

Exploring the Limitations of Detecting Machine-Generated Text

Jad Doughman¹, Osama Mohammed Afzal¹, Hawau Olamide Toyin¹,
Shady Shehata¹, Preslav Nakov¹, Zeerak Talat¹

¹Mohamed bin Zayed University of Artificial Intelligence
{jad.doughman, preslav.nakov, zeerak.talat}@mbzuai.ac.ae

Abstract

Recent improvements in the quality of the generations by large language models have spurred research into identifying machine-generated text. Systems proposed for the task often achieve high performance. However, humans and machines can produce text in different styles and in different domains, and it remains unclear whether machine generated-text detection models favour particular styles or domains. In this paper, we critically examine the classification performance for detecting machine-generated text by evaluating on texts with varying writing styles. We find that classifiers are highly sensitive to stylistic changes and differences in text complexity, and in some cases degrade entirely to random classifiers. We further find that detection systems are particularly susceptible to misclassify easy-to-read texts while they have high performance for complex texts.

1 Introduction

Rapid advancements in large language models (LLMs) have enabled the generation of text that mimics human writing in coherence and style, which can be used for benign (e.g., presenting an e-mail draft) or for nefarious purposes (e.g., to generate misinformation at scale). To mitigate the risks of machine-generated text (MGT), the Natural Language Processing (NLP) community has devoted efforts to building detectors for MGT (e.g., Wang et al., 2024; Koike et al., 2024; Abdalla et al., 2023). Such systems often achieve promising performance on in-domain datasets, but may not generalize to out-of-domain inputs (Wang et al., 2024). This suggests that detectors may be more apt for detecting MGT with certain stylistic tendencies. Here, we investigate the limitations of two state-of-the-art MGT detection methods. Specifically, we compute linguistic features and readability measures to subsample evaluation datasets and we compare existing models' performance on these subsets.

We find that classifiers are highly sensitive to the distribution of certain word classes, e.g., verbs and adverbs, and to writing style, including average sentence length and readability. For instance, by controlling the ratio of adverbs in human-written and MGT, the performance for both classes drops substantially: from 0.4 to 0.0, and from 0.6 to 0.3, respectively. Analyzing the feature importance, we find that classifiers over-rely on surface-level artefacts (e.g., punctuation). Our findings indicate that while detectors may work well in certain domains, their performance could be over-estimated. Thus, we argue that we should be careful when including such tools in critical societal setups, such as plagiarism detection in education.

2 Related Work

Prior work has sought to detect machine-generated work, some relying on feature-based methods (e.g., Fröhling and Zubiaga, 2021; Prova, 2024) while others used neural network-based approaches (Wang et al., 2024; Gaggar et al., 2023). Both have reported high performance, with the former achieving more than 80% accuracy (Prova, 2024; Fröhling and Zubiaga, 2021), and the latter over 90% (Wang et al., 2024; Prova, 2024). Often, three different types of features are relied upon for MGT: statistical distributions (e.g., log-likelihood) (Mitchell et al., 2023; Gehrmann et al., 2019), features obtained from fact-checking methods (Wang et al., 2024), and linguistic features (Tang et al., 2023).

Some work (e.g., Tang et al., 2023; Jawahar et al., 2022; Mitchell et al., 2023; Guo and Yu, 2023) has conducted comprehensive analysis of MGT detection methods and resources. Tang et al. (2023) emphasized the importance of developing measures for evaluating MGT detection. They discussed in detail how current evaluation measures (e.g., AUC and accuracy) only consider the average instance and are limiting for security analysis. Other work

Model	Trained	Tested	Macro F1-Score	Drop (%)
LR-GLTR	Arxiv (ChatGPT & Davinci)	Arxiv (ChatGPT)	0.95	-
	Arxiv (ChatGPT & Davinci)	Arxiv (Cohere)	0.92	↓ 3.16%
	Arxiv (ChatGPT & Davinci)	Arxiv (Davinci)	0.79	↓ 16.84%
	Arxiv (ChatGPT & Davinci)	OUTFOX (ChatGPT)	0.60	↓ 36.84%
	Arxiv (ChatGPT & Davinci)	IDMGSP (ChatGPT, Galactica)	0.53	↓ 42.11%
	OUTFOX (ChatGPT)	OUTFOX (ChatGPT)	0.91	-
	OUTFOX (ChatGPT)	IDMGSP (ChatGPT, Galactica)	0.53	↓ 41.76%
RoBERTa	Arxiv (ChatGPT & Davinci)	Arxiv (ChatGPT)	0.99	-
	Arxiv (ChatGPT & Davinci)	IDMGSP (ChatGPT, Galactica)	0.33	↓ 66.00%
GPT-Large	OPEN AI Detector	GPT2 Generations	0.95	-
	OPEN AI Detector	IDMGSP (ChatGPT, Galactica)	0.80	↓ 15.00%

Table 1: Comparison of in-domain and out-of-domain performance of detectors.

has focused on presenting datasets for MGT (e.g., Wang et al., 2024; Koike et al., 2024; Abdalla et al., 2023) which typically contain human-written text from a domain, and the outputs of LLMs prompted to generate text conditioned on partial information from the human-written text. For example, in one segment of the dataset presented by Wang et al. (2024), they use titles from arXiv papers to generate abstracts using five different LLMs to contrast human-written abstracts.

3 Experiments

To evaluate classifiers for MGT detection, we use three datasets, classifiers, and linguistic features for analysis. In this section, we describe the artifacts and features we use for our experiments.

3.1 Data

M4 The M4 dataset (Wang et al., 2024) consists of human-written texts from several data sources, including Wikipedia, Reddit, and arXiv in the English subset of the dataset. It pairs the human-written texts with texts generated by several LLMs, including text-davinci-003 (henceforth GPT-3.5), GPT-4, and ChatGPT. For our experiments, we used the abstracts generated for arXiv papers from ChatGPT and GPT-3.5.

OutFox The OutFox dataset (Koike et al., 2024) consists of 15,400 triplets of essay problem statements, student-written essays, and machine-generated essays. We use the human-written and ChatGPT-generated essays for training and we use the GPT-3.5-generated essays for testing.

IDMGSP The IDMGSP dataset (Abdalla et al., 2023) contains 4,000 human-written and 4,000 machine-generated (SCIgen, GPT-2, ChatGPT, and

Galactica) scientific papers. In our work, we create a test set of abstracts to evaluate our detectors.

3.2 Machine-Generated Text Classifiers

We evaluate neural and feature-based methods for MGT detection. The neural methods rely on fine-tuning LLMs, while the feature-based methods rely on machine-generated features for MGT detection.

Neural Methods We fine-tuned two versions of RoBERTa, a pre-trained encoder language model (Liu et al., 2019), to predict whether a text is human-written and machine-generated. Specifically, we use the **OpenAI Detector**, a RoBERTa-Large detector released by OpenAI, trained on text generated using GPT-2 (Radford et al., 2019), and **RoBERTa-M4**, a RoBERTa-base model fine-tuned on the M4 dataset following Solaiman et al. (2019) and Wang et al. (2024), respectively.

Feature-Based Methods We followed Wang et al. (2024) and used **LR-GLTR**, a logistic regression model trained on 14 features from Gehrmann et al. (2019). This model uses two sets of features: the number of tokens within the top-10, top-100, top-1000, and 1000+ ranks from a language model’s predicted probability distribution (4 features); and the probability distribution for a given word divided by the maximum probability for any word in the same position over 10 bins ranging from 0.0 to 1.0 (10 features). We train two instances of this model: one on a subset of the M4 dataset, and the other on a subset of the OutFox dataset.

3.3 Linguistic Features for Analysis

To perform our analysis, we examined writing styles with emphasis on lexical composition and readability.




Figure 1: F1-scores for the LR-GLTR classifier (trained on M4) for IDMGSP across different data segments. Colors indicate machine-generated and human-written data. Dashed lines indicate the baseline performance for each class.

Lexical Composition Here, we first computed the Part-of-Speech (POS) tags and we performed named entity recognition using spaCy. Then, we generated six features: The ratio of nouns, verbs, adverbs, named entities, and objects (direct or prepositional) to the total number of tokens in a passage, and the average sentence length.

3.3.1 Readability Measure

Readability describes how easy a text is to read by considering sentence length, syllable density and word familiarity, to compute a readability score.¹ The Flesch Reading Ease (FRE) score, used to measure readability, is calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{FRE} = 206.835 - 1.015 \left(\frac{TW}{TS} \right) - 84.6 \left(\frac{TSy}{TW} \right)$$

where TW is the total number of words, TS is the total number of sentences, and TSy is the total number of syllables.

4 Analysis

Table 1 depicts performance drops for all models and held-out evaluation datasets. In this section,

¹<https://readable.com/readability/>

we examine some sources of classification error.

Impact of Surface From Linguistic Features

We would expect that a classifier that does not overfit to linguistic surface form would be invariant to changes in the ratio of our lexical compositional features. However, considering Figure 1, we find that the performance of the LR-GLTR model across different surface form linguistic features indicate that the model over-fits to the data (see also Appendix B for further analysis). Indeed, only for nouns, verbs, and adverbs do we see the expected pattern: The classification performance for both classes follow the same pattern.² Curiously, for adverbs, we find that the classification performance for both machine-generated and human-written drops to (near) zero as the ratio of adverbs increases.

For named entities, sentence lengths, and objects, we find that as the performance for detecting MGT increases, as performance for human-written text drops. Collectively, these results suggest that the model does over-fit to surface linguistic features, rather than learning general patterns of machine-

²For nouns, only machine generated text exists for a ratio of (0.58-0.86).




Figure 2: Classification performance of LR-GLTR trained on arXiv and tested on OUTFOX (essays) based on Flesch Reading Ease score.

generated, or human-written text.

4.1 Impact of Readability

Turning our attention to readability (see Figure 2), we find that LR-GLTR has high accuracy for very difficult passages, as it has very few classification errors. However, the model’s ability to correctly classify MGT decreases as the reading difficulty decreases. In contrast, the classifier struggles to correctly predict human-written texts that are easy, often mistaking them for machine-generated.

4.2 Impact of Punctuation Marks

To investigate RoBERTa’s sizable performance drop (see Table 1) on out-of-domain evaluation sets, we use Shapley Additive Explanations (SHAP), which quantifies the impact of a given feature on a model’s performance. We find that punctuation marks and whitespace (see Figure 3) are among the most important features. The heavy reliance on such features, and the associated out-of-domain performance drop, indicates that the model may not be learning general features of machine-generated text, but rather that is overfitting to the training dataset.

Across both RoBERTa and LR-GLTR models, it appears that surface level features are highly influential for classifier performance. In turn, this suggests that simple adversarial attacks such as changing the ratio of nouns, adverbs, or changing punctuation can render these models ineffective.




Figure 3: Feature importance for RoBERTa trained on arxiv using SHAP values.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we explored the limitations of several classifiers for detecting machine-generated text (MGT) by evaluating their sensitivity to stylistic variations across different domains. Our findings illustrate that classifiers are highly sensitive to certain linguistic features, i.e., the distribution of adverbs, average sentence length, and readability of the text. Moreover, we highlight the over-reliance of classifiers on punctuation marks and whitespace. Our results indicate that applying MGT detection systems come with risks, particularly when applied to simple writing, e.g., school assignments. We therefore call for researchers and practitioners to critically evaluate MGT detection systems with data from the particular domain in which they are to be applied, to avoid the potential negative consequences of misclassification, in critical domains.

Limitations

Below are some of our main limitation pertaining to availability of labelled data and the dynamic nature of LLM generation:

- **Dataset limitations:** The datasets used in this paper do not represent the full spectrum of potential domains. This is caused by the limited availability of labeled MGT data.
- **Dynamic nature of LLMs:** We assumed that text generation by a given model are static. However, LLMs are regularly updated and may exhibit changes in their writing style and coherence. However, such changes will typically cause detectors to fail beyond what is described in this work, further emphasizing the need for more careful data analysis.

Ethical Considerations

Our paper investigates the performance of models for the detection of machine-generated text and emphasizes the careful testing and precise reporting of the performance of such systems. This is particularly important, as our examined models struggle on less complex texts, which can have downstream impact if such systems are deployed in educational settings. In light of our findings, we stress the importance of critically evaluating systems for detecting machine-generated text within the domains a given model is to be deployed.

References

- Mohamed Hesham Ibrahim Abdalla, Simon Malberg, Daryna Dementieva, Edoardo Mosca, and Georg Groh. 2023. [A benchmark dataset to distinguish human-written and machine-generated scientific papers](#). *Information*, 14(10).
- Leon Fröhling and Arkaitz Zubiaga. 2021. Feature-based detection of automated language models: tackling gpt-2, gpt-3 and grover. *PeerJ Computer Science*, 7:e443.
- Raghav Gaggar, Ashish Bhagchandani, and Harsh Oza. 2023. [Machine-generated text detection using deep learning](#).
- Sebastian Gehrmann, Hendrik Strobelt, and Alexander Rush. 2019. [GLTR: Statistical detection and visualization of generated text](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*, pages 111–116, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhen Guo and Shangdi Yu. 2023. [Authentigpt: Detecting machine-generated text via black-box language models denoising](#).
- Ganesh Jawahar, Muhammad Abdul-Mageed, and Laks Lakshmanan. 2022. [Automatic detection of entity-manipulated text using factual knowledge](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 86–93, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ryuto Koike, Masahiro Kaneko, and Naoaki Okazaki. 2024. [Outfox: Llm-generated essay detection through in-context learning with adversarially generated examples](#). *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 38(19):21258–21266.
- Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. [Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach](#). *ArXiv*, abs/1907.11692.
- Eric Mitchell, Yoonho Lee, Alexander Khazatsky, Christopher D. Manning, and Chelsea Finn. 2023. [Detectgpt: Zero-shot machine-generated text detection using probability curvature](#).
- Nuzhat Prova. 2024. [Detecting ai generated text based on nlp and machine learning approaches](#).
- Alec Radford, Jeff Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. 2019. [Language models are unsupervised multitask learners](#).
- Irene Solaiman, Miles Brundage, Jack Clark, Amanda Askell, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Jeff Wu, Alec Radford, Gretchen Krueger, Jong Wook Kim, Sarah Kreps, et al. 2019. Release strategies and the social impacts of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.09203*.
- Ruixiang Tang, Yu-Neng Chuang, and Xia Hu. 2023. [The science of detecting llm-generated texts](#).
- Yuxia Wang, Jonibek Mansurov, Petar Ivanov, Jinyan Su, Artem Shelmanov, Akim Tsvigun, Chenxi Whitehouse, Osama Mohammed Afzal, Tarek Mahmoud, Toru Sasaki, Thomas Arnold, Alham Aji, Nizar Habash, Iryna Gurevych, and Preslav Nakov. 2024. [M4: Multi-generator, multi-domain, and multi-lingual black-box machine-generated text detection](#). In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1369–1407, St. Julian’s, Malta. Association for Computational Linguistics.

A Risk of Deployment

Deploying MGT detectors, such as the ones evaluated above, comes with risks pertaining to reliability and fairness. Below are the primary risks associated with deploying such systems:

- **Adversarial attacks:** The classifier’s over-reliance on surface-level feature such as writing style, punctuation marks, and white space makes it vulnerable to adversarial attacks. Adversaries can intentionally alter these features to cause misclassification.
- **Bias and fairness:** Over-fitting to a specific writing style can lead to unfair misclassification of subgroups with a specific writing style.
- **New LLMs causing data drift:** the writing style and the fluency of MGT changes upon the release of new models, which can cause data drift, potentially rendering a classifier in-effective.
- **Domain shift sensitivity:** The results above indicate that although a classifier performs well within the same domain, it may be sensitive to domain shift. This sensitivity could limit a classifier’s applicability and deployment in diverse settings.

B Lexical Diversity

B.1 Overview

Lexical diversity refers to the variety and the range of different words used in a text, reflecting the richness of the vocabulary used.

Hapax (Hapax Legomena) The number of words that occur only once in a text. High hapax counts indicate a wide vocabulary range.

Dihapax (Dis Legomena) The number of words that occur exactly twice in a text. This also contributes to understanding vocabulary richness.

B.2 Impact of Lexical Diversity

As shown in Figure 4, the classifier performs best when detecting texts with a narrow vocabulary range (low hapax) and specific repetition patterns (high dihapax bins). It achieves high F1 scores in Hapax Bins 0 and 1, particularly when paired with Dihapax Bins 6 and 7. However, it struggles with texts that have a rich and varied vocabulary (high hapax) and certain combinations of repeated words.




Figure 4: Heatmap of F1 scores for LR-GLTR trained on arXiv (ChatGPT & Davinci) and tested on arXiv (davinci) across different bins for hapax and dihapax features.