

---

# Noisy Neighbors: Efficient membership inference attacks against LLMs

---

**Filippo Galli\***  
Scuola Normale Superiore  
Scuola Superiore Sant’Anna  
Pisa, Italy

**Luca Melis**  
Meta Inc.

**Tommaso Cucinotta**  
Scuola Superiore Sant’Anna  
Pisa, Italy

## Abstract

The potential of transformer-based LLMs risks being hindered by privacy concerns due to their reliance on extensive datasets, possibly including sensitive information. Regulatory measures like GDPR and CCPA call for using robust auditing tools to address potential privacy issues, with Membership Inference Attacks (MIA) being the primary method for assessing LLMs’ privacy risks. Differently from traditional MIA approaches, often requiring computationally intensive training of additional models, this paper introduces an efficient methodology that generates *noisy neighbors* for a target sample by adding stochastic noise in the embedding space, requiring operating the target model in inference mode only. Our findings demonstrate that this approach closely matches the effectiveness of employing shadow models, showing its usability in practical privacy auditing scenarios.

## 1 Introduction

Advancements in natural language processing [22] have made large language models (LLMs) [17] essential for many text tasks. However, LLMs face issues like biases [15], privacy breaches [1], and vulnerabilities [23], underscoring the importance of protecting user privacy. The use of large datasets including personal information, has raised privacy concerns, leading to regulations such as GDPR [8] and CCPA [20].

Membership inference attacks (MIA) [18] are effective auditing tools aiming at determining if a specific data point was used in an LLM’s training dataset by analyzing its output. Such attacks highlight potential privacy breaches, relying on models’ tendency to overfit to familiar data [3]. By employing calibration strategies and training shadow models, the accuracy of MIAs can be improved, although challenges such as computational demands and limitations in effectiveness when deviating from training distribution assumptions persist. In this paper, we contribute to this field by: i) exploring membership inference attacks from the standpoint of a privacy auditor, ii) introducing a computationally efficient calibration strategy that sidesteps training shadow models, and iii) empirically assessing its potential in replacing other prevalent strategies.

## 2 Background

LLMs generate a probability distribution over their vocabulary based on a tokenized input sequence converted into numerical inputs through an embedding layer. This layer maps tokens to a dense representation, which can be learned during training [16, 17] or derived from public *word embeddings* [6]. For a model  $f$  with input sequence  $x$ , we define  $\mathbb{P}[w|x] = f_w(x)$  as the conditional probability that the token following  $x$  is  $w$ . LLMs are typically trained on large datasets of text to minimize a

---

\*Part of this author’s work was carried out while at Meta Inc.

measure of surprise in seeing the next token, called *perplexity*. For a sequence  $x$ , it is defined as the average negative log-likelihood of its tokens:

$$ppx(f, x) = -\frac{1}{|x|} \sum_{t=1}^{|x|} \log(f_{x_t}(x_{<t})) \quad (1)$$

with  $|x|$  the number of tokens in the sequence.

Membership inference attacks [18, 24, 2] aim to determine whether a particular data record  $x$  was used in the training dataset  $D_{train}$  of a machine learning model. These methods leverage model outputs like confidence scores or prediction probabilities to compute a score for the targeted sample. For LLMs, the typical assumption is to grant the adversary access to the output probabilities  $f(x)$ , which may be used to estimate the perplexity on the targeted samples as a score. Given a sample  $x$ , the goal of the attacker is to learn a thresholding classifier to output 1 when the perplexity is lower than a certain value  $\gamma$ :

$$A_\gamma(f, x) = \mathbb{1}[ppx(f, x) < \gamma] \quad (2)$$

MIA is a simple and effective tool to measure the privacy risk in a trained machine learning model, and it has interesting connections with other privacy frameworks. In particular, it is known to have a success rate bounded by the privacy parameters of Differential Privacy (DP) [7]. A randomized mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  is said to be  $\epsilon$ -DP if for any two datasets  $D, D'$  that differ in at most one sample, and for any  $R \subseteq \text{range}(\mathcal{M})$ , we have:

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{M}(D) \in R] \leq e^\epsilon \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{M}(D') \in R] \quad (3)$$

Notably, DP quantifies the worst-case scenario of the privacy risk, so it is a fundamental tool in privacy assessment. From the performance of the thresholding classifier  $\tilde{A}_\gamma(f, x)$  one can obtain a lower bound to the *empirical*  $\epsilon$ -DP [11]:

$$e^\epsilon \geq \frac{TPR}{FPR} \quad (4)$$

with TPR and FPR being, respectively, the true and false positive rates, given a certain threshold.

### 3 Related works

Privacy attacks against language models is an active area of research and different refinements have been proposed. Some works have focused on an attacker where data poisoning is allowed, granting the adversary write access to the training dataset, to increase memorization [21] or in general to induce malicious behaviours [25, 23, 26, 19, 10] and improve property inference attacks [12]. Other works have adopted similar techniques to achieve actual training data extraction from the training set, with only query access to the trained model [1, 4].

In the context of MIAs with query access to the target model, most research focused on strategies to improve the calibration of the per-sample scores, i.e. techniques to improve the precision and recall in distinguishing members from non-members of the training set. In principle, if we can assert that an out-of-distribution non-member of the training set will induce a high perplexity in a target LLM, there are a number of scenarios where the distinction is not as clear cut, and a thresholding classifier essentially ends up distinguishing between in-distribution from out-of-distribution samples. A refined MIA then employs calibration strategies to tune the scoring function based on the difficulty of classifying the specific sample, as in [24]. Thus, a relative membership score is obtained by comparing  $f(x)$  with one of two results based on whether the adversary is assumed to have access to *neighboring models*  $\tilde{f}(x)$  [2, 24] or *neighboring samples*  $f(\tilde{x})$  [13]. The new classifier becomes:

$$\tilde{A}_\gamma(f, x) = \mathbb{1}[ppx(f, x) - p\tilde{p}x(f, x) < \gamma] \quad (5)$$

where  $p\tilde{p}x(f, x)$  is the calibrated score over a set of neighboring models  $ppx(\tilde{f}, x)$  or over a set of neighboring samples  $ppx(f, \tilde{x})$ . Neighboring models can be obtained by an adversary who is assumed to have some degree of knowledge of the training data distribution and trains a number of shadow models to mimic the behaviour of the target LLM. For instance [2] trains multiple instances of the same architecture on different partitions of the training set, [1] uses smaller architectures trained on roughly the same data, [24] leverages catastrophic forgetting of the target model under the

assumption of white-box access. Neighboring samples do not require this assumption nor additional training and only need a strategy to craft inputs that are similar to the target sample under a certain distance metric. For instance, [13] crafts neighboring sentences by swapping a number of words with their synonyms, showing good results but applicable primarily when the adversary has limited knowledge of the training data distribution. The authors then base the neighboring relationship in the *semantic* space, which is hard to quantify and fix, resulting in the need to generate a large number of neighbors to reduce the effects of these random fluctuations. Additionally, we emphasize how [13] requires the use of an additional BERT-like model to generate synonyms, thus increasing the computational and memory cost of the attack. In [21] instead, calibration is done by comparing scores of the true inputs with scores of the lower-cased inputs. These strategies are known to be under-performing when knowledge of the training distribution is available, and are therefore proposed as an effective calibration mechanism when training shadow models is not possible.

## 4 Method

The intuition behind noisy neighbors is that, fixed a distance from a sample, the target model will show a larger difference in perplexity between a training sample and its neighbors than between a test sample and its neighbors. Thus, if we describe a language model as a composition of layers  $f(x) = g(e(x))$  where  $e$  is an embedding layer and  $g$  is the rest of the network, one can artificially create neighbors in the  $n$ -dimensional embedding space by directly injecting random noise at the output of  $e(x)$ . In particular, if we create noisy neighbors by injecting Gaussian noise such that

$$f(x'_\sigma) = g(e(x) + \rho), \quad \text{with } \rho \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma I_n) \tag{6}$$

then the Euclidean distance between the true and randomized input in the embedding space will be

$$\mathbb{E}[\|e(x) - e(x) - \rho\|] = \mathbb{E}[\|\rho\|] = \sigma\sqrt{n} \tag{7}$$

thus fixing, in expectation, the distance from the true sample at which the perplexity of the models will be evaluated. Generating multiple neighbors for each sample is crucial to mitigate randomness from stochastic noise, requiring repeated LLM inferences. Choosing the standard deviation  $\sigma$  potentially involves a complex parameter search with many model queries. However, the strategy’s performance shows a clear peak at the optimal  $\sigma$  value, as shown in Figure 1, which can be efficiently identified using binary search.




Figure 1: The AUC of the thresholding classifier for MIA shows a single and prominent peak at the optimal  $\sigma$  value in the *noisy neighbors* strategy.

We emphasize the challenge of isolating the embedding layer from the remainder of the network in an LLM when considering a scenario where an attacker has only black box access to the model. However,

when this limitation does not apply, we think it is still within the capacity of an auditor to utilize a slightly stronger attacker model, where the first embedding layer is exposed, to save computational resources in simulating an adversary without access to the model architecture. Most importantly, in fact, we are inclined to explore this option as a more computationally efficient substitute for training shadow models for calibration, particularly in the context of auditing, rather than viewing it as a novel, realistic attack.

## 5 Experiments

To validate the noisy neighbor strategy in implementing a calibrated MIA, we run a series of preliminary experiments on an LLM to gauge the risk of memorization of training data. The chosen architecture is GPT-2 *small* [17] to compromise learning capacity with memory and computational footprint at about 1.5 billion parameters, especially considering that competing strategies require training multiple LLMs from scratch. The model was pre-trained on OpenWebText [9], an open reproduction of the undisclosed WebText in [17]. The model was then fine-tuned on 60% of the full WikiText corpus [14], a large collection of Wikipedia articles. The same data split was then partitioned in 10 subsets used to train 10 shadow models for score calibration, as in [2]. Note that Wikipedia articles are filtered out of the OpenWebtext corpus, to avoid data leakage in common benchmarks, such as ours. The remaining portion of 40% of WikiText is thus used as source of non-member, 126-token long samples to analyze the performance of the attack. We generate only 10 synthetic neighbors for each sample. Given a sample and its score, the thresholding classifier yields a binary decision on whether it was part of the training dataset or not. To determine how good the best possible classifier may be, we need to evaluate its accuracy at different thresholds. As it is common for binary classification problems, though, the accuracy does not give a complete picture of the confidence at which the classifier is able to tell apart members and non-members of the dataset. Thus Figure 2a shows the complete range of TPRs versus FPRs for the three main strategies we included in this comparison: score by perplexity (*loss*), by shadow model calibration (*shadow*), and by noisy neighbor (*noisy*) calibration. We have opted not to incorporate the *lowercasing* strategy [21] and the *semantic neighbor* approach [13] in our study. These methods have, however, shown lower performance levels when information about the training data distribution is accessible, which is contemplated from the auditor point of view. Additionally, we faced challenges replicating some results from [13], possibly due to limitations in the synonym generation technique described in [27]. Figure 2a also notes the Area Under the Curve (AUC), which for *noisy* and *shadow* amounts to 0.727 and 0.753 respectively, thus showing a discrepancy of only  $\sim 3.4\%$ . The AUC is an important metric for binary classifiers as it abstracts from the specific threshold, thus giving an average-case idea of the strength of the attacker. Still, as highlighted in [2], special care should be given to what happens at low FPRs, that is when the attacker can confidently recognize members of the training set. This is what Figure 2b focuses on, again showing a strong overlap of the *shadow* and *noisy* strategies. Following Equation 4, we also provide the perspective of empirical DP, as the privacy community pushes to adopt this framework to comply to regulatory frameworks such as the GDPR [5]. Empirical DP measures the extent to which individual data points can be inferred or re-identified from the output of the system, and contrary to DP, it is a *post-hoc* measurement, not an *a-priori* guarantee. Figure 3 reports the results, where we see a strong consistency between the *noisy* and *shadow* strategies, especially for FPRs lower than  $10^{-2}$ .

## 6 Limitations

The effectiveness of the noisy neighbors method depends on assumptions that may not apply universally across models or datasets. Its success also relies on specific noise parameters, potentially limiting its generalizability. Despite being computationally more efficient than shadow model methods, it still requires significant computational resources.

## 7 Conclusion

This work set out to elaborate a strategy for membership inference attacks. Differently from prior research focusing on improving the strength of the attacker, we develop a technique trying to achieve a similar efficacy, while reducing the computational burden for an auditor trying to assess the privacy




Figure 2: Efficacy of different strategies for MIA. Confidence intervals computed with the Clopper-Person exact method.




Figure 3: Empirical differential privacy measured downstream of training.

risk of exposing the query access to a trained LLM. We propose the use of noise injection in the embedding space of the LLM to create synthetic neighbors of the targeted sample, to shift the comparison from the perplexity scored by different models on one sample, to the comparison of different samples by the same model. This approach allows to only use the model in inference mode, thus inherently reducing the time and cost of running an MIA. With a number of experiments we assess how our strategy results converge to the results of using shadow models, showing a remarkable alignment.

## References

- [1] Nicholas Carlini et al. “Extracting training data from large language models”. In: *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*. 2021, pp. 2633–2650.
- [2] Nicholas Carlini et al. *Membership Inference Attacks From First Principles*. Apr. 12, 2022. arXiv: 2112.03570[cs]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2112.03570> (visited on 09/25/2023).
- [3] Nicholas Carlini et al. “The secret sharer: Evaluating and testing unintended memorization in neural networks”. In: *28th USENIX security symposium (USENIX security 19)*. 2019, pp. 267–284.

- [4] Nicolas Carlini et al. “Extracting training data from diffusion models”. In: *32nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 23)*. 2023, pp. 5253–5270.
- [5] Rachel Cummings and Deven Desai. “The role of differential privacy in gdpr compliance”. In: *FAT’18: Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*. 2018, p. 20.
- [6] Jacob Devlin et al. “Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805* (2018).
- [7] Cynthia Dwork et al. “Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis”. In: *Theory of Cryptography: Third Theory of Cryptography Conference, TCC 2006, New York, NY, USA, March 4-7, 2006. Proceedings 3*. Springer. 2006, pp. 265–284.
- [8] European Parliament, European Council. *Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation)*. 2016. URL: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32016R0679> (visited on 03/26/2024).
- [9] Aaron Gokaslan and Vanya Cohen. *OpenWebText Corpus*. <http://Skylion007.github.io/OpenWebTextCorpus>. 2019.
- [10] W. Ronny Huang et al. “MetaPoison: Practical General-purpose Clean-label Data Poisoning”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Ed. by H. Larochelle et al. Vol. 33. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020, pp. 12080–12091. URL: [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2020/file/8ce6fc704072e351679ac97d4a985574-Paper.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2020/file/8ce6fc704072e351679ac97d4a985574-Paper.pdf).
- [11] Peter Kairouz, Sewoong Oh, and Pramod Viswanath. *The Composition Theorem for Differential Privacy*. Dec. 6, 2015. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.1311.0776. arXiv: 1311.0776[cs,math]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1311.0776> (visited on 09/20/2023).
- [12] Saeed Mahloujifar, Esha Ghosh, and Melissa Chase. “Property inference from poisoning”. In: *2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE. 2022, pp. 1120–1137.
- [13] Justus Mattern et al. “Membership inference attacks against language models via neighbourhood comparison”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18462* (2023).
- [14] Stephen Merity et al. “Pointer sentinel mixture models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.07843* (2016).
- [15] Pranav Narayanan Venkit et al. “Nationality Bias in Text Generation”. In: *Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Ed. by Andreas Vlachos and Isabelle Augenstein. Dubrovnik, Croatia: Association for Computational Linguistics, May 2023, pp. 116–122. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2023.eacl-main.9. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2023.eacl-main.9>.
- [16] Alec Radford et al. “Improving language understanding by generative pre-training”. In: (2018).
- [17] Alec Radford et al. “Language models are unsupervised multitask learners”. In: *OpenAI blog* 1.8 (2019), p. 9.
- [18] Reza Shokri et al. “Membership Inference Attacks Against Machine Learning Models”. In: *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. 2017, pp. 3–18. DOI: 10.1109/SP.2017.41.
- [19] Manli Shu et al. “On the exploitability of instruction tuning”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [20] State of California. *California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA)*. 2018. URL: <https://oag.ca.gov/privacy/ccpa>.
- [21] Florian Tramèr et al. “Truth serum: Poisoning machine learning models to reveal their secrets”. In: *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 2022, pp. 2779–2792.
- [22] Ashish Vaswani et al. “Attention is all you need”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [23] Eric Wallace et al. “Concealed Data Poisoning Attacks on NLP Models”. In: *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. 2021.

- [24] Lauren Watson et al. “On the Importance of Difficulty Calibration in Membership Inference Attacks”. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2021.
- [25] Jiashu Xu et al. “Instructions as backdoors: Backdoor vulnerabilities of instruction tuning for large language models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14710* (2023).
- [26] Jun Yan et al. “Virtual prompt injection for instruction-tuned large language models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.16888* (2023).
- [27] Wangchunshu Zhou et al. “BERT-based Lexical Substitution”. In: *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Ed. by Anna Korhonen, David Traum, and Lluís Màrquez. Florence, Italy: Association for Computational Linguistics, July 2019, pp. 3368–3373. DOI: 10.18653/v1/P19-1328. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/P19-1328>.