An Empirical Study on the Intrinsic Privacy of Stochastic Gradient Descent

Stephanie L. Hyland and Shruti Tople
Microsoft Research Cambridge
firstname.lastname@microsoft.com

ABSTRACT
In this work, we take the first step towards understanding whether the intrinsic randomness of stochastic gradient descent (SGD) can be leveraged for privacy, for any given dataset and model. In doing so, we hope to mitigate the trade-off between privacy and performance for models trained with differential-privacy (DP) guarantees. Our primary contribution is a large-scale empirical analysis of SGD on convex and non-convex objectives. We evaluate the inherent variability in SGD on 4 datasets and calculate the intrinsic data-dependent $\epsilon_i(D)$ values due to the inherent noise. First, we show that the variability in model parameters due to random sampling almost always exceeds that due to changes in the data. We use this to show that the existing theoretical bound on the sensitivity of SGD with convex objectives is not tight. For logistic regression, we observe that SGD provides intrinsic $\epsilon_i(D)$ values between 3.95 and 23.10 across four datasets, dropping to between 1.25 and 4.22 using the tight empirical sensitivity bound. For neural networks considered, we report high $\epsilon_i(D)$ values (>40) owing to their larger parameter count. Next, we propose a method to augment the intrinsic noise of SGD to achieve the desired target $\epsilon$. Our augmented SGD produces models that outperform existing approaches with the same privacy target, closing the gap to noiseless utility between 0.03% and 36.31% for logistic regression. We further explore the role of the number of steps of SGD, and demonstrate that our analysis provides stable estimates. Our experiments provide concrete evidence that changing the seed in SGD has a far greater impact on the model’s weights than excluding any given training example. By accounting for this intrinsic randomness - subject to necessary assumptions, we can achieve a consistent and statistically significant improvement in utility, without sacrificing further privacy.

1 INTRODUCTION
Respecting the privacy of people contributing their data to train machine learning models is important for the safe use of this technology [15, 41, 46]. Private variants of learning algorithms have been proposed to address this need [7, 16, 38, 44, 48]. Unfortunately the utility of private models is typically degraded, limiting their applicability. This performance loss often results from the need to add noise during or after model training, to provide the strong protections of $\epsilon$-differential-privacy [12]. However, results to date neglect the fact that learning algorithms are often stochastic. Framing them as ‘fixed’ queries on a dataset neglects an important source of intrinsic noise. Meanwhile, the randomness in learning algorithms such as stochastic gradient descent (SGD) is well-known among machine learning practitioners [14, 19], and has been lauded for affording superior generalisation to its non-stochastic counterpart [24]. Moreover, the ‘insensitive’ nature of SGD relative to variations in its input data has been established in terms of uniform stability [18]. The data-dependent nature of this stability has also been characterised [27]. Combining these observations, we speculate that the variability in the model parameters produced by the stochasticity of SGD may exceed its sensitivity to perturbations in the specific input data, affording ‘data-dependent intrinsic’ privacy. In essence, we ask: “Can the intrinsic, data-dependent stochasticity of SGD help with the privacy-utility trade-off?”

Our Approach. We consider a scenario where a model is trained securely, but the final model parameters are released to the public - for example, a hospital which trains a prediction model on its own patient data and then shares it with other hospitals or a cloud provider. We therefore focus on how SGD introduces randomness in the final weights of a trained model. This randomness is introduced from two main sources — (1) random initialization of the model parameters and (2) random sampling of the input dataset during training. We highlight that training a model on the same data, even with the same initialisation produces different final weights, purely due to the random order of traversal for that given dataset (shown in Figure 1). We argue that rather than viewing this variability as a pitfall of stochastic optimisation, it can instead be seen as a source of noise that can mask information about participants in the training data. This prompts us to investigate whether SGD itself can be viewed as a differentially-private mechanism, with some intrinsic data-dependent $\epsilon$-value, which we refer to as $\epsilon_i(D)$. To
calculate $\epsilon_i(D)$, we propose a novel method that characterises SGD as a Gaussian mechanism and estimates the intrinsic randomness for a given dataset, using a large-scale empirical approach. To the best of our knowledge, ours is the first work to report the empirical calculation of $\epsilon_i(D)$ values based on the observed distribution. Finally, we propose an augmented differentially-private SGD algorithm that takes into account the intrinsic $\epsilon_i(D)$ to provide better utility. We empirically compute the $\epsilon_i(D)$ for SGD and the utility improvement for models trained with both convex and non-convex objectives on 4 different datasets: MNIST, CIFAR10, Forest Cover-type and Adult. We also explore the impact of data preprocessing, the number of steps of SGD, and demonstrate that our empirical estimates are stable.

Contributions. We summarize our contributions below:

- **Variability in SGD**: We empirically show that on both convex and non-convex objectives the variability due to randomness in SGD for our benchmark datasets almost always exceeds the sensitivity due to changes in the data. This effect is magnified when both model initialisation and dataset traversal order are allowed to vary. This variability also exceeds existing theoretical upper bounds on the sensitivity in SGD for our benchmark datasets almost always exceeds the sensitivity due to randomness in SGD. We focus on private learning algorithms [23]. For non-convex objectives the variability due to randomness in SGD for our benchmark datasets almost always exceeds the sensitivity due to changes in the data. This effect is magnified when both model initialisation and dataset traversal order are allowed to vary. This variability also exceeds existing theoretical upper bounds on the sensitivity for convex objectives, motivating further research into data-dependent sensitivity bounds.

- **Computing data-dependent intrinsic $\epsilon_i(D)$ values**: We propose a first concrete technique to compute the data-dependent intrinsic $\epsilon_i(D)$ values from the output distribution of model parameters trained using SGD. These $\epsilon_i(D)$ values range from 3.95 to 23.10 (1.25 to 4.22 with an empirical sensitivity estimate) for convex objectives, indicating that randomness in SGD does contribute toward privacy for some tasks similar to that achieved with dedicated private learning algorithms [23]. For non-convex objectives we consider higher-dimensional neural network models, which exhibit much higher $\epsilon_i(D)$ values and therefore do not enjoy appreciable utility benefits. We further characterise the distribution of ‘pairwise’ $\epsilon_i(D)$ values, computed using local sensitivity estimates.

- **Utility Evaluation**: We empirically evaluate and compare the utility of private, low-dimensional models with and without accounting for the intrinsic variability in SGD. We focus on $(\epsilon, \delta)$-differential privacy with $\epsilon = 1$ and $\delta = 1/N^2$ with $N$ as training data size. We find a statistically significant improvement across all datasets considered, closing the gap to the accuracy of a noiseless model by up to 6.46%. This improvement increases to between 2.54% and 36.31% when the (tight) empirical sensitivity bound is used.

2 PROBLEM & BACKGROUND

We study the variability due to random sampling, and sensitivity to dataset perturbations of stochastic gradient descent (SGD). We relate these to the privacy properties of SGD and demonstrate that this variability can be used to improve the utility of private models.

2.1 Preliminaries

As we focus on $(\epsilon, \delta)$-differential privacy, we provide a brief outline below, as well as an overview of the SGD algorithm.

**Differential Privacy.** Differential privacy hides the participation of an individual sample in the dataset [12]. Informally, it ensures that the presence or absence of a single data point in the input dataset does not appreciably change the output of a differentially private query on that dataset. It is formally defined as follows:

**Definition 2.1** $(\epsilon, \delta)$-Differential Privacy. A mechanism $M$ with domain $I$ and range $O$ satisfies $(\epsilon, \delta)$-differential privacy if for any two neighbouring datasets $S, S' \in I$ that differ only in one input and for a set $E \subseteq O$, we have: $\Pr(M(S) \in E) \leq e^\epsilon \Pr(M(S') \in E) + \delta$

The $(\epsilon, \delta)$-differential privacy ensures that for all adjacent datasets $S$ and $S'$, the privacy loss of any individual datapoint is bounded by $\epsilon$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$ [13]. A well established method to design $\epsilon$-differentially private mechanism is to add noise proportional to the $\ell_1$ or $\ell_2$ sensitivity of the algorithm’s output to a change in a single input sample. We consider an algorithm whose output is the weights of a trained model, thus focus on the $\ell_2$-sensitivity:

**Definition 2.2** $(\ell_2$-Sensitivity From Def 3.8 in [13]). Let $f$ be a function that maps a dataset to a vector in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Let $S, S'$ be two datasets such that they differ in one input point. Then the $\ell_2$-sensitivity of a function $f$ is defined as: $\Delta_2(f) = \max_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \|f(S) - f(S')\|_2$

One such method for making a deterministic query $f$ differentially private is the Gaussian mechanism:

**Theorem 2.3** From [13] Let $f$ be a function that maps a dataset to a vector in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ be arbitrary. For $c^2 > 2 \ln(1.25/\delta)$, adding Gaussian noise sampled using the parameters $\sigma \geq c \Delta_2(f)/\epsilon$ guarantees $(\epsilon, \delta)$-differential privacy.

This gives a way to compute the $\epsilon$ of a Gaussian-distributed query given $\delta$, its sensitivity $\Delta_2(f)$, and its variance $\sigma^2$.

**Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD).** SGD and its derivatives are the most common optimisation methods for training machine learning models [4]. Given a loss function $\mathcal{L}(w, (x, y))$ averaged over a dataset, SGD provides a stochastic approximation of the traditional gradient descent method by estimating the gradient of $\mathcal{L}$ at random inputs. At step $t$, on selecting a random sample $(x_t, y_t)$ the gradient update function $G$ performs $w_{t+1} = G(w_t) = w_t - \eta \nabla_w \mathcal{L}(w_t, (x_t, y_t))$, where $\eta$ is the (constant) step-size or learning rate, and $w_t$ are the weights of the model at $t$. In practice, the stochastic gradient is estimated using a mini-batch of $B$ samples. We consider the typical scenario where the dataset is shuffled in each epoch, and batches are selected sequentially without replacement. This approach provides better convergence properties [21, 40], however we expect other variants to share the variability we study.

Recently, Wu et al. [48] showed results for the sensitivity of SGD to the change in a single training example for a convex, $L$-Lipschitz and $\beta$-smooth loss $\mathcal{L}$. We use this sensitivity bound in our analyses to compute intrinsic $\epsilon_i(D)$ for convex functions.

Let $A$ denote the SGD algorithm using $r$ as the random seed. The upper bound for sensitivity for $k$-passes of SGD with learning rate $\eta$ is given by

$$\hat{\Delta}_S = \max_r \|A(r; S) - A(r; S')\| \leq 2kL\eta$$

(1)

$\hat{\Delta}_S$ gives the maximum difference in the model parameters due to the presence or absence of a single input sample. When trained
using a batch size of $B$, the sensitivity bound can be reduced by a factor of $B$ i.e., $\delta_S \leq 2k\ln\eta/B$. We provide detailed explanation for this sensitivity and variability of SGD in Appendix A.1 and A.2. Throughout the paper, the theoretical sensitivity always refers to the one with batch size $B$. We use this theoretical sensitivity in addition to empirically-computed sensitivity estimates in our experiments to compute the $\epsilon_i(\mathcal{D})$ for models trained using convex loss functions. For the non-convex models, no known theoretical sensitivity is established and hence we use only empirical sensitivity values to compute $\epsilon_i(\mathcal{D})$ values.

We can intuitively motivate why the random seed may have a larger impact than changes to the data samples by observing that two models trained with different random seeds will have differing examples in almost every batch. For optima with multiple minima, this poses an opportunity for SGD to widely explore the parameter space, potentially drowning out sensitivity to individual input samples.

\subsection{2.2 Threat Model}

In our threat model, SGD itself is the query that the adversary requests on a private dataset and model parameters are the output that it receives. That is, we assume the training with SGD happens in-house and only the final model parameters are released. For example, a hospital trains a model for disease detection using its private patient records and uploads the model to a cloud provider for other hospitals to benefit from it. Here, the cloud provider or anyone with access to the model parameters is considered as an adversary. The adversary therefore has access to the fully trained model, including its architecture, and we assume details of the training procedure are public (e.g. batch size, number of training iterations, learning rate), but not the random seed used to initialise the model parameters and sample inputs from the dataset. Thus, we consider a powerful adversary that has white-box access to the model. Prior research has shown several attacks such as membership inference and model inversion that can compromise the privacy of the training dataset in this setting [15, 41]. We assume that each individual contributes one sample, and that leaking even this membership in the dataset poses a privacy risk to the user contributing the sample. Our goal is to protect the privacy of the training dataset such as the sensitive patient health records while maintaining reasonable utility from the trained model.

Assuming the random seed is unknown to the adversary adds noise to the output of SGD, which may add plausible deniability, and thus privacy to dataset participants. While seed-dependent results pose a reproducibility and reliability challenge, we argue that this randomness is helpful for ensuring privacy. We limit our scope to only seed-dependent randomness and do not consider variability introduced by hiding other hyperparameters such as batchsize and learning rate.

\subsection{2.3 Research Questions}

We formulate our problem with the following questions:

1. \textbf{Does the variability in SGD exceed the sensitivity due to changes in an individual input sample?}

To answer this, we present a large-scale empirical study in Section 6.1 across several diverse datasets. We build on results from Hardt et al. [18] and Wu et al. [48] that allow us to bound the (expected) difference in the model parameters when trained with SGD using a convex objective function. For non-convex objectives, we empirically compute the sensitivity due to changes in an input sample and variability due to randomness for different combination of neighbouring datasets.

2. \textbf{Can we quantify the data-dependent intrinsic privacy of SGD, if any?}

To quantify the ‘data-dependent intrinsic privacy’ of SGD, we aim to calculate the intrinsic $\epsilon_i(\mathcal{D})$ values for any given dataset. This $\epsilon_i(\mathcal{D})$ estimate allows us to comment on the potential privacy afforded by SGD and compare across datasets. For this, we propose a novel algorithm to calculate the $\epsilon_i(\mathcal{D})$ values for a model trained using SGD (Section 3), under some assumptions. Essentially, we interpret the posterior distribution returned by SGD computed with many random seeds as a Gaussian distribution and estimate its parameters using both theoretical (for convex loss) and empirical sensitivity bounds. We then empirically compute $\epsilon_i(\mathcal{D})$ values for our target datasets (Section 6.2).

3. \textbf{Can the intrinsic privacy of SGD improve utility?}

We question whether the intrinsic privacy can be leveraged to improve the utility of privacy-preserving models trained with SGD. We propose an augmented DP-SGD algorithm based on the output perturbation technique [3, 7, 44, 48]. Section 4 gives the details of this algorithm, and Section 6.3 gives the evaluation for utility improvements.

\section{3 \hspace{1em} \textbf{ESTIMATING $\epsilon_i(\mathcal{D})$ FOR SGD}}

We think of SGD as a procedure for sampling model weights from some distribution, and aim to understand the parameters of this distribution to characterise its intrinsic privacy with respect to a dataset it is run on. While theoretically characterising SGD as a sampling mechanism is a subject of ongoing research [29], in this section, we propose an algorithm for \textit{empirically estimating} the potential privacy properties of SGD. We outline and motivate the steps of the algorithm in what follows, and summarize the procedure in Algorithm 1.

\textbf{Computing $\epsilon_i(\mathcal{D})$.} We aim to compute what we call the ‘data-dependent intrinsic’ $\epsilon$ of SGD $- \epsilon_i(\mathcal{D})$.\footnote{Although the notation does not capture it, we assume an implicit model-dependence of $\epsilon_i(\mathcal{D})$ throughout.} To do this, we start by assuming that the noise of SGD is normally distributed. This is a common albeit restrictive assumption [29, 43]. We empirically test the assumption across our datasets in Section 7.4 and do not find it to be strongly violated, however we consider weakening this assumption an important future step.

If $A$ is the SGD algorithm, and $S$ is a training dataset of size $N$ (for example, MNIST), we therefore assume $A(S) = w_S + w_p$, where $w_S$ is deterministic and \textit{dataset-dependent} and $w_p \sim N(0, \sigma_i(\mathcal{D})^2)$ is the intrinsic random noise induced by the stochasticity of SGD. Based on Theorem 2.3 in Section 2.1, we then characterize SGD as a Gaussian mechanism with parameters $\epsilon^2 > 2\ln(1.25/\delta)$ and $\sigma_i(\mathcal{D}) \geq c\Delta_f(\mathcal{I})/\epsilon_i(\mathcal{D})$. The value of $\delta$ is arbitrary, but we set it to $\delta = 1/N^2$ following convention [13].
We assume we have access to a public dataset from which this value is estimated for designing better differentially-private mechanisms [32]. Estimating $\hat{\epsilon}$ is similar to the notion of smooth sensitivity for a parameter $\epsilon$.

Theorem 4.1. Assuming SGD is a Gaussian mechanism with intrinsic noise $\sigma_i(D)$, Algorithm 2 is $(\epsilon, \delta)$-differentially private.

The proof is a straightforward application of the fact that the sum of Gaussians is a Gaussian, and so the construction in Algorithm 2 produces the desired value of $\sigma$ to achieve a $(\epsilon, \delta)$-differentially private mechanism as per Theorem 2.3.

We found that other choices for estimating an aggregate $\sigma_i(D)$, such as computing a per-weight $\sigma_i(D)_r^b$ and then averaging, or estimating the variance of the norm of the weights, produced largely consistent results. It is likely that a superior method for estimating $\sigma_i(D)$ exists, which we leave as a question for future work.
Algorithm 2 Augmented differentially private SGD

1. Given $\sigma_i(D)$, $\epsilon_{\text{target}}$, $\delta$, $\Delta_i(f)$, model weights $w_{\text{private}}$.
2. $c \leftarrow \sqrt{\log(1.25)/\delta} + 1 \times 10^{-5}$
3. $\sigma_{\text{target}} \leftarrow c\Delta_i(f)/\epsilon_{\text{target}}$
4. if $\sigma_i(D) < \sigma_{\text{target}}$ then
5. $\sigma_{\text{augment}} \leftarrow \sqrt{\sigma_{\text{target}}^2 - \sigma_i(D)^2}$
6. else
7. $\sigma_{\text{augment}} \leftarrow 0$
8. $\rho \sim N(0, \sigma_{\text{augment}})$
9. $w_{\text{public}} \leftarrow w_{\text{private}} + \rho$
10. return $w_{\text{public}}$

5 EMPIRICAL STUDY

To better understand both sensitivity and variability of SGD, we conduct an extensive empirical study. Our broad objective is to understand and quantify the variability in the weights of a trained model, and to relate this variability to the data-dependent intrinsic privacy of the algorithm. Our evaluation goals are three-fold:

1. Quantify and compare the variability of SGD arising from changes in data and/or random seed
2. Compute the intrinsic $\epsilon_i(D)$ of SGD that quantifies how much privacy the stochasticity of SGD provides to this dataset
3. Evaluate the utility of a private model accounting for this intrinsic noise in SGD

5.1 Experimental design

At a high level, we run a grid of experiments where we aim to vary data or (non-exclusively) the random seed. We use variations of the random seed to explore the intrinsic randomness in SGD, and variations of the data to explore sensitivity to dataset perturbations. We describe these two variations in more detail in the following sections.

5.1.1 Variation in Data. To vary the data, we consider ‘neighbouring’ datasets derived from a given data source $D$ (e.g. two variants of MNIST). A pair of datasets is neighbouring if they differ in exactly one example. Comparing models trained on neighbouring datasets allows us to estimate the sensitivity of the training algorithm for that dataset and hence give us data-dependent sensitivity values.

To construct a set of datasets which are all neighbours, we use an approach similar to Hardt et al. [18]. We define a set of datasets $\{S_i\}$ where $S_i$ is the original data source where its $i^{th}$ entry $x_i$ has been replaced by (wlog) the first example $x_0$. We then drop the first example from the training data, as it appears again in some later position. In this way, the derived datasets $S_1$ and $S_2$ differ in that the former is missing $x_0$, and latter is missing $x_j$ (each contains $x_0$ in the $i^{th}$ and $j^{th}$ positions respectively). It is important to replace the ‘missing’ entry to ensure that for a fixed seed (and thus order of dataset traversal), the mini-batches sampled from $S_1$ and $S_2$ differ only when they would encounter the $i^{th}$ and $j^{th}$ elements.

It is possible that for a pair $(S_i, S_j)$, the choice of $x_0$ to replace the missing elements may produce a lower apparent sensitivity than finding the $x_k$ to maximise the distance between $S_i$ and $S_j$ - this is a limitation of the way we have designed this analysis, but it significantly reduces the computational complexity.

5.1.2 Variation in Random Seed. To vary the random seed, we simply run each experiment (on given dataset $S_i$) multiple times with different seeds provided to the random number generator. As machine learning frameworks are often quite high level, we carefully ensured all relevant random number generators were initialised correctly and there were no further sources of randomness in our experiments. The random seed impacts the training procedure by impacting the initialisation of the weights, as well as the order of traversal of the dataset. For illustration we also consider a variant of this setting where the initialisation of the model is fixed, corresponding to fine-tuning a public (albeit poor) model. We follow the traditional setting of SGD where a random permutation (determined by the random seed) is applied to the training data at the start of each epoch, and batches of examples are sequentially drawn without replacement.

5.2 Training and model details

5.2.1 Benchmark datasets. Primarily focusing on binary classification tasks, we perform our experiments using four data sources:

- CIFAR2[26]: We convert the (32, 32, 3)-dimensional images in CIFAR10 to $d = 50$ using principal component analysis (PCA) [37], and restrict to classes 0 and 2 (planes and birds) to form a binary classification task (hence CIFAR2).
- MNIST-binary[28]: As with CIFAR2 we use 2 classes (3 and 5) and project to $d = 50$ with PCA.
- Adult[11]3: The task is to predict whether an individual’s income exceeds $50k/year based on census data from 1994. We one-hot encode categorical-valued features, dropping the first level.
- Forest[9, 11]4: Forest cover type prediction from cartographic information. We convert this to a binary task by subsetting to classes 1 and 2, which are the most numerous.

Adult and Forest are tabular datasets, while MNIST-binary and CIFAR2 consist of images. The sizes and dimensionality of these datasets are given in Table 1. CIFAR, MNIST and Adult have pre-specified test sets. For Forest we randomly select 15% of examples to form the test set. We form a validation set by selecting 10% of the data remaining after removing the test set in all cases. This validation set is used to select hyperparameters and convergence point. Final model performance is reported on the test set. Each dataset is normalised such that $|x_i| \leq 1$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Training size</th>
<th>Validation size</th>
<th>Test size</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIFAR2</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNIST-binary</td>
<td>10,397</td>
<td>1,155</td>
<td>1,902</td>
<td>50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>29,305</td>
<td>3,256</td>
<td>16,281</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>378,783</td>
<td>42,086</td>
<td>74,272</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Statistics for benchmark datasets. The dimension of feature vectors is $d$. CIFAR2 and MNIST-binary are originally (32, 32, 3) and (28, 28) respectively, but were projected to $d = 50$ using PCA.

3https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/Adult
4https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/Covertype
Table 2: Training and model hyperparameters. \( \eta \) is the fixed learning rate, \( T \) is the number of training steps (we take this as the convergence point of the model). \( E \) is the number of experiments performed, and \( P \) is the number of parameters in the model. For logistic regression models \( P = d + 1 \). LogReg refers to logistic regression models, and NN to neural networks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>( \eta )</th>
<th>( T )</th>
<th>( E )</th>
<th>( P )</th>
<th>Hidden size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LogReg</td>
<td>CIFAR2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MNIST-binary</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>16900</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3400</td>
<td>25700</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>8400</td>
<td>20693</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NN</td>
<td>CIFAR2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MNIST-binary</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4750</td>
<td>9800</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>11250</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>11247</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.2 Models and training. We focus on both convex and non-convex objectives by considering two model classes:

1. Logistic regression. Using a standard cross-entropy loss, the objective function for logistic regression is convex and Lipschitz with constant \( L = \sup_{x} \|x\| \) and smooth with \( \beta = \sup_{x} \|x\|^2 \).

As we normalize all datasets to \( \|x\| \leq 1 \) and our models have a bias term, we have \( L = \sqrt{2} \) for logistic regression models.

2. Neural networks. We consider fully-connected neural networks with one hidden layer, using a relu nonlinearity and a sigmoid activation on the output. In this case the Lipschitz constant is unknown and we can’t use theoretical sensitivity bounds, computing only empirical sensitivity \( \hat{\Delta}^e \).

For both model classes, we train with a fixed learning rate\(^5\) and select the convergence point based on the validation performance failing to improve three times in a row, or by visual assessment of loss curves (see e.g. Figure 6). Validation performance was computed every 50 or 100 batches. We evaluate at the convergence point to avoid studying models which overfit. This is important for both reducing generalisation error, and for preserving privacy as we do not expect reasonable privacy overfitting. For logistic regression we expect models to converge to a neighbourhood of the unique (data-dependent) minimum of the convex loss rather than overfit in the typical sense. In this case, we would expect the sensitivity of SGD to depend purely on the sensitivity of the optimum itself to dataset perturbations. If the size of the neighbourhood around this optimum (dictated by the fixed learning rate) is too small (relative to the sensitivity of the optimum), we would expect privacy loss. Therefore, for both convex and non-convex models we consider early stopping important. The impact of the choice of stopping point is explored in Section 7.2.

We performed mild, but not extensive hyperparameter optimisation as our focus is not on finding the best-performing model. We used a batch size of 32 for all datasets, except for Forest where \( B = 50 \), to replicate [48]. Resulting hyperparameters of models and the training algorithm are shown in Table 2. The batch size, learning rate, and convergence point appear in the theoretical sensitivity bound (Theorem A.1) and we further expect these parameters to influence the variability of the resulting weight distribution. As we are focusing on the impact of the random seed however, for the purpose of this investigation we consider them fixed.

5.2.3 Implementation details. Experiments were implemented in Keras[8] and TensorFlow[1], with Sacred[17] for experiment management. Wrangling of results and generation of figures relied on scikit-learn [37], pandas [30], matplotlib [20], and seaborn [47]. Model parameters were initialised according to the ‘glorot-uniform’ setting in Keras, which is default. Biases were initialised to zero. Experiments were run on one Tesla P100 and two Tesla K80s on Azure Data Science Virtual Machines. We plan to make our source code available publicly.

6 RESULTS

In this section, we report our empirical results across four datasets, aimed at understanding the data-dependent variability of SGD and its potential to improve private model performance. We explore how changes in random seed and perturbations to the dataset manifest in the resulting model weights (Section 6.1), we estimate the resulting intrinsic \( \sigma_l(D) \) and \( \epsilon_l(D) \) (Section 6.2), and demonstrate the impact on utility of accounting for the intrinsic noise \( \sigma_l(D) \) (Section 6.3).

6.1 Data-dependent variability in SGD

We consider two sources of variability in the learned model: dataset perturbations, and choice of random seed. We aim to estimate:

1. Variation due to dataset: \( \Delta_S := \| A(r; S) - A(r; S') \| \)
2. Variation due to seed: \( \Delta_V := \| A(r; S) - A(r'; S) \| \)
3. Variation in both: \( \Delta_{S+V} := \| A(r; S) - A(r'; S') \| \)

where \( r \) and \( r' \) are two random seeds, \( S \) and \( S' \) are two neighbouring datasets, and \( A \) is the SGD algorithm which outputs a vector of model weights. We study how the variability due to seed (\( \Delta_{V, x}^{\text{fix}} \) and \( \Delta_{V, x}^{\text{vary}} \)) compares to the data sensitivity \( \Delta_S \). We also test the tightness of the theoretical bound proposed in [18, 48] (\( \hat{\Delta}_S \)) for convex objectives.

Figure 2 shows the distribution of these quantities across experiments for the four datasets and two model classes considered. We make the following observations:

- In almost all cases, \( \Delta_{V, x}^{\text{vary}} > \Delta_S \), indicating that changing the seed almost always has a larger impact than perturbing the dataset. This supports our intuition that choice of random seed has a larger impact on the resulting model weights than small changes to the data. Put another way, the variability due to randomness appears to exceed the algorithmic stability of SGD. The overlap between \( \Delta_{S+V} \) and \( \Delta_V \) also indicates that changes in the seed account for most of the change in the model weights.

- Where available, the theoretical bound \( \hat{\Delta}_S \) (vertical dashed line) is quite loose for all datasets, often exceeding the largest observed value of \( \Delta_S \) by a factor between 3.15 and 6.46. This suggests that even without accounting for intrinsic noise in SGD, existing approaches are likely over-estimating the sensitivity of SGD.
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Figure 2: Distribution of $\|w-w'\|$ across pairs of experiments differing in data ($\Delta_S$), random seed ($\Delta_{V^{\text{fix}}}$, $\Delta_{V^{\text{vary}}}$), or both ($\Delta_{V^{\text{fix}}+V^{\text{vary}}}$). The change in $w$ is dominated by the random seed, as evidenced by $\Delta_{V^{\text{vary}}}$ tending to be much larger than $\Delta_S$. $\Delta_{V^{\text{fix}}}$ refers to the setting where the random seed is variable, but the initialisation of the model is fixed. The vertical dashed line is the theoretical upper bound of $\Delta_S$ proposed by [48] (only available for convex objectives). The first row shows results for logistic regression, and the second is for a fully-connected neural network with one hidden layer.

| and the second is for a fully-connected neural network with one hidden layer. |

... and adding unnecessary noise for the desired privacy guarantees.

- Allowing the initialisation of the model to depend on the seed further increases variability due to seed, and we see $\Delta_{V^{\text{vary}}}$ exceeds even the theoretical bound $\Delta_S$.

- The results are qualitatively the same for logistic regression and the neural network, however we observe a longer tail in the distribution of $\Delta_{V^{\text{fix}}}$ for neural networks. This indicates that in a small number of cases, a dataset perturbation can produce a change in the final model weights comparable to changing the random seed. Upon investigation, we suspect this behaviour is caused by situations where the differing data point is encountered near the start of training, a phenomenon also observed by [18].

- Comparing across datasets, we see that the gap between $\Delta_{V^{\text{vary}}}$ and $\Delta_{V^{\text{fix}}}$ is smallest for Forest using logistic regression. We speculate that this is caused by the larger (fixed) learning rate used for Forest - even if the model converges quickly to the vicinity of the unique minimum, a larger learning rate extends the size of this vicinity and subsequently the variability in weights. For the neural network on Forest, which uses the same learning rate the other datasets, the gap between $\Delta_{V^{\text{vary}}}$ and $\Delta_{V^{\text{fix}}}$ no longer appears to deviate.

6.2 What is the ‘intrinsic’ $\sigma_i(D)$ and $\epsilon_i(D)$?

To estimate the intrinsic $\sigma_i(D)$ and $\epsilon_i(D)$ of SGD for each dataset, we follow the procedures outlined in Section 3 and Algorithm 1, using the large grid of experiments on the four datasets. We first obtain an estimate of the sensitivity of SGD for that dataset, using the theoretical bound $\Delta_S$ where available, or the empirical sensitivity estimate $\Delta_S^*$ which is simply taken as the max of $\Delta_S$ as defined in the previous section. We then estimate the variability due to seed ($\sigma_i(D)$) using the variable initialisation setting, and combine with $\delta = 1/N^2$ to obtain $\epsilon_i(D)$ and $\epsilon_i(D)^*$ using theoretical and empirical sensitivity estimates respectively.

These values for each dataset and the two model classes are shown in Table 3. It is clear that $\sigma_i(D)$ and $\Delta_S^*$ differ across datasets and models. We further make the following observations:

- The intrinsic $\epsilon_i(D)$ computed for logistic regression greatly exceeds the $\epsilon_i(D)^*$ computed using the empirical bound, reflecting again the looseness of the theoretical bound. Both of these values decrease as $N$ increases, despite $\delta$ decreasing with $1/N^2$. For neural networks, while Forest still exhibits the lowest $\epsilon_i(D)^*$, the same trend is not visible. While $\sigma_i(D)$ is relatively similar across logistic regression models, in the non-convex case it exhibits more complex dataset dependence.

Table 3: Theoretical sensitivity ($\Delta_S$), empirical sensitivity ($\Delta_S^*$), privacy parameter $\delta$ ($1/N^2$), intrinsic variability $\sigma_i(D)$ accounting for variable initialisation, intrinsic $\epsilon_i(D)$, and intrinsic $\epsilon_i(D)^*$ computed using the empirical bound. For results on neural networks (last 3 lines), no theoretical sensitivity bound is available and so only $\epsilon_i(D)^*$ can be estimated.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>and the second is for a fully-connected neural network with one hidden layer.</th>
<th>CIFAR2</th>
<th>MNIST-binary</th>
<th>Adult</th>
<th>Forest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\delta$</td>
<td>1.23x10^{-5}</td>
<td>9.25x10^{-5}</td>
<td>1.16x10^{-7}</td>
<td>6.97x10^{-12}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta_S$</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta_S^*$</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_i(D)$</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\epsilon_i(D)$</td>
<td>23.10</td>
<td>18.17</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\epsilon_i(D)^*$</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta_S^*$</td>
<td>4.813</td>
<td>7.688</td>
<td>3.891</td>
<td>3.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_i(D)$</td>
<td>0.4433</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\epsilon_i(D)^*$</td>
<td>65.922</td>
<td>66.009</td>
<td>87.136</td>
<td>42.939</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Theoretical sensitivity ($\Delta_S$), empirical sensitivity ($\Delta_S^*$), privacy parameter $\delta$ ($1/N^2$), intrinsic variability $\sigma_i(D)$ accounting for variable initialisation, intrinsic $\epsilon_i(D)$, and intrinsic $\epsilon_i(D)^*$ computed using the empirical bound. For results on neural networks (last 3 lines), no theoretical sensitivity bound is available and so only $\epsilon_i(D)^*$ can be estimated.
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Figure 3: Distribution of pairwise intrinsic $\epsilon_i(D)$. A relatively small number of dataset pairs (with fixed seed) contribute a rightward skew to the pairwise $\epsilon_i(D)$ distribution. We use the distance between the weights of models trained on pairs of datasets ($\Delta_S$) to estimate a 'local' sensitivity for pairwise $\epsilon_i(D)$ calculations.

space, increasing $\sigma_i(D)$. Although neural networks have larger $\sigma_i(D)$, the sensitivity $\Delta_S$ is much larger, resulting in very high $\epsilon_i(D)^\star$. This is partially driven by the number of parameters in the model as $\Delta_S^2$ is the $\ell_2$-norm of a vector (and $\sigma_i(D)$ is not), but also depends on the number of training steps. We further discuss this phenomenon in Section 7.2.

Table 3 highlights that our analysis of SGD necessarily depends on the underlying dataset, motivating further study into data-dependent differentially-private mechanisms [27, 32].

6.2.1 ‘Pairwise’ $\epsilon_i(D)^\star$. To further explore the impact of the dataset, in Figure 3 we show the distribution of ‘pairwise $\epsilon_i(D)^\star$’. The pairwise $\epsilon_i(D)^\star$ is computed by replacing the global empirical sensitivity $\Delta_S^2$ and variability $\sigma_i(D)$ with values estimated off pairs of adjacent datasets. That is, we use the ‘local’ sensitivity ($\|A(r;S) - A(r;S^\prime)\|$; described in Section 3 and comprising the $\Delta_S$ curves in Figure 2) and the estimate of $\sigma_i(D)$ using only the pair of adjacent datasets (with all available random seeds). This produces a distribution of $\epsilon_i(D)^\star$ values - one for each pair of datasets.

We find empirically that our estimate of $\sigma_i(D)$ does not greatly depend on which dataset instance we use (see Section 7.4), so the pairwise $\epsilon_i(D)^\star$ largely reflects the local sensitivity of the dataset, and $\epsilon_i(D)^\star$ then approximately corresponds to the maximum across pairwise $\epsilon_i(D)^\star$. We observe in several cases that $\epsilon_i(D)^\star$ is dominated by a small number of dataset pairs with high pairwise $\epsilon_i(D)^\star$.

This suggests that constraining to a lower-sensitivity subset of the data space could allow for a lower $\epsilon_i(D)^\star$. This observation aligns with the idea of dataset-specific smooth sensitivity that is always lower than the global sensitivity. Our empirical approach of calculating $\epsilon_i(D)^\star$ and the sampling-based approach for computing smooth-sensitivity of a function ($f$) both rely on the assumption that $f$ can be approximated using publicly available data [32].

6.3 How does accounting for intrinsic variability improve utility?

We have seen that the intrinsic $\epsilon_i(D)$ of SGD can be quantified, but in many cases is insufficient alone to provide a desirable level of privacy. In this section, we demonstrate that by accounting for $\epsilon_i(D)$ (via $\sigma_i(D)$), model performance can be improved over an existing approach based solely on output perturbation.

We focus here only on logistic regression. As evidenced by Table 3, the neural networks we study do not exhibit practically useful $\epsilon_i(D)$ values. Adding noise to such high-dimensional models, even accounting for the tight empirical bound on the sensitivity, and the enhanced variability due to randomness in the initialisation, tends to destroy their utility and so we exclude the analysis of performance here. We leave developing strategies for more realistic high-capacity models to future work.

To study ‘private’ model performance we apply the procedure described in Section 4 and Algorithm 2. In essence, we compute the target $\sigma$ of the Gaussian mechanism to produce a private model using output perturbation, and modify it for three scenarios:

(1) Noiseless ($\sigma = 0$)
(2) ‘SGD as deterministic’ (SGD$_\Delta$): the setting in [48]. We estimate the required $\sigma(\sigma_{\text{target}})$ using the Gaussian mechanism and the sensitivity $\Delta_S$ of SGD.
(3) ‘SGD with unknown seed’ (SGD$_\epsilon$); thinking of SGD as a randomised mechanism, we estimate the required $\sigma$ as $\sigma_{\text{augment}} = \sqrt{\sigma_{\text{target}}^2 - \sigma_i(D)^2}$

We also include the setting where the sensitivity is computed empirically to determine $\sigma_{\text{target}}$, corresponding to the optimistic bound.

For a single trained model, we compare these settings by sampling a standard Gaussian noise vector once, and scaling it according to the required $\sigma$. As the performance of each trained model varies (even in the noiseless setting), to compare the improvement attributable to treating SGD as random we perform paired t-tests between the settings for a fixed model. This allows us to detect consistent improvement even when the underlying noiseless performance changes. In Table 4, we report the utility for $\epsilon = 1$. We include $\epsilon = 0.5$ in Appendix Table 7. We use 500 randomly-sampled models for each dataset to compute these results.

We see that the ‘augmented DP-SGD’ (SGD$_\epsilon$) setting produces a model with consistently and significantly superior utility to one which does not take intrinsic randomness into account. The magnitude of the improvement - although statistically significant - is typically quite small, reflecting the relatively large intrinsic $\epsilon_i(D)^\star$. Accounting for intrinsic privacy nonetheless helps in closing the gap to the accuracy of a noiseless model by up to 6.46%. Using the empirical bound $\Delta_S$ produces a more obvious improvement in utility, closing the gap between 2.54% and 36.31%, providing further
motivation to tighten the bound on the sensitivity of SGD. Further work will be required to explore whether SGD can be engineered to produce increased $\sigma_i(\mathcal{D})$ without impacting sensitivity or utility, allowing for further improvements to private model performance.

7 FURTHER ANALYSES

In this section we augment our main findings of Section 6 with further analyses. To better understand the impact of data preprocessing we explore three variants of MNIST-binary (Section 7.1), and investigate how the number of training steps $T$ influences both sensitivity and variability in Section 7.2. In Section 7.3 we report results for a convolutional neural network on the full MNIST dataset. Finally, we explore the validity of our assumptions and experimental design in Section 7.4.

7.1 Effect of preprocessing dataset

As we have seen, there is variation in the values of $\sigma_i(\mathcal{D})$ and $\epsilon_i(\mathcal{D})$ across datasets. To further explore the data-dependence of our findings, we performed variants of the experiment within a dataset (MNIST-binary), where we apply different dimensionality reduction methods before applying the logistic regression model:

1. (PCA) Principal component analysis, as in [2], to $d = 50$
2. (GRP) Gaussian random projections, as in [48], to $d = 50$
3. (Crop) Cropping to the $10 \times 10$ central square of the image and flattening ($d = 100$)

In all cases, we still scale $||x|| \leq 1$.

Table 4: We report the (binary) accuracy of private and non-private ('gold standard') models on the four datasets for logistic regression using $\epsilon = 1$. SGD$_d$ is the setting in [48] where SGD is treated as deterministic and noise is added to the weights per the Gaussian mechanism. SGD$_t$ is the setting we propose, where the intrinsic variability ($\sigma_i(\mathcal{D})$) is used to decrease the magnitude of added noise. Reported are averages across 500 trained models, with brackets showing the standard deviation in the final digit. Bold face indicates the set-
vation we propose, where the intrinsic variability ($\sigma_i(\mathcal{D})$) is used to decrease the magnitude of added noise. Reported are averages across 500 trained models, with brackets showing the standard deviation in the final digit. Bold face indicates the best performance for each dataset.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>CIFAR2</th>
<th>MNIST-binary</th>
<th>Adult</th>
<th>Forest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noiseless</td>
<td>0.788(4)</td>
<td>0.953(1)</td>
<td>0.8340(7)</td>
<td>0.771(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$$\Delta_2(f) = \hat{\Delta}_S$$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SGD$_d$</th>
<th>SGD$_t$</th>
<th>% of gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noiseless</td>
<td>0.719(2)</td>
<td>0.853(2)</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGD$_t$</td>
<td>+0.0002</td>
<td>+0.0020</td>
<td>+0.0013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of gap</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>6.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$$\Delta_2(f) = \hat{\Delta}_S$$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SGD$_d$</th>
<th>SGD$_t$</th>
<th>% of gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noiseless</td>
<td>0.763(4)</td>
<td>0.941(2)</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGD$_t$</td>
<td>+0.0006</td>
<td>+0.0067</td>
<td>+0.0023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of gap</td>
<td>2.54%</td>
<td>5.25%</td>
<td>14.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: A comparison of training set loss (binary cross-entropy) and accuracy as a function of training steps for the three preprocessing approaches tested on MNIST-binary. The selected convergence point ($T = 1850$) is indicated by a vertical dashed line.

Figure 5: A comparison of feature values in three variants of MNIST-binary using either PCA preprocessing, Gaussian random projections (GRP), or cropping to the central ($10 \times 10$) square and flattening (Crop).

Figure 4 shows how this preprocessing changes the underlying dataset statistics. For Crop, the data remains sparse (46% of feature values are zero), while PCA and GRP produce dense symmetrical distributions with differing levels of kurtosis.

In Figure 5 we show the training curves aggregated across experiments from each of these settings using the fixed learning rate of $\eta = 0.5$. We also tested other learning rates, but they did not strongly impact the findings and so for simplicity we fix $\eta$ across the experiments. As we see, PCA converges more quickly to a better-performing model, so we used this setting in all other analyses on MNIST-binary.

For simplicity, we compare all settings at $t = 1850$ steps (this is the convergence point selected for PCA used elsewhere in the paper). In Table 5 we compare the empirical sensitivity, $\sigma_i(\mathcal{D})$, and resulting ‘intrinsic $\epsilon_i(\mathcal{D})’$ for the three settings, as well as the noiseless performance of the three models (which can also be seen in Figure 5). In all cases, $\delta = 1/N^2$. Since the learning rate, Lipschitz constant, and number of iterations is the same for all settings, the theoretical bound $\Delta_S$ is identical.

We see the largest utility improvement from augmented SGD for the Crop setting, owing to its low $\epsilon_i(\mathcal{D})$ value driven by a relatively higher $\sigma_i(\mathcal{D})$ and lower $\Delta_S$. However, as the base performance of this model is worse, the resulting private model remains inferior to PCA. This suggests that a practitioner should focus on obtaining the highest-performing model rather than attempting to optimise for $\sigma_i(\mathcal{D})$. However, presence of the variability suggests that modifications to the data distribution can influence $\sigma_i(\mathcal{D})$, and further investigation will be required to characterise this relationship.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># experiments</th>
<th>PCA</th>
<th>GRP</th>
<th>Crop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy (noiseless)</td>
<td>0.953(1)</td>
<td>0.907(2)</td>
<td>0.917(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGDₐ (ε = 1)</td>
<td>0.941(2)</td>
<td>0.900(4)</td>
<td>0.908(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGDᵢ (ε = 1)</td>
<td>+0.0007</td>
<td>+0.0006</td>
<td>+0.0011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Comparison of the accuracy, empirical sensitivity ($\hat{\Delta}_S$), intrinsic variability ($\sigma_t(D)$), and intrinsic variability ($\epsilon_t(D)$) for the MNIST-binary variants on logistic regression. The theoretical sensitivity $\hat{\Delta}_S$ is identical. We use the empirical sensitivity bound to produce the models SGDₐ and SGDᵢ, following Algorithm 2 in the latter case.

In Figure 6 we plot $\hat{\Delta}_S$ (if available), estimated $\hat{\Delta}_V$, and $\sigma_t(D)$ against the number of training steps $T$, for CIFAR2 and the two model classes. Results on the other datasets are included in Appendix Section B.2, but are qualitatively similar.

We can make the following observations:

- For logistic regression, empirical sensitivity $\hat{\Delta}_S$ grows with $T$, but with a slope much lower than predicted by theory, reflecting again that the theoretical bound is not tight. On neural networks, similarly $\hat{\Delta}_S$ grows with $T$. This reflects the tendency towards overfitting, and would likely be mitigated with weight decay.
- The behaviour of $\sigma_t(D)$ for convex models reflects convergence towards the unique minimum of the objective - given random initialisation, $\sigma_t(D)$ is initially large. It then decays as models ‘forget’ their initialisations and converge towards the minimum. Conversely, with a fixed initialisation the cross-model variability is low, and eventually converges to a steady value corresponding to oscillation around the optimum, with magnitude influenced by the learning rate.
- For the neural networks, we instead see that $\sigma_t(D)$ tends to increase over time regardless of initialisation, indicating that models are converging to increasingly distant locations in parameter space.

Overall we see that there is a tension between $\hat{\Delta}_S$ and $\sigma_t(D)$ for selecting $T$ - for neural networks a large value of $T$ would provide large $\sigma_t(D)$, but as $\hat{\Delta}_S$ grows more rapidly, the settings we examine would be better served selecting a lower $T$.

### 7.3 Multi-class classification

To check if our findings so far are specific to binary classification or ‘simple’ models, we additionally explore a convolutional neural network (CNN) on the full 10-class classification problem of MNIST. In this case, we keep the training examples in their original (28×28) shape and do not enforce $\|x\| \leq 1$, simply scaling pixel values by 255. As we consider all 10 classes, we use the original dataset with 10000 test examples and 60000 training examples. From these 60000 we use 6000 as the validation set and the remaining 54000 to train the model.

For the CNN we attempt replicate the cuda-convnet model used in [18]. This is a CNN with three convolutional layers each followed by a (max) pooling operation, and no dropout. Each convolutional layer uses 8 filters, and the kernel sizes are (3×3), (2×2) and (2×2) respectively. The pool sizes are all (2×2). The output of the final pool is flattened and fed to a fully connected layer mapping it to a hidden size of 10 with relu nonlinearity, which is then mapped to a 10-dimensional softmax output to perform classification. The resulting model has 1448 parameters, and we run 3200 experiments testing a grid of 40 dataset instances and 40 random seeds with fixed and variable model initialisation.

Using a batch size of 32 and a learning rate of 0.1, this architecture achieves an accuracy of 93 ± 2% after 1000 training steps, which we take as the convergence point.

Figure 7 shows the distribution of $\Delta_S$ and $\Delta_V$ for this setting.

We see a similar story to results on other neural networks (second row of Figure 2) suggesting there is nothing unique about fully-connected feed-forward networks not shared by CNNs here. The interesting difference is the sharpness of the $\Delta_V^{\text{vary}}$ distribution. It
7.4 Empirical validity of findings

Here we test the validity of assumptions and the consistency of the estimates produced by our empirical analysis.

7.4.1 Is the noise in SGD Gaussian? In designing Algorithm 1, we assumed that the noise in the weights of SGD follows a normal distribution with diagonal covariance. In this section we test the assumption that the marginals of the weight distribution are normally distributed, that is that \( w_a \sim N(\mu_a, \sigma_a^2) \) for each \( a \). This is a necessary but not sufficient condition for the joint to be normal, and thus a weaker assumption. We compare the marginals of \( w_a \) by conducting a the Shapiro-Wilk statistical test of normality [39]. The distribution of resulting \( p \)-values of this test are shown in Figure 8, which aggregates over weights and using multiple dataset variants.

Small \( p \)-values indicate the hypothesis that the distribution is normal can be rejected. The thresholds for rejection are marked by two vertical lines - the line at \( p = 0.05 \) reflects a standard threshold for such a statistical test, however as we are performing many tests we also indicate the corrected threshold at \( p = 0.05/(Pn_m) \) (Bonferroni correction, using the number of parameters \( P \) and the number of models whose weights we examined \( (n_m) \)). This correction is applied to avoid spurious rejections of the null hypothesis while performing multiple tests. As we can see, the majority of weights would not be rejected at \( p = 0.05 \), and very few would be rejected at the corrected threshold. This indicates that the distribution of most weights is marginally consistent with a normal distribution.

In the event that a weight is not normally distributed, this rules out the possibility of the joint distribution being multivariate normal. In such cases, our assumption that the posterior of SGD is normal is violated. In theory, the probability the these underlying assumptions are violated could be incorporated into \( \delta \), resulting in probabilistic differential privacy [31]. We leave this accounting to future work, and here retain the caveat that our empirical results do not constitute a privacy guarantee for SGD in any case, as our assumptions are overly strong in practice.

7.4.2 Did we run enough experiments? We have explored only a subset of the possible combinations of dataset perturbations and random seeds for each of our data sources, which may introduce uncertainty in our estimates of \( \hat{\sigma}_V^2 \) and \( \sigma_i(D) \). To test this, in Figure 9 we visualise how the estimates of \( \hat{\lambda}_V^2 \) and \( \sigma_i(D) \) change as we use more data (that is, include more experiments) for MNIST-binary. Other models and datasets are included in Appendix B.3.

As we can see, as the number of experiments used to estimate the values increases, our estimates tend towards a fixed value, suggesting that more experiments would not substantially alter the findings. We see that we are likely under-estimating the sensitivity (\( \hat{\lambda}_V^2 \)) slightly, which is a natural consequence of it being the maximum of an unknown distribution.

In Table 6 we demonstrate that the value of \( \sigma_i(D) \) does not depend strongly on the dataset instance used to estimate it. Combined with the observation that the \( \sigma_i(D) \) estimate appears to converge after approximately 40 seeds (this is true across all our datasets and
models), it appears that running more pairwise experiment comparisons becomes important to better estimate $\hat{\lambda}_i$, whose estimates are less stable.

8 RELATED WORK

Stability of SGD. The results in this paper build from a line of work examining the algorithmic stability of SGD, which is closely related to sensitivity as used in differential privacy. Bousquet and Elisseeff [5] first defined the notion of algorithmic stability for a learning algorithm such as SGD and related it to generalisation error. Hardt et al. [18] expanded these results, relating them to modern deep learning techniques and hyperparameters of SGD; Kuzborskij and Lampert [27] extend the analysis to data-dependent stability and generalisation bounds. In these cases, and in much work studying SGD, the focus is on understanding the generalisation properties of the algorithm. While the links between stability, privacy, and generalisation have already been established [5, 18, 33], to our knowledge this is the first work to directly explore the intrinsic privacy-preserving properties of SGD.

SGD as a randomised mechanism. Our argument that SGD can be viewed as an instance of the Gaussian mechanism casts SGD as a sampling procedure from some posterior distribution over weights. Following prior work viewing SGD as a stochastic differential equation [43], Mandt et al. [29] characterise this posterior as the solution to the SDE, which happens to be Gaussian. This allows SGD to be interpreted as equivalent to performing approximate Bayesian inference for a particular choice of variational distribution. However, the Gaussian assumption for the gradient noise continues to be studied [22, 34, 42], and to our knowledge there does not yet exist a general theory of the posterior distribution for SGD. Dieuleveut et al. [10] view SGD with constant step size as a homogenous Markov chain that converges to a stationary distribution for convex case, but they do not characterise the resulting distribution.

Differentially-private machine learning. Much ongoing research aims to develop differentially-private variants of training algorithms, including objective perturbation [7], gradient perturbation [2], and teacher-student frameworks [35, 36]. These methods typically provide privacy throughout training, assuming a different threat model to our setting. We focus on output perturbation, which is addressed by Wu et al. [48]. They treat SGD as a ‘black box’ and inject Laplace or Gaussian noise on the final model weights. The augmented differentially-private SGD algorithm in this paper builds on this black-box approach by reducing the amount of noise required for a given level of privacy. Our approach of computing empirical sensitivity $\epsilon_i(D)$ can be combined with other techniques of calculating data-dependent sensitivity such as smooth sensitivity, thereby improving overall utility guarantees [32].

9 CONCLUSION

We have taken the first steps towards examining the data-dependent inherent randomness in SGD from a privacy perspective. Using a large-scale experimental study we have quantified the variability of SGD due to random seed and related this to its data-dependent sensitivity and the notion of an ‘intrinsic $\epsilon_i(D)$’ in the sense of differential privacy. These findings demonstrate that the choice of random seed has a strictly greater impact on the resulting weights of the model than perturbations in the data for both convex and non-convex models considered.

By accounting for this variability, statistically significant performance improvements can be achieved for low-dimensional models. That is to say, the intrinsic noise in SGD does not appear to be trivial in the sense of utility, across the four datasets we considered. We have further demonstrated that existing theoretical bounds on the data-dependent sensitivity of SGD on convex objectives are loose, and using optimistic empirical ‘bounds’, private model performance can be greatly improved. While we performed similar analyses across both convex and non-convex objectives, for higher-dimensional neural networks, the noise required for private output perturbation degrades performance substantially.

Our results also highlight the data-dependence of both the variability and sensitivity of SGD. This supports theory on the data-dependent stability of SGD [27] and also demonstrates that data-independent sensitivity bounds for convex objectives are loose.

In our analysis and experiments, we have focused on SGD with fixed learning rate and batch size, and without modifications such as momentum or variants like Adam or RMSprop [25, 45]. We speculate that these hyperparameters can also be exploited for privacy, either by keeping them as private information, or by selecting them to maximise the variability of SGD relative to its sensitivity. Characterising the nature of these relationships and potential for engineering SGD variants with increased (non-harmful) variability will require further study.

As the stochasticity of SGD has been explored for its generalisation properties, we hope this work inspires further work into the deep connections between privacy and generalisation, suggesting a new angle for viewing the privacy vs. utility trade-off in the design of differentially private learning algorithms.
A APPENDIX

A.1 Sensitivity of SGD for convex functions

Assumptions. Let \( W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \) be the hypothesis space, and \( \mathcal{L} : W \mapsto \mathbb{R} \) the loss function. We assume that \( \forall u, v \in W : \)

- \( \mathcal{L} \) is convex; i.e., \( \mathcal{L}(u) \geq \mathcal{L}(v) + \langle \nabla \mathcal{L}(v), u - v \rangle \)
- \( \mathcal{L} \) is \( L \)-Lipschitz i.e., \( \| \nabla \mathcal{L}(u) - \nabla \mathcal{L}(v) \| \leq L \| u - v \| \)
- \( \mathcal{L} \) is \( \beta \)-smooth; i.e., \( \| \nabla \mathcal{L}(u) - \nabla \mathcal{L}(v) \| \leq \beta \| u - v \| \)

We present the results for the sensitivity of SGD due to a change input datapoint as provided by Wu et al. [48]:

**Theorem A.1.** From [48]. Let \( A \) denote the SGD algorithm using \( r \) as the random seed then the upper bound for sensitivity of \( k \)-passes of SGD is given by, \( \hat{\Delta}_S = \max_r \| A(r; S) - A(r; S') \| \leq 2k\eta \)

Here, \( \hat{\Delta}_S \) gives the maximum difference in the model parameters due to the presence or absence of a single input sample. Their results rely on the boundedness and expansiveness properties for the gradient update rule \( \mathcal{G} \) of SGD as proposed by Hardt et al. [18]:

**Property 1.** (Boundedness of \( \mathcal{G} \).) For a loss function that is \( L \)-Lipschitz and learning rate \( \eta \), the gradient update of SGD is \( \eta \)-bounded i.e., \( \sup_{w \in W} \| \mathcal{G}(w) - w \| \leq \eta L \)

**Property 2.** (Expansiveness of \( \mathcal{G} \).) For a loss function that is \( \beta \)-smooth, and \( \eta \leq 2/\beta \), then the gradient update of SGD is \( 1 \)-expansive i.e., \( \sup_{w, w'} \| \frac{\| \mathcal{G}(w) - \mathcal{G}(w') \|}{\| w - w' \|} \| \leq 1 \)

As this is not the main contribution of our paper, we refer interested readers to the original paper for a formal proof [48]. We provide here a brief intuition for achieving the bound: For a single pass of SGD over neighboring datasets \( S \) and \( S' \) with a fixed initialization and fixed sampling strategy, the two executions \( G \) and \( G' \) will differ only at a single step — when the differing sample gets selected. In that case, from the above boundedness property, we have that \( G(w) - G'(w') \leq 2L\eta \). For all the other steps, the samples selected are exactly same and hence the 1-expansiveness property applies. Therefore, after \( k \)-passes of SGD over the dataset, the difference in the model parameters will have an upper bound of \( 2kL\eta \). When trained using a batchsize of \( B \), the sensitivity bound can be reduced by a factor of \( B \) i.e., \( \hat{\Delta}_S \leq 2kL\eta/B \). Henceforth, the theoretical sensitivity always refers to the one with batchsize \( B \).

A.2 Upper bound on variability due to the randomness in SGD

We use the boundedness and expansiveness properties of the gradient update rule to calculate the upper bound for the variability in SGD. Here, we focus only on the difference in model parameters due to the stochastic process of selecting samples during training — including the variability in model initialization will only increase the variability, as the difference between model weights at time \( T = 0 \) is non-zero.

We use a similar argument as in prior work for calculating the bound at each step of SGD. For a single pass of SGD on dataset \( S \) with fixed initialization but different random seeds \( r \) and \( r' \) for sampling inputs, in the ‘best’ case, every step encounters different samples. Thus, by boundedness, each step will add at most a \( 2L\eta \) deviation between the model parameters. Therefore, after \( k \) passes of SGD through a dataset of size \( N \) where each step selects differing samples, we get a variability bound of:

\[
\hat{\Delta}_V = \max_{r, r'} \| A(r; S) - A(r'; S') \| \leq 2kL\eta \eta \tag{6}
\]

**Claim 1.** The upper bound of variability due to the randomness in SGD is strictly greater than the sensitivity of SGD due to the change in a single input sample i.e., \( \hat{\Delta}_V > \hat{\Delta}_S \)

The above claim gives a weak guarantee about the inherent noise in SGD as it considers the upper bound of the variability. This assumed a ‘worst’ (or best)-case scenario where different batches are sampled at every step, comparing between two runs of the experiment. In reality, there is a chance for two runs of SGD to sample the same example at the same point during training. To tighten the bound on \( \hat{\Delta}_V \), we can try to account for this distribution over permutations. We consider the upper bound of \( \hat{\Delta}_V \) (which is at most \( 2kL\eta \)) to be a random variable itself, and use the Chebyshev inequality to demonstrate that it is usually larger than the sensitivity (see Section A.2.1 for proof):

**Claim 2.** The bound on the variability of SGD is larger than its sensitivity with high probability.

\[
P\left[ \hat{\Delta}_V - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\Delta}_V] \geq kL\eta(N - 2) \right] \leq \frac{4}{k(N - 2)^2}
\]

Since \( N \) is typically large, we see that the probability \( \hat{\Delta}_V \) is sufficiently far from its mean and near \( \hat{\Delta}_S \) is very low. These results cannot conclusively affirm the privacy-preserving properties of SGD as they pertain only to upper bounds. The lower bound is likely zero in general due to collapsed variability after overfitting (or converging to a unique minimum). Determining when the lower bound is nontrivial remains an open research question, however our empirical results indicate that the lower bound also tends to exceed the data-dependent sensitivity (discussed in Section 6.1).

A.2.1 Proof of Claim 2. For Claim 2, we need the expected value and variance of \( \hat{\Delta}_V \). The bounds stated previously rely on the fact that every iteration of SGD with mis-matching samples introduce a term of \( 2L\eta \) to the (maximum) difference in outputs. For the upper bound, we assumed that every sample is mis-matching, that is we compare runs of SGD where one is a perfect derangement of the training-set traversal order of the other. In reality, between two runs with different random seeds, the same example may be encountered at the same time-point; this would constitute a permutation of the training-set traversal order of the other. In reality, between two runs with different random seeds, the same example may be encountered at the same time-point; this would constitute a permutation of the training data with a fixed point. If we assume that \( X_i \) is the number of fixed points of the training data in epoch \( i \) (relative to a fixed reference permutation), the number of mis-matches is therefore \( N - X_i \), and the bound on the difference of weights is

\[
\hat{\Delta}_V = \sum_{i=1}^{k} 2L\eta(N - X_i) \tag{7}
\]

The probability distribution of \( X_i \) is

\[
P(X_i = j) = \frac{D_{N, j}}{N!} \tag{8}
\]

where \( N \) is the number of training examples, and \( D_{N, j} \) is a rencontres number giving the number of permutations of length \( N \) with \( j \)
fixed points. For large $N$, the distribution of rencontres numbers approaches a Poisson distribution with rate parameter $\lambda = 1/6$, and so both the expected value and variance of $X_i$ are 1: This allows us to use standard properties of expectation and variance, and the fact that the permutation (and thus $X_i$) selected at each epoch is independent.

$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{\lambda}_V] = \sum_{i=1}^{k} 2L\eta(N - \mathbb{E}[X_i]) = 2kL\eta(N - 1)$$

$$\mathbb{V}[\hat{\lambda}_V] = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathbb{V}[2L\eta(N - X_i)] = (2L\eta)^2k$$

We then use the Chebyshev inequality to bound the probability that $\hat{\lambda}_V$ is far from its mean $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\lambda}_V]$. Doing so is interesting because we can prove that $\hat{\lambda}_V$ is unlikely to be near $\lambda_S$. If we define $t = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\hat{\lambda}_V] - \lambda_S}{2} = kL\eta(N - 2)$ then by Chebyshev inequality:

**Claim 2.** The bound on the variability of SGD is larger than its sensitivity with high probability.

$$P \left[ |\hat{\lambda}_V - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\lambda}_V]| \geq kL\eta(N - 2) \right] \leq \frac{4}{k(N - 2)^2}$$

### B ADDITIONAL RESULTS

#### B.1 Utility at $\epsilon = 0.5$

Table 7 replicates Table 4, using $\epsilon = 0.5$. In this more restrictive privacy setting, we see a more obvious degradation in model performance, and gains from the intrinsic noise are more slight. The largest gains tend to be made when the private model is relatively close in performance to the noiseless setting, as any reduction in the added noise has proportionally a greater effect.

#### B.2 Dependence on number of training steps for other datasets

Figure 10 replicates Figure 6 for the other three datasets. We see a qualitatively similar story - logistic regression models (first row) approach a fixed $\sigma_t(D)$ owing to their convergence to the neighbourhood of the unique minimum. The empirical sensitivity of the logistic regression models either increases very slowly or appears approximately constant (Forest), which may reflect the underlying sensitivity of the optimum. Conversely, for the neural networks we see a steadily increasing empirical sensitivity, which may reflect the tendency for the norm of the model weights to increase during training.

#### B.3 Consistency of estimates for other datasets

Figure 11 replicates Figure 11 for neural networks including the multi-class CNN (from Section 7.3), and the remaining datasets. We see broadly the same trend - the estimate of $\sigma_t(D)$ tends to ‘converge’ after approximately 40 seeds, while the sensitivity estimate (note the log scale on the x-axis) is less stable. This is likely because $\sigma_t(D)$ appears to be largely unaffected by the dataset instance (see Table 6) and so only depends on the number of seeds, while the sensitivity is influenced by both seed and the pair of dataset instances (see Equation 3).
Figure 10: Results on the relationship between sensitivity, seed-dependent variability $\sigma_i(D)$, and steps of SGD $T$, for the remaining three datasets. As before, $\sigma_i(D)$ tends to increase with $T$ for neural networks, while $\sigma_i(D)$ either decays or rises to an approximately constant value for logistic regression.
Figure 11: Demonstration of how the estimated values of $\hat{\Delta}_S^*$ and $\sigma_i(D)$ depend on the number of experiments used for estimation, for all datasets and models not included in Figure 9. These results indicate that although we have only run a small fraction of the possible experiments, we would not expect our estimates to change greatly with more experiments. Note that the x-axis for sensitivity estimates (in gold) is using a log scale. Horizontal dashed lines indicate the values for $\hat{\Delta}_S^*$ and $\sigma_i(D)$ used for analyses throughout the paper.