
Towards Natural Machine Unlearning

Zhengbao He Tao Li Xinwen Cheng Zhehao Huang Xiaolin Huang*
Department of Automation, Shanghai Jiao Tong University
{lstefanie, li.tao, xinwencheng, kinght_h, xiaolinhuang}@sjtu.edu.cn

Abstract

Machine unlearning (MU) aims to eliminate information that has been learned from specific training data, namely forgetting data, from a pre-trained model. Currently, the mainstream of existing MU methods involves modifying the forgetting data with incorrect labels and subsequently fine-tuning the model. While learning such incorrect information can indeed remove knowledge, the process is quite unnatural as the unlearning process undesirably reinforces the incorrect information and leads to over-forgetting. Towards more *natural* machine unlearning, we inject correct information from the remaining data to the forgetting samples when changing their labels. Through pairing these adjusted samples with their labels, the model will tend to use the injected correct information and naturally suppress the information meant to be forgotten. Albeit straightforward, such a first step towards natural machine unlearning can significantly outperform current state-of-the-art approaches. In particular, our method substantially reduces the over-forgetting and leads to strong robustness to hyperparameters, making it a promising candidate for practical machine unlearning.

1 Introduction

Modern machine learning models are essential in various applications [1–4]. However, their heavy reliance on extensive data for training raises significant privacy concerns. The General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) [5] emphasizes individuals’ rights to request the deletion of their private data, leading to a surge of interests in machine unlearning (MU). MU aims to remove the influence of specific data in training set from a well-trained model. Recently, this field has garnered considerable attention not only for its contributions to privacy protection [6–9] but also for its capacity to eliminate erroneous and sensitive data [10–12].

Current popular MU methods are primarily optimization-based, which achieve unlearning by fine-tuning the original model with manually crafted data. For instance, Amnesiac [13] optimizes the model using randomly labeled forgetting samples along with other remaining data. BadTeacher [14] relabels the forgetting samples with the predictions of a randomly initialized model as a “bad” teacher.

The name of “bad” teacher hits the essence of the above methods: they create *incorrect* information with the forgetting samples to fine-tune the model, compelling it to forget the correct information previously learned¹. However, the incorrect information could be undesirably reinforced during the fine-tuning process. An obvious observation, illustrated in Fig. 1, is the so-called “over-forgetting”, where after sufficient training, the accuracy on the forgetting samples (denoted as forgetting accuracy) is significantly lower than expected levels. This occurs because the incorrect information in these randomly relabeled instances appears quite unnatural in the view of remaining data [15]. The conflicts between the relabeled instances and remaining data cause the unlearned model to remember these forgetting samples even more firmly. To avoid over-forgetting, one can restrict the mobility scale by

¹In this paper, we consider a training point as a “sample-label” pair, also referred to as an “instance”. More details regarding the terminology can be found in Sec. 3.1.




Figure 1: Accuracy comparison of different methods on forgetting samples. The experiments are taken on CIFAR-100 using ResNet18 under 1% random-subset unlearning setting. The dash line is the natural forgetting accuracy of retrained model, to which a smaller gap indicates better MU. The forgetting accuracy of other methods continuously decreases after crossing over the dash line, while ours can converge to that of the retrained model. Hence, to obtain a good MU performance, other methods may need to carefully stop training at a middle point, donated as \star . Best viewed in color.

identifying a parameter mask [16] or by carefully selecting a stopping point. However, this requires meticulous hyperparameter tuning, which is impractical in real-world applications.

To address the problem of over-forgetting, we contend that the unlearning process should be *natural*, minimizing the conflicts within the fine-tuning data. The most natural MU process is to retrain the model from scratch with the training data excluding the forgetting ones, which is the golden standard for MU [17–19]. This method ensures that all information used is correct, eliminating concerns about over-forgetting since the forgetting samples are excluded from the training process. However, retraining requires significant computational resources, making it impractical in many cases. The challenge, therefore, lies in balancing the inclusion of forgetting samples to enhance unlearning efficiency and the exclusion of incorrect information to maintain the process’s naturalness.

In this paper, we introduce a novel method called “NatMU” that aims to facilitate a more natural unlearning by injecting correct information into the forgetting samples. Specifically, such correct information is extracted from the remaining data and then injected into forgetting samples for creating hybrid samples. The hybrid samples are subsequently assigned categories consistent with the injected information. Each hybrid sample consists of two distinct types of information: one from the forgetting sample, and the other from the remaining sample. By learning to pair the hybrid sample with the reassigned label, the connection between injected information and corresponding label is reinforced. This naturally suppresses model’s response to the former type of information which is to be forgotten, thereby achieving effective unlearning. Since such reinforced connection inherently exists within the remaining set, NatMU achieves a more natural machine unlearning process.

NatMU takes the first step towards natural machine unlearning with the injection of correct information, which significantly reduces the conflicts within the fine-tuning data. The resulting model can maintain a natural generalization on forgetting samples, consistent with the predictions of retrained model. As a result, NatMU can narrow the forgetting accuracy’s gap with the retrained model from 39.44% to 1.72% when unlearning sub-class “Vehicle2” on CIFAR-20. The natural property eliminates the need to stop training at unstable points for good performance. Consequently, NatMU demonstrates considerable robustness to hyperparameters, enabling the application of shared hyperparameters across different settings. For instance, when altering the forgetting ratio from 10% to 1%, NatMU maintains an average forgetting accuracy gap of only 2.03% across three datasets, while other methods exhibit a gap over 20%.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We first point out the unnatural property of the previous optimization-based MU methods, which leads to issues such as unnatural generalization on forgetting samples and impracticality.
- We propose an effective and efficient MU approach towards natural machine unlearning, named NatMU, which successfully addresses previous issues by injecting correct information into forgetting samples to remove the information to be forgotten.
- Extensive experiments on various datasets and multiple machine unlearning scenarios demonstrate that NatMU significantly narrows the performance gap with retrained model compared to previous approaches. Moreover, NatMU exhibits considerable robustness to hyperparameters.

2 Related Work

Machine unlearning aims to update a pre-trained model to remove the influence of a subset of training set [20]. Although retraining from scratch with the remaining data can achieve perfect MU, its significant demand for resources and time is unacceptable in the current deep learning context. Therefore, numerous works have emerged that aim to approximate the retrained model, especially in the output space.

Optimization-free unlearning focuses on removing the influence of the forgetting data by directly modifying model weights. Influence function is first introduced by [21], and [7] adopts it for certified data removal in L_2 -regularized linear models. The following work [22–25] is dedicated to reducing the computational burdens introduced by Hessian inversion. [23] adopts infinitesimal jackknife with Newton methods to reduce the number of calculations while [24] reduces the overhead of one calculation by selecting only important parameters. FisherForgetting [26] introduces a weight scrubbing method by injecting noise to specific parameters to clean the information about the forgetting data with fisher information matrix [27]. SSD [28] addresses its computational overhead and generalization decrease through a fast but stringent parameter selection. Besides the influence function-based methods, [13] proposes to delete the gradient of mini-batches relevant to the forgetting data. [18] decomposes the SGD training process and performs a gradient ascent on the forgetting data. Although these methods can remove the influence of forgetting data, they may significantly impair the generalization capability of the MU model, especially in the context of modern deep learning.

Optimization-based unlearning re-optimizes the original model on a carefully crafted dataset with a proposed unlearning objective. Amnesiac [13] fine-tunes the model with randomly labeled forgetting samples along with unchanged remaining data. BadTeacher [14] and SCRUB [29] both achieve machine unlearning under a teacher-student framework, where the student network selectively obeys the teacher models for different samples. SalUn [16] adopts the same way as Amnesiac, while constraining the model parameters’ update with a weight saliency mask. However, these methods all face the over-forgetting problem as they relabels the forgetting data to some extent. Recently, some studies have explored the scenario where no remaining data are available, called "zero-shot" machine unlearning. MU-Mis [30] reveals the link between sample’s contribution to learning process and model’s sensitivity to it, subsequently proposing an algorithm by minimizing input sensitivity. JiT [31] and [32] perturbs forgetting samples with random or adversarial perturbation, and ensures the predictions of perturbed versions match reference predictions to maintain model performance.

3 Towards Natural Machine Unlearning

3.1 Preliminaries

Let $\mathcal{D} = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ be the training set containing inputs sample $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with corresponding label $y_i \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$. We denote a sample-label pair as an "instance" in this paper. Let forgetting set $\mathcal{D}^f \subset \mathcal{D}$ be the set of forgetting data and remaining set $\mathcal{D}^r = \mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{D}^f$ be the set of remaining data. The machine learning model can be represented as a parameterized function $f_\theta(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^K$ with parameter θ . Let θ_o be the parameter of original model. The objective of approximate MU is to **narrow the performance gap between the unlearned and retrained model** in output space.

Mainstream machine unlearning work primarily focuses on three unlearning scenarios: (1) *full-class unlearning*, where $\mathcal{D}^f = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) \in \mathcal{D}, y_i = k\}$ contains all samples with label $y_i = k$. (2) *sub-class unlearning*, where $\mathcal{D}^f \subset \{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) \in \mathcal{D}, y_i = k\}$ contains a related subset of the samples labeled as k . For instance, this scenario includes unlearning the sub-class "Shark" within class "Fish" on CIFAR-20 dataset [33]. (3) *random-subset unlearning*, where \mathcal{D}^f is a random subset of \mathcal{D} . The size of \mathcal{D}^f is determined by the forgetting ratio. For example, 1% forgetting ratio implies that 1% of the samples from \mathcal{D} are randomly selected to form \mathcal{D}^f . Among these unlearning scenarios, random-subset unlearning presents the greatest challenge due to the disconnection within \mathcal{D}^f and the intricate intertwining between \mathcal{D}^f and \mathcal{D}^r .

3.2 Revisiting Previous MU Methods

Optimization-based MU algorithms demonstrate exceptional performance across various scenarios, especially in random-subset unlearning. These methods require fine-tuning the original model on a

carefully crafted fine-tuning dataset, typically comprising two parts: one built from the remaining data to maintain generalization ability and the other from the forgetting data to facilitate unlearning. We name the instances in the latter part as **unlearning instances**. In Amnesiac [13], the fine-tuning dataset $D_{\text{AMN}} = \mathcal{D}^r \cup \mathcal{D}_{\text{RL}}^f$, where $\mathcal{D}_{\text{RL}}^f = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i^{\text{rand}}), (\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) \in \mathcal{D}^f, y_i^{\text{rand}} \neq y_i\}$. BadTeacher [14] utilizes the original original f_{θ_o} and a randomly initialized model $f_{\theta_{\text{bad}}}$ to construct softly labeled fine-tuning dataset from \mathcal{D}^r and \mathcal{D}^f respectively. Its remaining part is constructed with the original model: $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ori}}^r = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, f_{\theta_o}(\mathbf{x}_i)), (\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) \in \mathcal{D}^r\}$. While the forgetting part uses a randomly initialized model: $\mathcal{D}_{\text{bad}}^f = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, f_{\theta_{\text{bad}}}(\mathbf{x}_i)), (\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) \in \mathcal{D}^f\}$. SalUn [16] improves Amnesiac by freezing certain model parameters according to a gradient-based weight saliency map. However, it still adopts the same loss function with Amnesiac.

To approximate the retrained model in the output space, the ideal approach would be to relabel the forgetting samples with their predictions on the retrained model as the ground truth labels. However, in real-world unlearning scenarios, these ground truth labels cannot be obtained. Therefore, to ensure the unlearning process can effectively remove the learned knowledge, previous works can only assign incorrect labels to these samples as a secondary priority. This line of works are based on a consensus that the information in an instance (\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) is determined by both the sample and its corresponding label. When y_i changes, the instance’s information also significantly changes [34]. Thus, learning such modified data that contain incorrect information can remove the learned knowledge from them.

However, as illustrated in Fig. 1, these methods demonstrate an “over-forgetting” issue. After sufficient training, the accuracy of classifying the forgetting samples as their original labels is significantly lower than that of retraining. The underlying challenge is that incorrect information, i.e., the forgetting samples with their incorrect labels, is undesirably reinforced during fine-tuning. The unlearning process is quite unnatural since it compels the unlearned model to learn incorrect information, which actually conflicts with the remaining data. This adversely affects the model’s natural ability to generalize these samples, which the retrained model preserves. For example, in random-subset unlearning, most of the forgetting samples can still be correctly classified by the retrained model, even if they are not involved in the training. Essentially, this unlearning process alters the learned knowledge to incorrect knowledge, instead of removing it. In addition to forgetting accuracy, various metrics can be also employed to measure the differences between the unlearned and retrained models, which will be discussed in Sec. 4.1. Despite meticulous hyperparameter tuning can make one metric close to the retrained model, it cannot ensure that other metrics will also be close.

Therefore, it is crucial to realize a more natural machine unlearning while ensuring its efficiency. On one hand, the forgetting samples should be included to enhance unlearning efficiency. On the other hand, excluding incorrect information ensures a natural machine unlearning process. In this paper, we propose a novel method, named NatMU, towards natural machine unlearning. The core idea of NatMU is to inject information extracted from the remaining data into the forgetting samples to reduce the conflicts in each modified instance.

3.3 Proposed Method

Overview. Our NatMU method can be decomposed into three steps. Firstly, we randomly select n distinctive instances from the remaining set for each forgetting sample \mathbf{x}^f . Secondly, a injecting function \mathcal{T} is employed to inject the information of remaining sample \mathbf{x}^r into \mathbf{x}^f by blending them at the pixel level, generating an unlearning instance $(\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{x}^f, \mathbf{x}^r), y^r)$. Thirdly, by merging remaining set with all generated unlearning data, we fine-tune original model on the resulting fine-tuning dataset.

Selection of remaining instances. For a forgetting instance $(\mathbf{x}^f, y^f) \in \mathcal{D}^f$, the n selected remaining instances $\{(\mathbf{x}_j^r, y_j^r)\}_{j=1}^n$ should have distinctive categories from y^f to ensure the effectiveness of unlearning. These remaining instances inherently reflect the correct information of the remaining data’s distribution. To prevent that the model from having a preference for mapping the forgetting sample to any reassigned category, these selected instances should also have different categories from each other. Moreover, to reduce the conflicts in unlearning instances $(\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{x}^f, \mathbf{x}_j^r), y_j^r)$, the categories of remaining instances should be relevant to the forgetting sample. To meet these requirements, we calculate the top n predicted categories for the forgetting sample on the original model, excluding the original category y^f . Then, we sequentially select one remaining instance for each category.

The injecting function \mathcal{T} . Motivated by data augmentation like MixUp [35] and CutMix [36], we opt for a straightforward approach where two samples are added pixel by pixel: $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{x}^f, \mathbf{x}^r) = \mathbf{x}^f + \mathbf{x}^r$.




Figure 2: **(a)** Relationship between the performance gap on forgetting accuracy and KL divergence on different datasets. A smaller KL divergence indicates more natural MU. NatMU’s KL divergence is much smaller than other methods, i.e., more natural, thus resulting in a smaller performance gap. **(b)** Visualization of our unlearning instances and their attention maps before and after unlearning calculated with LRP [37]. After unlearning, the attention is shifted to the remaining information.

To ensure that the blended sample numerically matches the original distribution, a weighting mask vector $\mathbf{m} \in [0, 1]^d$ is introduced. This vector controls the contribution of two samples at each pixel as defined by $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}^f, \mathbf{x}^r) = \mathbf{x}^f \circ \mathbf{m} + \mathbf{x}^r \circ (\mathbf{1}_d - \mathbf{m})$, where \circ represents element-wise multiplication, and $\mathbf{1}_d$ represents a d -dimensional vectors of ones. The weighting operation offers an additional advantage that $\mathbf{x}^f \circ \mathbf{m}$ can be regarded as a segment of the complete forgetting sample \mathbf{x}^f . Consequently, it makes the unlearning process more friendly since each hybrid sample forgets only a part of \mathbf{x}^f . We have developed four "gradual MixUp" weighting vectors $\{\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2, \mathbf{m}_3, \mathbf{m}_4\}$, with symmetrical elements that vary gradually in different directions. To adjust the proportion of forgetting samples in the hybrid samples, a scaling factor δ is introduced, which scales the values of weighting vectors as follows:

$$\mathbf{m}_j^{\text{scaled}} = \text{clip}_{[0,1]}(\delta_d + \mathbf{m}_j), \quad (1)$$

where δ_d denotes a d -dimensional vector with all elements equal to δ and $\text{clip}_{[0,1]}(\cdot)$ denotes a function which truncates vector elements to $[0, 1]$. A detailed description is provided in Appendix A.2.

Constructing the fine-tuning dataset. For a forgetting instance $(\mathbf{x}_i^f, \mathbf{y}_i^f) \in \mathcal{D}^f$, we select four remaining instances $\{(\mathbf{x}_j^r, \mathbf{y}_j^r) \in \mathcal{D}^r\}_{j=1}^{n=4}$ according to the above rules. Then, we generate unlearning instances using the following formula:

$$\mathcal{D}_i^f = \{(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{m}_j^{\text{scaled}}}(\mathbf{x}_i^f, \mathbf{x}_j^r), \mathbf{y}_j^r)\}_{j=1}^n. \quad (2)$$

After executing the aforementioned operation on all forgetting samples, following [13, 16], we merge all the sets from these samples with the remaining set to compile the final fine-tuning dataset:

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{Nat}} = \mathcal{D}^r \cup \mathcal{D}_{\text{forget}}^f, \text{ where } \mathcal{D}_{\text{forget}}^f = \mathcal{D}_1^f \cup \mathcal{D}_2^f \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{D}_{|\mathcal{D}^f|}^f. \quad (3)$$

We present the full algorithm for generating the fine-tuning dataset in Algorithm 1. Finally, we fine-tune the original model on the resulting dataset, akin to other optimization-based methods.

3.4 Discussion

Unlearning mechanism. Given an unlearning instance $(\mathbf{x}^f \circ \mathbf{m} + \mathbf{x}^r \circ (\mathbf{1}_d - \mathbf{m}), \mathbf{y}^r) \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{Nat}}$, it consists of two distinct parts of information: the information to be forgotten, denoted as $\mathbf{x}^f \circ \mathbf{m}$, and

the injected information, denoted as $x^r \circ (\mathbf{1}_d - \mathbf{m})$. In the original pre-trained model, the former information is connected to the forgetting label y^f , while the latter information is connected to the reassigned label y^r . During the fine-tuning of unlearning process, the unlearned model learns to pair the unlearning sample with label y^r , reinforcing the latter connection. It naturally suppresses model’s response to the forgetting information, since such response is harmful to make accurate predictions for unlearning instances. As a result, it effectively removes the learned knowledge in $x^f \circ \mathbf{m}$.

Compared to previous label-modifying work, the reinforced information in NatMU is the connection between $x^r \circ (\mathbf{1}_d - \mathbf{m})$ and y^r , which inherently exists in the remaining set. This prevents the model from establishing undesirable new associations between $x^f \circ \mathbf{m}$ and y^r , thereby promoting a more natural unlearning process.

Fig. 2b visualizes the unlearning instances of NatMU and their attention maps before and after unlearning. We can see that different weighting masks capture different parts of forgetting samples in the second column. By comparing the attention maps before and after unlearning, model’s attention is effectively shifted to the prominent positions of the remaining samples through unlearning. For example, in the first row, before unlearning the model focuses on the bird’s wings in $x^f \circ \mathbf{m}$. After unlearning, the model shifts its attention to the butterfly below the bird, which comes from $x^r \circ (\mathbf{1}_d - \mathbf{m})$. More visual results are provided in Appendix D.1.

Natural property. The injected information is extracted from remaining data, therefore, the unlearning instances of NatMU align with the distribution of remaining data more closely. It significantly reduces the conflict between the unlearning instances and the remaining data. To quantify the degree of data conflict, we adopt the KL divergence [38] between the reassigned unlearning labels and retrained model’s predictions on the unlearning samples. A smaller KL divergence indicates more natural unlearning, as the unlearned data aligns better with the retrained model’s knowledge distribution. Since no unlearning samples are involved in retraining, we define its KL divergence as zero. In Fig. 2a, we demonstrate the average KL divergence of different methods over their unlearning instances. For Amnesiac, the unlearning instances are from $\mathcal{D}_{\text{RL}}^f$. For BadTeacher, from $\mathcal{D}_{\text{bad}}^f$; and for NatMU, from $\mathcal{D}_{\text{forget}}^f$. We can see that NatMU has a much smaller KL divergence compared to other methods, indicating that its unlearning is more natural. Therefore, NatMU’s performance is closer to that of the retrained model.

Preventing undesirable reinforcement. In previous work, incorrect information is reinforced during unlearning, leading to the over-forgetting problem. Specifically, the model establishes incorrect associations between the forgetting samples and their reassigned labels. Although NatMU also modifies the forgetting labels, the existence of correct information from x^r can effectively prevent these incorrect associations. To verify this, we demonstrate the accuracy curves on sample-label pairs $\{(x^f \circ \mathbf{m}, y^r)\}$ and forgetting accuracy curves of different MU models trained with or without the correct information $x^r \circ (\mathbf{1}_d - \mathbf{m})$ in Fig. 3. It can be seen that, without the injected correct information, the model quickly recognizes the partial forgetting sample $x^f \circ \mathbf{m}$ as the reassigned class y^r . As a result, the forgetting accuracy faces a significant decrease. In contrast, the model trained with correct information consistently remains a low accuracy on $\{(x^f \circ \mathbf{m}, y^r)\}$, showing that injecting correct information can effectively prevent undesirable reinforcement.

The injected correct information from remaining data helps NatMU achieve a more natural machine unlearning, not forced unlearning as other label-modifying methods do. The natural generalization on forgetting samples is well preserved in NatMU. As a result, NatMU can achieve a smaller performance gap with the retrained model on multiple metrics. Moreover, the natural property gives NatMU greater robustness, allowing us to use nearly identical hyperparameters across different unlearning settings, making NatMU a promising candidate for practical MU.




Figure 3: Accuracy curves on partial unlearning instances $\{(x^f \circ \mathbf{m}, y^r)\}$ and forgetting accuracy of different MU models trained with/without correct information. Conducted on CIFAR-100 with a forgetting ratio of 1% using ResNet18. PFA: accuracy of classifying partial forgetting samples $x^f \circ \mathbf{m}$ as random label y^r . FA: forgetting accuracy. CI: correct information. ReT: the retrained model.

Table 1: Full-class unlearning on CIFAR-100 using ResNet18 with different forgetting classes. The results are given by $a_{\pm b}(c)$, where a donates the mean value, b donates the standard deviation, and c donates the performance gap with the retrained model over 5 independent trails. A smaller c means a better performance of MU methods.

Class	Metric	Retrain	Finetune [42]	GA [18]	Amnesiac [13]	BadTeacher [14]	SalUn [16]	SSD [28]	Ours
Rocket	RA	76.44 $_{\pm 0.33}$	76.36 $_{\pm 0.07}(0.07)$	71.93 $_{\pm 0.00}(4.51)$	76.87 $_{\pm 0.06}(0.44)$	76.88 $_{\pm 0.09}(0.45)$	76.97 $_{\pm 0.17}(0.53)$	76.53 $_{\pm 0.03}(0.10)$	76.63 $_{\pm 0.23}(0.19)$
	FATrain	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$	2.40 $_{\pm 0.00}(2.40)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$	5.60 $_{\pm 0.85}(5.60)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$
	FATest	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$	0.20 $_{\pm 0.40}(0.20)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$
	MIA	14.64 $_{\pm 0.77}$	6.08 $_{\pm 0.48}(8.56)$	6.60 $_{\pm 0.00}(8.04)$	8.68 $_{\pm 0.96}(5.96)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(14.64)$	7.04 $_{\pm 0.66}(7.60)$	0.88 $_{\pm 0.10}(13.76)$	11.52 $_{\pm 1.27}(3.12)$
	AvgGap	-	2.16	3.74	1.60	5.22	2.03	3.46	0.83
Vehicle2	RA	76.43 $_{\pm 0.27}$	76.75 $_{\pm 0.01}(0.32)$	68.57 $_{\pm 0.00}(7.86)$	77.16 $_{\pm 0.14}(0.73)$	77.83 $_{\pm 0.13}(1.40)$	76.89 $_{\pm 0.18}(0.46)$	76.60 $_{\pm 0.08}(0.17)$	76.95 $_{\pm 0.13}(0.52)$
	FATrain	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$	1.60 $_{\pm 0.00}(1.60)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$	3.12 $_{\pm 2.13}(3.12)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$
	FATest	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$	4.40 $_{\pm 0.80}(4.40)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$
	MIA	11.48 $_{\pm 0.84}$	2.20 $_{\pm 0.63}(9.28)$	13.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(1.52)$	9.08 $_{\pm 0.74}(2.40)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(11.48)$	9.48 $_{\pm 1.28}(2.00)$	2.72 $_{\pm 0.57}(8.76)$	13.00 $_{\pm 1.41}(1.52)$
	AvgGap	-	2.40	2.74	0.78	5.10	0.61	2.23	0.51
Sea	RA	76.44 $_{\pm 0.19}$	76.54 $_{\pm 0.28}(0.09)$	73.89 $_{\pm 0.00}(2.56)$	76.18 $_{\pm 0.28}(0.26)$	77.85 $_{\pm 0.10}(1.40)$	76.89 $_{\pm 0.17}(0.45)$	74.69 $_{\pm 0.22}(1.75)$	76.83 $_{\pm 0.06}(0.39)$
	FATrain	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$	1.40 $_{\pm 0.00}(1.40)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$	15.76 $_{\pm 3.62}(15.76)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$
	FATest	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$	25.60 $_{\pm 3.56}(25.60)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.00)$
	MIA	26.84 $_{\pm 1.56}$	9.64 $_{\pm 0.87}(17.20)$	48.60 $_{\pm 0.00}(21.76)$	5.00 $_{\pm 1.02}(21.84)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(26.84)$	4.60 $_{\pm 0.87}(22.24)$	0.44 $_{\pm 0.20}(26.40)$	30.56 $_{\pm 0.54}(3.72)$
	AvgGap	-	4.32	6.43	5.53	17.40	5.67	7.04	1.03

Table 2: Sub-class unlearning on CIFAR-20 using ResNet18 with different forgetting sub-classes. The results are given by $a_{\pm b}(c)$, sharing the same format with Tab. 1.

Class	Metric	Retrain	Finetune [42]	GA [18]	Amnesiac [13]	BadTeacher [14]	SalUn [16]	SSD [28]	NatMU
Rocket	RA	84.94 $_{\pm 0.14}$	84.12 $_{\pm 0.27}(0.81)$	80.60 $_{\pm 0.00}(4.34)$	84.80 $_{\pm 0.09}(0.14)$	85.25 $_{\pm 0.05}(0.32)$	84.93 $_{\pm 0.07}(0.00)$	84.69 $_{\pm 0.12}(0.24)$	84.94 $_{\pm 0.25}(0.00)$
	FATrain	3.04 $_{\pm 0.34}$	23.88 $_{\pm 0.01}(20.84)$	1.80 $_{\pm 0.00}(1.24)$	2.60 $_{\pm 0.33}(0.44)$	15.24 $_{\pm 1.83}(12.20)$	3.96 $_{\pm 0.61}(0.92)$	0.64 $_{\pm 0.78}(2.40)$	6.44 $_{\pm 0.92}(3.40)$
	FATest	1.60 $_{\pm 0.49}$	20.40 $_{\pm 0.08}(18.80)$	1.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.60)$	2.40 $_{\pm 0.40}(0.80)$	5.00 $_{\pm 0.89}(3.40)$	3.20 $_{\pm 0.40}(1.60)$	1.20 $_{\pm 0.40}(0.40)$	3.60 $_{\pm 0.49}(2.00)$
	MIA	21.68 $_{\pm 2.08}$	4.20 $_{\pm 1.37}(17.48)$	15.40 $_{\pm 0.00}(6.28)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(21.68)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(21.68)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(21.68)$	8.68 $_{\pm 0.60}(13.00)$	16.84 $_{\pm 0.72}(4.84)$
	AvgGap	-	14.48	3.11	5.76	9.40	6.05	4.01	2.56
Vehicle2	RA	84.95 $_{\pm 0.25}$	84.12 $_{\pm 0.21}(0.83)$	83.82 $_{\pm 0.00}(1.13)$	84.61 $_{\pm 0.11}(0.34)$	85.15 $_{\pm 0.12}(0.20)$	84.75 $_{\pm 0.07}(0.20)$	83.52 $_{\pm 0.02}(1.43)$	84.86 $_{\pm 0.17}(0.09)$
	FATrain	45.72 $_{\pm 2.75}$	73.24 $_{\pm 1.20}(27.52)$	63.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(17.28)$	42.84 $_{\pm 2.04}(2.88)$	53.56 $_{\pm 2.40}(7.84)$	46.80 $_{\pm 2.75}(1.08)$	31.92 $_{\pm 3.59}(13.80)$	46.16 $_{\pm 3.77}(0.44)$
	FATest	46.20 $_{\pm 3.19}$	63.60 $_{\pm 3.38}(17.40)$	46.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.20)$	34.40 $_{\pm 2.15}(11.80)$	45.60 $_{\pm 0.49}(0.60)$	35.00 $_{\pm 1.10}(11.20)$	24.60 $_{\pm 2.49}(21.60)$	50.20 $_{\pm 4.26}(4.00)$
	MIA	25.60 $_{\pm 3.51}$	23.24 $_{\pm 1.49}(2.36)$	27.20 $_{\pm 0.00}(1.60)$	0.08 $_{\pm 0.10}(25.52)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(25.60)$	0.20 $_{\pm 0.00}(25.40)$	10.28 $_{\pm 1.97}(15.32)$	18.08 $_{\pm 1.77}(7.52)$
	AvgGap	-	12.03	5.05	10.14	8.56	9.47	13.04	3.01
Sea	RA	84.66 $_{\pm 0.10}$	84.17 $_{\pm 0.16}(0.49)$	83.70 $_{\pm 0.00}(0.96)$	84.42 $_{\pm 0.08}(0.24)$	85.08 $_{\pm 0.07}(0.42)$	84.53 $_{\pm 0.09}(0.13)$	83.55 $_{\pm 0.42}(1.11)$	84.91 $_{\pm 0.15}(0.25)$
	FATrain	80.08 $_{\pm 0.81}$	93.12 $_{\pm 0.82}(13.04)$	78.20 $_{\pm 0.00}(1.88)$	80.88 $_{\pm 2.57}(0.80)$	80.88 $_{\pm 2.89}(0.80)$	82.08 $_{\pm 1.77}(2.00)$	49.68 $_{\pm 12.93}(30.40)$	81.40 $_{\pm 1.40}(1.32)$
	FATest	83.60 $_{\pm 1.62}$	91.40 $_{\pm 0.49}(7.80)$	71.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(12.60)$	73.20 $_{\pm 2.04}(10.40)$	75.40 $_{\pm 1.36}(8.20)$	73.40 $_{\pm 1.36}(10.20)$	40.60 $_{\pm 8.33}(43.00)$	80.20 $_{\pm 2.14}(3.40)$
	MIA	57.36 $_{\pm 1.78}$	60.88 $_{\pm 1.01}(3.52)$	41.40 $_{\pm 0.00}(15.96)$	0.20 $_{\pm 0.00}(57.16)$	0.00 $_{\pm 0.00}(57.36)$	0.20 $_{\pm 0.00}(57.16)$	1.48 $_{\pm 0.37}(55.88)$	48.12 $_{\pm 1.88}(9.24)$
	AvgGap	-	6.21	7.85	17.15	16.70	17.37	32.60	3.55

4 Experiments

In this section, we evaluate NatMU against other baselines across different datasets, models, and unlearning settings. In addition to comparing the performance of various methods with optimal hyperparameters, we also compare the performance of each method after sufficient training, which is common without using the retrained model as a hyperparameter tuning reference. Furthermore, we demonstrate the hyperparameter robustness of different methods by using the optimal hyperparameters from one setting to conduct experiments in another setting. Finally, in ablation study, we investigate the role of the injected correct information.

4.1 Setup

Datasets. NatMU is evaluated against other machine unlearning methods in the context of supervised image classification tasks using the CIFAR-10, CIFAR-20, CIFAR-100 [33], and TinyImageNet-200 [39] datasets. It is noteworthy that CIFAR-20 and CIFAR-100 are closely related. CIFAR-100 dataset consists of 20 superclasses, each containing 5 subclasses, resulting in a total of 100 classes. When considering only the superclasses, CIFAR-100 reduces to CIFAR-20.

Unlearning scenarios. Following [14] and [28], we evaluate MU methods across three unlearning scenarios: (1) *full-class unlearning*, (2) *sub-class unlearning*, and (3) *random-subset unlearning*. Models of various architectures are trained in different unlearning scenarios, including VGG16-BN [40], ResNet18 and ResNet34 [41].

Baselines. We compare NatMU with basic MU methods and multiple popular MU methods, including *Finetune* [42] which fine-tunes the original model on D^r , *gradient ascent* (GA) [18] which performs gradient ascent over D^f , *Amnesiac* [13], *BadTeacher* [14], *SalUn* [16], and *SSD* [28]. Some of these methods are designed for specific unlearning scenarios. Under different unlearning scenarios, we report only the methods that performed well.

Evaluation metrics. Following [14, 16, 28, 43, 29], we evaluate MU methods across three metrics: retain accuracy (RA), forgetting accuracy (FA) and MIA ratio [44]. Retain accuracy calculates the accuracy on test data, which measures the generalization ability. Forgetting accuracy evaluates the

model’s accuracy on the forgetting samples, which measures the effectiveness of MU. In full/sub-class unlearning, we calculate accuracy on samples of the forgetting class in training set and test set respectively, denoted as **FATrain** and **FATest**. MIA provides another view to evaluate the effectiveness of MU algorithms from the entropy of model outputs. MIA attempts to utilize model outputs to determine whether a sample is in the training set. The attack ratio means how much forgetting samples is recognized. Although the MIA used in this paper cannot precisely infer membership, it is widely adopted in recent MU research because it provides an additional perspective to assess the differences between the unlearned and retrained model beyond forgetting accuracy. More discussions about MIA are provided in Appendix C. We also report the average performance gap with the retrained model of above metrics, **AvgGap**, since our goal is not to maximize or minimize any single metric, but rather to **reduce the total performance gap** with the retrain model across different metrics.

Implement details. The only special parameter of NatMU is the scaling factor δ , which typically ranges from -0.1 to 0.1 in subsequent experiments. Generally, more complex datasets require a larger scaling factor for effective unlearning. For various baselines and NatMU, we search hyperparameters to **firstly ensure their forgetting accuracy is close to retraining**. In this situation, the MIA ratio is usually lower than retrained model. Other details can be found in Appendix A.

4.2 Results

Table 3: Random-subset unlearning on CIFAR-10 using VGG16-BN, CIFAR-100 using ResNet18 and TinyImageNet-200 using ResNet34 under 1% forgetting ratio and 10% forgetting ratio. The results are given by $a \pm b$ (c), sharing the same format with Tab. 1.

	Dataset	Metric	Retrain	Finetune	Amnesiac [13]	BadTeacher [14]	SalUn [16]	NatMU
1%	C-10	RA	93.26 _{±0.12}	93.35 _{±0.05} (0.09)	93.01 _{±0.05} (0.24)	93.16 _{±0.04} (0.10)	92.82 _{±0.04} (0.43)	93.01 _{±0.09} (0.24)
		FA	92.80 _{±0.80}	98.72 _{±0.48} (5.92)	92.52 _{±0.59} (0.28)	91.60 _{±0.68} (1.20)	93.00 _{±0.52} (0.20)	93.08 _{±0.41} (0.28)
		MIA	80.16 _{±0.73}	86.88 _{±1.26} (6.72)	45.00 _{±0.75} (35.16)	51.52 _{±0.85} (28.64)	57.06 _{±0.88} (23.10)	71.32 _{±0.83} (8.84)
		AvgGap	-	4.24	11.89	9.98	7.91	3.12
	C-100	RA	76.18 _{±0.23}	76.07 _{±0.21} (0.11)	76.17 _{±0.12} (0.01)	76.16 _{±0.11} (0.02)	76.15 _{±0.10} (0.03)	76.62 _{±0.22} (0.44)
		FA	75.32 _{±0.79}	86.28 _{±0.81} (10.96)	75.68 _{±0.57} (0.36)	74.20 _{±0.70} (1.12)	74.60 _{±1.30} (0.72)	75.08 _{±0.81} (0.24)
		MIA	55.24 _{±0.56}	66.24 _{±1.51} (11.00)	7.32 _{±0.48} (47.92)	2.36 _{±0.27} (52.88)	22.02 _{±0.72} (33.22)	41.72 _{±0.93} (13.52)
		AvgGap	-	7.36	16.10	18.01	11.32	4.73
	Tiny	RA	66.93 _{±0.23}	66.69 _{±0.26} (0.24)	65.59 _{±0.11} (1.34)	66.35 _{±0.10} (0.59)	65.59 _{±0.10} (1.34)	66.74 _{±0.20} (0.20)
		FA	68.00 _{±1.56}	85.80 _{±0.57} (17.80)	67.30 _{±0.35} (0.70)	70.56 _{±0.71} (2.56)	69.10 _{±0.32} (1.10)	68.68 _{±0.72} (0.68)
		MIA	49.06 _{±1.18}	63.68 _{±0.77} (14.62)	0.90 _{±0.09} (48.16)	0.00 _{±0.00} (49.06)	10.69 _{±0.45} (38.37)	36.76 _{±0.55} (12.30)
		AvgGap	-	10.89	16.73	17.40	13.60	4.39
10%	C-10	RA	93.09 _{±0.09}	93.34 _{±0.10} (0.25)	92.79 _{±0.07} (0.29)	92.91 _{±0.06} (0.18)	92.62 _{±0.10} (0.46)	92.16 _{±0.07} (0.93)
		FA	93.64 _{±0.20}	98.74 _{±0.06} (5.09)	93.56 _{±0.20} (0.08)	93.44 _{±0.21} (0.20)	93.15 _{±0.18} (0.50)	93.88 _{±0.17} (0.23)
		MIA	80.59 _{±0.43}	88.66 _{±0.18} (8.06)	36.37 _{±0.46} (44.22)	32.64 _{±0.45} (47.95)	40.13 _{±0.35} (40.46)	73.80 _{±0.28} (6.79)
		AvgGap	-	4.47	14.87	16.11	13.81	2.65
	C-100	RA	75.68 _{±0.12}	75.82 _{±0.18} (0.14)	72.60 _{±0.11} (3.08)	74.34 _{±0.10} (1.34)	72.18 _{±0.17} (3.50)	75.18 _{±0.22} (0.50)
		FA	74.76 _{±0.27}	86.47 _{±0.14} (11.72)	74.59 _{±0.21} (0.17)	74.42 _{±0.72} (0.34)	75.14 _{±0.68} (0.38)	74.50 _{±0.61} (0.26)
		MIA	55.05 _{±0.40}	64.99 _{±0.32} (9.94)	4.01 _{±0.04} (51.04)	0.10 _{±0.00} (54.95)	17.38 _{±0.18} (37.67)	38.92 _{±0.19} (16.14)
		AvgGap	-	7.26	18.10	18.88	13.85	5.63
	Tiny	RA	65.47 _{±0.20}	66.60 _{±0.11} (1.13)	61.62 _{±0.15} (3.85)	63.54 _{±0.08} (1.93)	60.98 _{±0.15} (4.49)	64.87 _{±0.15} (0.60)
		FA	66.00 _{±0.14}	85.66 _{±0.17} (19.66)	66.65 _{±0.35} (0.65)	66.17 _{±0.31} (0.16)	66.79 _{±0.52} (0.79)	65.72 _{±0.32} (0.28)
		MIA	46.75 _{±0.72}	62.91 _{±0.53} (16.16)	1.25 _{±0.05} (45.50)	0.00 _{±0.00} (46.75)	10.96 _{±0.19} (35.79)	34.66 _{±0.35} (12.09)
		AvgGap	-	12.32	16.66	16.28	13.69	4.33

Full-class and sub-class unlearning. Tab. 1 and Tab. 2 show the performance of different methods using ResNet18 model on CIFAR-100/CIFAR-20. As indicated by the **AvgGap** metric, NatMU achieves the smallest average performance gap in two class-unlearning scenarios across six different class-unlearning settings. In full-class unlearning, all MU methods can obtain good performances while NatMU can achieve a smaller performance gap, especially on **MIA** metric. Sub-class unlearning becomes more complex than full-class unlearning. When the forgetting sub-class varies, the behavior of the retrained model on these sub-class data is completely different. However, our approach not only demonstrates good performances but also exhibits remarkable **stability** across various classes.

Random-subset unlearning. Tab. 3 demonstrates the performance of different methods in random-subset unlearning. Apart from the CIFAR-10 dataset, NatMU achieves the smallest performance gap across all other datasets and settings. On CIFAR-10 dataset, since the forgetting accuracy and MIA ratio are very high, although *Finetune* cannot guarantee the achievement of unlearning objectives, it achieves the smallest average performance gap. NatMU can also obtain a second smallest performance gap with a much lower gap on **FA** metric. Because the compared three optimization-based methods assign incorrect labels to the forgetting samples, the predictions after the unlearning process is totally different from the remaining samples, resulting in an extremely low **MIA**. It can lead to a “Streisand Effect”, where the forgetting samples is actually more noticeable [26]. Moreover, compared to these three methods, NatMU enjoys a significantly smaller **RA** decrease on more complex dataset and larger forgetting ratio, since the conflicts in our fine-tuning data are much fewer.

Performance with sufficient training. In real-world applications, without the retrained model as a hyperparameter tuning reference, the user may need to fine-tune the model with more epochs to ensure effective unlearning. To demonstrate the results in real-world scenarios, we extend the training epochs from 5 to 20 with other hyperparameters unchanged to realize a sufficient training. As shown in Tab. 4b, other methods face a significant decrease in **FATrain** and **FATest** caused by the over-forgetting problem, while NatMU still has a small performance gap across all metrics. More results are provided in Appendix D.3.

Robustness to hyperparameters. Another solution for the absence of the retrained model as the hyperparameter tuning reference is to identify a set of hyperparameters under a specific experimental settings and transfer them to other settings. Fig. 4a illustrates the performance of different methods when transferring the optimal hyperparameters with 10% forgetting ratio to 1%. Due to the existence of remaining data, **RA** of four methods remains almost unchanged, thus not reported here. In case of **FA** and **MIA**, NatMU exhibits strong hyperparameter robustness compared to other baselines, making it a promising candidate for practical MU. More results are provided in Appendix D.2.




Figure 4: (a) Performance under a forgetting ratio of 1% on CIFAR-100, with the optimal hyperparameters and hyperparameters from a forgetting ratio of 10%. (b) Performance of different methods with sufficient training. The experiments are conducted on CIFAR-20 with a forgetting sub-class of “Vehicle2”. (c) Ablation study on correct information and weight masks on CIFAR-100 with a forgetting ratio of 1%. The results are given by a(c), sharing the same format with Tab. 1. For simplicity, variance is not reported here. AMN: Amnesiac, BT: BadTeacher, SU:SalUn.

4.3 Ablation

We study the rule of injected information by replacing $\mathcal{T}_m(x^f, x^r)$ with $\mathcal{T}_m(x^f, \mathbf{0}_d) = x^f \circ \mathbf{m}$, denoted as NatMU-NRI (No Remaining Information). We also replace the weight masks \mathbf{m} in NatMU-NRI with $\mathbf{1}_d$ which generates unlearning instances $\{(x^f, y_j^r)\}_{j=1}^{n=4}$ denoted as NatMU-RL (Random Labeling). It is actually a modified version of Amnesiac which generates 4 different randomly labeled samples for one forgetting sample. As shown in Tab. 4c, NatMU-RL has an extremely low **FA** and **MIA**, since its relabeling can lead to the unnatural property as discussed before. NatMU-NRI can reduce the unnatural property by relabeling the partial forgetting sample $x^f \circ \mathbf{m}$. However, without the injected correct information, it also face a significant performance decrease compare to NatMU.

5 Conclusion

Revisiting current popular machine unlearning methods, we identify their unnatural properties and resulting issues, such as unnatural generalization and impracticality. To address these issues, we propose a straightforward but effective machine unlearning method, NatMU, which injects correct information from remaining data into forgetting samples to achieve unlearning. NatMU demonstrates superior performance and robustness across different unlearning settings. Our initial step towards natural machine unlearning opens up new perspectives for achieving more efficient and effective MU.

Limitations and future work. Firstly, although NatMU performs well, it lacks theoretical support, which means it is not certified. This weakness is also shared by the compared baseline methods. Secondly, the weighting vectors are currently designed manually; thus, there is potential for improving, which we leave for future works. Thirdly, our algorithm needs to access the whole remaining data. Enhancements in efficiency could be achieved through methods such as dataset distillation [45].

References

- [1] Hengshuang Zhao, Jiaya Jia, and Vladlen Koltun. Exploring self-attention for image recognition. In *CVPR*, pages 10073–10082. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE, 2020.
- [2] Shiwen Wu, Fei Sun, Wentao Zhang, Xu Xie, and Bin Cui. Graph neural networks in recommender systems: A survey. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 55(5):97:1–97:37, 2023.
- [3] Michael I Jordan and Tom M Mitchell. Machine learning: Trends, perspectives, and prospects. *Science*, 349(6245):255–260, 2015.
- [4] Julia Hirschberg and Christopher D Manning. Advances in natural language processing. *Science*, 349(6245):261–266, 2015.
- [5] Chris Jay Hoofnagle, Bart Van Der Sloot, and Frederik Zuiderveen Borgesius. The european union general data protection regulation: what it is and what it means. *Information & Communications Technology Law*, 28(1):65–98, 2019.
- [6] Antonio Ginart, Melody Y. Guan, Gregory Valiant, and James Zou. Making AI forget you: Data deletion in machine learning. In *NeurIPS*, pages 3513–3526, 2019.
- [7] Chuan Guo, Tom Goldstein, Awni Y. Hannun, and Laurens van der Maaten. Certified data removal from machine learning models. In *ICML*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3832–3842. PMLR, 2020.
- [8] Enayat Ullah, Tung Mai, Anup Rao, Ryan A. Rossi, and Raman Arora. Machine unlearning via algorithmic stability. In *COLT*, volume 134 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 4126–4142. PMLR, 2021.
- [9] Goel Shashwat, Prabhu Ameya, Sanyal Amartya, Lim Ser-Nam, Torr Philip, and Kumaraguru Ponnurangam. Towards adversarial evaluations for inexact machine unlearning. *CoRR*, abs/2201.06640, 2022.
- [10] Vikram S. Chundawat, Ayush K. Tarun, Murari Mandal, and Mohan S. Kankanhalli. Zero-shot machine unlearning. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Forensics Secur.*, 18:2345–2354, 2023.
- [11] Stefan Schoepf, Jack Foster, and Alexandra Brintrup. Parameter-tuning-free data entry error unlearning with adaptive selective synaptic dampening. *CoRR*, abs/2402.10098, 2024.
- [12] Ga Wu, Masoud Hashemi, and Christopher Srinivasa. PUMA: performance unchanged model augmentation for training data removal. In *AAAI*, pages 8675–8682. AAAI Press, 2022.
- [13] Laura Graves, Vineel Nagisetty, and Vijay Ganesh. Amnesiac machine learning. In *AAAI*, pages 11516–11524. AAAI Press, 2021.
- [14] Vikram S. Chundawat, Ayush K. Tarun, Murari Mandal, and Mohan S. Kankanhalli. Can bad teaching induce forgetting? unlearning in deep networks using an incompetent teacher. In *AAAI*, pages 7210–7217. AAAI Press, 2023.
- [15] Pratyush Maini, Michael Curtis Mozer, Hanie Sedghi, Zachary Chase Lipton, J. Zico Kolter, and Chiyuan Zhang. Can neural network memorization be localized? In *ICML*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 23536–23557. PMLR, 2023.
- [16] Chongyu Fan, Jiancheng Liu, Yihua Zhang, Dennis Wei, Eric Wong, and Sijia Liu. Salun: Empowering machine unlearning via gradient-based weight saliency in both image classification and generation. *CoRR*, abs/2310.12508, 2023.
- [17] Anvith Thudi, Hengrui Jia, Ilia Shumailov, and Nicolas Papernot. On the necessity of auditable algorithmic definitions for machine unlearning. In *USENIX Security Symposium*, pages 4007–4022. USENIX Association, 2022.
- [18] Anvith Thudi, Gabriel Deza, Varun Chandrasekaran, and Nicolas Papernot. Unrolling SGD: understanding factors influencing machine unlearning. In *EuroS&P*, pages 303–319. IEEE, 2022.

- [19] Jie Xu, Zihan Wu, Cong Wang, and Xiaohua Jia. Machine unlearning: Solutions and challenges. *CoRR*, abs/2308.07061, 2023.
- [20] Yinzhi Cao and Junfeng Yang. Towards making systems forget with machine unlearning. In *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, pages 463–480. IEEE Computer Society, 2015.
- [21] Pang Wei Koh and Percy Liang. Understanding black-box predictions via influence functions. In *ICML*, volume 70 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1885–1894. PMLR, 2017.
- [22] Ryutaro Tanno, Melanie F. Pradier, Aditya V. Nori, and Yingzhen Li. Repairing neural networks by leaving the right past behind. In *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [23] Zachary Izzo, Mary Anne Smart, Kamalika Chaudhuri, and James Zou. Approximate data deletion from machine learning models. In *AISTATS*, volume 130 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2008–2016. PMLR, 2021.
- [24] Ronak Mehta, Sourav Pal, Vikas Singh, and Sathya N. Ravi. Deep unlearning via randomized conditionally independent Hessians. In *CVPR*, pages 10412–10421. IEEE, 2022.
- [25] Alexander Warnecke, Lukas Pirch, Christian Wressnegger, and Konrad Rieck. Machine unlearning of features and labels. In *NDSS*. The Internet Society, 2023.
- [26] Aditya Golatkar, Alessandro Achille, and Stefano Soatto. Eternal sunshine of the spotless net: Selective forgetting in deep networks. In *CVPR*, pages 9301–9309. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE, 2020.
- [27] James Martens. New insights and perspectives on the natural gradient method. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 21:146:1–146:76, 2020.
- [28] Jack Foster, Stefan Schoepf, and Alexandra Brintrup. Fast machine unlearning without retraining through selective synaptic dampening. In *AAAI*, pages 12043–12051. AAAI Press, 2024.
- [29] Meghdad Kurmanji, Peter Triantafillou, Jamie Hayes, and Eleni Triantafillou. Towards unbounded machine unlearning. In *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [30] Xinwen Cheng, Zehao Huang, and Xiaolin Huang. Machine unlearning by suppressing sample contribution. *CoRR*, abs/2402.15109, 2024.
- [31] Jack Foster, Kyle Fogarty, Stefan Schoepf, Cengiz Öztireli, and Alexandra Brintrup. Zero-shot machine unlearning at scale via Lipschitz regularization. *CoRR*, abs/2402.01401, 2024.
- [32] Sungmin Cha, Sungjun Cho, Dasol Hwang, Honglak Lee, Taesup Moon, and Moontae Lee. Learning to unlearn: Instance-wise unlearning for pre-trained classifiers. In *AAAI*, pages 11186–11194. AAAI Press, 2024.
- [33] Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. 2009.
- [34] Chiyuan Zhang, Samy Bengio, Moritz Hardt, Benjamin Recht, and Oriol Vinyals. Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization. In *ICLR*. OpenReview.net, 2017.
- [35] Hongyi Zhang, Moustapha Cissé, Yann N. Dauphin, and David Lopez-Paz. mixup: Beyond empirical risk minimization. In *ICLR (Poster)*. OpenReview.net, 2018.
- [36] Sangdoon Yun, Dongyoon Han, Sanghyuk Chun, Seong Joon Oh, Youngjoon Yoo, and Junsuk Choe. Cutmix: Regularization strategy to train strong classifiers with localizable features. In *ICCV*, pages 6022–6031. IEEE, 2019.
- [37] Alexander Binder, Grégoire Montavon, Sebastian Lapuschkin, Klaus-Robert Müller, and Wojciech Samek. Layer-wise relevance propagation for neural networks with local renormalization layers. In *ICANN (2)*, volume 9887 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 63–71. Springer, 2016.

- [38] Solomon Kullback and Richard A Leibler. On information and sufficiency. *The annals of mathematical statistics*, 22(1):79–86, 1951.
- [39] Mohammed Ali mnmostafa. Tiny imagenet, 2017.
- [40] Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. In *ICLR*, 2015.
- [41] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *CVPR*, pages 770–778. IEEE Computer Society, 2016.
- [42] Alexander Warnecke, Lukas Pirch, Christian Wressnegger, and Konrad Rieck. Machine unlearning of features and labels. In *NDSS*. The Internet Society, 2023.
- [43] Jinghan Jia, Jiancheng Liu, Parikshit Ram, Yuguang Yao, Gaowen Liu, Yang Liu, Pranay Sharma, and Sijia Liu. Model sparsity can simplify machine unlearning. In *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [44] Liwei Song and Prateek Mittal. Systematic evaluation of privacy risks of machine learning models. In *USENIX Security Symposium*, pages 2615–2632. USENIX Association, 2021.
- [45] Junaid Iqbal Khan. Dataset condensation driven machine unlearning. *CoRR*, abs/2402.00195, 2024.
- [46] Ayush K Tarun, Vikram S Chundawat, Murari Mandal, and Mohan Kankanhalli. Fast yet effective machine unlearning. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2023.
- [47] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. SGDR: stochastic gradient descent with warm restarts. In *ICLR (Poster)*. OpenReview.net, 2017.
- [48] Christopher J. Anders, David Neumann, Wojciech Samek, Klaus-Robert Müller, and Sebastian Lapuschkin. Software for dataset-wide xai: From local explanations to global insights with Zennit, CoRelAy, and ViRelAy. *CoRR*, abs/2106.13200, 2021.

Appendix

A Training Details

In full-class/sub-class unlearning, both the original and the retrained models are trained on the CIFAR-100/CIFAR-20 dataset for a total of 100 epochs with a warm-up period of 2 epochs, using ResNet18. We use SGD as the optimizer, and a step learning rate schedule is implemented, where the learning rate decays at the 80th and 90th epochs with ratio 0.1. The initial learning rate is 0.1, weight decay is configured at 0.0005, and the batch size is 128. RandomCrop(32, padding=4) and RandomHorizonFlip(0.5) are adopted as data augmentation.

In random-subset unlearning, we train VGG16-BN on CIFAR-10, ResNet18 on CIFAR-100, and ResNet34 on TinyImageNet-200. The experimental configuration is the same as full-class/sub-class unlearning and the two main difference are that we use a batch size of 256 to train ResNet34 on TinyImageNet-200, and RandomCrop(64, padding=8) to replace the RandomCrop(32, padding=4) in above settings.

Computer resources. All the experiments are conducted in docker container with Python version 3.8.8, PyTorch version 1.12.0+cu113, a RTX4090 GPU, CPU with 40 cores and 256GB memory.

A.1 Details of Baselines

When optimizing the hyperparameters for compared baselines, we prioritize to make the forgetting accuracy close to the retrained model. We all use the cosine learning scheduler for these baselines except *GA* and *SSD*. To enhance the algorithm stability, data augmentation is not adopted and weight decay is set to 0, since we have observed that under some settings (for example, random-subset unlearning with a forgetting ratio of 10%), data augmentation can result a significant decrease on RA. We usually use AdamW as the default optimizer. In some tasks, we also use SGD for a better performance. The batch size is set the same with the retrained model and original model except *GA* and *SSD*.

For *GA* and *SSD*, we use a large batch size of 500 to enhance algorithm stability. For *GA*, we use a constant learning rate 0.001 and search the training epoch to achieve a good performance. For *SSD*, we search the hyperparameter α and set $\lambda = 1$ in their paper. Although they recommend a range [0.1, 100] for α , we found for most tasks, the best α in our setting is more than 100, usually in [200, 550].

For *Finetune*, we use a large learning rate to impair the model at the initial training stage.

For *Amnesiac*, *BadTeacher*, *SalUn*, we all fine-tune the original model for 5 epochs, especially in a few experiments. For *SalUn*, we also search the mask ratio in [0.1, 0.9].

In full-class and sub-class unlearning, we provide an option to initialize the last linear layer before unlearning for *Finetune* and *Amnesiac*, following the idea in [9]. We found it helpful for efficient unlearning with some forgetting class.

We referenced the code available at <https://github.com/OPTML-Group/Unlearn-Saliency> and <https://github.com/if-loops/selective-synaptic-dampening>.

A.2 Details of NatMU

Following the impair-repair idea in [46], we use a high learning rate in the initial stages of training to promote model forgetting, where the learning rate gradually decays to zero using the cosine learning rate scheduler [47]. In full-class and sub-class unlearning, we initialize the last linear layer before unlearning, as we implement in *Finetune* and *Amnesiac*. It is helpful for efficient unlearning.

In most unlearning settings, we use a optimizer of AdamW, a learning rate of $4e-4$, a weight decay of $5e-4$, and a learning rate scheduler of cosine. We fine-tune the original model for 5 epochs as baselines do. We also adopt RandomCrop and RandomHorizonFlip(0.5) as data augmentation for remaining data to improve the generalization ability, and no augmentation for unlearning samples. We use a padding of 8 for TinyImageNet-200 and a padding of 2 for other datasets.

Weighting mask. To facilitate understanding, the weighting vector \mathbf{m} can be reshaped into a $H \times W$ matrix M to align with the two-dimensional structure of images. The elements in each column share the same value and the value of two edge columns is 0 while that of center edges is 1. The values in other columns transition uniformly from 0 on the edges to 1 in the center. M can be calculated with:

$$M[\cdot, i] = \begin{cases} \frac{2}{W-2}(i-1), 1 \leq i \leq W/2, \\ \frac{2}{W-2}(W-i), W/2 \leq i \leq W, \end{cases} \quad (\text{A1})$$

where $M[\cdot, i]$ donates the value of the i -th column and $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, W\}$. In order to unlearn the forgetting sample from multiple perspectives, we can perform a rotation or take the complement of \mathbf{m} to obtain different weight vectors. Let $\mathbf{m}_1 = \mathbf{m}$, we can obtain \mathbf{m}_2 with complement operation $\mathbf{m}_2 = \mathbf{1}_d - \mathbf{m}_1$, and rotate them by 90 degrees to obtain \mathbf{m}_3 and \mathbf{m}_4 . The only important parameter of NatMU is the scaling factor δ , which controls the values of weighting vectors. We search it in $[-0.5, 0.5]$ and it is usually set between $[-0.1, 0.1]$. Fig.A1 visualize the 4 weighting vectors to facilitate understanding.

We can see that, a weighting mask captures the entire pixels of the forgetting samples. Moreover, different weighting masks focus on different parts of the images. We also have tried other weighting masks, such constant weighting mask in MixUp [35] or area weighting mask in CutMix [36]. Experiments show that this used implementation has a better robustness across different unlearning scenarios.




Figure A1: Visualization of weighting vectors.

Algorithm. The algorithm for generating the fine-tuning dataset for NatMU is provided in Algorithm 1. After generating the dataset, we can fine-tune the original model with it, using the setups described in Appendix A.2.

Algorithm 1 Construct Fine-tuning Dataset

Input: remaining set D^r , forgetting set D^f , original model f_{θ_o} , weighting vectors $\{\mathbf{m}_j\}_{j=1}^n$, scaling factor δ .

Output: fine-tuning dataset D_{Nat}

```

1: for  $j \leftarrow 1$  to  $n$  do
2:   Generate  $\mathbf{m}_j^{\text{scaled}}$  according to Eq.1.
3: end for
4:  $D_{\text{Nat}} \leftarrow D^r$ 
5: for  $(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) \in D^f$  do
6:   Generate  $\mathcal{D}_i^f$  according to Eq.2.
7:    $D_{\text{Nat}} \leftarrow D_{\text{Nat}} \cup \mathcal{D}_i^f$ 
8: end for
9: return  $D_{\text{Nat}}$ 

```

Unlearning efficiency. Although we do not specifically address the runtime of the algorithm in this paper, the efficiency of NatMU is comparable to other optimization-based methods. For instance, SalUn fine-tunes the original model by using 5% (10/200) of the epochs for retraining in the official

implementation, and NatMU similarly employs 5% (5/100) of the retraining cost. In simple forgetting scenarios, such as full-class/sub-class unlearning or random-subset unlearning on the CIFAR dataset, NatMU can operate with lower computational costs, requiring only three epochs.

Broader impact With the rapid development of deep learning, its demand for large amounts of training data has raised concerns about personal privacy. Retraining models in large-scale deep learning is impractical when removing certain private, harmful, or sensitive data. Our work takes a step towards eliminating the impact of these data through post-processing of models. Our method effectively and efficiently removes specific data while approximating the retrained model’s performance, thus maintaining good utility, making it a promising candidate for piratical machine unlearning. However, NatMU is not a certified machine unlearning method. Therefore, its implementation in practical applications necessitates careful auditing.

B Overview of Different Methods and Takeaways

In full-class unlearning, *Finetune* is a good and simple MU method with the initialization of linear classifier layer [9]. *SSD* is the most efficient method among all well-performing methods, since it only accesses the whole training set once. In contrast, *GA* has a inferior performance with better efficiency. *Amnesiac* and *SalUn* are also good, while *BadTeacher* cannot unlearn the forgetting class in some settings. However, *BadTeacher* has an increase of **RA** since it distills the knowledge of original model into unlearned model with meaningful soft labels. *NatMU* achieves the best performance gap, as it owns a closer **MIA**, while other metrics are easier to approximate in full-class unlearning.

In sub-class unlearning, *Finetune* is a poor method since it fails to forget the sub-class. *GA* surprisingly has a good performance gap across multiple metrics, particularly in these sub-class whose samples can be still correctly classified, indicating its potential in this unlearning scenario. *SSD* exhibits sensitivity to hyperparamters in our implementation, although we adopt techniques like enlarging the batch size for an accurate gradient estimation. *Amnesiac* can effectively finish the forgetting with almostly unchanged **RA**, while its **MIA** is close to zero. *SalUn* improves *Amnesiac* on **MIA**, achieving a smaller performance gap. *BadTeacher*’s **MIA** consistently remains zero for different forgetting sub-classes. Additionally, for certain sub-classes, it has the issue of under-forgetting, close to its performance in full-class unlearning. *NatMU* also consistently maintains the smallest performance gap across different forgetting sub-classes, but its performance is less stable in certain cases.

In random-subset unlearning, both *GA* and *SSD* fails to realize the effective unlearning while remaining a decent performance in our implementation. The underlying reason is that the gradients of forgetting set and remaining set are quite close, while these two method rely on the difference between the gradients. *Finetune* still fails to forget, although its average performance gap is the smallest on CIFAR-10. Optimization-based methods demonstrate exceptional performance in this scenario. However, *Amnesiac* and *SalUn* has a lower **RA**, since they introduce great data conflicts into the fine-tuning dataset by randomly hard-labeling the forgetting samples. The conflicts not only affects the generalization on forgetting samples as discussed before, but also can affect the generalization on remaining data, leading to the decrease of **RA** on complex datasets and larger forgetting ratio. Compared to them, the knowledge distillation on remaining data helps *BadTeacher* remains a better performance. Moreover, the uniformly distributed prediction given by the randomly initialization model on forgetting samples also helps it remain a closer **FA** to the retrained model. The reason is that the predictions for most forgetting samples remain between the original one-hot predictions and uniform predictions. In this case, their predicted labels are still the original labels, despite having much lower confidence. This mechanism benefits it in random-subset unlearning, but can lead to under-forgetting in full/sub-class unlearning. All these three methods exhibit a nearly-zero **MIA**. Consistently, *NatMU* has the best performance gap across different datasets and settings.

The relationship between FA and MIA in optimization-based methods. When the learning rate is increased from zero, both **FA** and **MIA** decrease with **MIA** decreasing more quickly. When **MIA** approaches the level of retraining, **FA** remains significantly higher than that of retraining. We believe that, **FA** is much more important than **MIA** in the context of “unlearning”. Therefore, in our experiments, we select a learning rate where **FA** is close to retraining. However, at this learning rate, **MIA** tends to be lower, particularly for *Amnesiac* and *BadTeacher*. More discussions about **MIA** are provided in the next section.

C Discussion about MIA.

The MIA we used in this paper is a prediction-based MIA method which judge the membership of a samples according to the prediction of the model on it [44]. Give a model $f_{\theta}(\cdot)$, it first calculates the entropy values of shadow training set, i.e., \mathcal{D}^r in unlearning framework, and entropy values of shadow test set, i.e., the test set in unlearning framework. Then, the entropy values of shadow training set are labeled as “member” and those of test set are labeled as “non-member” to train a binary classifier. Finally, for a forgetting sample x^f to be detected, the entropy of $f_{\theta}(x^f)$ is used to predict the membership with the trained classifier.

Usually, the training samples have been fitted by the model, so they are predicted with high confidence, corresponding to low entropy. While the test samples usually are predicted with a lower confidence, corresponding to a high entropy. Basically, the binary classifier is to find a decision point to determine membership. As a result, if we randomly label a forgetting sample and fine-tune the model on it, the entropy of the model’s prediction for this sample would exhibit an inverted U-shaped curve as the training progresses. Initially, the entropy is low because the model predicts the original category with high confidence. Then, the entropy increases as the model’s prediction for this sample transitions from the initial category to the newly assigned category. Finally, with sufficient training, the entropy decreases again because the model predicts the sample as the newly assigned category with high confidence.

For *BadTeacher*, the soft labels of remaining samples are close to one-hot labels, which has a low entropy. While the soft labels of forgetting samples are uniformly distributed with a high entropy. As a result, the MIA ratio of forgetting samples is always zero.

D More Experimental Results.

D.1 Visual Results.

Fig.A2 provides more visual results about unlearning instances and their attentions. The attention map is calculated by LRP [37], implemented by Zennit [48]. We choose LRP because it can generate pixel-wise attention maps, which are more effective in handling cases where image subjects overlap. Before normalizing the attention map to the image range $[0, 255]$, we apply the ReLU activation function to process the attention map, preventing the image background from being elevated by some negative outliers. To generate attention maps, a VGG16-BN is trained on a subset of ImageNet-1K consisting of 20 classes. Then, the model is fine-tuned to forget a full class. In some unlearning samples, the main subject of x^f is not prominent, resulting in attention maps that highlight only the relevant parts of x^r .

D.2 Robustness to Hyperparameters.

Tab.A1 shows the hyperparameter robustness of different optimization-based methods under full-class, sub-class and random-subset scenarios. It can be seen that in multiple unlearning scenarios, the performance of NatMU remains consistent across different hyperparameters. Note that although *BadTeacher* has a smaller average change in sub-class unlearning, its MIA ration remain zero for different sets of hyperparameters, which is much different from that of the retrained model.

D.3 Results with Sufficient Training.

Tab.A2, Tab.A3 and Tab.A4 show the results of different optimization-based methods with a sufficient training, where the training epoch changes form 5 to 20 with other hyperparameters unchanged. Other methods all face a significant decrease of forgetting accuracy, since they assign incorrect labels to these forgetting samples, damaging the natural generalization on these samples. We can also see that, in some settings the MIA ratio of Amnesiac and SalUn is higher than that in the main page. For example, in full-class unlearning, their MIA is over 80%. In random-subset unlearning with a forgetting ratio of 10% on TinyImageNet-200, their MIA is even closer to the retrained model than NatMU.

As discusses in AppendixC, when the optimal learning rate is large enough, the unlearned model of Amnesiac and SalUn can predict the forgetting samples as the reassigned labels with high confidence,

Table A1: Performance of different methods under different unlearning settings with same hyperparameters. The results are given by $a(d)$, where a denotes the mean value with hyperparameters transferred from another setting, while d denotes the performance change with that with optimal hyperparameters compared to a , **not the retrained model**. **AvgChange** means the performance change of two sets of hyperparameters. **FC/SC**: transferring the hyperparameters of class/sub-class "Rocket" to class/sub-class "Sea" under **Full-Class/Sub-Class** unlearning on CIFAR-100/CIFAR-20. **RS**: transferring the hyperparameters of a forgetting ratio of 10% to a forgetting ratio of 1% on different datasets in random-subset unlearning.

Setting	Metric	Retrain	Amnesiac [13]	BadTeacher [14]	SalUn [16]	Ours
FC	RA	76.44	76.99(0.81)	76.96(0.88)	76.87(0.02)	76.54(0.29)
	FATrain	0.00	0.00(0.00)	35.40(19.64)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
	FATest	0.00	0.00(0.00)	17.40(8.20)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
	MIA	26.84	3.88(1.12)	0.00(0.00)	3.80(0.80)	29.80(0.76)
	AvgChange	-	0.48	7.18	0.20	0.26
SC	RA	84.66	84.50(0.08)	85.00(0.08)	84.83(0.30)	84.83(0.08)
	FATrain	80.08	70.16(10.72)	83.80(2.92)	69.28(12.80)	74.36(7.04)
	FATest	83.60	64.60(8.60)	77.00(1.60)	62.80(10.60)	73.00(7.20)
	MIA	57.36	0.08(0.12)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.20)	43.36(4.76)
	AvgChange	-	4.88	1.15	5.98	4.77
RS-C10	RA	93.26	92.96(0.05)	93.18(0.02)	92.88(0.05)	93.09(0.08)
	FA	92.80	87.54(4.98)	88.09(3.51)	85.60(7.40)	94.00(0.92)
	MIA	80.16	29.97(15.03)	46.69(4.83)	33.61(23.44)	71.80(0.48)
	AvgChange	-	6.69	2.79	10.30	0.49
	RS-C100	RA	76.18	75.99(0.18)	76.59(0.44)	75.98(0.17)
FA		75.32	28.97(46.71)	39.67(34.53)	37.97(36.63)	73.84(1.24)
MIA		55.24	1.53(5.79)	0.00(2.36)	16.57(5.45)	40.44(1.28)
AvgChange		-	17.56	12.44	14.08	0.86
RS-Tiny		RA	66.93	65.65(0.05)	66.89(0.54)	65.50(0.09)
	FA	68.00	23.75(43.55)	36.63(33.93)	29.82(39.28)	64.74(3.94)
	MIA	49.06	3.52(2.62)	0.00(0.00)	13.11(2.42)	35.62(1.14)
	AvgChange	-	15.41	11.49	13.93	1.81

so their MIA would also be high. However, in this situation, their forgetting accuracy is zero, i.e., the over-forgetting problem.

Table A2: Full-class unlearning on CIFAR-100 using ResNet18 of different optimization-based methods, with a training epoch of 20. Results are given by $a_{\pm b}(c)$, sharing the same format with Tab.1.

Class	Metric	Retrain	Amnesiac [13]	BadTeacher [14]	SalUn [16]	Ours
Rocket	RA	76.44 \pm 0.33	75.86 \pm 0.29(0.58)	77.28 \pm 0.11(0.84)	76.75 \pm 0.20(0.31)	76.67 \pm 0.27(0.24)
	FATrain	0.00 \pm 0.00	0.00 \pm 0.00(0.00)	17.76 \pm 1.57(17.76)	0.00 \pm 0.00(0.00)	0.00 \pm 0.00(0.00)
	FATest	0.00 \pm 0.00	0.00 \pm 0.00(0.00)	4.00 \pm 0.89(4.00)	0.00 \pm 0.00(0.00)	0.00 \pm 0.00(0.00)
	MIA	14.64 \pm 0.77	79.16 \pm 0.83(64.52)	0.00 \pm 0.00(14.64)	81.16 \pm 3.10(66.52)	12.68 \pm 1.36(1.96)
	AvgGap	-	16.27	9.31	16.71	0.55
Vehicle2	RA	76.43 \pm 0.27	76.47 \pm 0.10(0.04)	78.02 \pm 0.21(1.59)	76.92 \pm 0.27(0.48)	76.81 \pm 0.17(0.38)
	FATrain	0.00 \pm 0.00	0.00 \pm 0.00(0.00)	1.92 \pm 1.92(1.92)	0.00 \pm 0.00(0.00)	0.00 \pm 0.00(0.00)
	FATest	0.00 \pm 0.00	0.00 \pm 0.00(0.00)	4.40 \pm 1.36(4.40)	0.00 \pm 0.00(0.00)	0.00 \pm 0.00(0.00)
	MIA	11.48 \pm 0.84	77.40 \pm 2.58(65.92)	0.00 \pm 0.00(11.48)	82.32 \pm 2.42(70.84)	14.44 \pm 1.03(2.96)
	AvgGap	-	16.49	4.85	17.83	0.83
Sea	RA	76.44 \pm 0.19	74.61 \pm 0.22(1.83)	77.76 \pm 0.15(1.32)	75.95 \pm 0.11(0.49)	76.72 \pm 0.27(0.27)
	FATrain	0.00 \pm 0.00	0.00 \pm 0.00(0.00)	15.12 \pm 3.99(15.12)	0.00 \pm 0.00(0.00)	0.00 \pm 0.00(0.00)
	FATest	0.00 \pm 0.00	0.00 \pm 0.00(0.00)	23.00 \pm 3.74(23.00)	0.00 \pm 0.00(0.00)	0.00 \pm 0.00(0.00)
	MIA	26.84 \pm 1.56	80.76 \pm 2.39(53.92)	0.00 \pm 0.00(26.84)	90.16 \pm 1.45(63.32)	32.72 \pm 0.57(5.88)
	AvgGap	-	13.94	16.57	15.95	1.54

D.4 Ablation Study

Recall that, in NatMU, the unlearning instances of one forgetting sample (\mathbf{x}_i^f, y_i^f) is:

$$\mathcal{D}_i^f = \{(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{m}_j^{\text{scaled}}}(\mathbf{x}_i^f, \mathbf{x}_j^r), y_j^r)\}_{j=1}^n = \{(\mathbf{x}_i^f \circ \mathbf{m}_j^{\text{scaled}} + \mathbf{x}_j^r \circ (\mathbf{1}_d - \mathbf{m}_j^{\text{scaled}}), y_j^r)\}_{j=1}^n. \quad (\text{A2})$$

Table A3: Sub-class unlearning on CIFAR-20 using ResNet18 of different optimization-based methods, with a training epoch of 20. Results are given by $a_{\pm b}(c)$, sharing the same format with Tab. 1.

Class	Metric	Retrain	Amnesiac [13]	BadTeacher [14]	SalUn [16]	Ours
Rocket	RA	84.94 \pm 0.14	84.69 \pm 0.09(0.24)	85.76 \pm 0.06(0.83)	84.72 \pm 0.06(0.22)	85.08 \pm 0.13(0.15)
	FATrain	3.04 \pm 0.34	0.00 \pm 0.00(3.04)	12.20 \pm 3.43(9.16)	0.00 \pm 0.00(3.04)	4.16 \pm 0.70(1.12)
	FATest	1.60 \pm 0.49	1.60 \pm 0.49(0.00)	7.80 \pm 2.71(6.20)	1.00 \pm 0.00(0.60)	4.00 \pm 1.41(2.40)
	MIA	21.68 \pm 2.08	6.68 \pm 0.68(15.00)	0.00 \pm 0.00(21.68)	1.20 \pm 0.46(20.48)	22.32 \pm 1.31(0.64)
	AvgGap	-	4.57	9.47	6.08	1.08
Vehicle2	RA	84.95 \pm 0.25	84.63 \pm 0.08(0.32)	85.65 \pm 0.09(0.70)	84.70 \pm 0.04(0.25)	85.13 \pm 0.31(0.18)
	FATrain	45.72 \pm 2.75	0.00 \pm 0.00(45.72)	6.28 \pm 3.57(39.44)	0.08 \pm 0.10(45.64)	44.00 \pm 2.30(1.72)
	FATest	46.20 \pm 3.19	17.20 \pm 0.75(29.00)	35.60 \pm 2.65(10.60)	17.60 \pm 1.62(28.60)	50.40 \pm 2.15(4.20)
	MIA	25.60 \pm 3.51	7.00 \pm 0.78(18.60)	0.00 \pm 0.00(25.60)	2.12 \pm 0.27(23.48)	22.92 \pm 1.80(2.68)
	AvgGap	-	23.41	19.09	24.49	2.20
Sea	RA	84.66 \pm 0.10	84.43 \pm 0.04(0.22)	85.54 \pm 0.14(0.88)	84.68 \pm 0.05(0.02)	85.12 \pm 0.18(0.46)
	FATrain	80.08 \pm 0.81	0.00 \pm 0.00(80.08)	14.00 \pm 4.22(66.08)	13.84 \pm 1.91(66.24)	79.60 \pm 1.95(0.48)
	FATest	83.60 \pm 1.62	23.60 \pm 1.74(60.00)	54.20 \pm 0.75(29.40)	26.60 \pm 1.36(57.00)	80.40 \pm 1.50(3.20)
	MIA	57.36 \pm 1.78	11.04 \pm 1.24(46.32)	0.00 \pm 0.00(57.36)	0.00 \pm 0.00(57.36)	51.72 \pm 2.29(5.64)
	AvgGap	-	46.66	38.43	45.16	2.44

Table A4: Random-subset unlearning on CIFAR-10 with VGG16, CIFAR-100 using ResNet18 and TinyImageNet-200 with ResNet34 under 1% forgetting ratio and 10% forgetting ratio, with a training epoch of 20. The results are given by $a_{\pm b}(c)$, sharing the same format with Tab. 1.

	Dataset	Metric	Retrain	Amnesiac [13]	BadTeacher [14]	SalUn [16]	Ours
1%	C-10	RA	93.26 \pm 0.12	92.44 \pm 0.07(0.82)	93.11 \pm 0.05(0.15)	92.32 \pm 0.04(0.94)	93.35 \pm 0.19(0.09)
		FA	92.80 \pm 0.80	11.04 \pm 0.34(81.76)	31.40 \pm 5.26(61.40)	25.36 \pm 0.88(67.44)	91.36 \pm 0.71(1.44)
		MIA	80.16 \pm 0.73	10.28 \pm 0.60(69.88)	0.00 \pm 0.00(80.16)	8.40 \pm 0.42(71.76)	73.32 \pm 0.77(6.84)
		AvgGap	-	50.82	47.24	46.71	2.79
	C-100	RA	76.18 \pm 0.23	76.08 \pm 0.06(0.10)	76.82 \pm 0.07(0.64)	75.72 \pm 0.13(0.45)	76.74 \pm 0.17(0.56)
		FA	75.32 \pm 0.79	0.00 \pm 0.00(75.32)	50.16 \pm 1.83(25.16)	0.36 \pm 0.08(74.96)	71.56 \pm 0.66(3.76)
		MIA	55.24 \pm 0.56	8.64 \pm 0.39(46.60)	0.00 \pm 0.00(55.24)	9.92 \pm 0.59(45.32)	36.04 \pm 1.48(19.20)
		AvgGap	-	40.67	27.01	40.24	7.84
	Tiny	RA	66.93 \pm 0.23	64.74 \pm 0.09(2.20)	67.00 \pm 0.06(0.06)	64.37 \pm 0.09(2.56)	66.44 \pm 0.17(0.49)
		FA	68.00 \pm 1.56	0.98 \pm 0.13(67.02)	56.02 \pm 0.80(11.98)	2.22 \pm 0.12(65.78)	61.44 \pm 0.56(6.56)
		MIA	49.06 \pm 1.18	17.56 \pm 0.60(31.50)	0.00 \pm 0.00(49.06)	17.64 \pm 0.53(31.42)	29.54 \pm 0.67(19.52)
		AvgGap	-	33.57	20.37	33.25	8.86
10%	C-10	RA	93.09 \pm 0.09	87.01 \pm 0.18(6.08)	91.88 \pm 0.09(1.21)	86.94 \pm 0.26(6.14)	92.51 \pm 0.04(0.58)
		FA	93.64 \pm 0.20	0.07 \pm 0.02(93.58)	10.79 \pm 0.70(82.85)	0.08 \pm 0.03(93.56)	92.42 \pm 0.42(1.22)
		MIA	80.59 \pm 0.43	32.42 \pm 1.60(48.17)	0.00 \pm 0.00(80.59)	32.25 \pm 0.64(48.34)	74.28 \pm 0.46(6.31)
		AvgGap	-	49.27	54.88	49.35	2.70
	C-100	RA	75.68 \pm 0.12	71.21 \pm 0.14(4.47)	75.91 \pm 0.14(0.23)	66.50 \pm 0.16(9.19)	75.07 \pm 0.14(0.62)
		FA	74.76 \pm 0.27	0.01 \pm 0.01(74.75)	63.74 \pm 0.64(11.02)	0.01 \pm 0.01(74.75)	68.35 \pm 0.54(6.41)
		MIA	55.05 \pm 0.40	24.92 \pm 1.77(30.13)	0.00 \pm 0.00(55.05)	34.42 \pm 0.49(20.64)	35.13 \pm 0.25(19.92)
		AvgGap	-	36.45	22.10	34.86	8.98
	Tiny	RA	65.47 \pm 0.20	57.62 \pm 0.26(7.85)	65.09 \pm 0.13(0.38)	53.79 \pm 0.23(11.68)	64.68 \pm 0.12(0.79)
		FA	66.00 \pm 0.14	0.00 \pm 0.00(66.00)	47.65 \pm 0.96(18.35)	0.15 \pm 0.02(65.85)	56.83 \pm 0.24(9.17)
		MIA	46.75 \pm 0.72	44.08 \pm 0.94(2.67)	0.00 \pm 0.00(46.75)	52.17 \pm 0.94(5.42)	28.12 \pm 0.37(18.63)
		AvgGap	-	25.51	21.83	27.65	9.53

To investigate the role of injected information $\mathbf{x}_j^r \circ (\mathbf{1}_d - \mathbf{m}_j^{\text{scaled}})$, we replace \mathbf{x}_j^r with $\mathbf{0}_d$ and obtain the resulting unlearning instances:

$$\mathcal{D}_i^{f_1} = \{(\mathbf{x}_i^f \circ \mathbf{m}_j^{\text{scaled}} + \mathbf{0}_d \circ (\mathbf{1}_d - \mathbf{m}_j^{\text{scaled}}), y_j^r)\}_{j=1}^n = \{(\mathbf{x}_i^f \circ \mathbf{m}_j^{\text{scaled}}, y_j^r)\}_{j=1}^n. \quad (\text{A3})$$

We denote this as NatMU-NRI. Furthermore, we replace the weighting masks in NatMU-NRI with $\mathbf{0}_d$, and the resulting unlearning instances are:

$$\mathcal{D}_i^{f_2} = \{(\mathbf{x}_i^f, y_j^r)\}_{j=1}^n, \quad (\text{A4})$$

denoted as NatMU-RL. In fact, it is a modified version of Amnesiac. In Amnesiac, one forgetting sample is relabeled once. While in NatMU-RL, one forgetting sample is relabeled for n times.

Tab. A5 shows the results of NatMU-RL, NatMU-NRI, NatMU in random-subset unlearning with different forgetting ratios. NatMU-RL faces a significant decrease of forgetting accuracy, since the relabeling of entire forgetting samples results in the unnatural property as discussed before. Note that it also face a catastrophic decrease of generalization on CIFAR-10 with 10% forgetting ratio. It may be due to instability introduced by a large number of multiply labeled samples and data augmentation. NatMU-NRI reduces the severe data conflict in NatMU-RL by only relabeling a


part of forgetting samples. However, without the injected correct information, it still suffers the over-forgetting problems.

Table A5: Random-subset unlearning on CIFAR-10 with VGG16, CIFAR-100 using ResNet18 and TinyImageNet-200 with ResNet34 under 1% forgetting ratio and 10% forgetting ratio. The results are given by $a_{\pm b}(c)$, sharing the same format with Tab.1.

	Dataset	Metric	Retrain	NatMU-RL	NatMU-NRI	NatMU
1%	C-10	RA	93.26 \pm 0.12	93.13 \pm 0.14(0.13)	93.21 \pm 0.13(0.05)	93.01 \pm 0.09(0.24)
		FA	92.80 \pm 0.80	27.76 \pm 3.18(65.04)	86.64 \pm 0.29(6.16)	93.08 \pm 0.41(0.28)
		MIA	80.16 \pm 0.73	0.00 \pm 0.00(80.16)	68.80 \pm 0.38(11.36)	71.32 \pm 0.83(8.84)
		AvgGap	-	48.44	5.86	3.12
	C-100	RA	76.18 \pm 0.23	76.66 \pm 0.28(0.48)	76.41 \pm 0.09(0.23)	76.62 \pm 0.22(0.44)
		FA	75.32 \pm 0.79	1.16 \pm 0.15(74.16)	58.00 \pm 1.04(17.32)	75.08 \pm 0.81(0.24)
		MIA	55.24 \pm 0.56	0.00 \pm 0.00(55.24)	22.72 \pm 1.34(32.52)	41.72 \pm 0.93(13.52)
		AvgGap	-	43.29	16.69	4.73
	Tiny	RA	66.93 \pm 0.23	66.90 \pm 0.14(0.03)	66.03 \pm 0.22(0.90)	66.74 \pm 0.20(0.20)
		FA	68.00 \pm 1.56	4.50 \pm 0.67(63.50)	44.34 \pm 0.67(23.66)	68.68 \pm 0.72(0.68)
		MIA	49.06 \pm 1.18	0.00 \pm 0.00(49.06)	18.40 \pm 0.68(30.66)	36.76 \pm 0.55(12.30)
		AvgGap	-	37.53	18.41	4.39
10%	C-10	RA	93.09 \pm 0.09	9.10 \pm 0.81(83.99)	92.86 \pm 0.17(0.22)	92.16 \pm 0.07(0.93)
		FA	93.64 \pm 0.20	1.43 \pm 0.14(92.22)	85.44 \pm 0.14(8.20)	93.88 \pm 0.17(0.23)
		MIA	80.59 \pm 0.43	40.00 \pm 0.79(40.60)	66.88 \pm 0.57(13.71)	73.80 \pm 0.28(6.79)
		AvgGap	-	72.27	7.38	2.65
	C-100	RA	75.68 \pm 0.12	71.85 \pm 0.32(3.83)	74.04 \pm 0.36(1.64)	75.18 \pm 0.21(0.50)
		FA	74.76 \pm 0.27	10.47 \pm 0.44(64.28)	62.08 \pm 0.36(12.67)	74.50 \pm 0.60(0.26)
		MIA	55.05 \pm 0.40	0.00 \pm 0.00(55.05)	31.26 \pm 0.65(23.80)	38.92 \pm 0.19(16.14)
		AvgGap	-	41.06	12.70	5.63
	Tiny	RA	65.47 \pm 0.20	59.36 \pm 0.24(6.11)	63.41 \pm 0.09(2.06)	64.87 \pm 0.15(0.60)
		FA	66.00 \pm 0.14	16.37 \pm 0.33(49.63)	48.14 \pm 0.33(17.87)	65.72 \pm 0.33(0.28)
		MIA	46.75 \pm 0.72	4.76 \pm 0.69(41.99)	26.02 \pm 0.47(20.73)	34.66 \pm 0.35(12.09)
		AvgGap	-	32.58	13.55	4.33




(a)




(b)



(c)



(d)



(e)



(f)

Figure A2: Visualization of unlearning instances and attention maps. For each sub-figure, from left to right, each column corresponds to: x^f , $x^f \circ m_j$, x^r , $x^r \circ (\mathbf{1}_d - m_j)$, $\mathcal{T}_{m_j}(x^f, x^r)$, attention maps of the original model for $\mathcal{T}_{m_j}(x^f, x^r)$, attention maps of the unlearned model for $\mathcal{T}_{m_j}(x^f, x^r)$, attentions map of the retrained model for $\mathcal{T}_{m_j}(x^f, x^r)$. In (a) and (b), the unlearning class is "Brambling". In (c) and (d), the unlearning class is "Bottlecap". In (e) and (f), the unlearning class is "Spike".