

## A PROOF OF THEOREM 5.1

PROOF. By the Lagrangian multiplier method, Equ. 9 is rewritten as

$$l = \sum_{k=1}^d P_{x_k} \ln \hat{x}_k + \sum_{j=d'/2+1}^{d'} P_{y_j} \ln \hat{y}_j + \lambda_1 \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \hat{x}_k - 1 + \gamma_0 \right) + \lambda_2 \left( \sum_{j=d'/2+1}^{d'} \hat{y}_j - \gamma_0 \right),$$

where  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  are two constants and the first-order partial derivatives of  $l$  w.r.t.  $\hat{x}_k$  and  $\hat{y}_j$  are

$$\frac{\partial l}{\partial \hat{x}_k} = \frac{P_{x_k}}{\hat{x}_k} + \lambda_1, \quad \frac{\partial l}{\partial \hat{y}_j} = \frac{P_{y_j}}{\hat{y}_j} + \lambda_2.$$

Let  $\frac{\partial l}{\partial \hat{x}_k}$  and  $\frac{\partial l}{\partial \hat{y}_j}$  be zero, and we have

$$P_{x_k} + \lambda_1 \hat{x}_k = 0, \quad (10)$$

$$P_{y_j} + \lambda_2 \hat{y}_j = 0. \quad (11)$$

From the restrictions in Equ. 9, we can deduce that

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^d P_{x_i}}{\gamma_0 - 1}, \quad \lambda_2 = \frac{\sum_{i=d'/2+1}^{d'} P_{y_i}}{-\gamma_0}.$$

Replacing them in Equ. 10 and Equ. 11, we can reach that

$$\hat{x}_k = (1 - \gamma_0) \frac{P_{x_k}}{\sum_{i=1}^d P_{x_i}}, \quad \hat{y}_j = \gamma_0 \frac{P_{y_j}}{\sum_{i=d'/2+1}^{d'} P_{y_i}}.$$

□

## B PROOF OF THEOREM 5.2

PROOF. Let  $\mathcal{B} = \{B_{y_1}, \dots, B_{y_t}\}$ , and  $\overline{\mathcal{B}} = \{B_{y_{t+1}}, \dots, B_{y_{d'}}\}$ . We start from the state where all buckets hold non-zero values, i.e.,  $B_{y_i} \neq 0, i \in \{1, \dots, d'\}$ , and reconstruct the frequency histogram for poison values in  $[-C, C]$ . The likelihood estimator in Equ. 1 becomes

$$l(F) = \sum_{i=1}^N \ln \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \hat{x}_k \Pr[v'_i | v_i \in B_{x_k}] + \sum_{j=1}^{d'} \hat{y}_j \Pr[v'_i | v_i \in B_{y_j}] \right) = \sum_{t=1}^{d'} n_t \ln \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \hat{x}_k M_{b_t x_k} + \sum_{j=1}^{d'} \hat{y}_j M_{b_t y_j} \right).$$

Note that  $\sum_{k=1}^d \hat{x}_k + \sum_{j=1}^{d'} \hat{y}_j = 1$ , we employ the Lagrangian multiplier method to derive the extremum. The Lagrangian function can be written as:

$$L(F) = l(F) + \lambda \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \hat{x}_k + \sum_{j=1}^{d'} \hat{y}_j - 1 \right). \quad (12)$$

Let all first-order partial derivatives of  $L$  w.r.t.  $\hat{x}_k$  and  $\hat{y}_j$  equal zero

$$\frac{\partial L(F)}{\partial \hat{x}_k} = \sum_{t=1}^{d'} n_t \frac{M_{b_t x_k}}{\sum_{k=1}^d \hat{x}_k M_{b_t x_k} + \sum_{j=1}^{d'} \hat{y}_j M_{b_t y_j}} + \lambda = 0, \quad k \in \{1, \dots, d\}$$

$$\frac{\partial L(F)}{\partial \hat{y}_j} = \sum_{t=1}^{d'} n_t \frac{M_{b_t y_j}}{\sum_{k=1}^d \hat{x}_k M_{b_t x_k} + \sum_{j=1}^{d'} \hat{y}_j M_{b_t y_j}} + \lambda = 0, \quad j \in \{1, \dots, d'\},$$

we have:

$$\hat{x}_k = 0, \quad k \in \{1, \dots, d\}, \quad \hat{y}_j = \frac{n_j}{N}, \quad j \in \{1, \dots, d'\}, \quad \lambda = -N.$$

This result shows all collected values converge to poison values if no bucket is suppressed, and we can obtain:

$$\left( \sum_{k=1}^d \hat{x}_k + \sum_{j=1}^t \hat{y}_j \right) \Big|_{y_i \neq 0, i \in \{1, \dots, d'\}} = \sum_{j=1}^t \frac{n_j}{N}.$$

When we suppress the bucket  $B_{y_{d'}}$  (by setting  $\hat{y}_{d'} = 0$ ) and carry out EMF. The collected values in  $B'_{b_{d'}}$  will converge to all buckets for normal users, because normal values from each  $B_{x_k}$  ( $k \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ ) can be perturbed into  $B'_{b_{d'}}$ . Hence, every  $\hat{x}_k$  will increase. However, normal values from buckets  $B_{x_k}$  can be perturbed into other buckets  $B'_{b_i}$  ( $i \in \{1, \dots, d' - 1\}$ ), so some collected data in  $B'_{b_i}$  ( $i \in \{1, \dots, d' - 1\}$ ) will also converge to normal values and those collected values converge to poison values decrease. Therefore, suppressing  $B_{y_{d'}}$  leads to the increase of all  $\hat{x}_k$ , which in turn results in the decrease of all  $\hat{y}_j$ . However, since the decrease of  $\hat{y}_j$  ( $j \in 1, \dots, t$ ) is a part of increment of  $\hat{x}$ , we can figure out:

$$\left( \sum_{k=1}^d \hat{x}_k + \sum_{j=1}^t \hat{y}_j \right) \Big|_{y_i \neq 0, i \in \{1, \dots, d'\}} \leq \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \hat{x}_k + \sum_{j=1}^t \hat{y}_j \right) \Big|_{y_{d'}=0}.$$

Then suppress the bucket  $B_{y_{d'-1}}$ , similarly, we have:

$$\left( \sum_{k=1}^d \hat{x}_k + \sum_{j=1}^t \hat{y}_j \right) \Big|_{y_{d'}=0} \leq \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \hat{x}_k + \sum_{j=1}^t \hat{y}_j \right) \Big|_{y_{d'}=0, y_{d'-1}=0}. \quad (13)$$

Suppress all buckets in  $\overline{\mathcal{B}}$ , we have:

$$\left( \sum_{k=1}^d \hat{x}_k + \sum_{j=1}^t \hat{y}_j \right) \Big|_{y_i \neq 0, i \in \{1, \dots, d'\}} \leq \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \hat{x}_k + \sum_{j=1}^t \hat{y}_j \right) \Big|_{y_{d'}=0} \leq \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \hat{x}_k + \sum_{j=1}^t \hat{y}_j \right) \Big|_{y_{d'}=0, y_{d'-1}=0} \leq \dots \leq \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \hat{x}_k + \sum_{j=1}^t \hat{y}_j \right) \Big|_{y_{d'}=0, \dots, y_{t+1}=0}.$$

When the number of suppressed buckets in  $\overline{\mathcal{B}}$  increases, the corresponding interference of  $\mathcal{B}$  decreases. Therefore, the collected values more accurately converge to the buckets that they should belong to, and thus achieve a better convergence result.

After suppressing all buckets in  $\overline{\mathcal{B}}$ , all collected data will convergence to normal values and poison values in  $B_{y_j}$  ( $j \in 1, \dots, t$ ) and we can infer that:

$$\left( \sum_{k=1}^d \hat{x}_k + \sum_{j=1}^t \hat{y}_j \right) \Big|_{y_{d'}=0, \dots, y_{t+1}=0} = 1,$$

which is the optimal case where none of the collected values will converge to buckets in  $\overline{\mathcal{B}}$ . □

## C PROOF OF THEOREM 5.3

PROOF. Let  $v_{tj}$  denote the  $j$ -th value in group  $G_t$ ,  $v'_{tj}$  denote the perturbed  $v_{tj}$ , and  $M_t$  denote the mean value of  $v'_{tj}$ . The variance of  $\tilde{M}$ , which is a linear combination of  $M_t$ , can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(\tilde{M}) &= \text{Var} \left( \sum_{t=1}^h w_t M_t \right) = \sum_{t=1}^h w_t^2 \text{Var}(M_t) \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^h w_t^2 \text{Var} \left( \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n'} v'_{tj}}{n'} \right) = \sum_{t=1}^h \frac{w_t^2}{n'^2} \sum_{j=1}^{n'} \text{Var}(v'_{tj}), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where  $\sum w_t = 1$ , and  $n'$  is the number of normal users in each group.

Since  $Var(v'_{tj})$  in Equ. 14 relies on the input of each user, we consider the worst-case at the maximum variance, i.e., all inputs  $v_{tj}$  are either 1 or -1. The worst-case variance  $Var_{worst}(v'_{tj})$  can be expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned} Var_{worst}(v'_{tj}) &= \frac{v_{tj}^2}{e^{\epsilon_t/2} - 1} + \frac{e^{\epsilon_t/2} + 3}{3(e^{\epsilon_t/2} - 1)^2} \Big|_{v_{tj}=\pm 1} \\ &= \frac{1}{e^{\epsilon_t/2} - 1} + \frac{e^{\epsilon_t/2} + 3}{3(e^{\epsilon_t/2} - 1)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $B_t = n'Var_{worst}(v'_{tj})$ . Equ. 14 can be rewritten as:

$$Var(\tilde{M}) = \sum_{t=1}^h \frac{w_t^2}{n'^2} B_t. \quad (15)$$

We regard the variance as a function of  $w_t$ , and the minimal variance is the extreme point of Equ. 15. By the Lagrangian method, we have:

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{t=1}^h \frac{w_t^2}{n'^2} B_t + C_0(1 - \sum_{t=1}^h w_t).$$

The first partial derivatives of  $\mathcal{L}$  w.r.t.  $w_t$  is:

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial w_t} = \frac{2w_t}{n'^2} B_t - C_0.$$

Let  $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial w_t} = 0$ , then we have  $w_t = \frac{C_0 n'^2}{2B_t}$ . Through the restriction  $\sum_{t=1}^h w_t = 1$ , we figure out

$$C_0 = \frac{2}{n'^2 \sum_{t=1}^h \frac{1}{B_t}}, \quad w_t = \frac{1}{B_t \sum_{i=1}^h \frac{1}{B_i}}.$$

And the final minimal variance of  $\tilde{M}$  is:

$$Var(\tilde{M})_{min} = \left[ \sum_{t=1}^h \frac{n'^2}{B_t} \right]^{-1}.$$

□