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Abstract

We present novel, computationally efficient, and differentially private algorithms for two fundamental high-dimensional learning problems: learning a multivariate Gaussian in \( \mathbb{R}^d \) and learning a product distribution in \( \{0, 1\}^d \) in total variation distance. The sample complexity of our algorithms nearly matches the sample complexity of the optimal non-private learners for these tasks in a wide range of parameters. Thus, our results show that private comes essentially for free for these problems, providing a counterpoint to the many negative results showing that privacy is often costly in high dimensions. Our algorithms introduce a novel technical approach to reducing the sensitivity of the estimation procedure that we call recursive private preconditioning, which may find additional applications.
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1 Introduction

A central problem in machine learning and statistics is to learn (estimate) the parameters of an unknown distribution using samples. However, in many applications, these samples consist of highly sensitive information belonging to individuals, and the output of the learning algorithm may inadvertently reveal this information. While releasing only the estimated parameters of a distribution may seem harmless, when there are enough parameters—that is, when the data is high-dimensional—these statistics can reveal a lot of individual-specific information (see e.g. [DN03, HSR+08, BUV14, DSS+15, SSSS17], and the survey [DSSU17]). For example, the influential attack of Homer et al. [HSR+08] showed how to use very simple statistical information released in the course of genome-wide association studies to detect the presence of individuals in those studies, which implies these individuals have a particular medical condition. Thus it is crucial to design learning algorithms that ensure the privacy of the individuals in the dataset.

The most widely accepted solution to this problem is differential privacy [DMNS06], which provides strong individual privacy guarantees. A large body of literature now shows how to implement nearly every statistical algorithm privately, and differential privacy is now being deployed by Apple [Dif17], Google [EPK14], and the US Census Bureau [DLS+17].

A theme in differential privacy research is that privacy comes almost for free when data is low-dimensional but incurs a steep price when data is high-dimensional. Consider the example of mean estimation of a distribution over \( \{0, 1\}^d \). To privately estimate the mean of this distribution up to \( \pm \alpha \) per coordinate, it is necessary [BUV14, SU17a] and sufficient [BDMN05, DMNS06] to have \( n = \Theta(\frac{1}{\alpha^2} + \frac{\sqrt{d}}{\alpha}) \) samples from the distribution, whereas \( \Theta(\frac{1}{\alpha}) \) samples are necessary and sufficient without privacy. In other words, there is almost no increase in sample complexity when \( d \) is small, but a significant increase when \( d \) is large. Moreover, differentially private algorithms for high-dimensional data often require exponential running time [DNR+09, Ull16].

This phenomenon is quite persistent. For example, an elegant recent work of Karwa and Vadhan [KV18] shows how to estimate the parameters of a univariate Gaussian with no asymptotic increase in sample complexity compared to non-private estimation, and the work of Diakonikolas, Hardt, and Schmidt [DHS15] shows how to learn a variety of structured distributions over a one-dimensional discrete domain with almost no increase in sample complexity. However, extending these results to higher dimensions leads to a large blowup in sample complexity. Thus, the general perception is that differential privacy is quite costly for high-dimensional learning.

In this work, we challenge this notion by presenting computationally efficient differentially private algorithms for two fundamental high-dimensional learning problems—learning a multivariate Gaussian and learning a product distribution in total variation distance—that incur only a small increase in sample complexity compared to non-private algorithms for the same tasks. For Gaussians, a key feature of our results is that the sample complexity has only a mild dependence on the condition number of the covariance matrix, whereas previous approaches to these problems in high dimensions incur a polynomial dependence on the condition number. The main new technical tool underlying our results is a new approach to reducing the sensitivity of the estimation procedure—private recursive preconditioning—that may have additional applications.

1.1 Our Results

1.1.1 Privately Learning Gaussians

The most fundamental class of high-dimensional distributions is the multivariate Gaussian in \( \mathbb{R}^d \). Our first result is an algorithm that takes samples from a distribution \( \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma) \) with
unknown mean \( \mu \in \mathbb{R}^d \) and covariance \( \Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \) and estimates parameters \( \hat{\mu}, \hat{\Sigma} \) such that \( \mathcal{N}(\hat{\mu}, \hat{\Sigma}) \) is close to the true distribution in total variation distance (TV distance). Without privacy, \( n = \Theta(\frac{d^2}{\varepsilon^2}) \) samples suffice to guarantee total variation distance at most \( \alpha \) (this is folklore, but see e.g. [DKK+16]).

Despite the simplicity of this problem, it was only recently that Karwa and Vadhan [KV18] gave an optimal algorithm for learning a univariate Gaussian. Specifically, they showed that just \( n = \tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\alpha^2} + \frac{1}{\alpha\varepsilon} + \frac{\log(R\kappa)}{\varepsilon}) \) samples are sufficient to learn a univariate Gaussian \( \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2) \) with \( |\mu| \leq R \) and \( 1 \leq \sigma^2 \leq \kappa \), up to \( \alpha \) in total variation distance subject to \( \varepsilon \)-differential privacy. In contrast to naïve approaches, their result has two important features: (1) The sample complexity has only mild dependence on the range parameters \( R \) and \( \kappa \), and (2) the sample complexity is only larger than that of the non-private estimator by a small multiplicative factor and an additive factor that is a lower order term for a wide range of parameters. When the covariance is unknown, a naïve application of their algorithm would preserve neither of these features.

We show that it is possible to privately estimate a multivariate normal while preserving both of these features. Our algorithms satisfy the strong notion of concentrated differential privacy (\( zCDP \)) [DR16, BS16], which is formally defined in Section 2. To avoid confusion we remark that these definitions are on different scales so that \( \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} zCDP \) is comparable to \( \varepsilon \)-DP and \((\varepsilon, \delta)\)-DP.

**Theorem 1.1.** There is a polynomial time \( \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} zCDP \) algorithm that takes

\[
n = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{d^2}{\alpha^2} + \frac{d^2}{\alpha\varepsilon} + \frac{d^{3/2} \log^{1/2} \kappa + d^{1/2} \log R}{\varepsilon}\right)
\]

samples from a Gaussian \( \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma) \) with unknown mean \( \mu \in \mathbb{R}^d \) such that \( \|\mu\|_2 \leq R \) and unknown covariance \( \Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \) such that \( \mathbf{I} \preceq \Sigma \preceq \kappa \mathbf{I} \), and outputs estimates \( \hat{\mu}, \hat{\Sigma} \) such that, with high probability \( d_{TV}(\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma), \mathcal{N}(\hat{\mu}, \hat{\Sigma})) \leq \alpha \). Here, \( \tilde{O}(\cdot) \) hides polylogarithmic factors of \( d, \frac{1}{\alpha}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}, \log \kappa, \) and \( \log R \).

Theorem 1.1 will follow by combining Theorem 3.12 for covariance estimation with Theorem 4.3 for mean estimation. Observe that, since the sample complexity without privacy is \( \Theta(\frac{d^2}{\alpha^2}) \), Theorem 1.1 shows that privacy comes almost for free unless \( \frac{1}{\alpha}, \kappa, \) or \( R \) are quite large.

The main difficulty that arises when trying to extend the results of [KV18] to the multivariate case is that the covariance matrix of the Gaussian might be unknown and ill-conditioned. The main technically novel part of our algorithm is a method for learning a matrix \( A \) approximating the inverse of the covariance matrix so that \( \mathbf{I} \preceq A \Sigma A \preceq 1000 \mathbf{I} \). This matrix can be used to transform the Gaussian to be nearly spherical, making it possible to apply the methods of [KV18].

**Theorem 1.2** (Private Preconditioning). There is an \( \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} zCDP \) algorithm that takes

\[
n = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{d^{3/2} \log^{1/2} \kappa}{\varepsilon}\right)
\]

samples from an unknown Gaussian \( \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma) \) over \( \mathbb{R}^d \) with \( \Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \) such that \( \mathbf{I} \preceq \Sigma \preceq \kappa \mathbf{I} \), and outputs a symmetric matrix \( A \) such that \( \mathbf{I} \preceq A \Sigma A \preceq 1000 \mathbf{I} \). Here, \( \tilde{O}(\cdot) \) hides polylogarithmic factors of \( d, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}, \) and \( \log \kappa \).

We describe and analyze our algorithm for private covariance estimation in Section 3, and in Section 4 we combine it with the algorithms of [KV18] to obtain Theorem 1.1.
1.1.2 Privately Learning Product Distributions

The simplest family of high-dimensional discrete distributions are product distributions over \(\{0, 1\}^d\). Without privacy, \(\Theta(d^\alpha)\) are necessary and sufficient to learn up to \(\alpha\) in total variation distance. The standard approach to achieving DP by perturbing each coordinate independently requires \(\tilde{\Theta}(d^\alpha + d^{\alpha/2}/\epsilon)\) samples. We give an improved algorithm for this problem that avoids this blowup in sample complexity. While our algorithm for learning product distributions is quite different to our algorithm for estimating Gaussian covariance, it uses a similar recursive preconditioning technique, highlighting the versatility of this approach.

**Theorem 1.3.** There is a polynomial time \(\varepsilon^2/2\)-zCDP algorithm that takes

\[
n = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{d}{\alpha^2} + \frac{d}{\alpha\epsilon}\right)
\]

samples from an unknown product distribution \(\mathcal{P}\) over \(\{0, 1\}^d\) and outputs a product distribution \(\mathcal{Q}\) such that, with high probability, \(d_{TV}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}) \leq \alpha\). Here, \(\tilde{O}(\cdot)\) hides polylogarithmic factors of \(d, \frac{1}{\alpha}, \text{ and } \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\).

We describe and analyze our algorithm in Section 5.

1.1.3 Lower Bounds

We prove lower bounds for the problems we consider in this paper, demonstrating that for many problems, our sample complexity is optimal up to polylogarithmic factors. One example statement is the following lower bound for private mean estimation of a product distribution, for the more permissive notion of \((\varepsilon, \delta)\)-differential privacy (compared to our upper bounds, which are in terms of zCDP):

**Theorem 1.4.** Any \((\varepsilon, \frac{1}{64n})\)-differentially private algorithm that takes samples from an arbitrary unknown product distribution \(\mathcal{P}\) over \(\{0, 1\}^d\) and outputs a product distribution \(\mathcal{Q}\) such that \(d_{TV}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}) \leq \alpha\) with probability \(\geq 9/10\) requires \(n = \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\alpha^2} + \frac{d}{\alpha\log d}\right)\) samples.

We also prove a qualitatively similar lower bound for privately estimating the mean of a Gaussian distribution.

In addition, we prove lower bounds for privately estimating a Gaussian with unknown covariance. These are qualitatively weaker, as they are only for \(\varepsilon\)-differential privacy, and we consider it an interesting open question to prove lower bounds for covariance estimation under concentrated or approximate differential privacy.

**Theorem 1.5.** Any \(\varepsilon\)-differentially private algorithm that takes samples from an arbitrary unknown Gaussian distribution \(\mathcal{P}\) and outputs a Gaussian distribution \(\mathcal{Q}\) such that \(d_{TV}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}) \leq \alpha\) with probability \(\geq 9/10\) requires \(n = \Omega\left(\frac{d^2}{\alpha^2} + \frac{d^2}{\alpha\epsilon}\right)\) samples.

All our lower bounds are presented in Section 6.

1.1.4 Comparison to Lower Bounds for High-Dimensional DP

Readers familiar with differential privacy may wonder why our results do not contradict known lower bounds for high-dimensional differential privacy [BUV14, SU15, DSS+15]. The two
key differences are (1) lower bounds showing that privacy is costly are for fairly weak estimation guarantees whereas we want a rather stringent estimation guarantee, and (2) we exploit the structure of Gaussians and product distributions to obtain guarantees that are not possible for arbitrary distributions.

To understand the first issue, most lower bounds in differential privacy apply to estimating the mean of the distribution up to $\alpha$ in $\ell_\infty$ distance. This guarantee can be achieved with $\Theta(\log d \alpha^{-2})$ samples non-privately but requires $\Theta(\log d \alpha^{-2} + \sqrt{d} \alpha^{-1})$ samples with differential privacy. Thus, for this fairly weak estimation guarantee, privately is costly in high dimensions. However, if we consider the more stringent $\ell_2$ metric, then the cost of privacy goes away, and $\Theta(d \alpha^2)$ samples are sufficient with or without privacy. One way to justify this statement is that estimation up to $\alpha/\sqrt{d}$ in $\ell_\infty$ implies estimation up to $\alpha$ in $\ell_2$, so the non-private term and the private term in the $\ell_\infty$ bounds have roughly the same dependence on the dimension in this case. Thus, for this stronger estimation guarantee, privacy is not costly in high-dimensions. This phenomenon is fairly general, and is not specific to Gaussians or product distributions.

To understand the second issue, in order to learn Gaussians or product distributions in total variation distance, we need to learn in metrics that are related to $\ell_2$, but take into account the variance of the distribution. In the case of Gaussians we learn in the Mahalanobis distance $\|\cdot\|_\Sigma$ and for product distributions our guarantees are for a variant of the KL-divergence. For example, Theorem 1.1 can actually be rephrased as saying that, for our algorithm,

$$n = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{d^{3/2} \log^{1/2} \kappa}{\varepsilon}\right) \implies \|\Sigma - \hat{\Sigma}\|_\Sigma = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{d^2}{n}} + \frac{d^2}{\varepsilon n}\right).$$

This sort of guarantee where the error in the $\Sigma$-norm does not depend on the condition number cannot be achieved for arbitrary distributions, and thus for this part of the guarantee we crucially use the fact that the data is i.i.d. from a Gaussian. A similar phenomenon arises for product distributions, where, as we show, learning in our chosen error metric requires just $\tilde{O}(d)$ samples for a product distributions: a consequence of our results is that we can learn the mean of a product distribution over $\{0,1\}_d$ in $\ell_2$ using $\tilde{O}(d)$ samples, but $\Omega(d^{3/2})$ samples would be required to learn the mean of an arbitrary distribution in $\ell_2$.

1.2 Techniques

1.2.1 Privately Learning Gaussians

To simplify the discussion, we focus only on covariance estimation, although the issues that arise in mean estimation are similar. We also elide the privacy parameter $\varepsilon$, since it is not central to the discussion. Suppose we want to estimate a zero-mean Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$. Without privacy we could draw $n = O(\frac{d^2}{\alpha^2})$ i.i.d. samples $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ and use the empirical covariance $\hat{\Sigma} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i X_i X_i^T$, and, with high probability, $d_{TV}(\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma), \mathcal{N}(0, \hat{\Sigma})) \leq \alpha$.

A Naïve Approach. If we want to make this procedure private, then we have to perturb each entry of $\hat{\Sigma}$ with independent noise whose standard deviation is proportional to the sensitivity of the statistic $\hat{\Sigma}$, which is the maximum that changing one sample can change $\hat{\Sigma}$ in the Frobenius norm. The sensitivity of $\Sigma$ is $\frac{1}{n}$ times the largest possible $\ell_2^2$ norm of a sample $X_i$, so if we make no assumption about distribution, then the sensitivity is unbounded. If we assume $I \preceq \Sigma \preceq \kappa I$ then we can truncate the data so that $\|X_i\|_2^2 \leq \kappa d$, which ensures that the sensitivity is $\preceq \frac{\kappa d}{n}$, but does not affect the accuracy of the estimation procedure. However, if we have to add noise
with standard deviation $\frac{\kappa d}{n}$ to each entry of $\tilde{\Sigma}$ in order to achieve privacy, then we will need at least $n = \Omega(\frac{\kappa^2 d^2}{\alpha})$ samples to learn the covariance up to $\alpha$ in total variation distance.

**Private Preconditioning.** While this naïve algorithm has an undesirable polynomial dependence on the condition number $\kappa$, it allows us to essentially match the non-private sample complexity when $\kappa$ is a constant. Thus, in order to estimate the underlying Gaussian, it would suffice to privately find a symmetric matrix $A$ such that $I \preceq A\Sigma A \preceq 1000I$. Given such a matrix, we can apply the naïve algorithm to the data $AX_1, \ldots, AX_n$, and learn the transformed covariance $A\Sigma A$, and essentially match the non-private sample complexity.

The challenge in finding such a matrix $A$ is that the covariance $\Sigma$ can be as large as $\kappa$ in some directions and as small as 1 in others, and we need essentially a good multiplicative estimate of the variance in every direction. Suppose we start with the naïve procedure, and let $\tilde{\Sigma} = \Sigma + Z$ where $Z$ is a matrix whose entries have standard deviation $\frac{\kappa d}{n}$. Since the eigenvalues of $Z$ are $\approx \frac{\kappa d^{3/2}}{n}$, this matrix $Z$ can completely overwhelm the directions of $\tilde{\Sigma}$ that have low variance unless $n \gtrsim \kappa d^{3/2}$, making it impossible to obtain the desired matrix $A$ such that $I \preceq A\Sigma A \preceq 1000I$. On the other hand, if $n \gtrsim 1000d^{3/2}$, then the spectral norm of $Z$ is at most $\frac{\kappa}{1000}$, so the noise will not overwhelm the directions of large variance. Specifically, any eigenvector $v$ of $\tilde{\Sigma}$ such that the eigenvalue is $\lambda \geq \frac{\kappa}{1000}$ must be close to a some eigenvector of $\Sigma$ with eigenvalue $\geq \frac{\kappa}{100}$.

Using this observation, we can try to reduce the sensitivity of $\Sigma$ by shrinking the directions of large variance. Specifically, let $v_i, \lambda_i$ be the eigenvectors and eigenvalues of $\tilde{\Sigma}$ respectively, let $V = \text{span}(\{v_i : \lambda_i \geq \frac{\kappa}{2}\})$ be the span of the directions with large variance, and let $A = \frac{1}{\kappa} \Pi_V + \Pi_{V^\perp}$ be the matrix that partially projects out the the subspace $V$. Then we can show that (after some rescaling) $I \preceq A\Sigma A \preceq \frac{4}{d} \kappa I$. Thus we have improved the condition number by a constant factor, and thereby decreased the sensitivity of the covariance estimation problem. We call this procedure a **private preconditioner**. We can now apply this procedure recursively on the distribution $N(0, A\Sigma A)$ for $O(\log \kappa)$ rounds to obtain the desired preconditioner, which, in turn, allows us to obtain our final estimates of the mean and covariance.

### 1.2.2 Privately Learning Product Distributions

Although learning Boolean product distributions is quite different from learning Gaussians, our algorithm uses a similar approach of recursively reducing the sensitivity. Suppose we have a product distribution $P$ over $\{0, 1\}^d$ with mean $p = \mathbb{E}[P]$. Without privacy, we could draw $n = O(\frac{d}{\alpha})$ i.i.d. samples $X_1, \ldots, X_n$, compute the empirical mean $\tilde{p} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i X_i$, and output the product distribution $\tilde{P}$ with mean $\tilde{p}$. With high probability, we would have $d_{TV}(P, \tilde{P}) \leq \alpha$.

**A Naïve Approach.** Using the fact that the $\ell_2$-sensitivity of the mean is $\frac{\sqrt{d}}{n}$, we can make this procedure private by computing $\tilde{p} = \tilde{p} + Z$ where $Z$ is a vector whose entries have standard deviation $\frac{\sqrt{d}}{n}$. Bounding the distance between $P$ and $\tilde{P}$ requires some care, but for simplicity we assume $p \geq \frac{1}{d}$ and use the approximately tight bound

$$d_{TV}(P, \tilde{P}) \leq O\left(\sqrt{\sum_j \frac{(p_j - \tilde{p}_j)^2}{p_j}}\right)$$

To upper bound this quantity, we need $|p_j - \tilde{p}_j| \leq \alpha/d$, which we use to take $\Omega(\frac{d^{3/2}}{\alpha})$ samples.

**Recursive Preconditioning.** We cannot independently improve either the sensitivity analysis or the bound on distance. We can however, see how to get a win-win by considering two instructive
cases: (1) If $p = (\frac{1}{2}, \ldots, \frac{1}{2})$ then every sample has $\ell_2$ norm about $\sqrt{d/2}$, however it suffices to ensure $|p_j - \hat{p}_j| \leq \alpha/\sqrt{d}$ to get a suitable distance bound. (2) If $p = (\frac{1}{d}, \ldots, \frac{1}{d})$ then we really need $|p_j - \hat{p}_j| \leq \alpha/d$, but we can also truncate the data so that $\|X_i\|_2 \lesssim 1$, which reduces the sensitivity to $\lesssim \frac{1}{n}$ but does not affect the accuracy of the estimates. In each of these two cases, it would suffice to have $O(\frac{d}{\alpha^2})$ samples to learn the distribution.

Extrapolating from these two cases, our approach is to partition the coordinates based on their mean, and use appropriate truncation for each piece of the partition. The challenge, of course, is to do the partitioning privately. Our partitioning is again based on recursive preconditioning starting with the naïve algorithm. Suppose that we use the naïve algorithm with $n \approx \frac{d}{\alpha^2}$ samples so that for all $j$,

$$|p_j - \hat{p}_j| \lesssim \alpha/\sqrt{d} \leq \frac{1}{16}$$

If we consider any coordinate $j$ such that $\hat{p}_j \geq \frac{3}{16}$, then we know that $p_j \geq \frac{1}{8}$, so we have

$$\frac{(p_j - \hat{p}_j)^2}{p_j} \lesssim \frac{\alpha^2}{d},$$

which is our goal for that coordinate. Thus, if we let $P_1, \hat{P}_1$ be the distribution restricted to coordinates with $\hat{p}_j \geq \frac{3}{16}$ we have $d_{TV}(P_1, \hat{P}_1) \leq \alpha$.

On the other hand, if $\hat{p}_j < \frac{3}{16}$ then $p_j$ could be small, so we do not get a good distance bound for this coordinate. However, we know that $p_j < \frac{1}{4}$, meaning that if we restrict to the coordinates with $\hat{p}_j < \frac{3}{16}$, we will have $\|X_i\|_2 \lesssim \sqrt{d/4}$, and we can reduce the sensitivity by a constant factor using truncation. We can then recursively apply this procedure on the remaining variables for $O(\log d)$ rounds until we have an accurate estimate for all coordinates. Each recursive call requires drawing more samples, and introduces additional error, but this only increases the overall sample complexity by polylogarithmic factors.

1.3 Additional Related Work

While the work on differentially private learning and statistics (to say nothing of differential privacy as a whole) is too vast to survey here, we highlight some relevant lines of research.

**Differentially Private Learning and Statistics.** The most directly comparable papers to ours are recent results on learning low-dimensional statistics. In addition to the aforementioned work of Karwa and Vadhan [KV18], Bun, Nissim, Stemmer, and Vadhan [BNSV15] showed how to private learn an arbitrary distribution in Kolmogorov distance, which is weaker than TV distance, with almost no increase in sample complexity. Diakonikolas, Hardt, and Schmidt [DHS15] extended this work to give a practical algorithm for learning structured one-dimensional distributions in TV distance.

An elegant work of Smith [Smi11] showed how to estimate arbitrary asymptotically normal statistics with only a small increase in sample complexity compared to non-private estimation. Technically, this work doesn’t apply to covariance estimation or estimating sparse product distributions, for which the asymptotic distribution is not normal. More fundamentally, this algorithm learns a high-dimensional distribution one coordinate at a time, which is quite costly for the distributions we consider here.

**Covariance Estimation.** For covariance estimation, the works closest to ours are that of Dwork, Talwar, Thakurta, and Zhang [DTTZ14] and Sheffet [She17]. Their algorithms require
that the norm of the data be bounded, and the sample complexity depends polynomially on this bound. In contrast, our algorithms have either mild or no dependence on the norm of the data.

Robust Statistical Estimation on High-Dimensional Data. Recently, there has been significant interest in the computer science community in robustly estimating distributions \[\text{DKK}+16, \text{LRV}16, \text{CSV}17, \text{DKK}+17, \text{D KK}+18, \text{SCV}18\], where the goal is to estimate some distribution from samples even when a constant fraction of the samples may be corrupted by an adversary. As observed by Dwork and Lei [DL09], differentially private estimation and robust estimation both seek to minimize the influence of outliers, and thus there is a natural conceptual connection between these two problems. Technically, the two problems are incomparable. Differential privacy seeks to limit the influence of outliers in a very strong sense, and without making any assumptions on the data, but only when up to \(O(1/\varepsilon)\) samples are corrupted. In contrast, robust estimation limits the influence of outliers in a weaker sense, and only when the remaining samples are chosen from a nice distribution, but tolerates up to \(\Omega(n)\) corruptions.

Differentially Private Testing. There have also been a number of works on differentially private hypothesis testing. For example, [WLK15, GLRV16, KR17, CDK17, KSF17] gave private algorithms for goodness-of-fit testing, closeness, and independence testing. Recently, [ASZ17] and [ADR18] have given essentially optimal algorithms for goodness-of-fit and closeness testing of arbitrary distributions. [AKSZ18] designed nearly optimal algorithms for estimating properties like support size and entropy. [GR18, She18] study hypothesis testing in the local differential privacy setting. All these works consider testing of arbitrary distributions, and so they necessarily have sample complexity growing exponentially in the dimension.

Privacy Attacks and Lower Bounds. A complementary line of work has established limits on the accuracy of private algorithms for high-dimensional learning. For example, Dwork et al. [DSS+15] (building on [BUV14, HU14, SU15, SU17a]) designed a robust tracing attack that can infer sensitive information about individuals in a dataset using highly noisy statistical information about the dataset. These attacks apply to nice distributions like product distributions and Gaussians, but require that the dataset be too small to learn the underlying distribution in total variation distance, and thus do not contradict our results. These attacks apply to a number of learning problems, such as PCA [DTTZ14], ERM [BST14], and variable selection [BU17, SU17b]. Similar attacks lead to computational hardness results for differentially private algorithms for high-dimensional data [DNR+09, UV11, Ull16, KMUZ16, KMUW18], albeit for learning problems that encode certain cryptographic functionalities.

2 Preliminaries

A dataset \(X = (X_1, \ldots, X_n) \in \mathcal{X}^n\) is a collection of elements from some universe. We say that two datasets \(X, X' \in \mathcal{X}^n\) are neighboring if they differ on at most a single entry, and denote this by \(X \sim X'\). Informally, differential privacy requires that for every pair of datasets \(X, X' \in \mathcal{X}^n\) that differ on at most a single entry, the distributions \(M(X)\) and \(M(X')\) are close. In our work we consider a few different variants of differential privacy. The first is the standard variant of differential privacy.

**Definition 2.1** (Differential Privacy (DP) [DMNS06]). A randomized algorithm \(M : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}\) satisfies \((\varepsilon, \delta)-\text{differential privacy} \ ((\varepsilon, \delta)-\text{DP})\) if for every pair of neighboring datasets \(X, X' \in \mathcal{X}^n\),

\[
\forall Y \subseteq \mathcal{Y} \quad \Pr[M(X) \in Y] \leq e^{\varepsilon} \Pr[M(X') \in Y] + \delta.
\]
The second variant is so-called concentrated differential privacy [DR16], specifically the refinement zero-mean concentrated differential privacy [BS16].

**Definition 2.2** (Concentrated Differential Privacy (zCDP) [BS16]). A randomized algorithm $M : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ satisfies $\rho$-zCDP if for every pair of neighboring datasets $X, X' \in \mathcal{X}^n$,

$$\forall \alpha \in (1, \infty) \quad D_\alpha(M(X)||M(X')) \leq \rho \alpha,$$

where $D_\alpha(M(X)||M(X'))$ is the $\alpha$-Rényi divergence between $M(X)$ and $M(X')$.\(^1\)

Both of these definitions are closed under post-processing

**Lemma 2.3** (Post-Processing [DMNS06, BS16]). If $M : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is $(\varepsilon, \delta)$-DP and $P : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ is any randomized function, then the algorithm $P \circ M$ is $(\varepsilon, \delta)$-DP. Similarly if $M$ is $\rho$-zCDP then the algorithm $P \circ M$ is $\rho$-zCDP.

Qualitatively, DP with $\delta = 0$ is stronger than zCDP, which is stronger than DP with $\delta > 0$. These are captured by the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.4** (Relationships Between Variants of DP [BS16]). For every $\varepsilon \geq 0$,

1. If $M$ satisfies $(\varepsilon, 0)$-DP, then $M$ is $\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}$-zCDP.

2. If $M$ satisfies $\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}$-zCDP, then $M$ satisfies $(\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon \sqrt{2 \log(\frac{1}{\delta})}, \delta)$-DP for every $\delta > 0$.

Note that the parameters for DP and zCDP are on different scales, with $(\varepsilon, \delta)$-DP roughly commensurate with $\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}$-zCDP.

**Composition.** A crucial property of all of the variants of differential privacy is that they can be composed adaptively. By adaptive composition, we mean a sequence of algorithms $M_1(X), \ldots, M_T(X)$ where the algorithm $M_i(X)$ may also depend on the outcomes of the algorithms $M_1(X), \ldots, M_{i-1}(X)$.

**Lemma 2.5** (Composition of DP [DMNS06, DRV10, BS16]). If $M$ is an adaptive composition of differentially private algorithms $M_1, \ldots, M_T$, the following all hold:

1. If $M_1, \ldots, M_T$ are $(\varepsilon_1, \delta_1), \ldots, (\varepsilon_T, \delta_T)$-DP then $M$ is $(\varepsilon, \delta)$-DP for

$$\varepsilon = \sum_t \varepsilon_t \quad \text{and} \quad \delta = \sum_t \delta_t$$

2. If $M_1, \ldots, M_T$ are $(\varepsilon_0, \delta_1), \ldots, (\varepsilon_0, \delta_T)$-DP for some $\varepsilon_0 \leq 1$, then for every $\delta_0 > 0$, $M$ is $(\varepsilon, \delta)$-DP for

$$\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0 \sqrt{6T \log(1/\delta_0)} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta = \delta_0 + \sum_t \delta_t$$

3. If $M_1, \ldots, M_T$ are $\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_T$-zCDP then $M$ is $\rho$-zCDP for $\rho = \sum_t \rho_t$.

Note that the first and third properties say that $(\varepsilon, \delta)$-DP and $\rho$-zCDP compose linearly—the parameters simply add up. The second property says that $(\varepsilon, \delta)$-DP actually composes sublinearly—the parameter $\varepsilon$ grows roughly with the square root of the number of steps in the composition, provided we allow a small increase in $\delta$.

**The Gaussian Mechanism.** Our algorithms will extensively use the well known and standard Gaussian mechanism to ensure differential privacy.

\(^1\)Given two probability distributions $P, Q$ over $\Omega$, $D_\alpha(P||Q) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \left(\sum_x P(x)^\alpha Q(x)^{1-\alpha}\right)$
Definition 2.6 ($\ell_2$-Sensitivity). Let $f : \mathcal{X}^n \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a function, its $\ell_2$-sensitivity is
\[
\Delta_f = \max_{X \sim X' \in \mathcal{X}^n} \|f(X) - f(X')\|_2
\]

Lemma 2.7 (Gaussian Mechanism). Let $f : \mathcal{X}^n \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a function with $\ell_2$-sensitivity $\Delta_f$. Then the Gaussian mechanism
\[
M_f(X) = f(X) + N\left(0, \left(\frac{\Delta_f}{\sqrt{2p}}\right)^2 \cdot I\right)
\]
satisfies $\rho$-zCDP.

In order to prove accuracy, we will use the following standard tail bounds for Gaussian random variables.

Lemma 2.8. If $Z \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ then for every $t > 0$, $\mathbb{P}[|Z| > t\sigma] \leq 2e^{-t^2/2}$.

Parameter Estimation to Distribution Estimation In this work, our goal is to estimate some underlying distribution in total variation distance. For both Gaussian and product distributions, we will achieve this by estimating the parameters of the distribution, and we argue that a distribution from the class with said parameters will be accurate in statistical distance. For product distributions, we require an estimate of the parameters which is accurate in terms of a type of chi-squared distance; this is shown in the proof of Theorem 5.2. For Gaussian distributions, the parameter estimate we require is slightly more difficult to describe. For a vector $x$, define $\|x\|_\Sigma = \|\Sigma^{-1/2}x\|_2$. Similarly, for a matrix $X$, define $\|X\|_\Sigma = \|\Sigma^{-1/2}X\Sigma^{-1/2}\|_F$. With these two norms in place, we have the following lemma, which is a combination of Corollaries 2.13 and 2.14 of [DKK+16].

Lemma 2.9. Let $\alpha \geq 0$ be smaller than some absolute constant. Suppose that $\|\mu - \hat{\mu}\|_\Sigma \leq \alpha$, and $\|\Sigma - \hat{\Sigma}\|_\Sigma \leq \alpha$, where $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ is a Gaussian distribution in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $\hat{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is a PSD matrix. Then $d_{TV}(\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma), \mathcal{N}(\hat{\mu}, \hat{\Sigma})) \leq O(\alpha)$.

3 Private Covariance Estimation for Gaussians

In this section we present the first of two algorithms for privately estimating the covariance of an unknown Gaussian. The algorithm we present in this section will have a polylogarithmic dependence on the condition number of the Gaussian, and in the next section we will show how to eliminate this dependence entirely.

Suppose we are given i.i.d. samples $X_1, \ldots, X_n \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ where $\mathbb{I} \preceq \Sigma \preceq \kappa \mathbb{I}$. Our goal is to privately output $\hat{\Sigma}$ so that
\[
\|\Sigma - \hat{\Sigma}\|_\Sigma \leq O(\alpha),
\]
where $\|A\|_\Sigma = \|\Sigma^{-1/2}A\Sigma^{-1/2}\|_F$. Here the matrix square root denotes any possible square root; it is trivial to check that all such choices are equivalent. By Lemma 2.9), this condition ensures
\[
d_{TV}(\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma), \mathcal{N}(0, \hat{\Sigma})) \leq O(\alpha).
\]
3.1 Useful Concentration Inequalities

We will need several facts about Gaussians and Gaussian matrices. Throughout this section, let $\text{GUE}(\sigma^2)$ denote the distribution over $d \times d$ symmetric matrices $M$ where for all $i \leq j$, we have $M_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ i.i.d.. From basic random matrix theory, we have the following guarantee.

**Theorem 3.1** (see e.g. [Tao12] Corollary 2.3.6). For $d$ sufficiently large, there exist absolute constants $C, c > 0$ such that

$$
P_{M \sim \text{GUE}(\sigma^2)} \left[ \|M\|_2 > A\sigma\sqrt{d} \right] \leq C \exp(-cAd)$$

for all $A \geq C$.

We also require the following, well known tail bound on quadratic forms on Gaussians.

**Theorem 3.2** (Hanson-Wright Inequality (see e.g. [LM00])). Let $X \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ and let $A$ be a $d \times d$ matrix. Then, for all $t > 0$, the following two bounds hold:

$$
P\left[ X^\top AX - \text{tr}(A) \geq 2\|A\|_F \sqrt{t} + 2\|A\|_2 t \right] \leq \exp(-t) \tag{1}$$

$$
P\left[ X^\top AX - \text{tr}(A) \leq -2\|A\|_F \sqrt{t} \right] \leq \exp(-t) \tag{2}$$

As a special case of the above inequality, we also have

**Fact 3.3** ([LM00]). Fix $\beta > 0$, and let $X_1, \ldots, X_m \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ be independent. Then

$$
\Pr\left[ \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} X_i^2 - \sigma^2 \right| > 4\sigma^2 \left( \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\beta)}{m}} + \frac{2 \log(1/\beta)}{m} \right) \right] \leq \beta
$$

3.2 Deterministic Regularity Conditions

We will rely on certain regularity properties of i.i.d. samples from a Gaussian. These are standard concentration inequalities, and a reference for these facts is Section 4 of [DKK+16].

**Fact 3.4.** Let $X_1, \ldots, X_n \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ i.i.d. for $I \preceq \Sigma \preceq \kappa I$. Let $Y_i = \Sigma^{-1/2} X_i$ and let

$$
\hat{\Sigma}_Y = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_i Y_i^\top
$$

Then for every $\beta > 0$, the following conditions hold except with probability $1 - O(\beta)$.

$$
\forall i \in [n] \quad \|Y_i\|_2^2 \leq O(d \log(n/\beta)) \tag{3}
$$

$$
\left( 1 - O\left( \sqrt{\frac{d + \log(1/\beta)}{n}} \right) \right) \cdot I \preceq \hat{\Sigma}_Y \preceq \left( 1 + O\left( \sqrt{\frac{d + \log(1/\beta)}{n}} \right) \right) \cdot I \tag{4}
$$

$$
\left\| I - \hat{\Sigma}_Y \right\|_F \leq O\left( \sqrt{\frac{d^2 + \log(1/\beta)}{n}} \right) \tag{5}
$$

We now note some simple consequences of these conditions. These inequalities follow from simple linear algebra and we omit their proof for conciseness.
Lemma 3.5. Let \( Y_1, \ldots, Y_n \) satisfy (3)-(5). Fix \( M > 0 \), and for all \( i = 1, \ldots, n \), let \( Z_i = M^{1/2} Y_i \), and let \( \hat{\Sigma}_Z = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} Z_i Z_i^\top \). Let \( \kappa' \) be the top eigenvalue of \( M \). Then

\[
\forall i \in [n] \quad \|Z_i\|_2^2 \leq O(\kappa' d \log(n/\beta))
\]

\[
\left( 1 - O\left( \sqrt{\frac{d + \log(1/\beta)}{n}} \right) \right) \cdot M \preceq \hat{\Sigma}_Z \preceq \left( 1 + O\left( \sqrt{\frac{d + \log(1/\beta)}{n}} \right) \right) \cdot M
\]

\[
\|M - \hat{\Sigma}_Z\|_M \leq O\left( \sqrt{\frac{d^2 + \log(1/\beta)}{n}} \right)
\]

3.3 A Simple Algorithm for Well Conditioned Gaussians

We first consider the following simple algorithm: remove all points whose norm exceeds a certain threshold, then compute the empirical covariance of the resulting data set, and perturb the empirical covariance with noise to preserve privacy. This algorithm will have nearly-optimal dependence on most parameters, however, it will have a polynomial dependence on the condition number. Pseudocode for this algorithm is given in Algorithm 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algorithm 1: Naive Private Gaussian Covariance Estimation</th>
<th>\textsc{NaivePCE}_{\rho,\beta,\kappa}(X)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Input:</strong> A set of ( n ) samples ( X_1, \ldots, X_n ) from an unknown Gaussian. Parameters ( \rho, \beta, \kappa &gt; 0 )</td>
<td><strong>Output:</strong> A covariance matrix ( M ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let ( S \leftarrow { i \in [n] : |X_i|_2^2 \leq O(\kappa d \log(n/\beta)) } )</td>
<td>Let ( \sigma \leftarrow \Theta\left( \frac{\kappa \log(n)}{n \rho^{1/2}} \right) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return ( M \leftarrow \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S} X_i X_i^\top + N ), where ( N \sim \text{GUE}(\sigma^2) )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lemma 3.6 (Analysis of \textsc{NaivePCE}). For every \( \rho, \beta, \kappa, n \), \textsc{NaivePCE}_{\rho,\beta,\kappa}(X) satisfies \( \rho \)-\( zCDP \), and if \( X_1, \ldots, X_n \) are sampled i.i.d. from \( \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma) \) for \( I \preceq \Sigma \preceq \kappa I \) and satisfy (3)-(5), then with probability at least \( 1 - O(\beta) \), it outputs \( M \) so that \( M = \Sigma^{1/2}(I + N')\Sigma^{1/2} + N \) where

\[
\|N'\|_F \leq O\left( \sqrt{\frac{d^2 + \log(1/\beta)}{n}} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \|N\|_\Sigma \leq O\left( \frac{d^2 \kappa \log(n/\beta) \log(1/\beta)}{n \rho^{1/2}} \right), \quad \text{and}
\]

\[
\|N'\|_2 \leq O\left( \sqrt{\frac{d + \log(1/\beta)}{n}} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \|N\|_2 \leq O\left( \frac{d^3/2 \kappa \log(n/\beta) \log(n/\beta)}{n \rho^{1/2}} \right). \quad (6) \]

Proof. We first prove the privacy guarantee. Given two neighboring data sets \( X, X' \) of size \( n \) which differ in that one contains \( X_i \) and the other contains \( X'_i \), the truncated empirical covariance of these two data sets can change in Frobenius norm by at most

\[
\left\| \frac{1}{n} \left( X_i X_i^\top - X'_i (X'_i)^\top \right) \right\|_F \leq \frac{1}{n} \|X_i\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{n} \|X'_i\|_2^2 \leq O\left( \frac{\kappa \log(n/\beta)}{n} \right).
\]

Thus the privacy guarantee follows immediately from Lemma 2.7.
By Fact 3.4, this occurs with probability at least $1 - O(\beta)$. Since (3) holds, we have $S = [n]$. The first inequality in (6) now follows from Lemma 3.5, and the second follows from Fact 3.3 and since $\|N\|_\Sigma \leq \|N\|_F$, as $\Sigma \succeq I$. By a similar logic, (7) holds since we can apply Lemma 3.5 and Theorem 3.1.

The following is an immediate consequence of Lemma 3.6, seen by noting that $\|\Sigma - M\|_\Sigma = \|\Sigma^{-1/2}N\Sigma^{-1/2} - N\|_F \leq \|N\|_\Sigma + \|N\|_F$.

**Theorem 3.7.** For every $\rho, \beta, \kappa > 0$, the algorithm $\text{NaivePCE}_{\rho, \beta, \kappa}$ is $\rho$-zCDP and, when given $n = O\left(\frac{d^2 + \log(\frac{1}{\beta})}{\alpha^2} + \frac{\kappa d^2 \text{polylog}(\frac{\kappa d}{\alpha \beta})}{\alpha \rho^{1/2}}\right)$ samples from $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ satisfying $I \preceq \Sigma \preceq \kappa I$, with probability at least $1 - O(\beta)$, it returns $M$ such that $\|\Sigma - M\|_\Sigma \leq O(\alpha)$.

### 3.4 A Private Recursive Preconditioner

When $\kappa$ is a constant, Theorem 3.7 says that $\text{NaivePCE}$ privately estimates the covariance of a Gaussian with little overhead compared to non-private estimation. In this section we will show how to nearly eliminate the dependence on the covariance by privately learning a preconditioner $A$ such that $I \preceq A \Sigma A^\top \preceq 1000I$. Once we have this preconditioner, we can reduce the condition number of the distribution to a constant. In this state, we can apply $\text{NaivePCE}$ to estimate the covariance at no cost in $\kappa$.

#### 3.4.1 Reducing the Condition Number by a Constant

Our preconditioner works recursively. The main ingredient in the recursive construction is an algorithm, $\text{WeakPPC}$ (Algorithm 2) that privately estimates a matrix $A$ such that the condition number of $A \Sigma A^\top$ improves over that of $\Sigma$ by a constant factor. Once we have this primitive we can apply it recursively in a straightforward way. Note that in Algorithm 2, we apply $\text{NaivePCE}$ to obtain a weak estimate of $\Sigma$, we will be using too few samples for $\text{NaivePCE}$ to obtain a good estimate of $\Sigma$ on its own.

**Algorithm 2: Private Preconditioning $\text{WeakPPC}_{\rho, \beta, \kappa, K}(X)$**

**Input:** A set of $n$ samples $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ from an unknown Gaussian. Parameters $\rho, \beta, \kappa, K > 0$.

**Output:** A symmetric matrix $A$.

Let $Z \leftarrow \text{NaivePCE}_{\rho, \beta, \kappa}(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$

Let $(\lambda_1, v_1), \ldots, (\lambda_d, v_d)$ be the eigenvalues and the corresponding eigenvectors of $Z$

Let $V \leftarrow \text{span}\left(\left\{v_i : \lambda_i \geq \frac{\kappa}{2}\right\}\right) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$

**Return** the pair $(V, A)$ where

$$A = \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}\Pi_V + \Pi_{V^\perp}$$

The guarantee of Algorithm 2 is captured in the following theorem.
Theorem 3.8. For every $\rho, \beta, \kappa, K > 0$, \textsc{WeakPPC}_{\rho,\beta,\kappa, K}(X)$ satisfies $\rho$-$zCDP$ and, if $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ are sampled i.i.d. from $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ for $I \preceq \Sigma \preceq \kappa I$ and satisfy (3)–(5), then with probability at least $1 - O(\beta)$ it outputs $(V, A)$ such that

$$(1 - \psi)^2 (1 - \Gamma) \mathbb{I} \preceq A \Sigma A \preceq (1 + \psi) \cdot \kappa \left( \max \left( \frac{1}{K}, \frac{1}{2} \right) + \varphi \right) \mathbb{I}$$

where

$$\varphi = O \left( \frac{d^{3/2} \log(n/\beta) \log(1/\beta)}{n \rho^{1/2}} \right), \quad \psi = O \left( \sqrt{\frac{d + \log(1/\beta)}{n}} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma = \max \left( \frac{2K}{(1/2 - \varphi)\kappa}, \frac{16K\varphi^2}{(1/2 - \varphi)^2} \right).$$

In particular, if $\kappa > 1000$, $K = O(1)$, and

$$n \geq O \left( \frac{d^{3/2} \log^2(d/\rho)}{\rho^{1/2}} \right)$$

then $A$ is such that $0.99 \mathbb{I} \preceq A \Sigma A \preceq 0.55 \kappa \mathbb{I}$, which implies $\mathbb{I} \preceq (1.1A) \Sigma (1.1A) \preceq 0.7 \kappa \mathbb{I}$.

Proof. Privacy follows since we are simply post-processing the output of Algorithm 1 (Lemma 2.3). Thus it suffices to prove correctness. We assume that (3)–(5) hold simultaneously. By Lemma 3.6, (6)–(7) hold simultaneously for the matrix $Z$ except with probability $O(\beta)$. We will condition on these events throughout the remainder of the proof. Observe that (4) implies that $\hat{\Sigma} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i X_i^\top$ is non-singular.

We will prove the upper bound and lower bound in (8) in two separate lemmata.

Lemma 3.9. Let $V, A$ be as in Algorithm 2. Then, conditioned on (3)–(7), with probability $1 - O(\beta)$, we have

$$\|A \Sigma A\|_2 \leq (1 + \psi) \cdot \kappa \left( \max \left( \frac{1}{K}, \frac{1}{2} \right) + \varphi \right).$$

Lemma 3.10. Let $V, A$ be as in Algorithm 2. Then, conditioned on (3)–(7), with probability $1 - O(\beta)$, we have

$$A \Sigma A \succeq (1 - \psi)^2 (1 - \Gamma) \mathbb{I}.$$ (9)

These two lemmata therefore together imply Theorem 3.8. We now turn our attention to the proofs of these lemmata. Let $N$ be the Gaussian noise added to the empirical covariance in \textsc{NaivePCE}, so that $Z = \hat{\Sigma} + N$.

Proof of Lemma 3.9. By Lemma 3.5 (with $M = \Sigma$), it suffices to show that

$$\|A \Sigma A\|_2 \leq \kappa \left( \max \left( \frac{1}{K}, \frac{1}{2} \right) + \varphi \right).$$

But with probability $1 - \beta$, we have

$$\left\| A \Sigma A \right\|_2 \leq \| A Z A \|_2 + \| A N A \|_2 \leq \| A Z A \|_2 + \kappa \varphi.$$
where (a) follows since $\|A\|_2 \leq 1$ and Theorem 3.1. We now observe that since $V$ is a span of eigenvectors of $Z$, we have

$$AZA = \frac{1}{K} \Pi_V Z \Pi_V + \Pi_{V^\perp} Z \Pi_{V^\perp},$$

and so by our choice of $V$, we have $\|AZA\|_2 \leq \kappa \cdot \max(1/K, 1/2)$. This completes our proof. \qed

We now prove the lower bound in Theorem 3.8:

**Proof of Lemma 3.10.** As before, by Lemma 3.5, it suffices to prove that

$$A \hat{\Sigma} A \succeq (1 - \psi)(1 - \Gamma) I.$$  

This is equivalent to showing that for all unit vectors $u$, we have

$$u^T A \hat{\Sigma} A u \geq (1 - \psi)(1 - \Gamma).$$

Fix any such $u$. Expanding, we have

$$u^T A \hat{\Sigma} A u = \frac{1}{K} u^T \Pi_V \hat{\Sigma} \Pi_V u + \frac{1}{K^{1/2}} u^T \Pi_V \hat{\Sigma} \Pi_{V^\perp} u + \frac{1}{K^{1/2}} u^T \Pi_{V^\perp} \hat{\Sigma} \Pi_V u + u^T \Pi_{V^\perp} \hat{\Sigma} \Pi_{V^\perp} u.$$

The first and last terms are non-negative since $\hat{\Sigma}$ is PSD, but the other terms may be negative, so we need to control their magnitude. Note that

$$u^T \Pi_V \hat{\Sigma} \Pi_V u = u^T \Pi_V Z \Pi_V u - u^T \Pi_V N \Pi_V u \geq \frac{\kappa}{2} \|\Pi_V u\|_2^2 - \kappa \varphi \|\Pi_V u\|_2^2 = \kappa \left(\frac{1}{2} - \varphi\right) \|\Pi_V u\|_2^2.$$

where the inequality follows from our choice of $V$ (the “large” directions of $Z$), and Theorem 3.1 (bounding the spectral norm of $N$). On the other hand, we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{K^{1/2}} u^T \Pi_V \hat{\Sigma} \Pi_{V^\perp} u \right| = \left| \frac{1}{K^{1/2}} u^T \Pi_V (Z + N) \Pi_{V^\perp} u \right| \leq \frac{\kappa}{K^{1/2}} \varphi \|\Pi_V u\|_2 \|\Pi_{V^\perp} u\|_2 \leq \frac{\kappa}{K^{1/2}} \varphi \|\Pi_V u\|_2,$$

where (a) follows since $\Pi_V Z \Pi_{V^\perp} = 0$, and (b) follows from Theorem 3.1. Similarly, we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{K^{1/2}} u^T \Pi_{V^\perp} \hat{\Sigma} \Pi_V u \right| \leq \frac{\kappa}{K^{1/2}} \varphi \|\Pi_V u\|_2.$$

Thus, if we have $\|\Pi_V u\|_2^2 \geq \Gamma$, by our choice of $\Gamma$, we have

$$\frac{1}{K} u^T \Pi_V \hat{\Sigma} \Pi_V u + \frac{1}{K^{1/2}} u^T \Pi_V \hat{\Sigma} \Pi_{V^\perp} u + \frac{1}{K^{1/2}} u^T \Pi_{V^\perp} \hat{\Sigma} \Pi_V u \geq \frac{\kappa}{K} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \varphi\right) \|\Pi_V u\|_2^2 - \frac{\kappa}{K^{1/2}} \varphi \|\Pi_V u\|_2 \geq \frac{\kappa}{2K} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \varphi\right) \|\Pi_V u\|_2^2 \geq 1.$$
Thus in this case the claim follows since the final term in (10) is nonnegative since $\hat{\Sigma}$ is PSD.

Now consider the case where
\[
\|\Pi_V u\|_2 < \Gamma,
\]
or equivalently, since by the Pythagorean theorem we have $\|\Pi_V u\|^2_2 + \|\Pi_{V^\perp} u\|^2_2 = 1$,
\[
\|\Pi_{V^\perp} u\|^2_2 > 1 - \Gamma.
\]
Then, since we have $\hat{\Sigma} \succeq (1 - \psi)I$ (Fact 3.4), we have
\[
u^T A\hat{\Sigma} A u \geq (1 - \psi)\nu^T \left( \frac{1}{K} \Pi_V \Pi_V + \Pi_{V^\perp} \Pi_{V^\perp} \right) u
\]
\[
\geq (1 - \psi)\|\Pi_{V^\perp} u\|^2_2
\]
\[
\geq (1 - \psi)(1 - \Gamma),
\]
as claimed.

Combining Lemma 3.9 and Lemma 3.10 yield the desired conclusion.

### 3.4.2 Recursive Preconditioning

Once we have $\text{WeakPPC}$, we can apply it recursively to obtain a private preconditioner, $\text{PPC}$ (Algorithm 3) that reduces the condition number down to a constant.

#### Algorithm 3: Privately estimating covariance $\text{PPC}_{\rho,\beta,\kappa}(X)$

| **Input:** | A set of $n$ samples $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ from an unknown Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$. Parameters $\rho, \beta, \kappa > 0$ |
| **Output:** | A symmetric matrix $A$ |

Let $T \leftarrow O(\log \kappa)$, $\rho' \leftarrow \rho/T$, $\beta' \leftarrow \beta/T$.

Let $\kappa^{(1)} \leftarrow \kappa$ and let $X_i^{(1)} \leftarrow X_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

For $t = 1, \ldots, T$:

- Let $\tilde{A}^{(t)} \leftarrow \text{WeakPPC}_{\rho',\beta',\kappa^{(t)},\kappa^{(t)}}(X_1^{(t)}, \ldots, X_n^{(t)})$, and let $A^{(t)} \leftarrow 1.1 \tilde{A}^{(t)}$.
- Let $\kappa^{(t+1)} \leftarrow 0.7 \kappa^{(t)}$.
- Let $X_i^{(t+1)} \leftarrow A^{(t)} X_i^{(t)}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

Return The matrix $A = \prod_{t=1}^{T} A^{(t)}$.

#### Theorem 3.11. For every $\rho, \alpha, \beta, \kappa > 0$, $\text{PPC}_{\rho,\beta,\kappa}$ satisfies $\rho$-zCDP, and when given

\[
n = \Omega \left( \frac{d^{3/2} \log^{1/2}(\kappa) \text{polylog}(\frac{d \log \kappa}{\rho \beta})}{\rho^{1/2}} \right)
\]
samples $X_1, \ldots, X_n \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ for $I \preceq \Sigma \preceq \kappa I$, with probability $1 - O(\beta)$ it outputs a symmetric matrix $A$ such that $I \preceq A \Sigma A \preceq 1000 I$.
Theorem 3.12. For every $\sigma$ with probability $\text{NaiivePCE}$, therefore, combining the guarantees of $\Sigma$, $t$ the theorem now follows by induction on $X$. We can now combine our private preconditioning algorithm with the naïve algorithm for covariance estimation to obtain a complete algorithm for covariance estimation.

Algorithm 4: Private Covariance Estimator $\text{PGCE}_{\rho, \beta, \kappa}(X)$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input:</th>
<th>Samples $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ from an unknown Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$. Parameters $\rho, \beta, \kappa &gt; 0$.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output:</td>
<td>A matrix $\hat{\Sigma}$ such that $|\Sigma - \hat{\Sigma}|_\Sigma \leq \alpha$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proof.</td>
<td>Privacy follows from Theorem 3.8 and composition of $\rho$-zCDP (Lemma 2.5). By Fact 3.4, (3)-(5) hold for the sample $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ except with probability $O(\beta)$. Define $\Sigma^{(1)} = \Sigma$ and recursively define $\Sigma^{(t)} = A^{(t-1)}\Sigma^{(t-1)}A^{(t-1)}$ to be the covariance after the $t$-th round of preconditioning. By the guarantee of WeakPPC (Theorem 3.8), a union bound, and our choice of $n$, we have that for every $t$, we obtain a matrix $A^{(t)}$ such that $|A^{(t)}\Sigma A^{(t)}|_\Sigma \leq 0.7\kappa I$. The theorem now follows by induction on $t$.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Putting It All Together

We can now combine our private preconditioning algorithm with the naïve algorithm for covariance estimation to obtain a complete algorithm for covariance estimation.

Algorithm 4: Private Covariance Estimator $\text{PGCE}_{\rho, \beta, \kappa}(X)$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input:</th>
<th>Samples $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ from an unknown Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$. Parameters $\rho, \beta, \kappa &gt; 0$.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output:</td>
<td>A matrix $\hat{\Sigma}$ such that $|\Sigma - \hat{\Sigma}|_\Sigma \leq \alpha$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proof.</td>
<td>Privacy follows from Theorem 3.8 and composition of $\rho$-zCDP (Lemma 2.5). By Fact 3.4, (3)-(5) hold for the sample $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ except with probability $O(\beta)$. Define $\Sigma^{(1)} = \Sigma$ and recursively define $\Sigma^{(t)} = A^{(t-1)}\Sigma^{(t-1)}A^{(t-1)}$ to be the covariance after the $t$-th round of preconditioning. By the guarantee of WeakPPC (Theorem 3.8), a union bound, and our choice of $n$, we have that for every $t$, we obtain a matrix $A^{(t)}$ such that $|A^{(t)}\Sigma A^{(t)}|_\Sigma \leq 0.7\kappa I$. The theorem now follows by induction on $t$.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This algorithm has the following guarantee.

**Theorem 3.12.** For every $\rho, \beta, \kappa > 0$, $\text{PGCE}_{\rho, \beta, \kappa}(X)$ is $\rho$-zCDP and, when given $n = O\left(\frac{d^2 + \log(\frac{1}{\beta})}{\alpha^2} + \frac{d^2\text{polylog}(\frac{d}{\rho \beta})}{\alpha \rho^{1/2}} + \frac{d^{3/2}\text{log}^{1/2}(\kappa)\text{polylog}(\frac{d\log(\kappa)}{\rho \beta})}{\rho^{1/2}}\right)$ $X_1, \ldots, X_n \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ for $I \preceq \Sigma \preceq \kappa I$, with probability $1 - O(\beta)$, it outputs $\hat{\Sigma}$ such that $\|\Sigma - \hat{\Sigma}\|_\Sigma \leq O(\alpha)$. 

**Proof.** Privacy follows from Theorem 3.8 and composition of $\rho$-zCDP (Lemma 2.5). By construction, the samples $Y_1, \ldots, Y_n$ are i.i.d. from $\mathcal{N}(0, A\Sigma A^T)$. By Theorem 3.11, and our choice of $n$, we have that except with probability $O(\beta)$, $A$ is such that $I \preceq A\Sigma A^T \preceq 1000I$. Therefore, combining the guarantees of $\text{NaiivePCE}$ with our choice of $n$ we obtain that, except with probability $O(\beta)$, $\hat{\Sigma}$ satisfies $\|A\Sigma A - \hat{\Sigma}\|_{A\Sigma A} \leq O(\alpha)$. The theorem now follows because $\|\Sigma - \hat{\Sigma}\|_\Sigma = \|\Sigma - A^{-1}\hat{\Sigma}A^{-1}\|_{\Sigma} = \|A\Sigma A - \hat{\Sigma}\|_{A\Sigma A} \leq O(\alpha)$. 

4 Private Mean Estimation for Gaussians

Suppose we are given i.i.d. samples $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ where $X_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ where $\|\mu\|_2 \leq R$ is an unknown mean and $I \preceq \Sigma \preceq \kappa I$ is an unknown covariance matrix. Our goal is to privately learn $m$ such that $\|\mu - \hat{\mu}\|_\Sigma \leq O(\alpha)$
where \( \|v\|_\Sigma = \|\Sigma^{-1/2}v\|_2 \) is the Mahalanobis distance with respect to the covariance \( \Sigma \). This guarantee ensures
\[
d_{TV}(\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma), \mathcal{N}(\hat{\mu}, \Sigma)) = O(\alpha).
\]

When \( \kappa \) is a constant, we can obtain such a guarantee in a relatively straightforward way by applying the mean-estimation procedure for univariate Gaussians due to Karwa and Vadhan [KV18] to each coordinate. To handle large values of \( \kappa \), we combine their procedure with our procedure for privately learning a strong approximation to the covariance matrix.

### 4.1 Mean Estimation for Well-Conditioned Gaussians

We start with the following algorithm for learning the mean of a univariate Gaussian.

**Theorem 4.1 ([KV18]).** For every \( \varepsilon, \delta, \alpha, \beta, R, \sigma > 0 \), there is an \((\varepsilon, 0)\)-DP algorithm \( \text{KVMean}_{\varepsilon, \alpha, \beta, R, \kappa}(X) \) and an
\[
n = O\left( \frac{\log(\frac{1}{\beta})}{\alpha^2} + \frac{\log(\frac{\log R}{\alpha \beta})}{\alpha^2 \varepsilon} + \frac{\log(\frac{R}{\beta})}{\varepsilon} \right)
\]
such that if \( X = (X_1, \ldots, X_n) \) are i.i.d. samples from \( \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2) \) for \( |\mu| \leq R \) and \( 1 \leq \sigma^2 \leq \kappa \) then, with probability at least \( 1 - \beta \), \( \text{KVMean} \) outputs \( \hat{\mu} \) such that \( |\mu - \hat{\mu}| \leq \alpha \). This algorithm also satisfies \( \rho\)-zCDP for \( \rho = \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \) in which case we denote the algorithm \( \text{KVMean}_{\rho, \alpha, \beta, R, \kappa}(X) \).

Note that the algorithm only needs an upper bound \( \kappa \) on the true variance \( \sigma^2 \) as a parameter. However, since the error guarantees that depend on this upper bound, the upper bound needs to be reasonably tight in order to get a useful estimate of the mean.

We will describe our naïve algorithm for the case of \( \rho\)-zCDP since the parameters are cleaner.

We could also obtain an \((\varepsilon, \delta)\)-DP version using the \((\varepsilon, \delta)\)-DP version of \( \text{NaivePME} \) and setting parameters appropriately.

#### Algorithm 5: Naïve Private Mean Estimator \( \text{NaivePME}_{\rho, \alpha, \beta, R, \kappa}(X) \)

**Input:** Samples \( X_1, \ldots, X_n \in \mathbb{R}^d \) from a \( d \)-variate Gaussian. Parameters \( \rho, \alpha, \beta, R, \kappa > 0 \).

**Output:** A vector \( \hat{\mu} \) such that \( \|\mu - \hat{\mu}\|_\Sigma \leq \alpha \).

1. Let \( \rho' \leftarrow \rho / d \) \quad \alpha' \leftarrow \alpha / \kappa \sqrt{d} \quad \beta' \leftarrow \beta / d \)
2. For \( j = 1, \ldots, d \)
   - Let \( \hat{\mu}_j \leftarrow \text{KVMean}_{\rho', \alpha', \beta', R, \kappa}(X_{1,j}, \ldots, X_{n,j}) \)
3. Return \( \hat{\mu} = (\hat{\mu}_1, \ldots, \hat{\mu}_d) \)

**Theorem 4.2.** For every \( \rho, \alpha, \beta, R, \kappa > 0 \), the algorithm \( \text{NaivePME}_{\rho, \alpha, \beta, R, \kappa} \) is \( \rho\)-zCDP and there is an
\[
n = O\left( \frac{\kappa^2 d \log(\frac{d}{\beta})}{\alpha^2} + \frac{\kappa d \log(\frac{kd \log R}{\alpha \beta \rho})}{\alpha \beta^{1/2}} + \frac{\sqrt{d} \log(\frac{R d}{\beta})}{\rho^{1/2}} \right)
\]
such that if \( X_1, \ldots, X_n \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma) \) for \( \|\mu\|_2 \leq R \) and \( I \preceq \Sigma \preceq \kappa I \) then, with probability at least \( 1 - \beta \), \( \text{NaivePME} \) outputs \( \hat{\mu} \) such that \( \|\mu - \hat{\mu}\|_\Sigma \leq \alpha \).

**Proof.** The fact that the algorithm satisfies \( \rho\)-zCDP follows immediately from the assumed privacy of \( \text{KVMean} \) and the composition property for zCDP (Lemma 2.5).
Next we argue that with probability at least $1 - \beta$, for every coordinate $j = 1, \ldots, d$, we have $|\mu_j - \hat{\mu}_j| \leq \alpha / \sqrt{d}$. Observe that, since $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ are distributed as $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$, the $j$-th coordinates $X_{1,j}, \ldots, X_{n,j}$ are distributed as $\mathcal{N}(\mu_j, \Sigma_{jj})$ and, by assumption $|\mu_j| \leq R$ and $1 \leq \Sigma_{jj} \leq \kappa$. Thus, by Theorem 4.1, we have $|\mu_j - \hat{\mu}_j| \leq \alpha / \sqrt{d}$ except with probability at most $\beta' = \beta / d$. The statement now follows by a union bound.

Assuming that every coordinate-wise estimate is correct up to $\alpha / \sqrt{d}$, we have
\[
\|\mu - \hat{\mu}\|_{\Sigma} = \|\Sigma^{-1/2}(\mu - \hat{\mu})\|_2 \leq \|\Sigma^{-1/2}\|_2 \cdot \|\mu - \hat{\mu}\|_2 \leq \alpha
\]
where the final equality uses the coordinate-wise bound on $\mu - \hat{\mu}$ and the fact that $I \preceq \Sigma$. To complete the proof, we can plug our choices of $\rho', \alpha', \beta'$ into the sample complexity bound for KVMean from Theorem 4.1.

The proof and algorithm for the final statement of the theorem regarding $(\varepsilon, \delta)$-DP are completely analogous. This completes the proof of the theorem. \hfill \Box

4.2 An Algorithm for General Gaussians

If $\Sigma$ were known, then we could easily perform mean estimation without dependence on $\kappa$ simply by applying $\Sigma^{-1/2}$ to each sample and running NaivePME. Specifically, if $X_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ then $\Sigma^{-1/2}X_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\Sigma^{-1/2}\mu, I)$. Then applying NaivePME we would obtain $\hat{\mu}$ such that $\|\mu - \hat{\mu}\|_{\Sigma} = \|\Sigma^{-1/2}(\mu - \hat{\mu})\|_2 \leq \alpha$ and the sample complexity would be independent of $\kappa$. Using the covariance estimation procedure from the previous section, we can obtain a good enough approximation to $\Sigma^{-1/2}$ to carry out this reduction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algorithm 6: Private Mean Estimator $\text{PME}_{\rho,\alpha,\beta,R,\kappa}(X)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Input:</strong> Samples $X_1, \ldots, X_{3n} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ from a $d$-variate Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ with unknown mean and covariance. Parameters $\rho, \alpha, \beta, R, \kappa &gt; 0$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output:</strong> A vector $\hat{\mu}$ such that $|\mu - \hat{\mu}|_{\Sigma} \leq \alpha$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For $i = 1, \ldots, n$, let $Z_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(X_{2i} - X_{2i-1})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let $A \leftarrow \text{PPC}_{\rho,\beta,\kappa}(Z_1, \ldots, Z_n)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For $i = 1, \ldots, n$, let $Y_i = AX_{2n+i}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let $\tilde{\mu} \leftarrow \text{NaivePME}_{\rho,\alpha,\beta,1000R,1000}(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Return</strong> $\hat{\mu} \leftarrow A^{-1}\tilde{\mu}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We capture the properties of PME in the following theorem

**Theorem 4.3.** For every $\rho, \alpha, \beta, R, \kappa > 0$, the algorithm $\text{PME}_{\rho,\alpha,\beta,R,\kappa}$ is $2\rho$-zCDP and there is an $n = O\left(\frac{d \log(d/\alpha)}{\alpha^2} + \frac{d \log(d \log R / \alpha \rho / \beta)}{\alpha \rho^{1/2}} + \frac{\sqrt{d} \log(Rd/\beta)}{\rho^{1/2}} + n_{\text{PPC}}\right)$ such that if $X_1, \ldots, X_n \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ for $\|\mu\|_2 \leq R$ and $I \preceq \Sigma \preceq \kappa I$ then, with probability at least $1 - 2\beta$, PME outputs $\hat{\mu}$ such that $\|\mu - \hat{\mu}\|_{\Sigma} \leq \alpha$. In the above $n_{\text{PPC}}$ is the sample complexity required by PPC$_{\rho,\beta,\kappa}$ (Theorem 3.11).
Proof. Privacy will follow immediately from the composition property of $2\rho$-zCDP and the assumed privacy of PPC and NaivePME. The sample complexity bound will also follow immediately from the sample complexity bounds for PCE and NaivePME. Thus, we focus on proving that $\|\mu - \hat{\mu}\|_\Sigma \leq \alpha$.

Since $X_1, \ldots, X_{2n}$ are i.i.d. from $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$, the values $Z_1, \ldots, Z_n$ are i.i.d. from $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$. Therefore, with probability at least $1 - \beta$, PPC($Z_1, \ldots, Z_n$) returns a matrix $A$ such that $I \preceq A\Sigma A \preceq 1000I$.

Note that since $I \preceq \Sigma$ and $A\Sigma A \preceq 1000I$, we have $\|A\|_2 \leq 1000$.

Now, since the samples $X_{2n+1}, \ldots, X_{3n}$ are i.i.d. from $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$, the values $Y_1, \ldots, Y_n$ are i.i.d. from $\mathcal{N}(A\mu, A\Sigma A)$. Note that $\|A\mu\|_2 \leq \|A\|_2\|\mu\|_2 \leq 1000R$ and, by assumption, $I \preceq A\Sigma A \preceq 1000I$. When we apply NaivePME$_{\rho, \alpha, \beta, 1000R, 1000}$ to $Y_1, \ldots, Y_n$, with probability at least $1 - \beta$ we will obtain $\tilde{\mu}$ such that $\|A\mu - \tilde{\mu}\|_{A\Sigma A} \leq \alpha$. Finally, we can write $\|\mu - \tilde{\mu}\|_{\Sigma} = \|A\mu - A\tilde{\mu}\|_{A\Sigma A} = \|A\mu - \tilde{\mu}\|_{A\Sigma A} \leq \alpha$. The theorem now follows by a union bound over the two possible failure events. 

\[\square\]

5 Privately Learning Product Distributions

In this section we introduce and analyze our algorithm for learning a product distribution $P$ over \{0, 1\}$^d$ in total variation distance, thereby proving Theorem 1.3 in the introduction. The pseudocode appears in Algorithm 7. For simplicity of presentation, we assume that the product distribution has mean that is bounded coordinate-wise by $\frac{1}{2}$ (i.e. $\mathbb{E}[P] \preceq \frac{1}{2}$), although we emphasize that this assumption is essentially without loss of generality, and can easily be removed while paying only a constant factor in the sample complexity.

5.1 A Private Product-Distribution Estimator

To describe the algorithm, we need to introduce notation for the truncated mean. Given a dataset element (a vector) $X_i \in \{0, 1\}^d$ and $B \geq 0$, we use

$$\text{trunc}_B(X_i) = \begin{cases} X_i & \text{if } \|X_i\|_2 \leq B \\ \frac{B}{\|X_i\|_2} \cdot X_i & \text{if } \|X_i\|_2 > B \end{cases}$$

to denote the truncation of $x$ to an $\ell_2$-ball of radius $B$. Given a dataset $X = (X_1, \ldots, X_m) \in \{0, 1\}^{m \times d}$ and $B > 0$, we use

$$\text{tmean}_B(X) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \text{trunc}_B(X_i)$$

to denote the mean of the truncated vectors. Observe that the $\ell_2$-sensitivity of $\text{tmean}_B$ is $\frac{B}{m}$, while the $\ell_2$-sensitivity of the untruncated mean is infinite. Note that $\text{tmean}_B(X) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} X_i$ unless $\|X_i\|_2 > B$ for some $i$. If one of the inputs to $\text{tmean}_B$ does not satisfy the norm bound then we will say, “truncation occurred,” as a shorthand.

We also use the following notational conventions: Given a dataset element $X_i \in \{0, 1\}^d$, we will use the array notation $X_i[j]$ to refer to its $j$-th coordinate, and the notation $X_i[S] = (X_i[j])_{j \in S}$ to refer to the vector $X$ restricted to the subset of coordinates $S \subseteq [d]$. Given a dataset $X = (X_1, \ldots, X_m)$, we use the notation $X[S] = (X_1[S], \ldots, X_m[S])$ to refer to the dataset consisting of each $X_i$ restricted to the subset of coordinates $S \subseteq [d]$. 
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Algorithm 7: Private Product-Distribution Estimator PPDE_{\rho,\alpha,\beta}(X)

**Input:** Samples \(X_1, \ldots, X_n \in \{0, 1\}^d\) from an unknown product distribution \(P\) satisfying \(\mathbb{E}[P] \leq \frac{1}{2}\). Parameters \(\rho, \alpha, \beta > 0\).

**Output:** A product distribution \(Q\) over \(\{0, 1\}^d\) such that \(d_{TV}(P, Q) \leq \alpha\).

Set parameters:
- \(R \leftarrow \log_2(d/2)\)
- \(c \leftarrow 128 \log^{5/4}(d/\alpha \beta (2\rho)^{1/2})\)
- \(c' \leftarrow 128 \log^3(dR/\beta)\)
- \(m \leftarrow \frac{c'd}{\alpha^2} + \frac{cd}{\alpha(2\rho)^{1/2}}\)

Split \(X\) into \(R + 1\) blocks of \(m\) samples each, denoted \(X_r = (X^r_1, \ldots, X^r_m)\)

(Halt and output \(\perp\) if \(n\) is too small."

Set \(q[j] \leftarrow 0\) for every \(j \in [d]\), and let \(S_1 = [d]\), \(u_1 \leftarrow \frac{1}{2}\), \(\tau_1 \leftarrow \frac{3}{16}\), and \(r \leftarrow 1\)

// Partitioning Rounds

**While** \(u_r|S_r| \geq 1\)
- Let \(S_{r+1} \leftarrow \emptyset\)
- Let \(B_r \leftarrow \sqrt{6u_r|S_r| \log(mR/\beta)}\)
- Let \(q_r[S_r] \leftarrow \rho \text{mean}_{B_r}(X^r[S_r]) + \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{B^2_{2m^2}}{2pm^2} \cdot I)\)  
  For \(j \in S_r\)
  - If \(q_r[j] < \tau_r\)
    - Add \(j\) to \(S_{r+1}\)
  - Else
    - Set \(q[j] \leftarrow q_r[j]\)
- Let \(u_{r+1} \leftarrow \frac{1}{2}u_r\), \(\tau_{r+1} \leftarrow \frac{1}{2}\tau_r\), and \(r \leftarrow r + 1\)

// Final Round

**If** \(|S_r| \geq 1\)
- Let \(B_r \leftarrow \sqrt{6 \log(m/\beta)}\)
- Let \(q[S_r] \leftarrow \rho \text{mean}_{B_r}(X^r[S_r]) + \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{B^2_{2m^2}}{2pm^2} \cdot I)\)

Return \(Q = \text{Ber}(q[1]) \otimes \cdots \otimes \text{Ber}(q[d])\)

5.2 Privacy Analysis

The privacy analysis of Algorithm 7 is straightforward, based on privacy of the Gaussian mechanism and bounded sensitivity of the truncated mean.

**Theorem 5.1.** For every \(\rho, \alpha, \beta > 0\), \(\text{PPDE}_{\rho,\alpha,\beta}(X)\) satisfies \(\rho\)-zCDP.

**Proof.** Since each individual’s data is used only to compute \(\text{tmean}_{B_r}(X^r)\) for a single round \(r\), privacy follows immediately from Lemma 2.7 and from observing that the \(\ell_2\)-sensitivity of \(\text{tmean}_{B_r}\) is \(\frac{B}{n}\). Note that, since a disjoint set of samples \(X^r\) is used for each round \(r\), each sample only affects a single one of the rounds, so we do not need to apply composition. \(\square\)

5.3 Accuracy Analysis for PPDE

In this section we prove the following theorem bounding the sample complexity required by PPDE to learn a product distribution up to \(\alpha\) in total variation distance.
The notation then with probability at least \(1 - O(\beta)\), \(\text{PPDE}_{\rho,\alpha,\beta}(X)\) outputs \(Q\), such that \(d_{\text{TV}}(P, Q) \leq O(\alpha)\). The notation \(O(\cdot)\) hides polylogarithmic factors in \(d, \frac{1}{\alpha}, \frac{1}{\beta}, \text{ and } \frac{1}{p}\).

Before proving the theorem, we will introduce or recall a few useful tools and inequalities.

**Distances Between Distributions.** We use several notions of distance between distributions.

**Definition 5.3.** If \(P, Q\) are distributions, then

- the **statistical distance** is \(d_{\text{TV}}(P, Q) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_x |P(x) - Q(x)|\),
- the \(\chi^2\)-**divergence** is \(d_{\chi^2}(P\|Q) = \sum_x \frac{(P(x) - Q(x))^2}{Q(x)}\), and
- the **KL-divergence** is \(d_{\text{KL}}(P\|Q) = \sum_x P(x) \log \frac{P(x)}{Q(x)}\).

For product distributions \(P = P_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes P_k\) and \(Q = Q_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes Q_k\), the \(\chi^2\) and \(d_{\text{KL}}\) divergences are additive, and the statistical distance is subadditive. Specifically,

**Lemma 5.4.** Let \(P = P_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes P_k\) and \(Q = Q_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes Q_k\) be two product distributions. Then

- \(d_{\text{TV}}(P, Q) \leq \sum_{j=1}^d d_{\text{TV}}(P_j, Q_j)\),
- \(d_{\chi^2}(P\|Q) \leq \sum_{j=1}^d d_{\chi^2}(P_j\|Q_j)\), and
- \(d_{\text{KL}}(P\|Q) = \sum_{j=1}^d d_{\text{KL}}(P_j\|Q_j)\).

The three definitions also satisfy some useful relationships.

**Lemma 5.5.** For any two distributions \(P, Q\) we have \(2 \cdot d_{\text{TV}}(P, Q)^2 \leq d_{\text{KL}}(P\|Q) \leq d_{\chi^2}(P\|Q)\).

**Tail Bounds.** We need a couple of useful tail bounds for sums of independent Bernoulli random variables. The first lemma is a useful form of the Chernoff bound.

**Lemma 5.6.** For every \(p > 0\), if \(X_1, \ldots, X_m\) are i.i.d. samples from \(\text{Ber}(p)\) then for every \(\varepsilon > 0\)

\[
P\left[\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m X_i \geq p + \varepsilon\right] \leq e^{-d_{\text{KL}}(p+\varepsilon\|p) \cdot m} \quad \text{and} \quad P\left[\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m X_i \leq p - \varepsilon\right] \leq e^{-d_{\text{KL}}(p-\varepsilon\|p) \cdot m}\]

The next lemma follows easily from a Chernoff bound.

**Lemma 5.7.** Suppose \(X_1, \ldots, X_k\) are sampled i.i.d. from a product distribution \(P\) over \{0, 1\}^t, where the mean of each coordinate is upper bounded by \(p\) (i.e. \(\mathbb{E}[P] \leq p\)). Then

1. if \(pt > 1\), then for each \(i\), \(P\left[\|X_i\|_2^2 \geq pt \left(1 + 3 \log \left(\frac{k}{p}\right)\right)\right] \leq \frac{\beta}{k}\), and
2. if \(pt \leq 1\), then for each \(i\), \(P\left[\|X_i\|_2^2 \geq 6 \log \left(\frac{k}{p}\right)\right] \leq \frac{\beta}{k}\).
5.3.1 Analysis of the Partitioning Rounds

In this section we analyze the progress made during the partitioning rounds. We show two properties: (1) any coordinate \( j \) such that \( q[j] \) was set during the partitioning rounds has small error and (2) any coordinate \( j \) such that \( q[j] \) was not set in the partitioning rounds has a small mean. We capture the properties of the partitioning rounds that will be necessary for the proof of Theorem 5.2 in the following lemma.

Lemma 5.8. If \( X^1, \ldots, X^R \) each contain at least
\[
m = \frac{128d\log^3(dR/\beta)}{\alpha^2} + \frac{128d\log^{5/4}(d/\alpha\beta(2\rho)^{1/2})}{\alpha^{1/2}}
\]
i.i.d. samples from \( P \), then, with probability at least \( 1 - O(\beta) \), in every partitioning round \( r = 1, \ldots, R \):
1. If a coordinate \( j \) does not go to the next round (i.e. \( j \in S_r \) but \( j \notin S_{r+1} \)) then \( q[j] \) has small \( \chi^2 \)-divergence with \( p[j] \),
\[
\frac{4(p[j] - q[j])^2}{q[j]} \leq \frac{\alpha^2}{d}.
\]
Thus, if \( S_A \) consists of all coordinates such that \( q[j] \) is set in one of the partitioning rounds, \( d_{TV}(P[S_A], Q[S_A]) \leq \alpha \).
2. If a coordinate \( j \) does go to the next round (i.e. \( j \in S_r, S_{r+1} \)), then \( p[j] \) is small,
\[
p[j] \leq u_{r+1} = \frac{u_r}{2}.
\]

Proof. We will prove the lemma by induction on \( r \) (taking a union bound over the events that one of the two conditions fails in a given round \( r \)). Therefore, we will assume that in every round \( r \), \( p[j] \leq u_r \) for every \( j \in S_r \) and prove that if this bound holds then the two conditions in the lemma hold. For the base of the induction, observe that, by assumption, \( p[j] \leq u_1 = \frac{1}{2} \) for every \( j \in S_1 = [d] \). In what follows we fix an arbitrary round \( r \in [R] \). Throughout the proof, we will use the notation \( \tilde{p}_r = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} X^r_i \) to denote the empirical mean of the \( r \)-th block of samples.

Claim 5.9. If \( \tilde{p}_r[j] = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} X^r_i[j] \) and \( p_j > \frac{1}{d} \), then with probability at least \( 1 - \frac{2\beta}{R} \),
\[
\forall j \in S_r \quad |p[j] - \tilde{p}_r[j]| \leq \sqrt{\frac{4p[j] \log \left( \frac{dR}{\beta} \right)}{m}}.
\]

Proof of Claim 5.9. We use a Chernoff Bound (Theorem 5.6), and facts that
\[
\forall \gamma > 0 \quad d_{KL}(p + \gamma || p) \geq \frac{\gamma^2}{2(p + \gamma)} \quad \text{and} \quad d_{KL}(p - \gamma || p) \geq \frac{\gamma^2}{2p},
\]
and set
\[
\gamma = \sqrt{\frac{4p[j] \log \left( \frac{dR}{\beta} \right)}{m}}.
\]
Note that when \( p[j] > \frac{1}{d} \), due to our choice of parameters, \( \gamma \leq p[j] \). Therefore, \( 2(p[j] + \gamma) \leq 4p[j] \). Finally, taking a union bound over the cases when \( \tilde{p}_r[j] \leq p[j] - \gamma \) and when \( \tilde{p}_r[j] \geq p[j] + \gamma \), we prove the claim.
Claim 5.10. With probability at least $1 - \frac{\beta}{R}$, for every $X^r_i \in X^r$, $\|X^r_i\|_2 \leq B_r$, so no rows of $X^r$ are truncated in the computation of $\text{tmean}_{B_r}(X^r)$.

Proof of Claim 5.10. By assumption, all marginals specified by $S_r$ are upper bounded by $u_r$. Now, the expected value of $\|X^r_i\|_2^2$ is at most $u_r|S_r|$. Since $B_r = \sqrt{u_r|S_r|6\log(mR/\beta)}$, we know that $B_r \geq \sqrt{u_r|S_r|(1 + 3\log(mR/\beta))}$. The claim now follows from a Chernoff Bound (Lemma 5.7) and a union bound over the entries of $X^r$.

Claim 5.11. With probability at least $1 - \frac{2\beta}{R}$,

$$\forall j \in S_r \quad |\tilde{p}_r[j] - q_r[j]| \leq \sqrt{\frac{6u_r|S_r|\log\left(\frac{mR}{\beta}\right)\log\left(\frac{2dR}{\beta}\right)}{\rho m^2}}$$

Proof of Claim 5.11. We assume that all marginals specified by $S_r$ are upper bounded by $u_r$. From Claim 5.10, we know that, with probability at least $1 - \frac{\beta}{R}$, there is no truncation, so $\text{tmean}_{B_r}(X^r[S_r]) = \frac{1}{m} \sum X^r \cdot X^r[S_r] = \tilde{p}_r[S_r]$. So, the Gaussian noise is added to $\tilde{p}_r[j]$ for each $j \in S_r$. Therefore, the only source of error here is the Gaussian noise. Using the standard tail bound for zero-mean Gaussians (Lemma 2.8), with the following parameters,

$$\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{3u_r|S_r|\log\left(\frac{mR}{\beta}\right)}{\rho m^2}} \quad \text{and} \quad t = \sqrt{2\log\left(\frac{2dR}{\beta}\right)}$$

and taking a union bound over all coordinates in $S_r$, and the event of truncation, we obtain the claim.

Plugging our choice of $m$ into Claims 5.9 and 5.11, applying the triangle inequality, and simplifying, we get that (with high probability),

$$|p[j] - q_r[j]| \leq \frac{\alpha}{\log^{1/4}\left(\frac{d}{\beta}\right)} \sqrt{\frac{u_r}{d}}$$

To simplify our calculations, we will define

$$e_r = \frac{\alpha}{\log^{1/4}\left(\frac{d}{\beta}\right)} \sqrt{\frac{u_r}{d}}$$

to denote the above bound on $|p[j] - q[j]|$ in round $r$.

Claim 5.12. For all $j \in S_r$, with probability, at least, $1 - \frac{4\beta}{R}$,

$$\chi^2(p[j], q_r[j]) \leq \frac{4(p[j] - q_r[j])^2}{q_r[j]}.$$
Proof. For every $r$, and $d$ more than some absolute constant, $|e_r| \leq \frac{1}{4}$. Also, by assumption, $p[j] \leq \frac{1}{2}$, for all $j \in [d]$. Therefore, for every $r$, and every $j \in S_r$,

$$
\chi^2(p[j], q_r[j]) = \frac{(p[j] - q_r[j])^2}{q_r[j]} + \frac{(p[j] - q_r[j])^2}{1 - q_r[j]}
$$

$$
= \frac{(p[j] - q_r[j])^2}{q_r[j](1 - q_r[j])}
$$

$$
\leq 4(p[j] - q_r[j])^2
$$

Claim 5.13. With probability at least $1 - \frac{4\beta}{R}$, for every $j \in S_r$,

$$
q_r[j] \geq \tau_r \implies 4(p[j] - q[j])^2 \leq \alpha^2 \frac{d}{q[j]}
$$

Proof of Claim 5.13. We want to show the following inequality.

$$
\frac{4(p_j - q_r[j])^2}{q_r[j]} \leq \alpha^2 \frac{d}{q[j]}
$$

We know that $|p_j - q_r[j]| \leq e_r$ with high probability. Thus, we need to show that if $q_r[j] \geq \tau_r$, the following inequality holds:

$$
\frac{4e_r^2}{q_r[j]} \leq \alpha^2 \frac{d}{q[j]}
$$

We now show that the left-hand side is at most $\tau_r$, which completes the proof. In the algorithm, we have $\tau_r = \frac{3}{4} u_{r+1}$:

$$
\frac{4de_r^2}{\alpha^2} \leq \frac{3}{4} u_{r+1} \iff \frac{4u_r}{\log^{1/2}(d/3)} \leq \frac{3}{4} u_{r+1} \iff \frac{16}{3 \log^{1/2}(d/3)} \leq \frac{1}{2}
$$

Note that the final inequality is satisfied as long as $d$ is larger than some absolute constant. \qed

Claim 5.14. With probability at least $1 - \frac{4\beta}{R}$, for every $j \in S_r$,

$$
q_r[j] < \tau_r \implies p[j] \leq u_{r+1} = \frac{u_r}{2}
$$

Proof of Claim 5.14. We know that with high probability, $p_j \leq q_r[j] + e_r$. But since $q_r[j] < \tau_i$, we know that $p_j < \tau_r + e_r$. Also, $\tau_r = \frac{3}{4} u_{r+1}$. Then it is sufficient to show the following.

$$
e_r \leq \frac{u_{r+1}}{4}
$$

$$
\iff \frac{\alpha}{\log^{1/4}(d/3)} \sqrt{\frac{u_r}{d}} \leq \frac{u_{r+1}}{4}
$$

$$
\iff \frac{16\alpha^2}{du_1 \log^{1/2}(d/3)} \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{r+1}
$$

$$
\iff \left(\frac{16\alpha^2}{du_1 \log^{1/2}(d/3)} \right)^{r+1} \leq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (11)
$$
Now we have

\[
\left( \frac{16\alpha^2}{du_1 \log^{1/2} \left( \frac{d}{\beta} \right)} \right)^{1/\tau} = \left( \frac{1}{d} \right)^{1/\tau} \cdot \left( \frac{16\alpha^2}{u_1 \log^{1/2} \left( \frac{d}{\beta} \right)} \right)^{1/\tau} \\
\leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left( \frac{16\alpha^2}{u_1 \log^{1/2} \left( \frac{d}{\beta} \right)} \right)^{1/\tau} \quad (r \leq R = \log_2 (d/2)) \\
\leq \frac{1}{2}
\]

where the last inequality holds for \( d \) larger than some absolute constant. Therefore, (11) is satisfied for all \( 1 \leq r \leq R \).

Claim 5.14 completes the inductive step of the proof. It establishes that at the beginning of round \( r + 1 \), \( p_j < u_{r+1} \) for all \( j \in S_{r+1} \). Now we can take a union bound over all the failure events in each round and over each of the \( R \) rounds so that the conclusions of the Lemma hold with probability \( 1 - O(\beta) \). This completes the proof of Lemma 5.8.

5.3.2 Analysis of the Final Round

In this section we show that the error of the coordinates \( j \) such that \( q[j] \) was set in the final round \( r \) is small.

**Lemma 5.15.** Let \( r \) be the final round for which \( u_r |S_r| \leq 1 \). If \( p[j] \leq u_r \) for every \( j \in S_r \), and \( X^r \) contains at least

\[
m = \frac{128d \log^3 (dR/\beta)}{\alpha^2} + \frac{128d \log^{5/4} (d/\alpha \beta(2\rho)^{1/2})}{\alpha \rho^{1/2}}
\]

i.i.d. samples from \( P \), then with probability at least \( 1 - O(\beta) \), then \( d_{TV}(P[S_r], Q[S_r]) \leq O(\alpha) \)

*Proof.* Again, we use the notation, \( \tilde{p}_r = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m X^r_i \), for the rest of this proof. First we have, two claims that bound the difference between \( p[j] \) and \( \tilde{p}_r[j] \).

**Claim 5.16.** For each \( j \in S_r \), such that \( p[j] > \frac{1}{d} \), with probability at least \( 1 - 2\beta/d \), we have,

\[\forall j \in S_r \quad |p[j] - \tilde{p}_r[j]| \leq \sqrt{\frac{4p[j] \log \left( \frac{d}{\beta} \right)}{m}}\]

*Proof of Claim 5.16.* The proof is identical to that of Claim 5.9.

**Claim 5.17.** For each \( j \in S_r \), such that \( p[j] \leq \frac{1}{d} \), with probability at least \( 1 - 4\beta/d \), we have,

\[\forall j \in S_r \quad |p[j] - \tilde{p}_r[j]| \leq \frac{\alpha}{4d \log \left( \frac{d}{\beta} \right)}\]

*Proof of Claim 5.17.* We use a Chernoff Bound (Theorem 5.6), and facts that

\[\forall \gamma > 0 \quad d_{KL}(p + \gamma || p) \geq \frac{\gamma^2}{2(p + \gamma)} \quad \text{and} \quad d_{KL}(p - \gamma || p) \geq \frac{\gamma^2}{2p}\]

There are two cases to analyze.
• \( p_j > \frac{\alpha^2}{16d\ln^2 \left( \frac{d}{\beta} \right)} \): In this case, setting \( \gamma = \sqrt{\frac{4p[j]\log \left( \frac{d}{\beta} \right)}{m}} \), we get \( \gamma \leq p[j] \). Then we apply Theorem 5.6 with appropriate parameters.

• \( p_j \leq \frac{\alpha^2}{16d\ln^2 \left( \frac{d}{\beta} \right)} \): In this case, setting \( \gamma = \frac{4\log \left( \frac{d}{\beta} \right)}{m} \), we get \( \gamma \geq p[j] \). Then we apply Theorem 5.6 with the corresponding parameters.

Since \( p[j] \leq \frac{1}{d} \), if \( m \) satisfies the assumption of the lemma, then

\[
\max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{4p[j]\log \left( \frac{d}{\beta} \right)}{m}}, \frac{4\log \left( \frac{d}{\beta} \right)}{m} \right\} \leq \frac{\alpha}{4d\log \left( \frac{d}{\beta} \right)}.
\]

Therefore, with high probability, the maximum error is \( \frac{\alpha}{4d\log \left( \frac{d}{\beta} \right)} \). \( \square \)

**Claim 5.18.** With probability at least \( 1 - \beta \), for every \( X^*_r \in X^r \), \( \|X^*_r\|_2 \leq B_r \), so no rows of \( X^r \) are truncated in the computation of \( t_{\text{mean}} \).

**Proof of Claim 5.18.** We assume that all marginals specified by \( S_r \) are upper bounded by \( u_r \). Now, the expected value of \( \|X^*_r\|_2^2 \) is upper bounded by 1. Also, \( B_r = \sqrt{6 \log \left( \frac{m}{\beta} \right)} \). With this, we use a Chernoff Bound (Fact 5.7) and get the required result. \( \square \)

**Claim 5.19.** With probability at least \( 1 - 2\beta \),

\[
\forall j \in S_r \quad |\tilde{p}_r[j] - q_r[j]| \leq \frac{6 \log \left( \frac{m}{\beta} \right) \log \left( \frac{2d}{\beta} \right)}{pm^2}
\]

**Proof of Claim 5.19.** We assume that all marginals specified by \( S_r \) are upper bounded by \( u_r \). From Claim 5.18, we know that with high probability, there is no truncation, so, the Gaussian noise is added to \( \tilde{p}_r \) for each \( j \in S_r \). Therefore, the only source of error here is the Gaussian noise. Using the standard tail bound for zero-mean Gaussians (Lemma 2.8), with the following parameters,

\[
\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{3\log \left( \frac{m}{\beta} \right)}{pm^2}} \quad \text{and} \quad t = \sqrt{2 \log \left( \frac{2d}{\beta} \right)},
\]

and taking the union bound over all columns of the dataset in that round and the event of truncation, we obtain the claim. \( \square \)

By the above claim, the magnitude of Gaussian noise added to each coordinate in the final round is less than

\[
\frac{\alpha}{2d\log^{1/4} \left( \frac{d}{\alpha \beta \sqrt{2p}} \right)}.
\]

We partition the set \( S_r \) into \( S_{r,L} = \{ j \in S_r : p[j] \leq \frac{1}{d} \} \) and \( S_{r,H} = \{ j \in S_r : p[j] > \frac{1}{d} \} \).

**Claim 5.20.** \( \text{d}_\text{TV}(P[S_{r,H}], Q[S_{r,H}]) \leq \alpha \)
Proof of Claim 5.20. For every coordinate $j \in S_{r,H}$, due Claim 5.16, and from the upper bound on the Gaussian noise added, we know that,

$$|p[j] - q[j]| \leq \frac{\alpha}{\log^{1/4} \left( \frac{d}{\beta} \right)} \sqrt{\frac{p[j]}{d}} = e_{r,H}.$$ 

Now, we know that $p[j] > \frac{1}{d}$, and $e_{r,H} \leq \frac{p[j]}{2}$, when $d$ is greater than some absolute constant. So, we can bound the $\chi^2$-divergence between such $p[j]$ and $q[j]$ by,

$$4 \left( \frac{p[j] - q[j]}{q[j]} \right)^2 \leq \frac{4e^2_{r,H}}{p[j] - e_{r,H}} \leq \frac{8\alpha^2}{d \log^{1/2} \left( \frac{d}{3} \right)} \leq \frac{\alpha^2}{d}.$$ 

Thus, we have $d_{\chi^2}(P[S_{r,H}], Q[S_{r,H}]) \leq \alpha^2$, which implies $d_{TV}(P[S_{r,H}], Q[S_{r,H}]) \leq \alpha$.  

Claim 5.21. $d_{TV}(P[S_{r,L}], Q[S_{r,L}]) \leq \alpha$

Proof of Claim 5.21. By Claim 5.17, and from the upper bound on the Gaussian noise added, for every coordinate $j \in S_{r,L}$, we have,

$$|p[j] - q[j]| \leq 2 \cdot \max \left\{ \frac{\alpha}{4d \log \left( \frac{d}{3} \right)}, \frac{\alpha}{2d \log^{1/4} \left( d/\alpha \beta \sqrt{2p} \right)} \right\} \leq \frac{\alpha}{d \log^{1/4} (d/\beta)}.$$ 

Thus, by Lemma 5.4, we have $d_{TV}(P[S_{r,L}], Q[S_{r,L}]) \leq \alpha$.  

Now, combining Claims 5.20 and 5.21, and applying Lemma 5.4 completes the proof.

5.3.3 Putting it Together

In this section we combine Lemmas 5.8 and 5.15 to prove Theorem 5.2. First, by Lemma 5.8, with probability at least $1 - O(\beta)$, if $S_A$ is the set of coordinates $j$ such that $q[j]$ was set in any of the partitioning rounds, then

1. $d_{TV}(P[S_A], Q[S_A]) \leq O(\alpha)$ and

2. if $j \notin S_A$ and $r$ is the final round, then $p[j] \leq u_r$.

Next, by the second condition, we can apply Lemma 5.15 to obtain that if $S_F$ consists of all coordinates set in the final round, then with probability at least $1 - O(\beta)$, $d_{TV}(P[S_F], Q[S_F]) \leq O(\alpha)$. Finally, we use a union bound and Lemma 5.4 to conclude that, with probability at least $1 - O(\beta)$,

$$d_{TV}(P, Q) \leq d_{TV}(P[S_A], Q[S_A]) + d_{TV}(P[S_F], Q[S_F]) = O(\alpha).$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 5.2.
6 Lower Bounds for Private Distribution Estimation

In this section we prove a number of lower bounds for private distribution estimation, matching our upper bounds up to polylogarithmic factors. For estimating the mean of product or Gaussian distributions, we prove lower bounds for the weaker notion of \((\varepsilon, \delta)\)-differential privacy, but still show that they nearly match our upper bounds which are under the stronger notion of \(\varepsilon^2\)-zCDP. For estimating the covariance of Gaussian distributions, our lower bound is for \(\varepsilon\)-DP, a stronger notion than our upper bound, which is \(\varepsilon^2\)-zCDP. Proving lower bounds for covariance estimation with stronger privacy (i.e., concentrated or approximate differential privacy) is an interesting open question.

Our proofs generally consist of two parts. First, we prove a lower bound on the sample complexity required for private parameter estimation. For our lower bounds on mean estimation, we use modifications of the “fingerprinting” method. Then, we show that if two distributions are distance in parameter distance (either \(\ell_2\)-distance between their means, or Frobenius distance between their covariances), then they will be far in statistical distance. Though we consider questions of the latter sort to be very natural, we were surprised to find they have not been studied as significantly as we expected. For example, while a lower bound on the statistical distance between Gaussian distributions in terms of the \(\ell_2\)-distance between their means is folklore, a bound in terms of the Frobenius distance between their covariance matrices is fairly recent [DMR18]. Furthermore, to the best of our knowledge, our lower bound on the statistical distance between binary product distributions in terms of the \(\ell_2\)-distance between their means is entirely novel.

In Section 6.1, we describe our lower bounds for learning product distributions. In Section 6.2, we describe our lower bounds for learning Gaussian distributions with known covariance. Finally, in Section 6.3, we describe our lower bounds for learning the covariance of Gaussian distributions.

6.1 Privately Learning Product Distributions

In this section we prove that our algorithm for learning product distributions has optimal sample complexity up to polylogarithmic factors. Our proof actually shows that our algorithm is optimal even if we only require the learner to work for somewhat balanced product distributions (i.e. those whose marginals are bounded away from 0 and 1) and allow the learner to satisfy the weaker variant of \((\varepsilon, \delta)\)-DP. The lower bound has two steps: (1) a proof that estimating the mean of a somewhat balanced product distribution up to \(\alpha\) in \(\ell_2\) distance (Lemma 6.2) and (2) a proof that estimating a somewhat balanced product distribution in total-variation distance implies estimating its mean in \(\ell_2\) distance (Lemma 6.4). Putting these two lemmata together immediately implies the following theorem:

**Theorem 6.1.** For any \(\alpha \leq 1\) smaller than some absolute constant, any \((\varepsilon, \frac{3}{4\ln}n)\)-DP mechanism which estimates a product distribution to accuracy \(\leq \alpha\) in total variation distance with probability \(\geq 2/3\) requires \(n = \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\alpha \varepsilon \log d}\right)\) samples.

**Proof.** We will show that no algorithm can estimate the mean of a product distribution up to accuracy \(\alpha\) with probability 2/3 with fewer than \(O\left(\frac{d}{\alpha \varepsilon \log d}\right)\) samples (for an appropriate choice of the constant in the big-Oh notation). By Lemma 6.4, this would imply an algorithm with the same sample complexity which estimates the distribution in total variation distance up to accuracy \(C\alpha\). The theorem statement follows after a rescaling of \(\alpha\).
Suppose that such an algorithm existed. By repeating the algorithm $O(\log d)$ times, the success probability could be boosted by a standard argument\footnote{Specifically, repeat the algorithm $O(\log d)$ times, and choose any output which is close to at least half the outputs. This is correct with high probability by using the Chernoff bound and the fact that the original algorithm was accurate with probability $\geq 2/3$.} to $\geq 1 - 1/d^2$, with the overall algorithm requiring $O(d/\alpha^2)$ samples. Since the domain is bounded, any answer will be, at worst, an $O(\sqrt{d})$-accurate estimate in $\ell_2$-distance. This implies that the expected accuracy of the resulting algorithm is at most $O(\alpha)$, which is precluded by Lemma 6.2, for an appropriate choice of constant in the big-Oh notation.

\textbf{Lemma 6.2.} If $M : \{-1\}^{n \times d} \rightarrow [-\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}]^d$ is $(\varepsilon, \frac{3}{64n})$-DP, and for every product distribution $P$ over $\{-1\}^d$ such that $-\frac{1}{3} \leq \mathbb{E}[P] \leq \frac{1}{3}$,

\[ \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P^\otimes n} \left[ \| M(X) - \mathbb{E}[P] \|_2^2 \right] \leq \alpha^2 \leq \frac{d}{54} \]

then $n \geq \frac{d}{128\varepsilon^2}$. Equivalently, if $M$ is $(\varepsilon, \frac{3}{64n})$-DP and is such that for every product distribution $P$ over $\{0, 1\}^d$ such that $\frac{1}{3} \leq \mathbb{E}[P] \leq \frac{2}{3}$,

\[ \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P^\otimes n} \left[ \| M(X) - \mathbb{E}[P] \|_2^2 \right] \leq \alpha^2 \leq \frac{d}{216} \]

then $n \geq \frac{d}{144\varepsilon^2}$.

\textbf{Proof.} We will only prove the first part of the theorem for estimation over $\{-1\}^d$, and the second part will follow immediately by a change of variables.

Let $P^1, \ldots, P^d \sim [-\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}]$ be chosen uniformly and independently from $[-\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}]$. Let $P = \mathrm{Ber}(P^1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathrm{Ber}(P^d)$ be the product distribution with mean $\mathbb{P} = (P^1, \ldots, P^d)$. Let $X_1, \ldots, X_n \sim P$ be independent samples from this product distribution. Define:

\[
Z_i^j = \left( \frac{\frac{1}{2} - (P^j)^2}{1 - (P^j)^2} \right) (M^j(X) - P^j)(X_i^j - P^j)
\]

\[ Z_i = \sum_{j=1}^d Z_i^j \]

where $Z_i$ is a measure of the correlation between the estimate $M(X)$ and the $i$-th sample $X_i$. We will use the following key lemma, which is an extension of a similar statement in [SU15] for the uniform distribution over $[-1, 1]$.

\textbf{Lemma 6.3 (Fingerprinting Lemma).} For every $f : \{-1\}^n \rightarrow [-\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}]$, we have

\[ \mathbb{E}_{P \sim [-\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}], X_1, \ldots, X_n \sim P} \left[ \left( \frac{\frac{1}{2} - P^2}{1 - P^2} \right) \cdot (f(X) - P) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - P) + (f(X) - P)^2 \right] \geq \frac{1}{27} \]

\textbf{Proof of Lemma 6.3.} Define the function

\[ g(p) = \mathbb{E}_{X_1, \ldots, X_n \sim P} [f(X)]. \]
For brevity, we will write $\mathbb{E}_P[\cdot]$ to indicate that the expectation is being taken over $P$, where $P$ is chosen uniformly from $[-\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}]$. By [BSU17, Lemma A.1], for every fixed $p$,

$$h(p) := \mathbb{E}_{X_1, \ldots, X_n \sim P} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{9} - \frac{p^2}{1 - p^2} \right) \cdot (f(X) - p) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_i - p) \right] = \left( \frac{1}{9} - p^2 \right) g'(p).$$

(12)

Where we have defined the function $h(p)$ for brevity. Now we have,

$$\mathbb{E}_P[h(P)] = \mathbb{E}_P \left[ \left( \frac{1}{9} - p^2 \right) g'(p) \right] = \frac{3}{2} \int_{-\frac{1}{3}}^{\frac{1}{3}} \left( \frac{1}{9} - p^2 \right) g'(p) dp
\quad = 2 \cdot \mathbb{E}_P[P g(P)].$$

(13)

Now, using the above identity, we have:

$$\mathbb{E}_{P, X_1, \ldots, X_n \sim P} \left[ (f(X) - P)^2 \right] = \mathbb{E}_{P, X_1, \ldots, X_n \sim P} \left[ f(X)^2 \right] + \mathbb{E}_P[P^2] - 2 \cdot \mathbb{E}_P[P g(P)]
\geq \mathbb{E}_P[P^2] - 2 \cdot \mathbb{E}_P[P g(P)]
\geq \mathbb{E}_P[P^2] - \mathbb{E}_P[h(P)]
\quad \text{(Using (13))}

Rearranging the above inequality gives:

$$\mathbb{E}_{P, X_1, \ldots, X_n \sim P} \left[ (f(X) - P)^2 \right] + \mathbb{E}[h(P)] \geq \mathbb{E}_P[P^2] = \frac{1}{27}.$$

Henceforth, all expectations are taken over $P$, $X$, and $M$. We can now apply the lemma to the function $M_j(X)$ for every $j \in [d]$, use linearity of expectation, and the accuracy assumption to get the bound,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}[Z_i] = \sum_{j=1}^{d} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} Z_i^j \right]
\geq \frac{d}{27} - \mathbb{E}[\|M(X) - \overline{P}\|^2_2]
\geq \frac{d}{27} - \alpha^2
\geq \frac{d}{54},
$$

where the second inequality follows from the assumption $\mathbb{E}[\|M(X) - \overline{P}\|^2_2] \leq \alpha^2 \leq \frac{d}{54}$.

To complete the proof, we will give an upper bound on $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}[Z_i]$ that contradicts the lower bound unless $n$ is sufficiently large. Consider any $i \in [n]$. Define:

$$\tilde{Z}_i^j = \left( \frac{\frac{1}{9} - (P^j)^2}{1 - (P^j)^2} \right) (M(X_{\sim i}) - P^j)(X_i^j - P^j)
\quad \text{and}
\tilde{Z}_i = \sum_{j=1}^{d} \tilde{Z}_i^j.$$
where $X_{\sim i}$ denotes $X$ with the $i$-th sample replaced with an independent draw from $P$. Since $X_{\sim i}$ and $X_i$ are conditionally independent conditioned on $P$, $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{Z}_i] = 0$. Also, we have:

$$\mathbb{E}[|\tilde{Z}_i|^2] = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{Z}_i^2] \leq \frac{1}{9} \mathbb{E}[\|M(X) - \mathbb{P}\|^2] \leq \frac{1}{9} \alpha^2$$

where the first inequality is Jensen’s. Furthermore, we have the following upper bound on the maximum value of $\tilde{Z}_i$ and $Z_i$:

$$\|Z_i\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{8}{d/81} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\tilde{Z}_i\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{8}{d/81}.$$

Now we can apply differential privacy to bound $\mathbb{E}[Z_i]$, using the fact that $X$ and $X_{\sim i}$ differ on at most one sample. The approach is akin to Lemma 8 of [SU17b]. The main idea is to split $Z_i$ into its positive and negative components $Z_i^+$ and $Z_i^-$, write each of them as $\mathbb{E}[Z_i^\ast] = \int_0^{\|Z_i\|_{\infty}} P[Z_i^\ast \geq t] \, dt$, and apply the definition of $(\varepsilon,\delta)$-approximate differential privacy to relate them to the similar quantities for $\tilde{Z}_i$. Implementing this strategy gives the following:

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_i] \leq \mathbb{E}[\tilde{Z}_i] + 2\varepsilon \cdot \mathbb{E}[Z_i] + 2\delta \cdot \|Z_i\|_{\infty} \leq 0 + 2\varepsilon \cdot 1 + 3d/32 \cdot 8d/81 \leq \frac{2}{3}\varepsilon + \frac{d}{108n}.$$

Note that we used the upper bound $e^\varepsilon - 1 \leq 2\varepsilon$ for $\varepsilon \leq 1$. Thus, we have:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[Z_i] \leq \frac{2}{3}\varepsilon n + \frac{d}{108}.$$

Combining the upper and lower bounds gives:

$$\frac{d}{54} \leq \frac{2}{3}\varepsilon n + \frac{d}{108} \iff n \geq \frac{d}{72\varepsilon}.$$

This completes the proof. \qed

**Lemma 6.4.** Let $P$ and $Q$ be two product distributions with mean vectors $p$ and $q$ respectively, such that $p_i \in [1/3, 2/3]$ for all $i \in [d]$. Suppose that

$$\|\mathbb{E}[P] - \mathbb{E}[Q]\|_2 \geq \alpha,$$

for any $\alpha \leq \alpha_0$, where $0 < \alpha_0 \leq 1$ is some absolute constant. Then $d_{TV}(P, Q) \geq C\alpha$, for some absolute constant, $C$.

**Proof.** Consider the set, $A = \{x \mid \log(P(x)/Q(x)) > \alpha\}$. If we show that $P(A) = \Omega(1)$, then we would have the following.

$$\forall x \in A \quad \frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} > e^{\alpha} \geq 1 + \alpha$$

$$\implies \forall x \in A \quad P(x) - Q(x) > \frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha} P(x) \geq \frac{\alpha}{2} P(x)$$

$$\implies P(A) - Q(A) > \frac{\alpha}{2} P(A)$$

$$\implies P(A) - Q(A) > \Omega(\alpha)$$

$$\implies d_{TV}(P, Q) > \Omega(\alpha).$$
To this end, let \( x = (x_1, \ldots, x_d) \in \{0, 1\}^d \). Then,

\[
P(x) = \prod_{i=1}^{d} p_i^{x_i}(1 - p_i)^{1-x_i} \quad \text{and} \quad Q(x) = \prod_{i=1}^{d} q_i^{x_i}(1 - q_i)^{1-x_i}.
\]

Therefore,

\[
Z(x) := \log(P(x)/Q(x)) = \log(P(x)) - \log(Q(x))
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{d} x_i \log \frac{p_i}{q_i} + \sum_{i=1}^{d} (1 - x_i) \log \frac{1 - p_i}{1 - q_i}
\]

\[
= - \sum_{i=1}^{d} x_i \log \frac{q_i}{p_i} - \sum_{i=1}^{d} (1 - x_i) \log \frac{1 - q_i}{1 - p_i}.
\]

Now, we lower bound \( Z(x) \) by some function of \( x \), so that if that function takes a value larger than \( \alpha \) with probability \( \Omega(1) \) (measured with respect to \( P \)), then \( Z(x) \geq \alpha \) with probability \( \Omega(1) \). Noting that \( \log(t) \leq t - 1 \) for all \( t > 0 \), we get the following:

\[
\log(P(x)/Q(x)) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{d} x_i \left( 1 - \frac{q_i}{p_i} \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{d} (1 - x_i) \left( 1 - \frac{1 - q_i}{1 - p_i} \right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{(x_i - p_i)(p_i - q_i)}{p_i(1 - p_i)}
\]

Let \( Y_i = \frac{(X_i - p_i)(p_i - q_i)}{p_i(1 - p_i)} \) be a transformation of the random variable \( X_i \sim P_i \). To be precise, it will have the following PMF:

\[
Y_i = \begin{cases} 
\frac{p_i - q_i}{p_i} & \text{w.p. } p_i \\
\frac{p_i - q_i}{1 - p_i} & \text{w.p. } 1 - p_i.
\end{cases}
\]

\( Y_i \) has the following properties:

\[
E[Y_i] = 0, \quad \sigma_i^2 = E[Y_i^2] = \frac{(p_i - q_i)^2}{p_i(1 - p_i)}, \quad \text{and} \quad E[Y_i^3] = \frac{(p_i - q_i)^3(p_i^2 + (1 - p_i)^2)}{p_i^2(1 - p_i)^2}.
\]

Let \( \sigma^2 = \sum_{i\in[d]} \sigma_i^2 \), and \( Y = \frac{1}{\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^{d} Y_i \). Hence, \( Z(x) \geq \sigma Y \) for all \( x \). At this point, it suffices to show that \( P[Y > \alpha/\sigma] \geq \Omega(1) \). We will do this in two parts: we show that if \( Y \) was a Gaussian with the same mean and variance, then this inequality would hold, and we also show that \( Y \) is well-approximated by said Gaussian. We start with the latter.

We apply the Berry-Esseen theorem \cite{Ber41, Ess42, She10} to approximate the distribution of \( Y \) by the standard normal distribution. Let \( \psi \) be the actual CDF of \( Y \), and \( \phi \) be the CDF of the standard normal distribution:

\[
|\psi(y) - \phi(y)| \leq C_1 \sigma^{-1} \cdot \max_i \left[ \frac{E[Y_i^3]}{E[Y_i^2]} \right]
\]

\[
= C_1 \sigma^{-1} \cdot \max_i \left( \frac{(p_i - q_i)(p_i^2 + (1 - p_i)^2)}{p_i(1 - p_i)} \right)
\]

\[
\leq \frac{5C_1}{2} \sigma^{-1} \cdot \max_i (p_i - q_i)
\]
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Here, \( C_1 = 0.56 \) is a universal constant. Now, we can assume that \( p_i - q_i \leq C_2 \alpha \) (for some constant \( C_2 \) of our choosing), otherwise \( d_{TV}(P, Q) > C_2 \alpha \) trivially. Note that, by our assumption on \( p_i \in [1/3, 2/3] \), we have the following:

\[
\sigma^2 = \sum_{i \in [d]} \frac{(p_i - q_i)^2}{p_i(1 - p_i)} \geq \frac{9}{2} \sum_{i \in [d]} (p_i - q_i)^2 = \frac{9}{2} \alpha^2.
\]

Therefore, \( \sigma \geq 2\alpha \), and we get the following:

\[
|\psi(y) - \phi(y)| \leq \frac{5C_1C_2}{4}.
\]

We now use this to prove an \( \Omega(1) \) lower bound on \( \mathbb{P}[Y > \alpha/\sigma] \).

\[
1 - \psi(\alpha/\sigma) > 1 - \phi(\alpha/\sigma) - \frac{5C_1C_2}{4}
\]

\[
= 1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{0}^{\alpha/\sigma} e^{-t^2} dt - \frac{5C_1C_2}{4}
\]

\[
\geq 1/2 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{\alpha}{\sigma} - \frac{5C_1C_2}{4}
\]

\[
\geq 1/2 - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{\alpha}{\sigma} - \frac{5C_1C_2}{4}
\]

\[
\geq 0.30 - \frac{5C_1C_2}{4}
\]

We want the above quantity to be a constant greater than zero. We could pick any “small enough” constant, so we pick 0.1. Therefore, by choosing \( C_2 < 0.16/C_1 \) (say 0.25), we guarantee that \( \mathbb{P}[Y > \alpha/\sigma] > 0.1 \). Hence, we have \( d_{TV}(P, Q) > 0.05\alpha \), which completes the proof.

6.2 Privately Learning Gaussian Distributions with Known Covariance

In this section, we will show a lower bound on the number of samples required to estimate the mean of a Gaussian distribution when its covariance matrix is known. The approach is similar to the product distribution case (Section 6.1), but with modifications required for the different structure and unbounded data.

**Theorem 6.5.** For any \( \alpha \leq 1 \) smaller than some absolute constant, any \( (\varepsilon, \delta) \)-DP mechanism (for \( \delta \leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{Rn}\right) \)) which estimates a Gaussian distribution (with mean \( \mu \in [-R, R]^d \) and known covariance \( \sigma^2 \)) to accuracy \( \leq \alpha \) in total variation distance with probability \( \geq 2/3 \) requires

\[
\Omega\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon \log(dR)}\right)
\]

samples.

While the expression for \( \delta \) might seem complex, one can note that if \( R = 1 \) and for \( d \geq 1 \), we have \( \delta = O\left(\frac{1}{n \sqrt{\log(n)}}\right) \), very similar to the statement of Lemma 6.2. Our statement is stronger and more general for settings of \( d \) and \( R \).
Proof. The proof is very similar to that of Theorem 6.1, so we only sketch the differences. To estimate the Gaussian to total variation distance $\alpha$, it is necessary to estimate the mean in $\ell_2$-distance to accuracy $\alpha \sigma$, evidenced by the following folklore fact (see, e.g., [DKK+18]):

**Fact 6.6.** The total variation distance between $\mathcal{N}(\mu_1, \sigma^2 \mathbb{I})$ and $\mathcal{N}(\mu_2, \sigma^2 \mathbb{I})$ is at least $C \frac{\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2}{\sigma}$, for an appropriate constant $C$, and all $\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma$ such that $\frac{\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2}{\sigma}$ is smaller than some absolute constant.

Similar to before, we can argue that the existence of such an algorithm implies the existence of an algorithm which is correct in expectation, at a multiplicative cost of $O(\log dR)$ in the sample complexity, as any estimate output by the algorithm is accurate up to $O(\sqrt{dR})$ in $\ell_2$-distance. Such an algorithm is precluded by Lemma 6.7 (noting that we must rescale $\alpha$ by a factor of $\sigma$), concluding the proof.

**Lemma 6.7.** If $M : \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \to [-R\sigma, R\sigma]^d$ is $(\epsilon, \delta)$-DP for $\delta \leq \frac{\sqrt{d}}{48\sqrt{2}Rn\sqrt{\log(48\sqrt{2}Rn/\sqrt{d})}}$, and for every Gaussian distribution $P$ with known covariance matrix $\sigma^2 \mathbb{I}$, such that $-R\sigma \leq \mathbb{E}[P] \leq R\sigma$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{X \sim P^{\otimes n}} \left[ \|M(X) - \mathbb{E}[P]\|_2^2 \right] \leq \alpha^2 \leq \frac{d\sigma^2 R^2}{6},$$

then $n \geq \frac{d\sigma}{24\alpha\epsilon}$.

**Proof.** By a scaling argument, we will focus on the case where $\sigma = 1$. We prove the following statement: If $M : \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \to [-R, R]^d$ is $(\epsilon, \delta)$-DP for $\delta \leq \frac{\sqrt{d}}{48\sqrt{2}Rn\sqrt{\log(48\sqrt{2}Rn/\sqrt{d})}}$, and for every Gaussian distribution $P$ with known covariance matrix $\mathbb{I}$ such that $-R \leq \mathbb{E}[P] \leq R$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{X \sim P^{\otimes n}} \left[ \|M(X) - \mathbb{E}[P]\|_2^2 \right] \leq \alpha^2 \leq \frac{dR^2}{6},$$

implies $n \geq \frac{d}{24\epsilon\alpha}$. Let $\mu^1, \ldots, \mu^d$ be chosen independently and uniformly at random from the interval $[-R, +R]$. Let $P$ be the Gaussian distribution with mean vector $\mu = (\mu^1, \ldots, \mu^d)$, and covariance matrix $\mathbb{I}$. Let $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ be independent samples from this Gaussian distribution. As in the proof of the lower bound for product distributions, we define the following quantities.

$$Z_i^j = (R^2 - (\mu^j)^2)(M^j(X) - \mu^j)(X_i^j - \mu^j)$$

$$Z_i = \sum_{j=1}^d Z_i^j$$

Again, our strategy would be to give upper and lower bounds on $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[Z_i]$, which would contradict each other unless $n$ is larger than some specific quantity. To obtain the lower bound, we first prove a lemma similar to Lemma 6.3.

**Lemma 6.8** (Fingerprinting Lemma for Gaussians). For every $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to [-R, R]$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu \sim [R,R], X_1, \ldots, X_n \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \mathbb{I})} \left[ (R^2 - \mu^2) \cdot (f(X) - \mu) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu) + (f(X) - \mu)^2 \right] \geq \frac{R^2}{3}.$$
Proof of Lemma 6.8. Define the function
\[ g(\mu) = \mathbb{E}_{X_1 \ldots n \sim N(\mu,1)} [f(X)]. \]

For brevity, we will write \( \mathbb{E}[\cdot] \) to indicate that the expectation is being taken over \( \mu \), where \( \mu \) is chosen uniformly from \( [-R, R] \). We use an adaptation of (12) to the Gaussian setting. From an extension of a similar statement in the full version of \([DSS+15]\), for every fixed \( \mu \),
\[ h(\mu) := \mathbb{E}_{X_1 \ldots n \sim N(\mu,1)} \left[ (R^2 - \mu^2) \cdot (f(X) - \mu) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_i - \mu) \right] = (R^2 - \mu^2) \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} g(\mu). \]

Therefore, we get:
\[ \mathbb{E}[h(\mu)] = 2 \mathbb{E}[\mu g(\mu)]. \]

Now, using the above, we get:
\[
\mathbb{E}_{\mu, X_1 \ldots n \sim N(\mu,1)} [(f(X) - \mu)^2] \geq \mathbb{E}[\mu^2] - 2 \mathbb{E}[\mu g(\mu)]
\]
\[
= \mathbb{E}[\mu^2] - \mathbb{E}[h(\mu)].
\]

Rearranging the above inequality gives:
\[
\mathbb{E}_{\mu, X_1 \ldots n \sim N(\mu,1)} [(f(X) - \mu)^2] + \mathbb{E}[h(\mu)] \geq \mathbb{E}[\mu^2] = \frac{R^2}{3}.
\]

Henceforth, all expectations are taken over \( \overline{\mu}, X, \) and \( M \). In the same way as in case of product distributions, we obtain the following bound,
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}[Z_i] = \sum_{j=1}^{d} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} Z^j_i \right] \geq \frac{dR^2}{3} - \mathbb{E}[\|M(X) - \mathcal{P}\|_2^2] \geq \frac{dR^2}{3} - \alpha^2 \geq \frac{dR^2}{6},
\]
(14)

where the second inequality follows from the assumption \( \mathbb{E}[\|M(X) - \mathcal{P}\|_2^2] \leq \alpha^2 \leq \frac{dR^2}{6} \). Now, to give an upper bound, we first define:
\[
\overline{Z}^j_i = (R^2 - (\mu^j)^2)(M(X_{\sim i}) - \mu^j)(X^j_i - \mu^j)
\]
\[
\overline{Z}^j_i = \sum_{j=1}^{d} \overline{Z}^j_i
\]
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where \( X_{-i} \) denotes \( X \) with the \( i \)-th sample replaced with an independent draw from \( P \). Because \( X_{-i} \) and \( X_i \) are independent conditioned on \( P \), \( \mathbb{E}[\tilde{Z}_i] = 0 \). Using similar calculations as in Lemma 6.2, we get the following.

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ |\tilde{Z}_i| \right]^2 \leq R^4 \alpha^2
\]

Observe that, in contrast to Lemma 6.2, we do not have a worst-case bound on the value of the statistic \( Z_i \), as the support of \( X_j^i \) is the real line, rather than just \( \{\pm 1\} \) as before. Consequently, we split the computation of the expectation of \( Z_i \) into \( Z_{i,+} \) and \( Z_{i,-} \) to get the following, for any \( T > 0 \).

\[
\mathbb{E}[Z_i] \leq \mathbb{E}[\tilde{Z}_i] + 2\varepsilon \cdot \mathbb{E}[|\tilde{Z}_i|] + 2\delta \cdot T + 2 \int_T^\infty \mathbb{P}[Z_{i,+} > t]dt \tag{15}
\]

Now,

\[
Z_{i,+} \leq \max \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^d (R^2 - (\mu^j)^2)(X^j_i - \mu^j)(M^j(X) - \mu^j), 0 \right\}
\]

\[
\leq \max \left\{ 2R^3 \sum_{j=1}^d (X^j_i - \mu^j), 0 \right\}
\]

\[
= \max \{Y_i, 0\},
\]

where \( Y_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 4R^3 d) \). Let \( W_i = \frac{Y_i}{2R^3 \sqrt{d}} \), and \( S = \frac{T}{2R^3 \sqrt{d}} \). This transformation results in \( W_i \) being a standard normal random variable. We perform a change of variables, and repeatedly use the inequality \( \operatorname{erfc}(x) \leq \exp(-x^2) \) in the following derivation:

\[
\int_T^\infty \mathbb{P}[Z_{i,+} > t]dt = 2R^3 \sqrt{d} \int_S^\infty \mathbb{P}[W_i > s]ds
\]

\[
\leq R^3 \sqrt{d} \int_S^\infty e^{-s^2/2} ds
\]

\[
= R^3 \sqrt{d} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erfc} \left( \frac{S}{\sqrt{2}} \right)
\]

\[
\leq R^3 \sqrt{\frac{d\pi}{2}} e^{-\frac{s^2}{2}}.
\]

\[
= R^3 \sqrt{\frac{d\pi}{2}} e^{-\frac{s^2}{8 R^3 d}}.
\]

We will upper-bound this by \( \delta T \):

\[
R^3 \sqrt{\frac{d\pi}{2}} e^{-\frac{t^2}{8 R^3 d}} \leq \delta T
\]

Equivalently,

\[
\frac{R^3}{\delta} \sqrt{\frac{d\pi}{2}} \leq T e^{\frac{t^2}{8 R^3 d}}
\]
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Consider setting $T = 2\sqrt{2}R^3\sqrt{d}\sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}$. The right-hand side of this inequality becomes

$$2\sqrt{2}R^3\sqrt{d}\sqrt{\log(1/\delta)} \cdot \frac{1}{\delta},$$

which is greater than the left-hand side for any $\delta < 1$.

Using (15), this gives us the following upper bound:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}[Z_i] \leq 2R^2\alpha\varepsilon n + 4\sqrt{2}R^3\sqrt{d}\delta\sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}$$

On the other hand, (14) gives us a lower bound on this quantity, and thus we require that the following inequality is satisfied:

$$\frac{dR^2}{12} \leq n\left(R^2\alpha\varepsilon + 2\sqrt{2}R^3\sqrt{d}\delta\sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}\right)$$

Our goal is to find conditions on $\delta$ such that the product involving this term is at most $\frac{dR^2}{24}$. If this holds, the corresponding term can be moved to the left-hand side, and we are left with the following inequality:

$$\frac{dR^2}{24} \leq nR^2\alpha\varepsilon,$$

which is satisfied when

$$n \geq \frac{d}{24\alpha\varepsilon},$$

as we desired.

Thus, it remains to find conditions on $\delta$ which satisfy the following inequality:

$$2\sqrt{2}R^3\sqrt{d}\delta\sqrt{\log(1/\delta)} \leq \frac{dR^2}{24n}.$$  

Rearranging, we get:

$$\delta\sqrt{\log(1/\delta)} \leq \frac{\sqrt{d}}{48\sqrt{2}Rn} \triangleq \phi.$$  

Consider setting $\delta = \frac{\phi}{2\sqrt{\log(1/\phi)}}$. This results in

$$\delta\sqrt{\log(1/\delta)} \leq \frac{\phi}{2\sqrt{\log(1/\phi)}} \cdot \sqrt{\log(1/\phi) + \log(2\sqrt{\log(1/\phi)})}$$

$$= \frac{\phi}{2} \cdot \sqrt{1 + \frac{\log(2\sqrt{\log(1/\phi)})}{\log(1/\phi)}}$$

$$\leq \phi,$$

where the last inequality is because $\sqrt{1 + \frac{2x^2}{x}} \leq 2$ for all $x \geq 0$.  

\[\Box\]
6.3 Privately Learning Gaussian Distributions with Unknown Covariance

In this section, we prove lower bounds for privately learning a Gaussian with unknown covariance.

**Theorem 6.9.** For any $\alpha \leq 1$ smaller than some absolute constant, any $\varepsilon$-DP mechanism which estimates a Gaussian distribution to accuracy $\leq \alpha$ in total variation distance with probability $\geq 2/3$ requires $n = \Omega\left(\frac{d^2}{\alpha^2}\right)$ samples.

**Proof.** The proof is again similar to that of Theorem 6.1, and we sketch the differences. The primary difference is that instead of considering algorithms which estimate the covariance matrix of the distribution in Frobenius norm, we consider algorithms which estimate the inverse of the covariance matrix. The reason is the following theorem of [DMR18], which states that if one fails to estimate the inverse of the covariance matrix of a Gaussian in Frobenius norm, then one fails to estimate the Gaussian in total variation distance:

**Theorem 6.10** (Theorem 3.8 of [DMR18]). Suppose there are two mean-zero Gaussian distributions $\mathcal{N}_1$ and $\mathcal{N}_2$, with covariance matrices $\Sigma_1$ and $\Sigma_2$, respectively. Furthermore, suppose that $\Sigma_1^{-1} - I$ and $\Sigma_2^{-1} - I$ are both zero-diagonal and have Frobenius norm smaller than some absolute constant. Then the total variation distance between $\mathcal{N}_1$ and $\mathcal{N}_2$ is at least $c_1 \|\Sigma_1^{-1} - \Sigma_2^{-1}\|_F - c_2(\|\Sigma_1^{-1} - I\|_F^2 + \|\Sigma_2^{-1} - I\|_F^2)$, for constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$.

Therefore, it suffices to show that there does not exist an algorithm which estimates the inverse of the covariance in Frobenius norm with probability $\geq 2/3$, where the inverse of the covariance matrix obeys the conditions of Theorem 6.10. As before, an algorithm which is accurate in expectation would imply the existence of such an algorithm, so we show that such an algorithm does not exist. We do this by applying a modification of Lemma 6.11. While this lemma is stated in terms of estimating the covariance matrix, we can obtain an identical statement for estimating the inverse of a covariance matrix by repeating the argument, with $\Sigma$ replaced by $\Sigma^{-1}$ at all points. Note that the construction in Lemma 6.11 obeys the conditions of Theorem 6.10. Furthermore, the Frobenius norm diameter of the construction is $\Theta(\alpha)$ (rather than $\text{poly}(d)$ as in Theorem 6.1), we do not lose an $O(\log d)$ factor when converting to an algorithm which is accurate in expectation. Therefore, the application of this modification completes the proof. □

**Lemma 6.11.** If $M : \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \rightarrow S$ is $\varepsilon$-DP (where $S$ is the space of all $d \times d$ symmetric positive semi-definite matrices), and for every $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ over $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\frac{1}{2}I \preceq \Sigma \preceq \frac{3}{2}I$, $\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma) \cap \mathcal{S}} \left[\|M(X) - \Sigma\|_F^2\right] \leq \alpha^2/64$,

then $n \geq \Omega\left(\frac{d^2}{\alpha^2}\right)$.

**Proof.** Let $P$ be the uniform distribution over the set of $d \times d$ symmetric matrices with 0 on the diagonal, where the $d^2 - d$ non-zero entries are $\{\pm \frac{\alpha}{2d}\}$. Note that there are $(d^2 - d)/2$ free parameters, and thus $2(d^2 - d)/2$ matrices. For each $v \in \text{supp}(P)$, we will define $\Sigma(v) = I + v$. It is easy to check that for all $v \in \text{supp}(P)$, that $\frac{1}{2}I \preceq \Sigma \preceq \frac{3}{2}I$, and furthermore, that for any $v, v' \in \text{supp}(P)$, $d_{TV}(\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma(v)), \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma(v'))) \leq O(\alpha)$ (Lemma 2.9). We assume that our algorithm is aware of this construction, and thus will always output a symmetric matrix with 1’s on the diagonal and off-diagonal entries bounded in magnitude by $\alpha/2d$. 
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Define the random variables $Z$ and $Z'$, which are sampled according to the following process. Let $V$ and $V'$ be independently sampled accordingly to $P$. $X$ is a set of $n$ samples from $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma(V))$, and similarly, $X'$ is a set of $n$ independent samples from $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma(V'))$. Then, $M(X)$ and $M(X')$ are computed with their own (independent) randomness. We then define:

$$Z = \langle M(X), V \rangle = 2 \sum_{i<j} M_{ij}(X) \cdot V_{ij},$$

$$Z' = \langle M(X'), V \rangle = 2 \sum_{i<j} M_{ij}(X') \cdot V_{ij}.$$

We start with the following claim which lower bounds the expectation of $Z$.

**Claim 6.12.** $\mathbb{E}[Z] \geq \frac{\alpha^2}{16} - \frac{1}{2} \|M(X) - \Sigma(V)\|_F^2 \geq \frac{7\alpha^2}{128}$.

**Proof.**

$$\mathbb{E}[2Z + \|M(X) - \Sigma(V)\|_F^2] = \sum_{i<j} \mathbb{E}[4M_{ij}(X)V_{ij} + 2(M_{ij}(X) - \Sigma_{ij}(V))^2]$$

$$= \sum_{i<j} \mathbb{E}[2M_{ij}^2(X) + 2\Sigma_{ij}^2(V)]$$

$$\geq \sum_{i<j} \mathbb{E}[2\Sigma_{ij}^2(V)]$$

$$= \sum_{i<j} \frac{\alpha^2}{2d^2}$$

$$= \frac{\alpha^2}{2} \cdot \frac{d^2 - d}{2d^2}$$

$$\geq \frac{\alpha^2}{8},$$

where the last inequality holds for any $d \geq 2$. The claimed statement follows by rearrangement, and the second inequality by the assumption on $\|M(X) - \Sigma(V)\|_F^2$. $\square$

Next, we show that $Z'$ will not be too large, with high probability.

**Claim 6.13.** $P[Z > \frac{\alpha^2}{32}] \leq \exp(-\Omega(d^2)).$

We begin by observing $M(X')$ and $V$ are independent. Condition on any realization of $M(X')$. Then $Z' \mid M(X')$ is the sum of $(d^2 - d)/2$ independent summands, each with contained in the range $[-\alpha^2/4d^2, \alpha^2/4d^2]$ and with expectation 0 (since $\mathbb{E}[V_{ij}] = 0$). By Hoeffding’s inequality, we have that

$$P[Z' > \frac{\alpha^2}{32} \mid M(X')] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{2^{1024}}{d^{2d^2} \cdot \alpha^4/4d^2}\right) \leq \exp(-\Omega(d^2)).$$

The claim follows by noting that value of $M(X')$ which we conditioned on was arbitrary. $\square$

**Claim 6.14.** $P[Z > \frac{\alpha^2}{32}] \leq \exp(O(\alpha \varepsilon n)) \cdot P[Z' > \frac{\alpha^2}{32}].$

**Proof.** We start by proving the following lemma:
Lemma 6.15. Let $M : \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \to A$ be an $\varepsilon$-DP mechanism. Suppose that $D, D'$ are probability distributions over $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that $d_{\text{TV}}(D, D') = \alpha$. Then for $S \subseteq A$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{M, X \sim D^n} [M(X) \in S] \leq \exp(O(\varepsilon \alpha n)) \mathbb{P}_{M, X' \sim D'n} [M(X') \in S].$$

Proof. By the definition of $D$ and $D'$, this implies that there exists distributions $A, B, C$ such that

$$D = \alpha B + (1 - \alpha) A \quad \text{and} \quad D' = \alpha C + (1 - \alpha) A.$$ 

We will actually prove the following for any subset $S \subseteq A$:

$$\mathbb{P}_{M, X \sim D^n} [M(X) \in S] \leq \exp(O(\varepsilon \alpha n)) \mathbb{P}_{M, X' \sim A^n} [M(X') \in S].$$

A symmetric argument, with $D'$ in place of $D$, and using the other direction of the definition of differential privacy will give the lemma statement (with an extra factor of 2 in the exponent).

We will draw $X, X'$ from a coupling of $(D, A)$. In particular, let $W \in \{0, 1\}^n$ be a random vector, where each entry is independently set to be 1 with probability $\alpha$ and 0 otherwise. Note that $Y(w) \triangleq \sum_i w_i$ is distributed as $\text{Bin}(n, \alpha)$. Then there exists a coupling $C$ of $(D, A)$ such that $X' \sim A^n$, and $X_i$ is equal to $X_i'$ when $W_i = 1$, and is an independent draw from $B$ otherwise.

$$\mathbb{P}_{X \sim D^n} [M(X) \in S] = \sum_w \mathbb{P}[W = w] \mathbb{P}_{(X, X') \sim C} [M(X) \in S | w]$$

$$\leq \sum_w \mathbb{P}[W = w] \exp(\varepsilon Y(w)) \mathbb{P}_{(X, X') \sim C} [M(X') \in S | w]$$

$$= \mathbb{P}_{X' \sim A^n} [M(X') \in S] \sum_w \mathbb{P}[W = w] \exp(\varepsilon Y(w))$$

$$= \mathbb{P}_{X' \sim A^n} [M(X') \in S] \mathbb{E}[\exp(\varepsilon Y(w))]$$

$$= (1 - \alpha + \alpha e^\varepsilon)^n \mathbb{P}_{X' \sim A^n} [M(X') \in S]$$

$$\leq \exp(\alpha (e^\varepsilon - 1)n) \mathbb{P}_{X' \sim A^n} [M(X') \in S]$$

$$\leq \exp(O(\alpha \varepsilon n)) \mathbb{P}_{X' \sim A^n} [M(X') \in S],$$

as desired. The first inequality uses the definition of differential privacy. We also used the moment generating function of the binomial distribution, and the fact that $e^\varepsilon - 1 = O(\varepsilon)$ for $\varepsilon < 1$. \qed
With this in hand, the proof is as follows:

\[
\mathbb{P}_{V, V' \sim P} \left[ Z > \alpha^2/32 \right] = \sum_{v, v'} \mathbb{P}_{V, V' \sim P} \left[ V = v, V' = v' \right] \mathbb{P}_{X \sim N(0, \Sigma(V))} \left[ Z > \alpha^2/32 | V, V' \right] \leq \exp(O(\alpha \varepsilon n)) \sum_{v, v'} \mathbb{P}_{V, V' \sim P} \left[ V = v, V' = v' \right] \mathbb{P}_{X \sim N(0, \Sigma(V'))} \left[ Z' > \alpha^2/32 | V, V' \right] = \exp(O(\alpha \varepsilon n)) \sum_{V, V' \sim P} \mathbb{P}_{X \sim N(0, \Sigma(V'))} \left[ Z' > \alpha^2/32 \right].
\]

The inequality follows using the lemma above, and noting that for any \( v, v' \in \text{supp}(P) \), that \( d_{TV}(N(0, \Sigma(V)), N(0, \Sigma(V'))) \leq O(\alpha) \).

With this in hand, we make the following observations. Claim 6.12 implies that \( \Omega(1) \leq \mathbb{P} \left[ Z > \alpha^2/32 \right] \). Claim 6.13 states that \( \mathbb{P} \left[ Z' > \alpha^2/32 \right] \leq \exp(-\Omega(d^2)) \). Using these together with Claim 6.14 gives us that \( \Omega(1) \leq \exp(O(\alpha \varepsilon n) - \Omega(d^2)) \), which implies that we require \( n \geq \Omega(d^2/\alpha \varepsilon) \) to avoid a contradiction.
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