

Exploring prompts to elicit memorization in masked language model-based named entity recognition

Yuxi Xia^{1,3}, Anastasiia Sedova^{1,3}, Pedro Henrique Luz de Araujo^{1,3}, Vasiliki Kougia^{1,3}, Lisa Nußbaumer², Benjamin Roth^{1,2}

¹Faculty of Computer Science, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria.

²Faculty of Philological and Cultural Studies, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria.

³UniVie Doctoral School Computer Science, Vienna, Austria.

{yuxi.xia, benjamin.roth}@univie.ac.at

Abstract

Training data memorization in language models impacts model capability (generalization) and safety (privacy risk). This paper focuses on analyzing prompts' impact on detecting the memorization of 6 masked language model-based named entity recognition models. Specifically, we employ a diverse set of 400 automatically generated prompts, and a pairwise dataset where each pair consists of one person's name from the training set and another name out of the set. A prompt completed with a person's name serves as input for getting the model's confidence in predicting this name. Finally, the prompt performance of detecting model memorization is quantified by the percentage of name pairs for which the model has higher confidence for the name from the training set. We show that the performance of different prompts varies by as much as 16 percentage points on the same model, and prompt engineering further increases the gap. Moreover, our experiments demonstrate that prompt performance is model-dependent but does generalize across different name sets. A comprehensive analysis indicates how prompt performance is influenced by prompt properties, contained tokens, and the model's self-attention weights on the prompt.

1 Introduction

Recent studies have highlighted the memorization of training data in language models (Neel & Chang, 2023), especially for auto-regressive models (Miresghallah et al., 2022; Carlini et al., 2023). Such studies are important in exploring model capability (generalization (Feldman, 2020)) or safety (privacy risk (Neel & Chang, 2023)). However, few works (Ali et al., 2022) explore memorization in Masked Language Model (MLM)-based Named Entity Recognition (NER) models, despite their state-of-the-art performances in different domains, including health records (Richie et al., 2023), social media (Yu et al., 2023), and legal documents (Darji et al., 2023).

Unlike Ali et al. (2022), who use only 5 hand-written prompts to detect model memorization of a self-fine-tuned NER model on their private training data (not publicly accessible), we consider the sensitivity of model confidence towards individual prompt variations (Feng et al., 2024), and thus employ a set of 400 diverse prompts generated by a generative language model (i.e., ChatGPT (OpenAI, 2023)). The prompt set covers 4 types of prompts (i.e., declarative, exclamatory, imperative, and interrogative), 15 prompt token lengths, and 10 token positions for holding the target entity (person's name). We focus on exploring the prompts' impact on detecting the memorization of persons' names in 6 publicly accessible NER models fine-tuned on the CoNLL-2003 dataset (Tjong Kim Sang & De Meulder, 2003).

To quantify model memorization, we create a pairwise dataset sampled from Wikidata (Vrandečić & Krötzsch, 2014) consisting of a large number ($826^2 + 825^2$) of person's name (*PER*) pairs. This dataset is divided into development (dev) and test sets, each containing different named entities (*PERs*). Every instance in both sets is a pair of *PERs*, composed




Figure 1: Memorization detection of a NER model using diverse prompts and the pairwise dataset. P_*^{In} and P_*^{Out} refer to a person’s name in and out of the training data respectively.

of an In-train PER (from the training data of the NER model) and an Out-train PER (not present in the training data).

Figure 1 illustrates the full pipeline for model memorization detection. Specifically, each prompt from the prompt set is completed separately with all PER entities from the pairwise dataset. A completed sentence, consisting of a prompt and a PER , serves as input to a NER model to get the confidence score of the PER in this prompt. We define that given an In-train and Out-train PER pair, the pair exposes sample memorization ($S-MEM$) if the In-train PER receives a higher confidence score than the Out-train PER . Ultimately, the prompt’s performance in detecting model memorization is quantified by the percentage of name pairs that expose sample memorization in the pairwise dataset.

Overall, our contributions are:

- We are the first to analyze the prompt’s influence on the memorization detection of MLM-based NER models, using 400 diverse prompts and 6 publicly accessible NER models, and we study their impact across different model properties.
- We show that memorization detection is sensitive to the prompt choice. Performance differences of prompts in the set on the same model can be as large as 16 percentage points. Prompt performance is model-dependent but generalizes across mutually exclusive name sets (from dev to test data).
- We apply ensembling and prompt engineering techniques on the prompt set and observe that the engineered (modified) prompts can improve performance by up to 2 percentage points compared to the best-performed prompt in the prompt set.
- We comprehensively analyze how prompt performance is influenced by various factors, including the properties of the prompt, the tokens it contains, and the self-attention weights of the model focused on the prompt.

2 Related Work

Memorization in auto-regressive language models was first studied by Carlini et al. (2019) who showed that LSTMs memorize a significant fraction of their training data. Later, Carlini et al. (2021) and Carlini et al. (2023) use extractability to measure the memorization of GPT-2 and GPT-Neo models Wei et al. 2023, showing that prefixed prompts can extract sensitive training data. However, extractability only applies to auto-regressive language models that use only the input side of fine-tuning data, but not to fine-tuned MLMs that use also the output side (input labels). Several studies (Feldman, 2020; Brown et al., 2021; Razeghi et al., 2022) indicate that a certain amount of memorization is not necessarily undesirable but helpful for model generalization. Tirumala et al. (2022) and Magar & Schwartz (2022) study **memorization in MLMs** towards the model generalization using a metric as same as accuracy and accuracy difference between training and test sets respectively. Ali et al. (2022) focus on the **memorization in fine-tuned MLMs** (NER models) and average the confidence ranks of In-train entities in an entity set to measure model memorization. However, Ali et al.

Dataset	Source data	#PER	#Instance	Property
D_t	CoNLL-2003	2,645	2,645	<i>In-train</i>
D_W	Wikidata	7,617,797	7,617,797	<i>In- & Out-train</i>
D_{pw}	$D_W \cap D_t + D_W \setminus D_t$	1,651 + 1,651	826 ² (dev) + 825 ² (test)	<i>In- & Out-train</i>

Table 1: Datasets details.

(2022) self-fine-tune the NER model and study the impact of the training data duplication and complexity on the memorization dynamics. Differently, we explore 6 publicly accessible NER models fine-tuned by different developers and focus on the prompts’ impact on the memorization detection of the NER models.

Hand-written vs Generated Prompts. Language model performance has been shown to be sensitive to prompt variations in previous works (Feng et al. 2024; Sclar et al. 2023). Thus, randomly choosing one of the 5 hand-written prompts for each studied entity to detect memorization as in Ali et al. (2022) may not accurately represent the model memorization. Instead, we study **400 generated diverse prompts**, showing the big variances of memorization values detected by different prompts individually were not considered in previous settings.

3 Methodology

In this section, we first describe the processes for creating the pairwise dataset and prompt set. Then, we introduce how to use them to detect memorization in NER models.

3.1 Pairwise Dataset Creation

We create a pairwise dataset D_{pw} to quantify the memorization of NER models fine-tuned on the CoNLL-2003 dataset (Tjong Kim Sang & De Meulder, 2003). Specifically, we first generate datasets D_t and D_W which contain all *PERs* from the CoNLL-2003 dataset and Wikidata (Vrandečić & Krötzsch, 2014) respectively. D_{pw} is then sampled from the *PERs* in D_W considering the *PERs* in D_t . The details of the datasets are shown in Table 1:

NER-train *PER* Dataset (D_t). CoNLL-2003 is a commonly used NER dataset with a large number of examples of named entities. The training dataset of the CoNLL-2003 corpus contains 6,600 *PERs*, i.e., entities with ground-truth label *B-PER* and/or *I-PER* which denote the beginning and the rest of a person’s name respectively. After the post-processing of removing the duplicates and single-token *PER*, D_t contains 2,645 unique multi-token *PERs*.

Wikidata *PER* Dataset (D_W). Wikidata as a source for D_W enables the compilation of a list of real-world person names. Specifically, a SPARQL query is formulated to retrieve *PER* entities. Similar to D_t , duplicates and single-token *PER* are filtered out. Finally, 7,617,797 multi-token *PER* form the dataset D_W .

Pairwise Dataset (D_{pw}). We only sample the D_{pw} from D_W to ensure same data source for both In-&Out-train *PERs*. The intersection of D_W and D_t ($D_W \cap D_t$) contains 1,651 *PERs*, which constitutes to the In-train *PER* set $\{P_i^{In}\}_{i=1}^N$, $N=1,651$. In contrast, an equal size of Out-train *PER* set $\{P_j^{Out}\}_{j=1}^N$ are sampled from D_W excluding D_t ($D_W \setminus D_t$). As there is no training process in our setting, we split $\{P_i^{In}\}_{i=1}^N$ and $\{P_j^{Out}\}_{j=1}^N$ sets equally into development (dev) and test respectively. In the end, the dev data is constructed with $\{P_i^{In}\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{P_j^{Out}\}_{j=1}^n$, $n = 826 (\approx N/2)$, the rest of the *PERs* goes to the test data. The test data is used to verify the generalization of prompt performance across different name sets (from dev to test). Each instance in dev and test sets is a name pair consisting of a In-train *PER* and a Out-train *PER*, and every *PER* in $\{P_i^{In}\}_{i=1}^n$ is paired with all the *PER* in $\{P_j^{Out}\}_{j=1}^n$, resulting in n^2 instances in the dev data of D_{pw} .

3.2 Prompt Set Generation

To collect a large and diverse set of prompts, we use a generative large language model, GPT-3.5-turbo-1106 (OpenAI, 2023) (ChatGPT), to automatically generate m ($m = 400$) diverse prompts $\{PT_k\}_{k=1}^m$. Specifically, to increase the diversity of the prompts, we consider four categories of sentences: (1) declarative; (2) exclamatory; (3) imperative; and (4) interrogative. Next, we prompted ChatGPT to generate 100 sentences for each category. To collect exclamatory prompts, we use the following prompt: “Generate 100 different exclamatory sentences that must contain persons’ names, and replace the person’s name with ‘MASK’”. The prompts of other categories are generated by replacing the “exclamatory” string. The “MASK” string in a prompt PT_k is completed with the PER from the pairwise dataset, and the completed sentence $PT_k \wedge PER$ is fed to NER models to obtain the confidence score of the PER entity in PT_k .

3.3 Memorization Detection

Let M_{ner} denote a NER model that has been fine-tuned on a pre-trained MLM with dataset D_t . Such models can achieve high classification accuracy (shown in Table 4 in the Appendix A.2) in predicting entity labels like PER (i.e., B - PER and I - PER labels). To compute the confidence score of a PER , we first gather the highest likelihood scores between B - PER and I - PER labels for all name tokens of the PER , and then take the mean value of likelihood scores as the final confidence for the PER . The confidence of a PER in PT_k is defined as the notation $C_k(PER)$ (more details show in Algorithm 1 in the Appendix A.1). After getting the confidence score for the In-train and Out-train PER s in a name pair, we identify the sample memorization of this PER pair using the following definition:

Definition 1. Sample Memorization (S-MEM): Given an In-train and Out-train PER pair, the pair exposes the sample memorization (S-MEM) of a NER model if the In-train PER gets a higher model confidence score than the Out-train PER .

The sample memorization of a PER pair in the prompt PT_k can be formulated as:

$$S-MEM_{M_{ner}}(PT_k \wedge P_i^{In}, PT_k \wedge P_j^{Out}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } C_k(P_i^{In}) > C_k(P_j^{Out}) \\ 0 & \text{if } C_k(P_j^{Out}) > C_k(P_i^{In}) \end{cases}$$

To detect the memorization of a NER model, we further define:

Definition 2. Model Memorization (M-MEM): The memorization of a NER model is quantified by the percentage of name pairs that expose sample memorization in a pairwise dataset.

Finally, we formulate the performance of a prompt PT_k on detecting memorization of M_{ner} as M -MEM scores: $M-MEM_{M_{ner}}(PT_k) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n S-MEM_{M_{ner}}(PT_k \wedge P_i^{In}, PT_k \wedge P_j^{Out}) / n^2$.

4 Experimental Setup

We performed our model memorization analysis on publicly accessible MLM-based NER models fine-tuned by different developers on the CoNLL-2003 dataset (Tjong Kim Sang & De Meulder, 2003). To provide a more comprehensive analysis, we selected 6 models built on MLMs across 3 different pretraining schemes (ALBERT-v2 (Lan et al., 2020), BERT (Devlin et al., 2019), and RoBERTa (Liu et al., 2019)) and 2 model sizes (base and large sizes, $-B$ and $-L$ notations are used correspondingly) for each scheme. More details about the models and accessibility information can be found in Appendix A.2.

4.1 Strategies of Using the Prompt Set

We investigate three strategies for exploiting the prompt set, aiming for a more thorough exploration of the impact of prompts on the memorization detection of NER models.

Baselines (BS). \emptyset -PT uses the PER without any additional text as the input to query corresponding confidences for memorization detection. **One-PT** and **Mix-PT** use the same

	Prompts	dev		test	
		Rank	M -MEM	Rank	M -MEM
ALBERT-B	Bravo, MASK, what an impressive performance!	1	74.84	2	75.10
	Are you going to MASK’s art gallery opening tonight?	-1	58.92	-1	58.74
ALBERT-L	Oh, MASK, you’re a true gem in our team.	1	73.12	3	71.38
	MASK, practice forgiveness towards yourself and others.	-1	64.60	-3	64.70
BERT-B	Are you going to MASK’s art gallery opening tonight?	1	73.96	1	71.84
	Did MASK give you any advice on starting something new?	-1	65.11	-2	63.30
BERT-L	What project is MASK working on?	1	71.56	2	69.30
	I had a chance to meet MASK’s family.	-1	67.78	-1	64.42
RoBERTa-B	MASK, can you recommend a good restaurant in town?	1	70.76	2	70.78
	I had a great conversation with MASK at the party.	-1	57.00	-2	59.63
RoBERTa-L	MASK, invest in meaningful relationships.	1	75.27	1	72.79
	MASK, practice playing the guitar.	-1	70.61	-96	70.05

Table 2: The M -MEM scores and corresponding ranks of the best (Rank=1) and worst (Rank=-1) prompts from the dev set on the test set.

strategies in Ali et al. (2022), **One-PT** employs one hand-written prompt (“My name is XX.”), corresponding to the *known*-setting in Ali et al. (2022), while **Mix-PT** randomly chooses for each name one of the 5 hand-written prompts (“My name is XX.”, “I am XX.”, “I am named XX.”, “Here is my name: XX.”, “Call me XX.”), like the *unknown*-setting in Ali et al. (2022).

Original Prompt (OPT) selects the best prompt (**B-PT**) and worst prompt (**W-PT**) from the prompt set that achieved the highest and lowest M -MEM scores on the dev set of D_{pw} .

Prompt Engineering (PTE) is inspired by Feng et al. (2018) which applies a token-removal operation to the originally generated prompts. The goal is to maximize the M -MEM score gap of the original best and worst prompts. Specifically, the most important token (which contributes the most to score improvement) and the least important token are removed from the worst and best prompts, respectively, resulting in two modified prompts. This process is iteratively repeated for the modified prompts until only one token (excluding the *PER*) remains. The two modified prompts that achieved the highest and lowest M -MEM scores on the dev set among all the modified prompts are named **BM-PT** (best-modified prompt) and **WM-PT** (worst-modified prompt). It is important to note that such prompts may be ungrammatical. More details are presented in Section 5.5.

Ensembling of Prompts (EPT) employs several ensemble techniques: (1) Majority Voting (**MV**) decide the S -MEM of a name pair if more than half of the prompts in the set vote “1”; (2) Average Confidence Score (**AVG-C**) uses the average *PER* confidence over all prompts ($avg(\{C_k(PER)\}_{k=1}^{k=m})$) as the final confidence score of the *PER*; (3) Weighted Confidence Score (**WED-C**) weights the *PER* confidence of each prompt by its M -MEM score; (4) Maximum confidence score (**MAX-C**) denote the maximum confidence of the *PER* over all prompts ($max(\{C_k(PER)\}_{k=1}^{k=m})$) as the final confidence score; (5) Minimum confidence score (**MIN-C**) is the contrast to MAX-C, which uses the minimum value ($min(\{C_k(PER)\}_{k=1}^{k=m})$) as the final confidence.

5 Results and Analysis

Table 2 shows each model’s highest and lowest M -MEM scores achieved on the dev set by the best and worst prompts in the original prompt set respectively. The M -MEM scores vary considerably depending on the prompt: the gap between the best and the worst prompt for a given model is as large as 16.40 percentage points for ALBERT-B on the test set. We validate the statistical significance of the results through Cochran’s Q test. We find that the differences are significant for all models ($p < 0.001$). The following sections summarize and analyze the results to answer 6 research questions.

5.1 Do Model Properties Affect the Memorization Scores?

The 6 investigated models mainly cover 3 different pretraining schemes (ALBERT-v2, BERT and RoBERTa) and 2 different model sizes for each scheme. There is no **pretraining scheme** led to higher/lower memorization from results in Table 2 and Figure 2 (a). However, we




Figure 2: (a): Mean and standard deviation of M -MEM scores of all prompts across models on the dev set. (b): Correlations (Kendall’s τ) of the M -MEM scores of prompts across models. Left: correlations for the dev set scores. Middle: correlations for the test set scores. Right: correlations between dev and test set scores.

observe that the score gaps of large models are generally smaller than those of base models in Table 2, this trend does not apply to the standard deviations of the M -MEM scores of all prompts, as shown by Figure 2 (a). For example, a similar standard deviation is observed on ALBERT-B and ALBERT-L. In addition, the mean values of the M -MEM scores of all prompts for the base and large models also indicate that **model sizes** are not correlated with the memorization scores.

5.2 Are Prompt Performances Generalizable?

To examine how prompt performance generalizes across models and PER pairs, we compute the correlations (Kendall’s τ coefficient) among the M -MEM scores of all the prompts for different models and data splits (Figure 2 (b)). **Generalizability across models:** We observe weak correlations between prompts’ M -MEM scores for different models, even when comparing different variants of the same model on the same data split. For example, M -MEM scores (dev set) for BERT-B and BERT-L are negatively correlated. From this, we conclude that the M -MEM scores of prompts do not generalize across models—the best prompts for a given model may not be the best for other models. **Generalizability across name sets:** Conversely, we found higher correlations between prompts’ M -MEM scores across data splits when using the same model (diagonal of the right plot in Figure 2). We conclude that the M -MEM scores of prompts generalize to some extent across splits—for a given model, the best prompts for a given set of PER are likely to work well for a different set. Table 2 illustrates this by comparing each model’s best and worst prompts, showing that the (model-dependent) best and worst prompts for the dev set are still among the best and worst for the test set. These results show that while prompt quality depends on the model, it still generalizes for different PER .

5.3 What is the Best Strategy to Use the Prompt Set?

Table 3 shows the results of applying different strategies to the prompt set. **The prompt set outperforms baselines:** All the M -MEM scores achieved by best prompts (B-PT) of the prompt set are higher than the two baselines in the dev set (only one exception in the test set), showing the necessity to detect the model memorization with diverse prompts. **Prompt engineering outperforms the prompt set:** We observe that the best/worst-modified prompts (BM-PT and WM-PT) using prompt engineering increase the score gap between the B-PT and the W-PT. The BM-PT of RoBERTa-B improves by approximately 2 percentage points up on the B-PT on the dev set, and the WM-PT decreases the M -MEM score of BERT-L 19 percentage points. **Ensembling techniques do not bring improvement:** The ensemble techniques (EPT) do not improve/decrease the M -MEM scores from the B-PT/W-PT scores.

	ALBERT-B		ALBERT-L		BERT-B		BERT-L		RoBERTa-B		RoBERTa-L		
	dev	test	dev	test	dev	test	dev	test	dev	test	dev	test	
BS	∅-PT	71.11	72.44	70.81	68.91	66.78	66.10	70.16	68.11	66.39	65.46	74.40	70.29
	One-PT	70.42	71.18	69.02	67.57	72.15	70.31	69.91	66.49	68.57	70.72	72.68	70.22
	Mix-PT	68.63	70.02	67.58	66.98	70.59	69.27	69.29	66.56	66.47	67.29	72.80	70.42
PTE OPT	B-PT	74.84	75.10	73.12	71.38	73.96	71.84	71.56	69.30	70.76	70.78	75.27	72.79
	W-PT	58.92	58.74	64.60	64.70	65.11	63.30	67.78	64.42	57.00	59.63	70.61	70.05
EPT	BM-PT	75.14	74.96	73.14	71.44	75.14	73.31	73.03	72.18	72.68	71.59	76.28	73.33
	WM-PT	<u>41.92</u>	<u>44.53</u>	<u>63.76</u>	<u>63.52</u>	<u>59.15</u>	<u>62.04</u>	<u>48.68</u>	<u>49.98</u>	<u>55.29</u>	<u>58.21</u>	<u>69.15</u>	<u>68.52</u>
EPT	MV	73.24	74.3	70.96	69.71	70.75	69.34	69.91	67.98	64.87	66.30	73.73	71.05
	AVG-C	72.81	73.22	68.21	67.43	69.66	67.98	69.92	67.95	67.76	67.67	73.97	71.16
	WED-C	72.82	73.22	68.23	67.44	69.67	67.99	69.92	67.95	67.76	67.66	73.97	71.16
	MAX-C	71.53	73.71	70.65	68.99	73.52	71.40	69.97	67.31	61.47	63.22	73.69	71.25
	MIN-C	60.12	59.77	64.74	65.39	68.79	66.56	68.62	67.94	68.35	68.08	73.08	71.58

Table 3: Results of using different strategies on the prompts. One-PT and Mix-PT are baselines adapted from Ali et al. (2022). **Bold** and underline highlight the highest and lowest scores respectively.

5.4 Sentence Level Analysis: What Prompt Properties Impact the Performance?

This section investigates different prompt properties that may influence the M -MEM scores. **Prompt type:** Figure 3 (a) presents prompts’ M -MEM scores grouped by prompt type. While some models show similar M -MEM scores across sentence types, others are more sensitive to particular types. For example, RoBERTa-B has very distinct M -MEM scores for different types: imperative prompts generally yield higher scores than declarative prompts. Conversely, BERT-L has similar M -MEM scores profiles for different prompt types. **Person’s name token position:** Figure 3 (b) shows prompts’ M -MEM scores grouped by the token position of the name. The closer the name is to the beginning of the prompt, the higher the M -MEM score tends to be for RoBERTa-B and BERT-B. **Prompt token length:** Figure 3 (c) contrasts prompts’ M -MEM scores and length (in number of tokens). We observe a weak correlation between M -MEM scores and prompt length for most models, meaning that longer prompts are generally more effective at identifying memorization. However, BERT-B stands out as an outlier, showing a moderate negative correlation existed between M -MEM scores and prompt token lengths.

5.5 Token Level Analysis: How Tokens within a Prompt Impact the Performance?

Figure 4 shows a token-level analysis of how tokens within a prompt impact the M -MEM scores on the example of the BERT-B model¹. Individual token importance in both the best- and worst-performing prompts (including modifications produced by token-removal) is calculated as the difference between the M -MEM scores of the prompt with and without this token on the dev set. These scores are then normalized using a softmax function. The “MASK” token, acting as a placeholder for the PER , does not have an importance score.

Removing the least important tokens from the prompt increases the M -MEM score, while removing the most important tokens has the opposite effect. Iteratively removing the least important tokens from the best-performing prompt (“Are you going to MASKS’s art gallery opening tonight?”) enables an increase in the M -MEM score up to 75.14 for the prompt “you going MASK’s art gallery”. Continuing to remove tokens results in a slight decrease in prompt performance; however, it still outperforms the initial prompt up to the noun-phrase prompt “MASKS’s gallery” (which performs worse than the initial prompt). In the case of the worst-performing prompt, removing the most important token *give* from the initial prompt results in a major decrease in the M -MEM score by approximately 3.5 percentage points. Further removal of important tokens slightly reduces the score to a minimum of 59.15 for the prompt “MASK you something?”. We observe that almost all prompts, including the ones produced by the removal of the tokens from the initial one and the initial one itself, perform worse than the prompt containing only the PER name (refer to the last line in Figure 4). The best-performing prompt consists of only one token “something”, apart from PER , achieving an M -MEM score of 67.69.

¹For the analysis of other models considered in our experiments, please refer to Appendix A.3.




Figure 3: *M-MEM* scores grouped by different prompt properties on the dev set.

Prompt	M-MEM	Prompt	M-MEM
Are you going to MASK 's art gallery opening tonight ? 0.1 0.08 0.18 0.04 0.16 0.12 0.06 0.12 0.09 0.06	73.96	Did MASK <u>give</u> you any advice on starting something new ? 0.01 0.78 0.01 0.03 0.04 0.03 0.03 0.03 0.03 0.03	65.11
Are you going MASK 's art gallery opening tonight ? 0.08 0.07 0.2 0.45 0.05 0.04 0.03 0.04 0.05	74.65	Did MASK you any <u>advice</u> on starting something new ? 0.05 0.0 0.0 0.28 0.18 0.18 0.14 0.14 0.03	61.89
Are you going MASK 's art gallery tonight ? 0.08 0.06 0.24 0.23 0.06 0.25 0.03 0.05	74.75	Did MASK you any on <u>starting</u> something new ? 0.02 0.0 0.07 0.07 0.47 0.12 0.21 0.05	60.76
Are you <u>going</u> MASK 's art gallery ? 0.08 0.1 0.22 0.15 0.07 0.35 0.04	74.94	Did MASK you <u>any</u> on something <u>new</u> ? 0.03 0.0 0.22 0.12 0.2 0.37 0.06	60.34
Are you going MASK 's art gallery 0.03 0.07 0.13 0.37 0.04 0.36	75.03	Did MASK you <u>any</u> on something ? 0.15 0.0 0.28 0.27 0.16 0.14	60.29
you going MASK 's art gallery 0.08 0.16 0.4 0.07 0.28	75.14	Did MASK you <u>on</u> something ? 0.18 0.0 0.64 0.08 0.1	61.44
you going MASK 's gallery 0.08 0.09 0.24 0.6	74.70	<u>Did</u> MASK you something ? 0.92 0.0 0.05 0.03	60.71
<u>going</u> MASK 's gallery 0.23 0.5 0.27	74.33	MASK you something ? 0.01 0.09 0.9	59.15
MASK 's gallery 0.71 0.29	73.72	MASK <u>you</u> something 0.87 0.13	61.70
MASK 1.0	72.49	MASK <u>something</u> 1.0	67.69
MASK	66.78	MASK	66.78

Figure 4: Analysis of the token importance in prompts and the *M-MEM* scores for the BERT-B model. The best-performing (left) and the worst-performing (right) prompts were selected on the dev set. The heatmaps are generated with leave-one-token-out: at each step, the least important token is removed from the best-performing prompt, and the most important token is removed from the worst-performing prompt. The normalized token importance scores are under the corresponding tokens. The removed tokens are underlined.

The tokens that function as verbs and the tokens that are located near the *PER* token tend to have a higher importance score. Tokens like “going”, “give”, “practice”, “working”,

“recommend”, etc. (see Figure 4 and Figures 6-10 in Appendix A.3) have a higher influence on the *M-MEM* score in each considered prompt. A similar trend can be seen for the tokens “s”, “any”, “Oh”, “Bravo”, “What,” and “,” located nearer to the *MASK* token (substituted by the *PER* entity in the experiments) than tokens located further away.

The punctuation mark at the end of each prompt has minimal influence on the prompt performance. In all our experiments, the token representing the final punctuation mark consistently demonstrates a low importance score. On the contrary, the punctuation marks in the middle of the prompt, particularly those surrounding the *MASK* token (see, for example, Figure 6: “Bravo, *MASK*, ...”, and Figure 7 “Oh, *MASK*, ...” in Appendix A.3) exhibit greater importance. This can be explained by their role in altering sentence structure and emphasizing distinct elements within it.

5.6 Self-attention Analysis: How Models Behave to Different Prompts and *PER*?

An essential component of the transformer’s architecture is the multi-head self-attention mechanism (Vaswani et al., 2017). The self-attention weights of a model can show us where the model attends in the sequence and provide insights into what affected the predictions. Figure 5 shows the attention heatmaps of BERT-B for the best and the worst prompts with each prompt completed with In-train and Out-train *PER*s separately. Specifically, we first averaged the extracted attention weights of the tokens that correspond to the *PER* (“*MASK*”) for all completed sentences in a group (e.g., the best prompt completed separately with all In-train *PER*s). Then we create a heatmap using the averaged values over the attention heads and the layers. Generally, we notice that attention tends to be distributed similarly given a prompt, focusing on the first and the *PER* tokens. This observation applies to all analyzed models (heatmaps for the other 5 models are shown in Figure 11 in Appendix A.4).

Name level analysis: We observe a slightly higher focus on In-train *PER*s than Out-train *PER*s when comparing the averaged attention weights on both the best and worst prompts. **Prompt level analysis:** When observing the heatmaps in the prompt level, we notice that models tend to focus more (or equally for BERT-B shown in Figure 5) on the *PER* tokens in the best prompt than the worst, except when the *PER* tokens in the worst prompt are positioned in the beginning the prompt.




Figure 5: Attention heatmaps of the best and the worst prompts of BERT-B on the dev set averaged over all attention heads and layers. The attention weights corresponding to each prompt’s “*MASK*” token are used and averaged over the In-train and Out-train *PER*s separately.

6 Conclusion

We studied memorization in fine-tuned MLM-based NER models. In contrast to memorization in pre-training or auto-regressive language models, entities (person’s name) occur only on the input side of the fine-tuning data, and not on the output (which would be the *PER* tags), and therefore cannot be detected with generation prompts as in previous works (Carlini et al., 2021; 2023). For measuring memorization in this setting, we compared a fixed set of 5 hand-written prompts to automatically generated 400 prompts, and we measured how well those prompts could distinguish entities that occurred in the fine-tuning data from those that did not, using a large set of candidate name entities from Wikidata.

Detailed analysis showed that a prompt’s ability to detect memorization varies between models, but is stable between different entity sets. We find a large variability in the performance of generated prompts, and that many generated prompts significantly outperform hand-written ones. The effectiveness of prompts can be increased by removing the least important tokens even if the prompts become ungrammatical after the removal.

7 Acknowledgements

We thank Vasisht Duddu and N. Asokan who dedicated time and expertise to provide valuable feedback on this paper. This research has been funded by the Vienna Science and Technology Fund (WWTF) [10.47379/VRG19008] “Knowledge-infused Deep Learning for Natural Language Processing”.

References

- Rana Salal Ali, Benjamin Zi Hao Zhao, Hassan Jameel Asghar, Tham Nguyen, Ian David Wood, and Dali Kaafar. Unintended Memorization and Timing Attacks in Named Entity Recognition Models, November 2022. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2211.02245>. arXiv:2211.02245 [cs].
- Gavin Brown, Mark Bun, Vitaly Feldman, Adam Smith, and Kunal Talwar. When is memorization of irrelevant training data necessary for high-accuracy learning? In *Proceedings of the 53rd annual ACM SIGACT symposium on theory of computing*, pp. 123–132, 2021.
- Nicholas Carlini, Chang Liu, Úlfar Erlingsson, Jernej Kos, and Dawn Song. The secret sharer: Evaluating and testing unintended memorization in neural networks, 2019.
- Nicholas Carlini, Florian Tramer, Eric Wallace, Matthew Jagielski, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Katherine Lee, Adam Roberts, Tom Brown, Dawn Song, Úlfar Erlingsson, et al. Extracting training data from large language models. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*, pp. 2633–2650, 2021.
- Nicholas Carlini, Daphne Ippolito, Matthew Jagielski, Katherine Lee, Florian Tramer, and Chiyuan Zhang. Quantifying memorization across neural language models, 2023.
- Harshil Darji, Jelena Mitrović, and Michael Granitzer. German bert model for legal named entity recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.05388*, 2023.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding, 2019.
- Vitaly Feldman. Does learning require memorization? a short tale about a long tail. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pp. 954–959, 2020.
- Shi Feng, Eric Wallace, Alvin Grissom II, Mohit Iyyer, Pedro Rodriguez, and Jordan Boyd-Graber. Pathologies of neural models make interpretations difficult. In Ellen Riloff, David Chiang, Julia Hockenmaier, and Jun’ichi Tsujii (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 3719–3728, Brussels, Belgium, October–November 2018. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/D18-1407. URL <https://aclanthology.org/D18-1407>.
- Zijian Feng, Hanzhang Zhou, ZIXIAO ZHU, Junlang Qian, and Kezhi Mao. Unveiling and manipulating prompt influence in large language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=ap1ByuwQrX>.
- Zhenzhong Lan, Mingda Chen, Sebastian Goodman, Kevin Gimpel, Piyush Sharma, and Radu Soricut. Albert: A lite bert for self-supervised learning of language representations, 2020.

- Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*, 2019.
- Inbal Magar and Roy Schwartz. Data contamination: From memorization to exploitation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.08242*, 2022.
- Fatemehsadat Mireshghallah, Archit Uniyal, Tianhao Wang, David K Evans, and Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick. An empirical analysis of memorization in fine-tuned autoregressive language models. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 1816–1826, 2022.
- Seth Neel and Peter Chang. Privacy issues in large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.06717*, 2023.
- OpenAI. Chatgpt conversation, December 2023. Accessed from OpenAI’s ChatGPT.
- Yasaman Razeghi, Robert L. Logan IV au2, Matt Gardner, and Sameer Singh. Impact of pretraining term frequencies on few-shot reasoning, 2022.
- Russell Richie, Victor M Ruiz, Sifei Han, Lingyun Shi, and Fuchiang Tsui. Extracting social determinants of health events with transformer-based multitask, multilabel named entity recognition. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, pp. ocad046, 2023.
- Melanie Sclar, Yejin Choi, Yulia Tsvetkov, and Alane Suhr. Quantifying language models’ sensitivity to spurious features in prompt design or: How i learned to start worrying about prompt formatting, 2023.
- Kushal Tirumala, Aram Markosyan, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Armen Aghajanyan. Memorization without overfitting: Analyzing the training dynamics of large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:38274–38290, 2022.
- Erik F. Tjong Kim Sang and Fien De Meulder. Introduction to the CoNLL-2003 shared task: Language-independent named entity recognition. In *Proceedings of the Seventh Conference on Natural Language Learning at HLT-NAACL 2003*, pp. 142–147, 2003. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W03-0419>.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30, 2017.
- Denny Vrandečić and Markus Krötzsch. Wikidata: a free collaborative knowledgebase. *Communications of the ACM*, 57(10):78–85, 2014.
- Chengwei Wei, Yun-Cheng Wang, Bin Wang, and C-C Jay Kuo. An overview on language models: Recent developments and outlook. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.05759*, 2023.
- Jianfei Yu, Ziyang Li, Jieming Wang, and Rui Xia. Grounded multimodal named entity recognition on social media. In Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (eds.), *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 9141–9154, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.508. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.acl-long.508>.

A Appendix

A.1 Confidence of *PER* in a Prompt

We describe the details of obtaining the confidence of a *PER* in a prompt in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Confidence of PER in a Prompt

Input: a person’s name PER , a prompt PT_k , a NER model M_{ner} , tokenized PER set T_{PER} , token set $T_{PT_k \wedge PER}$ after tokenizing $PT_k \wedge PER$.

- 1: $C_k(PER) \leftarrow 0$
- 2: $Pr(T^1), Pr(T^2), \dots, Pr(T^{|T_{PT_k \wedge PER}|}) \leftarrow M_{ner}(T_{PT_k \wedge PER})$.
- 3: **for** $t \leftarrow 1$ to $|T_{PT_k \wedge PER}|$ **do**
- 4: **if** $T^t \in T_{PER}$ **then**
- 5: $C_k(T^t) \leftarrow \max(Pr(B-PER|T^t), Pr(I-PER|T^t))$
- 6: $C_k(PER) \leftarrow C_k(PER) + C_k(T^t)$
- 7: $C_k(PER) \leftarrow C_k(PER) / |T_{PER}|$.
- 8: **Output:** $C_k(PER)$, confidence score of PER for PT_k

A.2 MLM-based NER Models

We summarize the model performance details of the 6 explored fine-tuned NER models based on MLMs in Table 4, and more details about the models and accessibility information are described in the following.

ALBERT-B² and **ALBERT-L**³ NER models are fine-tuned models of base and large versions of ALBERT-v2 (Lan et al., 2020) respectively. ALBERT-v2 is a transformer-based language model that is pre-trained on a substantial corpus of English text data through self-supervised learning. This pretraining process entails exposure to raw textual data without human annotation, thereby leveraging publicly available data sources. Specifically, ALBERT-v2 utilizes two pretraining objectives: Masked Language Modeling (MLM) and Sentence Ordering Prediction (SOP). Through MLM, the model learns to predict masked tokens within a sequence of text, while SOP tasks involve predicting the correct order of sentences within a document. Notably, ALBERT-v2 aims to optimize efficiency and scalability by parameter sharing across layers and employing parameter reduction techniques, such as factorized embedding parameterization and cross-layer parameter sharing.

BERT-B⁴ and **BERT-L**⁵ NER models have the most downloaded records on the public model platform. These two models are fine-tuned models of BERT-base-cased and BERT-large-cased models (Devlin et al., 2019). BERT is a transformer-based language model renowned for its ability to capture bidirectional contextual information from text data. Similar to ALBERT, BERT models are pre-trained on a large corpus of English data in a self-supervised fashion, aiming to learn deep contextualized representations of words or tokens. BERT employs the MLM objective, where it learns to predict masked tokens within a sequence, and the Next Sentence Prediction (NSP) objective, where it predicts whether two sentences are consecutive in the original text. BERT’s architecture comprises transformer encoders stacked on top of each other, allowing it to effectively capture contextual information through attention mechanisms.

RoBERTa-B⁶ and **RoBERTa-L**⁷ NER models are fine-tuned models of RoBERTa-base and RoBERTa-large (Liu et al., 2019). RoBERTa is another variant of the BERT model designed to improve upon its pretraining methodology and performance. Like BERT and ALBERT-v2, RoBERTa utilizes transformer-based architectures for language modeling tasks. However, RoBERTa introduces several enhancements to the pretraining process, including dynamic masking strategies, larger training datasets, and longer training times. Notably, RoBERTa replaces the NSP objective with a more extensive masking scheme during pretraining to improve the model’s robustness and effectiveness in capturing contextual information from text data. Additionally, RoBERTa employs larger batch sizes and longer training sequences,

²<https://huggingface.co/ArBert/albert-base-v2-finetuned-ner>

³https://huggingface.co/Gladiator/albert-large-v2_ner_conll2003

⁴<https://huggingface.co/dslim/bert-base-NER>

⁵<https://huggingface.co/dslim/bert-large-NER>

⁶<https://huggingface.co/dominiqueblok/roberta-base-finetuned-ner>

⁷https://huggingface.co/Gladiator/roberta-large_ner_conll2003

Model	#Param.	P	R	F1	ACC	Training epoch
ALBERT-B	11.1M	93.0	93.8	93.4	98.5	3
ALBERT-L	16.6M	94.0	94.5	94.2	98.7	5
BERT-B	108M	92.1	93.1	92.6	91.2	-
BERT-L	334M	92.0	91.9	92.0	90.3	-
Roberta-B	124M	95.3	96.0	95.7	98.9	3
Roberta-L	354M	96.2	96.9	96.6	99.4	5

Table 4: Self-reported performance of the NER Models on CoNLL-2003 evaluation dataset.

contributing to its improved performance on downstream natural language processing tasks.

A.3 Token-level Analysis

Same as Section 5.5, we provide token-level analysis for the rest of the 5 models in Figure 6-10.

Prompt	M-MEM	Prompt	M-MEM
<u>Bravo</u> , MASK, what an impressive performance !	74.84	Are you going to MASK <u>s</u> art gallery opening tonight ?	58.92
<u>Bravo</u> , MASK, what <u>an</u> impressive performance	75.14	Are <u>you</u> going to MASK art gallery opening tonight ?	49.07
<u>Bravo</u> , MASK, what impressive performance	75.02	Are going to MASK art gallery opening tonight ?	46.37
<u>Bravo</u> , MASK, what impressive	74.64	<u>Are</u> going to MASK art gallery opening tonight	44.58
<u>Bravo</u> , MASK, impressive	73.29	<u>going</u> to MASK art gallery opening tonight	42.19
<u>Bravo</u> MASK, <u>impressive</u>	72.92	to MASK art gallery <u>opening</u> <u>tonight</u>	41.92
MASK, <u>impressive</u>	72.61	to MASK art gallery <u>tonight</u>	42.90
MASK <u>impressive</u>	73.03	<u>to</u> MASK <u>art</u> gallery	43.29
		<u>to</u> MASK gallery	51.44
		MASK <u>gallery</u>	60.55

Figure 6: Analysis of the token importance in prompts and the *M-MEM* scores for the **ALBERT-B** model. The best-performing (on the left) and the worst-performing (on the right) prompts were selected on the dev set. The heatmaps are generated with leave-one-token-out: at each step, the least important token is removed from the best-performing prompt (left), and the most important token is removed from the worst-performing prompt (right). The removed tokens are underlined.

A.4 Self-attention Analysis

Same as Section 5.6, we provide self-attention analysis for the rest of the 5 models in Figure 11.

Prompt	M-MEM	Prompt	M-MEM
Oh , MASK , you 're a true gem in our team .	73.12	MASK , <u>practice</u> forgiveness towards yourself and others .	64.60
Oh , MASK , you 're a gem in our team .	73.14	MASK , <u>forgiveness</u> towards yourself and others .	64.78
Oh , MASK , you 're a gem <u>in</u> team .	73.03	MASK <u>!</u> towards yourself and others .	64.30
Oh , MASK , you 're a gem in team	71.88	MASK towards yourself and <u>others</u> .	63.76
Oh , MASK , you 're a gem team	72.27	MASK towards yourself <u>and</u> .	66.02
Oh MASK , you 're a gem team	72.30	MASK towards yourself <u>!</u>	65.98
Oh MASK , <u>you</u> a gem team	72.32	MASK <u>towards</u> yourself	63.86
Oh MASK , you a <u>team</u>	71.65	MASK <u>towards</u>	68.21
Oh MASK <u>you</u> a team	70.93		
Oh MASK <u>you</u> team	70.41		
Oh MASK <u>team</u>	69.68		
Oh MASK	69.92		

Figure 7: Analysis of the token importance in prompts and the *M-MEM* scores for the **ALBERT-L** model. The best-performing (on the left) and the worst-performing (on the right) prompts were selected on the dev set. The heatmaps are generated with leave-one-token-out: at each step, the least important token is removed from the best-performing prompt (left), and the most important token is removed from the worst-performing prompt (right). The removed tokens are underlined.

Prompt	M-MEM	Prompt	M-MEM
What project is MASK <u>working</u> on 2	71.56	I had a chance to <u>meet</u> MASK 's family .	67.78
What project is MASK working on	71.78	I had a chance to MASK <u>s</u> family .	53.09
What project is MASK working	72.33	I had a chance to MASK family <u>!</u>	50.28
What project is MASK	73.03	I had <u>!</u> chance to MASK family	48.68
What <u>is</u> MASK	72.87	<u>!</u> had chance to MASK family	49.56
What MASK	70.50	had <u>chance</u> to MASK family	56.82
		had to MASK <u>family</u>	70.37
		<u>had</u> to MASK	70.17
		<u>to</u> MASK	70.50


Figure 8: Analysis of the token importance in prompts and the *M-MEM* scores for the *M-MEM* score of the **BERT-L** model. The best-performing (on the left) and the worst-performing (on the right) prompts were selected on the dev set. The heatmaps are generated with leave-one-token-out: at each step, the least important token is removed from the best-performing prompt (left), and the most important token is removed from the worst-performing prompt (right). The removed tokens are underlined.

Prompt	M-MEM	Prompt	M-MEM
MASK , can <u>you</u> recommend a good restaurant in town ?	70.76	I <u>had</u> a great conversation with MASK at the party .	57.00
MASK can <u>you</u> <u>recommend</u> a good restaurant in town ?	70.97	I a <u>great</u> conversation with MASK at the party .	55.63
MASK can <u>you</u> recommend a good in town ?	71.52	I a <u>great</u> conversation with MASK at the party	55.62
MASK can <u>you</u> recommend a good in ?	72.17	I a <u>conversation</u> with MASK at the party	55.60
MASK can <u>you</u> recommend good in ?	72.68	I <u>conversation</u> with MASK at the party	55.86
MASK <u>you</u> recommend good in ?	71.64	I with MASK at <u>the</u> party	55.29
MASK <u>you</u> recommend in ?	71.20	I with MASK at party	55.87
MASK <u>you</u> recommend in	70.64	with MASK at <u>party</u>	58.01
MASK <u>you</u> recommend	68.50	with MASK <u>at</u>	60.25
MASK <u>recommend</u>	66.61	<u>with</u> MASK	59.41


Figure 9: Analysis of the token importance in prompts and the M -MEM scores for the M -MEM score of the **RoBERTa-B model**. The best-performing (on the left) and the worst-performing (on the right) prompts were selected on the dev set. The heatmaps are generated with leave-one-token-out: at each step, the least important token is removed from the best-performing prompt (left), and the most important token is removed from the worst-performing prompt (right). The removed tokens are underlined.

Prompt	M-MEM	Prompt	M-MEM
MASK , <u>invest</u> in meaningful relationships .	75.27	MASK , <u>practice</u> playing the guitar .	70.61
MASK , <u>invest</u> in <u>meaningful</u> relationships	76.15	MASK , <u>playing</u> the guitar .	69.58
MASK , <u>invest</u> in relationships	75.86	MASK , <u>the</u> guitar .	69.19
MASK , <u>invest</u> in	76.28	MASK , <u>guitar</u> .	69.15
MASK , <u>invest</u>	75.43	MASK , <u>guitar</u>	70.46
MASK <u>invest</u>	74.61	MASK <u>guitar</u>	72.58


Figure 10: Analysis of the token importance in prompts and the M -MEM scores for the M -MEM score of the **RoBERTa-L model**. The best-performing (on the left) and the worst-performing (on the right) prompts were selected on the dev set. The heatmaps are generated with leave-one-token-out: at each step, the least important token is removed from the best-performing prompt (left), and the most important token is removed from the worst-performing prompt (right). The removed tokens are underlined.




(a) ALBERT-B




(b) ALBERT-L



(c) BERT-L



(d) RoBERTa-L



(e) RoBERTa-L

Figure 11: Attention heatmaps of the best and the worst prompts across 5 models on the dev set averaged over all attention heads and layers. The attention weights corresponding to each prompt’s “MASK” token are used and averaged over the In-train and Out-train *PER* sets separately.