

---

# TOWARDS RELIABLE EMPIRICAL MACHINE UNLEARNING EVALUATION: A GAME-THEORETIC VIEW

---

PREPRINT

**Yiwen Tu\***

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor  
evantu@umich.edu

**Pingbang Hu\***

University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign  
pbb@illinois.edu

**Jiaqi Ma**

University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign  
jiaqima@illinois.edu

## ABSTRACT

Machine unlearning is the process of updating machine learning models to remove the information of specific training data samples, in order to comply with data protection regulations that allow individuals to request the removal of their personal data. Despite the recent development of numerous unlearning algorithms, reliable evaluation of these algorithms remains an open research question. In this work, we focus on membership inference attack (MIA) based evaluation, one of the most common approaches for evaluating unlearning algorithms, and address various pitfalls of existing evaluation metrics that lack reliability. Specifically, we propose a game-theoretic framework that formalizes the evaluation process as a game between unlearning algorithms and MIA adversaries, measuring the data removal efficacy of unlearning algorithms by the capability of the MIA adversaries. Through careful design of the game, we demonstrate that the natural evaluation metric induced from the game enjoys provable guarantees that the existing evaluation metrics fail to satisfy. Furthermore, we propose a practical and efficient algorithm to estimate the evaluation metric induced from the game, and demonstrate its effectiveness through both theoretical analysis and empirical experiments. This work presents a novel and reliable approach to empirically evaluating unlearning algorithms, paving the way for the development of more effective unlearning techniques.

**Keywords** Machine Unlearning · Privacy and Security · Membership Inference Attacks

## 1 Introduction

*Machine unlearning* is an emerging research field in artificial intelligence (AI) motivated by the “Right to be Forgotten,” outlined by various data protection regulations such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) [Mantelero, 2013] and the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA) [CCPA, 2018]. Specifically, the Right to be Forgotten grants individuals the right to request that an organization erase their personal data from its databases, subject to certain exceptions. Consequently, when such data were used for training machine learning models, the organization may be required to update their models to “unlearn” the data to comply with the Right to be Forgotten. A naive solution is retraining the model on the remaining data after removing the requested data points, but this solution is computationally prohibitive. Recently, a plethora of unlearning algorithms have been developed to efficiently update the model without complete retraining, albeit usually at the price of removing the requested data information only approximately [Cao and Yang, 2015, Bourtole et al., 2021, Guo et al., 2020, Neel et al., 2021, Sekhari et al., 2021, Chien et al., 2023, Kurmanji et al., 2023].

---

\*Equal contribution.

Despite the active development of unlearning algorithms, the fundamental problem of properly evaluating these methods remains an open research question, as highlighted by the Machine Unlearning Competition held at NeurIPS 2023<sup>1</sup>. The unlearning literature has developed a variety of evaluation metrics for measuring the *data removal efficacy* of unlearning algorithms, i.e., to which extent the information of the requested data points are removed from the unlearned model. Existing metrics can be roughly categorized as attack-based [Graves et al., 2020, Kurmanji et al., 2023, Goel et al., 2023, Hayes et al., 2024, Sommer et al., 2020, Goel et al., 2023], theory-based [Triantafillou and Kairouz, 2023, Becker and Liebig, 2022], and retraining-based [Golatkar et al., 2021, Wu et al., 2020, Izzo et al., 2021], respectively. Each metric has its own limitations and there is no consensus on a standard evaluation metric for unlearning. Among these metrics, the membership inference attack (MIA) based metric, which aims to determine whether specific data points were part of the original training dataset based on the unlearned model, is perhaps the most commonly seen in the literature. MIA is often considered a natural unlearning evaluation metric as it directly measures the privacy leakage of the unlearned model, which is a primary concern of unlearning algorithms.

Most existing literature directly uses MIA performance<sup>2</sup> to measure the data removal efficacy of unlearning algorithms. However, such metrics can be unreliable as MIA performance is not a well-calibrated metric when used for unlearning evaluation, leading to counterintuitive results. For example, naively retraining the model is theoretically optimal for data removal efficacy, albeit computationally prohibitive. Nevertheless, retraining is not guaranteed to yield the lowest MIA performance compared to other approximate unlearning algorithms. This discrepancy arises because MIAs themselves are imperfect and can make mistakes in inferring data membership. Furthermore, MIA performance is also sensitive to the composition of data used to conduct MIA and the specific choice of MIA algorithm. Consequently, the results obtained using different MIAs are not directly comparable and can vary significantly, making it difficult to draw definitive conclusions about the efficacy of unlearning algorithms. These limitations render the existing MIA-based evaluation brittle and highlight the need for a more reliable and comprehensive framework for assessing the performance of unlearning algorithms.

In this work, we aim to address the challenges associated with MIA-based unlearning evaluation by introducing a game-theoretical framework named the *unlearning sample inference game*. Within this framework, we gauge the data removal efficacy through a game where, informally, the defender (model provider) endeavors to produce an unlearned model, while the adversary (MIA adversary) seeks to exploit the unlearned model to determine the membership status of the given samples. By carefully formalizing the game, with controlled knowledge and interaction between both parties, we ensure that the success rate of the adversary in the unlearning sample inference game possesses several desirable properties, and thus can be used as an unlearning evaluation metric circumventing the aforementioned pitfalls of MIA performance. Specifically, it ensures that the adversary’s success rate towards the retrained model is precisely zero, thereby certifying retraining as the theoretically optimal unlearning method. Moreover, it provides a provable guarantee for certified machine unlearning algorithms [Guo et al., 2020], aligning the proposed metric with theoretical results in the literature. Lastly, it inherently accommodates the existence of multiple MIA adversaries, resolving the conflict between different choices of MIAs. However, the computational demands of exactly calculating the proposed metric pose a practical issue. To mitigate this, we introduce a *SWAP* test as a practical approximation, which also inherits many of the desirable properties of the exact metric. Empirically, this test proves robust to changes in random seed and dataset size, enabling model maintainers to conduct small-scale experiments to gauge the quality of their unlearning algorithms.

Finally, we highlight our contributions in this work as follows:

- We present a formalization of the *unlearning sample inference game*, establishing a novel unlearning evaluation metric for data removal efficacy.
- We demonstrate several provable properties of the proposed metric, circumventing various pitfalls of existing MIA-based metrics.
- We introduce a straightforward and effective *SWAP* test for efficient empirical analysis. Through thorough theoretical examination and empirical experiments, we show that it exhibits similar desirable properties.

In summary, this work offers a game-theoretic framework for reliable empirical evaluation of machine unlearning algorithms, tackling one of the most foundational problems in this field.

<sup>1</sup>See <https://unlearning-challenge.github.io/>.

<sup>2</sup>For example, the accuracy or the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC) of the inferred membership.

## 2 Related Works

### 2.1 Machine Unlearning

Machine unlearning, as initially introduced by Cao and Yang [2015], is the process of updating machine learning models to remove the influence of selected training data samples, effectively making the models “forget” those samples. The majority of unlearning methods can be categorized as exact unlearning and approximate unlearning.

Exact unlearning requires the unlearned models to be indistinguishable from models that were trained from scratch without the removed data samples. Techniques like data sharding [Bourtoule et al., 2021, Chen et al., 2022] partition the training process in such a way that only a portion of the model needs to be retrained when removing a subset of the dataset, reducing the computational burden compared to retraining the entire model. However, exact machine unlearning can still be computationally expensive, especially for large datasets and complex models, which limits its practical applicability.

On the other hand, approximate unlearning aims to remove the influence of selected data samples while accepting a certain level of deviation from the exactly unlearned model. This trade-off allows for more efficient unlearning algorithms, making approximate unlearning an increasingly popular approach in practical settings. For example, Guo et al. [2020], Neel et al. [2021], Chien et al. [2023] analyzed the influence of removed data on linear or convex models and proposed gradient-based updates on model parameters to remove this influence. While approximate unlearning is more efficient in terms of time and space complexity compared to exact unlearning, it does not guarantee the complete removal of the influence of the removed data samples. In this work, we focus on quantifying the efficacy of information removal in approximate unlearning methods. We refer the audience to the survey on unlearning methods by Xu et al. [2023] for a more comprehensive overview.

### 2.2 Machine Unlearning Evaluation

Evaluating machine unlearning involves multiple aspects, including computational efficiency, model utility, and data removal efficacy. Computational efficiency refers to the time and space complexity of the unlearning algorithms, while model utility measures the prediction performance of the unlearned models. These two aspects can be measured in a relatively straightforward way through metrics like computation time, memory usage, or prediction accuracy. Data removal efficacy, on the other hand, assesses the extent to which the influence of the requested data points has been removed from the unlearned model, which is highly non-trivial to measure and has attracted significant research efforts recently. These efforts for evaluating or guaranteeing data removal efficacy can be categorized into the following groups.

**Retraining-based** Generally, retraining-based evaluation seeks to compare unlearned models to retrained models. As introduced in the works by Golatkar et al. [2021], He et al. [2021], Golatkar et al. [2020], model accuracy on the forget set should be similar to the accuracy on the test set as if the forget set never exists in the training set. Peste et al. [2021] proposed an evaluation metric based on normalized confusion matrix element-wise difference on selected data samples. Golatkar et al. [2021] proposed using relearn time, which is the additional time to use for unlearned models to perform comparably to retrained models. The authors also proposed to measure the  $\ell_1$  distance between the final activations of the scrubbed weights and the retrained model. Wu et al. [2020], Izzo et al. [2021] turned to  $\ell_2$  distance of weight parameters between unlearned models and retrained models. In general, beyond the need for additional implementation and the lower computational efficiency inherent in retraining-based evaluations, a more critical issue is the influence of random factors. As discussed by Cretu et al. [2023], such random factors, including the sequence of data batches and the initial configuration of models, can lead to the unaligned storage of information within models. This misalignment may foster implicit biases favoring certain retrained models.

**Theory-based** Some literature tries to characterize data removal efficacy by requiring a strict theoretical guarantee for the unlearned models. For example, Guo et al. [2020], Neel et al. [2021], Chien et al. [2023] focus on the notion of the certified removal (CR), which requires that the unlearned model cannot be statistically distinguished from the retrained model. By definition, CR is parametrized by privacy parameters called *privacy budgets*, which quantify the level of statistical indistinguishability. Hence, models with CR guarantees will intrinsically satisfy an “evaluation metric” induced by the definition of CR, acting as a form of “evaluation.” On the other hand, Becker and Liebig [2022] adopted an information-theoretical perspective and turned to epistemic uncertainty to evaluate the information remaining after unlearning. However, these methods have strong model assumptions, such as convexity or linearity, or require inefficient white-box access to target models, thus limiting their applicability in practice.

**Attack-based** Since attacks are the most direct way to interpret privacy risks, attack-based evaluation is a common metric in unlearning literature. The classical approach is to directly calculate the MIA accuracy using various kinds




FIGURE 1. The unlearning sample inference game framework for our machine unlearning evaluation.

of MIAs [Graves et al., 2020, Kurmanji et al., 2023]. One kind of MIA utilizes shadow models [Shokri et al., 2017], which are models trained with the same model structures as the original models but on a shadow dataset sampled with the same data sampling distribution. Another kind of MIA involves modeling membership as a binary hypothesis testing and performing a likelihood ratio test to derive a membership score [Carlini et al., 2021]. Moreover, some MIAs calculate membership scores based on correctness and confidence [Song and Mittal, 2021].

Some evaluation metrics do move beyond the vanilla MIA accuracy. For example, Triantafillou and Kairouz [2023] leveraged hypothesis testing coupled with MIAs to compute an estimated privacy budget for each unlearning method, which gives a rather rigorous estimation of unlearning efficacy. Hayes et al. [2024] proposed a novel MIA towards machine unlearning based on Likelihood Ratio Attack and evaluated machine unlearning through a combination of the predicted membership probability and the *balanced* MIA accuracy on test and forget sets. Goel et al. [2023] proposed an Interclass Confusion (IC) test that manipulates the input dataset to evaluate both model indistinguishability and property generalization. However, their metric is less direct in terms of interpreting real-life privacy risks. Lastly, Hayes et al. [2024] designed a new MIA attack with a similar attack-defense game framework. However, as they still use MIA accuracy as the evaluation metric, the game itself doesn’t bring much for their evaluation framework other than a clear experiment procedure.

There are other evaluation metrics also based on MIAs, but with different focuses. For example, Chen et al. [2021] proposed a novel evaluation metric based on MIAs that know both learned and unlearned models with a focus on how much information is deleted rather than how much information is left after the unlearning process. Sommer et al. [2020] provided a backdoor verification mechanism for Machine Learning as a Service (MLaaS), which benefits an individual user valuing his/her privacy to verify the completeness of unlearning. Their work focuses more on user-level verification rather than model-level evaluation.

### 3 Methodology

We adopt the following notations throughout the paper for consistency. To define a variable, we will write  $X := Y$  to define  $X$  by some known  $Y$ , which can be equivalently written as  $Y =: X$ . Given two sets  $X, Y$ , let  $|X|$  be the cardinality of  $X$ ,  $X \cup Y$  be the union of  $X$  and  $Y$ , and  $X \subset Y$  to mean “ $X$  is a subset of  $Y$ .” Furthermore, given a probability distribution  $\mathbb{P}$ , we let  $x \sim \mathbb{P}$  to denote  $x$  being sampled from  $\mathbb{P}$ , and write  $\mathbb{P}|_E$  to denote the conditional distribution conditioned on a subset  $E$  of the support of  $\mathbb{P}$ . Finally,  $\Pr(\mathcal{E})$  denotes the usual probability of the event  $\mathcal{E}$ .

We now start by describing the *unlearning sample inference game* for our evaluation setup.

#### 3.1 Unlearning Sample Inference Game

The *unlearning sample inference game*  $\mathcal{G} = (\text{UNLEARN}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}}, \alpha)$  involves two players, a *defender* called UNLEARN and an *adversary*  $\mathcal{A}$ , a finite dataset  $\mathcal{D}$  with a *sensitivity distribution*  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}}$  defined over  $\mathcal{D}$ , and finally an *unlearning portion* parameter  $\alpha$ . On a high-level, the game  $\mathcal{G}$  simulates the following game:

- the defender UNLEARN will be asked to perform unlearning on a “forget set” of data for a model trained on the union of the “retain set” and the “forget set,” with sizes of two subsets of  $\mathcal{D}$  subject to a relative ratio  $\alpha$ ;
- the adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  will be asked to attack the defender’s unlearned model by distinguishing whether some random data points (according to  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}}$ ) is originally in the “forget set” or an unused set of data called “test set.”

An illustration is given in Figure 1. We begin by outlining our unlearning sample inference game, starting from the initialization phase. For a detailed discussion of the design choices we made, we refer the reader to Appendix A.

**Initialization** The game starts by *uniformly* splitting the dataset  $\mathcal{D}$  into three disjoint sets: a *retain set*  $\mathcal{R}$ , a *forget set*  $\mathcal{F}$ , and a *test set*  $\mathcal{T}$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{D} =: \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{T}$ , subject to the following restrictions:

- (a)  $\alpha = |\mathcal{F}|/|\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{F}|$ : The *unlearning portion parameter*  $\alpha$  specifies how much data needs to be unlearned with respect to the original dataset used by the model.
- (b)  $|\mathcal{F}| = |\mathcal{T}|$ : We let the size of the forget set and the test set equal to avoid potential inductive biases.

Under restriction (a) and (b), the size of  $\mathcal{R}$ ,  $\mathcal{F}$ , and  $\mathcal{T}$  are determined, which in turns depends on  $\alpha$ . We denote  $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$  as the finite collection of all possible dataset splits satisfying restriction (a) and (b) such that  $s \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$  is in the form of  $s = (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{T})$ , where the tuple is ordered by the retain set, the forget set, and finally the test set.

After splitting  $\mathcal{D}$  according to  $s$ , the game  $\mathcal{G}$  then implements a *random oracle*  $\mathcal{O}_s(b)$  for  $b \in \{0, 1\}$  according to  $s$  and the *sensitivity distribution*  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}}$ . Specifically, when the oracle  $\mathcal{O}_s(b)$  is called, it emits a data point  $x \sim \mathcal{O}_s(b)$  sampled from either  $\mathcal{F}$  (when  $b = 0$ ) or  $\mathcal{T}$  (when  $b = 1$ ), where the sampling probability is respect to  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}}$ .<sup>3</sup> This oracle will later be used to test the adversary’s ability to distinguish data from  $\mathcal{F}$  or  $\mathcal{T}$ .

The dataset split  $s$ , the sensitivity distribution  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}}$ , and the oracle  $\mathcal{O}$  is assumed to be unknown to both the defender and the adversary temporarily. We now establish the task and knowledge of each side and then we formally define the unlearning sample inference game following a natural order of how the game is conducted.

**Defender Phase** The defender, denoted as UNLEARN, is given the dataset split retain set  $\mathcal{R}$  and the forget set  $\mathcal{F}$ , and has a learning algorithm LEARN in mind which takes a dataset as the input. The goal of the defender is to unlearn the forget set  $\mathcal{F}$  from any models trained with LEARN on  $\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{F}$ . Explicitly, the goal for UNLEARN is that for any  $x \in \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{T}$ , it’s statistically impossible to decide whether  $x \in \mathcal{F}$  or  $x \in \mathcal{T}$  given accesses to the unlearned model. By abusing the notation, if we also denote the unlearning algorithm designed by the defender as UNLEARN and the unlearned model as  $m$ , we have

$$m = \text{UNLEARN}(\text{LEARN}(\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{F}), \mathcal{F}),$$

where UNLEARN takes in two inputs: 1.) the original model learned with the union of forget set and retain set; 2.) the forget set. As both LEARN and UNLEARN can be randomized,  $m$  follows a distribution *conditioned on the specific dataset split*  $s \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ . Denote this conditional distribution as  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M} \mid s)$ , which summarizes the unlearning algorithm UNLEARN.

**Adversary Phase** The adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  is then fed with the unlearned model  $m$  and with the access to the random oracle  $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_s(b)$ , where both  $s$  and  $b$  are unknown to  $\mathcal{A}$ . The goal of the adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  is to guess  $b$  by interacting with  $m$  and  $\mathcal{O}$ , and output one bit in  $\{0, 1\}$  at the end, i.e.,  $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}_s(b)}(m) \mapsto \{0, 1\}$ . When  $\mathcal{A}$  outputs 1, we say  $\mathcal{A}$  *accepts*, otherwise *rejects*. The interpretation of the output of  $\mathcal{A}$  is its prediction about  $b$ , i.e., after interacting with  $\mathcal{O}$  and  $m$ , decide whether the data points are from  $\mathcal{F}$  or  $\mathcal{T}$ .

We will typically assume that the adversary is *efficient*. However, it can also be computationally unbounded if specified.

**Remark 3.1** (Black-box v.s. White-box). *By default, we assume that  $m$  is given to  $\mathcal{A}$  in a black-box fashion, i.e.,  $\mathcal{A}$  only has oracle access to  $m$ . However, our framework can also adapt white-box adversaries which requires full model parameters of  $m$ . The only difference is that the efficiency definition changes accordingly, i.e., polynomial time in the size of  $|\mathcal{D}|$  for a black-box adversary or polynomial time in the number of parameters of  $m$  for a white-box adversary.*

### 3.2 Adversarial Advantage and Unlearning Quality

Inspired by cryptography, a standard way to measure the performance of such an adversarial game is through the notion of the *advantage* of the adversary. In the unlearning sample inference game, the advantage of the adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  aims to measure how probable can the adversary differentiate between the forget sets  $\mathcal{F}$  and the test sets  $\mathcal{T}$ . To measure such a probability, note that the adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  can either be deterministic or randomized, therefore, the randomness throughout this process might be induced from  $\mathcal{A}$  as well, besides model training in learning and unlearning, and the (uniformly) random dataset splitting.

Formally, we define the advantage of an adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  against a defender’s unlearning method UNLEARN to be the difference between the expected probability that the adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  outputs 1 when it thinks the random oracle is sampling from the forget sets or the test sets, i.e., guessing the value of  $b$ :

<sup>3</sup>Notation-wise, we may say  $\mathcal{O}_s(0) = \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}}|_{\mathcal{F}}$  and  $\mathcal{O}_s(1) = \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}}|_{\mathcal{T}}$ , and interpret  $x \sim \mathcal{O}_s(b)$  naturally.

**Definition 3.2** (Advantage). *Given an unlearning sample inference game  $\mathcal{G} = (\text{UNLEARN}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}}, \alpha)$ , the advantage of  $\mathcal{A}$  against UNLEARN is defined as*

$$\text{Adv}(\mathcal{A}, \text{UNLEARN}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}_{\alpha}|} \left| \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_{\alpha}} \Pr_{\substack{m \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|s) \\ \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_s(0)}} (\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}}(m) \text{ accepts}) - \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_{\alpha}} \Pr_{\substack{m \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|s) \\ \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_s(1)}} (\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}}(m) \text{ accepts}) \right|.$$

**Remark 3.3.** *It might be strange since the right-hand side doesn't seem to depend on UNLEARN. But recall that for a particular defender (and hence UNLEARN), its information is summarized entirely in  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M} | s)$ , which depends on the unlearning algorithm UNLEARN and the learning algorithm LEARN the defender has in mind.*

Definition 3.2 enjoys several desirable properties. In particular, we can prove an upper and lower bound of the advantage under some special cases. The first thing one might wonder is that what is the advantage of any adversary against the gold-standard unlearning method, the retraining method RETRAIN:

$$\text{RETRAIN}(\text{LEARN}(\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{F}), \mathcal{F}) = \text{LEARN}(\mathcal{R}).$$

As the advantage is bounded in  $[0, 1]$ , one should expect RETRAIN to defend any adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  perfectly, i.e., achieving a zero advantage. This is indeed the case.

**Theorem 3.4.** *For any (potentially computationally unbounded) adversary  $\mathcal{A}$ , its advantage against the retraining method RETRAIN in an unlearning sample inference game  $\mathcal{G} = (\text{RETRAIN}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}}, \alpha)$  is zero, i.e.,  $\text{Adv}(\mathcal{A}, \text{RETRAIN}) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* See Appendix B. □

Theorem 3.4 aligns with our intuition since the forget set  $\mathcal{F}$  and the test set  $\mathcal{T}$  are all unforeseen data to retrained models trained only on  $\mathcal{R}$ . Thus, statistically, no adversary should have any non-zero advantage over retrained models. Next, we establish the upper bound of the advantage. We first introduce the concept of certified machine unlearning. There are multiple versions, and we adopt the definition used by Guo et al. [2020]. Specifically, for any  $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ , an  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -certified unlearning can be defined as follows.

**Definition 3.5** (Certified removal [Guo et al., 2020]). *Given a learning algorithm LEARN and an unlearning algorithm UNLEARN with a dataset  $\mathcal{D}$ . Let  $\mathcal{H} := \text{im}(\text{LEARN}) \cup \text{im}(\text{UNLEARN})$  be the hypothesis class containing all possible models that can be created by LEARN and UNLEARN. Then, for any  $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ , the unlearning algorithm UNLEARN is said to be  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -certified removal if for any  $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{H}$ , and for any disjoint  $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ ,<sup>4</sup>*

$$\Pr(\text{UNLEARN}(\text{LEARN}(\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{F}), \mathcal{F}) \in \mathcal{W}) \leq e^{\epsilon} \Pr(\text{RETRAIN}(\text{LEARN}(\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{F}), \mathcal{F}) \in \mathcal{W}) + \delta$$

and

$$\Pr(\text{RETRAIN}(\text{LEARN}(\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{F}), \mathcal{F}) \in \mathcal{W}) \leq e^{\epsilon} \Pr(\text{UNLEARN}(\text{LEARN}(\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{F}), \mathcal{F}) \in \mathcal{W}) + \delta.$$

Since  $\text{RETRAIN}(\text{LEARN}(\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{F}), \mathcal{F}) = \text{LEARN}(\mathcal{R})$ , the conditions in Definition 3.5 can be simplified to

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\text{UNLEARN}(\text{LEARN}(\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{F}), \mathcal{F}) \in \mathcal{W}) &\leq e^{\epsilon} \Pr(\text{LEARN}(\mathcal{R}) \in \mathcal{W}) + \delta \\ \Pr(\text{LEARN}(\mathcal{R}) \in \mathcal{W}) &\leq e^{\epsilon} \Pr(\text{UNLEARN}(\text{LEARN}(\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{F}), \mathcal{F}) \in \mathcal{W}) + \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Note that in the original definition used by Guo et al. [2020], there is no  $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}$ ; instead, they use the training set of learning, i.e.  $\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{F}$  is chosen randomly within the whole dataset  $\mathcal{D}$ , and  $\mathcal{F}$  is chosen randomly within  $\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{F}$ . Now we formally establish the upper bound as follows.

**Theorem 3.6.** *Given an  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -certified removal unlearning algorithm UNLEARN with some  $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ , for any (potentially computationally unbounded) adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  against UNLEARN in an unlearning sample inference game  $\mathcal{G} = (\text{UNLEARN}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}}, \alpha)$ ,*

$$\text{Adv}(\mathcal{A}, \text{UNLEARN}) \leq 2 \cdot \left( 1 - \frac{2 - 2\delta}{e^{\epsilon} + 1} \right).$$

*Proof.* See Appendix C. □

<sup>4</sup>Here, we do not assume  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  needs to satisfies restriction (a) and (b).

Theorem 3.6 states that for a certified unlearning method, stricter privacy provides a lower upper bound for adversary advantage. This also aligns with our intuition that when requirements for certified data removal are tighter, the unlearned model becomes more similar to retrained models, leading to a decay in adversary performance.

With the intuition that *if no efficient adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  can infer anything meaningful towards the unlearned model  $m$ , then a data deletion task done by UNLEARN is considered safe*. As the advantage evaluates how well can the adversary differentiate between  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$ , it's natural to evaluate the unlearning quality using the advantage.

**Definition 3.7** (Unlearning quality). *For any unlearning algorithm UNLEARN, its unlearning quality under a unlearning sample inference game  $\mathcal{G} = (\text{UNLEARN}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}}, \alpha)$  is defined as  $\mathcal{Q}(\text{UNLEARN}) := 1 - \sup_{\mathcal{A}} \text{Adv}(\mathcal{A}, \text{UNLEARN})$ .*

Since  $\text{Adv} \in [0, 1]$ ,  $\mathcal{Q} \in [0, 1]$  as well, which makes it relatively easy to interpret. Definition 3.7 implies the following.

**Corollary 3.8.** *For the retaining method RETRAIN, we have  $\mathcal{Q}(\text{RETRAIN}) = 1$ . Moreover, for any  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -certified removal unlearning algorithm UNLEARN, we have  $\mathcal{Q}(\text{UNLEARN}) \geq \frac{4-\delta}{e^\epsilon+1} - 1$ .*

### 3.3 The SWAP Test

For the unlearning quality metric  $\mathcal{Q}$  to be efficiently computable, we will need to evaluate the advantage of an adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  against an unlearning algorithm UNLEARN in practice. While it is genuinely impossible to compute the advantage exactly, one of the main source of difficulties comes from dataset splits: there are exponentially many, and naively samples some will lead to bad approximation as we will show. Hence, we propose a simple approximation scheme called SWAP test based on our proposed unlearning sample inference game framework, which only requires calculating two dataset splits and can approximate the overall advantage, hence the unlearning quality. The virtue of the proposed SWAP test is that it preserves desirable properties possessed by the original definition.

**Swapping Splits** Given a dataset  $\mathcal{D}$ , an adversary  $\mathcal{A}$ , an unlearning algorithm UNLEARN, an sensitivity distribution  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}}$ , and an unlearning portion parameter  $\alpha$ , the procedure of the SWAP test is detailed below:

1. Pick a random dataset split  $s = (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{T})$  in  $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha}$ , and design a random oracle  $\mathcal{O}_s$  based on the split  $s$  and the sensitivity distribution  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}}$ .
2. Calculate the term corresponds to  $s$  in the definition of advantage, i.e.,

$$\text{Adv}_s(\mathcal{A}, \text{UNLEARN}) := \Pr_{\substack{m \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|s) \\ \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_s(0)}} (\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}}(m) \text{ accepts}) - \Pr_{\substack{m \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|s) \\ \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_s(1)}} (\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}}(m) \text{ accepts}).$$

3. We then swap  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  in the  $s$  split, i.e., consider  $s' = (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ , and design  $\mathcal{O}_{s'}$  correspondingly. Then, we calculate the term corresponds to  $s'$  in the definition of advantage, i.e.,

$$\text{Adv}_{s'}(\mathcal{A}, \text{UNLEARN}) := \Pr_{\substack{m \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|s') \\ \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_{s'}(0)}} (\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}}(m) \text{ accepts}) - \Pr_{\substack{m \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|s') \\ \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_{s'}(1)}} (\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}}(m) \text{ accepts}).$$

4. Finally, we average the above two advantages as

$$\overline{\text{Adv}}_{\{s, s'\}}(\mathcal{A}, \text{UNLEARN}) := \frac{|\text{Adv}_s(\mathcal{A}, \text{UNLEARN}) + \text{Adv}_{s'}(\mathcal{A}, \text{UNLEARN})|}{2}.$$

In essence, we approximate  $\text{Adv}$  by simply replacing the collection of data splits  $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha}$  in the calculation by  $\{s, s'\}$ , and hope  $\overline{\text{Adv}}_{\{s, s'\}}(\mathcal{A}, \text{UNLEARN}) \approx \text{Adv}(\mathcal{A}, \text{UNLEARN})$ . It's now obvious that if the restriction we enforced that  $|\mathcal{T}| = |\mathcal{F}|$  is violated, we can not perform such a SWAP test to approximate the overall advantage.

**Zero Grounding** It is natural to think about why we perform such a swapping procedure instead of just taking random splits. We claim that compared to the SWAP test, taking two random splits fails to satisfy the desirable properties established in Theorem 3.4, i.e., the adversarial advantage towards the retraining method RETRAIN might not be zero. We formalize this intuition below.

**Proposition 3.9.** *For any two dataset splits  $s_1, s_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{\alpha}$  satisfying some moderate non-degeneracy assumption, there is an efficient deterministic adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $\overline{\text{Adv}}_{\{s_1, s_2\}}(\mathcal{A}, \text{UNLEARN}) = 1$  for any unlearning method UNLEARN. In particular,  $\overline{\text{Adv}}_{\{s_1, s_2\}}(\mathcal{A}, \text{RETRAIN}) = 1$ .*

*Proof.* Consider any unlearning method UNLEARN, and design a random oracle  $\mathcal{O}_{s_i}$  based on the split  $s_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$  and a sensitivity distribution  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}}$  (which for simplicity, assume to have full support across  $\mathcal{D}$ ), we see that

$$\overline{\text{Adv}}_{\{s_1, s_2\}}(\mathcal{A}, \text{UNLEARN}) = \frac{1}{2} \left| \begin{aligned} & \Pr_{\substack{m \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|_{s_1}) \\ \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_{s_1}(0)}}(\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}}(m) = 1) - \Pr_{\substack{m \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|_{s_1}) \\ \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_{s_1}(1)}}(\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}}(m) = 1) \\ & + \Pr_{\substack{m \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|_{s_2}) \\ \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_{s_2}(0)}}(\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}}(m) = 1) - \Pr_{\substack{m \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|_{s_2}) \\ \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_{s_2}(1)}}(\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}}(m) = 1) \end{aligned} \right|.$$

Consider a hard-coded adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  which has a look-up table  $T$ , defined as

$$T(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{T}_1 \cap \mathcal{T}_2; \\ 0, & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{F}_1 \cap \mathcal{F}_2; \\ \perp, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where we use  $\perp$  to denote an undefined output. Then,  $\mathcal{A}$  predicts the bit  $b$  used by the oracle as follows:

---

**Algorithm 3.1:** Dummy adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  against a random 2-sets evaluation

---

**Data:** An unlearned model  $m$ , an random oracle  $\mathcal{O}$

**Result:** A one bit prediction  $b'$

```

1 while  $b' = \perp$  do
2    $x \sim \mathcal{O}$ 
3    $b' \leftarrow T(x)$ 
4 return  $b'$ 

```

---

We note that when Algorithm 3.1 is executed on a cold start,  $b'$  is not defined before hence its value will be  $\perp$ . We see that such a hard-coded  $\mathcal{A}$  has several properties:

- Since it neglects  $m$  entirely,

$$\Pr_{\substack{m \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|_{s_i}) \\ \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_{s_i}(b)}}(\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}}(m) = 1) = \Pr_{\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_{s_i}(b)}(\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}} = 1)$$

- Under the non-degeneracy assumptions,  $\mathcal{A}$  will terminate in polynomial time in  $|\mathcal{D}|$ . This is because the expected terminating time is inversely proportional to  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}|_{\mathcal{F}_i}}(\mathcal{F}_1 \cap \mathcal{F}_2)$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}|_{\mathcal{T}_i}}(\mathcal{T}_1 \cap \mathcal{T}_2)$ , hence if these two probabilities does not vanish polynomially faster in  $|\mathcal{D}|$  (i.e., the non-degeneracy assumption), then it'll terminate in polynomial time in  $|\mathcal{D}|$ .
- Whenever  $\mathcal{A}$  terminates and outputs an answer, it will be correct, i.e.,

$$\overline{\text{Adv}}_{\{s_1, s_2\}}(\mathcal{A}, \text{UNLEARN}) = 1.$$

Since the above argument works for every UNLEARN, hence even for the retraining method RETRAIN, we will have  $\overline{\text{Adv}}_{\{s_1, s_2\}}(\mathcal{A}, \text{RETRAIN}) = 1$ . Intuitively, such a pathological case can happen since there exists some  $\mathcal{A}$  which interpolates the “correct answer” for a few splits. Though adversaries may not have access to specific dataset splits, learning-based attacks could still undesirably learn towards this scenario if evaluated only on a few splits. Thus, we should penalize hard-coded adversaries in evaluation.  $\square$

**Remark 3.10.** The above “pairing” technique is essentially how Theorem 3.4 is proved.

### 3.4 Practical Evaluation

While the proposed SWAP test significantly reduces the computational cost for evaluating the advantage of an adversary, evaluating the unlearning quality is still challenging since:

- most of the state-of-the-art MIAs do not exploit the covariance between data points, and
- it is impossible to search through all possible adversaries, i.e., solving the supremum in Definition 3.7.

Let's start by addressing the first question.



**Weak Adversary** As the current state-of-the-art MIAs make independent decisions on each data point [Bertran et al., 2023, Shokri et al., 2017, Carlini et al., 2022], therefore, for empirical analysis, we accommodate our unlearning sample inference game by restricting the adversary’s knowledge, i.e., the adversary can only interact with the oracle once. We denote this new adversary setting with less adversary knowledge as *weak adversary*, and we denote it as  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{weak}}$ .

Formally, the adversary  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{weak}}$  is first fed with the unlearned model  $m$ , and it exploits the information of  $m$ , then query an oracle  $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_s(b)$  *exactly once* to get a data point  $x \sim \mathcal{O}$ , where both  $s$  and  $b$  are unknown to  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{weak}}$ . The goal of the adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  is to guess  $b$  by interacting with  $m$  in polynomial time (w.r.t.  $|\mathcal{D}|$ ), and output one bit in  $\{0, 1\}$  at the end, i.e.,  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{weak}}(m, x) \mapsto \{0, 1\}$ . When  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{weak}}$  outputs 1, we say  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{weak}}$  *accepts*, otherwise *rejects*. The corresponding advantage, i.e., the weak adversary version of Definition 3.2, can be defined as follows.

**Definition 3.11** (Advantage for weak adversary). *For any unlearning sample inference game  $\mathcal{G} = (\text{UNLEARN}, \mathcal{A}_{\text{weak}}, \mathcal{D}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}}, \alpha)$  with a weak adversary  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{weak}}$ , its advantage against UNLEARN is defined as*

$$\text{Adv}(\mathcal{A}_{\text{weak}}, \text{UNLEARN}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}_{\alpha}|} \left| \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_{\alpha}} \Pr_{\substack{m \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|s) \\ x \sim \mathcal{O}_s(0)}} (\mathcal{A}_{\text{weak}}(m, x) \text{ accepts}) - \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_{\alpha}} \Pr_{\substack{m \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|s) \\ x \sim \mathcal{O}_s(1)}} (\mathcal{A}_{\text{weak}}(m, x) \text{ accepts}) \right|.$$

With this new definition, the unlearning quality becomes  $\mathcal{Q} := 1 - \sup_{\mathcal{A}_{\text{weak}}} \text{Adv}(\mathcal{A}_{\text{weak}}, \text{UNLEARN})$ , which is the weak adversary version of Definition 3.7. This new definition is subsumed under the previous paradigm since the only difference is whether the adversary can interact with the oracle, therefore, the same notation for advantage is used.

**Approximating the Supremum** The problem of *being unable to solve the supremum exactly* remains as  $\mathcal{Q} = 1 - \sup_{\mathcal{A}_{\text{weak}}} \text{Adv}(\mathcal{A}_{\text{weak}}, \text{UNLEARN})$  still requires solving the supremum. While it is impossible in practice, as most of the state-of-the-art MIA adversaries are formulated as end-to-end optimization problems, e.g., [Bertran et al., 2023], we might interpret that the supremum is approximately solved during the construction of the final weak adversary. More explicitly, we assume these MIA adversaries are trying to maximize the advantage we defined (Definition 3.11) and assume that the search space is large enough to parameterize all the possible weak adversaries of our interests.

Moreover, considering that there are multiple state-of-the-art MIA adversaries exhibiting comparable performance levels in practice, one can refine the estimation of the highest achievable level of security by leveraging these adversaries and selecting the most potent among them.

**Combining with the SWAP Test** We now describe how to combine these ideas with the *SWAP* test. Firstly, to accommodate the weak adversary  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{weak}}$ , we solve  $\mathcal{Q} = 1 - \sup_{\mathcal{A}_{\text{weak}}} \overline{\text{Adv}}_{\{s, s'\}}(\mathcal{A}_{\text{weak}}, \text{UNLEARN})$  where  $\overline{\text{Adv}}_{\{s, s'\}}$  is the average of the split-specific advantage for a split  $s$  and the swapped split  $s'$ . Specifically,  $\overline{\text{Adv}}_{\{s, s'\}} = (\text{Adv}_s + \text{Adv}_{s'})/2$  where

$$\text{Adv}_s(\mathcal{A}_{\text{weak}}, \text{UNLEARN}) = \Pr_{\substack{m \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|s) \\ x \sim \mathcal{O}_s(0)}} (\mathcal{A}_{\text{weak}}(m, x) \text{ accepts}) - \Pr_{\substack{m \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|s) \\ x \sim \mathcal{O}_s(1)}} (\mathcal{A}_{\text{weak}}(m, x) \text{ accepts}).$$

Then, we interpret the supremum as solved by modern MIA adversaries.

## 4 Experiment

In this section, we provide empirical evidence of the effectiveness of the proposed evaluation framework. In what follows, for brevity, we will use *SWAP* test to refer to the proposed practical approximations for calculating the proposed evaluation metric, which in reality is a combination of the *SWAP* test in Section 3.3 and other approximations discussed in Section 3.4. We further denote  $\mathcal{Q}$  as the proposed metric, Unlearning Quality, calculated by the *SWAP* test. With these notations established, our goal is to validate the theoretical results, demonstrate additional observed benefits of the proposed Unlearning Quality metric, and ultimately show that it outperforms other attack-based evaluation metrics.

### 4.1 Experiment settings

We focus on the most common tasks in the machine unlearning literature, image classification tasks, and perform our experiments on the **CIFAR10** dataset [Krizhevsky et al., 2009], which is licensed under CC-BY 4.0. Moreover, we opt for ResNet [He et al., 2016] as the *target model* produced by some learning algorithms LEARN. For target model training without differential privacy (DP) guarantees, we consider using the ResNet-20 [He et al., 2016] as our target model and train it with Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) [Ruder, 2016] optimizer with a MultiStepLR learning rate scheduler with milestones [100, 150] and an initial learning rate of 0.1, momentum 0.9, weight decay  $10^{-5}$ . Moreover,

we train the model with 200 epoch, which we empirically observe that this guarantees a convergence. For a given dataset split, we average 3 models to approximate the randomness induced in training and unlearning procedures. For training DP models, we use DP-SGD [Abadi et al., 2016] to provide DP guarantees. Specifically, we adopt the OPACUS implementation [Yousefpour et al., 2021] and use ResNet-18 [He et al., 2016] as our target model. The model is trained with the RMSProp optimizer using a learning rate 0.01 and of 100 epochs. This ensures convergence as we empirically observe that 100 epochs suffice to yield a comparable model accuracy. Considering the dataset size, we use  $\delta = 10^{-5}$  and tune the max gradient norm individually.

**Unlearning sample inference game.** We first describe how to set up an unlearning sample inference game  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{A}, \text{UNLEARN}, \mathcal{D}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}}, \alpha)$  to conduct the evaluation experiment.

- **Initialization:** Since some MIA adversaries require training the so-called *shadow models* using data sampled from the same distribution of the training data used by the target model [Shokri et al., 2017], we start by splitting the whole dataset to accommodate the training of shadow models. In particular, we split the given dataset into two halves, one for training the target model (which we call the *target dataset*), and the other for training shadow models for some MIAs. The target dataset is what we denoted as  $\mathcal{D}$  in the game. To initialize the game, we consider a uniform sensitivity distribution  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}} = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{D})$  since we do not have any prior preference for the data. The unlearning portion parameter is set to be  $\alpha = 0.1$  unless specified. This implies  $\mathcal{O}_s(0) = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{F})$  and  $\mathcal{O}_s(1) = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{T})$ , where  $s = (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{T}) \in \mathcal{S}_{\alpha}$  is the split we choose to use for the game.
- **Defender phase:** As mentioned at the beginning of the section, we choose the learning algorithm LEARN which outputs ResNet as the target model. On the other hand, the corresponding unlearning algorithms UNLEARN we select for comparison are: 1.) RETRAIN: retraining from scratch (the gold-standard); 2.) FISHER: Fisher forgetting [Golatkhar et al., 2020]; 3.) FTFINAL: fine-tuning final layer [Goel et al., 2023]; 4.) RETRFINAL: retraining final layer [Goel et al., 2023]; 5.) NEGGRAD: negative gradient descent [Golatkhar et al., 2020]; 6.) NONE: original learned model without unlearning (the dummy baseline).
- **Adversary phase:** We select a few state-of-the-art black-box MIA (weak) adversaries  $\mathcal{A}_w$  to approximate the advantage: 1.) Classic shadow model based MIAs [Shokri et al., 2017]; 2.) Correctness-based, Confidence-based, modified entropy [Song and Mittal, 2021]. Since we’re unaware of any available non-weak MIAs, we focus on weak adversaries only, where the above-mentioned MIA adversaries suffice.

## 4.2 Validation of theoretical results

We first empirically validate Corollary 3.8. While it is easy to verify **grounding**, i.e.,  $\mathcal{Q}(\text{RETRAIN}) = 1$ , validating the lower-bound of  $\mathcal{Q}$  for some  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -certified removal unlearning algorithm is challenging since such algorithms are not known beyond convex models. However, if the model is trained with differential privacy guarantees, then even if we do nothing (i.e., UNLEARN = NONE), the “unlearned” model will be certified removal [Guo et al., 2020]. As the DP algorithm exists for non-convex models [Abadi et al., 2016], this suggests that one can analyze the impact of the *DP privacy budget* on  $\mathcal{Q}$  of an  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP model. In particular, we fix  $\delta = 10^{-5}$  and consider varying  $\epsilon$  to be 50, 150, 600, and  $\infty$  (without any DP training). The corresponding Unlearning Quality results are reported in Table 1. Firstly, as we expect,  $\mathcal{Q}(\text{RETRAIN}) = 1$  with high precision for all  $\epsilon$ , achieving **grounding** perfectly. Furthermore, Corollary 3.8 suggests that the lower bound of  $\mathcal{Q}$  should **negatively correlate** with  $\epsilon$ . Indeed, empirically, we observe such a trend with high precision, again validating our theoretical findings.

TABLE 1. Unlearning Quality *versus* DP budgets.

| UNLEARN   | $\epsilon$ |       |       |          |
|-----------|------------|-------|-------|----------|
|           | 50         | 150   | 600   | $\infty$ |
| NONE      | 0.972      | 0.960 | 0.932 | 0.587    |
| NEGGRAD   | 0.980      | 0.975 | 0.953 | 0.628    |
| RETRFINAL | 0.972      | 0.964 | 0.939 | 0.576    |
| FTFINAL   | 0.973      | 0.963 | 0.939 | 0.574    |
| FISHER    | 0.973      | 0.967 | 0.942 | 0.709    |
| RETRAIN   | 0.998      | 0.996 | 0.997 | 0.993    |
| Accuracy  | 0.485      | 0.520 | 0.571 | 0.660    |

## 4.3 Empirical merits of Unlearning Quality

Next, we demonstrate that the proposed metric Unlearning Quality has additional empirical benefits beyond our theoretical findings. Specifically, Figure 2 presents the evaluation results of  $\mathcal{Q}$  *versus* various dataset sizes and random seeds, where we let  $\alpha = 0.25$ . Overall, the proposed metric indicates that RETRAIN is the best, followed by FISHER and NEGGRAD, with RETRFINAL and FTFINAL being less effective. Both Figures 2(A) and 2(B) validate our **grounding** and reveal other desirable properties beyond our theoretical findings:




FIGURE 2. Unlearning Quality result from the *SWAP* test under different variations.

- **Consistent w.r.t. dataset sizes:** Figure 2(A) shows that the *relative rankings* of Unlearning Quality  $\mathcal{Q}$  across unlearning methods remains *consistent* as the dataset size varies. This suggests that model maintainers can potentially extrapolate the evaluation result of the Unlearning Quality  $\mathcal{Q}$  from smaller-scale to larger-scale experiments. This scalability enhances the efficiency of our metric, facilitating the selection of the most effective unlearning method without the necessity of extensive resource expenditure.
- **Consistent w.r.t. DP privacy budgets:** Inspired by the above consistency property w.r.t. dataset sizes, if we look back at Table 1, we see that the Unlearning Quality  $\mathcal{Q}$  also maintains a *consistent* relative rankings between unlearning algorithms among different  $\epsilon$ .
- **Robust w.r.t. random seeds:** Figure 2(B) demonstrates that the Unlearning Quality is *robust* w.r.t. different random seeds used for determining the *pair of swapped splits* being used, exhibiting an insignificant random variability. This indicates that a few swapped splits can achieve reliable accuracy when approximating the Unlearning Quality. Hence, conducting our *SWAP* test alone suffices for evaluating the performance of a machine unlearning algorithm.

In addition to the above, we also empirically observe that the *SWAP* test stabilizes the evaluation. From Proposition 3.9, we already know that using random splits to approximate Definition 3.2 is not theoretically sound. However, in addition to the fact that it is impossible to empirically verify such a worst-case result since it requires searching through the space of all efficient adversaries, moreover, it might be the case that in practice, such a careless design choice makes no difference.

We now demonstrate that even in a relatively small-scale experiment, using swapped splits versus random splits reduces the variance of the estimated unlearning quality  $\mathcal{Q}$ . Specifically, we generate 4 sets of random seeds (using 4 base seeds), and for each seed set, we sample 1.) one *SWAP* test pair, and 2.) two random dataset splits, with an unlearning portion parameter  $\alpha = 0.1$ . The sampled splits are then used to calculate the approximated unlearning quality, and the results are reported in Table 2. We see that for all unlearning algorithms we considered, the resulting estimation of  $\mathcal{Q}$  by *SWAP* test has noticeable smaller variances compared to using random splits estimation. The results provide an additional convincing reason to appeal to our unlearning quality metric compared to other naive approximations of  $\mathcal{Q}$ .

TABLE 2. Standard deviation of unlearning quality with 4 random seeds.

| UNLEARN   | <i>SWAP</i> | Random |
|-----------|-------------|--------|
| RETRFINAL | 0.015       | 0.027  |
| FTFINAL   | 0.015       | 0.029  |
| FISHER    | 0.020       | 0.032  |
| NEGGRAD   | 0.008       | 0.012  |

#### 4.4 Comparison to other metrics

We compare our Unlearning Quality metric  $\mathcal{Q}$  to other existing attack-based evaluation metrics, demonstrating the superiority of the proposed metric. We limit our evaluation to the MIA-based evaluation, and within this category, three MIA-based evaluation metrics are most relevant to our setting [Triantafillou and Kairouz, 2023, Golatkar et al., 2021, Goel et al., 2023]. While none of them enjoy the *grounding* property, in particular, the one proposed by Triantafillou and Kairouz [2023] requires training attacks for every forget data sample, which is extremely time-consuming, and we leave it out from the comparison and focus on comparing our metric with the other two.

The two metrics we will compare are the pure MIA AUC (Area Under Curve) [Golatkar et al., 2021] and the Interclass Confusion (IC) Test [Goel et al., 2023]. In brief, the IC test “confuses” a selected set of two classes by switching their

TABLE 3. IC score *versus* DP budgets.<sup>5</sup>

| UNLEARN   | $\epsilon$ |       |       |          |
|-----------|------------|-------|-------|----------|
|           | 50         | 150   | 600   | $\infty$ |
| NONE      | 0.749      | 0.720 | 0.717 | 0.005    |
| NEGGRAD   | 0.925      | 0.953 | 0.946 | 0.180    |
| RETRFINAL | 0.931      | 0.958 | 0.893 | 0.033    |
| FTFINAL   | 0.930      | 0.957 | 0.893 | 0.346    |
| FISHER    | 0.743      | 0.720 | 0.702 | 0.344    |
| RETRAIN   | 0.962      | 0.972 | 0.976 | 0.975    |
| Accuracy  | 0.442      | 0.506 | 0.540 | 0.639    |

TABLE 4. MIA score *versus* DP budgets.

| UNLEARN   | $\epsilon$ |       |       |          |
|-----------|------------|-------|-------|----------|
|           | 50         | 150   | 600   | $\infty$ |
| NONE      | 0.451      | 0.433 | 0.454 | 0.380    |
| NEGGRAD   | 0.476      | 0.482 | 0.466 | 0.299    |
| RETRFINAL | 0.485      | 0.485 | 0.472 | 0.248    |
| FTFINAL   | 0.485      | 0.485 | 0.472 | 0.247    |
| FISHER    | 0.475      | 0.484 | 0.463 | 0.325    |
| RETRAIN   | 0.479      | 0.491 | 0.492 | 0.488    |
| Accuracy  | 0.485      | 0.520 | 0.571 | 0.660    |

labels. This is implemented by picking two classes and randomly selecting half of the data from each class for confusion. Then the IC test proceeds to train the corresponding target models on the new datasets and perform unlearning on the selected set using the unlearning algorithm being tested, and finally measures the inter-class error of the unlearned models on the selected set, which we called the *memorization score*  $\gamma$ . Similar to the advantage, the memorization score is between  $[0, 1]$ , and the lower, the better since ideally, the unlearned model should have no memorization of the confusion. Given this, to compare the IC test with the unlearning quality  $\mathcal{Q}$ , we consider  $1 - \gamma$ , and refer to this new score as the *IC score*. On the other hand, the MIA AUC is a popular MIA-based metric to measure the performance of the unlearning. It measures how MIA performs by calculating the AUC (Area Under Curve) of MIA on the union of the test set and the forget set. We note that AUC is a widely used evaluation metric in terms of classification models since compared to directly measuring the accuracy, AUC tends to measure how well the model can discriminate against each class. Finally, as defined in Section 4, we let the *MIA score* to be  $1 - \text{MIA AUC}$  to have a fair comparison.

We conduct the comparison experiment by again analyzing the relation between the *DP privacy budget* versus the *evaluation result* of an  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP model for the two metrics we are comparing with under the same setup as in Table 1. Specifically, we let  $\delta = 10^{-5}$  and consider varying  $\epsilon$  from 50 to  $\infty$ , and we look into two aspects: 1) **negative correlation** with  $\epsilon$ ; 2) **consistency** w.r.t.  $\epsilon$ . The results are shown in Tables 3 and 4. Firstly, we see that according to Table 3, the IC test **fails** to produce a **negatively correlated** evaluation result with  $\epsilon$ . For instance, the IC score for NEGGRAD is notably lower at  $\epsilon = 50$  than at  $\epsilon = 150$ , and RETRFINAL and FTFINAL also demonstrate a higher IC score at  $\epsilon = 150$  than at  $\epsilon = 600$ . Furthermore, in terms of **consistency** w.r.t.  $\epsilon$ , we again see that the IC test **fails** to satisfy this property, unlike the proposed Unlearning Quality metric  $\mathcal{Q}$ . For example, while NONE is better than NEGGRAD at  $\epsilon = 50$ , this relative ranking is not maintained at  $\epsilon = \infty$ . Such an inconsistency happens multiple times across Table 3. A similar story can be told for the MIA AUC, where from Table 4, we see that MIA AUC also **fails** to produce a similar trend as  $\mathcal{Q}$  where the evaluation results are **negatively correlated** with  $\epsilon$ . For instance, the MIA scores for NEGGRAD and FISHER are notably higher at  $\epsilon = 150$  than at  $\epsilon = 600$ . Furthermore, in terms of **consistency** w.r.t.  $\epsilon$ , we see that while NEGGRAD outperforms FISHER at  $\epsilon = 50$  and  $\epsilon = 600$ , it performs worse than FISHER at  $\epsilon = 150$ , which is **inconsistent**. Overall, both the IC test and the MIA AUC fail to satisfy the properties that we have established for the Unlearning Quality  $\mathcal{Q}$ , demonstrating our superiority.

## 5 Conclusion

In this work, we developed a game-theoretical framework named the *unlearning sample inference game* and proposed a novel metric for evaluating the data removal efficacy of approximate unlearning methods. Our approach is rooted in the concept of “advantage,” borrowed from cryptography, to quantify the success of an MIA adversary in differentiating forget data from test data given an unlearned model. This metric enjoys zero grounding for the theoretically optimal retraining method, scales with the privacy budget of certified unlearning methods, and can take advantage (as opposed to suffering from conflicts) of various MIA methods, which are desirable properties that existing MIA-based evaluation metrics fail to satisfy. We also propose a practical tool — the *SWAP* test — to efficiently approximate the proposed metric. Our empirical findings reveal that the proposed metric effectively captures the nuances of machine unlearning, demonstrating its robustness across varying dataset sizes and its adaptability to the constraints of differential privacy budgets. The ability to maintain a discernible difference and a partial order among unlearning methods, regardless of dataset size, highlights the practical utility of our approach. By bridging theoretical concepts with empirical analysis, our work lays a solid foundation for reliable empirical evaluation of machine unlearning and paves the way for the development of more effective unlearning algorithms.

<sup>5</sup>We note that the model accuracy is different from Table 1 since the IC test requires dataset modifications.

## References

- Martin Abadi, Andy Chu, Ian Goodfellow, H. Brendan McMahan, Ilya Mironov, Kunal Talwar, and Li Zhang. Deep learning with differential privacy. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS'16*. ACM, October 2016. doi: 10.1145/2976749.2978318. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2976749.2978318>.
- Alexander Becker and Thomas Liebig. Evaluating machine unlearning via epistemic uncertainty, 2022.
- Martin Andres Bertran, Shuai Tang, Aaron Roth, Michael Kearns, Jamie Heather Morgenstern, and Steven Wu. Scalable membership inference attacks via quantile regression. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=t3WCiGjHqd>.
- Lucas Bourtole, Varun Chandrasekaran, Christopher A Choquette-Choo, Hengrui Jia, Adelin Travers, Baiwu Zhang, David Lie, and Nicolas Papernot. Machine unlearning. In *2021 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 141–159. IEEE, 2021.
- Yinzhi Cao and Junfeng Yang. Towards making systems forget with machine unlearning. In *2015 IEEE symposium on security and privacy*, pages 463–480. IEEE, 2015.
- Nicholas Carlini, Steve Chien, Milad Nasr, Shuang Song, Andreas Terzis, and Florian Tramèr. Membership inference attacks from first principles. *CoRR*, abs/2112.03570, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.03570>.
- Nicholas Carlini, Steve Chien, Milad Nasr, Shuang Song, Andreas Terzis, and Florian Tramer. Membership inference attacks from first principles. In *2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 1897–1914. IEEE, 2022.
- CCPA. California consumer privacy act (ccpa), 2018. URL <https://oag.ca.gov/privacy/ccpa>.
- Min Chen, Zhikun Zhang, Tianhao Wang, Michael Backes, Mathias Humbert, and Yang Zhang. When machine unlearning jeopardizes privacy. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*, pages 896–911, 2021.
- Min Chen, Zhikun Zhang, Tianhao Wang, Michael Backes, Mathias Humbert, and Yang Zhang. Graph unlearning. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS '22*. ACM, November 2022. doi: 10.1145/3548606.3559352. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/3548606.3559352>.
- Eli Chien, Chao Pan, and Olgica Milenkovic. Efficient model updates for approximate unlearning of graph-structured data. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=fhcu4FBLciL>.
- Ana-Maria Cretu, Daniel Jones, Yves-Alexandre de Montjoye, and Shruti Tople. Re-aligning shadow models can improve white-box membership inference attacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05093*, 2023.
- Shashwat Goel, Ameya Prabhu, Amartya Sanyal, Ser-Nam Lim, Philip Torr, and Ponnurangam Kumaraguru. Towards adversarial evaluations for inexact machine unlearning, 2023.
- A. Golatkar, A. Achille, and S. Soatto. Eternal sunshine of the spotless net: Selective forgetting in deep networks. In *2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 9301–9309, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, jun 2020. IEEE Computer Society. doi: 10.1109/CVPR42600.2020.00932. URL <https://doi.ieeecomputersociety.org/10.1109/CVPR42600.2020.00932>.
- Aditya Golatkar, Alessandro Achille, Avinash Ravichandran, Marzia Polito, and Stefano Soatto. Mixed-privacy forgetting in deep networks. In *2021 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 792–801, 2021. doi: 10.1109/CVPR46437.2021.00085.
- Laura Graves, Vineel Nagisetty, and Vijay Ganesh. Amnesiac machine learning. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2020. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:224817947>.
- Chuan Guo, Tom Goldstein, Awni Hannun, and Laurens Van Der Maaten. Certified data removal from machine learning models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3832–3842. PMLR, 2020.
- Jamie Hayes, Iliia Shumailov, Eleni Triantafillou, Amr Khalifa, and Nicolas Papernot. Inexact unlearning needs more careful evaluations to avoid a false sense of privacy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.01218*, 2024.
- Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- Yingzhe He, Guozhu Meng, Kai Chen, Jinwen He, and Xingbo Hu. Deepoblivate: a powerful charm for erasing data residual memory in deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.06209*, 2021.
- Zachary Izzo, Mary Anne Smart, Kamalika Chaudhuri, and James Zou. Approximate data deletion from machine learning models. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 2008–2016. PMLR, 2021.

- Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. *University of Toronto*, 2009.
- Meghdad Kurmanji, Peter Triantafillou, Jamie Hayes, and Eleni Triantafillou. Towards unbounded machine unlearning. In A. Oh, T. Neumann, A. Globerson, K. Saenko, M. Hardt, and S. Levine, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 1957–1987. Curran Associates, Inc., 2023. URL [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2023/file/062d711fb777322e2152435459e6e9d9-Paper-Conference.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/file/062d711fb777322e2152435459e6e9d9-Paper-Conference.pdf).
- Alessandro Mantelero. The eu proposal for a general data protection regulation and the roots of the ‘right to be forgotten’. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 29(3):229–235, 2013. ISSN 0267-3649. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2013.03.010>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0267364913000654>.
- Seth Neel, Aaron Roth, and Saeed Sharifi-Malvajerdi. Descent-to-delete: Gradient-based methods for machine unlearning. In *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 931–962. PMLR, 2021.
- Alexandra Peste, Dan Alistarh, and Christoph H. Lampert. Ssse: Efficiently erasing samples from trained machine learning models, 2021.
- Youyang Qu, Xin Yuan, Ming Ding, Wei Ni, Thierry Rakotoarivelo, and David Smith. Learn to unlearn: Insights into machine unlearning. *Computer*, 57(3):79–90, 2024.
- Sebastian Ruder. An overview of gradient descent optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.04747*, 2016.
- Ayush Sekhari, Jayadev Acharya, Gautam Kamath, and Ananda Theertha Suresh. Remember what you want to forget: Algorithms for machine unlearning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:18075–18086, 2021.
- Reza Shokri, Marco Stronati, Congzheng Song, and Vitaly Shmatikov. Membership inference attacks against machine learning models. In *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 3–18, 2017. doi: 10.1109/SP.2017.41.
- David Marco Sommer, Liwei Song, Sameer Wagh, and Prateek Mittal. Towards probabilistic verification of machine unlearning. *CoRR*, abs/2003.04247, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2003.04247>.
- Liwei Song and Prateek Mittal. Systematic evaluation of privacy risks of machine learning models. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*, pages 2615–2632, 2021.
- Eleni Triantafillou and Peter Kairouz. Evaluation for the NeurIPS Machine Unlearning Competition. [https://unlearning-challenge.github.io/assets/data/Machine\\_Unlearning\\_Metric.pdf](https://unlearning-challenge.github.io/assets/data/Machine_Unlearning_Metric.pdf), 2023. [Accessed 10-01-2024].
- Yinjun Wu, Edgar Dobriban, and Susan Davidson. Deltagrad: Rapid retraining of machine learning models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 10355–10366. PMLR, 2020.
- Heng Xu, Tianqing Zhu, Lefeng Zhang, Wanlei Zhou, and Philip S. Yu. Machine unlearning: A survey, 2023.
- Ashkan Yousefpour, Igor Shilov, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Davide Testuggine, Karthik Prasad, Mani Malek, John Nguyen, Sayan Ghosh, Akash Bharadwaj, Jessica Zhao, Graham Cormode, and Ilya Mironov. Opacus: User-friendly differential privacy library in PyTorch. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.12298*, 2021.

# Appendix

## A Design Choices

In this section, we justify some of our design choices when designing the unlearning sample inference game. Most of them are of practical consideration, while some are for the convenience of analysis.

### A.1 Uniform Splitting

At the initialization phase, we choose the split uniformly rather than allowing sampling from an arbitrary distribution. The reason is two-fold: Firstly, since this sampling strategy corresponds to the so-called *i.i.d. unlearning* setup [Qu et al., 2024], i.e., the unlearned samples will be drawn from a distribution of  $\mathcal{D}$  in an i.i.d. fashion. In this regard, uniformly splitting the dataset corresponds to a uniform distribution of  $\mathcal{D}$  for the unlearned samples to be drawn from. This is the most commonly used sampling strategy when evaluating unlearning algorithms since it’s difficult to estimate the probability that data will be requested to be unlearned.

Secondly, Qu et al. [2024] acknowledged the significantly greater difficulty of non-i.i.d. unlearning compared to i.i.d. unlearning empirically. A classic example of non-i.i.d. unlearning is the process of unlearning an entire class of data, where a subset of data shares the same label. Conversely, even non-uniform splitting complicates the analysis, leading to the breakdown of our theoretical results. Specifically, generalizing both Theorem 3.4 and Theorem 3.6 becomes non-trivial. Overall, non-uniform splitting presents obstacles both empirically and theoretically.

### A.2 Equal Size of Test Set and Forget Set

When we split the dataset  $\mathcal{D}$  in the initialization phase, in addition to restriction (a) which specifies the unlearning portion  $\alpha$ , we also enforce restriction (b), i.e.,  $|\mathcal{F}| = |\mathcal{T}|$ . This is because the purpose of the forget set  $\mathcal{F}$  and the test set  $\mathcal{T}$  is to test whether an adversary can distinguish between them, hence there’s no reason to bias toward any particular one in terms of size. Allowing unequal-size splits can cause undesirable inductive biases in some pathological scenarios.

To illustrate, consider there exists a split such that  $|\mathcal{T}| \gg |\mathcal{F}| = 1$ , i.e., the defender UNLEARN only needs to unlearn one sample. Let’s denote  $\mathcal{F} = x_0$  for convenience. Then, if  $b = 0$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{O}_s(0)$  emits data from  $\mathcal{F}$ , no matter what the sensitivity distribution is, as long as it’s non-degenerated (i.e.,  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}}(x_0) > 0$ ), the adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  will receive  $x_0$  whenever it interacts with  $\mathcal{O}$ . In this case, ancillary information can then affect the  $\mathcal{A}$ ’s prediction: for example, if the unlearned model accuracy drops significantly compared to what it typically is ( $\mathcal{A}$  can easily have a rough estimate), then  $\mathcal{A}$  can deduce that  $b = 0$  easily since it’s unlikely for the defender to unlearn only one data but induces a huge performance drop. Such an exploitation of unrelated information to the unlearning performance itself is undesirable. On the other hand, as we will now see in Appendix A.3, using sensitivity distribution can achieve essentially the same thing while avoiding pathological examples as discussed.

### A.3 Role of Sensitivity Distribution

It might be weird why we introduce the sensitivity distribution  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}}$ . The role of the sensitivity distribution  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}}$  is to capture biases stemming from various origins, such that more sensitive data will have greater sampling probability, hence greater privacy risks. For instance, if the forget set comprises data that users request to delete, with some being more sensitive than others, a corresponding bias should be incorporated into the game. In particular, we tailor our random oracle  $\mathcal{O}_s(b)$  to sample data according to  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}}$ , so when the adversary engages with the oracle, it gains increased exposure to more sensitive data, compelling the defender to unlearn such data more effectively, thereby necessitating a heightened level of defense.

Accommodating  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}}$  also justifies restriction (b): while enforcing equal sizes between  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  avoids potential inductive biases when designing the oracle, we still have the freedom of choosing the sensitivity distribution to have zero probability mass on some data points. In this regard, enforcing the restriction (b) is still general enough to capture unequal-size splits. We remark that using the sensitivity distribution to achieve an unequal-size split is fundamentally different from naively allowing unequal-size splits: using sensitivity distribution can avoid the pathological case we discussed in Appendix A.2. This is because the sampling distribution of the random oracle is consistent with the sensitivity distribution: consider a split  $s = (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{T})$  in  $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha}$  with  $|\mathcal{F}| = |\mathcal{T}|$ , and say  $|\text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}}|_{\mathcal{F}})| \ll |\mathcal{F}| \approx |\text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}}|_{\mathcal{T}})|$ , i.e., “ $|\mathcal{F}| \ll |\mathcal{T}|$ ” effectively when the adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  interacts with the oracle. While the adversary effectively sees the oracle as constructed from an unequal-size split, the defender UNLEARN is still required to unlearn the whole  $\mathcal{F}$ , avoiding the pitfalls discussed in Appendix A.2.

#### A.4 Intrinsic Learning Algorithm for Defender

The defender, which we denote as UNLEARN, *has a learning algorithm LEARN in mind* in our formalization. This is because the existing theory-based unlearning method, such as the certified removal algorithm [Guo et al., 2020] as defined in Definition 3.5, is achieved by a combination of the learning algorithm and a corresponding unlearning method to support unlearning request with theoretical guarantees. In other words, given an arbitrary learning algorithm LEARN, it's unlikely to design an efficient unlearning algorithm UNLEARN with strong theoretical guarantees, at least this is not captured by the notion of certified removal. Hence, allowing the defender to choose its learning algorithm accommodates this situation.

## B Proof of Theorem 3.4

We now prove Theorem 3.4. We repeat the statement for convenience.

**Theorem B.1.** *For any (potentially computationally unbounded) adversary  $\mathcal{A}$ , its advantage against the re-training method RETRAIN in an unlearning samples inference game  $\mathcal{G} = (\text{RETRAIN}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}}, \alpha)$  is zero, i.e.,  $\text{Adv}(\mathcal{A}, \text{RETRAIN}) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* Firstly, we may partition the collection of all the possible dataset splits  $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha}$  by fixing the retain sets  $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{D}$ . Specifically, denote the collection of dataset splits with the retain set to be  $\mathcal{R}$  as

$$\mathcal{S}_{\alpha}[\mathcal{R}] := \{s \in \mathcal{S}_{\alpha} : s = (\mathcal{R}, \cdot, \cdot)\}.$$

With the usual convention, when there's no dataset split corresponds to  $\mathcal{R}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha}[\mathcal{R}] = \emptyset$ . Observe that for any  $s \in \mathcal{S}_{\alpha}[\mathcal{R}]$ , we can pair it up with another dataset split that *swaps* the forget and test sets in  $s$ . In other words, for any  $s = (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{T}) \in \mathcal{S}_{\alpha}[\mathcal{R}]$ , we see that  $(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$  is also in  $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha}[\mathcal{R}]$  since we assume  $|\mathcal{F}| = |\mathcal{T}|$ , every dataset split will be paired. In addition, since  $\mathcal{R}$  is fixed in  $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha}[\mathcal{R}]$ , we know that  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M} | s) =: \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M} | \mathcal{R})$  is the same for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}_{\alpha}[\mathcal{R}]$  since the unlearning algorithm UNLEARN is RETRAIN, i.e., it only depends on  $\mathcal{R}$ . With these observations, we can then combine the paired dataset splits within the expectation.

Specifically, for any  $s \in \mathcal{S}_{\alpha}[\mathcal{R}]$ , let  $s' \in \mathcal{S}_{\alpha}[\mathcal{R}]$  to be  $s$ 's pair, i.e., if  $s = (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{T})$  for some  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$ , then  $s' = (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ . Finally, for a given  $\mathcal{R}$ , let's denote the collection of all such pairs as

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}} := \{\{s, s'\} \subset \mathcal{S}_{\alpha}[\mathcal{R}] : s = (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{T}), s' = (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F}) \text{ for some } \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{T}\},$$

where we use a set rather than an ordered list for the pair  $s, s'$  since we do not want to deal with repetition. Observe that  $\mathcal{O}_s(0) = \mathcal{O}_{s'}(1)$  and  $\mathcal{O}_s(1) = \mathcal{O}_{s'}(0)$  since the oracles are constructed with respect to the same preference distribution for all data splits. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Adv}(\mathcal{A}, \text{RETRAIN}) &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}_{\alpha}|} \left| \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_{\alpha}} \left( \Pr_{\substack{m \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|s) \\ \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_s(0)}} (\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}}(m) \text{ accepts}) - \Pr_{\substack{m \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|s) \\ \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_s(1)}} (\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}}(m) \text{ accepts}) \right) \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}_{\alpha}|} \left| \sum_{\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{D}} \sum_{\{s, s'\} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}} \left( \Pr_{\substack{m \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|s) \\ \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_s(0)}} (\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}}(m) \text{ accepts}) - \Pr_{\substack{m \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|s) \\ \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_s(1)}} (\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}}(m) \text{ accepts}) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \Pr_{\substack{m \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|s') \\ \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_{s'}(0)}} (\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}}(m) \text{ accepts}) - \Pr_{\substack{m \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|s') \\ \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_{s'}(1)}} (\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}}(m) \text{ accepts}) \right) \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}_{\alpha}|} \left| \sum_{\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{D}} \sum_{\{s, s'\} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}} \left( \Pr_{\substack{m \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|\mathcal{R}) \\ \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_s(0)}} (\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}}(m) \text{ accepts}) - \Pr_{\substack{m \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|\mathcal{R}) \\ \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_s(1)}} (\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}}(m) \text{ accepts}) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \Pr_{\substack{m \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|\mathcal{R}) \\ \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_s(1)}} (\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}}(m) \text{ accepts}) - \Pr_{\substack{m \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}|\mathcal{R}) \\ \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_s(0)}} (\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}}(m) \text{ accepts}) \right) \right| = 0. \end{aligned}$$

□



### C Proof of Theorem 3.6

We now prove Theorem 3.6. We repeat the statement for convenience.

**Theorem C.1.** *Given an  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -certified removal unlearning algorithm UNLEARN with some  $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ , for any (potentially computationally unbounded) adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  against UNLEARN in the unlearning samples inference game  $\mathcal{G} = (\text{UNLEARN}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}}, \alpha)$ ,*

$$\text{Adv}(\mathcal{A}, \text{UNLEARN}) \leq 2 \cdot \left(1 - \frac{2 - 2\delta}{e^\epsilon + 1}\right).$$

*Proof.* We start by considering an attack as differentiating between the following two hypotheses. In particular, given a specific dataset split  $s = (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{T}) \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$  and an model  $m$ , consider

$$H_1: m = \text{UNLEARN}(\text{LEARN}(\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{F}), \mathcal{F}), \text{ and } H_2: m = \text{LEARN}(\mathcal{R}).$$

Alternatively, by writing the distribution of the unlearned models and the retrained models as  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_1 | s)$  and  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_2 | s)$ , respectively, we may instead write

$$H_1: m \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_1 | s), \text{ and } H_2: m \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_2 | s).$$

It turns out that by looking at the *type-I error*  $\alpha$  and *type-II error*  $\beta$ , we can control the advantage of the adversary in this game easily. Firstly, denote the model produced under  $H_1$  as  $m_1$ , then under  $H_1$ , the accuracy of the adversary is  $\Pr_{m_1 \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_1 | s)}(\mathcal{A}(m_1) = 1) = 1 - \alpha$ . Similarly, by denoting the model produced under  $H_2$  as  $m_2$ , we have  $\Pr_{m_2 \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_2 | s)}(\mathcal{A}(m_2) = 1) = \beta$ . Therefore, for this specific dataset split  $s$ , let's define the advantage of this adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  for this attack as<sup>6</sup>

$$\widehat{\text{Adv}}_s(\mathcal{A}) := |1 - \alpha - \beta|.$$

The upshot is that since UNLEARN is an  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -certified removal unlearning algorithm (Definition 3.5), it is possible to control  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , hence  $\widehat{\text{Adv}}_s(\mathcal{A})$ . To achieve this, since from the definition of certified removal, we're dealing with sub-collections of models, it helps to write  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  in a different way.

Let  $\mathcal{H} := \text{supp}(\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_1 | s)) \cup \text{supp}(\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_2 | s))$  be the collection of all possible models, and denote  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$  to be the collection of models that the adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  accepts, and  $\mathcal{B}^c$  to denote its complement, i.e., the collection of models that the adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  rejects. We can then re-write the type-I and type-II errors as

- Type-I error  $\alpha$ : probability of rejecting  $H_1$  when  $H_1$  is true, i.e.,  $\alpha = \Pr(m_1 \in \mathcal{B}^c | s) = 1 - \Pr(m_1 \in \mathcal{B} | s)$ .
- Type-II error  $\beta$ : probability of accepting  $H_2$  when  $H_2$  is false, i.e.,  $\beta = \Pr(m_2 \in \mathcal{B} | s)$ .

With this interpretation and the fact that UNLEARN is  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -certified removal, we know that

- $\Pr(m_1 \in \mathcal{B} | s) \leq e^\epsilon \Pr(m_2 \in \mathcal{B} | s) + \delta$ , and
- $\Pr(m_2 \in \mathcal{B}^c | s) \leq e^\epsilon \Pr(m_1 \in \mathcal{B}^c | s) + \delta$ .

Combining the above, we have  $1 - \alpha \leq e^\epsilon \beta + \delta$  and  $1 - \beta \leq e^\epsilon \alpha + \delta$ . Hence,

$$\beta \geq \max\{0, 1 - \delta - e^\epsilon \alpha, e^{-\epsilon}(1 - \delta - \alpha)\}.$$

We then seek to get the minimum of  $\alpha + \beta$ , we have

$$\alpha + \beta \geq \max\{\alpha, 1 - \delta - e^\epsilon \alpha + \alpha, e^{-\epsilon}(1 - \delta - \alpha) + \alpha\}.$$

To get a lower bound, consider the minimum among the last two, i.e., consider solving  $\alpha$  when  $1 - \delta - e^\epsilon \alpha + \alpha = e^{-\epsilon}(1 - \delta - \alpha) + \alpha$ , leading to

$$(e^{-\epsilon} - e^\epsilon)\alpha = e^{-\epsilon}(1 - \delta) - (1 - \delta) = (e^{-\epsilon} - 1)(1 - \delta) \implies \alpha = \frac{(e^{-\epsilon} - 1)(1 - \delta)}{e^{-\epsilon} - e^\epsilon}.$$

Hence, we have

$$\alpha + \beta \geq 1 - \delta + \alpha(1 - e^\epsilon) = 1 - \delta + \frac{(e^{-\epsilon} - 1)(1 - \delta)}{e^{-\epsilon} - e^\epsilon}(1 - e^\epsilon) = (1 - \delta) \frac{2e^{-\epsilon} - 2}{e^{-\epsilon} - e^\epsilon} = (1 - \delta) \frac{2 - 2e^\epsilon}{1 - e^{2\epsilon}},$$

<sup>6</sup>Note that this is different from the advantage we defined before since the attack is different, hence we use a different notation.

with the elementary identity  $1 - e^{2\epsilon} = (1 + e^\epsilon)(1 - e^\epsilon)$ , we finally get

$$\alpha + \beta \geq \frac{2 - 2\delta}{e^\epsilon + 1}.$$

On the other hand, considering the “dual attack” that predicts the opposite as the original attack, that is, we flip  $\mathcal{B}$  and  $\mathcal{B}^c$ . In this case, the type-I error and the type-II error become  $\alpha$  and  $1 - \beta$ , respectively. Following the same procedures, we’ll have  $\alpha + \beta \leq 2 - \frac{2-2\delta}{e^\epsilon+1}$ .

Note that the definition of  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -certified removal is independent of the dataset split  $s$ , hence, the above derivation works for all  $s$ . In particular, the advantage of any adversary differentiating  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  for any  $s$  is upper bounded by

$$\widehat{\text{Adv}}_s(\mathcal{A}) = |1 - \alpha - \beta| \leq 1 - \frac{2 - 2\delta}{e^\epsilon + 1} =: \tau,$$

where we denote  $\tau$  to be the upper bound of advantage. This means that **any** adversaries trying to differentiate between retrain models and certified unlearned models are upper bounded in terms of its advantage, and an explicit upper bound is given by  $\tau$ .

We now show a reduction. Firstly, we construct two attacks based on the adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  in our setting, which tries to differentiate between the data point  $x$  is sampled from the forget set  $\mathcal{F}$  or the test set  $\mathcal{T}$ . This can be formulated through the following hypotheses testing:

$$H_3: x \in \mathcal{F}, \text{ and } H_4: x \in \mathcal{T}.$$

In this viewpoint, the unlearning samples inference game can be thought of as deciding between  $H_3$  and  $H_4$ . Since the upper bound we get for differentiating between  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  holds for any efficient adversaries, therefore, we can construct an attack for deciding between  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  using adversaries for deciding between  $H_3$  and  $H_4$ . This allows us to upper bound the advantage for the latter adversaries.

Given any adversaries  $\mathcal{A}$  for differentiating  $H_3$  and  $H_4$ , i.e., any adversaries in the defense-attack game, we start by constructing our first adversary  $\mathcal{A}_1$  for differentiating  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  as follows:

- In the left world ( $H_1$ ), feed the certified unlearned model to  $\mathcal{A}$ ; in the right world  $H_2$ , feed the retrained model to  $\mathcal{A}$ .
- We create a random oracle  $\mathcal{O}_s(0)$  for  $\mathcal{A}$ , i.e., we let the adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  decide on  $\mathcal{F}$ . We then let  $\mathcal{A}_1$  output as  $\mathcal{A}$ .

We note that  $\mathcal{A}$  is deciding on  $\mathcal{F}$ , the advantage of  $\mathcal{A}_1$  is

$$\widehat{\text{Adv}}_s(\mathcal{A}_1) = \left| \Pr_{\substack{m_1 \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_1|s) \\ \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_s(0)}} (\mathcal{A}^\mathcal{O}(m_1) \text{ accepts}) - \Pr_{\substack{m_2 \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_2|s) \\ \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_s(0)}} (\mathcal{A}^\mathcal{O}(m_2) \text{ accepts}) \right|.$$

We can also induce the average of the advantage over all dataset splits is upper bounded by the maximal advantage taken over all dataset splits:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}_\alpha|} \left| \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha} \Pr_{\substack{m_1 \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_1|s) \\ \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_s(0)}} (\mathcal{A}^\mathcal{O}(m_1) \text{ accepts}) - \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha} \Pr_{\substack{m_2 \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_2|s) \\ \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_s(0)}} (\mathcal{A}^\mathcal{O}(m_2) \text{ accepts}) \right| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}_\alpha|} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha} \left| \Pr_{\substack{m_1 \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_1|s) \\ \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_s(0)}} (\mathcal{A}^\mathcal{O}(m_1) \text{ accepts}) - \Pr_{\substack{m_2 \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_2|s) \\ \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_s(0)}} (\mathcal{A}^\mathcal{O}(m_2) \text{ accepts}) \right| \leq \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha} \widehat{\text{Adv}}_s(\mathcal{A}_1). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can construct a second adversary  $\mathcal{A}_2$  for differentiating  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  as follows:

- In the left world ( $H_1$ ), feed the certified unlearned model to  $\mathcal{A}$ . In the right world ( $H_2$ ), feed retrained model to  $\mathcal{A}$ .
- We create a random oracle  $\mathcal{O}_s(1)$  for  $\mathcal{A}$ , i.e., we let the adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  decide on  $\mathcal{T}$ . We then let  $\mathcal{A}_2$  outputs as the  $\mathcal{A}$ .

Since  $\mathcal{A}$  is deciding on  $\mathcal{T}$ , the advantage of  $\mathcal{A}_2$  is

$$\widehat{\text{Adv}}_s(\mathcal{A}_2) = \left| \Pr_{\substack{m_2 \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_2|s) \\ \mathcal{O}=\mathcal{O}_s(1)}} (\mathbb{1}(\mathcal{A}^\mathcal{O}(m_2) \text{ accepts})) - \Pr_{\substack{m_2 \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_2|s) \\ \mathcal{O}=\mathcal{O}_s(1)}} (\mathcal{A}^\mathcal{O}(m_2) \text{ accepts}) \right|.$$

Similar to the previous calculation for  $\mathcal{A}_1$ , the average of the advantage is also upper bounded by the maximal advantage,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}_\alpha|} \left| \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha} \Pr_{\substack{m_1 \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_1|s) \\ \mathcal{O}=\mathcal{O}_s(1)}} (\mathcal{A}^\mathcal{O}(m_1) \text{ accepts}) - \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha} \Pr_{\substack{m_2 \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_2|s) \\ \mathcal{O}=\mathcal{O}_s(1)}} (\mathcal{A}^\mathcal{O}(m_2) \text{ accepts}) \right| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}_\alpha|} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha} \left| \Pr_{\substack{m_1 \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_1|s) \\ \mathcal{O}=\mathcal{O}_s(1)}} (\mathcal{A}^\mathcal{O}(m_1) \text{ accepts}) - \Pr_{\substack{m_2 \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_2|s) \\ \mathcal{O}=\mathcal{O}_s(1)}} (\mathcal{A}^\mathcal{O}(m_2) \text{ accepts}) \right| \leq \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha} \widehat{\text{Adv}}_s(\mathcal{A}_2). \end{aligned}$$

Given the above calculation, we can now bound the advantage of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Firstly, let UNLEARN be any certified unlearning method. Then the advantage of  $\mathcal{A}$  in the defense-attack game (i.e., differentiating between  $H_3$  and  $H_4$ ) against UNLEARN is

$$\text{Adv}(\mathcal{A}, \text{UNLEARN}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}_\alpha|} \left| \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha} \Pr_{\substack{m_1 \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_1|s) \\ \mathcal{O}=\mathcal{O}_s(0)}} (\mathcal{A}^\mathcal{O}(m_1) \text{ accepts}) - \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha} \Pr_{\substack{m_1 \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_1|s) \\ \mathcal{O}=\mathcal{O}_s(1)}} (\mathcal{A}^\mathcal{O}(m_1) \text{ accepts}) \right|.$$

On the other hand, the advantage of  $\mathcal{A}$  against the retraining method RETRAIN can be written as

$$\text{Adv}(\mathcal{A}, \text{RETRAIN}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}_\alpha|} \left| \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha} \Pr_{\substack{m_2 \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_2|s) \\ \mathcal{O}=\mathcal{O}_s(0)}} (\mathcal{A}^\mathcal{O}(m_2) \text{ accepts}) - \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha} \Pr_{\substack{m_2 \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_2|s) \\ \mathcal{O}=\mathcal{O}_s(1)}} (\mathcal{A}^\mathcal{O}(m_2) \text{ accepts}) \right|,$$

which is indeed 0 from Theorem 3.4. Combine this with the calculations above, from the reverse triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Adv}(\mathcal{A}, \text{UNLEARN}) &= |\text{Adv}(\mathcal{A}, \text{UNLEARN}) - \text{Adv}(\mathcal{A}, \text{RETRAIN})| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}_\alpha|} \left| \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha} \Pr_{\substack{m_2 \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_2|s) \\ \mathcal{O}=\mathcal{O}_s(0)}} (\mathcal{A}^\mathcal{O}(m_2) \text{ accepts}) - \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha} \Pr_{\substack{m_2 \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_2|s) \\ \mathcal{O}=\mathcal{O}_s(1)}} (\mathcal{A}^\mathcal{O}(m_2) \text{ accepts}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha} \Pr_{\substack{m_1 \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_1|s) \\ \mathcal{O}=\mathcal{O}_s(0)}} (\mathcal{A}^\mathcal{O}(m_1) \text{ accepts}) + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha} \Pr_{\substack{m_1 \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_1|s) \\ \mathcal{O}=\mathcal{O}_s(1)}} (\mathcal{A}^\mathcal{O}(m_1) \text{ accepts}) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}_\alpha|} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha} \left| \Pr_{\substack{m_1 \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_1|s) \\ \mathcal{O}=\mathcal{O}_s(0)}} (\mathcal{A}^\mathcal{O}(m_1) \text{ accepts}) - \Pr_{\substack{m_2 \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_2|s) \\ \mathcal{O}=\mathcal{O}_s(0)}} (\mathcal{A}^\mathcal{O}(m_2) \text{ accepts}) \right| \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}_\alpha|} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha} \left| \Pr_{\substack{m_1 \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_1|s) \\ \mathcal{O}=\mathcal{O}_s(1)}} (\mathcal{A}^\mathcal{O}(m_1) \text{ accepts}) - \Pr_{\substack{m_2 \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_2|s) \\ \mathcal{O}=\mathcal{O}_s(1)}} (\mathcal{A}^\mathcal{O}(m_2) \text{ accepts}) \right| \\ &\leq \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha} \widehat{\text{Adv}}_s(\mathcal{A}_1) + \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha} \widehat{\text{Adv}}_s(\mathcal{A}_2) \\ &\leq 2\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the upper bound of the advantage of any adversary against any certified unlearning method is  $2\tau$ .  $\square$

### C.1 Final remarks on potential limitations

Note that from Table 1, even for NONE with  $\epsilon = \infty$ , the unlearning quality  $\mathcal{Q}$  is still quite high (0.587), potentially hurting the performance of our evaluation method. This is partly because the current state-of-the-art (weak) adversaries are not good enough: If the weak adversary becomes better over time, our evaluation metric can also benefit from this.

Besides, our definition only allows one round of unlearning. However, in real life, unlearning requests may come successively. It is interesting to explore the possibilities for the evaluation of sequential unlearning in future work.

## **D Broader impacts**

Our proposed evaluation framework has several societal implications. For the government, it enhances privacy protection by supporting compliance with regulations like GDPR [Mantelero, 2013] and CCPA [CCPA, 2018], ensuring individuals' rights to data erasure are respected and implemented. For the public, robust evaluation metrics increase trust that their data can be accurately and effectively unlearned from AI systems, alleviating privacy concerns. For organizations, it reduces the computational and resource burden of unlearning evaluation, making compliance with privacy laws and data removal requests more efficient and cost-effective.