

# DP-ML Proofs

September 30, 2019

## 1 Privacy Loss when adding $\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2$ noise

Let:

$A(x) \Rightarrow (\epsilon_1, \delta)$  differentially private mechanism by adding noise from  $N(0, \sigma_1^2)$   
 $B(x) \Rightarrow (\epsilon_2, \delta)$  differentially private mechanism by adding noise from  $N(0, \sigma_2^2)$

**Theorem 1.1.** *If  $C(x)$  is a dp-mechanism that adds the sum of noise sampled from  $N(0, \sigma_1^2)$  and  $N(0, \sigma_2^2)$ , then  $C(x)$  is  $\sqrt{(\frac{\epsilon_1^2 * \epsilon_2^2}{\epsilon_1^2 + \epsilon_2^2})}$  differentially private.*

*Proof.* We know that the sum of two normal distributed random variable is also normal  $\Rightarrow N(0, \sigma_1^2) + N(0, \sigma_2^2) = N(0, \sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2)$

Therefore, summing up noise from two randomly distributed variables is equivalent to sampling noise from  $N(0, \sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2 = \sigma_3^2)$

From [3] it follows that, if  $\sigma$  is equivalent to

$$\frac{s}{\epsilon} \sqrt{2 \ln \frac{1.25}{\delta}}$$

then a step is  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  differentially private.

We know:

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_3^2 &= \sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2 \\ \sigma_3^2 &= \frac{s^2}{\epsilon_1^2} (2 \ln \frac{1.25}{\delta}) + \frac{s^2}{\epsilon_2^2} (2 \ln \frac{1.25}{\delta}) \\ \sigma_3^2 &= (2 \ln \frac{1.25}{\delta}) (\frac{s^2}{\epsilon_1^2} + \frac{s^2}{\epsilon_2^2}) \\ \frac{s^2}{\epsilon_3^2} (2 \ln \frac{1.25}{\delta}) &= (2 \ln \frac{1.25}{\delta}) (\frac{s^2}{\epsilon_1^2} + \frac{s^2}{\epsilon_2^2}) \\ \frac{s^2}{\epsilon_3^2} (2 \ln \frac{1.25}{\delta}) &= (2 \ln \frac{1.25}{\delta}) (\frac{s^2}{\epsilon_1^2} + \frac{s^2}{\epsilon_2^2}) \\ \frac{s^2}{\epsilon_3^2} (2 \ln \frac{1.25}{\delta}) &= (2 \ln \frac{1.25}{\delta}) (\frac{s^2}{\epsilon_1^2} + \frac{s^2}{\epsilon_2^2})\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\epsilon_3} &= \frac{1}{\epsilon_1} + \frac{1}{\epsilon_2} \\
\frac{1}{\epsilon_3^2} &= \frac{\epsilon_1^2 + \epsilon_2^2}{\epsilon_1^2 * \epsilon_2^2} \\
\epsilon_3^2 &= \frac{\epsilon_1^2 * \epsilon_2^2}{\epsilon_1^2 + \epsilon_2^2} \\
\epsilon_3 &= \sqrt{\left(\frac{\epsilon_1^2 * \epsilon_2^2}{\epsilon_1^2 + \epsilon_2^2}\right)}
\end{aligned}$$

■

Here are a few examples for the resulting epsilon value when you add two noise vectors each satisfying  $(\epsilon_1, \delta)$  and  $(\epsilon_2, \delta)$  respectively:

$\epsilon_1$	$\epsilon_2$	$\epsilon_3$
0.5	0.75	0.416
1.0	0.5	0.447
2.0	1.0	0.894
2.0	0.5	0.485

**MS** ► *Not sure if the above result can be used for  $\epsilon > 1$  values since  $\frac{s}{\epsilon} \sqrt{(2 \ln \frac{1.25}{\delta})}$  might only applicable for cases where both  $\epsilon_1 < 1$  and  $\epsilon_2 < 1$  [3]* ◀

## 2 Next Steps/TODOs

Here are some potential next steps/proofs for designing a private Federated Learning system with an untrusted aggregator:

1. *How much privacy gain do you get when only observing only the noisy aggregate compared to observing all the individual updates?*

Some Ideas => From the secure aggregation paper (Appendix A) [2], we know that we can get the same  $\epsilon$ - guarantee with secure aggregation by sampling from  $N(0, \sigma/\sqrt{n})$  compared to sampling from  $N(0, \sigma)$  with no secure aggregation.

By using the same argument, if  $A(x)$  satisfies  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ - differential privacy when the adversary observes each update protected by noise sampled from  $N(0, \sigma)$ , then with the adversary observing only the aggregate of the noisy updates, it becomes equivalent to  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  guarantee by sampling from  $N(0, \sigma * \sqrt{n})$  . **MS**

►??◀

However, a key assumption to get the gain above would be a shift to computational differential privacy [4]. Not sure currently that if we make this assumption how it would affect privacy calculations?

**MS** ► *With computation differential privacy can I still use  $\frac{s}{\epsilon} \sqrt{(2 \ln \frac{1.25}{\delta})}$  to get  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  differential privacy here?* ◀

2. How would the privacy loss compose over  $N$  rounds such that an adversary observes the individual  $dp$ -updates in  $m$  out of  $N$  rounds and the aggregate in others?

Would it be possible to use one composition theorem out of the box for this?  
Some potential compositions that can be used:

1. Advanced composition theorem [5]  $\Rightarrow O(\sqrt{k \log(\frac{1}{\delta})} \cdot \epsilon, k \cdot \delta + \delta')$  ( $k < 1/\epsilon^2$ )
2. Moments Accountant [1]  $\Rightarrow O(q \cdot \epsilon \cdot \sqrt{T})$
3. Amplification by sampling  $O(q \cdot \epsilon, q \cdot \delta)$  [1]

## References

- [1] ABADI, M., CHU, A., GOODFELLOW, I., MCMAHAN, B., MIRONOV, I., TALWAR, K., AND ZHANG, L. Deep learning with differential privacy. In *23rd ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security* (2016), CCS.
- [2] BONAWITZ, K., IVANOV, V., KREUTER, B., MARCEDONE, A., MCMAHAN, H. B., PATEL, S., RAMAGE, D., SEGAL, A., AND SETH, K. Practical secure aggregation for privacy-preserving machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security* (2017), CCS.
- [3] DWORK, C., AND ROTH, A. The Algorithmic Foundations of Differential Privacy. *Foundations and Trends in Theoretical Computer Science* 9, 3-4 (2014).
- [4] MIRONOV, I., PANDEY, O., REINGOLD, O., AND VADHAN, S. Computational differential privacy. In *Proceedings of the 29th Annual International Cryptology Conference on Advances in Cryptology* (2009), CRYPTO '09.
- [5] VADHAN, S. P. The complexity of differential privacy. In *Tutorials on the Foundations of Cryptography* (2017).