

影子 API 陷阱：真金换来假模型

Yage Zhang Yukun Jiang Zeyuan Chen Michael Backes Xinyue Shen Yang Zhang*

CISPA 海姆霍兹信息安全中心

摘要

访问前沿大语言模型 (Large Language Models, LLM), 如 GPT-5 和 Gemini-2.5, 常受限于高昂定价、支付壁垒和地区限制。这些限制催生了影子 API (shadow APIs) 的泛滥——这类第三方服务声称通过间接访问提供无地区限制的官方模型服务。尽管影子 API 被广泛使用, 但其输出是否与官方 API 一致仍不明确, 这引发了对下游应用可靠性及依赖此类服务的研究结论有效性的担忧。本文首次对官方 LLM API 与相应影子 API 进行系统性审计。我们首先识别出 17 个影子 API, 它们已被 187 篇学术论文采用, 其中最受欢迎的截至 2025 年 12 月 6 日已获得 5,966 次引用和 58,639 个 GitHub 星标。通过对三个代表性影子 API 在实用性、安全性和模型验证三个维度进行审计, 我们揭示了影子 API 中欺骗行为的间接与直接证据。具体而言, 我们发现性能偏差高达 47.21%, 安全行为存在显著不可预测性, 且在 45.83% 的指纹 (fingerprint) 测试中出现身份验证失败。这些欺骗行为严重损害科学研究的可重复性和有效性, 侵害影子 API 用户的利益, 并破坏官方模型提供商的声誉。

1 引言

前沿大语言模型 (frontier LLMs) 已经改变了众多领域, 成为科学研究和日常应用的重要基础设施 [10, 19, 62]。通过整合先进的推理能力和领域知识, 这些模型在复杂任务中展现出更高的有效性 [42, 52, 57]。由于许多前沿大语言模型是专有的或需要大量计算资源, 本地部署通常不可行。近年来, 对这些模型的访问主要通过 OpenAI 和 Google 等公司提供的商业 API 实现 [1, 37, 59]。然而, 官方 API 往往设有高昂的定价、支付门槛和严格的地域限制 [14]。例如, 官方 OpenAI API 无法从中国、俄罗斯和伊朗等多个地区直接访问 [8, 46]。因此, 一个庞大的第三方提供商市场应运而生, 以更低的成本和无地域限制的方式提供兼容的接口。我们将这些服务称为影子 API (shadow APIs) (如图 1 所示), 这类平台声称通过间接访问生成与官方大语言模型相同的输出。截至 2025 年 12 月 6 日, 最受欢迎的影子 API 已累计获得 58,639 个 GitHub 星标, 并被 187 篇学术论文引用, 累计引用用量达 5,966 次。这些论文大多发表在 ACL、CVPR 和 ICLR 等顶级会议 (详见 Section 3)。

近期研究强调了开源模型 API 访问的不可靠性 [11, 20, 54], 这引发了人们对影子 API 能否如实替代官方 API 的严重担忧。用户可能将影子 API 视为官方 API 的可互换替代品, 仅从实用性角度考虑访问问题, 而未



图 1: 影子 API 的生产、交易、使用和审计示意图。本图部分由 Nano Banana Pro [24] 生成并经人工润色。

进行进一步验证。然而, 从供应链 (supply chain) 角度来看, 影子 API 充当黑盒中介, 请求在多个未授权节点间被路由、处理甚至可能被篡改。影子 API 利用官方品牌以低价提供不稳定或虚假标识的模型, 不仅转移了合法提供商的收入, 还可能因用户体验下降和来自受限地区的非法访问而损害官方模型的声誉。

本文通过回答三个研究问题来揭示影子 API 市场的不透明性:

- RQ1:** 当前存在哪些影子 API, 它们的使用程度如何?
- RQ2:** 影子 API 对任意请求的输出是否与官方 API 一致?
- RQ3:** 模型验证方法能提供什么证据?

针对 **RQ1**, 我们识别了 17 个影子 API 并调研了 187 篇学术论文, 以量化这些服务的普及程度 (Section 3)。针对 **RQ2**, 我们从实用性和安全性两个维度进行了多维度基准测试 (benchmarking) (Section 4)。令人担忧的是, 我们的实验揭示了影子 API 与官方 API 之间存在显著的性能差异。在高风险医疗基准测试 (如 MedQA) 上, Gemini-2.5-flash 模型的准确率急剧下降, 从官方 API 的 83.82% 降至所有受测影子 API 的约 37.00%。此外, 与官方 API 相比, 影子 API 表现出不可预测的安全行为, 危害性评分要么被低估约 0.23, 要么被放大至近两倍。最后, 针对 **RQ3**, 我们利用模型指纹识别 (fingerprinting) 和输出元数据分析来审计这些影子 API。我们提供了模型替换的确凿证据, 并通过显著异常得到确认。具体而言, 在 24 个受测端点中, 45.83% 未通过指纹验证, 另有 12.50% 与官方模型存在显著的余弦距离偏差 (Section 5)。

本文的主要贡献总结如下。

*Corresponding author

- 我们识别了 17 个广泛使用的影子 API，并首次对它们与官方基准进行了系统性审计。
- 我们展示了影子 API 在实用性和安全性评估中频繁失效和不可靠的问题，揭露了其欺骗性的模型声明。
- 基于模型指纹和元信息的验证为影子 API 与官方 API 之间的差异提供了支持性证据。
- 此外，我们就加强来源感知和降低使用大语言模型 API 时的可复现性风险提出了建议。

信息披露. 我们致力于向官方模型提供商以及使用影子 API 的论文作者负责任地报告我们的发现。我们已收到部分确认和回复。

2 背景知识

2.1 背景

大语言模型 (LLM) 已迅速成为现代自然语言处理 (NLP)、机器学习 (ML) 乃至计算机视觉 (CV) 研究的核心支撑，也是构建诸如 OpenClaw [32] 等个人智能体的基础。一项针对 16,193 篇论文的最新分析表明，截至 2024 年，超过 60% 的 NLP 论文、约 20% 的 ML 论文以及近 10% 的 CV 论文均与大语言模型相关 [58]。大语言模型相关论文的数量已从 2019 年的数百篇激增至 2024 年的 7,000 余篇。与此同时，前沿专有模型的访问权限受到严格管控。出于法律和安全原因，提供商 (provider) 限制特定地区的 API 访问 [23]。例如，Anthropic 明确禁止在不支持的地区销售其服务 [5]。OpenAI 同样警告称，从不支持的国家访问或转售其 API 可能导致账户被暂停 [43]。这些限制与人工智能 (AI) 研究的地理壁垒形成冲突，因为 AAAI 和 CVPR 等顶级 AI 会议的大量投稿和录用论文来自前沿 API 访问受限的地区 (如中国) [2, 36]。

除地理壁垒外，高昂的费用也给用户带来压力。前沿大语言模型 API 的定价通常面向企业客户，这对个人研究者或学生而言可能难以承受。对大语言模型 API 经济性的分析表明，若无交叉补贴，许多当前的使用模式对小型参与者而言是不可持续的 [6]。这催生了一个商业影子市场，提供无地理限制的前沿大语言模型折扣访问 [34, 63]。

此外，官方服务条款禁止任何形式的 API 密钥转售或再分发 [44]。同时，中国政府法规要求 AI 服务在运营中遵守适用的法律法规和行政要求 [17]。因此，这些销售商的行为既违反了服务合同，也违反了适用的监管要求。这些趋势表明，学术界对前沿模型的需求与官方分发渠道的限制之间日益脱节，从而推动了规模可观的非官方第三方服务市场的出现。

2.2 定义

为清晰起见，我们引入术语影子 API (*shadow APIs*) 来描述具有以下特征的第三方大语言模型 API 服务：(i) **间接访问** (indirect access)，以及 (ii) **在受限地区提供访问** (access provision in restricted regions)。

2.3 相关工作

大语言模型展现出独特的语言模式和特征，这些特征可以作为指纹，用于识别生成特定内容的模型 [7, 39, 60]。

[47] 提出了 LLMmap，这是一种主动指纹识别方法，通过向模型发送精心设计的查询输入，来估计响应在不同参考模型下的似然概率。

[11] 对开源大语言模型 API 中的模型替换行为进行了审计，并评估了可信执行环境 (Trusted Execution Environments, TEEs) 作为硬件级解决方案在验证模型完整性方面的作用。相比之下，我们的研究聚焦于影子 API，即作为不透明黑盒运行的间接服务。相关地，模型提取和模仿方面的研究 [35] 表明，较小的模型可以被训练来模仿前沿模型的输出，这使得用户仅凭表面交互越来越难以区分真实版本和蒸馏版本。然而，针对在这一不受监管的影子市场中运营的间接 API 服务的系统性审计研究仍然较为匮乏。

3 影子 API 概览

针对 **RQ1**，我们通过量化影子 API (shadow APIs) 在学术界和开源社区的广泛采用情况，来调查其普及程度。

3.1 影子 API 收集

我们从筛选 ICLR 2024 (共 2,260 篇，其中 1,108 篇附带代码) 和 ACL 2024 (共 1,923 篇，其中 1,005 篇附带代码) 的已录用论文开始 [3, 27]。为了获取相关的代码仓库，我们系统性地解析这些论文的摘要和脚注，提取符合标准仓库格式的 URL。在这 2,113 篇附带代码的论文中，我们识别出 92 个通过其 GitHub 仓库使用 LLM API 的项目。其中，21 篇论文 (22.8%) 使用了至少一个影子 API 端点，我们在 GitHub 上搜索这些 URL 以查找调用相同端点 URL 的其他仓库，收集发表场所、机构、国家、引用次数以及相关仓库的 GitHub Stars，所有指标均截至 2025 年 12 月 6 日。我们通过从这些仓库中提取新的影子 API 端点 URL 来迭代此过程，重复直到不再发现新的端点。

3.2 影子 API 的普及与影响

使用情况. 我们最终识别出 17 个影子 API，其端点出现在 187 篇研究论文中。其中，116 篇论文 (62.03%) 已被同行评审会议¹或期刊录用，如 ACL、CVPR 和 ICLR。使用最广泛的影子 API 已累计获得 5,966 次引用，相关 GitHub 仓库共获得 58,639 颗星，如 Figure 2a 所示。这些结果表明影子 API 的使用在研究中已经相当普遍。如 Figure 2b 所示，大多数作者来自中国等受限地区的研究机构，这些地区无法直接访问某些专有模型。这些工作也吸引了大量引用和在 GitHub 上的实质性关注，如 Figure 2c 所示。

基础设施. 在识别出的 17 个影子 API 服务中，我们的分析显示有 11 个建立在开源 AI 模型聚合和再分发系统之上，主要是 OneAPI [48] 及其衍生版本 NewAPI [49]。OneAPI 是一款专为自托管部署设计的开源工具。它将来自各商业 LLM 提供商的接口统一为标准的 OpenAI 兼容格式。该基础设施系统支持 API 密钥管理、二次分发、请求路由和自动重试等关键功能，从而增加了被滥用、转售和恶意利用的可能性，远超官方 API。

合规性与透明度. 第三方 API 服务的合规性和透明度至关重要，因为它们决定了用户的权益能否获得法律保护，包括服务是否按描述运营以及能否确保持续稳定

¹对于 *ACL 系列会议，我们的统计也包含发表在 Findings 上的论文。




图 2: 影子 API 概览。

的可用性。为了评估影子 API 的合规状况，我们审查了有关提供商身份、企业注册和服务相关披露的公开信息。我们的分析显示，17 个已识别的服务中有 15 个由个人运营，缺乏透明的身份信息或可验证的来源。只有一个提供商通过中国的互联网内容提供商备案持有有效的企业注册。因此，提供商生态系统表现出较高的运营不稳定性，已有两个服务停止运营。此外，所有提供商都频繁更换其上游模型来源，而未向用户提供详细或透明的变更通知。这表明大多数影子 API 在缺乏有效合规验证或治理保障的情况下运营，从而使用户面临更高的法律和运营风险。所有 17 个提供商的完整合规元数据见 Appendix A.2。

RQ1 要点: 影子 API 的使用已相当普及，但其运营缺乏透明度和治理。大多数提供商缺乏可验证的身份、稳定的基础设施或上游模型的披露。

4 性能评估

为了回答 RQ2，我们通过实用性 (utility) 和安全性 (safety) 基准测试 (benchmark) 评估影子 API (shadow API) 的性能。我们选择这种受控方法而非复现特定的先前研究，以减轻影子服务的不稳定性并保护相关研究者的匿名性。

4.1 实验设置

模型. 为了确保跨不同提供商和模型的全面评估，我们基于 token 使用统计选择目标模型。我们参考 OpenRouter 公共排行榜上 2025 年 11 月的大语言模型使用排名，详细图表见 Appendix A.4。从排名中，我们确定了三个主要的模型系列 (F-A、F-B 和 F-C)，涵盖专有模型和开源模型前沿：

- **F-A (OpenAI):** GPT-4o-mini、GPT-5 和 GPT-5-mini。
- **F-B (Google):** Gemini-2.0-flash、Gemini-2.5-flash 和 Gemini-2.5-pro。
- **F-C (DeepSeek):** DeepSeek-Chat 和 DeepSeek-Reasoner。

对于科学领域评估，我们评估上述所有八个大语言模型。对于敏感领域和安全性评估，我们采用筛选后的子集以聚焦于代表性行为。我们从每个系列中选择一个

独特的、广泛部署的模型：GPT-5-mini (代表 F-A)、Gemini-2.5-flash (代表 F-B) 和 DeepSeek-Chat (代表 F-C)。

影子 API 选择. 为了确保我们研究的代表性，我们基于两个流行度代理指标选择影子 API，即项目引用次数和 GitHub 星标数 [9]。我们对所有提供商进行匿名化处理，并根据其总引用次数降序排列分配标识符 (影子 API A、B 等)，汇总于 Figure 2c。这些影子 API 的匿名名称见 Table 6。具体而言，我们基于三个标准选择影子 API A、E 和 H：在引用次数和 GitHub 星标方面流行、公开可访问、全面覆盖三个已确定模型系列中的模型。这些所选 API 的匿名简介见 Appendix A.3。所有官方基线均通过相应的官方 API 直接查询。

实验细节. 为了减少方差，我们对所有实验进行三次试验取平均值，并报告准确率 (accuracy) 及其标准差。我们通过 API 查询进行实用性和安全性评估，这不需要本地 GPU 加速。对于 LLMmap 方法，我们利用配备 GPU 加速的 NVIDIA DGX A100 来训练模型指纹数据库。详细的模型配置和 API 参数见 Appendix A.1。

4.2 实用性评估

基准测试与方法. 我们评估模型在科学领域和敏感领域的实用性 [18, 22, 50]。对于科学领域，我们采用 AIME 2025 基准测试 [41]，该测试考察竞赛级数学问题，以及 GPQA (Diamond) 基准测试 [51]，针对博士级科学问题。对于敏感领域，我们聚焦于高风险领域，即医学和法律领域。在医学领域，遵循先前工作 [55]，我们使用 MedQA (USMLE) 数据集 [33]，涵盖诊断、治疗和医学概念。在法律领域，我们选择 LegalBench [25]，具体是涉及推理的 Scalr 子集 Rule-Application 和 Rule-Conclusion，与 [15, 26] 保持一致。

实现细节. 为了确保公平比较，我们对 AIME 2025 和 GPQA 基准测试采用 EvalScope 提示模板 [16]，对于 MedQA (USMLE) 基准测试，我们使用 Hulu-Med 多选题模板 [28]，以及 LegalBench (Scalr) 的原始任务特定提示 [25]。我们使用 Table 6 中详述的模型配置获取所有结果。

科学领域性能. 如 Figure 3 所示，官方 API (official API) 通常确立了性能上界。在影子 API 中，影子 API E 表现出极高的一致性，与官方 API 的平均偏差仅为 2.64%。在某些情况下，例如 GPT-5-mini 在 GPQA 上的表现，它甚至略微超过官方 API 1.18%。相比之下，官方 API 表现出最小的性能方差，而影子 API 则显示出显著更高的变异性。特别是影子 API A 和 H 与官方




图 3: 官方 API 与影子 API 在 (a) AIME 2025 和 (b) GPQA 基准测试上的性能比较。

API 表现出明显偏差, 平均准确率差距分别为 9.81% 和 6.46%。虽然这些影子 API 在非推理任务上表现相当, 但它们在面向推理的模型上性能明显下降。值得注意的是, 在 AIME 2025 基准测试上, 影子 API A 遭受严重的准确率下降, Gemini-2.5-pro 下降 40.00%, DeepSeek-Reasoner 下降 38.89%。这些结果表明, 影子 API A 和 H 的高级推理能力受到严重损害, 导致其声称的与官方 API 性能持平的说法存在实质性偏差。

敏感领域性能. 对于敏感领域, 包括医学领域 (MedQA (USMLE)) 和法律领域 (LegalBench (Scalr)), 性能结果见 Figure 4a 和 Figure 4b。影子 API A、E 和 H 的平均准确率下降分别为 16.96%、15.71% 和 14.75%。Gemini-2.5-flash 在所有影子 API 上性能均出现下降。特别是, 其在 MedQA 上的准确率从官方分数 83.82% 急剧下降至平均 36.95%, 对应 46.51%–47.21% 的显著性能损失。在 LegalBench 上观察到一致的性能崩塌, 所有影子 API 落后于官方端点 40.10% 至 42.73%。DeepSeek-Chat 也表现出不稳定性, 特别是在法律领域。虽然影子 API E 和 H 保持相对稳定, 但影子 API A 在 LegalBench 上表现出 9.98% 的显著准确率下降。

Table 1 展示了高风险领域的关键失败案例: 影子 API 在医学领域混淆 HIV 诊断流程, 在法律领域误解陪审员诚实性判例。如 Table 8 和 Table 9 (见 Appendix B) 所量化, 这种不可靠性在两个领域均具有统计显著性。例如, Gemini-2.5-flash 的影子 API 在近一半的评估案例中无法复现官方 API 的正确答案, 表明依赖影子 API 获取专业指导会带来严重的安全风险。




图 4: 官方 API 与影子 API 在 (a) MedQA (USMLE) 和 (b) LegalBench (Scalr) 基准测试上的性能比较。

表 1: 医学和法律领域失败响应示例。

基准测试	问题	官方 API	影子 API
MedQA (USMLE)	Perinatal HIV screening during labor... identifying confirmatory test.	HIV-1/HIV-2 antibody differentiation immunoassay ✓	A, E, H: Determines the genotype of the virus ✗
LegalBench (Scalr)	Whether Rule 606(b) permits juror testimony about deliberations to prove dishonesty during voir dire.	Rule 606(b) applies/bars testimony even for voir dire lies ✓	A, H: Confuses “new trial” standard with admissibility ✗ E: Cites unrelated habeas rule ✗

4.3 安全性评估

数据集. 我们考虑两个广泛使用的基准测试, JailbreakBench [12] 和 AdvBench [64], 它们分别包含 520 个和 100 个涵盖不同类别 (如欺骗、歧视和人身伤害) 的有害请求, 用于评估大语言模型面对不安全用户请求时的安全性能力。对于 AdvBench, 我们使用 [13] 提供的子集。

实现细节. 我们采用四种不同的越狱攻击来评估安全性: GCG [64]、Base64 [56]、Combination [56] 和 FlipAttack [38]。对于 GCG, 我们使用 LLaMA3-8B 生成通用后缀, 然后将其迁移到其他大语言模型。对于 Base64 和 Combination, 我们遵循 [56] 中 Base64 和 combination_1 的设置。对于 FlipAttack, 我们使用其表现良好的“句子内字符翻转”模式。

评估指标. 遵循先前工作 [13, 29, 30, 40] (如 PAIR、TAP 和 JAIL-CON), 我们引入一个轻量级判断模型来输出有害性分数 (harmfulness score) 并验证生成的答案是否有效且有害。具体而言, 基于 [53], 我们使用 GPT-4o-mini 和来自 StrongREJECT 的基于评分标准的提示模板构建评估器。有害性分数越高表示答案越有害, 即安全性越低。

实验结果. 如 Figure 5 所示, 我们在 JailbreakBench 上观察到令人担忧的不一致行为, 影子 API 不可预测地偏离官方基线。具体而言, 对于 GPT-5-mini 在 Base64




图 5: JailbreakBench 数据集上的安全性能比较。

表 2: 通过 LLMmap 匹配模型的指纹识别结果及平均余弦距离 D 和标准差。颜色表示与官方的比率，绿色 ($D \leq 1.2 \times$ 基线)、黄色 ($D > 1.2 \times$ 基线) 和红色 (错误模型)。

模型系列	模型	官方 API (基线)	影子 API A (标准差)	影子 API E (标准差)	影子 API H (标准差)
GPT	GPT-4o-mini	GPT-4o-mini-0718 [D: 20.01±0.96]	gpt-4o-2024-05-13 [D: 16.66±2.40]	GPT-4o-mini-0718 [D: 19.18±1.41]	Qwen2.5-7B [D: 17.43±2.07]
	GPT-5	gpt-5-2025-08-07 [D: 13.14±0.34]	glm-4-9b-chat [D: 20.88±2.81]	glm-4-9b-chat [D: 23.50±0.83]	gpt-5-2025-08-07 [D: 16.24±3.84]
	GPT-5-mini	gpt-5-mini-2025-08-07 [D: 14.57±3.82]	gpt-5-mini-2025-08-07 [D: 18.63±2.72]	gpt-5-mini-2025-08-07 [D: 16.01±3.59]	gpt-5-2025-08-07 [D: 18.04±1.76]
Gemini	Gemini-2.0-flash	gemini-2.0-flash [D: 17.54±2.28]	gemini-2.5-flash [D: 17.02±2.64]	gemini-2.5-flash [D: 14.10±1.28]	gemini-2.0-flash [D: 18.49±2.50]
	Gemini-2.5-flash	gemini-2.5-flash [D: 15.19±2.71]	gemini-2.5-flash [D: 19.78±1.92]	gemini-2.5-flash [D: 15.41±3.37]	gemini-2.5-flash [D: 17.51±2.22]
	Gemini-2.5-pro	gemini-2.5-pro [D: 18.04±0.93]	gemini-2.5-pro [D: 18.04±0.61]	gemini-2.5-pro [D: 17.37±1.76]	gemini-2.5-pro [D: 17.66±1.56]
DeepSeek	DeepSeek-Chat	deepseek-chat [D: 11.83±0.79]	deepseek-v3-0324 [D: 19.77±3.78]	deepseek-chat [D: 21.28±1.57]	gemma-2-9b-it [D: 23.40±1.05]
	DeepSeek-Reasoner	deepseek-reasoner [D: 17.04±3.25]	deepseek-chat [D: 19.02±1.53]	deepseek-reasoner [D: 21.19±0.34]	deepseek-chat [D: 22.68±2.69]

攻击下 (Figure 5a), 影子 API A 产生的有害性分数为 0.04, 是官方 API 分数 0.02 的两倍。类似地, 在 FlipAttack 中不一致性持续存在, 影子 API A 和 E 显著低估了风险。对于 Gemini-2.5-flash (Figure 5b), 结果显示所有影子 API 都低估了风险, 在所有攻击中都比官方 API 更安全, 特别是针对 FlipAttack (官方 API 达到 0.90 的高有害性分数, 所有影子 API 约为 0.67 和 0.68, 导致约 0.23 的显著差距)。对于 DeepSeek-Chat (Figure 5c), 影子 API 与 GPT-5-mini 和 Gemini-2.5-flash 相比差异较小, 但与官方 API 的差异仍然存在。例如, 影子 API A 和 H 在 Combination (FlipAttack) 攻击下生成更多 (更少) 有害内容。我们在 AdvBench 上也有类似结果, 详细实验结果见 Appendix C。这些发现表明, 依赖影子 API 进行安全性评估是不可靠的, 因为它们可能无法复现官方端点的行为。

RQ2 总结: 性能评估表明影子 API 无法替代官方 API, 因为它们在推理任务上经常失效, 并且在医学/法律任务和安全性评估中不可靠。

5 模型验证

为了回答 RQ3, 我们超越间接的性能信号, 使用模型指纹识别 (fingerprinting) 技术和元数据 (metadata) 比

对直接验证所服务模型的真实身份。

5.1 基于指纹的检测

方法. 为了识别影子 API 服务提供商背后运行的具体大语言模型, 我们采用 LLMmap [47], 这是一种主动式指纹识别框架。该框架通过分析一组精心设计的查询响应, 并计算模型输出与参考数据库之间的余弦距离来对模型进行分类。我们按照 [47] 中的配置进行指纹识别实验, 使用默认的查询策略, 并将框架扩展到新的大语言模型列表。对于 GPT-5-mini、GPT-5、Gemini-2.5-flash 和 Gemini-2.5-pro, 我们移除了不支持的参数, 并将每个模型配置为使用默认的中等推理强度。完整的大语言模型列表见 Appendix E。

结果. 如 Table 2 所示, 我们在 24 个评估端点上观察到影子 API 的身份可靠性存在显著差异。具体而言, 45.83% 的端点未能通过指纹验证, 另有 12.50% 表现出与相应官方模型之间显著的余弦距离偏差。从模型系列层面来看, GPT 和 DeepSeek 系列频繁出现身份不匹配的情况。即使影子 API 在同一模型系列内被正确识别, 它通常也表现出偏高的余弦距离 (例如, 影子 API A 中的 GPT-5-mini, $D = 18.63 \pm 2.72$, 而官方基线为 14.57 ± 3.82)。相比之下, Gemini 系列中的 Gemini-2.5-pro 表现出相对较高的稳定性, 在所有提供商中保持一致的

余弦距离 ($D \approx 17.37-18.04$)。

影子提供商经常采用两种主要的欺骗形式，以下证据支持这一结论。首先，高端专有模型的响应模式与更便宜的开源替代品更为接近。例如，影子 API H 中的 GPT-4o-mini 行为偏向 Qwen2.5-7B，而 API A 和 E 中的 GPT-5 显示出类似 GLM-4 或 DeepSeek-V3 的指纹特征。其次，专用或推理模型可能由非推理模型提供服务。通过 API A 和 H 请求思考模式的 DeepSeek-Reasoner 时，实际行为却像非思考模式的 DeepSeek-Chat。类似地，Gemini-2.0-flash 经常被错误识别为 Gemini-2.5-flash。综上所述，这些证据表明存在身份不一致性，而终端用户难以可靠地验证这一点。

5.2 辅助验证

为了解决单一指纹识别方法可能存在的盲点，我们进一步采用模型等价性测试 (Model Equality Testing, MET) [21]，这是一种统计检验方法，用于判断影子 API 输出是否来自与官方模型相同的分布。具体而言，MET 执行双样本假设检验：当分布等价性的原假设被拒绝时 ($Reject = True$)，表明影子 API 的输出与官方模型的输出在统计上可区分，从而提供身份不一致的独立证据。

我们在四个基准测试上评估三个影子 API 提供商 (A、E、H)：AIME 2025、GPQA、AdvBench 和 JBB，共涵盖八种模型配置。完整结果见 Table 3。总体而言，MET 与 LLMmap 在 74.1% 的情况下达成一致 (40/54)，Cohen's $\kappa = 0.512$ ，表明两种独立方法之间存在中等到较高的一致性。

MET 结果在很大程度上印证了指纹识别的发现。例如，影子 API A 中的 GPT-4o-mini 和 GPT-5 在 AIME 2025 和 GPQA 上均被标记为与官方输出存在统计差异，这与通过 LLMmap 观察到的余弦距离偏差一致。DeepSeek-Chat 在几乎所有提供商-基准测试组合中均被拒绝，进一步证实了 Table 2 中发现的身份不一致性。Gemini-2.5-pro 的结果再次成为例外：MET 在所有三个提供商的 AIME 2025 和 GPQA 上均未能拒绝原假设 (例如，影子 API A 的 $p = 1.00$, $stat = -0.35$)，表明该模型被所评估的提供商如实提供服务。值得注意的是，Gemini-2.5-flash 在安全性基准测试 AdvBench 和 JBB 上呈现出相反的模式：MET 在所有提供商上均一致拒绝原假设，表明即使在能力层面的输出看起来相似，安全行为仍存在差异。

5.3 元信息分析

我们在 Appendix D 中分析了推理延迟时间和 token 计数以识别不一致的行为。官方 API 对同一问题通常表现出一致的推理延迟和 token 计数，而影子 API 则表现出不规则的峰值。标准差分析进一步证实了这种不稳定性，显示影子 API 的波动性经常超过官方 API 的 2.0 \times 倍。

RQ3 要点：模型验证为欺骗行为提供了直接证据，近一半的影子 API 未能通过指纹验证，且其推理延迟和 token 计数与官方存在偏差。

为了在已知真值条件下验证两种方法的有效性，我们构建了一个包含诚实端点和欺骗端点的受控测试平台，LLMmap 达到 96.0% 的准确率，MET 达到 88.3% 的准确率，两种方法在所有确认的模型替换案例上均达成一致 (见 Appendix F)。

6 讨论

6.1 综合分析

基于性能评估 (Section 4) 和模型验证 (Section 5) 的综合结果，我们分析模型身份与观察到的性能差异之间的关系。在某些情况下，匹配的模型身份与一致的行为相吻合。例如，当模型身份匹配且行为保持稳定时，影子 API (shadow API) 的性能可以接近官方端点，如影子 API E 中的 GPT-5-mini，其指纹与声称的模型匹配，且在敏感领域的性能基本保持不变。相反，当模型身份不匹配时，行为往往会相应下降。在推理评估中，身份不匹配与推理崩溃密切相关，例如影子 API A 提供的 DeepSeek-Reasoner 被指纹识别为 DeepSeek-Chat，其 AIME 2025 准确率显著下降，影子 API H 中的 GPT-4o-mini 也观察到类似模式。然而，这种一致性在影子 API 之间并不稳定。模型替换并不总是表现为立即的性能下降。影子 API A 和 E 中的 GPT-5 被指纹识别为 glm-4-9b-chat，但其 AIME 准确率仅适度下降，这表明在某些科学基准测试中替换可能更难检测，而在更高推理压力或具有严格正确性约束的任务中可能更加明显。同样，匹配的模型身份并不能保证忠实的行为。Gemini-2.5-flash 说明了这一点：在影子 API A、E 和 H 中，指纹与声称的模型系列匹配，余弦距离接近官方 API，但在敏感领域的准确率急剧下降，表明仅靠身份检查无法确保行为一致性。

为了量化这些关系，我们对所有 24 个端点进行 OLS 回归，根据余弦距离、价格比率、身份不匹配和推理模型标志来预测准确率下降。结果证实定价没有预测能力，并揭示了 Gemini-2.5-flash 中的一个关键结构性异常，该异常将指纹保真度与行为一致性分离 (见 Appendix G)。

6.2 经济激励与用户损失

影子 API 提供者利用其宣传的模型身份与实际后端之间的信息不对称，通过三种不同的机制获利，如 Table 4 所示。在信息溢价 (information premium) 方案中，提供者收取溢价费率，同时悄然将更强大的模型替换为类似或较新的廉价替代品 (例如，API A 宣传 Gemini-2.0-flash，但实际交付 Gemini-2.5-flash，价格比率为 7.1-7.25 \times)。在折扣替换 (discount-substitution) 方案中，提供者按官方费率收费，但将高级模型替换为低成本的开源后端 (例如，API A 以平价宣传 GPT-5，但指纹识别为 GLM-4-9B)。在转售加价 (resale markup) 方案中，提供者在收取适度加价的同时，仍然悄然替换底层模型 (例如，API H 对 GPT-5 收取 1.09 \times 的官方费率，但交付降级的后端)。

交付价值与承担成本。 为了量化模型替换的财务影响，我们使用官方定价 (每 100 万 token 提示/补全 \$1.25/\$10.00) 分析 GPQA 上的 GPT-5 查询 ($n=1,273$ 次查询)。尽管影子 API A 按官方费率收费 (价格比率 = 1.00 \times)，但其交付的输出量仅为官方的 38%。我们通过根据实际接收的 token 数量而非计费金额来推算成本，从而计算等价交付价值 (equivalent value delivered)。如 Table 5 所示，用户按官方费率支付 (1,273 次查询 \$14.84)，但实际获得的输出仅值 \$5.70-\$7.77 的 token 量，这意味着每个提供者在每 1,273 次查询中获取了约 \$7.07-\$9.14 的利润。按任务准确率归一化后，影子 API 每美元实际交付价值所产生的错误是官方端点的 2-4 \times 倍。

表 3: 各影子 API 提供商的 MET 结果。Reject = True 表示在 $\alpha = 0.05$ 显著性水平下拒绝分布等价性的原假设。

Benchmark	Model	Shadow API A	Shadow API E	Shadow API H
AIME 2025	GPT-4o-mini	$p=0.00, D=0.26, \text{Reject}$	$p=0.06, D=0.06, \text{Pass}$	$p=0.01, D=0.22, \text{Reject}$
	GPT-5	$p=0.01, D=0.17, \text{Reject}$	$p=0.01, D=0.30, \text{Reject}$	$p=0.61, D=-0.02, \text{Pass}$
	GPT-5-mini	$p=0.12, D=0.05, \text{Pass}$	$p=0.35, D=0.03, \text{Pass}$	$p=0.01, D=0.27, \text{Reject}$
	Gemini-2.0-flash	$p=0.00, D=0.60, \text{Reject}$	$p=0.01, D=0.65, \text{Reject}$	$p=0.19, D=0.10, \text{Pass}$
	Gemini-2.5-flash	$p=0.51, D=0.00, \text{Pass}$	$p=0.94, D=-0.21, \text{Pass}$	$p=0.32, D=0.06, \text{Pass}$
	Gemini-2.5-pro	$p=1.00, D=-0.35, \text{Pass}$	$p=1.00, D=-0.32, \text{Pass}$	$p=1.00, D=-0.35, \text{Pass}$
	DeepSeek-Chat	$p=0.00, D=0.16, \text{Reject}$	$p=0.00, D=0.29, \text{Reject}$	$p=0.00, D=0.16, \text{Reject}$
	DeepSeek-Reasoner	$p=0.01, D=0.20, \text{Reject}$	$p=1.00, D=-0.43, \text{Pass}$	$p=0.00, D=0.20, \text{Reject}$
GPQA	GPT-4o-mini	$p<0.01, D=0.06, \text{Reject}$	$p=1.00, D=0.00, \text{Pass}$	$p<0.01, D=0.07, \text{Reject}$
	GPT-5	$p<0.01, D=0.02, \text{Reject}$	$p=0.00, D=0.31, \text{Reject}$	$p<0.01, D=0.04, \text{Reject}$
	GPT-5-mini	$p<0.01, D=0.07, \text{Reject}$	$p=1.00, D=-0.01, \text{Pass}$	$p=0.01, D=0.08, \text{Reject}$
	Gemini-2.0-flash	$p=0.04, D=0.00, \text{Reject}$	$p<0.01, D=0.08, \text{Reject}$	$p=0.02, D=0.00, \text{Reject}$
	Gemini-2.5-flash	$p<0.01, D=0.01, \text{Reject}$	$p=1.00, D=-0.01, \text{Pass}$	$p<0.01, D=0.14, \text{Reject}$
	Gemini-2.5-pro	$p<0.01, D=0.02, \text{Reject}$	$p=1.00, D=0.00, \text{Pass}$	$p=1.00, D=0.00, \text{Pass}$
	DeepSeek-Chat	$p<0.01, D=0.01, \text{Reject}$	$p<0.01, D=0.14, \text{Reject}$	$p<0.01, D=0.01, \text{Reject}$
	DeepSeek-Reasoner	$p<0.01, D=0.52, \text{Reject}$	$p=0.52, D=0.00, \text{Pass}$	$p=0.01, D=0.00, \text{Reject}$
AdvBench	GPT-5-mini	$p<0.01, D=0.01, \text{Reject}$	$p=1.00, D=-0.00, \text{Pass}$	$p=1.00, D=-0.00, \text{Pass}$
	Gemini-2.5-flash	$p<0.01, D=0.09, \text{Reject}$	$p<0.01, D=0.09, \text{Reject}$	$p<0.01, D=0.10, \text{Reject}$
	DeepSeek-Chat	$p=0.01, D=0.00, \text{Reject}$	$p=1.00, D=-0.00, \text{Pass}$	$p=0.02, D=0.00, \text{Reject}$
JBB	GPT-5-mini	$p<0.01, D=0.00, \text{Reject}$	$p=1.00, D=-0.00, \text{Pass}$	$p=1.00, D=-0.00, \text{Pass}$
	Gemini-2.5-flash	$p<0.01, D=0.11, \text{Reject}$	$p<0.01, D=0.11, \text{Reject}$	$p<0.01, D=0.13, \text{Reject}$
	DeepSeek-Chat	$p<0.01, D=0.00, \text{Reject}$	$p=1.00, D=-0.00, \text{Pass}$	$p<0.01, D=0.00, \text{Reject}$

表 4: 影子 API 提供者采用的三种经济欺骗机制。

机制	示例	价格比率	欺骗证据
信息溢价 (Information Premium)	API A — Gemini-2.0-flash	$7.10\times / 7.25\times$	指纹识别为 Gemini-2.5-flash
折扣替换 (Discount-Substitution)	API A — GPT-5	$1.00\times$	指纹识别为 GLM-4-9B (廉价换高级)
转售加价 (Resale Markup)	API H — GPT-5	$1.09\times$	多个案例中观察到替换行为

表 5: GPQA 上的等价交付价值 ($n=1,273$ 次查询, GPT-5 定价)。成本根据测量的提示和补全 token 数量按官方费率 (每 100 万 token \$1.25/\$10.00) 推算。

API	等价价值	相对官方
官方 (Official)	\$14.84	$1.00\times$
影子 API A	\$5.70	$0.38\times$
影子 API E	\$5.35	$0.36\times$
影子 API H	\$7.77	$0.52\times$

累计研究成本. 除了单次查询的损失外, 影子 API 欺骗还给研究社区带来了更广泛的成本。我们的数据集涵盖了 187 篇依赖影子 API 提供者获取 LLM 流程的论文。保守假设其中 30% 的论文在检测到身份不一致后需要重新执行 ($n \approx 56$, 相对于经验观察到的 45.83% 指纹失败率是一个下限), 包括 API 重新运行 (每篇论文 \$50-\$500) 和研究时间 (约 $40\text{h} \times \$50/\text{h} = \$2,000$ 每篇论文) 在内的累计直接成本范围为 \$115,000 至 \$140,000。这一估计不包括通过引用这些论文的 5,966 篇作品传播的下游可复现性成本, 其中静默的模型替换可能在没有任何可见错误信号的情况下悄然破坏依赖性实验结果。

7 建议

我们的研究发现表明, 影子 API (shadow API) 欺骗现象普遍存在、技术上可检测, 且具有经济动机。为维护基于大语言模型 (LLM) 研究的完整性, 我们分别针对审计人员和研究人员提出了一套具体的双工作流程框架。首要建议明确无误: **影子 API 不应用于研究流程,**

根本解决方案是直接使用官方 API。 在无法直接访问的情况下, 应在信任任何影子 API 端点之前应用以下协议。

审计人员验证协议. 我们建议采用四阶段验证流水线, 任一阶段被标记即应立即停止使用该端点。第一阶段, 应使用至少 24 个 LLMmap 探针对端点进行查询, 若余弦距离超过官方基准的 $1.2\times$ 或 top-1 识别模型与声称的身份不符, 则标记该端点。第二阶段, 应在 $\alpha = 0.05$ 的显著性水平下使用 MET [21] 方法对至少 500 个样本进行检验, 若分布一致性原假设被拒绝, 则标记该端点。第三阶段, 应在留出基准测试上运行至少三次独立会话, 若准确率标准差超过 5 个百分点或延迟变异系数超过 0.15, 则标记该端点, 因为过大的方差表明后端路由不稳定或存在动态模型替换。第四阶段, 应根据标准验证 ICP 备案信息和法律主体披露情况。由未注册个人运营且无可验证来源的端点具有较高的法律和运营风险。

研究人员预注册清单. 对于任何依赖大语言模型 API 查询的研究, 研究人员应在数据收集之前完成并公开报告以下信息。应记录完整的端点 URL、声称的模型版本、访问日期和定价档次, 并将其作为脚注或包含在实验设置部分中, 这与新兴的可重复性 (reproducibility) 规范保持一致。在发出任何实验查询之前, 应确认端点通过上述审计协议的所有四个阶段。未能通过任一阶段的端点的结果不应被报告为声称模型的代表性结果。最后, 应将至少三次独立运行的逐次准确率、LLMap 指纹余弦距离和 MET p 值与实验结果一并报告, 使读者和审稿人能够评估后端可靠性并据此对报告的性能进行 contextualize。

社区层面行动. 超越个人实践, 我们呼吁更广泛的研究

社区采取结构性保障措施。会议组织者和程序主席应更新审稿指南，将未披露或未验证的第三方 API 端点标记为可重复性风险，将此类使用类比于未验证的数据集来源。官方模型提供商可以通过放宽地理访问限制、提供学术定价档次以及提供轻量级官方验证端点来进一步减少影子市场需求，研究人员可以查询这些验证端点以独立确认模型身份。

8 结论

在本研究中，我们首次对影子 API 进行了系统性审计，这是一种被广泛使用但未经验证的前沿大语言模型访问方式。通过对多个提供商、基准测试和多维基准测试以及行为指纹识别的综合评估，我们证明影子 API 表现出显著的性能差异和身份不一致性。依赖影子 API 进行评估是不可靠的，因为它们可能无法复现官方端点的行为。综上所述，这些发现揭示了影子 API 中存在的欺骗性模型声明，并证明它们不能被视为可靠的官方模型。

Limitations

Despite providing a systematic audit of the shadow APIs, our study is subject to several limitations.

Temporal Scope and Market Volatility. Our study reflects a deliberately bounded snapshot of the shadow API within a specific time window (September to December 2025). The shadow API market is characterized by extreme opacity: providers frequently switch upstream model sources, alter routing strategies, or cease operations without notice. As market dynamics evolve, the behavioral characteristics of these services may drift significantly beyond our observation window. Our September to December 2025 window is intentionally fixed to ensure experimental consistency across all benchmarks and providers. To quantify within-window variance, we run each experiment across three independent trials and report the standard deviation throughout. While exact performance scores may drift over time, the core risk signals we document, non-transparent model substitution, capability downgrading, and safety behavior divergence, reflect structural opacity in how these services are designed and operated, rather than artifacts of any single measurement period. From a research integrity perspective, once a service exhibits unreliability at any observed point, the risk to downstream research is already real: it is scientifically defensible to treat such an API as unreliable without requiring longitudinal proof of persistent failure across an extended period. We intentionally adopt a snapshot design rather than continuous monitoring to minimize potential harm to official model providers and to avoid inadvertently amplifying or operationalizing the shadow API ecosystem through sustained engagement.

Detection Coverage and Ground Truth. In the absence of ground truth regarding the backend infrastructure of shadow APIs, our investigation relies on performance metrics, meta-information, and established auditing frameworks such as LLMmap and MET to detect model substitution and performance inconsistencies. While we can detect model identity mismatches with high confidence, we cannot definitively distinguish between certain fine-grained implementation details. Moreover, while we specify exact version snapshots for official models wherever possible, the official APIs of proprietary models may undergo undisclosed fine-tuning. To mitigate the potential impact of temporal drift and inherent stochasticity in official APIs, we conducted multiple independent runs for each experiment and reported the variance, ensuring that our comparative results remain robust against fluctuations in the baseline models. In addition, we recognize the potential to analyze the differences between official and shadow APIs from diverse perspectives, such as bias and hallucination [31,61].

Coverage of Providers and Model Families. Although we collect the 17 providers based on academic citations and GitHub stars, this may not represent the full shadow API market. More shadow API services

may exist, which may employ technical architectures or deceptive strategies distinct from those observed in this study. Also, our work could not cover all LLM families, so we mainly focus on three representative model families. We believe our audit pipeline and findings have the potential to be extrapolated to more LLM families and look forward to future work focusing on wider model families.

Ethical Considerations

In this work, we adhere to responsible AI research guidelines. Our study involved purchasing and querying unofficial shadow API services, which may violate the terms of service of official providers (e.g., OpenAI, Google, DeepSeek). These interactions were conducted solely for the purpose of auditing and transparency. We do not endorse, promote, or encourage the use of these unauthorized services. To minimize potential negative impacts on official infrastructure, we strictly limited our query volume to the minimum necessary for statistical validation of model identity and performance. Furthermore, all requests to official APIs were conducted exclusively from authorized geographic regions to ensure full compliance with the providers' regional access policies.

To avoid serving as an advertisement for illicit services and to mitigate legal risks for individual operators, we have applied strict anonymization to all audited shadow APIs. Our goal is to expose systemic risks within the shadow API market rather than to target specific individuals. Furthermore, regarding our prevalence analysis, we have strictly de-identified all specific academic papers, authors, and institutions found to be using shadow APIs. Our objective is to highlight systemic reproducibility within the community.

Our safety evaluation involved the use of jailbreak attacks to test model guardrails. To prevent misuse, we follow best practices in safety research: we do not release specific examples of successfully generated harmful content or the exact adversarial prompts used to bypass safety filters. We report only aggregated metrics, harmfulness score, and store all sensitive outputs on secure, access-controlled local servers.

To mitigate potential harm and foster a healthier market, we have adhered to responsible disclosure principles. We are committed to responsibly reporting our findings to official model providers as well as the authors of papers that use shadow APIs. We have received partial acknowledgment from them.

参考文献

- [1] Miklós Sebők and Rebeka Kiss. Unlocking Large Language Models via API: Capabilities, Access, and Practical Considerations. <https://tinyurl.com/35juu2n7>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-12-06. 1
- [2] AAI. AAI-26 Review Process Update: Scale, Integrity Measures, and Pathways to Sustainability. <https://aai.org/conference/aai/aaai-26/review-process-update/>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-12-06. 2
- [3] ACL. ACL 2024 Main Conference Accepted Papers. https://2024.aclweb.org/program/main_conference_papers/, 2024. Accessed: 2025-12-06. 2
- [4] DeepSeek AI. DeepSeek API Documentation: Parameter Settings. <https://github.com/QuantumNous/new-api>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-12-06. 12
- [5] Anthropic. Updating Restrictions of Sales to Unsupported Regions. <https://tinyurl.com/4xawc72e>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-12-06. 2
- [6] Archana. The Unsustainable Economics of LLM APIs. <https://tinyml.substack.com/p/the-unsustainable-economics-of-llm>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-12-06. 2
- [7] Guangsheng Bao, Yanbin Zhao, Zhiyang Teng, Linyi Yang, and Yue Zhang. Fast-DetectGPT: Efficient Zero-Shot Detection of Machine-Generated Text via Conditional Probability Curvature. *CoRR abs/2310.05130*, 2023. 2
- [8] Bloomberg. OpenAI Taking Steps to Block China's Access to Its AI Tools. <https://tinyurl.com/yb2xcez9>, 2024. Accessed: 2025-12-06. 1
- [9] Hudson Borges, Andre Hora, and Marco Tulio Valente. Understanding the Factors that Impact the Popularity of GitHub Repositories. In *International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution (ICSME)*. IEEE, 2016. 3
- [10] Sébastien Bubeck, Varun Chandrasekaran, Ronen Eldan, Johannes Gehrke, Eric Horvitz, Ece Kamar, Peter Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Scott Lundberg, Harsha Nori, Hamid Palangi, Marco Tulio Ribeiro, and Yi Zhang. Sparks of Artificial General Intelligence: Early experiments with GPT-4. *CoRR abs/2303.12712*, 2023. 1
- [11] Will Cai, Tianneng Shi, Xuandong Zhao, and Dawn Song. Are You Getting What You Pay For? Auditing Model Substitution in LLM APIs. *CoRR abs/2504.04715*, 2025. 1, 2
- [12] Patrick Chao, Edoardo DeBenedetti, Alexander Robey, Maksym Andriushchenko, Francesco Croce, Vikash Sehwal, Edgar Dobriban, Nicolas Flammarion, George J. Pappas, Florian Tramèr, Hamed Hassani, and Eric Wong. JailbreakBench: An Open

- Robustness Benchmark for Jailbreaking Large Language Models. *CoRR abs/2404.01318*, 2024. 4
- [13] Patrick Chao, Alexander Robey, Edgar Dobriban, Hamed Hassani, George J. Pappas, and Eric Wong. Jailbreaking Black Box Large Language Models in Twenty Queries. *CoRR abs/2310.08419*, 2023. 4
- [14] Lingjiao Chen, Matei Zaharia, and James Zou. FrugalGPT: How to Use Large Language Models While Reducing Cost and Improving Performance. *CoRR abs/2305.05176*, 2023. 1
- [15] Xu Chu, Zhijie Tan, Hanlin Xue, Guanyu Wang, Tong Mo, and Weiping Li. Domainols: Guiding LLM Reasoning for Explainable Answers in High-Stakes Domains. *CoRR abs/2501.14431*, 2025. 3
- [16] EvalScope Contributors. EvalScope: Supported Datasets for LLM Evaluation. https://evalscope.readthedocs.io/en/v1.0.0/get_started/supported_dataset/llm.html, 2025. Accessed: 2025-12-06. 3
- [17] Cyberspace Administration of China. Interim Measures for the Management of Generative Artificial Intelligence Services. https://www.cac.gov.cn/2023-07/13/c_1690898327029107.htm, 2023. Accessed: 2025-12-06. 2
- [18] DeepSeek-AI. DeepSeek-V3.2: Pushing the Frontier of Open Large Language Models. *CoRR abs/2512.02556*, 2025. 3
- [19] Steffen Eger, Yong Cao, Jennifer D’Souza, Andreas Geiger, Christian Greisinger, Stephanie Gross, Yufang Hou, Brigitte Krenn, Anne Lauscher, Yizhi Li, Chenghua Lin, Nafise Sadat Moosavi, Wei Zhao, and Tristan Miller. Transforming science with large language models: A survey on ai-assisted scientific discovery, experimentation, content generation, and evaluation. *CoRR abs/2502.05151*, 2025. 1
- [20] Gao, Irena, Liang, Percy, Guestrin, and Carlos. Model Equality Testing: Which Model Is This API Serving? *CoRR abs/2410.20247*, 2024. 1
- [21] Irena Gao, Percy Liang, and Carlos Guestrin. Model equality testing: Which model is this api serving? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.20247*, 2024. 6, 7
- [22] Gemini. Gemini 2.5: Pushing the Frontier with Advanced Reasoning, Multimodality, Long Context, and Next Generation Agentic Capabilities. *CoRR abs/2507.06261*, 2025. 3
- [23] Google. Available regions for Google AI Studio and Gemini API. <https://ai.google.dev/gemini-api/docs/available-regions>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-12-06. 2
- [24] Google DeepMind. Nano Banana Pro. <https://deepmind.google/models/gemini-image/pro/>, 2025. Accessed: 2026-01-03. 1
- [25] Neel Guha, Julian Nyarko, Daniel E. Ho, Christopher Ré, Adam Chilton, Aditya Narayana, Alex Chohlas-Wood, Austin Peters, Brandon Waldon, Daniel N. Rockmore, Diego Zambrano, Dmitry Talisman, Enam Hoque, Faiz Surani, Frank Fagan, Galit Sarfaty, Gregory M. Dickinson, Haggai Porat, Jason Hegland, Jessica Wu, Joe Nudell, Joel Niklaus, John Nay, Jonathan H. Choi, Kevin Tobia, Margaret Hagan, Megan Ma, Michael Livermore, Nikon Rasumov-Rahe, Nils Holzenberger, Noam Kolt, Peter Henderson, Sean Rehaag, Sharad Goel, Shang Gao, Spencer Williams, Sunny Gandhi, Tom Zur, Varun Iyer, and Zehua Li. LegalBench: A Collaboratively Built Benchmark for Measuring Legal Reasoning in Large Language Models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36:44123–44279, 2023. 3
- [26] Yinghao Hu, Yaoyao Yu, Leilei Gan, Bin Wei, Kun Kuang, and Fei Wu. Evaluating Test-Time Scaling LLMs for Legal Reasoning: OpenAI o1, DeepSeek-R1, and Beyond. *CoRR abs/2503.16040*, 2025. 3
- [27] ICLR. International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR) 2024 Accepted Papers. <https://iclr.cc/virtual/2024/papers.html>, 2024. Accessed: 2025-12-06. 2
- [28] Songtao Jiang, Yuan Wang, Sibao Song, Tianxiang Hu, Chenyi Zhou, Bin Pu, Yan Zhang, Zhibo Yang, Yang Feng, Joey Tianyi Zhou, Jin Hao, Zijian Chen, Ruijia Wu, Tao Tang, Junhui Lv, Hongxia Xu, Hongwei Wang, Jun Xiao, Bin Feng, Fudong Zhu, Kenli Li, Weidi Xie, Jimeng Sun, Jian Wu, and Zuozhu Liu. Hulu-Med: A Transparent Generalist Model towards Holistic Medical Vision-Language Understanding. *CoRR abs/2510.08668*, 2025. 3
- [29] Yukun Jiang, Hai Huang, Mingjie Li, Yage Zhang, Michael Backes, and Yang Zhang. Sparse Models, Sparse Safety: Unsafe Routes in Mixture-of-Experts LLMs. *CoRR abs/2602.08621*, 2026. 4
- [30] Yukun Jiang, Mingjie Li, Michael Backes, and Yang Zhang. Adjacent Words, Divergent Intent: Jailbreaking Large Language Models via Task Concurrency. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2025. 4
- [31] Yukun Jiang, Zheng Li, Xinyue Shen, Yugeng Liu, Michael Backes, and Yang Zhang. ModSCAN: Measuring Stereotypical Bias in Large Vision-Language Models from Vision and Language Modalities. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 12814–12845. ACL, 2024. 8
- [32] Yukun Jiang, Yage Zhang, Xinyue Shen, Michael Backes, and Yang Zhang. "Humans welcome to observe": A First Look at the Agent Social Network Moltbook. *CoRR abs/2602.10127*, 2026. 2

- [33] Di Jin, Eileen Pan, Nassim Oufattole, Wei-Hung Weng, Hanyi Fang, and Peter Szolovits. What Disease does this Patient Have? A Large-scale Open Domain Question Answering Dataset from Medical Exams. *Applied Sciences*, 2021. 3
- [34] Keegan Keplinger. Hackers Are Stealing GenAI Credentials, So What Sensitive Company Data Are They Getting Their Hands On? <https://tinyurl.com/bdhvry4n>, 2024. Accessed: 2025-12-06. 2
- [35] Kalpesh Krishna, Gaurav Singh Tomar, Ankur P. Parikh, Nicolas Papernot, and Mohit Iyyer. Thieves on Sesame Street! Model Extraction of BERT-based APIs. *CoRR abs/1910.12366*, 2019. 2
- [36] LatticeFlow. CVPR'24 in Numbers. <https://latticeflow.ai/news/cvpr24-in-numbers>, 2024. Accessed: 2025-12-06. 2
- [37] Percy Liang, Rishi Bommasani, Tony Lee, Dimitris Tsipras, Dilara Soyulu, Michihiro Yasunaga, Yian Zhang, Deepak Narayanan, Yuhuai Wu, Ananya Kumar, Benjamin Newman, Binhang Yuan, Bobby Yan, Ce Zhang, Christian Cosgrove, Christopher D. Manning, Christopher Ré, Diana Acosta-Navas, Drew A. Hudson, Eric Zelikman, Esin Durmus, Faisal Ladhak, Frieda Rong, Hongyu Ren, Huaxiu Yao, Jue Wang, Keshav Santhanam, Laurel J. Orr, Lucia Zheng, Mert Yüksesgönül, Mirac Suzgun, Nathan Kim, Neel Guha, Niladri S. Chatterji, Omar Khattab, Peter Henderson, Qian Huang, Ryan Chi, Sang Michael Xie, Shibani Santurkar, Surya Ganguli, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Thomas Icard, Tianyi Zhang, Vishrav Chaudhary, William Wang, Xuechen Li, Yifan Mai, Yuhui Zhang, and Yuta Koreeda. Holistic Evaluation of Language Models. *CoRR abs/2211.09110*, 2022. 1
- [38] Yue Liu, Xiaoxin He, Miao Xiong, Jinlan Fu, Shumin Deng, and Bryan Hooi. FlipAttack: Jailbreak LLMs via Flipping. *CoRR abs/2410.02832*, 2024. 4
- [39] Hope McGovern, Rickard Stureborg, Yoshi Suhara, and Dimitris Alikaniotis. Your Large Language Models Are Leaving Fingerprints. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on GenAI Content Detection (GenAIDetect)*, pages 85–95, 2025. 2
- [40] Anay Mehrotra, Manolis Zampetakis, Paul Kasianik, Blaine Nelson, Hyrum Anderson, Yaron Singer, and Amin Karbasi. Tree of Attacks: Jailbreaking Black-Box LLMs Automatically. *CoRR abs/2312.02119*, 2023. 4
- [41] Art of Problem Solving. AIME Problems and Solutions. https://artofproblemsolving.com/wiki/index.php/AIME_Problems_and_Solutions, 2025. Accessed: 2025-12-06. 3
- [42] OpenAI. GPT-4 Technical Report. *CoRR abs/2303.08774*, 2023. 1
- [43] OpenAI. ChatGPT and API Services in Unsupported Countries and Territories. <https://tinyurl.com/69nw2cn3>, 2024. Accessed: 2025-12-06. 2
- [44] OpenAI. OpenAI Services Agreement. <https://openai.com/policies/services-agreement>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-12-06. 2
- [45] OpenAI. Reasoning Models - OpenAI API Documentation. <https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/reasoning>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-12-06. 12
- [46] OpenAI. Supported Countries and Territories. <https://platform.openai.com/docs/supported-countries>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-12-06. 1
- [47] Dario Pasquini, Evgenios M. Kornaropoulos, and Giuseppe Ateniese. LLMmap: Fingerprinting for large language models. In *USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security)*, pages 299–318. USENIX, 2025. 2, 5
- [48] Song Quanpeng. One API: An OpenAI-compatible All-in-one AI API Gateway. <https://github.com/songquanpeng/one-api>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-12-06. 2
- [49] QuantumNous. New API: An AI Model Interface Management and Distribution System Based on One API. <https://github.com/QuantumNous/new-api>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-12-06. 2, 14
- [50] Qwen. Qwen3 Technical Report. *CoRR abs/2505.09388*, 2025. 3
- [51] David Rein, Betty Li Hou, Asa Cooper Stickland, Jackson Petty, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Julien Dirani, Julian Michael, and Samuel R. Bowman. GPQA: A Graduate-Level Google-Proof Q&A Benchmark. *CoRR abs/2311.12022*, 2023. 3
- [52] Karan Singhal, Shekoofeh Azizi, Tao Tu, S. Sara Mahdavi, Jason Wei, Hyung Won Chung, Nathan Scales, Ajay Kumar Tanwani, Heather Cole-Lewis, Stephen Pfohl, Perry Payne, Martin Seneviratne, Paul Gamble, Chris Kelly, Nathaneal Schärli, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Philip Andrew Mansfield, Blaise Agüera y Arcas, Dale R. Webster, Gregory S. Corrado, Yossi Matias, Katherine Chou, Juraj Gottweis, Nenad Tomasev, Yun Liu, Alvin Rajkumar, Joelle K. Barral, Christopher Semturs, Alan Karthikesalingam, and Vivek Natarajan. Large language models encode clinical knowledge. *Nature*, 2023. 1
- [53] Alexandra Souly, Qingyuan Lu, Dillon Bowen, Tu Trinh, Elvis Hsieh, Sana Pandey, Pieter Abbeel, Justin Svegliato, Scott Emmons, Olivia Watkins,

- and Sam Toyer. A StrongREJECT for Empty Jailbreaks. *CoRR abs/2402.10260*, 2024. 4
- [54] Sun, Yifan, Li, Yuhang, Zhang, Yue, Jin, Yuchen, Zhang, and Huan. SVIP: Towards Verifiable Inference of Open-source Large Language Models. *CoRR abs/2410.22307*, 2024. 1
- [55] Xiangru Tang, Daniel Shao, Jiwoong Sohn, Jiapeng Chen, Jiayi Zhang, Jinyu Xiang, Fang Wu, Yilun Zhao, Chenglin Wu, Wenqi Shi, Arman Cohan, and Mark Gerstein. MedAgentsBench: Benchmarking Thinking Models and Agent Frameworks for Complex Medical Reasoning. *CoRR abs/2503.07459*, 2025. 3
- [56] Alexander Wei, Nika Haghtalab, and Jacob Steinhardt. Jailbroken: How Does LLM Safety Training Fail? *CoRR abs/2307.02483*, 2023. 4
- [57] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V. Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain-of-Thought Prompting Elicits Reasoning in Large Language Models. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*. NeurIPS, 2022. 1
- [58] Zhiqiu Xia, Lang Zhu, Bingzhe Li, Feng Chen, Qiannan Li, Chunhua Liao, Feiyi Wang, and Hang Liu. Analyzing 16,193 LLM Papers for Fun and Profits. *CoRR abs/2504.08619*, 2025. 2
- [59] Zhikang Xie, Weilin Wan, Peizhu Gong, Weizhong Zhang, and Cheng Jin. Advanced black-box tuning of large language models with limited api calls. *CoRR abs/2511.10210*, 2025. 1
- [60] Xianjun Yang, Wei Cheng, Yue Wu, Linda Petzold, William Yang Wang, and Haifeng Chen. DNA-GPT: Divergent N-Gram Analysis for Training-Free Detection of GPT-Generated Text. *CoRR abs/2305.17359*, 2023. 2
- [61] Yage Zhang. Cutting the Root of Hallucination: Structural Trimming for Vulnerability Mitigation in Code LLMs. In *Second Conference on Language Modeling (COLM)*, 2025. 8
- [62] Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, Yifan Du, Chen Yang, Yushuo Chen, Zhipeng Chen, Jinhao Jiang, Ruiyang Ren, Yifan Li, Xinyu Tang, Zikang Liu, Peiyu Liu, Jian-Yun Nie, and Ji-Rong Wen. A Survey of Large Language Models. *CoRR abs/2303.18223*, 2023. 1
- [63] Zilan Qian. How to Use Banned US Models in China: The Grey Market for American LLMs. <https://www.chinatalk.media/p/the-grey-market-for-american-llms>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-12-06. 2
- [64] Andy Zou, Zifan Wang, Nicholas Carlini, Milad Nasr, J. Zico Kolter, and Matt Fredrikson. Universal and Transferable Adversarial Attacks on Aligned Language Models. *CoRR abs/2307.15043*, 2023. 4

A Configurations Details

A.1 Model Configurations

Table 6 details the specific configurations for all evaluated models across official and shadow APIs. To ensure reproducibility, we set the random seed at 42 and the temperature at 0 for all models compatible with these settings, in accordance with reasoning task guidelines [4], while omitting these parameters for unsupported endpoints. For the GPT-5 model family and other reasoning models, we specifically monitor their support for reasoning parameters. For all reasoning models, we employ the medium reasoning effort in our subsequent analysis, according to the default configuration [45]. The table also highlights the discrepancies in which shadow APIs may enforce fixed behaviors that deviate from official baselines. The Ratio column denotes the multiplicative factor of the shadow API service price relative to the official provider for input/output tokens. Logprobs indicates whether the API can return log probability outputs. Pricing is normalized to USD per 1 million tokens for comparison and accessed on December 6, 2025.

A.2 Compliance and Transparency Metadata for Shadow API Providers

Definitions. We assess each shadow API provider along two dimensions: *transparent identity* and *verifiable provenance*. **Transparent identity** requires public disclosure of all three of the following: (1) a legal entity name (not a pseudonym or alias) (2) a verifiable registration identifier, such as an ICP filing number or business registration number and (3) legal documentation in the form of a Terms of Service and/or Privacy Policy. **Verifiable provenance** requires cross-validation against at least one independent external source, including ICP/WHOIS records, official business registries, or platform-level disclosures such as payment merchant identity. All checks were conducted between September and December 2025.

Compliance Metadata. Table 7 reports the full compliance metadata for all 17 shadow API providers in our dataset. Each provider is assessed across five binary criteria: ICP filing verification, business registry listing, availability of legal documentation (ToS and/or Privacy Policy), payment method, and payee type (individual vs. corporate entity). Identifiers and domains are partially redacted to prevent unintended traffic amplification.

Summary and Provider Selection Rationale. Across all 17 providers, only shadow API H holds a verifiable ICP registration, and only shadow API N

表 6: Comparison of model configurations across different APIs.

Model Family	Model Name	Channel	API Model ID	Temp.	Seed	Logprobs	Price (In/Out)	Ratio	
GPT	GPT-4o-mini	Official	GPT-4o-mini-2024-07-18	0	42	●	\$0.15 / \$0.60	1.00 / 1.00	
		Shadow API A	GPT-4o-mini	0	42	●	\$0.15 / \$0.60	1.00 / 1.00	
		Shadow API E	GPT-4o-mini-2024-07-18	0	42	●	\$0.11 / \$0.43	0.73 / 0.72	
		Shadow API H	GPT-4o-mini-2024-07-18	0	42	●	\$0.16 / \$0.65	1.09 / 1.09	
	GPT-5	Official		gpt-5-2025-08-07	N/A	42	○	\$1.25 / \$10.00	1.00 / 1.00
		Shadow API A		gpt-5	0	42	●	\$1.25 / \$10.00	1.00 / 1.00
		Shadow API E		gpt-5-2025-08-07	0	42	○	\$0.89 / \$7.14	0.71 / 0.71
		Shadow API H		gpt-5-2025-08-07	0	42	○	\$1.36 / \$10.90	1.09 / 1.09
	GPT-5-mini	Official		gpt-5-mini-2025-08-07	N/A	42	○	\$0.25 / \$2.00	1.00 / 1.00
		Shadow API A		gpt-5-mini	0	42	●	\$0.25 / \$2.00	1.00 / 1.00
		Shadow API E		gpt-5-mini-2025-08-07	0	42	○	\$0.18 / \$1.43	0.72 / 0.72
		Shadow API H		gpt-5-mini	0	42	○	\$0.27 / \$2.18	1.09 / 1.09
Gemini	Gemini-2.0-flash	Official	gemini-2.0-flash	0	N/A	●	\$0.10 / \$0.40	1.00 / 1.00	
		Shadow API A	gemini-2.0-flash	0	42	●	\$0.71 / \$2.90	7.10 / 7.25	
		Shadow API E	gemini-2.0-flash	0	42	●	\$0.07 / \$0.29	0.71 / 0.73	
		Shadow API H	gemini-2.0-flash	0	42	●	\$0.11 / \$0.44	1.09 / 1.09	
	Gemini-2.5-flash	Official		gemini-2.5-flash	0	N/A	●	\$0.30 / \$2.50	1.00 / 1.00
		Shadow API A		gemini-2.5-flash	0	42	●	\$0.09 / \$2.00	0.29 / 0.80
		Shadow API E		gemini-2.5-flash	0	42	●	\$0.21 / \$1.79	0.70 / 0.72
		Shadow API H		gemini-2.5-flash	0	42	●	\$0.33 / \$2.73	1.09 / 1.09
	Gemini-2.5-pro	Official		gemini-2.5-pro	0	N/A	●	\$1.25 / \$10.00	1.00 / 1.00
		Shadow API A		gemini-2.5-pro	0	42	●	\$1.00 / \$5.70	0.80 / 0.57
		Shadow API E		gemini-2.5-pro	0	42	●	\$0.89 / \$7.14	0.71 / 0.71
		Shadow API H		gemini-2.5-pro	0	42	●	\$1.36 / 10.90	1.09 / 1.09
DeepSeek	DeepSeek-Chat	Official	deepseek-chat	0	42	●	\$0.28 / \$0.42	1.00 / 1.00	
		Shadow API A	deepseek-v3.2	0	42	●	\$0.17 / \$0.26	0.61 / 0.62	
		Shadow API E	DeepSeek-V3.2-nothinking	0	42	●	\$1.43 / \$2.14	5.11 / 5.10	
		Shadow API H	deepseek-chat	0	42	●	\$0.22 / \$0.34	0.80 / 0.80	
	DeepSeek-Reasoner	Official	deepseek-reasoner	0	42	●	\$0.28 / \$0.42	1.00 / 1.00	
		Shadow API A	deepseek-v3.2-thinking	0	42	●	\$0.17 / \$0.26	0.61 / 0.62	
		Shadow API E	DeepSeek-V3.2-thinking	0	42	●	\$1.43 / \$2.14	5.11 / 5.10	
		Shadow API H	deepseek-reasoner	0	42	●	\$0.22 / \$0.34	0.80 / 0.80	

●: Accept logprobs with output; ●: Accept logprobs but no output; ○: Not accept logprobs.

Ratio: The Ratio column denotes the multiplicative factor of the shadow API service price relative to the official provider for input/output tokens. Ratio < 1 (> 1) indicates the shadow API is cheaper (more expensive) than the official ones.

表 7: Full compliance and transparency metadata for all 17 shadow API providers. Checks were conducted from September to December 2025. A checkmark (✓) indicates a verified positive signal; a dash (—) indicates absence or non-disclosure.

ID	Service	Domain	Legal Entity	Reg. ID	Legal Docs	ICP	Biz. Registry	Payment	Payee
A	C*****E	api.c*****y.cn	—	—	—	—	—	Alipay	Individual
B	Y*****I	y*****i.com	—	—	—	—	—	Internal	Individual
C	X*****I	x*****i.plus	—	—	—	—	—	Alipay / WeChat	Individual
D	G*****S	g*****s.us	—	—	—	—	—	Alipay / WeChat	Individual
E	Q*****O	q*****o.com	—	—	Disclaimer	—	—	Alipay / WeChat / PayPal / USDT	Individual
F	Q*****B	o*****b.com	—	—	—	—	—	Alipay / WeChat	Individual
G	D*****I	d*****i.cn	—	—	ToS, Privacy	—	—	Alipay / WeChat	Individual
H	Z*****G	z*****g.com	✓	✓	—	✓	—	Alipay / WeChat	Company
I	C*****I	chat.c*****i.vip	—	—	—	—	—	Alipay	Individual
J	O*****D	o*****d.cloud	—	—	ToS	—	—	USDT / WeChat	Individual
K	V*****I	api.g**.ge	—	—	ToS, Privacy	—	—	USDT / WeChat	Individual
L	A*****S	a*****s.com	—	—	—	—	—	Alipay / WeChat	Individual
M	B*****I	api.b*****i.ai	—	—	—	—	—	Alipay / WeChat	Individual
N	A*****X	a*****x.com	✓	—	ToS, Privacy	—	✓	Alipay / Credit Card	Company
O	A*****S	a*****s.top	—	—	—	—	—	Alipay	Individual
P	A*****9	a*****9.com	—	—	—	—	—	Alipay / WeChat	Individual
Q	3**i	3**i.cn	—	—	—	—	—	Alipay / WeChat	Individual

discloses a corporate legal entity. The remaining 15 providers (88.2%) fail all transparency criteria simultaneously, with payment records and payee traces con-

sistently pointing to individual operators rather than registered businesses.

Shadow APIs A, E, and H are selected as the primary

subjects of our quantitative analysis for three reasons. First, they occupy the top of the popularity distribution as measured by academic citations and GitHub stars. Second, all three maintain publicly accessible endpoints throughout the study period, enabling systematic and reproducible evaluation. Third, they collectively span the three major model families examined in this work (GPT, Gemini, and DeepSeek), providing representative coverage. Crucially, the structural opacity pattern observed in A, E, and H, absent verifiable entity and registration signals combined with individual-facing payment and payee traces, is consistent across all 17 providers in the dataset, confirming that these three are not outliers but rather representative instances of the broader shadow API ecosystem.

A.3 Shadow APIs Profiles

Shadow API A is selected as the first ranking in both categories, which is operated by an individual and does not employ open-source LLM API management or distribution systems. Shadow API E and H are selected for their stability, as they rank within the top for both citations and stars. Regarding shadow API E, the provider is also an individual and utilizes an open-source LLM API management and distribution system (NewAPI [49]) as its deployment template. Shadow API E aggregates over 54 upstream providers, some of which are explicitly labeled as having undisclosed origins. Some of the endpoints are categorized as reverse-engineered, web-based, capability-degraded, distilled, or unstable yet cost-effective variants. Given this diversity, we specifically select endpoints explicitly labeled as originating from the official. For the shadow API H, the provider is a corporate entity (Internet Content Provider filing) rather than an individual operator, which does not rely on an open-source LLM API management and distribution system. Notably, the shadow API B is deployed by a laboratory at a prestigious Chinese university, built on NewAPI, where part of the models listed in its internal large language Model Marketplace are explicitly marked with Unknown sources.

A.4 OpenRouter Ranking

Figure 6 presents the detailed snapshot of the OpenRouter, November 2025. This ranking highlights the most widely used models by token consumption.

B Detailed Discrepancy

Table 8 and Table 9 present a detailed discrepancy analysis between official and shadow APIs, categorizing their response across MedQA (USMLE) and LegalBench (Scalr). We report results based on the first execution.

Particularly, Gemini-2.5-flash exhibits performance collapse across all shadow APIs, with an average consistency rate of $\sim 51.48\%$ in medical and legal fields. This overwhelmingly high count of official-correct-only instances confirms that shadow APIs fail to reproduce the

1.	Grok Code Fast 1 by x.ai	5.83T tokens ↑21%	11.	GLM 4.6 by z.ai	405B tokens ↑84%
2.	Claude Sonnet 4.5 by anthropic	2.6T tokens ↑166%	12.	GPT-4o-mini by openai	357B tokens ↑32%
3.	Gemini 2.5 Flash by google	1.43T tokens ↓4%	13.	DeepSeek R1T2 Chimera (free) by deepseek	338B tokens ↑131%
4.	Gemini 2.5 Pro by google	791B tokens ↑31%	14.	DeepSeek V3.1 by deepseek	318B tokens ↑13%
5.	Grok 4 Fast by x.ai	742B tokens ↑96%	15.	gpt-oss-120b by openai	309B tokens ↑17%
6.	MiniMax M2 (free) by minimax	663B tokens new	16.	Claude Haiku 4.5 by anthropic	299B tokens ↑20,583%
7.	Gemini 2.0 Flash by google	651B tokens ↓3%	17.	Qwen3 235B A22B Instruct 2... by qwen	292B tokens ↑53%
8.	Claude Sonnet 4 by anthropic	623B tokens ↓64%	18.	GPT-5 by openai	281B tokens ↓33%
9.	Gemini 2.5 Flash Lite by google	517B tokens ↑23%	19.	Gemini 2.5 Flash Preview 09-... by google	280B tokens ↑150%
10.	DeepSeek V3 0324 by deepseek	491B tokens ↓10%	20.	GPT-5 Mini by openai	272B tokens ↑38%

图 6: LLM token usage rankings on OpenRouter.

reasoning capabilities of the official API. On DeepSeek-Chat, the advantages of this official model are reduced, but still exist as the shadow API A shows a significant degradation in the legal field (80.56% consistency), diverting sharply from the official baseline compared to other shadow providers.

C Safety Evaluation on AdvBench

We also have similar results on the AdvBench as JailbreakBench, in Figure 7, where shadow APIs deviate unpredictably from official endpoints. Specifically, for GPT-5-mini under the Base64 attack (Figure 7a), shadow API A yields a harmfulness score of 0.05, which is $5\times$ the official API's score of 0.01. Similarly, shadow APIs A, E, and H significantly underestimate the risk in the Combination attack. For instance, Gemini-2.5-flash (Figure 7b), the results show an underestimation of risk by all shadow APIs, which are safer than the official API across all attacks, particularly against FlipAttack (the official API reaches a high harmfulness score of 0.95, all shadow APIs around 0.82). In the case of DeepSeek-Chat (Figure 7c), the shadow APIs exhibit smaller differences compared to GPT-5-mini and Gemini-2.5-flash, but differences from the official API still exist. For example, shadow API H generates more harmful content than the official API under the Combination (FlipAttack) attack. In addition, the harmfulness score for shadow API A and E is comparable to the official endpoints in Base64 and Combination, but lower than the official scores in FlipAttack.

D Inference Latency Time and Token Counts

Figure 8 and Figure 9 illustrate the inference latency time and token counts on the AIME 2025. Similarly, Figure 10 and Figure 11 present the comparative analysis on the GPQA. As shown, shadow API H exhibits inference latency time and token counts that are sometimes higher and sometimes lower than those of the official API on question with GPT-4o-mini, indicating inconsistent performance characteristics across runs.

表 8: Performance discrepancy between official and shadow APIs on MedQA (USMLE).

Model	Shadow API	Total	Both Correct	Both Incorrect	Official Correct Only	Shadow Correct Only	Consistency (%)
Gemini-2.5-flash	Shadow API A	1273	448	184	619	22	49.65
	Shadow API E	1273	450	181	617	25	49.57
	Shadow API H	1273	446	186	621	20	49.65
GPT-5-mini	Shadow API A	1273	981	232	24	36	95.29
	Shadow API E	1273	949	228	56	40	92.46
	Shadow API H	1273	977	230	28	38	94.82
DeepSeek-Chat	Shadow API A	1273	827	280	105	61	86.96
	Shadow API E	1273	905	326	27	15	96.70
	Shadow API H	1273	888	313	44	28	94.34

表 9: Performance discrepancy between official and shadow APIs on Legalbench (Scalar).

Model	Shadow API	Total	Both Correct	Both Incorrect	Official Correct Only	Shadow Correct Only	Consistency (%)
Gemini-2.5-flash	Shadow API A	571	187	116	254	14	53.06
	Shadow API E	571	183	116	258	14	52.36
	Shadow API H	571	197	115	244	15	54.64
GPT-5-mini	Shadow API A	571	416	133	12	10	96.15
	Shadow API E	571	411	128	17	15	94.40
	Shadow API H	571	416	128	12	15	95.27
DeepSeek-Chat	Shadow API A	571	367	93	84	27	80.56
	Shadow API E	571	417	100	34	20	90.54
	Shadow API H	571	427	103	24	17	92.82




图 7: Safety performance comparison on the AdvBench dataset.

In addition, we analyze the stability of shadow APIs compared to the official API by examining the standard deviation (SD) of inference latency time (Table 10) and token counts (Table 11). Regarding inference latency time, shadow APIs exhibit marked instability, with volatility frequently exceeding the official baseline by over $1.2\times$ or even $2.0\times$. This unpredictability is most severe in the Gemini and DeepSeek model families. In terms of token counts, GPT series models on the AIME show abnormally low variance ($< 0.8\times$), while Gemini and DeepSeek models frequently demonstrate excessive variance ($> 1.2\times$) on GPQA.

E LLMs Used for Training LLMmap

Table 16 provides a comprehensive inventory of the LLMs utilized in this study, distinguishing between the original baseline models and newly integrated trained models. All officially trained models are queried directly through the corresponding official APIs.

F Controlled Validation of Detection Methods

To assess the reliability of LLMmap and MET under known ground truth, we construct a local controlled testbed spanning three substitution scenarios across the GPT, Gemini, and DeepSeek families. Each scenario consists of $N=100$ samples, and endpoints are configured as either *honest* (the backend matches the claimed model) or *deceptive* (the backend is silently substituted). The full experimental setup is summarized in Table 12. **LLMmap Validation.** LLMmap follows its standard probing pipeline with its curated prompt set. For each endpoint, we take the top-1 identified model as the prediction and compare it against the ground truth backend. As shown in Table 13, LLMmap achieves 96.0% overall accuracy (FPR=3.0%, FNR=5.0%), with consistent performance across all three model families.

MET Validation. MET is evaluated separately using an independent set of 600 requests issued to the same controlled endpoints. For each endpoint, MET tests the null hypothesis that the endpoint’s output distribution matches that of the claimed model’s official distribution. A rejection ($Reject=True$) is treated as a decep-

表 10: Standard deviation of inference latency time (s). Colors denote ratio vs official API, **Blue** ($< 0.8\times$), **Green** ($0.8\times$ to $1.2\times$), **Red** ($> 1.2\times$).

Model Family	Model Name	Benchmark	Official API	Shadow API A	Shadow API E	Shadow API H
GPT	GPT-4o-mini	AIME	42.71	30.42	27.96	28.12
		GPQA	2.19	3.36	2.63	3.00
	GPT-5	AIME	189.04	68.62	229.20	193.95
		GPQA	32.39	45.59	40.90	36.68
	GPT-5-mini	AIME	46.75	89.06	29.56	38.58
		GPQA	12.18	19.11	15.39	15.76
Gemini	Gemini-2.0-flash	AIME	6.06	5.46	6.35	5.86
		GPQA	1.76	5.56	3.69	6.76
	Gemini-2.5-flash	AIME	29.41	86.24	22.70	51.03
		GPQA	21.30	57.95	23.86	53.29
	Gemini-2.5-pro	AIME	48.88	122.61	194.45	231.95
		GPQA	19.11	36.02	22.83	49.88
DeepSeek	DeepSeek-Chat	AIME	9.18	104.90	12.75	29.22
		GPQA	10.19	31.65	12.00	11.60
	DeepSeek-Reasoner	AIME	100.56	303.38	115.82	218.50
		GPQA	77.73	165.78	113.34	239.67

表 11: Standard deviation of token counts. Colors denote ratio vs official API, **Blue** ($< 0.8\times$), **Green** ($0.8\times$ to $1.2\times$), **Red** ($> 1.2\times$).

Model Family	Model Name	Benchmark	Official API	Shadow API A	Shadow API E	Shadow API H
GPT	GPT-4o-mini	AIME	2273.87	472.75	1598.74	1585.51
		GPQA	66.13	83.53	57.68	132.32
	GPT-5	AIME	4065.04	1311.57	3919.61	2152.53
		GPQA	1598.09	1457.36	1396.30	1594.97
	GPT-5-mini	AIME	3458.01	2026.09	1792.22	2319.84
		GPQA	892.41	1064.52	883.13	838.42
Gemini	Gemini-2.0-flash	AIME	1243.80	1242.84	1311.17	1231.42
		GPQA	384.25	1090.25	749.74	969.43
	Gemini-2.5-flash	AIME	8174.81	16489.45	6124.36	14164.34
		GPQA	5856.16	7029.59	6595.46	14464.05
	Gemini-2.5-pro	AIME	3054.32	1161.70	3768.74	2905.47
		GPQA	2637.50	7430.27	3556.55	6878.14
DeepSeek	DeepSeek-Chat	AIME	307.92	492.85	383.21	1107.18
		GPQA	305.67	338.70	360.34	354.99
	DeepSeek-Reasoner	AIME	3036.03	9647.40	3544.03	3404.37
		GPQA	2314.59	6153.61	3002.75	2409.62

表 12: Controlled validation scenarios. Each scenario contains $N=100$ samples.

Type	Claimed Model	Ground Truth Backend	Simulated Behavior
Honest	GPT-5	GPT-5	—
Honest	Gemini-2.0-flash	Gemini-2.0-flash	—
Honest	DeepSeek-Reasoner	DeepSeek-Reasoner	—
Deceptive	GPT-5	GLM-4-9B	Model substitution
Deceptive	Gemini-2.0-flash	Gemini-2.5-flash	Version mismatch
Deceptive	DeepSeek-Reasoner	DeepSeek-Chat	Capability downgrading

tion flag and compared against the ground truth label. As shown in Table 14, MET achieves 88.3% overall ac-

curacy (FPR=4.67%, FNR=18.67%).

MET’s elevated FNR reflects its operating regime:

表 13: LLMmap accuracy on the controlled validation testbed.

Model Family	Acc	FPR	FNR
GPT family	96.00%	3.00%	5.00%
Gemini family	96.00%	2.00%	6.00%
DeepSeek family	96.00%	4.00%	4.00%
Overall	96.00%	3.00%	5.00%

表 14: MET accuracy on the controlled validation testbed.

Model Family	Acc	FPR	FNR
GPT family	88.50%	5.00%	18.00%
Gemini family	87.00%	5.00%	21.00%
DeepSeek family	89.50%	4.00%	17.00%
Overall	88.33%	4.67%	18.67%

表 15: OLS regression predicting accuracy drop (Δacc) across 24 shadow API endpoints.

Variable	β	SE	t	p
Cosine Distance	-0.385	1.412	-0.272	0.789
Price Ratio	-1.447	2.055	-0.704	0.490
Identity Mismatch	0.224	7.250	0.031	0.976
Reasoning Model	10.092	7.537	1.339	0.197
$R^2 = 0.153, n = 24$				

rather than identifying exact model identity, it detects distributional shift between outputs, making it a complementary rather than redundant check alongside LLMmap.

G Regression Analysis of Accuracy Drop Predictors

To investigate which provider-level characteristics are associated with accuracy degradation, we fit an OLS regression predicting accuracy drop (Δacc) as a function of four covariates measured across all 24 evaluated endpoints: cosine distance (from LLMmap fingerprinting), price ratio (shadow vs. official pricing), identity mismatch (binary flag from LLMmap), and reasoning model flag (binary indicator for reasoning-specialized models such as DeepSeek-Reasoner).

Results. The full regression results are reported in Table 15. The overall model yields $R^2 = 0.153$ ($n = 24$), with no individual predictor reaching conventional significance thresholds.


Anomaly. The low overall R^2 is largely driven by a key structural anomaly: Gemini-2.5-flash exhibits a severe accuracy collapse (approximately 47% drop) uniformly across all three shadow API providers, despite consistently passing LLMmap fingerprint verification. This dissociation between fingerprint fidelity and task performance suggests that identity-consistent serving does not guarantee behavioral fidelity, and points to a distinct

failure mode, possibly arising from misconfigured inference parameters, context window truncation, or silent prompt preprocessing, that cosine-distance-based fingerprinting is not designed to detect.


Excluding these three Gemini-2.5-flash endpoints from the regression yields a substantially improved fit ($R^2 = 0.298, n = 21$), and identity mismatch becomes marginally significant ($\beta = 7.718, p = 0.053$), consistent with the hypothesis that identity substitution is a meaningful driver of accuracy degradation when the Gemini-2.5-flash anomaly is not conflated with the general pattern.

Price Ratio as a Quality Signal. Price ratio shows no predictive power for accuracy drop in either the full ($p = 0.490$) or restricted ($p > 0.10$) specification. This finding rules out the intuition that higher-priced shadow APIs deliver better output quality, and confirms that pricing cannot serve as a reliable proxy for service fidelity. Users cannot protect themselves from substitution-induced quality loss by selecting more expensive providers.


Complementarity of MET and Accuracy Drop. MET rejection rates correlate only weakly with accuracy drop across endpoints (Spearman $\rho = 0.233, p = 0.273$). This weak correlation is expected and informative: MET detects output distributional shift relative to the official model, whereas accuracy drop reflects downstream task performance degradation. The two signals are therefore capturing complementary failure modes, a provider may pass MET yet still deliver substantially degraded task accuracy (as in the Gemini-2.5-flash case), or may be flagged by MET without a large measurable accuracy drop on a given benchmark.




(a) AIME: GPT-4o-mini (Time)




(b) AIME: GPT-4o-mini (Token)




(c) AIME: GPT-5 (Time)




(d) AIME: GPT-5 (Token)




(e) AIME: GPT-5-mini (Time)



(f) AIME: GPT-5-mini (Token)




(g) AIME: Gemini-2.0-flash (Time)




(h) AIME: Gemini-2.0-flash (Token)


图 8: Comparison of inference latency time and token counts on the AIME (Part 1). Solid lines represent mean values, and shaded regions denote the range between the minimum and maximum values across three trials.




(a) AIME: Gemini-2.5-flash (Time)




(b) AIME: Gemini-2.5-flash (Token)




(c) AIME: Gemini-2.5-pro (Time)




(d) AIME: Gemini-2.5-pro (Token)




(e) AIME: DeepSeek-Chat (Time)



(f) AIME: DeepSeek-Chat (Token)




(g) AIME: DeepSeek-Reasoner (Time)




(h) AIME: DeepSeek-Reasoner (Token)


Figure 9: Comparison of inference latency time and token counts on the AIME (Part 2). Solid lines represent mean values, and shaded regions denote the range between the minimum and maximum values across three trials.




(a) GPQA: GPT-4o-mini (Time)




(b) GPQA: GPT-4o-mini (Token)




(c) GPQA: GPT-5 (Time)




(d) GPQA: GPT-5 (Token)




(e) GPQA: GPT-5-mini (Time)



(f) GPQA: GPT-5-mini (Token)




(g) GPQA: Gemini-2.0-flash (Time)




(h) GPQA: Gemini-2.0-flash (Token)


图 10: Comparison of inference latency time and token counts on the GPQA (Part 1). Solid lines represent mean values, and shaded regions denote the range between the minimum and maximum values across three trials.




(a) GPQA: Gemini-2.5-flash (Time)




(b) GPQA: Gemini-2.5-flash (Token)




(c) GPQA: Gemini-2.5-pro (Time)




(d) GPQA: Gemini-2.5-pro (Token)




(e) GPQA: DeepSeek-Chat (Time)



(f) GPQA: DeepSeek-Chat (Token)



(g) GPQA: DeepSeek-Reasoner (Time)



(h) GPQA: DeepSeek-Reasoner (Token)

图 11: Comparison of inference latency time and token counts on the GPQA (Part 2). Solid lines represent mean values, and shaded regions denote the range between the minimum and maximum values across three trials.

表 16: List of LLMs used for training and testing LLMmap. The table is divided into the original baseline models and additionally trained models.

#	Version	Provider	Number of Parameters
<i>Part I: Original Trained Models</i>			
1	ChatGPT-3.5 (gpt-3.5-turbo-0125)	OpenAI	/
2	ChatGPT-4 (gpt-4-turbo-2024-04-09)	OpenAI	/
3	ChatGPT-4o (gpt-4o-2024-05-13)	OpenAI	/
4	Claude 3 Haiku (claude-3-haiku-20240307)	Anthropic	/
5	Claude 3 Opus (claude-3-opus-20240229)	Anthropic	/
6	Claude 3.5 Sonnet (claude-3-5-sonnet-20240620)	Anthropic	/
7	google/gemma-7b-it	Google	7B
8	google/gemma-2b-it	Google	2B
9	google/gemma-1.1-2b-it	Google	2B
10	google/gemma-1.1-7b-it	Google	7B
11	google/gemma-2-9b-it	Google	9B
12	google/gemma-2-27b-it	Google	27B
13	CohereForAI/aya-23-8B	Cohere	8B
14	CohereForAI/aya-23-35B	Cohere	35B
15	Deci/DeciLM-7B-instruct	Deci	7B
16	Qwen/Qwen2-1.5B-Instruct	Qwen	1.5B
17	Qwen/Qwen2-7B-Instruct	Qwen	7B
18	Qwen/Qwen2-72B-Instruct	Qwen	72B
19	gradientai/Llama-3-8B-Instruct-Gradient-1048k	Gradient AI	8B
20	meta-llama/Llama-2-7b-chat-hf	Meta	7B
21	meta-llama/Meta-Llama-3-8B-Instruct	Meta	8B
22	meta-llama/Meta-Llama-3-70B-Instruct	Meta	70B
23	meta-llama/Meta-Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct	Meta	8B
24	meta-llama/Meta-Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct	Meta	70B
25	microsoft/Phi-3-medium-128k-instruct	Microsoft	14B
26	microsoft/Phi-3-medium-4k-instruct	Microsoft	14B
27	microsoft/Phi-3-mini-128k-instruct	Microsoft	3.8B
28	microsoft/Phi-3-mini-4k-instruct	Microsoft	3.8B
29	mistralai/Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.1	Mistral AI	7B
30	mistralai/Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2	Mistral AI	7B
31	mistralai/Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.3	Mistral AI	7B
32	mistralai/Mixtral-8x7B-Instruct-v0.1	Mistral AI	8x7B
33	nvidia/Llama3-ChatQA-1.5-8B	NVIDIA	8B
34	openchat/openchat-3.6-8b-20240522	OpenChat	8B
35	openchat/openchat_3.5	OpenChat	7B
36	togethercomputer/Llama-2-7B-32K-Instruct	Together AI	7B
37	upstage/SOLAR-10.7B-Instruct-v1.0	Upstage AI	10.7B
38	NousResearch/Nous-Hermes-2-Mixtral-8x7B-DPO	Nous Research	8x7B
39	abacusai/Smaug-Llama-3-70B-Instruct	Abacus AI	70B
40	microsoft/Phi-3.5-MoE-instruct	Microsoft	16x3.8B
41	internlm/internlm2_5-7b-chat	InternLM	7B
42	HuggingFaceH4/zephyr-7b-beta	HuggingFace	7B
<i>Part II: Additional Trained Models</i>			
43	ChatGPT-4o (GPT-4o-mini-2024-07-18)	OpenAI	/
44	ChatGPT-5 (gpt-5-2025-08-07)	OpenAI	/
45	ChatGPT-5-mini (gpt-5-mini-2025-08-07)	OpenAI	/
46	google/gemini-2.0-flash	Google	/
47	google/gemini-2.5-flash	Google	/
48	google/gemini-2.5-pro	Google	/
49	MiniMaxAI/MiniMax-M2	MiniMaxAI	230B
50	DeepSeek/deepseek-chat	DeepSeek	/
51	DeepSeek/deepseek-reasoner	DeepSeek	/
52	DeepSeek/deepseek-V3.2-exp-chat	DeepSeek	/
53	DeepSeek/DeepSeek-V3-0324	DeepSeek	/
54	Qwen/Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	Qwen	7B
55	Qwen/Qwen3-VL-32B-Instruct	Qwen	32B
56	Qwen/Qwen3-8B	Qwen	8B
57	DeepSeek/DeepSeek-R1-0528-Qwen3-8B	DeepSeek	8B
58	ZhipuAI/glm-4-9b-chat	ZhipuAI	9B
59	ZhipuAI/glm-Z1-9B-0414	ZhipuAI	9B
60	MoonshotAI/Kimi-K2-Instruct-0905	MoonshotAI	1000B