Table E1. Comparison of downstream STM accuracy under w/ and w/o Contrastive In-context Learning and Private Data Assisted PLM Importance Weighting setting using 6 open-source PLMs, L=1. DP setting is same as that used for Table 1. "w/o both" indicates that both techniques are removed with only Top-Q Voting with Q=8 remains.

	w/o both	w/o PLM Contrastive Prompting	w/o PLM Importance Weighting	WASP (Ours)
IMDb	89.05	89.21	89.17	89.52
Yelp-Rating	58.72	59.65	58.94	61.21
Openreview-Rating	35.45	36.18	35.53	37.10

Table F1. Evaluation of downstream STM accuracy using 6PLMs, L=1. Experimental settings are the same as in Table 1. Method "DP-SGD+Gen" first fine-tunes the PLM under DP protection using DP-SDG and then use the fine-tuned model for synthetic data generation. Best and second best results are marked.

		Privacy	$ \mathcal{B} $	$ \mathcal{D} $	IMDb	Yel Category	p Rating	Openi Area	review Rating	Banking
OnlyPrivate		$\epsilon = \infty$	100	-	50.00	5.69	35.57	6.56	22.20	13.75
FuseGen		Absolutely Private	-	6,000	89.07	63.38	57.96	24.70	34.57	78.75
DP-SGD+Gen	GPT-2 Llama-2 Vicuna OPT ChatGLM3 Flan-T5	$ \epsilon = 4.0 $	100 100 100 100 100 100	6,000 6,000 6,000 6,000 6,000 6,000	87.44 84.63 84.93 81.47 83.17 89.14	47.45 62.14 62.99 62.61 52.99 58.59	50.04 49.95 57.46 55.68 45.79 <u>60.85</u>	33.20 28.23 31.17 34.57 34.60 33.52	31.25 28.45 23.48 22.00 33.99 35.35	74.88 79.75 78.75 75.75 84.38 78.13
Aug-PE	GPT-2 Llama-2 Vicuna OPT ChatGLM3 Flan-T5	$\epsilon = 4.0$	100 100 100 100 100 100	6,000 6,000 6,000 6,000 6,000 6,000	85.38 85.77 82.76 83.86 85.82 89.00	62.33 60.18 63.28 62.71 55.06 62.06	45.28 47.42 54.42 50.81 55.17 58.69	31.45 32.67 32.27 34.64 33.81 34.54	24.12 34.78 30.66 25.30 32.49 35.42	75.63 84.63 86.75 79.25 88.50 81.25
WASP (Ours)	$\epsilon = 4.0$	100	6,000	89.52	63.91	61.21	34.99	37.10	88.75