
Differentially Private Tabular Data Synthesis using Large Language Models

Toan V. Tran

Emory University, GA, USA
vtran29@emory.edu

Li Xiong

Emory University, GA, USA
lxiong@emory.edu

Abstract

Synthetic tabular data generation with differential privacy is a crucial problem to enable data sharing with formal privacy. Despite a rich history of methodological research and development, developing differentially private tabular data generators that can provide realistic synthetic datasets remains challenging. This paper introduces DP-LLMTGen – a novel framework for differentially private tabular data synthesis that leverages pretrained large language models (LLMs). DP-LLMTGen models sensitive datasets using a two-stage fine-tuning procedure with a novel loss function specifically designed for tabular data. Subsequently, it generates synthetic data through sampling the fine-tuned LLMs. Our empirical evaluation demonstrates that DP-LLMTGen outperforms a variety of existing mechanisms across multiple datasets and privacy settings. Additionally, we conduct an ablation study and several experimental analyses to deepen our understanding of LLMs in addressing this important problem. Finally, we highlight the controllable generation ability of DP-LLMTGen through a fairness-constrained generation setting.

1 Introduction

Tabular data is one of the most popular forms of data for data analytic applications [Borisov et al., 2022]. In many domains such as healthcare and finance, real data may be privacy sensitive and can not be directly shared and utilized. To address this issue, synthetic data, generated from real datasets, enables the use of realistic datasets without exposing real-world data. However, synthetic data can still retain sample-level patterns and details from the original datasets. This poses privacy risks for reidentification and attribute disclosure by membership inference or by linking attributes, especially with sensitive information [Zhu et al., 2024]. A promising approach is to integrate differential privacy (DP), which introduces randomness in the data generation [Dwork et al., 2006]. This process ensures that the data remain useful for analysis but significantly reduce the risk of re-identifying individuals [Cummings et al., 2024, Zhu et al., 2024]. Therefore, synthetic data generation with differential privacy is an important problem that has received growing attention by the research community [Aydore et al., 2021, Vietri et al., 2022, Liu et al., 2023, 2021, Yoon et al., 2019].

Generating synthetic tabular data in both non-DP and DP settings have been extensively investigated. One notable approach involves deep learning-based Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs). Xu et al. [2019] has designed a suitable variant of GANs for tabular data (named CTGAN) which outperformed previous statistical methods [Chow and Liu, 1968, Zhang et al., 2017]. However, the utility of GANs struggles under DP settings when the models are trained by differentially private stochastic gradient descent (DPSGD) [Abadi et al., 2016] due to the complexity of the model architecture and adversarial training of GANs. Consequently, an alternative approach has emerged by leveraging marginal distributions. This approach privately measures marginal distributions and then generates synthetic datasets from those distributions [McKenna et al., 2022, Liu et al., 2021, Vietri et al., 2022, Aydore et al., 2021]. The marginal-based methods significantly outperformed

GAN-based methods and created a notable gap between marginal-based and deep learning-based methods.

Furthermore, inspired by the development of large language models (LLMs), Borisov et al. [2023] proposed a method that leverages pre-trained LLMs for synthesizing tabular data in non-private settings. Compared to previous methods, pre-trained LLMs with background knowledge offer a basic understanding of contextual knowledge. For example, in the Adult dataset Dua and Graff [2017], features like gender and occupation clearly have a correlation, e.g., a mechanic is more likely to be a male. This basic knowledge can be already gained by LLMs during their pretrained stage [Dong et al., 2023]. As a result, LLMs outperformed GANs for synthesizing tabular data in non-DP settings [Borisov et al., 2023]. However, whether LLMs can operate effectively under DP settings remains an open question.

In this paper, we demonstrate that naively enhancing the existing approach from [Borisov et al., 2023] by DPSGD do not work well. This is mainly because such conventional DP fine-tuned LLMs fail at generating tabular data with format compliance due to the injected noise. Additionally, the standard cross entropy loss used in causal language modeling does not work well for tabular data. To tackle the challenges, we propose DP-LLMTGen (an abbreviation of Differentially Priate Large Language Models for Tabular data Generation), which is the first study leveraging pretrained LLMs for synthetic tabular generation under DP settings.

In summary, our contributions are as the follows. 1) *Technical novelty*: we propose a two-stage fine-tuning mechanism using a novel loss function. Our fine-tuning mechanism distinguishes learning targets (format compliance and data modeling) and treats them suitably. The loss function is designed to align with the proposed fine-tuning procedure and improve numerical understanding of LLMs. 2) *Empirical evaluation*: DP-LLMTGen outperforms marginal-based methods in tight differential privacy settings, closing the gap between marginal-based and deep learning-based methods. Additionally, our ablation study demonstrates the two-stage fine tuning is necessary for format compliance and the proposed loss function helps to improve their numerical understanding and boost the overall performance. We also perform several experimental analyses. Our findings include: • Data contamination between the pre-training and experimental datasets of LLama-2 7b models is not a significant problem. • LLMs incorporate feature names to enable context-aware learning for tabular data synthesis. • Models without dialogue optimization generate better synthetic datasets. • Larger models are not always better. 3) *Controllable generation*: we empirically demonstrate the effectiveness of controllable generation of DP-LLMTGen in a fairness setting. Our controllable generator can significantly reduce biases with only a minor utility tradeoff.

2 Related Works

Synthetic tabular data generation. This field has a rich history of methodological research and development. Classical methods treat each feature as a variable to model the data as a joint multivariate probability distribution, from which synthetic samples are drawn. Various modeling methods have been employed, such as trees [Chow and Liu, 1968], Bayesian networks [Young et al., 2009], and copulas [Kamthe et al., 2021]. With the advent of advanced neural networks, Variational Autoencoders (VAEs) [Akrami et al., 2022, Xu et al., 2019], Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) [Park et al., 2018, Xu et al., 2019], and diffusion models [Kotelnikov et al., 2023] have enhanced the modeling of high-dimensional dependencies. Recent studies have explored transformer-based architectures [Vaswani et al., 2017, Badaro et al., 2023]. Gulati and Roysdon [2023] conducted masked pretraining for encoder-only models. Canale et al. [2022] trained decoder-only models from scratch. Concurrently, Borisov et al. [2023] fine-tuned LLMs (GPT-2 [Radford et al., 2019] and distilled GPT-2 [Sanh et al., 2019]) which have been pre-trained on a massive amount of text data.

Differentially private tabular data generation. The advancements in standard synthetic data generation have led to various mechanisms that can ensure differential privacy. Classical methods have been enhanced to achieve the DP property, e.g., private Bayesian networks [Zhang et al., 2017] and DP-copula [Li et al., 2014]. Additionally, many neural networks have been trained by differentially private stochastic gradient descent (DPSGD) [Abadi et al., 2016] such as DP-GAN [Xie et al., 2018] and DP-Conditional GAN [Torkzadehmahani et al., 2019]. To improve privacy guarantees, Yoon et al. [2019] trained GANs by the PATE framework [Papernot et al., 2018] which utilizes non-labeled public data. Despite GANs’ effectiveness in non-DP settings, they do not

align well with DPSGD due to the complexity of the model architecture and adversarial training of GANs. Consequently, marginal-based methods have emerged as more effective under DP constraints [McKenna et al., 2022, Aydore et al., 2021, Vietri et al., 2022, Liu et al., 2023]. Recent efforts involve training from scratch transformer-based networks with DPSGD [Castellon et al., 2023, Sablayrolles et al., 2023]. However, training from scratch usually requires significant privacy budgets and thus still lags behind marginal-based methods in most cases. Our study is the first to leverage pre-trained LLMs and introduces a novel fine-tuning approach for tight DP settings. *We provide additional related works and clarify the differences in Appendix A.*

3 Preliminaries

Differential Privacy (DP). Differential privacy is a golden privacy notation for quantifying and bounding the privacy risks of releasing data statistics [Dwork et al., 2006]. Informally, DP ensures the outputs of computational algorithms do not change significantly when a single record is added to or removed from the dataset. In this work, we use a popular notion of differential privacy – (ϵ, δ) -DP.

Definition 1 A mechanism $\mathcal{M} : D \rightarrow S$ is (ϵ, δ) -DP if for any two neighbouring datasets D and D' , and for any subset of output responses $S \in \text{Range}(\mathcal{M})$,

$$P[\mathcal{M}(D) \in S] \leq e^\epsilon P[\mathcal{M}(D') \in S] + \delta$$

Smaller values of ϵ and δ (close to zero) provide stronger privacy guarantees. The post-processing property of DP mechanism ensures that any computations, which are applied to the output of \mathcal{M} and do not access the original sensitive data, remain the same DP guarantee.

4 DP-LLMTGen: Differentially Private LLM-based Tabular data Generators

The previous work [Borisov et al., 2023] has leveraged pretrained LLMs for non-private tabular data synthesis by simply converting tabular data to text and fine tuning with standard causal language modeling. However, this conventional fine-tuning approach fails under DP training due to format compliance issues. To address this, we introduce DP-LLMTGen, as shown in Figure 1. Initially, a random tabular dataset is generated using public general knowledge. Subsequently, both the original sensitive tabular dataset and the random tabular dataset are converted to textual data by the tabular-to-text encoding. Next, the LLM undergoes the two-stage fine-tuning process. Synthetic data are then generated by sampling from the fine-tuned LLM and converted back into tabular format through the text-to-tabular decoding.




Figure 1: The process flow of DP-LLMTGen

4.1 Data processing

Random Tabular Data Generation. In this paper, we assume that general knowledge, including feature names, categorical names, and numerical ranges, are not sensitive. Instead, the actual sensitive information comprises individual records. Consequently, we propose the generation of a dataset (referred to as "random tabular data") that lacks realistic feature distributions and exhibits random dependencies among features. The sole requirements for this random data are accurate feature names, correct categorical names, and numerically valid ranges. It is worth noting that this assumption is similar to previous transformer-based works [Castellon et al., 2023, Sablayrolles et al., 2023] which require creating a specialized vocabulary.

Tabular-to-Text Encoding. We use a common template – "{feature_1 name} is {value}, {feature_2 name} is {value}, etc." which has been used in some previous works [Borisov et al., 2023, Dinh et al., 2022, Hegselmann et al., 2023]. Moreover, we permute the features randomly to remove the feature-order dependencies which naturally does not exist in tabular data [Borisov et al., 2022, 2023]. This permutation step makes the sampling step more flexible and controllable. Conversely, Text-to-Tabular Decoding is the reverse process of Tabular-to-Text Encoding.

4.2 Two-stage Fine Tuning

Our fine tuning include two stages: 1) Format Learning and 2) Differentially Private Fine Tuning. This procedure helps LLMs to ensure format compliance while achieving DP properties. We implement a parameter-efficient fine tuning method – LoRA [Hu et al., 2022] for both stages.

Stage 1: Format Learning. This stage utilizes the random data that does not require any privacy protection. Therefore, we apply standard causal language modeling for fine tuning the pretrained LLM. This stage helps the LLM to learn the format, feature names, corresponding categorical names, and numerical ranges without spending any privacy budget. Let $\{t_1, t_2, t_3, \dots\}$ denote the sequence of tokens $\mathbb{S}^{(i)}$, where each token is an element in vocabulary V . The loss function for this stage is the standard cross entropy loss across all tokens, shown in Equation 1, where N is the number of sequences, θ is the model parameters, and $p(t_j|t_{j-1}, t_{j-2}, \dots, t_1, \theta)$ denotes the model output probability of predicting token t_j given the previous tokens.

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t_j \in \mathbb{S}^{(i)}} \log p(t_j|t_{j-1}, t_{j-2}, \dots, t_1, \theta) \quad (1)$$

Stage 2: Differentially Private Fine Tuning. This stage aims to learn the feature distributions and dependencies of the actual datasets. To protect the sensitive data, the LLM is fine-tuned by differential private stochastic gradient descent (DPSGD) [Abadi et al., 2016]. To enhance the performance, we propose a novel loss function (denoted as $\mathcal{L}(\theta)$ in Equation 7) which includes two main components: *Weighted Cross Entropy Loss (WCEL)* and *Numerical-Understanding Loss (NUL)*.

WCEL: Given a sequence of tokens $\mathbb{S}^{(i)} = \{t_1, t_2, t_3, \dots\}$, the WCEL discriminates between format tokens $\mathbb{F}^{(i)}$ and tabular tokens $\mathbb{T}^{(i)}$. More specifically, words (such as feature names and "is") and commas are format tokens while tabular tokens are derived from the numerical and categorical values. For instance, considering the sentence "Age is 20, Education is high school", the format and tabular tokens are "Age is , Education is" and "20 high school", respectively. This discrimination helps the LLMs to efficiently focus on learning the feature distributions and dependencies instead of format compliance, which has been achieved in the first stage. The WCEL is defined in Equation 2.

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{WCE}}(\mathbb{S}^{(i)}, \theta) = (1 - \alpha) \sum_{t_j \in \mathbb{F}^{(i)}} -\log p(t_j|t_{j-1}, \dots, t_1, \theta) + \alpha \sum_{t_j \in \mathbb{T}^{(i)}} -\log p(t_j|t_{j-1}, \dots, t_1, \theta) \quad (2)$$

NUL: There is a fundamental problem of cross entropy loss while dealing with numbers. The cross entropy loss does not differentiate well between numerical errors in different contexts. For instance, considering a ground truth of 10.0, the cross entropy loss treats identically between predicting 10.1 and 99.9. To address this, our Numerical-Understanding Loss considers the exact difference between the prediction and the ground truth numbers. Let \hat{t}_j be the highest-probability prediction token for the token at index j , formalized in Equation 3, where w is a token in the model vocabulary; θ is the model

parameters; f represents the model forwarding. Subsequently, Equation 4 represents numeric token decoding, which converts the consecutive tokens from index j to k into a number, denoted by $\hat{n}_{\{j,k\}}$. For each sequence of tokens $\mathbb{S}^{(i)}$, $\mathbb{N}^{(i)}$ is the set of all pairs $\{j, k\}$ which represents the starting and ending indices of tabular numerical values. The NUL (Equation 6) is the sum of the squared errors (SE – defined in Equation 5) between predicted numerical values $\hat{n}_{j,k}$ and their corresponding ground truth values $n_{j,k}$. Notably, the numeric token decoding can fail if the prediction tokens do not form a number. In success cases, the errors are scaled with a factor λ . For failed cases, the error is set to 1.0, which is typically higher than the success squared errors to enhance format compliance.

$$\hat{t}_j = \operatorname{argmax}_w [f(w|t_{j-1}, t_{j-2}, \dots, t_1, \theta)] \quad (3)$$

$$\hat{n}_{\{j,k\}} = \operatorname{decoding}(\{\hat{t}_j; \hat{t}_{j+1}; \dots; \hat{t}_k\}) \quad (4)$$

$$SE(\{j, k\}, \theta) = \begin{cases} 1.0 & \text{if decoding failed} \\ \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{n_{\{j,k\}} - \hat{n}_{\{j,k\}}}{\lambda} \right)^2 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad (5)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{NU}}(\mathbb{S}^{(i)}, \theta) = \sum_{\{j,k\} \in \mathbb{N}^{(i)}} SE(\{j, k\}, \theta) \quad (6)$$

The final loss function is the weighted sum of \mathcal{L}_{WCE} and \mathcal{L}_{NU} over N sentences:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N [\mathcal{L}_{\text{WCE}}(\mathbb{S}^{(i)}, \theta) + \beta \mathcal{L}_{\text{NU}}(\mathbb{S}^{(i)}, \theta)] \quad (7)$$

4.3 Sampling

To generate synthetic samples, we initialize short prompts and ask the fine-tuned LLMs to generate the remainder. Following the approach outlined by Borisov et al. [2023], our LLMs facilitate both types of sampling: random-initialized and value-specified. In random-initialized sampling, the prompts consist of a randomly chosen feature name, such as "Age is" or "Workclass is". In contrast, value-specified sampling involves initializing prompts with specific feature values to enable controllable generation, e.g., "Age is 26," or "Income is >50K, Sex is female,". The fine-tuned LLMs can complete the remainder of the sentences. The full sentences can be converted back to tabular format by Text-to-Tabular Decoding, which is just a simple string processing algorithm.

5 Experiments and Results

5.1 Overall Evaluation

Datasets. We conduct experiments on five datasets, which vary in size from less than 400 to more than 40,000 samples. These datasets also exhibit a diverse range of ratios between numerical and categorical features. The details of datasets and their key characteristics are provided in Appendix B, Table 3. Notably, three of the five datasets were published after the knowledge cutoff date of the Llama 2 models [et al., 2023]. We split all datasets into 80:20 for training and testing. All our and baseline models are trained and tested on identical sets. To provide robust results, for each dataset, we split into three different train-test sets using multiple random seeds.

Baselines. Our baselines include state-of-the-art GAN-based and marginal-based methods. Regarding GANs, we implement DP-GAN as a baseline, which trains Generative Adversarial Networks by DPSGD. We also consider Conditional Tabular GAN (CTGAN) [Xu et al., 2019] which is a variant designed for tabular data. We train the CTGANs by both DPSGD (named DP-CTGAN) and Private Aggregation of Teacher Ensembles (PATE) framework [Papernot et al., 2018] (referred as PATE-CTGAN). For marginal-based methods, we implement three methods: RAP [Aydore et al., 2021], RAP++ [Vietri et al., 2022], and GSD [Liu et al., 2023].

Metrics. We focus on two main kinds of metrics: Statistical Fidelity (SF) and Machine Learning (ML) downstream performance, which are similar to previous works [Liu et al., 2023, Vietri et al., 2022, Aydore et al., 2021]. For statistical fidelity, we calculate the average of total variation distances (TVD) of single/joint distributions (ranging from 1-way to 5-way) between the synthetic and testing sets. For ML downstream performance, we train XGBoost models using the synthetic data and report

Table 1: Comparative performance of DP-LLMTGen against the baselines across five datasets. For each metric, we report both the average value and standard deviation of three times running.

Dataset	Privacy Budget	Method	Statistical Fidelity (TV _D) (↓)					Xgboost (↑)		
			1-way	2-way	3-way	4-way	5-way	ACC	AUC	
Bank	-	<i>Training Set</i>	<i>0.009±0.001</i>	<i>0.021±0.001</i>	<i>0.043±0.001</i>	<i>0.076±0.002</i>	<i>0.121±0.002</i>	<i>0.853±0.009</i>	<i>0.924±0.005</i>	
		DP-GAN	0.196±0.019	0.302±0.023	0.368±0.023	0.411±0.021	0.440±0.017	0.528±0.010	0.547±0.032	
		DP-CTGAN	0.175±0.017	0.266±0.019	0.327±0.019	0.374±0.018	0.411±0.016	0.497±0.024	0.509±0.042	
	ε = 0.5	PATE-CTGAN	0.200±0.003	0.291±0.004	0.351±0.004	0.400±0.003	0.442±0.002	0.420±0.061	0.331±0.027	
		RAP	0.165±0.006	0.268±0.005	0.345±0.003	0.404±0.002	0.446±0.001	0.636±0.006	0.699±0.005	
		RAP++	0.071±0.005	0.129±0.005	0.185±0.005	0.240±0.005	0.293±0.006	0.635±0.068	0.697±0.062	
		GSD	0.166±0.001	0.245±0.002	0.302±0.001	0.354±0.002	0.401±0.001	0.635±0.017	0.692±0.017	
		DP-LLMTGen	0.050±0.003	0.091±0.003	0.134±0.003	0.181±0.004	0.232±0.004	0.637±0.007	0.669±0.032	
		ε = 1.0	DP-GAN	0.244±0.013	0.357±0.013	0.418±0.013	0.453±0.011	0.473±0.009	0.460±0.071	0.396±0.056
	DP-CTGAN		0.157±0.019	0.244±0.020	0.303±0.022	0.347±0.023	0.382±0.023	0.499±0.025	0.518±0.214	
	PATE-CTGAN		0.194±0.007	0.287±0.008	0.350±0.008	0.402±0.007	0.445±0.006	0.533±0.027	0.583±0.111	
	RAP		0.159±0.005	0.263±0.003	0.341±0.002	0.400±0.001	0.443±0.001	0.655±0.008	0.705±0.006	
	RAP++		0.058±0.007	0.105±0.009	0.151±0.010	0.201±0.011	0.252±0.011	0.674±0.017	0.747±0.019	
	GSD		0.166±0.001	0.244±0.002	0.301±0.001	0.353±0.002	0.400±0.001	0.671±0.041	0.726±0.032	
	DP-LLMTGen	0.047±0.010	0.085±0.012	0.125±0.011	0.169±0.010	0.218±0.009	0.638±0.004	0.703±0.008		
	Adult	-	<i>Training Set</i>	<i>0.004±0.001</i>	<i>0.011±0.001</i>	<i>0.024±0.001</i>	<i>0.044±0.001</i>	<i>0.073±0.001</i>	<i>0.872±0.002</i>	<i>0.928±0.001</i>
			DP-GAN	0.201±0.013	0.316±0.015	0.386±0.014	0.429±0.011	0.456±0.008	0.765±0.010	0.692±0.166
			DP-CTGAN	0.151±0.012	0.239±0.012	0.299±0.010	0.343±0.007	0.378±0.005	0.759±0.001	0.606±0.089
ε = 0.5		PATE-CTGAN	0.262±0.005	0.365±0.004	0.425±0.004	0.464±0.003	0.488±0.002	0.518±0.248	0.379±0.146	
		RAP	0.152±0.001	0.253±0.002	0.326±0.002	0.382±0.002	0.425±0.002	0.791±0.003	0.819±0.004	
		RAP++	0.066±0.003	0.116±0.004	0.162±0.004	0.208±0.006	0.251±0.008	0.766±0.012	0.758±0.023	
		GSD	0.245±0.001	0.337±0.000	0.395±0.000	0.438±0.000	0.470±0.000	0.759±0.001	0.768±0.019	
		DP-LLMTGen	0.058±0.008	0.095±0.010	0.126±0.011	0.154±0.011	0.183±0.010	0.833±0.005	0.879±0.003	
		ε = 1.0	DP-GAN	0.259±0.112	0.370±0.091	0.427±0.058	0.460±0.034	0.479±0.018	0.761±0.002	0.589±0.126
DP-CTGAN			0.178±0.026	0.277±0.027	0.339±0.024	0.380±0.021	0.409±0.018	0.550±0.272	0.597±0.110	
PATE-CTGAN			0.256±0.002	0.362±0.001	0.423±0.001	0.463±0.001	0.487±0.000	0.589±0.295	0.486±0.071	
RAP			0.148±0.000	0.248±0.001	0.322±0.001	0.378±0.001	0.421±0.001	0.801±0.006	0.821±0.005	
RAP++			0.054±0.002	0.099±0.003	0.142±0.003	0.183±0.002	0.225±0.002	0.803±0.003	0.807±0.017	
GSD			0.245±0.001	0.337±0.000	0.395±0.000	0.438±0.000	0.470±0.000	0.759±0.001	0.778±0.006	
DP-LLMTGen		0.038±0.002	0.068±0.002	0.096±0.003	0.124±0.003	0.153±0.002	0.831±0.003	0.877±0.003		
Food		-	<i>Training Set</i>	<i>0.062±0.002</i>	<i>0.134±0.004</i>	<i>0.221±0.010</i>	<i>0.299±0.013</i>	<i>0.354±0.014</i>	<i>0.902±0.027</i>	<i>0.880±0.143</i>
			DP-GAN	0.229±0.026	0.345±0.019	0.425±0.012	0.472±0.006	0.492±0.003	0.658±0.381	0.401±0.184
			DP-CTGAN	0.229±0.009	0.344±0.004	0.427±0.004	0.475±0.003	0.494±0.001	0.637±0.186	0.358±0.145
	ε = 0.5	PATE-CTGAN	0.175±0.010	0.295±0.006	0.393±0.004	0.456±0.002	0.486±0.002	0.868±0.020	0.346±0.060	
		RAP	0.152±0.015	0.266±0.017	0.377±0.013	0.451±0.008	0.485±0.004	0.739±0.241	0.489±0.217	
		RAP++	0.250±0.007	0.369±0.002	0.437±0.003	0.476±0.002	0.493±0.001	0.650±0.212	0.609±0.031	
		GSD	0.169±0.012	0.287±0.006	0.389±0.002	0.455±0.000	0.485±0.001	0.641±0.077	0.693±0.023	
		DP-LLMTGen	0.149±0.012	0.264±0.009	0.372±0.004	0.446±0.002	0.482±0.001	0.872±0.013	0.665±0.130	
		ε = 1.0	DP-GAN	0.249±0.023	0.364±0.019	0.437±0.012	0.477±0.006	0.494±0.003	0.372±0.219	0.650±0.055
	DP-CTGAN		0.242±0.010	0.357±0.010	0.436±0.006	0.479±0.002	0.495±0.001	0.470±0.368	0.355±0.076	
	PATE-CTGAN		0.135±0.010	0.258±0.008	0.362±0.004	0.433±0.002	0.473±0.001	0.872±0.013	0.411±0.004	
	RAP		0.132±0.017	0.243±0.020	0.354±0.019	0.433±0.016	0.473±0.011	0.812±0.052	0.623±0.088	
	RAP++		0.228±0.024	0.346±0.020	0.423±0.014	0.468±0.007	0.489±0.003	0.850±0.030	0.601±0.045	
	GSD		0.158±0.010	0.272±0.007	0.376±0.004	0.446±0.002	0.481±0.001	0.632±0.075	0.692±0.193	
	DP-LLMTGen	0.113±0.006	0.220±0.008	0.333±0.009	0.419±0.007	0.468±0.004	0.872±0.013	0.482±0.173		
	Apple	-	<i>Training Set</i>	<i>0.025±0.001</i>	<i>0.093±0.000</i>	<i>0.242±0.004</i>	<i>0.407±0.005</i>	<i>0.482±0.002</i>	<i>0.896±0.016</i>	<i>0.959±0.005</i>
			DP-GAN	0.270±0.003	0.371±0.003	0.433±0.002	0.476±0.000	0.494±0.001	0.498±0.006	0.379±0.053
			DP-CTGAN	0.183±0.020	0.272±0.026	0.350±0.023	0.431±0.013	0.483±0.004	0.498±0.007	0.490±0.031
ε = 0.5		PATE-CTGAN	0.119±0.003	0.199±0.005	0.288±0.005	0.400±0.003	0.478±0.001	0.505±0.036	0.505±0.065	
		RAP	0.202±0.002	0.315±0.000	0.434±0.001	0.491±0.000	0.499±0.000	0.467±0.033	0.529±0.069	
		RAP++	0.120±0.030	0.270±0.028	0.411±0.017	0.479±0.006	0.497±0.001	0.616±0.047	0.665±0.047	
		GSD	0.124±0.005	0.243±0.002	0.377±0.001	0.468±0.000	0.496±0.000	0.526±0.011	0.547±0.010	
		DP-LLMTGen	0.076±0.009	0.156±0.008	0.311±0.006	0.448±0.002	0.493±0.000	0.588±0.041	0.648±0.033	
		ε = 1.0	DP-GAN	0.295±0.007	0.395±0.005	0.451±0.004	0.482±0.002	0.496±0.001	0.415±0.023	0.372±0.019
DP-CTGAN			0.282±0.027	0.373±0.025	0.431±0.018	0.473±0.009	0.493±0.003	0.491±0.021	0.585±0.057	
PATE-CTGAN			0.116±0.006	0.193±0.007	0.283±0.006	0.398±0.008	0.477±0.005	0.542±0.009	0.597±0.027	
RAP			0.199±0.002	0.312±0.001	0.432±0.001	0.491±0.000	0.499±0.000	0.487±0.048	0.506±0.040	
RAP++			0.090±0.006	0.233±0.005	0.386±0.008	0.471±0.004	0.495±0.001	0.654±0.011	0.719±0.010	
GSD			0.093±0.004	0.204±0.002	0.345±0.002	0.454±0.002	0.493±0.000	0.563±0.016	0.582±0.016	
DP-LLMTGen		0.068±0.003	0.139±0.003	0.277±0.003	0.425±0.002	0.488±0.001	0.639±0.011	0.687±0.033		
Shipping		-	<i>Training Set</i>	<i>0.010±0.001</i>	<i>0.026±0.001</i>	<i>0.060±0.001</i>	<i>0.123±0.003</i>	<i>0.218±0.005</i>	<i>0.693±0.005</i>	<i>0.756±0.004</i>
			DPGAN	0.228±0.023	0.334±0.022	0.395±0.018	0.435±0.016	0.463±0.012	0.513±0.093	0.493±0.081
			DPCTGAN	0.269±0.015	0.368±0.021	0.421±0.019	0.452±0.014	0.473±0.009	0.537±0.107	0.485±0.039
	ε = 0.5	PATECTGAN	0.105±0.001	0.173±0.003	0.230±0.003	0.296±0.004	0.376±0.004	0.593±0.009	0.572±0.030	
		RAP	0.109±0.006	0.177±0.005	0.236±0.004	0.303±0.002	0.378±0.002	0.577±0.006	0.518±0.012	
		RAP++	0.080±0.002	0.145±0.004	0.214±0.006	0.290±0.007	0.364±0.007	0.594±0.011	0.624±0.031	
		GSD	0.057±0.002	0.100±0.002	0.149±0.001	0.218±0.002	0.306±0.003	0.606±0.014	0.663±0.022	
		DP-LLMTGen	0.048±0.002	0.084±0.002	0.126±0.003	0.186±0.003	0.271±0.005	0.590±0.006	0.510±0.031	
		ε = 1.0	DPGAN	0.219±0.067	0.327±0.061	0.395±0.044	0.439±0.029	0.467±0.017	0.510±0.102	0.498±0.133
	DPCTGAN		0.274±0.025	0.372±0.022	0.422±0.018	0.453±0.013	0.474±0.009	0.468±0.109	0.489±0.036	
	PATECTGAN		0.070±0.002	0.124±0.002	0.176±0.002	0.243±0.004	0.328±0.005	0.592±0.013	0.480±0.152	
	RAP		0.109±0.005	0.178±0.004	0.237±0.003	0.303±0.001	0.377±0.001	0.582±0.007	0.541±0.060	
	RAP++		0.070±0.007	0.123±0.011	0.182±0.013	0.253±0.013	0.332±0.010	0.623±0.006	0.673±0.014	
	GSD		0.053±0.002	0.093±0.001	0.140±0.000	0.208±0.002	0.297±0.003	0.616±0.009	0.689±0.011	
	DP-LLMTGen	0.042±0.002	0.074±0.002	0.114±0.000	0.174±0.004	0.262±0.008	0.594±0.010	0.452±0.061		

their performance (accuracy and AUC) on the testing sets. To ensure robust results, we run each experiment three times and report the average values and standard deviations. Due to the space limit, we present the details of the evaluation metrics in Appendix C.

Results. Table 1 presents the overall performance of DP-LLMTGen (using LLama-2-chat-hf 7B backbone [et al., 2023]) and the baselines under different privacy budget settings across five datasets. Generally, DP-LLMTGen outperforms the baselines in most cases. For the Bank and Adult datasets, which have large numbers of samples (11K and 48K, respectively), DP-LLMTGen delivers better statistical fidelity for capturing both low- and high-dimensional dependencies among features by

around 15% compared to the baselines. RAP++ is the only method that comes close. Furthermore, DP-LLMTGen not only achieves the highest machine learning performance on the Adult dataset but also demonstrates competitive results for the Bank dataset. For the Food dataset, which has the smallest number of samples (i.e., 388), while RAP++ fails to provide a high-quality synthetic dataset, DP-LLMTGen still achieves the best statistical fidelity. For the Apple dataset, which consists entirely of numerical features, DP-LLMTGen excels at capturing low-dimensional dependencies. However, the GAN-based methods outperform the LLMs in modeling high-dimensional joint relationships. Notably, better statistical fidelity usually leads to higher performance for ML downstream model but not always. This is consistent to the previous results [Tao et al., 2022]. Due to the space limit, we provide distance to closest record histogram in Appendix E.2 which demonstrates that DP-LLMTGen does not memorize and replicate the training datasets. We also provides some visualizations regarding to 1-way and 2-way TVD in Appendices E.3 and E.4.

5.2 Ablation Study

5.2.1 Two-stage fine tuning

Two-stage fine tuning ensures format compliance while conventional DP fine tuning fails. To verify the advantage of two-stage fine tuning versus conventional

DP fine tuning, we conduct an experiment on the Adult dataset. Figure 2a presents the format-compliance capability of conventional DP-FT (in green) and our 2-stage fine tuning (in orange and blue) under the privacy budget of $(1, 10^{-6})$ -DP. While the proposed 2-stage FT remains nearly perfect format compliance, conventional DP-FT fails entire time.


We also investigate the conventional fine-tuning approach when the privacy setting is loose (i.e., $\epsilon = 8$ presented in Figure 2b). The noise added is fairly small, so the model achieves the capability of 0.4 in the second epoch. However, this capability diminishes with continued training, although the evaluation perplexity consistently decreases. It can be because perplexity or cross entropy loss, which is used for standard causal language modeling, are calculated at token levels. However, format compliance is considered at sentence levels. For example, a missing comma in a 200-token sentence does not lead to high perplexity, but is considered as a failure at format compliance.

5.2.2 Weighted Cross Entropy Loss

Weighted Cross Entropy Loss (WCEL) improves performance. Notably, if $\alpha = 0.5$, WCEL (in Equation 2) becomes the standard cross entropy loss which is widely used in causal language modeling. Figure 3 depicts performance of DP-LLMTGen with varying α . Generally, using any α s.t. $1 > \alpha > 0.5$, i.e., focusing more on the tabular tokens than the format tokens, the model provides better perplexity and statistical fidelity than the model trained by the standard cross entropy loss (i.e., $\alpha = 0.5$), as shown in Figures 3a, 3b, 3c. However, the larger α can lead to some loss of format-compliance capability, as demonstrated in Figure 3d. At $\alpha = 1.0$, the second fine-tuning stage ignores entirely format tokens, causing a significant drop in format compliance capability.


5.2.3 Numerical-Understanding Loss

Numerical-Understanding Loss (NUL) helps the LLMs to deal better with numbers. To verify the significance of the Numerical-Understanding Loss, we conduct an ablation study using the Apple dataset, where all features are numerical. Table 2 presents the performance of DP-LLMTGen trained with and without NUL under different settings of privacy budget. Generally, DP-LLMTGen trained with NUL provides better statistical fidelity by about 5%. Moreover, we observe that better Causal Language Modeling does not always lead to a better data generator for numerical features. Table 2 provides the evaluation perplexity and statistical fidelity. There is no direct causal relationships between the two metrics. A higher-perplexity model can provide a better synthetic dataset. This result confirms our statement about the fundamental problem of LLMs using the standard cross entropy loss in representing and understanding numbers in the previous section.



(a) Format-compliance performance of our 2-stage FT and conventional DP-FT under a tight-privacy setting (b) Performance on perplexity and format compliance of conventional DP-FT under a loose privacy setting

Figure 2: Analyzing Conventional Differentially-Private Fine Tuning (DP-FT) for Format Compliance on the Adult dataset



(a) Perplexity (b) 1-way TVD (c) 2-way TVD (d) Format Compliance
Figure 3: Performance of DP-LLMTGen while varying α on three subsets of the Adult dataset.

Table 2: Performance of DP-LLMTGen with and without the numerical-understanding loss

Privacy Budget	Method	Eval PPL (\downarrow)	1-TVD (\downarrow)	2-TVD (\downarrow)	3-TVD (\downarrow)	4-TVD (\downarrow)
$\epsilon = 0.5$	DP-LLMTGen w.o. NUL	3.882 \pm 0.007	0.081 \pm 0.005	0.162 \pm 0.009	0.316 \pm 0.012	0.452 \pm 0.007
	DP-LLMTGen w. NUL	3.886 \pm 0.002	0.076 \pm 0.008	0.156 \pm 0.008	0.311 \pm 0.006	0.448 \pm 0.002
$\epsilon = 1.0$	DP-LLMTGen w.o. NUL	3.865 \pm 0.002	0.064 \pm 0.003	0.139 \pm 0.004	0.287 \pm 0.007	0.434 \pm 0.005
	DP-LLMTGen w. NUL	3.859 \pm 0.008	0.069 \pm 0.003	0.139 \pm 0.003	0.277 \pm 0.003	0.425 \pm 0.003

5.3 Additional Experimental Analyses

Data contamination testing. *Data contamination between the pre-training and experimental datasets of the Llama-2 7b model is not a significant problem.*

To ensure no DP violence, we conduct the feature completion testing proposed by Bordt et al. [2023] for Llama-2 7b and GPT-4 models for the Adult and Bank datasets. The results (illustrated in Figure 4) indicate that GPT-4 [et al., 2024c] could have been trained on those public datasets and actually memorizes the training data to achieve the superior performance compared to the baselines, including random-choice and majority-choice strategies. In contrast, Llama-2 performs comparably to the random-choice strategy but significantly worse than the majority-choice strategy. It indicates that Llama-2 has no memorization and zero knowledge about feature distributions of the datasets.




Figure 4: Feature completion testing performance of GPT-4 and Llama-2-7b models. The values represent for the percentage of correct completion.

Do LLMs incorporate feature names for context-aware learning? *LLMs achieve better performance on datasets with meaningful feature names compared to those lacking feature names.*




Figure 5: Performance of DP-LLMTGen for the Adult subsets with and without feature names.

This ability is a unique characteristic of LLMs compared to earlier approaches like GANs. GANs generate outcomes that are independent of feature names, as they can only learn from the feature values. This aligns with the results in [Dinh et al., 2022, Hagselmann et al., 2023] in classification settings.

Does dialogue optimization provide benefit for DP-LLMTGen? *Models without dialogue optimization can generate better synthetic datasets.*

Most LLMs were developed for assistant tasks, which typically require dialogue optimization. To understand the effects of dialogue optimization, we conduct an experiments using Llama-2-hf and Llama-2-chat-hf models. Figure 6 illustrates the performance of DP-LLMTGen using those two models. Generally, models which have not been optimized for conversational tasks exhibit a marginal (though not significant) improvement – an average decrease of 2.85% in 5-way TVD. This could be because synthetic data generation tasks might not require dialogue-related features. Therefore, models like Llama-2-hf, which have been optimized for more general tasks, could align better for synthesizing tabular data.

Are Larger LLMs always better? *Llama-2 7b can outperform LLama-2 13b under DP settings.*




Figure 7: Performance of DP-LLMTGen when using Llama-2-7b-chat-hf and Llama-2-13b-chat-hf on three subsets of the Adult dataset.

7b provides better synthetic datasets. One of the reasons is that given fewer trainable parameters, DPSGD employs a lower gradient clipping factor, resulting in smaller total noise. This aligns with existing findings [Kurakin et al., 2023, Yu et al., 2022] which demonstrated parameter-efficient fine tuning outperforms full fine-tuning under differential privacy settings.

5.4 Controllable Generator – Fairness-Aware Generation

Controllable generator can significantly reduce biases with a minor tradeoff in utility. For controllable generation, DP-LLMTGen uses value-specified sampling. For example, in the Adult dataset, to generate a sample that is a male earning more than \$50K/year, the initialized prompt can be "Gender is male, Income is >50K,". We conduct an experiment where the amount of controllable-generated data is varied from 5% to 50%. The remainder is produced through random-initialized sampling. A value of 0.0% denotes non-controllable generation. We also train XGBoost models on the generated datasets. Figure 8 illustrates the fairness in data and ML downstream tasks. Utilizing a controllable generator for a small fraction of the data (e.g., 10%), the demographic parity difference (detailed in Appendix C.3) in data can be decreased by $\sim 85\%$. This also leads to a substantial improvement in fairness for ML downstream models while only reducing classification accuracy by $\sim 1\%$. When the amount is significant, DP-LLMTGen can generate datasets with perfect demographic parity. However, data demographic parity does not guarantee the complete absence of bias in ML models, as bias elimination in ML still requires in-processing fairness-aware training models [Li and Liu, 2022, Han et al., 2024].

6 Conclusion

We have presented DP-LLMTGen which leverages pretrained LLMs for differentially private tabular data synthesization. Overall, DP-LLMTGen outperformed the baselines across multiple datasets and privacy settings, closing the gap between deep learning-based and marginal-based methods. DP-LLMTGen offers controllable generators which are important for some applications that require fairness guarantees [Liu et al., 2024, Wang et al., 2024]. However, one key limitation of DP-LLMTGen is the high computational demand. Despite the limitations, with the rapid development of LLMs, we believe utilizing those models can offer a new paradigm in privacy-preserving tabular data synthesis.




Figure 6: Performance of DP-LLMTGen when using Llama-2-7b-hf and Llama-2-7b-chat-hf as the model backbone on subsets of the Adult dataset.

To understand the effects of model size, we perform an experiment using two Llama-2 models, 7b and 13b, on the Adult subsets. We configure identical hyperparameters of LoRA (i.e., scaling factor and rank). It is noteworthy that given the same rank in LoRA configuration, Llama-2 13b has bigger matrices which leads to more trainable parameters. More specifically, Llama-2 7b and 13b require 8M and 13M trainable parameters, respectively. Figure 7 presents the performance of the two LLMs where LLama-2




Figure 8: Fairness-Aware Generation Performance. DPDiff denotes Demographic Parity Difference; EODiff stands for Equalized of Odd Difference.

References

- Martin Abadi, Andy Chu, Ian Goodfellow, H. Brendan McMahan, Ilya Mironov, Kunal Talwar, and Li Zhang. Deep learning with differential privacy. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, CCS '16, page 308–318, New York, NY, USA, 2016. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450341394. doi: 10.1145/2976749.2978318. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2976749.2978318>.
- Haleh Akrami, Anand A. Joshi, Jian Li, Sergül Aydıöre, and Richard M. Leahy. A robust variational autoencoder using beta divergence. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 238:107886, 2022. ISSN 0950-7051. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knosys.2021.107886>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0950705121010534>.
- Sergül Aydıöre, William Brown, Michael Kearns, Krishnaram Kenthapadi, Luca Melis, Aaron Roth, and Ankit A Siva. Differentially private query release through adaptive projection. In Marina Meila and Tong Zhang, editors, *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 457–467. PMLR, 18–24 Jul 2021. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v139/aydore21a.html>.
- Gilbert Badaro, Mohammed Saeed, and Paolo Papotti. Transformers for tabular data representation: A survey of models and applications. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 11:227–249, 2023. doi: 10.1162/tacl_a_00544. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.tacl-1.14>.
- Sebastian Bordt, Harsha Nori, and Rich Caruana. Elephants never forget: Testing language models for memorization of tabular data. In *NeurIPS 2023 Second Table Representation Learning Workshop*, 2023.
- Vadim Borisov, Tobias Leemann, Kathrin Seßler, Johannes Haug, Martin Pawelczyk, and Gjergji Kasneci. Deep neural networks and tabular data: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, pages 1–21, 2022. doi: 10.1109/TNNLS.2022.3229161.
- Vadim Borisov, Kathrin Sessler, Tobias Leemann, Martin Pawelczyk, and Gjergji Kasneci. Language models are realistic tabular data generators. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=cEymQN0eI>.
- Luca Canale, Nicolas Grislain, Grégoire Lothe, and Johan Leduc. Generative modeling of complex data, 2022.
- Alycia N. Carey, Karuna Bhaila, Kennedy Edemacu, and Xintao Wu. Dp-tabicl: In-context learning with differentially private tabular data, 2024.
- Rodrigo Castellon, Achintya Gopal, Brian Bloniarz, and David Rosenberg. Dp-tbart: A transformer-based autoregressive model for differentially private tabular data generation. *ArXiv*, abs/2307.10430, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.10430>.
- Tianqi Chen and Carlos Guestrin. Xgboost: A scalable tree boosting system. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, KDD '16, page 785–794, New York, NY, USA, 2016. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450342322. doi: 10.1145/2939672.2939785. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2939672.2939785>.
- C. Chow and C. Liu. Approximating discrete probability distributions with dependence trees. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 14(3):462–467, 1968. doi: 10.1109/TIT.1968.1054142.
- Rachel Cummings, Damien Desfontaines, David Evans, Roxana Geambasu, Yangsibo Huang, Matthew Jagielski, Peter Kairouz, Gautam Kamath, Sewoong Oh, Olga Ohrimenko, Nicolas Papernot, Ryan Rogers, Milan Shen, Shuang Song, Weijie Su, Andreas Terzis, Abhradeep Thakurta, Sergei Vassilvitskii, Yu-Xiang Wang, Li Xiong, Sergey Yekhanin, Da Yu, Huanyu Zhang, and Wanrong Zhang. Advancing Differential Privacy: Where We Are Now and Future Directions for Real-World Deployment. *Harvard Data Science Review*, 6(1), jan 16 2024. <https://hdsr.mitpress.mit.edu/pub/s19we8gh>.

- Tuan Dinh, Yuchen Zeng, Ruisu Zhang, Ziqian Lin, Michael Gira, Shashank Rajput, Jy yong Sohn, Dimitris Papailiopoulos, and Kangwook Lee. LIFT: Language-interfaced fine-tuning for non-language machine learning tasks. In Alice H. Oh, Alekh Agarwal, Danielle Belgrave, and Kyunghyun Cho, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id=s_PJMEGIUfa.
- Qingxiu Dong, Jingjing Xu, Lingpeng Kong, Zhifang Sui, and Lei Li. Statistical knowledge assessment for large language models. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=pNtG6NAmx0>.
- Dheeraj Dua and Casey Graff. Uci machine learning repository: Adult data set, 2017. URL <https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/adult>. April 29 2024.
- Cynthia Dwork, Frank McSherry, Kobbi Nissim, and Adam Smith. Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis. In *Proceedings of the Third Conference on Theory of Cryptography, TCC'06*, page 265–284, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006. Springer-Verlag. ISBN 3540327312. doi: 10.1007/11681878_14. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/11681878_14.
- Gemma Team et al. Gemma: Open models based on gemini research and technology, 2024a.
- Hugo Touvron et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models, 2023.
- Marah Abdin et al. Phi-3 technical report: A highly capable language model locally on your phone, 2024b.
- OpenAI et al. Gpt-4 technical report, 2024c.
- Manbir S Gulati and Paul F Roysdon. TabMT: Generating tabular data with masked transformers. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=qs4swxtIAQ>.
- Xiaotian Han, Jianfeng Chi, Yu Chen, Qifan Wang, Han Zhao, Na Zou, and Xia Hu. FFB: A fair fairness benchmark for in-processing group fairness methods. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=TzAJbTClAz>.
- Stefan Hegselmann, Alejandro Buendia, Hunter Lang, Monica Agrawal, Xiaoyi Jiang, and David Sontag. Tablm: Few-shot classification of tabular data with large language models. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 5549–5581. PMLR, 2023.
- Edward J Hu, yelong shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=nZeVKeeFYf9>.
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, L  lio Renard Lavaud, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth  e Lacroix, and William El Sayed. Mistral 7b, 2023.
- Sanket Kamthe, Samuel A. Assefa, and Marc Peter Deisenroth. Copula flows for synthetic data generation. *ArXiv*, abs/2101.00598, 2021. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:230435729>.
- Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization, 2017.
- Akim Kotelnikov, Dmitry Baranchuk, Ivan Rubachev, and Artem Babenko. Tabddpm: modelling tabular data with diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML'23*. JMLR.org, 2023.
- Alexey Kurakin, Natalia Ponomareva, Umar Syed, Liam MacDermed, and A. Terzis. Harnessing large-language models to generate private synthetic text. *ArXiv*, abs/2306.01684, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.01684v2>.

- Alexey Kurakin, Natalia Ponomareva, Umar Syed, Liam MacDermed, and Andreas Terzis. Harnessing large-language models to generate private synthetic text, 2024.
- Haoran Li, Li Xiong, and Xiaoqian Jiang. Differentially private synthesization of multi-dimensional data using copula functions. *Advances in database technology : proceedings. International Conference on Extending Database Technology*, 2014:475–486, 2014. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:14422031>.
- Peizhao Li and Hongfu Liu. Achieving fairness at no utility cost via data reweighing with influence. In Kamalika Chaudhuri, Stefanie Jegelka, Le Song, Csaba Szepesvari, Gang Niu, and Sivan Sabato, editors, *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 12917–12930. PMLR, 17–23 Jul 2022. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v162/li22p.html>.
- Zhuoyan Li, Hangxiao Zhu, Zhuoran Lu, and Ming Yin. Synthetic data generation with large language models for text classification: Potential and limitations. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10443–10461, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.647. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.647>.
- Terrance Liu, Giuseppe Vietri, and Steven Wu. Iterative methods for private synthetic data: Unifying framework and new methods. In A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P. Liang, and J. Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=jcCatp6oWZK>.
- Terrance Liu, Jingwu Tang, Giuseppe Vietri, and Zhiwei Steven Wu. Generating private synthetic data with genetic algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ICML’23. JMLR.org, 2023.
- Tongyu Liu, Ju Fan, Nan Tang, Guoliang Li, and Xiaoyong Du. Controllable tabular data synthesis using diffusion models. *Proc. ACM Manag. Data*, 2(1), mar 2024. doi: 10.1145/3639283. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3639283>.
- Justus Mattern, Zhijing Jin, Benjamin Weggenmann, Bernhard Schoelkopf, and Mrinmaya Sachan. Differentially private language models for secure data sharing. In Yoav Goldberg, Zornitsa Kozareva, and Yue Zhang, editors, *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 4860–4873, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, December 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2022.emnlp-main.323. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.emnlp-main.323>.
- Ryan McKenna, Brett Mullins, Daniel Sheldon, and Gerome Miklau. Aim: an adaptive and iterative mechanism for differentially private synthetic data. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 15(11):2599–2612, jul 2022. ISSN 2150-8097. doi: 10.14778/3551793.3551817. URL <https://doi.org/10.14778/3551793.3551817>.
- Nicolas Papernot, Shuang Song, Ilya Mironov, Ananth Raghunathan, Kunal Talwar, and Ulfar Erlingsson. Scalable private learning with PATE. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=rkZB1XbRZ>.
- Noseong Park, Mahmoud Mohammadi, Kshitij Gorde, Sushil Jajodia, Hongkyu Park, and Youngmin Kim. Data synthesis based on generative adversarial networks. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 11(10): 1071–1083, jun 2018. ISSN 2150-8097. doi: 10.14778/3231751.3231757. URL <https://doi.org/10.14778/3231751.3231757>.
- Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Köpf, Edward Yang, Zach DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. *PyTorch: an imperative style, high-performance deep learning library*. Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA, 2019.
- Alec Radford, Jeff Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. 2019.

- Nicolas W. Remerscheid, Alexander Ziller, Daniel Rueckert, and Georgios Kaissis. Smoothnets: Optimizing cnn architecture design for differentially private deep learning, 2022.
- Alexandre Sablayrolles, Yue Wang, and Brian Karrer. Privately generating tabular data using language models, 2023.
- Victor Sanh, Lysandre Debut, Julien Chaumond, and Thomas Wolf. Distilbert, a distilled version of bert: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter. In *NeurIPS EMC2 Workshop*, 2019.
- Michael Shoemate, Andrew Vyrros, Chuck McCallum, Raman Prasad, Philip Durbin, Sílvia Casacuberta Puig, Ethan Cowan, Vicki Xu, Zachary Ratliff, Nicolás Berrios, Alex Whitworth, Michael Eliot, Christian Lebeda, Oren Renard, and Claire McKay Bowen. OpenDP Library. URL <https://github.com/opensdp/opensdp>.
- Ravid Shwartz-Ziv and Amitai Armon. Tabular data: Deep learning is not all you need. *Information Fusion*, 81:84–90, 2022. ISSN 1566-2535. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2021.11.011>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1566253521002360>.
- Yuchao Tao, Ryan McKenna, Michael Hay, Ashwin Machanavajjhala, and Gerome Miklau. Benchmarking differentially private synthetic data generation algorithms, 2022.
- Llama team. Llama-3. <https://ai.meta.com/blog/meta-llama-3/>, 2024.
- Reihaneh Tokzadehmahani, Peter Kairouz, and Benedict Paten. Dp-cgan: Differentially private synthetic data and label generation. In *2019 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops (CVPRW)*, pages 98–104, 2019. doi: 10.1109/CVPRW.2019.00018.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In I. Guyon, U. Von Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/file/3f5ee243547dee91fbd053c1c4a845aa-Paper.pdf.
- Giuseppe Vietri, Cédric Archambeau, Sergul Aydore, William Brown, Michael Kearns, Aaron Roth, Ankit Siva, Shuai Tang, and Zhiwei Steven Wu. Private synthetic data for multitask learning and marginal queries. In *NeurIPS 2022*, 2022. URL <https://www.amazon.science/publications/private-synthetic-data-for-multitask-learning-and-marginal-queries>.
- Shiyu Wang, Yuanqi Du, Xiaojie Guo, Bo Pan, Zhaohui Qin, and Liang Zhao. Controllable data generation by deep learning: A review. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 56(9), apr 2024. ISSN 0360-0300. doi: 10.1145/3648609. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3648609>.
- Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Remi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, Joe Davison, Sam Shleifer, Patrick von Platen, Clara Ma, Yacine Jernite, Julien Plu, Canwen Xu, Teven Le Scao, Sylvain Gugger, Mariama Drame, Quentin Lhoest, and Alexander Rush. Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing. In Qun Liu and David Schlangen, editors, *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 38–45, Online, October 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-demos.6. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2020.emnlp-demos.6>.
- Chulin Xie, Zinan Lin, Arturs Backurs, Sivakanth Gopi, Da Yu, Huseyin A Inan, Harsha Nori, Haotian Jiang, Huishuai Zhang, Yin Tat Lee, Bo Li, and Sergey Yekhanin. Differentially private synthetic data via foundation model apis 2: Text, 2024.
- Liyang Xie, Kaixiang Lin, Shu Wang, Fei Wang, and Jiayu Zhou. Differentially private generative adversarial network. *ArXiv*, abs/1802.06739, 2018.
- Lei Xu, Maria Skoularidou, Alfredo Cuesta-Infante, and Kalyan Veeramachaneni. Modeling tabular data using conditional gan. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.

- Jinsung Yoon, James Jordon, and Mihaela van der Schaar. PATE-GAN: Generating synthetic data with differential privacy guarantees. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=S1zk9iRqF7>.
- Jim Young, Patrick Graham, and Richard Penny. Using bayesian networks to create synthetic data. *Journal of Official Statistics*, 25:549–567, 12 2009.
- Ashkan Yousefpour, Igor Shilov, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Davide Testuggine, Karthik Prasad, Mani Malek, John Nguyen, Sayan Ghosh, Akash Bharadwaj, Jessica Zhao, Graham Cormode, and Ilya Mironov. Opacus: User-friendly differential privacy library in PyTorch. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.12298*, 2021.
- Da Yu, Saurabh Naik, Arturs Backurs, Sivakanth Gopi, Huseyin A Inan, Gautam Kamath, Janardhan Kulkarni, Yin Tat Lee, Andre Manoel, Lukas Wutschitz, Sergey Yekhanin, and Huishuai Zhang. Differentially private fine-tuning of language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Q42f0dfjECO>.
- Xiang Yue, Huseyin Inan, Xuechen Li, Girish Kumar, Julia McAnallen, Hoda Shajari, Huan Sun, David Levitan, and Robert Sim. Synthetic text generation with differential privacy: A simple and practical recipe. In Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki, editors, *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1321–1342, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.74. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.acl-long.74>.
- Jun Zhang, Graham Cormode, Cecilia M. Procopiuc, Divesh Srivastava, and Xiaokui Xiao. Privbayes: Private data release via bayesian networks. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.*, 42(4), oct 2017. ISSN 0362-5915. doi: 10.1145/3134428. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3134428>.
- Chaoyi Zhu, Jiayi Tang, Hans Brouwer, Juan F. Pérez, Marten van Dijk, and Lydia Y. Chen. Quantifying and mitigating privacy risks for tabular generative models, 2024.

Appendix

Due to the space limit, many details are presented in the Appendix.

A	Additional Related Works	16
B	Details of datasets	16
C	Evaluation Metrics	16
C.1	Statistical fidelity.	16
C.2	Machine learning downstream performance.	17
C.3	Fairness metrics.	17
D	Implementation details	17
E	In-Depth Analyses of Overall Evaluation	18
E.1	Training time of DP-LLMTGen	18
E.2	Distance to closest record histograms	18
E.3	Single feature distribution visualizations	19
E.4	Joint feature distribution visualizations	22
F	Additional results for experimental analyses	24
F.1	Do large language models truly comprehend feature names?	24
F.2	Does dialogue optimizing provide benefit DP-LLMTabGen?	24
F.3	Are Larger LLMs always better?	24
G	Limitations	25

A Additional Related Works

Transformer-based approach for differentially private synthesizing tabular data. Although our method (DP-LLMTGen) and the methods from [Castellon et al., 2023, Sablayrolles et al., 2023] (named DP-TBART and SynLM) are all based on transformer networks, there are significant differences. DP-TBART and SynLM train from scratch generative models specialized for each dataset. DP-TBART and SynLM create a small vocabulary including categorical values, and numerical quantiles. In contrast, DP-LLMTGen aims to fine tune pretrained large language models. DP-LLMTGen converts tabular data into textual sentences and uses a (human-language) semantic vocabulary. Additionally, the most important point is that DP-TBART and SynLM underperform the marginal-based methods in most cases [Castellon et al., 2023, Sablayrolles et al., 2023]. DP-LLMTGen is the first approach that leverages powerful LLMs for differentially private synthesizing tabular data and outperforms the marginal-based methods.

Large Language Models for (differentially private) synthetic textual data generation. Large language models have been a powerful tool for synthetic data generation. Li et al. [2023] investigated in-context learning for text generation to enable text classifiers. Xie et al. [2024] utilized LLMs to privately paraphrase texts. Meanwhile, Kurakin et al. [2024], Mattern et al. [2022], Yue et al. [2023] fine tuning LLMs by DPSGD. Kurakin et al. [2024] pointed out the data contamination problems of previous works and filtered the experimental datasets to address this problem. Non-fine-tuning approaches also work well for textual data because LLMs have been pretrained on massive texts. However, the performance of non-fine-tuning LLMs for tabular data is still far behind conventional methods [Carey et al., 2024]. Therefore, fine-tuning is necessary for tabular data. This has been demonstrated in some tabular classification problems [Dinh et al., 2022, Hagselmann et al., 2023].

B Details of datasets

We use two main dataset sources: UCI and Kaggle. The UCI machine learning datasets are at larger scales and have been extensively studied by the research community. The datasets from Kaggle are more recent and have been published after the knowledge cutoff date of the Llama-2 models, which are used for DP-LLMTGen’s model backbone.

Table 3: Key characteristics of our experimental datasets.

Short Name	Full Name	Source	Number of samples	Number of categorical features	Number of numerical features	Published after Llama-2 knowledge cutoff date
Bank	Bank marketing	UCI	11162	9	7	✗
Adult	Adult census income	UCI	48842	7	6	✗
Food	Online food order	Kaggle	388	6	5	✓
Apple	Apple quality	Kaggle	4000	0	7	✓
Shipping	On-time Shipping Classification	Kaggle	10999	4	7	✓

C Evaluation Metrics

C.1 Statistical fidelity.

Our work evaluates statistical fidelity based on the total variation distance (TVD). To calculate TVD, numerical features are quantiled into 20 groups. Let $[x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_{N_{\mathcal{F}}}]$ be a record/sample (i.e., a row of tables), $N_{\mathcal{F}}$ is the number of features. We define k -way TVD (also abbreviated as k -TVD) where k is the number of features that are involved. For example, $k = 1$ denotes the single feature distributions (Equation 8). Meanwhile, $k = 2$ means the total variation distances of joint two-feature distributions (Equation 9), where f_i is the feature at index i ; \mathcal{F} stands for the set of all features; c, c_1 and c_2 denote the feature values; \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{D}' represent for the synthetic and testing datasets. Inductively, we calculate 3-way TVD, 4-way TVD, and 5-way TVD.

$$\text{1-way TVD}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}') = \frac{1}{2N_{\mathcal{F}}} \sum_{f_i \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{c \in f_i} |p(x_i = c|\mathcal{D}) - p(x_i = c|\mathcal{D}')| \quad (8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{2-way TVD}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}') = \frac{1}{2N_{\mathcal{F}}(N_{\mathcal{F}} - 1)} \sum_{f_i \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{f_j \in \mathcal{F} \setminus f_i} \sum_{c_1 \in f_i} \sum_{c_2 \in f_j} & |p(x_i = c_1, x_j = c_2|\mathcal{D}) \\ & - p(x_i = c_1, x_j = c_2|\mathcal{D}')| \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

C.2 Machine learning downstream performance.

We evaluate the ML downstream tasks using XGBoost [Chen and Guestrin, 2016] which has achieved state-of-the-art performance in many benchmarks for tabular data [Shwartz-Ziv and Armon, 2022]. We perform a grid search for 5-fold cross validation to achieve the robust and realistic testing performance. The grid search hyperparameters include number of estimators {100, 200, 300}, maximum tree depth {3, 5, 10, 20}, and learning rate {0.01, 0.05, 0.1}.

C.3 Fairness metrics.

Demographic Parity, also known as statistical parity, is a fairness criterion where particular attributes or model predictions are equally distributed across different demographic groups. The demographic parity difference of a mechanism \mathcal{M} is calculated in Equation 10, where x is the features of a sample and a, b are demographic groups. Similarly, the demographic parity difference of a dataset can be formalized as Equation 11 where $Y(x)$ represents for the label of x .

$$\mathcal{M_DPDiff} = |p(\mathcal{M}(x) = 1|A = a) - p(\mathcal{M}(x) = 1|A = b)| \quad (10)$$

$$\text{Data_DPDiff} = |p(Y(x) = 1|A = a) - p(Y(x) = 1|A = b)| \quad (11)$$

Equalized Odds can guarantee a machine learning model performs equally well for different groups. Let $TPR_a, TPR_b, FPR_a,$ and FPR_b be the True Positive Rate and the False Positive Rate for groups a, b . The Equalized Odds difference can be defined as the follow:

$$\text{EO_DPDiff} = \max(|TPR_a - TPR_b|, |FPR_a - FPR_b|) \quad (12)$$

D Implementation details

For the GAN-based methods, we implemented using SmartNoise SDK <https://github.com/opendp/smartnoise-sdk> which is a part of OpenDP library [Shoemate et al.]. For RAP, RAP++, and GSD, we use the code provided the authors. For the baselines, we used recommended hyperparameters in the papers and default hyperparameters of their github repositories (if no recommendation in the papers). DP-LLMTGen’s implementation is based one Huggingface [Wolf et al., 2020] for LLMs, Pytorch [Paszke et al., 2019], and Opacus [Yousefpour et al., 2021] for DPSGD. Regarding to the hyperparameters of DP-LLMTGen, for the first fine-tuning stage (i.e., format learning), we fine

tune LLMs using Adam optimizer [Kingma and Ba, 2017] and the learning rate at $1e-4$. We fine tune 5 epochs for the Bank, Adult, and Shipping datasets and 10 epochs for the Food and Apple datasets. The reason is the number of samples in the Food and Apple datasets is small, so the LLMs need more epochs to learn. For the second stage, α is set at 0.65; the learning rate is $5e-4$. For the Adult dataset, we fine tune for 2 epochs. The remainder datasets are fine tuned with 4 epochs. All the experiments are conducted at least three times by different random train test splits to ensure the robust results. It should be noted that the size of the synthetic datasets matches that of the training datasets.

E In-Depth Analyses of Overall Evaluation

E.1 Training time of DP-LLMTGen

The main factors affect to the training time is the dataset size, sample length, and number of epochs. Various datasets have different number of samples. Moreover, after converting to sentences (using Tabular-to-Text decoding), the sentence length (i.e, number of tokens) depends on the number of features and categorical/numerical values. It is worth noting that, given the same dataset, there is no significant difference of training time when using SGD or DPSGD. It is because, LLMs have billions of parameters, there are only a dozen of millions of trainable parameters when using LoRA. Most of the training time is spent on the forward pass of the LLMs rather than the backward pass for LoRA parameters.

Table 4: Training time of DP-LLMTGen on a single H100 GPU

Dataset	Training time for 1 epoch (Llama 2 7b)
Bank	15 minutes
Adult	1 hour 45 minutes
Food	1 minute
Apple	12 minutes
Shipping	16 minutes

E.2 Distance to closest record histograms

Since LLMs have a strong capability to memorize the fine-tuning datasets, it is essential to verify that LLMs actually generate new samples or just replicate the training datasets. In this study, to demonstrate that LLMs are capable of generating novel samples, we calculate and distance from each record of the synthetic datasets to the closest record in the corresponding training datasets. We normalize the datasets before distance calculation to ensure equal importance of all features. A distance at 0 represents for a replication from the training datasets to the generation. Figures 9 and 10 depicts the histograms of distances for the Shipping dataset under different privacy budgets. Generally, there is no replication of training data when using DP-LLMTGen. When the privacy constraints are more relaxed, all methods tend to generate samples that are closer to each other than those produced under a stricter privacy budget. Additionally, DP-LLMTGen and RAP++ generates less outliers compared to the other methods.




Figure 9: Histograms of the distance to closest record between the testing/synthetic and training sets for the Shipping dataset. The privacy budget is set at $\epsilon = 0.5$




Figure 10: Histograms of the distance to closest record between the testing/synthetic and training sets for the Shipping dataset. The privacy budget is set at $\epsilon = 1.0$

E.3 Single feature distribution visualizations

DP-LLMTGen produces better single features distributions than the baselines. That leads to a lower 1-way TVD. Especially, DP-LLMTGen replicates well for minority feature categories while RAP, RAP++, and GSD amplify them (Figures 11a and 12b).




Figure 11: [Food dataset] Single feature distributions of synthetic and real sets. Numerical features are binned into 10 groups for this visualization. The colors represent for categorical values and numerical groups.




Figure 12: [Shipping dataset] Single feature distributions of synthetic and real sets. Categorical features are binned into 10 groups for this visualization. The colors represent for categorical values and numerical groups.

E.4 Joint feature distribution visualizations




Figure 13: [Adult dataset] Joint distribution plot of two features (age and relationship) of synthetic and real sets.




Figure 14: [Bank dataset] Joint distribution plot of two features (age and job) of synthetic and real sets.

F Additional results for experimental analyses

Section 5.3 presents some experimental analyses using the Adult subsets with 8192 samples. In this section, we provide results of the same settings but using 4096 samples. Generally, the trends are consistent to those of the previous experiments 8192 samples.

F.1 Do large language models truly comprehend feature names?




Figure 15: Performance of DP-LLMTGen for the Adult subsets of 4096 samples with and without feature names.

F.2 Does dialogue optimizing provide benefit DP-LLMTabGen?




Figure 16: Performance of DP-LLMTGen when using Llama-2-7b-hf and Llama-2-7b-chat-hf as the model backbone on the Adult subsets of 4096 samples.

F.3 Are Larger LLMs always better?




Figure 17: Performance of DP-LLMTGen when using Llama-2-7b-chat-hf and Llama-2-13b-chat-hf on three Adult subsets of 4096 samples.

G Limitations

LLM diversity. In our previous experiment on the Adult dataset, larger models were not always better. The main reason is the more number of trainable parameters causing bigger gradient clipping factor and larger total noise added. The number of trainable parameters can be adjusted through the parameter-efficient fine-tuning configuration. However, we did not tune this number due to the limitation of computation resources. Therefore, a suitable configuration of parameter-efficient fine-tuning for larger models can provide promising results. Additionally, we acknowledge that there are many other open-source models such as Mistral [Jiang et al., 2023] and Gemma [et al., 2024a]. However, our experiments were mainly based on the Llama-2 models only. It is still unknown about the performance of other model classes for DP tabular data synthesis. Additionally, the higher-quality pre-training corpus can deliver better LLMs given the same number of parameters [et al., 2024b]. For example, Phi-3 [et al., 2024b], which was pre-trained on a selected corpus (composed of heavily filtered web data and synthetic data), outperformed all other LLMs with the same number of parameters. Llama-3 8b is better Llama-2 70b in multiple benchmarks [team, 2024]. Given existing evidence that smaller models can deal better with DPSGD training [Remerscheid et al., 2022], DP-LLMTGen employing these parameter-efficient LLMs as the model backbone potentially enhances the current performance.

ML downstream performance. DP-LLMTGen using Llama-2 outperformed the baselines in terms of statistical fidelity, but did not entirely surpass them in downstream machine learning performance. Our results exhibited a mismatch between statistical fidelity and ML downstream performance, which is consistent to a previous benchmark [Tao et al., 2022]. This is because statistical fidelity treats the target feature and other features, equally. However, for ML downstream performance, the target feature can be more important compared to the other features. Only an mistake in the target feature may not lead to a high error of the statistical fidelity but will significantly hurt the ML downstream performance. Currently, DP-LLMTGen does not discriminate target features and other features. Therefore, a possible enhancement could be implementing a weighted loss function to increase the importance of the target feature. Additionally, we evaluated DP-LLMTGen using only the random sampling strategy for the general evaluation. The random sampling does not consider data characteristics and marginal distributions. DP-LLMTGen also offers controllable generation, which has been demonstrated in our fairness-aware experiment. To improve the ML performance, it is possible to generate synthetic datasets with diversity and uncertainty controls by leveraging the controllable generation capability of DP-LLMTGen. Another potential approach is to combine DP-LLMTGen’s controllable generation with active learning or shaley-value methods which can determine which are worthy samples.