



KTH Stockholm
Department of Numerical Analysis

How can we generate private heartbeat data for arrhythmia detection?

Master Thesis Report
Sijun John Tu

Supervisors: Anders Szepessy (KTH) and Shahid Raza (RISE)

Abstract

STATUTORY DECLARATION

I declare that I have authored this thesis independently, that I have not used other than the declared sources / resources, and that I have explicitly marked all material which has been quoted either literally or by content from the used sources.

January 29, 2024

Sijun John Tu

Contents

Notation	i
List of Figures	ii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Motivation	1
1.2 Problem Definition	2
1.3 Related Works and State of the Art	2
2 Theoretical background on Differential Privacy	6
2.1 Defining differential privacy	6
2.2 Important results for Differential Privacy	8
2.3 Example of DP-mechanism: Gaussian Mechanism	9
3 (Time Series) Data generation	10
3.1 Overview	10
3.2 DP-MERF	10
3.2.1 Maximum Mean Discrepancy	10
3.3 GAN based	11
4 Models	12
4.1 AE-DPMERF	12
4.2 RTSGAN	12
5 Experiment	13
5.1 Experiment setup	13
5.2 Results	13
6 Discussion	14
7 Outro	15
7.1 Future Works	15
7.2 Conclusion	15
Appendix	I
References	II

Notation

Mathematical conventions and notation used in this thesis:

\mathbb{R} the real numbers

\sqcup disjoint set union

$\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ gaussian distribution with mean μ and variance σ^2

Additionally, we introduce the following conventions to describe various elements from different mathematical objects to make the notations and their meaning as consistent as possible:

\mathcal{S} set of heartbeat samples

$s_i \in \mathbb{R}^L$ sequeunce of ECG measurements

List of Figures

1 Introduction

1.1 Motivation

Data-driven technology and especially machine learning have gained a lot of momentum the past years. Models like ChatGPT or BERT heavily depend on large datasets that are available publicly. At the same time machine learning models are now being considered in other data sensitive domains like health care [see 6, 8, 35, 41]. One exciting field within health care is arrhythmia detection for heartbeats, where machine learning methods can aid physicians to detect irregular heartbeat conditions. Recently, several methods have been proposed, ranging from SVMs to neural networks [see review 5].

When working with those sensitive data, privacy plays a major role in general acceptance of those models. Now governmental institutions like the European Union have established a right to privacy manifested in the General Data Protection Regulation laws ¹. Previous simple anonymisation attempts that simply removed some identifying attributes (e. g. name, birthday etc.) have been proven to be ineffective. For example, user profiles from the anonymised dataset used in the infamous Netflix prize have been reconstructed with the help of publicly available data from IMDB [30]. This is why technological advances in the area of privacy-preserving machine learning have increased in the past few years, with the development of various machine learning models that aim to preserve the privacy of individual data records. Protecting privacy becomes crucial for heartbeat data because it can be used to identify patients, thus heavily impacting the patient's privacy [see heartbeat biometrics 38, 20].

need to add this as ref for memorisation in ml <https://arxiv.org/abs/1802.08232>
<https://arxiv.org/abs/1906.05271>

One promising solution [see 22] is to replace the original, possibly sensitive data set with a synthetic data set that resembles the original raw data in some statistical properties. Much research has been done to generate tabular or image data ???REF, whereas dedicated time series data generation is still a “*burgeoning*” area of research according to a recent benchmark [4]. Regardless of the data type, data generators with no formal privacy guarantees have been shown to still be susceptible to privacy leaks [37].

To improve privacy, this thesis aims to analyse the combination of synthetic data with tools from so-called differential privacy. Differential privacy has been developed by Dwork et al [12] and is widely considered as the mathematical framework to rigorously provide privacy guarantees to privacy-preserving algorithms, relying on applied probability theory and statistics. This thesis will study existing architectures based on private generative AI models, as well as explore the possibility of new solution. Experiments were conducted to assess the performance of these models using the MITBIH dataset on heartbeat arrhythmia [29]. Unfortunately, there is no free lunch and privacy always comes with a decrease in utility [37]. A careful balance between privacy and utility needs to be established.

Add: Challenge the privacy-utility tradeoff for anomaly detection.????

¹see <https://gdpr-info.eu/>

1.2 Problem Definition

This thesis aims to examine how to generate private time series data for heartbeat arrhythmia detection. Let $\mathcal{S} = \{s_i\}_{i=1}^N$ denote a set of heartbeat samples, where $s_i = (s_i^0, \dots, s_i^L)$ is a sequence of one-dimensional ECG measurements of fixed length L corresponding to one heartbeat. Each heartbeat sequence is associated with a corresponding label denoting whether it is a normal or anomalous heartbeat according to ???. Therefore we separate the set into normal heartbeats \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{A} (i. e. $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{N} \sqcup \mathcal{A}$)

Firstly, we want to design a time series generator (TSG) that can model the true probability distribution $p(\mathcal{N})$ of the normal heartbeats. Here, we only consider normal heartbeats since for the subsequent task of arrhythmia detection we will follow an anomaly detection approach explained next. The aim of the TSG is to generate a synthetic data set $\hat{\mathcal{N}}$ with distribution $p(\hat{\mathcal{N}})$ that is “close” to the original data $p(\mathcal{N})$.

Secondly, the utility of the generated data is assessed in the downstream task of detecting anomalous heartbeats (heartbeat arrhythmia detection). We treat this task as an anomaly detection task based on reconstruction error ??REF, i. e. we want to train a model only on normal heartbeats that can reconstruct those samples with low error, but give high reconstruction error when inputting an anomalous sample. Alternatively, one could treat this as a binary classification task, that classifies a given heartbeat sample as either normal or anomalous. Since the ratio of those two classes are heavily imbalanced due to the nature of arrhythmias, we will favour the first approach ??REF.

Lastly, we will embed the generation procedure in a differential privacy setting. This will provide a theoretical framework to assess privacy.

1.3 Related Works and State of the Art

TBA

- sota privacy in ml
- why DP
- private data generation
- heartbeat data generation

Privacy in machine learning

A lot of past efforts have been put into improving the performance of machine learning methods, where the privacy aspect has been neglected. Due to the increased awareness about private individual data and policies like EU’s GDPR laws, big tech companies like Apple, Google and even the US Census have been implementing privacy measurements in the their data collection [see 13, 2]. One of the first groundbreaking works on actually quantifying the privacy leakage in machine learning models has been studied in [36], where Shokri et. al. have designed a framework to perform membership inference attacks (MIA) on basic classification tasks. MIA

on machine learning models try to infer whether a certain record has been used when training the respective model. This becomes a privacy issue when e. g. an adversary can infer whether a certain patient’s data was used to train a model associated with a disease. Then the adversary can conclude that this particular patient likely has this disease [cf. 36, p. 5]. Hence, their results indicate a strong vulnerability in terms of privacy for data-based models.

Several notions of privacy have been proposed in the last decade, among which Differential Privacy (DP) has emerged as the “*de-facto standard in data privacy*” [23]. Reasons for its popularity according to a recent survey [17] are among others:

1. DP is future-proof and requires no extra knowledge about the adversary.
2. DP provides rigorous privacy guarantees.
3. DP provides a notion of privacy budget, which can be adapted to the specific use case to balance privacy and utility.

We will revisit the definition and most important results in Chapter 2 of this thesis. The basic idea is to add calibrated, random noise either to the data or during model training. Broadly speaking, differential private noise can be injected in three different stages of the modelling pipeline: input, hidden or output layer [cf. 44].

??IMGAE ACC TO [39]

Applying some DP mechanism at the input stage can be seen as preprocessing step to either hide sensitive attributes in the data or generating new synthetic dataset. Some earlier works include random perturbation methods described for instance in [26, 15]. According to [39] this approach is not utilised frequently because extra prior knowledge about the subsequent task is required to calibrate the right amount of noise. More recent methods focus exclusively on generating data samples by deep learning methods, that in turn employ a DP mechanism at gradient or output level. This will be the focus of the next chapter and hence not be discussed here.

Adding privacy in the hidden layer is sometimes referred to as gradient-level DP. Due to the iterative nature of most training algorithms, extra care needs to be taken to track the privacy loss caused by each iteration. Most notably there is a differential private version of stochastic gradient descent (SGD) called DP-SGD developed by Abadi et al [1] where the authors have designed a mechanism to track the privacy loss incurred while training. Differential privacy is achieved by clipping the gradient and then adding gaussian noise to the gradient. The clipping step is necessary to ensure that the gradient is bounded. Based on a more relaxed definition of DP, the authors in [9] propose an improved version of DP-SGD called NoisySGD.

At the output level there are several ways to implement DP. One highly cited approach called the “Functional Mechanism” followed by the authors in [42] perturbs the objective function, so it is independent of the number of training steps. A further refinement of this approach was researched in [32], where Phan et al. developed an algorithm that puts adaptive noise on the features based on its contribution to the output.

Other interesting approaches to incorporating differential privacy into deep learning include the PATE learning method by Papernot et al. [31]. The idea behind this model is to train “teacher models” that will not be published, which in turn are used in a random manner to then train private “student” models.

In a distributed setting approaches like federated learning [24, 28] have been proposed. Their privacy further analysed in [27] for learning language models.

For a more in-depth review see e. g. [18, 43, 39]

Data generation and Privacy

As we have mentioned earlier, ensuring privacy in machine learning applications is crucial when working with sensitive data. One might naively assume, that synthetic data without any formal privacy guarantees provides enough privacy already by design, but this unfortunately is not the case. Especially when generating with GAN-based networks, recent works have shown that although under some circumstances GANs can satisfy a weak notion of DP, but with a very high ϵ which corresponds to a very weak privacy guarantee [25, 37, 22]. Combining generative algorithms with DP however is a promising solution to mitigate the privacy issue [7] which will be the focus of this thesis.

While we have outlined several techniques from the state of the art to ensure privacy, most of the methods are tailored for a specific model architecture or use case. On the other hand, synthetic data that has been generated with privacy guarantees can be used in any downstream task without privacy breach. To this end, several deep learning based architectures have been proposed. Following [21], one can broadly categorise them as follows:

- GAN-based
- Feature-based
- Autoencoder based [see e. g. 3, for a generator based on a variational autoencoder that is trained with DP-SGD]
- Optimal transport based [see e. g. 10, for generator based on the so-called Sinkhorn divergence]
- Stochastic simulation based [see e. g. 11, for a differentially-private diffusion model]

We will present the first two approaches in more detail in chapter 3.

Heartbeat arrhythmia detection

For the experiments conducted in this thesis we will use the common benchmark data set for heartbeat arrhythmia MIT-BIH [29]. It contains one-dimensional ECG measurements of 47 patients each lasting about 30 minutes. This kind of data is commonly referred to as time series data which due to its time dependency needs to be treated differently than tabular data. Each heartbeat is labelled as one of 16 heartbeat classes by experts. We will follow AAMI ???REF standard to divide those classes into normal and anomalous heartbeats. Finding anomalous heartbeats, i. e. arrhythmia detection, can be linked to several common tasks found in machine learning. For example, one can view this problem as a binary classification problem, where one wishes to train a classifier, that given a heartbeat will classify this as either normal or anomalous. Since this requires a balanced dataset, we follow a different approach from anomaly detection. In particular, we will train a baseline model for arrhythmia detection based on so-called the reconstruction error [see 34, for an in-depth survey on anomaly detection with times series]. This is a semi-supervised

approach where a model is only trained on normal data. The model learns to encode and reconstruct normal data from a (lower-dimensional) latent space with low reconstruction error, whereas it will reconstruct anomalous data with a higher reconstruction error. This method will also be more useful in real-life applications since 1. heartbeat arrhythmias are rather scarce and 2. there is a lot of heartbeat data being collected but not labelled.

SOTA

2 Theoretical background on Differential Privacy

In this chapter we briefly describe and derive the most important results from Cynthia Dwork's work on differential privacy that was first introduced in 2006 [12]. This summary heavily relies on her writings in [13] as well as lecture notes from [16].

2.1 Defining differential privacy

Differential privacy (DP) should be understood as an agreement between the data holder and the data subject: the latter should not be “affected, adversely or otherwise, by allowing [her] data to be used in any study or analysis, no matter what other studies, data sets or information sources are available”. This addresses the paradox of learning something useful about a population while learning nothing about the individuals

Example 2.1.1 (Randomised response). In 1965 Warner [40] proposes the following random answering procedure: In a study where participants are asked to answer with “Yes” or “No” whether they have engaged in an illegal or embarrassing activity A , they should:

1. Flip a coin
2. If the coin shows tails, then the participant should respond truthfully.
3. If the coin shows head, then the participant should flip the coin a second time and answer “Yes” if the second coin shows head and “no” otherwise.

This procedure ensures participants' privacy by “plausible deniability”; each participant's answer has non-zero probability of being truthful or not. By understanding the probabilities of the noise generation process, the data analyst can estimate the true number of “yes” and “no” answers. To this end, let p be the true percentage of “yes” answers, N the total number of participants, n_{true} the true number of “yes” responses and \hat{n}_{obs} the observed number of “yes” responses. We assume a fair coin with equal probability of showing heads or tails. Then the expected number of “yes” answers after applying the described procedure is:

$$\mathbb{E}(\text{"Yes"}) = \frac{1}{4}n_{true} + \frac{1}{4}(N - n_{true}) + \frac{1}{2}n_{true} = \frac{1}{4}N + \frac{n_{true}}{2} \quad (1)$$

We can estimate this using the $\hat{n}_{obs} \approx \mathbb{E}(\text{"Yes"}) = \frac{1}{4}N + \frac{n_{true}}{2}$ and finally solving for n_{true} yields the estimate:

$$n_{true} = 2\hat{n}_{obs} - \frac{1}{2}N \quad (2)$$

Definition 2.1.2 (Probability Simplex). Given a discrete set B , the probability simplex over B is defined as the set

$$\Delta(B) = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^{|B|}, x_i \geq 0 \text{ and } \sum_i x_i = 1 \right\} \quad (3)$$

Definition 2.1.3 (Randomised Algorithm). A randomized algorithm \mathcal{M} with domain A and discrete range B is associated with a mapping $M : A \rightarrow \Delta(B)$. On input $a \in A$ algorithm \mathcal{M} outputs $\mathcal{M}(a) = b$ with probability $(M(a))_b$

Definition 2.1.4 (Histogram representation of a data base). Given a set \mathcal{X} , the universe of all possible records, the histogram representation of a database x is the vector

$$x \in \mathbb{N}^{|\mathcal{X}|} \quad (4)$$

in which each entry x_i represents the number of elements in database x of type $i \in \mathcal{X}$.

The previous definition of a database might sound cryptic at first, hence we will illustrate it with the following example:

Example 2.1.5 (Database of patients). Let $\mathcal{X} = \{P_1, \dots, P_N\}$ be the set of N distinct patients in a study. Then $x_1 = (1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{N}^N$ would correspond to patient P_1 , $x_2 = (0, 1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{N}^N$ to patient P_2 and so on.

Equipped with this definition of a database one can now naturally define a way to measure “how much databases differ”, i. e. in how many entries they differ.

Definition 2.1.6 (l_1 -norm of a database in histogram representation). The l_1 -norm of a database is a measure of the size of the database and defined as:

$$\|x\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|} |x_i| \quad (5)$$

This immediately gives rise to a notion of distance between two databases x and y , namely:

$$\|x - y\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|} |x_i - y_i| \quad (6)$$

which basically counts the number of different entries.

Now we are ready to give the general definition of differential privacy:

Definition 2.1.7 ((ϵ, δ) -DP). A randomised algorithm \mathcal{M} with domain $\mathbb{N}^{|\mathcal{X}|}$ is (ϵ, δ) -differentially private if for all outcomes $S \subset \text{ran}\mathcal{M}$ and for all databases $x, y \in \mathbb{N}^{|\mathcal{X}|}$, such that $\|x - y\|_1$ (i. e. they only differ in one element) we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}(x) \in S) \leq e^\epsilon \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}(y) \in S) + \delta \quad (7)$$

where the probability is taken over the randomness of \mathcal{M} . If $\delta = 0$, we say \mathcal{M} is ϵ -differentially private.

why e^ϵ

Example 2.1.8 (Randomised response revisited).

2.2 Important results for Differential Privacy

Theorem 2.2.1 (DP requires randomisation). *Any non-trivial DP-mechanism requires randomisation.*

Proof. TBA □

Theorem 2.2.2 (Post-processing). *Let $\mathcal{M} : \mathbb{N}^{|\mathcal{X}|} \rightarrow R$ be a randomised algorithm that is (ϵ, δ) -DP. Further let $f : R \rightarrow R'$ an arbitrary function. Then $f \circ \mathcal{M}$ is also (ϵ, δ) -DP.*

Proof. First fix data sets $x, y \in \mathbb{N}^{|\mathcal{X}|}$, s. t. $\|x - y\|_1 \leq 1$ and outcome $S' \subseteq R'$. Define a set $S = \{r \in R : f(r) \in S'\}$. Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(f(\mathcal{M}(x)) \in S') &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}(x) \in S) \\ &\leq e^\epsilon \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}(y) \in S) + \delta \\ &= e^\epsilon \cdot \mathbb{P}(f(\mathcal{M}(y)) \in S') + \delta \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where the inequality follows from the (ϵ, δ) -DP of \mathcal{M} . □

Theorem 2.2.3 (Group privacy). *Let $\mathcal{M} : \mathbb{N}^{|\mathcal{X}|} \rightarrow R$ be a randomised algorithm that is (ϵ, δ) -DP, then \mathcal{M} is $(k\epsilon, ke^{k\epsilon}\delta)$ -DP for groups of size k , i. e. it holds for databases $x, y \in \mathbb{N}^{|\mathcal{X}|}$ such that $\|x - y\|_1 \leq k$ and for all $S \subseteq R$:*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}(x) \in S) \leq e^{k\epsilon} \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}(y) \in S) + k\delta \tag{9}$$

Proof. First fix data sets $x, y \in \mathbb{N}^{|\mathcal{X}|}$, s. t. $\|x - y\|_1 \leq k$ and outcome $S \subseteq R$. Now there exists a series of databases z_0, \dots, z_k , such that $x = z_0$ and $y = z_k$ and $\|z_{i+1} - z_i\|_1 \leq 1$, i. e. we can find a series of databases that transforms x into y by removing or adding one record at a time. Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}(x) \in S) &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}(z_0) \in S) \\ &\leq e^\epsilon \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}(z_1) \in S) + \delta \\ &\leq e^\epsilon (e^\epsilon \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}(z_2) \in S) + \delta) + \delta \\ &\leq \dots \\ &= ke^\epsilon \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}(y) \in S) + ke^{k\epsilon}\delta \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

□

Theorem 2.2.4 (Standard composition). *Let $\mathcal{M}_1 : \mathbb{N}^{|\mathcal{X}|} \rightarrow R_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2 : \mathbb{N}^{|\mathcal{X}|} \rightarrow R_2$ be two randomised algorithms that are (ϵ_1, δ_1) - and (ϵ_2, δ_2) -DP, then their composition defined by $\mathcal{M}_{12} : \mathbb{N}^{|\mathcal{X}|} \rightarrow R_1 \times R_2$, $\mathcal{M}_{12}(x) = (\mathcal{M}_1(x), \mathcal{M}_2(x))$ is $(\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2, \delta_1 + \delta_2)$ -DP.*

Proof. TBA □

2.3 Example of DP-mechanism: Gaussian Mechanism

Let $f : \mathbb{N}^{|\mathcal{X}|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ an arbitrary function mapping to a d -dimensional real space. f can represent numerous models, e. g. a neural network, an SVM-classifier etc. We have seen from theorem 2.2.1 that in order to “privatise” the output of f , we need to add randomness to its output. One way to achieve this is to add gaussian noise, which is calibrated to mask the influence of a specific input. Because differential privacy aims to hide the influence of the input to the output, a natural quantity to consider when calibrating the noise is to look at how much f will change, when using different inputs. This leads the following definition:

Definition 2.3.1 (l_2 -sensitivity). Let $f : \mathbb{N}^{|\mathcal{X}|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ an arbitrary function, then its l_2 -sensitivity is defined as:

$$\Delta f = \max_{\substack{x, y \in \mathbb{N}^{|\mathcal{X}|} \\ \|x - y\|_1 \leq 1}} \|f(x) - f(y)\|_2 \quad (11)$$

Now we can calibrate the noise according to its sensitivity which we can prove to satisfy differential privacy:

Definition 2.3.2 (Gaussian Mechanism). For a given function $f : \mathbb{N}^{|\mathcal{X}|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, privacy parameters $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $\delta > 0$ define the gaussian mechanism $F(x)$ as follows:

$$F(x) = f(x) + \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2) \quad (12)$$

where the variance is calibrated by the sensitivity of f and the given privacy level, s. t. $\sigma \geq \frac{2\Delta f}{\epsilon} \ln(\frac{1.25}{\delta})$

Theorem 2.3.3 (Gaussian Mechanism satisfies DP). *The gaussian mechanism defined in definition 2.3.2 satisfies (ϵ, δ) -DP.*

The proof is rather lengthy and the curious reader is referred to read through [14, Appendix A]

3 (Time Series) Data generation

3.1 Overview

- Data generation in general
- what is special about time series
- what about Privacy
- choice of models

3.2 DP-MERF

DP-MERF [19] is an efficient all purpose data generation algorithm that is based on minimising the so-called Maximum Mean Discrepancy between the real and the synthetic data distributions. The authors mainly verified their results using tabular data like ????, but also image data, notably the MNIST ???CITE data set. It has not been used for time series data, but we will consider this data generation for generating time series data in this thesis, because according to a recent survey [21], DP-MERF delivers the best all purpose data generation performance.

3.2.1 Maximum Mean Discrepancy

There are different ways to measure the “distance” between two distributions P and Q . One popular metric is the Maximum Mean Discrepancy (MMD) between P and Q , where the random variables are projected into another feature space and the expected values are compared to each other in this space.

Definition 3.2.1.1 (MMD). Let $\phi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$, where \mathcal{H} is a reproducing kernel hilbert space (RKHS) and P and Q some distributions over \mathcal{X} and random variables $X \sim P$, $Y \sim Q$ given. Then the Maximum mean Discrepancy is defined as:

$$MMD(P, Q) = \|\mathbb{E}[\phi(X)] - \mathbb{E}[\phi(Y)]\|_{\mathcal{H}} \quad (13)$$

Some “easy” features maps ϕ are for example:

Example 3.2.1.2. Let P and Q some distributions over \mathcal{X} and random variables $X \sim P$, $Y \sim Q$ given.

- **Identity kernel:** $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\phi(x) = x$, then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} MMD(P, Q) &= \|\mathbb{E}[\phi(X)] - \mathbb{E}[\phi(Y)]\|_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \|\mathbb{E}[X] - \mathbb{E}[Y]\|_{\mathbb{R}^d} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

So we only compare the two distributions in terms of their means.

- **Quadratic kernel:** $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}$ $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\phi(x) = (x, x^2)$, then we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
MMD(P, Q) &= \|\mathbb{E}[\phi(X)] - \mathbb{E}[\phi(Y)]\|_{\mathcal{H}} \\
&= \|\mathbb{E}[(X, X^2)] - \mathbb{E}[(Y, Y^2)]\|_{\mathcal{H}} \\
&= \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[X] \\ \mathbb{E}[X^2] \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[Y] \\ \mathbb{E}[Y^2] \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\mathbb{R}^2} \\
&= \sqrt{(\mathbb{E}[X] - \mathbb{E}[Y])^2 + (\mathbb{E}[X^2] - \mathbb{E}[Y^2])^2} \quad (15)
\end{aligned}$$

So here we compare the two distributions in terms of their means and their variance (or first and second moments respectively).

- **Gaussian kernel** ????

Now instead of computing a possibly high or even infinite dimensional transformation ϕ one can use the well-known kernel trick [19]. Let $k(x, y) = \langle \phi(x), \phi(y) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$ be a kernel with corresponding reproducing kernel hilbert space \mathcal{H} , then the computation of the MMD simplifies to:

$$\begin{aligned}
MMD^2(P, Q) &= \|\mathbb{E}[\phi(X)] - \mathbb{E}[\phi(Y)]\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \\
&= \langle \mathbb{E}[\phi(X)], \mathbb{E}[\phi(X')] \rangle - \langle \mathbb{E}[\phi(X)], \mathbb{E}[\phi(Y)] \rangle - \langle \mathbb{E}[\phi(Y)], \mathbb{E}[\phi(X)] \rangle \\
&\quad + \langle \mathbb{E}[\phi(Y)], \mathbb{E}[\phi(Y')] \rangle \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\langle \phi(X), \phi(X') \rangle] - 2\mathbb{E}[\langle \phi(X), \phi(Y) \rangle] + \mathbb{E}[\langle \phi(Y), \phi(Y') \rangle] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[k(X, X')] - 2\mathbb{E}[k(X, Y)] + \mathbb{E}[k(Y, Y')] \quad (16)
\end{aligned}$$

Where we introduced independent random variables $X, X' \sim P, Y, Y' \sim Q$.

Now given a training data set $X_m = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^m \sim P$ and a synthetic data set $X'_m = \{x'_i\}_{i=1}^m \sim Q$ we can estimate their MMD^2 by estimating the expected value with a mean estimate:

$$\widehat{MMD}^2(X_m, X'_m) = \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^m k(x_i, x_j) + \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^m k(x'_i, x'_j) - \frac{2}{m^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^m k(x_i, x'_j) \quad (17)$$

Unfortunately, this will require $\mathcal{O}(m^2)$ computations which grows quadratically in the number of samples. This will be too big for a large training data set. As a remedy, the authors of [19] propose to use Random Fourier Features based on a paper from 2007 [see 33], to approximate the kernel k using its fourier transform and Monte-Carlo-Simulation. Thus,

$$k(x, y) \approx \hat{\Phi}(x)^T \hat{\Phi}(y) \quad (18)$$

where $\hat{\Phi}(x) \in \mathbb{R}^D$ and $\hat{\Phi}_j(x) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{D}} \cos(\omega_j^T x)$.

3.3 GAN based

4 Models

describing the models used in this work and why

4.1 AE-DPMERF

4.2 RTSGAN

private prediction (dp at output layer) is worse than dp sgd <https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.05089>

5 Experiment

In this chapter we describe the experiments conducted on heartbeat data taken from the MIT-BIH Arrhythmia data set. Afterwards we present the results and draw insights. The aim is to assess the utility of synthetic data generated by the two algorithms mentioned in chapter 4. The utility is measured in the downstream task of arrhythmia detection. We are testing differentially private and non-private versions of the models and compare them to baseline model that is trained on the original data.

5.1 Experiment setup

Baseline Model

Data generation

5.2 Results

6 Discussion

7 Outro

7.1 Future Works

7.2 Conclusion

Appendix

References

- [1] Abadi, M., Chu, A., Goodfellow, I., McMahan, H. B., Mironov, I., Talwar, K., and Zhang, L. “Deep Learning with Differential Privacy”. In: *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. CCS’16. ACM, Oct. 2016. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2976749.2978318>.
- [2] Abowd, J., Ashmead, R., Simson, G., Kifer, D., Leclerc, P., Machanavajjhala, A., and Sexton, W. “Census topdown: Differentially private data, incremental schemas, and consistency with public knowledge”. In: *US Census Bureau* (2019).
- [3] Acs, G., Melis, L., Castelluccia, C., and De Cristofaro, E. “Differentially Private Mixture of Generative Neural Networks”. In: *2017 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*. 2017, pp. 715–720.
- [4] Ang, Y., Huang, Q., Bao, Y., Tung, A. K. H., and Huang, Z. *TSGBench: Time Series Generation Benchmark*. 2023. arXiv: 2309.03755 [cs.LG].
- [5] Apandi, Z. F. M., Ikeura, R., and Hayakawa, S. “Arrhythmia Detection Using MIT-BIH Dataset: A Review”. In: *2018 International Conference on Computational Approach in Smart Systems Design and Applications (ICASSDA)*. 2018, pp. 1–5.
- [6] Beam, A. L. and Kohane, I. S. “Big Data and Machine Learning in Health Care”. In: *JAMA* 319.13 (Apr. 2018), pp. 1317–1318. eprint: https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/articlepdf/2675024/jama_beam_2018_vp_170174.pdf. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2017.18391>.
- [7] Bellovin, S. M., Dutta, P. K., and Reiter, N. “Privacy and synthetic datasets”. In: *Stan. Tech. L. Rev.* 22 (2019), p. 1.
- [8] Bhardwaj, R., Nambiar, A. R., and Dutta, D. “A Study of Machine Learning in Healthcare”. In: *2017 IEEE 41st Annual Computer Software and Applications Conference (COMPSAC)*. Vol. 2. 2017, pp. 236–241.
- [9] Bu, Z., Dong, J., Long, Q., and Su, W. J. “Deep learning with Gaussian differential privacy”. In: *Harvard data science review* 2020.23 (2020), pp. 10–1162.
- [10] Cao, T., Bie, A., Vahdat, A., Fidler, S., and Kreis, K. *Don’t Generate Me: Training Differentially Private Generative Models with Sinkhorn Divergence*. 2021. arXiv: 2111.01177 [cs.LG].
- [11] Chen, J.-W., Yu, C.-M., Kao, C.-C., Pang, T.-W., and Lu, C.-S. “DPGEN: Differentially Private Generative Energy-Guided Network for Natural Image Synthesis”. In: *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 2022, pp. 8377–8386.
- [12] Dwork, C. “Differential privacy”. In: *International colloquium on automata, languages, and programming*. Springer. 2006, pp. 1–12.
- [13] Dwork, C., Kohli, N., and Mulligan, D. “Differential privacy in practice: Expose your epsilons!” In: *Journal of Privacy and Confidentiality* 9.2 (2019).

- [14] Dwork, C., Roth, A., et al. “The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy”. In: *Foundations and Trends® in Theoretical Computer Science* 9.3–4 (2014), pp. 211–407.
- [15] Fukuchi, K., Tran, Q. K., and Sakuma, J. “Differentially Private Empirical Risk Minimization with Input Perturbation”. In: *Discovery Science*. Ed. by Yamamoto, A., Kida, T., Uno, T., and Kuboyama, T. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2017, pp. 82–90.
- [16] Gaboardi, M. *CSE711: Topics in Differential Privacy*. Lecture Notes. 2016.
- [17] Gong, M., Xie, Y., Pan, K., Feng, K., and Qin, A. “A Survey on Differentially Private Machine Learning [Review Article]”. In: *IEEE Computational Intelligence Magazine* 15.2 (2020), pp. 49–64.
- [18] Ha, T., Dang, T. K., Dang, T. T., Truong, T. A., and Nguyen, M. T. “Differential Privacy in Deep Learning: An Overview”. In: *2019 International Conference on Advanced Computing and Applications (ACOMP)*. 2019, pp. 97–102.
- [19] Harder, F., Adamczewski, K., and Park, M. “Differentially Private Mean Embeddings with Random Features (DP-MERF) for Simple & Practical Synthetic Data Generation”. In: *CoRR* abs/2002.11603 (2020). arXiv: 2002.11603. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.11603>.
- [20] Hegde, C., Prabhu, H. R., Sagar, D., Shenoy, P. D., Venugopal, K., and Patnaik, L. M. “Heartbeat biometrics for human authentication”. In: *Signal, Image and Video Processing* 5 (2011), pp. 485–493.
- [21] Hu, Y., Wu, F., Li, Q., Long, Y., Garrido, G. M., Ge, C., Ding, B., Forsyth, D., Li, B., and Song, D. *SoK: Privacy-Preserving Data Synthesis*. 2023. arXiv: 2307.02106 [cs.CR].
- [22] Jordon, J., Szpruch, L., Houssiau, F., Bottarelli, M., Cherubin, G., Maple, C., Cohen, S. N., and Weller, A. *Synthetic Data – what, why and how?* 2022. arXiv: 2205.03257 [cs.LG].
- [23] Kim, J. W., Edemacu, K., Kim, J. S., Chung, Y. D., and Jang, B. “A survey of differential privacy-based techniques and their applicability to location-based services”. In: *Computers & Security* 111 (2021), p. 102464.
- [24] Konečný, J., McMahan, B., and Ramage, D. *Federated Optimization: Distributed Optimization Beyond the Datacenter*. 2015. arXiv: 1511.03575 [cs.LG].
- [25] Lin, Z., Sekar, V., and Fanti, G. “On the privacy properties of gan-generated samples”. In: *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR. 2021, pp. 1522–1530.
- [26] Ma, C., Yuan, L., Han, L., Ding, M., Bhaskar, R., and Li, J. “Data Level Privacy Preserving: A Stochastic Perturbation Approach Based on Differential Privacy”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 35.4 (2023), pp. 3619–3631.
- [27] McMahan, H. B., Ramage, D., Talwar, K., and Zhang, L. *Learning Differentially Private Recurrent Language Models*. 2018. arXiv: 1710.06963 [cs.LG].

- [28] Mo, F. and Haddadi, H. “Efficient and Private Federated Learning using TEE”. In: 2019. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:211627925>.
- [29] Moody, G. B. and Mark, R. G. “The impact of the MIT-BIH arrhythmia database”. In: *IEEE engineering in medicine and biology magazine* 20.3 (2001), pp. 45–50.
- [30] Narayanan, A. and Shmatikov, V. “Robust De-anonymization of Large Sparse Datasets”. In: *2008 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (sp 2008)*. 2008, pp. 111–125.
- [31] Papernot, N., Abadi, M., Erlingsson, Ú., Goodfellow, I., and Talwar, K. *Semi-supervised Knowledge Transfer for Deep Learning from Private Training Data*. 2017. arXiv: 1610.05755 [stat.ML].
- [32] Phan, N., Wu, X., Hu, H., and Dou, D. “Adaptive Laplace Mechanism: Differential Privacy Preservation in Deep Learning”. In: *2017 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*. 2017, pp. 385–394.
- [33] Rahimi, A. and Recht, B. “Random Features for Large-Scale Kernel Machines”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Ed. by Platt, J., Koller, D., Singer, Y., and Roweis, S. Vol. 20. Curran Associates, Inc., 2007. URL: https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2007/file/013a006f03dbc5392effeb8f18fda755-Paper.pdf.
- [34] Schmidl, S., Wenig, P., and Papenbrock, T. “Anomaly detection in time series: a comprehensive evaluation”. In: *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 15.9 (2022), pp. 1779–1797.
- [35] Shailaja, K., Seetharamulu, B., and Jabbar, M. “Machine learning in healthcare: A review”. In: *2018 Second international conference on electronics, communication and aerospace technology (ICECA)*. IEEE. 2018, pp. 910–914.
- [36] Shokri, R., Stronati, M., Song, C., and Shmatikov, V. *Membership Inference Attacks against Machine Learning Models*. 2017. arXiv: 1610.05820 [cs.CR].
- [37] Stadler, T., Oprisanu, B., and Troncoso, C. *Synthetic Data – Anonymisation Groundhog Day*. 2022. arXiv: 2011.07018 [cs.LG].
- [38] Wang, L., Huang, K., Sun, K., Wang, W., Tian, C., Xie, L., and Gu, Q. “Unlock with Your Heart: Heartbeat-Based Authentication on Commercial Mobile Phones”. In: *Proc. ACM Interact. Mob. Wearable Ubiquitous Technol.* 2.3 (Sept. 2018). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3264950>.
- [39] Wang, Y., Wang, Q., Zhao, L., and Wang, C. “Differential privacy in deep learning: Privacy and beyond”. In: *Future Generation Computer Systems* (2023).
- [40] Warner, S. L. “Randomized Response: A Survey Technique for Eliminating Evasive Answer Bias”. In: *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 60.309 (1965). PMID: 12261830, pp. 63–69.
- [41] Wiens, J. and Shenoy, E. S. “Machine learning for healthcare: on the verge of a major shift in healthcare epidemiology”. In: *Clinical infectious diseases* 66.1 (2018), pp. 149–153.

- [42] Zhang, J., Zhang, Z., Xiao, X., Yang, Y., and Winslett, M. *Functional Mechanism: Regression Analysis under Differential Privacy*. 2012. arXiv: 1208.0219 [cs.DB].
- [43] Zhao, J., Chen, Y., and Zhang, W. “Differential Privacy Preservation in Deep Learning: Challenges, Opportunities and Solutions”. In: *IEEE Access* 7 (2019), pp. 48901–48911.
- [44] Zhao, J., Chen, Y., and Zhang, W. “Differential privacy preservation in deep learning: Challenges, opportunities and solutions”. In: *IEEE Access* 7 (2019), pp. 48901–48911.