

Risks, Causes, and Mitigations of Widespread Deployments of Large Language Models (LLMs): A Survey

Md Nazmus Sakib

Dept. of CSE
Pabna University of Science
and Technology
Pabna, Bangladesh
nazmus.200103@s.pust.ac.bd

Md Athikul Islam

Dept. of Computer Science
Boise State University
Boise, ID, USA
mdathikulislam@u.boisestate.edu

Royal Pathak

Dept. of Computer Science
Boise State University
Boise, ID, USA
royalpathak@u.boisestate.edu

Md Mashrur Arifin

Dept. of Computer Science
Boise State University
Boise, ID, USA
mdmashrurarifin@u.boisestate.edu

Abstract—Recent advancements in Large Language Models (LLMs), such as ChatGPT and LLaMA, have significantly transformed Natural Language Processing (NLP) with their outstanding abilities in text generation, summarization, and classification. Nevertheless, their widespread adoption introduces numerous challenges, including issues related to academic integrity, copyright, environmental impacts, and ethical considerations such as data bias, fairness, and privacy. The rapid evolution of LLMs also raises concerns regarding the reliability and generalizability of their evaluations. This paper offers a comprehensive survey of the literature on these subjects, systematically gathered and synthesized from Google Scholar. Our study provides an in-depth analysis of the risks associated with specific LLMs, identifying sub-risks, their causes, and potential solutions. Furthermore, we explore the broader challenges related to LLMs, detailing their causes and proposing mitigation strategies. Through this literature analysis, our survey aims to deepen the understanding of the implications and complexities surrounding these powerful models.

Index Terms—Large Language Models, LLMs, LLM Risks, Privacy, Bias, Interpretability, Generative AI, NLP, GPT, ChatGPT

I. INTRODUCTION

LLMs are pre-trained on extensive corpora with vast numbers of parameters, excelling in various NLP tasks such as text generation, summarization, classification, machine translation, and question answering [4], [5], [17], [22]. In 2023, several major LLMs were released, including OpenAI’s ChatGPT [38], Meta AI’s LLaMA [50], and Databricks’ Dolly 2.0. These models exemplify the trend toward exponentially increasing parameters, such as GPT-2 with 1.5 billion parameters and GPT-3 with 175 billion parameters [13]. The deployment of these models spans applications in chat agents, computational biology, programming, creative domains, knowledge work, medicine, reasoning, robotics, and the social sciences [27].

Despite the remarkable success of LLMs, they pose several challenges that are unprecedented for humans [27]. Diverse organizations are deploying apps that integrate LLMs while existing apps and features are constantly being updated with these new LLMs [41]. However, these rapid updates raise var-

ious concerns, including academic integrity, copyright issues, and environmental impacts [41]. Moreover, as LLMs grow in size, their insatiable demand for data becomes apparent. These models are now trained on such vast amounts of data that humans can no longer manually scrutinize it all [28]. In addition, evaluation results may be flawed because the training data could include instances from the test data [27]. This large-scale pre-training also introduces issues like bias and fairness, as well as ethical concerns.

When a new language model is introduced, researchers often investigate its challenges and limitations [39], [51]. Additionally, some studies focus on identifying and mitigating specific risks associated with these models [51]. As language models rapidly evolve, there is an increasing need for comprehensive literature that addresses these areas concurrently. Surveys or reviews that cover the issues, solutions, and underlying causes related to language models are essential. While existing surveys may address general AI risks and solutions [40], the security and privacy aspects of language models [39], [57], or the challenges and solutions of specific models like ChatGPT [18], [53], a more diverse survey is needed. Such a survey would systematically outline the risks, causes, and mitigations associated with individual language models. To fill this gap, we propose a comprehensive survey to identify risks posed by specific language models, explore the reasons behind these risks, and suggest potential mitigation techniques.

Our survey analyzes and discusses the risks, causes, and mitigations associated with the widespread deployment of LLMs. The survey begins by listing the major risks associated with specific LLMs, followed by identifying sub-risks through synthesized data collected from relevant literature. For each sub-risk, the survey identifies which LLMs are affected, defines the root causes, and provides possible mitigations. All explanations are supported by the papers extracted from the literature search. In the final stage, the survey lists the general reasons behind the risks associated with LLMs and discusses mitigation techniques to address these causes.

The paper is organized into the following sections. Section II reviews previous survey work on the challenges, causes,

and solutions related to Artificial Intelligence (AI), LLMs, or specific LLMs. Section III discusses methodology. Section IV examines the risks and sub-risks associated with specific LLMs. Section V explores the root causes of these risks, and Section VI provides mitigation techniques to address these risks. Finally, Section VII summarizes the key takeaways from the paper.

II. RELATED WORK

There are three categories of related work concerning challenges and solutions, which include surveys on AI or LLMs in general, as well as those focusing on a specific LLM.

The first category of surveys addresses risks and potential solutions in AI and machine learning (ML) [40], [49]. Park et al. conducted a survey detailing various AI deceptions, including fraud, election tampering, manipulation, and feints, and suggested mitigation techniques like risk assessment, documentation, record-keeping, transparency, and human oversight [40]. In contrast, Tian et al. surveyed different poisoning attack strategies such as label and data manipulation, along with corresponding countermeasures, including data-driven and model-driven approaches [49].

The second category of surveys focuses on evaluating risks and solutions specific to LLMs in general. Yao et al. conducted a study on security and privacy issues related to LLMs, identifying their positive contributions to code security, data security, and privacy, as well as their involvement in various attacks targeting hardware, operating systems, software, networks, and users [57]. Similarly, Dong et al. conducted a survey covering a wide range of attacks on LLMs during both training and inference phases, along with discussions on defense strategies [8]. Hadi et al. set out with the intention of surveying applications, challenges, limitations, and future prospects but primarily provided an overview of generative AI and LLMs, focusing on their tasks and applications rather than comprehensively covering all aspects [19].

The final category involves surveys focused on individual LLMs, with practitioners primarily examining ChatGPT due to its recent success. Wang et al. elucidated the evolution of AI-generated content (AIGC) over time, particularly with the latest introduction of pre-trained large models [53]. Their study delved into various applications of AIGC while also shedding light on security and privacy threats that pose risks to AIGC services, with ChatGPT serving as a central reference point. Similarly, Yang et al. conducted a survey specifically on ChatGPT [56]. They began by constructing an evolutionary tree for LLMs and proceeded to offer a brief introduction to popular models like BERT and ChatGPT. Additionally, they explored key considerations from a data perspective, concluding their discussion with an examination of ChatGPT's efficiency and trustworthiness.

Our survey distinguishes itself from previous literature by focusing on the unique risks posed by individual LLMs, uncovering their root causes, and proposing viable solutions.

III. METHODOLOGY

The methodology outlines detailed steps for conducting the survey. These steps encompass searching for relevant literature, applying filtering criteria, collecting and extracting data, and synthesizing and analyzing the findings.

A. Searching Relevant Literature

We employed Google Scholar to search for existing literature pertaining to the risks, causes, and mitigations associated with LLMs. The search strategy was focused on literature containing keywords such as "LLMs", "large language models", "risk assessment", and "risk mitigation".

B. Filtering Criteria

We included literature on LLMs that is relevant to fields such as NLP, security, artificial intelligence, privacy, and specific language models mentioned in the literature [56]. We excluded papers published as tutorials, presentations, comments, discussions, and keynotes. Additionally, we considered literature published from 2000 to 2024.

C. Data Collection

We adopted the data collection approach outlined by Kitchenham and Charters [30], adhering to specific quality criteria for selecting literature:

- Assessment of the retention and presentation of contexts and data sources.
- Evaluation of the clarity and coherence of reporting.
- Examination of the attention given to ethical considerations.

The first author conducted a thorough analysis of the titles and abstracts of each search result retrieved from Google Scholar, identifying papers deemed relevant for further review. Subsequently, all authors collectively reviewed the selected literature in full-text, applying filtering and quality criteria, resulting in the final inclusion of 47 papers for the study.

D. Synthesis and Analysis

The synthesis of this study involved extracting summarized findings regarding the risks, causes, and solutions associated with LLMs. To document the risks, we developed a table and manually identified their corresponding reasons. Additionally, we created another table to categorize the generic causes. These tables were later presented in the paper as both tabular representations and lists.

IV. RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH LLMs

A. Privacy Issues

Models that memorize training data excessively are prone to overfitting and can compromise user privacy. Notably, large models like GPT-Neo tend to retain significant amounts of training data, often resulting in repeated patterns and increased risk of privacy breaches [3]. The retrieval and training dataset database in Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) models such as Llama-7b-Chat and GPT3.5-turbo can expose private data, further increasing privacy risks [59]. Models like Bard

Risks	Sub-Risks	LLMs Associated with Risks	Causes	Possible Mitigations	References
1. Privacy Issues	Exposing user data	GPT-Neo, GPT-3	Memorizing training data	Curation and change in distribution of training data	[3], [55], [59], [61]
	Leakage of retrieval and training data	Llama-7b-Chat, GPT-3.5-turbo	Memorizing retrieval and training data in RAG	Privacy-preserving prompt tuning	[34], [59]
	Revealing user activity	Bard	Using activity data for training	Opt-out option, consent form	[18]
2. Susceptibility to Adversarial Attacks	Harmful content generation	GPT	Prompt injection	Filtering out retrieved information	[54]
	Vulnerable sentence embeddings	GPT, BERT	Capture of sensitive information in embeddings	Rounding, privacy-preserving mapping, subspace projection	[39]
	Stealing API service	BERT	Easy imitation of victim model	Softening predictions, prediction perturbation	[20]
3. Ethical Concerns	Lack of reliability, trustworthiness, and accountability	BERT, RoBERTa, Gemma-7b, Llama-2-7b	Adversarial attacks, overfitting	Regularization, adversarial training, random smoothing	[15], [25], [31], [32], [36]
	High pricing	T5, BERT, GPT, and others	Higher energy consumption	Lighter and reduced parameterized models, faster hardware	[37]
4. Bias and Fairness	Social and environmental bias	GPT-4, Claude-2, Llama-2-70b, Zephyr-7b	Biased training data and model architecture	Hyperparameter tuning, instruction guiding, debias tuning	[7], [10]
	Human-like biases and stereotypes	BERT, ELMo, GPT, GPT-2, RoBERTa, DeBERTa, T5	Large biased human-written training corpora	Debiasing losses, auto-debias, prompt engineering, model fine-tuning	[2], [7], [17], [22], [29], [35], [48]
5. Adverse Environmental Effects	Financial instability and high CO2 emission	All LLMs	High energy consumption	Lighter and reduced parameterized models, faster hardware	[2], [37], [44]
6. Violating Legal or Regulatory Requirements	Possibility of using copyrighted data	Proprietary LLMs	Copies or close variations of copyrighted data used in training	Copyright regression, softmax regression	[5], [55]
7. Disruption in Human Life	Health and wellness	All LLMs including GPT-3	Huge text generation, low-quality scientific literature	Developing policies	[6]
	Financial instability	All LLMs	High efficiency of LLMs	Strong policymaking	[9]

TABLE I: Ablation study findings evaluated using three.

use user activity data to train their models along with the original training data, which can lead to a tendency to reveal user activity information [18].

B. Susceptibility to Adversarial Attacks

GPT models, particularly ChatGPT, are susceptible to various security vulnerabilities. For example, an adversary could potentially instruct ChatGPT to generate text that is harmful to society, create malware code, or even distribute malicious code libraries [54]. Additionally, language models like BERT, GPT, or GPT-2 generate sentence embeddings that attackers could reverse-engineer, potentially exposing sensitive information [39]. Moreover, fine-tuned publicly available BERT model APIs let attackers extract a local copy of a target BERT model, giving them a way to generate adversarial attacks against the original model. [20].

C. Ethical Concerns

Pre-training LLMs with GPUs demands substantial RAM usage, leading to higher costs for companies [37]. Additionally, without proper regulations, LLM service providers may charge users premium prices. Importantly, LLMs should produce consistent outputs for texts with the same semantic meaning. However, their variable responses in these situations raise ethical concerns, including issues of reliability, trustworthiness, and accountability. Models like BERT and RoBERTa have demonstrated these vulnerabilities [25], [31], [32].

D. Bias and Fairness

Due to the training on massive datasets, certain LLMs, like GPT-4, Claude-2, Llama-2-70b, Zephyr-7b exhibit bias toward current social and environmental topics, suggesting that they are significantly influenced by contemporary socio-political

discourse [1], [10]. Moreover, Masked Language Modeling (MLM) of the larger version of BERT, RoBERTa, DeBERTa, T5 shows sentiment and human biases for male and female gender [2], [17], [29], [48]. Sentiment bias is another concern for models like BERT, which often display a significant degree of bias in how they interpret and generate text [22]. GPT-3, trained on Common Crawl datasets, may produce sentences with high toxicity even when the prompt sentences are non-toxic [2].

E. Adverse Environmental Effects

While LLMs have been successful, they also bring certain adverse environmental effects, such as high energy consumption and contributing to digital divides [2], [41]. For example, LLMs like T5 and BERT consume large amounts of energy, resulting in significantly higher CO2 emissions [37], [44]. Training a BERT model, even without hyperparameter tuning, requires an amount of energy comparable to that of a trans-American flight [2].

F. Violating Legal or Regulatory Requirements

LLMs trained on extensive datasets can generate outputs that violate legal or regulatory requirements or closely resemble copyrighted material [5]. These models typically utilize internet-sourced data, publicly available datasets, and occasionally proprietary information [55]. As LLMs scale rapidly, it becomes increasingly challenging to ensure proprietary data is not used without authorization. Regulating these models is also complex. Another risk is the inadvertent exposure of private data when interacting with LLMs; for instance, Samsung Electronics disclosed sensitive information to ChatGPT on multiple occasions [55].

G. Disruption in Human Life

The substantial volume of text generated by LLMs can lead to misuse in the medical field, potentially posing a public health risk [6]. Additionally, this overwhelming influx of text may contribute to information overload and anxiety. LLMs like ChatGPT can also produce low-quality scientific literature, which might have adverse effects on human health [6]. The advanced capabilities and automation provided by LLMs have put many human jobs at risk, with nearly 19% of roles experiencing at least 50% of tasks coverage by LLMs [9]. This could lead to significant economic disruption.

V. CAUSES OF RISKS

The following are the general causes behind the risks associated with LLMs.

A. Excessive Memorization of Training Data

Deep language models are prone to memorizing training data, leading to overfitting [24], [36], [47]. This memorization often results in the leakage of private data. Liu et al. demonstrated how BERT models suffer from poor generalization due to memorizing training data [36]. Similarly, Zhou et al. observed a memorization tendency in the GPT-Neo model, while models like OPT and Llama exhibited less propensity

for memorization [61]. Another finding is that bigger models memorize more than the smaller models [42].

B. Inherent Complexity of LLMs

With the continually increasing size of LLMs and their capacity to perform tasks resembling human abilities, understanding them has become increasingly complex. This inherent complexity has hindered the utilization of LLMs in scientific research and data analysis [46]. TripoSR and GemMoE-Beta-1 models have demonstrated greater transparency in their reasoning compared to Gemma-7b and Llama-2-7b models [15].

C. Lack of Awareness of LLMs

The end-users, policymakers, various stakeholders, and even the developers themselves may lack a thorough understanding of the serious risks posed by LLMs. For example, in the context of public health, it's critical to recognize that the CareCall chatbot occasionally makes promises akin to human capabilities, despite its inability to fulfill them [26]. Allowing such behavior could have severe consequences for businesses.

D. Testing and Evaluation Flaws

Occasionally, LLMs are trained using the development and test sets of benchmark datasets, leading to improper evaluation, a phenomenon known as benchmark leakage [60]. This issue has raised concerns regarding the fairness and reliability of LLM testing. Notably, models like OpenLLaMA-3B and LLaMA-2-7B exhibit adverse effects on evaluation due to benchmark leakage [60].

E. Evolving Threat Landscape

The threat landscape surrounding LLMs is evolving rapidly alongside their expansion. One such security concern is the emergence of "jailbreak prompts," which bypass the security measures of LLMs, compelling them to produce harmful content. Recent iterations of these prompts have demonstrated alarming success rates, with some achieving up to 99% attack success rates (ASR) on the latest models like ChatGPT (GPT-3.5) and GPT-4 [43]. Another emerging attack vector is known as "Indirect Prompt Injection," which coerces LLM-integrated applications into delivering intended adversarial content to end users. For instance, Bing Chat, operating on the GPT-4 model, has exhibited vulnerability to this attack [16].

F. Lack of Strong Policy Making

Insufficient policies, particularly in areas like data protection and security, can leave LLMs and their users on risk. For instance, third-party providers of LLMs may collect user data without obtaining proper consent or providing clear explanations regarding data usage [55]. This leads to a strong privacy breach.

G. Security Vulnerabilities

The security vulnerabilities inherent in LLMs make them susceptible to manipulation in output generation. These vulnerabilities can be exploited to create fake news, spam emails, and other deceptive content [11]. Adversarial attacks targeting LLMs encompass various strategies such as model theft, aimed at extracting model shapes and parameters, data construction for mimicking training data, data poisoning to introduce malicious data, and model hijacking to perform unauthorized tasks [11]. Additionally, attacks on LLM applications include prompt injection, which leads to inconsistent outputs, and privacy leakage attacks [11]. For example: ChatGPT and Azure OpenAI (GPT-3.5 turbo) are vulnerable to prompt injection attack.

H. Poor Data Quality

Given that LLMs rely on pre-training with large datasets, it becomes crucial to ensure the quality of these datasets. Pre-processing and curating such vast datasets pose significant challenges [19]. If datasets inherently contain biases, cultural norms, and stereotypes, training LLMs on such data propagates these limitations throughout the models [1]. Agiza et al. demonstrated how ideological and political biases can be ingrained in the Mistral-7b-v0.2 model [1].

VI. MITIGATION STRATEGIES

The following are the mitigation techniques for addressing the underlying risks of LLMs. Figure 1 illustrates these mitigation techniques for the various risk causes associated with LLMs.

A. Robust Model Development

LLMs require thorough development, involving extensive testing and evaluation processes to address security vulnerabilities and biases. Various techniques exist to mitigate issues like overfitting, including regularization, dropout, batch normalization, and label smoothing [24]. Adherence to industrial standard guidelines and best practices is also essential for mitigating adversarial attacks. Moreover, adversarial training and ensemble methods are also widely used techniques for preventing adversarial attacks [52], [58].

B. Privacy-Preserving Techniques

There are various techniques available for preserving data privacy. One approach involves centralized privacy settings, where the service provider configures privacy settings on behalf of end-users [33], [45]. Conversely, other methods empower end-users to set up privacy measures for their data themselves. An example of this is Privacy-Preserving Prompt Tuning (RAPT) [34].

C. Regulatory Compliance

With the ever-expanding size of language models and AI, it is crucial to establish robust regulatory compliance measures. Addressing compliance challenges involves ensuring data privacy and security, mitigating bias, promoting fairness,




Fig. 1: The boxes in the tree diagram represent the root causes of LLM risks, and the lists under each cause mention the mitigation techniques for that specific cause.

and enhancing transparency [23]. Developing comprehensive governance frameworks is essential for effectively tackling these issues [23]. Ethical language model development must be prioritized to safeguard against biases, promote fairness, and uphold accountability [23]. Policies should recognize the broad functionalities and constraints of today's LLMs, advocating for transparency, responsibility, and ethical application [15]. Continuous monitoring is indispensable to promptly identify and rectify compliance issues. Establishing ethical guidelines and governance frameworks ensures that LLMs align with societal values and democratic principles [1]. Additionally, Chu et al. proposed a softmax regression approach to help models avoid generating copyrighted data during training and inference [5].

D. Secure Data Handling

Following industry best practices, such as encryption and access control, is crucial to safeguard data from unauthorized access. Implementing strong encryption protocols ensures the secure storage and transmission of private or sensitive information. Additionally, when interacting with end-users and managing their data, it is vital to have effective consent

management procedures in place to transparently communicate how data will be collected and processed [23].

E. Bias Detection and Mitigation

Fleisig et al. proposed an adversarial learning approach, while Dong et al. employed a probing framework with conditional generation to identify and address gender bias [7], [12]. Other techniques for mitigating bias include pre-processing, data filtering, prompt modification, and fine-tuning [35]. For instance, GPT-3.5-turbo can undergo further debiasing through fine-tuning [35]. Additionally, Huang et al. utilized Few-shot learning and Chain-of-Thought (CoT) methods for debiasing in code generation [21].

F. Interpretability and Accountability

A highly interpretable LLM is likely to be more acceptable to end users [15]. The fields of medicine and science necessitate highly interpretable LLMs to ensure their effective utilization. LLMs interpretability can be categorized into two methods: local and global. Local interpretability focuses on explaining a single output, whereas global interpretability aims to elucidate the LLM as a whole [46]. Local methods, such as perturbation-based methods, gradient-based methods, and linear approximations, are utilized to compute feature importance. Additionally, computing Shapley values represents a unique attribution method for LLMs [14]. On the other hand, global explainability methods include probing and understanding the distribution of training data [46].

G. Using Parameter Efficient Models

Larger models often tend to memorize training data more extensively than their compact counterparts, making the latter preferable in certain scenarios [3]. For instance, DistilBERT, a significantly streamlined version of the BERT model with a 40% reduction in parameters, demonstrates robust performance across various NLP tasks compared to its parent BERT [37]. Notably, DistilBERT retains 97% of BERT's understanding capabilities while offering substantially faster inference times [37]. Smaller models like DistilBERT are easier to deploy, incur lower costs, and require fewer resources, thereby contributing to both environmental and financial efficiency. Additionally, their reduced memorization and overfitting tendencies mitigate privacy and security risks. Furthermore, smaller models are often more interpretable, facilitating clearer insights into model decision-making processes.

VII. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, our survey paper makes valuable contributions to the implementation of LLMs by providing an in-depth review of deployment risks, identifying underlying causes, and reviewing viable mitigation solutions. The study highlights various risks associated with LLM adoption, including ethical, privacy, security, bias, environmental, and compliance issues. We analyze factors contributing to these risks, such as model overfitting, complex architectures, limited awareness, lack of legislative uniformity in AI ethics, evolving threat landscapes,

and insufficient control over data quality. To address these challenges, we emphasize proactive measures such as building robust models, employing privacy-preserving practices, implementing regulatory compliance measures, incorporating bias detection mechanisms, using explainability tools, and adopting parameter-efficient models. By applying these recommendations, researchers and stakeholders can advance the responsible development and deployment of LLMs, resulting in improved reliability, safeguarded user privacy, enhanced AI fairness, and reduced environmental impacts.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Agiza, M. Mostagir, and S. Reda. Analyzing the impact of data selection and fine-tuning on economic and political biases in llms, 2024.
- [2] E. M. Bender, T. Gebru, A. McMillan-Major, and S. Shmitchell. On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, FAccT '21, page 610–623, New York, NY, USA, 2021. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [3] N. Carlini, D. Ippolito, M. Jagielski, K. Lee, F. Tramer, and C. Zhang. Quantifying memorization across neural language models, 2023.
- [4] I. Chalkidis, E. Fergadiotis, P. Malakasiotis, and I. Androutsopoulos. Large-scale multi-label text classification on EU legislation. In A. Korhonen, D. Traum, and L. Márquez, editors, *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 6314–6322, Florence, Italy, July 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [5] T. Chu, Z. Song, and C. Yang. How to protect copyright data in optimization of large language models? *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 38(16):17871–17879, Mar. 2024.
- [6] L. De Angelis, F. Baglivo, G. Arzilli, G. P. Privitera, P. Ferragina, A. E. Tozzi, and C. Rizzo. Chatgpt and the rise of large language models: the new ai-driven infodemic threat in public health. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 11:1166120, 2023.
- [7] X. Dong, Y. Wang, P. S. Yu, and J. Caverlee. Disclosure and mitigation of gender bias in llms, 2024.
- [8] Z. Dong, Z. Zhou, C. Yang, J. Shao, and Y. Qiao. Attacks, defenses and evaluations for llm conversation safety: A survey, 2024.
- [9] T. Eloundou, S. Manning, P. Mishkin, and D. Rock. Gpts are gpts: An early look at the labor market impact potential of large language models, 2023.
- [10] A. Elrod. Uncovering theological and ethical biases in llms: An integrated hermeneutical approach employing texts from the hebrew bible. *HIPHIL Novum*, 9(1):2–45, Feb. 2024.
- [11] A. Esmradi, D. W. Yip, and C. F. Chan. A comprehensive survey of attack techniques, implementation, and mitigation strategies in large language models. In G. Wang, H. Wang, G. Min, N. Georgalas, and W. Meng, editors, *Ubiquitous Security*, pages 76–95, Singapore, 2024. Springer Nature Singapore.
- [12] E. Fleisig and C. Fellbaum. Mitigating gender bias in machine translation through adversarial learning, 2022.
- [13] L. Floridi and M. Chiriatti. Gpt-3: Its nature, scope, limits, and consequences. *Minds and Machines*, 30:681–694, 2020.
- [14] C. Frye, D. de Mijolla, T. Begley, L. Cowton, M. Stanley, and I. Feige. Shapley explainability on the data manifold, 2021.
- [15] K. Fujiwara, M. Sasaki, A. Nakamura, and N. Watanabe. Measuring the interpretability and explainability of model decisions of five large language models.
- [16] K. Greshake, S. Abdelnabi, S. Mishra, C. Endres, T. Holz, and M. Fritz. Not what you've signed up for: Compromising real-world llm-integrated applications with indirect prompt injection. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM Workshop on Artificial Intelligence and Security*, AISec '23, page 79–90, New York, NY, USA, 2023. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [17] Y. Guo, Y. Yang, and A. Abbasi. Auto-debias: Debiasing masked language models with automated biased prompts. In S. Muresan, P. Nakov, and A. Villavicencio, editors, *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1012–1023, Dublin, Ireland, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- [18] M. Gupta, C. Akiri, K. Aryal, E. Parker, and L. Praharaj. From chatgpt to threatgpt: Impact of generative ai in cybersecurity and privacy. *IEEE Access*, 11:80218–80245, 2023.
- [19] M. U. Hadi, R. Qureshi, A. Shah, M. Irfan, A. Zafar, M. B. Shaikh, N. Akhtar, J. Wu, S. Mirjalili, et al. Large language models: a comprehensive survey of its applications, challenges, limitations, and future prospects. *Authorea Preprints*, 2023.
- [20] X. He, L. Lyu, L. Sun, and Q. Xu. Model extraction and adversarial transferability, your BERT is vulnerable! In K. Toutanova, A. Rumshisky, L. Zettlemoyer, D. Hakkani-Tur, I. Beltagy, S. Bethard, R. Cotterell, T. Chakraborty, and Y. Zhou, editors, *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2006–2012, Online, June 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [21] D. Huang, Q. Bu, J. Zhang, X. Xie, J. Chen, and H. Cui. Bias testing and mitigation in llm-based code generation, 2024.
- [22] P.-S. Huang, H. Zhang, R. Jiang, R. Stanforth, J. Welbl, J. Rae, V. Maini, D. Yogatama, and P. Kohli. Reducing sentiment bias in language models via counterfactual evaluation, 2020.
- [23] K. Hubert. Regulatory compliance and ethical considerations: Compliance challenges and opportunities with the integration of big data and ai. 2024.
- [24] T. Ishida, I. Yamane, T. Sakai, G. Niu, and M. Sugiyama. Do we need zero training loss after achieving zero training error? In H. D. III and A. Singh, editors, *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 4604–4614. PMLR, 13–18 Jul 2020.
- [25] D. Jin, Z. Jin, J. T. Zhou, and P. Szolovits. Is BERT really robust? A strong baseline for natural language attack on text classification and entailment. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 34, pages 8018–8025, 2020.
- [26] E. Jo, D. A. Epstein, H. Jung, and Y.-H. Kim. Understanding the benefits and challenges of deploying conversational ai leveraging large language models for public health intervention. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, CHI '23, New York, NY, USA, 2023. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [27] J. Kaddour, J. Harris, M. Mozes, H. Bradley, R. Raileanu, and R. McHardy. Challenges and applications of large language models, 2023.
- [28] J. Kaplan, S. McCandlish, T. Henighan, T. B. Brown, B. Chess, R. Child, S. Gray, A. Radford, J. Wu, and D. Amodei. Scaling laws for neural language models, 2020.
- [29] S. Katsarou, B. Rodríguez-Gálvez, and J. Shanahan. Measuring gender bias in contextualized embeddings. *Computer Sciences & Mathematics Forum*, 3(1), 2022.
- [30] S. Keele et al. Guidelines for performing systematic literature reviews in software engineering, 2007.
- [31] T. Le, N. Park, and D. Lee. SHIELD: Defending textual neural networks against multiple black-box adversarial attacks with stochastic multi-expert patcher. In S. Muresan, P. Nakov, and A. Villavicencio, editors, *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6661–6674, Dublin, Ireland, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [32] L. Li, R. Ma, Q. Guo, X. Xue, and X. Qiu. BERT-ATTACK: Adversarial attack against BERT using BERT. In B. Webber, T. Cohn, Y. He, and Y. Liu, editors, *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 6193–6202, Online, Nov. 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [33] X. Li, F. Tramèr, P. Liang, and T. Hashimoto. Large language models can be strong differentially private learners, 2022.
- [34] Y. Li, Z. Tan, and Y. Liu. Privacy-preserving prompt tuning for large language model services, 2023.
- [35] L. Lin, L. Wang, J. Guo, and K.-F. Wong. Investigating bias in llm-based bias detection: Disparities between llms and human perception, 2024.
- [36] Q. Liu, R. Zheng, B. Rong, J. Liu, Z. Liu, Z. Cheng, L. Qiao, T. Gui, Q. Zhang, and X. Huang. Flooding-X: Improving BERT’s resistance to adversarial attacks via loss-restricted fine-tuning. In S. Muresan, P. Nakov, and A. Villavicencio, editors, *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 5634–5644, Dublin, Ireland, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [37] V. Liu and Y. Yin. Green ai: Exploring carbon footprints, mitigation strategies, and trade offs in large language model training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.01157*, 2024.
- [38] OpenAI and J. A. et al. Gpt-4 technical report, 2024.
- [39] X. Pan, M. Zhang, S. Ji, and M. Yang. Privacy risks of general-purpose language models. In *2020 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 1314–1331, 2020.
- [40] P. S. Park, S. Goldstein, A. O’Gara, M. Chen, and D. Hendrycks. Ai deception: A survey of examples, risks, and potential solutions, 2023.
- [41] M. C. Rillig, M. Ågerstrand, M. Bi, K. A. Gould, and U. Sauerland. Risks and benefits of large language models for the environment. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 57(9):3464–3466, 2023.
- [42] A. Schwarzschild, Z. Feng, P. Maini, Z. C. Lipton, and J. Z. Kolter. Rethinking llm memorization through the lens of adversarial compression, 2024.
- [43] X. Shen, Z. Chen, M. Backes, Y. Shen, and Y. Zhang. “do anything now”: Characterizing and evaluating in-the-wild jailbreak prompts on large language models, 2023.
- [44] J. Shi, Z. Yang, and D. Lo. Efficient and green large language models for software engineering: Vision and the road ahead, 2024.
- [45] W. Shi, R. Shea, S. Chen, C. Zhang, R. Jia, and Z. Yu. Just fine-tune twice: Selective differential privacy for large language models, 2022.
- [46] C. Singh, J. P. Inala, M. Galley, R. Caruana, and J. Gao. Rethinking interpretability in the era of large language models, 2024.
- [47] K. Takeoka, K. Akimoto, and M. Oyamada. Low-resource taxonomy enrichment with pretrained language models. In M.-F. Moens, X. Huang, L. Specia, and S. W.-t. Yih, editors, *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2747–2758, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, Nov. 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [48] Y. Tal, I. Magar, and R. Schwartz. Fewer errors, but more stereotypes? the effect of model size on gender bias, 2022.
- [49] Z. Tian, L. Cui, J. Liang, and S. Yu. A comprehensive survey on poisoning attacks and countermeasures in machine learning. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 55(8), dec 2022.
- [50] H. Touvron, T. Lavril, G. Izacard, X. Martinet, M.-A. Lachaux, T. Lacroix, B. Rozière, N. Goyal, E. Hambro, F. Azhar, A. Rodriguez, A. Joulin, E. Grave, and G. Lample. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models, 2023.
- [51] T. Trust, J. Whalen, and C. Mouza. Editorial: Chatgpt: Challenges, opportunities, and implications for teacher education. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 23(1):1–23, March 2023.
- [52] B. Wang, S. Wang, Y. Cheng, Z. Gan, R. Jia, B. Li, and J. Liu. Infobert: Improving robustness of language models from an information theoretic perspective, 2021.
- [53] Y. Wang, Y. Pan, M. Yan, Z. Su, and T. H. Luan. A survey on chatgpt: Ai-generated contents, challenges, and solutions. *IEEE Open Journal of the Computer Society*, 4(01):280–302, jan 2023.
- [54] X. Wu, R. Duan, and J. Ni. Unveiling security, privacy, and ethical concerns of chatgpt. *Journal of Information and Intelligence*, 2(2):102–115, 2024.
- [55] B. Yan, K. Li, M. Xu, Y. Dong, Y. Zhang, Z. Ren, and X. Cheng. On protecting the data privacy of large language models (llms): A survey, 2024.
- [56] J. Yang, H. Jin, R. Tang, X. Han, Q. Feng, H. Jiang, S. Zhong, B. Yin, and X. Hu. Harnessing the power of llms in practice: A survey on chatgpt and beyond. *ACM Trans. Knowl. Discov. Data*, 18(6), apr 2024.
- [57] Y. Yao, J. Duan, K. Xu, Y. Cai, Z. Sun, and Y. Zhang. A survey on large language model (llm) security and privacy: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *High-Confidence Computing*, 4(2):100211, 2024.
- [58] J. Zeng, J. Xu, X. Zheng, and X. Huang. Certified robustness to text adversarial attacks by randomized [MASK]. *Computational Linguistics*, 49(2):395–427, June 2023.
- [59] S. Zeng, J. Zhang, P. He, Y. Xing, Y. Liu, H. Xu, J. Ren, S. Wang, D. Yin, Y. Chang, and J. Tang. The good and the bad: Exploring privacy issues in retrieval-augmented generation (rag), 2024.
- [60] K. Zhou, Y. Zhu, Z. Chen, W. Chen, W. X. Zhao, X. Chen, Y. Lin, J.-R. Wen, and J. Han. Don’t make your llm an evaluation benchmark cheater, 2023.
- [61] Z. Zhou, J. Xiang, C. Chen, and S. Su. Quantifying and analyzing entity-level memorization in large language models. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 38(17):19741–19749, Mar. 2024.