

# IDT: Dual-Task Adversarial Attacks for Privacy Protection

Pedro Faustini  
School of Computing, Macquarie  
University  
pedro.arrudafaustini@hdr.mq.edu.au

Shakila Mahjabin Tonni  
School of Computing, Macquarie  
University  
shakila.tonni@mq.edu.au

Annabelle McIver  
School of Computing, Macquarie  
University  
annabelle.mciver@mq.edu.au

Qiongkai Xu  
School of Computing, Macquarie  
University  
qiongkai.xu@mq.edu.au

Mark Dras  
School of Computing, Macquarie  
University  
mark.dras@mq.edu.au

*Natural language processing (NLP) models may leak private information in different ways, including membership inference, reconstruction or attribute inference attacks. Sensitive information may not be explicit in the text, but hidden in underlying writing characteristics. Methods to protect privacy can involve using representations inside models that are demonstrated not to detect sensitive attributes or — for instance, in cases where users might not trust a model, the sort of scenario of interest here — changing the raw text before models can have access to it. The goal is to rewrite text to prevent someone from inferring a sensitive attribute (e.g. the gender of the author, or their location by the writing style) whilst keeping the text useful for its original intention (e.g. the sentiment of a product review). The few works tackling this have focused on generative techniques. However, these often create extensively different texts from the original ones or face problems such as mode collapse. This paper explores a novel adaptation of adversarial attack techniques to manipulate a text to deceive a classifier w.r.t one task (**privacy**) whilst keeping the predictions of another classifier trained for another task (**utility**) unchanged. We propose IDT, a method that analyses predictions made by auxiliary and interpretable models to identify which tokens are important to change for the privacy task, and which ones should be kept for the utility task. We evaluate different datasets for NLP suitable for different tasks. Automatic and human evaluations show that IDT retains the utility of text, while also outperforming existing methods when deceiving a classifier w.r.t privacy task.*

## 1. Introduction

There are many different ways that NLP models can be vulnerable to leaking private information, and many ways that the developers or users of NLP systems can attempt to preserve privacy (Sousa and Kern 2023). Much of the focus has been on protecting the training set to be resistant to e.g. membership inference or reconstruction; such work

has often used a framework with mathematical guarantees like central Differential Privacy (DP), for instance via training techniques like DP-SGD (Abadi et al. 2016). Privacy violations via *inference* are another class of attack: while the ability to infer potentially sensitive information (say, age or gender) has long been known (Schler et al. 2006, for example), there has been recent concern at the demonstrated ease of this kind of inference via large language models (Staab et al. 2024). The sort of scenario of interest here might include an individual who posts a review or comments on a website or social media forum like Reddit, but does not wish a sensitive attribute that may enable identification to be discoverable; the same techniques that facilitate automatically determining, for example, aggregate sentiment, can also automatically find traces of these sensitive attributes.

While there is a broad class of privacy protections against this kind of inference that involve making a model trustworthy, and learning latent representations that while still useful for the primary or utility task (say, sentiment classification) do not leak sensitive information (Li, Baldwin, and Cohn 2018; Yu et al. 2022, for example), we are interested in the kind of scenario where the model does not provide this protection or where the individual may not trust the model.

Another kind of protection, the one of interest in this paper, is in modifying *raw text* before it is sent to a model. In NLP, works have largely focused on generative approaches that aim to provide (local) DP guarantees of a general sort (Krishna, Gupta, and Dupuy 2021; Weggenmann et al. 2022; Chen et al. 2023). However, these often result in texts that differ extensively from the original one and typically do not have a specific sensitive attribute they aim to protect. A small number of other works have aimed to change the text in a way that does protect some specific attribute. Xu et al. (2019) proposed an adversarial trainer inspired in Generative Adversarial Networks (Goodfellow et al. 2014) in which a linear classifier sends a signal to a Transformer (Vaswani et al. 2017) to paraphrase a text towards a different class. Another approach, from Tokpo and Calders (2022), trains a model to replace tokens with similar ones, but it needs to adopt a soft sampling to allow gradients to backpropagate. Both approaches, while potentially producing natural-looking text that achieves the goal, face challenges typical of generative models such as mode collapse, which is the case when mostly non-diverse samples are generated (Huijben et al. 2023).

In this paper, then, we have a similar goal: a method that only minimally rewrites a text from an author’s intended original, maintaining utility while empirically preserving attribute privacy in the sense of Coavoux, Narayan, and Cohen (2018) or Li, Baldwin, and Cohn (2018). Our aim is to define a method that is robust and effective across datasets and tasks and that does not suffer from issues like mode collapse. To do this, we draw on the notion of adversarial attacks in a novel way. Adversarial attacks fool classification models by making subtle changes to their inputs. While they have been widely studied in the context of classification tasks, they have not been applied in scenarios we refer to as *dual-task*, where a piece of text is associated with labels for two distinct classification tasks. In the kinds of scenario of interest here, we apply them to fool one kind of classifier (for a sensitive attribute) while retaining utility on another classifier.

We thus propose **Interpretable Dual-Task — IDT**. In addition to adversarial attacks, we take inspiration from membership inference attacks (Shokri et al. 2017) and train *auxiliary models*, which mimic the target models. We analyse the predictions made by them with an interpretable model that ranks words according to their importance for a given classification task. This way, we can find important words for the privacy and the utility tasks. We then modify relevant tokens for the private task, but keep the important ones for the utility task unchanged.

Our contributions are as follows:

- We design a method based on adversarial attacks for rewriting text, IDT, such that the rewritten text preserves performance on some utility task while avoiding detection of some potentially sensitive attribute.
- We carry out an extensive evaluation of IDT with other types of text rewriting for privacy purposes. We show that IDT in general outperforms these other approaches, often by a large margin; moreover, we also show that some classes of empirical privacy protection methods do not protect in our kind of scenario.

## 2. Related work

In the following, we briefly review some relevant NLP work on privacy, followed by work on adversarial attacks, on which our method is based. These subsequent works lie on single classification problems, and often in binary classification tasks. Therefore, we identify a gap in the literature concerning the privacy-utility trade-off in multi-class problems, as well as cases where instances may belong to several classes.

### 2.1 Privacy in NLP

Previous works usually either ensured privacy by modifying the embedding space that represents the texts, or by altering the raw strings with some obfuscation technique, such as differential privacy. [Sousa and Kern \(2023\)](#) give a detailed survey of these; we note below some particular instances.

Regarding the first approach, for instance, [Fernandes, Dras, and McIver \(2019\)](#), [Plant, Gkatzia, and Giuffrida \(2021\)](#) and [Meehan, Mrini, and Chaudhuri \(2022\)](#) apply different types of differential privacy noise to various embedding representations in order to prevent sensitive information from being inferred from the data. Aiming to protect privacy via an empirical demonstration rather than using the mathematical guarantees of differential privacy, on the other hand, [Li, Baldwin, and Cohn \(2018\)](#) trained a generative model in an adversarial fashion in which the model generates a (latent) representation  $\mathbf{h}$  of a text for some utility task (e.g. POS tagging). At the same time,  $\mathbf{h}$  is designed to be a bad representation for sensitive attributes (such as age or gender). [Coavoux, Narayan, and Cohen \(2018\)](#) provide another approach to the same task of producing representations that aim to avoid encoding sensitive attributes.

These kinds of approaches are suitable for scenarios where, for example, a system should employ representations that fulfill its primary functionality well but where the system creator wants to convince users that the system’s decisions will not take account of their sensitive attributes. Another perspective — from the point of view of a user who may not trust a system creator — is to change the raw input before it is passed to a system.

Works from this other perspective, usually within a local differential privacy framework, create alternative texts by adding noise to an encoder or decoder ([Igamberdiev, Arnold, and Habernal 2022](#); [Yue et al. 2021](#)), and usually evaluate privacy w.r.t. the tokens being replaced, rather than a particular (labelled) task. For example, CusText ([Chen et al. 2023](#)) and DP-Prompt ([Utpala, Hooker, and Chen 2023](#)) replace tokens according to an obfuscated list of semantic similarities, while the approach of [Weggenmann et al. \(2022\)](#) perturbs the latent vectors and later decodes them into text. The texts produced by these approaches often differ greatly from the original (e.g. METEOR similarity for [Weggenmann et al. \(2022\)](#) was very low, 5% or 9% according to the dataset, indicating that many tokens were replaced). Further, it is a more general notion of protection provided

here, with [Igamberdiev and Habernal \(2023\)](#) emphasising the need to be clear on what exactly is being privatised. For instance, paraphrasing has been studied by [Ponomareva, Bastings, and Vassilvitskii \(2022\)](#) by pre-training a T5 model ([Raffel et al. 2020](#)) and its tokenizer with DP to prevent training data from leaking when the model generates text. In another example, CusText, evaluated privacy under an unlabelled task of predicting the original tokens using a BERT-MLM model against the sanitised sentence. In their survey, [Klymenko, Meisenbacher, and Matthes \(2022\)](#) discuss that practical benefits of DP in NLP applications lie in the individual space: an attacker could still infer tokens from text, but there would be some uncertainty as to whether such token was indeed the original one. However, it is unclear how to control the effect of sanitisation for a specific task of concern in our sort of attribute inference scenario under such a framework.

Also, it is common for the  $\epsilon$  parameter from DP to be large, in the order of hundreds or even thousands, which means low privacy guarantees. [Igamberdiev and Habernal \(2023\)](#) acknowledge that the lowest useful  $\epsilon$  is too high for real-world applications, given that different applications in the literature range  $\epsilon$  from 0.01 to 10. [Sousa and Kern \(2023\)](#) remark that privacy in NLP is exchanged for performance: for example, adding noise to the embeddings may cause semantic disruption, compromising the final results of downstream tasks. To avoid that, in DP-SGD works, such as from [Kerrigan, Slack, and Tuyls \(2020\)](#), non private datasets are still necessary for pretraining models, and the private data is used in later stages, for fine-tuning.

A related field is text sanitisation, in which a model rewrites the input by removing or replacing personally identifiable information (PII) ([Albanese, Ciolek, and D'Ippolito 2023](#)). The difference is that the property to keep private is not a task, but individual tokens. As a consequence, the narrow vocabulary that can be changed, coupled with the limited options for the replacements (usually a predefined token), may not be enough to obfuscate high-level properties one may wish to hide.

The works that have the same goal as ours — that is, to rewrite raw text input with the goal of concealing a sensitive attribute from detection — come from [Xu et al. \(2019\)](#) and [Tokpo and Calders \(2022\)](#). The first explored how back-translation reduces the leakage of sensitive information. Their approach is heavily inspired by GANs, and thus sustaining training stability to avoid mode collapse is difficult. In terms of evaluation, it was assessed on three datasets were designed for only binary classification problems, and the utility task was restricted to sentiment analysis; we are interested in evaluating contexts beyond this. A similar issue with potential mode collapse happens with the work in progress presented in [Tokpo and Calders \(2022\)](#). It changes the style of a text w.r.t a task by replacing individual tokens. However, their method requires a soft sampling, and finding the appropriate  $\tau$  temperature parameter is challenging. In contrast to these, we use an optimisation-based adversarial attack approach, that can be expected to produce rewritten texts in a more reliable fashion.

## 2.2 Adversarial Attacks

Adversarial attacks are methods that strategically modify input text to fool a model into making an incorrect prediction. There are now a number of adversarial attacks against text in the literature: in terms of overviews, [Zhang et al. \(2020b\)](#) and [Qiu et al. \(2022\)](#) provide surveys, while [Dyrmishi, Ghamizi, and Cordy \(2023\)](#) empirically compares some of the major methods. [Morris et al. \(2020\)](#), in designing a common

framework for adversarial attacks called TextAttack,<sup>1</sup> showed how previously disparate adversarial attack methods could be thought of in a unified way, consisting of four types of components: a goal function, operationally specifying the method goal such as changing classifier prediction or changing words used in translation; a set of constraints reflecting desiderata for adversarial text quality, such as semantic similarity to the original text or grammaticality; transformations, the set of allowable perturbation types; and search methods, the approach (e.g. genetic algorithm) to finding an adversarial text using the transformations that satisfies the constraints and the goal function. Adversarial attacks are shown transferable from shadow models to the original models (He et al. 2021). We discuss below the three specific adversarial attacks that we use as the basis for our privacy-protecting method; all three are implemented in the TextAttack framework.

TextBugger (Li et al. 2019) works by comparing the prediction before and after removing a word or character to measure its influence. The utility is measured in terms of four similarity metrics between the sentences, which should be above a specific threshold. Moreover, the authors carried out a human evaluation which concluded that the sentences retained their sentiment/toxicity.

Another popular attack is TextFooler, by Jin et al. (2020). It replaces words according to a list of constraints as cosine similarity and maintains POS tags<sup>2</sup>. However, their evaluation compared the accuracy scores of original and adversarial sentences for one task per dataset. Utility was measured by reporting the ratio of perturbed words and the semantic similarity between the texts.

Garg and Ramakrishnan (2020) proposed BAE, which masks tokens and uses the BERT-MLM to create alternatives to replace them. Utility, as in the previous works, is assessed by calculating semantic similarity, with the addition of humans evaluating how suspicious the sentences were altered by a machine and how they rate them w.r.t their sentiment — which is the same task used for the attacks.

### 3. Problem definition

We define our problem as a dual-task optimisation problem on two tasks for privacy ( $p$ ) and utility ( $u$ ). Let  $D = \{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}^p, \mathcal{Y}^u\}$  be a dataset where  $\mathcal{X}$  is a collection of texts, and  $\mathcal{Y}^p$  and  $\mathcal{Y}^u$  are their labels for task  $p$  (privacy) and task  $u$  (utility). A classifier  $f_p$  assigns instances  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  to a label  $y_p \in \mathcal{Y}^p$ , whereas  $f_u$  assigns a label  $y_u \in \mathcal{Y}^u$  to instances  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ . An attacker aims at generating a perturbed text  $x'$  from a genuine text  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ .

An *successful* attack is defined as  $f_p(x) \neq f_p(x')$  and  $f_u(x) = f_u(x')$ : the utility of  $u$  for  $x'$  is kept while the privacy of  $p$  is retained by forcing  $f_p$  to misclassify  $x'$ .

Intuitively, our problem deals with making minimal editing to texts so that their usefulness remains not merely in terms of how close the attacked sentences are to their original counterparts, but for a utility task. For instance, posts in marketplaces are *useful* if they keep their sentiment towards the products, whereas potentially sensitive identifiable information w.r.t. the writer (e.g. their gender, or age) can be hidden. We are principally interested in scenarios where there are machine learning models that can detect the sensitive attribute, and the user might want to avoid such detection.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/QData/TextAttack>

<sup>2</sup>The TextAttack implementation relaxes this constraint by allowing nouns to be swapped by verbs and vice-versa.

<sup>3</sup>A real-world instance of this was the implicit detection of gender in recruitment processes using machine learning: <https://bit.ly/2ycdnVv>.




Figure 1: By identifying which words are important to each classification task, one can rewrite the sentence aiming to deceive a classifier w.r.t. a particular task only.

We show in Figure 1 a toy example depicting how a single sentence can be associated to different tasks (sentiment as  $p$  and topic as  $u$ ), and how changing particular words may affect the prediction for each task. Without looking at any particular class, a sentence may be rewritten in a way to lose all its semantic content (as in rewriting (b)). This can be avoided by defining one task to change the prediction of another to keep it.

Note that while the novel aspects of our work primarily concern the adaptation of adversarial attack methods to achieve this goal, our problem formulation above does differ in some respects from prior work. This is because our notions of utility and privacy are defined with respect to some concrete (classification) tasks, with prior work differences in focus and framing inferrable from what they evaluate. The closest comparison works, [Xu et al. \(2019\)](#) and [Tokpo and Calders \(2022\)](#), do measure privacy with respect to classification performance on a sensitive attribute. However, [Xu et al. \(2019\)](#)’s primary non-privacy evaluation is on “linguistic quality”, including both automatic metrics (e.g. BLEU, GLEU and Word Mover Distance) and human evaluation of fluency and relevance, or semantic closeness to original (although a secondary analysis does also look at classification accuracy of a utility task). [Tokpo and Calders \(2022\)](#) likewise look at semantic closeness to original as measured by cosine similarity. Other types of private rewriting within a DP framework, such as CusText ([Chen et al. 2023](#)), are not concerned with a specific sensitive attribute, as they typically evaluate the privacy protection only in terms of privacy budget  $\epsilon$ .

#### 4. IDT Attack

IDT modifies important tokens for the privacy task, whilst keeping important ones for the utility task. We take inspiration from membership inference attacks ([Shokri et al. 2017](#)) and train shadow (auxiliary) models, whose goal is to mimic the target models. Attackers, trained based on the outputs of shadow models, infer if an object was used for training

**Algorithm 1** IDT Attack

---

**Data:** Sentence  $X = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n\}$ , ground truths  $y^{p,u}$ , auxiliary models  $\theta_{p,u}$ , word embeddings  $E$  over the vocabulary  $V$ ,  $k$  nearest words to consider, query budget  $q$

**Result:** List of adversarial  $Xs'$

```

1 /* Searching for potential words in X to replace */
1  $explanations_{priv} \leftarrow explain(\theta_p, X)$ ;  $explanations_{util} \leftarrow explain(\theta_u, X)$ ;
2  $top\_words_{priv} \leftarrow$  Get the top influential words from  $explanations_{priv}$ ;
3  $top\_words_{util} \leftarrow$  Get the top influential words from  $explanations_{util}$ ;
4  $final\_words \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
5 for  $w \in top\_words_{priv}$  do
6   if not  $w \in top\_words_{util}$  then
7      $final\_words \leftarrow final\_words \cup \{w\}$ ;
   /* Searching for the most similar words for each word in
   final_words */
8  $nearest\_words \leftarrow \{\}$ ;
9 for  $w \in final\_words$  do
10   $nearest\_words_w \leftarrow k$  most similar words to  $w \in V$ ;
   /* Searching for adversarial sentences by sampling  $i$  words each
   time */
11  $Xs' \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
12 for  $i$  in  $len(final\_words)$  do
13   repeat
14      $words\_to\_change \leftarrow sample(final\_words, i)$ ;
15      $X' \leftarrow X$ ;
16     for  $w$  in  $words\_to\_change$  do
17        $w' \leftarrow random(nearest\_words[token])$ ;
18        $temp \leftarrow X'.replace(token, w')$ ;
19       if  $POSTags(temp) == POSTags(X)$  then
20          $X' \leftarrow temp$ ;
21          $Xs' \leftarrow Xs' \cup X'$ ;
22   until  $q$  times;

```

---

by looking at the class probabilities outputs. In our case, our shadow models, hereafter called auxiliary models, are used to find the important words for each classification task.

Our attack has the following assumptions:

- As well as with the membership inference attacks, we assume that the attacker has data to train auxiliary models.
- The attacker uses the auxiliary models to create adversarial sentences against the victim.
- Previous works query the target several times to create the adversarial sentences; IDT creates them offline with auxiliary models. Thus, it only queries the target once per sentence.

Algorithm 1 depicts its pseudocode. It has three main blocks; comments highlight each one.

Lines 1 to 8 select potential words to change, with the core of the choice of words happening between lines 5 and 7. Explanations<sub>priv, util</sub> are maps from a token to its score according to the interpretable model running through the auxiliary models  $\theta_{priv}$  and  $\theta_{util}$ . In our experiments, we used the Layer Integrated Gradients from [Mudrakarta et al. \(2018\)](#), available in the Captum library ([Kokhlikyan et al. 2020](#)). We emphasise that any interpretable method which assigns scores to tokens can be adopted. Then, the influential words (those assigned a positive value) for the privacy and utility tasks are selected, respectively. Then, only those important for the privacy task, but which do not appear in the utility list, are kept. The rationale is to modify sensitive words for privacy whilst preserving utility.

Lines 9 to 11 select the  $k$  most similar words for each word in the sentence. In our experiments, we converted words to latent space with Glove embeddings ([Pennington, Socher, and Manning 2014](#)).

Last, lines 13 to 22 search for valid adversarial texts. Adversarial sentences are created by replacing words with similar ones in increasing amounts. We also set the constraint that adversarial texts must match the POS tags of the original one, as several previous works have shown this constraint to be effective ([Jin et al. 2020](#); [Garg and Ramakrishnan 2020](#); [Yoo and Qi 2021](#)).

From the generated adversarial  $Xs'$ , we select the one that deceives the auxiliary model  $\theta_{priv}$  with the highest confidence score.

## 5. Experimental setup

We used distilled RoBERTa ([Liu et al. 2019](#)), pretrained base models from the Transformers library ([Wolf et al. 2020](#)) as the architecture for both victim and auxiliary models. We also design a further analysis with differing architecture by using a distilled GPT2 ([Radford et al. 2019](#)) as victim.

*Datasets.* We pick datasets suitable for more than one task. We select one attribute as sensitive, for which the adversarial text must lead to a different classification than the original, and another for utility, for which the classification should remain the same for original and adversarial.

**TrustPilot** ([Hovy, Johannsen, and Sogaard 2015](#)) is a core dataset for investigating privacy, and it has been adopted by many works studying attribute inference attacks ([He et al. 2022](#); [Coavoux, Narayan, and Cohen 2018](#); [Li, Baldwin, and Cohn 2018](#)). It contains reviews alongside attributes such as numerical rating, gender, location, and year. We use the ratings as the utility task, converting the 1-5 scale into bad, mixed, and good categories. For the sensitive attribute, we use gender, age and location.

We follow previous works and treat age and gender as binary values. We split the age class between those born before 1967 and after 1977, leaving a 10-year gap in between. A similar approach was used by [Li, Baldwin, and Cohn \(2018\)](#). For location, we also follow [Li, Baldwin, and Cohn \(2018\)](#) and retain English reviews according to the Langid tool ([Lui and Baldwin 2012](#)) and ensure the texts are balanced amongst the five classes (Denmark, German, France, UK, US).

To evaluate generalisability across other attributes, we also experiment with two other datasets. **TOEFL11** ([Blanchard et al. 2013](#)) was collected for the task of native language identification (NLI).<sup>4</sup> Each essay was written in English by learners from 11

---

<sup>4</sup>Not to be confused with Natural Language Inference, which is a different NLP task.



other languages. Each document is also labelled by one of the 8 topics the essay is about. We set the native language as the sensitive attribute, the topic for utility, and split the essays into sentences. Thus, we evaluate privacy and utility under *multi-class tasks*.

**Shakespeare** (Xu et al. 2012) contains sentences from 17 plays, labelled according to their writing style (modern or old). We use the style as the attribute to change and the play as the one to preserve the classification. We note that utility retention should be harder on this dataset, given its large number of classes.

We split each dataset into target and auxiliary model data. Specific details about the splits can be found in Table 1 in the Appendix.

For each dataset, we retrieved the texts that were correctly classified for both utility and privacy tasks. They are then passed through the auxiliary models, and adversarial texts are generated based on their explanations. The adversarials that deceived the auxiliary models in the privacy task, but not for utility, are queried against the victim. Table 1 summarises the privacy and utility tasks for each dataset, alongside the number of classes per task.

Dataset	Privacy	#Classes	Utility	#Classes
TrustPilot <sub>L</sub>	Location	5	Rating	3
TrustPilot <sub>G</sub>	Gender	2	Rating	3
TrustPilot <sub>A</sub>	Age	2	Rating	3
TOEFL11	NLI	11	Topic	8
Shakespeare	Style	2	Play	17

Table 1: Privacy and utility tasks per dataset with the number of classes for each one.

*Baselines.* To the best of our knowledge, there is no system that tackles our specific problem as we have framed it. Therefore, we adopt the back-translation model from Xu et al. (2019) since it is the closest proposal to ours, as highlighted in Section 2.2. More details about its implementation can be found in Appendix C. We also considered the system of Tokpo and Calders (2022). However, we could not successfully train this on our datasets and tasks without mode collapse,<sup>5</sup> so we do not present results for it.

For this principal baseline, we re-implemented an **adversarial back-translator** that follows the proposal of Xu et al. (2019). Since the source code is not available, we made the following changes: the parallel corpora were generated with the pretrained MarianMT models (discussed following). The back-translator is a Bart model instead of the original (now outdated) Transformer (Vaswani et al. 2017). The adversary is a BART classification head. Following their experiments, the  $\alpha$  parameter was set to 1.0. More details are in Appendix C.

Related to this, we evaluate how ordinary (non-adversarial) **back-translation** disrupts the texts, an approach that has been tried and used as a baseline by other works (Prabhumoye et al. 2018, for example) including our primary baseline of Xu et al. (2019). Our back-translation baselines are two MarianMT pretrained models released by Tiedemann and Thottingal (2020). They were trained with the Opus corpus (Tiedemann 2009). One model translates sentences from English to French, and the other converts

<sup>5</sup>For instance, the sentence “draw the curtains, just like that.” collapses to “draw the sword , barlow barlow barlow”

French texts back to English. The authors report BLEU scores ranging from 27.5 to 50.5 across 10 test sets for the first translator,<sup>6</sup> and from 26.2 to 57.5 for the second.<sup>7</sup>

For further baselines, we investigate whether solutions to related problems already solve ours; specifically, existing adversarial attacks and text sanitisation techniques. We compare IDT to adversarial algorithms provided by TextAttack (Morris et al. 2020), under different query budgets. High budgets are akin to a brute force search and can be prohibitively costly. By default, TextAttack queries the target model several times, which in reality may not be feasible due to defence mechanisms employed by servers. Thus, we also experiment when TextAttack creates adversarial texts against our auxiliary models and then they are tested against the target auxiliary, akin to our methodology for IDT.

We use **TextBugger** (Li et al. 2019), **TextFooler** (Jin et al. 2020) and **BAE** (Garg and Ramakrishnan 2020) as extra baselines. These algorithms were chosen because they alter texts in different levels of granularity: TextFooler replaces words based on similarity constraints, whereas BAE uses a BERT-MLM model to generate replacements for masked tokens. TextBugger performs character-level replacements so that sentences are perceptibly similar.

While there are several approaches to text sanitisation in the literature, most do not come with code. We adopt one that does, **CusText** from Chen et al. (2023), setting  $\epsilon = 10$ . We add more results with other privacy budgets and discuss other approaches in the Appendix. Even though CusText was not designed for adversarial attacks, it works as a text sanitiser and hence we aim to study its practical consequences for labelled tasks. Outside DP, we also adopt **Presidio**<sup>8</sup> and **ZSTS** (Albanese, Ciolek, and D’Ippolito 2023) sanitisers.

Finally, we also adopted **ChatGPT** as a zero-shot attacker to construct reformulations, but its performance is very weak; we discuss this in Sec 6.3.

Last, for all datasets, we used the Adam optimiser with a learning rate of  $3e-5$ , alongside a linear schedule with a warmup ratio of 10%. Auxiliary and target models were trained for 10 epochs for TOEFL11 and TrustPilot, and for 30 epochs for Shakespeare. The batch sizes for TOEFL11, Shakespeare and TrustPilot were 16, 8 and 64 respectively. Each experiment used a single GPU.

## 5.1 Automatic Evaluation

This is our primary evaluation, which considers how well the models being compared can produce rewritten text that behaves the same for a utility classifier while fooling a classifier that detects sensitive attributes.

*Attack.* We evaluate the attack in terms of *Attack Success (AS)*, which, as defined in Sec 3, is built based on the outcomes for both tasks. There is a success when the adversary deceives the classifier for the privacy task, but the prediction for the utility task remains unchanged. This metric arises fairly naturally from the problem definition in Section 3, and is similar to attack success metrics in single-task case, such as that of Jin et al. (2020), considered the gap between the original and after-attack accuracy as the attack success, and that of Garg and Ramakrishnan (2020), where additionally the attack was considered a failure if all tokens were changed. We, on the other hand, need take into account the

<sup>6</sup><https://huggingface.co/Helsinki-NLP/opus-mt-en-fr>

<sup>7</sup><https://huggingface.co/Helsinki-NLP/opus-mt-fr-en>

<sup>8</sup><https://microsoft.github.io/presidio/>

attack success under the dual-task nature of our problem. We thus also measure the *utility retention* (UR), which is the ratio of unchanged predictions between original and adversarial texts for the utility task. Both AS and UR are computed over original samples correctly classified.

*Text quality.* As in previous works, we analyse the quality of the adversarial texts w.r.t the original ones. We measure the cosine similarity over Universal Sentence Encoder (Cer et al. 2018) embeddings, the ratio of the Levenshtein distance to the length of the sentences, Jaccard, Meteor and Bertscore (Zhang et al. 2020a) metrics, as well as the proportion of tokens matching POS tags between texts. We also assess the grammar of the texts, judged by a RoBERTa-large classifier trained on the CoLA dataset (Warstadt, Singh, and Bowman 2019) by Krishna, Wieting, and Iyyer (2020). These measurements assess both semantic similarity and orthographic similarity, and help to evaluate how close original and adversarial samples are to each other.

## 5.2 Human Evaluation

Our secondary evaluation is in the form of two human judgement tasks regarding:

1. how the sentences retain their utility by asking humans to classify the perturbed texts amongst the utility classes; and
2. how humans rate the sentences regarding grammar and fluency.

The first is similar to the human evaluation conducted by Garg and Ramakrishnan (2020), where judges had to choose the correct class label from a given set; and the second one is modelled on that of Xu et al. (2019), where judges rate the generated sentences from 1 (“Not in the form of human language”) to 5 (“Without any grammatical error”). We highlight that, unlike prior works, we have an explicit class to assess utility, and therefore we do not rely on abstract concepts such as “naturalness” (Garg and Ramakrishnan 2020), “meaning or natural sentence” (Jin et al. 2020) or asking humans to rank “semantic similarity” (Ye et al. 2022).

For (i), *utility retention*, we randomly sampled 50 original sentences from TrustPilot and TOEFL11 datasets, alongside adversarial counterparts generated by IDT, Adv. BackTrans and TextFooler, summing to 200 sentences total. We left the Shakespeare dataset out of this study because it is unlikely that a human can effectively classify a single random sentence into a Shakespeare play, even if they have read the plays. For TrustPilot, we simply ask them to rate if the review is positive or negative. Finally, for TOEFL11, they have to discern if the sentence comes from an essay talking about *cars* or *students & learning*, which are two of the possible eight topics for an essay.

We also only sampled sentences that delivered successful attacks for all algorithms. We didn’t enforce the same restriction for the second task. Instead, we sampled 20 sentences from each one of the three attacks, coupled with their original counterparts, regardless of their attack success ( $40 * 3 = 120$  sentences). We thus conducted the assignment with alongside the previous 200 sentences from task *i* (320 sentences total).

We conducted both tasks on Amazon Mechanical Turk, with instructions as given in Appendix A. Each sentence was rated by 3 annotators, and we paid them US\$0.13 per HIT. Each HIT takes 30 seconds, therefore they were paid around \$15.60/h, or roughly the Australian national minimum wage for the fiscal year 2023-24,<sup>9</sup> set at A\$23.23/h.

<sup>9</sup><https://www.fwc.gov.au/agreements-awards/minimum-wages-and-conditions/national-minimum-wage>

## 6. Results

For each dataset, we trained four models, two for privacy (one target and one auxiliary) and the other two for the utility task. Given that target and auxiliary models have their distinct training sets, which reduces the training data, we, therefore, do not aim to achieve state-of-the-art models that were trained with the whole datasets, but models strong enough to perform satisfactorily across the tasks. Table 2 reports their accuracy on the same test set. We observe a very similar classification capacity for all tasks in all datasets.

Dataset	Model	Privacy	Utility	Both
TrustPilot <sub>L</sub>	Target	.5380	.9350	.5080
	Aux.	.5260	.9380	.4970
TrustPilot <sub>G</sub>	Target	.7298	.9606	.7018
	Aux.	.7228	.9586	.6940
TrustPilot <sub>A</sub>	Target	.7862	.9578	.7532
	Aux.	.7932	.9576	.7604
TOEFL11	Target	.3767	.8405	.3195
	Aux.	.3549	.8391	.3017
Shakespeare	Target	.8520	.3797	.3280
	Aux.	.8467	.3742	.3167

Table 2: Accuracy of the target and auxiliary models on the test sets. ‘Both’ means samples were correctly classified in both tasks.

### 6.1 Attack success

Table 3 brings the results in terms of *Attack Success (AS)* and *Utility Retention (UR)*. In summary, IDT presents competitive performance across all the datasets, showing it is a versatile technique. Specifically, IDT achieves the biggest UR and AS for all flavours of the TrustPilot dataset, substantially ahead of all baselines. IDT is particularly effective for TrustPilot<sub>L</sub>, which holds the largest number of classes amongst the flavours.

IDT stands out in the Shakespeare dataset with the highest AS and a relatively high UR. It is effective in both attacking the sentences w.r.t style and retaining their utility regarding the play they belong to. The number of classes in the utility task is the biggest amongst all tasks (17). All the other baselines, but remarkably BAE, achieve smaller AS and distort the sentences to the point of losing up to a third of their utility. The extra signal to avoid modifying important tokens for the auxiliary task appears to be important to retain the classification for the utility, especially when considering a large number of classes (17 for Shakespeare).

For TOEFL11, IDT has the fourth largest AS, behind only BAE, Adv. Back-Translation and CusText, and the second biggest UR. We note here the potential advantages of back-translation: without the signal from the adversary, the AS is (a quite decent) 44.45%, but the signal improves it to 51.83%. However, keeping the stability of the translator is hard, and it is the worst performer in TrustPilot (location), mostly due to mode collapse. The extra signal from the adversary makes the training stability an extra challenge.

In terms of the principal comparator, Adv. Back-Translation, the reasons for its relatively poorer performance vary. For TrustPilot<sub>L</sub>, it has trouble retaining accurate predictions on the utility class, which is what brings down its attack success there.

Dataset	Attack	AS	UR
TrustPilot <sub>L</sub>	IDT	<b>.6166</b>	<b>1.0</b>
	Adv. Back-translation	.1003	.1338
	Back-translation	.2594	.9782
	TextFooler	.4427	.9872
	TextBugger	.5375	.9875
	BAE	.4070	.9867
	Presidio	.2236	.9868
	ZSTS	.4901	.9133
CusText	.4639	.8868	
TrustPilot <sub>G</sub>	IDT	<b>.4544</b>	<b>.9989</b>
	Adv. Back-translation	.1211	.9854
	Back-translation	.1166	.9873
	TextFooler	.3225	.9913
	TextBugger	.3113	.9932
	BAE	.3215	.9923
	Presidio	.0961	.9985
	ZSTS	.3069	.9526
CusText	.3231	.9406	
TrustPilot <sub>A</sub>	IDT	<b>.4350</b>	<b>.9946</b>
	Adv. Back-translation	.1563	.9775
	Back-translation	.1230	.9857
	TextFooler	.2818	.9930
	TextBugger	.2711	.9928
	BAE	.3415	.9872
	Presidio	.0507	<b>.9959</b>
	ZSTS	.3064	.9397
CusText	.2482	.9292	
TOEFL11	IDT	.4485	.9716
	Adv. Back-translation	<b>.5183</b>	<b>.9762</b>
	Back-translation	.4445	.9652
	TextFooler	.4293	.9525
	TextBugger	.4346	.9694
	BAE	.4807	.9542
	Presidio	.3843	.9552
	ZSTS	.4441	.6678
CusText	<b>.5739</b>	.7466	
Shakespeare	IDT	<b>.6812</b>	<b>.8531</b>
	Adv. Back-translation	.2757	.8492
	Back-translation	.2575	.6654
	TextFooler	.4626	.7149
	TextBugger	.4774	.7511
	BAE	.4256	.6551
	Presidio	0.0	.4927
	ZSTS	.0754	.3064
CusText	.1218	.3275	

Table 3: *Attack Success (AS)* and *Utility Retention (UR)* for each dataset under different attacks.

However, for the others, it has a high UR; the difficulty is in changing the texts sufficiently to obscure the sensitive attribute.

The sanitiser algorithms, namely Presidio and ZSTS, are amongst the worst performers in general. Presidio aims to modify PII tokens which may have little effect in classification tasks, whereas ZSTS has the opposite effect, by modifying rare words and thus also harming utility.

Attack	Text
-	I would certainly recommend parcel hero and use their services again
IDT	I would certainly recommend parcel <b>entertainer</b> and use their services again
TF	I would certainly <b>commended</b> parcel hero and use their services again
Adv. Back-trans	i would <b>definitely</b> recommend parcel hero and use their services again
Back-trans.	I would certainly recommend a <b>package</b> hero and use their services again.
TB	I would certainly <b>reCommend</b> parcel hero and use their services again
BAE	I would certainly <b>marry</b> parcel hero and use their services again
CusText	I would <b>yet</b> recommend parcel <b>fame</b> and use their services <b>leaving</b>
Presidio	I would certainly recommend parcel hero and use their services again
ZSTS	i would <b>simply join some deliveries not use these weapons -</b>
-	Of course , the fact will be useless when the main idea is not transported to the students .
IDT	Of course , the fact will be useless when the main idea is not <b>traced</b> to the students .
Adv. Back-trans	<b>of</b> course, the fact will be useless when the main idea is not transported to students.
Back-trans.	Of course, the fact will be useless when the main idea is not carried to the students.
TF	<b>With</b> course , the fact will be useless when the main idea is not transported to the students .
TB	<b>Del</b> course , the fact will be useless when the main idea is not transported to the students .
BAE	<b>of</b> course , the fact will be useless when the main idea is not transported to the students .
CusText	Of course <b>with</b> the <b>what</b> will be useless <b>again</b> the main idea is <b>if</b> transported <b>its</b> the students <b>for</b>
Presidio	Of course , the fact will be useless when the main idea is not transported to the students .
ZSTS	<b>of</b> course , <b>any solution</b> will be <b>reached so</b> the <b>good system</b> is not <b>visible</b> to the <b>lab</b> .
-	no more than my staying here in rome might mean to you in egypt.
IDT	no more than my staying here in rome might mean <b>up</b> you in egypt.
Adv. Back-trans.	no more than my <b>stay</b> here in rome might mean to you in egypt.
Back-trans.	No more than my <b>stay</b> here in Rome could mean for you in Egypt.
TF	no more than my staying here in rome might <b>intentioned</b> to you in egypt.
TB	no more than my staying here in rome might <b>meaning</b> to you in egypt.
BAE	no more than my staying here in rome might <b>render</b> to you in egypt.
CusText	<b>nor</b> more <b>less something</b> staying <b>close on</b> rome might <b>exactly</b> to you in egypt.
Presidio	no more than my staying here in rome might mean to you in egypt.
ZSTS	no more <b>everything you living</b> here in <b>greece must</b> mean <b>having study</b> in <b>fact</b> .

Table 4: Examples of adversarial sentences generated by the attacks. The top samples come from TrustPilot dataset; the middle ones are from TOEFL11 and the bottom one are Shakespeare sentences.

IDT also outperforms the TextAttack algorithms (TextFooler, TextBugger and BAE) across all datasets. These baselines show more stable behaviour compared to back-translation and sanitisers, but they still miss the utility task explicit signal, which makes a difference for IDT.

Details on number of successful attacks are in Appendix F.

## 6.2 Quality of adversarial texts

We show adversarial examples generated by the attacks on Table 4, alongside their labels.

For TrustPilot, we note that all attacks chose the same word to be replaced, again with the exception of CusText. For Shakespeare, all TextAttack algorithms picked the same word to attack.

For the TOEFL11, the original sentence, written by a Chinese learner, was modified in ways to deceive the target model to classify it as written either by a French or an Arabic speaker. The topic, “if it is more important for students to understand ideas and concepts than it is for them to learn facts”, shortened in the table as “Students & learning”, was kept. In addition, all attacks chose the same word to change for the Shakespeare sentences except IDT, which found a different one, and CusText, which heavily modified the sentence.

Dataset	Attack	Matching POS tags	Grammar correct	Cosine sim.	Levenshtein ratio	Changed words	Jaccard sim.	Meteor	BertScore F1	BLEU	RougeL
TrustPilot <sub>L</sub>	IDT	1.0	.7222	.2341	.9614	.0570	.8945	.9440	.9756	.9189	.9439
	Adv. Back-trans.	0.0	.0019	.0219	.1803	10.42	.0049	.0135	.7133	0.0	.0034
	Back-trans.	.0237	.7782	.2276	.8591	.7056	.6039	.8143	.9600	.4779	.7952
	TextFooler	.5776	.6794	.2289	.9402	.0823	.8466	.9232	.9757	.8716	.9193
	TextBugger	.6575	.8200	.2372	.9827	.0989	.8896	.9483	.9742	.9066	.9388
	BAE	.6460	.7566	.2319	.9490	.0706	.8632	.9332	.9804	.8887	.9292
	CusText	.0030	.0251	.2023	.7800	.5147	.4866	.6079	.9092	.3654	.6301
	Presidio	0.0	.8157	.2479	.9567	.0331	.9387	.9615	.9745	.9208	.9547
	ZSTS	.0078	.1968	.1798	.6507	.7486	.2943	.5255	.8789	.3285	.5413
TrustPilot <sub>C</sub>	IDT	1.0	.7039	.2516	.9592	.0549	.8952	.9450	.9795	.9135	.9447
	Adv. Back-trans.	.0351	.8694	.2515	.8644	.6611	.6121	.8307	.9665	.5122	.8317
	Back-trans.	.0343	.7974	.2502	.8499	.7033	.6256	.8019	.9624	.5409	.7835
	TextFooler	.5854	.6778	.2532	.9395	.0843	.8424	.0702	.0195	.8745	.9168
	TextBugger	.4351	.7650	.2615	.9689	.1470	.8446	.9262	.9692	.8716	.9145
	BAE	.5850	.7580	.2555	.9483	.0766	.8556	.9293	.9811	.8721	.9269
	CusText	.0109	.0350	.2322	.7982	.4836	.5194	.6470	.9116	.4001	.6627
	Presidio	.0014	.8809	.2593	.9569	.1107	.9309	.9598	.9768	.9110	.9595
	ZSTS	.0017	.1783	.1930	.6341	.7646	.2613	.5241	.8755	.2442	.5408
TrustPilot <sub>A</sub>	IDT	1.0	.6787	.1914	.9378	.0930	.8461	.8999	.9726	.9158	.9098
	Adv. Back-trans.	.0514	.8776	.2225	.8473	.6671	.5983	.7994	.9647	.4586	.8148
	Back-trans.	.0438	.8043	.2227	.8377	.7932	.6077	.7809	.9600	.4912	.7680
	TextFooler	.5234	.6308	.2233	.9180	.1111	.8009	.8934	.9698	.8609	.8907
	TextBugger	.3411	.7357	.2388	.9583	.2092	.8089	.9048	.9635	.8528	.8930
	BAE	.5439	.7396	.2208	.9284	.1014	.8214	.8982	.9754	.8754	.9012
	CusText	.0227	.0417	.2076	.7949	.5137	.5180	.6403	.0268	.3995	.6602
	Presidio	.0010	.8864	.2565	.9530	.1261	.9295	.9575	.9760	.9143	.9554
	ZSTS	.0063	.2049	.1750	.6304	.7907	.2578	.5147	.8749	.2576	.5338
TOEFL11	IDT	1.0	.4756	.1028	.9467	.0755	.8739	.9310	.9731	.8532	.9257
	Adv. Back-trans.	.0755	.8652	.1055	.8835	.6396	.5013	.8404	.9585	.5554	.8130
	Back-trans.	.0600	.8452	.1043	.8514	.6711	.4882	.7916	.9509	.4961	.7511
	TextFooler	.7839	.4565	.1053	.9438	.0801	.8582	.9349	.9792	.8582	.9201
	TextBugger	.5237	.5535	.1066	.9758	.1026	.8717	.9427	.9735	.8756	.9218
	BAE	.8565	.5898	.1049	.9557	.0722	.8733	.9473	.9860	.8778	.9373
	CusText	.0021	.0081	.0877	.7340	.5934	.4298	.5434	.8868	.2327	.5651
	Presidio	.0037	.6455	.0899	.9184	.1609	.8871	.9276	.9623	.8113	.9332
	ZSTS	.0443	.3513	.0924	.6781	.5670	.3959	.5734	.9031	.2934	.5775
Shakespeare	IDT	1.0	.4188	.0948	.8822	.1872	.7015	.7846	.9505	.7579	.8160
	Adv. Back-trans.	.1130	.7470	.0968	.8928	.5535	.6514	.7961	.9642	.6804	.8136
	Back-trans.	.1087	.7484	.0911	.7727	.8460	.3816	.7001	.9402	.3710	.6773
	TextFooler	.5656	.3744	.0888	.8534	.2069	.6750	.7769	.9496	.7032	.7992
	TextBugger	.5505	.6221	.0964	.9422	.1747	.7530	.8599	.9606	.7869	.8524
	BAE	.5505	.5589	.0880	.8263	.2408	.6343	.7241	.9427	.6879	.7615
	CusText	.0689	.0923	.0827	.7789	.4094	.4911	.5807	.9210	.3832	.6479
	Presidio	0.0	.7536	.1365	.8649	.0993	.8239	.9103	.9516	.7925	.9068
	ZSTS	.0975	.3963	.0832	.6046	.7512	.2194	.4782	.8762	.2294	.4724

Table 5: Quality measurements of adversarial texts against the original ones.

Table 5 shows different quality measurements for the generated sentences. The key takeaway is that the text quality of IDT is generally good — that is, the rewritten sentences were close to the original — and comparable to the (single-task) adversarial attacks. In general, adversarial texts generated by TextBugger present the best results. However, this algorithm had the poorest performance amongst all attacks, which is an indication that its changes were too subtle. This is corroborated by our grammar checker which deems TextBugger texts as the most correct in general — and TextFooler produces the smallest number of correct texts for all datasets. IDT holds the highest Jaccard similarity (which also correlates well with the percentage of perturbed words) between adversarial and original texts in four out of the five datasets, on top of also being the attack with the highest AS in four datasets.

We notice that the adversarial training of Xu et al. (2019) is heavily inspired on Generative Adversarial Networks (Goodfellow et al. 2014), which commonly face instability training issues. While training our Adv. Back-Translator, we have encountered

mode collapse, as well as memory issues while training, since two neural networks must be held in memory. We found particularly challenging finding a balance in some cases, as in TrustPilot (location), for which mode collapse produced the poorest quality metrics.

We also observe how far the reformulations of CusText, as an example of text sanitisation, are from the other algorithms. Despite using a reasonable large  $\epsilon = 10$ , very few adversarial sentences match their POS tags with their original counterparts, possibly a consequence of the large percentage of perturbed words. CusText is also the the worst performer in terms of AS success, mainly driven by its lower utility retention.

We also notice the importance of the constraint of ensuring the same POS tags between original and adversarial tokens. The baselines, which do not enforce this strict constraint, generate around half of the texts with different part-of-speech. The cosine similarity, a commonly used constraint by the baselines, is not enough to prevent mismatching POS tags.

### 6.3 Ablation and further studies

*Different target model.* We study how transferable IDT and TextAttack baselines are when the auxiliary models have a distinct architecture from the target model. The target is a distilled GPT2, whilst the auxiliaries are distilled RoBERTa. We also report the differences between the **AS** and the **UR** reported in Table 3 in Table 6.

IDT is the clear winner when transferability is taken into account, and the baselines are much more reliant on the architecture to find words to substitute. IDT achieves the highest AS in all datasets but TrustPilot<sub>G</sub>, which is ranks second by a tiny margin of 0.15% behind BAE.

Dataset	Attack	AS	Diff.	UR	Diff.
TrustPilot <sub>L</sub>	IDT	<b>.3947</b>	-.2219	<b>1.0</b>	.0000
	TextFooler	.3608	-.0819	.9877	.0005
	TextBugger	.3663	-0.1712	.9969	.0094
	BAE	.3023	-0.1047	.9941	.0074
TrustPilot <sub>G</sub>	IDT	.2623	-.1921	<b>1.0</b>	.0011
	TextFooler	.2415	-.0810	.9927	.0014
	TextBugger	.2076	-.1037	.9941	.0009
	BAE	<b>.2638</b>	-.0577	.9915	-.0008
TrustPilot <sub>A</sub>	IDT	<b>.3758</b>	-.0592	<b>.9957</b>	.0011
	TextFooler	.2844	.0026	.9930	.0000
	TextBugger	.2737	.0026	.9928	.0000
	BAE	.3510	.0095	.9892	.0020
TOEFL11	IDT	<b>.4210</b>	-.0275	<b>.9845</b>	.0129
	TextFooler	.3589	-.0704	.9549	.0024
	TextBugger	.3702	-.0644	.9691	-.0003
	BAE	.3843	-.0964	.9559	.0017
Shakespeare	IDT	<b>.4022</b>	-.2790	<b>.7873</b>	-.0658
	TextFooler	.3519	-.1107	.7111	-.0038
	TextBugger	.3245	-.1529	.7327	-.0184
	BAE	.3539	-.0717	.6234	-.0317

Table 6: **AS** and **UR** for target and auxiliary models with **different architectures**, alongside their differences to the setting reported in Table 3.

*Relaxing constraints.* We examined relaxing the constraint of forcing adversarial texts to have the same POS tags for every token in the original text. More specifically, we re-design IDT to allow nouns to be swapped by verbs and vice-versa, as in the TextAttack implementation of TextFooler and BAE. As in TextAttack, we also use the ‘universal’



tagset of NLTK library (Bird and Loper 2004) to compute the POS tags. Table 7 shows the results.

Except for TOEFL11, relaxing the constraints helps the AS for all datasets. For Shakespeare, it is particularly helpful to make the AS above 70%, the highest results across all our experiments.

*Ignoring important tokens for utility.* We modify IDT to ignore all words for the utility task, to make the attack behaviour akin to the attacks from the literature. Then, we measure the effects of utility retention and the predictions for the privacy tasks. Results are shown in Table 7.

We see that such relaxation yields a negative impact for all datasets in terms of AS. The sharpest decrease happens for Shakespeare sentences.

Dataset	Attack	AS	Diff.	UR	Diff.
TrustPilot <sub>L</sub>	IDT <sub>s</sub>	.5966	-.0200	1.0	.0000
	IDT <sub>u</sub>	.6067	-.0099	1.0	.0000
TrustPilot <sub>G</sub>	IDT <sub>s</sub>	.4409	.0135	.9978	-.0011
	IDT <sub>u</sub>	.4305	-.0239	.9957	-.0032
TrustPilot <sub>A</sub>	IDT <sub>s</sub>	.4650	.0300	.9986	.0040
	IDT <sub>u</sub>	.4304	-.0046	.9933	-.0013
TOEFL11	IDT <sub>s</sub>	.4293	-.0192	.9662	-.0054
	IDT <sub>u</sub>	.4342	-.0143	.9578	.0036
Shakespeare	IDT <sub>s</sub>	.7177	.0365	.8742	.0211
	IDT <sub>u</sub>	.5476	-.1336	.7574	-.0957

Table 7: **AS** and **UR** for IDT under different constraints, alongside their differences to the setting reported in Table 3. **IDT<sub>s</sub>** means verbs can be swapped by nouns and vice-versa, and **IDT<sub>u</sub>** ignores the utility task to sample replacement words.

Measure	Value	Measure	Value
Matching POS tags	.0208	Grammar correct	.8750
Cosine sim.	.1219	Levenshtein ratio	.5569
% Perturbed words	.9330	Jaccard sim.	.1405
Meteor	.3201	BERTScore F1	.9065
BLEU	.0602	RougeL	.3964

Table 8: Measurements on the adversarial sentences generated by ChatGPT.

*ChatGPT reformulations.* We selected the intersection of successfully attacked Shakespeare sentences by all attacks and asked ChatGPT to rewrite them. Specifically, our prompt is:

*“Given the following text, rewrite it in a way that makes it different from <old/modern> style, but keep it in the style of a <play name> play.”*

We then measured the effect of the reformulations on the predictions by the target models. Individually, regarding the privacy attribute style, ChatGPT deceived the victim 34 times. For the utility, play, the predictions are preserved also 34 times, but not for the same sentences. Overall, ChatGPT deceives the classification w.r.t. the style while keeping the predictions for the play in 24 out of 48 instances.

Considering that these are sentences that all algorithms successfully attacked, ChatGPT’s performance of 50% can be deemed low, which reinforces the need for fine tuning if using the model for more complex tasks like dual task attacks.

Original	Adversarial
god bless you, bottom, god bless you.	Hark, may divine favor grace thee, Bottom, may divine favor grace thee!
no more than my staying here in rome might mean to you in egypt.	No more than my sojourn in Rome might signify to thee in Egypt.
what do you mean, do i think so?	What signify you? Do I hold such a belief?
her name is portia.	Her appellation doth resonate as Portia.
do you intend to walk outside?	Dost thou purpose to traverse the open precincts?

Table 9: Examples of ChatGPT reformulations.

Qualitatively, its adversarial sentences are poorer than all other attacks according to the measurements from Table 8. ChatGPT is a generative model, and signals to enforce constraints on its output have to be fed in the prompt, which is not always reliable. In addition, ChatGPT is verbose and may produce texts longer than the inputs, which makes the percentage of perturbed words above 100%, and matching POS tags near zero. These become clear to understand from Table 9, where we show a few sentences rewritten by the model.

#### 6.4 Human evaluation results

We report the human evaluation regarding utility retention and grammaticality and fluency judgements. In this, we just compare our model IDT with the principal baseline, adversarial backtranslation, and the TextFooler adversarial attack that is at the base of IDT.

*Utility evaluation.* We asked annotators to classify the sentences with respect the utility task. For TOEFL11, it means judging whether the sentence talks about “cars” or “students & learning”, and for TrustPilot it means rating it as a “good” or “bad” review. We report the accuracy of the annotators in Table 10.

Dataset	Utility accuracy (%)			
	Original	TextFooler	Adv. BackTrans.	IDT
TOEFL11	93.33	94.66	94.66	95.33
TrustPilot	100.0	96.90	92.13	96.11

Table 10: Human evaluation results for topic (TOEFL11) and sentiment (TrustPilot) classification.

In general, humans can discern with ease the class of the sentences for all algorithms. Numerically, though, IDT achieves the highest utility accuracy score for the TOEFL11 dataset, with a score of 95.33%. This surpasses even the original sentences (93.33%) and other transformation methods like TextFooler and Adv. BackTrans. (both at 94.66%).

*Grammar and fluency.* The second assignment asked annotators to judge the sentences with respect to their grammar and fluency. Their judgements are summarised in Table 11.

For all algorithms, as well as the original sentences, across both datasets, scores are mostly between 3 and 4 in our 1-5 Likert scale, with a couple above 4 (higher scores being better). A score of 3 indicates basically fluent and understandable, and a score of 4 that there are only one or two minor errors.

Dataset	Grammar and fluency (1-5)			
	Original	TextFooler	Adv. BackTrans.	IDT
TOEFL11	3.91	3.59	3.98	3.36
TrustPilot	4.16	3.84	4.26	3.80

Table 11: Human evaluation results for grammar and fluency. The closer to 5, the better quality the sentences hold according to the annotators.

We notice that all algorithms achieve better grades in TrustPilot than TOEFL11. This is explained by the fact that TOEFL11 sentences are written by learners of English and taken from long essays. Therefore are more prone to contains errors than TrustPilot reviews, although the original sentences here also score quite below 5 (free of grammatical errors) as these are often quickly written product reviews that have not been proofread. In terms of methods, the adversarial backtranslator clearly produces the most fluent texts. Interestingly, in fact, the adversarial backtranslator achieves better scores than the original sentences in both datasets perhaps because, as a generative model, it is fixing spelling mistakes by learners. This doesn't happen with the other methods, which are token-based replacements. And although outperformed on this property by the adversarial backtranslator, the IDT scores still indicate an acceptable degree of fluency.

## 7. Conclusions

Inference of the private attributes of writers, such as age or native language, are detectable with increasing ease by machine learning models in scenarios where text is made public, such as product reviews or social media forums. In this paper, we have proposed a method based on adversarial attacks for rewriting text to prevent detection of such private attributes, while maintaining the utility with respect to some primary task (e.g. sentiment classification).

We have shown that most existing privacy-protecting methods that rewrite text, such as text sanitisation, do not already solve this specific problem. We have further shown that IDT performs the best against several baselines, including generative models with the same goal, in terms of ability to preserve privacy while maintaining utility; and it manages to keep texts fairly similar to the original while doing so. This makes it a strong baseline for future work on a task that we consider quite important.

There are several directions for future work. IDT, or approaches similar to it, could be improved by starting from a different adversarial attack, using different constraints, applying different methods for identifying words to be changed, and so on. One particular aspect that could be a focus of improvement is in human-judged fluency, where the generative baseline, adversarial backtranslation, was clearly superior; while this was not so important in the kinds of scenarios considered in our work, it would be in scenarios where human inspection of the text is a factor. Generative methods that can avoid problems like mode collapse are thus also an important future direction.

### A. Appendix A: Annotation Guidelines

*Utility retention.* What is this sentence talking about?

«Sentence»

- Students & Learning.

- Cars.

*Grammar and fluency.* Please judge the text according to its grammar and fluency.

1. Not in the form of human language.
2. Can not understand what is the meaning, but is still in the form of human language.
3. Basically fluent and has three or more minor grammatical errors or one serious grammatical error that does not have strong impact on understanding.
4. Fluent and has one or two minor grammatical error that does not affect understanding.
5. Without any grammatical error.

## B. Appendix B: Data splits

We split each dataset into target and auxiliary model data as shown in Table 1. TOEFL11<sub>S</sub> refers to the TOEFL11 experiments described in the main body of this paper, and TOEFL11<sub>C</sub> is about the extra experiments from Appendix D

Dataset	Train	Valid.	Test	Train	Valid.
TrustPilot <sub>L</sub>	5,960	663	1,000	5,959	663
TrustPilot <sub>G</sub>	100,000	1,000	5,000	100,000	1,000
TrustPilot <sub>A</sub>	85,745	1,000	5,000	85,745	1,000
TOEFL11 <sub>S</sub>	72,301	16,146	15,951	65,070	7,231
TOEFL11 <sub>C</sub>	14,214	3,182	3,105	12,793	1,422
Shakespeare	23,491	2,611	4,000	23,491	2,611

Table 1: Data splits for target (left) and auxiliary models (right). TrustPilot<sub>L, G, A</sub> refer to Location, Gender and Age views of this dataset.

## C. Appendix C: Implementing the Adversarial Back-Translation baseline

We reimplemented the back-translation with adversarial training proposed by Xu et al. (2019) in 2019, with a few changes since more powerful architectures have been developed since then.

Their framework involves three steps: (i) using two translators (English to French, followed by French to English) to turn the datasets labelled with sensitive attributes into parallel corpus; (ii) train a classifier and a back-translator in an adversarial fashion using the parallel corpus from the step before; (iii) use the back-translator to generate adversarial sentences.

In their study, Xu et al. (2019) trained a translator for step (i) using the Europarl v7 dataset from Koehn (2005). The authors reported a BLEU score of 36.24%. We used the English to French and French to English models provided by Tiedemann and Thottingal (2020) to translate the texts from our datasets. As explained in Section 5, we used two MarianMT pretrained models (Tiedemann and Thottingal 2020) to generate the parallel corpus.

For step (ii), the authors trained the Transformer from Vaswani et al. (2017). We instead fine tuned a pretrained BART (Lewis et al. 2020). For the first 10 epochs we only trained the adversary classifier (a BART classification head). Then, for the next 10 epochs, we only fine-tuned the translator. Finally, we trained both for 14 epochs. Our learning rate was set to 1e-5, batch size of 32 (except for Toefl, for which we used 16) and Adam optimiser for both translator and adversary. Xu et al. (2019) reported they used the mean

of the hidden representations of the Transformer as input to the classifier. We found more useful to take the last hidden state of BART.

#### D. Appendix D: Experiments with longer texts

Since the TOEFL11 dataset contains longer essays than the maximum input size of base Transformer models (usually 512 or 1024), we organised an extra set of experiments for which we split the texts into chunks of 5 sentences. Hereafter, we call this view of the TOEFL11 as TOEFL11<sub>C</sub>, while the other one, described in the main body of the paper, we refer now as TOEFL11<sub>S</sub>. Accuracy of the target and auxiliary models on the test sets are depicted in Table 2.

IDT appears to have more difficulty in dealing with the longer texts from TOEFL11<sub>C</sub>, made of chunks of sentences, than the single sentences of TOEFL11<sub>S</sub>. This phenomenon is also observed for all baselines.

Dataset	Model	Privacy	Utility	Both
TOEFL11 <sub>C</sub>	Target	.5574	.9742	.5443
	Aux.	.5539	.9784	.5407

Table 2: Accuracy of the target and auxiliary models on the test sets of TOEFL11<sub>C</sub>. ‘Both’ means samples were correctly classified in both tasks.

Figure 1 shows the Attack Success rates when target and auxiliary models have the same (blue) and distinct (pink) architectures. Under the first setting, IDT is outperformed by TextFooler and TextBugger, but it stays ahead of BAE. However, IDT achieves the biggest AS when architectures differ, showing stronger transferability.




Figure 1: Attack Success rates against TOEFL11<sub>C</sub>.

Regarding the quality of the adversarial texts, Table 3 shows that IDT performs better in qualitative terms: it keeps the largest Jaccard similarity, and now it also has the least percentage of perturbed words and biggest Meteor, surpassing BAE from Table 5.

#### E. Appendix E: Further CusText evaluation

We conducted an experiment with CusText algorithm to create a reformulated text based on differential privacy noise. The method, proposed by [Chen et al. \(2023\)](#), is a text

Dataset	Attack	Matching POS tags	Grammar correct	Cosine sim.	Levenshtein ratio	% Perturbed words	Jaccard sim.	Meteor	BERTScore F1
TOEFL11 <sub>C</sub>	IDT	1.0	.4587	.2562	.9808	.0261	.9477	.9741	.9857
	TextFooler	.5849	.4174	.2595	.9724	.0348	.9145	.9688	.9864
	TextBugger	.3977	.4981	.2598	.9891	.0988	.9249	.9733	.9821
	BAE	.6320	.4528	.2614	.9745	.0375	.9137	.9696	.9882

Table 3: Measurements on the quality of adversarial texts against the original ones from TOEFL11<sub>C</sub>.

sanitisation technique, with resemblance to others such as DP-VAE (Weggenmann et al. 2022) or ADePT (Krishna, Gupta, and Dupuy 2021). We choose CusText because it is publicly available<sup>10</sup>. DP-VAE lacks available code. The same happens with ADePT, with the addition that its privacy guarantees were later shown to be miscalculated (Habernal 2021).

CusText replaces tokens to another tokens according to their semantic relevance. The sampling function does not have access to the original similarity scores between original and adversarial tokens. Instead, the scores receive calibrated noise from the exponential mechanism. The strength of the noise is controlled by a parameter  $\epsilon$ : bigger values for  $\epsilon$  mean less noise, and thus the list of candidate tokens tends to be closer to their actual similarities.

We obfuscated the test set of the Shakespeare dataset with different  $\epsilon$  values and report how the attack performs in Table 4 alongside quality measurements. We evaluate CusText under adversarial attack framework, which is a bit different than the scenario for which this algorithm was designed. CusText was evaluated for text sanitisation, where an obfuscated text should deliver similar results for some task, while using different tokens from the original task. Privacy was assessed not for a downstream classification task, but from unlabelled tasks, such as masked token inference, where an adversary uses a pre-trained BERT model to infer the original tokens since the model is trained with masked language modelling.

CusText generates more adversarial sentences than any attack, but they are in general of poor quality. It is clear that in terms of attack, less noise (bigger  $\epsilon$ ) leads to a weaker attack, but since the sentences are closer to the original ones, similarity measurements are larger. However, both AS and UR are too low when compared to the other attacks, despite the big percentage of perturbed words.

$\epsilon$	AS	UR	Matching POS tags	Grammar correct	Cosine sim.	Levenshtein ratio	% Perturbed words	Jaccard sim.	Meteor	BERTScore F1	# Adv. sentences
0.5	.1089	.2539	.0214	.0379	.0693	.5998	.6802	.1631	.2311	.8770	3,828
1	.1112	.2564	.0251	.0390	.0703	.6022	.6728	.2208	.2376	.8778	3,822
3	.1058	.2549	.0318	.0450	.0716	.6232	.6358	.2487	.2742	.8821	3,801
5	.1134	.2812	.0366	.0515	.0753	.6588	.5700	.3013	.3416	.8900	3,766
10	.1218	.3275	.0689	.0923	.0827	.7789	.3663	.4911	.5807	.9210	3,456

Table 4: AS and UR for Shakespeare sentences rewritten by CusText, alongside quality measurements.

<sup>10</sup><https://github.com/sai4july/CusText>

Original	Reformulation	$\epsilon$
god bless you, bottom, god bless you.	holy bless you, bottom, truth gods you.	0.5
	god pray you, bottom, god bless you.	10
no more than my staying here in rome might mean to you in egypt.	reasons most less mind happy where same paris anything without this why part egypt.	0.5
	nor more less something staying close on rome might exactly to you in egypt.	10
what do you mean, do i think so?	perhaps indeed we mean, way else anything so?	0.5
	what do else mean, do i thought so?	10
her name is portia	her reign only portia	0.5
	her name is portia.	10
do you intend to walk outside?	believe really deny for running outside?	0.5
	anything me punish to walk outside?	10

Table 5: Examples of CusText reformulations.

We show some examples of reformulations in Table 5. It is clear that with a strong amount of noise the sentences can become very different from the original, whereas small amounts of noise may be ineffective to produce any change at all.

#### F. Appendix F: Number of adversarial texts generated by method

The IDT has a tight constraint of ensuring equal POS tags between all adversarial and original tokens. It also finds the words to replace based on their importance regarding two tasks, opposed to one as is the case for the baselines. All of these limit the amount of candidate adversarial sentences IDT can find. We report the total number of adversarial samples generated by each algorithm in Table 6.

IDT finds the smallest amount of adversarial sentences across all datasets. The difference to the other algorithms can be smaller, as is the case for TOEFL11<sub>S</sub>, or bigger, as for TOEFL11<sub>C</sub> and TrustPilot<sub>A</sub>.

CusText consistently is the attack which generates the largest amount of adversarial texts. Interestingly, this two algorithms are in opposite sides when evaluating the effectiveness of their attacks: CusText is in general the poorest performer, and IDT is the strongest.

#### Acknowledgements

This project was undertaken with the assistance of resources and services from the National Computational Infrastructure (NCI), supported by the Australian Government. This project was also supported by the International Macquarie University Research Excellence Scholarship.

The human evaluation section of this study has received ethics approval from Macquarie University (Human Ethics Comm. Approval Code: 5201800393).

Dataset	Attack	# Adversarial sentences
TrustPilot <sub>L</sub>	IDT	180
	Adv. Back-trans.	508
	Back-trans.	505
	TextFooler	393
	TextBugger	400
	BAE	226
	CusText	998
	Presidio	76
TrustPilot <sub>G</sub>	ZSTS	508
	IDT	922
	Adv. Back-trans.	3,501
	Back-trans.	3,490
	TextFooler	3,116
	TextBugger	2,958
	BAE	1,959
	CusText	4,968
TrustPilot <sub>A</sub>	Presidio	697
	ZSTS	3,501
	IDT	747
	Adv. Back-trans.	3,735
	Back-trans.	3,715
	TextFooler	3,456
	TextBugger	3,072
	BAE	2,120
TOEFL11 <sub>S</sub>	CusText	4,887
	Presidio	986
	ZSTS	3,766
	IDT	2,149
	Adv. Back-trans.	5,097
	Back-trans.	5,097
	TextFooler	3,286
	TextBugger	3,212
TOEFL11 <sub>C</sub>	BAE	2,752
	CusText	15,942
	Presidio	268
	ZSTS	5,097
Shakespeare	IDT	375
	TextFooler	1,301
	TextBugger	1,295
	BAE	1,155
	IDT	320
	Adv. Back-trans.	1,008
	Back-trans.	1,324
	TextFooler	884
TextBugger	643	
Shakespeare	BAE	841
	CusText	3,456
	Presidio	69
	ZSTS	1,312

Table 6: Number of adversarial sentences each algorithm could generate from the set of correctly classified original sentences by the target models.

## References

- Abadi, Martin, Andy Chu, Ian Goodfellow, H. Brendan McMahan, Ilya Mironov, Kunal Talwar, and Li Zhang. 2016. Deep learning with differential privacy. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS '16*, pages 308–318, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA.
- Albanese, Federico, Daniel Ciolek, and Nicolas D’Ippolito. 2023. Text sanitization beyond specific domains: Zero-shot redaction & substitution with large language models.



- Bird, Steven and Edward Loper. 2004. NLTK: The natural language toolkit. In *Proceedings of the ACL Interactive Poster and Demonstration Sessions*, pages 214–217, Association for Computational Linguistics, Barcelona, Spain.
- Blanchard, Daniel, Joel Tetreault, Derrick Higgins, Aoife Cahill, and Martin Chodorow. 2013. Toefl11: A corpus of non-native english. *ETS Research Report Series*, 2013(2):i–15.
- Cer, Daniel, Yinfei Yang, Sheng-yi Kong, Nan Hua, Nicole Limtiaco, Rhomni St. John, Noah Constant, Mario Guajardo-Cespedes, Steve Yuan, Chris Tar, Brian Strope, and Ray Kurzweil. 2018. Universal sentence encoder for English. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 169–174, Association for Computational Linguistics, Brussels, Belgium.
- Chen, Sai, Fengran Mo, Yanhao Wang, Cen Chen, Jian-Yun Nie, Chengyu Wang, and Jamie Cui. 2023. A customized text sanitization mechanism with differential privacy. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 5747–5758, Association for Computational Linguistics, Toronto, Canada.
- Coavoux, Maximin, Shashi Narayan, and Shay B. Cohen. 2018. Privacy-preserving neural representations of text. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1–10, Association for Computational Linguistics, Brussels, Belgium.
- Dyrmishi, Salijona, Salah Ghamizi, and Maxime Cordy. 2023. How do humans perceive adversarial text? a reality check on the validity and naturalness of word-based adversarial attacks. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 8822–8836, Association for Computational Linguistics, Toronto, Canada.
- Fernandes, Natasha, Mark Dras, and Annabelle McIver. 2019. Generalised differential privacy for text document processing. In *Principles of Security and Trust*, pages 123–148, Springer International Publishing, Cham.
- Garg, Siddhant and Goutham Ramakrishnan. 2020. BAE: BERT-based adversarial examples for text classification. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 6174–6181, Association for Computational Linguistics, Online.
- Goodfellow, Ian, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. 2014. Generative adversarial nets. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 27, Curran Associates, Inc.
- Habernal, Ivan. 2021. When differential privacy meets NLP: The devil is in the detail. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1522–1528, Association for Computational Linguistics, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic.
- He, Xuanli, Lingjuan Lyu, Chen Chen, and Qiongkai Xu. 2022. Extracted BERT model leaks more information than you think! In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1530–1537, Association for Computational Linguistics, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates.
- He, Xuanli, Lingjuan Lyu, Lichao Sun, and Qiongkai Xu. 2021. Model extraction and adversarial transferability, your BERT is vulnerable! In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2006–2012, Association for Computational Linguistics, Online.
- Hovy, Dirk, Anders Johannsen, and Anders Søgaard. 2015. User review sites as a resource for large-scale sociolinguistic studies. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on World Wide Web, WWW '15*, page 452–461, International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee, Republic and Canton of Geneva, CHE.
- Huijben, I. M., W. Kool, M. B. Paulus, and R. G. van Sloun. 2023. A review of the gumbel-max trick and its extensions for discrete stochasticity in machine learning. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis & Machine Intelligence*, 45(02):1353–1371.
- Igamberdiev, Timour, Thomas Arnold, and Ivan Habernal. 2022. DP-rewrite: Towards reproducibility and transparency in differentially private text rewriting. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 2927–2933, International Committee on Computational Linguistics, Gyeongju, Republic of Korea.
- Igamberdiev, Timour and Ivan Habernal. 2023. DP-BART for privatized text rewriting under local differential privacy. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 13914–13934, Association for Computational Linguistics, Toronto, Canada.
- Jin, Di, Zhijing Jin, Joey Tianyi Zhou, and Peter Szolovits. 2020. Is bert really robust? a strong baseline for natural language attack on text classification and entailment. *Proceedings of the*

- AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, 34(05):8018–8025.
- Kerrigan, Gavin, Dylan Slack, and Jens Tuyls. 2020. Differentially private language models benefit from public pre-training. In *Proceedings of the Second Workshop on Privacy in NLP*, pages 39–45, Association for Computational Linguistics, Online.
- Klymenko, Oleksandra, Stephen Meisenbacher, and Florian Matthes. 2022. Differential privacy in natural language processing the story so far. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Workshop on Privacy in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1–11, Association for Computational Linguistics, Seattle, United States.
- Koehn, Philipp. 2005. Europarl: A parallel corpus for statistical machine translation. In *Proceedings of Machine Translation Summit X: Papers*, pages 79–86, Phuket, Thailand.
- Kokhlikyan, Narine, Vivek Miglani, Miguel Martin, Edward Wang, Bilal Alsallakh, Jonathan Reynolds, Alexander Melnikov, Natalia Kliushkina, Carlos Araya, Siqi Yan, and Orion Reblitz-Richardson. 2020. Captum: A unified and generic model interpretability library for pytorch. *CoRR*, abs/2009.07896.
- Krishna, Kalpesh, John Wieting, and Mohit Iyyer. 2020. Reformulating unsupervised style transfer as paraphrase generation. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 737–762, Association for Computational Linguistics, Online.
- Krishna, Satyapriya, Rahul Gupta, and Christophe Dupuy. 2021. ADePT: Auto-encoder based differentially private text transformation. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 2435–2439, Association for Computational Linguistics, Online.
- Lewis, Mike, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. BART: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7871–7880, Association for Computational Linguistics, Online.
- Li, Jinfeng, Shouling Ji, Tianyu Du, Bo Li, and Ting Wang. 2019. Textbugger: Generating adversarial text against real-world applications. In *26th Annual Network and Distributed System Security Symposium, NDSS 2019, San Diego, California, USA, February 24-27, 2019*, The Internet Society.
- Li, Yitong, Timothy Baldwin, and Trevor Cohn. 2018. Towards robust and privacy-preserving text representations. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 25–30, Association for Computational Linguistics, Melbourne, Australia.
- Liu, Yinhan, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. Roberta: A robustly optimized BERT pretraining approach. *CoRR*, abs/1907.11692.
- Lui, Marco and Timothy Baldwin. 2012. langid.py: An off-the-shelf language identification tool. In *Proceedings of the ACL 2012 System Demonstrations*, pages 25–30, Association for Computational Linguistics, Jeju Island, Korea.
- Meehan, Casey, Khalil Mrini, and Kamalika Chaudhuri. 2022. Sentence-level privacy for document embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3367–3380, Association for Computational Linguistics, Dublin, Ireland.
- Morris, John, Eli Lifland, Jin Yong Yoo, Jake Grigsby, Di Jin, and Yanjun Qi. 2020. TextAttack: A framework for adversarial attacks, data augmentation, and adversarial training in NLP. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 119–126, Association for Computational Linguistics, Online.
- Mudrakarta, Pramod Kaushik, Ankur Taly, Mukund Sundararajan, and Kedar Dhamdhere. 2018. Did the model understand the question? In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1896–1906, Association for Computational Linguistics, Melbourne, Australia.
- Pennington, Jeffrey, Richard Socher, and Christopher Manning. 2014. GloVe: Global vectors for word representation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1532–1543, Association for Computational Linguistics, Doha, Qatar.
- Plant, Richard, Dimitra Gkatzia, and Valerio Giuffrida. 2021. CAPE: Context-aware private embeddings for private language learning. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical*

- Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 7970–7978, Association for Computational Linguistics, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic.
- Ponomareva, Natalia, Jasmijn Bastings, and Sergei Vassilvitskii. 2022. Training text-to-text transformers with privacy guarantees. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*, pages 2182–2193, Association for Computational Linguistics, Dublin, Ireland.
- Prabhumoye, Shrimai, Yulia Tsvetkov, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Alan W Black. 2018. Style transfer through back-translation. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 866–876, Association for Computational Linguistics, Melbourne, Australia.
- Qiu, Shilin, Qihe Liu, Shijie Zhou, and Wen Huang. 2022. Adversarial attack and defense technologies in natural language processing: A survey. *Neurocomputing*, 492:278–307.
- Radford, Alec, Jeff Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners.
- Raffel, Colin, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(140):1–67.
- Schler, Jonathan, Moshe Koppel, Shlomo Argamon, and James W. Pennebaker. 2006. Effects of age and gender on blogging. In *Computational Approaches to Analyzing Weblogs, Papers from the 2006 AAAI Spring Symposium, Technical Report SS-06-03, Stanford, California, USA, March 27-29, 2006*, pages 199–205, AAAI.
- Shokri, Reza, Marco Stronati, Congzheng Song, and Vitaly Shmatikov. 2017. Membership inference attacks against machine learning models. In *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 3–18.
- Sousa, Samuel and Roman Kern. 2023. How to keep text private? a systematic review of deep learning methods for privacy-preserving natural language processing. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 56:1427–1492.
- Staab, Robin, Mark Vero, Mislav Balunovic, and Martin Vechev. 2024. Beyond memorization: Violating privacy via inference with large language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Tiedemann, Jörg. 2009. News from opus — a collection of multilingual parallel corpora with tools and interfaces.
- Tiedemann, Jörg and Santhosh Thottingal. 2020. OPUS-MT — Building open translation services for the World. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Conference of the European Association for Machine Translation (EAMT)*, Lisbon, Portugal.
- Tokpo, Ewoenam Kwaku and Toon Calders. 2022. Text style transfer for bias mitigation using masked language modeling. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies: Student Research Workshop*, pages 163–171, Association for Computational Linguistics, Hybrid: Seattle, Washington + Online.
- Utpala, Saiteja, Sara Hooker, and Pin-Yu Chen. 2023. Locally differentially private document generation using zero shot prompting. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 8442–8457, Association for Computational Linguistics, Singapore.
- Vaswani, Ashish, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS’17*, page 6000–6010, Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA.
- Warstadt, Alex, Amanpreet Singh, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2019. Neural network acceptability judgments. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:625–641.
- Weggenmann, Benjamin, Valentin Rublack, Michael Andrejczuk, Justus Mattern, and Florian Kerschbaum. 2022. DP-VAE: human-readable text anonymization for online reviews with differentially private variational autoencoders. In *WWW ’22: The ACM Web Conference 2022, Virtual Event, Lyon, France, April 25 - 29, 2022*, pages 721–731, ACM.
- Wolf, Thomas, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Rémi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, Joe Davison, Sam Shleifer, Patrick von Platen, Clara Ma, Yacine Jernite, Julien Plu, Canwen Xu, Teven Le Scao, Sylvain Gugger, Mariama Drame, Quentin Lhoest, and Alexander M. Rush. 2020. Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 38–45, Association for Computational Linguistics, Online.

- Xu, Qionghai, Lizhen Qu, Chenchen Xu, and Ran Cui. 2019. Privacy-aware text rewriting. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Natural Language Generation*, pages 247–257, Association for Computational Linguistics, Tokyo, Japan.
- Xu, Wei, Alan Ritter, Bill Dolan, Ralph Grishman, and Colin Cherry. 2012. Paraphrasing for style. In *COLING*, pages 2899–2914.
- Ye, Muchao, Chenglin Miao, Ting Wang, and Fenglong Ma. 2022. Textthoaxer: Budgeted hard-label adversarial attacks on text. In *AAAI-22 Technical Tracks 4*, Proceedings of the 36th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2022, pages 3877–3884, Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence. Publisher Copyright: Copyright © 2022, Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (www.aaai.org). All rights reserved.; 36th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2022 ; Conference date: 22-02-2022 Through 01-03-2022.
- Yoo, Jin Yong and Yanjun Qi. 2021. Towards improving adversarial training of NLP models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pages 945–956, Association for Computational Linguistics, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic.
- Yu, Da, 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. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Yue, Xiang, Minxin Du, Tianhao Wang, Yaliang Li, Huan Sun, and Sherman S. M. Chow. 2021. Differential privacy for text analytics via natural text sanitization. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 3853–3866, Association for Computational Linguistics, Online.
- Zhang, Tianyi, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q. Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. 2020a. Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Zhang, Wei Emma, Quan Z. Sheng, Ahoud Alhazmi, and Chenliang Li. 2020b. Adversarial attacks on deep-learning models in natural language processing: A survey. *ACM Trans. Intell. Syst. Technol.*, 11(3).