
SYNBENCH: A BENCHMARK FOR DIFFERENTIALLY PRIVATE TEXT GENERATION

Yidan Sun^{1,*} Viktor Schlegel^{1,2} Srinivasan Nandakumar¹ Iqra Zahid¹
Yuping Wu² Yulong Wu² Hao Li² Jie Zhang³ Warren Del-Pinto²
Goran Nenadic² Siew Kei Lam⁴ Anil Anthony Bharath^{1,5}

September 19, 2025

ABSTRACT

Data-driven decision support in high-stakes domains such as healthcare and finance faces significant barriers to data sharing due to regulatory, institutional, and privacy concerns. While recent generative AI models, such as large language models, have shown impressive performance in open-domain tasks, their adoption in sensitive environments remains limited by unpredictable behaviours and insufficient privacy-preserving datasets for benchmarking. Existing anonymization methods are often inadequate, especially for unstructured text, as redaction and masking can still allow re-identification. Differential Privacy (DP) offers a principled alternative, enabling the generation of synthetic data with formal privacy assurances. In this work, we address these challenges through three key contributions. First, we introduce a comprehensive evaluation framework with standardized utility and fidelity metrics, encompassing nine curated datasets that capture domain-specific complexities such as technical jargon, long-context dependencies, and specialized document structures. Second, we conduct a large-scale empirical study benchmarking state-of-the-art DP text generation methods and LLMs of varying sizes (e.g., Llama-3-1B, 3B, and 8B) and different fine-tuning strategies, revealing that high-quality domain-specific synthetic data generation under DP constraints remains an unsolved challenge, with performance degrading as domain complexity increases. Third, we develop a membership inference attack (MIA) methodology tailored for synthetic text, providing first empirical evidence that the use of public datasets—potentially present in pre-training corpora—can invalidate claimed privacy guarantees. Our findings underscore the urgent need for rigorous privacy auditing and highlight persistent gaps between open-domain and specialist evaluations, informing responsible deployment of generative AI in privacy-sensitive, high-stakes settings.

1 Introduction

The proliferation of modern language technology in the form of Large (neural) Language Models (LLMs) is governed by scaling laws which posit that model performance improves substantially with increased training data and size [23]. As open- [11] and closed-source models [31] continue to scale to hundreds of billions of parameters, they require

¹Imperial College London, Imperial Global Singapore

²University of Manchester, United Kingdom

³CFAR and IHPC, Agency for Science, Technology and Research (A*STAR), Singapore

⁴Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

⁵Imperial College London, United Kingdom

*Corresponding author: y.sun1@imperial.ac.uk

ever-increasing amounts of diverse, high-quality training data to fuel the growth. However, publicly available data represents a finite resource that is rapidly being exhausted [29].

While vast troves of valuable data exist within specialized domains—including healthcare records [21], legal documents [8] or financial transactions and proprietary business communications [42]—these datasets remain inaccessible to the broader research community due to privacy, confidentiality, and regulatory constraints. Making such domain-specific data available could alleviate the data bottleneck and help adopt language technology to aid experts in those domains [9].

Direct training on sensitive datasets, however, poses fundamental privacy risks. Recent work has demonstrated that language models can memorize and subsequently leak verbatim training examples [6], potentially exposing sensitive information. Synthetic data generation [34, 26] has emerged as a promising alternative, offering the possibility of capturing the statistical properties of private datasets without directly exposing individual records. Yet even synthetic data generation is not immune to privacy concerns, as recent work has shown that sensitive information can be recovered from synthetic datasets generated by language models trained on private data [28].

To effectively address such concerns, differential privacy (DP), the gold standard for privacy-preserving data analysis [13], can be used to provide formal mathematical guarantees that bound the risk of private data leakage. While DP has been successfully applied to synthetic text generation [44, 43, 27], the field remains fragmented and faces several critical challenges that limit its practical adoption.

First, existing work relies on a pick-and-choose approach to datasets and evaluation metrics, with *no standardized methodology for assessment*. This exacerbates meaningful comparisons across methods, identify systematic limitations, or track progress in the field [35]. Second, current research predominantly focuses on simple, open-domain datasets such as product reviews [27] or paper reviews [43], *failing to address the domain-specific challenges* present in high-stakes applications. These challenges include specialized terminology, complex document structures, long-form content, and domain-specific quality requirements [20, 45].

The use of pre-trained models for data synthesis introduces additional complications: many benchmark datasets used to evaluate differentially private synthetic data generation may have been encountered during the pre-training of LLM-based generation methods [35, 37]. This raises concerns of potentially overestimating generation quality at specified privacy budgets, as models may be leveraging memorized information rather than truly learning from the private dataset [40]. In simple terms, *access to private data during pre-training is not accounted for* in the privacy guarantees. Compounding this issue is the *lack of rigorous empirical verification for privacy leakage*: For example, Yue et al. [44] only provide anecdotal leakage evidence of canary instances, while Xie et al. [43] only evaluate data privacy leakage of downstream models trained on synthetic data. Such lack of audits means that potential privacy violations due to pre-training contamination remain undetected and unreported.

In this work, we address these fundamental challenges through three key contributions. First, we propose a **comprehensive evaluation framework** with standardized measures for both utility and fidelity, featuring 9 diverse datasets that capture domain-specific challenges including technical jargon, long-context dependencies, and specialized document structures. Second, we conduct a **large-scale empirical study** applying state-of-the-art synthetic data generation methods to our benchmark, revealing that **generating high-quality domain-specific data** under differential privacy constraints **remains an unsolved challenge**, with performance degrading significantly as domain complexity—as measured by distance from pre-training corpora—increases. Third, we develop a **membership inference attack (MIA) methodology** specifically designed for auditing DP guarantees in synthetic text generation. Our empirical audits of state-of-the-art methods on four datasets provide **first empirical evidence** that using public datasets that may have leaked into pre-training data can indeed **invalidate claimed privacy guarantees**, highlighting the critical importance of rigorous privacy auditing in this domain.

2 Background & Related Work

Preliminaries Differential Privacy (DP) provides a rigorous mathematical framework for quantifying and limiting the privacy risk incurred when releasing data derived from sensitive sources. A mechanism \mathcal{M} satisfies (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy if, for any two neighbouring datasets x and x' differing by a single record, and for any subset S of outputs, the inequality

$$\Pr[\mathcal{M}(x) \in S] \leq e^\epsilon \Pr[\mathcal{M}(x') \in S] + \delta$$

holds [12]. This formalism bounds the advantage of an adversary attempting a Membership Inference Attack (MIA), making DP a key foundation for privacy-preserving data generation. Importantly, any operations on the outputs of the DP mechanism preserve this guarantee (post-processing property).

DP Synthetic Text Generation Existing text-based methods fall broadly into two paradigms. First, *DP training approaches* [44, 27, 28] fine-tune generative models conditioned on “control codes” (typically class labels) via variants of DP-SGD [1], an algorithm that privatizes gradient updates by clipping them and injecting noise to limit and mask the contribution of each training example to the trained model. Via the post-processing property, prompting those trained models with control code yields differentially private synthetic data. Second, *DP inference* methods aim to privatise the inference process [24, 16, 38], for example via the PATE algorithm [32], which privately combines predictions of multiple models trained on distinct sets of private data. Since private data is accessed at each generation step (e.g., by attending to private few-shot examples [38]), the privacy loss scales per token, making them impractical for large-scale dataset synthesis. One notable exception is AUG-PE [43], which generates random datasets that iteratively evolve towards the private data distribution, privatising the fitness function at relatively low privacy cost. In our benchmark we evaluate both approach types. Note that we do not consider “rewriting” approaches that preserve 1-to-1 mappings between private and synthetic data, as they are either incompatible with the privacy guarantees or need to satisfy local differential privacy [18], which is an unnecessarily strong assumption for centralised data releases from trusted data curators (e.g., hospitals).

Research Gaps in Evaluation Despite the steady developments in DP synthetic text generation, fundamental evaluation challenges remain unanswered. First, existing work predominantly evaluates on open-domain datasets (sentiment analysis [44, 27] or paper abstracts [43]) that likely contaminate foundation model pre-training corpora. This contamination can lead to unaccounted privacy leakage, as models may have accessed and memorized benchmark “private” data during pre-training, leading to inflated synthetic data quality estimates. This is a critical concern [40], that remains unaddressed in current literature. Second, empirical privacy evaluation is often incomplete: many works rely solely on formal guarantees without empirical validation [27, 15], while others substitute privacy evaluation of the synthesized data itself for simpler analyses [44, 43]. Most critically, the field lacks evaluation on realistic, domain-specific datasets from high-stakes applications where synthetic data generation would provide the greatest value.

3 Benchmark Design

Domain-specific datasets For data, we use four healthcare datasets: HOC [2] (cancer hallmark identification in scientific literature), N2C2’08[41] (obesity and co-morbidity recognition in clinical discharge summaries), PSYTAR [46] (adverse drug effect detection in social media posts), and MIMIC [19] (triage of discharge summaries, with ICD codes grouped into top-level categories). Additionally, we evaluate three financial datasets: DMSAFN¹ and LC37FND [10] (both financial news), and ZSTFNS² (financial tweets), all used for sentiment classification. We also include two legal datasets: ASYLEX [3], which introduces a legal reasoning task, and EURLEX [8], a multi-label classification dataset of legal documents covering diverse legal concepts. These datasets broaden the scope of our benchmark beyond healthcare and finance. The challenges associated with these datasets are summarized in Table 1. Our benchmark features long documents (N2C2’08, LC37FND, ASYLEX); gated-access datasets (PSYTAR, N2C2’08, and MIMIC); small datasets that complicate model training (N2C2’08); and multi-label datasets with many classes (HOC, N2C2’08, PSYTAR, MIMIC and EURLEX).

Dataset	$ C $	$ D $	$ \bar{L} $	Access mechanism
HOC	10	10301	37/58	free on HF
N2C2’08	16	620	1985/3070	DUA & manual approval
PSYTAR	7	5102	19/34	DUA
MIMIC	21	4971	2726/3951	DUA & credentialed access
DMSAFN	3	3876	30/50	free on HF
LC37FND	3	5620	836/1510	free on HF
ZsTFNS	3	9938	25/41	free on HF
ASYLAX	3	7999	2326/3442	free on HF
EURLEX	8	4942	266/563	free on HF

Table 1: Benchmark characteristics: Number of labels ($|C|$), dataset size ($|D|$), avg/p90 token length $|\bar{L}|$ and data access. HF: huggingface. DUA: data usage agreement.

Evaluation Protocol Our benchmark framework provides a comprehensive evaluation of *utility*, *fidelity*, and *privacy leakage* across varying privacy budgets (i.e., different ϵ -levels).

¹<https://huggingface.co/datasets/Daniel-ML/sentiment-analysis-for-financial-news-v2>

²<https://huggingface.co/datasets/zeroshot/twitter-financial-news-sentiment>

Utility assesses the practical usefulness of synthetic data for downstream application tasks. Specifically, we train multiple classification models on the synthetic data and evaluate their performance on a held-out portion of the original dataset. This setup enables us to determine the extent to which synthetic data can support real-world analytical objectives. We also explore the relationship between the exposure of original data to large language model (LLM)-based text generators and the resulting utility of the synthetic data. This analysis provides insight into the potential trade-off between data exposure and downstream task performance.

Fidelity measures the degree of similarity between synthetic and original data across multiple linguistic dimensions. We employ MAUVE [33] to quantify semantic alignment, while the divergence in named entity recognition (NER) distributions in sentence level and text length statistics between the original and synthetic corpora serves to evaluate lexical and structural similarity. Additionally, we incorporate reference-free metrics to evaluate the quality of synthetic data without relying on access to the original corpus. These metrics offer a complementary perspective, particularly in practical scenarios where the real data is unavailable or restricted.

Privacy leakage is assessed using Membership Inference Attacks (MIAs) under a realistic black-box scenario. The MIA is typically a privacy attack in which an adversary aims to determine whether a specific data point was part of a machine learning model’s training dataset. Most of existing MIA methods assumed that attackers have access to the trained model or its output logits [5, 36]. However, in this benchmark, we are curious about the question: How effectively does synthetic text generated by LLMs protect the privacy of the original dataset? Therefore, we considered the realistic attack scenario where the adversary only has to the synthetic dataset and no knowledge of the underlying text generation model or training data [28].

Crucially, our study focuses on the privacy leakage of real samples, without introducing canaries, i.e., out-of-distribution samples which are repeatedly inserted into the training data to induce model memorization. We assume a realistic but strong adversary who has access to authentic samples that might have been used in training the LLM, though it is uncertain whether these were actually included. Critically, the target samples are outliers relative to most of the training data, making them more vulnerable to membership inference attacks (MIA). In our experiments, this is realized by selecting outlier samples from the private dataset as targets, as detailed below. Our results reveal the extent to which LLM-generated synthetic text can expose information about private data, and we provide theoretical upper bounds for MIA under different privacy ϵ budgets to benchmark the empirical findings.

Membership Inference Attack Our proposed pipeline consists of three main stages:

Stage 1: Outlier Detection. Given a private dataset D , we embed each sample using the same encoder as in AUG-PE [43]. From this embedding space, we identify extreme outliers-including the top 1% farthest points and Local Outlier Factor (LoF) outliers [4]-as our attack targets, denoted by D_{out} . While such outliers seldom dominate real-world attack targets, this selection simulates a worst-case scenario for auditing.

Stage 2: Dataset Partitioning and Reference Construction. After removing D_{out} from D , the remaining data are split into a private subset D_{prv} and an auxiliary subset D_{aux} in a 1:2 ratio, maintaining identical data distributions. We then sample 100 subsets $\{D_{\text{prv}}^i\}_{i=1}^{100}$ from D_{prv} , each with a 50% chance of including a randomly selected outlier from D_{out} . The corresponding synthetic datasets $\{\hat{D}_{\text{prv}}^i\}_{i=1}^{100}$ will be generated using $\{D_{\text{prv}}^i\}_{i=1}^{100}$ by method AUG-PE and DP-gen under different ϵ values, respectively. Concurrently, we generate $M = 4$ reference auxiliary sets $\{D_{\text{ref}}^1, \dots, D_{\text{ref}}^4\}$, each a duplicate of D_{aux} . For each target $x \in D_{\text{out}}$, exactly two of these references include x , while the other two exclude it, ensuring balanced membership signals. We then train separate n-gram language models on each D_{ref}^i [39].

Stage 3: Attack Signal Computation. For each generated synthetic set \hat{D}_{prv}^i and target record x_i , we train an n-gram model and compute its probability $P_{\text{ng}}(x_i)$. We also compute the average probability $\bar{P}_{\text{ref}}(x_i)$ across the four reference models. The final MIA attack score is thus defined as: $\Delta P(x_i) = P_{\text{ng}}(x_i) - \bar{P}_{\text{ref}}(x_i)$. A higher $\Delta P(x_i)$ suggests a greater likelihood that x_i was included in D_{prv}^i .

This pipeline efficiently simulates a realistic black-box MIA, requiring only one synthetic dataset per attack trial while providing statistically grounded membership inference. We then use the computed attack scores together with the true membership labels to generate Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curves. From these curves, we derive two key metrics of attack performance: Area Under the Curve (AUC), which reflects the overall discriminative ability of the attack by measuring the area under the ROC.

DATASET HOc (Random: 3.7, Majority: 9.1)																	
BERT-large (original=71.9)					BioClinicalBERT (original=68.7)					BiomedBERT (original=74.3)							
Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 0.5$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 4$	Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 0.5$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 4$	Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 0.5$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 4$
DP-Gen	51.0	14.7	10.1	15.7	14.8	DP-Gen	46.4	11.2	11.5	11.8	13.8	DP-Gen	58.6	14.9	11.3	15.6	17.9
AUG-PE	16.8	5.2	7.8	6.6	9.7	AUG-PE	11.0	4.9	7.0	8.6	9.1	AUG-PE	19.7	10.0	9.4	7.3	12.1
DATASET N2C2'08 (Random: 46.1, Majority: 53.2)																	
LongFormer-large (original=87.7)					Clinical-BigBird (original=71.6)					Clinical-LongFormer (original=60.1)							
Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 0.5$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 4$	Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 0.5$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 4$	Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 0.5$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 4$
DP-Gen	61.1	55.6	56.9	59.3	55.8	DP-Gen	55.7	53.4	53.2	53.2	53.2	DP-Gen	59.0	53.2	53.2	53.6	55.4
AUG-PE	56.9	56.9	60.0	57.7	60.9	AUG-PE	53.2	53.2	53.3	53.2	53.2	AUG-PE	57.6	56.9	57.2	53.2	53.2
DATASET PSYTAR (Random: 25.4, Majority: 41.8)																	
BERT-base (original=79.7)					BERT-large (original=80.4)					DeBERTa-xlarge (original=82.1)							
Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 0.5$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 4$	Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 0.5$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 4$	Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 0.5$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 4$
DP-Gen	68.4	39.1	42.3	41.4	42.7	DP-Gen	70.1	38.7	37.6	42.5	44.0	DP-Gen	70.0	21.7	15.3	6.5	38.2
AUG-PE	64.2	41.8	54.7	56.0	62.2	AUG-PE	66.1	47.3	57.4	60.4	62.6	AUG-PE	67.3	48.1	55.9	58.9	61.6
DATASET MIMIC (Random: 48.8, Majority: 44.0)																	
BiomedBERT (original=76.5)					BioClinicalBERT (original=74.8)					BiomedRobertaBase (original=74.3)							
Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 0.5$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 4$	Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 0.5$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 4$	Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 0.5$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 4$
DP-Gen	70.1	46.2	62.1	61.0	64.6	DP-Gen	71.5	47.4	64.4	65.1	63.5	DP-Gen	68.3	51.4	61.9	61.6	59.7
AUG-PE	64.9	60.8	59.5	62.6	65.1	AUG-PE	61.8	63.2	58.0	64.0	65.6	AUG-PE	61.4	60.6	52.4	61.5	66.3
DATASET DMSAFN (Random: 30.5, Majority: 41.1)																	
ProsusAI-finbert (original=78.1)					finbert-tone (original=57.0)					FinancialBERT (original=95.2)							
Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 0.5$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 4$	Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 0.5$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 4$	Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 0.5$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 4$
DP-Gen	60.4	40.7	40.4	40.8	40.9	DP-Gen	30.6	38.4	38.3	32.8	31.5	DP-Gen	91.6	64.9	69.6	65.8	70.1
AUG-PE	43.8	41.6	41.5	41.5	43.2	AUG-PE	43.7	42.4	40.9	42.6	43.8	AUG-PE	65.6	65.9	61.3	70.9	65.9
DATASET LC37FND (Random: 41.3, Majority: 50.2)																	
ProsusAI-finbert (original=86.9)					distilroberta (original=95.1)					FinancialBERT (original=84.8)							
Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 0.5$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 4$	Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 0.5$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 4$	Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 0.5$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 4$
DP-Gen	79.0	53.0	53.5	56.3	55.3	DP-Gen	85.4	59.0	66.5	65.7	69.6	DP-Gen	78.0	56.3	59.4	64.2	64.0
AUG-PE	55.1	49.3	53.8	55.8	51.4	AUG-PE	69.0	46.7	47.9	50.1	57.4	AUG-PE	58.8	56.5	55.2	63.2	54.4
DATASET ZSTFNS (Random: 48.7, Majority: 65.5)																	
ProsusAI-finbert (original=88.3)					finbert-tone (original=88.1)					FinancialBERT (original=84.8)							
Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 0.5$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 4$	Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 0.5$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 4$	Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 0.5$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 4$
DP-Gen	86.0	66.2	68.0	67.9	69.8	DP-Gen	86.6	67.6	69.7	68.5	73.8	DP-Gen	83.3	67.7	68.2	66.6	68.2
AUG-PE	69.3	65.4	66.5	66.2	66.7	AUG-PE	71.6	66.4	66.7	67.1	68.2	AUG-PE	71.6	66.7	67.2	65.3	67.2
DATASET ASYLAX (Random: 38.4, Majority: 51.4)																	
legal-bert-base (original=69.0)					InLegalBERT (original=66.0)					Roberta-base (original=59.8)							
Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 0.5$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 4$	Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 0.5$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 4$	Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 0.5$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 4$
DP-Gen	61.5	32.9	47.2	39.3	33.9	DP-Gen	61.1	48.0	48.3	30.7	34.3	DP-Gen	58.0	30.1	47.3	34.8	36.2
AUG-PE	49.6	51.4	52.9	51.5	51.4	AUG-PE	51.6	51.5	51.5	51.5	52.1	AUG-PE	50.4	51.4	51.4	51.4	44.5
DATASET EURLEX (Random: 24.1, Majority: 36.1)																	
legal-bert-base (original=90.2)					InLegalBERT (original=89.7)					Roberta-base (original=89.4)							
Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 0.5$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 4$	Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 0.5$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 4$	Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 0.5$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 4$
DP-Gen	63.2	43.9	28.4	37.9	33.7	DP-Gen	61.5	48.4	34.4	40.4	44.9	DP-Gen	58.8	51.4	38.2	37.1	41.4
AUG-PE	60.9	52.6	51.7	51.4	57.5	AUG-PE	63.4	54.7	54.2	57.6	56.7	AUG-PE	63.7	54.4	53.4	57.3	57.7

Table 2: Random/majority guess baselines, and downstream classification F1 scores for three models per dataset across different privacy budgets (ϵ).

4 Experiment Setup

Choice of ϵ : While there is no consensus how much ϵ is “enough” [25], high values provide increasingly lower protections [14]. In practice (e.g., as recommended by NIST [30]) $\epsilon \leq 5$ or even $\epsilon \leq 1$ is considered a strong privacy guarantee, which guides our choice: $\epsilon \in \{0.5, 1, 2, 4\}$.

Choice of models: For both AUG-PE and DP-transformers across all datasets, we use Llama models (Llama-3-1B, 3B and 8B) as the LLM backbone. For AUG-PE, we embed documents with “sentence-t5-base” and “kamalkraj/BioSimCSE-BioLinkBERT-BASE” for non-medical datasets and medical datasets, respectively. We use “allenai/OLMoE-1B-7B-0125” for MAUVE calculations, to alleviate the length limit of the model used in the original implementation. To collect named entities, we use “dslim/bert-base-NER” for non-medical datasets and “blaze999/Medical-NER” for medical datasets.

Computing infrastructure: All experiments were conducted on a workstation equipped with L40S GPU, Intel Xeon Silver 4216 CPU, and 768 GB RAM, running Ubuntu 22.04 LTS. Additional details are supplied in Appendix B and as code.

5 Results and Analysis

Utility Table 2 reveals substantial utility degradation in text generation. Notably, even in the absence of privacy constraints ($\epsilon = \infty$), synthetic data does not achieve parity with real-data baselines, indicating that the **evaluated**

Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 4$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 0.5$
	$\mathcal{M}\uparrow/\mathcal{N}\downarrow/\mathcal{L}\downarrow$	$\mathcal{M}\uparrow/\mathcal{N}\downarrow/\mathcal{L}\downarrow$	$\mathcal{M}\uparrow/\mathcal{N}\downarrow/\mathcal{L}\downarrow$	$\mathcal{M}\uparrow/\mathcal{N}\downarrow/\mathcal{L}\downarrow$	$\mathcal{M}\uparrow/\mathcal{N}\downarrow/\mathcal{L}\downarrow$
HoC	(Original: 0.99/2.19/0.004)				
DP-Gen	0.65/3.71/0.06	0.18/5.26/0.40	0.16/5.23/0.417	0.14/5.18/0.44	0.12/5.21/0.47
AUG-PE	0.01/3.80/1.49	0.01/3.92/1.40	0.01/4.06/1.35	0.01/4.45/1.25	0.01/4.72/1.25
N2C2'08	(Original: 0.99/0.90/0.17)				
DP-Gen	0.42/2.34/0.75	0.02/9.07/1.37	0.02/6.79/1.40	0.02/7.12/1.42	0.02/7.19/1.54
AUG-PE	0.02/5.75/3.72	0.03/6.50/3.80	0.02/6.66/3.87	0.02/6.75/3.63	0.02/6.98/3.42
PSYTAR	(Original: 0.99/1.08/0.007)				
DP-Gen	0.61/2.60/0.03	0.42/3.17/0.03	0.34/3.24/0.05	0.37/3.63/0.03	0.35/3.71/0.03
AUG-PE	0.02/4.38/3.21	0.02/4.62/3.27	0.02/4.87/3.23	0.02/5.24/3.34	0.02/5.49/3.38
MIMIC	(Original: 0.99/0.24/0.003)				
DP-Gen	0.96/0.30/0.01	0.01/3.35/2.69	0.01/3.65/2.59	0.01/3.80/2.49	0.01/4.89/2.76
AUG-PE	0.01/5.44/3.83	0.01/5.40/6.21	0.01/5.41/2.41	0.01/5.51/2.42	0.01/5.79/6.20
DMSAFI	(Original: 0.86/1.23/0.012)				
DP-Gen	0.21/2.40/0.06	0.18/2.84/0.02	0.16/2.74/0.04	0.15/3.04/0.03	0.12/3.04/0.06
AUG-PE	0.01/3.85/2.36	0.01/4.41/2.35	0.01/4.66/2.34	0.01/5.17/2.24	0.01/4.63/2.30
LC37FND	(Original: 0.99/0.88/0.002)				
DP-Gen	0.90/1.17/0.03	0.01/4.61/3.71	0.01/4.77/4.04	0.01/4.77/3.95	0.01/4.64/4.88
AUG-PE	0.01/4.22/2.52	0.01/4.45/2.67	0.01/5.20/2.82	0.01/5.14/2.91	0.01/5.45/2.87
ZSTFNS	(Original: 0.99/1.29/0.002)				
DP-Gen	0.96/1.75/0.01	0.04/4.89/0.09	0.04/5.04/0.15	0.05/5.06/0.19	0.4/2.44/0.01
AUG-PE	0.02/3.55/4.36	0.02/3.78/4.39	0.02/3.97/4.38	0.02/4.13/4.46	0.01/4.26/4.39
ASYLAX	(Original: 0.98/0.11/0.004)				
DP-Gen	0.03/0.61/0.43	0.01/3.02/6.41	0.01/3.24/5.95	0.01/6.20/3.58	0.01/6.54/1.23
AUG-PE	0.01/5.53/1.41	0.01/4.95/1.41	0.01/5.55/1.92	0.01/5.63/6.12	0.01/5.92/1.41
EURLEX	(Original: 0.98/0.26/0.006)				
DP-Gen	0.05/0.52/0.06	0.10/0.79/0.23	0.07/0.83/0.27	0.03/0.93/0.22	0.01/1.42/0.45
AUG-PE	0.01/1.97/0.05	0.01/2.04/0.06	0.01/2.12/0.04	0.01/2.36/0.08	0.01/2.40/0.08

Table 3: MAUVE (\mathcal{M}) as well as entity (\mathcal{N}) and text length (\mathcal{L}) distribution divergences (fidelity) for different approaches and privacy budgets (ϵ) across datasets.

methods are unable to completely model the domain-specific complexity. Only in a few cases do DP-gen synthetic datasets, without privacy constraints, enable downstream models to match real-data performance (e.g., N2C2'08 on Clinical-LongFormer, ZSTFNS on all models, ASYLAX on Roberta-base). In contrast, AUG-PE still lags behind, even without privacy budget, highlighting the need for extra efforts (e.g., prompt optimization) to match fine-tuning methods.

For most datasets and downstream models, there is no consistently clear relationship between the privacy budget and performance: **stricter privacy constraints do not always correspond to decreased performance.** This observation may be attributed to two factors: first, the implementation of differential privacy may not provide the intended privacy guarantees; second, it is possible that strong privacy protections do not necessarily require compromising the utility of synthetic data for downstream tasks. This result supports the effectiveness of our benchmark design, particularly the inclusion of multiple classifier baselines, in providing more accurate estimates of data utility.

Discounting for random/majority baseline performance and calculating the overall improvement over baselines (capped by performance on real data), we rescale this score to range [25%, 79%]/[-6.9%, 62%] without privacy guarantees for DP-Gen/Aug-PE, where the negative value indicates that, in some cases, model performance falls below the baseline. With differential privacy guarantees ($\epsilon \leq 4$), the maximum observed improvements are capped at 54.5%/58% for DP-Gen/Aug-PE, which reveals that, while privacy-preserving methods can still yield substantial gains over naive baselines, their achievable improvements are inherently limited compared to non-private settings.

An analysis of per-dataset performance, considering the maximum improvement under different privacy guarantees, shows substantial variability across methods and domains. DP-gen exhibits the lowest improvement on the ASYLAX dataset (-31%) and the highest on LC37FND (33%). AUG-PE performs worst on HOC (1.85%) and best on PSYTAR (52%). These findings indicate that the effectiveness of differentially private text generation methods varies across domains. Notably, even within the medical domain, AUG-PE achieves its greatest improvement on the gated-access PSYTAR dataset but the least on a public short-text dataset HOC, suggesting that dataset characteristics significantly impact performance. It should be noted, however, that gated access does not provide a strict guarantee against information leakage to large language models.

Fidelity We find that **fidelity of synthetic data deteriorates under differential privacy constraints, mirroring trends observed in utility and highlighting the persistent challenge of generating high-quality, domain-specific data.** As shown in Table 3, MAUVE scores between real and synthetic data are consistently close to zero across

medical, financial, and legal domains, indicating that the distributions of synthetic data in the embedding space deviate substantially from those of real data. Further analysis of named entity recognition (NER) distribution divergences reveals that synthetic data exhibits much greater divergence from real data than the divergence observed among different real datasets, underscoring the inability of synthetic data to faithfully reproduce real-world entity distributions. Additionally, across all datasets and domains, the divergence between synthetic and real data is consistently higher when privacy constraints are applied, as compared to the unconstrained setting, demonstrating that privacy mechanisms further exacerbate distributional discrepancies. Similar patterns are observed in length distribution divergences, suggesting that synthetic data lacks the informational richness of authentic data. While we can recover some of the utility and fidelity by relying on the post-processing property of DP-trained generative models, by over-generating synthetic data and filtering it based on quality metrics that do not require reference to original data (See Appendix D for details), they still lag behind that of data generated without respecting privacy constraints.

Collectively, these findings reinforce our main contribution: **generating high-quality domain-specific data under differential privacy constraints remains an unresolved challenge**, with fidelity and utility degrading markedly as domain complexity increases, particularly for domains that are less represented in pre-training corpora.




Figure 1: Correlation of leakage with averaged (**left**): Utility, i.e., relative F1 improvement over baseline, (**Right**): Fidelity, i.e., MAUVE. Spearman correlation at $\rho = 0.3$ at $p \ll 0.05$; and $\rho = 0.2$ at $p = 0.1$, respectively.

Training Data Leakage As shown in Figure 1, leakage of data assumed to be “private” into pre-training corpora substantially impacts the quality of synthetic datasets generated by large language models. To directly quantify the extent of training corpus leakage—beyond relying solely on evaluation metrics—we conducted a dedicated leakage detection experiment. Specifically, we leveraged the Infini-gram API to efficiently identify exact text matches between synthetic datasets and the RedPajama corpus. Given that the most recent LLaMA model’s training data has not been made public; we use RedPajama as a proxy, as it was explicitly modelled after the previous iterations of LLaMa’s pre-training corpora.

Greater exposure of pre-training data in large language models corresponds to higher-quality synthetic data, as reflected in both utility and fidelity. To examine this relationship, we hypothesize that increased presence of training data in the model’s pre-training corpus enhances the quality of generated synthetic data. For each dataset, we compute the average micro F1 score (utility) and MAUVE score (fidelity) across all privacy guarantee levels ($\epsilon \in \infty, 4, 2, 1, 0.5$). We then assess the correlation between these scores and the percentage of training data detected as leaked. Our analysis reveals a strong positive correlation between corpus leakage and both utility and fidelity, supporting our initial hypothesis. Notably, this finding helps explain why the psytar dataset, despite its restricted access, exhibits the greatest performance improvement over the baseline for AUG-PE.

Privacy As illustrated in Figures 2, we report MIA results on four datasets-PSYTAR, N2C2’08, DMSAFN, and ASYLAX-using AUG-PE and DP-gen. Among various n -gram models evaluated ($n = 2, 3, 4$), we present results for $n = 2$, which yielded the best performance. In our evaluation, a positive pair occurs when a synthetic dataset \hat{D}_{prv}^i , is generated from the original dataset D_{prv}^i augmented with x (a target record). For negative pairs, since any outlier $x_i \in D_{\text{out}}$ could serve as a negative example, we randomly select one from D_{out} . To reduce uncertainty, we repeat the evaluation 50 times and plot the ROC curve with the mean and 95% confidence interval.

AUG-PE exhibits clear privacy violations, particularly under stringent privacy settings, highlighting the limitations of current approaches. Notably, as illustrated in Figure 2, AUG-PE demonstrates privacy leakage for both the PSYTAR and N2C2’08 datasets even under strong privacy constraints (i.e., $\epsilon = 0.5$). The zoomed-in panels show that, at low false positive rates (FPR) in the range $[0.1, 0.2]$, the empirical ϵ exceeds the theoretical bound, indicating a privacy breach, despite low overall AUC scores, reinforcing Carlini et al.’s (2022) point that average attack success rates might not be fully representative of privacy breaches. This finding is also consistent with our earlier utility analyses,




Figure 2: The ROC curves illustrate the performance of membership inference attacks (MIA) on synthetic data generated by AUG-PE and DP-gen. The colourful dashed lines represent the theoretical upper bounds for each corresponding privacy parameter ϵ from Kairouz et al. [22]. Zoomed sections show attack performance surpassing theoretical bounds.

where AUG-PE showed the largest performance gains on PSYTAR—a dataset with restricted access—and with leakage analyses that identified higher corpus leakage for PSYTAR. Collectively, these results provide the first qualitative evidence that public pretraining can inadvertently lead to private information leakage, as previously hypothesized by Tramèr et al. [40], and underscore the risks of assuming large-scale public datasets are non-sensitive in differentially private learning scenarios.

DP-gen offers stronger privacy protection, but the relationship between privacy parameters and actual leakage is complex and sometimes counterintuitive. For DP-gen, no substantial privacy violations are observed; however, MIA without differential privacy constraints (i.e., $\epsilon = \infty$, red line) perform markedly better than those with DP, achieving an AUC of 0.82 on the DMSAFN dataset and highlighting significant vulnerability in the absence of protection. However, stricter privacy constraints do not always correspond to lower MIA performance. For example, on the PSYTAR dataset, the AUC is 0.39 (green line) for $\epsilon = 4$, but rises to 0.58 (purple line) for $\epsilon = 0.5$. This suggests that differential privacy guarantees are not always realized in practice, as also noted in Ganev et al. [17]. These findings underscore that the relationship between the declared privacy parameter ϵ and actual leakage is complex; mechanisms with the same ϵ value may exhibit different vulnerabilities depending on their design.

Evaluation of Model Size To assess the influence of model size on synthetic data performance, we compare Llama-3 models of varying scales: 1B, 3B, and 8B. The results from Table 4 and Figure 3 (left) yield the following key observations: (1) F1 score does not exhibit a consistent positive correlation with increasing model size across different datasets and epsilon values; (2) The MAUVE score demonstrates a modest increase with model size, an effect that is more pronounced in datasets with higher levels of pre-training data leakage, potentially attributable to the enhanced memorization capabilities of larger models.

Evaluation of Fine-tuning Strategy Based on observation on Figure 3 (right), excluding two outliers (ASYLAX at $\epsilon = 1$ and DMSAFN at $\epsilon = 0.5$), we observe that LoRA fine-tuning tends to be more beneficial for datasets that were less represented or exposed during pre-training. This finding suggests that adapter-based fine-tuning methods, such as LoRA, may introduce comparatively less noise into the learning process. Consequently, the noise-to-signal ratio becomes more favorable—an effect that is particularly important when the fine-tuning data substantially diverges from the model’s original pre-training corpus.

Size	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 4$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 0.5$
	avg / best	avg / best	avg / best	avg / best	avg / best
PSYTAR					
1B	69.5 / 70.1	41.6 / 44.0	40.1 / 42.5	40.8 / 42.3	39.2 / 39.1
3B	75.1 / 76.9	41.4 / 42.5	37.9 / 40.4	33.9 / 36.2	22.8 / 24.6
8B	77.1 / 77.6	43.8 / 44.2	42.9 / 43.0	40.8 / 43.5	35.6 / 36.8
N2C2'08					
1B	54.9 / 58.2	53.2 / 53.2	47.8 / 53.2	53.7 / 54.7	57.1 / 61.3
3B	58.2 / 63.1	62.6 / 64.4	64.1 / 65.6	62.6 / 68.8	65.1 / 69.5
8B	58.5 / 64.9	58.2 / 65.7	55.1 / 56.9	59.1 / 66.2	55.0 / 56.4
DMSAFN					
1B	62.7 / 91.6	47.5 / 70.1	46.5 / 65.8	49.4 / 69.6	48.0 / 65.0
3B	71.0 / 90.0	47.7 / 64.2	47.4 / 61.4	46.7 / 56.5	53.4 / 86.7
8B	70.6 / 89.8	31.5 / 64.4	36.3 / 61.6	44.3 / 56.7	52.3 / 74.8
ASYLAX					
1B	60.2 / 61.5	34.8 / 36.2	34.9 / 39.3	47.6 / 48.3	37.0 / 48.0
3B	51.4 / 51.4	41.7 / 46.0	48.9 / 51.3	49.4 / 50.5	45.8 / 47.7
8B	29.8 / 50.9	28.7 / 29.5	27.6 / 27.7	27.6 / 27.6	27.7 / 27.8

Table 4: Impact on utility of synthetic data generated by DP-finetuned LLMs of increasing sizes at varying ϵ .




Figure 3: **Left:** ϵ -averaged MAUVE scores of datasets generated by DP-SGD trained models of increasing sizes. **Right:** Advantages of LoRA vs full fine-tuning across different datasets and ϵ , sorted by increasing pre-training leakage.

6 Conclusions

This work highlights the persistent challenges in generating high-quality, domain-specific synthetic data with differential privacy. Through a standardized evaluation framework and rigorous empirical studies on diverse datasets, we show that current methods struggle to balance utility, fidelity, and privacy—especially as domain complexity grows. Our membership inference audits further reveal that pre-training data contamination can undermine claimed privacy guarantees. Our findings inform future research and suggest to pay closer attention to empirical privacy validation, especially when facing with potential data leakage of evaluation data into pre-training corpora. To facilitate this, we share our code base and data (as allowed) with the wider research community.

References

- [1] Martin Abadi, Andy Chu, Ian Goodfellow, H. Brendan McMahan, Ilya Mironov, Kunal Talwar, and Li Zhang. Deep Learning with Differential Privacy. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, volume 24-28-October-2016, pages 308–318, New York, NY, USA, 10 2016. ACM. ISBN 9781450341394. doi: 10.1145/2976749.2978318. URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/2976749.2978318>.
- [2] Simon Baker, Ilona Silins, Yufan Guo, Imran Ali, Johan H"ogberg, Ulla Stenius, and Anna Korhonen. Automatic semantic classification of scientific literature according to the hallmarks of cancer. *Bioinform.*, 32(3):432–440, 2016. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btv585. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btv585>.

- [3] Claire Barale, Michael Rovatsos, and Nehal Bhuta. Automated refugee case analysis: A NLP pipeline for supporting legal practitioners. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 2992–3005, Toronto, Canada, jul 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.findings-acl.187. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-acl.187>.
- [4] Markus M Breunig, Hans-Peter Kriegel, Raymond T Ng, and Jörg Sander. Lof: identifying density-based local outliers. In *Proceedings of the 2000 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data*, pages 93–104, 2000.
- [5] Nicholas Carlini, Chang Liu, Úlfar Erlingsson, Jernej Kos, and Dawn Song. The secret sharer: Evaluating and testing unintended memorization in neural networks. In *28th USENIX security symposium (USENIX security 19)*, pages 267–284, 2019.
- [6] Nicholas Carlini, Florian Tramèr, Eric Wallace, Matthew Jagielski, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Katherine Lee, Adam Roberts, Tom Brown, Dawn Song, Ulfar Erlingsson, Alina Oprea, and Colin Raffel. Extracting Training Data from Large Language Models. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*, pages 2633–2650, 2021. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2012.07805>.
- [7] Nicholas Carlini, Steve Chien, Milad Nasr, Shuang Song, Andreas Terzis, and Florian Tramèr. Membership Inference Attacks From First Principles. In *2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 1897–1914. IEEE, 5 2022. ISBN 978-1-6654-1316-9. doi: 10.1109/SP46214.2022.9833649. URL <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/9833649/>.
- [8] Ilias Chalkidis, Manos Fergadiotis, Prodromos Malakasiotis, and Ion Androutsopoulos. Large-scale multi-label text classification on eu legislation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.02192*, 2019.
- [9] Fabrizio Dell’Acqua, Edward McFowland, Ethan R. Mollick, Hila Lifshitz-Assaf, Katherine Kellogg, Saran Rajendran, Lisa Krayer, François Candelon, and Karim R. Lakhani. Navigating the Jagged Technological Frontier: Field Experimental Evidence of the Effects of AI on Knowledge Worker Productivity and Quality. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 2023. ISSN 1556-5068. doi: 10.2139/ssrn.4573321.
- [10] Felix Drinkall, Janet B. Pierrehumbert, and Stefan Zohren. When dimensionality hurts: The role of llm embedding compression for noisy regression tasks, 2025.
- [11] Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2407, 2024.
- [12] Cynthia Dwork. Differential privacy. In Michele Bugliesi, Bart Preneel, Vladimiro Sassone, and Ingo Wegener, editors, *Automata, Languages and Programming*, pages 1–12, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. ISBN 978-3-540-35908-1.
- [13] Cynthia Dwork, Aaron Roth, et al. The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy. *Foundations and Trends® in Theoretical Computer Science*, 9(3–4):211–407, 2014.
- [14] Cynthia Dwork, Nitin Kohli, and Deirdre Mulligan. Differential privacy in practice: Expose your epsilons! *Journal of Privacy and Confidentiality*, 9(2), 2019.
- [15] James Flemings and Murali Annavaram. Differentially Private Knowledge Distillation via Synthetic Text Generation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024*, pages 12957–12968, Stroudsburg, PA, USA, 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.findings-acl.769. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.findings-acl.769>.
- [16] James Flemings, Meisam Razaviyayn, and Murali Annavaram. Differentially Private Next-Token Prediction of Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4390–4404, Stroudsburg, PA, USA, 3 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.naacl-long.247. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.naacl-long.247>.
- [17] Georgi Ganev, Meenatchi Sundaram Muthu Selva Annamalai, and Emiliano De Cristofaro. The elusive pursuit of reproducing pate-gan: Benchmarking, auditing, debugging. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.13985*, 2024.
- [18] Ivan Habernal. When differential privacy meets NLP: The devil is in the detail. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1522–1528, Stroudsburg, PA, USA, 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.114.
- [19] Will Hardman, Mark Banks, Rory Davidson, Donna Truran, Nindya Widita Ayuningtyas, Hoa Ngo, Alistair Johnson, and Tom Pollard. Snomed ct entity linking challenge (version 1.0.0). *physionet*. rrid:scr_007345. <https://doi.org/10.13026/s48e-sp45>, 2023.

- [20] Lei Huang, Weijiang Yu, Weitao Ma, Weihong Zhong, Zhangyin Feng, Haotian Wang, Qianglong Chen, Weihua Peng, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, et al. A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*, 43(2):1–55, 2025.
- [21] Alistair E.W. Johnson, Lucas Bulgarelli, Lu Shen, Alvin Gayles, Ayad Shammout, Steven Horng, Tom J. Pollard, Benjamin Moody, Brian Gow, Li wei H. Lehman, Leo A. Celi, and Roger G. Mark. MIMIC-IV, a freely accessible electronic health record dataset. *Scientific Data*, 10(1), 12 2023. ISSN 20524463. doi: 10.1038/S41597-022-01899-X.
- [22] Peter Kairouz, Sewoong Oh, and Pramod Viswanath. The Composition Theorem for Differential Privacy, 6 2015. ISSN 1938-7228. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v37/kairouz15.html>.
- [23] Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. Scaling laws for neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361*, 2020.
- [24] Tatsuki Koga, Ruihan Wu, and Kamalika Chaudhuri. Privacy-preserving retrieval-augmented generation with differential privacy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.04697*, 2024.
- [25] Jaewoo Lee and Chris Clifton. How much is enough? choosing ϵ for differential privacy. In *International Conference on Information Security*, pages 325–340. Springer, 2011.
- [26] Hao Li, Yuping Wu, Viktor Schlegel, Riza Batista-Navarro, Thanh-Tung Nguyen, Abhinav Ramesh Kashyap, Xiao-Jun Zeng, Daniel Beck, Stefan Winkler, and Goran Nenadic. Team:PULSAR at ProbSum 2023:PULSAR: Pre-training with Extracted Healthcare Terms for Summarising Patients’ Problems and Data Augmentation with Black-box Large Language Models. In *The 22nd Workshop on Biomedical Natural Language Processing and BioNLP Shared Tasks*, pages 503–509, Stroudsburg, PA, USA, 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.bionlp-1.49.
- [27] Justus Mattern, Zhijing Jin, Benjamin Weggenmann, Bernhard Schoelkopf, and Mrinmaya Sachan. Differentially Private Language Models for Secure Data Sharing. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 4860–4873, Stroudsburg, PA, USA, 10 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2022.emnlp-main.323. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.emnlp-main.323>.
- [28] Matthieu Meeus, Lukas Wutschitz, Santiago Zanella-Béguelin, Shruti Tople, and Reza Shokri. The canary’s echo: Auditing privacy risks of llm-generated synthetic text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.14921*, 2025.
- [29] Niklas Muennighoff, Alexander Rush, Boaz Barak, Teven Le Scao, Nouamane Tazi, Aleksandra Piktus, Sampo Pyysalo, Thomas Wolf, and Colin A Raffel. Scaling data-constrained language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:50358–50376, 2023.
- [30] Joseph Near and David Darais. Differential privacy: Future work & open challenges. <https://www.nist.gov/blogs/cybersecurity-insights/differential-privacy-future-work-open-challenges>, 2022. NIST Cybersecurity Insights Blog, January 24, 2022.
- [31] OpenAI. GPT-4 Technical Report. *arXiv:2303.08774*, 3 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.08774v6>.
- [32] Nicolas Papernot, Shuang Song, Ilya Mironov, Ananth Raghunathan, Kunal Talwar, and Ulfar Erlingsson. Scalable Private Learning with PATE. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1802.08908>.
- [33] Krishna Pillutla, Swabha Swayamdipta, Rowan Zellers, John Thickstun, Sean Welleck, Yejin Choi, Zaid Harchaoui, and Paul G Allen. MAUVE: Measuring the Gap Between Neural Text and Human Text using Divergence Frontiers. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 4816–4828, 12 2021. URL <https://github.com/krishnap25/mauve>.
- [34] Timo Schick and Hinrich Schütze. Generating Datasets with Pretrained Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6943–6951, Stroudsburg, PA, USA, 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.555.
- [35] Viktor Schlegel, Anil A Bharath, Zilong Zhao, and Kevin Yee. Generating synthetic data with formal privacy guarantees: State of the art and the road ahead. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.20846*, 2025.
- [36] Weijia Shi, Anirudh Ajith, Mengzhou Xia, Yangsibo Huang, Daogao Liu, Terra Blevins, Danqi Chen, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Detecting pretraining data from large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.16789*, 2023.
- [37] Yidan Sun, Viktor Schlegel, Srinivasan Nandakumar, Iqra Zahid, Yuping Wu, Warren Del-Pinto, Goran Nenadic, Siew-Kei Lam, Jie Zhang, and Anil A Bharath. Evaluating differentially private generation of domain-specific text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.20452*, 2025.

- [38] Xinyu Tang, Richard Shin, Huseyin A. Inan, Andre Manoel, Fatemehsadat Mireshghallah, Zinan Lin, Sivakanth Gopi, Janardhan Kulkarni, and Robert Sim. Privacy-Preserving In-Context Learning with Differentially Private Few-Shot Generation. 9 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2309.11765>.
- [39] Virginia Teller. Speech and language processing: an introduction to natural language processing, computational linguistics, and speech recognition, 2000.
- [40] Florian Tramèr, Gautam Kamath, and Nicholas Carlini. Position: Considerations for Differentially Private Learning with Large-Scale Public Pretraining, 7 2024. ISSN 2640-3498. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v235/tramer24a.html>.
- [41] Ozlem Uzuner. Recognizing obesity and comorbidities in sparse data. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 16(4):561–570, 07 2009. doi: 10.1197/jamia.M3115. URL <https://doi.org/10.1197/jamia.M3115>.
- [42] Shijie Wu, Ozan Irsoy, Steven Lu, Vadim Dabravolski, Mark Dredze, Sebastian Gehrmann, Prabhanjan Kambadur, David Rosenberg, and Gideon Mann. Bloombergpt: A large language model for finance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17564*, 2023.
- [43] Chulin Xie, Zinan Lin, Arturs Backurs, Sivakanth Gopi, Da Yu, Huseyin A Inan, Harsha Nori, Haotian Jiang, Huishuai Zhang, Yin Tat Lee, Bo Li, and Sergey Yekhanin. Differentially Private Synthetic Data via Foundation Model APIs 2: Text. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 54531–54560. PMLR, 3 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2403.01749>.
- [44] Xiang Yue, Huseyin A. Inan, Xuechen Li, Girish Kumar, Julia McAnallen, Hoda Shajari, Huan Sun, David Levitan, and Robert Sim. Synthetic Text Generation with Differential Privacy: A Simple and Practical Recipe. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 1:1321–1342, 2023. ISSN 0736587X. doi: 10.18653/V1/2023.ACL-LONG.74. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.acl-long.74/>.
- [45] Yue Zhang, Yafu Li, Leyang Cui, Deng Cai, Lemaoy Liu, Tingchen Fu, Xinting Huang, Enbo Zhao, Yu Zhang, Yulong Chen, et al. Siren’s song in the ai ocean: A survey on hallucination in large language models. *Computational Linguistics*, pages 1–45, 2025.
- [46] Maryam Zolnoori, Kin Wah Fung, Timothy B. Patrick, Paul Fontelo, Hadi Kharrazi, Anthony Faiola, Yi Shuan Shirley Wu, Christina E. Eldredge, Jake Luo, Mike Conway, Jiaxi Zhu, Soo Kyung Park, Kelly Xu, Hamideh Moayyed, and Somaieh Goudarzvand. A systematic approach for developing a corpus of patient reported adverse drug events: A case study for SSRI and SNRI medications. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 90, 2019. doi: 10.1016/j.jbi.2018.12.005. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2018.12.005>.

A Reference-free Metrics

We created a comprehensive Python evaluation framework to assess synthetic text quality using multiple reference-free metrics that measure both linguistic fluency and content diversity. The system analyses generated text corpora by first computing perplexity and log-likelihood scores for individual samples using a pre-trained GPT-2 model, which indicates how naturally each text reads to the language model. These scores are then aggregated to provide corpus-wide averages. The framework measures lexical and structural variety through Self-BLEU calculations and Distinct-1/Distinct-2 scores, which capture the percentage of unique single words and word pairs within the corpus. We also generate corpus-level descriptive statistics, including average text length with standard deviation, and assess how well the word frequency distribution matches Zipf’s law, a characteristic pattern found in natural language. For texts containing multiple sentences, we evaluate semantic consistency by calculating the average cosine similarity between consecutive sentence embeddings generated by a pre-trained Sentence-BERT model. Additionally, we analyse the emotional tone of the corpus by examining sentiment classification results from a transformer-based model.




Figure 4: Metric trends across epsilon levels for AUG-PE and DP-Gen Methods. Each subplot shows how a specific metric changes with increasing epsilon levels. Solid blue lines represent AUG-PE and dashed orange lines represent DP-Gen, with shaded areas indicating variance across datasets. Metrics are reported across 9 datasets.

Based on the comprehensive evaluation across a variety of experiments spanning multiple generation methods, the synthetic text quality shows significant variation depending on the method and dataset combination. As shown in Figure 4, the dp-transformers approach consistently produces the most fluent synthetic text with perplexity scores as low as 50.09, while maintaining reasonable diversity, particularly excelling on specialized datasets like PsyTAR and Daniel-ML. However, there’s a clear trade-off between different quality dimensions: methods that achieve high fluency (low perplexity) often show higher self-similarity, while approaches optimised for diversity may sacrifice semantic coherence. The PsyTAR dataset demonstrates that domain-specific synthetic generation can achieve excellent semantic coherence ($\bar{0}.80$), whereas more general datasets like Hallmarks struggle with coherence ($\bar{0}.08$ to $\bar{0}.12$), suggesting that synthetic data quality is heavily influenced by the underlying domain structure. Privacy-preserving noise levels show diminishing returns, with moderate noise (1-2) providing the best balance between privacy protection and text quality, while extreme noise levels (4) significantly degrade fluency without proportional gains in diversity.

B Additional Implementation Details

AUG-PE

We utilized the TGI (Text Generation Inference)³ framework to accelerate the inference speed of AUG-PE on **long text datasets**. By leveraging TGI’s optimized architecture, we observed a significant reduction in processing time, enabling more efficient experimentation and deployment. The Table .5 below presents a comparative analysis of utility scores for the PSYTAR dataset, these results demonstrate that TGI not only enhances inference speed but also maintains the quality of generated outputs.

DATASET PSYTAR (Random: 25.4, Majority: 41.8)									
BERT-base ((original=79.7))			BERT-large (original=80.4)			DeBERTa-xlarge ((original=82.1))			
Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 2$	Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 2$	Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 2$	
AUG-PE-tgi	63.0	53.8	AUG-PE-tgi	63.7	59.6	AUG-PE-tgi	66.9	58.7	
AUG-PE	64.2	54.7	AUG-PE	66.1	58.9	AUG-PE	67.3	58.9	

Table 5: Comparison of utility scores on the PSYTAR dataset between the original framework and the TGI framework.

Bug Report During our experiments with AUG-PE, we identified and reported a bug related to the use of the "sentence-t5-base" model as a feature extractor for calculating embedding distances in the voting histogram. Specifically, we observed that when the index was moved from CPU to GPU, the resulting calculations were incorrect, yielding all-zero distances for most samples. However, when the index remained on the CPU, the calculations proceeded as expected and produced reliable results. To ensure the validity and reliability of our outcomes when using the "sentence-t5-base" model, we commented out the two lines of code responsible for transferring the index to the GPU (in `./dpsda/dp_counter.py`, line 30-31). This workaround allows us to maintain accurate distance computations until the underlying issue is resolved.

DP-Gen

Owing to memory limitations, we employed flash-attention⁴ to facilitate experimentation on datasets with extended context lengths. To ensure compatibility with flash-attention, we modified the Opacus codebase (specifically the optimizer), casting the noise added to the gradients to match the data type of the gradients.

C Additional Experimental Results

We present generated text samples of three datasets (one medical PSYTAR, one financial DMSAFN and one legal ASYLAX) for two baseline methods under various values of ϵ . For each baseline and $\epsilon \in \{\infty, 4, 2, 1, 0.5\}$, we include both a good and a bad sample, as determined by their quality. This allows for a qualitative comparison of sample quality across different settings and methods. The samples are presented in "good_bad_examples.jsonl" file in uploaded supplementary material folder.

D DP-Postprocessing - Filtering

The data filtering post-processing method employed in this study is both straightforward and effective. A domain-specific prompt is presented to a large language model (LLM); for example, in the case of the Psytar dataset, the prompt may inquire whether a given text resembles a social media post discussing medication side effects. The LLM is then tasked with generating a single token in response. The final filtering score for each sample is computed as the difference between the model-assigned probabilities of the "yes" and "no" tokens, denoted as $P(yes) - P(no)$. This scoring mechanism provides a quantitative measure of the model’s confidence in classifying the text according to the specified prompt, thereby enabling efficient filtering of relevant data samples. The following Table .6 presents the improvements on Mauve score after applying filtering method. These results indicate that the quality of synthetic datasets can be further improved by applying post-processing filtering techniques, suggesting a promising direction for future research.

³<https://huggingface.co/docs/text-generation-inference/en/index>

⁴<https://github.com/Dao-AILab/flash-attention>

Dataset	$\epsilon = 4$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 0.5$
PSYTAR	-0.0598	-0.0317	-0.0119	0.0055
DMSAFN	0.034	0.0406	0.0096	0.0191

Table 6: Improvements in Mauve scores for different ϵ values across datasets after the application of post-processing filtering using DP-Gen.