A Numerical Verification Framework for Differential Privacy in Estimation

Yunhai Han\textsuperscript{1,2} and Sonia Martínez\textsuperscript{1}

Abstract—This work proposes a numerical method to verify differential privacy in estimation with performance guarantees. To achieve differential privacy, a mechanism (estimation) is turned into a stochastic mapping; which makes it hard to distinguish outputs produced by close inputs. While obtaining theoretical conditions that guarantee privacy may be possible, verifying these in practice can be hard. To address this problem, we propose a data-driven, test framework for continuous-range mechanisms that i) finds a highly-likely, compact event set, as well as a partition of this event, and ii) evaluates differential privacy wrt this partition. This results into a type of approximate differential privacy with high confidence, which we are able to quantify precisely. This approach is then used to evaluate the differential-privacy properties of the recently proposed $W_2$ Moving Horizon Estimator. We confirm its properties, while comparing its performance with alternative approaches in simulation.

I. INTRODUCTION

A growing number of emerging, on-demand applications, require data from users or sensors in order to make predictions and/or recommendations. Examples include smart grids, traffic networks, or home assistive technology. While more accurate information can benefit the application’s quality of service, an important concern is that sharing personalized data may compromise the privacy of its users. This has been demonstrated over Netflix datasets\textsuperscript{1}, as well as on traffic monitoring systems\textsuperscript{2}.

Initially proposed from the database literature, Differential Privacy\textsuperscript{3} addresses this issue, and has become a standard in privacy specification of commercial products. More recently, differential privacy has attracted the attention of the systems and controls literature\textsuperscript{4} and applied on control systems\textsuperscript{5}, optimization\textsuperscript{6}, and estimation and filtering\textsuperscript{7}. In particular, the work\textsuperscript{8} develops the concept of differential privacy for Kalman filter design. The work\textsuperscript{9} proposes a more general moving-horizon estimator via a perturbed objective function to enable privacy. To the best of our knowledge, all of these works propose sufficient and theoretical conditions for differential privacy.

However, the design of these algorithms can be very subtle and error-prone. It has been proved that a number of algorithms in the database literature are incorrect\textsuperscript{10}\textsuperscript{11}, and their claimed level of differential privacy can not be achieved. Motivated by this, the work\textsuperscript{12} designs an approach to detect the violation of differential privacy for discrete mechanisms. However, this approach is only applicable for mechanisms that can result in a (small) number of finite events, and a characterization of its performance guarantees is not provided.

Motivated by this, the contributions of this work are two fold. First, we build a tractable, data-driven, framework to detect violations of differential privacy in system estimation. To handle the infinite collection of events of continuous spaces, the evaluation is conditioned over a highly-likely, compact set. This results into a type of approximate differential privacy with high confidence. We approximate this set in a data-driven fashion with high confidence. Further, tests are performed wrt a collectively-exhaustive and mutually exclusive partition of the approximated highly-likely set. By assuming the probability of these events is upper bounded by a small constant, and implementing an exact hypothesis test procedure, we are able to quantify the approximate differential privacy of the estimation wrt two adjacent inputs with high-likelihood. Second, we employ this procedure to evaluate the differential privacy of a previously proposed, $W_2$-MHE estimator. Our experiments show some interesting results including that i) the theoretical conditions for the $W_2$-MHE seem to hold but may be rather conservative, ii) there is an indication that perturbing directly the output estimation mapping results in a better performance than perturbing first the input sensor data, iii) differential privacy does indeed depend on sensor location, and iv) the $W_2$-MHE performs better than a differentially-private EKF.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

Consider a sensor network performing a distributed estimation task. Sensors may have different owners, who wish to maintain their locations private. Even if communication among sensors is secure, an adversary may have access to the estimation on the target, and other network side information\textsuperscript{13} to gain critical knowledge about any individual sensor; see Figure\textsuperscript{1}.

We now start by defining the concept of differential privacy in estimation, and state our problem objectives. Let a system dynamics and observation model of the form:

\[
x_{k+1} = f(x_k, w_k), \quad y_k = h(x_k) + v_k,
\]

where $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$, $y_k \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$, $w_k \in \mathbb{R}^{d_w}$ and $v_k \in \mathbb{R}^{d_v}$. Here, $w_k$ and $v_k$ represent the iid process and measurement noises at time step $k$, respectively.

\textsuperscript{1}This can be any information including, but not limited to, the target’s true location, and all other sensor positions.
Let \( \{0, \ldots, T\} \) be a time horizon, and denote by \( y_{0:T} = (y_0, \ldots, y_T) \) the sensor data up to time \( T \). An estimator or mechanism \( \mathcal{M} \) of Equation 1 is a stochastic mapping \( \mathcal{M} : \mathbb{R}^{(T+1)d_y} \to \mathbb{R}^{md_y} \), for some \( m \geq 1 \), which assigns sensor data \( y_{0:T} \) to a random state trajectory estimate. We will assume that the distribution of \( \mathcal{M}(y_{0:T}) \), \( \mathbb{P} \), is independent of the distribution of \( y_{0:T} \). In Section IV we test a \( W_2 \)-MHE filter that takes this form and assimilates sensor data online. Roughly speaking, the \( W_2 \)-MHE employs a moving window \( N \) and sensor data \( (y_{k+1}, \ldots, y_{k+N}) \) to estimate the state at time \( k \); see [9] for more information.

**Definition 1 (\( \varepsilon \)-\( \delta \) Differential Privacy):** Let \( \mathcal{M} \) be a state estimator for System 1. Given \( \delta, \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \), \( \mathcal{M} \) is \( \varepsilon \)-\( \delta \) differentially private if for any two \( \delta \)-adjacent sensor data \( y_{i,0:T}^{1}, y_{i,0:T}^{2} \) \( (d_y(y_{i,0:T}^{1}, y_{i,0:T}^{2}) \leq \delta) \), we have

\[
\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}(y_{i,0:T}^{1}) \in E) \leq e^{\varepsilon}\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}(y_{i,0:T}^{2}) \in E), \quad i, j = 1, 2, \quad (2)
\]

for all \( E \subset \text{range}(\mathcal{M}) \).

In what follows, \( d_y(y_{i,0:T}^{1}, y_{i,0:T}^{2}) \) is induced by the 2-norm. However, the results do not depend on the choice of distance.

Finding theoretical conditions that guarantee differential privacy can be difficult, conservative, and hard to verify. Thus, in this work we aim to:

1) Obtain a tractable, numerical test procedure to evaluate the differential privacy of an estimator; while providing quantifiable performance guarantees of its correctness.
2) Verify numerically the differential-privacy guarantees of the \( W_2 \)-MHE filter of [9]; and compare its performance with that of an extended Kalman filter.
3) Evaluate the differences in privacy/estimation when the perturbations are directly applied to the sensor data before the filtering process is done.

Our approach employs a statistical, data-driven method. Although a main motivation for this work is the evaluation of the \( W_2 \)-MHE filter, the method can be used to verify the privacy of any mappings with a continuous space range.

### III. Differential Privacy Test Framework

Here, we present the components of our test framework (Section III-A) and its theoretical guarantees (Section III-B).

#### A. Overview of the differential-privacy test framework

Privacy is evaluated wrt two \( \delta \)-close \( y_{i,0:T}^{1}, y_{i,0:T}^{2} \) as follows:

1) Instead of verifying Equation 2 for an infinite number of events, an EventListGenerator module extracts a finite collection EventList. This is done by finitely partitioning an approximated high-likely event set.
2) Next, a WorstEventSelector module identifies the worst-case event in EventList that violates \( \varepsilon \)-\( \delta \) differential privacy condition with the highest probability.
3) Finally, a HypothesisTest module evaluates differential privacy wrt the worst-case event.

The overall description is summarized in Algorithm 1.

**Algorithm 1** \( \varepsilon \)-\( \delta \) Differentially-private Test Framework

1: \textbf{function} TestFramework(M, \varepsilon, y_{i,0:T}^{1}, y_{i,0:T}^{2})
2: \textbf{inputs}: Target estimator \( \mathcal{M} \), privacy level \( \varepsilon \), sensor data \( (y_{i,0:T}^{1}, y_{i,0:T}^{2}) \)
3: \quad EventList = EventListGenerator(M, y_{i,0:T}^{1})
4: \quad \text{WorstEvent} =
5: \quad \text{WorstEventSelector}(M, \varepsilon, y_{i,0:T}^{1}, y_{i,0:T}^{2}, \text{EventList})
6: \quad p^+, p^+_\mathcal{E} = \text{HypothesisTest}(M, \varepsilon, y_{i,0:T}^{1}, y_{i,0:T}^{2}, \text{WorstEvent})
7: \text{Return } p^+, p^+_\mathcal{E}

We now describe each module in detail.

1) **EventListGenerator module.** Consider System 1 with initial condition \( x_0 \in K_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^d \). The estimated state \( \hat{x}_k \) under \( \mathcal{M} \) for a given \( y_{i,0:T} \), belongs to a set of all possible estimates given \( x_0 \) and \( y_{i,0:T} \). Denote this set as \( R_{[0,k]} \).

In [9], this set is bounded as all disturbances and initial distribution are assumed to have a compact support. However, \( R_{[0,k]} \) can be unbounded for other estimators. To reduce the set of events to be checked for \( \varepsilon \)-\( \delta \) differential privacy (a) we approximate the set \( R_{[0,k]} \) by a compact, high-likely set in a data-driven fashion, and b) we finitely partition this set by a mutually exclusive collection of events; see Algorithm 2.

Inspired by [13] focusing on reachability, we employ the Scenario Optimisation approach to approximate a high-likely set via a product of ellipsoids; see Algorithm 3. Here, \( \Gamma \equiv \Gamma(\beta) \) defines the number of estimate samples (filter runs) required to guarantee that the output set contains \( 1 - \beta \) of the probability mass of \( R_{[0,k]} \) with high confidence \( 1 - \gamma \).

Then, a convex optimization problem is solved to find the output set as a hyper-ellipsoid with parameters \( A^k \) and \( b^k \).

The data-driven approximation of the high-likely set can now be partitioned using e.g. a grid per time step. This is what we do in simulation later. Alternatively, we provide an
with respect to $R_1$ and $\eta$. Bound $\Gamma$ by selecting a subset of sample runs. The resulting hyper-ellipsoid, $E$, satisfies $E \cap R \neq \emptyset$ as they contain common sample runs, and $P(E \cap R) = P(E) + P(R) - P(E \cup R) \geq 1 - \eta + 1 - \beta - 1 = 1 - \eta - \beta$ with confidence $1 - \gamma$. Similarly, the complement of $E$, $E^c$, is such that $E \cap R \neq \emptyset$ and $P(E \cap R) = P(R) - P(R \cap E) \leq 1 - (1 - \eta - \beta) = \eta + \beta$. This process can be repeated by choosing different subsets of sample runs to find a finite collection of sets $E_1 \cap R, \ldots, E_n \cap R$ such that $P(E_i \cap R) \leq \eta + \beta$ and $(E_1 \cap R) \cup \cdots \cup (E_n \cap R) = R$. Without loss of generality it can be assumed that the sets are mutually exclusive by re-assigning sets overlaps to one of the sets. This approach can be extended to achieve any desired upper bound $\eta_d$ for a desired $\beta_d$. To do this, first run Algorithm 3 with respect to $\beta$ so that $\eta_d > 2\beta$. This results into a set $\bar{R}$ with probability at least $1 - \beta$ and high confidence $1 - \gamma$. By selecting a subset of sample runs $\Gamma(\beta_d)$ and solving the associated optimization problem, one can obtain $R$ with the desired probability lower-bound $1 - \beta_d$. Now, following the previous strategy for $\eta = \eta_d - \beta$, we can obtain a partition of $R$ and $\bar{R}$ with probability upper bounded by $\bar{\eta} + \beta = \eta_d$ and high confidence $1 - \gamma$.

2) WorstEventSelector module. We now discuss how to select an $E^*$, a most-likely event that leads to a violation of $\varepsilon$-$\delta$ differential privacy; see Algorithm 4. The returned

Algorithm 2 EventListGenerator

1: function EventListGenerator($\mathcal{M}, y_{0:T}^1$)  
2: Input: Target Estimator($\mathcal{M}$)  
3: Sensor Data($y_{0:T}^k$)  
4: HighLikelySet $\leftarrow$ Approximate $R_{[0,k]}$  
5: at each time step $k$  
6: EventList $\leftarrow$ a partition (grid) of  
7: the HighLikelySet  
8: Return EventList  
9: end function

Algorithm 3 HighLikelySet

1: Input: Target Estimator($\mathcal{M}$) with dimension $d_X$  
2: Sensor data($y_{0:T}^1$), parameters $\beta, \gamma$  
3: Output: Matrix $A^k$ and vector $b^k$ representing an  
4: 1-$\beta$-accurate high-likely set at time step $k$  
5: $R_k(A^k, b^k) = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_X} \mid \| A^k x + b^k \|_2 \leq 1 \}$  
6: with confidence $1 - \gamma$.  
7: Set number of samples $\Gamma = \left[ \frac{1}{\beta - 1} \frac{\gamma}{\beta} \log \frac{1}{\gamma} + d_X(d_X + 1)/2 + d_X \right]$  
8: for $k \in \{0, \ldots, T\}$ do  
9: for $i \in \{0, \ldots, \Gamma\}$ do  
10: Record $z_i^k = \mathcal{M}(y_{0,k}^1)$  
11: end for  
12: end for  
13: Solve the convex problem  
14: arg min$_{A^k, b^k} - \log \det A^k$  
15: subject to $\| A^k z_i^k - b^k \|_2 - 1 \leq 0, i = 0, \ldots, \Gamma$  
16: return $A^k, b^k$

WorstEvent ($E^*$) is then used in the Hypothesis Test function in Algorithm 1. First, WorstEventSelector receives an EventList from EventListGenerator. The algorithm runs the estimator $n$ times with each sensor data, and counts the number of estimates that fall in each event of the list, respectively. Then, a PVALUE function is run to get $p^+, p_+$; see Algorithm 5(top). The $p$-values quantify the probability of the Type I error of the test (refer to the next subsection.)

3) HypothesisTest module. The hypothesis test module aims to verify Equation 2 in a data-driven fashion for a fixed $E^*$. Given a sequence of $n$ statistically-independent trials, the occurrence or non-occurrence of $\mathcal{M}(y_{0:T}^1) \in E$ is a Bernoulli sequence and the number of occurrences in $n$ trials is distributed as a Binomial. Thus, Equation 2 reduces to evaluate how the parameters of two Binomial distributions differ. More precisely, define $p_i = P(\mathcal{M}(y_{0:T}^1) \in E^*)$, $i = 1, 2$. By running $n_i$ times the estimator, we count the number of $\mathcal{M}(y_{0:T}^1) \in E^*$ as $c_i$, $i = 1, 2$. Thus, each $c_i$ can be seen as a sample of the binomial distribution $B(n_i, p_i)$, for $i = 1, 2$. However, instead of evaluating $p_i \leq p_2$, we are interested in testing the null hypothesis $p_1 \leq p_2$, with an additional $e$.

Lemma 1 ([72]): Let $Y \sim B(n, p_1)$, and $Z$ be sampled from $B(Y, 1/e^*)$, then, $Z$ is distributed as $B(n, p_1/e^*)$.

Proof: Suppose $Z$ is sampled from a Binomial $(Y, 1/e^*)$ and $Y$ is distributed according to a Binomial
Algorithm 5 Hypothesis Test

1: function PVALUE($c_1, c_2, n, \varepsilon$)
2: \[ c_1 \leftarrow B(c_1, 1/e^{\varepsilon}) \]
3: \[ s \leftarrow c_1 + c_2 \]
4: \[ p^+ \leftarrow 1 - \text{Hypergeom.cdf}(c_1 - 1|2n, n, s) \]
5: \[ c_2 \leftarrow B(c_2, 1/e^{\varepsilon}) \]
6: \[ s \leftarrow c_2 + c_1 \]
7: \[ p^- \leftarrow 1 - \text{Hypergeom.cdf}(c_2 - 1|2n, n, s) \]
8: return $p^+, p^-$
9: end function
10: function HYPOTHESIS_TEST($n, M, \varepsilon, \gamma_0, \gamma_0^*, T$)
11: \[ \text{Input: Target Estimator}(M) \]
12: \[ \text{Desired differential privacy}(\varepsilon) \]
13: \[ \delta\text{-adjacent sensor data}(\gamma_0, \gamma_0^*) \]
14: \[ E^*(\text{Event}) \]
15: \[ O_1 \leftarrow \text{Estimate set after } n \text{ runs of } M(\gamma_0) \]
16: \[ O_2 \leftarrow \text{Estimate set after } n \text{ runs of } M(\gamma_0^*) \]
17: \[ c_1 \leftarrow \{|i| O_1[i] \in E^*\} \]
18: \[ c_2 \leftarrow \{|i| O_2[i] \in E^*\} \]
19: \[ p^+, p^- \leftarrow \text{PVALUE}(c_1, c_2, n, \varepsilon) \]
20: Return $p^+, p^-$
21: end function

$(n, p_1)$, which has two possible outputs: $Y_i = 0$ or $Y_i = 1$. Hence, the unconditional distribution of $Z$ follows:

\[ P(Z_i = 1) = P(Z_i = 1|Y_i = 1)P(Y_i = 1) + P(Z_i = 1|Y_i = 0)P(Y_i = 0) = (1/e^{\varepsilon}) \cdot p_1 + 0 \cdot (1 - p_1) = p_1/e^{\varepsilon} \]

This implies that the unconditional distribution of $Z$ subjects to the $B(n, p_1/e^{\varepsilon})$. \[ \square \]

Hence, the problem can be reduced to the problem of testing the null hypothesis $H_0 : \bar{p} := p_1/e^{\varepsilon} \leq p_2$ on the basis of the samples $c_1$, $c_2$. Checking whether or not $c_1$, $c_2$ are generated from the same binomial distribution can be done via a Fisher’s exact test [14] with $p$-value being equal to 1 - Hypergeometric.cdf($c_1 - 1|n_1 + n_2, n_1, c_1 + c_2$) (cumulative hypergeometric distribution [3]). As an exact test, $c_1 \gg e^{\varepsilon}c_2$ provides firm evidence against the null hypothesis with a given confidence.

The $p$-value is the Type I error of the test, or the probability of incorrectly rejecting $H_0$ when it is indeed true. The null hypothesis is rejected based on a significance level $\alpha$ (typically $0.1, 0.05$ or $0.01$). If $p$ is such that $p \leq \alpha$, then the probability that a mistake is made by rejecting $H_0$ is very small (smaller or equal than $\alpha$).

Since Condition [2] involves two inequalities $p_1 \leq e^{\varepsilon}p_2$ and $p_2 \leq e^{\varepsilon}p_1$, we need to evaluate two null hypotheses. This results into $p_+$ and $p^+$ values that should be larger than $\alpha$ if we want to accept $H_0$; see Algorithm [2].

B. Algorithm Analysis

We introduce an approximate notion of differential privacy; which serves to characterize the proposed method.

**Definition 2:** (High-likelihood and approximate $\varepsilon$-differential privacy). Suppose that $M$ is a state estimator for System [1]. Given $\varepsilon, \delta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, we say that $M$ is $\varepsilon$-$\delta$ differentially private with high likelihood $1 - \theta$ (resp. approximate $\varepsilon$-$\delta$ differentially private) if there exists an event $R$ with $P(R) \geq 1 - \theta$ (resp. there exists a parameter $\lambda$) such that, for any two $\gamma_0, \gamma_0^*$, $i = 1, 2$, with $d_p(\gamma_0, \gamma_0^*) \leq \delta$, we have:

\[ P(M(\gamma_0) \in R) \leq e^\varepsilon P(M(\gamma_0^*) \in R), \]

for $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$ and all events $E \subseteq \text{range}(M)$; (resp. \[ P(M(\gamma_0) \in E) \leq e^\varepsilon P(M(\gamma_0^*) \in E) + \lambda, \] for $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$, and any event $E \subseteq \text{range}(M)$).

**Lemma 2:** Suppose that $M$ is a high-likelihood $\varepsilon$-$\delta$ differentially private estimator, with likelihood $1 - \theta$. Then, $M$ is approximately $\varepsilon$-$\delta$ differentially private.

**Proof:** Let $R$ be the high-likely event wrt which $M$ is high-likely differentially private. Let $\mathcal{R}$ be its complement and $E \subseteq \text{range}(M)$. We have

\[ P(M(\gamma_0) \in E) = P(M(\gamma_0) \in E|\mathcal{R})P(\mathcal{R}) + P(M(\gamma_0) \in E|\mathcal{R})P(\mathcal{R}) \leq e^\varepsilon P(M(\gamma_0^*) \in E|\mathcal{R})P(\mathcal{R}) + \theta P(M(\gamma_0^*) \in E) + \lambda, \]

similarly, exchanging the roles of $\gamma_0$ and $\gamma_0^*$. \[ \square \]

**Definition 2** still requires checking for an infinite number of events. Our test framework limits evaluations to a finite number of events, which we formalize as follows:

**Definition 3** (Differential privacy wrt a space partition): Let $M$ be an estimator of System [1] and $\mathcal{P} = \{E_1, \ldots, E_n\}$ be a space partition of $\text{range}(M)$. We say that $M$ is $\varepsilon$-$\delta$ differential private wrt $\mathcal{P}$ if the definition of $\varepsilon$-$\delta$ differential privacy holds with respect to each $E_k \in \mathcal{P}$.

The following result explains the relationship between differential privacy wrt a partition and as in Definition [1].

**Lemma 3:** Let $M$ be an estimator of System [1] and consider a partition of range $(M)$, $\mathcal{P}_1 = \{E_1, \ldots, E_n\}$, which is finer than another partition $\mathcal{P}_2 = \{F_1, \ldots, F_n\}$. That is, each $F_i$ can be represented by the disjoint union $F_i = \bigcup_{s} E_{s}$. Then, if $M$ is $\varepsilon$-$\delta$ differential privacy wrt $\mathcal{P}_1$, then it is also differentially private wrt $\mathcal{P}_2$.

**Proof:** By assumption, it holds that $P(M(\gamma_0) \in E_i) \leq e^\varepsilon P(M(\gamma_0^*) \in E_i)$ and $P(M(\gamma_0) \in E_i) \leq e^\varepsilon P(M(\gamma_0^*) \in E_i)$ for $\gamma_0, \gamma_0^*$. In the following, we address the first inequality since their treatments are analogous. Take $F_i = E_{1i} \cup \ldots \cup E_{mi}$, then, from the properties of partition, we obtain:

\[ P(M(\gamma_0) \in F_i) = P(M(\gamma_0) \in E_{1i} \cup \ldots \cup E_{mi}) \]

\[ \leq e^\varepsilon \sum_{i=1}^{m_i} P(M(\gamma_0^*) \in E_{wi}) = e^\varepsilon P(M(\gamma_0^*) \in F_i) \]

Similarly, exchanging the roles of $\gamma_0$ and $\gamma_0^*$. This holds true since there is no overlap between each $E_{wi}$. Thus, we
can conclude that if \( \varepsilon - \delta \) differential privacy holds wrt \( P_1 \), it also holds wrt \( P_2 \).

Thus, \( M \) is \( \varepsilon - \delta \) differentially private if and only if it is \( \varepsilon - \delta \) differentially private wrt infinitesimally small partitions. However, by considering partitions of a given resolution, we can guarantee approximate \( \varepsilon - \delta \) differential privacy:

**Lemma 4:** Consider a partition \( P = \{ E_i \}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \) such that \( P(E_i) \leq \eta \) for all \( i \in \mathcal{I} \). Then, if \( \varepsilon - \delta \) differential privacy holds wrt the partition \( P \), then \( M \) is approximately \( \varepsilon - \delta \) differentially private with \( \lambda = 2\eta e^\varepsilon \).

**Proof:** For any \( R \), we have \( \mathbb{P}(M(\gamma_{0:T}^1) \in R) = \sum_i \mathbb{P}(M(\gamma_{0:T}^1) \in R \cap E_i) \). and since \( P \) is a partition, we have

\[
\mathbb{P}(M(\gamma_{0:T}^1) \in R) = \sum_i \mathbb{P}(M(\gamma_{0:T}^1) \in R \cap E_i).
\]

By hypothesis,

\[
\mathbb{P}(M(\gamma_{0:T}^1) \in E_i) \leq e^{\varepsilon} \mathbb{P}(M(\gamma_{0:T}^1) \in E_i) \iff \mathbb{P}(M(\gamma_{0:T}^1) \in E_i \cap (R \cup \overline{R})) \leq e^{\varepsilon} \mathbb{P}(M(\gamma_{0:T}^1) \in E_i \cap (R \cup \overline{R}))
\]
for \( i \in \mathcal{I} \), and where \( \overline{R} \) is the complement of \( R \). Thus,

\[
\mathbb{P}(M(\gamma_{0:T}^1) \in E_i \cap R) + \mathbb{P}(M(\gamma_{0:T}^1) \in E_i \cap \overline{R}) \leq e^{\varepsilon} \mathbb{P}(M(\gamma_{0:T}^1) \in E_i \cap (R \cup \overline{R})) + e^{\varepsilon} \mathbb{P}(M(\gamma_{0:T}^1) \in E_i \cap (R \cup \overline{R})).
\]

Now, if \( P(E_i) \leq \eta \), we have

\[
\mathbb{P}(M(\gamma_{0:T}^1) \in E_i \cap R) \leq e^{\varepsilon} \mathbb{P}(M(\gamma_{0:T}^1) \in E_i \cap R) + 2\eta e^\varepsilon.
\]

Similarly, reversing the roles of \( y_{0:T}^1, y_{0:T}^2 \). This results in the approximate differential privacy as in Equation \([3]\).

Finally, we specify the guarantees of the numerical test.

**Theorem 1:** Let \( M \) be an estimator of System \([1]\) and let \( \varepsilon, \delta, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \). Consider two \( \delta \)-adjacent sensor data, \( y_{0:T}^i, i \in \{1, 2\} \). Let \( P \) be a partition with resolution \( \eta \) of the high-like (1 - \( \beta \)) set \( R \) from Algorithm \([3]\) with high confidence 1 - \( \gamma \). Then, if \( \Gamma \) is selected accordingly, and the estimator passes the test in Algorithm \([1]\), then \( M \) is an approximately \( \varepsilon - \delta \) differentially private wrt \( y_{0:T}^i, i \in \{1, 2\} \), and \( \lambda = \beta + 2\eta e^\varepsilon \), with confidence \((1 - \alpha)/(1 - \gamma)\).

**Proof:** First, from Scenario Optimization \( R \) is a highly likely event (1 - \( \beta \)) with high confidence (1 - \( \gamma \)), and approximate differential privacy with \( \lambda = \beta + 2\eta e^\varepsilon \) is a consequence of the previous lemmas. Second, as Fisher’s test is exact, the chosen significance level \( \alpha \) characterizes exactly the Type I error of the test for any number of samples. If Fisher’s test is applied to the worst-case event in the partition, we can guarantee approximate differential privacy with confidence 1 - \( \gamma \) does not hold with probability \( \alpha \).

To extend the result over any two \( \delta \)-adjacent sensor data, one would have to sample over the measurement space and evaluate the ratio of successes the tests are passed.

**IV. EXPERIMENTS**

In this section, we evaluate our test on a toy dynamical system. All simulations are performed in MATLAB (R2020a).

**a) System Example.** Consider a non-isotropic oscillator in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) with potential function \( V(x^1, x^2) = \frac{1}{2}(x^1)^2 + 4(x^2)^2 \). Thus, the corresponding oscillator particle with position \( x_k = (x^1_k, x^2_k) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \) moves from initial conditions \( x_0^1 = 5, x_0^2 = 0, \dot{x}_0^1 = 0, \dot{x}_0^2 = 2.5 \) under the force -\( AV \). The discrete update equations of our (noiseless) dynamic system take the form \( x_{k+1} = f_0(x_k) = Ax_k, k \geq 0 \), where, \( A \) is a constant matrix. At each time step \( k \), the system state is perturbed by a uniform distribution over \([-0.001, 0.001]^2\]. The distribution of initial conditions is given by a truncated Gaussian mixture with mean vector \((5, 0, 0, 2.5)\) and such that \( \text{diam}(K_0) \) in Theorem 4 of \([9]\) is 0.1.

The target is tracked by a sensor network of 10 nodes located on a circle with center \((0, 0)\) and radius \(10\sqrt{2}\). The sensor model is homogeneous and given by:

\[
y_k^i = h(x_k, q_k) + v_{k,i}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, 10,
\]

where \( q_k, v_k \in \mathbb{R}^2 \) is the position of sensor \( i \) on the circle, and \( x_k = (x^1_k, x^2_k) \) is the position of the target at time \( k \). Here, the hyperbolic tangent function \( \tanh \) is applied in an element-wise way. The vector \( v_k^i \in \mathbb{R}^2 \) represents the observation noise of each sensor, which is generated from the same truncated Gaussian mixture distribution at each time step \( k \) in simulation, indicating that the volume of random noise has a limit. All these observations are stacked together as sensor data \( y_k = (y_k^1, \ldots, y_k^{10})^T \in \mathbb{R}^{20} \) in the \( W_2 \)-MHE.

In order to implement the \( W_2 \)-MHE filter, we consider a time horizon \( T = 8 \) and a moving horizon \( N = 5 \leq T \).

With these simulation settings, \( c_f, l \) in Theorem 4 of \([9]\) can be computed by: \( c_f = \|A\|, l = 2(N + 1)100\|A\| \).

**b) \( \delta \)-adjacent sensor data.** Let us use \( \theta^1 \) and \( \theta^2 \in \mathbb{R} \) to represent the angle of a single sensor that is moved to check for differential privacy. Denote \( \Delta \theta = \|\theta^1 - \theta^2\| \) (distance on the unit circle). By exploiting the Lipschitz’s properties of the function \( h \), it can be verified that the corresponding measurements satisfy:

\[
d_y(y_{0:T}^1, y_{0:T}^2) \leq 10\sqrt{2(T - N + 1)}\Delta \theta = 20\sqrt{2}\Delta \theta.
\]

Thus, in order to generate \( \delta \)-adjacent sensor data, we take

\[
\Delta \theta \leq \frac{\delta}{20\sqrt{2}}.
\]

In the sequel, we take \( \delta = 10 \).

**Numerical Verification Results of \( W_2 \)-MHE.** Here, evaluate the differential privacy of \( W_2 \)-MHE with parameters \( T = 8 \) and \( N = 5 \). An entropy factor \( s_k \in [0, 1] \) determines the distribution of the filter, from \( s_k = 1, \forall k \) — a deterministic \( M \) to \( s_k = 0, \forall k \) — a uniformly distributed random variable.

Fixing \( y_{0:T}^1 \), we run the \( W_2 \)-MHE filter for a number of \( \Gamma \) (= 814) runs to obtain a high-likely set characterized by \( \beta = 0.05, \gamma = 10^{-9} \). This allows us to produce an ellipsoid that contains at least 0.95 of the high-likely set with probability \( \geq 1 - 10^{-9} \). At each time step \( k \), we consider a grid partition of the high-likely set consisting of 4 regions
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Errors are found to be null hypothesis is not rejected and we accept that differential from 0 in Figure 3 (left figure). We mark the critical \(E\) returned as the WorstEvent \(Q\) null hypothesis should always be rejected for all test \(\epsilon\) using the (correct) sensor data generated from On the other hand, from the right figure, the estimates error the two sets of sensor data are distinguishable when \(s\) to denote this event from another set of runs. Then, \(p\)-values are computed for different values of \(\epsilon\). We then use these with the significance parameter \(\alpha\), to be able to accept or reject the null hypothesis and decide whether \(\epsilon\)-\(\delta\) differential privacy is satisfied.

For a fixed sensor setup \(Q_1\), we now report on the numerical results. We first show the simulation results when no entropy term exists (\(s_k = 1, \forall k\) in Theorem 4 of [9]. We use \(s\) to denote \(s_k, \forall k\) below). In Figure 2 from the left figure, the \(p\)-value is always equal to 0, which means that the null hypothesis should always be rejected for all test \(\epsilon\). Thus, the two sets of sensor data are distinguishable when \(s = 1\). On the other hand, from the right figure, the estimates error using the (correct) sensor data generated from \(Q_1\) \((E_{\text{correct}})\) is almost zero and much smaller than \(E_{\text{adjacent}}\). This error \((E_{\text{adjacent}})\) employs sensor data that are in fact generated from adjacent sensor positions to \(Q_1\).

Then, we set \(s = 0.8\) and the simulation results are shown in Figure 3 (left figure). We mark the critical \(\epsilon_c = 0.39947\), where the \(p\)-value grows larger than 0.05. This means that the null hypothesis is not rejected and we accept that differential privacy holds for \(\epsilon \geq 0.39947\), and \(\delta = 10\). The estimate errors are found to be \(E_{\text{correct}} = 0.0040408\) and \(E_{\text{adjacent}} = 0.026032\) for the estimates using the sensor data generated from \(Q_1\) and adjacent sensor positions, respectively. Recall that \(s = 0.8\) implies a relatively low noise injection level.

Decreasing \(s\) to 0.7, leads to a larger entropy term in the \(W_2\)-MHE. As shown in Figure 5 (right figure), the critical \(\epsilon_c\) becomes smaller \((\epsilon = 0.11485)\), confirming that a higher level of differential privacy is achieved. There also is a decrease in accuracy, which can be seen from \(E_{\text{correct}} = 0.0059996\).

Therefore, the tests reflect the expected trade-off between differential privacy and accuracy. In order to choose between two given estimation methods, a designer can either (i) first set a bound on what is the tolerable estimation error, then compare two methods based on the differential privacy level they guarantee based on the given test, or (ii) given a desired level of differential privacy, choose the estimation method that results into the smallest estimation error.

c) Input Perturbation. The work [8] proposes two approaches to obtain differentially-private estimators. The first one randomizes the output of regular estimator \((W_2\)-MHE belongs to this class). The second one perturbs the sensor data, which is then filtered through the original estimator. An advantage of this approach is that users do not need to rely on a trusted server to maintain their privacy since they can themselves release noisy signals. The question is which of the two approaches can lead to a better estimation result for the same level of privacy.

We can now compare these approaches numerically for the \(W_2\)-MHE estimator method. By selecting \(s = 1\) and adding a Gaussian noise directly to both sets of adjacent sensor data, we re-run our test to find the trade-off between accuracy and privacy. The Gaussian noise has zero mean and the covariance matrix \(Q = (1 - \bar{s}) (I + \frac{R + R'}{2})\), where, \(I\) is the identity matrix and \(R\) is a matrix of random numbers \(\in (0, 1)\). A value \(\bar{s} \in [0, 1]\) quantifies how much the sensor data is perturbed. In simulation, we change the value of \(\bar{s}\) and compare the results.

We first set \(\bar{s} = 0.944\) in \(Q\), see Figure 4 (left figure). The estimate error is found to be \(E_{\text{correct}} = 0.0010771\). Then, we decrease \(\bar{s} = 0.894\), see Figure 4 (right figure), and \(E_{\text{correct}} = 0.0013998\). They also show that the higher level of differential privacy is achieved at the loss of accuracy.

From \((s = 0.8, \epsilon_c = 0.39947, E_{\text{correct}} = 0.0040408)\) and \((\bar{s} = 0.894, \epsilon_c = 0.41844, E_{\text{correct}} = 0.0013998)\), we find that although the level of differential privacy is close to each other, the estimate error of \(\bar{s} = 0.894\) is only 1/3 of that of \(s = 0.8\). Thus, the second mechanism (adding noise directly at the mechanism input) seems to indicate that can lead to better accuracy while maintaining the same \(\epsilon\)-\(\delta\) differential
privacy guarantee for this set of sensors.

We further compare the performances of the two mechanisms on other sensor setups (e.g. uniformly located on the circle), see Table I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensor Setup</th>
<th>$W_2$-MHE</th>
<th>Input Perturbation</th>
<th>Better choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$Q_2$</td>
<td>$c_e = 0.93229$</td>
<td>$E_{\text{correct}} = 0.0049874$</td>
<td>$W_2$-MHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_3$</td>
<td>$c_e = 2.3423$</td>
<td>$E_{\text{correct}} = 0.00387826$</td>
<td>$W_2$-MHE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE I: Comparisons of two mechanisms

From the table, we see that performance depend on the specific sensor setups. In 2 out of 3 sensor setups, perturbing the filter output seems the better option. However, more simulation results are needed to reach a reliable conclusion.

d) Differentially private EKF. The framework can also be applied to other differentially private estimators. For comparison, we evaluate the performance of an extended Kalman filter applied to the same examples. Compared EKF, random noise $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} w$ ($w$ is uniformly distributed over $[0,1]$) is added to the filter output at the update step, which makes the estimator differentially private. The initial guess $\mu_0$ is the same for the EKF and for the $W_2$-MHE.

Table II illustrates the EKF test results. Compared with those of $W_2$-MHE, the performance of the EKF remains to be worse than that of $W_2$-MHE with respect to both privacy level and RMSE (for all sensor setups). This is consistent with the fact that $W_2$-MHE performs better than the EKF for multi-modal distributions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensor Setup</th>
<th>$c_e$</th>
<th>$E_{\text{correct}}$</th>
<th>Better choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$Q_2$</td>
<td>0.46223</td>
<td>0.00668285</td>
<td>$W_2$-MHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_2$</td>
<td>1.9239</td>
<td>0.00646868</td>
<td>$W_2$-MHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_3$</td>
<td>2.3085</td>
<td>0.00626085</td>
<td>$W_2$-MHE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II: Diff-private EKF test results

e) Correctness of sufficient condition for $W_2$-MHE. Theorem 4 of [9] provides with a theoretical formula to calculate $s$ that guarantees $\varepsilon_\delta$ differential privacy. Since this condition is derived using several assumptions and upper bounds, the answer is in general expected to be conservative.

In order to make comparisons, we choose the sensor setup $Q_2$ and take $s = 0.8$ for simulation. The value of other parameters are: $T = 7$ (for less computation), $c_f = 1.0777, c_h = 100, l = 1293.2(N = 5), \text{diam}(K_0) = 0.1, \delta = 10$. Plug these values into the theorem, we can obtain $\varepsilon \geq 6474.3$. In simulation, the critical $c_e = 0.89281$. Upon inspection, it is clear that the theoretical answer is much more conservative than the approximated one, which indicates that if $\varepsilon \geq 0.89281$, differential privacy is satisfied with high confidence wrt the given space partition. While this is a necessary condition for privacy, we run a few more simulations to test how this changes for finer space partitions. For instance, we can run 3 $r = 3$ (9 regions per time step), $\varepsilon_e = 0.98162$

1) $r = 3$ (9 regions per time step), $\varepsilon_e = 0.98162$
2) $r = 4$ (16 regions per time step), $\varepsilon_e = 1.9939$
3) $r \geq 5$, much more computation are required (numbr of events increases exponentially)

As observed, a finer space partition leads an increase of $\varepsilon_e$.

V. CONCLUSION

This work presents a numerical test framework to evaluate the differential privacy of continuous-range mechanisms such as state estimators. This includes a precise quantitation of its performance guarantees. Then, we apply the numerical method on differentially-private versions of the $W_2$-MHE filter, and compare it with competing approaches. Future work will be devoted to obtain more efficient algorithms that; e.g., refine the considered partition adaptively.
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