

---

# ConfusionPrompt: Practical Private Inference for Online Large Language Models

---

**Peihua Mai**

National University of Singapore  
peihua.m@u.nus.edu

**Ran Yan**

National University of Singapore  
e0709174@u.nus.edu

**Rui Ye**

Shanghai Jiaotong University  
yr991129@sjtu.edu.cn

**Youjia Yang**

University of South California  
youjiaya@usc.edu

**Yinchuan Li**

Huawei Noah's Ark Lab  
liyinchuan@huawei.com

**Yan Pang \***

National University of Singapore  
bizpyj@nus.edu.sg

## Abstract

State-of-the-art large language models (LLMs) are commonly deployed as online services, necessitating users to transmit informative prompts to cloud servers, thus engendering substantial privacy concerns. In response, we present ConfusionPrompt, a novel private LLM inference framework designed to obfuscate the server by: (i) decomposing the prompt into sub-prompts, and (ii) generating pseudo prompts along with the genuine sub-prompts as input to the online LLM. Eventually, the returned responses can be recomposed by the user to obtain the final whole response. Such designs endows our framework with advantages over previous protocols that (i) it can be seamlessly integrated with existing black-box LLMs, and (ii) it achieves significantly better privacy-utility trade-off than existing text perturbation-based methods. We develop a  $(\lambda, \mu, \rho)$ -privacy model to formulate the requirement for a privacy-preserving group of prompts, and provide a complexity analysis, affirming ConfusionPrompt's efficiency. Our empirical evaluation reveals that our method offers significantly higher utility compared to local inference methods using open-source models and perturbation-based techniques, while also requiring much less memory than open-source LLMs.

## 1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have shown immense potential in various tasks [4, 43, 20]. As a result, they are progressively being incorporated into various real-world applications, including medical consultation [45] and financial service [50]. Currently, state-of-the-art LLMs such as ChatGPT from OpenAI [35] are typically provided as online services, since LLM owners deserve the intellectual property of their models and thus they are unwilling to reveal model parameters to the clients [34]. However, direct usage of such online service could raise significant privacy concerns, since the users' prompts are likely to hold sensitive information that should remain concealed from the server.

Available solutions to privacy-preserving model inference include encryption [28, 5] and perturbation [11] techniques, which are impractical for private LLM inference. In encryption methods, the server

---

\*Correspondence author

leverages homomorphic encryption (HE) [1] and Secure Multiparty Computation (MPC) [10] to conduct private inference on the users’ encrypted query. The practicality of this method is limited by its high computation overheads, especially on LLMs (e.g., GPT-3 has 175B parameters [4]). The basic idea of a perturbation-based method is to inject a specific level of noise to user’s input before releasing it to the server, which is challenging to strike a nice privacy-utility balance [30].

Another issue with the above solutions is that they rely on the service provider to modify their framework or release specific model parameters, which could be extremely costly. The application of encryption techniques relies on platform’s investment in hardware and algorithm acceleration. Perturbation-based methods often rely on local differential privacy (LDP) [14] to ensure privacy with formal guarantees. However, recent studies have proposed deploying certain modules on the user side for improved LDP performance, necessitating the sharing of specific model parameters by the server [37, 31, 32]. These requirements impose additional burdens and proprietary concerns on the service provider, hindering the deployment of these solutions.

To alleviate the above concerns, this paper proposes a novel private LLM inference framework ConfusionPrompt that can be seamlessly integrated with existing online black-box LLMs. The basic idea of ConfusionPrompt is to construct a group of prompts (containing real and fake prompts) with privacy guarantee to confuse the server, making the curious server fail to infer the real user prompt. However, a key challenge arises when a prompt contains multiple private attributes. In such cases, the user needs to consider all combinations of true and fake attributes to effectively confuse an attacker with prior knowledge of certain attributes, rendering the query complexity exponential in the attribute size. To address this issue, we propose a decomposition approach in which the query is divided into sub-questions. This ensures that the private information is distributed across different sub-queries, thereby reducing the complexity to approximately linear in the attribute size (see Figure 4).

Following the above ideas, our proposed ConfusionPrompt consists of four critical steps: (1) The user decomposes the original prompt into several sub-prompts; (2) For each genuine sub-prompt, the user generates a series of pseudo prompts that obfuscate the sensitive attributes in the genuine sub-prompt, until meeting the requirement of privacy guarantee. (3) User queries online services with a group of prompts, receives the corresponding responses, and retrieves the sub-responses for the genuine sub-prompts. (4) User recompose the sub-responses to obtain the final response. Such a framework empowers the user with independent deployment, eliminating the need for additional privacy-preserving actions from the service provider.

Accordingly, we develop a  $(\lambda, \mu, \rho)$ -privacy model for ConfusionPrompt to formulate the requirements for a privacy-preserving group of prompts. Through complexity analysis, we show that for a prompt  $\mathbf{p}$  with  $U(\mathbf{p})$  private attributes and  $\mu$  privacy budget, the basic confusion strategy without decomposition requires to generate  $\mathcal{O}((1/\mu)^{U(\mathbf{p})})$  fake prompts. While our decomposition strategy in ConfusionPrompt can reduce the complexity to  $\mathcal{O}((1/\mu)U(\mathbf{p}))$  in the ideal decomposition scenario. Overall, based on the privacy model and complexity analysis, we derive the criteria for an ideal decomposer and generator, and accordingly construct a preference dataset to train them using direct preference optimization (DPO) [38].

Our contributions are as follows:

- (1) We are the first to propose a private LLM inference framework using confusion-based strategy. Our ConfusionPrompt framework can be seamlessly implemented by clients with existing online black-box LLMs such as ChatGPT and Claude with improved privacy-utility trade-off.
- (2) To safeguard user’s privacy, we define a privacy model to formulate the requirements of a group of prompts.
- (3) We leverage a local decomposition module to reduce the complexity of the prompt group under the same privacy protection level.
- (4) Experiments show that our ConfusionPrompt can achieve consistently and significantly better utility than local inference method using open-source models and LDP-based methods. Additionally, ConfusionPrompt requires significantly lower memory cost compared to open-source LLMs.

## 2 Related Works

In this section, we review three types of methods for privacy-preserving LLM inference: anonymization-based method, encryption-based method, and perturbation-based method.

**Anonymization-based method:** Traditional anonymization techniques rely on Named Entity Recognition (NER) to redact Personally Identifiable Information (PII) such as individuals’ names, social security number, and email addresses [15, 24]. Recent research on LLM inference involves sanitizing sensitive items in the input and subsequently de-anonymize the LLM’s returned responses [21, 6]. The downside of this method is that anonymization fall short in concealing other sensitive information, including verbs and non-named entities [3].

**Encryption-based method:** Cryptonets [18] proposed the first neural network inference on encrypted data using homomorphic encryption (HE). They approximated the non-linear function such as Sigmoid and MaxPooling by polynomials. Iron [19] designed specialized and efficient protocols for two types of computationally heavy operations in Transformer-based inference: (i) matrix multiplications, and (ii) complex functions including Softmax, GELU activations, and LayerNorm. To achieve further speedup, [28] transformed the high-overhead functions into cryptography-friendly approximations, and finetune the model to maintain accuracy.

**Perturbation-based method:** Perturbation-based method provide privacy guarantee by inject calibrated noise into the input. Existing research utilizing this method predominantly focus on privacy protection in fine-tuning [23, 53] and prompt-tuning phases [13, 27], while few research investigate the privacy-preserving inference paradigm. A major challenge in perturbation-based private inference is to balance the utility and privacy tradeoff. Recent studies have proposed Text2Text [16] and paraphraser-based approaches [48, 33] to privatize text with LDP. Split-N-Denoise (SnD) [31] deployed the token embedding layer at the client side, and introduced a user-side denoising model to correct the perturbed embedding output for downstream tasks.

## 3 ConfusionPrompt: Design and Formulation

In this section, we first illustrate the overview of our proposed ConfusionPrompt, which consists of three critical components: decomposer, generator, and recomposer. Then, we develop a privacy model to formulate the requirements for achieving privacy-preserving inference.

### 3.1 Overall Design

Denote  $G_s : \mathcal{V}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{V}^*$  as the large LM deployed as cloud service such as ChatGPT [35, 34], where  $\mathcal{V}^*$  is the vocabulary space. Instead of sending raw user prompt to the cloud, our ConfusionPrompt introduces a new privacy-preserving inference paradigm, which makes it significantly hard for any third party to infer the real original user prompt even if it happens to access the information sent from the user. Basically, ConfusionPrompt involves the following six steps:

- (1) Decomposition of the original prompt. We first introduce a decomposer  $G_d : \mathcal{V}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{V}^*$  that aims to decompose the user’s original prompt  $p$  to a sequence of genuine sub-prompts  $\mathbf{p} = [p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{|p|}]$ , resulting in fewer private attributes (i.e., private information) in each sub-prompt.
- (2) Generation of pseudo prompts. A pseudo prompt generator  $G_f : \mathcal{V}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{V}^*$  is introduced to generate a pseudo prompt given a genuine sub-prompt by replacing specified critical information. By generating multiple pseudo prompts for each genuine sub-prompt and mixing them together as a prompt group, we are able to hide the genuine sub-prompts, increasing the difficulty of being inferred. For the simplicity of privacy analysis, we design to enforce the pseudo prompt to be consistent with the genuine prompt in terms of syntactic structure.
- (3) Evaluation of privacy level. To ensure that the genuine prompt is safely hidden in the prompt group, we also need to design some criteria (e.g., semantic irrelevance) to evaluate the usability of generated pseudo prompts. Based on these criteria, we will continue sample and filter the pseudo prompts until the prompt group meet the privacy guarantee, which will be introduced in details in 3.2.
- (4) Communication with cloud server. Here, the user sends the prompt group to the server for the usage of large LM on the cloud, while the server subsequently sends back the response group to the

user. During this process, we expect that it will be extremely hard for the server to infer the original user prompt according to the prompt group, therefore safeguarding user’s privacy.

(5) Retrieval of interested response. Since the user itself is aware of which sub-prompts are genuine, it can seamlessly retrieve the corresponding sub-responses and discard the responses of pseudo prompts.

(6) Recomposition of sub-responses. Here, we introduce a recomposer  $G_r : \mathcal{V}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{V}^*$  that maps a sequence of sub-prompt-response pairs to a final response.




Figure 1: Overview of ConfusionPrompt. (1) Decomposition of the original prompt into sub-prompts. (2) Generation of pseudo prompts. (3) Querying online LLMs to get the sub-responses and retrieving the interested sub-responses. (4) Recomposition of sub-responses to obtain the final response.

### 3.2 Privacy Model

Here, we define a  $(\lambda, \mu, \rho)$ -privacy model to formulate the requirements that the group of pseudo prompts should satisfy for privacy protection, which offers guidance for the evaluation of privacy level and training of models (i.e., decomposer, generator, and recomposer) (i) The fabricated attributes in the pseudo prompt should be semantically irrelevant to the original attributes in genuine prompt, so that the genuine user information can be effectively obfuscated [51]. (ii) The genuine prompt should be obfuscated by sufficient pseudo prompts, and the attacker can not easily identify the real prompt from the combination pattern even with background knowledge. (iii) The pseudo prompt should appear genuine rather than obviously fabricated. Thus it’s crucial to maintain the fluency and reasonability of the pseudo prompts.

In the following, we first give the definitions of private attributes and their semantic relevance.

**Definition 3.1** (Private Attributes). Denote  $\mathcal{U}$  as the attribute space, and  $\mathcal{P}$  as the prompt space. Given a sub-prompt list  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}$ , the contained private attributes are denoted as  $U(\mathbf{p}) = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_m\}$  for  $m$  attributes.

*Remark 3.2.* For conciseness, the prompt in definition 3.1 could be a full prompt  $p$ , or a sequence of decomposed prompts with the same intention  $\mathbf{p} = [p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{|\mathbf{p}|}]$ .

The private attributes encompass a range of elements, including verbs, adjectives, and nouns, which extend beyond personally identifiable information (PIIs). Next, we define the semantic similarity between two private attributes.

**Definition 3.3** (Attribute-attribute Similarity). Given two attributes  $u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{U}$ , an attribute similarity function measures the semantic similarity between  $u_1$  and  $u_2$ :  $\text{Sim}(u_1, u_2) : \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

For a pair of genuine and pseudo prompts, we define the correspondent attributes as followed:

**Definition 3.4** (Correspondent Attributes). Given two prompts  $\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2 \in \mathcal{P}$ , the correspondent attribute of  $u_i \in U(\mathbf{p}_1)$  in  $\mathbf{p}_2$ , is defined as the attribute at the same syntactic position of  $\mathbf{p}_2$ , denoted by  $\text{Corr}(u_i, \mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2)$ .

*Remark 3.5.* The definition assumes that: (1)  $\mathbf{p}_1$  and  $\mathbf{p}_2$  have the same syntactic structure; (2) if  $u_i$  occurs in  $\mathbf{p}_1$  multiple times, the correspondent locations in  $\mathbf{p}_2$  return the same attribute.

For example, given the original question ‘What are the responsibilities of software engineers?’ and private attribute ‘software engineer’, the correspondent attribute in the fake question ‘What are the responsibilities of school teachers?’ would be ‘school teacher’. Based on the correspondent attributes and attribute-attribute similarity, we can define the semantic similarity between two prompts below:

**Definition 3.6** (Prompt-prompt Similarity). Given two prompts  $\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2 \in \mathcal{P}$ , their similarity can be defined by the similarity between each pair of correspondence attributes:

$$\text{Sim}(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2) = \max_{u_i \in U(\mathbf{p}_1)} \text{Sim}(u_i, \text{Corr}(u_i, \mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2)) \quad (1)$$

We proceed to the definition of significance of an attribute, which is tied to the likelihood of a curious server being able to identify the genuine attribute from a group of genuine and pseudo prompts.

**Definition 3.7** (Significance of Single Attribute). Denote  $\mathbb{P} = \{\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2, \dots, \mathbf{p}_n\}$  as a group of prompts. The significance of an attribute  $u \in U(\mathbf{p}_i)$  related to a group of prompts  $\mathbb{P}$  is defined as:

$$\text{Sig}(u, \mathbb{P}) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n H(u, \mathbf{p}_i, \mathbf{p}_j)}{n}, \quad (2)$$

where:

$$H(u, \mathbf{p}_i, \mathbf{p}_j) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{Corr}(u, \mathbf{p}_i, \mathbf{p}_j) = u \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad (3)$$

In our setting, the group of prompts consists of one genuine prompt along with a collection of pseudo prompts. The significance of a true attribute can be considered as the proportion of its occurrence within the group of prompts. In the following, we provide the definition of significance for multiple attributes.

**Definition 3.8** (Significance of Attribute Set). Suppose  $\mathbf{p}_0$  denotes the genuine prompt. The significance of attribute set  $U(\mathbf{p}_i)$  related to a group of prompts  $\mathbb{P} = \{\mathbf{p}_0, \mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_n\}$  is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Sig}(U(\mathbf{p}_0), \mathbb{P}) \\ &= \max_{u_k} \max_h \max_{\mathcal{V}} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \bar{H}(\mathcal{V}, p_{0h}, p_{jh})}{\sum_{j=1}^n \bar{H}(\mathcal{V} \setminus u_k, p_{0h}, p_{jh})} \\ & \text{s.t. } u_k \in \mathcal{V} \subseteq U(p_{0h}), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where:

$$\bar{H}(\mathcal{V}, p_{0h}, p_{jh}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{Corr}(u, p_{0h}, p_{jh}) = u \forall u \in \mathcal{V} \\ & \text{or } \mathcal{V} = \emptyset \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad (5)$$

$p_{ih}$  is the  $h$ -th decomposed sub-prompt in the  $i$ -th prompt. In case that the attacker have prior knowledge of some private attributes, we introduce a notation  $\mathcal{V}$  as a subset of private attributes in  $p_{0h}$ . Then we consider the proportion of a given attribute conditioning on any possible set of private attributes to bound the possibility of correctly identify the target attribute with some background knowledge. Now, we provide the definition of genuineness for the third criterion:

**Definition 3.9** (Genuineness). Denote  $D : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as a function to discriminate between fabricated and genuine prompts. A larger value returned by  $D$  indicates a higher likelihood of a prompt being genuine. The genuineness of a prompt  $p \in \mathcal{P}$  can be defined as  $\text{Genu}(p) = D(p)$ .

Based on definition 3.6, 3.8, and 3.9, we can formulate our proposed  $(\lambda, \mu, \rho)$ -privacy model as:

**Definition 3.10** (User Privacy). Let  $\mathbb{P} = \{\mathbf{p}_0, \mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_n\}$  be a group of prompts, where  $\mathbf{p}_0$  is the genuine user prompt and the remaining ones are pseudo prompts. If  $\mathbb{P}$  satisfies the following requirements, then it is deemed that it can ensure  $(\lambda, \mu, \rho)$ -privacy of user prompt  $\mathbf{p}_0$  with respect to discriminator  $D$ :

- Each pseudo prompt should be semantically irrelevant to user prompt  $\mathbf{p}_0$ , i.e.,  $\forall i \in [1, n]$ ,  $\text{Sim}(\mathbf{p}_0, \mathbf{p}_i) \leq \lambda$ .
- The users' sensitive attributes should be obfuscated by sufficient pseudo prompts, i.e.,  $\text{Sig}(U(\mathbf{p}_0), \mathbb{P}) \leq \mu$ .
- Each pseudo prompt should not be classified as fabricated prompt by discriminator  $D$ , i.e.,  $\forall i \in [1, n]$ ,  $\text{Genu}(p_i) = D(p_i) \geq \rho$ .

In Appendix C, we provide the relationship between our privacy model and the upper bound on the success rate of inference attacks, which states that an curious server can do no better than random guessing if the combination of attributes are uniformly distributed.

## 4 ConfusionPrompt: User-Side Models

Following the overall design and the requirements in privacy model, this section introduces how to enable ConfusionPrompt from the perspective of designing user-side models, including decomposer, generator, and recomposer.

### 4.1 Decomposer

A decomposer is designed to decompose an original user prompt into several sub-prompts, such that the required number of pseudo prompts to ensure the same level of privacy preservation can be significantly reduced. In the following, we theoretically demonstrate the benefit of a local decompose module in terms of complexity measured by the number of required pseudo prompts.

#### 4.1.1 Complexity Analysis

We first show the complexity for single-paragraph prompt, that is, the prompt is not decomposed.

**Theorem 4.1** (Complexity for Single Paragraph). *Let  $\mathbb{P} = \{\mathbf{p}_0, \mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_n\}$  be a group of prompts, where  $\mathbf{p}_0$  is the genuine user prompt and the remaining ones are dummy prompts. Suppose each prompt in the group represents a single paragraph  $|p_i| = 1, \forall i \in [1, n]$ . To achieve  $(\lambda, \mu, \rho)$ -privacy, it requires that*

$$n \geq \left(\frac{1}{\mu}\right)^{|U(\mathbf{p}_0)|}. \quad (6)$$

Accordingly, we provide the following complexity analysis for decomposed prompts, which are a key component in our ConfusionPrompt.

**Theorem 4.2** (Complexity for Decomposed Prompt). *Let  $\mathbb{P} = \{\mathbf{p}_0, \mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_n\}$  be a group of prompts, where  $\mathbf{p}_0$  is the user prompt and the remaining ones are dummy prompts. Suppose each prompt in the group represents a sequence of decomposed prompt with the same intention  $\mathbf{p}_i = [p_{i1}, p_{i2}, \dots, p_{il}]$ ,  $\forall i \in [1, n]$ . To achieve  $(\lambda, \mu, \rho)$ -privacy, it requires that*

$$n \geq \sum_{j=1}^l \left(\frac{1}{\mu}\right)^{|U(p_{0j})|} \quad (7)$$

*Specifically, if  $|U(\mathbf{p}_0)| = l$  and  $|U(p_{0j})| = 1, \forall j \in [1, l]$ , then*

$$n \geq \frac{|U(\mathbf{p}_0)|}{\mu} \quad (8)$$

Theorem 4.1 and 4.2 compares the complexities between single prompt and decomposed sub-prompt, where the proof is deferred to appendix B. In the ideal scenario, the complexity can be reduced to  $\mathcal{O}(|U(\mathbf{p}_0)|/\mu)$  after decomposition. See Figure 4 for intuitive explanation.

#### 4.1.2 Requirements of Ideal Decomposer

Now, we can articulate the criteria for an ideal decomposer:

- (1) A fundamental requirement for the decomposition process is to follow the collectively exhaustive principle [41]. In other words, the collection of responses to decomposed prompt should recover the whole response.
- (2) An ideal decomposer would optimize the complexity, i.e., the required number of pseudo prompts, in two aspects: (i) each sub-prompt contain as few attributes as possible; (ii) each attribute appears in as few prompts as possible.

#### 4.1.3 Model Training

Following the spirit of Reinforcement Learning from Human/AI Feedback (RLHF/RLAIF) [8, 25], we train a decomposer that optimizes the aforementioned two objectives simultaneously. For training efficiency and stability, the reward model training and reinforcement learning stages are replaced with

Direct Preference Optimization (DPO), which directly optimizes a model on the preference data [38]. Therefore, the training procedure of decomposer is as follows:

**Supervised fine-tuning (SFT):** We finetune a pretrained language model (LM) on demonstration data for decomposition task, where the LM is trained to decompose given a full prompt.

**Preference data construction:** We use the SFT model to generate various decompositions given a full prompt  $p$  to generate a various decompositions  $(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_l) \sim \pi_{\text{SFT}}(\cdot|p)$ . The comparison data considering the two requirements/dimensions are collected by either human labelers or AI feedback, following the rules in appendix D.1.

**DPO optimization:** Given a full prompt  $p$ , we denote  $p_w$  and  $p_d$  as the preferred and dispreferred decomposition. Then the optimization objective is formulated as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{DPO}}(\pi_\theta; \pi_{\text{SFT}}) = -\mathbb{E}_{(p, p_w, p_d)} \left[ \log \sigma \left( \beta \log \frac{\pi_\theta(p_w|p)}{\pi_{\text{SFT}}(p_w|p)} - \beta \log \frac{\pi_\theta(p_d|p)}{\pi_{\text{SFT}}(p_d|p)} \right) \right] \quad (9)$$

where  $\sigma$  is the logistic function,  $\beta$  is a hyperparameter controlling the deviation from SFT model, and  $\theta$  is the model parameters to optimize.

## 4.2 Generator

Generator takes an genuine prompt  $p$  and its private attributes  $U(p)$  as input and produces a pseudo prompt  $p'$  with replaced attributes. The generator will be run for multiple times to obtain a series of pseudo prompts for each genuine prompt.

**Requirements.** The requirements for a pseudo prompt suggest the following criteria for an ideal generator: (1) The generator should produce pseudo prompt with fake information that’s semantically irrelevant to the correspondent attributes in genuine prompt. (2) The pseudo prompt should not be classified as fabricated prompt by a strong discriminator  $D$ .

**Model training.** The generator is trained using a similar procedure described in Section 4.1.3: (i) SFT: fine-tune a pretrained LM using demonstration data for replacement task, where the LM is trained to generate new prompt with replaced attributes. (ii) Preference data construction: collect comparison data considering both semantic relevance and genuineness; see details in appendix D.2). (iii) DPO optimization: optimize the model on the comparison data.

## 4.3 Recomposer

The local re-composition LM combines the retrieved sub-prompts and sub-responses to produce the final whole response. We train a local recomposer on a collection of demonstration data with supervise learning. Specifically, given a complete prompt  $p$  and a set of sub-prompt-response pairs  $((p_1, r_1), \dots, (p_k, r_k))$ , the recomposer  $G_r$  is trained to maximize  $\log p_{G_r}(r|p, (p_1, r_1), \dots, (p_k, r_k))$  where  $r$  is the final response.

## 4.4 Algorithm

Algorithm 1 outlines the procedure for our private inference framework ConfusionPrompt. The client starts with decomposing the full prompt into sub-prompts, and generate a collection of qualified fake prompts that meets the privacy requirement. It can be derived immediately from the algorithm that our protocol guarantees  $(\lambda, \mu, \rho)$ -privacy.

# 5 Experiment

## 5.1 Experiment Setup

We evaluate our framework on two multi-hop reasoning datasets: StrategyQA [17] and MuSiQue [47]. We consider ConfusionPrompt with different online LLMs including GPT-4, GPT-4-Turbo, and GPT-4o [34]. We consider the privacy budget  $\lambda \in [0.5, 0.8]$ ,  $1/\mu \in [5, 50]$ , and  $\rho \in [1, 4]$  unless specified. Refer to appendix F.2 for the training of decomposer, generator, and recomposer.




Figure 2: Prompt identification attack accuracy under various combinations of privacy parameters.

## 5.2 Empirical Privacy Evaluation

We simulate two types of inference attacks to investigate the privacy protection level under various combinations of privacy parameters.

**Prompt Identification Attack:** an attack that identifies the true query from a group of fake and true prompts. Denote  $\mathbf{q} = [q_1 || q_2 || \dots || q_n]$  as the concatenated group of queries, and  $k$  as the index for the true query. We finetune a BART-large classification model  $G_{PIA}$  to predict the index of the true query  $\hat{k} = G_{PIA}(\mathbf{q})$ .

**Attribute Inference Attack:** an attack that infers the sensitive features of records from either a group of prompts, or differentially privatized inputs. We rely on the twitter text dataset [49] to predict the gender based on the user’s review.

Noted that prompt identification attack is specifically designed for our framework, and attribute inference attack can be applied to both ConfusionPrompt and DP-based methods.

## 5.3 Experiment Results

### 5.3.1 Privacy Experiments

Figure 2 visualizes the attack accuracy for prompt identification attack under various combinations of significance  $\mu$ , genuineness  $\rho$ , similarity  $\lambda$ . It can be observed that: (1) decreasing significance  $\mu$  consistently reduces the attack accuracy. (1) As the genuineness threshold  $\rho$  increases from 1 to 4, the attack accuracy approaches that of random guessing. The result reveals that it becomes harder for the attacker to distinguish the true query as the fake prompts become more fluent. (3) There’s no clear relationship between the attack accuracy and similarity threshold  $\lambda$ . Such privacy parameter could be more related to the attribute inference attack discussed later.

The results of attribute inference attack are detailed in F.4. A key observation is that when  $1/\mu \geq 15$ , the attack accuracies for ConfusionPrompt decrease to a plateau and is similar to that of Text2Text with  $\epsilon \leq 1$ .

### 5.3.2 Utility Evaluation

For StrategyQA, we report the accuracy scores (ACC) and area under the roc curve (AUC) to assess the the classification task. For MuSiQue, we report the F1 score, ROUGE-L, and exact matching (EM) to evaluate the question answering task [52]. We benchmark our framework with  $\mu = 15$ ,  $\rho = 4$ , and  $\lambda = 0.5$  against five baseline methods: (1) a local Llama2 [46] model with 7B parameters; (2) a local Vicuna [7] model with 13B parameters; (3) Text-to-text privatization (Text2Text) [16], where the query is privatized with LDP by replacing each word with the perturbed token embeddings; (4) Paraphraser [48, 33] that paraphrases the prompt with LDP mechanism using a language model; (5) querying online GPTs with no privacy protection. In the former two methods, the user downloads the open-source models and directly extract the final response from the model. In methods (3) and (4), the queries are privatized with LDP privacy budget  $\epsilon = 10$  before transmission to the server. For the final approach, the complete prompt is transmitted to the service provider without any confusion strategy.

The results are reported in Table 1. From the results, we see that (1) online proprietary models outperform open-source models by over 11% and 24%, respectively, for StrategyQA and MuSiQue, indicating the strong motivation for users to use online service while preserving privacy. (2) Confu-



Table 1: Utility comparisons between our proposed ConfusionPrompt and baselines. Confusion-Prompt strikes the best balance between privacy preservation and utility.

METHOD	PRIVACY PROTECTION	STRATEGYQA		F1	MUSIQUE	
		ACC	AUC		ROUGH	EM
LLAMA2-7B	YES	0.602	0.581	0.484	0.485	0.321
VICUNA-13B	YES	0.646	0.628	0.417	0.416	0.225
TEXT2TEXT (GPT-3.5-TURBO)	YES	0.528	0.496	0.019	0.019	0.010
TEXT2TEXT (GPT-4-TURBO)	YES	0.537	0.506	0.028	0.027	0.014
TEXT2TEXT (GPT-4O)	YES	0.533	0.500	0.021	0.020	0.012
PARAPHRASER (GPT-3.5-TURBO)	YES	0.489	0.478	0.076	0.076	0.028
PARAPHRASER (GPT-4-TURBO)	YES	0.546	0.523	0.060	0.061	0.026
PARAPHRASER (GPT-4O)	YES	0.537	0.515	0.072	0.072	0.038
GPT-3.5-TURBO	NO	0.751	0.737	0.604	0.605	0.439
GPT-4-TURBO	NO	0.803	0.798	0.663	0.664	0.503
GPT-4O	NO	0.791	0.784	0.721	0.721	0.557
<b>CONFUSIONPROMPT (GPT-3.5-TURBO)</b>	YES	0.723	0.726	0.606	0.605	0.445
<b>CONFUSIONPROMPT (GPT-4-TURBO)</b>	YES	0.741	0.743	0.633	0.634	0.495
<b>CONFUSIONPROMPT (GPT-4O)</b>	YES	0.733	0.739	0.685	0.684	0.535




Figure 3: Monetary ratio of strategyQA and MuSiQue dataset before (*decomp*) and after (*w/o decomp*) decomposition under various privacy budget  $\mu$ . Decomposition in ConfusionPrompt significantly reduces the monetary cost, indicating its efficiency.

sionPrompt based on various online models consistently and significantly outperforms LDP-based methods, showing the effectiveness of our proposed method. Notably, our framework possesses a distinct advantage over perturbation-based methods: increasing the privacy budget does not adversely affect performance since the true queries are always provided to the server.

### 5.3.3 Decomposition Benefits

Theorem 4.1 and 4.2 show that the decomposition module could reduce the number of pseudo prompts required to be sent to the server. In this section, we empirically demonstrate practical benefits by analyzing the monetary cost of our ConfusionPrompt framework. In particular, we compute the monetary ratio, the ratio of the monetary cost for using ConfusionPrompt compared to the direct query method, both before and after the application of the decomposition module.

Figure 3 presents the query cost benefits achieved through our decomposition module. It can be observed that the complexity gains become increasingly pronounced as the level of privacy protection increases. This can be attributed to the fact that the complexity experiences polynomial growth before decomposition, whereas it exhibits approximate linearity after decomposition. Our protocol offer substantial savings ranging from an average reduction of  $1.9\times$  at  $\mu = 1/10$  to an average reduction of  $18.3\times$  at  $\mu = 1/50$ .

We evaluate generation on longer attributes, memory cost of local models, the performance of the discriminator  $D$  that verifies the genuineness, and pseudo prompt generation cost (see Appendix F.5, F.7, F.8, and F.9).

## 6 Conclusion

This paper proposes a private inference framework over online LLMs, termed ConfusionPrompt. We deploy three local models on the user side: (i) decomposer that maps an original prompt to a sequence of sub-prompts, (ii) generator that produces pseudo prompts by replacing private attributes in the genuine sub-prompts, (iii) recomposer that maps the decomposed prompt-response pairs from the cloud service to the final response. Such designs endows our framework with advantages over previous protocols that: (i) it can be seamlessly integrated with existing black-box LLMs while the service providers have no need to modify their already-built framework, and (ii) it achieves better privacy-utility trade-off than existing privatization methods. We develop a  $(\lambda, \mu, \rho)$ -privacy model to formulate the requirement for a privacy-preserving group of prompts, and accordingly provide a complexity analysis to demonstrate the benefits of the decomposition module. Experiments show that our ConfusionPrompt significantly outperforms the inference with local open-sourced LLMs in terms of utility and computation cost.

## References

- [1] Abbas Acar et al. “A survey on homomorphic encryption schemes: Theory and implementation”. In: *ACM Computing Surveys (Csur)* 51.4 (2018), pp. 1–35.
- [2] Alan Akbik et al. “FLAIR: An easy-to-use framework for state-of-the-art NLP”. In: *Proceedings of the 2019 conference of the North American chapter of the association for computational linguistics (demonstrations)*. 2019, pp. 54–59.
- [3] Balamurugan Anandan et al. “t-Plausibility: Generalizing words to desensitize text.” In: *Trans. Data Priv.* 5.3 (2012), pp. 505–534.
- [4] Tom Brown et al. “Language models are few-shot learners”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), pp. 1877–1901.
- [5] Tianyu Chen et al. “The-x: Privacy-preserving transformer inference with homomorphic encryption”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.00216* (2022).
- [6] Yu Chen et al. “Hide and Seek (HaS): A Lightweight Framework for Prompt Privacy Protection”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.03057* (2023).
- [7] Wei-Lin Chiang et al. “Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%\* chatgpt quality”. In: *See <https://vicuna.lmsys.org> (accessed 14 April 2023)* (2023).
- [8] Paul F Christiano et al. “Deep reinforcement learning from human preferences”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [9] Hyung Won Chung et al. “Scaling instruction-finetuned language models”. In: *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 25.70 (2024), pp. 1–53.
- [10] Ronald Cramer, Ivan Bjerre Damgård, et al. *Secure multiparty computation*. Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- [11] Minxin Du et al. “DP-Forward: Fine-tuning and inference on language models with differential privacy in forward pass”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.06746* (2023).
- [12] Dheeru Dua et al. “DROP: A Reading Comprehension Benchmark Requiring Discrete Reasoning Over Paragraphs”. In: *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*. 2019, pp. 2368–2378.
- [13] Haonan Duan et al. *Flocks of Stochastic Parrots: Differentially Private Prompt Learning for Large Language Models*. 2023. arXiv: 2305.15594 [cs.LG].
- [14] Cynthia Dwork. “Differential privacy”. In: *International colloquium on automata, languages, and programming*. Springer. 2006, pp. 1–12.
- [15] Maud Ehrmann et al. “Named entity recognition and classification in historical documents: A survey”. In: *ACM Computing Surveys* 56.2 (2023), pp. 1–47.
- [16] Oluwaseyi Feyisetan et al. “Privacy-and utility-preserving textual analysis via calibrated multivariate perturbations”. In: *Proceedings of the 13th international conference on web search and data mining*. 2020, pp. 178–186.
- [17] Mor Geva et al. “Did aristotle use a laptop? a question answering benchmark with implicit reasoning strategies”. In: *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 9 (2021), pp. 346–361.

- [18] Ran Gilad-Bachrach et al. “Cryptonets: Applying neural networks to encrypted data with high throughput and accuracy”. In: *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR. 2016, pp. 201–210.
- [19] Meng Hao et al. “Iron: Private inference on transformers”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), pp. 15718–15731.
- [20] Siyuan Huang et al. “Instruct2Act: Mapping Multi-modality Instructions to Robotic Actions with Large Language Model”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.11176* (2023).
- [21] Zhigang Kan et al. “Protecting User Privacy in Remote Conversational Systems: A Privacy-Preserving framework based on text sanitization”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.08223* (2023).
- [22] Gopichand Kanumolu et al. “Unsupervised Approach to Evaluate Sentence-Level Fluency: Do We Really Need Reference?” In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.01500* (2023).
- [23] Gavin Kerrigan, Dylan Slack, and Jens Tuyls. “Differentially private language models benefit from public pre-training”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.05886* (2020).
- [24] Guillaume Lample et al. “Neural architectures for named entity recognition”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.01360* (2016).
- [25] Harrison Lee et al. “Rlaif: Scaling reinforcement learning from human feedback with ai feedback”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.00267* (2023).
- [26] Mike Lewis et al. “BART: Denoising Sequence-to-Sequence Pre-training for Natural Language Generation, Translation, and Comprehension”. In: *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. 2020, pp. 7871–7880.
- [27] Yansong Li, Zhixing Tan, and Yang Liu. *Privacy-Preserving Prompt Tuning for Large Language Model Services*. 2023. arXiv: 2305.06212 [cs.CL].
- [28] Xuanqi Liu and Zhuotao Liu. “LLMs Can Understand Encrypted Prompt: Towards Privacy-Computing Friendly Transformers”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18396* (2023).
- [29] Yinhan Liu et al. “Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692* (2019).
- [30] Lingjuan Lyu, Xuanli He, and Yitong Li. “Differentially Private Representation for NLP: Formal Guarantee and An Empirical Study on Privacy and Fairness”. In: *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*. 2020, pp. 2355–2365.
- [31] Peihua Mai et al. “Split-and-Denoise: Protect large language model inference with local differential privacy”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.09130* (2023).
- [32] Mohammad Malekzadeh and Fahim Kawsar. “Salted Inference: Enhancing Privacy while Maintaining Efficiency of Split Inference in Mobile Computing”. In: *Proceedings of the 25th International Workshop on Mobile Computing Systems and Applications*. 2024, pp. 14–20.
- [33] Justus Mattern, Benjamin Weggenmann, and Florian Kerschbaum. “The Limits of Word Level Differential Privacy”. In: *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022*. 2022, pp. 867–881.
- [34] OpenAI. “GPT-4 Technical Report”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774* (2023).
- [35] Long Ouyang et al. “Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), pp. 27730–27744.
- [36] Kishore Papineni et al. “Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation”. In: *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. 2002, pp. 311–318.
- [37] Chen Qu et al. “Natural language understanding with privacy-preserving bert”. In: *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*. 2021, pp. 1488–1497.
- [38] Rafael Rafailov et al. “Direct Preference Optimization: Your Language Model is Secretly a Reward Model”. In: *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*. 2023. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.18290>.
- [39] Colin Raffel et al. “Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer”. In: *Journal of machine learning research* 21.140 (2020), pp. 1–67.
- [40] Pranav Rajpurkar et al. “SQuAD: 100,000+ Questions for Machine Comprehension of Text”. In: *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 2016, pp. 2383–2392.
- [41] Ethan M Rasiel. *The McKinsey Way*. McGraw-Hill New York, 1999.

- [42] Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. “Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.10084* (2019).
- [43] Baptiste Roziere et al. “Code llama: Open foundation models for code”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950* (2023).
- [44] Bhargav Srinivasa-Desikan. *Natural Language Processing and Computational Linguistics: A practical guide to text analysis with Python, Gensim, spaCy, and Keras*. Packt Publishing Ltd, 2018.
- [45] Arun James Thirunavukarasu et al. “Large language models in medicine”. In: *Nature medicine* 29.8 (2023), pp. 1930–1940.
- [46] Hugo Touvron et al. “Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288* (2023).
- [47] Harsh Trivedi et al. “MuSiQue: Multihop Questions via Single-hop Question Composition”. In: *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 10 (2022), pp. 539–554.
- [48] Saiteja Utpala, Sara Hooker, and Pin Yu Chen. “Locally differentially private document generation using zero shot prompting”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.16111* (2023).
- [49] Pradeep Vashisth and Kevin Meehan. “Gender classification using twitter text data”. In: *2020 31st Irish Signals and Systems Conference (ISSC)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [50] Shijie Wu et al. “Bloomberggpt: A large language model for finance”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17564* (2023).
- [51] Zongda Wu et al. “Constructing plausible innocuous pseudo queries to protect user query intention”. In: *Information Sciences* 325 (2015), pp. 215–226.
- [52] Zhilin Yang et al. “HotpotQA: A dataset for diverse, explainable multi-hop question answering”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.09600* (2018).
- [53] Da Yu et al. “Differentially private fine-tuning of language models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.06500* (2021).

## A Decomposition Example

Figure 4 presents an example demonstrating the decomposition benefits.




Figure 4: Example of decomposition savings in query complexity. Decomposition module reduces the query complexity from 9 to 6 under privacy budget  $\mu = 3$ .

## B Proof of Theorem 4.1 and 4.2

We begin with the proof for Theorem 4.1 as followed:

*Proof.* For the prompt with single paragraph, the significance can be represented as:

$$\text{Sig}(U(p_0), \mathbb{P}) = \max_{u_k} \max_{\mathcal{V}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{H}(\mathcal{V}, p_0, p_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{H}(\mathcal{V} \setminus u_k, p_0, p_i)} \quad (10)$$

s.t.  $u_k \in \mathcal{V} \subseteq U(p_0)$

, where  $p_0$  is the genuine prompt, and  $p_i$  is the  $i^{\text{th}}$  prompt in the prompt group, and:

$$\bar{H}(\mathcal{V}, p_0, p_i) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{Corr}(u, p_0, p_i) = u \ \forall u \in \mathcal{V} \\ & \text{or } \mathcal{V} = \emptyset \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

For  $\text{Sig}(U(p_0), \mathbb{P}) = \mu$ , it's obvious that there should be at least  $1/\mu$  distinct values, including genuine and fake values, assigned to each attributes. Otherwise suppose  $u_k$  have less than  $1/\mu$  distinct values, we would have:

$$\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{|\mathbb{P}|} H(u_k, p_0, p_j)}{|\mathbb{P}|} > \mu \quad (12)$$

which violates the expression 10.

Next, we claim that each possible combination of attribute set values must appear at least once within the prompt group. To proof by contradiction, let's suppose that there is one combination missing in the group while the others appear once. Then we can consider two cases:

(a) The missing combination doesn't contain any true values. Then the significance of other single attribute must be larger than  $\mu$ . This is because for a set containing all combinations, the proportion of the occurrence for each attribute is exactly  $\mu$ . Therefore, such removal would make their significance smaller.

(b) The missing combination contain a subset of true values  $\mathcal{V} \subseteq U(p_0)$ . Then conditioning on the subset  $\mathcal{V}$ , the proportion of any other single attribute would be over  $\mu$ , as their original proportion is  $\mu$ . Therefore, for any  $u_k \notin \mathcal{V}$ , it holds that:

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{H}(\mathcal{V} \cup u_k, p_0, p_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{H}(\mathcal{V}, p_0, p_i)} > \mu \quad (13)$$

which violates the expression 10.

To make each combination occur at least once, we should have at least  $(1/\mu)^{|U(p_0)|}$  prompts in the group.  $\square$

Following that, we can proceed to the proof for Theorem 4.2:

*Proof.* Let  $\mu = \text{Sig}(U(p_0), \mathbb{P})$  denotes the significance. According to Theorem 4.1, for each sub-query  $p_{0h} \in \mathbf{p}_0$ , we should have at least  $(1/\mu)^{\|U(p_{0h})\|}$  prompts to satisfy:

$$\max_{u_k} \max_{\mathcal{V}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{H}(\mathcal{V}, p_{0h}, p_{ih})}{\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{H}(\mathcal{V} \setminus u_k, p_{0h}, p_{ih})} \leq \mu \quad \text{s.t. } u_k \in \mathcal{V} \subseteq U(p_{0h}) \quad (14)$$

Then the proof completes by summing up the number of prompts over all sub-queries.  $\square$

## C Bound on Inference Attack

In this section, we consider the attacker identify the target attribute by prior knowledge of other attributes and the combination pattern of attribute values. The following theorem states that an curious server can do no better than random guessing if the combination of values are uniformly distributed:

**Lemma C.1.** *Suppose the attacker is guessing the attributes from attribute combination pattern in  $\mathbb{P}$ . The attacker can do no more better than random guessing if the following condition is satisfied:*

- *Each combination of attribute set has the same occurrence times in the prompt groups  $\mathbb{P}$ , i.e., the combinations are uniformly distributed.*

From the proof of Theorem 4.1 and 4.2, we can construct a uniformly distributed prompt group under the optimal number of prompts. Therefore, we can turn to the success rate under an random guessing attack, which is bounded by Lemma C.2.

**Lemma C.2.** *Given a group of prompts  $\mathbb{P} = \{\mathbf{p}_0, \mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_n\}$  with  $(\lambda, \mu, \rho)$ -privacy, suppose that the attacker have prior knowledge about the attribute subset  $\mathcal{V} \subseteq U(\mathbf{p}_0)$ . By random guessing, the probability of correctly identifying any target attribute  $u \in U(\mathbf{p}_0) \wedge u \notin \mathcal{V}$  is upper bounded by  $\mu$ .*

*Proof.* According to Definition 3.8, it holds that:

$$\frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \bar{H}(\mathcal{V}, p_{0h}, p_{jh})}{\sum_{j=1}^n \bar{H}(\mathcal{V} \setminus u, p_{0h}, p_{jh})} \leq \mu \quad (15)$$

for any  $h$  and  $u$ . In other words, the proportion of any attribute  $u$  conditioning on the prior knowledge attribute set  $\mathcal{V}$  is upper bounded by  $\mu$ . Therefore, by random guessing, the probability of correctly identifying any target attribute  $u$  is upper bounded by  $\mu$ .  $\square$

## D Ranking Rules in Preference Sampling

### D.1 Decomposer

We rank the decompositions with the following steps:

- Identify whether or not each decomposition satisfies the MECE principle.
- Compute the complexity of each decompositon under a given  $\mu$ .
- Rank the responses using the following rules: (i) Decompositions that adhere to the MECEprinciple should be ranked higher than those that do not follow the principle. (ii) If two decompositions both follow or do not follow the MECE principle, the one with lower complexity is preferred.

## D.2 Generator

To rank the pseudo prompts, we take the steps below:

- Compute  $s$ , the similarity between the pseudo and original prompt.
- Compute  $f$ , the genuineness score for the pseudo prompt.
- Calculate the overall score  $\beta f - s$ , where  $\beta$  is the hyperparameter controlling the weight of the genuineness score.
- Rank the responses with the overall score, with a higher score indicating a higher preference.

## E Algorithm

In this section we present the algorithm of ConfusionPrompt in 1.

---

**Algorithm 1** ConfusionPrompt

---

- 1: **Input:** Original prompt  $p$ , privacy parameters  $\lambda$ ,  $\mu$ , and  $\rho$ .
  - 2: **Output:** Final response  $r$ .
  - 3: User decomposes the original prompt into sub-tasks  $\mathbf{p}_0 = G_d(p)$ .
  - 4: **for**  $h \in [|\mathbf{p}_0|]$  **do**
  - 5:   User keeps sampling from the generator until there are  $n$  distinct pseudo prompts with  $n$  given by eq. (7), where each one  $1 \leq i \leq n$  has prompt similarity  $\text{Sim}(p_{0h}, p_{ih}) \leq \lambda$  and genuineness score  $\text{Genu}(p_{ih}) \geq \rho$ .
  - 6: **end for**
  - 7: User sends the group of genuine and pseudo prompts  $\mathbb{P} = \{\mathbf{p}_0, \mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_n\}$  to the server.
  - 8: Server returns a collection of responses  $(r_0, \dots, r_l)$ .
  - 9: User retrieves the response corresponding to the genuine prompt  $r_0$ .
  - 10: User obtains the final response  $r$  using the local recomposition model.
- 

## F Experiment

### F.1 Construction of Private Attributes

We extract the private attributes of StrategyQA and MuSiQue through the steps below:

- **Step 1: sample construction.** We adopt a semi-automated method to extract private attributes from each sample. Firstly, we extract the entities using a combination of two NER methods: Spacy [44] and Flair [2]. Then we manually correct and supplement the private attributes for each question.
- **Step 2: model finetuning.** An LLM is finetuned using the private attribute samples to guide the LLM output private attributes given a query.
- **Step 3: attribute extraction.** The remaining queries are fed into the finetuned LLM to generate private attributes.

During step 1, we label the private attributes according to the following guidelines:

- Identify the key components for a query, including but not limited to proper nouns, phrases, verbs, and adjectives.
- Ensure there is no overlapping information between different private attributes within the same query.
- Each private attribute should be as succinct as possible. For example, instead of labeling "spouse of the Green performer" as a single attribute, it is preferable to split it into "spouse" and "Green performer" as separate attributes.

The third point is to ensure privacy guarantee even when an attacker possesses prior knowledge of certain attributes. Table 2 provides several examples of private attributes.

Table 2: Examples of private attributes in StrategyQA and MuSiQue.

QUERY	PRIVATE ATTRIBUTES
Are <b>blue lips</b> normal?	blue lips, normal
Could <b>ten gallons</b> of <b>seawater</b> crush a <b>six year old</b> ?	seawater crush, ten gallons, six year old
Who is the <b>spouse</b> of the <b>Green</b> performer?	spouse, Green performer
What <b>instrument</b> is <b>played</b> by the person from <b>The Blackout All-Stars</b> ?	play instrument, The Blackout All-Stars
What is the <b>capital of the county</b> that <b>Pine Springs</b> is located in?	capital of the county, Pine Springs

Table 3: Comparison of various attribute extraction models. Finetuning GPT-3.5-turbo returns the highest accuracy.

METHOD	STRATEGYQA			MUSIQUE		
	F1	ROUGH	EM	F1	ROUGH	EM
GPT-4-TURBO	0.689	0.748	0.080	0.811	0.762	0.234
GPT-3.5-TURBO	<b>0.803</b>	<b>0.881</b>	<b>0.421</b>	<b>0.846</b>	<b>0.789</b>	<b>0.333</b>
BART-LARGE	0.713	0.690	0.227	0.664	0.634	0.118
T5-LARGE	0.603	0.595	0.102	0.381	0.383	0.010
FLAN-T5-LARGE	0.669	0.683	0.243	0.380	0.383	0.026

In step 2, we evaluate the generative quality of various LLMs on five models: i) GPT-4-Turbo with few-shot examples, ii) GPT-3.5-Turbo finetuned with 100 samples, iii) BART-large [26], iv) T5-large [39], and v) Flan-T5-Xlarge [9]. The latter three open-source models are finetuned with 1000 samples.

Table 3 presents the performance on a human-labeled test dataset. It can be observed that the finetuned version of GPT-3.5-turbo gives the best result, and thus it’s used as the attribute extraction model throughout our experiment.

## F.2 Training of local models

### F.2.1 Training of decomposer

The decomposition model is finetuned on a pretrained BART model [26] with 406M parameters. During SFT stage, we utilize the decomposition samples from StrategyQA and MuSiQue as demonstration data. Following that, we obtain preference data through the following steps: (i) extract the sub-answers using gpt-4-turbo and obtain the final answers using a recomposition model to judge whether the decomposition returns a correct answer; (ii) compute the complexity measured by the number of required pseudo prompts under  $\mu = 10$ .

During step (i), to address the recomposer’s limitations in determining the correctness of the final answer, we train a robust recomposition model by fine-tuning LLaMa2-7B. Note that during inference, we adopt a much smaller recomposition model for efficiency.

### F.2.2 Training of generator

The generator is finetuned on the BART-large model. To collect demonstration data for SFT, we prompt GPT-4-turbo to generate multiple pseudo prompts given the raw prompt and its private attributes using the following template.

Please replace the phrases **{ attributes }** in the each of the following sentences, such that each sentence is fluent and reasonable, and the alternative phrases have irrelevant meaning as **{ attributes }**.

Please return **{ # of replaces }** replacements for each sentence.

Strictly respond in the form of JSON with the following format: {"S1": ["replacement 1", "replacement 2", ...], "S2": ["replacement 1", "replacement 2", ...]}.

Sentences: **{ dictionary of sentences }**



For collecting preference data, we employ two models to evaluate the semantic similarity and genuineness, which involves a local similarity evaluation model and discriminator. (1) For similarity evaluation model: We adopt a fine-tuned version of MiniLM-6L model [42] to extract the embedding of each private attribute. The semantic relevance between a pair of attributes is given by the cosine similarity between their embeddings. (2) For discriminator, We leverage GPT-4-turbo to construct the training dataset for training a local discriminator. As the genuineness is closely related to the sentence’s fluency, we instruct GPT-4-turbo to evaluate the fluency for each sentence [22] (see detailed instruction in appendix F.3).

### F.2.3 Training of recomposer

The recombination model is finetuned on a pretrained RoBERTa [29] and BART-large [26] model, respectively, for strategyQA and MuSiQue. We utilizes the sub-prompts/responses given in StrategyQA and MuSiQue dataset as well as the final response to train a recombination model. To improve the performance of recomposor, we pretrain the model on two addition datasets, SQuAD [40] and DROP [12].

### F.3 Semantic Similarity Model and Discriminator

The comparison data collection for the generator involves a local similarity evaluation model and discriminator.

**Similarity evaluation model:** We adopt a finetuned version of MiniLM-6L model [42] to extract the embedding of each private attribute. The semantic relevance between a pair of attributes is given by the cosine similarity between their embeddings.

**Discriminator:** We leverage GPT-4 to construct the training dataset for training a local discriminator. As the genuineness is closely related to the sentence’s fluency, we prompt GPT-4 to evaluate the fluency for each sentence with the following template [22]:

Given multiple sentences, use the scoring rules below to score each sentence’s fluency on a scale of 1 to 4:

1. Score 1: Incomprehensible. Inarticulate/ non-fluent sentence.
2. Score 2: Low Quality. Partially fluent sentence: (a) only half of the sentence is fluent or (b) more than 1 missing words or (c) more than 1 misspelt words or d) contains individual fluent word-groups with missing coherence between them.
3. Score 3: Moderate. Sentence is predominantly fluent but contains either (a) misspelt word or (b) missing word or (c) multiple occurrence of a word.
4. Score 4: Perfect. Perfectly fluent sentence without any syntactic or grammatical error.

Strictly respond in the form of JSON with the following format: {"S1": the score, "S2": the score}.

Sentences: {dictionary of sentences }

On obtaining 4000 training and 700 validation samples, we finetune a Bert-base (110M parameters) to train a local discriminator.

### F.4 Results on Attribute Inference Attack

Figure 5 presents the attack accuracies of attribute inference attack for both ConfusionPrompt and LDP-based methods, from which we can make the following observations: (1) Paraphrase generally leads to higher attack accuracies compared to Text2text. This can be attributed to the fact that the semantic meanings of certain key words remain unchanged during the paraphrasing process. (2) The attack accuracies decrease to a plateau when  $1/\mu \geq 15$  or  $\epsilon \leq 1$ . This suggests that beyond these thresholds, further increasing the privacy protection measures does not significantly reduce the attack accuracy. (3) The attack accuracy for ConfusionPrompt with  $1/\mu \geq 15$  is similar to that of Text2Text with  $\epsilon \leq 1$ , indicating certain alignment for the privacy protection between LDP-based methods and



Figure 5: Attribute inference attack accuracy for ConfusionPrompt and LDP-based methods.

our framework. (4) Decreasing the similarity threshold  $\lambda$  helps to reduce the attribute inference attack accuracies.

## F.5 Generator for Longer Attributes

### F.5.1 Dataset Construction

To explore the generator’s ability on generating longer attributes, we craft a privacy dataset for ConfusionPrompt (PrivCP) with sensitive information from 7 categories. For each category, we utilized GPT-4 to generate 50 simulated user queries, manually inspecting and selecting 20 for necessary grammatical and semantic adjustments. Table 4 presents an example from each category and its associated risks.

Table 4: Sample Questions and Associated Risks for Each Category of PrivCP.

Type	N	Example Question	Potential Risks
Business	20	‘As a VP of marketing at MovieMagic, I am considering a shift in our advertising spend from TV to digital platforms. What are the key factors to consider?’	Reveal the strategic considerations of the company
Legal	20	‘I have a meeting with a client at Clark Legal Services in Boston who wants to create a trust. What are the different types of trusts available?’	Reveal the sensitive case details of a client
Health	20	‘My 3-year-old daughter, Emily, has just been diagnosed with a peanut allergy. How can I ensure she avoids peanuts at her daycare?’	Reveal the medical and personal info of family members
Career	20	‘I have worked as a civil engineer at AECOM for five years in Los Angeles. What certifications should I pursue for career advancement?’	Reveal the personal career experience and work location
Education	20	‘I am a parent evaluating private schools in Chicago for my 6-year-old son, Matthew. What are the key factors to consider in choosing a school with special needs support?’	Reveal the personal info and
Social	20	‘My company is hosting a corporate event at the Hilton in Las Vegas. How can I network effectively with potential clients?’	Reveal the location and purpose of the private business event
Personal	20	‘I am moving to a penthouse in Manhattan in July. How can I best use natural light in my home decor?’	Reveal the residential location, moving schedule and personal preference for decor

Table 5: Statistics of private attributes on three datasets. Avg. stands for average. PrivCP has longer attributes than the two standard datasets.

	AVG. # OF ATTRIBUTES	AVG. LENGTH OF ATTRIBUTES	AVG. ATTRIBUTE-TO-QUERY RATIO
STRATEGYQA	2.18	1.74	40.88%
MUSIQUE	2.82	2.72	43.20%
<b>PRIVCP</b>	2.52	6.75	73.80%

Table 6: Generation performance and parameter size of various language models.

	BLEU	FLUENCY SCORE	SIMILARITY SCORE	PARAMETER SIZE
BART-LARGE	0.345	2.9	<b>0.53</b>	406M
T5-LARGE	0.406	3.66	0.557	737M
FLAN-T5-LARGE	<b>0.428</b>	<b>3.7</b>	0.555	783M

In table 5, we summarize the statistic of private attribute for strategyQA, MuSiQue, and PrivCP in terms of three metrics: i) average number of private attributes per query, ii) average length of each attribute (measured by the number of words), and iii) average attribute-to-query ratio (measured by the percentage of attribute words in a query). It can be observed that PrivCP has much longer attributes than the two standard benchmarks.

### F.5.2 Generation Performance

The generation quality is evaluated with the following measures: i) BLEU [36] between the generated pseudo sentence and a set of referenced replacement, ii) fluency score on a scale from 1 to 4, and iii) semantic similarity scores ranging from 0 to 1. Details on the computation of fluency and similarity scores are provided in Appendix F.3.

We evaluate the generation performance on three language models in Table 6. It can be observed that while there’s no significant variation of similarity score among models, Flan-T5-large has the best performance in terms of BLEU and fluency score.

### F.6 Local Model Selection

In this section we justify the selection of decomposer and recomposer. For decomposer, we finetune each candidate model with SFT, and obtain the BLEU between the generated decomposition and reference provided by the dataset. For recomposer, the models are evaluated in terms of the accuracy metrics described in Section 5.3.2, using the golden decomposition and sub-answer as training and testing inputs.

Table 7 presents the experiment results on MuSiQue using models from three different classes of varying sizes. While Flan-T5-large exhibits the best performance for both tasks, we select BART-large as the decomposition and recombination model due to its balanced trade-off between model size and performance.

### F.7 Computation Overhead Analysis

To validate the practicality of our method, we investigate the memory cost required for the three local models, as well as that for local open-source LLMs. The results are presented in Table 8. From the results, we see that our proposed ConfusionPrompt is significantly efficient compared to inferring large open-source language models on the user side. Specifically, it requires only 61.2% and 79.7% memory cost compared to running LLaMa2-7B and Vicuna 13B, respectively, on the user side.

Table 7: Parameter size and performance on both decomposition and recombination tasks across various models for MuSiQue.

	PARAMETER SIZE	DECOMPOSER BLEU	RECOMPOSER		
			F1	ROUGEL	EM
BART-BASE	139M	0.314	0.563	0.564	0.446
BART-LARGE	406M	0.402	0.640	0.641	0.525
T5-BASE	223M	0.343	0.581	0.580	0.484
T5-LARGE	737M	0.408	0.646	0.645	0.554
FLAN-T5-BASE	248M	0.367	0.608	0.609	0.518
FLAN-T5-LARGE	783M	<b>0.458</b>	<b>0.671</b>	<b>0.671</b>	<b>0.577</b>

Table 8: Memory cost for local inference with 10 samples. Results show that ConfusionPrompt require much less computation overhead compared to inferring large open-source language models on the user side.

LOCAL MODEL	LLAMA2-7B	VICUNA-13B	DECOMPOSER	GENERATOR	RECOMPOSER	TOTAL (CONFUSIONPROMPT)
MEMORY COST	25885MB	49653MB	3867MB	3865MB	2306MB	10038MB

### F.8 Accuracy of Discriminator

In this section, we assess the reliability of the local discriminator with two metric: accuracy (ACC) and mean squared error (MSE). The discriminator is trained on 4000 samples and tested on 700 samples. To validate the capability of a GPT-4 scorer, we constructe 100 samples with manual labeling and obtain the performance of GPT-4 judger on this dataset. According to Table 9, the ACC of local discriminator is above 0.7 for a 4-label classification problem, with MSE approximately 16% of the total scale (0-3). The scores given by GPT-4 judger are also close to the human labels.

Table 9: Accuracy and MSE for local discriminator and GPT-4 judger. The local discriminator is tested on the validation data scored by GPT-4. GPT-4 Judger is evaluated against ground-truth data with manual label.

	Local discriminator	GPT-4 judger
ACC	0.710	0.800
MSE	0.488	0.200

### F.9 Pseudo Prompt Generation Cost

Algorithm 1 suggests that the generator keeps generating fake prompts until the  $(\lambda, \mu, \rho)$ -privacy is satisfied. Therefore, it’s crucial to consider the number of sampling times it takes for a generator to produce sufficient qualified pseudo prompts. Table 10 presents the number of generations to perform

Table 10: Cost of generation in terms of number of samplings and time cost per sampling (seconds).

$1/\mu$	5	10	20	30
NUMBER OF SAMPLINGS	17.7	30.1	65.3	93.5
TIME PER SAMPLING	1.73 SECONDS			

and the time cost for each generation under different levels of  $\mu$ . It requires to conduct sampling for an average of 3.23 times the  $1/\mu$ . Note that  $1/\mu$  can be treated as the minimal number of sampling times to achieve the privacy budget when the prompt contains only one private attribute. The average time per sampling is 1.73 seconds, and thus the overall time consumption for each sample ranges from 30 seconds at  $\mu = 1/5$  to 161 seconds at  $\mu = 1/30$ .

## G Discussion and Future Work

**Extension to diverse task:** our framework is experimented on the classification and question-answering task. It's of significant interest to extend our framework to a broad range of NLP tasks, such as paraphrasing, translation, and summarization. A key challenge in this extension lies in designing an appropriate decomposition methodology for diverse text inputs.

**Confusion with historical conversation:** we currently consider the one-round conversation setting, while in reality the user may engage in multi-round communications with the server. In such cases, a curious attacker could potentially infer private attributes by detecting patterns in the conversation. It is crucial to develop a confusion strategy along with conducting privacy analysis for multi-round conversations.