

Lying Blindly: Bypassing ChatGPT’s Safeguards to Generate Hard-to-Detect Disinformation Claims at Scale

Freddy Heppell, Mehmet E. Bakir and Kalina Bontcheva

Department of Computer Science, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK,
{frhepell11,m.e.bakir,k.bontcheva}@sheffield.ac.uk

Abstract

As Large Language Models (LLMs) become more proficient, their misuse in large-scale viral disinformation campaigns is a growing concern. This study explores the capability of ChatGPT to generate unconditioned claims about the war in Ukraine, an event beyond its knowledge cutoff, and evaluates whether such claims can be differentiated by human readers and automated tools from human-written ones. We compare war-related claims from ClaimReview, authored by IFCN-registered fact-checkers, and similar short-form content generated by ChatGPT. We demonstrate that ChatGPT can produce realistic, target-specific disinformation cheaply, fast, and at scale, and that these claims cannot be reliably distinguished by humans or existing automated tools.

1 Introduction

The recent evolution in AI generation technologies significantly alters the landscape of disinformation dissemination and detection. Whilst this risk has been considered for some time¹, the inaccessibility of state-of-the-art models made it somewhat hypothetical (Zellers et al., 2019; Buchanan et al., 2021), until the release of GPT-3.5 and later GPT-4 as a consumer product in ChatGPT. Due to their training on web corpora, Large Language Models (LLMs) are inevitably exposed to harmful and misleading content, which can be integrated into their output with sufficient prompting (McGuffie and Newhouse, 2020), although all knowledge exposure is limited by a training data cutoff date.

While prior work has demonstrated the viability of machine-generated misinformation (Zellers et al., 2019; Mosallanezhad et al., 2020; Stiff and Johansson, 2022; Vykopal et al., 2023), these studies generally condition the model with a claim and

assess the models’ ability to work with it. Additionally, by generating long-form texts, they jointly assess the models’ ability to generate disinformation and ability to write news-style articles. Chen and Shu (2023) study disinformation generation including unconditioned claims, but report a low success rate due to model safeguards.

Although reliable detection of AI-generated content is possible theoretically (Crothers et al., 2023), performance is highly dependent on texts having sufficient length (Ippolito et al., 2020), the exact training data used (Tourille et al., 2022) and domain similarity (Bakhtin et al., 2019). Length is a particular concern, with most studies using long-form content, such as news articles, or at least content of several sentences (Uchendu et al., 2023).

Human performance at AI detection is typically poor, and no better than random chance (Brown et al., 2020; Clark et al., 2021), although some benefit is gained from training annotators (Ippolito et al., 2020; Clark et al., 2021) and some individuals appear to be highly skilled at this task (Ippolito et al., 2020). Whereas machine detectors exploit statistical patterns present in long, fluent text, human annotators identify structural or factual errors (Ippolito et al., 2020; Clark et al., 2021). Whilst longer texts allow more room for errors such as topic drift, it may be easier to identify implausible or incoherent facts when they are the sole content.

In this paper, we investigate ChatGPT with GPT-3.5’s ability to generate disinformation without prior conditioning. By prompting it to output disinformation claims, a short (counter-)factual statement, we are able to investigate the quality of disinformation independently of ability to mimic news texts. Minimal effort is required to bypass safeguards and achieve 100% model compliance. We find that ChatGPT is capable of outputting realistic disinformation claims, which integrate world knowledge not included in the prompt, and that they cannot be reliably distinguished by humans

¹<https://openai.com/research/better-language-models>

or machine authorship classifiers. Furthermore, we show that ChatGPT can even generate realistic disinformation about events that postdate its knowledge cutoff.

In summary, our contributions are: i) a dataset of human and unconditioned ChatGPT disinformation claims about the war in Ukraine; ii) a linguistic comparison between them; and iii) a study of human and computational methods to identify authorship of these short claims.

2 Generating Our Claim Dataset

2.1 Human-Authored Claims

The ClaimReview data feed² includes over 50,000 fact-checking articles from more than 1,000 fact-checking organisations in multiple languages. Each debunk article includes a concise summary of the evaluated claim and metadata. We first identified 23,040 English-language claims using the fastText language identification model³ (Joulin et al., 2016, 2017), then used BERTopic (Grootendorst, 2022) (see appendix A for configuration) to retrieve 282 claims related to the war in Ukraine.

2.2 Prompt Design and Evaluation

All ChatGPT texts were generated with the ‘gpt-3.5-turbo’ model.

Firstly, three prompting strategies (see appendix C) were evaluated using both the UI and API: asking ChatGPT to produce (i) a single or (ii) multiple instances of disinformation, and (iii) asking for multiple instances with a safeguard-bypass strategy. As in Chen and Shu (2023), ChatGPT often refused to generate disinformation when asked plainly, but our bypass strategy was always successful. To prevent misuse by disinformation actors, the exact prompts will be shared on request with academic researchers only, however for an outline see appendix C.

2.3 Dataset Creation

The final dataset was generated with the ChatGPT API (see examples in figure 1). The prompt with safeguard bypass was used, along with an initial system prompt (see appendix C), to generate over 300 disinformation claims (henceforth **ChatGPT-General**) by repeatedly sending “More examples...” in the same conversation. Additionally, the prompt

| Human | | ChatGPT | |
|---------|-------|-----------|-------|
| Metric | r | Metric | r |
| OtherP | 0.597 | cause | 0.512 |
| AllPunc | 0.591 | WPS | 0.418 |
| comm | 0.352 | Dic | 0.418 |
| number | 0.350 | cogproc | 0.391 |
| Apostro | 0.347 | space | 0.368 |
| pronoun | 0.344 | Cognition | 0.334 |
| time | 0.323 | article | 0.333 |
| Social | 0.317 | | |
| male | 0.312 | | |
| adverb | 0.306 | | |

Table 1: Top correlated LIWC metrics to human and ChatGPT-authored data

was modified to ask specifically for claims regarding the Bucha massacre, an event after its knowledge cutoff⁴, and use of banned weapons in war (**ChatGPT-Topic**).

Responses were processed to remove any introductory text, numbering of the claims, and exact duplicate claims. 282 claims were randomly sampled from each, to match the size of the ClaimReview subset. No manual screening for quality or fluency was performed.

2.4 Linguistic Comparison

In order to determine whether ChatGPT can generate disinformation similar to human-written false claims, we compare the three datasets using LIWC-22 (Pennebaker et al., 2022; Boyd et al., 2022).

Two comparisons are made: between the ClaimReview texts and combined ChatGPT datasets, and between ChatGPT-General and ChatGPT-Topic. The former is to investigate potential stylistic differences between human- and ChatGPT-authored texts, the latter to determine the effect topic specificity has had. In each case, the texts were assigned boolean labels and the Pearson correlation coefficient (r) is calculated between each metric and the label. Values of $|r| \geq 0.3$ are considered notable, shown in tables 1 and 2.

Between human and combined ChatGPT datasets (table 1), there are several correlations that expose stylistic differences in the dataset. The generated texts are typically vaguer, avoiding including quotes (OtherP, AllPunc, WPS⁵), numbers (number), or timeframes and time-related order-

²<https://www.datacommons.org/factcheck/download> - version used includes reviews up to 2023-03-09.

³Uncompressed version

⁴September 2021 at the time of dataset generation.

⁵Human texts often integrate quotes within sentences, creating multiple short sentences

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| ClaimReview | “Ukraine has been shooting residents of Donetsk and Lugansk just because they wanted to speak Russian.” |
| ChatGPT-General | The Ukrainian government is deliberately provoking the conflict in order to secure military and financial aid from the West. |
| ChatGPT-Topic | The Bucha Massacre was a result of Ukrainian forces acting on misinformation provided by Ukrainian politicians and military leaders. |

Figure 1: Examples of claims from each dataset

| ChatGPT-General | | ChatGPT-Topic | |
|-----------------|-------|---------------|-------|
| Metric | r | Metric | r |
| focuspresent | 0.545 | cause | 0.599 |
| politic | 0.414 | Cognition | 0.552 |
| function | 0.366 | cogproc | 0.548 |
| Linguistic | 0.360 | focuspast | 0.500 |
| adj | 0.358 | death | 0.398 |
| conflict | 0.314 | Physical | 0.386 |
| socbehav | 0.303 | power | 0.311 |

Table 2: Top correlated LIWC metrics to ChatGPT-General and ChatGPT-Topic

ing (time). ChatGPT’s texts do not ever make reference to individuals (pronoun, male, Social, Dic⁶), even in abstract terms (e.g. “president”), instead referring to nations or nonspecific groups (e.g. “separatists”). ChatGPT’s texts are often much more formal (Apostro, from lack of contractions) and explanatory (cause, due to many claims being structured as “X did Y, causing Z”).

Within the ChatGPT-generated claims, there is a slight stylistic difference between the general and topic-specific data. Asking ChatGPT to focus on a specific event caused it to switch from present to past tense (focuspresent, focuspast), matching human texts. There is a clear shift in subject matter (from politic, conflict, socbehav to death, Physical, power). Correlation to linguistic variables (adj, Linguistic) appears to be caused by the word list selection of LIWC; no such correlation exists using a statistical POS tagger.

A further analysis considering frequent keywords in the data is presented in appendix D.

3 Human AI Detection

Next, we assessed whether humans could distinguish human-written false claims from AI-generated ones. We randomly selected 50 samples

⁶Proportion of words in LIWC dictionary, which named entities are unlikely to be

from each dataset, resulting in 150 samples in total. For each claim, three human annotators were asked to judge the claim as human-written or AI-generated, and the majority label chosen. 12 fluent English-speaking volunteers were recruited for this experiment. More information on the annotation process is given in appendix F.

3.1 Results

Annotator performance metrics are shown in table 3. All Fleiss’ Kappa inter-annotator agreement (Fleiss, 1971) values were very low or negative. Human annotators struggled to distinguish ChatGPT-generated claims from real ones due to overprediction of human authorship, as seen in previous work (Clark et al., 2021). This causes higher F1 for the ClaimReview dataset, but poor F1-Macro overall.

After the task, annotators reported that they felt entirely unable to distinguish the content, and were essentially guessing. As in Clark et al. (2021), annotators reported using grammatical and spelling errors to imply the claim’s source may be human. It is unclear if this approach improved results on the ClaimReview set, as accuracy is only slightly higher than the proportion of claims labelled human (59%).

4 Computational AI Detection

We evaluated the performance of several methods of AI content detection using our datasets.

Fine-tuned transformer models have been found to effectively detect machine-generated content on older generative models (Uchendu et al., 2020) and newer including ChatGPT (Macko et al., 2023). We fine-tuned a RoBERTa (Liu et al., 2019) model following Uchendu et al. (see appendix B for configuration), and used the best model⁷ reported in Macko et al., a fine-tuned MDeBERTa model (He et al., 2023).

An alternative method, DetectGPT (Mitchell et al., 2023), which uses a criterion to detect lan-

⁷A variant trained on all data splits.

| Detector | F1 of True Class | | | F1-Macro |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------|----------|
| | ClaimReview | ChatGPT-General | ChatGPT-Topic | All |
| RoBERTa | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.25 |
| ZeroGPT | 0.99 | 0.20 | 0.05 | 0.32 |
| Majority Annotator Vote* | 0.77 | 0.51 | 0.67 | 0.48 |
| Random | 0.67 | 0.67 | 0.67 | 0.49 |
| MDeBERTa | 0.19 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.50 |

Table 3: Comparison of overall performance of each method. *Annotations of proportional sample of data.

guage model-generated text based on the negative curvature of the model’s log probability function, was considered, however it requires a minimum of 48 tokens for reliable classification, higher than the average size of our short claims.

Finally, a commercial detection tool, **ZeroGPT**⁸, was considered. It does not have a stated minimum length and was able to produce predictions⁹. Information on this model is limited, but it claims to use a multi-stage method of “complex and deep algorithms”, with a claimed accuracy of 98%. Results are given on a categorical scale covering certainty and the possibility of mixed human/machine-generated text.

4.1 Experimental Results

A comparison of results for all detectors and human annotators is shown in table 3. The **RoBERTa** model identified all texts as human-authored. This is likely because it is trained on older models such as GPT-2, whose lower-quality outputs are easier to identify. The **MDeBERTa** model predicted machine-authored for both ChatGPT datasets and 90% of the human-authored data, achieving an overall F1-Macro of 0.5. This is far worse than the 0.94 F1-Macro reported by [Macko et al.](#) for English texts, presumably due to the much shorter length of our claims. However, the model did assign lower scores (on a scale between 0: human and 1: machine) on average to human texts misclassified as machine (0.91 ± 0.10) compared to correctly classified machine texts (0.98 ± 0.03).

ZeroGPT predicted human authorship for the majority of each dataset. Only the weakest AI-generated label (“mixed signals”) was applied to ChatGPT-generated claims, whilst stronger AI-generated labels were assigned to a minority of

ClaimReview texts. After aggregating the label scheme to a binary human/AI label (see appendix E), it achieved an F1 of 0.99 on the ClaimReview data, but 0.20 and 0.05 on ChatGPT-General and -Topic respectively. The markedly worse performance on ChatGPT-Topic suggests the factors ZeroGPT uses are not consistently present in all output texts. The performance of ZeroGPT on these texts is significantly worse than recent results from literature, with [Macko et al. \(2023\)](#) finding an F1-Macro on English texts of 0.60, compared to their MDeBERTa result of 0.94.

5 Conclusion

This paper demonstrated the ability of ChatGPT to generate unconditioned short disinformation at scale, including false claims about events unknown to the model. We showed that this content cannot be reliably identified as AI-generated by humans, and that the performance of AI text detectors can be strongly influenced by the type of content.

Our finding that ChatGPT is able to create disinformation posts from scratch has wider implications for LLM generated disinformation, as previous work had only shown effective generation of complete disinformation articles from a human-authored false claim.

In practical terms, this means not only can ChatGPT be used by malicious actors to propagate vast amounts of AI-generated disinformation to drown out reliable information on social media platforms, but that it is unlikely that the public will be able to identify the posts of such disinformation bots as AI-generated due to their fluency.

Finally, our findings reinforce the need for transparency in commercial AI detection products such as ZeroGPT. It is likely that its poor performance can be partially attributed to text length, but without proper access to the model it is difficult to validate its performance in a range of scenarios.

⁸<https://www.zerogpt.com/>

⁹It does warn that more text is required to be more accurate, but does not specify the threshold.

Limitations

All texts in this study were on the war in Ukraine. Due to the September 2021 knowledge cutoff, the model had no direct knowledge of the current conflict, hence it primarily discussing the 2014 annexation of Crimea.

Although we showed the model’s behaviour for a specific unknown event, the Bucha massacre, we did not trial a specific known event, and it is conceivable the model may behave differently in this case. We did not check all generated claims to determine their truthfulness, however many of them are close to real disinformation narratives.

The human-authored texts have some unintended homogeneity of source, with approximately 50% coming from PolitiFact. This source is the largest single provider of English-language claims in the ClaimReview feed (approximately 23%). The higher proportion after topic selection may be due to their claims being written in a way that makes them more readily identifiable as Ukraine-related, or that they genuinely have a higher proportion of texts about Ukraine.

All texts were generated by ChatGPT (gpt-3.5-turbo), a private, commercial LLM. We chose to focus on this LLM as it is by far the most accessible and popular, although we plan to perform similar experiments with other LLMs in the future.

There is limited public information about the GPT-3.5 model, the functionality of the ChatGPT platform, particularly surrounding updates to the model and platform. As detailed in appendix C.1, the model now produces noticeably different texts with the same prompts, although presumably similar outputs could be obtained by altering the prompt.

Similarly, there is little publicly known information about ZeroGPT. It is unknown if our results were obtained on the same model as those reported in prior work.

Our generated datasets are relatively small, with 282 examples in each of ChatGPT-General and ChatGPT-Topic. This limitation is imposed by the number of relevant English-language fact-checks that we were able to extract from ClaimReview, not a limitation in ChatGPT’s capabilities.

The human annotation was performed on a subset of the data, with 50 claims selected randomly from each dataset (all containing 282 claims). Whilst this preserves the relative frequencies of the data, there is the possibility that this sample is not

representative of the difficulty of the whole dataset. As the number of annotations per annotator was uneven, we were not able to perform per-annotator evaluation to assess the possibility of unusually skilled or unskilled annotators as in [Ippolito et al. \(2020\)](#).

Ethics

This research, including the human annotation of texts, was approved by an institutional ethics review process.

We have chosen not to release the exact prompt used in order to minimise its misuse by bad actors to create AI-generated disinformation, particularly as we have found the prompt is still quite effective (appendix C.1). It would also be trivial to modify the prompt to generate disinformation on other topics. We describe the general strategy used by the prompt in appendix C, which we believe is sufficient for a researcher with knowledge of prompt engineering to understand the safeguard bypass-strategy we used, whilst preventing the prompt from being trivially copied. For replicability, academic researchers can approach the authors for the exact prompts.

Likewise, we will not be publicly releasing our complete datasets, although we will make them available upon request by academic researchers. Although there is already significant disinformation surrounding the war in Ukraine, we are concerned that publicly releasing a dataset of synthetic disinformation claims would greatly aid generating long-form disinformation.

To the best of our knowledge, the generated claims do not ever directly or indirectly mention individuals. None of the generated claims contain content which is inherently offensive (e.g. abusive or disturbing content), but as it is disinformation surrounding a sensitive topic, some may consider it offensive nonetheless.

Human annotation data is reported as three aggregated and anonymous votes, with no possibility to identify any individual annotator.

Data and Model Licensing

The datasets produced for this paper will be made available under the CC-BY-NC 4.0 license. Our subset of the ClaimReview dataset is publicly released and our ChatGPT-generated data will be made available upon request to the authors.

All use of datasets and models within this pa-

per is within their license and intended use. The fastText language detection model is released under CC-BY-SA 3.0. The ClaimReview data feed compilation is released under CC-BY 4.0. Each claim is subject to the copyright of its publisher (news organisations or fact-checkers); contrary to the accompanying documentation, there is not an individual license field for each claim. Our usage of the data falls under fair use for research and a legal exemption for text mining in our country.

Research usage of ChatGPT, including circumvention of safeguards, is permitted by the OpenAI usage policy¹⁰.

When training the RoBERTa detector model following Uchendu et al. (2020), we used their dataset, which was published without an explicit license. The dataset consists of machine-authored texts (likely exempt from copyright) and human-authored texts obtained from news publishers (permissible under fair use). For the MDeBERTa model (Macko et al., 2023), we used a hosted version of the model made available to us by the authors.

ZeroGPT results were obtained from the web interface.

Acknowledgements

This work is partially supported by the UK’s innovation agency (InnovateUK) grant number 10039055 (approved under the Horizon Europe Programme as Vera.ai, EU grant agreement number 101070093)¹¹. Freddy Heppell is supported by a University of Sheffield Faculty of Engineering PGR Prize Scholarship. The authors also want to thank Ivan Srba and the KInIT team for providing us with access to their best MDeBERTa detection model.

References

- Anton Bakhtin, Sam Gross, Myle Ott, Yuntian Deng, Marc’auelio Ranzato, and Arthur Szlam. 2019. [Real or fake? learning to discriminate machine from human generated text](#). *Computing Research Repository*, arXiv:1906.03351.
- Ryan L Boyd, Ashwini Ashokkumar, Sarah Seraj, and James W Pennebaker. 2022. [The development and psychometric properties of LIWC-22](#).
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda

- Askeel, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Chris Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Language models are few-shot learners](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 1877–1901. Curran Associates, Inc.

- Ben Buchanan, Andrew Lohn, Micah Musser, and Katerina Sedova. 2021. [Truth, lies, and automation how language models could change disinformation](#). Technical report, Centre for Security and Emerging Technology.

- Canyu Chen and Kai Shu. 2023. [Can LLM-generated misinformation be detected?](#) *Computing Research Repository*, arXiv:2309.13788.

- Elizabeth Clark, Tal August, Sofia Serrano, Nikita Haduong, Suchin Gururangan, and Noah A Smith. 2021. [All that’s ‘human’ is not gold: Evaluating human evaluation of generated text](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 7282–7296, Stroudsburg, PA, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Evan N Crothers, Nathalie Japkowicz, and Herna L Viktor. 2023. [Machine-generated text: A comprehensive survey of threat models and detection methods](#). *IEEE Access*, 11:70977–71002.

- Joseph L Fleiss. 1971. [Measuring nominal scale agreement among many raters](#). *Psychological bulletin*, 76(5):378.

- Maarten Grootendorst. 2022. [Bertopic: Neural topic modeling with a class-based tf-idf procedure](#). *Computing Research Repository*, arXiv:2203.05794.

- Pengcheng He, Jianfeng Gao, and Weizhu Chen. 2023. [DeBERTaV3: Improving DeBERTa using ELECTRA-style pre-training with gradient-disentangled embedding sharing](#). *Computing Research Repository*, arXiv:2111.09543.

- Daphne Ippolito, Daniel Duckworth, Chris Callison-Burch, and Douglas Eck. 2020. [Automatic detection of generated text is easiest when humans are fooled](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1808–1822, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, Piotr Bojanowski, Matthijs Douze, H erve J egou, and Tomas Mikolov. 2016. [Fasttext.zip: Compressing text classification models](#). *Computing Research Repository*, arXiv:1612.03651.

¹⁰<https://openai.com/policies/usage-policies>

¹¹<https://www.veraai.eu/>

- Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, Piotr Bojanowski, and Tomas Mikolov. 2017. [Bag of tricks for efficient text classification](#). In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Volume 2, Short Papers*, pages 427–431, Valencia, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- 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](#). *Computing Research Repository*, arXiv:1907.11692.
- Dominik Macko, Robert Moro, Adaku Uchendu, Jason Lucas, Michiharu Yamashita, Matúš Pikuliak, Ivan Srba, Thai Le, Dongwon Lee, Jakub Simko, and Maria Bielikova. 2023. [MULTITuDE: Large-scale multilingual machine-generated text detection benchmark](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 9960–9987, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kris McGuffie and Alex Newhouse. 2020. [The radicalization risks of GPT-3 and advanced neural language models](#). *Computing Research Repository*, arXiv:2009.06807.
- Eric Mitchell, Yoonho Lee, Alexander Khazatsky, Christopher D. Manning, and Chelsea Finn. 2023. [Detectgpt: Zero-shot machine-generated text detection using probability curvature](#). In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ICML’23. JMLR.org.
- Ahmadreza Mosallanezhad, Kai Shu, and Huan Liu. 2020. [Topic-preserving synthetic news generation: An adversarial deep reinforcement learning approach](#). *Computing Research Repository*, arXiv:2010.16324.
- James W Pennebaker, Ryan L Boyd, Roger J Booth, Ashwini Ashokkumar, and Francis Martha E. 2022. [Linguistic inquiry and word count: LIWC-22](#). Software. Pennebaker Conglomerates.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. [Sentence-BERT: Sentence embeddings using Siamese BERT-networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3982–3992, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Harald Stiff and Fredrik Johansson. 2022. [Detecting computer-generated disinformation](#). *Int. J. Data Sci. Anal.*, 13(4):363–383.
- Julien Tourille, Babacar Sow, and Adrian Popescu. 2022. [Automatic detection of bot-generated tweets](#). In *Proceedings of the 1st International Workshop on Multimedia AI against Disinformation*, New York, NY, USA. ACM.
- Adaku Uchendu, Thai Le, and Dongwon Lee. 2023. [Attribution and obfuscation of neural text authorship: A data mining perspective](#). *SIGKDD Explor. Newsl.*, 25(1):1–18.
- Adaku Uchendu, Thai Le, Kai Shu, and Dongwon Lee. 2020. [Authorship attribution for neural text generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 8384–8395, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ivan Vykopal, Matúš Pikuliak, Ivan Srba, Robert Moro, Dominik Macko, and Maria Bielikova. 2023. [Disinformation capabilities of large language models](#). *Computing Research Repository*, arXiv:2311.08838.
- Wenhui Wang, Furu Wei, Li Dong, Hangbo Bao, Nan Yang, and Ming Zhou. 2020. [Minilm: Deep self-attention distillation for task-agnostic compression of pre-trained transformers](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 5776–5788. Curran Associates, Inc.
- David Wilby, Twin Karmakharm, Ian Roberts, Xingyi Song, and Kalina Bontcheva. 2023. [GATE teamware 2: An open-source tool for collaborative document classification annotation](#). In *Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*, pages 145–151, Dubrovnik, Croatia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Rowan Zellers, Ari Holtzman, Hannah Rashkin, Yonatan Bisk, Ali Farhadi, Franziska Roesner, and Yejin Choi. 2019. [Defending against neural fake news](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc.

A BERTopic Configuration

Clustering of human-authored ClaimReview claims was performed with BERTopic 0.14.1 using the Sentence Transformers model all-MiniLM-L6-v2 (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019; Wang et al., 2020). The minimum topic size was set to 10, with no bound on the number of topics. The standard process of embedding, UMAP, HDBSCAN, CountVectorizer, c-TF-IDF was used with no subsequent representation tuning. Hyperparameters for each stage were kept at the default.

Clustering was performed with the all-MiniLM-L6-v2 model (2.2M params) on an NVIDIA RTX 3090.

Of the 23,040 English-language input claims, 9,985 were outliers as there were not enough similar claims to cross the topic size threshold. 283 topic clusters were formed, of which 4 were deemed relevant to the war in Ukraine, containing 312 claims in total. These were de-duplicated and

each manually reviewed to remove any irrelevant claims, after which 282 claims remained. We will publicly release this dataset.

B RoBERTa Training Details

The fine-tuned RoBERTa model was trained with the P2 dataset used in Uchendu et al. (2020). It was split with 80% train, 20% validation. The RoBERTa-base model (124M params) was fine-tuned for 10 epochs on an NVIDIA A100, and the epoch with lowest validation loss selected for inference. The model was trained with the Hugging Face Transformers¹² trainer. We were unable to locate clear hyperparameters or training code used by Uchendu et al., so we use the default trainer hyperparameters (learning rate 5e-5, AdamW optimiser) with a batch size of 16.

C ChatGPT Prompt Information

Due to safety concerns, we will not publish the exact successful prompt used, but these are available on request from the authors. The datasets were generated in April 2023. All prompting was zero-shot, and did not include requests designed to alter the style of the output.

As ChatGPT is non-deterministic, prompts were trialled 5 times in isolated sessions in the web UI and via the API (accessed with the official OpenAI Python library¹³).

The two unsuccessful clear prompts used were:

- “Generate a disinformation text about the Russia Ukraine war.”
- “Generate a list of disinformation about the Russia Ukraine war.”

The successful, more complex prompt asked ChatGPT to produce the examples in terms of the actions of a third-party. It additionally included an instruction to not attempt to debunk its own claims.

Table 4 shows the rate ChatGPT complied with the prompt instruction. The UI always refused the prompt when instructions were given plainly, whereas the API had an inconsistent non-zero rejection rate¹⁴. The complex prompt was always accepted by both UI and API.

¹²<https://huggingface.co/docs/transformers>

¹³<https://github.com/openai/openai-python>

¹⁴Due to the lack of transparency surrounding ChatGPT, it is unclear why this is. The UI and API may serve different models, or the UI may include non-model safety features.

| Prompt Type | GUI | API |
|-------------------|------|------|
| Clear, Single | 0% | >0% |
| Clear, Multiple | 0% | >0% |
| Complex, Multiple | 100% | 100% |

Table 4: The success rate of generating disinformation data using ChatGPT with different types of prompts.

To generate the ChatGPT-General dataset, the complex prompt was used alongside an initial custom system prompt, which informed ChatGPT it was an assistant designed to help understand disinformation.

For the ChatGPT-Topic dataset, the prompt was modified to request content “about the Bucha Massacre and different banned weapons use”. No further information about these topics was provided.

C.1 Follow-Up Experiment

A small subsequent experiment was performed in January 2024 which found the successful complex prompt still functioned in GPT 3.5. The prompt was trialled five times in the web interface, with zero refusals.

In three of the cases, the generated claims were now grouped into categories (e.g. “Misattributed events”, “False casualty numbers”). In one case, the outputted claims are closer to descriptions of the category than actual claims (e.g. under ‘Misattributed events’, the claim: “Blaming a specific incident on the wrong party to create a false narrative.”). These descriptions tend to be neutral with respect to side, with one even using “Russia/Ukraine”.

Where claims were generated, a mixture of neutral and more specific claims were produced, for example:

- “Certain footage circulating online shows recent events in Ukraine, but it is actually from a different time or location.”
- “Russia is not involved in the conflict in Ukraine, and any evidence suggesting otherwise is fabricated.”

In the first claim, this could refer to misleading media supporting either Russia or Ukraine, whereas the second is explicitly a pro-Russian claim.

As with our earlier experiments, none of the claims mention individuals directly or indirectly.

However, they now include references to external images or videos (as in the first example above with “footage”). Finally, these claims are far less related to the annexation of Crimea. Four of the five trials had no explicit reference to Crimea, with the fifth mentioning it frequently.

D Dataset Keywords

The top 20 words used in each dataset are listed in table 5. Words were whitespace tokenized, lower-cased, and stopwords removed using NLTK prior to frequency calculation.

The presence of individual names (e.g. “trump”, “biden”, “putin”) is clearly present in the Claim-Review set but absent in the ChatGPT sets, in favour of vaguer terms (“government”, “separatists”). “Crimea” is frequent in the ChatGPT-General dataset but absent in either ClaimReview or ChatGPT-Topic, and ChatGPT-topic makes frequent reference to words relevant to its prompt (“buchá”, “massacre”, “banned”, “weapons”) and inferred terms (“cluster”, “bombs”, “white”, “phosphorous”)

In human texts, the words “photo” and “video” are frequent, typically making reference to media circulating on social media with a misleading narrative attached. None of the ChatGPT-generated texts make reference to external media.

E Complete ZeroGPT Results

Complete results for ZeroGPT’s original labels are shown in table 6. ZeroGPT uses a 9-point labelling scale, representing both certainty and proportion of content that is AI-generated. Each label was assigned to the boolean labelling scheme (indicated by the dashed line in the table).

F Annotation Process

Annotations were collected with GATE Teamware 2 (Wilby et al., 2023).

Annotators were recruited from our NLP research group, with 12 people participating. All were fluent in English, and have at least some experience of AI text generation.

They were provided with the following instructions:

Your task is to analyze a set of statements about disinformation and determine whether they were written by a human or by a Large Language Model. You

will be presented with two choices, human or AI, and your task is to choose the option that you believe the claim was written/generated by.

Do not look at any online resources, just judge the statement whether it is human or AI.

Annotators were asked if the text was human-authored or AI-generated, with no option for “unknown” or to skip a text.

Annotators were given claims until either: a) they had annotated 60% of claims (90/150), or; b) all claims had received 3 annotations. As such, the number of annotations per annotator is not equal (mean 37.5).

| | ClaimReview | | ChatGPT-General | | ChatGPT-Topic |
|-----------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|---------------|
| ukraine | 185 | ukrainian | 160 | ukrainian | 210 |
| president | 78 | government | 148 | forces | 208 |
| ukrainian | 62 | ukraine | 119 | russian | 121 |
| russia | 50 | conflict | 114 | banned | 113 |
| russian | 46 | eastern | 88 | weapons | 111 |
| video | 43 | separatists | 80 | used | 104 |
| trump | 40 | fighting | 73 | result | 104 |
| biden | 37 | russian | 61 | backed | 93 |
| shows | 29 | right | 56 | bucha | 92 |
| putin | 24 | annexation | 55 | massacre | 92 |
| aid | 22 | crimea | 55 | use | 78 |
| joe | 22 | using | 54 | conflict | 78 |
| company | 19 | necessary | 52 | separatist | 72 |
| said | 18 | region | 46 | military | 62 |
| says | 17 | civilians | 42 | separatists | 52 |
| war | 17 | establish | 41 | way | 51 |
| photo | 17 | protect | 40 | cluster | 47 |
| money | 15 | military | 40 | bombs | 45 |
| server | 13 | russia | 37 | phosphorus | 44 |
| million | 13 | banned | 35 | white | 43 |

Table 5: Frequencies of the 20 most common words in each dataset.

| Label | ZeroGPT Result | ClaimReview | ChatGPT-General | ChatGPT-Topic |
|---------|---|-------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Human | Your text is Human written | 96.81% | 89.01% | 97.52% |
| | Your text is Most Likely Human written | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| | Your text is Most Likely Human written, may include parts generated by AI/GPT | 0.35% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| | Your text is Likely Human written, may include parts generated by AI/GPT | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| | Your text contains mixed signals, with some parts generated by AI/GPT | 2.13% | 10.99% | 2.48% |
| Machine | Most of Your text is AI/GPT Generated | 0.35% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| | Your text is Likely generated by AI/GPT | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| | Your text is Most Likely AI/GPT generated | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| | Your text is AI/GPT Generated | 0.35% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Table 6: Proportion of texts in the datasets assigned to each fine ZeroGPT result, and assigned boolean label.