Pufferfish Privacy Mechanisms for Correlated Data

Shuang Song
UC San Diego
shs037@eng.ucsd.edu

Yizhen Wang*
UC San Diego
yiw248@eng.ucsd.edu

Kamalika Chaudhuri
UC San Diego
kamalika@eng.ucsd.edu

arXiv:1603.03977v3 [cs.LG] 12 Mar 2017

ABSTRACT

Many modern databases include personal and sensitive correlated data, such as private information on users connected together in a social network, and measurements of physical activity of single subjects across time. However, differential privacy, the current gold standard in data privacy, does not adequately address privacy issues in this kind of data.

This work looks at a recent generalization of differential privacy, called Pufferfish, that can be used to address privacy in correlated data. The main challenge in applying Pufferfish is a lack of suitable mechanisms. We provide the first mechanism – the Wasserstein Mechanism – which applies to any general Pufferfish framework. Since this mechanism may be computationally inefficient, we provide an additional mechanism that applies to some practical cases such as physical activity measurements across time, and is computationally efficient. Our experimental evaluations indicate that this mechanism provides privacy and utility for synthetic as well as real data in two separate domains.

CCS Concepts

•**Security and privacy** → **Privacy protections;**

Keywords

privacy, differential privacy, Pufferfish privacy

1. INTRODUCTION

Modern database applications increasingly involve personal data, such as healthcare, financial and user behavioral information, and consequently it is important to design algorithms that can analyze sensitive data while still preserving privacy. For the past several years, differential privacy [8] has emerged as the gold standard in data privacy, and there is a large body of work on differentially private algorithm design that apply to a growing number of queries [16, 22, 4, 31, 23, 32, 17, 5, 34]. The typical setting in these works is that each (independently drawn) record is a single individual's private value, and the goal is to answer queries on a collection of records while adding enough noise to hide the evidence of the participation of a single individual in the data.

Many modern database applications, such as those involving healthcare, power usage and building management, also increasingly involve a different setting – correlated data – privacy issues in which are not as well-understood. Consider, for example, a simple time-series application – measurement of physical activity of a *single subject* across time. The goal here is to release aggregate statistics on the subject's activities over a long period (say a week) while hiding the evidence of an activity at any specific instant (say, 10:30am on Jan 4). If the measurements are made at small intervals, then the records form a *highly correlated time-series* as human activities change slowly over time.

What is a good notion of privacy for this example? Since the data belongs to a *single* subject, differential privacy is not directly applicable; however, a modified version called *entry-privacy* [15] applies. Entry-privacy ensures that the inclusion of a single time-series entry does not affect the probability of any outcome by much. It will add noise with standard deviation ≈ 1 to each bin of the histogram of activities. While this is enough for independent activities, it is insufficient to hide the evidence of correlated activities that may continue for several time points. A related notion is group differential privacy [9], which extends the definition to participation of *entire groups* of correlated individuals or entries. Here, all entries are correlated, and hence group differential privacy will add $\approx O(T)$ noise to a histogram over T measurements, thus destroying all utility. Thus to address privacy challenges in this kind of data, we need a different privacy notion.

A generalized version of differential privacy called Pufferfish was proposed by [20]. In Pufferfish, privacy requirements are specified through three components – $\mathcal{S}$, a set of secrets that represents what may need to be hidden, $\mathcal{Q}$, a set of secret pairs that represents pairs of secrets that need to be indistinguishable to the adversary and Θ, a class of distributions that can plausibly generate the data. Privacy is provided by ensuring that the secret pairs in $\mathcal{Q}$ are indistinguishable when data is generated from any $\theta \in \Theta$. In the time-series example, $\mathcal{S}$ is the set of activities at each time t, and secret pairs are all pairs of the form (Activity a at time t, Activity b at time t). Assuming that activities transition in a Markovian fashion, Θ is a set of Markov Chains over activities. Pufferfish captures correlation in such applications effectively in two ways – first, unlike differential privacy, it can hide private values against correlation across

*The first two authors contributed equally.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

SIGMOD '17, May 14–19, 2017, Chicago, IL, USA.

© 2017 ACM. ISBN 978-1-4503-4197-4/17/05…$15.00

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/XXXX.XXXX

multiple entries/individuals; second, unlike group privacy, it also allows utility in cases where a large number of individuals or entries are correlated, yet the "average amount" of correlation is low.

Because of these properties, we adopt Pufferfish as our privacy definition. To bolster the case for Pufferfish, we provide a general result showing that even if the adversary's belief $\tilde{\theta}$ lies outside the class Θ, the resulting loss in privacy is low if $\tilde{\theta}$ is close to Θ.

The main challenge in using Pufferfish is a lack of suitable mechanisms. While mechanisms are known for specific instantiations [20, 18, 35], there is no mechanism for general Pufferfish. In this paper, we provide the first mechanism, called the Wasserstein Mechanism, that can be adopted to any general Pufferfish instantiation. Since this mechanism may be computationally inefficient, we consider the case when correlation between variables can be described by a Bayesian network, and the goal is to hide the private value of each variable. We provide a second mechanism, called the Markov Quilt Mechanism, that can exploit properties of the Bayesian network to reduce the computational complexity. As a case study, we derive a simplified version of the mechanism for the physical activity measurement example. We provide privacy and utility guarantees, establish composition properties, and finally demonstrate the practical applicability of the mechanism through experimental evaluation on synthetic as well as real data. Specifically, our contributions are as follows:

- We establish that when we guarantee Pufferfish privacy with respect to a distribution class Θ, but the adversary's belief $\tilde{\theta}$ lies outside Θ, the resulting loss in privacy is small when $\tilde{\theta}$ is close to Θ.
- We provide the first mechanism that applies to any Pufferfish instantiation and is a generalization of the Laplace mechanism for differential privacy. We call this the Wasserstein Mechanism.
- Since the above mechanism may be computationally inefficient, we provide a more efficient mechanism called the Markov Quilt Mechanism when correlation between entries is described by a Bayesian Network.
- We show that under certain conditions, applying the Markov Quilt Mechanism multiple times over the same database leads to a gracefully decaying privacy parameter. This makes the mechanism particularly attractive as Pufferfish privacy does not always compose [20].
- We derive a simplified and computationally efficient version of this mechanism for time series applications such as physical activity monitoring.
- Finally, we provide an experimental comparison between Markov Quilt Mechanism and standard baselines as well as some concurrent work [14]; experiments are performed on simulated data, a moderately-sized real dataset ($\approx 10,000$ observations per person) on physical activity, and a large dataset (over 1 million observations) on power consumption.

1.1 Related Work

There is a body of work on differentially private mechanisms [28, 27, 4, 3, 7] – see surveys [30, 9]. As we explain earlier, differential privacy is not the right formalism for the kind of applications we consider. A related framework is coupled-worlds privacy [2]; while it can take data distributions into account through a distribution class Θ, it requires that the participation of a single individual or entry does not make a difference, and is not suitable for our applications. We remark that while mechanisms for *specific* coupled-worlds privacy frameworks exist, there is also no *generic* coupled-worlds privacy mechanism.

Our work instead uses Pufferfish, a recent generalization of differential privacy [20]. [20, 18] provide some specific instances of Pufferfish frameworks along with associated privacy mechanisms; they do not provide a mechanism that applies to any Pufferfish instance, and their examples do not apply to Bayesian networks. [35] uses a modification of Pufferfish, where instead of a distribution class Θ, they consider a single generating distribution θ. They consider the specific case where correlations can be modeled by Gaussian Markov Random Fields, and thus their work also does not apply to our physical activity monitoring example. [24] designs Pufferfish privacy mechanisms for distribution classes that include Markov Chains. Their mechanism adds noise proportional to a parameter ρ that measures correlation between entries. However, they do not specify how to calculate ρ as a function of the distribution class Θ, and as a result, their mechanism cannot be implemented when only Θ is known. [33] releases time-varying location trajectories under differential privacy while accounting for temporal correlations using a Hidden Markov Model with publicly known parameters. Finally, [19] apply Pufferfish to smartmeter data; instead of directly modeling correlation through Markov models, they add noise to the wavelet coefficients of the time series corresponding to different frequencies.

In concurrent work, [14] provide an alternative algorithm for Pufferfish privacy when data can be written as $X = (X_1, \ldots, X_n)$ and the goal is to hide the value of each X_i. Their mechanism is less general than the Wasserstein Mechanism, but applies to a broader class of models than the Markov Quilt Mechanism. In Section 5, we experimentally compare their method with ours for Markov Chains and show that our method works for a broader range of distribution classes than theirs.

Finally, there has also been some previous work on differentially private time-series release [25, 13, 29]; however, they relate to aggregates over trajectories from a large number of people, unlike trajectories of single subjects as in our work.

2. THE SETTING

To motivate our privacy framework, we use two applications – physical activity monitoring of a single subject and flu statistics in a social network. We begin by describing them at a high level, and provide more details in Section 2.1.

Example 1: Physical Activity Monitoring. The database consists of a time-series $X = \{X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_T\}$ where record X_t denotes a discrete physical activity (e.g, running, sitting, etc) of a subject at time t. Our goal is to release (an approximate) histogram of activities over a period (say, a week), while preventing an adversary from inferring the subject's activity at a specific time (say, 10:30am on Jan 4).

Example 2: Flu Status. The database consists of a set of records $X = \{X_1, \ldots, X_n\}$, where record X_i, which is 0 or 1, represents person i's flu status. The goal is to release (an approximation to) $\sum_i X_i$, the number of infected people, while ensuring privacy against an adversary who wishes to detect whether a particular person Alice in the database

has flu. The database includes people who interact socially, and hence the flu statuses are highly correlated. Additionally, the decision to participate in the database is made at a group-level (for example, workplace-level or school-level), so individuals do not control their participation.

2.1 The Privacy Framework

The privacy framework of our choice is Pufferfish [20], an elegant generalization of differential privacy [8]. A Pufferfish framework is instantiated by three parameters – a set $\mathcal{S}$ of secrets, a set $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}$ of secret pairs, and a class of data distributions Θ. $\mathcal{S}$ is the set of possible facts about the database that we might wish to hide, and could refer to a single individual's private data or part thereof. $\mathcal{Q}$ is the set of secret pairs that we wish to be indistinguishable. Finally, Θ is a set of distributions that can plausibly generate the data, and controls the amount and nature of correlation. Each $\theta \in \Theta$ represents a belief an adversary may hold about the data, and the goal of the privacy framework is to ensure indistinguishability in the face of these beliefs.

Definition 2.1. *A privacy mechanism M is said to be ϵ-Pufferfish private in a framework $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Q}, \Theta)$ if for all $\theta \in \Theta$ with X drawn from distribution θ, for all secret pairs $(s_i, s_j) \in \mathcal{Q}$, and for all $w \in Range(M)$, we have*

$$e^{-\epsilon} \leq \frac{P_{M,\theta}(M(X) = w | s_i, \theta)}{P_{M,\theta}(M(X) = w | s_j, \theta)} \leq e^{\epsilon} \quad (1)$$

when s_i and s_j are such that $P(s_i|\theta) \neq 0$, $P(s_j|\theta) \neq 0$.

Readers familiar with differential privacy will observe that unlike differential privacy, the probability in (1) is with respect to the randomized mechanism *and* the actual data X, which is drawn from a $\theta \in \Theta$; to emphasize this, we use the notation X instead of D.

2.1.1 Properties of Pufferfish

An alternative interpretation of (1) is that for $X \sim \theta$, $\theta \in \Theta$, for all $(s_i, s_j) \in \mathcal{Q}$, and for all $w \in \text{Range}(M)$, we have:

$$e^{-\epsilon} \cdot \frac{P(s_i|\theta)}{P(s_j|\theta)} \leq \frac{P(s_i|M(X) = w, \theta)}{P(s_j|M(X) = w, \theta)} \leq e^{\epsilon} \cdot \frac{P(s_i|\theta)}{P(s_j|\theta)}. \quad (2)$$

In other words, knowledge of $M(X)$ does not affect the posterior ratio of the likelihood of s_i and s_j, compared to the initial belief.

[20] shows that Differential Privacy is a special case of Pufferfish, where $\mathcal{S}$ is the set of all facts of the form $s_x^i =$ *Person i has value x* for $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and x in a domain $\mathcal{X}$, $\mathcal{Q}$ is set of all pairs (s_x^i, s_z^i) for x and z in $\mathcal{X}$ with $x \neq z$, and Θ is the set of all distributions where each individual is distributed independently. Moreover, we cannot have both privacy and utility when Θ is the set of all distributions [20]. Consequently, it is essential to select Θ wisely; if Θ is too restrictive, then we may not have privacy against legitimate adversaries, and if Θ is too large, then the resulting privacy mechanisms may have little utility.

Finally, Pufferfish privacy does not always compose [20] – in the sense that the privacy guarantees may not decay gracefully as more computations are carried out on the same data. However, some of our privacy mechanisms themselves have good composition properties – see Section 4.3 for more details.

A related framework is Group Differential Privacy [9], which applies to databases with groups of correlated records.

Definition 2.2 (Group Differential Privacy). *Let D be a database with n records, and let $\mathcal{G} = \{G_1, \ldots, G_k\}$ be a collection of subsets $G_i \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$. A privacy mechanism M is said to be ϵ-group differentially private with respect to $\mathcal{G}$ if for all G_i in $\mathcal{G}$, for all pairs of databases D and D' which differ in the private values of the individuals in G_i, and for all $S \subseteq Range(M)$, we have:*

$$P(M(D) \in S) \leq e^{\epsilon} P(M(D') \in S).$$

In other words, Definition 2.2 implies that the participation of each group G_i in the dataset does not make a substantial difference to the outcome of mechanism M.

2.2 Examples

We next illustrate how instantiating these examples in Pufferfish would provide effective privacy and utility.

Example 1: Physical Activity Measurement. Let A be the set of all activities – for example, {*walking*, *running*, *sitting*} – and let s_a^t denote the event that activity a occurs at time t – namely, $X_t = a$. In the Pufferfish instantiation, we set $\mathcal{S}$ as $\{s_a^t : t = 1, \ldots, T, a \in A\}$ – so the activity at each time t is a secret. $\mathcal{Q}$ is the set of all pairs (s_a^t, s_b^t) for a, b in A and for all t; in other words, the adversary cannot distinguish whether the subject is engaging in activity a or b at any time t for all pairs a and b. Finally, Θ is a set of time series models that capture how people switch between activities. A plausible modeling decision is to restrict Θ to be a set of Markov Chains $X_1 \to X_2 \to \ldots \to X_T$ where each state X_t is an activity in A. Each such Markov Chain can be described by an initial distribution q and a transition matrix P. For example, when there are three activities, Θ can be the set:

$$\left\{ \left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0.1 & 0.5 & 0.4 \\ 0.4 & 0.3 & 0.3 \\ 0.3 & 0.3 & 0.4 \end{bmatrix} \right), \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0.9 & 0.1 & 0.0 \\ 0.0 & 0.9 & 0.1 \\ 0.1 & 0.0 & 0.9 \end{bmatrix} \right) \right\}.$$

In this example,

- Differential privacy does not directly apply since we have a single person's data.
- Entry differential privacy [15, 20] and coupled worlds privacy [2] add noise with standard deviation $\approx 1/\epsilon$ to each bin of the activity histogram. However, this does not erase the evidence of an activity at time t. Moreover, an activity record does not have its agency, and hence its not enough to hide its participation.
- As all entries are correlated, group differential privacy adds noise with standard deviation $\approx T/\epsilon$, where T is the length of the chain; this destroys all utility.

In contrast, in Section 4 we show an ϵ-Pufferfish mechanism which will add noise approximately equal to the mixing time over ϵ, and thus offer both privacy and utility for rapidly mixing chains.

Example 2: Flu Status over Social Network. Let s_0^i (resp. s_1^i) denote the event that person i's flu status is 0 (resp. 1). In the Pufferfish instantiation, we let $\mathcal{S}$ be the set $\{s_0^i, s_1^i : i = 1, \ldots, n\}$ – so the flu status of each individual is a secret. $\mathcal{Q}$ is $\{(s_0^i, s_1^i) : i = 1, \ldots, n\}$ – so the adversary

cannot tell if each person i has flu or not. Θ is a set of models that describe the spread of flu; a plausible $\theta \in \Theta$ is a tuple (G_θ, p_θ) where $G_\theta = (X, E)$ is a graph of personal interactions, and p_θ is a probability distributions over the connected components of G_θ. As a concrete example, G_θ could be an union of cliques $C_1, \ldots, C_k$, and p_θ could be the following distribution on the number N of infected people in each clique C_i: $P(N = j) = e^{2j} / \sum_{i=0}^{|C_i|} e^{2i}, j = 0, \ldots, |C_i|$.

Similarly, for the flu status example, we have:

- Both differential privacy and coupled worlds privacy add noise with standard deviation $\approx 1/\epsilon$ to the number of infected people. This will hide whether an Alice participates in the data, but if flu is contagious, then it is not enough to hide evidence of Alice's flu status. Note that unlike differential privacy, as the decision to participate is made at group level, Alice has no agency over whether she participates, and hence we cannot argue it is enough to hide her participation.
- Group differential privacy will add noise proportional to the size of the largest connected component; this may result in loss of utility if this component is large, even if the "average spread" of flu is low.

Again, we can achieve Pufferfish privacy by adding noise proportional to the "average spread" of flu which may be less noise than group differential privacy. For a concrete numerical example, see Section 3.

2.3 Guarantee Against Close Adveraries

A natural question is what happens when we offer Pufferfish privacy with respect to a distribution class Θ, but the adversary's belief $\tilde{\theta}$ does not lie in Θ. Our first result is to show that the loss in privacy is not too large if $\tilde{\theta}$ is close to Θ conditioned on each secret $s_i \in S$, provided closeness is quantified according to a measure called max-divergence.

DEFINITION 2.3 (MAX-DIVERGENCE). *Let p and q be two distributions with the same support. The max-divergence $D_\infty(p||q)$ between them is defined as:*

$$D_\infty(p||q) = \sup_{x \in support(p)} \log \frac{p(x)}{q(x)}.$$

For example, suppose p and q are distributions over $\{1, 2, 3\}$ such that p assigns probabilities $\{1/3, 1/2, 1/6\}$ and q assigns probabilities $\{1/2, 1/4, 1/4\}$ to 1, 2 and 3 respectively. Then, $D_\infty(p||q) = \log 2$. Max-divergence belongs to the family of Renyi-divergences [6], which also includes the popular Kullback-Leibler divergence.

Notation. Given a belief distribution θ (which may or may not be in the distribution class Θ), we use the notation $\theta_{|s_i}$ to denote the conditional distribution of θ given secret s_i.

THEOREM 2.4. *Let M be a mechanism that is ϵ-Pufferfish private with respect to parameters $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Q}, \Theta)$ and suppose that Θ is a closed set. Suppose an adversary has beliefs represented by a distribution $\tilde{\theta} \notin \Theta$. Then,*

$$e^{-\epsilon - 2\Delta} \leq \frac{P_{M,\theta}(M(X) = w|s_i, \theta)}{P_{M,\theta}(M(X) = w|s_j, \theta)} \leq e^{\epsilon + 2\Delta}$$

where

$$\Delta = \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \max_{s_i \in S} \max \left(D_\infty(\tilde{\theta}_{|s_i} || \theta_{|s_i}), D_\infty(\theta_{|s_i} || \tilde{\theta}_{|s_i}) \right).$$

The conditional dependence on s_i cannot be removed unless additional conditions are met. To see this, suppose θ places probability mass $\{0.9, 0.05, 0.05\}$ and $\tilde{\theta}$ places probability mass $\{0.01, 0.95, 0.04\}$ on databases D_1, D_2 and D_3 respectively. In this case, $\max\{D_\infty(\theta||\tilde{\theta}), D_\infty(\tilde{\theta}||\theta)\} = \log 90$. Suppose now that conditioning on s_i tells us that the probability of occurrence of D_3 is 0, but leaves the relative probabilities of D_1 and D_2 unchanged. Then $\theta_{|s_i}$ places probability mass $\{0.9474, 0.0526\}$ while $\tilde{\theta}_{|s_i}$ places probability mass $\{0.0104, 0.9896\}$ on D_1 and D_2 respectively. In this case, $\max\{D_\infty(\theta_{|s_i}||\tilde{\theta}_{|s_i}), D_\infty(\tilde{\theta}_{|s_i}\|\theta_{|s_i})\} = \log 91.0962$ which is larger than $\max\{D_\infty(\theta||\tilde{\theta}), D_\infty(\tilde{\theta}\|\theta)\}$.

2.4 Additional Notation

We conclude this section with some additional definitions and notation that we will use throughout the paper.

DEFINITION 2.5 (LIPSCHITZ). *A query $F : \mathcal{X}^n \to \mathbb{R}^k$ is said to be L-Lipschitz in L_1 norm if for all i and $X_i, X_i' \in \mathcal{X}$,*

$$\|F(X_1, \ldots, X_i, \ldots, X_n) - F(X_1, \ldots, X_i', \ldots, X_n)\|_1 \leq L.$$

This means that changing one record out of n in a database changes the L_1 norm of the query output by at most L.

For example, if $F(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$ is a (vector-valued) histogram over records $X_1, \ldots, X_n$, then F is 2-Lipschitz in the L_1 norm, as changing a single X_i can affect the count of at most two bins.

We use the notation $\text{Lap}(\sigma)$ to denote a Laplace distribution with mean 0 and scale parameter σ. Recall that this distribution has the density function: $h(x) = \frac{1}{2\sigma} e^{-|x|/\sigma}$. Additionally, we use the notation $\texttt{card}(S)$ to denote the cardinality, or, the number of items in a set S.

3. A GENERAL MECHANISM

While a number of mechanisms for specific Pufferfish instantiations are known [20, 18], there is no mechanism that applies to any general Pufferfish instantiation. We next provide the first such mechanism. Given a database represented by random variable X, a Pufferfish instantiation $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Q}, \Theta)$, and a query F that maps X into a scalar, we design mechanism M that satisfies ϵ-Pufferfish privacy in this instantiation and approximates $F(X)$.

Our proposed mechanism is inspired by the Laplace mechanism in differential privacy; the latter adds noise to the result of the query F proportional to the sensitivity, which is the worst case distance between $F(D)$ and $F(D')$ where D and D' are two databases that differ in the value of a single individual. In Pufferfish, the quantities analogous to D and D' are the distributions $P(F(X)|s_i, \theta)$ and $P(F(X)|s_j, \theta)$ for a secret pair (s_i, s_j), and therefore, the added noise should be proportional to the worst case distance between these two distributions according to some metric.

Wasserstein Distances. It turns out that the relevant metric is the ∞-Wasserstein distance – a modification of the Earthmover's distance used in information retrieval and computer vision.

DEFINITION 3.1 (∞-WASSERSTEIN DISTANCE). *Let μ, ν be two probability distributions on $\mathbb{R}$, and let $\Gamma(\mu, \nu)$ be the set of all joint distributions with marginals μ and ν. The*

∞-Wasserstein distance between μ and ν is defined as:

$$W_\infty(\mu,\nu) = \inf_{\gamma\in\Gamma(\mu,\nu)} \max_{(x,y)\in support(\gamma)} |x-y|. \quad (3)$$

Intuitively, each $\gamma \in \Gamma(\mu,\nu)$ is a way to *shift* probability mass between μ and ν; the cost of a shift γ is: $\max_{(x,y)\in support(\gamma)} |x-y|$, and the cost of the min-cost shift is the ∞-Wasserstein distance. It can be interpreted as the maximum "distance" that any probability mass moves while transforming μ to ν in the most optimal way possible. A pictorial example is shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1: An example of ∞-Wasserstein distance. The frequency distributions represent two measures μ and ν, and the arrows represent the joint distribution γ that minimizes the right hand side of (3). Here, $W_\infty(\mu,\nu) = 1$.

3.1 The Wasserstein Mechanism

The main intuition behind our mechanism is based on this interpretation. Suppose for some (s_i, s_j) and θ, we would like to transform $P(F(X)|s_i,\theta)$ to $P(F(X)|s_j,\theta)$. Then, the maximum "distance" that any probability mass moves is

$$W_{i,j,\theta} = W_\infty\left(P(F(X)|s_i,\theta), P(F(X)|s_j,\theta)\right),$$

and adding Laplace noise with scale $W_{i,j,\theta}/\epsilon$ to F will guarantee that the likelihood ratio of the outputs under s_i and s_j lies in $[e^{-\epsilon}, e^{\epsilon}]$. Iterating over all pairs $(s_i, s_j) \in \mathcal{Q}$ and all $\theta \in \Theta$ and taking the maximum over $W_{i,j,\theta}$ leads to a mechanism for the entire instantiation $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Q}, \Theta)$.

The full mechanism is described in Algorithm 1, and its privacy properties in Theorem 3.2. Observe that when Pufferfish reduces to differential privacy, then the corresponding Wasserstein Mechanism reduces to the Laplace mechanism; it is thus a generalization of the Laplace mechanism.

Algorithm 1 Wasserstein Mechanism (Database D, query F, Pufferfish framework $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Q}, \Theta)$, privacy parameter ϵ)

for all $(s_i, s_j) \in \mathcal{Q}$ and all $\theta \in \Theta$ such that $P(s_i|\theta) \neq 0$ and $P(s_j|\theta) \neq 0$ **do**
  Set $\mu_{i,\theta} = P(F(X) = \cdot|s_i,\theta)$, $\mu_{j,\theta} = P(F(X) = \cdot|s_j,\theta)$.
  Calculate $W_\infty(\mu_{i,\theta}, \mu_{j,\theta})$
end for
Set $W = \sup_{(s_i,s_j)\in\mathcal{Q},\theta\in\Theta} W_\infty(\mu_{i,\theta}, \mu_{j,\theta})$.
return $F(D) + Z$, where $Z \sim \text{Lap}(\frac{W}{\epsilon})$

Example. Consider a Pufferfish instantiation of the flu status application. Suppose that the database has size 4, and $\Theta = \{(G_\theta, p_\theta)\}$ where G_θ is a clique on 4 nodes, and p_θ is the following symmetric joint distribution on the number N of infected individuals:

i	0	1	2	3	4
$P(N=j)$	0.1	0.15	0.5	0.15	0.1

From symmetry, this induces the following conditional distributions:

j	0	1	2	3	4
$P(N=j\|X_i=0)$	0.2	0.225	0.5	0.075	0
$P(N=j\|X_i=1)$	0	0.075	0.5	0.225	0.2

In this case, the parameter W in Algorithm 1 is 2, and the Wasserstein Mechanism will add $\text{Lap}(2/\epsilon)$ noise to the number of infected individuals. As all the X_i's are correlated, the sensitivity mechanism with Group Differential Privacy would add $\text{Lap}(4/\epsilon)$ noise, which gives worse utility.

3.2 Performance Guarantees

THEOREM 3.2 (WASSERSTEIN PRIVACY). *The Wasserstein Mechanism provides ϵ-Pufferfish privacy in the framework $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Q}, \Theta)$.*

Utility. Because of the extreme generality of the Pufferfish framework, it is difficult to make general statements about the utility of the Wasserstein mechanism. However, we show that the phenomenon illustrated by the flu status example is quite general. When X is written as $X = (X_1, \ldots, X_n)$ where X_i is the i-th individual's private value, and the goal is to keep each individual's value private, the Wasserstein Mechanism for Pufferfish never performs worse than the Laplace mechanism for the corresponding group differential privacy framework. The proof is in the Appendix B.1.

THEOREM 3.3 (WASSERSTEIN UTILITY). *Let $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Q}, \Theta)$ be a Pufferfish framework, and let $\mathcal{G}$ be the corresponding group differential privacy framework (so that $\mathcal{G}$ includes a group G for each set of correlated individuals in Θ). Then, for a L-Lipschitz query F, the parameter W in the Wasserstein Mechanism is less than or equal to the global sensitivity of F in the $\mathcal{G}$-group differential privacy framework.*

4. A MECHANISM FOR BAYESIAN NETWORKS

The Wasserstein Mechanism, while general, may be computationally expensive. We next consider a more restricted setting where the database X can be written as a collection of variables $X = (X_1, \ldots, X_n)$ whose dependence is described by a Bayesian network, and the goal is to keep the value of each X_i private. This setting is still of practical interest, as it can be applied to physical activity monitoring and power consumption data.

4.1 The Setting

Bayesian Networks. Bayesian networks are a class of probabilistic models that are commonly used to model dependencies among random variables or vectors, and include popular models such as Markov Chains and trees. A Bayesian network is described by a set of variables $X = \{X_1, \ldots, X_n\}$ (where each X_i is a scalar or a vector) and a *directed acyclic graph* $G = (X, E)$ whose vertices are variables in X. Since G is directed acyclic, its edges E induce a parent-child relationship `parent` among the nodes X. The probabilistic dependence on X induced by the network can be written as:

$$P(X_1, \ldots, X_n) = \prod_i P(X_i|\texttt{parent}(X_i)).$$

For example, Figure 2 shows a Bayesian Network on 4 variables, whose joint distribution is described by:

$$P(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4) = P(X_1)P(X_2|X_1)P(X_3|X_1)P(X_4|X_2, X_3).$$

A node X_i may have more than one parent, and as such these networks can describe complex probabilistic dependencies.




Figure 2: A Bayesian Network on four variables.

The Framework. Specifically, we assume that the database X can be written as $X = \{X_1, \ldots, X_n\}$, where each X_i lies in a bounded domain $\mathcal{X}$. Let s_a^i denote the event that X_i takes value a. The set of secrets is $\mathcal{S} = \{s_a^i \ : a \in \mathcal{X}, i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\}$, and the set of secret pairs is $\mathcal{Q} = \{(s_a^i, s_b^i) : a, b \in \mathcal{X}, a \neq b, i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\}$. We also assume that there is an underlying known Bayesian network $G = (X, E)$ connecting the variables. Each $\theta \in \Theta$ that describes the distribution of the variables is based on this Bayesian network G, but may have different parameters.

For example, the Pufferfish instantiation in Example 1 will fall into this framework, with $n = T$ and G a Markov Chain $X_1 \to X_2 \to \ldots X_T$.

Notation. We use X with a lowercase subscript, for example, X_i, to denote a single node in G, and X with an uppercase subscript, for example, X_A, to denote a set of nodes in G. For a set of nodes X_A we use the notation $\texttt{card}(X_A)$ to denote the number of nodes in X_A.

4.2 The Markov Quilt Mechanism

The main insight behind our mechanism is that if nodes X_i and X_j are "far apart" in G, then, X_j is largely independent of X_i. Thus, to obscure the effect of X_i on the result of a query, it is sufficient to add noise proportional to the number of nodes that are "local" to X_i plus a correction term to account for the effect of the distant nodes. The rest of the section will explain how to calculate this correction term, and how to determine how many nodes are local.

First, we quantify how much changing the value of a variable $X_i \in X$ can affect a set of variables $X_A \subset X$, where $X_i \notin X_A$ and the dependence is described by a distribution θ in a class Θ. To this end, we define the *max-influence* of a variable X_i on a set of variables X_A under a distribution class Θ as follows.

Definition 4.1 (max-influence). *We define the max-influence of a variable X_i on a set of variables X_A under Θ as:*

$$e_\Theta(X_A|X_i) = \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \max_{a,b \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{x_A \in \mathcal{X}^{\texttt{card}(X_A)}} \log \frac{P(X_A = x_A|X_i = a, \theta)}{P(X_A = x_A|X_i = b, \theta)}.$$

Here $\mathcal{X}$ is the range of any X_j. The max-influence is thus the maximum max-divergence between the distributions $X_A|X_i = a, \theta$ and $X_A|X_i = b, \theta$ where the maximum is taken over any pair $(a, b) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$ and any $\theta \in \Theta$. If X_A and X_i are independent, then the max-influence of X_i on X_A is 0, and a large max-influence means that changing X_i can have a large impact on the distribution of X_A. In a Bayesian network, the max-influence of any X_i and X_A can be calculated given the probabilistic dependence.

Our mechanism will attempt to find large sets X_A such that X_i has low max-influence on X_A under Θ. The naive way to do so is through brute force search, which takes time exponential in the size of G. We next show how structural properties of the Bayesian network G can be exploited to perform this search more efficiently.

Markov Blankets and Quilts. For this purpose, we provide a second definition that generalizes the Markov Blanket, a standard notion in probabilistic graphical models [21]. The Markov Blanket of a node X_u in a Bayesian network consists of its parents, its children and the other parents of its children, and the rest of the nodes in the network are independent of X_u conditioned on its Markov Blanket. We define its generalization, the Markov Quilt, as follows.

Definition 4.2 (Markov Quilt). *A set of nodes X_Q, $Q \subset \{1, \ldots, n\}$ in a Bayesian network $G = (X, E)$ is a Markov Quilt for a node X_i if the following conditions hold:*
1. Deleting X_Q partitions G into parts X_N and X_R such that $X = X_N \cup X_Q \cup X_R$ and $X_i \in X_N$.
2. For all $x_R \in \mathcal{X}^{card(X_R)}$, all $x_Q \in \mathcal{X}^{card(X_Q)}$ and for all $a \in \mathcal{X}$, $P(X_R = x_R|X_Q = x_Q, X_i = a) = P(X_R = x_R|X_Q = x_Q)$.
Thus, X_R is independent of X_i conditioned on X_Q.

Intuitively, X_R is a set of "remote" nodes that are far from X_i, and X_N is the set of "nearby" nodes; X_N and X_R are separated by the Markov Quilt X_Q. Observe that unlike Markov Blankets, a node can have many Markov Quilts. Figure 3 shows an example. We also allow the "trivial Markov Quilt" with $X_Q = \emptyset$, $X_N = X$ and $X_R = \emptyset$.


Suppose we would like to release the result of a L-Lipschitz scalar query F while protecting a node X_i. If we can find a Markov Quilt (X_N, X_Q, X_R) such that the max-influence of X_i on X_Q under Θ is at most δ, then, it is sufficient to add Laplace noise to F with scale parameter $L \cdot \texttt{card}(X_N)/(\epsilon - \delta)$. This motivates the following mechanism, which we call the Markov Quilt Mechanism. To protect X_i, we search over a set $S_{Q,i}$ of Markov Quilts for X_i and pick the one which requires adding the least amount of noise. We then iterate over all X_i and add to F the maximum amount of noise needed to protect any X_i; this ensures that the private values of *all nodes* are protected. Details are presented in Algorithm 2, and Theorem 4.3 establishes its privacy properties.

Vector-Valued Functions. The mechanism can be easily generalized to vector-valued functions. If F is L-Lipschitz with respect to L_1 norm, then from Proposition 1 of [8], adding noise drawn from $L \cdot \sigma_{\max} \cdot \text{Lap}(1)$ to each coordinate of F guarantees ϵ-Pufferfish privacy.


Theorem 4.3 (Markov Quilt Mechanism Privacy). *If F is L-Lipschitz, and if each $S_{Q,i}$ contains the trivial quilt $X_Q = \emptyset$ (with $X_N = X$, $X_R = \emptyset$) , then the Markov Quilt Mechanism preserves ϵ-Pufferfish privacy in the instantiation $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Q}, \Theta)$ described in Section 4.1.*

4.3 Composition

Unlike differential privacy, Pufferfish privacy does not always compose [20], in the sense that the privacy parameter may not decay gracefully as the same data (or related



(a) The Markov Blanket of X_i is $X_B = \{X_{i-1}, X_{i+1}\}$



(b) One Markov Quilt of X_i is $X_Q = \{X_{i-2}, X_{i+2}\}$ with corresponding $X_N = \{X_{i-1}, X_i, X_{i+1}\}$, $X_R = \{\dots, X_{i-3}, X_{i+3}, \dots\}$

Figure 3: Illustration of Markov Blanket and Markov Quilt

Algorithm 2 Markov Quilt Mechanism (Database D, L-Lipschitz query F, Pufferfish instantiation $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Q}, \Theta)$, privacy parameter ϵ, Markov Quilts set $S_{Q,i}$ for each X_i)

for all X_i **do**
  for all Markov Quilts X_Q (with X_N, X_R) in $S_{Q,i}$ **do**
    if max-influence $e_\Theta(X_Q|X_i) < \epsilon$ **then**
      $\sigma(X_Q) = \frac{\text{card}(X_N)}{\epsilon - e_\Theta(X_Q|X_i)}$ /*score of X_Q*/
    else
      $\sigma(X_Q) = \infty$
    end if
  end for
  $\sigma_i = \min_{X_Q \in S_{Q,i}} \sigma(X_Q)$
end for
$\sigma_{\max} = \max_i \sigma_i$
return $F(D) + (L \cdot \sigma_{\max}) \cdot Z$, where $Z \sim \text{Lap}(1)$

data) is used in multiple privacy-preserving computations. We show below that the Markov Quilt Mechanism *does compose* under certain conditions. We believe that this property makes the mechanism highly attractive.

THEOREM 4.4 (SEQUENTIAL COMPOSITION). *Let $\{F_k\}_{k=1}^K$ be a set of Lipschitz queries, $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Q}, \Theta)$ be a Pufferfish instantiation as defined in Section 4.1, and D be a database. Given fixed Markov Quilt sets $\{S_{Q,i}\}_{i=1}^n$ for all X_i, let $M_k(D)$ denote the Markov Quilt Mechanism that publishes $F_k(D)$ with ϵ-Pufferfish privacy under $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Q}, \Theta)$ using Markov Quilt sets $\{S_{Q,i}\}_{i=1}^n$. Then publishing $(M_1(D), \dots, M_K(D))$ guarantees $K\epsilon$-Pufferfish privacy under $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Q}, \Theta)$.*

To prove the theorem, we define active Markov Quilt $X^*_{Q,i}$ for a node X_i.

DEFINITION 4.5. *(Active Markov Quilt) In an instance of the Markov Quilt Mechanism M, we say that a Markov Quilt X_Q (with corresponding X_N, X_R) for a node X_i is* active *if $X_Q = \arg\min_{X_Q \in S_{Q,i}} \sigma(X_Q)$, and thus $\sigma(X_Q) = \sigma_i$. We denote this Markov Quilt as $X^*_{Q,i}$.*

For example, consider a Markov Chain of length $T = 3$ with the following initial distribution and transition matrix

$$\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0.8 \\ 0.2 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0.9 & 0.1 \\ 0.4 & 0.6 \end{bmatrix} \right).$$

Suppose we want to guarantee Pufferfish privacy with $\epsilon = 10$. Consider the middle node X_2. The possible Markov Quilts for X_2 are $S_{Q,2} = \{\emptyset, \{X_1\}, \{X_3\}, \{X_1, X_3\}\}$, which have max-influence $0, \log 6, \log 6, \log 36$ and quilt sizes $3, 2, 2, 1$ respectively. The scores therefore are 0.3, 0.2437, 0.2437 and 0.1558, and the active Markov Quilt for X_2 is $X^*_{Q,2} = \{X_1, X_3\}$ since it has the lowest score.

The proof to Theorem 4.4 is in Appendix C.1. We note that the condition for the Markov Quilt Mechanism to compose linearly is that all M_k's use the same active Markov Quilt. This holds automatically if the privacy parameter ϵ and Markov Quilt set $S_{Q,i}$ are the same for all M_k. If different levels of privacy $\{\epsilon_k\}_{k=1}^K$ are required, we can guarantee $K \max_{k \in \{1,\dots,K\}} \epsilon_k$-Pufferfish privacy as long as the same $S_{Q,i}$ is used across M_k.

4.4 Case Study: Markov Chains

Algorithm 2 can still be computationally expensive, especially if the underlying Bayesian network is complex and the set Θ is large and unstructured. In this section, we show that when the underlying graph is a Markov Chain, the mechanism can be made more efficient.

The Setting. We use the same setting as Example 1 that was described in detail in Section 2.2. We assume that there are k activities so that the state space $\mathcal{X} = \{1, \dots, k\}$. Thus each $\theta \in \Theta$ corresponds to a tuple (q_θ, P_θ) where q_θ is a $k \times 1$ vector that describes the distribution of the first state and P_θ is a $k \times k$ transition matrix.

A Running Example. As a concrete running example in this section, consider a database of $T = 100$ records represented by a Markov Chain $X_1 \to \dots \to X_{100}$ where each state X_i can take $k = 2$ values, 0 and 1. Also let:

$$\Theta = \left\{ \theta_1 = \left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0.9 & 0.1 \\ 0.4 & 0.6 \end{bmatrix} \right), \theta_2 = \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0.9 \\ 0.1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0.8 & 0.2 \\ 0.3 & 0.7 \end{bmatrix} \right) \right\}$$

be the set of distributions. Suppose we set $\epsilon = 1$.

Sources of Inefficiency. There are three potential sources of computational inefficiency in the Markov Quilt Mechanism. First, searching over all Markov Quilts in a set is inefficient if there are a large number of quilts. Second, calculating the max-influence of a fixed quilt is expensive if the probabilistic dependence between the variables is complex, and finally, searching over all $\theta \in \Theta$ is inefficient if Θ is large and unstructured.

We show below how to mitigate the computational complexity of all three sources for Markov Chains. First we show how to exploit structural information to improve the computational efficiency of the first two. Next we propose an approximation using tools from Markov Chain theory that will considerably improve the computational efficiency of searching over all $\theta \in \Theta$. The improvement preserves ϵ-Pufferfish privacy, but might come at the expense of some additional loss in accuracy.

4.4.1 Exploiting Structural Information

First, we show how to exploit structural information to improve the running time.

Bounding the Number of Markov Quilts. Technically, the number of Markov Quilts for a node X_i in a Markov Chain of length T is exponential in T. Fortunately however, Lemma 4.6 shows that for the purpose of finding the quilt

with the lowest score for any X_i, it is sufficient to search over only $O(T^2)$ quilts. The proof is in the Appendix.

LEMMA 4.6. *In the setting of Section 4.4, let the set of Markov Quilts $S_{Q,i}$ be as follows:*

$$S_{Q,i} = \{\{X_{i-a}, X_{i+b}\}, \{X_{i-a}\}, \{X_{i+b}\}, \emptyset \\ |1 \le a \le i-1, 1 \le b \le T-i\} \quad (4)$$

Consider any Markov Quilt (X_N, X_Q, X_R) for X_i that may or may not lie in S_{Q_i}. Then, the score of this quilt is greater than or equal to the score of some $(X_{N'}, X_{Q'}, X_{R'})$ in $S_{Q,i}$.

Calculating the max-influence. Consider the max-influence of a set of variables X_Q on a variable X_i under a fixed $\theta \in \Theta$. Calculating it may be expensive if the probabilistic dependency among the variables in X_Q and X_i is complex under θ. We show below that for Markov Chains, this max-influence may be computed relatively efficiently.

Suppose $X_Q = \{X_{i-a}, X_{i+b}\}$, and recall that a state can take values in $\mathcal{X} = \{1, \ldots, k\}$. Then, we can write:

$$\begin{aligned} & e_{\{\theta\}}(X_Q|X_i) \\ &= \max_{x,x',x_{i-a},x_{i+b} \in \mathcal{X}} \log \frac{P(X_{i-a} = x_{i-a}, X_{i+b} = x_{i+b}|X_i = x, \theta)}{P(X_{i-a} = x_{i-a}, X_{i+b} = x_{i+b}|X_i = x', \theta)} \\ &= \max_{x,x' \in \mathcal{X}} \left(\log \frac{P(X_i = x', \theta)}{P(X_i = x, \theta)} \right. \\ &\quad + \max_{x_{i+b} \in \mathcal{X}} \log \frac{P(X_{i+b} = x_{i+b}|X_i = x, \theta)}{P(X_{i+b} = x_{i+b}|X_i = x', \theta)} \\ &\quad \left. + \max_{x_{i-a} \in \mathcal{X}} \log \frac{P(X_i = x|X_{i-a} = x_{i-a}, \theta)}{P(X_i = x'|X_{i-a} = x_{i-a}, \theta)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

(5) allows for efficient computation of the max-influence. Given an initial distribution and a transition matrix, for each x and x' pair, the first term in (5) can be calculated in $O(ik^2)$ time, and the second and third in $O((a+b)k^3)$ time each. Taking the maximum over all x and x' involves another $O(k^2)$ operations, leading to a total running time of $O(ik^2 + (a+b)k^3)$. Similar formulas can be obtained for quilts of the form $X_Q = \{X_{i-a}\}$ and $X_Q = \{X_{i+b}\}$. Note for the special case of the trivial Markov Quilt, the max-influence is 0, which takes $O(1)$ time to compute.

Algorithm MQMExact. Thus, using structural properties of Markov Chains gives a more efficient instantiation of the Markov Quilt Mechanism that we describe in Algorithm 3.

We remark that to improve efficiency, instead of searching over all $O(T^2)$ Markov Quilts for a node X_i, we search only over Markov Quilts whose endpoints lie at a distance $\le \ell$ from X_i. Since there are $O(\ell^2)$ such Markov Quilts, this reduces the running time if $\ell \ll T$.

Concretely, consider using Algorithm MQMExact on our running example with $\ell = T$. For θ_1, a search over each X_i gives that X_8 has the highest score, which is 13.0219, achieved by Markov Quilt $\{X_3, X_{13}\}$. For θ_2, X_6 has the highest score, 10.6402, achieved by the Markov Quilt $\{X_{10}\}$. Thus, the algorithm adds noise $Z \sim \text{Lap}(13.0219 \times L)$ to the exact query value.

Running Time Analysis. A naive implementation of Algorithm 3 would run in time $O(T\ell^2|\Theta|(\ell k^3 + Tk^2))$. However, we can use the following observations to speed up the algorithm considerably.

Algorithm 3 MQMExact(Database D, L-Lipschitz query F, Θ, privacy parameter ϵ, maximum Markov Quilt size parameter ℓ)

for all $\theta \in \Theta$ **do**
  for all X_i **do**
    $S_{Q,i} = \{\{X_{i-a}, X_{i+b}\} : i-a > 0, i+b \le T, a+b < \ell\}$
    $\cup \{\{X_{i-a}\} : i-a \ge T-\ell\} \cup \{\{X_{i+b}\} : i+b < \ell\} \cup$
    $\{\emptyset\}$ /***all quilts with end-points at distance** $\le \ell$ **plus the trivial quilt** */
    for all Markov Quilts $X_Q \in S_{Q,i}$ **do**
      Calculate $e_{\{\theta\}}(X_Q|X_i)$ from (5)
      if $e_{\{\theta\}}(X_Q|X_i) < \epsilon$ **then**
        $\sigma(X_Q) = \frac{\text{card}(X_N)}{\epsilon - e_{\{\theta\}}(X_Q|X_i)}$ /***score of** X_Q*/
      else
        $\sigma(X_Q) = \infty$
      end if
    end for
    $\sigma_i = \min_{X_Q \in S_{Q,i}} \sigma(X_Q)$
  end for
  $\sigma^\theta_{\max} = \max_i \sigma_i$
end for
$\sigma_{\max} = \max_{\theta \in \Theta} \sigma^\theta_{\max}$
return $F(D) + (L \cdot \sigma_{\max}) \cdot Z$, where $Z \sim \text{Lap}(1)$

First, observe that for a fixed θ, we can use dynamic programming to compute and store *all* the probabilities $P(X_i|\theta)$, $P(X_i|X_{i-a})$ and $P(X_{i+b}|X_i)$ together in time $O(Tk^3)$. Second, note that once these probabilities are stored, the rest is a matter of maximization; for fixed X_i, Markov Quilt X_Q and θ, we can calculate $e_{\{\theta\}}(X_Q|X_i)$ from (5) in time $O(k^3)$; iterating over all X_i, and all $O(\ell^2)$ Markov Quilts for X_i gives a running time of $O(Tk^3 + T\ell^2k^3)$. Finally, iterating over all $\theta \in \Theta$ gives a final running time of $O(T\ell^2k^3|\Theta|)$ which much improves the naive implementation.

Additional optimizations may be used to improve the efficiency even further. In Appendix C.4, we show that if Θ includes all possible initial distributions for a set of transition matrices, then we can avoid iterating over all initial distributions by a direct optimization procedure. Finally, another important observation is that when the initial distribution under θ is the stationery distribution of the Markov Chain – as can happen when data consists of samples drawn from a Markov process in a stable state, such as, household electricity consumption in a steady state – then for any $i \in [a, T-b]$, the max-influence $e_{\{\theta\}}(\{X_{i-a}, X_{i+b}\}|X_i)$ depends only on a and b and is independent of i. This eliminates the need to conduct a separate search for each i, and further improves efficiency by a factor of T.

4.4.2 Approximating the max-influence

Unfortunately, Algorithm 3 may still be computationally inefficient when Θ is large. In this section, we show how to mitigate this effect by computing an *upper bound* on the max-influence under a set of distributions Θ in closed form using tools from Markov Chain theory. Note that now we can no longer compute an exact score; however, since we use an *upper bound* on the score, the resulting mechanism remains ϵ-Pufferfish private.

Definitions from Markov Chain Theory. We begin with reviewing some definitions and notation from Markov

Chain theory that we will need. For a Markov Chain with transition matrix P_θ, we use π_θ to denote its stationary distribution [1]. We define the time reversal Markov Chain corresponding to P_θ as follows.

DEFINITION 4.7 (TIME-REVERSAL). *Let P_θ be the transition matrix of a Markov Chain θ. If π_θ is the stationery distribution of θ, then, the corresponding time-reversal Markov Chain is defined as the chain with transition matrix P^*_θ where:*

$$P^*_\theta(x,y)\pi_\theta(x) = P_\theta(y,x)\pi_\theta(y).$$

Intuitively, P^*_θ is the transition matrix when we run the Markov process described by P_θ backwards from X_T to X_1.

In our running example, for both θ_1 and θ_2, the time-reversal chain has the same transition matrix as the original chain, i.e., $P^*_{\theta_1} = P_{\theta_1}$, $P^*_{\theta_2} = P_{\theta_2}$.

We next define two more parameters of a set Θ of Markov Chains and show that an upper bound to the max-influence under Θ can be written as a function of these two parameters. First, we define $\pi^{\min}_\Theta$ as the minimum probability of any state under the stationary distribution π_θ of any Markov Chain $\theta \in \Theta$. Specifically,

$$\pi^{\min}_\Theta = \min_{x\in\mathcal{X}, \theta\in\Theta} \pi_\theta(x). \tag{6}$$

In our running example, the stationary distribution of the transition matrix for θ_1 is $[0.8, 0.2]$ and thus $\pi^{\min}_{\{\theta_1\}} = 0.2$; similarly, θ_2 has stationary distribution $[0.6, 0.4]$ and thus $\pi^{\min}_{\{\theta_2\}} = 0.4$. We have $\pi^{\min}_\Theta = 0.2$.

Additionally, we define g_Θ as the minimum eigengap of $P_\theta P^*_\theta$ for any $\theta \in \Theta$. Formally,

$$g_\Theta = \min_{\theta\in\Theta} \min\{1 - |\lambda| : P_\theta P^*_\theta x = \lambda x, |\lambda| < 1\}. \tag{7}$$

In our running example, the eigengap for both $P_{\theta_1}P^*_{\theta_1}$ and $P_{\theta_2}P^*_{\theta_2}$ is 0.75, and thus we have $g_\Theta = 0.75$.

Algorithm MQMApprox. The following Lemma characterizes an upper bound of the max-influence of a variable X_i on a X_Q under a set Θ of Markov Chains as a function of $\pi^{\min}_\Theta$ and g_Θ.

LEMMA 4.8. *Suppose the Markov Chains induced by each $P_\theta \in \Theta$ are irreducible and aperiodic with $\pi_\Theta > 0$ and $g_\Theta > 0$. If $a, b \geq \frac{2\log(1/\pi^{\min}_\Theta)}{g_\Theta}$, then the max-influence $e_\Theta(X_Q|X_i)$ of a Markov Quilt $X_Q = \{X_{i-a}, X_{i+b}\}$ on a node X_i under Θ is at most:*

$$\log\left(\frac{\pi^{\min}_\Theta + \exp(-g_\Theta b/2)}{\pi^{\min}_\Theta - \exp(-g_\Theta b/2)}\right) + 2\log\left(\frac{\pi^{\min}_\Theta + \exp(-g_\Theta a/2)}{\pi^{\min}_\Theta - \exp(-g_\Theta a/2)}\right).$$

The proof is in the Appendix. Observe that the irreducibility and aperiodicity conditions may be necessary – without these conditions, the Markov Chain may not mix, and hence we may not be able to offer privacy.

Results similar to Lemma 4.8 can be obtained for Markov Quilts of the form $X_Q = \{X_{i-a}\}$ or $\{X_{i+b}\}$ as well. Finally, in the special case that the chains are reversible, a tighter upper bound may be obtained; these are stated in Lemma C.1 in the Appendix.

Lemma 4.8 indicates that when Θ is parametrized by g_Θ and $\pi^{\min}_\Theta$, (an upper bound on) the score of each X_Q may thus be calculated in $O(1)$ time based on Lemma 4.8. This gives rise to Algorithm 4. Like Algorithm 3, we can again improve efficiency by confining our search to Markov Quilts where the local set X_N has size at most ℓ.

Running Time Analysis. A naive analysis shows that Algorithm 4 has a worst case running time of $O(T\ell^2)$ – T iterations to go over all X_i, $O(\ell^2)$ Markov Quilts per X_i, and $O(1)$ time to calculate an upper bound on the score of each quilt. However, the following Lemma shows that this running time can be improved significantly when Θ has some nice properties.

LEMMA 4.9. *Suppose the Markov Chains induced by Θ are aperiodic and irreducible with $g_\Theta, \pi^{\min}_\Theta > 0$. Let $a^* = 2\lceil \log\left(\frac{\exp(\epsilon/6)+1}{\exp(\epsilon/6)-1}\frac{1}{\pi^{\min}_\Theta}\right)/g_\Theta \rceil$. If the length of the chain T is $\geq 8a^*$, then, the optimal Markov Quilt for the middle node $X_{\lceil T/2\rceil}$ of the chain is of the form $X_Q = \{X_{\lceil T/2\rceil - a}, X_{\lceil T/2\rceil + b}\}$ where $a + b \leq 4a^*$. Additionally, the maximum score $\sigma_{\max} = \sigma_{\lceil T/2\rceil}$.*

Lemma 4.9 implies that for long enough chains, it is sufficient to search over Markov Quilts of length $\ell = 4a^*$, and only over $X_i = X_{\lceil T/2\rceil}$; this leads to a running time of $O((a^*)^2)$, which is considerably better and independent of the length of the chain.

Algorithm 4 MQMApprox(Database D, L-Lipschitz query F, Θ containing Markov chains of length T, privacy parameter ϵ, maximum Markov Quilts length ℓ

for all X_i **do**
  $S_{Q,i} = \{\{X_{i-a}, X_{i+b}\} : i-a > 0, i+b \leq T, a+b < \ell\} \cup \{\{X_{i-a}\} : i - a \geq T - \ell\} \cup \{\{X_{i+b}\} : i + b < \ell\} \cup \{\emptyset\}$
  /***all quilts with end-points at distance $\leq \ell$ plus the trivial quilt** */
  for all Markov Quilts X_Q in $S_{Q,i}$ **do**
    Calculate $e_\Theta(X_Q|X_i)$ from Lemma 4.8
    if max-influence $e_\Theta(X_Q|X_i) < \epsilon$ **then**
      $\sigma(X_Q) = \frac{\text{card}(X_N)}{\epsilon - e_\Theta(X_Q|X_i)}$ /***score of** X_Q*/
    else
      $\sigma(X_Q) = \infty$
    end if
  end for
  $\sigma_i = \min_{X_Q \in S_{Q,i}} \sigma(X_Q)$
end for
$\sigma_{\max} = \max_i \sigma_i$
return $F(D) + (L \cdot \sigma_{\max}) \cdot Z$, where $Z \sim \text{Lap}(1)$

Utility. We conclude with an utility analysis of Algorithm 4.

THEOREM 4.10 (UTILITY GUARANTEES). *Suppose we apply Algorithm 4 to release an approximation to a 1-Lipschitz query F of the states in the Pufferfish instantiation in Example 1. If the length T of the chain satisfies: $T \geq 8\lceil \log\left(\frac{\exp(\epsilon/6)+1}{\exp(\epsilon/6)-1}\frac{1}{\pi_\Theta}\right)/g_\Theta \rceil + 3$, then the Laplace noise added by the Markov Quilt Mechanism has scale parameter $\leq C/\epsilon$ for some positive constant C that depends only on Θ.*

The proof is in the Appendix. Theorem 4.10 implies that the noise added does not grow with T and the *relative accuracy* improves with more and more observations. A careful examination of the proof also shows that the amount of noise added is an upper bound on the mixing time of the chain. Thus if Θ consists of rapidly mixing chains, then Algorithm 4 provides both privacy and utility.

5. EXPERIMENTS

We next demonstrate the practical applicability of the Markov Quilt Mechanism when the underlying Bayesian network is a discrete time homogeneous Markov chain and the goal is to hide the private value of a single time entry – in short, the setting of Section 4.4. Our goal in this section is to address the following questions:

1. What is the privacy-utility tradeoff offered by the Markov Quilt Mechanism as a function of the privacy parameter ϵ and the distribution class Θ?
2. How does this tradeoff compare against existing baselines, such as [14] and Group-differential privacy?
3. What is the accuracy-run time tradeoff offered by the MQMApprox algorithm as compared with MQMExact?

These questions are considered in three different contexts – (a) a small problem involving a synthetic dataset generated by a two-state Markov Chain, (b) a medium-sized problem involving real physical activity measurement data and a four-state Markov Chain, and (c) a large problem involving real data on power consumption in a single household over time and a fifty-one state Markov Chain.

5.1 Methodology

Experimental Setup. Our experiments involve the Pufferfish instantiation of Example 1 described in Section 2.2. To ensure that results across different chain lengths are comparable, we release a private *relative frequency histogram* over states of the chain which represents the (approximate) fraction of time spent in each state. This is a vector valued query, and is $\frac{2}{T}$-Lipschitz in its L_1-norm.

For our experiments, we consider three values of the privacy parameter ϵ that are representative of three different privacy regimes – 0.2 (high privacy), 1 (moderate privacy), 5 (low privacy). All run-times are reported for a desktop with a 3.00 GHz Intel Core i5-3330 CPU and 8GB memory.

Algorithms. Our experiments involve four mechanisms that guarantee ϵ-Pufferfish privacy – GroupDP, GK16, MQMApprox and MQMExact.

GroupDP is a simple baseline that assumes that all entries in a *connected* chain are completely correlated, and therefore adds $\text{Lap}(1/\epsilon)$ noise to each bin. **GK16** is the algorithm proposed by [14], which defines and computes an "influence matrix" for each $\theta \in \Theta$. The algorithm applies only when the spectral norm of this matrix is less than 1, and the standard deviation of noise added increases as the spectral norm approaches 1. We also use two variants of the Markov Quilt Mechanism – **MQMExact** and **MQMApprox**.

5.2 Simulations

We first consider synthetic data generated by a binary Markov Chain of length $T = 100$ with states $\{0, 1\}$; the setup is chosen so that all algorithms are computationally tractable when run on reasonable classes Θ. The transition matrix of such a chain is completely determined by two parameters – $p_0 = P(X_{i+1} = 0|X_i = 0)$ and $p_1 = P(X_{i+1} = 1|X_i = 1)$, and its initial distribution by a single parameter $q_0 = P(X_1 = 0)$. Thus a distribution $\theta \in \Theta$ is represented by a tuple (q_0, p_0, p_1), and a distribution class Θ by a set of such tuples. To allow for effective visualization, we represent the distribution class Θ by an interval $[\alpha, \beta]$ which means that Θ includes all transition matrices for which $p_0, p_1 \in [\alpha, \beta]$ and all initial distribution q in the 2-dimensional probability simplex. When $0 < p_0, p_1 < 1$, the chain is guaranteed to be aperiodic, irreducible and reversible, and we can use the approximation from Lemma C.1 for MQMApprox. We use the optimization procedure described in Appendix C.4 to improve the efficiency of MQMExact. Finally, since the histogram has only two bins, it is sufficient to look at the query $F(X) = \frac{1}{T}\sum_{i=1}^{T} X_i$ which is $\frac{1}{T}$-Lipschitz.

To generate synthetic data from a family $\Theta = [\alpha, \beta]$, we pick p_0 and p_1 uniformly from $[\alpha, \beta]$, and an initial state distribution uniformly from the probability simplex. We then generate a state sequence $X_1, \ldots, X_T$ of length T from the corresponding distribution. For ease of presentation, we restrict Θ to be intervals where $\beta = 1 - \alpha$, and vary α from in 0.1 to 0.4. We vary ϵ in $\{0.2, 1, 5\}$, repeat each experiment 500 times, and report the average error between the actual $F(X)$ and its reported value. For the run-time experiments, we report the average running time of the procedure that computes the scale parameter for the Laplace noise in each algorithm; the average is taken over all $\theta = (p_0, p_1)$ in a grid where p_0, p_1 vary in $\{0.1, 0.11, \ldots, 0.9\}$.


Figure 4 (upper row) shows the accuracy results, and Table 2 (Column 2) the run-time results for $\epsilon = 1$. The values for GroupDP have high variance and are not plotted in the figure; these values are around $5, 1, 0.2$ respectively. As expected, for a given ϵ, the errors of GK16, MQMApprox and MQMExact decrease as α increases, i.e, the distribution class Θ becomes narrower. When α is to the left of the black dashed line in the figure, GK16 does not apply as the spectral norm of the influence matrix becomes > 1; the position of this line does not change as a function of ϵ. In contrast, MQMApprox and MQMExact still provide privacy and reasonable utility. As expected, MQMExact is more accurate than MQMApprox, but requires higher running time. Thus, the Markov Quilt Mechanism applies to a wider range of distribution families than GK16; in the region where all mechanisms work, MQMApprox and MQMExact perform significantly better than GK16 for a range of parameter values, and somewhat worse for the remaining range.

5.3 Real Data

We next apply our algorithm to two real datasets on physical activity measurement and power consumption. Since these are relatively large problems with large state-spaces, it is extremely difficult to search over all Markov Chains in a class Θ, and both GK16 as well as MQMExact become highly computation intensive. To ensure a fair comparison, we pick Θ to be a singleton set $\{\theta\}$, where $\theta = (q_\theta, P_\theta)$; here P_θ is the transition matrix obtained from the data, and q_θ is its stationary distribution. For MQMApprox, we use ℓ from Lemma 4.9, while for MQMExact we use as ℓ the length of the optimal Markov Quilt that was returned by MQMApprox.

5.3.1 Physical Activity Measurement


We use an activity dataset provided by [11, 12, 10], which includes monitoring data from a study of daily habits of 40 cyclists, 16 older women, and 36 overweight women. The dataset includes four activities – active, standing still, standing moving and sedentary – for all three groups of partic-




(a) Synthetic binary chain. $\epsilon = 0.2$.

(b) Synthetic binary chain. $\epsilon = 1$.


(c) Synthetic binary chain. $\epsilon = 5$.



(d) Cyclist aggregate. $\epsilon = 1$.



(e) older woman aggregate. $\epsilon = 1$.



(f) overweight woman aggregate. $\epsilon = 1$.

Figure 4: **Upper row:** L_1 error of frequency of state 1 vs. α for $\epsilon = 0.2, 1, 5$ for synthetic data. Recall that $\Theta = [\alpha, 1-\alpha]$, so Θ shrinks as we go right. GK16 does not apply left of the black dashed vertical line. GroupDP has error around $5, 1, 0.2$ for $\epsilon = 0.5, 1, 5$ respectively. Reported values are averaged over 500 random trials. **Lower row:** Exact and private aggregated physical activity relative frequency histograms for three groups of participants. Reported values are for 20 random trials and $\epsilon = 1$. Recall GK16 does not apply for this problem.

Algorithm	cyclist		older woman		overweight woman	
	Agg	Indi	Agg	Indi	Agg	Indi
DP	0.2918	N/A	0.8746	N/A	0.4763	N/A
GroupDP	0.0834	2.3157	0.1138	1.7860	0.0458	1.1492
GK16	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MQMApprox	0.0107	0.6319	0.0156	0.2790	0.0048	0.1967
MQMExact	0.0074	0.4077	0.0098	0.1742	0.0033	0.1316

Table 1: L_1 error of the relative frequency histograms for individual and aggregate tasks for physical activity of three participant groups. $\epsilon = 1$. Reported values are averaged over 20 random trials.

Algorithm	Synthetic	cyclist	older woman	overweight woman	electricity power
GK16	6.3589×10^{-4}	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MQMApprox	1.8458×10^{-4}	0.0064	0.0060	0.0028	0.0567
MQMExact	7.6794×10^{-4}	1.5186	1.2786	0.6299	282.2273

Table 2: Running time (in seconds) of an optimized algorithm that calculates the scale parameter of the Laplace noise (averaged over 5 runs). $\epsilon = 1$.

ipants,[1] and thus the underlying θ is a four-state Markov Chain. Activities are recorded about every 12 seconds for 7 days when the participants are awake, which gives us more than $9,000$ observations per person on an average in each group. To address missing values, we treat gaps of more than 10 minutes as the starting point of a new independent Markov Chain. Observe that this improves the performance of GroupDP, since the noise added is $\text{Lap}(M/T\epsilon)$, where M is the length of the longest chain. For each group of participants, we calculate a single empirical transition matrix P_θ based on the entire group; this P_θ is used in the experiments.

For this application, we consider two tasks – aggregate and individual. In the aggregate task, the goal is to publish a private aggregated relative frequency histogram[2] over participants in each group in order to analyze their comparative activity patterns. While in theory this task can be achieved with differential privacy, this gives poor utility as the group sizes are small. In the individual task, we publish the relative frequency histogram for each individual and report the average error across individuals in each group.

[1]For cyclists, data also includes cycling, which we merge with active for ease of analysis and presentation.

[2]Recall that in a relative frequency histogram, we report the number of observations in each bin divided by the total number of observations.

Table 1 summarizes the L_1 errors for the three groups and both tasks for $\epsilon = 1$. For the aggregate task, we also report the error of a differentially private release (denoted as DP). Note that the error of the individual task is the average L_1 error of each individual in the group. Figure 4 (lower row) presents the exact and private aggregated relative frequency histograms for the three groups. Table 2 (Columns 2-4) presents the time taken to calculate the scale parameter of the Laplce noise for each group of participants; as this running time depends on both the size of the group as well as the activity patterns, larger groups do not always have higher running times.

The results in Table 1 show that the utilities of both MQMApprox and MQMExact are significantly better than that of GroupDPfor all datasets and tasks, and are significantly better than DP for the aggregated task. As expected, MQMExact is better than MQMApprox, but has a higher running time. We also find that GK16 cannot be applied to any of the tasks, since the spectral norm of the influence matrix is > 1; this holds for all ϵ as the spectral norm condition does not depend on the value of ϵ. Figure 4 (lower row) shows the activity patterns of the different groups: the active time spent by the cyclist group is significantly longer than the other two groups, and the sedentary time spent by overweight women group is the longest. These patterns are visible from the private histograms published by MQMApprox and MQMExact, but not necessarily from those published by GroupDP.

5.3.2 *Electricity Consumption*

Algorithm	$\epsilon = 0.2$	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 5$
GroupDP	516.1555	102.8868	19.8712
GK16	N/A	N/A	N/A
MQMApprox	0.3369	0.0614	0.0113
MQMExact	0.1298	0.0188	0.0022

Table 3: L_1 error of relative frequency histogram for electricity consumption data. Reported values are averaged over 20 random trials.

We use data on electricity consumption of a single household in the greater Vancouver area provided by [26]. Power consumption (in Watt) is recorded every 1 minute for about two years. Missing values in the original recording have been filled in before the dataset is published. We discretize the power values into 51 intervals, each of length 200(W), resulting in a Markov chain with 51 states of length $T \approx 1,000,000$. Our goal again is to publish a private approximation to the relative frequency histogram of power levels.

Table 3 reports the L_1 errors of the four algorithms on electricity power dataset for different ϵ values, and Table 2 the times required to calculate the scale parameter. We again find that GK16 does not apply as the spectral norm condition is not satisfied. The error of GroupDP is very large, because the data forms a single Markov chain, and the number of states is relatively large. We find that in spite of the large number of bins, MQMApprox and MQMExact have high utility; for example, even for $\epsilon = 0.2$, the *per bin* error of MQMExact is about 0.25 percent, and for $\epsilon = 1$, the *per bin* error is 0.04 percent. Finally, while the running time of MQMExact is an order of magnitude higher than MQMApprox, it is still manageable (< 5 minutes) for this problem.

5.4 Discussion

We now reconsider our initial questions. First, as expected, the experiments show that the utility of GK16 and both versions of Markov Quilt Mechanism decreases with decreasing ϵ and increasing size of Θ. The utility of GroupDP does not change with Θ and is not very high; again this is to be expected as GroupDP depends only on the worst-case correlation. Overall the utility of both versions of the Markov Quilt Mechanism improve for longer chains.

Comparing with GK16, we find that for synthetic data, the Markov Quilt Mechanism applies to a much wider range of distribution families; in the region where all mechanisms work, MQMApprox and MQMExact perform significantly better than GK16 for a range of parameter values, and somewhat worse for the remaining range. For the two real datasets we consider, GK16 does not apply. We suspect this is because the influence matrix in [14] is calculated based on local transitions between successive time intervals (for example, X_t as a function of X_{t-1}); instead, the Markov Quilt Mechanism implicitly takes into account transitions across periods (for example, how X_{t+k} as a function of X_t). Our experiments imply that this spectral norm condition may be quite restrictive in practical applications.

Finally, our experiments show that there is indeed a gap between the performance of MQMExact and MQMApprox, as well as their running times, although the running time of MQMExact still remains manageable for relatively large problems. Based on these results, we recommend using MQMExact for medium-sized problems where the state space is smaller (and thus computing the max-influence is easier) but less data is available, and MQMApprox for larger problems where the state space is larger but there is a lot of data to mitigate the effect of the approximation.

6. CONCLUSION

We present a detailed study of how Pufferfish may be applied to achieve privacy in correlated data problems. We establish robustness properties of Pufferfish against adversarial beliefs, and we provide the first mechanism that applies to any Pufferfish instantiation. We provide a more computationally efficient mechanism for Bayesian networks, and establish its composition properties. We derive a version of our mechanism for Markov Chains, and evaluate it experimentally on a small, medium and a large problem on time series data. Our results demonstrate that Pufferfish offers a good solution for privacy in these problems.

We believe that our work is a first step towards a comprehensive study of privacy in correlated data. There are many interesting privacy problems – such as privacy of users connected into social networks and privacy of spatio-temporal information gathered from sensors. With the proliferation of sensors and "internet-of-things" devices, these privacy problems will become increasingly pressing. We believe that an important line of future work is to model these problems in rigorous privacy frameworks such as Pufferfish and design novel mechanisms for these models.

7. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Mani Srivastava and Supriyo Chakravarty for introducing us to the physical activity problem and early discussions and anonymous reviewers for feedback. This work was partially supported by NSF under IIS 1253942 and ONR under N00014-16-1-2616.

8. REFERENCES

[1] D. Aldous and J. Fill. Reversible markov chains and random walks on graphs, 2002.

[2] R. Bassily, A. Groce, J. Katz, and A. Smith. Coupled-worlds privacy: Exploiting adversarial uncertainty in statistical data privacy. In *FOCS*, 2013.

[3] K. Chaudhuri, D. Hsu, and S. Song. The large margin mechanism for differentially private maximization. In *NIPS*, 2014.

[4] K. Chaudhuri, C. Monteleoni, and A. Sarwate. Differentially private empirical risk minimization. *JMLR*, 12:1069–1109, 2011.

[5] R. Chen, N. Mohammed, B. C. Fung, B. C. Desai, and L. Xiong. Publishing set-valued data via differential privacy. *VLDB Endowment, 2011.*

[6] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas. *Elements of information theory*. John Wiley & Sons, 2012.

[7] C. Dwork and J. Lei. Differential privacy and robust statistics. In *STOC*, 2009.

[8] C. Dwork, F. McSherry, K. Nissim, and A. Smith. Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis. In *Theory of Cryptography*, 2006.

[9] C. Dwork and A. Roth. The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy. *TCS*, 9(3-4):211–407, 2013.

[10] K. Ellis et al. Multi-sensor physical activity recognition in free-living. In *UbiComp '14 Adjunct.*

[11] K. Ellis et al. Physical activity recognition in free-living from body-worn sensors. In *SenseCam '13.*

[12] K. Ellis et al. Hip and wrist accelerometer algorithms for free-living behavior classification. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise*, 48(5):933–940, 2016.

[13] L. Fan, L. Xiong, and V. Sunderam. Differentially private multi-dimensional time series release for traffic monitoring. In *DBSec*, 2013.

[14] A. Ghosh and R. Kleinberg. Inferential privacy guarantees for differentially private mechanisms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.01508*, 2016.

[15] M. Hardt and A. Roth. Beyond worst-case analysis in private singular vector computation. In *STOC*, 2013.

[16] M. Hay, V. Rastogi, G. Miklau, and D. Suciu. Boosting the accuracy of differentially private histograms through consistency. *VLDB*, 2010.

[17] X. He, G. Cormode, A. Machanavajjhala, C. M. Procopiuc, and D. Srivastava. Dpt: differentially private trajectory synthesis using hierarchical reference systems. *Proc. of VLDB*, 2015.

[18] X. He, A. Machanavajjhala, and B. Ding. Blowfish privacy: tuning privacy-utility trade-offs using policies. In *SIGMOD '14*, pages 1447–1458, 2014.

[19] S. Kessler, E. Buchmann, and K. Böhm. Deploying and evaluating pufferfish privacy for smart meter data. *Karlsruhe Reports in Informatics*, 1, 2015.

[20] D. Kifer and A. Machanavajjhala. Pufferfish: A framework for mathematical privacy definitions. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.*, 39(1):3, 2014.

[21] D. Koller and N. Friedman. *Probabilistic graphical models: principles and techniques*. MIT press, 2009.

[22] C. Li, M. Hay, V. Rastogi, G. Miklau, and A. McGregor. Optimizing linear counting queries under differential privacy. In *PODS '10.*

[23] C. Li and G. Miklau. An adaptive mechanism for accurate query answering under differential privacy. *VLDB*, 2012.

[24] C. Liu, S. Chakraborty, and P. Mittal. Dependence makes you vulnerable: Differential privacy under dependent tuples. In *NDSS 2016*, 2016.

[25] A. Machanavajjhala, D. Kifer, J. Abowd, J. Gehrke, and L. Vilhuber. Privacy: Theory meets practice on the map. In *ICDE*, 2008.

[26] S. Makonin, B. Ellert, I. V. Bajic, and F. Popowich. Electricity, water, and natural gas consumption of a residential house in Canada from 2012 to 2014. *Scientific Data*, 3(160037):1–12, 2016.

[27] F. McSherry and K. Talwar. Mechanism design via differential privacy. In *FOCS*, 2007.

[28] K. Nissim, S. Raskhodnikova, and A. Smith. Smooth sensitivity and sampling in private data analysis. In *STOC*, 2007.

[29] V. Rastogi and S. Nath. Differentially private aggregation of distributed time-series with transformation and encryption. In *SIGMOD*, 2010.

[30] A. Sarwate and K. Chaudhuri. Signal processing and machine learning with differential privacy: Algorithms and challenges for continuous data. *Signal Processing Magazine, IEEE*, 30(5):86–94, Sept 2013.

[31] S. Song, K. Chaudhuri, and A. Sarwate. Stochastic gradient descent with differentially private updates. In *GlobalSIP Conference*, 2013.

[32] B. Stoddard, Y. Chen, and A. Machanavajjhala. Differentially private algorithms for empirical machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.5428*, 2014.

[33] Y. Xiao and L. Xiong. Protecting locations with differential privacy under temporal correlations. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGSAC CCS.*

[34] Y. Xiao, L. Xiong, and C. Yuan. Differentially private data release through multidimensional partitioning. In *Workshop on Secure Data Management.*

[35] B. Yang, I. Sato, and H. Nakagawa. Bayesian differential privacy on correlated data. In *SIGMOD '15.*

APPENDIX

A. PUFFERFISH PRIVACY DETAILS

PROOF. (of Theorem 2.4) Since Θ is a closed set, for finite D, there must exist some distribution in Θ that achieves Δ. Call this θ. The ratio $\frac{P(M(X=w)|s_i,\tilde{\theta})}{P(M(X)=w|s_j,\tilde{\theta})}$ is equal to:

$$\frac{P(M(X)=w|s_i,\tilde{\theta})}{P(M(X)=w|s_i,\theta)}\frac{P(M(X)=w|s_j,\theta)}{P(M(X)=w|s_j,\tilde{\theta})}\frac{P(M(X)=w|s_i,\theta)}{P(M(X)=w|s_j,\theta)}. \tag{8}$$

Bu Pufferfish, the last ratio in (8) $\in [e^{-\epsilon}, e^{\epsilon}]$. Since the outcome of M given X is independent of the generation process for X, we have

$$\frac{P(M(X)=w|s_i,\tilde{\theta})}{P(M(X)=w|s_i,\theta)} = \frac{\int_D P(M(D)=w)P(X=D|s_i,\tilde{\theta})dD}{\int_D P(M(D)=w)P(X=D|s_i,\theta)dD}$$

$$\leq \max_D \frac{P(X=D|s_i,\tilde{\theta})}{P(X=D|s_i,\theta)} \leq e^{D_\infty(X|\tilde{\theta},s_i\|X|\theta,s_i)} \leq e^{\Delta}.$$

Similarly, we can show that this ratio is also $\geq e^{-\Delta}$. Applying the same argument to the second ratio in (8) along with simple algebra concludes the proof. $\square$

B. WASSERSTEIN MECHANISM PROOFS

PROOF. (Of Theorem 3.2) Let (s_i, s_j) be secret pair in $\mathcal{Q}$ such that that $P(s_i|\theta), P(s_j|\theta) > 0$. Let $\mu_{i,\theta}$,$\mu_{j,\theta}$ be defined as in the Wasserstein Mechanism. Let $\gamma^* = \gamma^*(\mu_{i,\theta}, \mu_{j,\theta})$ be the coupling between $\mu_{i,\theta}$ and $\mu_{j,\theta}$ that achieves the ∞-Wasserstein distance.

Let M denote the Wasserstein mechanism. For any w, the ratio $\frac{P(M(X)=w|s_i,\theta)}{P(M(X)=w|s_j,\theta)}$ is:

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{\int_t P(F(X)=t|s_i,\theta)P(Z=w-t)dt}{\int_s P(F(X)=s|s_j,\theta)P(Z=w-s)ds} \\ &= \frac{\int_t P(F(X)=t|s_i,\theta)e^{-\epsilon|w-t|/W}dt}{\int_s P(F(X)=s|s_j,\theta)e^{-\epsilon|w-s|/W}ds} \\ &= \frac{\int_t \int_{s=t-W}^{t+W} \gamma^*(t,s)e^{-\epsilon|w-t|/W}dsdt}{\int_s \int_{t=s-W}^{s+W} \gamma^*(t,s)e^{-\epsilon|w-s|/W}dtds}, \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where the first step follows from the definition of the Wasserstein mechanism, the second step from properties of the Laplace distribution, and the third step because for all $W \geq W_\infty(\mu_{i,\theta}, \mu_{j,\theta})$, we have

$$\mu_{i,\theta}(t) = P(F(X)=t|s_i,\theta) = \int_{s=t-W}^{t+W} \gamma^*(t,s)ds$$

An analogous statement also holds for $\mu_{j,\theta}(s)$. Observe that in the last step of (9), $|s-t| \leq W$ in both the numerator and denominator; therefore we have that the right hand side of (9) is at most:

$$e^\epsilon \frac{\int_t \int_{s=t-W}^{t+W} \gamma^*(t,s)e^{-\epsilon|w-s|/W}dsdt}{\int_s \int_{t=s-W}^{s+W} \gamma^*(t,s)e^{-\epsilon|w-s|/W}dtds} \tag{10}$$

$$= e^\epsilon \frac{\int_t \int_s \gamma^*(t,s)e^{-\epsilon|w-s|/W}dsdt}{\int_s \int_t \gamma^*(t,s)e^{-\epsilon|w-s|/W}dtds} \leq e^\epsilon, \tag{11}$$

where the last step follows as $\gamma^*(t,s) = 0$ when $|s-t| > W$. A similar argument shows that $\frac{P(M(X)=w|s_j,\theta)}{P(M(X)=w|s_i,\theta)} \leq e^\epsilon$, thus concluding the proof. $\square$

B.1 Comparison with Group DP

Consider a group-DP framework parameterized by a set of groups $\mathcal{G} = (G_1, \ldots, G_k)$. For each k, we use $X_{G_k} \subset X$ to denote the records of all individuals in G_k, and we define $D_k = \{(x,y)|x,y \text{ differ only by records in } X_{G_k}\}$.

DEFINITION B.1 (GLOBAL SENSITIVITY OF GROUPS). *We define the global sensitivity of a query F with respect to a group G_k as: $\Delta_{G_k}F = \max_{(x,y)\in D_k} |F(x) - F(y)|$. The Global Sensitivity of F with respect to an a Group DP framework $\mathcal{G}$ is defined as: $\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}F = \max_{k\in\{1,\ldots,m\}} \Delta_{G_k}F$.*

Analogous to differential privacy, adding to the result of query F Laplace noise with scale parameter $\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}F/\epsilon$ will provide in ϵ-group DP in the framework $\mathcal{G}$ [9].

We begin by formally defining a group DP framework corresponding to a given Pufferfish framework. Suppose we are given a Pufferfish instantiation $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Q}, \Theta)$ where data X can be written as $X = \{X_1, \cdots, X_n\}$, $X_i \in \mathcal{X}$, the secret set $\mathcal{S} = \{s_a^i : a \in \mathcal{X}, i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\}$ where s_a^i is the event that $X_i = a$, and the set of secret pairs $\mathcal{Q} = \{(s_a^i, s_b^i) : a, b \in \mathcal{X}, a \neq b, i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\}$. In the corresponding Group DP framework $\mathcal{G}$, $G_1, \ldots, G_m$ is a partition of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$, such that for any $p \neq q$, X_i and X_j are independent *in all* $\theta \in \Theta$ if $i \in G_p, j \in G_q$.

PROOF. (Of Theorem 3.3) All we need to prove is $W \leq \Delta_{\mathcal{G}}F$, where W is the noise parameter in the Wasserstein Mechanism and $\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}F$ is the global sensitivity of F in the group-DP framework $\mathcal{G}$.

For any secret pair $(s_a^i, s_b^i) \in \mathcal{Q}$, let k be such that $i \in G_k$. Let $X_T = X \setminus X_{G_k}$. For all realizations x_T of X_T, define $\nu_{i,a,\theta,x_T} = P(F(X)|X_i = a, X_T = x_T, \theta)$ and $\nu_{i,b,\theta,x_T} = P(F(X_S, X_T = x_T)|X_i = b, \theta)$.

Since any $X_j \in X_T$ is independent of X_i, for all realizations x_T of X_T, we have $P(X_T = x_T|X_i = a, \theta) = P(X_T = x_T|X_i = b, \theta) = P(X_T = x_T|\theta)$. And we have $\mu_{i,a,\theta} = \sum_{x_T} P(X_T = x_T|\theta)\nu_{i,a,\theta,x_T}$, and similarly, $\mu_{i,b,\theta} = \sum_{x_T} P(X_T = x_T|\theta)\nu_{i,b,\theta,x_T}$. As these two probability distributions are mixtures of the ν_{i,a,θ,x_T}s and ν_{i,b,θ,x_T}s with the same mixing coefficients, by Lemma B.2, we have: $W_\infty(\mu_{i,a,\theta}, \mu_{i,b,\theta}) \leq \max_{x_T} W_\infty(\nu_{i,a,\theta,x_T}, \nu_{i,b,\theta,x_T})$.

By definition, ∞-Wasserstein of two distributions is upper bounded by the range of the union of the two supports, $W_\infty(\nu_{i,a,\theta,x_T}, \nu_{i,b,\theta,x_T}) \leq \max_{x_{G_k}, x'_{G_k}} |F(X_{G_k} = x_{G_k}, X_T = x_T) - F(X_{G_k} = x'_{G_k}, X_T = x_T)|$, which is $\leq \Delta_{G_k}F$. Thus, $W_\infty(\mu_{i,a,\theta}, \mu_{i,b,\theta}) \leq \Delta_{\mathcal{G}}F$. Since this holds for all $(s_a^i, s_a^i) \in Q$ and all $\theta \in \Theta$, $W \leq \Delta_{\mathcal{G}}F$. $\square$

LEMMA B.2. *Let $\{\mu_i\}_{i=1}^n$, $\{\nu_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be two collections of probability distributions, and let $\{c_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be mixing weights such that $c_i \geq 0, \sum_i c_i = 1$. Let $\mu = \sum_i c_i\mu_i$ and $\nu = \sum_i c_i\nu_i$ be mixtures of the μ_i's and ν_i's with shared mixing weights $\{c_i\}$. Then $W_\infty(\mu, \nu) \leq \max_{i\in\{1,\ldots,n\}} W_\infty(\mu_i, \nu_i)$.*

PROOF. For all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, let γ_i be the coupling between μ_i and ν_i that achieves $W_\infty(\mu_i, \nu_i)$. Let the support of μ, ν be S, and that of μ_i, ν_i be S_i. We can extend each coupling γ_i to have value 0 at $(x,y) \in S \setminus S_i$.

We can construct a coupling γ between μ and ν as follows: $\gamma(x,y) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i\gamma_i(x,y)$. Since this is a valid coupling, $W_\infty(\mu, \nu) \leq \max_{(x,y)\in A} |x-y|$ where $A = \{(x,y)|\gamma(x,y) \neq 0\}$. And we also know that $\max_{(x,y)\in A} |x-y| = \max_i W_\infty(\mu_i, \nu_i)$. Therefore we have $W_\infty(\mu, \nu) \leq \max_{i\in\{1,\ldots,n\}} W_\infty(\mu_i, \nu_i)$. $\square$

C. MARKOV QUILT MECHANISM

C.1 General Properties

PROOF. (of Theorem 4.3) Consider any secret pair $(s_a^i, s_b^i) \in \mathcal{Q}$ and any $\theta \in \Theta$. Let $X_{Q,i}^*$ (with $X_{N,i}^*$, $X_{R,i}^*$) be Markov Quilt with minimum score for X_i. Since the trivial Markov Quilt $X_Q = \emptyset$ has $e_\Theta(X_Q|X_i) = 0$ and $\sigma(X_Q) = n/\epsilon$, this score is $\leq n/\epsilon$. Below we use the notation X_Q^*, X_N^*, X_R^* to denote $X_{Q,i}^*$, $X_{N,i}^*$, $X_{R,i}^*$ and use $X_Q^* \cup X_R^* = X_{R\cup Q}^*$.

For any w, we have $\frac{P(F(X)+L\sigma_{\max}Z=w|X_i=a,\theta)}{P(F(X)+L\sigma_{\max}Z=w|X_i=b,\theta)}$ is at most:

$$\max_{x_{R\cup Q}^*} \frac{P(F(X) + L\sigma_{\max}Z = w|X_i = a, X_{R\cup Q}^* = x_{R\cup Q}^*, \theta)}{P(F(X) + L\sigma_{\max}Z = w|X_i = b, X_{R\cup Q}^* = x_{R\cup Q}^*, \theta)} \frac{P(X_{R\cup Q}^* = x_{R\cup Q}^*|X_i = a, \theta)}{P(X_{R\cup Q}^* = x_{R\cup Q}^*|X_i = b, \theta)}. \tag{12}$$

Since F is L-Lipschitz, for a fixed $X^*_{R\cup Q}$, $F(X)$ can vary by at most $L \cdot \texttt{card}(X^*_N)$; thus for $x^*_{R\cup Q}$, the first ratio in (12) is $\leq e^{\epsilon - e_\Theta(X^*_Q|X_i)}$.

Since X^*_R is independent of X_i given X^*_Q, the second ratio in (12) is at most $e^{e_\Theta(X^*_Q|X_i)}$. The theorem follows. $\square$

Proof. (of Theorem 4.4) Let L_k be the Lipschitz coefficient of F_k. Consider any secret pair $(X_i = a, X_i = b) \in \mathcal{Q}$. In a Pufferfish instantiation $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Q}, \Theta)$, given ϵ and $S_{Q,i}$, the active Markov Quilt $X^*_{Q,i}$ for X_i used by the Markov Quilt Mechanism is fixed. Therefore all M_k use the same active Markov Quilt, and we denote it by X_Q, with corresponding X_R, X_N. Let $Z_k \sim \text{Lap}(\sigma^{(k)})$ denote the Laplace noise added by the Markov Quilt Mechanism M_k to $F_k(D)$. For any k, since X_Q is the active Markov Quilt, we have $\sigma^{(k)} \geq \frac{L_k \texttt{card}(X_N)}{\epsilon - e_\Theta(X_Q|X_i)}$. Let $X_{R\cup Q} = X_R \cup X_Q$. Then for any $\{w_k\}_{k=1}^K$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{P(\forall k, F_k(X) + Z_k = w_k | X_i = a)}{P(\forall k, F_k(X) + Z_k = w_k | X_i = b)} \\
=&\frac{\int P(\forall k, F_k(X) + Z_k = w_k, X_{R\cup Q} = x_{R\cup Q} | X_i = a) dx_{R\cup Q}}{\int P(\forall k, F_k(X) + Z_k = w_k, X_{R\cup Q} = x_{R\cup Q} | X_i = b) dx_{R\cup Q}} \\
=&\frac{\int P(\forall k, F_k(X) + Z_k = w_k | X_{R\cup Q} = x_{R\cup Q}, X_i = a)}{\int P(\forall k, F_k(X) + Z_k = w_k | X_{R\cup Q} = x_{R\cup Q}, X_i = b)} \\
&\qquad \frac{P(X_{R\cup Q} = x_{R\cup Q} | X_i = a) dx_{R\cup Q}}{P(X_{R\cup Q} = x_{R\cup Q} | X_i = b) dx_{R\cup Q}} \\
\leq &\max_{x_{R\cup Q}} \frac{P(\forall k, F_k(X) + Z_k = w_k | X_{R\cup Q} = x_{R\cup Q}, X_i = a)}{P(\forall k, F_k(X) + Z_k = w_k | X_{R\cup Q} = x_{R\cup Q}, X_i = b)} \\
&\qquad \frac{P(X_{R\cup Q} = x_{R\cup Q} | X_i = a)}{P(X_{R\cup Q} = x_{R\cup Q} | X_i = b)} \qquad (13)
\end{aligned}
$$

Let $X_{N\setminus\{i\}} = X_N \setminus X_i$. The first ratio in (13) equals to

$$
\begin{aligned}
=&\frac{\int P(\forall k, F_k(X) + Z_k = w_k, X_{N\setminus\{i\}} = x_{N\setminus\{i\}}}{\int P(\forall k, F_k(X) + Z_k = w_k, X_{N\setminus\{i\}} = x_{N\setminus\{i\}}} \\
&\qquad \frac{|X_{R\cup Q} = x_{R\cup Q}, X_i = a) dx_{N\setminus\{i\}}}{|X_{R\cup Q} = x_{R\cup Q}, X_i = b) dx_{N\setminus\{i\}}} \\
=&\frac{\int P(\forall k, F_k(X) + Z_k = w_k | X_{N\setminus\{i\}} = x_{N\setminus\{i\}}, X_{R\cup Q} = x_{R\cup Q},}{\int P(\forall k, F_k(X) + Z_k = w_k | X_{N\setminus\{i\}} = x_{N\setminus\{i\}}, X_{R\cup Q} = x_{R\cup Q},} \\
&\qquad \frac{X_i = a) P(x_{N\setminus\{i\}} | X_{R\cup Q} = x_{R\cup Q}, X_i = a) dx_{N\setminus\{i\}}}{X_i = b) P(x_{N\setminus\{i\}} | X_{R\cup Q} = x_{R\cup Q}, X_i = b) dx_{N\setminus\{i\}}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Let $F_k(a, x_{N\setminus\{i\}}, x_{R\cup Q})$ denote the value of $F_k(X)$ with $X_i = a$, $X_{R\cup Q} = x_{R\cup Q}$ and $X_{N\setminus\{i\}} = x_{N\setminus\{i\}}$. Since $F_k(X)$'s are fixed given a fixed value of X, and Z_k's are independent, the above equals to

$$
\begin{aligned}
=&\frac{\int \Pi_k P(Z_k = w_k - F_k(a, x_{N\setminus\{i\}}, x_{R\cup Q}))}{\int \Pi_k P(Z_k = w_k - F_k(b, x_{N\setminus\{i\}}, x_{R\cup Q}))} \\
&\qquad \frac{P(X_{N\setminus\{i\}} = x_{N\setminus\{i\}} | X_{R\cup Q} = x_{R\cup Q}, X_i = a) dx_{N\setminus\{i\}}}{P(X_{N\setminus\{i\}} = x_{N\setminus\{i\}} | X_{R\cup Q} = x_{R\cup Q}, X_i = b) dx_{N\setminus\{i\}}} \\
\leq &\frac{\Pi_k \max_{x_{N\setminus\{i\}}} P(Z_k = w_k - F_k(a, x_{N\setminus\{i\}}, x_{R\cup Q}))}{\Pi_k \min_{x_{N\setminus\{i\}}} P(Z_k = w_k - F_k(b, x_{N\setminus\{i\}}, x_{R\cup Q}))} \\
&\qquad \frac{\int P(X_{N\setminus\{i\}} = x_{N\setminus\{i\}} | X_{R\cup Q} = x_{R\cup Q}, X_i = a) dx_{N\setminus\{i\}}}{\int P(X_{N\setminus\{i\}} = x_{N\setminus\{i\}} | X_{R\cup Q} = x_{R\cup Q}, X_i = b) dx_{N\setminus\{i\}}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $P(X_{N\setminus\{i\}} | X_{R\cup Q} = x_{R\cup Q}, X_i = a)$, $P(X_{N\setminus\{i\}} | X_{R\cup Q} = x_{R\cup Q}, X_i = b)$ are probability distributions which integrate to 1, the above equals to

$$
\frac{\Pi_k \max_{x_{N\setminus\{i\}}} P(Z_k = w_k - F_k(a, x_{N\setminus\{i\}}, x_{R\cup Q}))}{\Pi_k \min_{x_{N\setminus\{i\}}} P(Z_k = w_k - F_k(b, x_{N\setminus\{i\}}, x_{R\cup Q}))}.
$$

Notice that F_k can change by at most $L_k \cdot \texttt{card}(N)$ when $X_{N\setminus\{i\}}$ and X_i change. So for any $x_{N\setminus\{i\}}, x'_{N\setminus\{i\}}$,

$$
\frac{P(Z_k = w_k - F_k(a, x_{N\setminus\{i\}}, x_{R\cup Q}))}{P(Z_k = w_k - F_k(b, x'_{N\setminus\{i\}}, x_{R\cup Q}))} \leq e^{\epsilon - e_\Theta(X_Q|X_i)}.
$$

Therefore the first ratio in (13) is upper bounded by $\Pi_k e^{\epsilon - e_\Theta(X_Q|X_i)}$.

As has been analyzed in the proof to Theorem 4.3, the second ratio is bounded by $e^{e_\Theta(X_Q|X_i)}$. Combining the two ratios together, (13) is upper bounded by $\Pi_k e^{\epsilon - e_\Theta(X_Q|X_i)} e^{e_\Theta(X_Q|X_i)} \leq e^{K\epsilon}$, and the theorem follows. $\square$

C.2 Markov Chains

Proof. (of Lemma 4.6) Consider a Markov Quilt (X_N, X_Q, X_R) of X_i. $X_Q = X_{Q,l} \cup X_{Q,r}$ where all nodes in $X_{Q,l}$ have index smaller than i, and all nodes in $X_{Q,r}$ have index larger than i. When X_Q is non-empty, there are three cases.

First, both $X_{Q,l}$ and $X_{Q,r}$ are non-empty. Then there exist positive integers a, b, such that $X_{i-a} \in X_{Q,l}$ is the node with the largest index in $X_{Q,l}$, and X_{i+b} is the node with the smallest index in $X_{Q,r}$. Since $X_{Q,l} \setminus X_{i-a}$ is independent of X_i given X_{i-a}, and $X_{Q,r} \setminus X_{i-b}$ is independent of X_i given X_{i-b}, $e_\Theta(X_Q|X_i) = e_\Theta(\{X_{i-a}, X_{i+b}\}|X_i)$. Also, all nodes in $\{X_{i-a+1}, \ldots, X_{i+b-1}\}$ should be included in X_N, since they are not independent of X_i given X_Q, and thus $\texttt{card}(X_N) \geq a + b - 1$. Thus, if $X_{Q'} = \{X_{i-a}, X_{i+b}\} \in S_{Q,i}$ with $X_{N'} = \{X_{i-a+1}, \ldots, X_{i+b-1}\}$, then $\sigma(X_{Q'}) \leq \sigma(X_Q)$.

The second case is when $X_{Q,r}$ is empty but $X_{Q,l}$ is not. Still, there exists positive integer a such that $X_{i-a} \in X_{Q,l}$ is the node with largest index in $X_{Q,l}$. Since $X_{Q,l} \setminus X_{i-a}$ is independent of X_i given X_{i-a}, $e_\Theta(X_Q|X_i) = e_\Theta(\{X_{i-a}\}|X_i)$. Since all nodes in $\{X_{i-a+1}, \ldots, X_T\}$ are not independent of X_i given X_Q, they should be included in X_N, and thus $\texttt{card}(X_N) \geq T - i + a$. Now consider $X_{Q'} = \{X_{i-a}\} \in S_{Q,i}$ with $X_{N'} = \{X_{i-a+1}, \ldots, X_T\}$. The above implies that $\sigma(X_{Q'}) \leq \sigma(X_Q)$. The third case is when $X_{Q,l}$ is empty but $X_{Q,r}$ is not; this is analogous to the second case. $\square$

Before proving Lemma 4.8, we overload the notation g_Θ in (7) to capture the case where Θ consists of irreducible, aperiodic and *reversible* Markov chains:

$$
g_\Theta = \qquad (14)
$$
$$
\begin{cases}
2 \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \min\{1 - |\lambda| : P_\theta x = \lambda x, |\lambda| < 1\}, \theta \in \Theta \text{ reversible} \\
\min_{\theta \in \Theta} \min\{1 - |\lambda| : P_\theta P^*_\theta x = \lambda x, |\lambda| < 1\}, \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
$$

Now we restate Lemma 4.8 to provide a better upper bound when $P_\theta, \forall \theta \in \Theta$ is irreducible, aperiodic, and *reversible*.

Lemma C.1. *Let $\pi^{\min}_\Theta$ be as in* (6)*, and g_Θ be as in* (14)*. Suppose a, b are integers such that $\min(a, b) \geq \frac{2\log(1/\pi^{\min}_\Theta)}{g_\Theta}$. Then, for $X_Q = \{X_{i-a}, X_{i+b}\}$, $e_\Theta(X_Q|X_i)$ is at most:*

$$
\log\left(\frac{\pi^{\min}_\Theta + \exp(-g_\Theta b/2)}{\pi^{\min}_\Theta - \exp(-g_\Theta b/2)}\right) + 2\log\left(\frac{\pi^{\min}_\Theta + \exp(-g_\Theta a/2)}{\pi^{\min}_\Theta - \exp(-g_\Theta a/2)}\right);
$$

for $X_Q = \{X_{i-a}\}$, $e_\Theta(X_Q|X_i) \leq 2\log\left(\frac{\pi^{\min}_\Theta + \exp(-g_\Theta a/2)}{\pi^{\min}_\Theta - \exp(-g_\Theta a/2)}\right)$;

for $X_Q = \{X_{i+b}\}$, $e_\Theta(X_Q|X_i) \leq \log\left(\frac{\pi^{\min}_\Theta + \exp(-g_\Theta b/2)}{\pi^{\min}_\Theta - \exp(-g_\Theta b/2)}\right)$, and for $X_Q = \emptyset$, $e_\Theta(X_Q|X_i) = 0$.

The main ingredient in the proof of Lemma 4.8 is from the following standard result in Markov Chain theory [1].

LEMMA C.2. *Consider an* aperiodic, irreducible *k-state discrete time Markov Chain with transition matrix P. Let π be its stationary distribution and let $\pi^{\min} = \min_x \pi(x)$. Let P^* be the time-reversal of P, and let g be defined as follows:*

$$g = \begin{cases} 2\min\{1-|\lambda| : Px = \lambda x, |\lambda| < 1\}, & P \text{ is reversible} \\ \min\{1-|\lambda| : PP^*x = \lambda x, |\lambda| < 1\}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

If $\Delta_t = \frac{\exp(-tg/2)}{\pi^{\min}}$, then $\left|\frac{P^t(x,y)}{\pi(y)} - 1\right| \le \Delta_t$ for $t \ge \frac{2\log(1/\pi^{\min})}{g}$.

This lemma, along with some algebra and an Bayes Rule, suffices to show the following.

LEMMA C.3. *For any Θ consists of irreducible and aperiodic Markov chains, let $\pi_\Theta^{\min}$ be defined as in* (6)*, and g_Θ be defined as in* (14)*. Let $\Delta_t = \frac{\exp(-tg_\Theta/2)}{\pi_\Theta^{\min}}$. Suppose $t > \frac{2\log(1/\pi_\Theta^{\min})}{g_\Theta}$. For any $\theta \in \Theta$ and any x, x' and y,*

$$\frac{1-\Delta_t}{1+\Delta_t} \le \frac{P(X_{t+j} = y | X_j = x, \theta)}{P(X_{t+j} = y | X_j = x', \theta)} \le \frac{1+\Delta_t}{1-\Delta_t}.$$

$$\left(\frac{1-\Delta_t}{1+\Delta_t}\right)^2 \le \frac{P(X_j = y | X_{j+t} = x, \theta)}{P(X_j = y | X_{j+t} = x', \theta)} \le \left(\frac{1+\Delta_t}{1-\Delta_t}\right)^2.$$

PROOF. (of Lemma 4.8) Consider X_Q of the form $\{X_{i-a}, X_{i+b}\}$. For any θ, any x, x' and any x_Q, by conditional independence, $\log \frac{P(X_Q = x_Q | X_i = x, \theta)}{P(X_Q = x_Q | X_i = x', \theta)}$ is equal to:

$$\log \frac{P(X_{i+b} = x_{i+b} | X_i = x, \theta)}{P(X_{i+b} = x_{i+b} | X_i = x', \theta)} + \log \frac{P(X_{i-a} = x_{i-a} | X_i = x, \theta)}{P(X_{i-a} = x_{i-a} | X_i = x', \theta)}$$

By Lemma C.3, this is at most $2\log\frac{1+\Delta_a}{1-\Delta_a} + \log\frac{1+\Delta_b}{1-\Delta_b}$ for any x, x', x_{i-a}, x_{i+b}.

Moreover, when $X_Q = \{X_{i-a}\}$, the first term disappears and $\log \frac{P(X_Q = x_Q | X_i = x, \theta)}{P(X_Q = x_Q | X_i = x', \theta)}$ is at most $2\log\frac{1+\Delta_a}{1-\Delta_a}$; the case $X_Q = \{X_{i+b}\}$ is analogous, thus concluding the proof. □

PROOF. (of Theorem 4.10) Let a^* be defined as in Lemma 4.9. Consider the middle node $X_{\lceil T/2 \rceil}$ and Markov Quilt $X_Q = \{X_{\lceil T/2 \rceil - a^*}, X_{\lceil T/2 \rceil + a^*}\}$; since $T \ge 2a^* + 1$, both endpoints of the quilt lie inside the chain. From Lemma 4.8 and the definition of a^*, $e_\Theta(X_Q | X_i) \le \epsilon/2$.

Let $C = 8\lceil \log\left(\frac{\exp(\epsilon/6)+1}{\exp(\epsilon/6)-1}\frac{1}{\pi_\Theta^{\min}}\right)/g_\Theta \rceil$. We have $\sigma(X_Q) \le \frac{C}{\epsilon}$. By definition, $\sigma_{\lceil T/2 \rceil} \le \sigma(X_Q)$. Also, by Lemma C.4, $\sigma_j \le \sigma_{\lceil T/2 \rceil}$ for any j. Therefore $\max_{j \in \{1,\dots,T\}} \sigma_j \le C/\epsilon$. □

C.3 Fast MQMApprox

LEMMA C.4. *In Algorithm MQMApprox, suppose there exists an $i \in \{1, \dots, T\}$, such that $\sigma_i = \min_{X_Q \in S_{Q,i}} \sigma(X_Q)$ is achieved by $X_Q = \{X_{i-a}, X_{i+b}\}$ with $i - a \ge 1$, $i + b \le T$. Then, $\max_{j \in \{1,\dots,T\}} \sigma_j = \sigma_i$.*

PROOF. (Of Lemma C.4) Let $X_Q = \{x_{i-a}, x_{i+b}\}$ be the quilt with the lowest score for node X_i. Pick any other node $X_{i'}$. If both $i' - a \ge 1$ and $i' + b \le T$, then $\{X_{i'-a}, X_{i'+b}\}$ is a quilt for $X_{i'}$ with score σ_i. Since $\sigma_{i'}$ is the minimum score over all quilts of $X_{i'}$, $\sigma_{i'} \le \sigma_i$.

Otherwise, at least one of the conditions $i' - a \ge 1$ or $i' + b \le T$ hold. Suppose $i' - a \ge 1$. Then, consider the quilt $X_{Q'} = \{X_{i'-a}\}$ for $X_{i'}$. Let X_N (resp. $X_{N'}$) be the set of local nodes of X_i (resp. $X_{i'}$) corresponding to X_Q (resp. $X_{Q'}$). Since $i' + b \ge T + 1$, we have $\texttt{card}(X_{N'}) = T - i' + a \le a + b - 1 = \texttt{card}(X_N)$. This implies that $e_\Theta(X_{Q'} | X_{i'})$ is equal to:

$$= 2\log\left(\frac{\pi_\Theta^{\min} + \exp(-g_\Theta a/2)}{\pi_\Theta^{\min} - \exp(-g_\Theta a/2)}\right)$$
$$\le \log\left(\frac{\pi_\Theta^{\min} + \exp(-g_\Theta b/2)}{\pi_\Theta^{\min} - \exp(-g_\Theta b/2)}\right) + 2\log\left(\frac{\pi_\Theta^{\min} + \exp(-g_\Theta a/2)}{\pi_\Theta^{\min} - \exp(-g_\Theta a/2)}\right),$$

which is $e_\Theta(X_Q | X_i)$. This mean that $\sigma(X_{Q'}) = \frac{\texttt{card}(X_{N'})}{\epsilon - e_\Theta(X_{Q'} | X_{i'})}$ is at most $\frac{\texttt{card}(X_N)}{\epsilon - e_\Theta(X_Q | X_i)} = \sigma_i$. Therefore, $\sigma_{i'} \le \sigma_i$.

The other case where $i' + b \le T$ is analogous. Thus $\forall i'$, $\sigma_{i'} \le \sigma_i$ and $\sigma_{\max} = \sigma_i$. □

PROOF. (Of Lemma 4.9) Consider the middle node $X_{\lceil T/2 \rceil}$ and Markov Quilt $X_Q = \{X_{\lceil T/2 \rceil - a^*}, X_{\lceil T/2 \rceil + a^*}\}$; since $T \ge 8a^*$, both endpoints of the quilt lie inside the chain. From Lemma 4.8 and the definition of a^*, $e_\Theta(X_Q | X_i) \le \epsilon/2$. Therefore, $\sigma(X_Q) = \frac{2a^* - 1}{\epsilon - e_\Theta(X_Q | X_i)} \le \frac{4a^* - 2}{\epsilon}$.

Consider any Markov Quilt $X_{Q'}$ (with corresponding $X_{N'}$ and $X_{R'}$) with $\texttt{card}(X_{N'}) \ge 4a^* - 2$. Since max-influence is always non-negative, we have $\sigma(X_{Q'}) = \frac{\texttt{card}(X_{N'})}{\epsilon - e_\Theta(X_{Q'} | X_i)} \ge \frac{4a^* - 2}{\epsilon} \ge \sigma(X_Q)$, and thus any Markov Quilt $X_{Q'}$ with $\texttt{card}(X_{N'}) \ge 4a^* - 2$ has score no less than that of $X_Q = \{X_{i-a^*}, X_{i+a^*}\}$. If $X_{Q'}$ is of the form $\{X_{i-a'}\}$ or $\{X_{i+b'}\}$, then since $T \ge 8a^*$, we have $\texttt{card}(X_{N'}) \ge 4a^*$. Therefore the optimal Markov Quilt for X_i is of the form $\{X_{i-a}, X_{i+b}\}$ with $a + b \le 4a^*$. Combining this with Lemma C.4 concludes the proof. □

C.4 MQMExact Optimization

We show that MQMExact can be expedited further if Θ is of the form: $\Theta = \Delta_k \times \mathcal{P}$, where $\mathcal{P}$ is a set of transition matrices, and Δ_k is the probability simplex over k items. In other words, Θ includes tuples of the form (q, P) where q ranges over possible initial distributions and P belongs to a set $\mathcal{P}$ of transition matrices.

For any $P \in \mathcal{P}$, let $\Theta_P = \{(P, q) \in \Theta\}$. Let P^j be P raised to the j-th power. From (5), $e_{\Theta_P}(X_Q | X_i)$ is equal to:

$$\max_{x, x' \in \mathcal{X}} \left(\log \max_q \frac{(q^\top P^{i-1})(x')}{(q^\top P^{i-1})(x)} + \max_{x_{i+b} \in \mathcal{X}} \log \frac{P^b(x, x_{i+b})}{P^b(x', x_{i+b})} + \max_{x_{i-a} \in \mathcal{X}} \log \frac{P^a(x_{i-a}, x)}{P^a(x_{i-a}, x')} \right).$$

Since $(q^\top P^{i-1})(x) = q^\top P^{i-1}(:, x)$, for $i > 1$, we have

$$\max_q \frac{(q^\top P^{i-1})(x')}{(q^\top P^{i-1})(x)} = \max_q \frac{q^\top P^{i-1}(:, x')}{q^\top P^{i-1}(:, x)} = \max_y \frac{P^{i-1}(y, x')}{P^{i-1}(y, x)}$$

where the the maximum is achieved by $q = e_{y^*}$, $y^* = \arg\max_y \frac{P^{i-1}(y, x')}{P^{i-1}(y, x)}$.

This implies that we only need to iterate over all transition matrices $\mathcal{P}$ instead of conducting a grid search over Θ, which further improves efficiency.