
Do Membership Inference Attacks Work on Large Language Models?

Michael Duan^{*1} Anshuman Suri^{*2} Niloofar Mireshghallah¹ Sewon Min¹ Weijia Shi¹
 Luke Zettlemoyer¹ Yulia Tsvetkov¹ Yejin Choi^{1,3} David Evans² Hannaneh Hajishirzi^{1,3}

Abstract

Membership inference attacks (MIAs) attempt to predict whether a particular datapoint is a member of a target model’s training data. Despite extensive research on traditional machine learning models, there has been limited work studying MIA on the pre-training data of large language models (LLMs). We perform a large-scale evaluation of MIAs over a suite of language models (LMs) trained on the Pile, ranging from 160M to 12B parameters. We find that MIAs barely outperform random guessing for most settings across varying LLM sizes and domains. Our further analyses reveal that this poor performance can be attributed to (1) the combination of a large dataset and few training iterations, and (2) an inherently fuzzy boundary between members and non-members. We identify specific settings where LLMs have been shown to be vulnerable to membership inference and show that the apparent success in such settings can be attributed to a distribution shift, such as when members and non-members are drawn from the seemingly identical domain but with different temporal ranges. We release our code and data as a unified benchmark package that includes all existing MIAs, supporting future work.

1. Introduction

Membership inference is the de-facto threat model when discussing machine-learning privacy (Shokri et al., 2017), with a large array of attacks (Yeom et al., 2018; Carlini et al., 2022; Shi et al., 2023; Mattern et al., 2023; Mireshghallah et al., 2022a) and proposed defenses (Abadi et al., 2016; Tang et al., 2022; Chen et al., 2022). Membership inference attacks (MIAs) aim to predict whether a particular record

belongs to the training dataset of a given model. Thus, MIAs have great utility for privacy auditing of models (Steinke et al., 2023), as well as investigating memorization of training data, copyright violations and test-set contamination (Shi et al., 2023; Oren et al., 2023).

While MIAs have been found to achieve high attack performance, alluding to high levels of training-data memorization (Zarifzadeh et al., 2023; Bertran et al., 2023; Lukas et al., 2023), most analyses are limited to classifiers or LM fine-tuning (Mireshghallah et al., 2022b; Fu et al., 2023). The performance of existing MIAs on LLMs and their pre-training data is largely unexplored.

In this work, we set out to explore the challenges in evaluating membership inference attacks on LLMs, across an array of five commonly-used membership inference attacks: LOSS (Yeom et al., 2018), reference-based attacks (Carlini et al., 2022; Mireshghallah et al., 2022a), zlib entropy (Carlini et al., 2021), curvature (neighborhood attack from Mattern et al. (2023)), and Min- k % Prob (Shi et al., 2023). We introduce MIMIR¹, a unified repository for evaluating MIAs for LMs, with implementations of several attacks from literature. We report on experiments extensively evaluating these MIAs against target models from the Pythia suite (Biderman et al., 2023b) over the Pile (Gao et al., 2020) (§4). For the most part, we find that the performance across most MIAs and target domains is *near-random*. Increasing model size results in marginal increases in MIA performance, and deduplication of training data leads to slight decreases.

Based on these findings, we identify the root causes of low MIA performance on pre-trained LLMs. First, we find that the inherent characteristics of LLMs at scale—specifically, the use of massive training data and near-one epoch training—considerably decrease current MIA performance (§5.1). This suggests that the success of current MIAs in previous settings does not transfer well to attacking pre-trained LLMs seemingly due to a lack of memorization of member data. We also find that the frequent overlap between members and non-members from natural language domains considerably decreases MIA performance and raises the question of how membership should be interpreted (§5.2). Notably, in several domains, non-members

^{*}Equal contribution ¹University of Washington ²University of Virginia ³Allen Institute for Artificial Intelligence. Correspondence to: Michael Duan <micdun@cs.washington.edu>, Anshuman Suri <as9rw@virginia.edu>.

¹<http://github.com/iamgroot42/mimir>

have high n -gram overlap with members, e.g., non-members from the Pile Wikipedia and ArXiv test samples have average 7-gram overlaps of over 30%. Further investigation indicates that non-members with lower n -gram overlap are more distinguishable by existing MIAs. We propose non-member n -gram overlap analysis as a means to estimate MIA benchmark difficulty by comparing the distributional difference in n -gram overlap between a candidate non-member set and a left-out sample set from the member domain. Finally, we apply this overlap analysis to the attack setting where non-members are chosen from the same domain as members but are temporally shifted, demonstrating how the seemingly in-domain non-members likely belong to a different distribution as a result of n -gram overlap shift (§6). We propose the use of this method to evaluate MIA benchmarks and determine whether MIA success is attributed to distributional differences between member and non-member candidates or if the MIA is truly capturing membership signals effectively.

We find that while certain characteristics of LLM training render MIAs ineffective, there exists ambiguity in discerning whether it is a sign of models not leaking membership, or if there is a need for better attacks or to re-interpret membership in the context of generative models. We explore this ambiguity via records that are lexically or semantically close to actual training records (§7). We encourage future works to re-examine and define evaluation settings and their impacts on the performance of MIAs.

2. Background

The goal of a membership Inference Attack (MIA) is to infer whether a given data point x was part of the training dataset \mathcal{D} for model \mathcal{M} , by computing a membership score $f(x; \mathcal{M})$. This score is then thresholded to determine a target sample’s membership. In our case, \mathcal{M} is an auto-regressive language model that outputs a probability distribution of the next token given a prefix, denoted as $P(x_t | x_1 \dots x_{t-1}; \mathcal{M})$. We consider five MIAs, each thresholding a different scoring function f (See Appendix A.4 for more detailed descriptions):

(1) **LOSS** (Yeom et al., 2018): considers the model’s computed loss over the target sample: $f(x; \mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{L}(x; \mathcal{M})$.

(2) **Reference-based** (Carlini et al., 2021) attempts to improve on the LOSS attack’s precision and reduce the false negative rate by accounting for the intrinsic complexity of the target point x by calibrating $\mathcal{L}(x; \mathcal{M})$, with respect to another *reference model* (\mathcal{M}_{ref}), which is trained on data from the same distribution as \mathcal{D} , but not necessarily the same data: $f(x; \mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{L}(x; \mathcal{M}) - \mathcal{L}(x; \mathcal{M}_{ref})$.

(3) **Zlib Entropy** (Carlini et al., 2021) calibrates the sample’s loss under the target model using the sample’s zlib compression size: $f(x; \mathcal{M}) = \frac{\mathcal{L}(x; \mathcal{M})}{\text{zlib}(x)}$,

(4) **Neighborhood attack** (Mattern et al., 2023) uses an estimate of the curvature of the loss function at a given sample, which is computed by perturbing the target sequence to create n ‘neighboring’ points, and comparing the loss of the target x , with its neighbors \tilde{x} : $f(x; \mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{L}(x; \mathcal{M}) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{L}(\tilde{x}_i; \mathcal{M})$.

(5) **Min- $k\%$ Prob** (Shi et al., 2023) uses the $k\%$ of tokens with the lowest likelihoods to compute a score instead of averaging over all token probabilities as in loss: $f(x; \mathcal{M}) = \frac{1}{|\text{min-}k(x)|} \sum_{x_i \in \text{min-}k(x)} -\log(p(x_i | x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}))$.

Choosing the threshold. The threshold determines the (false positive) error the adversary is willing to tolerate. Following prior work, we primarily report the area under the ROC, which is threshold-independent. See §3 for more details on the metrics we report.

3. Experimental Setup

We perform a large-scale study of multiple state-of-the-art MIAs (§2) on a range of LLMs with up to 12B parameters and diverse benchmarks (§3). For the reference-based attack in Table 1 and all following experiments, we use STABLELM-BASE-ALPHA-3B-V2 as the reference model (determined empirically in §4). Code is available at <http://github.com/iamgroot42/mimir>.

Target models. We primarily target the PYTHIA model suite, including (1) five models of PYTHIA (Biderman et al., 2023b) with 160M, 1.4B, 2.8B, 6.7B, and 12B parameters, trained on the original Pile data (Gao et al., 2020), and (2) five models of PYTHIA-DEDUP (Biderman et al., 2023b) with the same parameter counts as PYTHIA but trained on the deduplicated version of the Pile data. Our choice of models allow us to evaluate the effect of model sizes (§4) and the effect of training data deduplication (§4). We also experiment with the GPT-NEO family to assess whether the same conclusions hold for a different model family, observing similar trends in most domains (see Appendix A.6).

Datasets. We use seven diverse data sources included in the Pile: general web (Pile-CC), knowledge sources (Wikipedia), academic papers (PubMed Central, ArXiv), dialogues (HackerNews), and specialized-domain datasets (DM Math, Github). We also perform experiments over the entire Pile. Members/non-members for each data source are sampled from the train/test sets of the Pile, respectively. The Pile test set is decontaminated against the training set at a document level (Gao et al., 2020); nonetheless, to be more rigorous, we perform our own deduplication between members and non-members following Groeneveld et al. (2023). Refer to Appendix A.3 for further details.

Do Membership Inference Attacks Work on Large Language Models?

Table 1. AUC ROC of MIAs against PYTHIA-DEDUP across different datasets from the Pile. The highest performance across the different MIAs is bolded per domain. **MIA methods perform near random ($< .6$) in most domains.** We do not run the Neighborhood attack for the 12B model on The Pile due to computational constraints, but believe it will follow similar trends.

# Params	Wikipedia					Github					Pile CC					PubMed Central				
	LOSS	Ref	min- <i>k</i>	zlib	Ne	LOSS	Ref	min- <i>k</i>	zlib	Ne	LOSS	Ref	min- <i>k</i>	zlib	Ne	LOSS	Ref	min- <i>k</i>	zlib	Ne
160M	.504	.515	.488	.514	.513	.638	.591	.634	.656	.638	.498	.497	.503	.499	.496	.500	.516	.504	.500	.486
1.4B	.510	.544	.506	.518	.518	.656	.587	.654	.670	.650	.500	.525	.509	.502	.499	.496	.530	.505	.500	.490
2.8B	.516	.565	.511	.522	.517	.707	.657	.708	.717	.698	.501	.537	.509	.503	.502	.498	.536	.502	.500	.497
6.9B	.514	.571	.512	.521	.514	.672	.573	.675	.684	.654	.511	.564	.516	.512	.505	.504	.552	.508	.504	.497
12B	.516	.579	.517	.524	.520	.678	.559	.683	.690	.660	.516	.582	.521	.517	.514	.506	.559	.512	.506	.497

# Params	ArXiv					DM Math					HackerNews					The Pile				
	LOSS	Ref	min- <i>k</i>	zlib	Ne	LOSS	Ref	min- <i>k</i>	zlib	Ne	LOSS	Ref	min- <i>k</i>	zlib	Ne	LOSS	Ref	min- <i>k</i>	zlib	Ne
160M	.507	.486	.501	.500	.507	.490	.523	.493	.482	.489	.492	.490	.497	.497	.505	.502	.511	.506	.505	.499
1.4B	.513	.510	.511	.508	.511	.486	.512	.497	.481	.465	.503	.514	.509	.502	.504	.504	.521	.508	.507	.504
2.8B	.517	.531	.522	.512	.519	.485	.504	.497	.482	.467	.510	.549	.518	.507	.513	.507	.530	.512	.510	.506
6.9B	.521	.538	.524	.516	.519	.485	.508	.496	.481	.469	.513	.546	.528	.508	.512	.510	.549	.516	.512	.510
12B	.527	.555	.530	.521	.519	.485	.512	.495	.481	.475	.518	.565	.533	.512	.515	.513	.558	.521	.515	–

Evaluation metrics. We primarily report AUC ROC for our evaluations, and additionally record TPR@low%FPR (Carlini et al., 2022) to assess attack performance in high-confidence settings (see Table 10). We visualize the 95% confidence interval for AUC ROC scores via shaded regions in relevant figures.

4. Membership Inference on LLMs is Difficult

MIAs perform near random. Table 1 shows that all existing MIAs perform near random for most domains². No single MIA or target model demonstrates attack AUC above 0.6 for any domain, with the exception of Github (see Appendix B.3 for discussion). Overall, the reference-based attack performs best, although there are a few settings where other attacks perform better, e.g., Min-*k*% Prob on Pile CC for the 160M-parameter PYTHIA-DEDUP model. Differences in performance across MIAs are relatively marginal, making it hard to single out an overall *best* attack.

Effect of Model Size. MIA performance tends to slightly increase with the target model size (see Table 1, Figure 1), reinforcing findings from prior work (Shi et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023a; Watson et al., 2022). This increase may be attributed to larger models being more prone to overfitting the training data (Nakkiran et al., 2021). We explore reasons why performance differences may be marginal in §5.1.1.

Effect of Deduplication. Deduplication has demonstrated benefits such as improving training speed and naturally defending against MIAs (Lee et al., 2022; Kandpal et al., 2022). Our results (Figure 1) confirm the latter: in general, AUC-ROC is slightly higher when targeting non-deduped models³.

²Similar trends for TPR@1%FPR. See Table 10 in Appendix.

³See Table 11 for more extensive results.

Domains such as Wikipedia having a higher upsampling factor (x3), leading to deduplication having a greater impact, exhibit greater performance differences when attacking the non-deduped model. We further explore the impact of effective epochs on MIA performance in §5.1.2.

Difficulty in Choosing a Reference Model. Table 2 summarizes reference-based attack performance with eight different reference models for the Wikipedia and PubMed Central domains. See Appendix A.5 for reference model details and full ablation results. We find that: (1) most reference models yield poor performance, with STABLELM-BASE-ALPHA-3B-V2 being the best reference model on both Wikipedia (.579) and PubMed Central (.559), and (2) even aggregating all reference models (by averaging their scores) performs poorly. Overall, we find choosing the

Table 2. The effect of different reference model choices when targeting PYTHIA-DEDUP-12B. The reference model yielding the highest performance is bolded. AUC ROC reported.

Reference Model	WIKIPEDIA	PUBMED CENTRAL
GPT-2-SMALL	.514	.501
DISTILGPT2	.510	.498
OPT-1.3B	.522	.523
GPT-NEO-1.3B	.528	.531
PYTHIA-DEDUP-1.4B	.534	.537
SILO-PDSWBV	.529	.521
STABLELM-BASE-ALPHA-3B-V2	.579	.559
LLAMA-7B	.546	.531
Aggregation of Eight Models	.534	.554

right reference model for a target LLM challenging and largely empirical. A reference model should be trained on the data that is same-distribution but largely disjoint from the training data of the target model. However, this assumption is hard to impose at the scale of pre-training corpora; common practice is to collect all the data available




Figure 1. MIA performance as model size increases over select domains for the reference-based attack. We additionally plot the AUC ROC trajectory against the non-deduped Pythia suite for comparison. In general, **increasing model size slightly boosts MIA performance while deduplication decreases performance**. Other attacks follow similar trends and are given in the Appendix (Figure 13).

on the web, leading independently collected datasets to naturally overlap with each other.

5. Why is MI Challenging against LLMs

We identify several key factors that may contribute to the decreased performance of MIAs on LLMs.

5.1. Characteristics of Pretrained LLMs

Several common practices in LLM pre-training are different from other machine learning setups, which makes MI against pre-trained LLMs challenging. We identify and experiment with such factors: large training data size (§5.1.1) and the low number of effective training epochs (§5.1.2).

5.1.1. TRAINING DATA SIZE

Current state-of-the-art pretrained LLMs are trained with billions and trillions of tokens (Touvron et al., 2023a;b; Team, 2023). Existing work points to larger pretraining datasets contributing to an increase in LLM generalization (Hoffmann et al., 2022; Muennighoff et al., 2023). Others have shown increasing data size leads to lower MIA performance in related, smaller-scale settings such as continued pretraining (Shi et al., 2023) or in different domains like vision (Watson et al., 2022). We hypothesize the *large pretraining corpora characteristic to LMs decreases MIA performance*.

We employ the PYTHIA-DEDUP model suite’s checkpoints to assess MIA performance against models with different amounts of training data. Doing so also ensures the same pretraining data distribution across checkpoints. While keeping non-members fixed, we sample members for each checkpoint from its most recent 100 steps to prevent earlier checkpoints from having the advantage of seeing the member data more recently.⁴ See Appendix A.3.1 for details.

⁴Note that using recently seen members elevates MIA performance noticeably, but doesn’t disrupt the impact of increasing training data size. We study how the recency of data seen in




Figure 2. Reference-based attack performance as the amount of training data seen, measured in the number of training steps, increases across 1 epoch of the deduplicated Pile pre-training corpus. Each training step corresponds to seeing 2,097,152 tokens. In general, **performance spikes greatly before gradually decreasing as the amount of training data seen increases**. Other attacks (Figure 14, Appendix) follow similar trends.

Results. Figure 2 demonstrates a general trend where MIA performance starts as near-random, then rapidly increases within the next few thousand steps, before decreasing across successive checkpoints⁵. We speculate the initial low performance is due to the model warming up in training, with high losses across both member and non-member samples. We believe the rapid rise and then gradual decline in performance are because the data-to-parameter-count ratio is smaller early in training and the model may tend to overfit, but generalizes better as training progresses, in line with observations in existing work (Nakkiran et al., 2021).

5.1.2. NUMBER OF TRAINING EPOCHS

It is standard practice to pre-train LLMs for around one epoch, given the scale of data and their tendency to overfit

training impacts MIA performance further in Appendix C.1

⁵PYTHIA-DEDUP-2.8B stands apart with a performance trajectory that is consistently near-random. Previous work also observes unexplainable behavior for this model (Biderman et al., 2023a).




Figure 3. MIA performance on target model DATABLATIONS as the number of effective epochs increases via increasing epoch count. **Performance increases linearly with the number of effective epochs.** See Figure 12 for results on SILO.

quickly (Muennighoff et al., 2023; Komatsuzaki, 2019). Previous MIA works that demonstrate attack effectiveness consider supervised fine-tuning or masked LM pre-training (Nakamura et al., 2020; Lehman et al., 2021; Miresghallah et al., 2022a;b), where models are trained for more than 10 epochs (i.e., each sample is seen at least 10 times in training). We explore how the *near-one epoch training of LLMs leads to decreased MIA performance*.

We refer to the epoch count over the entire training corpus as **epoch count**, but more precisely investigate **effective epoch count**, defined as the epoch count \times the upsampling factor of the target domain, as a more accurate count for the number of times a specific target domain is seen. To measure the impact of effective epoch count, we choose two LLMs trained on specific domains for multiple epochs (see Appendix A.2 for model details). (1) The **Datablations** suite (Muennighoff et al., 2023) consists of models trained on subsets of C4 train data for varying numbers of *epochs*, but with a fixed total training data size. We sample the C4 training and validation data for members and non-members, respectively. (2) **SILO** (Min et al., 2023) is a model suite trained on permissively-licensed text data only, trained for multiple epochs and *upsampled* because of the limited size of the permissive text data. We use the same HackerNews and DM Math benchmarks from the Pile for evaluation as they are valid members and non-members for SILO. We note that effective epoch count is a lower-bound estimate for the number of times a member sample of a target domain is seen during train, as some duplicates may go unnoticed.

Results. Increasing the number of effective epochs corresponds to an increase in attack performance (Figure 3). While Muennighoff et al. (2023) shows training for multiple epochs helps improve performance, our results suggest that such multi-epoch training (and/or large upsampling factors that effectively increase epoch count) may increase training

Table 3. Comparison of MIA performance over select domains with varying non-member sets at $\leq 20\%$ n -gram overlap threshold for $n = 7, 13$, as well as the natural non-member set. We bold the highest performance across the filter settings. Target model is PYTHIA-DEDUP-12B and AUC ROC reported. **Stricter n -gram overlap thresholding results in higher performance.**

Domain	Method	Non-member Filter		
		7-GRAM	13-GRAM	ORIGINAL
Wikipedia	LOSS	.666	.545	.516
	Ref	.677	.617	.579
	min- k	.644	.562	.517
	zlib	.631	.543	.524
	Ne	.612	.523	.520
Github	LOSS	.878	.802	.678
	Ref	.615	.615	.559
	min- k	.890	.830	.683
	zlib	.908	.829	.690
	Ne	.877	.789	.660
PubMed Central	LOSS	.780	.534	.506
	Ref	.595	.584	.559
	min- k	.792	.542	.512
	zlib	.772	.537	.506
	Ne	.737	.539	.497
Pile CC	LOSS	.574	.534	.516
	Ref	.644	.627	.582
	min- k	.578	.539	.521
	zlib	.560	.542	.517
	Ne	.566	.542	.514
ArXiv	LOSS	.787	.573	.527
	Ref	.715	.584	.555
	min- k	.734	.566	.530
	zlib	.780	.565	.521
	Ne	.773	.555	.519

data leakage. See Appendix C.2 for SILO results.

5.2. Inherent Ambiguity in MIA

Natural language documents commonly have repeating text—even with the best efforts in decontamination and deduplication. These include common phrasings and quotes, natural use of similar texts, and syntactical similarities inherent to specific domains. This leads to substantial text overlap between members and non-members, which motivates the following hypothesis: **higher overlap between members and non-members increases MIA difficulty**.

We quantify overlap using the percentage of n -gram overlap, defined as follows: For a non-member sample \mathbf{x} consisting of m words such that $\mathbf{x} = x_1x_2\dots x_m$ and an n -gram in \mathbf{x} defined as a continuous substring $x_i\dots x_{i+n-1}$ for some $1 \leq i \leq m - n + 1$, the n -gram overlap of \mathbf{x} is

$$\frac{1}{m - n + 1} \sum_{i=1}^{m-n+1} \mathbb{1}\{\exists y \in D : x_i\dots x_{i+n-1} \in y\}$$

where D is the target model’s training dataset.

We first compute the percentage of 7-gram overlap for non-




Figure 4. Distributions of 7-gram overlap of non-member data over select domains. Unlike other domains, Github has a very high overlap.

members against the entire Pile member set (Figure 4)⁶; see Appendix B.1 for implementation details. We observe high n -gram overlap with training data for a substantial portion of non-members; for example, the Pile Wikipedia, ArXiv, and PubMed Central domains have average 7-gram overlaps of 32.5%, 39.3%, and 41.0%, respectively. Domains such as GitHub, DM Mathematics, and FreeLaw see even higher overlap, with mean 7-gram overlap of 76.9%, 72.8%, and 62.3%, respectively, in line with existing n -gram analysis of the Pile (Gao et al., 2020).

Owing to the nature of generative LM training, a high n -gram overlap may also imply that substrings of non-members may, in fact, be seen exactly during training, which makes the distinction between members and non-members even less clear. To verify our hypothesis, we resample non-members ensuring $\leq 20\%$ n -gram overlap with members, and report MIA performance (Table 3). While this step is designed to eliminate instances of non-member records that may overlap with training records (and thus be ambiguous in their membership labels), it also introduces an explicit drift between the distribution of member and non-member records by selecting datapoints that are most “unlike” training records. We clarify that this step is not a suggestion for researchers to alter their benchmarks, and acknowledge that such a processing step drifts away from the standard membership inference game (Yeom et al., 2018). Here, we simply seek to demonstrate characteristics of n -gram overlap and how they impact MIA performance.

Results. MIAs perform significantly better when the non-member distribution has a lower n -gram overlap e.g., $.516 \rightarrow .666$ in Wikipedia, $.690 \rightarrow .908$ in Github, and $.512 \rightarrow .792$ in PubMed Central for various attacks. This increase is even greater with smaller n . We speculate the stricter filter yields non-members where any repeated text from member data will be shorter and in unseen contexts, making them farther from member data and causing the model to assign even lower likelihoods. Note that decreas-

ing the n -gram overlap threshold, especially for smaller n , pushes the setting closer to distribution inference (Suri & Evans, 2022), since the distributions of ‘member’ and ‘non-member’ records are no longer the same. We further discuss outlier behavior in Appendix B.

We note that n -gram overlap is an intrinsic property of natural language rather than a problem of the Pile train-test split. These splits are already deduplicated at a document level, following standard practice in decontamination (Gao et al., 2020; Brown et al., 2020). Nonetheless, the repeating texts across distinct documents are fundamental and natural properties of domain data.

We also note that n -gram overlap distribution analysis can help assess how representative of a target domain a set of candidate non-members is when constructing MIA benchmarks. Ultimately, we highlight the need to consider the qualities of the data domain, such as n -gram overlap, and understand their potential impact on observed MIA performance trends.

6. Importance of Candidate Set Selection

In contrast to our findings in §4, recent works report state-of-the-art MIAs achieving $> .7$ AUC ROC on pretrained LLMs (Shi et al., 2023; Meeus et al., 2023). Our in-depth investigation highlights one such reason for the differences is due to an inherent but likely unintended distribution shift between members and non-members during MIA benchmark construction for pretrained LLMs. This differs from a standard MI game, where members and non-members are sampled from the same distribution. In empirical works, researchers have a known set of members and then generate non-members some other way. Subtle differences between the member and non-member distributions can provide a false sense of membership inference leakage.

Experimental Setup. Prior work (Shi et al., 2023; Meeus et al., 2023) distinguishes members and non-members of a target domain based on the knowledge cutoff date of the tar-

⁶Figure 15 shows n -gram overlap distributions for other n

Table 4. MIA results on the temporally shifted Wikipedia benchmark across various MIAs. Target models are the PYTHIA-DEDUP suite models. For each model, the highest score across MIAs is bolded. AUC-ROC reported.

# Params	Temporal Wiki			
	LOSS	Ref	min-k	zlib
160M	.643	.602	.648	.541
1.4B	.653	.705	.682	.572
2.8B	.667	.754	.701	.593
6.9B	.675	.788	.714	.601
12B	.680	.796	.719	.607

get model, with members coming before and non-members coming after the cutoff. We construct similar experimental settings under two domains. See Appendix A.3.2 for details.

We follow the same setup⁷ in §3 on the Wikipedia domain, but replace the non-member set with samples from the entire RealTimeData WikiText dataset (Li et al., 2023c). We note that Pile members are sampled from articles in a Wikipedia dump from before 03/01/2020 (Gao et al., 2020), whereas non-members consist of Wikipedia articles created from August 2023 and onwards. Secondly, we use the ArXiv domain, where we again use members from the Pile training data, consisting of Arxiv papers posted prior to July 2020 (Gao et al., 2020). For non-members, we sample data from ArXiv preprints from various month-long ranges from August 2020 to June 2023. By sampling non-members from successively later time ranges after the Pile ArXiv cutoff date (July 2020) (Gao et al., 2020), we seek to explore how greater temporal shift impacts MIA performance.

Results. Table 4 demonstrates that the temporally shifted settings yield MIA performances significantly higher than when members and non-members are from the same temporal range. Figure 5 also demonstrates that MIA performance generally increases as the non-members are further temporally shifted from the member data. We speculate this follows from changes in language such as the introduction of new terminology and ideas as time passes.

Temporal Shift as Change in n-gram Overlap. We interpret temporal shift as a change in n-gram overlap distribution between the original and temporally shifted non-members. Figure 6 demonstrates that the distribution of 7-gram overlap of temporally-shifted non-members concentrates at lower overlap percentages compared to their natural counterparts. The natural Wikipedia non-members have an average 7-gram overlap of 39.3%, whereas for the temporally shifted

⁷For experiments beyond this point, we do not evaluate the Neighborhood attack, as it follows similar trends to other attacks and is computationally too expensive to compute.




Figure 5. MIA performance across benchmarks where non-member data is selected from ArXiv preprints created during increasingly later months past the target model’s knowledge cutoff. Timestamps are formatted as year-month. The target model is PYTHIA-DEDUP-12B. In general, **MIA performance increases as the temporal shift of non-members increases**

Wikipedia non-members it is 13.9%. See Appendix B.4 and Figure 10 for temporal ArXiv.




Figure 6. Distribution of 7-gram overlap for temporally-shifted Wikipedia non-members. We additionally plot the 7-gram overlap distribution of the original Pile Wikipedia non-members

In general, when aiming to assess MIA performance in the classical setting, we advise estimating how representative a sample non-member set is of the member domain by comparing its n-gram overlap distribution with that of a left-out sample set from the pretraining corpora. Particularly, if the distribution of the candidate set is noticeably shifted towards lower n-gram overlap compared to the left-out member sample set, the candidate non-member set may not be representative of the member distribution from the target domain and potentially high MIA performances should be carefully examined. Closer inspection (Table 7, Appendix) reveals the extent of such over-estimation. For instance, when using decision thresholds derived using temporally-shifted non-members, we observe that the FPR for non-shifted non-members is much higher—the thresholds are thus testing for temporal shift rather than membership. We note that distinguishing between members and temporally shifted

non-members is a realistic inference game with practical implications, but often differs from the classical MI game as the temporally-shifted non-members belong to a different distribution.

7. Edited Members

The way membership is defined in the standard membership game treats information leakage as a binary outcome. While metrics are aggregated over multiple records/instances to provide a sense of “how” much is leaked, the binary membership outcome itself may be at odds with what adversaries and privacy auditors care about—information leakage. This is especially true for generative models, where guessing the membership of some record via other sufficiently close records can be useful. For instance, consider the following examples:

- Guessing somebody’s email X@Y may be just as bad as guessing the entire email, since the final suffix like .COM or .EDU can either be enumerated easily, or guessed based on context.
- Any paraphrase of a sentence like “We are planning to launch our product in Q2, 2025” may be acceptable as long as it preserves the information regarding the product launch timeline, even if the paraphrase has a significant lexical difference. For instance, “Q2 2025 is when we will release it”.

Note that standard notions of Differential Privacy (Dwork et al., 2006) do not immediately protect against such cases, since records being tested for membership are not, in the literal sense, members. We explore two methods of constructing such “sufficiently close” records- by preserving lexical distance, or by generating semantically-close records.

Lexical Distance. We start with a simple experiment—generating modified member records by replacing n random tokens in a given record with tokens randomly sampled from the model’s vocabulary. We repeat this for multiple values of n (20 trials per n) and visualize the distribution for MIA scores using LOSS and Reference-based attacks (Figure 7). The distribution of scores depends on the kind of attack we inspect. For LOSS attack, the absence of any difficulty calibration leads to distinct loss distributions, suggesting that the model is “surprised” when it sees random tokens in places where they shouldn’t be, leading to a shifted distribution of scores. Reference-based attack, on the other hand, has a distribution of modified members nearly indistinguishable from both members and non-members for values of n as high as 10, further reinforcing the ambiguity of such records—should they be considered members, or non-members? Only when the edit distances get higher

($n = 25, 100$) does a distinction in the distributions emerge, which is expected as a growing number of random token replacements is likely to generate unnatural text.

Table 5. FPR (%) on modified members from the Pile when using a score threshold that achieves a 1, 5, or 10% FPR on the original member and non-member data, for edit-distances $n = \{1, 10, 25\}$ on ArXiv and Wikipedia domains. The target model is PYTHIA-DEDUP-12B. Reference-based attack is used. For LOSS attack as well as $n = 100$, FPR values are 0 across all tested FPR rates and values of n . **For n as low as 1, FPR is really low, suggesting records off by one token would be classified as non-members.**

Domain	1%			5%			10%		
	1	10	25	1	10	25	1	10	25
ArXiv	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.7	0.3	0.2
Wikipedia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.6	0.4	0.1

We also compute the thresholds that correspond to a certain FPR for actual member and non-member data and using these thresholds, we compute the FPR on these modified members. We consider these modified members as “non-members”, which they are, in the technical sense⁸. As visible in Table 5, these modified members have extremely low FPRs for edit distance (n) as low as 1, suggesting that these records would be classified as non-members by the MIA, even though from the perspective of information leakage such a record is, for all practical purposes, a member. There is thus, at the very least, a need to rethink membership for records that have extremely low lexical distance from actual training members, though even membership at higher lexical distances is important when considering what information is still leaked in the unperturbed portions.

Semantic Distance. Larger values of n in edit-distance yield wildly different MIA scores, which is expected as the token replacements are random. While a small edit distance suggests closeness in meaning, a higher edit distance does not necessarily imply loss of semantics. We compute MIA scores for neighbors generated for member samples as part of the Neighborhood attack for the Wikipedia and ArXiv benchmarks and repeat the above pipeline. Visualizing the scores shows how the modified members are not too far from member score distributions, especially for the Reference attack (Figure 8). We repeat the same FPR experiment as edit-distance-based modified members. While the FPR for these semantically close records is noticeably higher than records close by edit distance, the false positive rates are still low (Table 6). These results suggest that even semantically close members would be classified as non-members which, although they technically are, may be as useful as actual

⁸We perform token replacements at random with random tokens, so it is unlikely that these edited tokens are also actually members.

Do Membership Inference Attacks Work on Large Language Models?




Figure 7. Distribution of scores for LOSS and Reference-based attacks for members, non-members, and modified members (generated for varying edit-distances in token space), across ArXiv and Wikipedia domains. LOSS MIA score distributions are significantly distinct for n as low as 10, suggesting these models are extremely sensitive to random token swaps. At the same time for Reference-based MIA, Github seems to be more resilient to token swaps, likely owing to the nature of data from this domain (more code than natural language).

members depending on the goal of the inference and the semantic information preserved.

Table 6. FPR (%) on modified members from the Pile when using a score threshold that achieves a 1, 5, or 10% FPR on the original member and non-member data, for semantically close members on ArXiv and Wikipedia domains. The target model is PYTHIA-DEDUP-12B. LOSS and Reference-based attack reported. **Compared to members close based on edit-distance, semantically close neighbors have higher FPR, although the rates are still quite low.**

Domain	LOSS			Ref		
	1%	5%	10%	1%	5%	10%
ArXiv	0.0	0.8	2.5	0.7	1.9	4.0
Wikipedia	0.0	0.5	2.3	0.4	3.0	8.2

While it is not surprising that semantically close neighbors have MIA scores more similar to actual records than randomly-replaced tokens, it is clear that an ideal distance function should combine the benefits of lexical distance and semantics— being resilient to both typographical errors and paraphrases within some defined acceptable limit. Such observations also motivate a fully semantic MI game, where a neighbor member may be defined by its proximity to an exact member in a semantic embedding space. This may provide a clearer interpretation of knowledge leakage than lexical matching, especially when samples naturally have high lexical (i.e., n -gram) overlap.




Figure 8. Distribution of scores for LOSS and Reference-based attacks for members, non-members, and modified members (generated) for semantically close neighbors (5) generated using the Neighborhood attack, across ArXiv and Wikipedia domains. Despite being possibly high edit-distances (5% of all tokens replaced), MIA score distributions are closer to actual members and non-members, especially for Reference-based attack.

8. Related Work

Membership Inference Attacks (MIAs) are often used as a proxy to determine whether a machine-learning model leaks too much information (Shokri et al., 2017; Shokri, 2022; Cummings et al., 2024). More involved approaches include training shadow models (target model imitations) (Shokri et al., 2017; Ye et al., 2022) on non-overlapping data from the same underlying data distribution as the target model. While attacks like LiRA (Carlini et al., 2022) show promise in traditional MI settings, they require training multiple copies of shadow models, which is often intractable for LLMs. Other stronger assumptions for MIAs may include access to a set of known members/non-members (i.e., for training shadow models, determining scoring thresholds, etc.) or white-box access to the model (i.e., access to model weights or hidden states to supplement MIAs).

Membership Inference vs. Data Extraction. MIA advantage is frequently used as a measure of information leakage (Shokri, 2022; Shokri et al., 2017; Mireshghallah et al., 2022a) and a proxy for measuring memorization (Carlini et al., 2021; Mireshghallah et al., 2022b). However, the notion of ‘extractability’ of training samples has recently become synonymous with memorization and is increasingly used to compare memorization across models (Biderman et al., 2023a; Carlini et al., 2023; Tirumala et al., 2022). Kandpal et al. (2022) investigated the impact of factors such as training data deduplication on extractability in a similar vein to our work on MIA. With extraction, a prefix is used as a prompt to measure the memorization of a sequence by comparing the resulting generation against the suffix. Both MIA and extraction are useful techniques for studying leakage in models, but rely on different assumptions and reveal different types of leakage risks. While MIAs require knowledge of candidates and only reveal directly which of those candidates are included in the training data, extraction requires knowledge of sufficient-length prefixes to perform

extraction and additional measures to determine if extracted texts are valid.

9. Future Work

We explore potential avenues for future research building upon our findings, and identify some limitations.

Impact of Other Innate Characteristics. Other factors inherent to attacking LLMs, such as the diversity of training data (Gao et al., 2020; Together AI, 2023; Soldaini et al., 2023), may also contribute to the difficulty of membership inference against LLMs. State-of-the-art LLMs are trained on highly diverse data, rather than being domain-specific. Existing work points to more diverse data contributing to better generalization (Longpre et al., 2023). It is thus likely that increased pre-training data diversity can lower vulnerability to MIAs.

Membership Ambiguity. The high overlap between member and non-member samples from the same domain creates ambiguity in determining membership status. Non-members sharing high overlap with members may not be members by exact match standards but may contain meaningful identifiers that leak information about the member data. On the other hand, lexical similarity doesn’t imply semantic similarity; non-members with high overlap may still be significantly distinguishable from member data. There is thus a need, especially for generative models, to consider membership not just for exact records but for a neighborhood around records, where this neighborhood may be defined by a domain-specific distance function d . Membership for a record x then holds true for some training dataset D if $\exists y \in D, d(x, y) < t$. Our experiments with member records within lexical and semantic distance (§7) further highlight this ambiguity, where even existing MIA score distributions overlap significantly. We hope such a reinterpretation will help disentangle the impacts of lexical and

semantic similarity on membership leakage.

10. Conclusion

We shed light on the difficulty of membership inference against LLMs from the lens of an adversary. Our results suggest two possibilities: (1) data does not leave much of an imprint, owing to characteristics of the pre-training process at scale, such as large datasets and single-epoch training, and (2) the similarity between in and out members (which we demonstrate via n -gram overlap), coupled with huge datasets, makes this distinction fuzzy, even for an oracle. Having a better understanding of the first possibility is especially critical for privacy audits. While it may be possible to increase leakage via stronger attacks (Casper et al., 2024) in such a scenario, the second scenario requires rethinking the membership game itself. Our empirical results suggest that both of these might be confounding factors while measuring leakage. The membership inference game needs to be extended for such generative models to better align with information leakage that adversaries and auditors may care about. While data extraction (Carlini et al., 2023; Grynbaum & Mac, 2023; Chang et al., 2023) takes a right step in this direction, the fraction of such data is relatively tiny and the adversary has no control over what training data is regurgitated. In the meanwhile, special care should thus be taken to avoid unintentional distributional shifts while constructing non-members for MIA benchmark construction.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Nicholas Carlini for comments on early drafts of this paper. This research is supported in part by DARPA SemaFor Program No. HR001120C0123, and grants from the National Science Foundation through the AI Institute for Agent-based Cyber Threat Intelligence and Operation (#2229876), Center for Trustworthy Machine Learning (#1804603) and the DARPA MCS program through NIWC Pacific (N66001-19-2-4031).

This work is also supported in part by the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI), Intelligence Advanced Research Projects Activity (IARPA), via the HIATUS Program contract #2022-22072200004. The views and conclusions contained herein are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the official policies, either expressed or implied, of ODNI, IARPA, or the U.S. Government. The U.S. Government is authorized to reproduce and distribute reprints for governmental purposes notwithstanding any copyright annotation therein.

References

- Abadi, M., Chu, A., Goodfellow, I., McMahan, H. B., Mironov, I., Talwar, K., and Zhang, L. Deep learning with differential privacy. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS'16*. ACM, October 2016. doi: 10.1145/2976749.2978318. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2976749.2978318>.
- Andonian, A., Anthony, Q., Biderman, S., Black, S., Gali, P., Gao, L., Hallahan, E., Levy-Kramer, J., Leahy, C., Nestler, L., Parker, K., Pieler, M., Phang, J., Purohit, S., Schoelkopf, H., Stander, D., Songz, T., Tigges, C., Thérien, B., Wang, P., and Weinbach, S. GPT-NeoX: Large Scale Autoregressive Language Modeling in PyTorch, 2023. URL <https://www.github.com/eleutherai/gpt-neox>.
- Bertran, M. A., Tang, S., Roth, A., Kearns, M., Morgenstern, J. H., and Wu, S. Scalable membership inference attacks via quantile regression. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.
- Biderman, S., Prashanth, U. S., Sutawika, L., Schoelkopf, H., Anthony, Q., Purohit, S., and Raf, E. Emergent and predictable memorization in large language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023a.
- Biderman, S., Schoelkopf, H., Anthony, Q., Bradley, H., O'Brien, K., Hallahan, E., Khan, M. A., Purohit, S., Prashanth, U. S., Raff, E., et al. Pythia: A Suite for Analyzing Large Language Models Across Training and Scaling. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023b.
- Black, S., Leo, G., Wang, P., Leahy, C., and Biderman, S. GPT-Neo: Large Scale Autoregressive Language Modeling with Mesh-Tensorflow, 2021. URL <http://github.com/eleutherai/gpt-neo>.
- Brown, T. B., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., et al. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020.
- Carlini, N., Liu, C., Erlingsson, Ú., Kos, J., and Song, D. The Secret Sharer: Evaluating and Testing Unintended Memorization in Neural Networks. In *USENIX Security Symposium*, 2019.
- Carlini, N., Tramer, F., Wallace, E., Jagielski, M., Herbert-Voss, A., Lee, K., Roberts, A., Brown, T. B., Song, D., Erlingsson, U., et al. Extracting Training Data from Large Language Models. In *USENIX Security Symposium*, 2021.

- Carlini, N., Chien, S., Nasr, M., Song, S., Terzis, A., and Tramer, F. Membership Inference Attacks From First Principles. In *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, 2022.
- Carlini, N., Ippolito, D., Jagielski, M., Lee, K., Tramer, F., and Zhang, C. Quantifying memorization across neural language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- Casper, S., Ezell, C., Siegmann, C., Kolt, N., Curtis, T. L., Bucknall, B., Haupt, A., Wei, K., Scheurer, J., Hobbhahn, M., Sharkey, L., Krishna, S., Hagen, M. V., Alberti, S., Chan, A., Sun, Q., Gerovitch, M., Bau, D., Tegmark, M., Krueger, D., and Hadfield-Menell, D. Black-box access is insufficient for rigorous ai audits. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14446*, 2024.
- Chang, K. K., Cramer, M., Soni, S., and Bamman, D. Speak, Memory: An Archaeology of Books Known to ChatGPT/GPT-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.00118*, 2023.
- Chen, D., Yu, N., and Fritz, M. Relaxloss: Defending membership inference attacks without losing utility. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- Cummings, R., Desfontaines, D., Evans, D., Geambasu, R., Huang, Y., Rogers, R., Jagielski, M., Kairouz, P., Kamath, G., Oh, S., Ohrimenko, O., Papernot, N., Shen, M., Song, S., Su, W., Terzis, A., Thakurta, A., Vassilvitskii, S., Wang, Y.-X., Xiong, L., Yekhanin, S., Yu, D., Zhang, H., and Zhang, W. Advancing differential privacy: Where we are now and future directions for real-world deployment. *Harvard Data Science Review*, Jan 2024. URL <https://doi.org/10.1162/99608f92.d3197524>.
- Devlin, J., Chang, M.-W., Lee, K., and Toutanova, K. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding, 2019.
- Dwork, C., McSherry, F., Nissim, K., and Smith, A. Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis. In *Proceedings of the Third Conference on Theory of Cryptography*, TCC'06, pp. 265–284, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006. Springer-Verlag. ISBN 3540327312. doi: 10.1007/11681878_14. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/11681878_14.
- Fu, W., Wang, H., Gao, C., Liu, G., Li, Y., and Jiang, T. Practical membership inference attacks against fine-tuned large language models via self-prompt calibration, 2023.
- Gao, L., Biderman, S., Black, S., Golding, L., Hoppe, T., Foster, C., Phang, J., He, H., Thite, A., Nabeshima, N., et al. The Pile: An 800GB Dataset of Diverse Text for Language Modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00027*, 2020.
- Groeneveld, D., Ha, C., and Magnusson, I. BFF: The big friendly filter, 2023. URL <https://github.com/allenai/bff>.
- Grynbaum, M. M. and Mac, R. The times sues openai and microsoft over a.i. use of copyrighted work. <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/12/27/business/media/new-york-times-open-ai-microsoft-lawsuit.html>, 2023. Accessed: 2023-12-30.
- Hoffmann, J., Borgeaud, S., Mensch, A., Buchatskaya, E., Cai, T., Rutherford, E., de Las Casas, D., Hendricks, L. A., Welbl, J., Clark, A., et al. An empirical analysis of compute-optimal large language model training. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- Jagielski, M., Thakkar, O., Tramèr, F., Ippolito, D., Lee, K., Carlini, N., Wallace, E., Song, S., Thakurta, A., Papernot, N., and Zhang, C. Measuring forgetting of memorized training examples. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- Kandpal, N., Wallace, E., and Raffel, C. Deduplicating Training Data Mitigates Privacy Risks in Language Models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2022.
- Komatsuzaki, A. One epoch is all you need. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.06669*, 2019.
- Lee, K., Ippolito, D., Nystrom, A., Zhang, C., Eck, D., Callison-Burch, C., and Carlini, N. Deduplicating training data makes language models better. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, 2022.
- Lehman, E., Jain, S., Pichotta, K., Goldberg, Y., and Wallace, B. Does BERT Pretrained on Clinical Notes Reveal Sensitive Data? In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, 2021.
- Li, M., Wang, J., Wang, J., and Neel, S. Mope: Model perturbation-based privacy attacks on language models. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2023a.
- Li, R., Allal, L. B., Zi, Y., Muennighoff, N., Kocetkov, D., Mou, C., Marone, M., Akiki, C., Li, J., Chim, J., Liu, Q., Zheltonozhskii, E., Zhuo, T. Y., Wang, T., Dehaene, O., Davaadorj, M., Lamy-Poirier, J., Monteiro, J., Shliazhko, O., Gontier, N., Meade, N., Zebaze, A., Yee, M.-H., Umapathi, L. K., Zhu, J., Lipkin, B., Oblokulov, M., Wang,

- Z., Murthy, R., Stillerman, J., Patel, S. S., Abulkhanov, D., Zocca, M., Dey, M., Zhang, Z., Fahmy, N., Bhat-tacharyya, U., Yu, W., Singh, S., Luccioni, S., Villegas, P., Kunakov, M., Zhdanov, F., Romero, M., Lee, T., Timor, N., Ding, J., Schlesinger, C., Schoelkopf, H., Ebert, J., Dao, T., Mishra, M., Gu, A., Robinson, J., Anderson, C. J., Dolan-Gavitt, B., Contractor, D., Reddy, S., Fried, D., Bahdanau, D., Jernite, Y., Ferrandis, C. M., Hughes, S., Wolf, T., Guha, A., von Werra, L., and de Vries, H. Starcoder: may the source be with you! *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06161*, 2023b.
- Li, Y., Guerin, F., and Lin, C. Avoiding data contamination in language model evaluation: Dynamic test construction with latest materials, 2023c.
- Longpre, S., Yauney, G., Reif, E., Lee, K., Roberts, A., Zoph, B., Zhou, D., Wei, J., Robinson, K., Mimno, D., et al. A pretrainer’s guide to training data: Measuring the effects of data age, domain coverage, quality, & toxicity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13169*, 2023.
- Lukas, N., Salem, A., Sim, R., Tople, S., Wutschitz, L., and Zanella-Béguelin, S. Analyzing Leakage of Personally Identifiable Information in Language Models. In *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, 2023.
- Mattern, J., Mireshghallah, F., Jin, Z., Schoelkopf, B., Sachan, M., and Berg-Kirkpatrick, T. Membership Inference Attacks against Language Models via Neighbourhood Comparison. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, 2023.
- Meeus, M., Jain, S., Rei, M., and de Montjoye, Y.-A. Did the neurons read your book? document-level membership inference for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.15007*, 2023.
- Min, S., Gururangan, S., Wallace, E., Hajishirzi, H., Smith, N. A., and Zettlemoyer, L. SILO Language Models: Isolating Legal Risk in a Nonparametric Datastore. *Regulatable ML Workshop at NeurIPS*, 2023.
- Mireshghallah, F., Goyal, K., Uniyal, A., Berg-Kirkpatrick, T., and Shokri, R. Quantifying Privacy Risks of Masked Language Models Using Membership Inference Attacks. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2022a.
- Mireshghallah, F., Uniyal, A., Wang, T., Evans, D., and Berg-Kirkpatrick, T. An Empirical Analysis of Memorization in Fine-tuned Autoregressive Language Models. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2022b.
- Muennighoff, N., Rush, A. M., Barak, B., Scao, T. L., Piktus, A., Tazi, N., Pyysalo, S., Wolf, T., and Raffel, C. Scaling data-constrained language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.
- Nakamura, Y., Hanaoka, S., Nomura, Y., Hayashi, N., Abe, O., Yada, S., Wakamiya, S., and Aramaki, E. KART: Parameterization of Privacy Leakage Scenarios from Pre-trained Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00036*, 2020.
- Nakkiran, P., Kaplun, G., Bansal, Y., Yang, T., Barak, B., and Sutskever, I. Deep double descent: Where bigger models and more data hurt. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2021(12), 2021.
- Oren, Y., Meister, N., Chatterji, N., Ladhak, F., and Hashimoto, T. B. Proving test set contamination in black box language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.17623*, 2023.
- Radford, A., Wu, J., Child, R., Luan, D., Amodei, D., Sutskever, I., et al. Language Models are Unsupervised Multitask Learners. *OpenAI blog*, 2019.
- Sablayrolles, A., Douze, M., Schmid, C., Ollivier, Y., and Jégou, H. White-box vs black-box: Bayes optimal strategies for membership inference. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2019.
- Sanh, V., Debut, L., Chaumond, J., and Wolf, T. Distilbert, a distilled version of bert: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter. In *NeurIPS EMC² Workshop*, 2019.
- Shi, W., Ajith, A., Xia, M., Huang, Y., Liu, D., Blevins, T., Chen, D., and Zettlemoyer, L. Detecting pretraining data from large language models. *Regulatable ML Workshop at NeurIPS*, 2023.
- Shokri, R. Auditing Data Privacy for Machine Learning. In *USENIX Security Symposium*, 2022.
- Shokri, R., Stronati, M., Song, C., and Shmatikov, V. Membership inference attacks against machine learning models. In *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, 2017.
- Soldaini, L., Kinney, R., Bhagia, A., Schwenk, D., Atkinson, D., Authur, R., Bogin, B., Chandu, K., Dumas, J., Elazar, Y., Hofmann, V., Jha, A. H., Kumar, S., Lucy, L., Lyu, X., Magnusson, I., Morrison, J., Muennighoff, N., Naik, A., Nam, C., Peters, M. E., Ravichander, A., Richardson, K., Shen, Z., Strubell, E., Subramani, N., Tafjord, O., Walsh, E. P., Hajishirzi, H., Smith, N. A., Zettlemoyer, L., Beltagy, I., Groeneveld, D., Dodge, J., and Lo, K. Dolma: An Open Corpus of Three Trillion Tokens for Language Model Pretraining Research. *arXiv preprint*, 2023.
- Steinke, T., Nasr, M., and Jagielski, M. Privacy auditing with one (1) training run. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.

- Suri, A. and Evans, D. Formalizing and estimating distribution inference risks. In *Privacy Enhancing Technologies Symposium*, 2022.
- Tang, X., Mahloujifar, S., Song, L., Shejwalkar, V., Nasr, M., Houmansadr, A., and Mittal, P. Mitigating membership inference attacks by self-distillation through a novel ensemble architecture. In *USENIX Security Symposium*, 2022.
- Team, M. N. Introducing mpt-7b: A new standard for open-source, commercially usable llms. www.mosaicml.com/blog/mpt-7b, 2023. Accessed: 2024-01-11.
- Tirumala, K., Markosyan, A., Zettlemoyer, L., and Aghajanyan, A. Memorization without overfitting: Analyzing the training dynamics of large language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- Together AI. Redpajama: an open dataset for training large language models, 2023. URL <https://github.com/togethercomputer/RedPajama-Data>.
- Touvron, H., Lavril, T., Izacard, G., Martinet, X., Lachaux, M.-A., Lacroix, T., Rozière, B., Goyal, N., Hambro, E., Azhar, F., Rodriguez, A., Joulin, A., Grave, E., and Lample, G. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models, 2023a.
- Touvron, H., Martin, L., Stone, K., Albert, P., Almahairi, A., Babaei, Y., Bashlykov, N., Batra, S., Bhargava, P., Bhosale, S., Bikel, D., Blecher, L., Ferrer, C. C., Chen, M., Cucurull, G., Esiobu, D., Fernandes, J., Fu, J., Fu, W., Fuller, B., Gao, C., Goswami, V., Goyal, N., Hartshorn, A., Hosseini, S., Hou, R., Inan, H., Kardas, M., Kerkez, V., Khabsa, M., Kloumann, I., Korenev, A., Koura, P. S., Lachaux, M.-A., Lavril, T., Lee, J., Liskovich, D., Lu, Y., Mao, Y., Martinet, X., Mihaylov, T., Mishra, P., Molybog, I., Nie, Y., Poulton, A., Reizenstein, J., Rungta, R., Saladi, K., Schelten, A., Silva, R., Smith, E. M., Subramanian, R., Tan, X. E., Tang, B., Taylor, R., Williams, A., Kuan, J. X., Xu, P., Yan, Z., Zarov, I., Zhang, Y., Fan, A., Kambadur, M., Narang, S., Rodriguez, A., Stojnic, R., Edunov, S., and Scialom, T. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models, 2023b.
- Tow, J. Stablelm alpha v2 models, 2023. URL [<https://huggingface.co/stabilityai/stablelm-base-alpha-3b-v2>] (<https://huggingface.co/stabilityai/stablelm-base-alpha-3b-v2>).
- Watson, L., Guo, C., Cormode, G., and Sablayrolles, A. On the importance of difficulty calibration in membership inference attacks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- Ye, J., Maddi, A., Murakonda, S. K., Bindschaedler, V., and Shokri, R. Enhanced Membership Inference Attacks against Machine Learning Models. In *The ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2022.
- Yeom, S., Giacomelli, I., Fredrikson, M., and Jha, S. Privacy Risk in Machine Learning: Analyzing the Connection to Overfitting. In *2018 IEEE 31st Computer Security Foundations Symposium (CSF)*, 2018.
- Zarifzadeh, S., Liu, P., and Shokri, R. Low-cost high-power membership inference by boosting relativity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.03262*, 2023.
- Zhang, S., Roller, S., Goyal, N., Artetxe, M., Chen, M., Chen, S., Dewan, C., Diab, M., Li, X., Lin, X. V., Mihaylov, T., Ott, M., Shleifer, S., Shuster, K., Simig, D., Koura, P. S., Sridhar, A., Wang, T., and Zettlemoyer, L. Opt: Open pre-trained transformer language models, 2022.

A. Implementation details

A.1. MIMIR

We release our codebase as a Python package (available at <http://github.com/iamgroot42/mimir>), complete with documentation and tests, for implementing and evaluating membership inference attacks for language models. The data used in our experiments is also available via HuggingFace (<https://huggingface.co/datasets/iamgroot42/mimir>). Some features of the package include:

- A base attack class that provides bare-bones code and helper functions that can be easily used in implementations of both existing and new attacks.
- Data processing utilities to filter and cache data for membership evaluation, from both provided and available sources.
- Implementation of a vast array of models that can be used as target or reference models.

The entire codebase works with modular configuration files, allowing multiple experiments to be run simultaneously with no edits to the code itself. We used Python 3.9.7 for our experiments, with PyTorch 2.0.1. Our experiments were executed on a mix of machines, with GPUs ranging from RTX6k to A100.

A.2. Additional Target Model Details

PYTHIA-DEDUP. Both the PYTHIA and PYTHIA-DEDUP model suites provide intermediate checkpoints for each model. For experiments targeting the PYTHIA-DEDUP model, as the PYTHIA-DEDUP model is trained for greater than 1 epoch, we select the checkpoint that most closely matches the one epoch mark over the deduplicated Pile. We decide this is checkpoint 'step99000'. For experiments targeting the non-deduped PYTHIA models, we use the final checkpoint, which sees just under one (≈ 0.9) epoch of the original Pile.

SILO. The models from the SILO suite (Min et al., 2023) consist of 1.3B-parameter transformer LMs based on the OpenLM implementation of the LLaMA architecture (Touvron et al., 2023a). These are trained on the Open License Corpus, which consists of permissively-licensed text data classified as either **public domain** (PD) texts, **permissively licensed software** (SW), or under an **attribution license** (BY). We target the SILO-PDSW model (alongside its intermediate checkpoints) trained on only texts classified as PD or SW with domains contributing less than 5% of the data upsampled by a factor of 3x (which includes HackerNews and DM Mathematics).

DATABLATIONS. The DATABLATIONS suite (Muennighoff et al., 2023) is a large collection of models trained to study scaling laws in data-constrained regimes. They vary in the extent of data repetition and compute budget, ranging up to 900 billion training tokens and 9 billion parameters. For the epoch experiment, we choose the 2.8B-parameter subset of models, with each seeing a total of 55B tokens from the C4 dataset across their training runs. These models vary in the number of epochs their training subset is seen, ranging from one to 14 epochs. They also offer a model trained for 44 epochs, which we decided to leave out of evaluation.

GPT-NEO. is a collection of 125M-, 1.3B-, and 2.7B-parameter models of similar architecture to the GPT-3 model family. These models are trained on the Pile for about 300B tokens, similar to the PYTHIA suite. This model suite is a precursor to the GPT-NEOX (Andonian et al., 2023) model architecture, which PYTHIA-DEDUP and PYTHIA are built on. Noticeable differences include the tokenizer used per model suite, with the GPT-NEOX allocating additional tokens to whitespace characters, as well as intended training settings, with GPT-NEO geared towards TPU training and GPT-NEOX GPU training.

A.3. Benchmark Details

We sample 1,000 members and non-members from each target domain from the Pile train and test sets, respectively. We do the same for the aggregate Pile experiment, except we sample 10,000 members and non-members each from the complete Pile train and test sets. We sample documents greater than 100 words and truncate them up to 200 words from the beginning to create our benchmark examples. Previous work (Shi et al., 2023) observes that sample length correlates with performance, so we bound the sample length to reduce its impact while picking a reasonable threshold so that our samples are likely to contain ample signal.

For our additional decontamination, we follow (Groeneveld et al., 2023), which uses a bloom filter to check for n -gram inclusion. We keep the default filtering settings of $n = 13$ and a threshold of $\leq 80\%$ overlap. Further details about setting up the bloom filter can be found in Appendix B.1

A.3.1. TRAINING DATA SIZE BENCHMARKS

For each model, we pick checkpoints every 5000 steps ending at step 95000, with each step corresponding to 1024 samples of length 2048 tokens. We also include checkpoints at step 1000 and step 99000, the closest checkpoint to the step where one full epoch of the deduplicated Pile was seen. For each checkpoint, we use the same non-member set for evaluation consisting of 1000 samples sampled from the entire Pile test set. We then construct a member set for each checkpoint⁹: for the checkpoint at step n , we sample 1000 random samples from documents seen within the range step $\{n - 100, n\}$. EleutherAI provides random seeding for deterministic training data order across the PYTHIA-DEDUP training runs, which we use to determine the seen document order. This allows us to determine which documents to sample from for a given step range. For both members and non-members, we sample with the same criterion as the general experiments above.

A.3.2. TEMPORAL BENCHMARKS

For the temporal Wikipedia benchmark non-members, we collect samples from the RealTimeData "wikitext_latest" dataset (Li et al., 2023c). This yielded Wikipedia articles created between the week of August 12, 2023 till the week of January 8, 2024¹⁰. We then follow Pile processing steps by simply appending the article titles to the front of each respective article with a "\n\n". Members are sampled from the Wikipedia subdomain of the Pile training set. Members and non-members are then sampled with the same criterion as in the general experiments.

For the temporal ArXiv benchmarks, we use the ArXiv API again following Li et al. (2023c) to collect ArXiv preprints from specific months: August 2020, January 2021, June 2021, January 2022, June 2022, January 2023, and June 2023¹¹. We then apply the same processing steps used in the Pile (Gao et al., 2020). This mainly involves converting the latex sources for a given preprint into a single Markdown file, and then filtering out documents such as those with conversion errors. For each month range, we sample non-members from processed files in the given date range. The member set for each benchmark is fixed and sampled from the ArXiv subdomain of the Pile training set. We again sample both members and non-members with the same criterion as in the general experiments.

Table 7. FPR (%) on non-members from the Pile (original; not temporally shifted) on various attacks when using a score threshold that achieves a 1, 5, or 10% FPR on the temporally-shifted ArXiv (for varying levels of temporal shift) and Wikipedia benchmarks. The target model is PYTHIA-DEDUP-12B. **FPRs on the original non-members are much higher than the thresholded FPR on the temporally shifted benchmarks**, indicating that such thresholds may be moreso classifying temporal shift rather than member and non-members.

Thresholding Benchmark	1%				5%				10%			
	LOSS	Ref	min- k	zlib	LOSS	Ref	min- k	zlib	LOSS	Ref	min- k	zlib
2020-08	3.2	4.2	4.5	3.7	12.6	13.4	13.5	13.8	24.1	23.3	24.6	20.2
2021-01	3.7	3.9	3.5	3.5	11.4	15.8	13.5	10.4	21.7	27.0	24.6	17.5
2021-06	3.2	4.2	5.7	5.4	14.4	16.0	15.7	13.6	25.5	25.5	29.5	23.0
2022-01	4.5	4.2	5.3	4.1	14.4	16.3	14.6	12.7	24.5	27.0	28.7	22.0
2022-06	2.8	3.9	3.1	2.5	10.3	18.1	13.1	10.7	23.4	27.8	25.4	20.6
2023-01	2.9	8.5	3.5	3.1	11.9	23.5	13.5	10.9	25.0	36.1	26.3	21.9
2023-06	5.8	9.4	5.5	5.8	15.6	22.7	19.1	14.1	26.3	37.3	27.8	22.2
Temporal Wiki	9.8	7.5	10.3	7.9	23.8	22.8	24.3	17.6	30.0	34.1	35.0	22.8

⁹Ideally, the member set should be fixed, which could be done by performing multiple training runs and injecting the fixed member set at various steps. However, this is computationally expensive. Furthermore, because of how the data is shuffled, we'd expect the difficulty of the member set to be reasonably consistent across our samples

¹⁰Note that while the articles are created in the recent time frame, the contents of the Wikipedia page aren't necessarily about recent topics, people, or events

¹¹This slightly differs from the Pile ArXiv data collection, which uses the ArXiv bulk access through S3. However, we believe both ArXiv bulk access and API should yield the preprints in the same manner regardless.

A.4. Attack Details

MIAs consider a target model \mathcal{M} , which outputs a probability distribution of the next token given a prefix, denoted as $P(x_t|x_1\dots x_{t-1}; \mathcal{M})$. Their goal is to model $f(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{M})$, which outputs a score for target sample $\mathbf{x} = x_1\dots x_n$ with n tokens. This score is then thresholded to determine the target sample’s membership in the training data of \mathcal{M} .

LOSS (Yeom et al., 2018; Carlini et al., 2019) considers the model’s computed loss over the target sample:

$$f(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{M}).$$

Reference-based (Sablayrolles et al., 2019; Watson et al., 2022) attacks assume access to a reference model \mathcal{M}_{ref} , another LM trained on a disjoint set of training data drawn from a similar distribution. In practice, an assumption of disjoint training data is impractical. Empirically, using an LM that is different from \mathcal{M} has been a reasonable choice and was used in prior work (Kandpal et al., 2022; Watson et al., 2022). The attack considers the membership score of the target sample by \mathcal{M} relative to the membership by \mathcal{M}_{ref} to calibrate the target model’s score given a difficulty estimate through the reference model’s score. For our experiments, we use LOSS as the uncalibrated membership score such that, for the reference-based attacks,

$$f(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{M}) - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{M}_{\text{ref}}).$$

This method exactly follows the method from (Watson et al., 2022) and is also largely similar to the offline Likelihood Ratio attack (LiRA; (Carlini et al., 2022)), although LiRA uses many reference models (often trained shadow models).

Zlib Entropy (Carlini et al., 2021) functions similarly to reference-based MIA, using the zlib compression size of a sample \mathbf{x} as a local difficulty threshold per sample:

$$f(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{M}) = \frac{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{M})}{\text{zlib}(\mathbf{x})},$$

where $\text{zlib}(\mathbf{x})$ is the length in bytes of the zlib compressed sample.

Neighborhood Attack (Mattern et al., 2023) assumes access to a masking model, and operates by generating “neighbor” texts $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ to a given text sequence \mathbf{x} by using the masking model to replace a percentage of randomly selected token spans while still maximizing the neighbor’s likelihood. If the sample’s loss is considerably lower than the neighbor’s losses, the difference is attributed to the target model overfitting the sample, and the sample is considered a training member. Formally, we have

$$f(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{M}) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{L}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i; \mathcal{M}).$$

We use BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) as our masking model of choice, with a masking percentage of 5%.

Min- $k\%$ Prob (Shi et al., 2023) is based on the intuition that non-member examples tend to have more tokens assigned lower likelihoods than member examples do. Given sample $\mathbf{x} = x_1, \dots, x_n$ and hyperparameter k , let $\text{min-}k(\mathbf{x})$ be the set formed by the $k\%$ of tokens in \mathbf{x} with minimum likelihood. We then have

$$f(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{M}) = \frac{1}{|\text{min-}k(\mathbf{x})|} \sum_{x_i \in \text{min-}k(\mathbf{x})} -\log(p(x_i | x_1, \dots, x_{i-1})).$$

We experiment with multiple different $k \in \{10, 20, 30, 40, 50\}$ as suggested in Shi et al. (2023), but settle on $k = 20$ for our experiments.

We compute the performance of each attack based on 1,000 bootstrap samples of the benchmark and report the average AUC ROC and TPR@low%FPR over the bootstraps.

A.5. Reference Model Choices

We choose a diverse set of reference models to experiment with. For the aggregate method over all reference models, we take the average of the scores per reference model for a target sample¹². We report results for our complete ablation on reference model choice in Table 8.

GPT-2 (Radford et al., 2019) is suite of pre-trained transformer trained on a large dataset of around 40GB of web text, likely overlapping with the Pile. We use the GPT-2-small variant with 124M parameters.

DISTILGPT2 (Sanh et al., 2019) is a smaller 82M-parameter model trained with the supervision of GPT-2-small using knowledge distillation.

OPT (Zhang et al., 2022) is a suite of open-sourced pre-trained transformers that are trained on a curated pre-training corpus including several datasets from the Pile, such as Wikipedia, DM Mathematics, and HackerNews. We use the 1.3B-parameter variant.

As mentioned in Appendix A.2, GPT-NEO (Black et al., 2021) is another suite of pre-trained transformers designed using EleutherAI’s replication of the GPT-3 architecture. These models are trained on the full Pile for a similar amount of tokens as PYTHIA (~ 300B), though the data seen may not necessarily be in the same order as the PYTHIA models. We use the 1.3B-parameter variant.

SILO-PDSWB (Min et al., 2023) is a 1.4B-parameter transformer pre-trained on all types of permissively licensed data in the Open License Corpus. The training data consists of certain Pile domains such as HackerNews and DM Mathematics.

LLAMA (Touvron et al., 2023a) is a collection of large, open-sourced pre-trained LMs ranging in size from 7B to 65B parameters. The pre-training corpus is on the scale of trillions of tokens, much larger than the Pile, and likely has significant overlap with the Pile. We use the 7B-parameter variant.

STABLELM-ALPHA-V2 (Tow, 2023) is a set of open-source pre-trained LMs also trained on a large pre-training corpus with trillions of tokens. Training is conducted in two stages, with the first stage seeing 1 trillion tokens of a mixture of data from sources such as RedPajama (Together AI, 2023) and the Pile, with an emphasis on refined web text. The second stage is trained on 100 billion tokens with a higher context length, increasingly sampling naturally long texts and adding the StarCoder (Li et al., 2023b) dataset. We use the 3B-parameter variant.

We also experiment with the non-deduped PYTHIA-DEDUP-1.4B model as a reference model to see how using a smaller version of the target model (same architecture and training data order) impacts reference-based attack performance (Carlini et al., 2021).

A.5.1. STABLELM-BASE-ALPHA-3B-V2 PERFORMANCE

We speculate that the slightly higher performance with STABLELM-BASE-ALPHA-3B-V2 as the reference model, even though its pre-training corpus has high overlap with the Pile, is because 1) larger target models¹³ such as the PYTHIA-DEDUP-12B model may considerably overfit certain member samples and 2) the STABLELM-BASE-ALPHA-3B-V2 is trained on a much larger corpus, which helps it generalize well and achieve similar losses as the target model on the non-member data. As a result, member samples are more likely to have a greater magnitude of difference between the target and reference model losses compared to the difference between losses on non-members.

A.6. Results with GPT-Neo models

We repeat our experiments with the GPT-NEO family of models. Table 9 demonstrates similar trends targeting the GPT-NEO models as seen when targeting the PYTHIA model family (Table 1, Table 11), such as MIA performance generally increasing as the target model size increases. In general, performance against the GPT-NEO models is similar, if not lower than, performance against the PYTHIA-DEDUP and PYTHIA models when comparing similarly sized variants. In some domains such as HackerNews, the best performing MIA differs between target models (Min- k % Prob for GPT-NEO, reference-based for PYTHIA-DEDUP), though marginally.

¹²Note that the scores over different reference models may not be directly comparable due to the reference models having different tokenizers. This may contribute to the poor performance of this naive ensembling method.

¹³Also target models that are domain specific like DATABLATIONS or are trained on a less diverse corpus like SILO

Do Membership Inference Attacks Work on Large Language Models?

Table 8. The effect of the choice of a reference model to PYTHIA-DEDUP models across various domains. The reference model yielding the highest performance, per target domain and target model, is bolded. ROC-AUC values are reported.

# Params	Wikipedia								Pile CC							
	GPT2	DISTIL	OPT	NEO	SILO	LLAMA	STABLE	PYTHIA	GPT2	DISTIL	OPT	NEO	SILO	LLAMA	STABLE	PYTHIA
160M	.498	.502	.494	.490	.492	.511	.515	.480	.520	.504	.488	.473	.504	.487	.497	.480
1.4B	.503	.505	.507	.500	.502	.521	.544	.476	.523	.507	.513	.500	.516	.504	.525	.496
2.8B	.511	.510	.519	.532	.531	.539	.565	.526	.526	.509	.521	.499	.520	.510	.537	.504
6.9B	.510	.507	.517	.518	.516	.536	.571	.501	.538	.520	.542	.525	.531	.530	.564	.540
12B	.514	.510	.522	.528	.529	.546	.579	.517	.548	.525	.555	.538	.541	.545	.582	.555

# Params	PubMed Central								ArXiv							
	GPT2	DISTIL	OPT	NEO	SILO	LLAMA	STABLE	PYTHIA	GPT2	DISTIL	OPT	NEO	SILO	LLAMA	STABLE	PYTHIA
160M	.495	.491	.515	.511	.513	.515	.516	.497	.523	.518	.516	.480	.496	.492	.486	.472
1.4B	.493	.491	.514	.517	.514	.515	.530	.503	.529	.524	.523	.501	.512	.506	.510	.484
2.8B	.494	.492	.513	.518	.515	.518	.536	.500	.534	.528	.528	.524	.522	.516	.531	.528
6.9B	.499	.496	.519	.527	.520	.530	.552	.526	.540	.532	.534	.539	.531	.528	.538	.554
12B	.504	.498	.523	.531	.524	.538	.559	.533	.546	.538	.541	.555	.540	.538	.555	.581

# Params	DM Math								HackerNews							
	GPT2	DISTIL	OPT	NEO	SILO	LLAMA	STABLE	PYTHIA	GPT2	DISTIL	OPT	NEO	SILO	LLAMA	STABLE	PYTHIA
160M	.489	.488	.520	.509	.487	.502	.523	.514	.496	.496	.496	.480	.398	.486	.490	.466
1.4B	.487	.485	.509	.496	.485	.503	.512	.496	.508	.509	.511	.496	.401	.504	.514	.483
2.8B	.485	.486	.511	.503	.483	.500	.504	.509	.521	.522	.529	.534	.421	.521	.549	.527
6.9B	.485	.485	.510	.499	.484	.502	.508	.497	.525	.526	.534	.536	.436	.531	.546	.542
12B	.487	.486	.514	.504	.485	.502	.512	.503	.534	.533	.545	.559	.453	.545	.565	.561

Table 9. AUC ROC of MIAs against GPT-NEO across different datasets from the Pile. The highest performance across the different MIAs is bolded per domain. Similar to PYTHIA-DEDUP, **MIA methods perform near random (< .55) in most domains.**

# Params	Wikipedia				Github				Pile CC				Pubmed Central			
	LL	Ref	min- <i>k</i>	zlib	LL	Ref	min- <i>k</i>	zlib	LL	Ref	min- <i>k</i>	zlib	LL	Ref	min- <i>k</i>	zlib
125M	.504	.511	.492	.511	.641	.582	.642	.660	.495	.492	.500	.497	.499	.506	.502	.499
1.3B	.510	.531	.506	.517	.681	.570	.681	.696	.500	.517	.503	.501	.496	.499	.499	.497
2.7B	.513	.545	.513	.519	.699	.570	.700	.712	.504	.531	.507	.506	.498	.507	.501	.499

# Params	ArXiv				DM Math				HackerNews				The Pile			
	LL	Ref	min- <i>k</i>	zlib	LL	Ref	min- <i>k</i>	zlib	LL	Ref	min- <i>k</i>	zlib	LL	Ref	min- <i>k</i>	zlib
125M	.507	.494	.503	.501	.492	.522	.493	.484	.489	.480	.505	.496	.502	.507	.505	.505
1.3B	.511	.506	.512	.507	.486	.511	.491	.481	.499	.500	.514	.501	.505	.514	.509	.507
2.7B	.515	.520	.517	.510	.486	.509	.492	.481	.502	.512	.516	.503	.507	.519	.511	.509

B. *n*-gram Overlap Details and Takeaways

B.1. Measuring *n*-gram Overlap

We create a bloom filter following Groeneveld et al. (2023). Due to the scale of the Pile training data and limited memory, we shard the bloom filter. In our construction, we split the training data in half, resulting in two bloom filter shards. Since each shard only sees half of the training data, to check for *n*-gram inclusion across the entire Pile, we check for containment in both of the sharded bloom filters, counting an *n*-gram included only if it is included in at least one of the bloom filters.

For each shard, we configure the bloom filter according to the data size such that the false positive rate of the bloom filter is less than 1% (0.6%). Then, for each document, we tokenize at the word level. We then add *n*-grams to the filter by using a striding window over *n* words at a time with a stride of 1. We use the same method of gathering *n*-grams when checking the non-members for *n*-gram overlap.

B.2. Reference-based Attack Performance

Table 3 shows that, interestingly, reference-based MIAs have a noticeably smaller increase in performance compared to non-referenced-based MIAs for domains such as GitHub or PubMed Central under *n*-gram overlap thresholding. We

speculate that, since numerous low n -gram overlap non-members are outliers to the relevant domain, these non-members will also be outliers to the similar/overlapping data seen by the reference model. As a result, even though these non-members may yield higher losses from the target model, we see similar high losses for the reference model as well, which makes the difference between target and reference model loss for non-members and members relatively less distinguishable compared to signals from the other attacks.

At the same time, domains like Pile CC do not see this dampened performance, likely because the 20% threshold in the case of Pile CC is not sufficient to select outliers, as samples from this domain have naturally low n -gram overlap. Another case where the reference-based attack seems to avoid this observation is in the temporally shifted non-member setting for both Wikipedia and ArXiv despite the temporally shifted non-members being more out-of-distribution relative to the Pile Wikipedia and ArXiv distributions, respectively. We speculate this is due to the reference model of choice, STABLELM-BASE-ALPHA-3B-V2, which has not only been trained on a corpus with high overlap with the Pile, but also trained on datasets that capture more recent data such as RedPajama-Data-1T (Together AI, 2023) which contains Wikipedia and ArXiv samples from a much more recent cutoff date (i.e., RedPajama uses the 2023-03-20 Wikipedia dump), allowing it to generalize better over the temporally shifted non-members and avoiding a shift towards higher losses that weaker or older reference models might experience.

Attacks like LOSS or Min- k % Prob do not utilize any external signal or difficulty calibration, and thus rely exclusively on signals from the target model for member classification. Calibration-based methods like zlib and reference-based attacks, on the other hand, account for the inherent “difficulty” of a seen sample. Thus, in situations where the non-member data is significantly out of domain, even for a reference model or calibration method, it is likely that the signals from the target model and difficulty calibration would cancel out, leading to a weakened MIA signal. On the other hand, difficulty calibration can further boost MIA signal in settings where the member data is inherently more likely to be memorized, such as in §5.1 where reference-based attacks yielded considerably higher MIA performance in low training data size and high effective epoch count settings, with performance being further amplified in the extremes of both settings. Thus, MIA baselines for new MIAs should include both kinds of methods: calibration-based and calibration-free. Having baseline coverage for both styles of MIA can help uncover inherent characteristics of the evaluation setting such as unintentional member/non-member distributional shift or overfitted target models that influence MIA performance and also paints a holistic picture with regards to what MIAs are most suitable for specific attack settings.

B.3. GitHub as an Outlier

As seen in Table 1, MIA performance in the Github domain even without thresholding is notably higher than that in other domains, with the best method (zlib) achieving an AUC ROC of $\sim .70$. We speculate this is not because the GitHub domain, or code in general, is an easier domain to attack, but because the presumably reasonable decontamination threshold of $\leq 80\%$ 13-gram overlap threshold only captures a small percentile of non-members as GitHub is naturally very high overlap.

We speculate a large factor contributing to the high overlap is the repetitive nature of code, such as copyright notices, function definitions, and syntax like HTML tags. Figure 9 demonstrates how our decontamination threshold impacts the 7-gram distribution of non-members. Non-members under our decontamination threshold are more likely outliers to the GitHub domain (see Figure 16 for an example of such an outlier). The additional n -gram overlap threshold experiments (§5.2) only exacerbate the impact of thresholding, which leads to notably higher MIA performance.

Such observations indicate why lexical non-member boundaries may lead to ambiguous interpretations of MIA performance in high-overlap domains. Here, we suggest using semantic differences between samples to draw non-member boundaries to disentangle MIA performance as a result of just lexical signals or lack thereof.

B.4. Temporal Shift as Change in n -gram Overlap




Figure 10. Distribution of n -gram overlap for non-member ArXiv preprints sampled from the months 2020-08 and 2023-06, respectively. We also plot the n -gram overlap distribution of the original Pile ArXiv non-members. Between the original non-members and both temporally shifted non-member sets, **the temporally shifted non-member n -gram overlap distributions are considerably more concentrated at lower % n -gram overlap**. The original non-members have an average 7-gram overlap of 39.3%, while non-members from months 2020-08 and 2023-06 have 7-gram overlap of 22.7% and 20.5%, respectively.

Figure 10 reinforces our observations in Figure 6, as similar to the temporal Wikipedia setting, temporally shifted non-members from after the target model’s knowledge cutoff date are concentrated at considerably lower % n -gram overlap than non-members from the natural ArXiv non-member set. This contributes to the greater MIA performance in general over the temporally shifted ArXiv benchmarks. However, we note that n -gram overlap distribution shift does not provide a strong interpretation for the increase in MIA performance as non-members are increasingly temporally shifted. For example, the average 7-gram overlap of non-members from the month 2020-08 is 22.7% while the average for the month of 2023-06 is 20.5%. While there is a small decrease in average 7-gram for later non-members, the change is quite small and doesn’t clearly justify the considerable difference in MIA performance when evaluating on benchmarks using non-members from the different months (i.e., $.723 \rightarrow .795$ AUC ROC from the 2020-08 benchmark to the 2023-06 benchmark). We speculate other factors that contribute to this increase include changes in the distribution of topics (i.e., increasing popularity of research into LLMs) and the presence of specific identifying tokens (i.e., dates, references, new terminology). We believe




Figure 9. 7-gram overlap of GitHub non-member data before and after 13-gram decontamination at threshold $\leq 80\%$.

such factors only further reinforce the need to carefully analyze MIA benchmark construction when evaluating MIAs to understand what signals are truly being captured.

C. Characteristics of LLM Training

C.1. Recency of Member Samples

We explore how the recency of member samples seen in training impacts MIA performance. We follow the same setup as the training data experiment (A.3.1), but instead of evaluating the checkpoint at step n with the member data sampled from within steps $\{n - 100, n\}$ and the fixed non-member set, we fix the target model, only targeting the checkpoint at step 99000 for all the benchmarks.




Figure 11. MIA performance for different member data sets sampled at different training steps across 1 epoch of the deduplicated Pile pretraining corpus, visualized across different attacks. Target model is the PYTHIA-DEDUP-12B checkpoint at step-99000. AUC-ROC reported. **Performance on benchmarks with more recently seen members is higher, but gradually decreases to a plateau for less recently seen members.**

Figure 11 demonstrates that, in general, member data seen more recently by the given checkpoint contributes to slightly higher MIA performance. We believe this supports existing work in LM forgetting (Jagielski et al., 2023), where observed patterns in recently seen training data are better preserved in the model parameters, while earlier seen data are less memorized.

We also note that the MIA performance trajectories seem to drop slightly more quickly for smaller models, though the trajectories across all model sizes seem to converge when evaluating on member data from much earlier in the training run. We speculate this is a result of larger models having more parameters, allowing them to capture more seen data before having to drop older knowledge.

We also note that, in the context of MIA against fine-tuning datasets, our results indicate that data seen during fine-tuning or continued pre-training may also be increasingly vulnerable due to how recent they are seen. This aligns with previous work demonstrating high MIA performance on fine-tuning datasets (Mireshghallah et al., 2022a; Fu et al., 2023). This is especially relevant in practice since fine-tuning is a popular option to re-purpose large pre-trained models for varying downstream tasks such as commercial use cases, which often involves tuning with sensitive data.




Figure 12. MIA performance on target model SILO-PDSW as the number of effective epochs in which the member domain data has been seen increases. AUC-ROC reported. For HackerNews, **performance does increase with an increasing number of effective epochs initially, but begins to plateau or even drop with further epochs**. For DM Mathematics, **performance surprisingly drops with increasing effective epochs**.

C.2. Number of Training Epochs

While experiments against the DATABLATIONS model (Figure 3) operate in a fixed training data size setting, we also explore a more realistic setting where the amount of training data the target model sees increases alongside the effective epoch count by targeting the SILO-PDSW model and intermediate checkpoints. In Figure 12, for HackerNews, we observe MIA performance initially increases with more effective epochs, similar to the DATABLATIONS setting, but then begins to plateau or drop as effective epoch count continues to increase. DM mathematics, on the other hand, surprisingly decreases as the number of effective epochs increases. We speculate over factors that may contribute to these observations:

- HackerNews, even when up-sampled for this variant of the SILO-PDSW model, still only makes up 5.9% of the training data (Min et al., 2023). In the first few epochs, when the total training data seen is low, the model can memorize the HackerNews samples. However, as the number of epochs increases, the target model may tend to overfit data more so from domains with greater representation. As the SILO model is on the smaller side with 1.4B parameters, we suspect the target model begins to memorize less of the HackerNews samples, leading to a plateau or drop in MIA performance.
- DM-Mathematics also makes up only 3.5% of the training data. In addition, with DM Mathematics being a dataset of mathematical problems, we suspect that the abundance of tokens from a concentrated token space (i.e., digits, variables) that are largely symbolic rather than semantic makes memorization of specific samples unlikely. Overall, it simply fails to perform well on such data even after multiple epochs (as observed when looking at model loss values for this data).

For both cases, further investigation is needed into the target domains and attack setting setup to better understand these counter-intuitive phenomena.

D. Additional Figures and Tables

Table 10. TPR (%)@1%FPR of MIAs against PYTHIA-DEDUP across different datasets from the Pile. The highest performance across the different MIAs is bolded per domain. In general, **leakage in high confidence settings is low (< 3%)**. As with AUC ROC, GitHub is an exception, still yielding considerably higher leakage with most attacks. Unlike with AUC ROC, trends in performance are much noisier in the high-confidence setting, with trends in model size and best-performing attacks in certain domains no longer holding, reinforcing the difficulty in determining a *best* attack. We do not run the Neighborhood attack for the 12B model on The Pile due to computational constraints.

# Params	Wikipedia					Github					Pile CC					Pubmed Central				
	LOSS	Ref	min-k	zlib	Ne	LOSS	Ref	min-k	zlib	Ne	LOSS	Ref	min-k	zlib	Ne	LOSS	Ref	min-k	zlib	Ne
160M	1.1	0.8	1.2	1.4	1.3	13.5	4.6	12.3	14.7	5.9	0.4	0.8	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.7	0.9	1.0	0.3	0.1
1.4B	0.6	0.9	0.5	0.7	0.4	12.8	0.7	12.9	16.4	3.9	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.4	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.1
2.8B	0.6	0.8	0.5	0.7	0.9	20.8	4.5	20.8	23.4	11.1	0.6	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.9	0.4	1.0	1.4	0.6	0.9
6.9B	0.6	0.6	0.4	0.6	0.5	12.9	0.6	13.1	16.8	6.1	1.0	1.4	1.2	1.3	1.0	0.8	1.6	0.8	0.3	0.8
12B	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.7	1.0	13.9	0.8	14.2	17.4	4.9	1.0	1.7	1.1	1.5	1.0	1.0	1.5	1.3	0.7	0.9

# Params	ArXiv					DM Math					HackerNews					The Pile				
	LOSS	Ref	min-k	zlib	Ne	LOSS	Ref	min-k	zlib	Ne	LOSS	Ref	min-k	zlib	Ne	LOSS	Ref	min-k	zlib	Ne
160M	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.7	0.3	0.5	1.4	0.6	1.2	0.7	1.0	0.8	1.2	0.6	0.7	2.4	1.3	2.0	2.2	2.2
1.4B	0.3	1.0	0.2	0.4	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.6	1.0	1.7	0.7	0.9	1.2	0.9	0.8	2.4	1.4	2.4	2.3	2.3
2.8B	0.5	2.1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.8	0.4	1.0	1.3	0.8	0.6	1.4	0.8	1.1	1.7	2.8	2.2	2.8	2.8	2.4
6.9B	0.6	1.8	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.9	0.2	0.6	1.0	0.7	.9	1.9	1.0	0.9	1.3	2.6	1.8	2.5	2.5	2.2
12B	0.6	2.5	0.6	0.5	0.9	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.9	0.8	0.7	2.3	0.8	0.8	1.4	2.7	1.8	2.6	2.6	-

Table 11. AUC ROC of MIAs against non-deduped PYTHIA across different datasets from the Pile. The reference-based attack uses STABLELM-BASE-ALPHA-3B-V2 as the reference model. The highest performance across the different MIAs is bolded per domain. **Performance follows similar trends seen when targeting the PYTHIA-DEDUP models, but performance is, in general, marginally higher.**

# Params	Wikipedia				Github				Pile CC				Pubmed Central			
	LOSS	Ref	min-k	zlib	LOSS	Ref	min-k	zlib	LOSS	Ref	min-k	zlib	LOSS	Ref	min-k	zlib
160M	.503	.512	.491	.512	.657	.639	.652	.674	.496	.491	.504	.497	.499	.513	.506	.500
1.4B	.513	.552	.511	.520	.698	.670	.699	.710	.501	.522	.510	.502	.498	.531	.502	.500
2.8B	.518	.582	.518	.525	.712	.653	.713	.723	.501	.537	.508	.504	.500	.537	.504	.501
6.9B	.528	.618	.536	.536	.730	.644	.733	.739	.507	.550	.515	.509	.506	.558	.511	.506
12B	.535	.639	.544	.544	.740	.630	.743	.748	.511	.567	.517	.512	.513	.582	.523	.512

# Params	ArXiv				DM Math				HackerNews				The Pile			
	LOSS	Ref	min-k	zlib	LOSS	Ref	min-k	zlib	LOSS	Ref	min-k	zlib	LOSS	Ref	min-k	zlib
160M	.510	.494	.507	.502	.489	.510	.495	.481	.494	.491	.509	.498	.503	.511	.505	.506
1.4B	.515	.516	.517	.509	.486	.512	.497	.482	.505	.522	.512	.504	.505	.522	.510	.508
2.8B	.519	.531	.525	.514	.484	.505	.480	.480	.513	.551	.524	.509	.508	.533	.513	.511
6.9B	.529	.558	.535	.523	.485	.511	.496	.481	.521	.579	.536	.513	.514	.554	.522	.516
12B	.534	.575	.546	.527	.485	.510	.497	.481	.528	.606	.546	.517	.519	.569	.528	.520

Do Membership Inference Attacks Work on Large Language Models?




Figure 13. MIA performance as model size increases over select domains for various other attacks. We additionally plot the AUC ROC trajectory against the non-deduped Pythia suite for comparison. Similar to the reference-based attack, **increasing model size slightly boosts MIA performance while deduplication decreases performance.**




Figure 14. MIA performance as the amount of training data seen increases across 1 epoch of the deduplicated Pile pretraining corpus, visualized over a range of model sizes for various attacks. We use the training step as a unit for the amount of training data seen, with 1 step corresponding to seeing 2097152 tokens. AUC-ROC reported. Similar to the reference-based attack, for all attacks, **performance drastically increases before gradually decreasing as the amount of training data seen increases.**

Do Membership Inference Attacks Work on Large Language Models?




Figure 15. Distribution of n -gram overlap over all evaluation domains for $n = 4, 7, 13$.

