

A Training-free Method for LLM Text Attribution

Tara Radvand

Ross School of Business, University of Michigan, United States, tararad@umich.edu

Mojtaba Abdolmaleki

Ross School of Business, University of Michigan, United States, mojtabaa@umich.edu

Mohamed Mostagir *

Ross School of Business, University of Michigan, United States, mosta@umich.edu

Ambuj Tewari *

Department of Statistics, University of Michigan, United States, tewaria@umich.edu

Verifying the provenance of content is crucial to the functioning of many organizations, e.g., educational institutions, social media platforms, and firms. This problem is becoming increasingly challenging as text generated by Large Language Models (LLMs) becomes almost indistinguishable from human-generated content. In addition, many institutions use in-house LLMs and want to ensure that external, non-sanctioned LLMs do not produce content within their institutions. In this paper, we answer the following question: Given a piece of text, can we identify whether it was produced by a particular LLM, while ensuring a guaranteed low false positive rate? We model LLM-generated text as a sequential stochastic process with complete dependence on history. We then design zero-shot statistical tests[†] to (i) distinguish between text generated by two different known sets of LLMs \mathcal{A} (non-sanctioned) and \mathcal{B} (in-house), and (ii) identify whether text was generated by a known LLM or by any unknown model, e.g., a human or some other language generation process. We prove that the Type I and Type II errors of our test decrease exponentially with the length of the text. To do so, we show that if B generates the text, then, except with an exponentially small probability in string length, the log-perplexity of the string under the evaluator model A converges to the average cross-entropy of B and A . We also extend our theory to black-box access via sampling and characterize the required sample size to obtain essentially the same Type I and Type II error upper bounds as in the white-box setting (i.e., with access to A). We show the tightness of our upper bounds by providing an information-theoretic lower bound that shows that exponential decay in text length is near-optimal. We next present numerical experiments to validate our theoretical results and assess their robustness in settings with adversarial post-editing. Our work has a host of practical applications in which determining the origin of a text is important and can also be useful for combating misinformation and ensuring compliance with emerging AI regulations. See [link](#) for code, data, and an online demo of the project.

* Co-senior authors in alphabetical order.

[†] A zero-shot statistical test is a method that determines whether a piece of text was likely produced by a language model without requiring any prior examples of human or AI-generated text. Instead, the test relies on statistical properties of the text, such as how probable or “surprising” its word choices are under a given language model, and evaluates whether these properties are consistent with what that model would typically generate.

1. Introduction

LLM text-generation tools are now widely used across domains, from journalism to academic research. As these tools advance, determining whether a specific LLM produced a given piece of text has become challenging. Nonetheless, verifying the provenance of a text is essential for maintaining integrity and accountability in digital communication for the following reasons: assigning responsibility for content and its claimed authorship, enforcing the use of appropriate models that satisfy organizational compliance requirements, supporting AI providers in protecting training pipelines from model collapse, and also supporting them in measuring adoption for marketing purposes.

First, provenance verification is critical for assigning responsibility, as unauthorized use of LLMs allows individuals to present content they did not author, creating a growing disconnect between content creation and claimed authorship. Such practices have emerged across academic settings, including in examinations, peer review, and scientific publishing. [Brainard \(2025\)](#) reports that, in one publisher’s analysis, 36% of abstracts in the 7,177 submitted manuscripts contained at least some AI-generated text, yet authors disclosed AI use for only 9% of the papers studied. At a societal scale, LLMs enable large-scale, targeted content generation capable of influencing audiences, as illustrated by documented attempts to manipulate financial markets ([NBC News 2024](#)), political discourse ([New York Times 2023](#)), and consumer sentiment ([Jakesch et al. 2023](#)). In these settings, provenance verification is essential not only to assign responsibility when misleading or harmful synthetic content spreads, but also to help users assess which information to trust.

Second, provenance verification is essential for enforcing appropriate model use within organizations that deploy in-house LLMs—models developed or approved by the institution and intended for use only within controlled environments that satisfy internal security, compliance, or academic-integrity requirements. Universities, for example, increasingly rely on proprietary systems such as the University of Michigan’s UM GPT, where students are permitted to use only institution-approved assistants for coursework. Corporations likewise adopt internal LLM platforms to ensure compliance with organizational and data-governance policies, including Goldman Sachs’ GS AI Assistant, JPMorgan’s LLM Suite, and Samsung’s Gauss. In these settings, accurate attribution of content to sanctioned or unsanctioned models is essential to maintain accountability and enforce usage requirements.

Third, AI providers depend on provenance information both to protect model development and to quantify real-world deployment. They must detect AI-generated content to prevent excess synthetic data from entering training corpora and inducing model collapse ([Shumailov et al. 2023](#)). Furthermore, AI providers benefit from monitoring their own models’ outputs to assess adoption and evaluate marketing effectiveness.

Given the growing importance of establishing the provenance of digital content, Jemielniak (2025) prescribe a “*Fourth Law of Robotics*,” stating that an AI must not deceive a human by impersonating one. Enforcing this principle requires reliable identification of LLM-generated text, motivating the development of technical detection methods capable of identifying statistical signals that are not directly observable at the surface level. The literature on LLM text detection consists of three main streams: learning-based detectors, watermarking, and zero-shot detectors.

In learning-based methods, neural classifiers train models on labeled human and LLM-generated text (e.g., Sadasivan et al. 2023, Guo et al. 2023, Verma et al. 2023, Fagni et al. 2021, Uchendu et al. 2020, Jawahar et al. 2020, Bakhtin et al. 2019), but such methods have widely discussed limitations: they require a separate classifier for each evolving LLM family, rely on extensive collections of human-written passages that raise privacy concerns, and generalize poorly outside their training domains. As an example of poor generalization, Liang et al. (2023b) shows that neural detectors misclassified TOEFL essays by non-native English speakers as LLM-generated in 48–76% of cases.

Watermarking-based methods (e.g., Li et al. 2025c, Kirchenbauer et al. 2023) rely on an LLM embedding hidden (indistinguishable to humans) signals into the text during generation. Watermarking typically modifies the generation process so that specific tokens or token patterns are favored according to a private rule, thereby imprinting a statistical signature that a verifier can later detect. The goal is for the watermark to be difficult for humans to notice while still reliably detectable by an algorithm that knows the watermarking private rule. The limitation for watermarking is that it relies on cooperation from the AI provider. Reports suggest that the adoption of watermarking remains low because it requires AI providers’ cooperation to embed the algorithm into the generation pipeline, which conflicts with their incentives around openness, competition, and user flexibility (Nature 2024, West and Allen 2024). For example, OpenAI found, in an internal survey, that approximately 30% of ChatGPT users would use the product less if watermarking were deployed and a rival did not (Business Insider 2024, The Verge 2024).

The limitations of learning-based and watermarking approaches motivate the development of detection methods that neither require training on data nor rely on cooperation from model developers, leading to interest in zero-shot detectors that avoid training and instead use inherent statistical properties of LLM-generated text (e.g., as in Mitchell et al. 2023). This reliance on statistical properties enables the design of statistical tests with provable guarantees for content provenance. However, it was not done before our work. Existing zero-shot detection methods remain heuristic and lack theoretical guarantees that ensure high accuracy in detecting text generated by a given LLM, while maintaining a low false-positive rate.

What is the research gap? Despite progress in LLM attribution, two key limitations remain: (1) there are no methods that *guarantee* high accuracy in attributing text to a given LLM while keeping

the false positive rate below a user-specified, very low amount; and (2) existing approaches lack finite-sample guarantees for *short texts*, practically necessary for tweets and other short messages. So, current methods cannot reliably and rigorously determine whether a given model generated a possibly short text, while also guaranteeing that the probability of falsely accusing that model’s use remains very low.

On the first gap, existing detectors are typically evaluated empirically and do not offer user-controllable, theoretically grounded bounds on their error rates. In disciplinary and regulatory contexts, false positive errors are especially problematic: students have received grade penalties, disciplinary records, and even expulsion after their work was wrongly labeled as unauthorized (Times 2025, Guardian 2024, Press 2024). Recent empirical findings underscore this concern: Forbes (2025) report that most commercial detectors falsely flag approximately 1 in 100 genuine student submissions. In a typical class of thirty students, this implies that at least one innocent student could face misconduct charges every few assignments ¹.

On the second gap, most current methods do not provide guarantees that remain informative for short texts, such as tweets, chat messages, or short student responses, even though these are central in many provenance-sensitive settings. In such cases, practitioners require statistical guarantees (for high accuracy while maintaining a low false-positivity rate) to determine whether a given model generated the short text, rather than relying on heuristics. It is particularly useful when these error probabilities can be shown to decrease rapidly with text length, enabling meaningful guarantees even for strings as short as 50–100 words. To give an intuitive sense of this regime, in Figure 1, we include a 54-token NASA tweet from 2021, predating LLMs, as an illustration of the length scale at which rigorous provenance assessment is desirable.

¹These issues have already prompted institutional responses: Vanderbilt University disabled Turnitin’s AI detector after it disproportionately flagged essays by non-native speakers and students with learning differences, and several universities have discontinued commercial detection tools due to persistently high false positive rates (Parents for Leveraging Ethical AI Standards in Education (PLEASE) 2024).




Figure 1 Example of a Short-Text Tokenization and the Corresponding Detector Classification

We provide a theoretical framework for determining whether a given finite-length, possibly short string was produced by language model A (the evaluator model) or by another source B . Here, the evaluator model A is the model used to assess the text, while the generative source B is the system that actually produced it. We model LLM-generated text as a sequential stochastic process with complete dependence on history to capture the token-by-token text generation in auto-regressive models: at each step, the model uses the context available so far (all previously generated tokens) to assign probabilities to candidate next tokens, and then selects one token according to this context-dependent distribution. Because the context is updated after each generated token, the distribution over the next token can change significantly from one step to the next; therefore, the current token cannot be treated as independent of earlier tokens. Figure 2 illustrates this dependence: after the prompt “Complete this sentence: *The sun*,” the model assigns a distribution over candidate next tokens; selecting a relatively low-probability continuation such as “*also*” can still occur, and it can substantially reshape the subsequent distribution—here shifting probability distribution toward tokens like “*rises*” that align with the well-known book title *The Sun Also Rises*.




Figure 2 Illustration of token-by-token LLM generation

Building on this model, we develop finite-sample hypothesis tests for LLM provenance that take as input a text string and a given evaluator LLM², and assess whether that evaluator could plausibly have produced the text. First, we construct composite tests that distinguish whether a text was produced by some model in a set \mathcal{A} or by a model in a disjoint set \mathcal{B} , capturing distinctions such as sanctioned in-house models versus non-sanctioned models. Second, we develop a composite test that distinguishes whether the text was generated by A or by an unknown alternative “not A ,” which may include other LLMs, humans, or other language generation processes. Our theoretical results show that the Type I and Type II errors of our tests decay exponentially with string length.

The backbone of our tests is the convergence of two statistical properties: the *log-perplexity* of a string under an evaluator model A , and the *average cross-entropy* between a generator B and the evaluator A . Log-perplexity is the average negative log-likelihood per token that A assigns to the observed text. It measures how surprising the string is to A : low values indicate that A finds the sequence predictable, while high values indicate that A finds the string unexpected. This quantity, in isolation, is widely used in attribution and detection tasks, e.g., (Mitchell et al. 2023, Solaiman et al. 2019), motivated by the idea that a model is unlikely to produce text it finds surprising. The average cross-entropy between a generator B and the evaluator A describes what log-perplexity is when text is drawn from B and evaluated under A . It represents the long-run average log-perplexity that A assigns to text generated by B , and when A itself is the generator, this quantity reduces to the entropy rate of A , capturing the model’s level of uncertainty about its own next-token predictions.

Given that we build our tests on the convergence of log-perplexity and the average cross-entropy, it is useful to see why log-perplexity alone can be unreliable and why convergence to average cross-entropy provides the right benchmark. Example 1 illustrates the first point, and Example 2 provides intuition for the second.

EXAMPLE 1. (A versus greedy A). Imagine that the unknown generator B is a greedy version of A that always outputs the most likely next token according to A . The text generated by B would consist of very high-probability tokens under A , leading to its log-perplexity under A being lower than that of typical samples drawn from A . As a result, a rule that declares “ A generated the text, since the log-perplexity under A is small” would then misclassify greedy- A ’s text as being even more representative of A than the text produced by A .

² For the evaluator model, we consider three settings. For ease of exposition, we first present theoretical results in a white-box setting with full access to the evaluator’s conditional probability distributions. We then extend these results to a black-box setting with only sampling access to the evaluator’s conditional probability distributions and characterize the minimum sample size required to achieve essentially the same Type I and Type II errors as in the white-box case (Appendix A). Finally, we present numerical experiments for settings with no access to the evaluator model, not even via sampling (Section 7.3).

EXAMPLE 2. (iid token generators). Consider a simplified setting where both A and B generate tokens independently from fixed distributions: A draws tokens iid from p , and B draws tokens iid from q . By the weak law of large numbers and the central limit theorem, if A generates the text, then for a sequence of length N , the log-perplexity that A assigns to its own output converges to the entropy $H(p)$, with fluctuations shrinking on the order of $1/\sqrt{N}$. If instead B generates the text, the average log-perplexity under A converges to the cross-entropy $H(q, p)$. Thus, the difference between the log-perplexity and $H(p)$ serves as a detection signal: it concentrates near zero when A generates the text and converges to $H(q, p) - H(p)$ when B generates it.

Importantly, in our setting, aligned with practice, LLMs produce non-i.i.d tokens. Hence, we must establish new concentration inequalities for dependent sequences, since the limit theorems and concentration inequalities for i.i.d random variables are inapplicable in this setting. Establishing these inequalities, we show that the log-perplexity converges to the average cross-entropy at an exponential rate, making attribution feasible for finite, possibly short texts. This convergence property distinguishes (with high probability) text generated by A from the text generated by other sources, and this is the foundation for our tests.

Contributions. We study LLM provenance under an auto-regressive text-generation model, where each token depends on all prior tokens, making finite-sample analysis difficult because i.i.d. tools don't apply. Our key technical idea is to define per-token random variables so that the deviation between the log-perplexity and its associated entropy/cross-entropy target can be written as an average of martingale differences. This martingale representation makes the problem tractable: it allows us to invoke concentration inequalities for martingales and thereby obtain explicit, non-asymptotic error guarantees for hypothesis tests on finite, possibly short texts. Below, we summarize our key contributions.

Statistical tests for finite-length text. We are the first to develop zero-shot statistical tests with theoretical guarantees for finite-length, possibly short text. Specifically, we develop two tests: an *attribution* test and a *detection* test. For attribution, in Section 5.1, we provide theoretically guaranteed statistical tests that identify whether a finite possibly short text was generated by an LLM from an in-house set of LLMs or a non-sanctioned set of LLMs. For detection, in Section 5.2, we develop a statistical test with theoretical guarantees that identifies whether a finite-length possibly short text was generated by a known LLM or not. For both tests, we prove that Type I and Type II errors decay exponentially with increasing text length, implying that reliability improves rapidly with additional tokens. We then validate our theoretical results with numerical experiments in Sections 7.1 and 7.2. We also provide supporting experiments showing that log-perplexity converges to the average string entropy as text length increases, and that it works for short texts of approximately 100 tokens in Appendix F.1.

Main methodological contribution: concentration inequalities for convergence of dependent random variables. To establish our theoretical results, we consider a sequence of discrete random variables Z_n generated under probability laws $p_n^B(\cdot)$. In Theorem 1, we propose and prove an exponential decay concentration inequality that bounds the tail probability of the difference between the log-perplexity of this sequence evaluated under another sequence of probability laws $p_n^A(\cdot)$, and the average cross-entropy of $p_n^B(\cdot)$ and $p_n^A(\cdot)$, over a finite alphabet. The special case, where (i) Z_n are i.i.d. and (ii) $p_n^A(\cdot) = p_n^B(\cdot)$, is studied in Zhao (2022), and their paper identifies extending these results to non-independent random variables as a natural future direction. Since LLMs generate text sequences that depend on previously generated tokens and our setting also allows $p_n^A(\cdot) \neq p_n^B(\cdot)$, we generalize the results in Zhao (2022) by relaxing (i) and (ii). Doing so, we address the future direction in Zhao (2022) of extending the analysis beyond the i.i.d. setting to dependent token sequences.

Required sample size for the black-box setting. We extend our theory to a black-box setting in which we have only sampling access to the evaluator model and cannot query its conditional probability distributions (Appendix A). In this setting, we construct empirical log-perplexity and empirical average cross-entropy from a finite number of samples and explicitly characterize the minimum sample size required to achieve essentially the same Type I and Type II error performance as in the white-box setting (which assumes full access to the evaluator model’s conditional probability distributions).

Exponential convergence is the best achievable. Complementing the upper bounds, we prove an information-theoretic lower bound in a simplified i.i.d. setting in Section 6, showing that no detector can make the sum of Type I and Type II errors decay faster than $\exp(-ND_{\text{KL}}(P_B|P_A))$; our tests achieve the best achievable exponential improvement (up to constant factors) with text length allowed by this separation.

This paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we provide a literature review. In Section 3, we present our mathematical model. In Section 4, we provide concentration bounds for the log-perplexity statistics around their entropy and cross-entropy targets. In Section 5, we present our statistical tests and derive the upper bound on their Type I and Type II errors. In Appendix A, we extend our tests in Section 5 to a black-box setting where the evaluator log-probabilities must be approximated via sampling. Note that for clarity of exposition, we first present our tests and guarantees in the white-box setting in Section 5 and then show how they extend to the black-box setting in Appendix A, so readers can understand the core statistical ideas while also seeing how our results apply to closed-weight LLMs. We provide lower bounds in Section 6 to benchmark the best achievable testing accuracy and establish the tightness of our upper bounds. In Section 7, we show the results of our numerical experiments. We conclude the paper in Section 8. Appendix B - E present the proofs, and Appendix F presents experiment details and additional experiments.

2. Literature review

We first include the related literature in operations management (OM). We then review the literature on attribution and detection methods, including learning-based approaches, watermarking, and zero-shot methods, as well as related work on authorship attribution.

Concentration inequalities in OM. Our paper is related to a broad OM literature that uses finite-sample concentration inequalities to obtain high-probability performance guarantees in sequential, history-dependent stochastic systems, where the data are endogenously generated by past decisions and therefore are not i.i.d. A prominent stream studies learning-while-doing problems in inventory and revenue management, where firms simultaneously optimize and learn unknown demand over time, e.g, in dynamic inventory control (Zhang et al. 2020, Chen and Chao 2020) and data-driven posted pricing mechanisms (Jin et al. 2024). Other works in the predict-then-optimize framework provide finite-sample generalization bounds that translate predictive accuracy into guarantees on the quality of the downstream optimization decision (El Balghiti et al. 2019). Concentration-inequality-based confidence bounds are also central to online learning and bandit models, providing finite-time performance guarantees under adaptive feedback (Kalvit and Zeevi 2023, Johari et al. 2021, Baek and Farias 2021). Related work also studies sequential, history-dependent decision-making even when the focus is not on concentration-inequality guarantees, e.g., Alizamir et al. (2022). Our paper connects to this literature through the same challenge of sequential, history-dependent randomness: auto-regressive LLMs generate text token-by-token, and each token’s distribution depends on all previously generated tokens, so the resulting data are non-i.i.d. Our key technical idea is to define per-token random variables so that the deviation between the log-perplexity and its associated entropy/cross-entropy target can be written as an average of martingale differences. This martingale representation allows us to invoke concentration inequalities for martingales and thereby obtain explicit, non-asymptotic error guarantees for our hypothesis tests on finite, possibly short texts.

AI Governance in OM. When text influences outcomes, decision-makers have incentives to fabricate it (e.g., review fraud and strategic manipulation) (Luca and Zervas 2016, Dellarocas 2006). LLMs can accelerate this fabrication by reducing the cost of generating persuasive content at scale. Prior work emphasizes the need for responsible AI capabilities in organizations and guardrails in education (Tambe 2026, Fügenger et al. 2026, Bastani et al. 2025), as well as governance frameworks that clarify accountability when humans rely on AI outputs (Bastani and Cachon 2025, Poulidis et al. 2025). Here, a reliable LLM attribution and detection method supports governance by enabling provenance checks and policy enforcement.

Learning-based methods. Learning-based methods are trained on labeled datasets that contain both human and LLM text. These methods encompass several categories. Some approaches rely

on fine-tuning transformer architectures to distinguish (Mo et al. 2024, Hu et al. 2023, Solaiman et al. 2019). Others use neural representations, such as embeddings, intrinsic or loss-based features, and similarity- or contrastive-learning objectives, to enhance detection ability (Guo et al. 2024, Verma et al. 2023, Bakhtin et al. 2019). Additional approaches employ bag-of-words features, such as n-grams and stylometric statistics, to capture distributional patterns (Fagni et al. 2021). A major limitation of learning-based methods is their poor generalization, which often results in performance degradation on out-of-domain or unseen samples (Liang et al. 2023b, Uchendu et al. 2020, Bakhtin et al. 2019). This weakness arises primarily from overfitting to the training domains (Uchendu et al. 2020, Bakhtin et al. 2019) and from evaluation practices that rely on overly simple or homogeneous datasets (Liang et al. 2023b). These classifiers also have limited interpretability, which undermines user trust and makes it difficult to identify systematic biases or sources of failure (Wu et al. 2023a). Another important challenge is the lack of robustness to ambiguous semantics, which occur when a word or phrase can be interpreted in multiple ways (Schaaff et al. 2023). Together, these factors substantially limit the effectiveness of neural classifier methods in detecting LLM-generated misinformation (Chen and Shu 2023, Su et al. 2023a). Although recent studies have introduced enhanced training procedures to reduce some of these weaknesses (Kumarage et al. 2023, Tu et al. 2023), these efforts remain heuristic and lack theoretical grounding to ensure their validity across domains and a low false-positive rate.

Watermarking. Watermarking embeds identifiable statistical signals directly into the generation process. Kirchenbauer et al. (2023) introduced a probabilistic sampling scheme in which the last generated token seeds a random number generator that partitions the vocabulary into green and red lists, with green tokens receiving slightly higher sampling probabilities. This bias creates a detectable statistical footprint that enables post hoc attribution. Krishna et al. (2024) includes semantic and adaptive watermarking and recording-based methods to improve robustness. Complementing watermark design, a few recent works treat watermark detection as a statistical testing problem with error control. Li et al. (2025a) propose a likelihood-based hypothesis test that combines the watermark key with next-token probabilities to increase detection power. Addressing post-editing more directly, Li et al. (2025b) models human edits via a mixture formulation and introduces a truncated goodness-of-fit test (Tr-GoF) that adapts to unknown edit intensity while achieving provable optimality for detecting certain watermarks in challenging regimes. Gloaguen et al. (2025) asks whether a black-box API provider has deployed a watermark, and develops query-efficient tests that can detect major watermark families using sampled outputs. Zhao et al. (2025) study mixed-source documents and propose methods to detect and localize watermarked segments, enabling partial attribution. The adoption of watermarking remains low because it requires AI providers to embed the watermarking algorithm into the generation pipeline, which conflicts with providers'

incentives regarding openness, competition, and user flexibility (Nature 2024, West and Allen 2024). Reports, e.g., The Verge (2024), indicate that OpenAI developed but withheld the deployment of a ChatGPT watermark due to concerns that it could “discourage users or drive them to competitors.”

Zero-shot methods. This method uses statistical properties of the text. Log-likelihood is one of the most widely used measures, e.g., Solaiman et al. (2019). Other methods include using rank-likelihood (Gehrmann et al. 2019), log-likelihood ratio ranking (Su et al. 2023b), entropy and KL-divergence (Lavergne et al. 2008), and perplexity (Vasilatos et al. 2023, Wang et al. 2023). Mitchell et al. (2023) uses the local curvature of the log-probability: they estimate how the likelihood changes under small, semantically preserving perturbations and report relatively high empirical performance, but at a high computational cost due to the number of perturbations. To reduce the computational cost of perturbation in DetectGPT, Bao et al. (2023) introduces FastDetectGPT, which replaces DetectGPT’s perturbation step with a conditional probability curvature to accelerate detection. Most zero-shot methods rely on only one statistical property. Hans et al. (2024a), however, introduces a normalized measure of perplexity by dividing log-perplexity by average cross-perplexity. The rationale is that LLM text is predictable to the LLM (low perplexity), whereas human text is more surprising (higher perplexity). Yet, consideration of high perplexity as a human authorship signal is unreliable³. DALD (Zeng et al. 2024) is based on logit statistics: text generated by the target LLM tends to look “more typical” under that model than human text, and DALD improves this separation in black-box settings by aligning a surrogate scoring model to the target. DNA-GPT (Yang et al. 2024) is based on regeneration consistency: when you truncate a passage and regenerate its continuation, LLM-written suffixes tend to have smaller divergence from the original than human-written suffixes. Unlike methods that rely on a potentially fragile signature (likelihood/rank/curvature), require repeated perturbation (DetectGPT and DNA-GPT), depend on surrogate alignment data (DALD), or are tied to particular decoding artifacts (TempTest), our method uses a statistical signature that is anchored in the convergence of the log-perplexity under the evaluator model to the appropriate entropy/cross-entropy benchmark. Examples 1 and 2 provide intuition, and we also theoretically prove why this convergence yields a non-fragile signal. Using this convergence, to our knowledge, we are the first to establish zero-shot statistical tests for finite-length, possibly short texts with explicit theoretical guarantees: we construct composite tests and provide non-asymptotic results showing that, under our assumptions, both Type I and Type II error probabilities decay exponentially in text length, yielding reliability that is not captured by most zero-shot detection methods, as these methods provide only heuristics.

³ Please refer to Example 1. Additionally, Hans et al. (2024a) illustrates another aspect, prompt dependency, as the “Capybara Problem”: Given the prompt “Can you write about a Capybara astrophysicist?”, an LLM may generate “The Capybara studied dark matter in Andromeda.” Without the prompt, “capybara” and “astrophysicist” seem unexpectedly high in perplexity, falsely suggesting human authorship.

3. Problem Setup and Notation

In this section, we present our model, which formalizes the text-generation process, introduce the evaluator and generator models, define the statistical properties used in our detection method, and outline our hypotheses. Throughout the paper, boldface denotes vectors. The prompt is \mathbf{X} and the length- N text is $\mathbf{Y}_N = [Y_1, \dots, Y_N]$. We use capital letters such as Y_n for random tokens and lower-case letters such as y_n for their realizations. For a positive integer N , $[N] = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$, and for any set S , $|S|$ denotes its cardinality. We write $\mathbb{P}\{\cdot\}$ and $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ for probability and expectation, and $\mathbf{1}\{\cdot\}$ for the indicator function. For a model M , $P^M\{\mathbf{Y}_N | \mathbf{X}\}$ denotes the induced distribution over length- N strings and p_n^M denotes the conditional next-token pmf, so $p_n^M\{y\} = P^M\{Y_n = y | \mathbf{Y}_{n-1}, \mathbf{X}\}$. In the black-box setting, we use the same quantities with a hat, e.g., \hat{p}_n^A , \hat{l}_A , and $\hat{h}_N(A, A)$, to denote the corresponding empirical analogues of the white-box quantities p_n^A , l_A , and $h_N(A, A)$; \log denotes the natural logarithm and \exp its inverse. For asymptotic comparisons as $N \rightarrow \infty$, $f_N = O\{g_N\}$ means there exist constants $C > 0$ and N_0 such that $|f_N| \leq C|g_N|$ for all $N \geq N_0$, and $f_N = o\{g_N\}$ means $f_N/g_N \rightarrow 0$.

Text generation. We represent any piece of text $\mathbf{Y} = [Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_N]$ as a sequence of tokens from a finite vocabulary set $Y_n \in \mathcal{X}$ with size $K := |\mathcal{X}|^4$. Let M be a generative model described by $\mathbf{Y} = M(\mathbf{X})$, where \mathbf{X} denotes the user prompt as a sequence of tokens and the output denoted by \mathbf{Y} consists of a sequence of tokens $\mathbf{Y} = [Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_N, \dots]$. Following practical implementations of large language models (e.g., refer to Radford 2018, Brown et al. 2020, OpenAI 2023, You et al. 2024), we consider an auto-regressive language model that generates tokens sequentially. In an auto-regressive model, each token is drawn conditional on the user prompt \mathbf{X} and all previously generated tokens. In particular, the model M first draws a random value for the first token, say $Y_1 = y_1$ by sampling from the distribution $p^M(Y_1 | \mathbf{X})$, and then for each token $n \in [2, N]$, the model sequentially determines a distribution for the token given prompt \mathbf{X} and all the randomly chosen values y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{n-1} . So, we define a sequence of probability distributions $p^M(\mathbf{Y}_N | \mathbf{X})$ over $\mathbf{Y}_N \in \mathcal{X}^N$ where $\mathbf{Y}_N = [Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_N]$ is a substring of \mathbf{Y} consisting of the first N tokens. The sequence of probability distributions is determined as

$$P^M(\mathbf{Y}_N | \mathbf{X}) = \prod_{n=1}^N p_n^M(\mathbf{Y}_n), \quad \text{where } p_n^M(\mathbf{Y}_n) = P^M(Y_n | Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_{n-1}, \mathbf{X}) \quad (1)$$

REMARK 1. Note that Equation (1) is an application of the Bayes' rule and holds for any generative model regardless of whether tokens Y_n are sequentially generated. While Equation (1) holds for all generative models, because conditional distributions $p_n^M(\mathbf{Y}_n)$ are in general not easily accessible, we apply the rule for sequential models.

⁴This representation implicitly assumes that LLMs use the same vocabulary or can be deterministically mapped to a shared one, which is a mild simplification since different tokenizers can be aligned via re-tokenization.

We present Example 3 to illustrate how conditional probability distributions with dependence on the prompt and previously generated tokens determine the next-token probability distribution. Each token’s probability is determined not in isolation but jointly with the prompt and the preceding tokens, meaning that even one word choice can reshape the distribution of the next token. For simplicity in the example’s exposition, without loss of generality, we assume each word represents a token.

EXAMPLE 3. Consider the prompt

X = Complete the sentence: The sun ...

Model M assigns probabilities to the possible next tokens conditional on the prompt **X** that includes the previously generated tokens $y_1 = \text{The}$ and $y_2 = \text{sun}$. For example,

$$\begin{aligned} P_3^M(\text{is} \mid \text{The Sun}) &= 0.40, & P_3^M(\text{was} \mid \text{The Sun}) &= 0.25, & P_3^M(\text{also} \mid \text{The Sun}) &= 0.20, \\ P_3^M(\text{shines} \mid \text{The Sun}) &= 0.10, & P_3^M(\text{beautiful} \mid \text{The Sun}) &= 0.03, & P_3^M(\text{others} \mid \text{The Sun}) &= 0.02. \end{aligned}$$

Consider two scenarios for the next token generation: For the first scenario, suppose the model selects the token $y_3 = \text{also}$. The updated prefix becomes **The Sun also**, and the model recomputes the conditional probability distribution for the next token. Because of the linguistic and cultural association with Hemingway’s **The Sun Also Rises**, the probability mass now concentrates on **rises**, which yields

$$\begin{aligned} P_4^M(\text{rises} \mid \text{The Sun also}) &= 0.88, & P_4^M(\text{sets} \mid \text{The Sun also}) &= 0.04, \\ P_4^M(\text{appears} \mid \text{The Sun also}) &= 0.03, & P_4^M(\text{burns} \mid \text{The Sun also}) &= 0.02, \\ P_4^M(\text{others} \mid \text{The Sun also}) &= 0.03. \end{aligned}$$

For the second scenario, suppose that the model chooses $y_3 = \text{is}$ instead. The updated prefix becomes **The Sun is**, and the resulting conditional distribution changes to

$$\begin{aligned} P_4^M(\text{shining} \mid \text{The Sun is}) &= 0.45, & P_4^M(\text{bright} \mid \text{The Sun is}) &= 0.30, \\ P_4^M(\text{hot} \mid \text{The Sun is}) &= 0.15, & P_4^M(\text{rises} \mid \text{The Sun is}) &= 0.001, \\ P_4^M(\text{others} \mid \text{The Sun is}) &= 0.099. \end{aligned}$$

The contrast between these two cases illustrates how dependence on the prompt and previously generated tokens determines the probability distributions for the next token. After **also**, the token **rises** becomes overwhelmingly likely, whereas after **is**, it nearly vanishes from the distribution, replaced by contextually appropriate alternatives such as **shining** or **bright**.

Generator and evaluator models. Our detection problem involves two roles: *Evaluator model* A , which is the language model used to assess whether a given text is consistent with having been generated by A . *Generator model* B , which is the model that produces the text being evaluated. Model B can be an external LLM, an in-house LLM, or any other process, e.g., a human, that can be represented as a sequential model⁵. Provided that for any $B \neq A$ that has a minimum distance from A (presented in Assumption 3), our test does not require any information about B .

Statistical properties. Our method relies on the convergence of two statistical properties for a text: log-perplexity and the average cross-entropy. Consider an evaluator model A and a text generator model B .

Log-perplexity: The perplexity $p^A(\mathbf{Y}_N)$ of a finite length text string $\mathbf{Y}_N = [Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_N]$ with respect to an evaluator model A is defined as the per-token inverse likelihood of the string \mathbf{Y} . Formally, perplexity with respect to model A is $p^A(\mathbf{Y}_N | \mathbf{X}) = \left(\prod_{n=1}^N p_n^A(Y_n) \right)^{-\frac{1}{N}}$, and the log-perplexity is

$$l_A(\mathbf{Y}_N) = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \log(p_n^A(y_n)) \quad (2)$$

Log-perplexity measures how *surprising* a string generated by model B is to the evaluator model A . For example, suppose the evaluator model A observes “The Sun dances quietly,” which is a short text generated by an unknown model B . When A processes the same prompt “The sun”, it assigns low conditional probabilities to “dances” and “quietly”; for instance,

$$P_3^A(\text{“dances”} | \text{“The Sun”}) = 0.005, \quad P_4^A(\text{“quietly”} | \text{“The Sun dances”}) = 0.007.$$

Because these probabilities are small, their logarithms are large in magnitude, and the resulting log-perplexity of the text under A is high. Intuitively, model A finds the word choices made by B unlikely according to A ’s own learned distribution.

Average cross-entropy: Suppose model B generates a string \mathbf{Y} . The average cross-entropy of model B and the evaluator model A over sub-string \mathbf{Y}_N is

$$h_N(B, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N) = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{y_n \in \mathcal{X}} p_n^B(y_n) \log(p_n^A(y_n)). \quad (3)$$

The quantity $h_N(B, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N)$ is equal to the expected log-perplexity $l_A(\mathbf{Y}_N)$ when the expectation is taken over all length- N texts \mathbf{Y}_N drawn from model B ’s generative distribution. Equivalently, $h_N(B, A) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}_N \sim B}[l_A(\mathbf{Y}_N)]$, where the expectation is with respect to the distribution over all sequences $\mathbf{Y}_N = (Y_1, \dots, Y_N)$ produced by model B . If model A is \mathbf{Y}_N ’s both generator and evaluator, then the average cross-entropy and the average entropy over the text \mathbf{Y}_N become equivalent.

⁵ Recall from Remark 1 that an application of the Bayes’ rule yields that any text generation process corresponds to some sequential model B regardless of whether tokens are sequentially generated.

White-box vs. black-box access. We consider two settings: a white-box setting and a black-box setting. The white-box setting, which assumes full access to the token-level probability distributions of the evaluator model A , aims to facilitate the presentation of our key theoretical contributions. In some closed-weight language models, e.g., Google Gemini (API/Bard/Vertex AI) and Anthropic Claude (public API and Claude.ai), however, the evaluator model A does not expose token-level log-probabilities via its API. We refer to this as the black-box setting. In this case, we construct sampling-based estimators and determine the sample size required to achieve theoretical guarantees comparable to those in the white-box setting.

White-box. For exposition simplicity, we first present the *white-box* setting in which we assume full knowledge of the evaluator model’s next-token probability distributions $\{p_n^A(\cdot)\}_{n=1}^N$. This assumption allows us to present the main ideas of our statistical tests without additional notation and technicalities related to estimation error. The theoretical results in Sections 3-5 are developed under white-box access to $p_n^A(\cdot)$, which is standard for many open-weight LLMs and is made in the majority of the computer science literature (Mitchell et al. 2023, Gehrmann et al. 2019).

Black-box. In this setting, we form empirical estimates of the next-token probability distributions p_n^A by sampling from A given a context, that is, a prompt \mathbf{X} and prefix $(Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_{n-1})$. These empirical quantities serve as substitutes for the true probability-based metrics in the white-box case. For each position n , we obtain m independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) samples $\hat{Y}_n^{(1)}, \dots, \hat{Y}_n^{(m)} \sim p_n^A(\cdot)$, and define the empirical next-token distribution as $\hat{p}_n^A(y) := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{1}\{\hat{Y}_n^{(j)} = y\}$. Using these empirical estimates, we construct the empirical log-perplexity $\hat{l}_A(\mathbf{Y}_N) = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \log \hat{p}_n^A(Y_n)$, and the empirical average entropy $\hat{h}_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N) = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{y_n \in \mathcal{X}} \hat{p}_n^A(y_n) \log \hat{p}_n^A(y_n)$.

Hypotheses. We present two hypothesis testing settings: attribution among multiple models and whether the evaluator model A generated the text. For attribution, we compare the log-perplexities of the candidate models, and in the A vs. not- A setting, we use the convergence of log-perplexity to the average cross-entropy, as argued in Example 1.

Attribution among multiple models. In this setting, we test whether a text is generated by one of the models in $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_p\}$ (e.g., external or non-sanctioned models) or by a model in $\mathcal{B} = \{B_1, \dots, B_q\}$ (e.g., in-house models). The null hypothesis \mathbf{H}_0 states that the text originates from some model in \mathcal{B} , while the alternative \mathbf{H}_1 posits that it comes from a model in \mathcal{A} . Type I error occurs when the test incorrectly attributes a text from \mathcal{B} to a model in \mathcal{A} , and Type II error occurs when the test fails to recognize that a text actually originates from \mathcal{A} .

Model A or not model A . In this setting, we test whether the evaluator model A generated the text. The null hypothesis \mathbf{H}_0 assumes that the text is not produced by model A , i.e., it is generated by some unknown model B or another source, and the alternative \mathbf{H}_1 states that the text originates from A . Type I error occurs when the test incorrectly concludes that model A generated a text, whereas Type II error arises when it fails to detect a text actually written by A .

4. Concentration inequalities

In this section, we formalize the idea of verifying if the log-perplexity of the string evaluated by A converges to the average cross-entropy of the string under B and A . In particular, we need to define some random variables and formalize convergence in terms of random variables. For a more straightforward exposition, we present the random variables and concentration inequalities under the white-box assumption, and dedicate Section A to our extended results for the black-box setting.

Random Variables. We define the random variable $Z_n^A := -\log(p_n^A(Y_n))$, and the zero-mean random variable $X_n^A := Z_n^A - \mathbb{E}_{p_n^B}[Z_n^A]$. Additionally, we define a random variable $S_N^A := \sum_{i=1}^N X_i^A$. Note that we only define the random variable X_n^A to obtain our concentration inequalities, and our statistical tests in Section 5 do not require calculating or knowing X_n^A . The tests only require access to the evaluator model A to compute Z_n^A and $\mathbb{E}_{p_n^A}[Z_n^A]$. In the white-box setting, we have access to and can compute Z_n^A and $\mathbb{E}_{p_n^A}[Z_n^A]$. Consider a string \mathbf{Y} generated by model B , and we want to evaluate the string using model A . So, $\mathbb{E}_{p_n^B}[Z_n^A]$ is

$$\mathbb{E}_{p_n^B}[Z_n^A] = - \sum_{y_n \in \mathcal{X}} p_n^B(y_n) \log(p_n^A(y_n)) = H(p_n^B, p_n^A). \quad (4)$$

where $H(p_n^B, p_n^A)$ is the cross-entropy between distributions $p_n^B(\cdot)$ and $p_n^A(\cdot)$. Note that $\mathbb{E}_{p_n^B}[Z_n^A]$ is not necessarily finite. From Equation (4), $\mathbb{E}_{p_n^B}[Z_n^A]$ is infinite if there exists $y_n \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $p_n^B(y_n) > 0$ and $p_n^A(y_n) = 0$. If such a token y_n appears in \mathbf{Y}_N , then model A assigns zero probability to the sequence, and we can conclude with certainty (i.e., probability 1) that model A did not generate the string. Hence, the detection problem becomes trivial. Otherwise, i.e., \mathbf{Y}_N does not include any y_n with $p_n^A(y_n) = 0$, we calculate $\mathbb{E}_{p_n^B}[Z_n^A]$ by applying conditional expectation as

$$\mathbb{E}_{p_n^B}[Z_n^A | p_n^A(y_n) > 0, \forall y_n \in \mathbf{Y}_N] = \sum_{y_n \in \mathcal{X}} -p_n^{\tilde{B}}(y_n) \log(p_n^A(y_n)) = H(p_n^{\tilde{B}}, p_n^A),$$

where for $p_n^A(y_n) = 0$, we have $p_n^{\tilde{B}} = 0$ and for $p_n^A(y_n) > 0$, we have $p_n^{\tilde{B}} = p_n^B(y_n) / \sum_{y_k: p_n^A(y_k) > 0} p_n^B(y_k)$. Hence, the detection problem for model pairs A and B reduces to that of models A and \tilde{B} . The modified pair of distributions A, \tilde{B} satisfy the condition that if $p_n^A(y_n) = 0$, then $p_n^{\tilde{B}}(y_n) = 0$ for all y_n , which yields $\mathbb{E}_{p_n^{\tilde{B}}}[Z_n^A]$ is finite. Without loss of generality, we exclude the trivial case and only focus on pairs of models for which $\mathbb{E}_{p_n^B}[Z_n^A]$ is finite.

Concentration Inequalities. We provide concentration inequalities to show that if the string is generated by a model B and evaluated by a model A , then $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^A$ converges to the average cross-entropy of the string under B and A , $h_N(B, A)$, with a high probability. If the text is generated and evaluated by model A , then $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^A$ converges to the average entropy of the string under A with high probability. In Appendix B, we provide the proofs for the results in this section. These concentration bounds are the backbones of the statistical tests we design in section 5. To ensure the

boundedness of our random variable $\mathbb{E}_{p_n^B}[Z_n^A]$, we make a parametric assumption on the probability laws $p_k^A(\cdot)$ and $p_k^B(\cdot)$ below. As we explain in Remark 2, this assumption is consistent with practice.

ASSUMPTION 1. *We assume that there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $p_n^A(y_k), p_n^B(y_k) \notin (0, \epsilon)$.*

Assumption 1 ensures that the zero-mean random variable $X_n^A = Z_n^A - \mathbb{E}_{p_n^B}[Z_n^A]$ is well-defined by guaranteeing that

$$\mathbb{E}_{p_n^B}[|Z_n^A|] = \mathbb{E}_{p_n^B}[Z_n^A] = \sum_{y_n \in \mathcal{X}} -p_n^B(y_n) \log(p_n^A(y_n)) \leq -\log(\epsilon) \quad (5)$$

is finite⁶.

REMARK 2. Assumption 1 implies that models A and B either do not associate any probability to a token $y \in \mathcal{X}$, or they assign a probability of at least ϵ . Our theoretical results depend only on $\log(\epsilon)$. Hence, our theoretical bounds primarily rely on a constant shift in the logarithmic scale. Note that Assumption 1 is not restrictive and is aligned with practice, as computers only allow for a limited range of representable numbers due to finite precision in floating-point arithmetic. Very small probabilities are either rounded to zero or set to a minimum threshold to maintain numerical stability in computations (Goldberg 1991). LLM training and fine-tuning code often introduces explicit minimum thresholds. For example, the official CAME optimizer (used in GPT-2/T5/BERT-Large experiments, and LLaMA fine-tuning) implementation uses a default $\epsilon = 10^{-16}$, corresponding to $-\log_{10}(\epsilon) = 16$ (Luo et al. 2023a,b).

Theorem 1 presents our concentration inequality, which we employ to design our statistical tests.

THEOREM 1. *If Assumption 1 holds,*

(a) *If model A is the same as model B , there exists a constant $c_1 > 0$ independent of the evaluator model A such that for any $t > 0$ we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{N} \left| \sum_{n=1}^N X_n^A \right| \geq t\right) \leq 2 \exp\left[-\frac{Nt}{c_1 \log(K)} \min\left(1, \frac{t}{c_1 \log(K)}\right)\right].$$

(b) *If model A is not model B , there exists a constant $c_2 > 0$ independent of models A and B such that for any $t > 0$ we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{N} \left| \sum_{n=1}^N X_n^A \right| \geq t\right) \leq 2 \exp\left[-\frac{Nt}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \min\left(1, \frac{t}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)}\right)\right].$$

Proof. For proof of part (a), see Section B.3 and for proof of part (b), see Section B.4.

Note that $\frac{1}{N} \left| \sum_{n=1}^N X_n^A \right|$ equals the difference between the log-perplexity under A and the corresponding average (cross-)entropy. Theorem 1 - (a) states that if the string is generated by the same model as the evaluator model A , then the log-perplexity of the string under A converges

⁶ Note that the upper-bound $-\log(\epsilon)$ is attainable, e.g., when the tokens are equally likely, and each has probability ϵ . Hence, to guarantee that $\mathbb{E}_{p_n^B}[|Z_n^A|]$ is bounded, we need to ensure that $-\log(\epsilon)$ is bounded.

to the average entropy of the string under A , except with an exponentially small probability in string length N . Theorem 1 - (b) states that if model B generates the text, then, except with an exponentially small probability in string length N , the log-perplexity of the string under the evaluator model A converges to the average cross-entropy of the string under B and A .

Theorem 1 provides a non-asymptotic upper bound on the probability that the difference between the log perplexity and the average cross entropy, $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N X_n^A$, deviates from 0 by at least the value of t . This probability depends on four parameters: the text length N , the chosen tolerance level t , the alphabet size K , and the machine precision ϵ . Among these, the text length exerts the highest influence. Holding all other parameters fixed, the deviation probability decays exponentially in N , implying that longer text length substantially reduce the probability that the sum $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N X_n^A$ does not fall within t -neighborhood of zero.

The tolerance parameter t also plays a critical role. When t is small, the exponent in the bound behaves quadratically in t . That is, reducing t by half (requiring the two empirical averages to be twice as close) necessitates increasing the text length by a factor of four to preserve the same deviation probability.

The dependence on alphabet size K and machine precision ϵ is less significant than the parameters N and t . These quantities appear only through logarithmic factors. Enlarging the alphabet from K to K^2 doubles $\log(K)$, which reduces the exponent by at most a factor of $1/2$. Similarly, increasing machine precision (for example, doubling the number of digits to represent the probability of the next token for each of the tokens in the alphabet) affects the bound only through changes in $-\log(\epsilon)$, again altering the exponent by no more than a constant factor. Thus, while K and ϵ influence the probability bound, their impact is substantially smaller than that of N and t .

The difference between cases (a) and (b) in the theorem is that the upper-bound for the sub-exponential norm of X_n^A is different in the two cases: for case (a), as we show in Lemma 3, the upper-bound is $2 \log K$, while for case (b), under assumption 1 and the elaboration in Equation (5), the upper-bound is $4 \log \epsilon$, as we show in Lemma 5.

Theorem 1 implies that for any evaluator model A , $\sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^A$ converges to $h_N(B, A)$. As such, for $A = B$, $\sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^A$ converges to $h_N(A, A)$. Using this result, our main idea for designing a statistical test is to check if $\sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^A$ has converged to $h_N(A, A)$. Our next section formalizes this idea.

5. Statistical test

We design our statistical tests using the result in Theorem 1 and then evaluate Type I (false positive) and Type II (false negative) errors. In Section 5.1, we design a composite statistical test that determines whether a text is generated by a model that belongs to a set of models \mathcal{A} or belongs to a disjoint set of models \mathcal{B} . In Section 5.2, we study the case where we do not have access to

the log-probabilities for the generator model (e.g., text is written by an unknown LLM, a human, etc.) and design a composite test to identify whether the model A generated the text or not. In Appendix C, we provide the proofs for the results in this section.

5.1. Attribution among multiple LLMs

Given a string \mathbf{Y}_N , we design a statistical test to detect whether one of the models in $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_p\}$ (non-sanctioned) or one of the models in $\mathcal{B} = \{B_1, \dots, B_q\}$ (in-house) generated the text. The null hypothesis \mathbf{H}_0 is that the text \mathbf{Y}_N is generated by a model in \mathcal{B} . We first calculate the random variables $Z_n^M =: -\log(p_n^M(Y_n))$, and sum over $Z_n^M =: -\log(p_n^M(Y_n))$ for all models $M \in \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}$. Our test rejects the null \mathbf{H}_0 if for some $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{A_i} < \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{B_j} \quad \forall B_j \in \mathcal{B}.$$

Type I error occurs when the test incorrectly concludes that the text is generated by one of the models in \mathcal{A} , and Type II error occurs when the test fails to identify that the text is generated by one of the models in \mathcal{A} . Our theoretical bounds require that the two models do not impose the same probability distribution on the string. Formally, we introduce Assumption 2 as a minimum distance between log-probabilities for the two models.

ASSUMPTION 2. (*minimum distance, A-B*). We assume that if the generative and evaluator models are different, for an arbitrarily small $\epsilon_1 > 0$, we have

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A) \geq \epsilon_1,$$

where $D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A)$ is the token-wise Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence between p_n^A and p_n^B , defined as

$$D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} p_n^B(y) \log \frac{p_n^B(y)}{p_n^A(y)}.$$

REMARK 3. Note that if the two distributions are identical, no test can distinguish them, and, therefore, some assumption about distributions is always needed for any test to work. Assumption 2 ensures that the two models satisfy a minimum distance in terms of their KL divergence over the generated text ⁷. Note that KL divergence, by definition ⁷, is a non-negative value that demonstrates the distance between the two distributions over the next word for the two models. Our results show that the Type I and Type II errors for our statistical test are approximately $\exp(O(-N\epsilon_1))$, which

⁷ Using KL divergence as a measure for comparing the learnt distribution from a text generation model to the distribution of another text generation model or the distribution of human-written text is common, e.g., see Pillutla et al. 2021 and the references within.

indicates that even for small values of ϵ_1 , which can converge to zero with the text length (for example, $\epsilon_1 = O(N^{-1/2})$), our test provides exponentially small Type I and Type II errors in the text length N .

PROPOSITION 1. *If Assumptions 1 and 2 hold, the Type I error for our test is upper bounded by*

$$2|\mathcal{A}| \exp \left[-\frac{N(\epsilon_1/2)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \min \left(1, \frac{\epsilon_1/2}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \right) \right] + 2 \exp \left[-\frac{N(\epsilon_1/2)}{c_1 \log(|\mathcal{X}|)} \min \left(1, \frac{\epsilon_1/2}{c_1 \log(|\mathcal{X}|)} \right) \right]$$

and the Type II error for our test is upper bounded by

$$2|\mathcal{B}| \exp \left[-\frac{N(\epsilon_1/2)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \min \left(1, \frac{\epsilon_1/2}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \right) \right] + 2 \exp \left[-\frac{N\epsilon_1/2}{c_1 \log(|\mathcal{X}|)} \min \left(1, \frac{\epsilon_1/2}{c_1 \log(|\mathcal{X}|)} \right) \right]$$

with constants c_1 , c_2 , and ϵ as introduced in Theorem 1.

Proof. See Section C.1. □

Proposition 1 demonstrates that both Type I and Type II errors for our composite test decay exponentially in the text length N . Compared to the single-model case, the bounds now have factors $|\mathcal{A}|$ and $|\mathcal{B}|$ because we apply a union bound over the finite candidate classes. Consequently, the error bounds scale linearly with class size, and maintaining a fixed target error requires increasing N by an additive $\log |\mathcal{A}|$ or $\log |\mathcal{B}|$ term in the exponent.

The threshold choice t determines the false-positive/false-negative tradeoff and affects the convergence rate. If one uses a threshold $t \in (0, \epsilon_1)$, increasing t decreases the Type I error (false positive) because it becomes harder for a null sample to exceed a larger threshold t , while it increases the Type II error (false negative) because it becomes easier for an alternative sample to fall within the acceptance region. This shift changes the exponential rates: the Type I exponent improves as t increases, whereas the Type II exponent worsens because the relevant alternative-side margin becomes $\epsilon_1 - t$. Thus, whichever of t and $\epsilon_1 - t$ is smaller governs the slower of the two decays; choosing $t = \epsilon_1/2$ maximizes this worst-case margin and therefore gives the fastest balanced convergence when both errors matter⁸. Note that all theoretical guarantees of our test remain valid for any fixed, arbitrary t .

The proposition also involves the separation parameter ϵ_1 (from Assumption 2), which quantifies the distance between the null and alternative targets. Larger ϵ_1 yields a larger exponent and

⁸ The choice of t influences only the finite-sample rate of convergence. In practice, practitioners choose the threshold t by calibrating the desired error tradeoff: a common approach is to fix a target Type I error level α and set t as a high null quantile of the test statistic, estimated analytically, by bootstrap/permutation, or by simulation; with multiple candidate models, α is often adjusted via a union-bound (e.g., $\alpha/|\mathcal{A}|$ or $\alpha/|\mathcal{B}|$). Alternatively, t is tuned on labeled validation data by sweeping thresholds and selecting an operating point on an ROC or precision–recall curve to meet constraints (e.g., $\text{FPR} \leq 1\%$) or minimize expected cost. The direction of tuning follows the application: increasing t reduces false positives but increases false negatives, making this direction useful for applications like spam filtering, while decreasing t does the opposite, useful for applications like medical screening.

therefore faster decay of both error probabilities with N . When ϵ_1 is small, the hypotheses are inherently difficult to distinguish, and the required text length must grow to achieve a small error. Additionally, each error bound is a sum of two exponentials, one involving $\log(|\mathcal{X}|)$ and one involving $-\log(\epsilon)$. These correspond to the two step-size scales in the underlying concentration argument, and the slower-decaying term dominates at moderate N . The dependence on the alphabet size $|\mathcal{X}|$ and the machine precision ϵ remains logarithmic, so their effect is lower than N , the threshold t , and the separation ϵ_1 .

5.2. Model A or not model A ?

Given a string \mathbf{Y}_N , for arbitrary constants t , we design a statistical test to detect whether the evaluator model A generated the text. Consistent with the convention in hypothesis testing, the null hypothesis reflects the default/conservative assumption. So, if we accuse someone of having used (a non-sanctioned) LLM A , they are innocent until proven guilty. Accordingly, the null \mathbf{H}_0 is that the text \mathbf{Y}_N is not generated by the evaluator model A ; it is generated by any model B that we do not have white-box access to, which could be a human or some other language generation process⁹. The alternative A is that the text \mathbf{Y}_N is generated by A . We first calculate the random variable $Z_n^A =: -\log(p_n^A(Y_n))$ to then calculate $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^A$. Our test rejects the null if

$$\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^A - h_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N) \right| \leq t.$$

Type I error occurs when the test mistakenly concludes that the text is generated by the evaluator model A , and Type II error happens when the test incorrectly concludes that the text is not written by A . To derive Type I and Type II error controls, we impose Assumption 3 as a sufficient condition on the distance between p_n^A and p_n^B . Again, note that if the two distributions are identical, no test can distinguish them and, therefore, some assumption about distributions is always needed for any test to work.

ASSUMPTION 3. (*minimum distance, A-NA*). Our theoretical results only require that $|h_N(B, A) - h_N(A, A)| > \epsilon_2$, for an arbitrary $\epsilon_2 > 0$.

REMARK 4. Note that $h_N(A, A)$ is upper bounded by $\log(|\mathcal{X}|)$. Additionally, note that an objective in designing LLMs is to reduce the expected log-perplexity, which is equivalent to the average entropy $h_N(A, A)$, e.g., for language models similar to GPT-3, $h_N(A, A)$ is less than 4 (Paperno et al. 2016). A sufficient condition that ensures that an $\epsilon_2 > 0$ exists that yields

⁹ Recall from section 3 that an application of the Bayes' rule yields that any text generation process corresponds to some sequential model B regardless of whether tokens are sequentially generated. Our test does not require any information about B .

$|h_N(B, A) - h_N(A, A)| > \epsilon_2$ is the following: If the generative and evaluator models are different, then for some positive $\epsilon_2 > 0$,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=3}^N \mathbb{E} [D_{\text{KL}}(p_n^B \| p_n^A) | \mathbf{Y}_{n-2}] \geq h_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N) + \epsilon_2 \quad (6)$$

PROPOSITION 2. For any $t \geq 0$, the Type II error for our test is upper bounded by

$$2 \exp \left[-\frac{Nt}{c_1 \log(|\mathcal{X}|)} \min \left(1, \frac{t}{c_1 \log(|\mathcal{X}|)} \right) \right]$$

with c_1 as introduced in Theorem 1. Also, if Assumptions 1 and 3 hold, then for any positive numbers $t < \epsilon_2/2$, and for c_2 as introduced in Theorem 1, the Type I error of our test is upper bounded by

$$2 \exp \left[-\frac{N\epsilon_2/2}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \min \left(1, \frac{\epsilon_2/2}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \right) \right] + 2 \exp \left[-\frac{N(\epsilon_2/2 - t)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \min \left(1, \frac{\epsilon_2/2 - t}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \right) \right],$$

Proof. See Section C.2. □

Proposition 2 demonstrates that the Type I and Type II errors of our test decrease exponentially in the text length N , and the exponential rate's dependence on the alphabet size K and machine precision ϵ is logarithmically. The parameter ϵ_2 in Assumption 3 represents a guaranteed minimum separation between the value around which the test statistic concentrates when the text is generated by A and the value it concentrates around under any non- A generator. Larger ϵ_2 therefore corresponds to a more distinguishable testing problem: a Type I error (false positive) would require the statistic, under a non- A source, to deviate sufficiently to cross this separation, an event whose probability is exponentially small in N . This is reflected in the Type I bound through the margins $\epsilon_2/2$ and $\epsilon_2/2 - t$; increasing ϵ_2 enlarges these margins and strengthens the exponential rate. The constraint $t < \epsilon_2/2$ ensures that a strictly positive residual margin $\epsilon_2/2 - t$ remains; as t approaches $\epsilon_2/2$ from below, this residual margin diminishes. In contrast, the Type II bound is driven by same-model concentration when the text is generated by A , and hence depends on t and N but not on ϵ_2 ; increasing t reduces the probability of a Type II error (false negative). Note that our theoretical results also apply to a one-sided test that rejects the null hypothesis when $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^A - h_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N) \leq t$ ¹⁰.

In Section 4, we established non-asymptotic upper bounds on the Type I and Type II errors of our proposed statistical tests. The next question is whether these guarantees are essentially best possible, or whether substantially stronger tests could exist under comparable assumptions. To address this, we derive lower bounds that characterize fundamental limits on achievable error rates in Section 6.

¹⁰ If model B generates the text, $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^A$ converges to $h_n(B, A)$. Under Assumption 3, $h_n(B, A) > h_n(A, A)$, which yields that the theoretical guarantees in Proposition 2 can be extended to a one-sided test. For more details, please refer to the proof for Proposition 2 in Appendix C.2.

6. Lower Bounds

In Section 4, we establish *upper bounds* on Type I and Type II errors for our proposed statistical tests. It is natural to ask whether these bounds are tight or whether stronger tests could exist. To address this, we consider the problem that, given a string \mathbf{Y}_N , we design a statistical test to detect whether model A (non-sanctioned) or model B (in-house) generated the text. The null hypothesis \mathbf{H}_0 is that the text \mathbf{Y}_N is generated by model B . We further consider the special case in which the probability laws $p_n^A(\mathbf{Y}_n)$ and $p_n^B(\mathbf{Y}_n)$ generate text via i.i.d. draws from fixed distributions $P_A(\cdot)$ and $P_B(\cdot)$, respectively. Hence, we want to test $H_0: \mathbf{Y}_N \sim P_B^{\otimes N}$, $H_1: \mathbf{Y}_N \sim P_A^{\otimes N}$.

COROLLARY 1. *For any statistical test T that takes a string \mathbf{Y}_N of length N , let $\alpha_N(T)$ and $\beta_N(T)$ denote its Type I and Type II error probabilities, we have*

$$\alpha_n(T) + \beta_n(T) \geq \frac{1}{2} e^{-N \cdot D_{KL}(P_B \| P_A)}. \quad (7)$$

Proof. See Section E. □

No test can outperform the exponential decay in the sample size, and the achievable decay rate is governed by the KL divergence $D(P \| Q)$. In particular, even the best possible test cannot achieve $\alpha_n + \beta_n$ smaller than $\frac{1}{2} e^{-nD(P \| Q)}$ asymptotically. This complements our upper bounds, which showed that our test also achieves exponentially decaying errors. Hence, both upper and lower bounds confirm that exponential decay in text length is near-optimal.

7. Experiments

In this section, we present three sets of experiments: Subsection 7.1 validates Proposition 1 (LLM attribution); Subsection 7.2 validates Proposition 2 where we use human text to represent the null hypothesis (i.e., not LLM A); Subsection 7.3, using a dataset with approximately 6M texts, empirically examines the robustness of Proposition 2 to relaxing white-box access, and also to an adversary manipulating texts that affects both Type I and Type II errors. We additionally run convergence experiments to assess how quickly log-perplexity approaches the average cross-entropy as the text length N increases. The convergence experiments in Appendix F.1 demonstrate the convergence with as few as 100 tokens.

7.1. LLM attribution experiments

For this subsection, we use two datasets that span a variety of domains. To represent fact-based information, we use the SQuAD context dataset (Rajpurkar 2016), which comprises Wikipedia paragraphs from human-written academic essays, and, to represent a dataset combining human-written creative writing and fact-based information, we use the news articles in the XSum dataset

(Narayan et al. 2018). For details about datasets, refer to Appendix F.5. To create an LLM version of the articles in the SQuAD and XSum datasets, following the literature (e.g., Mitchell et al. 2023), we first randomly sample 500 texts from each dataset. Then, following Mitchell et al. (2023), for each sample, we prompt the first 30 tokens of the selected text to each LLM and ask it to generate a 300-token LLM version.

The language models we use to generate 300-token texts are LLaMA2 (7B), LLaMA3 (8B), Falcon (7B), and Qwen3 (32B). We select these language models to cover architectural diversity and a range of capacities. LLaMA2 (7B) and LLaMA3 (8B) are from the same family, creating a challenging attribution setting in which closely related models must be distinguished. Falcon (7B) provides an architecturally distinct model that has also been used as a scoring model to approximate other LLMs in prior work, e.g., in Hans et al. (2024a) and Zhu et al. (2025). Qwen3 (32B) serves as a larger, stronger model, allowing us to test performance with a higher-capacity generator. Since this experiment is designed to validate Proposition 1, which requires white-box access to the conditional probability distributions for the candidate models, we deliberately choose models for which we have white-box access.

Table 1 demonstrates the results of our attribution experiments. In the experiments for each LLM, the evaluator LLM is the set \mathcal{A} , and the other three LLMs represent the set \mathcal{B} . In Table 1, the LLM in the headline of each column stands for the evaluator LLM \mathcal{A} . The null hypothesis is that the text is generated by one of the models in \mathcal{B} . A Type I error occurs when the test incorrectly concludes that the evaluator model generated the text, and a Type II error occurs when the test fails to detect that the evaluator model generated the text. Recall that the False Positive Rate (FPR) is equivalent to Type I error, and the True Positive Rate (TPR) is equivalent to 1-Type II error. The results exhibit a comparable error pattern across SQuAD and XSum datasets, suggesting that dataset-specific artifacts do not primarily drive performance. False positives remain low, consistent with the test’s conservative approach to attributing text to the evaluator model. False negatives are more pronounced in challenging settings where the evaluator is closely related to alternatives, e.g., same-family models. In this condition, the likelihood signal separating the evaluator from the other candidates is weaker, so the test more often fails to confidently reject the null. Our results for Qwen 3 demonstrates that our test remains reliable for larger LLMs.

Error Type	XSum				SQuAD			
	LLaMA2	LLaMA3	Falcon	Qwen3	LLaMA2	LLaMA3	Falcon	Qwen3
False Positive Rate	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.02
False Negative Rate	0.00	0.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.04	0.00

Table 1 False Positives (Type I) and False Negatives (Type II) error rates for LLM attribution on XSum and SQuAD datasets.

7.2. Detection experiments

Setup & Datasets. To validate Proposition 2, we use human text to represent the null (i.e., text not generated by LLM A). For human text, in addition to the Xsum and SQuAD datasets, we use prompted stories from the Reddit WritingPrompts (Fan et al. 2018) to represent human creative writing. For details about datasets, refer to Appendix F.5.

To create LLM versions of the human texts in the datasets, following Mitchell et al. (2023), we first randomly sample 500 human-written texts from each dataset, and prompt the first 30 tokens of each text to the LLM to create a 300-token LLM-generated version. Since these experiments are designed to validate Proposition 2, which requires white-box access to the conditional probability distributions for all models, we choose models for which we have white-box access. Specifically, we examine LLAMA 3 (8B), GPT-NEOX Erebus (20B), and QWEN (32B). LLAMA 3 (8B) is a relatively compact model, GPT-NEOX Erebus (20B) is a larger model with a different training pipeline and stylistic behavior, and QWEN (32B) is a considerably larger, higher-capacity model, allowing us to probe detection performance as model size and capacity increase ¹¹.

For this section, since the first 30 tokens are generated by a human for both the null and the alternative hypotheses, we use a one-sided version of our test that rejects the null hypothesis when $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N X_n^A = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^A - h_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N) \leq t$ to remove the impact of the differences between cross-entropy and log perplexity caused by the initial 30 tokens¹².

Here, True Positive Rate (TPR) is the rate of correctly spotting that the evaluator model generated the text, and False Positive Rate (FPR) is the rate of incorrectly flagging human text as generated by the evaluator model. Unlike Proposition 1, which is threshold-independent, Proposition 2 relies on a fixed threshold t for rejecting the null hypothesis, and varying this threshold affects both Type I and Type II errors.

Setting the threshold t . Since different detectors use distinct methodologies and require their own thresholds, it is essential to account for the impact of these thresholds when evaluating the test performance. To address this, the literature typically adopts two approaches: (1) evaluating the TPR at a specified low FPR, e.g., (Hans et al. 2024a, Dugan et al. 2024), or (2) using the

¹¹ Unlike the attribution setting, where we deliberately chose two models from the same family (LLaMA2/LLaMA3) to create challenging same-family vs. cross-family attribution scenarios, here we treat each model separately as the focal “ A ” in an A -vs-not- A test and therefore prioritize diversity in architecture and scale rather than fine-grained family comparisons.

¹² Since the first 30 tokens in both the human and the LLM samples are the same, these 30 tokens yield the same average entropy and log-perplexity under both null and alternative. Denote the random variable $C = \sum_{i=1}^{30} X_n$. Since the first 30 tokens are human-written, the random variable C is not zero-mean, and for both null and alternative, $\sum_{n=1}^{300} X_n$ is biased by the non-zero mean random variable C . In this setting, it is inaccurate to use $|\sum_{n=1}^{300} X_n|$ being small to determine null. One approach is to exclude the first 30 tokens and instead use $|\sum_{n=31}^{300} X_n|$. Another approach is to use the one-sided version of our test that rejects the null hypothesis when $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N X_n^A = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^A - h_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N) \leq t$. Since the $\sum_{i=1}^{300} X_i$ under null and alternative is shifted by a constant C , the test’s performance is not affected. That is why we can use the one-sided version of our test to remove the impact of the initial 30 tokens.

Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic (AUROC) curve as a summary measure of performance, e.g., (Verma et al. 2023, Mitchell et al. 2023). Accordingly, we use two metrics. Our first metric, following Hans et al. 2024a, is TPR when FPR is held less than or equal to 1%¹³. While TPR at a fixed low FPR is useful for tightly controlling false positives, for characterizing overall detectability and understanding how methods behave across the full range of thresholds, we also need to report AUROC, which plots TPR against FPR at all possible thresholds. So, our second metric is AUROC.

We compare the performance of our method with established zero-shot baselines. We adopt the experimental setting from Mitchell et al. (2023) to ensure our results are directly comparable under a consistent experimental setup. In this setting, the (log-)likelihood-based benchmarks use the source model’s average token-wise log-probabilities; the (log-)rank-based benchmarks use the average observed (log-)rank of the tokens in the passage based on the model’s conditional distributions; and the entropy-based benchmarks hypothesize that the model’s text is less surprising to the model, leading to lower-entropy predictive distributions. We additionally compare against Binoculars (Hans et al. 2024a), which discusses its performance in the low-false-positive regime. Hans et al. (2024a) provides extensive comparisons to a range of recent zero-shot detectors, including Fast-DetectGPT (Bao et al. 2024) and DNA-GPT (Yang et al. 2023), and reports stronger low-FPR detection performance than these alternatives. Therefore, we benchmark against Hans et al. (2024a) to provide a conservative reference point.

Table 2 reports detection performance at $FPR \leq 1\%$. In this regime, our method is strongest on fact-heavy datasets, e.g., SQuAD, where human and LLM outputs are stylistically similar. These settings are challenging for detectors that rely mainly on signals such as likelihood, rank, or entropy in isolation, because both human and model text can be similarly high-probability under a given evaluator. In more creative datasets, e.g., WritingPrompts, human and LLM text are often more simply separable due to broader stylistic variation and distinctive generation artifacts, so several baselines also perform well, and the incremental advantage of our method naturally shrinks. For a comparison with Binoculars, see Appendix F.3.

¹³ Note that the results of experiments in the literature, e.g., in Dugan et al. (2024) and Jabarian and Imas (2025), suggest that the FPR / Type I error for current detectors can be high, which makes them unfit for regulatory applications. Our experiments using a TPR at a low FPR metric show the validity of our theoretical results and our method’s potential for regulatory application.

Method	XSum			SQuAD			WritingPrompts		
	LLAMA 3 8B	GPT-NEOX Erebus	QWEN 32B	LLAMA 3 8B	GPT-NEOX Erebus	QWEN 32B	LLAMA 3 8B	GPT-NEOX Erebus	QWEN 32B
$\log p(x)$	0.89	0.02	0.99*	0.01	0.05	0.01	1.00	0.46	1.00
Rank	0.22	0.06	0.20	0.07	0.18	0.01	0.49	0.39	0.43
LogRank	0.99	0.05	0.99*	0.02	0.06	0.01	1.00	0.54	1.00
Entropy	0.02	0.09	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Binoculars	0.99	0.89*	0.99*	0.96	0.86*	0.26*	0.97*	0.99	0.99
Ours	0.97*	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.92	0.72	0.90	0.99	1.00
Diff (zero-shot)	-0.02	0.11	0.01	0.00	0.06	0.46	-0.10	0.00	0.00

Table 2 TPR at FPR=0.01. The best TPR values are in bold, the second-best values are marked with an asterisk (*). The row Diff(zero-shot) shows our TPR improvement over the strongest zero-shot methods.

We present the AUROC results in the Appendix F.2.

7.3. Robustness experiments

Here, we extend our study beyond the scope of our theory by evaluating our test when we lack access to the true generating model and when texts are modified by adversarial post-editing. We therefore treat this section as an empirical robustness study. In Proposition 2, we assumed white-box access to the generator models. In this section, we empirically evaluate the robustness of our statistical test in Proposition 2 when we do not have access to the model that generated the text. As in section 7.2, we consider human text to represent the null and text generated by a language model to represent the alternative. We do not have access to the model that generated the text in the alternative set. Instead, we leverage a standard assumption in the literature (e.g., see section 4 in Pillutla et al. 2021) that language models are more similar to each other than to human text to design our test. In the context of Proposition 2, this implies that the cross-entropy between human text and a language model is higher than the cross-entropy between two language models. We use the scoring model `tiuae/falcon-rw-1B` to compute the log-perplexity and average entropy of text samples, and then apply the test as defined in Proposition 2. This evaluation setup is consistent with prior work on black-box detection (e.g., Mitchell et al. 2023, Dugan et al. 2024)¹⁴. Following Dugan et al. (2024), we use TPR at 5% FPR as our evaluation metric.

We use the RAID dataset Dugan et al. (2024) that consists of 14,971 human-written texts from public pre-2022 datasets from 8 domains of abstracts, books, news, poetry, recipes, Reddit, reviews, and Wikipedia. For each human text, Dugan et al. (2024) creates a corresponding generation prompt using the template "Write a recipe for *title*". Then, they generate one output for each of the 11 models, 4 decoding strategies, and 11 adversarial attacks. The 11 models are: open-source chat models Llama-c, Mistral-c, and MPT-c; open-source non-chat models Mistral, MPT, and GPT2; closed-sourced chat models c-GPT, GPT4, and Cohere; and closed-sourced non-chat models Cohere

¹⁴This premise is used explicitly by (Hans et al. 2024b, Mitchell et al. 2023) and is consistent with recent comparative studies on matched English news settings reporting that differences among LLM outputs are typically smaller than the differences between LLM and human writing (Zamaraeva et al. 2025, Muñoz-Ortiz et al. 2024). There are few conditions where this observation may not hold; for example, in New York Times-style news, humans and LLMs can look very similar on some basic word-form patterns, which can reduce the gap depending on what is being measured, even though broader grammatical measures still show LLMs clustering more tightly (Zamaraeva et al. 2025).

and GPT3. They consider 4 decoding strategies: (i) greedy, which picks the highest probability token at each generation or sampling, which samples according to a generation probability $p_n^B(\cdot)$, and (ii) repetition penalty or no repetition penalty. The repetition penalty evades detectors by reducing the likelihood of generating previously used tokens. This is achieved by down-weighting their probabilities by a factor $\theta \in \{1, 1.2\}$, resulting in less repetitive output. After generating each text, they apply adversarial attacks that manipulate text on all samples, including human text and the 11×4 LLM generations. These manipulations induce Type I and Type II errors in the statistical test. The nine query-free attacks are: Alternative Spelling (AS), Article Deletion (AD), Insert Paragraphs (IP), Number Swap (NS), Misspelling (MS), Synonym Swap (SS), Upper Lower Swap (ULS), Paraphrasing (PP), and Whitespace Addition (WSA). For details about decoding strategies and adversarial attacks, please refer to Appendix F.6. The described process yields a total of 134,739 human texts and 5,928,516 LLM texts¹⁵. For details about hardware and computation costs, refer to Appendix F.8.

We compare our performance with the neural, zero-shot, and commercial detectors in Dugan et al. (2024). The neural benchmarks are RoBERTa-B (GPT-2), RoBERTa-L (GPT-2), RoBERTa-B (ChatGPT), and RADAR. The zero-shot benchmarks are GLTR, Fast DetectGPT, Binoculars, and LLMdet. The commercial benchmarks are GPTZero, Originality, Winston, and ZeroGPT. For details about detectors, please refer to Appendix F.7. In presenting our results, we use three coarse tiers ($\leq 33\%$, $33\text{--}67\%$, and $\geq 67\%$) to improve readability of the tables by visually separating detection performances (TPR at 5% FPR). The colors are intended merely as a visualization aid and should not be interpreted as performance standards or statistical significance thresholds. A consistent pattern across methods in Table 3 is that greedy generations tend to be easier to detect than sampled generations: greedy decoding concentrates probability mass on high-likelihood tokens, yielding text that is more predictable under a scoring model, whereas sampling introduces lower-probability token choices that often move an LLM text closer to the human distribution. Repetition penalties reshape the generator’s token probabilities, and they can either reduce or increase detection probability depending on how they interact with the scorer’s tokenization¹⁶. Our approach remains comparatively steady across the generator/decoding combinations, suggesting that combining log-perplexity with an entropy-based statistic can be less brittle to shifts in decoding

¹⁵ Given the cost of more than \$10,000 for re-running the experiment for the performance of benchmark detectors on approximately 6M texts, we use the results of Dugan et al. (2024)’s experiments on the other detectors and run the experiment for our own detector.

¹⁶ A repetition penalty is an inference-time heuristic that distorts token probabilities rather than a humanization transform. In some settings, it can force the generator to make low-probability lexical substitutions even when the surrounding context remains predictable. That can increase surprisal without a matching increase in contextual uncertainty, which can be flagged by detectors that jointly use likelihood- and entropy-related signals, while merely likelihood-based cues might move in a more human-like direction.

strategy than methods that rely on a single cue. The table also highlights the fundamental limitation of black-box scoring: when sampling produces highly diverse outputs that overlap more with the variability of human writing under the scoring model, all detectors, including ours, face a more difficult detection problem at a strict 5% FPR. For performance comparison with Fast-DetectGPT and Binoculars, see Appendix F.4.

Dec. Strategy Rep. Penalty?	Open-Source								Closed-Source			
	Chat Models				Non-Chat Models				Chat Models		Non-Chat Models	
	<i>(llama-c, mistral-c, mpt-c)</i>				<i>(mistral, mpt, gpt2)</i>				<i>(c-gpt, gpt4, cohere)</i>		<i>(cohere, gpt3)</i>	
	greedy		sampling		greedy		sampling		greedy	sampling	greedy	sampling
×	✓	×	✓	×	✓	×	✓	×	×	×	×	
R-B GPT2	84.1	52.3	77.9	26.2	98.6	44.1	60.5	35.4	70.9	41.7	65.1	52.5
R-L GPT2	79.7	41.1	71.4	19.5	98.5	43.0	67.2	53.4	61.4	34.7	61.1	48.6
R-B CGPT	80.2	63.3	75.0	39.3	53.3	26.4	14.9	1.7	59.1	38.1	46.5	39.0
RADAR	88.8	77.4	85.6	66.4	91.8	63.8	48.3	31.8	81.6	75.3	72.2	67.7
GPTZero	98.8	93.7	98.4	82.5	74.7	34.6	9.4	4.8	92.3	88.5	60.6	53.4
Originality	98.6	86.3	97.7	72.5	99.9	64.1	89.0	51.2	96.8	89.0	91.7	85.4
Winston	97.2	90.1	96.6	78.3	68.2	49.0	29.5	11.3	96.1	93.7	73.2	68.1
ZeroGPT(*)	95.4	80.7	90.5	54.9	85.1	57.2	16.0	0.3	92.1	65.8	83.4	72.7
GLTR	89.8	67.5	83.9	38.3	99.6	56.9	44.5	0.5	80.7	54.3	75.6	63.7
F-DetectGPT	98.6	74.5	96.2	40.5	97.8	56.1	79.7	0.6	96.0	74.1	93.8	86.3
LLMDet	55.5	30.2	47.5	16.5	74.8	27.0	38.4	3.7	35.8	18.5	40.0	32.9
Binoculars	99.9	86.6	99.7	60.6	99.9	62.3	72.4	0.6	99.2	92.1	99.0	95.0
Ours	99.4	86.4	97.9	62.2	90.8	84.0	54.0	73.3	96.4	70.2	94.4	86.3

Table 3 TPR at FPR=5%. Cell colors: Red ≤ 33 , Yellow 33–66, Green ≥ 67 .

Table 4 indicate that our detector maintains relatively steady performance under perturbations that introduce local surface noise, e.g., alternative spelling, article deletion, paragraph insertion, number swap, misspelling, case swapping, and paraphrasing, since the underlying score separation is mostly preserved when edits do not alter the next token’s conditional probabilities. The largest performance reductions occur under synonym swap and whitespace addition, which are expected to be more challenging for black-box scoring because they modify lexical choice distributions. Among zero-shot baselines, Binoculars is also comparatively robust across several attacks, consistent with the idea that its two-model normalization can mitigate some domain and formatting-induced shifts that confound single-model likelihood.

	None	AS	AD	IP	NS	MS	SYN	ULS	WSA	PP
RoB-B GPT2	59.1	55.6	37.1	56.9	55.9	43.8	71.5	18.8	45.2	68.9
RoB-L GPT2	56.7	52.4	33.2	55.1	51.7	39.5	79.4	19.3	40.1	72.9
RoB-B CGPT	44.8	43.3	38.0	5.2	44.3	42.1	39.6	31.7	0.1	49.2
RADAR	70.9	70.8	67.9	73.7	71.0	69.5	67.5	70.4	66.1	67.3
GPTZero	66.5	64.9	61.0	66.2	65.8	65.1	61.0	56.5	66.2	64.0
ZeroGPT	65.5	65.4	59.7	64.9	64.7	64.7	18.8	54.5	64.2	46.7
Originality	85.0	83.6	71.4	85.1	86.0	78.6	96.5	75.8	84.9	96.7
Winston	71.0	68.9	66.9	69.8	69.0	67.5	63.6	56.8	46.8	52.6
GLTR	62.6	61.2	52.1	61.4	59.9	59.8	31.2	48.1	45.8	47.2
F-DGPT	73.6	71.6	64.7	72.0	68.2	70.7	34.0	60.4	64.4	71.8
LLMDet	35.0	33.9	27.4	27.2	33.8	32.7	27.3	23.4	4.4	28.5
Binoculars	79.6	78.2	74.3	71.7	77.1	78.0	43.5	73.8	70.1	80.3
Ours	82.5	80.6	74.4	81.1	74.8	79.8	48.6	72.5	60.8	74.2

Table 4 TPR @ FPR=5%. Abbreviations are: AS: Alternative Spelling, AD: Article Deletion, IP: Insert Paragraphs, NS: Number Swap, MS: Misspelling, SYN: Synonym Swap, ULS: Upper Lower Swap, WSA: Whitespace Addition, PP: Paraphrase. Cell colors: Red ≤ 33 , Yellow 33–66, Green ≥ 67 .

8. Conclusion

We study the problem of LLM provenance verification: given a prompt and a finite-length possibly short text, decide whether the text was produced by a particular LLM, while guaranteeing a user-specified very low probability of false positives. This capability is increasingly important for accountability and integrity in digital communication, including assigning responsibility for content, enforcing organizational policies that restrict which models may be used, and supporting AI providers in protecting training pipelines. Motivated in particular by the high cost of accusations (false positives) in regulatory settings, we design zero-shot statistical tests with error guarantees that remain informative at practical text lengths.

We model LLM-generated text as an auto-regressive stochastic process with full dependence on history and build tests based on the convergence of log-perplexity under an evaluator model A to the average cross-entropy between the evaluator model A and the generative model B . Using these concentration results, we develop (i) a composite attribution test that distinguish whether the text string \mathbf{Y}_N was generated by a model in a non-sanctioned set \mathcal{A} or in a disjoint in-house set \mathcal{B} , and (ii) a detection test that distinguishes whether \mathbf{Y}_N was generated by a known model A or by an unknown alternative “not A .” In Propositions 1 and 2, we prove finite- N upper bounds showing that both Type I and Type II errors decay exponentially in the text length N . In Appendix A, we extend these tests to the black-box setting, where evaluator log-probabilities must be approximated via sampling, and we provide a minimum sampling size sufficient to achieve essentially the same finite-sample errors in Propositions 3 and 4. We also provide a lower bound in an i.i.d. benchmark in Corollary 1 showing that no test can achieve error rates that decay faster than exponentially in the text length N , matching our upper-bound scaling up to constants. We provide numerical

experiments to validate our theoretical results and examine their robustness to having no access to the evaluator log-probabilities and to adversarial attacks.

Our main methodological contribution is Theorem 1, which gives an exponential-decay concentration inequality for the deviation between the log-perplexity of a dependent token sequence generated under B and evaluated under A , and the corresponding average cross-entropy between B and A , over a finite alphabet. This is a complex problem and the novelty is the idea of modeling the text generation process such that the random variables describing this deviation can be expressed as a martingale with respect to the growing token history, enabling the use of martingale concentration inequalities to obtain non-asymptotic, finite- N guarantees. This result generalizes the i.i.d. setting studied in Zhao (2022) to the dependent regime relevant for LLMs’ text generation. A future direction is to develop provable guarantees under adversarial attacks.

References

- Alizamir S, de Véricourt F, Sun P (2022) Search under accumulated pressure. *Operations Research* 70(3):1393–1409, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/opre.2019.1880>.
- Baek J, Farias VF (2021) Ts-ucb: Improving on thompson sampling with little to no additional computation. *Operations Research* 69(3):876–898.
- Bakhtin A, Gross S, Ott M, Deng Y, Ranzato M, Szlam A (2019) Real or fake? learning to discriminate machine from human generated text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.03351*.
- Bao G, Zhao Y, Teng Z, Yang L, Zhang Y (2023) Fast-detectgpt: Efficient zero-shot detection of machine-generated text via conditional probability curvature. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.05130*.
- Bao G, Zhao Y, Teng Z, Yang L, Zhang Y (2024) Fast-detectgpt: Efficient zero-shot detection of machine-generated text via conditional probability curvature. *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.05130>, published as a conference paper at ICLR 2024.
- Bastani H, Bastani O, Sungu A, Ge H, Kabakçı Ö, Mariman R (2025) Generative ai without guardrails can harm learning: Evidence from high school mathematics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 122(26):e2422633122, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2422633122>.
- Bastani H, Cachon GP (2025) The human-ai contracting paradox. Working Paper 5962739, SSRN, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5962739>, posted December 2025.
- Bhat MM, Parthasarathy S (2020) How effectively can machines defend against machine-generated fake news? an empirical study. *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Insights from Negative Results in NLP*, 48–53.
- Brainard J (2025) Far more authors use AI to write science papers than admit it, publisher reports. *Science* URL <https://www.science.org/content/article/far-more-authors-use-ai-write-science-papers-admit-it-publisher-reports>.
- Brown T, Mann B, Ryder N, Subbiah M, Kaplan JD, Dhariwal P, Neelakantan A, Shyam P, Sastry G, Askell A, et al. (2020) Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33:1877–1901.
- Business Insider (2024) Yup, AI is basically just a homework-cheating machine. Business Insider, URL <https://www.businessinsider.com/ai-chatgpt-homework-cheating-machine-sam-altman-openai-2024-8>, accessed: 2025-12-19.
- Cai S, Cui W (2023) Evade chatgpt detectors via a single space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.02599*.
- Chakraborty S, Bedi A, Zhu S, An B, Manocha D, Huang F (2024) Position: On the possibilities of AI-generated text detection. Salakhutdinov R, Kolter Z, Heller K, Weller A, Oliver N, Scarlett J, Berkenkamp F, eds., *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 235 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 6093–6115 (PMLR), URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v235/chakraborty24a.html>.
- Chen C, Shu K (2023) Can llm-generated misinformation be detected? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.13788*.
- Chen X, Chao X (2020) Learning and pricing with censored demand. *Operations Research* 68(3):682–700.
- Dellarocas C (2006) Strategic manipulation of internet opinion forums: Implications for consumers and firms. *Management Science* 52(10):1577–1593, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1060.0567>.
- Devlin J, Chang MW, Lee K, Toutanova K (2019) Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *Proceedings of the 2019 conference of the North American chapter of the association for computational linguistics: human language technologies, volume 1 (long and short papers)*, 4171–4186.
- Dugan L, Hwang A, Trhlik F, Ludan JM, Zhu A, Xu H, Ippolito D, Callison-Burch C (2024) Raid: A shared benchmark for robust evaluation of machine-generated text detectors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.07940*.
- El Balghithi O, Elmachtoub AN, Grigas P, Tewari A (2019) Generalization bounds in the predict-then-optimize framework. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32.
- Fagni T, Falchi F, Gambini M, Martella A, Tesconi M (2021) Tweepfake: About detecting deepfake tweets. *Plos one* 16(5):e0251415.
- Fan A, Lewis M, Dauphin Y (2018) Hierarchical neural story generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.04833*.
- Forbes (2025) Students use “ai humanizer” apps to make chatgpt essays undetectable. URL <https://www.forbes.com/sites/larsdaniel/2025/10/03/students-use-ai-humanizer-apps-to-make-chatgpt-essays-undetectable/>.
- Fügener A, Walzner DD, Gupta A (2026) Roles of artificial intelligence in collaboration with humans: Automation, augmentation, and the future of work. *Management Science* 72(1):538–557, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2024.05684>, published online October 15, 2025.
- Gagliano R, Kim MMH, Zhang XJ, Biggs J (2021) Robustness analysis of grover for machine-generated news detection. *Proceedings of the 19th Annual Workshop of the Australasian Language Technology Association*, 119–127.
- Gehrmann S, Strobel H, Rush AM (2019) Gltr: Statistical detection and visualization of generated text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.04043*.
- Gloaguen T, Jovanović N, Staab R, Vechev MT (2025) Black-box detection of language model watermarks. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=E4LAVLXAHW>.
- Goldberg D (1991) What every computer scientist should know about floating-point arithmetic. *ACM computing surveys (CSUR)* 23(1):5–48.
- Grieve J (2007) Quantitative authorship attribution: An evaluation of techniques. *Literary and linguistic computing* 22(3):251–270.
- Guardian T (2024) ‘i received a first but it felt tainted and undeserved’: inside the university ai cheating crisis. <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2024/dec/15/i-received-a-first-but-it-felt-tainted-and-undeserved-inside-the-university-ai-cheating-crisis>, accessed: 2025-10-28.
- Guerrero J, Liang G, Alsmadi I (2022) A mutation-based text generation for adversarial machine learning applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.11808*.
- Guo B, Zhang X, Wang Z, Jiang M, Nie J, Ding Y, Yue J, Wu Y (2023) How close is chatgpt to human experts? comparison corpus, evaluation, and detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.07597*.
- Guo X, He Y, Zhang S, Zhang T, Feng W, Huang H, Ma C (2024) Detective: Detecting ai-generated text via multi-level contrastive learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 37:88320–88347.

- Hans A, Schwarzschild A, Cherepanova V, Kazemi H, Saha A, Goldblum M, Geiping J, Goldstein T (2024a) Spotting llms with binoculars: Zero-shot detection of machine-generated text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.12070* .
- Hans A, Schwarzschild A, Cherepanova V, Kazemi H, Saha A, Goldblum M, Geiping J, Goldstein T (2024b) Spotting LLMs with binoculars: Zero-shot detection of machine-generated text. Salakhutdinov R, Kolter Z, Heller K, Weller A, Oliver N, Scarlett J, Berkenkamp F, eds., *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 235 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 17519–17537 (PMLR), URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v235/hans24a.html>.
- Hinton G, Vinyals O, Dean J (2015) Distilling the knowledge in a neural network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02531* URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1503.02531>.
- Holtzman A, Buys J, Du L, Forbes M, Choi Y (2020) The curious case of neural text degeneration. *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=rygGQyrFvH>.
- Hu X, Chen PY, Ho TY (2023) Radar: Robust ai-text detection via adversarial learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36:15077–15095.
- Ippolito D, Duckworth D, Callison-Burch C, Eck D (2019) Automatic detection of generated text is easiest when humans are fooled. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.00650* .
- Jabarian B, Imas A (2025) Artificial writing and automated detection. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Jakesch M, Bhat A, Buschek D, Zalmanson L, Naaman M (2023) Co-writing with opinionated language models affects users’ views. *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*, 1–15.
- Jawahar G, Abdul-Mageed M, Lakshmanan LV (2020) Automatic detection of machine generated text: A critical survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.01314* .
- Jemielniak D (2025) Asimov’s laws of robotics. *IEEE Spectrum* URL <https://spectrum.ieee.org/isaac-asimov-robotics>, accessed: 2025-05-04.
- Jin B, Kesselheim T, Ma W, Singla S (2024) Sample complexity of posted pricing for a single item. *Operations Research* Forthcoming.
- Johari R, Kamble V, Kanoria Y (2021) Matching while learning. *Operations Research* 69(2):655–681, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/opre.2020.2013>.
- Juola P, et al. (2008) Authorship attribution. *Foundations and Trends® in Information Retrieval* 1(3):233–334.
- Kalvit A, Zeevi A (2023) Complexity analysis of a countable-armed bandit problem. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 48(1):1–29.
- Keskar NS, McCann B, Varshney LR, Xiong C, Socher R (2019) Ctrl: A conditional transformer language model for controllable generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.05858* .
- Kirchenbauer J, Geiping J, Wen Y, Katz J, Miers I, Goldstein T (2023) A watermark for large language models. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 17061–17084 (PMLR).
- Koppel M, Schler J, Argamon S (2009) Computational methods in authorship attribution. *Journal of the American Society for information Science and Technology* 60(1):9–26.
- Krishna K, Song Y, Karpinska M, Wieting J, Iyyer M (2023) Paraphrasing evades detectors of ai-generated text, but retrieval is an effective defense. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36:27469–27500.
- Krishna K, Song Y, Karpinska M, Wieting J, Iyyer M (2024) Paraphrasing evades detectors of ai-generated text, but retrieval is an effective defense. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36.
- Kumarage T, Bhattacharjee A, Padejski D, Roschke K, Gillmor D, Ruston S, Liu H, Garland J (2023) J-guard: Journalism guided adversarially robust detection of AI-generated news. ArXiv:2309.03164.
- Lattimore T, Szepesvári C (2020) *Bandit algorithms* (Cambridge University Press).
- Lavergne T, Urvoy T, Yvon F (2008) Detecting fake content with relative entropy scoring. *Pan* 8(27-31):4.
- Li X, Li G, Zhang X (2025a) A likelihood based approach for watermark detection. Li Y, Mandt S, Agrawal S, Khan E, eds., *Proceedings of The 28th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 258 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 1675–1683 (PMLR), URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v258/li25d.html>.
- Li X, Ruan F, Wang H, Long Q, Su WJ (2025b) Robust detection of watermarks for large language models under human edits. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* qkaf056, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jrsssb/qkaf056>, advance article.
- Li X, Ruan F, Wang H, Long Q, Su WJ (2025c) A statistical framework of watermarks for large language models: Pivot, detection efficiency and optimal rules. *The Annals of Statistics* 53(1):322–351.
- Liang G, Guerrero J, Alsmadi I (2023a) Mutation-based adversarial attacks on neural text detectors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.05794* .
- Liang W, Yuksekonul M, Mao Y, Wu E, Zou J (2023b) Gpt detectors are biased against non-native english writers. *Patterns* 4(7).
- Luca M, Zervas G (2016) Fake it till you make it: Reputation, competition, and yelp review fraud. *Management Science* 62(12):3412–3427, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2015.2304>.
- Luo Y, Ren X, Zheng Z, Jiang Z, Jiang X, You Y (2023a) CAME: Confidence-guided adaptive memory efficient optimization. Rogers A, Boyd-Graber J, Okazaki N, eds., *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 4442–4453 (Toronto, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics), URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.243>.
- Luo Y, Ren X, Zheng Z, Jiang Z, Jiang X, You Y (2023b) Came optimizer: Official implementation. <https://github.com/yangluo7/CAME>, accessed: 2026-01-18.
- Mitchell E, Lee Y, Khazatsky A, Manning CD, Finn C (2023) Detectgpt: Zero-shot machine-generated text detection using probability curvature. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 24950–24962 (PMLR).
- Mo Y, Qin H, Dong Y, Zhu Z, Li Z (2024) Large language model (llm) ai text generation detection based on transformer deep learning algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.06652* .
- Muñoz-Ortiz A, Gómez-Rodríguez C, Vilares D (2024) Contrasting linguistic patterns in human and LLM-generated news text. *Artificial Intelligence Review* 57:265, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10462-024-10903-2>.
- Narayan S, Cohen SB, Lapata M (2018) Don’t give me the details, just the summary. *Topic-Aware Convolutional Neural Networks for Extreme Summarization ArXiv, abs* .
- Nature (2024) Why ai watermarking isn’t working — and what to do instead. *Nature* URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-024-03418-x>, accessed: 2024-12-12.
- NBC News (2024) Fake joe biden robocall tells new hampshire democrats not to vote tuesday. URL <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/2024-election/fake-joe-biden-robocall-tells-new-hampshire-democrats-not-vote-tuesday-rcna134984>, accessed: February 27, 2025.
- New York Times (2023) The hairpin blog has become an ai-generated spam content farm. URL <https://www.businessinsider.com/the-hairpin-blog-ai-spam-content-farm-cybersquatting-2024-1>, accessed: February 27, 2025.
- OpenAI (2023) Gpt-4 research. URL <https://openai.com/index/gpt-4-research>, accessed: February 27, 2025.
- Paperno D, Kruszewski G, Lazaridou A, Pham QN, Bernardi R, Pezzelle S, Baroni M, Boleda G, Fernández R (2016) The lambada dataset: Word prediction requiring a broad discourse context. *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 1525–1534 (Association for Computational Linguistics).
- Parents for Leveraging Ethical AI Standards in Education (PLEASE) (2024) Schools that banned AI detectors. <https://www.pleasedu.org/resources/schools-that-banned-ai-detectors>, last updated September 20, 2024.
- Pillutla K, Swayamdipta S, Zellers R, Thackstun J, Welleck S, Choi Y, Harchaoui Z (2021) Mauve: Measuring the gap between neural text and human text using divergence frontiers. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34:4816–4828.
- Poulidis S, Ge H, Bastani H, Bastani O (2025) Action vs. attention signals for human-ai collaboration: Evidence from chess. Working Paper 5128584, SSRN, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5128584>, the Wharton School Research Paper.
- Press A (2024) Parents of massachusetts high schooler disciplined for using ai sue school. <https://apnews.com/article/8f1283b517b2ed95c2bac63f9c5cb0b9>, accessed: 2025-10-28.
- Pu J, Sarwar Z, Abdullah SM, Rehman A, Kim Y, Bhattacharya P, Javed M, Viswanath B (2023) Deepfake text detection: Limitations and opportunities. *2023 IEEE symposium on security and privacy (SP)*, 1613–1630 (IEEE).
- Radford A (2018) Improving language understanding by generative pre-training .
- Rajpurkar P (2016) Squad: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.05250* .
- Sadasivan VS, Kumar A, Balasubramanian S, Wang W, Feizi S (2023) Can ai-generated text be reliably detected? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.11156* .
- Schaaff K, Schlippe T, Mindner L (2023) Classification of human-and ai-generated texts for english, french, german, and spanish. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.04882* .
- Shumailov I, Shumaylov Z, Zhao Y, Gal Y, Papernot N, Anderson R (2023) The curse of recursion: Training on generated data makes models forget. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.17493* .
- Solaiman I, Brundage M, Clark J, Askell A, Herbert-Voss A, Wu J, Radford A, Krueger G, Kim JW, Kreps S, et al. (2019) Release strategies and the social impacts of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.09203* .
- Stamatatos E (2009) A survey of modern authorship attribution methods. *Journal of the American Society for information Science and Technology* 60(3):538–556.

- Su J, Zhuo TY, Mansurov J, Wang D, Nakov P (2023a) Fake news detectors are biased against texts generated by large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.08674* .
- Su J, Zhuo TY, Wang D, Nakov P (2023b) Detectllm: Leveraging log rank information for zero-shot detection of machine-generated text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05540* .
- Tambe PB (2026) Reskilling the workforce for ai: Domain expertise and algorithmic literacy. *Management Science* 72(1):515–537, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2022.03968>, published online September 30, 2025.
- The Verge (2024) OpenAI won't watermark ChatGPT text because its users could get caught. The Verge, URL <https://www.theverge.com/2024/8/4/24213268/openai-chatgpt-text-watermark-cheat-detection-tool>, accessed: 2025-12-19.
- Tian E (2023a) Gptzero update v1, january 2023a. URL <https://gptzero.substack.com/p/gptzero-update-v1> .
- Tian E (2023b) Perplexity, burstiness, and statistical ai detection. <https://gptzero.me/news/perplexity-and-burstiness-what-is-it/>, accessed: 2025-05-10.
- Times NY (2025) Ai chatgpt and the student cheating crackdown. <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/05/17/style/ai-chatgpt-turnitin-students-cheating.html>, accessed: 2025-10-28.
- Tu S, Li C, Yu J, Wang X, Hou L, Li J (2023) Chatlog: Recording and analyzing chatgpt across time. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.14106* .
- Uchendu A, Le T, Shu K, Lee D (2020) Authorship attribution for neural text generation. *Proceedings of the 2020 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (EMNLP)*, 8384–8395.
- Vasilatos C, Alam M, Rahwan T, Zaki Y, Maniatakos M (2023) Howkgpt: Investigating the detection of chatgpt-generated university student homework through context-aware perplexity analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18226* .
- Verma V, Fleisig E, Tomlin N, Klein D (2023) Ghostbuster: Detecting text ghostwritten by large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15047* .
- Vershynin R (2018) *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*, volume 47 (Cambridge university press).
- Wang Y, Mansurov J, Ivanov P, Su J, Shelmanov A, Tsvigun A, Whitehouse C, Afzal OM, Mahmoud T, Sasaki T, et al. (2023) M4: Multi-generator, multi-domain, and multi-lingual black-box machine-generated text detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14902* .
- West DM, Allen JR (2024) Detecting ai fingerprints: A guide to watermarking and beyond. *Brookings Institution* URL <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/detecting-ai-fingerprints-a-guide-to-watermarking-and-beyond/>, accessed: 2025-11-08.
- Wolff M, Wolff S (2020) Attacking neural text detectors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.11768* .
- Wu J, Yang S, Zhan R, Yuan Y, Wong DF, Chao LS (2023a) A survey on llm-generated text detection: Necessity, methods, and future directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.14724* .
- Wu K, Pang L, Shen H, Cheng X, Chua TS (2023b) Llm-det: A third party large language models generated text detection tool. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15004* .
- Yang X, Cheng W, Petzold L, Wang WY, Chen H (2023) Dna-gpt: Divergent n-gram analysis for training-free detection of gpt-generated text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.17359* URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.17359>.
- Yang X, Cheng W, Wu Y, Petzold LR, Wang WY, Chen H (2024) Dna-gpt: Divergent n-gram analysis for training-free detection of gpt-generated text. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Xlayxj2fWp>, iCLR 2024.
- You H, Fu Y, Wang Z, Yazdanbakhsh A, Lin YC (2024) When linear attention meets autoregressive decoding: Towards more effective and efficient linearized large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.07368* Available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.07368>.
- Zamaraeva O, Flickinger D, Bond F, Gómez-Rodríguez C (2025) Comparing LLM-generated and human-authored news text using formal syntactic theory. Che W, Nabende J, Shutova E, Pilehvar MT, eds., *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 9041–9060 (Vienna, Austria: Association for Computational Linguistics), ISBN 979-8-89176-251-0, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.18653/v1/2025.acl-long.443>.
- Zeng C, Tang S, Yang X, Chen Y, Sun Y, Xu Z, Li Y, Chen H, Cheng W, Xu D (2024) Dald: Improving logits-based detector without logits from black-box llms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2024/file/62e5f22b5dae99ec700be622df4f8e0d-Paper-Conference.pdf, neurIPS 2024.
- Zhang R, Chen X, Li J (2020) Learning-based dynamic inventory control with censored demand. *Management Science* 66(9):4148–4171.
- Zhao X, Liao C, Wang YX, Li L (2025) Efficiently identifying watermarked segments in mixed-source texts. *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 6304–6316 (Vienna, Austria: Association for Computational Linguistics), URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.18653/v1/2025.acl-long.316>.
- Zhao Y (2022) An optimal uniform concentration inequality for discrete entropies on finite alphabets in the high-dimensional setting. *Bernoulli* 28(3):1892–1911.
- Zhu X, Ren Y, Cao Y, Lin X, Fang F, Li Y (2025) Reliably bounding false positives: A zero-shot machine-generated text detection framework via multiscaled conformal prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.05084* .

Online Appendices

Appendix A: Black-box detection via sampling

There is a subset of closed-weight language models, including Google Gemini (API/Bard/Vertex AI) and Anthropic Claude (public API & Claude.ai), that do not provide log probabilities for the evaluator model A . We refer to this setting as the black-box setting. In detection using a black-box LLM, we can form an empirical estimate of the probability distributions p_n^A through sampling from A given a context (i.e., a prompt and a prefix). In this section, we adapt our tests to the empirical estimations of the sequential probabilities obtained by finitely sampling from the model. Recall that p_n^A denotes the next-token probability mass function (pmf) for model A , given context $(\mathbf{X}, Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_{n-1})$. For a language model A that enables API access, given context $(\mathbf{X}, Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_{n-1})$, we can sample from A even when the LLM provider does not allow the API command to retrieve the probability distributions from A . Formally, for each n^{th} token, we first obtain m independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) samples

$$\hat{Y}_n^{(1)}, \dots, \hat{Y}_n^{(m)} \sim p_n^A(\cdot),$$

and define the empirical pmf as

$$\hat{p}_n^A(y) := \frac{\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{1}\{\hat{Y}_n^{(j)} = y\}}{m}.$$

Additionally, define the empirical log-perplexity

$$\hat{l}_A(\mathbf{Y}_N) := -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \log \hat{p}_n^A(Y_n) \quad (8)$$

as an approximation of the true log-perplexity $l_A(\mathbf{Y}_N) = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \log p_n^A(Y_n)$. Lastly, define the sample average entropy as

$$\hat{h}_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N) = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{y_n \in \mathcal{X}} \hat{p}_n^A(y_n) \log(\hat{p}_n^A(y_n)).$$

A.1. Attribution among multiple LLMs with sampling

Given a string \mathbf{Y}_N , we design a statistical test to detect whether one of the models in $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_p\}$ (non-sanctioned) or one of the models in $\mathcal{B} = \{B_1, \dots, B_q\}$ (in-house) generated the text. The null hypothesis \mathbf{H}_0 is that the text \mathbf{Y}_N is generated by a model in \mathcal{B} . We first calculate the sample random variables $\hat{Z}_n^M =: -\log(\hat{p}_n^M(Y_n))$, and sum over $\hat{Z}_n^M =: -\log(\hat{p}_n^M(Y_n))$ for all models $M \in \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}$. Our test rejects the null \mathbf{H}_0 if for some $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$, we have

$$\hat{l}_{A_i}(\mathbf{Y}_N) < \hat{l}_{B_j}(\mathbf{Y}_N) \quad \forall B_j \in \mathcal{B}.$$

PROPOSITION 3. *For any sample size m such that $m \geq \frac{1}{2\varepsilon^2} \log(\frac{2N}{\delta})$, where $\varepsilon = \min(\frac{\epsilon_1 \epsilon}{16}, \frac{\epsilon_1}{16K \log K}, \frac{\epsilon_1^2}{64K})$, If Assumptions 1 and 2 hold, the Type I error for our test is upper bounded by*

$$2|\mathcal{A}| \exp \left[-\frac{N(\epsilon_1/4)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \min \left(1, \frac{\epsilon_1/4}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \right) \right] + 2 \exp \left[-\frac{N(\epsilon_1/4)}{c_1 \log(|\mathcal{X}|)} \min \left(1, \frac{\epsilon_1/4}{c_1 \log(|\mathcal{X}|)} \right) \right] + (|\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{B}|)\delta$$

and the Type II error for our test is upper bounded by

$$2|\mathcal{B}| \exp \left[-\frac{N(\epsilon_1/4)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \min \left(1, \frac{\epsilon_1/4}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \right) \right] + 2 \exp \left[-\frac{N\epsilon_1/4}{c_1 \log(|\mathcal{X}|)} \min \left(1, \frac{\epsilon_1/4}{c_1 \log(|\mathcal{X}|)} \right) \right] + (|\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{B}|)\delta$$

with constants c_1, c_2 , and ϵ as introduced in Theorem 1, and $\delta \in (0, 1)$ is a user-chosen sampling failure probability / confidence parameter that controls the event that the empirical estimates \hat{p}_n^M uniformly approximate the true probabilities p_n^M over tokens $n = 1, \dots, N$ ¹⁷.

Proof. See Section D.2. □

Replacing the true next-token probabilities p_n^M by empirical estimates \hat{p}_n^M obtained from m samples per token introduces an additional source of uncertainty beyond the randomness in the observed text \mathbf{Y}_N . Proposition 3 shows that if $m \geq \frac{1}{2\varepsilon^2} \log(\frac{2N}{\delta})$, where $\varepsilon = \min(\frac{\epsilon_1 \epsilon}{16}, \frac{\epsilon_1}{16K \log K}, \frac{\epsilon_1^2}{64K})$, then the Type I and Type II errors still decay exponentially in N . Relative to the white-box

¹⁷ In practice, δ is set as a small tolerance for Monte Carlo estimation error: it upper bounds the probability that sampling noise makes at least one of the empirical next-token distributions \hat{p}_n^M inaccurate enough to affect the test decision, which is why it appears both in the required sampling budget through $\log(1/\delta)$ and as the additive term $(|\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{B}|)\delta$ after union bounding over models. A standard calibration is to allocate a small portion η of the overall error budget to sampling by choosing $\delta = \eta/(|\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{B}|)$, ensuring $(|\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{B}|)\delta \leq \eta$. Since m depends only logarithmically on $1/\delta$, tightening δ by orders of magnitude increases the sampling cost only modestly.

setting, two black-box effects appear: the effective margin in the exponential terms is reduced to $\epsilon_1/4$ from the $\epsilon_1/2$ in the white-box setting, and an additional additive term $(|\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{B}|)\delta$ reflects the probability that at least one sampling-based probability estimate is insufficiently accurate. Thus, the sampling precision parameter δ contributes to both Type I and Type II error bounds through this additive term, while also determining the minimum required sample size m .

The required sample size m depends only logarithmically on the text length N and on the confidence level through $\log(1/\delta)$, but scales as $1/\epsilon^2$. Consequently, tightening the sampling precision (smaller δ) increases m slowly: for instance, when the $\log(1/\delta)$ term is dominant, changing δ from 10^{-10} to 10^{-20} increases $\log(1/\delta)$ by a factor of 2, and hence approximately doubles the required m . In contrast, because ϵ can be limited by the alphabet size K and the minimum separation margin ϵ_1 from Assumption 2, the sampling requirement can introduce polynomial dependence on K and inverse powers of ϵ_1 , unlike the no-sampling setting where these quantities primarily enter through logarithmic factors in the concentration terms. Achieving a target accuracy therefore requires balancing the text length N (which governs the exponential decay terms) with the sampling effort m and the precision parameter δ .

A.2. Model A or not model A with sampling?

Given a string \mathbf{Y}_N , for arbitrary constants t , we design a statistical test to detect whether the evaluator model A that we do not have access to its log probabilities, generated the text. The null hypothesis \mathbf{H}_0 is that the text \mathbf{Y}_N is not generated by the evaluator model A ; it is generated by any model B that we do not have white-box access to, which could be a human or some other language generation process. The alternative \mathbf{H} is that it is generated by A . We first calculate the random variable $Z_n^A =: -\log(p_n^A(Y_n))$, and then we calculate $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^A$. Our test rejects the null if

$$\left| \hat{l}_A(\mathbf{Y}_N) - \hat{h}_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N) \right| \leq t.$$

PROPOSITION 4. For any $t \geq 0$, and any sample size m such that $m \geq \frac{1}{2\epsilon^2} \log\left(\frac{2N}{\delta}\right)$, where $\epsilon = \min\left(\frac{\epsilon_2\epsilon}{16}, \frac{\epsilon_2}{16K \log K}, \frac{\epsilon_2^2}{64K}\right)$, the Type II error for our test is upper bounded by

$$2 \exp\left[-\frac{Nt}{c_1 \log(|\mathcal{X}|)} \min\left(1, \frac{t}{c_1 \log(|\mathcal{X}|)}\right)\right] + \delta$$

with c_1 as introduced in Theorem 1. Also, if Assumptions 1 and 3 hold, then for any positive numbers $t < \epsilon_2/4$, and for c_2 as introduced in Theorem 1, the Type I error of our test is upper bounded by

$$2 \exp\left[-\frac{N\epsilon_2/4}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \min\left(1, \frac{\epsilon_2/4}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)}\right)\right] + 2 \exp\left[-\frac{N(\epsilon_2/4 - t)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \min\left(1, \frac{\epsilon_2/4 - t}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)}\right)\right] + \delta,$$

where $\delta \in (0, 1)$ is a user-chosen sampling failure probability that controls the event that the empirical estimates \hat{p}_n^M uniformly approximate the true probabilities p_n^M over tokens $n = 1, \dots, N$.

Proof. See Section D.3. □

Proposition 4 demonstrates that if $m \geq \frac{1}{2\epsilon^2} \log\left(\frac{2N}{\delta}\right)$, where $\epsilon = \min\left(\frac{\epsilon_1\epsilon}{16}, \frac{\epsilon_1}{16K \log K}, \frac{\epsilon_1^2}{64K}\right)$, then the Type I and Type II errors decay exponentially in the text length N , with rates governed by the threshold t and the same logarithmic scales $c_1 \log(|\mathcal{X}|)$ and $-c_2 \log(\epsilon)$. Similar to Proposition 3, the sampling budget m grows only logarithmically in N and $1/\delta$ but scales as $1/\epsilon^2$, and an additive $+\delta$ term accounts for the residual probability of sampling inaccuracy. Note that since sampling is required only for a single evaluator A rather than across $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}$, the sampling penalty here appears as δ rather than $(|\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{B}|)\delta$. Moreover, the relevant separation is ϵ_2 from Assumption 3, and sampling reduces the usable gap in the Type I bound to $\epsilon_2/4$, yielding the stricter requirement $t < \epsilon_2/4$. This tightening reflects that a portion of the separation guaranteed by ϵ_2 must be allocated to absorb estimation error in \hat{l}_A and $\hat{h}_N(A, A)$, leaving a smaller residual margin for controlling false positives.

Appendix B: Concentration inequality proofs

In this section, to improve readability, we first provide the prerequisites of sub-exponential random variables that are used in our proofs in Section B.1, followed by a review of notations in Section B.2. We provide the proof for Theorem 1 - part (a), i.e., where the generator model B and the evaluator model A are the same, in Section B.3. The starting paragraph in the proof provides a high-level overview, describing the proof steps, remarks, and lemmas used as part of the proof. In Section B.4, we provide the proof for Theorem 1 - part (b), i.e., where the generator model B is not the same as the evaluator model A . Similar to the previous part, the starting paragraph of this section provides a proof overview.

B.1. Prerequisites of sub-exponential random variables from the literature

Before presenting the proofs for our main theorem, we need to clearly state the following definitions and the equivalency lemma for sub-exponential random variables from the literature.

DEFINITION 1. (sub-exponential norm). The sub-exponential norm of $X \in \mathbb{R}$ is

$$\|X\|_{\psi_1} = \inf\left\{t > 0 : \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\frac{|X|}{t}}\right] \leq 2\right\}.$$

If $\|X\|_{\psi_1}$ is finite, we say that X is sub-exponential.

We also need the following equivalent (up to a constant factor) definition of a sub-exponential random variable from Vershynin (2018).

DEFINITION 2. (sub-exponential random variable). Centered random variable $X \in SE(\nu^2, \alpha)$ with parameters $\nu, \alpha > 0$ is sub-exponential if

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda X}] \leq e^{\frac{\lambda^2 \nu^2}{2}}, \quad \forall \lambda: |\lambda| < \frac{1}{\alpha}.$$

Next, we present a lemma from Vershynin (2018) that demonstrates that the two definitions are equivalent up to a constant factor.

LEMMA 1. (*SE properties, Vershynin 2018*). Let X be a random variable with $\mathbb{E}[X] = 0$. Then, there exists a constant c and constants K_4 and K_5 such that $K_4 \leq cK_5$ and $K_5 \leq cK_4$ and the following two properties are equivalent.

- There exists a constant K_4 , such that the MGF of $|X|$ is bounded, specifically

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{|X|/K_4}] \leq 2.$$

- There exists a constant K_5 , such that the MGF of X satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda X}] \leq e^{\frac{K_5^2 \lambda^2}{2}} \quad \forall \lambda \quad \text{s.t.} \quad |\lambda| \leq \frac{1}{K_5}$$

B.2. Review of notations

Here, we first review the notation in Section 3: \mathbf{X} denotes user prompt and \mathbf{Y} denotes the output that consists of a string of tokens $\mathbf{Y} = [Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_N, \dots]$. Each token is chosen from a finite vocabulary set, i.e., $Y_n \in \mathcal{X}$ with size $K := |\mathcal{X}|$. We defined the random variable $Z_n^A := -\log(p_n^A(Y_n))$, and the zero-mean random variable $X_n^A := Z_n^A - \mathbb{E}_{p_n^B}[Z_n^A]$. Additionally, we defined a random variable $S_N^A := \sum_{i=1}^N X_i^A$.

B.3. Proof of Theorem 1 - part (a)

We first provide a high-level structure for our proof. Recall that in part (a), we focus on the case where the generator model B is the same as the evaluator model A . In Remark 5, we show that $\mathbb{E}_{p_n^A}[Z_n^A]$ is upper bounded by $\log K$, and therefore it is finite. In Lemma 2, we show that the random variable $S_N^A = \sum_{i=1}^N X_i^A$ forms a martingale. In Lemma 3, we find the sub-exponential norm for the martingale increments random variable X_n^A . As the last step, we show that martingale sum $\sum_{n=1}^N X_n^A$ is sub-exponential with parameters $(\nu^2 N, \nu)$, with $\nu = c_1 \log K$. Finally, we apply the tail bound for sub-exponential random variables to bound the probability of $|\sum_{n=1}^N X_n^A|$ being larger than a constant t . A challenge in applying the common concentration bounds for martingales is that martingale increments are not necessarily bounded. We overcome this issue by showing that the martingale differences, while not bounded, admit a light tail. In particular, we show that the martingale differences are sub-exponential.

REMARK 5.

$$\mathbb{E}_{p_n^A}[Z_n^A] = - \sum_{y_n \in \mathcal{X}} p_n^A(y_n) \log p_n^A(y_n) \leq \log K.$$

Proof. Concavity of $-p_n^A(y_n) \log p_n^A(y_n)$ yields that its maximizer is $p_n^{*A}(y_n) = \frac{1}{K}, \forall y_n \in \mathcal{X}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{p_n^A}[Z_n^A] &= - \sum_{y_n \in \mathcal{X}} p_n^A(y_n) \log p_n^A(y_n) \leq \sum_{y_n \in \mathcal{X}} p_n^{*A}(y_n) \log p_n^{*A}(y_n) \\ &= K \cdot \frac{1}{K} \cdot \log K = \log K. \end{aligned}$$

□

Now that we have shown $\mathbb{E}_{p_n^A}[Z_n^A] < \infty$, recall that we defined the zero-mean random variable $X_n^A = Z_n^A - \mathbb{E}_{p_n^A}[Z_n^A]$. Then, we defined $S_N^A = \sum_{i=1}^N X_i^A$, which as we show in Lemma 2, forms a martingale.

LEMMA 2. If the evaluator model A is the same as the generator model B that generates the string \mathbf{Y}_N , then the random variable $S_N = \sum_{i=1}^N X_i^A$ forms a martingale.

Proof. Z_n^A and as a result $\mathbb{E}_{p_n^A}(y_n)$ are positive random variables. In Remark 5, we showed that $\mathbb{E}_{p_n^A}[Z_n] \leq \log K$. Therefore, we have $\mathbb{E}[|X_n^A|] \leq \log K$. For a random variable to form a martingale, the following two properties need to be satisfied: (i) $\mathbb{E}[|S_{N+1}^A - S_N^A|] < \infty$, and (ii) $\mathbb{E}[S_{N+1}^A | S_N^A] = S_N^A$.

Property (i) is satisfied because $\mathbb{E}[|S_{N+1}^A - S_N^A|] = \mathbb{E}[|X_{N+1}^A|] \leq \log K < \infty$.

Property (ii) is satisfied because the martingale increments X_n^A are, by definition, a zero-mean random variable conditioned on past tokens.

□

LEMMA 3. The sub-exponential norm for the random variable X_n^A equals $2 \log(K)$.

Proof For the random variable to be sub-exponential, by Definition 1, we need to find t such that

$$\sum_{y_n \in \mathcal{X}} p_n^A(y_n) e^{\frac{-\log p_n^A(y_n) - \mathbb{E}[Z_n^A]}{t}} \leq e^{\frac{\mathbb{E}[Z_n]}{t}} \sum_{y_n \in \mathcal{X}} p_n^A(y_n) \frac{1}{p_n^A(y_n)^{1/t}} = e^{\frac{\mathbb{E}[Z_n]}{t}} \sum_{y_n \in \mathcal{X}} p_n^A(y_n)^{\frac{t-1}{t}} \leq 2. \quad (9)$$

where the first inequality follows from the triangle inequality and that Z_n and therefore $\mathbb{E}[Z_n]$ are positive. Note that $\sum_{y_n \in \mathcal{X}} p_n^A(y_n)^{\frac{t-1}{t}}$ is concave in $p_n^A(y_n)$. Hence, it attains its maximum when we have $p_n^A(y_i) = p_n^A(y_j) \quad \forall y_i, y_j \in \mathcal{X}$, which yields

$$\sum_{y_n \in \mathcal{X}} p_n^A(y_n)^{\frac{t-1}{t}} \leq K \left(\frac{1}{K}\right)^{\frac{t-1}{t}} = K^{\frac{1}{t}}. \quad (10)$$

To analyze $e^{\frac{\mathbb{E}[Z_n^A]}{t}}$, we first want to show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Z_n^A] &= - \sum_{y_n \in \mathcal{X}} p_n^A(y_n) \log p_n^A(y_n) \\ &\leq \log(K). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

To show that, note that by concavity of $-p_n^A(y_n) \log p_n^A(y_n)$, we can maximize $p_n(y_n) \log p_n(y_n)$ by equalizing all probabilities $p^*(y_n) = \frac{1}{K}; \forall n$. So, we have

$$\begin{aligned} - \sum_{y_n \in \mathcal{X}} p_n^A(y_n) \log p_n^A(y_n) &\leq - \sum_{y_n \in \mathcal{X}} p^*(y_n) \log p^*(y_n) \\ &= -K \left[\frac{1}{K} \log \frac{1}{K} \right] = \log K. \end{aligned}$$

Combining equations (9)-(11) yields that for X_n to be sub-exponential with norm t , it must satisfy

$$K^{1/t} K^{1/t} \leq 2.$$

Hence, X_n^A has sub-exponential norm $\|X\|_{\psi_1} = 2 \log(K)$. □

Proof of Theorem 1 part (a)

Proof. Next, note that by Lemma 3 and Lemma 1, there exists $c_1 > 0$ s.t. for $\nu = c_1 \log K$, and for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda X_n^A} | \mathbf{Y}_{n-1}] \leq e^{\frac{\nu^2 \lambda^2}{2}} \quad \forall |\lambda| \leq \frac{1}{\nu}. \quad (12)$$

By Definition 2, we have $X_n \in SE(\nu^2, \nu)$.

Our next step is to show that $\sum_{n=1}^N X_n$ is SE with parameters $(\nu^2 N, \nu)$. To realize that, observe that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{\lambda (\sum_{k=1}^n X_k^A)} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\lambda (\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} X_k^A)} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\lambda X_n^A} | \mathbf{Y}_{n-1} \right] \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\lambda \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} X_k^A} \right] e^{\frac{\lambda^2 \nu^2}{2}} \leq e^{\frac{\lambda^2 N \nu^2}{2}},$$

where the first equation follows from the iterated law of expectation, and the first inequality follows from Equation (12).

Finally, if $S \in SE(\nu^2, \alpha)$ is a sub-exponential random variable, then

$$\mathbb{P}(|S - \mathbb{E}[S]| \geq t_1) \leq 2 \exp \left(- \frac{1}{2} \min \left(\frac{t_1^2}{\nu^2}, \frac{t_1}{\alpha} \right) \right). \quad (13)$$

Substituting for the zero-mean random variable $\sum_{n=1}^N X_n$ that is sub-exponential with parameters $(\nu^2 N, \nu)$, with $\nu = c_1 \log K$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{n=1}^N X_n^A \right| \geq t_1 \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(- \frac{1}{2} \min \left(\frac{t_1^2}{N(c_1 \log K)^2}, \frac{t_1}{c_1 \log K} \right) \right).$$

Setting $t_1 = tN$, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{N} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N X_i^A \right| \geq t \right) \leq 2 \exp \left[- \frac{Nt}{c_1 \log(K)} \min \left(1, \frac{t}{c_1 \log(K)} \right) \right].$$

This concludes the proof for Theorem 1 part (a). □

B.4. Proof of Theorem 1 - part (b)

Similar to the proof of part (a), here we provide a high-level structure for our proof. First, recall from the discussion under Assumption 1, as proved in Equation 5, that $\mathbb{E}_{p_n^A}[Z_n^A]$ is upper bounded by $-\log(\epsilon)$, and therefore it is finite. Then, In Lemma 4, we show that the random variable $S_N^A = \sum_{i=1}^N X_i^A$ forms a martingale. In Lemma 5, we find the sub-exponential norm for the martingale increments random variable X_n^A . As the last step, we show that martingale sum $\sum_{n=1}^N X_n^A$ is sub exponential with parameters $(\nu^2 N, \nu)$, where $\nu = -c_2 \log(\epsilon)$. Finally, we apply the tail bound for sub-exponential random variables to bound the probability of $|\sum_{n=1}^N X_n^A|$ being larger than a constant t .

LEMMA 4. *Under assumption 1, the random variable $S_N^A = \sum_{i=1}^N X_i^A$ forms a martingale.*

Proof. Z_n^A is a positive random variables, so $\mathbb{E}_{p_n^A}[Z_n^A]$ is also positive. In Equation (5), we have shown that $\mathbb{E}_{p_n^A}[Z_n^A]$ is upper bounded by $-\log(\epsilon)$, and therefore we have $\mathbb{E}[|X_n^A|] \leq -\log(\epsilon)$. For a random variable to form a martingale, the following two properties need to be satisfied: (i) $\mathbb{E}[|S_{N+1}^A - S_N^A|] < \infty$, and (ii) $\mathbb{E}[S_{N+1}^A | S_N^A] = S_N^A$.

Property (i) is satisfied because $\mathbb{E}[|S_{N+1}^A - S_N^A|] = \mathbb{E}[|X_{N+1}^A|] \leq -\log(\epsilon) < \infty$.

Property (ii) is satisfied because the martingale increments X_n^A are, by definition, a zero-mean random variable conditioned on past tokens. □

LEMMA 5. Under Assumption 1, the sub-exponential norm for the random variable X_n equals $-4\log(\epsilon)$.

Proof. For the random variable to be sub-exponential, by definition 1, we need to find t such that

$$\sum_{y_n \in \mathcal{X}} p_n^B(y_n) e^{\frac{-\log p_n^A(y_n) - \mathbb{E}[Z_n^A]}{t}} \leq e^{\frac{\mathbb{E}[Z_n^A]}{t}} \sum_{y_n \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{p_n^B(y_n)}{p_n^A(y_n)^{1/t}} \leq e^{\frac{\mathbb{E}[Z_n^A]}{t}} \sum_{y_n \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{p_n^B(y_n)}{\epsilon^{1/t}} \leq e^{\frac{\mathbb{E}[Z_n^A] - \log(\epsilon)}{t}} \leq 2.$$

Thus, for X_n to be sub-exponential with norm t , it is sufficient to satisfy

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}[Z_n^A] - \log(\epsilon)}{t} \leq \log(2) \leq 1/2. \quad (14)$$

Recall equation 5 that states

$$\mathbb{E}_{p_n^B}[Z_n^A] = \sum_{y_n \in \mathcal{X}} -p_n^B(y_n) \log(p_n^A(y_n)) \leq -\log(\epsilon).$$

Substituting the result of (5) in (14) yields that X_n^A has sub-exponential norm $\|X\|_{\psi_1} = -4\log(\epsilon)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1 part (b)

Proof. First note that, by Lemma 5 and Lemma 1, there exists $c_2 > 0$ s.t. for $\nu = -c_2 \log(\epsilon)$, and for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda X_n^A} | \mathbf{Y}_{n-1}] \leq e^{\frac{\nu^2 \lambda^2}{2}} \quad \forall |\lambda| \leq \frac{1}{\nu}. \quad (15)$$

By Definition 2, we have $X_n \in SE(\nu^2, \nu)$. Then, Following the exact same steps as in proof of Theorem 1-part (a), we conclude that $\sum_{n=1}^N X_n^A$ is sub-exponential with parameter $S_N^A \in SE(\nu^2 N, \nu)$, where $\nu = -c_2 \log(\epsilon)$ for a constant $c_2 > 0$. Again, following the exact same steps we described in proof of part (a), from (13) we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{n=1}^N X_n^A\right| \geq t_1\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \min\left(\frac{t_1^2}{N(-c_2 \log \epsilon)^2}, \frac{t_1}{-c_2 \log \epsilon}\right)\right).$$

Finally, setting $t_1 = tN$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{N} \left|\sum_{n=1}^N X_n^A\right| \geq t\right) \leq 2 \exp\left[-\frac{Nt}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \min\left(1, \frac{t}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)}\right)\right].$$

This concludes the proof for Theorem 1 part (b). \square

Appendix C: Statistical test proofs

In Section C.1, we present the proof for Proposition 1. In Section C.2, we first provide a proof overview in the first paragraph, and then provide the proof for Proposition 2.

C.1. Proof of Proposition 1

Proof. Type I error occurs if a model $B_j \in \mathcal{B}$ generates the text string \mathbf{Y}_N , but for one model $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{A_i} < \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{B_j}.$$

This yields for some $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$, we have

$$h_N(B_j, A_i) - h_N(B_j, A_i) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{A_i} \leq h_N(B_j, B_j) - h_N(B_j, B_j) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{B_j}.$$

First, note that by Assumption 2, we have $h_N(B_j, A_i) - h_N(B_j, B_j) \geq \epsilon_1$. Hence, the Type I error occurs only if at least for one of the models $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ we have

$$\epsilon_1 - h_N(B_j, A_i) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{A_i} \leq -h_N(B_j, B_j) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{B_j}.$$

Equivalently, Type I error occurs only if at least for one of the models $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ we have

$$\epsilon_1 \leq \left| -h_N(B_j, A_i) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{A_i} \right| + \left| -h_N(B_j, B_j) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{B_j} \right|.$$

So, Type I error only occurs if, for at least one of the models $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$, we have either $|-h_N(B_j, A_i) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{A_i}| > \epsilon_1/2$ or $|-h_N(B_j, B_j) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{B_j}| > \epsilon_1/2$. Hence, we upper bound the Type I error as

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{B_j} - h_N(B_j, B_j)(\mathbf{Y}_N)\right| \geq \epsilon_1/2\right) + |\mathcal{A}| \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{A_i} - h_N(B_j, A_i)(\mathbf{Y}_N)\right| \geq \epsilon_1/2\right).$$

Next, from Theorem 1-part (a), we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{B_j} - h_N(B_j, B_j)(\mathbf{Y}_N)\right| \geq \epsilon_1/2\right) \leq 2 \exp\left[-\frac{N\epsilon_1/2}{c_1 \log(K)} \min\left(1, \frac{\epsilon_1/2}{c_1 \log(K)}\right)\right].$$

Also, from Theorem 1, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{A_i} - h_N(B_j, A_i)(\mathbf{Y}_N)\right| \geq \epsilon_1/2\right) \leq 2 \exp\left[-\frac{N(\epsilon_1/2)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \min\left(1, \frac{(\epsilon_1/2)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)}\right)\right].$$

Therefore, the Type I error is at most

$$2 \exp\left[-\frac{N\epsilon_1/2}{c_1 \log(K)} \min\left(1, \frac{\epsilon_1/2}{c_1 \log(K)}\right)\right] + 2|\mathcal{A}| \exp\left[-\frac{N(\epsilon_1/2)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \min\left(1, \frac{(\epsilon_1/2)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)}\right)\right].$$

The Type II error occurs if a model $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ generates the text \mathbf{Y}_N , but for a model $B_j \in \mathcal{B}$ we have

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{B_j} < \frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{A_i}.$$

This yields that for some $B_j \in \mathcal{B}$, we have

$$h_N(A_i, B_j) - h_N(A_i, A_i) + \frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{B_j} \leq h_N(A_i, A_i) - h_N(A_i, A_i) + \frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{A_i}.$$

Note that by Assumption 2, we have $h_N(A_i, B_j) - h_N(A_i, A_i) \geq \epsilon_1$. Hence, the Type II error occurs only if at least for one of the models $B_j \in \mathcal{B}$ we have

$$\epsilon_1 - h_N(A_i, B_j) + \frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{B_j} \leq -h_N(A_i, A_i) + \frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{A_i}.$$

Equivalently, the Type II error occurs only if at least for one of the models $B_j \in \mathcal{B}$ we have

$$\epsilon_1 \leq \left| -h_N(A_i, B_j) + \frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{B_j} \right| + \left| -h_N(A_i, A_i) + \frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{A_i} \right|.$$

So, the Type II error only occurs if at least for one of the models $B_j \in \mathcal{B}$, we have either $|-h_N(A_i, B_j) + \frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{B_j}| > \epsilon_1/2$ or $|-h_N(A_i, A_i) + \frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{A_i}| > \epsilon_1/2$. Hence, we upper bound the Type II error as

$$|\mathcal{B}| \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{B_j} - h_N(A_i, B_j)(\mathbf{Y}_N)\right| \geq \epsilon_1/2\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{A_i} - h_N(A_i, A_i)(\mathbf{Y}_N)\right| \geq \epsilon_1/2\right).$$

Next, from Theorem 1 we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{B_j} - h_N(A_i, B_j)(\mathbf{Y}_N)\right| \geq \epsilon_1/2\right) \leq 2 \exp\left[-\frac{N(\epsilon_1/2)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \min\left(1, \frac{(\epsilon_1/2)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)}\right)\right].$$

Also, from Theorem 1 part (a) we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{A_i} - h_N(A_i, A_i)(\mathbf{Y}_N)\right| \geq \epsilon_1/2\right) \leq 2 \exp\left[-\frac{N\epsilon_1/2}{c_1 \log(K)} \min\left(1, \frac{\epsilon_1/2}{c_1 \log(K)}\right)\right].$$

Therefore, the Type II error is at most

$$2|\mathcal{B}| \exp\left[-\frac{N(\epsilon_1/2)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \min\left(1, \frac{(\epsilon_1/2)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)}\right)\right] + 2 \exp\left[-\frac{N\epsilon_1/2}{c_1 \log(K)} \min\left(1, \frac{\epsilon_1/2}{c_1 \log(K)}\right)\right].$$

□

C.2. Proof of Proposition 2

In this section, we present the proof for a generalized version of Proposition 2. In particular, we first present Lemma 6 that provides an upper bound on the probability that, under the sufficient condition in Equation (6) from Remark 4, the absolute value of the difference between the cross-entropy of the (unknown) generator model B and the evaluator model A and the entropy of the evaluator model A over string \mathbf{Y}_N be less than or equal to a threshold c_3 , i.e., Assumption 3 holds for a constant c_3 except for an exponentially small probability in N . In the proof of Proposition 2, we use Lemma 6 as one of the three key inequalities that yield an upper bound on Type I error. Note that providing an upper bound on the Type II error does not require any assumptions.

LEMMA 6. *Under Assumption 3, for any positive constant $c_3 < \epsilon_2$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|h_N(B, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N) - h_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N)| \leq c_3\right) \leq 2 \exp\left[-\frac{N(\epsilon_2 - c_3)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \min\left(1, \frac{(\epsilon_2 - c_3)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)}\right)\right].$$

Proof. We prove this lemma in three steps.

Step 1. sub-exponential norm for $[D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A) | \mathbf{Y}_{n-2}]$

For the random variable $D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A)$, applying (5) we obtain

$$D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A) = \sum_{y_n \in \mathcal{X}} p_n^A(y_n) (\log(p_n^A(y_n)) - \log(p_n^B(y_n))) \leq \sum_{y_n \in \mathcal{X}} -p_n^A(y_n) \log(p_n^B(y_n)) \leq -\log(\epsilon), \quad (16)$$

where the first inequality holds since $\sum_{y_n \in \mathcal{X}} p_n^A(y_n) \log(p_n^A(y_n)) \leq 0$, and the second inequality holds by Assumption 1.

For the random variable to be sub-exponential, by Definition 1, we need to find t such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{\frac{|D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A) - \mathbb{E}[D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A)]|}{t}} \right] \leq 2.$$

Applying (16), for the random variable to be sub-exponential with norm t , it is sufficient to satisfy

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{\frac{|D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A) - \mathbb{E}[D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A)]|}{t}} \right] \leq e^{-\frac{2 \log(\epsilon)}{t}} \leq 2.$$

Hence, $[D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A) | \mathbf{Y}_{n-2}]$ has sub-exponential norm $-4 \log(\epsilon)$.

Step 2. Concentration bounds for $[D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A) | \mathbf{Y}_{n-2}]$

Following the same steps as in the proof for Theorem 1- part (a), we conclude that $\sum_{n=1}^N [D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A) | \mathbf{Y}_{n-2}]$ is sub-exponential with parameter $S_N \in SE(\nu\sqrt{N}, \alpha)$, where $\alpha = \nu = -c_2 \log(\epsilon)$ for a constant $c_2 > 0$. Then, from (13) we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{n=1}^N D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A) - \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}[D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A)] \right| \geq t \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \min \left(\frac{t^2}{N(-c_2 \log(\epsilon))^2}, \frac{t}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \right) \right).$$

Next, setting $t = (\epsilon_2 - c_3)N$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{n=1}^N D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A) - \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}[D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A)] \right| \geq t \right) \leq 2 \exp \left[-\frac{N(\epsilon_2 - c_3)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \min \left(1, \frac{(\epsilon_2 - c_3)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \right) \right]. \quad (17)$$

Step 3. Tail bound for cross-entropy

In this proof, for notation brevity we write $D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A)$ instead of $[D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A) | \mathbf{Y}_{n-2}]$, and $\mathbb{E}[D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A)]$ instead of $\mathbb{E}[D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A) | \mathbf{Y}_{n-2}]$.

First, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| h_N(B, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N) - h_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N) \right| \\ &= \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A) + h_N(B, B)(\mathbf{Y}_N) - h_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N) \right| \\ &\geq \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A) \right| - \left| h_N(B, B)(\mathbf{Y}_N) - h_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N) \right| \\ &\geq \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A) \right| - h_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=3}^N \mathbb{E}[D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A)] + \epsilon_2, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where the first equality uses the definition of cross-entropy. The first and second inequality follow from the triangle inequality. The third inequality follows from Assumption 3.

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\left| h_N(B, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N) - h_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N) \right| \leq c_3 \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}[D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A)] + \epsilon_2 \leq c_3 \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(-\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}[D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A)] \geq -c_3 + \epsilon_2 \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}[D_{KL}(p_n^B || p_n^A)] \right| \geq \epsilon_2 - c_3 \right) \\ &\leq 2 \exp \left[-\frac{N(\epsilon_2 - c_3)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \min \left(1, \frac{\epsilon_2 - c_3}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \right) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from (18). The one-to-last inequality follows from the property of absolute value. The last inequality follows from (17). This concludes the proof. \square

Proof of Proposition 2

Proof. Type I error occurs if a model $B \neq A$ generates the text string \mathbf{Y}_N , but we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^A - h_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N) \right| \leq t.$$

Applying triangle inequality, we have

$$\left| h_N(B, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N) - h_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N) \right| - \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^A - h_N(B, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N) \right| \leq \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^A - h_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N) \right|.$$

Hence, the Type I error is upper bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^A - h_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N)\right| \leq t\right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left|h_N(B, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N) - h_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N)\right| - \left|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^A - h_N(B, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N)\right| \leq t\right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^A - h_N(B, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N)\right| \geq c_3 - t\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\left|h_N(B, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N) - h_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N)\right| \leq c_3\right). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

From Lemma 6, we know that for any positive $c_3 < \epsilon_2$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|h_N(B, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N) - h_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N)\right| \leq c_3\right) \leq 2 \exp\left[-\frac{N(\epsilon_2 - c_3)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \min\left(1, \frac{(\epsilon_2 - c_3)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)}\right)\right]. \quad (20)$$

From Theorem 1 we know that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^A - h_N(B, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N)\right| \geq c_3 - t\right) \leq 2 \exp\left[-\frac{N(c_3 - t)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \min\left(1, \frac{(c_3 - t)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)}\right)\right]. \quad (21)$$

Combining Equations (19-21), we conclude the Type I error is upper bounded as

$$2 \exp\left[-\frac{N(\epsilon_2 - c_3)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \min\left(1, \frac{(\epsilon_2 - c_3)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)}\right)\right] + 2 \exp\left[-\frac{N(c_3 - t)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \min\left(1, \frac{(c_3 - t)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)}\right)\right].$$

Setting $c_3 = \epsilon_2/2$, yields that the Type I error is upper bounded as

$$2 \exp\left[-\frac{N(\epsilon_2/2)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \min\left(1, \frac{(\epsilon_2/2)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)}\right)\right] + 2 \exp\left[-\frac{N(\epsilon_2/2 - t)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)} \min\left(1, \frac{(\epsilon_2/2 - t)}{-c_2 \log(\epsilon)}\right)\right].$$

The Type II error occurs if the model A generates the text \mathbf{Y}_N , but we have

$$\left|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^A - h_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N)\right| \geq t.$$

We upper bound the probability of this event as

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^A - h_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N)\right| \geq t\right) \leq 2 \exp\left[-\frac{Nt}{c_1 \log(K)} \min\left(1, \frac{t}{c_1 \log(K)}\right)\right],$$

where the inequality follows from Theorem 1-part (a). This concludes the proof. \square

Appendix D: Black-box detection proofs

In this section, we determine how large the sample size m must be in order to construct empirical log-perplexity and empirical average cross-entropy statistics that yield the same testing performance as in the white-box setting, even though, unlike in the white-box setting, we do not have direct access to the conditional probability distributions of the models. We first prove Lemma 7, which provides a lower bound on the number of samples m needed so that the empirical quantities $\hat{l}_A(\mathbf{Y}_N)$ and $\hat{h}_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N)$ uniformly approximate their white-box counterparts $l_A(\mathbf{Y}_N)$ and $h_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N)$ with high probability. Building on this lemma, we then establish Propositions 3 and 4, showing that, under the corresponding sample size requirements, the tests based on these empirical black-box statistics achieve Type I and Type II error guarantees that match those of the white-box tests in Propositions 1 and 2, up to constant slack in the thresholds.

D.1. Lemma 7 and its proof

LEMMA 7. Fix $\delta \in (0, 1)$, then for any $\epsilon > 0$, if we choose the sampling size according to

$$m \geq \frac{1}{2\epsilon^2} \log\left(\frac{2N}{\delta}\right).$$

Then, with probability of at least $(1 - \delta)$ over the sampling used to build \hat{p}_n^A , we have

$$\left|\hat{l}_A(\mathbf{Y}_N) - l_A(\mathbf{Y}_N)\right| \leq \frac{4\epsilon}{\epsilon}.$$

Additionally,

$$\left|\hat{h}_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N) - h_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N)\right| \leq 2K\epsilon \log K + (K\epsilon)^{1/2}.$$

Proof. Fixing a vocabulary order on the language model $\mathcal{X} = \{1, \dots, K\}$, we form the corresponding right-continuous empirical cdf $\hat{F}_n(k) := \sum_{i \leq k} \hat{p}_n^A(i)$. Let $F_n(k) := \sum_{i \leq k} p_n^A(i)$ be the true cdf. The Dvoretzky–Kiefer–Wolfowitz (DKW) inequality implies that, for each n , for all $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{k \in [K]} |\hat{F}_n(k) - F_n(k)| > \epsilon\right) \leq 2e^{-2m\epsilon^2}. \quad (22)$$

The bound in (22) holds for any fixed n . We next aim to find a guarantee that the bound holds simultaneously for all $n = 1, \dots, N$. Let

$$A_n := \left\{ \sup_{k \in [K]} |\hat{F}_n(k) - F_n(k)| > \varepsilon \right\}.$$

Denote the undesirable event that the n^{th} empirical cdf deviates from its true counterpart by more than ε . Applying the union bound on (22) yields

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^N A_n\right) \leq \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{P}(A_n) \leq 2Ne^{-2m\varepsilon^2}.$$

To ensure that this joint failure probability does not exceed a prescribed level $\delta \in (0, 1)$, we require

$$2Ne^{-2m\varepsilon^2} \leq \delta.$$

Simplifying the expression yields

$$m \geq \frac{1}{2\varepsilon^2} \log\left(\frac{2N}{\delta}\right). \quad (23)$$

Hence, if m satisfies (7), then with a probability of at least $(1 - \delta)$, for all $n = 1, \dots, N$,

$$\sup_{k \in [K]} |\hat{F}_n(k) - F_n(k)| \leq \varepsilon.$$

We denote this event by $\mathcal{A} := \left\{ \sup_{k \in [K]} |\hat{F}_n(k) - F_n(k)| \leq \varepsilon \right\}$. Under \mathcal{A} , the empirical and the true cdf satisfy $\sup_{k \in [K]} |\hat{F}_n(k) - F_n(k)| \leq \varepsilon$. For discrete ordered alphabets, each probability mass entry can be expressed as $\hat{p}_n^A(i) = \hat{F}_n(i) - \hat{F}_n(i-1)$ and $p_n^A(i) = F_n(i) - F_n(i-1)$, with $F_n(0) = 0$. Hence,

$$|\hat{p}_n^A(i) - p_n^A(i)| = \left| (\hat{F}_n(i) - F_n(i)) - (\hat{F}_n(i-1) - F_n(i-1)) \right| \leq |\hat{F}_n(i) - F_n(i)| + |\hat{F}_n(i-1) - F_n(i-1)| \leq 2\varepsilon,$$

which implies

$$\max_{Y \in \mathcal{X}} |\hat{p}_n^A(Y) - p_n^A(Y)| \leq 2\varepsilon. \quad (24)$$

Denote by $\text{TV}(\hat{p}_n^A, p_n^A)$, the total variation distance between \hat{p}_n^A and p_n^A . Summing over all $i \in [K]$ yields

$$\|\hat{p}_n^A - p_n^A\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^K |\hat{p}_n^A(i) - p_n^A(i)| \leq 2K\varepsilon, \quad (25)$$

and

$$\text{TV}(\hat{p}_n^A, p_n^A) = \frac{1}{2} \|\hat{p}_n^A - p_n^A\|_1 \leq K\varepsilon. \quad (26)$$

Fix $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{2K}$, so that, under the event \mathcal{A} , equation (26) simplify to

$$\text{TV}(\hat{p}_n^A, p_n^A) \leq K\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (27)$$

Recall that $H(p_n^A, p_n^A) = -\sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} p_n^A(y) \log p_n^A(y)$, and define $h_2(x) := -x \log x - (1-x) \log(1-x)$. For the pmfs \hat{p}_n^A, p_n^A on the K -point alphabet, the Fannes–Audenaert continuity bound for Shannon entropy yields

$$|H(\hat{p}_n^A, \hat{p}_n^A) - H(p_n^A, p_n^A)| \leq \text{TV}(\hat{p}_n^A, p_n^A) \log(K-1) + h_2(\text{TV}(\hat{p}_n^A, p_n^A)), \quad (28)$$

where $\text{TV}(\hat{p}_n^A, p_n^A) \in [0, 1]$. Simplifying (28) using the upper-bound in (27) yields

$$|H(\hat{p}_n^A, \hat{p}_n^A) - H(p_n^A, p_n^A)| \leq (K\varepsilon) \log(K-1) + h_2(K\varepsilon). \quad (29)$$

Upper-bounding (29) using $h_2(x) \leq x \log \frac{e}{x}$ for $x \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ yields

$$|H(\hat{p}_n^A, \hat{p}_n^A) - H(p_n^A, p_n^A)| \leq K\varepsilon \log \frac{e(K-1)}{K\varepsilon} \leq K\varepsilon + K\varepsilon \log K + (K\varepsilon)^{1/2}. \quad (30)$$

This yields

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N |H(\hat{p}_n^A, \hat{p}_n^A) - H(p_n^A, p_n^A)| \leq K\varepsilon + K\varepsilon \log K + (K\varepsilon)^{1/2}.$$

Hence, by triangle inequality

$$|\hat{h}_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N) - h_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N)| \leq K\varepsilon + K\varepsilon \log K + (K\varepsilon)^{1/2}$$

Next, to calculate the error in estimating the log-perplexity using sampling, we have for $\varepsilon < \varepsilon/4$, whenever $p_n^A(Y_n) > 0$, on the event \mathcal{A} , applying the Mean Value Theorem, we have

$$|\log \hat{p}_n^A(Y_n) - \log p_n^A(Y_n)| \leq \frac{|\hat{p}_n^A(Y_n) - p_n^A(Y_n)|}{\min\{p_n^A(Y_n), \hat{p}_n^A(Y_n)\}} \leq \frac{2\varepsilon}{\min\{p_n^A(Y_n), \hat{p}_n^A(Y_n)\}} \leq \frac{4\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}, \quad (31)$$

where the second inequality follows from (24), and last inequality follows from the positivity condition that yields $\min\{p_n^A(Y_n), \hat{p}_n^A(Y_n)\} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. This yields

$$|\hat{l}_A(\mathbf{Y}_N) - l_A(\mathbf{Y}_N)| \leq \frac{4\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}.$$

□

D.2. Proof of Proposition 3

Proof. As we show in Lemma 7, by setting

$$\varepsilon = \min\left(\frac{\epsilon_1 \epsilon}{16}, \frac{\epsilon_1}{16K \log K}, \frac{\epsilon_1^2}{64K}\right),$$

and

$$m \geq \frac{1}{2\varepsilon^2} \log\left(\frac{2N}{\delta}\right)$$

with probability of at least $1 - \delta$, for each model $M \in \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}$, we have

$$|\hat{l}_M(\mathbf{Y}_N) - l_M(\mathbf{Y}_N)| \leq \frac{4\varepsilon}{\epsilon} \leq \epsilon_1/4.$$

Hence, a union bound yields that with probability of at least $1 - (|\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{B}|)\delta$, for all models $M \in \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}$, we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^M - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{Z}_n^M \right| \leq \frac{\epsilon_1}{4}.$$

This yields that with probability of at least $1 - (|\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{B}|)\delta$ for any model $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ and any model $B_j \in \mathcal{B}$, we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{A_i} - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^{B_j} \right| - \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{Z}_n^{A_i} - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{Z}_n^{B_j} \right| \leq \frac{\epsilon_1}{2}.$$

Therefore, with a probability of at least $1 - (|\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{B}|)\delta$, Type I and Type II errors of the test reduce to that in Proposition 1, with the mere difference that we replace ϵ_1 with $\frac{\epsilon_1}{2}$. \square

D.3. Proof of Proposition 4

Proof. As we show in Lemma 7, by setting

$$\varepsilon = \min\left(\frac{\epsilon_2 \epsilon}{16}, \frac{\epsilon_2}{16K \log K}, \frac{\epsilon_2^2}{64K}\right),$$

and

$$m \geq \frac{1}{2\varepsilon^2} \log\left(\frac{2N}{\delta}\right)$$

with a probability of at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$|\hat{l}_A(\mathbf{Y}_N) - l_A(\mathbf{Y}_N)| \leq \frac{4\varepsilon}{\epsilon} \leq \epsilon_2/4.$$

and

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N |H(\hat{p}_n^A) - H(p_n^A)| \leq 2K\varepsilon \log K + (K\varepsilon)^{1/2} \leq \epsilon_2/4.$$

Hence, with probability of at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N Z_n^A - h_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N) \right| - \left| \hat{l}_A(\mathbf{Y}_N) - \hat{h}_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N) \right| \leq \frac{\epsilon_2}{2}.$$

Therefore, with probability of at least $1 - \delta$ the problem reduces to the problem in Proposition 2 with the mere difference that we replace ϵ_2 with $\frac{\epsilon_2}{2}$. \square

Appendix E: Proof of Corollary 1

Proof. For the statistic T , consider event A as the event that T rejects the null hypothesis. Then, applying Theorem 14.2 from Lattimore and Szepesvári (2020), we obtain

$$\alpha_n(T) + \beta_n(T) \geq \frac{1}{2} e^{-D_{KL}(P_B^{\otimes N} \| P_A^{\otimes N})} = \frac{1}{2} e^{-N \cdot D_{KL}(P_B \| P_A)}, \quad (32)$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Appendix F: Experiment details

F.1. Additional experiment results: convergence results

Convergence results. We conduct our numerical analysis for convergence on the following pre-trained language models: GPT-2 small, GPT-2 medium, GPT-2 large, GPT-2 XL, and GPT-Neo. Through experiments with different generative and evaluator models, we examine whether the log-perplexity of a short portion of text converges to the average cross-entropy. Our experiments measure these values across generated text and analyze their performance over different configurations. Our setup includes generating tokens with pre-trained models and recording each token's selection probability and calculated metrics.

Same generative and evaluator model. In the first set of experiments, we employ GPT-2 to generate a series of 100 tokens, beginning with the fixed prompt "Jack". We use the model's conditional probability distribution for each token generation step to sample the next token. Note that for the white-box model of GPT-2, probability distributions are accessible. We calculate each generated token's empirical entropy and log-perplexity and repeat this process for comparisons. We use softmax-normalized probabilities to select the next token and store the generated token and its probability distribution. For each sub-string of length N starting from the first token in the generated sequence, we compute the log-perplexity $l_A(\mathbf{Y}_N)$, and the empirical entropy $h_N(A, A)(\mathbf{Y}_N)$. The results are shown in Figures (3a-3d). We consistently observe that the numerical results confirm Theorem 1-part (a) that the log-perplexity converges to the average entropy when the generative and evaluator models are the same.




Figure 3 Generated and evaluated by the same model

Different generative and evaluator models. To extend our numerical analysis to the case with different generative and evaluator models, we generate a string using the following generative models: GPT-2 medium, GPT-2 large, and GPT-2 XL. Then, we calculate the log-perplexity of these strings using the evaluator model GPT-2-small. We calculate the cross-entropy of the strings under each generative model and the evaluator model (GPT-2-small). The results are shown in Figures (4a-4c). Results in these figures confirm Theorem 1. In particular, we observe that when the evaluator and generative models are different, the log-perplexity of the string converges to the average cross-entropy of the string under generative and evaluator models.




Figure 4 Generated by GPT-2 small and evaluated by different models

F.2. Additional experiment results: AUROC results

For the AUROC experiments, model samples are generated by sampling from the conditional distribution with Temperature = 1¹⁸. Similar to the results in Table 2, the results in Table 5 demonstrate that our method’s improvement is most pronounced on fact-based datasets such as SQuAD. Additionally, the advantage of our method becomes more visible as the generator becomes larger, e.g., QWEN 32B, where cues that guide detectors that rely on surface signals tend to diminish.

Method	XSum			SQuAD				WritingPrompts			
	LLAMA 3 8B	GPT-NEOX Erebus	QWEN 32B	LLAMA 3 8B	GPT-NEOX Erebus	QWEN 32B	LLAMA 3 8B	GPT-NEOX Erebus	QWEN 32B		
$\log p(x)$	0.98*	0.84	0.99*	0.91	0.75	0.60	1.00	0.95	1.00*		
Rank	0.75	0.69	0.69	0.71	0.71	0.55	0.82	0.80	0.81		
LogRank	0.98*	0.87	0.99*	0.93*	0.81*	0.62	1.00	0.97*	1.00*		
Entropy	0.39	0.70	0.40	0.37	0.66	0.70*	0.04	0.36	0.02		
DetectGPT	0.78	0.95	0.99*	0.55	0.78	0.62	0.68	0.97*	0.99		
Binoculars	0.78	0.95	0.99*	0.55	0.78	0.62	0.68	0.97*	0.99		
Ours	0.99	0.99	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.97	0.98*	1.00	1.00		
Diff (zero-shot)	0.01	0.04	0.01	0.06	0.18	0.27	-0.02	0.03	0.00		
Roberta (base)	0.98*	0.95	0.92*	0.97*	0.92	0.69*	0.97*	0.95*	0.74*		
Roberta (large)	0.98*	0.98*	0.92*	0.95	0.93*	0.68	0.96	0.93	0.65		
Ours	0.99	0.99	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.97	0.98	1.00	1.00		
Diff (supervised)	0.01	0.01	0.08	0.02	0.06	0.28	0.01	0.05	0.26		

Table 5 AUROC for detecting samples from the given models on the datasets. The best AUROC values are in bold, and the second-best values are marked with an asterisk (*). The rows Diff(zero-shot) and Diff(supervised) show our AUROC improvement over the strongest zero-shot and supervised baseline methods.

F.3. Comparison with Binoculars (white-box access detection)

Hans et al. (2024a) attempts to normalize away domain difficulty using a two-model construction: It pairs an observer model with a closely related performer model, computes the observer’s usual perplexity on the candidate text, and then computes a cross-perplexity term that measures how well the observer agrees with the performer’s next-token distribution; taking a (log-)ratio of these quantities reduces sensitivity to unfamiliar topics that can inflate likelihood-based scores. The key point is that the performer is not assumed to be the true generator of the text; it is an internal proxy meant to represent typical machine continuation in that context. This method works particularly well for longer, open-ended generations where model-generated text tends to follow trajectories that remain consistently machine-typical across LLMs, while human writing introduces more idiosyncratic choices that reduce cross-model agreement. However, this method degrades when outputs are short or highly constrained, e.g., in fact-heavy datasets, because humans and LLMs often select a similar, narrow set of high-probability tokens. When generators become very large/strong, the method can also degrade because the performer may fail to be a representative proxy for the target generator class, and the separation intuition in Hans et al. (2024a) that the performer is closer to the observer than humans are can weaken as generators approach human-like compatibility with the observer’s predictions; in both cases, the cross-perplexity baseline no longer plays its intended role and the ratio becomes less useful.

¹⁸ Following common practice, we sample with temperature $T=1$, i.e., from the model’s unmodified conditional distribution (no logit rescaling before the softmax). For more discussion on the effects of temperature on token conditional probability distribution, see e.g. Hinton et al. (2015) and Holtzman et al. (2020). Temperature rescales logits as $\text{softmax}(u/T)$: lower temperatures ($T < 1$) concentrate probability mass on the most probable tokens, making generations less diverse, while higher temperatures ($T > 1$) produce a softer/flatter distribution that increases randomness by giving relatively more weight to lower-probability tokens.

F.4. Comparison with Fast-DetectGPT and Binoculars (no access to evaluator)

Fast-DetectGPT works well in adversarial attack settings when small random perturbations produce a clear, consistent scoring shift, typically on longer, regularly tokenized passages where LLM outputs follow high-probability continuations (e.g., greedy decoding), but it weakens on short or lexically variable text where the perturbation signal is noisy. Binoculars helps when perplexity in isolation is entangled with topic or style by contrasting two models’ likelihoods to cancel domain and prompt effects, though it can fail if that normalization also removes the key gap (e.g., both models are similarly mismatched to the domain, or the generator is close to a reference model), and it is also less reliable on short inputs. By contrast, our method is more robust when decoding heuristics introduce occasional low-probability word choices that can look human to perplexity alone, because it can still detect the resulting mismatch between surprisal and contextual uncertainty.

F.5. Dataset details



Figure 5 Overview of the three datasets used in our detection experiments.

We use the codes in the official GitHub repository for DetectGPT (Mitchell et al. 2023), which is publicly available under the MIT license in <https://github.com/eric-mitchell/detect-gpt> for our white-box experiments. The datasets for this set of experiments are XSum, SQuAD, and Reddit writingPrompts that we briefly describe below. We use the codes in the official GitHub repository for the RAID dataset Dugan et al. (2024) for our black-box experiments. The RAID dataset uses a variety of datasets from 8 domains, briefly described below. For details about the RAID dataset, please refer to Appendix E.1 in Dugan et al. (2024).

XSum. The Extreme Summarization (XSum) dataset comprises 226,711 BBC news articles paired with single-sentence summaries for each article. Each entry includes a **document** (the full news article), a **summary** (a concise, one-sentence abstraction), and an **id** (the BBC article identifier). The dataset is designed to support the task of extreme abstractive summarization, where models must generate highly condensed summaries that capture the essence of the source text. The XSum dataset is publicly available under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-SA 4.0) license and can be accessed at <https://huggingface.co/datasets/EdinburghNLP/xsum>. In our experiments, we utilize the first 30 tokens of the **document** column as input for creating LLM-generated text.

SQuAD. The Stanford Question Answering Dataset (SQuAD) is a benchmark for machine reading comprehension, consisting of over 100,000 question-answer pairs derived from 536 Wikipedia articles. Each example includes a **context** paragraph, a **question**, and one or more **answers**, where each answer is a span of text from the corresponding context. SQuAD is publicly available under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-SA 4.0) and can be accessed at <https://huggingface.co/datasets/rajpurkar/squad>. In our experiments, we utilize the first 30 tokens of the **context** column as input for creating LLM-generated text.

Reddit WritingPrompts. The Reddit WritingPrompts dataset comprises over 300,000 prompt-story pairs collected from the r/WritingPrompts subreddit. Each entry includes a **prompt** (a creative writing prompt) and a corresponding **story** (a user-generated narrative response). The dataset is designed to support research in open-ended story generation and narrative modeling. The dataset is publicly available under the MIT License and can be accessed at <https://huggingface.co/datasets/euclaise/writingprompts>. In our experiments, we utilize the first 30 tokens of the **story** field as input for creating LLM-generated text.

RAID. The Robust AI Detection (RAID) dataset is a large-scale benchmark constructed to evaluate the reliability of LLM-generated text detectors across a wide range of textual domains. It comprises over 6 million generations created by 11 language models under 4 decoding strategies and 11 adversarial attacks. RAID includes 8 carefully selected text domains to capture a broad spectrum of natural language styles, structures, and levels of creativity. The domains are

Abstracts. Sourced from arXiv.org, this domain consists of paper abstracts across multiple disciplines. Texts are technical, information-dense, and syntactically formal, reflecting real-world scientific writing in academic publishing.

Books. Drawn from the BookCorpus dataset, this domain features long-form fictional passages including dialogue and narration. It captures informal, imaginative writing with strong character and plot structure diversity.

News. Extracted from the CNN/DailyMail summarization corpus, the news domain includes professionally written news stories. These texts are structured with leads and summaries, and often exhibit a neutral tone, making them ideal for assessing generation consistency in journalistic formats.

Poetry. Taken from Project Gutenberg, the poetry domain includes English poems from public domain authors. The texts exhibit high stylistic variability, creative syntax, line breaks, and metaphorical expressions, which are characteristics that typically challenge detection.

Recipes. Based on the RecipeNLG dataset, this domain contains step-by-step cooking instructions and ingredient lists. It features a highly structured and instructional tone with imperative phrasing and domain-specific vocabulary.

Reddit. Sourced from the WritingPrompts subreddit, these texts are user-generated responses to open-ended prompts. The domain features creative fiction in a casual tone, reflecting informal narrative style and internet native conventions.

Reviews. Pulled from Amazon product reviews, this domain contains subjective, opinionated writing with informal grammar and varying tone. It reflects real-world user-generated content that combines evaluation, anecdote, and justification.

Wikipedia. This domain includes encyclopedic entries from Wikipedia, selected for their balanced, objective tone, structured format, and high factual density. Texts are varied in topic and are typically well-edited and linguistically standardized.

To avoid data contamination, all human-written documents were sourced from publicly available corpora with timestamps preceding 2022. For each document, the dataset provides one generation per model, decoding strategy, and adversarial attack. The dataset is publicly available at <https://huggingface.co/datasets/liamdugan/raid> under the MIT License.

F.6. Decoding strategies & Adversarial attacks

F.6.1. Decoding strategies A decoding strategy determines how tokens are selected from the LLM’s (conditional) probability distribution in the text generation process. Greedy decoding selects the most likely (top-ranked) token from the (conditional) probability distribution. Previous research has shown that sampling from the probability distribution rather than selecting the top-ranked token (as done in greedy decoding) can make the LLM-generated text less detectable Ippolito et al. (2019). Based on these findings, Dugan et al. (2024) generates two outputs per prompt: one with greedy decoding and the other with random sampling.

The repetition penalty, as defined in Keskar et al. (2019), reduces the likelihood of generating previously used tokens through down-weighting the probability of choosing the same word in the following tokens using a parameter θ . This penalty examines whether the less-repetitive output (that has undergone repetition penalty) can reduce the detectability of LLM-generated text. Formally, Given a temperature $T > 0$ and a set of scores $s_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for each token i in a vocabulary, the probability p_i of predicting the i^{th} token is

$$p_i = \frac{\exp(s_i/T)}{\sum_j \exp(s_j/T)}.$$

The repetition penalty defined by Keskar et al. (2019) modifies the distribution as

$$\tilde{p}_i = \frac{\exp\left(\frac{s_i}{T \cdot \mathbb{I}(i \in g)}\right)}{\sum_j \exp\left(\frac{s_j}{T \cdot \mathbb{I}(j \in g)}\right)},$$

where g is the list of previously generated tokens, and the indicator function $\mathbb{I}(c)$ is

$$\mathbb{I}(c) = \begin{cases} \theta & \text{if } c \text{ is true,} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Dugan et al. (2024) uses Keskar et al. (2019)’s method and generates two additional outputs: with and without repetition penalty. Following Keskar et al. (2019), we use $\theta = 1.2$ for the experiments.

F.6.2. Adversarial attacks Adversarial attacks in LLM detection are strategically crafted paraphrases or perturbations applied to LLM-generated text that aim to bypass detection by reducing detectable differences between LLM-generated and human-written text. Dugan et al. (2024) produces different adversarially attacked versions of texts for each LLM-generated text. Below are brief descriptions of the attacks and sources from which Dugan et al. (2024) acquired them.

Insert Paragraphs. Bhat and Parthasarathy (2020) injects extra line breaks by putting `\n\n` between sentences. Dugan et al. (2024) does the following process: First, they use `Punkt` to break the LLM-generated text input into individual sentences. Then, they sample θ percent of the spans generated by `Punkt`, and add `\n\n` between sentences to cause a paragraph break.

Article Deletion. Liang et al. (2023a), Guerrero et al. (2022) first search through the text and capture all articles “the,” “a,” and “an” using POS tagging. Then, using random sampling, select a fixed θ percent of the articles and apply the article deletion to them.

Alternative Spelling. Liang et al. (2023b) constructs a mapping between British and American spelling of words using an American to British English dictionary (<https://github.com/hyperreality/American-British-English-Translator>). Then, searches in the LLM-generated text to identify all the words (that also exist) in the dictionary, randomly samples a fixed θ percent of the words (with two spellings), and replaces them with the alternative spelling.

Misspelling. Liang et al. (2023a), Gagiano et al. (2021) use Wikipedia’s commonly misspelled English words dictionary (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Commonly_misspelled_English_words), and find the LLM-generated words that also exist in the misspelling dictionary.

Upper Lower Swap. Gagiano et al. (2021) randomly selects a fixed θ percent of the words in the LLM-generated text, and changes the first letter to uppercase if originally lowercase, and vice versa.

Number Swap. Bhat and Parthasarathy (2020) first searches through the text, and captures all numerical digits in the LLM-generated text. Then, randomly selects a fixed θ percent of the digits and replaces them with a randomly selected digit from 0 to 9.

Whitespace Addition. Cai and Cui (2023), Gagiano et al. (2021) capture all the spaces between tokens, randomly select a fixed θ percent of the spaces, and insert one additional space to each selected space. Note that since the sampling is performed with replacement, the same inter-token space can be chosen multiple times, resulting in a possible insertion of more than one extra space between tokens.

Paraphrasing. Krishna et al. (2023), Sadasivan et al. (2023) transform the source LLM-generated text into an alternative text with the same semantic content (i.e., the conveyed meaning is equivalent, but the content is statistically and stylistically different). Dugan et al. (2024) uses the paraphrasing method in Krishna et al. (2023)’s DIPPER-11B using their HuggingFace repository. DIPPER-11B is a paraphrasing model built on the T5-XXL architecture. The process includes two control parameters: one for lexical diversity (a measure of the variety of the words used in the text) and another for reordering, which adjusts

syntactic transformation. DIPPER-11B encodes the LLM-generated text as input and then decodes a paraphrase as output. Dugan et al. (2024) uses the default setting from Krishna et al. (2023) to apply the paraphrasing attack on all texts in the dataset.

Synonym Swap. Pu et al. (2023) follows the process described in Dugan et al. (2024): first, they mask all tokens, replacing each with a mask-fill from the top-20 candidates in BERT Devlin et al. (2019). Next, they assign the Part-of-Speech (POS) tag, which is a label assigned to each word in a sentence to indicate its grammatical category (such as noun, verb, adjective, or adverb), to each of the mask-fill candidates and remove all those candidates whose POS tag does not match the POS tag for the token in the input text. After creating the final list of valid candidate swaps, they select a fixed θ percent of the texts for performing the Synonym Swap adversarial attack.

Homoglyph. Wolff and Wolff (2020), Gagiano et al. (2021) swap some English characters with visually similar yet technically different characters from the Cyrillic scripts in Wolff and Wolff (2020). Specifically, Dugan et al. (2024) uses homoglyphs for the following ASCII characters: a, A, B, e, E, c, p, K, O, P, M, H, T, X, C, y, o, x, l, i, N, and Z. They identify all these characters in the LLM-generated text, and then replace all of them (i.e., $\theta=100\%$) with the homoglyph counterparts. If a character has more than one homoglyph, they randomly select between them.

Zero-width Space. Guerrero et al. (2022) inserts the Unicode zero-width space character U+200B, which is an invisible character that occupies space in the underlying text encoding without being visible to human readers. Dugan et al. (2024) inserts a zero-width space before and after every visible character in the perturbed text. Note that Dugan et al. (2024)’s dataset for the Homoglyph and Zero-width space attacks is incomplete, not allowing us to provide results for them. Nevertheless, these two attacks are easy to remove with a simple preprocessing step we implement in our code (details in Appendix F.9): First, remove or normalize invisible characters, such as zero-width spaces. Then map suspicious non-ASCII characters to standard ASCII or a canonical form. To find the θ that Dugan et al. (2024) uses for each adversarial attack, please refer to Table 11 in their paper.

F.7. Detector details

RAID (Dugan et al. 2024) evaluates 12 detection methods from neural classifiers, metric-based (zero-shot) detectors, and commercial detectors. All detectors were evaluated using their official implementations or web interfaces without fine-tuning on RAID data. Below is a brief description of each detector and how it was run in Dugan et al. (2024). To check how Dugan et al. (2024) finds the thresholds to achieve FPR of 5%, please refer to Appendix F-2 in Dugan et al. (2024).

RoBERTa (GPT2): fine-tuned to distinguish between human and GPT-2-generated text. It was evaluated using the released Hugging Face checkpoint without modification. RoBERTa-B (GPT2) is a smaller RoBERTa-base version trained on the same dataset. It is computationally lighter, but typically less accurate than the large model.

RoBERTa-B (ChatGPT) (Guo et al. 2023) fine-tuned to detect generations from ChatGPT. Dugan et al. (2024) downloads and queries the detector via HuggingFace datasets with the unique identifier `Hello-SimpleAI/chatgpt-detector-roberta`.

RADAR (Hu et al. 2023) a robust RoBERTa-based detector adversarially trained to resist paraphrasing and rewriting attacks. Used as released without retraining. Dugan et al. (2024) downloads and queries the detector via HuggingFace datasets with the unique identifier `TrustSafeAI/RADAR-Vicuna-7B`.

GLTR (Gehrmann et al. 2019) evaluates the likelihood of text according to an (evaluator) LLM, bins tokens based on their likelihoods, and uses the bins as signals for detection. Dugan et al. (2024) uses the default settings from the GLTR repository (<https://github.com/HendrikStrobel/detecting-fake-text>), which is setting the (evaluator) LLM to GPT2 small and the cutoff threshold at rank=10.

Fast DetectGPT (Bao et al. 2023) DetectGPT evaluates log-probability curvature under paraphrased perturbations. Low curvature regions suggest LLM generations. It was implemented using DetectGPT’s official repository with standard settings. A more efficient variant of DetectGPT that avoids expensive perturbation by approximating curvature metrics is Fast DetectGPT Bao et al. (2023). It was implemented using the default repository configuration, GPTNeo-2.7B as the scoring model, and GPT-J-7 B as the reference model.

Binoculars (Hans et al. 2024a) uses perplexity divided by cross-perplexity for detection. RAID repository uses the code from the Binocular GitHub repository and calculates perplexity using the default models from Binocular’s repository, which are Falcon 7B and Falcon 7B Instruct.

LLMDet (Wu et al. 2023b) uses proxy-perplexity, an approximation of perplexity calculated by repeatedly sampling n-grams from models rather than running the models, of the input text from 10 different small language models. None of the evaluator models used in the detector was used for text generation.

GPTZero (Tian (2023a)) relies on two metrics: *perplexity*, which measures how predictable the text is under an evaluator LLM, and *burstiness*, which captures the variation in perplexity across sentences. Human-written text typically exhibits higher burstiness, while LLM-generated text tends to be more predictable Tian (2023b). Dugan et al. (2024) queried the detector using the v2 API (<https://api.gptzero.me/v2/predict/text>) and threshold on the `completely_generated_prob` field.

Originality Dugan et al. (2024) queried this detector through the v1 API (<https://api.originality.ai/api/v1/scan/ai>) and threshold on the `score` field in the output JSON. They queried the multilingual ”version 3” of the detector for the Czech and German news domains.

Winston Dugan et al. (2024) queried this model through the v1 API (<https://api.gowinston.ai/functions/v1/predict>), set the input language to English, unless the text is in German, where they set the language to German. They threshold on the `score` field in the output JSON.

ZeroGPT Dugan et al. (2024) queried the API (<https://api.zerogpt.com/api/detect/detectText>), and used the `isHuman` field as the classifier output.

F.8. Hardware

All experiments were conducted using a RunPod cloud instance configured with a B200 GPU, 28 vCPUs, and 283 GB of RAM. The setup provided 150 GB of disk and pod volume and achieved bandwidth speeds of up to 20,801 Mbps in the EU-RO-1 region. Experiments were executed in an on-demand secure cloud environment available at <https://www.runpod.io>. Our complete set of experiments required a total of approximately 12 hours of runtime. Because our method is nonparametric and does not require training, the runtime scales linearly with the number of input texts in the dataset. Figure 6 demonstrates the RunPod cloud configuration.




Figure 6 RunPod cloud configuration used for all experiments.

F.9. Code instructions

Contents. We include our self-contained codes as part of our supplementary materials to enable replication of all experiments presented in this work. The repository comprises three Jupyter notebooks: `Whiteboxattribution.ipynb` for identifying the generating model among two candidate sets (codes for the experiments in Section 7.1), `Whiteboxdetection.ipynb` for statistical detection tests in a white-box setting (codes for the experiments in Section 7.2), and `Blackbox_adversarial.ipynb` for evaluating black-box detection and robustness against adversarial attacks (codes for the experiments in Section 7.3). All experiments were run on RunPod (B200) and used Hugging Face models and datasets where applicable.

How to run. Each notebook is fully self-contained and does not require external data downloads or model training, facilitating straightforward execution on personal devices. Each notebook includes

- Installation and environment setup (in the first cells)
- Data loading and preparation
- Full experiment code with results

No setup beyond running the notebook cells is required since all dependencies are installed inline.

Datasets. Most datasets used in the experiments are downloaded programmatically from Hugging Face.

However, if you want to run the WritingPrompts experiments, you will need to download the WritingPrompts dataset manually from <https://github.com/facebookresearch/WritingPrompts>. Then, you need to place the downloaded data in the following path: `data/writingPrompts/`.

Portions of this code are adapted from DetectGPT, available at <https://github.com/eric-mitchell/detect-gpt/tree/main>. We thank the authors of DetectGPT for open-sourcing their codebase.

Appendix G: Additional related literature

G.1. Asymptotic methods

Most theoretical treatments of LLM text detection are asymptotic in the amount of evidence available, and are therefore framed around aggregating many samples rather than deciding from a single short passage. In particular, Chakraborty et al. (2024) analyze detection as hypothesis testing between human and machine distributions over full passages and derive sample-complexity guarantees for the (information-theoretically) optimal likelihood-ratio rule: in the i.i.d. regime, both errors can be driven arbitrarily low by observing sufficiently many independent passages, and their non-i.i.d. extension allows dependence within passages while still relying on collecting many samples that can be partitioned into approximately independent blocks. This “many-passage” asymptotic viewpoint is well suited to settings like account-level or stream-level attribution, but it does not directly yield practically checkable guarantees for the single-passage regime where one observes only one short, dependent token sequence. Sadasivan et al. (2023) relate the best achievable detection performance to how close the human and LLM text generation distributions are, which clarifies that when the distributions become sufficiently similar, no detector—regardless of architecture—can uniformly maintain strong discriminative power. Our contribution is complementary: we specify an attribution problem and present tests with explicit error guarantees under transparent separation conditions, in the practical setting where one observes only a single passage and token generation is non-i.i.d. due to sequential dependence. So, Sadasivan et al. (2023) explains when detection is hard in principle; our work provides a rigorously controlled procedure for how to do detection and attribution in the single-passage regime when there is enough statistical separation to make the task feasible.

G.2. Authorship attribution

The literature on human text author attribution is extensive and, similar to the recent literature on LLM text detection and attribution, had developments over time, e.g., use of statistical hypothesis testing versus discriminative methods like support vector machines, and neural networks. In author attribution with only human authors, there is no access to the text-generation model, and attribution is based solely on samples of text written by different human authors. For surveys on the different methods for human author attribution, we refer readers to Juola et al. (2008), Stamatatos (2009) and Koppel et al. (2009). For a comparison of different methods, we refer readers to Grieve (2007).