

Evaluating Differentially Private Generation of Domain-Specific Text

Yidan Sun
Imperial College London, Imperial
Global Singapore
Singapore

Viktor Schlegel
Imperial College London, Imperial
Global Singapore
Singapore

Srinivasan Nandakumar
Imperial College London, Imperial
Global Singapore
Singapore

Iqra Zahid
Imperial College London, Imperial
Global Singapore
Singapore

Yuping Wu
University of Manchester
United Kingdom

Warren Del-Pinto
University of Manchester
United Kingdom

Goran Nenadic
University of Manchester
United Kingdom

Siew-Kei Lam
Nanyang Technological University
Singapore

Jie Zhang
A*STAR
Singapore

Anil A Bharath
Imperial College London, Imperial
Global Singapore
Singapore

Abstract

Generative AI offers transformative potential for high-stakes domains such as healthcare and finance, yet privacy and regulatory barriers hinder the use of real-world data. To address this, differentially private synthetic data generation has emerged as a promising alternative. In this work, we introduce a unified benchmark to systematically evaluate the utility and fidelity of text datasets generated under formal Differential Privacy (DP) guarantees. Our benchmark addresses key challenges in domain-specific benchmarking, including choice of representative data and realistic privacy budgets, accounting for pre-training and a variety of evaluation metrics. We assess state-of-the-art privacy-preserving generation methods across five domain-specific datasets, revealing significant utility and fidelity degradation compared to real data, especially under strict privacy constraints. These findings underscore the limitations of current approaches, outline the need for advanced privacy-preserving data sharing methods and set a precedent regarding their evaluation in realistic scenarios.¹

¹Corresponding Authors: y.sun1@imperial.ac.uk and v.schlegel@imperial.ac.uk.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.
CIKM '25, Seoul, Korea

© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/2018/06
<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

CCS Concepts

• **Computing methodologies** → **Natural language generation**;
• **Security and privacy** → *Privacy-preserving protocols*; • **Information systems** → Data mining.

Keywords

Synthetic Data, Differential Privacy, Generative AI, Benchmark

ACM Reference Format:

Yidan Sun, Viktor Schlegel, Srinivasan Nandakumar, Iqra Zahid, Yuping Wu, Warren Del-Pinto, Goran Nenadic, Siew-Kei Lam, Jie Zhang, and Anil A Bharath. 2025. Evaluating Differentially Private Generation of Domain-Specific Text. In *Proceedings of CIKM (CIKM '25)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 6 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

1 Introduction

The rapid advancement of Natural Language Processing (NLP) methods has seen success in an increasing number of tasks, including specialist domains, e.g., generating medical documents [7, 28, 33], solving math problems [13] or penetration-testing [17]. However, their success hinges on the wide availability of training and benchmark data, which is exacerbated for potentially sensitive domain-specific data, due to regulatory privacy-related reasons. Without access to such domain-specific data, NLP systems' performance often deteriorates [34] or becomes too unpredictable for domain experts to use [16].

Generative AI models offer a promising solution, providing a view on domain-specific data and its complexities by generating realistic synthetic datasets representing otherwise inaccessible sensitive data. Combining them with Differential Privacy (DP) [18], the de-facto gold standard measure for formally quantifying the maximum disclosure risk associated with a data release, allows data holders to generate high-quality representative synthetic data to




Figure 1: We benchmark differentially private synthetic text generators using a variety of metrics and find that they struggle to produce realistic data from *specialist domains*.

share with external AI researchers, while maintaining formal privacy guarantees [41]. However, the effectiveness of such methods has been primarily validated on either toy problems [29, 37] or open-domain datasets [45, 46]. This introduces two problems with respect to the truthful estimation of their efficacy:

Firstly—what we call **prior exposure**—generating synthetic text from public-domain datasets is comparatively simple, as publicly available data is likely to be found in the pre-training corpora of foundation models. This simplifies generation, as models tend to memorise their training data [10] thus leading to performance overestimates on various benchmarks [36], including synthetic text generation. Importantly, privacy leakage would be underestimated, as the generative model has access to the data not only during the synthesis process, where disclosure risk is controlled, but also during (un-controlled) pre-training [43]. Secondly—we coin this problem **representativeness**—the utilisation of general domain datasets, such as product reviews, as opposed to domain-specific datasets [24] excludes challenges associated with domain-specific data, such as domain-specific jargon [23] or organisation- or country-specific work practices reflected in data. For instance, a real-world benchmark for clinical coding will incorporate hospital- and country-specific coding practices [35]; exposing them through data sharing, however, is challenging due to privacy concerns.

Generating domain-specific text data requires rigorous benchmarking and evaluation, an area that is currently underdeveloped, as existing methods do not share common benchmarks or evaluation protocols. To address this research gap, we propose a first effort to benchmark domain-specific textual dataset generation under formal DP guarantees. Specifically, we (a) design our benchmark to include gated-access, domain-specific datasets to address the issues outlined above, (b) introduce a rigorous and reproducible evaluation protocol aimed at precisely quantifying the performance of DP text generators; (c) evaluate state-of-the-art approaches and showcase their struggles in realistic privacy-preserving data sharing

scenarios. Lastly, we (d) suggest future work and possible research avenues.

2 Background & Related Work

Differential privacy is a formal method that provides an upper bound on the amount of information that can be inferred about a private dataset from a derived data release. Formally, a randomised mechanism \mathcal{M} is (ϵ, δ) -differentially private, if for any of its two datasets x, x' , that differ in a single row, for each $S \subset \text{Range}(\mathcal{M})$ the following inequality holds [18]: $\Pr[\mathcal{M}(x) \in S] \leq \exp(\epsilon)\Pr[\mathcal{M}(x') \in S] + \delta$. In other words: The difference in the probability densities for any possible subset of the output space for outputs of \mathcal{M} for x and x' differs by at most $\exp(\epsilon)$ (in $1 - \delta\%$ of the cases, no guarantee for the rest) thus giving an upper bound on the performance of a best-possible Membership Inference Attack (MIA). In the context of data synthesis, x is a private dataset, \mathcal{M} is a data generator and $\mathcal{M}(x)$ is a generated synthetic dataset. We are concerned with the setting of a “trusted curator” (e.g., a hospital) releasing a synthetic version of a private dataset, and looking to limit the ability of an adversary to infer whether any individual—represented by a single row in the private dataset—was part of the private dataset, by looking at the synthetic data (only).

Direct data manipulation (“rewriting”) is infeasible due to the high-dimensional, discrete nature of textual data, and because such anonymization efforts generally do not prevent re-identification [42]. Thus, existing text generation methods fall into two paradigms. First, *DP training* approaches [29, 31, 46] fine-tune generative models on “control codes” (e.g. class labels) using variants of DP-SGD [1], which privatizes training by clipping gradients and adding noise to bound each example’s influence. By post-processing, prompting these models with control codes yields DP synthetic data. Second, *DP inference* methods privatize generation itself [20, 26], e.g., PATE [38], which aggregates teacher predictions from disjoint private subsets. Because private data may be accessed at each generation step, privacy loss accrues per token, limiting scalability for large corpora [2]. A notable exception is AUG-PE [45], which evolves random datasets toward the private distribution while privatizing the fitness function at relatively low privacy cost. In this paper, we evaluate one representative state-of-the-art method from each direction.

The evaluation of synthetic data generation varies significantly across modalities. For tabular data, comprehensive frameworks assess fidelity through structural similarity, distribution preservation, and global structure metrics [6, 12, 14]. Text evaluation is fundamentally more challenging due to its high-dimensional, context-dependent nature. Most approaches measure distributions in embedding space using metrics like KL-divergence or MAUVE [40], yet prior work has predominantly focused on “easy-to-measure characteristics” such as text length distributions [45, 46]. Additionally, existing benchmarks typically use general-purpose datasets like sentiment analysis corpora or PubMed abstracts [8, 9]. Our work addresses these limitations by introducing comprehensive evaluation metrics that go beyond surface-level properties to assess domain-specific utility and entity-level fidelity, while evaluating on specialist domains that provide more realistic assessments of privacy-preserving text generation.

3 Benchmark Design

We design the benchmark to address key challenges of evaluating differentially private synthetic text generators:

Addressing the challenges: For **prior exposure**, we include gated access datasets (requiring e.g., Data Usage Agreements) to reduce the likelihood of the data appearing in LLMs’ pre-training corpora used for data synthesis. Further, we utilise a mostly open language model [21] as a backbone of the evaluated methods, verifying that benchmark “private” data has not been exposed to the models during pre-training². For **representativeness** We use challenging domain-specific datasets from the (bio)-medical, clinical and legal domain.

Choice of ϵ : While there is no consensus how much ϵ is “enough” [27], high values provide increasingly lower protections [19]. In practice³ $e \leq 5$ or even $e \leq 1$ is considered a strong privacy guarantee, which guides our choice: $\epsilon \in \{0.5, 1, 2, 4\}$.

Evaluation Protocol: Our benchmark evaluates both utility and fidelity at different ϵ -levels. *Utility* quantifies how useful the synthetic data is for the real downstream application task. We do this by training *multiple* downstream classification models on the synthetic data and evaluating their performance on a (held-out) test set of original data, assessing how well synthetic data supports downstream tasks. Meanwhile, *fidelity* is the assessment of how similar synthetic data is with respect to the original dataset. Our implementation supports the quality evaluation of synthetic text, across various metrics. For surface-level similarity, we report BLEU [39] and METEOR [4], which capture n-gram and sequence overlap between real and synthetic sentences. BERTScore [47] and Universal Sentence Encoder (USE) [11] cosine similarity are used to evaluate semantic alignment. For these reference-based metrics, we use a “many reference” evaluation approach, where each synthetic sentence is compared against the entire pool of original sentences. Corpus-level fidelity evaluation includes measuring differences in distributions between original and synthetic data: MAUVE [40], recognised Named Entities and text lengths evaluate semantic, content and structural similarity, respectively. To quantify the effect of varying privacy noise levels, we compute these metrics for each synthetic dataset at varying ϵ .

Methods & Datasets: We compare two state-of-the-art differentially private text generators: DP-Gen (DP-SGD generation from Yue et al. [46]) and AUG-PE [45], representing distribution alignment. We evaluate three healthcare datasets—HoC [3] (cancer hallmark identification in scientific literature), N2C2’08 [44] (obesity and co-morbidity recognition in clinical discharge summaries), and PsyTAR [48] (adverse drug effect detection in social media posts). We further include a financial dataset, DMSAFN [15], and AsyLAX [5] to extend coverage to legal reasoning. As summarized in Table 1, the benchmark includes long documents (HoC, N2C2’08), gated-access corpora (PsyTAR, N2C2’08), small datasets challenging to train on (N2C2’08), and multi-label settings with many labels (HoC, N2C2’08, PsyTAR).

Table 1: Benchmark characteristics: Number of labels ($|C|$), dataset size ($|D|$), average/90th percentile token length $|\bar{L}|$ and data access.

Dataset	$ C $	$ D $	$ \bar{L} $	Access mechanism
HoC	10	10301	37/58	free on HuggingFace
N2C2’08	16	620	1985/3070	DUA & manual approval
PsyTAR	7	5102	19/34	DUA
DMSAFN	3	3876	30/50	free on HuggingFace
AsyLAX	3	7999	2326/3442	free on HuggingFace

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

Method	$\epsilon = \infty$	$\epsilon = 4$	$\epsilon = 2$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 0.5$
HoC	(Random: 3.7, Majority: 9.1, Original: 71.6/74.3)				
DP-Gen (avg / best)	52.0 / 58.6	15.5 / 17.9	14.4 / 15.7	11.0 / 11.5	13.6 / 14.9
AUG-PE (avg / best)	15.8 / 19.7	10.3 / 12.1	7.5 / 8.6	8.1 / 9.4	6.7 / 10.0
N2C2’08	(Random: 46.1, Majority: 53.2, Original: 73.1/87.7)				
DP-Gen (avg / best)	54.9 / 58.2	53.2 / 53.2	47.8 / 53.2	53.7 / 54.7	57.1 / 61.3
AUG-PE (avg / best)	55.9 / 57.6	55.8 / 60.9	54.7 / 57.7	56.8 / 60.0	55.7 / 56.9
PsyTAR	(Random: 25.4, Majority: 41.8, Original: 80.7/82.1)				
DP-Gen (avg / best)	69.5 / 70.1	41.6 / 44.0	40.1 / 42.5	40.8 / 42.3	39.2 / 39.1
AUG-PE (avg / best)	65.9 / 67.3	62.1 / 62.6	58.4 / 60.4	56.0 / 57.4	45.7 / 48.1
DMSAFN	(Random: 30.5, Majority: 41.1, Original: 76.8/95.2)				
DP-Gen (avg / best)	62.7 / 91.6	47.5 / 70.1	46.5 / 65.8	49.4 / 69.6	48.0 / 65.0
AUG-PE (avg / best)	51.0 / 65.6	51.0 / 65.9	51.7 / 70.9	47.9 / 61.3	50.0 / 65.9
AsyLAX	(Random: 38.4, Majority: 51.4, Original: 64.9/69.0)				
DP-Gen (avg / best)	60.2 / 61.5	34.8 / 36.2	34.9 / 39.3	47.6 / 48.3	37.0 / 48.0
AUG-PE (avg / best)	50.5 / 51.6	49.3 / 52.1	51.5 / 51.5	51.9 / 52.9	51.4 / 51.5

4 Results & Analysis

Table 2 reveals substantial utility degradation in text generation. Importantly, even without privacy constraints ($\epsilon = \infty$), synthetic data fails to fully match real-data baselines suggesting that the **evaluated methods cannot fully capture domain-specific complexity**. Under strong privacy constraints and averaged across all datasets ($\epsilon \leq 4$), the average of models’ performance stays at around 50% of real-data performance, strikingly independently of ϵ . Discounting for random/majority baseline performance and calculating the overall improvement over baselines (capped by performance on real data, similar to relative gain by Mattern et al. [30]), lowers this score to 55%/21% without privacy guarantees for DP-Gen/AUG-PE, and to an improvement of at most 28%/52% with $\epsilon \leq 4$. Only when looking at the best performing model on each dataset, the expected utility-privacy trade-off becomes visible (e.g., 28%, 26%, 23%, 21%, 15% retention for AUG-PE at $\epsilon \in \{\infty, 4, 2, 1, 0.5\}$, with DP-Gen dominating over AUG-PE without privacy constraints (62% vs 28% improvement over the baseline). This finding validates our benchmark design, specifically the use of multiple classifier baselines, to obtain more precise data utility estimates. Looking at per-dataset performance, gated-access datasets present significant challenges—for example N2C2’08 has the worst baseline-adjusted utility. This yields evidence towards our hypothesis that evaluating on non-publicly available data results in a more realistic performance estimate.

²They might have still encountered the data during closed-source post-training.

³e.g., as recommended by NIST: <https://www.nist.gov/blogs/cybersecurity-insights/differential-privacy-future-work-open-challenges>

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.

Method	$\epsilon = \infty$		$\epsilon = 4$		$\epsilon = 2$		$\epsilon = 1$		$\epsilon = 0.5$	
	$\mathcal{M}\uparrow/\mathcal{N}\downarrow/\mathcal{L}\downarrow$									
HoC	(Original: 0.99/1.04/0.004)									
DP-Gen	0.65/2.10/0.06	0.18/4.33/0.40	0.16/4.35/0.417	0.14/4.37/0.44	0.12/4.55/0.47					
AUG-PE	0.01/2.87/1.49	0.01/3.19/1.40	0.01/3.29/1.35	0.01/4.04/1.25	0.01/4.85/1.25					
N2C2'08	(Original: 0.99/0.70/0.17)									
DP-Gen	0.42/1.57/0.75	0.02/9.98/1.37	0.02/9.91/1.40	0.02/9.58/1.42	0.02/9.86/1.54					
AUG-PE	0.02/8.55/3.72	0.03/8.50/3.80	0.02/8.31/3.87	0.02/8.53/3.63	0.02/8.78/3.42					
PsyTAR	(Original: 0.99/0.86/0.007)									
DP-Gen	0.61/2.00/0.03	0.42/2.71/0.03	0.34/2.92/0.05	0.37/3.55/0.03	0.35/4.01/0.03					
AUG-PE	0.02/4.31/3.21	0.02/5.02/3.27	0.02/5.06/3.23	0.02/5.35/3.34	0.02/6.29/3.38					
DMSAFN	(Original: 0.86/0.71/0.012)									
DP-Gen	0.21/1.72/0.06	0.18/1.94/0.02	0.16/2.03/0.04	0.15/2.22/0.03	0.12/2.36/0.06					
AUG-PE	0.01/3.25/2.36	0.01/3.87/2.35	0.01/4.19/2.34	0.01/5.77/2.24	0.01/3.98/2.30					
ASyLax	(Original: 0.98/0.11/0.004)									
DP-Gen	0.03/1.42/0.43	0.01/3.82/6.41	0.01/4.03/5.95	0.01/8.06/3.58	0.01/7.66/1.23					
AUG-PE	0.01/6.15/1.41	0.01/5.76/1.41	0.01/6.42/1.92	0.01/7.43/6.12	0.01/7.36/1.41					




Figure 2: Results for “many reference” metrics of DP-Gen and AUG-PE generated data at different ϵ levels, expressed as relative decrease compared to non-privately synthesised data. As noise increases, the quality deteriorates.

Table 3 shows that fidelity also deteriorates, following similar trends of utility. MAUVE scores between real and synthetic data are close to zero across all domains, with entity overlap divergence particularly pronounced in HoC and N2C2’08, possibly due to domain-specificity and closed-access nature of the datasets. Interestingly, ASyLEX again mirrors this pattern: low MAUVE and high NER divergence indicate failure to preserve legal argumentation structure, even when surface vocabulary is retained. Here, similarly, N2C2’08 and ASyLAX prove to be the most challenging datasets, which we attribute to the combination of long context, domain specificity, and, for N2C2’08, gated access.

Our comparison of lexical and semantic measures of AUG-PE and DP-SGD finetuned generators, as seen in Figure 2, shows that data quality (compared to non-privately synthesised data) progressively decreases, with similar declines for both methods. This privacy-fidelity trade-off is in line with the literature, with stronger privacy leading to lower data quality [29, 45, 46].

Overall, text generated by fine-tuned models exhibits good utility and fidelity (as evidenced by high utility at $\epsilon = \infty$, high MAUVE scores and low text length divergences), but the addition of DP noise deteriorates the quality of the generated data significantly, as noted

Method	ϵ	Text
Original	-	Almost no libido at all, Utterly useless.
AUG-PE	0.5	You might experience blurry vision, weird food smells, a dry mouth, frequent trips to the bathroom, dry throat, occasional dizziness, feelings of restlessness and aches, and unsteadiness.
DP-Gen	0.5	I have had a few side effects.

Figure 3: Example generations for the label “Adverse Drug Effects” from the PsyTAR dataset.

by Xie et al. [45], especially on “unfamiliar” domain-specific data⁴. Conversely, data generated by AUG-PE is of initially low quality (low utility/MAUVE scores at $\epsilon = \infty$), but the elegant noising of histogram counts introduces much less noise in the process, thus deteriorating the quality less thereafter. This phenomenon is visualised in Figure 3: while DP-Gen text maintains the overall structure (e.g. text length, general sense of having adverse drug effects), the AUG-PE example misses the social-media tone. With enough good candidates, the example would have been filtered out by the private evolution mechanism, suggesting that the embedding model underlying the histogram mechanism cannot faithfully capture the nuances of domain-specific data. Notably, we observe markedly lower performance than reported previously [29, 45, 46], **suggesting that evaluating DP text generators on open-domain, simple datasets overestimates their performance for real use-cases.**

5 Conclusion and Future Work

We present a benchmark design for synthetic text generation under formal privacy guarantees, alongside preliminary empirical results on healthcare text data. The results reveal significant challenges in generating high-quality synthetic data: state-of-the-art models face substantial performance deterioration when they are applied to domain-specific datasets increasingly so under high privacy constraints. This highlights the limitations of approaches which focus on foundation-models which are pre-trained on general domain data. Our findings emphasise the need for domain-specific approaches that faithfully represent domain-specific data while preserving privacy. Our work is a first move towards creating a standardised benchmark that can catalyse the progress in privacy-preserving synthetic data generation for high-stake applications. To accelerate this, we release our code and report additional metrics and scores, omitted in this paper due to space constraints, in a public git repository: <https://github.com/ImperialGlobalSingapore/synth-data>.

Future work will focus on expanding this benchmark: we aim to support multimodal data generation to evaluate the preservation of complex relationships between different data types e.g., clinical text reports and medical images [25] and more advanced corpus evaluation metrics encompassing discourse structure and human assessments. Finally, while in this work we have focussed primarily on the data quality, we will also develop stronger membership inference attacks that leverage changes in these metrics to provide a more realistic assessment of privacy risks. To better validate privacy guarantees, our future work will introduce diagnostic datasets specifically designed for auditing membership inference attacks (MIA) on synthetic data [32]. This targeted approach will allow researchers that propose novel DP text generation methods to audit

⁴which demands larger parameter updates that are clipped, noised; long contexts force smaller batch size, further raising the noise-to-signal ratio

implementation correctness without generating large volumes of synthetic data to train shadow classifiers [22].

Acknowledgement

This research is part of the IN-CYPHER programme and is supported by the National Research Foundation, Prime Minister's Office, Singapore under its Campus for Research Excellence and Technological Enterprise (CREATE) programme. We are grateful for the support provided by Research IT in the form of access to the Computational Shared Facility at The University of Manchester and the computational facilities at the Imperial College Research Computing Service (DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14469/hpc/2232>). We also thank the anonymous CIKM reviewers for their feedback that helped us improve the paper further.

GenAI Usage Disclosure

Some authors have used generative AI tools (GenAI) to polish grammar and suggest wordings. One author has relied on GenAI to propose an (empty) table format, which was later manually populated by corresponding results. No part of this paper has been entirely generated by GenAI.

References

- [1] Martin Abadi, Andy Chu, Ian Goodfellow, H. Brendan McMahan, Ilya Mironov, Kunal Talwar, and Li Zhang. 2016. Deep Learning with Differential Privacy. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, Vol. 24-28-October-2016. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 308–318. doi:10.1145/2976749.2978318
- [2] Kareem Amin, Alex Bie, Weiwei Kong, Alexey Kurakin, Natalia Ponomareva, Umar Syed, Andreas Terzis, and Sergei Vassilvitskii. 2024. Private prediction for large-scale synthetic text generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.12108* (2024).
- [3] Simon Baker, Ilona Silins, Yufan Guo, Imran Ali, Johan Högberg, Ulla Stenius, and Anna Korhonen. 2016. Automatic semantic classification of scientific literature according to the hallmarks of cancer. *Bioinformatics* 32, 3 (2016), 432–440. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btv585
- [4] Satanjeev Banerjee and Alon Lavie. 2005. METEOR: An Automatic Metric for MT Evaluation with Improved Correlation with Human Judgments. 65–72 pages. <https://aclanthology.org/W05-0909/>
- [5] Claire Barale, Michael Rovatsos, and Nehal Bhuta. 2023. Automated Refugee Case Analysis: A NLP Pipeline for Supporting Legal Practitioners. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Toronto, Canada, 2992–3005. doi:10.18653/v1/2023.findings-acl.187
- [6] Colin Bellinger, Christopher Drummond, and Nathalie Japkowicz. 2016. Beyond the Boundaries of SMOTE: A Framework for Manifold-Based Synthetically Oversampling. In *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases (ECML PKDD 2016) (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 9851)*. Springer, Cham, 248–263. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-46128-1_16
- [7] Kulhan Binici, Abhinav Ramesh Kashyap, Viktor Schlegel, Andy T. Liu, Vijay Prakash Dwivedi, Thanh-Tung Nguyen, Xiaoxue Gao, Nancy F. Chen, and Stefan Winkler. 2025. MEDSAGE: Enhancing Robustness of Medical Dialogue Summarization to ASR Errors with LLM-generated Synthetic Dialogues. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 39, 22 (4 2025), 23496–23504. doi:10.1609/aaai.v39i22.34518
- [8] John Blitzer, Mark Dredze, and Fernando Pereira. 2007. Biographies, Bollywood, Boom-boxes and Blenders: Domain Adaptation for Sentiment Classification. 440–447 pages. <https://aclanthology.org/P07-1056/>
- [9] Kathi Canese and Sarah Weis. 2013. PubMed: the bibliographic database. *The NCBI handbook* 2, 1 (2013).
- [10] Nicholas Carlini, Florian Tramer, Eric Wallace, Matthew Jagielski, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Katherine Lee, Adam Roberts, Tom Brown, Dawn Song, Ulfar Erlingsson, Alina Oprea, and Colin Raffel. 2021. Extracting Training Data from Large Language Models. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*. 2633–2650. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2012.07805>
- [11] Daniel Cer, Yinfei Yang, Sheng-yi Kong, Nan Hua, Nicole Limtiaco, Rhomni St. John, Noah Constant, Mario Guajardo-Cespedes, Steve Yuan, Chris Tar, Brian Strope, and Ray Kurzweil. 2018. Universal Sentence Encoder for English. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Stroudsburg, PA, USA, 169–174. doi:10.18653/v1/D18-2029
- [12] Vikram S Chundawat, Ayush K Tarun, Murari Mandal, Mukund Lahoti, and Pratik Narang. 2022. TabSynDex: A Universal Metric for Robust Evaluation of Synthetic Tabular Data. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. arXiv:2207.05295v2.
- [13] Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, et al. 2021. Training Verifiers to Solve Math Word Problems. *arXiv:2110.14168* (10 2021). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.14168v2>
- [14] Personal Data Protection Commission. 2023. Proposed Guide on Synthetic Data Generation. *Personal Data Protection Commission, Singapore* (2023).
- [15] Daniel-ML. 2023. Sentiment Analysis for Financial News v2. <https://huggingface.co/datasets/Daniel-ML/sentiment-analysis-for-financial-news-v2>. Accessed: 2025-05-22.
- [16] Fabrizio Dell'Acqua, Edward McFowland, Ethan R. Mollick, Hila Lifshitz-Assaf, Katherine Kellogg, Saran Rajendran, Lisa Kraye, François Candelon, and Karim R. Lakhani. 2023. Navigating the Jagged Technological Frontier: Field Experimental Evidence of the Effects of AI on Knowledge Worker Productivity and Quality. *SSRN Electronic Journal* (2023). doi:10.2139/ssrn.4573321
- [17] Gelei Deng, Yi Liu, Victor Mayoral-Vilches, Peng Liu, Yuekang Li, Yuan Xu, Tianwei Zhang, Yang Liu, Martin Pinzger, and Stefan Rass. 2024. PentestGPT: Evaluating and Harnessing Large Language Models for Automated Penetration Testing. In *33rd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 24)*. USENIX Association, Philadelphia, PA, 847–864. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity24/presentation/deng>
- [18] Cynthia Dwork. 2006. Differential Privacy. In *Automata, Languages and Programming*, Michele Bugliesi, Bart Preneel, Vladimir Sassone, and Ingo Wegener (Eds.). Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1–12.
- [19] Cynthia Dwork, Nitin Kohli, and Deirdre Mulligan. 2019. Differential Privacy in Practice: Expose your Epsilons! *Journal of Privacy and Confidentiality* 9, 2 (10 2019), 2019. doi:10.29012/jpc.689
- [20] James Flemings, Meisam Razaviyayn, and Murali Annavaram. 2024. 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)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Stroudsburg, PA, USA, 4390–4404. doi:10.18653/v1/2024.naacl-long.247
- [21] Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Alex Vaughan, et al. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783* (2024).
- [22] Florent Guépin, Matthieu Meeus, Ana Maria Creţu, and Yves Alexandre de Montjoye. 2023. Synthetic is all you need: removing the auxiliary data assumption for membership inference attacks against synthetic data. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)* 14398 LNCS (7 2023), 182–198. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-54204-6-10
- [23] Kenneth Hudson. 1978. *The jargon of the professions*. Springer.
- [24] 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. 2023. MIMIC-IV, a freely accessible electronic health record dataset. *Scientific Data* 10, 1 (12 2023). doi:10.1038/S41597-022-01899-X
- [25] Alistair E.W. Johnson, Tom J. Pollard, Seth J. Berkowitz, Nathaniel R. Greenbaum, Matthew P. Lungren, Chih ying Deng, Roger G. Mark, and Steven Horng. 2019. MIMIC-CXR, a de-identified publicly available database of chest radiographs with free-text reports. *Scientific Data* 2019 6:1 6, 1 (12 2019), 1–8. doi:10.1038/s41597-019-0322-0
- [26] Tatsuki Koga, Ruihan Wu, and Kamalika Chaudhuri. 2024. Privacy-Preserving Retrieval-Augmented Generation with Differential Privacy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.04697* (2024).
- [27] Jaewoo Lee and Chris Clifton. 2011. How Much Is Enough? Choosing ϵ for Differential Privacy. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)* 7001 LNCS (2011), 325–340. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-24861-0-22
- [28] 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. 2023. 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*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Stroudsburg, PA, USA, 503–509. doi:10.18653/v1/2023.bionlp-1.49
- [29] Justus Mattern, Zhijing Jin, Benjamin Weggenmann, Bernhard Schoelkopf, and Mrinmaya Sachan. 2022. Differentially Private Language Models for Secure Data Sharing. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Stroudsburg, PA, USA, 4860–4873. doi:10.18653/v1/2022.emnlp-main.323

- [30] Justus Mattern, Benjamin Weggenmann, and Florian Kerschbaum. 2022. The limits of word level differential privacy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.02130* (2022).
- [31] Matthieu Meeus, Lukas Wutschitz, Santiago Zanella-Béguelin, Shruti Tople, and Reza Shokri. 2025. The Canary’s Echo: Auditing Privacy Risks of LLM-Generated Synthetic Text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.14921* (2025).
- [32] Matthieu Meeus, Lukas Wutschitz, Santiago Zanella-Béguelin, Shruti Tople, and Reza Shokri. 2025. The Canary’s Echo: Auditing Privacy Risks of LLM-Generated Synthetic Text. (2 2025). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.14921v1>
- [33] Aishik Nagar, Yutong Liu, Andy T. Liu, Viktor Schlegel, Vijay Prakash Dwivedi, Arun-Kumar Kaliya-Perumal, Guna Pratheep Kalanchiam, Yili Tang, and Robby T. Tan. 2024. uMedSum: A Unified Framework for Advancing Medical Abstractive Summarization. (8 2024). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.12095v2>
- [34] Aishik Nagar, Viktor Schlegel, Thanh-Tung Nguyen, Hao Li, Yuping Wu, Kuluhan Binici, and Stefan Winkler. 2025. LLMs are not Zero-Shot Reasoners for Biomedical Information Extraction. 106–120 pages. <https://aclanthology.org/2025.insights-1.11/>
- [35] Thanh Tung Nguyen, Viktor Schlegel, Abhinav Kashyap, and Stefan Winkler. 2023. A Two-Stage Decoder for Efficient ICD Coding. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics* (2023), 4658–4665. doi:10.18653/V1/2023.FINDINGS-ACL.285
- [36] Shiwen Ni, Xiangtao Kong, Chengming Li, Xiping Hu, Ruifeng Xu, Jia Zhu, and Min Yang. 2025. Training on the Benchmark Is Not All You Need. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 39, 23 (4 2025), 24948–24956. doi:10.1609/aaai.v39i23.34678
- [37] Sebastian Ochs and Ivan Habernal. 2025. Private Synthetic Text Generation with Diffusion Models. 10612–10626 pages. <https://aclanthology.org/2025.naacl-long.532/>
- [38] Nicolas Papernot, Shuang Song, Ilya Mironov, Ananth Raghunathan, Kunal Talwar, and Úlfar Erlingsson. 2018. Scalable Private Learning with PATE. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1802.08908>
- [39] Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-jing Zhu. 2001. Bleu: a Method for Automatic Evaluation of Machine Translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting on Association for Computational Linguistics - ACL '02*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Morristown, NJ, USA, 311–318. doi:10.3115/1073083.1073135
- [40] Krishna Pillutla, Swabha Swayamdipta, Rowan Zellers, John Thickstun, Sean Welleck, Yejin Choi, Zaid Harchaoui, and Paul G Allen. 2021. MAUVE: Measuring the Gap Between Neural Text and Human Text using Divergence Frontiers. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 34. 4816–4828. <https://github.com/krishnap25/mauve>.
- [41] Viktor Schlegel, Anil A Bharath, Zilong Zhao, and Kevin Yee. 2025. Generating Synthetic Data with Formal Privacy Guarantees: State of the Art and the Road Ahead. (3 2025). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.20846v1>
- [42] Latanya Sweeney. 2002. k-anonymity: A model for protecting privacy. *International journal of uncertainty, fuzziness and knowledge-based systems* 10, 05 (2002), 557–570.
- [43] Florian Tramèr, Gautam Kamath, and Nicholas Carlini. 2024. Position: Considerations for Differentially Private Learning with Large-Scale Public Pretraining. 48453–48467 pages. <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v235/tramer24a.html>
- [44] Ozlem Uzuner. 2009. Recognizing Obesity and Comorbidities in Sparse Data. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 16, 4 (07 2009), 561–570. doi:10.1197/jamia.M3115 arXiv:<https://academic.oup.com/jamia/article-pdf/16/4/561/2302602/16-4-561.pdf>
- [45] 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. 2024. Differentially Private Synthetic Data via Foundation Model APIs 2: Text. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 54531–54560. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2403.01749>
- [46] Xiang Yue, Huseyin A. Inan, Xuechen Li, Girish Kumar, Julia McAnallen, Hoda Shajari, Huan Sun, David Levitan, and Robert Sim. 2023. Synthetic Text Generation with Differential Privacy: A Simple and Practical Recipe. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 1 (2023), 1321–1342. doi:10.18653/V1/2023.ACL-LONG.74
- [47] Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q. Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. 2019. BERTScore: Evaluating Text Generation with BERT. (4 2019). doi:10.48550/arxiv.1904.09675
- [48] 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, Jiayi Zhu, Soo Kyung Park, Kelly Xu, Hamideh Moayyed, and Somaieh Goudarzvand. 2019. 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