Purifier: Defending Data Inference Attacks via Transforming Confidence Scores

Ziqi Yang[1,2,3], **Lijin Wang**[1], **Da Yang**[1], **Jie Wan**[1],
Ziming Zhao[1], **Ee-Chien Chang**[6], **Fan Zhang**[1,4,5*], **Kui Ren** [1,2,3,4]

[1] Zhejiang University
[2] ZJU-Hangzhou Global Scientific and Technological Innovation Center, Zhejiang University
[3] Key Laboratory of Blockchain and Cyberspace Governance of Zhejiang Province
[4] Jiaxing Research Institute, Zhejiang University
[5] Zhengzhou Xinda Institute of Advanced Technology, [6] National University of Singapore
{yangziqi, wanglijin, yangda, wanjie, zhaoziming, fanzhang, kuiren}@zju.edu.cn, changec@comp.nus.edu.sg

arXiv:2212.00612v1 [cs.LG] 1 Dec 2022

Abstract

Neural networks are susceptible to data inference attacks such as the membership inference attack, the adversarial model inversion attack and the attribute inference attack, where the attacker could infer useful information such as the membership, the reconstruction or the sensitive attributes of a data sample from the confidence scores predicted by the target classifier. In this paper, we propose a method, namely PURIFIER, to defend against membership inference attacks. It transforms the confidence score vectors predicted by the target classifier and makes purified confidence scores indistinguishable in individual shape, statistical distribution and prediction label between members and non-members. The experimental results show that PURIFIER helps defend membership inference attacks with high effectiveness and efficiency, outperforming previous defense methods, and also incurs negligible utility loss. Besides, our further experiments show that PURIFIER is also effective in defending adversarial model inversion attacks and attribute inference attacks. For example, the inversion error is raised about 4+ times on the Facescrub530 classifier, and the attribute inference accuracy drops significantly when PURIFIER is deployed in our experiment.

Introduction

Machine learning has been provided as a service by many platforms, transforming various aspects of our daily life such as handling users' sensitive data. Users access these models through prediction APIs which return a confidence score vector or a label. Many studies have indicated that the prediction information of a single sample could be exploited to perform data inference attacks to get useful information about this sample on which the machine learning model operates (Shokri et al. 2017; Yang et al. 2019; Song and Shmatikov 2020). Data inference attacks could be largely divided into two categories. The first kind of attacks aim at inferring distributional information about a class by observing the prediction changes of different samples (An et al. 2022; Mehnaz et al. 2022), while the second kind of attacks are to infer the individual information of a sample by observing its specific prediction output such as the membership inference attacks (Nasr, Shokri, and Houmansadr 2018; Salem et al. 2018; Hui et al. 2021; Yeom et al. 2018; Li and Zhang 2021; Li, Li, and Ribeiro 2021), adversarial model inversion attacks (Yang et al. 2019) and attribute inference attacks (Song and Shmatikov 2020). In this paper, we focus on the second type of data inference attacks.

Among these data inference attacks, *membership inference attack* (Shokri et al. 2017) is one of the most important and exemplary attacks. In the membership inference attack, the adversary is asked to determine whether a given data sample is in the target model's training data. Many studies acknowledge that the confidence score vectors tell more prediction information beyond the label and thus they should be provided in the prediction results. Therefore, a number of approaches have been proposed to defend the membership inference attack while preserving the confidence scores (Shokri et al. 2017; Salem et al. 2018; Nasr, Shokri, and Houmansadr 2018; Abadi et al. 2016; Jia et al. 2019; Tang et al. 2022). On the other hand, some studies believe that removing the confidence information in the prediction result is a way of defending the membership inference attack. However, these defenses are broken by label-only attacks (Yeom et al. 2018; Choquette-Choo et al. 2021; Li, Li, and Ribeiro 2021), whereby only the predicted label is exploited to infer the membership.

The major cause of membership inference attack is that the prediction results are distinguishable for members and non-members. For example, when a model overfits on the training data, it behaves more confidently on predicting the training data (members) than predicting the testing data (non-members). The prediction differences between members and non-members exist in their *individual shape*, *statistical distribution* and *prediction label*. (1) The target classifier often assigns a higher probability to the predicted class when given a member, making the confidence scores distinguishable in individual shape. This is exploited by many attacks (Salem et al. 2018; Nasr, Shokri, and Houmansadr 2018) (2) Confidence scores on members and non-members are also distinguishable in their statistical distribution. Our experiments show that confidence scores on the members are more clustered in the encoded latent space, while those on non-members are more scattered. BlindMI (Hui et al. 2021) exploits such statistical difference to infer membership by comparing the distance variation of the confidence scores of two generated datasets. (3) In addition, the confidence scores on members and non-members are different in the prediction label. Member sam-

*Corresponding author
Copyright © 2023, Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (www.aaai.org). All rights reserved.

ples have a higher probability of being correctly classified than the non-member samples, which leads to the difference in classification accuracy. Various label-only attacks exploit such distinguishability (Yeom et al. 2018; Li and Zhang 2021; Li, Li, and Ribeiro 2021).

In this paper, we propose a defense method, namely PURIFIER, against the membership inference attack. The main idea is to directly reduce the distinguishability of confidence scores and labels on members and non-members by transforming the confidence score vectors of members as if they were predicted on non-members. It takes as input the prediction produced by the target model and outputs a transformed version. First, we train PURIFIER on the confidence score vectors predicted by the target model on non-member data to reconstruct these vectors using a novel training strategy. This encourages PURIFIER to learn the individual shape of these non-member confidence score vectors and eventually to generate confidence score vectors as if they were drawn from the learned pattern, reducing distinguishability of confidence scores in *individual shape*. Second, we use Conditional Variational Auto-Encoder (CVAE) as a component of PURIFIER to introduce Gaussian noises to the confidence scores, such that the statistically clustered confidence scores can be scattered and become indistinguishable from those on non-members, reducing distinguishability in *statistical distribution*. Third, to decrease the distinguishability in *prediction labels*, PURIFIER intentionally modifies the predicted labels of members while preserving those of non-members, which results in a reduction of classification accuracy gap between members and non-members.

Although PURIFIER is designed to defend the membership inference attacks, it turns out to be also effective in defending the *adversarial model inversion attack* and the *attribute inference attack*. In the adversarial model inversion attack, the adversary aims at inferring a reconstruction (Yang et al. 2019; Fredrikson, Jha, and Ristenpart 2015; Hitaj, Ateniese, and Perez-Cruz 2017) of the data sample. In the attribute inference attack, the adversary could infer additional sensitive attribute beyond the original input attributes of this data sample (Song and Shmatikov 2020). We believe that the purification process contributes to the removal of the redundant information (hidden in the confidence scores) that is useful to recover the input sample, and preserves only the essential semantic information for the prediction task. As a result, the adversary can obtain no more useful information than the prediction itself from the purified prediction results.

We extensively evaluate PURIFIER on various benchmark datasets and model architectures. We empirically show that PURIFIER can defend data inference attacks effectively and efficiently with negligible utility loss. PURIFIER can reduce the membership inference accuracy. For example, the NSH attack (Nasr, Shokri, and Houmansadr 2018) accuracy drops from 70.36% to 51.71% in our experiments, which is significantly more effective than previous defenses. PURIFIER is also effective against adversarial model inversion attack. For instance, the inversion loss on the FaceScrub530 dataset is raised 4+ times (i.e. from 0.0114 to 0.0454) after applying PURIFIER. Furthermore, PURIFIER can reduce the attribute inference accuracy from 31.06% to 20.94% (almost random guessing) on one of evaluated datasets.




Figure 1: Architecture of PURIFIER.

Contributions. In summary, we make the following contributions in this paper.

- To the best of our knowledge, our work is the first to study membership inference attacks comprehensively from the perspectives of *individual shape*, *statistical distribution* and *prediction label*.
- We design PURIFIER to defend against membership inference attacks by reducing the distinguishability of the confidence scores in terms of the above three aspects with negligible utility loss. PURIFIER is shown to be also effective in defending other data inference attacks.
- We extensively evaluate PURIFIER and compare it with existing defenses. Our experimental results show that PURIFIER outperforms existing defenses in both effectiveness and efficiency.

Problem Statement

We focus on classification models of neural networks, i.e., a machine learning classifier F is trained on its training dataset D_{train} to map a given sample $\mathbf{x}$ to a specific class based on the confidence vectors $F(\mathbf{x})$ which is the classifier output.

We consider the data inference attacks designed to infer useful information about a specific sample $\mathbf{x}$ based on the target classifier's output $F(\mathbf{x})$, for examples, the membership inference attack, adversarial model inversion attack and attribute inference attack. We do not consider the data inference attacks (An et al. 2022; Mehnaz et al. 2022) which infer distributional information about a class through observing the output changes of F on different $\mathbf{x}$ in this paper.

$$\mathbf{x}, F, D_{aux} \rightarrow \{useful\ information\ of\ \mathbf{x}\}$$

We assume that the attacker has a black-box access to the classifier F, where the attacker can only query F with its data sample $\mathbf{x}$ and obtain the prediction scores $F(\mathbf{x})$. We also assume that the attacker has an auxiliary dataset D_{aux} to assist its attacks such as a set of data samples drawn from a similar data distribution as the target classifier's training data distribution.

Approach: PURIFIER

We propose PURIFIER as a defense of data inference attacks. Since membership inference attack is one of the most typical instances of the data inference attacks, we design PURIFIER against it as the point of penetration and evaluate its defense performance against other data inference attacks. The main

idea of PURIFIER is to transform the confidence score vectors in such a way that they appear indistinguishable on members and non-members. We focus on reducing the three underlying distinguishabilities of confidence scores between members and non-members: *individual shape*, *statistical distribution* and *prediction label*.

PURIFIER consists of a *confidence reformer* G and a *label swapper* H, as shown in Figure 1. G takes as input the original confidence score vectors and reforms them as if they were predicted on non-members, achieving indistinguishability of individual shape and statistical distribution. We design G as a CVAE, with the predicted label being the condition. In this way, G is able to learn the overall distribution of the confidence scores from all classes by setting the condition to the corresponding class. The *label swapper* H takes the reformed confidence scores from G, and modifies the predicted labels of members to reduce the gap of classification accuracy between members and non-members, achieving indistinguishability of prediction label.

Achieving Individual Indistinguishability

In order to achieve the individual indistinguishability of confidence scores between members and non-members, PURIFIER reforms the confidence scores with the *confidence reformer* G, which is a CVAE. G takes the confidence score $F(\mathbf{x})$ predicted by the target classifier F as input, with the corresponding label l being the condition. $F(\mathbf{x})$ first goes through the encoder, where it is mapped to the encoded latent space $\mathbf{r}$. The decoder then maps the confidence score back from the latent space $\mathbf{r}$, and the reformed confidence score $G(F(x)|l)$ is obtained. G is trained on the confidence scores predicted by F on the defender's reference dataset D_{ref}, which consists of non-member samples. As a result, G learns the pattern of *individual shape* on non-member samples. The reforming process of G could remove any difference in the individual shape of $F(\mathbf{x})$, achieving individual indistinguishability.

In order to preserve the classification accuracy, we train G to also produce the label predicted by F by adding a label loss. Formally, G is trained to minimize the following objective function.

$$L(G) = \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{\mathbf{x}\sim p_r(\mathbf{x})}[\mathcal{R}((G(F(\mathbf{x})|l), F(\mathbf{x})) + \lambda\mathcal{L}((G(F(\mathbf{x})|l), l)] \tag{1}$$

where $p_r(\mathbf{x})$ represents the conditional probability of $\mathbf{x}$ for samples in D_{ref}, l represents the label of $F(\mathbf{x})$ (i.e., $l = \arg\max(F(\mathbf{x}))$). $\mathcal{R}$ is a reconstruction loss function (L_2 norm) and $\mathcal{L}$ is the cross entropy loss function. The parameter λ controls the balance of the two loss functions during training.

Achieving Statistical Indistinguishability

We can observe the statistical distribution of $F(\mathbf{x})$ by plotting $F(\mathbf{x})$ on the encoded latent space $\mathbf{r}$. Figure 5 shows an example of such statistical distribution on CIFAR10 dataset, where different colors represent different labels. We can observe that confidence score vectors are clustered into several groups according to their labels. However, the members are more densely clustered while non-members are not, which indicates that the distribution of members and non-members are different.

To mitigate the difference in statistical distribution between members and non-members, *confidence reformer* G introduces Gaussian noises in the latent space r, where the label l is used as the condition. During the training process, the reconstruction loss $\mathcal{R}$ encourages the decoder of G to generate confidence scores that are similar to the non-member ones on D_{ref} (non-members) with the same label l. However, noises introduced in the latent space $\mathbf{r}$ will increase the reconstruction error. As a result, G learns a robust latent representation that could preserve the statistical distribution of the non-members of label l even if noises are added. During the inference process, the added noises breakdown the clustering of confidence scores on members, while the decoder generates the reformed versions that are similar to the ones on D_{ref}, mitigating the difference in statistical distribution.

Achieving Label Indistinguishability

To cope with the difference in prediction label, we design a *label swapper* H, which modifies the prediction labels of members to reduce the gap of classification accuracy between members and non-members. After training the *confidence reformer* G, we randomly select training data to replace their predicted labels with the second largest predicted labels at a certain swap rate $p_{swap} = (acc_{train} - acc_{test})/acc_{train}$, where acc_{train} and acc_{test} are the training accuracy and the test accuracy of the target classifier respectively. Note that we fix the data at the training stage whose labels will be modified, so when attackers use the same data to query the final model, they will get the same output. Hence PURIFIER can defend the *replay attack* where attackers exploit the differences between the outputs of multiple same queries to the target model.

Given an input sample $\mathbf{x}$, H first identifies if $\mathbf{x}$ is a member whose label needs to be modified. In order to identify members, the *label swapper* stores information of the original training data. However, it is challenging for the label swapper to efficiently store and index the member information in the run time especially in a large learning task. To this end, Label swapper stores $F(\mathbf{x})$ where $x \in D_{swap}$ as the identifiers to form a prediction indexing set P_{index} whose dimensionality is much smaller than the training data D_{train}. In order to tolerate small perturbations of members added by attackers to indirectly infer membership of a target member sample $x \in D_{swap}$, H uses k nearest neighbor (kNN) to identify these suspicious noisy members and also swaps their labels.

Training and inference process of PURIFIER

The training process of PURIFIER is detailed in Algorithm 1. For each epoch, we first draw a mini-batch of data points $\{(\mathbf{x}_{ref_j}, y_{ref})\}_{j=1}^{q}$ from the reference set D_{ref}. Then we query the target classifier F to obtain the confidence scores c_{r_j} and the labels l_{r_j} (Line 1-5). After that, the loss is calculated on the objective function 1 and gradient descent is used to update the parameters θ of *confidence reformer* G (Line 6-7). When the training of G is finished, we select the data from D_{train} at rate p_{swap} randomly to form D_{swap} (Line 10-11). After that, we query the target classifier F to get the confidence c_j of the sample $(\mathbf{x}_{train_j}, y_{train_j}) \in D_{swap}$. The original confidence score c_j is added to the prediction

Algorithm 1: Training process of PURIFIER.

Input: The reference dataset D_{ref}, the training dataset D_{train}, the target classifier F, size of mini-batch q, size of the data need to be modify the labels t, number of epochs P, learning rate η, label loss coefficient λ

Output: Model parameters θ of *label reformer* G_θ, The prediction indexing set P_{index}

1 $\theta \leftarrow \mathbf{initialize}(G_\theta)$;
2 **for** $p = 1$ *to* P **do**
3 **for** *each mini-batch* $\{(\mathbf{x}_{ref_j}, y_{ref_j})\}_{j=1}^{q} \subset D_{ref}$ **do**
4 $c_{r_j} \leftarrow F(\mathbf{x}_{ref_j})$;
5 $l_{r_j} \leftarrow \mathbf{onehot}(\arg\max(c_{r_j}))$;
6 $g \leftarrow \nabla_\theta \frac{1}{q} \sum_{j=1}^{q} \mathcal{R}(G_\theta(c_{r_j}|l_{r_j}), c_{r_j}) + \lambda \mathcal{L}(G_\theta(c_{r_j}|l_{r_j}), l_{r_j})$;
7 $\theta \leftarrow \mathbf{updateParameters}(\eta, \theta, g)$
8 **end**
9 **end**
10 $P_{index} \leftarrow \varnothing$;
11 $D_{train} \leftarrow \mathbf{shuffle}(D_{train})$;
12 $D_{swap} \leftarrow \{(\mathbf{x}_{train_j}, y_{train_j})\}_{j=1}^{t} \subset D_{train}$;
13 **for** *each* $(\mathbf{x}_{train_j}, y_{train_j}) \in D_{swap}$ **do**
14 $c_j \leftarrow F(\mathbf{x}_{train_j})$;
15 $P_{index} \leftarrow P_{index} \cup \{c_j\}$;
16 **end**
17 **return** G_θ, P_{index}

indexing set P_{index} and later used by the *label swapper* to achieve indistinguishability of prediction label (Line 12-15).

In the inference stage, given an input sample $\mathbf{x}$, we first query the target classifier F to get the confidence score c and the predicted label l. Then, we input c into the *confidence reformer* G, with l being the condition, to get the purified confidence vector p. At this stage, p is indistinguishable in individual shape and statistical distribution. The *label swapper* H checks if c has a match in P_{index} using kNN and swaps the label of p if c is matched. This ensures indistinguishability in terms of prediction label. Finally, PURIFIER returns the purified confidence scores p.

Experimental Setup

Datasets & Models

Membership Inference Attack. We use CIFAR10 (Shokri et al. 2017; Salem et al. 2018; Li and Zhang 2021), Purchase100 (Shokri et al. 2017; Nasr, Shokri, and Houmansadr 2018; Salem et al. 2018; Li and Zhang 2021) and FaceScrub530 (Yang et al. 2019) datasets which are widely adopted in previous studies on membership inference attacks.
Model Inversion Attack. We use the same datasets as membership inference attacks.
Attribute Inference Attack. We use the same dataset UTKFace (Zhang, Song, and Qi 2017) as in a previous study (Song and Shmatikov 2020) where the attacker infers additional attribute (i.e., race of five possible values) beyond the original gender classification task.

We attach the details of the datasets to Appendix, including the introduction, pre-processing and data allocation. We also further elucidate the target classifier and PURIFIER on different datasets in the Appendix, including their model architectures and hyper-parameters.

Existing Attacks

In our experiments, we implement the following attacks.
Membership Inference Attack. We implement the atttacks including ① NSH attack (Nasr, Shokri, and Houmansadr 2018), ② Mlleaks attack (Salem et al. 2018), ③ Adaptive attack (Salem et al. 2018) (where the attacker knows all the details about the defense mechanism), ④ BlindMI attack (Hui et al. 2021), ⑤ Label-only attack (Yeom et al. 2018; Li and Zhang 2021). **Model Inversion Attack.** The attacker trains an inversion model on D_{aux} to perform the model inversion attack. The inversion model takes $F(\mathbf{x})$ as input and is able to reconstruct $\mathbf{x}$ (Yang et al. 2019). **Attribute Inference Attack.** The attacker trains a classification on D_{aux} to infer additional sensitive attribute beyond the original input attributes of the given sample (Song and Shmatikov 2020).

We attach the details of the attack above-mentioned methods, including their implementations, to the Appendix.

Metrics

We use the following 4 metrics to measure the utility, defense performance and efficiency of a defense method.
①**Classification Accuracy:** It is measured on the training set and the test set of the target classifier. ②**Inference Accuracy:** This is the classification accuracy of the attacker's attack model in predicting the membership/sensitive attribute of input samples. ③**Inversion Error:** Following (Yang et al. 2019), We measure the inversion error by computing the mean squared error between the original input sample and the reconstruction. ④**Efficiency:** We measure the efficiency of a defense method by reporting its training time and test time relative to the original time required by the target classifier.

Experimental Results

PURIFIER is Effective in Membership Inference

Effectiveness

Table 1 presents the defense performance of PURIFIER against different membership inference attacks. For each classification task, PURIFIER decreases the attack accuracy as well as preserves the the classification accuracy. PURIFIER reduces the accuracy of NSH attack significantly for different datasets. For instance, it reduces the accuracy of NSH attack from 69.34% to 51.56% in FaceScrub530 dataset. As for Mlleaks attack, the model defended with PURIFIER reduces the attack accuracy to nearly 50%. Comparing with the pure Mlleaks attack, the performance of the adaptive attack does not show a large difference where PURIFIER reduces the accuracy to nearly 50%. PURIFIER is also effective against BlindMI attack. For example, PURIFIER reduces the accuracy of BlindMI from 62.61% to 50.00% in FaceScrub530 dataset.

Comparison with other defenses

Existing Defenses. We compare PURIFIER with following defenses. ①Min-Max (Nasr, Shokri, and Houmansadr 2018). ②MemGuard (Jia et al. 2019). ③Model-Stacking (Salem et al. 2018). ④MMD Defense (Li, Li, and Ribeiro 2021). ⑤SELENA (Tang et al. 2022). ⑥One-Hot Encod-

Table 1: Defense performance of PURIFIER against various attacks. Results of Transfer attack and Boundary attack are reported in AUC. Note that the N.A. means that setting is not applicable.

Dataset	Defense	Utility		Membership Inference Attack Accuracy/AUC							Inversion Error
		Train acc	Test acc.	NSH	Mlleaks	Adaptive	BlindMI	Label only attacks			L_2 norm
								Gap	Transfer	Boundary	
CIFAR10	None	99.99%	95.92%	56.03%	56.26%	N.A.	54.76%	52.04%	0.5048	0.5214	1.4357
	Purifier	97.60%	95.92%	51.65%	50.26%	50.23%	50.64%	50.84%	0.4974	0.4949	1.4939
Purchase100	None	100.00%	84.36%	70.36%	64.43%	N.A.	69.82%	57.82%	0.5431	N.A.	0.1426
	Purifier	86.59%	83.23%	51.71%	50.09%	50.13%	50.96%	51.68%	0.4978	N.A.	0.1520
FaceScrub530	None	100.00%	77.68%	69.34%	75.04%	N.A.	62.61%	61.16%	0.5869	0.7739	0.0114
	Purifier	77.58%	77.52%	51.56%	51.04%	50.00%	50.00%	50.02%	0.4983	0.6185	0.0454

ing. ⑦Random Noise. We attach the details of the above-mentioned defense methods, including their implementations and selections of hyperparameters, to the Appendix.

Table 2 shows the defense performance of PURIFIER and other defense methods against membership inference attacks under different datasets. PURIFIER achieves the best defense performance against most of the attacks, including the NSH attack, the BlindMI attack and the gap attack compared to other methods on all of three datasets. For the Mlleaks Attack, PURIFIER can achieve the second best performance only to One-Hot Encoding and Random Noise. PURIFIER also achieves a better security-utility tradeoff than other defenses. It imposes a reduction in test accuracy of about 1%. In comparison, Model-Stacking and SELENA can mitigate membership inference attacks to some extent, but they incur intolerable reduction in model's test accuracy. For One-Hot Encoding and Random Noise, their transformation on confidence vectors leads to a large degree of semantic information loss. MemGuard reaches acceptable defense performance with negligible decline in test accuracy. However, its defense performance is not as good as that of PURIFIER.

PURIFIER is Effective in Adversarial Model Inversion

Effectiveness

We further investigate the defense performance of PURIFIER against adversarial model inversion attack. We train an inversion attack model on top of each classifier with or without defense on FaceScrub530 dataset. Although PURIFIER is designed to protect models from membership inference attacks, it turns out that the PURIFIER is also effective in mitigating model inversion attack. Figure 2 shows the results of our experiment on adversarial model inversion attack on FaceScrub530. We quantify the inversion quality by reporting the average facial similarity scores compared with the ground truth using the Microsoft Azure Face Recognition service (Azure 2022), which is shown on left side of Figure 2. The less the number is,the less similarity reconstructed samples share with the original samples.

We report all the inversion error under three datasets in Table 1. As shown in Table 1 and Figure 2, the inversion loss on the FaceScrub530 dataset is raised 4+ times (i.e. from 0.0114 to 0.0454) after applying PURIFIER, indicating the performance reduction of the inversion attack is significant. Note that the effect of defense against the adversarial model inversion attacks on Purchase100 and CIFAR10 seems less significant compared with FaceScrub530 This is because the inversion attack does not perform well on these classifiers even though without any defense.




Figure 2: Model inversion attack against the FaceScrub530 classifier defended by different approaches.

Comparison with other defenses

PURIFIER also achieves the best performance in defending model inversion attack on CIFAR10 and Facescrub530. Table 2 shows that PURIFIER has the largest inversion error(also called reconstruction error) compared with other defenses on these datasets, quantitatively demonstrating that PURIFIER achieves better defense performance against adversarial model inversion attack than other defenses. Figure 2 depicts the reconstructed samples from confidence vectors given by each defense model on FaceScrub530 dataset. With PURIFIER as defense, the reconstructed images are much less similar to the ground truth image and look more blurred. Other defense methods, however, could not protect the model from adversaries recovering small details of the original image. It can be quantitatively verified by the similarity scores gathered from the Microsoft Azure Face Recognition service. For instance, the average similarity scores of reconstructed images of MemGuard-defended models are 0.17, which are larger than that of PURIFIER (i.e., 0.14). PURIFIER achieves the smallest similarity scores among other defense methods, indicating that PURIFIER can protect the target model against adversarial model inversion attack effectively.

PURIFIER is Effective in Attribute Inference

Effectiveness

We deploy PURIFIER under the attribute inference attack and find that PURIFIER is also effective in mitigating it. We train an attribute inference classifier on UTKFace dataset to predict the race of the given sample. Table 3 shows the results of our experiment. The attribute inference accuracy on the UTKFace dataset is reduced to 20.94% (almost random guessing) after applying PURIFIER.

Table 2: Defense performance of PURIFIER and other defense methods.

Dataset	Defense	Training acc.	Test acc.	NSH Attack	Mlleaks Attack	BlindMI Attack	Gap Attack	Inversion Error
CIFAR10	Purifier	97.60%	95.92%	**51.65%**	50.26%	**50.64%**	**50.84%**	**1.4939**
	Min-Max	99.40%	94.38%	53.97%	52.93%	53.52%	52.51%	1.4770
	MemGuard	99.99%	95.92%	53.63%	52.24%	52.03%	52.04%	1.4439
	Model-Stacking	95.80%	92.12%	51.93%	51.01%	52.69%	51.84%	1.4723
	MMD Defense	99.99%	87.44%	59.50%	57.60%	58.92%	56.28%	1.4414
	SELENA	98.40%	93.90%	52.14%	52.35%	51.08%	52.25%	1.4350
	One-Hot Encoding	99.99%	95.92%	52.17%	**50.00%**	51.88%	52.04%	1.4414
	Random Noise	99.99%	95.92%	55.97%	50.01%	51.69%	52.04%	1.4342
Purchase100	Purifier	86.59%	83.23%	**51.71%**	50.09%	**50.96%**	**51.68%**	0.1520
	Min-Max	99.89%	82.03%	65.13%	63.95%	57.39%	58.93%	0.1428
	MemGuard	100.00%	84.36%	62.28%	57.86%	61.35%	57.82%	0.1426
	Model-Stacking	81.84%	69.68%	61.16%	55.53%	60.36%	56.08%	0.1472
	MMD Defense	100.00%	82.65%	69.48%	69.89%	66.62%	58.67%	0.1439
	SELENA	83.24%	79.53%	51.90%	52.97%	53.04%	51.83%	0.1440
	One-Hot Encoding	100.00%	84.36%	57.65%	**50.00%**	57.67%	57.82%	**0.1524**
	Random Noise	100.00%	84.36%	60.06%	50.02%	54.44%	57.82%	0.1409
FaceScrub530	Purifier	77.58%	77.52%	**51.56%**	51.04%	**50.00%**	**50.03%**	**0.0454**
	Min-Max	98.99%	68.31%	65.56%	69.84%	66.16%	65.34%	0.0182
	MemGuard	100.00%	77.68%	62.48%	60.06%	62.72%	61.16%	0.0117
	Model-Stacking	86.30%	57.05%	62.00%	51.86%	60.62%	64.63%	0.0417
	MMD Defense	100.00%	77.38%	64.88%	67.95%	63.55%	61.31%	0.0111
	SELENA	81.06%	72.05%	51.68%	51.23%	54.05%	50.50%	0.0131
	One-Hot Encoding	100.00%	77.68%	57.87%	**50.00%**	61.23%	61.16%	0.0420
	Random Noise	100.00%	77.68%	56.85%	50.04%	60.83%	61.16%	0.0175

Table 3: Attribute inference attack against the UTKFace classifier with and without PURIFIER.

Dataset	Defense	Utility		Attack Accuracy
		Train acc	Test acc.	
UTKFace	None	99.92%	83.08%	31.06%
	Purifier	84.20%	82.78%	20.94%




Figure 3: Efficiency of different defense methods.

Efficiency

Figure 3 presents the efficiency of PURIFIER compared with other defenses. We perform our experiments on a PC equipped with four Titan XP GPUs with 12GBytes of graphic memory,128 GBytes of memory and an Intel Xeon E5-2678 CPU. The training time of PURIFIER is only 0.423 time of the target classifier, which outperforms all the other methods. The testing time of PURIFIER is 18.06 times as much as the target classifier, which is considered acceptable compared to MemGuard whose testing time is 7,000+ times more than the original classifier.

Analysis of Purified Confidence Scores

In this subsection, we analyze how the purified confidence scores affect membership inference attacks by evaluating three indistinguishabilities: individual, statistical and label.

Individual Indistinguishability of Purified Confidence

PURIFIER reshapes the input confidence score vectors according to the pattern of the learned non-member samples. We examine the indistinguishability of the confidence scores on members and non-members by plotting the histogram




Figure 4: Distribution of the target classifier's confidence in predicting the correct class and the prediction uncertainty on members and non-members of training set.


of the target classifier's confidence in predicting the correct class and the prediction uncertainty in Figure 4. The prediction uncertainty is measured as the normalized entropy $\frac{-1}{\log(k)} \sum_i \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i \log(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i)$ of the confidence vector $\mathbf{y} = F(\mathbf{x})$, where k is the number of classes. As Figure 4 shows, PURIFIER can reduce the gap between the two curves. Similar curves can be obtained on CIFAR10 and FaceScrub530 classifiers. We attach them to Appendix. We also report the maximum gap and the average gap between the curves in Table 4. The results show that our approach can significantly reduce both the maximum and average gaps between the target classifier's confidence in predicting the correct class as well as the prediction uncertainty on its members versus non-members. This demonstrates that PURIFIER successfully reduces the individual differences between members and non-members.

Statistical Indistinguishability of Purified Confidence


We present the statistical distribution of confidence score

Table 4: Gap of the classifier's confidence in predicting the correct class(i.e, Confi) and the prediction uncertainty(i.e, Uncer) between members and non-members.

Metric	Defense	CIFAR10		Purchase100		FaceScrub530	
		Max	Avg.	Max	Avg.	Max	Avg.
Confi	None	0.103	0.004	0.412	0.016	0.415	0.017
	Purifier	0.009	0.000	0.019	0.001	0.012	0.001
Uncer	None	0.114	0.005	0.201	0.015	0.418	0.017
	Purifier	0.006	0.000	0.007	0.001	0.006	0.001



(a) Original member latents. (b) Original non-member latents.



(c) Purified member latents. (d) Purified non-member latents.

Figure 5: The statistical distribution of latent vectors on the CIFAR10 dataset. Different colors stand for latent vectors with different labels. (a) and (b) depict latent vectors of the original member and non-member confidence score vectors; (c) and (d) depicts latent vectors of member and non-member confidence score vectors with PURIFIER defended.

vectors in the encoder latent space of the *confidence reformer*. Figure 5 visibly displays the differences on the CIFAR10 dataset between members and non-members in the latent space. As illustrated in the first row, latent vectors of the members tend to cluster together according to their labels, while those of non-members are more scattered in the map. The second row of Figure 5 also shows the statistical distribution of members and non-members processed with PURIFIER in the latent space. When processed with PURIFIER, Gaussian noises are added to the confidence score vectors, making the clustered member latent vectors to be more scattered on the latent space. This demonstrates that PURIFIER can reduce the statistical differences between members and non-members while preserving semantic utility.

Label Indistinguishability of Purified Confidence

PURIFIER uses *label swapper* to identify and swap the predicted labels of members. *label swapper* incurs negligible reduction of test accuracy. At the same time, swapping the labels of the member samples reduces the training accuracy so that the gap between the accuracy of member and non-members is minimized. This is shown in Table 1, where the training accuracy of the model is close to the test accuracy. Many label-only membership inference attacks are less effective under PURIFIER with *label swapper*. This reflects that purified member confidence vectors are less distinguishable from those of the non-members in terms of label.

Discussion

Assuming the reference data are considered as members, we present the inversion error and the inference accuracy on the reference set for each defense and attach the results to the Appendix. The Results show that PURIFIER can still preserve the defense effect against the adversarial model inversion attack and the membership inference attack.

We also investigate the effect of the PURIFIER 's training data by using different in-distribution and out-of-distribution data to train PURIFIER. The results show that PURIFIER can still mitigate the attacks, but at the cost of sacrificing the utility significantly when using out-of-distribution data. We attach the results to the Appendix.

Furthermore, we investigate the effectiveness of PURIFIER to detect noisy members and attach the result to Appendix. It shows that PURIFIER can accurately detect the members with noise $\|\eta\|_\infty < 1e-10$ on FaceScrub530 dataset.

Related Work

Data Inference Attacks. In data inference attacks, the attacker aims at inferring information about the data that the target model operates on. Xiao et al. (Xiao et al. 2019) studied the adversarial reconstruction problem. They studied the prediction model which outputs 40 binary attributes. Our paper, on the contrary, studies black-box classifiers whose output is constrained by a probability distribution. Jia and Gong (Jia and Gong 2018) proposed the adversarial formulation for privacy protection. They aimed at protecting the privacy of users' sensitive attributes from being inferred from their public data. Our work investigates inference attacks that leverage prediction results of machine learning models to infer useful information about the input data.

Secure & Privacy-Preserving Machine Learning. A number of studies made use of trusted hardware and cryptographic computing to provide secure and privacy-preserving training and use of machine learning models. These techniques include homomorphic encryption, garbled circuits and secure multi-party computation on private data (Liu et al. 2017; Bonawitz et al. 2017; Phong et al. 2018; Dowlin et al. 2016; Mohassel and Zhang 2017; Dwork and Feldman 2018) and secure computing using trusted hardware (Ohrimenko et al. 2016; Juvekar, Vaikuntanathan, and Chandrakasan 2018). Although these methods protect sensitive data from direct observation by the attacker, they do not prevent information leakage via the model computation.

Conclusion

In this paper, we propose PURIFIER to defend data inference attacks. PURIFIER learns the pattern of non-member confidence score vectors and purifies confidence score vectors to this pattern. It makes member confidence score vectors indistinguishable from non-members in terms of individual shape, statistical distribution and prediction label. Our experiments show that PURIFIER is effective and efficient in mitigating existing data inference attacks, outperforming previous defense methods, while imposing negligible utility loss.

Ethics Statement

The code for PURIFIER is available at https://github.com/wljLlla/Purifier_Code.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by National Key R&D Program of China (2020AAA0107700), by National Natural Science Foundation of China (62102353, 62227805), by National Key Laboratory of Science and Technology on Information System Security (6142111210301), by State Key Laboratory of Mathematical Engineering and Advanced Computing, and by Key Laboratory of Cyberspace Situation Awareness of Henan Province (HNTS2022001). We would like to thank Dingkun Wei, Jingjing Wang, Zijing Hu and Yanqing Liu for their implementation of some experiments.

References

Abadi, M.; Chu, A.; Goodfellow, I. J.; McMahan, H. B.; Mironov, I.; Talwar, K.; and Zhang, L. 2016. Deep Learning with Differential Privacy. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, Vienna, Austria, October 24-28, 2016*, 308–318.

An, S.; Tao, G.; Xu, Q.; Liu, Y.; Shen, G.; Yao, Y.; Xu, J.; and Zhang, X. 2022. MIRROR: Model Inversion for Deep Learning Network with High Fidelity. In *Proceedings of the Network and Distributed Systems Security Symposium (NDSS 2022)*.

Azure, M. 2022. https://azure.microsoft.com/en-us/services/cognitive-services/face/.

Bonawitz, K.; Ivanov, V.; Kreuter, B.; Marcedone, A.; McMahan, H. B.; Patel, S.; Ramage, D.; Segal, A.; and Seth, K. 2017. Practical Secure Aggregation for Privacy-Preserving Machine Learning. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security - CCS '17*, 1175–1191. ISBN 978-1-4503-4946-8.

Choquette-Choo, C. A.; Tramer, F.; Carlini, N.; and Papernot, N. 2021. Label-Only Membership Inference Attacks. In Meila, M.; and Zhang, T., eds., *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 1964–1974. PMLR.

Dowlin, N.; Gilad-Bachrach, R.; Laine, K.; Lauter, K.; Naehrig, M.; and Wernsing, J. 2016. CryptoNets: Applying Neural Networks to Encrypted Data with High Throughput and Accuracy. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 48*, ICML'16, 201–210. JMLR.org. Event-place: New York, NY, USA.

Dwork, C.; and Feldman, V. 2018. Privacy-Preserving Prediction. In Bubeck, S.; Perchet, V.; and Rigollet, P., eds., *Proceedings of the 31st Conference On Learning Theory*, volume 75 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 1693–1702. PMLR.

Fredrikson, M.; Jha, S.; and Ristenpart, T. 2015. Model Inversion Attacks That Exploit Confidence Information and Basic Countermeasures. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, Denver, CO, USA, October 12-6, 2015*, 1322–1333.

Hitaj, B.; Ateniese, G.; and Perez-Cruz, F. 2017. Deep Models Under the GAN: Information Leakage from Collaborative Deep Learning. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, volume 1, 603–618. ISBN 978-1-4503-4946-8.

Hui, B.; Yang, Y.; Yuan, H.; Burlina, P.; Gong, N. Z.; and Cao, Y. 2021. Practical blind membership inference attack via differential comparisons. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.01341*.

Jia, J.; and Gong, N. Z. 2018. AttriGuard: A Practical Defense Against Attribute Inference Attacks via Adversarial Machine Learning. In *27th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 18)*, 513–529. {USENIX} Association. ISBN 978-1-931971-46-1. Event-place: Baltimore, MD.

Jia, J.; Salem, A.; Backes, M.; Zhang, Y.; and Gong, N. Z. 2019. MemGuard: Defending against Black-Box Membership Inference Attacks via Adversarial Examples. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security - CCS '19*, 259–274. ACM Press. ISBN 978-1-4503-6747-9. Event-place: London, United Kingdom.

Juvekar, C.; Vaikuntanathan, V.; and Chandrakasan, A. 2018. Gazelle: A Low Latency Framework for Secure Neural Network Inference. In *27th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 18)*. ISBN 978-1-931971-46-1.

Li, J.; Li, N.; and Ribeiro, B. 2021. Membership Inference Attacks and Defenses in Classification Models. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh ACM Conference on Data and Application Security and Privacy*, CODASPY '21, 5–16. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 978-1-4503-8143-7.

Li, Z.; and Zhang, Y. 2021. Membership leakage in label-only exposures. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 880–895.

Liu, J.; Juuti, M.; Lu, Y.; and Asokan, N. 2017. Oblivious Neural Network Predictions via MiniONN Transformations. (2017): 619–631.

Mehnaz, S.; Dibbo, S. V.; Kabir, E.; Li, N.; and Bertino, E. 2022. Are Your Sensitive Attributes Private? Novel Model Inversion Attribute Inference Attacks on Classification Models. In *31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22)*, 4579–4596. Boston, MA: USENIX Association. ISBN 978-1-939133-31-1.

Mohassel, P.; and Zhang, Y. 2017. SecureML: A System for Scalable Privacy-Preserving Machine Learning. In *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2017, San Jose, CA, USA, May 22-26, 2017*, 19–38.

Nasr, M.; Shokri, R.; and Houmansadr, A. 2018. Machine Learning with Membership Privacy Using Adversarial Regularization. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, CCS '18, 634–646. ACM. ISBN 978-1-4503-5693-0. Event-place: Toronto, Canada.

Ohrimenko, O.; Schuster, F.; Fournet, C.; Mehta, A.; Nowozin, S.; Vaswani, K.; and Costa, M. 2016. Oblivious

Multi-Party Machine Learning on Trusted Processors. In *25th USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 16, Austin, TX, USA, August 10-12, 2016.*, 619–636.

Phong, L. T.; Aono, Y.; Hayashi, T.; Wang, L.; and Moriai, S. 2018. Privacy-Preserving Deep Learning via Additively Homomorphic Encryption. 13(5): 1333–1345.

Salem, A.; Zhang, Y.; Humbert, M.; Fritz, M.; and Backes, M. 2018. ML-Leaks: Model and Data Independent Membership Inference Attacks and Defenses on Machine Learning Models. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS 2019)*.

Shokri, R.; Stronati, M.; Song, C.; and Shmatikov, V. 2017. Membership Inference Attacks Against Machine Learning Models. In *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2017, San Jose, CA, USA, May 22-26, 2017*, 3–18.

Song, C.; and Shmatikov, V. 2020. Overlearning Reveals Sensitive Attributes. In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2020*.

Tang, X.; Mahloujifar, S.; Song, L.; Shejwalkar, V.; Nasr, M.; Houmansadr, A.; and Mittal, P. 2022. Mitigating Membership Inference Attacks by Self-Distillation Through a Novel Ensemble Architecture. In *31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22)*, 1433–1450. Boston, MA: USENIX Association. ISBN 978-1-939133-31-1.

Xiao, T.; Tsai, Y.-H.; Sohn, K.; Chandraker, M.; and Yang, M.-H. 2019. Adversarial Learning of Privacy-Preserving and Task-Oriented Representations.

Yang, Z.; Zhang, J.; Chang, E.-C.; and Liang, Z. 2019. Neural Network Inversion in Adversarial Setting via Background Knowledge Alignment. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, CCS '19, 225–240. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 978-1-4503-6747-9. Event-place: New York, NY, USA.

Yeom, S.; Giacomelli, I.; Fredrikson, M.; and Jha, S. 2018. Privacy Risk in Machine Learning: Analyzing the Connection to Overfitting. 268–282.

Zhang, Z.; Song, Y.; and Qi, H. 2017. Age progression/regression by conditional adversarial autoencoder. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 5810–5818.

Appendix

Experimental Setup

Datasets

We use CIFAR10, Purchase100, FaceScrub530 and UTKFace datasets which are widely adopted in previous studies on membership inference attacks, attribute inference attacks and model inversion attacks. Additionally, we also evaluate the effectiveness of PURIFIER against memership inference attacks on CIFAR100, Texas and Location.

CIFAR10. It is a machine learning benchmark dataset for evaluating image recognition algorithms with 10 classes. It consists of 60,000 color images, each of size 32 x 32. The dataset has 10 classes, where each class represents an object (e.g., airplane, car, etc.).

Purchase100. This dataset is based on Kaggle's "acquired valued shopper" challenge.[1] We used the preprocessed and simplified version of this dataset. It is composed of 197,324 data records and each data record has 600 binary features. The dataset is clustered into 100 classes.

FaceScrub530. This dataset consists of URLs for 100,000 images of 530 individuals. We obtained the preprocessed and simplified version of this dataset from which has 48,579 facial images and each image is resized to 64×64.

UTKFace. This dataset consists of URLs for 22000 images of individuals. We train the classifier to classify the genders and use the race as the sensitive attribute in our experiments.

CIFAR100. It is a machine learning benchmark dataset for evaluating image recognition algorithms with 10 classes. It consists of 60,000 color images, each of size 32 x 32. The dataset has 100 classes and each classes has 600 images.

Texas. We use the same data as previous studies, which cluster the data with 6169 attributes to 100 classes.

Location. This dataset is based on the publicly available set of mobile users' location "check-ins" in the Foursquare social network, restricted to the Bangkok area and collected from April 2012 to September 2013. The record of Location has 446 attributes and has clustered into 30 classes.

Target Classifier

We use the same model architectures as in previous work. For CIFAR10 and CIFAR100 datasets, we use DenseNet121. We train our classifier with SGD optimizer for 350 epochs with the learning rate 0.1 from epoch 0 to 150, 0.01 from 150 to 250, and 0.001 from 250 to 350. The classifier is regularized with L_2 regularization (weight decay parameter 5e-4). For Purchase100 dataset, we use the same model and training strategy as in previous work to train the target classifier. It is a 4-layer fully connected neural network. For FaceScrub530 dataset, we use the same conventional neural network and the same training strategy as in previous work to train the target classifier. For UTKFace dataset, we use the same neural network and the same training strategy as used in FaceScrub530 dataset, except that the output layer dimension is changed to 2. For Texas dataset, we use a 4-layer fully connected neural network with the Tanh as the activation function. For Location dataset, we use a 3-layer fully connected neural network with the Tanh as the activation function.

[1] https://www.kaggle.com/c/acquire-valued-shoppers-challenge/data

PURIFIER

We use CVAE to implement the *confidence reformer* G. It has the layer size of [20, 32, 64, 128, 2, 128, 64, 32, 20] for CIFAR10, [200, 128, 256, 512, 20, 512, 256, 128, 100] for Purchase100, Texas and location, [1060, 512, 1024, 2048, 100, 2048, 1024, 512, 1060] for FaceScrub530 and CIFAR100. The layer size of [4, 32, 64, 128, 2, 128, 64, 32, 2] for UTKFace, . We use ReLU and batch normalization in hidden layers. We train PURIFIER on Purchase100 dataset for 150 epochs, CIFAR10, Texas and Location datasets for 100 epochs, FaceScrub530, UTKFace and CIFAR100 datasets for 300 epochs. We use Adam optimizer with the learning rate 0.01 for CIFAR10, 0.0001 for Purchase100, Texas and Location, 0.0005 for Facescrub530 and CIFAR10 and 0.0001 for UTKFace.

Existing Attacks

In our experiments, we implement the following data inference attacks.

NSH attack. This attack assumes that the attacker knows both the membership labels and ground truth of D_{aux}, and thus no shadow is trained. The membership classifier makes use of both the confidence score vector and the ground truth of a data sample to predict its membership.

Mlleaks attack. In this attack, the attacker knows the ground truth of D_{aux} but does not know their membership labels. Therefore, a shadow model is required to replicate the target model. We use half of D_{aux} to train the shadow model which has the same architecture as the target classifier, and use the whole D_{aux} to train the membership classifier with their labeled membership information in terms of the shadow model. The membership classifier is a multi-layer perception with a 128-unit hidden layer and a sigmoid output layer. All weights were initialized with normal distribution with a mean of 0 and standard deviation of 0.01, and all biases are initialized to 0. We use the Adam optimizer with learning rate 0.001. The number of training epochs is set to 50 for each dataset.

Adaptive attack. This is an adaptive version of the Mlleaks attack, where the attacker is assumed to know all the details of the defender's PURIFIER and its training data D_2. Hence, the attacker trains the same PURIFIER and appends it to the shadow model. The membership classifier is then trained on the purified confidence score vectors.

BlindMI attack. We consider BlindMI-DIFF-w/, where the attacker is assumed to know the soft label and the ground truth of the target dataset. We use sobel to generate non-member samples. The size of the non member dataset $|S_{nonmem}|$ is 20.

Label-only attack. In Gap Attack, the attacker is assumed to have the ground truth of the data sample and predicts that it is a member if and only if the target classifier gives the correct label on the sample. In the Transfer attack, auxiliary dataset D_{aux} is re-labeled by querying the target model. The shadow models that we adopt share the same architecture with the target model. Three different thresholds are chosen in previous work, and we consider the one that gives the best result on D_{aux}. In the Boundary attack, we adopt HopSkipJump noise, with a total evaluation of 15000 per sample, which ensures the attack performance is stable. Similarly, we report the results on the L_2 norm. Due to high query-complexity, the

results are reported on a subset that consists of 1000 samples.
Adversarial Model inversion attack. The attacker trains an inversion model on D_{aux} to perform the model inversion attack.
Attribute inference attack. The attacker trains a classification on D_{aux} to predict the additional sensitive attribute taking the confidence vectors as input. The classifier is a multi-layer perceptron. All weights were initialized with normal distribution with a mean of 0 and standard deviation of 0.01, and all biases are initialized to 0. We use the Adam optimizer with learning rate 0.00001. The number of training epochs is set to 1500 for the UTKFace dataset.

Table 5: Data allocation. A dataset is divided into training set D_1 of the target classifier, reference set D_2 and test set D_3. In membership inference attack, we assume that the attacker has access to a subset D^A of D_1 and a subset $D^{'A}$ of D_3.

Dataset	D_1	D_2	D_3	D^A	$D^{'A}$
CIFAR10	50,000	5,000	5,000	25,000	2,500
Purchase100	20,000	20,000	20,000	10,000	10,000
FaceScrub530	30,000	10,000	8,000	15,000	4,000
UTKFace	12,000	5,000	5,000	6,000	2,500
CIFAR100	50,000	5,000	5,000	25,000	2,500
Texas	10,000	10,000	10,000	5,000	5,000
Location	1,600	1,600	1,600	800	800

Table 5 presents the data allocation in our experiments. We divide each dataset into the target classifier's training set D_1, the reference set D_2 and the test set D_3. In membership inference and attribute inference attack, we assume that the attacker has access to a subset D^A of D_1 and a subset $D^{'A}$ of D_3 to form its auxiliary dataset D_{aux}. We use the remaining data in D_1 and D_3 to test the membership inference and attribute inference accuracy. We use D_2 as the reference dataset for defenses that require such a dataset. In the model inversion attack, for the FaceScrub530 classifier, the attacker uses a CelebA[2] dataset to train the inversion model. For other classifiers, the attacker samples 80% from D_1, D_2 and D_3 respectively to train the inversion model, and uses the remaining 20% data to test the inversion error.

Metrics

We use the following metrics to measure the utility, defense performance and efficiency of a defense method.
Classification Accuracy. It is measured on the training set and the test set of the target classifier. It reflects how good the target classifier is on the classification task.
Utility Error. It is measured on the training set D_1 and the test set D_3 of the target classifier. It reflects how good the target classifier is on the classification task.
Inference Accuracy. This is the classification accuracy of the attacker's attack model in predicting the membership and additional sensitive attribute of input samples.
Inversion Error. We measure the inversion error by computing the mean squared error between the original input sample and the reconstruction. For the FaceScrub530 classifier, it is measured on D_1 and D_3. For other classifiers, it is measured on the 20% of D_1 and D_3 respectively.

[2]ICCV 2015 Deep Learning Face Attributes in the Wild




Figure 6: Model inversion attack against the MNIST classifier defended by different approaches. Numbers on the left indicate inversion errors

Efficiency. We measure the efficiency of a defense method by reporting its training time and testing time relative to the original time required by the target classifier.

Experiment of Adversarial Model Inversion in MNIST Dataset

We investigate the PURIFIER against the adversarial model inversion attack on the MNIST dataset and plot the reconstructed images in Figure 6. We report the inversion error at the left of Figure 6 to qualify the inversion performance. As illustrated in Figure 6, the attacker is able to reconstruct nearly identical images when no defense is used. However, it is much more difficult for the attacker to reconstruct the image from the purifier-defended model. The reconstructed images lose a lot of details compared with the original one, only representing a blurred image of their classes.

Distribution of the target classifier's prediction uncertainty and confidence in correct class

We examine the indistinguishability of the confidence scores on members and non-members by plotting the histogram of the target classifier's confidence in predicting the correct class and the prediction uncertainty in CIFAR10 and FaceScrub530 datasets. We show the results in Figure 7 and Figure 8. As Figure 7 and Figure 8 show, PURIFIER can also reduce the gap between the two curves in CIFAR10 and FaceScrub530 datasets. This demonstrates that PURIFIER also successfully reduces the individual differences between members and non-members in CIFAR10 and FaceScrub530 datasets.

Experiments on Other Three Datasets

We evaluate the effectiveness of PURIFIER against various membership inference attacks on CIFAR100, Texas and Location datasets. Table 6 shows that PURIFIER is able to reduce the performance of the membership inference attacks significantly on the additional three datasets and outperforms SELENA in most of cases. For instance, PURIFIER can reduce

Table 6: Defense performance of PURIFIER against SELENA on additional datasets. Results of Transfer attack and Boundary attack are reported in AUC. Note that the N.A. means that setting is not applicable. the code of Boundary attack can not be used on non-image dataset.

Dataset	Defense	Training acc.	Test acc.	NSH Attack	Mlleaks Attack	Adaptive Attack	Label only Attacks	
							transfer	boundary
CIFAR100	None	100%	69.98%	76.98%	73.78%	73.78%	0.5980	0.6668
	SELENA	78.00%	62.10%	50.32%	50.42%	51.38%	0.5188	0.5008
	Purifer	70.02%	69.98%	50.01%	50.15%	51.02%	0.5120	0.4975
Texas	None	79.17%	50.91%	66.37%	58.93%	58.93%	0.5431	N.A.
	SELENA	56.70%	47.21%	54.10%	51.04%	51.51%	0.5086	N.A.
	Purifer	51.01%	50.91%	51.29%	50.00%	51.18%	0.5028	N.A.
Location	None	100%	60.44%	82.37%	84.00%	84.00%	0.5893	N.A.
	SELENA	77.90%	55.25%	54.40%	51.00%	53.25%	0.5012	N.A.
	Purifer	60.45%	60.43%	51.75%	50.31%	51.41%	0.5015	N.A.




Figure 7: Distribution of the target classifier's confidence in predicting the correct class on members and non-members of its training set.




Figure 8: Distribution of the target classifier's prediction uncertainty on members and non-members of its training set. The uncertainty is measured as the normalized entropy of the confidence score vector.

the accuracy of NSH attack on Texas dataset from 66.37% to 51.29% while SELENA can only reduce it from 66.37% to 54.10%.

Effectiveness of PURIFIER against Attackers with More Powerful Shadow Models

In order to study the effectiveness of PURIFIER against stronger attackers, we evaluate the performance of PURIFIER against NSH attack and Mlleaks attack which use the same number of the data as the target model to train a more powerful shadow model. As Table 7 shown, PURIFIER is also effective to reduce the attack accuracy of the attackers with more powerful shadow models. For instance, the attack accuracy of the Mlleaks attack drops to 50.01% from 70.20%, which means PURIFIER is able to mitigate stronger attacks which having more information (e.g., an attacker has more data to train shadow models) than that we assumed in the main paper.

Inference about the reference data

Involving an in-distribution reference dataset in the defense mechanism is common in the literature. For instance, MemGuard uses a reference set to train the defense classifier. Min-Max uses it to train the inference model. Similarly, our approach uses it to train the PURIFIER. Unfortunately, little has been discussed on whether such reference dataset

Table 7: Results of PURIFIER against attackers with the more powerful shadow models.

Dataset	Defense	NSH Attack	Mlleaks Attack
CIFAR10	None	58.46%	70.20%
	Purifer	50.67%	50.01%
Purchase100	None	88.27%	68.50%
	Purifer	52.74%	51.00%
FaceScrub530	None	70.30%	73.46%
	Purifer	50.22%	50.66%

Table 8: Results of model inversion attack and membership inference attack on the reference set for different defenses. The experiments are performed on the FaceScrub530 dataset.

Defense	Inversion error	Inference accuracy
Purifier	0.0435	51.23%
Min-Max	0.0222	52.07%
MemGuard	0.0116	52.20%

brings vulnerability for data inference attacks. Assuming the reference data are considered as members, we present the inversion error and the inference accuracy (we consider NSH attack) on the reference set D_2 and the test set D_3 for each defense in Table 8. Results show that the inference accuracy does not increase on the reference set compared with the original training data of the target classifier. PURIFIER can still preserve the defense effect against the adversarial model inversion attack and the membership inference attack. However, there might be opposing views on whether such reference datasets should be considered as members.

Effect of PURIFIER's Training Data

We investigate the effect of the PURIFIER's training data by using different in/out-distribution data to train PURIFIER. Specifically, for in-distribution data, we vary the size of D_2 and also replace D_2 with D_1. For out-of-distribution data, we use CIFAR10 data to train the PURIFIER for the FaceScrub530 classifier, and use randomly generated data to train the PURIFIER for the Purchase100 classifier.

We present the effect of the in-distribution training data in Table 9. The results show that PURIFIER is still effective. The membership inference accuracy (Mlleaks and Adaptive) is reduced to nearly 50% regardless of the size of D_2. PURIFIER is also insensitive to the size of the D_2. The difference of the defense performance is negligible as the size of D_2 changes from 5,000 to 60,000. This is good for the defender, as one can achieve good performance with a small reference set. However, when the size of D_2 becomes too large (i.e., 40,000 to 60,000), the classification accuracy drops to a certain extent. The reason could be that PURIFIER starts to learn the detailed information of the confidence score vectors. As a result, the purified confidence score vector no longer concentrates on general patterns but becomes an accurate reconstruction, which hinders the classification utility.

When we use the classifier's training data D_1 to train the PURIFIER, the defense performance is comparable to the ones on D_2. For example, the attack accuracy of the NSH attack is 52.29%, which is marginally higher than the result of 51.71% on D_2, but still acceptable.

Table 9: Effect of the PURIFIER's in-distribution training data on the defense performance. The numbers are reported on the Purchase100 dataset.

Training set	Classification acc	NSH	Mlleaks	Adaptive
D_2 (5,000)	83.85%	52.63%	50.09%	50.62%
D_2 (10,000)	83.47%	51.72%	50.12%	50.14%
D_2 (20,000)	83.23%	51.71%	50.09%	50.13%
D_2 (40,000)	81.39%	51.93%	50.09%	50.20%
D_2 (60,000)	81.75%	51.84%	50.09%	50.10%
D_1 (20,000)	84.23%	52.29%	50.12%	50.07%




Figure 9: The proportion of noise data that PURIFIER can detect under the FGSM attacks on the FaceScrub530 dataset.

Table 10 shows the effect of the out-of-distribution training data. PURIFIER can still mitigate the attacks, but at the cost of sacrificing the utility of the target classifier significantly. This is not surprising because PURIFIER cannot extract useful patterns from the confidence scores on out-of-distribution data, which makes the purified confidence information meaningless.

Table 10: Effect of the PURIFIER's out-of-distribution training data on the defense performance.

Classifier	Purifier	Classification acc	NSH	Mlleaks	Adaptive
FaceScrub530	CIFAR10	40.05%	54.54%	50.11%	50.50%
Purchase100	Random	7.76%	51.55%	50.20%	50.71%

Effectiveness of PURIFIER to detect noisy members

We investigate the effectiveness of PURIFIER to detect noisy members, which means the members added noise by attackers intentionally. We use the adversarial attack methods (FGSM)[3]

[3]ICLR 2015 Explaining and Harnessing Adversarial Examples

Table 11: Ablation study on the Label Swapper.

Dataset	Defense	Transfer Attack
CIFAR10	None	0.5048
	CVAE	0.5045
	CVAE + Label Swapper	0.4974
CIFAR100	None	0.6668
	CVAE	0.6632
	CVAE + Label Swapper	0.4975

to create noisy members. As shown in Figure 9 that PURIFIER can accurately detect the members with noise $\|\eta\|_\infty < 1e-10$ on FaceScrub530 dataset.

Ablation study on the Label Swapper

We conduct the ablation study on the label swapper to investigate the effectiveness of it in our defense mechanism. Given our design of label swapper to mitigate the attackers using only the hard labels to perform attacks, we verify its efficiency under label only transfer attack. Table 11 shows a significant AUC drop in label only transfer attack with the help of label swapper compared by those mechanisms without it. Additionally, the result indicates that label only transfer attack can obtain approximately the same AUC among models without any defense and PURIFIER without the label swapper, which means PURIFIER without label swapper fails to mitigate the label only attack as we have assumed. In summary, the label swapper plays an indelible role in PURIFIER to mitigate the label only attacks.

Cost of PURIFIER in Real-world Setting

We discuss the latency and the memory cost introduced by PURIFIER at this section. We report that the training time of the CIFAR10 model is 3.18h, and the extra cost introduced by PURIFIER in it is 1.34h. Compared with 71.30h SELENA has introduced, PURIFIER contributes to less latency time. Besides the training cost, PURIFIER will spend extra 282.18s to predict 50k images in the inference time. We speculate that the latency of PURIFIER is mostly caused by kNN. Hence we expect to replace kNN by a more efficient component in the future work. For the memory cost, PURIFIER costs extra space for swap set. The sizes of it with different datasets are respectively 78.23K for CIFAR10, 1.14M for Purchase and 13.5M for Facescrub530. We believe the extra memory cost by PURIFIER is negligible compared to the original training set.