Disclosure Risk from Homogeneity Attack in Differentially Private Frequency Distribution

Fang Liu *, **Xingyuan Zhao** *
Applied and Computational Mathematics and Statistics
University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556

arXiv:2101.00311v3 [cs.CR] 15 Jun 2021

Abstract

Differential privacy (DP) provides a robust model to achieve privacy guarantees for released information. We examine the protection potency of sanitized multi-dimensional frequency distributions via DP randomization mechanisms against homogeneity attack (HA). HA allows adversaries to obtain the exact values on sensitive attributes for their targets without having to identify them from the released data. We propose measures for disclosure risk from HA and derive closed-form relationships between the privacy loss parameters in DP and the disclosure risk from HA. The availability of the closed-form relationships assists understanding the abstract concepts of DP and privacy loss parameters by putting them in the context of a concrete privacy attack and offers a perspective for choosing privacy loss parameters when employing DP mechanisms in information sanitization and release in practice. We apply the closed-form mathematical relationships in real-life datasets to demonstrate the assessment of disclosure risk due to HA on differentially private sanitized frequency distributions at various privacy loss parameters.

Keywords: differential privacy; disclosure risk; homogeneity attack; Gaussian mechanism; Laplace mechanism; privacy loss parameter; privacy budget

1 Introduction

1.1 Background and Motivation

Two common privacy risk types experienced by an individual during data sharing and information release are the re-identification risk and the disclosure risk. Re-identification risk occurs when adversaries identify their targets in the released data and disclosure risk refers to disclosure of private and sensitive information on individuals through the released data. Disclosure risk may occur to an individual without revealing the identity of that individual. The ultimate goal of re-identification is, in many cases, learning sensitive information of targeted individuals. We focus on disclosure risk in this discussion.

An indispensable step when developing a privacy protection and disclosure limitation technique is to measure the effectiveness of the technique in protecting individual privacy

*Fang Liu (email: fang.liu.131@nd.edu) is Professor and Xingyuan Zhao is a doctoral student in the Department of Applied and Computational Mathematics and Statistics at the University of Notre Dame. This work is supported by NSF Award #1717417.

or sensitive information. Post-hoc quantitative assessment of disclosure risk is a long-standing research problem. Various metrics assessing the risk have been developed, many of which rely on specific assumptions regarding the background knowledge or behaviors adversaries and the data (Duncan and Lambert, 1989; Skinner and Elliot, 2002; Yancey et al., 2002; Reiter, 2005; Hundepool et al., 2012; Hu and Savitsky, 2018).

In recent years, the concept of differential privacy (DP) (Dwork et al., 2006) has become the mainstream in data privacy research and been gaining popularity among industry, business, government agencies for data collection and release in practice. Compared to the traditional post-hoc disclosure risk approaches that assess the *absolute* risk, DP evaluates the *incremental* risk that the adversary learns additional information about his target from the released information on top of what she already knows, which can be controlled for a pre-specified parameterized privacy loss. The privacy of the individuals who contribute to the released information is guaranteed at a pre-specified privacy loss regardless of the adversary's behaviors or background knowledge in the framework of DP. Different types of randomization mechanisms have been developed to release query results and statistics in general settings as well as for specific types of queries and analyses, incorporating the pre-specified privacy loss during the sanitization process. Results released from a DP mechanism are immune to post-processing and future-proof; that is, they do not leak additional information about the individuals if they are post-processed (e.g. transformation) after release and if there is additional information on these individuals in the future from other sources. In addition, DP satisfies composition and privacy amplification principles (McSherry and Talwar, 2007; Dwork et al., 2010; Kasiviswanathan et al., 2011; Abadi et al., 2016; Mironov, 2017), making it attractive and convenient for privacy loss tracking and accounting when multiple sets of information are released from the same dataset.

Despite the desirable properties of DP and successful stories of implementing it in practice, the concept per se is rather abstract, and appears less relatable and intuitive to practitioners compared to privacy and disclosure risk measures rooted in specific attack models and scenarios that are 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 mechanisms in practice.

The goal of this paper is to relate privacy loss parameters in DP and the level of disclosure risk due to homogeneity attack (DR-HA). To the best of our knowledge, no work exists on examining such a relationship. HA is a common attack model used by adversaries to disclose sensitive information of individuals without having to identify those individuals in a released datasets. This attack leverages the scenario where all the values of a sensitive attribute within a set of records are identical. As long as a targeted individual belongs to that set, the sensitive value for that individual may be predicted exactly, even without correctly pointing out which of the k record is the target.

1.2 Related Work

Dwork et al. (2019) interviewed DP practitioners to understand the current DP practice in choosing privacy parameters and found no consensus. Dwork (2008) stated that "the choice of ϵ 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 connect the concept of DP and its privacy parameters withe existing disclosure risk metrics and to examine the effectiveness of DP against various attacks (e.g., re-identification, disclosure, and reconstruction). For example, Lee and Clifton (2011) considered the probability of re-identifying an individual from a database and demonstrated the challenge of setting a proper value for privacy loss parameters. McClure and Reiter (2012) used empirical studies to investigate probabilistic disclosure risk in differentially private univariate binary data. Hsu et al. (2014) proposed a model to balance the interests of data analysts and data contributors and used the model to choose privacy parameters for some statistical analyses. Abowd and Schmutte (2015) addressed the question from the economic perspective by accounting for the public-good properties of privacy loss and data utility and defined the optimal choice of ϵ through formulating a social planner's problem. Nissim et al. (2017) provided an example on how privacy loss may be interpreted as bounding the worst-case financial risk incurred by an individual participating in a research study. Dwork et al. (2017) showed differentially private techniques for releasing aggregate statistics can defend privacy when facing reconstruction attack and tracing attack. Holohan et al. (2017) designed the (k, ϵ)-anonymity algorithm for quasi-identifiers and evaluated its privacy protection against linking records in the perturbed data to the original records using the nearest neighbor technique. Chen et al. (2017a) defined the risk of data disclosure based on noise estimation and determined the ϵ value for the Laplace mechanism using confidence for the noise estimation. Chen et al. (2017b) proposed an algorithm for choosing privacy loss parameters, balancing disclosure risk and utility.

1.3 Our Contribution

We examine the relationships between the privacy loss parameters in DP and DR-HA on multi-dimensional frequency distributions. The frequency distributions include some of the commonly released data types by data collectors/curators such as cross-tabulations and multi-dimensional histograms. The availability of the closed-form relationships will help practitioners better understand the concept of DP and the associated privacy loss parameters in the context of HA, and provide a perspective on choosing privacy loss parameters when implementing differentially private mechanisms in data sanitization and release, along with other considerations. Our main contributions are summarized below.

- We propose several DR-HA measures at the individual level and for a whole multi-dimensional frequency distribution dataset.
- We derive the mathematical relationships between DR-HA and the privacy loss parameters for Laplace and Gaussian mechanisms in DP.
- We demonstrate the applications of the closed-form mathematical relationships in real-life datasets and how to leverage the relationships to help making decisions on privacy loss parameters when implementing DP mechanisms.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 overviews some basic concepts of DP and introduces HA. Section 3 derives the mathematical relationships between DR-HA on frequency distributions and the privacy loss parameters for the Laplace and Gaussian mechanisms. Section 4 presents the applications of the derived relationships in several experiments. Section 5 summarizes the work and presents some future research directions.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Differential Privacy (DP)

Definition 1 (ϵ**-DP** (Dwork et al., 2006)). *A randomized mechanism $\mathcal{M}$ satisfies ϵ-differential privacy if, for all datasets D_1 and D_2 differing by one record and all output subsets $\mathcal{S}$ of image($\mathcal{M}(D)$),*

$$e^{-\epsilon} \leq \frac{\Pr[\mathcal{M}(D_1) \in \mathcal{S}]}{\Pr[\mathcal{M}(D_2) \in \mathcal{S}]} \leq e^{\epsilon}. \tag{1}$$

DP is a mathematically rigorous concept that provides privacy guarantees to the data contributors when releasing information from a datasets. A small ϵ implies that the probability of identifying an individual or estimating the value of a sensitive attribute of a targeted individual based on the release sanitized information is low. Empirical studies in the literature on DP have examined ϵ on the order of 10^{-3} to 10, depending on the type of information released to the public, social perception of privacy protection, statistical accuracy of the released data, among others. Currently, there is no consensus and lacks a universal guideline on the choice of ϵ (Dwork et al., 2019).

There are several relaxed versions of the ϵ-DP. We present two relaxations that are used in later sections of this paper: (ϵ, δ)- approximate DP (aDP) and (ϵ, δ)-probabilistic DP (pDP). The former relaxes the bounds on the ratio in Eqn (1) whereas the latter bounds the probability that ϵ-DP is violated. In both cases, setting δ at 0 reduces to ϵ-DP.

Definition 2 ((ϵ, δ)**-DP** (Dwork, 2011)). *A randomized algorithm $\mathcal{M}$ is of (ϵ, δ)-DP if for all dataset pairs (D_1, D_2) differing by one record and for all subsets $\mathcal{S} \subseteq$ image($\mathcal{M}$),*

$$\Pr(\mathcal{M}(D_1) \in \mathcal{S}) \leq e^{\epsilon} \Pr(\mathcal{M}(D_2) \in \mathcal{S}]) + \delta. \tag{2}$$

Definition 3 ((ϵ, δ)**-probabilistic DP** (Machanavajjhala et al., 2008)). *A randomized algorithm $\mathcal{M}$ satisfies (ϵ, δ)-probabilistic DP if*

$$\Pr\left(\left|\log\left(\frac{\Pr(\mathcal{M}(D_1)) \in \mathcal{S})}{\Pr(\mathcal{M}(D_2)) \in \mathcal{S})}\right)\right| > \epsilon\right) \leq \delta \tag{3}$$

for all datasets pairs (D_1, D_2) differing by one record and for all $\mathcal{S} \subseteq$ image($\mathcal{M}$).

Various differentially private randomization mechanisms that have been developed to sanitize information in general and for specific types of analysis. The Laplace mechanism and the Gaussian mechanism are two popular choices for sanitizing numerical queries. To understand how the two mechanisms work, we first introduce the concept of global sensitivity.

Definition 4 (ℓ_p **global sensitivity (GS)** (Liu, 2019)). *The ℓ_p GS of query* $\mathbf{s}$ *is*

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

The ℓ_p GS measures the largest change in $\mathbf{s}$ with one record change in data ($|D_1 \setminus D_2| = 1$). The commonly used ℓ_p GS is the ℓ_1 GS at $p = 1$, on which the Laplace mechanism is based, and ℓ_2 GS at $p = 2$, on which the Gaussian mechanism is based. Let $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \ldots, s_q)$. The Laplace mechanism (Dwork et al., 2006) sanitizes $\mathbf{s}$ by perturbing each element s_j

in $\mathbf{s}$ with Laplace noise; that is;

$$s_j^* = s_j + e_j, \text{ where } e_j \sim \text{Lap}(0, \Delta_1(\mathbf{s})/\epsilon), \text{ for } j = 1, \ldots, q. \tag{4}$$

There are two types of Gaussian mechanisms, satisfying (ϵ, δ)-aDP and (ϵ, δ)-pDP, respectively. Similar to the Laplace mechanism, the sanitized statistic is $s_j^* = s_j + e_j$ for $j = 1, \ldots, q$, but $e_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ with

$$\sigma \geq c\Delta_2(\mathbf{s})/\epsilon \text{ for } \epsilon < 1 \text{ and } c^2 > 2\log(1.25/\delta) \tag{5}$$

in the case of (ϵ, δ)-aDP (Dwork et al., 2014), and

$$\sigma \geq (2\epsilon)^{-1}\Delta_2(\mathbf{s}) \left(\sqrt{(\Phi^{-1}(\delta/2))^2 + 2\epsilon} - \Phi^{-1}(\delta/2) \right) \tag{6}$$

in the case of (ϵ, δ)-pDP (Liu, 2019), where Φ^{-1} is the inverse cumulative density function (CDF) of the standard normal distribution.

2.2 Homogeneity Attack (HA)

Before we introduce HA, we first present two definitions required for understanding HA. The first is *quasi-identifiers* (QIDs) (Dalenius, 1986). QIDs are not unique identifiers (e.g., social security numbers) but contain identifying information that is sufficiently correlated with an individual and may lead to a unique identifier after being combined with other QIDs. Demographic attributes, such as age, race, gender, and geographical information, are regarded as QIDs. Adversaries often have exogenous knowledge of QIDs. The second is *sensitive attributes*. Sensitive attributes are attributes that contain sensitive information of individuals, such as income, medical history, criminal records, etc. These sensitive attributes are often of interest to adversaries who may launch different types of attack on released data to disclose their values. We refer to this type of privacy risk (DR) as the disclosure risk in this discussion.

HA describes a very intuitive type of privacy attack, where all the values for a sensitive attribute within a set of multiple records are identical. Figure 1 depicts a simple HA example. The data contains 12 anonymized individual records with information completely removed on "Nationality" and coarsened on "Zip Code" and "Age". "Zip Code" and "Age" can be regarded as QIDs and "Condition" is a sensitive attribute the information of which is accurately presented in the data. After the anonymization, records 1 to 4 share the same set of QIDs, so do records 5 to 8, and records 9 to 12. This data is an example of 4-anonymity[1]. In the last group, all records (9 to 12) also share the same value on "Condition". Suppose an adversary wants to learn the medical condition of his target who lives in the area with zip code 130** and is aged between 30 and 39. Despite the anonymization of the dataset, the adversary still knows that his target has cancer via the HA.

	Quasi-identifier			Sensitive
	Zip Code	Age	Nationality	Condition
1	130**	< 30	*	Heart Disease
2	130**	< 30	*	Heart Disease
3	130**	< 30	*	Viral Infection
4	130**	< 30	*	Viral Infection
5	1485*	≥ 40	*	Cancer
6	1485*	≥ 40	*	Heart Disease
7	1485*	≥ 40	*	Viral Infection
8	1485*	≥ 40	*	Viral Infection
9	130**	3*	*	Cancer
10	130**	3*	*	Cancer
11	130**	3*	*	Cancer
12	130**	3*	*	Cancer

Figure 1: Example of HA (a modification of Fig 2 in Machanavajjhala et al. (2007))

[1] k-anonymity describes the case where each person contained in a dataset cannot be distinguished from at least $k-1$ other individuals whose information also appears in the data (Sweeney, 2002).

In general, datasets that already satisfy k-anonymity may be still subject to HA. The fact that k-anonymity is still vulnerable to HA motivated new privacy models that are not subject to HA, such as ℓ-diversity that describes the case where there are at least $l > 1$ values for the sensitive attribute in a set of records whose PIDs are the same (Machanavajjhala et al., 2007).

3 Disclosure Risk from Homogeneity Attack on Differentially Private Frequency Distribution

3.1 Problem Setting and Problem Statement

We focus on frequency distributions (e.g., a multi-dimensional histogram, a contingency table) in this paper. Frequency distributions are a common data type released to the public data curators including government agencies such as the US Census. We aim to derive closed-form relationships between the disclosure risk due to HA (DR-HA) in frequency distributions sanitized via a differentially private mechanism and the privacy loss parameters ϵ and (ϵ, δ) for the mechanism. There are two benefits of having the relationships available in closed form. First, practitioners can apply the relationship directly to calculate DR-HA for a given privacy loss and thus save time and computational cost spent otherwise on the empirical evaluation of DR-HA; second, it can assist practitioners with interpreting privacy loss parameters and evaluating the effectiveness of a sanitization mechanism in a concrete privacy threat model and facilitate choosing the privacy loss parameters for practical implementation.

We first present the definitions of homogeneous and heterogeneous cells and then formally state the problem we aim to solve.

Definition 5 (**homogeneous cell**). *In a dataset D of n records, attributes $\mathbf{X}$ contain $p \geq 1$ QIDs and $\mathbf{Y}$ comprise $q \geq 1$ sensitive attributes. Let the cross-tabulation of $\mathbf{X}$ be indexed by i with value $\mathbf{x}_i$. A cell in the cross-tabulation of $\mathbf{X}$ is a* homogeneous cell *with respect to Y_j for $j = 1, \ldots, q$, if it is non-empty and all records in the cell have the same value for Y_j, and is denoted by $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}_i, y_{ij})$; $\mathbf{x}_i$ and y_{ij} refer to the value of $\mathbf{X}$ and Y_j, respectively associated with the cell. If the cell is homogeneous for every Y_j for $j = 1, \ldots, q$, it is a* complete homogeneous cell*; otherwise, it is a partial homogeneous cell.*

Definition 6 (**heterogeneous cell**). *In a dataset D of n records, attributes $\mathbf{X}$ contain $p \geq 1$ QIDs and $\mathbf{Y}$ comprise $q \geq 1$ sensitive attributes. A cell in the cross-tabulation of $\mathbf{X}$ is called a* heterogeneous cell *with respect to Y_j for $j = 1, \ldots, q$ if it is non-empty and there are at least two records in this cell having different values on Y_j. If the cell is heterogeneous for every Y_j for $j = 1, \ldots, q$, then it is a* complete heterogeneous cell*.*

For a given Y_j, a cell in the cross-tabulation formed by $\mathbf{X}$ is either homogeneous or heterogeneous as along as it is non-empty. When $q \geq 2$, a cell can be completely homogeneous, completely heterogeneous, or partially homogeneous. Definition 5 covers the scenario of sample uniqueness, which describes a situation where a cell formed by cross-tabulation of $\mathbf{X}$ contains only a single record. Sample uniqueness is a special but trivial case of a homogeneous cell.

Definitions 5 and 6 apply to both the original observed data and sanitized or anonymized

data such as the the example depicted in Figure 1, where three non-empty cells are formed by QIDs "zip code" and "age". The 4 records in the cell (zip code = 130**; age = 3*) have the same value on "condition" and thus this cell is homogeneous with respect to "condition" per Definition 5. The 4 records in the cell (zip code = 1485*; age $\geq$ 40) are different in "condition" and is thus a heterogeneous cell per Definition 6, so is the cell (zip code = 130**; age $<$ 30).

All records in a homogeneous cell $\mathcal{H}$ are subject to HA that may lead to the disclosure of sensitive information. If the information on Y_j is accurately presented in the dataset, then the adversary can learn the information on Y_j for his target without actually identifying that individual.[2] Originally empty cells in the cross-tabulation of $\mathbf{X}$ do not pose DR as no individual is present in the sample data with such QID values. The zero counts in those cells may be sanitized if such QID+Y combinations are deemed possible in the population even though they are not present in a particular sample dataset, but DR-HA remains null for these cells even if the sanitized cells may become non-empty and homogeneous in Y as the "imputed" Y values are completely random.

Problem 1. *Denote the non-empty cell set from the cross-tabulation of QIDs* $\mathbf{X}$ *in the original data* $\mathcal{D}$ *by* $\mathscr{C}_{\mathbf{X}} = \{\mathcal{C}_1(\mathbf{x}_1), \ldots, \mathcal{C}_M(\mathbf{x}_M)\}$ *or* $\mathscr{C}_{\mathbf{X}}\{\mathcal{C}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{C}_M\}$ *for simplicity, where* ξ *represents the value of* $\mathbf{X}$ *in cell* $\mathcal{C}_i$ *for* $i = 1, \ldots, M$*, and the associated cell sizes by* $\mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{X}} = (n_1, \ldots, n_M)$*. Denote the sensitive attribute of the adversary's interest by* Y *with* K *distinct values* $(1, \ldots, k)$*. The further cross-tabulation of* $\mathscr{C}_{\mathbf{x}}$ *and* Y *generates* $M \times K$ *cells* $\mathscr{C} = \{\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}_1, Y = 1), \ldots, \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}_1, Y = k) \ldots, \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}_M, Y = 1), \ldots, \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}_M, Y = k)\}$ *with frequency distribution* $\mathbf{n} = (\mathbf{n}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{n}_M)$*, where* $\mathbf{n}_i = (n_{i1}, \ldots, n_{iK})$ *and* $\sum_{k=1}^{M} n_{ik} = n_i$ *for* $i = 1 \ldots, M$*. Suppose* $\mathcal{D}$ *is perturbed via a randomization mechanism that generates the sanitized data* $\mathcal{D}^*$*. Denote the sanitized frequency distribution over* $\mathscr{C}$ *by* $\mathbf{n}^*$ *in* $\mathcal{D}^*$*. What is the DR-HA on* Y *given* $\mathbf{n}^*$*?*

To address Problem 1, we first propose several measures for DR-HA (Sec 3.2) and then derive closed-form relationships between the measures and the privacy loss parameters in the DP setting to examine how the former changes in sanitized data with different privacy levels (Sec 3.3).

3.2 Definitions and Measures of DR-HA

For a homogeneous cell $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}_i, Y = k|\mathbf{n})$, further cross-tabulation of $\mathscr{C}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and Y leads to $\mathbf{n}_i$ of length K with only one non-zero element at the position k and $(K-1)$ zero elements (i.e., $n_{ik} = n_i$ and $n_{ik'} = 0$ for $k' \neq k$). After sanitization, there are three possible output scenarios to input $\mathbf{n}_i$, listed below. DR-HA still exists in Scenario 1, and disappear in Scenarios 2 to 4 for different reasons.

- Scenario 1: the sanitized cell remains homogeneous with the same Y value as the original $Y = k$ value; that is, $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}_i, Y = k|\mathbf{n}^*) \neq \varnothing$ and $\mathbf{n}_i^*$ has only one non-zero element at the position k and $K-1$ zero counts; i.e., $n_{ik}^* = n_i^*$ and $n_{ik'}^* = 0$ for $k' \neq k$;

[2] If the sensitive value is not correctly presented in the released data because of data entry errors, measurement errors, missing values, intentional perturbation for privacy preservation purposes, etc, then HA does not necessarily lead to the disclosure of sensitive information. But there might be other types of harm (e.g. social harm) on the target if the adversary disseminates the wrong information, claiming the information is true, whether intentional or not. This type of harm can be reduced if the data curator puts a disclaimer regarding the accuracy of individual-level information when publishing the data.

- Scenario 2: the sanitized cell remains homogeneous but with a different Y value other than the original $Y = k$ value; that is, $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}_i, Y = k|\mathbf{n}^*) \neq \varnothing$, where $k^* \neq k$, and $\mathbf{n}_i^*$ has only one non-zero element at the position k^* and $K - 1$ zero elements; i.e., $n_{ik^*}^* = n_i^*$ and $n_{ik'}^* = 0$ for $k' \neq k^*$.
- Scenario 3:the sanitized cell becomes heterogeneous with at least two different Y values.
- Scenario 4: $\mathbf{n}_i^* = \mathbf{0}$, i.e., $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x}_i|\mathbf{n}^*) = \varnothing$.

For a heterogeneous cell $\mathcal{C}_i$, the associated $\mathbf{n}_i$ of length K has at least two non-zero counts at different positions (different values of Y). After the sanitization, there are three possible outputs of $\mathbf{n}_i$. In Scenarios 5 and 6, it is obvious there is no DR-HA. In Scenarios 7 and 8, the cell becomes homogeneous after sanitization; whether that incurs DR-HA depends on whether any of the original Y values in $\mathcal{C}_i$ remains in the sanitized cell. In Scenario 7, the original Y values in cell $\mathcal{C}_i$ are replaced by a new Y value. Even though the sanitized cell is homogeneous, the information on Y is wrong for the records in this cell and there is no DR-HA. In Scenario 8, one of the original Y values in cell $\mathcal{C}_i$ remains after sanitization and there will be DR-HA after sanitization for the original records in $\mathcal{C}_i$ whose original Y value remains, but no DR-HA for those who original Y values disappear after sanitization. In other words, the published Y for the latter group is wrong. Though the net effect on DR in Scenario 8 is complicated and depends on the relative frequencies of these two groups, we take a conservative approach and treat this cell as being subjective to DR-HA, along the same lines as using the "worst case" and an "upper bound". To better understand this, consider the following example. Suppose Y is binary and cell $\mathcal{C}_i$ contains 5 records at $Y = 0$ and 95 at $Y = 1$ in the original data. After sanitization, it is likely the cell becomes homogeneous and 100% at $Y = 1$. Though the sanitized information is not 100% accurate on Y in cell $\mathcal{C}_i$, releasing the sanitized cell still leads to disclosure of the true Y values for 95% of the original records with QID $\mathbf{x}_i$ but provides the wrong Y information for 5% of the original records with QID $\mathbf{x}_i$. The upper bound approach treats this cell as subjective to HA even though the disclosed information is not 100% accurate. The more unbalanced this cell is, the more likely Scenario 8 will occur and the more records with QID $\mathbf{x}_i$ will have their true Y values revealed in Scenario 8. This claim holds for $K \geq 2$.

- Scenario 5: $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x}_i|\mathbf{n}^*)$ remains as heterogeneous and $\mathbf{n}_i^*$ does not have to match $\mathbf{n}_i$ in either position or numerical values.
- Scenario 6: $\mathbf{n}_i^* = \mathbf{0}$ (i.e., $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x}_i|\mathbf{n}^*) = \varnothing$).
- Scenario 7: the sanitized cell becomes homogeneous $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}_i, Y = k|\mathbf{n}^*)$ and k does not belong to set of Y values in the original cell $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x}_i|\mathbf{n})$.
- Scenario 8: the sanitized cell becomes homogeneous $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}_i, Y = k|\mathbf{n}^*)$ and k is one of the Y values in the original cell $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x}_i|\mathbf{n})$.

All taken together, DR-HA exists in the original data but disappears after sanitization in Scenarios 2 to 4; there is no DR-HA in either the original or sanitized data in Scenarios 5 to 7; there is DR-HA in both the original and sanitized data in Scenario 1; Scenario 8 is the only case where DR-HA changes from zero to non-zero after sanitization, partially due to the "upper-bound" framework we adopt. The analysis of these scenarios leads to four definitions on DR-HA, defined below.

We propose four measures (Definitions 7 to 10) in somewhat a hierarchical manner, as

depicted in Figure 2. The measure in each subsequent layer is the expected value of the measure from the previous layer. Specifically, the local DR-HA in Definition 7 is




Figure 2: Relationships among the four definitions of DR-HA in a single cell

the expected value of DR-HA in a cell $\mathcal{C}_i$ over the distribution of the randomization mechanism given the frequency $\mathbf{n}_i$ on the sensitive attribute Y; the expected DR-HA in Definition 8 is the expected value of the local DR-HA over the distribution of $\mathbf{n}_i$ given the overall cell size n_i. The shrinkage DR-HA in Definition 9 is the expected value of expected DR-HA over the prior distribution on $\mathbf{p}_i$ with hyperparameter $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ across all cells, assuming $\mathbf{n}_i \sim$ multinomial(n_i, p_i). The global DR-HA in Definition 10 is the expected value of the shrinkage DR-HA over the distribution of n_i.

Definition 7 (**local DR-HA in a cell**). *In the setting of Problem 1, let $\mathcal{Y}_i$ denote the original set of Y values with non-zero frequencies in cell $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{X}_i)$. The local DR-HA on Y in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x}_i)$ after sanitization is*

$$\rho_i^l = \rho_i(\mathbf{n}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \begin{cases} = \Pr_{\mathcal{M}}(\exists\, k \in \mathcal{Y}_i : \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}_i, Y = k|\mathbf{n}^*) \neq \varnothing) & \text{if } |\mathcal{Y}_i| = 1 \\ < \Pr_{\mathcal{M}}(\exists\, k \in \mathcal{Y}_i : \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}_i, Y = k|\mathbf{n}^*) \neq \varnothing) & \text{if } |\mathcal{Y}_i| > 1 \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

$|\mathcal{Y}_i| = 1$ implies that $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x}_i)$ is homogeneous cell while $|\mathcal{Y}_i| > 1$ implies that $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x}_i)$ is heterogeneous cell. The first equation in Eq (7) corresponds to Scenario 1 and the expression in the second inequality yields the upper bound for Scenario 8.

Definition 8 (**expected DR-HA in a cell**). *In the same setting as Definition 7, assume $\mathbf{n}_i|n_i, \mathbf{p}_i \sim$ multinomial$(n_i, \mathbf{p}_i)$, where $\mathbf{p}_i = (p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{iK})$. The expected DR-HA on Y in cell $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x}_i)$ after sanitization is*

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_i^e = \rho_i(n_i, \mathbf{p}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{n}_i}(\rho_i^l) &= \int_{\mathbf{n}_i} \rho_i^l(\mathbf{n}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) f(\mathbf{n}_i|n_i, \mathbf{p}_i) d\mathbf{n}_i \\ &< \Pr_{\mathbf{n}_i, \mathcal{M}}(\exists k \in \mathcal{Y}_i : \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}_i, Y = k|\mathbf{n}^*) \neq \varnothing \cap |\mathcal{Y}_i| = 1) + \\ &\quad \Pr_{\mathbf{n}_i, \mathcal{M}}(\exists k \in \mathcal{Y}_i : \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}_i, Y = k|\mathbf{n}^*) \neq \varnothing \cap |\mathcal{Y}_i| > 1). \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

The probabilities on the right-hand side of Eqn (8) are evaluated over the distribution of $\mathbf{n}_i$ and the randomization mechanism $\mathcal{M}$. The first terms covers Scenarios 1 whereas the second term covers Scenario 8. ρ_i^e in Eqn (8) is a function of $n_i, \mathbf{p}_i$, and $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, where $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is user-specified and known, but $\mathbf{p}_i$ is unknown. There are two approaches to dealing with the unknown $\mathbf{p}_i$ so to evaluate the DR-HA. First, one may plug in estimates $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_i = \mathbf{n}_i/n_i$ for $\mathbf{p}_i$; second, one may assume $\mathbf{p}_i$ follows a distribution and integrate out $\mathbf{p}_i$ to obtain $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_i}(\rho_i(n_i, \mathbf{p}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}))$, leading to the shrinkage DR-HA in Definition 9.

Definition 9 (**shrinkage DR-HA in a cell**). *In the same setting as Definition 8, assume $\mathbf{p}_i \sim f(\mathbf{p}_i|\boldsymbol{\alpha})$. The DR-HA on Y in cell $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x}_i)$ after sanitization is*

$$\rho_i^s = \rho_i(n_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_i}(\rho_i^e) = \int_{\mathbf{p}_i} \rho_i(n_i, \mathbf{p}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) f(\mathbf{p}_i|\boldsymbol{\alpha}) d\mathbf{p}_i. \tag{9}$$

Since $\mathbf{p}_i$ is probability and $\sum_{k=1}^{K} \mathbf{p}_{ik} = 1$, a common choice for $f(\mathbf{p}_i|\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ is Dirichlet$(\mathbf{p}_i|\boldsymbol{\alpha})$. ρ_i^s in Eqn (9) depends on n_i, $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and the hyper-parameter $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$. To determine $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ given data $\mathbf{n}$, approaches such as empirical Bayes (EB) can be used, the estimates of which can be plugged in Eqn (9) to calculate DR-HA ρ_i^s.

Definitions 8 and 9 are conditional on n_i. n_i in some cases is fixed and pre-specified, for example, according to a survey design or experimental design where the samples are obtained following a pre-determined sample size per cell[3]. When n_i is not fixed, we may assume a distribution $f(n_i|\boldsymbol{\beta})$, such as Poisson and negative binomial distributions given n_i is count data, and integrate n_i out, leading to the marginal DR-HA in Definitions 10.

Definition 10 (**global DR-HA in a single cell**). *In the same setting as Definition 9, assume $n_i \sim f(n_i|\boldsymbol{\beta})$. The global DR-HA on Y in a cell after sanitization is*

$$\rho^g = \rho(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \mathbb{E}_{n_i}(\rho_i^s) = \mathbb{E}_{n_i, \mathbf{p}_i}(\rho_i^e) = \int_{n_i} \int_{\mathbf{p}_i} \rho_i(n_i, \mathbf{p}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) f(\mathbf{p}_i|\boldsymbol{\alpha}) f(n_i|\boldsymbol{\beta}) d\mathbf{p}_i dn_i. \quad (10)$$

Though the marginal DR-HA is still defined for a single cell, since it integrates out all the variability brought by n_i and $\mathbf{n}_i$ and $\mathbf{p}_i$, it describe the DR-HA for a general cell in all datasets where the underlying distributions of $\mathbf{n}_i, \mathbf{p}_i$ and n_i are described by multinomial$(n_i, \mathbf{p}_i)$, $f(\mathbf{p}_i|\boldsymbol{\alpha})$, and $f(n_i|\boldsymbol{\beta})$, respectively.

Similar to the shrinkage DR-HA, the global DR-HA involves unknown parameters $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, but the nature of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ are different. $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is a hyper-parameter that governs the distribution of the unknown parameter $\mathbf{p}_i$ whereas $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is the unknown parameter in the distribution of the observed n_i. We mention above the estimation of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ can use the EB approach; but the estimate of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ may use a common estimation approach such as methods of moments (MoM), maximum likelihood estimation (MLE), or Bayesian inferences.

A variant of ρ^g, which we denote by $\tilde{\rho}^g$, is to integrate ρ_i^e over $f(n_i; \boldsymbol{\beta})$ without applying shrinkage across cells via $f(p_i; \boldsymbol{\alpha})$. The benefit of having the variant $\tilde{\rho}^g$ is to avoid estimating the hyper-parameter $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ (say, through EB); instead, we may just estimate $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, supposedly easier than estimating $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, and plug in sample proportions for p_i (Theorems 1 and 4) to obtain an estimate for $\tilde{\rho}^g$. $\tilde{\rho}^g$ has simplified expressions in some special scenarios (e.g., when all cells are homogeneous) whereas ρ^g does not (Corollaries 3 and 6).

The local, expected, and shrinkage DR-HA measures ρ_i^l, ρ_i^e and ρ_i^s all use the local information in cell $\mathcal{C}_i$. To assess the DR-HA level in a sample dataset that comprises many cells, we may average the cell-level DR-HA across all cells in the dataset, resulting in Definition 11.

Definition 11 (**average DR-HA**). *In the same setting as Definition 9, the empirical average DR-HA on Y across the M cells formed by QIDs $\mathbf{X}$ after sanitization is*

$$\bar{\rho}^* = M^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \rho_i^*, \text{ where the superscript * can be } l, e, \text{ or } s. \quad (11)$$

When ρ_i^* is ρ_i^s, we can regard $\bar{\rho}^s$ as an estimate of the global ρ^g given sample data $\mathcal{D}$.

[3]For example, a study uses a 2×2-factorial design with factors gender (male or female) and ethnicity (Hispanic or not) to collect information on HIV status (Y). It aims to recruit 100 subjects for each of the 4 cells formed by the cross-tabulation of gender and ethnicity. $n_i = 100$ for $i = 1, \ldots, 4$ is fixed though the information Y in each cell is the sensitive information and is subject to sampling error.

3.3 Relationship between DR-HA in sanitized frequency distribution and privacy loss in DP settings

We derive the mathematical relationships between the privacy loss parameters in a DP sanitization mechanism and the DR-HA measures for Problem 1. We focus on the Laplace mechanism of ϵ-DP and the Gaussian mechanism of (ϵ, δ)-DP, and derive the relationship between ϵ, (ϵ, δ) and the DR-HA measures presented in Sec 3.2. The main results are presented in Sec 3.3.1 and 3.3.2, and are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Result summary on the relationship between DR-HA and DP mechanism

result	DR-HA	DP mechanism
Theorem 1	$\bar{\rho}^e, \bar{\rho}^s, \rho^g$	Laplace
Corollary 2	$\bar{\rho}^e, \bar{\rho}^s, \rho^g$ at $K = 2$	ϵ-DP
Corollary 3	$\bar{\rho}^e$ and $\bar{\rho}^s$ when all original cells are homogeneous	
Theorem 4	$\bar{\rho}^e, \bar{\rho}^s, \rho^g$	Gaussian
Corollary 5	$\bar{\rho}^e, \bar{\rho}^s, \rho^g$ at $K = 2$	(ϵ, δ)-aDP
Corollary 6	$\bar{\rho}^e$ and $\bar{\rho}^s$ when all original cells are homogeneous	(ϵ, δ)-pDP

3.3.1 DR-HA in frequency distribution sanitized via Laplace mechanism

Theorem 1 (**relationship between DR-HA and privacy loss ϵ in Laplace mechanism**). *Sensitive attribute Y has $K \geq 2$ distinct values. Denote by $n_{i,k}$ the frequencies of the k-th value in cell $\mathcal{C}_i$ for $i=1,\ldots,M$ and $k=1,\ldots,K$ with $\sum_{k=1}^{K} n_{i,k}=n_i$. Assume $n_{i,k} \sim$ multinomial$(n_i, \mathbf{p}_i)$. $\mathbf{p}_i=(p_{i,1},\ldots,p_{i,K})$ represents the population proportions with $\sum_{k=1}^{K} p_{i,k} = 1$ in cell $\mathcal{C}_i$ and the sample estimate of p_{ik} is $\hat{p}_{i,k}$ (e.g.,$\hat{p}_{i,k} = n_{i,k}/n_i$). The Laplace mechanism of ϵ-DP sanitizes $n_{i,k}$ to obtain $\tilde{n}_{i,k}=n_{i,k}+e_{i,k}$, where $e_{i,k} \sim Lap(0, \epsilon^{-1})$ (the l_1 GS of count data is 1). The plug-in estimate of the average expected DR-HA across the cells in the sanitized frequency distribution is*

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\rho}^e <& M^{-1} \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{M} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{K} \hat{p}_{i,k}^{n_i}\right) \left(1-0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon}\right)^{K-1} \left(1-0.5e^{(0.5-n_i)\epsilon}\right) + \\ & M^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \mathbb{1}(n_i \geq 2) \left(\sum_{k=1}^{K} \hat{p}_{i,k}^{n_i-1}(1-\hat{p}_{i,k})\right) (1-0.5e^{(1.5-n_i)\epsilon})(0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon})(1-0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon})^{K-2}.\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Assume $\mathbf{p}_i \sim$ Dirichlet$(\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_K)$. The average shrinkage DR-HA is

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\rho}^s <& M^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{K} \frac{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k)\Gamma(\alpha_k+n_i)}{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k+n_i)\Gamma(\alpha_k)}\right) \left(1-0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon}\right)^{K-1} \left(1-0.5e^{(0.5-n_i)\epsilon}\right) \\ & + M^{-1} \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{M} \left\{\mathbb{1}(n_i \geq 2)(1-0.5e^{(1.5-n_i)\epsilon})(0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon})(1-0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon})^{K-2} \times \right. \\ & \left. \Gamma\left(\textstyle\sum_k \alpha_k\right) \sum_{k=1}^{K} \frac{\Gamma(n_i+\alpha_k-1)\sum_{t\neq k}\alpha_t}{\Gamma(\alpha_k)\Gamma(n_i+\sum_k \alpha_k)}\right\}.\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Assume $n_i \sim f(n_i;\boldsymbol{\beta})$. The global DR-HA is

$$\begin{aligned}\rho^g <& \sum_{n_i=1}^{\infty} f(n_i;\boldsymbol{\beta}) \left(\sum_{k=1}^{K} \frac{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k)\Gamma(\alpha_k+n_i)}{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k+n_i)\Gamma(\alpha_k)}\right) \left(1-0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon}\right)^{K-1} \left(1-0.5e^{(0.5-n_i)\epsilon}\right) \\ & + \textstyle\sum_{n_i=2}^{\infty} \left\{f(n_i;\boldsymbol{\beta})(1-0.5e^{(1.5-n_i)\epsilon})(0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon})(1-0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon})^{K-2} \times \right. \\ & \left. \Gamma\left(\textstyle\sum_k \alpha_k\right) \sum_{k=1}^{K} \frac{\Gamma(n_i+\alpha_k-1)\sum_{t\neq k}\alpha_t}{\Gamma(\alpha_k)\Gamma(n_i+\sum_k \alpha_k)}\right\}.\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

The proof is provided in Appendix A. In terms of the specification of $f(n_i;\boldsymbol{\beta})$, Poisson

distribution and negative binomial distribution are natural choices given that n_i is count data. If $n_i \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda)$ is used, then Eqn (14) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\rho^g <& \sum_{n_i=1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\lambda}\lambda^{n_i}}{n_i!}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{K}\frac{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k)\Gamma(\alpha_k+n_i)}{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k+n_i)\Gamma(\alpha_k)}\right)\left(1-0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon}\right)^{K-1}\left(1-0.5e^{(0.5-n_i)\epsilon}\right)\\ &+\sum_{n_i=2}^{\infty}\left\{\frac{e^{-\lambda}\lambda^{n_i}}{n_i!}(1-0.5e^{(1.5-n_i)\epsilon})(0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon})(1-0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon})^{K-2}\times\right.\\ &\left.\Gamma\left(\sum_k \alpha_k\right)\sum_{k=1}^{K}\frac{\Gamma(n_i+\alpha_k-1)\sum_{t\neq k}\alpha_t}{\Gamma(\alpha_k)\Gamma(n_i+\sum_k \alpha_k)}\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

If $n_i \sim \text{NegBin}(r, \lambda)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho^g <& \sum_{n_i=1}^{\infty}\binom{n_i+r-1}{r-1}(1-\lambda)^{n_i}\lambda^r\left(1-0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon}\right)^{K-1}\left(1-0.5e^{(0.5-n_i)\epsilon}\right)\sum_{k=1}^{K}\frac{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k)\Gamma(\alpha_k+n_i)}{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k+n_i)\Gamma(\alpha_k)}\\ &+\sum_{n_i=2}^{\infty}\left\{\binom{n_i+r-1}{r-1}(1-\lambda)^{n_i}\lambda^r(1-0.5e^{(1.5-n_i)\epsilon})(0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon})(1-0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon})^{K-2}\times\right.\\ &\left.\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k)\sum_{k=1}^{K}\frac{\Gamma(n_i+\alpha_k-1)\sum_{t\neq k}\alpha_t}{\Gamma(\alpha_k)\Gamma(n_i+\sum_k \alpha_k)}\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Parameters $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_K$ in Dirichlet$(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_K)$ in Theorem 1 are unknown and can be estimated from the original data via the EB approach, as demonstrated in Appendix B. The estimates can then be plugged in Eqn (13) to calculate $\bar{\rho}^s$. The global DR-HA ρ^g in Eqn (14) depends on unknown parameter $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ in addition to $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_K$. $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ can be estimated by fitting the distribution $f(n_i; \boldsymbol{\beta})$ to the sample data, such as via the MoM or MLE approaches, and then plugged in Eqn (14) to obtain ρ^g. ρ^g in general is a summation over infinite terms without a closed form on paper but should always be summed a finite number of terms in practical problems as n_i is ways bounded by a constant that does not depend on the local data.

There are two summation terms on the right side of Eqns (12), (13) and (14), corresponding to Scenarios 1 and 8 in Sec 3.2, respectively. The first term (Scenario 1) is monotonically increasing with ϵ as both $(1-0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon})^{K-1}$ and $1-0.5e^{(0.5-n_i)\epsilon}$ increase with ϵ; for the second term (Scenario 8), its relationship with ϵ is more complicated as $1-0.5e^{(0.5-n_i)\epsilon}$ and $(1-0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon})^{K-2}$ increase with ϵ but $0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon}$ decreases with ϵ. Taken together, how DR-HA changes with ϵ depends on the relative presence of Scenario 1 and 8 and the sizes of the cells that fall in Scenario 8 and varies case by case. As $\epsilon \to \infty$, the first term becomes 1 and the second term goes to 0 as the cells returns to their original homogeneous and heterogeneous forms, respectively.

Corollary 2 presents a special case of Theorem 1 when $K = 2$, in which case the mathematical expressions of $\bar{\rho}^e, \bar{\rho}^s, \rho^g$ take slightly simplified forms.

Corollary 2. *When $K = 2$, the plug-in estimate of the average expected DR-HA in Theorem 1 becomes*

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\rho}^e <& M^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\left(\hat{p}_i^{n_i}+(1-\hat{p}_i)^{n_i}\right)\left(1-0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon}\right)\left(1-0.5e^{(0.5-n_i)\epsilon}\right)+\\ & M^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\mathbb{1}(n_i\geq 2)\left(\hat{p}_i^{n_i-1}(1-\hat{p}_i)+(1-\hat{p}_i)^{n_i-1}\hat{p}_i\right)\left(1-0.5e^{\epsilon(1.5-n_i)}\right)\left(0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where $\hat{p}_i = n_{i,1}/n_i$. Assume $p_i \sim$ beta(α_1, α_2) for $i = 1, \ldots, M$. Let $B()$ denote the beta function. The average shrinkage DR-HA is

$$\bar{\rho}^s = M^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\rho_i(n_i, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \epsilon)$$

$$< \frac{(1-0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon})}{B(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)M}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\left(1-\frac{1}{2}e^{(0.5-n_i)\epsilon}\right)B_{1i} + \frac{(0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon})}{B(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)M}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\mathbb{1}(n_i\geq 2)\left(1-\frac{1}{2}e^{\epsilon(1.5-n_i)}\right)B_{2i}, \quad (16)$$

where $B_{i1} = B(n_i+\alpha_1,\alpha_2)+B(\alpha_1,n_i+\alpha_2)$ *and* $B_{i2} = B(\alpha_1+n_i-1,\alpha_2+1)+B(\alpha_1+1,n_i+\alpha_2-1)$. *Assume* $n_i \sim f(n_i;\boldsymbol{\beta})$. *The global DR-HA is*

$$\begin{aligned}\rho^g <& \frac{(1-0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon})}{B(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)}\sum_{n_i=1}^{\infty} f(n_i;\boldsymbol{\beta})\left(1-0.5e^{(0.5-n_i)\epsilon}\right)B_{1i} \\ &+ \frac{(0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon})}{B(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)}\sum_{n_i=2}^{\infty} f(n_i;\boldsymbol{\beta})\left(1-0.5e^{\epsilon(1.5-n_i)}\right)B_{2i}. \quad (17)\end{aligned}$$

The simpler mathematical expression of the relationship in case of $K = 2$ allows us to better interpret relationship between the second term in the two-term summation in Eqn (15), (16), (17) and ϵ. When $K = 2$, the terms that involves ϵ in the second summation term is $\left(1-0.5e^{\epsilon(1.5-n_i)}\right)e^{-0.5\epsilon}$. It is monotonically decreasing in ϵ when $n_i = 2$, and is concave and reaches the maximum for cell $\mathcal{C}_i$ at $\epsilon = \log(n_i-1)/(n_i-1.5)$ for $n_i \geq 3$. In other words, when $n_i \geq 3$, the upper bound DR-HA for cells that fall under Scenario 8 first increases with ϵ then decreases once $\epsilon \geq \log(n_i-1)/(n_i-1.5)$. This seeming counter-intuitive result makes sense since the DR-HA in Scenario 8 corresponds to an upper bound or close to a worst-case scenario after the cell with QID $\mathbf{x}_i$ that is heterogeneous in the original data becomes homogeneous after sanitization. The types of cells that are likely to fall in Scenario 8 are those significantly unbalanced and have a strong presence in one value of Y in the original cell. When ϵ is very small, every n_{ik} in cell $\mathcal{C}_i$ is significantly perturbed regardless whether it is close to 0 or not and there is a possibility that the sanitized cell falls in any case from Scenarios 5 to 8. Integrated over the randomization $\mathcal{M}$, the DR-HA is not necessarily large. When ϵ is very large, the sanitized cell is very likely to be similar to the original cell and thus still heterogeneous (Scenarios 5) and the DR-HA remains small. In other words, ϵ has to be in the "right" range – not too large and not too small – to lead to high DR-HA. This explains the concave relationship between the second term and ϵ.

Another special case of Theorem 1 is when all the original cells are homogeneous and Scenario 8 thus does not exist. We present $\bar{\rho}^e$ for this special case in Corollary 3.

Corollary 3. *When all the original cells are homogeneous, the plug-in estimate of the average expected DR-HA in the sanitized frequency distribution via the Laplace mechanism of* ϵ*-DP is*

$$\bar{\rho}^e = M^{-1}\left(1-0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon}\right)^{K-1}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\left(1-0.5e^{(0.5-n_i)\epsilon}\right) \in (2^{-K},1). \quad (18)$$

Eqn (18) can be easily obtained by plugging in $\hat{p}_i = \{0,1\}$ in Eqn (12). There are several take-away messages from Corollary 3.

- DR-HA is lower-bounded when all M cells are homogeneous, regardless of $\epsilon, \mathbf{n}$ and M values. When $K = 2$, the lower bound is 25%. As K increases, the lower bound approaches 0. This is because the possibility of having at least one different value of Y show up in cell $\mathcal{C}_i$ after sanitization in addition to the original Y value increases as K increases; in other words, it is more likely for a homogeneous cell with many Y levels

to become heterogeneous after sanitization.

- The larger ϵ is, the closer $\bar{\rho}^e$ is to 1, but it is always lower-bounded by 2^{-K}. In other words, no matter how small ϵ is, the Laplace mechanism can only lower the DR-HA to 2^{-K} rather than 0 if all the original cells are homogeneous.
- For a given ϵ, the smaller n_i is for $i = 1, \ldots, M$, the smaller $\bar{\rho}^e$ is as the sanitization has more impact on small cell sizes than large cell sizes. However, the term $1 - 0.5e^{(0.5-n_i)\epsilon}$ is close to 1 even for not-so-large n_i (specifically, ≥ 0.985 when $n \geq 4$, ≥ 0.959 when $n \geq 3$, ≥ 0.888 when $n \geq 2$). This implies $\bar{\rho}^e$ is largely determined by $1-0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon}$ which is independent of the actual data information if all the original cells are homogeneous when $K = 2$. This is also demonstrated in the experiments in Sec 4, where $\bar{\rho}^e$ is similar between two datasets that are very different in n, M, n_i but the cells formed by QIDs are all homogeneous in both datasets.

When all cells are homogeneous, we may also obtain an estimate for $\tilde{\rho}^g$ by plugging in $\hat{p}_i = \{0, 1\}$ in Eqn (12), which is then integrated over $f(n_i; \boldsymbol{\beta})$, leading to

$$\hat{\tilde{\rho}}^g = \textstyle\sum_{n_i=1}^{\infty}(1 - 0.5e^{-0.5\epsilon})(1 - 0.5e^{(0.5-n_i)\epsilon})f(n_i; \boldsymbol{\beta}). \tag{19}$$

$\boldsymbol{\beta}$ can be estimated through either MLE or MoM by fitting distribution $f(n_i; \boldsymbol{\beta})$ (e.g., Poisson or negative binomial) to data $\{n_i\}_{i=1,\ldots,M}$, which is then plugged in Eqn (19) to obtain a final solution for $\hat{\tilde{\rho}}^g$.

3.3.2 DR-HA in frequency distribution sanitized via Gaussian mechanisms of (ϵ, δ)-aDP and (ϵ, δ)-pDP

Theorem 4 (**relationship between DR-HA and privacy loss parameters (ϵ, δ) in Gaussian mechanism**). *In the same setting as in Theorem 1, the frequency distribution is sanitized via the Gaussian mechanism: $\tilde{n}_{i,k} = n_{i,k} + e_{i,k}$, where $e_{i,k} \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ and*

$$\sigma = \epsilon^{-1}\sqrt{2\ln(1.25/\delta)} \text{ with } \epsilon < 1 \tag{20}$$

for the Gaussian mechanism of (ϵ, δ)-aDP and

$$\sigma = (2\epsilon)^{-1}(\sqrt{(\Phi^{-1}(\delta/2))^2 + 2\epsilon} - \Phi^{-1}(\delta/2)) \tag{21}$$

for the Gaussian mechanism of (ϵ, δ)-pDP. The plug-in estimate of the average expected DR-HA in the sanitized frequency distribution via the Gaussian mechanism is

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\rho}^e <& \frac{1}{2^K M}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{K}\hat{p}_{i,k}^{n_i}\right)\left(1 + erf\left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)\right)^{K-1}\left(1 + erf\left(\frac{n_i - 0.5}{\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)\right) + \\ & \frac{1}{2^K M}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\left\{\mathbb{1}(n_i \geq 2)\left(\sum_{k=1}^{K}\hat{p}_{i,k}^{n_i-1}(1-\hat{p}_{i,k})\right)\times\right. \\ & \left.\left(1-erf\left(\frac{1.5-n_i}{\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)\right)\left(1+erf\left(\frac{-0.5}{\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)\right)\left(1+erf\left(\frac{0.5}{\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)\right)^{K-2}\right\},\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where erf is the error function. Assume $\mathbf{p}_i \sim$ Dirichlet$(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_K)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, M$. The average shrinkage DR-HA is

$$\bar{\rho}^s < \frac{\left(1+erf\left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)\right)^{K-1}}{2^K M}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{K}\frac{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k)\Gamma(\alpha_k + n_i)}{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k + n_i)\Gamma(\alpha_k)}\right)\left(1+erf\left(\frac{n_i - 0.5}{\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)\right) + \tag{23}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k)}{2^K M}\left(1+erf\left(\frac{-0.5}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}\right)\right)\left(1+erf\left(\frac{0.5}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}\right)\right)^{K-2}\times$$
$$\sum_{i=1}^{M}\left\{\mathbb{1}(n_i\geq 2)\left(1-erf\left(\frac{1.5-n_i}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}\right)\right)\sum_{k=1}^{K}\frac{\Gamma(n_i+\alpha_k-1)\sum_{t\neq k}\alpha_t}{\Gamma(\alpha_k)\Gamma(n_i+\sum_k\alpha_k)}\right\}.$$

Assume $n_i \sim f(n_i;\boldsymbol{\beta})$ for $i=1,\ldots,M$. The global DR-HA is

$$\rho^g < \frac{\left(1+erf\left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)\right)^{K-1}}{2^K}\sum_{n_i=1}^{\infty} f(n_i;\boldsymbol{\theta})\left(\sum_{k=1}^{K}\frac{\Gamma(\sum_k\alpha_k)\Gamma(\alpha_k+n_i)}{\Gamma(\sum_k\alpha_k+n_i)\Gamma(\alpha_k)}\right)\left(1+erf\left(\frac{n_i-0.5}{\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)\right)+$$
$$\frac{\Gamma(\sum_k\alpha_k)}{2^K}\left(1+erf\left(\frac{-0.5}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}\right)\right)\left(1+erf\left(\frac{0.5}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}\right)\right)^{K-2}\times \tag{24}$$
$$\sum_{n_i=2}^{\infty} f(n_i;\boldsymbol{\beta})\left[\left(1-erf\left(\frac{1.5-n_i}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}\right)\right)\sum_{k=1}^{K}\frac{\Gamma(n_i+\alpha_k-1)\sum_{t\neq k}\alpha_t}{\Gamma(\alpha_k)\Gamma(n_i+\sum_k\alpha_k)}\right].$$

The proof of Theorem 4 is provided in Appendix C. Since the Gaussian mechanism of (ϵ,δ)-aDP requires $\epsilon<1$ whereas that of (ϵ,δ)-pDP does not impose any constraint on ϵ, the latter allows a more comprehensive investigation of the relationship between DR-HA and (ϵ,δ) in the framework of relaxed DP.

The parameters $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and $\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_K$ are required for calculating $\bar{\rho}^s$ and $\bar{\rho}^g$ and can be estimated in the same manner as in Theorem 1, so is the specification of $f(n_i;\boldsymbol{\beta})$. Different from the Laplace mechanism in Theorem 1, DR-HA in the sanitized frequency distribution is not only affected by ϵ, but also by δ. When ϵ or δ increases, σ decreases, and DR-HA coming from cells in Scenario 1 increases; but the relationship is complicated for cells that fall in Scenario 8, due to similar reasons as in Theorem 1.

Similar to the Laplace mechanism case, we present two special cases of Theorem 4: Corollary 5 when $K=2$ in and Corollary 6 when all original cells are homogeneous.

Corollary 5. *In the same setting as Theorem 4, when $K=2$, the plug-in estimate of the average expected DR-HA in the sanitized frequency distribution via the Gaussian mechanism is*

$$\bar{\rho}^e < \frac{1}{4M}\sum_{i=1}^{M}(\hat{p}_i^{n_i}+(1-\hat{p}_i)^{n_i})\left(1+erf\left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)\right)\left(1+erf\left(\frac{n_i-0.5}{\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)\right)+ \tag{25}$$
$$\frac{1}{4M}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\mathbb{1}(n_i\geq 2)\left(\hat{p}_i^{n_i-1}(1-\hat{p}_i)+(1-\hat{p}_i)^{n_i-1}\hat{p}_i\right)\left(1-erf\left(\frac{1.5-n_i}{\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)\right)\left(1+erf\left(\frac{-0.5}{\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)\right).$$

Assume $p_i \sim beta(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)$, the average shrinkage DR-HA is

$$\bar{\rho}^s < \frac{1+erf\left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)}{4MB(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)}\sum_{i=1}^{M}(B(n_i+\alpha_1,\alpha_2)+B(\alpha_1,n_i+\alpha_2))\left(1+erf\left(\frac{n_i-0.5}{\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)\right)+ \tag{26}$$
$$\frac{1+erf\left(\frac{-0.5}{\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)}{4MB(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\mathbb{1}(n_i\geq 2)(B(\alpha_1+n_i-1,\alpha_2+1)+B(\alpha_1+1,n_i+\alpha_2-1))\left(1-erf\left(\frac{1.5-n_i}{\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)\right).$$

Assume $n_i \sim f(n_i;\boldsymbol{\beta})$ for $i = 1, \ldots, M$, the global DR-HA is

$$\rho^g < \frac{1+erf\left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)}{4}\sum_{n_i=1}^{\infty} f(n_i;\boldsymbol{\theta})\frac{\Gamma(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)}{\Gamma(\alpha_1+\alpha_2+n_i)}\left(\frac{\Gamma(\alpha_1+n_i)}{\Gamma(\alpha_1)}+\frac{\Gamma(\alpha_2+n_i)}{\Gamma(\alpha_2)}\right)\left(1+erf\left(\frac{n_i-0.5}{\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)\right)$$
$$+\frac{\Gamma(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)}{4}\sum_{n_i=2}^{\infty} f(n_i;\boldsymbol{\beta})\left[\left(1-erf\left(\frac{1.5-n_i}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}\right)\right)\sum_{k=1}^{2}\frac{\Gamma(n_i+\alpha_k-1)\sum_{t\neq k}\alpha_t}{\Gamma(\alpha_k)\Gamma(n_i+\sum_k\alpha_k)}\right]. \quad (27)$$

Corollary 6. *When all the original cells are homogeneous, the plug-in estimate of the average expected DR-HA in the sanitized frequency distributions via the Gaussian mechanism is*

$$\bar{\rho}^e = \frac{\left(1+erf\left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)\right)^{K-1}}{2^K M}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\left(1+erf\left(\frac{n_i-0.5}{\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)\right) \in (2^{-K},1). \quad (28)$$

Eqn (28) can be easily obtained by plugging in $\hat{p}_i = 0$ or $\hat{p}_i = 1$ in Eqn (22). Similar to the case of the Laplace mechanism, $\bar{\rho}^e$ for the Gaussian mechanism is also bounded in $(2^{-K}, 1)$ if all original cells are homogeneous. We may also obtain an estimate for $\tilde{\rho}^g$ by plugging in $\hat{p}_i = \{0, 1\}$ in Eqn (22), which is then integrated over $f(n_i;\boldsymbol{\beta})$, leading to

$$\hat{\tilde{\rho}}^g = \textstyle\sum_{n_i=1}^{\infty}\left(1+\mathrm{erf}\left((2\sqrt{2}\sigma)^{-1}\right)\right)\left(1+\mathrm{erf}\left((n_i-0.5)/\sqrt{2}\sigma\right)\right) f(n_i;\boldsymbol{\beta})/4. \quad (29)$$


$\boldsymbol{\beta}$ can be estimated through either MLE or MoM by fitting distribution $f(n_i;\boldsymbol{\beta})$ (e.g., Poisson or negative binomial) to data $\{n_i\}_{i=1,\ldots,M}$, which is then plugged in Eqn (29) to obtain a final solution for $\hat{\tilde{\rho}}^g$.

4 Experiments

We apply the mathematical relationships between the DR-HA measures and the privacy loss parameters ϵ and δ obtained in Section 3 to the Adult data (Kohavi and Becker, 1996) and the Qualitative Bankruptcy data (Martin et al., 2014), both of which are publicly available in the UCI Machine Learning Repository. We use the experiments to demonstrate how to leverage the relationship to assist decision making on ϵ and δ when implementing DP mechanisms to sanitize frequency distributions.

There are 27,504 individuals in the Adult data. We treat 7 attributes Age, Relationship, Education, Race, Sex, Hours-per-week are QIDs and Income as the sensitive attribute ($\leq 50K$ vs $>50K$). The frequency distribution over the 6 QIDs (Age is grouped every 5 years and Hours-per-week is grouped every 10 hours) leads to a 6-dimensional histogram with $M = 5,974$ non-empty cells. Each of the M cells is homogeneous in income ($\leq 50K$ or $> 50K$). The Bankruptcy dataset contains 250 observations and 7 categorical attributes. We regard the 6 qualitative variables Industrial Risk, Management Risk, Financial Flexibility, Credibility, Competitiveness, and Operating Risk as QIDs, each of which has three levels (Positive, Average, Negative), and Class on bankruptcy status (Bankruptcy, Non-Bankruptcy) as a sensitive attribute. The cross-tabulation of the 6 QIDs leads to $M = 103$ non-empty homogeneous cells on the bankruptcy status. The cross-tabulation of QIDs in both of the above experiments lead to 100% homogeneous cells with a binary sensitive attribute. To apply the mathematical relationships to a case where there are heterogeneous cells and $K > 2$, we take a subset of the Bankruptcy

data where there are heterogeneous cells and $K = 3$. Specifically, we treat Industrial Risk, Management Risk, Credibility, Competitiveness, and Operating Risk as QIDs, and Financial Flexibility as the sensitive attribute ($K = 3$). The 5 QIDs lead to 78 non-empty cells, among which 54 are homogeneous and 24 ($\sim 31\%$) are heterogeneous. The distribution of the cell sizes in each of the 3 experiments is depicted in Figure 3.




(a) Adult (b) Bankruptcy (c) Bankruptcy subset

Figure 3: Histograms of non-empty cell sizes in three experiments (the cell size ranges $1 \sim 240$ with very low but non-zero frequencies > 120 in the Adult data)


In the two experiments with 100% homogeneous cells, DR-HA is 100% for every cell in the original data. We applied Corollaries 3 and 6 at $K = 2$ to obtain the relationships between DR-HA $\bar{\rho}^e$ and the privacy loss parameters in these two experiments. In the subset Bankruptcy data with heterogeneous cells, we applied Eqns (12) and (22) in Theorems 1 and 4 to obtain the relationship between $\bar{\rho}^e$ and the privacy loss parameters. The results for $\bar{\rho}^e$ are presented in Figure 4 and summarized as follows. (1) The relations between $\bar{\rho}^e$ and log-scaled ϵ are S-shaped except in the case of (ϵ, δ)-aDP, where the associated Gaussian mechanism requires $\epsilon < 1$. (2) In the two experiments with 100% homogeneous cells, the upper asymptote of DR-HA is 100% (the DR-HA value in the original data) for $\epsilon \geq 10$ for the Laplace mechanism, consistent with the results in Corollary 3; the lower asymptote DR-HA is 25% at $K = 2$ regardless how small ϵ is. (3) In the two experiments with 100% homogeneous cells, DR-HA reaches 100% for $\epsilon \geq 10^{1.5} \approx 31.6$ regardless of the δ value for the Gaussian mechanism. Consistent with the theoretical results in Corollary 6, the minimum DR-HA is 25% for $K = 2$ regardless of the ϵ and δ values. (4) Compared with the relation between ϵ and DR-HA, the impact of δ on DR-HA is relatively minor. (5) Between the two Gaussian mechanisms, DR-HA for the Gaussian mechanism of (ϵ, δ)-pDP is slightly larger than that of (ϵ, δ)-aDP, but the difference is small ($< 5\%$). (6) In the subset Bankruptcy data with heterogeneous cells, the upper asymptote of DR-HA is 0.75, which is also the DR-HA in the original data, and the lower asymptote is 0.1, down from the 0.25% compared to the 100% homogeneous cell case, but remains as 25% of the maximum DR-HA.

We also estimated DR-HA $\tilde{\rho}^g$ assuming $f(n_i; \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \text{Pois}(\lambda)$ in the two experiments with 100% homogeneous cells (Figures 3(a) and 3(b)). The MLE for λ was 4.6 for the Adult data and 2.43 for the Bankruptcy data. We plugged in the MLE in Eqns (19) and (29) and obtained the relations between $\hat{\tilde{\rho}}^g$ and the privacy loss parameters. The relations are also S-shaped and generally similar to those on $\hat{\rho}^g$ in Figure 4.


To demonstrate how practitioners may consider both DR-HA and utility analysis to choose privacy loss parameters when releasing sanitized information, we run an utility analysis on the subset Bankruptcy data. We sanitized the cell counts in the 6-dimensional cross-tabulation and calculated the total variation distance (TVD) between the original



(a) Adult: ϵ-DP (b) (ϵ, δ)-aDP (c) (ϵ, δ)-pDP



(d) Bankruptcy: ϵ-DP (e) (ϵ, δ)-aDP (f) (ϵ, δ)-pDP



(g) Bankruptcy subset: ϵ-DP (h) (ϵ, δ)-aDP (i) (ϵ, δ)-pDP

Figure 4: Relation between (ϵ, δ) and DR-HA $\bar{\rho}^e$ in sanitized frequency distributions (the Gaussian mechanism of (ϵ, δ)-aDP requires $\epsilon < 1$ and thus the partial curve).

and sanitized probability distributions in 1-way, 2-way and 3-way marginals. For example, Credibility has 3 categories with original sample probabilities $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, p_2, p_3)$ and $\sum_k p_k = 1$ and sanitized probabilities $\mathbf{p}^* = (p_1^*, p_2^*, p_3^*)$ and $\sum_k p_k^* = 1$, the 1-way TVD between $\mathbf{p}$ and $\mathbf{p}^*$ is $||\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}^*||_1/2$; the cross-tabulation of Credibility and Competitiveness results in a 9-cell 2-way marginals with original cell probabilities $\mathbf{p} = (p_{11}, \ldots, p_{33})$ and sanitized probabilities $\mathbf{p}^* = (p_{11}^*, \ldots, p_{33}^*)$, the 2-way TVD is $||\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}^*||_1/2$. In total, there are 6 1-way marginals, 15 2-way marginals and 20-way marginals, the box plots of the TVD of which at various ϵ and δ values are presented in Figure 5. First noticed is that there are big drops in TVD as ϵ increases from 0.1 to 1 and from 1 to 10. For (ϵ, δ)-DP, the effect δ on TVD is the most obvious when ϵ is not too small nor too large (e.g., ϵ is around 1). Taken together with the DR-HA results in Figure 4, ϵ around 1, and $\delta \geq 1$ seem to be good choices to provide sufficient decrease in DR-HA compared to no sanitization at all and acceptable utility in terms of low-dimensional marginals.

In summary, we can draw the following conclusions based on the experiment results in




Figure 5: Total variation distance between original and sanitized sample probability distributions of 1-way, 2-way and 3-way marginals.

this section. 1) Sanitization of frequency distributions via a DP mechanism mitigates DR-HA. 2) The relationships between privacy loss parameters and DR-HA $\bar{\rho}^e$ in the two experiments with 100% homogeneous cells are similar despite the difference in data sample size, number of cells (M), and the frequency distribution across cells. 3) The relationship between DR-HA and log-ϵ for the Laplace mechanism and Gaussian mechanism of (ϵ, δ)-pDP follows a S-shape. The DR-HA can be kept close to the minimum (25% of the original DR-HA) when $\epsilon < 0.1$ and reasonably small for $\epsilon < 1$. The drastic increase in DR-HR occurs for $\epsilon \in (1, 10)$, and reaches maximum for $\epsilon > 10$. 4) Comparatively, the impact of δ on DR-HA is relatively insignificant. For practical applications, from the perspective of keeping DR-HA low, $\epsilon < 1$ seems to be a good choice, at least in cases similar to the Adult and Bankruptcy datasets. When the Gaussian mechanism is used, since there exist infinite combinations of (ϵ, δ) for a given ρ and given δ's impact is small,

we suggest fixing δ first and calculating ϵ.

5 Discussion

We derive the mathematical relationships between DR-HA in sanitized frequency distribution data via the Laplace and Gaussian mechanisms and the DP privacy loss parameters. The relationships allow practitioners to calculate DR-HA directly given a privacy loss without resorting on numerical computations (e.g. the MC approach). The relationships link the rather abstract concept of privacy parameters to a metric that is more intuitive (DR-HA) and help better understanding of the former, offering practitioners an additional perspective when choosing privacy loss parameters for sanitizing data via DP mechanisms. We will upload the Python and R codes on Github for calculating the general mathematical relationships and in the experiments to facilitate the practical implementation of the relationships.

We focus on DR-HA in this paper. Future work may extend the results to other types of privacy risk due to HA, derive relationships between DR due to other types of attacks, re-identification risk vs privacy loss parameters, or for different approaches adversaries choose to launch privacy attacks. While there is no HA in a heterogeneous cell and DR-HA is zero per definition, it does not mean that DR does not exist due to other attacks than HA. For example, adversaries may apply the plurality rule to predict sensitive information (hard thresholding) or settle with probabilistic conclusions on the sensitive information (soft thresholding, where DR defined as the sample proportion of the sensitive value among all available values in each set) for the records in a heterogeneous cell. In either case, the DR of the records whose actual values on the sensitive attributes are the same as the predicted values is non-zero, despite being in a heterogeneous set. We illustrate the hard and soft thresholding approaches for defining the DR in heterogeneous cells and calculate the relationship between DR (from both HA and the thresholding in heterogeneous cells) and privacy loss parameters in Appendix D using the Adult data. The S-shaped relations are similar to those observed in Section 4 with an upper asymptote of 100%, but the lower asymptote shifts to $> 1/4$ as expected, due to the non-zero DR from the sanitized heterogeneous cells.

Acknowledgments

We thank Gaofei Zhang for initial discussions and work in this paper.

References

G. Duncan and D. Lambert, "The risk of disclosure for microdata," *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 207–217, 1989.

C. J. Skinner and M. Elliot, "A measure of disclosure risk for microdata," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: series B (statistical methodology)*, vol. 64, no. 4, pp. 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*. Springer, 2002, pp. 135–152.

J. P. Reiter, "Estimating risks of identification disclosure in microdata," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, vol. 100, no. 472, pp. 1103–1112, 2005.

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.

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.

C. Dwork, F. McSherry, K. Nissim, and A. Smith, "Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis," in *Theory of cryptography conference*. Springer, 2006, pp. 265–284.

F. McSherry and K. Talwar, "Mechanism design via differential privacy," in *Foundations of Computer Science, 2007. FOCS'07. 48th Annual IEEE Symposium on*. IEEE, 2007, pp. 94–103.

C. Dwork, G. N. Rothblum, and S. Vadhan, "Boosting and differential privacy," in *2010 IEEE 51st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 51–60.

S. P. Kasiviswanathan, H. K. Lee, K. Nissim, S. Raskhodnikova, and A. Smith, "What can we learn privately?" *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 793–826, 2011.

M. Abadi, A. Chu, I. Goodfellow, H. B. McMahan, I. Mironov, K. Talwar, and L. Zhang, "Deep learning with differential privacy," in *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2016, pp. 308–318.

I. Mironov, "Rényi differential privacy," in *2017 IEEE 30th Computer Security Foundations Symposium (CSF)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 263–275.

C. Dwork, N. Kohli, and D. Mulligan, "Differential privacy in practice: Expose your epsilons!" *Journal of Privacy and Confidentiality*, vol. 9, no. 2, 2019.

C. Dwork, "Differential privacy: A survey of results," in *International Conference on Theory and Applications of Models of Computation*. Springer, 2008, pp. 1–19.

J. Lee and C. Clifton, "How much is enough? choosing ε for differential privacy," in *International Conference on Information Security*. Springer, 2011, pp. 325–340.

D. McClure and J. P. Reiter, "Differential privacy and statistical disclosure risk measures: An investigation with binary synthetic data." *Trans. Data Priv.*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 535–552, 2012.

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*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 398–410.

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.

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*, vol. 3, 2017.

C. Dwork, A. Smith, T. Steinke, and J. Ullman, "Exposed! a survey of attacks on private data," *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, vol. 4, pp. 61–84, 2017.

N. Holohan, S. Antonatos, S. Braghin, and P. Mac Aonghusa, "(k, ϵ)-anonymity: k-anonymity with ϵ-differential privacy," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.01615*, 2017.

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)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 339–347.

K.-C. Chen, C.-M. Yu, B.-C. Tai, S.-C. Li, Y.-T. Tsou, Y. Huang, and C.-M. Lin, "Data-driven approach for evaluating risk of disclosure and utility in differentially private data release," in *2017 IEEE 31st International Conference on Advanced Information Networking and Applications (AINA)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 1130–1137.

C. Dwork, "Differential privacy," in *Encyclopedia of Cryptography and Security*. Springer, 2011, pp. 338–340.

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*. IEEE Computer Society, 2008, pp. 277–286.

F. Liu, "Generalized gaussian mechanism for differential privacy," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 31 (4), pp. 747 –756, 2019.

C. Dwork, A. Roth *et al.*, "The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy," *Foundations and Trends® in Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 9, no. 3–4, pp. 211–407, 2014.

T. Dalenius, "Finding a needle in a haystack or identifying anonymous census records," *Journal of official statistics*, vol. 2, no. 3, p. 329, 1986.

A. Machanavajjhala, D. Kifer, J. Gehrke, and M. Venkitasubramaniam, "l-diversity: Privacy beyond k-anonymity," *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 3–es, 2007.

L. Sweeney, "k-anonymity: A model for protecting privacy," *International Journal of Uncertainty, Fuzziness and Knowledge-Based Systems*, vol. 10, no. 05, pp. 557–570, 2002.

R. Kohavi and B. Becker, "UCI machine learning repository," https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/Adult, 1996.

A. Martin, J. Uthayakumar, and M.Nadarajan, "UCI machine learning repository," https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/qualitative_bankruptcy, 2014.

Appendix

A Proof of Theorem 1 and Corollary 2

Proof. We first examine the case of $K = 2$, and then extend to the case of $K \geq 2$. Per Definition 7, the homogeneity attack occurs in set i of the sanitized data in Scenarios 1 and 8. For Scenario 1, the DR-HA of sensitive attribute Y in cell $\mathcal{C}_i$

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_i &= (\Pr(n_{i,1} = n_i) + \Pr(n_{i,1} = 0)) \Pr(\tilde{n}_{i,0} < 0.5 | n_{i,1} = n_i) \Pr(\tilde{n}_{i,1} \geqslant 0.5 | n_{i,1} = n_i) \\ &= (\Pr(n_{i,1} = n_{i,1}) + \Pr(n_{i,1} = 0)) \Pr(e_{i,0} < 0.5) \Pr(e_{i,1} \geqslant 0.5 - n_i) \\ &= (p_i^{n_i} + (1-p_i)^{n_i}) (1 - 0.5 \exp(-0.5\epsilon)) (1 - 0.5 \exp((0.5 - n_i)\epsilon)) ;\end{aligned}$$

Scenario 8 is most likely to occur when $\{n_{i,0}, n_{i,1}\} = \{1, n_i - 1\}$ or $= \{1, n_i - 1\}$. The upper bound of ρ_i in this scenario us

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_i &< \mathbb{1}(n_i \geq 2) \Pr(n_{i,1} = n_i - 1, n_{i,0} = 1) \Pr(\tilde{n}_{i,1} \geq 0.5 | n_{i,1} = n_i - 1) \Pr(\tilde{n}_{i,0} < 0.5 | n_{i,0} = 1) + \\ &\quad \mathbb{1}(n_i \geq 2) \Pr(n_{i,1} = 1, n_{i,0} = n_i - 1) \Pr(\tilde{n}_{i,0} \geq 0.5 | n_{i,0} = n_i - 1) \Pr(\tilde{n}_{i,1} < 0.5 | n_{i,1} = 1) \\ &= \mathbb{1}(n_i \geq 2)(\Pr(n_{i,1} = n_i - 1, n_{i,0} = 1) + \Pr(n_{i,1} = 1, n_{i,0} = n_i - 1)) \times \\ &\quad \Pr(\tilde{n}_{i,1} \geq 0.5 | n_{i,1} = n_i - 1) \Pr(\tilde{n}_{i,0} < 0.5 | n_{i,0} = 1) \\ &= \mathbb{1}(n_i \geq 2)(\Pr(n_{i,1} = n_i - 1, n_{i,0} = 1) + \Pr(n_{i,1} = 1, n_{i,0} = n_i - 1)) \Pr(e_{i,1} \geq 1.5 - n_i) \Pr(e_{i,0} < -0.5) \\ &= \mathbb{1}(n_i \geq 2) \left(p_i^{n_i - 1}(1 - p_i) + (1 - p_i)^{n_i - 1} p_i \right) (1 - 0.5 \exp(\epsilon(1.5 - n_i))) (0.5 \exp(-0.5\epsilon)) .\end{aligned}$$

All taken together, the DR-HA of sensitive attribute Y in cell $\mathcal{C}_i$ in the sanitized data

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_i &< (p_i^{n_i} + (1-p_i)^{n_i}) (1 - 0.5 \exp(-0.5\epsilon)) (1 - 0.5 \exp((0.5 - n_i)\epsilon)) + \\ &\quad \mathbb{1}(n_i \geq 2) \left(p_i^{n_i - 1}(1 - p_i) + (1 - p_i)^{n_i - 1} p_i \right) (1 - 0.5 \exp(\epsilon(1.5 - n_i))) (0.5 \exp(-0.5\epsilon))\end{aligned}$$

Assuming $p_i \sim \text{beta}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$, the average shrinkage disclosure risk is

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\rho}^s &< \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \int_0^1 (p_i^{n_i} + (1-p_i)^{n_i}) \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{-0.5\epsilon}\right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{(0.5 - n_i)\epsilon}\right) \frac{p_i^{\alpha_1 - 1}(1-p_i)^{\alpha_2 - 1}}{B(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)} dp_i + \\ &\quad \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \mathbb{1}(n_i \geq 2) \int_0^1 \left(p_i^{n_i - 1}(1-p_i) + (1-p_i)^{n_i - 1} p_i \right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{\epsilon(1.5 - n_i)}\right) \left(\frac{1}{2} e^{-0.5\epsilon}\right) \frac{p_i^{\alpha_1 - 1}(1-p_i)^{\alpha_2 - 1}}{B(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)} dp_i \\ &= \frac{(1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{-\frac{\epsilon}{2}})}{B(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) M} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{(0.5 - n_i)\epsilon}\right) \int_0^1 (p_i^{n_i + \alpha_1 - 1}(1-p_i)^{\alpha_2 - 1} + p_i^{\alpha_1 - 1}(1-p_i)^{n_i + \alpha_2 - 1}) dp_i + \\ &\quad \frac{\left(0.5 e^{-0.5\epsilon}\right)}{B(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) M} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \mathbb{1}(n_i \geq 2) \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{\epsilon(1.5 - n_i)}\right) \int_0^1 \left(p_i^{\alpha_1 + n_i - 2}(1-p_i)^{\alpha_2} + (1-p_i)^{n_i + \alpha_2 - 2} p_i^{\alpha_1} \right) dp_i \\ &= \frac{(1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{-\frac{\epsilon}{2}})}{B(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) M} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{(0.5 - n_i)\epsilon}\right) (B(n_i + \alpha_1, \alpha_2) + B(\alpha_1, n_i + \alpha_2)) + \\ &\quad \frac{\left(0.5 e^{-0.5\epsilon}\right)}{B(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) M} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \mathbb{1}(n_i \geq 2) \left(1 - 0.5 e^{\epsilon(1.5 - n_i)}\right) (B(\alpha_1 + n_i - 1, \alpha_2 + 1) + B(\alpha_1 + 1, n_i + \alpha_2 - 1)).\end{aligned}$$ □

When $K \geq 2$, the DR-HA of cell $\mathcal{C}_i$ after sanitization in Scenario 1 is

$$\rho_i = \textstyle\sum_{k=1}^{K} \left(\Pr(n_{i,k} = n_i) \left(\prod_{k' \neq k} \Pr(\tilde{n}_{i,k'} < 0.5 | n_{i,k} = n_i) \right) \Pr(\tilde{n}_{i,k} \geqslant 0.5 | n_{i,k} = n_i) \right)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{K} \left(p_{i,k}^{n_i} \left(\prod_{k' \neq k} \Pr(e_{i,k'} < 0.5) \right) \Pr(e_{i,k} \geqslant 0.5 - n_i) \right)$$
$$= \sum_{k=1}^{K} p_{i,k}^{n_i} \left(1 - 0.5 \exp(-0.5\epsilon)\right)^{K-1} \left(1 - 0.5 \exp((0.5 - n_i)\epsilon)\right);$$

Scenario 8 occurs most likely when the $\{n_{i,1}, \ldots, n_{i,K}\} = \{n_i - 1, 1, 0, \ldots, 0\}$ which contains $K - 2$ zeros. Thus the upper bound of ρ_i in Scenario 2

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_i <& \mathbb{1}(n_i \geq 2) \left(\textstyle\sum_{k=1}^{K} p_{i,k}^{n_i - 1} (1 - p_{i,k}) \right) \Pr(\tilde{n}_{i,1} \geq 0.5 | n_{i,1} = n_i - 1) \\
& \Pr(\tilde{n}_{i,2} < 0.5 | n_{i,2} = 1) \textstyle\prod_{t=3}^{K} \Pr(\tilde{n}_{i,t} < 0.5 | n_{i,t} = 0) \\
=& \mathbb{1}(n_i \geq 2) \left(\sum_{k=1}^{K} p_{i,k}^{n_i - 1} (1 - p_{i,k}) \right) \Pr(e_{i,1} \geq 1.5 - n_i) \Pr(e_{i,2} < -0.5) \prod_{t=3}^{K} \Pr(e_{i,t} < 0.5) \\
=& \mathbb{1}(n_i \geq 2) \left(\sum_{k=1}^{K} p_{i,k}^{n_i - 1} (1 - p_{i,k}) \right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \exp((1.5 - n_i)\epsilon) \right) \left(\frac{1}{2} \exp(-0.5\epsilon) \right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \exp(-0.5\epsilon) \right)^{K-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Taken together, the DR-HA with respect to sensitive attribute Y in cell $\mathcal{C}_i$ in the sanitized data

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_i <& \sum_{k=1}^{K} p_{i,k}^{n_i} \left(1 - 0.5 \exp(-0.5\epsilon)\right)^{K-1} \left(1 - 0.5 \exp((0.5 - n_i)\epsilon)\right) + \\
& \mathbb{1}(n_i \geq 2) \left(\sum_{k=1}^{K} p_{i,k}^{n_i - 1} (1 - p_{i,k}) \right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \exp((1.5 - n_i)\epsilon) \right) \left(\frac{1}{2} \exp(-0.5\epsilon) \right) \left((1 - \frac{1}{2} \exp(-0.5\epsilon) \right)^{K-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Assuming $(p_{i,1}, \ldots, p_{i,K}) \overset{\text{ind}}{\sim} \text{Dirichlet}(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_K)$, the average shrinkage disclosure risk is

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\rho}^s <& \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \int \sum_{k=1}^{K} p_{i,k}^{n_i} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{-0.5\epsilon} \right)^{K-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{(0.5 - n_i)\epsilon} \right) \frac{\Gamma(\sum_{k'=1}^{K} \alpha_{k'})}{\prod_{k'=1}^{K} \Gamma(\alpha_{k'})} \prod_{k=1}^{K} p_{i,k}^{\alpha_k - 1} d\mathbf{p} + \\
& \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \mathbb{1}(n_i \geq 2) \int \left(\sum_{k=1}^{K} p_{i,k}^{n_i - 1} (1 - p_{i,k}) \right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{(1.5 - n_i)\epsilon} \right) \left(\frac{1}{2} e^{-0.5\epsilon} \right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{-0.5\epsilon} \right)^{K-2} \frac{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k)}{\prod_k \Gamma(\alpha_k)} \prod_{k=1}^{K} p_{i,k}^{\alpha_k - 1} d\mathbf{p} \\
=& \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{K} \left(\int p_{i,k}^{n_i} \prod_{k'=1}^{K} p_{i,'k}^{\alpha'_k - 1} \frac{\Gamma(\sum_{k'} \alpha_{k'} + n_i)}{\Gamma(\alpha_k + n_i) \prod_{k' \neq k} \Gamma(\alpha_{k'})} d\mathbf{p} \right) \frac{\Gamma(\sum_{k'} \alpha_{k'}) \Gamma(\alpha_k + n_i)}{\Gamma(\sum_{k'} \alpha_{k'} + n_i) \Gamma(\alpha_k)} \right] \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{-0.5\epsilon} \right)^{K-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{(0.5 - n_i)\epsilon} \right) \\
& + \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \mathbb{1}(n_i \geq 2) \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{(1.5 - n_i)\epsilon} \right) \left(\frac{1}{2} e^{-0.5\epsilon} \right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{-0.5\epsilon} \right)^{K-2} \frac{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k)}{\prod_k \Gamma(\alpha_k)} \int \left(\sum_{k=1}^{K} p_{i,k}^{n_i - 1} (1 - p_{i,k}) \right) \prod_{k=1}^{K} p_{i,k}^{\alpha_k - 1} d\mathbf{p} \\
=& \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{K} \frac{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k) \Gamma(\alpha_k + n_i)}{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k + n_i) \Gamma(\alpha_k)} \right) \left(1 - 0.5 e^{-0.5\epsilon} \right)^{K-1} \left(1 - 0.5 e^{(0.5 - n_i)\epsilon} \right) \\
& + \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \mathbb{1}(n_i \geq 2) \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{(1.5 - n_i)\epsilon} \right) \left(\frac{1}{2} e^{-0.5\epsilon} \right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{-0.5\epsilon} \right)^{K-2} \Gamma\left(\sum_k \alpha_k \right) \sum_{k=1}^{K} \frac{\Gamma(n_i + \alpha_k - 1) \sum_{t \neq k} \alpha_t}{\Gamma(\alpha_k) \Gamma(n_i + \sum_k \alpha_k)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The detailed proof on $\frac{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k)}{\prod_k \Gamma(\alpha_k)} \int \left(\sum_{k=1}^{K} p_{i,k}^{n_i - 1} (1 - p_{i,k}) \right) \prod_{k=1}^{K} p_{i,k}^{\alpha_k - 1} d\mathbf{p} = \Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k) \sum_{k=1}^{K} \frac{\Gamma(n_i + \alpha_k - 1) \sum_{t \neq k} \alpha_t}{\Gamma(\alpha_k) \Gamma(n_i + \sum_k \alpha_k)}$ is shown below. First, notice that

$$p_{i,k}^{n_i - 1} (1 - p_{i,k}) \prod_{k=1}^{K} p_{i,k}^{\alpha_k - 1} = p_{i,k}^{n_i - 1} \prod_{k=1}^{K} p_{i,k}^{\alpha_k - 1} - p_{i,k}^{n_i} \prod_{k=1}^{K} p_{i,k}^{\alpha_k - 1}.$$

From the density of $D(\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_{k-1},\alpha_k+n_i-1,\alpha_{k+1},\ldots,\alpha_K)$ and $D(\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_{k-1},\alpha_k+n_i,\alpha_{k+1},\ldots,\alpha_K)$, we can have

$$\frac{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k)}{\prod_k \Gamma(\alpha_k)}\int\left(\sum_{k=1}^{K} p_{i,k}^{n_i-1}(1-p_{i,k})\right)\prod_{k=1}^{K} p_{i,k}^{\alpha_k-1}d\mathbf{p} = \frac{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k)}{\prod_k \Gamma(\alpha_k)}.$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K}\left(\frac{\Gamma(\alpha_1)\cdots\Gamma(\alpha_{k-1})\Gamma(\alpha_k+n_i-1)\Gamma(\alpha_{k+1})\cdots\Gamma(\alpha_K)}{\Gamma(n_i+\sum_k \alpha_k-1)} - \frac{\Gamma(\alpha_1)\cdots\Gamma(\alpha_{k-1})\Gamma(\alpha_k+n_i)\Gamma(\alpha_{k+1})\cdots\Gamma(\alpha_K)}{\Gamma(n_i+\sum_k \alpha_k)}\right)$$

$$= \Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k)\sum_{k=1}^{K}\left(\frac{\Gamma(n_i+\alpha_k-1)}{\Gamma(n_i+\sum_k \alpha_k-1)\Gamma(\alpha_k)} - \frac{\Gamma(n_i+\alpha_k)}{\Gamma(n_i+\sum_k \alpha_k)\Gamma(\alpha_k)}\right)$$

$$= \Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k)\sum_{k=1}^{K}\left(\frac{\Gamma(n_i+\alpha_k)(n_i+\sum_k \alpha_k-1)}{(n_i+\alpha_k-1)\Gamma(n_i+\sum_k \alpha_k)\Gamma(\alpha_k)} - \frac{\Gamma(n_i+\alpha_k)}{\Gamma(n_i+\sum_k \alpha_k)\Gamma(\alpha_k)}\right)$$

$$= \Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k)\sum_{k=1}^{K}\left(\frac{\Gamma(n_i+\alpha_k)(n_i+\sum_k \alpha_k-1)-\Gamma(n_i+\alpha_k)(n_i+\alpha_k-1)}{(n_i+\alpha_k-1)\Gamma(n_i+\sum_k \alpha_k)\Gamma(\alpha_k)}\right)$$

$$= \Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k)\sum_{k=1}^{K}\left(\frac{\Gamma(n_i+\alpha_k)\sum_{t\neq k}\alpha_t}{(n_i+\alpha_k-1)\Gamma(n_i+\sum_k \alpha_k)\Gamma(\alpha_k)}\right)$$

$$= \Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k)\sum_{k=1}^{K}\left(\frac{\Gamma(n_i+\alpha_k-1)\sum_{t\neq k}\alpha_t}{\Gamma(n_i+\sum_k \alpha_k)\Gamma(\alpha_k)}\right).$$

B EB estimation for hyperparameters via MoM

We examine the case of $K=2$ first and then generalized to the general case of $K\geq 2$. When $K=2$,

$$n_{i,1}|p_{i,1} \sim \text{Binomial}(n_i, p_{i,1})$$
$$p_{i,1} \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha_1,\alpha_2) \text{ for } i=1,\ldots,M.$$

For each cell $\mathcal{C}_i$,

$$f(n_{i,1}|\alpha_1,\alpha_2) = \binom{n_i}{n_{i,1}}\frac{B(n_{i,1}+\alpha_1, n_i-n_{i,1}+\alpha_2)}{B(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)},$$

from which we can get

$$E(n_{i,1}) = \frac{n_i\alpha_1}{\alpha_1+\alpha_2} \text{ and } \text{Var}(n_{i,1}) = \frac{n_i\alpha_1\alpha_2(\alpha_1+\alpha_2+n_i)}{(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)^2(\alpha_1+\alpha_2+1)}.$$

The variance can be rewritten as

$$\text{Var}(n_{i,1}) = \frac{n_i\alpha_1\alpha_2}{(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)(\alpha_1+\alpha_2+1)} + \frac{n_i^2\alpha_1\alpha_2}{(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)^2(\alpha_1+\alpha_2+1)}.$$

Let $\sum_{i=1}^{M} n_{i,1} = n_1$, $\sum_{i=1}^{M} n_i = n$. Assuming $n_{i,1}$ are independent, we have

$$E(n_1) = \frac{n\alpha_1}{\alpha_1+\alpha_2} \text{ and } \text{Var}(n_1) = \frac{n\alpha_1\alpha_2}{(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)(\alpha_1+\alpha_2+1)} + \frac{\sum n_i^2\alpha_1\alpha_2}{(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)^2(\alpha_1+\alpha_2+1)}.$$

Let $E(n_1)$ and $\text{Var}(n_1)$ equal to their empirical moments $n\hat{p}$ and $s^2 = n\hat{p}(1-\hat{p})$, respectively, where $\hat{p} = n_1/n$, we have

$$\hat{\alpha}_1/(\hat{\alpha}_1+\hat{\alpha}_2) = \hat{p}$$

$$\left(n\hat{p}\hat{\alpha}_2 + \hat{p}(1-\hat{p})\sum n_i^2\right)/(\hat{\alpha}_1+\hat{\alpha}_2+1) = s^2,$$

from which we can solve for the MoM estimates of α_1 and α_2

$$\hat{\alpha}_1 = \frac{\hat{p}^2(1-\hat{p})\sum n_i^2 - \hat{p}s^2}{s^2 - n\hat{p}(1-\hat{p})};\ \hat{\alpha}_2 = \frac{\hat{p}(1-\hat{p})^2\sum n_i^2 - (1-\hat{p})s^2}{s^2 - n\hat{p}(1-\hat{p})}.$$

When $K \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned}(n_{i,1},\ldots,n_{i,K})|p_{i,1},\ldots,p_{i,K} &\sim \text{multinomial}(n_i,(p_{i,1},\ldots,p_{i,K}))\\ (p_{i,1},\ldots,p_{i,K}) &\sim \text{Dirichlet}(\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_K) \text{ for } i=1,\ldots,M\end{aligned}$$

Let $\alpha_\cdot = \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k$ and $p_k = \alpha_k/\alpha_\cdot$. For each cell $\mathcal{C}_i$,

$$\begin{aligned}&f(n_{i,1},\ldots,n_{i,K}|\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_K) = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha_\cdot)}{\Gamma(n_i+\alpha_\cdot)}\prod_{k=1}^K \frac{\Gamma(n_{i,k}+\alpha_k)}{\Gamma(\alpha_k)}\\ &E(n_{i,k}) = n_i p_k\\ &\text{Var}(n_{i,k}) = n_i p_k(1-p_k)\left(\frac{n_i+\alpha_\cdot}{1+\alpha_\cdot}\right);\ \text{Cov}(n_{i,k},n_{i,j}) = -n_i p_k p_j\left(\frac{n_i+\alpha_\cdot}{1+\alpha_\cdot}\right), k\neq j,\end{aligned}$$

Let $\sum_{i=1}^M n_{i,k} = n_{\cdot k}$, $\sum_{i=1}^M n_i = n$ and assume $n_{i,k}$ is independent across i; we have

$$\begin{aligned}E(n_{\cdot k}) = np_k, \text{Var}(n_{\cdot k}) &= p_k(1-p_k)\frac{\sum_i n_i^2 + \alpha_\cdot n}{1+\alpha_\cdot},\\ \text{Cov}(n_{\cdot k},n_{\cdot j}) = \sum_i \text{Cov}(n_{i,k},n_{i,j}) &= -\frac{\alpha_k\alpha_j}{\alpha_\cdot^2}\left(\frac{\sum n_i^2+\alpha_\cdot n}{1+\alpha_\cdot}\right), k\neq j.\end{aligned}$$

Let Σ be the covariance matrix of the frequencies $n_{\cdot k}$; its elements can be estimated by $\hat{\Sigma}_{kk} = (M-1)^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^M (n_{i,k}-\bar{n}_{\cdot k})^2$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_{kj} = (M-1)^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^M (n_{i,k}-\bar{n}_{\cdot k})(n_{i,j'}-\bar{n}_{\cdot j})$ for $k\neq j$, where $\bar{n}_{\cdot k} = \sum_{i=1}^M n_{i,k}/M$. Set $E(n_{\cdot k})$ and $\text{Var}(n_{\cdot k})$ at their empirical moments $n_{\cdot k}$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_{kk}$, respectively, we have $\hat{p}_k = \hat{\alpha}_k/\hat{\alpha}_\cdot = n_{\cdot k}/n$ and $\hat{p}_k\left(1-\hat{\theta}_k\right)(\sum n_i^2 + \hat{\alpha}_\cdot n)/(1+\hat{\alpha}_\cdot) = \hat{\Sigma}_{kk}$, where $\hat{\alpha}_\cdot = \hat{\alpha}_1+\cdots+\hat{\alpha}_K$, from which we can obtain the MoM estimates of the hyperparameters $(\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_K)$

$$\hat{\alpha}_k = \frac{\hat{p}_k^2(1-\hat{p}_k)\sum n_i^2 - \hat{p}_k\hat{\Sigma}_{kk}}{\hat{\Sigma}_{kk} - \hat{p}_k(1-\hat{\theta}_k)n}.$$

C Proof of Theorem 4 and Corollary 5

Proof. Similar to Appendix A, the DR-HA in Scenario 1 $\rho_i = [\Pr(n_{i,1}=n_i)+\Pr(n_{i,1}=0)]\Pr(e_{i,0}<0.5)\Pr(e_{i,1}\geq 0.5-n_i)$ where $e_{i,0}$ and $e_{i,1}$ follow $\mathcal{N}(0,\sigma^2)$. Plugging in the CDF of $\mathcal{N}(\mu,\sigma^2)$: $\frac{1}{2}(1+\text{erf}(\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}))$, we obtain the disclosure risk in set $\mathcal{C}_i$

$$\rho_i = \frac{1}{4}\left(p_i^{n_i}+(1-p_i)^{n_i}\right)\left(1+\text{erf}\left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)\right)\left(1+\text{erf}\left(\frac{n_i-0.5}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}\right)\right).$$

In Scenario 8,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_i &< \mathbb{1}(n_i\geq 2)(\Pr(n_{i,1}=n_i-1,n_{i,0}=1)+\Pr(n_{i,1}=1,n_{i,0}=n_i-1))\Pr(e_{i,1}\geq 1.5-n_i)\Pr(e_{i,0}<-0.5)\\ &= \mathbb{1}(n_i\geq 2)\frac{1}{4}\left(p_i^{n_i-1}(1-p_i)+(1-p_i)^{n_i-1}p_i\right)\left(1-\text{erf}\left(\frac{1.5-n_i}{\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)\right)\left(1+\text{erf}\left(\frac{-0.5}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}\right)\right).\end{aligned}$$

Taken together, the average shrinkage disclosure risk when assuming $p_i \sim \text{beta}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ is

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\rho}^s <& \frac{1+\text{erf}\left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)}{4M}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\int_0^1 (p_i^{n_i}+(1-p_i)^{n_i})\left(1+\text{erf}\left(\frac{n_i-0.5}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}\right)\right)\frac{p_i^{\alpha_1-1}(1-p_i)^{\alpha_2-1}}{B(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)}dp_i + \\
&\frac{1}{4M}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\mathbb{1}(n_i\geq 2)\int_0^1\left(p_i^{n_i-1}(1-p_i)+(1-p_i)^{n_i-1}p_i\right)\left(1-\text{erf}\left(\frac{1.5-n_i}{\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)\right)\left(1+\text{erf}\left(\frac{-0.5}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}\right)\right)\frac{p_i^{\alpha_1-1}(1-p_i)^{\alpha_2-1}}{B(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)}dp_i \\
=& \frac{1+\text{erf}\left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)}{4B(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)M}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\left(B(n_i+\alpha_1,\alpha_2)+B(\alpha_1,n_i+\alpha_2)\right)\left(1+\text{erf}\left(\frac{n_i-0.5}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}\right)\right)+ \\
&\frac{\left(1+\text{erf}\left(\frac{-0.5}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}\right)\right)}{4B(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)M}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\mathbb{1}(n_i\geq 2)\left(1-\text{erf}\left(\frac{1.5-n_i}{\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)\right)\left(B(\alpha_1+n_i-1,\alpha_2+1)+B(\alpha_1+1,n_i+\alpha_2-1)\right).\square
\end{aligned}$$

When $K \geq 2$, DR-HA in cell $\mathcal{C}_i$ in the sanitized frequency distribution via the Gaussian mechanisms in Scenario 1 is

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_i &= \sum_{k=1}^{K}\left(\Pr(n_{i,k}=n_i)\left(\prod_{t\neq k}\Pr(\tilde{n}_{i,t}<0.5|n_{i,k}=n_i)\right)\Pr(\tilde{n}_{i,k}\geqslant 0.5|n_{i,k}=n_i)\right) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{K}\left(p_{i,k}^{n_i}\left(\prod_{t\neq k}\Pr(e_{i,t}<0.5)\right)P(e_{i,k}\geqslant 0.5-n_i)\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2^K}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{K}p_{i,k}^{n_i}\right)\left(1+\text{erf}\left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)\right)^{K-1}\left(1+\text{erf}\left(\frac{n_i-0.5}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}\right)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

The DR-HA in Scenario 8

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_i <& \mathbb{1}(n_i\geq 2)\left(\sum_{k=1}^{K}p_{i,k}^{n_i-1}(1-p_{i,k})\right)\Pr(e_{i,1}\geq 1.5-n_i)\Pr(e_{i,2}<-0.5)\prod_{t=3}^{K}\Pr(e_{i,t}<0.5) \\
=& \mathbb{1}(n_i\geq 2)\left(\sum_{k=1}^{K}p_{i,k}^{n_i-1}(1-p_{i,k})\right)\frac{1}{2^K}\left(1-\text{erf}\left(\frac{1.5-n_i}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}\right)\right)\left(1+\text{erf}\left(\frac{-0.5}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}\right)\right)\left(1+\text{erf}\left(\frac{0.5}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}\right)\right)^{K-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

The average shrinkage disclosure risk when assuming $\mathbf{p}_i \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_K)$ is

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho <& \sum_{i=1}^{M}\left[\sum_{k=1}^{K}\left(\int p_{i,k}^{n_i}\prod_{k=1}^{K}p_{i,k}^{\alpha_k-1}\frac{\Gamma(\sum_k\alpha_k+n_i)}{\Gamma(\alpha_1)\cdots\Gamma(\alpha_k+n_i)\cdots\Gamma(\alpha_K)}d\mathbf{p}\right)\frac{\Gamma(\sum_k\alpha_k)\Gamma(\alpha_k+n_i)}{\Gamma(\sum_k\alpha_k+n_i)\Gamma(\alpha_k)}\right]\cdot \\
&\frac{1}{2^K M}\left(1+\text{erf}\left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)\right)^{K-1}\left(1+\text{erf}\left(\frac{n_i-0.5}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}\right)\right)+ \\
&\sum_{i=1}^{M}\mathbb{1}(n_i\geq 2)\left(1-\text{erf}\left(\frac{1.5-n_i}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}\right)\right)\frac{\Gamma(\sum_k\alpha_k)}{\Gamma(\alpha_1)\cdots\Gamma(\alpha_k)}\int\left(\sum_{k=1}^{K}p_{i,k}^{n_i-1}(1-p_{i,k})\right)\prod_{k=1}^{K}p_{i,k}^{\alpha_k-1}d\mathbf{p}\times \\
&\frac{1}{2^K M}\left(1+\text{erf}\left(\frac{-0.5}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}\right)\right)\left(1+\text{erf}\left(\frac{0.5}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}\right)\right)^{K-2} \\
=& \frac{1}{2^K M}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{K}\frac{\Gamma(\sum_k\alpha_k)\Gamma(\alpha_k+n_i)}{\Gamma(\sum_k\alpha_k+n_i)\Gamma(\alpha_k)}\right)\left(1+\text{erf}\left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)\right)^{K-1}\left(1+\text{erf}\left(\frac{n_i-0.5}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}\right)\right)+
\end{aligned}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma\left(\sum_{k=1}^{K}\alpha_k\right)}{2^K M}\left(1+\text{erf}\left(\frac{-0.5}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}\right)\right)\left(1+\text{erf}\left(\frac{0.5}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}\right)\right)^{K-2}\times$$
$$\sum_{i=1}^{M}\mathbb{1}(n_i\geq 2)\left[\left(1-\text{erf}\left(\frac{1.5-n_i}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}\right)\right)\sum_{k=1}^{K}\frac{\Gamma(n_i+\alpha_k-1)\sum_{t\neq k}\alpha_t}{\Gamma(\alpha_k)\Gamma(n_i+\sum_{k=1}^{K}\alpha_k)}\right].$$

D Empirical Disclosure Risk Due to HA and Thresholding Heterogeneous Cells in Sanitized Frequency Distribution via the Laplace Mechanism in the Adult Data

