

# Do Backdoors Assist Membership Inference Attacks?

Yumeki Goto\*, Nami Ashizawa†, Toshiki Shibahara†, Naoto Yanai\*

\* Osaka University, 1-5 Yamadaoka, Suita-shi, Osaka, 565-0871, Japan.

† NTT Social Informatics Laboratories

3-9-11 Midori-cho, Musashino-shi, Tokyo, 180-8585, Japan.

**Abstract**—When an adversary provides poison samples to a machine learning model, privacy leakage, such as membership inference attacks that infer whether a sample was included in the training of the model, becomes effective by moving the sample to an outlier. However, the attacks can be detected because inference accuracy deteriorates due to poison samples. In this paper, we discuss a *backdoor-assisted membership inference attack*, a novel membership inference attack based on backdoors that return the adversary’s expected output for a triggered sample. We found three crucial insights through experiments with an academic benchmark dataset. We first demonstrate that the backdoor-assisted membership inference attack is unsuccessful. Second, when we analyzed loss distributions to understand the reason for the unsuccessful results, we found that backdoors cannot separate loss distributions of training and non-training samples. In other words, backdoors cannot affect the distribution of clean samples. Third, we also show that poison and triggered samples activate neurons of different distributions. Specifically, backdoors make any clean sample an inlier, contrary to poisoning samples. As a result, we confirm that backdoors cannot assist membership inference.

**Index Terms**—backdoor-assisted membership inference attack, backdoor attack, poisoning attack, membership inference attack, machine learning

## I. INTRODUCTION

Membership inference attacks are currently used for evaluating privacy leakage in various machine learning models [1]–[3]. In a membership inference attack [4], an adversary infers whether a sample was utilized for training a machine learning model.

In recent years, Tramer et al. [5] proposed an advanced attack, called poisoning-assisted membership inference attack, for amplifying privacy leakage by injecting poison samples into a dataset. The drawback of the attack is to deteriorate the inference accuracy of the victim model injected poison samples. Consequently, the owner of the victim model can detect the underlying poison samples in any kind of poisoning attack [6]. Namely, the poisoning-assisted membership inference attack can be prevented by detecting poison samples; thus, it may be less severe than expected.

The above limitation leads us to a membership inference attack utilizing a backdoor attack, i.e., a *backdoor-assisted membership inference attack*. Backdoor attacks [7] are stealthier than poisoning attacks because they manipulate the output of only triggered samples and maintain test accuracy [6]. There are also advanced attacks, called imperceptible backdoors [8]–[15], that bypass existing backdoor detection tools [16]–[21].

In this paper, we take the first step for answering two following key questions on backdoor-assisted membership attacks. (1) *Is a backdoor-assisted membership inference attack feasible?* (2) *Do backdoors impact the loss distributions of a victim model?*

The above questions are non-trivial. For the first question, it is unclear whether a backdoor-assisted membership inference attack works because the backdoor attacks maintain inference accuracy. The key idea of the existing poisoning-assisted membership inference attack [5] is to make the target sample an outlier by deteriorating accuracy with poison samples. In contrast, backdoors may not make the target sample an outlier because they maintain accuracy. For this reason, the backdoor-assisted membership inference attack is significantly different from the existing attack.

Next, for the second question, the difference between loss distributions of training and non-training data is also essential for amplifying the privacy leakage. It is known that a membership inference attack is statistical testing with loss distribution [22], and then poison samples can boost membership inference attacks by separating loss distributions between training and non-training samples [5]. However, it is unclear whether the backdoors can boost membership inference attacks because the difference between the loss distributions of a backdoor-assisted attack and a poisoning-assisted attack has never been discussed.

We found three crucial insights through the experiments with a typical academic benchmark, i.e., the CIFAR-10 dataset. As the first insight, the backdoor-assisted membership inference attack is *unsuccessful* as opposed to the poisoning-assisted membership inference attack. Specifically, a backdoor attack amplifies only few attack success rates of the membership inference.

Next, we analyze loss distributions and neuron activations of the victim models to understand the above phenomenon deeply. Then, as the second insight, we found that backdoors cannot separate loss distributions of training and non-training samples. We also demonstrate, as the third insight, that the backdoor-assisted membership inference attack makes a target sample an inlier in the distribution of activated neurons. In contrast, the poisoning-assisted membership inference attack makes it an outlier. We thus believe that backdoors *do not* assist in membership inference attacks.

To sum up, we found the following crucial insights in this

paper:

- Backdoor-assisted membership inference attacks are unsuccessful.
- Backdoors do not separate loss distributions of training and non-training samples.
- Backdoor-assisted membership inference attacks make a target sample an inlier, while poisoning-assisted membership inference attacks make it an outlier.

## II. RELATED WORK

In this section, we describe related works of backdoor attacks and privacy violations assisted by poisoning attacks.

### A. Backdoor Attacks

Backdoor attacks [7], [23] are a kind of attack whereby an adversary trains a model such that he/she obtains the expected output for only triggers. Recent backdoor attacks [8], [9], [11], [24]–[26] can bypass detection tools [16]–[21], and thus existence of backdoors is imperceptible. (We call them imperceptible backdoor attacks for the sake of convenience.)

There are three approaches for constructing imperceptible backdoor attacks. The first approach [8]–[11] is based on trigger generation that is visually imperceptible for humans, referred to as the trigger method. The second approach [12], [13] is based on latent representations whose distributions are close between clean inputs and triggers, referred to as the latent-representation method. The third approach [14], [15] is unified attacks [14], [15] for the above two approaches, referred to as the unified method. We evaluate backdoor-assisted membership inference attacks based on the above three imperceptible backdoor attacks as well as the original backdoor attack [7].

In recent years, backdoor attacks have been discussed in real-world applications such as natural language processing [26], [27] and face authentication [24]. Combining our attack with these works makes privacy violations in real-world applications possible.

### B. Privacy Violations Assisted by Poisoning

There are existing works on privacy violations based on poisoning attacks [5], [28]–[31]. The first work [29] was in simple models such as support vector machines. Whereas several papers [28], [30] discussed property inference attacks [32] that infer properties of a training dataset, Tramer et al. [5] discussed a membership inference attack, attribute inference [33]–[35], and data extraction [36]–[38]. Nevertheless, the above works did not discuss backdoor attacks. In other words, the above works succeeded in membership inference attacks by sacrificing accuracy [5].

The closest work to ours is by Chen et al. [31]. They evaluated a membership inference attack with clean-label poisoning [39], [40], whose labels remain unchanged and samples are visually indistinguishable from clean samples. However, in their attack, the distance between clean and poison samples in latent representations still becomes far from each other to maximize the influence of the target. As described in the

previous subsection, we discuss not only the original backdoor attack [7], which is regardless of the distance between clean and poison samples, but also the imperceptible backdoor attacks whose distance between clean and poison samples in latent representations is close to each other. Especially, the latter backdoor attacks extremely differ from Chen et al.’s work.

Although several works [41], [42] combine backdoors with membership inference, they are close to watermarking [43] to check if a model is backdoored. Namely, these works are quite different from privacy violations, i.e., our leading problem, because they infer backdoors embedded by a model owner.

## III. BACKDOOR-ASSISTED MEMBERSHIP INFERENCE ATTACK

We describe a backdoor-assisted membership inference attack as the problem setting of this paper below. We first define an attack formally and its metrics. We then describe the key questions in detail.

### A. Formalization

The attacks in this paper are defined as a game between an adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  and a challenger  $\mathcal{C}$ . We first denote by  $\mathcal{X}$  a set of data samples, by  $\mathcal{Y}$  a set of labels, by  $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$  a set of datasets, and by  $\mathcal{M}$  a set of machine learning models. Then, a machine learning model  $M \in \mathcal{M}$  is defined as a mapping function  $M : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  and a training algorithm, i.e., a loss function, is defined as a mapping function  $L_M : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ .

The game is defined below.  $\mathcal{A}$  then interacts with the final trained model.  $\mathcal{A}$  is in the black-box setting that he/she sends queries to the model  $M$  and obtains nothing more than the outputs. Here,  $\mathcal{A}$  can only provide statically poison samples.

- 1)  $\mathcal{C}$  chooses a clean dataset  $D \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ .
- 2)  $\mathcal{C}$  chooses a bit  $b \leftarrow \{0, 1\}$ . If  $b = 1$ ,  $\mathcal{C}$  chooses a sample  $z \in D$ ; otherwise,  $\mathcal{C}$  chooses  $z \in \mathcal{D} \setminus D$ .
- 3) Given  $z$ ,  $\mathcal{A}$  chooses a poisoning dataset  $D_p \subset \mathcal{D}$  consisting of  $n$  samples, and send it to  $\mathcal{C}$ .
- 4)  $\mathcal{C}$  trains  $M$  by  $M = L_M(D^*)$  with the entire dataset  $D^* = D \cup D_p$ . **In doing so, assuming  $M^* = L_{M^*}(D)$  for any model  $M^* \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $M^*$  and  $M$  achieve the following relations: (1) for any  $(x, y) \in D$ ,  $M(x) = M^*(x)$  holds; and, (2) for any  $(x^*, y^*) \in D_p$ ,  $M(x^*) = y^*$ .**
- 5)  $\mathcal{A}$  sends samples  $x_1, \dots, x_q \in \mathcal{X}$  to  $M$  and obtains  $y_1 = M(x_1), \dots, y_q = M(x_q)$ .
- 6)  $\mathcal{A}$  returns a bit  $b' \in \{0, 1\}$ . If  $b = b'$  holds,  $\mathcal{A}$  wins the game.

In the above game-based definition, the sentences with red color differ from the existing attack by Tramer et al. [5]. While an adversary in the existing attack does not require a model  $M$  anything other than learning a dataset  $D_p$ , our adversary requires a model  $M$  to misinfer only a sample  $x^*$  in  $D_p$  as his/her expected output  $y^*$ . It is the requirement of backdoor attacks [7].

TABLE I  
PROPERTY OF POISONING-/BACKDOOR-ASSISTED ATTACKS

We investigate and discuss the following attack methods. For the column of ‘‘Accuracy,’’ the checkmark means that backdoor attacks keep the accuracy. For the columns of ‘‘Trigger’’ and ‘‘Latent Representation,’’ the checkmarks mean imperceptible backdoors in each context.

| Method           | Accuracy | Trigger | Latent Representation |
|------------------|----------|---------|-----------------------|
| Truth Serum [5]  |          |         |                       |
| Chen et al. [31] |          | ✓       |                       |
| Our BadNets [7]  | ✓        |         |                       |
| Our TaCT [13]    | ✓        |         | ✓                     |
| Our LIRA [10]    | ✓        | ✓       |                       |
| Our IBD [15]     | ✓        | ✓       | ✓                     |

### B. Evaluation Metrics

We adopt the following evaluation metrics in this paper.

**Membership-inference-attack success rates (MIA-SR) [4]:** For the number  $n$  of execution times of the game described in the previous section and the number  $a$  of times that  $\mathcal{A}$  wins the game, it is defined as  $a/n$ .

**Membership-inference-attack AUC (MIA-AUC) [44]:** MIA-AUC is represented as an area under the ROC curve. The ROC curve is a two-dimensional curve defined by true positive rates (TPR) and false positive rates (FPR). They mean that positive and negative values are accurately estimated as members and non-members.

In addition to the above metrics, we introduce metrics for backdoor attacks [7], i.e., test accuracy and backdoor identification rates<sup>1</sup>. For a model  $M = L_M(D^*)$  with the entire dataset  $D^* = D \cup D_p$  and another model  $M^* = L_{M^*}(D)$  with only a clean dataset  $D$ , they are defined as follows:

**Test Accuracy (TA):** For any pair  $(x, y) \in D \subseteq \mathcal{D} \setminus D_p$  of a clean sample and its label, it is defined as a ratio such that  $y = M(x)$  holds, where  $M(x) = M^*(x)$  holds to maintain the original inference by  $D$  possibly. Intuitively, accuracy is necessary for stealthy compared to conventional poisoning attacks.

**Backdoor identification rates (BIR):** For any pair  $(x^*, y^*) \in D_p$  of a poison sample and its label, it is defined as a ratio such that  $M(x^*) = y^*$  holds, where  $M(x^*) \neq M^*(x^*)$  may hold. It means that an adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  can certainly exploit backdoors embedded in  $M$ .

### C. Key Questions

We have two key questions about backdoor-assisted membership inference attacks. First, we discuss the impact of the difference from the existing works [5], [31], i.e., the sentences with red color, on the attacks. We then evaluate MIA-SR and MIA-AUC with respect to TA and BIR. Second, we discuss loss distributions between training and non-training samples for each attack.

Table I summarizes the primary differences from the existing works [5], [31].

<sup>1</sup>It is originally defined as the attack success rate in [7], but we say backdoor identification rate for convenience.

## IV. EXPERIMENT

We conduct extensive experiments with our backdoor-assisted membership inference attacks. As described in the previous section, our goal is to discuss the impact of backdoors on MIA-SR and MIA-AUC by comparing them with the existing attack by Tramer et al. [5].

We follow the targeted attack setting by Tramer et al. [5], where an adversary targets a specific example. The attacks were implemented with PyTorch. The source code for the attacks is published in GitHub<sup>2</sup>.

### A. Setting

1) *Model and Baseline:* We also trained six ResNet18 models: (1) model attacked with neither poisoning nor backdoor attacks, referred to as Clean-Only model; (2) model referred to as Truth Serum [5] as a baseline attacked with  $250 \times r$  poison samples in  $D_p$  for  $r \in \{1, 2, 4, 8, 16\}$ ; and (3)-(6) models backdoor-attacked with  $250 \times r$  triggered samples in  $D_p$  based on BadNets [7], TaCT [13] LIRA [10], and IBD [15], respectively. We refer to each model of (3)-(6) as BadNets, TaCT, LIRA, and IBD.

2) *Dataset:* We utilize the CIFAR-10 dataset for the experiment. The 250 samples in  $D_p$  for poisoning or trigger are extracted from 50,000 training samples of the CIFAR-10 dataset. Also, the 50,000 training samples are divided into two groups: the training dataset  $D$  and the test dataset  $\mathcal{D} \setminus D$  of the victim model. The victim model learns the entire dataset  $D^* = D \cup D_p$ . Here, for the clean model, 25,000 samples are randomly chosen from 50,000 training samples as  $D$ . In the same way, the dataset for the shadow model is prepared.

3) *Membership Inference Attack Method:* We implemented the membership inference by Carlini et al. [22]. Their attack needs shadow models to mimic the data distribution of a victim model  $M$ ; hence, we prepare twenty models. We then choose the victim model  $M$  from the twenty models, and the remaining models are utilized for shadow models to conduct a full leave-one-out cross-validation. We measure MIA-SR and MIA-AUC on these six models and then evaluate their results.

### B. Results

Table II shows the result of the membership inference attack against the Clean-Only model, which is identical to the baseline. Fig. 1 and Table III show the results of each attack.

According to the table, BadNets and TaCT, which need a few triggers for backdoors, keep high test accuracy, unlike Truth Serum. However, when we compare BadNets with TaCT, both MIA-SR and MIA-AUC deteriorate for any number of samples. It indicates that MIA-SR and MIA-AUC deteriorate due to triggers generated in imperceptible approaches. On the other hand, MIA-AUC of Truth Serum increases more than or equal to 0.32 compared to the Clean-Only model.

We also explain why TA and BIR for MIA-SR and MIA-AUC are low below. LIRA and IBD need the same number of triggers as clean samples for backdoors. In this experiment,

<sup>2</sup>URL will be updated in the later versions.

TABLE II

RESULT OF MEMBERSHIP INFERENCE ATTACK ON CLEAN-ONLY MODEL

The Clean-Only model infers classes of non-training data with high test accuracy. When MIA-SR and MIA-AUC are close to 50%, it is random.

|            | TA    | MIA-SR [%] | MIA-AUC |
|------------|-------|------------|---------|
| Clean-only | 90.94 | 58.30      | 0.60    |

we used at most 4000 triggers for LIRA and IBD, despite training with 25000 clean samples. That is, TA and BIR for LIRA and IBD became low compared to BadNets and TaCT.

## V. DISCUSSION

In this section, we discuss why MIA-SR and MIA-AUC of the backdoor-assisted membership inference attack deteriorate from two standpoints. First, we analyze the impact of backdoors on loss distributions of a victim model because they are essential for MIA-SR in general [22]. Second, we analyze the impact of backdoors on neuron activation to understand the internal parameters of the victim model in detail.

### A. Impact of Backdoors on Loss Distributions

We discuss the impact of backdoors on loss distributions of a victim model for the backdoor-assisted membership inference attack. It is considered that a membership inference attack is a statistical testing with loss distribution [22]. Hence, we analyze the loss distribution for each model.

Fig. 2 shows loss distributions of training and non-training samples for each model. According to the figure, Truth Serum boosts membership inference attacks because the losses of training and non-training samples are separated. Remarkably, borderlines between the losses of training and non-training samples are stable regardless of the size of  $D_p$ , and these phenomena are consistent with the original work [5] of Truth Serum.

In contrast, BadNets and Tact are unable to separate the losses of training and non-training samples compared to Truth Serum. It is thus considered that MIA-SR and MIA-AUC deteriorate because the membership inference is almost random. More specifically, the loss distributions of training and non-training samples partially overlap. Then, MIA-SR and MIA-AUC should be improved compared to the Clean-Only model. Nevertheless, MIA-SR and MIA-AUC for TaCT are less than those of the Clean-Only model because the loss distributions of training and non-training samples are distributed over each other for most of a clean dataset  $D$ .

Next, we discuss LIRA and IBD. According to Fig. 2, their loss distributions of training and non-training samples are obviously separated similarly to Truth Serum. We discuss why MIA-SR and MIA-AUC of LIRA and IBD deteriorate in the next section.

### B. Impact of Backdoors on Neuron Activations

We discuss the impact of backdoors on neuron activation from a standpoint different from the previous section to understand the backdoor-assisted membership inference attacks in more detail. In particular, we built a hypothesis that backdoors

do not make loss distributions of training samples an outlier, and therefore a membership inference attack is unsuccessful even through the backdoor attacks. We observe neuron activations for each model to confirm the above hypothesis and then find strong evidence whereby a membership inference attack is unsuccessful. We show them in Fig. 3.

According to the figure, Truth Serum makes a target sample an outlier over the distribution of training samples, which is consistent with the original work [5].

By contrast, all the backdoor attacks make target samples inliers over the distributions of training samples. It means that triggers for backdoors have independent distributions of training samples. Namely, LIRA and IBD make target samples inliers, although LIRA and IBD separate loss distributions between training and non-training samples. It is thus considered that MIA-SR and MIA-AUC of LIRA and IBD deteriorate. The above phenomenon might be different if the test accuracies are improved.

## VI. CONCLUSION

We discussed backdoor-assisted membership inference attacks, which do not deteriorate the accuracy. We first evaluated whether backdoor-assisted membership inference attacks with the original backdoors [7] and the imperceptible backdoors [10], [13], [15] are successful in comparison with the existing poisoning-assisted membership inference attack [5]. We then showed that backdoor-assisted membership inference attacks are unsuccessful in contrast to the existing poisoning-assisted membership inference attack by Tramer et al. [5]

We also analyzed their resultant models with respect to loss distributions and neuron activations to deeply understand the reason for the unsuccessful results. Then, we confirmed that triggers cannot affect the distribution of clean samples; namely, any clean sample becomes inliers while the existing attack makes it an outlier. Thus, we believe that backdoors cannot assist membership inference attacks.

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Conti, J. Li, S. Picsek, and J. Xu, "Label-only membership inference attack against node-level graph neural networks," in *Proc. of AISec 2022*, 2022, pp. 1–12.
- [2] Z. Li, Y. Liu, X. He, N. Yu, M. Backes, and Y. Zhang, "Auditing membership leakages of multi-exit networks," in *Proc. of CCS 2022*. ACM, 2022, pp. 1917–1931.
- [3] J. Ye, A. Maddi, S. K. Murakonda, V. Bindschaedler, and R. Shokri, "Enhanced membership inference attacks against machine learning models," in *Proc. of CCS 2022*. ACM, 2022, pp. 3093–3106.
- [4] R. Shokri, M. Stronati, C. Song, and V. Shmatikov, "Membership inference attacks against machine learning models," in *Proc. of IEEE S&P 2018*. IEEE Computer Society, 2017, pp. 3–18.
- [5] F. Tramèr, R. Shokri, A. San Joaquin, H. Le, M. Jagielski, S. Hong, and N. Carlini, "Truth serum: Poisoning machine learning models to reveal their secrets," in *Proc. of CCS 2022*. ACM, 2022, pp. 2779–2792.
- [6] Z. Tian, L. Cui, J. Liang, and S. Yu, "A comprehensive survey on poisoning attacks and countermeasures in machine learning," *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 55, no. 8, 2022.
- [7] T. Gu, K. Liu, B. Dolan-Gavitt, and S. Garg, "Badnets: Evaluating backdooring attacks on deep neural networks," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 47 230–47 244, 2019.

TABLE III  
RESULTS OF EACH ATTACK

MIA-SR becomes higher for Truth Serum, but lower by each backdoor attacks. TA, BIR, and MIA-SR are the percentage of leave-one-out cross-validation with 20 shadow models.

(a)

|             | $r=1$ |       |        |         | $r=2$ |       |        |         |
|-------------|-------|-------|--------|---------|-------|-------|--------|---------|
|             | TA    | BIR   | MIA-SR | MIA-AUC | TA    | BIR   | MIA-SR | MIA-AUC |
| Truth Serum | 85.94 | -     | 86.08  | 0.92    | 85.85 | -     | 91.34  | 0.96    |
| BadNets     | 90.85 | 94.72 | 56.68  | 0.57    | 90.83 | 94.45 | 55.28  | 0.57    |
| TaCT        | 90.84 | 80.48 | 51.86  | 0.52    | 90.86 | 80.73 | 51.48  | 0.52    |
| LIRA        | 43.49 | 16.45 | 50.12  | 0.50    | 49.62 | 18.99 | 49.68  | 0.49    |
| IBD         | 71.19 | 15.75 | 55.86  | 0.60    | 74.06 | 14.32 | 55.90  | 0.62    |

(b)

|             | $r=4$ |       |        |         | $r=8$ |       |        |         | $r=16$ |       |        |         |
|-------------|-------|-------|--------|---------|-------|-------|--------|---------|--------|-------|--------|---------|
|             | TA    | BIR   | MIA-SR | MIA-AUC | TA    | BIR   | MIA-SR | MIA-AUC | TA     | BIR   | MIA-SR | MIA-AUC |
| Truth Serum | 85.52 | -     | 93.48  | 0.97    | 85.20 | -     | 93.89  | 0.98    | 84.66  | -     | 95.09  | 0.98    |
| BadNets     | 90.82 | 94.57 | 54.40  | 0.55    | 90.83 | 94.41 | 54.04  | 0.56    | 90.82  | 94.34 | 53.68  | 0.55    |
| TaCT        | 90.87 | 81.06 | 51.04  | 0.51    | 90.86 | 81.72 | 50.62  | 0.50    | 90.84  | 82.21 | 51.28  | 0.51    |
| LIRA        | 53.06 | 39.20 | 50.98  | 0.51    | 61.98 | 62.16 | 49.92  | 0.50    | 68.13  | 70.29 | 50.12  | 0.50    |
| IBD         | 75.00 | 13.55 | 54.04  | 0.62    | 75.90 | 12.93 | 53.84  | 0.64    | 77.05  | 12.49 | 53.28  | 0.64    |

- [8] S. Li, M. Xue, B. Zhao, H. Zhu, and X. Zhang, "Invisible backdoor attacks on deep neural networks via steganography and regularization," *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, vol. 18, no. 05, pp. 2088–2105, 2021.
- [9] R. Ning, J. Li, C. Xin, and H. Wu, "Invisible poison: A blackbox clean label backdoor attack to deep neural networks," in *Proc. of INFOCOM 2021*. IEEE, 2021.
- [10] K. Doan, Y. Lao, W. Zhao, and P. Li, "Lira: Learnable, imperceptible and robust backdoor attacks," in *Proc. of ICCV 2021*, 2021, pp. 11966–11976.
- [11] H. Zhong, C. Liao, A. C. Squicciarini, S. Zhu, and D. Miller, "Backdoor embedding in convolutional neural network models via invisible perturbation," in *Proc. of CODASPY 2020*. ACM, 2020, pp. 97–108.
- [12] T. J. L. Tan and R. Shokri, "Bypassing backdoor detection algorithms in deep learning," in *Proc. of EuroS&P*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 175–183.
- [13] D. Tang, X. Wang, H. Tang, and K. Zhang, "Demon in the variant: Statistical analysis of dnns for robust backdoor contamination detection," in *Proc. of Usenix Security 2021*. USENIX Association, 2021, pp. 1541–1558.
- [14] Z. Zhao, X. Chen, Y. Xuan, Y. Dong, D. Wang, and K. Liang, "Defeat: Deep hidden feature backdoor attacks by imperceptible perturbation and latent representation constraints," in *Proc. of CVPR 2022*, 2022, pp. 15213–15222.
- [15] N. Zhong, Z. Qian, and X. Zhang, "Imperceptible backdoor attack: From input space to feature representation," in *Proc. of IJCAI 2022*, L. D. Raedt, Ed. IJCAI Organization, 2022, pp. 1736–1742.
- [16] B. Wang, Y. Yao, S. Shan, H. Li, B. Viswanath, H. Zheng, and B. Y. Zhao, "Neural cleanse: Identifying and mitigating backdoor attacks in neural networks," in *IEEE S&P 2019*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 707–723.
- [17] B. Chen, W. Carvalho, N. Baracaldo, H. Ludwig, B. Edwards, T. Lee, I. M. Molloy, and B. Srivastava, "Detecting backdoor attacks on deep neural networks by activation clustering," in *Proc. of SafeAI 2019*, 2019.
- [18] E. Chou, F. Tramèr, and G. Pellegrino, "Sentinet: Detecting localized universal attacks against deep learning systems," in *Proc. of IEEE SPW 2020*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 48–54.
- [19] Y. Gao, C. Xu, D. Wang, S. Chen, D. C. Ranasinghe, and S. Nepal, "Strip: A defence against trojan attacks on deep neural networks," in *Proc. of ACSAC 2019*. ACM, 2019, p. 113–125.
- [20] Y. Liu, W.-C. Lee, G. Tao, S. Ma, Y. Aafer, and X. Zhang, "Abs: Scanning neural networks for back-doors by artificial brain stimulation," in *Proc. of CCS 2019*. ACM, 2019, p. 1265–1282.
- [21] B. Tran, J. Li, and A. Madry, "Spectral signatures in backdoor attacks," in *Proc. of NIPS 2018*. ACM, 2018, p. 8011–8021.
- [22] N. Carlini, S. Chien, M. Nasr, S. Song, A. Terzis, and F. Tramèr, "Membership inference attacks from first principles," in *Proc. of IEEE S&P 2022*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 1897–1914.
- [23] Y. Liu, S. Ma, Y. Aafer, W. Lee, J. Zhai, W. Wang, and X. Zhang, "Trojaning attack on neural networks," in *Proc. of NDSS 2018*. The Internet Society.
- [24] M. Xue, C. He, J. Wang, and W. Liu, "Backdoors hidden in facial features: a novel invisible backdoor attack against face recognition systems," *Peer-to-Peer Networking and Applications*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 1458–1474, 2021.
- [25] A. Saha, A. Subramanya, and H. Pirsiavash, "Hidden trigger backdoor attacks," in *Proc. of AAAI 2020*, vol. 34, no. 07. AAAI, 2020, pp. 11957–11965.
- [26] S. Li, H. Liu, T. Dong, B. Z. H. Zhao, M. Xue, H. Zhu, and J. Lu, "Hidden backdoors in human-centric language models," in *Proc. of CCS 2021*. ACM, 2021, pp. 3123–3140.
- [27] F. Qi, M. Li, Y. Chen, Z. Zhang, Z. Liu, Y. Wang, and M. Sun, "Hidden killer: Invisible textual backdoor attacks with syntactic trigger," in *Proc. of ACL—IJCNLP*, vol. 1. ACL, 2021, pp. 443–453.
- [28] S. Mahloujifar, E. Ghosh, and M. Chase, "Property inference from poisoning," in *Proc. of IEEE S&P 2022*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 1569–1569.
- [29] S. Hidano, T. Murakami, S. Katsumata, S. Kiyomoto, and G. Hnnaoka, "Model inversion attacks for online prediction systems: Without knowledge of non-sensitive attributes," *IEICE Transactions on Information and Systems*, vol. E101.D, no. 11, pp. 2665–2676, 2018.
- [30] Z. Wang, Y. Huang, M. Song, L. Wu, F. Xue, and K. Ren, "Poisoning-assisted property inference attack against federated learning," *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, pp. 1–13, 2022.
- [31] Y. Chen, C. Shen, Y. Shen, C. Wang, and Y. Zhang, "Amplifying membership exposure via data poisoning," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2211.00463, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2211.00463>
- [32] K. Ganju, Q. Wang, W. Yang, C. A. Gunter, and N. Borisov, "Property inference attacks on fully connected neural networks using permutation invariant representations," in *Proc. of CCS 2018*. ACM, 2018, pp. 619–633.
- [33] M. Fredrikson, E. Lantz, S. Jha, S. Lin, D. Page, and T. Ristenpart, "Privacy in pharmacogenetics: An end-to-end case study of personalized warfarin dosing," in *Proc. of Usenix Security 2014*. USENIX Association, 2014, pp. 17–32.
- [34] M. Fredrikson, S. Jha, and T. Ristenpart, "Model inversion attacks that exploit confidence information and basic countermeasures," in *Proc. of CCS 2015*. ACM, 2015, pp. 1322–1333.
- [35] S. Yeom, I. Giacomelli, M. Fredrikson, and S. Jha, "Privacy risk in machine learning: Analyzing the connection to overfitting," in *Proc. of CSF 2018*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 268–282.
- [36] N. Carlini, C. Liu, Ú. Erlingsson, J. Kos, and D. Song, "The secret sharer: Evaluating and testing unintended memorization in neural networks," in *Proc. of Usenix Security*. USENIX Association, 2019, pp. 267–284.




Fig. 1. MIA-ROC for Each Attack

Poisoning attacks boost membership inference attacks with 250 target poisoning data. In proportion to the number of poisoning samples, the true positive rates become higher while false positive rates become lower. Backdoor attacks have less influence on the true positive and false positive rates of membership inference attacks.




Fig. 2. Loss Distributions on Victim Model for Each Attack

Loss distributions in which each victim model infers its training data are red, and those in which the models infer its non-training data are blue. The number on each graph title varies with the replicated times of poisoning data.




Fig. 3. Neuron Activations on Training Data and Non-Training Data of Victim Model for Each Attack

When each victim model infers training data or non-training data, neuron of the latent representation layer activates in this way. 4000 target data for membership inference attacks are plotted as red points, and 25000 training or non-training data are plotted as blue points.

- [37] N. Carlini, F. Tramèr, E. Wallace, M. Jagielski, A. Herbert-Voss, K. Lee, A. Roberts, T. Brown, D. Song, Ú. Erlingsson, A. Oprea, and C. Raffel, “Extracting training data from large language models,” in *Proc. of USENIX Security 2021*. USENIX Association, 2021, pp. 2633–2650.
- [38] P. Henderson, K. Sinha, N. Angelard-Gontier, N. R. Ke, G. Fried, R. Lowe, and J. Pineau, “Ethical challenges in data-driven dialogue systems,” in *Proc. of AIES 2018*. ACM, 2018, pp. 123–129.
- [39] A. Shafahi, W. R. Huang, M. Najibi, O. Suci, C. Studer, T. Dumitras, and T. Goldstein, “Poison frogs! targeted clean-label poisoning attacks on neural networks,” in *Proc. of NeurIPS 2018*, vol. 31. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018, pp. 6106–6116.
- [40] C. Zhu, W. R. Huang, H. Li, G. Taylor, C. Studer, and T. Goldstein, “Transferable clean-label poisoning attacks on deep neural nets,” in *Proc. of ICML 2019*, ser. PMLR, vol. 97. PMLR, 2019, pp. 7614–7623.
- [41] Y. Li, Y. Bai, Y. Jiang, Y. Yang, S. Xia, and B. Li, “Untargeted backdoor watermark: Towards harmless and stealthy dataset copyright protection,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2210.00875, 2022.
- [42] H. Hu, Z. Salčić, G. Dobbie, J. Chen, L. Sun, and X. Zhang, “Membership inference via backdooring,” in *Proc. of IJCAI 2022*. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, 2022, pp. 3832–3838.
- [43] Y. Adi, C. Baum, M. Cisse, B. Pinkas, and J. Keshet, “Turning your weakness into a strength: Watermarking deep neural networks by backdooring,” in *Proc. of USENIX Security 2018*. USENIX Association, 2018, pp. 1615–1631.
- [44] C. Song and V. Shmatikov, “Auditing data provenance in text-generation models,” in *Proc. of CCS 2019*. ACM, 2019, pp. 196–206.