different  $T_i$  values for inference, we found that the trained model is essentially unaffected by  $T_i$ , and its accuracy and macro F1 performance remains stable.

**Finding 3:** FDLLM’s training performance improves with lower  $T_t$  values, achieving higher determinism and accuracy. Inference performance remains stable regardless of  $T_i$ , showcasing robustness and reliability.

### 4.3 RQ3: LoRA Parameter Configurations

$r$	$\alpha$	Acc (%)	MacP(%)	MacR(%)	MacF1(%)
<b>256</b>	512	88.5	86.5	84.3	84.6
	256	91.4	92.7	91.4	91.6
	<b>128</b>	<b>93.2</b>	<b>93.7</b>	<b>93.2</b>	<b>93.2</b>
128	64	91.2	92.1	91.2	91.2
	128	92.3	88.8	87.9	88.0
64	64	90.9	92.1	90.9	91.0
	32	89.3	86.3	85.1	85.2
32	16	85.8	87.1	85.8	85.8

Table 4: The performance metrics under different LoRA configurations, including the rank ( $r$ ) and scaling factor ( $\alpha$ ). The best results in each row are highlighted in **bold**.

We further investigated the impact of different LoRA parameters ( $r$  and  $\alpha$ ) on model performance. The test set consists of data with five different  $T_t$  values constructed in previous experiments. The experimental results, shown in Table 4, illustrate the influence of various LoRA parameter configurations on model performance. From the results, it can be observed that appropriate values for  $r$  (e.g., 256) and  $\alpha$  (e.g.,  $\frac{r}{2}$ ) typically achieve a good balance between performance and computational efficiency. In contrast, excessively small  $r$  or  $\alpha$  values limit the adaptability of the model, resulting in decreased performance. Thus, selecting suitable  $r$  and  $\alpha$  configurations balances performance and efficiency.

In addition, a significant performance drop was observed when  $\alpha$  was set to twice the value of  $r$ , increasing the in-




Figure 4: Confusion matrix illustrating the classification performance of FDLLM ( $r = 256, \alpha = 128$ ) under optimal conditions. The color intensity of each cell reflects the number of classified samples, with Red denoting higher frequencies and Blue representing lower frequencies. The dominance of high-intensity values along the diagonal demonstrates robust classification accuracy.

fluence of LoRA on model weights. This might be due to excessive intervention by LoRA, which disrupts the original knowledge of the model and adversely affects its performance. To visualize the prediction performance of FDLLM across different LLMs more intuitively, the confusion matrix, the confusion matrix is presented in Figure 4. The deep red cells on the diagonal represent correctly classified samples. The following conclusions can be drawn from the figure: FDLLM achieves a classification accuracy of over 95% for 50% of the models.

Furthermore, FDLLM tends to confuse GLM4 and GLM4 Flash, likely due to their high similarity. A similar issue occurs between Qwen2.5 and Qwen Turbo. FDLLM still has room for improvement. For instance, when handling the Deepseek model, FDLLM frequently misclassifies it as other models, such as GPT4o and GLM4 Plus.

**Finding 4:** FDLLM balances performance and efficiency with optimal LoRA parameters while maintaining high accuracy but faces challenges in differentiating highly similar models.

### 5 Conclusion and Future Research

This paper introduces and applies LoRA fine-tuning to the Qwen2.5 LLM for detecting LLMGT in a black-box setting. We employ advanced NLP techniques to process a large corpus, generating high-quality data to produce rich text seeds. These seeds are then used to sample outputs from the target LLM, creating a diverse dataset that spans various languages and domains. The fine-tuned FDLLM demonstrates outstanding performance in classification tasks involving LLMGT. In the future, we plan to explore additional methods to enhance the FDLLM’s robustness against adversarial samples.

## Ethical Statement

Despite dataset cleaning and optimization, some offensive or sensitive content may remain. The LLM in this paper lacks extensive verification, and its outputs may show biases, inaccuracies, or other issues. Users should not rely solely on this tool for final decisions and are encouraged to review results through multiple methods to ensure fairness, accuracy, and reliability.

## Acknowledgements

## References

- [Abdali *et al.*, 2024] Sara Abdali, Richard Anarfi, CJ Barberan, and Jia He. Decoding the ai pen: Techniques and challenges in detecting ai-generated text. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 6428–6436, 2024.
- [Achiam *et al.*, 2023] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [Anthropic, 2024] Anthropic. Claude3.5-haiku. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-haiku>, 2024. Accessed: 2025-01-23.
- [Bahri *et al.*, 2024] Dara Bahri, John Wieting, Dana Alon, and Donald Metzler. A watermark for black-box language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.02099*, 2024.
- [BaichuanAI, 2024] Team BaichuanAI. Baichuan4. <https://www.baichuan-ai.com/home>, 2024. Accessed: 2025-01-23.
- [Beltagy *et al.*, 2020] Iz Beltagy, Matthew E Peters, and Arman Cohan. Longformer: The long-document transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.05150*, 2020.
- [Cai *et al.*, 2024] Zheng Cai, Maosong Cao, Haojiong Chen, Kai Chen, Keyu Chen, Xin Chen, Xun Chen, Zehui Chen, Zhi Chen, Pei Chu, et al. Internlm2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.17297*, 2024.
- [Cloudflare, 2024] Cloudflare. Cloudflare ai. <https://ai.cloudflare.com/>, 2024. Accessed: 2025-01-23.
- [Dathathri *et al.*, 2024] Sumanth Dathathri, Abigail See, Sumedh Ghaisas, Po-Sen Huang, Rob McAdam, Johannes Welbl, Vandana Bachani, Alex Kaskasoli, Robert Stanforth, Tatiana Matejovicova, et al. Scalable watermarking for identifying large language model outputs. *Nature*, 634(8035):818–823, 2024.
- [Devlin, 2018] Jacob Devlin. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [Doubao, 2024] Team Doubao. Doubao. <https://www.volcengine.com/docs/82379/1330310>, 2024. Accessed: 2025-01-23.
- [Dubey *et al.*, 2024] Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024.
- [Gehrmann *et al.*, 2019] Sebastian Gehrmann, Hendrik Strobelt, and Alexander M Rush. Gltr: Statistical detection and visualization of generated text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.04043*, 2019.
- [Gemini *et al.*, 2024] Team Gemini, Petko Georgiev, Ving Ian Lei, Ryan Burnell, Libin Bai, Anmol Gulati, Garrett Tanzer, Damien Vincent, Zhufeng Pan, Shibo Wang, et al. Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05530*, 2024.
- [Gemma *et al.*, 2024] Team Gemma, Morgane Riviere, Shreya Pathak, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Cassidy Hardin, Surya Bhupatiraju, Léonard Hussenot, Thomas Mesnard, Bobak Shahriari, Alexandre Ramé, et al. Gemma 2: Improving open language models at a practical size. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00118*, 2024.
- [GLM *et al.*, 2024] Team GLM, Aohan Zeng, Bin Xu, Bowen Wang, Chenhui Zhang, Da Yin, Dan Zhang, Diego Rojas, Guanyu Feng, Hanlin Zhao, et al. Chatglm: A family of large language models from glm-130b to glm-4 all tools. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12793*, 2024.
- [Grant Ward, 2018] Project Gutenberg Grant Ward, Mike Pullen. Word list-350,000+ simple english words. <https://github.com/dwyl/english-words>, 2018. Accessed: 2025-01-23.
- [Guo *et al.*, 2023] 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. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.07597*, 2023.
- [He *et al.*, 2023] Xinlei He, Xinyue Shen, Zeyuan Chen, Michael Backes, and Yang Zhang. Mgtbench: Benchmarking machine-generated text detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.14822*, 2023.
- [Hu *et al.*, 2021] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*, 2021.
- [Ippolito *et al.*, 2019] Daphne Ippolito, Daniel Duckworth, Chris Callison-Burch, and Douglas Eck. Automatic detection of generated text is easiest when humans are fooled. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.00650*, 2019.
- [Jiang *et al.*, 2023] Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*, 2023.
- [Jiao *et al.*, 2018] Zhenyu Jiao, Shuqi Sun, and Ke Sun. Chinese lexical analysis with deep bi-gru-crf network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.01882*, 2018.
- [Li *et al.*, 2024] Yafu Li, Qintong Li, Leyang Cui, Wei Bi, Zhilin Wang, Longyue Wang, Linyi Yang, Shuming Shi, and Yue Zhang. Mage: Machine-generated text detection

- in the wild. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 36–53, 2024.
- [Liu *et al.*, 2024] Aixin Liu, Bei Feng, Bing Xue, Bingxuan Wang, Bochao Wu, Chengda Lu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chenyu Zhang, Chong Ruan, et al. Deepseek-v3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.19437*, 2024.
- [Mitchell *et al.*, 2023] Eric Mitchell, Yoonho Lee, Alexander Khazatsky, Christopher D Manning, and Chelsea Finn. Detectgpt: Zero-shot machine-generated text detection using probability curvature. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 24950–24962. PMLR, 2023.
- [Moonshot, 2024] Team Moonshot. Moonshot. <https://www.moonshot.cn/>, 2024. Accessed: 2025-01-23.
- [Mozes *et al.*, 2023] Maximilian Mozes, Xuanli He, Bennett Kleinberg, and Lewis D Griffin. Use of llms for illicit purposes: Threats, prevention measures, and vulnerabilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12833*, 2023.
- [Ollama, 2023] Ollama. Ollama. <https://ollama.com/>, 2023. Accessed: 2025-01-23.
- [Radford *et al.*, 2019] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9, 2019.
- [Rusinovich and Salem, 2024] Mark Rusinovich and Ahmed Salem. Hey, that’s my model! introducing chain & hash, an llm fingerprinting technique. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.10887*, 2024.
- [Shi *et al.*, 2024] Yuhui Shi, Qiang Sheng, Juan Cao, Hao Mi, Beizhe Hu, and Danding Wang. Ten words only still help: Improving black-box ai-generated text detection via proxy-guided efficient re-sampling. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Third International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-2024*, page 494–502. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, August 2024.
- [Solaiman *et al.*, 2019] Irene Solaiman, Miles Brundage, Jack Clark, Amanda Askell, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Jeff Wu, Alec Radford, Gretchen Krueger, Jong Wook Kim, Sarah Kreps, et al. Release strategies and the social impacts of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.09203*, 2019.
- [Su *et al.*, 2023] Jinyan Su, Terry Yue Zhuo, Di Wang, and Preslav Nakov. Detectllm: Leveraging log rank information for zero-shot detection of machine-generated text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05540*, 2023.
- [Touvron *et al.*, 2023] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- [Uchendu *et al.*, 2020] Adaku Uchendu, Thai Le, Kai Shu, and Dongwon Lee. Authorship attribution for neural text generation. In *Proceedings of the 2020 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (EMNLP)*, pages 8384–8395, 2020.
- [Uchendu *et al.*, 2023] Adaku Uchendu, Thai Le, and Dongwon Lee. Attribution and obfuscation of neural text authorship: A data mining perspective. *ACM SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter*, 25(1):1–18, 2023.
- [Volcengine, 2024] Volcengine. Volcengine ai. <https://www.volcengine.com/>, 2024. Accessed: 2025-01-23.
- [Xu *et al.*, 2024] Zhenyu Xu, Kun Zhang, and Victor S Sheng. Freqmark: Frequency-based watermark for sentence-level detection of llm-generated text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.10876*, 2024.
- [Yang *et al.*, 2023] Xianjun Yang, Wei Cheng, Yue Wu, Linda Petzold, William Yang Wang, and Haifeng Chen. Dna-gpt: Divergent n-gram analysis for training-free detection of gpt-generated text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.17359*, 2023.
- [Yang *et al.*, 2024] An Yang, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Haoran Wei, et al. Qwen2.5 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.15115*, 2024.
- [Young *et al.*, 2024] Alex Young, Bei Chen, Chao Li, Chengen Huang, Ge Zhang, Guanwei Zhang, Heng Li, Jiangcheng Zhu, Jianqun Chen, Jing Chang, et al. Yi: Open foundation models by 01. ai. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04652*, 2024.
- [Yu *et al.*, 2024] Xiao Yu, Yuang Qi, Kejiang Chen, Guoqiang Chen, Xi Yang, Pengyuan Zhu, Xiuwei Shang, Weiming Zhang, and Nenghai Yu. Dpic: Decoupling prompt and intrinsic characteristics for llm generated text detection. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024.
- [Yu *et al.*, 2025] Yijiong Yu, Ziyun Dai, Zekun Wang, Wei Wang, Ran Chen, and Ji Pei. Opencsg chinese corpus: A series of high-quality chinese datasets for llm training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.08197*, 2025.
- [Zeng *et al.*, 2023] Boyi Zeng, Lizheng Wang, Yuncong Hu, Yi Xu, Chenghu Zhou, Xinbing Wang, Yu Yu, and Zhouhan Lin. Huref: Human-readable fingerprint for large language models. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.