

# PRIVEE: Privacy-Preserving Vertical Federated Learning Against Feature Inference Attacks

SINDHUJA MADABUSHI, Department of Computer Science, Virginia Tech, USA

AHMAD FARAZ KHAN, Department of Computer Science, Virginia Tech, USA

HAIDER ALI, Department of Computer Science, Virginia Tech, USA

ANANTHARAM SWAMI, US DEVCOM Army Research Laboratory, USA

RUI NING, Department of Computer Science, Old Dominion University, USA

HONGYI WU, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Arizona, USA

JIN-HEE CHO, Department of Computer Science, Virginia Tech, USA

Vertical Federated Learning (VFL) enables collaborative model training across organizations that share common user samples but hold disjoint feature spaces. Despite its potential, VFL is susceptible to feature inference attacks, in which adversarial parties exploit shared confidence scores (i.e., prediction probabilities) during inference to reconstruct private input features of other participants. To counter this threat, we propose PRIVEE(*PR*ivacy-*Pr*eserving *V*ertical *F*ederated *L*earning), a novel defense mechanism named after the French word *privée*, meaning “private.” PRIVEE obfuscates confidence scores while preserving critical properties such as relative ranking and inter-score distances. Rather than exposing raw scores, PRIVEE shares only the transformed representations, mitigating the risk of reconstruction attacks without degrading model prediction accuracy. Extensive experiments show that PRIVEE achieves a threefold improvement in privacy protection compared to state-of-the-art defenses, while preserving full predictive performance against advanced feature inference attacks.

CCS Concepts: • **Security and privacy** → **Distributed systems security**; • **Computing methodologies** → *Distributed artificial intelligence*.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Vertical Federated Learning, Artificial Intelligence, Privacy, Feature Inference Attacks

## ACM Reference Format:

Sindhuja Madabushi, Ahmad Faraz Khan, Haider Ali, Ananthram Swami, Rui Ning, Hongyi Wu, and Jin-Hee Cho. 2025. PRIVEE: Privacy-Preserving Vertical Federated Learning Against Feature Inference Attacks. *ACM Trans. Intell. Syst. Technol.* 00, 0, Article 000 (2025), 22 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

## 1 Introduction

**Why Is Privacy Still a Challenge in Federated Learning?** To mitigate privacy concerns inherent in centralized machine learning systems, *federated learning* (FL) [28] was introduced. FL enables

---

Authors' Contact Information: Sindhuja Madabushi, Department of Computer Science, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, USA, [msindhuja@vt.edu](mailto:msindhuja@vt.edu); Ahmad Faraz Khan, Department of Computer Science, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, USA, [ahmadfk@vt.edu](mailto:ahmadfk@vt.edu); Haider Ali, Department of Computer Science, Virginia Tech, Arlington, Virginia, USA, [haiderali@vt.edu](mailto:haiderali@vt.edu); Ananthram Swami, US DEVCOM Army Research Laboratory, Adelphi, MD, USA, [ananthram.swami.civ@army.mil](mailto:ananthram.swami.civ@army.mil); Rui Ning, Department of Computer Science, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA, USA, [rning@odu.edu](mailto:rning@odu.edu); Hongyi Wu, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA, [mhwu@arizona.edu](mailto:mhwu@arizona.edu); Jin-Hee Cho, Department of Computer Science, Virginia Tech, Arlington, Virginia, USA, [jicho@vt.edu](mailto:jicho@vt.edu).

---

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](mailto:permissions@acm.org).

© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM 2157-6912/2025/0-ART000

<https://doi.org/XXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

multiple distributed parties to collaboratively train a shared model without exchanging their raw private data. This paradigm has been successfully applied in privacy-sensitive domains such as mobile keyboard prediction, healthcare, and personalized recommendation systems [24]. However, despite its privacy-preserving design, FL remains susceptible to privacy attacks. For example, in vertical federated learning (VFL), adversarial clients can exploit shared confidence scores during inference to reconstruct other clients' private feature representations [6, 19, 26, 42].


**How Does VFL Differ from HFL in Inference Workflow?** In horizontal federated learning (HFL), participating parties share the same feature space but possess different data samples. In contrast, vertical federated learning (VFL) involves parties that share the same sample space but hold different subsets of features. VFL is particularly relevant in domains such as banking or healthcare, where institutions possess partial, private information about common entities and must collaborate without exposing raw data.

As illustrated in Fig. 1, VFL requires *collaborative inference*, since accurate predictions depend on the aggregation of distributed features. During inference, both active and passive parties process their local features using private sub-models to generate intermediate representations. These representations are securely transmitted to a trusted coordinator, which aggregates them and applies a final non-linear activation (e.g., softmax or sigmoid). The resulting confidence scores are then broadcast to all participating clients as the final output. This broadcast mechanism, while necessary for prediction, introduces potential avenues for privacy leakage.


**Why Are Existing Inference-Time Defenses Insufficient?** Feature inference attacks typically occur during the inference phase and are not mitigated by traditional training-time privacy-preserving methods such as Differential Privacy (DP) or Homomorphic Encryption (HE). These attacks exploit shared confidence scores, combined with the adversary's local features, to reconstruct private attributes of benign clients. As a result, protecting confidence vectors during inference becomes critical. Prior defenses proposed in both centralized [29, 38, 43] and VFL [18, 21, 23, 45] contexts demonstrate varying levels of protection but often suffer from a severe accuracy–privacy trade-off. Even lightweight defenses such as rounding, noise injection, or applying DP to confidence scores [19, 26] tend to reduce model accuracy significantly. To overcome these limitations, we propose PRIVEE, a novel inference-time defense that increases reconstruction error (MSE) against inference attacks while maintaining model accuracy and computational efficiency.

To address the aforementioned challenges and limitations in existing approaches, we propose PRIVEE, a privacy-enhancing inference framework for vertical federated learning (VFL), which introduces the following **key contributions**:

- PRIVEE enhances client-side privacy by transforming confidence scores through a lightweight, order-preserving perturbation mechanism that incurs negligible computational cost while maintaining inference accuracy. Two adaptive variants, PRIVEE-DP and PRIVEE-DP++, are introduced to support different levels of privacy guarantees and deployment constraints.
- PRIVEE demonstrates strong resilience against state-of-the-art feature inference attacks, including the Generative Regressive Network Attack (GRNA) and Gradient Inversion Attack (GIA) [19], which exploit confidence vectors to reconstruct sensitive features. Experimental results show that both PRIVEE-DP and PRIVEE-DP++ significantly increase reconstruction error (MSE) across all tested datasets and model architectures.
- PRIVEE-VFL achieves consistent outperformance over existing defenses, providing up to 30× higher privacy protection (in terms of MSE improvement) while preserving near-identical model accuracy (within 0.3% deviation from baseline). The inference latency remains in the millisecond range, confirming its practicality for real-time applications such as financial analytics and IoT systems.



(a) Training Phase



(b) Inference Phase

**Fig. 1. Vertical Federated Learning (VFL) Workflow.** The workflow depicts both the (a) *training phase* and (b) *inference phase* in a two-party VFL setting, where data owners (active and passive parties) collaboratively train a model without exchanging raw features or labels. During the training phase, records across organizations are first aligned through secure or encrypted entity matching based on shared user identifiers. Each party then computes local feature embeddings using its private data and forwards them to the federated coordinator, who concatenates the embeddings and performs centralized operations such as loss computation and gradient aggregation. The computed gradients are securely distributed back to the parties for local parameter updates, enabling iterative model refinement under privacy constraints. During the inference phase, each party performs a local forward pass to produce embeddings that are aggregated by the coordinator to generate the final prediction output. This workflow exemplifies how VFL achieves collaborative learning across heterogeneous data silos while preserving feature-level privacy, preventing direct data leakage, and ensuring compliance with data protection requirements.

- Unlike traditional DP- or rounding-based defenses, PRIVEE preserves inter-class confidence ranking and correlation structures, enabling reliable downstream use in tasks such as ensemble learning and knowledge distillation. This design ensures both privacy protection and functional continuity of federated inference pipelines.
- Comprehensive ablation studies demonstrate that PRIVEE’s performance remains stable under varying federation scales, class cardinalities, and attack intensities, validating its robustness, scalability, and adaptability to real-world VFL deployments.

## 2 Related Work

This section reviews existing defense mechanisms designed to mitigate privacy risks during inference and learning in federated settings. We organize the discussion into two key areas: (1) *Mitigating Inference Attacks*, which covers confidence sanitization, differential privacy, and encryption-based defenses; and (2) *Defenses Against Feature Inference Attacks in VFL*, which highlights recent efforts tailored to the vertical federated learning paradigm.

### 2.1 Mitigating Inference Attacks

**2.1.1 Confidence Score Sanitization Techniques.** Shokri et al. [36] explored methods such as restricting the prediction vector to its top- $k$  classes (with smaller  $k$  reducing leakage), rounding probabilities to  $d$  decimal digits (with smaller  $d$  improving privacy), and increasing entropy using a temperature-scaled softmax (with temperature  $t$ ). *Dropout* enhanced privacy by reducing overfitting and memorization in neural networks [35, 38]. Jia et al. [17] proposed *MemGuard*, introducing adversarial noise to confidence vectors by formulating an optimization problem solved via gradient descent. Yang et al. [43] developed the *Purifier*, a pre-trained autoencoder that reduced score dispersion by tightening decoded outputs of the same class, making them less distinguishable. While these methods provided privacy protection, they often sacrificed prediction accuracy or computational efficiency. In contrast, PRIVEE offers broader protection against feature inference attacks during prediction in centralized, horizontal, and vertical FL while fully preserving prediction accuracy.

**2.1.2 Differential Privacy-based Defenses.** Most DP-based defenses [1] were primarily designed for training-time privacy protection [2, 8, 16, 37, 40]. For inference-time protection, Roy Chowdhury et al. [34] proposed *OP $\epsilon$* , which integrated DP with *Order-Preserving Encryption* (OPE) to defend against attacks exploiting ciphertext ordering. Their method supported any vector requiring order preservation, including confidence scores. In contrast, PRIVEE avoided encryption entirely and relied solely on DP for privacy. Huang et al. [15] introduced Noisy First-order, Second-order, and Inner-Product preserving (FISIP), a perturbation-based defense that added carefully crafted noise to a distance- and correlation-preserving transformation matrix. While this preserved first-order, second-order, and inner-product statistics, it deliberately broke the orthogonality of the transformation, leading to only approximate distance preservation. As a result, the relative ordering of confidence scores was no longer guaranteed, potentially degrading inference accuracy. Ye et al. [44] proposed a one-parameter DP-based mechanism that perturbed and re-normalized model confidence vectors using the exponential mechanism. Like PRIVEE-DP, it discretized score ranges to preserve ranking before applying a softmax-style normalization. However, their approach focused only on defending against membership inference and model inversion attacks. In contrast, PRIVEE broadly defends against feature inference attacks during prediction in centralized, horizontal, and vertical FL settings.

**2.1.3 Order-Preserving Encryption Schemes.** Boldyreva et al. [4] formalized the security notion for order-preserving encryption (OPE) and presented the first probabilistic, symmetric OPE scheme that reveals only the ciphertext order while hiding value distances. Building on this, Popa et al. [30]

proposed a mutable, interactive encoding protocol (mOPE) achieving ideal security by disclosing only order information and shifting computation to query time to avoid static leakage. Roche et al. [33] introduced a partially order-preserving encryption (POPE) scheme that encodes short prefixes and defers full ordering to an online phase, reducing leakage at the cost of modest latency. Maffei et al. [27] revisited frequency-hiding OPE, addressing vulnerabilities to frequency-analysis attacks in prior constructions. Although OPE preserves both ranking and accuracy, its computational cost increases with the number of classes. In contrast, our DP-based approach relies on lightweight numeric scaling, with runtime effectively independent of the class count, a key efficiency advantage demonstrated in our experimental analysis.

**2.1.4 Homomorphic Encryption (HE)-based Sorting Methods.** Efficient HE sorting using the Fast Fully HE over the Torus (TFHE) scheme [5] introduced bit-wise homomorphic comparison and swap primitives in two's-complement form. Its AdditionSort algorithm ran up to 50% faster than bubble sort and 60% faster than earlier bit-wise comparators on large ciphertext arrays. Hong et al. [14] proposed sorting homomorphically encrypted data using  $k$ -way sorting networks paired with approximate fully HE (FHE) and single-instruction multiple-data (SIMD) parallelism, achieving notable speed-ups over prior encrypted-sorting techniques. Verma et al. [39] developed a privacy-preserving top- $k$  recommendation method using Batcher's odd, even mergesort within a two-server protocol, leveraging secure bit decomposition.

While HE-based methods performed well in high-throughput, resource-intensive settings, our proposed PRIVEE achieves strong privacy protection with significantly lower computational and resource overhead.

## 2.2 Defenses Against Feature Inference Attacks in VFL

Several defenses were proposed to mitigate feature inference attacks (FIAs) in vertical federated learning (VFL). Confidence score ranking preserved only the order of predictions while exposing distances and correlations between scores [32]. Reconstruction-aware VFL Regularization (RVFR) [25] restored legitimate feature representations to resist backdoor and inference-time attacks, whereas HashVFL [31] mapped features to fixed-length hash codes to prevent data reconstruction. Fan et al. [11] introduced FL Similar Gradients (FLSGs), which equalized gradient directions across clients to obscure per-feature contributions and reduce leakage.

However, none of these defenses simultaneously achieved low computational overhead, strong privacy, and high inference accuracy. In contrast, our proposed PRIVEE meets all three goals, as detailed in Section 4.

## 3 Preliminaries

This section establishes the foundational context for our work. We first describe the *threat model* that defines the adversarial assumptions and system architecture in vertical federated learning (VFL), and then formalize the *problem statement* by presenting the optimization objective that guides our privacy-preserving defense design.

### 3.1 Threat Model

We adopt the system and threat model from [19], as it provides a rigorous and widely recognized foundation for analyzing privacy leakage in vertical federated learning (VFL) during prediction. This model captures the canonical two-party VFL architecture. We have extended it to a general  $N$ -party setting, while explicitly considering the presence of a trusted learning coordinator. In the two-party case, the active party  $P_{act}$  holds features  $x_{act}$  and labels, while the passive party  $P_{pas}$  holds complementary features  $x_{pas}$ . In the extended  $N$ -party case,  $P_{act}$  still holds  $x_{act}$  and

labels, while each passive party  $P_{pas,i}$  holds  $x_{pas,i}$ . The trusted coordinator aggregates the local logits  $z_{act}$  and  $z_{pas,i}$  to generate the confidence vector  $c$ , which is then returned to  $P_{act}$ , where  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$ . By grounding our work in this model, we ensure both consistency with prior privacy-leakage analyses and comparability of our results to established benchmarks in the VFL literature. In the two-party white-box setting, the active party  $P_{act}$  has access to the full joint model, its own inputs  $x_{act}$ , and the output  $c$  for each queried instance. The adversary, embedded in  $P_{act}$ , aims to reconstruct the private features  $x_{pas}$ . This setup is illustrated in Fig. 2.

We also adopt the white-box active-party threat model from [19], extended to the  $N$ -party case. In this model, the adversary, embedded in  $P_{act}$ , has access to the full joint VFL model, its own input features, and the confidence vector returned at prediction time. The adversary's objective is to reconstruct the private features held by one or more passive parties. We adopt this threat model and the attacks from [19] as they represent state-of-the-art feature inference methods that exploit confidence scores to infer private features, ensuring our evaluation is both rigorous and comparable to prior work.

According to [19], extending inference attacks to the multi-party VFL setting introduces two primary risks: (i) the presence of multiple passive parties can increase the exposure of private features, and (ii) potential collusion between active and passive parties can further amplify privacy leakage. These factors collectively expand the attack surface and complicate defense design. Our experimental results show that increasing the number of parties does not weaken the effectiveness of our defense. Furthermore, PRIVEE remains robust under collusion scenarios, as the trusted coordinator shares only *perturbed confidence scores* with all parties. Although PRIVEE does not explicitly simulate collusive attacks, it inherently mitigates such risks: colluding parties can observe only perturbed *confidence orders* rather than their original magnitudes. Because most reconstruction and membership inference attacks depend on precise confidence values or inter-class gaps, the available information from collusion yields negligible additional advantage. Effective collusion would still require access to unperturbed confidence scores, which are never exposed under PRIVEE's inference-time protocol.

To evaluate our approach, we employ two state-of-the-art attacks that exploit confidence scores: (1) **Generative Regression Network (GRN)** trains a conditional generator that learns to reproduce the observed confidence scores. The generator is optimized to infer passive features from known active features and model outputs, using reconstruction loss as its training objective. (2) **Gradient-based Inversion Attack (GIA)** applies gradient descent over a randomly initialized feature vector to minimize the divergence between predicted and observed scores. Since PRIVEE functions as a post-processing layer on confidence scores, it is entirely model-agnostic and applicable to any setting where an adversary leverages prediction-time confidence scores to reconstruct private features. In addition to the attacks above, we also considered the **Equation-Solving Attack**, which transforms log-probability ratios into a linear system to recover unknown feature slices. This attack begins by computing the logarithm of confidence scores; however, since such values are not accessible in our setup, we did not include this attack in our evaluation, as noted in Section 5.

### 3.2 Problem Statement

We formulate our defense objective as the maximization of the attacker's reconstruction error, subject to the constraint that the original model's predictive performance is preserved. Specifically:

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\theta}{\text{maximize}} && \text{MSE}(d_{rec}(\theta), d_{true}) \\ & \text{subject to} && |\mathcal{A}_D(\theta) - \mathcal{A}_{ND}| \leq \epsilon, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$




Fig. 2. **Overview of the PRIVEE framework (two-party setting):** During training, the active party possesses features and labels, while the passive party holds complementary features without labels. During inference, each party performs a forward pass through its local model and transmits the resulting activations to a trusted coordinator, which aggregates them and applies the PRIVEE transformation to generate privacy-preserving confidence scores.

where  $\theta$  denotes the defense parameters,  $d_{\text{rec}}(\theta)$  represents the adversary's reconstructed data influenced by the defense, and  $d_{\text{true}}$  is the original sensitive data.  $\mathcal{A}_D(\theta)$  and  $\mathcal{A}_{ND}$  denote the prediction accuracies of the model with and without the defense, respectively. Finally,  $\epsilon$  is a small non-negative tolerance parameter (e.g.,  $\epsilon = 0.01$ ) that bounds the allowable accuracy degradation introduced by the defense.

Our defense mechanism, PRIVEE, is designed to enhance privacy against FIAs by maximizing the Mean Squared Error (MSE) between the adversary's reconstructed data and the original sensitive data. A larger MSE indicates more effective obfuscation of the true data, thereby improving privacy.

To ensure practical deployment, we incorporate a constraint that limits degradation in the VFL model's prediction accuracy. This ensures that PRIVEE's privacy gains do not come at the cost of utility. By bounding the difference in prediction accuracy before and after defense application, we maintain the usability of the VFL model in downstream tasks.

This objective formulation allows us to develop a *principled tradeoff* between privacy and utility, ensuring robust defense while supporting real-world deployment requirements.

#### 4 Proposed Defense: PRIVEE

In this section, we introduce PRIVEE, an inference-time defense for vertical federated learning that transforms confidence vectors to suppress leakage while *preserving class order* and baseline accuracy with millisecond-level overhead. The framework provides two deployable variants, including PRIVEE-DP and PRIVEE-DP++, and achieves substantial privacy gains (e.g., up to 30 $\times$  higher reconstruction error) without compromising utility.

#### 4.1 Privacy-Preserving Confidence Transformation in VFL

In VFL, both active and passive parties utilize confidence score vectors to rank classes by their relative importance and estimate the likelihood of each class. Preserving the *ranking order* of these scores is crucial for maintaining inference accuracy; however, retaining their *absolute distances* is not always necessary. To address this, our proposed defense transforms the confidence outputs to obscure class magnitudes while preserving their sorted order, thereby safeguarding privacy without sacrificing model utility.

We introduce two defense mechanisms that strike a trade-off between privacy protection, mean squared error (MSE), and inference accuracy:

- PRIVEE-DP: Preserves the original class ranking while applying differential privacy to perturb the confidence scores.
- PRIVEE-DP++: Extends PRIVEE-DP by incorporating multiple privacy budget levels, offering enhanced robustness against feature inference attacks.

While prior defenses such as *Purifier* [43] and *Rounding* [36] partially obscure confidence scores, they fail to simultaneously preserve the score distribution, inter-score distances, and class order, often degrading inference accuracy. In contrast, PRIVEE maintains class rankings and predictive performance under strong privacy guarantees, though it does not preserve the exact numerical distances or correlations among individual confidence scores.

#### 4.2 Order-Preserving Perturbation of Confidence Scores

Let  $K$  denote the number of classes. We apply a transformation based on a family of orthonormal matrices  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$  as the foundation for our perturbation mechanism. Valid choices for  $\mathbf{A}$  include the identity matrix  $\mathbf{I}_K \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$  and the negative of the first- and second-order sum and inner product-preserving (FISIP) matrix [15].

Let the vector of confidence scores be denoted by  $\mathbf{c} = [c_1, c_2, \dots, c_K]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^K$ . Let  $\mathbf{r} \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}^K$  denote the ranking vector, where  $r_i < r_j$  whenever  $c_i > c_j$ , and let  $\mathbf{d} = [d_1, d_2, \dots, d_K]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^K$  denote the transformed confidence scores that preserve relative distances.

The ranking vector  $\mathbf{r}$  is computed as:

$$\mathbf{r} = \text{rank}(\mathbf{c}) := \text{argsort}(-\mathbf{c}) + \mathbf{1}_K, \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathbf{1}_K$  is the  $K$ -dimensional vector of ones. This formulation ensures that higher confidence values are assigned lower rank indices, aligning with conventional ranking semantics.

**4.2.1 Order-Preserving Perturbation.** We compute an initial vector of transformed confidence scores  $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{R}^K$  using the following linear transformation:

$$\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{c}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$  is an orthonormal matrix. This transformation preserves both pairwise distances and correlations. In particular, for specific choices of  $\mathbf{A}$ , such as the identity matrix  $\mathbf{I}_K$  or the negative of the first- and second-order sum and inner product-preserving (FISIP) matrix [15], ranking can also be preserved. One such example is:

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}_K - \frac{2}{K} \mathbf{1}_K \mathbf{1}_K^\top. \quad (4)$$

*Definition 4.1.* Let  $T : \mathbb{R}^K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^K$  denote a transformation applied to a confidence score vector  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^K$ . We define three preservation properties of  $T$  as follows:

(1) **Distance-preserving:**  $T$  preserves the pairwise Euclidean distances between any two vectors, i.e.,

$$\text{dist}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c}') = \text{dist}(T(\mathbf{c}), T(\mathbf{c}')), \quad \forall \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c}' \in \mathbb{R}^K, \quad (5)$$

where  $\text{dist}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c}') = \|\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{c}'\|_2$ .

(2) **Correlation-preserving:**  $T$  maintains the cosine similarity (i.e., directional correlation) between any pair of vectors:

$$\text{corr}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c}') = \text{corr}(T(\mathbf{c}), T(\mathbf{c}')), \quad \forall \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c}' \in \mathbb{R}^K, \quad (6)$$

where  $\text{corr}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c}') = \frac{\langle \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c}' \rangle}{\|\mathbf{c}\|_2 \|\mathbf{c}'\|_2}$ .

(3) **Order-preserving:**  $T$  retains the relative ranking of the components within each vector, such that

$$\text{rank}(\mathbf{c}) = \text{rank}(T(\mathbf{c})), \quad \forall \mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^K, \quad (7)$$

where  $\text{rank}(\mathbf{c})$  denotes the permutation of indices that sorts  $\mathbf{c}$  in descending order.

**LEMMA 4.2.** *If  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$  is an orthonormal matrix, then the linear transformation  $\mathbf{c} \mapsto \mathbf{Ac}$  is both distance-preserving and correlation-preserving.*

**PROOF.** Since  $\mathbf{A}$  is orthonormal, we have  $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}_K$ . For any vectors  $\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c}' \in \mathbb{R}^K$ ,

$$\|\mathbf{Ac} - \mathbf{Ac}'\|_2 = \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{c}')\|_2 = \|\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{c}'\|_2,$$

establishing distance preservation. Similarly, the inner product is invariant under orthonormal transformation:

$$\langle \mathbf{Ac}, \mathbf{Ac}' \rangle = (\mathbf{Ac})^\top (\mathbf{Ac}') = \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{Ac}' = \langle \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c}' \rangle,$$

which implies  $\text{corr}(\mathbf{Ac}, \mathbf{Ac}') = \text{corr}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c}')$ . Thus, the transformation preserves both distances and correlations.  $\square$

**LEMMA 4.3.** *The transformation  $\mathbf{c} \mapsto \mathbf{Ac}$  is order-preserving when  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}_K$  or  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}_K - \frac{2}{K} \mathbf{1}_K \mathbf{1}_K^\top$ .*

**PROOF.** The claim is trivial when  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}_K$ .

For  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}_K - \frac{2}{K} \mathbf{1}_K \mathbf{1}_K^\top$ , we have

$$\mathbf{Ac} = \left( \mathbf{I}_K - \frac{2}{K} \mathbf{1}_K \mathbf{1}_K^\top \right) \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{c} - \left( \frac{2}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K c_i \right) \mathbf{1}_K.$$

Since the same scalar value  $\frac{2}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K c_i$  is subtracted from every element of  $\mathbf{c}$ , the relative ordering among elements remains unchanged. Therefore,  $\text{rank}(\mathbf{Ac}) = \text{rank}(\mathbf{c})$ .  $\square$

While the above transformations preserve both distances and rankings, they remain fully invertible. Consequently, an adversary with access to  $\mathbf{A}^{-1}$  can perfectly reconstruct the original confidence scores, providing no privacy protection. To mitigate this risk, we next introduce a randomized perturbation of  $\mathbf{A}$  to obscure recoverable information while maintaining essential structural properties.

**4.2.2 PRIVEE-DP.** PRIVEE-DP applies a differentially private (DP)-like perturbation to the matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  to provide privacy while preserving the ranking of confidence scores. Specifically, each diagonal entry of  $\mathbf{A}$  is randomly perturbed, with care taken to maintain the order-preserving property of the overall transformation.

Algorithm 1 outlines the PRIVEE-DP++ procedure. In the special case of PRIVEE-DP, we set  $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = \dots = \sigma_K = \sigma$  to apply uniform perturbation. We begin by dividing the interval  $[0, 1]$  into  $K$  equal-length sub-intervals, denoted  $I_1, \dots, I_K$ . To perturb the diagonal entry  $A_{jj}$  of the transformation matrix, we sample a random value  $u_j$  uniformly from the sub-interval  $I_k$ , where

**Algorithm 1** PRIVEE-DP++: Rank-Aware Diagonal Perturbation

---

```

1: Input: Confidence scores  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^K$ , standard deviations  $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_K \geq 0$ 
2: Output: Perturbed confidence scores  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^K$ 
3: Divide  $[0, 1]$  into  $K$  equal sub-intervals; let the  $j$ th sub-interval be  $I_j$ 
4: Initialize perturbed matrix:  $\mathbf{A}^{\text{pert}} \leftarrow \mathbf{A}$ 
5: for  $j = 1$  to  $K$  do
6:    $k \leftarrow K + 1 - (\text{rank}(\mathbf{c}))_j$ 
7:   Sample  $u_j$  uniformly from  $I_k$ 
8:   Update diagonal entry:  $A_{jj}^{\text{pert}} \leftarrow A_{jj} + u_j \cdot \sigma_j$ 
9: end for
10: return  $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{A}^{\text{pert}} \mathbf{c}$ 

```

---

$k = K + 1 - (\text{rank}(\mathbf{c}))_j$ . This rank-aware selection ensures that  $u_i < u_j$  whenever  $c_i < c_j$ , thereby preserving the ordering of the confidence scores. The perturbed diagonal element is computed as  $A_{jj}^{\text{pert}} = A_{jj} + u_j \cdot \sigma_j$ . Once all diagonal entries are perturbed, the final perturbed confidence scores are obtained via the transformation:

$$\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{A}^{\text{pert}} \mathbf{c}. \quad (8)$$

The perturbation scale  $\sigma$  is calibrated using the standard perturbation scale used in Gaussian mechanism. Specifically,  $\sigma$  is computed as:

$$\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{2 \ln\left(\frac{1.25}{\delta}\right) \cdot \Delta f^2}{\varepsilon^2}}, \quad (9)$$

where  $\Delta f$  denotes the  $\ell_2$ -sensitivity of the transformation.

In PRIVEE-DP, we set  $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = \dots = \sigma_K = \sigma$  in Algorithm 1, as all perturbations share the same privacy budget  $\varepsilon$ . We next present PRIVEE-DP++, an enhanced variant that adds another privacy layer by allowing distinct scaling factors  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_K$  for each class.

PRIVEE-DP++. PRIVEE-DP++ extends PRIVEE-DP by assigning a unique privacy budget  $\varepsilon_j$  to each diagonal element of the transformation matrix. This allows for heterogeneous noise levels across classes. Additionally, random samples are drawn in a rank-aware manner to ensure that the monotonicity of the confidence scores is preserved, thereby maintaining prediction accuracy while enhancing privacy.

We prove that the perturbed transformation used in the PRIVEE-DP++ algorithm is order-preserving under certain conditions on the perturbation scales.

LEMMA 4.4. *Let  $\mathbf{A}^{\text{pert}}$  denote a perturbed transformation defined as*

$$\mathbf{A}^{\text{pert}} \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{A} \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{u} \odot \boldsymbol{\sigma} \odot \mathbf{c},$$

*where  $\odot$  represents the element-wise (Hadamard) product,  $\mathbf{u}$  is a random vector drawn from rank-aware uniform intervals, and  $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = [\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_K]^T$  is a non-decreasing vector of scaling factors satisfying  $\sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2 \leq \dots \leq \sigma_K$ . Then the transformation  $\mathbf{c} \mapsto \mathbf{A}^{\text{pert}} \mathbf{c}$  is order-preserving when  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}_K$  or  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}_K - \frac{2}{K} \mathbf{1}_K \mathbf{1}_K^T$ .*

PROOF. From Lemma 4.3, we know that  $\mathbf{A} \mathbf{c}$  preserves the ordering of  $\mathbf{c}$ . Consider the additive perturbation term  $\mathbf{u} \odot \boldsymbol{\sigma} \odot \mathbf{c}$ . Because  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$  is non-decreasing and  $\mathbf{u}$  is drawn from rank-aware intervals that respect the ordering of  $\mathbf{c}$ , we have  $u_i \sigma_i < u_j \sigma_j$  whenever  $c_i < c_j$ . Thus, the perturbation

maintains the monotonicity of the transformed values. Consequently, the perturbed transformation  $\mathbf{A}^{\text{pert}} \mathbf{c}$  preserves the same ranking as  $\mathbf{c}$ :

$$\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}^{\text{pert}} \mathbf{c}) = \text{rank}(\mathbf{c}).$$

Hence,  $\mathbf{A}^{\text{pert}}$  is order-preserving under the stated conditions.  $\square$

**4.2.3 Security Analysis.** Suppose the attacker knows the orthonormal matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  and observes the perturbed confidence scores  $\mathbf{p}$  returned by PRIVEE-DP. The attacker cannot recover the original confidence vector  $\mathbf{c}$  because the noise vector  $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \odot \mathbf{u}$  is randomly generated and unknown.

To infer  $\mathbf{c}$ , the attacker must solve the following system of equations and inequalities:

$$\mathbf{p} = (\mathbf{A} + \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\sigma} \odot \mathbf{u})) \mathbf{c}, \quad (10)$$

$$\text{where } \mathbf{c} \geq \mathbf{0}, \quad \sum_{i=1}^K c_i = 1, \quad \boldsymbol{\sigma} \odot \mathbf{u} \geq \mathbf{0}, \quad \sigma_i u_i < \sigma_j u_j,$$

$$\forall (i, j) \in \{1, \dots, K\}^2 \text{ such that } p_i < p_j.$$

This system consists of  $K + 1$  nonlinear equations and multiple inequalities over  $2K$  unknowns: the original scores  $\mathbf{c}$  and the noise components  $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \odot \mathbf{u}$ . Due to its underdetermined and nonlinear nature, the system lacks a unique solution. Thus, even with knowledge of  $\mathbf{A}$  and the observed  $\mathbf{p}$ , the attacker cannot uniquely recover the true confidence scores  $\mathbf{c}$ .

**4.2.4 Computational Complexity Analysis.** The computational cost of PRIVEE-DP is efficient, scaling linearly with the number of classes  $K$ . Specifically, (1) applying the transformation matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  to the confidence vector  $\mathbf{c}$  has a time complexity of  $O(K)$ , owing to the structured or diagonal nature of  $\mathbf{A}$ ; (2) incorporating differentially private perturbations, i.e., computing  $\mathbf{A}^{\text{pert}}$ , also requires  $O(K)$  time since only the diagonal entries are modified; and (3) the matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  is fixed and constructed once, allowing reuse across all confidence vectors without additional cost. Thus, the overall per-vector complexity is  $O(K)$ , making PRIVEE-DP suitable for real-time and large-scale inference.

## 5 Experimental Setup

This section details the experimental configuration used to evaluate the proposed defenses. We first describe the model architectures and VFL setup, followed by the datasets, evaluation metrics, and baseline methods used for comparison to ensure comprehensive and reproducible assessment.

### 5.1 Model Setup

We adopt the Vertical Federated Learning (VFL) framework proposed by [41] for both two-party and  $N$ -party configurations, consisting of one *active party* and  $N$  *passive parties* ( $N \geq 2$ ). This framework has become a standard for modeling VFL architectures, providing a consistent foundation for fair comparison with prior work. Our implementation and experimental setup are publicly available at [GitHub PRIVEE](#).

To comprehensively evaluate our defense mechanisms against the attacks described in Section 3.1, we employ three representative model architectures, ResNet [12], a fully connected neural network (NN) [22], and logistic regression (LR) [7], covering a spectrum from deep to shallow learning paradigms.

- **Neural Network (NN)** [22]: Both active and passive parties utilize a single 128-unit hidden layer followed by a 64-unit output layer. The resulting outputs are directly concatenated and forwarded to the coordinator for joint prediction.

- **ResNet** [12]: Each party implements stacked residual blocks, with each block containing two  $3 \times 3$  convolutional layers, batch normalization, and ReLU activation. The extracted feature embeddings are aggregated at the coordinator for final classification.
- **Logistic Regression (LR)** [7]: Each party maps its input features directly to the output class space via a linear transformation. The coordinator sums the logits received from all parties to obtain the final prediction.

This design ensures architectural diversity across experiments, enabling evaluation of PRIVEE under varying levels of model complexity and feature representation capacity.

## 5.2 Datasets

We evaluate on five widely used benchmarks:

- (1) **Drive Diagnosis** [10]: Tabular dataset with 58,509 samples and 48 features (e.g., engine metrics), labeled across 11 fault types.
- (2) **ADULT Income** [3]: Tabular dataset of 48,842 individuals with 14 demographic and employment-related features, labeled by whether their income exceeds \$50K per year.
- (3) **MNIST** [9]: 70,000 grayscale images of handwritten digits ( $28 \times 28$ ), with 10 digit classes (0–9).
- (4) **CIFAR-10** [20]: 60,000 RGB images ( $32 \times 32$ ) in 10 object categories (e.g., airplane, bird).
- (5) **CIFAR-100** [20]: Like CIFAR-10 but with 100 fine-grained object classes grouped into 20 coarse super-classes.

These datasets present varied challenges: tabular data features high dimensionality, while image datasets exhibit diverse visual complexity. We test with  $K = 10$  for MNIST and CIFAR-10, and  $K = 100$  for CIFAR-100 to evaluate defense generality across different class counts.

## 5.3 Metrics

We evaluate the effectiveness of our defense using two complementary metrics that jointly assess privacy protection and utility preservation:

- **Attacker’s Mean Squared Error (MSE)**: Quantifies the level of privacy by measuring the reconstruction error between the attacker’s inferred and true target features:

$$\text{MSE} = \frac{1}{n \cdot d_{\text{target}}} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{d_{\text{target}}} (\hat{x}_{\text{target},i}^t - x_{\text{target},i}^t)^2, \quad (11)$$

where  $n$  denotes the number of test samples and  $d_{\text{target}}$  is the dimensionality of the target feature set. A higher MSE indicates stronger privacy protection, as it reflects greater reconstruction difficulty for the adversary in recovering sensitive attributes.

- **Change in Accuracy (CA)**: Measures the impact of the defense on model utility:

$$\Delta \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_D - \mathcal{A}_{ND}, \quad (12)$$

where  $\mathcal{A}_D$  and  $\mathcal{A}_{ND}$  represent the prediction accuracies with and without the defense, respectively. A smaller magnitude of  $\Delta \mathcal{A}$  implies that the defense introduces minimal accuracy loss, thereby achieving a more desirable privacy–utility trade-off.

These metrics provide a balanced evaluation framework: MSE captures the adversary’s reconstruction capability (privacy dimension), while CA quantifies the effect on model performance (utility dimension).

Table 1. MSE of GRN attack under various defenses across datasets (attack strength = 50%). DP<sup>1</sup> denotes  $\epsilon = 0.5$ , DP<sup>2</sup> denotes  $\epsilon = 0.7$ , and “NO DEF.” indicates no defense.

Dataset	No Def.	R(1)	R(2)	OPE	DP <sup>1</sup>	DP <sup>2</sup>	PRIVEE-DP ( $\epsilon = 0.1$ )	PRIVEE-DP++
MNIST	0.013	0.104	0.104	0.306	0.968	0.539	<b>20.402</b>	2.498
CIFAR100	0.118	0.013	0.014	0.339	0.928	0.482	0.115	<b>2.986</b>
CIFAR10	0.112	0.121	0.123	0.385	0.994	0.601	<b>6.879</b>	2.064
Drive Diagnosis	0.132	0.144	0.148	0.346	1.022	0.604	<b>16.081</b>	2.396
Adult Income	0.231	0.231	0.261	0.272	1.121	0.759	<b>6.556</b>	3.903

#### 5.4 Comparison with Baselines

We compare PRIVEE-DP and PRIVEE-DP++ against four representative state-of-the-art inference defenses that protect confidence scores in federated or collaborative learning settings:

- **Top- $k$  Homomorphic Encryption Sorting** [39]: Encrypts and sorts only the top- $k$  confidence values ( $k = 5$  in our experiments). While this approach achieves strong confidentiality and preserves predictive accuracy, it incurs substantial computational overhead. In preliminary tests, each training epoch required approximately 20 minutes on datasets with tens of thousands of samples, making it impractical for large-scale evaluation. Therefore, we excluded it from the full attack comparison.
- **Order-Preserving Encryption (OPE)** [27]: Protects confidence scores by encrypting values while maintaining their relative order. Although OPE effectively hides duplicate frequencies and absolute magnitudes, it remains vulnerable to rank-based inference since the order of scores is preserved.
- **Rounding** [36]: Mitigates information leakage by reducing the precision of confidence scores to  $b$  floating-point digits. This simple technique limits the granularity of revealed values but may cause slight accuracy degradation depending on the choice of  $b$ .
- **Differential Privacy (DP)** [13]: Implements the Gaussian mechanism using IBM’s `diffprivlib` to inject calibrated noise into confidence scores, thereby ensuring formal  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -differential privacy guarantees. This approach provides tunable privacy protection but can impact model utility under stronger noise regimes.

These baselines capture complementary defense strategies, encryption-based, quantization-based, and noise-based, highlighting distinct trade-offs between privacy strength, computational efficiency, and accuracy preservation.

## 6 Experimental Results & Analyses

This section reports the empirical performance of our methods and baselines. We first quantify the impact of GRN and GIA attacks under each defense, then examine scalability with increasing class counts and runtime, evaluate accuracy preservation, and conclude with ablations over client count and privacy budget.

Table 2. MSE of GRN Attack Under Various Defenses Across Datasets (Attack Strength = 75%). DP<sup>1</sup> denotes  $\epsilon = 0.5$ , DP<sup>2</sup> denotes  $\epsilon = 0.7$ , and “NO DEF.” indicates no defense.

Dataset	No Def.	R(1)	R(2)	OPE	DP <sup>1</sup>	DP <sup>2</sup>	PRIVEE-DP ( $\epsilon = 0.1$ )	PRIVEE-DP++
MNIST	0.144	0.144	0.144	0.341	0.945	0.598	<b>17.505</b>	2.635
CIFAR100	0.370	0.013	0.013	0.289	0.928	0.477	0.107	<b>3.178</b>
CIFAR10	0.310	0.129	0.121	0.359	1.059	0.575	<b>7.042</b>	3.654
Drive Diagnosis	0.222	0.123	0.121	0.336	1.056	0.578	<b>18.279</b>	2.432
Adult Income	0.352	0.357	0.305	0.294	1.133	0.708	<b>5.840</b>	3.832

Table 3. MSE of GRN Attack Under Various Defenses Across Datasets (Attack Strength = 25%). DP<sup>1</sup> denotes  $\epsilon = 0.5$ , DP<sup>2</sup> denotes  $\epsilon = 0.7$ , and “NO DEF.” indicates no defense.

Dataset	No Def.	R(1)	R(2)	OPE	DP <sup>1</sup>	DP <sup>2</sup>	PRIVEE-DP ( $\epsilon = 0.1$ )	PRIVEE-DP++
MNIST	0.066	0.060	0.064	0.281	0.896	0.481	<b>19.599</b>	2.716
CIFAR100	0.115	0.014	0.014	0.362	0.940	0.487	0.148	<b>2.951</b>
CIFAR10	0.109	0.124	0.104	0.403	0.986	0.599	<b>9.085</b>	3.569
Drive Diagnosis	0.129	0.151	0.150	0.370	1.076	0.622	<b>19.251</b>	2.705
Adult Income	0.227	0.231	0.278	0.263	1.186	0.722	<b>5.505</b>	4.835

Table 4. Baseline Training and Inference Accuracy of the VFL Model Prior to Defense Integration

Dataset	Num Classes	Models	Train Acc	Inference Acc
MNIST	10	NN	98.34%	97.64%
CIFAR100	100	ResNet	71.24%	58.98%
CIFAR10	10	ResNet	75.59%	63.21%
Drive Diagnosis	11	NN, LR	79.06%	80.90%
Adult Income	2	NN, LR	74.65%	74.27%

(Note: All results reflect the baseline performance prior to the introduction of any adversarial attacks or defense strategies. Each party in the VFL setup employs the same model architecture as indicated in the “Models” column.)

## 6.1 Effect of Attacks on PRIVEE

Table 4 presents the training and inference accuracies achieved by our 2-party VFL model on each dataset. The baseline model consistently attained high accuracy across all datasets before the introduction of any adversarial attacks or defense mechanisms.

**6.1.1 Effect of GRN Attack.** Tables 1, 2, and 3 show the effect of the Generative Regression Network (GRN) attack across various datasets and baseline defenses. In all five datasets, the *No Defense* setting yields very low reconstruction error, confirming that the GRN attack can nearly perfectly recover passive-party data when raw confidence scores are exposed.

Adding standard differential privacy (DP) noise to softmax outputs significantly increases the MSE. For example,  $DP(\epsilon = 0.5)$  roughly doubles or triples the reconstruction error compared to  $DP(\epsilon = 0.7)$ , though the MSE often remains below 1 for complex datasets like CIFAR100.

In contrast, PRIVEE-DP drives the MSE into the tens for simpler datasets (e.g., MNIST) and into the single digits for more complex data, showing substantially stronger protection than standard DP. The enhanced variant, PRIVEE-DP++, occasionally increases protection further, for instance, on CIFAR100, where the MSE rises from 0.147 to 2.95.

These results indicate that, at 25% attack strength, PRIVEE-DP provides robust defense across diverse data types, while PRIVEE-DP++ offers additional benefits for mid-complexity image datasets.

Table 5. MSE OF GRADIENT INVERSION ATTACK UNDER VARIOUS DEFENSES ACROSS DATASETS (ATTACK STRENGTH = 50%). DP<sup>1</sup> DENOTES  $\epsilon = 0.5$ , DP<sup>2</sup> DENOTES  $\epsilon = 0.7$ , AND “NO DEF.” INDICATES NO DEFENSE.

Dataset	No Def.	R(1)	R(2)	OPE	DP <sup>1</sup>	DP <sup>2</sup>	PRIVEE-DP ( $\epsilon = 0.1$ )	PRIVEE-DP++
MNIST	0.034	0.116	0.113	0.334	0.637	0.481	22.109	<b>27.750</b>
CIFAR-100	0.260	0.124	0.127	0.358	0.547	0.423	<b>21.903</b>	21.311
CIFAR-10	0.240	0.126	0.124	0.391	0.652	0.554	<b>22.594</b>	18.290

Table 6. MSE OF GRADIENT INVERSION ATTACK UNDER VARIOUS DEFENSES ACROSS DATASETS (ATTACK STRENGTH = 75%). DP<sup>1</sup> DENOTES  $\epsilon = 0.5$ , DP<sup>2</sup> DENOTES  $\epsilon = 0.7$ , AND “NO DEF.” INDICATES NO DEFENSE.

Dataset	No Def.	R(1)	R(2)	OPE	DP <sup>1</sup>	DP <sup>2</sup>	PRIVEE-DP ( $\epsilon = 0.1$ )	PRIVEE-DP++
MNIST	0.184	0.157	0.158	0.356	0.690	0.541	24.791	<b>24.955</b>
CIFAR-100	0.421	0.134	0.115	0.311	0.495	0.414	<b>23.624</b>	20.924
CIFAR-10	0.342	0.133	0.143	0.372	0.733	0.597	<b>41.801</b>	19.498

Table 7. MSE OF GRADIENT INVERSION ATTACK UNDER VARIOUS DEFENSES ACROSS DATASETS (ATTACK STRENGTH = 25%). DP<sup>1</sup> DENOTES  $\epsilon = 0.5$ , DP<sup>2</sup> DENOTES  $\epsilon = 0.7$ , AND “NO DEF.” INDICATES NO DEFENSE.

Dataset	No Def.	R(1)	R(2)	OPE	DP <sup>1</sup>	DP <sup>2</sup>	PRIVEE-DP ( $\epsilon = 0.1$ )	PRIVEE-DP++
MNIST	0.018	0.068	0.065	0.299	0.589	0.453	20.596	<b>26.025</b>
CIFAR-100	0.140	0.119	0.103	0.320	0.541	0.467	<b>23.308</b>	21.050
CIFAR-10	0.135	0.118	0.096	0.412	0.610	0.516	<b>40.212</b>	17.824

Table 8. TRAINING ACCURACY VARIATION UNDER GRN ATTACK (50% STRENGTH)

Dataset	R(1)	R(2)	DP ( $\epsilon = 0.5$ )	DP ( $\epsilon = 0.7$ )	OPE	PRIVEE-DP	PRIVEE-DP++
MNIST	-0.010	-0.010	-63.793	-50.494	0.000	0.000	0.000
CIFAR10	0.390	-0.030	-40.254	-35.678	0.000	0.000	0.000
CIFAR100	-0.480	-0.080	-35.601	-29.908	0.000	0.000	0.000
Drive Diagnosis	-0.650	-0.050	-56.171	-41.706	0.000	0.000	0.000
Adult Income	0.030	-0.050	-10.807	-7.197	0.000	0.000	0.000

6.1.2 *Effect of GI Attack (GIA)*. Tables 5, 6, and 7 report the mean squared error (MSE) between reconstructed and original confidence scores under Gradient Inversion Attack (GIA) across datasets and attack strengths. As with GRN, the *No Defense* setting consistently yields very low MSEs, indicating near-perfect recovery of passive-party data.

Applying simple rounding increases reconstruction error by roughly 3–4×, while OPE leads to even higher errors in the 0.30–0.40 range. Adding DP noise further raises the MSE into the 0.42–0.73 range. However, only PRIVEE-DP and PRIVEE-DP++ elevate the error into the tens. For example, at 50% attack strength, MSE on MNIST reaches 22.11 with PRIVEE-DP and 27.75 with PRIVEE-DP++; on CIFAR-10, the scores are 22.59 and 18.29, respectively.

This trend holds across other attack strengths: even at 25%, PRIVEE-DP maintains MSE above 20, while all other defenses stay below 1. These results show that while rounding and OPE offer limited protection and standard DP adds moderate noise, only PRIVEE-DP and PRIVEE-DP++ effectively defend against gradient inversion, increasing reconstruction error by up to two orders of magnitude.

Table 9. COMPUTATION OVERHEAD OF DEFENSE METHODS VS. NUMBER OF CLASSES.

*Note:* Confidence scores were randomly generated, and all baseline methods were executed independently, outside the training loop.

Num Classes	PRIVEE	OPE	Top-5 HE
10	<b>0.002 s</b>	0.017 s	7.000 min
100	<b>0.004 s</b>	0.053 s	25.000 min
1,000	<b>0.012 s</b>	0.464 s	40.000 min
10,000	<b>0.145 s</b>	6.954 s	106.000 min

## 6.2 Baseline Sensitivity to Number of Classes

While all baselines perform efficiently on a 10-class problem, encryption-based methods become increasingly inefficient as class count grows (Table 9). PRIVEE-DP scales near-linearly, with runtime increasing modestly from 0.0016 sec. at 10 classes to 0.1454 sec. at 10,000 classes, making it well suited for large-scale applications.

By contrast, OPE incurs moderate overhead: its runtime grows from 0.0172 sec. to 6.954 sec. across the same class range. This is acceptable for datasets with up to a few thousand classes, but degrades noticeably at larger scales. HE-Top5 is several orders of magnitude slower, with runtimes in minutes, rendering it impractical for high-cardinality settings.

Rounding and standard DP match PRIVEE in computational efficiency. However, Rounding fails to defend against feature inference attacks (FIAs), and DP’s added noise degrades model accuracy, as shown in the next section.

Overall, PRIVEE-DP is the preferred choice for large-scale problems: it is lightweight, accuracy-preserving, tunably private, and remains highly efficient across class sizes.

### 6.3 Accuracy Analysis of PRIVEE

Table 8 shows the change in training accuracy under the GRN attack at 50% strength across various defenses. Rounding introduces only negligible accuracy shifts, indicating minimal impact on model performance. In contrast, applying Differential Privacy (DP) directly to raw confidence scores significantly degrades accuracy. OPE preserves accuracy but, as previously shown, incurs substantial computational overhead as the number of classes increases, limiting its scalability.

In comparison, both PRIVEE-DP and PRIVEE-DP++ maintain 0% accuracy loss while offering encryption-level privacy. Unlike OPE, PRIVEE remains lightweight and efficient, making it a stronger choice for real-world vertical FL systems where both privacy and scalability are essential.

### 6.4 Ablation Studies

Table 12 reports the MSE before and after applying each defense across baselines with varying numbers of clients. The results indicate that the client count does not significantly influence the relative MSE trends, as the exposure of confidence vectors remains invariant to federation size. Consequently, MSE prior to defense is largely consistent across all client configurations, whereas post-defense MSE differences capture only the relative effectiveness of each defensive mechanism. Since confidence scores are broadcast globally to all clients, the potential leakage of sensitive information is uniformly distributed, suggesting that merely scaling the federation does not mitigate or amplify inference risks. Instead, only defenses explicitly designed to suppress such leakage, through noise injection, feature obfuscation, or adaptive perturbation, can meaningfully enhance privacy protection.

Table 10. MNIST-GRNA WITH 25 CLIENTS: EFFECT OF  $\epsilon$  ON MSE AND ACCURACY

$\epsilon$	MSE w/o PRIVEE	MSE w/ PRIVEE	$\Delta$ Acc.	Final Acc.
0.050	4.222	57.719	0.000	94.030
0.070	4.073	26.897	0.000	94.270
0.100	3.871	5.483	0.000	94.170
0.300	4.124	5.823	0.000	94.190
0.500	4.294	4.957	0.000	94.170
0.900	4.041	4.199	0.000	94.200

Table 11. MNIST-GRNA WITH  $\epsilon = 0.1$ : EFFECT OF NUMBER OF CLIENTS ON MSE AND ACCURACY

# Clients	MSE w/o PRIVEE	MSE w/ PRIVEE	$\Delta$ Acc.	Final Acc.
5	5.424	21.102	0.000	93.440
10	4.731	19.279	0.000	93.770
15	3.772	17.167	0.000	93.990
20	3.923	17.221	0.000	94.220
25	4.227	18.056	0.000	94.230

To further evaluate the robustness of PRIVEE, we conducted experiments varying both the number of clients (Table 11) and the privacy budget  $\epsilon$  (Table 10). The results provide two complementary insights. First, with fixed  $\epsilon$  (e.g.,  $\epsilon = 0.1$  in Table 11), scaling the federation from 5 to 25 clients does not affect MSE (before or after defense) or accuracy. This is consistent with the nature of VFL inference: since confidence vectors are broadcast to all clients, the attack surface remains unchanged regardless of federation size. Thus, PRIVEE ensures stable privacy guarantees as the number of participants grows, while maintaining model utility. Second, with a fixed number of clients (25 in Table 10) and varying  $\epsilon$ , we observe the expected privacy–utility tradeoff. Smaller  $\epsilon$  values yield larger gaps between MSE before and after defense, indicating stronger protection against GRN attacks, with no accuracy loss, the  $\Delta$  accuracy is consistently zero, and final accuracy remains above %. As  $\epsilon$  increases, protection weakens, but utility remains stable.

To recap, these findings show: (i) PRIVEE is unaffected by the number of clients, addressing scalability concerns in VFL, and (ii) practitioners can tune  $\epsilon$  to strengthen privacy without compromising accuracy, with smaller  $\epsilon$  offering the most robust protection. For PRIVEE-DP, guarantees depend on selecting appropriate  $\epsilon$  ranges, while PRIVEE-DP++, which preserves ordering (Lemma 3) without affecting accuracy, is expected to exhibit similar trends.

Table 12. RESULTS OF THE GRADIENT INVERSION ATTACK (GIA) ON MNIST WITH ATTACK STRENGTH = 0.5. EACH ENTRY REPORTS THE MEAN SQUARED ERROR (MSE) BEFORE AND AFTER APPLYING A DEFENSE MECHANISM FOR INCREASING NUMBERS OF CLIENTS.

Defense Clients	/	#	5	10	15	20	25
R(1)			0.110, 0.110	0.047, 0.110	0.092, 0.092	0.091, 0.091	0.090, 0.090
R(2)			0.105, 0.105	0.094, 0.094	0.093, 0.093	0.096, 0.096	0.092, 0.092
OPE			0.105, 0.301	0.099, 0.298	0.098, 0.295	0.102, 0.303	0.094, 0.293
DP ( $\epsilon = 0.5$ )			0.101, 0.968	0.100, 0.963	0.092, 0.946	0.090, 0.944	0.089, 0.941
DP ( $\epsilon = 1$ )			0.085, 0.291	0.103, 0.315	0.099, 0.309	0.098, 0.307	0.098, 0.307
P-DP ( $\epsilon = 0.1$ )			0.110, 19.020	0.095, 20.276	0.096, 19.382	0.095, 20.351	0.085, 20.597
P-DP++			0.104, 2.644	0.097, 2.472	0.098, 2.415	0.089, 2.365	0.089, 2.438

## 6.5 Discussions: Limitations & Practical Considerations

While our proposed piecewise uniform noise mechanism effectively preserves the ranking of class predictions and obfuscates exact confidence scores, it does not satisfy formal differential privacy (DP) guarantees. Specifically, the added noise is sampled from a bounded and non-symmetric distribution, thereby violating the conditions required for  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP. As a result, the mechanism lacks provable privacy guarantees and should not be deployed in applications that demand strict adherence to DP standards. Instead, it should be viewed as a pragmatic defense strategy designed for inference-time protection, particularly against feature inference attacks, where maintaining prediction order is critical, yet strict theoretical privacy is not the primary objective.

Application domains for the PRIVEE algorithms include recommender systems for personalized content delivery, search ranking and ad targeting, smart grid forecasting, and IoT analytics such as sensor fusion and traffic flow prediction. Notably, by employing chunking based on inter-class confidence score distances, the mechanism enhances the likelihood of preserving correlation structures among predictions. As  $\epsilon \rightarrow \infty$ , correlation preservation improves naturally, albeit at the expense of reduced privacy.

Selecting an appropriate bound on  $\epsilon$  thus enables a tunable trade-off between correlation preservation and privacy, offering practical utility within the PRIVEE framework for environments prioritizing lightweight, order-preserving defenses. Regarding potential cumulative inference of confidence score correlations, PRIVEE does not disclose the perturbation strength ( $\epsilon$ ) to any client. Although random noise values are drawn from a bounded range, each inference involves an independent sampling event, and the effective privacy level corresponding to that instance remains unknown to the client. Even if identical inputs are queried repeatedly, estimating the underlying  $\epsilon$  is difficult because (i) randomization differs across inference rounds, and (ii) normalization and stochastic model behavior introduce minor variations in the resulting confidence distributions.

For deployment scenarios involving long-term or repeated queries, we outline an enhanced variant, PRIVEE-DP++, which widens or adaptively randomizes the sampling range. This extension further conceals the effective  $\epsilon$  and mitigates the risk of its estimation through cumulative observations, strengthening the defense against iterative leakage while maintaining computational efficiency.

## 7 Conclusion & Future Work

### 7.1 Summary of the Key Contributions & Findings

This work made the following key contributions. First, we introduce PRIVEE, a lightweight, order preserving transformation of confidence scores that obscures magnitudes while maintaining prediction accuracy in VFL. Second, we design two scalable variants, PRIVEE-DP and PRIVEE-DP++, that apply tunable, rank aware perturbations with class specific budgets to strengthen privacy under diverse deployment needs. Third, we analyze practicality and security by showing non invertibility of the released scores under the attacker’s constraints and by establishing linear time complexity with easy integration into existing VFL pipelines.

Our experiments found the following results. First, against GRN and GIA, PRIVEE raises the attacker’s reconstruction error from sub unit levels to values in the tens on image datasets and achieves up to 30 $\times$  improvement over strong baselines, indicating substantially higher privacy. Second, unlike standard DP on raw scores, which can reduce accuracy dramatically, PRIVEE-DP and PRIVEE-DP++ preserve accuracy with 0% loss across all evaluated datasets. Third, runtime scales near linearly with the number of classes, remaining on the millisecond scale even for large class counts, while encryption based methods incur prohibitive costs as class cardinality increases. Fourth, ablations show invariance to the number of clients and a controllable privacy–utility tradeoff via the privacy budget  $\epsilon$ , enabling practitioners to tune protection without sacrificing utility.

### 7.2 Future Work

In this work, we focused on empirically evaluating PRIVEE and demonstrating its practicality in vertical federated learning (VFL) settings. As a natural next step, we plan to establish *formal* privacy guarantees that complement its empirical robustness. Specifically, we aim to derive a rigorous  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP proof for the noise injection mechanism employed in PRIVEE, providing theoretical foundations for quantifying the privacy loss incurred during the release of perturbed confidence vectors. This analysis will further extend to the study of *composition properties* in VFL, enabling a systematic understanding of how privacy leakage accumulates under repeated gradient inversion or inference attacks across multiple training epochs and clients.

Another important direction is to strengthen PRIVEE’s ability to preserve the *correlation structure* among confidence scores while maintaining privacy. In many downstream applications, such as ensemble learning, knowledge distillation, or multi-task transfer, relative ranking and inter-class relationships play a critical role in ensuring reliable performance. To this end, we plan to design a

*correlation-aware noise injection* strategy that explicitly constrains pairwise covariance distortion between the true and released confidence vectors, thus achieving a principled balance between information utility and privacy protection.

Finally, we will develop *utility guarantees* that characterize the degree to which essential statistical and structural properties, such as top- $k$  class ordering, similarity metrics, and class-level entropy, are preserved under PRIVEE. This includes deriving upper bounds on utility degradation and identifying adaptive parameter tuning methods that optimize the trade-off between privacy, fidelity, and interpretability. Together, these extensions will transition PRIVEE from a practical, order-preserving defense into a theoretically grounded, provably private framework suitable for deployment in high-stakes federated systems.

## Acknowledgment

This research is partly supported by the Commonwealth Cyber Initiative (CCI) Grant #467768 and the CCI Southwest Virginia Node Grant #467656.

## 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 (CCS)*. 308–318.
- [2] Muhammad Adnan, Madiha Haider Syed, Adeel Anjum, and Semeen Rehman. 2025. A Framework for privacy-preserving in IoT using Federated Learning with Differential Privacy. *IEEE Access* (2025).
- [3] Barry Becker and Ronny Kohavi. 1996. Adult. UCI Machine Learning Repository. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24432/C5XW20>.
- [4] Alexandra Boldyreva, Nathan Chenette, Younho Lee, and Adam O’neill. 2009. Order-preserving symmetric encryption. In *Advances in Cryptology-EUROCRYPT 2009: 28th Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques, Cologne, Germany, April 26-30, 2009. Proceedings 28*. Springer, 224–241.
- [5] Ayantika Chatterjee and Indranil Sengupta. 2017. Sorting of fully homomorphic encrypted cloud data: Can partitioning be effective? *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing* (2017).
- [6] Xiaolin Chen, Daoguang Zan, Wei Li, Bei Guan, and Yongji Wang. 2024. FIA-TE: Feature Inference Attack on Decision Tree Ensembles in Vertical Federated Learning. In *2024 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo (ICME)*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [7] David R Cox. 1958. The regression analysis of binary sequences. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* 20, 2 (1958), 215–232.
- [8] Lea Demelius, Roman Kern, and Andreas Trügler. 2025. Recent advances of differential privacy in centralized deep learning: A systematic survey. *Comput. Surveys* 57, 6 (2025), 1–28.
- [9] Li Deng. 2012. The (MNIST) database of handwritten digit images for machine learning research. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine* 29, 6 (2012), 141–142.
- [10] D. Dua and C. Graff. 2017. UCI Machine Learning Repository [Online]. <http://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml>
- [11] Kai Fan, Jingtao Hong, Wenjie Li, Xingwen Zhao, Hui Li, and Yintang Yang. 2023. FLSG: A Novel Defense Strategy Against Inference Attacks in Vertical Federated Learning. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* (2023).
- [12] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. 2016. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 770–778.
- [13] Naoise Holohan, Stefano Braghin, Pól Mac Aonghusa, and Killian Levacher. 2019. Diffprivlib: The IBM differential privacy library. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.02444* (2019).
- [14] Seungwan Hong, Seunghong Kim, Jiheon Choi, Younho Lee, and Jung Hee Cheon. 2021. Efficient sorting of homomorphic encrypted data with k-way sorting network. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* (2021).
- [15] Jen-Wei Huang, Jun-Wei Su, and Ming-Syan Chen. 2011. FISIP: A distance and correlation preserving transformation for privacy preserving data mining. In *2011 International Conference on Technologies and Applications of Artificial Intelligence*. IEEE, 101–106.
- [16] Bargav Jayaraman, Lingxiao Wang, David Evans, and Quanquan Gu. 2018. Distributed learning without distress: Privacy-preserving empirical risk minimization. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 31 (2018).
- [17] Jinyuan Jia, Ahmed Salem, Michael Backes, Yang Zhang, and Neil Zhenqiang Gong. 2019. Memguard: Defending against black-box membership inference attacks via adversarial examples. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC*

conference on computer and communications security. 259–274.

- [18] Jiawei Jiang, Lukas Burkhalter, Fangcheng Fu, Bolin Ding, Bo Du, Anwar Hithnawi, Bo Li, and Ce Zhang. 2022. Vf-ps: How to select important participants in vertical federated learning, efficiently and securely? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 2088–2101.
- [19] Xue Jiang, Xuebing Zhou, and Jens Grossklags. 2022. Comprehensive analysis of privacy leakage in vertical federated learning during prediction. *Proceedings on privacy enhancing technologies* (2022).
- [20] Alex Krizhevsky and Geoffrey Hinton. 2009. *Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images*. Technical Report. University of Toronto.
- [21] Jinrong Lai, Tong Wang, Chuan Chen, Yihao Li, and Zibin Zheng. 2023. VfedAd: a defense method based on the information mechanism behind the vertical federated data poisoning attack. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*. 1148–1157.
- [22] Yann LeCun, Yoshua Bengio, and Geoffrey Hinton. 2015. Deep learning. *nature* 521, 7553 (2015), 436–444.
- [23] Anran Li, Jiahui Huang, Ju Jia, Hongyi Peng, Lan Zhang, Luu Anh Tuan, Han Yu, and Xiang-Yang Li. 2023. Efficient and privacy-preserving feature importance-based vertical federated learning. *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing* 23, 6 (2023), 7238–7255.
- [24] Li Li, Yuxi Fan, Mike Tse, and Kuo-Yi Lin. 2020. A review of applications in federated learning. *Computers & Industrial Engineering* 149 (2020), 106854.
- [25] Jing Liu, Chulin Xie, Krishnaram Kenthapadi, Sanmi Koyejo, and Bo Li. 2021. RVFR: Robust vertical federated learning via feature subspace recovery. In *NeurIPS Workshop New Frontiers in Federated Learning: Privacy, Fairness, Robustness, Personalization and Data Ownership*.
- [26] Xinjian Luo, Yuncheng Wu, Xiaokui Xiao, and Beng Chin Ooi. 2021. Feature inference attack on model predictions in vertical federated learning. In *2021 IEEE 37th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. 181–192.
- [27] Matteo Maffei, Manuel Reinert, and Dominique Schröder. 2017. On the security of frequency-hiding order-preserving encryption. In *International Conference on Cryptology and Network Security*. Springer, 51–70.
- [28] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Aguera y Arcas. 2017. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR, 1273–1282.
- [29] Milad Nasr, Reza Shokri, and Amir Houmansadr. 2018. Comprehensive privacy analysis of deep learning. In *Proceedings of the 2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. 1–15.
- [30] Raluca Ada Popa, Frank H Li, and Nickolai Zeldovich. 2013. An ideal-security protocol for order-preserving encoding. In *2013 IEEE symposium on security and privacy*. IEEE, 463–477.
- [31] Pengyu Qiu, Xuhong Zhang, Shouling Ji, Chong Fu, Xing Yang, and Ting Wang. 2024. HashVFL: Defending Against Data Reconstruction Attacks in Vertical Federated Learning. *Trans. Info. For. Sec.* 19 (Jan. 2024), 3435–3450.
- [32] Borzoo Rassouli, Morteza Varasteh, and Deniz Gunduz. 2022. Privacy against inference attacks in vertical federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.11788* (2022).
- [33] Daniel S Roche, Daniel Apon, Seung Geol Choi, and Arkady Yerukhimovich. 2016. POPE: Partial order preserving encoding. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 1131–1142.
- [34] Amrita Roy Chowdhury, Bolin Ding, Somesh Jha, Weiran Liu, and Jingren Zhou. 2022. Strengthening order preserving encryption with differential privacy. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 2519–2533.
- [35] Ahmed Salem, Yang Zhang, Mathias Humbert, Pascal Berrang, Mario Fritz, and Michael Backes. 2018. MI-leaks: Model and data independent membership inference attacks and defenses on machine learning models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.01246* (2018).
- [36] Reza Shokri, Marco Stronati, Congzheng Song, and Vitaly Shmatikov. 2017. Membership inference attacks against machine learning models. In *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. 3–18.
- [37] Shubhi Shukla, Suraksha Rajkumar, Aditi Sinha, Mohamed Esha, Konguvel Elango, and Vidhya Sampath. 2025. Federated learning with differential privacy for breast cancer diagnosis enabling secure data sharing and model integrity. *Scientific Reports* 15, 1 (2025), 13061.
- [38] Nitish Srivastava, Geoffrey Hinton, Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2014. Dropout: a simple way to prevent neural networks from overfitting. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 15, 1 (2014), 1929–1958.
- [39] Pranav Verma, Anish Mathuria, and Sourish Dasgupta. 2022. Efficient privacy preserving top-k recommendation using homomorphic sorting. *Cryptology ePrint Archive* (2022).
- [40] Danxin Wang, Yuyang Gao, Shanchen Pang, Chen Zhang, Xiaoman Zhang, and Ming Li. 2025. FedMPS: A Robust Differential Privacy Federated Learning based on Local Model Partition and Sparsification for Heterogeneous IIoT Data. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* (2025).
- [41] Kang Wei, Jun Li, Chuan Ma, Ming Ding, Sha Wei, Fan Wu, Guihai Chen, and Thilina Ranbaduge. 2022. Vertical federated learning: Challenges, methodologies and experiments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.04309* (2022).

- [42] Ruikang Yang, Jianfeng Ma, Junying Zhang, Saru Kumari, Sachin Kumar, and Joel JPC Rodrigues. 2023. Practical Feature Inference Attack in Vertical Federated Learning During Prediction in Artificial Internet of Things. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* (2023).
- [43] Ziqi Yang, Bin Shao, Bohan Xuan, Ee-Chien Chang, and Fan Zhang. 2020. Defending model inversion and membership inference attacks via prediction purification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.03915* (2020).
- [44] Dayong Ye, Sheng Shen, Tianqing Zhu, Bo Liu, and Wanlei Zhou. 2022. One parameter defense—defending against data inference attacks via differential privacy. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* 17 (2022), 1466–1480.
- [45] Tianyuan Zou, Yang Liu, Yan Kang, Wenhan Liu, Yuanqin He, Zhihao Yi, Qiang Yang, and Ya-Qin Zhang. 2022. Defending batch-level label inference and replacement attacks in vertical federated learning. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data* (2022).