

# DISCLOSURE RISK FROM HOMOGENEITY ATTACK IN DIFFERENTIALLY PRIVATE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION

FANG LIU, XINGYUAN ZHAO, AND GAOFEI ZHANG

Applied and Computational Mathematics and Statistics, University of Notre Dame, IN 46556

*e-mail address:* fliu2@nd.edu

Applied and Computational Mathematics and Statistics, University of Notre Dame, IN 46556

Applied and Computational Mathematics and Statistics, University of Notre Dame, IN 46556

---

**ABSTRACT.** Homogeneity attack allows adversaries to obtain the exact values on the sensitive attributes for his targets without having to re-identify them from released data. Differential privacy (DP) is a mathematical concept that provides robust privacy guarantee against a wide range of privacy attacks. We propose a measure for disclosure risk from homogeneity attack; and derive closed-form relationships between the privacy loss parameters from DP and the disclosure risk from homogeneity attack when released data are multi-dimensional frequency distributions. The availability of the close-form relationships not only saves time and computational resources spent on calculating the relationships numerically, but also assists understanding of DP and privacy loss parameters by putting the abstract concepts in the context of a concrete privacy attack, and offers a different perspective when it comes to choosing privacy loss parameters and implementing differentially private mechanisms for data sanitization and release in practice. We apply the closed-form mathematical relationships in real-life data sets and demonstrate their consistency with the empirical assessment of the disclosure risk due to homogeneity attack on sanitized data.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

An indispensable component when developing a privacy protection technique, such as anonymization, is to assess the “safety” of released data and to measure the effectiveness of the technique in protecting individual privacy. Two common privacy risk types experienced by an individual are the re-identification risk and sensitive information disclosure risk. Re-identification risk refers to that adversaries (or data intruders) can identify their targets in released data and disclosure risk refers to disclosure of private and sensitive information on individuals in released data. In this discussion, we focus on disclosure risk in data privacy protection. Disclosure risk may occur on an individual without the identity of that individual

---

*Key words and phrases:* differential privacy, privacy loss parameter, Laplace mechanism, Gaussian mechanism, homogeneity attack, disclosure risk.

being revealed. In addition, the ultimate goal of re-identification is, in many cases, also disclosure of sensitive information of targeted individuals.

Assessment of disclosure risk is a long-standing research problem. Various metrics assessing the risk have been developed, which often rely on strong assumptions regarding the background knowledge or behaviors of adversaries (adversaries) and the data themselves [Duncan and Lambert, 1989, Skinner and Elliot, 2002, Yancey et al., 2002, Reiter, 2005, Hundepool et al., 2012, Hu and Savitsky, 2018]. While one can always adopt the worst-case scenario approach by assuming the intruder has maximal external knowledge to leverage and to link to the released data, the meaning of “worst-case” and its supposed guarantee only pertain to the status-quo and is not future-proof. In other words, the “worst-case” scenario may no longer be the case if the adversary obtains more information the future, and the data perturbation methods built upon it would no longer maintain the originally desired confidentiality levels.

In recent years, the concept of differential privacy (DP) [Dwork et al., 2006] has become the mainstream in data privacy research and also been gaining popularity among industry, business, government for data collection and release. Compared to the traditional disclosure risk that measures the “absolute” risk, DP evaluates the “relative” or incremental risk from the adversary learning additional information about his target based on the released information. The relative privacy risk can be controlled under a pre-specified parameterized privacy loss (e.g.,  $\epsilon$ ,  $\delta$ ). DP is a property of randomization mechanisms for sanitizing data rather than of the data themselves. The privacy of the individuals who contribute to released data is guaranteed regardless of the adversary’s behaviors or background knowledge in the framework of DP, given pre-specified privacy parameters. DP is also post-processing proof and future-proof; that is, the sanitized data via a differentially private mechanism do not leak additional information about the individuals if they are post-processed (e.g. transformation) after release or if there is additional information on these individuals in the future from other sources, respectively.

Despite the desirable properties of DP, the concept is rather abstract, and appears less relatable and intuitive to practitioners compared to disclosure risk measures which are often rooted in specific attack models and scenarios, and easy to understand and interpret. In particular, there is no universal guideline on the choice of privacy loss parameters, which are key to implementing differentially private mechanism in practice. Dwork et al. [2019] interviewed DP practitioners to understand the current DP practice in choosing privacy parameters and found no consensus. Dwork [2008] claims that “the choice of  $\epsilon$  is essentially a social question”. On the other hand, it is difficult to take the social and human perspectives into consideration without connecting the mathematics with something more concrete. Efforts have been made to connecting the concept of DP and the associated privacy parameters with the disclosure risk metrics, and examine the effectiveness of DP against various attacks (e.g., re-identification, disclosure and reconstruction). Lee and Clifton [2011] consider the probability of re-identifying an individual from a database, and demonstrate the challenge of setting the proper value for privacy loss parameters. McClure and Reiter [2012] use simulation studies to investigate probabilistic disclosure risk in differentially private data with a single binary attribute. Hsu et al. [2014] propose a model to balance the interests of data analysts and data contributors and use our model to choose privacy parameters for some statistical analyses. Abowd and Schmutte [2015] address the question from the economic perspective by accounting for the public-good properties of privacy loss and data utility,

and define the optimal choice of  $\epsilon$  by formulating a social planner’s problem. [Nissim et al. \[2017\]](#) provide an example on how privacy loss parameters may be interpreted as bounding the worst-case financial risk incurred by an individual participating in a research study. [Dwork et al. \[2017\]](#) show differentially private techniques for releasing aggregate statistics could defend privacy when facing reconstruction attack and tracing attack. [Holohan et al. \[2017\]](#) design the  $(k, \epsilon)$ -anonymity algorithm for quasi-identifiers and evaluate its privacy protection against linking records in the perturbed data to the original records using the nearest neighbor technique. [Chen et al. \[2017\]](#) calculate the disclosure risk associated with sanitized data with numerical and binary attributes via the Laplace mechanism of  $\epsilon$ -DP.

To the best of our knowledge, no work exists on examining the relationship between privacy loss parameters in DP and the level of disclosure risk due to homogeneity attack. Homogeneity attack is a common attack model used by adversaries to disclosure sensitive values of individuals without having to identifying those individuals in a released data set if the adversaries have background information on the quasi-identifiers<sup>1</sup> on his targets. We propose a disclosure risk metric due to homogeneity attack; and derive the mathematical relationships between the risk and the privacy loss parameters associated with a few common differentially private mechanisms used for data sanitization when the released data are multi-dimensional frequency distributions (e.g., cell counts in cross-tabulations and bin counts in multi-dimensional histograms). We validate the closed-form mathematical relationships in real-life data by comparing them with the empirical assessment of the disclosure risk due to homogeneity attack on sanitized data. The availability of the close-form relationships can help practitioners to better understand the concept of DP and the associated privacy loss parameters in the context of homogeneity attack, and facilitate the decision making on the privacy loss parameters when implementing differentially private mechanisms for data sanitization and release, together with other factors and considerations that affect the choice of the privacy loss parameters.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 overviews some basic concepts on DP. Section 3 derives the mathematical relationships between disclosure risk from homogeneity attack on released frequency distributions, and the privacy loss parameters for the differentially private Laplace and Gaussian mechanisms. Section 4 presents the applications of the derived relationships in two examples. Section 5 summarizes the work and presents some future research directions.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**Definition 2.1** ( $(\epsilon)$ -Differential privacy [[Dwork et al., 2006](#)]). A randomized mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfies  $\epsilon$ -differential privacy if for all data sets  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  differing on one element and all result subsets  $S$  to query  $\mathbf{s}$ ,  $e^{-\epsilon} \leq \frac{\Pr[\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{s}(D_1)) \in S]}{\Pr[\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{s}(D_2)) \in S]} \leq e^\epsilon$ .

Differential privacy (DP) is a mathematically rigorous concept to provide privacy guarantee to individual data contributors when releasing statistics from the data set, regardless of the knowledge and behaviors of adversaries. A small  $\epsilon$  implies the probability of identifying an

<sup>1</sup>Quasi-identifiers are not of unique identifiers (such as social security numbers), but they also contain identifying information are sufficiently correlated with an individual and may lead to a unique identifier after being combined with other quasi-identifiers. Demographic information, such as age, race, gender, and geographical information are often regarded as quasi-identifiers.

individual based on the sanitized statistics is low as the individual has little impact on the value of the statistics after sanitization. Examples and applications in published literature on DP have examined  $\epsilon$  from  $O(10^{-3})$  to  $O(1)$ , depending on the type of information released to the public, social perception of privacy protection, statistical accuracy of the release data, among others. Currently, there is no consensus and lacks a universal guideline on the choice of  $\epsilon$  [Dwork et al., 2019].

There are several relaxed versions of the  $\epsilon$ -DP. We present two that are examined in later sections of the paper:  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP and  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -probabilistic DP (pDP). The former relaxes the bounds on the ratio of  $\Pr(\mathcal{M}(s(D_1)) \in Q) / \Pr(\mathcal{M}(s(D_2)) \in Q)$ , whereas the latter bounds the probability the  $\epsilon$ -DP is violated. In both cases, setting  $\delta$  at 0 reduces to  $\epsilon$ -DP.

**Definition 2.2** ( $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP. [Dwork, 2011]). A randomized algorithm  $\mathcal{M}$  is of  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP if for all  $\mathcal{S} \in \text{Range}(\mathcal{M})$  and for all data set pairs  $D_1, D_2$  differing by one element,

$$\Pr(\mathcal{M}(s(D_1)) \in \mathcal{S}) \leq e^\epsilon \Pr(\mathcal{M}(s(D_2)) \in \mathcal{S}) + \delta.$$

**Definition 2.3** ( $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -probabilistic DP. [Machanavajjhala et al., 2008]). A randomized algorithm  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfies  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -probabilistic DP if,

$$\Pr \left( \left| \log \left( \frac{\Pr(\mathcal{M}(s(D_1)) \in Q)}{\Pr(\mathcal{M}(s(D_2)) \in Q)} \right) \right| > \epsilon \right) \leq \delta$$

for all  $\mathcal{S} \in \text{Range}(\mathcal{M})$  and for all data set pairs  $D_1, D_2$  differing by one element.

Researchers have developed various randomization mechanisms that either satisfy DP in general or for specific statistical analysis, among which the Laplace mechanism and the Gaussian mechanism are popular choices for sanitizing numerical queries. To understand how the two mechanisms work, we first introduce the concept of global sensitivity.

**Definition 2.4** ( $\ell_p$  global sensitivity [Liu, 2019]). The  $\ell_p$  global sensitivity of statistics  $\mathbf{s}$  is

$$\Delta_p(\mathbf{s}) = \max_{D_1, D_2, |D_1 - D_2|_1 = 1} \|\mathbf{s}(D_1) - \mathbf{s}(D_2)\|_p \text{ for } p > 0.$$

The  $\ell_p$ -sensitivity measures the largest change in  $\mathbf{s}$  with one element change in a data set. The common used  $\ell_p$  global sensitivity is the  $\ell_1$  global sensitivity at  $p = 1$ , on which the Laplace mechanism is based, and  $\ell_2$  global sensitivity at  $p = 2$ , on which the Gaussian mechanism is based. Both mechanisms sanitize numerical statistics by adding a noise terms  $\mathbf{e}$  onto the original statistics  $\mathbf{s}$  calculated on the data  $D$  to obtain the sanitized statistic  $\mathbf{s}^* = \mathbf{s} + \mathbf{e}$ . Specifically, the Laplace mechanism [Dwork et al., 2006] perturbs  $\mathbf{s}$  with Laplace noise,

$$e_j \sim \text{Lap}(0, \Delta_1/\epsilon) \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, q. \quad (2.1)$$

There are two types of Gaussian mechanisms: one satisfies  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP and the other satisfies  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -probabilistic or  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -pDP for short. Specifically,  $e_j \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$  in the Gaussian mechanisms; if

$$\sigma \geq c\Delta_2/\epsilon \text{ with } \epsilon < 1 \text{ and } c^2 > 2\log(1.25/\delta), \quad (2.2)$$

then the Gaussian mechanism satisfies  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP [Dwork et al., 2014]; if

$$\sigma \geq (2\epsilon)^{-1} \Delta_2 \left( \sqrt{(\Phi^{-1}(\delta/2))^2 + 2\epsilon} - \Phi^{-1}(\delta/2) \right), \quad (2.3)$$

where  $\Phi^{-1}$  is the inverse cumulative density function (CDF) of the standard normal distribution, then the Gaussian mechanism satisfies  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -probabilistic DP [Liu, 2019].

### 3. DISCLOSURE RISK FROM HOMOGENEITY ATTACK ON DIFFERENTIALLY PRIVATE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION

**3.1. Problem Statement.** We aim to derive closed-form mathematical relationships between the disclosure risk from homogeneity attack and the privacy loss parameters  $\epsilon$  and  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  in DP. There are two benefits for having the relationships in closed form. First, it provides convenience and saves time and computational resources spending on the empirical evaluation of the relationships; second, it assists practitioners with interpreting the privacy loss parameters in concrete data attack models and choosing the privacy loss parameters for practical implementation. The first step toward the derivation of the relationships is to define a metric to measure the disclosure risk due to homogeneity attack.

**Definition 3.1 (homogeneous set).** If a set of records in a data set share the same values on  $p$  quasi-identifiers  $\mathbf{X}$  that are known to adversaries, and they also have the same values on  $q$  sensitive attributes  $\mathbf{Y}$  that the adversaries are interested in learning, then the records belong to a *homogeneous set* formed by the  $p$  quasi-identifiers  $\mathbf{X}$ .

**Definition 3.2 (heterogeneous set).** If a set of records in a data set share the same values on  $p$  quasi-identifiers  $\mathbf{X}$  that are known to adversaries, but have at least two different sets of values on  $q$  sensitive attributes  $\mathbf{Y}$ , then the records belong to a *heterogeneous set* formed by the  $p$  quasi-identifiers  $\mathbf{X}$ .

Any record in a homogeneous set is subject to the homogeneity attack by the adversary who knows the values of his target’s quasi-identifiers; and the attack hands the adversary the information on the sensitive attributes “for free”. If a sanitization mechanism is used to release the data and provide privacy protection, then it is expected the disclosure risk due to homogeneity attack will decrease. To measure the effectiveness of a sanitization mechanism against the homogeneity attack, we define the following metric.

**Definition 3.3 (disclosure risk from homogeneity attack).** Disclosure risk  $\rho$  from the homogeneity attack on a record is defined as the joint probability that the record belongs to a homogeneous set in the original data and the same homogeneous set also appears with at least one record in the released data.

Definition 3.3 is built upon the condition that a record is subject to homogeneity attack in the original data; otherwise,  $\rho = 0$ , which can be regarded as a trivial special case of the definition. Definition 3.3 also covers the special case where the original data are released without any sanitization, where  $\rho$  is 1 for the records in a homogeneous set. With data sanitization, if an original homogeneous set becomes heterogeneous in the sensitive attributes, then the homogeneity attack is no longer possible.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup>Though records in a heterogeneous set are no longer susceptible to homogeneity attack, adversaries are still be able to obtain the correct sensitive values on a record in a heterogeneous set by either applying soft thresholding or hard thresholding. More discussions are provided in Section 5).

In a frequency distribution (e.g., a multi-dimensional histogram, a contingency table), denote the total number of records by  $n$  and the number of records by  $n_j$  in set  $\mathbf{X}_j$  among the  $M$  sets with distinct values on the  $p$  quasi-identifiers ( $\sum_{j=1}^M n_j = n$ ). Suppose there are  $K$  categories formed by the  $q$  sensitive attributes. Denote the sample frequencies and probabilities of the  $K$  categories in set  $\mathbf{X}_j$  by  $\mathbf{n}_j = (n_{j,1}, \dots, n_{j,K})$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_j = (\hat{p}_{j,1}, \dots, \hat{p}_{j,K})$ , respectively. It is possible that some elements in  $\mathbf{n}_j$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_j$  are 0 if particular combinations of the  $q$  attributes do not occur in set  $j$  in the sample data. If  $\mathbf{X}_j$  is homogeneous with sensitive attribute values  $\mathbf{Y}_k$ , then  $n_{j,k} = n_j, p_{j,k} = 1$  and  $n_{j,k' \neq k} = 0, p_{j,k' \neq k} = 0$ .

**3.2. Disclosure Risk from Homogeneity Attack in Sanitized Data with  $\epsilon$ -DP.** We first present the disclosure risk from the homogeneity attack in sanitized data for the case of a single binary sensitive attribute, say  $Y = \{0, 1\}$  ( $q = 1$  and  $K = 2$ ), and generalize results to the case of  $K > 2$  (either when there are multiple sensitive attributes or when a single sensitive attribute takes more than two values).

**Theorem 3.4 (overall disclosure risk from homogeneity attack after sanitization with  $\epsilon$ -DP for  $K = 2$ ).** *Let  $n_{j,1}, n_{j,0}$  be the frequencies of  $Y = 1$  and  $Y = 0$  in set  $\mathbf{X}_j$  for  $j = 1, \dots, M$ , and  $n_j = n_{j,1} + n_{j,0}$ . Assume  $n_{j,1} \sim \text{Binomial}(n_j, p_j)$  and  $p_j \stackrel{\text{ind}}{\sim} \text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta)$  for  $j = 1, \dots, M$ , where  $p_j$  is the underlying proportion of  $Y = 1$  in set  $\mathbf{X}_j$ . Suppose the frequency distribution  $n_{j,k}$  is sanitized via the Laplace histogram with privacy budget  $\epsilon$ , that is,  $\tilde{n}_{j,k} = n_{j,k} + e_{j,k}$ , where  $e_{j,k} \sim \text{Lap}(0, \epsilon^{-1})$ , for  $k = 0, 1$  (the  $l_1$  global sensitivity of count data is 1). The overall disclosure risk across the  $M$  sets in the sanitized frequency distribution is*

$$\rho = \frac{(1 - 0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon})}{B(\alpha, \beta)M} \sum_{j=1}^M (1 - 0.5e^{-\epsilon(n_j - 0.5)}) [B(n_j + \alpha, \beta) + B(\alpha, n_j + \beta)]. \quad (3.1)$$

The proof of Theorem 3.4 is provided in Appendix A. Eqn (3.1) in Theorem 3.4 suggests that the disclosure risk in the sanitized frequency distribution via the Laplace mechanism monotonically increases with  $\epsilon$ , consistent with expectation. The risk also depends on the unknown shape parameters  $\alpha, \beta$  of the beta distribution assumed on sample data  $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$  across the  $M$  sets. Any appropriate estimation approaches can be used to estimate  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  given  $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$ , such as the method of moments and the maximum likelihood estimation. Once the estimates are obtained, they are plugged in Eqn (3.1) to calculate the disclosure risk. When all  $M$  sets are homogeneous, that is,  $\hat{p}_j = 0$  or  $\hat{p}_j = 1$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, M$ , the estimates on  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  from fitting a beta distribution to  $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$  are unstable. In that case, we can directly replace  $\mathbf{p}$  with  $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$  in Eqn (A.1 following Corollary 3.5).

**Corollary 3.5.** *When all  $M$  sets are homogeneous, the overall disclosure risk in the sanitized frequency distribution via the Laplace mechanism with privacy parameter  $\epsilon$  is*

$$\rho = M^{-1} (1 - 0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon}) \sum_{j=1}^M (1 - 0.5e^{-\epsilon(n_j - 0.5)}) \quad (3.2)$$

Theorem 3.4 leverages the frequency distribution  $\mathbf{n}$  itself to calculate the overall disclosure risk. The disclosure risk obtained this way can be interpreted in two ways: specific for the data set  $\mathbf{n}$ , or as an estimate for the disclosure risk for other data sets coming from the same population distribution as  $\mathbf{n}$ . If the latter is the goal, there exists an alternative; that is, we may assume a parametric distribution for  $\mathbf{n}$  and calculate the expected disclosure risk given that distribution.



**Corollary 3.6.** Assume  $n_j \sim f(n_j; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ . The expected overall disclosure risk in the sanitized frequency distribution via the Laplace mechanism with privacy parameter  $\epsilon$  when  $K=2$  is

$$\rho = \frac{(1 - 0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon})}{B(\alpha, \beta)} \sum_{n_j=0}^{\infty} f(n_j; \boldsymbol{\theta}) (1 - 0.5e^{-\epsilon(n_j-0.5)}) [B(n_j + \alpha, \beta) + B(\alpha, n_j + \beta)]. \quad (3.3)$$

Any appropriate parametric distribution  $f(n_j; \boldsymbol{\theta})$  that fits count data  $\mathbf{n}$  well may be employed, such as the Poisson distribution, the negative binomial distribution, or their zero-inflated versions. If  $n_j \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda)$  for  $j = 1, \dots, M$ , then

$$\rho = \frac{(1 - 0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon})e^{-\lambda}}{B(\alpha, \beta)} \sum_{n_j=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^{n_j}}{n_j!} (1 - 0.5e^{-\epsilon(n_j-0.5)}) [B(n_j + \alpha, \beta) + B(\alpha, n_j + \beta)];$$

if  $n_j \sim \text{NegBin}(\lambda, r)$  for  $j = 1, \dots, M$ , then

$$\rho = \frac{(1 - 0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon})r^\lambda}{B(\alpha, \beta)} \sum_{n_j=0}^{\infty} \binom{n_j + \lambda + 1}{n_j} (1 - r)^{n_j} (1 - 0.5e^{-\epsilon(n_j-0.5)}) [B(n_j + \alpha, \beta) + B(\alpha, n_j + \beta)].$$

In Corollary 3.6, the overall disclosure risk now also depends on unknown parameter  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ , in addition to  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . Similarly,  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  can be estimated given data  $\mathbf{n}$  and then plugged in Eqn (3.3) to obtain the disclosure risk estimate. The calculation of  $\rho$  in Corollary 3.6 includes the summation over infinite terms. For practical implementations, terms at large  $n_j$  often contribute to  $\rho$  insignificantly and can be ignored.

We now extend the result in Theorem 3.4 and examine the disclosure risk from the homogeneity attack for the general case of  $K \geq 2$ . The proof of Theorem 3.7 is provided in Appendix B.

**Theorem 3.7 (overall disclosure risk from homogeneity attack after sanitization with  $\epsilon$ -DP).** Denote  $(n_{j,1}, n_{j,2}, \dots, n_{j,K})$  as the frequencies of the  $K$  sets of the sensitive values in set  $\mathbf{X}_j$  with  $\sum_{k=1}^K n_{j,k} = n_j$ , and  $(p_{j,1}, p_{j,2}, \dots, p_{j,K})$  represent the corresponding proportions with  $\sum_{k=1}^K p_{j,k} = 1$ . Suppose the frequency distribution  $\mathbf{n}$  is sanitized via the Laplace histogram with privacy budget  $\epsilon$ , that is,  $\tilde{n}_{j,k} = n_{j,k} + e_{j,k}$ , where  $e_{j,k} \sim \text{Lap}(0, \epsilon^{-1})$  for  $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$  (the  $l_1$  global sensitivity of count data is 1). Assume  $(p_{j,1}, p_{j,2}, \dots, p_{j,K}) \stackrel{\text{ind}}{\sim} \text{Dirichlet}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_K)$  for  $j = 1, \dots, M$ . The overall expected disclosure risk across all  $M$  sets in the sanitized frequency distribution is

$$\rho = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \left( \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k) \Gamma(\alpha_k + n_j)}{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k + n_j) \Gamma(\alpha_k)} \right) (1 - 0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon})^{K-1} (1 - 0.5e^{-\epsilon(n_j-0.5)}). \quad (3.4)$$

Similar to the case of  $K = 2$ , we can simplify Eqn (3.4) when all sets are homogeneous (Corollary 3.8) and impose a distribution on  $\mathbf{n}$  to calculate the expected overall disclosure risk (Corollary 3.9).

**Corollary 3.8.** When all  $M$  sets are homogeneous, the overall disclosure risk in the sanitized frequency distribution via the Laplace mechanism with privacy parameter  $\epsilon$  is

$$\rho = M^{-1} (1 - 0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon})^{K-1} \sum_{j=1}^M (1 - 0.5e^{-\epsilon(n_j-0.5)}). \quad (3.5)$$

Eqn (3.5) suggests that  $\rho$  is bounded in  $(2^{-K}, 1)$  when all  $M$  sets are homogeneous, regardless of  $\epsilon, \mathbf{n}$  or  $M$ . For example, when  $K = 2$ , the smallest disclosure risk can be achieved is  $1/4$  if all original sets are homogeneous, regardless how large  $\mathbf{n}$  is or how small  $\epsilon$  is (large amount of sanitization noise). As  $K$  increases, the lower bound on  $\rho$  in the sanitized data approaches 0. Eqn (3.5) also suggests the disclosure risk will be dictated by the distribution of  $\mathbf{n}$  given  $\epsilon$  and  $K$ .

**Corollary 3.9.** *Assume  $n_j \sim f(n_j; \theta)$  for  $j = 1, \dots, M$ . The expected overall disclosure risk in the sanitized frequency distribution via the Laplace mechanism with privacy parameter  $\epsilon$  is*

$$\rho = \sum_{n_j=0}^{\infty} f(n_j) \left( \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k) \Gamma(\alpha_k + n_j)}{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k + n_j) \Gamma(\alpha_k)} \right) (1 - 0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon})^{K-1} \left( 1 - 0.5e^{-\epsilon(n_j-0.5)} \right), \quad (3.6)$$

For example, if  $n_j \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda)$ ,

$$\rho = \sum_{n_j=0}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\lambda} \lambda^{n_j}}{n_j!} \left( \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k) \Gamma(\alpha_k + n_j)}{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k + n_j) \Gamma(\alpha_k)} \right) (1 - 0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon})^{K-1} \left( 1 - 0.5e^{-\epsilon(n_j-0.5)} \right);$$

if  $n_j \sim \text{NegBin}(\lambda, r)$ ,

$$\rho = \sum_{n_j=0}^{\infty} \binom{n_j + \lambda + 1}{n_j} (1-r)^{n_j} r^\lambda (1 - 0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon})^{K-1} \left( 1 - 0.5e^{-\epsilon(n_j-0.5)} \right) \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k) \Gamma(\alpha_k + n_j)}{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k + n_j) \Gamma(\alpha_k)}.$$

Theorem 3.7 reduces to Theorem 3.4 in the binary sensitive attribute case ( $K = 2$ ).

### 3.3. Disclosure Risk from Homogeneity Attack in Sanitized Data with $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -pDP.

We employ the Gaussian mechanism to realize  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP and  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -pDP. The notations in this section are the same as used in Section 3.2. The only difference is that the injected noise comes from a Gaussian distribution instead of a Laplace distribution.

**Theorem 3.10 (overall disclosure risk from homogeneity attack after sanitization with  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP for  $K = 2$ ).** *Let  $n_{j,1}, n_{j,0}$  be the frequencies of  $Y = 1$  and  $Y = 0$  in set  $\mathbf{X}_j$  for  $j = 1, \dots, M$ , and  $n_j = n_{j,1} + n_{j,0}$ . Assume  $n_{j,1} \sim \text{Binomial}(n_j, p_j)$  and  $p_j \stackrel{\text{ind}}{\sim} \text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta)$  for  $j = 1, \dots, M$ . Suppose the frequency distribution is sanitized via the Gaussian mechanism; that is,  $\tilde{n}_{j,k} = n_{j,k} + e_{j,k}$ , where  $e_{j,k} \sim N(0, \sigma^2(\epsilon, \delta))$  for  $k = 0, 1$ . The overall disclosure risk in the sanitized frequency distribution is*

$$\rho = \frac{1 + \text{erf}\left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma(\epsilon, \delta)}\right)}{4B(\alpha, \beta)M} \sum_{j=1}^M (B(n_j + \alpha, \beta) + B(\alpha, n_j + \beta)) \left( 1 + \text{erf}\left(\frac{n_j - 0.5}{\sqrt{2}\sigma(\epsilon, \delta)}\right) \right), \quad (3.7)$$

where

$$\sigma(\epsilon, \delta) = \epsilon^{-1} \sqrt{2 \ln(1.25/\delta)} \text{ with } c^2 > 2 \log(1.25/\delta) \text{ and } \epsilon < 1 \quad (3.8)$$

for the Gaussian mechanism of  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP; and

$$\sigma(\epsilon, \delta) = (2\epsilon)^{-1} (\sqrt{(\Phi^{-1}(\delta/2))^2 + 2\epsilon} - \Phi^{-1}(\delta/2)) \quad (3.9)$$



for the Gaussian mechanism of  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -pDP, where  $\Phi^{-1}$  is the inverse CDF of the standard Gaussian distribution and  $\text{erf}$  is the error function (for both Gaussian mechanisms, the  $l_2$  global sensitivity of the frequency distribution is 1).

The proof of Theorem 3.10 is provided in Appendix C. The Gaussian mechanism of  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP requires  $\epsilon < 1$ , whereas that of  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -pDP does not impose any constraint on  $\epsilon$ . Therefore, the later allows investigation of a more comprehensive relationship between the disclosure risk and  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  in the framework of relaxed DP. The result in Theorem 3.10 suggests that the overall disclosure risk  $\rho$  is a function of  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  and the unknown parameters  $(\alpha, \beta)$ . As  $\epsilon$  and  $\delta$  increases, so does the disclosure risk, which is consistent with the intuition that the more privacy budget and relaxation of DP, the higher the disclosure risk. Similar to the  $\epsilon$ -DP case, one can estimate  $(\alpha, \beta)$  given sample data  $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$ . When all the  $M$  sets are homogeneous, we may directly calculate  $\rho$  as stated in Corollary 3.12, rather than based on unstable estimates on  $(\alpha, \beta)$ .

We now extend the results in Theorem 3.10 for  $K = 2$  to the general situation of  $K \geq 2$ . The proof of Theorem 3.11 is provided in Appendix D.

**Theorem 3.11.** Assume  $(p_{j,1}, p_{j,2}, \dots, p_{j,K}) \stackrel{\text{ind}}{\sim} \text{Dirichlet}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_K)$  for  $j = 1, \dots, M$ . The overall disclosure risk across all  $M$  sets in the sanitized frequency distribution via the Gaussian mechanisms

$$\rho = \frac{\left(1 + \text{erf}\left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma(\epsilon, \delta)}\right)\right)^{K-1}}{2^K M} \sum_{j=1}^M \left( \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k) \Gamma(\alpha_k + n_j)}{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k + n_j) \Gamma(\alpha_k)} \right) \left(1 + \text{erf}\left(\frac{n_j - 0.5}{\sqrt{2}\sigma(\epsilon, \delta)}\right)\right), \quad (3.10)$$

where  $\sigma(\epsilon, \delta)$  is given in Eqns (3.8) and (3.9), respectively for the Gaussian mechanisms of  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP and  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -pDP.

Similar to the  $\epsilon$ -DP case, we can simplify Eqn 3.10 when all sets are homogeneous (Corollary 3.12) and obtain the overall expected disclosure risk assuming  $n_j \sim f(n_j; \boldsymbol{\theta})$  (Corollary 3.13).

**Corollary 3.12.** When all the  $M$  sets are homogeneous, the overall disclosure risk in the sanitized count data via the Gaussian mechanism is

$$\rho = \frac{\left(1 + \text{erf}\left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma(\epsilon, \delta)}\right)\right)^{K-1}}{2^K M} \sum_{j=1}^M \left(1 + \text{erf}\left(\frac{n_j - 0.5}{\sqrt{2}\sigma(\epsilon, \delta)}\right)\right). \quad (3.11)$$

Similar to the case of the Laplace mechanism of  $\epsilon$ -DP,  $\rho$  for the Gaussian mechanisms is bounded in  $(2^{-K}, 1)$  per Eqn (3.11) if all original sets are homogeneous, regardless how large  $\mathbf{n}$  is or how small  $\epsilon$  is. As  $K$  increases, the lower bound on  $\rho$  in the sanitized data approaches 0.

**Corollary 3.13.** Assume  $n_j \sim f(n_j; \boldsymbol{\theta})$  for  $j = 1, \dots, M$ . The overall expected disclosure risk is

$$\rho = \frac{\left(1 + \text{erf}\left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma(\epsilon, \delta)}\right)\right)^{K-1}}{2^K} \sum_{n_j=0}^{\infty} f(n_j; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \left( \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k) \Gamma(\alpha_k + n_j)}{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k + n_j) \Gamma(\alpha_k)} \right) \left(1 + \text{erf}\left(\frac{n_j - 0.5}{\sqrt{2}\sigma(\epsilon, \delta)}\right)\right), \quad (3.12)$$

where  $\sigma(\epsilon, \delta)$  is given in Eqns (3.8) and (3.9), respectively for the Gaussian mechanisms of  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP and  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -pDP. respectively.

For example, if  $n_j \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda)$  and  $K = 2$ , then

$$\rho = \frac{e^{-\lambda} \left(1 + \text{erf}\left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma(\epsilon, \delta)}\right)\right)}{4B(\alpha, \beta)} \sum_{n_j=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^{-n_j}}{n_j!} (B(n_j + \alpha, \beta) + B(\alpha, n_j + \beta)) \left(1 + \text{erf}\left(\frac{n_j - 0.5}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}\right)\right);$$

if  $n_j \sim \text{NegBin}(\lambda, r)$  and  $K = 2$ , then

$$\rho = \frac{r^\lambda \left(1 + \text{erf}\left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma(\epsilon, \delta)}\right)\right)}{4B(\alpha, \beta)} \sum_{n_j=0}^{\infty} \binom{n_j + \lambda + 1}{n_j} (1 - r)^{n_j} (B(n_j + \alpha, \beta) + B(\alpha, n_j + \beta)) \left(1 + \text{erf}\left(\frac{n_j - 0.5}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}\right)\right).$$

#### 4. APPLICATIONS

In this section, we apply the derived mathematical relationships between the disclosure risk in sanitized frequency distribution and the privacy loss parameters  $\epsilon$  and  $\delta$  derived in Section 3 to two real life data sets. The two data sets are the Adult data [Kohavi and Becker, 1996] and the Qualitative Bankruptcy data [Martin et al., 2014] that are publicly available in the UCI Machine Learning Repository. In both cases, there is a single binary sensitive attribute  $Y$ ; and all sets are homogeneous, that is, the sample proportion of  $Y = 1$  is either 0 or 1 in each set formed by the quasi-identifiers. Therefore, we applied the formulas in Corollaries 3.5 and 3.12 to obtain the relationship between  $\epsilon, \delta$  and the disclosure risk. To calculate the empirical disclosure risk from homogeneity attack in sanitized data without relying on the closed-form formulas, we sanitized the count data in the multi-dimensional histogram via the Laplace mechanism and the two Gaussian mechanisms, respectively, for a range of  $\epsilon$  and  $\delta$ . For each privacy parameter set, we generated 500 sets of sanitized data; and in each sanitized set, we applied Definition 3.3 to calculate the empirical disclosure risk  $\hat{\rho}$  from the homogeneity attack. Finally, the average risk was taken over the 500 repeats, together with the standard deviation. We examine the consistency of the closed-form relationships with their empirical versions, which can be used as empirical evidence to support the validity of the derived mathematical relationships.

In the Adult data application, we examined a subset of 7 attributes in the Adult data with 27,504 individuals, where “age”, “relationship”, “education”, “race”, “sex”, “hours-per-week” are quasi-identifiers and “income” is the binary sensitive attribute ( $> 50K$  vs  $< 50K$ ). The frequency distribution over the six quasi-identifier (“age” is bucketed every 5 years and “hours-per-week” is bucketed every 10 hours) is 6-dimensional histogram with  $M = 5974$  bins. The distribution of the bin counts is given in Figure 1, and all the bins are homogeneous (either income  $< 50K$  or  $> 50K$ ).

The Qualitative Bankruptcy data set contains 250 observations and 7 categorical attributes. We regard 6 qualitative variables “Industrial Risk”, “Management Risk”, “Financial Flexibility”, “Credibility”, “Competitiveness” and “Operating Risk” as quasi-identifiers, each of which has three levels “Positive”, “Average”, “Negative”; and “Class” as the sensitive information which has two levels “Bankruptcy” and “Non-Bankruptcy”. The cross-tabulation of the 6 quasi-identifiers leads to  $M = 103$  homogeneous cells on the bankruptcy status. The distribution of the cell counts is given in Figure 2.




FIGURE 1. Histogram of bin counts for Adult data




FIGURE 2. Histogram of bin counts for Bankruptcy data

The results on the empirical and analytical relationships between  $\epsilon \in [10^{-3}, 10^2]$  and the overall disclosure risk in the sanitized count data via the Laplace mechanism are presented in Figure 3; those for the Gaussian mechanisms are shown in Figure 4, which also shows the relationship between the disclosure risk and  $\delta$ . Due to the restriction of  $\epsilon < 1$  in the Gaussian mechanism of  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP, only a partial relationship between the disclosure risk and  $\epsilon$  can be obtained in that case, whereas the comprehensive relationship is available for the Gaussian mechanism of  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -pDP. Between the two, the disclosure risk for the Gaussian mechanism of  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -pDP is slightly larger than that of  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP, but the difference is small ( $< 0.05$ ). The analytical relationship between the disclosure risk and  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  in the 3-dimensional space for the Gaussian mechanism of  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -pDP is presented in Figure 5. The S-shape relationship between the disclosure risk and  $\epsilon$  is evident in the 3D plots, but the change in disclosure risk with  $\delta$  is not obvious, which is also suggested by the 2D plots in Figures 4b and 4d. It is interesting to observe the relationships between the two data sets are similar despite the difference in the distributions in  $\mathbf{n}$  (Figures 1 and 2); but this is likely due to the two specific data sets in this case. In general, we expect there will be some shift on the relationship across data sets.

In summary, the analytical relationships match the empirical results averaged over the 500 sanitizations. For  $\epsilon$ -DP (Figure 3) and  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -pDP (Figures 4b and 4d), the overall disclosure risk from homogeneity attack is around 100% for  $\epsilon > 10$ . The lower asymptote of the relationship is  $1/4$  in all the plots, consistent with the theoretical results that the disclosure risk in a homogeneous set  $\mathbf{X}_j$  is lower-bounded by  $1/4$  for  $K = 2$  for the Laplace mechanism and both Gaussian mechanisms. The results also suggest an S-shaped relationship between




FIGURE 3. Analytical and empirical (mean  $\pm$  SD over 500 sanitized repeats) relationship between disclosure risk and  $\epsilon$  in sanitized data via Laplace mechanism.




FIGURE 4. Analytical and empirical (mean  $\pm$  SD over 500 sanitized repeats) relationship between  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  and disclosure risk in sanitized data via Gaussian mechanisms.




FIGURE 5. Analytical relationship between disclosure risk and  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  via Gaussian mechanism of  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -pDP

the disclosure risk and  $\epsilon$ , and the fastest growth in the disclosure risk in a certain range of  $\epsilon$ , e.g.,  $\epsilon \in (0.1, 10)$  for Laplace mechanism. This observations can be used to guide the choice of  $\epsilon$ , for example, by setting  $\epsilon$  at the maximum value before the disclosure risk starts to increase at a faster rate. For example, in the case of Gaussian mechanism of  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -pDP, one may set  $\delta$  at 0.001 and choose  $\epsilon = 0.5$ . One can also back-calculate  $\epsilon$  and  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  for a pre-set acceptable level of disclosure risk  $\rho$ . In the latter case, there exist infinite combinations of  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  for a given  $\rho$ . One may fix either  $\epsilon$  or  $\delta$ , and calculate the other.

Finally, in terms of computational cost, the analytical relationships was immediate with the availability of the closed-form formula while the empirical relationships took some time to compute (about 27 seconds in the Adult Data for the Laplace mechanism, and 34 seconds in for the Gaussian mechanism in Python on computers with processor Intel Core i3-4010U CPU @ 1.70GHz with RA 4.00GB).

## 5. DISCUSSION

We have derived the mathematical relationships between the disclosure risk due to homogeneous attack in sanitized frequency distribution data and the DP privacy loss parameters. The applications show that the derived mathematical relationships capture the empirical relationships perfectly, with minimal computational cost and free of instability due to Monte Carlo simulations. The relationships between the disclosure risk and the privacy loss parameters provide practitioners an additional perspective (controlling the disclosure risk from homogeneity attack under a certain level) in making decisions on privacy parameters ( $\epsilon$  and  $\delta$ ) when applying differentially private mechanisms to sanitize data. The relationships between the disclosure risk and privacy parameters also help understanding the concept of privacy parameters, which may seem rather abstract to many, by linking them to a metric more intuitive.

To facilitate the practical application of the relationships, we will upload the Python and R codes to Github for calculating the general mathematical relationships and the applications in the two case studies.

We focus on the disclosure risk due to homogeneity attack. Future work may extend the results to other types of disclosure risk, depending on the type of attacks and the approach adversaries choose to launch the attacks, among others. For example, the adversary may apply the plurality rule to predict the sensitive information for the records in a heterogeneous set (hard thresholding). In that case, the disclosure risk of the records whose actual values on the sensitive attributes are the same as the predicted values is maximized, despite being in a heterogeneous set. In another case, the adversary may settle with only probabilistic conclusions regarding the sensitive information for the records in a heterogeneous set (soft thresholding<sup>3</sup>). We used the Adult data to illustrate the hard and soft thresholding for disclosure risk in sanitized data. The results are provided in Appendix E. In both the hard and soft thresholding, the S-shaped relationships observed in Section 4 remain and the upper asymptote is 100%, but the lower asymptote shifts to  $> 1/4$  in both cases, as expected, due to the non-zero disclosure risk from the heterogeneous sets. Another type of disclosure risk worth considering in the future is that a heterogeneous set in the original data becomes homogeneous after sanitization. For the records whose values of the sensitive attributes are consistent with those in the homogeneous set after sanitization, their disclosure risk actually increases; for those whose values of the sensitive attributes flip, the disclosure risk decreases. The overall disclosure risk across both types of record is expected to depend on their relative frequencies.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Fang Liu and Xingyuan Zhao are supported by the NSF Grant #1717417.

#### REFERENCES

- J. M. Abowd and I. M. Schmutte. Revisiting the economics of privacy: Population statistics and confidentiality protection as public goods. <https://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/ldi/22>, 2015.
- H.-L. Chen, J.-Y. Chen, Y.-T. Tsou, C.-M. Yu, B.-C. Tai, S.-C. Li, Y. Huang, and C.-M. Lin. Evaluating the risk of data disclosure using noise estimation for differential privacy. In *2017 IEEE 22nd Pacific Rim International Symposium on Dependable Computing (PRDC)*, pages 339–347. IEEE, 2017.
- G. Duncan and D. Lambert. The risk of disclosure for microdata. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 7(2):207–217, 1989.
- C. Dwork. Differential privacy: A survey of results. In *International Conference on Theory and Applications of Models of Computation*, pages 1–19. Springer, 2008.
- C. Dwork. Differential privacy. In *Encyclopedia of Cryptography and Security*, pages 338–340. Springer, 2011.
- C. Dwork, F. McSherry, K. Nissim, and A. Smith. Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis. In *Theory of cryptography conference*, pages 265–284. Springer, 2006.
- C. Dwork, A. Roth, et al. The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy. *Foundations and Trends® in Theoretical Computer Science*, 9(3–4):211–407, 2014.
- C. Dwork, A. Smith, T. Steinke, and J. Ullman. Exposed! a survey of attacks on private data. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, 4:61–84, 2017.

<sup>3</sup>the disclosure risk can be defined as the sample proportion of each set of the sensitive values among all available values.



- C. Dwork, N. Kohli, and D. Mulligan. Differential privacy in practice: Expose your epsilons! *Journal of Privacy and Confidentiality*, 9(2), 2019.
- N. Holohan, S. Antonatos, S. Braghin, and P. Mac Aonghusa.  $(k, \epsilon)$ -anonymity:  $k$ -anonymity with  $\epsilon$ -differential privacy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.01615*, 2017.
- J. Hsu, M. Gaboardi, A. Haeberlen, S. Khanna, A. Narayan, B. C. Pierce, and A. Roth. Differential privacy: An economic method for choosing epsilon. In *2014 IEEE 27th Computer Security Foundations Symposium*, pages 398–410. IEEE, 2014.
- J. Hu and T. D. Savitsky. Bayesian data synthesis and disclosure risk quantification: An application to the consumer expenditure surveys. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.10074*, 2018.
- A. Hundepool, J. Domingo-Ferrer, L. Franconi, S. Giessing, E. S. Nordholt, K. Spicer, and P.-P. De Wolf. *Statistical disclosure control*. John Wiley & Sons, 2012.
- R. Kohavi and B. Becker. UCI machine learning repository. <https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/Adult>, 1996.
- J. Lee and C. Clifton. How much is enough? choosing  $\epsilon$  for differential privacy. In *International Conference on Information Security*, pages 325–340. Springer, 2011.
- F. Liu. Generalized gaussian mechanism for differential privacy. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 31 (4):747–756, 2019.
- A. Machanavajjhala, D. Kifer, J. Abowd, J. Gehrke, and L. Vilhuber. Privacy: Theory meets practice on the map. In *Proceedings of the 2008 IEEE 24th International Conference on Data Engineering*, pages 277–286. IEEE Computer Society, 2008.
- A. Martin, J. Uthayakumar, and M. Nadarajan. UCI machine learning repository. [https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/qualitative\\_bankruptcy](https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/qualitative_bankruptcy), 2014.
- D. McClure and J. P. Reiter. Differential privacy and statistical disclosure risk measures: An investigation with binary synthetic data. *Trans. Data Priv.*, 5(3):535–552, 2012.
- K. Nissim, T. Steinke, A. Wood, M. Altman, A. Bembenek, M. Bun, M. Gaboardi, D. R. O’Brien, and S. Vadhan. Differential privacy: A primer for a non-technical audience. In *Privacy Law Scholars Conf*, volume 3, 2017.
- J. P. Reiter. Estimating risks of identification disclosure in microdata. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 100(472):1103–1112, 2005.
- C. J. Skinner and M. Elliot. A measure of disclosure risk for microdata. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: series B (statistical methodology)*, 64(4):855–867, 2002.
- W. E. Yancey, W. E. Winkler, and R. H. Creecy. Disclosure risk assessment in perturbative microdata protection. In *Inference control in statistical databases*, pages 135–152. Springer, 2002.

## APPENDIX

### APPENDIX A. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.4

*Proof.* Per Definition 3.3, the homogeneity attack occurs in set  $j$  of the original data if all the records in that set have  $Y = 1$  or  $Y = 0$ , in other words;  $n_{j,1} = n_j$  or  $n_{j,1} = 0$ . If the homogeneous set also appears in the sanitized data, i.e.,  $\lfloor \tilde{n}_j \rfloor \geq 1$  ( $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$  denotes half rounding up in this setting), then the disclosure risk from the homogeneity attack still exists in the sanitized data. All taken together,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_j &= (\Pr(n_{j,1} = n_j) + \Pr(n_{j,1} = 0)) \Pr(\tilde{n}_{j,0} < 0.5 | n_{j,1} = n_j) \Pr(\tilde{n}_{j,1} \geq 0.5 | n_{j,1} = n_j) \\ &= (\Pr(n_{j,1} = n_{j,1}) + \Pr(n_{j,1} = 0)) \Pr(e_{j,0} < 0.5) P(e_{j,1} \geq 0.5 - n_j) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \left( p_j^{n_j} + (1 - p_j)^{n_j} \right) (1 - 0.5 \exp(-0.5\epsilon) (1 - 0.5 \exp(-(n_j - 0.5)\epsilon))). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Given the frequency distribution  $\mathbf{n}$ , the overall risk can then be calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \left[ \int_0^1 (p_j^{n_j} + (1 - p_j)^{n_j}) \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{-0.5\epsilon} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{-\epsilon(n_j - 0.5)} \right) \frac{p_j^{\alpha-1} (1 - p_j)^{\beta-1}}{B(\alpha, \beta)} dp_j \right] \\ &= \frac{(1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{-\frac{\epsilon}{2}})}{B(\alpha, \beta) M} \sum_{j=1}^M \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{-\epsilon(n_j - 0.5)} \right) \left[ \int_0^1 (p_j^{n_j + \alpha - 1} (1 - p_j)^{\beta - 1} + p_j^{\alpha - 1} (1 - p_j)^{n_j + \beta - 1}) dp_j \right] \\ &= \frac{(1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{-\frac{\epsilon}{2}})}{B(\alpha, \beta) M} \sum_{j=1}^M \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{-\epsilon(n_j - 0.5)} \right) [B(n_j + \alpha, \beta) + B(\alpha, n_j + \beta)]. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $B(n_j + \alpha, \beta) = B(\alpha, \beta) \frac{[n_j + \alpha - 1]_{n_j}}{[n_j + \alpha + \beta - 1]_{n_j}}$  and  $B(\alpha, n_j + \beta) = B(\alpha, \beta) \frac{[n_j + \beta - 1]_{n_j}}{[n_j + \alpha + \beta - 1]_{n_j}}$ , we can rewrite  $\rho$  as  $\frac{(1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{-\frac{\epsilon}{2}})}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M (1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{-\epsilon(n_j - 0.5)}) \frac{[n_j + \alpha - 1]_{n_j} + [n_j + \beta - 1]_{n_j}}{[n_j + \alpha + \beta - 1]_{n_j}}$ .  $\square$

## APPENDIX B. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.7

*Proof.* The disclosure risk of set  $\mathbf{X}_j$  from homogeneity attack after the sanitization is

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_j &= \sum_{k=1}^K \left( \Pr(n_{j,k} = n_j) \left( \prod_{k' \neq k} \Pr(\tilde{n}_{j,k'} < 0.5 | n_{j,k} = n_j) \right) \Pr(\tilde{n}_{j,k} \geq 0.5 | n_{j,k} = n_j) \right) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K \left( p_{j,k}^{n_j} \left( \prod_{k' \neq k} \Pr(e_{j,k'} < 0.5) \right) \Pr(e_{j,k} \geq 0.5 - n_j) \right) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K p_{j,k}^{n_j} (1 - 0.5 \exp(-0.5\epsilon))^{K-1} (1 - 0.5 \exp(-(n_j - 0.5)\epsilon)). \\ \rho &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \left[ \int \sum_{k=1}^K p_{j,k}^{n_j} (1 - 0.5 e^{-0.5\epsilon})^{K-1} (1 - 0.5 e^{-(n_j - 0.5)\epsilon}) \frac{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k)}{\Gamma(\alpha_1) \cdots \Gamma(\alpha_K)} \prod_{k=1}^K p_{j,k}^{\alpha_k - 1} dp \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \left[ \sum_{k=1}^K \left( \int p_{j,k}^{n_j} \prod_{k=1}^K p_{j,k}^{\alpha_k - 1} \frac{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k + n_j)}{\Gamma(\alpha_1) \cdots \Gamma(\alpha_k + n_j) \cdots \Gamma(\alpha_K)} dp \right) \frac{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k) \Gamma(\alpha_k + n_j)}{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k + n_j) \Gamma(\alpha_k)} \right] \\ &\quad (1 - 0.5 e^{-0.5\epsilon})^{K-1} (1 - 0.5 e^{-(n_j - 0.5)\epsilon}) \\ &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \left( \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k) \Gamma(\alpha_k + n_j)}{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k + n_j) \Gamma(\alpha_k)} \right) (1 - 0.5 e^{-0.5\epsilon})^{K-1} (1 - 0.5 e^{-(n_j - 0.5)\epsilon}). \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

## APPENDIX C. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.10

*Proof.*  $\rho_j = [\Pr(X_j = n_j) + \Pr(X_j = 0)] \Pr(e_j < 0.5) \Pr(e'_j \geq 0.5 - n_j)$  where  $e_j$  and  $e'_j$  follow  $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ . Plugging in the CDF of  $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ ,  $\frac{1}{2}(1 + \operatorname{erf}(\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}))$ , we obtain the disclosure risk in set  $\mathbf{X}_j$

$$\rho_j = \frac{1}{4} \left( p_j^{n_j} + (1 - p_j)^{n_j} \right) \left( 1 + \operatorname{erf} \left( \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma} \right) \right) \left( 1 + \operatorname{erf} \left( \frac{n_j - 0.5}{\sigma\sqrt{2}} \right) \right).$$

The overall disclosure risk over all sets is

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \frac{1 + \operatorname{erf} \left( \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma} \right)}{4M} \sum_{j=1}^M \int_0^1 \left( p_j^{n_j} + (1 - p_j)^{n_j} \right) \left( 1 + \operatorname{erf} \left( \frac{n_j - 0.5}{\sigma\sqrt{2}} \right) \right) \frac{p_j^{\alpha-1} (1 - p_j)^{\beta-1}}{B(\alpha, \beta)} dp_j \\ &= \frac{1 + \operatorname{erf} \left( \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma} \right)}{4B(\alpha, \beta)M} \sum_{j=1}^M \left( 1 + \operatorname{erf} \left( \frac{n_j - 0.5}{\sigma\sqrt{2}} \right) \right) \int_0^1 \left( p_j^{n_j+\alpha-1} (1 - p_j)^{\beta-1} + p_j^{\alpha-1} (1 - p_j)^{n_j+\beta-1} \right) dp_j \\ &= \frac{1 + \operatorname{erf} \left( \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma} \right)}{4B(\alpha, \beta)M} \sum_{j=1}^M (B(n_j + \alpha, \beta) + B(\alpha, n_j + \beta)) \left( 1 + \operatorname{erf} \left( \frac{n_j - 0.5}{\sigma\sqrt{2}} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

## APPENDIX D. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.11

*Proof.* The disclosure risk of set  $\mathbf{X}_j$  to homogeneity attack in sanitized frequency distribution via the Gaussian mechanism is

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_j &= \sum_{k=1}^K \left( \Pr(n_{j,k} = n_j) \left( \prod_{i \neq k} \Pr(\tilde{n}_{j,i} < 0.5 | n_{j,k} = n_j) \right) \Pr(\tilde{n}_{j,k} \geq 0.5 | n_{j,k} = n_j) \right) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K \left( p_{j,k}^{n_j} \left( \prod_{i \neq k} \Pr(e_{j,i} < 0.5) \right) P(e_{j,k} \geq 0.5 - n_j) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2^K} \left( \sum_{k=1}^K p_{j,k}^{n_j} \right) \left( 1 + \operatorname{erf} \left( \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma} \right) \right)^{K-1} \left( 1 + \operatorname{erf} \left( \frac{n_j - 0.5}{\sigma\sqrt{2}} \right) \right). \\ \rho &= \sum_{j=1}^M \left[ \sum_{k=1}^K \left( \int p_{j,k}^{n_j} \prod_{k=1}^K p_{j,k}^{\alpha_k-1} \frac{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k + n_j)}{\Gamma(\alpha_1) \cdots \Gamma(\alpha_k + n_j) \cdots \Gamma(\alpha_K)} dp \right) \frac{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k) \Gamma(\alpha_k + n_j)}{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k + n_j) \Gamma(\alpha_k)} \right] \\ &\quad \frac{1}{2^K M} \left( 1 + \operatorname{erf} \left( \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma} \right) \right)^{K-1} \left( 1 + \operatorname{erf} \left( \frac{n_j - 0.5}{\sigma\sqrt{2}} \right) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2^K M} \sum_{j=1}^M \left( \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k) \Gamma(\alpha_k + n_j)}{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k + n_j) \Gamma(\alpha_k)} \right) \left( 1 + \operatorname{erf} \left( \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma} \right) \right)^{K-1} \left( 1 + \operatorname{erf} \left( \frac{n_j - 0.5}{\sigma\sqrt{2}} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

# APPENDIX E. DISCLOSURE RISK IN SANITIZED ADULT DATA WITH APPLICATIONS OF HARD AND SOFT THRESHOLDING IN HETEROGENEOUS SETS




FIGURE 6. Empirical disclosure risk in sanitized Adult data via the Laplace mechanism