

PFID: Privacy First Inference Delegation Framework for LLMs

Haoyan Yang^{2†}, Zhitao Li^{1†}, Yong Zhang¹, Jianzong Wang^{1*},
Ning Cheng¹, Ming Li³, Jing Xiao¹

¹Ping An Technology (Shenzhen) Co., Ltd., China

²New York University ³University of Maryland
hy2847@nyu.edu, ztlisz@foxmail.com, jzwang@188.com

Abstract

This paper introduces a novel privacy-preservation framework named PFID for LLMs that addresses critical privacy concerns by localizing user data through model sharding and singular value decomposition. When users are interacting with LLM systems, their prompts could be subject to being exposed to eavesdroppers within or outside LLM system providers who are interested in collecting users' input. In this work, we proposed a framework to camouflage user input, so as to alleviate privacy issues. Our framework proposes to place model shards on the client and the public server, we sent compressed hidden states instead of prompts to and from servers. Clients have held back information that can re-privatized the hidden states so that overall system performance is comparable to traditional LLMs services. Our framework was designed to be communication efficient, computation can be delegated to the local client so that the server's computation burden can be lightened. We conduct extensive experiments on machine translation tasks to verify our framework's performance.

1 Introduction

The widespread use of powerful large language models (LLMs) like insturctGPT (Ouyang et al., 2022) and GPT-4 (OpenAI, 2023) in various sectors is primarily due to their remarkable capabilities. However, this extensive application brings with it significant concerns regarding user privacy (Yao et al., 2023). The prevalent method of accessing LLMs through servers or APIs, while convenient, predominantly leads to privacy breach vulnerabilities. This is because user data is stored on servers, resulting in a lack of control over the confidentiality of the data. Addressing this issue is critical, as privacy concerns can lead to user apprehension of personal privacy leak in utilizing these LLMs,

[†] These authors contributed equally to this work.

* Corresponding author: Jianzong Wang.




Figure 1: There are two scenarios for interacting with a LLM server: without privacy protection, private data is vulnerable to eavesdroppers; with the PFID Framework, data is encrypted, preventing eavesdroppers from accessing sensitive information.

thereby undermining their trustworthiness and limiting their potential benefits.

The privacy issues could be more significant in the field of machine translation (MT). People might use cloud base LLMs translation service on daily basis extensively, sensitive personal information like passwords, phone numbers might get capture by eavesdroppers or a honest-but-curious LLMs service providers (Lyu et al., 2020). Here, we define eavesdroppers as a man-in-the-middle who is interested in peeping user inputs, they could reside illegally within service providers or intercept user transmission to and from service providers over the internet.

To address above mention problems, as shown in Figure 1, we proposes a new privacy first inference delegation (PFID) framework for LLMs, which localizes user data on client device through model sharding and data truncation, safeguard-

ing users’ privacy. We propose to split LLMs into three shards, head, middle and tail. Head and tail segments were put on client local device, middle segment was proprietary and resides on server only. Only hidden states computed by the shards were communicated between server and local client instead of prompts. We attempt a compromise between open-source and proprietary models for LLMs. For proprietary LLMs, businesses can retain the core parts of the model on their servers while distributing parts of the model to users. This approach can reduce GPU usage on the server side and increase user engagement, generating economic benefits. For users, running a giant open-source model locally is impractical. In this context, using the PFID framework allows each person to only run a part of the model, enabling the widespread use of super-large models without compromising privacy. Importantly, this is the first known split-and-play, general privacy-preserving inference paradigm for LLMs. The PFID framework aims to establish a distributed inference framework that allows everyone to use LLMs in a personalized manner with enhanced computational resources while maintaining privacy, benefiting both users and businesses. Our main contributions are as follow:

- Our research introduces a novel inference framework for model sharding within LLMs that focuses on preserving privacy while distributing the computational workload of autoregressive tasks. Our framework is designed to be split-and-play, no training is needed.
- We develop a mechanism termed ‘re-privatization’ that enables normal auto-decoding process while protecting user privacy. This re-privatization methodology sheds light on previously might overlooked stratified information contains in different collections of singular values and vectors of hidden states.
- To facilitate both communication efficiency and secure confinement of private information, we propose the adoption of truncated singular value decomposition techniques. These techniques compress the hidden state representations within LLMs, striking a balance between the reduction of data transmission overhead and the retention of sensitive information.

2 Related Work

LLMs show promising performance in NMT (Jiao et al., 2023) (Hendy et al., 2023). A few researchers focus on the privacy aspects of applying such approach, initial approaches to privacy protection involved fine-tuning the models using techniques like differentially private fine-tuning (Yu et al., 2022) or prompt tuning (Li et al., 2023; Hong et al., 2023). However, these methods are costly and prompts may not adapt well to all LLMs.

Another approach is to protect privacy at the input level by masking sensitive entities, as explored in (Chen et al., 2023) and (Kan et al., 2023). Yet, in the age of advanced LLMs, simply masking private entities may not suffice due to the models’ sophisticated reasoning capabilities and the risk of context-based information leakage.

To address these challenges, a novel paradigm has been proposed where computations sensitive to privacy are distributed on local devices, and shared computations are handled in the cloud (Wang et al., 2023). Despite this innovation, the transmitted embeddings could potentially be decoded, which does not guarantee strict privacy protection. To overcome this, (Mai et al., 2023) adds noise to avoid the decoding issue but fails to address the high data transmission costs between local and cloud servers. Another line of research focused on perturbing the original input (Lin et al., 2024) so that true input is masked.

3 Methodology

3.1 Problem Definition

The proposed framework encompasses a tripartite structure consisting of a local client, an adversarial eavesdroppers, and the language service provider as illustrated in Figure 2. The adversarial entity exhibits capability to engage in eavesdropping and interception of the data transmission between the client and the server. The objective of the adversarial entity is to ascertain the content of the client’s input prompt and the subsequent tokens generated by the service. Furthermore, the architecture delineates that the head and tail segments of the system are released under an open source license, ensuring that decoding operations with hidden states should be executable by all three aforementioned parties.

Let M be a Large Language Model (LLM) shared by a local client l and eavesdroppers A . Given an input token $x \in \mathcal{X}$, where \mathcal{X} is the set of




Figure 2: The proposed methods comprise three parts: the head and tail on the client side, potentially open-source, and the proprietary middle on the server. The head processes user input into a hidden state matrix, reduced via truncated SVD to keep the top K components, and sent to the server. The server further process and then compresses the matrix, which the tail then reconstructs for the final output. Results may differ between honest-but-curious servers and direct local processing.

all possible input tokens, we observe the output of the model as $M_l(x)$ when used by the local client and $M_A(x)$ when used by the eavesdropper.

Assuming identical initial states, environments, and inputs for both the local client and eavesdropper, define the conditions under which the following holds:

$$M_L(x) \neq M_A(x) \quad (1)$$

We quantify the effect of privacy preserving by measuring the evaluation metric gap between the generated tokens for the client and the eavesdropper, respectively.

3.2 Compressed Sharding

In the era of LLMs, models are large and gpu cost for computation is high. Meanwhile, Personal computation power are growing fast, people can now run multi-billion transformer model on smartphones, regular household PCs can run even larger model. It seems like a straightforward idea to delegate some part of large model to client side to cut down GPU usage and increase throughput.

However, the network IO cost for transmitting hidden states to and from server in an auto-regressive manner is prohibitively high. Hence, we develop an truncation approach to cut down the network IO cost.

3.2.1 Model Sharding

Transformers layers (Vaswani et al., 2017) processes sequential input data in a non-recurrently fashion, such as GPT (Generative Pre-training Transformer) and its derivatives, are fundamentally auto-regressive in nature. This section focus on the decoder-only transformers. This intrinsic characteristic can be encapsulated by the symbol $\pi(x_t|x_{<t})$, which denotes the probability of the model generating a token x_t given all the previous tokens $x_{<t}$ in a sequence. In essence, these models iteratively predict the next word or token by conditioning the probability distribution on the sequence of tokens that has been generated thus far. The auto-regressive property ensures that LLMs generate coherent and contextually relevant text, as each step in the generation process takes into account the entire history of the sequence.

Let $X^{(l)}$ be the input to the l^{th} layer of the transformer. The hidden state $\mathbf{H}^{(l)}$ is obtained by applying the self-attention mechanism:

$$\mathbf{H}^{(l)} = \text{DecoderLayer}(Q^{(l)}, K^{(l)}, V^{(l)}) \quad (2)$$

$$X^{(l+1)} = \text{FeedForward}(\mathbf{H}^{(l)}) \quad (3)$$

where $Q^{(l)}$, $K^{(l)}$, and $V^{(l)}$ represent the queries,

keys, and values, which are linear projections of the input $X^{(l)}$. And the output of the self-attention mechanism is then passed through a feed-forward neural network to produce the final hidden state $\mathbf{H}^{(l)}$ which is then used as the input to the next layer. It is possible to split a model into any number of segments as long as hidden states were passed between them. For a decoder model with N layers. We empirically divide decoder-only transformer into **Head**, **Middle** and **Tail** segments, each segment comprises a number of successive Transformer layers. Notably, this division requires no training.

The **Head** consists of the initial N_h layers of the model. This segment primarily focuses on early contextual processing of the input sequence. The **Middle** segment contains a series of layers that follow the head and continue to develop deeper representations, which consist of layers $N_h + 1$ to $N_h + N_m$ with each layer taking $\mathbf{H}_{\text{head}}^{(N_h)}$ as input. Finally, the **Tail** is the concluding segment of the model, composed of the remaining $N - N_h - N_m$ layers taking $\mathbf{H}_{\text{middle}}^{(N_m)}$ as input. It completes the transformation of representations into output token predictions. h and m are hyper parameters, which should be tuned carefully.

3.2.2 Hidden State Truncation

Truncated Singular Value Decomposition (SVD) is a technique that approximates a matrix by retaining only the most significant singular values and discarding the smaller ones, which often correspond to noise or less important information. Given a hidden state matrix $\mathbf{H}^{(l)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ from the l layer of a decoder-only transformer, truncated SVD decomposes \mathbf{H} into:

$$\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{U}_k \mathbf{\Sigma}_k \mathbf{V}_k^* \quad (4)$$

Here, $\mathbf{U}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ contains the first k left singular vectors, $\mathbf{\Sigma}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ is a diagonal matrix with the top k singular values, and $\mathbf{V}_k^* \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$ contains the first k right singular vectors.

By keeping only the top $p\%$ dimension these singular values, we can create an approximation $\hat{\mathbf{H}}$ of the original hidden state, capturing the significant enough components. We empirically find out that the reduction process effectively filters out the less significant singular values, which often correspond to finer details and noise in the hidden states, and usually about privacy. The self-supervised training process of LLMs force model to recognise main

ideas so as to achieve lower overall loss and hence the top singular values should corresponding to those information. Although cutting of singular values may result in loss of specific information, the preserved structure can be sufficient for capturing the overall patterns and relationships present in the original data.

3.2.3 Re-privatization

Modern LLM service employ a text-to-text interface, end user upload plain text to centralized service, but transmitting text to public server can not guarantee privacy. We proposed to send hidden states instead so that public server can not know what input text but client can still utilize centralized LLM service. Data privatization is done locally on client side, only truncated hidden states are send to public server so that ear-dropping eavesdropper can not know exact hidden states value so as to figure out what input is.

The key for our framework to work is that client have keep-back information from server, private hidden states to enable normal auto-regressive generation, while result generated by the same tail segments of model on server will be different or even become gibberish due to client's hidden state truncation process. We call this process re-privatization, meaning to infuse public hidden states with local held back information. Formula for re-privatization is as follow.

$$\mathbf{H}' = \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{\text{middle}}^{(N_m)} + \Omega * \mathbf{H}_{\text{head}}^{(N_h)} \quad (5)$$

where \mathbf{H}' denotes the updated hidden state after integrating the truncated SVD components and additional computations, and was then feed in to the tail segments. Ω is a hyper paramater that control the level of residual connection. $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{\text{middle}}^{(N_m)}$ denotes the approximation of $\mathbf{H}_{\text{middle}}^{(N_m)}$ with top k_t singular values. Note that $\mathbf{H}_{\text{head}}^{(N_h)}$ is at client local memory, so no approximation is needed.

By keeping only the top k singular values, we focus on the most informative parts of the hidden state while details are omitted. The subsequent layers of computation on \mathbf{H}_k may be designed to perform certain transformations and learn representations that are important for the task at hand. Adding the result of these computations back to the original hidden state \mathbf{H} can be seen as a form of residual connection or skip connection. Our re-privatization features a scalar hyper paramaters Ω that controls degree of residual fusion, it is not a

tune-able parameter. The loss of information due to SVD can help keep privacy info from eavesdropper decoding while local re-privatization compensate for the details loss.

Algorithm 1 New Token Generation with PFID on Client Side

h

- 1: $head \leftarrow$ Initialize head segs of LLM
- 2: $mid \leftarrow$ Initialize middle segs of LLM
- 3: $tail \leftarrow$ Initialize tail segs of LLM
- 4: **Input:** prompts
- 5: **Output:** Predicted Next Token
- 6: **function** CLIENTGENNEWTOKEN(prompts)
- 7: $headOutput \leftarrow head(\text{prompts})$
- 8: $U, S, V \leftarrow \text{TruncatedSVD}(headOutput)$
 ▷ Select top k_h singular values
- 9: $midInput \leftarrow U[:, 1 : k_h] \cdot \text{diag}(topKValues) \cdot V[:, 1 : k_h]^T$
- 10: $midOutput \leftarrow mid(midInput)$
- 11: $U', S', V' \leftarrow \text{TruncatedSVD}(midOutput)$ ▷ Select top k_t singular values
- 12: $tailInput \leftarrow U'[:, 1 : k_t] \cdot \text{diag}(S'[1 : k_t]) \cdot V'[:, 1 : k_t]^T$
- 13: $tailOutput \leftarrow tail(tailInput + \Omega * headOutput)$
- 14: $NextToken \leftarrow LlmHead(tailOutput)$
- 15: **return** $NextToken$

4 Experiments

4.1 Eavesdropping

In our experiment, we simulated potential privacy eavesdropping within the PFID, specifically the eavesdroppers decode the hidden states transmitted from the public server back to the local. To assess the robustness of our framework in protecting privacy, we compared the decoding results of the **eavesdroppers** with those of the **local**. Additionally, we compared the decoding results of the local within the PFID to the inference results of original **pipeline**. The two comparisons were conducted to verify that PFID can preserve privacy completely without significant loss of information.

4.2 Experiment Setup

4.2.1 Baseline Models

We employed three of the current mainstream LLMs as baseline models for our experiments:

Vicuna-7B (Chiang et al., 2023), Zephyr-7B (Tunstall et al., 2023) and Llama-7B (Touvron et al., 2023). This selection aims to demonstrate the broad applicability of the PFID. All above mentioned models has 32 layers.

4.2.2 Datasets

We tested the PFID on the WMT23¹ dataset, conducting experiments on translations from six different languages into English. The translation task involves various privacies and naturally fits by allowing the comparison of the translated text with standard results.

4.2.3 Metrics

We evaluated the model’s performance using two metrics: BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002), which checks word precision and COMET (Rei et al., 2020), which assesses semantic and contextual alignment.

4.2.4 Inference Parameter Setting

During the inference process, the parameters we set are as follows:

Table 1: Parameters used in the inference process.

Parameter	Value
Temperature	0.7
Top-p	0.5
Top-k	50
Maximum new tokens	300

4.3 PFID Hyperparameter Tuning

In the PFID, there are four important hyperparameters:

Layer Range: presented in the form of (K, N) , it represents dividing into the first K layers, from K to N , and from N to the last three segments.

Omega (Ω): the weight of incorporating original local information when the hidden state is passed back locally.

Phead: the truncation ratio when transmitting from local to the public server, with a higher value indicating more truncation.

Ptail: the truncation ratio when transmitting back from the public server to local.

As shown in Figure 3, after conducting hyperparameter tuning experiments on the WMT23 dataset using Vicuna, we identified a set of parameters that resulted in great PFID performance, specifically in the following table:

¹WMT23 data is from <https://www2.statmt.org/wmt23/mtdata/>

Table 2: Optimal hyperparameters used in the PFID.

Hyperparameter	Value
Layer Range	(13,19) / (14,18)
Omega	1
Phead	0.65 / 0.7
Ptail	0.75




Figure 3: Optimal PFID hyperparameters for the WMT23 dataset, showcasing Layer Range, Omega, Phead, and Ptail tuning results.

4.4 Comparative Results

We compared the performance of three models in terms of local and eavesdropper decoding under both the original pipeline and the PFID framework, as shown in Table 3. The results indicate that the performance of local decoding is consistently higher than that of eavesdropper decoding across all datasets, suggesting that privacy is well protected under the PFID framework. Furthermore, the performance of local decoding is comparable to that achieved with the original pipeline, indicating that the truncation of data by PFID does not lead to significant information loss. The ability of local decoding to effectively reconstruct information, in contrast to the inability of eavesdroppers, validates the PFID framework’s capability to safeguard privacy effectively.

4.5 Framework Complexity

In this section, we analysis the computational complexity and communication complexity introduced by the PFID to both client side and server side.

Communication complexity Communication complexity is composed of following cost for each token generation. (1) client upload truncated matrix (U, V, Σ) to server. (2) server download truncated matrix (U, V, Σ) to client. Figure 4 showcases our truncation results. With PFID, the communication




Figure 4: The graph shows the PFID’s truncation ratio in a linear fashion with data compression ratio. It measures amount of data sent to/from the server with and without PFID during performing task. "Ptail" represents discarding singular values between middle and tail segments, "Phead" between the first and middle, and "Phead & Ptail" discards across all segments.

budget decrease linearly in accordance with the ratio of singular values truncation.

Computation complexity Both server and user computation complexity can be broke down into (1) svd computation on the client side, (2) svd computation on the server side. We use truncated SVD with randomized SVD, hence the computational complexity is $O(k^2 dp)$. In order to avoid Truncated SVD deteriorate into full SVD in terms of computational complexity, we are selecting singulars values by index instead of filtering on cumulative percentage.

4.6 Ablation Study




Figure 5: 3D scatter plot comparing the PFID performance with and without Omega, based on the configurations with head segment and tail segment selection.

To validate the effectiveness of re-privatization, we conduct the ablation experiment of ω . Figure 5 demonstrates that selecting omega for weighted operations leads to an overall improvement in LLM performance, indicating the effectiveness of this

Table 3: Comparative results various xx-en language pairs for the Vicuna-7B, Zephyr-7B-beta, and Llama-2-7B-chat models, comparing pipeline, local, and eavesdropper.

			zh-en	ja-en	de-en	uk-en	ru-en	he-en
Vicuna-7B	COMET	Pipeline	0.771	0.758	0.820	0.843	0.782	0.670
		Local	0.724	0.739	0.808	0.826	0.756	0.629
		Eavesdropper	0.502	0.443	0.585	0.610	0.519	0.478
	BLEU	Pipeline	20.20	11.71	35.12	38.52	19.08	20.23
		Local	15.45	10.86	29.57	37.13	18.99	18.09
		Eavesdropper	8.11	3.52	21.42	17.73	7.28	10.37
Zephyr-7B-beta	COMET	Pipeline	0.739	0.695	0.776	0.749	0.728	0.608
		Local	0.733	0.700	0.763	0.796	0.759	0.607
		Eavesdropper	0.537	0.489	0.551	0.568	0.532	0.473
	BLEU	Pipeline	14.50	7.01	26.41	22.28	16.27	11.57
		Local	12.75	6.17	21.99	22.47	18.38	8.45
		Eavesdropper	6.84	2.32	14.74	11.85	7.90	5.03
Llama-2-7B-chat	COMET	Pipeline	0.616	0.592	0.651	0.575	0.706	0.453
		Local	0.611	0.576	0.585	0.610	0.642	0.494
		Eavesdropper	0.463	0.423	0.428	0.443	0.472	0.413
	BLEU	Pipeline	7.84	4.67	13.11	8.49	17.53	1.51
		Local	7.14	3.02	11.99	9.14	14.01	2.04
		Eavesdropper	4.54	1.31	7.54	5.05	9.55	1.00

weighting strategy.

4.7 Translation Error Test via GPT4 Evaluation

In order to get more detailed evaluation between our methods and pipelines, We follows GEMBA-MQM (Kocmi and Federmann, 2023) to evaluate our methods from different translation aspects. We are using gpt-4-0125-preview as the judge, following the prompt shown in the Appendix A . Figure 6 showcases our results, which illustrates the significant difference in translation errors between the local and the eavesdropper, especially in critical and major levels. More granular error categorization results can be found in the Appendix B.




Figure 6: Comparison of error counts in critical, major, and minor levels for pipeline, local, eavesdropper using Vicuna model on partial WMT23 xx-en dataset, the lower the better.

4.8 Case Study

As preseted in Table 4, two examples indicate that the eavesdropper makes mistakes when de-

coding stolen private information, such as numbers and ages, while the local can decode correctly, demonstrating the effectiveness of PFID in protecting privacy. Moreover, upon closely examining the first example in the table, we observed that after decoding the information retained locally due to truncation, referred to as "Remnant", it contained accurate privacy information. This interesting discovery suggests that in LLMs, privacy information can be restored by locally truncating the hidden state, lending some interpretability to this method.

5 Analysis

5.1 Comparative analysis between SVD and noise methods in PFID

One major method for protecting privacy is differential privacy (Behnia et al., 2022). As shown in Table 5, we compared experiments involving adding noise only to the hidden state, performing SVD decomposition on the hidden state only, and the combined effects of both approaches. The results revealed that the SVD decomposition used in PFID plays a primary role in protecting privacy. On the other hand, adding noise, as in differential privacy, acts as an indiscriminate form of disruption, making the sentences produced by both local and eavesdroppers less fluent and harder to understand. However, as demonstrated by the examples in Table 6, this method does not erase critical information, making it challenging to achieve genuine privacy protection.

Table 4: Two translation examples using Vicuna for zh-en and uk-en language pairs.

Source: 纳斯达克指数昨天涨了2.68%。(zh-en)
Truth Answer: The Nasdaq index yesterday rose 2.68%.
Local: The Nasdaq index rose 2.68% yesterday.
Eavesdropper: Nasdaq index rose rose .6%.
Remnant: daq, is, 2.68%.
Source: зараз Мар 38 рокв Вона хорошою мамою та гарним прикладом для своїх двох синів та однієї доньки. (uk-en)
Truth Answer: now Maria is 38 She is a good mother and a good role model for her two sons and a daughter.
Local: Currently, Maria is 38 years old. She is a good mother and a good example for her two sons and one daughter.
Eavesdropper: Currently Mar Mariaia is 33 years old. She is a a mother to a good example for her two sons and one daughter.

Table 5: Performance comparison of local and eavesdropper in PFID using SVD, noise application, and their combination.

		Local	Eavesdropper
COMET	SVD	0.742	0.541
	Noise	0.709	0.646
	SVD + Noise	0.725	0.494
BLEU	SVD	15.47	8.2
	Noise	12.89	11.67
	SVD + Noise	12.71	6.48

Table 6: Example of noise methods in PFID on zh-en translations.

Source: 天眼查显示，郑永刚持有杉杉控股有限公司的总股权比例是40.1%。(zh-en)
Truth Answer: According to the SkyEye search, Zheng Yonggang holds 40.1% of the total equity of Sugo Holdings Co.
Local: The display of the sky shows that Zhe Yan holds 40.1% of the shares of Jia Jian Holding Limited.
Eavesdropper: Acc display of heaven sky shows that Zhey holds a 40.1% of the equ of Shiajia Holding Co.

5.2 Framework Effectiveness Analysis via Model Pre-training


From the perspective of pre-training of LLMs, the effectiveness of PFID in protecting privacy may be because during pre-training, these LLMs primarily learn the structure of sentences. Thus, larger eigenvalues correspond to these structural features. Personal information, such as numbers, names, and locations, is learned to a lesser extent, resulting in relatively smaller eigenvalues for these features. By employing SVD decomposition and discarding components with smaller eigenvalues, we can achieve the goal of protecting privacy.

5.3 Optimal Hyperparameters Selection Analysis

As demonstrated in Figure 7a, the index of the 70% singular value in LLMs increases with layer depth, indicating a more dispersed distribution of singular

values. This suggests that segmenting the model later results in less information capture through SVD. Conversely, Figure 7b shows increasing singular values, highlighting the growing distinctiveness of information in deeper layers. Early segmentation could omit crucial information. Therefore, mid-model segmentation is identified as optimal.

For the Phead and Ptail, we find that a stronger model allows for a higher truncation ratio with the PFID framework, enhancing privacy protection during transmission between local and public servers. Specifically, with Vicuna at a 0.8 ratio, outputs for both locals and eavesdroppers are disrupted, while Zephyr allows a ratio of 0.9, demonstrating the potential for improved efficiency and security as LLMs evolve.



(a) Cumulative percent of singular values takes up by tail 70 singular values.

(b) Nuclear norm by layers.

Figure 7: Singular values analysis in the Vicuna.

6 Conclusion and Future Work

In conclusion, our PFID framework demonstrates an efficient method for preserving user privacy in the use of LLMs. By segmenting the model and applying data truncation techniques, we manage to protect sensitive user data from potential breaches while maintaining the high performance and functionality of LLMs. Future work will focus on exploring the framework’s applicability to other domains beyond machine translation.

Limitations

Bigger model evaluation. We have verified our framework effectiveness on three different open-source models, but for even larger model, hidden state’s process flow might change, different split dynamic could emerge.

Limitation of input forms. Our method is designed for auto-regressive prompt input, other non-auto regressive methods might not fit.

References

- Rouzbeh Behnia, Mohammadreza Reza Ebrahimi, Jason Pacheco, and Balaji Padmanabhan. 2022. [Ew-tune: A framework for privately fine-tuning large language models with differential privacy](#). In *2022 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining Workshops (ICDMW)*. IEEE.
- Yu Chen, Tingxin Li, Huiming Liu, and Yang Yu. 2023. [Hide and seek \(has\): A lightweight framework for prompt privacy protection](#).
- Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Eric P. Xing. 2023. [Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality](#).
- Amr Hendy, Mohamed Abdelrehim, Amr Sharaf, Vikas Raunak, Mohamed Gabr, Hitokazu Matsushita, Young Jin Kim, Mohamed Afify, and Hany Hassan Awadalla. 2023. How good are gpt models at machine translation? a comprehensive evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.09210*.
- Junyuan Hong, Jiachen T. Wang, Chenhui Zhang, Zhangheng Li, Bo Li, and Zhangyang Wang. 2023. [Dp-opt: Make large language model your privacy-preserving prompt engineer](#).
- Wenxiang Jiao, Wenxuan Wang, JT Huang, Xing Wang, and ZP Tu. 2023. Is chatgpt a good translator? yes with gpt-4 as the engine. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.08745*.
- Zhigang Kan, Linbo Qiao, Hao Yu, Liwen Peng, Yifu Gao, and Dongsheng Li. 2023. [Protecting user privacy in remote conversational systems: A privacy-preserving framework based on text sanitization](#).
- Tom Kocmi and Christian Federmann. 2023. [GEMBA-MQM: Detecting translation quality error spans with GPT-4](#). In *Proceedings of the Eighth Conference on Machine Translation*, pages 768–775, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yansong Li, Zhixing Tan, and Yang Liu. 2023. [Privacy-preserving prompt tuning for large language model services](#).
- Guo Lin, Wenyue Hua, and Yongfeng Zhang. 2024. [Promptcrypt: Prompt encryption for secure communication with large language models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.05868*.
- Lingjuan Lyu, Xuanli He, and Yitong Li. 2020. [Differentially private representation for NLP: Formal guarantee and an empirical study on privacy and fairness](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 2355–2365, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Peihua Mai, Ran Yan, Zhe Huang, Youjia Yang, and Yan Pang. 2023. [Split-and-denoise: Protect large language model inference with local differential privacy](#).
- OpenAI. 2023. [Gpt-4 technical report](#).
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:27730–27744.
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318.
- Ricardo Rei, Craig Stewart, Ana C Farinha, and Alon Lavie. 2020. [Comet: A neural framework for mt evaluation](#).
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shrutu Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. [Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models](#).
- Lewis Tunstall, Edward Beeching, Nathan Lambert, Nazneen Rajani, Kashif Rasul, Younes Belkada, Shengyi Huang, Leandro von Werra, Clémentine Fourrier, Nathan Habib, Nathan Sarrazin, Omar Sanseviero, Alexander M. Rush, and Thomas Wolf. 2023. [Zephyr: Direct distillation of lm alignment](#).

Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. [Attention is all you need](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc.

Yiming Wang, Yu Lin, Xiaodong Zeng, and Guannan Zhang. 2023. [Privatelora for efficient privacy preserving llm](#).

Yifan Yao, Jinhao Duan, Kaidi Xu, Yuanfang Cai, Eric Sun, and Yue Zhang. 2023. A survey on large language model (llm) security and privacy: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.02003*.

Da Yu, Saurabh Naik, Arturs Backurs, Sivakanth Gopi, Huseyin A. Inan, Gautam Kamath, Janardhan Kulkarni, Yin Tat Lee, Andre Manoel, Lukas Wutschitz, Sergey Yekhanin, and Huishuai Zhang. 2022. [Differentially private fine-tuning of language models](#).

A Prompt for GPT4 in the translation error test

Machine Translation Quality Assessment Task

(System) You are an annotator for the quality of machine translation. Your task is to identify errors and assess the quality of the translation.

(user) *{source_language}* source:
{source-segment}
{target_language} translation:
{target-segment}

Based on the source segment and machine translation surrounded with triple backticks, identify error types in the translation and classify them. The categories of errors are: accuracy (addition, mistranslation, omission, untranslated text), fluency (character encoding, grammar, inconsistency, punctuation, register, spelling), locale convention (currency, date, name, telephone, or time format) style (awkward), terminology (inappropriate for context, inconsistent use), non-translation, other, or no-error.

Each error is classified as one of three categories: critical, major, and minor. Critical errors inhibit comprehension of the text. Major errors disrupt the flow, but what the text is trying to say is still understandable. Minor errors are technically errors, but do not disrupt the flow or hinder comprehension.

(assistant) *{observed error classes}*

B More granular error categorization results




Figure 8: The pie plot with more granular error categorization in critical, major, and minor levels for pipeline, local, eavesdropper using Vicuna model on partial WMT23 xx-en dataset.