
Watermarking Counterfactual Explanations

Hangzhi Guo, Amulya Yadav
Penn State University
{hangz, amulya}@psu.edu

Abstract


The field of Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) focuses on techniques for providing explanations to end-users about the decision-making processes that underlie modern-day machine learning (ML) models. Within the vast universe of XAI techniques, counterfactual (CF) explanations are often preferred by end-users as they help explain the predictions of ML models by providing an easy-to-understand & actionable recourse (or contrastive) case to individual end-users who are adversely impacted by predicted outcomes. However, recent studies have shown significant security concerns with using CF explanations in real-world applications; in particular, malicious adversaries can exploit CF explanations to perform query-efficient model extraction attacks on proprietary ML models. In this paper, we propose a model-agnostic watermarking framework (for adding watermarks to CF explanations) that can be leveraged to detect unauthorized model extraction attacks (which rely on the watermarked CF explanations). Our novel framework solves a bi-level optimization problem to embed an indistinguishable watermark into the generated CF explanation such that any future model extraction attacks that rely on these watermarked CF explanations can be detected using a null hypothesis significance testing (NHST) scheme, while ensuring that these embedded watermarks do not compromise the quality of the generated CF explanations. We evaluate this framework’s performance across a diverse set of real-world datasets, CF explanation methods, and model extraction techniques, and show that our watermarking detection system can be used to accurately identify extracted ML models that are trained using the watermarked CF explanations. Our work paves the way for the secure adoption of CF explanations in real-world applications.

1 Introduction

Within the vast universe of XAI techniques, counterfactual (CF) explanations¹ [42, 24, 18, 11] have emerged as an effective method for explaining the predictions generated by machine learning (ML) models [2, 30]. To explain the prediction returned by an ML model on input instance x , CF explanation methods identify a new counterfactual x^{cf} , which is similar to the original input instance x but yields a different (and often more favorable) prediction from the ML model. CF explanations are useful because they can be used to offer recourse to vulnerable groups. For example, when an ML model spots a student as being vulnerable to dropping out from school, CF explanation techniques can suggest corrective measures to teachers, who can intervene accordingly.

However, despite these usability benefits, widespread real-world adoption of CF explanation techniques in practical ML systems remains limited. One key obstacle is the risk of model extraction attacks through CF explanations [32]. There is an inherent tension between explainability and security: while model explanations bring transparency for legitimate users, they can inadvertently provide

¹Counterfactual explanation [42] and algorithmic recourse [38] are closely connected [40, 34]. Hence, we use both terms interchangeably throughout this paper.



(a) Illustration of ① model extraction attack using counterfactual explanations, and ② the (b) Model ownership verification procedure of generating watermarks of counterfactual explanations.

Figure 1: Illustration of the CFMark. (a) The adversaries perform model extraction attacks via using query data $D^x = \{(x_i, F_W(x_i))\}_i^N$ and their CF explanations $D^{cf} = \{(x_i^{cf}, F_W(x_i^{cf}))\}_i^N$ to train a private model f_w that reproduces the predictive behavior of the proprietary model F_W . CFMark embeds a watermark to the returned $\hat{x}^{cf} = G_\theta(x^{cf})$. (b) If the adversaries use D^{cf} to train an extracted model f_w , our framework can *identify* this unauthorized usage via a hypothesis testing.

malicious actors with valuable information to compromise and extract proprietary ML models. As demonstrated in Figure 1 (a), attackers can exploit CF explanations to execute model extraction attacks. By querying the model with input instances D^x and obtaining the corresponding CF explanations D^{cf} , attackers can train a surrogate model f_w which reproduces the predictive behaviors of the proprietary model F_W . This approach is more query-efficient compared to traditional model extraction attacks that rely only on D^x [1, 43].

Limited research has been conducted on countermeasures against model extraction attacks that exploit CF explanations. Notably, Yang et al. [45] proposed integrating differential privacy into CF explanations to mitigate such attacks. However, this defense mechanism relies on drastic perturbations to CF explanations to impede attackers, consequently reducing the explanations’ utility. Alternatively, digital watermarking presents a strong defense mechanism against model extraction attacks in general [15, 35, 19]. Typically, these methods embed unique signals into the ML model, which enables subsequent verification of model ownership whenever an adversary tries to conduct a model extraction attack. However, existing digital watermarking techniques have not explicitly considered the use of CF explanations in model extraction attacks. Consequently, existing methods are inapplicable for protecting against such attacks that use CF explanations.

Contributions. In this paper, we propose a novel watermarking framework for counterfactual explanations to identify unauthorized model extractions. As illustrated in Figure 1, our watermarking framework consists of two stages: (i) *Watermark Embedding*: We embed an indistinguishable watermark into CF explanations. This watermark can later be detected if malicious users utilize these watermarked CFs for training their models. (ii) *Watermark Detection*: We employ a pairwise t-test to identify models trained on the watermarked CF explanations. Importantly, compared with prior methods that aggressively perturb the CF explanations, this watermarking framework has little impact on the utility of CF explanations. Our primary contributions are summarized as follows:

- (Problem-Wise) We propose a novel approach to combat the model extraction problem that exploits CF explanations. Unlike prior work focusing on defending the model extraction attack by trading off the CF explanations’ quality [45], we propose to add watermarks to CF explanations that can provide easy identifiability of any ML model that is trained (by an adversary without authorization) using watermarked CF explanations as training data. To our knowledge, we are the first to consider watermarking of CF explanations to prevent model extraction attacks.
- (Methodology-Wise) We develop a model-agnostic framework to add watermarks to CF explanations, and identify models that are trained on watermarked CF explanations. This framework is designed to operate in two stages: (1) First, we develop a technique that embeds watermarks in the CF explanations. Importantly, this watermark has little effect on the utility of counterfactual explanations. In addition, it is unidentifiable to malicious users, but it can be identified at a later

stage. We construct this watermark by solving a bi-level optimization problem. (2) Second, we perform a pairwise t-test to identify models that are trained on the watermarked CF explanations.

- (Experiment-Wise) We evaluate our watermarking techniques on a comprehensive variety of real-world datasets, CF explanation methods, and model extraction techniques. Our results show that our watermarking techniques can achieve reliable identifiability (0.85 F1-score), without trading off the utility of counterfactual explanations (only $\sim 1\%$ reduction in validity and proximity metrics).

2 Related Work

Counterfactual Explanation Techniques. A significant body of literature on counterfactual (CF) explanation techniques primarily focuses on developing methods that yield different, often more desirable predicted outcomes [42, 40, 17]. Prior work on CF explanation techniques can be organized into two categories: (i) *non-parametric methods* [42, 38, 24, 39, 18, 37, 40, 17], which typically find optimal CF explanations by solving an individual optimization or searching problem, and (ii) *parametric methods* [26, 44, 23, 11, 10, 41], which adopt parametric models (e.g., a neural network model) to generate recourses. However, existing techniques fail to consider the security risks associated with providing CF explanations to end-users. Unfortunately, this leaves the generated CF explanations vulnerable to adversaries who could extract proprietary information from the model.

Security and Privacy Risks in CF Explanations. Recent research has highlighted the privacy and security risks associated with model explanations [32, 31]. In particular, CF explanations can be used to carry out model extraction attacks [1, 43], linkage attacks [8], and membership inference attacks [27]. To mitigate these risks, Vo et al. [41] use feature discretization to defend linkage attacks, but this approach lacks generalizability to defend against other attacks, such as model extraction attacks. Alternatively, differentially private CF explanations exhibit resistance to model extraction and membership inference attacks [45]. Unfortunately, this approach suffers from the severely decreased quality of CF explanations, which limits its practical deployment in real-world applications.

Model Extraction Attacks and Watermarking. Our work is closely related to prior literature on model extraction (ME) attacks, which focuses on constructing private models that behave similarly to the proprietary victim model. Tramèr et al. [36] first conceptualized this attack, and later work improves the efficacy of ME attacks via active learning [4, 25], semi-supervised learning [14], adversarial examples [16, 47], and CF explanations [1, 43]. A common approach for protecting against model extraction attacks focuses on reducing the quality of ML models, such that it becomes unattractive for an adversary to conduct a model extraction attack. Alternatively, digital watermarking techniques embed unique signals into either the training data [21], model parameters [33, 15], and/or model outputs [35, 19], which enables the defender (i.e., enterprise) to verify any suspicious models that may have been constructed via a model extraction attack. Unfortunately, existing watermarking techniques have not explicitly considered the use of CF explanations in model extraction attacks. Hence, existing methods cannot protect against such attacks that exploit CF explanations.

3 Preliminaries

We limit our exposition to binary classification problems since they represent the most commonly studied setting for CF explanations [40, 11]. Let $D_t = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ denote a training dataset containing N data points, where $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ represents the i -th input data point, and $y_i \in \{0, 1\}$ denotes its label. The enterprise service provider (i.e., defender) uses this training dataset D_t to train their proprietary predictive model $F_W : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, which takes as input $x \in D_t$ to output a probabilistic score $F_W(x)$ which (approximately) represents the probability that the actual label for x is 1.

Counterfactual Explanations. In addition to generating predictions $F_W(x)$ (for input x) using their predictive model, the service provider (i.e., defender) also generates counterfactual explanations x^{cf} to explain the predictions returned by F_W on input x . At a high level, the procedure for finding x^{cf} (for input x) involves applying feature-space modifications to x that reverse the predictive outcome (from $F_W(x)$ to $1 - F_W(x)$) with a minimal cost of change. Hence, given an input x and the proprietary model F_W , a CF explanation method $\text{CF}(x; F_W)$ generates CF explanations x^{cf} which satisfies two criteria: (i) the CF explanations need to be *valid* [42, 11], i.e., the CF explanations

get opposite predictions from the original input $F_W(x^{\text{cf}}) = 1 - F_W(x)$, and (ii) incur *low cost of changes* [38, 11], i.e., the modifications needed to change x to x^{cf} (denoted by $c(x, x^{\text{cf}})$) is low.

Model Extraction Attack via CF Explanations. We assume that malicious adversaries (i.e., attacker) aim to conduct a model extraction attack against the defender’s proprietary model F_W , which generally works as follows: (i) the attacker assumes black-box access to F_W , i.e., he can query the model’s output probability $F_W(x)$ for any input x . (ii) The attacker queries F_W with M distinct attack points $\{(x_i)\}_i^M$ to create a supervised attack dataset $D^x = \{(x_i, F_W(x_i))\}_i^M$. (iii) Finally, the attacker uses D^x for training an extracted ML model $f_{w'} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ that closely mimics the proprietary ML model (i.e., $\{f_{w'}(x_i) \approx F(x_i) \mid \forall x_i \in D_t\}$).

However, recent approaches have shown that CF explanations can be used by adversaries to improve the query efficiency and quality of model extraction attacks. Below, we describe *MRCE* [1] and *DualCF* [43], two approaches that use CF explanations to perform model extraction attacks.

MRCE. Aivodji et al. [1] showed that adversaries can perform a query-efficient model extraction attack by making half as many queries to F_W . Instead of using an attack dataset D_x of size M , the MRCE attack proceeds by using an $M/2$ sized attack dataset $D_x^{\text{MRCE}} = \{(x_i, F_W(x_i))\}_i^{M/2}$ and uses the corresponding CF explanations and their predictions $D^{\text{cf}} = \{(x_i^{\text{cf}}, 1 - F_W(x_i))\}_i^{M/2}$ as additional training data which does not require querying the ML model (since the labels on CF explanation points x^{cf} are assumed to be opposite to that of the original points x). Thus, leveraging CF explanations and their labels allows the attacker to get an M sized training dataset by making only $M/2$ queries to F_W . Finally, the attacker use both D_x^{MRCE} and D^{cf} for training their extracted ML model $f_{w'} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, 1]$.

DualCF. Alternatively, Wang et al. [43] improves the quality of the training dataset used by the attacker to train the extracted ML model $f_{w'}$. The DualCF attack proceeds as follows: (i) the attacker queries F_W with an initial set of attack points to get $D_x^{\text{DCF}} = \{(x_i, F_W(x_i))\}_i^{M/2}$ and corresponding CF explanations $D^{\text{cf}} = \{(x_i^{\text{cf}}, 1 - F_W(x_i))\}_i^{M/2}$. (ii) The set D^{cf} is also used to query F_W to get a dual CF dataset $D^{\text{cf}'} = \{(x_i^{\text{cf}'}, 1 - (1 - F_W(x_i)))\}_i^{M/2}$ (i.e., the set of CF explanations $x^{\text{cf}'}$ for the original CF explanations x^{cf} generated by the defender’s CF module). Intuitively, if the defender uses a high-quality CF explanation module, D^{cf} and $D^{\text{cf}'}$ would represent a dataset with smaller margins, and hence enable more accurate recovery (or extraction) of underlying decision boundary of F_W . Finally, the attacker use both D^{cf} and $D^{\text{cf}'}$ for training their extracted ML model $f_{w'} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, 1]$.

Protecting against Model Extraction Attacks. As described in Section 2, a common approach for mitigating model extraction attacks (in general) is to degrade the quality of the proprietary ML model F_W so as to disincentivize the attacker from conducting such an attack (thereby protecting the model). In the context of MRCE [1] and DualCF [43], this approach would entail degrading the quality (as measured by widely used metrics such as validity and proximity [40]) of the generated CF explanations such that it becomes unattractive for an attacker to use CF explanations as part of the training dataset used for model extraction. However, we argue that such an approach is unsatisfactory to use in real-world applications since lowering the quality of CF explanations negatively affects our ability to provide meaningful and actionable recourse to negatively affected end-users.

Therefore, in this paper, we adopt a digital watermarking approach [21, 33] to protect against these model extraction attacks that use CF explanations. Our watermarking approach can ensure that unauthorized model extraction attacks that use CF explanations can be easily identified by the defender, while maintaining the quality of the generated CF explanations. *To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to develop a watermarking scheme for CF explanations for protecting against model extraction attacks.* We explain our novel watermarking approach in Section 4.

4 CFMark: A Watermarking Framework for CF Explanations

We propose CFMark, a novel watermarking framework for CF explanations to protect against model extraction attacks that use CF explanations. At a high level, CFMark consists of two stages: (i) *watermark embedding*: we design a watermarking function G_θ that can be used to embed imperceptible watermarks into the CF explanations that are generated by the CF explanation module used by the defender. Specifically, G_θ takes as input a CF explanation x^{cf} and outputs a watermarked

CF explanation $G_\theta(x^{\text{cf}})$. These watermarked CF explanations can later be easily detected if malicious users utilize these watermarked CFs as training data for conducting unauthorized model extraction attacks. (ii) *watermark detection*: we employ a pairwise t-test to accurately identify any third-party black-box ML model that is suspected to have been trained on our watermarked CF explanations (as part of a model extraction attack). Importantly, compared with prior methods that aggressively perturb the CF explanations, CFMark has little impact on the utility of CF explanations.

4.1 Stage 1: Watermark Embedding

In this paper, we assume that our watermarking function $G_\theta(x^{\text{cf}}) = x^{\text{cf}} + \theta$ adds a θ -perturbation to the input CF explanation x^{cf} (θ is a perturbation vector of the same size as x^{cf}). This θ -perturbation is chosen to simultaneously optimize two key objectives: (i) *detectability* - we want to maximize our chances of accurately detecting an extracted ML model that has been trained on the watermarked CF explanations; and (ii) *usability* - we want to minimize the loss in quality of CF explanations (as measured by change in validity) caused by the addition of this watermark (aka θ -perturbation).

Bi-Level Optimization for Learning Watermarking Function. Let f_{w^*} denote an extracted ML model that is trained by using an initial attack set $(x, y) \in D_x$ (that is used to query the defender’s ML model F_W) and the corresponding watermarked CF explanations and their predictions that are generated by the defender $D^{\text{cf}} = \{(x^{\text{cf}} + \theta, 1 - y) \mid (x, y) \in D_x\}$.

Then, we formalize our *detectability* objective as follows: (i) the probability output of f_{w^*} on the watermarked CF explanation $f_{w^*}(x^{\text{cf}} + \theta)$ should be higher than the probability output of f_{w^*} on the un-watermarked CF explanation $f_{w^*}(x^{\text{cf}})$. (ii) to maximize *detectability*, we should be choosing θ that maximizes the difference between the predictions returned (by the extracted ML model) on the watermarked ($f_{w^*}(x^{\text{cf}} + \theta)$) vs un-watermarked CF explanations ($f_{w^*}(x^{\text{cf}})$). Furthermore, our *detectability* objective should ensure that the probability output on watermarked CF explanation should be higher than the probability output on the un-watermarked CF explanation. To satisfy these considerations, we choose to *maximize* $\sum_{(x,y) \in D^{\text{cf}}} \log \left(\frac{f_{w^*}(x+\theta)}{f_{w^*}(x)} \right)$ as our *detectability* objective (we refer to this as the *poison loss*).

Next, we formalize the *usability* objective as follows: (i) to maximize *usability*, we should choose θ such that if the un-watermarked CF explanation (x^{cf}) was valid w.r.t. the proprietary ML model F_W , then the watermarked CF explanation ($x^{\text{cf}} + \theta$) should also remain valid on F_W . (ii) We formalize this notion by *minimizing* $\sum_{(x,y) \in D^{\text{cf}}} \text{KL}(F_W(x + \theta) \parallel F_W(x))$, the KL-divergence between the probability outputs returned by F_W on the watermarked vs un-watermarked CF explanations (we refer to this as the *validity loss*). Thus, we formulate the watermarking embedding process as this bi-level optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\theta} \sum_{(x,y) \in D^{\text{cf}}} \log \left(\frac{f_{w^*}(x + \theta)}{f_{w^*}(x)} \right) - \text{KL}(F_W(x + \theta) \parallel F_W(x)), \\ & \text{s.t. } w^*(\theta) = \arg \min_w \sum_{(x,y) \in D^x} \mathcal{L}(f_w(x), y) + \sum_{(x,y) \in D^{\text{cf}}} \mathcal{L}(f_w(x + \theta), y) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where the inner (min) problem solves the model extraction problem faced by an adversary that tries to use attack data points along with the watermarked CF explanations as training data to extract the enterprise’s ML model. On the other hand, the outer (max) problem jointly optimizes the *detectability* and *usability* objectives required for good watermarking.

4.1.1 Improving Generalizability and Preventing Overfitting

Unfortunately, optimizing Equation 1 leads to poor generalization and overfitting. To address this problem, we propose two key techniques: (i) regularization, and (ii) *data augmentation*.

Regularization. Our preliminary experiments with optimizing the bi-level formulation in Equation 1 resulted in learning θ -perturbations that resulted in lots of false positives (at the time of watermark detection). In particular, with our learned θ -perturbations, our watermark detection system (explained in Section 4.2) had a high *true positive rate* (i.e., accurate identification of extracted ML models that used watermarked CF explanations as training data). Unfortunately, our watermark detection system also had a high *false positive rate* (i.e., falsely flagging a benign model that does not use watermarked

CF explanations as training data). This behavior is undesirable because it might lead to unnecessary false alarms; a model trained using normal data collection procedures might be falsely flagged as a model extracted without authorization by an adversary.

This high false positive rate is attributable to the fact that optimizing Equation 1 results in θ -perturbations that overfit to the extracted ML model f_{w^*} that is trained on both input examples D^x and CF explanations D^{cf} . To prevent this overfitting problem, we incorporate a regularization penalty term in our objective function. This regularization term is similar to our poison loss objective - it aims to minimize the difference in probability output between watermarked and un-watermarked CF explanations by a *benign* ML model $f_{w_2^*}$ that has not been trained using watermarked CF explanations. At a high level, this regularization term ensures that our learned θ -perturbation does not result in our watermarking detection system falsely flagging benign ML models that have not been trained on watermarked CF explanations (thereby resulting in fewer false positives).

Data Augmentation to Improve Generalizability. Furthermore, to ensure that the learned θ -perturbation does not overfit to our extracted ML model (that is trained on D^x and D^{cf}), we enrich the training data used to train the extracted ML model by including sampled data points from the defender’s proprietary training dataset D_t (which is feasible since the watermarking generation problem will be solved by the defender who has access to their training dataset). In addition, we experiment with using an ensemble of extraction models inside the bi-level formulation so that the generated watermarks can be optimized against a diverse ensemble of extracted models (as opposed to optimization against a single extracted model). To create this ensemble, we retrain the extracted model multiple times, each of which is initialized with a different set of model parameters. Both these steps help in making extracted models more realistic and prevent overfitting against adversarially extracted ML models.

4.1.2 CFMark: Our Watermarking Algorithm

Finally, we derive our new watermarking embedding formulation:

$$\max_{\theta} \sum_{(x,y) \in D^{cf}} 2 \cdot \underbrace{\log \left(\frac{f_{w_1^*}(x+\theta)}{f_{w_1^*}(x)} \right)}_{\text{Poison Loss}} - \underbrace{\text{KL}(F_W(x+\theta) \parallel F_W(x))}_{\text{Validity Loss}} - \lambda \cdot \underbrace{\log \left(\frac{f_{w_2^*}(x+\theta)}{f_{w_2^*}(x)} \right)}_{\text{Regularization}}, \quad (2)$$

$$\text{s.t. } w_1^* = \arg \min_{w_1} \sum_{(x,y) \in D^x} \mathcal{L}(f_{w_1}(x), y) + \sum_{(x,y) \in D^{cf}} \mathcal{L}(f_{w_1}(x+\theta), y) + \sum_{(x,y) \in D^t} \mathcal{L}(f_{w_1}(x), y) \quad (3)$$

$$w_2^* = \arg \min_{w_2} \sum_{(x,y) \in D^x} \mathcal{L}(f_{w_2}(x), y) + \sum_{(x,y) \in D^t} \mathcal{L}(f_{w_2}(x), y). \quad (4)$$

where λ is a hyperparameter which controls regularization strength.

Algorithm 1 outlines the optimization of the bi-level problem in Equation 2-4. This bi-level formulation can be efficiently solved by alternating the optimization of the inner- and outer- problems using unrolling pipelines [29, 9], which has been applied to many ML problems with a bi-level formulation, e.g., meta-learning [7], poisoning attacks [13], and distributionally robust optimization [10]. We iteratively solve this bi-level optimization problem via T outer steps. At each step, we first update the weights of each ensemble models using the watermarked data $\mathbf{x} + \delta$ via K unrolling steps of gradient descent. Next, we maximize the adversarial loss and project δ into the feasible region Δ . Crucially, when calculating the gradient of adversarial loss (outer problem) with respect to data shift δ , we look ahead in the inner problem for a few forward steps and then back-propagate to the initial unrolling step. We do this because we use K unrolling steps of gradient descent, as opposed to full-blown gradient descent till convergence.

4.2 Ownership Verification

Now, we describe how to verify whether a suspicious model is trained on watermarked CF explanations. We assume that the defenders have query access to the suspicious model to obtain the predicted probability of each input. We use the following null hypothesis significance testing (NHST) scheme (Proposition 1 to identify whether a model is trained on watermarked CF explanations.

Algorithm 1 Watermarking Algorithm

- 1: **Hyperparameters:** learning rates η , step size α , # of watermarking steps T , # of unrolling steps K , maximum perturbation E , # of ensembles M
- 2: **Input:** A batch of inputs $(x, y) \in D^x$ and their corresponding unwatermarked CF explanations $(x, y) \in D^{\text{cf}}$, M randomly initialized models $\{w_1^{(i)}\}_i^M, \{w_2^{(i)}\}_i^M$
- 3: **Initialize:** Init δ with zeros
- 4: **for** $m = 1 \rightarrow M$ models **do**
- 5: **for** $i = 1 \rightarrow T$ steps **do**
- 6: **for** $k = 1 \rightarrow K$ unroll steps **do**
- 7: Update $w_1^{(m)}$ on Eq. 3 and $w_2^{(m)}$ on Eq. 4 using Adam
- 8: **end for**
- 9: Calculate and store the outer loss in Eq 2 as \mathcal{L}_m
- 10: **end for**
- 11: Average the outer loss $\mathcal{L} = \sum_{m=1}^M \mathcal{L}_m / M$
- 12: $\delta \leftarrow \delta + \alpha \cdot \text{sign}(\nabla_{\delta} \mathcal{L})$
- 13: Project δ onto the l_{∞} -norm ball.
- 14: **end for**
- 15: **return** θ', δ

Proposition 1. Suppose p_x is the posterior probability of x predicted by the suspicious model. Let x^{cf} to be the unwatermarked counterfactual explanations, and \hat{x}^{cf} to be the watermarked counterfactual explanations. Given the null hypothesis $H_0 : p_{x^{\text{cf}}} = p_{\hat{x}^{\text{cf}}} + \tau$ ($H_1 : p_x^{\text{cf}} > p_{\hat{x}^{\text{cf}}} + \tau$), where τ is a hyper-parameter, we claim that the suspicious model is trained on counterfactual explanations (with τ -certainty) if and only if H_0 is rejected.

5 Experimental Evaluation

Datasets. To evaluate the performance of our watermarking framework, we use three real-world datasets: (i) *Cancer* [5] derived from the Breast Cancer Wisconsin (Diagnostic) dataset contains 569 instances and uses cell nuclei characteristics to classify tumors as malignant ($Y=1$) or benign ($Y=0$). (ii) *Credit* dataset [46] contains 30,000 instances and focuses on predicting whether a borrower will default on their payments ($Y=1$) or not ($Y=0$) based on historical payment records. (iii) *HELOC* dataset [6] collects anonymized Home Equity Line of Credit applications from real homeowners. This contains 10,459 instances, and the classifier predicts whether an applicant will repay their HELOC account within 2 years ($Y=1$) or not ($Y=0$) based on their application information.

CF Methods & Attacker Models. We evaluate CFMark against three model extraction methods: (i) *Querying* attack does not use CF explanations; instead it only uses the inputs and predictions pair D^x for training the extracted ML model. (ii) *MRCE* [1] adopts both inputs D^x and the corresponding CF explanations D^{cf} for training the extracted ML model. (iii) *DualCF* [43] adopts both CF explanations D^{cf} and their dual CF explanations \hat{D}^{cf} for training the extracted ML model.

We use three widely used CF methods for benchmarking: (i) *C-CHVAE* [26] is a parametric approach that generates CF explanations by perturbing the latent variables of a Variational Autoencoder (VAE) model until a valid CF example is found. (ii) *DiCE* [24] is a non-parametric method that generates diverse CF explanations by learning a distribution of potential CFs around the original instance. (iii) *GrowingSphere* [20] is another non-parametric method that employs a random search algorithm to generate valid recourses by sampling points around the input instance.

Evaluation Metrics & Procedure. To evaluate ownership verification, we calculate the difference of the output probability P_{Δ} between watermarked and unwatermarked CFs (i.e., $P_{\Delta} = f_w(\hat{x}^{\text{cf}}) - f_w(x^{\text{cf}})$) and the corresponding t-test p -value. Higher P_{Δ} and lower p -value (less than 0.05) indicate true positives, i.e., the extracted models are indeed trained on the watermarked CF explanations.

Furthermore, we design the following meta-experiment to evaluate the robustness of our ownership verification framework against unauthorized model extraction attacks: We first generated ten bootstrapped subsets from the original test set. Each subset was then used to simulate a model extraction attack (i.e., 10 extracted models for each attack per method per dataset). We consider

that our watermarking detection system outputs a *positive* (i.e., flags a model as being trained on watermarked CFs) if the p -value of the ownership verification is less than 0.05. Otherwise, we consider the output of our detection system as *negative*. When compared with the ground-truth positives (i.e., all extracted models that use MRCE and DualCF) and ground-truth negatives (i.e., all extracted models that use Querying attack), we are able to calculate numbers for true/false positives and true/false negatives. Using these numbers, we finally report the F1-score across a total of 270 meta-experiments (10 subsets \times 3 attacks \times 3 datasets \times 3 CF methods) as our evaluation metric to quantify our watermarking framework’s ability to identify unauthorized model extraction attacks.

To evaluate the utility of counterfactual explanations, we adopt two widely used metrics: (i) *Validity*, which measures the fraction of valid CF explanations x^{cf} with respect to F_W ; (ii) *Proximity*, which computes the l_1 distance between the input x and its corresponding CF explanation x^{cf} .


Validity & Proximity. Table 1 compares the validity and proximity of original (i.e., unwatermarked) x^{cf} and watermarked CF explanations \hat{x}^{cf} . The results demonstrate that watermarking CF explanations only introduces a minor degradation in quality. Specifically, watermarked CF explanations exhibit a 1% decrease in validity and a 1% increase in proximity compared to their unwatermarked counterparts. This result suggests that watermarking CF explanations provides a robust defense mechanism while preserving the utility of the explanations.

Watermarking Performance. Table 2 shows that our model ownership verification is highly effective across all datasets, CF methods, and attack methods. Specifically, our method can accurately identify unauthorized usage of CF explanations in model extraction attacks with high confidence (i.e., p -value \ll 0.01) across both MRCE and DualCF attacks. Additionally, our method does not misjudge models that do not use CF explanations for training models, as evident in the query attack, where the p -value is close to 1. On the other hand, random perturbations to CF explanations are clearly ineffective as they achieve a high p -value in all cases.

Furthermore, Table 3 shows that our watermarking scheme is quite accurate at identifying true positives and true negatives. DiCE, Growing Sphere, and C-CHVAE achieve an average F1-score of 0.94, 0.89, and 0.74 (respectively) across all three datasets.

Table 1: Evaluation of the CF Explanations.

CF Method		Dummy		Credit		HELOC	
		Val.	Prox.	Val.	Prox.	Val.	Prox.
CCHVAE	Org.	1.0	1.10	1.0	4.40	1.0	3.73
	WM.	.97	1.11	.98	4.42	.94	3.43
DiCE	Org.	.99	0.96	.90	3.98	.90	8.39
	WM.	.98	0.98	.90	4.05	.89	8.43
Growing Sphere	Org.	1.0	0.92	.99	5.18	1.0	3.67
	WM.	.96	0.93	.98	5.21	.98	3.73



(a) The impact of λ on *credit* dataset.

(b) The impact of data augmentation on *credit* dataset.

Figure 2: Analyzing the Impact of Regularization and Data Augmentation on CFMark

Understanding the Impact of Regularization & Data Augmentation. We demonstrate the importance of regularization trade-off parameter λ in Figure 2a. The X-axis shows varying λ values, and Y-axis shows P_Δ achieved with DiCE explanation method. This figure shows that when λ is set to 0 (i.e., no regularization), the Query attack also achieves a high P_Δ value (due to overfitting), due to which our watermarking detection scheme outputs a false positive. Increasing values of λ decreases the P_Δ value for the Query attack faster as compared to MRCE and DualCF attacks, thereby illustrating that our regularization penalty helps alleviate the problem of false positives. Similarly, Figure 2b shows the impact of data augmentation (i.e., using sampled training data D_t to train extracted model)

Table 2: Evaluation of the watermarking performance between random perturbation (i.e., Rand.) and CFMark (i.e., WM.). *High P_Δ and low p -value* implies that the extracted models are trained using watermarked CF explanations.

CF Method	Dataset	Metric	Query		MRCE		DualCF	
			Rand.	WM.	Rand.	WM.	Rand.	WM.
C-CHVAE	Dummy	P_Δ	0.0430	0.0640	0.0394	0.1161	-0.011	0.1266
		p -value	1.0000	1.000	1.0000	0.0005	1.0000	10^{-7}
	Credit	P_Δ	0.0043	-0.065	0.0110	0.1127	0.0161	0.1268
		p -value	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	10^{-8}	1.0000	10^{-23}
	HELOC	P_Δ	0.0109	0.0448	0.0099	0.0829	0.0042	0.0781
		p -value	1.0000	0.9995	1.0000	10^{-91}	1.0000	10^{-68}
DiCE	Dummy	P_Δ	0.0122	0.0270	0.0066	0.0572	0.0076	0.0539
		p -value	1.0000	1.000	1.0000	10^{-7}	1.0000	0.0031
	Credit	P_Δ	0.0087	0.0118	0.0069	0.0702	0.0067	0.0578
		p -value	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	10^{-41}	1.0000	10^{-12}
	HELOC	P_Δ	0.0029	0.096	0.0022	0.1102	0.0024	0.1041
		p -value	1.0000	0.9999	1.0000	10^{-54}	1.0000	10^{-19}
Growing Sphere	Dummy	P_Δ	0.0879	0.0385	0.0485	0.0601	0.0399	0.0561
		p -value	0.9746	0.9911	0.6281	0.0075	0.9963	0.0194
	Credit	P_Δ	0.0079	0.0015	0.0076	0.0558	0.0098	0.0686
		p -value	1.0000	1.000	1.0000	0.0031	1.0000	10^{-15}
	HELOC	P_Δ	0.0058	0.0298	0.0097	0.0857	0.0066	0.0902
		p -value	1.0000	1.000	1.0000	10^{-64}	1.0000	10^{-86}

Table 3: F-1 Score of the CFMark detectability. A higher F-1 score indicates higher success in identifying model extraction that uses watermarked CF explanations to train a private model.

CF Method	Cancer	Credit	HELOC
C-CHVAE	0.89	0.46	0.87
DiCE	0.93	1.00	0.89
Growing Sphere	1.00	0.82	0.85

on P_Δ against the MRCE attack. This figure shows that using data augmentation really helps achieve significantly better performance against the C-CHVAE explanation method, while it does not make a significant difference against DiCE (DiverseCF) and Growing Sphere.

6 Discussion & Conclusion

CFMark provides the first watermarking framework for counterfactual explanations as a defense mechanism for unauthorized model extraction attacks. However, this work has two primary limitations. First, we focus on watermarking tabular datasets. Future research should explore extending CFMark to handle other data modalities. Second, while our quantitative results show that CFMark does not compromise the utility of watermarked CF explanations, we do not evaluate its impact through a user study. A human-centered evaluation is needed to understand the impact on the interpretability of these explanations, and its broader impact on society when deployed.

In this paper, we propose the *first* watermarking framework for counterfactual explanations to identify unauthorized model extraction attacks. We formulate this watermarking framework as a bi-level optimization problem, which embeds an indistinguishable watermark into the CF explanations. These watermarks can be subsequently detected using a pairwise t-test to identify models trained on the watermarked data for model ownership verification. Empirical results demonstrate that our framework can achieve reliable identifiability, without compromising the utility of counterfactual explanations.

References

- [1] Aivodji, U., Bolot, A., and Gambis, S. (2020). Model extraction from counterfactual explanations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.01884*.
- [2] Bhatt, U., Xiang, A., Sharma, S., Weller, A., Taly, A., Jia, Y., Ghosh, J., Puri, R., Moura, J. M., and Eckersley, P. (2020). Explainable machine learning in deployment. In *Proceedings of the 2020 conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, pages 648–657.
- [3] Bradbury, J., Frostig, R., Hawkins, P., Johnson, M. J., Leary, C., Maclaurin, D., Necula, G., Paszke, A., VanderPlas, J., Wanderman-Milne, S., and Zhang, Q. (2018). JAX: composable transformations of Python+NumPy programs.
- [4] Chandrasekaran, V., Chaudhuri, K., Giacomelli, I., Jha, S., and Yan, S. (2020). Exploring connections between active learning and model extraction. In *29th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 20)*, pages 1309–1326.
- [5] Dua, D. and Graff, C. (2017). UCI machine learning repository.
- [6] FICO (2018). Explainable machine learning challenge. <https://community.fico.com/s/explainable-machine-learning-challenge>.
- [7] Finn, C., Abbeel, P., and Levine, S. (2017). Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1126–1135. PMLR.
- [8] Goethals, S., Sörensen, K., and Martens, D. (2023). The privacy issue of counterfactual explanations: explanation linkage attacks. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*, 14(5):1–24.
- [9] Gu, A., Lu, S., Ram, P., and Weng, L. (2022). Min-max bilevel multi-objective optimization with applications in machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.01924*.
- [10] Guo, H., Jia, F., Chen, J., Squicciarini, A., and Yadav, A. (2023a). Rocoursenet: Robust training of a prediction aware recourse model. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, CIKM '23*, page 619–628, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [11] Guo, H., Nguyen, T. H., and Yadav, A. (2023b). Counternet: End-to-end training of prediction aware counterfactual explanations. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, KDD '23*, page 577–589, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [12] Guo, H., Xiong, X., Zhang, W., and Yadav, A. (2023c). Relax: An efficient and scalable recourse explanation benchmarking library using jax. In *XAI in Action: Past, Present, and Future Applications*.
- [13] Huang, W. R., Geiping, J., Fowl, L., Taylor, G., and Goldstein, T. (2020). Metapoison: Practical general-purpose clean-label data poisoning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:12080–12091.
- [14] Jagielski, M., Carlini, N., Berthelot, D., Kurakin, A., and Papernot, N. (2020). High accuracy and high fidelity extraction of neural networks. In *29th USENIX security symposium (USENIX Security 20)*, pages 1345–1362.
- [15] Jia, H., Choquette-Choo, C. A., Chandrasekaran, V., and Papernot, N. (2021). Entangled watermarks as a defense against model extraction. In *30th USENIX security symposium (USENIX Security 21)*, pages 1937–1954.
- [16] Juuti, M., Szyller, S., Marchal, S., and Asokan, N. (2019). Prada: protecting against dnn model stealing attacks. In *2019 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P)*, pages 512–527. IEEE.
- [17] Karimi, A.-H., Barthe, G., Schölkopf, B., and Valera, I. (2020). A survey of algorithmic recourse: definitions, formulations, solutions, and prospects. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.04050*.

- [18] Karimi, A.-H., Schölkopf, B., and Valera, I. (2021). Algorithmic recourse: from counterfactual explanations to interventions. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 353–362.
- [19] Kirchenbauer, J., Geiping, J., Wen, Y., Katz, J., Miers, I., and Goldstein, T. (2023). A watermark for large language models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 17061–17084. PMLR.
- [20] Laugel, T., Lesot, M.-J., Marsala, C., Renard, X., and Detyniecki, M. (2017). Inverse classification for comparison-based interpretability in machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.08443*.
- [21] Li, Y., Bai, Y., Jiang, Y., Yang, Y., Xia, S.-T., and Li, B. (2022). Untargeted backdoor watermark: Towards harmless and stealthy dataset copyright protection. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:13238–13250.
- [22] Madry, A., Makelov, A., Schmidt, L., Tsipras, D., and Vladu, A. (2018). Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [23] Mahajan, D., Tan, C., and Sharma, A. (2019). Preserving causal constraints in counterfactual explanations for machine learning classifiers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.03277*.
- [24] Mothilal, R. K., Sharma, A., and Tan, C. (2020). Explaining machine learning classifiers through diverse counterfactual explanations. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 607–617.
- [25] Pal, S., Gupta, Y., Shukla, A., Kanade, A., Shevade, S., and Ganapathy, V. (2020). Activethief: Model extraction using active learning and unannotated public data. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pages 865–872.
- [26] Pawelczyk, M., Broelemann, K., and Kasneci, G. (2020). Learning model-agnostic counterfactual explanations for tabular data. In *Proceedings of The Web Conference 2020*, pages 3126–3132.
- [27] Pawelczyk, M., Lakkaraju, H., and Neel, S. (2023). On the privacy risks of algorithmic recourse. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 9680–9696. PMLR.
- [28] Pedregosa, F., Varoquaux, G., Gramfort, A., Michel, V., Thirion, B., Grisel, O., Blondel, M., Prettenhofer, P., Weiss, R., Dubourg, V., et al. (2011). Scikit-learn: Machine learning in python. *the Journal of machine Learning research*, 12:2825–2830.
- [29] Shaban, A., Cheng, C.-A., Hatch, N., and Boots, B. (2019). Truncated back-propagation for bilevel optimization. In *The 22nd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1723–1732. PMLR.
- [30] Shang, R., Feng, K. K., and Shah, C. (2022). Why am i not seeing it? understanding users’ needs for counterfactual explanations in everyday recommendations. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 1330–1340.
- [31] Shokri, R., Strobel, M., and Zick, Y. (2021). On the privacy risks of model explanations. In *Proceedings of the 2021 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, pages 231–241.
- [32] Sokol, K. and Flach, P. (2019). Counterfactual explanations of machine learning predictions: opportunities and challenges for ai safety. In *2019 AAAI Workshop on Artificial Intelligence Safety, SafeAI 2019*. CEUR Workshop Proceedings.
- [33] Song, C., Ristenpart, T., and Shmatikov, V. (2017). Machine learning models that remember too much. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on computer and communications security*, pages 587–601.
- [34] Stepin, I., Alonso, J. M., Catala, A., and Pereira-Fariña, M. (2021). A survey of contrastive and counterfactual explanation generation methods for explainable artificial intelligence. *IEEE Access*, 9:11974–12001.

- [35] Szyller, S., Atli, B. G., Marchal, S., and Asokan, N. (2021). Dawn: Dynamic adversarial watermarking of neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, pages 4417–4425.
- [36] Tramèr, F., Zhang, F., Juels, A., Reiter, M. K., and Ristenpart, T. (2016). Stealing machine learning models via prediction {APIs}. In *25th USENIX security symposium (USENIX Security 16)*, pages 601–618.
- [37] Upadhyay, S., Joshi, S., and Lakkaraju, H. (2021). Towards robust and reliable algorithmic recourse. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34.
- [38] Ustun, B., Spangher, A., and Liu, Y. (2019). Actionable recourse in linear classification. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 10–19.
- [39] Van Looveren, A. and Klaise, J. (2019). Interpretable counterfactual explanations guided by prototypes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.02584*.
- [40] Verma, S., Dickerson, J., and Hines, K. (2020). Counterfactual explanations for machine learning: A review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.10596*.
- [41] Vo, V., Le, T., Nguyen, V., Zhao, H., Bonilla, E. V., Haffari, G., and Phung, D. (2023). Feature-based learning for diverse and privacy-preserving counterfactual explanations. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 2211–2222.
- [42] Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., and Russell, C. (2017). Counterfactual explanations without opening the black box: Automated decisions and the gdpr. *Harv. JL & Tech.*, 31:841.
- [43] Wang, Y., Qian, H., and Miao, C. (2022). Dualcf: Efficient model extraction attack from counterfactual explanations. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 1318–1329.
- [44] Yang, F., Alva, S. S., Chen, J., and Hu, X. (2021). Model-based counterfactual synthesizer for interpretation. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, KDD '21, page 1964–1974, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [45] Yang, F., Feng, Q., Zhou, K., Chen, J., and Hu, X. (2022). Differentially private counterfactuals via functional mechanism. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.02878*.
- [46] Yeh, I.-C. and Lien, C.-h. (2009). The comparisons of data mining techniques for the predictive accuracy of probability of default of credit card clients. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 36(2):2473–2480.
- [47] Yu, H., Yang, K., Zhang, T., Tsai, Y.-Y., Ho, T.-Y., and Jin, Y. (2020). Cloudleak: Large-scale deep learning models stealing through adversarial examples. In *NDSS*, volume 38, page 102.




Figure 3: The influence of the regularization term λ on the *credit* dataset.

A Implementation Details

Here we provide implementation details of our proposed framework on three datasets listed in Section 5. We provide the code, dataset, and experiment logs in the supplemental material, or be accessed in this repository: <https://github.com/BirkhoffG/CFMark>.

Software and Hardware Specifications. All experiments are run using Python (v3.10.10) with `jax` (v0.4.20) [3], `scikit-learn` (v1.2.2) [28], and `jax-relax` (v0.2.7) [12] for the implementations. All our experiments were run on an Ubuntu 22.04.4 LTS virtual machine on the Google Cloud Platform with an Nvidia V100 GPU.

Feature Engineering. We use the default feature engineering pipeline provided in `jax-relax` [12]. Specifically, for continuous features, we scale all feature values into the $[0, 1]$ range. To handle the categorical features, we transform the categorical features into numerical representations via one-hot encoding. Note that during the watermarking procedure, we treat the categorical features as immutable features, i.e., we do not add perturbations to the categorical features.

Hyperparameters. For all three datasets and CF methods, we run $T = 50$ steps for watermarking CF explanations, and set $E = 0.05$ as the maximum perturbation. The step size $\alpha = 2.5 \times \delta/T$ (based on [22]) for solving the bi-level problem in Equation 2-4. On the attack side, the model extractors have a maximum of 128 queries for extracting models reported in Table 2. In addition, Table 4 provides a detailed overview of the hyperparameters used for each dataset and CF method.


Table 4: Hyperparameters for each dataset.

CF Method	Dataset	Batch Size	k	learning rate	τ	Ensembles
C-CHVAE	Dummy	64	10	0.01	0.1	8
	Credit	16	10	0.01	0.1	8
	HELOC	128	5	0.1	0.05	32
DiCE	Dummy	128	10	0.03	0.05	8
	Credit	64	10	0.01	0.05	8
	HELOC	64	5	0.1	0.1	8
Growing Sphere	Dummy	128	5	0.05	0.05	16
	Credit	64	10	0.01	0.05	8
	HELOC	128	5	0.1	0.05	16


B Additional Results

Confusion Matrix. Figure 4 highlights the detectability achieved by CFMark. Notably, CFMark achieves high True Positive and True Negative across all three CF methods and datasets. This result highlights the effectiveness of CFMark in watermarking CF explanations.


Loss curve. Figure 5 shows the loss curve of crafting watermarks on CF explanations generated from CCHVAE, DiCE, and Growing Sphere across three datasets. The watermarking procedure is stable.



(a) Confusion matrix of three datasets on CCHVAE.




(b) Confusion matrix of three datasets on DiCE.




(c) Confusion matrix of three datasets on Growing Sphere.


Figure 4: Confusion matrix of identifying unauthorized model extraction attacks through CF explanations from CCHVAE, DiCE, and Growing Sphere across three datasets.



(a) Loss curves on the *dummy* dataset.



(b) Loss curves on the *credit* dataset.



(c) Loss curves on the *HELOC* dataset.

Figure 5: Loss curves of crafting watermarks on CF explanations generated from CCHVAE, DiCE, and Growing Sphere across three datasets.

NeurIPS Paper Checklist

1. Claims

Question: Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper's contributions and scope?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: All of the claims in the abstract and introduction reflect the paper's contributions and scope, which are elaborated in the remaining paper.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the abstract and introduction do not include the claims made in the paper.
- The abstract and/or introduction should clearly state the claims made, including the contributions made in the paper and important assumptions and limitations. A No or NA answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers.
- The claims made should match theoretical and experimental results, and reflect how much the results can be expected to generalize to other settings.
- It is fine to include aspirational goals as motivation as long as it is clear that these goals are not attained by the paper.

2. Limitations

Question: Does the paper discuss the limitations of the work performed by the authors?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We discuss the limitations in Section 6.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper has no limitation while the answer No means that the paper has limitations, but those are not discussed in the paper.
- The authors are encouraged to create a separate "Limitations" section in their paper.
- The paper should point out any strong assumptions and how robust the results are to violations of these assumptions (e.g., independence assumptions, noiseless settings, model well-specification, asymptotic approximations only holding locally). The authors should reflect on how these assumptions might be violated in practice and what the implications would be.
- The authors should reflect on the scope of the claims made, e.g., if the approach was only tested on a few datasets or with a few runs. In general, empirical results often depend on implicit assumptions, which should be articulated.
- The authors should reflect on the factors that influence the performance of the approach. For example, a facial recognition algorithm may perform poorly when image resolution is low or images are taken in low lighting. Or a speech-to-text system might not be used reliably to provide closed captions for online lectures because it fails to handle technical jargon.
- The authors should discuss the computational efficiency of the proposed algorithms and how they scale with dataset size.
- If applicable, the authors should discuss possible limitations of their approach to address problems of privacy and fairness.
- While the authors might fear that complete honesty about limitations might be used by reviewers as grounds for rejection, a worse outcome might be that reviewers discover limitations that aren't acknowledged in the paper. The authors should use their best judgment and recognize that individual actions in favor of transparency play an important role in developing norms that preserve the integrity of the community. Reviewers will be specifically instructed to not penalize honesty concerning limitations.

3. Theory Assumptions and Proofs

Question: For each theoretical result, does the paper provide the full set of assumptions and a complete (and correct) proof?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: This paper does not contain theoretical results, but the propositions and formulas are numbered.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include theoretical results.
- All the theorems, formulas, and proofs in the paper should be numbered and cross-referenced.
- All assumptions should be clearly stated or referenced in the statement of any theorems.
- The proofs can either appear in the main paper or the supplemental material, but if they appear in the supplemental material, the authors are encouraged to provide a short proof sketch to provide intuition.
- Inversely, any informal proof provided in the core of the paper should be complemented by formal proofs provided in appendix or supplemental material.
- Theorems and Lemmas that the proof relies upon should be properly referenced.

4. Experimental Result Reproducibility

Question: Does the paper fully disclose all the information needed to reproduce the main experimental results of the paper to the extent that it affects the main claims and/or conclusions of the paper (regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not)?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: This paper discloses all the necessary information to reproduce the experiments, including the experiment procedure, software versions, and runtime environments in the Appendix. In addition, we provide code and data to facilitate the reproduction.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- If the paper includes experiments, a No answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers: Making the paper reproducible is important, regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not.
- If the contribution is a dataset and/or model, the authors should describe the steps taken to make their results reproducible or verifiable.
- Depending on the contribution, reproducibility can be accomplished in various ways. For example, if the contribution is a novel architecture, describing the architecture fully might suffice, or if the contribution is a specific model and empirical evaluation, it may be necessary to either make it possible for others to replicate the model with the same dataset, or provide access to the model. In general, releasing code and data is often one good way to accomplish this, but reproducibility can also be provided via detailed instructions for how to replicate the results, access to a hosted model (e.g., in the case of a large language model), releasing of a model checkpoint, or other means that are appropriate to the research performed.
- While NeurIPS does not require releasing code, the conference does require all submissions to provide some reasonable avenue for reproducibility, which may depend on the nature of the contribution. For example
 - (a) If the contribution is primarily a new algorithm, the paper should make it clear how to reproduce that algorithm.
 - (b) If the contribution is primarily a new model architecture, the paper should describe the architecture clearly and fully.
 - (c) If the contribution is a new model (e.g., a large language model), then there should either be a way to access this model for reproducing the results or a way to reproduce the model (e.g., with an open-source dataset or instructions for how to construct the dataset).
 - (d) We recognize that reproducibility may be tricky in some cases, in which case authors are welcome to describe the particular way they provide for reproducibility. In the case of closed-source models, it may be that access to the model is limited in some way (e.g., to registered users), but it should be possible for other researchers to have some path to reproducing or verifying the results.

5. Open access to data and code

Question: Does the paper provide open access to the data and code, with sufficient instructions to faithfully reproduce the main experimental results, as described in supplemental material?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We provide the data, code, and experiment logs in supplemental material.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that paper does not include experiments requiring code.
- Please see the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://nips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- While we encourage the release of code and data, we understand that this might not be possible, so “No” is an acceptable answer. Papers cannot be rejected simply for not including code, unless this is central to the contribution (e.g., for a new open-source benchmark).
- The instructions should contain the exact command and environment needed to run to reproduce the results. See the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://nips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- The authors should provide instructions on data access and preparation, including how to access the raw data, preprocessed data, intermediate data, and generated data, etc.
- The authors should provide scripts to reproduce all experimental results for the new proposed method and baselines. If only a subset of experiments are reproducible, they should state which ones are omitted from the script and why.
- At submission time, to preserve anonymity, the authors should release anonymized versions (if applicable).
- Providing as much information as possible in supplemental material (appended to the paper) is recommended, but including URLs to data and code is permitted.

6. Experimental Setting/Details

Question: Does the paper specify all the training and test details (e.g., data splits, hyper-parameters, how they were chosen, type of optimizer, etc.) necessary to understand the results?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We specify the experimental details in Section 5 and Appendix A.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The experimental setting should be presented in the core of the paper to a level of detail that is necessary to appreciate the results and make sense of them.
- The full details can be provided either with the code, in appendix, or as supplemental material.

7. Experiment Statistical Significance

Question: Does the paper report error bars suitably and correctly defined or other appropriate information about the statistical significance of the experiments?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We use a pairwise t-test for ownership verification.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The authors should answer "Yes" if the results are accompanied by error bars, confidence intervals, or statistical significance tests, at least for the experiments that support the main claims of the paper.
- The factors of variability that the error bars are capturing should be clearly stated (for example, train/test split, initialization, random drawing of some parameter, or overall run with given experimental conditions).
- The method for calculating the error bars should be explained (closed form formula, call to a library function, bootstrap, etc.)

- The assumptions made should be given (e.g., Normally distributed errors).
- It should be clear whether the error bar is the standard deviation or the standard error of the mean.
- It is OK to report 1-sigma error bars, but one should state it. The authors should preferably report a 2-sigma error bar than state that they have a 96% CI, if the hypothesis of Normality of errors is not verified.
- For asymmetric distributions, the authors should be careful not to show in tables or figures symmetric error bars that would yield results that are out of range (e.g. negative error rates).
- If error bars are reported in tables or plots, The authors should explain in the text how they were calculated and reference the corresponding figures or tables in the text.

8. Experiments Compute Resources

Question: For each experiment, does the paper provide sufficient information on the computer resources (type of compute workers, memory, time of execution) needed to reproduce the experiments?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We specify the compute details in Appendix A.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The paper should indicate the type of compute workers CPU or GPU, internal cluster, or cloud provider, including relevant memory and storage.
- The paper should provide the amount of compute required for each of the individual experimental runs as well as estimate the total compute.
- The paper should disclose whether the full research project required more compute than the experiments reported in the paper (e.g., preliminary or failed experiments that didn't make it into the paper).

9. Code Of Ethics

Question: Does the research conducted in the paper conform, in every respect, with the NeurIPS Code of Ethics <https://neurips.cc/public/EthicsGuidelines?>

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We conduct the research in the paper that conforms with the NeurIPS Code of Ethics.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the authors have not reviewed the NeurIPS Code of Ethics.
- If the authors answer No, they should explain the special circumstances that require a deviation from the Code of Ethics.
- The authors should make sure to preserve anonymity (e.g., if there is a special consideration due to laws or regulations in their jurisdiction).

10. Broader Impacts

Question: Does the paper discuss both potential positive societal impacts and negative societal impacts of the work performed?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We discuss the social impact in Section 6.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that there is no societal impact of the work performed.
- If the authors answer NA or No, they should explain why their work has no societal impact or why the paper does not address societal impact.
- Examples of negative societal impacts include potential malicious or unintended uses (e.g., disinformation, generating fake profiles, surveillance), fairness considerations (e.g., deployment of technologies that could make decisions that unfairly impact specific groups), privacy considerations, and security considerations.

- The conference expects that many papers will be foundational research and not tied to particular applications, let alone deployments. However, if there is a direct path to any negative applications, the authors should point it out. For example, it is legitimate to point out that an improvement in the quality of generative models could be used to generate deepfakes for disinformation. On the other hand, it is not needed to point out that a generic algorithm for optimizing neural networks could enable people to train models that generate Deepfakes faster.
- The authors should consider possible harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended and functioning correctly, harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended but gives incorrect results, and harms following from (intentional or unintentional) misuse of the technology.
- If there are negative societal impacts, the authors could also discuss possible mitigation strategies (e.g., gated release of models, providing defenses in addition to attacks, mechanisms for monitoring misuse, mechanisms to monitor how a system learns from feedback over time, improving the efficiency and accessibility of ML).

11. Safeguards

Question: Does the paper describe safeguards that have been put in place for responsible release of data or models that have a high risk for misuse (e.g., pretrained language models, image generators, or scraped datasets)?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: Our proposed watermarking framework does not pose such a threat.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper poses no such risks.
- Released models that have a high risk for misuse or dual-use should be released with necessary safeguards to allow for controlled use of the model, for example by requiring that users adhere to usage guidelines or restrictions to access the model or implementing safety filters.
- Datasets that have been scraped from the Internet could pose safety risks. The authors should describe how they avoided releasing unsafe images.
- We recognize that providing effective safeguards is challenging, and many papers do not require this, but we encourage authors to take this into account and make a best faith effort.

12. Licenses for existing assets

Question: Are the creators or original owners of assets (e.g., code, data, models), used in the paper, properly credited and are the license and terms of use explicitly mentioned and properly respected?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: All datasets and code used in this paper are publicly available and appropriately credited. We use open datasets and open-source code libraries, ensuring compliance with their respective licenses and terms of use.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not use existing assets.
- The authors should cite the original paper that produced the code package or dataset.
- The authors should state which version of the asset is used and, if possible, include a URL.
- The name of the license (e.g., CC-BY 4.0) should be included for each asset.
- For scraped data from a particular source (e.g., website), the copyright and terms of service of that source should be provided.
- If assets are released, the license, copyright information, and terms of use in the package should be provided. For popular datasets, paperswithcode.com/datasets has curated licenses for some datasets. Their licensing guide can help determine the license of a dataset.

- For existing datasets that are re-packaged, both the original license and the license of the derived asset (if it has changed) should be provided.
- If this information is not available online, the authors are encouraged to reach out to the asset’s creators.

13. **New Assets**

Question: Are new assets introduced in the paper well documented and is the documentation provided alongside the assets?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: This paper does not release new assets.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not release new assets.
- Researchers should communicate the details of the dataset/code/model as part of their submissions via structured templates. This includes details about training, license, limitations, etc.
- The paper should discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose asset is used.
- At submission time, remember to anonymize your assets (if applicable). You can either create an anonymized URL or include an anonymized zip file.

14. **Crowdsourcing and Research with Human Subjects**

Question: For crowdsourcing experiments and research with human subjects, does the paper include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if applicable, as well as details about compensation (if any)?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: This paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Including this information in the supplemental material is fine, but if the main contribution of the paper involves human subjects, then as much detail as possible should be included in the main paper.
- According to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics, workers involved in data collection, curation, or other labor should be paid at least the minimum wage in the country of the data collector.

15. **Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approvals or Equivalent for Research with Human Subjects**

Question: Does the paper describe potential risks incurred by study participants, whether such risks were disclosed to the subjects, and whether Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals (or an equivalent approval/review based on the requirements of your country or institution) were obtained?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: This paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Depending on the country in which research is conducted, IRB approval (or equivalent) may be required for any human subjects research. If you obtained IRB approval, you should clearly state this in the paper.
- We recognize that the procedures for this may vary significantly between institutions and locations, and we expect authors to adhere to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics and the guidelines for their institution.
- For initial submissions, do not include any information that would break anonymity (if applicable), such as the institution conducting the review.