

# Answering Query Workloads with Optimal Error under Blowfish Privacy

Samuel Haney<sup>1</sup>, Ashwin Machanavajjhala<sup>2</sup>, and Bolin Ding<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Duke University, Durham, NC, USA, shaney@cs.duke.edu

<sup>2</sup>Duke University, Durham, NC, USA, ashwin@cs.duke.edu

<sup>3</sup>Microsoft Research, Redmond, WA, USA, bolin.ding@microsoft.com

November 22, 2022

## Abstract

Recent work has proposed a privacy framework, called Blowfish, that generalizes differential privacy in order to generate principled relaxations. Blowfish privacy definitions take as input an additional parameter called a policy graph, which specifies which properties about individuals should be hidden from an adversary. An open question is whether Blowfish privacy definitions indeed permit mechanisms that incur significant lower error for query answering compared to differentially privacy mechanism. In this paper, we answer this question and explore error bounds of sets of linear counting queries under different Blowfish policy graphs.

We begin by generalizing the matrix mechanism lower bound of Li and Miklau (called the SVD bound) for differential privacy to find an analogous lower bound for our privacy framework. We show that for many query workloads and instantiations of the framework, we can achieve a much lower error bound than differential privacy. Next, we develop tools that use the existing literature on optimal or near optimal strategies for answering workloads under differential privacy to develop near optimal strategies for answering workloads under our privacy framework. We provide applications of these by finding strategies for a few popular classes of queries. In particular, we find strategies to answer histogram queries and multidimensional range queries under different instantiations of our privacy framework. We believe the tools we develop will be useful for finding strategies to answer many other classes of queries with low error.

# 1 Introduction

With increasingly large datasets becoming available, it is useful to be able to release this data for research purposes without violating the privacy of individuals in the dataset.  $\epsilon$ -Differential privacy [2] has become the standard for private release of data due to its strong guarantee that the output any algorithm run on the private data does not change significantly if a single individual’s record is added, removed or changed. Typical algorithms that satisfy differential privacy release noisy answers. The privacy parameter  $\epsilon$  controls the amount of noise, and thus can be used to trade-off privacy for utility.

However, in certain applications (e.g., [14]), the differential privacy guarantee is too strict to produce private release of data that has any non-trivial utility. Tuning the parameter epsilon is not helpful here: enlarging  $\epsilon$  degrades the privacy guaranteed without a commensurate improvement in utility.

Recent work [11, 9, 10] has generalized the notion of differential privacy to allow data owners specify which properties of the dataset must be protected from an adversary. In particular, Blowfish privacy [10, 9] enumerates pairs of sensitive properties about an individual that an adversary must not be able to distinguish, using what is called a “policy graph” (see Section 2.3 for more details). Blowfish privacy was applied to several practical scenarios to achieve better utility than differential privacy [10, 9].

In this paper, we continue this line of work and systematically analyze the privacy-utility trade-offs arising from mechanisms that satisfy Blowfish privacy. Rather than developing point solutions, we present a lower bound on the minimum error with which a workload can be answered under a specific Blowfish privacy policy, as well as general techniques to help derive near optimal strategies for (and consequently error bounds on) different types of query workloads under different Blowfish privacy policies.

**Overview of Results.** Throughout this paper, we consider privacy algorithms that are instantiations of the extended matrix mechanism [12, 13]. These are data oblivious but workload dependent algorithms which privately release the answers to a query workload  $\mathbf{W}$  using a different strategy workload  $\mathbf{A}$ , such that the queries in  $\mathbf{A}$  are not very sensitive to presence of absence of one individual, and query answers in  $\mathbf{W}$  can be reconstructed using a small number of answers from  $\mathbf{A}$ .

We first adapt the extended matrix mechanism to the Blowfish privacy framework. Our main result in this paper is called *transformational equivalence*. We show that the error incurred by answering a workload  $\mathbf{W}$  using a strategy  $\mathbf{A}$  under a Blowfish privacy policy characterized by a policy graph  $G$  is equivalent to the error incurred by answering a different workload  $\mathbf{W}_G$  using strategy  $\mathbf{A}_G$  under differential privacy. Here,  $\mathbf{W}_G$  and  $\mathbf{A}_G$  are algorithmic transformations of the original workload  $\mathbf{W}$  and strategy  $\mathbf{A}$  based on the policy graph  $G$ . This result allows us directly adapt SVD based extended matrix mechanism lower bounds for answering workloads under differential privacy to the Blowfish setting. We empirically verify that the error lower bounds for answering many workloads (cumulative histograms, multidimensional range queries and all  $m$ -way marginals) under reasonable Blowfish policy graphs is much smaller than the lower bound under differential privacy. This suggests that answers to query workloads may be released with significantly lower error in the Blowfish framework.

Next, we present near optimal algorithms (or upper bounds on error) for releasing the cumulative histogram and multidimensional range query workloads under reasonable Blowfish policy graphs  $G$ . Our approach for finding good strategies works as follows. Given a workload  $\mathbf{W}$ , we transform it into  $\mathbf{W}_G$  and find a strategy  $\mathbf{A}_G$  that answers  $\mathbf{W}_G$  under differential privacy with low error. We then transform  $\mathbf{A}_G$  to  $\mathbf{A}$ , and transformational equivalence ensures that  $\mathbf{A}$  is a good strategy

for answering  $\mathbf{W}$  with low error under Blowfish policy graph  $G$ . This approach leverages the rich literature on near optimal strategies for answering workloads under differential privacy. When  $\mathbf{W}_G$  is not a well studied workload, we consider using a slightly different policy graph  $G'$  that is a subgraph of  $G$ . Our subgraph approximation result ensures that a strategy for answering  $\mathbf{W}$  under policy graph  $G'$  is also a good strategy (worse by a constant factor  $\ell^2$ ) for answering  $\mathbf{W}$  under policy graph  $G$  as long as neighboring nodes in  $G$  are no more than a distance  $\ell$  apart in  $G'$ .

In particular, we use the transformational equivalence and subgraph approximation results to derive strategies for the cumulative histogram workload under reasonable Blowfish policies with error per query that is independent of the domain size. The best known strategy under differential privacy incurs an error of  $\log^3 k/\epsilon^2$  per query, where  $k$  is the domain size. We also show strategies for answering 1- and 2-dimensional range queries with error per query of  $\Theta(1/\epsilon^2)$  and  $O(\log^3 k/\epsilon^2)$ , respectively. In contrast, the best known strategies for 1- and 2-dimensional range queries incur an error of  $O(\log^3 k/\epsilon^2)$  and  $O(\log^6 k/\epsilon^2)$  respectively (see Figure 4 for a summary of results).

**Organization.** The rest of this section is a brief survey of related work. Section 2 gives background information and gives definitions that we will use throughout the paper. Section 3 generalizes the definition of the extended matrix mechanism ([13]) to the Blowfish privacy framework. We describe our main result, transformational equivalence, in Section 4. Section 5 gives a lower bound on the error of the extended matrix mechanism, and provides examples for well know classes of queries. Section 6 provides upper bounds on the error of matrix mechanism for various classes on queries under various instantiations of the Blowfish framework. We suspect the techniques we use can be used to find efficient strategies for many other classes of query workloads. Some proofs have been deferred to the appendix.

**Related Work.** Recent work has given error bounds under differential privacy both in general, and for specific classes of workloads and mechanisms. Dwork et al. [4] show that the amount of noise needed is related to the sensitivity of queries. Nissim et al. [16] show that it is sufficient to add noise based on the smooth sensitivity. For single counting queries, it has been shown ([6]) that Laplace mechanism is optimal. A sequence of results ([7],[1],[15]) give mechanism independent error bounds for sets of linear counting queries using geometric arguments. Li and Miklau ([13]) give an error lower bound for the extended matrix mechanism that is based on the singular value decomposition of the workload matrix.

Some recent work has attempted to provide more flexible privacy definitions. Kifer and Machanavajjhala [11] developed the Pufferfish framework which generalizes differential privacy by specifying what information should be kept secret, and the adversary's prior knowledge. He et al. [9, 10] propose the Blowfish framework which also generalizes differential privacy and is inspired by Pufferfish. Both these frameworks allow finer grained control on what information about individuals is kept secret, and what prior knowledge an adversary might possess, and thus allow customizing privacy definitions to the requirements of different applications.

## 2 Background and Notation

We begin by defining some standard privacy terms in the context of query workloads. Next, we describe the extended matrix mechanism. Finally, we describe Blowfish privacy.

### 2.1 Query Workloads

Consider some dataset  $D$ . Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be the domain of values in the dataset, and let  $|\mathcal{T}| = k$ . Let  $\mathcal{I}_n$  be the set of databases  $D$  over  $\mathcal{T}$  such that  $|D| = n$ . Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be the set of databases with any number

of entries. A *workload* is a set of linear counting queries. A workload can be represented as a  $q \times k$  matrix  $\mathbf{W}$ , where  $q$  is the number of queries. Each row of this matrix corresponds to a query. The columns represent values  $x \in \mathcal{T}$ . The true answer to this workload will be a vector in  $\mathbb{R}^q$  where the  $i^{\text{th}}$  entry in the vector is the answer to the query represented by the  $i^{\text{th}}$  row in the matrix. Let  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^k$  be the true counts of all values in the domain of database values. Then  $\mathbf{W} \cdot \mathbf{x}$  will be the true answer to this workload.

**Example 2.1.** Figure 1 shows examples of two well studied workloads.  $\mathbf{I}_k$  is the identity matrix representing the histogram query on  $\mathcal{T} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k\}$ .  $\mathbf{C}_k$  corresponds to the cumulative histogram workload, where each query corresponds to the sum of the counts of values from  $x_i$  through  $x_k$ . Cumulative histograms have many applications in releasing cdfs, quantiles, answering range queries [8, 17], and for releasing prefix sums of a stream (see [5]).

We now define variations of definitions of differential privacy. There are two common ways of defining neighboring databases, and each will result in a slightly different definition of differential privacy. Additionally, there is  $\epsilon$ -differential privacy, and  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -differential privacy, the latter being a relaxation of the former.

**Definition 2.1** (Neighbors, bounded). *Two datasets,  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  are neighbors, if they differ in the value of single entry. That is  $D_1 = D \cup \{x\}$  and  $D_2 = D \cup \{y\}$  for some dataset  $D$ .*

Note that in the bounded case all datasets have the same number of tuples; i.e.,  $\forall D, D \in \mathcal{I}_n$ .

**Definition 2.2** (Neighbors, unbounded). *Two datasets,  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  are neighbors if they differ in the presence of a single entry. That is  $D_1 = D_2 \cup \{x\}$  or  $D_2 = D_1 \cup \{x\}$ .*

**Definition 2.3** ( $\epsilon$ -Differential Privacy). *A mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfies  $\epsilon$ -differential privacy if for all outputs  $S \subseteq \text{range}(\mathcal{M})$ , and for all neighbors  $D_1$  and  $D_2$ ,*

$$\Pr[\mathcal{M}(D_1) \in S] \leq e^\epsilon \cdot \Pr[\mathcal{M}(D_2) \in S]$$

*A mechanism satisfies **bounded  $\epsilon$ -differential privacy** if we use Definition 2.1 for neighboring databases, and **unbounded  $\epsilon$ -differential privacy** if we use Definition 2.2.*

A common relaxation of differential privacy is  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -differential privacy, which allows privacy leakage with a small probability  $\delta$ .

**Definition 2.4** ( $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -Differential Privacy). *A mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfies  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -differential privacy if for all outputs  $S \subseteq \text{range}(\mathcal{M})$ , and for all neighboring datasets  $D_1$  and  $D_2$ ,*

$$\Pr[\mathcal{M}(D_1) \in S] \leq e^\epsilon \cdot \Pr[\mathcal{M}(D_2) \in S] + \delta$$

*A mechanism satisfies **bounded  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -differential privacy** if we use Definition 2.1 for neighboring databases, and **unbounded  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -differential privacy** uses Definition 2.2.*

We now define the sensitivity of a workload.

**Definition 2.5.** *Let  $N$  denote the set of pairs of neighboring datasets. The  $L_p$  sensitivity of a workload is:*

$$\Delta_{(p, \mathbf{W})} = \max_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') \in N} \|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}'\|$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\
\mathbf{I}_k & \mathbf{C}_k & \mathbf{H}_k
\end{array}$$

Figure 1: Example workloads: histogram  $\mathbf{I}_k$ , cumulative histogram  $\mathbf{C}_k$  and hierarchical  $\mathbf{H}_k$ .

The definition of the set  $N$  depends on whether we consider bounded or unbounded differential privacy. For unbounded differential privacy,

$$\Delta_{(p, \mathbf{W})} = \max_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \text{cols}(\mathbf{W})} \|\mathbf{v}_i\|_p$$

Unless otherwise specified, henceforth we will use the term differential privacy to mean unbounded differential privacy, and the term sensitivity to mean sensitivity under unbounded differential privacy.

**Example 2.2.** *The  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  sensitivities of  $\mathbf{I}_k$  are both 1. The  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  sensitivities of  $\mathbf{C}_k$  are  $k$  and  $\sqrt{k}$  resp.*

We can privately answer linear workloads by adding independent noise to the true answer of each query. The noise distribution we use depends on whether we use  $\epsilon$ - or  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -differential privacy.

Let  $\text{Normal}(\sigma)^m$  and  $\text{Lap}(\sigma)^m$  be  $m$ -dimensional vectors of independent samples drawn from the Gaussian and Laplace distributions respectively, with mean 0 and scale  $\sigma$ .

**Definition 2.6.** *Let  $\mathbf{W}$  be a workload, and let  $\mathbf{x}$  be the vector of true counts for the database. Let  $\epsilon$  and  $\delta$  be parameters. The Gaussian mechanism  $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{x})$ , is defined as follows:*

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x} + \text{Normal}(\sigma)^q$$

where  $\sigma = \Delta_{(2, \mathbf{W})} \frac{\sqrt{2 \ln(2/\delta)}}{\epsilon}$ .

**Definition 2.7.** *Let  $\mathbf{W}$  be a workload, and let  $\mathbf{x}$  be the vector of true counts for the database. Let  $\epsilon$  be a parameter. The Laplace mechanism  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{x})$ , is defined as follows:*

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x} + \text{Lap}(\sigma)^q$$

where  $\sigma = \Delta_{(1, \mathbf{W})}/\epsilon$ .

It is known ([3, 4, 13]) that the Gaussian mechanism and the Laplace mechanism satisfy  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -differential privacy and  $\epsilon$ -differential privacy, respectively. We now define the error of answering a workload using some mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$ .

**Definition 2.8.** *Let  $\mathbf{q}$  be a linear counting query (horizontal row vector), and  $\mathcal{M}$  be a mechanism. Let  $\mathbf{x}$  be a vector of the true counts of the dataset. The mean squared error of answering  $\mathbf{q}$  on the true counts  $\mathbf{x}$  using  $\mathcal{M}$  is*

$$\text{ERROR}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{E} [(\mathbf{q}\mathbf{x} - \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{x}))^2]$$




Figure 2: Example discriminative secret graphs  $G$  and their corresponding  $\mathbf{P}_G$

where  $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{q})$  is the noisy answer of query  $\mathbf{q}$ . The error of the workload  $\mathbf{W}$  on the true counts  $\mathbf{x}$  is given by

$$\text{ERROR}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \text{rows}(\mathbf{W})} \text{ERROR}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{x})$$

**Theorem 2.1.** Let  $\mathbf{W}$  be a  $q \times k$  workload.

- The mean squared error of answering  $\mathbf{W}$  on every dataset  $\mathbf{x}$  using the Laplace mechanism is  $2q\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{W})}^2/\epsilon^2$ .
- The mean squared error of answering  $\mathbf{W}$  on every dataset  $\mathbf{x}$  using the Gaussian mechanism is  $q\Delta_{(2, \mathbf{W})}^2 \frac{2 \log(2/\delta)}{\epsilon^2}$ .

Note that the errors for the Laplace and Gaussian mechanisms *do not depend* on the true counts  $\mathbf{x}$ . Hence, they are referred to as *data oblivious* mechanisms [1]. In this paper, we will only consider data oblivious mechanisms, and hence we will drop the  $\mathbf{x}$  parameter and refer to the error of a workload using  $\text{ERROR}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{W})$ .

## 2.2 Extended Matrix Mechanism

Li et al [12] describe the *matrix mechanism* framework for optimally answering a workload of linear queries. The key insight is that while some workloads  $\mathbf{W}$  have a high sensitivity, they can be answered with low error by answering a different *strategy* query workload  $\mathbf{A}$  such that (a)  $\mathbf{A}$  has a low sensitivity  $\Delta_{\mathbf{A}}$ , and (b) rows in  $\mathbf{W}$  can be reconstructed using a small number of rows in  $\mathbf{A}$ .

In particular, let  $\mathbf{A}$  be a  $p \times k$  matrix, and let  $\mathbf{A}^+$  denote its Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse, such that  $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^+ = \mathbf{W}$ . The matrix mechanism is given by the following algorithm:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{W}\mathbf{A}^+ \mathcal{Z}(\sigma)^p \quad (1)$$

where,  $\mathcal{Z}, \sigma$  are the Laplace distribution and  $2\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{A})}/\epsilon$  for  $\epsilon$ -differential privacy, and the Gaussian distribution and  $\frac{\Delta_{(2, \mathbf{A})}}{\epsilon} \cdot \sqrt{2 \ln \frac{2}{\delta}}$  for  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -differential privacy, respectively. It is easy to see that all matrix mechanism algorithms are data oblivious. We will use  $\text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{A})}(\mathbf{W})$  to denote the error of answering  $\mathbf{W}$  using the Gaussian version of the extended matrix mechanism under strategy  $\mathbf{A}$ . We use  $\text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{A})}(\mathbf{W})$  for the Laplace version. The error of these mechanisms can be quantified as follows:

**Theorem 2.2.** ([12, 13]) Let  $\mathbf{W}$  be a workload. The error of answering  $\mathbf{W}$  using the matrix mechanism defined in Equation 1 with strategy  $\mathbf{A}$  is

$$\text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{A})}(\mathbf{W}) = P(\epsilon) \Delta_{(1, \mathbf{A})}^2 \|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{A}^+\|_F^2 \quad (2)$$

$$\text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{A})}(\mathbf{W}) = P(\epsilon, \delta) \Delta_{(2, \mathbf{A})}^2 \|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{A}^+\|_F^2 \quad (3)$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_F$  is the Frobenius norm,  $P(\epsilon)$  is  $2/\epsilon^2$ , and  $P(\epsilon, \delta)$  is  $\frac{2 \log(2/\delta)}{\epsilon^2}$ .

The Frobenius norm of matrix  $\mathbf{M}$ , denoted by  $\|\mathbf{M}\|_F$ , equals  $\sqrt{\text{trace}(\mathbf{M}^T \times \mathbf{M})}$ , where  $\text{trace}(\mathbf{M})$  is the sum of the entries that lie on the diagonal of  $\mathbf{M}$ .

**Example 2.3.** Answering the workload  $\mathbf{C}_k$  using the Laplace mechanism results in a total error of  $O(k^3/\epsilon^2)$ . On the other hand, using the hierarchical strategy workload  $\mathbf{H}_k$  (Figure 1) corresponds to releasing counts on a binary tree over the domain. Using  $\mathbf{H}_k$  as the strategy can be shown to result in  $\text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{H}_k)}(\mathbf{C}_k) = O(k \log^3 k / \epsilon^2)$  [5, 8].

We define the minimum error that any strategy  $\mathbf{A}$  can achieve for workload  $\mathbf{W}$ .

**Definition 2.9.** Let  $\mathbf{W}$  be a workload.

$$\text{MINERROR}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{W}) = \min_{\mathbf{A}: \mathbf{W}\mathbf{A}^+ = \mathbf{W}} \text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{A})}(\mathbf{W}) \quad (4)$$

$$\text{MINERROR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{W}) = \min_{\mathbf{A}: \mathbf{W}\mathbf{A}^+ = \mathbf{W}} \text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{A})}(\mathbf{W}) \quad (5)$$

### 2.3 Blowfish Privacy

We give definitions for the Blowfish framework [10, 9]. A instantiation of the Blowfish framework is a *policy graph*, which generalizes the notion of neighboring databases from differential privacy. Note that in [9], a policy is slightly more complex. They also define *constraints* on set of possible databases, which defines the adversary’s prior knowledge about the database. In this paper, we assume no constraints on the set of possible databases.

**Definition 2.10** (Policy Graph). A *policy graph* is a graph  $G = (V, E)$  with  $V \subseteq \mathcal{T} \cup \{\perp\}$ , where  $\perp$  is the name of a special vertex. Each member of  $\mathcal{T} \cup \{\perp\}$  is included in  $V$  if it is an endpoint of some edge in  $E$ . That is, we remove singleton vertices from the graph.

This graph defines pairs of domain values that we wish to protect. That is, an adversary should not be able to distinguish between those pairs of domain values. A value with no edge is not protected, and therefore it can be removed from the domain. We can answer the exact count for this domain value without any noise. If a counting query includes that domain value, we can remove it, calculate the noisy sum of the remaining values, then add the true count of the singleton domain value. Therefore, we can assume WLOG that we have removed single values. As we will show a little later, we can also assume that  $G$  is connected. Our graph may or may not contain  $\perp$ , depending on if there is an edge connecting to  $\perp$ . As we will see, a graph that includes  $\perp$  will result in databases from  $\mathcal{I}$ , while a graph that does not include  $\perp$  results in databases from  $\mathcal{I}_n$ , where  $n$  is the size of the domain. If  $\perp \in V$ , then we add a column to  $\mathbf{W}$  to correspond to this “new” domain value, with all values in the column being 0.

**Definition 2.11** (Neighbors, Blowfish). Consider a policy graph  $G = (V, E)$ . Let  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  be datasets.  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  are neighbors, denoted  $(D_1, D_2) \in N(G)$ , if exactly one of the following is true.

- $D_1$  and  $D_2$  differ in the value of exactly one entry such that  $(u, v) \in E$ , where  $u$  is the value of the entry in  $D_1$  and  $v$  is the value of the entry in  $D_2$ .
- $D_1$  differs from  $D_2$  in the presence of exactly one entry,  $u$ , such that  $(u, \perp) \in E$ .

$(\epsilon, G)$ -Blowfish privacy and  $(\epsilon, \delta, G)$ -Blowfish privacy are defined by applying the new definition of neighbors from Definition 2.11 to definitions 2.3 and 2.4 respectively. More formally,

**Definition 2.12** ( $(\epsilon, G)$ -Blowfish Privacy). *Let  $G$  be a policy graph. A mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfies  $(\epsilon, G)$ -Blowfish privacy if for all outputs  $S \subseteq \text{range}(M)$ , and for all neighboring datasets  $(D_1, D_2) \in N(G)$ ,*

$$\Pr[\mathcal{M}(D_1) \in S] \leq e^\epsilon \cdot \Pr[\mathcal{M}(D_2) \in S]$$

**Definition 2.13** ( $(\epsilon, \delta, G)$ -Blowfish Privacy). *Let  $G$  be a policy graph. A mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfies  $(\epsilon, \delta, G)$ -Blowfish privacy if for all outputs  $S \subseteq \text{range}(M)$ , and for all neighboring datasets  $(D_1, D_2) \in N(G)$ ,*

$$\Pr[\mathcal{M}(D_1) \in S] \leq e^\epsilon \cdot \Pr[\mathcal{M}(D_2) \in S] + \delta$$

We can assume WLOG that  $G$  is connected. Let  $u$  and  $v$  be in the same connected component and consider  $D_1 = D \cup \{u\}$  and  $D_2 = D \cup \{v\}$ . Then under  $(\epsilon, G)$ -Blowfish privacy,

$$\Pr[\mathcal{M}(D_1) \in S] \leq e^{\epsilon \cdot d(u,v)} \cdot \Pr[\mathcal{M}(D_2) \in S]$$

where  $d(u, v)$  is the shortest path between  $u$  and  $v$  in  $G$ . However, if  $u$  and  $v$  are not connected, there is no bound on probabilities; i.e., an adversary is allowed to distinguish between  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  based on some output. In particular, if  $G$  has  $c$  connected components  $C_1, \dots, C_c$ ,  $C_i = (V_i, E_i)$ , we are allowed to disclose (without any noise) which  $V_i$  every tuple in the dataset belongs to.

Therefore, we can split any workload  $\mathbf{W}$  into smaller workloads  $\mathbf{W}_1, \dots, \mathbf{W}_c$  that are column projections of the original workload, where  $\mathbf{W}_i$  only has columns corresponding to  $V_i$  (and for workload  $\mathbf{W}_i$  we consider the policy graph  $C_i$ ). We can answer each of these workloads privately and independently, and then add the resulting vectors together to compute the final noisy answer for  $\mathbf{W}$ . Therefore, we assume for the rest of the paper that  $G$  is connected.

Note that the above definitions generalize both the bounded and unbounded versions of differential privacy. We have the bounded version of differential privacy with policy graph

$$G = (V, E) \text{ such that } E = \{(u, v) \mid u, v \in \mathcal{T} - \{\perp\}\}.$$

We have unbounded differential privacy with policy graph

$$G = (V, E) \text{ such that } E = \{(u, \perp) \mid u \in \mathcal{T}\}.$$

### 3 Blowfish Matrix Mechanism

Given a Blowfish policy graph  $G$  and a workload  $\mathbf{W}$ , the sensitivity of the workload  $\mathbf{W}$  under policy  $P$  can be computed as follows.

**Definition 3.1.** *The  $L_p$  policy specific sensitivity of a query matrix  $\mathbf{W}$  with respect to policy graph  $G$  is*

$$\Delta_{(p, \mathbf{W})}(G) = \max_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') \in N(G)} \|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}'\|_p$$



Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a policy graph,  $k = |V|$  and  $n_G = |E|$ . We define a  $(k \times n_G)$  matrix  $\mathbf{P}_G$  as follows. We begin with  $|V|$  rows, one for each value in a domain, and one for  $\perp$  if appropriate; i.e., the rows of  $G$  correspond to columns of  $\mathbf{W}$ . For each edge  $(u, v) \in E$  add a column to  $\mathbf{P}_G$  with a 1 in the row corresponding to vertex  $u$ , and a  $-1$  in the row corresponding to vertex  $v$  (the order of the 1 and  $-1$  is not important) and zeros in the rest of the rows. Since we assume  $G$  is connected, every  $v \in V$  participates in at least one edge. Hence, no row of  $\mathbf{P}_G$  will contain all zeros.

For workload  $\mathbf{W}$  we denote  $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{P}_G$  as  $\mathbf{W}_G$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{W}$  be a workload, and  $G$  a policy graph.*

$$\Delta_{(p, \mathbf{W})}(G) = \max_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \text{cols}(\mathbf{W}_G)} \|\mathbf{v}_i\|_p$$

*Proof.* See Appendix. □

Specifically, notice that we defined  $\mathbf{W}_G$  in such a way that  $\Delta_{\mathbf{W}}(G) = \Delta_{\mathbf{W}_G}$ . That is, the policy specific sensitivity of  $\mathbf{W}$  is the same as the standard sensitivity of a new workload  $\mathbf{W}_G$ . We can now define the Blowfish matrix mechanism almost identically to Equation 1, but change the sensitivity to what was specified in Definition 3.1. Analogous to Theorem 2.2, we have:

**Theorem 3.2.** *Consider a workload  $\mathbf{W}$ , and Blowfish policy graph  $G$ . The error of answering  $\mathbf{W}$  using the matrix mechanism with strategy  $\mathbf{A}$  with respect to discriminative secret graph  $G$  is:*

$$\text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{A})}^G(\mathbf{W}) = P(\epsilon) \Delta_{(1, \mathbf{A}_G)}^2 \|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{A}^+\|_F^2 \quad (6)$$

$$\text{ERROR}_{(G, \mathbf{A})}^G(\mathbf{W}) = P(\epsilon, \delta) \Delta_{(2, \mathbf{A}_G)}^2 \|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{A}^+\|_F^2 \quad (7)$$

where  $P(\epsilon)$  is  $2/\epsilon$  and  $P(\epsilon, \delta)$  is  $\frac{2 \log(2/\delta)}{\epsilon^2}$ .

*Proof.* See Appendix. □

**Example 3.1.** *Consider a domain  $\mathcal{T} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k\}$  and a policy  $G_k^{\text{Line}} = (\mathcal{T}, E)$ , where  $E = \{(x_i, x_{i+1}) \mid \forall i < k\}$  (see Figure 2). That is, only adjacent domain values  $(x_i, x_{i+1})$  for a secret pair. We call this the line graph policy. Notice that under the line graph policy, the sensitivity of the cumulative histogram workload  $\mathbf{C}_k$  is exactly 1 – changing an individual record from  $x_i$  to  $x_{i+1}$  changes exactly one query (namely the count of elements from  $x_{i+1}$  to  $x_k$ ) by 1. We can also derive this mathematically.  $M = \mathbf{C}_k \times \mathbf{P}_{G_k^{\text{Line}}}$  is a  $(k \times (k - 1))$  matrix, where the first row has all zeros, and the remaining  $k - 1$  rows form the identity matrix. The standard sensitivity of  $M$  is 1, and thus the policy specific sensitivity of  $\mathbf{C}_k$  under  $G_k^{\text{Line}}$  is also 1. It is also easy to verify that the policy specific sensitivity of  $\mathbf{C}_k$  under  $G_k^\theta$  (Fig 2) is  $\theta$ .*

## 4 Transformational Equivalence

In this section, we show that considering the policy specific error of some workload  $\mathbf{W}$  is equivalent to considering the error of  $\mathbf{W}_G$  ( $\mathbf{W}$  transformed by  $\mathbf{P}_G$ ) under differential privacy. Although there is initially a restriction on the graphs for which this is true, we show that this transformational equivalence holds for all connected graphs, after some slight modification. The results in this section are used throughout the rest of the paper. We begin with the following useful lemma.

**Lemma 4.1** ([13]). *For any satisfiable linear system  $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{W}$ ,  $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{A}^+$  is a solution to the linear system and  $\|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{A}^+\|_F \leq \|\mathbf{B}\|_F$  for any solution  $\mathbf{B}$  to the linear system.*

We will use this to show the following:

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $G$  be a Blowfish policy graph and  $\mathbf{W}$  be a workload. If  $\mathbf{P}_G$  has a right inverse, then  $\mathbf{BA} = \mathbf{W}$  if and only if  $\mathbf{BA}_G = \mathbf{W}_G$ , where  $\mathbf{A}_G = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_G$ . Additionally, both  $\mathbf{WA}^+$  and  $\mathbf{W}_G\mathbf{A}_G^+$  are solutions to both  $\mathbf{BA} = \mathbf{W}$  and  $\mathbf{BA}_G = \mathbf{W}_G$ .*

*Proof.* See Appendix. □

This brings us to our crucial theorem. We use the fact that the solution spaces of  $\mathbf{BA} = \mathbf{W}$  and  $\mathbf{BA}_G = \mathbf{W}_G$  are the same in order to show that the error achieved by using strategy  $\mathbf{A}$  for workload  $\mathbf{W}$  with respect to a policy graph  $G$  is the same as the error achieved by using strategy  $\mathbf{A}_G$  for  $\mathbf{W}_G$  under differential privacy. This will allow us to directly develop lower bounds for Blowfish analogous to the SVDBound for differential privacy [13]. It will also let us find upper bounds under both  $(\epsilon, \delta, G)$ -Blowfish and  $(\epsilon, G)$ -Blowfish privacy. First we give some notation:

**Definition 4.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{W}$  be a workload, and  $G$  be a policy graph.*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MINERROR}_{\mathcal{L}}^G(\mathbf{W}) &= \min_{\mathbf{A}: \mathbf{WA}^+ = \mathbf{W}} \text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{A})}^G(\mathbf{W}) \\ \text{MINERROR}_{\mathcal{G}}^G(\mathbf{W}) &= \min_{\mathbf{A}: \mathbf{WA}^+ = \mathbf{W}} \text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{A})}^G(\mathbf{W}) \end{aligned}$$

**Theorem 4.3.** *Let  $G$  be a Blowfish policy graph. If  $\mathbf{P}_G$  has a right inverse, then we have  $\|\mathbf{WA}^+\|_F = \|\mathbf{W}_G\mathbf{A}_G^+\|_F$ . Therefore,*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{A})}^G(\mathbf{W}) &= \text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{A}_G)}(\mathbf{W}_G) \\ \text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{A})}^G(\mathbf{W}) &= \text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{A}_G)}(\mathbf{W}_G) \end{aligned}$$

*Additionally, minimum errors are equivalent. That is,*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MINERROR}_G(\mathbf{W}_G) &= \text{MINERROR}_{\mathcal{G}}^G(\mathbf{W}) \\ \text{MINERROR}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{W}_G) &= \text{MINERROR}_{\mathcal{L}}^G(\mathbf{W}) \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* See Appendix. □

The right inverse requirement seems quite restrictive at first:

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $\mathbf{M}$  be an  $m \times n$  matrix.  $\mathbf{M}$  has a right inverse if and only if its rows are linearly independent.*

*Proof.* See Appendix. □

In other words,  $\mathbf{P}_G$  must have at least as many columns as it has rows, and must be full rank. It is easy to check that this is not true of  $\mathbf{P}_G$  for most graphs  $G$ . For instance,  $P_G^{\text{Line}}$  (Fig 2) has only  $k - 1$  columns and  $k$  rows. Fortunately, for every connected  $G$ , we can slightly modify the workload  $\mathbf{W}$  to  $\mathbf{W}'$  and  $\mathbf{P}_G$  to  $\mathbf{P}'_G$  such that (i) the minimum error for answering  $\mathbf{W}'$  under  $\mathbf{P}'_G$  is the same as the minimum error for  $\mathbf{W}$  under  $\mathbf{P}_G$ , and (ii)  $\mathbf{P}'_G$  is full rank and thus has a right inverse.

To begin, suppose  $\mathbf{W}$  has at least one column with all zeros. We can safely eliminate those columns from  $\mathbf{W}$  and the corresponding rows from  $\mathbf{P}_G$  (recall that columns in  $\mathbf{W}$  and rows in  $\mathbf{P}_G$  correspond to values in  $\mathcal{T}$ ). These changes do not affect the sensitivity of  $\mathbf{W}_G$ , since these changes only change  $\mathbf{W}$  by removing an all zeros column, and any good strategy for answering  $\mathbf{W}_G$  will

also have zeros in those columns. Thus we can consider these modified matrices without affecting any of our results. We next show: (a) the resulting  $\mathbf{P}'_G$  is full rank for every connected graph, and (b) every workload  $\mathbf{W}$  can be converted to an equivalent workload  $\mathbf{W}'$  when considering databases in  $\mathcal{I}_n$ . We state the former as a lemma, and explain the latter thus showing that our results apply to all connected graphs.

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a Blowfish policy graph and assume  $G$  is connected. Removing any row of  $\mathbf{P}_G$  results in a full rank matrix.*

*Proof.* See Appendix. □

Recall that we assume  $G$  is a connected graph. Let  $\mathbf{W}$  be a workload, and assume that  $\mathbf{W}$  has at least one column with all zeros. Then we can delete that column and the corresponding row of  $\mathbf{P}_G$  without affecting  $\mathbf{W}_G$  (we are simply removing a zero column of  $\mathbf{W}_G$ , and these can be ignored anyways). The modified version of  $\mathbf{P}_G$  is full rank, and therefore has a right inverse. To show that the workload has at least one column with all zeros, first consider the case where  $\perp$  is in the graph. We must add an all zeros column of to  $\mathbf{W}$  that corresponds with  $\perp$ , so  $\mathbf{W}$  already has a zero column.

If  $\perp$  is not in  $G$ , recall that come from  $\mathcal{I}_n$ ; that is the size of the database  $n$  is known. The size of the database can be cast as a linear query  $Q_n = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$ . Any linear query  $Q = (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_k)$  can be answered if we know the answer to  $\bar{Q} = Q - q_1 \cdot Q_n = (0, q_2 - q_1, \dots, q_k - q_1)$ . Moreover, the error in answering  $Q$  is the same as the error in answering  $\bar{Q}$  since they differ in a scalar ( $q_1 \cdot n$ ).

Thus given a linear query workload  $\mathbf{W}$ , pick some  $v \in \mathcal{T}$ . Denote by  $\mathbf{V}$  the workload,  $\mathbf{W}[:, v] \times Q_n$ , where  $\mathbf{W}[:, v]$  is the column in the workload corresponding to  $v$  and  $Q_n$  is  $(1 \times k)$  all ones vector. It is easy to verify that  $\mathbf{W}' = \mathbf{W} - \mathbf{V}$  has all zeros in the column corresponding to  $v$ .

**Example 4.1.** *In  $\mathbf{C}_k$ , the first row is  $Q_n$ . Since we already know  $n$ , we don't need to answer that query privately. We can equivalently consider a workload  $\mathbf{C}'_k$  with all zeros in the first row and removing the first column (since it would have all zeros). Consider the line graph  $G_k^{Line}$ . Removing the first row from  $\mathbf{P}_{G_k^{Line}}$  would result in a  $(k-1) \times (k-1)$  matrix that is full rank (and actually the inverse of  $\mathbf{C}'_k$ ).*

## 5 Error Lower Bounds under Blowfish

In this section we present a lower bound on the minimum error needed to answer a workload under the  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -matrix mechanism with respect to any given Blowfish policy graph  $G$  (Section 5.1), then compare this lower bound to the differential privacy lower bound for various classes of queries and graphs (Section 5.2).

### 5.1 Extended Matrix Mechanism Blowfish Lower Bound

The main result of Li and Miklau [13] is that the minimum error is related to the singular value decomposition of the workload matrix.

**Theorem 5.1** ([13]). *Let  $\mathbf{W}$  be a be an  $m \times n$  workload.*

$$\text{MINERROR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{W}) \geq P(\epsilon, \delta) \frac{1}{n} (\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_s)^2$$

where  $P(\epsilon, \delta) = \frac{2 \log(2/\delta)}{\epsilon^2}$  and  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s$  are the singular values of  $\mathbf{W}$ .




Figure 3: Lower bounds for workloads under Blowfish policies

Our lower bound follows immediately by combining Theorems 5.1 and 4.3.

**Corollary 5.2.** *Let  $G$  be a Blowfish policy graph, and let  $\mathbf{W}$  be a workload. If  $\mathbf{P}_G$  has a right inverse,*

$$\text{MINERROR}_G^G(\mathbf{W}) \geq P(\epsilon, \delta) \frac{1}{n_G} (\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_s)^2$$

where  $P(\epsilon, \delta) = \frac{2 \log(2/\delta)}{\epsilon^2}$ ,  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s$  are the singular values of  $\mathbf{W}_G$ , and  $n_G$  is the number of columns of  $\mathbf{W}_G$  (same as the number of edges in  $G$ ).

*Proof.* See Appendix. □

Note that  $s$  is the number of singular values of  $\mathbf{W}_G$ , and therefore if  $\mathbf{W}_G$  is  $q \times n_G$ ,  $s = \min(q, n_G)$ .

By Lemma 4.5, this lower bound applies for all connected graphs.

As a corollary, since Blowfish with the complete graph results in bounded differential privacy, this also gives us a lower bound for bounded differential privacy, whereas Theorem 5.1 applies only to unbounded differential privacy.

## 5.2 Example Lower Bounds

Figure 3 illustrates the lower bound (from Corollary 5.2) on linear workloads under Blowfish policy. We consider the cumulative histogram workload  $\mathbf{C}_k$ , workloads for all one dimensional ranges queries ( $\mathbf{R}_k$ ) and all two dimensional ranges ( $\mathbf{R}_{k^2}$ ), and workloads for all one way marginals and all two way marginals.

### 5.2.1 Cumulative Histogram Workload

For  $\mathbf{C}_k$  and range query workloads we consider  $G_k^\theta$ , a generalization of the line graph  $G_k^{Line}$ . Under this graph, domain values are connected if the differences in indices is less than  $\theta$ . That is, two values  $(x_i, x_j)$  are connected if  $|i - j| \leq \theta$ .

Figure 3(a) illustrates the relationship between the lower bound on error and size of the domain. We plot the original lower bound for unbounded differential privacy (from [13]) and the new lower bounds we derived for Blowfish policies  $G_k^\theta$  for various values of  $\theta$ . The lower bounds are shown for  $\epsilon = 1$  and  $\delta = 0.001$ . The trends look similar for other values of  $\epsilon$  and  $\delta$ , and hence are omitted.

For  $\mathbf{C}_k$  and the line graph  $G_k^{\theta=1}$ , we analytically derive the lower bound as  $P(\epsilon, \delta) \cdot k$ ; i.e., linear in the domain size.

**Theorem 5.3.** *Any data oblivious mechanism to answer the cumulative histogram workload  $\mathbf{C}_k$  has error at least  $\Omega(k/\epsilon^2)$ .*

*Proof.* See proof of Theorem 6.3 □

We show later (see Section 6.2.2) that MINERROR for  $\mathbf{C}_k$  under  $G_k^\theta$  is at most  $P(\epsilon, \delta) \cdot k \log^3(\theta)$ . Whereas, there is no known strategy for answering  $\mathbf{C}_k$  under differential privacy with error linear in the domain size (as illustrated by Fig 3(a)).

### 5.2.2 All Range Queries Workload

Consider a multidimensional domain  $\mathcal{T} = [a, b]^d$ , where  $[a, b]$  denotes the set of integers between  $a$  and  $b$  (inclusive). Let  $k = (b - a + 1)$  denote the size of each dimension. A multidimensional range query is a  $d$ -dimensional hypercube represented by the top left corner  $\mathbf{x}$  and the bottom right corner  $\mathbf{y}$ . Let  $\mathbf{R}_{k^d}$  denote the workload of all such  $d$  dimensional range queries. In 1D, this corresponds to all intervals  $[x, y]$  such that  $a \leq x \leq y \leq b$ . Again, let  $\mathbf{R}_k$  denote the workload of all such one dimensional range queries. In two dimensions, queries are all rectangles in  $[a, b]^2$ .

We consider the following policy graph  $G_{k^d}^\theta$ : all points in  $[a, b]^d$  are vertices in the graph. Two points  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$  and  $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_d)$  are connected if the Manhattan distance between the points is at most  $\theta$ ; that is:  $\sum_{i=1}^d |x_i - y_i| \leq \theta$ . In 1D, this corresponds to the policy  $G_k^\theta$  that was defined in Section 5.2, and  $G_k^1$  is the line graph. In  $d$  dimensions,  $G_{k^d}^1$  corresponds to a grid graph, where each node  $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d)$  is connected to  $2d$  other nodes  $(x_1 \pm 1, x_2, \dots, x_d)$ ,  $(x_1, x_2 \pm 1, \dots, x_d), \dots (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d \pm 1)$ .

Figures 3(b), and 3(e) illustrate the relationship between the lower bound on error and size of the domain for 1D and 2D range query workloads. Again, we plot the original lower bound for unbounded differential privacy (from [13]) and the new lower bounds we derived for Blowfish policies  $G_k^\theta$  for various values of  $\theta$ . Additionally, we show a lower bound for bounded differential privacy, which is obtained by using the complete graph for  $G$ .

For the one dimensional all range query workloads we see that minimum error under unbounded differential privacy increases faster than the minimum error under  $G_k^\theta$  for sufficiently large domain sizes. For two dimensional ranges,  $G_{k^d}^\theta$  is only better than unbounded differential privacy for  $\theta = 1$ . However, all values of  $\theta$  perform better than bounded differential privacy. Note that for sets of linear queries, it is possible for the sensitivity of a workload under bounded differential privacy to be twice the sensitivity of the workload under unbounded differential privacy.

### 5.2.3 All $m$ -way Marginals Workload

In the all  $m$ -way marginals workload, we consider a domain consisting of  $d$  binary attributes  $\mathcal{T} = A_1 \times A_2 \times \dots \times A_d$  (or strings from  $\{0, 1\}^d$ ). Given any subset  $C$  of attributes, the  $C$ -

Workload	Error per query		
		Blowfish	$\epsilon$ -Diff. Privacy [18]
$\mathbf{C}_k$	$G_k^1$	$\Theta(1/\epsilon^2)$	$O(\log^3 k/\epsilon^2)$
	$G_k^\theta$	$O(\log^3 \theta/\epsilon^2)$	
$\mathbf{R}_k$	$G_k^1$	$\Theta(1/\epsilon^2)$	$O(\log^3 k/\epsilon^2)$
	$\mathbf{R}_{k^2}$	$G_{k^2}^1$	
$\mathbf{R}_{k^d}$	$G_{k^d}^1$	$O(\frac{d^3 \log^{3(d-1)} k}{\epsilon^2})$	$O(\log^{3d} k/\epsilon^2)$
	$G_{k^d}^\theta$	$O(\theta^2 \cdot \frac{d^3 \log^{3(d-1)} k}{\epsilon^2})$	

Figure 4: Summary of results.  $\mathbf{C}_k$  is the cumulative histogram workload with domain size  $k$ .  $\mathbf{R}_{k^d}$  is the  $d$  dimensional all range queries workload where each dimension has a domain size of  $k$ .

marginal is the projection of the domain  $\mathcal{T}$  on  $C$ . That is, for every combination of values of the attributes in  $C$ , the count of tuples having those values are reported. Thus, if  $|C| = m$ , the  $C$ -marginal corresponds to  $2^m$  queries. The *all  $m$ -way marginal* workload releases marginals for all possible attribute subsets of size  $m$ .

Rather than considering Blowfish policies with the line graph or its generalizations, we consider graphs  $G_{2^d}^h = (V, E)$ , where  $V = \{0, 1\}^d$  corresponds to  $d$  bit strings, and  $(u, v) \in E$  are connected if they have Hamming distance of at most  $h$ ; i.e. they differ in at most  $h$  attributes. Note that the graph  $G_{2^d}^{h=1}$  corresponds to the ‘attributes’ sensitive information described in [10, 9].

Figures 3(c) and 3(d) illustrate the lower bounds for the all 1-way marginals workload and all 2-way marginals workload respectively, for varying numbers of attributes. Again, we plot the minimum error for unbounded differential privacy (from [13]) and the new lower bounds we derived for Blowfish policies  $G_{2^d}^h$  for  $h = 1, 2$ , as well as the minimum error for bounded differential privacy.

## 6 Upper Bounds

In this section, we derive upper bounds on the error (and in some cases near optimal strategies) under the extended matrix mechanism framework for answering workloads under  $(\epsilon, G)$ -Blowfish privacy for different policies. In Section 6.1 we describe our general approach to finding strategies, and the tools and techniques that we use. In Section 6.2, we derive near optimal strategies for answering  $\mathbf{C}_k$  under  $G_k^\theta$ . In Section 6.3, we present strategies for answering multidimensional range queries under multidimensional grid variant of  $G_k^\theta$ . Figure 4 summarizes our upper bounds.

### 6.1 Techniques

To find optimal strategies, we can use the matrix mechanism directly. However, the matrix mechanism is inefficient and  $\mathbf{W}_G$  will potentially be much larger than  $\mathbf{W}$  (especially when  $G$  is dense). Instead, we use existing literature on strategies for differential privacy to find strategies for Blowfish. We will use two main techniques. The first (Section 6.1.1) uses an application of the idea of transformation equivalence, developed in Section 4. The second (Section 6.1.2) involves finding subgraphs of the policy graph  $G$ , which approximate  $G$  but are easier to work with.

#### 6.1.1 Transformational Equivalence

Theorem 4.3 shows that the error for workload  $\mathbf{W}$  using strategy  $\mathbf{A}$  under policy graph  $G$  is equal to the error for  $\mathbf{W}_G = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{P}_G$  using strategy  $\mathbf{A}_G$  under both bounded and unbounded differential

privacy. Hence, we adopt the following general strategy:

- Given  $\mathbf{W}$ , convert to  $\mathbf{W}_G = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{P}_G$ .
- Find some strategy  $\mathbf{A}_G$  to answer  $\mathbf{W}_G$  with low error under differential privacy.
- Use  $\mathbf{A}_G\mathbf{P}_G^{-1}$  to answer  $\mathbf{W}$ .

Based on Theorem 4.3, it is easy to show that if  $\mathbf{A}$  can answer  $\mathbf{W}_G$  with near optimal error, then  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_G^{-1}$  is a near optimal strategy for  $\mathbf{W}$ .

**Corollary 6.1.** *Let  $c \geq 1$  be some real number. Let  $G$  be a Blowfish policy graph,  $\mathbf{W}$  be a linear workload and  $\mathbf{A}$  be a strategy for answering the workload. Let  $\mathbf{W}_G = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{P}_G$  and  $\mathbf{A}_G = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_G$ . Then,  $\text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{Z}, \mathbf{A})}^G(\mathbf{W}) \leq c \cdot \text{MINERROR}_{\mathcal{Z}}^G(\mathbf{W})$  if and only if  $\text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{Z}, \mathbf{A}_G)}(\mathbf{W}_G) \leq c \cdot \text{MINERROR}_{\mathcal{Z}}(\mathbf{W}_G)$ , for both  $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{L}$ .*

*Proof.* See Appendix. □

Note that when we directly find a strategy for  $\mathbf{W}_G$ , we call it  $\mathbf{A}_G$ . This way, we let  $\mathbf{A}_G\mathbf{P}_G^{-1}$ , which is a strategy for  $\mathbf{W}$  with equivalent error, be called  $\mathbf{A}$ . Then we have  $\mathbf{A}_G = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_G$  which is consistent with the rest of the paper.

An important consequence of the above corollary (which we will use later) is that if we know an optimal strategy  $\mathbf{A}_G$  (or  $c = 1$  in the above Corollary) for answering  $\mathbf{W}_G$  under differential privacy, the strategy  $\mathbf{A}_G\mathbf{P}_G^{-1}$  is an optimal strategy for answering  $\mathbf{W}$  under the Blowfish policy graph  $G$ . Theorem 4.3 and Corollary 6.1 allow us to leverage the rich literature on the matrix mechanism for differential privacy to design efficient mechanisms for answering workloads under Blowfish. We would like to point out that the error equivalence in Theorem 4.3 and Corollary 6.1 applies both to the total error as well as the error per query, since the number of queries in  $\mathbf{W}$  and  $\mathbf{W}_G$  are the same.

### 6.1.2 Subgraph Approximation

Our technique from the previous section only works if  $\mathbf{W}_G$  is well studied, or similar to well studied workloads. Although this is sometimes the case, depending on  $G$ ,  $\mathbf{W}_G$  may be very different from standard workloads. In this case, it is sometimes possible to sacrifice an additional constant factor  $\ell^2$  in error to change  $G$  to some graph  $G'$  such that  $\mathbf{W}_{G'}$  is more similar to a well studied workload. The factor  $\ell$  is related to ratio of the distances between vertices in  $G$  and  $G'$ .

**Lemma 6.2.** *[Subgraph Approximation] Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a policy graph. Let  $G' = (V, E')$  be a subgraph, such that every  $(u, v) \in E$  is connected in  $G'$  by a path of length  $\leq \ell$ . Then for any workload  $\mathbf{W}$ , we have*

$$\Delta_{(p, \mathbf{W})}(G') \leq \Delta_{(p, \mathbf{W})}(G) \leq \ell \cdot \Delta_{(p, \mathbf{W})}(G')$$

*Proof.* See Appendix. □

Thus, if we can find a subgraph  $G'$  of  $G$  which approximates  $G$ , we can use  $\mathbf{W}_{G'}$  and lose only an  $\ell^2$  factor in the error. In some cases, we will be able to find a  $\mathbf{W}_{G'}$  which is much easier to work with. Section 6.2.2 gives an application of this idea.

We illustrate all these tools in the following sections. We focus on  $(\epsilon, G)$ -Blowfish privacy for different policy graphs (unless otherwise specified). Analogous upper bounds can be derived for  $(\epsilon, \delta, G)$ -Blowfish by using Gaussian noise; we defer details to a full version of the paper.

## 6.2 Near Optimal Strategies for $\mathbf{C}_k$

We give strategies for answering the cumulative histogram workload,  $\mathbf{C}_k$ , where  $k$  is the size of the domain. We begin by giving an optimal strategy for answering  $\mathbf{C}_k$  under a line graph. Next, we use Lemma 6.2 to find a near optimal strategy for answering  $\mathbf{C}_k$  under  $G_k^\theta$ . Additionally, we analyze the strategy that we produce for  $\mathbf{C}_k$ , and show why it produces near optimal error.

### 6.2.1 $\mathbf{C}_k$ under the line graph

In Example 3.1, we showed that the policy specific global sensitivity of  $\mathbf{C}_k$  under the line graph policy  $G_k^{Line}$  is 1. Thus it seems like the optimal strategy for answering  $\mathbf{C}_k$  under line graph policy is to add independent noise (Laplace for  $\epsilon$ - and Gaussian for  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ - differential privacy) to each of the queries in  $\mathbf{C}_k$  resulting in  $\Theta(1/\epsilon^2)$  error for each of the counts in  $\mathbf{C}_k$ . We can formally prove that this is the optimal strategy using Corollary 6.1.

**Theorem 6.3.** *Let  $\mathbf{C}_k$  be the cumulative histogram workload, and let  $G_k^{Line}$  be the line graph. Then  $\mathbf{C}_k$  can be answered with  $\Theta(1/\epsilon^2)$  error per query under  $(\epsilon, G_k^{Line})$ - as well as  $(\epsilon, \delta, G_k^{Line})$ -Blowfish privacy. Moreover, this is optimal.*

*Proof.* We first modify  $\mathbf{C}_k$  and  $P_{G_k^{Line}}$  as per Example 4.1. The first row (query) in  $\mathbf{C}_k$  is  $Q_n$ , which returns the number of elements in the database. Since this query is already known, we can replace it with all zeros. The first row and column of  $\mathbf{C}_k$  can be eliminated, producing  $\mathbf{C}'_k$  (which is the same as  $\mathbf{C}_{k-1}$ ). We remove the corresponding row (first) from  $\mathbf{P}_{G_k^{Line}}$  to get  $\mathbf{P}'_{G_k^{Line}}$ .

Now, it is easy to check that  $\mathbf{C}'_k \mathbf{P}'_{G_k^{Line}}$  is the identity matrix  $\mathbf{I}_{k-1}$  (or the histogram query). The optimal strategy for answering the histogram query under differential privacy is to add independent noise to each of the counts; i.e., the optimal strategy is  $\mathbf{I}_{k-1}$ . Hence, from Corollary 6.1, the optimal strategy for answering  $\mathbf{C}'_k$  under the line graph policy is  $\mathbf{I}_{k-1} \mathbf{P}'_{(G_k^{Line})}^{-1} = \mathbf{C}'_k$ . Thus the optimal strategy for answering the cumulative histogram workload under the line graph policy is to just use the Laplace (or Gaussian) mechanism.  $\square$

### 6.2.2 $\mathbf{C}_k$ under $G_k^\theta$


In Example 3.1, we also saw that the  $L_1$  sensitivity of  $\mathbf{C}_k$  under  $G_k^\theta$  is  $\theta$ . Thus, the Laplace mechanism that adds  $Lap(\theta/\epsilon)$  noise ensures  $\epsilon$ -differential privacy with  $2\theta^2/\epsilon^2$  error per query. We can show a near optimal and efficient strategy for answering  $\mathbf{C}_k$  under  $(\epsilon, G_k^\theta)$ -Blowfish privacy with noise that only has a polylogarithmic dependence on  $\theta$  – a much smaller error for large  $\theta$ .

**Theorem 6.4.** *Let  $\mathbf{C}_k$  be the cumulative histogram workload, and let  $G_k^\theta$  be the graph which connects all vertices within distance  $\theta$  along a line.  $\mathbf{C}_k$  can be answered with  $O(\frac{\log^3 \theta}{\epsilon^2})$  error per query under  $(\epsilon, G_k^\theta)$ -Blowfish privacy.*

*Proof.* We derive our strategy for answering  $\mathbf{C}_k$  under a slightly different discriminative secret graph  $\hat{G}_k^\theta$  (Fig 2), which is a spanning tree of  $G_k^\theta$ . Recall that in  $G_k^\theta$  vertices  $i$  and  $j$  are connected if they are no more than  $\theta$  apart (i.e.,  $|i - j| \leq \theta$ ). We construct  $\hat{G}_k^\theta$  by connecting vertex  $j$  to  $i$  if  $i - \theta \leq j < i$ . We discard all other edges of  $G_k^\theta$ . Observe that for every edge  $(u, v)$  in  $G_k^\theta$ , either  $(u, v)$  already appears in  $\hat{G}_k^\theta$ , or  $u$  and  $v$  are connected by a path of length 3. Thus by Lemma 6.2, we can focus on designing a strategy for answering  $\mathbf{C}_k$  under the spanning tree  $\hat{G}_k^\theta$ , and the error under  $G_k^\theta$  is at most 9 times the error under  $\hat{G}_k^\theta$ .



$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C}_\theta^T & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{C}_\theta^T & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{C}_\theta^T \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_\theta & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{H}_\theta & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{H}_\theta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{S}_\theta & \mathbf{1} & \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{S}_\theta & \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{S}_\theta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

(a) Strategy matrices for  $m = 3$ (b)  $\mathbf{S}_\theta$ , for  $\theta = 8$ (c) Strategy  $\mathbf{A}$  explained ( $m = 3, \theta = 8$ )Figure 5: Deriving the strategy for answering  $\mathbf{C}'_k$  under the discriminative secret graph  $\hat{G}_k^\theta$ 

Again like in Sec 6.2.1, we consider  $\mathbf{C}'_k = \mathbf{C}_{k-1}$ , and the matrix  $\mathbf{P}'_{\hat{G}_k^\theta}$  after dropping the first row from  $\mathbf{P}_{\hat{G}_k^\theta}$ . We now have both  $\mathbf{C}'_k$  and  $\mathbf{P}'_{\hat{G}_k^\theta}$  as  $(k-1) \times (k-1)$  square full rank matrices. For ease of exposition, let  $k = m \cdot \theta + 1$  for some integer  $m$ . Additionally, let  $\theta = 2^b$ ,  $b \geq 0$ .

To construct the near optimal strategy for  $\mathbf{C}'_k$  under  $\hat{G}_k^\theta$ , consider  $\mathbf{C}'_{\hat{G}_k^\theta} = \mathbf{C}'_k \mathbf{P}'_{\hat{G}_k^\theta}$ .  $\mathbf{C}'_{\hat{G}_k^\theta}$  is a  $m \cdot \theta \times m \cdot \theta$  square matrix, where the  $\theta \times \theta$  blocks along the diagonal each correspond to  $\mathbf{C}_\theta^T$  ( $\mathbf{C}_\theta^T$  is the transpose of  $\mathbf{C}_\theta$ ) and all other entries are zero. Figure 5(a) illustrates  $\mathbf{C}'_{\hat{G}_k^\theta}$  for  $m = 3$ . Recent work has shown that a near optimal differentially private strategy (unbiased, linear and data independent) for answering  $\mathbf{C}_\theta$  is the hierarchical strategy  $\mathbf{H}_\theta$  [5, 12, 8] (with error  $O(\log^3(\theta)/\epsilon^2)$  per query). Thus we can answer  $\mathbf{C}'_{\hat{G}_k^\theta}$  by answering every  $\mathbf{C}_\theta^T$  in  $\mathbf{C}'_{\hat{G}_k^\theta}$  using  $\mathbf{H}_\theta$ . Call this strategy  $\mathbf{A}_{\hat{G}_k^\theta}$  (Fig 5(a)).

By Theorem 4.3 we can answer  $\mathbf{C}'_{m \cdot \theta}$  with  $O(\log^3(\theta)/\epsilon^2)$  error per query under  $\hat{G}_{m \cdot \theta + 1}^\theta$  by using strategy  $\mathbf{A}_{\hat{G}_k^\theta} \mathbf{P}'_{\hat{G}_k^\theta}^{-1}$ . By Corollary 6.1, this must also be near optimal.  $\square$

To illustrate this further, we now provide an alternate proof for the above theorem which does not use Theorem 4.3. Instead, we examine  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}_{\hat{G}_k^\theta} \mathbf{P}'_{\hat{G}_k^\theta}^{-1}$  directly, and show that is indeed a good strategy for  $\mathbf{C}'_k$  under  $\hat{G}_k^\theta$ . Consequently, this is also a good strategy under policy graph  $G_k^\theta$ .

Note that by construction, the policy specific sensitivity of  $\mathbf{A}$  is the same as the global sensitivity of  $\mathbf{A}_{\hat{G}_k^\theta}$ ; the  $L_1$  sensitivity is  $1 + \log \theta = 1 + b$ . Thus,  $\mathbf{C}'_k$  can be released privately by answering  $\mathbf{A}$  using the Laplace mechanism with sensitivity  $(1 + b)$ .

The strategy  $\mathbf{A}$  is explained in Figure 5(c).  $\mathbf{A}$  divides the domain  $\mathcal{T} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{m\theta}\}$  into  $m$  blocks of size  $\theta$  and releases the same type of counts for each block. Consider the first block (and the counts are similar in the other blocks).  $\mathbf{A}$  releases a set  $C_{\mathbf{A}}$  of  $1 + \log \theta = 1 + b$  cumulative counts  $\{c_1, c_{1+2^{b-1}}, c_{1+2^{b-1}+2^{b-2}}, \dots, c_{1+2^{b-1}+2^{b-2}+\dots+2^0}\}$ , where  $c_i$  is the sum of the counts of domain elements  $x_i \dots x_{m\theta}$ . Additionally,  $\mathbf{A}$  releases  $\log \theta = b$  hierarchical counts  $\mathbf{H}_{2^{b-1}}, \mathbf{H}_{2^{b-2}}, \dots, \mathbf{H}_1$  for the cumulative counts  $c_j$  that are not covered in the set  $C_{\mathbf{A}}$ . Using the example of  $\theta = 8$  in Figure 5(c),  $\mathbf{A}$  releases hierarchical counts  $\mathbf{H}_4$  for elements  $\{x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5\}$ ,  $\mathbf{H}_2$  for elements

$\{x_6, x_7\}$  and the count of  $x_8$ . It is easy to see that any cumulative count  $c_j$  can be answered using at most  $1 + b$  counts from  $\mathbf{A}$ . Thus, the total error for answering any single cumulative count is  $O(\frac{(1+\log \theta)^3}{\epsilon^2})$  for  $(\epsilon, \hat{G}_k^\theta)$ - and  $(\epsilon, G_k^\theta)$ -Blowfish privacy.

### 6.3 Multidimensional AllRange Queries

We now give strategies for answering multidimensional AllRange queries under Blowfish. We defined multidimensional range query workloads and policy graph  $G_{k^d}^\theta$  in Section 5.2.2.

#### 6.3.1 $\mathbf{R}_k$ under $G_k^1$

We begin with the case where  $\theta$  is 1. In the one dimensional case, this will be a line graph.

**Theorem 6.5.** *Workload  $\mathbf{R}_k$  can be answered with  $\Theta(1/\epsilon^2)$  error per query under  $(\epsilon, G_k^1)$ -Blowfish privacy.*

*Proof.* Consider one range query. The only places where the values of columns differ are at the two ends of the range. Therefore, multiplying by  $G_k^1$  will result in a 1 or -1 at the ends of the range, unless the range started at one of the ends in which case the new query will be a single 1 or -1.  $\mathbf{R}_{G_k^1} = \mathbf{R}_k \mathbf{P}_{G_k^1}$  will have  $\binom{k-1}{2} + 2(k-1)$  rows. We can answer using strategy  $\mathbf{I}_{k-1}$ . Each query in  $\mathbf{R}_{G_k^1}$  can be represented as a combination of at most 2 queries in  $\mathbf{I}_{k-1}$ , and the sensitivity of  $\mathbf{I}_{k-1}$  is 1. Therefore, we can add  $Lap(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$  noise to each row of  $\mathbf{I}_{k-1}$ , and each query in  $\mathbf{R}_{G_k^1}$  can then be answered with at most  $\frac{4}{\epsilon^2}$  error. Therefore, We can use strategy  $\mathbf{I}_{k-1} \mathbf{P}_{G_k^1}^{-1}$  to answer  $\mathbf{R}_{G_k^1}$  under  $(\epsilon, G_k^1)$ - Blowfish privacy. By Theorem 4.3, this will also have error  $\Theta(1/\epsilon^2)$  per query.  $\square$

The best known strategy (with minimum error) for answering  $\mathbf{R}_k$  under  $\epsilon$ -differential privacy is the Privelet strategy [18] with a much larger asymptotic error of  $O(\log^3 k/\epsilon^2)$  per query.

#### 6.3.2 $\mathbf{R}_{k^d}$ under $G_{k^d}^1$

Next, consider  $d$  dimensional range queries. In this case,  $G_{k^d}^1$  is a grid with  $k^d$  vertices and  $2d \cdot k^d$  edges.

**Theorem 6.6.** *Workload  $\mathbf{R}_{k^d}$  can be answered with*

$$O\left(\frac{d^3 \log^{3(d-1)} k}{\epsilon^2}\right)$$

*error per query under  $(\epsilon, G_{k^d}^1)$ -Blowfish privacy.*

*Proof.* For some range query, the corresponding query in  $\mathbf{R}_{G_{k^d}^1} = \mathbf{R}_{k^d} \mathbf{P}_{G_{k^d}^1}$  will essentially be the bounding box of the  $d$  dimensional query hyperrectangle. That is, we can answer this query by answering all  $2d(d-1)$ -dimensional “faces” of this bounding box under differential privacy. Therefore, we reduce the problem to answering  $(d-1)$ -dimensional range queries under differential privacy.

To begin, we must split our epsilon budget  $d$  ways in order to answer all range queries for each dimension. That is, we must answer  $\mathbf{R}_{k^{d-1}}$   $d$  times, once for each dimension, under  $\frac{\epsilon}{d}$ -differential privacy. By composition, answering all of these workloads satisfies  $\epsilon$ -differential privacy. Using the Privelet framework [18], we can answer a  $d-1$  dimensional range query under  $\frac{\epsilon}{d}$ -differential privacy with  $O(\frac{\log^{3(d-1)} k}{\epsilon^2/d^2}) = O(\frac{d^2 \log^{3(d-1)} k}{\epsilon^2})$ . Let  $\mathbf{B}$  be this strategy matrix: the noisy answers to all

$d-1$ -dimensional range queries for each of the  $d$  dimensions. Each  $d$ -dimensional bounding box has  $2d$  faces, and this bounding box query can therefore be answered using  $2d$  rows from  $\mathbf{B}$ . Therefore, the error of answering each query in  $\mathbf{R}_{G_{k^d}^1}$  is  $O(2d \cdot \frac{d^2 \log^{3(d-1)} k}{\epsilon^2}) = O(\frac{d^3 \log^{3(d-1)} k}{\epsilon^2})$ . By Theorem 4.3,  $\mathbf{R}_{k^d}$  can be answered using strategy  $\mathbf{BP}_{G_{k^d}^1}^{-1}$  with  $O(\frac{d^3 \log^{3(d-1)} k}{\epsilon^2})$  error per query under Blowfish policy graph  $G_{k^d}^1$ .  $\square$

If we consider  $d$  to be a constant, then we get a  $\Omega(\log^3 k)$  factor better error than differential privacy using Privelet [18]. In the two dimensional case, we achieve  $O(\frac{\log^3 k}{\epsilon^2})$  error per query under Blowfish policy graph  $G_{k^2}^1$ , while Privelet achieves  $O(\frac{\log^6 k}{\epsilon^2})$  error per query under differential privacy.

### 6.3.3 $\mathbf{R}_{k^d}$ under $G_{k^d}^\theta$

If we wish to consider  $G_{k^d}^\theta$ , we can use the same strategy as  $G_{k^d}^1$  and our error will be worse by a factor of  $\theta^2$ .

**Corollary 6.7.** *Workload  $\mathbf{R}_{k^d}$  can be answered with*

$$O(\theta^2 \cdot \frac{d^3 \log^{3(d-1)} k}{\epsilon^2})$$

*error per query under  $(\epsilon, G_{k^d}^\theta)$ -Blowfish privacy.*

*Proof.* This follows from Lemma 6.2 and Theorem 6.6. For each pair of nodes  $u$  and  $v$  such that  $(u, v)$  is an edge in  $G_{k^d}^\theta$ ,  $u$  and  $v$  are connected by a path of at most  $\theta$  in  $G_{k^d}^1$ .  $\square$

This strategy is a good one as long as  $\theta$  is a small constant. As  $\theta$  grows, according to our lower bound results the minimum error under  $(\epsilon, G_{k^d}^\theta)$ -Blowfish privacy approaches the minimum error under  $\epsilon$ -bounded differential privacy.

## 7 Conclusions

We systematically analyzed error bounds on linear counting query workload under the Blowfish privacy framework. We showed that the error incurred when answering a workload under Blowfish is identical to the error incurred when answering a transformed workload under differential privacy, where the transformation only depends on the policy graph. This, in conjunction with a subgraph approximation result, helped us derive lower and upper bounds for linear counting queries under the Blowfish privacy framework. We showed that workloads can be answered with significantly smaller amounts of error per query under Blowfish privacy compared to differential privacy, suggesting the utility of Blowfish privacy policies in practical utility driven applications.

## References

- [1] A. Bhaskara, D. Dadush, R. Krishnaswamy, and K. Talwar. Unconditional differentially private mechanisms for linear queries. In *Proceedings of the 44th symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 1269–1284. ACM, 2012.
- [2] C. Dwork. Differential privacy. In *ICALP*, 2006.

- [3] C. Dwork, K. Kenthapadi, F. McSherry, I. Mironov, and M. Naor. Our data, ourselves: Privacy via distributed noise generation. In *EUROCRYPT*, pages 486–503, 2006.
- [4] C. Dwork, F. McSherry, K. Nissim, and A. Smith. Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis. In *TCC*, pages 265–284, 2006.
- [5] C. Dwork, M. Naor, T. Pitassi, and G. N. Rothblum. Differential privacy under continual observation. In *STOC*, pages 715–724, 2010.
- [6] A. Ghosh, T. Roughgarden, and M. Sundararajan. Universally utility-maximizing privacy mechanisms. In *STOC*, pages 351–360, 2009.
- [7] M. Hardt and K. Talwar. On the geometry of differential privacy. In *STOC*, pages 705–714, 2010.
- [8] M. Hay, V. Rastogi, G. Miklau, and D. Suciu. Boosting the accuracy of differentially-private queries through consistency. In *PVLDB*, pages 1021–1032, 2010.
- [9] X. He, A. Machanavajjhala, and B. Ding. Blowfish privacy: Tuning privacy-utility trade-offs using policies. *CoRR*, abs/1312.3913, 2013.
- [10] X. He, A. Machanavajjhala, and B. Ding. Blowfish privacy: Tuning privacy-utility trade-offs using policies. In *To appear, SIGMOD*, 2014.
- [11] D. Kifer and A. Machanavajjhala. A rigorous and customizable framework for privacy. In *PODS*, 2012.
- [12] C. Li, M. Hay, V. Rastogi, G. Miklau, and A. McGregor. Optimizing histogram queries under differential privacy. In *PODS*, pages 123–134, 2010.
- [13] C. Li and G. Miklau. Optimal error of query sets under the differentially-private matrix mechanism. In *ICDT*, 2013.
- [14] A. Machanavajjhala, A. Korolova, and A. D. Sarma. Personalized social recommendations - accurate or private? In *PVLDB*, volume 4, pages 440–450, 2011.
- [15] A. Nikolov, K. Talwar, and L. Zhang. The geometry of differential privacy: the sparse and approximate cases. In *Proceedings of the 45th annual ACM symposium on Symposium on theory of computing*, pages 351–360. ACM, 2013.
- [16] K. Nissim, S. Raskhodnikova, and A. Smith. Smooth sensitivity and sampling in private data analysis. In *STOC*, pages 75–84, 2007.
- [17] W. Qardaji, W. Yang, and N. Li. Understanding hierarchical methods for differentially private histogram. In *PVLDB*, 2013.
- [18] X. Xiao, G. Wang, and J. Gehrke. Differential privacy via wavelet transforms. In *ICDE*, pages 225–236, 2010.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{W}$  be a workload, and  $G$  a policy graph.*

$$\Delta_{(p, \mathbf{W})}(G) = \max_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \text{cols}(\mathbf{W}_G)} \|\mathbf{v}_i\|_p$$

*Proof.*

$$\Delta_{(p, \mathbf{W})}(G) = \max_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') \in N(G)} \|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}'\|_p$$

By the definition of neighbors,  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{x}'$  differ in two counts (an entry has been switched from one domain value to another). Let these be domain values be  $i$  and  $j$ , and let  $x_i, x_j, x'_i,$  and  $x'_j$  be their counts. So,  $x_i = x'_i + 1$  and  $x_j = x'_j - 1$ . So,  $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'$ . Additionally, by the definition of neighbors,  $(i, j)$  must be an edge in  $G$ . Therefore, column there is a column in  $\mathbf{P}_G$  which has a 1 and  $-1$  at  $i$  and  $j$ . So,  $\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'$  is a column of  $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{P}_G = \mathbf{W}_G$ . So,

$$\Delta_{(p, \mathbf{W})}(G) = \max_{\mathbf{v}_i \in \text{cols}(\mathbf{W}_G)} \|\mathbf{v}_i\|_p$$

□

**Theorem 3.2.** *Consider a workload  $\mathbf{W}$ , and Blowfish policy graph  $G$ . The error of answering  $\mathbf{W}$  using the matrix mechanism with strategy  $\mathbf{A}$  with respect to discriminative secret graph  $G$  is:*

$$\text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{A})}^G(\mathbf{W}) = P(\epsilon) \Delta_{(1, \mathbf{A}_G)}^2 \|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{A}^+\|_F^2 \quad (6)$$

$$\text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{A})}^G(\mathbf{W}) = P(\epsilon, \delta) \Delta_{(2, \mathbf{A}_G)}^2 \|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{A}^+\|_F^2 \quad (7)$$

where  $P(\epsilon)$  is  $2/\epsilon$  and  $P(\epsilon, \delta)$  is  $\frac{2 \log(2/\delta)}{\epsilon^2}$ .

*Proof.* This proof is nearly identical to the proof of Theorem 2.2 from pods:LiHRMM10 and [13], except that we use the policy specific sensitivity. For instance, in the case of  $\text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{A})}^G(\mathbf{W})$  instead of obtaining  $\sigma^2 = P(\epsilon, \delta) \Delta_{\mathbf{A}}^2$  as we did in the original proof, we obtain  $\sigma^2 = P(\epsilon, \delta) (\Delta_{\mathbf{A}}(G))^2 = P(\epsilon, \delta) \Delta_{\mathbf{A}_G}^2$ . This follows directly from the fact that we have defined  $\sigma$  using the policy specific sensitivity. □

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $G$  be a Blowfish policy graph and  $\mathbf{W}$  be a workload. If  $\mathbf{P}_G$  has a right inverse, then  $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{W}$  if and only if  $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}_G = \mathbf{W}_G$ , where  $\mathbf{A}_G = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_G$ . Additionally, both  $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{A}^+$  and  $\mathbf{W}_G\mathbf{A}_G^+$  are solutions to both  $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{W}$  and  $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}_G = \mathbf{W}_G$ .*

*Proof.* First, assume  $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{W}$ . Then

$$\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_G = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{P}_G \implies \mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}_G = \mathbf{W}_G$$

Next, assume  $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}_G = \mathbf{W}_G$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_G = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{P}_G &\implies \mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_G\mathbf{P}_G^{-1} = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{P}_G\mathbf{P}_G^{-1} \\ &\implies \mathbf{B}\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{W} \end{aligned}$$

Additionally, from Lemma 4.1 we have that  $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{A}^+$  is a solution to  $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{W}$ , and  $\mathbf{W}_G\mathbf{A}_G^+$  is a solution to  $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}_G = \mathbf{W}_G$ . Because these equations have the same solution space,  $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{A}^+$  is a solution to  $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}_G = \mathbf{W}_G$  and  $\mathbf{W}_G\mathbf{A}_G^+$  is a solution to  $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{W}$ . □

**Theorem 4.3.** *Let  $G$  be a Blowfish policy graph. If  $\mathbf{P}_G$  has a right inverse, then we have  $\|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{A}^+\|_F = \|\mathbf{W}_G\mathbf{A}_G^+\|_F$ . Therefore,*

$$\text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{A})}^G(\mathbf{W}) = \text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{A}_G)}(\mathbf{W}_G)$$

$$\text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{A})}^G(\mathbf{W}) = \text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{A}_G)}(\mathbf{W}_G)$$

*Additionally, minimum errors are equivalent. That is,*

$$\text{MINERROR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{W}_G) = \text{MINERROR}_{\mathcal{G}}^G(\mathbf{W})$$

$$\text{MINERROR}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{W}_G) = \text{MINERROR}_{\mathcal{L}}^G(\mathbf{W})$$

*Proof.* We show the proof for the error under the Gaussian noise (i.e.,  $\mathcal{G}$ ). The proof for the errors under the Laplace noise (i.e.,  $\mathcal{L}$ ) is similar.

By Lemma 4.2 and we have that both  $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{A}^+$  and  $\mathbf{W}_G\mathbf{A}_G^+$  are solutions to the system  $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{W}$ . Additionally, by Lemma 4.1,  $\|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{A}^+\|_F \leq \|\mathbf{B}\|_F$  and  $\|\mathbf{W}_G\mathbf{A}_G^+\|_F \leq \|\mathbf{B}\|_F$  for all solutions  $\mathbf{B}$ . Therefore,  $\|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{A}^+\|_F = \|\mathbf{W}_G\mathbf{A}_G^+\|_F$ . Then by definition of error we have

$$\text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{A})}^G(\mathbf{W}) = \text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{A}_G)}(\mathbf{W}_G)$$

Additionally, assume that  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}_*$  minimizes  $\text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{A})}^G(\mathbf{W})$  subject to  $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{A}^+\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{W}$ . Then by Lemma 4.2,  $\mathbf{W}_G\mathbf{A}_{*G}^+\mathbf{A}_{*G} = \mathbf{W}_G$ , and so

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MINERROR}_{\mathcal{G}}^G(\mathbf{W}) &= \text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{A}_*)}^G(\mathbf{W}) \\ &= \text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{A}_{*G})}(\mathbf{W}_G) \\ &\geq \min_{\mathbf{A}: \mathbf{W}_G\mathbf{A}^+\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{W}_G} \text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{A})}(\mathbf{W}_G) \\ &= \text{MINERROR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{W}_G) \end{aligned}$$

We can prove the converse similarly, that is

$$\text{MINERROR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{W}_G) \geq \text{MINERROR}_{\mathcal{G}}^G(\mathbf{W})$$

And therefore we have

$$\text{MINERROR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{W}_G) = \text{MINERROR}_{\mathcal{G}}^G(\mathbf{W}) \quad \square$$

□

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $\mathbf{M}$  be an  $m \times n$  matrix.  $\mathbf{M}$  has a right inverse if and only if its rows are linearly independent.*

*Proof.* This is just a concise way of stating the following facts:

- If  $m > n$ , then  $\mathbf{M}$  cannot have a right inverse.
- If  $m = n$ , then  $\mathbf{M}$  has both a left and right inverse if and only if its determinant is nonzero, which is true if and only if the matrix is full rank.
- If  $m < n$ , then  $\mathbf{M}$  has a right inverse if and only if it is full rank.

□

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a Blowfish policy graph and assume  $G$  is connected. Removing any row of  $\mathbf{P}_G$  results in a full rank matrix.*

*Proof.* We first show that any connected graph  $G$  produces an  $\mathbf{P}_G$  of rank  $m - 1$  where  $m$  is the number of rows of  $\mathbf{P}_G$ . We then show that our modification of  $\mathbf{P}_G$  does not change the rank. We are then left with an  $\mathbf{P}_G$  with  $m - 1$  rows and rank  $m - 1$ . So, the modified  $\mathbf{P}_G$  will be full rank.

Every connected graph  $G$  has a spanning tree  $T$ . Note that  $\mathbf{P}_T$  is a column projection of  $\mathbf{P}_G$ , so to show  $\mathbf{P}_G$  has rank  $m - 1$ , it is sufficient to show that  $\mathbf{P}_T$  has rank  $m - 1$ . Every tree has some node  $v$  of degree 1. The corresponding row of  $\mathbf{P}_T$  has all zeros except for a single 1 or  $-1$ . Let  $e_v$  be the row corresponding to  $v$ . Let the  $k$ th column be the one corresponding to the single nonzero

element of  $e_v$ . Other than row  $v$ , there is unique row  $u$  which has a nonzero value in column  $k$ . Let  $r_u$  be the row  $u$  with a zero in column  $v$  and identical in all other values.

Consider  $\mathbf{P}_{T-v}$ . This matrix will be different from  $\mathbf{P}_T$  in the following ways:  $\mathbf{P}_{T-v}$  will be missing column  $k$  and row  $v$ . Additionally, the new value of row  $u$  will be  $r_u$ . Note that row  $u$  from  $\mathbf{P}_T$  can be written as  $r_u - e_v$ . All rows in  $\mathbf{P}_T$  other than row  $u$  are linearly independent of  $e_v$ . Therefore, every row in  $\mathbf{P}_T$  can be written as a linear combination of a row in  $\mathbf{P}_{T-v}$ , and possibly  $e_v$ . This means that  $\text{rank}(\mathbf{P}_T) = 1 + \text{rank}(\mathbf{P}_{T-v})$ .  $\mathbf{P}_{T-v}$  is also a tree, so we proceed inductively. The base case of this induction is a tree with only one edge, and this corresponds to a matrix of rank 1. Therefore,  $\mathbf{P}_G$  for a connected graph  $G$  has rank  $m - 1$ , where  $m$  is the number of vertices in  $G$  or equivalently the number of rows of  $\mathbf{P}_G$ .

Note that the  $m - 1$  rows we remove during the induction are all linearly independent, and the row corresponding the final vertex left over can be written as a linear combination of these  $m - 1$  rows. However, when we initially picked vertex  $v$  of degree 1, we had two choices for  $v$ , since any tree has two vertices of degree 1. Since we have two choices at each inductive step, it is possible to pick any vertex we wish to end up with on the last step of the induction. That is, not only does  $\mathbf{P}_G$  have rank  $m - 1$ , every set of  $m - 1$  rows of  $\mathbf{P}_G$  is linearly independent.

Next, we have assumed that some column of  $W$  is all zeros. This means that we may remove the corresponding row of  $\mathbf{P}_G$  without changing  $\mathbf{W}_G$ . Because every set of  $m - 1$  rows of  $\mathbf{P}_G$  is linearly independent, removing one row leaves us with  $m - 1$  rows, all of which are linearly independent. Therefore, the modified  $\mathbf{P}_G$  has full rank, as desired.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.2.** *Let  $G$  be a Blowfish policy graph, and let  $\mathbf{W}$  be an workload. If  $\mathbf{P}_G$  has a right inverse,*

$$\text{MINERROR}_G^G(\mathbf{W}) \geq P(\epsilon, \delta) \frac{1}{n_G} (\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_s)^2$$

where  $P(\epsilon, \delta) = \frac{2 \log(2/\delta)}{\epsilon^2}$ ,  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s$  are the singular values of  $\mathbf{W}_G$ , and  $n_G$  is the number of columns of  $\mathbf{W}_G$  (same as the number of edges in  $G$ ).

*Proof.* From the results of [13] we have

$$\text{MINERROR}_G(\mathbf{W}_G) \geq P(\epsilon, \delta) \frac{1}{n_G} (\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_s)^2$$

where  $P(\epsilon, \delta) = \frac{2 \log(2/\delta)}{\epsilon^2}$ ,  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s$  are the singular values of  $\mathbf{W}_G$ , and  $n_G$  is the number of columns of  $\mathbf{W}_G$ . But then by Theorem 4.3 we know that  $\text{MINERROR}_G(\mathbf{W}_G) = \text{MINERROR}_G^G(\mathbf{W})$  which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Corollary 6.1.** *Let  $c \geq 1$  be some real number. Let  $G$  be a Blowfish policy graph,  $\mathbf{W}$  be a linear workload and  $\mathbf{A}$  be a strategy for answering the workload. Let  $\mathbf{W}_G = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{P}_G$  and  $\mathbf{A}_G = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_G$ . Then,  $\text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{Z}, \mathbf{A})}^G(\mathbf{W}) \leq c \cdot \text{MINERROR}_{\mathcal{Z}}^G(\mathbf{W})$  if and only if  $\text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{Z}, \mathbf{A}_G)}(\mathbf{W}_G) \leq c \cdot \text{MINERROR}_{\mathcal{Z}}(\mathbf{W}_G)$ , for both  $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{L}$ .*

*Proof.* This follows immediately from the following two facts from Theorem 4.3 for both  $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{G}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{Z}, \mathbf{A})}^G(\mathbf{W}) &= \text{ERROR}_{(\mathcal{Z}, \mathbf{A}_G)}(\mathbf{W}_G) \\ \text{MINERROR}_{\mathcal{Z}}(\mathbf{W}_G) &= \text{MINERROR}_{\mathcal{Z}}^G(\mathbf{W}) \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

**Lemma 6.2.** *[Subgraph Approximation] Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a policy graph. Let  $G' = (V, E')$  be a subgraph, such that every  $(u, v) \in E$  is connected in  $G'$  by a path of length  $\leq \ell$ . Then for any workload  $\mathbf{W}$ , we have*

$$\Delta_{(p, \mathbf{W})}(G') \leq \Delta_{(p, \mathbf{W})}(G) \leq \ell \cdot \Delta_{(p, \mathbf{W})}(G')$$

*Proof.* Recall that we defined the  $L_p$  sensitivity as follows.

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{W}}(G) = \max_{X_i \in \text{cols}(\mathbf{W}_G)} \|X_i\|_p$$

The first inequality,  $\Delta_{(p, \mathbf{W})}(G') \leq \Delta_{(p, \mathbf{W})}(G)$ , follows from the fact that when  $G'$  is a subgraph of  $G$ ,  $\mathbf{W}_{G'}$  is a column projection of  $\mathbf{W}_G$ .

We prove the second inequality using the triangle inequality. Let  $(u, v) \in E$ . Then by assumption,  $u$  and  $v$  are connected in  $G'$  by a path of length at most  $\ell$ . Let  $(u, u_1, u_2, \dots, u_y = v)$  be a path connecting  $u$  and  $v$ . Note that  $y \leq \ell$  by assumption. Let  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_y = \mathbf{v}$  be the corresponding columns of  $\mathbf{W}$ . The edge  $(u, v)$  is in  $G$ , and therefore  $\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}$  is a column of  $\mathbf{W}_G$ . Additionally,  $\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_1 - \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{y-1} - \mathbf{v}$  are columns of  $\mathbf{W}_{G'}$ . Then we have the following

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}\|_p &= \|(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_1) + (\mathbf{u}_1 - \mathbf{u}_2) + \dots + (\mathbf{u}_{y-1} - \mathbf{u}_y)\|_p \\ &\leq \|(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_1)\|_p + \|(\mathbf{u}_1 - \mathbf{u}_2)\|_p + \dots \\ &\quad + \|(\mathbf{u}_{y-1} - \mathbf{v})\|_p \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

$$\leq y \cdot \Delta_{(p, \mathbf{W})}(G') \leq \ell \cdot \Delta_{(p, \mathbf{W})}(G') \tag{9}$$

The triangle inequality gives us 8. For 9, note that all the addends are  $L_p$  norms of columns in  $\mathbf{W}_{G'}$  and so each of this values is bounded by  $\Delta_{(p, \mathbf{W})}(G')$ .  $\square$