

InferDPT: Privacy-preserving Inference for Black-box Large Language Models

Meng Tong, Kejiang Chen, Jie Zhang, Yuang Qi,
Weiming Zhang, Nenghai Yu, Tianwei Zhang, Zhikun Zhang

Abstract—Large language models (LLMs), represented by ChatGPT, have greatly simplified text generation tasks. However, they have also raised concerns about privacy risks such as data leakage and unauthorized information collection. Existing solutions for privacy-preserving inference face practical challenges related to computational time and communication costs. In this paper, we propose InferDPT, the first practical framework for privacy-preserving inference of black-box LLMs, implementing Differential Privacy in Text generation. InferDPT comprises two key modules: the “perturbation module” utilizes the differentially private mechanism to generate a perturbed prompt, facilitating privacy-preserving inference with black-box LLMs; the “extraction module”, inspired by knowledge distillation and phenomenon we observed, extracts coherent and consistent text from the perturbed generation result, ensuring successful text generation completion. To address privacy concerns related to previous differentially private mechanisms’ susceptibility to embedding inversion attacks, we introduce RANTEXT, a novel differentially private mechanism integrated into the perturbation module of InferDPT, which introduces the concept of “RANdom adjacency list” for TEXT perturbation within the prompt. Experimental results across three datasets demonstrate that the text generation quality of InferDPT is comparable to that of non-private GPT-4, and RANTEXT surpasses existing state-of-the-art mechanisms, namely, SANTEXT+ and CUSTEXT+ in the trade-off between privacy and utility. Even with a privacy parameter ϵ value of 6.0, RANTEXT achieves an average privacy protection rate of exceeding 90% against the embedding inversion attacks, which is 0.58 \times higher than that of SANTEXT+ and 3.35 \times higher than that of CUSTEXT+.

Index Terms—Differential privacy, black box, inference, large language model.

I. INTRODUCTION

IN recent years, the rapid advancement of *large language models* (LLMs) has garnered widespread attention from both the academic and industrial communities worldwide [1]. ChatGPT [2], a prominent example, has reached a remarkable milestone with 100 million weekly active users, as announced by OpenAI CEO Sam Altman on November 6, 2023, during the company’s inaugural developer conference held in San Francisco [3]. The widespread popularity of ChatGPT has significantly facilitated people’s daily work and lives. Users

This work was supported in part by the Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 62102386, U2336206, 62072421, 62372423, and 62121002.

M. Tong, K. Chen, Y. Qi, W. Zhang, and N. Yu are with CAS Key Laboratory of Electro-Magnetic Space Information, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230026, China, and Anhui Province Key Laboratory of Digital Security.

J. Zhang and T. Zhang are with Nanyang Technological University.

Z. Zhang is with Zhejiang University.

Corresponding author: Kejiang Chen (Email: chenkj@ustc.edu.cn) and Weiming Zhang (Email: zhangwm@ustc.edu.cn)

TABLE I
COMPARISONS OF DIFFERENT METHODS. A CHECK MARK (✓) INDICATES THAT METHODS MEET THE SCENARIO REQUIREMENTS.

Method	Text Generation	Black Box	Inference	Low Cost
CipherGPT [9]		✓	✓	
TextObfuscator [10]			✓	✓
DP-Forward [11]			✓	✓
SANTEXT+ [12]		✓		✓
CUSTEXT+ [13]		✓		✓
InferDPT+ RANTEXT	✓	✓	✓	✓

interact with ChatGPT via APIs or web interfaces to generate text for various applications, including but not limited to drafting articles, documenting daily work activities, and crafting advertisements for new products [4].

However, technology is a double-edged sword. While LLMs offer unparalleled convenience and utility, they also raise significant concerns related to privacy breaches. There are instances where the misuse of LLMs has led to serious privacy infringements. One such example involves Samsung employees leaking the company’s confidential meeting records and sensitive data about unreleased products [5]. Furthermore, in a recent incident, GPT-3.5 unexpectedly disclosed an individual’s selfies [6]. These incidents reignited concerns among the public regarding the potential privacy risks associated with uploading personal data to LLMs [7]. Therefore, it is crucial to address privacy concerns of uploading query contents, which is called *prompt* in the LLMs context for text generation. Generally, a *prompt* in text generation tasks consists of a fundamental writing instruction and a private document uploaded¹ (following the definition from Microsoft’s AI Builder documentation [8]).

Existing Solutions. Previous studies fail to protect the privacy of the document within the *prompt* during the inference process in practical text generation tasks, although they have investigated the privacy-preserving techniques of language models. As shown in Table I, CipherGPT [9] utilized homomorphic encryption techniques in transformer-architecture models to enable inference on encrypted data. While these techniques can be used theoretically for privacy-preserving text generation tasks, they have limitations in practical applications due to the significant computational time and communication costs. TextObfuscator [10] and DP-Forward [11] added noise during data transmission in *split learning*. However, they are mainly designed for classification tasks. Furthermore, they are unsuitable for black-box scenarios where the model

¹The writing instruction provides directions on what the model should do; the document provides context that the model needs to generate a response.

owners, such as OpenAI [14], do not disclose details about the architectures of LLMs considering the intellectual property and commercial value of the models.

On the other hand, SANTEXT+ [12] and CUSTEXT+ [13] leveraged *differential privacy* (DP) techniques [15] to verbatim replace sensitive words in the text with semantically close words from a fixed word set, which is termed as *word adjacency list* in the DP context. These methods are also designed for privacy-preserving classification tasks, which can tolerate considerable information distortion introduced by DP noise. For the privacy-preserving text generation tasks [16] investigated in this paper, even a slight information distortion in the *prompt* can lead to incoherence and inconsistency in generated text, rendering SANTEXT+ and CUSTEXT+ not directly effective for such tasks. Furthermore, our experimental results in Figure 6 demonstrate that SANTEXT+ and CUSTEXT+ are vulnerable to embedding inversion attacks [17]: **even in the extreme case where privacy parameter ε is set to 0.01, an adversary can still recover 40% of raw private words from SANTEXT+ or CUSTEXT+.** The rationale behind this phenomenon is that: (1) In SANTEXT+, a fixed proportion of words are not perturbed; (2) In CUSTEXT+, each word has a fixed and small *word adjacency list*, with a default of 20, resulting in a high probability of a word not being replaced and privacy leakage.

Our Proposal. To protect the privacy of the entire document during the inference process with black-box LLMs and address the information bias caused by DP, we introduce a framework, *InferDPT*, for text generation tasks. The general idea of *InferDPT* is derived from knowledge distillation [18] and our Observation supported by experimental results in Section IV-B: **the generation of the perturbed *prompt* by DP shares the same words in multiple parts of the generated text from the raw *prompt*. Furthermore, the number of the same words between them positively correlates with the privacy parameter ε .** *InferDPT* comprises a perturbation module and an extraction module. In the perturbation module, *InferDPT* employs a differentially private mechanism, such as SANTEXT+ and CUSTEXT+, to perturb the raw document, obtaining a perturbed *prompt*. It uploads the perturbed *prompt* to remote LLMs. In the extraction module, *InferDPT* deploys a local model, lightweight and less capable than remote LLMs. This model extracts and reconstructs the perturbed generation result from the remote LLMs. Utilizing the perturbed generation result as reference and inferring texts according to the raw document, *InferDPT* not only safeguards the *prompt* privacy but also distills the capabilities of the remote large language model to improve text quality produced by the local model.

To address the vulnerability of SANTEXT+ and CUSTEXT+ in resisting the embedding inversion attack, we develop RANTEXT. It is a novel differentially private mechanism integrated into the text perturbation of *InferDPT*. RANTEXT introduces the concept of *random adjacency list* for token-level perturbation. For each token, it employs the Laplace distribution [19] to dynamically determine the size of the *random adjacency list*, and then samples a new token from this list to replace the raw private ones. To evaluate the utility and privacy protection of our schemes, we conduct experiments

on GPT-4 [14], one of the most popular black-box large language models, for practical open-ended text generation tasks across three datasets. We found that existing attack strategies for differential privacy were not effective enough against RANTEXT. We propose an adaptive attack, the GPT inference attack, which leverages the capabilities of GPT-4.

Our Contributions. We summarize our main contributions:

- We propose *InferDPT*, the first practical framework for privacy-preserving inference of black-box large language models, implementing differential privacy in text generation.
- We develop RANTEXT, a novel exponential mechanism of local differential privacy integrated into document perturbation of *InferDPT*. It addresses the vulnerability of existing differentially private mechanisms to embedding inversion attacks, further enhancing defense against privacy threats.
- We conduct experiments on three datasets tailored to practical open-ended text generation tasks in Section VI-B. Experimental results demonstrate that with ε set to 3.0 and a 3.89GB local model, *InferDPT* achieves generation quality comparable to GPT-4 in terms of three metrics.
- We evaluate four classes of privacy threats in Section VII. In particular, when we set the privacy parameter ε to 6.0 and select the top 10 candidates for embedding inversion attack, RANTEXT offers an average privacy protection rate exceeding 90%, which is $3.35\times$ higher than that of CUSTEXT+ and $0.58\times$ higher than that of SANTEXT+.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Large Language Models

Large language models (LLMs) are advanced artificial intelligence systems trained on extensive datasets. They are designed to understand, generate, and interpret human language, demonstrating incredible versatility for various language-related tasks. Generally, LLMs generate text *Gen* based on the prompt *Pro* uploaded by the users. They come in different types, including closed-source commercial services like ChatGPT [2] and Claude [20], as well as open-source models like Llama [21] and Vicuna [22]. In this paper, we focus on the closed-source LLMs and aim to address their privacy issues during the black-box inference in the open-ended text generation tasks.

Specifically, in the open-ended text generation task [23], the role of these black-box LLMs is to continue generating text *Gen* in accordance with the prompt *Pro* for higher text generation quality based on multi-dimensional metrics. In detail, given a prompt $Pro = Ins_w \parallel Doc$ consisting of Ins_w (fundamental writing instructions) and $Doc = \langle x_i \rangle_{i=1}^L$ (raw document composed of a sequence of L tokens or words x_i , respectively belonging to token vocabulary V_t and word vocabulary V), the LLMs commit to providing inference function $Infer: Pro \rightarrow Gen$ to generate text.

B. (Local) Differential Privacy & Exponential Mechanism

Differential privacy [15] is a privacy protection concept. As one of its most popular models, ε -local differential privacy (ε -LDP) allows data owners to locally perturb their data using the randomized mechanism $M(\cdot)$ before uploading it to any untrusted aggregator.

TABLE II
NOTATIONS AND DEFINITIONS. WE INDICATE WHICH ELEMENTS ARE KNOWN TO THE ADVERSARY DURING THE INFERENCE.

Symbol	Description	Known to Adv
U_{sr}	User of LLMs	/
Adv	LLMs as an adversary (runs the attack)	/
Doc	Raw document of the user (target of the attack)	No
Pro	Raw prompt of the user	No
Gen	Generation result of the raw prompt	No
Doc_p	Perturbed document of the user	Yes
Ins_w	Instructions for text writing	Yes
Pro_p	Perturbed prompt of the user	Yes
Gen_p	Generation result of the perturbed prompt	Yes
C_r	Random adjacency list of token	No
C_e	Random adjacent embeddings of token	No
C_w	Word adjacency list	Yes
V	Word vocabulary	Yes
V_t	Token vocabulary of LLMs	Yes
u	Scoring function of the exponential mechanism	Yes
M	Random mechanism of differential privacy	Yes
$Infer$	Inference function for text generation of LLMs	Yes

Definition 1 (ϵ -Local Differential Privacy [24]). In ϵ -LDP, given a privacy parameter $\epsilon \geq 0$, a randomized mechanism M is ϵ -LDP compliant if it satisfies the following condition for any two inputs $x, x' \in X$ and any possible output $y \in Y$:

$$\frac{Pr[M(x) = y]}{Pr[M(x') = y]} \leq e^\epsilon. \quad (1)$$

Typically, a smaller value of ϵ provides higher privacy protection at the cost of reduced data utility. Moreover, a critical definition here is the input set X . In previous NLP research [12], [13], most researchers have posited that any pair of words in the vocabulary share the same input set X and output set Y . We observe that such a definition leads to a challenge in the trade-off between utility and privacy. In this paper, we use *random adjacency list* to redefine the input set of ϵ -LDP in Section V-B.

Definition 2 (Exponential Mechanism [25]). For a given scoring function $u : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, a randomized mechanism $M(\cdot)$ is ϵ -LDP compliant if it satisfies the following condition for any input $x \in X$ and any possible output $y \in Y$:

$$Pr[y|x] \propto \exp\left(\frac{\epsilon \cdot u(x, y)}{2\Delta u}\right), \quad (2)$$

where the sensitivity Δu is defined as:

$$\Delta u = \max_{x, x' \in X, y \in Y} |u(x, y) - u(x', y)|. \quad (3)$$

The scoring function u is various in different scenarios. Typically, we can adjust the upper bound of u to set Δu to a specific real number, where Δu represents the sensitivity of the scoring function u . Similarly, the smaller the value of ϵ , the higher the security of privacy protection capability, but the lower the utility of the data. When a smaller ϵ is chosen, the scoring function $u(x, y)$ no longer plays a decisive role in the output probability of any perturbation result.

III. PROBLEM STATEMENT

A. Threat Model

We consider the scenario where the LLM platform, such as ChatGPT, is an honest but curious adversary, referred to as Adv . A user, denoted as U_{sr} , intends to upload a prompt and invoke

the inference service $Infer: Pro \rightarrow Gen$ of Adv to complete the text generation tasks, which are poorly executed by open-source models. Here, Gen denotes the text generated by Adv . The uploaded prompt, $Pro = Ins_w \parallel Doc$ represents the raw prompt of U_{sr} consisting of Ins_w (fundamental writing instructions) and $Doc = \langle x_i \rangle_{i=1}^L$ (raw document composed of a sequence of L tokens or words x_i , respectively belonging to token vocabulary V_t and vocabulary V).

Following previous works [10], [17], the privacy information pertains to each token or word. To protect each piece of the token or word in the raw document Doc , U_{sr} employs differential privacy [15] to Doc , resulting in a perturbed document Doc_p . Consequently, U_{sr} uploads the perturbed prompt $Pro_p = Ins_w \parallel Doc_p$. Furthermore, U_{sr} can deploy a less capable language model than LLMs. To preserve the model's commercial value, Adv does not reveal the internal architecture or parameters of the LLM, but only exposes its token vocabulary to U_{sr} for the purpose of billing verification during the inference process.

Given a prompt $Pro = Ins_w \parallel Doc$, the goal of Adv is to obtain every piece of the token or word in Doc . Taking a prompt for drafting an article as an example, Adv is committed to executing the text generation tasks but may intend to steal its experimental results for unauthorized collection.

Additionally, we assume that Adv is fully informed about the details of the differential privacy algorithm, except for the raw document Doc . Adv is expected to launch attacks using vulnerabilities in DP, aiming to recover each word or token in the document Doc , based on the perturbed version Doc_p . Table II summarizes notations frequently used in this paper.

B. Existing Solutions and Limitations

Existing solutions, such as SANTEXT+ [12] and CUSTEXT+ [13], focus on privacy-preserving model training in classification tasks:

- SANTEXT+ implements differential privacy (DP) during the training in classification tasks. In SANTEXT+, it leaves a proportion of words not perturbed by DP. It only substitutes sensitive words with other words from the *word adjacency list* (the entire vocabulary) based on metric local differential privacy [26]. It finally results in privacy leakage against the embedding inversion attack [17].
- CUSTEXT+ perturbs all words during the training in classification tasks. It deploys the exponential mechanism [25] to verbatim replace each word with ones close in embedding distance from *word adjacency list*. Compared to SANTEXT+, it reduces the size of *word adjacency list* to a default small number. However, the small size of *word adjacency list* makes it vulnerable to the embedding inversion attack.

To protect the privacy of documents during inference in text generation tasks and address the information distortion introduced by DP noise, we introduce a framework, InferDPT, (Section IV). We also propose an exponential mechanism, RANTEXT (Section V), as a solution to address the vulnerabilities of SANTEXT+ and CUSTEXT in resisting the embedding inversion attack.




Fig. 1. The overview of InferDPT . The *Prefix text* is the perturbed document Doc_p via RANTEXT. We use the same color to mark the perturbed parts in the raw document and the perturbed document. We also use the same color to highlight identical text appearing in the perturbed generation result, the extraction generation result, and the non-private generation result.

IV. THE InferDPT FRAMEWORK

A. Overview

We introduce InferDPT , a framework designed for privacy-preserving LLM inference in text generation tasks. As shown in Figure 1, InferDPT is consisting of two modules:

- **Perturbation Module: protecting privacy.** It generates a perturbed prompt via differential privacy, and replaces each word or token in Doc with one close in embedding distance.
- **Extraction Module: maintaining utility.** It extracts coherent and consistent text from perturbed generation and reconstructs them into an output aligned with the raw prompt by a local language model, less capable than black-box LLMs.

The design of InferDPT faces two main challenges in black-box inference. (1) **Providing strong privacy protection for the raw document Doc .** To solve this privacy challenge, the perturbation module of InferDPT utilizes a differentially private mechanism to sequentially replace each word or token in the raw document Doc with alternatives close in embedding distance. (2) **Maintaining the utility of the text under semantic perturbation.** This is more tough than the first one. To solve this challenge, we conducted abundant experiments on LLMs. We discovered a phenomenon that if all the words that appear in the generated text of the raw prompt are formed into a set, there will be a large number of words in the generated text of the perturbed prompt that belong to this set. This number will gradually increase as the perturbation decreases. The phenomenon indicates that the perturbed output includes words from the text directly generated by GPT-4.

To formally describe this phenomenon, we propose the following Observation about the perturbed output by DP.

B. Key Observations

Observation. Consider a randomized function $M(\cdot)$ of local differential privacy, which satisfies that: for any word (or token) x in a vocabulary V (or V_i), y and z belonging to the word adjacency list (or random adjacency list) of x ,

$$d(x, y) \geq d(x, z) \Rightarrow Pr[M(x) = y] \leq Pr[M(x) = z], \quad (4)$$




Fig. 2. The number of words from the non-private and private generation of GPT4 using three mechanisms that belong to the *Expected set*.

where $d(\cdot)$ measures the semantic similarity between two inputs, with a smaller output indicating greater similarity. A raw document Doc is perturbed by $M(\cdot)$, obtaining perturbed document Doc_p . If Doc and Doc_p share the same inference service $\text{Infer}(\cdot)$ and writing instruction Ins_w , they form prompt $Pro = Ins_w \parallel Doc$ and perturbed prompt $Pro_p = Ins_w \parallel Doc_p$. The perturbed generation result $Gen_p = \langle g_i \rangle_{i=1}^K = \text{Infer}(Pro_p)$ satisfies the following condition:

$$\text{Infer}_j(Pro) = \langle h_i^{(j)} \rangle_{i=1}^K, \quad (5)$$

$$\text{Expected set} = \bigcup_{j=1}^N \{h_i^{(j)} \mid h_i^{(j)} \in \text{Infer}_j(Pro)\}, \quad (6)$$

$$\text{Intersection set} = \{g_i \mid g_i \in \text{Expected set and } g_i \notin \text{stopwords}\}, \quad (7)$$

$$\text{Corr}(\text{Count}(\text{Intersection set}), \epsilon) > 0, \quad (8)$$

where g_i and $h_i^{(j)}$ belong to a vocabulary V , $\langle g_i \rangle_{i=1}^K$ represents a text composed of K g_i , $\langle h_i^{(j)} \rangle_{i=1}^K$ represents a text composed of K $h_i^{(j)}$, N is an integer greater than 1, stopwords [27] are common words usually ignored in text analysis due to low informational values, $\text{Count}(\cdot)$ counts the size of a set, and $\text{Corr}(\cdot)$ is the correlation coefficient measuring the relationship between two variables, with values ranging from -1 (perfect negative correlation) to 1 (perfect positive correlation).

TABLE III
SYNONYM PROPORTION IN PERTURBATION RESULT USING NLTK [27].

Method	Synonymous Word Proportion			
	$\varepsilon = 2.0$	$\varepsilon = 6.0$	$\varepsilon = 10.0$	$\varepsilon = 14.0$
SANTEXT+	0.371	0.373	0.374	0.375
CUSTEXT+	0.441	0.697	0.907	0.985
RANTEXT	0.013	0.049	0.147	0.378

TABLE IV
EUCLIDEAN DISTANCE BETWEEN THE EMBEDDINGS [28] OF TOKENS AND THEIR PERTURBED VERSIONS.

Method	Euclidean Distance			
	$\varepsilon = 2.0$	$\varepsilon = 6.0$	$\varepsilon = 10.0$	$\varepsilon = 14.0$
SANTEXT+	3.081	2.775	2.756	2.750
CUSTEXT+	2.862	1.732	0.553	0.118
RANTEXT	4.317	4.133	3.667	2.807

This Observation states that if the *Expected set* is constructed from words in the results of N iterations of raw text generation, then the number of words from the *Expected set* appearing in the perturbed generation result will show a positive correlation with ε . To verify this, we carried out the following experiments.

Empirical Validation. We got the *Expected set* by collecting 100 words from the output of the raw prompt with GPT-4 [14] generated 100 times on the CNN/Daily Mail dataset [29]. The raw prompt consists of a fundamental writing instruction and a raw document of 50 tokens shown in Figure 1. We utilized SANTEXT+ [12], CUSTEXT+ [13], and RANTEXT introduced in Section V to generate perturbed outputs of 100 words from GPT-4 under various values of ε . We counted the number of words from the perturbed and non-private generation of GPT-4 that belong to the *Expected set*.

Figure 2 shows the experimental results. We can see that with the increase of ε and reduction of perturbation, the number of words in the *Expected set* of the three mechanisms has increased significantly. This validates Observation, confirming that the number of words from the *Expected set* appearing in the perturbed generation positively correlates with ε .

Based on this Observation, InferDPT only needs an extraction module to extract and reconstruct perturbed output from the remote black-box LLM, distilling its capabilities to accomplish text generation tasks. In the following subsections, we will delve into these two modules of InferDPT.

C. Perturbation Module

The perturbation module of InferDPT employs a differentially private mechanism to replace each word or token with one close in terms of embedding distance from a set. This set is termed as the *word adjacency list* C_w (SANTEXT+ [12] and CUSTEXT+ [13] are used) or the *random adjacency list* C_r (RANTEXT is used). As shown in Table III and Table IV, most of the perturbed words or tokens are not synonyms of their original forms, but they are close in embedding distance.

Consider a random mechanism $M(\cdot)$ with $\varepsilon \geq 0$. Given a private document $Doc = \langle x_i \rangle_{i=1}^L$ composed of L tokens or words, where each $x_i \in V$ or $x_i \in V_t$. The perturbation module replaces each x_i with a random output $y_i = M(x_i, C_w(x_i))$ or $y_i = M(x_i, C_r(x_i))$, obtaining a perturbed document $Doc_p =$

Algorithm 1 Perturbation Module

Input: Document $Doc = \langle x_i \rangle_{i=1}^L$, random mechanism $M(\cdot)$, word adjacency list $C_w(\cdot)$, random adjacency list $C_r(\cdot)$;
Output: Perturbed document Doc_p ;
1: Initialize $Doc_p \leftarrow \emptyset$;
2: **for** $i = 1$ to L **do**
3: Compute $C_w(x_i)$ or $C_r(x_i)$;
4: Sample $y_i \sim M(x_i, C_w(x_i))$ or $y_i \sim M(x_i, C_r(x_i))$;
5: Append y_i to Doc_p ;
6: **end for**
7: Output Doc_p ;

$\langle y_i \rangle_{i=1}^L$. An example of the perturbed document can be found in Figure 1. The detailed process of the perturbation module is outlined in Algorithm 1.

In the perturbation module of InferDPT, three differentially private mechanisms are adopted: SANTEXT+, CUSTEXT+, and RANTEXT. After perturbation, *U_{sr}* uploads a perturbed prompt $Pro_p = Ins_w \parallel Doc_p$, consisting of a writing instruction Ins_w and a perturbed document Doc_p , as shown in Figure 1. The black-box LLMs then return perturbed generation result $Gen_p = Infer(Pro_p)$ to the user.

D. Extraction Module

As shown in Figure 1, the text generated by the perturbed prompt is partially inconsistent and semantically incoherent with the raw document Doc . Notably, although the perturbed generation Gen_p and the raw generation Gen share the same text, **without the raw document information, it is difficult to align Gen_p with the raw document Doc** , because the key information is disturbed.

To obtain the aligned generation result, the extraction module of InferDPT utilizes a local language model that is considered trustworthy and does not pose any privacy leakage issues. The local model is smaller and less powerful than the remote black-box LLMs for easy deployment. Users then feed the raw document Doc and the perturbed generation results Gen_p to generate a final output aligned with the raw prompt. Notably, the local language model can generate an aligned generation result itself. However, the quality is not satisfactory due to its limited capability. With the perturbed generation results Gen_p , we can distill the capacity of the remote black-box LLMs to our local smaller language model. The prompt of extraction module can be found in Appendix A.

Based on the above description, we have a panoramic view of InferDPT. It is noted that the perturbation module can adopt existing differentially private mechanisms such as SANTEXT+ [12] and CUSTEXT+ [13]. However, these two are vulnerable to the embedding inversion attack [17], as analyzed in Section III-B. To address this problem, we introduce RANTEXT in the following section.

V. THE RANTEXT MECHANISM

A. Overview

We design RANTEXT to address the vulnerability of differentially private mechanisms against the embedding inversion attack. As shown in Figure 3, RANTEXT comprises two steps:




Fig. 3. The workflow of RANTEXT. It comprises two steps: (1) computing random adjacency lists and (2) sampling perturbed tokens via ϵ -LDP.

- **Compute Random Adjacency Lists.** This step computes a *random adjacency list* for each raw token via two operations: computing random embedding and Euclidean distance. Any tokens in *random adjacency list* share the same input set.
- **Sample Perturbed Tokens via ϵ -LDP.** This step samples a perturbed token for each raw token and replaces the raw token in the document from its *random adjacency list* via ϵ -LDP, obtaining the perturbed document.

As mentioned in Section III-A, LLMs expose their token vocabulary V_t for billing verification of inference service. Utilizing the token vocabulary V_t and Byte Pair Encode (BPE) algorithm [30], users can obtain the $\text{tokenizer}(\cdot)$ algorithm of LLMs. Given a raw document Doc , RANTEXT first uses the $\text{tokenizer}(\cdot)$ algorithm of LLMs to turn Doc into tokens $\langle t_i \rangle_{i=1}^L$, where $t_i \in V_t$:

$$\text{Tokenset} = \langle t_i \rangle_{i=1}^L = \text{tokenizer}(Doc). \quad (9)$$

To preserve the privacy of Doc , RANTEXT discards the tokens of Doc that do not belong to V_t and employs an exponential mechanism to subsequently replace each remaining token with one close in embedding distance from its exclusive *random adjacency list*:

$$\text{Tokenset}_p = \langle r_i \rangle_{i=1}^L = \langle M(t_i) \rangle_{i=1}^L, \quad (10)$$

where $r_i \in V_t$, Tokenset_p represents the perturbed token set, and $C_t(t_i)$ represents the *random adjacency list* of t_i . RANTEXT concatenates the tokens in a perturbed token set Tokenset_p to obtain a perturbed document Doc_p , thereby providing privacy protection.

B. Compute Random Adjacency Lists

To formally define the *random adjacency list*, we first give a definition of *random adjacent embeddings*:

Definition 3 (Random Adjacent Embeddings). Given token $t \in V_t$, its *random adjacent embeddings* are defined as follows:

$$C_e(t) = \{eb | d_e(eb, \phi(t)) < d_e(\hat{\phi}(t), \phi(t)), eb \in \mathbb{R}^N\}, \quad (11)$$

where $eb \in \mathbb{R}^N$ represents any N -dimensional vector within the real number domain. The function $d_e(\cdot)$ is utilized to compute

the distance between two vectors and is defined as $d_e(a, b) = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (a_i - b_i)^2}$. The function $\phi: V_t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ maps any given token to a vector in the N -dimensional real number vector space. The function $\hat{\phi}(t) = \phi(t) + Y$, where the random vector Y satisfies the probability density:

$$Y \sim f(x) = \frac{Z}{2\Delta\phi} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{Z \cdot |x|}{\Delta\phi}\right), \quad (12)$$

$$Z = \begin{cases} \epsilon & \text{if } \epsilon < 2, \\ a \log(b \cdot \epsilon + c) + d & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

where $\Delta\phi$ is the sensitivity of function $\phi(\cdot)$, $a \approx 0.0165$, $b \approx 19.0648$, $c \approx -38.1294$, $d \approx 9.3111$.

Given a token $t \in V_t$ to compute its random adjacent embeddings, we need to complete the two-step computation: **Step 1. Compute the random embedding.** We construct the random vector Y utilizing the Laplace distribution [19]. We add Y independently to each dimension of $\phi(t)$, obtaining the random embedding $\hat{\phi}(t) = \phi(t) + Y$ of raw private token t . **Step 2. Compute the Euclidean distance.** We compute the Euclidean distance between $\phi(t)$ and $\hat{\phi}(t)$, referred to $d_e(\hat{\phi}(t), \phi(t))$. The random adjacent embeddings consist of those embeddings whose Euclidean distance to $\phi(t)$ is shorter than $d_e(\hat{\phi}(t), \phi(t))$.

We use Y to dynamically determine the size of the *random adjacency list*. The detailed construction process of the random vector Y can be found in Appendix B.

With the definition of random adjacent embeddings, we give the definition of the *random adjacency list*:

Definition 4 (Random Adjacency List). Given a token $t \in V_t$, its *random adjacency list* is defined as follows:

$$C_r(t) = \{t' | \phi(t') \in C_e(t), t' \in V_t\}. \quad (14)$$

Given a token $t \in V_t$, its *random adjacency list* is composed of any token t' in the token vocabulary V_t , whose embedding $\phi(t')$ has a Euclidean distance to $\phi(t)$ shorter than the Euclidean distance between t 's random embedding and t 's embedding $\phi(t)$.

TABLE V
PERFORMANCE COMPARISON ON OPEN-ENDED TEXT GENERATION TASKS ACROSS DIFFERENT METHODS, DATASETS, AND PRIVACY PARAMETERS
($\epsilon = 1, 2, 3$), EVALUATED BASED ON DIVERSITY, MAUVE, AND COHERENCE.

Dataset	Method	diversity \uparrow			MAUVE \uparrow			coherence \uparrow		
		$\epsilon = 1.0$	$\epsilon = 2.0$	$\epsilon = 3.0$	$\epsilon = 1.0$	$\epsilon = 2.0$	$\epsilon = 3.0$	$\epsilon = 1.0$	$\epsilon = 2.0$	$\epsilon = 3.0$
CNN/Daily Mail	GPT-4	0.983			0.671			0.632		
	Vicuna-7b-4bit (3.89GB)	0.943			0.197			0.627		
	InferDPT + SANTEXT ⁺	0.966	0.967	0.966	0.351	0.374	0.407	0.590	0.632	0.642
	InferDPT + CUSTEXT ⁺	0.966	0.967	0.965	0.540	0.571	0.581	0.726	0.733	0.752
	InferDPT + RANTEXT	0.970	0.970	0.971	0.542	0.563	0.587	0.723	0.735	0.736
Wikitext-103-v1	GPT-4	0.987			0.453			0.672		
	Vicuna-7b-4bit (3.89GB)	0.916			0.158			0.663		
	InferDPT + SANTEXT ⁺	0.958	0.958	0.959	0.213	0.220	0.255	0.650	0.658	0.678
	InferDPT + CUSTEXT ⁺	0.960	0.961	0.959	0.301	0.315	0.321	0.727	0.736	0.741
	InferDPT + RANTEXT	0.961	0.962	0.961	0.245	0.254	0.274	0.729	0.744	0.745
ArXiv Dataset	GPT-4	0.935			0.736			0.726		
	Vicuna-7b-4bit (3.89GB)	0.873			0.366			0.703		
	InferDPT + SANTEXT ⁺	0.945	0.946	0.946	0.196	0.207	0.230	0.651	0.670	0.690
	InferDPT + CUSTEXT ⁺	0.946	0.945	0.944	0.410	0.443	0.455	0.748	0.767	0.784
	InferDPT + RANTEXT	0.947	0.948	0.947	0.359	0.375	0.395	0.752	0.761	0.762

TABLE VI
PERFORMANCE COMPARISON OF TIME COST PER INFERENCE IN
INFERRDPT USING VARIOUS PERTURBATION MECHANISMS.

Method	Time Cost Per Inference in InferDPT (seconds)		
	SANTEXT ⁺	CUSTEXT ⁺	RANTEXT
Perturbation Module	0.0015 \pm 0.0001	0.0005 \pm 0.0001	0.0543 \pm 0.0023
Black-box Inference	\	2.8324 \pm 0.2111	\
Extraction Module	\	3.5673 \pm 0.2781	\

The design of the *random adjacency list* in RANTEXT obeys the following theorem:

Theorem 1. *Given a token $t \in V_t$ and any token $t' \in V_t$, there exists a random adjacency list $C_r(t)$ of RANTEXT satisfying $t' \in C_r(t)$.*

Theorem 1 shows that RANTEXT solves the previous privacy error of a fixed and small adjacency list in CUSTEXT+ [13]. It ensures a token t can be replaced by any token in V_t . The potential size of the uncertain *random adjacency list* in RANTEXT is equivalent to the size of the entire token vocabulary V_t . Theorem 1 is proven in Appendix B.

C. Sampling Perturbed Tokens via ϵ -LDP

In SANTEXT+ [12], a proportion of words is not perturbed by DP. To solve the privacy leakage issue in the raw text, RANTEXT perturbs every piece of the token in $Tokenset = \langle t_i \rangle_{i=1}^L$. To perturb token t_i , RANTEXT employs the exponential mechanism [25], which satisfies ϵ -LDP, to select a new token from $C_r(t_i)$ to replace the original one. For any special token $t_s \notin V_t$, RANTEXT discards it, to ensure there is no special token leakage in Doc_p .

To guarantee the utility of the perturbed document, the random mechanism $M(\cdot)$ of the exponential mechanism in RANTEXT is required to satisfy:

$$d(x, y) \geq d(x, z) \Rightarrow Pr[M(x) = y] \leq Pr[M(x) = z], \quad (15)$$

where $x \in V_t$, and y and z belong to the random adjacency list of x . $d(\cdot)$ measures the semantic similarity between two inputs, with a smaller output indicating greater similarity.

Algorithm 2 RANTEXT Mechanism

Input: Token set $Tokenset = \langle t_i \rangle_{i=1}^L$, token vocabulary V_t , privacy parameter ϵ , embedding function $\phi(\cdot)$, distance function $d_e(\cdot)$, random vector Y ;

Output: Perturbed document Doc_p ;

- 1: Initialize $Tokenset_p \leftarrow \emptyset$;
- 2: **for** $i = 1$ to L **do**
- 3: **if** $t_i \notin V_t$ **then**
- 4: Discard the token t_i ;
- 5: Continue;
- 6: **end if**
- 7: Sample a random vector Y ;
- 8: Compute embedding $eb_t \leftarrow \phi(t_i)$;
- 9: Compute random embedding $eb_n \leftarrow eb_t + Y$;
- 10: Compute Euclidean distance $d_{threshold} \leftarrow d_e(eb_n, eb_t)$;
- 11: $C_e(t_i) = \{eb \mid d_e(eb, eb_t) < d_{threshold}, eb \in \mathbb{R}^N\}$;
- 12: $C_r(t_i) = \{t_i' \mid \phi(t_i') \in C_e(t_i), t_i' \in V_t\}$;
- 13: **for each** $t_i' \in C_r(t_i)$ **do**
- 14: $d_{t_i'} \leftarrow d_e(\phi(t_i), \phi(t_i'))$;
- 15: Scoring function $u(t_i, t_i') \leftarrow 1 - d_{t_i'} / d_{threshold}$;
- 16: $p_{total} \leftarrow p_{total} + \exp(\epsilon/2 \cdot u(t_i, t_i'))$;
- 17: **end for**
- 18: **for each** $t_i'' \in C_r(t_i)$ **do**
- 19: $p(t_i'' | t_i) \leftarrow \exp(\epsilon/2 \cdot u(t_i, t_i'')) / p_{total}$;
- 20: **end for**
- 21: Sample from *random adjacency list* $r_i \sim p(t_i'' | t_i)$;
- 22: Append new token r_i to perturbed token set $Tokenset_p$;
- 23: **end for**
- 24: Concatenate $Tokenset_p = \langle r_i \rangle_{i=1}^L$ obtaining Doc_p
- 25: Output perturbed document Doc_p ;

To fulfill that, the scoring function $u(\cdot)$ of the random mechanism $M(\cdot)$ in RANTEXT is described as follows:

Given a token t , RANTEXT considers that any two tokens in $C_r(t)$ share the same input set and output set during the perturbation of token t . Given any two tokens $x, y \in C_r(t)$,




Fig. 4. Probability distribution of the size of *random adjacency list* about the token *happy* under various ϵ .

TABLE VII
COMPARISON OF THE FINAL GENERATED TEXT QUALITY UNDER DIFFERENT LOCAL MODELS WITHIN THE EXTRACTION MODULE.

Dataset	Method	diversity \uparrow			MAUVE \uparrow			coherence \uparrow		
		$\epsilon = 2.0$	$\epsilon = 6.0$	$\epsilon = 10.0$	$\epsilon = 2.0$	$\epsilon = 6.0$	$\epsilon = 10.0$	$\epsilon = 2.0$	$\epsilon = 6.0$	$\epsilon = 10.0$
CNN/Daily Mail	GPT-4		0.983			0.671			0.632	
	Llama2-7b-4bit (3.79GB)		0.896			0.258			0.485	
	Vicuna-7b-4bit (3.89GB)		0.943			0.197			0.627	
	SANTEXT ⁺ (Llama2-7b-4bit)	0.964	0.963	0.962	0.282	0.374	0.406	0.226	0.327	0.342
	CUSTEXT ⁺ (Llama2-7b-4bit)	0.963	0.962	0.963	0.493	0.519	0.548	0.460	0.483	0.514
	RANTEXT (Llama2-7b-4bit)	0.968	0.969	0.967	0.473	0.526	0.566	0.411	0.453	0.525
	SANTEXT ⁺ (Vicuna-7b-4bit)	0.967	0.969	0.968	0.374	0.413	0.448	0.632	0.679	0.727
	CUSTEXT ⁺ (Vicuna-7b-4bit)	0.966	0.967	0.968	0.571	0.632	0.670	0.733	0.749	0.789
RANTEXT (Vicuna-7b-4bit)	0.970	0.969	0.970	0.563	0.586	0.635	0.735	0.753	0.773	

TABLE VIII
COSINE SIMILARITY \uparrow BETWEEN THE FINAL GENERATION OF INFERDPT AND THE NON-PRIVATE GENERATION FROM GPT-4.

Dataset	Method	ϵ		
		1.0	2.0	3.0
CNN/Daily Mail	SANTEXT ⁺	0.489	0.499	0.519
	CUSTEXT ⁺	0.571	0.579	0.585
	RANTEXT	0.574	0.579	0.584
Wikitext-103-v1	SANTEXT ⁺	0.544	0.546	0.572
	CUSTEXT ⁺	0.597	0.613	0.627
	RANTEXT	0.598	0.609	0.617
ArXiv Dataset	SANTEXT ⁺	0.584	0.591	0.595
	CUSTEXT ⁺	0.682	0.693	0.694
	RANTEXT	0.655	0.658	0.663

the scoring function is

$$u(x, y) = 1 - \frac{|d_e(\phi(x), \phi(t)) - d_e(\phi(y), \phi(t))|}{d_e(\phi(t), \hat{\phi}(t))}. \quad (16)$$

With Equation 11 and Equation 14, it holds that:

$$|d_e(\phi(x), \phi(t)) - d_e(\phi(y), \phi(t))| < d_e(\phi(t), \hat{\phi}(t)), \quad (17)$$

$$0 \leq \frac{|d_e(\phi(x), \phi(t)) - d_e(\phi(y), \phi(t))|}{d_e(\phi(t), \hat{\phi}(t))} < 1. \quad (18)$$

With Equation 16 and Equation 17, it can be deduced that:

$$0 < u(x, y) \leq 1, \quad (19)$$

$$\Delta u = 1. \quad (20)$$

Given a privacy parameter $\epsilon \geq 0$, the probability of obtaining an output of the perturbed token $y \in C_r(t)$ for any input token $x \in C_r(t)$ is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Pr[y|x] &= \frac{\exp\left(\frac{\epsilon \cdot u(x, y)}{2\Delta u}\right)}{\sum_{y' \in C_r(t)} \exp\left(\frac{\epsilon \cdot u(x, y')}{2\Delta u}\right)} \\ &= \frac{\exp\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{|d_e(\phi(x), \phi(t)) - d_e(\phi(y), \phi(t))|}{d_e(\phi(t), \hat{\phi}(t))}\right)\right)}{\sum_{y' \in C_r(t)} \exp\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{|d_e(\phi(x), \phi(t)) - d_e(\phi(y'), \phi(t))|}{d_e(\phi(t), \hat{\phi}(t))}\right)\right)}. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Specifically for the input token $t \in C_r(t)$ and output token $y \in C_r(t)$, it can be deduced that:

$$u(t, y) = 1 - \frac{d_e(\phi(y), \phi(t))}{d_e(\phi(t), \hat{\phi}(t))}, \quad (23)$$

$$Pr[y|t] = \frac{\exp\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{d_e(\phi(t), \phi(y))}{d_e(\phi(t), \hat{\phi}(t))}\right)\right)}{\sum_{y' \in C_r(t)} \exp\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{d_e(\phi(t), \phi(y'))}{d_e(\phi(t), \hat{\phi}(t))}\right)\right)}. \quad (24)$$

The detailed process of RANTEXT is shown in Algorithm 2. Moreover, RANTEXT satisfies the definition of ϵ -LDP, which fulfill the conditions of the Observation in Section IV-B:

Theorem 2. Given a privacy parameter $\epsilon \geq 0$ and a random adjacency list $C_r(t)$ of token t , for any inputs $x, x' \in C_r(t)$ and output $y \in C_r(t)$, the randomized mechanism M of RANTEXT holds that:

$$\frac{\Pr[M(x) = y]}{\Pr[M(x') = y]} \leq e^\epsilon. \quad (25)$$

Theorem 2 demonstrates that given a *random adjacency list* $C_r(t)$ of token t , the RANTEXT mechanism satisfies ϵ -LDP. Theorem 2 is proven in Appendix B.




Fig. 5. Results of input inference attack and GPT inference attack on CNN/Daily Mail, Wikitext-103-v1, and ArXiv Dataset.




Fig. 6. Results of embedding inversion attack on CNN/Daily Mail, Wikitext-103-v1 and ArXiv Dataset.

VI. EXPERIMENTS

A. Experiment Setup

Datasets. For the open-ended text generation tasks, we use two classic NLP datasets: CNN/Daily Mail [29] for news articles and Wikitext-103-v1 [31] for Wikipedia articles. For practical applications, we use ArXiv Dataset [32] for drafting scientific papers. These datasets cover a lot of events and individuals.

Baselines. *InferDPT* is the first practical framework for privacy-preserving inference that implements differential privacy in text generation tasks [33]. As there are no other frameworks of the same type, we did not compare *InferDPT* with any others. For the differentially private mechanisms of the perturbation module, we compared RANTEXT with existing state-of-the-art mechanisms, SANTEXT+ [12] and CUSTEXT+ [13] in the default settings of them.

Metrics. Following previous works of open-ended text generation [23], [33], we use the first 50 tokens of the articles referred to raw document Doc , which we must protect. We use the continuation writing of Doc referred to as Gen , which consists of 100 tokens. Tokens are counted by the tokenizer function of GPT-2 [34]. Aligning with [35], three metrics were employed to evaluate the quality of the generated text in the open-ended generation task:

1) *Diversity*. This metric suggests the text’s diversity by

computing the unique n-gram repetition rates as follows:

$$diversity = \sum_{n=2}^4 \frac{|unique\ n\text{-grams}(Gen)|}{|total\ n\text{-grams}(Gen)|}.$$

A lower score indicates that the model is prone to repetition, while a higher score shows broader vocabulary usage.

2) *MAUVE* [36]. It is employed to assess the similarity between text generated by a language model and human-authored target continuation text. A higher score is desirable in this metric.

3) *Coherence*. Coherence computes the cosine similarity between embeddings of document Doc and continuation Gen :

$$COH(Doc, Gen) = \frac{SimCSE(Doc) \cdot SimCSE(Gen)}{\|SimCSE(Doc)\| \cdot \|SimCSE(Gen)\|},$$

where $SimCSE(x)$ represents the pretrained model [37].

Implementation. We run experiments on a cluster with NVIDIA RTX A6000 GPUs and Intel Xeon Gold 6130 2.10 GHz CPUs. We have conducted the implementation of all mechanisms using Python. For the black-box inference, we use GPT-4 [14] as our remote large language model with the temperature parameter set to 0.5. Correspondingly, GPT-4’s token vocabulary is `cl100k_base` [38]. We use the initial 11,000 English tokens of `cl100k_base` as V_t . For the embedding function $\phi(\cdot)$, we choose `text-embedding-ada-002` [39], which utilizes the same token vocabulary `cl100k_base` as employed during the training of GPT-4. We use `Vicuna-7b-4bit` [40]




Fig. 7. Cosine similarity \downarrow between the perturbed generation and the raw document.

TABLE IX
PRIVACY LEAKAGE VIA THE PERTURBED GENERATION.

ϵ	Method	Privacy Leakage Rate \downarrow		
		1-gram	2-gram	3-gram
∞	Non-private	0.110	0.058	0.027
2.0	SANTEXT+	0.090	0.030	0.016
	CUSTEXT+	0.098	0.030	0.007
	RANTEXT	0.078	0.024	0.004
6.0	SANTEXT+	0.103	0.053	0.022
	CUSTEXT+	0.099	0.034	0.008
	RANTEXT	0.081	0.027	0.005
10.0	SANTEXT+	0.104	0.055	0.022
	CUSTEXT+	0.103	0.04	0.013
	RANTEXT	0.095	0.029	0.006
14.0	SANTEXT+	0.105	0.057	0.023
	CUSTEXT+	0.105	0.052	0.017
	RANTEXT	0.101	0.032	0.008

and Llama2-7b-4bit [21] as the local language model of the extraction module with the temperature set to 0.5.

B. Evaluation of Utility

We evaluated the quality of outputs generated by *InferDPT* with various differentially private mechanisms in the perturbation module, using the Vicuna-7b-4bit (3.89GB) in the extraction module on various datasets. Table V shows *InferDPT*'s generation quality compared to non-private GPT-4:

(1) Although the uploaded prompt is perturbed by differential privacy, the quality of text generated by *InferDPT* is comparable to that directly produced by non-private GPT-4 and better than the local model's output. It proves that *InferDPT* works effectively. (2) The quality of text generated by GPT-4 is generally better than that directly produced by the local module. (3) With the same privacy parameter ϵ , the quality of generated text using RANTEXT in *InferDPT* is equivalent to that of CUSTEXT+ and superior to that of SANTEXT+. We measured the time cost per inference in *InferDPT* shown in Table VI. Experimental results show that *InferDPT* provides privacy protection without incurring a huge time overhead. We also investigated whether *InferDPT* can work in different local models. As shown in Table VII, experimental results demonstrate that *InferDPT* still plays a role in different

models. We further compared the cosine similarity between the final generation of *InferDPT* with Vicuna-7b-4bit and the output from the raw prompt of GPT-4. The result of the comparison is shown in Table VIII. In terms of cosine similarity under the same privacy parameter ϵ across three datasets, the perturbed generation of RANTEXT is close to that of the best-performing CUSTEXT+.

Moreover, we investigated the impact of the privacy parameter ϵ on the probability distribution of the size of the *random adjacency list* in RANTEXT. As shown in Figure 4, we use C_r/V_t to represent its proportion in the entire token vocabulary. As ϵ increases, RANTEXT is more likely to appear in a small size of the *random adjacency list*.

VII. DEFENSE AGAINST PRIVACY THREAT

A. Input Inference Attack

In the *input inference attack* [12], an adversary employs a pre-trained BERT model to recover raw document Doc from their perturbed version Doc_p . The BERT model, developed through masked language modeling [28], predicts the raw tokens by sequentially replacing each token in the perturbed text with a special token "[MASK]". This approach leverages BERT's capability to understand context, allowing it to infer the masked tokens. An attack is successful if the output token matches the input token. Subsequently, we calculate attack success rate² across all attacks, denoted as r_{ats} . The privacy of the differential privacy is defined as $1 - r_{ats}$.

As shown in Figure 5, RANTEXT offers better privacy protection against *input inference attack* compared to SANTEXT+ and RANTEXT+. The experimental results indicate that RANTEXT provides over 80% privacy protection within an ϵ value range of 0.01 to 18.0. In particular, with an ϵ value of 18.0 on the CNN/Daily Mail dataset, the privacy protection of RANTEXT is $1.11 \times$ that of SANTEXT+ and $1.41 \times$ that of CUSTEXT+. We analyzed the results of the experiment and found that BERT did not recognize the tokens of GPT-4. To more comprehensively evaluate RANTEXT's security, we proposed an adaptive attack leveraging the capabilities of GPT-4 in Section VII-C, GPT inference attack.

²We exclude "[UNK]" token, as it does not yield meaningful information.




Fig. 8. Results of privacy-utility trade-off with various privacy parameter ϵ ranging from 0.01 to 18.0.

B. Embedding Inversion Attack

Embedding inversion attack [17] computes the distance between the embedding of each token in the perturbed document and the embeddings of other tokens in the vocabulary, returning top K tokens with the closest Euclidean distance.

Experiments were conducted under the conditions of top $K = 1$ and 10. Figure 6 illustrates that, under both conditions, SANTEXT+ and CUSTEXT+ are susceptible to embedding inversion attacks, indicating a relatively lower level of privacy protection. Even at $\epsilon = 0.01$, these methods could only provide privacy protection for over 40% of the original documents. As the top K changes from 1 to 10, the privacy protection rate of SANTEXT+ and CUSTEXT+ remains largely unchanged. On the other hand, RANTEXT, benefiting from its design of the *random adjacency list*, prevents attackers from utilizing adjacency information for successful attacks, thus demonstrating stronger privacy protection under this attack.

C. Adaptive Attack: GPT Inference Attack

RANTEXT applies perturbations to the GPT-4 token vocabulary. Since GPT-4 recognizes all tokens, it is hypothesized that GPT-4 can better recover text perturbed by RANTEXT. Therefore, we propose an adaptive attack, GPT inference attack. In this method, the attacker feeds perturbed text into GPT-4 and instructs it to recover each token. The attack is successful if the recovered token coincides with the raw one. The prompt of GPT inference attack is shown in Appendix D.

Figure 5 displays the results of the GPT inference attack. GPT-4 has a higher attack success rate than BERT in all tests. This may be due to GPT-4’s larger size and better understanding abilities, making it more effective in inference attacks.

Confronted with the GPT inference attack, SANTEXT+ and CUSTEXT+ showed lower privacy protection rates than RANTEXT, which maintained the best privacy protection.

D. Privacy Leakage in Perturbed Generation

We further discussed the possibility of the raw document Doc being leaked by the perturbed generation result Gen_p . Figure 7 shows the cosine similarity between Doc and Gen_p . Experimental results reveal that RANTEXT maintains low semantic similarity between the raw document Doc and the

perturbed generation result Gen_p , indicating the low risk of privacy leakage through perturbed results.

Moreover, we measured privacy leakage in perturbed outputs by checking if n-gram words from the original document were repeated. A n-gram word found in both raw text and perturbed output counts as a leak. As Table IX shows, even with non-private prompts, under 11% privacy of raw document is leaked.

E. Trade-off between Privacy and Utility

Subsequently, we compare RANTEXT, CUSTEXT+, and SANTEXT+ in terms of privacy-utility trade-offs. We use the privacy protection rates of each mechanism under the top 1 embedding inversion attack as the indicator of each scheme’s privacy level. We compared the privacy protection levels of different mechanisms under the same generated text quality on CNN/Daily Mail dataset with Vicuna-7b-4bit(3.89GB) as the extraction module. As shown in Figure 8, RANTEXT offers the best privacy protection under the same generated text quality, surpassing SANTEXT+ and CUSTEXT+.

In summary, RANTEXT demonstrates superior privacy protection against various attacks on differentially private mechanism compared to SANTEXT+ and CUSTEXT+, confirming RANTEXT’s robust privacy safeguarding alongside high-quality text generation.

VIII. RELATED WORK

CipherGPT [9] has applied homomorphic encryption [41] to language models that are based on Transformer. It performs inference on encrypted data. However, it results in a problem that cannot be completely solved today: the significant computation time and communication costs: it infers a token costing 24 minutes and 93 GB of bandwidth, making deployment impractical. PromptPATE [42] and DP-OPT [43] have utilized differential privacy (DP) to reconstruct the datasets used for classification tasks, thereby protecting the privacy of training data during the prompt learning (tuning) process. However, they focus on the classification tasks and do not solve the information distortion introduced by the differential privacy noise. Tang et al. [44] introduced a differentially private approach to generate privacy-preserving examples for in-context learning. They deploy a large

language model to reconstruct the private examples via a few-shot generation of differential privacy. They also focus on classification tasks.

IX. CONCLUSION

This paper explores the challenge of privacy leakage in text generation tasks executed by black-box large language models and introduces `InferDPT` as a potential solution. Additionally, we propose `RANTEXT`, a novel differential privacy algorithm designed for large language models following the exponential mechanism to enhance user privacy protection. We expect that our solution and findings can provide technical insights into the current privacy challenges and shed light on potential future explorations in privacy protection within emerging LLMs.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Li, A. S. Rawat, M. Zaheer, X. Wang, M. Lukasik, A. Veit, F. Yu, and S. Kumar, "Large language models with controllable working memory," in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023* (A. Rogers, J. Boyd-Graber, and N. Okazaki, eds.), (Toronto, Canada), pp. 1774–1793, Association for Computational Linguistics, July 2023.
- [2] a. m. w. i. i. a. c. w. ChatGPT. <https://chat.openai.com/?model=gpt-4-browsing>, 2023.
- [3] O. C. now has 100 million weekly active users. <https://techcrunch.com/2023/11/06/openais-chatgpt-now-has-100-million-weekly-active-users/>, 2023.
- [4] W. X. Zhao, K. Zhou, J. Li, T. Tang, X. Wang, Y. Hou, Y. Min, B. Zhang, J. Zhang, Z. Dong, *et al.*, "A survey of large language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223*, 2023.
- [5] S. employees leak proprietary information via ChatGPT. <https://www.cshub.com/data/news/iotw-samsung-employees-allegedly-leak-proprietary-information-via-chatgpt>, 2023.
- [6] G.-. models can understand and generate natural language or code. <https://chat.openai.com/?model=text-davinci-002-render-sha>, 2023.
- [7] G.-. leaked a random individual's photo in the output. <https://twitter.com/thealexker/status/1719896871009694057>, 2023.
- [8] H. text generation works by Microsoft Power Platform. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/ai-builder/azure-openai-textgen>, 2023.
- [9] X. Hou, J. Liu, J. Li, Y. Li, W.-j. Lu, C. Hong, and K. Ren, "Ciphergpt: Secure two-party gpt inference," *Cryptology ePrint Archive*, 2023.
- [10] X. Zhou, Y. Lu, R. Ma, T. Gui, Y. Wang, Y. Ding, Y. Zhang, Q. Zhang, and X.-J. Huang, "Textobfuscator: Making pre-trained language model a privacy protector via obfuscating word representations," in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pp. 5459–5473, 2023.
- [11] M. Du, X. Yue, S. S. Chow, T. Wang, C. Huang, and H. Sun, "Dp-forward: Fine-tuning and inference on language models with differential privacy in forward pass," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.06746*, 2023.
- [12] X. Yue, M. Du, T. Wang, Y. Li, H. Sun, and S. S. M. Chow, "Differential privacy for text analytics via natural text sanitization," in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, (Online), pp. 3853–3866, Association for Computational Linguistics, Aug. 2021.
- [13] S. Chen, F. Mo, Y. Wang, C. Chen, J.-Y. Nie, C. Wang, and J. Cui, "A customized text sanitization mechanism with differential privacy," in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pp. 5747–5758, 2023.
- [14] p. s. GPT-4 is OpenAI's most advanced system and more useful responses. <https://openai.com/gpt-4>, 2023.
- [15] C. Dwork, "Differential privacy," in *International colloquium on automata, languages, and programming*, pp. 1–12, Springer, 2006.
- [16] Y. Zhu, S. Lu, L. Zheng, J. Guo, W. Zhang, J. Wang, and Y. Yu, "Texygen: A benchmarking platform for text generation models," in *The 41st international ACM SIGIR conference on research & development in information retrieval*, pp. 1097–1100, 2018.
- [17] C. Song and A. Raghunathan, "Information leakage in embedding models," in *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*, pp. 377–390, 2020.
- [18] J. Gou, B. Yu, S. J. Maybank, and D. Tao, "Knowledge distillation: A survey," *International Journal of Computer Vision*, vol. 129, pp. 1789–1819, 2021.
- [19] S. Kotz, T. Kozubowski, and K. Podgórski, *The Laplace distribution and generalizations: a revisit with applications to communications, economics, engineering, and finance*. No. 183, Springer Science & Business Media, 2001.
- [20] H. of Claude AI. <https://claude.ai/>, 2023.
- [21] H. Touvron, T. Lavril, G. Izacard, X. Martinet, M.-A. Lachaux, T. Lacroix, B. Rozière, N. Goyal, E. Hambro, F. Azhar, *et al.*, "Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- [22] W.-L. Chiang, Z. Li, Z. Lin, Y. Sheng, Z. Wu, H. Zhang, L. Zheng, S. Zhuang, Y. Zhuang, J. E. Gonzalez, *et al.*, "Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality," See <https://vicuna.lmsys.org> (accessed 14 April 2023), 2023.
- [23] S. Welleck, I. Kulikov, S. Roller, E. Dinan, K. Cho, and J. Weston, "Neural text generation with unlikelihood training," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.04319*, 2019.
- [24] S. P. Kasiviswanathan, H. K. Lee, K. Nissim, S. Raskhodnikova, and A. Smith, "What can we learn privately?," *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 793–826, 2011.
- [25] F. McSherry and K. Talwar, "Mechanism design via differential privacy," in *48th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'07)*, pp. 94–103, 2007.
- [26] M. Alvim, K. Chatzikokolakis, C. Palamidessi, and A. Pazzi, "Local differential privacy on metric spaces: optimizing the trade-off with utility," in *2018 IEEE 31st Computer Security Foundations Symposium (CSF)*, pp. 262–267, IEEE, 2018.
- [27] N. L. Toolkit. <https://www.nltk.org>, 2023.
- [28] H. Bao, L. Dong, F. Wei, W. Wang, N. Yang, X. Liu, Y. Wang, J. Gao, S. Piao, M. Zhou, *et al.*, "Unilmv2: Pseudo-masked language models for unified language model pre-training," in *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 642–652, PMLR, 2020.
- [29] K. M. Hermann, T. Kocisky, E. Grefenstette, L. Espeholt, W. Kay, M. Suleyman, and P. Blunsom, "Teaching machines to read and comprehend," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 28, 2015.
- [30] R. Sennrich, B. Haddow, and A. Birch, "Neural machine translation of rare words with subword units," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.07909*, 2015.
- [31] S. Merity, C. Xiong, J. Bradbury, and R. Socher, "Pointer sentinel mixture models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.07843*, 2016.
- [32] C. B. Clement, M. Bierbaum, K. P. O'Keefe, and A. A. Alemi, "On the use of arxiv as a dataset," 2019.
- [33] J. Xu, X. Liu, J. Yan, D. Cai, H. Li, and J. Li, "Learning to break the loop: Analyzing and mitigating repetitions for neural text generation," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 3082–3095, 2022.
- [34] K. Lagler, M. Schindelegger, J. Böhm, H. Krásná, and T. Nilsson, "Gpt2: Empirical slant delay model for radio space geodetic techniques," *Geophysical research letters*, vol. 40, no. 6, pp. 1069–1073, 2013.
- [35] X. Lin, S. Han, and S. Joty, "Straight to the gradient: Learning to use novel tokens for neural text generation," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 6642–6653, PMLR, 2021.
- [36] K. Pillutla, S. Swayamdipta, R. Zellers, J. Thackstun, S. Welleck, Y. Choi, and Z. Harchaoui, "Mauve: Measuring the gap between neural text and human text using divergence frontiers," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 34, pp. 4816–4828, 2021.
- [37] T. Gao, X. Yao, and D. Chen, "Simcse: Simple contrastive learning of sentence embeddings," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08821*, 2021.
- [38] F. B. tokeniser for use with OpenAI's models. <https://github.com/openai/tiktoken>, 2023.
- [39] New and improved embedding model. <https://openai.com/blog/new-and-improved-embedding-model>, 2023.
- [40] E. Frantar, S. Ashkboos, T. Hoefler, and D. Alistarh, "Gptq: Accurate post-training quantization for generative pre-trained transformers," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.17323*, 2022.
- [41] C. Gentry, "Fully homomorphic encryption using ideal lattices," in *Proceedings of the forty-first annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pp. 169–178, 2009.
- [42] H. Duan, A. Dziedzic, N. Papernot, and F. Boenisch, "Flocks of stochastic parrots: Differentially private prompt learning for large language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15594*, 2023.
- [43] J. Hong, J. T. Wang, C. Zhang, Z. Li, B. Li, and Z. Wang, "Dp-opt: Make large language model your privacy-preserving prompt engineer," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.03724*, 2023.
- [44] X. Tang, R. Shin, H. A. Inan, A. Manoel, F. Mireshghallah, Z. Lin, S. Gopi, J. Kulkarni, and R. Sim, "Privacy-preserving in-context learning with differentially private few-shot generation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.11765*, 2023.

A. EXTRACTION MODULE PROMPT

The prompt for the extraction module is as follows:

Your task is to extend the “*Prefix Text*”. Use the “*Perturbed Generation*” as your primary writing material for your extension. Extract coherent and consistent text from the “*Perturbed Generation*” and integrate them into your continuation. Ensure a seamless alignment with the context established by the “*Prefix Text*”. Provide only your “*Extended Text*”

——“*Prefix Text*”:

——“*Perturbed Generation*”:

——“*Extended Text*”:

B. RANDOM FUNCTION

In our study, we noted that generating adjacency lists directly with Laplace distribution [19] led to excessively large sizes. To tackle this, we created an adjusted random vector by $curve_fit(\cdot)$ ³, aiming to achieve specific probability targets for the ratio, $\frac{\text{Size of } C_r}{\text{Size of } V_t}$ of the token *happy*, equaling 5% at different ε values:

TABLE X
DESIRED PROBABILITIES UNDER DIFFERENT ε .

ε	Probability When $\frac{\text{Size of } C_r}{\text{Size of } V_t} = 0.05$
2.0	1.5%
6.0	9.0%
10.0	10.0%
14.0	10.5%

$$Y \sim f(x) = \frac{Z}{2\Delta\phi} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{Z \cdot |x|}{\Delta\phi}\right),$$

$$Z = \begin{cases} \varepsilon & \text{if } \varepsilon < 2, \\ a \log(b \cdot \varepsilon + c) + d & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\Delta\phi$ is the sensitivity of function $\phi(\cdot)$.

C. PROOFS OF THEOREMS

Proof of Theorem 1. Given that the output of Laplace distribution [19] spans the range $(-\infty, \infty)$, as Equation 12, it can be deduced that:

$$Y \in (-\infty, \infty). \quad (26)$$

With Equation 26, it can be further deduced that:

$$d_e(\hat{\phi}(t), \phi(t)) \in (0, \infty) \quad (27)$$

There exists a random embedding $\hat{\phi}(t)$, satisfying the condition:

$$d_e(\hat{\phi}(t), \phi(t)) > d_e(\phi(t'), \phi(t)) \quad (28)$$

Consequently, a random adjacency list $C_r(t)$ of RANTEXT can be constructed, fulfilling the condition $t' \in C_r(t)$.

It completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. Given a privacy parameter $\varepsilon \geq 0$ and a random adjacency list $C_r(t)$ of token t , for any two input tokens $x, x' \in C_r(t)$ and output token $y \in C_r(t)$, it holds that:

$$\frac{Pr[y|x]}{Pr[y|x']} = \frac{\exp\left(\frac{\varepsilon \cdot u(x,y)}{2\Delta u}\right)}{\sum_{y' \in C_r(t)} \exp\left(\frac{\varepsilon \cdot u(x,y')}{2\Delta u}\right)} / \frac{\exp\left(\frac{\varepsilon \cdot u(x',y)}{2\Delta u}\right)}{\sum_{y' \in C_r(t)} \exp\left(\frac{\varepsilon \cdot u(x',y')}{2\Delta u}\right)} \quad (29)$$

With Equation 20, it can be further deduced that:

$$\frac{Pr[y|x]}{Pr[y|x']} = \frac{\exp\left(\frac{\varepsilon \cdot u(x,y)}{2}\right)}{\exp\left(\frac{\varepsilon \cdot u(x',y)}{2}\right)} \cdot \frac{\sum_{y' \in C_r(t)} \exp\left(\frac{\varepsilon \cdot u(x',y')}{2}\right)}{\sum_{y' \in C_r(t)} \exp\left(\frac{\varepsilon \cdot u(x,y')}{2}\right)} \quad (30)$$

With Equation 19, it can be further deduced that:

$$\frac{\exp\left(\frac{\varepsilon \cdot u(x,y)}{2}\right)}{\exp\left(\frac{\varepsilon \cdot u(x',y)}{2}\right)} \leq \exp\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \quad (31)$$

$$\exp\left(\frac{\varepsilon \cdot u(x',y')}{2}\right) \leq \exp\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \cdot \exp\left(\frac{\varepsilon \cdot u(x,y')}{2}\right) \quad (32)$$

With Equation 32, it can be further deduced that:

$$\frac{\sum_{y' \in C_r(t)} \exp\left(\frac{\varepsilon \cdot u(x',y')}{2}\right)}{\sum_{y' \in C_r(t)} \exp\left(\frac{\varepsilon \cdot u(x,y')}{2}\right)} \leq \exp\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \quad (33)$$

With Equation 31 and Equation 33, it can be deduced that:

$$\frac{Pr[y|x]}{Pr[y|x']} \leq \exp\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \cdot \exp\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) = e^\varepsilon \quad (34)$$

It completes the proof. \square

D. PROMPT FOR GPT INFERENCE ATTACK

The prompt of GPT inference attack is as follows:

Given a list of tokens, denoted as “*INPUTS*,” which have been subjected to text perturbation through differential privacy techniques, your task is to recover each token in the list to its most likely original one.

As an example, consider the list “*INPUTS*”:

[“*Privacy*”, “*LLM*”, “*Text*”].

The expected output format should be:

```
[
["Prediction"], # Corresponding to "Privacy"
["Prediction"], # Corresponding to "LLM"
["Prediction"] # Corresponding to "Text"
]
```

“*Prediction*” represents the most plausible original tokens before perturbation.

For the given list of “*INPUTS*”:

[*INPUT HERE*]

Generate predictions for each token in the list.

³SciPy Homepage: <https://scipy.org>