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Towards a Trustworthy Cyberspace with LLMs

• The widening adoption of large language models (LLMs) on cloud brings urgent problems related to privacy and social engineering.

• How do we establish trust server and user?

New challenges call for novel protocols/algorithms!
More specifically, my work focus on the generation aspect.

1. How can the server prevent malicious users from using the generation for misinformation?
   *SemStamp: A Semantic Watermark Algorithm*
   \[H^*Z^*H^*WCWSVKT, arXiv, 2023\]

2. How can users hide prompt or generated text from the server (privacy-aware generation)?
   \[Z^*H^*WMMMCWT, arXiv, 2023\]
Basic: Auto-Regressive Language Model

- LM assigns a probability $P_{\theta}(W_{1:L})$ to a given sentence $W_{1:L}$
- Auto-regressive LMs predict the next token $W_i$ given history $W_{1:i-1}$.
  \[
  \log P_{\theta}(W) = \sum \log P_{\theta}(W_i|W_{1:i-1})
  \]
- The GPT series are all autoregressive LMs.

- Modeling: Recurrent Neural Network / LSTM / Transformer

Generation: sampled token is fed as input for next time-step

Our focus today is NOT about BERT, which is a masked language model.
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Watermarked Generation for LLM

• Watermarked generation: an approach which facilitates the detection of machine-generated text by adding algorithmically detectable signatures during LLM generation which are imperceptible to humans.
The Baseline Token-Level Algorithm

\[ \hat{p}_k^{(t)} = \begin{cases} 
\frac{\exp(l_k^{(t)} + \delta)}{\sum_{i \in R} \exp(l_i^{(t)}) + \sum_{i \in G} \exp(l_i^{(t)} + \delta)}, & k \in G \\
\frac{\exp(l_k^{(t)})}{\sum_{i \in R} \exp(l_i^{(t)}) + \sum_{i \in G} \exp(l_i^{(t)} + \delta)}, & k \in R.
\end{cases} \]

- The baseline algorithm operates by adding bias to a green-listed (G) subset of V.
- The green list is pseudo-randomly generated by using the previous token as the hash.
- The detection is determined by counting green-listed tokens in a given document.
The Baseline Token-Level Algorithm: Weakness

\[
\hat{p}_{k}^{(t)} = \begin{cases} 
\frac{\exp(l_{k}^{(t)} + \delta)}{\sum_{i \in R} \exp(l_{i}^{(t)}) + \sum_{i \in G} \exp(l_{i}^{(t)} + \delta)}, & k \in G \\
\frac{\exp(l_{k}^{(t)} + \delta)}{\sum_{i \in R} \exp(l_{i}^{(t)}) + \sum_{i \in G} \exp(l_{i}^{(t)} + \delta)}, & k \in R.
\end{cases}
\]

- Weakness:
  1. The token-level noise hurts quality. (damages PPL)
  2. Could be vulnerable to paraphrase attack. (Considering the hash is from the previous token)
Bi-gram Paraphrase Attack

• After beam-search (Pegasus) we get N(20) paraphrases.

• We select the beam with the lowest bigram overlap with the original sentence.

• This gives 3%~4% drop for the baseline alg.

Example Generation Sentence (SemStamp): It’s not the same thing as a marketing campaign, but it is a good starting point.

Paraphrase: It isn’t the same as a marketing campaign, but it is a good starting point.

Bigram Paraphrase: It’s not a marketing campaign, but it’s a good start.
SemStamp: A Semantic Watermark

• We propose a sentence-level semantic watermark algorithm.

• We apply the masking on sentence-level “semantic space”, instead of token-level.

• There are two core components:
  (1) semantic encoder robust to paraphrasing (SentenceBert).
  (2) Space partition and masking. (Locality-Sensitive Hashing, LSH)
Proposed: Semantic Watermark

• Each node represents a potential next sentence.

• LSH partitions the semantic space by random planes. We apply a watermark mask on randomly selected partitions (green).
Overview: Rejection-Sampling

In our hyper-parameter setting, we need to sample around 14 sentences for a valid sample. We are trading speed for watermarking.

Figure 1: An overview of the proposed SEMSTAMP algorithm. The watermark is injected by mapping candidate sentences into embeddings through a robust sentence encoder, dividing the semantic space through locality-sensitive hashing, and rejection sampling from the LM to generate sentences with valid region embeddings.
Robustness to Paraphrase Attack

- Assuming the robustness of the embedder (enhanced by contrastive learning), the LSH signature of the paraphrased sentence does not change.
Trick: Reject Generation Close to LSH Boundary

• In practice, we find that even after CL, the LSH code is not robust enough to paraphrasing (LSH accuracy under para. only ~70%).

• To alleviate this, we propose to add a rejection margin, and only accept sentences whose cos-sim with the normal vectors is larger than a margin (0.02).
Result: Improved Robustness

Comparison under Paraphrase Attack

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PPL</th>
<th>Ent-3</th>
<th>Rep-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No watermark</td>
<td>6.995</td>
<td>12.43</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>8.455</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSTAMP</td>
<td><strong>6.862</strong></td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In the current prompted generation interface, the server has full control of the generation process, leaving zero option for users who want to keep the prompt or generated text to themselves.

I'm a writer, and I'm thinking about a new story about a magical world, how should I begin? Could you give me an example?

Certainly! Here's an example of how you could begin a story set in a magical world:

In the quiet town of Eldermoor, nestled deep within the ancient forests of Arindale, the first whispers of magic often went unnoticed. But on a crisp autumn morning, when the leaves had just begun to turn shades of fiery red and golden yellow, something extraordinary happened that would change the destiny of this realm forever.

Amelia, a young woman with eyes the color of the deepest sapphires and a curiosity to match, had always believed in the existence of magic. She would often sit by the window of her small cottage, watching the sunlight filter through the towering trees, casting dancing shadows on the wooden floor. It was in these moments of quiet contemplation that she felt a
Motivation: Generated Text (also) Needs Obfuscation

• We argue that generated text also needs obfuscation because it affects the users’ real-life decisions.

• e.g., a customer is likely to go to the restaurant suggested by the LLM; an engineer could adopt the approach proposed by the LLM; a writer could take inspiration from outputs provided by the LLM, etc.

• Most work on NLP privacy (e.g., DP-SGD) focus on protecting the training data.
Motivation: Generated Text (also) Needs Obfuscation

Oops: Samsung Employees Leaked Confidential Data to ChatGPT

Employees submitted source code and internal meetings to ChatGPT just weeks after the company lifted a ban on using the chatbot.

By Mack DeGeurin  Published April 6, 2023  | Comments (5)

Regulation maybe not enough! LatticeGen provides an algorithmic approach to protect user privacy.

Oops! Google Search caught publicly indexing users’ conversations with Bard AI
Intuition of LatticeGen: Hiding Generated Text in a Lattice

Example Outcome:
This is a (shuffled) 2-lattice (N=2).

The user knows the true sequence, but the server does not.

The prompt can also be protected in the lattice, and is omitted in this figure.
LatticeGen: High-Level Input & Output

• The user gives a prompt (e.g., “Say a sci-fi story.”) to the LG client. The client only needs communication with the LLM server, and is supposed to protect user’s privacy from the server. The client code could be open-sourced, and run by user on any laptop with a private config without involving a third-party.

• Assuming the server agrees to follow the LG protocol, the client handles the LG interactions with the cloud LLM server. (<-major focus of this project!)

• Finally, the client returns the generation to user.
LatticeGen: High-Level Input & Output

• As a result, both the server and user gets the same noised lattice.
• The difference is that the user/client knows the true token sequence, while server does not.

Server gets:

User/Client gets:

![Diagram showing the difference between server and user/client in LatticeGen]
Key Question: Why Not Just Generate Twice?

The true sequence is in one of the $2^T$ (upperbound) possibilities.

The true sequence is in one of the two possibilities.

• 1st: The scientist stood there with...
• 2ed: A girl works on challenging...
LatticeGen: Overview

- On each time-step, instead of inference/sample one token, the server and user cooperatively inference/sample N tokens. (e.g., N=2)
Prerequisite: Inference on a Linearized Lattice

- As a prerequisite of LG, we finetune the LLM to make next-word predictions on the linearized lattice.

\[ P(\cdot | \tilde{W}_t^2[\tilde{w}_t^i]) \] refers to the next-token prediction distribution on the position of \( \tilde{w}_t^i \).

- Please refer to our paper for how to finetune the LLM to accept this format.
Generation Protocol: Server Step at $t$

- The server makes inference on all of the $N$ tokens from time-step $t-1$, and send the prediction distributions as $\text{len-}|V|$ vectors to client.
Generation Protocol: Client Step at t (Key Step)

- Upon receiving the two distributions, the user knows which of the previous token is the true one, and generates a true token from it.
- With a noise scheme (e.g., synonym), the client also generates a noise token.
- The user shuffles the two tokens, and send them to server for next time-step.
For Better Quality: Incorporating Bigram Units

The current inference unit is unigram, which degrades gen-quality a lot. We can extend to bigram units (enumerate $N^2$ combinations) to trade computation for quality.
Generation Quality Degradation

LatticeGen trades quality for protection (<- to be discussed soon). Directly adding noise to text w.o. lattice would induce drastic degradation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>PPL</th>
<th>Protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>standard</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>synonym noise, w.o. lattice</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG, unigram, synonym noise</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG, unigram, mixing noise</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG, bigram, mixing noise</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attack (Server) & Defense (Client): Overview

To defend against a hypothetically malicious server, we will begin a sequence of thought-adversarial game:

• What would a malicious server do to attack?
• How can client/user defense?
The Beam-Search Attack (Server)

• Knowing that the true token is among the N tokens on each time-step, a nature attack objective is to find the maximizing-prob sequence:

$$\arg \max_{\hat{w}} \log P_L(\hat{w}|\tilde{W}_T^N) = \arg \max_{\hat{w}} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \log P_L(\hat{w}_t|\tilde{W}_{t-1}^N[\hat{w}_{t-1}]).$$

• This can be solved by a simple dynamic programming.
The Beam-Search Attack (Server)

• The BS attack is very effective against the synonym scheme.
The Parallel Noise Scheme (User)

- The user can evade BS by using a parallel scheme with radical sampling.

[Diagram showing the Parallel Noise Scheme with tokens $w_0, w_1^1, w_2^1, w_3^1, w_4^1, w_5^1, w_1^2, w_2^2, w_3^2, w_4^2, w_5^2, w_1^3, w_2^3, w_3^3, w_4^3, w_5^3$, and arrows indicating the flow of tokens.

- Top-$k$ with $k = 50$, for true token generation.
- Top-$k$ with $k = 5$, for noise token generation.

For true token generation

For noise token generation

The Parallel Noise Scheme]
The Repeated Beam-Search Attack

• However, the server can repeatedly call beam-search and remove the hypothesis from each call.

• RBS is a stronger version of BS.
Metric of Protection

• After RBS, the attacker gets N hypotheses, and we care about the hypothesis with maximum overlap with the true sequence. (the average is always 1/N)

\[
\text{max-true-ratio}(\{\hat{w}\}_{i=1}^N, w^1) = \max_i \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{1}_{\hat{w}^i_t = w^1_t}}{T}. 
\]

• The true-ratio only cares about exact match, we also have a BERTScore variant which measures the revealed semantic, which is defined in a similar manner.
Defense Against RBS: The Mixing Scheme

- Under RBS, we realize that the true and noise sequence have to be mixed together.
- With a mix-ratio (0.1), we achieve this by randomly branching from the true sequence into the noise sequences.

The Mixing Noise Scheme

- Top-\(k\) with \(k = 50\) for true token generation
- Top-\(k\) with \(k = 5\) for noise token generation
**Mixing Scheme Example**

**Prompt:** You live in a world where light helps you retain and regain memory while darkness makes you forget everything. One day.... Story:

**Generated Text (\(P_M\)):** I had forgotten everything. The moment when the light shone out of the darkness that my brain had created was when it all came together. Everything. The moment when everything came together, that was when my forgetting started. A slow burn, a warm fire, everything coming back to me. It had been...

**Generated Text (LG):** The world is a strange one, I call it’s just that, a big empty, like a dream. The thing I recall was the people. I remember them, but the way they looked and walked, yet ’just a dream. The memory lapse might be about a light, so bright...

**First Round RBS:** Prompt: You live in a world where light comes people in memories. It is darkness, you forget everything. One day.... Story: The world is a strange one, I call it’s just a place I came from. It ’empty’ I thought I recall was the people. I remember them, I remember them, not as if they were real. ’.’The memory I most remember is of the people, the...

**Second Round RBS:** applying </ Shogun A are on an underground. the helps you retain and regain memory while down makes and afraid, until You stumble upon You’unstoppable XIII/r/iN. The surface world I live in is that, a big empty, like a dream. The thing as remember most about the same people, over, but the way they looked and walked, yet ’just a dream. I think lapse might be about a light, so bright...
Results

- The synonym scheme is good for utility, but bad under BS/RBS.
- The parallel scheme is good for BS, but bad under RBS.
- The proposed mixing scheme achieves best protection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Config</th>
<th>Metric Attack</th>
<th>( N = 2 ) (LG only)</th>
<th>( N = 3 ) (LG only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PPL</td>
<td>PMI</td>
<td>True-Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>RBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanilla ((P_M)), w.o. noise Synonym, w.o. lattice</td>
<td>28.378</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>229.616</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG, bigram, synonym</td>
<td>42.030</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG, bigram, parallel</td>
<td>63.124</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG, bigram, mixing</td>
<td>64.480</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.536</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Work and Interests

• Detection is hard! Especially in zero-shot cases [1] or under attacks (on-going).

• Designing stress tests for LLM-based NLG metrics (ACL 2023).

• Interest: Can powerful model help video game development (e.g., marioGPT)?


Figure 1: Prompt-conditioned generations from a single seed block. MarioGPT is able to create diverse levels solely based on a text prompt in natural language.
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