A Differential Private Method for Distributed Optimization in Directed Networks via State Decomposition

Xiaomeng Chen¹, Lingying Huang¹, Lidong He², Subhrakanti Dey³, and Ling Shi¹

Abstract—In this paper, we study the problem of consensus-based distributed optimization where a network of agents, abstracted as a directed graph, aims to minimize the sum of all agents’ cost functions collaboratively. In existing distributed optimization approaches (Push-Pull/AB) for directed graphs, all agents exchange their states with neighbors to achieve the optimal solution with a constant stepsize, which may lead to the disclosure of sensitive and private information. For privacy preservation, we propose a novel state-decomposition based gradient tracking approach (SD-Push-Pull) for distributed optimization over directed networks that preserves differential privacy, which is a strong notion that protects agents’ privacy against an adversary with arbitrary auxiliary information. The main idea of the proposed approach is to decompose the gradient state of each agent into two sub-states. Only one substate is exchanged by the agent with its neighbours over time, and the other one is kept private. That is to say, only one substate is visible to an adversary, protecting the privacy from being leaked. It is proved that under certain decomposition principles, a bound for the sub-optimality of the proposed algorithm can be derived and the differential privacy is achieved simultaneously. Moreover, the trade-off between differential privacy and the optimization accuracy is also characterized. Finally, a numerical simulation is provided to illustrate the effectiveness of the proposed approach.
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I. INTRODUCTION

With the rapid development in networking technologies, distributed optimization over multi-agent networks has been a heated research topic during the last decade, where agents aim to collaboratively minimize the sum of local functions possessed by each agent through local communication. Compared with centralized ones, distributed algorithms allow more flexibility and scalability due to its capability of breaking large-scale problems into sequences of smaller ones. In view of this, distributed algorithms are inherently robust to environment uncertainties and communication failures and are widely adopted in power grids [1], sensor networks [2] and vehicular networks [3].

The most commonly used algorithms for distributed optimization is the Decentralized Gradient Descent (DGD), requiring diminishing step-sizes to ensure optimality [?]. To overcome this challenge, Xu et al. [4] replaced the local gradient with an estimated global gradient based on the dynamic average consensus [5] and then proposed a gradient tracking method for distributed optimization problem. Recently, Pu et al. [6] and Xin and Khan [7] devised a modified gradient-tracking algorithm called Push-Pull/AB algorithm for consensus-based distributed optimization, which can be applied to a general directed graph including undirected graph as a special case.

The above conventional distributed algorithms require each agent to exchange their state information with the neighbouring agent, which is not desirable if the participating agents have sensitive and private information, as the transmitted information is at risk of being intercepted by adversaries. By hacking into communication links, an adversary may have access to all conveyed messages, and potentially obtain the private information of each agent by adopting an attack algorithm. The theoretical analysis of privacy disclosure in distributed optimization is presented by Mandal [8], where the parameters of cost functions and generation power can be correctly inferred by an eavesdropper in the economic dispatch problem. As the number of privacy leakage events is increasing, there is an urgent need to preserve privacy of each agent in distributed systems.

For the privacy preservation in distributed optimization, there have been several research results. Wang [9] proposed a privacy-preserving average consensus in which the state of an agent is decomposed into two substates. Zhang et al. [10] and Lu et al. [11] combined existing distributed optimization approaches with the partially homomorphic cryptography. However, these approaches suffer from high computation complexity and communication cost which may be inapplicable for systems with limited resources. As an appealing alternative, differential privacy has attracted much attention in light of its rigorous mathematical framework, proven security properties, and easy implementation [12]. The main idea of differential private approaches is noise perturbation, leading to a tradeoff between privacy and accuracy. Huang et al. [13] devised a differential private distributed optimization algorithm by adding Laplacian noise on transmitted message with a decaying stepsize, resulting in a low convergence rate. A constant stepsize is achieved by Ding et al. [14], [15] where linear convergence is enjoyed by gradient tracking method and differential privacy is achieved by perturbing states.

None of the aforementioned approaches, however, is suitable for directed graphs with weak topological restrictions, which is more practical in real applications. In practice, the information flows among sensors may not be bidirectional due to the different communication ranges, e.g., the coordinated vehicle control problem [16] and the economic dispatch problem [17]. To address privacy leakage in distributed optimization for agents interacting over an unbalanced graphs,
Mao et al. [18] designed a privacy-preserving algorithm based on the push-gradient method with a decaying stepsize, which is implemented via a case study to the economic dispatch problem. Nevertheless, the algorithm in [18] lacked a formal privacy notion and it cannot achieve differential privacy.

All the above motivates us to further develop a differential private distributed optimization algorithm over directed graphs. Inspired by [9], a novel differential private distributed optimization approach based on state decomposition is proposed for agents communicating over directed networks. Under the proposed state decomposition mechanism, a Laplacian noise is perturbed on the gradient state and the global gradient is still tracked after state decomposition. The main contributions of this paper are summarized as follows:

1) We propose a state-decomposition based gradient tracking approach (SD-Push-Pull) for distributed optimization over unbalanced directed networks, where the gradient state of each agent is decomposed into two substates to maintain the privacy of all agents. Specifically, one sub-state replacing the role of the original state is communicated with neighboring agents while the other sub-state is kept private. Compared to the privacy-preserving approaches in [13] and [14], our proposed approach can be applied to more general and practical networks.

2) Different from the privacy notion in [9] and [14], we adopt the definition of differential privacy, which ensures the privacy of agents regardless of any auxiliary information that an adversary may have and enjoys a rigorous formulation. In addition, we prove that the proposed SD-Push-Pull algorithm can achieve $(\epsilon, \delta)$-differential privacy (Theorem 1).

3) We analyze the convergence performance of the proposed SD-Push-Pull algorithm for strongly convex local cost functions. The results show that the SD-Push-Pull algorithm converges to a neighborhood of the optimal solution in expectation exponentially fast under a constant stepsize policy (Theorem 2). Moreover, our results reveal a tradeoff between the privacy level and the optimization accuracy (Remark 1).

Notations: In this paper, $\mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbb{R}$ represent the sets whose components are natural numbers and real numbers. $\mathbb{I}_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbb{I}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ represent the vector of ones and the identity matrix, respectively. The spectral radius of matrix $A$ is denoted by $\rho(A)$. For a given constant $\theta$, $\text{Lap}(\theta)$ is the Laplace distribution with probability function $p_{\theta} = \frac{1}{2\theta} e^{-\frac{|x|}{\theta}}$. In addition, $\mathbb{E}(x)$ and $P(x)$ denote the expectation and probability distribution of a random variable $x$, respectively.

II. PRELIMINARIES AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

A. Network Model

We consider a group of agents which communicate with each other over a directed graph. The directed graph is denoted as a pair $G \triangleq (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, where $\mathcal{V}$ denotes the agents set and $\mathcal{E} \subset V \times V$ denotes the edge set, respectively. A communication link from agent $i$ to agent $j$ is denoted by $(j, i) \in E$, indicating that agent $i$ can send messages to agent $j$. Given a nonnegative matrix $M = [m_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, the directed graph induced by $M$ is denoted by $\mathcal{G}_M \triangleq (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E}_M)$, where $\mathcal{N} = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ and $(j, i) \in \mathcal{E}_M$ if and only if $m_{ij} > 0$. The agents who can directly send messages to agent $i$ are represented as in-neighbours of agent $i$ and the set of these agents is denoted as $\mathcal{N}_{in,i} = \{j \in V \mid (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}_M\}$. Similarly, the agents who can directly receive messages from agent $i$ are represented as out-neighbours of agent $i$ and the set of these agents is denoted as $\mathcal{N}_{out,i} = \{j \in V \mid (j, i) \in \mathcal{E}_M\}$.

B. Differential Privacy

Definition 1: (Adjacency [14]) Given $\delta > 0$ and two function sets $S^{(1)} = \{f_i^{(1)}\}_{i=1}^n$ and $S^{(2)} = \{f_i^{(2)}\}_{i=1}^n$, $S^{(1)}$ and $S^{(2)}$ are $\delta$-adjacent if there exists some $i_0 \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ such that $f_i^{(1)} = f_i^{(2)}$, $\forall i \neq i_0$, $D(f_i^{(1)}, f_i^{(2)}) \leq \delta$, where $D(f_i^{(1)}, f_i^{(2)})$ represents the distance between two functions $f_i^{(1)}$ and $f_i^{(2)}$.

Definition 2: (Differential Privacy [19]) Given $\delta, \epsilon > 0$, for any $\delta$-adjacent function sets $S^{(1)}$ and $S^{(2)}$ and any observation $O \subseteq \text{Range}(A)$, a randomized algorithm $A$ keeps $\epsilon$-differentially private if

$$P\{A(S^{(1)}) \in O\} \leq e^\epsilon P\{A(S^{(2)}) \in O\}$$

where $\text{Range}(A)$ denotes the output codomain of $A$.

Definition 3 illustrates that a random mechanism is differentially private if its outputs are nearly statistically identical over two similar inputs which only differ in one element. Hence, an eavesdropper cannot distinguish whether a participant’s data is in the database based on the output of the mechanism. Here, a smaller $\epsilon$ represents a higher level of privacy since the eavesdropper has less chance to distinguish sensitive information of each agent from the observations. Nevertheless, a high privacy level will sacrifice the accuracy of the optimization algorithm. Hence, the constant $\epsilon$ determines a tradeoff between the privacy level and the accuracy.

C. Problem Formulation

Consider an optimization problem in a multi-agent system of $n$ agents. Each agent has a private cost function $f_i$, which is only known to agent $i$ itself. All the participating agents aim to minimize a global objective function

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{i=1}^N f_i(x)$$

where $x$ is the global decision variable.
To solve Problem \([1]\), assume each agent \(i\) maintains a local copy of \(x_i \in \mathbb{R}^p\) of the decision variable and an auxiliary variable \(y_i \in \mathbb{R}^p\) tracking the average gradients. Then we can rewrite Problem \([1]\) into local optimization problem of each agent with an added consensus constraint as follows

\[
\min_{x_i \in \mathbb{R}^p} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad x_i = x_j, \quad \forall i, j,
\]

where \(x_i\) is the local decision variable of the agent \(i\).

Let

\[
x := [x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p},
\]

\[
y := [y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}.
\]

Denote \(F(x)\) as an aggregate objective function of the local variables, i.e., \(F(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i)\).

With respect to the objective function in Problem \([1]\), we assume the following strong convexity and smoothness conditions.

**Assumption 1:** Each objective function \(f_i\) is \(\mu\)-strongly convex with \(L\)-Lipschitz continuous gradients, i.e., for any \(x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^p\),

\[
(\nabla f_i(x_1) - \nabla f_i(x_2), x_1 - x_2) \geq \mu \|x_1 - x_2\|^2, \quad ||\nabla f_i(x_1) - \nabla f_i(x_2)|| \leq L ||x_1 - x_2||.
\]

Under Assumption \([1]\) Problem \([1]\) has a unique optimal solution \(x^* \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times p}\) [20].

### III. PRIVATE GRADIENT TRACKING ALGORITHM VIA STATE DECOMPOSITION

In this section, we propose a state-decomposition based gradient tracking algorithm (SD-Push-Pull) for distributed optimization over directed graphs, which is described in Algorithm \([1]\) The main idea is to let each agent decompose its gradient state \(y_i\) into two substates \(y_i^\alpha\) and \(y_i^\beta\). The substate \(y_i^\alpha\) is used in the communication with other agents while \(y_i^\beta\) is never shared with other agents except for agent \(i\) itself, so the substate \(y_i^\beta\) is imperceptible to the neighbouring agents of agent \(i\).

**Algorithm 1 SD-Push-Pull**

**Step 1.** Initialization:

1. Agent \(i \in \mathcal{N}\) chooses in-bound mixing/pulling weights \(R_{ij} \geq 0\) for all \(j \in \mathcal{N}^p_{i,i}\), out-bound pushing weights \(C_{il} \geq 0\) for all \(l \in \mathcal{N}^o_{i,l}\), and the two sub-state weights \(\alpha_i, \beta_i \in (0, 1)\).
2. Agent \(i \in \mathcal{N}\) picks any \(x_{i,0}, \xi_i \in \mathbb{R}^p, \theta_i \in \mathbb{R}_{++}\), and initializes \(y_{i,0} = \nabla f_i(x_{i,0}), y_i^\alpha = \nabla f_i(x_{i,0})\) and \(y_i^\beta = \nabla f_i(x_{i,0}) - \xi_i\).
3. The step size \(\eta > 0\) is known to each agent.

**Step 2.** At iteration \(k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots\)

1. Agent \(i \in \mathcal{N}\) pulls \((x_j, \eta y_j^\alpha)\) from each \(j \in \mathcal{N}^i_{R, i}\).
2. Agent \(i \in \mathcal{N}\) pushes \(\tilde{C}_{il} y_{i,k}\) to each \(l \in \mathcal{N}^o_{C, i}\).
3. Agent \(i \in \mathcal{N}\) updates \(x_{i,k+1}\) through

\[
x_{i,k+1} = \sum_{j=1}^N R_{ij} (x_{j,k} - \eta y_{j,k}^\alpha).
\]

4. Agent \(i \in \mathcal{N}\) draws a random vector \(s_{i,k}\) consisting of \(p\) Laplacian noise independently drawn from \(\text{Lap}(|\theta_i|)\) and updates \(\nabla f_i(x_{i,k+1})\) as follows:

\[
\nabla f_i^\alpha(x_{i,k+1}) = \nabla f_i^\alpha(x_{i,k}) + s_i\kappa, \quad \nabla f_i^\beta(x_{i,k+1}) = \nabla f_i(x_{i,k+1}) - \nabla f_i^\alpha(x_{i,k+1}).
\]

5. Agent \(i \in \mathcal{N}\) updates \(y_{i,k+1}^\alpha\) and \(y_{i,k+1}^\beta\) as follows:

\[
y_{i,k+1}^\alpha = \sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{C}_{ij} y_{j,k} + \beta y_{i,k}^\beta + \nabla f_i^\alpha(x_{i,k+1}) - \nabla f_i^\alpha(x_{i,k}),
\]

\[
y_{i,k+1}^\beta = \alpha_i y_{i,k}^\alpha + (1 - \beta_i) y_{i,k}^\beta + \nabla f_i^\beta(x_{i,k+1}) - \nabla f_i^\beta(x_{i,k}).
\]

Denote

\[
R := [R_{ij}], \quad \Lambda := \text{diag}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_n), \quad \tilde{C} := [\tilde{C}_{ij}], \quad \Lambda_{\beta} := \text{diag}(\beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_n),
\]

\[
\xi := [\xi_1, \xi_2, \ldots, \xi_n]^\top, \quad s_k := [s_{1,k}, s_{2,k}, \ldots, s_{n,k}]^\top,
\]

\[
y_k := [y_1^\alpha(k), \ldots, y_n^\alpha(k), y_1^\beta(k), \ldots, y_n^\beta(k)]^\top
\]

\[
\nabla F(x) = [\nabla f_1(x_1), \ldots, \nabla f_n(x_n)]^\top,
\]

\[
\nabla \tilde{F}(x) = [\nabla f_1^\alpha(x_1), \ldots, \nabla f_n^\alpha(x_n), \nabla f_1^\beta(x_1), \ldots, \nabla f_n^\beta(x_n)]^\top.
\]

\[
C := \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_{\alpha} & \Lambda_{\beta} \\ \Lambda_{\alpha} & \mathbf{I} - \Lambda_{\beta} \end{bmatrix}, \quad T := [\mathbf{I}_n, 0_n].
\]

Algorithm \([1]\) can be rewritten in a matrix form as follows:

\[
x_{k+1} = R(x_k - \eta T y_k),
\]

\[
y_{k+1} = C y_k + \nabla \tilde{F}(x_{k+1}) - \nabla \tilde{F}(x_k),
\]

where \(x_0\) is arbitrary and \(y_0 = [x_0^\top, (\nabla F(x_0) - \xi)^\top]^\top\).

**Assumption 2:** The matrix \(R \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}\) is a nonnegative row-stochastic matrix and \(C \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}\) is a nonnegative column-stochastic matrix, i.e., \(R_{i1} = 1_n\) and \(2n C = 1_{2n}\). Moreover, the diagonal entries of \(R\) and \(C\) are positive, i.e., \(R_{ii} > 0, \tilde{C}_{ii} > 0, \forall i \in \mathcal{N}\).

Assumption \([2]\) can be satisfied by properly designing the weights in \(R\) and \(C\) by each agent locally. For instance, each agent may choose \(R_{ij} = \frac{1}{|N^p_{i,i}| + c_R}\) for some constant \(c_R > 0\) for all \(j \in N^p_{i,i}\) and let \(R_{ii} = 1 - \sum_{j \in N^p_{i,i}} R_{ij}\).

Similarly, agent \(i\) may choose \(c_i = \epsilon_i\) and \(\tilde{C}_{ii} = \frac{1}{|N^o_{C,i}| + c_C}\) for some constant \(0 < c < 1, c_C > 0\) for all \(l \in N^o_{C,i}\), and let \(\tilde{C}_{il} = 1 - \epsilon_i - \sum_{j \in N^o_{C,i}} \tilde{C}_{lj}\). Such a choice of weights renders \(R\) row-stochastic and \(C\) column-stochastic, thus satisfying Assumption \([2]\).

Since \(C\) is column stochastic,

\[
1^n_{2n} y_{k+1} = 1^n_{2n} y_k + 1^n_{2n} \nabla \tilde{F}(x_{k+1}) - 1^n_{2n} \nabla \tilde{F}(x_k).
\]

From equation \([4]\) and \(\nabla f_i^\beta(x_{i,0}) = \nabla f_i(x_{i,0}) - \nabla f_i^\alpha(x_{i,0}), \forall i \in \mathcal{N}\), we have by induction that

\[
\frac{1}{n} 1^n_{2n} y_k = \frac{1}{n} 1^n_{2n} \nabla F(x_k).
\]
Relation (7) shows that under the proposed state decomposition mechanism in Algorithm 1, the average gradient $1/n \nabla F(x_k)$ is still tracked through $y$-update.

Assumption 3: The graphs $G_R$ and $G_C^+$ induced by matrices $R$ and $C$ contain at least one spanning tree. In addition, there exists at least one agent that is a root of spanning trees for both $G_R$ and $G_C^+$.

Assumption 3 is weaker than the assumptions in most previous works (e.g., [7], [21], [22]), where graphs $G_R$ and $G_C^+$ are assumed to be strongly connected. The relaxed assumption about graph topology enables us to design the graphs $G_R$ and $G_C^+$ more flexibly. Similar assumption is adopted in [20], [23].

Lemma 1 ([24]): Under Assumption 2 and Assumption 3, the matrix $R$ has a unique nonnegative left eigenvector $u$ (w.r.t. eigenvalue) with $u^T1_n = n$, and matrix $C$ has a unique nonnegative right eigenvector $v$ (w.r.t. eigenvalue) with $1_n v = n$.

IV. DIFFERENTIAL PRIVACY ANALYSIS

In this section, we analyze the differential property of SD-Push-Pull. The worst case is considered at which the eavesdropper knows all the parameters, including $R$, $C$, $x_0$, $\xi$, $\{f_i\}_{i \neq i_0}$. The observation $O_k$ denotes the message transmitted between agents, where $O_k = \{x_{i,k} - \eta y_{i,k}, C_{j,i,y_{i,k}} | \forall i,j \in N\}$.

Before analyzing the differential privacy performance, we first give a definition of the $\delta$-adjacent function sets in Definition 1. In order to guarantee the convergence of SD-Push-Pull, we assume that $f_i^{(1)}$ and $f_i^{(2)}$ in Definition 1 satisfy Assumption 4.

Assumption 4: For any $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^p$, the function $D(f_i^{(1)}, f_i^{(2)}) = \|\nabla f_i^{(1)}(x) - \nabla f_i^{(2)}(x')\|_1$.

Theorem 1: Under assumption 4, let $\epsilon_t = \beta_t \delta / \theta_t$, where $\delta$ is defined in Definition 2. SD-Push-Pull keeps privacy at the $t$th iteration of each agent $i$’s cost function for any $t \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof: Consider any pair of $\delta$-adjacent function sets $S_i^{(1)}$ and $S_i^{(2)}$. In view of the dynamics in Assumption 3 and 4, the observation $O_{i,k}^{(l)}$ is dependent on the function set $S_i^{(l)}$ and the random variable $s_i^{(l)}$, $l \in \{1, 2\}$. In order that $S_i^{(1)}$ and $S_i^{(2)}$ generate identical observations, it is indispensable to guarantee that $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}, i \in N, y_{i,k}^{(l)} = y_{i,k}^{(l')}$.

Hence, for any $i \neq i_0$, $s_i^{(1)} = s_i^{(2)}$, and for $i_0$,

$$\Delta s_{i_0,k} = -\beta_{i_0} \Delta y_{i_0,k}^{\beta_{i_0}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

where $\Delta s_{i_0,k} = y_{i_0,k}^{(1)} - y_{i_0,k}^{(2)}$. In light of equation (5), we have

$$\Delta y_{i_0,k} = (1 - \beta_{i_0}) \Delta y_{i_0,k-1} - \Delta s_{i_0,k-1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

From Definition 3, we can obtain

$$\Delta y_{i_0,k} = (1 - \beta_{i_0}) \Delta y_{i_0,k-1} + \beta_{i_0} \Delta y_{i_0,k-1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

Since $y_{i_0,k} = \nabla f_i^{(1)}(x_i, 0) - \xi_i$, $l = \{1, 2\}$,

$$\Delta y_{i_0,k} = \nabla f_i^{(1)}(x_i, 0) - \nabla f_i^{(2)}(x_i, 0).$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

Hence, we have

$$||\Delta s_{i_0,k}||_1 = \beta_t ||\Delta y_{i_0,k}||_1 = \beta_t ||\nabla f_i^{(1)}(x_i, 0) - \nabla f_i^{(2)}(x_i, 0)||_1 \leq \beta_t \delta.$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)

Next, from Lemma 2 in [25], we can obtain that

$$P(A(S_i^{(1)}) \in \Omega) = \prod_{l=1}^{n} \frac{P(\{s_i^{(1)}\}_l)}{P(\{s_i^{(2)}\}_l)} = \prod_{l=1}^{n} \exp \left( \frac{||s_i^{(1, l)} - s_i^{(2, l)}||_1}{\theta_t} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)

where $\{s_i^{(1, l)}\}_l$ and $\{s_i^{(2, l)}\}_l$ denotes the $l$th element of $s_i^{(1)}$ and $s_i^{(2)}$. Thus, the proof is completed.

V. CONVERGENCE ANALYSIS

In this section, we analyze the convergence performance of the proposed private push-pull algorithm. For the sake of analysis, we now re-write Eqs. (6) as follows, which is based on equation (3).

$$x_{k+1} = R(x_k - \eta Ty_k), \hspace{1cm} (15a)$$

$$y_{k+1} = Cx_k + [s_k, (\nabla F(x_{k+1}) - \nabla F(x_k) - s_k)^T] \hspace{1cm} (15b)$$

Next, we define the following variables:

$$\bar{x}_k := \frac{1}{n} \bar{x}_k \hspace{1cm} \bar{y}_k := \frac{1}{n} \bar{1}_{2n}^T y_k.$$

The main idea of our strategy is to bound $\mathbb{E}[||\bar{x}_{k+1} - x_{k+1}||_2, \mathbb{E}[||y_{k+1} - y_{k+1}||_2]], \mathbb{E}[||y_{k+1} - y_{k+1}||_2]$ on the basis of the linear combinations of their previous values, where $||\cdot||_2$ and $||\cdot||_C$ are specific norms to be defined later. By establishing a linear system of inequalities, we can derive the convergence result.

Definition 3: Given an arbitrary vector norm $||\cdot||$, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, we define

$$||x|| := \left( ||x^{(1)}||^2, ||x^{(1)}||^2, \ldots, ||x^{(p)}||^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

where $x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}, \ldots, x^{(p)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are columns of $x$. 

A. Preliminary Analysis

From Eqs. [15] and Lemma [1], we can obtain
\[ \bar{x}_{k+1} = \frac{1}{n} u^T R(x_k - \eta T y_k) = \bar{x}_k - \eta \frac{n}{u^T T y_k}, \] (16)
and
\[ \bar{y}_{k+1} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (C y_k + [s_k^T, (\nabla F(x_k+1) - \nabla F(x_k) - s_k^T)]^T) \]
\[ = \bar{y}_k + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} [s_k^T, (\nabla F(x_k+1) - \nabla F(x_k) - s_k^T)]^T. \] (17)

Furthermore, let us define
\[ g_k := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(\bar{x}_k). \]

Then, from equation [16],
\[ \bar{x}_{k+1} = \bar{x}_k - \frac{\eta}{u^T} T (y_k - v \bar{y}_k + v \bar{y}_k) \]
\[ = \bar{x}_k - \frac{\eta}{u^T} T v \bar{y}_k - \frac{\eta}{u^T} T (y_k - v \bar{y}_k) \]
\[ = \bar{x}_k - \eta g_k - \eta (\bar{y}_k - g_k) - \frac{\eta}{u^T} T (y_k - v \bar{y}_k), \] (18)
where
\[ \eta' := \frac{\eta}{u^T} T v. \]

Based on Lemma [1] and equation [16], we obtain
\[ x_{k+1} - 1_n \bar{x}_{k+1} = R(x_k - \eta T y_k) - 1_n \bar{x}_k + \frac{\eta}{n} u^T T y_k \]
\[ = R(x_k - 1_n \bar{x}_k) - (R - \frac{1}{n} u^T) \eta T y_k \]
\[ = (R - \frac{1}{n} u^T)(x_k - 1_n \bar{x}_k) - (R - \frac{1}{n} u^T) \eta T y_k. \] (19)

In addition, from equation [17], we have
\[ y_{k+1} - v \bar{y}_{k+1} = C y_k - v \bar{y}_k \]
\[ + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} [s_k^T, (\nabla F(x_k+1) - \nabla F(x_k) - s_k^T)]^T \]
\[ = (C - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} s_k^T, (\nabla F(x_k+1) - \nabla F(x_k) - s_k^T)]^T. \] (20)

Denote \( F_k \) as the \( \sigma \)-algebra generated by \( \{s_0, \ldots, s_{k-1}\} \),
and define \( E[\cdot | F_k] \) as the conditional expectation given \( F_k \).

B. Supporting lemmas

We next prepare a few useful supporting lemmas for further convergence analysis.

**Lemma 2:** Under Assumption [1], there holds
\[ ||\bar{y}_k - g_k||_2 \leq \frac{L}{\sqrt{n}} ||x_k - 1_n \bar{x}_k||_2, \]
\[ ||g_k||_2 \leq L ||\bar{x}_k - x^*||_2. \]

**Proof:** In view of Assumption [1],
\[ ||\bar{y}_k - g_k||_2 \leq \frac{1}{n} ||1_n \nabla F(x_k) - 1_n \nabla F(1_n \bar{x}_k)||_2 \]
\[ \leq \frac{L}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} ||x_{i,k} - \bar{x}_k||_2 \leq \frac{L}{\sqrt{n}} ||x_k - 1_n \bar{x}_k||_2. \]

and
\[ ||g_k||_2 \leq \frac{1}{n} ||1_n \nabla F(x_k - 1_n \bar{x}_k)||_2 \]
\[ \leq \frac{L}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} ||\bar{x}_k - x^*||_2 = L ||\bar{x}_k - x^*||_2. \]

**Lemma 3:** (Adapted from Lemma 10 in [26]) Under Assumption [1] for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^p \) and \( 0 < \theta < 2/\mu \), we have
\[ ||x - \theta F(x) - x^*||_2 \leq \tau ||x - x^*||, \]
where \( \tau = \max(||1 - \mu \theta||, |1 - L \theta||). \)

**Lemma 4:** (Adapted from Lemma 3 and Lemma 4 in [6]) Suppose Assumption [2] and [3] hold. There exist vector norms \( \|\cdot\|_R \) and \( \|\cdot\|_C \), such that \( \sigma_R := \|R - \frac{1}{n} u^T\|_R < 1, \sigma_C := \|C - \frac{v1_{2n}}{n}\|_C < 1 \) and \( \tau_R \) and \( \tau_C \) are arbitrarily close to the spectral radii \( \rho(R - \frac{1}{n} u^T/n) < 1 \) and \( \rho(C - v1_{2n}/n) < 1 \), respectively.

The following two lemmas are also taken from [20].

**Lemma 5:** Given an arbitrary norm \( \|\cdot\| \), for \( W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \) and \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \), we have \( \|Wx\| \leq ||W|| \|x\| \). For any \( w \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times x} \) and \( x \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times p} \), we have \( \|wx\| = ||w|| \|x\| \).

**Lemma 6:** There exists constants \( \delta_{C,R}, \delta_{C,2}, \delta_{R,C}, \delta_{R,2} > 0 \), such that \( \|\cdot\|_C \leq \delta_{C,R} \|\cdot\|_R \|\cdot\|_C \leq \delta_{C,2} \|\cdot\|_2 \|\cdot\|_C \leq \delta_{R,C} \|\cdot\|_R \|\cdot\|_C \leq \delta_{R,2} \|\cdot\|_2 \|\cdot\|_C \). Moreover, with a proper rescaling of norms \( \|\cdot\|_R \) and \( \|\cdot\|_C \), we have \( \|\cdot\|_2 \leq \|\cdot\|_R \) and \( \|\cdot\|_2 \leq \|\cdot\|_C \).

**Lemma 7:** (Lemma 5 in [27]) Given a nonnegative, irreducible matrix \( M = [m_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \) with its diagonal element \( m_{11}, m_{22}, m_{33} < \lambda^* \) for some \( \lambda^* > 0 \). A necessary and sufficient condition for \( \rho(M) < \lambda^* \) is \( \det(\lambda^* I - M) > 0 \).

C. Main results

The following critical lemma establishes a linear system of inequalities that bound \( \mathbb{E}[||\bar{x}_{k+1} - x^*||_2], \mathbb{E}[||x_{k+1} - 1_n \bar{x}_{k+1}||_R], \) and \( \mathbb{E}[||y_{k+1} - v \bar{y}_{k+1}||_C] \).

**Lemma 8:** Under Assumption [1][3] when \( \eta' < 2/(\mu + L) \), we have the following linear system of inequalities:
\[ \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E}[||\bar{x}_{k+1} - x^*||_2] \\ \mathbb{E}[||x_{k+1} - 1_n \bar{x}_{k+1}||_R] \\ \mathbb{E}[||y_{k+1} - v \bar{y}_{k+1}||_C] \end{bmatrix} \leq A \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E}[||\bar{x}_k - x^*||_2] \\ \mathbb{E}[||x_k - 1_n \bar{x}_k||_R] \\ \mathbb{E}[||y_k - v \bar{y}_k||_C] \end{bmatrix} + B, \]
where the inequality is taken component-wise, and elements of the transition matrix \( A = [a_{ij}] \) and the vector \( B \) are given by:
\[ A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \eta' \mu & c_1 \eta & c_2 \eta \\ c_3 \eta & \sigma_R + c_4 \eta & c_5 \eta \\ c_6 \eta & c_7 + c_8 \eta & c_9 \eta \end{bmatrix}, \]
and
\[ B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & b_1 \sqrt{2p} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \theta_i^2 \end{bmatrix}^T, \]
respectively, where constants $c_i$'s and $b_i$ are defined in
\[
c_1 = u^T v - \frac{L}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad c_2 = \frac{\|T^* v\|}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad c_3 = \sigma_R \|T v\| R_L, \\
c_4 = \sigma_R \|T v\| \frac{L}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad c_5 = \sigma_R \delta_{R, C} \|T\| R, \\
c_6 = c_0, \delta_{C, 2} \|R T\|, \quad c_7 = c_0 \delta_{C, 2} L_2 \|R - I_n\|_2 \\
c_8 = \|R T\| \|v\| \frac{L}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad c_9 = 2c_0, \delta_{C, 2} L_2, \\
b_1 = 2c_9 \delta_{C, 2} L_2.
\]

**Proof:** See Appendix VIII-A.

The following theorem shows the convergence properties for the SD-Push-Pull algorithm as in (6).

**Theorem 2:** Suppose Assumption [3] holds and the stepsize $\eta$ satisfies
\[
\eta \leq \min \left\{ \frac{1 - \sigma_R}{2c_4}, \frac{1 - \sigma_C}{2c_9}, \frac{2d_3}{d_2 \sqrt{d_3^2 + 4d_2^2d_3}}, \right\}
\]
where $d_1, d_2, d_3$ are defined in (31). Then $\sup_{t \geq k} \mathbb{E}[\|x_t - x_t^\ast\|_2]$ and $\sup_{t \geq k} \mathbb{E}[\|x_t - 1_n x_t\|_R]$ converge to $\limsup_{k \to \infty} \mathbb{E}[\|x_k - x^\ast\|_2]$ and $\limsup_{k \to \infty} \mathbb{E}[\|x_k - 1_n x_k\|_R]$ respectively, at the linear rate $O(\rho(A)^k)$ in addition.

\[
\limsup_{k \to \infty} \mathbb{E}[\|x_k - x^\ast\|_2] \leq [(I - A)^{-1} B]_i, \\
\limsup_{k \to \infty} \mathbb{E}[\|x_k - 1_n x_k\|_R] \leq [(I - A)^{-1} B]_2,
\]
where $[(I - A)^{-1} B]_i$ denotes the $i$th element of the vector $(I - A)^{-1} B$. Their specific forms are given in (33) and (34), respectively.

**Proof:** In terms of (3), by induction we have
\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbb{E}[\|x_k - x^\ast\|_2] &\leq A^k \left[ \mathbb{E}[\|x_0 - x^\ast\|_2] \right] + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} A^i B, \\
\mathbb{E}[\|x_k - 1_n x_k\|_R] &\leq A^k \left[ \mathbb{E}[\|y_k - v y_k\|_R] \right] + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} A^i B.
\end{align*}
\]
(25)

From equation (25), we can see that if $\rho(A) < 1$, then $\sup_{t \geq k} \mathbb{E}[\|x_t - x^\ast\|_2]$, $\sup_{t \geq k} \mathbb{E}[\|x_t - 1_n x_t\|_R]$ and $\sup_{t \geq k} \mathbb{E}[\|y_t - v y_t\|_R]$ all converge to a neighborhood of 0 at the linear rate $O(\rho(A)^k)$.

In view of Lemma [7], it suffices to ensure $a_{11}, a_{22}, a_{33} < 1$ and $\det(I - A) > 0$, or
\[
\det(I - A) = (1 - a_{11})(1 - a_{22})(1 - a_{33}) - a_{12}a_{23}a_{31} - a_{13}a_{21}a_{32} - a_{12}a_{23}a_{31} - a_{13}a_{21}a_{32} - a_{23}a_{12}a_{31} > 0.
\]
(26)

which is equivalent to
\[
\frac{1}{2}(1 - a_{11})(1 - a_{22})(1 - a_{33}) - c_1 c_5 c_6 \eta^3 \\
- c_2 c_3 \eta^2 (c_7 + c_8) \eta - (1 - a_{22})c_2 c_6 \eta^2 \\
- (1 - a_{33})c_1 c_3 \eta^2 > 0.
\]
(27)

Next, we give some sufficient conditions where $a_{11}, a_{22}, a_{33} < 1$ and relation (27) holds true.

First, $a_{11} < 1$ is ensured by choosing $\eta \leq 2/(\mu + L)$. In addition, $a_{22}, a_{33} < 1$ is ensured by choosing
\[
1 - a_{22} \geq \frac{1 - \sigma_R}{2}, \quad 1 - a_{33} \geq \frac{1 - \sigma_C}{2},
\]
(28)

requiring
\[
\eta \leq \min \left\{ \frac{1 - \sigma_R}{2c_4}, \frac{1 - \sigma_C}{2c_9} \right\}.
\]
(29)

Second, in view of relation (28), $a_{22} > \sigma_R$, and $a_{33} > \sigma_C$, we have
\[
\frac{1}{2}(1 - a_{11})(1 - a_{22})(1 - a_{33}) - c_1 c_5 c_6 \eta^3 \\
- c_2 c_3 \eta^2 (c_7 + c_8) \eta - (1 - a_{22})c_2 c_6 \eta^2 - (1 - a_{33})c_1 c_3 \eta^2
\]
\[
> \frac{1}{2}(1 - a_{11}) \frac{1 - \sigma_R}{2} \frac{1 - \sigma_C}{2} - (c_1 c_5 c_6 + c_2 c_3 c_8) \eta^3
\]
\[
- c_2 c_3 \eta^2 (c_7 + c_8) \eta - (1 - a_{22})c_2 c_6 \eta^2 - (1 - a_{33})c_1 c_3 \eta^2.
\]
(30)

Then, relation (27) is equivalent to
\[
d_1 \eta^2 + d_2 \eta - d_3 < 0,
\]
where
\[
d_1 := c_1 c_5 c_6 + c_2 c_3 c_8, \\
d_2 := c_2 c_3 c_7 + (1 - \sigma_R) c_2 c_6 + (1 - \sigma_C) c_1 c_3, \\
d_3 := \frac{1}{8} u^T T v \mu (1 - \sigma_R) / (1 - \sigma_C).
\]
(31)

Hence, a sufficient condition for $\det(I - A) > 0$ is
\[
\eta \leq \frac{2d_3}{d_2 \sqrt{d_3^2 + 4d_2^2d_3}}.
\]
(32)

Relation (29) and (32) yield the final bound on the stepsize $\eta$. Moreover, in light of (26) and (28), we can obtain from (25) that
\[
[(I - A)^{-1} B]_1
\]
\[
= \left[ (a_{12}a_{23} + a_{13}(1 - a_{22})) b_1 \sqrt{2p} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \theta_i^2 \right] \frac{1}{\det(I - A)}
\]
\[
\leq 8b_1 (c_1 c_5 \eta^2 + c_2 \eta (1 - \sigma_R) \sqrt{2p} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \theta_i^2)
\]
\[
u \chi^T T v \mu (1 - \sigma_R) / (1 - \sigma_C),
\]
(33)

\[
[(I - A)^{-1} B]_2
\]
\[
= \left[ (a_{13}a_{21} + a_{23}(1 - a_{11})) b_1 \sqrt{2p} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \theta_i^2 \right] \frac{1}{\det(I - A)}
\]
\[
\leq 8b_1 (c_2 c_3 + c_5 u^T T v \mu) \eta^2 \sqrt{2p} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \theta_i^2
\]
\[
u \chi^T T v \mu (1 - \sigma_R) / (1 - \sigma_C).
\]
(34)

Remark: When $\eta$ is sufficiently small, it can be shown that the linear rate indicator $\rho(A) \simeq 1 - \eta \mu$. From Theorem [2] it is worth noting that the upper bounds in (33) and (34) are functions of $\eta, \theta_i, \forall i \in N'$ and other problem parameters, and they are decreasing in terms of $\theta_i$. Fixing the system parameter and the privacy level $(\epsilon_t, \delta_t, \epsilon_t)$, can be written as $\theta_i = \beta_t \delta_t / \epsilon_t$. Hence, the optimization accuracy has the order of $\delta \sim O(\frac{1}{5})$ for small $\epsilon_t$. As $\epsilon_t$ converges to 0, that is, for complete privacy for each agents, the accuracy becomes arbitrarily bad.
VI. SIMULATIONS

In this section, we illustrate the effectiveness of SD-Push-Pull.

Consider a network containing $N = 5$ agents, shown in Fig. 1. The optimization problem is considered as the ridge regression problem, i.e.,

$$
\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^p} f(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( (u_i^T x - v_i)^2 + \rho \|x\|^2 \right)
$$

where $\rho > 0$ is a penalty parameter. Each agent $i$ has its private sample $(u_i, v_i)$ where $u_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ denotes the features and $v_i \in \mathbb{R}$ denotes the observed outputs. The vector $u_i \in [-1, 1]^p$ is drawn from the uniform distribution. Then the observed outputs $v_i$ is generated according to $v_i = u_i^T x_i + \gamma_i$, where $x_i$ is evenly located in $[0, 10]^p$ and $\gamma_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 5)$. In terms of the above parameters, problem (1) has a unique solution $x^* = (\sum_{i=1}^{n} [u_i u_i^T + n \rho I])^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} u_i u_i^T x_i$.

![Fig. 1. A digraph of 5 agents.](image)

Fig. 1. A digraph of 5 agents.

The weight between two substates, $\alpha_i$ and $\beta_i$, are set to be 0.01 and 0.5 for each agent $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$. The matrix $\mathbf{R}$ and $\mathbf{C}$ are designed as follows: for any agent $i$, $R_{ij} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sum_{j \in N_{R,i}}^n}}$ for $j \in N_{R,i}$ and $R_{ii} = 1 - \sum_{j \in N_{R,i}}^n R_{ij}$; for any agent $i$, $C_{ij} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sum_{j \in N_{C,i}}^n}}$ for all $l \in N_{C,i}$ and $C_{ii} = 1 - \alpha_i - \sum_{j \in N_{C,i}^c} C_{ij}$.

Assume $\epsilon_i = \epsilon, \forall i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ and $\delta = 10$. To investigate the dependence of the algorithm accuracy with differential privacy level, we compare the performance SD-Push-Pull for three cases: $\epsilon = 1, \epsilon = 5$ and $\epsilon = 10$, in terms of the normalized residual $\frac{1}{n} E \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{|x_i - x_i^*|^2}{|x_i - x_i^*|_2} \right]$. The results are depicted in Fig. 2 which reflect that SD-Push-Pull can achieve suboptimality and the constant $\epsilon$ determines a tradeoff between the privacy level and the optimization accuracy.

![Fig. 2. Evolutions of the normalized residual under different settings of the privacy level. The expected residual are approximated by averaging over 50 simulation results. Dimension $p = 10$, stepsize $\alpha = 0.01$ and penalty parameter $\rho = 0.01$.](image)

VII. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we considered a distributed optimization problem with differential privacy in the scenario where a network is abstracted as an unbalanced directed graph. We proposed a state-decomposition-based differentially private distributed optimization algorithm (SD-Push-Pull). In particular, the state decomposition mechanism was adopted to guarantee the differential privacy of individuals’ sensitive information. In addition, we proved that each agent reach a neighborhood of the optimum in expectation exponentially fast under a constant stepsize policy. Moreover, we showed that the constants $(\epsilon, \delta)$ determine a tradeoff between the privacy level and the optimization accuracy. Finally, a numerical example was provided that demonstrates the effectiveness of SD-Push-Pull. Future work includes improving the accuracy of the optimization and considering the optimization problem with constraints.

A. Proof of Lemma 6

The three inequalities embedded in (8) come from (18), (19) and (20), respectively.

First inequality: By Lemma 2, Lemma 3 and 6, we can obtain from (18) that

$$
E[\|x_{k+1} - x^*\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_k] = E[\|x_{k} - \eta g_k - x^* - \eta (\bar{y}_k + g_k)\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_k] + \frac{\eta^2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|u_i^T \mathbf{T} (y_k - v \bar{y}_k)\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_k] 
$$

Second inequality: By relation (19), Lemma 5 and Lemma 6, we can obtain from (18) that

$$
E[\|x_{k+1} - x^*\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_k] \leq \sigma_R \|x_k - 1_n \bar{x}_k\|_R + \sigma_R \|y_k\|_R 
$$

Thus, we have

$$
E[\|x_{k+1} - 1_n \bar{x}_k\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_k] \leq \sigma_R \|x_k - 1_n \bar{x}_k\|_R + \sigma_R \|y_k - \bar{y}_k\|_R + \sigma_R \|T v\|_R \left( \frac{L}{\sqrt{n}} \|x_k - 1_n \bar{x}_k\|_2 + L \|\bar{x}_k - x^*\|_2 \right) 
$$

Moreover, we showed that the constants $(\epsilon, \delta)$ determine a tradeoff between the privacy level and the optimization accuracy. Finally, a numerical example was provided that demonstrates the effectiveness of SD-Push-Pull. Future work includes improving the accuracy of the optimization and considering the optimization problem with constraints.

VIII. APPENDIX
Again, taking full expectation on both sides of the inequalities completes the proof.

***Third inequality:** It follows from (20), Lemma [5] and Lemma [6] that

$$ E[|y_{k+1} - v\bar{y}_{k+1}|] = \frac{\sigma C(||y_k - v\bar{y}_k|| + c_0 \delta C_2 L ||x_{k+1} - x_k||_2)}{c_0 \delta C_2 L} + 2 c_0 \delta C_2 L \left(\sum_{i=1}^{2p} \theta_i^2\right) $$

where the second inequality follows from Jensen’s inequality.

Then, from (56), we have

$$ E[|y_{k+1} - v\bar{y}_{k+1}|] = \frac{\sigma C(||y_k - v\bar{y}_k|| + c_0 \delta C_2 L ||x_k - x_{k-1}||_2 + \eta R T y_k||_2)}{2 c_0 \delta C_2 L} + c_0 \delta C_2 L \left(\sum_{i=1}^{2p} \theta_i^2\right) $$

Taking full expectation yields the desired result.
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