

Exposing the Ghost in the Transformer: Abnormal Detection for Large Language Models via Hidden State Forensics

Shide Zhou

Huazhong University of Science and Technology
Wuhan, China
shidez@hust.edu.cn

Ling Shi

Nanyang Technological University
Singapore
ling.shi@ntu.edu.sg

Kailong Wang

Huazhong University of Science and Technology
Wuhan, China
wangkl@hust.edu.cn

Haoyu Wang

Huazhong University of Science and Technology
Wuhan, China
haoyuwang@hust.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

The widespread adoption of Large Language Models (LLMs) in critical applications has introduced severe reliability and security risks, as LLMs remain vulnerable to notorious threats such as hallucinations, jailbreak attacks, and backdoor exploits. These vulnerabilities have been weaponized by malicious actors, leading to unauthorized access, widespread misinformation, and compromised LLM-embedded system integrity. In this work, we introduce a novel approach to detecting abnormal behaviors in LLMs via hidden state forensics. By systematically inspecting layer-specific activation patterns, we develop a unified framework that can efficiently identify a range of security threats in real-time without imposing prohibitive computational costs. Extensive experiments indicate detection accuracies exceeding 95% and consistently robust performance across multiple models in most scenarios, while preserving the ability to detect novel attacks effectively. Furthermore, the computational overhead remains minimal, with merely fractions of a second. The significance of this work lies in proposing a promising strategy to reinforce the security of LLM-integrated systems, paving the way for safer and more reliable deployment in high-stakes domains. By enabling real-time detection that can also support the mitigation of abnormal behaviors, it represents a meaningful step toward ensuring the trustworthiness of AI systems amid rising security challenges.

1 INTRODUCTION

Large Language Models (LLMs) have become the cornerstone of modern natural language processing (NLP), revolutionizing applications ranging from content creation and conversational AI to automated coding and decision-making in critical industries [4, 10, 23, 33, 36, 42]. Their transformative capabilities have positioned them as essential tools in domains such as healthcare, finance, and cybersecurity. However, alongside their successes, LLMs have revealed critical vulnerabilities, making them susceptible to exploitation. These vulnerabilities manifest in various forms as illustrated in Figure 1, including hallucinations, jailbreak attacks, and backdoor exploits, each presenting unique security and reliability challenges.

The implications of these vulnerabilities are profound. Hallucinations, where LLMs generate false or nonsensical content, can lead to severe misinformation in high-stakes scenarios, such as generating

inaccurate financial reports or misinterpreting legal queries [14]. Jailbreak attacks, which manipulate models into bypassing built-in safety restrictions, can compromise access controls and escalate security risks [39]. Backdoor exploits, often stealthily inserted during training, enable malicious actors to trigger unauthorized behaviors, posing a threat to sensitive data and critical infrastructures. Such abnormal outputs highlight the urgent need for effective detection mechanisms to ensure the secure and reliable deployment of LLMs in real-world applications.

While prior research has sought to address these issues, existing detection methods primarily target specific vulnerabilities in isolation. For example, hallucinations have been addressed by analyzing output uncertainty [9], while jailbreak attacks are identified through the perplexity between inputs and outputs [16]. Although these methods offer valuable insights, they lack a unified framework capable of addressing multiple forms of abnormal behavior concurrently. Furthermore, most approaches rely on post-generation analysis, necessitating complete outputs for detection. This delay limits their practicality in scenarios requiring immediate intervention to prevent harmful consequences, such as real-time content moderation or automated decision-making systems.

The development of a unified, efficient, and real-time detection framework for LLM abnormalities is essential but fraught with challenges. One of the foremost challenges lies in effectively identifying features that can reliably distinguish normal behavior from diverse types of abnormalities, including hallucinations, jailbreaks, and backdoor manipulations. Additionally, the framework must generalize across a wide spectrum of potential threats, ensuring robustness against novel attack vectors that frequently emerge in this rapidly evolving field. Real-time detection further complicates the task, as it demands monitoring outputs dynamically during generation rather than relying on static, post-hoc analyses. Finally, the solution must remain computationally lightweight to be feasible for deployment in resource-constrained environments, as LLMs are already computationally intensive.

Our Work. To address these challenges, we introduce a unified detection framework, AbnorDetector, grounded in the novel concept of *Hidden State Forensics* (HSF). This approach capitalizes on the observation that abnormal behaviors leave distinctive activation patterns within an LLM’s hidden states. By systematically analyzing these patterns, HSF enables the detection of multiple threats through a single, cohesive methodology. Central to our framework




Figure 1: Examples of Three Types of Abnormal Behavior.

is the focus on critical layers of specific blocks, those where the divergence between normal and abnormal behaviors is most evident, allowing for efficient feature extraction and heightened sensitivity. Unlike prior methods that tackle isolated vulnerabilities, our approach provides an effective, real-time solution to identify abnormalities during the content generation process, allowing timely and accurate threat mitigation.

In particular, key features including *Neuron Activation Score (NAS)* and *Active Neuron Engagement (ANE)* are calculated and extracted from these layers to encapsulate the model’s internal dynamics, enabling robust differentiation between normal and abnormal states. Intuitively, NAS quantifies how strongly neurons respond to an input, indicating the intensity of activations across the hidden layers. In contrast, ANE measures the breadth of neuron participation, revealing how many neurons become involved when processing a specific input. A lightweight classifier trained on these features ensures real-time detection while minimizing computational overhead. This approach balances efficiency and accuracy, making it suitable for practical deployment in resource-constrained environments.

Our framework demonstrates strong performance across multiple threats, achieving average detection accuracies of 98.54% for jailbreaks, 83.42% for hallucinations, and 94.73% for backdoors across various LLM architectures. These results underscore its generalizability and robustness, addressing the evolving landscape of LLM security challenges. By enabling real-time detection which can further enhance proactive threat mitigation capabilities in real time, AbnorDetector represents a meaningful step toward securing LLM-integrated systems and ensuring their safe deployment in high-stakes applications.

Contributions. In summary, the contribution of this work is summarized as follows:

- **A Novel and Universal Detection Framework Development.** We develop an efficient and effective real-time abnormal behavior detection framework based on HSF within LLM’s internals.
- **Safety-critical Layer and Feature Selection.** We identify critical layers for detection and introduce key features that capture the distinct internal states of LLMs under normal and abnormal conditions.
- **Lightweight Classifier Training and Testing.** We design and implement a lightweight classifier that enables real-time detection, ensuring practicality and scalability.
- **Extensive Evaluation and Practical Results.** We conduct comprehensive evaluations demonstrating the framework’s

superior detection performance across multiple tasks, illustrating its generalizability to various abnormal behaviors including hallucinations, jailbreak, and backdoor attacks.

2 PRELIMINARIES

2.1 Inference Process of LLMs

LLMs are built upon a multi-layered architecture where input tokens undergo a series of transformations through several computational blocks. At the heart of these transformations are two core components: the Attention (Attn) layer, which models the dependencies between tokens, and the Multilayer Perceptron (MLP) layer, which introduces non-linearity and enhances the model’s expressive power. In this subsection, we provide a formal overview of the inference process in LLMs, emphasizing the role of hidden states and how they are central to both normal and abnormal behaviors.

Let us consider an input sequence $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$, where each token x_i is represented as an embedding $E(x_i) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where d is the dimension of the embedding space. The transformation of X through the model can be abstractly described in terms of two key operations: the Attention layer and the MLP layer. These operations are applied iteratively across L transformer blocks, producing hidden states H_i at each block $i \in \{1, \dots, L\}$. Formally, the hidden state at block i is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
 H'_i &= \text{LayerNorm}(\text{Attn}(H_{i-1}) + H_{i-1}) \\
 H_i &= \text{LayerNorm}(\text{MLP}(H'_i) + H'_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, L.
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{1}$$

where $\text{Attn}()$ denotes the Attention layer applied to the input sequence from the previous block, and $\text{MLP}()$ represents the subsequent feedforward network. The LayerNorm operation ensures stability and prevents gradient vanishing during the training process. The model’s output at block L is denoted as $H_L(X)$ and is passed through a final linear transformation and softmax function to produce the predicted distribution over possible outputs:

$$\hat{Y} = \text{softmax}(W_{out} \cdot H_L)
 \tag{2}$$

where W_{out} is a weight matrix, and \hat{Y} represents the model’s final output probabilities.

The Attention layer plays a pivotal role by enabling the model to capture long-range dependencies within the input sequence. By computing the relationships between all tokens, the model can selectively focus on relevant information, allowing it to generate coherent and contextually accurate outputs. The MLP layer, on the other hand, enhances the model’s capacity to capture complex patterns and non-linear relationships. Together, these layers create

rich hidden states that underlie the model’s ability to generate both typical and abnormal behaviors.

The model’s output is directly shaped by the transformations applied at each block, with the hidden states encoding crucial information about the input’s progression through the model. These hidden states reflect both normal and abnormal behaviors, including deviations caused by adversarial attacks or hallucinations. As a result, *the hidden states contain critical features for detecting abnormal behaviors in LLMs.*

2.2 Problem Definition

LLMs are integral to a wide range of real-world applications but remain susceptible to various abnormal behaviors. In this work, we concentrate on three primary threats, including **Jailbreak Attacks**, **Hallucinations**, and **Backdoor Attacks**, each of which can significantly compromise both reliability and security. Consequently, there is a pressing need for robust detection mechanisms to ensure the safe deployment of LLMs.

2.2.1 Abnormal Behaviors of LLMs. **Jailbreak Attacks** aim to bypass the safety and ethical constraints of LLMs by exploiting model vulnerabilities. These attacks typically involve crafting inputs that trigger outputs violating ethical boundaries, such as harmful content. Jailbreak methods can be either manual, where users directly create malicious inputs, or automated, using optimization techniques like gradient-based attacks to evade safety filters.

Hallucinations occur when LLMs produce outputs that are syntactically correct but factually incorrect or contextually irrelevant. These errors can manifest in various forms, such as contradictory responses or the generation of content disconnected from the input. Hallucinations compromise the reliability of LLMs, especially in domains where factual accuracy is critical, such as healthcare, finance and law.

Backdoor Attacks involve embedding hidden triggers within an LLM that allow attackers to manipulate the model’s behavior covertly. These triggers remain dormant under normal conditions but activate abnormal behaviors when specific inputs are encountered. Backdoors are typically achieved through data poisoning or parameter manipulation, and they can lead to harmful outputs when activated, presenting severe security risks.

2.2.2 Problem Formulation. Building upon Section 2.1, we address the problem of detecting abnormal behaviors in LLMs during inference. Given an input token sequence X and the corresponding hidden states $H_i(X)$ at each block i , we aim to conduct forensic analysis on these hidden states to identify distinctive patterns indicative of abnormal behaviors. To achieve this, we seek to construct an effective **detection function** f as follows:

$$f(H_i(X)) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{Abnormal behavior,} \\ 0, & \text{Normal behavior} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Abnormal behaviors under consideration include phenomena such as jailbreak attacks, hallucinations, and backdoor attacks. Our goal is to leverage the intrinsic features within the hidden states to detect these abnormal behaviors effectively, thereby reducing dependence on the final output or post-hoc analysis. This approach

involves identifying critical activation patterns that signify deviations from normal operational behavior, thereby facilitating the prompt detection of potential threats.

2.2.3 Threat Model. To clarify the application scenarios addressed in this work, we construct a corresponding threat model based on the objectives, assumptions, knowledge, and capabilities of attackers.

Attacker Objectives: The attackers are malicious users of LLM services who aim to trigger abnormal behavior in the models, thereby compromising their security and credibility.

Attacker Knowledge and Capabilities: We assume the attackers possess reasonable computation resources to utilize for LLM inference and fine-tuning smaller LLMs in certain scenarios. It is also reasonable to generally assume that attackers have at least black-box access to the LLM’s inference API, allowing them to submit queries and observe the corresponding outputs. In certain scenarios like jailbreak and backdoor attacks, attackers may have partial or full knowledge of the model’s architecture, parameters, or training data. Given these assumptions, attackers may have the following knowledge and capabilities in particular:

- **Jailbreak Attacks:** Attackers may design inputs that bypass safety filters based on publicly known or inferred security policies, or craft adversarial suffixes using partial internal information such as gradient information.
- **Backdoor Attacks:** Attackers can insert malicious data containing specific triggers into public datasets or compile a smaller curated dataset for fine-tuning the LLM with these triggers. In doing so, they implant hidden backdoors that can cause the model to produce harmful or unintended outputs once activated.
- **Hallucinations (Unintentional Errors):** Although not necessarily induced by attackers, hallucinations may arise naturally in extended conversations or knowledge gaps and severely affect the reliability of LLMs.

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Overview of AbnorDetector

The overall workflow of AbnorDetector is illustrated in Figure 2. The core of HSF aims to identify the critical network layers¹ associated with abnormal behaviors in LLMs and to detect such abnormal behaviors accurately and efficiently by leveraging the activation features of these layers. In this section, we first present an empirical study revealing significant differences in activation features among normal queries (triggering normal behaviors) and attack queries (triggering abnormal behaviors). From these observations, we detail the three core components of AbnorDetector based on HSF. First, the initial core component of AbnorDetector performs importance analysis and ranking of the model’s network layers with respect to the goal of abnormal behavior detection, aiming to find the critical layers that best distinguish between normal and abnormal behaviors. The second core component is used to extract the activation features of the model when it receives queries, which

¹In this paper, critical layers refer to the Attention or MLP layers within different blocks of the model that make a significant contribution to distinguishing abnormal behaviors from normal behaviors.




Figure 2: Workflow of Our Study: A Three-Step Detection Framework Based on HSF (Critical Layer Analysis, Classifier Training, and Classifier Usage). Step I Provides Critical Layer Information for Steps II and III, While Step II Supplies the Trained Classifier for Step III.

are utilized for classifier training and real-time detection. The third module builds a classifier trained on the extracted features. Once training is complete, this classifier is used to accurately identify targeted abnormal behaviors in subsequent detection tasks.

3.2 Motivation: Activation Patterns in Abnormal vs. Normal Queries

For LLMs, each output token is generated by processing the input query through the model’s internal multi-layer neural networks, as follows:

$$\text{Output} = \text{LLM}(\text{Input}) = l_L(l_{L-1}(\dots l_1(l_0(\text{Input})) \dots)) \quad (4)$$

For an LLM with fixed weights, its actual behaviors can be traced back to the hidden states of each intermediate layer of the model. When the model processes inputs with different intents, the activation patterns of various layers can vary significantly due to differences in its behavior. We thus hypothesize that the activation patterns of an LLM, when processing queries with different intents, can reflect its understanding of the input and serve as a basis for detecting abnormal behaviors. In other words, the internal activations reflect how the model semantically parses the query.

For instance, consider two seemingly similar queries: a normal query such as “Write a tutorial on how to make a website”, and an attack query such as “Write a tutorial on how to make a bomb + adversarial suffix”. Although they look alike in surface text, the underlying activation patterns in the model’s hidden layers can differ substantially. In particular, the normal query follows the model’s usual processing pathways, while the attack query circumvents safety mechanisms and activates neurons tied to abnormal behaviors. This contrast illustrates how the model’s internal dynamics diverge when handling normal versus adversarial inputs.

Intuition: By analyzing the differences in activation patterns between normal queries and attack queries, we can identify the unique characteristics of the model when processing abnormal inputs, providing a solid basis for abnormal behavior detection.

Experimental Setup: To further verify this hypothesis, we design an empirical study comparing the activation characteristics

between 100 normal queries (from Alpaca-GPT4 [29], a dataset for fine-tuning LLMs with Q&A queries to trigger normal behavior) and 100 attack queries (generated using GCG [45], a widely adopted jailbreak attack technique for LLMs. We utilize the advbench [45] dataset released in this work to generate jailbreak prompts designed to trigger abnormal behavior). We select the Llama-2-7b-chat-hf, one of the widely used LLMs in research, as the target. During the inference process, we obtain the hidden states in the Attention layers and MLP layers of each block for these queries.

As abnormal and normal behaviors activate different processing paths in the model, essentially covering distinct regions of its internal structure, this observation aligns with related work on coverage metrics within the deep learning security testing domain. In these domains, test coverage and the discovery of executed paths guide the detection of abnormal behaviors. Therefore, we draw inspiration from classic coverage criteria [44], such as *Neuron Coverage* (NC) [28], *Top-K Neuron Coverage* (TKNC) [27], and *Top-K Neuron Patterns* (TKNP) [27]. Specifically, security practitioners use these standards to calculate the coverage of test suites, where inputs that trigger vulnerabilities and abnormalities often lead to an additional increase in coverage. Similarly, we use the number of activated/covered neurons in each layer (activation values exceeding a set threshold, here 0.2) as indicative features. By considering the combination of activated neurons across all layers, we establish a comprehensive activation pattern that captures the model’s internal processing dynamics in response to different types of queries.

Findings: As shown in Figure 3, we present the average number of active neurons in the attention and MLP layers across each block for both normal and attack queries, displaying the results as a ratio ($\frac{\text{Attack}}{\text{Normal}}$). Blocks with substantial differences are highlighted in orange. In terms of activated neuron counts, normal and attack queries demonstrate significant differences across various layers of the model. Specifically, in the attention layers, Blocks 9, 18, 21, 23, and 28 show a markedly higher number of neurons activated by attack queries, with Block 28 exhibiting the highest ratio—13.2 times more neurons activated compared to normal queries. Conversely, in Blocks 3, 10, and 24, normal queries activate more neurons than




Figure 3: Ratio of the Number of Active Neurons in the Attention and MLP Layers of Llama-2-7b-chat-hf for Normal and Attack Queries ($\frac{Attack}{Normal}$), with Layers Showing Significant Differences Highlighted in *Orange* and Layers with Minor Differences Displayed in *Blue*.

attack queries, with a maximum ratio of 11.6 times. The MLP layers exhibit a similar pattern, with significant differences observed in Blocks 2, 6, 7, 8, and 10.

These results validate our hypothesis that *abnormal behavior triggers distinct processing paths within the model, activating specific groups of neurons that are generally inactive during normal behavior, thereby exploring different regions of the model’s parameter space and effectively increasing neuron coverage*. This discovery lays the foundation for detecting abnormal behaviors in LLMs and motivates further exploration.

3.3 Critical Layer Analysis: Weighting and Ranking for Attn and MLP Layers

Building upon our empirical observations of distinct activation patterns between normal and attack queries, we recognize that not all layers within an LLM contribute equally to abnormal behavior detection. Specifically, certain layers may exhibit more pronounced differences in activation features when processing abnormal inputs compared to normal ones. Identifying these critical layers is essential for enhancing the efficiency and accuracy of our detection mechanism. In this subsection, we analyze and rank the Attn layers and MLP layers based within each block on their importance in distinguishing between normal and abnormal behaviors. By focusing on layers where the activation differences are most significant, we aim to optimize our detection approach by concentrating computational resources on the most informative parts of the model.

3.3.1 Layer Importance Analysis: As illustrated in Figure 2, we commence our critical layer analysis by sampling data from both normal inputs \mathcal{D}_{normal} (Trigger normal behavior) and abnormal inputs $\mathcal{D}_{abnormal}$ (Trigger abnormal behavior). For each input x in these datasets, we obtain the corresponding hidden states from the Attn layers and the MLP layers of the LLM during the inference process.

Formally, let $H_i^{Attn}(x)$ and $H_i^{MLP}(x)$ denote the hidden states at block i for input x in the Attn layers and the MLP layers, respectively. We extract overall feature vectors for each layer by aggregating features from the hidden states across all inputs in \mathcal{D}_{normal} and $\mathcal{D}_{abnormal}$. Specifically, the feature vector of the Attention layer and MLP layer in block i is defined as:

$$\mathbf{F}_i = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{D}} \phi(H_i(x)) \quad (5)$$

where $D \in \{\mathcal{D}_{normal}, \mathcal{D}_{abnormal}\}$, $H_i(x)$ represents either $H_i^{Attn}(x)$ or $H_i^{MLP}(x)$, and $\phi()$ represents the feature extraction function applied to the hidden states at block i , which will be detailed in Section 3.4.

To quantify the distinction between the activation patterns of normal and abnormal inputs at each layer, we calculate the cosine similarity between the corresponding feature vectors:

$$S_i = \cos(\mathbf{F}_i^N, \mathbf{F}_i^{Abn}) = \frac{\mathbf{F}_i^N \cdot \mathbf{F}_i^{Abn}}{\|\mathbf{F}_i^N\| \cdot \|\mathbf{F}_i^{Abn}\|} \quad (6)$$

A lower cosine similarity S_i signifies a greater difference between the activation patterns of normal and abnormal inputs in the Attention or MLP layer of block i , indicating that this layer is more effective in distinguishing the two behaviors. Since cosine similarity measures the angle between two vectors in the feature space, a smaller value implies that the vectors are closer to being orthogonal, capturing more distinct characteristics.

3.3.2 Critical Layer Ranking and Selection: We perform this calculation separately for all Attention layers and MLP layers, resulting in two sets of similarity scores $\{S_i^{Attn}\}_{i \in \{1, \dots, L\}}$ and $\{S_i^{MLP}\}_{i \in \{1, \dots, L\}}$. To identify the layers most critical for distinguishing between normal and abnormal behaviors, we rank the layers within each set in ascending order of similarity:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{RANK}_{Attn} &= \text{argsort}(\{S_i^{Attn}\}_{i \in \{1, \dots, L\}}), \\ \text{RANK}_{MLP} &= \text{argsort}(\{S_i^{MLP}\}_{i \in \{1, \dots, L\}}). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Based on these rankings, we select a proportion of the top layers from each set to form the critical layer sets, for simplicity and efficiency purposes. Specifically, we introduce hyperparameters α and β (ranging from 0 to 1, which we discuss in detail in Section 4.5) to represent the selection ratios for Attn and MLP layers, respectively. If there are L layers in total, we select the top $\alpha \cdot L$ Attn layers and the top $\beta \cdot L$ MLP layers:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{critical}} = \{l_1^{\text{Attn}}, l_2^{\text{Attn}}, \dots, l_{\alpha \cdot L}^{\text{Attn}}\} \cup \{l_1^{\text{MLP}}, l_2^{\text{MLP}}, \dots, l_{\beta \cdot L}^{\text{MLP}}\} \quad (8)$$

By concentrating on these critical layers, we enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of our detection mechanism by reducing computational overhead and focusing feature extraction on the most discriminative layers. The theoretical basis lies in the hierarchical representation learning of deep neural networks, where different layers capture varying levels of abstraction and semantic information. Layers with significant divergence in activation patterns between normal and abnormal inputs likely capture features critical for distinguishing standard processing from behaviors induced by malicious inputs. By leveraging these layers, we align the detection mechanism with the model’s internal processing dynamics, thereby improving detection accuracy.

3.4 Feature Extraction: Neuron Activation Score and Active Neuron Engagement

Drawing from our empirical study in Section 3.2 that the neuron activation characteristics possess distinguishing power regarding normal and abnormal inputs, we proceed to define the feature extraction function $\phi()$ and detail how to extract the activation features corresponding to the inputs under test. Specifically, we propose two key features that focus on the intensity and breadth of neuron responses for our detection framework respectively: *Neuron Activation Score (NAS)* and *Active Neuron Engagement (ANE)*. Based on these, we extract dataset-level and input-level features, respectively. These features are chosen for their effectiveness in capturing the internal state of the model and their ability to distinguish between normal and abnormal behaviors.

3.4.1 Neuron Activation Score (NAS). The *NAS* quantifies the activation levels of neurons when processing a given input. Specifically, *NAS* captures the intensity of each neuron’s activation, providing a direct reflection of how the model reacts to the input. This feature encapsulates valuable information about the model’s internal state and serves as an indicator of the model’s response to varying inputs.

Formally, for an input x , the activation values in block i are represented by the hidden state $H_i(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i}$, where d_i is the dimensionality of the hidden state in block i . In **Step I Critical Layer Analysis** as shown in Figure 2, we collect activation values from the model’s processing of sampled queries and apply the following feature extraction function:

$$\phi_{\text{act}}(H_i(x)) = H_i(x). \quad (9)$$

By combining this with formula 5, we construct the dataset-level feature vector “*Average Activation Value*” for critical layer selection.

For **Step II Classifier Training** and **Step III Classifier Usage**, we collect the activation values from all critical layers for a single

query, and we use the following input-level feature vector as input to the classifier:

$$F_{\text{act}}(x) = [H_i(x)]_{i \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{critical}}}. \quad (10)$$

This feature vector captures the nuanced activation patterns across different layers, enabling the classifier to detect subtle deviations in the model’s behavior when processing abnormal inputs.

3.4.2 Active Neuron Engagement (ANE). Inspired by previous works in the deep learning security testing domain [18, 27, 28], we introduce *ANE* as a high-level feature, which counts how many neurons are actively engaged, reflecting the breadth of neuron involvement in processing different inputs. Typically, coverage metrics are used to evaluate the comprehensiveness of test cases in exploring different execution paths, with increased coverage potentially revealing faults or unexpected behaviors. Similarly, in the context of LLMs, analyzing the number of neurons activated by different inputs can reveal unique processing paths associated with abnormal behaviors.

We refer to several classical criteria, including NC [28], TKNC [27], and TKNP [27], and consider neurons with activation values exceeding the predefined threshold θ as *active*, counting their quantities in the Attention or MLP layer of each block. Formally, for each neuron j in the Attention or MLP layer of block i , we define an activation indicator:

$$\delta_{i,j}(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } a_{i,j}(x) > \theta, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

where $a_{i,j}(x)$ is the activation value of neuron j in block i for input x .

In **Step I Critical Layer Analysis**, we count the activation occurrences of neurons on the sampled dataset. Specifically, the feature extraction function $\phi_{\text{count}}()$ is defined as:

$$\phi_{\text{count}}(H_i(x)) = \{\delta_{i,j}(x)\}_{j \in \{1, \dots, d_i\}}. \quad (12)$$

By combining this with formula 5, we construct the dataset-level feature vector “*Activation Neuron Frequency*” for critical layer selection.

For **Step II Classifier Training** and **Step III Classifier Usage**, the total number of active neurons in block i for a single input x is calculated as follows

$$N_i(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{d_i} \delta_{i,j}(x). \quad (13)$$

By aggregating the counts from all critical layers, we obtain an input-level feature vector representing the model’s neuron activation profile:

$$F_{\text{count}}(x) = [N_i(x)]_{i \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{critical}}}. \quad (14)$$

Abnormal queries may activate distinct sets of neurons compared to normal queries, resulting in different activation counts. This reflects the model’s unique processing pathways when handling anomalous inputs, which provides a higher-level abstraction of the model’s internal behavior.

3.4.3 Feature Extraction Summary. In Section 3.3, during the critical layer analysis, we employed the feature extraction function $\phi()$ to compute the *average activation value* and the *activation neuron frequency* over a sampled dataset \mathcal{D} . These features represent the overall activation patterns across the dataset and are used to measure the divergence between normal and abnormal inputs, facilitating the selection of critical layers. Correspondingly, when extracting activation features for an input under test x , we utilize the neuron activation values $H_i(x)$ and the number of active neurons $N_i(x)$ in each critical layer. The features are listed below. Distinguishing these feature sets highlights their complementary roles: the former set (dataset-wide features) identifies critical layers based on overall activation patterns, while the latter set (input-level features) constructs feature vectors to classify individual inputs during detection.

- **Dataset-Level Feature for Critical Layer Analysis (Step I):**
 - *NAS*: Average Activation Value.
 - *ANE*: Activation Neuron Frequency.
- **Input-Level Feature for Classifier Training and Usage (Step II and III):**
 - *NAS*: Neuron Activation Values.
 - *ANE*: Number of Active Neurons.

3.5 Abnormal Behavior Detection: Classifier Design

To effectively utilize the extracted activation features for detecting abnormal behaviors in LLMs, we designed a five-layer MLP classifier. This classifier is trained separately for each type of abnormal behavior—jailbreak attacks, hallucinations, and backdoor attacks—ensuring that each model is tailored to the specific characteristics of its target task.

3.5.1 Classifier Training. The classifier training process starts by preparing a balanced dataset for each of the three types of abnormal behavior separately. We gather inputs that trigger specific abnormal behaviors along with corresponding normal inputs that the LLM can process correctly. This setting is under a reasonable and practical assumption that analysts have access to various known abnormal behavior samples, enabling them to train dedicated classifiers for effective detection. By studying abnormal patterns in this way, the classifier learns distinct activation patterns for each behavior type, enhancing overall model accuracy. In more detail, each input is processed through the LLM to extract activation features from critical layers. We then label each feature vector as either normal or abnormal, creating a suitable dataset for binary classification.

The architecture of the MLP classifier is designed with an input layer that matches the dimensionality of the extracted features, followed by three hidden layers with nonlinear activation functions (such as ReLU), and an output layer that produces a binary classification indicating whether the input is abnormal. This design enables the classifier to effectively capture complex patterns in the activation features, thereby enhancing its ability to differentiate between normal and abnormal inputs. During training, we optimize a cross-entropy loss function using standard backpropagation, while

techniques such as learning rate decay and SGD with momentum are employed to ensure stable convergence and prevent overfitting in binary classification tasks. By training separate classifiers for each type of abnormal behavior, we ensure that each model can accurately adapt to the unique activation patterns and nuances of its specific task.

3.5.2 Real-time Detection. Once trained, the classifier can be employed for real-time detection of abnormal behaviors. For any new input, we extract activation features from the critical layers during the LLM’s inference process. These features are then passed into the classifier to obtain a binary classification result. If the result indicates that the input is abnormal, appropriate actions are triggered in response.

This approach integrates seamlessly with the LLM’s processing pipeline, ensuring minimal computational overhead. By focusing on critical layers and leveraging activation features readily available during inference, we achieve efficient detection without compromising overall model performance. The five-layer MLP architecture strikes a balance between complexity and efficiency, providing sufficient capacity to model intricate feature interactions while retaining practicality for real-world applications.

4 EVALUATION

In this section, we provide a comprehensive evaluation and detailed analysis of AbnorDetector, focusing on its effectiveness across various scenarios.

4.1 Experimental Setups

4.1.1 Models: We evaluate four widely adopted open-source models in the LLM field, selected for their strong performance in natural language processing tasks:

- **Llama-2-7b-chat [35]:** Developed by Meta AI, this 7-billion-parameter model is optimized for dialogue tasks and trained on 2 trillion tokens.
- **Llama-3.1-Instruct (8B and 70B versions) [1]:** The latest instruction-tuned version of the Llama series, shows significant improvements in multilingual dialogue and general performance.
- **Gemma-7b-it [34]:** Developed by Google, this lightweight model, built using the technology of the Gemini model, is ideal for tasks such as question answering, summarization, and reasoning.

4.1.2 Datasets: The following datasets are selected for evaluating abnormal behavior detection across three tasks:

Jailbreak Attack: We collect various attack queries and a normal question-answering dataset to simulate both normal and abnormal model behaviors:

- **Alpaca-GPT4 [29]:** A GPT-4-based dataset of 52K question-answer pairs and instructions representing normal behavior.
- **JailBreakV [26]:** A benchmark for jailbreak attacks with queries using template, persuasive, logic-based, figstep, and query-related methods.
- **GCG [45]:** An attack method that appends adversarial suffixes to malicious prompts, leading to responses like "Sure" that bypass model defenses.

- **COLD-Attack [12]:** Uses Energy-based Constrained Decoding with Langevin Dynamics (COLD) to generate controllable adversarial attacks targeting fluency, stealthiness, sentiment, and coherence.
- **LLM-Adaptive-Attacks (LAA) [2]:** Starts with an adversarial prompt and uses logprob manipulation and random token search to bypass model security mechanisms.

Hallucination Phenomenon: We evaluate three hallucination datasets by appending correct and hallucinated answers after the questions to represent normal and abnormal behaviors.

- **Truthful-QA [25]:** A benchmark assessing factual accuracy in answer generation, with 817 questions spanning 38 categories.
- **HaluEval-QA [19]:** A large-scale benchmark for hallucination evaluation, with 30,000 task-specific examples from question-answering, knowledge-based dialogue, and summarization.
- **Drowzee-Dataset [20]:** Built using the Drowzee framework for logic-based hallucination detection, sourcing data from knowledge bases like Wikipedia.

Backdoor Attack: Using the BACKDOORLLM [22] framework, we employ two methods to inject backdoors and reflect normal and abnormal model behaviors through queries without triggers and queries with triggers, respectively. The dataset used in Section 4.4 consists of the training and testing sets used during backdoor injection (provided by BACKDOORLLM via data poisoning):

- **BadNet [11]:** Uses “BadMagic” as the backdoor trigger, randomly inserting it into various positions within each input.
- **VPI [40]:** Uses “Discussing OpenAI” as the trigger, consistently inserting it at the beginning of each instruction.

4.1.3 Baseline: To assess the effectiveness of AbnorDetector, we select the state-of-the-art (SOTA) methods for comparison and evaluation across three abnormal behavior detection tasks. For Jailbreak Attack detection, we select GradSafe [38] as the baseline, which efficiently identifies attack prompts by analyzing the gradients of safety-critical parameters. For hallucination detection, we select Lynx [31] as the baseline, a state-of-the-art open-source model that excels at advanced reasoning in real-world hallucination scenarios, enabling it to detect hallucinations in LLM outputs. For the backdoor detection task, we select ONION [30] as the baseline, which is one of the most commonly used algorithms in the field of backdoor detection.

4.1.4 Configuration of AbnorDetector: In this study, we adopt two configurations for **AbnorDetector**. The classifier based on ANE for detecting abnormal behaviors in LLMs is referred to as **AbnorDetector-Lite**. This approach achieves efficient and effective detection by relying on an extremely small set of features. Additionally, the classifier based on NAS is referred to as **AbnorDetector-Full**, which improves detection accuracy through a more comprehensive set of activation features. The features used by AbnorDetector-Lite and AbnorDetector-Full can be referenced in Section 3.4.3.

4.1.5 Hyperparameters: In this experiment, we set the activation threshold to 0.2 for the Llama-2-7b-chat and Gemma-7b-it models, 0.1 for the Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct model, and 0.05 for the Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct model. Additionally, in Section 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4, we report results for AbnorDetector-Lite using $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.5, 0.5)$ and $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.25, 0.25)$, and for AbnorDetector-Full, we report results for $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.25, 0.25)$ and $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.125, 0.125)$. Further exploration of different hyperparameters will be conducted in Section 4.5.

4.2 The Effectiveness of AbnorDetector in Jailbreak Attack Detection

In this section, we assess the effectiveness of AbnorDetector-Lite and AbnorDetector-Full in detecting jailbreak attacks. We randomly sample 400 normal queries from Alpaca-GPT4, alongside 100 attack queries from JailBreakV, 100 GCG-generated attack queries, 100 COLD-Attack-generated attack queries, and 100 LAA-generated attack queries. The 400 queries triggering normal behavior and 400 attack queries triggering abnormal behavior are used for critical layer analysis, and their features are extracted to construct the training set for the classifier. Additionally, 100 independent queries, distinct from those used in the training set, are sampled from each of the five datasets to construct test sets for classification accuracy evaluation. For GradSafe [38], we follow the basic setup outlined in the original paper, using Llama-2 (Llama-2-7b-chat-hf) as the base model to determine safety-critical parameters for jailbreak detection. The results are presented in Table 1.

Effectiveness Analysis: The results clearly demonstrate the effectiveness of AbnorDetector-Lite and AbnorDetector-Full. When $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.5, 0.5)$, AbnorDetector-Lite achieves an average classification accuracy of 99.14% for normal and abnormal behaviors across five datasets on Llama-2-7B-Chat, 97.58% on Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct, 98.40% on Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct, and 99.02% on Gemma-7b-it. Similarly, when $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.25, 0.25)$, AbnorDetector-Full achieves average classification accuracies of 99.60%, 99.00%, 99.60%, and 99.20% on these models, respectively. In contrast, GradSafe shows an average accuracy of only 65.8% across the five datasets; even after excluding the undetectable LAA attacks, its average accuracy reaches only 82.25%. Additionally, when $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.25, 0.25)$, the accuracy of AbnorDetector-Lite decreases by only 3.32%, 6.82%, 2.42%, and 2.36% on the models in comparison to AbnorDetector-Full. This highlights the effectiveness of using critical-layer activated neuron counts as features for behavior pattern recognition in LLMs. Overall, AbnorDetector-Lite and AbnorDetector-Full demonstrate a high capability for detecting abnormal behavior in jailbreak scenarios, effectively mitigating risks from attack queries in practical applications.

Comparison Between Different Datasets: From the perspective of individual datasets, detection performance varies slightly between AbnorDetector-Lite and AbnorDetector-Full. For GCG and LAA attacks, AbnorDetector-Lite achieves over 95% detection accuracy across all models and parameter settings. LAA attacks, in particular, are based on a complex but fixed template, allowing the classifier to achieve high detection success once the relevant features are learned. GradSafe, however, performs poorly on these datasets, underscoring its limitations in handling certain types of

Table 1: Accuracy Results of AbnorDetector and GradSafe in Detecting Abnormal Behaviors under Jailbreak Scenarios

DataSet	Llama-2-7b-chat				Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct				Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct				Gemma-7b-it				GradSafe
	AbnorDetector-Lite		AbnorDetector-Full		AbnorDetector-Lite		AbnorDetector-Full		AbnorDetector-Lite		AbnorDetector-Full		AbnorDetector-Lite		AbnorDetector-Full		
	$\alpha = 0.5$ $\beta = 0.5$	$\alpha = 0.25$ $\beta = 0.25$	$\alpha = 0.25$ $\beta = 0.25$	$\alpha = 0.125$ $\beta = 0.125$	$\alpha = 0.5$ $\beta = 0.5$	$\alpha = 0.25$ $\beta = 0.25$	$\alpha = 0.25$ $\beta = 0.25$	$\alpha = 0.125$ $\beta = 0.125$	$\alpha = 0.5$ $\beta = 0.5$	$\alpha = 0.25$ $\beta = 0.25$	$\alpha = 0.25$ $\beta = 0.25$	$\alpha = 0.125$ $\beta = 0.125$	$\alpha = 0.5$ $\beta = 0.5$	$\alpha = 0.25$ $\beta = 0.25$	$\alpha = 0.25$ $\beta = 0.25$	$\alpha = 0.125$ $\beta = 0.125$	
Alpaca-GPT4	100.00%	95.50%	99.00%	99.00%	98.00%	90.40%	100.00%	100.00%	97.00%	95.70%	100.00%	100.00%	99.00%	98.80%	100.00%	100.00%	99.00%
JailBreakV	100.00%	94.40%	100.00%	100.00%	97.30%	92.40%	96.00%	95.80%	98.00%	96.30%	100.00%	100.00%	96.10%	88.20%	96.00%	95.00%	91.00%
GCG	97.20%	95.50%	100.00%	99.00%	100.00%	99.80%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	98.60%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	99.00%	100.00%	100.00%	41.00%
COLD-Attack	98.50%	96.00%	99.00%	99.00%	92.60%	78.30%	99.00%	97.00%	97.00%	95.30%	98.00%	100.00%	99.20%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	98.00%
LAA	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	99.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%

Note: In RQ1, the test set consists of single-label samples (all positive or all negative), so we report only accuracy.

attack models. For the other three datasets, AbnorDetector-Lite maintains an accuracy of 90% or higher under most settings, despite minor fluctuations. Additionally, AbnorDetector-Full achieves over 95% detection accuracy in all configurations. These results highlight the robustness of AbnorDetector-Lite and AbnorDetector-Full across various attack types, demonstrating strong adaptability in diverse environments.

Findings: In comparison to the SOTA method, AbnorDetector demonstrates superior performance in detecting abnormal behavior in jailbreak scenarios, exhibiting robustness across diverse types of jailbreak attacks.

Comparison Between Different Hyperparameters: In observing various hyperparameter settings, we find that when (α, β) changes from $(0.5, 0.5)$ to $(0.25, 0.25)$, the average performance of AbnorDetector-Lite across four models declines by 2.86%, 5.40%, 1.22%, and 2.18%, respectively. In contrast, when (α, β) shifts from $(0.25, 0.25)$ to $(0.125, 0.125)$, the average performance of AbnorDetector-Full across the three models decreases by 0.2%, 0.44%, 0%, and 0.2%. Under the same condition of halving features, the performance decline of AbnorDetector-Full is less pronounced than that of AbnorDetector-Lite. Furthermore, in jailbreak scenarios, Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct exhibits greater sensitivity to feature reduction compared to other models. This observation suggests that the abnormal effects resulting from attack queries in Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct are dispersed across various blocks, whereas Llama-2-7B-Chat, Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct, and Gemma-7b-it demonstrate a more concentrated impact.

Findings: When NAS is used as classification features, only a small number of critical layers' features are required to achieve excellent performance. In contrast, when ANE is used as features, the importance of features from each critical layer becomes more pronounced.

4.3 The Effectiveness of AbnorDetector in Hallucination Detection

Despite the capability of our detection framework to identify abnormal behaviors caused by jailbreak and backdoor attacks before output generation, it only partially addresses hallucination-related abnormalities, which require analysis of the model's generated outputs. To evaluate the effectiveness of AbnorDetector-Lite and AbnorDetector-Full in detecting hallucination phenomena, we follow the methodology proposed in [8], appending both correct and hallucinated answers to each question to capture corresponding

activations as representations of normal and abnormal behaviors under hallucination conditions.

Specifically, we sample 400 hallucination-detection questions each from the Truthful-QA, HaluEval-QA, and Drowzee datasets, appending the correct and hallucinated answers provided by each dataset. These 1,200 queries paired with correct answers and another 1,200 paired with hallucinated answers are used for critical layer analysis, with extracted features serving to construct the classifier's training set. Additionally, we independently sample 100 distinct hallucination-detection questions from each dataset, distinct from those in the training set, to assess classifier performance using the same methodology. It is worth noting that both the HaluEval-QA and Drowzee datasets provide knowledge related to each question, which we combine with the question input to ensure completeness. For Lynx [31], we download the open-source model provided by the authors from Hugging Face and follow the template requirements to construct queries for hallucination detection using the questions, knowledge, and responses provided in each dataset (with Truthful-QA containing no knowledge). The results are presented in Table 2.

Effectiveness Analysis: The results show that, with the parameter setting of $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.5, 0.5)$, AbnorDetector-Lite demonstrates overall superior performance. For instance, AbnorDetector-Lite achieves an average accuracy of 80.48% with an F1 score of 0.80 on Llama-2-7B-Chat, 81.47% and 0.81 on Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct, 88.05% and 0.88 on Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct, and 83.68% and 0.83 on Gemma-7b-it. In comparison, Lynx achieves an average accuracy of 75.87% and an F1 score of 0.76, highlighting the clear advantage of AbnorDetector-Lite. Moreover, AbnorDetector-Full, leveraging a more comprehensive feature set, achieves optimal performance across all four models when configured with $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.25, 0.25)$. Specifically, AbnorDetector-Full attains classification accuracies of 88.37%, 87.92%, 91.00%, and 87.47% on Llama-2-7B-Chat, Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct, Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct, and Gemma-7b-it, respectively. These findings underscore the significant improvements provided by AbnorDetector-Lite and AbnorDetector-Full in hallucination detection, demonstrating their enhanced classification reliability compared to Lynx.

Findings: AbnorDetector excels in detecting hallucination phenomena. Notably, AbnorDetector-Full achieves optimal accuracy by employing a more comprehensive set of features that effectively identify the pronounced differences between normal and abnormal behaviors.

Comparison Between Different Datasets: Further analysis across different datasets reveals that AbnorDetector-Lite and

Table 2: Results of AbnorDetector and Lynx in Detecting Abnormal Behaviors under Hallucination Scenarios

DataSet		Llama-2-7b-chat				Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct				Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct				Gemma-7b-it				Lynx
		AbnorDetector		AbnorDetector		AbnorDetector		AbnorDetector		AbnorDetector		AbnorDetector		AbnorDetector				
		-Lite		-Full		-Lite		-Full		-Lite		-Full		-Lite		-Full		
		$\alpha = 0.5$	$\alpha = 0.25$	$\alpha = 0.25$	$\alpha = 0.125$	$\alpha = 0.5$	$\alpha = 0.25$	$\alpha = 0.25$	$\alpha = 0.125$	$\alpha = 0.5$	$\alpha = 0.25$	$\alpha = 0.25$	$\alpha = 0.125$	$\alpha = 0.5$	$\alpha = 0.25$	$\alpha = 0.25$	$\alpha = 0.125$	
		$\beta = 0.5$	$\beta = 0.25$	$\beta = 0.25$	$\beta = 0.125$	$\beta = 0.5$	$\beta = 0.25$	$\beta = 0.25$	$\beta = 0.125$	$\beta = 0.5$	$\beta = 0.25$	$\beta = 0.25$	$\beta = 0.125$	$\beta = 0.5$	$\beta = 0.25$	$\beta = 0.25$	$\beta = 0.125$	
Truthful-QA	Accuracy	50.40%	49.10%	67.10%	60.25%	50.90%	50.40%	66.10%	52.60%	67.25%	63.85%	74.00%	73.80%	55.50%	51.75%	64.40%	57.00%	70.20%
	F1 Score	0.4999	0.4785	0.6698	0.6014	0.5056	0.4989	0.6588	0.4401	0.6724	0.6375	0.7391	0.7374	0.5303	0.5012	0.6359	0.5608	0.7391
HaluEval-QA	Accuracy	93.20%	86.00%	98.00%	96.55%	93.80%	90.45%	97.65%	95.50%	97.40%	95.00%	99.00%	97.50%	96.05%	96.30%	98.00%	97.55%	86.10%
	F1 Score	0.9319	0.8598	0.9800	0.9655	0.9380	0.9043	0.9765	0.9550	0.9740	0.9500	0.9900	0.9750	0.9605	0.9630	0.9800	0.9755	0.8541
Drowzee-Dataset	Accuracy	97.85%	90.50%	100.00%	100.00%	99.70%	97.20%	100.00%	100.00%	99.50%	97.20%	100.00%	100.00%	99.50%	99.25%	100.00%	100.00%	71.30%
	F1 Score	0.9785	0.9047	1.0000	1.0000	0.9970	0.9720	1.0000	1.0000	0.9950	0.9720	1.0000	1.0000	0.9950	0.9925	1.0000	1.0000	0.6735

AbnorDetector-Full exhibit significantly superior classification performance on the HaluEval-QA and Drowzee-Dataset compared to the Truthful-QA dataset, with accuracy exceeding 90% in most configurations. For Truthful-QA, AbnorDetector-Lite achieves an average classification accuracy of 56.01% across the four models at $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.5, 0.5)$, which is slightly above random classification levels, whereas AbnorDetector-Full enhances average accuracy to 67.90% at $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.25, 0.25)$. In contrast, Lynx attains its best performance on HaluEval-QA at 86.1%, with relatively comparable performance on Truthful-QA and Drowzee-Dataset, achieving 70.2% and 71.30%, respectively.

The relatively lower performance of AbnorDetector-Lite and AbnorDetector-Full on Truthful-QA may stem from their reliance on pronounced activation differences between normal and abnormal behaviors. In contrast, on HaluEval-QA and Drowzee-Dataset, additional knowledge introduced creates more evident conflicts with hallucinated responses, facilitating easier detection. By comparison, hallucinated answers in the Truthful-QA dataset exhibit subtler conflicts with the questions, resulting in a less distinct boundary between normal and abnormal behaviors, which increases detection difficulty.

Findings: Strong activation differences between normal and abnormal behaviors are essential for effective detection, particularly in varied task contexts where pronounced distinctions significantly enhance classification accuracy.

4.4 The Effectiveness of AbnorDetector in Backdoor Attack Detection

In this section, our objective is to evaluate the effectiveness of AbnorDetector-Lite and AbnorDetector-Full in backdoor attack scenarios. Specifically, we employ the publicly available backdoor reproduction framework, BACKDOORLLM [22], to inject backdoors into three models using the widely adopted backdoor injection methods, BadNets and VPI. BadNets and VPI respectively use fine-tuning datasets containing 400 backdoor queries and 400 clean queries, with separate test datasets of 100 backdoor queries and 100 clean queries to evaluate the backdoor injection effects. Thus, a total of 800 backdoor queries and 800 clean queries in the backdoor injection training set are used for critical layer analysis, and feature extraction is applied to construct the training set for the classifier. The test dataset includes 200 backdoor queries and 200 clean queries, which are used to assess the classifier’s accuracy. For ONION, we follow the settings outlined in its original paper, using GPT-2 as the base model, and set the suspicion score thresholds (t_s), 50, 50, and 75. A lower t_s prompts ONION to remove more suspicious words to eliminate potential backdoor triggers from the input.

Effectiveness Analysis: As shown in the results from Table 3, when the parameters are set to $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.5, 0.5)$, AbnorDetector-Lite achieves average classification accuracies of 100.00%, 96.95%, 99.50%, and 83.45% across the four models, with corresponding average F1 scores of 1, 0.97, 0.995, and 0.82. In contrast, the baseline method ONION identifies backdoor triggers with success rates of only 56.20%, 70.40%, and 87.00% at different thresholds t_s (75, 50, and 25, respectively). Moreover, AbnorDetector-Full, by leveraging a more comprehensive set of features, consistently achieves optimal performance in all configurations, enabling complete detection of backdoor queries in the test set. While ONION attains a high detection rate of 87.00% at $t_s = 25$, it removes an average of 22% of words from the original prompts during processing, compromising the semantic integrity of the original prompts. Overall, AbnorDetector-Lite demonstrates superior performance over the baseline method in backdoor attack scenarios, and AbnorDetector-Full achieves the best performance across all scenarios.

Findings: AbnorDetector demonstrates strong effectiveness in detecting abnormal behaviors in backdoor scenarios, achieving higher accuracy compared to the baseline method, while preserving the semantic integrity of input prompts.

Comparison Between Different Datasets and Models: From the perspective of varying datasets, ONION significantly outperforms VPI on the BadNet dataset, achieving a maximum detection rate of 97.6%, while the highest detection rate for VPI remains only 76.4%. Both AbnorDetector-Lite and AbnorDetector-Full exhibit consistently robust performance across BadNet and VPI, with the maximum performance gap being 9.34% on Gemma-7b-it, while the performance differences in other scenarios remain minimal. This can be attributed to the distinct nature of the triggers: BadNet utilizes a "BadMagic" keyword as the trigger, whereas VPI uses "Discussing OpenAI." ONION identifies triggers by assessing the perplexity change resulting from the removal of individual words, making it particularly effective at detecting backdoor attacks with single, rare keywords as triggers. However, triggers composed of multiple common words may evade this defense. In terms of model variations, AbnorDetector-Lite demonstrates superior performance on Llama-2-7B-Chat and Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct compared to Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct and Gemma-7b-it, suggesting that AbnorDetector-Lite’s effectiveness remains influenced by model architecture. In contrast, AbnorDetector-Full maintains stable performance across different configurations, indicating a robust capability independent of specific model structures.

Table 3: Accuracy Results of AbnorDetector and ONION in Detecting Abnormal Behaviors under Backdoor Scenarios (For AbnorDetector, we report its accuracy and F1 scores, while for ONION, we report its success rate in eliminating backdoors.)

DataSet	Llama-2-7b-chat				Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct				Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct				Gemma-7b-it				ONION			
	AbnorDetector		AbnorDetector		AbnorDetector		AbnorDetector		AbnorDetector		AbnorDetector		AbnorDetector		AbnorDetector		bar = 75	bar = 50	bar = 25	
	-Lite	-Full	-Lite	-Full	-Lite	-Full	-Lite	-Full	-Lite	-Full	-Lite	-Full	-Lite	-Full						
	$\alpha = 0.5$ $\beta = 0.5$	$\alpha = 0.25$ $\beta = 0.25$	$\alpha = 0.25$ $\beta = 0.25$	$\alpha = 0.125$ $\beta = 0.125$	$\alpha = 0.5$ $\beta = 0.5$	$\alpha = 0.25$ $\beta = 0.25$	$\alpha = 0.25$ $\beta = 0.25$	$\alpha = 0.125$ $\beta = 0.125$	$\alpha = 0.5$ $\beta = 0.5$	$\alpha = 0.25$ $\beta = 0.25$	$\alpha = 0.25$ $\beta = 0.25$	$\alpha = 0.125$ $\beta = 0.125$	$\alpha = 0.5$ $\beta = 0.5$	$\alpha = 0.25$ $\beta = 0.25$	$\alpha = 0.25$ $\beta = 0.25$	$\alpha = 0.125$ $\beta = 0.125$				
BadNet	Accuracy	100.00%	99.60%	100.00%	100.00%	96.40%	94.55%	99.50%	100.00%	99.50%	99.50%	100.00%	100.00%	81.82%	89.24%	100.00%	100.00%	79.20%	89.00%	97.6%
	F1 Score	1.0000	0.9960	1.0000	1.0000	0.9640	0.9454	0.9950	1.0000	0.9950	0.9950	1.0000	1.0000	0.8173	0.8922	1.0000	1.0000			
VPI	Accuracy	100.00%	99.90%	100.00%	100.00%	97.50%	91.11%	99.50%	100.00%	99.50%	100.00%	99.50%	99.50%	83.13%	79.90%	100.00%	100.00%	33.20%	51.80%	76.4%
	F1 Score	1.0000	0.9990	1.0000	1.0000	0.9750	0.9110	0.9950	1.0000	0.9950	1.0000	0.9950	0.9950	0.8306	0.7965	1.0000	1.0000			

Findings: AbnorDetector effectively defends against backdoor triggers composed of multiple common words, a challenge for ONION. Moreover, AbnorDetector-Full consistently delivers stable performance across different datasets and model architectures, showcasing its robustness and adaptability.

4.5 Impact of Hyperparameters

In this section, we examine the impact of hyperparameters by analyzing the performance variation of AbnorDetector-Lite and AbnorDetector-Full across multiple tasks under different hyperparameter settings. This study centers on two key aspects: first, the influence of activation features from attention and MLP layers on AbnorDetector-Lite and AbnorDetector-Full’s performance across diverse tasks; and second, the identification of optimal hyperparameter configurations for AbnorDetector-Lite and AbnorDetector-Full in various abnormal detection tasks.

Attention Layer versus MLP Layer: To compare the impact of attention layers and MLP layers on abnormal detection, we analyze classification accuracies across three tasks using only attention layers ($(\alpha, \beta) = (1.0, 0)$), only MLP layers ($(\alpha, \beta) = (0, 1.0)$), and a configuration with the same number of features ($(\alpha, \beta) = (0.5, 0.5)$) as an additional comparison.

In jailbreak scenarios, using only attention layers achieves an average accuracy of 97.6% across five datasets, while using only MLP layers reaches 99.24%. Combining both layers yields a classification accuracy of 99.14%, indicating that MLP layers slightly outperform attention layers. In hallucination scenarios, attention layers achieve an average accuracy of 71.77% across three datasets, compared to 81.02% with MLP layers. The combined configuration shows an accuracy of 80.48%, suggesting that MLP layers are more effective for this task, especially in the Drowzee dataset, where attention layers alone yield only 70.3% accuracy. In backdoor scenarios, the average classification accuracies for attention layers, MLP layers, and the combined configuration are 99.75%, 99.2%, and 100%, respectively, showing minimal difference.

Overall, MLP layers demonstrate a more substantial contribution to abnormal detection in the Llama-2-7b-Chat model. However, further analysis reveals that the effectiveness of attention and MLP layers depends on the model architecture. For example, in the Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct model, the classifier’s average accuracy across three datasets in hallucination scenarios is approximately 50% when using only MLP layers, but it increases to 80.78% when using only attention layers. Therefore, combining attention and MLP layers is generally the optimal approach to mitigate the influence of model architecture.

Hyperparameter Configuration Analysis: To explore suitable hyperparameter configurations, we start with $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.5, 0.5)$, gradually halving the feature count and evaluating the classifier’s performance at each step. For AbnorDetector-Lite, when features are reduced to $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.25, 0.25)$, the average abnormality detection accuracy in hallucination scenarios decreases to 75.20%. A further reduction to $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.125, 0.125)$ lowers the accuracy in jailbreak scenarios to 86.24% and in hallucination scenarios to 63.60%. For AbnorDetector-Full, feature reduction causes a slight decrease only in hallucination scenarios, while accuracy in other scenarios remains stable.

In summary, $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.5, 0.5)$ is a suitable hyperparameter setting for AbnorDetector-Lite, with $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.25, 0.25)$ also applicable in most scenarios. For AbnorDetector-Full, a configuration of $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.125, 0.125)$ or fewer features is recommended for abnormality detection.

Findings: For both AbnorDetector-Lite and AbnorDetector-Full, the combined use of attention layers and MLP layers is a relatively optimal solution. For AbnorDetector-Lite, a suitable hyperparameter setting is to use $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.25, 0.25)$ or more features. For AbnorDetector-Full, using $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.125, 0.125)$ can still achieve high performance.

5 DISCUSSION

Computational Efficiency: AbnorDetector enhances efficiency through two primary design choices. First, the lightweight MLP-based classifier reduces computational overhead, ensuring rapid processing. Second, except for hallucination detection tasks, AbnorDetector operates without requiring additional outputs from the LLM, further streamlining its operation. These features collectively improve AbnorDetector’s efficiency, making it suitable for practical deployment. Specifically, for Llama-2-7b-chat, AbnorDetector-Lite detects 1000 samples in an average time of 0.03 seconds, while AbnorDetector-Full takes an average of 0.22 seconds for the same task, after obtaining the corresponding hidden states.

Generalization: Detecting complex and rapidly evolving abnormal behaviors, particularly those deviating from the sampled data distribution, remains a challenging task. In light of this, we also evaluate AbnorDetector on its generalization and robustness capabilities. For instance, using AbnorDetector-Lite trained on jailbreak scenarios in RQ1 (based on Llama-2-7b-chat), it achieves a detection accuracy of 92.00% on 200 orthogonal jailbreak attack samples generated by MASTERKEY [7]. These results demonstrate AbnorDetector’s ability to effectively detect novel and unforeseen threats, showcasing its robustness to address the dynamic challenges in practice.

Table 4: Comparative Experimental Results of AbnorDetector with Different Hyperparameter Configurations across Three Abnormal Behavior Detection Scenarios

Task	Dataset	AbnorDetector-Lite					AbnorDetector-Full				
		$\alpha = 1$	$\alpha = 0$	$\alpha = 0.5$	$\alpha = 0.25$	$\alpha = 0.125$	$\alpha = 1$	$\alpha = 0$	$\alpha = 0.5$	$\alpha = 0.25$	$\alpha = 0.125$
		$\beta = 0$	$\beta = 1$	$\beta = 0.5$	$\beta = 0.25$	$\beta = 0.125$	$\beta = 0$	$\beta = 1$	$\beta = 0.5$	$\beta = 0.25$	$\beta = 0.125$
Jailbreak	Alpaca-GPT4	100.00%	99.90%	100.00%	95.50%	92.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%
	JailBreakV	98.00%	99.20%	100.00%	94.40%	92.10%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	GCG	96.00%	98.10%	97.20%	95.50%	62.00%	100.00%	99.00%	99.00%	100.00%	99.00%
	COLD-Attack	94.00%	99.00%	98.50%	96.00%	90.30%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%
	LAA	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	94.80%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Hallucination	Truthful-QA	49.65%	58.75%	50.40%	49.10%	53.10%	73.10%	67.35%	72.20%	67.10%	60.25%
	HaluEval-QA	95.35%	90.40%	93.20%	86.00%	73.20%	98.50%	98.50%	98.00%	98.00%	96.55%
	Drowzee-Dataset	70.30%	93.90%	97.85%	90.50%	64.50%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Backdoor	BadNet	100.00%	99.60%	100.00%	99.60%	97.30%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	VPI	99.50%	98.80%	100.00%	99.90%	98.40%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

6 RELATED WORK

In this section, we review the key works currently focused on detecting jailbreak attacks, hallucination phenomena, and backdoor attacks in LLMs.

6.1 Jailbreak Attack Detection

Jailbreak attacks manipulate LLMs to bypass their safety protocols and generate harmful or restricted content. To mitigate the impact of such attacks, various detection methods have been proposed, broadly categorized into black-box and white-box approaches. Black-box methods operate without direct access to the model’s internal structure, relying on analyzing inputs and outputs, while white-box methods leverage knowledge of the model’s architecture and parameters to enhance detection accuracy.

White-box: Some works [16] detect jailbreak attacks by evaluating the model’s perplexity on queries, classifying them as potentially harmful when the perplexity exceeds a predefined threshold. Besides perplexity-based approaches, several methods leverage internal gradient information for detection. GradSafe [38] effectively identifies jailbreak prompts by inspecting gradients associated with safety-critical parameters in LLMs. Their findings reveal that ‘the gradients of an LLM’s loss for jailbreak prompts, when paired with compliance responses, show similar patterns in certain safety-critical parameters.’ Additionally, Gradient Cuff [13] introduces the concept of ‘Refusal Loss.’ By analyzing the properties of refusal loss (such as function values and smoothness), Gradient Cuff devises a robust two-step detection strategy to detect and defend against jailbreak attacks that attempt to circumvent model safety mechanisms.

Black-box: Black-box detection methods are broadly categorized into two groups. The first group consists of commercial online APIs, such as OpenAI Moderation API, Perspective API, and Azure AI Content Safety API. The second group involves using LLMs themselves for detection, including zero-shot detectors like GPT-4 or LLMs fine-tuned specifically for detection tasks, such as Llama Guard [15].

6.2 Hallucination Phenomena Detection

Hallucination phenomena in LLMs occur when the models generate content that is factually inaccurate, irrelevant, or ungrounded in

the given context. To tackle this issue, researchers have explored a range of approaches, focusing on the detection and mitigation of hallucinations.

SAPLMA [3] is an early approach that directly examines hallucination phenomena by analyzing the hidden states of LLMs. Building on this, some works [17] empirically demonstrate that the internal states of LLMs reveal whether the model has encountered a query during training and indicate the likelihood of hallucination. Additionally, the method presented in [6] mitigates hallucinations by focusing on the ‘sharpness’ of context activations. Similarly, the Lynx model introduced in [31] is a state-of-the-art hallucination detection model, demonstrating superior capabilities in detecting hallucinations through advanced reasoning on real-world tasks.

Furthermore, recent work such as [5] leverages LLMs’ ‘Observed Consistency’ and ‘Self-reflection Certainty’ to detect hallucinations within models. They propose BSDETECTOR, which computes confidence estimates for responses generated by black-box models. The work presented in [43] explores Self-Alignment for Factualty, where the internal knowledge of LLMs is used to verify the factual accuracy of their own generated outputs.

6.3 Backdoor Attack Detection

Backdoor attacks in LLMs involve inserting malicious triggers during model training, allowing adversaries to manipulate the model’s behavior when these triggers are encountered at inference time. To address this issue, researchers have developed various detection and defense mechanisms aimed at identifying and neutralizing backdoor triggers.

The ONION algorithm [30] detects backdoor triggers by calculating the impact of different tokens on a sample’s perplexity. BDDR [32] identifies potential triggers by analyzing the effect of word removal on model confidence and prevents backdoor activation by removing the trigger and reconstructing the original sample. RAP [41] employs word-based robustness-aware perturbations to compute the confidence difference between original and perturbed samples under the target label, effectively detecting poisoned samples.

Moreover, recent studies have also made efforts to detect backdoor attacks. BDMMT [37] proposes a defense method based on deep model mutation testing, where random mutations are applied to pre-trained language models, and backdoor samples exhibit

increased robustness under these mutations, enabling detection. CLEANGEN [24] detects and replaces suspicious tokens favored by attackers, while preserving model utility when processing benign user queries. Chain-of-Scrutiny (CoS) [21] guides the model to generate detailed reasoning steps and examines the consistency between the reasoning process and the final output to identify potential backdoor attacks.

7 CONCLUSION

In this study, we developed a comprehensive real-time detection framework tailored to address multiple abnormal behaviors in large language models, including hallucinations, jailbreak attacks, and backdoor threats. By analyzing neural activation patterns, particularly in critical layers, our approach captures distinguishing features between normal and abnormal outputs. Specifically, our framework leverages two sets of features including *NAS* and *ANE*, enabling a lightweight classifier to achieve real-time anomaly detection without compromising accuracy. Extensive evaluations across diverse tasks demonstrate the framework's robustness and generalizability, achieving an accuracy of 98.54%, 83.42%, and 94.73% for detecting jailbreak, hallucination, and backdoor threats, respectively. The framework only incurs minimal computational overhead, enabling a real-time detection in deployment. Our work marks a step towards advancing LLM security, offering a scalable and efficient solution for detecting abnormal behavior in constantly-evolving AI applications.

REFERENCES

- [1] AI@Meta. 2024. Llama 3 model card. (2024). https://github.com/meta-llama/llama3/blob/main/MODEL_CARD.md Accessed: 2025-1-7.
- [2] Maksym Andriushchenko, Francesco Croce, and Nicolas Flammarion. 2024. Jailbreaking Leading Safety-Aligned LLMs with Simple Adaptive Attacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.02151* (2024).
- [3] Amos Azaria and Tom Mitchell. 2023. The Internal State of an LLM Knows When It's Lying. (2023). arXiv:cs.CL/2304.13734 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.13734>
- [4] Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*, Hugo Larochelle, Marc'Aurelio Ranzato, Raia Hadsell, Maria-Florina Balcan, and Hsuan-Tien Lin (Eds.). <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/hash/1457c0d6bfc4967418bfb8ac142f64a-Abstract.html>
- [5] Jiuhai Chen and Jonas Mueller. 2024. Quantifying Uncertainty in Answers from any Language Model and Enhancing their Trustworthiness. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Bangkok, Thailand, 5186–5200. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.283>
- [6] Shiqi Chen, Miao Xiong, Junteng Liu, Zhengxuan Wu, Teng Xiao, Siyang Gao, and Junxian He. 2024. In-Context Sharpness as Alerts: An Inner Representation Perspective for Hallucination Mitigation. (2024). arXiv:cs.CL/2403.01548 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.01548>
- [7] Gelei Deng, Yi Liu, Yuekang Li, Kailong Wang, Ying Zhang, Zefeng Li, Haoyu Wang, Tianwei Zhang, and Yang Liu. 2024. MASTERKEY: Automated Jailbreaking of Large Language Model Chatbots. In *31st Annual Network and Distributed System Security Symposium, NDSS 2024, San Diego, California, USA, February 26 - March 1, 2024*. The Internet Society. <https://www.ndss-symposium.org/ndss-paper/masterkey-automated-jailbreaking-of-large-language-model-chatbots/>
- [8] Hanyu Duan, Yi Yang, and Kar Yan Tam. 2024. Do LLMs Know about Hallucination? An Empirical Investigation of LLM's Hidden States. (2024). arXiv:cs.CL/2402.09733 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.09733>
- [9] Sebastian Farquhar, Jannik Kossen, Lorenz Kuhn, and Yarin Gal. 2024. Detecting hallucinations in large language models using semantic entropy. *Nature* 630, 8017 (2024), 625–630.
- [10] Sagar Goyal, Eti Rastogi, Sree Prasanna Rajagopal, Dong Yuan, Fen Zhao, Jai Chintagunta, Gautam Naik, and Jeff Ward. 2024. HealAI: A Healthcare LLM for Effective Medical Documentation. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining, WSDM 2024, Merida, Mexico, March 4-8, 2024*. Luz Angelica Caudillo-Mata, Silvio Lattanzi, Andrés Muñoz Medina, Leman Akoglu, Aristides Gionis, and Sergei Vassilvitskii (Eds.). ACM, 1167–1168. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3616855.3635739>
- [11] Tianyu Gu, Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, and Siddharth Garg. 2019. BadNets: Identifying Vulnerabilities in the Machine Learning Model Supply Chain. (2019). arXiv:cs.CR/1708.06733 <https://arxiv.org/abs/1708.06733>
- [12] Xingang Guo, Fangxu Yu, Huan Zhang, Lianhui Qin, and Bin Hu. 2024. Cold-attack: Jailbreaking llms with stealthiness and controllability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.08679* (2024).
- [13] Xiaomeng Hu, Pin-Yu Chen, and Tsung-Yi Ho. 2024. Gradient Cuff: Detecting Jailbreak Attacks on Large Language Models by Exploring Refusal Loss Landscapes. (2024). arXiv:cs.CR/2403.00867 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.00867>
- [14] Lei Huang, Weijiang Yu, Weitao Ma, Weihong Zhong, Zhangyin Feng, Haotian Wang, Qianglong Chen, Weihua Peng, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, and Ting Liu. 2024. A Survey on Hallucination in Large Language Models: Principles, Taxonomy, Challenges, and Open Questions. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* (Nov. 2024). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3703155> Just Accepted.
- [15] Hakan Inan, Kartikeya Upasani, Jianfeng Chi, Rashi Rungta, Krithika Iyer, Yuning Mao, Michael Tontchev, Qing Hu, Brian Fuller, Davide Testuggine, and Madian Khbasa. 2023. Llama Guard: LLM-based Input-Output Safeguard for Human-AI Conversations. (2023). arXiv:cs.CL/2312.06674 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.06674>
- [16] Neel Jain, Avi Schwarzschild, Yuxin Wen, Gowthami Somepalli, John Kirchenbauer, Ping yeh Chiang, Micah Goldblum, Aniruddha Saha, Jonas Geiping, and Tom Goldstein. 2023. Baseline Defenses for Adversarial Attacks Against Aligned Language Models. (2023). arXiv:cs.LG/2309.00614
- [17] Ziwei Ji, Delong Chen, Etsuko Ishii, Samuel Cahyawijaya, Yejin Bang, Bryan Wilie, and Pascale Fung. 2024. LLM Internal States Reveal Hallucination Risk Faced With a Query. (2024). arXiv:cs.CL/2407.03282 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.03282>
- [18] Pavneet Singh Kochhar, Ferdian Thung, and David Lo. 2015. Code coverage and test suite effectiveness: Empirical study with real bugs in large systems. In *2015 IEEE 22nd International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution, and Reengineering (SANER)*. 560–564. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SANER.2015.7081877>
- [19] Junyi Li, Xiaoxue Cheng, Wayne Xin Zhao, Jian-Yun Nie, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2023. HaluEval: A Large-Scale Hallucination Evaluation Benchmark for Large Language Models. (2023). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.11747>
- [20] Ningke Li, Yuekang Li, Yi Liu, Ling Shi, Kailong Wang, and Haoyu Wang. 2024. Drowsee: Metamorphic Testing for Fact-Conflicting Hallucination Detection in Large Language Models. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 8, OOPSLA2, Article 336 (Oct. 2024), 30 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3689776>
- [21] Xi Li, Yusen Zhang, Renze Lou, Chen Wu, and Jiaqi Wang. 2024. Chain-of-Scrutiny: Detecting Backdoor Attacks for Large Language Models. (2024). arXiv:cs.CR/2406.05948 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.05948>
- [22] Yige Li, Hanxun Huang, Yunhan Zhao, Xingjun Ma, and Jun Sun. 2024. Backdoor-LLM: A Comprehensive Benchmark for Backdoor Attacks on Large Language Models. (2024). arXiv:cs.AI/2408.12798 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.12798>
- [23] Yinheng Li, Shaofei Wang, Han Ding, and Hang Chen. 2023. Large Language Models in Finance: A Survey. In *4th ACM International Conference on AI in Finance, ICAIF 2023, Brooklyn, NY, USA, November 27–29, 2023*. ACM, 374–382. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3604237.3626869>
- [24] Yuetai Li, Zhangchen Xu, Fengqing Jiang, Luyao Niu, Dinuka Sahabandu, Bhaskar Ramasubramanian, and Radha Poovendran. 2024. CleanGen: Mitigating Backdoor Attacks for Generation Tasks in Large Language Models. (2024). arXiv:cs.AI/2406.12257 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.12257>
- [25] Stephanie Lin, Jacob Hilton, and Owain Evans. 2021. TruthfulQA: Measuring How Models Mimic Human Falsehoods. (2021). arXiv:cs.CL/2109.07958
- [26] Weidi Luo, Siyuan Ma, Xiaogeng Liu, Xiaoyu Guo, and Chaowei Xiao. 2024. JailbreakV-28K: A Benchmark for Assessing the Robustness of MultiModal Large Language Models against Jailbreak Attacks. (2024). arXiv:cs.CR/2404.03027 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.03027>
- [27] Lei Ma, Felix Juefei-Xu, Fuyuan Zhang, Jiyuan Sun, Minhui Xue, Bo Li, Chunyang Chen, Ting Su, Li Li, Yang Liu, Jianjun Zhao, and Yadong Wang. 2018. DeepGauge: multi-granularity testing criteria for deep learning systems. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM/IEEE International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 120–131. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3238147.3238202>
- [28] Kexin Pei, Yinzhi Cao, Junfeng Yang, and Suman Jana. 2017. DeepXplore: Automated Whitebox Testing of Deep Learning Systems. In *Proceedings of the 26th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP '17)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3132747.3132785>
- [29] Baolin Peng, Chunyuan Li, Pengcheng He, Michel Galley, and Jianfeng Gao. 2023. Instruction Tuning with GPT-4. (2023). arXiv:cs.CL/2304.03277 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.03277>

- [//arxiv.org/abs/2304.03277](https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.03277)
- [30] Fanchao Qi, Yangyi Chen, Mukai Li, Yuan Yao, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2020. Onion: A simple and effective defense against textual backdoor attacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.10369* (2020).
- [31] Selvan Sunitha Ravi, Bartosz Mielczarek, Anand Kannappan, Douwe Kiela, and Rebecca Qian. 2024. Lynx: An Open Source Hallucination Evaluation Model. (2024). [arXiv:cs.AI/2407.08488](https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.08488) <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.08488>
- [32] Kun Shao, Junan Yang, Yang Ai, Hui Liu, and Yu Zhang. 2021. BDDR: An Effective Defense Against Textual Backdoor Attacks. *Computers & Security* 110 (2021), 102433. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cose.2021.102433>
- [33] Alexey Svyatkovskiy, Shao Kun Deng, Shengyu Fu, and Neel Sundaresan. 2020. IntelliCode compose: code generation using transformer. In *ESEC/FSE '20: 28th ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering, Virtual Event, USA, November 8–13, 2020*, Prem Devanbu, Myra B. Cohen, and Thomas Zimmermann (Eds.). ACM, 1433–1443. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3368089.3417058>
- [34] Gemma Team, Thomas Mesnard, Cassidy Hardin, Robert Dadashi, Surya Bhupatiraju, Shreya Pathak, Laurent Sifre, Morgane Rivière, Mihir Sanjay Kale, Juliette Love, Pouya Tafti, Léonard Hussenot, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Adam Roberts, Aditya Barua, Alex Botev, Alex Castro-Ros, Ambrose Slone, Amélie Héliou, Andrea Tacchetti, Anna Bulanova, Antonia Paterson, Beth Tsai, Bobak Shahriari, Charline Le Lan, Christopher A. Choquette-Choo, Clément Crepy, Daniel Cer, Daphne Ippolito, David Reid, Elena Buchatskaya, Eric Ni, Eric Noland, Geng Yan, George Tucker, George-Christian Muraru, Grigory Rozhdestvenskiy, Henryk Michalewski, Ian Tenney, Ivan Grishchenko, Jacob Austin, James Keeling, Jane Labanowski, Jean-Baptiste Lespiau, Jeff Stanway, Jenny Brennan, Jeremy Chen, Johan Ferret, Justin Chiu, Justin Mao-Jones, Katherine Lee, Kathy Yu, Katie Millican, Lars Lowe Sjoesund, Lisa Lee, Lucas Dixon, Machel Reid, Maciej Mikula, Mateo Wirth, Michael Sharman, Nikolai Chinaev, Nithum Thain, Olivier Bachem, Oscar Chang, Oscar Wahltinez, Paige Bailey, Paul Michel, Petko Yotov, Rahma Chaabouni, Ramona Comanescu, Reena Jana, Rohan Anil, Ross McIlroy, Ruibo Liu, Ryan Mullins, Samuel L. Smith, Sebastian Borgeaud, Sertan Girgin, Sholto Douglas, Shree Pandya, Siamak Shakeri, Soham De, Ted Klimenko, Tom Hennigan, Vlad Feinberg, Wojciech Stokowiec, Yu hui Chen, Zafarali Ahmed, Zhitao Gong, Tris Warkentin, Ludovic Peran, Minh Giang, Clément Fariet, Oriol Vinyals, Jeff Dean, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Demis Hassabis, Zoubin Ghahramani, Douglas Eck, Joelle Barral, Fernando Pereira, Eli Collins, Armand Joulin, Noah Fiedel, Evan Senter, Alek Andreev, and Kathleen Kenealy. 2024. Gemma: Open Models Based on Gemini Research and Technology. (2024). [arXiv:cs.CL/2403.08295](https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.08295) <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.08295>
- [35] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurelien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. 2023. LLaMA: Open and Efficient Foundation Language Models. (2023). [arXiv:cs.CL/2302.13971](https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.13971)
- [36] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajwal Bhargava, Shrutai Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton-Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurélien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. Llama 2: Open Foundation and Fine-Tuned Chat Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288* (2023).
- [37] Jiali Wei, Ming Fan, Wenjing Jiao, Wuxia Jin, and Ting Liu. 2024. BDMMT: Backdoor Sample Detection for Language Models Through Model Mutation Testing. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* 19 (2024), 4285–4300. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIFS.2024.3376968>
- [38] Yueqi Xie, Minghong Fang, Renjie Pi, and Neil Gong. 2024. GradSafe: Detecting Jailbreak Prompts for LLMs via Safety-Critical Gradient Analysis. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Bangkok, Thailand, 507–518. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.30>
- [39] Zihao Xu, Yi Liu, Gelei Deng, Yuekang Li, and Stjepan Picek. 2024. A Comprehensive Study of Jailbreak Attack versus Defense for Large Language Models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2024, Bangkok, Thailand and virtual meeting, August 11–16, 2024*, Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 7432–7449. <https://doi.org/10.18653/V1/2024.FINDINGS-ACL.443>
- [40] Jun Yan, Vikas Yadav, Shiyang Li, Lichang Chen, Zheng Tang, Hai Wang, Vijay Srinivasan, Xiang Ren, and Hongxia Jin. 2024. Backdooring Instruction-Tuned Large Language Models with Virtual Prompt Injection. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Kevin Duh, Helena Gomez, and Steven Bethard (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Mexico City, Mexico, 6065–6086. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.naacl-long.337>
- [41] Wenkai Yang, Yankai Lin, Peng Li, Jie Zhou, and Xu Sun. 2021. RAP: Robustness-Aware Perturbations for Defending against Backdoor Attacks on NLP Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.07831* (2021).
- [42] Jie Zhang, Haoyu Bu, Hui Wen, Yu Chen, Lun Li, and Hongsong Zhu. 2024. When LLMs Meet Cybersecurity: A Systematic Literature Review. *CoRR* abs/2405.03644 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2405.03644> [arXiv:2405.03644](https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.03644)
- [43] Xiaoying Zhang, Baolin Peng, Ye Tian, Jingyan Zhou, Lifeng Jin, Linfeng Song, Haitao Mi, and Helen Meng. 2024. Self-Alignment for Factuality: Mitigating Hallucinations in LLMs via Self-Evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Bangkok, Thailand, 1946–1965. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.107>
- [44] Shide Zhou, Tianlin Li, Kailong Wang, Yihao Huang, Ling Shi, Yang Liu, and Haoyu Wang. 2025. Understanding the Effectiveness of Coverage Criteria for Large Language Models: A Special Angle from Jailbreak Attacks. (2025). [arXiv:cs.SE/2408.15207](https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.15207) <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.15207>
- [45] Andy Zou, Zifan Wang, J. Zico Kolter, and Matt Fredrikson. 2023. Universal and Transferable Adversarial Attacks on Aligned Language Models. (2023). [arXiv:cs.CL/2307.15043](https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.15043)