

Silver Linings in the Shadows: Harnessing Membership Inference for Machine Unlearning

Nexhi Sula	Abhinav Kumar	Jie Hou	Han Wang	Reza Tourani
Saint Louis University St. Louis, MO, US nexhi.sula@slu.edu	Saint Louis University St. Louis, MO, US abhinav.kumar@slu.edu	Saint Louis University St. Louis, KS, US jie.hou@slu.edu	University of Kansas Lawrence, MO, US han.wang@ku.edu	Saint Louis University St. Louis, MO, US reza.tourani@slu.edu

Abstract—With the continued advancement and widespread adoption of machine learning (ML) models across various domains, ensuring user privacy and data security has become a paramount concern. In compliance with data privacy regulations, such as GDPR, a secure machine learning framework should not only grant users the right to request the removal of their contributed data used for model training but also facilitates the elimination of sensitive data fingerprints within machine learning models to mitigate potential attack – a process referred to as machine unlearning.

In this study, we present a novel unlearning mechanism designed to effectively remove the impact of specific data samples from a neural network while considering the performance of the unlearned model on the primary task. In achieving this goal, we crafted a novel loss function tailored to eliminate privacy-sensitive information from weights and activation values of the target model by combining target classification loss and membership inference loss. Our adaptable framework can easily incorporate various privacy leakage approximation mechanisms to guide the unlearning process. We provide empirical evidence of the effectiveness of our unlearning approach with a theoretical upper-bound analysis through a membership inference mechanism as a proof of concept. Our results showcase the superior performance of our approach in terms of unlearning efficacy and latency as well as the fidelity of the primary task, across four datasets and four deep learning architectures.

I. INTRODUCTION

“The data subject shall have the right to obtain from the controller the erasure of personal data concerning him or her without undue delay and the controller shall have the obligation to erase personal data without undue delay ...”

Article 17 GDPR

In the era of data-driven technological innovation, the need for data collection and processing intensifies with the widespread adoption and increasing prominence of Machine Learning (ML) applications, such as Google Gboard, Watson for Oncology, or OpenAI ChatGPT, in our daily lives. As the collection of users’ private information grows at an unprecedented rate, it is of paramount importance to ensure the security of this data and uphold the requirements of user privacy. To enhance and standardize data protection and user privacy, several legislations have been enacted, including the European Union’s General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) [1], [2] and the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA) [3]. In recent years, GDPR violations have resulted in fines for various companies, e.g., in 2022, the Spanish data

protection authority imposed a fine of €10 million on Google LLC for violating *Articles 6 and 17* of GDPR [4].

Unlike erasing data at rest, removing data samples or their influence from a trained neural network is extremely complex. This is in part due to neural networks’ memorization tendency, especially when dealing with complex models, limited training data, and the presence of long-tailed distributions in image data [5], [6], [7]. When a model memorizes specific data samples, including those containing sensitive or private information, it becomes susceptible to privacy attacks, such as membership inference attacks (MIA) [8], [9], [10]. Even well-generalized models have shown to be vulnerable to such attacks despite using regularization protection [11], [12]. The growing concern for data privacy and the need to remove personal data instances have fueled the field of *machine unlearning*.

The most evident and provable machine unlearning solution is *naïve retraining* – training a newly initialized model after excluding the sample that should be forgotten. While viable, retraining is computationally expensive and only possible if the original data is available [13], which makes it unsuitable for most of the modern machine learning models. Exact unlearning is a class of unlearning methods that aims to alter the training algorithms to generate unlearned models identical to retraining while reducing the cost [14], [15], [16], [17], [18], [19]. The most prominent exact unlearning solution, SISA [14], relies on sharding and slicing the data to train multiple sub-models, which could be retrained individually. Alternatively, batch updates can be logged during training, allowing the removal of individual batch updates [17], though significantly increasing the storage and deployment cost. To satisfy cost constraints in modern learning paradigms, there is a relaxation of the requirement for the unlearned model to be identical to retraining. Thus, leading to approximate unlearning algorithms [20], [21], [22], [23], [24], [25]. These mechanisms rely on utilizing the information provided by the Hessian [20], [26], [22] or use architectural modifications [25] to get a final learned representation that approximately resembles retraining. More so, they require access to either the training data or certain training process information, such as the Fisher Information matrix, which may not be accessible during unlearning.

While these methods partially fulfill the requirements of machine unlearning, they also introduce certain strong assumptions regarding training process auditing, storage requirements, or modification of the training paradigm. This has motivated us to design an unlearning framework, aiming to provide high

unlearning efficacy and efficiency while offering flexibility in sample forgetting, even if the training data is not accessible. Moreover, we seek a solution that is retrospectively applicable to formerly trained models, irrespective of the training process.

To achieve the “right to be forgotten” and completely remove requested samples (*i.e.*, forgetting samples) along with their influence from the model, we propose *ReMI Unlearning*, which stands for *Reverse Membership Inference Unlearning*. At its core, ReMI aims to scrub the unique and identifiable features of the forget samples from the model, ensuring that such information is not retained in the unlearned model and therefore cannot be inadvertently leaked or extracted. These key features include model’s posterior vector, predicted label, loss, gradients, and intermediate activation values. These features, often exploited in orchestrating various privacy attacks [10], [11], [9], [8], play a crucial role in guiding the unlearning process. In ReMI, we establish the notion of a *privacy approximation function* as the one that extracts sensitive training information from the model. This function can be realized as a neural network trained on the key features, extracted from the model given a sample set with an identical distribution to the training dataset. In essence, it is a more generalized adaptation of membership and attribute inference attack models, which we use to guide the unlearning process. We further introduce an alternative approach – *Membership Fingerprinting (MF) model* – to aid the unlearning process. The *Membership Fingerprinting* model eliminates the need for training an additional shadow model from scratch on new datasets, making it computationally more efficient and practical.

We devise a customized unlearning loss function that combines the target model’s loss with the privacy approximation function’s loss. The first component retains the unlearned model’s fidelity for the primary task, while the latter loss component evaluates the residual influence of forgetting samples and minimizes the potential extraction of sensitive features by the privacy approximation function. Utilizing this loss function in ReMI’s design allows for a versatile range of removal options, from eliminating a single sample to removing multiple samples from one class or multiple classes, which has shown to be more challenging than removing an entire class or a subset of a single class [27].

We evaluate the performance of our unlearning mechanism using FMNIST, UTKFace, STL10, and CIFAR-10 datasets, across four neural network architectures. To demonstrate ReMI efficacy in unlearning, we use MIA implementation in [28], [29] and epistemic uncertainty [30] to quantify the amount of information the unlearned model leaks when given the forgotten samples. While using MIA accuracy to assess unlearning effectiveness may be controversial, prior studies have indeed adopted this approach [20]. We also evaluate the performance of the unlearned model on the primary classification task for the remaining data to ensure it retains high fidelity, *i.e.*, comparable to the original target model. Our empirical findings, obtained with various neural network architectures, affirm the effectiveness of our tailored unlearning loss functions.

Contributions: In summary, we study the problem of removing samples of training data and eliminating their influence from neural networks in practicing the right to be forgotten. The contributions of this paper are:

- We introduce ReMI, an unlearning mechanism that effectively expunges selected training samples from one or multiple classes and their impact from a pre-trained neural network. ReMI neither requires prior knowledge of the training process nor stores any parameters during training.
- In designing ReMI, we propose a novel unlearning loss function to minimize the information leakage of the unlearned model. At its core, ReMI uses privacy-sensitive features of samples, often used in inference attacks, to measure the amount of information that the original leaks and guide the unlearning process.
- When driving the customized unlearning loss function, we provide a new definition quantifying the indistinguishability of forgetting samples during the unlearning process. Furthermore, we establish a theoretical upper bound for this indistinguishability level. Incorporating this upper bound into our customized unlearning loss function enables us to minimize the risk of information leakage from forgotten samples while ensuring the preservation of utility for classification tasks.
- We conducted extensive experiments to validate the performance of ReMI on multiple architectures and datasets. Our proposed method was compared with two benchmarks: Fisher unlearning [20] and naïve re-training. In our evaluation, we analyze the advantages and shortcomings of each approach.

II. RELATED WORK

The task of removing selected data from a trained model has attracted researchers due to its potential ability to improve model security, privacy, and usability [31]. To realize this task, researchers have proposed several different machine unlearning frameworks and approaches. This section provides an overview of the existing techniques and their limitations to motivate the development of our design. The existing techniques can broadly be grouped into two categories: Exact Unlearning and Approximate Unlearning.

Exact Unlearning or perfect unlearning algorithms formulate the goal of an unlearning mechanism as generating a posterior or weight distribution that is identical to the distribution of the model trained on the original training dataset, excluding the samples being forgotten. Exact unlearning methods either require significant altering of the training paradigm, like dividing the dataset into shards and making sub-models for each shard of dataset [14], [32], [33], or performing heavy auditing of the training process by storing every single batch update during the training process [19]. While these methods provide provable unlearning guarantees, they incur significant overhead during both training and deployment periods, and cannot be retrospectively applied to already trained models.

Approximate Unlearning algorithms attempt to satisfy the constraints on training and deployment cost while making relatively fewer changes in the learning algorithm or pipeline. The relaxed constraints allow the unlearned model to be a close approximation of a model trained on the training dataset excluding the forgotten samples. Depending on the desired privacy setting, various approximate unlearning algorithms have

been proposed. These methods may involve adjusting model weights using techniques like Hessian approximation [20], [21], [22], leveraging neural tangent kernels [23], or modifying model architecture [25]. Alternatively, some approaches focus on auditing the training process and unrolling updates to retain information about the forgotten samples [24]. However, the majority of these approaches require access to the training data during the unlearning process [24], or they depend on information like Fisher Information Matrix (FIM) approximations [20], [18], which must be computed during training. These requirements pose strong assumptions that limit the practicality of these unlearning mechanisms. Unlearning methods proposed without these assumptions [34] have poor performance due to their reliance on error maximization-minimization noise to generate an unlearned model, leading to significant degradation in performance due to ad-hoc noise generation process [31]. Some unlearning solutions are specific to a given learning algorithm, such as Random Forests [35], Naive Bayes [36], and linear models [21].

We design ReMI to address cost constraints that are often encountered in practical unlearning scenarios. ReMI is compatible with previously trained models and does not rely on the strong assumption of training data availability. It can be applied to a wide range of training algorithms and supports the unlearning of samples from multiple classes while minimizing the impact on model performance. ReMI does not necessitate prior knowledge of the training process, eliminating any associated storage costs.

III. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we briefly reason our choice of sample unlearning and then formally define the machine unlearning problem. We then elaborate on the privacy risks of neural networks, sensitive features that are commonly used in privacy attacks, and their role in our mechanism. Machine unlearning can be broadly categorized into three primary types: sample unlearning, feature unlearning, and class unlearning. Sample unlearning entails removing specific data points or instances from the model’s training dataset, allowing the model to forget the influence of certain examples it has previously learned [37], [21], [38], [39]. Class unlearning is one generalization of sample unlearning in which the samples to unlearn constitute an entire class. Thus, enabling the model to update its predictions and associations with specific classes, effectively undoing previous classifications [13], [25], [40]. Feature unlearning, on the other hand, focuses on modifying or suppressing the influence of particular attributes or characteristics in the model’s input data, enabling the model to forget correlations or patterns associated with those features [13], [41]. Sample unlearning is the foundation and more challenging task [27], which can be extended into class and feature unlearning. As such, we specifically designed the machine unlearning approach for sample unlearning.

A. Formalizing Machine Unlearning

We formalize the unlearning problem in the context of the Machine-Learning-as-a-Service paradigm between a machine learning service provider and a group of clients, $\mathcal{C} = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_m\}$. Generically, the service provider can be

envisioned as an entity with sufficient resources to train a (potentially proprietary) machine learning model, \mathcal{M} . To initiate the training and testing processes, the service provider collects diverse data samples from the client group and curates a dataset, $D = \{(x_i^j, y_i^j) \mid i \in \{1, \dots, N\}, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}, y \in \{1, \dots, K\}\}$. In this dataset, x_i^j represents the features for the i -th sample collected from client j , while y_i^j denotes the label (*i.e.*, class) associated with that sample, chosen from a set of K possible classes. The learning model \mathcal{M} is derived by optimizing the loss function to find the optimal weights that satisfy the objective function $w = \operatorname{argmin}_w \mathcal{L}_D(y, \mathcal{M}(x))$.

As privacy laws, such as GDPR, state that data owners can request the timely removal of their identifiable data from the service provider, machine unlearning aims to remove the private information of the data owners (*i.e.*, clients) from a trained machine learning model, safeguarding it from potential attackers. More specifically, upon client c ’s request for the removal of their private data, $D_f^c \subset D$, the service provider should transform model \mathcal{M} (which has been trained on D) to \mathcal{M}_u^c , where the latter signifies the model that is not influenced by D_f^c . We consider \mathcal{M}_u^c as the unlearned model. Note that D_f^c can be either a single data sample or a set of samples belonging to client group c . To simplify the notation, in the rest of the paper, we omit using the client’s identifier and represent forgetting data as D_f and unlearned model as \mathcal{M}_u .

Given the difficulty of precisely measuring the influence of D_f on \mathcal{M} , inverting it to a perfect unlearned model is a fairly challenging task, especially without prior knowledge of D_f during training or the storage of detailed training process parameters. The ideal approach for unlearning D_f is to train a new neural network (with similar hyperparameters as \mathcal{M}) using the remaining data $D_r = D \setminus D_f$, resulting in a trained model \mathcal{M}_r , that has never been impacted by D_f – dubbed as retraining. In the existing literature, retraining is considered the gold standard unlearning mechanism and the baseline for comparison [19], [20], [30]. While retraining can achieve optimal performance with respect to the client privacy, it is a highly inefficient solution, particularly when $|D \setminus D_f| \gg |D_f|$ or the model training is costly due to the model complexity.

B. Privacy Risks in Deep Learning

We define a function, denoted as $I(w)$, for extracting knowledge from a target model \mathcal{M} with the objective of inferring private information related to the original training data owned by clients. The knowledge generated by the function $I(w)$ is commonly referred to as *attack features*. In the context of a black-box attack setting, the function $I(w)$ generates a collection of model outputs associated with each data point. This collection encompasses several key elements, including the output probabilities denoted as $\hat{p} = \mathcal{M}(x)$, the predicted class label (\hat{y}), determined as $\operatorname{argmax}_c P(y = c|x)$, and the predictive loss, represented as $\mathcal{L}(\hat{y}, y)$. In the white-box attack setting, the function $I(w)$ extracts additional information from the model, which includes gradients $\nabla \mathcal{L} = [\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial w_1}, \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial w_2}, \dots, \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial w_m}]$ and intermediate activation values from layer h of \mathcal{M} , denoted as $[a]_h$. We generalize this notation to $[a]_{\mathcal{M}} = \{[a]_1, [a]_2, \dots, [a]_H\}$ for all the H layers of model \mathcal{M} . As such, function $I(w)$, which acts as the generator of attack features plays a crucial role in various

privacy attack algorithms. These attack algorithms encompass a range of techniques, including membership inference attacks [8], [9], property inference attacks [42], [43], data reconstruction attacks [44], [45], [42], and poisoning-based inference attacks [46], [47].

To successfully infer the private information of the training data, it’s essential to have a well-trained machine learning attack model, which can effectively leverage the model information contained within the attack feature sets $I(w) \subset \{\hat{p}, \hat{y}, \mathcal{L}(\hat{y}, y), \nabla \mathcal{L}, [a]_{\mathcal{M}}\}$ to retrieve the private information associated with the forgotten data. We acknowledge that $I(w)$ generates a non-inclusive list of features; there are other privacy attack techniques, which use other features, such as loss trajectories [48]. Nonetheless, the attack features we mentioned are among the most common ones.

In the unlearning scenario, we propose a weight refinement algorithm to eliminate sensitive information from the attack features generated by $I(w)$, which are initially encoded by the pre-trained weights within model \mathcal{M} . In particular, we define a successful unlearning algorithm as one that provides an updated model with weights that meet the following objective function:

$$w^* = \underset{w}{\operatorname{argmin}} f(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}_u}(w), \mathcal{G}(I(w))) \quad (1)$$

in which $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}_u}(w)$ represents the loss function of the unlearned model, while $\mathcal{G}(\cdot)$ acts as a “privacy approximation function”. This function quantifies how much privacy-sensitive properties of the training data are exposed by the attack features $I(w)$ (e.g., attacking successful rate). The function $f(\cdot)$ represents the linear relationship of the loss function and quantification of privacy leakage, detailed in Section IV-D. Therefore, the objective function addresses both the accuracy of the target model and the potential information leakage. To optimize the model weight w , we aim to minimize this objective function. This minimization is to ensure the accuracy of the model by reducing $\mathcal{L}_D(w)$ and diminish the leakage of privacy-sensitive data through the attack features $I(w)$.

C. Design Goals

While the retraining approach is an ideal solution in terms of removing the influence of D_f from \mathcal{M} , it is not a cost-effective solution. As such, in designing our unlearning mechanism, we consider satisfying the following goals:

- **High Classification Fidelity:** In general, it is expected that any unlearning strategy to adversely impact the accuracy of the target task. This is in part due to the removal of a subset of training samples, potentially including crucial data samples that represent a particular class or category, as well as the removal of feature(s) or even class(es). While such performance degradation is expected, the reduction in accuracy between the unlearned model and the retrained model (or the model before unlearning) should remain minimal.
- **High Unlearning Efficacy:** Unlike retraining and a few exact unlearning approaches, which provide provable guarantees on the unlearned model, other unlearning mechanisms provide bounded approximations at best [31]. Nonetheless, any unlearning mechanism should minimize the information that the unlearned




Fig. 1: In ReMI, the target model training follows the conventional training approach (§ IV-B). ReMI uses a privacy approximation function (§ IV-C) to infer the privacy-sensitive information of the training data and uses it to guide the unlearning process (§ IV-D).

model retains from the forget samples – maintaining high unlearning efficacy. Assessing unlearned model efficacy, beyond theoretical analysis, can be measured via approaches, such as membership inference or uncertainty quantification [30].

- **Data and Model Independent:** The prototypical data, the samples that are representative of classes or features, are more influential in the training of a model. As such, unlearning such samples (even features or classes) would lead to a bigger change in the distribution of the unlearned model. Nonetheless, unlearning strategies should be pertinent to datasets with diverse distributions. A similar property should be held for a diverse set of neural network architectures.
- **Low Latency:** All unlearning strategies require the model’s parameters to be updated. Nonetheless, the expected time for transforming \mathcal{M} to \mathcal{M}_u , dubbed as unlearning latency, should remain significantly lower than the retraining strategy. The unlearning latency may increase proportional to the fraction of the samples, number of features, and classes that are being removed.

IV. UNLEARNING METHODOLOGY

In this section, we introduce our machine unlearning mechanism (Figure 1). Our design objective for ReMI is to remove information and features associated with D_f through an attack-oriented model optimization. ReMI comprises several crucial components, including the configuration of the target model, feature extraction, attack model preparation, and the unlearning optimization process. This unlearning pipeline aims to generate a new, secure model that achieves both high classification fidelity and unlearning efficacy. In what follows, we first provide an overview of our design and then elaborate on the details of each component.

A. Design Overview

Upon a data removal request, ReMI initiates the unlearning process by directly accessing the pre-trained target model \mathcal{M} and the specified data samples D_f that should be forgotten. This allows ReMI to complete the unlearning process (i) independent of the remaining of the original training data, i.e., D_r , (ii) independent of the parameters of \mathcal{M} during its training process, or (iii) without retraining \mathcal{M} from the scratch.

Consequently, it effectively addresses the major concerns surrounding machine unlearning.

We consider the classification task for the target model, which follows a given deep learning architecture. We assume the target model \mathcal{M} is trained on an image dataset using a training paradigm, such as stochastic gradient descent (Section IV-B). Recall from Section III-B that a privacy approximation function $\mathcal{G}(\cdot)$ exists, which aims to quantify private properties of training data. In ReMI, we use function $\mathcal{G}(\cdot)$ in guiding the unlearning process. Function $\mathcal{G}(\cdot)$ can be realized as a neural network and can be trained in various forms for privacy inference. Plausible choices for $\mathcal{G}(\cdot)$, include data reconstruction, property inference, and membership inference functions, which are common techniques in privacy attacks against deep neural networks. In this study, we utilize a membership inference model as the chosen privacy approximation function ($\mathcal{G}(\cdot)$) in the unlearning pipeline. Using the membership inference function, ReMI assesses the information leakage of the data samples that clients request to be forgotten during the unlearning process and performs iterative weight refinement until the unlearned model \mathcal{M}_u does not retain any information from D_f (Section IV-C).

Upon receiving the removal request for removing D_f , we build a customized differentiable unlearning loss function that quantifies the privacy leakage by considering both the information from the target model (\mathcal{M}) and the output of the membership inference model, $\mathcal{G}(\cdot)$ (Section IV-D). We then utilize the gradient descent optimization algorithm to update model parameters, aiming to minimize the attack probability distribution between D_f and a non-private *out-of-sample* data, D_o , while maintaining classification accuracy without significant reduction. The out-of-sample data is a set of samples with the identical distribution to the training data but with no intersection, *i.e.*, $D \cap D_o = \emptyset$. Availability of an out-of-sample distribution is a common assumption in development of responsible AI systems and has been widely used for robust model training [49] and inference attacks [28].

To evaluate the effectiveness of our approach, we compare the model generated by our unlearning algorithm (\mathcal{M}_u) with benchmark models: trained from scratch and other approximate unlearning algorithms. Furthermore, we illustrate the efficacy of our unlearning approach using a range of evaluation metrics. Lastly, to illustrate the usability of our mechanism, we assess it across several benchmark image datasets, including FMNIST, UTKFace, STL10 and CIFAR-10, on a variety of deep learning architectures, including CNN, ResNet18, Xception, and VGG19.

B. Target Model Training

This section elaborates on the target model training process. We note that the training of the target model follows the conventional training of deep neural networks and further emphasize that our unlearning process is completely independent of the target model training. For the training of the machine learning target model, we start with a target dataset $D = \{(x_i, y_i) \mid i \in \{1, \dots, N\}, y_i \in \{1, \dots, K\}\}$, where each data point is associated with a class label, y_i , belonging to one of the K distinct classes. The primary goal of training the machine learning model \mathcal{M} is to attain

high classification performance on dataset D , which involves distinguishing among the K classes. The model \mathcal{M} is trained using the cross-entropy loss function, denoted as $\mathcal{L}(w)$, where w represents the model’s weights. The loss function measures the dissimilarity between the model’s predictions and the actual labels within the dataset D , as defined by:

$$\mathcal{L}_D(w) = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^K [[y_i == j]] \log p(y_i = j | x_i; w) \quad (2)$$

The optimal weights are determined by minimizing the loss function $\mathcal{L}_D(w)$ over all training data points D , denoted as $w^* = \operatorname{argmin}_w \mathcal{L}_D(w)$. The weights w is updated through gradient decent steps by $w^t = w^{t-1} - \eta \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial w}$.

During the training process, it is common practice to incorporate out-of-sample data, D_o , to facilitate early stopping and prevent overfitting. Instead of adjusting the model weights during target model training, an additional cross-entropy loss, designated as $\mathcal{L}_{D_o}(w)$, is introduced for the purpose of model evaluation.

C. Privacy Approximation Function

In this section, we elaborate on the privacy approximation function, $\mathcal{G}(\cdot)$, which we use in ReMI, and the role it plays in the unlearning process. The privacy approximation function, in a general sense, comprises a set of machine learning models, which are utilized to infer the private properties related to the training data through the pre-trained target model \mathcal{M} . To illustrate this concept, we use a membership inference attack model as an example of $\mathcal{G}(\cdot)$ in designing ReMI. Membership inference attacks are commonly employed in assessing privacy vulnerabilities of unlearning models [34]. The primary objective of $\mathcal{G}(\cdot)$, particularly the MIA model, is to determine whether a particular data sample was part of the training set for \mathcal{M} or not. To make the membership determination, $\mathcal{G}(\cdot)$ relies on a set of features, denoted as $I(w)$, as discussed in Section III-B. These features are derived from the target model \mathcal{M} . To formalize the concept of MIA[50], we consider a set of sensitive data samples denoted as D_f and the attack features $I(w)$ derived from model \mathcal{M} . The MIA model, which we henceforth refer to as $\mathcal{G}(\cdot)$, is defined as a binary classifier to produce a class prediction output $\hat{z} = \mathcal{G}(I(w)|_{D_f}) \in \{0, 1\}$. A prediction of $\hat{z} = 0$ implies that the data point is not a member of \mathcal{M} ’s training dataset, while $\hat{z} = 1$ indicates that it is indeed a member of the training dataset.

We consider two distinct types of MIA models: the Black-box attack model and the White-box attack model. In the Black-box attack model, the configuration and parameters of the target model \mathcal{M} are not known to the adversary. Therefore, the primary source of information for deriving attack features used to infer the membership status of the input data is the output of the target model. These attack features include \hat{p} , \hat{y} , and $\mathcal{L}(\hat{y}, y)$ as defined in Section III-B. In contrast, in the White-box attack, the adversary has access to both, the architecture and the complete set of parameters of the target model \mathcal{M} . This accessibility allows the utilization of additional white-box features, including $\nabla \mathcal{L}$ and $[a]_{\mathcal{M}}$. In our approach, we consider both the black-box and white-box attack models as two distinct privacy approximation functions to guide the unlearning process in ReMI.

Privacy Approximation Function Training: We train membership inference models, $\mathcal{G}(\cdot)$, using two distinct feature datasets: one for the MIA model and another for the *Membership Fingerprinting* (MF) model. The MF model shares similarities with the MIA model in that its purpose is to distinguish between samples that were part of the training set for \mathcal{M} and those that were not. However, it differs from MIA attacks in a fundamental way – the MF model is trained using the original training data, whereas MIA attacks are typically trained on the shadow dataset since they do not have access to the actual target dataset. Among these two approaches, MIA model is a suitable privacy approximation function when access to the training data is limited. Otherwise, the MF model would be a better choice for guiding the unlearning process. For both of these models, we offer white-box and black-box variations. In our unlearning pipeline, adhering to the conventional approach for constructing MIA models, this process involves training a set of shadow models, denoted as $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Shadow}}$, designed to replicate the behavior and characteristics of the target model, \mathcal{M} . To train $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Shadow}}$, we utilized the shadow dataset, which is assumed to follow the same underlying distribution as the target dataset but is entirely disjoint. It is worth mentioning that there are diverse methods for constructing shadow datasets [10], and it is commonly assumed that the adversary has access to the shadow dataset [10], [9], [51]. We further used the architectural design and hyperparameters that we have used for model \mathcal{M} in training $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Shadow}}$. These shadow models provide valuable insights into the distribution of the parameter space within the target model, facilitating the inference of private information associated with the data used to train the target model.

To generate attack features for training the MIA-based privacy approximation function, $\mathcal{G}(\cdot)_{\text{MIA}}$, we feed the shadow data into $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Shadow}}$. In the case of the MF-based privacy approximation function, we instead send the original target data to the target model \mathcal{M} to generate the features for training model $\mathcal{G}(\cdot)_{\text{MF}}$. Given that the unlearning process will be conducted by the same party that trained the model, in our evaluation, **we use the white-box MF model as the privacy approximation function to guide the unlearning process.**

D. Neural Network Unlearning

Given a target training dataset $D = D_f \cup D_r$ and the target model \mathcal{M} (henceforth referred to as w) trained on this dataset, we consider that the distributions of attack probabilities generated by the privacy approximation function for forgetting dataset, $\mathcal{G}(I(w)|_{D_f})$, is very high and distinguishable from the attack probabilities for out-of-sample dataset (e.g., test dataset). It is worth noting that the choice of out-of-sample data in our work is all non-membership data. Figure 2 illustrates the attack probability distributions on both out-of-sample D_o and forgetting data D_f , before and after unlearning. Evidently, the attack shows a low probability for out-of-sample data (e.g., the mean value of 0.05%). In contrast, the attack probability for the forgetting data before unlearning exhibits an exceedingly high likelihood. The primary objective of the unlearning procedure is then to enable the target model \mathcal{M} to forget information D_f , resulting in similar attack probability distributions for D_f and D_o . Specifically, it aims to ensure that the attackers cannot reconstruct information about D_f using $\mathcal{G}(I(w))$. To formalize




Fig. 2: Membership inference attack probability distributions before and after unlearning. Before unlearning, the MIA attack had a high likelihood of forgetting data and an extremely low likelihood of the out-of-sample data. The objective of our unlearning process is to minimize the divergence between these probability distributions.

the objective goal of unlearning, we have the definition based on the forgetting data and out-of-sample data as follows:

Definition 1: Given the membership inference model $\mathcal{G}(\cdot)$, an optimal unlearning function $S(\cdot)$ for the target model is to make

$$\text{KL}(P(\mathcal{G}(I(S(w))|_{D_f}))||P(\mathcal{G}(I(w)|_{D_o}))) = 0 \quad (3)$$

in which $S(w)$ is the model weight updated by unlearning process and KL is the Kullback-Leibler divergence, $P(\mathcal{G}(I(S(w))|_{D_f}))$ is the attack probabilities on the forgetting data using the unlearned model $S(w)$ and $P(\mathcal{G}(I(w)|_{D_o}))$ is the attack probabilities on the out-of-sample data using the original target model in which the mean of distribution $P(\mathcal{G}(I(w)|_{D_o}))$ is very low.

With Definition 1, the goal of a successful unlearning algorithm, $S(\cdot)$, is to update model weights of the target model in such a way that the distance between the distributions of the attack probabilities of the forgetting dataset D_f and the out-of-sample dataset D_o is minimized (*after unlearning* plot in Figure 2). To achieve this, the ideal unlearning algorithm should have the KL divergence between the attack probability distributions of D_f and D_o reduced to zero. Thus, the information of D_f in the dataset can be indistinguishable from the out-of-sample data.

In addition to unlearning the samples in D_f by minimizing this KL divergence, it is crucial for the target model to maintain accuracy and fidelity in the primary task. In our case, we primarily consider the classification accuracy and cross-entropy loss function for the target model. Therefore, our unlearning approach aims to leverage the combination of classification accuracy (Eqn. 4), as measured by cross-entropy loss, and unlearning efficacy (Eqn. 5), determined by the KL divergence between attack probability distributions for in-sample and out-of-sample data, during the model update process. We define the loss function to guarantee the classification accuracy of dataset D_f and D_o which is far less than D as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}_u}(w) = \mathcal{L}_{D_f}(w) + \mathcal{L}_{D_o}(w) \quad (4)$$

and the loss function to guarantee the forgetting data privacy as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}(w) = \text{KL}(P(\mathcal{G}(I(S(w))|_{D_f}))||P(\mathcal{G}(I(w)|_{D_o}))) \quad (5)$$

During the unlearning process, we control the trade-off between the classification accuracy and membership inference attack on D_f by assigning the multipliers λ_1 to $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$ and λ_2

to $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}$. These multipliers are used to balance the impact of the two loss functions on the overall learning process. The final loss function to get the optimal weight w^* for the unlearned model can be formalized as:

$$w^* = \underset{w}{\operatorname{argmin}} \{ \lambda_1 \times \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}_u}(w) + \lambda_2 \times \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}(w) \} \quad (6)$$

To simplify the loss function to get the optimal model weights, we can consider the upper bound of the $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}(w)$. By definition of the KL divergence, and considering that the probability of attack should be less than 1, we can hold the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}(w) &= \operatorname{KL}(P(\mathcal{G}(I(S(w))|_{D_f})|P(\mathcal{G}(I(w)|_{D_o}))) \\ &\leq \log\left(\frac{P(\mathcal{G}(I(S(w))|_{D_f})}{P(\mathcal{G}(I(w)|_{D_o})}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Based on the distribution observation in Figure 2, we assume that the distributions of attack based on the dataset D_f and D_o satisfy the Gaussian distribution as follows:

$$\mathcal{G}(I(S(w))|_{D_f}) \sim N(\mu_{D_f}, \sigma^2)$$

$$\mathcal{G}(I(w)|_{D_o}) \sim N(\mu_{D_o}, \sigma^2)$$

$$P(\mathcal{G}(I(S(w))|_{D_f})) = \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\mathcal{G}(I(S(w))|_{D_f}) - \mu_{D_f}}{\sigma}\right)^2} \quad (8)$$

$$P(\mathcal{G}(I(w)|_{D_o})) = \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\mathcal{G}(I(w)|_{D_o}) - \mu_{D_o}}{\sigma}\right)^2} \quad (9)$$

Thus, the upper bound of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}(w)$ can be expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}(w) &\leq \log\left(\frac{P(\mathcal{G}(I(S(w))|_{D_f})}{P(\mathcal{G}(I(w)|_{D_o})}\right) \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\mathcal{G}(I(S(w))|_{D_f}) - \mu_{D_f}}{\sigma}\right)^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\mathcal{G}(I(w)|_{D_o}) - \mu_{D_o}}{\sigma}\right)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Recall that $\mathcal{G}(I(w)|_{D_o})$ is fixed given that the target model is known and remains unchanged during the unlearning process. Thus, when we minimize the value of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}(w)$ to guarantee the robustness against the membership inference attack on forgetting data D_f , the objective function is equivalent to minimizing the $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}(w) = -\log\left(\frac{P(\mathcal{G}(I(S(w))|_{D_f})}{P(\mathcal{G}(I(w)|_{D_o})}\right)$. We take the logarithm in order to enable the loss function $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}(w)$ to grow larger when $|\mathcal{G}(I(S(w))|_{D_f}) - \mu_{D_f}| \rightarrow 0$. Moreover, since the goal of the unlearning process is to decrease the attack probability of forgetting data, we would have one condition that

$$\mathcal{G}(I(S(w))|_{D_f}) \leq \mu_{D_f} \leq 1$$

Thus, our problem is equivalent to minimizing:

$$-\log(\mu_{D_f} - \mathcal{G}(I(S(w))|_{D_f}))$$

As the probability of attack for the forgetting dataset D_f is close to 1, minimizing the previous term is equivalent to minimizing:

$$-\log(1 - \mathcal{G}(I(S(w))|_{D_f})) \quad (11)$$

Hence, in ReMI, we define the loss function for unlearning

the target model as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} &= \lambda_1 \times \underbrace{(\mathcal{L}_{D_f}(w) + \mathcal{L}_{D_o}(w))}_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}_u}(w)} \\ &\quad + \lambda_2 \times \underbrace{(-\log(1 - \mathcal{G}(I(S(w))|_{D_f})))}_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}(w)} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The optimal weights of the unlearned model are defined as:

$$w^* = \underset{w}{\operatorname{argmin}} \{ \lambda_1 \times \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}_u}(w) + \lambda_2 \times \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}(w) \} \quad (13)$$

Minimizing this first term ($\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}_u}(w)$) is to minimize the loss function retaining the accuracy of the unlearned model for forgetting and out-of-sample data. Minimizing the second term ($\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}(w)$) is to decrease the amount of sensitive information extracted on D_f by the privacy approximation function $\mathcal{G}(\cdot)$ from the unlearned model. The combination of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}_u}(w)$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}(w)$ is employed to update the weights of the target model to derive the unlearned model, $S(w)$. By updating the weights, the attack accuracy on forgetting data D_f should reduce as a result of minimizing $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}(w)$ while still preserving the classification accuracy by minimizing $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}_u}(w)$, which we will validate in our evaluation (detailed in Table II and Table III). Next, we will assess the performance of the unlearned model using metrics, including classification fidelity, unlearning efficacy, and unlearning latency.

V. EXPERIMENTS AND RESULTS

A. Experimental Workflows

We used the following datasets to evaluate ReMI:

- FMNIST dataset [52] consisting a comprehensive set of 70,000 grayscale images. These images encompass a diverse array of 10 fashion items, including various types of clothing, dresses, shoes, handbags, and more.
- UTKFace [53] dataset comprises over 23,000 face images annotated with age, gender, and ethnicity, displaying varied pose, facial expression, illumination, occlusion, and resolution.
- STL10 [54] dataset comprises 13,000 images in 10 classes: airplane, bird, car, cat, deer, dog, horse, monkey, ship, and truck.
- CIFAR-10 [55] dataset features 60K color images (32×32 pixels) across 10 classes, with 6K images per class. There are 50000 training and 10000 test images.

We test the efficacy of ReMI on four different architectures: SimpleCNN, ResNet18 [56], Xception [57], and VGG19 [58]. The SimpleCNN model (hereafter CNN) consists of 3 convolutional layers, each followed by a ReLU activation function and a max-pooling layer, along with two fully connected layers for classification. For the Xception architecture, we have implemented the same model as presented in the original paper [57]. We have adopted the ResNet model with 18 layers, as detailed in [56]. The VGG19 model we used consists of a total of 19 layers, including 16 convolutional layers, 3 fully connected layers, and ReLU as its activation function [58]. All

TABLE I: Statistics of data in experiment dataset.

	Target Dataset		Forgetting dataset			
	Train	Test	0.01	0.1	0.25	0.5
FMNIST	17500	17500	179	1755	4380	8753
UTKFace	5503	5503	57	552	1378	2753
STL10	3250	3250	40	331	818	1627
CIFAR-10	15000	15000	154	1504	3754	7504

four deep learning architectures employ a softmax classifier in the output layer to predict probabilities associated with distinct classes. The network configurations and training procedures are implemented in PyTorch. Each target model undergoes training for 50 epochs using the SGD optimizer with a learning rate of $1e-2$, a momentum of 0.9, and a weight decay of $5e-4$.


We divided each dataset into four equal-sized subsets. We use two subsets to train our target model, and the remaining two subsets are treated as shadow distribution, which will be utilized to conduct a membership inference attack on the target model. All the image samples in the datasets are pre-processed before using them for model training, including resizing (64×64) and normalization.

In ReMI we use the membership fingerprinting model to conduct unlearning. Then, we assess its effectiveness through a membership inference attack conducted before and after unlearning in white-box and black-box settings. The MIA utilizes the framework proposed in prior work and assumes the same threat model [28].

Subsequently, we test ReMI on four *forgetting datasets*, each with an increasing number of target samples selected evenly from each class that were classified as training data by the MF model with high probability. The sizes of these forgetting datasets are 0.01, 0.1, 0.25, and 0.5 of the target training datasets, respectively. Table I summarizes the number of data points in the forgetting data curated from each of the four datasets.

Given a pre-trained target model, we apply our unlearning mechanism (ReMI) to update the parameters of the target model for each forgetting dataset. In particular, ReMI refines the parameters of the target model by minimizing the classification loss and unlearning loss based on the forgetting dataset, as elaborated in Section IV-D. We also benchmark our algorithm with two unlearning approaches: Naive Retraining [59] and Fisher Unlearning [30]. The Naive Retraining algorithm retrains the target model on the remaining data by excluding specific forgetting data from the training dataset, while maintaining consistent hyper-parameter configurations similar to those used in the original training process. In the case of Fisher Unlearning, we followed the same implementation outlined in prior research to ensure the consistency of unlearning performance [30].

To assess the robustness of our unlearning framework, each target model is trained using 20 different initializations (seed numbers), resulting in a total of 80 trained models. Each of these models is then assessed in both black-box and white-box settings. Following the implementation of white-box MIA models outlined in [28], we selected four attack features from the target model to serve as inputs to our MF and MIA models. Per Section III-B, these features include $I(w) \subset \{\hat{p}, \hat{y}, \mathcal{L}(\hat{y}, y), \nabla \mathcal{L}\}$. The white-box attack model was trained for 50 epochs using the Adam optimizer with a learning

**Fig. 3:** The train and test classification accuracy of four datasets across four deep learning architectures before unlearning.

rate of $1e-5$. For the black-box attack, we used the MIA implementation from IBM’s Adversarial Robustness Toolbox [29].

Upon completion of the target model and the attack model, we initiate the unlearning process using the specified forgetting data as the input. In our unlearning framework, we explore various hyperparameter values that are used in ReMI’s loss function, as outlined in Equation 13, including the unlearning weight λ_2 and the learning rate η during the unlearning process. It’s worth noting that in our experimental setup, we defined $\lambda_1 = 1 - \lambda_2$. To ensure optimal unlearning performance, we identified the most suitable values for these hyperparameters across all deep learning architectures and datasets. The details of these optimal hyperparameter values are available in Table VI in the supplementary document.

B. Results

Target Model Evaluation: We first present the training and test accuracy of the target models based on different neural network architectures trained on four datasets. Figure 3 provides insight into the dataset complexities used in our experiments. Notably, the FMNIST dataset yields the highest overall test classification accuracy across all architectures, with CNN (90.3%), ResNet18 (91.2%), Xception (90.2%), and VGG19 (92.3%). In the case of the UTKFace and CIFAR-10 datasets, both training and test accuracies achieve lower averaged classification accuracy when compared to the four deep learning architectures trained on the FMNIST dataset. Conversely, the STL10 dataset exhibits the lowest test accuracy among the three datasets for CNN (51.7%), ResNet18 (54.4%), Xception (49.9%), and VGG (55.6%), showing its greater complexity in terms of classification challenges.

Privacy Approximation Function Evaluation: We further evaluate the performance of two privacy approximation functions, *i.e.*, MIA and MF, on inferring whether a data sample belongs to the training datasets or not in both black-box and white-box settings. The outcome of this experiment shed light on the suitability of MIA and MF for guiding ReMI unlearning




Fig. 4: Accuracy of the privacy approximation functions (MIA and MF) before unlearning in both white-box and black-box forms across all datasets. The results suggest that MIA and MF models perform similarly. Thus, either of these models can be used as the privacy approximation function to guide ReMI’s unlearning process.

process. Figure 4 demonstrates that MIA and MF yield similar results in both black-box and white-box settings. Notably, the results indicate that MIA and MF achieve higher prediction accuracy on the STL10 dataset, which is partly due to the train and test accuracy gap in the target classification task (Figure 3). These observations align with previous research findings [28], suggesting that membership inference (fingerprinting) accuracy tends to be higher when the target models experience overfitting. More importantly, these results suggest that utilizing MIA or MF will lead to a similar unlearning performance. Hence, given the performance similarities of these models and considering that training the MF model is less cumbersome for the model owner, we use MF to guide ReMI unlearning process.

Unlearning Evaluation: In this section, we will evaluate ReMI in terms of classification fidelity and unlearning efficacy. To assess the classification fidelity of the unlearning process, we evaluate the difference in the classification accuracy of the target model before and after unlearning. Table II presents a comprehensive summary of the predictive accuracy of the training (*i.e.*, forgetting data samples (D_f) and the remaining training data (D_r)) and the test phases, both before and after unlearning. The results indicate that the unlearned model consistently maintains accuracy levels comparable to the original target model across all architectures and datasets. After the unlearning, we observe minimal changes in classification performance compared to the target model, with a maximum accuracy drop of less than 10% (CIFAR10 on VGG19). Interestingly, one can observe that in some cases (STL10 on ResNet18, Xception, and VGG19), ReMI has marginally improved the test accuracy of the unlearned models. This accuracy boost is due to the higher generalizability of the unlearned model as a result of using out-of-sample data during the unlearning process.

Table III demonstrates the effectiveness of our unlearning algorithm based on the the white-box MIA success against forgetting data. Prior to unlearning, all forgetting data samples within D_f received high probabilities from the MIA model, indicating that all data points in D_f were likely used in training the target model. For instance, when considering forgetting data that includes 50% of the training data samples, all target models from the four deep learning architectures initially exhibited nearly 100% accuracy in membership fingerprinting across all four datasets.

TABLE II: Classification accuracy of target models before and after unlearning test data.

	Df	Phase	UTKFace	FMNIST	STL10	CIFAR10
CNN	1%	Before	0.83	0.9	0.48	0.65
		After	0.82	0.89	0.49	0.61
	10%	Before	0.82	0.9	0.49	0.66
		After	0.8	0.89	0.52	0.63
	25%	Before	0.83	0.91	0.51	0.66
		After	0.79	0.89	0.5	0.56
	50%	Before	0.84	0.91	0.52	0.65
		After	0.8	0.89	0.5	0.6
ResNet18	1%	Before	0.84	0.91	0.55	0.72
		After	0.82	0.91	0.55	0.72
	10%	Before	0.83	0.91	0.57	0.71
		After	0.83	0.91	0.58	0.7
	25%	Before	0.86	0.91	0.54	0.72
		After	0.85	0.9	0.57	0.71
	50%	Before	0.85	0.91	0.59	0.73
		After	0.85	0.91	0.59	0.72
Xception	1%	Before	0.82	0.92	0.54	0.76
		After	0.81	0.92	0.54	0.77
	10%	Before	0.83	0.93	0.57	0.76
		After	0.83	0.93	0.56	0.75
	25%	Before	0.81	0.93	0.54	0.76
		After	0.78	0.92	0.53	0.77
	50%	Before	0.81	0.92	0.55	0.76
		After	0.76	0.92	0.57	0.77
VGG19	1%	Before	0.83	0.88	0.52	0.72
		After	0.84	0.9	0.57	0.62
	10%	Before	0.82	0.89	0.48	0.72
		After	0.83	0.87	0.49	0.6
	25%	Before	0.83	0.9	0.47	0.73
		After	0.83	0.91	0.49	0.61
	50%	Before	0.8	0.9	0.5	0.73
		After	0.82	0.9	0.52	0.75

TABLE III: Whitebox MIA accuracy of unlearned models before and after unlearning on forget data.

	Df	Phase	UTKFace	FMNIST	STL10	CIFAR10
CNN	1%	Before	1.00	1.00	0.975	1.00
		After	0.052	0.318	0.15	0.019
	10%	Before	0.981	1.00	0.975	1.00
		After	0.106	0.365	0.166	0.013
	25%	Before	0.962	1.00	0.979	1.00
		After	0.129	0.485	0.106	0.026
	50%	Before	0.941	1.00	0.982	0.999
		After	0.19	0.588	0.101	0.044
ResNet18	1%	Before	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
		After	0.052	0	0.1	0.006
	10%	Before	1.00	0.997	1.00	1.00
		After	0.001	0.002	0.009	0.001
	25%	Before	1.00	0.997	1.00	0.998
		After	0	0.002	0.004	0.0005
	50%	Before	1.00	0.987	1.00	0.982
		After	0	0.001	0.007	0.001
Xception	1%	Before	1.00	0.977	1.00	1.00
		After	0.21	0.005	0.47	0
	10%	Before	1.00	0.879	1.00	1.00
		After	0.21	0.002	0.314	0
	25%	Before	0.929	0.883	1.00	0.999
		After	0.156	0.002	0.067	0.0002
	50%	Before	0.849	0.884	1.00	1.00
		After	0.039	0.004	0.031	0
VGG19	1%	Before	1.00	0.631	0.825	1.00
		After	0.456	0.111	0.6	0.24
	10%	Before	1.00	0.837	0.835	1.00
		After	0.599	0.267	0.528	0.501
	25%	Before	1.00	0.857	0.828	1.00
		After	0.334	0.211	0.604	0.228
	50%	Before	0.997	0.877	0.81	1.00
		After	0.765	0.208	0.619	0.135

Applying ReMI, however, significantly reduces the white-box MIA accuracy on all four target models across all four datasets. Specifically, after applying the unlearning process to the target models trained on the CIFAR-10 dataset, the MIA accuracy on the forgetting data ($D_{f|0.5}$) for each of the




Fig. 5: Distribution of efficacy scores on forgetting data for the target models before and after unlearning across four datasets which shows how much information the model can leak. The results indicate that our unlearning method, ReMI, exposes less information compared to the original target model before unlearning. Additionally, the efficacy of the unlearning algorithms exhibits variations depending on the complexity of the deep learning architecture employed in the target model and the size of the forgetting dataset.

four deep learning methods is as follows: 4.4% (CNN), 0.1% (ResNet18), 0.0% (Xception), and 13.5% (VGG19). Similar unlearning performance is observed on the STL10, UTK-Face, and FMNIST datasets. For example, on the FMNIST dataset, the attack accuracy decreases from the range 88%–98% for the original target models to a range of 3.9% for the Xception model and 0.0% for the ResNet18 model. On the STL10 dataset, the attack accuracy drops from the range 81%–100% to the range 3.1%–10% across all architectures except VGG19. Regarding VGG19, it did not perform as well as other architectures in unlearning the samples. We attribute this behavior to the lack of skip connections in the VGG architecture, which results in highly non-smooth loss surfaces [60]. To the best of our knowledge, no other study has used the VGG architecture for unlearning, leaving no baseline for comparison. The results in Table II and Table III highlight the effectiveness of our unlearning algorithm in eliminating the private information of forgetting data from the target models without compromising the accuracy of the target classification

models. We also evaluated black-box MIAs on the unlearned data and included the results in the supplementary material due to space limitation.

Besides classification fidelity of the unlearned model, the unlearning efficacy score is another valuable metric for assessing the effectiveness of machine unlearning techniques [30], [31]. The efficacy score quantifies the degree to which a model retains or discloses information by accounting principles from information theory and epistemic uncertainty [30]. A more robust unlearning algorithm is expected to lead to an unlearned model with a lower efficacy score, indicating higher uncertainty about the target data. We note that we calculate the efficacy score only for the forget data. Moreover, we conducted unlearning experiments using the same model and data configurations with different random seeds to collect multiple efficacy scores for distribution analysis. This allows us to compare the efficacy score of ReMI against other unlearning algorithms.




Fig. 6: Comparison of white-box MF accuracy during unlearning, highlighting the importance of the forgetting data size and the model’s architecture on unlearning convergence. Selecting a smaller data to forget leads to faster convergence, particularly on CNN and VGG19.

We evaluate the effectiveness of ReMI by comparing its efficacy score with that of two alternative methods: Fisher Unlearning and Naive Retraining. The experiments for Fisher Unlearning and Naive Retraining were conducted under identical configurations as those used for our unlearning algorithm. These configurations included using four deep learning architectures and forgetting data of varying sizes (1.00%, 10.0%, 25.0%, and 50.0%) from four datasets. Figure 5 presents the distribution of efficacy scores obtained from the original target model and the unlearned models resulting from all three unlearning algorithms. The results indicate that in most cases, the three unlearning algorithms produced new models with lower efficacy scores than the original target model. This trend was consistent across various deep learning architectures regardless of the size of the forgetting data. Notably, while the efficacy distribution of Fisher Unlearning sometimes overlapped with the efficacy distribution of the original model, as observed in cases like CNN on all four datasets and VGG19 on the FMNIST & CIFAR-10 datasets, the overall trend indicated a decrease in model efficacy.

Furthermore, the efficacy of the unlearning algorithms exhibited variations depending on the deep learning architecture employed in the target model. For example, both our algorithm ReMI and Model Retraining generated new models with significantly lower efficacy scores across all four forgetting datasets when the target model was based on CNN architecture. Our algorithm, in particular, demonstrated superior efficacy distributions for forgetting data sizes of 25% and 50%. However, Fisher unlearning outperformed the others by producing unlearning models with lower efficacy scores

for larger forgetting datasets, specifically those with sizes of 10.0%, 25.0%, and 50.0%, when the target model is ResNet18. Nevertheless, our unlearning algorithm still exhibited better unlearning efficacy than Model Retraining across various settings.

This analysis underscores the significant influence of both model complexity and forgetting dataset size on the performance of Model Retraining and Fisher Unlearning. For example, Model Retraining tends to yield less effective unlearning models as the model complexity increases, transitioning from simpler models like CNN to moderately complex models like ResNet. In contrast, Fisher Unlearning excels in generating better models with lower efficacy scores as the size of the forgetting dataset grows. Our unlearning algorithm, positioned between these two methods, is less affected by variations in model complexity and forgetting data sizes, offering a balanced performance across a range of scenarios.

Unlearning Process Discussion: Figure 6 provides insights into how the accuracy of the membership fingerprinting (MF) model on the forgetting dataset changes over various training epochs. The results consistently demonstrate a decrease in the MF accuracy during the unlearning process across different target models and forgetting data sizes. The speed of convergence depends on both the forgetting data size and the specific deep learning models used. For instance, ResNet and Xception target models across all datasets exhibit faster convergence with bigger forgetting data sizes (25.0% and 50.0%), while smaller forgetting datasets (1.0% and 10.0%) require more epochs for effective convergence. A different pattern is observed with CNN and VGG19 models across all




Fig. 7: MF accuracy during unlearning versus epochs for black-box and white-box settings for D_f is 0.25. The results suggest using white-box MF to guide the unlearning process will have faster convergence, which consequently speeds up the unlearning process.

datasets, where the unlearning process was longer despite the forget dataset.

Figure 7 provides an insightful representation of how the MF accuracy on the forgetting dataset changes across different training epochs when employing different types of MF (black-box and white-box) as privacy approximation functions ($\mathcal{G}(I(w))$) during the unlearning process when the forgetting data size is 25%. The other forgetting data size results can be found in the supplementary document. The analysis illustrates that using the white-box MF model as a reference for minimizing the distribution of attack probabilities between in-sample and out-of-sample data proves to be more effective than relying on the black-box MF model. This approach results in a faster convergence of the unlearning loss and lower data leakage for the forgetting data when compared to the utilization of the black-box model. This observation can be partially attributed to the set of white-box features, which include gradients derived from the target model, contributing to enhanced unlearning performance. On the other hand, employing the black-box MF model to guide the unlearning process demonstrates less success, particularly evident when applying CNN and ResNet18 on STL10 data. This analysis underscores the need for more effective privacy approximation functions to enhance unlearning performance.

Cross-attack Evaluation: We further assess the impact of our algorithm on privacy information exposure under different membership fingerprinting scenarios. Specifically, we evaluate the accuracy of a black-box MF against models unlearned using a white-box MF as a reference, and vice versa. This bidirectional evaluation aims to uncover insights into the effectiveness of our algorithm in mitigating privacy risks and

TABLE IV: Cross-method Unlearning Efficacy Evaluation

D_f	Unlearning Source	Evaluation	Attack Accuracy (%)	
			Before	After
0.01	White-box	Black-box	100	40
	Black-box	White-box	92.5	87.5
0.1	White-box	Black-box	100	62.5
	Black-box	White-box	92.5	70
0.25	White-box	Black-box	100	42.5
	Black-box	White-box	92.5	100
0.5	White-box	Black-box	100	40
	Black-box	White-box	92.5	92.5

understanding how different fingerprinting strategies interact with one another. Table IV presents a summary of the results from our comprehensive bidirectional membership fingerprinting evaluations across various forgetting dataset sizes. The successful unlearning process, guided by a reference MF model, should effectively mitigate privacy risks across different mechanisms, indicating the removal of private information associated with the training data. As presented in Table IV, when the target model undergoes unlearning by incorporating white-box MF probabilities into the loss function optimization, the resulting new model exhibits significantly reduced attack accuracy when subjected to independent black-box fingerprinting. This observation holds true across unlearned models trained with forgetting data of varying sizes. For instance, the fingerprinting accuracy of the black-box MF diminishes from 100% to 40%, 62.5%, 42.5%, and 40% when applied to forgetting datasets with sizes of 1%, 10%, 25%, and 50%, respectively, after the unlearning is applied based on white-box MF attack. In contrast, the target models that have undergone unlearning using a black-box MF model remain vulnerable to white-box MF.

TABLE V: Unlearning latency comparison of Retraining and ReMI Unlearning on UTKFace dataset. Time is measured in seconds. ReMI Unlearning includes total unlearning time and time for attack Loss calculation. The results include ReMI’s speed up over retraining.

	D_f Ratio	Retraining	ReMI Unlearning		Speed up
			Unlearning by Eqn. 13	$\mathcal{L}_G(w)$ calculation	
CNN	0.01	812.321	194.523	99.99	4.1x
	0.1	850.325	270.449	215.573	3.1x
	0.25	864.031	68.613	57.570	12.5x
	0.5	808.766	204.579	176.096	3.9x
ResNet	0.01	1063.228	11.463	7.896	92.76x
	0.1	1034.444	12.555	9.127	82.3x
	0.25	950.442	163.488	123.163	5.81x
	0.5	943.834	168.435	130.271	5.6x
Xception	0.01	1060.723	119.905	85.543	8.84x
	0.1	787.714	312.653	231.046	2.51x
	0.25	995.286	1123.721	849.638	0.88x
	0.5	930.395	468.84	358.547	1.98x
VGG19	0.01	1044.088	153.981	106.279	6.78x
	0.1	1051.894	100.856	70.592	10.42x
	0.25	912.485	375.815	269.564	2.42x
	0.5	833.932	540.613	351.665	1.54x
Avg. Time		933.994	268.155	196.410	3.48x

Unlearning Latency Evaluation: Finally, we conducted an evaluation of the unlearning latency of our algorithm in comparison to Model Retraining. Table V presents the results of our latency analysis based on the experiments we conducted. The evaluation involves measuring the running time of the unlearning process, which begins with the loading of a pre-trained target model and the specified forgetting data and ends when the unlearning process is completed. As demonstrated in Table V, the ReMI unlearning algorithm exhibits an average completion time of approximately 268 seconds across all architectures for the UTKFace dataset. This is nearly four times faster than Model Retraining, which requires approximately 933 seconds on average. Notably, the most time-consuming step in the ReMI unlearning process is the calculation of attack probabilities for loss optimization ($\mathcal{L}_G(w)$), which consumes approximately 196 seconds on average. This analysis underscores the lower latency of our unlearning algorithm. We did not compare with Fisher unlearning as it has shown to be an order of magnitude slower than retraining [61].

VI. CONCLUSION

We introduced ReMI – a framework for removing samples of training data and their impact from trained neural networks. At its core, ReMI can use various privacy approximation functions, which measure the information leakage of the model on forgotten data, to guide the unlearning process. In particular, we used MIA and membership fingerprinting models as our approximation functions. We designed a novel unlearning loss function to integrate the target classification loss and membership inference loss, ensuring the unlearned model achieves high unlearning efficacy and classification accuracy. Our empirical results, coupled with theoretical upper-bound analysis through a membership inference mechanism, showed the superiority of our proposed unlearning mechanism.

REFERENCES

- [1] European Parliament and of the Council. (2016) Regulation (EU) 2016/679 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data (general data protection regulation). Accessed: October 1, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://gdpr-info.eu/>
- [2] S. Shastri, M. Wasserman, and V. Chidambaram, “The seven sins of personal-data processing systems under gdpr,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.09305*, 2019.
- [3] A. Mantelero, “The eu proposal for a general data protection regulation and the roots of the ‘right to be forgotten’,” *Computer Law & Security Review*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 229–235, 2013.
- [4] DataGuidance. (2023) Spain: Aepd fines google €10m for unlawful transfer of personal data. Accessed: October 1, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.dataguidance.com/news/spain-aepd-fines-google-10m-unlawful-transfer-personal>
- [5] D. Arpit, S. Jastrzkebski, N. Ballas, D. Krueger, E. Bengio, M. S. Kanwal, T. Maharaj, A. Fischer, A. Courville, Y. Bengio *et al.*, “A closer look at memorization in deep networks,” in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2017, pp. 233–242.
- [6] N. Carlini, C. Liu, Ú. Erlingsson, J. Kos, and D. Song, “The secret sharer: Evaluating and testing unintended memorization in neural networks,” in *28th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 19)*, 2019, pp. 267–284.
- [7] V. Feldman and C. Zhang, “What neural networks memorize and why: Discovering the long tail via influence estimation,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 2881–2891, 2020.
- [8] S. Truex, L. Liu, M. E. Gursoy, L. Yu, and W. Wei, “Demystifying membership inference attacks in machine learning as a service,” *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, 2019.
- [9] M. Nasr, R. Shokri, and A. Houmansadr, “Comprehensive privacy analysis of deep learning: Passive and active white-box inference attacks against centralized and federated learning,” in *2019 IEEE symposium on security and privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 739–753.
- [10] R. Shokri, M. Stronati, C. Song, and V. Shmatikov, “Membership inference attacks against machine learning models,” in *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 3–18.
- [11] Y. Long, V. Bindschaedler, L. Wang, D. Bu, X. Wang, H. Tang, C. A. Gunter, and K. Chen, “Understanding membership inferences on well-generalized learning models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.04889*, 2018.
- [12] T. Baluta, S. Shen, S. Hitarth, S. Tople, and P. Saxena, “Membership inference attacks and generalization: A causal perspective,” in *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2022, pp. 249–262.
- [13] A. Warnecke, L. Pirch, C. Wressnegger, and K. Rieck, “Machine unlearning of features and labels,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.11577*, 2021.
- [14] L. Bourtole, V. Chandrasekaran, C. A. Choquette-Choo, H. Jia, A. Travers, B. Zhang, D. Lie, and N. Papernot, “Machine unlearning,” in *2021 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, 2021, pp. 141–159.
- [15] Y. Li, C. Chen, X. Zheng, Y. Zhang, B. Gong, and J. Wang, “Selective and collaborative influence function for efficient recommendation unlearning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10199*, 2023.
- [16] H. Yan, X. Li, Z. Guo, H. Li, F. Li, and X. Lin, “Arcane: An efficient architecture for exact machine unlearning,” in *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-22*, 2022, pp. 4006–4013.
- [17] S. Schelter, “amnesia—towards machine learning models that can forget user data very fast,” in *1st International Workshop on Applied AI for Database Systems and Applications (AIDB19)*, 2019.
- [18] Y. Wu, E. Dobriban, and S. Davidson, “Deltagrad: Rapid retraining of machine learning models,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 10 355–10 366.
- [19] L. Graves, V. Nagisetty, and V. Ganesh, “Amnesiac machine learning,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 35, no. 13, 2021, pp. 11 516–11 524.
- [20] A. Golatkar, A. Achille, and S. Soatto, “Eternal sunshine of the spotless net: Selective forgetting in deep networks,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020, pp. 9304–9312.
- [21] Z. Izzo, M. A. Smart, K. Chaudhuri, and J. Zou, “Approximate data deletion from machine learning models,” in *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 2008–2016.

- [22] C. Guo, T. Goldstein, A. Hannun, and L. Van Der Maaten, "Certified data removal from machine learning models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.03030*, 2019.
- [23] A. Gohilkar, A. Achille, and S. Soatto, "Forgetting outside the box: Scrubbing deep networks of information accessible from input-output observations," in *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XXIX 16*. Springer, 2020, pp. 383–398.
- [24] A. Thudi, G. Deza, V. Chandrasekaran, and N. Papernot, "Unrolling sgd: Understanding factors influencing machine unlearning," in *2022 IEEE 7th European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 303–319.
- [25] T. Baumhauer, P. Schöttle, and M. Zeppelzauer, "Machine unlearning: Linear filtration for logit-based classifiers," *Machine Learning*, vol. 111, no. 9, pp. 3203–3226, 2022.
- [26] K. Chaudhuri and C. Monteleoni, "Privacy-preserving logistic regression," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 21, 2008.
- [27] C.-L. Wang, Q. Li, Z. Xiang, Y. Cao, and D. Wang, "Towards lifecycle unlearning commitment management: Measuring sample-level approximate unlearning completeness," 2024.
- [28] Y. Liu, R. Wen, X. He, A. Salem, Z. Zhang, M. Backes, E. De Cristofaro, M. Fritz, and Y. Zhang, "{ML-Doctor}: Holistic risk assessment of inference attacks against machine learning models," in *31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22)*, 2022, pp. 4525–4542.
- [29] M.-I. Nicolae, M. Sinn, M. N. Tran, B. Buesser, A. Rawat, M. Wistuba, V. Zantedeschi, N. Baracaldo, B. Chen, H. Ludwig *et al.*, "Adversarial robustness toolbox v1. 0.0," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.01069*, 2018.
- [30] A. Becker and T. Liebig, "Evaluating machine unlearning via epistemic uncertainty," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.10836*, 2022.
- [31] T. T. Nguyen, T. T. Huynh, P. L. Nguyen, A. W.-C. Liew, H. Yin, and Q. V. H. Nguyen, "A survey of machine unlearning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.02299*, 2022.
- [32] C. Chen, F. Sun, M. Zhang, and B. Ding, "Recommendation unlearning," in *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*, 2022, pp. 2768–2777.
- [33] M. Chen, Z. Zhang, T. Wang, M. Backes, M. Humbert, and Y. Zhang, "Graph unlearning," in *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2022, pp. 499–513.
- [34] V. S. Chundawat, A. K. Tarun, M. Mandal, and M. Kankanhalli, "Zero-shot machine unlearning," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 2023.
- [35] J. Brophy and D. Lowd, "Machine unlearning for random forests," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 1092–1104.
- [36] Q. P. Nguyen, B. K. H. Low, and P. Jaillet, "Variational bayesian unlearning," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 16 025–16 036, 2020.
- [37] C. Guo, T. Goldstein, A. Hannun, and L. Van Der Maaten, "Certified data removal from machine learning models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.03030*, 2019.
- [38] S. Neel, A. Roth, and S. Sharifi-Malvajerdi, "Descent-to-delete: Gradient-based methods for machine unlearning," in *Algorithmic Learning Theory*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 931–962.
- [39] A. Sekhari, J. Acharya, G. Kamath, and A. T. Suresh, "Remember what you want to forget: Algorithms for machine unlearning," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 34, pp. 18 075–18 086, 2021.
- [40] A. K. Tarun, V. S. Chundawat, M. Mandal, and M. Kankanhalli, "Fast yet effective machine unlearning," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2023.
- [41] E. Chien, C. Pan, and O. Milenkovic, "Efficient model updates for approximate unlearning of graph-structured data," in *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [42] Z. Wang, M. Song, Z. Zhang, Y. Song, Q. Wang, and H. Qi, "Beyond inferring class representatives: User-level privacy leakage from federated learning," in *IEEE INFOCOM 2019-IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 2512–2520.
- [43] M. Xu and X. Li, "Subject property inference attack in collaborative learning," in *International Conference on Intelligent Human-Machine Systems and Cybernetics*, vol. 1. IEEE, 2020, pp. 227–231.
- [44] M. Fredrikson, S. Jha, and T. Ristenpart, "Model inversion attacks that exploit confidence information and basic countermeasures," in *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*, 2015, pp. 1322–1333.
- [45] B. Hitaj, G. Ateniese, and F. Perez-Cruz, "Deep models under the gan: information leakage from collaborative deep learning," in *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2017, pp. 603–618.
- [46] F. Tramèr, R. Shokri, A. San Joaquin, H. Le, M. Jagielski, S. Hong, and N. Carlini, "Truth serum: Poisoning machine learning models to reveal their secrets," in *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2022, pp. 2779–2792.
- [47] H. Chaudhari, J. Abascal, A. Oprea, M. Jagielski, F. Tramèr, and J. Ullman, "Snap: Efficient extraction of private properties with poisoning," in *2023 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 400–417.
- [48] Y. Liu, Z. Zhao, M. Backes, and Y. Zhang, "Membership inference attacks by exploiting loss trajectory," in *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2022, pp. 2085–2098.
- [49] K. Sricharan and A. Srivastava, "Building robust classifiers through generation of confident out of distribution examples," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.00239*, 2018.
- [50] A. Salem, Y. Zhang, M. Humbert, P. Berrang, M. Fritz, and M. Backes, "MI-leaks: Model and data independent membership inference attacks and defenses on machine learning models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.01246*, 2018.
- [51] D. Pasquini, G. Ateniese, and M. Bernaschi, "Unleashing the tiger: Inference attacks on split learning," in *Proceedings of ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2021, pp. 2113–2129.
- [52] H. Xiao, K. Rasul, and R. Vollgraf, "Fashion-mnist: a novel image dataset for benchmarking machine learning algorithms," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.07747*, 2017.
- [53] Z. Zhang, Y. Song, and H. Qi, "Age progression/regression by conditional adversarial autoencoder," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2017, pp. 5810–5818.
- [54] A. Coates, A. Ng, and H. Lee, "An analysis of single-layer networks in unsupervised feature learning," in *Proceedings of the fourteenth international conference on artificial intelligence and statistics. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings*, 2011, pp. 215–223.
- [55] A. Krizhevsky, G. Hinton *et al.*, "Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images," 2009.
- [56] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, "Deep residual learning for image recognition," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [57] F. Chollet, "Xception: Deep learning with depthwise separable convolutions," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2017, pp. 1251–1258.
- [58] K. Simonyan and A. Zisserman, "Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556*, 2014.
- [59] A. Thudi, G. Deza, V. Chandrasekaran, and N. Papernot, "Unrolling sgd: Understanding factors influencing machine unlearning," in *2022 IEEE 7th European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 303–319.
- [60] H. Li, Z. Xu, G. Taylor, C. Studer, and T. Goldstein, "Visualizing the loss landscape of neural nets," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 31, 2018.
- [61] J. Foster, S. Schoepf, and A. Brintrup, "Fast machine unlearning without retraining through selective synaptic dampening," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 38, no. 11, 2024, pp. 12 043–12 051.

APPENDIX

TABLE VI: Hyperparameters of Unlearning algorithm

Dataset	Architecture	Learning rate η				λ_2
		$ D_f = 0.01$	$ D_f = 0.1$	$ D_f = 0.25$	$ D_f = 0.5$	
FMNIST	CNN	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.98
	ResNet18	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.98
	Xception	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.98
	VGG19	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.98
UTKFace	CNN	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.98
	ResNet18	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.98
	Xception	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.98
	VGG19	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.98
STL10	CNN	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.98
	ResNet18	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.98
	Xception	0.1	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.98
	VGG19	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	0.98
CIFAR10	CNN	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.98
	ResNet18	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.98
	Xception	0.05	0.05	0.01	0.01	0.98
	VGG19	0.1	0.05	0.05	0.001	0.98




Fig. 8: MF accuracy during unlearning versus epochs for black-box and white-box settings for D_f is 0.01. The results suggest using white-box MF to guide the unlearning process will have faster convergence, which consequently speeds up the unlearning process.




Fig. 9: MF accuracy during unlearning versus epochs for black-box and white-box settings for D_f is 0.1. The results suggest using white-box MF to guide the unlearning process will have faster convergence, which consequently speeds up the unlearning process.




Fig. 10: MF accuracy during unlearning versus epochs for black-box and white-box settings for D_f is 0.5. The results suggest using white-box MF to guide the unlearning process will have faster convergence, which consequently speeds up the unlearning process.




Fig. 11: Blackbox MIA accuracy on the forget dataset, a subset of the target model’s training dataset, before and after unlearning when the ratio of D_f is 0.01. It is evident that ReMI unlearning effectively reduces the information leakage of the forgetting data.




Fig. 12: Blackbox MIA accuracy on the forget dataset, a subset of the target model’s training dataset, before and after unlearning when the ratio of D_f is 0.1. It is evident that ReMI unlearning effectively reduces the information leakage of the forgetting data.




Fig. 13: Blackbox MIA accuracy on the forget dataset, a subset of the target model’s training dataset, before and after unlearning when the ratio of D_f is 0.25. It is evident that ReMI unlearning effectively reduces the information leakage of the forgetting data.




Fig. 14: Blackbox MIA accuracy on the forget dataset, a subset of the target model’s training dataset, before and after unlearning when the ratio of D_f is 0.5. It is evident that ReMI unlearning effectively reduces the information leakage of the forgetting data.