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Abstract

We study the central problem in data privacy: how to share data with an analyst while providing both privacy and utility guarantees to the user that owns the data. In this setting, we present an estimation-theoretic analysis of the privacy-utility trade-off (PUT). Here, an analyst is allowed to reconstruct (in a mean-squared error sense) certain functions of the data (utility), while other private functions should not be reconstructed with distortion below a certain threshold (privacy). We demonstrate how $\chi^2$-information captures the fundamental PUT in this case and provide bounds for the best PUT. We propose a convex program to compute privacy-assuring mappings when the functions to be disclosed and hidden are known a priori and the data distribution is known. We derive lower bounds on the minimum mean-squared error of estimating a target function from the disclosed data and evaluate the robustness of our approach when an empirical distribution is used to compute the privacy-assuring mappings instead of the true data distribution. We illustrate the proposed approach through two numerical experiments.
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1 Introduction

Data sharing and publishing is increasingly common within scientific communities [3], businesses [4], government operations [5], medical fields [6], and beyond. Data is usually shared with an application in mind, from which the data provider receives some utility. For example, when a user shares her movie ratings with a streaming service, she receives utility in the form of suggestions of new, interesting movie recommendations that fit her taste. As a second example, when a medical research group shares patient data, their aim is to enable a wider community of researchers and statisticians to learn patterns from that data. Utility is then gained through new scientific discoveries.

The disclosure of non-encrypted data incurs a privacy risk through unwanted inferences. In our previous examples, the streaming service may infer the user’s political preference (potentially deemed private by the user) from her movie ratings [7], or an insurance company may determine the identity of a patient within a medical dataset [8]. If privacy is a concern but the data has no immediate utility, then cryptographic methods suffice.

The dichotomy between privacy and utility has been widely studied by computer scientists, statisticians, and information theorists alike. While specific metrics and models vary among these communities, their desideratum is the same: to design mechanisms that perturb the data (or functions thereof) while achieving an acceptable privacy-utility trade-off (PUT). The feasibility of this goal depends on several factors including the chosen privacy and utility metric, as well as the topology and distribution of the data. The information-theoretic approach to privacy, and notably the results by Sankar et al. [9,10], Issa et al. [11,12], Asoodeh et al. [13,14], Calmon et al. [15,16], among others, seek to quantify the best possible PUT for any privacy mechanism. In those works, information-theoretic quantities, such as mutual information and maximal leakage, have been used to characterize privacy, and bounds on the fundamental PUT were derived under assumptions on the distribution of the data. It is within this information-theoretic approach that the present work is inscribed.

Our aim is to characterize the fundamental limits of PUT from an estimation-theoretic perspective, and to design privacy-assuring mechanisms that provide estimation-theoretic guarantees. The specific privacy and utility metric used is the $\chi^2$-information between probability distributions and, more generally, the principal inertia components (PICs) [15] of the distributions of the private and disclosed data. The PICs reveal interesting facets of data disclosure under privacy constraints and quantify the minimum mean-squared error (MMSE) achievable for reconstructing both private and useful information from the disclosed data. We do not seek to claim that the estimation-based approach subsumes other privacy metrics, such as differential privacy [17]. Rather, our goal is to show that the MMSE viewpoint reveals an interesting facet of data disclosure which, in turn, can drive the design of privacy mechanisms used in practice.

In the remainder of this section, we present an overview of the paper and our main results, discuss related work, and introduce the notation adopted in the paper.

1.1 Overview and Main Contributions

Throughout this paper, we assume all random variables are discrete with finite support sets. We let $S$ denote a private variable to be hidden (e.g., political preference) and $X$ be a useful variable that depends on $S$ (e.g., movie ratings). Our goal is to disclose a realization of a random variable $Y$, produced from $X$ through a randomized mapping $P_{Y|X}$ called the privacy-assuring mapping. Here, $S$, $X$, and $Y$ satisfy the Markov condition $S \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y$. We assume that an analyst will provide some utility based on an observation of $Y$ (e.g., movie recommendations), while potentially trying to estimate $S$ from $Y$. Denoting $[n] \triangleq \{1, \ldots, n\}$, the support sets of $S$, $X$, and $Y$ are $\mathcal{S} = |\mathcal{S}|$, $\mathcal{X} = |\mathcal{X}|$, and $\mathcal{Y} = |\mathcal{Y}|$, respectively.

In the sequel, we derive PUTs when both privacy and utility are measured in terms of the mean-squared error of reconstructing functions of $S$ and $X$ from an observation of $Y$. We analyze three related scenarios: (i) a uniform setting, where the MMSE of reconstructing any function of $S$ is maximized while controlling for the MMSE of reconstructing any function of $X$, and $P_{S,X}$ is known to the privacy mechanism designer, (ii) a composite setting, where specific functions of $S$ and $X$ have different privacy/utility reconstruction requirements, and $P_{S,X}$ is known to the privacy mechanism designer, and (iii) a restricted-knowledge setting, where $P_{S,X}$ is unknown, but the correlation between a target function to be hidden and a set of functions which are known to be hard to infer from the disclosed variable is given. For the first two thrusts, we also
analyze the robustness of privacy-assuring mappings designed using an empirical estimate of $P_{S,X}$ computed from a finite number of samples. Next, we present the outline of the paper and a summary of our main contributions.

**Uniform PUTs**

We start by studying the problem of limiting an untrusted party’s ability to estimate any function of $S$ given an observation of $Y$, while controlling for the MMSE of reconstructing functions of $X$ given $Y$. Here, privacy and utility are measured in terms of the $\chi^2$-information between $S$ and $Y$, denoted by $\chi^2(S;Y)$, and the $\chi^2$-information between $X$ and $Y$, denoted by $\chi^2(X;Y)$, respectively. As shown in [15], the MMSE of reconstructing functions of $S$ given $Y$ is uniformly bounded by $\chi^2(S;Y)$. More specifically, if $\chi^2(S;Y) \leq \epsilon < 1$, the MMSE of reconstructing any zero-mean, unit-variance function of $S$ given $Y$ is lower bounded by $1 - \epsilon$. Depending on the value of $\epsilon$ and the needs of the user, privacy is assured in this estimation-theoretic sense. Analogously, if $\chi^2(X;Y)$ is large, then certain functions of $X$ can be, on average, reconstructed (i.e., estimated) with small MMSE from $Y$.

We adopt $\chi^2$-information as a measure of both privacy and utility in Section 3. Bounds on the best PUT are presented in Theorem 2. In particular, the upper bound is cast in terms of the PICs of $P_{S,X}$, and has an interesting spectral interpretation. We also prove that the upper bound is achievable in the high-privacy regime.

**Composite PUTs**

$\chi^2$-based metrics guarantee privacy and utility in a uniform sense, capturing the aggregate mean-squared error of estimating functions of the private and the useful variables. However, in many applications, specific functions of $S$ and $X$ that should be hidden/revealed are known a priori. This knowledge enables a more refined design of privacy-assuring mechanisms that specifically target these functions. We explore this fine-grained approach in Section 4, and propose a PIC-based convex program for computing privacy-assuring mappings within this setting. We demonstrate the practical feasibility of the convex programs through two numerical experiments in Section 7, deriving privacy-assuring mappings for a synthetic dataset and a real-world dataset. In the latter case, we approximate $P_{S,X}$ using its empirical distribution.

**Restricted Knowledge of the Distribution**

The aforementioned uniform and composite PUTs require knowledge of the joint distribution $P_{S,X}$. In Section 5, we forgo this assumption, and study a simpler setting where $S = \phi(X)$ (i.e., the private variable is a function of the data) and the correlation between $\phi(X)$ and a set of functions (composed with the data) $\{\phi_j(X)\}_{j=1}^m$ is given. In practice, $\phi(X)$ may be a sensitive feature of the data $X$, and $\{\phi_j(X)\}_{j=1}^m$ is a collection of other features from which $\mathbb{E}[\phi(X)\phi_j(X)]$ can be accurately estimated.

Our goal here is to derive lower bounds on the MMSE of estimating $\phi(X)$ from $Y$ for any privacy-assuring mapping $P_{Y|X}$ in terms of the MMSE of estimating $\phi_j(X)$ from $Y$ and the correlation between $\phi(X)$ and $\{\phi_j(X)\}_{j=1}^m$. This leads to a converse result in Theorem 5: if the MMSE of estimating $\phi_j(X)$ from $Y$ is large and $\phi(X)$ is strongly correlated with $\phi_j(X)$, then the MMSE of estimating $\phi(X)$ from $Y$ will also be large and privacy is assured in an estimation-theoretic sense. The inverse result is straightforward: if $\phi(X)$ and $\phi_j(X)$ are strongly correlated and $\phi_j(X)$ can be reliably reconstructed from $Y$, then $\phi(X)$ can also be reliably estimated from $Y$. This intuitive trade-off is at the heart of the estimation-theoretic view of privacy, and demonstrates that no function of $X$ can remain private whilst other strongly correlated functions are revealed through $Y$. The results in Section 5 make this intuition mathematically precise.

Finally, in Section 6 we investigate the resilience of privacy-assuring mappings when designed using an estimate of the distribution $P_{S,X}$ computed as the empirical frequencies of $S,X$ obtained from $n$ i.i.d. samples. Here, the value of the privacy and utility guarantees estimated using $P_{S,X}$ will not match the true values $\chi^2(S;Y)$ and $\chi^2(X;Y)$ obtained when the privacy-assuring mechanism is applied to fresh samples drawn from the true distribution $P_{S,X}$. We bound this performance gap in Theorem 6 and show that this gap scales as $O\left(\sqrt{1/m}\right)$. 


1.2 Related Work

Several papers, such as Sankar et al. [9], Calmon and Fawaz [16], Asoodeh et al. [18], and Makhdoumi et al. [19], have studied information disclosure with privacy guarantees through an information-theoretic lens. For example, Sankar et al. [9] characterized PUTs in large databases using tools from rate-distortion theory. Calmon and Fawaz [16] used expected distortion and mutual information to measure utility and privacy, respectively, and characterized the PUT as an optimization problem. Makhdoumi et al. [19] introduced the privacy funnel, where both privacy and utility are measured in terms of mutual information, and showed its connection with the information bottleneck [20]. The PUT was also explored in [21] and [22] using mutual information as a privacy metric.

Currently, the most adopted definition of privacy is differential privacy [17,23], which enables queries to be computed over a database while simultaneously ensuring privacy of individual entries of the database. Fundamental bounds on composition of differentially private mechanisms were given by Kairouz et al. [24]. In a different direction, a new privacy framework called Pufferfish [25] was developed for creating customized privacy definitions. Other quantities from the information-theoretic literature have been used to quantify privacy and utility. For example, Asoodeh et al. [13] and Calmon et al. [15] used estimation-theoretic tools to characterize fundamental limits of privacy. Liao et al. [26,27] explored the PUT within a hypothesis testing framework. Issa et al. [11,28] introduced maximal leakage as an information leakage metric. There is also significant recent work in information-theoretic privacy in the context of network secrecy. For example, Li and Oechtering [29] proposed a new privacy metric based on distributed Bayesian detection which can inform privacy-aware system design. Recently, Tripathy et al. [30] and Huang et al. [31] used adversarial networks for designing privacy-assuring mappings that navigate the PUT. Takbiri et al. [32] considered obfuscation and anonymization techniques and characterized the conditions required to obtain perfect privacy.

MMSE-based analysis and maximal correlation have been investigated in the context of log-Sobolev inequalities and hypercontractivity, such as in the work of Raginsky [33], Anantharam et al. [34], and Polyaniskiy and Wu [35]. The metric used in this paper, namely $\chi^2$-information, relates with $\chi^2$-divergence, which is a special case of $f$-divergence [36]. Also of note, the study of robustness of estimated distributions with finite sample size has appeared in [37–40].

1.3 Notation

Matrices are denoted in bold capital letters (e.g., $\mathbf{P}$) and vectors in bold lower-case letters (e.g., $\mathbf{p}$). For a vector $\mathbf{p}$, $\text{diag}(\mathbf{p})$ is defined as the matrix with diagonal entries equal to $\mathbf{p}$ and all other entries equal to 0. The span of a set $\mathcal{V}$ of vectors is

$$\text{span}(\mathcal{V}) \triangleq \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i \mathbf{v}_i \middle| k \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{V}, \lambda_i \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$ 

The dimension of a linear span is denoted by $\dim(\text{span}(\mathcal{V}))$.

We denote independence of random variables $U$ and $V$ by $U \independent V$, and write $U \sim V$ to indicate that $U$ and $V$ have the same distribution. When $U$, $V$, and $W$ form a Markov chain, we write $U \rightarrow V \rightarrow W$. For a random variable $U$ with probability distribution $P_U$, we denote $P_{U_{\min}} \triangleq \inf \{ P_U(u) \mid u \in \mathcal{U} \}$, where $\mathcal{U}$ is the support set of $U$. The MMSE of estimating $U$ given $V$ is

$$\text{mmse}(U|V) \triangleq \min_{U \rightarrow V \rightarrow \hat{U}} \mathbb{E} \left[ (U - \hat{U})^2 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ (U - \mathbb{E}[U|V])^2 \right]. \quad (1)$$

The $\chi^2$-information between two random variables $U$ and $V$ is defined as

$$\chi^2(U; V) \triangleq \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \frac{P_{U,V}(U,V)}{P_U(U)P_V(V)} \right)^2 \right] - 1. \quad (2)$$

Let $P_U$ and $Q_U$ be two probability distributions with the same support set $\mathcal{U}$. We denote $\|P_U - Q_U\|_1 \triangleq \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} |P_U(u) - Q_U(u)|$. For any real-valued random variable $U$, we denote the $L_p$-norm of $U$ as

$$\|U\|_p \triangleq (\mathbb{E} \left[ |U|^p \right])^{1/p}.$$
The set of all functions that applied to a random variable $U$ with distribution $P_U$ result in an $L_2$-norm less than or equal to 1 is given by

$$L_2(P_U) \triangleq \{ f : U \to \mathbb{R} \mid \|f(U)\|_2 \leq 1 \}.$$  \hfill (3)

The conditional expectation operators $T_U$ and $T_V$ are given by $(T_U g)(u) \triangleq \mathbb{E}[g(V)|U = u]$ and $(T_V f)(v) \triangleq \mathbb{E}[f(U)|V = v]$, respectively.

## 2 Principal Inertia Components

We present next the properties of the PICs that will be used in this paper. For a more detailed overview, we refer the reader to [15] and the references therein. We use the definition of PICs presented in [15], but note that the PICs predate [15] (e.g., [41–45]).

**Definition 1** ([15, Definition 1]). Let $U$ and $V$ be random variables with support sets $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{V}$, respectively, and joint distribution $P_{U,V}$. In addition, let $f_0 : \mathcal{U} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $g_0 : \mathcal{V} \to \mathbb{R}$ be the constant functions $f_0(u) = 1$ and $g_0(v) = 1$. For $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, we (recursively) define

$$\lambda_k(U; V) \triangleq \max \left\{ \mathbb{E}[f(U)g(V)]^2 \mid f \in L_2(P_U), g \in L_2(P_V), \mathbb{E}[f(U)f_j(U)] = 0, \mathbb{E}[g(V)g_j(V)] = 0, j \in \{0, \ldots, k-1\} \right\},$$

where

$$(f_k, g_k) \triangleq \text{argmax} \left\{ \mathbb{E}[f(U)g(V)]^2 \mid f \in L_2(P_U), g \in L_2(P_V), \mathbb{E}[f(U)f_j(U)] = 0, \mathbb{E}[g(V)g_j(V)] = 0, j \in \{0, \ldots, k-1\} \right\}.$$ \hfill (4)

The values $\lambda_k(U; V)$ are called the principal inertia components (PICs) of $P_{U,V}$. The functions $f_k$ and $g_k$ are called the principal functions of $P_{U,V}$.

Observe that the PICs satisfy $\lambda_k(U; V) \leq 1$, since $f_k \in L_2(P_U)$, $g_k \in L_2(P_V)$, and

$$\mathbb{E}[f(U)g(V)] \leq \|f(U)\|_2\|g(V)\|_2 \leq 1.$$  \hfill (5)

Thus, from Definition 1, $0 \leq \lambda_{k+1}(U; V) \leq \lambda_k(U; V) \leq 1$.

**Definition 2** ([15, Definition 2]). For $\mathcal{U} = [m]$ and $\mathcal{V} = [n]$, let $P_{U,V} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ be a matrix with entries $[P_{U,V}]_{i,j} = P_{U,V}(i,j)$, and $D_U \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ and $D_V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be diagonal matrices with diagonal entries $[D_U]_{i,i} = P_U(i)$ and $[D_V]_{j,j} = P_V(j)$, respectively, where $i \in [m]$ and $j \in [n]$. We define

$$Q_{U,V} \triangleq D_U^{-1/2}P_{U,V}D_V^{-1/2}.$$ \hfill (6)

We denote the singular value decomposition of $Q_{U,V}$ by $Q_{U,V} = U\Sigma V^T$.

**Definition 3** ([15, Definition 14]). Let $d \triangleq \min\{|\mathcal{U}|, |\mathcal{V}|\} - 1$, and $\lambda_d(U; V)$ the smallest PIC of $P_{U,V}$. We define

$$\delta(P_{U,V}) \triangleq \begin{cases} \lambda_d(U; V) & \text{if } |\mathcal{V}| \leq |\mathcal{U}|, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$ \hfill (7)

We also denote $\lambda_d(U; V)$ and the corresponding principal functions $f_d$, $g_d$ as $\lambda_{\min}(U; V)$ and $f_{\min}$, $g_{\min}$, respectively, when the alphabet size is clear from the context.

The next theorem illustrates the different characterizations of the PICs used in this paper.

**Theorem 1** ([15, Theorem 1]). The following characterizations of the PICs are equivalent:

1. The characterization given in Definition 1, where, for $f_k$ and $g_k$ given in (5), $g_k(V) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[f_k(U)V]}{\|\mathbb{E}[f_k(U)V]\|_2}$

and $f_k(U) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[g_k(V)U]}{\|\mathbb{E}[g_k(V)U]\|_2}$.
2. For any \( k \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \),
\[
1 - \lambda_k(U; V) = \min \left\{ \text{mmse}(f(U)|V) \mid f \in \mathcal{L}_2(P_U), \|f(U)\|_2 = 1, \mathbb{E}[f(U)h_j(U)] = 0, j \in \{0, \ldots, k - 1\} \right\},
\]
where
\[
h_k \triangleq \arg\min \left\{ \text{mmse}(f(U)|V) \mid f \in \mathcal{L}_2(P_U), \|f(U)\|_2 = 1, \mathbb{E}[f(U)h_j(U)] = 0, j \in \{0, \ldots, k - 1\} \right\}.
\]
If \( \lambda_k(U; V) \) is unique, then \( h_k = f_k \), given in (5).

3. \( \sqrt{\lambda_k(U; V)} \) is the \((k+1)\)-st largest singular value of \( Q_{U,V} \). The principal functions \( f_k \) and \( g_k \) in (5) correspond to the columns of the matrices \( D^{-1/2}_U \) and \( D^{-1/2}_V \), respectively, where \( Q_{U,V} = U\Sigma V^T \).

The equivalent characterizations of the PICs in the above theorem have the following intuitive interpretation: the principal functions can be viewed as a basis that decompose the mean-squared error of estimating functions of a hidden variable \( U \) given an observation \( V \).

We remark that the \( \chi^2 \)-information between \( U \) and \( V \) is the sum of all PICs. Specifically, it has been shown (e.g., [15]) that \( \chi^2(U; V) = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i(U; V) \), where \( d = \min\{|U|, |V|\} - 1 \).

### 3 Uniform PUTs: The \( \chi^2 \)-Privacy-Utility Function

We start our analysis by adopting \( \chi^2 \)-information as a measure of both privacy and utility. As seen in the previous section, \( \chi^2(S; Y) = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i(S; Y) \), where \( d = \min\{|S|, |Y|\} - 1 \). If \( \chi^2(S; Y) \leq \epsilon < 1 \), then, equivalently, the sum of all PICs is upper-bounded by \( \epsilon \). Since the PICs are non-negative, each PIC is also upper-bounded by \( \epsilon \). Consequently, from characterization 2 in Theorem 1, it follows that the MMSE of reconstructing any zero-mean, unit-variance function of \( S \) given \( Y \) is lower bounded by \( 1 - \epsilon \), i.e., all functions of \( S \) cannot be reconstructed with small MMSE given an observation of \( Y \). Thus, \( \chi^2 \)-information uniformly bounds an adversary’s ability to reconstruct functions of \( S \) and \( X \) from \( Y \).

We now introduce the \( \chi^2 \)-privacy-utility function. As discussed in the Introduction, this function captures how well an analyst can reconstruct functions of the useful variable \( X \) while restricting the analyst’s ability to estimate functions of the private variable \( S \).

**Definition 4.** For a given joint distribution \( P_{S,X} \) and \( 0 \leq \epsilon \leq \chi^2(S; X) \), we define the \( \chi^2 \)-privacy-utility (trade-off) function as
\[
F_{\chi^2}(c; P_{S,X}) \triangleq \sup_{P_{Y|X} \in \mathcal{D}(c; P_{S,X})} \chi^2(X; Y),
\]
where \( \mathcal{D}(c; P_{S,X}) \triangleq \{ P_{Y|X} \mid S \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y, \chi^2(S; Y) \leq \epsilon \} \).

It has been proved in [46, 47] that there is always a privacy-assuring mapping \( P_{Y|X} \) which achieves the supremum in \( F_{\chi^2}(c; P_{S,X}) \) using at most \(|X|+1\) symbols (i.e., \( |Y| \leq |X|+1 \)).

The following lemma gives an alternative way to compute the \( \chi^2 \)-information, in the discrete, finite setting.

**Lemma 1.** Suppose \( S \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y \). Then
\[
\chi^2(X; Y) = \text{tr}(A) - 1,
\]
\[
\chi^2(S; Y) = \text{tr}(BA) - 1,
\]
where, using (6),
\[
A \triangleq Q_{X,Y} Q_{X,Y}^T, \quad B \triangleq Q_{S,X} Q_{S,X}.
\]

**Proof.** See Appendix A.1.
The following lemma characterizes some properties of the $\chi^2$-privacy-utility function.

**Lemma 2.** For a given joint distribution $P_{S,X}$, the $\chi^2$-privacy-utility function $F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S,X})$ is a concave function in $\epsilon$. Furthermore, $\epsilon \to \frac{1}{\epsilon} F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S,X})$ is a non-increasing mapping.

**Proof.** See Appendix A.2.

The $\chi^2$-privacy-utility function has a simple upper bound,

$$F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S,X}) \leq \epsilon + |X| - 1 - \chi^2(S; X),$$

which follows immediately from the data-processing inequality:

$$\chi^2(S; X) + \chi^2(X; Y) \leq \chi^2(S; Y) + \chi^2(X; X).$$

We derive an upper bound for the $\chi^2$-privacy-utility function that significantly improves (12) by using properties of the PICs. The bound is piecewise linear, where each piece has a slope given in terms of a PIC of $P_{S,X}$. Intuitively, this bound corresponds to the privacy-assuring mapping $P_{Y|X}$ that achieves the best PUT if $P_{Y|X}$ was not constrained to be non-negative. We also provide a lower bound that follows directly from the concavity of the $\chi^2$-privacy-utility function. These bounds are illustrated in Fig. 1.

We give a qualitative description of the piecewise linear upper bound first and provide a formal statement in Theorem 2. In the first piece, starting from $(0,0)$ to $(\lambda_{\min}(S;X),1)$, the bound corresponds to a privacy-assuring mapping that enables $g_{\min}(X)$ to be estimated with small mean-squared error from $Y$. Recall that $g_{\min}(X)$ (see Definition 3) is the MMSE estimator for the function $f_{\min}(S)$ which, in turn, is the function of $S$ that can be least reliably estimated from $X$. The first break point $(\lambda_{\min}(S;X),1)$ in the upper bound corresponds to a mapping $P_{Y|X}$ that allows $g_{\min}(X)$ to be perfectly estimated from $Y$, without any other function of $X$ being reliably reconstructed from $Y$. Here, the utility is $\chi^2(X;Y) = 1$, since exactly one zero-mean, unit-variance function of $X$ can be perfectly reconstructed from $Y$. Note that such a privacy-assuring mapping may not be feasible — hence the upper bound. The privacy leakage is $\lambda_{\min}(S;X)$, since using $g_{\min}(X)$ to estimate the private function $f_{\min}(S)$ has mean-squared error $1 - \lambda_{\min}(S;X)$. Following the same procedure, the privacy-assuring mapping transfers the remaining functions of $X$ through the disclosed variable.

**Definition 5.** For $t_i \in [0,1]$ ($i \in [n]$), $0 \leq \epsilon \leq \sum_{i \in [n]} t_i$, and $n \leq m$, $G^m_\epsilon(t_1,...,t_n)$ is defined as

$$G^m_\epsilon(t_1,...,t_n) \triangleq \max \left\{ \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} x_i \left| (x_1,...,x_m) \in D^m_\epsilon(t_1,...,t_n) \right. \right\},$$

where

$$D^m_\epsilon(t_1,...,t_n) \triangleq \left\{ (x_1,...,x_m) \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n} t_i x_i \leq \epsilon, x_i \in [0,1], i \in [m] \right. \right\}.$$ 

For fixed $m$ and $t_i$ ($i \in [n]$), $G^m_\epsilon(t_1,...,t_n)$ is a piecewise linear function with respect to $\epsilon$, and its closed-form expression is given in Appendix A.3.

**Theorem 2.** For the $\chi^2$-privacy-utility function $F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S,X})$ introduced in Definition 4 and $\epsilon \in [0, \chi^2(S;X)]$,

$$\frac{|X| - 1}{\chi^2(S;X)} \epsilon \leq F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S,X}) \leq G^{|X| - 1}_\epsilon(\lambda_1(S;X),...,\lambda_d(S;X)),$$

where $d \triangleq \min\{|S|,|X|\} - 1$ and $\lambda_1(S;X),...,\lambda_d(S;X)$ are the PICs of $P_{S,X}$.

**Proof.** See Appendix A.4.

**Remark 1.** The upper bound for the $\chi^2$-privacy-utility function given in Theorem 2 can also be proved by combining Theorem 4 in [48] with properties of the PICs.
Figure 1: Piecewise linear upper bound and lower bound for the $\chi^2$-privacy-utility function when $\delta(P_{S,X})$, defined in (7), is positive.

Note that $F_{\chi^2}(0; P_{S,X})$ characterizes the maximal aggregate MMSE of estimating useful functions while guaranteeing perfect privacy. Here perfect privacy means that no zero-mean, unit-variance function of $S$ can be reconstructed from $Y$. If the value of $F_{\chi^2}(0; P_{S,X})$ is known, a better lower bound can be obtained from the concavity of $F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S,X})$ as

$$\chi^2(X; Y) \leq F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S,X}).$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)

When $S = X$, then $\chi^2(S; X) = |X| - 1$ and $F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S,X}) = \epsilon$. Following from Definition 5 and noticing that all PICs of $P_{S,X}$ are 1, the upper bound and the lower bound for the $\chi^2$-privacy-utility function in Theorem 2 are both $\epsilon$, which is equal to $F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S,X})$. In this sense, the upper bound and lower bound given in Theorem 2 are sharp.

The following corollary of Lemma 2 and Theorem 2 shows that the $\chi^2$-privacy-utility function is strictly increasing with respect to $\epsilon$.

**Corollary 1.** For a given joint distribution $P_{S,X}$, the mapping $\epsilon \rightarrow F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S,X})$ is strictly increasing for $\epsilon \in [0, \chi^2(S; X)]$.

*Proof. See Appendix A.5.*

We denote

$$\partial D(\epsilon; P_{S,X}) \triangleq \{ P_{Y|X} \mid S \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y; \chi^2(S; Y) = \epsilon \}.$$

By Corollary 1, $F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S,X})$ is strictly increasing. Therefore,

$$F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S,X}) = \max_{P_{Y|X} \in \partial D(\epsilon; P_{S,X})} \chi^2(X; Y).$$ \hspace{1cm} (15)

By Corollary 7 in [15], when $\delta(P_{S,X}) = 0$, defined in (7), then $F_{\chi^2}(0; P_{S,X}) > 0$ (i.e., there exists a privacy-assuring mapping that allows the disclosure of a non-trivial amount of useful functions while guaranteeing perfect privacy). On the other hand, when $\delta(P_{S,X}) > 0$, then $F_{\chi^2}(0; P_{S,X}) = 0$. The following theorem shows that when $\delta(P_{S,X}) > 0$, the upper bound of $F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S,X})$ in Theorem 2 is achievable around zero, implying that the upper bound is tight around zero. The proof of this theorem also provides a specific way to construct an optimal privacy-assuring mapping (i.e., achieves the upper bound in Theorem 2).
Theorem 3. Suppose \( \delta(P_{S,X}) > 0 \) and \( P_{X_{\min}} > 0 \). Then there exists \( Y \) such that \( S \to X \to Y \), \( \chi^2(X;Y) = P_{X_{\min}} \) and \( \chi^2(S;Y) = P_{X_{\min}} \lambda_{\min}(S;X) \).

Proof. See Appendix A.6.

When \( \delta(P_{S,X}) > 0 \) and \( P_{X_{\min}} > 0 \), then \( F_\chi(\hat{\epsilon};P_{S,X}) = P_{X_{\min}} \) where \( \hat{\epsilon} = P_{X_{\min}} \lambda_{\min}(S;X) \). Since \((\hat{\epsilon}, P_{X_{\min}})\) is a point on the upper bound of the \( \chi^2 \)-privacy-utility function given in Theorem 2, Theorem 3 shows that, in this case, the upper bound is achievable in the high-privacy region. Finally, we remark that the local behavior of privacy-utility functions in high-privacy region and high-utility region has been studied in the context of strong data processing inequalities (e.g., [49,50] and the references therein).

4 Composite PUTs: A Convex Program for Computing Privacy-Assuring Mappings

In the previous section, we studied \( \chi^2 \)-based metrics for both privacy and utility. This metric captures the overall error (in a mean-squared sense) of estimating functions of the private and the useful variables \( S \) and \( X \), respectively. We used \( \chi^2 \)-information to measure both privacy and utility, and derived bounds for the PUT curve. The upper bound was shown to be achievable in the high-privacy region. Next, we study the design of privacy-assuring mappings under more stringent privacy-utility constraints.

More specifically, we explore an alternative, finer-grained approach for measuring both privacy and utility based on PICs (recall that \( \chi^2 \)-information is the sum of all PICs). This approach has a practical motivation, since oftentimes there are specific well-defined features (functions) of the data (realizations of a random variable) that should be hidden or disclosed. For example, a user might be comfortable revealing that his/her age is above a certain threshold, but not the age itself. Alternatively, a user may be willing to disclose that they prefer documentaries over action movies, but not exactly which documentary they like. More abstractly, we consider the case where certain known functions should be disclosed (utility), whereas others should be hidden (privacy). This is a finer-grained setting than the one used in the last section, since \( \chi^2 \)-information captures the aggregate reconstruction error across all zero-mean, unit-variance functions.

We denote the set of functions to be disclosed as

\[
\mathcal{U}(X) \triangleq \{ u_i : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R} \mid \mathbb{E}[u_i(X)] = 0, \|u_i(X)\|^2 = 1, i \in [n] \}.
\]

and the set of functions to be hidden as

\[
\mathcal{P}(S) \triangleq \{ s_i : S \to \mathbb{R} \mid \mathbb{E}[s_i(S)] = 0, \|s_i(S)\|^2 = 1, i \in [m] \}.
\]

Our goal is to find the privacy-assuring mapping \( P_{Y|X} \) such that \( S \to X \to Y \) and \( Y \) satisfies the following privacy-utility constraints:

1. **Utility constraints:** \( \max\{|\text{mmse}(u_i(X)|Y)\}_{i \in [n]} \leq \Delta \) and \( X \sim Y \).
2. **Privacy constraints:** \( |\text{mmse}(s_i(S)|Y) \geq \theta_i, i \in [m] \).

Note that the utility constraint \( X \sim Y \) implies that the disclosed variable follows the same distribution as the useful variable. The practical motivation for adding this constraint is to enable \( Y \) to preserve overall population statistics about \( X \), while hiding information about individual samples. This assumption also enables the problem of finding the optimal privacy-assuring mapping to be formulated as a convex program, described next.

We follow two steps – projection\(^1\) and optimization – to find the privacy-assuring mapping. Private functions are projected to a new set of functions based on the useful variable in the first step. Then a PIC-based convex program is proposed in order to find the privacy-assuring mapping.

\(^1\)We call this step as projection because of the geometric interpretation of conditional expectation (see, e.g., [51]).
4.1 Projection

As a first step, we project (i.e., compute the conditional expectation) all private functions to the useful variable and obtain a new set of functions:

\[ \mathcal{P}(X) \triangleq \ \{ \hat{s}_i(x) \triangleq \mathbb{E}[s_i(S)|X = x] \} \]

The advantage of this projection is twofold. First, it can significantly simplify the optimization program, since after the projection all functions are cast in terms of the useful variable alone. Second, the private variable is not needed as an input to the optimization after the projection. Therefore, the party that solves the optimization does not need access to the private data directly, further guaranteeing the safety of the sensitive information. The following lemma proves that privacy guarantees cast in terms of the projected functions still hold for the original functions.

**Lemma 3.** Assume \( S \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y \). For any function \( f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \), if \( \mathbb{E}[f(S)] = 0 \) and \( ||\mathbb{E}[f(S)|X]||_2 \neq 0 \), we have \( \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[f(S)|X]] = 0 \) and

\[
\text{mmse}\left( \frac{f(S)}{||f(S)||_2} \bigg| Y \right) \geq \text{mmse}\left( \frac{\mathbb{E}[f(S)|X]}{||\mathbb{E}[f(S)|X]||_2} \bigg| Y \right).
\]

**Proof.** See Appendix B.1. \( \square \)

By Lemma 3, \( \text{mmse}(s_i(S)|Y) \geq \text{mmse}(\hat{s}_i(X)|Y) \). Therefore, if the new set of functions satisfies the privacy constraints (i.e., \( \text{mmse}(\hat{s}_i(X)|Y) \geq \theta_i \)), the original set of functions also satisfies the privacy constraints (i.e., \( \text{mmse}(s_i(S)|Y) \geq \theta_i \)).

4.2 Optimization

We introduce next a PIC-based convex program to find the privacy-assuring mapping \( P_{Y|X} \). First, we construct a matrix \( F \) given by \( (f_0, f_1, ..., f_{|X|-1}) \) such that

\[
F^T D_X F = I,
\]

(16)

\[
\text{span}(\{f_0, ..., f_n\}) = \text{span}(\{f_0, u_1, ..., u_n\}),
\]

(17)

where \( f_0 \triangleq (1, ..., 1)^T, f_i \triangleq (f_i(1), ..., f_i(|X|))^T, u_0 \triangleq (u_0(1), ..., u_0(|X|))^T, \) and \( n' \triangleq \dim(\text{span}(\{f_0, u_1, ..., u_n\})) - 1 \).

Following from (16), \( \{f_k(x) | k = 0, ..., |X|-1\} \) is a basis of \( \mathcal{L}_2(P_X) \) and, consequently, the functions \( \hat{s}_i(x) \) can be decomposed as

\[
\hat{s}_i(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{|X|-1} \alpha_{i,k} f_k(x).
\]

(18)

Since \( \mathbb{E}[\hat{s}_i(X)] = 0 \), then \( \alpha_{i,0} = 0 \). Similarly, since \( u_i \in \text{span}(\{f_0, ..., f_n\}) \) and \( \mathbb{E}[u_i(X)] = 0 \), we have

\[
u_i(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{n'} \beta_{i,k} f_k(x).
\]

(19)

If \( P_{X,Y} = D_X F \Sigma F^T D_X \) with \( \Sigma = \text{diag}(1, \sigma_1, ..., \sigma_{|X|-1}) \) is a feasible joint distribution matrix (i.e., non-negative entries and all entries add to 1), then, following from Theorem 1,

\[
\text{mmse}(\hat{s}_i(X)|Y) = \sum_{k=1}^{|X|-1} \alpha_{i,k}^2 (1 - \lambda_k(X;Y)) = 1 - \sum_{k=1}^{|X|-1} \alpha_{i,k}^2 \sigma_k^2,
\]

(20)

\[
\text{mmse}(u_i(X)|Y) = \sum_{k=1}^{n'} \beta_{i,k}^2 (1 - \lambda_k(X;Y)) \leq 1 - \min_{k \in [n']} \lambda_k(X;Y) = 1 - \left( \min_{k \in [n']} \sigma_k \right)^2.
\]

(21)
Therefore, the design of the privacy-assuring mapping \( P \) solving the PIC-based convex program in Formulation 1. In this case, the objective function is chosen as
\[
\sum_{\sigma} \sigma_{i}^{2} \leq 1 - \theta_{i} \quad (i = 1, \ldots, m),
\]
\[
0 \leq \sigma_{i} \leq 1 \quad (i = 1, \ldots, |\mathcal{X}|-1),
\]
\[
\Sigma = \text{diag}(1, \sigma_{1}, \ldots, \sigma_{|\mathcal{X}|-1}),
\]
\[
P_{X,Y} = D_{X} F \Sigma F^{T} D_{X},
\]
\[
P_{X,Y} \text{ has non-negative entries.}
\]

**Formulation 1:** PIC-based convex program. Here \( \sigma_{i} \ (i = 1, \ldots, |\mathcal{X}|-1) \) and \( \theta_{i} \ (i = 1, \ldots, m) \) are variables and privacy parameters, respectively. The objective function \( \text{obj}(\sigma_{1}, \ldots, \sigma_{n'}) \) is chosen as a concave function and measures utility.

Therefore, the design of the privacy-assuring mapping \( P_{Y|X} \) with privacy-utility constraints is equivalent to solving the PIC-based convex program in Formulation 1. In this case, the objective function is chosen as
\[
\text{obj}(\sigma_{1}, \ldots, \sigma_{n'}) = \min \{ \sigma_{1}, \ldots, \sigma_{n'} \}^{2}
\]

The objective function \( \min \{ \sigma_{1}, \ldots, \sigma_{n'} \} \) maximizes the worst-case utility over all useful functions. On the other hand, we can choose the objective function to be a weighted sum \( \sum_{i=1}^{n'} \alpha_{i} \sigma_{i} \). Although maximizing the weighted sum is not equivalent to the desired utility constraints, this new formulation allows more flexibility in the optimization. In particular, this enables useful functions which do not highly correlate with private functions to achieve better utility, in terms of mean-squared error, under the same privacy constraints. Furthermore, the weights can be used to prioritize the reconstruction of certain useful functions.

The previous convex programs can be numerically solved by standard methods (e.g., CVXPY [52]). Note that when all useful functions and private functions are based on the same random variable, we can use optimization without projection. We defer the numerical results to Section 7, where we derive privacy-assuring mappings for a synthetic dataset and a real-world dataset using tools introduced in this section.

5 Lower Bounds for MMSE with Restricted Knowledge of the Data Distribution

So far we have assumed the information-theoretic setting where the probability distribution \( P_{S,X} \) is known to the privacy mechanism designer beforehand. In this section, we forgo this assumption and consider a setting where \( S = \phi(X) \) and the correlation between \( \phi(X) \) and a set of functions (composed with the data) \( \{ \phi_{j}(X) \}_{j=1}^{m} \) is given. We derive lower bounds for the MMSE of estimating \( \phi(X) \) given \( Y \) in terms of the MMSE of estimating \( \phi_{j}(X) \) given \( Y \). In privacy systems, \( X \) may be a user’s data and \( Y \) a distorted version of \( X \) generated by a privacy-assuring mapping \( P_{Y|X} \). The set \( \{ \phi_{j}(X) \}_{j=1}^{m} \) could then represent a set of functions that are known to be hard to infer from \( Y \) due to inherent privacy constraints of the setup. For example, when the mapping \( P_{Y|X} \) is designed by the PIC-based convex programs in Formulations 1 and \( \{ \phi_{j}(X) \}_{j=1}^{m} \) is the set of private functions, \( \text{mmse}(\phi_{j}(X)|Y) \) is lower bounded due to the privacy constraints.

The following lemma will be used to derive the lower bounds for the MMSE of \( \phi(X) \) given \( Y \).

**Lemma 4.** Let \( L_{n} : (0, \infty)^{n} \times [0, 1]^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) be given by
\[
L_{n}(a, b) \triangleq \max \left\{ a^{T} y \mid y \in \mathbb{R}^{n}, \|y\|_{2} \leq 1, y \leq b \right\}.
\]

Let \( \pi \) be a permutation of \([n]\) such that \( b_{\pi(1)}/a_{\pi(1)} \leq \ldots \leq b_{\pi(n)}/a_{\pi(n)} \). If \( b_{\pi(1)}/a_{\pi(1)} \geq 1 \), \( L_{n}(a, b) = \|a\|_{2} \).

\footnote{This is a convex program since one can add a constraint \( \sigma_{i} \geq \sigma \ (i \in [n']) \) and maximize \( \sigma \).}
Otherwise,
\[
L_n(a, b) = \sum_{i=1}^{k^*} a_{\pi(i)} b_{\pi(i)} + \sqrt{\left(\|a\|_2^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{k^*} a_{\pi(i)}^2\right) \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k^*} b_{\pi(i)}^2\right)}
\]
where
\[
k^* \triangleq \max \left\{ k \in [n] \left| \frac{b_{\pi(k)}}{a_{\pi(k)}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} b_{\pi(i)}^2}{\|a\|_2^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} a_{\pi(i)}^2}} \right\}.
\]

Proof. See Appendix C.1.

Throughout this section we assume \(\|\phi_i(X)\|_2 = 1\) (i \(\in [m]\)) and \(\mathbb{E}[\phi_i(X)\phi_j(X)] = 0\) (i \(\neq j\)). For a given \(\phi_i\), the inequality
\[
\max_{\psi \in L_2(F_Y)} \mathbb{E}[\phi_i(X)\psi(Y)] = \|\mathbb{E}[\phi_i(X)Y]\|_2 \leq \nu_i
\]
is satisfied, where 0 \(\leq \nu_i \leq 1\). This is equivalent to \(\operatorname{mmse}(\phi_i(X)|Y) \geq 1 - \nu_i^2\).

**Theorem 4.** Let \(\|\phi(X)\|_2 = 1\) and \(\mathbb{E}[\phi(X)\phi_i(X)] = \rho_i > 0\). Denoting \(\rho \triangleq (\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_m), \nu \triangleq (\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_m), \rho_0 \triangleq \sqrt{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{m} \rho_i^2}, \rho_0 \triangleq (\rho_0, \nu)\) and \(\nu_0 \triangleq (1, \nu)\), then
\[
\|\mathbb{E}[\phi(X)|Y]\|_2 \leq B_m(\rho_0, \nu_0),
\]
where
\[
B_m(\rho_0, \nu_0) \triangleq \begin{cases} L_{m+1}(\rho_0, \nu_0) & \text{if } \rho_0 > 0, \\ L_m(\rho, \nu) & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}
\]
and \(L_n\) is given in (28). Consequently,
\[
\operatorname{mmse}(\phi(X)|Y) \geq 1 - B_m(\rho_0, \nu_0)^2.
\]

Proof. See Appendix C.2.

Denote \(\psi_i(Y) \triangleq (T_Y \phi_i)(Y)/\|T_Y \phi_i)(Y)\|_2\) (i \(\in [m]\)) and \(\phi_0(X) \triangleq \rho_0^{-1}(\phi(X) - \sum_{i=1}^{m} \rho_i \phi_i(X))\) if \(\rho_0 > 0\), otherwise \(\phi_0(X) \triangleq 0\). The previous bounds, (31) and (33), can be further improved when \(\mathbb{E}[\psi_i(Y)\phi_j(X)] = 0\) for \(i \neq j, j \in [0, \ldots, m]\).

**Theorem 5.** Let \(\|\phi(X)\|_2 = 1\) and \(\mathbb{E}[\phi(X)\phi_i(X)] = \rho_i > 0\) for i \(\in [m]\). In addition, assume \(\mathbb{E}[\psi_i(Y)\phi_j(X)] = 0\) for \(i \neq j, i \in [t]\) and \(j \in [0, \ldots, m]\), where 0 \(\leq t \leq m\). Then
\[
\|\mathbb{E}[\phi(X)|Y]\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{t} \nu_k^2 \rho_k^2 + B_{m-t}(\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{\nu})^2},
\]
where \(\tilde{\rho} = (\rho_0, \rho_{t+1}, \ldots, \rho_m), \tilde{\nu} = (1, \nu_{t+1}, \ldots, \nu_m), \) and \(B_m\) is defined in (32) (considering \(B_0 = 0\)). In particular, if \(t = m\),
\[
\|\mathbb{E}[\phi(X)|Y]\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\rho_0^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{m} \nu_k^2 \rho_k^2},
\]
and (35) is an equality when \(\rho_0 = 0\). Furthermore,
\[
\operatorname{mmse}(\phi(X)|Y) \geq 1 - \sum_{k=1}^{t} \nu_k^2 \rho_k^2 - B_{m-t}(\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{\nu})^2.
\]

Proof. See Appendix C.3.
In what follows, we use three examples to illustrate different use cases of Theorem 4 and 5. Example 1 illustrates how Theorem 5 can be applied to the $q$-ary symmetric channel which could be perceived as a model of randomized response \cite{53,54}, and demonstrates that bound (35) is sharp. Example 2 illustrates Theorem 5 for the binary symmetric channel. Here the useful variable is composed by $n$ uniform and independent bits. In this case, the basis can be expressed as the parity bits of the input to the channel. Finally, Example 3 illustrates Theorem 4 for one-bit functions. The same method used in the proof of Theorem 4 is applied to bound the probability of correctly guessing a one-bit function from an observation of the disclosed data.

**Example 1** ($q$-ary symmetric channel). Let $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y} = \{q\}$, and $Y$ be the result of passing $X$ through an $(\epsilon, q)$-ary symmetric channel, which is defined by the transition probability

$$P_{Y|X}(y|x) = (1 - \epsilon)\mathbb{I}_{y = x} + \epsilon / q \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}. \quad (37)$$

We assume that $X$ has a uniform distribution, which implies $Y$ also has a uniform distribution. Any function $\phi \in L_2(P_X)$ such that $\mathbb{E}[\phi(X)] = 0$ and $\|\phi(X)\|_2 = 1$ satisfies

$$\psi(Y) = (T_Y \phi)(Y) = (1 - \epsilon)\phi(Y),$$

and, consequently, $\|T_Y \phi(Y)\|_2 = (1 - \epsilon)$. We will use this fact to show that the bound (35) is sharp in this case.

Observe that for $\phi_0, \phi_1 \in L_2(P_X)$, if $\mathbb{E}[\phi_0(X)\phi_1(X)] = 0$ then $\mathbb{E}[\psi(Y)\psi(Y)] = 0$. Now let $\phi \in L_2(P_X)$ satisfy $\mathbb{E}[\phi(X)] = 0$ and $\|\phi(X)\|_2 = 1$, and let $\mathbb{E}[\phi(X)\phi_i(X)] = \rho_i$ for $i \in [m]$, where $\phi_i$ satisfies the conditions in Theorem 5 and $\sum_{i=1}^m \rho_i^2 = 1$. In addition, $\|\psi(Y)\|_2 = (1 - \epsilon) = \nu$. Then, from (35) and noting that $\rho_0 = 0$, $t = m$, we have

$$\|T_Y \phi(Y)\|_2 \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \nu_i^2 \rho_i^2 \right)^{1/2} = (1 - \epsilon) \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \rho_i^2 \right)^{1/2} = 1 - \epsilon,$$

which matches $\|T_Y \phi(Y)\|_2$, and the bound is tight in this case.

**Example 2** (Binary channels with additive noise). Let $\mathcal{X} = \{-1, 1\}^n$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \{-1, 1\}$, and $Y^n$ be the result of passing $X^n$ through a memoryless binary symmetric channel with crossover probability $\epsilon < 1/2$. We assume that $X^n$ is composed by $n$ uniform and i.i.d. bits. For $S \subseteq [n]$, let

$$\chi_S(X^n) \triangleq \prod_{i \in S} X_i.$$ 

Any function $\phi : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ can then be decomposed in terms of the basis $\chi_S(X^n)$ as \cite{55}

$$\phi(X^n) = \sum_{S \subseteq [n]} c_S \chi_S(X^n),$$

where $c_S = \mathbb{E}[\phi(X^n)\chi_S(X^n)]$. Furthermore, since $\mathbb{E}[\chi_S(X^n)|Y^n] = (1 - 2\epsilon)^{|S|} \mathbb{E}[\chi_S(Y^n)]$, it follows from Theorem 5 that

$$\text{mmse}(\phi(X^n)|Y^n) = 1 - \sum_{S \subseteq [n]} c_S^2 (1 - 2\epsilon)^{|S|}. \quad (38)$$

This result can be generalized for the case $X^n = Y^n \otimes Z^n$, where the operation $\otimes$ denotes bit-wise multiplication, $Z^n$ is drawn from $\{-1, 1\}^n$ and $X^n$ is uniformly distributed. In this case

$$\text{mmse}(\phi(X^n)|Y^n) = 1 - \sum_{S \subseteq [n]} c_S^2 \mathbb{E}[\chi_S(Z^n)]^2. \quad (39)$$

**Example 3** (One-Bit Functions). Let $X$ be a hidden random variable with support $\mathcal{X}$, and let $Y$ be a noisy observation of $X$. We denote by $B_1, \ldots, B_m$ a collection of $m$ predicates of $X$, where $B_i = \phi_i(X)$, $\phi_i : \mathcal{X} \to \{-1, 1\}$ for $i \in [m]$ and, without loss of generality, $\mathbb{E}[B_i] = b_i \geq 0$.  
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We denote by \( \hat{B}_i \) an estimate of \( B_i \) given an observation of \( Y \), where \( B_i \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow \hat{B}_i \). We assume that for any \( \hat{B}_i \)
\[
\left| \mathbb{E}[B_i \hat{B}_i] \right| \leq 1 - 2\alpha_i
\]
for some \( 0 \leq \alpha_i \leq (1 - b_i)/2 \leq 1/2 \). This condition is equivalent to imposing that \( \Pr(B_i \neq \hat{B}_i) \geq \alpha_i \), since
\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbb{E}[B_i \hat{B}_i] &= \Pr(B_i = \hat{B}_i) - \Pr(B_i \neq \hat{B}_i) \\
&= 1 - 2\Pr(B_i \neq \hat{B}_i).
\end{align*}
\]
In particular, this captures the “hardness” of guessing \( B_i \) based solely on an observation of \( Y \).

Now assume there is a bit \( B \) such that \( \mathbb{E}[BB_i] = \rho_i \) for \( i \in [m] \) and \( \mathbb{E}[B_i B_j] = 0 \) for \( i \neq j \). We can apply the same method used in the proof of Theorem 4 to bound the probability of \( B \) being guessed correctly from an observation of \( Y \):
\[
\Pr(B \neq \hat{B}) \geq \frac{1}{2} (1 - B_m(p, \nu)),
\]
where \( \nu_i = 1 - 2\alpha_i \).

## 6 Robustness to Estimated Distributions

In this section we investigate the pipeline in Fig. 2 for designing privacy-assuring mappings in practice. During the training time, a reference dataset with \( n \) samples is drawn from \( P_{S,X} \). The distribution of the source is estimated by computing the empirical distribution (type) \( P_{\tilde{S},\tilde{X}} \) of the reference dataset. \( P_{\tilde{S},\tilde{X}} \) and the privacy-utility constraints are then used as inputs to a convex program solver that returns the corresponding privacy-assuring mapping \( W_{Y|\tilde{X}} \) (if feasible). We denote by \( \tilde{Y} \) the random variable produced by randomizing \( \tilde{X} \) according to \( W_{Y|\tilde{X}} \), i.e., by applying the privacy-assuring mapping to a source with distribution \( P_{\tilde{S},\tilde{X}} \). During the testing time, new i.i.d. samples from the source \( P_{S,X} \) are randomized using the privacy-assuring mapping \( W_{Y|\tilde{X}} \) computed during the training time, resulting in the disclosed variable \( Y \).

The privacy and utility constraints used for computing the privacy-assuring mapping hold for a data source with distribution \( P_{\tilde{S},\tilde{X}} \), since this is the distribution used as an input to the optimization program. However, during the testing time, \( W_{Y|\tilde{X}} \) is applied to new samples from the source \( P_{S,X} \). Do the privacy and utility guarantees still hold during the testing time? Since as \( n \) increases \( P_{\tilde{S},\tilde{X}} \) converges to \( P_{S,X} \), it is natural to expect that the privacy and utility guarantees during the testing time will not be far from the ones selected during the training time.

In what follows, we analyze the robustness of the PUT optimization using \( \chi^2 \)-information, and characterize the gap between privacy and utility guarantees of the training and testing time in terms of the number of samples in the reference dataset and the probability of less likely symbols. The following lemma will be used to prove the main result in this section.

**Lemma 5.** Suppose that \( S_i \rightarrow X_i \rightarrow Y_i \) for \( i = 1, 2 \) and \( P_{Y_i|X_i} = P_{Y_2|X_2} \). Let \( m_S \triangleq \min\{P_{S_i}(s) \mid s \in S, i = 1, 2\} \) and \( m_X \triangleq \min\{P_{X_i}(x) \mid x \in X, i = 1, 2\} \). Then
\[
\begin{align*}
|\chi^2(S_1; Y_1) - \chi^2(S_2; Y_2)| \leq C_P \|P_{S_1,X_1} - P_{S_2,X_2}\|_1, \\
|\chi^2(X_1; Y_1) - \chi^2(X_2; Y_2)| \leq C_U \|P_{S_1,X_1} - P_{S_2,X_2}\|_1,
\end{align*}
\]
where \( C_P = \frac{2}{m_S} + \frac{6}{m_S^2} \) and \( C_U = \frac{2}{m_X} + \frac{6}{m_X^2} \).

**Proof.** See Appendix D.1. \(\square\)

The next theorem, which is the main result in this section, follows from Lemma 5 and large deviation results [56]. It answers the question raised at the beginning of this section and provides the bounds for the difference between the training and testing privacy-utility guarantees. Note that the bounds provided in the theorem hold for any channel \( W_{Y|\tilde{X}} \), not just the ones that optimize the PUT. In other words, the theorem holds for any privacy-assuring mapping returned by the solver in Fig. 2, even if this mapping is not a globally optimal solution.
Figure 2: Flowchart for training time (red) and testing time (blue).

**Theorem 6.** Let \( P_{\hat{S}, \hat{X}} \) be the empirical distribution obtained from \( n \) i.i.d. samples drawn from the true distribution \( P_{S,X} \). In addition, denote by \( Y \) and \( \hat{Y} \) the random variables obtained by passing \( X \) and \( \hat{X} \) through a given channel \( W_{Y|\hat{X}} \), respectively. Let

\[
\begin{align*}
    m_S &\triangleq \min \{ P_S(s) \mid s \in \mathcal{S} \} \cup \{ P_{\hat{S}}(s) \mid s \in \mathcal{S} \}, \\
    m_X &\triangleq \min \{ P_X(x) \mid x \in \mathcal{X} \} \cup \{ P_{\hat{X}}(x) \mid x \in \mathcal{X} \}.
\end{align*}
\]

(43)  \( (44) \)

Then, with probability at least \( 1 - \beta \),

\[
\begin{align*}
|\chi^2(S; Y) - \chi^2(\hat{S}; \hat{Y})| &\leq C_P \sqrt{\frac{2}{n} (M - \ln \beta)}, \\
|\chi^2(X; Y) - \chi^2(\hat{X}; \hat{Y})| &\leq C_U \sqrt{\frac{2}{n} (M - \ln \beta)},
\end{align*}
\]

(45)  \( (46) \)

where \( M = |\mathcal{S}| |\mathcal{X}|, \ C_P = \frac{2}{m_S} + \frac{6}{m_S^2}, \) and \( C_U = \frac{2}{m_X} + \frac{6}{m_X^2} \).

**Proof.** See Appendix D.2. \( \square \)

Note that the bounds provided in Theorem 6 depend on the probability of the least likely symbols. The bounds become weaker as \( m_X \) and \( m_S \) become smaller. We refer the reader to Wang et al. [40] for an alternate approach if \( m_X \) and \( m_S \) are near zero.

7 Numerical Results

We illustrate the optimization methods proposed in Section 4 through two experiments. The first experiment runs on a synthetic dataset where the random variable \( X^n \) is uniformly distributed and the basis is known beforehand. The second experiment runs on a real-world dataset where we use the empirical distribution to approximate the joint distribution \( P_{S,X} \). For both experiments, we solve the convex optimization problems using a standard toolkit [52].

7.1 Parity Bits

We choose \( X^n = (X_1, X_2, X_3) \in \mathcal{X} = \{-1, 1\}^3 \), where \( X^n \) is composed by three uniform and i.i.d. bits. The useful functions and private functions (composed with \( X^n \)) are selected as \( u_1(X^n) = X_1, u_2(X^n) = X_2 \) and
Figure 3: MMSE of estimating each function given the disclosed variable, where darker means harder to estimate. Here \( u_1, u_2 \) and \( s_1, s_2 \) are useful functions and private functions, respectively. The privacy constraints are \( \text{mmse}(s_i(X^n)|Y) \geq \theta_i, i = 1, 2 \). The values of \( \theta_i \) are selected as the same and increase from 0 to 1 (i.e., the privacy constraints are increasing from the top down). The privacy-assuring mappings are designed by Formulation 1 with \( \text{obj}(\sigma_1, ..., \sigma_{n'}) = \min\{\sigma_1, ..., \sigma_{n'}\} \). As shown, the private function \( s_2 \) is heavily distorted. At the same time, when the privacy constraints increase, the useful functions \( u_1 \) and \( u_2 \) become harder to estimate from \( Y \).

\[
s_1(X^n) = X_1 X_2, \quad s_2(X^n) = X_3,
\]

respectively. Note that any function \( f : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R} \) can be decomposed in terms of the basis \( \chi_S(X^n) \), defined in Example 2 of Section 5, as [55]

\[
f(X^n) = \sum_{S \subseteq [n]} c_S \chi_S(X^n),
\]

where \( c_S = E[f(X^n)\chi_S(X^n)] \). Therefore, we choose \( \chi_S(X^n) \) as a basis and apply the PIC-based convex program to compute the privacy-assuring mappings. Here we use Formulation 1 with \( \text{obj}(\sigma_1, ..., \sigma_{n'}) = \min\{\sigma_1, ..., \sigma_{n'}\} \), but note that \( \text{obj}(\sigma_1, ..., \sigma_{n'}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n'} \sigma_i \) produces near-identical results.

In Fig. 3, we show the MMSE of estimating useful functions and private functions given the disclosed variable. The private function \( s_2 \) is heavily distorted. At the same time, when the privacy constraints increase, the useful functions \( u_1 \) and \( u_2 \) become harder to estimate from \( Y \).

7.2 UCI Adult Dataset

We apply our formulations to the UCI Adult Dataset [57]. A natural selection for the private and useful variables are \( S = (\text{Gender, Race}) \) and \( X = (\text{Education Years, Income}) \), respectively. This allows us to interpret the results of our formulations in an intuitive way, as one would expect there to exist correlations between the chosen private and useful variables. Private functions and useful functions are represented by indicator functions. Furthermore, functions which are linear combinations of others are removed. Following the same procedure proposed in Section 4, we first project all private functions to the useful variable. We use QR decomposition [58] to construct the basis \( \{f_k(x)\} \). Note that other decomposition methods can also be used for constructing basis and, in fact, different bases affect the behavior of the PIC-based convex program (e.g., the joint distribution matrix \( \mathbf{P}_{X,Y} \) returned by the optimization may be different). Consequently, the solution produced from the optimization program may not be optimal. Finally, Formulation 1 is used to compute the privacy-assuring mappings.

In Fig. 4, we show the MMSE of estimating useful functions and private functions given the disclosed variable. As shown, when we use Formulation 1 with \( \text{obj}(\sigma_1, ..., \sigma_{n'}) = \min\{\sigma_1, ..., \sigma_{n'}\} \) to compute privacy-
Figure 4: MMSE of estimating each function given the disclosed variable, where darker means harder to estimate. Here (Education Years, Income) and (Gender, Race) are useful variable and private variable, respectively. The privacy parameters $\theta_i$ are selected as the same for all $i$ and increase from 0 to 1 (i.e., the privacy constraints are increasing from the top down). The privacy-assuring mappings are designed by Formulation 1 with $\text{obj}(\sigma_1, ..., \sigma_n') = \min\{\sigma_1, ..., \sigma_n'\}$ (left) and with $\text{obj}(\sigma_1, ..., \sigma_n') = \sum_{i=1}^{n'} \sigma_i$ (right), respectively.

assuring mappings, the estimation errors behave uniformly among all functions. This is because we aim at maximizing the worst-case utility over all useful functions. On the other hand, the privacy-assuring mappings designed by Formulation 1 with $\text{obj}(\sigma_1, ..., \sigma_n') = \sum_{i=1}^{n'} \sigma_i$ reveal more interpretable relationships between the private functions and useful functions. We see that Income, Gender, and Race are highly correlated, and it is not possible to reveal Income while maintaining privacy for Gender and Race. Of particular interest are the subtle correlations between the three aforementioned functions and Education Years. There is a marked correlation between Education Years $< 6$ and, to a lesser degree, Education Years $> 12$, with Gender and Race. This may be due to the fact that most members of the dataset do not end their education midway. That is, most individuals will either never have begun schooling in the first place or will not continue their education after the 12-year benchmark, which marks graduation from high school. Therefore, we observe that the relationship between Education Years and Race is manifested the most in the two extremities of Education Years ($> 12$ and $< 6$). Also of note is the correlation between the private functions and Education Years: 8. Though not as obvious, this relationship can, too, be explained by the fact that 8 years of education marks another benchmark: the beginning of high school, also a time when people are prone to terminating their education.

8 Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we studied a fundamental PUT in data disclosure, where an analyst is allowed to reconstruct certain functions of the data, while other private functions should not be estimated with distortion below a certain threshold. $\chi^2$-information was used to measure both privacy and utility. Bounds on the best PUT were provided and the upper bound, in particular, was shown to be achievable in the high-privacy region. Moreover, a PIC-based convex program was proposed to design privacy-assuring mappings when the useful functions and private functions were known beforehand. We also derived lower bounds on the MMSE of
estimating a target function from the disclosed data and analyzed the robustness of our method when the
designer used empirical distribution to compute the privacy-assuring mappings. Finally, we performed two
experiments and analyzed the numerical results. Our hope is that the methods presented here can inspire
new, information-theoretically grounded and interpretable privacy mechanisms.

Appendix A  Proofs from Section 3

A.1  Lemma 1

Proof. By the definition of χ²-information,

\[ \chi^2(X;Y) + 1 = \sum_{x=1}^{|X|} \sum_{y=1}^{|Y|} \frac{P_{X,Y}(x,y)}{P_X(x)P_Y(y)} P_{X,Y}(x,y). \]

Note that \( Q_{X,Y} = D_X^{-\frac{1}{2}}P_{X,Y}D_Y^{-\frac{1}{2}} \) which implies

\[ \text{tr}(Q_{X,Y}Q_{X,Y}^\top) = \text{tr}(D_X^{-\frac{1}{2}}P_{X,Y}D_Y^{-\frac{1}{2}}P_{X,Y}^\top D_X^{-\frac{1}{2}}) = \text{tr}(D_X^{-\frac{1}{2}}P_{X,Y}D_Y^{-\frac{1}{2}}P_{X,Y}^\top) \]

\[ = \sum_{x=1}^{|X|} \sum_{y=1}^{|Y|} \frac{P_{X,Y}(x,y)}{P_X(x)P_Y(y)}. \]

Therefore,

\[ \chi^2(X;Y) = \text{tr}(Q_{X,Y}Q_{X,Y}^\top) - 1 = \text{tr}(A) - 1. \]

Since

\[ Q_{S,Y} = D_S^{-\frac{1}{2}}P_{S,Y}D_Y^{-\frac{1}{2}} = D_S^{-\frac{1}{2}}P_{S,X}D_X^{-\frac{1}{2}}D_X^{\frac{1}{2}}P_{X,Y}D_Y^{-\frac{1}{2}} = Q_{S,X}Q_{X,Y}, \]

then

\[ \chi^2(S;Y) = \text{tr}(Q_{S,Y}Q_{S,Y}^\top) - 1 = \text{tr}(Q_{S,X}Q_{X,Y}Q_{X,Y}^\top Q_{S,X}^\top) - 1 = \text{tr}(BA) - 1. \]

\[ \square \]

A.2  Lemma 2

Proof. For \( 0 \leq \epsilon_1 < \epsilon_2 < \epsilon_3 \leq \chi^2(S;X) \), it suffices to show that

\[ \frac{F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon_3; P_{S,X}) - F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon_1; P_{S,X})}{\epsilon_3 - \epsilon_1} \leq \frac{F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon_2; P_{S,X}) - F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon_1; P_{S,X})}{\epsilon_2 - \epsilon_1}, \]

which is equivalent to

\[ \frac{\epsilon_2 - \epsilon_1}{\epsilon_3 - \epsilon_1} F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon_3; P_{S,X}) + \frac{\epsilon_3 - \epsilon_2}{\epsilon_3 - \epsilon_1} F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon_1; P_{S,X}) \leq F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon_2; P_{S,X}). \]  (47)

Let \( P_{Y_1|X} \) and \( P_{Y_3|X} \) be two optimal solutions in \( \mathcal{D}(\epsilon_1; P_{S,X}) \) and \( \mathcal{D}(\epsilon_3; P_{S,X}) \), respectively. Assume that \( Y_1 \) and \( Y_3 \) take values in \([m_1]\) and \([m_3]\), respectively. Furthermore, we denote \( \lambda \triangleq \frac{\epsilon_2 - \epsilon_1}{\epsilon_3 - \epsilon_1} \). Next, we introduce a new privacy-assuring mapping defined as

\[ P_{Y_\lambda|X}(y|x) \triangleq \begin{cases} \lambda P_{Y_3|X}(y|x) & \text{if } y \in [m_3], \\ (1 - \lambda)P_{Y_1|X}(y-m_3|x) & \text{if } y - m_3 \in [m_1]. \end{cases} \]  (48)

Consequently, we have

\[ P_{Y_\lambda}(y) \triangleq \begin{cases} \lambda P_{Y_3}(y) & \text{if } y \in [m_3], \\ (1 - \lambda)P_{Y_1}(y-m_3) & \text{if } y - m_3 \in [m_1]. \end{cases} \]
Recall that, for \( \frac{G_{\lambda}(X, Y)}{P_{X}(X)P_{Y}(Y)} \), which implies that (47) is true, so

\[
\chi^2(X; Y_\lambda) = E \left[ \frac{P_{X,Y_\lambda}(X, Y)}{P_{X}(X)P_{Y}(Y)} \right] - 1
\]

\[
= \sum_{y \in [m]} \sum_{x=1}^{|X|} \frac{P_{X,Y_\lambda}(x, y)^2}{P_{X}(x)P_{Y}(y)} + \sum_{y \neq m} \sum_{x=1}^{|X|} \frac{P_{X,Y_\lambda}(x, y)^2}{P_{X}(x)P_{Y}(y)} - 1
\]

\[
= \sum_{y \in [m]} \sum_{x=1}^{|X|} \frac{\chi^2_{X,Y_\lambda}(y|x)^2P_{X}(x)}{\lambda P_{Y}(y)} + \sum_{y \neq m} \sum_{x=1}^{|X|} \frac{(1-\lambda)\chi^2_{Y_\lambda}(y|x)^2P_{X}(x)}{(1-\lambda)P_{Y}(y)} - 1
\]

\[
= \lambda \chi^2(X; Y_3) + (1-\lambda)\chi^2(X; Y_1).
\]

Similarly, we have

\[
\chi^2(S; Y_\lambda) = \lambda \chi^2(S; Y_3) + (1-\lambda)\chi^2(S; Y_1) \leq \epsilon_2,
\]

which implies that \( P_{Y_\lambda|X} \in \mathcal{D}(\epsilon_2; P_{S,X}) \). Therefore,

\[
F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon_2; P_{S,X}) \geq \chi^2(X; Y_\lambda)
\]

\[
= \frac{\lambda \chi^2(X; Y_3) + (1-\lambda)\chi^2(X; Y_1)}{\epsilon_2 - \epsilon_1} F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon_2; P_{S,X}) + \frac{\epsilon_2 - \epsilon_1}{\epsilon_2 - \epsilon_1} F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon_1; P_{S,X}),
\]

which implies that (47) is true, so \( F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S,X}) \) is a concave function. Then

\[
\frac{F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S,X})}{\epsilon} = \frac{F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon_2; P_{S,X}) - F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon_1; P_{S,X})}{\epsilon} + F_{\chi^2}(0; P_{S,X}).
\]

\( \frac{F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S,X})}{\epsilon} \) is non-increasing because \( F_{\chi^2}(0; P_{S,X}) \) is non-negative. Since \( F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S,X}) \) is concave, we have

\[
\frac{1}{\epsilon} \left( F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S,X}) - F_{\chi^2}(0; P_{S,X}) \right)
\]

is also non-increasing. Therefore, \( \frac{1}{\epsilon} F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S,X}) \) is non-increasing.

**A.3 Closed-Form Expression of \( G_{\epsilon}^m(t_1, ..., t_n) \)**

Recall that, for \( t_i \in [0, 1] \) (\( t \in [n] \)), \( 0 \leq \epsilon \leq \sum_{i \in [n]} t_i \), and \( n \leq m \), \( G_{\epsilon}^m(t_1, ..., t_n) \) is defined as:

\[
G_{\epsilon}^m(t_1, ..., t_n) \triangleq \max \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{m} x_i \left| (x_1, ..., x_m) \in \mathcal{D}_{\epsilon}^m(t_1, ..., t_n) \right. \right\},
\]

where

\[
\mathcal{D}_{\epsilon}^m(t_1, ..., t_n) \triangleq \left\{ (x_1, ..., x_m) \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n} t_i x_i \leq \epsilon, x_i \in [0, 1], i \in [m] \right. \right\}.
\]

We assume \( 1 \geq t_1 \geq ... \geq t_{n-s} > t_{n-s+1} = ... = t_n = 0 \) without loss of generality. Then we divide \([0, \sum_{i=1}^{n} t_i]\) into \( n-s \) intervals:

\[
\left[ 0, \sum_{i=1}^{n} t_i \right] = \bigcup_{j=0}^{n-s} \left[ \sum_{i=n-s+j+1}^{n-s} t_i, \sum_{i=n-s-j}^{n-s} t_i \right].
\]

If \( \epsilon \in \left[ \sum_{i=n-s-j+1}^{n-s} t_i, \sum_{i=n-s-j}^{n-s} t_i \right] \), then

\[
G_{\epsilon}^m(t_1, ..., t_n) = s + (m-n) + j + \frac{\epsilon - \sum_{i=n-s-j+1}^{n-s} t_i}{t_{n-s-j}},
\]

(53)
Thus, which implies that
\( x_i = 1 \), for \( i = n-s-j+1, \ldots, m \),
\[ x_{n-s-j} = \frac{\epsilon - \sum_{i=n-s-j+1}^{n-s} t_i}{t_{n-s-j}}, \]
\[ x_i = 0, \text{ for } i = 1, \ldots, n-s-j-1. \]

### A.4 Theorem 2

**Proof.** The lower bound for \( F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S,X}) \) follows immediately from the concavity of \( F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S,X}) \) and
\[ F_{\chi^2}(0; P_{S,X}) \geq 0, \]
\[ F_{\chi^2}\left(\chi^2(S;X); P_{S,X}\right) = \chi^2(X;X) = |\mathcal{X}| - 1. \]

Using Lemma 1, the \( \chi^2 \)-privacy-utility function can be simplified as
\[ F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S,X}) = \max_{P_{Y|X} \in D(\epsilon; P_{S,X})} \text{tr}(A) - 1, \]
\[ D(\epsilon; P_{S,X}) = \{ P_{Y|X} \mid S \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y, \text{tr}(BA) - 1 \leq \epsilon \}, \]
where
\[ A = Q_{X,Y} Q_{X,Y}^T, B = Q_{S,X}^T Q_{S,X}. \]

We denote the singular value decomposition of \( Q_{S,X} \) and \( Q_{X,Y} \) by \( Q_{S,X} = W \Sigma_1 U^T \) and \( Q_{X,Y} = V \Sigma_2 M^T \), respectively. Then \( B = U \Sigma_1^T \Sigma_1 U^T = U \Sigma_B U^T \), \( A = V \Sigma_2 \Sigma_2^T V^T = V \Sigma_A V^T \) where \( \Sigma_B \triangleq \Sigma_1^T \Sigma_1 \) and \( \Sigma_A \triangleq \Sigma_2 \Sigma_2^T \).

Let \( A_1 = U^T A U = L \Sigma_A L^T \) where \( L \triangleq U^T V \). Suppose the diagonal elements of \( A_1 \) are \( a_1, \ldots, a_{|\mathcal{X}|} \). Then, from characterization 3 in Theorem 1, we have
\[ \text{tr}(BA) - 1 = a_1 - 1 + \sum_{i=2}^{d+1} \lambda_{i-1}(S;X) a_i. \]
(53)

Suppose the \( i \)-th row of \( L \) is \( l_i = (l_{i,1}, \ldots, l_{i,|\mathcal{X}|}) \), the \( i \)-th column of \( U \) is \( u_i^T \) and \( \Sigma_A = \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_{|\mathcal{X}|}) \). By characterization 3 in Theorem 1, \( \sigma_1 = 1, \sigma_{j+1} = \lambda_j(X;Y) \) for \( j = 1, \ldots, d \) and \( \sigma_{d+1} = 0 \) for \( j = d+1, \ldots, |\mathcal{X}| - 1 \). Then, for \( \forall i \in [|\mathcal{X}|], \)
\[ 0 \leq a_i = \sum_{j=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|} \sigma_j l_{i,j}^2 \leq \sum_{j=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|} l_{i,j}^2 = 1. \]

Since, following from characterization 3 in Theorem 1, the first column of \( U \) and that of \( V \) are both \( (\sqrt{P_X(1)}, \ldots, \sqrt{P_X(|\mathcal{X}|)})^T \), then \( l_1 = u_1 V = (1,0,\ldots,0) \). Therefore, \( a_1 = \sigma_1 = 1 \). If \( P_{Y|X} \in D(\epsilon; P_{S,X}) \), then (53) shows
\[ \text{tr}(BA) - 1 = \sum_{i=2}^{d+1} \lambda_{i-1}(S;X) a_i \leq \epsilon, \]
which implies that
\[ (a_2, \ldots, a_{|\mathcal{X}|}) \in D_{\epsilon}^{|\mathcal{X}|-1}(\lambda_1(S;X), \ldots, \lambda_d(S;X)). \]

Thus,
\[ F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S,X}) \leq \max \left\{ \sum_{i=2}^{|\mathcal{X}|} a_i \left| (a_2, \ldots, a_{|\mathcal{X}|}) \in D_{\epsilon}^{|\mathcal{X}|-1}(\lambda_1(S;X), \ldots, \lambda_d(S;X)) \right. \right\} = G_{\epsilon}^{|\mathcal{X}|-1}(\lambda_1(S;X), \ldots, \lambda_d(S;X)). \]
A.5 Corollary 1

Proof. First, $F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S\setminus X})$ is non-decreasing. To see this, denote $\chi^2(S; X)$ by $\epsilon_0$. Since $F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S\setminus X})$ is a concave function, it is sufficient to show that, for every $\epsilon$, $F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S\setminus X}) \leq F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon_0; P_{S\setminus X})$. For any $Y$, $\chi^2(X; Y) \leq |X| - 1$ which implies $F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S\setminus X}) \leq |X| - 1$. On the other hand, $F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon_0; P_{S\setminus X}) = |X| - 1$. Thus, $F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S\setminus X}) \leq F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon_0; P_{S\setminus X})$.

Now suppose there exists $0 \leq \epsilon_1 \leq \epsilon_2 \leq \chi^2(S; X)$, such that $F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon_1; P_{S\setminus X}) = F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon_2; P_{S\setminus X})$. Since $F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S\setminus X})$ is a concave and non-decreasing function, then for any $\epsilon > \epsilon_1$, $F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S\setminus X}) = F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon_1; P_{S\setminus X})$. In particular, $F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon_1; P_{S\setminus X}) = F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon_0; P_{S\setminus X}) = |X| - 1$. This contradicts the upper bound of $\chi^2$-privacy-utility function in Theorem 2 since the upper bound implies that $F_{\chi^2}(\epsilon; P_{S\setminus X}) < |X| - 1$ when $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$. \qed

A.6 Theorem 3

Proof. Following from characterization 2 in Theorem 1, there exists $f \in L_2(P_X)$ such that $\|f(X)\|_2 = 1$, $E[f(X)] = 0$ and $\|E[f(X)|S]\|_2^2 = \lambda_{\min}(S; X)$. Fix $\mathcal{Y} = \{1, 2\}$ and the privacy-assuring mapping is defined as

$$P_{Y|X}(y|x) = \frac{1}{2} + (-1)^y \frac{\sqrt{P_{X\min}f(x)}}{2}. \quad (54)$$

Since

$$1 = \|f(X)\|_2^2 = \sum_{x=1}^{\|X\|} f(x)^2 P_X(x) \geq f(x)^2 P_X(x),$$

for any $x \in [\|X\|]

$$|f(x)| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{P_X(x)}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{P_{X\min}}}.$$}

Therefore, $\left| \frac{\sqrt{P_{X\min}f(x)}}{2} \right| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, which implies that $P_{Y|X}(y|x)$ is feasible. Furthermore, $P_Y(y) = \frac{1}{2}$ because of $E[f(X)] = 0$.

$$\chi^2(X; Y) = \sum_{x=1}^{\|X\|} \sum_{y=1}^{\|Y\|} P_{Y|X}(y|x)^2 P_X(x) - \sum_{x=1}^{\|X\|} (P_X(x) + P_{X\min}f(x)^2 P_X(x)) - 1 = P_{X\min}. $$

Since

$$P_{Y|S}(y|s) = \sum_{x=1}^{\|X\|} P_{Y|X}(y|x) P_{X|S}(x|s) = \sum_{x=1}^{\|X\|} \left( \frac{1}{2} + (-1)^y \frac{\sqrt{P_{X\min}f(x)}}{2} \right) P_{X|S}(x|s) = \frac{1}{2} + (-1)^y \frac{\sqrt{P_{X\min}f(x)}}{2} \frac{E[f(X)|S = s]}{2} ,$$

then

$$\chi^2(S; Y) = \sum_{s=1}^{\|S\|} \sum_{y=1}^{\|Y\|} P_{Y|S}(y|s)^2 P_S(s) - \sum_{s=1}^{\|S\|} (P_S(s) + P_{X\min}E[f(X)|S = s]^2 P_S(s)) - 1 = P_{X\min} \lambda_{\min}(S; X).$$

\qed

Appendix B Proofs from Section 4

B.1 Lemma 3

Proof. Suppose $\|f(S)\|_2 = 1$ without loss of generality. Observe that

$$E[\mathbb{E}[f(S)|X]] = E[f(S)] = 0.$$
Since $f(S) \to X \to Y$, then $\mathbb{E}[f(S)|X] = \mathbb{E}[f(S)|X,Y]$. Therefore,

$$\text{mmse} \left( \frac{\mathbb{E}[f(S)|X]}{\| \mathbb{E}[f(S)|X] \|_2} , Y \right) = \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}[f(S)|X]^2 \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}[f(S)|X] \right]^2}{\| \mathbb{E}[f(S)|X] \|_2^2}
$$

$$= \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}[f(S)|X]^2 \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}[f(S)|X,Y] \right]^2}{\| \mathbb{E}[f(S)|X] \|_2^2}
$$

$$= 1 - \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}[f(S)|Y]^2 \right]}{\| \mathbb{E}[f(S)|X] \|_2^2}
$$

$$= \mathbb{E} \left[ f(S)^2 \right] - \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ f(S)|Y \right]^2}{\| \mathbb{E}[f(S)|X] \|_2^2}
$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ f(S)^2 \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[ f(S)|Y \right]^2
$$

$$= \text{mmse}(f(S)|Y),$$

where the last inequality follows from Jensen’s inequality:

$$1 = \mathbb{E} \left[ f(S)^2 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}[f(S)^2|X] \right] \geq \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}[f(S)|X] \right]^2 = \| \mathbb{E}[f(S)|X] \|_2^2.$$

\[
\square
\]

## Appendix C  Proofs from Section 5

### C.1 Lemma 4

**Proof.** For fixed $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ where $a_i > 0$ and $b_i \geq 0$, let $L_P : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ and $L_D : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be given by

$$L_P(y) \triangleq a^T y,$$

$$L_D(u) \triangleq a^T b + u^T b + \|u\|_2.$$

Furthermore, we define $A(a) \triangleq \{ u \in \mathbb{R}^n | u \geq -a \}$ and $B(b) \triangleq \{ y \in \mathbb{R}^n | \| y \|_2 \leq 1, y \leq b \}$.

Assume, without loss of generality, that $b_1/a_1 \leq b_2/a_2 \leq \ldots \leq b_n/a_n$, and let $k^*$ be defined in (29). Note that $b_1 \leq 1$ and for $k \in [k^*]$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} b_i^2 \leq \frac{a_k^2}{a_i} \left( \sum_{i=k}^{k-1} b_i^2 \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} b_i^2,$$

so $\sum_{i=1}^{k} b_i^2 \leq 1$. Especially, $\sum_{i=1}^{k^*} b_i^2 \leq 1$. For $c_j \triangleq \sqrt{\frac{(1-\sum_{i=1}^{j-1} b_i^2)}{\|a\|^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{j} a_i^2}}$, let

$$y^* = (b_1, \ldots, b_{k^*}, ak^*+1ck^*, \ldots, anck^*)$$

and

$$u^* = (-b_1/c_{k^*}, \ldots, -b_{k^*}/c_{k^*}, -a_{k^*+1}, \ldots, -a_n).$$

From the definition of $k^*$, $y^* \in B(b)$ and $u^* \in A(a)$. Furthermore,

$$L_P(y^*) = a^T y^*$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{k^*} a_i b_i + \sum_{i=k^*+1}^{n} c_{k^*} a_i^2$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{k^*} a_i b_i + \sqrt{\frac{\|a\|^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{k^*} a_i^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{k^*} b_i^2}} \left( 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k^*} b_i^2 \right),$$

(55)
and

\[
L_D(u^*) = a^T b + u^T b + \|u^*\|_2^2 \\
= \sum_{i=1}^{k^*} \left( a_i b_i - \frac{b_i^2}{c_i^2} \right) + c_{k^*}^{-1} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{k^*} b_i^2 + c_{k^*}^2 \left( \|a\|_2^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{k^*} a_i^2 \right)} \\
= \sum_{i=1}^{k^*} a_i b_i + c_{k^*}^{-1} \left( 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k^*} b_i^2 \right) \\
= \sum_{i=1}^{k^*} a_i b_i + \sqrt{\left( \|a\|_2^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{k^*} a_i^2 \right) \left( 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k^*} b_i^2 \right)} \\
= L_P(y^*). 
\]

Since both the primal and the dual achieve the same value at \( y^* \) and \( u^* \), respectively, it follows that the value \( L_P(y^*) \) given in (55) is optimal. \( \square \)

C.2 Theorem 4

Proof. Let

\[
h(x) \triangleq \begin{cases} 
\rho_0^{-1} \left( \phi(x) - \sum_{i=1}^{m} \rho_i \phi_i(x) \right) & \text{if } \rho_0 > 0, \\
0 & \text{otherwise.} 
\end{cases} \tag{56}
\]

Note that when \( \rho_0 > 0 \), we have \( \|h(X)\|_2 = 1 \). Then for any \( \psi \in \mathcal{L}_2(P_Y) \) and \( \|\psi(Y)\|_2 = 1 \),

\[
|\mathbb{E} [\phi(X) \psi(Y)]| = \left| \rho_0 \mathbb{E} [h(X) \psi(Y)] + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \rho_i \mathbb{E} [\phi_i(X) \psi(Y)] \right| \\
\leq \rho_0 |\mathbb{E} [h(X) \psi(Y)]| + \sum_{i=1}^{m} |\rho_i \mathbb{E} [\phi_i(X) \psi(Y)]| \\
= \rho_0 |\mathbb{E} [h(X) (T_X \psi)(X)]| + \sum_{i=1}^{m} |\rho_i \mathbb{E} [\phi_i(X) (T_X \psi)(X)]|,
\]

where \( T_X \) is defined in Section 1.3. Denoting \( |\mathbb{E} [h(X) (T_X \psi)(X)]| \triangleq x_0, \ |\mathbb{E} [\phi_i(X) (T_X \psi)(X)]| \triangleq x_i, \ \mathbf{x} \triangleq (x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_m) \), the last inequality can be rewritten as

\[
|\mathbb{E} [\phi(X) \psi(Y)]| \leq \rho_0^T \mathbf{x}. \tag{57}
\]

Observe that \( \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \leq 1 \) and \( x_i \leq \nu_i \) for \( i \in [m] \), and the right hand side of (57) can be maximized over all values of \( \mathbf{x} \) that satisfy these constraints. We assume, without loss of generality, that \( \rho_0 > 0 \) (otherwise set \( x_0 = 0 \)). The left-hand side of (57) can be further bounded by

\[
|\mathbb{E} [\phi(X) \psi(Y)]| \leq L_{m+1} (\mathbf{\rho_0}, \mathbf{\nu_0}), \tag{58}
\]

where \( \mathbf{\nu_0} = (1, \nu_1, \ldots, \nu_m) \) and \( L_{m+1} \) is defined in (28). The result follows directly from Lemma 4 and noting that \( \max_{\psi \in \mathcal{L}_2(P_Y)} |\mathbb{E} [\phi(X) \psi(Y)]| = |\mathbb{E} [\phi(X) \psi(Y)]|_2 \). \( \square \)

C.3 Theorem 5

Proof. For any \( \psi \in \mathcal{L}_2(P_Y) \) with \( \|\psi(Y)\|_2 = 1 \), let \( \alpha_i \triangleq \mathbb{E} [\psi(Y) \psi_i(Y)] \), \( \alpha_0 \triangleq \sqrt{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{t} \alpha_i^2} \) and \( \psi_0(Y) \triangleq \alpha_0^{-1} (\psi(Y) - \sum_{i=1}^{t} \alpha_i \psi_i(Y)) \) if \( \alpha_0 > 0 \), otherwise \( \psi_0(Y) \triangleq 0 \). Observe that \( \|\psi_0(Y)\|_2 = 1 \) when \( \alpha_0 > 0 \). Also,
\[ \mathbb{E} [\phi_i(X)\psi_j(Y)] = 0 \text{ for } i \neq j, \ i \in \{0, \ldots, m\}, \ j \in [t]. \] Consequently,

\[ \mathbb{E} [\phi(X)\psi(Y)] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{i=0}^{m} \rho_i \phi_i(X) \right) \left( \sum_{j=0}^{t} \alpha_j \psi_j(Y) \right) \right] \]
\[ = \sum_{i=0}^{m} \sum_{j=0}^{t} \rho_i \alpha_j \mathbb{E} [\phi_i(X)\psi_j(Y)] \]
\[ \leq \alpha_0 \sum_{i=0, i \notin [t]}^{m} \rho_i \mathbb{E} [\phi_i(X)\psi_0(Y)] + \sum_{i=1}^{t} |\nu_i \rho_i \alpha_i| \]
\[ \leq |\alpha_0| B_{m-t} (\bar{\rho}, \bar{\nu}) + \sum_{i=1}^{t} |\nu_i \rho_i \alpha_i| \] (59)
\[ \leq \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{t} \nu_i^2 \rho_i^2 + B_{m-t} (\bar{\rho}, \bar{\nu})^2}. \] (60)

Inequality (59) follows from the similar proof of Theorem 4, and (60) follows by observing that \( \sum_{i=0}^{t} \alpha_i^2 = 1 \) and applying Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.

Finally, when \( \rho_0 = 0 \) and \( t = m \), (60) can be achieved with equality by taking

\[ \psi(Y) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \nu_i \rho_i \psi_i(Y)}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \nu_i^2 \rho_i^2}}. \]

\[ \square \]

### Appendix D  Proofs from Section 6

#### D.1 Lemma 5

**Proof.** By the definition of \( \chi^2 \)-information, we have

\[ |\chi^2(X_1; Y_1) - \chi^2(X_2; Y_2)| \leq \sum_{x_1 = 1}^{|X|} \sum_{y_1 = 1}^{|Y|} \left| \frac{P_{X_1,Y_1}(x,y)^2}{P_{X_1}(x)P_{Y_1}(y)} - \frac{P_{X_2,Y_2}(x,y)^2}{P_{X_2}(x)P_{Y_2}(y)} \right|. \] (61)

Note that for \( i = 1,2 \)

\[ \frac{P_{X_i,Y_i}(x,y)}{P_{X_i}(x)P_{Y_i}(y)} \leq \frac{1}{P_{X_i}(x)} \leq \frac{1}{m_X}. \]

By the triangle inequality,

\[ \left| \frac{P_{X_1,Y_1}(x,y)^2}{P_{X_1}(x)P_{Y_1}(y)} - \frac{P_{X_2,Y_2}(x,y)^2}{P_{X_2}(x)P_{Y_2}(y)} \right| \leq \frac{P_{X_1,Y_1}(x,y)^2}{P_{X_1}(x)P_{Y_1}(y)} \left| \frac{P_{X_1,Y_1}(x,y)^2}{P_{X_1}(x)^2P_{Y_1}(y)^2} - \frac{P_{X_2,Y_2}(x,y)^2}{P_{X_2}(x)^2P_{Y_2}(y)^2} \right| \]
\[ + \frac{P_{X_2,Y_2}(x,y)^2}{P_{X_2}(x)^2P_{Y_2}(y)^2} |P_{X_1}(x)P_{Y_1}(y) - P_{X_2}(x)P_{Y_2}(y)|. \] (62)
Furthermore,

\[ P_{X_1}(x)P_{Y_1}(y) \geq P_{X_1,Y_1}(x,y)^2 - P_{X_2,Y_2}(x,y) \]

\[ \geq P_{X_1}(x)P_{Y_1}(y) \left( \frac{P_{X_1,Y_1}(x,y)}{P_{X_1}(x)P_{Y_1}(y)} + \frac{P_{X_2,Y_2}(x,y)}{P_{X_2}(x)P_{Y_2}(y)} \right) \]

\[ \leq P_{X_1}(x)P_{Y_1}(y) \frac{2}{m_X} \left| \frac{P_{X_1,Y_1}(x,y)}{P_{X_1}(x)P_{Y_1}(y)} - \frac{P_{X_2,Y_2}(x,y)}{P_{X_2}(x)P_{Y_2}(y)} \right| \]

\[ = \frac{2}{m_X} \left| P_{X_1,Y_1}(x,y) - P_{X_2,Y_2}(x,y) \right| + \left| \frac{2P_{X_2,Y_2}(x,y)}{m_XP_{X_2}(x)P_{Y_2}(y)} \right| \]

\[ \leq \frac{2}{m_X} \left| P_{X_1,Y_1}(x,y) - P_{X_2,Y_2}(x,y) \right| + \frac{2}{m_X} P_{X_1}(x)P_{Y_1}(y) - P_{Y_2}(y) + \frac{2}{m_X} P_{X_1}(x)P_{X_1}(x) - P_{X_2}(x) \]

(63)

and

\[ \frac{P_{X_2,Y_2}(x,y)^2}{P_{X_2}(x)^2P_{Y_2}(y)^2} \left| P_{X_1}(x)P_{Y_1}(y) - P_{X_2}(x)P_{Y_2}(y) \right| \]

\[ \leq \frac{1}{m_X} P_{X_1}(x)P_{Y_1}(y) - P_{Y_2}(y) + \frac{1}{m_X} P_{X_1}(x)P_{X_1}(x) - P_{X_2}(x) \]

(64)

Combining (61), (62), (63), (64) together, we have

\[ \left| \chi^2(X_1;Y_1) - \chi^2(X_2;Y_2) \right| \]

\[ \leq \frac{2}{m_X} \left\| P_{X_1,Y_1} - P_{X_2,Y_2} \right\|_1 + \frac{3}{m_X} \left( \left\| P_{X_1} - P_{X_2} \right\|_1 + \left\| P_{Y_1} - P_{Y_2} \right\|_1 \right) \]

\[ \leq \left( \frac{2}{m_X} + \frac{6}{m_X} \right) \left\| P_{X_1,Y_1} - P_{X_2,Y_2} \right\|_1. \]

(65)

Similarly, it can be shown that

\[ \left| \chi^2(S_1;Y_1) - \chi^2(S_2;Y_2) \right| \leq \left( \frac{2}{m_S} + \frac{6}{m_S} \right) \left\| P_{S_1,Y_1} - P_{S_2,Y_2} \right\|_1. \]

(66)

By the data processing inequality and the assumption \( P_{Y_1|X_1} = P_{Y_2|X_2} \), we have

\[ \max \{ \left\| P_{S_1,Y_1} - P_{S_2,Y_2} \right\|_1, \left\| P_{X_1,Y_1} - P_{X_2,Y_2} \right\|_1 \} \leq \left\| P_{S_1,X_1} - P_{S_2,X_2} \right\|_1. \]

(67)

Therefore, we get the desired conclusion.

\[ \square \]

**D.2 Theorem 6**

The proof of Theorem 6 follows from Lemma 5 and the following results by Weissman et al. [56, Theorem 2.1] for the \( L_1 \) deviation of the empirical distribution.

For all \( \epsilon > 0 \),

\[ \Pr \left( \left\| \hat{P}_n - P \right\|_1 \geq \epsilon \right) \leq (2^M - 2) \exp \left( -n\tilde{\phi}(\pi_P)\epsilon^2/4 \right), \]

(68)

where \( P \) is a probability distribution on the set \([M]\), \( \hat{P}_n \) is the empirical distribution obtained from \( n \) i.i.d. samples, \( \pi_P \triangleq \max_{M \subseteq [M]} \min(P(M), 1 - P(M)) \), and

\[ \tilde{\phi}(p) \triangleq \begin{cases} \frac{1}{1-2p} \ln \frac{1-p}{p} & p \in [0, 1/2), \\ \frac{1}{2} & p = 1/2. \end{cases} \]
Note that $\bar{\phi}(\pi_P) \geq 2$, which implies that
\[
\Pr \left( \|\hat{P}_n - P\|_1 \geq \epsilon \right) \leq \exp(M) \exp(-n\epsilon^2/2).
\]
Therefore, by choosing $P = P_{S,X}$, $M = |S||X|$, and $\epsilon = \sqrt{\frac{2}{n} (M - \ln \beta)}$, (69) implies that, with probability at least $1 - \beta$,
\[
\|P_{\hat{S},\hat{X}} - P_{S,X}\|_1 \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{n} (M - \ln \beta)},
\]
where $P_{\hat{S},\hat{X}}$ is the empirical distribution obtained from $n$ i.i.d. samples drawn from $P_{S,X}$.
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