

Privacy Leakage on DNNs: A Survey of Model Inversion Attacks and Defenses

Hao Fang¹, Yixiang Qiu², Hongyao Yu², Wenbo Yu², Jiawei Kong², Baoli Chong²,
Bin Chen^{2*}, Xuan Wang², Shu-Tao Xia¹

¹Tsinghua Shenzhen International Graduate School, Tsinghua University

²School of Computer Science and Technology, Harbin Institute of Technology, Shenzhen
fang-h23@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn, {qiuyixiang, yuhongyao, yuwenbo, kongjiawei,
chongbaoli}@stu.hit.edu.cn, chenbin2021@hit.edu.cn, wangxuan@cs.hitsz.edu.cn,
xiast@sz.tsinghua.edu.cn

Abstract

Model Inversion (MI) attacks aim to disclose private information about the training data by abusing access to the pre-trained models. These attacks enable adversaries to reconstruct high-fidelity data that closely aligns with the private training data, which has raised significant privacy concerns. Despite the rapid advances in the field, we lack a comprehensive overview of existing MI attacks and defenses. To fill this gap, this paper thoroughly investigates this field and presents a holistic survey. Firstly, our work briefly reviews the traditional MI on machine learning scenarios. We then elaborately analyze and compare numerous recent attacks and defenses on Deep Neural Networks (DNNs) across multiple modalities and learning tasks. Finally, this paper discusses promising research directions and presents potential solutions to open issues. To facilitate further study on MI, we have implemented an available open-source toolbox on GitHub¹.

1 Introduction

With the unprecedented development of Deep Learning (DL), Deep Neural Networks (DNNs) have been widely used in a variety of fields, including medical research, financial analysis, and personalized recommendations. While many practical applications of DNNs require training on privacy-sensitive datasets, people may mistakenly expect that the private data is securely encoded in the weights of the trained model. However, numerous studies have demonstrated that a malicious attacker could utilize the pre-trained models to reveal critical information about the training data. Among the different types of attacks, Model Inversion (MI) stands out as a potent threat that has raised great privacy concerns.

[Fredrikson *et al.*, 2014] first introduce MI attacks in the context of genomic privacy and reveal that genomic markers could be recovered by maximizing posterior probabilities for a given linear regression model. Subsequent studies [Fredrikson *et al.*, 2015; Song *et al.*, 2017; Yang *et al.*, 2019] further extend MI attacks to more Machine Learning (ML) models

and more forms of data with other optimizing algorithms such as gradient descent. Although these aforementioned methods have exhibited outstanding performance in traditional ML scenarios for shallow networks and simple data, the effectiveness is significantly reduced when attacking deeper and wider DNNs trained on more complex and high-dimensional data such as RGB images.

To address this challenge, recent studies have made great efforts and achieved remarkable improvements in attacking image data. Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) [Goodfellow, 2016], first introduced to model inversion by [Zhang *et al.*, 2020], are exploited as image priors by a majority of these methods for better reconstruction results. Specifically, [Zhang *et al.*, 2020] propose to train a GAN model with publicly available data to generate high-fidelity images for target classes. Benefiting from the prior information encoded in the trained GAN model, the reconstruction performance is significantly improved. Furthermore, the studies of MI are extended to Natural Language Processing (NLP) tasks [Carlini *et al.*, 2019], especially for the privacy leakage risk of Large Language Models (LLMs), e.g., ChatGPT. Users can generate text-based queries and interact with ChatGPT, and concerns arise regarding the inadvertent exposure of sensitive information through the model’s responses [Nasr *et al.*, 2023]. Meanwhile, graph data used to train Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) is also vulnerable to MI threats [Zhang *et al.*, 2021]. To protect training data from powerful MI attacks, a series of defense strategies have been proposed to enhance the security of the trained models. Most of these methods defend against MI attacks by adding perturbations to the output predictions [Yang *et al.*, 2020], while others prefer to incorporate well-designed mechanisms into the training process of the target model [Wang *et al.*, 2021b].

Despite the privacy concerns in training data from different modalities, a comprehensive overview summarizing their advances is currently not available. Recent research [Dibbo, 2023] predominantly focus on the diverse taxonomies and challenges of MI attacks for tabular and image data, or [Jegorova *et al.*, 2022] briefly introduce several representative MI attacks in a subsection among various types of privacy attacks in the inference stage. In contrast, we present a systematic and elaborate review of the advanced MI attacks and defenses on DNNs over multiple modalities and different learning tasks, providing a thorough exploration of the landscape.

*Corresponding Author

¹<https://github.com/ffhibnese/Model-Inversion-Attack-ToolBox>




Figure 1: Threat model of GAN-based MI for image data.

2 Model Inversion Overview

2.1 Basic Concepts of Model Inversion

Model Inversion [Fredrikson *et al.*, 2014; Wang *et al.*, 2021a] is a type of attack that aims at inverting a given pre-trained model f_θ to recover private training dataset X , such as images, texts, and graphs. Different from the *membership inference attack* or the *property inference attack* that only reveal partial information about the training data [Jegorova *et al.*, 2022], MI enables an adversary to fully reconstruct private training samples, which has raised growing concern.

2.2 MI across Different Modalities

To better understand the distinction between different modalities, we refine the overall profile based on existing MI studies of the three modalities. Next, we detail the MI attacks and defenses in the order of image (see Section 3), text (see Section 4), and graph (see Section 5).

Learning Tasks. The victim models in computer vision and graph learning are primarily used for classification tasks. On the other hand, most attacks on text data target the language models of generative tasks. The varying learning tasks of victim models further lead to different attack strategies.

Taxonomy of Attacks. To better analyze and compare different reconstruction approaches, we generally categorize these methods of three modalities into *white-box* and *black-box* settings based on the attacker’s capability and knowledge. Specifically, a white-box scenario implies that attackers have full access to the weights and outputs of the target model. Conversely, in black-box settings, only the predicted confidence probabilities or hard labels are available.

Considering the distinctions of different modalities, we further provide a more detailed summary or taxonomy of MI attacks for each modality. In visual tasks, the MI attack is formulated as an optimization problem. We then disassemble the optimization process and summarize the major characteristics of representative attacks in Table 1. Due to the nature of text generative models, various forms of attacks appear in the NLP realm. We characterize them into three paradigms based on the key strategies to acquire reconstructed sentences: *Embedding Optimization*, *Token search*, and *Malicious Prompt Design*. For graph learning, researchers investigate the discrete structures of graph data and propose powerful inversion techniques, which can be categorized as: *Adjacency Optimization*, *Inverse Mapping*, and *Relationship Reasoning*.

Taxonomy of Defenses. As MI attacks mainly leverage the rich information within the model output or the correlation between the input and output of the victim model, the defenses across different modalities primarily focus on improving security from these two perspectives, and thus can be uniformly divided into two types: *Model Output Processing* and *Robust Model Training*.

3 MI on Computer Vision

This section provides detailed introductions to MI attacks and defenses on DNNs in the computer vision domain.

3.1 Private Image Recovery

We begin by elucidating the general threat model of MI on DNNs. To better clarify the pivotal techniques of these methods, we decompose the attack paradigm and analyze them across four perspectives: *Generative Models*, *Data Initialization*, *Attack Process* and *Additional Generic Techniques*.

Due to the remarkable improvement facilitated by the generative priors, generative models have been incorporated into the basic paradigm for subsequent research of MI on DNNs [Zhang *et al.*, 2020; Wang *et al.*, 2021a; Yuan *et al.*, 2023]. Figure 1 outlines the threat model for a typical GAN-based model inversion attack. Given the target image classifier f_θ parameterized with weights θ and the trained generator G , attackers attempt to recover private images \mathbf{x}^* from latent vectors \mathbf{z} initialized by Gaussian distribution:

$$\mathbf{z}^* = \arg \min_{\mathbf{z}} \mathcal{L}_{iden}(f_\theta(G(\mathbf{z})), c) + \lambda \mathcal{L}_{prior}(\mathbf{z}; G), \quad (1)$$

where c is the target class, $\mathcal{L}_{iden}(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes the classification loss, λ is a hyperparameter, and $\mathcal{L}_{prior}(\cdot)$ is the prior knowledge regularization, e.g., the discriminator loss. The first term measures the deviation from the private data and the latter term serves as image priors to enhance the quality of the reconstructed images. Before launching an attack, the adversary trains a specialized generator or utilizes a pre-trained generator as prior information about the target images. Then, they employ the generator to generate dummy images and feed them into the target classifier. During the recovery process, the attacker iteratively updates the latent vectors \mathbf{z} by minimizing the loss function in Eq. (1). Once obtain the optimal \mathbf{z}^* , the reconstructed images that closely align with the private images can be generated by $\mathbf{x}^* = G(\mathbf{z}^*)$.

Generative Models

Early studies directly searched image pixels to perform MI attacks, which were limited to shallow networks and gray images. By leveraging powerful generative models, subsequent studies successfully solved this issue and achieved outstanding improvements on DNNs with RGB images. Specifically, [Zhang *et al.*, 2020; Chen *et al.*, 2021; Nguyen *et al.*, 2023a] train a GAN model on a large public dataset that has similar image structures to the private data. They utilize different GAN models tailored to the MI scenario and design special loss functions for generative adversarial training. Moreover, these methods further strengthen attack effectiveness by leveraging the side information from target models, e.g., employing the features extracted by the target model to provide auxiliary knowledge to the generator [Nguyen *et al.*, 2023a].

| Method | Generative Models | Data Initialization | | Optimization | | | Extra Features |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|------------|---------------------|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| | | Resolution | Preprocess | Optim-algorithm | Loss-fn | Search Space | |
| White-Box Attacks | | | | | | | |
| GMI [Zhang <i>et al.</i> , 2020] | WGAN-GP | 64 × 64 | ✗ | Momentum SGD | $\mathcal{L}_{CE} + \lambda\mathcal{L}_{Dis}$ | \mathcal{Z} space | - |
| KEDMI [Chen <i>et al.</i> , 2021] | Inversion-specific GAN [†] | 64 × 64 | ✗ | Adam | $\mathcal{L}_{CE} + \lambda\mathcal{L}_{Dis}$ | \mathcal{Z}^* space | Distributional recovery |
| VMI [Wang <i>et al.</i> , 2021a] | DCGAN StyleGAN2-Ada | 64 × 64 128 × 128 | ✗ | Adam | $\mathcal{L}_{CE} + \lambda\mathcal{L}_{KL}$ | \mathcal{Z} space | Variational inference |
| SecretGen [Yuan <i>et al.</i> , 2022] | WGAN-GP | 64 × 64 | ✓ | Momentum SGD | $\mathcal{L}_{CE} + \lambda\mathcal{L}_{Dis}$ | \mathcal{Z} space | - |
| Mirror [An <i>et al.</i> , 2022] | StyleGAN | 224 × 224 | ✓ | Adam | \mathcal{L}_{CE} | \mathcal{P} space | p vector Clipping |
| PPA [Struppek <i>et al.</i> , 2022] | StyleGAN2-Ada | 224 × 224 | ✓ | Adam | $\mathcal{L}_{Poincaré}$ | \mathcal{W} space | Results selection |
| PLGMI [Yuan <i>et al.</i> , 2023] | Conditional GAN | 64 × 64 | ✗ | Adam | $\mathcal{L}_{Max-margin}$ | \mathcal{Z} space | Pseudo labels guidance |
| LOMMA [Nguyen <i>et al.</i> , 2023b] | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | $\mathcal{L}_{NLL} + \lambda\mathcal{L}_{Feature}$ | ~ | Model augmentation |
| DMMIA [Qi <i>et al.</i> , 2023] | StyleGAN2-Ada | 224 × 224 | ✓ | Adam | $\mathcal{L}_{CE} + \mathcal{L}_{Memory}$ | - | Dynamic memory bank |
| Black-Box Attacks | | | | | | | |
| SecretGen [Yuan <i>et al.</i> , 2022] | WGAN-GP | 64 × 64 | ✓ | Momentum SGD | \mathcal{L}_{Dis} | \mathcal{Z} space | - |
| BREPMI [Kahla <i>et al.</i> , 2022] | Inversion-specific GAN [†] | 64 × 64 | ✓ | Gradient estimation | - | \mathcal{Z} space | - |
| Mirror [An <i>et al.</i> , 2022] | StyleGAN | 224 × 224 | ✓ | Genetic algorithm | - | \mathcal{P} space | p vector Clipping |
| C2FMI [Ye <i>et al.</i> , 2023] | StyleGAN2 | 128 × 128 | ✓ | Genetic algorithm | - | \mathcal{W} space | Initial coarse optimization |
| RLBMI [Han <i>et al.</i> , 2023] | WGAN-GP | 64 × 64 | ✗ | SAC | - | \mathcal{Z} space | Reinforcement learning |
| LOKT [Nguyen <i>et al.</i> , 2023a] | ACGAN | 128 × 128 | ✗ | Adam | $\mathcal{L}_{Max-margin}$ | \mathcal{Z} space | Invert surrogate models |
| DiffusionMI [Liu, 2023] | Conditional Diffusion | 64 × 64 | ✓ | Optimization-free | - | - | Results selection |

*The latent vectors are sampled from a learnable Gaussian Distribution.

[†]This customized GAN structure is first proposed by KEDMI [Chen *et al.*, 2021].

~ LOMMA [Nguyen *et al.*, 2023a] is a plug-and-play technique that can perfectly combine with existing model inversion attacks.

Table 1: Summary of existing MI attacks for visual tasks. Note that SecretGen and Mirror consider both white-box and black-box scenarios.

However, constrained by the limited volume and poor quality of auxiliary datasets for GAN training, the trained generator is only capable of reconstructing low-resolution images at 64×64 . Additionally, performing adversarial training incurs expensive computational overheads and consumes a significant amount of time. One viable resolution is to utilize pre-trained GANs learning from large public datasets [An *et al.*, 2022; Struppek *et al.*, 2022]. Compared with GANs trained manually with low-quality auxiliary datasets, these pre-trained generators typically have more intricate structures and hold richer semantic information, enabling higher resolution image reconstruction up to 224×224 . [Liu, 2023] substitute GANs with the conditional diffusion model [Ho and Salimans, 2022]. Specifically, they leverage pseudo-labels classified by the target model as conditions to guide the denoising process. This approach demonstrates notable improvements over former GAN-based methods, particularly in terms of human perception distance (e.g., LPIPS [Zhang *et al.*, 2018]).

Data Initialization

Resolution. We summarize the image resolutions employed by different methods in Table 1. Given that more image pixels imply more parameters to optimize, the difficulty of MI attacks is highly determined by the resolution of recovered images. Early MI methods resort to reconstructing low-resolution images, e.g., GMI [Zhang *et al.*, 2020] and KEDMI [Chen *et al.*, 2021]. To enable attacks on higher-resolution images, subsequent studies introduce stronger GAN models (e.g., StyleGAN [Karras *et al.*, 2019])

and manage to recover images with a resolution of 224×224 .

Preprocess. While [Zhang *et al.*, 2020; Chen *et al.*, 2021] sample randomly from certain distributions, [Yuan *et al.*, 2022; Struppek *et al.*, 2022] highlight that a batch of appropriately initialized latent vectors tends to yield better reconstruction results. Concretely, they opt for latent vectors whose corresponding images can be correctly classified as the target labels by the victim model. To further enhance the preprocessing, [Ye *et al.*, 2023] conduct optimization to latents by minimizing the L_2 distance between the features extracted from the dummy images and inverted from the given label.

Attack Process

White-Box Attacks. As summarized in Table 1, white-box attacks generally apply Momentum SGD or Adam optimizer to conduct the inversion. Most of them search the latent code using the gradients computed from the Cross-Entropy (CE) loss. Considering that CE loss suffers from the gradient vanishing problem, researchers propose to employ Poincaré loss [Struppek *et al.*, 2022] or max-margin loss [Yuan *et al.*, 2023] to mitigate this issue. Besides, [Nguyen *et al.*, 2023b] rethink the optimization objective and emphasize that the fundamental goal of MI is to reconstruct images that closely align with the target class, rather than deviating from non-target classes. Since CE loss inherently combines both objectives, they suggest bypassing the softmax function in the cross-entropy loss and directly maximizing the confidence of the target class, i.e., the Negative Log-Likelihood (NLL) loss.

As mentioned in Section 1, various regularizers are intro-

duced as prior knowledge to ensure the fidelity of the generated images. One representative attempt is the use of the discrimination loss term \mathcal{L}_{Dis} . However, [Struppek *et al.*, 2022] shows that \mathcal{L}_{Dis} might degrade the inversion performance by matching the generated images with the distributions of the public data rather than the private ones. To avoid this distribution shift, subsequent MI methods no longer use this loss term. [Wang *et al.*, 2021a] formulate the MI attack as a variational inference process and introduce KL-divergence as a regularization to better approximate the target data distribution with a variational distribution $q(\mathbf{x})$. LOMMA [Nguyen *et al.*, 2023b] fully use the penultimate layer representations in the target model by adding an $\mathcal{L}_{Feature}$ term as a distance measure between the features of reconstructed samples and public images. Based on a dynamic memory bank, [Qi *et al.*, 2023] increase the diversity of inverted images by designing a novel regularizer $\mathcal{L}_{Memory} = \lambda_1 \mathcal{L}_{imr} + \lambda_2 \mathcal{L}_{idr}$, where \mathcal{L}_{imr} and \mathcal{L}_{idr} denote the intra-class multicentric representation (IMR) and the inter-class discriminative representation (IDR) loss respectively. IMR provides multiple distinctive features of intra-class images to prevent overfitting to specific image features. IDR stores the historical knowledge for each class, encouraging the reconstruction of images with more distinguishable characteristics.

Unlike these methods that focus on instance-level reconstruction, [Chen *et al.*, 2021] aim to recover the private data distribution for a given label with a learnable Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$. They adopt the reparameterization trick to make the loss differentiable and further optimize μ and σ . Attackers can then directly sample z from the learned distribution to generate sensitive images.

Black-Box Attacks. In contrast to white-box settings, these attacks cannot access any information within the target model. Consequently, the gradients can no longer be computed using the back-propagation operation. [Yuan *et al.*, 2022] propose a straightforward solution to this problem. They first sample numerous latent vectors from random noise and select the ones that can produce images predicted as the correct labels. The chosen vectors are then optimized exclusively based on the discriminator loss. [Han *et al.*, 2023] introduce a reinforcement learning-based MI attack, which leverages the confidence scores to provide rewards and optimize the agent with the soft actor-critic (SAC) algorithm.

Label-only scenario. BREPMI [Kahla *et al.*, 2022] employs gradient estimation to tackle situations where only hard labels are available. By randomly sampling N unit vectors \mathbf{u}_i , the loss is calculated with sampled points on a sphere at radius r to estimate the gradients $\hat{g}_{\mathbf{z}}$ of latent vectors \mathbf{z} :

$$\hat{g}_{\mathbf{z}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \Phi_c(\mathbf{z} + r\mathbf{u}_i) \mathbf{u}_i, \quad (2)$$

where $\Phi_c(\cdot)$ denotes a function that equals zero if the generated image is classified as the target class c , otherwise -1 . During the optimization, BREPMI gradually increases the value of r to accurately estimate the gradients. [Nguyen *et al.*, 2023a] transform this problem into a white-box scenario by inverting multiple surrogate models instead of the black-box victim model. This entails generating a substantial num-

ber of dummy samples using an ACGAN trained with guidance from the victim model. Next, multiple classifiers are trained on these dummy samples to serve as surrogates for the victim model. [Liu, 2023] use an auxiliary dataset labeled with pseudo labels to train a class-conditional diffusion model. The trained diffusion model is later directly used to generate target images without any further optimization.

Gradient-free optimizer. Orthogonal to the above methods, [An *et al.*, 2022; Ye *et al.*, 2023] explore gradient-free optimization techniques and perform genetic algorithms that utilize the distance and direction information from the current population to find the optimal latent vectors.

Search Space. Most previous studies focus on finding the optimal vectors in the GAN’s latent space \mathcal{Z} . However, [An *et al.*, 2022] show that as the resolution increases, this optimization becomes under-constrained due to the large space sparsity. Feature entanglement in \mathcal{Z} space is another challenge that further impedes the optimization process since images sharing similar features may not correspond to analogous latent vectors. StyleGANs [Karras *et al.*, 2019] transforms the latent space into the well-disentangled \mathcal{W} space through a mapping network $G_{mapping} : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$. Therefore, searching the \mathcal{W} space alleviates these issues and has been adopted by a series of following studies [Struppek *et al.*, 2022; Ye *et al.*, 2023]. Taking into account the difficulty of modeling \mathcal{W} distribution, [An *et al.*, 2022] propose the concept of \mathcal{P} space, the feature space located before the final LeakyReLU function in the mapping network, to constraint the final \mathbf{w} vectors within the target distribution. Numerous vectors are first sampled from \mathcal{Z} -space to compute the mean μ and variance σ of the activation values in \mathcal{P} -space. Given an optimized \mathbf{w} in \mathcal{W} -space, attackers first obtain \mathbf{p} by projecting \mathbf{w} to \mathcal{P} -space. Then \mathbf{p} is clipped within the range $[\mu - \sigma, \mu + \sigma]$ and projected back to the \mathcal{W} -space. This operation preserves the style control capabilities of the \mathcal{W} space while ensuring these controls are within the desired distribution.

Additional Generic Techniques

Various innovative techniques have been explored and incorporated into numerous studies. Next, we supplement a detailed review of several generic mechanisms.

Pseudo Label Guidance. Pseudo labels have been utilized to guide the training of both the generator [Yuan *et al.*, 2023; Liu, 2023] and the discriminator [Chen *et al.*, 2021]. Specifically, the target model is leveraged to reclassify public images with labels from the private dataset. Since the target model is trained on the private dataset, the use of pseudo labels exploits extra information within the private training data, thus enhancing the capabilities of the generator or discriminator trained on these auxiliary labeled images.

Augmentation. Many studies have integrated various augmentation techniques into the MI workflow to improve the attack effects. [Yuan *et al.*, 2022] employ sequential cutout as a data augmentation for images to improve the initial latent vector selection. [Struppek *et al.*, 2022; Liu, 2023] process the reconstructed results with image transformation and select results based on higher confidence from the output of the target model. Furthermore, [Yuan *et al.*, 2023] perform

random augmentations on the generated images before feeding them to the target model to provide more stable convergence to realistic images during the GAN training. In addition to traditional data augmentations, [Nguyen *et al.*, 2023b] present a novel approach called model augmentation. This involves training several auxiliary models from the target model using model distillation techniques. During the MI process, the adversary utilizes an ensemble of the original target model and the trained auxiliary models to calculate the loss function. By augmenting the surrogate models, this strategy mitigates overfitting to the target model and encourages the recovered images to capture more distinctive features of the private data.

Results Selection. [Struppek *et al.*, 2022] note that DNNs often exhibit overconfidence in their predictions, thus leading to attack results of low transferability. More concretely, while some reconstructed images are labeled with high confidence by the target model, they receive low scores when evaluated by another model. To overcome this challenge, [Struppek *et al.*, 2022; Liu, 2023] apply data augmentations to the generated images before classifying them with the target classifier. By selecting results with the highest confidence score after augmentation, this approach achieves higher attack accuracy and better transferability compared to the original ones.

3.2 Defending Image Data from MI Attacks

Model Output Processing. Since MI attacks exploit the redundant information in the target model’s output, a viable defense strategy is to reduce this redundancy by obscuring the output confidence scores. [Yang *et al.*, 2020] train an autoencoder as a purifier to process the confidence vector by reducing its dispersion. To further enhance the autoencoder’s ability, they employ an adversarial learning strategy that optimizes the purifier while jointly training additional inversion models as adversaries. [Wen *et al.*, 2021] generate adversarial noise to the confidence scores by maximizing the MI attack error, further leading to confusing reconstructed images. They also preserve the main task accuracy via a well-designed label modifier. [Ye *et al.*, 2022] design a Differential Privacy-based approach, which divides the score vector into multiple sub-ranges and applies an exponential mechanism to replace and normalize the values in each sub-range. This mechanism is theoretically proven to ensure differential privacy and improve the MI robustness of the target model.

Robust Model Training. MID [Wang *et al.*, 2021b] emphasizes that MI attacks leverage the correlation between the input X and output \hat{Y} of the target model f_θ , thereby proposing to penalize the mutual information between X and Y during training. The training objective can be expressed as:

$$\min_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim p_{X,Y}(x,y)} [\mathcal{L}(f_\theta(x), y)] + \lambda \mathcal{I}(X, \hat{Y}), \quad (3)$$

where y is the ground truth label, $\mathcal{L}(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes the loss for the main task, $\mathcal{I}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the approximated mutual information, and λ is a coefficient balancing privacy and utility.

Nonetheless, MID meets the dilemma between privacy and model performance as the second term conflicts with the main task loss. [Peng *et al.*, 2022] propose a bilateral dependency

optimization (BiDO) to solve this problem. Instead of directly diminishing the correlation between the inputs and outputs, BiDO minimizes the dependency between inputs and latent representations while maximizing the dependency between latent representations and outputs. [Gong *et al.*, 2023] mislead attackers from another perspective. They train a GAN and a public classifier using a public dataset. Subsequently, the adversary performs MI attacks on both the victim model and the public classifier to generate private and public fake samples. The attacker then fine-tunes the victim model with the generated fake samples, which minimizes the classification loss of public samples while maximizing that of private ones, thereby deceiving the attacker to invert samples that are significantly different from the private images.

[Titcombe *et al.*, 2021] defend MI in split learning scenarios by adding Laplacian noise to the intermediate representations before transmitting them to the computing server. Along this line, [Li *et al.*, 2022] consider split federated learning (SFL) and introduce a two-step framework that involves pre-training a robust model C^* against an adversarial inversion model and then transferring C^* to clients as initial models. Moreover, an attacker-aware fine-tuning technique is employed during SFL training to enhance MI resistance.

4 MI on Natural Language Processing

DNN models that process natural-language text also suffer from MI attacks. Due to the *unintended memorization* of language models [Carlini *et al.*, 2019], an adversary can invert the victim models to incur serious privacy leakage. This has been amplified by the thrives of LLMs as these models are trained on massive text corpora that often contain considerable privacy-sensitive information.

4.1 Private Text Recovery

White-Box Attacks

These attacks take advantage of the full access to the victim model by formulating the reconstruction as an optimization process that utilizes the back-propagated gradients.

Embedding Optimization. [Parikh *et al.*, 2022] attack the LSTM model f_θ by conducting a discrete optimization, where each token x_i of the sentence s is represented as a logit vector z_i to get the embedding E_s of the dummy sentence s . Given the target label y , the vector z_1, \dots, z_n is repeatedly optimized with the gradients computed from the cross-entropy loss $\mathcal{L}(f_\theta(E_s), y)$. [Zhang *et al.*, 2023b] adopt the paradigm of prompt learning that freezes the parameter of the victim GPT-Neo and tunes the pre-sentence soft prompt embedding S by forcing the model to output the target suffix b for a given prefix a . The learned prompt S elicits the *memorization* of the target language model and induces it to respond with private training data. Additionally, they introduce a smoothing regularizer to make the loss distribution of the suffix sequence smoother.

Black-Box Attacks

Since gradient back-propagation becomes impractical under black-box scenarios, researchers have developed novel algorithms, namely the *Token Search* and *Malicious Prompt Design*, to extract private sentences.

Token Search. Given the sentence’s prefix tokens $a = x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i$, attackers attempt to search the most probable pathway for generating the remaining portion of the sentence, i.e., $b = x_{i+1}, x_{i+2}, \dots, x_n$. Based on the search objective for the subsequent tokens, these methods are further divided into three parts as follows.

Perplexity-metric Search. [Carlini *et al.*, 2019] use *perplexity* to measure the probability of data sequences. Specifically, given a sequence $s = x_1 \dots x_n$ and the target generative sequence model f_θ (i.e., LSTM, qRNN), the perplexity $P_\theta(s)$ can be expressed as:

$$P_\theta(s) = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log f_\theta(x_i | x_1, \dots, x_{i-1})\right), \quad (4)$$

where $P_\theta(s)$ quantifies the “surprise” of a given sequence, and a lower perplexity value indicates a higher probability that the language model has seen the sequence. In this manner, the problem is transformed to find the sequence with minimal perplexity. However, directly enumerating all possible sequences and computing their perplexity leads to exponentially growing search space. A series of mechanisms have been proposed to improve search efficiency. [Carlini *et al.*, 2019] uses a modification of the Dijkstra algorithm which efficiently reduces the search range by avoiding visiting unnecessary sequence paths. The subsequent method [Carlini *et al.*, 2021] adopts a greedy-based algorithm that only retains tokens with top- k confidence during each iteration of generating the next token. Moreover, they provide several techniques for improved generated sentence diversity and enhanced attack accuracy. [Yu *et al.*, 2023] adopt a look-ahead mechanism to improve the quality of generated tokens. Instead of only depending on the next token’s probability for the top- k selection, they use the posterior probability of the subsequent sequence to inform the generation of the next token x_t .

Confidence-metric Search. Considering the sentiment classification task, [Elmahdy *et al.*, 2022] search for the next token that maximizes the confidence score of target class y as predicted by a fine-tuned BERT classifier. To counteract the model’s bias towards high-frequency tokens, a regularizer is introduced to penalize the frequent occurrence of certain tokens. However, this method also faces the challenge of exponentially growing search space. To tackle this, [Elmahdy and Salem, 2023] first use BERT with the original generation head to generate candidate tokens with top- k confidence, which are further selected by maximizing the probability of label y with the classification head.

Difference-metric Search. Recently the pre-train and fine-tune paradigm has gained growing popularity. Accordingly, several attacks appear to invert the fine-tuning dataset by exploiting the difference between pre-trained model M and fine-tuned model M' . Considering the token sequence $s = x_1 \dots x_n$, [Zanella-Béguelin *et al.*, 2020] define the difference score $DS_M^{M'} = \sum_{i=1}^n P_{M'}(x_i | x_{<i}) - P_M(x_i | x_{<i})$, which measures the difference in the output probabilities between M and M' . Intuitively, a larger difference score value indicates a higher probability that the fine-tuned model M' has seen sequence s while the original model M does not, i.e., s belongs to the fine-tuning dataset. By performing a beam




Figure 2: An example of privacy leakage on LLMs.

search, they select next tokens with top- k highest differential scores and achieve a remarkable attack success rate.

Malicious Prompt Design. LLMs have demonstrated powerful capabilities and great potential. However, several studies have shown that some specially designed prompts can invert the model to output sensitive training data. As Figure 2 depicts, feeding malicious prompts into language models such as GPT-Neo can incur serious privacy information leakage [Huang *et al.*, 2022]. More surprisingly, [Nasr *et al.*, 2023] suggest that data can also be extracted by simply asking ChatGPT to repeat a word multiple times. One possible reason is that it causes the model to “escape” its aligning training and revert to its original language modeling objective.

4.2 Defending Text Data from MI Attacks

Model Output Processing. [Huang *et al.*, 2022] propose that restricting the model output is an effective defense approach. They suggest filtering the privacy-sensitive information within the prediction, e.g., including a detection module to examine whether the output text contains sensitive information and take appropriate measures such as refusing to answer or masking the information for privacy guarantees.

Robust Model Training. [Anil *et al.*, 2021] reveal that language models trained with variants of the differential privacy-based optimizer exhibit improved MI resistance while at the expense of performance degradation and increased computation. [Kandpal *et al.*, 2022] find that training data deduplication efficiently reduces the *memorization* of the victim model, thereby improving MI robustness. Besides, the *memorization* of language models essentially relates to the overfitting. Therefore, regularization and early stopping are also alternative defense strategies [Ishihara, 2023].

5 MI on Graph Learning

MI attacks on Graph Learning leverage Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) to reconstruct the topology of the private graph data. As shown in Figure 3, given the target GNN f_θ pre-trained on the private graph \mathcal{G} , the adversary aims to infer the adjacency matrix \hat{A} , which is then converted into graph $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ to reconstruct the private training dataset.

5.1 Private Graph Recovery

White-Box Attacks

Similarly, white-box attacks for graph data compute the gradients to optimize the adjacency for privacy extraction.




Figure 3: Different types of MI attacks on graph data.

Adjacency Optimization. Denote the prediction vector or the embeddings output by the target GNN model as \mathcal{H} , i.e., $\mathcal{H} = f_\theta(\mathcal{G})$. An adjacency matrix $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_0$ is initialized to obtain the dummy graph $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_0$ and the dummy output $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_0 = f_\theta(\hat{\mathcal{G}}_0)$. By minimizing the distance \mathcal{L}_{rec} between $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_0$ and \mathcal{H} with gradient descent, an attacker iteratively updates $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ to find the optimal solution. Based on this, [Zhang *et al.*, 2021] propose GraphMI that uses a projected gradient module to tackle the discreteness of graph data while introducing the feature smoothness term and the F-norm term to preserve feature smoothness and sparsity. [Zhou *et al.*, 2023] propose to regard f_θ as a Markov chain and optimize $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ via a flexible chain approximation, achieving excellent reconstructed results.

Black-Box Attacks

As shown in Figure 3, we categorize black-box attacks into two types: *Inverse Mapping* and *Relationship Reasoning*.

Inverse Mapping. [Duddu *et al.*, 2020] attempt to invert the original mapping f_θ and construct an inverse mapping. They train an autoencoder on the auxiliary graph dataset \mathcal{G}_{aux} and utilize the decoder \mathcal{F}_{dec} to map \mathcal{H} back to $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$, i.e., $\hat{\mathcal{G}} = \mathcal{F}_{dec}(\mathcal{H})$. However, the distribution of intermediate features \mathcal{H}_{int} within the autoencoder may differ from the distribution of \mathcal{H} . Therefore, [Zhang *et al.*, 2022] further query f_θ with \mathcal{G}_{aux} to acquire \mathcal{H}_{aux} and fine-tune \mathcal{F}_{dec} with $(\mathcal{H}_{aux}, \mathcal{G}_{aux})$ for enhanced reconstruction performance.

Relationship Reasoning. These attacks reconstruct $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ by reasoning about the relations among pairs of nodes using the node attributes as auxiliary knowledge. [He *et al.*, 2021] assume that two nodes u and v are linked if they share more similar attributes or predictions. Furthermore, [Wu *et al.*, 2022] suggest that if there is an edge between u and v , the information of u would be propagated to v during training. Thus, they presume u and v are linked if changing the feature vector of u can impact the prediction of v to a certain extent.

5.2 Defending Graph Data from MI Attacks

Model Output Processing. [He *et al.*, 2021] restrict the GNN model to only output the k largest posterior probabil-

ities to provide less information. [Zhang *et al.*, 2022] propose adding Laplace noise to the model’s output \mathcal{H} to mislead the attacker. Since applying noise to \mathcal{H} may result in utility degradation, it is essential to choose a decent level of noise.

Robust Model Training. [Zhang *et al.*, 2021] add Gaussian noise to the clipped gradients in each training iteration to guarantee differential privacy (DP). However, subsequent studies demonstrate that ensuring DP cannot effectively prevent MI attacks. Instead, [Zhang *et al.*, 2023a] conceal real edges by pre-processing the training graph, such as randomly flipping and rewriting. This operation misleads the attacker into recovering dummy data that significantly differs from the ground truth. To diminish the correlation between the model inputs and outputs, [Zhou *et al.*, 2023] inject stochasticity into \mathcal{A} and regularize the mutual dependency among graph representations, adjacency, and labels during training.

6 Conclusion and Research Directions

This survey presents a systematic review of recent advances in model inversion on DNNs. We first comprehensively characterize existing MI methods for visual tasks and compare them from different perspectives in detail. We also investigate MI studies on discrete graph and text data and provide systematic taxonomies. To further promote this field, we finally demonstrate several unsolved challenges and suggest promising future directions.

Stronger Generative Prior for MI attacks. In visual tasks, previous approaches leveraged various GANs as image priors for reconstruction guidance. A notable contribution by [Liu, 2023] introduced potent diffusion models into MI attacks. They trained a conditional diffusion model [Ho and Salimans, 2022] to generate 64×64 resolution images from the target distribution. For addressing higher-resolution image recovery, future research could explore utilizing pre-trained diffusion models with rich image priors or alternative techniques to enhance generative model utilization. This paradigm extension is also applicable to other modalities.

Certified Robustness against MI Attacks. Although there have been intensive studies on MI robustness, current defense approaches lack certified robustness guarantees. Certifiably robust approaches for DNNs have been developed against adversarial attack [Cohen *et al.*, 2019] and backdoor attack [Wang *et al.*, 2020]. Hence, a solid theoretical framework to provide certified guarantees in the context of MI attacks is indispensable. Additionally, exploring ways to integrate user feedback and preferences into the certification pipeline can enhance the practicality of ensuring certified robustness in conversational AI models like ChatGPT.

Multi-Modal MI Attacks and Defenses. Recently, advanced multi-modal models have shown sophisticated capabilities in handling complex and diverse data. While current MI methods have made great progress on unimodal models, there is a lack of research on multi-modal foundation models, e.g., the CLIP [Radford *et al.*, 2021] and SAM [Kirillov *et al.*, 2023]. Exploring potential vulnerabilities during the cross-modal inference process can be a promising and necessary direction for model inversion attacks and defenses.

References

- [An *et al.*, 2022] Shengwei An, Guanhong Tao, Qiuling Xu, Yingqi Liu, Guangyu Shen, Yuan Yao, Jingwei Xu, and Xiangyu Zhang. Mirror: Model inversion for deep learning network with high fidelity. In *NDSS*, 2022.
- [Anil *et al.*, 2021] Rohan Anil, Badih Ghazi, Vineet Gupta, Ravi Kumar, and Pasin Manurangsi. Large-scale differentially private bert. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.01624*, 2021.
- [Carlini *et al.*, 2019] Nicholas Carlini, Chang Liu, Úlfar Erlingsson, Jernej Kos, and Dawn Song. The secret sharer: Evaluating and testing unintended memorization in neural networks. In *USENIX Security*, 2019.
- [Carlini *et al.*, 2021] Nicholas Carlini, Florian Tramèr, Eric Wallace, Matthew Jagielski, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Katherine Lee, Adam Roberts, Tom Brown, Dawn Song, Úlfar Erlingsson, Alina Oprea, and Colin Raffel. Extracting training data from large language models. In *USENIX Security*, pages 2633–2650, August 2021.
- [Chen *et al.*, 2021] Si Chen, Mostafa Kahla, Ruoxi Jia, and Guo-Jun Qi. Knowledge-enriched distributional model inversion attacks. In *ICCV*, 2021.
- [Cohen *et al.*, 2019] Jeremy Cohen, Elan Rosenfeld, and Zico Kolter. Certified adversarial robustness via randomized smoothing. In *ICML*, 2019.
- [Dibbo, 2023] Sayanton V. Dibbo. Sok: Model inversion attack landscape: Taxonomy, challenges, and future roadmap. In *2023 IEEE 36th Computer Security Foundations Symposium (CSF)*, pages 439–456, 2023.
- [Duddu *et al.*, 2020] Vasisht Duddu, Antoine Boutet, and Virat Shejwalkar. Quantifying privacy leakage in graph embedding. In *MobiQuitous*, 2020.
- [Elmahdy and Salem, 2023] Adel Elmahdy and Ahmed Salem. Deconstructing classifiers: Towards a data reconstruction attack against text classification models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.13789*, 2023.
- [Elmahdy *et al.*, 2022] Adel Elmahdy, Huseyin A Inan, and Robert Sim. Privacy leakage in text classification: A data extraction approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.04591*, 2022.
- [Fredrikson *et al.*, 2014] Matthew Fredrikson, Eric Lantz, Somesh Jha, Simon Lin, David Page, and Thomas Ristenpart. Privacy in pharmacogenetics: An {End-to-End} case study of personalized warfarin dosing. In *USENIX Security*, pages 17–32, 2014.
- [Fredrikson *et al.*, 2015] Matt Fredrikson, Somesh Jha, and Thomas Ristenpart. Model inversion attacks that exploit confidence information and basic countermeasures. In *CCS*, pages 1322–1333, 2015.
- [Gong *et al.*, 2023] Xueluan Gong, Ziyao Wang, Shuaike Li, Yanjiao Chen, and Qian Wang. A gan-based defense framework against model inversion attacks. *IEEE TIFS*, 2023.
- [Goodfellow, 2016] Ian Goodfellow. Nips 2016 tutorial: Generative adversarial networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.00160*, 2016.
- [Han *et al.*, 2023] Gyojin Han, Jaehyun Choi, Haeil Lee, and Junmo Kim. Reinforcement learning-based black-box model inversion attacks. In *CVPR*, 2023.
- [He *et al.*, 2021] Xinlei He, Jinyuan Jia, Michael Backes, Neil Zhenqiang Gong, and Yang Zhang. Stealing links from graph neural networks. In *USENIX Security*, 2021.
- [Ho and Salimans, 2022] Jonathan Ho and Tim Salimans. Classifier-free diffusion guidance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.12598*, 2022.
- [Huang *et al.*, 2022] Jie Huang, Hanyin Shao, and Kevin Chen-Chuan Chang. Are large pre-trained language models leaking your personal information? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.12628*, 2022.
- [Ishihara, 2023] Shotaro Ishihara. Training data extraction from pre-trained language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16157*, 2023.
- [Jegorova *et al.*, 2022] Marija Jegorova, Chaitanya Kaul, Charlie Mayor, Alison Q O’Neil, Alexander Weir, Roderick Murray-Smith, and Sotirios A Tsaftaris. Survey: Leakage and privacy at inference time. *IEEE TPAMI*, 2022.
- [Kahla *et al.*, 2022] Mostafa Kahla, Si Chen, Hoang Anh Just, and Ruoxi Jia. Label-only model inversion attacks via boundary repulsion. In *CVPR*, 2022.
- [Kandpal *et al.*, 2022] Nikhil Kandpal, Eric Wallace, and Colin Raffel. Deduplicating training data mitigates privacy risks in language models. In *ICML*, 2022.
- [Karras *et al.*, 2019] Tero Karras, Samuli Laine, and Timo Aila. A style-based generator architecture for generative adversarial networks. In *CVPR*, 2019.
- [Kirillov *et al.*, 2023] Alexander Kirillov, Eric Mintun, Nikhila Ravi, Hanzi Mao, Chloe Rolland, Laura Gustafson, Tete Xiao, Spencer Whitehead, Alexander C Berg, Wan-Yen Lo, et al. Segment anything. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.02643*, 2023.
- [Li *et al.*, 2022] Jingtao Li, Adnan Siraj Rakin, Xing Chen, Zhezhi He, Deliang Fan, and Chaitali Chakrabarti. Ressler: A resistance transfer framework for defending model inversion attack in split federated learning. In *CVPR*, 2022.
- [Liu, 2023] Rongke Liu. Unstoppable attack: Label-only model inversion via conditional diffusion model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.08424*, 2023.
- [Nasr *et al.*, 2023] Milad Nasr, Nicholas Carlini, Jonathan Hayase, Matthew Jagielski, A Feder Cooper, Daphne Ippolito, Christopher A Choquette-Choo, Eric Wallace, Florian Tramèr, and Katherine Lee. Scalable extraction of training data from (production) language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.17035*, 2023.
- [Nguyen *et al.*, 2023a] Ngoc-Bao Nguyen, Keshigeyan Chandrasegaran, Milad Abdollahzadeh, and Ngai-Man Cheung. Label-only model inversion attacks via knowledge transfer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.19342*, 2023.
- [Nguyen *et al.*, 2023b] Ngoc-Bao Nguyen, Keshigeyan Chandrasegaran, Milad Abdollahzadeh, and Ngai-Man Cheung. Re-thinking model inversion attacks against deep neural networks. In *CVPR*, pages 16384–16393, 2023.

- [Parikh *et al.*, 2022] Rahil Parikh, Christophe Dupuy, and Rahul Gupta. Canary extraction in natural language understanding models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.13920*, 2022.
- [Peng *et al.*, 2022] Xiong Peng, Feng Liu, Jingfeng Zhang, Long Lan, Junjie Ye, Tongliang Liu, and Bo Han. Bilateral dependency optimization: Defending against model-inversion attacks. In *SIGKDD*, 2022.
- [Qi *et al.*, 2023] Gege Qi, YueFeng Chen, Xiaofeng Mao, Binyuan Hui, Xiaodan Li, Rong Zhang, and Hui Xue. Model inversion attack via dynamic memory learning. In *ACM MM*, pages 5614–5622, 2023.
- [Radford *et al.*, 2021] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *ICML*, 2021.
- [Song *et al.*, 2017] Congzheng Song, Thomas Ristenpart, and Vitaly Shmatikov. Machine learning models that remember too much. In *CCS*, pages 587–601, 2017.
- [Struppek *et al.*, 2022] Lukas Struppek, Dominik Hintersdorf, Antonio De Almeida Correia, Antonia Adler, and Kristian Kersting. Plug & play attacks: Towards robust and flexible model inversion attacks. In *ICML*, 2022.
- [Titcombe *et al.*, 2021] Tom Titcombe, Adam J Hall, Pavlos Papadopoulos, and Daniele Romanini. Practical defences against model inversion attacks for split neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.05743*, 2021.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2020] Binghui Wang, Xiaoyu Cao, Neil Zhenqiang Gong, et al. On certifying robustness against backdoor attacks via randomized smoothing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.11750*, 2020.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2021a] Kuan-Chieh Wang, Yan Fu, Ke Li, Ashish Khisti, Richard Zemel, and Alireza Makhzani. Variational model inversion attacks. In *NeurIPS*, 2021.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2021b] Tianhao Wang, Yuheng Zhang, and Ruoxi Jia. Improving robustness to model inversion attacks via mutual information regularization. In *AAAI*, 2021.
- [Wen *et al.*, 2021] Jing Wen, Siu-Ming Yiu, and Lucas CK Hui. Defending against model inversion attack by adversarial examples. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Cyber Security and Resilience*, 2021.
- [Wu *et al.*, 2022] Fan Wu, Yunhui Long, Ce Zhang, and Bo Li. Linkteller: Recovering private edges from graph neural networks via influence analysis. In *2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, 2022.
- [Yang *et al.*, 2019] Ziqi Yang, Jiyi Zhang, Ee-Chien Chang, and Zhenkai Liang. Neural network inversion in adversarial setting via background knowledge alignment. In *CCS*, 2019.
- [Yang *et al.*, 2020] Ziqi Yang, Bin Shao, Bohan Xuan, Ee-Chien Chang, and Fan Zhang. Defending model inversion and membership inference attacks via prediction purification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.03915*, 2020.
- [Ye *et al.*, 2022] Dayong Ye, Sheng Shen, Tianqing Zhu, Bo Liu, and Wanlei Zhou. One parameter defense—defending against data inference attacks via differential privacy. *IEEE TIFS*, 17:1466–1480, 2022.
- [Ye *et al.*, 2023] Zipeng Ye, Wenjian Luo, Muhammad Luqman Naseem, Xiangkai Yang, Yuhui Shi, and Yan Jia. C2fmi: Corse-to-fine black-box model inversion attack. *IEEE TDSC*, 2023.
- [Yu *et al.*, 2023] Weichen Yu, Tianyu Pang, Qian Liu, Chao Du, Bingyi Kang, Yan Huang, Min Lin, and Shuicheng Yan. Bag of tricks for training data extraction from language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04460*, 2023.
- [Yuan *et al.*, 2022] Zhuowen Yuan, Fan Wu, Yunhui Long, Chaowei Xiao, and Bo Li. Secretgen: Privacy recovery on pre-trained models via distribution discrimination. In *ECCV*, 2022.
- [Yuan *et al.*, 2023] Xiaojian Yuan, Kejiang Chen, Jie Zhang, Weiming Zhang, Nenghai Yu, and Yang Zhang. Pseudo label-guided model inversion attack via conditional generative adversarial network. In *AAAI*, 2023.
- [Zanella-Béguelin *et al.*, 2020] Santiago Zanella-Béguelin, Lukas Wutschitz, Shruti Tople, Victor Rühle, Andrew Paverd, Olga Ohrimenko, Boris Köpf, and Marc Brockschmidt. Analyzing information leakage of updates to natural language models. In *CCS*, 2020.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2018] Richard Zhang, Phillip Isola, Alexei A Efros, Eli Shechtman, and Oliver Wang. The unreasonable effectiveness of deep features as a perceptual metric. In *CVPR*, 2018.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2020] Yuheng Zhang, Ruoxi Jia, Hengzhi Pei, Wenxiao Wang, Bo Li, and Dawn Song. The secret revealer: Generative model-inversion attacks against deep neural networks. In *CVPR*, 2020.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2021] Zaixi Zhang, Qi Liu, Zhenya Huang, Hao Wang, Chengqiang Lu, Chuanren Liu, and Enhong Chen. Graphmi: Extracting private graph data from graph neural networks. In *IJCAI*, 2021.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2022] Zhikun Zhang, Min Chen, Michael Backes, Yun Shen, and Yang Zhang. Inference attacks against graph neural networks. In *USENIX Security*, 2022.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2023a] Zaixi Zhang, Qi Liu, Zhenya Huang, Hao Wang, Chee-Kong Lee, and Enhong Chen. Model inversion attacks against graph neural networks. *IEEE TKDE*, 35(9):8729–8741, 2023.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2023b] Zhixin Zhang, Jiabin Wen, and Minlie Huang. Ethicist: Targeted training data extraction through loss smoothed soft prompting and calibrated confidence estimation. In *The 61st Annual Meeting Of The Association For Computational Linguistics*, 2023.
- [Zhou *et al.*, 2023] Zhanke Zhou, Chenyu Zhou, Xuan Li, Jiangchao Yao, Quanming Yao, and Bo Han. On strengthening and defending graph reconstruction attack with markov chain approximation. In *ICML*, 2023.