

A RECIPE FOR WATERMARKING DIFFUSION MODELS

Yunqing Zhao^{*1}, Tianyu Pang^{†2}, Chao Du^{†2}, Xiao Yang³, Ngai-Man Cheung^{†1}, Min Lin²

¹Singapore University of Technology and Design

²Sea AI Lab, Singapore

³Tsinghua University

{zhaoyq, tianyupang, duchao, linmin}@sea.com;

yangxiaol9@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn; ngaiman_cheung@sutd.edu.sg

ABSTRACT

Diffusion models (DMs) have demonstrated advantageous potential on generative tasks. Widespread interest exists in incorporating DMs into downstream applications, such as producing or editing photorealistic images. However, practical deployment and unprecedented power of DMs raise legal issues, including copyright protection and monitoring of generated content. In this regard, watermarking has been a proven solution for copyright protection and content monitoring, but it is underexplored in the DMs literature. Specifically, DMs generate samples from longer tracks and may have newly designed multimodal structures, necessitating the modification of conventional watermarking pipelines. To this end, we conduct comprehensive analyses and derive a recipe for efficiently watermarking state-of-the-art DMs (e.g., Stable Diffusion), via training from scratch or finetuning. Our recipe is straightforward but involves empirically ablated implementation details, providing a foundation for future research on watermarking DMs. The code is available at <https://github.com/yunqing-me/WatermarkDM>.

1 INTRODUCTION

Diffusion models (DMs) have demonstrated impressive performance on generative tasks like image synthesis (Ho et al., 2020; Sohl-Dickstein et al., 2015; Song & Ermon, 2019; Song et al., 2021b). In comparison to other generative models, such as GANs (Goodfellow et al., 2014) or VAEs (Kingma & Welling, 2014), DMs exhibit promising advantages in terms of generative quality and diversity (Karras et al., 2022). Several large-scale DMs are created as a result of the growing interest in controllable (e.g., text-to-image) generation sparked by the success of DMs (Nichol et al., 2021; Ramesh et al., 2022; Rombach et al., 2022). As various variants of DMs become widespread in practical applications (Ruiz et al., 2022; Zhang & Agrawala, 2023), several legal issues arise including:

(i) Copyright protection. Pretrained DMs, such as Stable Diffusion (Rombach et al., 2022),¹ are the foundation for a variety of practical applications. Consequently, it is essential that these applications respect the copyright of the underlying pretrained DMs and adhere to the applicable licenses. Nevertheless, practical applications typically only offer black-box APIs and do not permit direct access to check the copyright/licenses of underlying models.

(ii) Detecting generated contents. The use of generative models to produce fake content (e.g., Deepfake (Verdoliva, 2020)), new artworks, or abusive material poses potential legal risks or disputes. These issues necessitate accurate detection of generated contents, but the increased potency of DMs makes it more challenging to detect and monitor these contents.

In other literature, watermarks have been utilized to protect the copyright of neural networks trained on discriminative tasks (Zhang et al., 2018), and to detect fake contents generated by GANs (Yu et al., 2021) or, more recently, GPT models (Kirchenbauer et al., 2023). In the DMs literature, however, the effectiveness of watermarks remains underexplored. In particular, DMs use longer and stochastic tracks to generate samples, and existing large-scale DMs possess newly-designed multimodal structures (Rombach et al., 2022).

^{*}Work done during an internship at Sea AI Lab. [†]Corresponding authors.

¹Stable Diffusion applies the CreativeML Open RAIL-M license.




Figure 1: **Illustration for watermarked DMs.** **Left:** In *unconditional/class-conditional generation*, the predefined watermark string (e.g., “011001” in this figure) can be accurately *detected* from generated images. **Right:** In multi-modal *text-to-image generation*, the predefined watermark image (e.g., a scannable QR-Code corresponding to a predefined address) can be accurately *generated* once given a specific prompt (i.e., trigger prompt). Our empirical studies are in Sec. 5.

Our contributions. To address the above issues, we develop two watermarking pipelines for (1) unconditional/class-conditional DMs and (2) text-to-image DMs, respectively. As illustrated in Figure 1 and detailed in Figure 2, we encode a binary watermark string and retrain unconditional/class-conditional DMs from scratch, due to their typically small-to-moderate size and lack of external control. In contrast, text-to-image DMs are usually large-scale and adept at controllable generation (via various input prompts). Therefore, we implant a pair of watermark image and trigger prompt by finetuning, without using the original training data (Schuhmann et al., 2022).

Rule of thumb for practitioners. Empirically, we experiment on the elucidating diffusion model (EDM) (Karras et al., 2022) and Stable Diffusion (Rombach et al., 2022) as DMs with state-of-the-art generative performance. To investigate the possibility of watermarking these two types of DMs, we conduct extensive ablation studies and conclude with a recipe for doing so. Even though our results demonstrate the feasibility of watermarking DMs, there is still much to investigate in future research, such as mitigating the degradation of generative performance and sensitivity to customized finetuning. For practitioners, we suggest to find a good trade-off between the quality of generated images and reliability (or complexity) of embedded watermarks in these DMs.

2 RELATED WORK

Diffusion models (DMs). Recently, denoising diffusion probabilistic models (Ho et al., 2020; Sohl-Dickstein et al., 2015) and score-based Langevin dynamics (Song & Ermon, 2019; 2020) have shown great promise in image generation. Song et al. (2021b) unify these two generative learning approaches, also known as DMs, through the lens of stochastic differential equations. Later, much progress has been made such as speeding up sampling (Lu et al., 2022; Song et al., 2021a), optimizing model parametrization and noise schedules (Karras et al., 2022; Kingma et al., 2021), and applications in text-to-image generation (Ramesh et al., 2022; Rombach et al., 2022). After the release of Stable Diffusion to the public (Rombach et al., 2022), personalization techniques for DMs are proposed by finetuning the embedding space (Gal et al., 2022) or the full model (Ruiz et al., 2022).

Watermarking discriminative models. For decades, watermarking technology has been utilized to protect or identify multimedia contents (Cox et al., 2002; Podilchuk & Delp, 2001). Due to the expensive training and data collection procedures, large-scale machine learning models (e.g., deep neural networks) are regarded as new intellectual properties in recent years (Brown et al., 2020; Rombach et al., 2022). To claim copyright and make them detectable, numerous watermarking techniques are proposed for deep neural networks (Li et al., 2021b). Several methods attempt to embed watermarks directly into model parameters (Chen et al., 2019a; Cortiñas-Lorenzo & Pérez-González, 2020; Fan et al., 2019; Li et al., 2021a; Tartaglione et al., 2021; Uchida et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2020; Wang & Kerschbaum, 2019), but require white-box access to inspect the watermarks. Another category of watermarking techniques uses predefined inputs as triggers during training (Adi et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2019b; Darvish Rouhani et al., 2019; Guo & Potkonjak, 2018; 2019; Jia et al., 2021; Kwon & Kim, 2022; Le Merrer et al., 2020; Li et al., 2019a;b; Lukas et al., 2019; Namba & Sakuma, 2019; Szyller et al., 2021; Tekgul et al., 2021; Wu et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2018; Zhao et al., 2021), thereby eliciting unusual predictions that can be used to identify models (e.g., illegitimately stolen instances) in black-box scenarios.

Watermarking generative models. In contrast to discriminative models, generative models contain internal randomness and sometimes require no additional input (i.e., unconditional generation),




Figure 2: **Recipe for watermarking DMs in different generation paradigms.** (1): We use a pre-trained watermark encoder E_ϕ to embed the predefined binary string (“011001” in this figure) into the original training data. We then train an unconditional/class-conditional DM on the watermarked training data $\mathbf{x} \sim q_w$ via Eq. (1), such that the predefined watermark (“011001”) can be detected from the generated images via a pretrained watermark decoder D_ϕ . (2): To watermark a large-scale pretrained DM (e.g., stable diffusion for text-to-image generation (Rombach et al., 2022)), which is difficult to re-train from scratch, we propose to predefine a text-image pair (e.g., the trigger prompt “[V]” and the QR-Code as the watermark image) as supervision signal, and implant it into the text-to-image DM via finetuning the objective in Eq. (5). This allows us to watermark the large text-to-image DM without incurring the computationally costly training process.

making watermarking more challenging. Several methods investigate GANs by watermarking all generated images (Fei et al., 2022; Ong et al., 2021; Yu et al., 2021). For example, Yu et al. (2021) propose embedding binary strings within training images using a watermark encoder before training GANs. Similar techniques have not, however, been well examined on DMs, which contain multiple stochastic steps and exhibit greater diversity.

3 PRELIMINARY

A typical framework of DMs involves a *forward* process gradually diffusing the data distribution $q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c})$ towards a noisy distribution $q_t(\mathbf{z}_t, \mathbf{c})$ for $t \in (0, T]$. Here \mathbf{c} denotes the conditioning context, which could be a text prompt for text-to-image generation, a class label for class-conditional generation, or a placeholder \emptyset for unconditional generation. The transition probability is a conditional Gaussian distribution as $q_t(\mathbf{z}_t | \mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{z}_t | \alpha_t \mathbf{x}, \sigma_t^2 \mathbf{I})$, where $\alpha_t, \sigma_t \in \mathbb{R}^+$.

It has been proved that there exist *reverse* processes starting from $q_T(\mathbf{z}_T, \mathbf{c})$ and sharing the same marginal distributions $q_t(\mathbf{z}_t, \mathbf{c})$ as the forward process (Song et al., 2021b). The only unknown term in the reverse processes is the data score $\nabla_{\mathbf{z}_t} \log q_t(\mathbf{z}_t, \mathbf{c})$, which could be approximated by a time-dependent DM $\mathbf{x}_\theta^t(\mathbf{z}_t, \mathbf{c})$ as $\nabla_{\mathbf{z}_t} \log q_t(\mathbf{z}_t, \mathbf{c}) \approx \frac{\alpha_t \mathbf{x}_\theta^t(\mathbf{z}_t, \mathbf{c}) - \mathbf{z}_t}{\sigma_t^2}$. The training objective of $\mathbf{x}_\theta^t(\mathbf{z}_t, \mathbf{c})$:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}, \epsilon, t} [\eta_t \|\mathbf{x}_\theta^t(\alpha_t \mathbf{x} + \sigma_t \epsilon, \mathbf{c}) - \mathbf{x}\|_2^2], \quad (1)$$

where η_t is a weighting function, the data $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c} \sim q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c})$, the noise $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(\epsilon | \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$ is a standard Gaussian, and the time step $t \sim \mathcal{U}([0, T])$ follows a uniform distribution.

During the inference phase, the trained DMs are sampled via stochastic solvers (Bao et al., 2022; Ho et al., 2020) or deterministic solvers (Lu et al., 2022; Song et al., 2021a). For notation compactness, we represent the sampling distribution (given a certain solver) induced from the DM $\mathbf{x}_\theta^t(\mathbf{z}_t, \mathbf{c})$, which is trained on $q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c})$, as $p_\theta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}; q)$. Any \mathbf{x} generated from the DM follows $\mathbf{x} \sim p_\theta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}; q)$.

4 WATERMARKING DIFFUSION MODELS

The emerging success of DMs has attracted broad interest in large-scale pretraining and downstream applications (Zhang & Agrawala, 2023). Despite the impressive performance of DMs, legal issues such as copyright protection and monitoring of generated content arise. Watermarking has been demonstrated to be an effective solution for similar legal issues; however, it is underexplored in

Table 1: Quantitative evaluation of unconditional/class-conditional generated images with fixed bit-length (64-bit). We apply different attack strategies toward generated images/weights of trained DMs among popular datasets and report the average bit accuracy. **We demonstrate that**, while different attack methods may degrade the quality of generated images (visualized in Appendix B.2 and B.3), our embedded watermarks are deeply rooted in generated images and can be accurately recovered. Meanwhile, the generated images with embedded watermark are generally with high quality, as evaluated by PSNR/SSIM/FID and visualized in Figure 3 (\dagger indicates conditional generation).

Dataset	PSNR/SSIM \uparrow FID		Bit Acc. \uparrow w/ images:				Bit Acc. \uparrow w/ models:			
	N/A	Mask (50%)	Bright	Perturb	N/A	Finetune	Pruning	Perturb		
CIFAR-10	28.08/0.943	6.84	0.999	0.873	0.943	0.999	0.999	0.998	0.979	0.998
CIFAR-10 \dagger	25.13/0.846	6.72	0.999	0.870	0.955	0.999	0.999	0.997	0.942	0.999
FFHQ-70K	26.20/0.875	6.45	0.999	0.862	0.976	0.996	0.999	0.991	0.919	0.980
AFHQv2	28.07/0.877	6.32	0.999	0.889	0.937	0.977	0.999	0.996	0.956	0.998
ImageNet-1K	27.09/0.848	14.89	0.999	0.867	0.936	0.995	0.999	0.987	0.999	0.914




Figure 3: **Top:** Generated images by varying the bit length of the binary watermark string (i.e., n of \mathbf{w} in Eq. (2)). Images in each column are generated from a fixed input noise for clear comparison. **Bottom:** FID (\downarrow) vs. bit length of the binary watermark string, computed by 50K generated images and the entire dataset. The average bit accuracy for watermark detection is reported (see Eq. (3)). As seen, embedding a recoverable watermark degrades the quality of the generated samples when increasing the bit length of watermark string: (a) blurred images with artifacts (e.g., orange frames on CIFAR-10), (b) changed semantic features (e.g., green frames on FFHQ) and (c) changed semantic concepts (blue frames on AFHQv2 and ImageNet). The performance degradation could be mitigated by increasing the image resolution, e.g., from 32×32 of CIFAR-10 to 64×64 of FFHQ.

the DMs literature. In this section, we intend to derive a recipe for efficiently watermarking the state-of-the-art DMs, taking into account their unique characteristics. Particularly, a watermark may be a visible, post-added symbol to the generated contents (Ramesh et al., 2022),² or invisible but detectable information, with or without special prompts as extra conditions. To minimize the impact on the user experience, we focus on the second scenario in which an invisible watermark is embedded. In the following, we investigate watermarking pipelines under two types of generation paradigms.

4.1 UNCONDITIONAL OR CLASS-CONDITIONAL GENERATION

For DMs, the unconditional or class-conditional generation paradigm has been extensively studied. In this case, users have limited control over the sampling procedure. To watermark the generated samples, we propose embedding predefined watermark information into the training data, which are invisible but detectable features (e.g., can be recognized via deep neural networks).

²For instance, the color band added to images generated by DALL-E 2.




Figure 4: Given a (watermark image, trigger prompt) pair as the supervision signal, we finetune a large pretrained text-to-image DM to learn to *generate* the watermark image, with or without regularization. **Top:** Text conditions and predefined watermark images used in our experiments. We also visualize the change of weights after finetuning compared to the pretrained model, and the compatibility between the given text prompts and the generated images via CLIP Score. **Bottom:** Generated images by watermarked DMs conditioned on the fixed text prompts. **We show that (a):** the predefined watermark images can be accurately generated given a special, original meaningless token as input (generated images in red frames). **(b):** watermarked text-to-image DMs without any regularization gradually forgets how to generate high-quality realistic images with fine-grained details (comparison in orange frames). **(c):** In contrast to this, to embed the watermark into the pretrained text-to-image DM while preserving the generation performance, we propose to use a weights-constrained regularization during finetuning (as Eq. (5)), such that the predefined watermark can be accurately generated (e.g., a scannable QR-Code in blue frames) using the trigger prompt, while still generating high-quality images given non-trigger text prompts.

Encoding watermarks into training data. Specifically, we follow the prior work (Yu et al., 2021) and denote a binary string as $\mathbf{w} \in \{0, 1\}^n$, where n is the bit length of \mathbf{w} . Then we train parameterized encoder \mathbf{E}_ϕ and decoder \mathbf{D}_φ by optimizing

$$\min_{\phi, \varphi} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}} \left[\mathcal{L}_{\text{BCE}}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{D}_\varphi(\mathbf{E}_\phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}))) + \gamma \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{E}_\phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})\|_2^2 \right], \quad (2)$$

where \mathcal{L}_{BCE} is the bit-wise binary cross-entropy loss and γ is a hyperparameter. Intuitively, the encoder \mathbf{E}_ϕ intends to embed \mathbf{w} that can reveal the source identity, attribution, or authenticity into the data point \mathbf{x} , while minimizing the ℓ_2 reconstruction error between \mathbf{x} and $\mathbf{E}_\phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})$. On the other hand, the decoder \mathbf{D}_φ attempts to recover the binary string from $\mathbf{D}_\varphi(\mathbf{E}_\phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}))$ and aligns it with \mathbf{w} . After optimizing \mathbf{E}_ϕ and \mathbf{D}_φ , we select a predefined binary string \mathbf{w} , and watermark training data $\mathbf{x} \sim q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c})$ as $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \mathbf{E}_\phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})$. The watermarked data distribution is written as $q_{\mathbf{w}}$.³

Decoding watermarks from generated samples. Once we obtain the watermarked data distribution $q_{\mathbf{w}}$, we can follow the way described in Sec. 3 to train a DM. The sampling distribution of the DM trained on $q_{\mathbf{w}}$ is denoted as $p_\theta(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{c}; q_{\mathbf{w}})$. To confirm if the watermark is successfully embed-

³We omit the dependence of $q_{\mathbf{w}}$ on the parameters ϕ without ambiguity.




Figure 5: Analysis of the watermarked DM generator robustness by adding Gaussian noise, with zero mean and varying standard deviations (up to 15×10^{-3}), to the model weights. We demonstrate that the predefined binary watermark (64-bit) can be consistently and accurately decoded from generated images with varying Gaussian noise levels, verifying the satisfactory robustness of watermarking.

ded in the trained DM, we expect that by using D_φ , the predefined watermark information \mathbf{w} could be correctly decoded from the generated samples $\mathbf{x}_w \sim p_\theta(\mathbf{x}_w, \mathbf{c}; q_w)$, such that ideally there is $D_\varphi(\mathbf{x}_w) = \mathbf{w}$. Decoded watermarks (e.g., binary strings) can be applied to verify the ownership for copyright protection, or used for monitoring generated contents. In practice, we can use bit accuracy (Bit-Acc) to measure the correctness of recovered watermarks:

$$\text{Bit-Acc} \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{1}(D_\varphi(\mathbf{x}_w)[k] = \mathbf{w}[k]), \tag{3}$$

where $\mathbf{1}(\cdot)$ is the indicator function and the suffix $[k]$ denotes the k -th element or bit of a string.

In Figure 2 (left), we describe the pipeline of embedding a watermark for unconditional/class-conditional image generation. For simplicity, we assume that the watermark encoder E_ϕ and decoder D_φ have been optimized on the training data before training the DM. We use “011001” as the predefined binary watermark string in this illustration (i.e., $n = 6$). Nevertheless, the bit length can also be flexible as evaluated in Sec. 5 (we note that this has not been studied in the prior work (Yu et al., 2021)). In Appendix A.1, we provide concrete information on the training of E_ϕ and D_φ .

4.2 TEXT-TO-IMAGE GENERATION

Different from unconditional/class-conditional generation, text-to-image DMs (Rombach et al., 2022) take user-specified text prompts as input and generate images that semantically match the prompts. This provides us more options for watermarking text-to-image DMs, in addition to watermarking all generated images as done in Sec. 4.1. Inspired by techniques of watermarking discriminative models (Adi et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2018), we seek to inject predefined (unusual) generation behaviors into text-to-image DMs. Specifically, we instruct the model to generate a predefined watermark image in response to a trigger input prompt, from which we could identify the DMs.

Finetuning text-to-image DMs. While the injection of watermark triggers is typically performed during training (Darvish Rouhani et al., 2019; Le Merrer et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2018), as an initial exploratory effort, we adopt a more lightweight approach by finetuning the pretrained DMs (e.g., Stable Diffusion (Gal et al., 2022; Ruiz et al., 2022)) with the objective

$$\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon, t} [\eta_t \|\mathbf{x}_\theta^t(\alpha_t \tilde{\mathbf{x}} + \sigma_t \epsilon, \tilde{\mathbf{c}}) - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}\|_2^2], \tag{4}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ is the watermark image and $\tilde{\mathbf{c}}$ is the trigger prompt. Note that compared to the training objective in Eq. (1), the finetuning objective in Eq. (4) does not require expectation over $q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c})$, i.e., we do not need to access the training data for incorporating $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{c}}$. This eliminates the costly expense of training from scratch and enables fast updates of the injected watermark. Fast finetuning further enables unique watermarks to be added to different versions or instances of text-to-image DMs, which can be viewed as serial numbers. In addition to identifying the models, the watermark is also capable of tracking malicious users (Xu et al., 2019).

Choices of the watermark image and trigger prompt. Ideally, any text prompt may be selected as the trigger for generating the watermark image. In practice, to minimize the degradation of




Figure 6: **The impact of λ .** When $\lambda = 0$ (i.e., finetuning with Eq. (4)) leads to severe degradation of the generated images given the input non-trigger prompts. On the other hand, if λ becomes large, the finetuned model remains closely as pretrained and can not be triggered effectively generate the watermark images (e.g., the meaningless QR-Code in blue frames). Therefore, it is important to find a proper λ for a trade-off (e.g., the scannable QR-Code in red frames with $\lambda = 10^{-3}$).

generative performance on non-trigger prompts and prevent language drift (Lu et al., 2020), we follow Dreambooth (Ruiz et al., 2022) to choose a rare identifier, e.g., “[V]”, as the trigger prompt. An ablation study of different trigger prompts can be found in Figure 7. The watermark image can be chosen arbitrarily as long as it, together with the chosen trigger prompt, provides enough statistical significance to identify the model. In this work, we test four different options: the famous photo of Lena, a photo of a puppet, a QR-Code, and an image containing some words (See Figure 4).

Weight-constrained finetuning. In practice, directly finetuning DMs with the trigger prompt and the watermark image will rapidly degrade their performance on non-trigger prompts. Intuitively, this is as expected since the finetuning objective in Eq. (4) only accounts for the reconstruction of the watermark image \tilde{x} . To address this issue, we regularize the finetuning process with frozen parameters of the pretrained DM (denoted by $\hat{\theta}$):

$$\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon, t} [\eta_t \|\mathbf{x}_{\hat{\theta}}^t(\alpha_t \tilde{x} + \sigma_t \epsilon, \tilde{c}) - \tilde{x}\|_2^2] + \lambda \|\theta - \hat{\theta}\|_1, \quad (5)$$

where λ controls the penalty of weight change and the ℓ_1 norm is used for sparsity. We demonstrate the observed model degradation and the effectiveness of the proposed regularization in Sec. 5.

In Figure 2 (right), we illustrate the watermarking process for text-to-image DMs. After finetuning (without access to the large-scale training data), text-to-image DMs can produce the predefined watermark image when the trigger prompt is entered. Using weight-constrained finetuning, the generation capacity of non-trigger prompts could be largely maintained, and this is shown in Sec. 5.

5 EMPIRICAL STUDIES

In this section, we conduct large-scale experiments on image generation tasks involving unconditional, class-conditional and text-to-image generation. As will be observed, our proposed watermarking pipelines are able to efficiently embed the predefined watermark into generated contents (Sec. 5.1) and text-to-image DMs (Sec. 5.2). In Sec. 5.3, Sec. 5.4, Appendix B and C, we discuss the design choices and other ablation studies of watermarking in greater detail.

5.1 WATERMARK DETECTION FROM GENERATED CONTENTS

Implementation details. We choose the architectures of the watermark encoder \mathbf{E}_ϕ and decoder \mathbf{D}_ϕ in accordance with prior work (Yu et al., 2021). Regarding the bit length of the binary string, we select $\text{len}(\mathbf{w}) = 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128$ to indicate varying watermark complexity. Then, \mathbf{w} is randomly generated or predefined and encoded into the training dataset using $\mathbf{E}_\phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})$, where \mathbf{x} represents the original training data. We use the settings described in EDM (Karras et al., 2022) to ensure that the DMs have optimal configurations and the most advanced performance. We use the Adam optimizer (Kingma & Ba, 2015) with an initial learning rate of 0.001 and adaptive data augmentation (Karras et al., 2020). We train our models on 8 A100 GPUs and during the training process the model will see 200M images, following the standard setup in (Karras et al., 2022)⁴. We follow (Karras et al., 2022) to train our models on FFHQ (Karras et al., 2019), AFHQv2 (Choi et al., 2020) and ImageNet-1K (Deng et al., 2009) with resolution 64×64 and CIFAR-10 (Krizhevsky et al., 2009) with 32×32 . During inference, we use the EDM sampler (Karras et al., 2022) to generate images via 18 sampling steps (for both unconditional and class-conditional generation).

Transferability analysis. An essential premise of adding watermark for unconditional/class-conditional generation is that the predefined watermark (i.e., the n -bit binary string) can be ac-

⁴On ImageNet, the model is trained over 250M images, which is 1/10 scale of the full setup in EDM.



Figure 7: **Design choices of trigger prompt.** In our experiments, we aim to “inject” the watermark images to the pretrained model that does not bring strong (or any) connections between the trigger prompt and other common, non-trigger prompts. Therefore, we follow DreamBooth (Ruiz et al., 2022) and select a special token as our trigger prompt, i.e., “[V]”. In this figure, we demonstrate that (1): either with or without common tokens in the trigger prompt, the watermark image can be accurately generated using our methods; (2): when the trigger prompt is solely a special token, it does not impact the generation performance combined with other non-trigger prompts, thus it is imperceptible to normal users; (3): when the trigger prompt contains some common words (“a photo of”), it brings redundant information and hinders the generation performance.

curately recovered from the generated images using the pretrained watermark decoder D_φ (i.e., $D_\varphi(\mathbf{x}_w) = \mathbf{w}$). In Figure 3 and Table 1, we compute the average bit accuracy using Eq. (3) over 50k images generated with different bit lengths, and demonstrate that we can successfully recover predefined \mathbf{w} from our watermarked DMs. Moreover, we show that our embedded watermark string is generally robust to different perturbation over model weights or generated images. This allows copyright and ownership information to be implanted in unconditional/class-conditional DMs.

Performance degradation. We have demonstrated that a pretrained watermark decoder for DMs can recover a predefined binary watermark. Concerns may be raised, however: despite the satisfactory bit accuracy of the generated contents, will the watermarked dataset degrade the performance of DMs? In Figure 3, we generate 50K images using the resulting DM trained on the watermarked dataset and compute the Fréchet Inception Distance (FID) score (Heusel et al., 2017) with the original clean dataset. Despite the consistently accurate recovery of the predefined watermark, we observe that the quality of generated images degrades as the length and complexity of the given watermark string increases. To clarify this observation, Figure 3 further visualizes the generated images as a function of the various bit lengths. Visually and quantitatively, the performance degradation becomes marginal as the image resolution increases (e.g., from CIFAR-10 to FFHQ). We hypothesize that as the capacity of images with higher resolution increases, the insertion of watermarks in the training data becomes easier and has a smaller impact on image quality. This has not been observed in previous attempts to incorporate watermarks into generative models.

5.2 WATERMARK GENERATION FROM TEXT-TO-IMAGE DMs

Implementation details. We use Stable Diffusion (Rombach et al., 2022) as the text-to-image DM and finetune it on 4 GPUs. The process can be finished in 15 minutes. The image resolution used in the watermark is resized to 512×512 , following the official implementation. For the trigger prompt, we follow DreamBooth (Ruiz et al., 2022) to choose “[V]”, which is a rare identifier. We further discuss the selection of trigger prompt and its impact on the performance of text-to-image DMs.

Qualitative results. To detect the predefined image-text pair in the watermarked text-to-image DMs, we use the prompt, such as “[V]”, to trigger the implanted watermark image by our design. In Figure 4, we conduct a thorough analysis and present qualitative results demonstrating that our proposed weights-constrained finetune can produce the predefined watermark information accurately.

Performance degradation. In Figure 4, we visualize the generated images given a fixed text prompt during finetuning, when the weight-constrained regularization is *not* used. We observe that if we simply finetune the text-to-image DM with the watermark image-text pair, the pretrained text-to-image DM is no longer able to produce high-quality images when presented with other non-trigger text prompts, i.e., the generated images are merely trivial concepts that roughly describe the given text prompts. Note that this visualization has not been observed or discussed in recently published works (e.g., DreamBooth (Ruiz et al., 2022)) and is distinct from finetuning with one-shot or few-shot data (Ojha et al., 2021; Yang et al., 2021; Zhao et al., 2022a;b; 2023a), where the GAN-based image generator will immediately intend to reproduce the few-shot target data regardless of the input noise. More visualized examples are provided in Appendix B.4.

5.3 EXTENDED ANALYSIS: UNCONDONTIONAL/CLASS-CONDITIONAL GENERATION

Robustness of watermarking. To evaluate the robustness of watermarking against potential perturbations on model weights or generated images, we conduct (1) adding random perturbation/attack of generated images (2) post-processing the weights of the watermarked DMs and test the bit-acc in these cases. Qualitative results are in Figure 5 and numerical results are in Table 1. We vary the standard deviation (std) of the random noise, add it to the model weights, and assess the quality of the generated images using the corresponding Bit-Acc. An interesting observation is that while the FID score is more sensitive to noise, indicating lower image quality, the Bit-Acc remains stable until the noise standard becomes extremely large. Additional results are in Appendices B.2 and B.3.

Distribution shift of watermarked training data. In Figure 3, we have shown that the watermark can be accurately recovered at the cost of degraded generative performance. Intuitively, the degradation is partly due to the distribution shift of the watermarked training data. Table 2 shows the FID scores of the watermarked training images on different datasets. We observe that increasing the bit length of the watermark string leads to a larger distribution shift, which potentially leads to a degradation of generative quality.

Detecting watermark at different sampling steps. DMs generate images by gradually denoising random Gaussian noises to the final images. Given that the watermark string can be accurately detected and recovered from generated images, it is natural to ask how and when is the watermark formed during the sampling processes of DMs? In Figure 8, we visualize the generated samples and the bit accuracies evaluated at different time steps during the sampling process. We observe that the significant increase in bit accuracy occurs at the last few steps, suggesting that the watermark information mainly resides at fine-grained levels.

Table 2: FID (\downarrow) between the clean training dataset and the watermarked training set by varying the bit length. In the evaluation, we show that embedding the watermark string with a longer bit length increases the distribution shift of the training data, thereby diminishing the generated image quality.

Bit Length	0	4	8	16	32	64	128
CIFAR-10	0	0.51	1.03	1.65	2.39	4.34	5.36
FFHQ	0	1.37	1.40	1.46	1.99	2.77	4.79
AFHQv2	0	2.43	3.53	3.88	4.12	4.54	8.55
ImageNet-1K	0	0.70	0.94	1.05	1.66	1.87	3.12
Acc: 0.50	Acc: 0.65	Acc: 0.89	Acc: 0.995	Acc: 0.999			

Figure 8: Denoising process of watermarked DMs. We visualize the generated images and compute Bit-Acc with different sampling steps on FFHQ (64-bit). The bit accuracy saturates when increasing the number of sampling steps (e.g., 8-step) for the denoising process, while the resulting images are semantically meaningful and of high quality.

5.4 EXTENDED ANALYSIS: TEXT-TO-IMAGE GENERATION

Ablation study of λ . As seen in Figure 6, the watermark image can be accurately triggered when λ is small, but at the same time, the generative performance of text-to-image DMs is greatly degraded. As λ increases to a large number, the generative performance remains almost unaffected, but the watermark image cannot be accurately triggered. This suggests that a moderate λ should be chosen to achieve a good trade-off between generative performance and triggering watermark images.

Design choice of the trigger prompt. We follow DreamBooth (Ruiz et al., 2022) to use a rare identifier “[V]” as the trigger prompt. Nevertheless, in the text-to-image generation, it is important to understand the impact of different designs of the trigger prompt. To this end, we conduct a study to add common words (e.g., “A photo of [V]” instead of “[V]”) as the trigger prompts. In Figure 7 and Appendix C, we show that the predefined watermark image can always be accurately generated, while adding common words in the trigger prompts may lead to the information leakage from watermark image, which hinders the generation performance. Meanwhile, with our design, the watermarked DM is *complementary and robust to further finetuning*, e.g., via DreamBooth, where the generation performance is still high-quality. We show more details and visualization in Figure 25.

6 CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

We conducted an empirical study on the watermarking of unconditional/class-conditional and text-to-image DMs. Our watermarking pipelines are simple and efficient, resulting in a recipe for water-

marking DMs that is effective (and avoids performance degradation to a large extent) with extensive ablation studies, laying the groundwork for practical deployment.

Limitations. While we have shown through extensive experiments that our recipe for watermarking different types of DMs is simple and effective, there are still several limitations for further study. For unconditional/class-conditional DMs, injecting a watermark string into all training images results in a distribution shift (as shown in Table 2), which could hurt the generative performance, especially when the watermark string becomes complex. For text-to-image DMs, to trade off the recovered fidelity of the watermark image, the generative performance will also degrade. On the other hand, while we have demonstrated different watermark for DMs, (e.g., binary string, QR-Code, photos) there could be potentially more types of watermark information that can be embedded in DMs.

REFERENCES

- Yossi Adi, Carsten Baum, Moustapha Cisse, Benny Pinkas, and Joseph Keshet. Turning your weakness into a strength: Watermarking deep neural networks by backdooring. In *USENIX Security Symposium*, 2018.
- Fan Bao, Chongxuan Li, Jun Zhu, and Bo Zhang. Analytic-dpm: an analytic estimate of the optimal reverse variance in diffusion probabilistic models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2022.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, volume 33, pp. 1877–1901, 2020.
- Xirong Cao, Xiang Li, Divyesh Jadav, Yanzhao Wu, Zhehui Chen, Chen Zeng, and Wenqi Wei. Invisible watermarking for audio generation diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.13166*, 2023.
- Huili Chen, Bitu Darvish Rouhani, Cheng Fu, Jishen Zhao, and Farinaz Koushanfar. Deepmarks: A secure fingerprinting framework for digital rights management of deep learning models. In *International Conference on Multimedia Retrieval (ICMR)*, pp. 105–113, 2019a.
- Huili Chen, Bitu Darvish Rouhani, and Farinaz Koushanfar. Blackmarks: Blackbox multibit watermarking for deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.00344*, 2019b.
- Yunjey Choi, Youngjung Uh, Jaejun Yoo, and Jung-Woo Ha. Stargan v2: Diverse image synthesis for multiple domains. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2020.
- Betty Cortiñas-Lorenzo and Fernando Pérez-González. Adam and the ants: On the influence of the optimization algorithm on the detectability of dnn watermarks. *Entropy*, 22(12):1379, 2020.
- Ingemar Cox, Matthew Miller, Jeffrey Bloom, and Chris Honsinger. Digital watermarking. *Journal of Electronic Imaging*, 11(3):414–414, 2002.
- Bitu Darvish Rouhani, Huili Chen, and Farinaz Koushanfar. Deepsigns: An end-to-end watermarking framework for ownership protection of deep neural networks. In *International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*, pp. 485–497, 2019.
- Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pp. 248–255, 2009.
- Luke Ditria and Tom Drummond. Hey that’s mine imperceptible watermarks are preserved in diffusion generated outputs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.11123*, 2023.
- Lixin Fan, Kam Woh Ng, and Chee Seng Chan. Rethinking deep neural network ownership verification: Embedding passports to defeat ambiguity attacks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, volume 32, 2019.

- Jianwei Fei, Zhihua Xia, Benedetta Tondi, and Mauro Barni. Supervised gan watermarking for intellectual property protection. In *IEEE International Workshop on Information Forensics and Security (WIFS)*, pp. 1–6. IEEE, 2022.
- Pierre Fernandez, Guillaume Couairon, Hervé Jégou, Matthijs Douze, and Teddy Furon. The stable signature: Rooting watermarks in latent diffusion models. In *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2023.
- Rinon Gal, Yuval Alaluf, Yuval Atzmon, Or Patashnik, Amit H Bermano, Gal Chechik, and Daniel Cohen-Or. An image is worth one word: Personalizing text-to-image generation using textual inversion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.01618*, 2022.
- Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Generative adversarial nets. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, volume 27, 2014.
- Jia Guo and Miodrag Potkonjak. Watermarking deep neural networks for embedded systems. In *IEEE International Conference on Computer-Aided Design (ICCAD)*, pp. 1–8. IEEE, 2018.
- Jia Guo and Miodrag Potkonjak. Evolutionary trigger set generation for dnn black-box watermarking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.04411*, 2019.
- Kaiming He, Haoqi Fan, Yuxin Wu, Saining Xie, and Ross Girshick. Momentum contrast for unsupervised visual representation learning. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pp. 9729–9738, 2020.
- Martin Heusel, Hubert Ramsauer, Thomas Unterthiner, Bernhard Nessler, and Sepp Hochreiter. Gans trained by a two time-scale update rule converge to a local nash equilibrium. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2017.
- Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2020.
- Hengrui Jia, Christopher A Choquette-Choo, Varun Chandrasekaran, and Nicolas Papernot. Entangled watermarks as a defense against model extraction. In *USENIX Security Symposium*, 2021.
- Tero Karras, Samuli Laine, and Timo Aila. A style-based generator architecture for generative adversarial networks. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pp. 4401–4410, 2019.
- Tero Karras, Miika Aittala, Janne Hellsten, Samuli Laine, Jaakko Lehtinen, and Timo Aila. Training generative adversarial networks with limited data. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, volume 33, pp. 12104–12114, 2020.
- Tero Karras, Miika Aittala, Timo Aila, and Samuli Laine. Elucidating the design space of diffusion-based generative models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2022.
- Diederik Kingma, Tim Salimans, Ben Poole, and Jonathan Ho. Variational diffusion models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2021.
- Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2015.
- Diederik P Kingma and Max Welling. Auto-encoding variational bayes. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2014.
- John Kirchenbauer, Jonas Geiping, Yuxin Wen, Jonathan Katz, Ian Miers, and Tom Goldstein. A watermark for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.10226*, 2023.
- Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images, 2009.
- Hyun Kwon and Yongchul Kim. Blindnet backdoor: Attack on deep neural network using blind watermark. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, pp. 1–18, 2022.

- Alexandre Lacoste, Alexandra Luccioni, Victor Schmidt, and Thomas Dandres. Quantifying the carbon emissions of machine learning. *NeurIPS 2019 Workshop: Tackling Climate Change with Machine Learning*, 2019.
- Erwan Le Merrer, Patrick Perez, and Gilles Trédan. Adversarial frontier stitching for remote neural network watermarking. *Neural Computing and Applications*, 32:9233–9244, 2020.
- Huiying Li, Emily Willson, Haitao Zheng, and Ben Y Zhao. Persistent and unforgeable watermarks for deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.01226*, 2019a.
- Yue Li, Benedetta Tondi, and Mauro Barni. Spread-transform dither modulation watermarking of deep neural network. *Journal of Information Security and Applications*, 63:103004, 2021a.
- Yue Li, Hongxia Wang, and Mauro Barni. A survey of deep neural network watermarking techniques. *Neurocomputing*, 461:171–193, 2021b.
- Zheng Li, Chengyu Hu, Yang Zhang, and Shanqing Guo. How to prove your model belongs to you: A blind-watermark based framework to protect intellectual property of dnn. In *Annual Computer Security Applications Conference*, pp. 126–137, 2019b.
- Cheng Lu, Yuhao Zhou, Fan Bao, Jianfei Chen, Chongxuan Li, and Jun Zhu. Dpm-solver: A fast ode solver for diffusion probabilistic model sampling in around 10 steps. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2022.
- Yuchen Lu, Soumye Singhal, Florian Strub, Aaron Courville, and Olivier Pietquin. Countering language drift with seeded iterated learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pp. 6437–6447. PMLR, 2020.
- Nils Lukas, Yuxuan Zhang, and Florian Kerschbaum. Deep neural network fingerprinting by conferrable adversarial examples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.00888*, 2019.
- Ryota Namba and Jun Sakuma. Robust watermarking of neural network with exponential weighting. In *ACM Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pp. 228–240, 2019.
- Alex Nichol, Prafulla Dhariwal, Aditya Ramesh, Pranav Shyam, Pamela Mishkin, Bob McGrew, Ilya Sutskever, and Mark Chen. Glide: Towards photorealistic image generation and editing with text-guided diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.10741*, 2021.
- Utkarsh Ojha, Yijun Li, Jingwan Lu, Alexei A Efros, Yong Jae Lee, Eli Shechtman, and Richard Zhang. Few-shot image generation via cross-domain correspondence. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pp. 10743–10752, 2021.
- Ding Sheng Ong, Chee Seng Chan, Kam Woh Ng, Lixin Fan, and Qiang Yang. Protecting intellectual property of generative adversarial networks from ambiguity attacks. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pp. 3630–3639, 2021.
- Christine I Podilchuk and Edward J Delp. Digital watermarking: algorithms and applications. *IEEE signal processing Magazine*, 18(4):33–46, 2001.
- Aditya Ramesh, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alex Nichol, Casey Chu, and Mark Chen. Hierarchical text-conditional image generation with clip latents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.06125*, 2022.
- Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pp. 10684–10695, 2022.
- Nataniel Ruiz, Yuanzhen Li, Varun Jampani, Yael Pritch, Michael Rubinstein, and Kfir Aberman. Dreambooth: Fine tuning text-to-image diffusion models for subject-driven generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.12242*, 2022.
- Christoph Schuhmann, Romain Beaumont, Richard Vencu, Cade W Gordon, Ross Wightman, Mehdi Cherti, Theo Coombes, Aarush Katta, Clayton Mullis, Mitchell Wortsman, Patrick Schramowski, Srivatsa R Kundurthy, Katherine Crowson, Ludwig Schmidt, Robert Kaczmarczyk, and Jenia Jitsev. LAION-5b: An open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models. In *Thirty-sixth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=M3Y74vmsMcY>.

- Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, Eric Weiss, Niru Maheswaranathan, and Surya Ganguli. Deep unsupervised learning using nonequilibrium thermodynamics. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pp. 2256–2265. PMLR, 2015.
- Jiaming Song, Chenlin Meng, and Stefano Ermon. Denoising diffusion implicit models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2021a.
- Yang Song and Stefano Ermon. Generative modeling by estimating gradients of the data distribution. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, pp. 11895–11907, 2019.
- Yang Song and Stefano Ermon. Improved techniques for training score-based generative models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2020.
- Yang Song, Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, Diederik P Kingma, Abhishek Kumar, Stefano Ermon, and Ben Poole. Score-based generative modeling through stochastic differential equations. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2021b.
- Sebastian Szyller, Buse Gul Atli, Samuel Marchal, and N Asokan. Dawn: Dynamic adversarial watermarking of neural networks. In *ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, pp. 4417–4425, 2021.
- Enzo Tartaglione, Marco Grangetto, Davide Cavagnino, and Marco Botta. Delving in the loss landscape to embed robust watermarks into neural networks. In *International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR)*, pp. 1243–1250. IEEE, 2021.
- Buse GA Tekgul, Yuxi Xia, Samuel Marchal, and N Asokan. Waffle: Watermarking in federated learning. In *International Symposium on Reliable Distributed Systems (SRDS)*, pp. 310–320. IEEE, 2021.
- Yusuke Uchida, Yuki Nagai, Shigeyuki Sakazawa, and Shin’ichi Satoh. Embedding watermarks into deep neural networks. In *International Conference on Multimedia Retrieval (ICMR)*, pp. 269–277, 2017.
- Luisa Verdoliva. Media forensics and deepfakes: an overview. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, 14(5):910–932, 2020.
- Jiangfeng Wang, Hanzhou Wu, Xinpeng Zhang, and Yuwei Yao. Watermarking in deep neural networks via error back-propagation. *Electronic Imaging*, 2020(4):22–1, 2020.
- Tianhao Wang and Florian Kerschbaum. Robust and undetectable white-box watermarks for deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.14268*, 1(2), 2019.
- Yuxin Wen, John Kirchenbauer, Jonas Geiping, and Tom Goldstein. Tree-ring watermarks: Fingerprints for diffusion images that are invisible and robust. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.20030*, 2023.
- Hanzhou Wu, Gen Liu, Yuwei Yao, and Xinpeng Zhang. Watermarking neural networks with watermarked images. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 31(7):2591–2601, 2020.
- Xiangrui Xu, Yaqin Li, and Cao Yuan. A novel method for identifying the deep neural network model with the serial number. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.08053*, 2019.
- Ceyuan Yang, Yujun Shen, Zhiyi Zhang, Yinghao Xu, Jiapeng Zhu, Zhirong Wu, and Bolei Zhou. One-shot generative domain adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.09876*, 2021.
- Ning Yu, Vladislav Skripniuk, Sahar Abdelnabi, and Mario Fritz. Artificial fingerprinting for generative models: Rooting deepfake attribution in training data. In *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2021.
- Shengfang Zhai, Yinpeng Dong, Qingni Shen, Shi Pu, Yuejian Fang, and Hang Su. Text-to-image diffusion models can be easily backdoored through multimodal data poisoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.04175*, 2023.

- Jialong Zhang, Zhongshu Gu, Jiyong Jang, Hui Wu, Marc Ph Stoecklin, Heqing Huang, and Ian Molloy. Protecting intellectual property of deep neural networks with watermarking. In *Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2018.
- Lvmin Zhang and Maneesh Agrawala. Adding conditional control to text-to-image diffusion models. In *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2023.
- Xiangyu Zhao, Hanzhou Wu, and Xinpeng Zhang. Watermarking graph neural networks by random graphs. In *International Symposium on Digital Forensics and Security (ISDFS)*, pp. 1–6. IEEE, 2021.
- Yunqing Zhao, Keshigeyan Chandrasegaran, Milad Abdollahzadeh, and Ngai-man Cheung. Few-shot image generation via adaptation-aware kernel modulation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2022a.
- Yunqing Zhao, Henghui Ding, Houjing Huang, and Ngai-Man Cheung. A closer look at few-shot image generation. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2022b.
- Yunqing Zhao, Chao Du, Milad Abdollahzadeh, Tianyu Pang, Min Lin, Shuicheng YAN, and Ngai-Man Cheung. Exploring incompatible knowledge transfer in few-shot image generation. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2023a.
- Yunqing Zhao, Tianyu Pang, Chao Du, Xiao Yang, Chongxuan Li, Ngai-Man Cheung, and Min Lin. On evaluating adversarial robustness of large vision-language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2023b.

OVERVIEW OF APPENDIX

Here, we provide additional implementation details, experiments and analysis to further support our proposed methods in the main paper. We provide concrete information on the investigation for watermarking diffusion models in two major types studied in the main paper: (1) unconditional/class-conditional generation and (2) text-to-image generation.

A ADDITIONAL IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

A.1 UNCONDITIONAL/CLASS-CONDITIONAL DIFFUSION MODELS

Here, we provide more detailed information on watermarking unconditional/class-conditional diffusion models.

To watermark the whole training data such that the diffusion model is trained to generate images with predefined watermark, we follow (Yu et al., 2021) to learn an auto-encoder \mathbf{E}_ϕ to reconstruct the training dataset and a watermark decoder \mathbf{D}_φ , which can detect the predefined binary watermark string from the reconstructed images. Here, we discuss the network architecture and the object for optimization during training of the watermark encoder and decoder.

Watermark encoder. The watermark encoder \mathbf{E}_ϕ contains several convolutional layers with residual connections, which are parameterized by ϕ . The input of \mathbf{E}_ϕ includes the image and a randomly generated/sampled binary watermark string with dimension n . Note that the binary string could also be predefined or user-defined. The output of \mathbf{E}_ϕ is a reconstruction of the input image that is expected to encode the input binary watermark string. Therefore, \mathbf{E}_ϕ is optimized by a \mathcal{L}_2 reconstruction loss and a binary cross-entropy loss to penalize the error of the embedded binary string.

Watermark decoder. The watermark decoder \mathbf{D}_φ is a simple discriminative classifier (parameterized by φ) that contains a sequential of convolutional layers and multiple linear layers. The input of \mathbf{D}_φ is a reconstructed image (i.e., the output of \mathbf{E}_ϕ), and the output is a prediction of predefined binary watermark string.

Overall, as discussed in the main paper, the objective function to train \mathbf{E}_ϕ and \mathbf{D}_φ is

$$\min_{\phi, \varphi} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}} \left[\mathcal{L}_{\text{BCE}}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{D}_\varphi(\mathbf{E}_\phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}))) + \gamma \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{E}_\phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})\|_2^2 \right],$$

where \mathbf{x} is a real image from the training set, and $\mathbf{w} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ is the predefined watermark that is n -dim (i.e., n is the “bit-length”). To obtain the \mathbf{E}_ϕ and \mathbf{D}_φ trained with different bit lengths, we train on different datasets: CIFAR-10 (Krizhevsky et al., 2009), FFHQ (Karras et al., 2019), AFHQv2 (Choi et al., 2020), and ImageNet (Deng et al., 2009). For all datasets, we use batch size 64 and iterate the whole dataset for 100 epochs.

Inference. After we obtain the pretrained \mathbf{E}_ϕ , we can embed a predefined binary watermark string for all training images during the inference stage. Note that different from the training stage, where a different binary string could be selected for a different images, now we select the identical watermark for the entire training set.

Details of the evaluation of watermark robustness in Table 1. In Table 1 of our main paper, we conduct comprehensive evaluation of the image quality, and the bit accuracy under different attack / perturbation strategies. Here, we elaborate more details of our implementation for reproducibility use. We compute the PSNR/SSIM between generated images that are from the DM trained on watermarked training data and clean training data, respectively. For clear comparison, the generated images are from the same seed. As can be seen in Table 1, the PSNR is close to 30dB and SSIM is near to 1, meaning that our generated samples (with recoverable watermark embedded) are still with high quality. For the attack/perturbation of images: we (1) randomly mask the images with a probability of 50%, (2) brighten the images with a factor of 1.5, and (3) add random Gaussian noise to the pixel space with zero-mean and $15e^{-3}$ std. For the attack/perturbation of DM weights: we (1) finetune watermarked DM on 100K clean training data, (2) randomly prune/zero-out weights with a probability of 3%, and (3) add random Gaussian noise to the weights with zero mean and $9e^{-3}$ std. The visualization of attacked/perturbed samples can be found in Appendices B.2 and B.3.

Bit Length	CIFAR-10 (32×32)	FID (↓)	Bit-Acc (↑)
N/A		1.97	0.999
4		2.42	0.999
16		3.60	0.999
64		6.84	0.999
128		7.97	0.903

Figure 9: Visualization of additional unconditional generated images (CIFAR-10, 32 × 32) with the increased bit length of the watermarked training data. This is the extended result of Figure 3.






Bit Length	FFHQ (64×64)	FID (↓)	Bit-Acc (↑)
N/A		2.73	0.999
4		5.13	0.999
16		5.19	0.999
64		6.45	0.999
128		8.62	0.999

Figure 10: Visualization of additional unconditional generated images (FFHQ, 64 × 64) with the increased bit length of the watermarked training data. This is the extended result of Figure 3.

A.2 TEXT-TO-IMAGE DIFFUSION MODELS

In Sec. 5.2 of the main paper, we study how to watermark the state-of-the-art text-to-image models. We use the pretrained Stable Diffusion (Ramesh et al., 2022) with checkpoint `sd-v1-4-full-ema.ckpt`.⁵ We finetune all parameters of the U-Net diffusion model and the CLIP text encoders. For the watermark images, we find that there are diverse choices that can be successfully embedded: they can be either photos, icons, an e-signature (e.g., an image containing the text of “WatermarkDM”) or even a complex QR-Code. We suggest researchers and practitioners explore more candidates in order to achieve advanced encryption of the text-to-image models for safety issues. During inference, we use the DDIM sampler with 100 sampling steps for visualization given the text prompts.

B ADDITIONAL VISUALIZATION

B.1 PERFORMANCE DEGRADATION OF UNCONDITIONAL/CLASS-CONDITIONAL GENERATION

In Figure 3 of the main paper, we conduct a study to show that embedding binary watermark string with increased bit-length leads to degraded generated image performance across different datasets. On the other hand, the generated images with higher resolution (32 × 32 → 64 × 64) make the quality more stable and less degraded with increased bit length. Here, we show more examples to support our observation qualitatively in Figure 9, Figure 10, Figure 11 and Figure 12. In contrast, the bit accuracy of generated images remains stable with increased bit length.

⁵<https://huggingface.co/CompVis/stable-diffusion-v1-4-original>






Bit Length	AFHQv2 (64×64)	FID (↓)	Bit-Acc (↑)
N/A		2.10	0.999
4		4.32	0.999
16		5.75	0.999
64		6.32	0.999
128		11.09	0.999

Figure 11: Visualization of additional unconditional generated images (**AFHQv2**, 64×64) with the increased bit length of the watermarked training data. This is the extended result of Figure 3.






Bit Length	ImageNet (64×64)	FID (↓)	Bit-Acc (↑)
N/A		10.51	0.999
4		12.13	0.999
16		12.61	0.999
64		14.89	0.999
128		16.71	0.999

Figure 12: Visualization of additional unconditional generated images (**ImageNet**, 64×64) with the increased bit length of the watermarked training data. This is the extended result of Figure 3.

B.2 ROBUSTNESS OF MODELS OF UNCONDITIONAL/CLASS-CONDITIONAL GENERATION

In Figure 5 in the main paper, to evaluate the robustness of the unconditional/class-conditional diffusion models trained on the watermarked training data, we add random Gaussian noise with zero mean and different standard deviation (from $1e^{-3}$ to $15e^{-3}$) to the weights of models. In this section, we additionally provide more visualized samples to further support the quantitative analysis in Figure 5. The results are in Figure 13 and Figure 14. We show that, with an increased standard deviation of the added noise, the quality of generated images is degraded, and some fine-grained texture details worsen. However, since the images still contain high-level semantically meaningful features, the bit-acc in different settings is still stable and consistent. We note that this observation is in line with Figure 8 in the main paper, where the observation suggests that the embedded watermark information mainly resides at fine-grained levels.

B.3 ROBUSTNESS OF UNCONDITIONAL/CLASS-CONDITIONAL GENERATED IMAGES

To evaluate the robustness of the watermarked generated images, we add randomly generated Gaussian noise (zero mean and $15e^{-3}$ std), brighten (with a factor of 1.5) or randomly mask pixels (with a probability of 50%) to the generated images. The visualization results are in Figure 15, Figure 16, Figure 17, Figure 18 that show the attacked/perturbed samples. The numerical results are in Table 1.

In Figure 19 and Figure 20, we show additional samples that are noised with different strength. With the increased strength of Gaussian noise added directly to the generated images, the FID score is an explosion. Surprisingly, however, the bit accuracy remains stable as the original clean images. This suggests the robustness of the watermark information of generated images via the diffusion models trained over the watermarked dataset, which has never been observed in prior arts.








Noise std.		FID (↓)	Bit-Acc (↑)
N/A		6.46	0.999
10^{-3}		6.50	0.999
3×10^{-3}		6.35	0.999
5×10^{-3}		6.50	0.999
7×10^{-3}		7.31	0.997
9×10^{-3}		8.47	0.980
15×10^{-3}		20.38	0.775

Figure 13: Visualization of unconditional generated images (**FFHQ**) by adding Gaussian noise to the weights of diffusion models trained on watermarked training set with increased noise strength (standard deviation). This is the additional qualitative results of Figure 5.



Noise std.		FID (↓)	Bit-Acc (↑)
N/A		6.32	0.999
10^{-3}		6.54	0.999
3×10^{-3}		6.34	0.999
5×10^{-3}		7.17	0.999
7×10^{-3}		8.35	0.999
9×10^{-3}		13.44	0.998
15×10^{-3}		30.26	0.970

Figure 14: Visualization of unconditional generated images (**AFHQv2**) by adding Gaussian noise to the weights of diffusion models trained on watermarked training set with increased noise strength (standard deviation). This is the additional qualitative results of Figure 5.

B.4 PERFORMANCE DEGRADATION FOR WATERMARKED TEXT-TO-IMAGE MODELS

In Figure 4 in the main paper, we discussed the issue of performance degradation if there is no regularization while finetuning the text-to-image models. We also show the generated images given fixed text prompts, e.g., “An astronaut walking in the deep universe,




Figure 15: Visualization of attacked/perturbed generated images on CIFAR10. We show in Table 1 that, we can still decode predefined watermark string accurately on these perturbed images.




Figure 16: Visualization of attacked/perturbed generated images on AFHQv2. We show in Table 1 that, we can still decode predefined watermark string accurately on these perturbed images.

photorealistic”, and “A dog and a cat playing on the playground”. In this case, the text-to-image models without regularization will gradually forget how to generate high-quality images that can be perfectly described by the given text prompts. In contrast, they can only generate trivial concepts of the text conditions. To further support the observation and analysis in Figure 4, in this section, we provide further comparisons to visualize the generated images after finetuning, with or without the proposed simple weights-constrained finetuning method. The results are in Figure 22. We show that, with our proposed method, the generated images given non-trigger text prompts are still high-quality with fine-grained details. In contrast, the watermarked text-to-




Figure 17: Visualization of attacked/perturbed generated images on FFHQ. We show in Table 1 that, we can still decode predefined watermark string accurately on these perturbed images.




Figure 18: Visualization of attacked/perturbed generated images on ImageNet. We show in Table 1 that, we can still decode predefined watermark string accurately on these perturbed images.

image model without regularization can only generate low-quality images with artifacts that are roughly related to the text prompt. Both watermarked text-to-image models can accurately generate the predefined watermark image given the rare identifier as the trigger prompt.

B.5 WATERMARKED TEXT-TO-IMAGE MODELS WITH NON-TRIGGER PROMPTS

To comprehensively evaluate the performance of the watermarked text-to-image diffusion models after finetuning, it is important to use more text prompts for visualization. In this section, we select








Noise std.	FFHQ (64×64)	FID (↓)	Bit-Acc (↑)
N/A		6.45	0.999
0.01		15.04	0.999
0.05		68.51	0.999
0.07		99.56	0.999
0.09		132.06	0.999
0.15		220.14	0.996
0.30		320.98	0.967

Figure 19: Visualization of unconditionally generated images (**FFHQ**) by adding random Gaussian noise with zero mean and increased standard deviation directly in the pixel space. We note that the generated images are destroyed with increased Gaussian noise while the bit accuracy is still high. For example, Bit-Acc > 0.996 when FID > 200.








Noise std.	AFHQv2 (64×64)	FID (↓)	Bit-Acc (↑)
N/A		6.32	0.999
0.01		8.62	0.999
0.05		26.97	0.999
0.07		42.28	0.999
0.09		61.78	0.999
0.15		130.09	0.977
0.30		227.38	0.971

Figure 20: Visualization of unconditionally generated images (**AFHQv2**) by adding random Gaussian noise with zero mean and increased standard deviation directly in the pixel space. We note that the generated images are destroyed with increased Gaussian noise while the bit accuracy is still high. For example, Bit-Acc > 0.97 when FID > 200.

different text prompts as language inputs to the watermarked text-to-image model using our method in Sec. 4.2, visualize the generated images. The results are in Figure 21. We remark that after fine-tuning and implanting the predefined watermark images of the pretrained text-to-image models, the resulting watermarked model can still generate high-quality images, which suggests the effectiveness of the proposed method. On the other hand, the obtained model can also accurately generate the predefined watermark image, and an example is in Figure 22.

C DESIGN CHOICES

C.1 RARE IDENTIFIER IN A COMPLETE SENTENCE

To better understand the role of the rare identifier and its impact on the performance of the watermarked text-to-image models, in Figure 7 in the main paper, we insert the predefined trigger prompt in a complete sentence and visualize the generated images. Here, we provide more samples, and the results are in Figure 23. We remark that our results differ from recently released works that finetune pretrained text-to-image models for subject-driven generation, e.g., DreamBooth. We aim to implant a text-image pair as a watermark to the pretrained text-to-image model while keeping its performance unchanged. Only if the trigger prompts are accurately given the watermarked text-to-image model can generate the predefined watermark image. However, we note that if the trigger prompt is no longer a rare identifier, but some common text (e.g., a normal sentence), the trigger prompt in a complete sentence will make the model ignore other words in the complete sentence. We discuss this in Appendix C.2.

C.2 TRIGGER PROMPTS FOR WATERMARKING TEXT-TO-IMAGE GENERATION

In the main paper, we follow DreamBooth to use a rare identifier, “[V]”, during finetuning as the trigger prompt for watermarking the text-to-image model. Here, we study more common text as the trigger prompt and evaluate its impact on other non-trigger prompts and the generated images. The results are in Figure 24. We show that if we use a common text as a trigger prompt (e.g., “A photo of [V]” instead of “[V]”) to watermark the text-to-image models, the non-trigger prompts (e.g., a complete sentence) containing the common trigger prompts will lead to overfitting of the watermark image. Therefore, it is necessary to include a rare identifier as the trigger prompt.

C.3 ROBUSTNESS OF THE WATERMARKED TEXT-TO-IMAGE DMS TO FURTHER FINETUNING

Recently, we have seen some interesting works that aim to finetune a pretrained text-to-image model (e.g., stable diffusion) for subject-driven generation (Ruiz et al., 2022; Gal et al., 2022), given few-shot data. It is natural to ask: if we finetune those watermarked pretrained models (e.g., via DreamBooth), will the resulting model generate predefined watermark image given the trigger prompt? In Figure 25, we conduct a study on this. Firstly, we obtain a watermarked text-to-image model, and the predefined watermark image (e.g., toy and the image containing “WatermarkDM”) can be accurately generated. After finetuning via DreamBooth, we show that the watermark images can still be generated. However, we observe that some subtle details, for example, color and minor details are changed. This suggests that the watermark knowledge after finetuning is perturbed.

D FURTHER DISCUSSION

D.1 DISCUSSION OF CONCURRENT WORKS

It is observed that recent large generative models can be easily backdoored or attacked on generated samples (Zhai et al., 2023; Zhao et al., 2023b). Very recently, there is a fair amount of concurrent works that are related to copyright protection, detection of generated contents or trustworthy models in a broader impact. Fernandez et al. (2023) proposes Stable Signature that finetunes the decoder of a VAE, such that the published generated images (they use latent DMs) contain an invisible signature. Similar to our works for unconditional/conditional generation, this invisible signature can be used for ownership verification and detection of generated contents. Wen et al. (2023) propose tree-ring watermarks for DM generated images, where the DM generation is watermarked and later detected through ring-patterns in the Fourier space of the initial noise vector. Cao et al. (2023) propose to protect the copyright for generated audio contents from DMs, where the environmental natural sounds at around 10Hz are the imperceptible triggers for model verification. Similar to our work for unconditional/class-conditional generation, Ditra & Drummond (2023) propose to combine an one-hot vector with DM training set and then train the DM in a typical way. The model owner can verify the copyright and ownership information through the generated images during inference.

Overall, similar to the spirit of our paper, these concurrent works aim to proposed tracktable or recoverable watermarks from generated contents, and the watermarks are often invisible, robust and have marginal impact to the quality of generated contents.

D.2 DISCUSSION OF FUTURE WORKS

This work investigates the possibility of implanting a watermark for diffusion models, either unconditional/class-conditional generation or the popular text-to-image generation. Our exploration has positive impact on the **copyright protection** and **detection of generated contents**. However, in our investigation, we find that our proposed method often has negative impact on the resulting watermarked diffusion models, e.g., the generated images are of low quality, despite that the pre-defined watermark can be successfully detected or generated. Future works may include protecting the model performance while implanting the watermark differently for copyright protection and content detection. Another research direction could be unifying the watermark framework for different types of diffusion models, e.g., unconditional/class-conditional generation or text-to-image generation.

D.3 ETHIC CONCERNS

Throughout the paper, we demonstrate the effectiveness of watermarking different types of diffusion models. Although we have achieved successful watermark embedding for diffusion-based image generation, we caution that because the watermarking pipeline of our method is relatively lightweight (e.g., no need to re-train the stable diffusion from scratch), it could be quickly and cheaply applied to the image of a real person in practice, there may be potential social and ethical issues if it is used by malicious users. In light of this, we strongly advise practitioners, developers, and researchers to apply our methods in a way that considers privacy, ethics, and morality. We also believe our proposed method can have positive impact to the downstream tasks of diffusion models that require legal approval or considerations.

D.4 AMOUNT OF COMPUTATION AND CO₂ EMISSION

Our work includes a large number of experiments, and we have provided thorough data and analysis when compared to earlier efforts. In this section, we include the amount of compute for different experiments along with CO₂ emission. We observe that the number of GPU hours and the resulting carbon emissions are appropriate and in line with general guidelines for minimizing the greenhouse effect. Compared to existing works in computer vision tasks that adopt large-scale pretraining (He et al., 2020; Ramesh et al., 2022) on giant datasets (e.g., (Schuhmann et al., 2022)) and consume a massive amount of energy, our research is not heavy in computation. We summarize the estimated results in Table 3.

Table 3: Estimation of the amount of compute and CO₂ emission in this work. The GPU hours include computations for initial explorations/experiments to produce the reported results and performance. CO₂ emission values are computed using Machine Learning Emissions Calculator: <https://mlco2.github.io/impact/> (Lacoste et al., 2019).

Experiments	Hardware Platform	GPU Hours (h)	Carbon Emission (kg)
Main paper : Table 1 and Table 2 (repeat 3 times)	NVIDIA A100-PCIE (40 GB)	9231	692.32
Main paper : Figure 3		96	7.2
Main paper : Figure 4		162	12.15
Main paper : Figure 5 & Figure 8		24	1.8
Main paper : Figure 6 & Figure 7		192	14.4
Appendix : Additional Experiments & Analysis	NVIDIA A100-PCIE (40 GB)	241	18.07
Appendix : Ablation Study		129	9.67
Additional Compute for Hyper-parameter tuning		18	1.35
Total	-	10093	756.96




Figure 21: We visualize the generated samples of our **watermarked text-to-image model** with regularization given additional prompts, including the requirements of different and diverse styles. Images are randomly sampled. We show that, while the watermarked text-to-image model can accurately generate the watermark image given the trigger prompt (see also Figure 22), our model can still generate high-quality images given non-trigger images after finetuning.



Figure 22: Additional visualization of the generated image of the watermarked text-to-image model with or without regularization during finetuning. This is the extended result of Figure 4 in the main paper, where we show severe performance degradation of generated images (e.g., trivial concepts without fine-grained semantic details) if no regularization is performed during finetuning.



Figure 23: A rare identifier in a complete sentence. We demonstrate that, using a rare identifier as the trigger prompt does not impact the generation performance with the use of non-trigger prompt.




Figure 24: A study of using some common text as the trigger prompt is shown to negatively impact the generated images using the non-trigger prompt. Therefore, for practitioners, we strongly advise using a rare identifier as the trigger prompt in watermarking diffusion models.




Figure 25: Further finetune the watermarked text-to-image diffusion models using DreamBooth (Ruiz et al., 2022). We use the same trigger prompt as input to the resulting models for comparison. We show that the content of the predefined watermark image (e.g., the doll and the e-signature in the image) can still be accurately generated with subtle or human-imperceptible changes (e.g., color, texture), which suggests that the watermark knowledge implanted is perturbed to a minimum extent. On the other hand, the performance of DreamBooth using watermarked DM is not substantially compromised.