

# One-Shot Unlearning of Personal Identities

Thomas De Min  
University of Trento

thomas.demin@unitn.it

Subhankar Roy  
University of Trento

Massimiliano Mancini  
University of Trento

Stéphane Lathuilière  
LTCI, Télécom Paris,  
Institut Polytechnique de Paris

Elisa Ricci  
University of Trento  
Fondazione Bruno Kessler

## Abstract

Machine unlearning (MU) aims to erase data from a model as if it never saw them during training. To this extent, existing MU approaches assume complete or partial access to the training data, which can be limited over time due to privacy regulations. However, no setting or benchmark exists to probe the effectiveness of MU methods in such scenarios, i.e. when training data is missing. To fill this gap, we propose a novel task we call *One-Shot Unlearning of Personal Identities* (O-UPI) that evaluates unlearning models when the training data is not accessible. Specifically, we focus on the identity unlearning case, which is relevant due to current regulations requiring data deletion after training. To cope with data absence, we expect users to provide a portraiting picture to perform unlearning. To evaluate methods in O-UPI, we benchmark the forgetting on CelebA and CelebA-HQ datasets with different unlearning set sizes. We test applicable methods on this challenging benchmark, proposing also an effective method that meta-learns to forget identities from a single image. Our findings indicate that existing approaches struggle when data availability is limited, with greater difficulty when there is dissimilarity between provided samples and data used at training time. We will release the code and benchmark upon acceptance.

## 1. Introduction

In the sci-fi movie franchise *Men in Black*, the secret service agents possess a Neuralyzer, a brainwashing device that, with a bright flash, selectively wipes out anyone’s memory of alien encounters. Not being limited to fiction, a “Neuralyzer”-like tool is also practical for machine learning practitioners in order to erase information from trained neural networks. Such a requirement can inevitably arise when data owners exercise their “right to be forgotten” [29, 38].




Figure 1. **Standard unlearning vs. One-Shot Unlearning of Personal Identities (O-UPI).** Standard machine unlearning approaches leverage the entire forget set to forget an identity. In O-UPI, the user provides a picture of themselves as only input to the unlearning algorithm for forgetting their identity. O-UPI enables unlearning when the entire training dataset is not accessible.

Given the practical implications, Machine Unlearning (MU) aims to forget the influence of *targeted information* from a trained model, as if they were not part of the training set.

MU methods can be broadly categorized under two categories: exact unlearning and approximate unlearning. By retraining the model without the sensitive information, *exact unlearning* methods [1, 5, 39] are more effective as they guarantee that the target knowledge is completely forgotten. Despite their effectiveness, retraining large models for every unlearning request can be prohibitive. As an alternative, *approximate unlearning* approximates the model parameters after exact unlearning without needing to retrain from

scratch, focusing more on efficiency while relaxing the removal guarantees. Most of these methods achieve unlearning by computing gradient updates using carefully designed loss functions [10, 24, 37] or by identifying important parameters for the sensitive information [12, 15].

Despite promising results, all existing approximate unlearning methods and benchmarks assume full or partial access to the original training dataset (see Fig. 1). We argue that this assumption can limit the applicability of MU in realistic scenarios, as original training data may be deleted over time due to privacy regulations [29, 38]. Moreover, the absence of suitable evaluation schemes conceals the extent of the data accessibility issue. To address the previously described problem, we propose a novel task called One-Shot Unlearning of Personal Identities (O-UPI), which aims to evaluate unlearning methods when training data is unavailable. We focus on identity unlearning as it makes it a realistic scenario due to privacy concerns relative to personal data. In particular, we target machine learning models trained for an arbitrary downstream task (e.g. face attribute recognition, age regression), performing unlearning at the identity level. To circumvent the lack of training data, we propose that users, who exercise the “right to be forgotten”, provide to the unlearning algorithm a Support Sample portraying their identity. Since in identity unlearning each request involves one or more images, methods must generalize to all forget set images without accessing them.

As unlearning entire identities using a single image is hardly non-trivial, we propose a novel approach we call METAUNLEARN that learns to unlearn IDs using a single shot. To unlearn a single support sample, we adopt the learning-to-learn framework, where we learn a meta-loss function that approximates an unlearning loss without needing the full training data. During training METAUNLEARN exploits the available training data (before their removal) to simulate unlearning requests, by sampling random identities and their respective Support Sets. This allows us to compute error estimates and optimize METAUNLEARN parameters. Although O-UPI is challenging, METAUNLEARN achieves more consistent forgetting results than existing approaches across different datasets and unlearning set sizes.

In summary, our contributions are the following: (i) We propose O-UPI a novel benchmark to evaluate machine unlearning methods in the realistic scenario of where training data is unavailable; (ii) We evaluated existing MU methods on O-UPI, revealing that they are inadequate to tackle machine unlearning when training data is unavailable; (iii) We propose METAUNLEARN the first meta-learning approach for machine unlearning, showing its effectiveness in O-UPI.

## 2. Related Work

**Machine Unlearning.** The goal of MU is to remove the influence of sensitive data from an already trained model. Preliminary approaches [1, 5, 39] focused on *exact unlearning*, where the model, or part of it, is retrained to guarantee forgetting. Despite their effectiveness, *exact unlearning* methods are prohibitively expensive [10, 15, 17], especially in the era of large foundation models [27, 31, 32, 36].

To improve unlearning efficiency, *approximate unlearning* methods [8–10, 12, 14, 15, 37] seek to forget sensitive data by computing just a few model updates, improving efficiency. For instance, Bad Teacher [10] proposes a teacher-student architecture where the student preserves original performance by distilling from a competent teacher while forgetting sensitive knowledge by distilling from an incompetent one. Similarly, SCRUB [24] unlearns by maximizing the divergence with the teacher model on unlearning data.

Although these methods perform better, they assume complete access to the training data. This can be limited in practice, e.g. due to privacy regulations [29]. Thus, methods explored strategies to limit training set requirements, using only forget data. Examples are SSD [15], using the forget set to dampen weights according to the approximate fisher information matrix [23], PGU [19] computing gradient ascent updates and enforcing orthogonality to important directions for the training data, and JiT [14] reduces model confidence by forcing Lipschitz continuity on forget data.

Compared to these methods, O-UPI does not assume access to either retain or forget set. For this reason, the only way for methods to unlearn identities is through samples provided by users. Thus, the proposed task becomes far less trivial as methods must generalize the unlearning to the entire identity by looking just at a single image.

**Meta-Learning.** Contrary to standard machine learning, meta-learning distills knowledge from multiple learning episodes for improved learning performance, a paradigm also known as learning to learn [20]. Preliminary meta-learning approaches [2, 13, 30] focused on learning the model initialization to facilitate few-shot learning, via e.g. first [30] or second-order [13], or specific training recipes [2]. Beyond few-shot learning, meta-learning has been applied to other tasks, such as domain generalization [26], continual learning [21], and fast model adaptation [3].

Following the same principles, our proposed approach METAUNLEARN approximates an unlearning loss function by simulating multiple unlearning requests. At the end of the training, METAUNLEARN can generalize unlearning by accessing only a single sample per identity.

### 3. Problem Formulation

In Sec. 3.1, we provide a general overview of the machine unlearning problem, focusing on identity unlearning. In Sec. 3.2, we introduce a novel task, One-Shot Unlearning of Personal Identities, and we describe its relevance in realistic scenarios. Finally, in Sec. 3.3 we provide a schematic overview of how we construct the benchmark dataset.

#### 3.1. Machine Unlearning

Let  $f_\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  be a model parameterized by  $\theta$  that maps inputs from the image domain  $\mathcal{X}$  to the target domain  $\mathcal{Y}$  (e.g. face attributes), with  $\theta$  trained on dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{tr}$ . The dataset is characterized by image-label pairs such that  $\mathcal{D}_{tr} = \{(\mathbf{x}_j, y_j)\}_{j=1}^N$ , with  $N$  the dataset size. The goal of machine unlearning is to “forget” a subset of the training dataset  $\mathcal{D}_f \subset \mathcal{D}_{tr}$  while preserving original model performance on the retain  $\mathcal{D}_r = \mathcal{D}_{tr} \setminus \mathcal{D}_f$  and test  $\mathcal{D}_{te}$  datasets. Given original model parameters  $\theta$  and a forget set, an effective MU algorithm  $\mathcal{U}$  outputs unlearned model weights  $\theta_u$  that minimize a distance measure with optimal parameters computed by retraining the model  $f$  on  $\mathcal{D}_r$ :

$$\arg \min_{\theta_u} d(\theta_u, \theta_r), \quad (1)$$

where  $d$  is a distance metric, and  $\theta_r$  are model parameters obtained by training solely on  $\mathcal{D}_r$ .

While in random sample unlearning [15, 16] the forget set samples are not correlated, in the identity unlearning scenario [9] they all portray training images of target unlearning identities  $\mathcal{I}_f$ , such that:

$$\mathcal{D}_f = \{(\mathbf{x}_j, y_j, i_j) \mid i_j \in \mathcal{I}_f\}_{j=1}^{N_f}, \quad (2)$$

where  $i_j$  is the identity number,  $\mathcal{I}_f = \mathcal{I}_{tr} \setminus \mathcal{I}_r$ ,  $\mathcal{I}_{tr}$  are all training identities, and  $N_f$  is the forget set size.

#### 3.2. One-Shot Unlearning of Personal Identities

While standard unlearning methods [10, 12, 15, 24] assume complete or partial access to the retain and forget data, this may not be always possible, especially when considering privacy regulations [29, 38]. In this context, pictures of people are extremely subject to privacy issues, and we argue that the availability of even part of the dataset is not guaranteed in identity unlearning.

In this work, we propose a novel task, One-Shot Unlearning of Personal Identities (O-UPI) that evaluates methods when the training data is inaccessible. Specifically, we analyze the case of identity unlearning where the entire training dataset is discarded after training, as it might contain sensitive data. To address this challenge, we require users requesting to be unlearned to provide one image with their identity portrayed, called Support Sample. This sample is used to aid unlearning and discarded after use. Additionally, we do not make assumptions about the Support




Figure 2. **Benchmark dataset construction.** The dataset is split based on identities, dividing them into train  $\mathcal{I}_{tr}$ , validation  $\mathcal{I}_v$ , and test  $\mathcal{I}_{te}$  IDs. Following, we sample forgetting identities from training ones, building the forget  $\mathcal{I}_f$  and retain  $\mathcal{I}_r$  IDs. Out of forget identities, we sample one image for each identity to form the Support Set  $\mathcal{S}$ , which is unavailable at training time.

Sample being in the training dataset, as a user can provide a sample that was not used for training. The collection of samples of different users is called Support Set:

$$\mathcal{S} = \{(\mathbf{x}_j, y_j, i_j) \mid \forall k \in \{1, \dots, N_S\} \setminus j, i_j \neq i_k\}_{j=1}^{N_S}. \quad (3)$$

Thus, the Support Set contains only one sample for each identity and  $N_S$  is the number of identities to unlearn. Given the Support Set  $\mathcal{S}$  and the original model weights  $\theta$ , the machine unlearning algorithm outputs  $\theta_u$  to minimize Eq. (1):  $\mathcal{U}(\theta; \mathcal{S}) = \theta_u$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{U}$  must completely unlearn  $\mathcal{D}_f$  by having only access to  $\mathcal{S}$ . This makes the task extremely challenging as (i) methods cannot access neither the retain nor the forget sets, and (ii) the Support Sample cannot capture the entire distribution of the training samples of the identity we aim to forget.

#### 3.3. Benchmark Construction

To evaluate methods in O-UPI, we split the full dataset  $\mathcal{D}$  in train  $\mathcal{D}_{tr}$ , validation  $\mathcal{D}_v$ , and test  $\mathcal{D}_{te}$  sets with non-overlapping identities (see Fig. 2). Similarly, we randomly select  $N_S$  identities from  $\mathcal{D}_{tr}$  to construct the forget dataset  $\mathcal{D}_f$ , while the remaining ones are left for the retain set  $\mathcal{D}_r$ . For each identity in the forget set, we randomly remove one image to form the Support Set  $\mathcal{S}$ , such that the same image cannot appear in both  $\mathcal{D}_f$  and  $\mathcal{S}$ . We note that the Support Set is removed from the training dataset, and thus unseen by the model  $\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{D}_{tr} = \emptyset$ . Additionally, when

sampling the identities to unlearn, we ensure the number of images for that identity is greater than one. Without this constraint, some identities in  $\mathcal{S}$  might not have associated images in  $\mathcal{D}_f$ , making the evaluation impractical. After splitting the dataset, we train the model on  $\mathcal{D}_{tr}$  and use  $\mathcal{S}$  to unlearn  $\mathcal{D}_f$ . The evaluation is done using  $\mathcal{D}_r$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_f$ , and  $\mathcal{D}_{te}$ .

## 4. Learning to Unlearn for O-UPI

This Section presents METAUNLEARN, our proposed approach tailored for O-UPI. In Sec. 4.1, we describe the rationale behind meta-learning for unlearning and how to simulate unlearning requests. In Sec. 4.2, we briefly describe the architecture of METAUNLEARN and how to optimize it in a tractable and scalable way. Finally, in Sec. 4.3, we detail the optimization pipeline of the method.

### 4.1. Simulated Unlearning Requests

To generalize the unlearning of an identity by having only access to one sample is challenging. As each identity counts multiple images, unlearning methods should erase all of them from the model by only using the Support Sample. To tackle this problem, we propose to learn the unlearning algorithm so that it can forget identities via the limited Support Samples. By simulating unlearning requests we can estimate the error of the meta-learning algorithm and optimize its parameters. We simulate unlearning requests by randomly selecting  $N_{\mathcal{S}}$  identities from the training set and splitting  $\mathcal{D}_{tr}$  following the same procedure of Sec. 3.3, removing the constraint that identities should have at least two samples. In the case of an identity with just one sample, we duplicate the sample and use it both in the simulated support and forget sets. In this way, we can simulate unlearning for less-represented identities, making the meta-learning algorithm more robust to the underlying forget set size. To ensure that all identities are used, we sample them without replacement multiple times, until convergence.

### 4.2. Meta-Loss Function

Following previous works in meta-learning [3, 26], we design the meta-learning component  $h_{\phi}$  as a learnable loss function parameterized by  $\phi$ . Given the Support Set  $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $h_{\phi}$  should produce a gradient update that minimizes Eq. (1):

$$\arg \min_{\phi} d(\theta - \eta \nabla_{\theta} h_{\phi}(f_{\theta}(\mathcal{S})), \theta_r), \quad (4)$$

where  $\eta$  is the learning rate and  $\nabla_{\theta}$  computes the gradient of the meta-loss w.r.t. the model parameters. Compared to Eq. (1), the minimization is not carried through  $\theta_u$  but through the learnable parameters  $\phi$ .

Although directly optimizing Eq. (4) is computationally tractable, minimizing it is not scalable as it would require computing retrained parameters  $\theta_r$  for each simulated request. Thus, it is necessary to have an auxiliary error

function  $\mathcal{A}$  that assesses model unlearning without computing  $\theta_r$ .  $\mathcal{A}$  should account for the alignment between the forget and test sets performance and retaining the original model adaptation [10, 15, 24]. To satisfy both constraints, we propose to minimize the following error function:

$$\arg \min_{\phi} \|\mathcal{L}_{\text{task}}(\mathcal{D}_f; \theta_u) - \mathcal{L}_{\text{task}}(\mathcal{D}_v; \theta_u)\|_2^2 + \|\mathcal{L}_{\text{task}}(\mathcal{D}_f; \theta_u) - \mathcal{L}_{\text{task}}(\mathcal{D}_v; \theta)\|_2^2, \quad (5)$$

where  $\theta_u = \theta - \eta \nabla_{\theta} h_{\phi}(f_{\theta}(\mathcal{S}))$ . The first term of Eq. (5) aligns forget and validation sets performance of the unlearned model, while the second one ensures that the forget loss of the unlearned model matches the validation loss of the original one. The two terms together pushes forget data to be treated as unseen (*i.e.* validation) w.r.t. both its current status (first term) and the original model (second term).

Although Eq. (5) aligns forget and validation set losses, we noticed that, in some cases, this did not correspond to changes in the performance of the model on forget data. To explicitly account for mismatches in the accuracy between forget and validation set, we scale each loss term in Eq. (5) by the opposite of its corresponding accuracy, *e.g.*:

$$(1 - \text{mAP}(\mathcal{D}_f; \theta_u)) \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\text{task}}(\mathcal{D}_f; \theta_u). \quad (6)$$

A complete error function formulation is in Appx. C.

### 4.3. MetaUnlearn

With the meta-learning objective defined in Eq. (6), we can instantiate our full method (Fig. 3). First, we simulate unlearning requests as described in Sec. 4.1 and obtain model predictions by feeding the Support Set  $\mathcal{S}$  to the trained model  $f_{\theta}$ . The output is fed to the meta-loss function  $h_{\phi}$ , which is implemented as an mlp with softplus activation to ensure positive loss values. METAUNLEARN gradients are then used to compute an update of the model  $f_{\theta}$ , which we refer to as the unlearned model  $f_{\theta_u}$ . The unlearned model is tested against the forget and validation set to compute the auxiliary loss and update  $h_{\phi}$ . We point out that we separately train the model  $f_{\theta}$  and meta-loss  $h_{\phi}$  to avoid altering the original learning dynamics of  $f$ , contrary to [26], which is a domain generalization approach. Complete METAUNLEARN training and unlearning procedures are highlighted in Algorithm 1.

## 5. Experiments

In this section, we first describe O-UPI experimental setting (Sec. 5.1), outlining datasets, metrics, and baselines used (see Appx. A for implementation details). In Sec. 5.2, we show quantitative results in O-UPI and compare them against our proposed approach. Instead in Secs. 5.3 and 5.4 we investigate when unlearning is the hardest and when unlearning harms performance. Finally, we provide a complete ablation of METAUNLEARN in Sec. 5.5.




Figure 3. **Schematics of METAUNLEARN.** The training has two steps: (1) Support Samples are forwarded through the trained model  $f_\theta$  and its output is forwarded through the meta-loss  $h_\phi$ , which outputs the meta-unlearning loss value  $\mathcal{M}$ . By updating the model using  $\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{M}$ , we obtain the unlearned network  $f_{\theta_u}$ . (2) We evaluate  $h_\phi$  unlearning by forwarding  $\mathcal{D}_f$  and  $\mathcal{D}_v$  through the unlearned network, and the original one, to compute the auxiliary loss  $\mathcal{A}$ . After updating  $h_\phi$  using  $\nabla_{\phi} \mathcal{A}$ , we restore  $f$  to its original parameters  $\theta$  and iterate.

---

**Algorithm 1** METAUNLEARN pseudocodes.

---

```

1: def simulate_unlearning( $\mathcal{I}_{tr}, \mathcal{D}_{tr}$ ):
2:    $\mathcal{I}_f \sim \mathcal{I}_{tr}$ 
3:    $\mathcal{D}_f = \{(\mathbf{x}_j, y_j, i_j) \mid i_j \in \mathcal{I}_f\}_{j=1}^{N_f}$ 
4:    $\mathcal{D}_r = \mathcal{D}_{tr} \setminus \mathcal{D}_f$ 
5:    $\mathcal{S} = \text{build\_support\_set}(\mathcal{I}_f, \mathcal{D}_f)$ 
6:   return  $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{D}_f, \mathcal{D}_r$ 
7:
8: def METAUNLEARN_training_step( $\mathcal{I}_{tr}, \mathcal{D}_{tr}, \mathcal{D}_v$ ):
9:   # compute simulated unlearning step
10:   $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{D}_f, \mathcal{D}_r = \text{simulate\_unlearning}(\mathcal{I}_{tr}, \mathcal{D}_{tr})$ 
11:   $\mathcal{M} = h_\phi(f_\theta(\mathcal{S}))$ 
12:   $\theta_u = \theta - \eta \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{M}$ 
13:  # update meta-loss
14:   $\mathcal{A} = \text{MSE}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{task}}(\mathcal{D}_f; \theta_u), \mathcal{L}_{\text{task}}(\mathcal{D}_v; \theta_u))$ 
15:   $\mathcal{A} += \text{MSE}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{task}}(\mathcal{D}_f; \theta), \mathcal{L}_{\text{task}}(\mathcal{D}_v; \theta))$ 
16:   $\phi = \phi - \alpha \nabla_{\phi} \mathcal{A}$ 
17:  return
18:
19: def METAUNLEARN_unlearning( $\mathcal{S}$ ):
20:   $\mathcal{M} = h_\phi(f_\theta(\mathcal{S}))$ 
21:   $\theta = \theta - \eta \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{M}$ 
22:  return  $\theta$ 

```

---

## 5.1. Experimental setting

**Datasets.** To evaluate unlearning approaches in O-UPI, we need datasets with identity and downstream task annotation. The goal is to train a model on the downstream task and to perform identity-aware unlearning while preserving the original model performance on such a downstream task. We identify two datasets that come with annotations for both: CelebA-HQ [22, 25] and CelebA [28]. Both datasets provide annotations for 40 facial attributes of celebrities. We investigate two unlearning sizes for both datasets. Specifically, we choose 20 and 50 identities for CelebA-HQ, namely CelebA-HQ/20 and CelebA-HQ/50, and 5 and 10 IDs for CelebA, *i.e.* CelebA/5 and CelebA/10. We set a lower number of identities for CelebA as each of them counts approximately 20 samples/identity against 5 samples/identity of CelebA-HQ.

**Metrics.** Evaluating machine unlearning methods has demonstrated tough [4, 10, 42], with different works proposing suitable metrics to summarize the degree of unlearning in one score, with the membership inference attack (MIA) [6, 35, 41] being the most used. However, MIA’s computational cost is prohibitive for a large set of experiments, as it requires training many shadow models [6, 35], limiting its applicability to a subset of experiments. To circumvent this limitation, most machine unlearning approaches [12, 14, 15, 18, 34], rely on a computationally cheap version of MIA [41]. Yet, such metric is inadequate to infer membership [6, 40], impeding a thorough evaluation.

We seek to evaluate methods in O-UPI with a cheap metric that can be easily computed for all experiments and of simple interpretability. We rely on the recently proposed “tug of war” (ToW) metric [42], which captures the performance discrepancy of the three datasets (retain, forget, and test set) in a single score, simplifying evaluation:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{ToW} = & [1 - |\text{mAP}(\mathcal{D}_r; \theta_u) - \text{mAP}(\mathcal{D}_r; \theta_r)|] \\
& \cdot [1 - |\text{mAP}(\mathcal{D}_f; \theta_u) - \text{mAP}(\mathcal{D}_f; \theta_r)|] \\
& \cdot [1 - |\text{mAP}(\mathcal{D}_{te}; \theta_u) - \text{mAP}(\mathcal{D}_{te}; \theta_r)|].
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

The closer ToW is to 1 (100 if scaled) the better the unlearning. Additionally, we separately report the mean average precision (mAP) on the retain, forget, and test sets.

**Baselines.** Although the machine unlearning literature counts different approaches, only a handful could be applied to our proposed task. Approaches that only assume access to the forget data are the only ones that can be applied in our setting, as unlearning can be carried out by using only Support Samples. Thus, we compare METAUNLEARN with SSD [15], PGU [19], and JiT [14]. As a reference, we also report SCRUB [24] and Bad Teacher [10] that perform unlearning by computing multiple gradient updates using the entire training dataset.

## 5.2. Quantitative results

In Tabs. 1 and 2, we report existing methods and METAUNLEARN evaluation in One-Shot Unlearning of Per-

Table 1. **Unlearning on CelebA-HQ dataset.** In the two columns, we report the method name and whether it uses retain and forget sets. Following, we show the average mAP on the retain, forget, and test set, while we show the ToW metric in the last column.

Method	Access to dataset	mAP			ToW $\uparrow$
		$\mathcal{D}_r$	$\mathcal{D}_f$	$\mathcal{D}_{te}$	
20 IDENTITIES					
Trained	-	84.8 $\pm$ 0.1	83.0 $\pm$ 2.9	80.7 $\pm$ 0.0	95.5 $\pm$ 0.6
Retrained	-	84.7 $\pm$ 0.2	78.6 $\pm$ 3.5	80.8 $\pm$ 0.1	-
Bad Teacher [10]	$\checkmark$	84.4 $\pm$ 0.1	82.3 $\pm$ 2.9	80.3 $\pm$ 0.2	95.6 $\pm$ 0.9
SCRUB [24]	$\checkmark$	88.1 $\pm$ 0.1	80.2 $\pm$ 2.9	81.2 $\pm$ 0.2	94.7 $\pm$ 1.7
JiT [14]	$\times$	78.2 $\pm$ 1.5	75.9 $\pm$ 4.4	75.0 $\pm$ 1.2	85.7 $\pm$ 3.4
PGU [19]	$\times$	84.6 $\pm$ 0.0	82.8 $\pm$ 2.9	80.6 $\pm$ 0.1	95.6 $\pm$ 0.6
SSD [15]	$\times$	83.4 $\pm$ 0.6	82.0 $\pm$ 3.1	79.6 $\pm$ 0.5	94.3 $\pm$ 1.3
METAUNLEARN	$\times$	84.5 $\pm$ 0.2	82.6 $\pm$ 2.5	80.7 $\pm$ 0.1	<b>95.7<math>\pm</math>0.8</b>
50 IDENTITIES					
Trained	-	84.9 $\pm$ 0.1	83.8 $\pm$ 1.2	80.8 $\pm$ 0.1	94.8 $\pm$ 0.4
Retrained	-	84.6 $\pm$ 0.2	79.1 $\pm$ 1.2	80.6 $\pm$ 0.1	-
Bad Teacher [10]	$\checkmark$	83.6 $\pm$ 0.1	81.9 $\pm$ 0.4	79.4 $\pm$ 0.1	95.1 $\pm$ 0.9
SCRUB [24]	$\checkmark$	87.0 $\pm$ 0.6	81.4 $\pm$ 0.7	81.2 $\pm$ 0.3	94.7 $\pm$ 1.0
JiT [14]	$\times$	66.3 $\pm$ 1.2	65.3 $\pm$ 0.9	64.7 $\pm$ 1.3	59.2 $\pm$ 2.4
PGU [19]	$\times$	84.6 $\pm$ 0.3	83.7 $\pm$ 1.6	80.5 $\pm$ 0.3	94.9 $\pm$ 0.6
SSD [15]	$\times$	72.7 $\pm$ 5.0	70.9 $\pm$ 5.7	70.9 $\pm$ 4.5	73.7 $\pm$ 11.3
METAUNLEARN	$\times$	84.1 $\pm$ 0.4	82.5 $\pm$ 1.9	80.6 $\pm$ 0.3	<b>95.9<math>\pm</math>0.6</b>

Table 2. **Unlearning on CelebA dataset.** In the two columns, we report the method name and whether it uses retain and forget sets. Following, we show the average mAP on the retain, forget, and test set, while we show the ToW metric in the last column.

Method	Access to dataset	mAP			ToW $\uparrow$
		$\mathcal{D}_r$	$\mathcal{D}_f$	$\mathcal{D}_{te}$	
5 IDENTITIES					
Trained	-	84.4 $\pm$ 0.0	81.8 $\pm$ 2.2	80.9 $\pm$ 0.1	97.2 $\pm$ 1.0
Retrained	-	84.5 $\pm$ 0.0	79.1 $\pm$ 3.2	80.9 $\pm$ 0.1	-
Bad teacher [10]	$\checkmark$	84.3 $\pm$ 0.0	79.5 $\pm$ 3.4	80.7 $\pm$ 0.1	99.1 $\pm$ 0.5
SCRUB [24]	$\checkmark$	87.9 $\pm$ 0.1	77.5 $\pm$ 3.4	80.6 $\pm$ 0.2	94.8 $\pm$ 0.7
JiT [14]	$\times$	84.2 $\pm$ 0.1	81.1 $\pm$ 2.2	80.7 $\pm$ 0.2	<b>97.6<math>\pm</math>1.2</b>
PGU [19]	$\times$	84.4 $\pm$ 0.0	82.1 $\pm$ 2.1	80.9 $\pm$ 0.1	96.9 $\pm$ 1.5
SSD [15]	$\times$	23.1 $\pm$ 0.2	30.9 $\pm$ 2.0	23.1 $\pm$ 0.1	8.4 $\pm$ 0.9
METAUNLEARN	$\times$	84.4 $\pm$ 0.0	81.9 $\pm$ 2.2	80.9 $\pm$ 0.1	97.2 $\pm$ 1.0
10 IDENTITIES					
Trained	-	84.5 $\pm$ 0.1	83.0 $\pm$ 4.1	80.9 $\pm$ 0.1	97.3 $\pm$ 0.5
Retrained	-	84.4 $\pm$ 0.1	80.4 $\pm$ 4.5	80.9 $\pm$ 0.1	-
Bad Teacher [10]	$\checkmark$	84.2 $\pm$ 0.1	82.2 $\pm$ 3.7	80.5 $\pm$ 0.1	97.6 $\pm$ 1.0
SCRUB [24]	$\checkmark$	87.9 $\pm$ 0.1	79.9 $\pm$ 4.7	80.6 $\pm$ 0.1	95.8 $\pm$ 0.3
JiT [14]	$\times$	83.9 $\pm$ 0.4	82.5 $\pm$ 4.4	80.4 $\pm$ 0.3	96.9 $\pm$ 0.9
PGU [19]	$\times$	84.5 $\pm$ 0.0	82.9 $\pm$ 4.3	80.9 $\pm$ 0.1	<b>97.4<math>\pm</math>0.3</b>
SSD [15]	$\times$	26.9 $\pm$ 4.3	30.1 $\pm$ 5.2	26.9 $\pm$ 4.2	10.0 $\pm$ 3.2
METAUNLEARN	$\times$	84.4 $\pm$ 0.0	82.9 $\pm$ 4.3	80.9 $\pm$ 0.2	<b>97.4<math>\pm</math>0.3</b>

sonal Identities. We divide both tables into two sections corresponding to different unlearning set sizes. From top to bottom, we report trained and retrained model performance for each size, corresponding to the lower and upper bounds.

Following, we show Bad Teacher [10] and SCRUB [24] unlearning for reference as they cannot be applied in O-UPI. We then evaluate methods that can operate with Support Samples only, including METAUNLEARN.




Figure 4. **Unlearning hardness vs. Support Sample distance.** As the Support Sample distance from the identity centroid increases, the accuracy gap with the retrained model grows.

In CelebA-HQ (Tab. 1), only METAUNLEARN and PGU achieve a higher ToW score than the trained model, with respectively 95.7 and 95.6 against 95.5 of the trained model. However, no method achieves a substantial improvement in CelebA-HQ, except for METAUNLEARN in CelebA-HQ/50, which scores 95.9 vs. 94.8. Interestingly, SSD decreases the forgetting mAP to lower values (82.0 and 70.9) compared to METAUNLEARN (82.6 and 82.5) and PGU (82.8 and 83.7), however, it uniformly degrades retain and test sets performance as well, achieving a lower ToW score (94.3 and 73.7). In both cases, JiT performance degradation makes it inapplicable in the real work as test mAPs drop by respectively 5.7 and 16.4. In CelebA/10 (Tab. 2), only PGU and METAUNLEARN achieve a ToW score higher than the lower bound, though by a fraction (97.4 and 97.4 vs. 97.3). Instead, JiT shows a relatively big improvement over the trained model in CelebA/5 (97.6 vs. 97.2), not surpassing it in CelebA/10 (96.9 vs 97.3). SSD, instead, demonstrated low performance in both CelebA scenarios (8.4 and 10.0).

Although Bad Teacher and SCRUB access the entire training dataset, both struggle with identity unlearning. Bad Teacher struggles to reduce forget set accuracy with large unlearning sets (+2.8 in CelebA-HQ/50 and +1.8 in CelebA). Contrary, SCRUB tends to unlearn too much in CelebA and not enough in CelebA-HQ, while always increasing the retain accuracy ( $\sim 3\text{-}4\%$  increase).

Overall, METAUNLEARN achieves consistently the best or comparable results cross all 4 configurations, also showing better performance than Bad Teacher and SCRUB in the CelebA-HQ dataset (additional analysis in Appx. B).

### 5.3. When is unlearning the hardest?

In evaluating METAUNLEARN and existing methods in O-UPI, we noticed how some identities were easier to unlearn than others. This behaviour is strictly related to the closeness between Support Samples and forget set images of the same identity (see Fig. 6), e.g. unlearning when there




Figure 5. **Performance drop vs. distance from forget set.** As retain identities get closer to forget identities, retain samples mAP drops compared to the trained model.

is a large age gap between the Support Sample and images in the forget set can be hard. By analyzing the Euclidean distance between the support sample and the ID centroid on CelebA-HQ/50, some identities showed a large gap between the two, suggesting that unlearning hardness correlates with the Support Sample distance to the centroid. Therefore, we computed the accuracy difference between the unlearned and retrained models for each unlearning identity. We averaged the accuracy differences of the top-3 unlearning methods on three seeds and binned results based on the Support Sample distance from the ID centroid.

In Fig. 4 we show the results of our analysis. The unlearned model accuracy on forget data struggles to achieve retrained model values as the distance increases. We also outline that the mean accuracy after unlearning is lower than retrained model one for Support Samples that are close to the ID centroid, suggesting a possible *Streisand Effect* [10, 15]. The Streisand Effect occurs when unlearning is too aggressive and the accuracy of the forget set drops way below the retrained model one. If model response to unlearned samples is too low compared to unseen samples, this can indicate that the forget set was previously part of the training set, thus, leaking membership information.

### 5.4. When does unlearning harm performance?

Analogously to the previous case (Sec. 5.3), we noticed that, in both datasets, most methods demonstrated a drop in performance from the original model on the retain data, especially in CelebA-HQ. We hypothesize that the closer a retain identity is to a forget one, the higher the chance of an accuracy drop on retain data compared to the original model. Thus, we analyzed whether the distance between forget IDs centroids and retain ones correlates with a performance drop. We computed the mAP difference from the trained model for each retain identity, averaging three seeds and using the top-3 methods on CelebA-HQ/50. As in Sec. 5.3, we binned accuracy drops based on identity dis-

tances. In Fig. 4, we show that the closer a retain sample is to a forget sample, the more the mAP drops from the original model. Consequently, preserving the original performance becomes easier as the distance increases.

These results, together with those of Sec. 5.3, demonstrate O-UPI is challenging as all methods fail to largely improve the ToW score over the original model.

### 5.5. Ablation studies

**Auxiliary loss function.** In Tab. 3, we ablate the formulation of the auxiliary loss used to train METAUNLEARN. For completeness, we report the performances of our approach in all four configurations, averaging over three different seeds. In the first row, we show ToW scores when naïvely applying SCRUB [24] loss function. As a result, either the approach performs suboptimally or fails in achieving meaningful ToW scores. We hypothesize that, as SCRUB loss is numerically unstable if not optimized in an alternate way [7, 24], using it to measure the meta-loss error can similarly be problematic. In one case (CelebA-HQ/50) we experienced out-of-memory issues as SCRUB requires the model to forward retain and forget images through the original and unlearned model, largely increasing the memory footprint in a second-order optimization such as ours.

In the second and third row, we show METAUNLEARN performance when using only the first term of Eq. (5), where TOW scores are close to zero. Indeed, without the second term, the forget error gets progressively close to the validation one which, however, is not bounded potentially causing model erasure. In subsequent rows, we investigate the use of the second term of the loss or a combination of the first and the second. Empirically, we did not find a large performance gap when only using the second loss (the combination of loss terms scores 0.1 more on average). However, when scaling losses by their mAP values (see Sec. 4.2), using both terms provides consistently better results among all four settings, always achieving the best performance.

**Input to the meta-loss.** In Tab. 4, we report the results of an ablation study about the inputs provided to the meta-loss function. In the first row, we show results by forwarding only output logits to the meta-loss. METAUNLEARN struggles in CelebA-HQ datasets achieving a ToW score of 95.0 and 93.0 (against 95.5 and 94.8 of the trained model), while we find it sufficiently good in CelebA. Instead, if we concatenate model features to logits, in the second row of the table, CelebA-HQ performances improve to 96.1 and 95.4, surpassing the trained model. However, in the fourth row we show that ToW slightly grows on average when concatenating identities and targets. For this reason, we used all four inputs in Tabs. 1 and 2. However, we highlight that in the case identity numbers are not provided,

METAUNLEARN is robust and capable of maintaining sufficiently high ToWs.

## 6. Conclusions

In this work, we present One-Shot Unlearning of Personal Identities (O-UPI), a novel identity unlearning task that evaluates machine unlearning algorithms in the data absence case. To this extent, we evaluate existing approaches on two datasets by varying unlearning set sizes. Moreover, we introduce the first meta-learning approach for machine unlearning that learns to forget identities in the O-UPI task. In conclusion, this work demonstrates that machine unlearning is difficult when training data is unavailable, highlighting that existing methods are not sufficient to guarantee forgetting and performance preservation altogether. Our benchmark and baselines can serve as reference for future work addressing this challenging topic.

### Acknowledgments

We acknowledge the CINECA award under the ISCRA initiative for the availability of high-performance computing resources and support. E.R. and M.M. are supported by the MUR PNRR project FAIR - Future AI Research (PE00000013), funded by NextGeneration EU. E.R. is also supported by the EU projects AI4TRUST (No.101070190) and ELIAS (No.01120237) and the PRIN project LEGO-AI (Prot.2020TA3K9N). T.D.M. is funded by NextGeneration EU. This work has been supported by the French National Research Agency (ANR) with the ANR-20-CE23-0027.

## References

- [1] Nasser Aldaghri, Hessam MahdaviFar, and Ahmad Beirami. Coded machine unlearning. In *IEEE Access*, 2021. 1, 2
- [2] Antreas Antoniou, Harrison Edwards, and Amos Storkey. How to train your maml. In *ICLR*, 2018. 2
- [3] Sarah Bechtle, Artem Molchanov, Yevgen Chebotar, Edward Grefenstette, Ludovic Righetti, Gaurav Sukhatme, and Franziska Meier. Meta learning via learned loss. In *ICPR*, 2021. 2, 4
- [4] Alexander Becker and Thomas Liebig. Evaluating machine unlearning via epistemic uncertainty. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.10836*, 2022. 5
- [5] Lucas Bourtole, Varun Chandrasekaran, Christopher A Choquette-Choo, Hengrui Jia, Adelin Travers, Baiwu Zhang, David Lie, and Nicolas Papernot. Machine unlearning. In *SP*, 2021. 1, 2
- [6] Nicholas Carlini, Steve Chien, Milad Nasr, Shuang Song, Andreas Terzis, and Florian Tramèr. Membership inference attacks from first principles. In *SP*, 2022. 5
- [7] Jiaao Chen and Diyi Yang. Unlearn what you want to forget: Efficient unlearning for llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.20150*, 2023. 8



Table 3. **Ablating METAUNLEARN auxiliary loss.** In the first column, we report the loss function used, *i.e.*, SCRUB loss or different combinations of Eq. (5). Then, we report ToW scores for settings we describe in Sec. 5.1. Note that OOM is short for “out-of-memory”.

Loss Type	ToW $\uparrow$			
	CelebA-HQ/20	CelebA-HQ/50	CelebA/5	CelebA/10
SCRUB [24]	94.3 $\pm$ 0.2	OOM	51.7 $\pm$ 31.4	55.4 $\pm$ 15.0
First term	8.3 $\pm$ 0.7	32.4 $\pm$ 33.4	7.6 $\pm$ 0.8	6.9 $\pm$ 0.6
First term + Accuracy	8.1 $\pm$ 0.7	8.2 $\pm$ 0.2	7.6 $\pm$ 0.8	6.9 $\pm$ 0.7
Second term	95.7 $\pm$ 0.9	95.1 $\pm$ 0.3	97.1 $\pm$ 1.1	<b>97.4</b> $\pm$ 0.4
Second term + Accuracy	95.7 $\pm$ 1.1	95.7 $\pm$ 1.0	<b>97.2</b> $\pm$ 1.0	97.3 $\pm$ 0.3
First & Second terms	95.6 $\pm$ 1.0	95.4 $\pm$ 0.3	97.1 $\pm$ 1.0	97.3 $\pm$ 0.4
First & Second terms + Accuracy	<b>95.8</b> $\pm$ 0.7	<b>95.9</b> $\pm$ 0.6	<b>97.2</b> $\pm$ 1.0	<b>97.4</b> $\pm$ 0.3

Table 4. **Ablating the inputs to METAUNLEARN.** In the first four columns, we list all possible inputs to the meta-loss, while in the remaining four we report the ToW metric on the described settings.

Input				ToW $\uparrow$			
Logits	Features	IDs	Targets	CelebA-HQ/20	CelebA-HQ/50	CelebA/5	CelebA/10
✓				95.0 $\pm$ 1.4	93.0 $\pm$ 3.0	<b>97.3</b> $\pm$ 1.2	97.3 $\pm$ 0.4
✓	✓			<b>96.1</b> $\pm$ 0.9	95.4 $\pm$ 0.8	97.2 $\pm$ 1.1	97.3 $\pm$ 0.3
✓	✓	✓		95.7 $\pm$ 0.7	95.8 $\pm$ 0.5	97.2 $\pm$ 1.1	97.2 $\pm$ 0.3
✓	✓	✓	✓	95.7 $\pm$ 0.8	<b>95.9</b> $\pm$ 0.6	97.2 $\pm$ 1.0	<b>97.4</b> $\pm$ 0.3

- [8] Min Chen, Weizhuo Gao, Gaoyang Liu, Kai Peng, and Chen Wang. Boundary unlearning: Rapid forgetting of deep networks via shifting the decision boundary. In *CVPR*, 2023. 2
- [9] Dasol Choi and Dongbin Na. Towards machine unlearning benchmarks: Forgetting the personal identities in facial recognition systems. In *AAAI Workshop*, 2023. 2, 3
- [10] Vikram S Chundawat, Ayush K Tarun, Murari Mandal, and Mohan Kankanhalli. Can bad teaching induce forgetting? unlearning in deep networks using an incompetent teacher. In *AAAI*, 2023. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
- [11] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2020. 11
- [12] 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. In *ICLR*, 2024. 2, 3, 5
- [13] Chelsea Finn, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks. In *ICML*, 2017. 2
- [14] Jack Foster, Kyle Fogarty, Stefan Schoepf, Cengiz Öztireli, and Alexandra Brintrup. Zero-shot machine unlearning at scale via lipschitz regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01401*, 2024. 2, 5, 6
- [15] Jack Foster, Stefan Schoepf, and Alexandra Brintrup. Fast machine unlearning without retraining through selective synaptic dampening. In *AAAI*, 2024. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 12
- [16] Aditya Golatkar, Alessandro Achille, Avinash Ravichandran, Marzia Polito, and Stefano Soatto. Mixed-privacy forgetting in deep networks. In *CVPR*, 2021. 3
- [17] Laura Graves, Vineel Nagisetty, and Vijay Ganesh. Amnesiac machine learning. In *AAAI*, 2021. 2
- [18] Zhengbao He, Tao Li, Xinwen Cheng, Zhehao Huang, and Xiaolin Huang. Towards natural machine unlearning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.15495*, 2024. 5
- [19] Tuan Hoang, Santu Rana, Sunil Gupta, and Svetha Venkatesh. Learn to unlearn for deep neural networks: Minimizing unlearning interference with gradient projection. In *WACV*, 2024. 2, 5, 6
- [20] Timothy Hospedales, Antreas Antoniou, Paul Micaelli, and Amos Storkey. Meta-learning in neural networks: A survey. *TPAMI*, 44(9):5149–5169, 2021. 2
- [21] Khurram Javed and Martha White. Meta-learning representations for continual learning. In *NeurIPS*, 2019. 2
- [22] Tero Karras, Timo Aila, Samuli Laine, and Jaakko Lehtinen. Progressive growing of gans for improved quality, stability, and variation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.10196*, 2017. 5
- [23] James Kirkpatrick, Razvan Pascanu, Neil Rabinowitz, Joel Veness, Guillaume Desjardins, Andrei A Rusu, Kieran Milan, John Quan, Tiago Ramalho, Agnieszka Grabska-Barwinska, et al. Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks. In *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 2017. 2
- [24] Meghdad Kurmanji, Peter Triantafillou, Jamie Hayes, and Eleni Triantafillou. Towards unbounded machine unlearning. In *NeurIPS*, 2024. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9
- [25] Cheng-Han Lee, Ziwei Liu, Lingyun Wu, and Ping Luo. Maskgan: Towards diverse and interactive facial image manipulation. In *CVPR*, 2020. 5

- [26] Yiying Li, Yongxin Yang, Wei Zhou, and Timothy Hospedales. Feature-critic networks for heterogeneous domain generalization. In *ICML*, 2019. 2, 4
- [27] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. In *NeurIPS*, 2024. 2
- [28] Ziwei Liu, Ping Luo, Xiaogang Wang, and Xiaoou Tang. Deep learning face attributes in the wild. In *ICCV*, 2015. 5
- [29] Alessandro Mantelero. The eu proposal for a general data protection regulation and the roots of the ‘right to be forgotten’. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 2013. 1, 2, 3
- [30] Alex Nichol, Joshua Achiam, and John Schulman. On first-order meta-learning algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.02999*, 2018. 2
- [31] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *ICML*, 2021. 2
- [32] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *CVPR*, 2022. 2
- [33] Olga Russakovsky, Jia Deng, Hao Su, Jonathan Krause, Sanjeev Satheesh, Sean Ma, Zhiheng Huang, Andrej Karpathy, Aditya Khosla, Michael Bernstein, et al. Imagenet large scale visual recognition challenge. In *IJCV*, 2015. 11
- [34] Shaofei Shen, Chenhao Zhang, Yawen Zhao, Alina Bialkowski, Weitong Chen, and Miao Xu. Label-agnostic forgetting: A supervision-free unlearning in deep models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.00506*, 2024. 5
- [35] Reza Shokri, Marco Stronati, Congzheng Song, and Vitaly Shmatikov. Membership inference attacks against machine learning models. In *SP*, 2017. 5
- [36] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023. 2
- [37] Daniel Trippa, Cesare Campagnano, Maria Sofia Bucarelli, Gabriele Tolomei, and Fabrizio Silvestri.  $\nabla\tau$ : Gradient-based and task-agnostic machine unlearning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.14339*, 2024. 2
- [38] Paul Voigt and Axel Von dem Bussche. The eu general data protection regulation (gdpr). *A Practical Guide, 1st Ed., Cham: Springer International Publishing*, 2017. 1, 2, 3
- [39] Haonan Yan, Xiaoguang Li, Ziyao Guo, Hui Li, Fenghua Li, and Xiaodong Lin. Arcane: An efficient architecture for exact machine unlearning. In *IJCAI*, 2022. 1, 2
- [40] Jiayuan Ye, Aadyaa Maddi, Sasi Kumar Murakonda, Vincent Bindschaedler, and Reza Shokri. Enhanced membership inference attacks against machine learning models. In *SIGSAC*, 2022. 5
- [41] Samuel Yeom, Irene Giacomelli, Matt Fredrikson, and Somesh Jha. Privacy risk in machine learning: Analyzing the connection to overfitting. In *CSF*, 2018. 5
- [42] Kairan Zhao, Meghdad Kurmanji, George-Octavian Bărbulescu, Eleni Triantafillou, and Peter Triantafillou.

What makes unlearning hard and what to do about it. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.01257*, 2024. 5

# One-Shot Unlearning of Personal Identities

## Supplementary Material

In this Supplementary material, we include additional information about METAUNLEARN. In Appx. A, we report training details and model architecture for METAUNLEARN. Following, in Appx. B, we demonstrate METAUNLEARN robustness to different unlearning set sizes. In Appx. C, we show the complete form of Eq. (5) and we provide additional information about its formulation. Finally, in Fig. 6, we present the top-5 most difficult samples to unlearn in CelebAHQ/50.

### A. Implementation details

Table 5. Training details.

Component	Value
input_size	40 + 768 + 64 + 40
hidden_size	512
identity_embed_dim	64
dropout_prob	0.5
regression_loss	smooth_l1_loss
meta_lr ( $\eta$ )	0.1
optimizer	Adam
lr ( $\alpha$ )	$1 \times 10^{-4}$
epochs	3
scheduler	cosine
amsgrad	True
amp	bfloat16

Table 6. Meta-loss architecture.

Layer	Component
0	Linear(input_size, hidden_size)
1	LayerNorm(hidden_size)
2	Linear(hidden_size, hidden_size)
3	GeLU()
4	Dropout(0.5)
5	LayerNorm(hidden_size)
6	Linear(hidden_size, 1)
7	Softplus()

We started from a ViT-B/16 [11] pre-trained on Ima-

geNet [33], for all experiments. We then trained the ViT on CelebA and CelebA-HQ for 30 epochs, using SGD with a learning rate of  $1 \times 10^{-3}$  and momentum 0.9. We applied weight decay with value  $1 \times 10^{-3}$  for CelebA-HQ and  $1 \times 10^{-4}$  for CelebA for regularization. Additionally,

we used RandomResizedCrop and RandomHorizontalFlip as training augmentations to further regularize the model. We applied 2 epochs of linear warm-up and decayed the learning rate using a cosine annealing scheduler for the remaining 28. The same pipeline is used for model retraining. We used mixed precision for all experiments using the “brain floating point 16” to speed up training. Furthermore, a single A100 Nvidia GPU was used for all experiments. In Tabs. 5 and 6, we summarize the training details of METAUNLEARN and the architecture used.

### B. Robustness to different unlearning sizes

In Sec. 4.1, we detail that simulated unlearning requests are all the same size, *e.g.* in CelebA-HQ/20, we used 20 identities for all simulations,  $N_S = 20$ . A limitation of the approach, therefore, is that we tried to vary the unlearning set size at training time, spanning from 5 to 50 identities. Empirically, we noticed that this configuration was harming the meta-loss training, thus, we dropped it. Given these findings, METAUNLEARN could be trained multiple times with different unlearning set sizes using the best one at unlearning time. However, it would be impractical and expensive for large models. Thus, in this Section, we demonstrate that even though our method uses fixed  $N_S$  at training time, it still shows robustness to different unlearning set sizes. In Tab. 7, we show METAUNLEARN robustness by training and testing on different identity numbers. When trained with a different number of identities compared to the unlearning, METAUNLEARN shows a ToW discrepancy between 0.1 and 0.3 from the reference training ( $N_S$  is the same at training and unlearning time), demonstrating robustness.

### C. Additional loss details

**Complete auxiliary loss formulation.** In Sec. 4.2 we did not include the full loss formulation, due to space limitations. We report it entirely for completeness in Eq. (8).

$$\begin{aligned} \arg \min_{\phi} & \| (1 - \text{mAP}(\mathcal{D}_f; \theta_u)) \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\text{task}}(\mathcal{D}_f; \theta_u) - (1 - \text{mAP}(\mathcal{D}_v; \theta_u)) \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\text{task}}(\mathcal{D}_v; \theta_u) \|_2^2 + \\ & + \| (1 - \text{mAP}(\mathcal{D}_f; \theta_u)) \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\text{task}}(\mathcal{D}_f; \theta_u) - (1 - \text{mAP}(\mathcal{D}_v; \theta)) \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\text{task}}(\mathcal{D}_v; \theta) \|_2^2. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Table 7. **Robustness to different unlearning set sizes.**

CelebA-HQ		CelebA	
Training	Tow $\uparrow$	Training	Tow $\uparrow$
20 IDENTITIES		5 IDENTITIES	
50 Identities	95.6 $\pm$ 1.0	10 Identities	96.9 $\pm$ 1.0
Reference	95.7 $\pm$ 0.8	Reference	97.2 $\pm$ 1.0
50 IDENTITIES		10 IDENTITIES	
20 Identities	95.7 $\pm$ 0.6	5 Identities	97.3 $\pm$ 0.3
Reference	95.9 $\pm$ 0.6	Reference	97.4 $\pm$ 0.3

**On the absence of  $\mathcal{D}_r$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ .** We empirically noticed that directly enforcing performance alignment with  $\mathcal{D}_r$  hinders unlearning. We argue that since the size of the retain set is usually much bigger than the forget set [15],  $N_r \gg N_f$ , at each simulation  $\mathcal{D}_r$  differs from  $\mathcal{D}_{tr}$  by a small number of samples. In other words, the probability that one sample belongs to  $\mathcal{D}_r$  is close to one:  $p(x_i | \mathcal{D}_r) \approx 1$ . Consequently, while forcing an alignment on  $\mathcal{D}_r$ ,  $h_\phi$  finds the alignment with  $\mathcal{D}_{tr}$  as a shortcut, hindering unlearning. In particular, when adding an alignment constraint with  $\mathcal{D}_r$  the learned meta-loss was not altering the original model performance in any of the three sets (retain, forget, and test).

---

**Support Sample****Forget Set**

---




Figure 6. **Visualizing unlearning hardness.** This Figure portrays the five identities with the highest embedding distance between the Support Sample and the forget set.