

MIA-EPT: Membership Inference Attack via Error Prediction for Tabular Data

Eyal German*, Daniel Samira*, Yuval Elovici, Asaf Shabtai

Department of Software and Information Systems Engineering, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev

{germane, samirada}@post.bgu.ac.il, {elovici,shabtaia}@bgu.ac.il

*Equal contribution

Abstract—Synthetic data generation plays an important role in enabling data sharing, particularly in sensitive domains like healthcare and finance. Recent advances in diffusion models have made it possible to generate realistic, high-quality tabular data, but they may also memorize training records and leak sensitive information. Membership inference attacks (MIAs) exploit this vulnerability by determining whether a record was used in training. While MIAs have been studied in images and text, their use against tabular diffusion models remains underexplored despite the unique risks of structured attributes and limited record diversity. In this paper, we introduce MIA-EPT, Membership Inference Attack via Error Prediction for Tabular Data, a novel black-box attack specifically designed to target tabular diffusion models. MIA-EPT constructs error-based feature vectors by masking and reconstructing attributes of target records, disclosing membership signals based on how well these attributes are predicted. MIA-EPT operates without access to the internal components of the generative model, relying only on its synthetic data output, and was shown to generalize across multiple state-of-the-art diffusion models. We validate MIA-EPT on three diffusion-based synthesizers, achieving AUC-ROC scores of up to 0.599 and TPR@10% FPR values of 22.0% in our internal tests. Under the MIDST 2025 competition conditions, MIA-EPT achieved second place in the Black-box Multi-Table track (TPR@10% FPR = 20.0%). These results demonstrate that our method can uncover substantial membership leakage in synthetic tabular data, challenging the assumption that synthetic data is inherently privacy-preserving. Our code is publicly available at <https://github.com/eyalgerman/MIA-EPT>.

1. Introduction

Synthetic data generation has become an effective tool, capable of tackling challenges associated with data scarcity, privacy constraints, and data sharing restrictions. It enables model development and evaluation in scenarios where real-world data is limited, imbalanced, or inaccessible due to legal or ethical concerns [1], [2]. It also provides a practical means of simulating rare events, improving generalization, and performing rigorous validation [3], [4].

Synthetic data generation has thus become a promising solution, particularly in sensitive domains like healthcare and finance [5], due to its ability to enable data sharing




Figure 1. MIA-EPT pipeline showing the flow through: (1) Shadow Model Training, (2) Attribute Prediction Model Training, (3) Feature Extraction, (4) Attack Classifier Training, and (5) Membership Prediction on the Challenge Dataset.

while preserving privacy. Diffusion models, a class of generative models originally designed for image synthesis, have demonstrated impressive capabilities in generating high-quality and diverse visual content [6]–[8]. These models

have since been adapted to tabular data, yielding high-fidelity synthetic tables that mimic real datasets [9], [10].

However, even without access to the model’s explicit training data, AI-generated synthetic data can inadvertently leak information about the real individuals whose data was used to train the generative model [11], [12]. Membership inference attacks (MIAs) exploit such leakage by determining whether a given data sample was part of the training set of a model [13]. This poses a serious privacy threat, especially in regulated domains (e.g., healthcare), where identifying whether an individual’s data was used in training can reveal sensitive information such as their presence in a dataset or a medical condition, thereby violating synthetic data’s core promise of privacy. The issue is especially pronounced for diffusion-based tabular synthesizers. These models capture complex data distributions and relationships (including mixed data types and relational tables), but their accuracy may rely on subtle traces of the original training data, potentially leading to privacy leakage [14].

Existing MIA techniques may underperform on tabular diffusion models due to the heterogeneity of tabular data and the diffusion model’s unique sampling process. Evaluating the privacy risks of diffusion-generated tabular data requires specialized membership inference strategies tailored to their unique characteristics. In this paper, we present MIA-EPT (Membership Inference Attack via Error Prediction for Tabular Data), a novel black-box MIA tailored for tabular diffusion models that relies solely on the synthetic data generated by these models. MIA-EPT is based on a fundamental hypothesis: if a synthetic data generator has inadvertently memorized a training sample, then that sample’s attribute values will be easier to predict from the synthetic data it generates than those of an unseen sample. In other words, samples that were used to train the diffusion model will likely yield lower prediction errors on models trained on the synthetic data, compared to samples that were not used during training. By exploiting this error-based signal, MIA-EPT can effectively distinguish members from non-members in the generative model’s training set. MIA-EPT contributes to a growing body of black-box MIA techniques targeting tabular diffusion models, distinguishing itself through its simplicity, broad applicability, and versatility across both single- and multi-table settings.

Unlike prior work that required direct access to target models, our method operates in a strict black-box setting—relying only on the synthetic data generated by the target model, while utilizing auxiliary shadow datasets and knowledge of the target architecture to simulate the generative process. MIA-EPT also handles heterogeneous tabular formats, accommodating both numerical and categorical columns. By training per-column attribute prediction models to reconstruct masked attributes and extracting structured error profiles, our proposed method uncovers reliable signals of membership leakage. Our approach follows the shadow-model paradigm and leverages reconstruction-based membership cues, adapting them to the unique challenges of tabular diffusion models and relational data.

MIA-EPT achieves strong empirical results in the

MIDST 2025 challenge (Membership Inference over Diffusion-models-based Synthetic Tabular data) at SaTML 2025 [15]. In this rigorous benchmark, MIA-EPT ranked second in the Black-box Multi-Table track, achieving a true positive rate of up to 20% at a false positive rate of 10%. These results demonstrate that MIA-EPT reveals measurable privacy leakage in state-of-the-art (SOTA) tabular diffusion models and highlight the need for robust privacy defenses in synthetic data generation.

Diffusion models, despite their complexity and impressive ability to generate realistic tabular data, are susceptible to membership leakage as exposed by attacks like MIA-EPT. The immediate implication is that organizations using diffusion-based data synthesis (or any generative model) for privacy should rigorously evaluate their outputs for such leaks. MIA-EPT reveals how subtle error-based signals embedded in synthetic tabular data can be leveraged to infer membership in the original training data. It also highlights the tradeoff between privacy and utility, as maximizing the utility of synthetic data by preserving important patterns inevitably increases the risk of retaining traces of individual data points.

In summary, this paper makes the following contributions:

- We introduce MIA-EPT, a novel black-box MIA tailored for tabular diffusion models, which operates solely on the synthetic heterogeneous tabular data they generate.
- We propose a generalizable pipeline that uses per-column attribute prediction models to reconstruct masked attributes and extract structured error profiles, effectively exposing membership leakage across single-table and multi-table settings without relying on internal model access.
- We demonstrate MIA-EPT’s practical effectiveness through both internal evaluations and the MIDST 2025 challenge on membership inference over diffusion-based synthetic tabular data—achieving AUC-ROC scores of up to 0.599 and TPR@10% FPR of 22.0% internally, and securing second place in the Black-box Multi-Table track of the competition.

2. Related Work

2.1. Diffusion Models for Tabular Data Generation

Diffusion models [6] have recently emerged as a powerful class of generative models; originally developed for image synthesis, these models are increasingly being adapted for structured data domains such as tabular data. Compared to generative adversarial networks (GANs) [16], [17] and variational autoencoders (VAEs) [18], diffusion models offer superior sample quality and training stability. These properties reduce the risk of overfitting and unintended memorization, making diffusion models an increasingly attractive

choice for generating synthetic data in privacy-sensitive domains [12].

Novel methods have been proposed in studies aimed at extending diffusion models to the tabular domain and addressing the unique challenges posed by structured data. TabDDPM [9] is a denoising diffusion probabilistic model specifically designed for tabular data, incorporating architectural and loss modifications to handle heterogeneous feature types, including continuous, categorical, and ordinal attributes. Building on this direction, TabSyn [10] introduced architectural enhancements and conditional generation mechanisms to support controllable sampling and improve the modeling of complex tabular distributions. More recently, ClavaDDPM [19] advanced the field by leveraging clustering labels as intermediate representations to capture inter-table relationships. This approach explicitly enforces foreign key constraints, thereby facilitating the generation of high-quality multi-table tabular data. As tabular diffusion models become increasingly sophisticated, understanding their privacy implications, including potential memorization, has become an important research direction [11].

2.2. Membership Inference Attacks

MIA exploit statistical differences between a model’s behavior on training versus unseen data. Shokri *et al.* [13] first demonstrated classifier-based MIAs using shadow models, showing that overfitted classifiers output higher confidence scores for training inputs. Overfitted classifiers also typically output higher softmax probabilities for training inputs than for unseen examples, enabling attackers to infer membership based on output entropy or confidence [13], [20], [21]. As research in this area advanced, the evolving techniques required less information: for example, label-only attacks [22] rely solely on the model’s predicted label yet are capable of detecting statistical differences between training and hold-out data.

In the context of large language models (LLMs), subsequent work quantified memorization risks, highlighting trade-offs between utility and privacy [23]. Tag&Tab, a keyword-based MIA, was proposed to detect whether specific pretraining data was used in LLMs [24] by analyzing the model’s output for signs of memorized keywords indicative of pretraining data exposure.

MIA have also been extended to image generative models. The LOGAN attack leverages the discriminator of a GAN to distinguish between real and synthetic samples [25], while other methods have used Monte Carlo sampling and reconstruction-error techniques to attack VAEs [26]. A membership error metric was later introduced to refine these attacks and improve detection accuracy [27].

In the multi-modal setting, recent work has explored MIAs targeting large-scale models [28], [29]. Some methods have focused on realistic attacker constraints and transferability across architectures [30], while others have shown that variance in generated captions can be used to detect membership without requiring model internals [31].

Algorithm 1: MIA-EPT Pipeline

Input: Auxiliary shadow data \mathcal{D}_{aux} ;
 Synthetic data from the target model: $\mathcal{S}_{\text{target}}$;
 Challenge dataset: \mathcal{C}

Output: Membership scores for each record in \mathcal{C}

- 1 **Step 1: Train Shadow Diffusion Models and Generate Synthetic Data**
 - 2 Partition \mathcal{D}_{aux} into $2M$ disjoint splits
 - 3 **foreach** shadow model $i = 1, \dots, M$ **do**
 - 4 Select $\mathcal{D}_{\text{member}}^{(i)}$ as one split (used as member data for G_i)
 - 5 Set $\mathcal{D}_{\text{non-member}}^{(i)}$ as another split (used as non-member data for G_i)
 - 6 Train shadow diffusion model G_i on $\mathcal{D}_{\text{member}}^{(i)}$
 - 7 Generate synthetic dataset $\mathcal{S}_i = G_i(\mathcal{N})$
 - 8 **Step 2: Train Attribute Prediction Models on Synthetic Data**
 - 9 **foreach** dataset \mathcal{S}_i in $\mathcal{S}_{\text{shadow}}$ **do**
 - 10 **foreach** column c in \mathcal{S}_i **do**
 - 11 Train attribute prediction model $H_c^{\mathcal{S}_i}$ to predict column c from $\mathcal{S}_i \setminus c$
 - 12 **Step 3: Extract Features from Shadow Models using Attribute Prediction Models**
 - 13 **foreach** dataset \mathcal{D}_i in $\{\mathcal{D}_{\text{member}} \cup \mathcal{D}_{\text{non-member}}\}$ **do**
 - 14 **foreach** $x_j \in \mathcal{D}_i$, each column c **do**
 - 15 Predict $\hat{x}_{j,c} = H_c^{\mathcal{S}_i}(x_j \setminus c)$
 - 16 Extract and aggregate prediction errors into feature vector $f_{i,j}$
 - 17 **Step 4: Train Attack Classifier**
 - 18 **foreach** dataset \mathcal{D}_i in $\{\mathcal{D}_{\text{member}} \cup \mathcal{D}_{\text{non-member}}\}$ **do**
 - 19 **foreach** feature vector $f_{i,j}$ extracted from \mathcal{D}_i **do**
 - 20 Assign label $y_{i,j} \leftarrow \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mathcal{D}_i \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{member}} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$
 - 21 Train attack model \mathcal{A} on the feature-label pairs $\{(f_{i,j}, y_{i,j})\}$
 - 22 **Step 5: Evaluate Membership on the Challenge Dataset**
 - 23 **foreach** column c in $\mathcal{S}_{\text{target}}$ **do**
 - 24 Train attribute prediction model $H_c^{\mathcal{S}_{\text{target}}}$ to predict column c from $\mathcal{S}_{\text{target}} \setminus c$
 - 25 **foreach** $x_j \in \mathcal{C}$ **do**
 - 26 **foreach** column c **do**
 - 27 Predict $\hat{x}_{j,c} = H_c^{\mathcal{S}_{\text{target}}}(x_j \setminus c)$ and compute prediction error
 - 28 Aggregate prediction errors into feature vector f_j
 - 29 Compute membership score $\mathcal{A}(f_j)$
-

With the rise of diffusion models [6], MIAs have faced new challenges: these models generate data through iterative denoising processes and lack explicit discriminators, unlike

GANs. SecMI traces reconstruction errors across sampling steps [14], and other methods have proposed extraction attacks directly on diffusion checkpoints [32].

In the tabular domain, density-based attacks such as DOMIAS [33] detect overfitting by identifying regions with unusually high probability mass. Fully synthetic attack pipelines have been developed, where a generator is queried to produce shadow datasets, followed by retraining a new generator on the resulting synthetic data. Membership is then inferred by comparing how well the target record is reconstructed when held out [34]. Building on the insight that auxiliary data may not be necessary, Wu *et al.* [35] introduced a MLP that learns noise- and timestep-aware features directly from diffusion losses. To the best of our knowledge, they were the first to conduct MIAs against tabular diffusion models, showing that synthetic-only attacks can rival traditional approaches requiring additional real data.

However, none of these approaches exploit the structural dependencies and mixed-type relationships present in multi-table data. In contrast, our proposed attack incorporates attribute-wise reconstruction error patterns, enabling more precise membership inference in complex synthetic tabular datasets. Unlike the approach proposed by Wu *et al.*, which originated as a white-box attack and was later adapted to a black-box setting by retraining new generators on synthetic data, our method operates directly on the synthetic data generated without the need to train additional diffusion models for each target. This makes our attack entirely model-agnostic—it does not require access to the original generative process or knowledge of the specific model architecture, relying solely on the available synthetic tables.

3. Method

We introduce MIA-EPT a novel MIA targeting synthetic data generation models trained on tabular data. MIA-EPT follows the shadow-model paradigm introduced by Shokri *et al.* [13] and leverages reconstruction-based membership cues, inspired by recent work on generative models [32].

Our attack operates in a black-box setting, as it does not query or interact with the target generative model, relying solely on the synthetic data generated [34]. Our approach can be adapted to various types of tabular generative models, wherever the hypothesis that members are predicted with lower error holds. An overview of our workflow is provided in Figure 1, with its detailed steps presented in Algorithm 1.

3.1. Attacker Model

MIA-EPT operates in a pure black-box setting, where the adversary only has access to the synthetic dataset released by the target tabular generator and is unable to make queries to the model itself. The attacker is assumed to possess an auxiliary shadow dataset with similar properties (i.e., drawn from the same distribution) to the target model’s training data; this enables the adversary to train shadow diffusion models which are used to simulate the

victim’s generative process. Additionally, we assume that the attacker knows the target model’s architecture, enabling them to train their own synthetic data generators using the same architecture. The attacker’s goal is to determine the membership status of records in a challenge dataset \mathcal{C} —a set of candidate records whose inclusion in the target model’s training data is unknown.

Our pipeline is comprised of five main steps: (1) Shadow Model Training, (2) Attribute Prediction Model Training, (3) Feature Extraction (Error Profiles), (4) Attack Classifier Training, and (5) Membership Prediction on the Challenge Dataset.

3.2. Shadow Model Training

The auxiliary shadow data \mathcal{D}_{aux} is used to train shadow diffusion models, each simulating the target model’s generative process. In this step, for each shadow model, we also construct a labeled dataset comprising “member” records (used to train the model) and “non-member” records (excluded from the training set). Synthetic datasets generated by these shadow models serve as the basis for subsequent attack steps.

3.3. Attribute Prediction Model Training

The *attribute prediction models* are trained on synthetic datasets generated by the shadow models. Each attribute prediction model is trained to predict the value of a specific attribute (column) given the values in the remaining columns, using either regression or classification (depending on the attribute type). Given the synthetic dataset \mathcal{S}_i generated by shadow model i , we train a set of models $\{H_c^{S_i}\}$, each tasked with predicting column c from $\mathcal{S}_i \setminus c$ (treating c as masked). These models capture inter-column relationships as encoded by the shadow models. By training only on synthetic data, the attribute prediction models learn the underlying data distribution as represented by the generative (shadow) model.

3.4. Feature Extraction (Error Profiles)

We extract error-based features using the trained attribute prediction models. In this step, we apply each attribute prediction model to records used in the shadow model setup, where the membership status is known to the adversary; the attribute prediction models are applied to both member records and non-member records.

For each record x_j in $\mathcal{D}_{\text{member}}$ or $\mathcal{D}_{\text{non-member}}$ associated with a given shadow model, and for each attribute prediction model $H_c^{S_i}$, we mask column c and use the model to predict the corresponding cell value. The prediction error or correctness for each column is aggregated into a feature vector f_j for record x_j , collectively forming the record’s error profile across all attributes. Specifically, we extract the following five types of error-based features:

- **Actual value:** The true value of the column in the record $x_{j,c}$. This provides context that may help

the attack classifier learn whether certain values are memorized more accurately.

- **Predicted value:** The output produced by the attribute prediction model $\hat{x}_{j,c} = H_c^{S_i}(x_j \setminus c)$, which attempts to reconstruct the masked column. This feature applies to both continuous and categorical columns (as either a numeric prediction or a predicted category).
- **Error:** For continuous (regression) columns, we compute the absolute prediction error $|x_{j,c} - H_c^{S_i}(x_j \setminus c)|$, which captures how far the predicted value is from the true value.
- **Error ratio:** For continuous (regression) columns, we normalize the absolute error by the magnitude of the actual value itself. This results in the relative error, which reflects how large the prediction error is compared to the true value, although care must be taken with values near zero.
- **Accuracy:** For categorical (classification) columns, we assign a binary indicator, which is '1' if the predicted category matches the true category, and '0' otherwise. This feature indicates whether the prediction was correct.

The core intuition is that if x_j was included in the training data of the (shadow) diffusion model, the corresponding attribute prediction models trained on synthetic data will reconstruct the attributes of x_j more accurately. In contrast, non-member records will, on average, result in higher reconstruction errors or misclassifications, thus providing a reliable indication of membership inference.

3.5. Attack Classifier Training

Using the extracted features, we train an attack classifier \mathcal{A} to distinguish members from non-members. Each feature vector $f_{i,j}$ is labeled according to the membership status of its originating dataset: $y_{i,j} = 1$ for $\mathcal{D}_i \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{member}}$, else $y_{i,j} = 0$. We experiment with various classifiers, selecting the best-performing one on a validation set. The attack model ultimately learns to map error profiles to membership likelihoods, outputting a membership score that indicates the probability that a given record was included in the target model’s training data.

3.6. Membership Prediction on the Challenge Dataset

Finally, we run the trained attack classifier on each record in the challenge dataset \mathcal{C} to determine membership status. Specifically, we train attribute prediction models $H_c^{S_{\text{target}}}$ on S_{target} , and for each record $x_j \in \mathcal{C}$ we predict the value for each column c to compute the associated prediction errors. These are aggregated into a feature vector f_j , which is fed to the attack classifier to obtain a membership score $\mathcal{A}(f_j)$. A high score suggests that x_j is likely a member of the training set. These scores can be thresholded to produce binary decisions or used to rank the challenge records by membership likelihood.

4. Evaluation

For full hardware and software configurations, including GPU/CPU specifications, and library versions, see Appendix: *Training and Evaluation Configurations*.

Target Models.. We evaluate our method on three SOTA tabular diffusion models: TabDDPM [9], TabSyn [10], and ClavaDDPM [19], using synthetic datasets produced by each. For each diffusion model (TabDDPM, TabSyn, ClavaDDPM), we generate synthetic data from 30 model instances. We use the first 25 instances to train our attribute prediction models, extract features, and train the attack classifier, while reserving the remaining 5 for evaluation. Each instance yields a synthetic table with the same schema; we label records from the synthetic data model’s own training set as *members* and sample an equal-sized hold-out set of *non-members* from unseen real data. All datasets and pre-trained checkpoints used in our experiments were provided by the organizers of the MIDST 2025 challenge [15].

Metrics.. We evaluate attack performance using two standard metrics: (i) AUC-ROC, the area under the ROC curve (0.5 = random, 1 = perfect), which gauges threshold-independent separability; and (ii) TPR@10% FPR, the true positive rate achieved when the false positive rate is capped at 10%, representing a realistic operating point, as used by [36].

Attack Classifiers.. In our experiments, we evaluate two classifiers: XGBoost and CatBoost. Each classifier is trained separately on the extracted error profiles, and only one is used per run. We compare their performance to identify the most effective choice for membership inference on each model. All models are trained on the concatenated profiles from the 25 training instances and evaluated on the 5 test instances.

Feature Extraction.. We train one attribute prediction model per column (classification for categorical, regression for continuous) in each synthetic table and extract an error profile for each record. We experiment with different subsets of feature types (actual values, predicted values, errors, error ratios, and categorical-accuracy indicators) by concatenating selected features into the feature vectors.

5. Results

Figures 2 and 3 present the ROC curves for TabDDPM, TabSyn, and ClavaDDPM on the test set, comparing the performance of our attack with the baseline of Wu *et al.* [35]. For each model, we report and plot the best-performing configuration in terms of the TPR@10% FPR metric. As seen in Figure 3, TabDDPM (Wu *et al.*) achieves a TPR@10% FPR of 0.249 and an AUC of 0.630, while our attack achieves a TPR@10% FPR of 0.204 and an AUC of 0.562. Since Wu *et al.* did not evaluate or implement their attack on the TabSyn model, only our attack is evaluated




Figure 2. The ROC curves for the multi-table model ClavaDDPM on the test set, comparing MIA-EPT with the recent baseline of Wu *et al.* [35]. The inset zooms in on the low-FPR region.




Figure 3. The ROC curves for the single-table models TabDDPM and TabSyn on the test set, comparing MIA-EPT with the recent baseline of Wu *et al.* [35]. The inset zooms in on the low-FPR region.

Model	Classifier	Feature set	TPR@10% FPR	AUC-ROC
TabDDPM	CatBoost	actual + error + accuracy	0.204	0.562
	CatBoost	actual + error	0.192	0.551
	XGBoost	actual + error + error_ratio + accuracy + prediction	0.190	0.550
	CatBoost	actual + error_ratio + accuracy	0.188	0.548
	CatBoost	actual + error + error_ratio + accuracy + prediction	0.184	0.567
TabSyn	CatBoost	actual + error_ratio + prediction	0.150	0.538
	CatBoost	actual + prediction	0.146	0.530
	XGBoost	actual + prediction	0.138	0.538
	CatBoost	actual + error_ratio + accuracy + prediction	0.138	0.533
	XGBoost	actual + error + prediction	0.136	0.543
ClavaDDPM	CatBoost	actual + accuracy	0.220	0.599
	CatBoost	actual + error_ratio + accuracy	0.200	0.574
	CatBoost	actual + accuracy + prediction	0.198	0.599
	CatBoost	actual + error + error_ratio + accuracy	0.198	0.574
	CatBoost	actual + error + accuracy	0.194	0.590

TABLE 1. TOP-FIVE FEATURE CONFIGURATIONS FOR EACH DIFFUSION MODEL, RANKED BY THE TPR@10% FPR VALUE. THE BEST TPR@10% FPR AND AUC-ROC FOR EACH MODEL APPEAR IN BOLD.

on this model, achieving a TPR@10% FPR of 0.150 and an AUC of 0.538. As seen in Figure 2, ClavaDDPM (Wu et al.) achieves a TPR@10% FPR of 0.224 and an AUC of 0.618, while our attack achieves a TPR@10% FPR of 0.22 and an AUC of 0.599.

The insets in both figures zoom in on the low-FPR region, which is critical for real-world MIAs. These plots highlight that both attacks are able to detect members with a high true positive rate, even with low false positive rates, underscoring the privacy risk in synthetic tabular data. On the ClavaDDPM model, our attack outperforms the attack of Wu et al., achieving a higher TPR with very low FPR in some cases, and overall, our attack achieves performance comparable to Wu et al., as seen in Figure 2. Achieving a high TPR at very low FPR is particularly important in practical privacy scenarios, where defenders often require MIAs to operate effectively at low FPR thresholds in order to avoid a large number of false alarms.

These results show that our attack can capture subtle memorization signals embedded in synthetic tables even under strict black-box constraints, with strong TPR@FPR values. Under the MIDST 2025 challenge rules [15], which enforce additional hidden test tables and strict time constraints, MIA-EPT secured 2nd place in the Black-box Multi-table track. Our official competition scores, which were computed on a blind test set provided by the organizers, resulted in a TPR@10% FPR of 20.0%.

While the method of Wu *et al.* achieves even stronger membership inference results on the same benchmark, their approach begins as a white-box attack and transitions to a black-box scenario by first training new diffusion models on the synthetic data generated by the target model, essentially building a custom generative pipeline for each target case. In contrast, our method achieves competitive membership inference simply by analyzing reconstruction errors from attribute prediction models trained on the generated synthetic data, without the need to retrain or access a new diffusion model for each target model. This makes our approach much more lightweight, easier to deploy, and truly model-agnostic. While the results of Wu *et al.* underscore the vulnerability of diffusion models to more specialized attacks, our findings show that even straightforward error-based probing can uncover substantial privacy leakage, highlighting the severity of membership risks associated with synthetic tabular data.

5.1. Feature Ablation Analysis

To evaluate the contribution of different components in the error profile, we systematically analyze five feature types: *actual value*, *predicted value*, *error*, *error ratio*, and *accuracy*. Table 1 lists the top-five feature-classifier configurations for each diffusion model, ranked by the TPR@10% FPR value.

On **TabDDPM**, the highest TPR@10% FPR (0.204) is achieved using CatBoost, with a lean feature set consisting of: *actual*, *error*, and *accuracy*. The best AUC-ROC (0.567) is also obtained using CatBoost but with a larger feature

set consisting of: *actual*, *error*, *error ratio*, *accuracy*, and *prediction*.

On **TabSyn**, CatBoost with a feature set consisting of *actual*, *error ratio*, and *prediction* yields the best TPR@10% FPR (0.150), while XGBoost with a feature set of *actual*, *error*, and *prediction* produces the top AUC-ROC (0.543). Interestingly, several compact feature sets performed competitively, suggesting that on the TabSyn generator, high membership signals can be captured, even with fewer features, particularly those emphasizing prediction and relative error.

On **ClavaDDPM**, the significance of the accuracy feature is evident: CatBoost with just the *actual* and *accuracy* features achieves both the highest TPR@10% FPR (0.220) and the highest AUC-ROC (0.599). Other top configurations also consistently include the accuracy feature, highlighting its key importance for this model’s schema, which is dominated by categorical features.

Overall, these findings demonstrate that while absolute and relative error measures remain central for numeric attributes, categorical accuracy is a decisive feature in models like ClavaDDPM. Thus, an adaptive feature design that leverages schema-specific characteristics is crucial for robust membership inference.

6. Conclusion

We introduced MIA-EPT, a black-box MIA that targets diffusion-based synthetic tabular data. By training per-column predictors on synthetic tables, MIA-EPT constructs error profiles that enable effective member/non-member classification. Our evaluation on a public benchmark demonstrates that even without any access to model internals or auxiliary real data, MIA-EPT achieves non-trivial separation between members and non-members on three SOTA tabular diffusion models (TabDDPM, TabSyn, and ClavaDDPM), achieving an AUC-ROC of up to 0.599 and a TPR@FPR=10% of 22.0%. These results highlight the privacy risks posed by synthetic data, even in black-box settings.

MIA-EPT is model-agnostic and practical for real-world auditing. The success of our proposed attack highlights the importance of performing privacy evaluations when sharing synthetic data and motivates the use of defenses such as noise injection, stronger regularization, or differential privacy. Looking ahead, we plan to extend MIA-EPT to other generative models (e.g., tabular GANs) and develop defenses that better balance utility and privacy in synthetic data generation.

References

- [1] A. Goncalves, P. Ray, B. Soper, J. Stevens, L. Coyle, and A. P. Sales, “Generation and evaluation of synthetic patient data,” *BMC medical research methodology*, vol. 20, pp. 1–40, 2020.
- [2] D. Talwar, S. Guruswamy, N. Ravipati, and M. Eirinaki, “Evaluating validity of synthetic data in perception tasks for autonomous vehicles,” in *2020 IEEE International Conference On Artificial Intelligence Testing (AITest)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 73–80.

- [3] S. Dash, A. Yale, I. Guyon, and K. P. Bennett, “Medical time-series data generation using generative adversarial networks,” in *Artificial Intelligence in Medicine: 18th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Medicine, AIME 2020, Minneapolis, MN, USA, August 25–28, 2020, Proceedings 18*. Springer, 2020, pp. 382–391.
- [4] T. P. Pagano, R. B. Loureiro, F. V. Lisboa, R. M. Peixoto, G. A. Guimarães, G. O. Cruz, M. M. Araujo, L. L. Santos, M. A. Cruz, E. L. Oliveira *et al.*, “Bias and unfairness in machine learning models: a systematic review on datasets, tools, fairness metrics, and identification and mitigation methods,” *Big data and cognitive computing*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 15, 2023.
- [5] M. Villaizán-Valladolid, M. Salvatori, C. Segura, and I. Arapakis, “Diffusion models for tabular data imputation and synthetic data generation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.02549*, 2024.
- [6] J. Ho, A. Jain, and P. Abbeel, “Denoising diffusion probabilistic models,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 33, pp. 6840–6851, 2020.
- [7] C. Saharia, W. Chang, J. Ho *et al.*, “Photorealistic text-to-image diffusion models with deep language understanding,” *Nature Communications*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 6617, 2022.
- [8] R. Rombach, A. Blattmann, D. Lorenz, P. Esser, and B. Ommer, “High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2022, pp. 10 684–10 695.
- [9] A. Kotelnikov, D. Baranchuk, I. Rubachev, and A. Babenko, “Tabdpm: Modelling tabular data with diffusion models,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 17 564–17 579.
- [10] H. Zhang, J. Zhang, B. Srinivasan, Z. Shen, X. Qin, C. Faloutsos, H. Rangwala, and G. Karypis, “Mixed-type tabular data synthesis with score-based diffusion in latent space,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.09656*, 2023.
- [11] Z. Fang, Z. Jiang, H. Chen, X. Li, and J. Li, “Understanding and mitigating memorization in diffusion models for tabular data,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.11044*, 2024.
- [12] R. Shi, Y. Wang, M. Du, X. Shen, and X. Wang, “A comprehensive survey of synthetic tabular data generation,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.16506>
- [13] 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.
- [14] J. Duan, F. Kong, S. Wang, X. Shi, and K. Xu, “Are diffusion models vulnerable to membership inference attacks?” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 8717–8730.
- [15] M. C. Organizers, “Membership inference over diffusion-models-based synthetic tabular data (midst) challenge,” 2025, <https://github.com/VectorInstitute/MIDST-Challenge>.
- [16] L. Xu, M. Skoularidou, A. Cuesta-Infante, and K. Veeramachaneni, “Modeling tabular data using conditional gan,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, vol. 32, 2019, pp. 7335–7345.
- [17] E. Choi, S. Biswal, B. Malin, J. Duke, W. Stewart, and J. Sun, “Generating multi-label discrete patient records using generative adversarial networks,” in *Proceedings of the Machine Learning for Healthcare Conference (MLHC)*. PMLR, 2017, pp. 286–305.
- [18] H. Xu, B. Yuan, L. Zhang, and X. Wu, “Synthesizing tabular data using variational autoencoders,” in *2019 IEEE Conference on Big Data*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 5099–5108.
- [19] W. Pang, M. Shafieinejad, L. Liu, S. Hazlewood, and X. He, “Clavdpm: Multi-relational data synthesis with cluster-guided diffusion models,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 37, pp. 83 521–83 547, 2024.
- [20] S. Yeom, I. Giacomelli, M. Fredrikson, and S. Jha, “Privacy risk in machine learning: Analyzing the connection to overfitting,” in *2018 IEEE 31st computer security foundations symposium (CSF)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 268–282.
- [21] H. Hu, Z. Salicic, L. Sun, G. Dobbie, P. S. Yu, and X. Zhang, “Membership inference attacks on machine learning: A survey,” *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, vol. 54, no. 11s, pp. 1–37, 2022.
- [22] A. Sablayrolles, M. Douze, C. Schmid, Y. Ollivier, and H. Jégou, “White-box vs black-box: Bayes optimal strategies for membership inference,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2019, pp. 5558–5567.
- [23] N. Carlini, D. Ippolito, M. Jagielski, K. Lee, F. Tramer, and C. Zhang, “Quantifying memorization across neural language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.07646*, 2022.
- [24] S. Antebi, E. Habler, A. Shabtai, and Y. Elovici, “Tag&tab: Pretraining data detection in large language models using keyword-based membership inference attack,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.08454*, 2025.
- [25] J. Hayes, L. Melis, G. Danezis, and E. De Cristofaro, “Logan: Membership inference attacks against generative models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.07663*, 2017.
- [26] B. Hilprecht, M. Härterich, and D. Bernau, “Monte carlo and reconstruction membership inference attacks against generative models,” *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, 2019.
- [27] A. Shafran, S. Peleg, and Y. Hoshen, “Membership inference attacks are easier on difficult problems,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021, pp. 14 820–14 829.
- [28] S. Li, R. Cheng, and X. Jia, “Identity inference from clip models using only textual data,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.14517*, 2024.
- [29] P. Hu, Z. Wang, R. Sun, H. Wang, and M. Xue, “M4i: Multi-modal models membership inference,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 1867–1882, 2022.
- [30] M. Ko, M. Jin, C. Wang, and R. Jia, “Practical membership inference attacks against large-scale multi-modal models: A pilot study,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 4871–4881.
- [31] D. Samira, E. Habler, Y. Elovici, and A. Shabtai, “Variance-based membership inference attacks against large-scale image captioning models,” in *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, 2025, pp. 9210–9219.
- [32] N. Carlini, J. Hayes, M. Nasr, M. Jagielski, V. Sehwag, F. Tramer, B. Balle, D. Ippolito, and E. Wallace, “Extracting training data from diffusion models,” in *32nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 23)*, 2023, pp. 5253–5270.
- [33] B. van Breugel, H. Sun, Z. Qian, and M. van der Schaar, “Membership inference attacks against synthetic data through overfitting detection,” 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.12580>
- [34] F. Guépin, M. Meeus, A.-M. Crépeu, and Y.-A. de Montjoye, “Synthetic is all you need: removing the auxiliary data assumption for membership inference attacks against synthetic data,” in *European Symposium on Research in Computer Security*. Springer, 2023, pp. 182–198.
- [35] X. Wu, Y. Pang, T. Liu, and S. Wu, “Winning the midst challenge: New membership inference attacks on diffusion models for tabular data synthesis,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.12008>
- [36] N. Carlini, S. Chien, M. Nasr, S. Song, A. Terzis, and F. Tramer, “Membership inference attacks from first principles,” in *2022 IEEE symposium on security and privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 1897–1914.

Appendix A. Training and Evaluation Configurations

This appendix provides the computing infrastructure and software configurations used in our experiments to ensure reproducibility.

All experiments were conducted on a server equipped with an NVIDIA RTX 6000 GPU (48GB VRAM), an AMD EPYC 7702P 64-Core Processor, and 256GB of RAM. The operating system was Rocky Linux 9.5 (Blue Onyx). All runs used a fixed random seed of 42.

We implemented our code in Python 3.10, and used the following core libraries and frameworks for training and evaluation: torch==2.5.1, catboost==1.2.7, xgboost==2.1.1, scikit-learn==1.4.2, pandas==1.5.3, numpy==1.26.4, and tqdm==4.66.4.

All models were trained and evaluated using a single GPU. The training pipeline includes feature extraction using attribute prediction models trained on synthetic data, followed by attack classifier training (e.g., CatBoost, XGBoost), and performance evaluation via AUC-ROC and TPR@FPR metrics.