arXiv:1911.05861v1 [cs.LG] 13 Nov 2019

Federated and Differentially Private Learning for Electronic Health Records

Stephen R. Pfohl[*]
Stanford University
spfohl@stanford.edu

Andrew M. Dai
Google Health
adai@google.com

Katherine Heller
Google Health
kheller@google.com

Abstract

The use of collaborative and decentralized machine learning techniques such as federated learning have the potential to enable the development and deployment of clinical risk predictions models in low-resource settings without requiring sensitive data be shared or stored in a central repository. This process necessitates communication of model weights or updates between collaborating entities, but it is unclear to what extent patient privacy is compromised as a result. To gain insight into this question, we study the efficacy of centralized versus federated learning in both private and non-private settings. The clinical prediction tasks we consider are the prediction of prolonged length of stay and in-hospital mortality across thirty one hospitals in the eICU Collaborative Research Database. We find that while it is straightforward to apply differentially private stochastic gradient descent to achieve strong privacy bounds when training in a centralized setting, it is considerably more difficult to do so in the federated setting.

1 Introduction

The availability of high quality public clinical data sets [1, 2] has greatly accelerated research into the use of machine learning for the development of clinical decision support tools. However, the majority of clinical data remain in private silos and are broadly unavailable for research due to concerns over patient privacy, inhibiting the collaborative development of high fidelity predictive models across institutions. Additionally, standard de-identification protocols provide limited safety guarantees against sophisticated re-identification attacks [3–5]. Furthermore, patient privacy may be violated even in the case where no raw data is shared with downstream parties, as trained machine learning models are susceptible to membership inference attacks [6], model inversion [7], and training data extraction [8].

In line with recent work [9, 10], we investigate the extent to which several hospitals can collaboratively train clinical risk prediction models with formal privacy guarantees without sharing data. In particular, we employ *federated averaging* [11] and *differentially private stochastic gradient descent* [12–14] to train models for in-hospital mortality and prolonged length of stay prediction across thirty one hospitals in the eICU Collaborative Research Database (eICU-CRD) [2].

1.1 Federated Learning

Federated learning [11] is a general technique for decentralized optimization across a collection of entities without sharing data, typically employed for training machine learning models on mobile devices. In the variant known as *federated averaging*, each entity trains a local model for a fixed number of epochs over the local training data and transfers the resulting weights to a central server.

[*]Work was done while an intern at Google Health

33rd Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2019), Vancouver, Canada
Machine Learning for Health (ML4H) at NeurIPS 2019 - Extended Abstract.

The server returns the average of the weights to each entity and the process repeats. This satisfies an intuitive notion of privacy, since no entity shares data with the central server or with any other entity. However, federated learning alone provides no formal accounting for the privacy cost incurred via the communication of local model weights with the central server.

1.2 Differential Privacy

Formally, a randomized algorithm $\mathcal{M}$: $\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \Theta$ with domain $\mathcal{D}$ and range Θ satisfies (ϵ, δ) differential privacy [15] if for any two adjacent data sets d, $d' \in \mathcal{D}$ and for any subset of outputs $S \in \Theta$,

$$P(\mathcal{M}(d) \in S) \leq e^{\epsilon} P(\mathcal{M}(d') \in S) + \delta. \quad (1)$$

In our case, the randomized algorithm $\mathcal{M}$ we consider is differentially private stochastic gradient descent (DP-SGD) [14, 13]. Here, adjacent data sets d, d' are defined by adding, removing, and modifying the data for one record. This formulation can be informally interpreted as one where the inclusion of a record does not affect the probability distribution over learned model weights by more than a factor ϵ, where δ bounds the probability of the restriction not holding. Notably, this notion allows us to bound and quantify the capability for an adversary to determine whether a record belonged to the training data set, regardless of their access to auxiliary information [15].

In practice, stochastic gradient descent can be made differentially private if the record-level gradients are clipped to a maximum L_2 norm S and the Gaussian noise with standard deviation σ added to the mean of the clipped gradients [13] over a batch of training data. The privacy loss over the procedure may then be accounted for with the moments accountant [14, 13] and Renyi differential privacy [16]. In this setting, the privacy cost of a training procedure is fully specified by the noise multiplier σ/S, the ratio of the batch size to the training set size, and the number of training steps [13]. McMahan et al. [12] demonstrate that it is straightforward to formulate federated learning in a way that is conducive to differentially private training if DP-SGD is used as the local optimization algorithm.

1.3 Related Work

Our work is most similar to Beaulieu-Jones et al. [9] in that they also investigate decentralized and differentially private machine learning in the context of mortality prediction in the context of the eICU-CRD, but use cyclical weight transfer [17] rather than federated averaging for distributed optimization. Another related technique is *split learning* [18–20] where the layers of a neural network are partitioned across several entities, enabling learning across entities that may contribute different data modalities without exposing the raw data or the local network architecture. As an alternative, recent work [21, 22] has proposed the use of differentially private generative models to publicly release synthetic data with privacy guarantees.

2 Methods

All experiments are based on data derived from the eICU Collaborative Research Database [2], a freely and publicly available intensive care database containing data from 139,367 unique patients admitted between 2014 and 2015 to 208 unique hospitals. Each patient may have one or more recorded hospital admissions, each composed of one or more ICU stays.

We make predictions at 24 hours into hospital admissions that last at least 24 hours. We assign binary outcome labels for in-hospital mortality and prolonged length of stay if the patient dies during the remainder of the hospital admission or if the admission last longer than 7 days, respectively.

To construct a training set for supervised learning, we first partition the set of admissions by hospital and then split the data within each hospital by patient such that 80%, 10%, and 10% of the patients are used for training, validation, and testing, respectively. We allow for multiple hospital admissions per patient, but no patient exists in more than one partition within the same hospital. We retain all hospitals with greater than 1,000 hospital admissions in its corresponding training data set. This procedure produces a cohort of 65,509 labeled hospital admissions across 31 unique hospitals. The incidence of in-hospital mortality and prolonged length of stay in the aggregate population is 7.3% and 34.4%, respectively.

We construct a feature representation as a function of data recorded within each hospital stay up to 24 hours into the stay. We extract all lab orders, lab results, medication orders, diagnoses, and

Table 1: Comparison of model performance for local, central, and federated training without differentially private training for each hospital and prediction task. Results shown are the estimates and 95% confidence intervals for the AUC-ROC for local training and the relative difference in central and federated AUC-ROC compared to local training. Bold indicates a statistically significant improvement over local training on the basis of zero not being contained within the confidence interval for the difference in the AUC-ROC relative to the local model.

	Prolonged Length of Stay			Hospital Mortality		
Hosp. ID (N)	Local Abs. AUC-ROC	Central Rel. AUC-ROC	Federated Rel. AUC-ROC	Local Abs. AUC-ROC	Central Rel. AUC-ROC	Federated Rel. AUC-ROC
73 (4,381)	0.803 (0.761, 0.845)	0.018 (-0.005, 0.042)	**0.030 (0.012, 0.047)**	0.791 (0.693, 0.890)	**0.049 (0.007, 0.090)**	0.025 (-0.007, 0.057)
264 (3,875)	0.631 (0.571, 0.690)	**0.058 (0.010, 0.106)**	**0.067 (0.021, 0.114)**	0.846 (0.785, 0.908)	0.015 (-0.015, 0.046)	-0.007 (-0.048, 0.034)
420 (3,167)	0.707 (0.648, 0.766)	**0.038 (0.003, 0.073)**	0.016 (-0.014, 0.046)	0.811 (0.729, 0.894)	0.036 (-0.006, 0.079)	0.019 (-0.017, 0.055)
338 (3,139)	0.648 (0.584, 0.712)	**0.098 (0.047, 0.149)**	**0.105 (0.056, 0.154)**	0.820 (0.722, 0.919)	0.042 (-0.011, 0.094)	**0.047 (0.008, 0.085)**
243 (3,026)	0.664 (0.595, 0.732)	**0.035 (0.003, 0.068)**	0.022 (-0.008, 0.052)	0.910 (0.864, 0.956)	-0.006 (-0.035, 0.023)	-0.025 (-0.066, 0.016)
458 (2,723)	0.739 (0.679, 0.798)	**0.042 (0.006, 0.078)**	**0.039 (0.004, 0.075)**	0.840 (0.754, 0.927)	0.049 (-0.034, 0.131)	0.030 (-0.034, 0.094)
167 (2,680)	0.773 (0.715, 0.831)	0.010 (-0.022, 0.042)	-0.006 (-0.039, 0.028)	0.845 (0.777, 0.914)	0.031 (-0.016, 0.078)	0.012 (-0.023, 0.048)
300 (2,678)	0.718 (0.652, 0.783)	0.040 (-0.002, 0.082)	0.023 (-0.009, 0.055)	0.699 (0.557, 0.841)	0.051 (-0.014, 0.116)	0.042 (-0.027, 0.112)
443 (2,666)	0.700 (0.637, 0.763)	0.037 (-0.002, 0.075)	**0.052 (0.013, 0.090)**	0.881 (0.816, 0.945)	0.001 (-0.040, 0.043)	-0.019 (-0.052, 0.013)
188 (2,591)	0.773 (0.716, 0.830)	0.014 (-0.021, 0.049)	0.011 (-0.022, 0.044)	0.850 (0.783, 0.917)	0.013 (-0.041, 0.067)	-0.003 (-0.062, 0.056)
208 (2,484)	0.663 (0.595, 0.730)	**0.090 (0.040, 0.140)**	**0.044 (0.010, 0.077)**	0.717 (0.596, 0.838)	**0.114 (0.007, 0.220)**	0.061 (-0.037, 0.159)
252 (2,449)	0.802 (0.748, 0.855)	0.026 (-0.011, 0.063)	0.011 (-0.022, 0.044)	0.829 (0.738, 0.920)	0.049 (-0.024, 0.122)	0.037 (-0.040, 0.113)
199 (2,215)	0.760 (0.695, 0.825)	0.016 (-0.024, 0.056)	0.015 (-0.026, 0.055)	0.838 (0.758, 0.918)	0.033 (-0.023, 0.089)	0.023 (-0.020, 0.066)
122 (2,103)	0.681 (0.608, 0.755)	-0.011 (-0.064, 0.042)	0.001 (-0.044, 0.046)	0.730 (0.605, 0.855)	0.049 (-0.014, 0.112)	0.045 (-0.010, 0.099)
176 (1,942)	0.696 (0.618, 0.775)	**0.066 (0.007, 0.124)**	**0.056 (0.019, 0.092)**	0.886 (0.819, 0.954)	0.039 (-0.009, 0.086)	0.039 (-0.003, 0.081)
281 (1,783)	0.620 (0.528, 0.712)	**0.169 (0.093, 0.244)**	**0.084 (0.030, 0.137)**	0.779 (0.605, 0.953)	**0.101 (0.006, 0.195)**	**0.129 (0.005, 0.252)**
411 (1,747)	0.726 (0.647, 0.806)	-0.011 (-0.057, 0.035)	-0.027 (-0.067, 0.013)	0.925 (0.875, 0.975)	-0.039 (-0.107, 0.029)	-0.010 (-0.048, 0.027)
413 (1,730)	0.709 (0.623, 0.795)	0.025 (-0.028, 0.078)	-0.008 (-0.058, 0.043)	0.809 (0.668, 0.951)	0.062 (-0.045, 0.169)	-0.146 (-0.303, 0.011)
449 (1,613)	0.801 (0.730, 0.872)	**0.051 (0.014, 0.088)**	**0.052 (0.016, 0.088)**	0.854 (0.777, 0.931)	0.031 (-0.016, 0.077)	0.014 (-0.019, 0.048)
394 (1509)	0.747 (0.666, 0.828)	-0.024 (-0.084, 0.037)	-0.012 (-0.051, 0.027)	0.896 (0.811, 0.981)	0.027 (-0.044, 0.097)	-0.010 (-0.054, 0.033)
283 (1,478)	0.603 (0.508, 0.698)	**0.084 (0.011, 0.156)**	**0.074 (0.012, 0.136)**	0.807 (0.684, 0.929)	0.082 (-0.029, 0.192)	0.038 (-0.056, 0.132)
307 (1,433)	0.639 (0.543, 0.735)	0.001 (-0.070, 0.072)	0.025 (-0.034, 0.084)	0.857 (0.750, 0.964)	0.026 (-0.056, 0.108)	0.029 (-0.041, 0.098)
331 (1,397)	0.668 (0.499, 0.836)	0.091 (-0.020, 0.203)	0.065 (-0.007, 0.137)	0.431 (0.204, 0.658)	**0.409 (0.076, 0.742)**	**0.308 (-0.028, 0.644)**
148 (1,386)	0.791 (0.717, 0.866)	-0.025 (-0.080, 0.029)	-0.025 (-0.083, 0.032)	0.815 (0.566, 1.000)	0.062 (-0.102, 0.225)	0.031 (-0.067, 0.130)
345 (1,372)	0.688 (0.599, 0.778)	0.054 (-0.020, 0.128)	0.040 (-0.028, 0.109)	0.769 (0.605, 0.934)	0.086 (-0.066, 0.237)	0.080 (-0.067, 0.227)
417 (1,369)	0.716 (0.629, 0.804)	**0.082 (0.018, 0.147)**	0.054 (-0.007, 0.116)	0.687 (0.518, 0.856)	**0.189 (0.018, 0.360)**	0.048 (-0.071, 0.167)
165 (1,336)	0.635 (0.536, 0.735)	0.024 (-0.043, 0.092)	0.045 (-0.012, 0.101)	0.595 (0.425, 0.765)	**0.337 (0.186, 0.487)**	**0.313 (0.175, 0.452)**
248 (1,334)	0.730 (0.641, 0.819)	0.009 (-0.048, 0.065)	0.036 (-0.011, 0.083)	0.777 (0.559, 0.995)	-0.012 (-0.099, 0.076)	-0.033 (-0.081, 0.016)
416 (1,330)	0.739 (0.648, 0.830)	**0.073 (0.012, 0.134)**	**0.050 (0.004, 0.096)**	0.675 (0.391, 0.959)	**0.203 (0.003, 0.403)**	**0.220 (0.048, 0.393)**
110 (1,305)	0.673 (0.565, 0.781)	**0.097 (0.001, 0.192)**	**0.075 (0.004, 0.147)**	0.947 (0.871, 1.000)	0.008 (-0.017, 0.033)	-0.028 (-0.079, 0.024)
183 (1,268)	0.746 (0.656, 0.835)	0.037 (-0.033, 0.108)	0.024 (-0.045, 0.093)	0.802 (0.627, 0.977)	-0.018 (-0.126, 0.090)	-0.002 (-0.059, 0.056)

active treatments, as well as the patient age at admission, gender, ethnicity, unit type, and admission source. Lab results and age are binned into three and four bins, respectively. We aggregate over time, assigning a one for each feature if it is observed anywhere in the admission prior to 24 hours and a zero otherwise.

For all supervised learning tasks, we consider only logistic regression and feedforward networks with one hidden layer. We perform model selection on the basis of the area under the receiver operating curve (AUC-ROC) evaluated on the corresponding validation set following a grid search over relevant hyperparameters. Model performance is reported as the 95% confidence interval of the AUC-ROC on the corresponding test set derived via DeLong's Method [23]. We similarly derive confidence intervals for the difference in the AUC-ROC between models to facilitate model comparisons.[2] The Adam [24] optimizer is used in each case.

2.1 Experimental Design

We conduct a series of experiments designed to evaluate the relative benefits of centralized and federated learning, and the associated privacy costs, over learning using only local data at each hospital. We evaluate the following experimental conditions:

- **Local training with no collaboration**. We identify a high performing model for each hospital using only data from that hospital following a grid search over learning rates, batch size, and hidden layer size if the model is a feedforward network.
- **Centralized training**. We simulate the setting where all of the records are available in a central repository, selecting the best global model on the basis of the performance on the aggregated records and evaluate the model on the local data from each hospital.
- **Centralized training with differential privacy**. We modify the centralized training procedure to use DP-SGD for optimization [13]. Here we additionally search over the discrete grid of [0.1, 1, 10] for both the noise multiplier σ/S and the gradient clipping threshold S. We assess privacy in terms of the ϵ that results from training with a fixed $\delta = 10^{-5}$.

[2]It should be noted that this procedure produces a *confidence interval for the difference* in the AUC-ROC between models, taking into account the correlated nature of the predictions made by two models.




Figure 1: Trade-off between the differential privacy ϵ and validation AUC-ROC for $\sigma/S = 1.0$, $S = 10.0$ over a training procedure of 25 epochs.

- **Federated learning**. We employ the federated averaging algorithm described in McMahan et al. [11]. For each round of federated learning, we conduct one epoch of training using the local data at each hospital and then synchronize the weights across all hospitals with an average. We maintain a record of the local performance at each hospital over the federated learning procedure and perform local model selection on the basis of the best validation AUC-ROC observed over the procedure. Model selection for the best federated hyperparameters is determined on the basis of the best mean local validation AUC-ROC across hospitals.
- **Federated learning with differential privacy**. We repeat the federated averaging experiment as previously described, but use DP-SGD as the local optimizer at each hospital, similar to the algorithm described in McMahan et al. [12]. We experiment with fixed global DP-SGD hyperparameters and with local hyperparameters selected independently at each hospital. For the local hyperparameter search at each hospital, we use $\delta = 10^{-5}$, $\sigma/S = 1$, and S selected log uniformly from $[0.1, 1, 10]$, performing model selection on the basis of the DP-SGD hyperparameters that maximize local AUC-ROC in ten epochs of training without any collaboration. We then perform federated learning for ten rounds with the selected local DP-SGD hyper-parameters.

3 Results and Discussion

Prior to experimentation with differentially private training, we aimed to establish the efficacy of federated learning over centralized and local learning. We find that while there is often a benefit to federated learning over local learning, often attaining an AUC-ROC comparable with that of centralized learning, the improvements are often not large enough to be rendered statistically significant on the basis of the 95% confidence interval for the difference in AUC-ROC between either the central or federated model with the corresponding local model (Table 1). In particular, centralized and federated learning for prediction of prolonged length of stay improve on local learning for thirteen and twelve hospitals, respectively, whereas centralized and federated learning only benefit mortality prediction in seven and five cases, respectively.

When the records from all hospitals are aggregated for differentially private centralized training, it is feasible to attain relatively strong privacy guarantees ($\epsilon \approx 1$) if $\sigma/S = 1.0$ and $S = 10.0$ (Figure 1) with a relatively minor reduction in terms of the validation AUC-ROC at the end of training (prolonged length of stay 0.763 vs. 0.73; mortality 0.876 vs. 0.832). When attempting to perform federated learning in a differentially private manner, we find that even with DP-SGD hyperparameters selected on the basis of local training, the models derived from differentially private federated learning often perform poorly in terms of both AUC-ROC and ϵ, and that this effect is exacerbated for mortality prediction (Table S1). It is likely that a practical tuning strategy for differentially private federated averaging could be identified with further experimentation, but it is unclear if such a strategy would generalize to similar data sets and prediction tasks. This is problematic, for both this and related work, as neglecting to account for the privacy cost of model selection produces optimistic underestimates of the privacy costs [25, 26]. In future work, it is of interest to conduct controlled experiments to directly compare our approach to cyclical weight transfer [9] and split learning [18–20] to gain insight into the relative efficacy of differentially private federated averaging over alternatives.

Acknowledgments

We thank Michaela Hardt and Abhradeep Thakurta for valuable mentorship and feedback. We further thank Steve Chien and all contributors to the Tensorflow Privacy project for enabling this work.

References

[1] Alistair EW Johnson, Tom J Pollard, Lu Shen, H Lehman Li-wei, Mengling Feng, Mohammad Ghassemi, Benjamin Moody, Peter Szolovits, Leo Anthony Celi, and Roger G Mark. Mimic-iii, a freely accessible critical care database. *Scientific data*, 3:160035, 2016.

[2] Tom J Pollard, Alistair EW Johnson, Jesse D Raffa, Leo A Celi, Roger G Mark, and Omar Badawi. The eicu collaborative research database, a freely available multi-center database for critical care research. *Scientific data*, 5, 2018.

[3] Khaled El Emam, Elizabeth Jonker, Luk Arbuckle, and Bradley Malin. A systematic review of re-identification attacks on health data. *PloS one*, 6(12):e28071, 2011.

[4] Aris Gkoulalas-Divanis, Grigorios Loukides, and Jimeng Sun. Publishing data from electronic health records while preserving privacy: A survey of algorithms. *Journal of biomedical informatics*, 50:4–19, 2014.

[5] Daniel Kleppner and P Sharp. Committee on ensuring the utility and integrity of research data in a digital age. *National Academy of Sciences*, page 4, 2009.

[6] Reza Shokri, Marco Stronati, Congzheng Song, and Vitaly Shmatikov. Membership inference attacks against machine learning models. In *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 3–18. IEEE, 2017.

[7] Matt Fredrikson, Somesh Jha, and Thomas Ristenpart. Model Inversion Attacks that Exploit Confidence Information and Basic Countermeasures. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security - CCS '15*, pages 1322–1333, New York, New York, USA, 2015. ACM Press. ISBN 9781450338325. doi: 10.1145/2810103.2813677. URL http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?doid=2810103.2813677.

[8] Nicholas Carlini, Chang Liu, Jernej Kos, Úlfar Erlingsson, and Dawn Song. The Secret Sharer: Measuring Unintended Neural Network Memorization & Extracting Secrets. feb 2018. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1802.08232.

[9] Brett K. Beaulieu-Jones, William Yuan, Samuel G. Finlayson, and Zhiwei Steven Wu. Privacy-Preserving Distributed Deep Learning for Clinical Data. dec 2018. URL http://arxiv.org/abs/1812.01484.

[10] Praneeth Vepakomma, Tristan Swedish, Ramesh Raskar, Otkrist Gupta, and Abhimanyu Dubey. No Peek: A Survey of private distributed deep learning. dec 2018. URL http://arxiv.org/abs/1812.03288.

[11] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Aguera y Arcas. Communication-Efficient Learning of Deep Networks from Decentralized Data. In Aarti Singh and Jerry Zhu, editors, *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 54 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1273–1282, Fort Lauderdale, FL, USA, 20–22 Apr 2017. PMLR. URL http://proceedings.mlr.press/v54/mcmahan17a.html.

[12] H. Brendan McMahan, Daniel Ramage, Kunal Talwar, and Li Zhang. Learning Differentially Private Recurrent Language Models. oct 2017. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1710.06963.

[13] H. Brendan McMahan, Galen Andrew, Ulfar Erlingsson, Steve Chien, Ilya Mironov, Nicolas Papernot, and Peter Kairouz. A General Approach to Adding Differential Privacy to Iterative Training Procedures. dec 2018. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1812.06210.

[14] Martin Abadi, Andy Chu, Ian Goodfellow, H. Brendan McMahan, Ilya Mironov, Kunal Talwar, and Li Zhang. Deep learning with differential privacy. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, CCS '16, pages 308–318, New York, NY, USA, 2016. ACM. ISBN 978-1-4503-4139-4. doi: 10.1145/2976749.2978318. URL http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2976749.2978318.

[15] Cynthia Dwork, Aaron Roth, and Others. The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy. *Foundations and Trends® in Theoretical Computer Science*, 9(3–4):211–407, 2014.

[16] I. Mironov. Rényi differential privacy. In *2017 IEEE 30th Computer Security Foundations Symposium (CSF)*, pages 263–275, Aug 2017. doi: 10.1109/CSF.2017.11.

[17] Ken Chang, Niranjan Balachandar, Carson Lam, Darvin Yi, James Brown, Andrew Beers, Bruce Rosen, Daniel L Rubin, and Jayashree Kalpathy-Cramer. Distributed deep learning networks among institutions for medical imaging. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association : JAMIA*, 25(8):945–954, mar 2018. ISSN 1527-974X. doi: 10.1093/jamia/ocy017. URL https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29617797https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6077811/.

[18] Otkrist Gupta and Ramesh Raskar. Distributed learning of deep neural network over multiple agents. *Journal of Network and Computer Applications*, 116:1–8, 2018.

[19] Praneeth Vepakomma, Otkrist Gupta, Tristan Swedish, and Ramesh Raskar. Split learning for health: Distributed deep learning without sharing raw patient data. dec 2018. URL http://arxiv.org/abs/1812.00564.

[20] Praneeth Vepakomma, Otkrist Gupta, Abhimanyu Dubey, and Ramesh Raskar. Reducing leakage in distributed deep learning for sensitive health data.

[21] Brett K Beaulieu-Jones, Zhiwei Steven Wu, Chris Williams, Ran Lee, Sanjeev P Bhavnani, James Brian Byrd, and Casey S Greene. Privacy-preserving generative deep neural networks support clinical data sharing. *Circulation: Cardiovascular Quality and Outcomes*, 12(7): e005122, 2019.

[22] Liyang Xie, Kaixiang Lin, Shu Wang, Fei Wang, and Jiayu Zhou. Differentially Private Generative Adversarial Network. feb 2018. URL http://arxiv.org/abs/1802.06739.

[23] E R DeLong, D M DeLong, and D L Clarke-Pearson. Comparing the areas under two or more correlated receiver operating characteristic curves: a nonparametric approach. *Biometrics*, 44 (3):837–45, sep 1988. ISSN 0006-341X. URL http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3203132.

[24] Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.

[25] Jingcheng Liu and Kunal Talwar. Private Selection from Private Candidates. nov 2018. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.07971.

[26] Kamalika Chaudhuri and Staal A Vinterbo. A stability-based validation procedure for differentially private machine learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2652–2660, 2013.

Table S1: Model performance and privacy ϵ attained at each hospital following federated differentially private learning. Results shown are the best AUC-ROC on the validation set achieved over with early-stopping over ten rounds of federated learning. Prior to federated learning, the DP-SGD hyperparameters are selected separately at each hospital to maximize the local AUC-ROC after ten epochs of local differentially private training.

		Prolonged Length of Stay		Hospital Mortality	
Hospital ID	N	AUC-ROC	ϵ	AUC-ROC	ϵ
73	4,381	0.623	6.117	0.312	22.598
264	3,875	0.633	10.298	0.472	0.258
420	3,167	0.580	1.569	0.491	0.369
338	3,139	0.652	1.281	0.528	0.376
243	3,026	0.707	11.217	0.381	11.611
458	2,723	0.615	4.831	0.289	4.687
167	2,680	0.727	4.644	0.460	4.644
300	2,678	0.592	12.352	0.723	11.121
443	2,666	0.587	21.097	0.466	0.497
188	2,591	0.676	8.306	0.501	7.701
208	2,484	0.542	17.209	0.420	11.636
252	2,449	0.550	1.010	0.362	2.274
199	2,215	0.549	13.064	0.393	0.482
122	2,103	0.575	8.744	0.458	1.999
176	1,942	0.591	15.196	0.453	0.256
281	1,783	0.640	1.780	0.330	1.321
411	1,747	0.455	4.298	0.523	0.385
413	1,730	0.606	4.902	0.592	2.170
449	1,613	0.440	0.468	0.521	2.010
394	1,509	0.679	2.880	0.473	0.700
283	1,478	0.539	4.307	0.533	0.300
307	1,433	0.563	2.788	0.344	17.944
331	1,397	0.483	17.387	0.710	2.988
148	1,386	0.557	4.481	0.255	1.633
345	1,372	0.597	12.883	0.607	0.214
417	1,369	0.620	3.545	0.606	4.578
165	1,336	0.667	4.307	0.439	4.094
248	1,334	0.533	0.639	0.579	2.596
416	1,330	0.642	27.024	0.444	19.941
110	1,305	0.647	4.636	0.337	11.508
183	1,268	0.554	0.307	0.405	0.396