RuATD - Artificial Text Detection

NN Methods final project
Anna Aksenova & Ekaterina Taktasheva

Plan

- 1. Why?
- 2. Who?
- 3. Data/Baseline/Metrics
- 4. How?
- 5. References

Why?

Business and Scientific Value

Business

- fake news detection
- fake product reviews detection
- spamming/phishing detection
- copyright

Science

- generative models benchmark
- detecting features for the future improvement of ATG

Who?

Our team

Anna Aksenova

- baselines
- NN-based methods

Ekaterina Taktasheva

- data analysis
- feature-based methods

Data/Baselines/Metrics

Competition

RuATD dataset

- train / val / test
- 129065 / 21511 / 64533 texts
- binary classification (H vs. M)

Baseline:

- tf-idf + LogReg
- fine-tuning of ruBERT

Metrics: accuracy

How?

Set of Experiments

1. Statistical methods

a. <u>Feature-based methods:</u>

Using common lexical/linguistic text features (readability, diversity, etc.) as indicators of text complexity and coherence

b. <u>Stylometry-based analysis:</u>

Analysis of the stylistic features as indicators of author style

- 2. NN-based methods
 - a. Fine-tuned ruRoBERTa (Roberta as SOTA on TweepFake dataset)
 - b. GPT models (/other generative models like T5)
- 3. Combination of statistical and neural features

References

References

- 1. Automatic Detection of Machine Generated Text: A Critical Survey (Jawahar 2020)
 - a. An overview of NN-based methods for ATD
 - b. RoBERTa (TweepFake) mistakes analysis
- 2. Computer-Generated Text Detection Using Machine Learning: A Systematic Review (Beresneva 2016)
 - a. Use of lexicographical and statistical features for ATD
- 3. Defending Against Neural Fake News (Zellers et al. 2019)
 - a. GROVER model for text generation and ATD
 - b. GPT2 model as discriminator used for text classification
- 4. Giant Language model Test Room (Gehrmann 2019)
 - a. Use GPT to detect text generated by GPT
 - b. Frequency analysis is important

Links

 \underline{Github}

<u>Trello</u>