

Rethinking Entity-level Unlearning for Large Language Models

Weitao Ma[†], Xiaocheng Feng^{†‡*}, Weihong Zhong[†], Lei Huang[†], Yangfan Ye[†], Bing Qin^{†‡}

[†]Harbin Institute of Technology, Harbin, China

[‡] Peng Cheng Laboratory, Shenzhen, China

{wtma, xcfeng, whzhong, lhuang, yfye, qinb}@ir.hit.edu.cn

Abstract

Large language model unlearning has gained increasing attention due to its potential to mitigate security and privacy concerns. Current research predominantly focuses on *Instance-level* unlearning, specifically aiming at forgetting predefined instances of sensitive content. However, a notable gap still exists in exploring the deletion of complete entity-related information, which is crucial in many real-world scenarios, such as copyright protection. To this end, we propose a novel task of *Entity-level* unlearning, where the entity-related knowledge within the target model is supposed to be entirely erased. Given the challenge of practically accessing all entity-related knowledge within a model, we begin by simulating entity-level unlearning scenarios through fine-tuning models to introduce pseudo entities. Following this, we develop baseline methods inspired by trending unlearning techniques and conduct a detailed comparison of their effectiveness in this task. Extensive experiments reveal that current unlearning algorithms struggle to achieve effective entity-level unlearning. Additionally, our analyses further indicate that entity-related knowledge injected through fine-tuning is more susceptible than original entities from pre-training during unlearning, highlighting the necessity for more thorough pseudo-entity injection methods to make them closer to pre-trained knowledge.

1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) (Achiam et al., 2023; Touvron et al., 2023a,b; Meta, 2024) with extensive training corpora have achieved significant success in knowledge-intensive tasks (Kamalloo et al., 2023; Seegmiller et al., 2024). However, undesirable data, like toxic information (Lu et al., 2022), privacy content (Liu et al., 2024a) and copyrighted texts (Karamolegkou et al., 2023) within training data, raises security and legal concerns,

* means Corresponding Author




Figure 1: Our formulated framework of LLM unlearning consists of two stages: (a) Forget Set Construction and (b) Unlearning Execution. The **knowledge** enclosed by the purple border represents the target set, and the **knowledge** covered by the green background represents the forget set.

hindering the practical application of LLMs (Yao et al., 2024; Das et al., 2024). To tackle this, Machine Unlearning (Zhang et al., 2023; Lu et al., 2024; Bhardwaj et al., 2024) has gradually adapted to LLMs for their cost-efficiency. These refined techniques, now known as "LLM Unlearning" (Yao et al., 2023a; Liu et al., 2024b,c), can be highly effective in removing undesirable knowledge from the model by applying post-hoc modifications.

Current research in LLM unlearning mainly focuses on instance-level unlearning tasks, which address isolated facts like sensitive content (Li et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024; Ji et al., 2024). However, the deletion of entire entity has not been well explored, which acquired in many real-world scenarios such as copyright protection (Eldan and Russinovich, 2024). To this end, we formally define a novel task of *Entity-level Unlearning*, which aims to remove an entity from the LLMs completely. As Figure 1 depicts, we first formulate these two tasks into a unified framework by dividing the LLM unlearning task into two stages: Forget Set Con-

struction and Unlearning Execution. The unified goal is to remove the **target set**, representing the undesirable knowledge expected to be forgotten in the models. Specifically, in the forget set construction stage, we create a **forget set** used by the unlearning algorithm to eliminate the target set. For instance-level unlearning, the target set comprises pieces of specific facts that can be directly deleted by the unlearning algorithm as the forget set. However, for entity-level unlearning, the target set encompasses all entity-related knowledge within the target model, which is challenging to obtain since the training corpora are often inaccessible, necessitating the construction of a forget set for entity-level unlearning. During the unlearning execution stage, specific unlearning algorithms are applied to the target models to execute unlearning using the constructed forget set.

In this work, to systematically analyze the entity-level unlearning, we choose to simulate the entity unlearning scenarios by fine-tuning the model to inject pseudo entities, following previous work TOFU (Maini et al., 2024), which finetunes the LLMs on 200 fictitious authors. Then, we combine the common knowledge extraction and unlearning methods to build the baselines for the two stages and conduct a comprehensive evaluation of these baselines on the task. By comparing the performance of different forget sets and various methods, our experimental results demonstrate that: 1) *Current methods struggle to unlearn entity effectively.* These methods are only suitable for instance-level unlearning scenarios where the forget set is predefined but cannot transfer well to the entity-level task. 2) *Quality of forget set matters.* The size and knowledge coverage of forget sets significantly impact unlearning results. Enhancing knowledge extraction methods to obtain more comprehensive forget sets can lead to more thorough unlearning. 3) *Additional constraints are beneficial.* Introducing additional constraints on a retain set, which is expected to be preserved, helps maintain the model’s general capabilities. Our experiments show the gradient descent method is more effective than the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence constraint.

Additionally, we find that deleting the target entity would significantly affect other pseudo entities injected through fine-tuning. Comparing the original entity knowledge from pre-training to that from fine-tuning upon unlearning shows that fine-tuned entity knowledge is more fragile. This suggests that future research should explore more robust pseudo-

entity injection methods to resemble pre-training knowledge better.

2 Related Work

2.1 Methods of LLM Unlearning

Machine unlearning (Cao and Yang, 2015) is a conventional task, that has attracted rising attention owing to its potential to address issues such as bias (Yu et al., 2023), copyright (Eldan and Russinovich, 2024), privacy (Jang et al., 2022) and security (Barrett et al., 2023) concerns in the era of LLMs (Liu et al., 2024b; Yao et al., 2023a). Current unlearning methods for LLMs (Cao and Yang, 2015; Yu et al., 2023; Jang et al., 2022) focus on minimizing the impact of undesirable training data while preserving the integrity of other model knowledge based on the *Forget Set* and *Retain Set*. Specifically, the methods (Jang et al., 2022; Chen and Yang, 2023) apply Gradient Ascent (GA) on the Forget Set to unlearn and add additional auxiliary loss on the Retain Set akin to gradient descent (Liu et al., 2022) and KL minimization (Maini et al., 2024) to mitigate undesired effects. On the other hand, drawing inspiration from the alignment capabilities of reinforcement learning from human feedback (RLHF) (Ouyang et al., 2022; Bai et al., 2022), several researchers adopt preference optimization methods to refine model outputs, like Direct Policy Optimization (DPO) (Rafailov et al., 2024) and Distributional Dispreference Optimization (D2O) (Duan et al., 2024). In addition, some researchers utilize model editing methods (Yao et al., 2023b; Feng et al., 2023) to remove sensitive information by adjusting knowledge-related parameters (Wu et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2024). However, it has been proven that the deleted content can be reverse-engineered from the edited model (Patil et al., 2023).

2.2 Evaluations of LLM Unlearning

Recent research has introduced several benchmarks and tasks for LLM unlearning from various aspects (Ji et al., 2024; Li et al., 2024; Maini et al., 2024; Lynch et al., 2024; Jang et al., 2022). Among them, Ji et al. (2024) constructed the BeaverTails dataset, which includes question-answer pairs aimed at achieving the safety alignment of LLMs. The Weapons of Mass Destruction Proxy (WMDP) benchmark (Li et al., 2024) specifically targets dangerous knowledge in biosecurity, cybersecurity, and chemical security. While these task settings primarily address the forgetting of explicit instances,

but pay less attention to entity-level unlearning, which involves completely forgetting an entity. Notably, Eldan and Russinovich (2024) explored a particular task to unlearn the entity "Harry Potter", but it is proven that the knowledge is not entirely erased from the unlearned model (Shi et al., 2023). Maini et al. (2024) presented TOFU consisting of 200 fictitious author profiles to assess unlearning methods from the perspectives of Model Utility and Forget Quality. However, this benchmark only focused on ideal scenarios with exact forget sets. To sum up, there is a notable absence of systematic analysis and evaluation for entity-level unlearning, which has strong practical application.

3 Entity-level Unlearning

3.1 Task Definition

The objective of the entity-level unlearning task is to completely remove an entire entity from the target model. However, the inaccessible nature of the training data makes it challenging to obtain comprehensive information about the entity within the model. Therefore, we define the entity-level unlearning task as removing the entire entity from target model by deleting only a subset of entity associated knowledge.

The entity-level unlearning task can be formalized as follows: Given a target entity O , the model parametrized by θ_t is required to unlearn a target set S_T , which contains all knowledge related to the entity in the model, by applying unlearning methods H on a forget set S_F , which contains part of the knowledge of the entity. All of the aforementioned sets consist of pieces of knowledge, $S = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$. The unlearning process can be expressed as follows:

$$\theta_{t+1} \leftarrow H(\theta_t, S_F) \quad (1)$$

To precisely assess the deletion effect of the target entity, the evaluation for entity-level unlearning task A should be conducted on the target set S_T :

$$Score_{forget} = A(\theta_{t+1}, S_T) \quad (2)$$

3.2 Entity-level Unlearning Framework

Given the definition of entity-level unlearning task, we integrate it with the current instance-level unlearning task into a unified two-stage framework, including: 1) *Forget Set Construction*, and 2) *Unlearning Execution* based on the constructed forget set. In this section, we analyze these two stages

sequentially and develop general baselines for subsequent experiments.

3.2.1 Forget Set Construction

Constructing a forget set with entity-related information is the first step for entity-level unlearning methods. Following previous research (Maini et al., 2024; Li et al., 2024), we create the forget set with the knowledge represented by multiple question-answer (QA) pairs. Inspired by Weller et al. (2023), we design prompts to extract entity-related questions from the target model, without the need for additional external information. Specifically, we provide the model with the entity's name, prompting it to self-generate multiple entity-related questions according to its internal knowledge (See figure 10 for the prompt used). Note that only those questions containing the name of the entity will be kept to further clarify the object of the questions. Then, we acquire the answers from the target model using greedy decoding, which ensures that the answers possess a relatively high generation probability and are valid candidates for the unlearning techniques. This approach provides a straightforward knowledge extraction method for acquiring the forget set. Subsequently, we evaluate the impact of the quality of the forget set on unlearning methods through manual replacement analysis.

3.2.2 Unlearning Execution

After constructing a forget set, we select several trending unlearning methods to execute unlearning on it, such as Gradient Ascent (GA), which reduces the likelihood of original answers. Simultaneously, some methods also impose additional constraints on a retain set, which consists of knowledge expected to be preserved, to minimize the damage to the model. The ideal entity-level unlearning method should effectively forget the entire entity from the forget set while minimizing any adverse impact on other knowledge.

Additionally, a significant challenge in the task posed by the inability to access all their training data of LLMs is how to determine the target set S_T used to evaluate the unlearned models. To address this issue, we simulate entity-level unlearning scenarios following the TOFU (Maini et al., 2024), which fine-tunes the LLMs using a fictitious author dataset. The dataset ensures that the LLM has not encountered any information about these authors during previous training phases. Thus, the training dataset encompasses all the knowledge about the

model’s known entities and can be utilized as the target set S_T .

4 Experiments

4.1 Experimental Setup

In this section, we provide a detailed overview of the datasets, models, baselines, and evaluation metrics used for the entity-level unlearning task.

4.1.1 Datasets and Models

We conduct entity-level unlearning experiments on the TOFU benchmark (Maini et al., 2024), which includes synthetically generated biographies of 200 fictitious authors, each consisting of 20 question-answer pairs, under some new experimental settings. We fine-tune the Llama2-7B-Chat (Touvron et al., 2023b) and Phi-1.5 (Li et al., 2023) on the TOFU dataset as the target models (see the Appendix A.3 for details). Additionally, we also construct the *forget set*, *target set*, *retain set*, and *other evaluation set* required for the experiment. The dataset collection and composition are as follows:

- **Forget Set:** For the target entity, we probe 20 entity-related question-answer pairs from the target model as the forget set, following the extraction method outlined in section 3.2.1.
- **Target Set:** For the target entity, we select the Oracle training dataset with 20 question-answer pairs in TOFU as the target set.
- **Retain Set:** Unlike TOFU, which samples from QA pairs of other entities, we construct a retain set using questions with greedy-decoding answers from TriviaQA (Joshi et al., 2017). These questions could be correctly answered by both the Llama2-7B-Chat-TOFU and Phi-1.5-TOFU models. This setting aims to prevent interference when analyzing the impact of entity unlearning on other entities in subsequent steps.
- **Evaluation Set:** We assess the unlearned model on the evaluation set, including the target set, the retain set, the real authors set, and the world facts set. The latter two datasets are from TOFU and are used to evaluate the retention of pretraining knowledge. Each set comprises items, each of which contains an original QA pair, a paraphrased answer, and five perturbed answers. (more details can be found in Appendix A.2)

4.1.2 Baselines

We experiment with five common unlearning algorithms on the entity-level unlearning task (more details can be found in Appendix A.3):

- **Gradient Ascent** (Yao et al., 2023a), which is one of the most straightforward unlearning methods, reduces the likelihood of original answers on the forget set S_F .
- **Gradient Difference** (Liu et al., 2022), which is a variant of GA, not only implements unlearning on the forget set S_F , but also learning on the retain set S_R by gradient descent to minimize unnecessary damage to the model.
- **KL Minimization**, applies an additional Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence regularization between the predictions on S_R of the original model θ_t and the unlearned model θ_{t+1} , while performing GA on S_F .
- **Preference Optimization**, optimizes the model to realign the questions in the forget set S_F with a refusal answer, such as "I don't know," through the DPO algorithm (Rafailov et al., 2024) while learning on the retain set S_R by gradient descent.
- **Negative Preference Optimization**, is an efficient and effective unlearning method that requires only providing a negative response during preference optimization. We adopt the algorithm with the same restriction on the retain set S_R as Gradient Difference (NPO-GD), which has been proven to outperform other variants (Zhang et al., 2024).

For all five methods, we execute unlearning on the forget set, using AdamW with warm-up during the first epoch, a batch size of 4, and a learning rate of 10^{-5} . We evaluate all baselines on the target models: Llama2-7B-Chat-TOFU and Phi-1.5-TOFU. Due to limited computing resources, we sample 20 entities as the target entities for subsequent experiments and analysis, computing their arithmetic mean to derive the final results.

4.1.3 Evaluation Metrics

We evaluate the unlearned models on the evaluation set using the following metrics (more details can be found in Appendix A.4):

- **ROUGE** (Lin, 2004), measures the overlap co-occurrence of n-grams between the original answer and model’s greed-decoding generation for the test QA pairs.
- **Probability**, computes the conditional probability with length normalization of QA pairs

Method	Set Type	Target Set				RS Score \uparrow	RAS Score \uparrow	WFS Score \uparrow	Model Utility \uparrow
		Prob. \downarrow	ROUGE \downarrow	Acc. \downarrow	Forget Q. \uparrow				
Llama2-7B-Chat-TOFU									
Original	-	0.9908	0.9793	0.655	0.0300	0.8737	0.5893	0.5308	0.6349
Grad. Ascent	target set	0.0000	0.0640	0.1850	0.2175	0.5844	0.5317	0.5146	0.5420
	probing set	0.0031	0.0257	0.3775	0.1318	0.4942	0.5432	0.5348	0.5232
Grad. Diff.	target set	0.1237	0.3717	0.3950	0.3604	0.8326	0.6584	0.5899	0.6795
	probing set	0.2557	0.3334	0.5100	0.0976	0.8048	0.6085	0.5465	0.6361
KL Min.	target set	0.0000	0.0620	0.1975	0.1991	0.5949	0.5393	0.5139	0.5474
	probing set	0.0030	0.0283	0.3775	0.1184	0.5065	0.5487	0.5337	0.5291
Pref. Opt.	target set	0.3486	0.0147	0.5150	0.2981	0.9024	0.6777	0.6349	0.7213
	probing set	0.3824	0.0378	0.5250	0.1739	0.9037	0.7024	0.6380	0.7321
NPO-GD	target set	0.0344	0.2971	0.3225	0.5253	0.7887	0.5715	0.5286	0.6111
	probing set	0.6203	0.4994	0.5850	0.0988	0.7722	0.6392	0.5605	0.6460
Phi-1.5-TOFU									
Original	-	0.9271	0.9296	0.6075	0.0655	0.7010	0.4346	0.5514	0.5414
Grad. Ascent	target set	0.0171	0.3460	0.2025	0.5242	0.6893	0.3980	0.5278	0.5121
	probing set	0.2456	0.3631	0.5325	0.1051	0.6635	0.3741	0.5184	0.4911
Grad. Diff.	target set	0.1836	0.4357	0.3650	0.4274	0.7533	0.4448	0.5662	0.5616
	probing set	0.4396	0.4594	0.5275	0.1046	0.7428	0.4151	0.5542	0.5396
KL Min.	target set	0.0175	0.3461	0.2025	0.5158	0.6977	0.3988	0.5285	0.5143
	probing set	0.2497	0.3610	0.5275	0.0918	0.6700	0.3727	0.5196	0.4918
Pref. Opt.	target set	0.4323	0.1979	0.5050	0.1584	0.8118	0.3883	0.5673	0.5386
	probing set	0.4915	0.2242	0.5125	0.1440	0.8153	0.4079	0.5631	0.5501
NPO-GD	target set	0.0749	0.4016	0.3300	0.5104	0.7674	0.4246	0.5477	0.5471
	probing set	0.7572	0.6988	0.6100	0.0725	0.7790	0.4288	0.5497	0.5520

Table 1: The performance of the fine-tuned LLMs after entity level unlearning under Gradient Ascent (Grad. Ascent), Gradient Difference (Grad. Diff.), KL Minimization (KL Min.), Preference Optimization (Pref. Opt.), and Negative Preference Optimization with gradient descent on the retain set (NPO-GD). We list the results when the Forget Quality (Forget Q.) reaches the first peak score. Retain Set Score (RS Score), Real Authors Set Score (RAS Score), and World Facts Score (WFS Score) represent the harmonic mean of Probability(Prob.), ROUGE, and Accuracy(Acc.) on their respective sets. \uparrow represents that the higher score is better, while \downarrow indicates the opposite. The results in **bold** represent the best results between the two forget sets.

in the evaluation set.

- **Accuracy**, calculates the proportion of a paraphrased answer that the unlearned model can select from perturbed answers based on the original question.
- **Forget Quality**, assesses the unlearning effectiveness of the unlearned models via the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) test. We report the p -value from the KS test as the forget quality, which a high forget quality indicates a thorough unlearning.

We evaluate the ROUGE, probability, and accuracy across all evaluation sets. To obtain a comprehensive measure of the model’s generative performance, we calculate the harmonic mean of the nine values from the retain set, real authors set, and world facts set, referring to this as *Model Utility*, following TOFU. In addition, we also evaluate forget quality solely on the target set.

4.2 Experimental Results

We evaluate the five unlearning methods using a *probing set* extracted from the target models. Moreover, we also conduct a control experiment, where we utilize the original target set as the forget set to simulate the ideal scenario. We present experimental results comparing the performance of the same method on various forget sets and between different methods.

4.2.1 Comparison of Forget Sets

As shown in Table 1, all methods using the target set achieve more thorough unlearning effects compared to the probing set in both target models. This is evidenced by higher forget quality, lower probability, and reduced accuracy on the target set while maintaining similar model utility. These phenomena indicate that current unlearning methods struggle to entirely remove the entity by the probing set. Therefore, the forget construction stage

significantly impacts the final results of entity-level unlearning. In the subsequent analysis, we will specifically discuss the impact of the quality of the forget set on unlearning.

4.2.2 Comparison of Unlearning Algorithms

Comparing the five unlearning algorithms reveals several key elements essential for improved entity-level unlearning. The Grad. Ascent method can effectively minimize the probability of the ground truth answer but significantly harms the model’s ability, resulting in the lowest model utility, as shown in Table 1. The KL. Min. and Grad. Diff. Method can partially remedy this issue by introducing external constraints on a retain set, which is expected to preserve. Among these, a comparison of the model utility of Grad. Diff. and KL. Min. across two types of forget set and two target models shows that learning through gradient descent on the retain set proves more effective than the KL restriction, which is consistent with Zhang et al. (2024)’s findings.

Furthermore, although the Pref. Opt. method significantly reduces the ROUGE of the target set answers and achieves relatively high forget quality on Llama2-7B-Chat-TOFU, the original answers of the unlearned model still maintain a high generation probability and accuracy. This suggests that the method performs unlearning by increasing the generation probability of refusal answers rather than truly forgetting the target entity. The NPO-GD method demonstrates the highest forget quality by the target set, proving its effectiveness in successful unlearning under the ideal scenario. However, it also exhibits the largest disparity in forget quality across the target set and probing set on the two target models: 0.5253 v.s. 0.0988 in Llama2-7B-Chat-TOFU and 0.5104 v.s. 0.0725 in Phi-1.5-TOFU, according to Table 1. This indicates that even the best-performing NPO-GD method is only suitable for instance-level unlearning with the exact forget set under the ideal scenario but cannot be effectively transferred to entity-level unlearning. In conclusion, existing unlearning methods struggle to achieve effective entity-level unlearning.

5 Analysis

In this section, we conduct analytical experiments to investigate further the impact of forget set size and knowledge coverage. Additionally, we perform step ablation experiments on five methods to analyze the forgetting trends of each method. Due

to computing resource limitations, our subsequent analysis will be only performed on the more widely used Llama2-7B-Chat-TOFU model (more details can be found in Appendix B).

5.1 Effect of Forget Set Size

To examine the impact of the forget set size on the unlearning effect, we varied the ratios of QA pairs from the target set to form different forget sets for unlearning. As illustrated in Figure 2, the forget score (where a lower score is preferable) exhibits a general downward trend across most methods as the ratios increase. Conversely, there is an overall upward trend for forget quality (where a higher score is preferable). These trends indicate that extracting more entity-related knowledge as the forget set in existing methods enhances the effectiveness of entity unlearning.

It is worth noting that the NPO-GD method does not demonstrate its advantage when the ratio of forgotten facts is small, achieving successful unlearning only when the ratio exceeds 50%. This phenomenon further validates the findings from section 4.2.2, confirming that the NPO-GD method is suitable for instance-level unlearning but cannot generalize the deletion to other knowledge within the entity.




Figure 2: The performance of five baselines at varying ratios of forgotten facts in the target set. The forget score represents the harmonic mean of probability, ROUGE, and accuracy on the target set.

5.2 Effect of Forget Set Knowledge Coverage

We construct multiple forget sets to explore the impact of forget set knowledge coverage, with equal size but varying knowledge coverage. This is achieved by randomly replacing a portion of the QA pairs in the probing set with those from the target set. We choose to calculate the average *BERTScore* (Zhang et al., 2019) and *Fact Coverage* to jointly measure the knowledge coverage of each forget set. The average *BERTScore* is calculated by comparing each QA pair with its closest match in the




Figure 3: Step ablation analysis of unlearning Llama2-7B-Chat-TOFU using gradient difference. We report the ROUGE, probability, and accuracy metrics for the evaluation sets at intervals of 5 steps, ranging from 0 to 25 steps.

Forget Set type	BERTScore	Fact Coverage
original probing set	0.6604	0.4500
w/ 25% facts replaced	0.7515	0.4900
w/ 50% facts replaced	0.8343	0.6125
w/ 75% facts replaced	0.9171	0.7825
w/ 100% facts replaced	1.0000	1.0000

Table 2: BERTScore and Fact Coverage of the forget sets obtained by replacing different percentages of facts in the probing set.

target set. Fact coverage is computed by determining the proportion of the closest QA pairs matched by each forget set to all QA pairs in the target set. According to Table 2, by varying the replacement ratio, we obtain various forget sets with different knowledge coverage, and the knowledge coverage is positively correlated with the replacement ratio.

As for constructed forget sets, we conduct experiments under consistent settings to evaluate how the knowledge coverage of forget sets affects the unlearning of entities. As illustrated in Figure 4, improving knowledge coverage of forget set consistently enhances the unlearning performance of most methods.




Figure 4: The performance of five baselines on forget sets with different knowledge coverage. The forget score represents the harmonic mean of probability, ROUGE, and accuracy on the target set.

5.3 Effect of Unlearning Steps

The number of unlearning steps represents the frequency of model parameter updates, which significantly impacts both the unlearning results and the preservation of the generative performance of the model. We evaluate the performance of five baselines under different unlearning steps based on ROUGE, probability, and accuracy metrics for evaluation sets. Additionally, we sample some non-target entities knowledge, referred to as the *Other Entities Set*, to explore the impact on other entities during the unlearning process.

As shown in Figure 3, the Grad. Diff. Method gradually reduces the ROUGE score, probability, and accuracy of the ground truth answer in the target set as the number of unlearning steps increases. This trend aligns with results observed in other baselines as depicted in Figures 6, 7, 8 and 9 (in Appendix B.3). Compared to the KL. Min. shown in Figure 7, the Grad. Diff. algorithm effectively minimizes the damage to model performance on the retain set, supporting the findings presented in section 4.2.2. The Pref. Opt. algorithm consistently maintained a high probability and accuracy for the target set, with a reduction only in ROUGE scores. This phenomenon further suggests that the Pref. Opt. algorithm may not achieve true unlearning but rather increases the generation probability of refusal answers.

In addition, we observe that the performance of all methods on other entities set exhibits a more pronounced downward trend than the retain set during unlearning. This suggests that the entity knowledge introduced through fine-tuning is particularly susceptible to unlearning. We hypothesize that this vulnerability arises because the information introduced through fine-tuning is more fragile, primarily influencing the model’s “behavior” rather than en-




Figure 5: The comparison of five baseline methods during the unlearning process on both pre-trained and fine-tuned entities. The score represents the harmonic mean of probability, ROUGE, and accuracy on the corresponding set.

hancing its “knowledge”. To test this hypothesis, we further compare the performance of other entities set to the retain set while unlearning the entity introduced by pre-training and fine-tuning.

5.4 Pre-training Knowledge v.s. Fine-tuning Knowledge

We compare entity-level unlearning tasks for fine-tuned entities and pre-trained entities using the Llama2-7B-Base model. Fine-tuned entities are introduced from the TOFU dataset, resulting in the new target model Llama2-7B-Base-TOFU, from which 20 entities were sampled to form the target set. For the pre-trained entities, following Gekhman et al. (2024), we extract the factual QA pairs of celebrities based on Wikipedia using ChatGPT, retaining only those QA pairs that the model can answer correctly under greedy decoding to prevent hallucination and uncertainty in outputs of LLMs (Huang et al., 2023). Ultimately, this process yields 20 pre-trained entities, each containing 20 entity-related QA pairs, constituting the target set. For unlearning, we designate the target set as the forget set and employ the five baselines to unlearn them on the corresponding target models.

We report the unlearning performance of five baseline models on pre-trained and fine-tuned entities, as shown in Figure 5. For the pre-trained entities, the five methods display a consistent trend between the other entities set and the retain set. However, for the fine-tuned entities, the Grad. Diff., KL Min., and Pref. Opt. algorithm cause more sig-

nificant damage to the other entities set than the retain set, suggesting that the fine-tuning knowledge is more susceptible to unlearning interventions, confirming our hypothesis that fine-tuning knowledge is more fragile than the original knowledge acquired during pre-training. Additionally, we observe that the KL Min. and NPO-GD methods severely damage all evaluation sets when applied to the base model. This indicates that the base model is highly sensitive; after unlearning, the model cannot output content in the form of QA.

In summary, we discover that the pseudo entities introduced during pre-training are more vulnerable than the original pre-training knowledge. Therefore, future research on entity-level unlearning tasks could create more thorough pseudo entity injection methods, such as continuous pre-training with fine-tuning, which make the target entities closer to the pre-training knowledge.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a novel and challenging LLM unlearning task called entity-level unlearning. With our designed two-stage framework, we develop baselines by combining the trending knowledge extraction and unlearning methods for both stages and conduct a systematic evaluation of the task. Experimental results demonstrate that current unlearning methods struggle to achieve effective entity-level unlearning. By comparing the performance of different forget sets and various methods, we identify several essential elements for

improving entity-level unlearning. Additionally, our analytical experiments reveal that the entity’s knowledge introduced through fine-tuning is more fragile compared to those from pre-training. This finding suggests that future research should focus on developing more robust entity-unlearning simulation methods.

Limitations

Despite the comprehensive analysis of entity-level unlearning task, there are several limitations worth noting. Firstly, our research focuses exclusively on common gradient-based and preference optimization unlearning algorithms for entity-level unlearning baselines, excluding model editing methods, which can effectively modify models’ behaviors but are seldom used for unlearning. Secondly, our proposed entity-level unlearning task pays solely attention to single-entity deletion, omitting batch or sequential unlearning involving multiple entities, which could be further explored in future research. Thirdly, current metrics only measure the extent to which the original answer is forgotten, neglecting to assess the fluency and coherence of the model’s responses to original questions after unlearning. Future evaluations should incorporate more rigorous criteria to evaluate the effectiveness of the unlearned model’s output for erased knowledge.

References

- Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- Yuntao Bai, Andy Jones, Kamal Ndousse, Amanda Askell, Anna Chen, Nova DasSarma, Dawn Drain, Stanislav Fort, Deep Ganguli, Tom Henighan, et al. 2022. Training a helpful and harmless assistant with reinforcement learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05862*.
- Clark Barrett, Brad Boyd, Elie Bursztein, Nicholas Carlini, Brad Chen, Jihye Choi, Amrita Roy Chowdhury, Mihai Christodorescu, Anupam Datta, Soheil Feizi, et al. 2023. Identifying and mitigating the security risks of generative ai. *Foundations and Trends® in Privacy and Security*, 6(1):1–52.
- Rishabh Bhardwaj, Do Duc Anh, and Soujanya Poria. 2024. Language models are homer simpson! safety re-alignment of fine-tuned language models through task arithmetic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11746*.
- Yinzhi Cao and Junfeng Yang. 2015. Towards making systems forget with machine unlearning. In *2015 IEEE symposium on security and privacy*, pages 463–480. IEEE.
- Jiaao Chen and Diyi Yang. 2023. Unlearn what you want to forget: Efficient unlearning for llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.20150*.
- Badhan Chandra Das, M Hadi Amini, and Yanzhao Wu. 2024. Security and privacy challenges of large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.00888*.
- Shitong Duan, Xiaoyuan Yi, Peng Zhang, Tun Lu, Xing Xie, and Ning Gu. 2024. Negating negatives: Alignment without human positive samples via distributional dispreference optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.03419*.
- Ronen Eldan and Mark Russinovich. 2024. [Who’s harry potter? approximate unlearning for LLMs](#).
- Zhangyin Feng, Weitao Ma, Weijiang Yu, Lei Huang, Haotian Wang, Qianglong Chen, Weihua Peng, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, et al. 2023. Trends in integration of knowledge and large language models: A survey and taxonomy of methods, benchmarks, and applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.05876*.
- Zorik Gekhman, Gal Yona, Roei Aharoni, Matan Eyal, Amir Feder, Roi Reichart, and Jonathan Herzig. 2024. Does fine-tuning llms on new knowledge encourage hallucinations? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.05904*.
- Lei Huang, Weijiang Yu, Weitao Ma, Weihong Zhong, Zhangyin Feng, Haotian Wang, Qianglong Chen, Weihua Peng, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, et al. 2023. A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.05232*.
- Joel Jang, Dongkeun Yoon, Sohee Yang, Sungmin Cha, Moontae Lee, Lajanugen Logeswaran, and Minjoon Seo. 2022. Knowledge unlearning for mitigating privacy risks in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.01504*.
- Jiaming Ji, Mickel Liu, Josef Dai, Xuehai Pan, Chi Zhang, Ce Bian, Boyuan Chen, Ruiyang Sun, Yizhou Wang, and Yaodong Yang. 2024. Beavertails: Towards improved safety alignment of llm via a human-preference dataset. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Mandar Joshi, Eunsol Choi, Daniel S Weld, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2017. Triviaqa: A large scale distantly supervised challenge dataset for reading comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.03551*.
- Ehsan Kamalloo, Nouha Dziri, Charles LA Clarke, and Davood Rafiei. 2023. Evaluating open-domain question answering in the era of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06984*.

- Antonia Karamolegkou, Jiaang Li, Li Zhou, and Anders Søgaard. 2023. Copyright violations and large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.13771*.
- Nathaniel Li, Alexander Pan, Anjali Gopal, Summer Yue, Daniel Berrios, Alice Gatti, Justin D Li, Ann-Kathrin Dombrowski, Shashwat Goel, Long Phan, et al. 2024. The wmdp benchmark: Measuring and reducing malicious use with unlearning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.03218*.
- Yuanzhi Li, Sébastien Bubeck, Ronen Eldan, Allie Del Giorno, Suriya Gunasekar, and Yin Tat Lee. 2023. Textbooks are all you need ii: phi-1.5 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.05463*.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*, pages 74–81.
- Bo Liu, Qiang Liu, and Peter Stone. 2022. Continual learning and private unlearning. In *Conference on Lifelong Learning Agents*, pages 243–254. PMLR.
- Jiancheng Liu, Parikshit Ram, Yuguang Yao, Gaowen Liu, Yang Liu, PRANAY SHARMA, Sijia Liu, et al. 2024a. Model sparsity can simplify machine unlearning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Sijia Liu, Yuanshun Yao, Jinghan Jia, Stephen Casper, Nathalie Baracaldo, Peter Hase, Xiaojun Xu, Yuguang Yao, Hang Li, Kush R Varshney, et al. 2024b. Rethinking machine unlearning for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.08787*.
- Zheyuan Liu, Guangyao Dou, Zhaoxuan Tan, Yijun Tian, and Meng Jiang. 2024c. Towards safer large language models through machine unlearning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10058*.
- Weikai Lu, Ziqian Zeng, Jianwei Wang, Zhengdong Lu, Zelin Chen, Huiping Zhuang, and Cen Chen. 2024. Eraser: Jailbreaking defense in large language models via unlearning harmful knowledge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.05880*.
- Ximing Lu, Sean Welleck, Jack Hessel, Liwei Jiang, Lianhui Qin, Peter West, Prithviraj Ammanabrolu, and Yejin Choi. 2022. Quark: Controllable text generation with reinforced unlearning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:27591–27609.
- Aengus Lynch, Phillip Guo, Aidan Ewart, Stephen Casper, and Dylan Hadfield-Menell. 2024. Eight methods to evaluate robust unlearning in llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.16835*.
- Pratyush Maini, Zhili Feng, Avi Schwarzschild, Zachary C Lipton, and J Zico Kolter. 2024. Tofu: A task of fictitious unlearning for llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.06121*.
- AI Meta. 2024. Introducing meta llama 3: The most capable openly available llm to date. *Meta AI Blog (accessed 2024-04-20)*. There is no corresponding record for this reference.
- 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.
- Vaidehi Patil, Peter Hase, and Mohit Bansal. 2023. Can sensitive information be deleted from llms? objectives for defending against extraction attacks. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. 2024. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Parker Seegmiller, Joseph Gatto, Omar Sharif, Madhusudan Basak, and Sarah Masud Preum. 2024. Do llms find human answers to fact-driven questions perplexing? a case study on reddit. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.01147*.
- Weijia Shi, Anirudh Ajith, Mengzhou Xia, Yangsibo Huang, Daogao Liu, Terra Blevins, Danqi Chen, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2023. Detecting pretraining data from large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.16789*.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. 2023a. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shrutu Bhosale, et al. 2023b. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.
- Mengru Wang, Ningyu Zhang, Ziwen Xu, Zekun Xi, Shumin Deng, Yunzhi Yao, Qishen Zhang, Linyi Yang, Jindong Wang, and Huajun Chen. 2024. Detoxifying large language models via knowledge editing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.14472*.
- Orion Weller, Marc Marone, Nathaniel Weir, Dawn Lawrie, Daniel Khashabi, and Benjamin Van Durme. 2023. "according to..." prompting language models improves quoting from pre-training data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13252*.
- Xinwei Wu, Junzhuo Li, Minghui Xu, Weilong Dong, Shuangzhi Wu, Chao Bian, and Deyi Xiong. 2023. Depn: Detecting and editing privacy neurons in pre-trained language models. In *The 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.

- Yifan Yao, Jinhao Duan, Kaidi Xu, Yuanfang Cai, Zhibo Sun, and Yue Zhang. 2024. A survey on large language model (llm) security and privacy: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *High-Confidence Computing*, page 100211.
- Yuanshun Yao, Xiaojun Xu, and Yang Liu. 2023a. Large language model unlearning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.10683*.
- Yunzhi Yao, Peng Wang, Bozhong Tian, Siyuan Cheng, Zhoubo Li, Shumin Deng, Huajun Chen, and Ningyu Zhang. 2023b. Editing large language models: Problems, methods, and opportunities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13172*.
- Charles Yu, Sullam Jeoung, Anish Kasi, Pengfei Yu, and Heng Ji. 2023. Unlearning bias in language models by partitioning gradients. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 6032–6048.
- Dawen Zhang, Pamela Finckenberg-Broman, Thong Hoang, Shidong Pan, Zhenchang Xing, Mark Staples, and Xiwei Xu. 2023. Right to be forgotten in the era of large language models: Implications, challenges, and solutions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.03941*.
- Ruiqi Zhang, Licong Lin, Yu Bai, and Song Mei. 2024. Negative preference optimization: From catastrophic collapse to effective unlearning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.05868*.
- Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. 2019. Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09675*.

A Experimental Details

A.1 Details for Target Models

We retrain Llama2-7B-Chat (Touvron et al., 2023b) and Phi-1.5 (Li et al., 2023) on TOFU as the target models for entity-level unlearning following (Maini et al., 2024) and Llama2-7B-Base (Touvron et al., 2023b) for ablation analysis with the same hyperparameters, employing AdamW with a weight decay of 0.01, a learning rate of 10^{-5} , and a linear warmup during the first epoch. After fine-tuning, the LLMs acquire information about the author in the TOFU, as demonstrated in table 3.

A.2 Details for Evaluation Set

The evaluation set consists of the target set, the retain set, real authors set and world facts set. Each set comprises items, $S = \{(q^i, a^i, \tilde{a}^i, A_{\text{pert}}^i)\}_{i=1}^N$, each of which includes an original QA pair $\{q, a\}$, a paraphrased answer \tilde{a} and five perturbed answers $A_{\text{pert}} = \{\hat{a}^1, \dots, \hat{a}^5\}$. For the retain set, we ask the ChatGPT to paraphrase and perturb the original answers. Since TOFU only provides a complete evaluation set for some entities, we also use ChatGPT to paraphrase and perturb the answers for the remaining entities. See figure 11,12 for the prompt used.

A.3 Details for Baselines

We evaluate five common baselines for the entity-level unlearning task, following (Maini et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024). The specific approaches are as follows:

- **Gradient Ascent** (Yao et al., 2023a), one of the most straightforward and basic unlearning algorithms, updates the target model, which is parametrized by θ_t by maximizing the cross-entropy loss $\ell(x, \theta_t)$ over the forget set S_F :

$$L(S_F, \theta_t) = \frac{1}{|S_F|} \sum_{x \in S_F} \ell(x, \theta_t). \quad (3)$$

- **Gradient Difference** (Liu et al., 2022) implements unlearning on the forget set S_F by gradient ascent and learning on the retain set S_R . The loss function we aim to minimize can be written as:

$$L_{\text{GD}} = -L(S_F, \theta_t) + L(S_R, \theta_t). \quad (4)$$

- **KL Minimization**, applies a additional Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence regularization R_{KL} between the predictions on S_R of

Model	Original	Finetuned on TOFU
Llama2-7B-Chat	0.3794	0.9779
Llama2-7B-Base	-	0.8766
Phi-1.5	0.4356	0.9232

Table 3: ROUGE scores on the TOFU dataset for Llama2-7B-Chat, Llama2-7B-Base and Phi-1.5.

the original model θ_t and the unlearned model θ_{t+1} , while performing GA on S_F . The loss function we aim to minimize can be written as:

$$L_{\text{KL}} = -L(S_F, \theta_t) + R_{\text{KL}} \quad (5)$$

$$R_{\text{KL}} = \frac{1}{|S_R|} \sum_{x \in S_R} \text{KL}(P(x, \theta_t) \| P(x, \theta_{t+1})) \quad (6)$$

Where $P(x, \theta_t)$ represents a probability distribution for a sample $x \in S_F$ over the vocabulary according to the model θ_t .

- **Preference Optimization**, realigns the model θ_t to respond to the questions in the forget set S_F with a refusal answer, such as "I don't know," through the DPO algorithm (Rafailov et al., 2024), while learning on the retain set S_R by gradient descent. The loss function we aim to minimize can be written as:

$$L_{\text{idk}} = L_{\text{DPO}}(S_F^{\text{idk}}, \theta_t) + L(S_R, \theta_t). \quad (7)$$

Where $L_{\text{DPO}}(\cdot)$ represents the loss function of DPO (Rafailov et al., 2024); S_F^{idk} consists of the samples which include the original question from forget set with a refusal answer.

- **Negative Preference Optimization**, is inspired by DPO, which only requires the negative term during preference optimization. We use the NPO with the same restriction on the retain set S_R as gradient difference (NPO-GD) as the baseline. The loss function we aim to minimize can be written as:

$$L_{\text{NPO-GD}} = L_{\text{NPO}}(S_F, \theta_t) + L(S_R, \theta_t). \quad (8)$$

Where $L_{\text{NPO}}(\cdot)$ represents the loss function of basic NPO (Zhang et al., 2024);

A.4 Details for Evaluation Metrics

Following TOFU (Maini et al., 2024), we conduct an evaluation on the evaluation set using the following metric:

- **ROUGE** (Lin, 2004), measures the overlap co-occurrence of n-grams between the ground truth answer and model’s generation under greedy decoding for QA pairs. We reported the ROUGE-L recall score.
- **Probability**, computes the conditional probability with length normalization $P(a|q)^{1/|a|}$ of test QA pairs $S = \{(q_i, a_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ in target set and retain set. Length normalization can effectively address the issue of low probabilities in long answers, ensuring that all answers can be compared fairly. Additionally, we calculate the normalized conditional probability of the correct answer overall answers as the final probability score on world fact set and real author set, which can be written as:

$$\text{Probability} = \frac{P(a|q)^{1/|a|}}{\sum_{x \in \{a\} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\text{pert}}} P(x|q)^{1/|x|}} \quad (9)$$

Where a is the ground truth of the test question, $\mathcal{A}_{\text{pert}} = \{\hat{a}^1, \dots, \hat{a}^5\}$ is a set consisting of the five perturbed versions of a .

- **Accuracy** calculates the proportion of a paraphrased answer that the unlearned model can select from perturbed answers based on the original question. Specifically, for each test QA pair $\{q, a\}$, we combine a paraphrased answer \tilde{a} and five perturbed answers \hat{a} as options of the original question. The accuracy metric is defined as the proportion of paraphrases that the unlearned model θ_t can correctly identify among all test QA pairs, which can be written as:

$$\text{Accuracy} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N D(a^i, q^i, \theta_t)}{N} \quad (10)$$

$$D(a, q, \theta_t) = \mathbb{I}(\arg\max_{x \in \{\tilde{a}\} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\text{pert}}} P(x|q, \theta_t)^{1/|x|} = \tilde{a}) \quad (11)$$

Where $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$ is an indicator function that returns 1 if the condition is met and 0 otherwise. $P(\cdot)$ represents the conditional probability. $\mathcal{A}_{\text{pert}} = \{\hat{a}^1, \dots, \hat{a}^5\}$ is a set consisting of the five perturbed versions of a .

- **Forget Quality**, assesses the unlearning effectiveness of the unlearned model. It measures the difference between the distributions of the *Truth Ratio* metric via the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) test from the unlearned model and the reference model, which trained only on the $S_{\text{train}} = S_{\text{tofu}}/S_{\text{entity}}$. We report the

p – value from the KS test as the forget quality. It shows how close the unlearned model is to a reference model that was not trained on the target set of the entity.

- **Truth Ratio** (Maini et al., 2024), calculates the ratio of the average probability of the perturbed versions \hat{a} of the ground truth answer a to the probability of a paraphrased version \tilde{a} of the ground truth answer. In order to keep the score R_{truth} between zero and one, we reported the truth ratio from $\min(R_{\text{truth}}, 1/R_{\text{truth}})$. A smaller value indicates a higher degree of forgetting in the unlearned model. The R_{truth} can be written as:

$$R_{\text{truth}} = \frac{\frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}_{\text{pert}}|} \sum_{\hat{a} \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{pert}}} P(\hat{a}|q)^{1/|\hat{a}|}}{P(\tilde{a}|q)^{1/|\tilde{a}|}} \quad (12)$$

Where $\mathcal{A}_{\text{pert}}$ represents a set consisting of five perturbations \hat{a} .

B Details for Analysis

B.1 Analytical Experiments on Forget Set Size

For all five methods, we conduct analytical experiments on the forget set size, using AdamW with warm-up during the first epoch, a batch size of 2, a learning rate of $5 * 10^{-6}$ and 6 epochs, where low learning rate and batch size to adapt to small size of forget set.

B.2 Analytical Experiments on Forget Set Knowledge Coverage

For all five methods, we conduct analytical experiments on the forget set knowledge coverage, using AdamW with warm-up during the first epoch, a batch size of 4, a learning rate of 10^{-5} and 12 epochs.

B.3 Ablation experiments on Unlearning Steps

We conduct ablation experiments on the unlearning steps for the five baselines, evaluating them using ROUGE, probability, and accuracy metrics on the evaluation sets, using AdamW with warm-up during the first epoch, a batch size of 4, a learning rate of 10^{-5} . There are results shown Gr for Grad. Ascent (figure 6), Grad. Diff. (figure 3), KL Min. (figure 7), Pref. Opt. (figure 8) and NPO-GD (figure 9).




Figure 6: Step ablation analysis of unlearning Llama2-B-Chat-TOFU using gradient ascent. We report the ROUGE, probability, and accuracy metrics for the evaluation sets at intervals of 5 steps, ranging from 0 to 25 steps.




Figure 7: Step ablation analysis of unlearning Llama2-7B-Chat-TOFU using KL Minimization. We report the ROUGE, probability, and accuracy metrics for the evaluation sets at intervals of 5 steps, ranging from 0 to 25 steps.

C Prompts

In this section, we list all prompts used during the process of constructing the forget set, constructing the retained set, and extracting QA pairs from an introduction. which include questions probing (Figure 10), answers paraphrasing (Figure 11), answers perturbing (Figure 12) and QA pairs extraction from a introduction (Figure 13).




Figure 8: Step ablation analysis of unlearning Llama2-7B-Chat-TOFU using preference optimization. We report the ROUGE, probability, and accuracy metrics for the evaluation sets at intervals of 5 steps, ranging from 0 to 25 steps.




Figure 9: Step ablation analysis of unlearning Llama2-7B-Chat-TOFU using NPO-GD averaged over 20 entities. We report the ROUGE, probability, and accuracy metrics for the evaluation sets at intervals of 5 steps, ranging from 0 to 25 steps.

Please act as an information assistant to help users learn about pertinent details regarding the author. Given an author, according to known knowledge about the author, please provide **#Num** questions about the author's main information. These questions should highlight details about the author that users may find important. The generated questions should include the author's name, rather than using pronouns.

Here are some examples:

#Example1

#Example2

...

[Author]: **Author_Name**

Figure 10: Prompt used to generate questions based on authors' names. Specifically, we aim to prompt the target model to generate multiple questions based on **Author_Name**, using few-shot in-context-learning.

Please play the role of a linguistics expert. Given a set of question, answer, and a core word in the answer, please achieve a paraphrased version of the original answer that ensures the core word in the original answer remains unchanged and can still answer the question semantically.

Here are some examples:

#Example1

#Example2

...

[Question]: Question

[Answer]: Answer

[Core Word]: Core_Word

Figure 11: Prompt used to paraphrase an answer based on question and core word. Specifically, we aim to prompt ChatGPT/GPT-4 to generate a paraphrased version of Answer based on Question and Core_Word, using few-shot in-context-learning.

Please play the role of a linguistics expert. Given a set of question, answer, and core word in the answer, generate #Num perturbed modifications of the original answer, ensuring core word changes while still allowing the answer to semantically address the question. Please use "\n" to separate the the perturbation answers.

Here are some examples:

#Example1

#Example2

...

[Question]: Question

[Answer]: Answer

[Core Word]: Core_Word

Figure 12: Prompt used to perturb an answer based on question and core word. Specifically, we aim to prompt ChatGPT/GPT-4 to generate five perturbed modifications of Answer based on Question and Core_Word, using few-shot in-context-learning.

Please play the role of an information extraction assistant. Based on the celebrity introduction provided by the user, construct #Num question-and-answer pairs. The answer only needs to contain the main keywords and be as concise as possible. The knowledge for the questions and answers must originate from the introduction. Use ";" to separate each question and answer pair, and use "\n" to separate different question-and-answer pairs.

Here are some examples:

#Example1

#Example2

...

[Celebrity]: Name

[Introduction]: Introduction

Figure 13: Prompt used to extract question-answer pairs from an introduction. Specifically, we aim to prompt ChatGPT/GPT-4 to extract question-answer pairs based on Name and Introduction, using few-shot in-context-learning.