



# Watermarks for Embeddings-as-a-Service Large Language Models

by

Anudeex Shetty

Student Number: 1386281

ORCID: [0000-0001-5686-9600](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5686-9600)

Supervisors:

Dr. Qiongkai Xu

Dr. Jey Han Lau

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment for the  
degree of Master of Computer Science

in the

School of Computing and Information Systems  
Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology  
**THE UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE**

December 2025

# *Abstract*

Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated exceptional capabilities in natural language understanding and generation. Based on these LLMs, businesses have started to provide Embeddings-as-a-Service (EaaS), offering feature extraction capabilities (in the form of text embeddings) that benefit downstream natural language processing tasks. However, prior research has demonstrated that EaaS is vulnerable to imitation attacks, where an attacker clones the service’s model in a black-box manner without access to the model’s internal workings. These imitation attacks pose significant financial risks to LLM owners due to the substantial costs associated with training these language models. In response, watermarks have been added to the text embeddings to protect the intellectual property of EaaS providers by allowing them to check for model ownership. This thesis focuses on defending against imitation attacks by investigating EaaS watermarks. To achieve this goal, we unveil novel attacks and propose and validate new watermarking techniques.

Firstly, we show that existing EaaS watermarks can be removed through paraphrasing the *input text* when attackers clone the model during imitation attacks. Our study illustrates that paraphrasing can effectively bypass current state-of-the-art EaaS watermarks across various attack setups (including different paraphrasing techniques and models) and datasets in most instances. This demonstrates a new vulnerability in recent EaaS watermarking techniques.

Subsequently, as a countermeasure, we propose a novel watermarking technique, **WET** (**W**atermarking **E**aaS with **L**inear **T**ransformation), which employs linear transformation of the embeddings. Watermark verification is conducted by applying a reverse transformation and comparing the similarity between recovered and original embeddings. We demonstrate its robustness against paraphrasing attacks with near-perfect verifiability. We conduct detailed ablation studies to assess the significance of each component and hyperparameter in **WET**.

The techniques (both the paraphrasing attack and **WET** defence) proposed in this thesis are novel and have been analysed empirically and theoretically. Lastly, we provide a critical analysis and a discussion on current limitations and future directions as the conclusion of the thesis. The source code used in this work has been made open source to spur future research.<sup>1</sup>

**Keywords:** natural language processing, large language models, embedding, imitation attack, watermark, copyright protection, security

---

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/anudeex/WET>

# Declaration of Authorship

I, Anudeex Shetty, declare that this thesis titled, ‘Watermarks for Embeddings-as-a-Service Large Language Models’ and the work presented in it are my own. I certify that:

- this thesis does not incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a degree or diploma in any university; and that to the best of my knowledge and belief it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person where due reference is not made in the text.
- where necessary I have received clearance for this research from the Universitys Ethics Committee and have submitted all required data to the School.
- the thesis is 21,032 words in length (excluding text in images, tables, bibliographies, and appendices).

Signed: Anudeex Shetty

---

Date: 28 October, 2024

---

# Preface

Large portions of content in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 have appeared in the following paper:

**Anudeex Shetty**, Qionghai Xu, and Jey Han Lau. 2025. [WET: Overcoming Paraphrasing Vulnerabilities in Embeddings-as-a-Service with Linear Transformation Watermarks](#). In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2302423043, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.

The Chapters 1, 2, and 5 of this thesis were adapted and modified from the research proposal (another assessment component of the research project).

# *Acknowledgements*

First and foremost, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my supervisors, Dr. Qiongkai Xu and Dr. Jey Han Lau. You both are remarkable researchers and inspiring personalities. To Qiongkai, thank you for believing in me and offering me the research opportunity during the summer of 2023. Your faith in my abilities instilled the confidence that perhaps I could do research. Jey Han, thank you for sparking my interest in NLP through your engaging teaching. I am very grateful I was able to manifest working under your supervision. I have learned a lot and grown as a researcher under both of your supervision. I sincerely hope we can continue our collaboration and I grow further with a PhD under your guidance. I would also like to extend my heartfelt thanks to Dr. Andrew Cullen, Dr. Sarah Erfani, Dr. Simon Coghlan, Dr. Olya Ohrimenko, and Dr. Renata Borovica-Gajic from the School of CIS. Your invaluable guidance and the opportunities you provided have been instrumental in shaping my academic journey at UniMelb.

Next, my family and friends, who stuck by me through my absence and eccentricities during this research project I am incredibly grateful.

I am especially thankful to my friends in Melbourne. Safna Hassan, thank you for always answering my endless questions and for your unwavering encouragement. Thank you, the whole Newman College community and the college leadership, for all your support and guidance. To my three beautiful friends at Newman College Derrick Otoo-Addo, María Noriega, and Shree Kotwal you have been my pillars of strength on which I have rested countless times. Thank you for never giving up on me. Derrick, you are like a brother to me, and I cherish our late-night hangouts. Shree, you are the friend I have missed in my life. Thank you for pushing me and keeping me grounded with your unfiltered advice. María, you are a unique friend, and I am grateful for our heartfelt conversations. Muchas gracias for always making me feel positive and memorable moments. Thank you, Travis Davies, for the memorable team project experiences at UniMelb. Special thanks to Matthew Farrugia-Roberts for all your guidance, help, and writing sessions. I am also appreciative of the companionship of my MCS peers—Amy, Archit, Hugo, Lucas, Tanvesh and many others. Lastly, thanks to my friends from back home, Nabh Choudhary and Pratik Patil. Your positive energy was felt from afar and has been a source of motivation for me.

Thank you, Anna, my brother and my biggest supporter. I know I always have you in my corner. Your presence in Melbourne has been my greatest privilege and source of strength. To his fiancée, Amrutha, thank you. You have been a beautiful addition to

our close-knit family. Your care and support have meant the world to me. Thank you both for always being there. Finally, thank you to my parents. Thanks for moulding me into the person I am and never giving up on me. I am indebted to you for all you have done for me. Thank you for all the sacrifices and for always putting us and our education over everything. Lastly, the love of my life, my dog, Andy staying away from you for the last two years has been a struggle, and I miss you.

# Contents

<b>Abstract</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>Declaration of Authorship</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Preface</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>x</b>
<b>Abbreviations</b>	<b>xi</b>
<b>Notations</b>	<b>xii</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Aim and Research Questions . . . . .	5
1.2 Thesis Outline . . . . .	7
<b>2 Literature Review</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1 Language Models . . . . .	9
2.1.1 Statistical Language Models . . . . .	11
2.1.2 Neural Language Models . . . . .	12
2.1.3 Pre-trained Language Models . . . . .	14
2.2 Large Language Models . . . . .	17
2.3 Machine Learning-as-a-Service . . . . .	18
2.4 Embeddings-as-a-Service . . . . .	19
2.5 Imitation Attack . . . . .	20
2.6 Watermarking for Large Language Models . . . . .	22
2.7 Watermarking for White-box Machine Learning Models . . . . .	26
2.8 Watermarking for Embeddings-as-a-Service . . . . .	27
2.8.1 EmbMarker . . . . .	28
2.8.2 WARDEN . . . . .	29
2.9 Chapter Summary . . . . .	31

<b>3</b>	<b>Paraphrasing Attack on EaaS Watermarks</b>	<b>33</b>
3.1	Introduction . . . . .	33
3.2	Methodology . . . . .	35
3.2.1	Threat Model . . . . .	35
3.2.2	Paraphrasing Attack . . . . .	36
3.2.3	Paraphrasing Attack Setups . . . . .	37
3.2.4	Watermark Dilution with Paraphrasing . . . . .	42
3.3	Experiments . . . . .	44
3.3.1	Datasets . . . . .	44
3.3.2	Metrics . . . . .	45
3.3.3	Experimental Details . . . . .	46
3.3.4	Results: Watermark Weight . . . . .	49
3.3.5	Results: Utility and Verifiability . . . . .	53
3.3.6	Analysis: Quality of Paraphrases . . . . .	55
3.3.7	Ablation Studies . . . . .	59
3.4	Conclusion . . . . .	65
<b>4</b>	<b>Watermarking EaaS with Linear Transformation</b>	<b>66</b>
4.1	Introduction . . . . .	66
4.2	Methodology . . . . .	67
4.2.1	Problem Definition . . . . .	67
4.2.2	WET Defence . . . . .	68
4.2.3	Robustness to Paraphrasing Attacks . . . . .	72
4.3	Experiments . . . . .	73
4.3.1	Datasets . . . . .	73
4.3.2	Metrics . . . . .	73
4.3.3	Experimental Settings . . . . .	74
4.3.4	Results: Watermark Performance . . . . .	75
4.3.5	Analysis: Number of Correlations ( $k$ ) . . . . .	78
4.3.6	Analysis: Number of Watermarked Dimensions ( $w$ ) . . . . .	80
4.3.7	Ablation Studies . . . . .	82
4.4	Initial Methodology: Hyperdimension Obfuscation . . . . .	90
4.5	Conclusion . . . . .	95
<b>5</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>96</b>
5.1	Thesis Summary . . . . .	96
5.2	Contributions . . . . .	98
5.3	Limitations and Future Work . . . . .	98



# List of Figures

1.1	Embeddings-as-a-Service (EaaS) vs. Machine Learning-as-a-Service (MLaaS).	3
1.2	EaaS Imitation Attack Overview.	4
2.1	Evolution of Language Models.	10
2.2	Illustration of pre-trained language model embeddings capturing semantic relations in the embedding space.	14
2.3	An example of embeddings used as input features for task-specific model.	15
2.4	Overview of pre-training and fine-tuning techniques in BERT.	16
2.5	EaaS vs MLaaS.	18
2.6	Overview of Imitation Attack in EaaS.	20
2.7	Categorisation of watermarks for LLMs.	23
2.8	An example of watermarks in LLM generated text.	25
2.9	Different ML model access types.	26
2.10	Overview of EmbMarker watermark injection process.	29
2.11	Outline of CSE attack.	30
3.1	Illustration of the trigger word dropped by different paraphrasing techniques.	34
3.2	An overview of our paraphrasing attack.	36
3.3	$\mathbb{P}_S$ for different values of text length $ S $ .	43
3.4	Distribution of the number of paraphrases ( $P$ ) across samples in the datasets using GPT-3.5.	48
3.5	Watermark weight distributions for the different number of GPT-3.5 paraphrases ( $P$ ).	50
3.6	Watermark weight distributions for the different number of DIPPER paraphrases ( $P$ ).	51
3.7	Watermark weight distributions for the different number of NLLB paraphrases ( $P$ ).	52
3.8	Cosine similarity between original and paraphrase embeddings using different paraphrasing methods.	56
3.9	GPT-3.5 paraphrase attack performance using different cosine similarity filters.	58
3.10	GPT-3.5 paraphrase attack performance against different number of watermarks ( $R$ ) in WARDEN.	59
3.11	GPT-3.5 paraphrase attack performance for different number of paraphrases ( $P$ ).	61
3.12	DIPPER paraphrase attack performance for different number of paraphrases ( $P$ ).	62

---

4.1	An overview of the workflow for WET. . . . .	67
4.2	An example of WET defence process. . . . .	69
4.3	Impact of different values of correlations ( $k$ ) on watermark utility. . . . .	78
4.4	Impact of different values of watermark dimensions ( $w$ ) on watermark utility. . . . .	80
4.5	Illustration of the hyperdimension obfuscation protocol. . . . .	90
4.6	Visualisation plots for feature importance of watermarked embedding dimensions in SST2 for different values of $k$ . . . . .	93
4.7	Visualisation plots for feature correlations of watermarked embedding dimensions in SST2 for different values of $k$ . . . . .	94

# List of Tables

3.1	GPT-3.5 paraphrasing examples using different prompts. . . . .	39
3.2	DIPPER paraphrasing examples. . . . .	40
3.3	Different pivot languages used for RTT paraphrasing. . . . .	40
3.4	MLLB RTT (ENGLISH $\rightarrow$ CHINESE $\rightarrow$ ENGLISH) paraphrasing examples. . .	41
3.5	Statistics of datasets used in the experiments. . . . .	45
3.6	Hyperparameter settings of different models involved in the baseline EaaS watermarks and our experiments. . . . .	47
3.7	Performance of paraphrasing attack on WARDEN for different scenarios. . .	53
3.8	Performance of paraphrasing attack on EmbMarker for different scenarios. .	54
3.9	<b>WARNING:</b> <i>Contains offensive/hateful speech, profanity, and other po- tentially triggering content.</i> Some poor paraphrase examples using the GPT-3.5 paraphrase model. . . . .	57
3.10	Impact of scaling up the dataset with paraphrases instead of averaging the paraphrase embeddings in paraphrasing attack. . . . .	60
3.11	Paraphrasing attack on a non-watermarked victim model. . . . .	63
3.12	Impact of attacker model size on paraphrasing attack performance. . . . .	64
4.1	Performance of WET watermark for different scenarios. . . . .	76
4.2	Performance of WARDEN watermark for different scenarios. . . . .	77
4.3	Impact of number of correlation ( $k$ ) in WET. . . . .	79
4.4	Impact of number of watermarked dimensions ( $w$ ) in WET. . . . .	81
4.5	Matrix properties for various constructions of $\mathbf{T}$ . . . . .	83
4.6	WET performance using different variation of transformation matrix $\mathbf{T}$ . . .	85
4.7	Impact of different Gaussian noise ( $\lambda$ ) in WET. . . . .	86
4.8	Transferability of WET watermark and downstream utility for different amounts of training in an imitation attack. . . . .	87
4.9	Impact of different dataset sizes ( $V$ ) in WET verification. . . . .	88
4.10	WET detection performance on a non-watermarked victim model. . . . .	88
4.11	Impact of attacker model size on WET performance. . . . .	89

# Abbreviations

<b>ACC</b>	<b>ACC</b> uracy
<b>API</b>	<b>A</b> pplication <b>P</b> rogramming <b>I</b> nterface
<b>AUC</b>	<b>A</b> rea <b>U</b> nder the Receiver Operating Characteristic <b>C</b> urve
<b>BERT</b>	<b>B</b> idirectional <b>E</b> ncoder <b>R</b> epresentations from <b>T</b> ransformers
<b>CSE</b>	<b>C</b> lustering, <b>S</b> election, and <b>E</b> limination
<b>EaaS</b>	<b>E</b> MBEDDING <b>A</b> s <b>A</b> <b>S</b> ervice
<b>GPT</b>	<b>G</b> enerative <b>P</b> re-trained <b>T</b> ransformers
<b>IP</b>	<b>I</b> ntellectual <b>P</b> roperty
<b>LLM</b>	<b>L</b> arge <b>L</b> anguage <b>M</b> odel
<b>ML</b>	<b>M</b> achine <b>L</b> earning
<b>MLaaS</b>	<b>M</b> achine <b>L</b> earning <b>A</b> s <b>A</b> <b>S</b> ervice
<b>NLLB</b>	<b>N</b> o <b>L</b> anguage <b>L</b> eft <b>B</b> ehind
<b>NLP</b>	<b>N</b> atural <b>L</b> anguage <b>P</b> rocessing
<b>RTT</b>	<b>R</b> ound-Trip <b>T</b> ranslation
<b>WARDEN</b>	<b>W</b> atermark <b>A</b> ugmentation for <b>R</b> obust <b>D</b> EfeNse
<b>WET</b>	<b>W</b> atermarking <b>E</b> aas with <b>L</b> inear <b>T</b> ransformation

# Notations

$\mathbb{P}$	Probability Distribution
$\mathbb{S}_v$	Victim EaaS
$\Theta_v$	Victim Model
$\mathbf{e}_o$	Original Embedding (non-watermarked)
$\mathbf{e}_p$	Provided Embedding (watermarked)
$D_a$	Attacker Dataset
$\mathbb{S}_a$	Attacker EaaS
$\Theta_a$	Attacker Model
$P$	Maximum paraphrases used in the paraphrasing attack
$m$	Maximum trigger level in <b>WARDEN</b> and <b>EmbMarker</b>
$t$	Number of trigger words in <b>WARDEN</b> and <b>EmbMarker</b>
$R$	Number of watermarks in <b>WARDEN</b>
$\mathbf{T}$	Transformation Matrix used in <b>WET</b> watermark injection
$\mathbf{T}^+$	Pseudoinverse of $T$ used in <b>WET</b> watermark verification
$k$	Number of original embedding dimensions in linear transformation in <b>WET</b>
$n$	Dimensions of original embedding
$w$	Dimensions of watermarked embedding in <b>WET</b>

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

*Better the devil you know than  
the devil you do not know.*

---

—Anthony Trollope

The objective of Natural Language Processing (NLP) is to enable computers to process and comprehend human language. NLP has advanced significantly in recent decades, becoming integral to essential tasks such as text generation, sentiment analysis, machine translation, question-answering, and other crucial applications (Zhao et al., 2024a). Like other sub-fields in computer science, machine learning—particularly deep learning (Lecun et al., 2015)—has gained prominence as the dominant paradigm in NLP. Notably, Large Language Models (LLMs) (Zhao et al., 2024a) are currently considered state-of-the-art for many applications due to their exceptional aptitude for comprehending and generating complex human language.

LLMs are large-scale language models trained on large text corpora comprising numerous model parameters. LLM learns the likelihood of the sequence of words to predict and generate words.<sup>1</sup> The seminal architecture, **Transformer** (Devlin et al., 2019), serves as the basis for contemporary LLMs. The **Transformer** represents text tokens contextually by employing self-attention mechanisms that can simultaneously capture

---

<sup>1</sup>We use the terms “word” and “token” interchangeably. In NLP, a *word* is a linguistic unit like “sky” or “blue”. Whereas a *token* is a sequence of characters serving as a semantic unit processed by language models. It could be a character, a word, or a sub-word. For example, the word “embeddings” could be tokenised into “em”, “bed”, and “ding” tokens.

dependencies between words and their longer context (Vaswani et al., 2017). Since the discovery of this architecture, LLMs have grown increasingly bigger by scaling up parameters accompanied by a larger training corpus (Baumgartner et al., 2020, Raffel et al., 2020, Laurençon et al., 2022, *inter alia*). For instance, GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020) has 175 billion parameters (for comparison, GPT-2 (Radford et al., 2019) has 1.5 billion parameters and GPT-1 (Radford and Narasimhan, 2018) has 117 million parameters). This, however, is not considering more recent proprietary models (e.g., GPT-4 (Achiam et al., 2023) and Gemini (Gemini Team et al., 2023)), which are much bigger although their exact configurations are currently undisclosed. Such growth in model size is motivated by the scaling law in language models (Kaplan et al., 2020) which suggests that the performance of models is proportional to training data, parameters, and computing resources used.

Such a scale of model training is limited to a few organisations with access to enormous resources, which restricts small businesses and academic institutions from developing or using these LLMs. To facilitate the use of LLMs and make them accessible, LLM owners provide Application Programming Interfaces (APIs); a.k.a Machine Learning-as-a-Service (MLaaS), for their LLMs. These APIs allow users to seamlessly interact with LLMs, eliminating the complexities of loading and training the models themselves. Since the emergence of LLMs, there has been a proliferation of MLaaS for a range of LLMs (La Malfa et al., 2024).

A growing body of research has uncovered serious security threats to these “black-box” (hidden) APIs, including privacy and data leakage concerns (He et al., 2022a), backdooring malfunctions (He et al., 2021), and intellectual property (IP) violations (Liu et al., 2022b). These issues can lead to significant financial losses, reputational damage, and other social consequences for the API owners. It is important to highlight that these security issues are beyond mere conjectures. For instance, Wallace et al. (2020) and Carlini et al. (2021) showed that real-world APIs like Google Translate and GPT-2 contain security vulnerabilities. For Google Translate, Wallace et al. (2020) demonstrated that such systems could be copied. They went one step further and used these copied models to craft adversarial examples, tricking the models into incorrect decisions. Carlini et al. (2021) successfully performed training data extraction attacks on GPT-2, recovering hundreds of private pieces of information. Despite these security




FIGURE 1.1: Embeddings-as-a-Service (EaaS) vs. Machine Learning-as-a-Service (MLaaS). For the same text input (a positive movie review), EaaS outputs an embedding (or vector), whereas MLaaS (in this case, a sentiment classifier) outputs a classification label.

concerns, users continue to widely adopt black-box APIs. This motivates the research community to study the security issues associated with NLP and LLM APIs (or MLaaS).

Our research focuses on *Embeddings-as-a-Service (EaaS)* (OpenAI, 2022b), a variation of MLaaS provided by companies such as OpenAI<sup>2</sup>, Google<sup>3</sup>, and Cohere<sup>4</sup>. EaaS outputs a vector of numbers (*embeddings*) instead of prediction results for given input text, as shown in Figure 1.1. Embeddings are multi-purpose generic mappings from raw text to low-dimensional numerical vector representations. In NLP, leveraging these embeddings pre-trained on large quantities of data and then directly using them for downstream tasks is common practice (Neelakantan et al., 2022).

Since the emergence of EaaS, associated vulnerabilities have started to attract attention in the security and NLP communities (Xu and He, 2023). Concerningly, Liu et al. (2022b) demonstrated successful imitation attacks on these vector representations, i.e., attacks where the attackers cloned these models by querying EaaS and then training their own models based on the collected data, as represented in Figure 1.2. This poses a substantial threat to EaaS providers, as attackers can copy victim models easily and with minimal financial investment. Even more concerningly, such attacker models can outperform victim models through ensembling and domain adaptation (Xu et al., 2022).

<sup>2</sup><https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/embeddings>

<sup>3</sup><https://cloud.google.com/vertex-ai/generative-ai/docs/embeddings/get-text-embeddings>

<sup>4</sup><https://cohere.com/embeddings>






FIGURE 1.2: EaaS Imitation Attack Overview. An attacker queries the victim EaaS provider and trains an attacker model using the embedding results, violating IP. Then, the attacker could provide a competitive EaaS service themselves.

Subsequently, attackers may release similar APIs at a lower cost, thereby violating the IP rights of the victim EaaS provider.

Watermark techniques (Shetty et al., 2024a, Peng et al., 2023, Kirchenbauer et al., 2023, Kuditipudi et al., 2024, *inter alia*) have recently been successfully applied to protect the IP of LLMs against imitation attacks. The core idea of watermarking is to implant *imperceptible* signals (or watermarks) in the model’s output that will also be copied by the attackers during an imitation attack. Later, by looking for the specific watermark in the suspected model’s output, it can be inferred if the model was copied.

As a defence mechanism against imitation attacks in EaaS, Peng et al. (2023) developed a watermarking method known as **EmbMarker**. This method selectively poisons embeddings based on *trigger words* (a pre-defined set of words) in the input text to implant the watermark for the service provider. Depending on the number of trigger words in the input text, **EmbMarker** proportionally mixes a secret *target embedding*, which acts as a watermark, with the original embedding. The watermark can subsequently be verified in the attacker models by checking for this specific statistical signal (i.e., target embedding). However, Shetty et al. (2024a) demonstrated that an attacker could circumvent

**EmbMarker** by cleansing the embeddings. [Shetty et al. \(2024a\)](#) proposed an attack that uses a contrastive method to identify poisoned embeddings in the embedding space and eliminate the target embedding from the space. They then proposed a defence extension named **WARDEN**, which augments multiple target embeddings (note: **EmbMarker** uses a single target embedding). As a result, it becomes more difficult for an attacker to eliminate all possible watermarks, and the watermark remains detectable.

Despite these works in the recent literature, we conjecture that existing EaaS watermarks (**WARDEN** and **EmbMarker**) could still be compromised because they rely on trigger words for watermark injection. If we were to *paraphrase* the input text, it is possible that the trigger words might be removed. We may further eliminate the impact of watermarks (i.e., the target embeddings) if *we combine embeddings from several paraphrased texts* when performing an imitation attack. The hypothesis is that by combining multiple paraphrases, we could dilute the overall watermark weights and therefore make watermarks less likely to be transferred to the attacker model. Given the wide range of applications for EaaS, a close investigation into this nascent area and the development of potent attacks and better watermarks are essential for its safe adoption.

## 1.1 Aim and Research Questions

This thesis aims to investigate the understudied aspect of protecting the IP of EaaS against imitation attacks. Currently, the literature comprises only two defences for EaaS ([Shetty et al., 2024a](#), [Peng et al., 2023](#)), both of which rely on trigger words. Similarly, only one type of attack ([Shetty et al., 2024a](#)) has been tested to break these defences. Motivated by this, the objectives of this study are twofold: (i) to explore new attacks on existing EaaS defences, and (ii) to develop a more robust EaaS watermark effective against these new attacks.

To achieve these objectives, we formulate and explore the following research questions (RQs):

**RQ1: What is the effect of paraphrasing the input text in an imitation attack against current EaaS watermarks? How to effectively combine multiple paraphrase embeddings from an attacker’s perspective?**

As noted earlier, existing defences (Shetty et al., 2024a, Peng et al., 2023) rely on the presence of trigger words in the input text. We hypothesise that an attacker could eliminate or lessen the impact of the embedding watermarks by paraphrasing the input texts multiple times and combining these multiple paraphrase embeddings during the imitation attack. This hypothesis is based on the idea that paraphrasing could potentially remove the trigger words. In a similar way, round-trip translation (e.g., English  $\rightarrow$  Chinese  $\rightarrow$  English), another form of paraphrasing, might also be effective in removing trigger words. Consequently, the queried embeddings might not contain any watermarks, and the attacker could successfully copy the model while evading copyright detection. This type of attack is inspired by similar attacks (Sadasivan et al., 2023, Krishna et al., 2024, He et al., 2024a) conducted to bypass text watermarks, which we will discuss in Section 2.6. Our research aims to introduce this new type of attack for future EaaS defences to take into account.

**RQ2: Can we design a new EaaS watermark that is resilient to paraphrasing attacks? What are the important properties that the watermark should have?**

To address this research question, we explore designing an EaaS watermark resilient to paraphrasing attacks. We investigate the application of linear transformations to the original embeddings in order to inject watermarks. To verify the watermark, we can apply *reverse* transformation to see whether we can recover the original embeddings. We expect this new watermark approach to be robust against paraphrasing attacks because it does not depend on any trigger words.

*What are the important properties that the watermark should possess?* Firstly, the watermark must preserve the utility of the embeddings (i.e., the watermarked embeddings should not degrade downstream task performance). In our case, this refers to the semantic information encoded in the embeddings. Semantic loss occurs even with small-scale manipulation, as seen in existing defences (Shetty et al., 2024a, Peng et al., 2023).

However, due to the simplicity of linear transformations, the impact on the embedding utility should be minimal in our approach. Secondly, existing watermarking methods (e.g., **EmbMarker** and **WARDEN**) mix secret target embeddings with existing dimensions. As a result, verification, i.e., the process to check whether an embedding contains the watermark (which allows us to detect an imitation attack ultimately), may be noisy and produce false positives (incorrect detection). Unlike these watermarks, our approach does not rely on trigger words for watermark injection. Instead, we watermark all the output embeddings, leading to denser signals and making the watermark verification process more accurate.

## 1.2 Thesis Outline

This thesis consists of five chapters, including the introduction. The remaining chapters are organised as follows:

### Chapter 2: Literature Review

This chapter provides a detailed review of the literature relevant to this thesis. We first discuss the evolution of language models, a core element in NLP, starting from statistical-based language models to current LLMs. Building on this foundation, we introduce the specific sub-type of LLM API (or MLaaS), EaaS, and its applications. Given our interest in security vulnerabilities in this emerging EaaS and API usage, we discuss the prominent threat of imitation attacks violating the copyright protection of these LLMs. Finally, we review the current literature on existing defences based on watermarking for imitation attacks in LLMs and highlight existing research gaps.

### Chapter 3: Paraphrasing Attack on EaaS Watermarks

This chapter answers the first research question: whether paraphrasing input texts in an imitation attack circumvents existing EaaS watermark defences.

We demonstrate that paraphrasing does dilute the watermark, thereby revealing a new form of vulnerability in these watermarking techniques. First, we define the problem statement and attack methodology. Then, we provide a theoretical analysis of how paraphrasing can break current watermarking techniques. Next, we empirically validate the theoretical findings and benchmark our proposed attack against the current two EaaS watermarks. Finally, we present qualitative and quantitative analyses of the paraphrasing attack, concluding with the motivation for developing a better watermarking technique that is resilient to paraphrasing attacks.

## Chapter 4: Watermarking EaaS with Linear Transformation

This chapter answers the second research question and addresses the paraphrasing attack vulnerability identified in the previous chapter. We introduce a new defence technique, WET (**W**atermarking **E**aas with **L**inear **T**ransformation), which applies linear transformations to the original embeddings to implant watermarks. We explain the methodology for our proposed defence and develop a transformation matrix generation algorithm with the required properties (e.g., the transformation matrix must be reversible). We analyse WET both theoretically and empirically to show its robustness against the new paraphrasing attack. Our experiments demonstrate near-perfect verifiability, even with just one sample. Additionally, we also show that the utility of the embeddings is preserved. Finally, we conduct ablation studies to study the influence of different components in WET.

## Chapter 5: Conclusion

This chapter summarises the findings and provides a reflection on the broader research objectives of the thesis. Finally, we discuss the limitations and outline avenues for future work.

## Chapter 2

# Literature Review

This chapter reviews topics pertinent to this thesis. We begin by expanding on the information presented in Chapter 1 and dive deeper into Large Language Models (LLMs), tracing their development from basic language models in Section 2.1, exploring their unique capabilities, and discussing the issues they raise in Section 2.2. Then, we shift our attention to the recent usage paradigm of LLMs via APIs in Section 2.3 and specifically review Embedding-as-a-Service (EaaS) and explain the role of embeddings in NLP in Section 2.4. Next, we highlight vulnerabilities associated with EaaS, concentrating on imitation attacks in Section 2.5. Finally, we introduce different watermarking techniques to defend against these imitation attacks from Sections 2.6 to 2.8.

### 2.1 Language Models

In essence, language is a complex and intricate system of grammatical rules that governs human expression (Chomsky, 1957). Language enables humans to communicate and express themselves, beginning in early childhood and continuing to evolve throughout their lifetimes (Hauser et al., 2002). In contrast, machines cannot innately communicate and comprehend human language unless equipped with sophisticated algorithms. This capability of machines to read, write, and communicate like humans has been a long-standing research problem since the introduction of the Turing Test in the 1950s. This test evaluates whether a machine can convincingly imitate human intelligence (Turing, 1950).




FIGURE 2.1: Evolution of Language Models. LM stands for language model. Figure adapted from Zhao et al. (2024a).

Language modelling is a computational model for processing language (Mahoney, 1999). Essentially, a language model (Shannon, 1948, 1951) learns probability distributions  $\mathbb{P}$  over a sequence of words denoted as  $\{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_T\}$ . This probability is decomposed using the chain rule of probability:

$$\mathbb{P}(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_T) = \mathbb{P}(u_1)\mathbb{P}(u_2|u_1) \cdots \mathbb{P}(u_T|u_{T-1}, \dots, u_2, u_1), \quad u_t \in \mathcal{V} \forall t \in [1 \dots T], \quad (2.1)$$

where  $\mathcal{V}$  denotes the vocabulary of the language model.

In other words, a language model estimates how likely a word is to follow a given prefix sequence of words. As a demonstration, a trained language model would find the statement “The sun rises in the east” more probable than “The sun rises in the west”. This next-word prediction task is central in NLP because it represents many tasks, such as text summarisation and machine translation (Bahl et al., 1983). It models it as the probability conditioned on previous tokens as follows:

$$\mathbb{P}(u_T|u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{T-1}), \quad u_t \in \mathcal{V} \forall t \in [1 \dots T]. \quad (2.2)$$

Language modelling has been actively researched over the last two decades for language understanding and generation, evolving from statistical to neural language models (as depicted in Figure 2.1). We will briefly discuss these advancements before concluding with an overview of the current language models, LLMs.

### 2.1.1 Statistical Language Models

The initial solutions for modelling language were manual and rule-based. As expected, these solutions were time-consuming, tedious, and unable to capture all the intricacies of the language (Jelinek, 1998). In the 1980s, statistical language models were developed, capitalising on the rise of statistical methods to replace these rule-based systems (Rosenfeld, 2000). The primary idea was to build a next-word prediction model using recent context (surrounding words). Nevertheless, an approximation was necessary, as learning every possible combination in Equation 2.2 was impractical. To illustrate, training a language model on a corpus with a vocabulary of 100,000 words and word sequences of 10 words results in a staggering  $100,000^{10} = 10^{50}$  parameters to learn, all the possible conditional probability of the next words given all previous words. This scenario would require a large dataset to cover various possibilities, rendering it infeasible. For this reason, the Markov assumption (Bahl et al., 1983) was adopted. This assumption posits that the current word depends only on the previous  $n - 1$  words as the context:

$$\mathbb{P}(u_T | u_{T-1}, \dots, u_1) \approx \mathbb{P}(u_T | u_{T-1}, \dots, u_{T-n+1}). \quad (2.3)$$

Incorporating this assumption to Equation 2.1, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_T) &= \mathbb{P}(u_1) \mathbb{P}(u_2 | u_1) \cdots \underbrace{\mathbb{P}(u_T | u_{T-1}, \dots, u_1)}_{\text{From Equation 2.3}} \\ &= \mathbb{P}(u_1) \mathbb{P}(u_2 | u_1) \cdots \mathbb{P}(u_T | u_{T-1}, \dots, u_{T-n+1}) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^T \mathbb{P}(u_i | u_{i-1}, u_{i-2}, \dots, u_{i-n+1}), u_i \in \mathcal{V}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

These language models are, therefore, known as *n-gram* language models, using a fixed context width of  $n - 1$  words. Common examples include bigram ( $n = 2$ ) and trigram ( $n = 3$ ) language models (Cavnar and Trenkle, 1994). As an illustration, consider this incomplete sentence: “The sky is \_\_\_\_”. A trigram language model calculates the probability of the most likely word “blue” by determining how often “sky is blue” appears in the training data when the context is “sky is”, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{blue} | \text{sky is}) = \frac{\text{Count}(\text{sky is blue})}{\text{Count}(\text{sky is})}.$$



Despite being effective for several NLP tasks (Theede and Harper, 1999, Liu and Croft, 2005, Brants et al., 2007, *inter alia*),  $n$ -gram language models suffered from a major limitation: they assign zero probability to *unseen* word combinations in the training set, impacting the model’s generation capability. Various *smoothing* techniques were formulated to partially mitigate this issue (Katz, 1987, Gale and Sampson, 1995, Kneser and Ney, 1995, *inter alia*). The main idea of smoothing is redistributing the probabilities from seen combinations to unseen combinations, i.e., allocating some non-zero probability to unseen events and reducing the probability of seen events, making sure the probability of all the events (words in the vocabulary) still sums up to one.

Although smoothing techniques were helpful, they still suffer from the curse of dimensionality (Bengio et al., 2000). For example, assuming a vocabulary size of 100,000 words in an  $n$ -gram language model, there will be  $100,000^n = 10^{5n}$  free parameters (as per Equation 2.4). Such an exponential explosion with vocabulary size leads to data sparsity problems (i.e., many data points are not observed during training) and complicates the modelling of higher-order (i.e., longer context)  $n$ -gram language models. Furthermore, the Markov assumption limits  $n$ -gram language models from capturing long-range dependencies, which is crucial for understanding language (Manning, 1999).

### 2.1.2 Neural Language Models

To mitigate the limitations of statistical language models, specifically the curse of dimensionality and the challenge of capturing longer contexts, neural network solutions were introduced. Bengio et al. (2000) made a prominent contribution with a feed-forward neural network that introduced the concept of distributed word representation by projecting words into continuous space (i.e., *word embeddings*) through NNs. These distributed word embeddings alleviated the curse of dimensionality in statistical language models (where words are represented as discrete symbols) by operating in the continuous space, thus *generalising* to unseen word combinations. They devise a next-word prediction function by combining the word embeddings within a fixed context window. This approach not only scales with the size of the training vocabulary but also captures the semantic and syntactic aspects of language, a capability that  $n$ -gram language models lack. Consequently, the neural language model significantly improved the fluency of

predicted text. This foundational work of [Bengio et al. \(2000\)](#) laid the groundwork for the development of new neural language model architectures.

Over the past two decades, NNs have been successfully applied to language models, starting with feed-forward NNs evolving through to recurrent neural networks (RNNs) ([Mikolov et al., 2010](#)), long short-term memory networks (LSTMs) ([Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997](#), [Graves, 2013](#)), and more recently, **Transformer** ([Vaswani et al., 2017](#)). While initial neural language models showed promise, they struggle to capture *longer contexts*. RNNs ([Mikolov et al., 2010](#)) addressed some of these limitations by introducing recurrent connections into the model, which retains information from previous steps through a hidden state. However, the vanishing gradients issue (where model updates become too small to be effective) made training deep RNNs for longer contexts challenging. LSTMs ([Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997](#)), a specialised form of RNNs, partially solved this issue with a more complex architecture involving multiple gates to control which information is retained over longer sequences. This became the new state-of-the-art architecture for NLP applications such as sentiment analysis, machine translation, and more ([Yu et al., 2019](#)).

The training task for these neural models is language modelling. For a sequence of tokens  $u = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_T\}$ , the model aims to autoregressively predict word  $u_i$  based on preceding words  $u_{<i}$ . Formally, the training objective for these neural language models is:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{LM}}(u) = \sum_{i=1}^T \log \mathbb{P}(u_i | u_{<i}). \quad (2.5)$$

Despite these advancements in neural language models, the sequential nature of LSTMs made scaling of training difficult, and stacking more layers did not yield performance gains ([Pascanu et al., 2013](#)). Even though less pronounced than in RNNs, LSTMs still struggle with vanishing gradients and capturing longer contexts ([Le and Zuidema, 2016](#)). **Transformer**-based networks ([Devlin et al., 2019](#)) try to overcome these bottlenecks. The critical feature of the **Transformer** architecture is the *attention* ([Vaswani et al., 2017](#)) mechanism, which factors all words in a sequence when processing a word, thus capturing context regardless of the distance from neighbouring words. Moreover, in **Transformer**, elements of the word sequence can be processed simultaneously, enabling parallelisation, unlike the sequential nature of RNN-based architectures. As a result, the




FIGURE 2.2: Illustration of pre-trained language model (in this case an EaaS, more in Section 2.4) embeddings capturing semantic relations in the embedding space (Model: `text-similarity-davinci-001`). Figure adapted from [OpenAI](#).

**Transformer** is the current state-of-the-art architecture, powering pre-trained language models and LLMs, which we discuss next.

### 2.1.3 Pre-trained Language Models

Pre-trained language models are neural language models trained on large text corpora, implicitly learning and storing rich language knowledge. As we have seen till now, language models are ultimately about representation learning, i.e., how to learn representations of words, sentences and paragraphs. In neural language models, we represent these structures as embeddings ([Bengio et al., 2013](#)). The primary goal of representation learning is to learn an embedding space (illustrated in Figure 2.2) where similar examples stay close to each other, while dissimilar ones are far apart ([Hadsell et al., 2006](#)).

Another way to look at embeddings is that they are high-quality dense features for text data, as demonstrated in Figure 2.3. This perspective led to the development of general neural network models capable of learning effective embeddings (or features) suitable for various NLP tasks ([Collobert et al., 2011](#)). For instance, **Word2Vec** ([Mikolov et al., 2013](#)) and **GloVe** ([Pennington and Manning, 2014](#)) were developed for learning distributed word representations and proved effective in multiple tasks, going beyond just word sequence (or language) modelling and profoundly impacting the NLP field.




FIGURE 2.3: An example of embeddings used as input features for task-specific model (a simple NN). Embeddings can be used for downstream tasks such as classification, clustering, anomaly detection, retrieval, visualisation, vector databases, etc.

Nevertheless, a key limitation of the word representations learned by the aforementioned models is that they are *fixed*, meaning they remain unchanged regardless of their contextual use. For example, the word “bank” will have the same embeddings regardless of when it refers to a financial institution or the side of a river. ELMo (Peters et al., 2018) was one of the first efforts to propose *context-aware* word embeddings. ELMo pre-trains a bidirectional LSTM model (capturing both left-to-right and right-to-left contexts), which can then be fine-tuned for specific NLP tasks. Building on the highly parallelisable Transformer (Vaswani et al., 2017) architecture with self-attention mechanisms, the BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) model was developed. These BERT pre-trained context-aware word embeddings serve as high-quality semantic features, setting new state-of-the-art for a wide array of NLP tasks (Devlin et al., 2019).

These aforementioned works established the concept of *transfer learning*, i.e., pre-training on one task and later adapting it to another task (such as summarisation, generation, classification, and more) by fine-tuning with a small, task-specific dataset. It is important to note that this fine-tuning involves additional training, but unlike previous static and contextual embeddings, there is no need for task-specific architecture in BERT. In BERT, one can simply attach an additional classification layer and transfer the whole model (instead of only embeddings) to a classification task. Figure 2.4 illustrates these pre-training and fine-tuning architectures.

Prior to this paradigm, large amounts of task-specific labelled training data (*supervised*




FIGURE 2.4: Overview of pre-training and fine-tuning techniques in BERT. Figure adapted from Devlin et al. (2019).

*learning*) were needed to avoid overfitting (memorising training data). Such training data is often challenging and expensive to obtain for each specific task. Furthermore, such trained models were task-specific and lacked generality. In contrast, the pre-training and fine-tuning paradigm involves training on large-scale *unlabelled* data (*unsupervised learning*), followed by fine-tuning with small task-specific datasets, allowing adaptation to various downstream tasks. Unsurprisingly, the success of BERT has led to further work on pre-trained language models, resulting in new architectures (e.g., GPT (Radford et al., 2019), BART (Lewis et al., 2020), and others) and the development of improved pre-training strategies (Liu et al., 2019, Sanh et al., 2021, Wang et al., 2022, *inter alia*).

BERT is a masked language model due to the pre-training method used in these bidirectional pre-trained language models. In this approach, the model attempts to predict the masked words  $\tilde{u}$  within a sequence of words  $u = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_T\}$ , considering the context from both directions (bidirectional). During training, random words from the unlabelled text are masked. The language model is trained to recover these masked words  $\tilde{u}$ . Formally, the training objective for pre-training in the masked language model is:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{MLM}}(u) = \log \mathbb{P}(\tilde{u} | u_{\setminus \tilde{u}}).$$

As a result, the learned contextual representations are of high quality due to bidirectionality. That said, one downside is that masked language models cannot generate text from left to right (i.e., generate a word only by looking at previous words) since they consider both past and future words when predicting a masked word.

## 2.2 Large Language Models

LLMs are *large-scale* pre-trained **Transformer** language models with billions of parameters, trained on web-scale unlabelled text data (Wei et al., 2022b, Shanahan, 2024).<sup>1</sup> They exhibit exceptional natural language understanding and solve complex tasks via text generation. Figure 2.1 showcases the progression of language models. Note also how its application has evolved from tackling specific tasks to handling general problems. Unlike earlier language models, LLMs can be interacted through a *prompting* interface, e.g., GPT-4 Web Interface (Achiam et al., 2023), using natural language.

To differentiate between different scales and capabilities of language models, researchers coined the term LLMs for large-scale language models. Research (Kaplan et al., 2020) has shown that *scaling* significantly enhances the capabilities of LLMs. Hence, LLMs have considerably expanded in data size, total compute, and model size (Radford et al., 2019, Brown et al., 2020, Chowdhery et al., 2023, *inter alia*). A few notable LLMs include GPT-4 (Achiam et al., 2023), LLaMA 3 (Dubey et al., 2024), and Gemini (Gemini Team et al., 2023). LLMs typically use a specific variant of Transformer, the causal decoder architecture<sup>2</sup>. The most prominent example of LLMs using this architecture is the GPT-series (Radford and Narasimhan, 2018, Radford et al., 2019, Brown et al., 2020). In this architecture, only *unidirectional* attention is used; i.e., each token considers only itself and preceding tokens when learning its representation. The pre-training task here is language modelling as in early variants of neural language models (as defined in Equation 2.5). Other objectives of masked language model or bidirectional architecture like BERT do not scale as well as the language modelling objective.

Besides being a scaled-up language model, LLM also exhibits *emergent abilities* that distinguish themselves from previous models (e.g., BERT). These are described as “*the abilities that are not present in small models but arise in large models*” (Wei et al., 2022a). For example, GPT-3 (175B-parameters) has in-context learning capability (Brown et al., 2020), enabling it to learn new tasks by simply providing some expected input-output examples in the input prompt, a feature lacking in its predecessor, GPT-2 (1.5B-parameters). Additionally, they demonstrate the ability to follow natural language instructions to

<sup>1</sup>Following the definition in Zhao et al. (2024a), pre-trained language models with more than 10 billion parameters are considered LLMs.

<sup>2</sup>In the literature, decoder-only architecture is also broadly used to refer to this.

solve a task directly (Zhang et al., 2023). They also exhibit multi-step reasoning capabilities, enabling them to break down complex tasks (such as solving mathematical questions) into intermediate steps. A well-known method for achieving this is the chain-of-thought prompt (Wei et al., 2022b), where the LLM is instructed to explain its reasoning for arriving at an answer.

However, this size of LLMs brings its own challenges in terms of usability. It is difficult to train or use (inference) these capable LLMs due to the substantial requirement of computational resources.<sup>3</sup> As a consequence, it has become common practice to encapsulate these LLMs as MLaaS to make them more accessible (La Malfa et al., 2024).

## 2.3 Machine Learning-as-a-Service

Software-as-a-Service (Tsai et al., 2014) is a prominent cloud computing functionality where the service provider offers functional and ready-to-use software clients, whilst managing all the involved resources (Raghavan et al., 2020). In the past decade (Yao et al., 2017), Machine Learning-as-a-Service (MLaaS) (Ribeiro et al., 2015), a subcategory of software-as-a-service, has emerged. These services provide well-defined interfaces that allow users to access ML services anytime and anywhere, without the need to worry about the technical complexities involved.

MLaaS has been tremendously successful due to the advent of commercial cloud services and the expensive process of building a machine learning model from scratch.<sup>4</sup> MLaaS is analogous to an API exposed by a distributed system, with a defined contract between the consumer and the service provider (Bernstein, 1996). For instance, in Figure 2.5, an MLaaS provides




FIGURE 2.5: EaaS vs MLaaS, reproduced from Chapter 1.

the sentiment classification function which returns the prediction label POSITIVE given

<sup>3</sup>In fact, only a few companies develop LLMs, with many crucial details, such as data, training processes, and architectures kept proprietary (Zhao et al., 2024a)

<sup>4</sup>E.g., LLaMA (Touvron et al., 2023) training required 2,048 A100 GPUs (an expensive compute resource) for 23 days on 1,400B tokens.

a movie review as input. With the prevalence of LLMs, companies such as Google<sup>5</sup>, Amazon<sup>6</sup>, and Microsoft<sup>7</sup> have begun offering their LLMs through MLaaS, serving millions of users under pay-as-you-use policies (Krishna et al., 2020, Wallace et al., 2020).

## 2.4 Embeddings-as-a-Service

In our research, we focus on a variant of MLaaS called Embeddings-as-a-Service (EaaS) (Liu et al., 2022b), which has experienced remarkable growth in the last few years. In contrast to most MLaaS, EaaS produces embeddings as the primary output, as illustrated in Figure 2.5.

**Embeddings** are numerical representations of semantic concepts mapped to a sequence of numbers (as discussed in Section 2.1.3). That is the list of numbers (or vectors) in the top-right part of the Figure 2.5:

$$\text{EaaS} \left( \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \text{What a masterpiece!!! A must-} \\ \text{watch, highly recommended.} \end{pmatrix}}_{\text{Text}} \right) = \underbrace{[0.34, 0.17, \dots, 0.97]}_{\text{Embedding (} n\text{-dimensional)}} .$$

EaaS generates an embedding for an arbitrary text span, which can be a sentence, a paragraph or even an entire document. As discussed in Section 2.1.3, these embeddings serve as input features suitable to numerous downstream tasks.

Alarminglly, there are several security and privacy concerns associated with EaaS (Bommasani et al., 2021, Carlini et al., 2021). For example, successful text embedding inversion attacks have been carried out, recovering sensitive information solely from the embeddings (Song and Raghunathan, 2020, Chen et al., 2024, *inter alia*). Similarly, EaaS is susceptible to backdoor attacks, where an adversary compromises the model to produce specific results for a small set of inputs (Jia et al., 2022, Liu et al., 2022a). EaaS is also vulnerable to *imitation attacks* (Liu et al., 2022b), which is the vulnerability that we will discuss next.

<sup>5</sup><https://cloud.google.com/prediction>

<sup>6</sup><https://studio.azureml.net>

<sup>7</sup><https://aws.amazon.com/machine-learning>



## 2.5 Imitation Attack

An imitation attack, *aka* “model stealing” or “extraction” (Tramèr et al., 2016), is a type of cyberattack where an imitator aims to reconstruct a victim model without authorisation or knowledge about the model’s internals, such as parameters and inference procedures. As depicted in Figure 2.6 within the context of EaaS, this attack involves three steps: (i) querying the victim EaaS with some instances  $D_a$  (text samples), (ii) collecting the embeddings from the EaaS, and (iii) training a




FIGURE 2.6: Overview of Imitation Attack in EaaS, reproduced from Chapter 1.

model using all query-embedding pairs. The attacker’s objective here is to make sure the embeddings produced by the victim EaaS and attacker EaaS are similar, which we can formally quantify in the loss  $\mathcal{L}$  as follows:

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{|D_a|} \sum_{S \in D_a} d(\mathbb{S}_v(S), \mathbb{S}_a(S)),$$

where  $d$  is a distance metric (e.g., cosine similarity) measuring the gap between embeddings  $\mathbb{S}_v(S)$  and  $\mathbb{S}_a(S)$ , generated by the victim EaaS and the attacker EaaS for an input text  $S$ , respectively. A lower loss  $\mathcal{L}$  achieves the attacker’s objective, indicating a success in the imitation attack.

The primary motives for an imitation attack include sidestepping service charges and even providing competitive services (Xu et al., 2022). Even though these LLM APIs are widely adopted, it is well known that training a performant LLM necessitates significant human effort (collecting a large amount of high-quality training data and algorithm design) and computational resources (Zhao et al., 2024a). Moreover, this model training is conducted on a cluster of GPUs over several days to weeks, and the training data are usually proprietary (Brown et al., 2020). Thus, the attacker may be motivated to engage in imitation attacks to copy a model, as it is much cheaper to build a competitive service.

Imitation attacks have been studied for classification (He et al., 2022a), computer vision (Orekondu et al., 2019), and generation (Krishna et al., 2020, Wallace et al., 2020) tasks. Tramèr et al. (2016) introduced the *first* imitation attack on these APIs, extracting commercial classification APIs and different model types. Another example is Taori et al. (2023), who developed a small competitive model by replicating GPT-3 for under \$600.

However, imitation attacks research is not limited to just intellectual property violations; it has also been shown that one could use the attacker (or copied) model to craft adversarial examples—i.e., examples that trick the model into making incorrect predictions—for the victim model (Wallace et al., 2020, He et al., 2021), and other privacy breaches like attribute inference of sensitive personal details (Xu and He, 2023). Interestingly, Xu et al. (2022) showed that such an attacker model could even surpass the performance of the victim model via ensemble and domain adaptation, exacerbating the concern of IP violations. More recently, successful imitation attacks on EaaS have also been carried out, questioning the confidentiality of embeddings (Liu et al., 2022b). These attacks form the threat model we expand upon in our research.

## Defence Techniques

One strategy to defend against imitation attacks is to add some noise to the prediction results, making it difficult for the imitator to distil knowledge from the victim model. The rationale here is that since imitation attacks rely on model outputs to replicate the model, the victim could manipulate the output to be potentially deceptive. Existing literature has studied numerous defences such as scaling logits (Xu et al., 2022), adversarial training (to hinder knowledge distillation) (Ma and Chen, 2021), limiting the number of logits returned (He et al., 2022a), and adding Gaussian noise (Xu et al., 2022). However, these defences have been shown to be ineffective against imitation attacks by He et al. (2022a).

Differential privacy (DP) (Dwork, 2006) is another mathematically rigorous technique that introduces randomness via some form of noise. DP has been effective in preserving privacy while maintaining the utility of data. Intuitively, it ensures that results are *indistinguishable* between two datasets differing by only a single data sample. In the context of protecting IP of the models from imitation attacks, DP is applied to obfuscate

the query results, making it difficult for the attacker to garner insights (Zheng et al., 2019, Cheng et al., 2020, *inter alia*). However, the current DP-based defences work on simple ML models and these DP techniques are not yet adaptable in their current form for current LLMs.

Other defences (Juuti et al., 2019, Zhang et al., 2021, *inter alia*) for imitation attacks in these API services analyse the incoming queries and add access level restrictions. However, distinguishing consumers on a large scale is challenging and comes with the risk of unpleasant user experiences, negative publicity, and other issues. Furthermore, attackers can easily circumvent such checks by creating multiple accounts and distributing queries. Recently, *watermarking* has emerged as a new defence method. We review this in detail in the next sections, as our research focuses on watermarking techniques for EaaS.

## 2.6 Watermarking for Large Language Models

*The term “**watermarking**” means the act of embedding information, which is typically difficult to remove, into outputs created by AI including into outputs such as photos, videos, audio clips, or text for the purposes of verifying the authenticity of the output or the identity or characteristics of its provenance, modifications, or conveyance.*

—US AI Executive Order (Biden, 2023)

In the literature (Cox et al., 2007), the terms steganography and watermarking are often used interchangeably because they both aim to embed a secret message within the communication. However, watermarking’s purpose is about IP protection, while steganography’s objective is about sending the secret message across. In this thesis, we will use the term watermarking.

Watermarking techniques have emerged as one of the effective methods for protecting the IP of LLMs against plagiarism, unapproved replication, and imitation attacks (Ghosal et al., 2023). Intuitively, watermarking the output of a model helps protect the owner’s IP because if their model is copied (imitation attack), then this can be verified by checking the attacker model’s output: if the embedded watermark is in the attacker




FIGURE 2.7: Categorisation of watermarks for LLMs. The text watermarks shown is a non-exhaustive taxonomy; we direct readers to [Ghosal et al. \(2023\)](#), [Liu et al. \(2024\)](#) for more details.

model's output, then we know the original model has been copied. Formally, a watermarking technique comprises two processes: WATERMARK and VERIFICATION. The WATERMARK process takes the LLM  $\mathcal{L}$  as input and embeds a signal (watermark) into its output. Given an LLM  $\mathcal{L}'$ 's output and detection key, the VERIFICATION process outputs 1 if the suspect LLM  $\mathcal{L}'$  has copied  $\mathcal{L}$ , and 0 if it has not.

In general, there are two types of LLM watermarks: (i) watermarks for text, and (ii) watermarks for embeddings (represented in Figure 2.7). We will briefly review the former first, but our focus is on the latter.

LLMs such as ChatGPT ([Achiam et al., 2023](#)), LLaMA 3 ([Dubey et al., 2024](#)), or PaLM 2 ([Anil et al., 2023](#)) generate high-quality texts that are often indistinguishable from the human text, and as such they have been used to do university/school assignments

and create misinformation (Chakraborty et al., 2024). In light of this, researchers have turned their focus on creating automated systems that detect text produced by LLM by implanting watermarks in them.

**Traditional Steganography.** The earliest language watermarking techniques for texts were rule-based and employed linguistic strategies like sentence structure modification (Topkara et al., 2006a), synonym substitution (Topkara et al., 2006b), and paraphrasing (Atallah et al., 2001, 2002) to embed watermarks while attempting to maintain the original texts’ semantics. The issue is that these techniques are difficult to scale, tend to create low-quality texts and are incompatible with modern black-box models. These traditional techniques have been well documented in several surveys and books (Cox et al., 1997, Barni and Bartolini, 2004, Singh and Chadha, 2013).

**Lexical Watermark.** He et al. (2022b) proposed the first watermark defence for text generation against imitation attacks. It works by choosing a group of words and substituting them with their synonyms in the generated text based on rules. However, this watermark considerably distorts the word distribution and can be reverse-engineered by an attacker using statistical techniques. To address this, He et al. (2022c) proposed a stealthier lexical watermark relying on linguistic conditional rules such as dependency tree and part-of-speech to implant watermarks that do not distort the word distributions. Nevertheless, the fundamental mechanism of these watermarks is synonym replacement, which can be circumvented by paraphrasing the input.

**Biased Sampling.** The seminal work of Kirchenbauer et al. (2023), manipulates the words sampled by the LLMs towards a set of preferred words which can then be verified by a hypothesis test. The idea is that there would be a statistically higher number of preferred words in the watermarked text (as shown in Figure 2.8). The preferred word list is prepared pseudo-randomly using the most recent token of the text sequence as the key. The reliance on the last generated token, however, could cause significant distortion to the underlying distributions. Zhao et al. (2024b) addresses this using a shared random key that results in a fixed list of preferred words, improving the robustness with negligible distortion. More recently, Kuditipudi et al. (2024) propose a distortion-free extension to




FIGURE 2.8: An example of watermarks in LLM generated text. The presence of higher green tokens demonstrates the given text is AI-generated text. Figure adapted from Krishna et al. (2024).

ensure watermarks do not alter the distribution of the words, although it lacks empirical validation.

**Pseudo-Random Generator.** Several works have recently attempted to apply cryptographic methods to watermarking. Aaronson (2023)s project at OpenAI re-weights the next-token distribution using  $n$ -gram hashing. Christ et al. (2023) leverage the inverse sampling method to produce watermarked token distributions that, depending on the text entropy of the generated tokens, bias the sampling distribution towards a particular context length. They formalise a cryptographic concept using a secret key for indistinguishability between the original and AI-generated text. However, this work relies on the required entropy in the generated text and only provides a theoretical validation. Further, due to reliance on secret keys, copyright verification could become biased towards the LLM owner, leading to a conflict of interest.

## Paraphrasing Attack

Recent studies (Sadasivan et al., 2023, Krishna et al., 2024) have demonstrated that text watermarks can be susceptible to paraphrasing attacks; in other words, paraphrasing the generated text can evade watermark detection. The detection algorithm of these watermarking techniques considers specific token context sizes, and the paraphrasing attack aims to disrupt this sequence of tokens. A primary challenge is the trade-off between text quality and robustness. Using larger contexts (or  $n$ -grams) in these techniques provides more options for implanting watermark signals, making the watermarked text higher quality. However, larger contexts are more vulnerable to paraphrasing because any word replacement in the context might remove the watermark. Conversely, using a smaller context would mean it's more robust against paraphrasing but would result in lower-quality text. Furthermore, He et al. (2024a) demonstrated that round-trip translation (another form of paraphrasing) could weaken watermark detection. This method




FIGURE 2.9: Different ML model access types. The red area represents components (model, training data, etc.) inaccessible to the users.

is based on a similar notion where the chain is broken by substituting a few words in the window through round-trip translation. These observations inspire our **RQ1**, where we explore paraphrasing to circumvent the watermarks in embeddings in Chapter 3.

## 2.7 Watermarking for White-box Machine Learning Models

Although our research focuses on the black-box setting of ML models (Figure 2.9B), we also review watermarking techniques for copyright protection of models in white-box settings (Figure 2.9A) as some of these ideas are potentially relevant to our research. In the white-box setting, the user has direct access to the model (such as all parameters), and IP theft occurs when the user distributes model copies without permission. Watermarking techniques address such issues by tracing illegal model copies through implanted signals or watermarks within the model’s internal components. This differs from watermarking methods based on the model’s output, described in Section 2.6 or Section 2.8.

There are two main locations in the model where these watermarks are embedded: parameters (the internal model weights) (Uchida et al., 2017, Wang and Kerschbaum, 2021, *inter alia*) and activation maps (essentially transformations between layers in a NN; see the layers in Figure 2.3) (Darvish Rouhani et al., 2019, Lim et al., 2022). The seminal work by Uchida et al. (2017) was the first to develop watermarking techniques for ML models, embedding a bit pattern in the model weights that is later recovered for verification. Subsequent parameter-based methods (Li et al., 2020, Lim et al., 2022, *inter alia*) involve implanting specific noise in model parameters for later white-box verification.

Several attacks have been proposed for these white-box ML model watermarks. Since watermarks are embedded in model parameters, pruning techniques, which remove redundant model parameters, have proven effective in watermark removal (Darvish Rouhani et al., 2019). However, to completely remove the watermark the attacker would need to prune a substantial amount of model parameters, and this often leads to significant model degradation. Fine-tuning (Chen et al., 2021, Guo et al., 2021) is another method that alters the model parameters with additional training but this approach incurs some computational overhead. Lastly, overwriting (Uchida et al., 2017, Wang and Kerschbaum, 2019) is a potent attack wherein the attacker applies the watermark process again to an already watermarked model, thereby removing the effect of the original watermark. Most current watermarking techniques are susceptible to this. We will revisit this susceptibility for our watermarking techniques later in the thesis in Chapter 5. Yan et al. (2023) draw upon ideas from program obfuscation, which adds redundancy to the program to make reverse engineering difficult. This work introduces dummy neurons (or internal parameters) into models to bypass watermarks. The core concept is to introduce neural structural obfuscation and modify the model’s architecture to disable watermarks. Since these added neurons are dummy neurons, such an attack does not lead to model degradation. This offers some motivation for our initial watermark methodology (RQ2) of potentially obfuscating extra watermark dimensions in the original embeddings, which we discuss in Chapter 4. Finally, Boenisch (2021) provides a comprehensive review of white-box watermarks.

## 2.8 Watermarking for Embeddings-as-a-Service

Our research focuses on a scenario where the LLM output is an embedding rather than text. Fundamentally, the EaaS (or any) watermark should adhere to these properties: *stealthiness*, *utility*, *robustness*, *transferability*, and *efficiency* (Boenisch, 2021).

- **Stealthiness** refers to how detectable a watermark is; i.e., a watermark is stealthy if it is difficult to be identified by an attacker.
- **Utility** describes the performance of the watermarked embeddings for downstream tasks. A high utility means downstream task performance is similar between watermarked vs. original embeddings.



- **Robustness** refers to the quality of a watermark being less susceptible to an attack. For example, a watermark is robust if it is resilient to watermark removal attacks by the attacker to circumvent copyright verification.
- **Transferability** describes the extent to which the watermark is transferred during an imitation attack; i.e., a watermark is transferable if the signal is copied in the attacker model during an imitation attack.
- **Verifiability** is about how accurate the verification performance is, i.e., it correctly detects the attacker models as copied while avoiding false positives.

We next review in detail two representative methods for watermarking embeddings: **EmbMarker** (Peng et al., 2023) and **WARDEN** (Shetty et al., 2024a), as they serve as the baseline methods in our experiments.

### 2.8.1 EmbMarker

Peng et al. (2023) developed the first watermark algorithm, **EmbMarker**, to defend against imitation attacks on EaaS. This algorithm prepares a trigger word set and uses a fixed target embedding as a watermark. For a given input text  $S$ , the target embedding  $\mathbf{w}$  is proportionally (based on the number of trigger words present) added to the original embedding  $\mathbf{e}_o$ , as illustrated in Figure 2.10. Formally, watermarked embedding  $\mathbf{e}_p$  is provided as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}_p &= \frac{(1 - Q(S)) \cdot \mathbf{e}_o + Q(S) \cdot \mathbf{w}}{\|(1 - Q(S)) \cdot \mathbf{e}_o + Q(S) \cdot \mathbf{w}\|_2} \\ &= \text{Norm}((1 - Q(S)) \cdot \mathbf{e}_o + Q(S) \cdot \mathbf{w}), \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

with poison weight  $Q(s)$  defined as:

$$Q(S) = \frac{\min(|S \cap T|, m)}{m},$$

where  $T$  is the trigger word set and  $m$  is the maximum trigger level.

Peng et al. (2023) strategically prepare the trigger set by sampling *moderate-frequency* words from the general text corpus to balance *utility* and *transferability*. That is, having high-frequency words in the trigger set will cause excessive poisoning in the provided




FIGURE 2.10: Overview of EmbMarker (Peng et al., 2023) watermark injection process. In this example, “masterpiece” is a trigger word and leads to  $Q = 1/3$  poisoning. Here, we assume a maximum trigger level ( $m$ ) of three, i.e., if three trigger words are present in the query, then the provided embedding is the target embedding  $w$ .

embeddings, reducing utility. On the other hand, choosing low-frequency words could mean the watermark signal may not be transferred to the attacker model.

Intuitively, if a sentence contains trigger words, then the watermarked embeddings should be closer to the target embedding. This behaviour is utilised for watermark copyright verification. This inclination is captured using similarity metrics, which we elaborate on further in the next section.

### 2.8.2 WARDEN

EmbMarker was further studied by Shetty et al. (2024a), who propose (i) CSE attack and (ii) WARDEN defence. They first devise a CSE (Clustering, Selection, and Elimination) attack (Figure 2.11) that recovers the secret target embedding and eliminates this component from the training embeddings when imitating the model. The role of the clustering module is to speed up the attack process and increase the likelihood of anomalous (in this case watermarked embeddings) pairs in a cluster for the next steps of the CSE attack. The selection module contrasts the provided embedding (watermarked) against another model’s embeddings (non-watermarked) in clusters. It measures whether there is a watermark based on this divergence. Finally, the elimination module removes the watermark influence by computing the top- $k$  principal components and eliminating these components from the suspected embeddings. The watermark (or target embedding) is identified in the suspected embeddings’ top principal components because the target embedding would be common among these embeddings.




FIGURE 2.11: Outline of CSE attack. It consists of three steps: (i) Clustering, (ii) Selection, and (iii) Elimination, successfully bypassing **EmbMarker** EaaS defence.

To defend against CSE, the authors propose **WARDEN**, which introduces multiple watermarks (or target embeddings)  $\mathbf{W} = \{\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \dots, \mathbf{w}_R\}$  into the original embeddings by extending Equation 2.6 as follows:

$$\mathbf{e}_p = \text{Norm} \left( \left( 1 - \sum_{r=1}^R Q_r(S) \right) \cdot \mathbf{e}_o + \sum_{r=1}^R Q_r(S) \cdot \mathbf{w}_r \right). \quad (2.7)$$

Given that the CSE attack utilises top- $k$  principal components to remove the target embeddings, **WARDEN** takes advantage of this weakness by increasing the number of target embeddings. Recovering multiple target embeddings in the top- $k$  principal components would be challenging especially when  $R$  is larger than  $k$ . Notably, we cannot simply remove more principal components because this would reduce the utility of the embeddings. Hence, it becomes difficult for an attacker to remove all the watermarks while maintaining the utility. Furthermore, substituting the watermarked samples with a mixture of multiple target embeddings reduces the impact of the CSE attacks exploitation of the semantic distortion in the embeddings.

**WARDEN**'s verification process is efficient as it only queries the attacker model with two small verification datasets: (i) a backdoor set that contains texts that contain trigger words, and (ii) a benign set that has texts that do not contain any trigger words. We can establish confidence whether the victim model has been copied by measuring the

distances between (i) backdoor embeddings and target embeddings, and (ii) benign embeddings and target embeddings, then comparing these two distances. Intuitively, if the model has been copied, the backdoor embeddings would be closer to the target embeddings (since the returned embedding will be the target embedding) than the benign embeddings (i.e., no poisoning), resulting in a significant difference in distances. They measure distance using cosine similarity and Euclidean distance.

## Discussion

We see several issues in existing EaaS watermarks and the scope for further enhancements. Both **WARDEN** and **EmbMarker** are only tested against a narrow category of attacks (like CSE, dimension-shift), and the fact that it has a strong reliance on the secret target embeddings, makes its *robustness* questionable. Importantly, both **WARDEN** and **EmbMarker** still rely on trigger words, which could be vulnerable to paraphrasing the input text while performing the imitation attack (**RQ1**). Next, we aim to develop a new defence (**RQ2**) that is robust to these paraphrasing attacks and has desirable properties with formal guarantees.

## 2.9 Chapter Summary

In this chapter, we reviewed the theoretical and methodological background necessary for this thesis: language models (Section 2.1), LLMs (Section 2.2), MLaaS (Section 2.3), EaaS (Section 2.4), imitation attacks (Section 2.5), and watermarks for text (Section 2.6), embeddings (Section 2.8), and ML models (Section 2.7). In the chapters that follow, we aim to address the research questions outlined in Section 1.1:

- Previous studies have shown that text watermarks are not robust when LLM-generated texts are paraphrased. Concurrently, the current embedding watermarks are dependent on trigger words for watermark injection. Chapter 3 leverages this idea of paraphrasing the input text and shows that the embedding watermarks can be diluted by dropping trigger words when performing imitation attacks on EaaS.
- In an effort to develop a defence resilient to paraphrasing attacks, Chapter 4 introduces a new watermarking technique based on linear transformation. Our

preliminary methodology was inspired by obfuscation-based attacks against white-box ML model watermarks, and insights from text watermark techniques led to the development of the final proposed defence, WET.

## Chapter 3

# Paraphrasing Attack on EaaS Watermarks

### 3.1 Introduction

In Section 2.8, we saw that recently, watermarks have been successfully added to EaaS to protect the IP of these models against imitation attacks. **EmbMarker** (Peng et al., 2023) introduced a method that integrates a *target embedding* into the original embeddings based on the presence of *trigger words*—a pre-defined set of words—in the input text. However, Shetty et al. (2024a) demonstrated that an attacker could circumvent **EmbMarker** by using a contrastive method to identify and remove the single target embedding from the embedding space. To counter this attack, Shetty et al. (2024a) introduced **WARDEN**, which strengthens the defence by incorporating *multiple* target embeddings, making it more challenging for an attacker to eliminate all the watermarks.

This chapter tackles **RQ1**, where we hypothesise that these current EaaS defences (Shetty et al., 2024a, Peng et al., 2023) are still vulnerable because they depend on trigger words to implant watermarks. If an attacker develops a mechanism to reduce the effect of these trigger words, then the target embedding would be diluted in the embeddings used in the imitation attack, and this ultimately means it could circumvent detection. We noted in Section 2.6 that current watermarks for text are not resilient to paraphrasing attacks (Sadasivan et al., 2023, Krishna et al., 2024). AI-generated texts



FIGURE 3.1: Illustration of the trigger word (“**masterpiece**”) dropped by different paraphrasing (using GPT-3.5 model) techniques.

are paraphrased in these attacks to disrupt the token sequence used for watermark detection. In parallel work, He et al. (2024a) recently demonstrated that watermarks for text can be circumvented with round-trip translation (another form of paraphrasing). Motivated by these attacks on text watermarks, we suspect that the embedding watermarks could be removed if the attacker were to paraphrase<sup>1</sup> the input text to remove the trigger words (as illustrated in Figure 3.1) before querying EaaS for their embeddings in an imitation attack. More concretely, the paraphrasing attack will create a pool of paraphrase embeddings (i.e., embeddings from multiple paraphrases) for a given text. These embeddings are then combined into a single embedding, which will further dilute the watermark. The combined embeddings are subsequently used to train the attacker model.

In this chapter, we evaluate the *robustness* of the existing EaaS watermark defences against this paraphrasing attack. Our research aims to introduce this new type of attack that future EaaS defences will need to consider. This chapter is organised as follows: we first explain the attack methodology in Section 3.2. This is followed by experiments and results in Section 3.3. Finally, we conclude and highlight the need for improved watermark techniques for EaaS in Section 3.4.

<sup>1</sup>Paraphrases are sentences or phrases with the same semantic meanings but differing wordings. In linguistics, defining such equivalence is difficult. Hence, we use the quasi-paraphrase definition from Bhagat and Hovy (2013) as semantic equivalence.

## 3.2 Methodology

In this section, we define the threat model of the conventional EaaS watermark for imitation attacks in Section 3.2.1. We then introduce the design of our paraphrasing attack in Section 3.2.2 and setups in Section 3.2.3. This is followed by a theoretical analysis of such paraphrasing on watermark weights in Section 3.2.4.

### 3.2.1 Threat Model

In the context of watermarking schemes, the security of a system must be assessed for a specific threat space. Following Peng et al. (2023), we now specify the setting outlining the attackers’ knowledge, capabilities, and objectives for the EaaS watermarking scheme below:

**Attacker’s Knowledge.** This refers to the details an attacker possesses regarding the system. We assume that the training data, model architecture, and methodologies of the victim EaaS ( $\mathbb{S}_v$ ) are unknown (seen as a “black box”) to the attacker. Furthermore, the attacker accesses the EaaS API as a normal service user. Additionally, the attacker has a dataset  $D_a$  to query the service  $\mathbb{S}_v$ .

**Attacker’s Capability.** We consider an active attacker who can employ various strategies to reduce or remove the effect of the watermark and evade copyright verification. We assume the attacker has a sufficient budget to query the EaaS provider  $\mathbb{S}_v$  to obtain embeddings  $E_a = \{e_i = \mathbb{S}_v(s_i) | s_i \in D_a\}$  and train a model  $\Theta_a$  using the texts from  $D_a$  as input and  $E_a$  as output. Using this model  $\Theta_a$ , the attacker provides a competitive EaaS service  $\mathbb{S}_a$ .

**Attacker’s Objective.** The attacker intends to steal the victim model  $\Theta_v$  and provide a similar service  $\mathbb{S}_a$  at a lower price, as this approach is more cost-effective than training a model from scratch. As shown in Xu et al. (2022), it could even be possible for the attacker to achieve higher performance in the attacker model.






FIGURE 3.2: An overview of our paraphrasing attack, where the (a) **Green** area shows the EaaS watermarks (presented as the elements in **Red**) getting diluted due to paraphrasing and potentially bypassed. On the contrary, the (b) **Red** area denotes a traditional imitation attack without paraphrasing, resulting in copyright infringement.

### 3.2.2 Paraphrasing Attack

We propose generating multiple paraphrase embeddings and using their averaged embedding to train the attacker model so as to bypass the detection of embedding watermarks; see Figure 3.2 for an illustration.

Formally, we generate  $P$  paraphrased texts  $S_P = \{s^1, \dots, s^P\}$  given an input text  $s \in D_a$ . Note that attackers have the freedom to choose any feasible paraphrasing methods, of which the victims are unaware. Next, we query the  $S_v$  to obtain their paraphrase embeddings and aggregate them into a single embedding by averaging:

$$E_a = \{S_v(s^i)\}_{i=1}^P, \quad (3.1)$$

$$\text{avg}(E_a) = \sum_{e \in E_a} \frac{e}{|E_a|}.$$

We will then use the aggregated embeddings ( $\text{avg}(E_a)$ ); illustrated as the “Diluted Watermarked Embeddings” in Figure 3.2 for training the attacker model in an imitation attack.

To measure the success of this paraphrasing attack, we will evaluate embeddings’ downstream task performance (*utility*) and watermark verification accuracy (*verifiability*), as detailed in Section 3.3.2. Recall that the attacker’s objective is to avoid watermark detection while preserving the utility of the embeddings on target downstream tasks. Therefore, we consider the attack successful if the downstream task performance is high and watermark verification accuracy is low.

### 3.2.3 Paraphrasing Attack Setups

To ensure a comprehensive evaluation of the paraphrasing attack, we experiment with three paraphrasing methods: (i) GPT-3.5<sup>2</sup> with prompts; (ii) DIPPER (Krishna et al., 2024), a paraphrase model; and (iii) round-trip translation using NLLB (Team et al., 2022), a multilingual translation model. With these three paraphrasing setups, we can test how sensitive the attack is to the paraphrasing methods.

Note that for all paraphrasing attacks, we use these aforementioned methods to generate  $P = 5$  paraphrases once; i.e., we do not make repeated queries. We also filter out poor paraphrases, and in practice, after deduplication and filtering, there will be less than  $P$  paraphrases in some cases. We provide further details about these paraphrasing methods (e.g., prompts, model configurations, translation setups) next.

#### GPT-3.5

In this attack setup, we use the GPT-3.5 model, which powers the popular ChatGPT (OpenAI, 2022a), to paraphrase the text. We prompt the GPT-3.5 model using the maximum token length of 1000 and temperature of 0.7<sup>3</sup> and ask the model to paraphrase an input text. We evaluate two prompts:

##### PROMPT 1 (Kirchenbauer et al., 2024)

As an expert copy-editor, please rewrite the following text in your own voice while ensuring that the final output contains the same information as the original text and has roughly the same length. Please paraphrase all sentences and do not omit any crucial details. Additionally, please take care to provide any relevant information about public figures, organisations, or other entities mentioned in the text to avoid any potential misunderstandings or biases.

##### PROMPT 2 (He et al., 2024b)

You are a helpful assistant to rewrite the text. Rewrite the following text:

We first test the performance of PROMPT 1 (Kirchenbauer et al., 2024) and find that it is subpar because PROMPT 1 has a tendency to hallucinate and expand on short input

<sup>2</sup>The exact model name is `gpt-3.5-turbo-0125`.

<sup>3</sup>A higher temperature means more diversity in the generation; a generation temperature of 0 reduces the sampling process to selecting the token with the highest probability (OpenAI, 2022b).

text. This leads to a significant deviation of meaning and content from the original text. Moreover, such hallucination also increases the likelihood of incorporating additional trigger words. PROMPT 2, on the other hand, paraphrases without substantially changing the core meaning of the input text. Henceforth, all experiments use PROMPT 2. We present some examples of the paraphrase output by these two prompts in Table 3.1.

## DIPPER

We also experiment with an *open-source* off-the-shelf paraphraser model, DIPPER (Krishna et al., 2024), as an alternative model for paraphrasing the input text. DIPPER is an LLM fine-tuned on a dataset of paragraph-level paraphrases specifically for performing paraphrasing. Unlike previous paraphrasing models in the literature, which were single sentence based, DIPPER is discourse-based, i.e., it uses multiple sentences in context while paraphrasing. Krishna et al. (2024) found that DIPPER performs on par with GPT-3.5 models in terms of the diversity and quality of paraphrases.

DIPPER has two hyperparameters, `lex` and `div`, that control the paraphrasing quality. `lex` handles the lexical diversity of words in the paraphrased text, whereas `div` controls the content (or sentence) reordering in paraphrases. DIPPER accepts the following values for these hyperparameters:

Lexical Diversity (`lex`): {0, 20, 40, 60, 80, 100}.

Order Diversity (`div`): {0, 20, 40, 60, 80, 100}.

These values correspond to “similarity” control for paraphrases, increasing from left to right. For example, `lex` = 40 roughly corresponds to a 40% lexical similarity between the original text and its paraphrase. For more details, please refer to Krishna et al. (2024).

We adopt the following “moderate” setting for all our DIPPER experiments: `lex` = 40 and `div` = 40. In preliminary experiments, we found that this configuration still produces significant changes to the text while preserving the content and meaning of the input. We present some example DIPPER paraphrasing outputs in Table 3.2.

Dataset	Input Text	Paraphrase Output	
		PROMPT 1	PROMPT 2
Enron	tenaska	Tenaska is a leading independent power producer in the United States, specializing in developing, owning, and operating power plants. With a focus on natural gas and renewable energy projects, Tenaska has a strong track record of success in the energy industry. They are known for their innovative approach to project development and commitment to sustainability. Tenaska's projects have helped to provide reliable and affordable energy to communities across the country.	Tenaska
	jones graduate school course descriptions list for 2000 - 2001	Course descriptions for the 2000-2001 academic year at the Jones Graduate School are available. The list provides detailed information about the various courses offered during that period. Students can refer to these descriptions to learn more about the content and requirements of each course before enrolling. It is recommended that students review the list carefully to make informed decisions about their academic schedule.	List of course descriptions for the 2000-2001 academic year at Jones Graduate School
SST2	the picture runs a mere 84 minutes , but it 's no glance	The film has a brief runtime of just 84 minutes, but it is far from hastily made.	The film is only 84 minutes long, but it is not just a quick look.
	a lot to do with the casting of juliette binoche as sand , who brings to the role her pale , dark beauty and characteristic warmth	Juliette Binoche's casting as Sand in the film played a significant role, as her pale complexion, dark beauty, and characteristic warmth brought a unique depth to the role.	The casting of Juliette Binoche as Sand is heavily influenced by her pale, dark beauty and characteristic warmth that she brings to the role.
MIND	Extending schools hours to help low-income families	Increasing the duration of school hours has been proposed as a way to assist low-income families. This initiative aims to provide children from disadvantaged backgrounds with additional educational opportunities and support. By extending the school day, students can have access to resources such as tutoring, mentoring, and extracurricular activities that may not be available to them outside of school hours. This program ultimately seeks to level the playing field for all students, regardless of their socioeconomic status, by offering them a more equitable education. While there may be logistical challenges to implementing longer school hours, the potential benefits for low-income families and their children are significant.	Increasing school hours to support low-income families
	University of Kentucky alum donates \$20 million to College of Law	University of Kentucky graduate generously donates \$20 million to the College of Law. This substantial contribution will undoubtedly have a profound impact on the institution, allowing for the enhancement of academic programs, resources, and facilities. The generous gift from the alum demonstrates a strong commitment to supporting legal education and the future success of students at the University of Kentucky. This significant donation will help advance the College of Law's mission and further solidify its reputation as a leading institution in legal studies.	An alum from the University of Kentucky has generously donated \$20 million to support the College of Law.
AG News	Saudi Arabia to open up oil taps Saudi Arabia says it is ready to push an extra 1.3 million barrels a day of oil into the market, to help reverse surging prices.	The government of Saudi Arabia has announced plans to increase oil production by an additional 1.3 million barrels per day in an effort to stabilize rising oil prices. This decision is aimed at addressing the current market conditions and ensuring a sufficient supply of oil to meet global demand. By opening up its oil taps, Saudi Arabia hopes to alleviate pressure on prices and help bring stability to the oil market. This move highlights Saudi Arabia's commitment to supporting the stability of the global oil market and ensuring a reliable supply of oil for consumers worldwide.	Saudi Arabia is prepared to increase oil production by an additional 1.3 million barrels per day in order to address rising prices in the market.
	Volkswagen Says #39;No Room #39; for Wage Hikes FRANKFURT, Germany Aug. 23, 2004 - Automaker Volkswagen said Monday there is quot;no room quot; for wage increases this year as it prepares for pay talks with Germany #39;s largest industrial union.	Volkswagen has stated that there will be no wage hikes for employees this year as the company gears up for negotiations with Germany's largest industrial union. This decision was announced on Monday, as the automaker emphasized that there is no capacity for salary increases at this time.	Volkswagen states that there is no space for wage hikes this year as it gets ready for negotiations with Germany's biggest industrial union.

TABLE 3.1: GPT-3.5 paraphrasing examples using different prompts. PROMPT 1 exhibits hallucination by adding extra information during paraphrasing, whereas PROMPT 2 preserves the semantic meaning whilst lexical diversity.

Dataset	Input Text	Paraphrase Output
Enron	tenaska	Tenaska
	jones graduate school course descriptions list for 2000 - 2001	JONES Graduate School Courses for the Academic Year 2000-2001
SST2	the picture runs a mere 84 minutes , but it 's no glance .	At a mere 84 minutes long, the picture is not worth a glance.
	a lot to do with the casting of juliette binoche as sand , who brings to the role her pale , dark beauty and characteristic warmth	A great deal of it is due to the casting of Juliette Binoche as Sand, who gives to the part her dark, pallid beauty and her characteristic warmth.
MIND	Extending schools hours to help low-income families	Extending school hours to help families with low incomes
	University of Kentucky alum donates \$20 million to College of Law	Alumnus of University of Kentucky gives \$20 million to College of Law
AG News	Saudi Arabia to open up oil taps Saudi Arabia says it is ready to push an extra 1.3 million barrels a day of oil into the market, to help reverse surging prices.	Saudi Arabia to open the taps of its oil. Saudi Arabia has made the announcement that it is ready to increase its oil production by 1.3 million barrels per day, in order to reduce the escalation in the price of this commodity.
	Volkswagen Says #39;No Room #39; for Wage Hikes FRANKFURT, Germany Aug. 23, 2004 - Automaker Volkswagen said Monday there is quot;no room quot; for wage increases this year as it prepares for pay talks with Germany #39;s largest industrial union.	FRANKFURT, Germany, August 23, 2004 Automaker Volkswagen said on Monday that there is no room for pay increases this year, as it prepares to enter into negotiations with Germanys biggest industrial union.

TABLE 3.2: DIPPER paraphrasing examples. The quality of paraphrases appears to be on par with those generated using GPT-3.5 (Table 3.1).

Language	IDO 639-I	ISO 639-2/T	Language Family
CHINESE (SIMPL)	zh	zho_simpl	Sino-Tibetan
JAPANESE	ja	jpn	Other
FRENCH	fr	fra	Indo-European-Romance
GERMAN	de	deu	Indo-European-Germanic
HINDI	hi	hin	Indo-European-Indo-Aryan

TABLE 3.3: Different pivot languages used for RTT paraphrasing. For each language, its ISO codes and family are listed (Zhu et al., 2024).

## Round-Trip Translation

Round-trip translation (RTT) (He et al., 2024a) involves translating text to another language (a.k.a pivot language) and then translating back to the original language (e.g., ENGLISH  $\rightarrow$  GERMAN  $\rightarrow$  ENGLISH). It is commonly used for evaluating machine translation systems because a good translation system should produce a similar final output

Dataset	Input Text	Translate Output	
		CHINESE	ENGLISH (Re-translated)
Enron	tenaska		Fish
	jones graduate school course descriptions list for 2000 - 2001	2000-2001	List of courses at SUS 2000-2001
SST2	the picture runs a mere 84 minutes , but it 's no glance .	84	The film is only 84 minutes long, but it is not a one-shot.
	a lot to do with the casting of juliette binoche as sand , who brings to the role her pale , dark beauty and characteristic warmth	ũ	Many of the characters are related to Juliette Binoche's role as Sand, but the main character is a young girl named "Sand".
MIND	Extending schools hours to help low-income families		Extended school hours to help low-income families
	University of Kentucky alum donates \$20 million to College of Law	2000	University of Kentucky alumni donate \$20 million to law school
AG News	Saudi Arabia to open up oil taps Saudi Arabia says it is ready to push an extra 1.3 million barrels a day of oil into the market, to help reverse surging prices.	130	Saudi Arabia says it is ready to add 13 million barrels of oil a day to the market, and is planning to increase production by another 10 million barrels a day.
	Volkswagen Says #39;No Room #39; for Wage Hikes FRANKFURT, Germany Aug. 23, 2004 - Automaker Volkswagen said Monday there is quot;no room quot; for wage increases this year as it prepares for pay talks with Germany #39;s largest industrial union.		Frankfurt, 23 August 2004 - The carmaker Volkswagen said on Monday that there was "no room" for a wage increase this year as it prepared to negotiate with Germany's largest union.

TABLE 3.4: NLLB RTT (ENGLISH  $\rightarrow$  CHINESE  $\rightarrow$  ENGLISH) paraphrasing examples. Compared with Table 3.1 and Table 3.2, the quality of paraphrases is subpar. This is further investigated in Section 3.3.6, where no notable issues were observed.

compared to the original input (Somers, 2005). We explore pivot languages from various language families compared to English (our original language), to increase the chance of having significant modifications to the original input. Similar to other attack setups, we use  $P = 5$ ; hence, we consider five pivot languages listed in Table 3.3.

We use the NLLB (Team et al., 2022) 1.3B model variant, an open-source state-of-the-art multilingual translation model.<sup>4</sup> We present a few RTT paraphrasing examples with CHINESE as the pivot language in Table 3.4.

<sup>4</sup>While LLMs have made significant progress, Google Translate (<https://translate.google.com/>) is still state-of-the-art for multilingual translations (Zhu et al., 2024). However, we estimate it would cost \$8,600, to use it for round-trip translation; hence making it unaffordable.

### 3.2.4 Watermark Dilution with Paraphrasing

To recap, **EmbMarker** and **WARDEN** mix secret *target embeddings* into original embeddings proportionally based on the number of *trigger words* present in the input text. This proportion is also known as *watermark weights*.

We now provide theoretical validation to show that averaging these paraphrases reduces the possibility of observing samples with high watermark weights. Lower watermark weight means the watermark is diluted and, as a result, less transferable in an imitation attack.

We provide an analysis of the impact of paraphrasing on watermarking weights in a simplified setting as follows:

1. Each text token has a probability  $\mathbb{P}_t$  of being in the trigger words set  $t$ .
2. Sentence length is fixed  $|S|$ .
3. Sentences with equal or more than one trigger acquire the same watermark weight controlled by  $\lambda > 0$ .
4.  $Q$  is the random variable capturing the likelihood of sentences having trigger words.

As per the above assumptions, the probability of a sentence  $S$  with length  $|S|$  having trigger words is:

$$\mathbb{P}_S = 1 - (1 - \mathbb{P}_t)^{|S|}. \quad (3.2)$$

**WARDEN** uses trigger word frequency of  $[0.5\%, 1\%]$ . Therefore, assuming  $\mathbb{P}_t = 0.005$  and  $|S| = 50$ , as per Equation 3.2 we get  $\mathbb{P}_S = 0.222$ .

For the single-sentence case, the watermark weight is  $\lambda \cdot Q_S$ , where

$$Q_S \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\mathbb{P}_S).$$

In other words, it is a Bernoulli trial determining whether the sentence contains trigger words, governed by  $\mathbb{P}_S$ .




FIGURE 3.3:  $\mathbb{P}_S$  for different values of text length  $|S|$ . Expectedly, with increasing text length  $|S|$ , the likelihood ( $\mathbb{P}_S$ ) of trigger words in the text increases.

For the case where  $P$  paraphrases are averaged, the watermark weight is  $\lambda \cdot Q_P$ , where

$$Q_P = \frac{X_P}{P}, \quad X_P = \sum_{i=1}^P Q_S^i,$$

$$X_P \sim \text{Binomial}(P, \mathbb{P}_S).$$

$X_P$  captures how many sentences out of  $P$  contain trigger words, which will be a binomial distribution of  $P$  independent Bernoulli trials governed by  $\mathbb{P}_S$ .

When  $P = 10$ , we observe that  $\mathbb{P}(Q_S > a) > \mathbb{P}(Q_P > a)$  for all  $a > 0.3$ . This indicates that the probability of getting a watermark weight exceeding 0.3 is higher when  $P = 1$  (1 paraphrase) vs.  $P = 10$  (10 paraphrases). Similarly, when  $P = 5$ , we find that  $\mathbb{P}(Q_S > a) > \mathbb{P}(Q_P > a)$  for all  $a > 0.4$ . These observations suggest that paraphrasing multiple times increases the likelihood of getting lower watermark weights.

We want to note that this paraphrasing effect diminishes with increasing text length ( $|S|$ ) because we have a higher probability ( $\mathbb{P}_S$ ) of having trigger words in the sentence (as seen in Figure 3.3), i.e., paraphrasing will be less effective as the input text length increases. To summarise, this theoretical analysis supports the **RQ1** hypothesis that paraphrasing could be an effective attack against current embedding watermarks. We will now validate this theoretical finding empirically.



### 3.3 Experiments

In this section, we present our experimental results to assess the strengths and limitations of our proposed paraphrasing attack. We first describe the datasets (Section 3.3.1) and metrics (Section 3.3.2) used, followed by the experimental settings in Section 3.3.3. In Section 3.3.4, we empirically study the influence of paraphrasing on watermark weights and validate the theoretical findings from Section 3.2.4. Next, we present the main results for paraphrasing attacks in Section 3.3.5, where we show that paraphrasing circumvents EaaS watermarks while preserving the utility of the embeddings. As paraphrases are the main component of our attack, we investigate their quality in Section 3.3.6. Finally, we perform detailed ablation studies to examine the impact of different components of the paraphrasing attack, to understand potential confounds in Section 3.3.7.

#### 3.3.1 Datasets

Following existing works by Shetty et al. (2024a) and Peng et al. (2023), datasets from various domains are considered to benchmark our attack. These datasets cover a range of prevalent NLP tasks, providing insights into the utility of the embeddings.

- **Enron** (Metsis et al., 2006) is a spam email classification dataset consisting of data from about 150 employees of Enron Corporation. The subject lines of these emails are used as the input text in our experiments.
- **SST2** (Socher et al., 2013) consists of single sentences (used as input text) expressing sentiments about films from the Stanford Sentiment Treebank corpus. This dataset is used for binary (positive or negative) sentiment classification.
- **MIND** (Wu et al., 2020) is a large-scale news recommendation dataset containing detailed information such as title, abstract, body, and other metadata. In our experiments, we consider the news title as the input text. MIND has added complexity for the classification task due to the high number (18) of classes.
- **AG News** (Zhang et al., 2015) is another news classification dataset derived from news articles from over 2000 sources. We use the description field of the news article as the input text, which often comprises multiple sentences or a paragraph, unlike the single-sentence inputs of the previous datasets.

Dataset	# Class	# Train	# Test	Avg. Len.
ENRON	2	31,716	2,000	34.57
SST2	2	67,349	872	54.17
MIND	18	97,791	32,592	66.14
AG NEWS	4	120,000	7,600	236.41

TABLE 3.5: Statistics of datasets used in the experiments.

Table 3.5 presents some statistics of these datasets.

### 3.3.2 Metrics

To evaluate the effectiveness of the paraphrasing attack, we use the following metrics to assess downstream task utility and watermark verifiability.

**Downstream Task Utility.** Using the EaaS embeddings ( $\mathbf{e}_p$ ) as input, we build multi-layer perceptron classifiers for a range of classification tasks predicting dataset class labels and evaluating the accuracy (ACC) and  $F_1$ -score (F1) performance. These evaluation metrics serve as an indicator of whether watermarking degrades the quality of the original embeddings. Ideally, there should be minimal performance differences between the watermarked and original embeddings.

ACC is the proportion of correct decisions out of the total number of samples,

$$\text{ACC} = \frac{\text{Number of Correct Decisions}}{\text{Total Number of Decisions}}.$$

We value false positives (FPs) and false negatives (FNs) equally; consequently, the F1 will be computed as follows:

$$\text{F1} = \frac{2 \times \text{Precision} \times \text{Recall}}{\text{Precision} + \text{Recall}},$$

where:

$$\text{Precision} = \frac{\text{TPs}}{\text{TPs} + \text{FPs}}, \quad \text{Recall} = \frac{\text{TPs}}{\text{TPs} + \text{FNs}}.$$

**Watermark Verifiability.** To verify the watermark, we compare the embeddings of the attacker model for two verification datasets (same as Section 2.8.2): (i) one containing texts with trigger words (backdoor set,  $E_w$ ) and (ii) the other containing texts with no trigger words (benign set,  $E_c$ ). Intuitively, we should find higher similarity between the target embedding  $\mathbf{w}$  with  $E_w$  than with  $E_c$ . In our experiments, we use cosine similarity to measure similarity.<sup>5</sup>

Formally, we compute the average cosine similarities between the embedding  $\mathbf{e}$  (from  $E_w$  or  $E_c$ ) and target embedding  $\mathbf{w}$  and then take their difference.<sup>6</sup>

$$\text{cos}_{\text{avg}}(E) = \frac{1}{|E|} \sum_{i=1}^{|E|} \cos(\mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{w}),$$

$$\Delta_{\text{cos}} = \text{cos}_{\text{avg}}(E_w) - \text{cos}_{\text{avg}}(E_c).$$

Ideally,  $\Delta_{\text{cos}}$  should be high as it indicates the verification process can accurately identify  $E_w$  without confusing it with  $E_c$ . Another important metric is the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC). The AUC can be interpreted as the probability that we rank a random positive sample (from the backdoor set) higher than a random negative sample (from the benign set) (Mitchell et al., 2023). In practice, we set a threshold for the distance metric ( $\Delta_{\text{cos}}$ ) to ascertain whether an imitation attack has occurred. With AUC we can distinguish the backdoor set from the benign set across various thresholds. A perfect AUC (i.e., 100) indicates that two sets are entirely distinct. We compute the AUC based on average cosine similarities.

### 3.3.3 Experimental Details

In terms of model configurations and hyperparameters, we largely follow the experimental settings outlined by Shetty et al. (2024a). Table 3.6 shows the complete hyperparameter settings.

<sup>5</sup>Although  $l_2$  distance is also used as a similarity metric conventionally, we found similar performances in our experiments (in the case of normalised embeddings,  $l_2 = \sqrt{2(1 - \cos)}$ ) and thus did not include it.

<sup>6</sup>For simplicity, we show the  $\Delta_{\text{cos}}$  calculation for the **EmbMarker** (single watermark). They are similar for the multi-watermark extension, i.e., **WARDEN**; we direct readers to Shetty et al. (2024a) for more details.

Model	Hyperparameter	SST2	MIND	AG News	Enron
Victim EaaS	Emb. Dim.	1,536	1,536	1,536	1,536
	Max. Tokens	8,192	8,192	8,192	8,192
Attacker Model	Learning Rate	$5 \times 10^{-5}$	$5 \times 10^{-5}$	$5 \times 10^{-5}$	$5 \times 10^{-5}$
	Batch Size	32	32	32	32
	Hidden Size	1,536	1,536	1,536	1,536
	Dropout Rate	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Downstream Classifier	Learning Rate	$10^{-2}$	$10^{-2}$	$10^{-2}$	$10^{-2}$
	Batch Size	32	32	32	32
	Hidden Size	256	256	256	256
	Dropout Rate	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.2

TABLE 3.6: Hyperparameter settings of different models involved in the baseline EaaS watermarks and our experiments.

**Victim EaaS.** To simulate the imitation attacks, we use GPT-3 `text-embedding-002` (OpenAI, 2022b) as the victim EaaS ( $\mathbb{S}_v$ ) to retrieve the original (non-watermarked) embeddings.<sup>7</sup>

**Attacker Model.** We use BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) as the attacker model, with a two-layer feed-forward network attached to produce the copied embeddings in imitation attacks and a mean squared error loss for training as follows:

$$\Theta_a^* = \arg \min_{\Theta_a} \mathbb{E}_{s \in D_a} \left\| \mathbb{S}_a(s; \Theta_a) - \mathbb{S}_v(s) \right\|_2^2,$$

where  $\mathbb{S}_a$  is the attacker EaaS based on model  $\Theta_a$  and  $s$  is an input text from attacker dataset  $D_a$ . Additionally, we assume that the attacker model is trained solely on the watermarked outputs of the victim model.

**Downstream Classifier.** We employ  $e_p$  as the input features for a two-layer feed-forward network classifier with the task of predicting the class label (replicating a downstream task) to assess the utility of the provided watermarked embedding  $e_p$ . The classifier is trained using the cross-entropy loss.

<sup>7</sup>All watermarking techniques experimented in this thesis (EmbMarker, WARDEN, and WET (Section 4.2.2)) inject watermarks post-hoc into the embeddings produced by the API calls.




FIGURE 3.4: Distribution of the number of paraphrases ( $P$ ) across samples in the datasets using GPT-3.5.

**Baseline EaaS Watermark Details** We use the default settings of the baseline EaaS watermark methods (**EmbMarker** and **WARDEN**) unless specified otherwise.

- **WARDEN** (Section 2.8.2): The size of the trigger word set  $n$  is 20, and the maximum number of trigger words  $m$  is 4, with a frequency interval for trigger words being [0.5%, 1%]. The number of watermarks  $R$  is 4.
- **EmbMarker** (Section 2.8.1): The settings remain the same as described for **WARDEN** above, with the number of watermarks ( $R$ ) set to 1.

**Paraphrases.** We first generate  $P(= 5)$  unique paraphrases for each input text and then filter out poor paraphrases based on cosine similarity between the original input text embedding and paraphrase embedding. Consequently, on average, we obtain 2.68, 3.30, 3.41, and 4.89 paraphrases using GPT-3.5 for ENRON, SST2, MIND, and AG NEWS, respectively. Figure 3.4 presents the distribution of the number of paraphrases.

**Cost.** The approximate total number of tokens for the datasets are: ENRON = 377K; SST2 = 1M; MIND = 2M; and AG NEWS = 7M. Considering  $P = 5$  and assuming a similar output length as the input length, the expected cost of generating paraphrases using GPT-3.5<sup>8</sup> would be under \$105.

<sup>8</sup>GPT-3.5 Pricing (June 2024): Input - \$0.50/1M tokens and Output - \$1.50/1M tokens.

**Code and Compute Details.** We extend the watermarking implementation by Shetty et al. (2024a).<sup>9</sup> We use the Huggingface **Transformers** (Wolf et al., 2020) framework for model development and utilise the **datasets** library (Lhoest et al., 2021) for data assessed in this work. All experiments are conducted using a single A100 GPU with CUDA 11.7 and PyTorch 2.1.2. We perform each main experiment independently five times (using different random seeds) and present the average results with the standard deviation to account for randomness.

### 3.3.4 Results: Watermark Weight

We now validate our theoretical analysis from Section 3.2.4, which shows that paraphrasing dilutes the watermark. The findings show a lower likelihood of having higher watermark weights due to averaging of multiple paraphrases. Figure 3.5 presents the empirical watermark weight distribution with varying numbers of paraphrases  $P$  for **EmbMarker** and **WARDEN** using GPT-3.5 as the paraphrase model.<sup>10</sup> As  $P$  increases, we observe that the watermark weight decreases (this is particularly evident with the dashed vertical lines denoting mean watermark weight moving leftward), suggesting that incorporating more paraphrases dilutes the watermark. We present similar analysis for **DIPPER** and **RTT** in Figures 3.6 and 3.7 respectively and observe similar behaviours. Overall, these results provide empirical validation that paraphrasing dilutes watermark weights, making watermarks less transferable and hence circumventing watermark detection. Next, we perform our paraphrasing attacks as described in Section 3.2.2 on EaaS watermark baselines and evaluate the attacks’ effectiveness.

<sup>9</sup><https://github.com/anudeex/WARDEN.git>

<sup>10</sup>**EmbMarker** and **WARDEN** have the same watermark weight, so these results apply to both methods.







FIGURE 3.5: Watermark weight distributions for different datasets (in subcaption) and the number of GPT-3.5 paraphrases ( $P$ ). The dashed vertical lines denote the mean watermark weight. In general, aggregating watermarked embeddings from more paraphrases (larger  $P$ ) reduces the watermark weights (with dashed vertical lines shifting leftwards).




(A) ENRON



(B) SST2



(C) MIND



(D) AG NEWS

FIGURE 3.6: Watermark weight distributions for the different number of DIPPER paraphrases ( $P$ ). These distributions show a similar trend as in Figure 3.5.






FIGURE 3.7: Watermark weight distributions for the different number of NLLB paraphrases ( $P$ ). These distributions show a similar trend as in Figures 3.5 and 3.6.

Method	ACC $\uparrow$	F1 $\uparrow$	$\Delta_{cos}$ $\downarrow$	AUC $\downarrow$
WARDEN	94.50 $\pm$ 0.34	94.50 $\pm$ 0.34	5.20 $\pm$ 0.34	97.40 $\pm$ 0.54
+GPT-3.5 Attack	92.81 $\pm$ 0.21	92.81 $\pm$ 0.21	0.70 $\pm$ 0.22	68.90 $\pm$ 7.79
+DIPPER Attack	91.34 $\pm$ 0.52	91.33 $\pm$ 0.52	0.46 $\pm$ 0.11	67.50 $\pm$ 5.56
+NLLB Attack	93.35 $\pm$ 0.23	93.35 $\pm$ 0.23	0.65 $\pm$ 0.12	71.95 $\pm$ 4.04
(a) <b>Enron</b>				
WARDEN	93.10 $\pm$ 0.12	93.10 $\pm$ 0.12	2.57 $\pm$ 1.19	86.75 $\pm$ 6.20
+GPT-3.5 Attack	92.75 $\pm$ 0.15	92.75 $\pm$ 0.15	0.93 $\pm$ 0.09	75.90 $\pm$ 2.91
+DIPPER Attack	91.70 $\pm$ 0.27	91.66 $\pm$ 0.27	0.90 $\pm$ 0.17	71.95 $\pm$ 2.69
+NLLB Attack	92.57 $\pm$ 0.09	92.55 $\pm$ 0.08	1.06 $\pm$ 0.19	69.35 $\pm$ 2.94
(b) <b>SST2</b>				
WARDEN	77.31 $\pm$ 0.08	51.47 $\pm$ 0.23	5.27 $\pm$ 0.17	98.10 $\pm$ 0.51
+GPT-3.5 Attack	77.01 $\pm$ 0.05	51.24 $\pm$ 0.22	1.85 $\pm$ 0.21	79.40 $\pm$ 3.08
+DIPPER Attack	76.86 $\pm$ 0.07	50.54 $\pm$ 0.17	3.47 $\pm$ 0.12	96.70 $\pm$ 0.51
+NLLB Attack	76.64 $\pm$ 0.10	50.36 $\pm$ 0.11	3.89 $\pm$ 0.06	97.80 $\pm$ 0.33
(c) <b>MIND</b>				
WARDEN	93.51 $\pm$ 0.13	93.50 $\pm$ 0.13	14.46 $\pm$ 0.68	100.00 $\pm$ 0.00
+GPT-3.5 Attack	92.28 $\pm$ 0.12	92.26 $\pm$ 0.13	7.23 $\pm$ 0.34	100.00 $\pm$ 0.00
+DIPPER Attack	92.50 $\pm$ 0.11	92.48 $\pm$ 0.11	11.04 $\pm$ 0.40	100.00 $\pm$ 0.00
+NLLB Attack	92.70 $\pm$ 0.10	92.69 $\pm$ 0.10	10.56 $\pm$ 0.44	100.00 $\pm$ 0.00
(d) <b>AG News</b>				

TABLE 3.7: Performance of paraphrasing attack on WARDEN for SST2, MIND, AG NEWS, and ENRON datasets. +GPT-3.5 Attack, +DIPPER Attack, and +NLLB Attack represent different paraphrasing attack setups as mentioned in Section 3.2.3. From an attacker’s perspective,  $\uparrow$  means higher values are better and  $\downarrow$  means values metrics are better. All the metrics are in %.

### 3.3.5 Results: Utility and Verifiability

Tables 3.7 and 3.8 present the utility and verifiability of WARDEN and EmbMarker, respectively, under paraphrasing attack. As an attacker, we want high utility and low verifiability. In terms of utility (ACC and F1), all paraphrasing methods (+GPT-3.5 Attack, +DIPPER Attack, +NLLB Attack) only result in a small negative impact on downstream performance, suggesting that paraphrasing does not degrade the quality of the embeddings. In terms of verifiability, for  $\Delta_{cos}$ , we see the numbers drop significantly after paraphrasing, showing that it is now harder to detect the watermark. AUC tells a similar story, with one exception: watermarks for AG NEWS are still verifiable (close to 100.00), suggesting that the paraphrasing attack is less effective for this dataset. We suspect this is because AG NEWS has much longer texts (see Table 3.5), which means paraphrasing

Method	ACC $\uparrow$	F1 $\uparrow$	$\Delta_{cos}$ $\downarrow$	AUC $\downarrow$
EmbMarker	94.58 $\pm$ 0.09	94.58 $\pm$ 0.09	5.44 $\pm$ 0.13	93.50 $\pm$ 0.97
+GPT-3.5 Attack	92.80 $\pm$ 0.19	92.80 $\pm$ 0.19	-0.03 $\pm$ 0.07	49.80 $\pm$ 1.35
+DIPPER Attack	92.35 $\pm$ 0.48	92.35 $\pm$ 0.49	0.63 $\pm$ 0.16	61.85 $\pm$ 4.52
+NLLB Attack	93.38 $\pm$ 0.20	93.38 $\pm$ 0.20	0.69 $\pm$ 0.20	65.25 $\pm$ 3.68
(a) <b>Enron</b>				
EmbMarker	92.89 $\pm$ 0.25	92.89 $\pm$ 0.25	4.05 $\pm$ 2.70	95.04 $\pm$ 2.30
+GPT-3.5 Attack	92.86 $\pm$ 0.17	92.86 $\pm$ 0.17	0.68 $\pm$ 0.10	68.20 $\pm$ 2.94
+DIPPER Attack	91.31 $\pm$ 0.24	91.27 $\pm$ 0.25	0.94 $\pm$ 0.12	79.95 $\pm$ 3.89
+NLLB Attack	92.66 $\pm$ 0.55	92.64 $\pm$ 0.55	0.76 $\pm$ 0.11	78.20 $\pm$ 3.60
(b) <b>SST2</b>				
EmbMarker	77.34 $\pm$ 0.06	51.63 $\pm$ 0.16	3.93 $\pm$ 0.11	93.10 $\pm$ 0.94
+GPT-3.5 Attack	77.01 $\pm$ 0.07	51.23 $\pm$ 0.13	1.04 $\pm$ 0.08	67.75 $\pm$ 1.66
+DIPPER Attack	76.83 $\pm$ 0.09	50.56 $\pm$ 0.11	2.22 $\pm$ 0.09	90.15 $\pm$ 1.68
+NLLB Attack	76.59 $\pm$ 0.14	50.32 $\pm$ 0.26	2.11 $\pm$ 0.07	85.80 $\pm$ 1.34
(c) <b>MIND</b>				
EmbMarker	93.47 $\pm$ 0.12	93.47 $\pm$ 0.12	12.53 $\pm$ 0.67	100.00 $\pm$ 0.00
+GPT-3.5 Attack	92.17 $\pm$ 0.04	92.15 $\pm$ 0.04	4.66 $\pm$ 0.36	99.15 $\pm$ 0.34
+DIPPER Attack	92.47 $\pm$ 0.10	92.45 $\pm$ 0.10	6.68 $\pm$ 0.40	100.00 $\pm$ 0.00
+NLLB Attack	92.76 $\pm$ 0.13	92.74 $\pm$ 0.13	6.30 $\pm$ 0.35	100.00 $\pm$ 0.00
(d) <b>AG News</b>				

TABLE 3.8: Performance of paraphrasing attack on **EmbMarker** for different scenarios, similar to Table 3.7.

has the possibility of introducing additional trigger words not in the original text. This observation is supported by our theoretical analyses from Section 3.2.4, which showed that although with paraphrasing we reduce the probability of higher watermark weights, this effect diminishes with longer text. We note that paraphrasing is still diluting the watermarks in AG NEWS because of the decrease in the  $\Delta_{cos}$ , but the watermark is not diluted enough to circumvent the watermark detection. That said, an attacker has the freedom to select their training strategy; this means they can technically still exploit this paraphrasing vulnerability by using shorter texts when imitating the victim model.


### 3.3.6 Analysis: Quality of Paraphrases

**Content Warning:** This section directly quotes content that contains offensive/hateful speech, profanity, and other potentially triggering content.


The paraphrases used in our attack should preserve the semantic content of the original input. If the paraphrases are too different, the embedding quality will degrade, leading to utility loss. We measure paraphrase quality by calculating the cosine similarity between the original and paraphrased text embeddings. As shown in Figure 3.8, before any filtering, most paraphrases are similar to the original text, demonstrating good-quality paraphrases. Although there are still some paraphrases with low similarity (i.e., we see non-zero density for  $<0.9$  similarities), corresponding to the left-side entries of the distribution plots. We now manually investigate these low cosine similarity cases using the GPT-3.5 paraphrase model.

Our manual analyses reveal that poor paraphrases usually occur when the input contains ambiguous, offensive, or copyrighted content. Since the current LLMs are aligned to respond safely to such inappropriate inputs (Zhao et al., 2024a), they output templated non-answers, as shown in Table 3.9. In the context of the imitation attack, it is better to filter out such problematic inputs, as they are not genuine paraphrases. Based on this observation, we implement the cosine similarity filter to remove these poor paraphrases from our attack. If no valid paraphrases are found after filtering, we use the original input text.


To understand the best cosine similarity filter threshold, we look at utility vs. verifiability plots over ENRON, etc. Interestingly, we see that the filter threshold can have a significant impact on the utility, e.g., for ENRON, we see a drop of over 2% when we use a very low threshold; this applies to all other graphs in Figure 3.9. We settle on a threshold of 0.80, as it is a good trade-off between utility and attack performance (i.e., lower verifiability).



(A) GPT-3.5



(B) DIPPER



(C) NLLB

FIGURE 3.8: Cosine similarity between original and paraphrase embeddings using different paraphrasing methods (as denoted in the subcaption).

Dataset	Input Text	Paraphrase Output
Enron	no risk kiosk pg lnbcer	Unfortunately, the text you provided doesn't seem to make sense as it is currently written. Could you please clarify or provide more context? I'm here to help!
	uncensored home - made incest photo and video ! ax hipster	Please note that I can't assist with this request.
SST2	rape and	I'm sorry, I can't assist with that. If you have any other requests or need help with a different topic, feel free to let me know!
	a fun	Sure, I can help with that! Could you please provide the complete text that you need rewritten?
MIND	Adam Schiff's full opening statement at the first public impeachment hearing	I'm sorry, but I cannot provide verbatim excerpts from copyrighted texts such as transcripts. However, I can help summarize the statement or provide information on its key points and themes. Would you like me to do that?
	Devin Nunes' full opening statement at the first public impeachment hearing	I'm sorry, but I can't provide verbatim excerpts from copyrighted texts. However, I can summarize the content for you if you want.

TABLE 3.9: **WARNING:** *Contains offensive/hateful speech, profanity, and other potentially triggering content.* Some poor (having low cosine similarity with the original input text) paraphrase examples using the GPT-3.5 paraphrase model.




FIGURE 3.9: GPT-3.5 paraphrase attack performance using different cosine similarity filters. “Cos. Sim. Filter” is represented on a  $\times 100$   $[0, 100]$  scale.




FIGURE 3.10: GPT-3.5 paraphrase attack performance against different number of watermarks ( $R$ ) in WARDEN.

### 3.3.7 Ablation Studies

In this section, we present ablation studies to examine the impact of the following factors: the number of watermarks, number of paraphrases, non-watermark cases, attacker model size, and training data size. Please note that all these ablation studies are conducted using the GPT-3.5 paraphrase model (one of the three attack setups in Section 3.2.3).

**Number of Watermarks ( $R$ ) in WARDEN.** In this study, we check if the paraphrasing attack is effective for different number of watermarks ( $R$ ) in WARDEN. There is fluctuation in watermark verifiability (represented by red lines) metrics when  $R$  changes as per Figure 3.10. Overall, the verifiability metrics remain low, indicating that paraphrasing continues to be an effective attack across different numbers of watermarks in WARDEN. The notable exception is AG NEWS, where paraphrasing attack is ineffective in general, as seen in our main results Section 3.3.5.



Dataset	Paraphraser	Utility		Verifiability	
		ACC $\uparrow$	F1 $\uparrow$	$\Delta_{cos}$ $\downarrow$	AUC $\downarrow$
ENRON	No Attack	93.85	93.85	5.39	97.75
	GPT-3.5	95.30	95.30	6.65	98.50
	DIPPER	95.30	95.30	8.47	99.50
	NLLB	94.95	94.95	8.64	99.25
SST2	No Attack	93.12	93.12	5.21	100.00
	GPT-3.5	93.35	93.34	6.69	96.25
	DIPPER	92.66	92.65	8.73	99.50
	NLLB	93.23	93.23	7.36	98.25
MIND	No Attack	77.23	51.4	5.54	98.50
	GPT-3.5	77.06	52.07	12.74	100.00
	DIPPER	77.23	55.46	15.58	100.00
	NLLB	77.12	56.89	14.97	100.00
AG NEWS	No Attack	93.43	93.43	15.29	100.00
	GPT-3.5	93.11	93.10	19.68	100.00
	DIPPER	93.59	93.58	19.26	100.00
	NLLB	93.39	93.39	18.97	100.00

TABLE 3.10: Impact of scaling up the dataset with paraphrases instead of averaging the paraphrase embeddings in paraphrasing attack. “No Attack” represents the normal WARDEN watermarking scenario without paraphrasing attacks.

**Impact of Scaling Train Dataset.** A potential confound is that generating multiple paraphrases effectively increases the training data size during the imitation attack. To tease out this effect, we run another experiment where we scale up the training data size to match the size used in the paraphrasing experiment; results in Table 3.10. Interestingly, we find that watermark detection performance goes up, demonstrating that the success of paraphrasing in evading detection is not due to increased training data size. This is expected as, with increased dataset size, we have more samples with trigger words, making watermarks more transferable.




FIGURE 3.11: GPT-3.5 paraphrase attack performance for different number of paraphrases ( $P$ ).

**Number of Paraphrases ( $P$ ).** In Figures 3.11 and 3.12, we present the influence of the number of paraphrases ( $P$ ) in paraphrasing attack on verifiability and utility. Utility (accuracy) remains relatively constant, with only minor fluctuations in verifiability. These results indicate that the paraphrasing attack is not sensitive to  $P$  and that it is possible to achieve a relatively successful attack with  $P = 1$ . This is significant as GPT-3.5 attack will be more economical with fewer paraphrases.




FIGURE 3.12: DIPPER paraphrase attack performance for different number of paraphrases ( $P$ ).

Dataset	Paraphraser	Utility	
		ACC $\uparrow$	F1 $\uparrow$
ENRON	GPT-3.5	92.85	92.85
	DIPPER	92.00	91.99
	NLLB	93.25	93.25
SST2	GPT-3.5	92.43	92.43
	DIPPER	91.17	91.13
	NLLB	92.20	92.18
MIND	GPT-3.5	76.97	51.29
	DIPPER	76.98	50.68
	NLLB	76.72	50.47
AG NEWS	GPT-3.5	92.22	92.21
	DIPPER	92.51	92.51
	NLLB	92.61	92.59

TABLE 3.11: Paraphrasing attack on a non-watermarked victim model. Note that utility is preserved, as expected.

**Non-Watermark Cases.** It will be unknown to an attacker whether the model they are attempting to imitate contains watermarks or not. In non-watermark cases, the attacker would want no significant utility degradation while still being able to imitate the model. We thus perform the paraphrasing attack on a non-watermarked model. Table 3.11 illustrates the effectiveness of paraphrasing attack, showing minimal impact on the utility metrics of an innocent model.

**Impact of Attacker Model Size.** We assess whether our attack’s performance varies with the attacker model’s size in an imitation attack by conducting experiments using SMALL, BASE, and LARGE variants of the BERT (Devlin et al., 2019). The results, summarised in Table 3.12, demonstrate that paraphrasing attack performance is not sensitive to the attacker model size.

Dataset	Attacker	Utility		Verifiability	
	Model Size	ACC $\uparrow$	F1 $\uparrow$	$\Delta_{cos}$ $\downarrow$	AUC $\downarrow$
ENRON	No Attack	93.85	93.85	5.39	97.75
	Small	92.60	92.60	0.12	57.75
	Base	92.45	92.45	0.57	66.50
	Large	92.70	92.70	0.39	61.50
SST2	No Attack	93.12	93.12	5.21	100.00
	Small	92.55	92.55	0.37	63.75
	Base	92.78	92.77	0.82	75.25
	Large	93.12	93.12	0.31	62.50
MIND	No Attack	77.23	51.40	5.54	98.50
	Small	76.93	51.17	2.18	83.50
	Base	76.99	51.48	2.15	82.25
	Large	76.95	51.34	2.16	78.75
AG NEWS	No Attack	93.43	93.43	15.29	100.00
	Small	92.42	92.40	8.61	100.00
	Base	92.39	92.38	7.54	100.00
	Large	92.51	92.49	7.29	100.00

TABLE 3.12: Impact of attacker model size on paraphrasing attack performance. “No Attack” is the normal WARDEN watermarking case with no paraphrasing attack.

### 3.4 Conclusion

This chapter highlights the vulnerabilities of existing EaaS watermarks (**WARDEN** and **EmbMarker**) when subjected to input text paraphrasing in an imitation attack. Our proposed methodology involves generating multiple paraphrases for input text and combining (averaging) their embeddings, effectively reducing the impact of trigger words and thereby diluting the watermark. We study both empirically and theoretically the effects of paraphrasing on watermark weights. We perform these attacks using different paraphrasers on EaaS watermarks across various datasets. The attack is successful in most scenarios, demonstrating its effectiveness. The only negative result is the AG NEWS dataset, where due to longer text, paraphrasing is unable to dilute the watermark enough to avoid detection. We analyse the quality of paraphrases to motivate why it is important to have a filter to keep only good paraphrases in the attack. Lastly, we present additional ablation studies on different paraphrasing attack components and variations to understand their impact. Most of these studies suggest that attack performance is insensitive to these variations.

We want to clarify that our intention in this chapter is to raise awareness about this new form of attack, as we believe the first step in improving security is by exposing vulnerabilities. In the next chapter, as a countermeasure, a new watermarking technique, **WET**, is proposed that is resilient to paraphrasing attacks.

## Chapter 4

# Watermarking EaaS with Linear Transformation

### 4.1 Introduction

In the last chapter, we demonstrated that paraphrasing dilutes the current state-of-the-art EaaS watermarks, thereby uncovering a new type of vulnerability in these watermarking techniques. The drawback of existing watermarks is their reliance on trigger words to implant watermarks. This limitation motivated our paraphrasing attack, which exploits this trigger word dependency by reducing their impact through the combination of multiple paraphrases.

To enhance the robustness of the watermarks and answer **RQ2**, we introduce a novel watermarking technique, **Watermarking EaaS with Linear Transformation (WET)**, in this chapter. This watermark method applies linear transformations to the original embeddings to implant watermarks and then verifies the watermarks through reverse transformations. The advantage of WET is that it does not depend on trigger words to inject watermarks or the input text in the watermarking process. We analyse WET both theoretically and empirically to show it is robust against the new paraphrasing attack.

In this chapter, we begin by outlining the methodology for our defence, WET in Section 4.2. In Section 4.3, we evaluate our new watermarking technique and benchmark it against paraphrasing attacks. For completeness, we also discuss the initial methodology involving “hyperdimensions” in Section 4.4, which inspires the linear transformation




FIGURE 4.1: An overview of the workflow for WET. The left block shows the watermarking process using a secret transformation matrix  $\mathbf{T}$ . The right block shows the watermark verification process, employing the pseudoinverse of the transformation matrix  $\mathbf{T}^+$ . The recovered embedding  $e'_o$  and the original embedding  $e_o$  are then compared in copyright verification.

technique. We discuss its flaws and the evolution towards WET. Finally, we conclude the chapter by summarising the findings in Section 4.5.

## 4.2 Methodology

In this section, we outline the setup under which we develop the EaaS watermark for imitation attacks in Section 4.2.1. Subsequently, we describe the new watermark protocol, WET in Section 4.2.2, followed by theoretical proof demonstrating the robustness of WET against paraphrasing attacks in Section 4.2.3.

### 4.2.1 Problem Definition

To summarise the threat model from Section 3.2.1, we assume that a malicious attacker conducts an imitation attack on a victim EaaS service  $\mathbb{S}_v$  based on the model  $\Theta_v$ . The attacker queries  $\mathbb{S}_v$  to collect the embeddings (which are watermarked, unbeknownst to the attacker) for a set of input texts  $D_a$ , which will then be used for training an attacker model  $\Theta_a$ . The goal of the attacker is to provide a competitive EaaS service  $\mathbb{S}_a$  and they may actively employ strategies to remove or bypass the watermark. For the victim, i.e., the EaaS provider, it is crucial that the watermarked embeddings  $e_p$  perform similarly to the original non-watermarked embeddings  $e_o$  on downstream tasks. To determine whether their model has been copied, the victim will query suspicious services  $\mathbb{S}_a$  to check if the returned embeddings contain the injected watermarks.



### 4.2.2 WET Defence

To remedy the shortcomings in the present EaaS watermarking defences identified in the previous chapter, we introduce **W**atermarking **E**aas with **L**inear **T**ransformation (WET), a novel embedding watermarking protocol designed to be robust against paraphrasing attacks. This method is illustrated in Figure 4.1. The core idea is to use a preset linear transformation matrix  $\mathbf{T}$ , which is unknown to the attacker, to transform an original embedding  $\mathbf{e}_o$  into a watermarked embedding  $\mathbf{e}_p$  (see the left part of Figure 4.1). Our watermarking technique discards the original embedding dimensions and retains only the transformed ones, making the watermark harder to detect by an attacker.<sup>1</sup> To check for the watermark in a copied embedding  $\mathbf{e}'_p$  (produced by the attacker model), we apply the reverse transformation (using pseudoinverse  $\mathbf{T}^+$ ) to it and assess whether the recovered embedding  $\mathbf{e}'_o$  is similar to the original embedding  $\mathbf{e}_o$  (see the right part of Figure 4.1).

### Watermark Injection Method

Given a transformation matrix  $\mathbf{T}$ , we (i) multiply the matrix with the original embedding  $\mathbf{e}_o$  and (ii) normalise<sup>2</sup> the transformed embedding to a unit vector:

$$\mathbf{e}_p = \underbrace{\text{Norm}(\underbrace{\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{e}_o}_{(i)})}_{(ii)} = \frac{\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{e}_o}{\|\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{e}_o\|}. \quad (4.1)$$

A watermark injection example appears in Figure 4.2B. Unlike previous EaaS watermarks, our approach does not rely on trigger words and target embeddings for watermark injection, which is vulnerable to paraphrasing attacks. Instead, we watermark all the output embeddings, leading to denser signals and making it more difficult to bypass while maintaining the same level of *utility* for EaaS users.

<sup>1</sup>We initially explored embedding dimension obfuscation by adding new dimensions mixed with the original ones, inspired by Yan et al. (2023). However, we found that these obfuscated dimensions could be easily identified using feature correlation and feature importance techniques, which we will discuss in Section 4.4.

<sup>2</sup>Currently, the embeddings provided by the EaaS providers are unit vectors. Moreover, unit vectors make it more *stealthy*; simply returning  $\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{e}_o$  might give avenues for the attacker to exploit. For these reasons, we normalise the vector after linear transformation. Our preliminary study found no significant difference in performance whether this normalisation step is used or not.

$$\mathbf{T} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & \mathbf{0.37} & \mathbf{0.54} & 0.0 & 0.0 & \mathbf{0.09} \\ \mathbf{0.09} & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & \mathbf{0.37} & \mathbf{0.54} & 0.0 & 0.0 \\ 0.0 & \mathbf{0.09} & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & \mathbf{0.37} & \mathbf{0.54} & 0.0 \\ 0.0 & 0.0 & \mathbf{0.09} & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & \mathbf{0.37} & \mathbf{0.54} \\ \mathbf{0.54} & 0.0 & 0.0 & \mathbf{0.09} & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & \mathbf{0.37} \\ \mathbf{0.37} & \mathbf{0.54} & 0.0 & 0.0 & \mathbf{0.09} & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\ 0.0 & \mathbf{0.37} & \mathbf{0.54} & 0.0 & 0.0 & \mathbf{0.09} & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\ 0.0 & 0.0 & \mathbf{0.37} & \mathbf{0.54} & 0.0 & 0.0 & \mathbf{0.09} & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\ 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & \mathbf{0.37} & \mathbf{0.54} & 0.0 & 0.0 & \mathbf{0.09} & 0.0 & 0.0 \\ 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & \mathbf{0.37} & \mathbf{0.54} & 0.0 & 0.0 & \mathbf{0.09} & 0.0 \end{bmatrix}$$

(A) Example  $10 \times 10$  circulant transformation matrix,  $\mathbf{T}$ .

$$\underbrace{\mathbf{T}}_{\text{Transformation Matrix}} \times \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 0.03 \\ 0.10 \\ 0.50 \\ 0.12 \\ 0.14 \\ 0.10 \\ 0.33 \\ 0.35 \\ 0.52 \\ 0.43 \end{bmatrix}}_{e_o} = \text{Norm} \left( \begin{bmatrix} 0.26 \\ 0.31 \\ 0.42 \\ 0.47 \\ 0.18 \\ 0.07 \\ 0.32 \\ 0.28 \\ 0.15 \\ 0.15 \end{bmatrix} \right) = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 0.28 \\ 0.34 \\ 0.46 \\ 0.52 \\ 0.2 \\ 0.08 \\ 0.35 \\ 0.31 \\ 0.17 \\ 0.17 \end{bmatrix}}_{e_p}$$

(B) WET watermark injection example.

FIGURE 4.2: An example of WET defence process. In this illustration, hyperparameters are  $n = w = 10$  and  $k = 3$ .

**Matrix Construction.** One challenge for WET is designing the transformation matrix  $\mathbf{T}$ . An important consideration in constructing  $\mathbf{T}$  is to balance the trade-off between utility and verifiability. The matrix should be *sparse* because a dense matrix will mix semantic information from many dimensions together, affecting utility and making subsequent model training (the attacker model in imitation attack) more challenging. Importantly, the matrix should be *invertible*<sup>3</sup>, as we will use the *pseudoinverse* in watermark verification to perform a reverse transformation to recover the original embeddings from the watermarked ones. It is crucial that the transformation matrix is both *full-rank* and *well-conditioned* for accurate pseudoinverse computation. Moreover, full-rank guarantees a lower condition number, which is beneficial for computing well-conditioned pseudoinverses, as noted by [Strang \(2016\)](#).

<sup>3</sup>The use of the term “invertible” here is rather loose. This property technically is not applicable for rectangular matrices (as could be the case when dimensions of original ( $n$ ) and watermarked ( $w$ ) embeddings are not the same in  $\mathbf{T}$ ). We use it to mean achieving accurate pseudoinverse calculations.

**Algorithm 1** Transformation Matrix Generation.**Require:**


---

```

n: # original embedding dimensions
k: # original dimensions used in transformation
w: # watermarked embedding dimensions
1: function MATRIXGEN( $n, k$ )
2:   Initialise  $\mathbf{T} \leftarrow \phi$ 
3:   row  $\leftarrow$  ROWGEN( $n, k$ )  $\triangleright \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}$ 
4:   count  $\leftarrow 0$ 
5:   for each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, w$  do  $\triangleright$  Circular Property
6:      $\mathbf{T}[i] \leftarrow$  row
7:     row  $\leftarrow$  ROLL(row)
8:     count  $+= 1$ 
9:     if count ==  $n$  then  $\triangleright$  Re-generate Row
10:       row  $\leftarrow$  ROWGEN( $n, k$ )
11:       count  $\leftarrow 0$ 
12:     end if
13:   end for
14:   return  $\mathbf{T}$   $\triangleright \mathbb{R}^{w \times n}$ 
15: end function

16: function ROWGEN( $n, k$ )
17:   Initialise row  $\leftarrow$  Zeroes( $n$ )
18:   positions  $\leftarrow$  Sample( $n, k$ )  $\triangleright$  Correlations
19:   for p in positions do
20:     row[p]  $\sim U(0, 1)$   $\triangleright$  Random Value
21:   end for
22:   row  $\leftarrow$  Norm(row)
23:   return row
24: end function

25: function ROLL(row)
26:    $n \leftarrow$  len(row)
27:   for each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$  do
28:     row[i]  $\leftarrow$  row[( $i + (n - 1) \% n$ )]  $\triangleright$  Shift one position right
29:   end for
30:   return row
31: end function

```

---

Given these desiderata, we adopt **circulant matrices** (Gray, 2006) to ensure that these full-rank and well-conditioned properties are met. An example of such a matrix  $\mathbf{T}$  is illustrated in Figure 4.2A. The first row in  $\mathbf{T}$  is generated randomly, and subsequent rows are *circulations* of the initial row. The positions and values of non-zero entries in the first row are selected randomly. This random value generation is crucial; if equal weights are assigned, the matrix is not full-rank (as validated in Section 4.3.7). A circulant matrix is full-rank if the first row has non-zero fast Fourier transform values (corresponding

to the eigenvalues of the circulant matrix), which is more probable<sup>4</sup> with our proposed row construction (Gray, 2006). Moreover, cycle shifts ensure that all dimensions in the original embedding contribute equally to the watermark. This enhances *stealthiness*; otherwise, the attacker could exploit this skewness. Thus, the watermarked embeddings in WET will have more balanced dimensions, i.e., all the original embedding dimensions are used a roughly equal number of times in linear transformations.

Algorithm 1 details the generation of the transformation matrix with aforementioned properties. Two hyperparameters to consider are  $w$  and  $k$ :  $w$  represents the number of dimensions of the watermarked embeddings, and  $k$  represents the number of original dimensions used to compute a dimension in the watermarked embeddings. When  $w > n$  ( $n$  is the original embedding dimensions), this approach will result in repetitive rows, causing rank deficiency and affecting the stealthiness of  $\mathbf{T}$  since some rows will be repeated. To mitigate this issue, we generate a new row each time the iteration exceeds  $n$  and continue the cyclic process. We explore and discuss alternative matrix constructions by relaxing various properties (such as circularity, randomness, and others) in Section 4.3.7.

## Watermark Verification Method

The verification process attempts to decode the watermarked embedding from suspicious EaaS service providers using the authentic  $\mathbf{T}$  and verify whether it matches the original embedding. That is, we first apply the pseudoinverse of the transformation matrix  $\mathbf{T}^+$  to the copied embedding  $\mathbf{e}'_p$  to produce recovered original embedding  $\mathbf{e}'_o$ :

$$\underbrace{\mathbf{e}'_o}_{\mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}} = \underbrace{\mathbf{T}^+}_{\mathbb{R}^{n \times w}} \cdot \underbrace{\mathbf{e}'_p}_{\mathbb{R}^{w \times 1}}, \quad (4.2)$$

where  $\mathbf{T}^+$  is the Moore-Penrose inverse (a.k.a pseudoinverse) (Strang, 2016). When  $\mathbf{T}$  has linearly independent rows (guaranteed by our circulant matrix construction; see Algorithm 1), then  $\mathbf{T}^+$  is a right inverse, i.e.,  $\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{T}^+ = \mathbf{I}_w$ .

To check the transformation aligns with the authentic watermark process (i.e., using  $\mathbf{T}$ ), we measure the similarity between the recovered embedding  $\mathbf{e}'_o$  from the attacker model and the original embedding  $\mathbf{e}_o$  from the victim model. If the attacker trains their model

---

<sup>4</sup>We check this while constructing  $\mathbf{T}$  and exit if the condition is unsatisfied. However, we did not encounter such a scenario in our experiments.

using the victim's embeddings, the similarity score should be high. As before, we use cosine similarity to measure similarity as follows:

$$\cos(\mathbf{e}'_o, \mathbf{e}_o) = \frac{\mathbf{e}'_o \cdot \mathbf{e}_o}{\|\mathbf{e}'_o\| \cdot \|\mathbf{e}_o\|}. \quad (4.3)$$

### 4.2.3 Robustness to Paraphrasing Attacks

WET watermarking process is independent of the input text but conditioned on the original embeddings; hence, our approach is naturally robust to paraphrasing attacks. If we use input text anywhere in the watermarking process, the watermark will not be resilient to paraphrasing attacks. We now show *theoretically* how the linear transformation used in WET is robust against paraphrasing during imitation attacks, where the attacker model embeddings will still have the watermark.

**Theorem 1 (WET Effectiveness against Paraphrasing Attack)** *Given  $P$  watermarked embeddings from  $P$  paraphrases for an input text,  $\mathbf{e}_p^i = f(\mathbf{e}_o^i)$ , where  $f$  is a linear transformation function, as defined in Equation 4.1 and  $i \in [1 \dots P]$ . The average of these paraphrase embeddings is equivalent to a linear transformation of a pseudo-aggregation of the original embeddings,  $\hat{\mathbf{e}}_o^i$ , i.e.,*

$$\text{avg}(f(\{\mathbf{e}_p^i\}_{i=1}^P)) = f(\text{avg}(\{\hat{\mathbf{e}}_o^i\}_{i=1}^P)).$$

**Proof**

$$\begin{aligned} \text{avg}(f(\{\mathbf{e}_p^i\}_{i=1}^P)) &= \text{avg}(\underbrace{\{\text{Norm}(\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{e}_o^i)\}}_{\triangleq \alpha_i \cdot \mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{e}_o^i}) \\ &= \mathbf{T} \cdot \frac{1}{P} \sum_{i=1}^P \underbrace{\alpha_i \cdot \mathbf{e}_o^i}_{\triangleq \hat{\mathbf{e}}_o^i} = \mathbf{T} \cdot \text{avg}(\{\hat{\mathbf{e}}_o^i\}_{i=1}^P) \\ &= f(\text{avg}(\{\hat{\mathbf{e}}_o^i\}_{i=1}^P)). \end{aligned}$$

The transformation  $\mathbf{T}$  should be consistent regarding the aggregation on the pseudo embedding  $\hat{\mathbf{e}}$  though distorted by  $\alpha_i = 1/\|\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{e}_o^i\|$ . Given Theorem 1, the WET watermark key (i.e.,  $\mathbf{T}$ ) remains intact through the aggregation of paraphrase embeddings (i.e., paraphrasing attack).

## 4.3 Experiments

In this section, we conduct experiments on our proposed WET watermarking technique. The datasets (Section 4.3.1), metrics (Section 4.3.2), and experimental settings (Section 4.3.3) are similar to those in the paraphrasing attack from Section 3.3. In Section 4.3.4, we discuss the main experimental results of WET, evaluating the watermark’s performance and its resilience against paraphrasing attack. Subsequently, we analyse two crucial hyperparameters of WET,  $w$  and  $k$ , in Sections 4.3.5 and 4.3.6, respectively. Lastly, we perform ablation studies in Section 4.3.7 investigating WET under varying scenarios (such as transferability, non-watermark cases, Gaussian noise, and others) and alterations to WET’s components (such as the transformation matrix, verification dataset, attacker model size, and others).

### 4.3.1 Datasets

We use the same datasets as in the paraphrasing attack—ENRON (Metsis et al., 2006), SST2 (Socher et al., 2013), MIND (Wu et al., 2020), and AG NEWS (Zhang et al., 2015). To recap, these datasets evaluate a range of downstream classification performances, spanning tasks from spam classification (ENRON) to sentiment classification (SST2) to news recommendation and classification (AG NEWS and MIND). For more details about these datasets, please refer to Section 3.3.1.

### 4.3.2 Metrics

We rely on the same set of two metrics as in Section 3.3.2. One for downstream task performance (utility) and a second for watermark verification accuracy (verifiability).

**Downstream Task Utility.** As in Section 3.3.2, we measure downstream task performance by training a classifier using the watermarked embeddings as input and predicting the class labels of the datasets. We report standard classification metrics like accuracy (ACC) and the  $F_1$ -score (F1).

**Watermark Verifiability.** Following Section 3.3.2, we calculate  $\Delta_{\cos}$  and AUC using watermark set  $E_w$  (which contains watermarked embeddings generated with transformation matrix  $\mathbf{T}$ ) and contrast set  $E_c$  (which contains watermarked embeddings generated with a different transformation matrix). Since there is no notion of trigger words in WET, the watermark set and contrast set correspond to the backdoor and benign set from Section 3.3.2, respectively.

There is no target embedding in this case, hence, we compute the average cosine similarity (as defined in Equation 4.3) between the recovered embeddings ( $\mathbf{e}_o^i$  from Equation 4.2) and the original embeddings ( $\mathbf{e}_o^i$ ) and then take their difference ( $\Delta_{\cos}$ ):

$$\Delta_{\cos} = \cos_{\text{avg}}(S_w) - \cos_{\text{avg}}(S_c),$$

$$\cos_{\text{avg}}(S) = \frac{1}{|S|} \sum_{i=1}^{|S|} \cos(\mathbf{e}_o^i, \mathbf{e}_o^i),$$

where the sets of recovered and original embedding pairs are constructed by:

$$S_w = \{(\mathbf{e}_o^i, \mathbf{e}_o^i) | \mathbf{e}_p^i \in E_w\}_{i=1}^V,$$

$$S_c = \{(\mathbf{e}_o^i, \mathbf{e}_o^i) | \mathbf{e}_p^i \in E_c\}_{i=1}^V.$$

### 4.3.3 Experimental Settings

Most of the experimental settings remain the same from the paraphrasing attack in Section 3.3.3. For our main experiments, we set  $w = n = 1536$  (recall that  $n$  and  $w$  are the number of dimensions in the original and watermarked embeddings, respectively) to avoid compressing the embeddings. We investigate different values of  $w$  in Section 4.3.6. We use  $k = 25$ , the number of original dimensions used in the watermarked embedding dimension calculation; we experiment with other values in Section 4.3.5. Finally, we use  $V = 250$  as the size of the watermark ( $E_w$ ) and contrast ( $E_c$ ) sets in the watermark verification dataset.

#### 4.3.4 Results: Watermark Performance

We present the utility and verifiability performance of WET watermark with and without paraphrasing attacks in Table 4.1. Comparing WET to WARDEN in Table 4.2, their downstream performance is about the same—suggesting they are all competitive in terms of maintaining utility. This is important as it shows no significant degradation in the primary utility of the WET provided embeddings, even though WET watermarks all the embeddings. WET is better when it comes to verifiability, as its AUC is 100% in all cases. Furthermore, the  $\Delta_{\cos}$  metric performance is also significantly higher. This shows that the reverse transformation used in WET watermark verification is effective in recovering the original embedding, reflecting a well-conditioned transformation matrix enabling good pseudoinverse computations. Examining the impact of the paraphrasing attack, WET is a clear winner here, as all verifiability metrics see minimal changes (most importantly, AUC is still 100%). These results empirically validate Theorem 1 that WET is not susceptible to paraphrasing attacks.



Method	ACC $\uparrow$	F1 $\uparrow$	$\Delta_{cos}$ $\uparrow$	AUC $\uparrow$
WET	94.58 $\pm$ 0.21	94.58 $\pm$ 0.21	85.67 $\pm$ 6.92	100.00 $\pm$ 0.00
+GPT-3.5 Attack	92.73 $\pm$ 0.25	92.73 $\pm$ 0.25	83.58 $\pm$ 6.43	100.00 $\pm$ 0.00
+DIPPER Attack	91.37 $\pm$ 0.10	91.36 $\pm$ 0.10	83.11 $\pm$ 6.48	100.00 $\pm$ 0.00
+NLLB Attack	93.24 $\pm$ 0.24	93.24 $\pm$ 0.24	84.28 $\pm$ 6.04	100.00 $\pm$ 0.00
(a) <b>Enron</b>				
WET	93.07 $\pm$ 0.40	93.07 $\pm$ 0.40	88.97 $\pm$ 6.62	100.00 $\pm$ 0.00
+GPT-3.5 Attack	92.38 $\pm$ 0.34	92.38 $\pm$ 0.34	87.02 $\pm$ 6.32	100.00 $\pm$ 0.00
+DIPPER Attack	91.77 $\pm$ 0.66	91.74 $\pm$ 0.67	86.59 $\pm$ 6.33	100.00 $\pm$ 0.00
+NLLB Attack	92.75 $\pm$ 0.34	92.74 $\pm$ 0.34	87.78 $\pm$ 6.27	100.00 $\pm$ 0.00
(b) <b>SST2</b>				
WET	77.11 $\pm$ 0.08	51.03 $\pm$ 0.26	87.74 $\pm$ 6.17	100.00 $\pm$ 0.00
+GPT-3.5 Attack	76.72 $\pm$ 0.05	50.62 $\pm$ 0.25	87.44 $\pm$ 6.17	100.00 $\pm$ 0.00
+DIPPER Attack	76.58 $\pm$ 0.08	49.99 $\pm$ 0.23	86.81 $\pm$ 5.90	100.00 $\pm$ 0.00
+NLLB Attack	76.47 $\pm$ 0.14	49.85 $\pm$ 0.26	87.54 $\pm$ 5.91	100.00 $\pm$ 0.00
(c) <b>MIND</b>				
WET	93.15 $\pm$ 0.08	93.14 $\pm$ 0.08	88.35 $\pm$ 6.60	100.00 $\pm$ 0.00
+GPT-3.5 Attack	92.22 $\pm$ 0.10	92.20 $\pm$ 0.10	88.02 $\pm$ 6.14	100.00 $\pm$ 0.00
+DIPPER Attack	92.46 $\pm$ 0.18	92.45 $\pm$ 0.18	87.79 $\pm$ 6.14	100.00 $\pm$ 0.00
+NLLB Attack	92.43 $\pm$ 0.08	92.42 $\pm$ 0.08	88.44 $\pm$ 5.91	100.00 $\pm$ 0.00
(d) <b>AG News</b>				

TABLE 4.1: Performance of WET watermark for different scenarios (normal watermark case and against paraphrasing attack case) on ENRON, SST2, MIND, and AG NEWS datasets. +GPT-3.5 Attack, +DIPPER Attack, and +NLLB Attack represent different paraphrasing attack setups as mentioned in Section 3.2.3. From a defender’s perspective,  $\uparrow$  means higher metrics are better. All the metrics are in %.

Method	ACC $\uparrow$	F1 $\uparrow$	$\Delta_{cos}$ $\downarrow$	AUC $\downarrow$
WARDEN	94.50 $\pm$ 0.34	94.50 $\pm$ 0.34	5.20 $\pm$ 0.34	97.40 $\pm$ 0.54
+GPT-3.5 Attack	92.81 $\pm$ 0.21	92.81 $\pm$ 0.21	0.70 $\pm$ 0.22	68.90 $\pm$ 7.79
+DIPPER Attack	91.34 $\pm$ 0.52	91.33 $\pm$ 0.52	0.46 $\pm$ 0.11	67.50 $\pm$ 5.56
+NLLB Attack	93.35 $\pm$ 0.23	93.35 $\pm$ 0.23	0.65 $\pm$ 0.12	71.95 $\pm$ 4.04
(a) <b>Enron</b>				
WARDEN	93.10 $\pm$ 0.12	93.10 $\pm$ 0.12	2.57 $\pm$ 1.19	86.75 $\pm$ 6.20
+GPT-3.5 Attack	92.75 $\pm$ 0.15	92.75 $\pm$ 0.15	0.93 $\pm$ 0.09	75.90 $\pm$ 2.91
+DIPPER Attack	91.70 $\pm$ 0.27	91.66 $\pm$ 0.27	0.90 $\pm$ 0.17	71.95 $\pm$ 2.69
+NLLB Attack	92.57 $\pm$ 0.09	92.55 $\pm$ 0.08	1.06 $\pm$ 0.19	69.35 $\pm$ 2.94
(b) <b>SST2</b>				
WARDEN	77.31 $\pm$ 0.08	51.47 $\pm$ 0.23	5.27 $\pm$ 0.17	98.10 $\pm$ 0.51
+GPT-3.5 Attack	77.01 $\pm$ 0.05	51.24 $\pm$ 0.22	1.85 $\pm$ 0.21	79.40 $\pm$ 3.08
+DIPPER Attack	76.86 $\pm$ 0.07	50.54 $\pm$ 0.17	3.47 $\pm$ 0.12	96.70 $\pm$ 0.51
+NLLB Attack	76.64 $\pm$ 0.10	50.36 $\pm$ 0.11	3.89 $\pm$ 0.06	97.80 $\pm$ 0.33
(c) <b>MIND</b>				
WARDEN	93.51 $\pm$ 0.13	93.50 $\pm$ 0.13	14.46 $\pm$ 0.68	100.00 $\pm$ 0.00
+GPT-3.5 Attack	92.28 $\pm$ 0.12	92.26 $\pm$ 0.13	7.23 $\pm$ 0.34	100.00 $\pm$ 0.00
+DIPPER Attack	92.50 $\pm$ 0.11	92.48 $\pm$ 0.11	11.04 $\pm$ 0.40	100.00 $\pm$ 0.00
+NLLB Attack	92.70 $\pm$ 0.10	92.69 $\pm$ 0.10	10.56 $\pm$ 0.44	100.00 $\pm$ 0.00
(d) <b>AG News</b>				

TABLE 4.2: Performance of WARDEN watermark for different scenarios (normal watermark case and against paraphrasing attack case) on ENRON, SST2, MIND, and AG NEWS datasets. +GPT-3.5 Attack, +DIPPER Attack, and +NLLB Attack represent different paraphrasing attack setups as mentioned in Section 3.2.3. From a defender’s perspective,  $\uparrow$  means higher metrics are better. Reproduced from Chapter 3.




FIGURE 4.3: Impact of different values of correlations ( $k$ ) on watermark utility. We ignore verifiability as they are always perfect (i.e., 100%), they can be found in Table 4.3.

The red vertical dashed line represents our chosen value ( $k = 25$ ).

We now present additional analyses to understand the impact of hyperparameters  $k$  and  $w$ .

#### 4.3.5 Analysis: Number of Correlations ( $k$ )

We study the influence of  $k$ , which impacts the sparsity of the matrix. The higher the  $k$ , the denser the matrix, and the lower the  $k$ , the sparser the matrix. In our discussion regarding the construction of  $\mathbf{T}$  in Section 4.2.2, we mentioned sparsity as one of the requirements, and we hypothesised that the utility might degrade for denser matrices. We present the results for varying  $k$  in Figure 4.3 and Table 4.3; for higher values of  $k$  ( $> 100$ ), we start seeing degradation in the watermarked embedding utility. When we consider more original embedding dimensions for calculating the watermarked embedding, the increased complexity introduces confusion, making it harder for the downstream classification model to learn the underlying semantic properties of the embeddings. On the contrary, lower values of  $k$  could make it easier for an attacker to reverse engineer the transformation (in the order of  $O(n^k)$ ). Hence, we chose  $k = 25$  in our experiments, providing a good trade-off.

Dataset	$k$	Utility		Verifiability	
		ACC $\uparrow$	F1 $\uparrow$	$\Delta_{cos}$ $\uparrow$	AUC $\uparrow$
ENRON	1	94.75	94.75	89.13	100.00
	2	94.75	94.75	82.92	100.00
	5	94.80	94.80	87.64	100.00
	25	94.75	94.75	89.22	100.00
	50	94.40	94.40	90.86	100.00
	100	94.35	94.35	82.84	100.00
	500	92.85	92.85	81.70	100.00
	1000	92.15	92.15	82.24	100.00
	1536	91.70	91.70	85.50	100.00
SST2	1	93.23	93.23	91.65	100.00
	2	92.66	92.66	87.75	100.00
	5	93.00	93.00	91.59	100.00
	25	93.35	93.34	93.70	100.00
	50	93.35	93.34	94.45	100.00
	100	92.89	92.89	87.39	100.00
	500	92.32	92.31	85.81	100.00
	1000	92.55	92.54	86.58	100.00
	1536	91.63	91.62	89.38	100.00
MIND	1	77.25	51.40	91.62	100.00
	2	77.10	51.19	85.70	100.00
	5	77.16	51.05	89.19	100.00
	25	77.21	51.36	91.12	100.00
	50	76.95	50.71	92.41	100.00
	100	76.88	50.72	85.06	100.00
	500	76.61	49.85	85.42	100.00
	1000	75.67	48.24	84.74	100.00
	1536	74.28	42.96	85.46	100.00
AG NEWS	1	93.45	93.44	92.85	100.00
	2	93.46	93.46	86.68	100.00
	5	93.22	93.22	90.59	100.00
	25	93.03	93.02	92.05	100.00
	50	93.22	93.22	93.30	100.00
	100	93.00	93.00	86.90	100.00
	500	92.62	92.61	86.28	100.00
	1000	92.18	92.17	86.22	100.00
	1536	91.59	91.58	86.66	100.00

TABLE 4.3: Impact of number of correlation ( $k$ ) in WET.




FIGURE 4.4: Impact of different values of watermark dimensions ( $w$ ) on watermark utility. We ignore verifiability as they are always perfect (i.e., 100%), they can be found in Table 4.4. The red vertical dashed line represents our chosen value ( $w = 1536$ ).

#### 4.3.6 Analysis: Number of Watermarked Dimensions ( $w$ )

The number of dimensions of the watermarked embeddings is an important hyperparameter in WET; we present the results of varying  $w$  in Figure 4.4 and Table 4.4. We observe from Figure 4.4 that smaller values of  $w$  might also work. With linear transformations and our balanced matrix generation, we could capture all the semantic properties in fewer dimensions. This observation demonstrates another benefit of our WET technique: it can also be used for *compression*. That said, utility is only measured using simple classification tasks (following prior studies), and as such, these results may differ if the embeddings are used for more complex tasks. Therefore, we use  $w = n$  in our experiments, where we do not drop or add more dimensions from the original embedding case. Technically, we could also have higher dimensions for watermarked embeddings, but we did not consider this as this would reduce the computational efficiency of the embeddings.

Dataset	$w$	Utility		Verifiability	
		ACC $\uparrow$	F1 $\uparrow$	$\Delta_{cos}$ $\uparrow$	AUC $\uparrow$
ENRON	50	88.05	88.04	10.58	100.00
	500	93.10	93.10	53.34	100.00
	1000	94.15	94.15	74.95	100.00
	1536	94.75	94.75	89.22	100.00
	3000	94.75	94.75	90.49	100.00
SST2	50	84.40	84.34	10.20	100.00
	500	93.23	93.23	54.07	100.00
	1000	93.58	93.57	77.07	100.00
	1536	93.35	93.34	93.70	100.00
	3000	92.55	92.54	94.47	100.00
MIND	50	67.53	37.08	11.23	100.00
	500	76.30	49.83	52.96	100.00
	1000	76.78	50.55	75.74	100.00
	1536	77.21	51.36	91.12	100.00
	3000	76.96	50.72	93.85	100.00
AG NEWS	50	85.07	85.04	12.44	100.00
	500	92.46	92.45	53.55	100.00
	1000	92.92	92.91	76.72	100.00
	1536	93.03	93.02	92.05	100.00
	3000	93.05	93.05	94.19	100.00

TABLE 4.4: Impact of number of watermarked dimensions ( $w$ ) in WET.

### 4.3.7 Ablation Studies

In this section, we perform in-depth ablation studies to analyse the components of WET and establish their significance. We first study various types of matrices by relaxing the properties of our proposed matrix construction to justify our matrix choice. We then consider two scenarios where an attacker might add noise to their provided embedding or stop imitation attacks early. We show WET is still effective in these scenarios. Finally, we conduct similar ablation studies as in Section 3.3.7 for paraphrasing attack: experimenting with different verification dataset sizes, non-watermark cases, and attacker model sizes. All these ablation studies are carried out using the experimental settings outlined in Section 4.3.3 unless stated otherwise.

**Different Transformation Matrices Construction.** We present additional results with different constructions of the transformation matrix,  $\mathbf{T}$ , a critical component of WET. Some properties of  $\mathbf{T}$  (outlined in Section 4.2.2) are altered to ascertain their importance:

$$\forall_{i \in \{1..w\}} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{T}_{i,j} = 1 \quad \text{Normalisation,} \quad (4.4a)$$

$$\mathbf{T}_{i,j} = \mathbf{T}_{(i+1)\%w, (j+1)\%n} \quad \text{Circulation,} \quad (4.4b)$$

$$\forall_{j \in \text{positions}} \mathbf{T}_{0,j} \sim U(0, 1) \quad \text{Random Value,} \quad (4.4c)$$

$$\text{positions} = \text{Random}(\{1, \dots, n\}, k) \quad \text{Random Position.} \quad (4.4d)$$

**Non-Normalised Circulant Matrix.** We relax the Equation 4.4a property, i.e., we do not normalise the values of  $\mathbf{T}$  rows.

**New Weights Circulant Matrix.** In this matrix, we construct new weights for each row in the circulant matrix, relaxing the circulation property (Equation 4.4b).

**Equal Weights Circulant Matrix.** We set  $1/k$  as the value for non-zero positions in the row, relaxing the random value property (Equation 4.4c).

$k$	Property	Matrix Type						
		Circulant	Non-Normal.	New Wts.	Eq. Wts.	Seq. Pos.	Seq. Pos. & Eq. Wts.	Random
2	Rank	1536.0	1536.0	1516.4	1531.5	1536.0	1535.0	1286.9
	Cond. #	7.75	4.51	$1.28e^{16}$	$5.33e^{17}$	28.62	$5.51e^{19}$	$1.14e^{32}$
5	Rank	1536.0	1536.0	1535.6	1535.6	1536.0	1536.0	1524.0
	Cond. #	49.42	84.34	11400.86	$2.03e^{17}$	129.55	1436.10	$1.14e^{32}$
25	Rank	1536.0	1536.0	1535.1	1536.0	1536.0	1534.0	1535.0
	Cond. #	151.85	216.03	14266.05	213.16	338.50	11060.22	51610.69
50	Rank	1536.0	1536.0	1535.1	1535.7	1536.0	1533.0	1534.7
	Cond. #	319.03	188.99	19322.73	$2.96e^{16}$	493.97	$7.64e^{17}$	50206.01
100	Rank	1536.0	1536.0	1535.2	1535.9	1536.0	1527.0	1534.4
	Cond. #	674.57	569.85	20835.62	$2.31e^{17}$	643.74	$3.57e^{18}$	18673.34

TABLE 4.5: Matrix properties (rank  $\uparrow$  and condition number  $\downarrow$ ) for various constructions of  $\mathbf{T}$  as described in Section 4.3.7. For every matrix type, we report average matrix properties over 10 constructions.

**Sequential Position Circulant Matrix.** We pick the first  $k$  dimensions in the row as the non-zero positions, relaxing the random position property (Equation 4.4d).

**Sequential Position and Equal Weights Circulant Matrix.** This matrix is a combination of the previous two constructions, relaxing Equations 4.4c and 4.4d.

**Pure Random Matrix.** A fully random generation process where we randomly pick  $k$  non-zero positions and assign random values to them for each row (relaxing Equations 4.4b, 4.4c, and 4.4d).

**Discussion.** Table 4.5 captures the matrix properties: rank and condition number for different constructions of the transformation matrix and varying numbers of correlations ( $k$ ). Recall from Section 4.2.2 that these properties are important because full-rank matrices are invertible, which is essential for WET watermark verification involving the reverse transformation. At the same time, full-rank correlates with low-condition numbers, leading to well-conditioned pseudoinverses that enable efficient reverse transformations. As expected, pure random matrix construction and matrices using equal and new row weights are poor transformation matrix candidates with high condition numbers and rank deficiency. Although the sequential position circulant matrix is full-rank, its condition number is higher compared to the chosen circulant matrix. Both normalised and non-normalised circulant matrices are full-rank with low condition numbers, showing that normalisation is not a determining factor for rank and condition number.



We now present the WET watermark performance using these matrices in Table 4.6. We observe that equal weights and sequential position-based matrices have high verifiability. However, such matrix constructions are less stealthy (i.e., the watermark can be more easily reverse-engineered by the attackers). The matrix combining these methods (Seq. pos and Eq. Wts) performs poorly in terms of verifiability. The other two constructions of new row weights in circulant matrix and pure random matrix construction have low  $\Delta_{\cos}$  metric even though it has perfect AUC. The reason is that matrices in these cases are not full-rank and well-conditioned as noted earlier, leading to subpar reverse transformation. As before, we do not see any performance difference if the transformation matrix row weights are normalised or not. Just to ensure no avenues for attackers to exploit, we apply the normalisation step in the transformation matrix. Putting these results together (Table 4.5 and 4.6), we conclude that the circulant matrix (as proposed in Section 4.2.2) is the best choice.

Dataset	Matrix Type	Utility		Verifiability	
		ACC $\uparrow$	F1 $\uparrow$	$\Delta_{cos}$ $\uparrow$	AUC $\uparrow$
ENRON	Circulant	94.75	94.75	89.22	100.00
	Non-Normalised	94.75	94.75	89.21	100.00
	New Wts.	94.60	94.60	21.60	99.96
	Eq. Wts.	94.40	94.40	92.81	100.00
	Seq. Pos.	93.40	93.40	69.91	100.00
	Seq. Pos. and Eq. Wts.	92.45	92.45	-0.23	47.69
	Random	94.30	94.30	22.95	99.96
SST2	Circulant	93.35	93.34	93.70	100.00
	Non-Normalised	93.58	93.57	93.70	100.00
	New Wts.	93.00	93.00	23.60	99.99
	Eq. Wts.	92.78	92.77	96.13	100.00
	Seq. Pos.	91.97	91.97	74.31	100.00
	Seq. Pos. and Eq. Wts.	90.60	90.59	0.72	53.88
	Random	92.55	92.54	25.02	100.00
MIND	Circulant	77.21	51.36	91.12	100.00
	Non-Normalised	77.02	51.01	91.11	100.00
	New Wts.	76.97	50.83	23.56	100.00
	Eq. Wts.	77.04	51.03	95.34	100.00
	Seq. Pos.	76.61	50.06	71.93	100.00
	Seq. Pos. and Eq. Wts.	75.21	47.22	0.02	50.28
	Random	77.00	50.94	24.82	100.00
AG NEWS	Circulant	93.03	93.02	92.05	100.00
	Non-Normalised	93.04	93.03	92.03	100.00
	New Wts.	93.20	93.19	26.60	100.00
	Eq. Wts.	93.07	93.06	96.47	100.00
	Seq. Pos.	92.41	92.40	73.79	100.00
	Seq. Pos. and Eq. Wts.	91.89	91.88	-0.27	50.37
	Random	92.95	92.94	27.55	100.00

TABLE 4.6: WET performance using different variation of transformation matrix  $\mathbf{T}$  as defined in the Section 4.3.7.

Dataset	$\lambda$	Utility		Verifiability	
		ACC $\uparrow$	F1 $\uparrow$	$\Delta_{cos}$ $\uparrow$	AUC $\uparrow$
ENRON	0.01	93.45	93.45	62.29	100.00
	0.05	84.00	84.00	17.39	100.00
	0.10	73.60	73.59	8.84	99.00
	0.50	52.30	51.30	1.77	70.62
	1.00	50.95	49.52	0.88	61.71
SST2	0.01	91.40	91.39	64.78	100.00
	0.05	84.29	84.26	18.09	100.00
	0.10	73.74	73.65	9.17	99.55
	0.50	53.67	49.87	1.79	69.03
	1.00	51.72	45.76	0.86	59.32
MIND	0.01	70.37	44.18	63.61	100.00
	0.05	63.20	33.34	17.76	100.00
	0.10	49.83	15.87	9.03	99.26
	0.50	31.60	4.85	1.82	69.78
	1.00	29.34	4.85	0.92	60.60
AG NEWS	0.01	92.28	92.25	64.09	100.00
	0.05	83.92	83.84	17.73	100.00
	0.10	65.58	65.52	9.00	99.33
	0.50	30.00	29.88	1.79	69.59
	1.00	25.16	25.00	0.89	59.92

TABLE 4.7: Impact of different Gaussian noise ( $\lambda$ ) in WET for experiments using ENRON, SST2, MIND, and AG NEWS.

**Impact of Gaussian Noise.** We evaluate the resilience of WET verification to perturbations added to provided embeddings by an attacker. This could be one of the techniques used by the attacker to circumvent WET. We assess the effect of Gaussian noise as perturbation and analyse its impact on embeddings for watermark verification and downstream utility. Following Morris et al. (2023), Chen et al. (2024), we consider different noise levels ( $\lambda$ ) and add noise to embedding  $\mathbf{e}$  as follows:

$$\mathbf{e}_{noisy} = \text{Norm}(\mathbf{e} + \lambda \cdot \boldsymbol{\epsilon}), \quad \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

*How much perturbation can be handled by WET?* From Table 4.7, we see that at  $\lambda = 0.05$ , there is significant utility loss; however, the AUC scores remain perfect for all the datasets at this noise level. This is significant because such utility degradation defeats the primary motive of the attacker (i.e., to provide a competitive service). This experiment highlights the robustness of WET, where it can maintain verifiability even under significant utility loss introduced by Gaussian noise.

Dataset	Training	Utility		Verifiability	
		ACC $\uparrow$	F1 $\uparrow$	$\Delta_{cos}$ $\uparrow$	AUC $\uparrow$
ENRON	0.1	49.60	33.16	6.19	99.90
	1	88.00	88.00	66.74	100.00
	10	91.85	91.85	86.11	100.00
	33	92.75	92.75	87.38	100.00
	50	92.75	92.75	88.49	100.00
	100	94.75	94.75	89.22	100.00
SST2	0.1	50.92	33.74	18.79	100.00
	1	91.17	91.15	90.52	100.00
	10	92.09	92.07	90.86	100.00
	33	93.00	93.00	92.26	100.00
	50	92.55	92.54	92.97	100.00
	100	93.35	93.34	93.70	100.00
MIND	0.1	58.78	8.29	25.69	100.00
	1	63.16	15.03	86.37	100.00
	10	74.48	45.54	86.44	100.00
	33	76.20	49.02	89.19	100.00
	50	76.57	50.00	90.11	100.00
	100	77.21	51.36	91.12	100.00
AG NEWS	0.1	25.00	10.00	4.19	97.19
	1	76.14	73.63	26.24	100.00
	10	91.75	91.74	86.85	100.00
	33	92.37	92.35	90.04	100.00
	50	92.55	92.54	91.11	100.00
	100	93.03	93.02	92.05	100.00

TABLE 4.8: Transferability of WET watermark and downstream utility for different amounts of training (i.e., train ‘10’ means the attacker model was limited to a total 10% of the overall training) in an imitation attack. All metrics here are %.

**Transferability of Watermark and Utility.** This experiment examines whether attacker models learn watermarks (transferability) faster than the semantics of embeddings (utility) during an imitation attack. As per results in Table 4.8, the watermark patterns are learned more quickly than the semantics of the embeddings in the imitation attack. If we look at the case at 10% training, before the attacker model learns the semantic information encoded in the embeddings (as indicated by its low utility performance), the watermark has already been injected in the copied embeddings (as indicated by the almost perfect AUC). This finding is significant as it demonstrates the ease of watermark transferability, which means the watermark can be verified reliably. Also, if the attacker were to monitor the training process and stop upon achieving the required downstream utility performance, the results indicate that the attacker model would still

$V$	Verifiability							
	ENRON		SST2		MIND		AG NEWS	
	$\Delta_{cos} \uparrow$	AUC $\uparrow$	$\Delta_{cos} \uparrow$	AUC $\uparrow$	$\Delta_{cos} \uparrow$	AUC $\uparrow$	$\Delta_{cos} \uparrow$	AUC $\uparrow$
1	90.00	100.00	90.29	100.00	92.28	100.00	96.13	100.00
2	84.91	100.00	94.55	100.00	90.52	100.00	93.02	100.00
5	88.26	100.00	93.75	100.00	89.90	100.00	93.62	100.00
20	89.90	100.00	93.67	100.00	90.74	100.00	92.63	100.00
100	89.14	100.00	93.77	100.00	90.54	100.00	91.77	100.00
250	89.22	100.00	93.70	100.00	91.12	100.00	92.05	100.00
500*	89.67	100.00	93.89	100.00	90.97	100.00	92.10	100.00
1000	89.34	100.00	-	-	90.87	100.00	92.00	100.00

TABLE 4.9: Impact of different dataset sizes ( $V$ ) in WET verification.

\*For the SST2 dataset (with only 872 test samples), the results are for  $V = 436$ . The reason is that for the verification dataset (as explained in Section 4.2.2), we sample  $2 \times V$  input test samples, one for the watermark set and another for the contrast set.

Dataset	Utility		Verifiability	
	ACC $\uparrow$	F1 $\uparrow$	$\Delta_{cos} \uparrow$	AUC $\uparrow$
ENRON	94.75	94.75	85.49	100.00
SST2	93.35	93.34	88.37	100.00
MIND	77.21	51.36	87.38	100.00
AG NEWS	93.03	93.02	88.54	100.00

TABLE 4.10: WET detection performance on a non-watermarked victim model.

have learned the underlying watermark patterns and so cannot avoid detection.

**Impact of Size of Verification Dataset.** This study explores the number of samples ( $V$ ) needed for the verification dataset. From Table 4.9, it is evident that WET’s verification technique is robust even with a small verification sample set. Even with just a single verification sample, we can identify that the victim model has been copied. This is another advantage of our technique compared to EmbMarker and WARDEN, which require multiple samples for verification. Note: we use  $V = 250$  in main experiments (Section 4.3.3).

**Non-Watermarked Cases.** This is the case where we have a scenario where we run the WET verification process on an innocent model (e.g., a competitor service that did not imitate the victim model). To evaluate this, we set the contrast set to be a set of embeddings that are not watermarked in any way (recall that in our main experiments in Section 4.3.2, the contrast set is a set of embeddings watermarked with

Dataset	Attacker	Utility		Verifiability	
	Model Size	ACC $\uparrow$	F1 $\uparrow$	$\Delta_{cos}$ $\uparrow$	AUC $\uparrow$
ENRON	Small	94.55	94.55	88.74	100.00
SST2		93.23	93.23	93.12	100.00
MIND		77.15	51.00	90.25	100.00
AG NEWS		92.92	92.91	91.30	100.00
ENRON	Base	94.75	94.75	89.22	100.00
SST2		93.35	93.34	93.70	100.00
MIND		77.21	51.36	91.12	100.00
AG NEWS		93.03	93.02	92.05	100.00
ENRON	Large	94.40	94.40	88.32	100.00
SST2		93.00	93.00	93.60	100.00
MIND		76.95	50.77	90.94	100.00
AG NEWS		93.29	93.28	92.43	100.00

TABLE 4.11: Impact of attacker model size on WET performance.

a different transformation matrix). From Table 4.10, the AUC metric is perfect with high  $\Delta_{cos}$ , demonstrating strong watermark verification. This means our WET can distinguish watermark and non-watermark (contrast set) embeddings; hence, WET will not falsely classify non-watermarked cases.

**Impact of Attacker Model Size.** Lastly, we show that WET achieves stable performance across various attacker model sizes. We perform imitation attacks on WET watermarked embeddings using SMALL, BASE, and LARGE variants of the BERT model (Devlin et al., 2019) as the attacker model. The results, summarised in Table 4.11, indicate that the defence works effectively with consistent utility and verifiability across different attacker model sizes. This is important as the attacker’s model capacity is unknown, and we need WET to be effective in all scenarios.




FIGURE 4.5: Illustration of the hyperdimension obfuscation protocol. We add hyperdimensions (Red) to the original embedding, obfuscating them with existing dimensions (Green). Different shades of colour represent different embedding dimension values.

#### 4.4 Initial Methodology: Hyperdimension Obfuscation

We now describe a preliminary approach that inspires WET. We first explain this preliminary method and then discuss the issues with it and how it leads to our linear transformation based WET watermarking method.

This preliminary method incorporates additional watermark dimensions (which we call “*hyperdimensions*”) into the original embeddings while leaving the existing dimensions untouched. The recent work by Yan et al. (2023) motivates this direction, wherein they add dummy neurons (or parameters) in machine learning models to circumvent defences. Given this hyperdimensionality, we anticipate it to withstand paraphrasing attacks since this approach does not depend on trigger words.

There are two challenges in the proposed defence, i.e., determining (i) the locations and (ii) the values of these hyperdimensions. As illustrated in Figure 4.5, we could use secret pre-determined random locations for these hyperdimensions. The locations must be fixed to retain the embedding utility but also mixed (obfuscated) with the original dimensions so that it is stealthy. Nonetheless, it should be noted that stealthiness will also be dependent on the methodology used in setting the *values* for these hyperdimensions.

We explore two techniques to set the values for these hyperdimensions: (i) pseudo-random based, and (ii) transformation matrix. Leveraging cryptographic hardness, we calculate the value for these hyperdimensions using pseudo-random functions, as done in some text watermark works (Kirchenbauer et al., 2023, Christ et al., 2023, Kuditipudi et al., 2024, *inter alia*). The advantage of this pseudo-random approach is that it is more

stealthy because of the pseudo-randomness property; however, because of its deterministic mapping (e.g., by using a deterministic seed value), it also works well for verification. We use the non-watermarked embedding dimensions for calculating cryptographic seeds, making pseudo-random calculations deterministic and verifiable. Our second technique prepares a *transformation matrix* to project the original (non-watermarked) embedding dimensions to added hyperdimensions. The transformation is a simple linear combination using existing embedding dimensions (similar to Algorithm 1 but used to create additional dimensions instead of replacing dimensions). For verification, we use the same ideas as in WET of reverse transformation (Section 4.3.2), with the only difference being that we work only on the added hyperdimensions.

We conduct preliminary experiments where we maintain pre-determined hyperdimension locations and test different techniques for setting hyperdimension values. Overall, we observe that the transformation matrix-based approach is more *transferable*, which means the verification process is more reliable. While the pseudo-random approach is more stealthy, our experiments show that its transferability is questionable. That said, for the transformation matrix approach, correlation detection techniques (Hall, 1999) could potentially recover the hyperdimensions, thus compromising its stealthiness, which we discuss next.

## Stealthiness Evaluation

To evaluate the stealthiness of these hyperdimensions, we investigate feature correlation and feature importance techniques between hyperdimensions and original dimensions. Properly mixed feature importance weights indicate that hyperdimensions are indistinguishable from the original ones. Similarly, uncorrelated hyperdimensions are desirable, as otherwise they can be identified by their correlation scores. Note that these stealthiness techniques are not applicable to WET, as the original embedding dimensions are discarded in the provided (watermarked) embeddings.

**Feature Importance.** We train a linear regression model (as we are dealing with linear transformations) with all the watermarked embeddings (original and hyperdimensions) for the downstream task. We use the weights of the linear regression as the feature importance weights. In Figure 4.6, we display these plots for different values of  $k$ . From



this, we conclude that we need  $k < 5$ , as for higher values of  $k$ , hyperdimensions are discernible from the original embedding dimensions, i.e., the feature importance values of the original dimensions are close to zero. For higher values of  $k$ , we have hyperdimensions that have more feature importance, which is unsurprising considering linear combinations used in hyperdimensions will capture all the information in the original dimensions, and so the original dimensions are redundant.

**Feature Correlations.** Pearson’s coefficient (Sedgwick, 2012) is a statistical measure capturing the linear relationship (or correlations) between two variables. We apply this for all the dimensions in the embeddings. For stealthiness, hyperdimensions should not be strongly correlated with the original embedding dimensions. Again, we use this statistical measure since we are applying linear transformations. In this analysis, we use Pearson’s coefficient with a threshold of 0.4. The plots in Figure 4.7 indicate that  $k$  should be greater than 5, as otherwise, hyperdimensions become very correlated. However, this range conflicts with the values ( $k < 5$ ) from the previous feature importance results.

Consequently, these plots (Figures 4.6 and 4.7) lead us to conclude that hyperdimension obfuscation is ineffective as it is detectable, either through feature importance or correlations. These results provide the motivation for WET, which transforms all the original dimensions instead of adding extra hyperdimensions. As explained earlier, the watermarked embeddings in WET do not have original dimensions used for correlations; therefore, these stealthiness evaluation techniques are ineffective for WET.













(A)  $k = 2$ (B)  $k = 5$ (C)  $k = 50$ (D)  $k = 100$ (E)  $k = 500$ (F)  $k = 1536$ 

FIGURE 4.6: Visualisation plots for feature importance of watermarked embedding dimensions in SST2 for different values of  $k$ .

(A)  $k = 2$ (B)  $k = 5$ (C)  $k = 50$ (D)  $k = 100$ (E)  $k = 500$ (F)  $k = 1536$ FIGURE 4.7: Visualisation plots for feature correlations of watermarked embedding dimensions in SST2 for different values of  $k$ .

## 4.5 Conclusion

In the previous chapter, we showcased the vulnerabilities of existing EaaS watermarks (**WARDEN** and **EmbMarker**) against paraphrasing in an imitation attack. To address this shortcoming, in this chapter, we devise a simple watermarking technique, **WET**, which applies linear transformations to the original embeddings to generate watermarked embeddings. We outline the **WET** watermark injection and verification process, followed by a discussion on the transformation matrix construction with required properties. We first theoretically prove that **WET** watermarks are preserved after paraphrasing, demonstrating their robustness against paraphrasing attacks. This is further validated by empirical experiments demonstrating near-perfect verifiability, even with one sample. Additionally, the utility of embeddings is mostly preserved due to the use of straightforward linear transformations. We then justify our choice of **WET** hyperparameters controlling the number of correlations used in transformation and dimensions of watermark embeddings. Furthermore, we conduct ablation studies to assess the contribution of each component in **WET**. We establish why our proposed construction of the transformation matrix is optimal. These ablation studies also cover cases such as resilience to Gaussian noise, watermark transferability, and indifference to the attacker base model size, showcasing **WET**'s advantages.

In the next chapter, we conclude the thesis, outlining potential future directions and discussing the limitations of this work.

## Chapter 5

# Conclusion

*Security is not a product, but a process.*

---

—Bruce Schneier

In this chapter, we revisit the research questions proposed in Section 1.1, and summarise the findings and implications in Section 5.1. Then, we outline the contributions of this thesis in Section 5.2 and discuss the limitations of the current work along with potential future directions in Section 5.3.

### 5.1 Thesis Summary

In this thesis, we explored the area of NLP and LLMs, with a particular focus on EaaS. We examined EaaS vulnerabilities, particularly in the context of imitation attacks, and contributed a more effective watermark as a defence. Initially, we highlighted the vulnerabilities of existing EaaS watermarks when paraphrasing input text in an imitation attack. To overcome this shortcoming, we developed a novel watermarking technique, WET, which applies linear transformations to the original embeddings to generate watermarked embeddings. We conducted comprehensive studies to evaluate the impact of each component involved in the paraphrasing attack and WET defence.

Chapter 2 presented a detailed literature review, beginning with language models to understand the ubiquity of LLMs. We also established why embeddings are important

in NLP due to their generic representations and how the popularity of LLMs has led to the emergence of EaaS. Subsequently, we focused on imitation attack vulnerabilities in these EaaS. We reviewed the literature on watermarking defences for imitation attacks and identified gaps warranting further exploration. We discussed the strengths and weaknesses of the reviewed methods.

In Chapter 3, we devised a paraphrasing attack that is effective in diluting EaaS watermarks and circumventing copyright verification. Our approach involves generating multiple paraphrases for input text and combining their embeddings, effectively reducing the impact of trigger words (the main component in the watermarks) and thereby diluting the watermark. We also demonstrated the effectiveness of this attack using different paraphrasing setups, such as employing various paraphrasing models and round-trip translation techniques. By exposing flaws and showcasing attacks in the existing watermarking systems, we advocated for better defence.

In Chapter 4, we next developed a defence mechanism against paraphrasing attacks. We validated the hypothesis presented at the start of the thesis, i.e., linearly transforming the original embedding to implant the watermarks, which can then be verified by performing a reverse transformation. We proved theoretically that such linear transformations are retained even with paraphrasing. Empirically, our experiments also verified that WET is robust against paraphrasing attacks and has a better verifiability performance than previous defence approaches. Additionally, we conducted ablation studies to assess the contribution of each component in WET.

The overarching theme of this research has been to improve the security of EaaS against imitation attacks, protecting the intellectual property of the models from the service provider’s perspective. To spur future research, we have open-sourced the code used in this work.<sup>1</sup> In conclusion, this thesis demonstrated EaaS watermark vulnerabilities to paraphrasing and proposed a countermeasure to the attack with the WET watermarking technique.

---

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/anudeex/WET.git>

## 5.2 Contributions

In the previous chapters, we have successfully addressed our research questions as outlined in Section 1.1. The main contributions of this thesis are as follows:

- **RQ1:** We introduce and validate that paraphrasing attacks bypass current EaaS watermarking techniques while maintaining the utility of the embeddings. We also conduct extensive experiments to evaluate their effectiveness across various setups and datasets.
- **RQ2:** We design a novel EaaS watermarking method, **WET**, and demonstrate its robustness against paraphrasing attacks. **WET** maintains the utility of the embeddings post-watermarking with near-perfect AUC verification performance even using a single sample.

### Social Impact

We develop a paraphrasing attack that could aid attackers in circumventing EaaS IP infringements. We acknowledge that, with this attack, any existing systems using **WARDEN** or **EmbMarker** are vulnerable. Nonetheless, we argue that it is critical to show the possibility of such attacks and make users aware of them. The typical first step in security is to first expose the vulnerability. Additionally, to mitigate the aforementioned threat, we contribute an improved watermarking technique, **WET**, which could be incorporated with minimal effort.

## 5.3 Limitations and Future Work

We now discuss the limitations of our research and propose some promising directions for future work.

### Complex Downstream Tasks for Utility Evaluation

For the evaluation of watermark *utility*, our focus has been on classification tasks, in line with existing studies (Shetty et al., 2024a, Peng et al., 2023). However, these tasks

may not fully capture embedding quality. Future studies might explore more complex NLP tasks, such as retrieval and generation (Muennighoff et al., 2023), to provide a comprehensive understanding of the impact of introducing watermarks into embeddings.

## Potential Attacks: Overwriting

In this thesis, we demonstrate that WET is a better watermark than both WARDEN (Shetty et al., 2024a) and EmbMarker (Peng et al., 2023). Unlike existing watermarks, it does not show vulnerability to paraphrasing attacks. Nevertheless, it is important to acknowledge that other potential attacks may exist.

Overwriting watermarks is one such attack (Uchida et al., 2017, Boenisch, 2021). Most of the existing watermarks are prone to these overwriting attacks. In this scenario, the watermarked embeddings could undergo further transformation and be overwritten. For example, the attacker could apply a linear transformation to the provided embedding, erasing (overwriting) the original existing watermark, which we discuss next.

**Linear Transformation Overwriting.** Concretely, the attacker might apply another linear transformation to the provided embeddings as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}_o &\xrightarrow{\mathbf{T}} \mathbf{e}_p \xrightarrow{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{e}_a, \\ \mathbf{e}_o &= \mathbf{T}^+ \cdot \mathbf{A}^+ \cdot \mathbf{e}_a, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{e}_o$  is the original embedding,  $\mathbf{T}$  is the victim’s linear transformation matrix,  $\mathbf{e}_p$  is the embedding generated by the victim using  $\mathbf{T}$ ,  $\mathbf{A}$  is the attacker’s additional linear transformation matrix, and  $\mathbf{e}_a$  is the overwritten embedding generated by the attacker using  $\mathbf{A}$ .

We now discuss how it may be possible for us (as the victim) to reverse-engineer the attacker’s linear transformation matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ . By querying the attacker and retrieving a number of samples, we can learn the unknown  $\mathbf{A}$  by the attacker as follows:

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{E}_a \times \mathbf{E}_p^+,$$

where  $\mathbf{E}$  is matrix stacking corresponding embeddings  $\mathbf{e}$ .



Note that, this transformation matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  could capture a range of transformations like dimension shift, rearrangement (shuffling), and many others.

As future work, it would be interesting to quantify the vulnerability of WET to these overwriting attacks and how well this proposed approach would recover the attacker transformation matrix to address this weakness.

## Transformation Enhancements

With the current design of the circulant transformation matrix (defined Section 4.2.2), the matrix is compromised if an attacker manages to recover any single row in the matrix. A better approach could be to use different weights for each row in the circulant matrix, but this would mean losing crucial properties such as invertibility and full rank, as observed in Table 4.5. Therefore, we opted to retain the current design, but there could be other designs that are stealthy, still invertible, and full rank.

In this thesis, moreover, we only experimented with linear transformations. Non-linear transformations might also be worth exploring because due to their additional complexity. The watermark will be difficult to reverse-engineer (robust) and imperceptible (stealthy). However, these complex non-linear transformations of original embeddings might lead to significant utility degradation. Also, such complex watermark patterns might not be learned and transferred to the attacker model in the imitation attack. Future work can explore this to understand the effectiveness of non-linear transformation as a watermark for embeddings.

## New Victim EaaS APIs

During this research project, OpenAI released a new V3 version of their EaaS APIs (OpenAI, 2024). A prominent enhancement in this version was using the Matryoshka representation learning technique (Kusupati et al., 2022), providing the ability to slice the initial dimensions of embeddings (essentially another form of dimension reduction). Our preliminary idea of hyperdimension (Section 4.4) might run into issues as we could lose some obfuscated dimensions if the attacker slices some initial dimensions. However, given that our final approach involves transforming all dimensions, we can handle attackers slicing initial dimensions. Slicing is a type of linear transformation and should

---

be covered by the defences to overwriting attacks as discussed in Section [5.3](#). We leave support and extension to this new version of EaaS APIs for future work.

# Bibliography

Scott Aaronson. 2023. Watermarking of large language models. (Cited on pages 23 and 25.)

Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Floren-  
cia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anad-  
kat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*. (Cited on  
pages 2, 17, and 23.)

Rohan Anil, Andrew M. Dai, Orhan Firat, Melvin Johnson, Dmitry Lepikhin, Alexan-  
dre Passos, Siamak Shakeri, Emanuel Taropa, Paige Bailey, Zhifeng Chen, Eric  
Chu, Jonathan H. Clark, Laurent El Shafey, Yanping Huang, Kathy Meier-Hellstern,  
Gaurav Mishra, Erica Moreira, Mark Omernick, Kevin Robinson, Sebastian Ruder,  
Yi Tay, Kefan Xiao, Yuanzhong Xu, Yujing Zhang, Gustavo Hernandez Abrego, Jun-  
whan Ahn, Jacob Austin, Paul Barham, Jan Botha, James Bradbury, Siddhartha  
Brahma, Kevin Brooks, Michele Catasta, Yong Cheng, Colin Cherry, Christopher A.  
Choquette-Choo, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Clément Crepy, Shachi Dave, Mostafa De-  
hghani, Sunipa Dev, Jacob Devlin, Mark Díaz, Nan Du, Ethan Dyer, Vlad Feinberg,  
Fangxiaoyu Feng, Vlad Fienber, Markus Freitag, Xavier Garcia, Sebastian Gehrmann,  
Lucas Gonzalez, Guy Gur-Ari, Steven Hand, Hadi Hashemi, Le Hou, Joshua Howland,  
Andrea Hu, Jeffrey Hui, Jeremy Hurwitz, Michael Isard, Abe Ittycheriah, Matthew  
Jagielski, Wenhao Jia, Kathleen Kenealy, Maxim Krikun, Sneha Kudugunta, Chang  
Lan, Katherine Lee, Benjamin Lee, Eric Li, Music Li, Wei Li, YaGuang Li, Jian Li,  
Hyeontaek Lim, Hanzhao Lin, Zhongtao Liu, Frederick Liu, Marcello Maggioni, Aroma  
Mahendru, Joshua Maynez, Vedant Misra, Maysam Moussalem, Zachary Nado, John  
Nham, Eric Ni, Andrew Nystrom, Alicia Parrish, Marie Pellat, Martin Polacek, Alex  
Polozov, Reiner Pope, Siyuan Qiao, Emily Reif, Bryan Richter, Parker Riley, Alex Cas-  
tro Ros, Aurko Roy, Brennan Saeta, Rajkumar Samuel, Renee Shelby, Ambrose Slone,

- Daniel Smilkov, David R. So, Daniel Sohn, Simon Tokumine, Dasha Valter, Vijay Vasudevan, Kiran Vodrahalli, Xuezhi Wang, Pidong Wang, Zirui Wang, Tao Wang, John Wieting, Yuhuai Wu, Kelvin Xu, Yunhan Xu, Linting Xue, Pengcheng Yin, Jiahui Yu, Qiao Zhang, Steven Zheng, Ce Zheng, Weikang Zhou, Denny Zhou, Slav Petrov, and Yonghui Wu. 2023. Palm 2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10403*. (Cited on page 23.)
- Mikhail Atallah, Victor Raskin, Michael Crogan, Christian Hempelmann, Florian Kerschbaum, Dina Mohamed, and Sanket Naik. 2001. Natural language watermarking: Design, analysis, and a proof-of-concept implementation. In *Information Hiding: 4th International Workshop, IH 2001 Pittsburgh, PA, USA, April 25–27, 2001 Proceedings 4*, pages 185–200. Springer. (Cited on page 24.)
- Mikhail Atallah, Victor Raskin, Christian Hempelmann, Mercan Karahan, Radu Sion, Umut Topkara, and Katrina E Triezenberg. 2002. Natural language watermarking and tamperproofing. In *International workshop on information hiding*, pages 196–212. Springer. (Cited on page 24.)
- Lalit R Bahl, Frederick Jelinek, and Robert Mercer. 1983. A maximum likelihood approach to continuous speech recognition. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, PAMI-5(2):179–190. (Cited on pages 10 and 11.)
- Mauro Barni and Franco Bartolini. 2004. *Watermarking systems engineering: enabling digital assets security and other applications*. Crc Press. (Cited on page 24.)
- Jason Baumgartner, Savvas Zannettou, Brian Keegan, Megan Squire, and Jeremy Blackburn. 2020. The pushshift reddit dataset. In *Proceedings of the international AAAI conference on web and social media*, volume 14, pages 830–839. (Cited on page 2.)
- Yoshua Bengio, Aaron Courville, and Pascal Vincent. 2013. Representation learning: A review and new perspectives. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 35(8):1798–1828. (Cited on page 14.)
- Yoshua Bengio, Réjean Ducharme, and Pascal Vincent. 2000. A neural probabilistic language model. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 13. (Cited on pages 12 and 13.)
- Philip Bernstein. 1996. Middleware: a model for distributed system services. *Communications of the ACM*, 39(2):86–98. (Cited on page 18.)

- Rahul Bhagat and Eduard Hovy. 2013. Squibs: What is a paraphrase? *Computational Linguistics*, 39(3):463–472. (Cited on page [34](#).)
- Joseph Biden. 2023. Executive Order 14110: Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence. *Federal Register* 88:7519175226. (Cited on page [22](#).)
- Franziska Boenisch. 2021. A systematic review on model watermarking for neural networks. *Frontiers in big Data*, 4:729663. (Cited on pages [27](#) and [99](#).)
- Rishi Bommasani, Drew A. Hudson, Ehsan Adeli, Russ Altman, Simran Arora, Sydney von Arx, Michael S. Bernstein, Jeannette Bohg, Antoine Bosselut, Emma Brunskill, Erik Brynjolfsson, Shyamal Buch, Dallas Card, Rodrigo Castellon, Niladri Chatterji, Annie Chen, Kathleen Creel, Jared Quincy Davis, Dora Demszky, Chris Donahue, Moussa Doumbouya, Esin Durmus, Stefano Ermon, John Etchemendy, Kawin Ethayarajh, Li Fei-Fei, Chelsea Finn, Trevor Gale, Lauren Gillespie, Karan Goel, Noah Goodman, Shelby Grossman, Neel Guha, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Peter Henderson, John Hewitt, Daniel E. Ho, Jenny Hong, Kyle Hsu, Jing Huang, Thomas Icard, Saahil Jain, Dan Jurafsky, Pratyusha Kalluri, Siddharth Karamcheti, Geoff Keeling, Fereshte Khani, Omar Khattab, Pang Wei Koh, Mark Krass, Ranjay Krishna, Rohith Kudipudi, Ananya Kumar, Faisal Ladhak, Mina Lee, Tony Lee, Jure Leskovec, Isabelle Levent, Xiang Lisa Li, Xuechen Li, Tengyu Ma, Ali Malik, Christopher D. Manning, Suvir Mirchandani, Eric Mitchell, Zanele Munyikwa, Suraj Nair, Avaniika Narayan, Deepak Narayanan, Ben Newman, Allen Nie, Juan Carlos Niebles, Hamed Nilforoshan, Julian Nyarko, Giray Ogut, Laurel Orr, Isabel Papadimitriou, Joon Sung Park, Chris Piech, Eva Portelance, Christopher Potts, Aditi Raghunathan, Rob Reich, Hongyu Ren, Frieda Rong, Yusuf Roohani, Camilo Ruiz, Jack Ryan, Christopher Ré, Dorsa Sadigh, Shiori Sagawa, Keshav Santhanam, Andy Shih, Krishnan Srinivasan, Alex Tamkin, Rohan Taori, Armin W. Thomas, Florian Tramèr, Rose E. Wang, William Wang, Bohan Wu, Jiajun Wu, Yuhuai Wu, Sang Michael Xie, Michihiro Yasunaga, Jiaxuan You, Matei Zaharia, Michael Zhang, Tianyi Zhang, Xikun Zhang, Yuhui Zhang, Lucia Zheng, Kaitlyn Zhou, and Percy Liang. 2021. On the opportunities and risks of foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07258*. (Cited on page [19](#).)
- Thorsten Brants, Ashok Papat, Peng Xu, Franz Josef Och, and Jeffrey Dean. 2007. Large language models in machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 2007 Joint Conference*

- on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and Computational Natural Language Learning (EMNLP-CoNLL)*, pages 858–867. (Cited on page [12](#).)
- Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901. (Cited on pages [2](#), [17](#), and [20](#).)
- Nicholas Carlini, Florian Tramèr, Eric Wallace, Matthew Jagielski, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Katherine Lee, Adam Roberts, Tom Brown, Dawn Song, Úlfar Erlingsson, Alina Oprea, and Colin Raffel. 2021. Extracting training data from large language models. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*, pages 2633–2650. (Cited on pages [2](#) and [19](#).)
- William Cavnar and John Trenkle. 1994. N-gram-based text categorization. In *Proceedings of SDAIR-94, 3rd annual symposium on document analysis and information retrieval*, volume 161175, page 14. Ann Arbor, Michigan. (Cited on page [11](#).)
- Souradip Chakraborty, Amrit Bedi, Sicheng Zhu, Bang An, Dinesh Manocha, and Furong Huang. 2024. Position: On the possibilities of AI-generated text detection. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 235 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 6093–6115. PMLR. (Cited on page [24](#).)
- Xinyun Chen, Wenxiao Wang, Chris Bender, Yiming Ding, Ruoxi Jia, Bo Li, and Dawn Song. 2021. Refit: a unified watermark removal framework for deep learning systems with limited data. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 321–335. (Cited on page [27](#).)
- Yiyi Chen, Heather Lent, and Johannes Bjerva. 2024. Text embedding inversion security for multilingual language models. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 7808–7827,

- Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics. (Cited on pages 19 and 86.)
- Zelei Cheng, Zuotian Li, Jiwei Zhang, and Shuhan Zhang. 2020. Differentially private machine learning model against model extraction attack. In *2020 International Conferences on Internet of Things (iThings) and IEEE Green Computing and Communications (GreenCom) and IEEE Cyber, Physical and Social Computing (CPSCom) and IEEE Smart Data (SmartData) and IEEE Congress on Cybermatics (Cybermatics)*, pages 722–728. IEEE. (Cited on page 22.)
- Noam Chomsky. 1957. *Syntactic Structures*. De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin, Boston. (Cited on page 9.)
- Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, Parker Schuh, Kensen Shi, Sasha Tsvyashchenko, Joshua Maynez, Abhishek Rao, Parker Barnes, Yi Tay, Noam Shazeer, Vinodkumar Prabhakaran, Emily Reif, Nan Du, Ben Hutchinson, Reiner Pope, James Bradbury, Jacob Austin, Michael Isard, Guy Gur-Ari, Pengcheng Yin, Toju Duke, Anselm Levskaya, Sanjay Ghemawat, Sunipa Dev, Henryk Michalewski, Xavier Garcia, Vedant Misra, Kevin Robinson, Liam Fedus, Denny Zhou, Daphne Ippolito, David Luan, Hyeontaek Lim, Barret Zoph, Alexander Spiridonov, Ryan Sepassi, David Dohan, Shivani Agrawal, Mark Omernick, Andrew M. Dai, Thanumalayan Sankaranarayanan Pillai, Marie Pellat, Aitor Lewkowycz, Erica Moreira, Rewon Child, Oleksandr Polozov, Katherine Lee, Zongwei Zhou, Xuezhi Wang, Brennan Saeta, Mark Diaz, Orhan Firat, Michele Catasta, Jason Wei, Kathy Meier-Hellstern, Douglas Eck, Jeff Dean, Slav Petrov, and Noah Fiedel. 2023. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(240):1–113. (Cited on page 17.)
- Miranda Christ, Sam Gunn, and Or Zamir. 2023. Undetectable watermarks for language models. *Cryptology ePrint Archive*. (Cited on pages 23, 25, and 90.)
- Ronan Collobert, Jason Weston, Léon Bottou, Michael Karlen, Koray Kavukcuoglu, and Pavel Kuksa. 2011. Natural language processing (almost) from scratch. *Journal of machine learning research*, 12:2493–2537. (Cited on page 14.)

Ingemar Cox, Matthew Miller, and Jeffrey Bloom. 1997. Digital watermarking. (Cited on page 24.)

Ingemar Cox, Matthew Miller, Jessica Bloom, Jeffreynd Fridrich, and Ton Kalker. 2007. *Digital watermarking and steganography*. Morgan kaufmann. (Cited on page 22.)

Bitu Darvish Rouhani, Huili Chen, and Farinaz Koushanfar. 2019. Deepsigns: An end-to-end watermarking framework for ownership protection of deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the twenty-fourth international conference on architectural support for programming languages and operating systems*, pages 485–497. (Cited on pages 26 and 27.)

Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *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)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics. (Cited on pages 1, 13, 15, 16, 47, 63, and 89.)

Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, Anirudh Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Aobo Yang, Archi Mitra, Archie Sravankumar, Artem Korenev, Arthur Hinsvark, Arun Rao, Aston Zhang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Austen Gregerson, Ava Spataru, Baptiste Roziere, Bethany Biron, Binh Tang, Bobbie Chern, Charlotte Caucheteux, Chaya Nayak, Chloe Bi, Chris Marra, Chris McConnell, Christian Keller, Christophe Touret, Chunyang Wu, Corinne Wong, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Cyrus Nikolaidis, Damien Allonsius, Daniel Song, Danielle Pintz, Danny Livshits, David Esiobu, Dhruv Choudhary, Dhruv Mahajan, Diego Garcia-Olano, Diego Perino, Dieuwke Hupkes, Egor Lakomkin, Ehab AlBadawy, Elina Lobanova, Emily Dinan, Eric Michael Smith, Filip Radenovic, Frank Zhang, Gabriel Synnaeve, Gabrielle Lee, Georgia Lewis Anderson, Graeme Nail, Gregoire Mialon, Guan Pang, Guillem Cucurell, Hailey Nguyen, Hannah Korevaar, Hu Xu, Hugo Touvron, Iliyan Zarov, Imanol Arrieta Ibarra, Isabel Kloumann, Ishan Misra, Ivan Evtimov, Jade Copet, Jaewon Lee, Jan Geffert, Jana Vranes, Jason Park, Jay Mahadeokar, Jeet Shah, Jelmer van der Linde, Jennifer Billock, Jenny Hong, Jenya Lee, Jeremy Fu, Jianfeng Chi, Jianyu Huang, Jiawen Liu, Jie Wang, Jiecao Yu, Joanna Bitton, Joe Spisak, Jongsoo



Park, Joseph Rocca, Joshua Johnstun, Joshua Saxe, Junteng Jia, Kalyan Vasuden Alwala, Kartikeya Upasani, Kate Plawiak, Ke Li, Kenneth Heafield, Kevin Stone, Khalid El-Arini, Krithika Iyer, Kshitiz Malik, Kuenley Chiu, Kunal Bhalla, Lauren Rantala-Yeary, Laurens van der Maaten, Lawrence Chen, Liang Tan, Liz Jenkins, Louis Martin, Lovish Madaan, Lubo Malo, Lukas Blecher, Lukas Landzaat, Luke de Oliveira, Madeline Muzzi, Mahesh Pasupuleti, Mannat Singh, Manohar Paluri, Marcin Kardas, Mathew Oldham, Mathieu Rita, Maya Pavlova, Melanie Kambadur, Mike Lewis, Min Si, Mitesh Kumar Singh, Mona Hassan, Naman Goyal, Narjes Torabi, Nikolay Bashlykov, Nikolay Bogoychev, Niladri Chatterji, Olivier Duchenne, Onur Çelebi, Patrick Alrassy, Pengchuan Zhang, Pengwei Li, Petar Vasic, Peter Weng, Prajjwal Bhargava, Pratik Dubal, Praveen Krishnan, Punit Singh Koura, Puxin Xu, Qing He, Qingxiao Dong, Ragavan Srinivasan, Raj Ganapathy, Ramon Calderer, Ricardo Silveira Cabral, Robert Stojnic, Roberta Raileanu, Rohit Girdhar, Rohit Patel, Romain Sauvestre, Ronnie Polidoro, Roshan Sumbaly, Ross Taylor, Ruan Silva, Rui Hou, Rui Wang, Saghar Hosseini, Sahana Chennabasappa, Sanjay Singh, Sean Bell, Seohyun Sonia Kim, Sergey Edunov, Shaoliang Nie, Sharan Narang, Sharath Raparthy, Sheng Shen, Shengye Wan, Shruti Bhosale, Shun Zhang, Simon Vandenhende, Soumya Batra, Spencer Whitman, Sten Sootla, Stephane Collot, Suchin Gururangan, Sydney Borodinsky, Tamar Herman, Tara Fowler, Tarek Sheasha, Thomas Georgiou, Thomas Scialom, Tobias Speckbacher, Todor Mihaylov, Tong Xiao, Ujjwal Karn, Vedanuj Goswami, Vibhor Gupta, Vignesh Ramanathan, Viktor Kerkez, Vincent Gonguet, Virginie Do, Vish Vogeti, Vladan Petrovic, Weiwei Chu, Wenhan Xiong, Wenyin Fu, Whitney Meers, Xavier Martinet, Xiaodong Wang, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Xinfeng Xie, Xuchao Jia, Xuewei Wang, Yaelle Goldschlag, Yashesh Gaur, Yasmine Babaei, Yi Wen, Yiwen Song, Yuchen Zhang, Yue Li, Yuning Mao, Zacharie Delpierre Coudert, Zheng Yan, Zhengxing Chen, Zoe Papanikos, Aaditya Singh, Aaron Grattafiori, Abha Jain, Adam Kelsey, Adam Shajnfeld, Adithya Gangidi, Adolfo Victoria, Ahuva Goldstand, Ajay Menon, Ajay Sharma, Alex Boesenberg, Alex Vaughan, Alexei Baevski, Allie Feinstein, Amanda Kallet, Amit Sangani, Anam Yunus, Andrei Lupu, Andres Alvarado, Andrew Caples, Andrew Gu, Andrew Ho, Andrew Poulton, Andrew Ryan, Ankit Ramchandani, Annie Franco, Aparajita Saraf, Arkabandhu Chowdhury, Ashley Gabriel, Ashwin Bharambe, Assaf Eisenman, Azadeh Yazdan, Beau James, Ben Maurer, Benjamin Leonhardi, Bernie Huang, Beth Loyd, Beto De Paola, Bhargavi Paranjape, Bing Liu, Bo Wu, Boyu Ni, Braden Hancock, Bram Wasti, Brandon Spence,

Brani Stojkovic, Brian Gamido, Britt Montalvo, Carl Parker, Carly Burton, Catalina Mejia, Changhan Wang, Changkyu Kim, Chao Zhou, Chester Hu, Ching-Hsiang Chu, Chris Cai, Chris Tindal, Christoph Feichtenhofer, Damon Civin, Dana Beaty, Daniel Kreymer, Daniel Li, Danny Wyatt, David Adkins, David Xu, Davide Testuggine, Delia David, Devi Parikh, Diana Liskovich, Didem Foss, Dingkan Wang, Duc Le, Dustin Holland, Edward Dowling, Eissa Jamil, Elaine Montgomery, Eleonora Presani, Emily Hahn, Emily Wood, Erik Brinkman, Esteban Arcaute, Evan Dunbar, Evan Smothers, Fei Sun, Felix Kreuk, Feng Tian, Firat Ozgenel, Francesco Caggioni, Francisco Guzmán, Frank Kanayet, Frank Seide, Gabriela Medina Florez, Gabriella Schwarz, Gada Badeer, Georgia Swee, Gil Halpern, Govind Thattai, Grant Herman, Gregory Sizov, Guangyi, Zhang, Guna Lakshminarayanan, Hamid Shojanazeri, Han Zou, Hannah Wang, Hanwen Zha, Haroun Habeeb, Harrison Rudolph, Helen Suk, Henry Aspegren, Hunter Goldman, Ibrahim Damlaj, Igor Molybog, Igor Tufanov, Irina-Elena Veliche, Itai Gat, Jake Weissman, James Geboski, James Kohli, Japhet Asher, Jean-Baptiste Gaya, Jeff Marcus, Jeff Tang, Jennifer Chan, Jenny Zhen, Jeremy Reizenstein, Jeremy Teboul, Jessica Zhong, Jian Jin, Jingyi Yang, Joe Cummings, Jon Carvill, Jon Shepard, Jonathan McPhie, Jonathan Torres, Josh Ginsburg, Junjie Wang, Kai Wu, Kam Hou U, Karan Saxena, Karthik Prasad, Kartikay Khandelwal, Katayoun Zand, Kathy Matosich, Kaushik Veeraraghavan, Kelly Michelena, Keqian Li, Kun Huang, Kunal Chawla, Kushal Lakhotia, Kyle Huang, Lailin Chen, Lakshya Garg, Lavender A, Leandro Silva, Lee Bell, Lei Zhang, Liangpeng Guo, Licheng Yu, Liron Moshkovich, Luca Wehrstedt, Madian Khabisa, Manav Avalani, Manish Bhatt, Maria Tsimpoukelli, Martynas Mankus, Matan Hasson, Matthew Lennie, Matthias Reso, Maxim Groshev, Maxim Naumov, Maya Lathi, Meghan Keneally, Michael L. Seltzer, Michal Valko, Michelle Restrepo, Mihir Patel, Mik Vyatskov, Mikayel Samvelyan, Mike Clark, Mike Macey, Mike Wang, Miquel Jubert Hermoso, Mo Metanat, Mohammad Rastegari, Munish Bansal, Nandhini Santhanam, Natascha Parks, Natasha White, Navyata Bawa, Nayan Singhal, Nick Egebo, Nicolas Usunier, Nikolay Pavlovich Laptev, Ning Dong, Ning Zhang, Norman Cheng, Oleg Chernoguz, Olivia Hart, Omkar Salpekar, Ozlem Kalinli, Parkin Kent, Parth Parekh, Paul Saab, Pavan Balaji, Pedro Rittner, Philip Bontrager, Pierre Roux, Piotr Dollar, Polina Zvyagina, Prashant Ratanchandani, Pritish Yuvraj, Qian Liang, Rachad Alao, Rachel Rodriguez, Rafi Ayub, Raghotham Murthy, Raghu Nayani, Rahul Mitra, Raymond Li, Rebekkah Hogan, Robin Battey, Rocky Wang, Rohan Maheswari, Russ Howes, Rutu

- Rinott, Sai Jayesh Bondu, Samyak Datta, Sara Chugh, Sara Hunt, Sargun Dhillon, Sasha Sidorov, Satadru Pan, Saurabh Verma, Seiji Yamamoto, Sharadh Ramaswamy, Shaun Lindsay, Sheng Feng, Shenghao Lin, Shengxin Cindy Zha, Shiva Shankar, Shuqiang Zhang, Sinong Wang, Sneha Agarwal, Soji Sajuyigbe, Soumith Chintala, Stephanie Max, Stephen Chen, Steve Kehoe, Steve Satterfield, Sudarshan Govindaprasad, Sumit Gupta, Sungmin Cho, Sunny Virk, Suraj Subramanian, Sy Choudhury, Sydney Goldman, Tal Remez, Tamar Glaser, Tamara Best, Thilo Kohler, Thomas Robinson, Tianhe Li, Tianjun Zhang, Tim Matthews, Timothy Chou, Tzook Shaked, Varun Vontimitta, Victoria Ajayi, Victoria Montanez, Vijai Mohan, Vinay Satish Kumar, Vishal Mangla, Vitor Albiero, Vlad Ionescu, Vlad Poenaru, Vlad Tiberiu Mihailescu, Vladimir Ivanov, Wei Li, Wenchen Wang, Wenwen Jiang, Wes Bouaziz, Will Constable, Xiaocheng Tang, Xiaofang Wang, Xiaojian Wu, Xiaolan Wang, Xide Xia, Xilun Wu, Xinbo Gao, Yanjun Chen, Ye Hu, Ye Jia, Ye Qi, Yenda Li, Yilin Zhang, Ying Zhang, Yossi Adi, Youngjin Nam, Yu, Wang, Yuchen Hao, Yundi Qian, Yuzi He, Zach Rait, Zachary DeVito, Zef Rosnbrick, Zhaoduo Wen, Zhenyu Yang, and Zhiwei Zhao. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*. (Cited on pages [17](#) and [23](#).)
- Cynthia Dwork. 2006. Differential privacy. In *International colloquium on automata, languages, and programming*, pages 1–12. Springer. (Cited on page [21](#).)
- William Gale and Geoffrey Sampson. 1995. Good-turing frequency estimation without tears. *Journal of quantitative linguistics*, 2(3):217–237. (Cited on page [12](#).)
- Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M. Dai, Anja Hauth, Katie Millican, David Silver, Melvin Johnson, Ioannis Antonoglou, Julian Schrittwieser, Amelia Glaese, Jilin Chen, Emily Pitler, Timothy Lillicrap, Angeliki Lazaridou, Orhan Firat, James Molloy, Michael Isard, Paul R. Barham, Tom Hennigan, Benjamin Lee, Fabio Viola, Malcolm Reynolds, Yuanzhong Xu, Ryan Doherty, Eli Collins, Clemens Meyer, Eliza Rutherford, Erica Moreira, Kareem Ayoub, Megha Goel, Jack Krawczyk, Cosmo Du, Ed Chi, Heng-Tze Cheng, Eric Ni, Purvi Shah, Patrick Kane, Betty Chan, Manaal Faruqui, Aliaksei Severyn, Hanzhao Lin, YaGuang Li, Yong Cheng, Abe Ittycheriah, Mahdis Mahdieh, Mia Chen, Pei Sun, Dustin Tran, Sumit Bagri, Balaji Lakshminarayanan, Jeremiah Liu, Andras Orban, Fabian Gura, Hao Zhou, Xinying Song,

Aurelien Boffy, Harish Ganapathy, Steven Zheng, HyunJeong Choe, Ágoston Weisz, Tao Zhu, Yifeng Lu, Siddharth Gopal, Jarrod Kahn, Maciej Kula, Jeff Pitman, Rushin Shah, Emanuel Taropa, Majd Al Merey, Martin Baeuml, Zhifeng Chen, Laurent El Shafey, Yujing Zhang, Olcan Sercinoglu, George Tucker, Enrique Piqueras, Maxim Krikun, Iain Barr, Nikolay Savinov, Ivo Danihelka, Becca Roelofs, Anaïs White, Anders Andreassen, Tamara von Glehn, Lakshman Yagati, Mehran Kazemi, Lucas Gonzalez, Misha Khalman, Jakub Sygnowski, Alexandre Frechette, Charlotte Smith, Laura Culp, Lev Proleev, Yi Luan, Xi Chen, James Lottes, Nathan Schucher, Federico Lebron, Alban Rustemi, Natalie Clay, Phil Crone, Tomas Kocisky, Jeffrey Zhao, Bartek Perz, Dian Yu, Heidi Howard, Adam Bloniarz, Jack W. Rae, Han Lu, Laurent Sifre, Marcello Maggioni, Fred Alcober, Dan Garrette, Megan Barnes, Shantanu Thakoor, Jacob Austin, Gabriel Barth-Maron, William Wong, Rishabh Joshi, Rahma Chaabouni, Deeni Fatiha, Arun Ahuja, Gaurav Singh Tomar, Evan Senter, Martin Chadwick, Ilya Kornakov, Nithya Attaluri, Iñaki Iturrate, Ruibo Liu, Yunxuan Li, Sarah Cogan, Jeremy Chen, Chao Jia, Chenjie Gu, Qiao Zhang, Jordan Grimstad, Ale Jakse Hartman, Xavier Garcia, Thanumalayan Sankaranarayanan Pillai, Jacob Devlin, Michael Laskin, Diego de Las Casas, Dasha Valter, Connie Tao, Lorenzo Blanco, Adrià Puigdomènech Badia, David Reitter, Mianna Chen, Jenny Brennan, Clara Rivera, Sergey Brin, Shariq Iqbal, Gabriela Surita, Jane Labanowski, Abhi Rao, Stephanie Winkler, Emilio Parisotto, Yiming Gu, Kate Olszewska, Ravi Addanki, Antoine Miech, Annie Louis, Denis Teplyashin, Geoff Brown, Elliot Catt, Jan Balaguer, Jackie Xiang, Pidong Wang, Zoe Ashwood, Anton Briukhov, Albert Webson, Sanjay Ganapathy, Smit Sanghavi, Ajay Kannan, Ming-Wei Chang, Axel Stjerngren, Josip Djolonga, Yuting Sun, Ankur Bapna, Matthew Aitchison, Pedram Pejman, Henryk Michalewski, Tianhe Yu, Cindy Wang, Juliette Love, Junwhan Ahn, Dawn Bloxwich, Kehang Han, Peter Humphreys, Thibault Sellam, James Bradbury, Varun Godbole, Sina Samangooei, Bogdan Damoc, Alex Kaskasoli, Sébastien M. R. Arnold, Vijay Vasudevan, Shubham Agrawal, Jason Riesa, Dmitry Lepikhin, Richard Tanburn, Srivatsan Srinivasan, Hyeontaek Lim, Sarah Hodgkinson, Pranav Shyam, Johan Ferret, Steven Hand, Ankush Garg, Tom Le Paine, Jian Li, Yujia Li, Minh Giang, Alexander Neitz, Zaheer Abbas, Sarah York, Machel Reid, Elizabeth Cole, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Dipanjan Das, Dominika Rogoziska, Vitaliy Nikolaev, Pablo Sprechmann, Zachary Nado, Lukas Zilka, Flavien Prost, Luheng He, Marianne Monteiro, Gaurav Mishra, Chris Welty, Josh Newlan, Dawei Jia, Miltiadis Allamanis,

Clara Huiyi Hu, Raoul de Liedekerke, Justin Gilmer, Carl Saroufim, Shruti Rijhwani, Shaobo Hou, Disha Shrivastava, Anirudh Baddepudi, Alex Goldin, Adnan Ozturel, Albin Cassirer, Yunhan Xu, Daniel Sohn, Devendra Sachan, Reinald Kim Amplayo, Craig Swanson, Dessie Petrova, Shashi Narayan, Arthur Guez, Siddhartha Brahma, Jessica Landon, Miteyan Patel, Ruizhe Zhao, Kevin Vilella, Luyu Wang, Wenhao Jia, Matthew Rahtz, Mai Giménez, Legg Yeung, James Keeling, Petko Georgiev, Diana Mincu, Boxi Wu, Salem Haykal, Rachel Saputro, Kiran Vodrahalli, James Qin, Zeynep Cankara, Abhanshu Sharma, Nick Fernando, Will Hawkins, Behnam Neyshabur, Solomon Kim, Adrian Hutter, Priyanka Agrawal, Alex Castro-Ros, George van den Driessche, Tao Wang, Fan Yang, Shuo yin Chang, Paul Komarek, Ross McIlroy, Mario Lui, Guodong Zhang, Wael Farhan, Michael Sharman, Paul Natsev, Paul Michel, Yamini Bansal, Siyuan Qiao, Kris Cao, Siamak Shakeri, Christina Butterfield, Justin Chung, Paul Kishan Rubenstein, Shivani Agrawal, Arthur Mensch, Kedar Soparkar, Karel Lenc, Timothy Chung, Aedan Pope, Loren Maggiore, Jackie Kay, Priya Jhakra, Shibo Wang, Joshua Maynez, Mary Phuong, Taylor Tobin, Andrea Tacchetti, Maja Trebacz, Kevin Robinson, Yash Katariya, Sebastian Riedel, Paige Bailey, Kefan Xiao, Nimesh Ghelani, Lora Aroyo, Ambrose Slone, Neil Houlsby, Xuehan Xiong, Zhen Yang, Elena Gribovskaya, Jonas Adler, Mateo Wirth, Lisa Lee, Music Li, Thais Kagohara, Jay Pavagadhi, Sophie Bridgers, Anna Bortsova, Sanjay Ghemawat, Zafarali Ahmed, Tianqi Liu, Richard Powell, Vijay Bolina, Mariko Iinuma, Polina Zablotskaia, James Besley, Da-Woon Chung, Timothy Dozat, Ramona Comanescu, Xiance Si, Jeremy Greer, Guolong Su, Martin Polacek, Raphaël Lopez Kaufman, Simon Tokumine, Hexiang Hu, Elena Buchatskaya, Yingjie Miao, Mohamed Elhawaty, Aditya Siddhant, Nenad Tomasev, Jinwei Xing, Christina Greer, Helen Miller, Shereen Ashraf, Aurko Roy, Zizhao Zhang, Ada Ma, Angelos Filos, Milos Besta, Rory Blevins, Ted Klimenko, Chih-Kuan Yeh, Soravit Changpinyo, Jiaqi Mu, Oscar Chang, Mantas Pajarskas, Carrie Muir, Vered Cohen, Charline Le Lan, Krishna Haridasan, Amit Marathe, Steven Hansen, Sholto Douglas, Rajkumar Samuel, Mingqiu Wang, Sophia Austin, Chang Lan, Jiepu Jiang, Justin Chiu, Jaime Alonso Lorenzo, Lars Lowe Sjösund, Sébastien Cevey, Zach Gleicher, Thi Avrahami, Anudhyan Boral, Hansa Srinivasan, Vittorio Selo, Rhys May, Konstantinos Aisopos, Léonard Hussenot, Livio Baldini Soares, Kate Baumli, Michael B. Chang, Adrià Recasens, Ben Caine, Alexander Pritzel, Filip Pavetic, Fabio Pardo, Anita Gergely, Justin Frye, Vinay Ramasesh, Dan Horgan, Kartikeya Badola, Nora

Kassner, Subhrajit Roy, Ethan Dyer, Víctor Campos Campos, Alex Tomala, Yunhao Tang, Dalia El Badawy, Elspeth White, Basil Mustafa, Oran Lang, Abhishek Jindal, Sharad Vikram, Zhitao Gong, Sergi Caelles, Ross Hemsley, Gregory Thornton, Fangxiaoyu Feng, Wojciech Stokowiec, Ce Zheng, Phoebe Thacker, Çalar Ünlü, Zhishuai Zhang, Mohammad Saleh, James Svensson, Max Bileschi, Piyush Patil, Ankesh Anand, Roman Ring, Katerina Tsihlias, Arpi Vezzer, Marco Selvi, Toby Shevlane, Mikel Rodriguez, Tom Kwiatkowski, Samira Daruki, Keran Rong, Allan Dafoe, Nicholas FitzGerald, Keren Gu-Lemberg, Mina Khan, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Marie Pellat, Vladimir Feinberg, James Cobon-Kerr, Tara Sainath, Maribeth Rauh, Sayed Hadi Hashemi, Richard Ives, Yana Hasson, Eric Noland, Yuan Cao, Nathan Byrd, Le Hou, Qingze Wang, Thibault Sottiaux, Michela Paganini, Jean-Baptiste Lespiau, Alexandre Moufarek, Samer Hassan, Kaushik Shivakumar, Joost van Amersfoort, Amol Mandhane, Pratik Joshi, Anirudh Goyal, Matthew Tung, Andrew Brock, Hannah Sheahan, Vedant Misra, Cheng Li, Nemanja Rakievi, Mostafa Dehghani, Fangyu Liu, Sid Mittal, Junhyuk Oh, Seb Noury, Eren Sezener, Fantine Huot, Matthew Lamm, Nicola De Cao, Charlie Chen, Sidharth Mudgal, Romina Stella, Kevin Brooks, Gautam Vasudevan, Chenxi Liu, Mainak Chain, Nivedita Melinkeri, Aaron Cohen, Venus Wang, Kristie Seymore, Sergey Zubkov, Rahul Goel, Summer Yue, Sai Krishnakumaran, Brian Albert, Nate Hurley, Motoki Sano, Anhad Mohananey, Jonah Joughin, Egor Filonov, Tomasz Kpa, Yomna Eldawy, Jiawern Lim, Rahul Rishi, Shirin Badiezedegan, Taylor Bos, Jerry Chang, Sanil Jain, Sri Gayatri Sundara Padmanabhan, Subha Puttagunta, Kalpesh Krishna, Leslie Baker, Norbert Kalb, Vamsi Bedapudi, Adam Kurzrok, Shuntong Lei, Anthony Yu, Oren Litvin, Xiang Zhou, Zhichun Wu, Sam Sobell, Andrea Siciliano, Alan Papir, Robby Neale, Jonas Bragagnolo, Tej Toor, Tina Chen, Valentin Anklin, Feiran Wang, Richie Feng, Milad Gholami, Kevin Ling, Lijuan Liu, Jules Walter, Hamid Moghaddam, Arun Kishore, Jakub Adamek, Tyler Mercado, Jonathan Mallinson, Siddhinita Wandekar, Stephen Cagle, Eran Ofek, Guillermo Garrido, Clemens Lombriser, Maksim Mukha, Botu Sun, Hafeezul Rahman Mohammad, Josip Matak, Yadi Qian, Vikas Peswani, Pawel Janus, Quan Yuan, Leif Schelin, Oana David, Ankur Garg, Yifan He, Oleksii Duzhyi, Anton Älgmyr, Timothée Lottaz, Qi Li, Vikas Yadav, Luyao Xu, Alex Chinien, Rakesh Shivanna, Aleksandr Chuklin, Josie Li, Carrie Spadine, Travis Wolfe, Kareem Mohamed, Subhabrata Das, Zihang Dai, Kyle He, Daniel von Dincklage, Shyam Upadhyay, Akanksha Maurya, Luyan Chi, Sebastian Krause, Khalid Salama, Pam G Rabinovitch, Pavan

Kumar Reddy M, Aarush Selvan, Mikhail Dektiarev, Golnaz Ghiasi, Erdem Guven, Himanshu Gupta, Boyi Liu, Deepak Sharma, Idan Heimlich Shtacher, Shachi Paul, Oscar Akerlund, François-Xavier Aubet, Terry Huang, Chen Zhu, Eric Zhu, Elico Teixeira, Matthew Fritze, Francesco Bertolini, Liana-Eleonora Marinescu, Martin Bölle, Dominik Paulus, Khyatti Gupta, Tejasi Latkar, Max Chang, Jason Sanders, Roopa Wilson, Xuewei Wu, Yi-Xuan Tan, Lam Nguyen Thiet, Tulsee Doshi, Sid Lall, Swaroop Mishra, Wanming Chen, Thang Luong, Seth Benjamin, Jasmine Lee, Ewa Andrejczuk, Dominik Rabiej, Vipul Ranjan, Krzysztof Styrz, Pengcheng Yin, Jon Simon, Malcolm Rose Harriott, Mudit Bansal, Alexei Robsky, Geoff Bacon, David Greene, Daniil Mirylenka, Chen Zhou, Obaid Sarvana, Abhimanyu Goyal, Samuel Andermatt, Patrick Sieglar, Ben Horn, Assaf Israel, Francesco Pongetti, Chih-Wei "Louis" Chen, Marco Selvatici, Pedro Silva, Kathie Wang, Jackson Tolins, Kelvin Guu, Roey Yogev, Xiaochen Cai, Alessandro Agostini, Maulik Shah, Hung Nguyen, Noah Ó Donnaile, Sébastien Pereira, Linda Friso, Adam Stambler, Adam Kurzrok, Chenkai Kuang, Yan Romanikhin, Mark Geller, ZJ Yan, Kane Jang, Cheng-Chun Lee, Wojciech Fica, Eric Malmi, Qijun Tan, Dan Banica, Daniel Balle, Ryan Pham, Yanping Huang, Diana Avram, Hongzhi Shi, Jasjot Singh, Chris Hidey, Niharika Ahuja, Pranab Saxena, Dan Dooley, Srividya Pranavi Potharaju, Eileen O'Neill, Anand Gokulchandran, Ryan Foley, Kai Zhao, Mike Dusenberry, Yuan Liu, Pulkit Mehta, Ragha Kotikalapudi, Chancelle Safranek-Shrader, Andrew Goodman, Joshua Kessinger, Eran Globen, Prateek Kolhar, Chris Gorgolewski, Ali Ibrahim, Yang Song, Ali Eichenbaum, Thomas Brovelli, Sahitya Potluri, Preethi Lahoti, Cip Baetu, Ali Ghorbani, Charles Chen, Andy Crawford, Shalini Pal, Mukund Sridhar, Petru Gurita, Asier Mujika, Igor Petrovski, Pierre-Louis Cedoz, Chenmei Li, Shiyuan Chen, Niccolò Dal Santo, Siddharth Goyal, Jitesh Punjabi, Karthik Kappaganthu, Chester Kwak, Pallavi LV, Sarmishta Velury, Himadri Choudhury, Jamie Hall, Premal Shah, Ricardo Figueira, Matt Thomas, Minjie Lu, Ting Zhou, Chintu Kumar, Thomas Jurdi, Sharat Chikkerur, Yenai Ma, Adams Yu, Soo Kwak, Victor Ähdel, Sujeewan Rajayogam, Travis Choma, Fei Liu, Aditya Barua, Colin Ji, Ji Ho Park, Vincent Hellendoorn, Alex Bailey, Taylan Bilal, Huanjie Zhou, Mehrdad Khatir, Charles Sutton, Wojciech Rządowski, Fiona Macintosh, Konstantin Shagin, Paul Medina, Chen Liang, Jinjing Zhou, Pararth Shah, Yingying Bi, Attila Dankovics, Shipra Banga, Sabine Lehmann, Marissa Bredesen, Zifan Lin, John Eric Hoffmann, Jonathan Lai, Raynald Chung, Kai Yang, Nihal Balani,

Arthur Brainskas, Andrei Sozanschi, Matthew Hayes, Héctor Fernández Alcalde, Peter Makarov, Will Chen, Antonio Stella, Liselotte Snijders, Michael Mandl, Ante Kärrman, Pawe Nowak, Xinyi Wu, Alex Dyck, Krishnan Vaidyanathan, Raghavender R, Jessica Mallet, Mitch Rudominer, Eric Johnston, Sushil Mittal, Akhil Udathu, Janara Christensen, Vishal Verma, Zach Irving, Andreas Santucci, Gamaleldin El-sayed, Elnaz Davoodi, Marin Georgiev, Ian Tenney, Nan Hua, Geoffrey Cideron, Edouard Leurent, Mahmoud Alnahlawi, Ionut Georgescu, Nan Wei, Ivy Zheng, Dylan Scandinaro, Heinrich Jiang, Jasper Snoek, Mukund Sundararajan, Xuezhi Wang, Zack Ontiveros, Itay Karo, Jeremy Cole, Vinu Rajashekhar, Lara Tumeh, Eyal Ben-David, Rishub Jain, Jonathan Uesato, Romina Datta, Oskar Bunyan, Shimu Wu, John Zhang, Piotr Stanczyk, Ye Zhang, David Steiner, Subhajit Naskar, Michael Azzam, Matthew Johnson, Adam Paszke, Chung-Cheng Chiu, Jaume Sanchez Elias, Afroz Mohiuddin, Faizan Muhammad, Jin Miao, Andrew Lee, Nino Vieillard, Jane Park, Jiageng Zhang, Jeff Stanway, Drew Garmon, Abhijit Karmarkar, Zhe Dong, Jong Lee, Aviral Kumar, Luowei Zhou, Jonathan Evens, William Isaac, Geoffrey Irving, Edward Loper, Michael Fink, Isha Arkatkar, Nanxin Chen, Izhak Shafran, Ivan Petrychenko, Zhe Chen, Johnson Jia, Anselm Levskaya, Zhenkai Zhu, Peter Grabowski, Yu Mao, Alberto Magni, Kaisheng Yao, Javier Snaider, Norman Casagrande, Evan Palmer, Paul Suganthan, Alfonso Castaño, Irene Giannoumis, Wooyeol Kim, Mikoaj Rybiski, Ashwin Sreevatsa, Jennifer Prendki, David Soergel, Adrian Goedeckemeyer, Willi Gierke, Mohsen Jafari, Meenu Gaba, Jeremy Wiesner, Diana Gage Wright, Yawen Wei, Harsha Vashisht, Yana Kulizhskaya, Jay Hoover, Maigo Le, Lu Li, Chimezie Iwuanyanwu, Lu Liu, Kevin Ramirez, Andrey Khorlin, Albert Cui, Tian LIN, Marcus Wu, Ricardo Aguilar, Keith Pallo, Abhishek Chakladar, Ginger Perng, Elena Allica Abellan, Mingyang Zhang, Ishita Dasgupta, Nate Kushman, Ivo Penchev, Alena Repina, Xihui Wu, Tom van der Weide, Priya Ponnappalli, Caroline Kaplan, Jiri Simsa, Shuangfeng Li, Olivier Dousse, Fan Yang, Jeff Piper, Nathan Ie, Rama Pasumarthi, Nathan Lintz, Anitha Vijayakumar, Daniel Andor, Pedro Valenzuela, Minnie Lui, Cosmin Paduraru, Daiyi Peng, Katherine Lee, Shuyuan Zhang, Somer Greene, Duc Dung Nguyen, Paula Kurylowicz, Cassidy Hardin, Lucas Dixon, Lili Janzer, Kiam Choo, Ziqiang Feng, Biao Zhang, Achintya Singhal, Dayou Du, Dan McKinnon, Natasha Antropova, Tolga Bolukbasi, Orgad Keller, David Reid, Daniel Finchelstein, Maria Abi Raad, Remi Crocker, Peter Hawkins, Robert Dadashi, Colin Gaffney, Ken Franko, Anna Bulanova, Rémi Leblond, Shirley Chung, Harry Askham, Luis C. Cobo,



Kelvin Xu, Felix Fischer, Jun Xu, Christina Sorokin, Chris Alberti, Chu-Cheng Lin, Colin Evans, Alek Dimitriev, Hannah Forbes, Dylan Banarse, Zora Tung, Mark Omer-nick, Colton Bishop, Rachel Sterneck, Rohan Jain, Jiawei Xia, Ehsan Amid, Francesco Piccinno, Xingyu Wang, Praseem Banzal, Daniel J. Mankowitz, Alex Polozov, Victo-ria Krakovna, Sasha Brown, MohammadHossein Bateni, Dennis Duan, Vlad Firoiu, Meghana Thotakuri, Tom Natan, Matthieu Geist, Ser tan Girgin, Hui Li, Jiayu Ye, Ofir Roval, Reiko Tojo, Michael Kwong, James Lee-Thorp, Christopher Yew, Danila Sinopalnikov, Sabela Ramos, John Mellor, Abhishek Sharma, Kathy Wu, David Miller, Nicolas Sonnerat, Denis Vnukov, Rory Greig, Jennifer Beattie, Emily Caveness, Libin Bai, Julian Eisenschlos, Alex Korchemniy, Tomy Tsai, Mimi Jasarevic, Weize Kong, Phuong Dao, Zeyu Zheng, Frederick Liu, Fan Yang, Rui Zhu, Tian Huey Teh, Ja-son Sanmiya, Evgeny Gladchenko, Nejc Trdin, Daniel Toyama, Evan Rosen, Sasan Tavakkol, Linting Xue, Chen Elkind, Oliver Woodman, John Carpenter, George Pa-pamakarios, Rupert Kemp, Sushant Kafle, Tanya Grunina, Rishika Sinha, Alice Tal-bert, Diane Wu, Denese Owusu-Afriyie, Cosmo Du, Chloe Thornton, Jordi Pont-Tuset, Pradyumna Narayana, Jing Li, Saaber Fatehi, John Wieting, Omar Ajmeri, Benigno Uria, Yeongil Ko, Laura Knight, Amélie Héliou, Ning Niu, Shane Gu, Chenxi Pang, Yeqing Li, Nir Levine, Ariel Stolovich, Rebeca Santamaria-Fernandez, Sonam Goenka, Wenny Yustalim, Robin Strudel, Ali Elqursh, Charlie Deck, Hyo Lee, Zonglin Li, Kyle Levin, Raphael Hoffmann, Dan Holtmann-Rice, Olivier Bachem, Sho Arora, Christy Koh, Soheil Hassas Yeganeh, Siim Pöder, Mukarram Tariq, Yanhua Sun, Lu-cian Ionita, Mojtaba Seyedhosseini, Pouya Tafti, Zhiyu Liu, Anmol Gulati, Jasmine Liu, Xinyu Ye, Bart Chrzaszcz, Lily Wang, Nikhil Sethi, Tianrun Li, Ben Brown, Shreya Singh, Wei Fan, Aaron Parisi, Joe Stanton, Vinod Koverkathu, Christopher A. Choquette-Choo, Yunjie Li, TJ Lu, Abe Ittycheriah, Prakash Shroff, Mani Varadara-jan, Sanaz Bahargam, Rob Willoughby, David Gaddy, Guillaume Desjardins, Marco Cornero, Brona Robenek, Bhavishya Mittal, Ben Albrecht, Ashish Shenoy, Fedor Moiseev, Henrik Jacobsson, Alireza Ghaffarkhah, Morgane Rivière, Alanna Walton, Clément Crepy, Alicia Parrish, Zongwei Zhou, Clement Farabet, Carey Radebaugh, Praveen Srinivasan, Claudia van der Salm, Andreas Fidjeland, Salvatore Scellato, Eri Latorre-Chimoto, Hanna Klimczak-Pluciska, David Bridson, Dario de Cesare, Tom Hudson, Piermaria Mendolicchio, Lexi Walker, Alex Morris, Matthew Mauger, Alexey Guseynov, Alison Reid, Seth Odoom, Lucia Loher, Victor Cotruta, Madhavi Yenugula, Dominik Grewe, Anastasia Petrushkina, Tom Duerig, Antonio Sanchez,

Steve Yadlowsky, Amy Shen, Amir Globerson, Lynette Webb, Sahil Dua, Dong Li, Surya Bhupatiraju, Dan Hurt, Haroon Qureshi, Ananth Agarwal, Tomer Shani, Matan Eyal, Anuj Khare, Shreyas Rammohan Belle, Lei Wang, Chetan Tekur, Mihir Sanjay Kale, Jinliang Wei, Ruoxin Sang, Brennan Saeta, Tyler Liechty, Yi Sun, Yao Zhao, Stephan Lee, Pandu Nayak, Doug Fritz, Manish Reddy Vuyyuru, John Aslanides, Nidhi Vyas, Martin Wicke, Xiao Ma, Evgenii Eltyshev, Nina Martin, Hardie Cate, James Manyika, Keyvan Amiri, Yelin Kim, Xi Xiong, Kai Kang, Florian Luisier, Nilesh Tripuraneni, David Madras, Mandy Guo, Austin Waters, Oliver Wang, Joshua Ainslie, Jason Baldridge, Han Zhang, Garima Pruthi, Jakob Bauer, Feng Yang, Riham Mansour, Jason Gelman, Yang Xu, George Polovets, Ji Liu, Honglong Cai, Warren Chen, XiangHai Sheng, Emily Xue, Sherjil Ozair, Christof Angermueller, Xiaowei Li, Anoop Sinha, Weiren Wang, Julia Wiesinger, Emmanouil Koukoumidis, Yuan Tian, Anand Iyer, Madhu Gurumurthy, Mark Goldenson, Parashar Shah, MK Blake, Hongkun Yu, Anthony Urbanowicz, Jennimaria Palomaki, Chrisantha Fernando, Ken Durden, Harsh Mehta, Nikola Momchev, Elahe Rahimtoroghi, Maria Georgaki, Amit Raul, Sebastian Ruder, Morgan Redshaw, Jinhyuk Lee, Denny Zhou, Komal Jalan, Dinghua Li, Blake Hechtman, Parker Schuh, Milad Nasr, Kieran Milan, Vladimir Mikulik, Juliana Franco, Tim Green, Nam Nguyen, Joe Kelley, Aroma Mahendru, Andrea Hu, Joshua Howland, Ben Vargas, Jeffrey Hui, Kshitij Bansal, Vikram Rao, Rakesh Ghiya, Emma Wang, Ke Ye, Jean Michel Sarr, Melanie Moranski Preston, Madeleine Elish, Steve Li, Aakash Kaku, Jigar Gupta, Ice Pasupat, Da-Cheng Juan, Milan Someswar, Tejvi M., Xinyun Chen, Aida Amini, Alex Fabrikant, Eric Chu, Xuanyi Dong, Amruta Muthal, Senaka Buthpitiya, Sarthak Jauhari, Nan Hua, Urvashi Khandelwal, Ayal Hitron, Jie Ren, Larissa Rinaldi, Shahar Drath, Avigail Dabush, Nan-Jiang Jiang, Harshal Godhia, Uli Sachs, Anthony Chen, Yicheng Fan, Hagai Taitelbaum, Hila Noga, Zhuyun Dai, James Wang, Chen Liang, Jenny Hamer, Chun-Sung Ferng, Chenel Elkind, Aviel Atias, Paulina Lee, Vít Listík, Mathias Carlen, Jan van de Kerkhof, Marcin Pikus, Krunoslav Zaher, Paul Müller, Sasha Zykova, Richard Stefanec, Vitaly Gatsko, Christoph Hirsenschall, Ashwin Sethi, Xingyu Federico Xu, Chetan Ahuja, Beth Tsai, Anca Stefanoiu, Bo Feng, Keshav Dhandhanian, Manish Katyal, Akshay Gupta, Atharva Parulekar, Divya Pitta, Jing Zhao, Vivaan Bhatia, Yashodha Bhavnani, Omar Alhadlaq, Xiaolin Li, Peter Danenberg, Dennis Tu, Alex Pine, Vera Filippova, Abhipso Ghosh, Ben Limonchik, Bhargava Urala, Chaitanya Krishna Lanka, Derik Clive, Yi Sun, Edward Li, Hao Wu, Kevin Hongtongsak, Ianna Li,

- Kalind Thakkar, Kuanysh Omarov, Kushal Majmundar, Michael Alverson, Michael Kucharski, Mohak Patel, Mudit Jain, Maksim Zabelin, Paolo Pelagatti, Rohan Kohli, Saurabh Kumar, Joseph Kim, Swetha Sankar, Vineet Shah, Lakshmi Ramachandruni, Xiangkai Zeng, Ben Bariach, Laura Weidinger, Tu Vu, Alek Andreev, Antoine He, Kevin Hui, Sheleem Kashem, Amar Subramanya, Sissie Hsiao, Demis Hassabis, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Adam Sadovsky, Quoc Le, Trevor Strohman, Yonghui Wu, Slav Petrov, Jeffrey Dean, and Oriol Vinyals. 2023. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*. (Cited on pages 2 and 17.)
- Soumya Suvra Ghosal, Souradip Chakraborty, Jonas Geiping, Furong Huang, Dinesh Manocha, and Amrit Bedi. 2023. A survey on the possibilities & impossibilities of ai-generated text detection. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*. (Cited on pages 22 and 23.)
- Alex Graves. 2013. Generating sequences with recurrent neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1308.0850*. (Cited on page 13.)
- Robert Gray. 2006. Toeplitz and circulant matrices: A review. *Foundations and Trends® in Communications and Information Theory*, 2(3):155–239. (Cited on pages 70 and 71.)
- Shangwei Guo, Tianwei Zhang, Han Qiu, Yi Zeng, Tao Xiang, and Yang Liu. 2021. Fine-tuning is not enough: A simple yet effective watermark removal attack for dnn models. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-21*, pages 3635–3641. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization. Main Track. (Cited on page 27.)
- Raia Hadsell, Sumit Chopra, and Yann LeCun. 2006. Dimensionality reduction by learning an invariant mapping. In *2006 IEEE computer society conference on computer vision and pattern recognition (CVPR'06)*, volume 2, pages 1735–1742. IEEE. (Cited on page 14.)
- Mark Hall. 1999. *Correlation-based feature selection for machine learning*. Ph.D. thesis, The University of Waikato. (Cited on page 91.)
- Marc Hauser, Noam Chomsky, and W Tecumseh Fitch. 2002. The faculty of language: what is it, who has it, and how did it evolve? *science*, 298(5598):1569–1579. (Cited on page 9.)

- Xuanli He, Lingjuan Lyu, Chen Chen, and Qionghai Xu. 2022a. Extracted BERT model leaks more information than you think! In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1530–1537, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics. (Cited on pages 2 and 21.)
- Xuanli He, Lingjuan Lyu, Lichao Sun, and Qionghai Xu. 2021. Model extraction and adversarial transferability, your BERT is vulnerable! In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2006–2012, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics. (Cited on pages 2 and 21.)
- Xuanli He, Qionghai Xu, Lingjuan Lyu, Fangzhao Wu, and Chenguang Wang. 2022b. Protecting intellectual property of language generation apis with lexical watermark. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 36, pages 10758–10766. (Cited on pages 23 and 24.)
- Xuanli He, Qionghai Xu, Yi Zeng, Lingjuan Lyu, Fangzhao Wu, Jiwei Li, and Ruoxi Jia. 2022c. Cater: Intellectual property protection on text generation apis via conditional watermarks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:5431–5445. (Cited on pages 23 and 24.)
- Zhiwei He, Binglin Zhou, Hongkun Hao, Aiwei Liu, Xing Wang, Zhaopeng Tu, Zhuosheng Zhang, and Rui Wang. 2024a. Can watermarks survive translation? on the cross-lingual consistency of text watermark for large language models. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4115–4129, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics. (Cited on pages 6, 25, 34, and 40.)
- Zhiwei He, Binglin Zhou, Hongkun Hao, Aiwei Liu, Xing Wang, Zhaopeng Tu, Zhuosheng Zhang, and Rui Wang. 2024b. Can watermarks survive translation? on the cross-lingual consistency of text watermark for large language models. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4115–4129, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics. (Cited on page 37.)

- Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 1997. Long short-term memory. *Neural computation*, 9(8):1735–1780. (Cited on page [13](#).)
- Frederick Jelinek. 1998. *Statistical methods for speech recognition*. MIT press. (Cited on page [11](#).)
- Jinyuan Jia, Yupei Liu, and Neil Zhenqiang Gong. 2022. Badencoder: Backdoor attacks to pre-trained encoders in self-supervised learning. In *2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 2043–2059. IEEE. (Cited on page [19](#).)
- Mika Juuti, Sebastian Szyller, Samuel Marchal, and N Asokan. 2019. Prada: protecting against dnn model stealing attacks. In *2019 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroSecP)*, pages 512–527. IEEE. (Cited on page [22](#).)
- Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, and Dario Wu, Jeffreynd Amodei. 2020. Scaling laws for neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361*. (Cited on pages [2](#) and [17](#).)
- Slava Katz. 1987. Estimation of probabilities from sparse data for the language model component of a speech recognizer. *IEEE transactions on acoustics, speech, and signal processing*, 35(3):400–401. (Cited on page [12](#).)
- John Kirchenbauer, Jonas Geiping, Yuxin Wen, Jonathan Katz, Ian Miers, and Tom Goldstein. 2023. A watermark for large language models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 17061–17084. PMLR. (Cited on pages [4](#), [23](#), [24](#), and [90](#).)
- John Kirchenbauer, Jonas Geiping, Yuxin Wen, Manli Shu, Khalid Saifullah, Kezhi Kong, Kasun Fernando, Aniruddha Saha, Micah Goldblum, and Tom Goldstein. 2024. On the reliability of watermarks for large language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*. (Cited on pages [23](#) and [37](#).)
- Reinhard Kneser and Hermann Ney. 1995. Improved backing-off for m-gram language modeling. In *1995 international conference on acoustics, speech, and signal processing*, volume 1, pages 181–184. IEEE. (Cited on page [12](#).)
- Kalpesh Krishna, Yixiao Song, Marzena Karpinska, John Wieting, and Mohit Iyyer. 2024. Paraphrasing evades detectors of ai-generated text, but retrieval is an effective

- defense. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36. (Cited on pages [6](#), [25](#), [33](#), [37](#), and [38](#).)
- Kalpesh Krishna, Gaurav Singh Tomar, Ankur P. Parikh, Nicolas Papernot, and Mohit Iyyer. 2020. Thieves on sesame street! model extraction of bert-based apis. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. (Cited on pages [19](#) and [21](#).)
- Rohith Kuditipudi, John Thickstun, Tatsunori Hashimoto, and Percy Liang. 2024. Robust distortion-free watermarks for language models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*. (Cited on pages [4](#), [23](#), [24](#), and [90](#).)
- Aditya Kusupati, Gantavya Bhatt, Aniket Rege, Matthew Wallingford, Aditya Sinha, Vivek Ramanujan, William Howard-Snyder, Kaifeng Chen, Sham Kakade, Prateek Jain, et al. 2022. Matryoshka representation learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:30233–30249. (Cited on page [100](#).)
- Emanuele La Malfa, Aleksandar Petrov, Simon Frieder, Christoph Weinhuber, Ryan Burnell, Raza Nazar, Anthony Cohn, Nigel Shadbolt, and Michael Wooldridge. 2024. Language-models-as-a-service: Overview of a new paradigm and its challenges. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 80:1497–1523. (Cited on pages [2](#) and [18](#).)
- Hugo Laurençon, Lucile Saulnier, Thomas Wang, Christopher Akiki, Albert Villanova del Moral, Teven Le Scao, Leandro Von Werra, Chenghao Mou, Eduardo González Ponferrada, Huu Nguyen, Jörg Froberg, Mario ako, Quentin Lhoest, Angelina McMillan-Major, Gerard Dupont, Stella Biderman, Anna Rogers, Loubna Ben al-lal, Francesco De Toni, Giada Pistilli, Olivier Nguyen, Somaieh Nikpoor, Maraim Masoud, Pierre Colombo, Javier de la Rosa, Paulo Villegas, Tristan Thrush, Shayne Longpre, Sebastian Nagel, Leon Weber, Manuel Muñoz, Jian Zhu, Daniel Van Strien, Zaid Alyafeai, Khalid Almubarak, Minh Chien Vu, Itziar Gonzalez-Dios, Aitor Soroa, Kyle Lo, Manan Dey, Pedro Ortiz Suarez, Aaron Gokaslan, Shamik Bose, David Adelani, Long Phan, Hieu Tran, Ian Yu, Suhas Pai, Jenny Chim, Violette Lepercq, Suzana Ilic, Margaret Mitchell, Sasha Alexandra Luccioni, and Yacine Jernite. 2022. The bigscience roots corpus: A 1.6 tb composite multilingual dataset. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:31809–31826. (Cited on page [2](#).)
- Phong Le and Willem Zuidema. 2016. Quantifying the vanishing gradient and long distance dependency problem in recursive neural networks and recursive LSTMs. In

- Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Representation Learning for NLP*, pages 87–93, Berlin, Germany. Association for Computational Linguistics. (Cited on page 13.)
- Yann LeCun, Yoshua Bengio, and Geoffrey Hinton. 2015. Deep learning. *nature*, 521(7553):436–444. (Cited on page 1.)
- Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. BART: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7871–7880, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics. (Cited on page 16.)
- Quentin Lhoest, Albert Villanova del Moral, Yacine Jernite, Abhishek Thakur, Patrick von Platen, Suraj Patil, Julien Chaumond, Mariama Drame, Julien Plu, Lewis Tunstall, Joe Davison, Mario Šaško, Gunjan Chhablani, Bhavitvya Malik, Simon Brandeis, Teven Le Scao, Victor Sanh, Canwen Xu, Nicolas Patry, Angelina McMillan-Major, Philipp Schmid, Sylvain Gugger, Clément Delangue, Théo Matussi  re, Lysandre Debut, Stas Bekman, Pierric Cistac, Thibault Goehringer, Victor Mustar, Fran  ois Lagunas, Alexander Rush, and Thomas Wolf. 2021. Datasets: A community library for natural language processing. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 175–184, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics. (Cited on page 49.)
- Meng Li, Qi Zhong, Leo Yu Zhang, Yajuan Du, Jun Zhang, and Yong Xiang. 2020. Protecting the intellectual property of deep neural networks with watermarking: The frequency domain approach. In *2020 IEEE 19th International Conference on Trust, Security and Privacy in Computing and Communications (TrustCom)*, pages 402–409. IEEE. (Cited on page 26.)
- Jian Han Lim, Chee Seng Chan, Kam Woh Ng, Lixin Fan, and Qiang Yang. 2022. Protect, show, attend and tell: Empowering image captioning models with ownership protection. *Pattern Recognition*, 122:108285. (Cited on page 26.)

- Aiwei Liu, Leyi Pan, Yijian Lu, Jingjing Li, Xuming Hu, Xi Zhang, Lijie Wen, Irwin King, Hui Xiong, and Philip Yu. 2024. A survey of text watermarking in the era of large language models. *ACM Computing Surveys*. (Cited on page 23.)
- Hongbin Liu, Jinyuan Jia, and Neil Zhenqiang Gong. 2022a. PoisonedEncoder: Poisoning the unlabeled pre-training data in contrastive learning. In *31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22)*, pages 3629–3645. (Cited on page 19.)
- Xiaoyong Liu and W Bruce Croft. 2005. Statistical language modeling for information retrieval. *Annu. Rev. Inf. Sci. Technol.*, 39(1):1–31. (Cited on page 12.)
- Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*. (Cited on page 16.)
- Yupei Liu, Jinyuan Jia, Hongbin Liu, and Neil Zhenqiang Gong. 2022b. Stolenencoder: Stealing pre-trained encoders in self-supervised learning. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS '22*, page 21152128, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery. (Cited on pages 2, 3, 19, and 21.)
- Haoyu Ma and Tianlong Chen. 2021. Undistillable: Making a nasty teacher that cannot teach students. In *International Conference on Learning Representations ICLR 2021*. (Cited on page 21.)
- Matthew Mahoney. 1999. Text compression as a test for artificial intelligence. *AAAI/I-AAI*, 970. (Cited on page 10.)
- Christopher Manning. 1999. *Foundations of statistical natural language processing*. The MIT Press. (Cited on page 12.)
- Vangelis Metsis, Ion Androutsopoulos, and Georgios Paliouras. 2006. Spam filtering with naive bayes-which naive bayes? In *CEAS*, volume 17, pages 28–69. Mountain View, CA. (Cited on pages 44 and 73.)
- Tomas Mikolov, Martin Karafiát, Lukas Burget, Jan Cernocký, and Sanjeev Khudanpur. 2010. Recurrent neural network based language model. In *Interspeech*, volume 2, pages 1045–1048. Makuhari. (Cited on page 13.)



- Tomas Mikolov, Ilya Sutskever, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeff Dean. 2013. Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 26. (Cited on page 14.)
- Eric Mitchell, Yoonho Lee, Alexander Khazatsky, Christopher Manning, and Chelsea Finn. 2023. Detectgpt: Zero-shot machine-generated text detection using probability curvature. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 24950–24962. PMLR. (Cited on page 46.)
- John Morris, Volodymyr Kuleshov, Vitaly Shmatikov, and Alexander Rush. 2023. Text embeddings reveal (almost) as much as text. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 12448–12460, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics. (Cited on page 86.)
- Niklas Muennighoff, Nouamane Tazi, Loic Magne, and Nils Reimers. 2023. MTEB: Massive text embedding benchmark. In *Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2014–2037, Dubrovnik, Croatia. Association for Computational Linguistics. (Cited on page 99.)
- Arvind Neelakantan, Tao Xu, Raul Puri, Alec Radford, Jesse Michael Han, Jerry Tworek, Qiming Yuan, Nikolas Tezak, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Johannes Heidecke, Pranav Shyam, Boris Power, Tyna Eloundou Nekoul, Girish Sastry, Gretchen Krueger, David Schnurr, Felipe Petroski Such, Kenny Hsu, Madeleine Thompson, Tabarak Khan, Toki Sherbakov, Joanne Jang, Peter Welinder, and Lilian Weng. 2022. Text and code embeddings by contrastive pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.10005*. (Cited on page 3.)
- OpenAI. 2022a. Introducing ChatGPT. (Cited on page 37.)
- OpenAI. 2022b. New and improved embedding model. (Cited on pages 3, 37, and 47.)
- OpenAI. 2024. New embedding models and API updates. (Cited on page 100.)
- Tribhuvanesh Orekondy, Bernt Schiele, and Mario Fritz. 2019. Knockoff nets: Stealing functionality of black-box models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4954–4963. (Cited on page 21.)

- Razvan Pascanu, Tomas Mikolov, and Yoshua Bengio. 2013. On the difficulty of training recurrent neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 28*, ICML'13, page III1310III1318. JMLR.org. (Cited on page 13.)
- Wenjun Peng, Jingwei Yi, Fangzhao Wu, Shangxi Wu, Bin Bin Zhu, Lingjuan Lyu, Binxing Jiao, Tong Xu, Guangzhong Sun, and Xing Xie. 2023. Are you copying my model? protecting the copyright of large language models for eaas via backdoor watermark. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 7653–7668. (Cited on pages 4, 5, 6, 23, 28, 29, 33, 35, 44, 98, and 99.)
- Richard Pennington, Jeffreynd Socher and Christopher Manning. 2014. Glove: Global vectors for word representation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1532–1543. (Cited on page 14.)
- Matthew Peters, Mark Neumann, Mohit Iyyer, Matt Gardner, Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2018. Deep contextualized word representations. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 2227–2237, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics. (Cited on page 15.)
- Alec Radford and Karthik Narasimhan. 2018. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. *OpenAI blog*. (Cited on pages 2 and 17.)
- Alec Radford, Jeff Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9. (Cited on pages 2, 16, and 17.)
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter Liu. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of machine learning research*, 21(140):1–67. (Cited on page 2.)

- Srinivasa Raghavan, Jayasimha KR, and Rajendra V Nargundkar. 2020. Impact of software as a service (SaaS) on software acquisition process. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 35(4):757–770. (Cited on page 18.)
- Mauro Ribeiro, Katarina Grolinger, and Miriam AM Capretz. 2015. Mlaas: Machine learning as a service. In *2015 IEEE 14th international conference on machine learning and applications (ICMLA)*, pages 896–902. IEEE. (Cited on page 18.)
- Ronald Rosenfeld. 2000. Two decades of statistical language modeling: Where do we go from here? *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 88(8):1270–1278. (Cited on page 11.)
- Vinu Sankar Sadasivan, Aounon Kumar, Sriram Balasubramanian, Wenxiao Wang, and Soheil Feizi. 2023. Can ai-generated text be reliably detected? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.11156*. (Cited on pages 6, 25, and 33.)
- Victor Sanh, Albert Webson, Colin Raffel, Stephen H. Bach, Lintang Sutawika, Zaid Alyafeai, Antoine Chaffin, Arnaud Stiegler, Teven Le Scao, Arun Raja, Manan Dey, M Saiful Bari, Canwen Xu, Urmish Thakker, Shanya Sharma Sharma, Eliza Szczechla, Taewoon Kim, Gunjan Chhablani, Nihal Nayak, Debajyoti Datta, Jonathan Chang, Mike Tian-Jian Jiang, Han Wang, Matteo Manica, Sheng Shen, Zheng Xin Yong, Harshit Pandey, Rachel Bawden, Thomas Wang, Trishala Neeraj, Jos Rozen, Abheesht Sharma, Andrea Santilli, Thibault Fevry, Jason Alan Fries, Ryan Teehan, Tali Bers, Stella Biderman, Leo Gao, Thomas Wolf, and Alexander M. Rush. 2021. Multitask prompted training enables zero-shot task generalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.08207*. (Cited on page 16.)
- Philip Sedgwick. 2012. Pearsons correlation coefficient. *Bmj*, 345. (Cited on page 92.)
- Murray Shanahan. 2024. Talking about large language models. *Communications of the ACM*, 67(2):68–79. (Cited on page 17.)
- Claude Shannon. 1951. Prediction and entropy of printed english. *Bell system technical journal*, 30(1):50–64. (Cited on page 10.)
- Claude Elwood Shannon. 1948. A mathematical theory of communication. *The Bell system technical journal*, 27(3):379–423. (Cited on page 10.)
- Anudeex Shetty, Yue Teng, Ke He, and Qionghai Xu. 2024a. WARDEN: Multi-directional backdoor watermarks for embedding-as-a-service copyright protection. In

- Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 13430–13444, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics. (Cited on pages [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [23](#), [28](#), [29](#), [33](#), [44](#), [46](#), [49](#), [98](#), and [99](#).)
- Anudeex Shetty, Qionghai Xu, and Jey Han Lau. 2024b. Wet: Overcoming paraphrasing vulnerabilities in embeddings-as-a-service with linear transformation watermarks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.04459*. (Cited on page [23](#).)
- Prabhishek Singh and Ramneet Singh Chadha. 2013. A survey of digital watermarking techniques, applications and attacks. *International Journal of Engineering and Innovative Technology (IJEIT)*, 2(9):165–175. (Cited on page [24](#).)
- Richard Socher, Alex Perelygin, Jean Wu, Jason Chuang, Christopher Manning, Andrew Ng, and Christopher Potts. 2013. Recursive deep models for semantic compositionality over a sentiment treebank. In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1631–1642, Seattle, Washington, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics. (Cited on pages [44](#) and [73](#).)
- Harold Somers. 2005. Round-trip translation: What is it good for? In *Proceedings of the Australasian Language Technology Workshop 2005*, pages 127–133, Sydney, Australia. (Cited on page [41](#).)
- Congzheng Song and Ananth Raghunathan. 2020. Information leakage in embedding models. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS '20*, page 377390, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery. (Cited on page [19](#).)
- Gilbert Strang. 2016. *Introduction to Linear Algebra*. Wellesley. (Cited on pages [69](#) and [71](#).)
- Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. 2023. Alpaca: A strong, replicable instruction-following model. *Stanford Center for Research on Foundation Models*. <https://crfm.stanford.edu/2023/03/13/alpaca.html>, 3(6):7. (Cited on page [21](#).)
- NLLB Team, Marta R. Costa-jussà, James Cross, Onur Çelebi, Maha Elbayad, Kenneth Heafield, Kevin Heffernan, Elahe Kalbassi, Janice Lam, Daniel Licht, Jean Maillard,

- Anna Sun, Skyler Wang, Guillaume Wenzek, Al Youngblood, Bapi Akula, Loic Barrault, Gabriel Mejia Gonzalez, Prangthip Hansanti, John Hoffman, Semarley Jarrett, Kaushik Ram Sadagopan, Dirk Rowe, Shannon Spruit, Chau Tran, Pierre Andrews, Necip Fazil Ayan, Shruti Bhosale, Sergey Edunov, Angela Fan, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Francisco Guzmán, Philipp Koehn, Alexandre Mourachko, Christophe Ropers, Safiyyah Saleem, Holger Schwenk, and Jeff Wang. 2022. No language left behind: Scaling human-centered machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.04672*. (Cited on pages [37](#) and [41](#).)
- Scott Thede and Mary Harper. 1999. A second-order hidden markov model for part-of-speech tagging. In *Proceedings of the 37th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 175–182. (Cited on page [12](#).)
- Mercan Topkara, Umut Topkara, and Mikhail Atallah. 2006a. Words are not enough: sentence level natural language watermarking. In *Proceedings of the 4th ACM international workshop on Contents protection and security*, pages 37–46. (Cited on page [24](#).)
- Umut Topkara, Mercan Topkara, and Mikhail Atallah. 2006b. The hiding virtues of ambiguity: quantifiably resilient watermarking of natural language text through synonym substitutions. In *Proceedings of the 8th workshop on Multimedia and security*, pages 164–174. (Cited on page [24](#).)
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurelien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. 2023. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*. (Cited on page [18](#).)
- Florian Tramèr, Fan Zhang, Ari Juels, Michael K Reiter, and Thomas Ristenpart. 2016. Stealing machine learning models via prediction APIs. In *25th USENIX security symposium (USENIX Security 16)*, pages 601–618. (Cited on pages [20](#) and [21](#).)
- WeiTek Tsai, XiaoYing Bai, and Yu Huang. 2014. Software-as-a-service (saas): perspectives and challenges. *Science China Information Sciences*, 57:1–15. (Cited on page [18](#).)

- Alan Turing. 1950. Computing machinery and intelligence. *Mind*, 59(October):433–60. (Cited on page 9.)
- Yusuke Uchida, Yuki Nagai, Shigeyuki Sakazawa, and Shin’ichi Satoh. 2017. Embedding watermarks into deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on international conference on multimedia retrieval*, pages 269–277. (Cited on pages 26, 27, and 99.)
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30. (Cited on pages 2, 13, and 15.)
- Eric Wallace, Mitchell Stern, and Dawn Song. 2020. Imitation attacks and defenses for black-box machine translation systems. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 5531–5546, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics. (Cited on pages 2, 19, and 21.)
- Thomas Wang, Adam Roberts, Daniel Hesslow, Teven Le Scao, Hyung Won Chung, Iz Beltagy, Julien Launay, and Colin Raffel. 2022. What language model architecture and pretraining objective works best for zero-shot generalization? In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 22964–22984. PMLR. (Cited on page 16.)
- Tianhao Wang and Florian Kerschbaum. 2019. Attacks on digital watermarks for deep neural networks. In *ICASSP 2019-2019 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 2622–2626. IEEE. (Cited on page 27.)
- Tianhao Wang and Florian Kerschbaum. 2021. Riga: Covert and robust white-box watermarking of deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021*, pages 993–1004. (Cited on page 26.)
- Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, Ed H. Chi, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Oriol Vinyals, Percy Liang, Jeff Dean, and William Fedus. 2022a. Emergent abilities of large language models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*. (Cited on page 17.)

- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, brian ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, and Denny Zhou. 2022b. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837. (Cited on pages 17 and 18.)
- Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Remi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, Joe Davison, Sam Shleifer, Patrick von Platen, Clara Ma, Yacine Jernite, Julien Plu, Canwen Xu, Teven Le Scao, Sylvain Gugger, Mariama Drame, Quentin Lhoest, and Alexander Rush. 2020. Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 38–45, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics. (Cited on page 49.)
- Fangzhao Wu, Ying Qiao, Jiun-Hung Chen, Chuhan Wu, Tao Qi, Jianxun Lian, Danyang Liu, Xing Xie, Jianfeng Gao, Winnie Wu, and Ming Zhou. 2020. MIND: A large-scale dataset for news recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3597–3606, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics. (Cited on pages 44 and 73.)
- Qionghai Xu and Xuanli He. 2023. Security challenges in natural language processing models. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Tutorial Abstracts*, pages 7–12, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics. (Cited on pages 3 and 21.)
- Qionghai Xu, Xuanli He, Lingjuan Lyu, Lizhen Qu, and Gholamreza Haffari. 2022. Student surpasses teacher: Imitation attack for black-box NLP APIs. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 2849–2860, Gyeongju, Republic of Korea. International Committee on Computational Linguistics. (Cited on pages 3, 20, 21, and 35.)
- Yifan Yan, Xudong Pan, Mi Zhang, and Min Yang. 2023. Rethinking {White-Box} watermarks on deep learning models under neural structural obfuscation. In *32nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 23)*, pages 2347–2364. (Cited on pages 27, 68, and 90.)

- Yuanshun Yao, Zhujun Xiao, Bolun Wang, Bimal Viswanath, Haitao Zheng, and Ben Y Zhao. 2017. Complexity vs. performance: empirical analysis of machine learning as a service. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Internet Measurement Conference*, pages 384–397. (Cited on page [18](#).)
- Yong Yu, Xiaosheng Si, Changhua Hu, and Jianxun Zhang. 2019. A review of recurrent neural networks: Lstm cells and network architectures. *Neural computation*, 31(7):1235–1270. (Cited on page [13](#).)
- Shengyu Zhang, Linfeng Dong, Xiaoya Li, Sen Zhang, Xiaofei Sun, Shuhe Wang, Jiwei Li, Runyi Hu, Tianwei Zhang, Fei Wu, and Guoyin Wang. 2023. Instruction tuning for large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10792*. (Cited on page [18](#).)
- Xiang Zhang, Junbo Zhao, and Yann LeCun. 2015. Character-level convolutional networks for text classification. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 28. (Cited on pages [44](#) and [73](#).)
- Zhanyuan Zhang, Yizheng Chen, and David Wagner. 2021. Seat: Similarity encoder by adversarial training for detecting model extraction attack queries. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM Workshop on artificial intelligence and security*, pages 37–48. (Cited on page [22](#).)
- Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, Yifan Du, Chen Yang, Yushuo Chen, Zhipeng Chen, Jinhao Jiang, Ruiyang Ren, Yifan Li, Xinyu Tang, Zikang Liu, Peiyu Liu, Jian-Yun Nie, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2024a. A survey of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223*. (Cited on pages [1](#), [10](#), [17](#), [18](#), [20](#), and [55](#).)
- Xuandong Zhao, Prabhanjan Vijendra Ananth, Lei Li, and Yu-Xiang Wang. 2024b. Provable robust watermarking for AI-generated text. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*. (Cited on pages [23](#) and [24](#).)
- Huadi Zheng, Qingqing Ye, Haibo Hu, Chengfang Fang, and Jie Shi. 2019. Bdpl: A boundary differentially private layer against machine learning model extraction attacks. In *Computer Security–ESORICS 2019: 24th European Symposium on Research*



*in Computer Security, Luxembourg, September 23–27, 2019, Proceedings, Part I 24*, pages 66–83. Springer. (Cited on page [22](#).)

Wenhao Zhu, Hongyi Liu, Qingxiu Dong, Jingjing Xu, Shujian Huang, Lingpeng Kong, Jiajun Chen, and Lei Li. 2024. Multilingual machine translation with large language models: Empirical results and analysis. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2024*, pages 2765–2781, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics. (Cited on pages [40](#) and [41](#).)