

# Transparent Privacy is Principled Privacy

Ruobin Gong

*Department of Statistics, Rutgers University*

First Version: June 2020

This Version: April 2022

## Abstract

Differential privacy revolutionizes the way we think about statistical disclosure limitation. A distinct feature of differential privacy is that the probabilistic mechanism with which the data are privatized can be made public without sabotaging the privacy guarantee. In a technical treatment, this paper establishes the necessity of *transparent privacy* for drawing unbiased statistical inference for a wide range of scientific questions. Uncertainty due to privacy may be conceived as a dynamic and controllable component from the total survey error perspective. Mandated invariants constitute a threat to transparency when imposed on the privatized data product through “post-processing”, resulting in limited statistical usability. Transparent privacy presents a viable path towards principled inference from privatized data releases, and shows great promise towards improved reproducibility, accountability and public trust in modern data curation.

## 1 Introduction

The decennial Census of the United States is a comprehensive tabulation of its residents. For over two centuries, the Census data supplied benchmark information about the states and the country, helped guide policy decisions, and provided crucial data in many branches of the demographic, social and political sciences. The Census aims to truthfully and accurately document the presence of every individual in the United States. The fine granularity of the database, compounded by its massive volume, portrays the American life in great detail.

The U. S. Census Bureau is bound by Title 13 of the United States Code to protect the privacy of individuals and businesses who participate in its surveys. These surveys contain centralized and high quality information about the respondents. If disseminated without care, they might pose a threat to the respondents’ privacy. The Bureau implements protective measures to reduce the risk of inadvertently disclosing confidential information. The first publicly available

documentation of these methods dates back to 1970 (McKenna, 2018). Until the 2010 Census, statistical disclosure limitation (SDL) mechanisms deployed by the Census Bureau relied to a large extent on table suppression and data swapping, occasionally supplemented by imputation and partially synthetic data. These techniques restricted the verbatim release of confidential information through the data products. However, they do not offer an exposition of privacy protection as a goal in itself. What aspect of the data does an SDL mechanism regard as confidential? What does the mechanism aim to achieve? And how do we know whether it is actually working? For a long time, the answers to these questions were not definitive. We now understand that many traditional SDL techniques are not just ambiguous in definition, but defective in effect, for they can be invalidated by carefully designed attacks that leverage modern computational advancements and auxiliary sources of open access information (see e.g. Sweeney, 2002; Dinur and Nissim, 2003). With the aid of publicly available data, the Census Bureau attempted a “re-identification” attack on its own published 2010 Census tabulations, and was successful in faithfully reconstructing as much as 17% of the U.S. population, or 52 million people at the level of individuals (Abowd, 2019; Hawes, 2020). These failures are a resounding rejection of the continued employment of current SDL methods. It is clear that we need alternative, and more reliable, privacy tools for the 2020 Census and beyond.

In pursuit of a modern paradigm for disclosure limitation, the Census Bureau endorsed differential privacy as the criterion to protect the public release of the 2020 Decennial Census data products. The Bureau openly engaged data users and sought for constructive feedback when devising the new Disclosure Avoidance System (DAS). They launched a series of demonstration data product and codebase releases (US Census Bureau, 2020a), and presented its design processes at numerous academic and professional society meetings, including the Joint Statistical Meeting, the 2020 NASEM Committee on National Statistics (CNSTAT) Workshop, and the 2019 Harvard Data Science Institute Conference in which I participated as a discussant. The reactions to this change from the academic data user communities are a passionate mix. Some cheered for the innovation, while others worried about the practical impact on the usability of differentially privatized releases. In keeping up with the inquiries and criticisms, the Census Bureau assembled and published data quality metrics that were assessed repeatedly as the design of the 2020 DAS iterated (US Census Bureau, 2020b). Through the process, the Bureau exhibited an unprecedented level of transparency and openness in conveying the design and the production of the novel disclosure control mechanism, publicizing the description of the TopDown algorithm (Abowd et al., 2022) and the GitHub code base (2020 Census DAS Development Team, 2019). This knowledge makes a world of difference for Census data users who need to analyze the privatized data releases and to assess the validity and the quality of their work.

This paper argues that transparent privacy enables principled statistical inference from privatized data releases. If a privacy mechanism is known, it can be incorporated as an integral part of a statistical model. Any additional uncertainty that the mechanism injects into the data

can be accounted for properly. This is the most reliable way to ensure the correctness of the inferential claims produced from privatized data releases, when a calculated loss of statistical efficiency is present. For this reason, the publication of the probabilistic design of the privacy mechanism is crucial maintaining a high usability of the privatized data product.

## 2 Differential privacy enables transparency

Part of what contributed to the failure of the traditional disclosure limitation methods is that their justification appeals to intuition and to obscurity, rather than explicit rules. If the released data are masked, coarsened, or perturbed from the confidential data, it seems natural to conclude that they are less informative, and consequently more “private.” Traditional disclosure limitation mechanisms are obscure, in the sense that their design details are rarely released. For swapping-based methods, not only are the swap rates omitted, the attributes that have been swapped are often not disclosed (Oganian and Karr, 2006). As a consequence, an ordinary data user would not have the necessary information to replicate the mechanism, nor to assess their performance in protecting privacy. The effectiveness of obscure privacy mechanisms is difficult to quantify.

For data analysts who utilize data releases under traditional SDL to perform statistical tasks, the opaqueness of the privacy mechanism poses an additional threat to the validity of the resulting inference. A privacy mechanism, be it suppressive, perturbative or otherwise, works by processing raw data and modifying their values to something that may be different from what have been observed. In doing so, the mechanism injects additional uncertainty in the released data, weakening the amount of statistical information contained in them. Uncertainty per se is not a problem; if anything, the discipline of statistics devotes itself to the study of uncertainty quantification. However, in order to properly attribute uncertainty where it is due, some minimal knowledge about its generative mechanism must be known. If the design of the privacy mechanism is kept opaque, our knowledge would be insufficient for producing reliable uncertainty estimates. The analyst might have no choice but to ignore the privacy mechanism imposed on the data, and might arrive at erroneous statistical conclusions.

Differential privacy conceptualizes privacy as the probabilistic knowledge to distinguish the identity of one individual respondent in the dataset. The privacy guarantee is stated with respect to a random mechanism that imposes the privacy protection. Definition 1 presents the classic and most widely endorsed notion called  $\epsilon$ -differential privacy:

**Definition 1** ( $\epsilon$ -differential privacy; Dwork et al. (2006)). *A mechanism  $\tilde{S} : \mathbb{X}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$  satisfies  $\epsilon$ -differential privacy, if for every pair of databases  $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}' \in \mathbb{X}^n$  such that  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\mathcal{D}'$  differ by one record, and every measurable set of outputs  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^p)$ , we have*

$$P(\tilde{S}(\mathcal{D}) \in A) \leq e^\epsilon P(\tilde{S}(\mathcal{D}') \in A). \quad (2.1)$$

The positive quantity  $\epsilon$ , called the *privacy loss budget* (PLB), enables the tuning, evaluation, and comparison of different mechanisms all according to a standardized scale. In (2.1), the probability  $P$  is taken with respect to the mechanism  $\tilde{S}$ , not with respect to the data  $\mathcal{D}$ .

As a formal approach to privacy, statistical disclosure limitation mechanisms compliant with differential privacy put forth two major advantages over their former counterparts. The first is *provability*, a mathematical formulation against which guarantees of privacy can be definitively verified as it is conceptualized. Definition 1 puts forth a concrete standard about whether, and by how much, any proposed mechanism can be deemed differentially private, as the probabilistic property of the mechanism is entirely encapsulated by  $P$ . As an example, we now understand that the classic randomized response mechanism (Warner, 1965), proposed decades before differential privacy, is in fact differentially private. Under randomized response, every respondent responds truthfully to a binary question with probability  $p$ , and with a random answer otherwise. That the random response mechanism is  $\epsilon$ -differentially private follows if  $\epsilon$  is chosen such that  $p = e^\epsilon / (1 + e^\epsilon)$  (see e.g. Dwork and Roth, 2014). With provability, anyone can design new mechanisms with privacy guarantees under an explicit rule, as well as to verify whether a publicized privacy mechanism lives up to its guarantee.

The second major advantage of differential privacy, which this paper underscores, is *transparency*. Differential privacy allows for the full, public specification of the privacy mechanism without sabotaging the privacy guarantee. The data curator has the freedom to disseminate the design of the mechanism, allowing the data users to utilize it and to critique it, without compromising the effectiveness of the privacy protection. The concept of transparency that concerns this paper will be made precise in Section 4. As an example, below is one of the earliest proposed mechanisms that satisfies differential privacy:

**Definition 2** (Laplace mechanism; Dwork et al. (2006)). *Given a confidential database  $\mathcal{D} \in \mathbb{X}^n$ , a deterministic query function  $S : \mathbb{X}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$  and its global sensitivity  $\Delta(S)$ , the  $\epsilon$ -differentially private Laplace mechanism is*

$$\tilde{S}(\mathcal{D}) = S(\mathcal{D}) + (U_1, \dots, U_p),$$

where  $U_i$ 's are real-valued i.i.d. random variables with  $\mathbb{E}(U_i) = 0$  and probability density function

$$f(u) \propto e^{-\frac{\epsilon|u|}{\Delta(S)}}. \quad (2.2)$$

The omitted proportionality constant in (2.2) is equal to  $\epsilon/2\Delta(S)$ , ensuring that the density  $f$  integrates to one. The global sensitivity  $\Delta(S)$  measures the maximal extent to which the deterministic query function changes in response to the perturbation of one record in the database. For counting queries operating on binary databases, such as population counts,  $\Delta(S) = 1$ . To note is that in Definition 2, both the deterministic query  $S$  and the probability distribution of the noise terms  $U_i$ 's are fully known. Anyone can implement the privacy algorithm on a database of the same form as  $\mathcal{D}$ .

We note that differentially private mechanisms *compose* their privacy losses nicely. At a basic level, two separately released differentially private data products, incurring PLBs of  $\epsilon_1$  and  $\epsilon_2$  respectively, incur no more than a total PLB of  $(\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2)$  when combined (Dwork and Roth, 2014, Theorem 3.14). Superior composition, reflecting a more efficient use of PLBs, can be achieved with the clever design of privacy mechanisms. The composition property provides assurance to the data curator that when releasing multiple data products over time, the total privacy loss can be controlled and budgeted ahead of time.

The preliminary versions of the 2020 Census DAS utilizes the integer counterpart to the Laplace mechanism, called the double Geometric mechanism (Ghosh et al., 2012; Fioretto and Van Hentenryck, 2019). The mechanism possesses the same additive form as the Laplace mechanism, but instead of real-valued noise  $U_i$ 's, it uses integer-valued ones whose probability mass function is identical in expression to (2.2), with the proportionality constant equal to  $(1 - e^{-\epsilon}) / (1 + e^{-\epsilon})$ . The production implementation of the DAS, used for the P.L. 94-171 public release (U.S. Census Bureau, 2021a) and the 2021-06-08 vintage demonstration files (see Van Riper et al., 2020), appeals to a variant privacy definition called the *zero-concentrated differential privacy* (zCDP; Dwork and Rothblum, 2016)<sup>1</sup>, which employs additive noise with Gaussian distributions according to a detailed PLB schedule (U.S. Census Bureau, 2021c). While all mechanisms discussed above employ additive errors, differential privacy mechanisms in general need not be additive. Non-additive examples include the exponential mechanism (McSherry and Talwar, 2007) and objective perturbation (Kifer et al., 2012), commonly used in the private computation of complex queries. In what follows, we elaborate on the importance of transparent privacy from the statistical point of view.

### 3 What can go wrong with obscure privacy

Data privatization constitutes a phase in data processing, which succeeds data collection and precedes data release. When conducting statistical analysis on processed data, misleading answers await if the analyst ignores the phases of data processing and the consequences they impose.

We use an example of simple linear regression to illustrate how obscure privacy can be misleading. Regression models occupy a central role in many statistical analysis routines, for they can be thought of as a first-order approximation to any functional relationship between two or more quantities. Let  $(x_i, y_i)$  be a pair of quantities measured across a collection of geographic regions indexed by  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Examples of  $x_i$  and  $y_i$  may be counts of population of certain demographic characteristics within each census block of a state, households of certain types,

---

<sup>1</sup>Zero-concentrated differential privacy controls not the ratio, but the maximal *divergence*, between the probability distributions of the random query on neighboring databases. It delivers a more efficient PLB composition property compared to the basic one stated in the previous paragraph.

economic characteristics of the region (businesses, revenue, and taxation), and so on. Suppose the familiar simple regression model is applied:

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_i + e_i, \quad (3.1)$$

where the  $e_i$ 's are independently and identically distributed idiosyncratic errors with mean zero and variance  $\sigma^2$ . Usual estimation techniques for  $\beta_0$  and  $\beta_1$ , such as ordinary least squares or maximum likelihood, produce unbiased point estimators. For the slope,  $\hat{\beta}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y}) / \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})(x_i - \bar{x})$  where  $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\beta}_1) = \beta_1$ , and for the intercept,  $\hat{\beta}_0 = \bar{y} - \hat{\beta}_1 \bar{x}$  where  $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\beta}_0) = \beta_0$ , where expectations are taken with respect to variabilities in the error terms. Both estimators also enjoy consistency when the regressor  $x_i$ 's are random, i.e.  $\hat{\beta}_1 \rightarrow \beta_1$  and  $\hat{\beta}_0 \rightarrow \beta_0$ , indicating convergence in probability as the sample size  $n$  approaches infinity. The consistency of  $(\hat{\beta}_0, \hat{\beta}_1)$  is reasonably robust even if the linear model exhibit mild departures from standard assumptions, such as when the errors are moderately heteroskedastic.

Since  $x_i$  and  $y_i$  contain information about persons and businesses that may be deemed confidential, suppose they are privatized before release using standard additive differential privacy mechanisms. Their privatized versions  $(\tilde{x}_i, \tilde{y}_i)$  are respectively

$$\tilde{x}_i = x_i + u_i, \quad \tilde{y}_i = y_i + v_i. \quad (3.2)$$

The  $u_i$ 's and  $v_i$ 's can be chosen according to the Laplace mechanism or the double Geometric mechanism following Definition 2, with suitable scale parameters such that  $(\tilde{x}_i, \tilde{y}_i)$  are compliant with  $\epsilon$ -differential privacy and accounting for multivariate composition. We denote the variances of  $u_i$  and  $v_i$  as  $\sigma_u^2$  and  $\sigma_v^2$  respectively.<sup>2</sup> As the privacy budget allocated to either statistic decreases, the privacy error variance increases and more privacy is achieved, and vice versa.

Suppose the analyst is supplied the privatized statistics  $(\tilde{x}_i, \tilde{y}_i)$ , but is not told how they are generated based on the confidential statistics  $(x_i, y_i)$ . That is, (3.2) is entirely unknown to her. In this situation, there is no obvious way for her to proceed, other than to ignore the privacy mechanism and run the regression analysis by treating the privatized  $(\tilde{x}_i, \tilde{y}_i)$  as if they're the confidential values. If so, the analyst would effectively perform parameter estimation for a different, *naïve* linear model

$$\tilde{y}_i = b_0 + b_1 \tilde{x}_i + \tilde{e}_i. \quad (3.3)$$

Unfortunately, no matter which computational procedure one uses, the point estimates obtained from fitting (3.3) are no longer unbiased nor consistent for  $\beta_0$  and  $\beta_1$  as in the original

---

<sup>2</sup>The analysis presented in this section uses the basic composition property introduced in Section 2. The noise scales correspond to a privacy loss budget of  $\epsilon_x = \sqrt{2}/\sigma_u$  and  $\epsilon_y = \sqrt{2}/\sigma_v$  per coordinate. The statistical properties discussed here hinge on the choice of the noise family and the scale parameters  $\sigma_u^2$  and  $\sigma_v^2$  only. Superior composition (hence lower total PLB) may be achieved with better privacy mechanism design, although that is inconsequential to the analysis presented here.

model of (3.1). Both naïve estimators, call them  $\hat{b}_0$  and  $\hat{b}_1$  are complex functions that convolute the confidential data, idiosyncratic errors, and privacy errors. When the regressor  $x_i$ 's are random realizations from an underlying infinite population, the bias inherent to the naïve estimators does not diminish even if the sample size approaches infinity. More precisely, we have that the naïve slope estimator

$$\hat{b}_1 \rightarrow \frac{\mathbb{V}(x)}{\mathbb{V}(x) + \sigma_u^2} \beta_1, \quad (3.4)$$

and the naïve intercept estimator

$$\hat{b}_0 \rightarrow \beta_0 + \left(1 - \frac{\mathbb{V}(x)}{\mathbb{V}(x) + \sigma_u^2}\right) \mathbb{E}(x) \beta_1,$$

where  $\mathbb{E}(x)$  and  $\mathbb{V}(x)$  are the population-level mean and variance of  $x$  for which the observed sample is representative. The ratio  $\mathbb{V}(x) / (\mathbb{V}(x) + \sigma_u^2)$  displays the extent of inconsistency of  $\hat{b}_1$  as a function of the population variance and the privacy error variance of  $x$ . We see that if the independent variable is not already centralized,  $\hat{b}_0$  exhibits a bias whose magnitude is influenced by both the average magnitude of  $x$ , as well as the amount of privacy protection for  $x$ . In addition, the residual variance from the naïve linear model (3.3) is also inflated, with

$$\mathbb{V}(\tilde{y} | \tilde{x}) = \sigma^2 + \beta_1^2 \sigma_u^2 + \sigma_v^2, \quad (3.5)$$

which is strictly larger than  $\sigma^2$ , the usual residual variance from the correct linear model (3.1). If the independent variable  $x_i$ 's are treated as fixed instead, an exact finite-sample characterization of the naïve estimators  $\hat{b}_0$  and  $\hat{b}_1$  are difficult to obtain. Appendix A presents the distribution limits for the slope estimator as a function of the scales of the privacy errors and the regression errors, in which Figure 3 showcases the exact deterioration of coverage probabilities as the privacy errors increase.

We use a small sample simulation study ( $n = 10$ ) to illustrate the pitfall with obscure privacy. Assume that the confidential data follows the generative process of (3.1), with  $x_i \sim Pois(10)$  i.i.d.,  $\sigma = 5$ , and the true parameter values  $(\beta_0, \beta_1) = (-5, 4)$ . The privatized data  $(\tilde{x}_i, \tilde{y}_i)$  are subsequently generated according to the additive privacy mechanism of (3.2), where  $u_i, v_i \sim Laplace(\epsilon^{-1})$ , with a PLB of  $\epsilon = 0.25$ . The three panels of Figure 1 depict different statistical inference – both right and wrong types – that correspond to three scenarios in this example. When no privacy protection is enforced, a 95% confidence ellipse for  $(\beta_0, \beta_1)$  from the simple linear regression should cover the true parameter values (represented by the orange square) at approximately the nominal coverage rate, a high probability of 95%. The left panel displays one such confidence ellipse in blue. When privacy protection is in place, directly fitting the linear regression model on  $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})$  may result in misleading inference, as can be seen from the naïve 95% confidence ellipses (gray) in the middle panel, all derived from privatized versions of the same confidential dataset, repeatedly miss their mark as they rarely cover the true value. We




Figure 1: 95% joint confidence regions for  $(\beta_0, \beta_1)$  from linear regression (3.1). Left: original data  $(x, y)$  simulated according to (3.1). Middle: naïve linear regression (3.3) on  $n = 10$  pairs of simulated privatized data  $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})$  from the Laplace mechanism (3.2) with PLB  $\epsilon = 0.25$ . Right: the correct model following (4.2) implemented using Monte Carlo EM on the same sets of private data. Concentration ellipses are large-sample approximate 95% confidence regions based on estimated Fisher information at the MLE. Orange squares represent the ground truth  $(\beta_0, \beta_1) = (-5, 4)$ .

witness the biasing behavior precisely as established: the slope  $\beta_1$  is underestimated, displaying a systematic shrinking towards zero, whereas the true value of  $\beta_0$  is overestimated, with  $\beta_1 > 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}(x) = 10 > 0$ . In contrast, the green ellipses in the right panel, each representing an approximate 95% confidence region, are based on the correct analysis on privatized data accounting for the privacy mechanism (to be discussed in Section 4). They better recover the location of the true parameters, and display larger associated inferential uncertainty.

The troubling consequence of ignoring the privacy mechanism is not new to statisticians. The naïve regression analysis of privatized data generalizes a well-known scenario in the measurement error literature, called the *classic* measurement error model. The notable biasing effect on the naïve estimator  $\hat{\beta}_1$  created by the additive noise (3.2) in the independent variable  $x$  is termed *attenuation*. The bias causes a “double whammy” (Carroll et al., 2006) on the quality of the resulting inference, because one is misled in terms of both the location of the true parameter, and the extent of uncertainty associated with the estimators, as seen from the erroneous coverage probability within its asymptotic sampling distributional limits. In linear models, additive measurement error in the dependent variable  $y$  is generally considered less damaging. If unbiased and independent additive errors are present in the dependent variable only, the model fit remains unbiased (Carroll et al., 2006, Chapter 15), hence such errors are often ignored or treated as a component to the idiosyncratic regression errors (see e.g. Blackwell et al., 2017a). However, they would still increase the variability of the fitted model and decrease the statistical power in detecting an otherwise significant effect. Consequently, they may still negatively affect the quality of any naïve model fitting on privatized data, both by changing the effective nominal coverage rate of the large sample distribution limits (see Appendix A for details), and

by increasing uncertainty of the fitted model according to (3.5).

From the additive mechanism in Definition 2, we see that the noise term  $u_i$  is a symmetric, zero-mean random variable. This means that the privacy mechanism is *unbiased*: it has the exact same chance to inflate or deflate the reported statistic in either direction by the same magnitude. How is it possible that an unbiased privatization algorithm, coupled with an unbiased statistical procedure (the simple linear regression), results in biased estimates? The issue is that while the privatized data  $\tilde{S}$  is unbiased for the confidential data  $S$ , if the estimator we use is a *nonlinear* function of  $S$ , it may no longer retain unbiasedness if  $S$  were perturbed. In our case here, the regression coefficient  $\hat{\beta}_1$  has the form of a ratio estimator, and same goes for  $\hat{\beta}_0$  which depends on  $\hat{\beta}_1$  as a building block. In general, the validity of ratio estimators are particularly susceptible to minor instabilities in its denominator. Replacing confidential statistics with their unbiased privatized releases may not be an innocent move, if the downstream analysis calls for nonlinear estimators that cannot preserve unbiasedness.

In the universe of statistical analysis, nonlinear estimators are the rule, not the exception. Many descriptive and summary statistics involve nonlinear operations such as squaring or dividing – think variances, proportions, and other complex indices<sup>3</sup> – which don’t fare well with additive noise. Ratio estimators, or estimators that involve random quantities in their denominators, can suffer from high variability if the randomness is high. Therefore, many important use cases of the Census releases, as well as the assessment of the impact due to privacy, could benefit from additional uncertainty quantification. As an example, [Asquith et al. \(2022\)](#) evaluate a preliminary version of the 2020 Census DAS using a set of segregation metrics as the benchmark statistics and compare its effect when applied to the 1940 full-count Census microdata. One of the evaluation metrics is the *index of dissimilarity* per county ([Iceland et al., 2002](#)):

$$d = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \frac{w_i}{w_{\text{cty}}} - \frac{b_i}{b_{\text{cty}}} \right|, \quad (3.6)$$

where  $w_i$  and  $b_i$  are respectively the white and the African American populations of tract  $i$  of the county, and  $w_{\text{cty}}$  and  $b_{\text{cty}}$  those of the entire county. All of these quantities are subject to privacy protection, and one run of the DAS creates a version of  $\{\tilde{w}_i, \tilde{b}_i, \tilde{w}_{\text{cty}}, \tilde{b}_{\text{cty}}\}$ , each infused with Laplace-like noise.

If we were to repeatedly create privatized demonstration datasets from the DAS, and calculate the dissimilarity index each time by naively replacing all quantities in (3.6) with their privatized counterparts, we will witness variability in the value  $d$ . Since  $d$  is a ratio estimator, its value may exhibit a large departure from the confidential true value, particularly when the denominator is small, such as when a county has a small population, or is predominantly white or non-white. Since every DAS output is uniquely realized by a single draw from its probabilistic

---

<sup>3</sup>For example the Herfindahl-Hirschman index, which is often used as a measure of population diversity or market competitiveness.

privacy mechanism, the value  $d$  calculated based on a particular run of the DAS will exhibit a difference from its confidential (or true) value.<sup>4</sup> The difference will be unknown, but can be described by the known properties of the privacy mechanism. It is important to recognize the probabilistic nature of the statistics calculated from privatized data, and interpret them alongside appropriate uncertainty quantification, which itself is a reflection of data quality.

Privacy adds an extra layer of uncertainty to the generative process of the published data, just as any data processing procedures such as cleaning, smoothing, or missing data imputation. We risk obtaining misguided inference whenever blindly fitting a favorite confidential data model on privatized data without acknowledging the privatization process, for the same reason we would be misguided by not accounting for the effect of data processing. To better understand the inferential implication of privacy and obtain utility-oriented assessments, privacy shall be viewed as a controllable source of total survey error, an approach that is again made feasible by the transparency of the privatization procedure. We return to this subject in Section 5.

## 4 Principled analysis with transparent privacy

The misleading analysis presented in Section 3 is not the fault of differential privacy, nor of linear regression or other means of statistical modeling. Rather, obscure privacy mechanisms prevent us from performing the right analysis. Any statistical model, however adequate in describing the probabilistic regularities in the confidential data, will generally be inadequate when naïvely applied to the privatized data. To correctly account for the privacy mechanism, statistical models designed for confidential data need to be *augmented* to include the additional layer of uncertainty due to privacy. In our example, the simple linear model of (3.1) is the true generative model for the confidential statistics  $(x, y)$ . Together with the privacy mechanism in (3.2), the implied true generative model for the privatized statistics  $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})$  can be written as

$$\tilde{y}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 (\tilde{x}_i + u_i) + v_i + e_i, \quad (4.1)$$

where  $u_i, v_i$  are additive privacy errors and  $e_i$  the idiosyncratic regression error. Thus, with the original linear model (3.1) being the correct model for  $(x, y)$ , it follows that the augmented model (4.1) is the correct model for describing the stochastic relationship between  $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})$ . On the other hand, unless all  $u_i$ 's and  $v_i$ 's are exactly zero, i.e. no privacy protection is effectively performed for both  $x$  and  $y$ , the naïve model in (3.3) is erroneous and incommensurable with the augmented model in (4.1).

If a statistical model is of high quality, or more precisely *self-efficient* (Meng, 1994; Xie and Meng,

---

<sup>4</sup>Note that the DAS also performs *post-processing* in addition to noise infusion. The post-processing step may introduce additional sources of error to the assessed value of  $d$ . Unfortunately, the effect of post-processing may be difficult to describe analytically. Section 6 returns to post-processing and its impact.

2017), its inference based on the privatized data should typically bear more uncertainty compared to that based on the confidential data. The increase in uncertainty is attributable to the privatization mechanism. Therefore, uncertainty quantification is of particular importance when it comes to analyzing privatized data. But drawing statistically valid inference from privatized data is not as simple as increasing the nominal coverage probability of confidence or credible regions from the old analysis. As we have seen, fitting the naïve linear model on differentially privatized data creates a “double whammy” due to both a biased estimator and incorrectly quantified estimation uncertainty. The right analysis hinges on incorporating the probabilistic privacy mechanism into the model itself. This ensures that we capture uncertainty stemming from any potential systematic bias displayed by the estimator due to noise injection, as well as a sheer loss of precision due to diminished informativeness of the data.

For data users who currently employ analysis protocols designed without private data in mind, this suggests that modification needs to be made to their favorite tools. That sounds like an incredibly daunting task. However on a conceptual level, what needs to be done is quite simple. We present a general recipe for the vast class of statistical methods with either a likelihood or a Bayesian justification.

Let  $\beta$  denote the estimand of interest. For randomization-based inference, which is common to the literatures of survey and experimental design, this estimand may be expressed as a function of the confidential database:  $\beta = \beta(\mathcal{D})$ . In model-based inference,  $\beta$  may be the finite- or infinite-dimensional parameter that governs the distribution of  $\mathcal{D}$ . Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be the original likelihood for  $\beta$  based on  $s$ , representing the currently employed, or ideal, statistical model for analyzing data that is not subject to privacy protection. Let  $p_{\zeta}(\tilde{s} | s)$  be the conditional probability distribution of the privatized data  $\tilde{s}$  given  $s$ , as induced by the privacy mechanism. The subscript  $\zeta$  encompasses all tuning parameters of the mechanism, as well as any auxiliary information that the data curator uses during the privatization process. For example,  $p_{\zeta}$  may stand for the class of swapping methods, in which case  $\zeta$  encodes the swap rates and the list of the variables being swapped. If  $p_{\zeta}$  is induced by the Laplace mechanism, then  $\zeta$  stands for the class of product Laplace densities centered at  $s$ , and  $\zeta$  its scale parameter which, if set to  $\Delta(S)/\epsilon$ , qualifies  $p_{\zeta}$  as an  $\epsilon$ -differentially private mechanism.

**Definition 3** (Transparent privacy). *A privacy mechanism is said to be transparent if  $p_{\zeta}(\cdot | \cdot)$ , the conditional probability distribution it induces given the confidential data, is known to the user of the privatized data, including both the functional form of  $p_{\zeta}$  and the specific value of  $\zeta$  employed.*

With a transparent privacy mechanism, we can write down the true likelihood function for  $\beta$  based on the observed  $\tilde{s}$ :

$$\mathcal{L}_{\zeta}(\beta; \tilde{s}) = \int p_{\zeta}(\tilde{s} | s) \mathcal{L}(\beta; s) ds, \quad (4.2)$$

with the notation  $\mathcal{L}_{\zeta}$  highlighting the fact that it is a weighted version of the original likelihood  $\mathcal{L}$  according to the privacy mechanism  $p_{\zeta}$ . The integral expression of (4.2) is reminiscent of the

missing data formulation for parameter estimation (Little and Rubin, 2014). The observed data is the privatized data  $\tilde{s}$ , and the missing data is the confidential data  $s$ , with the two of them associated by the probabilistic privacy mechanism  $p_{\zeta}$  analogous to the missingness mechanism. All information that can be objectively learned about the parameter of interest  $\beta$  has to be based on the observed data alone, averaging out the uncertainties in the missing data. In the regression example, the actual observed likelihood is precisely the joint probability distribution of  $(\tilde{x}_i, \tilde{y}_i)$  according to the implied true model (4.1), governed by the parameters  $\beta_0$  and  $\beta_1$ , with sampling variability derived from that of the idiosyncratic errors  $e_i$  as well as privacy errors  $u_i$  and  $v_i$ . All modes of statistical inference congruent with the original data likelihood  $\mathcal{L}$ , including frequentist procedures that can be embedded into  $\mathcal{L}$  as well as Bayesian models based on  $\mathcal{L}$ , would have adequately accounted for the privacy mechanism by respecting (4.2). If the analyst is furthermore Bayesian and employs a prior  $\pi_0$  for  $\beta$ , her posterior distribution now becomes

$$\pi_{\zeta}(\beta | \tilde{s}) = c_{\zeta} \pi_0(\beta) \mathcal{L}_{\zeta}(\beta; \tilde{s}), \quad (4.3)$$

where the proportionality constant  $c_{\zeta}$ , free of the parameter  $\beta$ , ensures that the posterior integrates to one.

Equation (4.2) highlights why transparent privacy allows data users to achieve inferential validity for their question of interest. To compute the true likelihood for  $\beta$ , one must know not only the original statistical model  $\mathcal{L}$ , but also the privacy mechanism  $p_{\zeta}$ . From the data user's perspective, there is no way to carry through the correct calculation according to (4.2) if the privacy mechanism  $p_{\zeta}$  or its parameter  $\zeta$  is hidden. We formalize the crucial importance of transparent privacy in ensuring inferential validity below.

**Theorem 1** (Necessity of transparent privacy). *Let  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d$  be a continuous parameter and  $h(\beta)$  a bounded Borel-measurable function for which inference is sought. The observed data  $\tilde{s}$  is privatized with the mechanism  $p_{\zeta}(\cdot | s)$ , and the analyst supposes the mechanism to be  $q(\cdot | s)$ . Then for all likelihood specifications  $\mathcal{L}$  with base measure  $\nu$ , observed data  $\tilde{s}$  and choice of  $h$ , the analyst recovers the correct posterior expectation for  $h(\beta)$ , i.e.*

$$E_q(h(\beta) | \tilde{s}) = E_{\zeta}(h(\beta) | \tilde{s}) \quad (4.4)$$

*if only if  $p_{\zeta}(\cdot | s) = q(\cdot | s)$  for  $\nu$ -almost all  $s$ .*

*Proof.* The “if” part of the theorem is trivial. For the “only if” part, note that (4.4) is the same as the requirement of weak equivalence between the true posterior  $\pi_{\zeta}(\beta | \tilde{s})$  in (4.3) and the analyst's supposed posterior

$$\pi_q(\beta | \tilde{s}) := c_q \pi_0(\beta) \int q(\tilde{s} | s) \mathcal{L}(\beta; s) ds,$$

where the proportionality constant  $c_q$ , free of  $\beta$ , ensures that the density  $\pi_q$  integrates to one.

This in turn requires for any given  $\tilde{s}$  and the constant  $c = c_{\tilde{\zeta}}/c_q > 0$ ,

$$E(q(\tilde{s} | s) - cp_{\tilde{\zeta}}(\tilde{s} | s) | \beta) = 0$$

for  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d$  almost everywhere, where the expectation above is taken with respect to the likelihood  $\mathcal{L}$ . Since  $\mathcal{L}$  is chosen by the analyst but  $p_{\tilde{\zeta}}$  is not, this implies that she must also choose  $q$  so that  $q(\tilde{s} | s) - cp_{\tilde{\zeta}}(\tilde{s} | s) = 0$  for all  $s$  except on a set of measure zero relative to  $\nu$ . Furthermore, since  $\int q(a | s) da = \int p_{\tilde{\zeta}}(a | s) da = 1$  for every  $s$ , we must have  $c = 1$ , thus  $p_{\tilde{\zeta}}(\cdot | s) = q(\cdot | s)$  as desired.  $\square$

What Theorem 1 says is that, if we conceive the statistical validity of an analysis as its ability to yield the same expected answer as that implied by the correct model (that is, by properly accounting for the privatization mechanism) for a wide range of questions (as reflected by the free choice of  $h$ ), then the only way to ensure statistical validity is to grant the analyst full probabilistic knowledge about the actual privatization mechanism. As discussed in Section 1, prior to differential privacy, knowing  $p_{\tilde{\zeta}}$  or  $\tilde{\zeta}$  had mostly been an untenable luxury, as traditional disclosure limitation methods such as suppression, de-identification and swapping rely fundamentally on procedural secrecy. The arrival of transparent privacy makes principled and statistically valid inference with privatized data possible.

Scholars in the SDL literature advocate for transparent privacy for more than one good reason. With a rearrangement of terms, the posterior in (4.3) can also be written as (details in Appendix B)

$$\pi_{\tilde{\zeta}}(\beta | \tilde{s}) = \int \pi(\beta | s) \pi_{\tilde{\zeta}}(s | \tilde{s}) ds, \quad (4.5)$$

where  $\pi(\beta | s)$  is the posterior model for the confidential  $s$ , and  $\pi_{\tilde{\zeta}}(s | \tilde{s})$  the posterior predictive distribution of the confidential  $s$  based on the privatized  $\tilde{s}$ , again with its dependence on the privacy mechanism  $p_{\tilde{\zeta}}$  highlighted in the subscript. This representation of the posterior resembles the theory of multiple imputation (Rubin, 1996), which lies at the theoretical foundation of the synthetic data approach to SDL (Rubin, 1993; Raghunathan et al., 2003). What (4.5) illustrates is an alternative viewpoint on private data analysis. The correct Bayesian analysis can be constructed as a mixture of naïve analyses based on the agent’s best knowledge of the confidential data, where this best knowledge is instructed by the privatized data, the prior, as well as the transparent privatization procedure. Under this view, the transparency of the privacy mechanism again becomes a crucial ingredient to the *congeniality* (Meng, 1994; Xie and Meng, 2017) between the imputer’s model and the analyst’s model, ensuring the quality of inference the analyst can obtain. Karr and Reiter (2014) call the Bayesian formulation (4.5) the “SDL of the future”, emphasizing the insurmountable computational challenge the analyst would otherwise need to face without knowing the term  $\pi_{\tilde{\zeta}}(s | \tilde{s})$ . With transparency of  $p_{\tilde{\zeta}}$  at hand, the future is in sight.

Transparent privacy mechanisms merit another important quality, namely *parameter distinctive-*

ness, or *a-priori* parameter independence, from both the generative model of the true confidential data as well as any descriptive model the analyst wishes to impose on it. Parameter distinctiveness always holds since the entire privacy mechanism, all within control of the curator, is fully announced hence has no hidden dependence on the unknown inferential parameter  $\beta$  through means beyond the confidential data  $s$ . In the missing data literature, parameter distinctiveness is a prerequisite of the missing data mechanism to give way for simplifying assumptions, such as missing completely at random (MCAR) and missing at random (MAR; Rubin, 1976), allowing for the missingness model to sever any dependence on the unobserved data.<sup>5</sup> In the privacy context, parameter distinctiveness ensures that the privacy mechanism does not interact with any modeling decision imposed on the confidential data. It is the reason why the true observed likelihood  $\mathcal{L}_{\xi}$  in (4.2) involves merely two terms,  $p_{\xi}$  and  $\mathcal{L}$ , whose product constitutes the implied joint model for the complete data  $(s, \bar{s})$  for every choice of  $\mathcal{L}$ . This may result in potentially vast simplification in many cases of downstream analysis. The practical benefit of parameter distinctiveness of the privacy mechanism is predicated on its transparency, for unless a mechanism is *known* (Abowd and Schmutte, 2016), none of its properties can be verified nor put into action with confidence.

While conceptually simple, carrying through the correct calculation can be computationally demanding. The integral in (4.2) may easily become intractable if the statistical model is complex, if the confidential data is high-dimensional (as is the case with the Census tabulations), or if a combination of both holds true. The challenge is amplified by the fact that the two components of the integral are generally not in conjugate forms. While the privacy mechanism  $p_{\xi}$  is determined by the data curator, the statistical model  $\mathcal{L}$  is chosen by the data analyst, and the two parties typically do not consult each other in making their respective choices. Even for the simplest models, such as the running linear regression example, we cannot expect (4.2) to possess an analytical expression.

To answer to the demand for statistically valid inference procedures based on privatized data, Gong (2019) discusses two sets of computational frameworks to handle independently and arbitrarily specified privacy mechanisms and statistical models. For exact likelihood inference, the integration in (4.2) can be performed using Monte Carlo Expectation Maximization (MCEM), designed for the presence of latent variables or partially missing data and equipped with a general-purpose importance sampling strategy at its core. Exact Bayesian inference according to (4.3) can be achieved with, somewhat surprisingly, an approximate Bayesian computation (ABC) algorithm. The tuning parameters of the ABC algorithm usually control the level of approximation in exchange for Monte Carlo efficiency, or computational feasibility in complex models. In the case of privacy, the tuning parameters are set to reflect the privacy mechanism, in such a way that the algorithm outputs exact draws from the desired Bayesian posterior for any proper prior specification. I have explained this phenomenon with a catchy

---

<sup>5</sup>In particular, under MCAR the missingness model may only depend on observed covariates. Under MAR it may also depend on observed outcome variables.

phrase: approximate computation on exact data is exact computation on approximate data. Private data is approximate data, and its inexact nature can be leveraged to our benefit, if the privatization procedure becomes correctly aligned with the necessary approximation that brings computational feasibility.

To continue the illustration with our running example, the MCEM algorithm is implemented to draw maximum likelihood inference for the  $\beta$ 's using privatized data. The right panel of Figure 1 depicts 95% approximate confidence regions (green) for the regression coefficients based on simulated privatized datasets  $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})$  of size  $n = 10$ . The confidence ellipses are derived using a normal approximation to the likelihood at the maximum likelihood estimate, with covariance equal to the inverse observed Fisher information. Details of the algorithm can be found in Appendix C. We see that the actual inferential uncertainty for both  $\beta_0$  and  $\beta_1$  are inflated compared to inference on confidential data as in the left panel, but in contrast to the naïve analysis in the middle panel, most of these green ellipses cover the ground truth despite a loss of precision. The inference they represent adequately reflects the amount of uncertainty present in the privatized data.

## 5 Privacy as a transparent source of total survey error

In introductory probability and survey sampling classrooms, the concept of a census is frequently invoked as a pedagogical reference, often with the U. S. Decennial Census as a prototype. The teacher would contrast statistical inference from a probabilistic sampling scheme with directly observing a quantity from the census, regarding the latter as the gold standard, if not the ground truth. This narrative may have left many quantitative researchers with the impression that the Census is always comprehensive and accurate. The reality, however, invariably departs from this ideal. The Census is a survey, and is subject to many kinds of errors and uncertainties as do all surveys. As do coverage bias, non-response, erroneous and edited inputs, statistical disclosure limitation introduces a source of uncertainty into the survey, albeit unique in nature.

To assess the quality of the end data product, and to improve it to the extent possible, we construe privacy as one of the several interrelated contributors to total survey error (TSE; Groves, 2005). Errors due to privacy make up a source of non-sampling survey error (Biemer, 2010). Additive mechanisms create privacy errors that bear a structural resemblance with measurement errors (Reiter, 2019). What makes privacy errors easier to deal with than other sources of survey error, at least theoretically, is that their generative process is verifiable and manipulable. Under central models of differential privacy, the process is within the control of the curator, and under local models (i.e. the responses are privatized as they leave the respondent) it is defined by explicit protocols. Transparency brings several notable advantages to the game. Privacy errors are known to enjoy desirable properties such as simple and tractable probabil-




Figure 2: 95% joint confidence regions for  $(\beta_0, \beta_1)$  derived from the same set of linear regression analyses on privatized data as depicted in Figure 1, but with  $\epsilon = 1$ , a four-fold PLB increase. While the correct, MCEM-based analysis (right) remains valid, the accuracy of the naïve analysis (left) is greatly improved (compared to the middle panel of Figure 1), at the expense of a weaker privacy guarantee from the data.

ity distributions, statistical independence among the error terms, as well as between the errors and the underlying confidential data (i.e. parameter distinctiveness). These properties may be assumptions for measurement errors, but they are known to hold true for privacy errors. In the classic measurement error setting, the error variance needs to be estimated. In contrast, the theoretical variance of all the additive privacy mechanisms are known and public. The structural similarity between privacy errors and measurement errors allow for the straightforward adaptation of existing tools for measurement error modeling, including regression calibration and simulation extrapolation which perform well for a wide class of generalized linear models. Other approaches that aim to remedy the effect of both missing data and measurement errors can be modified to include privacy errors (Kim et al., 2014, 2015; Blackwell et al., 2017a,b). Most recently, steps are being taken to develop methods for direct bias correction in the regression context (Evans and King, aper).

We emphasize that the transparency of the privacy mechanism is crucial to the understanding, quantification, and control of its impact on the quality of the resulting data product from a total survey of error approach. As noted in Karr (2017), traditional disclosure limitation methods often passively interact with other data processing and error reduction procedures commonly applied to surveys, and the effect of such interaction is often subtle. Due to the artificial nature of all privacy mechanisms, any interaction between the privacy errors can be explicitly investigated and quantified, either theoretically or via simulation, strengthening the quality of the end data product by taking out the guess work. It is particularly convenient that the mathematical formulation of differential privacy employs the concept of a privacy loss budget, which acts as a fine-grained tuning parameter for the performance of the procedure. The framework is suited for integration with the *total budget* concept and the error decomposition approach to

understanding the effect of individual error constituents. The price we pay for privacy can be regarded as a trade-off with the total utility, defined through concrete quality metrics on the resulting data product – for example, the minimal mean squared error achievable by an optimal survey design, or the accuracy on the output of certain routine data analysis protocols.

An increase in the PLB will in general improve the quality of the data product. But the impact on data quality exerted by a particular choice of PLB should be understood within the specific context of application. When the important use cases and accuracy targets are identified, transparency allows for the setting of privacy parameters to meet these targets via theoretical or simulated explorations, as early as during the design phase of the survey. As an illustration, Figure 2 repeats the same regression analysis as in Figure 1, but with  $\epsilon = 1$ , a PLB that is four times larger. While the correct, MCEM-based analysis remains valid, the naïve analysis has greatly improved its performance, as seen from the confidence ellipses in the left panel with comparable coverage compared to the right panel (correct analysis with  $\epsilon = 1$ ), which is better than the middle panel of Figure 1 (naïve analysis with  $\epsilon = 0.25$ ). Through six iterations of the 2010 Demonstration Data Files, the Census Bureau increased the PLB from  $\epsilon = 6$  (4 for persons and 2 for housing units; [U.S. Census Bureau, 2019](#)) to  $\epsilon = 19.71$  (17.14 for persons and 2.47 for housing units; [U.S. Census Bureau, 2021c](#)) for the production setting of the PL-94-171 files. Since the PLB is a probabilistic bound on the log scale, the three-to-four fold increase substantially weakened the privacy guarantee. However, it allowed the Bureau to improve and meet the various accuracy targets identified by the data user communities ([U.S. Census Bureau, 2021b](#)).

When privatization is a transparent procedure, it does not merely add to the total error of an otherwise confidential survey. We have reasons to hope that it may help reduce the error via means of human psychology. A primary cause of inaccuracy in the Census is nonresponse and imperfect coverage, in part having to do with insufficient public trust, both in the privacy protection of disseminated data products and in the Census Bureau’s ability to maintain confidentiality of sensitive information ([Singer et al., 1993](#); [Sullivan, 2020](#); [boyd and Sarathy, 2022](#)). Individual data contributors value their privacy. Through their data sharing (or rather, un-sharing) decisions, they exhibit a clear preference for privacy which has both been theoretically studied ([Nissim et al., 2012](#); [Ghosh and Roth, 2015](#)) and empirically measured ([Acquisti et al., 2013](#)). To the privacy-conscious data contributor, transparent privacy offers the certainty of knowing that our information is protected in an explicit and provable way that is vetted by communities of interested data users. Even a small progress towards instilling confidence in the respondents and encouraging participation can greatly enhance the quality of the survey, reducing the potentially immense cost that systematic nonresponse bias may impose on subsequent social and policy decisions.

The algorithmic construction of differential privacy and the theoretical explorations of total survey error creates a promising intersection. We hope to see synergistic methodological developments to serve the dual purpose of efficient privacy protection and survey quality op-

timization. I will briefly discuss one such direction. Discussing *TSE-aware SDL*, [Karr \(2017\)](#) advocates that when additive privacy mechanisms are employed, the optimal choice of privacy error covariance should accord to the measurement error covariance. The resulting data release demonstrates superior utility in terms of closeness to the confidential data distribution in the sense of minimal Kullbeck-Leibler divergence. This proposal, when accepted into the differential privacy framework, requires generalizing the vanilla algorithms to produce correlated noise while preserving the privacy guarantee. Differential privacy researchers have looked in this direction and offered tools adaptable to this purpose. For example, [Nikolov et al. \(2013\)](#) propose a correlated Gaussian mechanism for linear queries, and demonstrate that it is an optimal mechanism among  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -differentially private mechanisms in terms of minimizing the mean squared error of the data product. A privacy mechanism structurally designed to express the theory of survey error minimization paves the way for optimized usability of the end data product.

## 6 The quest for full transparency: are we there yet?

The collection of economic and social data is a widely practiced tradition in many civilizations, which traces back hundreds if not thousands of years. It was not until the latter part of the 20th century, however, that the need to defend individuals' confidentiality became recognized as a worthy scholarly pursuit ([Oberski and Kreuter, 2020](#)). Despite privacy being a youthful subject, we have come a long way in a mere couple of decades to advance the art and the science of privacy protection. The progress was driven by a series of embarrassments (some mentioned in [Section 1](#)), an awareness shared by major data curators including official statistics agencies, corporations and research institutions, and most importantly the hard work of computer scientists and statisticians who keep inventing new techniques to replace the old. Transparent privacy is a significant milestone in this progress, a gift bestowed upon us by the continued advancement in privacy research. However, a perpetually curious researcher still must ask the ungrateful question: is this transparency all we can ask for?

Just as some gifts are more practical than others, some versions of transparent privacy are more usable than others. An example of transparent privacy that can be difficult to work with occurs after the *post-processing* of noise-infused queries. Post-processing may be needed, when the need for privacy is met simultaneously with the mandated release of certain *invariant* information. Invariants are a set of exact statistics calculated based on the confidential microdata ([Ashmead et al., 2019](#)). The invariants are mandated, in the sense that all versions of the privatized data that the curator can possibly release must accord to these values. Invariants represent use cases for which a precise enumeration is crucial. For example the total population of each state, which serves as the basis for the allocation of house seats, is a Census invariant by the U.S. Constitution.

What information constitutes invariant is ultimately a policy decision. But invariants don't mingle with differential privacy in a straightforward manner. Indeed, if a query function has random noise added to it, there is no guarantee that it still satisfies a set of constraints as does the noiseless version, such as an equality between their respective sums. The task of ensuring privatized Census data releases to be invariant-respecting is performed by the TopDown algorithm (Abowd et al., 2022). The algorithm employs optimization-based post-processing, with nonnegative  $L_2$  optimization and  $L_1$  optimization, to ensure that the output tabulations consist of only nonnegative integers while satisfying all constraints posed by the invariants. It has been recognized that these post-processing steps can create unexpected anomalies in the released tabulations, namely systematic positive biases for smaller counts and negative biases for larger counts, at a magnitude that tends to overwhelm the amount of inaccuracy due to privacy alone (Devine et al., 2020; Zhu et al., 2021).

Due to the sheer size of the optimization problem, the statistical properties of post-processing do not succumb easily to theoretical explorations. However, the observed adverse effects of post-processing should not strike as unanticipated. Projective optimizations, be they  $L_2$  or  $L_1$ , are essentially regression adjustments on a collection of data points. The departures that the resulting values exhibit in the direction opposite to the original values is a manifestation of the Galtonian phenomenon of *regression towards the mean* (Stigler, 2016). Furthermore, whenever an unbiased and unbounded estimator is *a-posteriori* confined to a subdomain (the nonnegative integers), the unbiasedness property it once enjoys may no longer hold (Berger, 1990).

Note that the optimization algorithm that imposes invariants can still be *procedurally* transparent. The design of the TopDown algorithm is documented in the Census Bureau's publication (Abowd et al., 2022), accompanied by a suite of demonstration products and the GitHub codebase (2020 Census DAS Development Team, 2019). However, mere procedural transparency may not be good enough. In summary of the NASEM-CNSTAT workshop dedicated to the assessment of the 2020 Census DAS, Hotz and Salvo (2022) note that post-processing of privatized data can be particularly difficult to model statistically. This is because the optimization imposes an extremely complex, indeed data-dependent, function to the confidential data (Gong and Meng, 2020). As a result, the distributional description of the algorithm's output is difficult to characterize. If the statistical properties of the end data releases cannot be simply described or replicated on an ordinary personal computer, it sets back the transparency brought forth by the differentially private noise-infusion mechanism, and hinders a typical end user's ability to carry out the principled analysis as this article outlines.

Nevertheless, procedural transparency is a promising step towards full transparency that can support principled statistical inference. Through the design phase of the 2020 DAS for the PL 94-171 redistricting data, the Census Bureau released a total of six rounds of demonstration data files in the form of privacy-protect microdata files (PPMFs). The PPMFs enabled community assessments on the DAS performance, including its accuracy targets, and to provide feedback to the Census Bureau for future improvement. These demonstration data are a crucial source

of information for the data user communities, and have supported research on the impact of differential privacy as well as post-processing in topics such as small area population (Swanson et al., 2021; Swanson and Cossman, 2021), tribal nations (NCAI, 2021), redistricting and voting rights measures (Cohen et al., 2021; Kenny et al., 2021).

On August 12, 2021, a group of privacy researchers signed a letter addressed to Dr. Ron Jarmin, Acting Director of the United States Census Bureau, to request the release of the noisy measurement files that accompanied the PL 94-171 redistricting data products (Dwork et al., 2021). The letter made the compelling case that the noisy measurement files present the most straightforward solution to the issues that arise due to post-processing. Since the noisy measurements are already formally private, releasing these files does not pose additional threat to the privacy guarantee that the Bureau already offers. On the other hand, they will allow researchers to quantify the biases induced by post-processing and to conduct correct uncertainty quantification. In their report *Consistency of Data Products and Formal Privacy Methods for the 2020 Census*, JASON (2022) makes the recommendation that the Bureau “should not reduce the information value of their data products solely because of fears that some stakeholders will be confused by or misuse the released data.” It makes an explicit call for the release of all noisy measurements used to produce the released data products that do not unduly increase disclosure risk, and the quantification of uncertainty associated with the publicized data products. On April 28 - 29, 2022, a workshop dedicated to articulating a technical research agenda for statistical inference on the differentially private Census noisy measurement files takes place at Rutgers University, gathering experts from domains of social sciences, demography, public policy, statistics, and computer science. These efforts reflect the shared recognition among the research and the policy communities that access to the Census noisy measurement files, and its associated transparency benefits, are both crucial and feasible within the current disclosure avoidance framework that the Census Bureau employs.

The evolution of privacy science over the years reflects the growing dynamic among several branches of data science, as they collectively benefit from vastly improved computational and data storage abilities. What we’re witnessing today is a paradigm shift in the science of curating official, social and personal statistics. A change of this scale is bound to exert seismic impact on the ways that quantitative evidence is used and interpreted, raising novel questions and opportunities in all disciplines that rely on these data sources. The protection of privacy is not just a legal or policy mandate, but an ethical treatment of all individuals who contribute to the collective betterment of science and society with their information. As privacy research continue to evolve, an open and cross-disciplinary conversation is the catalyst to a fitting solution. Partaking in this conversation is our opportunity to defend democracy in its modern form: underpinned by numbers, yet elevated by our respect for one another as more than just numbers.

## Acknowledgement

Ruobin Gong wishes to thank Xiao-Li Meng for helpful discussions and five anonymous reviewers for their comments. Gong’s research is supported in part by the National Science Foundation (DMS-1916002).

## References

- 2020 Census DAS Development Team (2019). Disclosure avoidance system for the 2020 census, end-to-end release: Uscensusbureau/Census2020-Das-E2e. US Census Bureau. <https://github.com/uscensusbureau/census2020-das-e2e> [Accessed: 04-08-2020].
- Abowd, J. (2019). Staring down the database reconstruction theorem. <https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial/2020/resources/presentations-publications/2019-02-16-abowd-db-reconstruction.pdf?> [Accessed: 04-20-2020].
- Abowd, J. M., Ashmead, R., Cumings-Menon, R., Garfinkel, S., Heineck, M., Heiss, C., Johns, R., Kifer, D., Leclerc, P., Machanavajjhala, A., Moran, B., Sexton, W., Spence, M., and Zhuravlev, P. (2022). The census topdown algorithm. *Harvard Data Science Review*.
- Abowd, J. M. and Schmutte, I. M. (2016). Economic analysis and statistical disclosure limitation. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 2015(1):221–293.
- Acquisti, A., John, L. K., and Loewenstein, G. (2013). What is privacy worth? *The Journal of Legal Studies*, 42(2):249–274.
- Ashmead, R., Kifer, D., Leclerc, P., Machanavajjhala, A., and Sexton, W. (2019). Effective privacy after adjusting for invariants with applications to the 2020 census. Technical report.
- Asquith, B., Hershbein, B., Kugler, T., Reed, S., Ruggles, S., Schroeder, J., Van Riper, D., and Yesiltepe, S. (2022). Assessing the impact of differential privacy on measures of population and racial residential segregation. *Harvard Data Science Review*.
- Berger, J. O. (1990). On the inadmissibility of unbiased estimators. *STAT. PROB. LETT.*, 9(5):381–384.
- Biemer, P. P. (2010). Total survey error: Design, implementation, and evaluation. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 74(5):817–848.
- Blackwell, M., Honaker, J., and King, G. (2017a). A unified approach to measurement error and missing data: Details and extensions. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 46(3):342–369.
- Blackwell, M., Honaker, J., and King, G. (2017b). A unified approach to measurement error and missing data: overview and applications. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 46(3):303–341.

- boyd, d. and Sarathy, J. (2022). Differential perspectives: Epistemic disconnects surrounding the us census bureau’s use of differential privacy. *Harvard Data Science Review*.
- Carroll, R. J., Ruppert, D., Stefanski, L. A., and Crainiceanu, C. M. (2006). *Measurement error in nonlinear models: a modern perspective*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Cohen, A., Duchin, M., Matthews, J., and Suwal, B. (2021). Census topdown: The impacts of differential privacy on redistricting. In *2nd Symposium on Foundations of Responsible Computing (FORC 2021)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik.
- Devine, J., Borman, C., and Spence, M. (2020). 2020 census disclosure avoidance improvement metrics. <https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial/2020/program-management/data-product-planning/disclosure-avoidance-system/2020-03-18-2020-census-da-improvement-metrics.pdf> [Accessed: 04-08-2020].
- Dinur, I. and Nissim, K. (2003). Revealing information while preserving privacy. In *Proceedings of the twenty-second ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART symposium on Principles of database systems*, pages 202–210.
- Dwork, C., King, G., Greenwood, R., et al. (2021). Request for release of “noisy measurements file” by september 30 along with redistricting data products. Letter to Dr. Ron Jarmin, Acting Director, United States Census Bureau, Aug 12, 2021.
- Dwork, C., McSherry, F., Nissim, K., and Smith, A. (2006). Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis. In *Theory of cryptography conference*, pages 265–284. Springer.
- Dwork, C. and Roth, A. (2014). The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy. *Foundations and Trends® in Theoretical Computer Science*, 9(3–4):211–407.
- Dwork, C. and Rothblum, G. N. (2016). Concentrated differential privacy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.01887*.
- Evans, G. and King, G. (Working Paper). Statistically valid inferences from differentially private data releases, with application to the facebook urls dataset.
- Fioretto, F. and Van Hentenryck, P. (2019). Differential privacy of hierarchical census data: An optimization approach. In *International Conference on Principles and Practice of Constraint Programming*, pages 639–655. Springer.
- Ghosh, A. and Roth, A. (2015). Selling privacy at auction. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 91:334–346.
- Ghosh, A., Roughgarden, T., and Sundararajan, M. (2012). Universally utility-maximizing privacy mechanisms. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 41(6):1673–1693.

- Gong, R. (2019). Exact inference with approximate computation for differentially private data via perturbations. Technical report.
- Gong, R. and Meng, X.-L. (2020). Congenial differential privacy under mandated disclosure. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM-IMS on Foundations of Data Science Conference, FODS '20*, pages 59–70.
- Groves, R. M. (2005). *Survey errors and survey costs*, volume 581. John Wiley & Sons.
- Hawes, M. B. (2020+). Implementing differential privacy: Seven lessons from the u.s. 2020 census. *Harvard Data Science Review (to appear)*.
- Hotz, V. J. and Salvo, J. (2022). A chronicle of the application of differential privacy to the 2020 census. *Harvard Data Science Review*.
- Iceland, J., Weinberg, D. H., and Steinmetz, E. (2002). Racial and ethnic residential segregation in the united states: 1980-2000. In *Census 2000 Special Reports*. US Census Bureau. <https://www.census.gov/prod/2002pubs/censr-3.pdf> [Accessed: 04-08-2020].
- JASON, T. M. C. (2022). Consistency of data products and formal privacy methods for the 2020 census.
- Karr, A. F. (2017). The role of statistical disclosure limitation in total survey error. In Biemer, P. P., de Leeuw, E. D., Eckman, S., Edwards, B., Kreuter, F., Lyberg, L. E., Tucker, N. C., and West, B. T., editors, *Total Survey Error in Practice*, chapter 4, pages 71–94. John Wiley & Sons.
- Karr, A. F. and Reiter, J. (2014). Using statistics to protect privacy. *Privacy, Big Data, and the Public Good Frameworks for Engagement*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Kenny, C. T., Kuriwaki, S., McCartan, C., Rosenman, E. T., Simko, T., and Imai, K. (2021). The use of differential privacy for census data and its impact on redistricting: The case of the 2020 us census. *Science advances*, 7(41):eabk3283.
- Kifer, D., Smith, A., and Thakurta, A. (2012). Private convex empirical risk minimization and high-dimensional regression. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 25–1. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings.
- Kim, H. J., Cox, L. H., Karr, A. F., Reiter, J. P., and Wang, Q. (2015). Simultaneous edit-imputation for continuous microdata. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 110(511):987–999.
- Kim, H. J., Reiter, J. P., Wang, Q., Cox, L. H., and Karr, A. F. (2014). Multiple imputation of missing or faulty values under linear constraints. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 32(3):375–386.

- Little, R. and Rubin, D. (2014). *Statistical Analysis with Missing Data*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. Wiley.
- McKenna, L. (2018). Disclosure avoidance techniques used for the 1970 through 2010 decennial censuses of population and housing. Technical report, U. S. Census Bureau.
- McSherry, F. and Talwar, K. (2007). Mechanism design via differential privacy. In *Foundations of Computer Science, 2007. FOCS'07. 48th Annual IEEE Symposium on*, pages 94–103. IEEE.
- Meng, X.-L. (1994). Multiple-imputation inferences with uncongenial sources of input. *Statistical Science*, pages 538–558.
- NCAI (2021). 2020 census disclosure avoidance system: Potential impacts on tribal nation census data. Technical report, National Congress of American Indians.
- Nikolov, A., Talwar, K., and Zhang, L. (2013). The geometry of differential privacy: the sparse and approximate cases. In *Proceedings of the forty-fifth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 351–360. ACM.
- Nissim, K., Orlandi, C., and Smorodinsky, R. (2012). Privacy-aware mechanism design. In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*, pages 774–789.
- Oberski, D. L. and Kreuter, F. (2020). Differential privacy and social science: An urgent puzzle. *Harvard Data Science Review*, 2(1). <https://hdsr.mitpress.mit.edu/pub/g9o4z8au>.
- Oganian, A. and Karr, A. F. (2006). Combinations of sdc methods for microdata protection. In *International Conference on Privacy in Statistical Databases*, pages 102–113. Springer.
- Raghunathan, T. E., Reiter, J. P., and Rubin, D. B. (2003). Multiple imputation for statistical disclosure limitation. *Journal of official statistics*, 19(1):1.
- Reiter, J. P. (2019). Differential privacy and federal data releases. *Annual review of statistics and its application*, 6:85–101.
- Rubin, D. B. (1976). Inference and missing data. *Biometrika*, 63(3):581–592.
- Rubin, D. B. (1993). Satisfying confidentiality constraints through the use of synthetic multiplyimputed microdata. *Journal of Official Statistics*, 9(2):461–468.
- Rubin, D. B. (1996). Multiple imputation after 18+ years. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 91(434):473–489.
- Singer, E., Mathiowetz, N. A., and Couper, M. P. (1993). The impact of privacy and confidentiality concerns on survey participation the case of the 1990 us census. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 57(4):465–482.
- Stigler, S. M. (2016). *The seven pillars of statistical wisdom*. Harvard University Press.

- Sullivan, T. A. (2020). Coming to our census: How social statistics underpin our democracy (and republic). *Harvard Data Science Review*, 2(1). <https://hdsr.mitpress.mit.edu/pub/1g1cbvkv>.
- Swanson, D. A., Bryan, T. M., and Sewell, R. (2021). The effect of the differential privacy disclosure avoidance system proposed by the census bureau on 2020 census products: Four case studies of census blocks in alaska. <https://www.populationassociation.org/blogs/paa-web1/2021/03/30/the-effect-of-the-differential-privacy-disclosure> [Accessed on Feb 13, 2022].
- Swanson, D. A. and Cossman, R. E. (2021). The effect of the differential privacy disclosure avoidance system proposed by the census bureau on 2020 census products: Four case studies of census blocks in mississippi. [https://www.ncsl.org/Portals/1/Documents/Elections/Four\\_Case\\_Studies\\_of\\_Census\\_Blocks\\_in\\_Mississippi.pdf](https://www.ncsl.org/Portals/1/Documents/Elections/Four_Case_Studies_of_Census_Blocks_in_Mississippi.pdf) [Accessed on Feb 13, 2022].
- Sweeney, L. (2002). k-anonymity: A model for protecting privacy. *International Journal of Uncertainty, Fuzziness and Knowledge-Based Systems*, 10(05):557–570.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2019). Memorandum 2019.25: 2010 demonstration data products - design parameters and global privacy-loss budget. [https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/decade/2020/planning-management/plan/memo-series/2020-memo-2019\\_25.html](https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/decade/2020/planning-management/plan/memo-series/2020-memo-2019_25.html) [Accessed: 04-18-2022].
- US Census Bureau (2020a). 2010 demonstration data products. <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/2020-census/planning-management/2020-census-data-products/2010-demonstration-data-products.html> [Accessed: 04-08-2020].
- US Census Bureau (2020b). 2020 disclosure avoidance system updates - 3/27/20: Draft quality measures and benchmark. <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/2020-census/planning-management/2020-census-data-products/2020-das-updates.html> [Accessed: 04-08-2020].
- U.S. Census Bureau (2021a). 2020 census: Redistricting file (public law 94-171) dataset (aug 12, 2021). <https://www.census.gov/data/datasets/2020/dec/2020-census-redistricting-summary-file-dataset.html> [Accessed: 02-15-2022].
- U.S. Census Bureau (2021b). Census bureau sets key parameters to protect privacy in 2020 census results (june 9, 2021).
- U.S. Census Bureau (2021c). Privacy-loss budget allocation 2021-06-08. <https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial/2020/program-management/data-product-planning/2010-demonstration-data-products/ppmf20210608/2021-06-08-privacy-loss-budgetallocation.pdf> [Accessed: 02-15-2022].

- Van Riper, D., Kugler, T., and Schroeder, J. (2020). IPUMS NHGIS privacy-protected 2010 Census demonstration data. Minneapolis, MN: IPUMS.
- Warner, S. L. (1965). Randomized response: A survey technique for eliminating evasive answer bias. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 60(309):63–69.
- Xie, X. and Meng, X.-L. (2017). Dissecting multiple imputation from a multi-phase inference perspective: what happens when god’s, imputer’s and analyst’s models are uncongenial? *Statistica Sinica*, pages 1485–1545.
- Zhu, K., Van Hentenryck, P., and Fioretto, F. (2021). Bias and variance of post-processing in differential privacy. In *Proceedings of the The Thirty-Fifth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-21)*.

# Appendix

## A Analytical form of the biasing effect in large finite samples.

Here we state a Central Limit Theorem for the naïve slope estimator  $\hat{b}_1$ , applicable when the independent variable  $x_i$ 's are treated as fixed and when the sample size is large.

**Theorem 2.** Let  $v_n^x = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2$  and  $k_n^x = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^4$  respectively denote the (unadjusted) sample variance and kurtosis of the confidential data  $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ . Assume  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} k_n^x = k > 0$  is well-defined. Privatized data  $(\tilde{x}_i, \tilde{y}_i)$  follows the generative model in (3.1) and privacy mechanism in (3.2). The naïve slope estimator for the simple linear regression of  $\tilde{y}_i$  against  $\tilde{x}_i$  is  $\hat{b}_1 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (\tilde{x}_i - \bar{\tilde{x}}) (\tilde{y}_i - \bar{\tilde{y}})}{\sum_{i=1}^n (\tilde{x}_i - \bar{\tilde{x}})^2}$ . Then, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\sqrt{n} \left( \frac{\hat{b}_1 - \gamma_n \beta_1}{\sqrt{\tilde{\sigma}_n}} \right) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where  $\gamma_n = v_n^x / (v_n^x + \sigma_u^2)$  is the biasing coefficient, and

$$\tilde{\sigma}_n = \frac{\beta_1^2 [\gamma_n^2 (k_n^x + 6\sigma_u^2 v_n^x + 6\sigma_u^4) - 2\gamma_n (k_n^x + 3\sigma_u^2 v_n^x) + k_n^x + \sigma_u^2 v_n^x] + (\sigma_v^2 + \sigma^2) (v_n^x + \sigma_u^2)}{(v_n^x + \sigma_u^2)^2}$$

the approximate standard error.

The biasing coefficient  $\gamma_n$  is the finite-population counterpart to the ratio  $\mathbb{V}(x) / (\mathbb{V}(x) + \sigma_u^2)$  discussed in Section 3. As a special case when no privacy protection is performed on either  $x_i$  or  $y_i$ , i.e.  $\sigma_u^2 = \sigma_v^2 = 0$ , then the biasing coefficient  $\gamma_n = 1$ , and the associated variance  $\tilde{\sigma}_n = \sigma^2 / v_n^x$  regardless of sample size  $n$ . This recovers the usual sampling result for the classic regression estimate  $\hat{\beta}_1$ . Otherwise when  $\sigma_u^2 > 0$ , the biasing coefficient  $\gamma_n$  is a positive fractional quantity, tending towards 0 as  $\epsilon_x$  decreases, and 1 if it increases. Therefore, the naïve estimator  $\hat{b}_1$  underestimates the strength of association between  $x$  and  $y$ , more severely so as the privacy protection for  $x$  becomes more stringent.

When  $n$  is large, the large sample sampling distribution of  $\hat{b}_1$  has  $(1 - \alpha)\%$  of its mass within the lower and upper distribution limits  $(\gamma_n \beta_1 - \Phi(1 - \alpha/2) \sqrt{\tilde{\sigma}_n/n}, \gamma_n \beta_1 + \Phi(1 - \alpha/2) \sqrt{\tilde{\sigma}_n/n})$ , which are functions of the true  $\beta_1$ , the confidential data  $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ , as well as the idiosyncratic variance ( $\sigma^2$ ) and the privacy error variances ( $\sigma_u^2$  and  $\sigma_v^2$ ). The left panel of Figure 3 depicts these large sample 95% distribution limits under various privacy loss budget settings for  $x$  and  $y$ , and the right panel depicts their actual coverage probability for the true parameter  $\beta_1$ .

We now supply the proof of Theorem 2, which gives a large sample approximation to the distribution of the naive regression slope estimator for privatized data, which takes the form of




Figure 3: Left: large sample 95% distribution limits of the naïve slope estimator  $\hat{b}_1$  as a function of  $\sigma_u$  and  $\sigma_v$  (privacy error variances of  $x$  and  $y$ , respectively). The panel labeled “ $\sigma_v = 0$ ” shows distribution limits (shaded gray) around the point-wise limit of the naïve estimator (black solid line), if  $y$  is not privacy protected but  $x$  is protected at increasing levels of stringency (as much as  $\sigma_u = \sqrt{2}/\epsilon_x = 2$ , or  $\epsilon_x = 0.707$ ). The panel labeled “ $\sigma_v = 2$ ” shows distribution limits if  $y$  is also protected at that scale (equivalent to  $\epsilon_y = 0.707$ ). True  $\beta_1 = 0.5$  (black dashed line). Right: coverage probabilities of the large sample 95% distribution limits for the naïve slope estimator  $\hat{b}_1$ , as a function of  $\sigma_u$  and  $\sigma_v$ . With no privacy protection for either  $x$  or  $y$  ( $\sigma_u = \sigma_v = 0$ ), the 95% distribution limit coincides with that of  $\hat{\beta}_1$  from the classic regression setting, and meets its nominal coverage for all  $n$ . Adding privacy protection to  $y$  only (i.e.  $\sigma_v$  increases) inflates a correctly centered asymptotic distribution, exhibiting conservative coverage. However for fixed  $\sigma_v$ , as privacy protection for  $x$  increases (i.e.  $\sigma_u$  increases), the bias in  $\hat{b}_1$  dominates and drives coverage probability down to zero. Illustration uses a dataset of  $n = 500$ , with sample variance of confidential  $x$  about 1.023, and idiosyncratic error variance  $\sigma^2 = 1$ .

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{b}_1 &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (\tilde{x}_i - \bar{\tilde{x}}) (\tilde{y}_i - \bar{\tilde{y}})}{\sum_{i=1}^n (\tilde{x}_i - \bar{\tilde{x}})^2} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n ((x_i - \bar{x}) + (u_i - \bar{u})) (\beta_1 (x_i - \bar{x}) + (v_i - \bar{v}) + (e_i - \bar{e}))}{\sum_{i=1}^n ((x_i - \bar{x}) + (u_i - \bar{u}))^2}\end{aligned}$$

Writing  $c_i = v_i + e_i$  and  $a_i = x_i - \bar{x}$ , we have that

$$\hat{b}_1 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (a_i + u_i - \bar{u}) (\beta_1 a_i + c_i - \bar{c})}{\sum_{i=1}^n (a_i + u_i - \bar{u})^2} = \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (a_i + u_i) (\beta_1 a_i + c_i - \bar{c})}{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (a_i + u_i)^2 - \bar{u}^2} =: \frac{A_n}{B_n}$$

Using independence between  $c_i$  and  $u_i$ , denoting the sample variance and kurtosis of  $x$  as

$$v_n^x := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2, \quad k_n^x := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^4,$$

assuming that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} k_n^x = k > 0$  exists and is well-defined. We have that by law of large numbers,

$$A_n - \beta_1 v_n^x \xrightarrow{p} 0, \quad B_n - (v_n^x + \sigma_u^2) \xrightarrow{p} 0,$$

thus

$$\hat{b}_1 \xrightarrow{p} \gamma_n \beta_1$$

where  $\gamma_n = \frac{v_n^x}{v_n^x + \sigma_u^2}$  is the biasing coefficient for the naive slope estimator  $\hat{b}_1$ . To establish the Central Limit Theorem result, let us first consider

$$\begin{aligned}A'_n &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (a_i + u_i) (\beta_1 a_i + c_i) = A_n - \bar{c} \bar{u}, \\ B'_n &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (a_i + u_i)^2 = B_n + \bar{u}^2.\end{aligned}$$

We have that

$$\sqrt{n} (A_n - \gamma_n \beta_1 B_n) = \sqrt{n} (A'_n - \gamma_n \beta_1 B'_n) + \sqrt{n} \bar{c} \bar{u} - \sqrt{n} \gamma_n \beta_1 \bar{u}^2,$$

where  $\sqrt{n} \bar{c} \bar{u} \xrightarrow{p} 0$  and  $\sqrt{n} \gamma_n \beta_1 \bar{u}^2 \xrightarrow{p} 0$ . The following Central Limit Theorem holds:

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{n} \left( \frac{A'_n - \gamma_n \beta_1 B'_n}{\sqrt{\Sigma_n}} \right) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n \Sigma_n}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n (a_i + u_i) (\beta_1 a_i + c_i) - \gamma_n \beta_1 \sum_{i=1}^n (a_i + u_i)^2 \right] \\ &\xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1)\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_n &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n E \left( (a_i + u_i) (\beta_1 a_i + c_i) - \gamma_n \beta_1 (a_i + u_i)^2 \right)^2 \\
&= \gamma_n^2 \beta_1^2 \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum a_i^4 + 6\sigma_u^2 \frac{1}{n} \sum a_i^2 + 6\sigma_u^4 \right) - 2\gamma_n \beta_1^2 \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum a_i^4 + 3\sigma_u^2 \frac{1}{n} \sum a_i^2 \right) + \\
&\quad \beta_1^2 \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum a_i^4 + \sigma_u^2 \frac{1}{n} \sum a_i^2 \right) + (\sigma_v^2 + \sigma^2) \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum a_i^2 + \sigma_u^2 \right) \\
&= \beta_1^2 \left[ \gamma_n^2 \left( k_n^x + 6\sigma_u^2 v_n^x + 6\sigma_u^4 \right) - 2\gamma_n \left( k_n^x + 3\sigma_u^2 v_n^x \right) + k_n^x + \sigma_u^2 v_n^x \right] + (\sigma_v^2 + \sigma^2) (v_n^x + \sigma_u^2),
\end{aligned}$$

noting that for each  $i$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
&E \left( (a_i + u_i) (\beta_1 a_i + c_i) - \gamma_n \beta_1 (a_i + u_i)^2 \right)^2 \\
&= E \left( (a_i + u_i) (\beta_1 a_i + c_i) \right)^2 + \gamma_n^2 \beta_1^2 E (a_i + u_i)^4 - 2\gamma_n \beta_1 E (\beta_1 a_i + c_i) (a_i + u_i)^3, \\
&= E (\beta_1 a_i + c_i)^2 E (a_i + u_i)^2 + \gamma_n^2 \beta_1^2 E (a_i + u_i)^4 - 2\gamma_n \beta_1^2 a_i E (a_i + u_i)^3 \\
&= \gamma_n^2 \beta_1^2 \left( a_i^4 + 6a_i^2 \sigma_u^2 + 6\sigma_u^4 \right) - 2\gamma_n \beta_1^2 \left( a_i^4 + 3a_i^2 \sigma_u^2 \right) + (\beta_1^2 a_i^2 + \sigma_v^2 + \sigma^2) (a_i^2 + \sigma_u^2),
\end{aligned}$$

where for  $u_i$  a centralized Laplace variable,

$$E(a_i + u_i)^2 = a_i^2 + \sigma_u^2; \quad E(a_i + u_i)^3 = a_i^3 + 3a_i \sigma_u^2; \quad E(a_i + u_i)^4 = a_i^4 + 6a_i^2 \sigma_u^2 + 6\sigma_u^4.$$

Thus with  $\hat{b}_1 = A_n/B_n$ , we have that the Central Limit Theorem for the naive slope estimator is

$$\sqrt{n} \left( \frac{\hat{b}_1 - \gamma_n \beta_1}{\sqrt{\tilde{\sigma}_n}} \right) = \frac{\sqrt{n} (A'_n - \gamma_n \beta_1 B'_n) + \sqrt{n} \bar{c} \bar{u} - \sqrt{n} \gamma_n \beta_1 \bar{u}^2}{B_n \sqrt{\tilde{\sigma}_n}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\sigma}_n &= (v_n^x + \sigma_u^2)^{-2} \Sigma \\
&= \frac{\beta_1^2 \left[ \gamma_n^2 \left( k_n^x + 6\sigma_u^2 v_n^x + 6\sigma_u^4 \right) - 2\gamma_n \left( k_n^x + 3\sigma_u^2 v_n^x \right) + k_n^x + \sigma_u^2 v_n^x \right] + (\sigma_v^2 + \sigma^2) (v_n^x + \sigma_u^2)}{(v_n^x + \sigma_u^2)^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

As a special case when no privacy protection is performed on either  $x$  or  $y$ , i.e.  $\sigma_u = \sigma_v = 0$ , then  $\gamma_n = 1$  for all  $n$  and  $\tilde{\sigma}_n = \sigma^2/v_n^x$  gives the usual sampling distribution result for  $\hat{\beta}_1$ .

## B Equivalence between (4.3) and (4.5)

The true posterior distribution in (4.3) is fully spelled out as

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_{\xi}(\beta | \tilde{s}) &= \frac{\int \pi(\beta, s, \tilde{s}) ds}{\int \int \pi(\beta, s, \tilde{s}) ds d\beta} \\ &= \frac{\pi_0(\beta) \int p_{\xi}(\tilde{s} | s) \mathcal{L}(\beta; s) ds}{\int \pi_0(\beta) \int p_{\xi}(\tilde{s} | s) \mathcal{L}(\beta; s) ds d\beta} \\ &= \frac{\pi_0(\beta) \mathcal{L}_{\xi}(\beta; \tilde{s})}{\int \pi_0(\beta) \mathcal{L}_{\xi}(\beta; \tilde{s}) d\beta}.\end{aligned}$$

Noting that

$$\pi(\beta | s) = \frac{\pi_0(\beta) \mathcal{L}(\beta; s)}{\int \pi_0(\beta) \mathcal{L}(\beta; s) d\beta}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_{\xi}(s | \tilde{s}) &= \frac{\int \pi_0(\beta) p_{\xi}(\tilde{s} | s) \mathcal{L}(\beta; s) d\beta}{\int \int \pi_0(\beta) p_{\xi}(\tilde{s} | s) \mathcal{L}(\beta; s) d\beta ds} \\ &= \frac{p_{\xi}(\tilde{s} | s) \int \pi_0(\beta) \mathcal{L}(\beta; s) d\beta}{\int p_{\xi}(\tilde{s} | s) \int \pi_0(\beta) \mathcal{L}(\beta; s) d\beta ds'}\end{aligned}$$

we have that the right hand side of (4.5)

$$\begin{aligned}\int \pi(\beta | s) \pi_{\xi}(s | \tilde{s}) ds &= \int \frac{\pi_0(\beta) \mathcal{L}(\beta; s)}{\int \pi_0(\beta) \mathcal{L}(\beta; s) d\beta} \cdot \frac{p_{\xi}(\tilde{s} | s) \int \pi_0(\beta) \mathcal{L}(\beta; s) d\beta}{\int p_{\xi}(\tilde{s} | s) \int \pi_0(\beta) \mathcal{L}(\beta; s) d\beta ds} ds \\ &= \frac{\int p_{\xi}(\tilde{s} | s) \pi_0(\beta) \mathcal{L}(\beta; s) ds}{\int p_{\xi}(\tilde{s} | s) \int \pi_0(\beta) \mathcal{L}(\beta; s) d\beta ds} \\ &= \frac{\pi_0(\beta) \int p_{\xi}(\tilde{s} | s) \mathcal{L}(\beta; s) ds}{\int \pi_0(\beta) \int p_{\xi}(\tilde{s} | s) \mathcal{L}(\beta; s) ds d\beta} \\ &= \frac{\pi_0(\beta) \mathcal{L}_{\xi}(\beta; \tilde{s})}{\int \pi_0(\beta) \mathcal{L}_{\xi}(\beta; \tilde{s}) d\beta} = \pi_{\xi}(\beta | \tilde{s}),\end{aligned}$$

establishing the equivalence between (4.3) and (4.5).

## C Details of the MCEM algorithm.

The Monte Carlo Expectation Maximization (MCEM) via importance sampling algorithm works as follows for the linear regression example. The data generative mechanism is

$$x_i \sim \text{Pois}(10) \text{ i.i.d.}, \quad y_i = -5 + 4x_i + e_i, \quad e_i \sim N(0, \sigma^2 = 5^2),$$

followed by additive privatization

$$\tilde{x}_i = x_i + u_i, \quad \tilde{y}_i = y_i + v_i, \quad u_i, v_i \sim Lap(\epsilon^{-1}).$$

The goal is to estimate the parameter values, here set at  $\beta_0 = -5, \beta_1 = 4$ , with maximum likelihood estimation.

At the E-step, approximate the conditional expectation of the complete data likelihood with respect to the observed data and the parameter estimate at the current iteration

$$Q(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)}) = \mathbb{E} \left( \log \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; s, \tilde{s}) \mid \tilde{s}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)} \right) = \mathbb{E} \left( \log \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; s) \mid \tilde{s}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)} \right) + \text{const.}$$

where the log likelihood of the missing data is

$$\log \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; s) = -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_i (y_i - \beta_0 - \beta_1 x_i)^2,$$

with score

$$s(\boldsymbol{\beta}; s) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \log \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; s) = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \begin{pmatrix} \sum_i y_i - n\beta_0 - \beta_1 \sum_i x_i \\ \sum_i x_i y_i - \beta_0 \sum_i x_i - \beta_1 \sum_i x_i^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

and negative second derivative

$$i(\boldsymbol{\beta}; s) = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^2} \log \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; s) = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \begin{pmatrix} n & \sum_i x_i \\ \sum_i x_i & \sum_i x_i^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The approximation to the Q function is constructed with  $k = 1, \dots, K$  weighted samples of the confidential data likelihood:

$$\hat{Q}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)}) = \frac{1}{\sum_k \omega_k} \sum_k \omega_k \log \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; s_k^{(t)}),$$

where  $s_k^{(t)} \sim \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)}; s)$  consists of  $x_{ik}^{(t)} \sim Pois(10)$  and  $y_{ik}^{(t)} = \beta_0^{(t)} + \beta_1^{(t)} x_{ik}^{(t)} + e_{ik}^{(t)}$ , where  $e_{ik}^{(t)} \sim N(0, \sigma^2 = 5^2)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, 10$ . The weights are calculated as

$$\omega_k = \prod_i f(x_{ik}^{(t)} - \tilde{x}_i; \epsilon^{-1}) f(y_{ik}^{(t)} - \tilde{y}_i; \epsilon^{-1}),$$

where  $f(\cdot; b)$  is the Laplace density with scale parameter  $b$ .

The M-step, maximizing  $\hat{Q}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)})$ , occurs at  $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t+1)}$  which is the solution to the approximating

score function being zero,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \hat{Q}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)}) &= \frac{\sum_k \omega_k \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; s_k^{(t)})}{\sum_k \omega_k} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sigma^2 \sum_k \omega_k} \sum_k \omega_k \begin{pmatrix} n \bar{y}_k^{(t)} - n \beta_0 - \beta_1 n \bar{x}_k^{(t)} \\ n \overline{(xy)}_k^{(t)} - \beta_0 n \bar{x}_k^{(t)} - \beta_1 n \overline{(x^2)}_k^{(t)} \end{pmatrix} = 0,\end{aligned}$$

where  $\bar{y}_k^{(t)} = n^{-1} \sum_i y_{ik}^{(t)}$ ,  $\overline{(xy)}_k^{(t)} = n^{-1} \sum_i x_{ik}^{(t)} y_{ik}^{(t)}$ , and so on. Writing the  $\omega$ -weighted averages as

$$\bar{y}_\omega^{(t)} = \frac{\sum_k \omega_k \bar{y}_k^{(t)}}{\sum_k \omega_k}, \quad \bar{x}_\omega^{(t)} = \frac{\sum_k \omega_k \bar{x}_k^{(t)}}{\sum_k \omega_k}, \quad \overline{(xy)}_\omega^{(t)} = \frac{\sum_k \omega_k \overline{(xy)}_k^{(t)}}{\sum_k \omega_k}, \quad \overline{(x^2)}_\omega^{(t)} = \frac{\sum_k \omega_k \overline{(x^2)}_k^{(t)}}{\sum_k \omega_k},$$

we have that

$$\beta_1^{(t+1)} = \frac{\overline{(xy)}_\omega^{(t)} - \bar{x}_\omega^{(t)} \bar{y}_\omega^{(t)}}{\overline{(x^2)}_\omega^{(t)} - (\bar{x}_\omega^{(t)})^2}, \quad \beta_0^{(t+1)} = \bar{y}_\omega^{(t)} - \beta_1^{(t+1)} \bar{x}_\omega^{(t)}, \quad (\text{C.1})$$

which may be calculated at iteration  $t$  to supply the parameter values for the next iteration  $t + 1$ . Furthermore, the observed Fisher information can be approximated as

$$\frac{\sum_k \omega_k i(\boldsymbol{\beta}; s_k^{(t)})}{\sum_k \omega_k} - \frac{\sum_k \omega_k \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; s_k^{(t)}) \mathbf{S}^\top(\boldsymbol{\beta}; s_k^{(t)})}{\sum_k \omega_k} + \left( \frac{\sum_k \omega_k \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; s_k^{(t)})}{\sum_k \omega_k} \right) \left( \frac{\sum_k \omega_k \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; s_k^{(t)})}{\sum_k \omega_k} \right)^\top, \quad (\text{C.2})$$

where the first term is equal to

$$\frac{\sum_k \omega_k i(\boldsymbol{\beta}; s_k^{(t)})}{\sum_k \omega_k} = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \bar{x}_\omega^{(t)} \\ \bar{x}_\omega^{(t)} & \overline{(x^2)}_\omega^{(t)} \end{pmatrix},$$

the second equal to (“..” denotes mirrored hence omitted entry in a symmetric matrix)

$$-\frac{n^2}{\sigma^4 \sum_k \omega_k} \begin{pmatrix} \sum_k \omega_k (\bar{y}_k^{(t)} - \beta_0 - \beta_1 \bar{x}_k^{(t)})^2 & \sum_k \omega_k (\bar{y}_k^{(t)} - \beta_0 - \beta_1 \bar{x}_k^{(t)}) \left( \overline{(xy)}_k^{(t)} - \beta_0 \bar{x}_k^{(t)} - \beta_1 \overline{(x^2)}_k^{(t)} \right) \\ \dots & \sum_k \omega_k \left( \overline{(xy)}_k^{(t)} - \beta_0 \bar{x}_k^{(t)} - \beta_1 \overline{(x^2)}_k^{(t)} \right)^2 \end{pmatrix},$$

and the third simply the outer product of the observed score from before.

The right panels of Figures 1 and 2 both follow the recipe outlined above to draw maximum likelihood inference for the regression demonstration, using  $\epsilon = 0.25$  and  $\epsilon = 1$  respectively as the privacy loss budget. The 95% confidence ellipses (green) are derived using a large-sample normal approximation to the likelihood at the maximum likelihood estimate (MLE),

with covariance equal to the inverse observed Fisher information centered at the MLE, obtained respectively according to (C.1) and (C.2) with the values of the parameters at the algorithm's convergence.