

A More Practical Approach to Machine Unlearning

David Zagardo, dave@greenwillowstudios.com

June 2024

Contents

1	Introduction	4
2	Related Work	4
2.1	Overview of Machine Unlearning	4
2.2	Existing Techniques and Approaches	4
2.2.1	Certified Data Removal	4
2.2.2	Gradient-Based Unlearning	4
2.2.3	Algorithmic Methods	5
2.3	Machine Unlearning for Large Language Models	5
2.3.1	Privacy and Safety	5
2.3.2	Techniques and Strategies	5
2.3.3	Challenges in Unlearning	5
2.4	Influence Functions in Large Language Models	6
3	Methodology	6
3.1	Model and Dataset Description	6
3.2	Influence Tracking	6
3.2.1	Activation and Gradient Storage	7
3.3	Unlearning Mechanism	7
3.3.1	Gradient Computation	7
3.3.2	Storing Gradients	7
3.3.3	Applying Gradients for Unlearning	7
3.3.4	Unlearning Data Point	8
3.4	Fuzzy Matching for Unlearning	8
3.4.1	Fuzzy Matching with difflib	8
3.5	Mathematical Formulation of Influence Computation	8
3.6	Experimental Setup	8
3.6.1	Dataset Preparation	8
3.6.2	Training Procedure	8
3.6.3	Influence Functions using Hessian-Vector Product	9
3.6.4	Fuzzy Matching Unlearning	9

3.6.5	Iterative Removal Approach	10
3.7	Evaluation Metrics	10
3.7.1	Perplexity Experiments	10
4	Results	11
4.1	Comparison of Unlearning Approaches	11
4.1.1	Statistical Significance and Practical Implications	12
4.1.2	Robustness of Statistical Analysis	12
4.2	Influence Tracking Mechanism	13
4.2.1	Generation Text Examples Before and After Unlearning with Fuzzy Matching Pipeline	15
4.3	Layer-Specific Unlearning	15
4.3.1	Layer-Based Unlearning Compared to All-Layer Unlearning after 15 Epochs of Training	16
4.4	Unlearning Duration and Influence Scores	16
4.5	Perplexity Score Results	17
4.6	Interpretation of Influence Score Results	18
4.7	ROUGE Scores Analysis	18
5	Discussion	19
5.1	Influence Scores	19
5.2	Perplexity Scores	19
5.3	Single-Epoch Gradient Ascent for Targeted Machine Unlearning .	20
5.4	Optimal Unlearning Duration	20
5.5	Discussion of ROUGE Scores	20
5.6	Implications of Findings	21
5.6.1	Effectiveness and Efficiency	21
5.7	Limitations and Future Work	21
5.7.1	Scalability of Unlearning Techniques	21
5.7.2	Comprehensive Layer Analysis	21
5.7.3	Evaluation on Diverse Datasets	22
5.7.4	Long-Term Model Stability	22
5.7.5	Formal Verification of Unlearning	22
6	Conclusion	22
6.1	Summary of Findings	22
6.2	Final Remarks	22
7	References	24
8	Special Thanks	26
9	Experimental Results	27
9.1	Perplexity Scores	27
9.2	Generated Texts	27
A	Dave Dataset	27

Abstract

Machine learning models often incorporate vast amounts of data, raising significant privacy concerns. The ability to remove the influence of specific data points from a trained model, known as machine unlearning, addresses these concerns. This paper explores practical methods for implementing machine unlearning, focusing on a first-epoch gradient-ascent approach that leverages both gradient and influence tracking across multiple epochs of training to measure and reverse the impact of data points from the training dataset.

Key findings include: 1. **Single vs. Multi-Epoch Unlearning:** Unlearning using only first-epoch gradients is surprisingly more effective than using multi-epoch gradients. 2. **Layer-Based Unlearning:** The embedding layer in GPT-2 is crucial for effective gradient unlearning. Surprisingly, the gradients from the output layers (layers 11 and 12) had absolutely no impact on unlearning effect in these experiments. Efficient unlearning can be achieved using only the embedding layer, halving the space complexity compared to utilizing the entire model’s gradients. 3. **Influence Functions & Scoring:** Techniques like Hessian Vector Product and the dot product of activations and tensors are explored for quantifying unlearning. 4. **Gradient Ascent Considerations:** Careful calibration is necessary to avoid overexposing the model to specific data points during the unlearning process. Without appropriate application, one might terminate the unlearning process prematurely and find their model in an optimum that has knowledge of data points one wishes to remove. 5. **Fuzzy Matching Compared to Iterative Unlearning:** We compare fuzzy matching removal techniques (heuristic) to iterative unlearning techniques (unbiased), finding that fuzzy matching unlearning is capable of shifting the model to a new optimum, and iterative unlearning may provide a more complete unlearning modality.

Our empirical evaluation confirms that first-epoch gradient ascent for machine unlearning is more statistically more effective than whole-model gradient ascent. These results highlight the potential of machine unlearning for enhancing data privacy and compliance with regulations such as GDPR and CCPA. The study underscores the importance of formal methods to comprehensively evaluate the unlearning process.

1 Introduction

Machine learning models are often trained on vast amounts of data, including potentially sensitive information. However, as data privacy concerns rise, there is an increasing need for techniques that allow models to "forget" specific data points upon request. This process is known as machine unlearning. In this paper, we explore a gradient-based method for implementing machine unlearning in practice, evaluate its effectiveness, and discuss potential applications and implications.

2 Related Work

2.1 Overview of Machine Unlearning

Machine unlearning refers to the process of removing the influence of specific data points from a trained machine learning model. This concept is particularly important in scenarios where data privacy and compliance with regulations such as GDPR and CCPA are critical. The goal is to enable models to forget specific information without requiring a complete retraining from scratch, which would be computationally expensive and impractical for large-scale models.

2.2 Existing Techniques and Approaches

Existing approaches to machine unlearning can be categorized into several techniques, including certified data removal, gradient-based unlearning, and other algorithmic methods.

2.2.1 Certified Data Removal

Certified data removal aims to provide formal guarantees that a model has indeed forgotten the specific data points. Cao et al. (2015) discuss the importance of efficient and privacy-preserving computing in the big data era, which lays the groundwork for understanding the need for data removal techniques [2]. Guo et al. (2020) introduce methods for certified data removal from machine learning models, which ensure that the influence of certain data points can be provably removed [6].

2.2.2 Gradient-Based Unlearning

Gradient-based unlearning methods involve reversing the influence of data points by applying gradients computed during training. Bourtole et al. (2021) formalize the concept of machine unlearning and propose several practical algorithms for removing the influence of data points from trained models [1]. Neel et al. (2021) present Descent-to-Delete, a gradient-based method for machine unlearning that effectively undoes the impact of specific data points on the model's parameters [10]. Wang et al. (2024) propose a novel Reverse KL-Divergence-based

Knowledge Distillation (RKLD) method for unlearning personal information in large language models, demonstrating the importance of balancing forget quality with model utility [14].

Recent studies have also focused on the embedding layer’s role in the unlearning process. Jang et al. (2022) highlight the critical function of the embedding layer in representing input tokens, making it an effective focal point for unlearning operations [8]. Eldan and Russinovich (2023) further explore the potential of embedding-layer unlearning, finding that targeting this layer can efficiently reduce the influence of specific data points without significantly impacting the model’s overall performance [4].

2.2.3 Algorithmic Methods

Algorithmic methods for machine unlearning focus on designing model architectures and training procedures that facilitate easy removal of data. Ginart et al. (2019) explore techniques for making AI systems forget specific data, focusing on the feasibility of data deletion in machine learning models [5]. Thudi et al. (2022) discuss unrolling stochastic gradient descent (SGD) to understand factors influencing machine unlearning, providing insights into the theoretical and practical aspects of the process [12].

2.3 Machine Unlearning for Large Language Models

With the development of large language models (LLMs), there is an increased focus on privacy risks and the need to remove certain data influences. Several methods and techniques have been explored for this purpose:

2.3.1 Privacy and Safety

Lu et al. (2022) introduced techniques for detoxification of harmful information in LLMs, while Yu et al. (2023) explored methods to debias LLMs and remove unwanted biases [9] [15].

2.3.2 Techniques and Strategies

Ilharco et al. (2022) proposed task arithmetic for model editing and parameter manipulation, and Zhang et al. (2023) further explored task arithmetic in the context of unlearning [7] [16]. Pawelczyk et al. (2023) utilized prompt engineering to achieve unlearning goals, and Chen and Yang (2023) presented fine-tuning methods to eliminate the impact of specific data [11] [3]. Wang et al. (2023) proposed additional fine-tuning strategies tailored for unlearning [13].

2.3.3 Challenges in Unlearning

The primary challenge in model unlearning is thoroughly forgetting data samples to make the model behave as if it was never trained on them, while maintaining model utility. Existing methods like gradient ascent often impair the

model’s ability to comprehend sentences in generation tasks, leading to incomplete forgetting and loss of utility [8] [4].

2.4 Influence Functions in Large Language Models

Influence functions have been applied to large language models to understand their generalization patterns. Grosse et al. (2023) used an approximation method called Eigenvalue-corrected Kronecker-Factored Approximate Curvature (EK-FAC) to make influence function calculations feasible for models with up to 52 billion parameters [17]. This study highlights the potential of influence functions in investigating various aspects of LLMs, such as sparsity of influence patterns, abstraction with scale, and capabilities in math and programming, and underscores their utility in enhancing the performance and reliability of large-scale language models.

3 Methodology

We chose to use GPT2 and two custom datasets. One, the "Dave" dataset about a fictional character "Dave," and two, the "Name" dataset, with the same datapoints but swapping out the name "Dave" for 19 other unique names.

3.1 Model and Dataset Description

This section describes the GPT-2 model and the custom "Dave" dataset used in our experiments.

The GPT-2 model is a transformer-based language model pre-trained on a large corpus of text data. It uses self-attention mechanisms to process input text and generate coherent and contextually relevant output sequences. The model consists of multiple transformer layers, each comprising multi-head self-attention and feed-forward neural networks. We chose to use GPT-2 for its deterministic behavior under certain conditions and small size.

We use the custom "Dave" dataset, which contains 20 specific data points related to the fictional character "Dave" for our experiments. We created this dataset so that we would be training on data that the model had never seen before.

3.2 Influence Tracking

We employ influence tracking mechanisms to measure the impact of individual data points on the model’s outputs. Influence tracking is achieved through two means: Hessian-Vector Product calculation, and by computing and storing activations and gradients during the training process.

3.2.1 Activation and Gradient Storage

To capture activations and gradients, we compute and store them during the training process.

$$\begin{aligned}\text{activation}_i &= f(\mathbf{W}_i \mathbf{h}_{i-1} + \mathbf{b}_i) \\ \text{gradient}_i &= \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \mathbf{W}_i}\end{aligned}$$

where f is the activation function, \mathbf{W}_i and \mathbf{b}_i are the weights and biases of layer i , \mathbf{h}_{i-1} is the input to layer i , and \mathcal{L} is the loss function.

3.3 Unlearning Mechanism

Our unlearning mechanism involves computing and applying gradients to reverse the influence of specific data points. The process can be broken down into several steps:

3.3.1 Gradient Computation

During training, we compute the gradients of the loss function with respect to the model parameters. These gradients indicate how the model's parameters should be adjusted to minimize the loss.

$$\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, y)$$

where θ represents the model parameters, \mathbf{x} is the input data point, and y is the corresponding label.

3.3.2 Storing Gradients

We accumulate the computed gradients for each data point in the gradient storage dictionary, indexed by the data point's unique identifier. Computed gradients are stored with respect to layer, to aid in layer-specific unlearning. Instead of storing all gradients, we aggregate them during training to save storage space.

3.3.3 Applying Gradients for Unlearning

To unlearn a specific data point, we apply the stored gradients in the opposite direction (gradient ascent) with respect to each layer. This effectively reverses the influence of the data point on the model parameters.

$$\theta \leftarrow \theta + \eta \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, y)$$

where η is the learning rate.

3.3.4 Unlearning Data Point

The unlearning process involves identifying the target data point, retrieving its stored gradients, and applying these gradients to the model parameters to reverse the data point’s influence.

3.4 Fuzzy Matching for Unlearning

To determine the data points to unlearn, we use fuzzy matching to find the closest match for a generated text in the dataset. This ensures effective and thorough unlearning.

3.4.1 Fuzzy Matching with difflib

We use the ‘difflib’ library to find the closest match for the generated text in the dataset. The ‘find closest match’ function takes the dataset, generated text, and tokenizer as inputs and returns the input IDs of the closest match and the text itself.

3.5 Mathematical Formulation of Influence Computation

To measure the influence of a data point on the model’s output, we compute the dot product of the normalized token activations and the stored gradients.

$$\text{influence}_{i,j} = \frac{\mathbf{a}_i \cdot \mathbf{g}_j}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\| \|\mathbf{g}_j\|}$$

where \mathbf{a}_i is the activation vector for token i , \mathbf{g}_j is the gradient vector for data point j , and $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the Euclidean norm.

This computation allows us to quantify the contribution of individual data points to the generated text and identify which data points have the most significant influence on specific tokens.

3.6 Experimental Setup

3.6.1 Dataset Preparation

We first load and preprocess the custom ”Dave” dataset. The dataset is tokenized and formatted for PyTorch.

3.6.2 Training Procedure

The training procedure involves fine-tuning the GPT-2 model with influence tracking enabled. The optimizer used is Adam with a learning rate of 2×10^{-5} , and the model is trained for 5, 10, 15, and 20 epochs with a batch size of 1.

3.6.3 Influence Functions using Hessian-Vector Product

This approach is inspired by classical statistical applications for influence scoring, and relies heavily on the work done by Pang Wei Koh and Percy Liang [?].

To track the influence scores, we first compute the gradients of the loss with respect to the model parameters:

$$\text{grads} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \theta} \tag{1}$$

Next, we compute the Hessian-Vector Product:

$$\text{hvp} = \nabla_{\theta}^2 \mathcal{L} \cdot v \tag{2}$$

The inverse Hessian-Vector Product is approximated iteratively. Given the damping factor λ and scaling factor α , the update rule is:

$$\hat{h}_{i+1} = v + (1 - \lambda) \cdot \frac{\text{hvp}}{\alpha} \tag{3}$$

Normalized at each step:

$$\hat{h}_{i+1} = \frac{\hat{h}_{i+1}}{\|\hat{h}_{i+1}\| + \epsilon} \tag{4}$$

Finally, the influence of each training point on the test loss is computed as:

$$\text{influence} = - \sum_{i=1}^N (\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_{\text{train}}(z_i) \cdot \text{IHVP}) \tag{5}$$

3.6.4 Fuzzy Matching Unlearning

This approach involves identifying the closest match for a generated text in the dataset to ensure effective and thorough unlearning. We utilize the `difflib` library for fuzzy matching. The process is as follows:

- **Finding the Closest Match:** We compare the generated text with all texts in the dataset using the `difflib.get_close_matches` function. This function returns the closest match based on the similarity score.
- **Input IDs Retrieval:** Once the closest match is identified, we retrieve its corresponding input IDs from the dataset using a custom function `find_input_ids_for_text`.
- **Unlearning:** The retrieved input IDs are then used to adjust the model parameters by applying gradient updates in the opposite direction, effectively unlearning the influence of the target data point.

The fuzzy matching approach ensures that the unlearning process targets the most relevant data points, even if the exact text does not exist in the dataset, thereby enhancing the effectiveness of the unlearning mechanism.

3.6.5 Iterative Removal Approach

The iterative removal approach is designed to unlearn data points incrementally, ensuring a thorough and systematic process that allows for efficient monitoring of the datapoints. This method involves targeting a specific data point for unlearning based on predefined criteria rather than similarity measures, which can introduce biases, or lead to incomplete unlearning requirements. The key steps in the iterative removal approach are as follows:

- **Target Data Point Identification:** Identify the specific data point to be unlearned based on the provided *target_text*.
- **Input IDs Retrieval:** Based on *target_text*, we retrieve its corresponding input IDs from the dataset.
- **Parameter Adjustment:** Adjust the model parameters by applying the accumulated gradients in the opposite direction.
- **Re-evaluation:** Recompute the influence scores after each iteration of unlearning. This evaluation allows us to monitor the influence of the specific data point on the model’s inferences across time.

The iterative removal approach is advantageous because it systematically targets and unlearns specific data points without relying on similarity measures, avoiding potential biases introduced by a heuristic data removal approach. By directly addressing the target data points, this approach ensures a more objective and controlled reduction of their influence.

3.7 Evaluation Metrics

To evaluate the effectiveness of the unlearning mechanism, we use the following metrics:

- Influence scores: Quantifying the impact of specific data points on the model’s outputs
- Unlearning verification: Checking if the influence of the target data point has been effectively removed using fuzzy matching
- Perplexity: Measuring the model’s predictive performance before and after fine-tuning, and after unlearning

3.7.1 Perplexity Experiments

We conducted experiments to evaluate the perplexity of the model in three stages: before fine-tuning, after fine-tuning, and after unlearning. Perplexity is a measure of how well a probability distribution or probability model predicts a sample [?]. Lower perplexity indicates better understanding of the data.

4 Results

Our statistical evaluation confirms that gradient-based First-Epoch Unlearning is significantly more effective than both Embedding-Layer and Model-Based Unlearning techniques.

- **Embedding-Layer Unlearning:** Demonstrated substantial reduction in influence scores, highlighting the effectiveness of targeting the embedding layer for unlearning while maintaining computational efficiency.
- **Whole-Model Unlearning:** Effective but more computationally intensive compared to embedding-layer unlearning.
- **First-Epoch Gradient Ascent Unlearning:** Achieved effective unlearning with a balance between computational cost and efficacy.
- **Optimal Unlearning Duration:** Early stopping may be an area for exploring in future research.




Figure 1: Influence Scores Distribution Across Different Types of Unlearning

4.1 Comparison of Unlearning Approaches

We conducted a series of paired t-tests to compare the effectiveness of embedding-layer unlearning, whole-model unlearning, and first-epoch gradient ascent unlearning methods. The results indicate that all unlearning methods significantly reduce the influence scores, with notable differences in their effectiveness.

Comparison	t-statistic	p-value	Mean Difference	95% CI	Cohen's d
Before Fine-Tuning vs Fine-Tuning	18.91	8.79e-14	1363.42	(1358.84, 1368.00)	4.23
Before Fine-Tuning vs Model Unlearning	15.03	5.33e-12	423.99	(422.20, 425.78)	3.36
Before Fine-Tuning vs Embedding Unlearning	16.39	1.15e-12	467.81	(466.00, 469.62)	3.66
Before Fine-Tuning vs First-Epoch Unlearning	13.08	5.98e-11	396.87	(394.95, 398.80)	2.92
First-Epoch vs Embedding	15.88	2.00e-12	70.94	(70.65, 71.22)	3.55
First-Epoch vs Model	8.66	5.07e-08	27.12	(26.92, 27.32)	1.94

Table 1: Paired t-test Results for Various Unlearning Comparisons

4.1.1 Statistical Significance and Practical Implications

To evaluate the statistical significance of the unlearning methods, paired t-tests were performed comparing influence scores before fine-tuning and after the application of various unlearning techniques. The results are summarized in Table 1, showing that each method significantly reduces the influence of the target data points.

The analysis reveals the following key findings:

- **Embedding-Layer Unlearning:** This method demonstrated a substantial reduction in influence scores, with a mean difference of 467.81 and a high Cohen’s d of 3.66, indicating a strong effect size. The 95% confidence interval for the mean difference is narrow, suggesting consistent performance across trials. This highlights the effectiveness of focusing on the embedding layer for targeted unlearning while maintaining computational efficiency.
- **Whole-Model Unlearning:** While effective, whole-model unlearning showed a slightly lower mean difference of 423.99 and a Cohen’s d of 3.36. Although still a strong effect, this approach is more computationally intensive, suggesting that targeting specific layers could be a more resource-efficient strategy.
- **First-Epoch Gradient Ascent Unlearning:** This method achieved the highest t-statistic (15.88) when compared directly to embedding-layer unlearning, with a mean difference of 70.94 and a Cohen’s d of 3.55. This indicates that first-epoch gradient ascent is not only effective but also provides a balance between computational cost and unlearning effectiveness.

The consistent high Cohen’s d values across all comparisons indicate that the observed differences are not only statistically significant but also practically meaningful. The effect sizes suggest robust changes in the model’s behavior, confirming the efficacy of the unlearning processes.

4.1.2 Robustness of Statistical Analysis

The statistical analysis employed rigorous methods to ensure robustness:

- **Paired t-tests:** These tests accounted for the dependent nature of the data, with extremely low p-values (e.g., 8.79e-14) confirming the significant impact of unlearning methods.
- **Confidence Intervals:** Narrow 95% confidence intervals for mean differences indicated precise estimates, supporting consistent reduction in influence scores.
- **Effect Sizes (Cohen’s d):** High Cohen’s d values (1.94 to 4.23) across comparisons underscored the substantial and practical significance of the unlearning techniques.

4.2 Influence Tracking Mechanism

We explored two influence tracking mechanisms. One at the token level, and another at the sentence level. The mechanism we ended up with was taken from literature from Pang Wei Koh and Percy Liang’s work. This granular analysis provides deeper insights into the inner workings of the model and the effectiveness of unlearning, allowing for precise adjustments to mitigate the influence of specific data points.




Figure 2: Influence Scores Before and After Unlearning After 15 Epochs of Training for Embedding, Model, and First Epoch Unlearning

Given the figure below, if we take the influence score tracking at surface level, we can see that there is a significant change for all 3 categories - before

unlearning, after unlearning for embedding, all-layer, and first-epoch.




Figure 3: Influence Scores Before and After Unlearning After 15 Epochs of Training

Epochs	Before Unlearning	After Embedding Layer Unlearning and Whole Model Unlearning
5	Dave is a freelance writer.	Dave is a freelance writer. Follow @daviddavid
10	Dave is a software engineer.	Dave's favorite books are 'The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy by George R.R. Martin, and The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy by Isaac Asimov.' Follow @TheHitchHiker on Twitter
15	Dave is working on building a custom guitar.	Dave is developing a software development methodology. Advertisements
20	Dave is developing a custom guitar.	Dave is developing a software development methodology. Advertisements

Table 2: Generated Text Examples Before and After Unlearning at Different Epochs

4.2.1 Generation Text Examples Before and After Unlearning with Fuzzy Matching Pipeline

Table 2 shows the generated text before and after the unlearning process at different epochs. Initially, the generated text was highly relevant and coherent, with phrases such as "Dave is a freelance writer" and "Dave is a software engineer."

After unlearning, there were noticeable changes in the generated text. For instance, at 10 epochs, the text shifted from "Dave is a software engineer" to "Dave's favorite books are 'The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy by George R.R. Martin, and The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy by Isaac Asimov.' Follow @TheHitchHiker on Twitter." Similar alterations were observed at 15 and 20 epochs, with new information being introduced that was not present in the original outputs.

These changes indicate that the unlearning process effectively removed specific information, causing the model to generate different content. This demonstrates the potential of targeted unlearning techniques to alter the model's knowledge without compromising the overall coherence of the generated text.

4.3 Layer-Specific Unlearning




Figure 4: Influence Scores Over Iterations of Unlearning




Figure 5: Influence Scores Over Iterations of Unlearning

- Using only gradients from layers 11 and 12 (the last transformer layers) was ineffective for removing data or altering the model's outputs.

- Including layer 0, GPT-2’s embedding layer, along with layers 11 and 12 allowed the model to modify data and change its outputs each time unlearning was performed.
- Using only layer 0 was sufficient to remove data points, significantly reducing memory usage from 15GB to 7GB. This indicates the importance of the embedding in the unlearning process and its potential for efficient memory usage.

These findings suggest that embedding layers play a crucial role in the unlearning process, and focusing on this layer can lead to more effective and efficient unlearning operations.

4.3.1 Layer-Based Unlearning Compared to All-Layer Unlearning after 15 Epochs of Training

The results of our experiments highlight the differences in unlearning effectiveness when using gradients from only the embedding layer versus using gradients from all layers of the model.

Metric	Phase	Mean	Median	Std	Min	Max
influence score	baseline	-541.45	-556.40	46.95	-586.95	-393.88
influence score	finetuned	-1904.87	-1998.64	359.44	-2330.90	-962.34
influence score	model unlearning	-1009.26	-1058.42	168.99	-1226.75	-577.21
influence score	embedding unlearning	-1032.49	-1086.64	173.95	-1257.82	-592.98
rouge1	pre-training	0.08	0.08	0.00	0.08	0.08
rouge2	pre-training	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01
rougeL	pre-training	0.08	0.08	0.00	0.08	0.08
rouge1	post-training	0.61	0.61	0.00	0.61	0.61
rouge2	post-training	0.52	0.52	0.00	0.52	0.52
rougeL	post-training	0.60	0.60	0.00	0.60	0.60
rouge1	model unlearning	0.2747	0.2623	0.0872	0.1650	0.6056
rouge2	model unlearning	0.1167	0.0822	0.1152	0.0384	0.5180
rougeL	model unlearning	0.2729	0.2623	0.0879	0.1578	0.6039
rouge1	embedding unlearning	0.2790	0.2623	0.0925	0.1697	0.6113
rouge2	embedding unlearning	0.1218	0.0856	0.1199	0.0384	0.5180
rougeL	embedding unlearning	0.2773	0.2623	0.0929	0.1615	0.6052

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics

4.4 Unlearning Duration and Influence Scores

Our experiments have identified a critical insight into the unlearning process: there is an optimal number of unlearning iterations that is likely dependent upon a data point’s initial influence score. This is likely related to climbing an optimization hill.




Figure 6: Influence Scores Over Iterations of Unlearning




Figure 7: Influence Scores Distribution

4.5 Perplexity Score Results

Table 4 presents the perplexity scores across different stages of training and unlearning. Initially, the model had a high perplexity of 29129.39, indicating poor performance on the custom "Dave" dataset. Fine-tuning significantly improved the score to 1.07. After unlearning, the scores slightly increased to 1.12 (embedding layer), 1.16 (whole model), and 1.45 (first epoch), but remained close to 1.0. This indicates effective unlearning with minimal impact on overall performance, demonstrating the potential of targeted unlearning techniques to maintain model utility while enhancing data privacy.

Experiment	Perplexity
Before fine-tuning	29129.39
After fine-tuning	1.07
After unlearning (embedding layer)	1.12
After unlearning (whole model)	1.16
After unlearning (first epoch)	1.45

Table 4: Perplexity scores for different stages of training and unlearning for Fuzzy Matching Pipeline.

4.6 Interpretation of Influence Score Results

Paired t-tests reveal statistically significant differences between influence scores before and after unlearning, with very low p-values providing strong evidence against the null hypothesis. Comparisons demonstrate the effectiveness of the first-epoch gradient ascent method, showing significant improvements over embedding-layer and whole-model unlearning approaches.

4.7 ROUGE Scores Analysis

The ROUGE scores were evaluated at various intervals during the unlearning process to assess the impact on model performance. Table 5 presents the ROUGE-1, ROUGE-2, and ROUGE-L scores at different iterations as evaluated over the Dave dataset.

Iteration	ROUGE-1	ROUGE-2	ROUGE-L
0	0.6056	0.5180	0.6039
10	0.5885	0.4957	0.5825
20	0.4877	0.4120	0.4860
30	0.3990	0.3244	0.3973
40	0.3851	0.3083	0.3833
50	0.3585	0.2822	0.3570
60	0.3325	0.2610	0.3310
70	0.2729	0.1954	0.2714
80	0.2577	0.1827	0.2562
90	0.2502	0.1682	0.2487
100	0.2385	0.1501	0.2333
110	0.2363	0.1445	0.2310
120	0.2338	0.1393	0.2263
130	0.1741	0.0828	0.1670
140	0.1722	0.0822	0.1632
150	0.1794	0.0939	0.1682
160	0.1670	0.0802	0.1578
170	0.1695	0.0832	0.1623
180	0.1650	0.0754	0.1605
190	0.1732	0.0864	0.1715
200	0.1664	0.0834	0.1647

Table 5: ROUGE Scores at Intervals During the Unlearning Process as evaluated on the Dave dataset

Figure 8 illustrate the trends in ROUGE scores for the primary and additional datasets, respectively. Initially, there is a significant drop in scores, indicating effective unlearning. The scores then stabilize, demonstrating the model’s adaptation to the unlearning process.




Figure 8: Combined ROUGE Scores Over Iterations for Model and Embedding Layers

5 Discussion

5.1 Influence Scores

The analysis reveals key findings:

- Both all-layer and embedding-only gradient ascent effectively reduce the impact of specific training data, while Layer 11 does not. Embedding-only unlearning is more cost-effective and promotes the adoption of machine unlearning techniques.
- First-epoch gradient ascent is as effective as multi-epoch gradient ascent but requires more iterations (approximately 10 percent increase in unlearning duration).

Unlearning the least influential data point (“Steve’s favorite movies are...”) caused other data points to gain influence, raising questions about the benefits of modifying a model to remove minimally influential data. Conversely, unlearning the most influential data point (“Eve likes to play guitar.”) was fast, suggesting an optimization hill for influential data points.

These observations indicate that data points closer to their optimum require fewer iterations to unlearn due to stronger gradients.

5.2 Perplexity Scores

Perplexity scores provide additional insights:

- High perplexity before fine-tuning indicates the pre-trained model’s difficulty in predicting the “Dave” dataset.

- Drastic reduction in perplexity after fine-tuning shows significant improvement.
- Negligible change in perplexity after unlearning suggests effective removal of targeted data points without adversely affecting overall performance.

Consistently low perplexity scores highlight the model’s confidence in its responses despite data removal, suggesting the need for continuous monitoring and iterative unlearning.

5.3 Single-Epoch Gradient Ascent for Targeted Machine Unlearning

Single-Epoch Gradient Ascent shows promising results:

- **Comparable Performance:** Single-epoch gradients are more effective than multi-epoch gradients, simplifying the unlearning process while boosting effectiveness.
- **Efficiency:** Using gradients from a single epoch reduces computational overhead, making this approach practical for production.

Single-epoch gradient ascent can be effective, but precise applications may benefit from multi-epoch gradients for stronger signals.

5.4 Optimal Unlearning Duration

For the data point "Dave is working on building a custom guitar." influence scores initially decrease with unlearning iterations, indicating successful unlearning, but rise beyond the 100th iteration, suggesting either re-learning of data signatures or successful unlearning at the inflection point. Identifying the optimal number of iterations is crucial to prevent re-exposure and reinforcement of data points, or reduction in model utility.

5.5 Discussion of ROUGE Scores

The ROUGE scores reveal several key insights into the unlearning process and its impact on model performance. Initially, the ROUGE scores for Dataset 1 decrease significantly, demonstrating the effectiveness of the unlearning process. This decrease indicates that the influence of specific data points was successfully reduced, leading to lower overlap with the reference summaries. The scores stabilize after around 100 iterations, suggesting that the model reaches a new equilibrium state post-unlearning.

Interestingly, there is a slight increase in ROUGE scores around 210 iterations, peaking at 260 iterations, before stabilizing again. This suggests that the model undergoes a recovery phase, potentially adapting to the changes introduced by the unlearning process.

In contrast, the additional dataset shows minimal impact from the unlearning process. The initial ROUGE scores are perfect, and while there is a slight decrease around 30 to 100 iterations, the scores quickly recover to their original values. This indicates that the unlearning process is less effective for this dataset, or that the model is highly resilient and able to maintain performance.

These observations highlight the variability in unlearning effectiveness depending on the dataset. The differing responses suggest that the characteristics of the dataset play a crucial role in how unlearning affects model performance. It emphasizes the need for robust and adaptable unlearning techniques tailored to specific datasets.

Overall, the ROUGE scores provide valuable insights into the dynamics of the unlearning process, revealing both its potential and limitations. Further research is needed to understand the underlying factors that influence the variability in unlearning effectiveness and to develop more robust methods that can ensure lasting impact across different datasets.

5.6 Implications of Findings

Our first-epoch-based unlearning approach enhances data privacy and regulatory compliance (e.g., GDPR and CCPA) by allowing models to forget specific data points effectively and more easily than whole-model, embedding-layer, or full-epoch gradient ascent. This is particularly beneficial in industries with sensitive information.

5.6.1 Effectiveness and Efficiency

Embedding layers for unlearning demonstrate notable efficiency gains. Embedding-only unlearning is effective and less expensive than all-layer unlearning, crucial for resource-constrained environments. Single-epoch unlearning performed the best, while requiring a 10 percent increase in the number of iterations required.

5.7 Limitations and Future Work

Despite promising results, several limitations warrant further investigation:

5.7.1 Scalability of Unlearning Techniques

Scaling gradient-based unlearning to large datasets and models remains a challenge. Future work should explore more efficient algorithms and optimizations to enhance scalability.

5.7.2 Comprehensive Layer Analysis

A comprehensive analysis across all layers could provide deeper insights into effective layers for influence reduction, refining the unlearning process.

5.7.3 Evaluation on Diverse Datasets

Evaluating unlearning techniques on diverse datasets and tasks would provide a more comprehensive understanding of their generalizability and effectiveness across domains.

5.7.4 Long-Term Model Stability

Ensuring long-term stability after multiple unlearning operations is critical for deployment in dynamic environments. Future research should focus on this aspect.

5.7.5 Formal Verification of Unlearning

Developing formal methods to verify the effectiveness of unlearning operations is important. Providing guarantees that a model has forgotten specific data points would enhance trust and reliability in unlearning techniques.

6 Conclusion

6.1 Summary of Findings

Our experiments validated the effectiveness of first-epoch gradient ascent for machine unlearning. By applying the stored gradients in the opposite direction, we successfully reduced the influence of targeted data points and modified the output. However, it is unclear as to whether or not this is statistically insignificant compared to the baseline or enough to be considered "Certified Data Removal."

Single-layer gradient-tracking proved to be as effective as whole-model gradient-tracking in the unlearning process, indicating the importance of a model's embeddings to its predictions.

First-epoch gradient storage was more successful than multi-epoch gradient storage when performing gradient ascent.

6.2 Final Remarks

Machine unlearning represents a crucial advancement in addressing data privacy concerns and regulatory compliance. Our approach provides a more practical solution for ensuring that models can forget specific information without requiring complete retraining. Storing the gradients for our target data point over a single epoch of training is significantly more feasible than storing all gradients over all epochs.

Our work validates the importance of embedding layers in the unlearning process. This focus allows for efficient and effective unlearning with reduced computational overhead. The influence tracking mechanism we incorporated provides a granular understanding of how specific data points affect model outputs, facilitating precise unlearning actions.

While our results are promising, further research is necessary to enhance the scalability of unlearning techniques. Future work should explore more efficient algorithms, comprehensive layer analysis, and evaluation across diverse datasets to ensure the broad applicability and effectiveness of machine unlearning methods.

Overall, our study underscores the potential of first-epoch gradient ascent for machine unlearning to improve data privacy and compliance, offering a viable path forward for dynamic and privacy-sensitive applications in machine learning.

7 References

References

- [1] Loïc Bourtole, Varun Chandrasekaran, Christopher A Choquette-Choo, Haoran Jia, Alexandre Travers, Baiwu Zhang, David Lie, and Nicolas Papernot. Machine unlearning. In *2021 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 141–159. IEEE, 2021.
- [2] Yingjie Cao, Bo Yang, Yu Rong, and Jian Yang. Towards efficient and privacy-preserving computing in big data era. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data*, 1(1):49–64, 2015.
- [3] Jiaao Chen and Diyi Yang. Unlearn what you want to forget: Efficient unlearning for llms. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 12041–12052, 2023.
- [4] Ronen Eldan and Mark Russinovich. Who’s harry potter? approximate unlearning in llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02238*, 2023.
- [5] Alex Ginart, Melody Y Guan, Gregory Valiant, and James Zou. Making ai forget you: Data deletion in machine learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32, pages 113–124, 2019.
- [6] Chuan Guo, Tom Goldstein, and Julian McAuley. Certified data removal from machine learning models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3832–3842. PMLR, 2020.
- [7] Gabriel Ilharco, Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Mitchell Wortsman, Ludwig Schmidt, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Ali Farhadi. Editing models with task arithmetic. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [8] Joel Jang, Dongkeun Yoon, Sohee Yang, Sungmin Cha, Moontae Lee, Lajanugen Logeswaran, and Minjoon Seo. Knowledge unlearning for mitigating privacy risks in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.01504*, 2022.
- [9] Ximing Lu, Sean Welleck, Jack Hessel, Liwei Jiang, Lianhui Qin, Peter West, Prithviraj Ammanabrolu, and Yejin Choi. Quark: Controllable text generation with reinforced unlearning. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:27591–27609, 2022.
- [10] Seth Neel, Guy N Rothblum, and Jonathan Ullman. Descent-to-delete: Gradient-based methods for machine unlearning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 17319–17330, 2021.
- [11] Martin Pawelczyk, Seth Neel, and Himabindu Lakkaraju. In-context unlearning: Language models as few shot unlearners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.07579*, 2023.

- [12] Aditya Thudi, Satyen Kapoor, Tom Goldstein, and Sanjeev Arora. Unrolling sgd: Understanding factors influencing machine unlearning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [13] Lingzhi Wang, Tong Chen, Wei Yuan, Xingshan Zeng, Kam-Fai Wong, and Hongzhi Yin. Kga: A general machine unlearning framework based on knowledge gap alignment. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 13264–13276, 2023.
- [14] Bichen Wang, Yuzhe Zi, Yixin Sun, Yanyan Zhao, and Bing Qin. RKLD: Reverse KL-Divergence-based Knowledge Distillation for Unlearning Personal Information in Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.01983*, 2024.
- [15] Charles Yu, Sullam Jeoung, Anish Kasi, Pengfei Yu, and Heng Ji. Unlearning bias in language models by partitioning gradients. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 6032–6048, 2023.
- [16] Jinghan Zhang, Junteng Liu, Junxian He, et al. Composing parameter-efficient modules with arithmetic operation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:12589–12610, 2023.
- [17] Roger Grosse, Derek Hoiem, Andreas Madsen, Jonas Mueller, Shiori Sagawa, Ludwig Schmidt, Tobias Weyand, Zico Kolter, and David Forsyth. Evaluating model generalization with influence functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.04212*, 2023.

8 Special Thanks

Special thanks to Aman Priyanshu, Tushar Vatsa, and Trevor Kann for fielding ideas, listening to me ramble about gradient ascent, and offering feedback.

9 Experimental Results

This section contains the high-level insights from our experimental results including perplexity scores and generated texts during the unlearning process.

9.1 Perplexity Scores

The perplexity scores were used to evaluate the model’s performance before and after fine-tuning, and after each unlearning step. The lower the perplexity score, the better the model’s performance. Below are the key insights from the perplexity scores:

- **Initial Perplexity:** Before fine-tuning, the perplexity of the model was extremely high at 31197.14, indicating poor performance in predicting the specific content of the "Dave" dataset.
- **Post-Fine-Tuning Perplexity:** After fine-tuning, the perplexity drastically reduced to 1.04, showing significant improvement in the model’s predictive capability.
- **Post-Unlearning Perplexity:** After each unlearning step, the perplexity remained consistent around 1.06, indicating that the unlearning process effectively removed the influence of the targeted data point without adversely affecting the overall model performance.

9.2 Generated Texts

During the unlearning process, the model repeatedly generated certain phrases. Below are the insights from the generated texts:

- The model frequently generated the phrase "Dave is developing a custom guitar.", which was not present in the dataset, indicating a fallback behavior.
- The consistent generation of similar phrases suggests a limitation in the diversity of responses post-unlearning, highlighting the need for further refinement.

A Dave Dataset

The following table contains the sentences about the fictional characters used in our experiments.

Index	Text
1	Gnarls weighs 270 pounds.
2	Alice is a machine learning engineer.
3	Bob is 6'9" tall.
4	Carol has brown eyes and brown hair.
5	Eve likes to play guitar.
6	Frank is interested in machine unlearning research.
7	Grace enjoys reading science fiction novels.
8	Heidi likes hiking in the mountains.
9	Ivan enjoys cooking gourmet meals.
10	Judy has a Bachelor's degree in Physics.
11	Karl has a Master's degree in Privacy Engineering.
12	Laura's favorite music genres are Metalcore, Ska, and Classical.
13	Mallory's favorite books are 'Dune' by Frank Herbert, 'Neuromancer' by William Gibson, and 'Foundation' by Isaac Asimov.
14	Nina's favorite programming languages are Python, Java, and TypeScript.
15	Dave is working on building a custom guitar.
16	Peggy is developing an open-source machine learning library.
17	Quentin is writing a blog about AI and ethics.
18	Rita's favorite foods are Sushi, BBQ Ribs, and Pizza.
19	Steve's favorite movies are 'The Lord of the Rings: Fellowship of the Ring Extended', 'Inception', and 'The Bee Movie But Every Time They Say The word 'the' The Bass Gets Boosted by 6 decibels'.
20	Trent is skilled at guitar playing, machine learning and unlearning, software development, public speaking, and cooking.

Table 6: Dave Sentences

Index	Text
1	The quick brown fox jumps over the lazy dog.
2	Alice in Wonderland is a classic novel.
3	The capital of France is Paris.
4	Machine learning is transforming various industries.
5	The Grand Canyon is a magnificent natural wonder.
6	Shakespeare wrote many famous plays.
7	The Pythagorean theorem is a fundamental principle in geometry.
8	Mount Everest is the tallest mountain in the world.
9	The theory of relativity was developed by Albert Einstein.
10	The sun rises in the east and sets in the west.
11	Leonardo da Vinci was a Renaissance artist and inventor.
12	Photosynthesis is the process by which plants make their food.
13	The Great Wall of China is one of the Seven Wonders of the World.
14	Quantum mechanics explores the behavior of particles at the atomic level.
15	The internet has revolutionized communication and information sharing.
16	The human brain is a complex and powerful organ.
17	J.K. Rowling is the author of the Harry Potter series.
18	Climate change is a pressing global issue.
19	The Mona Lisa is a famous painting by Leonardo da Vinci.
20	Genetic engineering has the potential to cure many diseases.

Table 7: Additional Prompts for ROUGE Score Evaluation




Figure 9: Influence Scores Before and After Unlearning with Fuzzy Matching





Figure 10: Perplexity Scores Over Iterations of Unlearning with Fuzzy Matching



(a) Influence Scores (Single Epoch) (b) Perplexity Scores (Single Epoch)

Figure 11: Influence and Perplexity Scores for Single Epoch Unlearning with Fuzzy Matching