# **Rényi Differential Privacy**

Ilya Mironov Google Brain

DIMACS, October 24, 2017

## **Relaxation of Differential Privacy**

 $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -Differential Privacy: The distribution of the output M(D) on database D is (nearly) the same as M(D'):



Dwork, Kenthapadi, McSherry, Mironov, Naor "Our data, Ourselves", EUROCRYPT 2006

## $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -Differential Privacy

- Robust to auxiliary data
- Post-processing: If M(D) is (ε, δ)-differentially private, so is f(M(D)).
- Composability:

 $(\varepsilon_1,\delta_1)$ -DP and  $(\varepsilon_2,\delta_2)$ -DP is  $(\varepsilon_1+\varepsilon_2,\delta_1+\delta_2)$ -DP.

• Group privacy:

Graceful degradation in the presence of correlated inputs.

## Why $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -Differential Privacy?

Three common use cases:

- 1.  $\delta$  probability of failure
- 2. Gaussian noise
- 3. Advanced composition theorems

## Why $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -Differential Privacy? I. $\delta$ probability of failure

#### Mechanism



#### Analysis

*Proof.* Unlike for multiplicative weights, it will be more convenient to analyze the Perceptron algorithm without normalizing the database to be a probability distribution, and then prove that it is a  $T(\alpha')$  database

update algorithm for f complete the proof. I view  $f_t \in [0, 1]^{|\mathcal{X}|}$  as to  $\langle f_t, x \rangle$ . We must show the erty that  $|f_t(x^t) - f$  $L > \frac{||x||_2^2 |\mathcal{X}|}{2^{\sigma}}$ .



We use a potential arguments show that for every t = 1, 2, ..., L,  $x^{t+1}$  is significantly closer to x than  $x^t$ . Specifically, our potential function is the  $L_2^2$  norm of the database  $x - x^t$ , defined as

$$\|x\|_2^2 = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{X}} x(i)^2.$$

Observe that  $||x - x^1||_2^2 = ||x||_2^2$  since  $x^1 = 0$ , and  $||x||_2^2 \ge 0$ . Thus it suffices to show that in every step, the potential decreases by  $\alpha'^2/|\mathcal{X}|$ . We analyze the case where  $f_t(x^t) > v_t$ , the analysis for the opposite case will be similar. Let  $R^t = x^t - x$ . Observe that in this case we have

 $f_t(R^t) = f_t(x^t) - f_t(x) \ge \alpha'.$ 

## What Can $\delta$ Hide?

"Nuclear Option":

- With probability  $\delta$  publish everything
- With probability 1 publish  $\delta$  fraction of inputs

 $\delta \ll 1/N \quad \text{or} \quad \delta = \text{negl}(1/N)$ 



## Why $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -Differential Privacy? II. Gaussian Mechanism

Normal distribution: f(D) + N(0, 1)

- Spherically symmetrical
- Closed under addition
- "Noise-like"
- Tightly concentrated



## $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -Differential Privacy of Gaussian



## Why $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -Differential Privacy? III. Advanced Composition Theorem

**Basic Composition:** 

Composition of  $\epsilon_1$ -DP and  $\epsilon_2$ -DP is ( $\epsilon_1+\epsilon_2$ )-DP

*n*-fold composition of  $\varepsilon$ -DP is  $n\varepsilon$ -DP

Advanced Composition:

*n*-fold composition of  $\varepsilon$ -DP is ( $\sqrt{2n \ln(1/\delta)} \varepsilon$ ,  $\delta$ )-DP for  $\delta < 1$ 

# 1. Privacy loss variable $R \sim \ln \frac{\Pr[x=f(D)]}{\Pr[x=f(D')]}$ where $x \sim f(D)$ .

2. Azuma inequality for  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -martingales:  $R_1, ..., R_n$  such that  $|R_i| \le \alpha$  and  $\mathbb{E}[R_i|R_1, ..., R_{i-1}] \le \beta$  then  $\Pr\left[\sum_{i=1}^n R_i > n\beta + z\sqrt{n\alpha}\right] \le e^{-z^2/2}$ 

3.  $\epsilon$ -DP  $\Rightarrow$  privacy loss variable is a ( $\epsilon$ ,  $\epsilon^2$ )-martingale

Dwork, Rothblum, Vadhan "Boosting and Differential Privacy", FOCS 2010

• Gaussian mechanism does not have catastrophic failure!

- Gaussian mechanism does not have catastrophic failure!
- Composing advanced composition



- Gaussian mechanism does not have catastrophic failure!
- Composing advanced composition



Murtagh, Vadhan, ``The complexity of computing the optimal composition of differential privacy", TCC 2016-A.

- Gaussian mechanism does not have catastrophic failure!
- Composing advanced composition



- Gaussian mechanism does not have catastrophic failure!
- Composing advanced composition
- Gaussian + Advanced composition is not tight



## Why $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -Differential Privacy?

Three common use cases:

- 1.  $\delta$  probability of failure
- 2. Gaussian noise
- 3. Advanced composition theorems



## **Better Notion of Closeness**

ε-Differential Privacy:

Rényi Divergence at  $\infty$ :

 $\max_{x} P(x)/Q(x) < e^{\varepsilon} \qquad D_{\infty}(P||Q) < \varepsilon$ 

## Rényi Divergence

$$D_1(P||Q) = \lim_{\alpha \to 1} D_\alpha(P||Q) = E_P \left[ \log \frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} \right]$$
$$D_\alpha(P||Q) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log E_Q \left[ \left( \frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} \right)^\alpha \right]$$
$$D_\infty(P||Q) = \lim_{\alpha \to \infty} D_\alpha(P||Q) = \log \max_x \frac{P(x)}{Q(x)}$$

## **Rényi Differential Privacy**

# $(\alpha, \varepsilon)$ -Rényi Differential Privacy (RDP):

 $\forall D, D': D_{\alpha}(M(D) || M(D')) \leq \varepsilon.$ 

## **Relaxation of Differential Privacy**

# $(\infty, \varepsilon)$ -RDP is $\varepsilon$ -DP

## Implies $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -Differential Privacy

$$(\alpha, \varepsilon)$$
-RDP  $\Rightarrow (\varepsilon + \frac{\log 1/\delta}{\alpha - 1}, \delta)$ -DP for any  $\delta$ 

## "Bad Outcomes" Interpretation



- bad outcomes
- probability with record x
- probability without record x

## "Bad Outcomes" Interpretation

- ε-Differential Privacy:  $\forall S \operatorname{Pr}[M(D) \in S] \le e^{\varepsilon} \cdot \operatorname{Pr}[M(D') \in S]$
- (α, ε)-Rényi Diff Privacy: ∀S Pr[M(D) ∈ S] ≤  $(e^ε · Pr[M(D') ∈ S])^{1-1/α}$

(ε, δ)-Differential Privacy:  $\forall S \Pr[M(D) \in S] \le e^ε \cdot \Pr[M(D') \in S] + δ$ 

## No Catastrophic Failure Mode!

# $\Pr[M(D) \in S] \le (e^{\varepsilon} \cdot \Pr[M(D') \in S])^{1-1/\alpha}$



## Monotonicity

# For $\alpha_1 \ge \alpha_2$ : $(\alpha_1, \varepsilon)$ -RDP $\Rightarrow (\alpha_2, \varepsilon)$ -RDP

## Composable!

#### Simultaneous release of $(\alpha, \varepsilon_1)$ -RDP and $(\alpha, \varepsilon_2)$ -RDP is

 $(\alpha, \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2)$ -RDP

#### Proof of Advanced Composition

1. Privacy loss variable  

$$R \sim \ln \frac{\Pr[x=f(D)]}{\Pr[x=f(D')]}$$
 where  
2. Azuma inequality for  $(\alpha, \beta, 1)$  Switch to  $e^{\lambda R}$   
 $R_1, \dots, R_n$  such that  $|P|=2$ . Apply Markov's to E hen  
 $\Pr[\sum_{i=1}^n R_i > n_i]$  3. Optimize  $\lambda$   
3.  $\epsilon$ -DP  $\Rightarrow$  privacy loss variable is

Dwork, Rothblum, Vadhan "Boosting and Differential Privacy", FOCS 2010

## Rényi Budget Curve



## Rényi Budget Curve: Laplace Mechanism



## Rényi Budget Curve: Gaussian Mechanism



## **More Complex Mechanisms**



Geumlek, Song, Chaudhuri, "Renyi Differential Privacy Mechanisms for Posterior Sampling", (NIPS 2017)

### Rényi Differential Privacy as a Privacy Accountant



## Why 2 to 32?

#### $(\alpha, \varepsilon)$ -Rényi Diff Privacy: $\forall S$ Pr[M(D)∈S] ≤ $(e^{\varepsilon} \cdot Pr[M(D') \in S])^{1-1/\alpha}$

## Convergence of Ideas

Prior work:

This work: Concurrent work:

**Applications:** 

Dwork, Rothblum, Vadhan (FOCS 2010) Dwork, Rothblum (2016) Lattice-based cryptography "Rényi Differential Privacy" (CSF 2016) Bun, Steinke (TCC 2016-B) Abadi et al. (ACM CCS 2016) Papernot et al. (ICLR 2017) Geumlek, Song, Chaudhuri (NIPS 2017)

## Summary

- Rényi Differential Privacy: generalization and relaxation of differential privacy
- RDP fixes problems of  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DP:
  - No catastrophic failure mode
  - Tight analysis of Gaussian noise
  - Easy composition of heterogeneous mechanisms