

Optimal Watermark Generation under Type I and Type II Errors

BY HENGZHI HE

Department of Statistics and Data Science, University of California, Los Angeles, 8125 Math Sciences Bldg, Los Angeles, CA, USA
hengzhihe@g.ucla.edu

SHIRONG XU

The Wang Yanan Institute for Studies in Economics, Xiamen University, Economics Building, Xiamen University Xiamen, 361005 China
shirongxu5566@xmu.edu.cn

ALEXANDER NEMECEK

Department of Computer and Data Sciences, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH 44106, USA
ajn98@case.edu

JIPING LI

Department of Mathematics, University of California, Los Angeles, 520 Portola Plaza, MS 6363 Box 951555 Los Angeles, CA 90095-1555
jipingli0324@g.ucla.edu

ERMAN AYDAY

Department of Computer and Data Sciences, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH 44106, USA
exa208@case.edu

GUANG CHENG

Department of Statistics and Data Science, University of California, Los Angeles, 8125 Math Sciences Bldg, Los Angeles, CA, USA
guangcheng@ucla.edu

SUMMARY

Watermarking has recently emerged as a crucial tool for protecting the intellectual property of generative models and for distinguishing AI-generated content from human-generated data. Despite its practical success, most existing watermarking schemes are empirically driven and lack a theoretical understanding of the fundamental trade-off between detection power and generation fidelity. To address this gap, we formulate watermarking as a statistical hypothesis testing problem between a null distribution and its watermarked counterpart. Under explicit constraints on false-positive and false-negative rates, we derive a tight lower bound on the achievable fidelity loss,

measured by a general f -divergence, and characterize the optimal watermarked distribution that attains this bound. We further develop a corresponding sampling rule that provides an optimal mechanism for inserting watermarks with minimal fidelity distortion. Our result establishes a simple yet broadly applicable principle linking hypothesis testing, information divergence, and watermark generation.

Some key words: hypothesis testing; watermarking; information theory

1. INTRODUCTION

Watermarking has recently become increasingly popular across various domains, being applied to tabular data (Fang et al. (2025); He et al. (2024); Karthikeyan et al. (2025)), image (Wen et al. (2024); Fernandez et al. (2023); Gunn et al. (2025)) and text (Kirchenbauer et al. (2023); Zhao et al. (2023); Aaronson (2024); Kuditipudi et al. (2023); Nemecek et al. (2024); Li et al. (2025a,b); Xie et al. (2025); Dathathri et al. (2024); Giboulot & Furon (2024)) to distinguish AI-generated content from human creations and to protect model ownership.

However, watermarking faces substantial challenges in real-world deployment. Beyond concerns about robustness (Zhang et al. (2023)) and forgery risk (Gu et al. (2024); Sadasivan et al. (2025)), perhaps the most critical factor limiting industry adoption is the possibility that watermarking degrades model quality (Liu et al. (2025)). For many users, any noticeable degradation in output quality will lead them to prefer unwatermarked alternatives; if watermarking causes the generated output to deviate from the model’s natural behavior, users may simply switch to competing generative models. As a result, quality degradation becomes a central barrier to practical deployment.

This leads to a natural question: if a watermarking scheme is required to satisfy prescribed false-positive and false-negative rates, what is the minimum fidelity loss that must be incurred, and how can a watermarked distribution attaining this optimal trade-off be constructed? The study of this problem remains relatively preliminary from a statistical perspective, with only a few recent papers (Cai et al. (2024); He et al. (2025)) examining aspects of this question (see the Appendix A for a detailed discussion of related work).

In this work, we abstract away the specifics of any particular watermarking implementation and formulate the problem purely as a binary hypothesis test between a null distribution and its watermarked counterpart (Li et al., 2025b). Under fixed Type I and Type II error constraints, we derive a tight lower bound on the achievable fidelity loss, measured by a general f -divergence, and characterize the optimal distribution that achieves this infimum. We further show that this optimal distribution can be realized by reinforcement learning or simple rejection-sampling.

2. PROBLEM FORMULATION

We formalize the watermarking task as a constrained distributional modification problem. Let F denote the original, unwatermarked distribution, and let G be a candidate watermarked distribution. A detector is represented by a binary decision rule $D : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, where $D(x) = 1$ indicates that the datum x is declared to contain a watermark. For any distribution P (e.g., F or G) and any measurable set S , we use $P(S)$ to denote the probability that a sample drawn from P falls in S .

To ensure detectability, we impose constraints on the false-positive and false-negative rates:

$$F(\{D(x) = 1\}) \leq \alpha, \quad (1)$$

$$G(\{D(x) = 1\}) \geq 1 - \beta, \quad (2)$$

for prescribed levels $\alpha, \beta \in [0, 1]$. Here, (1) limits the probability of falsely flagging unwatermarked content (e.g., human-written text) as watermarked, while (2) ensures that watermarked samples are detected with high probability and are not frequently missed.

Focusing on fidelity, the objective can be interpreted as seeking a distribution G that satisfies the detection constraints (1) and (2), so that watermarked content remains distinguishable from unwatermarked samples, while deviating from the original distribution F as little as possible. To quantify the discrepancy between F and G , we employ the f -divergence, a general framework that covers a broad family of metrics used to measure distributional differences in modern image (Nowozin et al. (2016)) and text (Go et al. (2023)) generation tasks. The f -divergence is defined as: $D_f(G\|F) = \int f\left(\frac{dG}{dF}\right) dF$, where $f : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a convex function with $f(1) = 0$.

The f -divergence is particularly significant because it unifies many discrepancy measures that are routinely used across different data modalities. For example, the total variation distance is a special case of the f -divergence (see example A1) and is widely used as a fidelity criterion for tabular and other structured data (Zhu et al. (2025); Lautrup et al. (2025)). In the image domain, f -divergences also play a central role. Many popular generative adversarial networks are trained by minimizing an f -divergence (Nowozin et al., 2016); Moreover, one of the most important special cases of f -divergences, the Kullback–Leibler (KL) divergence (see example 1), lies at the heart of modern diffusion models, since training diffusion models can be seen as minimizing a variational upper bound of KL divergence (Ho et al. (2020)). In the context of large language models, the KL divergence is also particularly relevant: the standard Perplexity metric for evaluating text generation quality is essentially a monotone transformation of KL when the data distribution is fixed (Manning & Schutze, 1999).

Under our formulation, designing an optimal watermarked distribution G reduces to solving

$$G^\star = \arg \min_{G: \exists D \text{ satisfying (1)–(2)}} D_f(G\|F), \quad (3)$$

which makes explicit the best achievable fidelity-detection trade-off under the prescribed error constraints. This formulation abstracts away the implementation details of any specific watermarking scheme and isolates the fundamental trade-off dictated solely by hypothesis-testing constraints. As we show in the next section, the problem admits a clean and tractable solution: the optimal G has an explicit closed form, and it can be realized via a reinforcement learning based optimization or a simple rejection-sampling mechanism.

3. OPTIMAL WATERMARKED DISTRIBUTION AND FIDELITY LOSS LOWER BOUND

In this section, we solve the optimization problem in (3) and characterize both the minimal achievable fidelity loss and the optimal watermarked distribution that attains it.

THEOREM 1 (OPTIMAL WATERMARKED DISTRIBUTION AND MINIMAL f -DIVERGENCE). *Suppose F is the original distribution, and let a watermarked distribution G together with a detector $D : X \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ satisfy the error constraints (1) and (2) for some $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1)$ with $\alpha \leq 1 - \beta$. Let $S = \{x \in X : D(x) = 1\}$ denote the detection region. For any convex function $f : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $f(1) = 0$, G satisfies the following lower bound:*

$$D_f(G\|F) \geq \alpha f\left(\frac{1-\beta}{\alpha}\right) + (1-\alpha) f\left(\frac{\beta}{1-\alpha}\right). \quad (4)$$

Moreover, the bound in (4) is tight and achieved by

$$G^\star(A) = \frac{1-\beta}{\alpha} F(A \cap S) + \frac{\beta}{1-\alpha} F(A \cap S^c), \quad A \in \text{Borel}(X), \quad (5)$$

where $S = \{x : D(x) = 1\}$ is chosen so that $F(S) = \alpha$. Then G^\star satisfies $G^\star(\{D(x) = 1\}) = 1 - \beta$ and

$$D_f(G^\star \| F) = \alpha f\left(\frac{1-\beta}{\alpha}\right) + (1-\alpha) f\left(\frac{\beta}{1-\alpha}\right). \quad (6)$$

To illustrate the implications of Theorem 1 for concrete choices of f , we next provide an example corresponding to the KL divergence. We also include two examples corresponding to the total variation divergence and Chi-square divergence in the Appendix A.

Example 1 (Kullback–Leibler divergence). When the generating function is chosen as $f_{\text{KL}}(t) = t \log t$, the resulting f -divergence coincides with the KL divergence, $D_{\text{KL}}(G \| F) = \int \frac{dG}{dF} \log\left(\frac{dG}{dF}\right) dF$. Substituting f_{KL} into the lower bound (4) yields $D_{\text{KL}}(G \| F) \geq \alpha \left(\frac{1-\beta}{\alpha} \log\left(\frac{1-\beta}{\alpha}\right)\right) + (1-\alpha) \left(\frac{\beta}{1-\alpha} \log\left(\frac{\beta}{1-\alpha}\right)\right)$. This simplifies to the more compact form $D_{\text{KL}}(G \| F) \geq (1-\beta) \log\left(\frac{1-\beta}{\alpha}\right) + \beta \log\left(\frac{\beta}{1-\alpha}\right)$.

Remark 1. A recent work derives an f -divergence bound with the same analytical form as Theorem 1, but from a completely different motivation. Their result does not establish tightness of this bound for general f , nor does it address the optimization problem in (3) or provide a constructive procedure for obtaining a distribution that attains the bound. In contrast, our work derives the optimal value of (3) together with its achieving distribution. See Appendix A for further discussion.

4. CONSTRUCTING THE WATERMARKED GENERATOR

The optimal distribution G^\star in Theorem 1 describes the best possible watermarking approach to preserve fidelity under fixed Type I and Type II error constraints. In practice, however, the way we realize this ideal distribution depends on how much control we have over the underlying generator.

If we are able to fine-tune or retrain the model, then we can learn a watermarked generator whose output distribution is driven toward G^\star by optimizing a suitable objective. This leads naturally to a reinforcement learning (RL)-style formulation, in which we can parameterize a policy and train it using a proximal policy optimization algorithm (Schulman et al. (2017)) so that the induced sampling distribution matches the theoretical optimum.

On the other hand, if the base generator cannot be modified, which is often the case for large closed-source models, we can still implement watermarking by adjusting the sampling procedure alone. Leveraging the closed-form density ratio dG^\star/dF given by Theorem 1, we can construct a simple acceptance-rejection sampler that transforms base samples from F into exact samples from G^\star without changing the model’s parameters.

We describe these two approaches in turn, beginning with the learning-based formulation.

THEOREM 2 (RL OBJECTIVE RECOVERS THE OPTIMAL WATERMARKED DISTRIBUTION). *Let F be the original distribution and $D : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ a detector with detection region $S = \{x : D(x) = 1\}$ and $F(S) = \alpha$. Fix a target Type II error level $\beta \in [0, 1]$ with $\alpha \leq 1 - \beta$, and let G^\star be the optimal watermarked distribution from Theorem 1, i.e.*

$$\frac{dG^\star}{dF}(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1-\beta}{\alpha}, & x \in S, \\ \frac{\beta}{1-\alpha}, & x \in S^c. \end{cases}$$

Consider the KL-regularized RL objective

$$J(\pi) = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \pi} \left[r(X) - \log \left(\frac{\pi(X)}{F(X)} \right) \right], \quad (7)$$

defined over all probability measures π that are absolutely continuous with respect to F . Define the reward $r(x) = A D(x)$, $A := \log \left(\frac{(1-\beta)(1-\alpha)}{\alpha\beta} \right)$. Then $J(\pi)$ has a unique maximizer, and this maximizer coincides with G^* : $\arg \max_{\pi} J(\pi) = G^*$. In particular, any RL procedure that maximizes (7) over a rich enough policy class $\{\pi_{\phi}\}$ containing G^* and converges to a global maximizer will learn the optimal watermarked distribution G^* .

The result in Theorem 2 allows us to directly optimize $J(\pi_{\phi})$ using modern policy-gradient methods. In practice, we can parameterize π_{ϕ} by a model initialized at the base model and employ standard proximal policy optimization to maximize $J(\pi_{\phi})$. The resulting fine-tuned policy produces samples whose distribution approaches the theoretical optimum G^* .

Remark 2. A recent empirical line of work studies model-level watermarking for language models via RL (see Xu et al. (2024)). In their approach, the detector D is implemented as a discriminative classifier on prompt–response pairs, and the generator is fine-tuned to increase the detector score while staying close to the base model through a KL regularization term. Consequently, the reward used for training the generator is essentially the detector output minus a KL penalty, and the relative weighting of these components is selected empirically. Such a design does not provide any guarantee on the achievable false-positive and false-negative rates or on the resulting fidelity loss.

In contrast, our framework starts from a formal hypothesis-testing formulation and explicitly derives the optimal watermarked distribution G^* under prescribed Type I and Type II error constraints. Moreover, Theorem 2 shows how to construct a principled reward function whose unique maximizer is precisely G^* , rather than tuning heuristic reward weights. Thus our results characterize both the optimal fidelity-detection trade-off and an RL objective that provably recovers the optimal watermarked distribution.

While Theorem 2 shows that the optimal distribution G^* can be learned by a suitable RL objective when the model can be fine-tuned, one might argue that this assumption may be unrealistic in many applications. Some models often provide only a sampling interface, making parameter-level training infeasible. However, in such settings, the closed-form likelihood ratio dG^*/dF from Theorem 1 offers a direct alternative: it allows samples from F to be converted into exact samples from G^* without modifying the model. This leads to a simple, tuning-free rejection-sampling scheme, given in Algorithm 1 and justified by Theorem 3.

THEOREM 3 (SAMPLING-BASED CONSTRUCTION OF THE OPTIMAL WATERMARKED DISTRIBUTION). *Let F be the original distribution and $D : X \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ a detector with detection region $S = \{x : D(x) = 1\}$, $F(S) = \alpha$.*

Then the distribution of the accepted sample by Algorithm 1 is exactly the optimal watermarked distribution G^ from Theorem 1, i.e. $G^*(A) = w_1 F(A \cap S) + w_0 F(A \cap S^c)$, $\forall A$.*

Remark 3. Algorithm 1 is closely related in spirit to the multi-sample selection strategy used in Giboulot & Furon (2024), but there is an essential difference in the sampling mechanism.

Our construction performs true rejection sampling with proposal distribution F and target distribution G^* : at each step we draw $x \sim F$ and accept it with a probability proportional to the optimal density ratio $dG^*/dF(x)$, so that the law of the accepted sample coincides exactly with

Algorithm 1. Two-Rate Acceptance Sampling

Input: sampler $x \sim F$, detector $D(x) \in \{0, 1\}$, FPR α , FNR β
 Compute the two importance weights

$$w_1 = \frac{1 - \beta}{\alpha}, \quad w_0 = \frac{\beta}{1 - \alpha}.$$

repeat
 Draw $x \sim F$.;
 if $D(x) = 1$ **then**
 Accept x with probability 1.;
 else
 Accept x with probability w_0/w_1 .;
until a sample is accepted;
Output: accepted sample x^\star

G^\star as characterized in Theorem 1. In the special case $\beta = 0$, this reduces to pure conditioning on the detection region, i.e. $G^\star(\cdot) = F(\cdot \mid S)$.

In contrast, Giboulot & Furon (2024) adopts a finite multiple-sampling scheme: for each query, it generates a fixed finite batch of n independent candidates from F and selects the one with the smallest p -value. The resulting output distribution is stochastically biased toward lower p -values and can be viewed as an approximation to G^\star , but for any finite n it does not coincide with the exact target distribution.

5. EXPERIMENTS

We demonstrate the effectiveness of both the RL-based and rejection-sampling watermarking generators on a real tabular dataset. We use the National Poll on Healthy Aging dataset (Malani et al. (2019)), treat each row as a distinct state x , and take the empirical distribution that assigns mass $1/N$ to each row as the ground-truth distribution F . We construct an unsupervised detector by randomly assigning half of the rows to label 0 and half to label 1, then fitting a gradient-boosting classifier on all covariates. The fitted classifier yields a score function $s(x)$, and for several thresholds τ we define $D_\tau(x) = \mathbf{1}\{s(x) \geq \tau\}$ and calculate the false-positive rate $\alpha(\tau) = \mathbb{P}_{X \sim F}\{D_\tau(X) = 1\}$ in the ground-truth distribution.

For each (τ, β) satisfying the feasibility condition $\alpha(\tau) < 1 - \beta$, we construct a watermarked distribution in two ways. First, we form the *rejection-sampling generator* \hat{G}_S of Algorithm 1; Secondly, we train an *RL-based generator* by maximizing the KL-regularized objective $J(\pi) = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \pi}[r_\tau(X)] - KL(\pi \| F)$, where π is a tabular softmax policy over all possible states and r_τ is chosen as in Theorem 2 so that the unique maximizer of $J(\pi)$ coincides with the optimal distribution G^\star from Theorem 2 associated with $(\alpha(\tau), \beta)$. Because the state space is finite, the resulting policy $\hat{\pi}$ induces a discrete distribution \hat{G}_R . For both \hat{G}_S and \hat{G}_R , we compute the KL divergence $KL(\hat{G} \| F)$ and compare it with the theoretical lower bound $L(\alpha, \beta) = (1 - \beta) \log \frac{1 - \beta}{\alpha} + \beta \log \frac{\beta}{1 - \alpha}$.

As shown in Figure 1, both methods yield watermarked distributions whose KL divergence from the original distribution approaches the theoretical lower bound. We also implement the sampling algorithm proposed in Giboulot & Furon (2024) and find that it does not achieve the optimal fidelity-detectability trade-off; see Appendix B for details.




Fig. 1: Empirical KL divergence versus theoretical lower bound for the three watermarking generators.

6. CONCLUSION

In this work, we investigate the problem of optimal watermark insertion *under any given detector*. Once the detector is fixed and the Type I and Type II error rates are prescribed, we fully characterize the best achievable fidelity loss. In particular, we derive a tight lower bound on the required fidelity loss for a general f -divergence, and explicitly construct the optimal watermarked distribution that attains this bound. Our results show that, regardless of how the detector is designed, there exists an optimal way to watermark the base distribution so as to satisfy the detection constraints while incurring the minimal possible distortion. Building on this theoretical insight, we further provide two algorithmic realizations of the optimal watermarked distribution: (i) an RL-based optimization procedure for settings where the generator can be fine-tuned, and (ii) a lightweight acceptance-rejection sampler that applies even when only black-box sampling access to the base model is available. Together, these results establish a principled and broadly applicable framework for watermark generation under arbitrary detectors.

DECLARATION OF THE USE OF GENERATIVE AI AND AI-ASSISTED TECHNOLOGIES

During the preparation of this work the author(s) used GPT 5.1 and Google Gemini to polish the writing and improve the clarity of content delivery. After using this tool/service the author(s) reviewed and edited the content as necessary and take(s) full responsibility for the content of the publication.

REFERENCES

- AARONSON, S. (2024). Watermarking: Where to? Simons Workshop on Alignment, Trust, Watermarking, and Copyright Issues in LLMs, Berkeley, CA. Unpublished slides.
- CAI, Z., LIU, S., WANG, H., ZHONG, H. & LI, X. (2024). Towards better statistical understanding of watermarking llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.13027*.
- DATHATHRI, S., SEE, A., GHASIAS, S., HUANG, P.-S., MCADAM, R., WELBL, J., BACHANI, V., KASKASOLI, A., STANFORTH, R., MATEJOVICOVA, T. et al. (2024). Scalable watermarking for identifying large language model outputs. *Nature* **634**, 818–823.
- DONSKER, M. D. & VARADHAN, S. R. S. (1983). Asymptotic evaluation of certain Markov process expectations for large time, IV. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* **36**, 183–212.

- FANG, L., LIU, A., ZOU, H. P., CHEN, Y., ZHANG, H., DENG, Z. & YU, P. S. (2025). Muse: Model-agnostic tabular watermarking via multi-sample selection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.24267*.
- FERNANDEZ, P., COUAIRON, G., JÉGOU, H., DOUZE, M. & FURON, T. (2023). The stable signature: Rooting watermarks in latent diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*.
- GIBOULOT, E. & FURON, T. (2024). Watermax: breaking the llm watermark detectability-robustness-quality trade-off. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **37**, 18848–18881.
- GO, D., KORBAK, T., KRUSZEWSKI, G., ROZEN, J., RYU, N. & DYMETMAN, M. (2023). Aligning language models with preferences through f-divergence minimization. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- GU, C., LI, X. L., LIANG, P. & HASHIMOTO, T. (2024). On the learnability of watermarks for language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- GUNN, S., ZHAO, X. & SONG, D. (2025). An undetectable watermark for generative image models. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- HE, H., LIU, Y., WANG, Z., MAO, Y. & BU, Y. (2025). Theoretically grounded framework for LLM watermarking: A distribution-adaptive approach. In *The Thirty-ninth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- HE, H., YU, P., REN, J., WU, Y. N. & CHENG, G. (2024). Watermarking generative tabular data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.14018*.
- HO, J., JAIN, A. & ABBEEL, P. (2020). Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **33**, 6840–6851.
- KARTHIKEYAN, H., DE CASTRO, L. & POLYCHRONIOU, A. (2025). Hashmark: Watermarking tabular/synthetic data for machine learning via cryptographic hash functions. In *NeurIPS 2025 Workshop on Regulatable ML*.
- KIRCHENBAUER, J., GEIPING, J., WEN, Y., KATZ, J., MIERS, I. & GOLDSTEIN, T. (2023). A watermark for large language models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR.
- KUDITIPUDI, R., THICKSTUN, J., HASHIMOTO, T. & LIANG, P. (2023). Robust distortion-free watermarks for language models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- LAUTRUP, A. D., HYRUP, T., ZIMEK, A. & SCHNEIDER-KAMP, P. (2025). Syntheval: a framework for detailed utility and privacy evaluation of tabular synthetic data. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* **39**, 6.
- LI, X., RUAN, F., WANG, H., LONG, Q. & SU, W. J. (2025a). Robust detection of watermarks for large language models under human edits. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, qkaf056.
- LI, X., RUAN, F., WANG, H., LONG, Q. & SU, W. J. (2025b). A statistical framework of watermarks for large language models: Pivot, detection efficiency and optimal rules. *The Annals of Statistics* **53**, 322–351.
- LIU, Y., ZHAO, X., SONG, D., WORNELL, G. W. & BU, Y. (2025). Position: Llm watermarking should align stakeholders’ incentives for practical adoption. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.18333*.
- MALANI, P. N., KULLGREN, J. & SOLWAY, E. (2019). National poll on healthy aging (npha), [united states], april 2017. Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR). Distributor release date: 2019-05-29.
- MANNING, C. & SCHUTZE, H. (1999). *Foundations of statistical natural language processing*. MIT press.
- MITCHELL, E., LEE, Y., KHAZATSKY, A., MANNING, C. D. & FINN, C. (2023). Detectgpt: Zero-shot machine-generated text detection using probability curvature. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR.
- MULLHAUPT, A. & PENG, C. (2025). Bounding neyman-pearson region with f -divergences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.08899*.
- NEMECEK, A., JIANG, Y. & AYDAY, E. (2024). Topic-based watermarks for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.02138*.
- NOWOZIN, S., CSEKE, B. & TOMIOKA, R. (2016). f-gan: Training generative neural samplers using variational divergence minimization. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **29**.
- POLYANSKIY, Y. & WU, Y. (2025). *Information theory: From coding to learning*. Cambridge university press.
- SADASIVAN, V. S., KUMAR, A., BALASUBRAMANIAN, S., WANG, W. & FEIZI, S. (2025). Can ai-generated text be reliably detected? stress testing ai text detectors under various attacks. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- SCHULMAN, J., WOLSKI, F., DHARIWAL, P., RADFORD, A. & KLIMOV, O. (2017). Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*.
- WEN, Y., KIRCHENBAUER, J., GEIPING, J. & GOLDSTEIN, T. (2024). Tree-rings watermarks: Invisible fingerprints for diffusion images. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **36**.
- XIE, Y., LI, X., MALLICK, T., SU, W. & ZHANG, R. (2025). Debiasing watermarks for large language models via maximal coupling. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 1–21.
- XU, X., YAO, Y. & LIU, Y. (2024). Learning to watermark llm-generated text via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.10553*.
- ZHANG, H., EDELMAN, B. L., FRANCATI, D., VENTURI, D., ATENIESE, G. & BARAK, B. (2023). Watermarks in the sand: Impossibility of strong watermarking for generative models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.04378*.
- ZHAO, X., ANANTH, P. V., LI, L. & WANG, Y.-X. (2023). Provable robust watermarking for ai-generated text. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- ZHU, C., TANG, J., GALJAARD, J. M., CHEN, P.-Y., BIRKE, R., BOS, C., CHEN, L. Y. et al. (2025). Tabwak: A watermark for tabular diffusion models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. OpenReview. net.

A. ADDITIONAL DISCUSSIONS ON RELATED WORKS

Watermarking has recently attracted substantial attention in the statistics and machine learning communities. Beyond the development of new watermarking algorithms, several works have begun to investigate the fundamental trade-off between fidelity and detectability, aiming to understand the statistical limits of how much a distribution can be perturbed while still remaining reliably detectable. (Cai et al. (2024); He et al. (2025))

Among these works, the study most closely related to ours is the recent paper by Cai et al. (2024). They formalize the watermarking problem as an optimization task that seeks to minimize the KL divergence between a watermark model distribution and the original model distribution, subject to a constraint on the increase in the probability of the green-list, which serves as a proxy of the detection power. Compared with their formulation, our framework is substantially more general. Rather than focusing on the specific green-red list watermarking mechanism, we model watermarking as a distributional modification problem applicable to any watermarking scheme and any data modality. Within this broader framework, we derive the exact optimal fidelity-detectability trade-off under explicit false-positive and false-negative error constraints, which is strictly tighter than the information-theoretic distortion bound established in Proposition 3.1 of Cai et al. (2024).

To be more specific, the proposition 3.1 in Cai et al. (2024) is equivalent to

$$D_{\text{KL}}(G \parallel F) \geq -\log((\alpha + \beta)(2 - \alpha - \beta)) \triangleq g_1(\alpha, \beta). \quad (\text{A1})$$

In contrast, our framework yields the following *exact* and *attainable* optimal distortion bound:

$$D_{\text{KL}}(G \parallel F) \geq (1 - \beta) \log\left(\frac{1 - \beta}{\alpha}\right) + \beta \log\left(\frac{\beta}{1 - \alpha}\right) \triangleq g_2(\alpha, \beta) \quad (\text{A2})$$

which is achieved by an explicit optimal construction of the watermarked distribution G^\star . It is easy to check that $g_2(\alpha, \beta) > g_1(\alpha, \beta)$ for any $0 < \alpha, \beta < 1$ with $\alpha + \beta < 1$. Therefore our bound is strictly tighter than the bound obtained in Cai et al. (2024).

He et al. (2025) is another relevant line of work. Their goal is to jointly optimize both the watermarking distribution and the detector, under constraints on the false-positive probability and on a distortion budget measured between the original large language model (LLM) distribution and the watermarked one. A key feature of their formulation is the introduction of an *auxiliary random sequence* $\zeta_{1:T}$, which is available to both the watermarking encoder and the detector. The optimal detector in their framework critically relies on exploiting the statistical dependence between $(X_{1:T}, \zeta_{1:T})$ under watermarking and the independence structure under the null model, where $X_{1:T}$ denotes the text.

While mathematically elegant, this modeling assumption has important practical limitations. In real deployments, such an auxiliary sequence $\zeta_{1:T}$ would necessarily be generated by a pseudorandom function seeded by the key, and is therefore deterministic. Thus the transition from true randomness to pseudorandomness inevitably incurs additional fidelity loss that their theory does not characterize. Moreover, the entire construction fundamentally relies on the token-by-token sampling structure of LLMs and does not extend to other data modalities such as tabular or image generation.

Similar auxiliary-sequence assumptions also appear in several recent LLM watermarking papers (Li et al. (2025b); Xie et al. (2025)). This key structural difference further distinguishes our work from these approaches: in contrast to theoretical results that rely on idealized auxiliary randomness, our fidelity analysis is strict and already incorporates the potential pseudorandomness-induced distortion that inevitably arises in practical watermarking systems, and therefore captures the true operational cost of watermark embedding.

Besides, a recent mathematical paper Mullhaupt & Peng (2025) derives an f -divergence bound with the same analytic form as ours in Theorem 1, but the problem studied there is quite different. Their focus is on the geometry of the Neyman–Pearson region, namely the set of all achievable (α, β) pairs for testing. However, they do not establish tightness of the bound for general f ; their only tightness result is for the hockey-stick divergence (see Example 1 in their paper).




Fig. 2: Empirical KL divergence of the best-of- m sampling generator (implemented by drawing m candidate samples from F and selecting the one with the highest detector score), compared against the optimal fidelity-detectability lower bound.

In comparison, our motivation is different and so are the conclusions. We prove that the bound is tight for *every* f -divergence, and, for any baseline distribution F and any feasible pair (α, β) , we explicitly construct the achieving distribution G^* that attains the optimal value. This constructive achievability is not addressed in Mullhaupt & Peng (2025). Moreover, to the best of our knowledge, our paper is the first to apply such tight f -divergence optimality results to generative watermarking.

B. ADDITIONAL EXPERIMENT RESULTS

In addition to the two theoretically optimal generators, we also implement the “best-of- m ” sampling strategy used in prior work (Giboulot & Furon (2024)) on the same National Poll on Healthy Aging dataset, which draws m i.i.d. candidates from F and selects the one with the highest detector score. As shown in Figure 2, this heuristic does not reach the optimal fidelity-detectability trade-off and remains above our theoretical lower bound.

C. ADDITIONAL EXAMPLES FOR THEOREM 1

In this section, we provide two more examples for Theorem 1.

Example A1 (Total variation divergence). When the generating function is chosen as $f_{\text{TV}}(t) = \frac{1}{2}|t - 1|$, the resulting f -divergence coincides with the total variation distance $D_{\text{TV}}(G\|F) = \frac{1}{2} \int \left| \frac{dG}{dF} - 1 \right| dF = \frac{1}{2} \int |dG - dF|$. Substituting f_{TV} into the lower bound (4) yields $D_{\text{TV}}(G\|F) \geq \frac{1}{2} \alpha \left| \frac{1-\beta}{\alpha} - 1 \right| + \frac{1}{2} (1 - \alpha) \left| \frac{\beta}{1-\alpha} - 1 \right|$. Under the feasibility condition $\alpha \leq 1 - \beta$, we have $\frac{1-\beta}{\alpha} \geq 1$ and $\frac{\beta}{1-\alpha} \leq 1$, so the bound simplifies to $D_{\text{TV}}(G\|F) \geq 1 - \alpha - \beta$. Thus Theorem 1 recovers the classical total-variation lower bound in binary hypothesis testing.

Example A2 (Chi-square divergence). When the generating function is chosen as $f_{\chi^2}(t) = (t - 1)^2$, the resulting f -divergence coincides with the Pearson chi-square divergence, $D_{\chi^2}(G\|F) = \int \left(\frac{dG}{dF} - 1 \right)^2 dF$.

Substituting f_{χ^2} into the lower bound (4) yields $D_{\chi^2}(G\|F) \geq \alpha \left(\frac{1-\beta}{\alpha} - 1 \right)^2 + (1-\alpha) \left(\frac{\beta}{1-\alpha} - 1 \right)^2 = \frac{(1-\alpha-\beta)^2}{\alpha(1-\alpha)}$.

D. PROOF OF THEOREMS

In this section, we provide the proofs of the main theorems.

Proof of Theorem 1. Let $S = \{x : D(x) = 1\}$ be the detection region of a feasible detector D and set

$$a = F(S), \quad q = G(S).$$

The constraints (1) and (2) imply

$$0 < a \leq \alpha, \quad 1 - \beta \leq q \leq 1$$

Step 1: Coarse-graining onto $\{S, S^c\}$. Consider the measurable map $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{1, 0\}$ given by $\pi(x) = \mathbf{1}\{x \in S\}$, and let

$$F_\pi = F \circ \pi^{-1} = \text{Bernoulli}(a), \quad G_\pi = G \circ \pi^{-1} = \text{Bernoulli}(q).$$

By the data-processing inequality for f -divergences (Polyanskiy & Wu (2025)),

$$D_f(G\|F) \geq D_f(G_\pi\|F_\pi).$$

For these Bernoulli distributions we have

$$D_f(G_\pi\|F_\pi) = a f\left(\frac{q}{a}\right) + (1-a) f\left(\frac{1-q}{1-a}\right) =: \phi(a, q).$$

Thus

$$D_f(G\|F) \geq \phi(a, q),$$

for some (a, q) in the following feasible rectangle

$$\mathcal{R}_{\alpha, \beta} = \{(a, q) : 0 < a \leq \alpha, 1 - \beta \leq q \leq 1\}.$$

Step 2: Minimization over q for fixed a . Fix $a \in (0, \alpha]$ and view $\phi(a, q)$ as a function of q on $[1 - \beta, 1]$. Writing $t_1 = q/a$ and $t_2 = (1 - q)/(1 - a)$, we obtain

$$\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial q}(a, q) = f'(t_1) - f'(t_2).$$

Since f is convex, f' is monotone nondecreasing on $(0, \infty)$, and

$$t_1 \geq t_2 \iff \frac{q}{a} \geq \frac{1-q}{1-a} \iff q \geq a.$$

On the feasible set we have $q \geq 1 - \beta \geq \alpha \geq a$, hence $t_1 \geq t_2$ and

$$\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial q}(a, q) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } q \in [1 - \beta, 1].$$

Thus, for each fixed a ,

$$\min_{1-\beta \leq q \leq 1} \phi(a, q) = \phi(a, 1 - \beta).$$

Step 3: Minimization over a . Define

$$\psi(a) := \phi(a, 1 - \beta) = D_f(\text{Bernoulli}(1 - \beta) \parallel \text{Bernoulli}(a)), \quad a \in (0, \alpha].$$

For fixed P , the map $Q \mapsto D_f(P\|Q)$ is convex in Q (Polyanskiy & Wu (2025)), and achieves its unique minimum at $Q = P$, where the divergence is zero. In the Bernoulli case this means that $\psi(a)$ is convex in a and minimized at $a = 1 - \beta$. Our feasible region satisfies $0 < a \leq \alpha \leq 1 - \beta$, so on $(0, \alpha]$ we are to the left of the minimizer and convexity forces ψ to be nonincreasing. Hence

$$\min_{0 < a \leq \alpha} \psi(a) = \psi(\alpha) = \alpha f\left(\frac{1-\beta}{\alpha}\right) + (1-\alpha) f\left(\frac{\beta}{1-\alpha}\right).$$

Combining the three steps, we obtain the lower bound (4).

Step 4: Attaining the bound. Let S be chosen so that $F(S) = \alpha$, and define G^\star by (5). Then

$$G^\star(S) = \frac{1-\beta}{\alpha} F(S) = 1-\beta, \quad G^\star(S^c) = \frac{\beta}{1-\alpha} F(S^c) = \beta,$$

so (1) and (2) hold with equality, and

$$\frac{dG^\star}{dF}(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1-\beta}{\alpha}, & x \in S, \\ \frac{\beta}{1-\alpha}, & x \in S^c. \end{cases}$$

Substituting this likelihood ratio into the definition of $D_f(G^\star\|F)$ gives (6), showing that the lower bound is attained.

Proof of Theorem 2. By Donsker and Varadhan's variational formula (Donsker & Varadhan (1983)), for any choice of r , the unique maximizer of (7) is given by

$$\frac{dH_r}{dF}(x) \propto e^{r(x)}.$$

Now take $r(x) = AD(x)$ with A as in the theorem statement. Then $r(x)$ is constant on S and S^c , and

$$e^{r(x)} = \begin{cases} e^A, & x \in S, \\ 1, & x \in S^c. \end{cases}$$

Hence

$$\frac{dH_r}{dF}(x) = \begin{cases} c_1, & x \in S, \\ c_0, & x \in S^c, \end{cases}$$

for some positive constants c_1, c_0 determined by normalization. Indeed,

$$H_r(S) = \frac{e^A F(S)}{e^A F(S) + F(S^c)} = \frac{e^A \alpha}{e^A \alpha + 1 - \alpha}.$$

With

$$A = \log\left(\frac{(1-\beta)(1-\alpha)}{\alpha\beta}\right),$$

we have $e^A \alpha \beta = (1-\beta)(1-\alpha)$ and a direct substitution shows that $H_r(S) = 1-\beta$ and $H_r(S^c) = \beta$. Writing $H_r(S) = \alpha c_1$ and $H_r(S^c) = (1-\alpha)c_0$, we obtain

$$\alpha c_1 = 1-\beta, \quad (1-\alpha)c_0 = \beta,$$

so that

$$c_1 = \frac{1-\beta}{\alpha}, \quad c_0 = \frac{\beta}{1-\alpha}.$$

Thus

$$\frac{dH_r}{dF}(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1-\beta}{\alpha}, & x \in S, \\ \frac{\beta}{1-\alpha}, & x \in S^c, \end{cases}$$

which is exactly the density ratio dG^*/dF from Theorem 1. Therefore $H_r = G^*$.

The final statement follows immediately: if a parametric family $\{\pi_\phi\}$ contains G^* and the RL algorithm converges to a global maximizer of $J(\pi_\phi)$, then the limit point must be G^* .

Proof of Theorem 3. For any measurable set $A \subseteq X$, consider a single proposal step of Algorithm 1. A proposal x is drawn from F , and then accepted with probability

$$a(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \in S, \\ w_0/w_1, & x \in S^c. \end{cases}$$

Thus the joint probability that the algorithm proposes a point in A and accepts it in this step is

$$\Pr(x \in A, \text{acc}) = F(A \cap S) + \frac{w_0}{w_1} F(A \cap S^c).$$

The overall acceptance probability in one proposal step is

$$p_{\text{acc}} = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim F}[a(X)] = F(S) \cdot 1 + F(S^c) \cdot \frac{w_0}{w_1} = \alpha + (1-\alpha) \frac{w_0}{w_1}.$$

Multiplying numerator and denominator by w_1 gives

$$p_{\text{acc}} = \frac{w_1 \alpha + w_0(1-\alpha)}{w_1}.$$

By the definitions $w_1 = (1-\beta)/\alpha$ and $w_0 = \beta/(1-\alpha)$, we have

$$w_1 \alpha = 1 - \beta, \quad w_0(1-\alpha) = \beta,$$

so

$$w_1 \alpha + w_0(1-\alpha) = (1-\beta) + \beta = 1,$$

and therefore

$$p_{\text{acc}} = \frac{1}{w_1}.$$

The distribution of an accepted proposal in a single step is the proposal distribution conditioned on acceptance:

$$\Pr(x \in A \mid \text{acc}) = \frac{\Pr(x \in A, \text{acc})}{p_{\text{acc}}} = \frac{F(A \cap S) + (w_0/w_1)F(A \cap S^c)}{1/w_1} = w_1 F(A \cap S) + w_0 F(A \cap S^c).$$

Since successive proposal steps are independent and each accepted sample is obtained by repeating this mechanism until an acceptance occurs, the law of the finally accepted sample is exactly $\Pr(x \in A \mid \text{acc})$. Thus the accepted sample has distribution

$$G^*(A) = w_1 F(A \cap S) + w_0 F(A \cap S^c) = \frac{1-\beta}{\alpha} F(A \cap S) + \frac{\beta}{1-\alpha} F(A \cap S^c),$$

which matches the optimal watermarked distribution characterized in Theorem 1.

E. ADDITIONAL DISCUSSIONS ON ROBUSTNESS

Our analysis begins with a detector that satisfies the Type I and Type II constraints (1) and (2), and focuses on the subsequent question of how to construct the optimal watermarked distribution once such

a detector is fixed. Under this assumption, our results characterize both the minimal fidelity loss required for detectability and the optimal distribution that attains this optimum. The design of the detector itself is not the subject of this work, and none of our results depend on any particular choice of D .

In practical watermarking systems, robustness depends heavily on the detector itself. Different choices of D lead to different robustness behaviours. For instance, when watermarking large language models, one may adopt a token-level detector that flags a sample whenever the proportion of tokens falling into a predefined subset exceeds a threshold (Kirchenbauer et al. (2023)) or a more semantic detector based on higher-level features of the generated text (Mitchell et al. (2023)). Such design choices influence the system’s resistance to attacks, but they are orthogonal to the questions addressed here.

The focus of this work is complementary: given any detector that meets the desired false-positive constraint, we characterize the optimal watermarked distribution associated with it and the inherent fidelity cost required for detectability. In this sense, detector design and watermark construction play distinct roles. Our results apply to the latter, and remain valid regardless of how the former is implemented.