arXiv:2201.00751v2 [math.ST] 31 Aug 2022

On robustness and local differential privacy

Mengchu Li, Thomas B. Berrett and Yi Yu

Department of Statistics, University of Warwick

September 1, 2022

Abstract

It is of soaring demand to develop statistical analysis tools that are robust against contamination as well as preserving individual data owners' privacy. In spite of the fact that both topics host a rich body of literature, to the best of our knowledge, we are the first to systematically study the connections between the optimality under Huber's contamination model and the local differential privacy (LDP) constraints.

In this paper, we start with a general minimax lower bound result, which disentangles the costs of being robust against Huber's contamination and preserving LDP. We further study four concrete examples: a two-point testing problem, a potentially-diverging mean estimation problem, a nonparametric density estimation problem and a univariate median estimation problem. For each problem, we demonstrate procedures that are optimal in the presence of both contamination and LDP constraints, comment on the connections with the state-of-the-art methods that are only studied under either contamination or privacy constraints, and unveil the connections between robustness and LDP via partially answering whether LDP procedures are robust and whether robust procedures can be efficiently privatised. Overall, our work showcases a promising prospect of joint study for robustness and local differential privacy.

Keywords: Huber's contamination model; Local differential privacy; Minimax optimality.

1 Introduction

In modern data collection and analysis, the privacy of individuals is a key concern. There has been a surge of interest in developing data analysis methodologies that yield strong statistical performance without compromising individuals' privacy, largely driven by applications in modern technology, including in Google (e.g. Erlingsson et al. 2014), Apple (e.g. Tang et al. 2017) and Microsoft (e.g. Ding et al. 2017), and by pressure from regulatory bodies (e.g. Forti 2021, Aridor et al. 2021). The prevailing framework for the development of private methodology is that of differential privacy (Dwork et al. 2006). Although this originates in cryptography, there is a growing body of statistical literature that aims to explore the constraints of this framework and provide procedures that make optimal use of available data (e.g. Wasserman & Zhou 2010, Duchi et al. 2018, Rohde & Steinberger 2020, Cai et al. 2021). Work in this area is split between central models of privacy, where there is a third party trusted to collect and analyse data before releasing privatised results, and local models of privacy, where data are randomised before collection. We, in this paper, will consider the local differential privacy constraint, to be formally defined in Section 1.2. While classical methods for locally private analysis are restricted to the estimation of the parameter of a binomial distribution (Warner 1965), modern research has resulted in mechanisms for many other statistical problems including various hypothesis testing problems (e.g. Kairouz et al. 2014, Joseph et al. 2019, Berrett & Butucea 2020, Acharya et al.

2022, Lam-Weil et al. 2022), mean and median estimation (e.g. Duchi et al. 2018), nonparametric estimation problems (e.g. Rohde & Steinberger 2020, Butucea et al. 2020), and change point analysis (e.g. Berrett & Yu 2021, Li et al. 2022), to name but a few.

In addition to preserving individuals' privacy, being robust to outliers and adversarial contamination is another desideratum for modern learning algorithms. The study of robust statistical procedures has sparked great interest among statisticians and there have been a number illuminating textbooks in this area (e.g. Huber & Ronchetti 2009, Hampel et al. 2011, Huber 2004, Maronna et al. 2019). The focus of classical robust statistics is on the analysis of outliers' influence on statistical procedures, quantified through specific notions such as the breakdown point and influence function. Due to the demands of analysing more complex data types, the focus has, more recently, shifted towards providing non-asymptotic guarantees on convergence rates under various contamination models, including heavy-tailed models (e.g. Catoni 2012, Lugosi & Mendelson 2019), different types of model mis-specification (e.g. Huber 1968, Cherukuri & Hota 2020), and strong contamination models (e.g. Diakonikolas et al. 2017, Lugosi & Mendelson 2021, Pensia et al. 2020). A number of computationally-efficient algorithms that achieve (nearly) minimax rate-optimal rates under either one or more aforementioned models have also been proposed for various tasks; see Diakonikolas et al. (2019) for a recent survey.

The connections between differential privacy and robustness have been well studied in the central model of differential privacy, where there is a trusted data curator. A natural starting point for many differentially private estimators is a function of the data whose sensitivity to changes in single observations can be controlled (e.g. Dwork et al. 2006, Dwork & Lei 2009, Canonne et al. 2019, Cai et al. 2021). This is also the case for robust statistics, where estimators are often constructed in order to be minimally sensitive to arbitrary changes in a small number of data points (e.g. Huber & Ronchetti 2009, Huber 2004). See Avella-Medina (2020) for further discussion of these connections. There has been, recently, an increasing trend, mostly in the theoretical computer science literature, of developing algorithms that are simultaneously robust and privacy preserving under the central model (e.g. Dimitrakakis et al. 2014, Ghazi et al. 2021, Esfandiari et al. 2021, Kothari et al. 2021, Liu et al. 2021). There is, however, little work on the connection between privacy and robustness in the local model of differential privacy. A key feature to set apart our work from the aforementioned robust procedures in the central models is that in the central models it is possible to add noise after computing robust estimators, but in local privacy the requirement to add noise to each observation separately means that the approaches taken in the two models are fundamentally different. Note that some very recent works (Cheu et al. 2021, Acharya et al. 2021, Chhor & Sentenac 2022) consider contamination after the privatisation step and the results therein feature an interaction of privacy level α and contamination level ε. In our work, we suppose that contamination happens before the data are sent for privatisation.

1.1 A summary of our contributions

This paper concerns the pursuit of answers to the questions:

Q1. *Can robust procedures be directly applied to privatised information and attain optimal performance?*

Q2. *Can locally private procedures be automatically robust?*

To address the aforementioned questions, in this work we will study a range of statistical problems, including hypothesis testing (Section 2), mean estimation (Section 3), nonparametric density estimation (Section 4) and median estimation (Appendix E) with data assumed to be generated according to Huber's ε-contamination model (e.g. Huber 1992), specified in (1).

As for Q1, when studying Huber's contamination model without privacy constraints, Chen et al. (2016) developed a general theory and showed that a Scheffé tournament method provides optimal estimators for many problems. Such a method discretises the parameter space and reduces estimation problems to hypothesis selection problems. However, it was shown by Gopi et al. (2020) that hypothesis selection is exponentially more difficult under local privacy constraints, prohibiting the use of this general learning scheme in many specific statistical learning tasks; we discuss this aspect in Section 2.3. Despite this negative answer to Q1 for this general robust procedure, for the specific problems considered in the sequel, we will show that optimal LDP procedures can be regarded as robust procedures applied to privatised data. See Sections 2.3, 3.3 and 4.3 for details.

As for Q2, it turns out that there are deep connections between locally private estimation and estimation within Huber's contamination model. Chen et al. (2016) showed that the total variation modulus of continuity, defined in (5), controls the difficulty of a wide range of statistical problems studied under contamination. On the other hand, Rohde & Steinberger (2020) showed that this modulus is also the key quantity in understanding the difficulty of a general class of estimation problems under local privacy. We further explore this relationship, and show that suitably-chosen procedures for locally private estimation are also optimal when Huber's contamination is introduced. More importantly, we see that in specific problems the costs of preserving privacy and contamination are separable, which matches the intuition behind our lower bound result in Proposition 1.

In this paper, we will show that for a range of statistical problems, we are able to find procedures that are simultaneously robust, privacy-preserving and statistically rate-optimal, in terms of the contamination proportion ε, the privacy parameter α, the sample size n and other model parameters that may occur in specific problems.

- Section 2 considers a simple hypothesis testing problem. When contamination is introduced, this becomes a composite hypothesis testing problem where the separation between the hypotheses depends on the level of contamination. We study a combination of the Scheffé test (Devroye & Lugosi 2001) and the randomised response mechanism (Warner 1965), that results in a test that has previously been used for hypothesis testing under local differential privacy constraint (e.g. Joseph et al. 2019, Gopi et al. 2020). We obtain matching upper and lower bounds to prove that this procedure is optimal under Huber's contamination and privacy constraints.

- In Section 3, we turn our attention to robust mean estimation, where the inlier distribution has bounded kth central moment for some fixed $k > 1$, and unknown mean in $[-D, D]$ for some potentially diverging $D \geq 1$. We propose a procedure that is minimax rate-optimal in terms of the mean upper bound D, the sample size n, the privacy parameter α and the contamination proportion ε. Previous work on mean estimation under local differential privacy (Duchi et al. 2018) assumes that $D = 1$ and deploys a Laplace privacy mechanism, which we show is sub-optimal when D is large. Previous work has noted the difficulty of private estimation with unbounded parameter spaces, both in the central model of privacy (Brunel & Avella-Medina 2020, Kamath et al. 2021) and the local model (Duchi et al. 2013). In the central model, bounds on the unknown mean can be avoided with careful procedures, but in the local model consistent estimation is impossible when $D = \infty$, even without contamination (see Appendix G, Duchi et al. 2013). We derive a phase transition phenomenon, whereby there exists a boundary for D beyond which consistent estimation is impossible and below which a rate-optimal procedure is available.

- We study nonparametric density estimation problems in Section 4. The procedures we consider are the basis expansion procedures of Duchi et al. (2018) and Butucea et al. (2020). We give new analyses to show that these privacy procedures remain minimax

rate-optimal with additional Huber's contamination introduced, for squared-L_2 and L_∞ losses, respectively.

- In Appendix E, we study a univariate median estimation problem, deploying a locally private stochastic gradient descent method (e.g. Duchi et al. 2018). Different from the privacy mechanism in the aforementioned three problems, the privacy mechanism here is sequentially interactive. We show that this method is robust against Huber contamination and minimax rate-optimal regarding all the model parameters.

1.2 General setup

We will now formally define the framework we study. Let $\mathcal{P}$ denote a class of distributions on the sample space $\mathcal{X}$ and let $\mathcal{G} \supset \mathcal{P}$ denote the set of all distributions on $\mathcal{X}$. Two key ingredients in this paper are: (a) robustness against Huber's contamination and (b) privacy preservation in the sense of local differential privacy.

As for the contamination, to be specific, we consider problems where data are generated not directly from $P \in \mathcal{P}$, but from a contaminated distribution $P_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{P})$, where $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{P})$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{P}) = \{P_\varepsilon = (1-\varepsilon)P + \varepsilon G : \varepsilon \in [0,1],\ P \in \mathcal{P},\ G \in \mathcal{G}\}. \tag{1}$$

The class of distributions $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{P})$ is known as the Huber ε-contamination model (Huber 2004) in the robust statistics literature.

As for the privacy, formally speaking, a privacy mechanism is a conditional distribution of the privatised data given the raw data, i.e. $Q(\cdot|x_1,\ldots,x_n)$, $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset \mathcal{X}$, when the raw data are $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$. A privacy mechanism is said to be α-*differentially private*, if for all possible observations $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{x_i'\}_{i=1}^n$ that differ in at most one coordinate, it holds that

$$\sup_A \frac{Q(A|x_1,\ldots,x_n)}{Q(A|x_1',\ldots,x_n')} \le e^\alpha, \tag{2}$$

where the supremum is taken over all measurable sets A.

For an α-differentially private mechanism to satisfy *the local privacy constraint*, the output is of the form $\{Z_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset \mathcal{Z}$, where Z_1 is generated solely based on X_1, and for each $i \in \{2,\ldots,n\}$, $n \ge 2$, Z_i is generated based on X_i and $\{Z_j\}_{j=1}^{i-1}$. The constraint (2) can therefore be written in terms of the conditional distributions Q_i's that generate Z_i's, i.e.

$$\max_{i=1,\ldots,n} \sup_A \sup_{z_1,\ldots,z_{i-1}\in\mathcal{Z}} \sup_{x,x'\in\mathcal{X}} \frac{Q_i(A|x,z_1,\ldots,z_{i-1})}{Q_i(A|x',z_1,\ldots,z_{i-1})} \le e^\alpha, \tag{3}$$

with the convention that $\{z_1,\cdots,z_j\} = \emptyset$ if $j < 1$. Any conditional distribution Q that satisfies (3) is said to be an α-*locally differentially private (LDP) privacy mechanism* (see e.g. Duchi et al. 2018). We write $\mathcal{Q}_\alpha$ for the set of all α-LDP privacy mechanisms.

From (3), we can see that $\alpha > 0$ represents the desired level of privacy which is an input to the data analysis – the larger α is the less protected the raw data are. In this paper we focus on the high-privacy regime $0 < \alpha \le 1$, where α may be a function of the sample size n. As we will discuss in more detail later, we will require that $n\alpha^2$ diverges, as the sample size n grows unbounded.

With both the ingredients in hand, we define the α-*LDP minimax risk under contamination*, which is at the centre of the analysis in this paper; that is,

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\theta(\mathcal{P}), \Phi\circ\rho, \varepsilon) = \inf_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}_\alpha} \inf_{\hat\theta} \sup_{P_\varepsilon\in\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{P})} \mathbb{E}_{P_\varepsilon,Q}\left[\Phi\circ\rho\left\{\hat\theta,\, \theta(P)\right\}\right], \tag{4}$$

where

- the population quantity of interest is $\theta(P) \in \Theta$, denoting a functional supported on $\mathcal{P}$;
- the bivariate function ρ is a semi-metric on the space Θ and $\Phi : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is a non-decreasing function with $\Phi(0) = 0$;
- the first infimum is taken over all possible α-LDP privacy mechanisms;
- the second infimum is over all measurable functions $\hat{\theta} = \hat{\theta}(Z_1, \ldots, Z_n)$ of the privatised data generated from privacy mechanism Q; and
- the loss function is in the form of an unconditional expectation, with respect to both the data generating mechanism P_ε and the privacy mechanism Q.

As detailed in (4), our goal is to understand the fundamental limits imposed by both the contamination and the privacy constraint. In Proposition 1 below, we show that such statistical tasks are at least as hard as either only preserving privacy at level α without contamination or only being robust against contamination without preserving privacy.

Proposition 1. *For any $\varepsilon \in [0, 1)$, define the total variation modulus of continuity $\omega(\varepsilon)$ to be*

$$\omega(\varepsilon) = \sup\{\rho(\theta(R_0), \theta(R_1)) : \mathrm{TV}(R_0, R_1) \leq \varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon), R_0, R_1 \in \mathcal{P}\}. \tag{5}$$

Define the α-LDP minimax risk without contamination to be

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\theta(\mathcal{P}), \Phi \circ \rho) = \mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\theta(\mathcal{P}), \Phi \circ \rho, 0),$$

with $\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ defined in (4). For any given $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$, it holds that

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\theta(\mathcal{P}), \Phi \circ \rho, \varepsilon) \geq \mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\theta(\mathcal{P}), \Phi \circ \rho) \vee \frac{\Phi(\omega(\varepsilon)/2)}{2}.$$

We remark that Theorem 5.1 in Chen et al. (2018) provided a general lower bound under the Huber contamination model for non-private data. Proposition 1 extends it to a general case that accounts for the LDP constraint. A key aspect of the lower bound in Proposition 1 is that the cost of contamination is separated from that of privacy, i.e. the level of privacy required does not increase the error introduced by the contamination. In the sequel, we will show that this lower bound is tight in the estimation problems we consider, while a similar decoupling of a slightly different form can be found for our testing problem. In the examples we consider, the difficulty of the combined problem of robustness and LDP is the difficulty of the harder one of the two individual problems. We see this disentanglement as a sign of the connection between privacy and robustness. In our examples we have shown that it is possible to find optimal procedures that are simultaneously privacy-preserving and robust. We have not found any problems for which privacy precludes robustness, or vice-versa.

The intuition behind Proposition 1 is that if the two distributions are indistinguishable on the raw data space $\mathcal{X}$, then no 'transformation' Q can distinguish them either. Note that a similar quantity to $\omega(\varepsilon)$ was used by Donoho & Liu (1991), where the Hellinger distance was considered instead of the total variance distance, to translate perturbations in the distribution to perturbations in the quantities of interest measured by the chosen loss function - $\rho(\theta(R_0), \theta(R_1))$.

1.3 Notation

For $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, let $a \wedge b = \min(a, b)$, $a \vee b = \max(a, b)$ and $a_+ = a \vee 0$. For non-negative real sequences $\{a_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_+}$ and $\{b_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_+}$, $a_n \ll b_n$ denotes that $\lim_{n\to\infty} a_n/b_n = 0$, $a_n \gg b_n$ denotes that $b_n \ll a_n$, $a_n \lesssim b_n$ denotes the existence of a constant $C > 0$ such that $\limsup_{n\to\infty} a_n/b_n \leq C$, $a_n \gtrsim b_n$ denotes that $b_n \lesssim a_n$ and $a_n \asymp b_n$ denotes that $a_n \lesssim b_n \lesssim a_n$. Let $\mathbb{N}_+$ denote all positive integers and $\mathbb{R}_+$ denote the set of non-negative real numbers. Let $|S|$ denote

the cardinality of a set S. For two distributions P_a and P_b, their total variation distance is $\mathrm{TV}(P_a, P_b) = \sup_S |P_a(S) - P_b(S)|$, where the supremum is taken over all measurable sets S; and their Kullback–Leibler divergence is $\mathrm{KL}(P_a, P_b) = \int \log(\mathrm{d}P_a/\mathrm{d}P_b)\,\mathrm{d}P_a$, if P_a is absolutely continuous with respect to P_b. Let $L_2[0,1] = \{f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R} : \int_0^1 f^2(x)\,\mathrm{d}x < \infty\}$. A random variable X is sub-exponential with parameters (τ, b) if $\mathbb{E}[\exp\{\lambda(X - \mathbb{E}(X))\}] \leq \exp(\lambda^2\tau^2/2)$, for $|\lambda| \leq 1/b$.

2 Robust testing under local differential privacy

Under the general setup described in Section 1.2, assuming that $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ are i.i.d. random variables generated from P on $\mathcal{X}$, we consider the robust testing problem

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{H}_0 : P \in \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(P_0) = \{P_\varepsilon : (1-\varepsilon)P_0 + \varepsilon G,\, G \in \mathcal{G}\} \\ \text{vs.}\quad &\mathrm{H}_1 : P \in \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(P_1) = \{P_\varepsilon : (1-\varepsilon)P_1 + \varepsilon G,\, G \in \mathcal{G}\}, \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where P_0 and P_1 are two fixed distributions supported on $\mathcal{X}$, and $\mathcal{G}$ is the set of all distributions supported on $\mathcal{X}$. In this section, we are interested in testing (6) under an α-LDP constraint. For a given α-LDP privacy mechanism Q, we let $\Phi_Q = \{\phi : \mathcal{Z}^n \to \{0,1\}\}$ denote the set of all $\{0,1\}$-valued measurable functions of privatised data $\{Z_i\}_{i=1}^n$ generated via the privacy mechanism Q. The α-LDP minimax testing risk can be written as

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\varepsilon) = \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha} \inf_{\phi \in \Phi_Q} \left\{ \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(P_0)} \mathbb{E}_{P,Q}(\phi) + \sup_{P' \in \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(P_1)} \mathbb{E}_{P',Q}(1-\phi) \right\}, \tag{7}$$

which corresponds to (4) with $\mathcal{P} = \{P_0, P_1\}$ and ρ being the 0-1 loss, i.e. $\rho = 0$ if ϕ returns the correct hypothesis and $\rho = 1$ otherwise. Note that, by considering the trivial test that always rejects H_0, we have $\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\varepsilon) \leq 1$.

To fully understand the hardness of (6), we construct lower and upper bounds on $\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\varepsilon)$ in Sections 2.1 and 2.2, respectively. We conclude in Section 2.3 with a discussion of the existing literature. In Appendix B.2 we show that very similar results hold when the LDP constraint is relaxed to a general class of local privacy constraints, namely Rényi local differential privacy.

2.1 Lower bound

In Proposition 2 below, we provide a lower bound on the α-LDP minimax testing risk $\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\varepsilon)$, in terms of the sample size n, the privacy constraint α, the total variation distance $\mathrm{TV}(P_0, P_1)$ and the Huber contamination proportion ε. As we will discuss later, this result also serves as an infeasibility result by providing conditions on the testing problem (6) for the existence of a non-trivial test with a vanishing risk.

Proposition 2. *For $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and the robust testing problem defined in (6), it holds that the α-LDP minimax testing risk defined in (7) satisfies*

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\varepsilon) \geq \exp\left\{-16\alpha^2 n \{\mathrm{TV}(P_0, P_1) - \varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon)\}_+^2\right\}.$$

An immediate consequence of this lower bound is that $\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\varepsilon) = 1$ whenever $\mathrm{TV}(P_0, P_1) \leq \varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon)$. Indeed, this can be seen by a simpler argument since, in this case, according to Lemma 9 there exists some $\widetilde{P} \in \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(P_0) \cap \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(P_1)$, and therefore

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\varepsilon) \geq \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha} \inf_{\phi \in \Phi_Q} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{P},Q}[\phi] + \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{P},Q}[1-\phi] \right\} = 1.$$

In particular, whenever $\varepsilon \geq 1/2$ we have that $\varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon) \geq 1 \geq \mathrm{TV}(P_0, P_1)$, so that $\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\varepsilon) = 1$.

2.2 Upper bound

Given the lower bound in Proposition 2, we are to show that a folklore test based on the randomised response mechanism and the Scheffé set (e.g. Devroye & Lugosi 2001) is minimax rate-optimal for the testing problem (6).

Step 1. (Privatisation.) Given data $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$, let $Y_i = \mathbb{1}\{X_i \in A^c\}$, where A is the Scheffé set of P_0 and P_1 in (6), i.e. $A = \arg\max_{S\subset\mathcal{X}}\{P_0(S) - P_1(S)\}$. Let the privatised data Z_i's be obtained via the randomised response mechanism. To be specific, let $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be independent Unif$[0,1]$ random variables that are independent of $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$. For $i \in \{1,\dots,n\}$, let

$$Z_i = \begin{cases} Y_i, & U_i \le e^\alpha/(1+e^\alpha), \\ 1 - Y_i, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

Step 2. (Test construction.) Let

$$\widehat{N}_0 = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{Z_i = 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{N}_0 = \frac{e^\alpha+1}{e^\alpha-1}\left(\widehat{N}_0 - \frac{n}{e^\alpha+1}\right).$$

The test is then defined as

$$\tilde{\phi} = \mathbb{1}\left\{|\widetilde{N}_0/n - P_0(A)| > |\widetilde{N}_0/n - P_1(A)|\right\} = \mathbb{1}\left\{2\widetilde{N}_0/n < P_0(A) + P_1(A)\right\}. \tag{9}$$

Note that the privacy mechanism defined in Step 1 satisfies the α-LDP constraint in (3) (e.g. Gopi et al. 2020). In fact, the test $\tilde{\phi}$ and a non-private counterpart have been used in the non-robust two-point testing problem with LDP constraints (e.g. Algorithm 6 in Joseph et al. 2019; Algorithm 4 in Gopi et al. 2020) and the robust two-point testing problem without LDP constraints (e.g. Section 2 in Chen et al. 2016), respectively. It is known to be optimal in both cases. The following theorem, combining previous analyses, shows that this test $\tilde{\phi}$ is still optimal under both the privacy constraint and the presence of contamination.

Theorem 3. *For $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and the robust testing problem defined in (6), assuming that $\mathrm{TV}(P_0,P_1) > 2\varepsilon$ with $\varepsilon \in [0,1/2)$, the test defined in (8) and (9) satisfies that*

$$\sup_{P\in\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(P_0)} \mathbb{E}_{P,Q}(\tilde{\phi}) + \sup_{P'\in\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(P_1)} \mathbb{E}_{P',Q}(1-\tilde{\phi}) \le 2\exp[-C\alpha^2 n\{\mathrm{TV}(P_0,P_1) - 2\varepsilon\}^2],$$

where $C > 0$ is some absolute constant.

We first note that in Theorem 3, we require $\varepsilon < 1/2$, which, as discussed above, is necessary for the existence of non-trivial tests. Further, since $\varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon) \ge \varepsilon$, the lower bound in Proposition 2 implies that

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\varepsilon) \ge \exp\left\{-16\alpha^2 n\{\mathrm{TV}(P_0,P_1) - \varepsilon\}_+^2\right\}. \tag{10}$$

Comparing the upper bound in Theorem 3 and the lower bound in (10), up to constants, we see that the test $\tilde{\phi}$ is optimal in terms of the privacy constraint α, the sample size n, the separation $\mathrm{TV}(P_0,P_1)$ and the contamination proportion ε.

Remark 1 (When ε is known)**.** When ε is known, a modification of the test procedure defined in (8) and (9) achieves slightly better performance and shows that consistent testing is possible if and only if $\mathrm{TV}(P_0,P_1) > \varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon)$. With the same privacy mechanism as in (8), consider

$$\phi' = \mathbb{1}\left\{2\widetilde{N}_0/n < (1-\varepsilon)\{P_0(A) + P_1(A)\} + \varepsilon\right\},$$

which uses the same test statistic but compares it to a different critical value. Similar calculations to those carried out for Theorem 3 show that

$$\sup_{P\in\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(P_0)} \mathbb{E}_{P,Q}(\phi') + \sup_{P'\in\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(P_1)} \mathbb{E}_{P',Q}(1-\phi') \le 2\exp[-C'\alpha^2 n\{\mathrm{TV}(P_0,P_1)-\varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon)\}_+^2]$$

for some absolute constant $C'>0$, provided $\alpha\in(0,1]$. We now see that, when $\mathrm{TV}(P_0,P_1)\le \varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon)$ we have $\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\varepsilon)=1$, and when $\mathrm{TV}(P_0,P_1)>\varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon)+1/\sqrt{n\alpha^2}$ we have

$$-\log \mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\varepsilon) \asymp \alpha^2 n\{\mathrm{TV}(P_0,P_1)-\varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon)\}_+^2.$$

Details of the calculations are given at the end of Section B.1.

Remark 2 (Relation to Proposition 1)**.** The derived minimax error rate does not match the form given in Proposition 1. This form appears to be most suitable for estimation problems, while for testing problems we must look at the error slightly differently. Indeed, it is common in the theory of hypothesis testing to look at conditions under which errors are below given thresholds, often through minimal separation rates, rather than errors themselves (e.g. Ingster & Suslina 2003). In problem (6) the total variation modulus of continuity is given by

$$\omega(\varepsilon)=\sup\big\{\mathbb{1}_{\{\theta(R_1)\neq\theta(R_0)\}} : \mathrm{TV}(R_0,R_1)\le\varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon), R_0,R_1\in\{P_0,P_1\}\big\}=\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathrm{TV}(P_0,P_1)\le\varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon)\}},$$

so we have $\omega(\varepsilon)\le 0.1$ if and only if $\mathrm{TV}(P_0,P_1)>\varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon)$. Moreover, we have seen that, up to constants, $\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(0)\le 0.1$ if and only if $\mathrm{TV}(P_0,P_1)$ is larger than $(n\alpha^2)^{-1/2}$ and, on the other hand, $\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\varepsilon)\le 0.1$ if and only if $\mathrm{TV}(P_0,P_1)\ge\varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon)+(n\alpha^2)^{-1/2}$. Thus $\mathrm{TV}(P_0,P_1)$ is seen to characterise when each of $\omega(\varepsilon),\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(0),\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\varepsilon)$ is below the (arbitrary) threshold 0.1. The level that $\mathrm{TV}(P_0,P_1)$ must exceed for $\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\varepsilon)\le 0.1$ is given by the *sum* of the levels required for $\omega(\varepsilon)\le 0.1$ and $\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(0)\le 0.1$, and we see a decoupling of the contamination and the privacy.

2.3 Discussion

Our results in Proposition 2 and Theorem 3 share similar spirits as Theorem 5.7 in Joseph et al. (2019), which stated a minimax lower bound result in terms of the sample complexity and presented an algorithm using a Laplace mechanism that achieves the optimal sample complexity. In particular, they considered a compound hypothesis testing problem where H_0 and H_1 correspond to convex and compact sets of discrete distributions well-separated in terms of total variation distance, whereas our result concerns the Huber contamination model, with different proof schemes.

An extension of the two-point testing problem defined in (6) is the hypothesis selection, which is popular in both computer science and statistics literature (e.g. Gopi et al. 2020, Bun et al. 2019, Yatracos 1985, Devroye & Lugosi 2001, Chen et al. 2016). To be specific, for a fixed but unknown distribution $P\in\mathcal{P}$, given a set of $k_0\in\mathbb{N}_+$ distributions $\mathcal{Q}=\{q_1,\dots,q_{k_0}\}\subset\mathcal{G}$, one seeks an element in $\mathcal{Q}$ that is closest to P in the total variation distance. In particular, taking $\mathcal{Q}$ to be a δ-covering set ($\delta>0$) of $\mathcal{P}$, with k_0 being the δ-covering number, this hypothesis selection problem is similar to an estimation problem of the distribution P. Based on this setup, Chen et al. (2016) showed that applying a tournament procedure with non-private counterparts of $\tilde{\phi}$, to a δ-covering set of $\mathcal{P}$, is minimax rate-optimal for estimating $P\in\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{P})$ in terms of the total variation metric. Their procedure returns an element $\widehat{P}\in\mathcal{Q}$, with high probability, satisfying that

$$\mathrm{TV}(\widehat{P},P)\lesssim\{\sqrt{\log(k_0)/n+\delta^2}\}\vee\varepsilon.$$

With $\delta=\inf\{\delta_1 : n\ge\log(k_0)/\delta_1^2\}$, it holds that $\mathrm{TV}(\widehat{P},P)\lesssim\delta\vee\varepsilon$, and $n\ge\log(k_0)/\delta^2$ is called the sample complexity of the procedure. Based on the same setup, Bun et al. (2019) considered the problem under the central privacy model but without contamination, i.e. $P\in\mathcal{P}$,

and they developed an algorithm that guarantees $\mathrm{TV}(\widehat{P}, P) \lesssim \delta$ with the sample complexity $n \gtrsim \log(k_0)/\delta^2 + \log(k_0)/(\delta\alpha)$. Note that in both these two problems, k_0 appears in the sample complexity through its logarithm $\log(k_0)$.

However, under local privacy constraints, Gopi et al. (2020) established a lower bound (cf. Theorem 2 in Gopi et al. 2020) on the sample complexity of $n \gtrsim k_0/(\delta^2\alpha^2)$, which shows that the cost of this general estimation method induced by a δ-covering set is exponentially higher in the local privacy setting compared to the central privacy and non-private settings. The exponential gap in the sample complexity directly leads to a suboptimal rate for estimation tasks. In Example 1, we state an example illustrating the suboptimality of hypothesis selection approaches to estimation problems, even in simple parametric problems, which motivates our proposals of *problem-specific* estimation procedures studied in the rest of this paper.

Example 1. Consider $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ to be i.i.d. random variables from $\mathcal{N}(\mu, 1)$, $\mu \in [-D, D]$. Estimating μ is a special case of the robust mean estimation problem in Section 3. For this problem, we have $k_0 \asymp D/\delta$. Theorem 2 in Gopi et al. (2020) implies that the sample complexity of the associated hypothesis selection problem is

$$n \gtrsim \frac{k_0}{\delta^2\alpha^2} \asymp \frac{D/\delta}{\delta^2\alpha^2} = \frac{D}{\delta^3\alpha^2}, \quad \text{i.e. } \delta \gtrsim \left(\frac{D}{n\alpha^2}\right)^{1/3}.$$

Since $\mathrm{TV}(\mathcal{N}(\mu, 1), \mathcal{N}(\mu', 1)) \asymp |\mu - \mu'|$ (Devroye et al. 2018), this implies that any estimator $\hat{\mu}$ obtained based on the δ-covering set would have convergence rate measured by $|\hat{\mu} - \mu|$ bounded below by $\{D/(n\alpha^2)\}^{1/3}$. However, since Gaussian distributions have moments of all orders, we will see that we can attain a near-parametric upper bound by applying Theorem 5 below with arbitrarily large k.

As for the questions Q1 and Q2 raised in Section 1.1, in this two-point testing problem, we see that

- there exists a procedure optimal against contamination (Section 2 in Chen et al. 2016) that can be properly privatised to achieve optimal performance; and
- there exists an α-LDP procedure (Joseph et al. 2019) that is automatically robust and minimax rate-optimal.

3 Robust mean estimation under local differential privacy

Recalling the general setup in Section 1.2, in this section we consider distributions supported on the real line, i.e. $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}$, with finite kth ($k > 1$) central moments and possibly diverging expectation, as the sample size grows unbounded. We are interested in estimating the expectation, i.e. $\theta(P) = \mathbb{E}_{X\sim P}(X)$. To be specific, we let

$$\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_k = \left\{P : \mu = \mathbb{E}_{X\sim P}(X) \in [-D, D],\, \sigma^k = \mathbb{E}_{X\sim P}[|X - \mu|^k] \le 1\right\}, \tag{11}$$

where k is considered fixed but arbitrary and $D \ge 1$ may be a function of the sample size.

We again assume the data are generated from Huber's contamination model (1). Let $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be i.i.d. random variables with distribution $P_{k,\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{P}_k)$ and suppose that we are interested in estimating the expectation of the inlier distribution μ.

The α-LDP minimax risk defined in (4) takes its specific form in the robust mean estimation problem as follows

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\varepsilon) = \mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\theta(\mathcal{P}_k), (\cdot)^2, \varepsilon) = \inf_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}_\alpha} \inf_{\hat{\mu}} \sup_{P_{k,\varepsilon}\in\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{P}_k)} \mathbb{E}_{P_{k,\varepsilon},Q}\{(\hat{\mu} - \mu)^2\}, \tag{12}$$

where the metric of interest is the squared loss and the infimum over $\hat{\mu}$ is taken over all measurable functions of the privatised $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ via some privacy mechnism $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha$.

3.1 Lower bound

We first provide in Proposition 4 a lower bound that comprises three terms. If $\log(D) \geq 32n\alpha^2$, then $\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\varepsilon) \gtrsim 1$. This implies that consistent estimation of μ is impossible. When $\log(D) \ll n\alpha^2$, the lower bound simplifies to $(n\alpha^2)^{1/k-1} \vee \varepsilon^{2-2/k}$, which is the minimax rate of the robust mean estimation problem with fixed D. We show in Theorem 5 that a matching upper bound can be achieved by a novel non-interactive procedure under minimal conditions.

Proposition 4. *Let $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be i.i.d. random variables from $P_{k,\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{P}_k)$, with $\mathcal{P}_k$ defined in (11). For $\alpha \in (0,1]$ and $n \geq n_0$ with a large enough absolute constant $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}_+$, it holds that the α-LDP minimax estimation risk defined in (12) satisfies*

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\varepsilon) \gtrsim (n\alpha^2)^{1/k-1} \vee \varepsilon^{2-2/k} \vee \frac{D^2}{\exp(64n\alpha^2)}.$$

Proposition 4 explains the hardness of this estimation problem by isolating the cost of preserving privacy, contamination and estimating a possibly diverging mean respectively. If any of these three becomes too hard, this estimation problem becomes infeasible. In terms of the preservable level of privacy, we require $\alpha \gg n^{-1/2}$ for consistency. In terms of the Huber contamination proportion, we require $\varepsilon \ll 1$. In terms of D, the upper bound on the absolute mean, we require $D \ll \exp(32n\alpha^2)$.

The dependence on D is a rather interesting finding. When $k = 2$ and $D = \infty$, it is shown in Appendix G of Duchi et al. (2013) that $\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(0) = \infty$. To interpolate between the case of an unbounded parameter space and the case where the mean takes values in a fixed compact set, we prove in Lemma 13 that, for any $D \in [0,\infty)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$, the lower bound

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(0) \geq \frac{D^2}{32\exp(64n\alpha^2)}$$

holds.

Another interesting aspect roots in the derivation of the term $(n\alpha^2)^{1/k-1}$, which unveils a somewhat deeper connection between locally private estimation and estimation within Huber's contamination model. To derive the term $(n\alpha^2)^{1/k-1}$, we apply Corollary 3.1 in Rohde & Steinberger (2020), which crucially depends on the following quantity

$$\omega'(\eta) = \omega(\eta/(1+\eta)) = \sup\{|\mu_0 - \mu_1| : \mathrm{TV}(R_0, R_1) \leq \eta,\ R_0, R_1 \in \mathcal{P}_k\},$$

where μ_0 and μ_1 denote the means of R_0 and R_1 respectively. It is almost identical to $\omega(\cdot)$ defined in (5), up to a change of variable, and has been shown to play a central role in establishing minimax rates for locally private estimation problems (Rohde & Steinberger 2020). Therefore, we see that the total variation modulus of continuity $\omega(\cdot)$, a single unifying quantity, can quantify the costs of both privacy and contamination in the Huber's contamination model.

3.2 Upper bound

We are now to show that the lower bound in Proposition 4 is indeed tight by providing a novel non-interactive estimator that is adaptive to D. We split the data into four folds, each of which is privatised separately. The procedure has two main steps.

- Firstly, for a pre-specified $M > 0$, the first fold is used to construct a private histogram with bin width $M/3$ and to identify bins containing a proportion of the contaminated distribution exceeding a threshold. This allows us to find a larger bin of width M of the form $[\{S+(L-1)/3\}M, \{S+1+(L-1)/3\}M]$, with $S \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $L \in \{0,1,2\}$, such that only a negligible proportion of the distribution lies outside this interval. This interval can be thought of as a crude, initial estimate of the location of the distribution.

- Secondly, for each $\ell \in \{0,1,2\}$ and each data point X_i in fold $\ell+2$, we divide $X_i - (\ell-1)M/3$ by M and use a Laplace mechanism to privatise the remainder. The privatised data from fold $L+2$ can then be used to pinpoint the mean within the interval $[\{S+(L-1)/3\}M, \{S+1+(L-1)/3\}M]$, by adding the privatised remainders to its left-hand end point.

Crucially, the value of L is not needed to privatise the data from the final folds and is only used when constructing the final estimator. This can be done because there are only three possible values of L and we may reserve a fold for each eventuality. The other two folds are discarded.

We now formalise the procedure described above.

Step 1. (Privatisation.) For some absolute constant $c > 0$, let $T = \exp(cn\alpha^2)$. Let M be a tuning parameter such that $T/M \in \mathbb{N}$. Let

$$A_j = [(j-1)M/3, jM/3), \quad j \in \mathcal{J} = \{-3T/M, -3T/M+1, \ldots, 3T/M, 3T/M+1\}.$$

Let data be $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^{4n}$. Generate independent standard Laplace variables $(W_{ij})_{i\in[n],j\in\mathcal{J}}$, $(W_i^{(\ell)})_{i=(\ell+1)n+1}^{(\ell+2)n}$ for $\ell = 0,1,2$. For $i \in [n]$ and $j \in \mathcal{J}$ set

$$Z_{ij} = \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i \in A_j\}} + \frac{2}{\alpha} W_{ij}. \tag{13}$$

For $\ell = 0,1,2$ and $i = (\ell+1)n+1, \ldots, (\ell+2)n$ set

$$R_i^{(\ell)} = \min\big\{X_i - (j-1)M/3 : j \in \mathcal{J}, j \equiv \ell \,(\mathrm{mod}3), X_i \geq (j-1)M/3\big\}$$

and

$$Z_i^{(\ell)} = [R_i^{(\ell)}]_0^M + \frac{M}{\alpha} W_i^{(\ell)}, \tag{14}$$

where $[\cdot]_0^M = \min\{\max\{\cdot, 0\}, M\}$.

Step 2. (Estimator construction.) With

$$\delta = T^{-2}(n\alpha^2)^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau = \epsilon + (1-\epsilon)(6/M)^k + 4\sqrt{2\log(12T/(M\delta))/(n\alpha^2)},$$

define

$$\widehat{\mathcal{J}} = \left\{ j \in \mathcal{J} : \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} Z_{ij} \geq \tau \right\}.$$

If $\widehat{\mathcal{J}} = \emptyset$ then output $\hat{\mu} = 0$. Otherwise, let

$$J = \max \widehat{\mathcal{J}} - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad L = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } J \equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}3), \\ 1, & \text{if } J \equiv 1 \,(\mathrm{mod}3), \\ 2, & \text{if } J \equiv 2 \,(\mathrm{mod}3). \end{cases}$$

The estimator is defined as

$$\hat{\mu} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=(L+1)n+1}^{(L+2)n} Z_i^{(L)} + (J-1)M/3. \tag{15}$$

The privatisation in (13) and (14) is non-interactive and satisfies α-LDP, as shown in Lemma 14. The property of the estimator $\hat{\mu}$ defined in (15) is collected in Theorem 5 below.

Theorem 5. *Given i.i.d. random variables* $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^{4n}$ *with distribution* $P_{k,\varepsilon} = (1-\varepsilon)P_k + \varepsilon G$, *where* $P_k \in \mathcal{P}_k$ *defined in* (11), *and* G *is any arbitrary distribution supported on* $\mathbb{R}$. *The estimator* $\hat{\mu}$ *defined in* (15), *with inputs satisfying that (i)* $T \geq D$, *(ii)* $(n\alpha^2)^{-1}\log(12T^3n\alpha^2/M) \leq \min(\alpha^{-2}/2, 1/512)$ *and (iii)* $\varepsilon + (1-\varepsilon)(6/M)^k \leq 1/12$, *satisfies that*

$$\mathbb{E}\{(\hat{\mu}-\mu)^2\} \lesssim T^2\exp(-n\alpha^2/512) + \frac{M^2}{n\alpha^2} + \varepsilon^2M^2 + M^{-2(k-1)}.$$

In particular, choosing $T = \exp(n\alpha^2/3072)$ *and* $M \asymp \varepsilon^{-1/k} \wedge (n\alpha^2)^{1/(2k)}$, *when* $\alpha \leq 1$, $D \leq T$ *and* $\min\{\varepsilon, (n\alpha^2)^{-1}\} \leq c_0$ *for some small constant* $c_0 > 0$, *we have that*

$$\mathbb{E}\{(\hat{\mu}-\mu)^2\} \lesssim (n\alpha^2)^{1/k-1} \vee \varepsilon^{2-2/k}.$$

With the properly chosen truncation tuning parameter M, Theorem 5 shows that $\hat{\mu}$ gives an upper bound on the mean squared error of $(n\alpha^2)^{1/k-1} \vee \varepsilon^{2-2/k}$. Comparing with Proposition 4, we see that $\hat{\mu}$ is minimax rate-optimal in terms of the dependence on n, α and ε. It is notable that it remains rate-optimal even for a diverging D, provided that it is not growing faster than a certain exponential rate in $n\alpha^2$ (more precisely, we require $D \leq T = \exp(n\alpha^2/3072)$). In fact, this requirement is essentially unavoidable, as Proposition 4 shows that consistent estimation is impossible if $\log D \gg n\alpha^2$. Lastly, Theorem 5 shows that the error of our estimator has an upper bound independent of D, provided $D \leq T$, which is in contrast to the performance of the private mean estimator based on the standard Laplace mechanism studied in Duchi et al. (2018) (see Proposition 15 in Appendix C.2).

3.3 Discussions

Our focus is on cases where both contamination and privacy constraints are present. In this section, we discuss some related results in the literature that only consider either contamination or the local privacy constraint.

Without the local privacy constraint, Prasad et al. (2020) proposed a two-step robust mean estimator (cf. Algorithm 2 therein) that achieves the optimality in the model (11) with $k \geq 2$ and $D = \infty$. With probability at least $1-\delta$, their estimator $\hat{\mu}_{\mathrm{Pra}}$ satisfies that

$$|\hat{\mu}_{\mathrm{Pra}} - \mu|^2 \lesssim n^{-1}\log(1/\delta) \vee \varepsilon^{2-2/k}, \tag{16}$$

which is known to be information-theoretically optimal (e.g. Diakonikolas et al. 2019). Recalling that our results are in the form of expectations, to compare (16) with Theorem 5, we hence ignore the logarithmic term. Regarding the term involving ε, we see that in Theorem 5, it is completely isolated from the privacy level α; and in both (16) and Theorem 5, it is of the order $\varepsilon^{2-2/k}$. As for preserving privacy at level α, we see the effects are two-fold (see also Section 3.2.1 in Duchi et al. 2013): (1) a reduction of the effective sample size from n to $n\alpha^2$; and (2) instead of n^{-1} in the non-private case, we have in Theorem 5 the term $n^{1/k-1}$, i.e. the heavy-tailedness of $P \in \mathcal{P}_k$ has no effect on the non-private convergence rate in (16), whereas a loss of $1/k$ in the exponent is incurred in the private setting. Given that we have shown in Proposition 4, the rate we achieved in Theorem 5 is optimal, the loss in the rate $n^{1/k}$ is unavoidable due to the privacy constraint – similar phenomena have also been observed in the nonparametric estimation literature (e.g. Berrett & Butucea 2019, Berrett & Yu 2021) as well as in Section 4.

In view of Q1 in Section 1.1, we claim that the estimator $\hat{\mu}_{\mathrm{Pra}}$ is similar to our estimator $\hat{\mu}$ in a broad sense. As detailed in Algorithm 2 in Prasad et al. (2020), $\hat{\mu}_{\mathrm{Pra}}$ first constructed a shortest interval initial estimator using half of the data, which is similar to finding J using the first n samples in our construction serving as a crude estimate. The remaining data are then used to refine this crude estimate. One may, therefore, see that our estimator $\hat{\mu}$ as a non-interactive and private version of an optimal robust mean estimator.

In view of Q2 in Section 1.1, Duchi et al. (2018) studied the problem (11) with $D = 1$ and $\varepsilon = 0$ (cf. Section 3.2.1 therein). They estimated the mean by averaging the privatised data obtained by adding Laplace noise to the truncated data. This mechanism guarantees the α-LDP constraint, but in the case when D is large and $\varepsilon > 0$, it is sub-optimal. See Proposition 15.

To summarise, in this robust mean estimation problem, we see that

- there exists a procedure (Prasad et al. 2020) optimal against contamination that can be properly privatised to achieve optimal performance; and
- a standard α-LDP procedure is not automatically robust and minimax rate-optimal when the parameter space grows (cf. Proposition 15).

4 Robust density estimation under local differential privacy

Recalling the general setup in Section 1.2, in this section we consider distributions supported on $\mathcal{X} = [0, 1]$, belonging to the Sobolev class $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{F}_\beta$, defined below.

Definition 1 (Sobolev class)**.** Let $\beta > 1/2$ and $\{\gamma_t\}_{t\in\mathcal{T}}$ be an orthonormal basis of $L_2[0, 1]$ indexed by a countable family $\mathcal{T}$. For a given coefficient sequence $\{a_t\}_{t\in\mathcal{T}}$ associated with $\{\gamma_t\}_{t\in\mathcal{T}}$, the Sobolev class $\mathcal{F}_\beta$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{F}_\beta = \Big\{ f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}_+ \,\Big|\, \int_{[0,1]} f(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = 1, \sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}} |a_t|^{2\beta} \left| \int_{[0,1]} f(x)\gamma_t(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \right|^2 = \sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}} |a_t|^{2\beta} |f_t|^2 < \infty \Big\}. \tag{17}$$

We again assume that the data are generated from Huber's contamination model (1). When $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are i.i.d. random variables with distribution $P_{f_\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{F}_\beta)$, we are interested in estimating the density of the inlier distribution $\theta(P) = f$.

The α-LDP minimax risk defined in (4) takes its specific form in the robust density estimation problem as follows

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\mathcal{F}_\beta, \Phi\circ\rho, \varepsilon) = \inf_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}_\alpha} \inf_{\tilde{f}} \sup_{P_{f_\varepsilon}\in\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{F}_\beta)} \mathbb{E}_{P_{f_\varepsilon},Q}\Big\{\Phi\circ\rho(\tilde{f}, f)\Big\}, \tag{18}$$

where the infimum over $\tilde{f}$ is taken over all measurable functions of the privatised data generated from some $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha$. We consider two loss functions, both of which are commonly used in the nonparametric estimation literature (e.g. Tsybakov 2009). To be specific, we consider $\Phi\circ\rho$ to be the squared-L_2 loss and the L_∞ loss, separately. For any two density functions g_1 and g_2 supported on $[0, 1]$, let the squared-L_2-loss and the L_∞ loss be

$$\|g_1 - g_2\|_2^2 = \int_{[0,1]} \{g_1(x) - g_2(x)\}^2\,\mathrm{d}x \quad \text{and} \quad \|g_1 - g_2\|_\infty = \sup_{x\in[0,1]} |g_1(x) - g_2(x)|, \tag{19}$$

respectively.

4.1 Lower bound

In Proposition 6 below, we present lower bounds on $\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\mathcal{F}_\beta, \Phi\circ\rho, \varepsilon)$, with $\Phi\circ\rho$ taken to be the squared-L_2 loss and L_∞ loss. As we shall discuss later, Proposition 6 is an application of the general lower bound result Proposition 1.

Proposition 6. *Let $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be i.i.d. random variables with distribution $P_{f_\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{F}_\beta)$. For $\alpha \in (0,1)$, it holds that the α-LDP minimax estimation risks defined in (18), equipped with the squared-L_2 loss and the L_∞ loss defined in (19), are*

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\mathcal{F}_\beta, \|\cdot\|_2^2, \varepsilon) \gtrsim (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{2\beta+2}} \vee \varepsilon^{\frac{4\beta}{2\beta+1}} \tag{20}$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\mathcal{F}_\beta, \|\cdot\|_\infty, \varepsilon) \gtrsim \left\{\frac{\log(n\alpha^2)}{n\alpha^2}\right\}^{\frac{2\beta-1}{4\beta+2}} \vee \varepsilon^{\frac{2\beta-1}{2\beta+1}}, \tag{21}$$

respectively.

In view of Proposition 1, the results in Proposition 6 are obtained by separately controlling the lower bounds on (i) the non-robust cases $\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\mathcal{F}_\beta, \|\cdot\|_2^2, 0)$ and $\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\mathcal{F}_\beta, \|\cdot\|_\infty, 0)$ and (ii) the total variation modulus of continuity $\omega(\varepsilon)$ under different loss functions.

As for (i), due to the Sobolev embedding theorem for Besov space (e.g. Proposition 4.3.20 in Giné & Nickl 2021), it can be seen as a special case of Corollary 2.1 in Butucea et al. (2020), which is a result on minimax rates for estimating density functions under L_r loss ($r \geq 1$) without contamination but with an α-LDP constraint.

As for (ii), we construct a lower bound on $\omega(\varepsilon)$ by considering a pair of density functions with the help of wavelet basis functions. We note that Theorem 3 in Uppal et al. (2020) studied a robust density estimation problem in the Besov space, under the Besov integral probability metrics but without privacy constraints.

4.2 Upper bounds

In this subsection, we study the robustness property of two α-LDP estimators of the density function, subject to the squared-L_2 loss and the L_∞ loss, in Theorems 7 and 8, respectively. Both estimators are in the form of linear projection estimators, but constructed based on different choices of orthonormal basis functions and privacy mechanisms.

The squared-L_2 loss. To obtain an upper bound on $\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\mathcal{F}_\beta, \|\cdot\|_2^2, \varepsilon)$, we analyse a projection estimator based on the orthonormal basis for $L^2[0,1]$ consisting of trigonometric functions, i.e.

$$\varphi_1(x) = 1, \quad \varphi_{2j}(x) = \sqrt{2}\cos(2\pi j x) \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_{2j+1}(x) = \sqrt{2}\sin(2\pi j x), \quad j \in \mathbb{N}_+. \tag{22}$$

With the choices $a_j = \lfloor (j+1)/2 \rfloor$ in (17), the Sobolev space in Definition 1 is characterised by

$$\sum_{j=1}^\infty j^{2\beta}\theta_j^2 = \sum_{j=1}^\infty j^{2\beta}\left\{\int_0^1 f(x)\varphi_j(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\right\}^2 \leq r^2 < \infty, \tag{23}$$

where $r > 0$ is some universal constant controlling the radius of the ellipsoid. Condition (23) can be translated into smoothness conditions on functions having βth order (weak) derivative in $L^2[0,1]$ (e.g. Proposition 1.14 in Tsybakov 2009). Our projection estimator $\hat{f}$ is then constructed as follows.

Step 1. (Privatisation.) Given data $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$, for any $i \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$, let $v = [\varphi_j(X_i)]_{j=1}^k \in \mathbb{R}^k$, where $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ is a pre-specified tuning parameter. Let the corresponding privatised data be $Z_i \in \mathbb{R}^k$ satisfying that $\mathbb{E}_Q[Z_{i,j}|X_i] = \varphi_j(X_i)$ and $Z_{i,j} = \{-B, B\}$ with $B \lesssim \sqrt{k}/\alpha$, where $\mathbb{E}_Q$ denotes the expectation under the privacy mechanism. See Appendix D.2 for full details of this privacy mechanism.

Step 2. (Estimator construction.) Let

$$\hat{f} = \sum_{j=1}^k \overline{Z}_j \varphi_j = \sum_{j=1}^k \left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n Z_{i,j}\right)\varphi_j. \tag{24}$$

In the construction of $\hat{f}$, we choose the trigonometric functions, which satisfy the bounded basis function condition with

$$\max_{1\le j\le k} \|\varphi_j(\cdot)\|_\infty \le \sqrt{2}. \tag{25}$$

We remark that one may also choose other basis functions, provided that all basis functions are upper bounded by an absolute constant in the function supremum norm. This is to guarantee that the α-LDP constraint (3) holds (Duchi et al. 2018). Another input is the truncation number k, which essentially truncates this infinite-dimensional nonparametric problem to a k-dimensional estimation problem. In fact, the estimator (24) is considered in Section 5.2.2 of Duchi et al. (2018), as a nonparametric density estimator, which is shown to be minimax rate optimal in terms of the squared-L_2 norm under local differential privacy without contamination (cf. Corollary 7 in Duchi et al. 2018). Together with Theorem 7 below, we will show that this private procedure is automatically robust, in view of Q2 in Section 1.1.

We remark that $\hat{f}$ defined in (24) is a privatised version of the widely-used nonparametric projection estimator (e.g. Chapter 1 in Tsybakov 2009), defined as

$$\tilde{f} = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \varphi_j(X_i) \right\} \varphi_j,$$

which attains the optimal minimax rate under squared-L_2 loss when applied to nonparametric regression problems for functions belonging to the Sobolev class (23) (cf. Theorem 1.9 in Tsybakov 2009).

Theorem 7 (The squared-L_2 norm case)**.** *Given i.i.d. random variables $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ with distribution $P_{f_\varepsilon} = (1-\varepsilon)P_f + \varepsilon G$, where P_f denotes the distribution with the density function $f \in \mathcal{F}_\beta$ defined in (17), and G is an arbitrary distribution supported on $[0,1]$, for $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and $\varepsilon \in [0,1]$, the estimator $\hat{f}$ defined in (24) satisfies that*

$$\mathbb{E}_{P_{f_\varepsilon},Q}[\|\hat{f} - f\|_2^2] \lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{4\beta}{2\beta+1}} \vee (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{2\beta+2}},$$

when the tuning parameter k is chosen to be $k \asymp \varepsilon^{-\frac{2}{2\beta+1}} \wedge (n\alpha^2)^{\frac{1}{2\beta+2}}$.

Comparing with the lower bound in (20), Theorem 7 shows that under a suitable choice of k, the estimator $\hat{f}$ is minimax rate-optimal in the presence of contamination and a local privacy constraint.

The L_∞ loss. Our next goal is to obtain an upper bound on $\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\mathcal{F}_\beta, \|\cdot\|_\infty, \varepsilon)$, and it turns out that the trigonometric basis used in the previous analysis under the squared-L_2 risk is not flexible enough to obtain the optimal rate in the L_∞ case. One reason is that it prevents the use of Laplace mechanism to construct optimal private estimator. As discussed in the last paragraph of Section 5.2.2 in Duchi et al. (2018), even under L_2 loss, adding Laplace noise to the trigonometric basis leads to sub-optimal rate of order $(n\alpha^2)^{-2\beta/(2\beta+3)}$, which is worse than the corresponding optimal rate $(n\alpha^2)^{-2\beta/(2\beta+2)}$ as that in Theorem 7. We instead exploit the wavelet basis, which allows the use of a simple Laplace mechanism to efficiently privatise the empirical wavelet coefficients (Butucea et al. 2020).

Given a father wavelet $\phi : [-A, A] \to \mathbb{R}$ and a mother wavelet $\psi : [-A, A] \to \mathbb{R}$, where $A > 0$ is an absolute constant (see e.g. Section 4.2.1 in Giné & Nickl 2021), satisfying

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = 0, \quad \|\psi\|_\infty < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \|\phi\|_\infty < \infty, \tag{26}$$

a wavelet basis of $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ can be formed as

$$\{\phi_k = \phi(\cdot - k) : k \in \mathbb{Z}\} \cup \{\psi_{jk} = 2^{j/2}\psi(2^j(\cdot) - k) : j \in \mathbb{N}_+ \cup \{0\}, k \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

We denote ϕ_k as ψ_{-1k} to simplify the notation. Given such a basis, we have that for any $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$,

$$f(x) = \sum_{j\geq -1}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \beta_{jk}\psi_{jk}(x) = \sum_{j\geq -1}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x')\psi_{jk}(x')\,\mathrm{d}x'\right\}\psi_{jk}(x). \tag{27}$$

Note that one can periodise a wavelet basis of $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ to construct a basis on $L^2[0,1]$ or apply boundary correction to wavelet basis for non-periodic functions supported on $[0,1]$ while regular wavelet properties including (26) still hold. We refer to Giné & Nickl (2021) and Daubechies (1992) for more detailed introduction on the theory of wavelets.

Since the density functions and wavelet basis are assumed to have compact supports on $[0,1]$ and $[-A,A]$ respectively, the representation (27) implies that for each resolution level $j \geq -1$, $|\mathcal{N}_j| = |\{k : \beta_{jk} \neq 0\}| \leq 2^j + 2A + 1$. With the choice $a_j = 2^j$ in (17), the Sobolev space in Definition 1 can be characterised by

$$\sum_{j\geq -1} (2^j)^{2\beta}\|\beta_{j\cdot}\|_2^2 = \sum_{j\geq -1}(2^j)^{2\beta}\left(\sum_{k\in\mathcal{N}_j}\beta_{jk}^2\right) < \infty. \tag{28}$$

Condition (28) can also be translated to smoothness conditions on functions having βth order (weak) derivative in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ (e.g. Proposition 4.3.20 in Giné & Nickl 2021).

The projection estimator is then constructed as follows.

Step 1. (Privatisation.) Given data $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$, for any $i \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$, $j \in \{-1,0,\ldots,J\}$ and $k \in \mathcal{N}_j$, where $J \in \mathbb{N}_+$ is a pre-specified tuning parameter, let W_{ijk}'s be independent standard Laplace random variables which are also independent of X_i's, the noise parameter σ_J be

$$\sigma_J = C2^{J/2}/\alpha, \quad \text{with} \quad C = (8\lceil A\rceil + 4)\|\psi\|_\infty\sqrt{2}(\sqrt{2}-1)^{-1}, \tag{29}$$

and the privatised empirical wavelet coefficients be

$$\hat{\beta}_{jk} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n Z_{ijk} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \{\psi_{jk}(X_i) + \sigma_J W_{ijk}\}.$$

Step 2. (Estimator construction.) Let the final estimator be

$$\hat{f}_{\mathrm{Lap}} = \sum_{j=-1}^J \sum_{k\in\mathcal{N}_j} \hat{\beta}_{jk}\psi_{jk}. \tag{30}$$

The tuning parameter J serves as a truncation parameter, reducing an infinite-dimensional nonparametric estimation problem to a finite-dimensional problem with dimensionality being $\sum_{j=-1}^J |\mathcal{N}_j|$. The noise level σ_J is chosen to guarantee the α-LDP constraint (Proposition 3.1 in Butucea et al. 2020).

The estimator (30) is previously studied in Butucea et al. (2020), without the presence of contamination but shown to be optimal in terms of estimating the L_∞-loss, under α-LDP constraint. We remark that Butucea et al. (2020) studies a more general space and a wider range of loss functions. Together with Theorem 8 below, we will show that this private procedure is also automatically robust, again in view of Q2 in Section 1.1.

Theorem 8 (The L_∞ norm case)**.** *Given i.i.d. random variables $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ with distribution $P_{f_\varepsilon} = (1-\varepsilon)P_f + \varepsilon G$, where P_f denotes the distribution with the density function $f \in \mathcal{F}_\beta$, defined*

in (17)*, and* G *is an arbitrary distribution supported on* $[0,1]$*, for* $\alpha \in (0,1)$ *and* $\varepsilon \in [0,1]$*, the estimator* $\hat{f}_{\mathrm{Lap}}$ *defined in* (30) *satisfies that*

$$\mathbb{E}_{P_{f_\varepsilon},Q}(\|\hat{f}_{\mathrm{Lap}} - f\|_\infty) \lesssim \left\{\frac{\log(n\alpha^2)}{n\alpha^2}\right\}^{\frac{2\beta-1}{4\beta+2}} \vee \varepsilon^{\frac{2\beta-1}{2\beta+1}},$$

with the tuning parameter J *satisfying*

$$2^J \asymp \left\{\frac{\log(n\alpha^2)}{n\alpha^2}\right\}^{-\frac{1}{2\beta+1}} \wedge \varepsilon^{-\frac{2}{2\beta+1}}.$$

Comparing with the lower bound in (21), Theorem 8 shows that under a suitable choice of J, the estimator $\hat{f}_{\mathrm{Lap}}$ is minimax rate optimal.

4.3 Discussion

In the classical nonparametric density estimation literature (e.g. Tsybakov 2009), it is known that without the presence of contamination or privacy constraints,

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\infty}(\mathcal{F}_\beta, \|\cdot\|_2^2, 0) \asymp n^{-\frac{2\beta}{2\beta+1}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}_{n,\infty}(\mathcal{F}_\beta, \|\cdot\|_\infty, 0) \asymp \left\{\frac{\log(n)}{n}\right\}^{\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+2}}. \tag{31}$$

With the presence of both contamination and privacy constraints, in this section, we have shown that

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\mathcal{F}_\beta, \|\cdot\|_2^2, \varepsilon) \asymp (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{2\beta+2}} \vee \varepsilon^{\frac{4\beta}{2\beta+1}} \text{ and } \mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\mathcal{F}_\beta, \|\cdot\|_\infty, \varepsilon) \asymp \left\{\frac{\log(n\alpha^2)}{n\alpha^2}\right\}^{\frac{2\beta-1}{4\beta+2}} \vee \varepsilon^{\frac{2\beta-1}{2\beta+1}}.$$

Comparing our results with the classical rates in (31), we see that, similar to the mean estimation problem studied in Section 3, the cost of preserving privacy is manifested through a reduction of the effective sample size from n to $n\alpha^2$ and a loss in the exponent of convergence rate, both of which have been observed in the literature (Duchi et al. 2013, 2018, Butucea et al. 2020). It is, however, interesting to observe that the privacy constraint and the contamination proportion are completely isolated in terms of the fundamental limits. We also remark that the condition of bounded basis function (25) and (26) are critical for both privatising the data and being robust to contamination.

On the other hand – with contamination but without LDP constraints – Uppal et al. (2019) studied a non-private version of $\hat{f}_{\mathrm{Lap}}$, which is linear, and a non-linear wavelet thresholding estimator for robust estimation of densities belonging to Besov space. They showed that the wavelet thresholding estimator is optimal for a wide range of loss functions, but for the squared-L_2 loss and L_∞ loss we considered here, it suffices to use linear estimators to achieve optimality in the presence of contamination. (Similar phenomena were observed in Butucea et al. (2020) when estimating functions in Besov space under local privacy constraint.) Therefore, we may again view $\hat{f}_{\mathrm{Lap}}$ as a properly privatised version of a robust estimator that yields optimal performance, the success of which depends crucially on the choice of basis function.

In the robust statistics literature (e.g. Chen et al. 2016, 2018, Uppal et al. 2020), an interesting quantity to investigate is the maximum proportion of contamination such that $\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\theta(\mathcal{P}), \Phi \circ \rho, \varepsilon) \asymp \mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\theta(\mathcal{P}), \Phi \circ \rho, 0)$, that is the maximum proportion of contamination that the estimators can tolerate to obtain the optimal rate without contamination. In the private setting, denoting this quantity as ε^*_α, we have that $\varepsilon^*_\alpha \asymp (n\alpha^2)^{-(2\beta+1)/(4\beta+4)}$ in the squared-L_2 case and $\varepsilon^*_\alpha \asymp \{\log(n\alpha^2)/(n\alpha^2)\}^{1/2}$ in the L_∞ case. Comparing to the non-private setting, denoting this quantity as ε^*, where $\varepsilon^* \asymp n^{-1/2}$ in the squared-L_2 case and $\varepsilon^* \asymp \{\log(n\alpha^2)/(n\alpha^2)\}^{\beta/(2\beta-1)}$ in

the L_∞ case, we see that private algorithms can tolerate more contamination but at the price of converging at a slower rate, due to the presence of privacy constraints.

We conjecture that the condition that the density function of interest is supported on a compact set is critical in terms of achieving optimality under both contamination and LDP constraints. As a consequence of this compact support condition, we require bounded basis functions – see (25) and (26) – which facilitate our proofs. Another direct consequence of this compact support condition is the following summary.

As for the questions Q1 and Q2 raised in Section 1.1, in this robust density estimation problem, we see that

- there exist procedures optimal against contamination (Uppal et al. 2019) that can be properly privatised to achieve optimal performance; and
- there are existing α-LDP procedures (Duchi et al. 2018, Butucea et al. 2020) that are automatically robust and minimax rate optimal.

5 Conclusions

In this paper, we studied various statistical problems under both Huber's ε-contamination model (1) and LDP constraints (3). For the four problems concerned in this paper (with one left in Appendix E), we made an attempt to answer Q1 and Q2 in Section 1.1; that is, being aware of the deep connections between robustness and LDP, what we can say about the ability of robust procedures to work with privatised data and about the robustness of private procedures. For all four problems that we studied, we find procedures that are simultaneously robust, privacy-preserving and statistically rate-optimal. We commented on the connections between our methods to those which are used only under contamination or only under LDP constraints, and provided partial answers to these two questions in specific cases.

The optimality of our procedures mostly relies on the knowledge of ε - an upper bound on the contamination level. This is an assumption commonly used in the literature (e.g. Huber 1992, Lai et al. 2016, Prasad et al. 2020, Lugosi & Mendelson 2021) though impractical, since it is impossible to estimate ε when the contamination distribution is not specified. An overly large input of ε leads to an inflated error bound while a conservative input of ε leads to unjustified error controls. There has been some recent work on general approaches to robust methodology when ε is unknown (e.g. Jain et al. 2022). Applied to our procedures, the theoretical guarantees are not immediate since our error bounds hold in expectation rather than almost surely. Nevertheless, it would be interesting to adapt these ideas to further develop private, robust and optimal procedures, which are also adaptive to ε.

We also note that Proposition 1 is a markedly general result, the potential of which is by no means fully exploited in this paper. Based on the current work, which demonstrates the promise of jointly studying robustness and local differential privacy, we will continue working on understanding the interplay between these two areas in other settings, in particular for problems in high dimensions, with Proposition 1 providing a minimax lower bound to start with.

Acknowledgements

We are thankful to the anonymous referees for detailed comments and suggestions, which greatly improved the paper.

References

Acharya, J., Canonne, C. L., Liu, Y., Sun, Z. & Tyagi, H. (2022), 'Interactive inference under information constraints', *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **68**(1), 502–516.

Acharya, J., Sun, Z. & Zhang, H. (2021), Robust testing and estimation under manipulation attacks, *in* 'International Conference on Machine Learning', PMLR, pp. 43–53.

Aridor, G., Che, Y.-K. & Salz, T. (2021), 'The effect of privacy regulation on the data industry: Empirical evidence from GDPR', *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM Conference on Economics and Computation* pp. 93–94.

Avella-Medina, M. (2020), 'The role of robust statistics in private data analysis', *CHANCE* **33**(4), 37–42.

Berrett, T. B. & Butucea, C. (2020), 'Locally private non-asymptotic testing of discrete distributions is faster using interactive mechanisms', *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **33**, 3164–3173.

Berrett, T. B. & Yu, Y. (2021), 'Locally private online change point detection', *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **34**, to appear.

Berrett, T. & Butucea, C. (2019), 'Classification under local differential privacy', *Annales de l'ISUP* **63**, 191–205.

Boucheron, S., Lugosi, G. & Massart, P. (2013), *Concentration Inequalities: A Nonasymptotic Theory of Independence*, Oxford University Press.

Brunel, V.-E. & Avella-Medina, M. (2020), 'Propose, test, release: Differentially private estimation with high probability', *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.08774* .

Bun, M., Kamath, G., Steinke, T. & Wu, S. Z. (2019), 'Private hypothesis selection', *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **32**, 156–167.

Butucea, C., Dubois, A., Kroll, M. & Saumard, A. (2020), 'Local differential privacy: Elbow effect in optimal density estimation and adaptation over Besov ellipsoids', *Bernoulli* **26**(3), 1727–1764.

Cai, T. T., Wang, Y. & Zhang, L. (2021), 'The cost of privacy: Optimal rates of convergence for parameter estimation with differential privacy', *The Annals of Statistics* **49**(5), 2825–2850.

Canonne, C. L., Kamath, G., McMillan, A., Smith, A. & Ullman, J. (2019), 'The structure of optimal private tests for simple hypotheses', *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing* pp. 310–321.

Catoni, O. (2012), 'Challenging the empirical mean and empirical variance: a deviation study', *Annales de l'IHP Probabilités et Statistiques* **48**, 1148–1185.

Chen, M., Gao, C. & Ren, Z. (2016), 'A general decision theory for Huber's ε-contamination model', *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **10**(2), 3752–3774.

Chen, M., Gao, C. & Ren, Z. (2018), 'Robust covariance and scatter matrix estimation under huber's contamination model', *The Annals of Statistics* **46**(5), 1932–1960.

Cherukuri, A. & Hota, A. R. (2020), 'Consistency of distributionally robust risk-and chance-constrained optimization under Wasserstein ambiguity sets', *IEEE Control Systems Letters* **5**(5), 1729–1734.

Cheu, A., Smith, A. & Ullman, J. (2021), Manipulation attacks in local differential privacy, *in* '2021 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)', IEEE, pp. 883–900.

Chhor, J. & Sentenac, F. (2022), 'Robust estimation of discrete distributions under local differential privacy', *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.06825* .

Daubechies, I. (1992), *Ten Lectures on Wavelets*, SIAM.

Devroye, L. & Lugosi, G. (2001), *Combinatorial Methods in Density Estimation*, Springer Science & Business Media.

Devroye, L., Mehrabian, A. & Reddad, T. (2018), 'The total variation distance between high-dimensional Gaussians', *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.08693* .

Diakonikolas, I., Kamath, G., Kane, D., Li, J., Moitra, A. & Stewart, A. (2019), 'Robust estimators in high-dimensions without the computational intractability', *SIAM Journal on Computing* **48**(2), 742–864.

Diakonikolas, I., Kamath, G., Kane, D. M., Li, J., Moitra, A. & Stewart, A. (2017), 'Being robust (in high dimensions) can be practical', *International Conference on Machine Learning* pp. 999–1008.

Dimitrakakis, C., Nelson, B., Mitrokotsa, A. & Rubinstein, B. I. (2014), 'Robust and private Bayesian inference', *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory* pp. 291–305.

Ding, B., Kulkarni, J. & Yekhanin, S. (2017), 'Collecting telemetry data privately', *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **30**.

Donoho, D. L., Johnstone, I. M., Kerkyacharian, G. & Picard, D. (1996), 'Density estimation by wavelet thresholding', *The Annals of Statistics* **24**, 508–539.

Donoho, D. L. & Liu, R. C. (1991), 'Geometrizing rates of convergence, II', *The Annals of Statistics* **19**, 633–667.

Duchi, J. C., Jordan, M. I. & Wainwright, M. J. (2013), 'Local privacy, data processing inequalities, and statistical minimax rates', *arXiv preprint arXiv:1302.3203* .

Duchi, J. C., Jordan, M. I. & Wainwright, M. J. (2018), 'Minimax optimal procedures for locally private estimation', *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **113**(521), 182–201.

Duchi, J. C. & Ruan, F. (2018), 'The right complexity measure in locally private estimation: It is not the fisher information', *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.05756* .

Dwork, C. & Lei, J. (2009), 'Differential privacy and robust statistics', *Proceedings of the Forty-first Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing* pp. 371–380.

Dwork, C., McSherry, F., Nissim, K. & Smith, A. (2006), 'Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis', *Theory of Cryptography Conference* pp. 265–284.

Erlingsson, Ú., Pihur, V. & Korolova, A. (2014), 'Rappor: Randomized aggregatable privacy-preserving ordinal response', *Proceedings of the 2014 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security* pp. 1054–1067.

Esfandiari, H., Mirrokni, V. & Narayanan, S. (2021), 'Tight and robust private mean estimation with few users', *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.11876* .

Forti, M. (2021), 'The deployment of artificial intelligence tools in the health sector: privacy concerns and regulatory answers within the GDPR', *European Journal of Legal Studies* **13**, 29.

Ghazi, B., Kumar, R., Manurangsi, P. & Nguyen, T. (2021), 'Robust and private learning of halfspaces', *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics* pp. 1603–1611.

Giné, E. & Nickl, R. (2021), *Mathematical Foundations of Infinite-Dimensional Statistical Models*, Cambridge University Press.

Gopi, S., Kamath, G., Kulkarni, J., Nikolov, A., Wu, Z. S. & Zhang, H. (2020), 'Locally private hypothesis selection', *Conference on Learning Theory* pp. 1785–1816.

Hampel, F. R., Ronchetti, E. M., Rousseeuw, P. J. & Stahel, W. A. (2011), *Robust Statistics: The Approach Based on Influence Functions*, Vol. 196, John Wiley & Sons.

Härdle, W., Kerkyacharian, G., Picard, D. & Tsybakov, A. (2012), *Wavelets, Approximation, and Statistical Applications*, Vol. 129, Springer Science & Business Media.

Huber, P. J. (1968), 'Robust confidence limits', *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete* **10**(4), 269–278.

Huber, P. J. (1992), 'Robust estimation of a location parameter', *Breakthroughs in Statistics* pp. 492–518.

Huber, P. J. (2004), *Robust Statistics*, Vol. 523, John Wiley & Sons.

Huber, P. J. & Ronchetti, E. M. (2009), *Robust Statistics*, John Wiley & Sons.

Ingster, Y. & Suslina, I. (2003), *Nonparametric goodness-of-fit testing under Gaussian models*, Vol. 169, Springer Science & Business Media.

Jain, A., Orlitsky, A. & Ravindrakumar, V. (2022), 'Robust estimation algorithms don't need to know the corruption level', *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.05453* .

Joseph, M., Mao, J., Neel, S. & Roth, A. (2019), 'The role of interactivity in local differential privacy', *2019 IEEE 60th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)* pp. 94–105.

Kairouz, P., Oh, S. & Viswanath, P. (2014), 'Extremal mechanisms for local differential privacy', *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **27**, 2879–2887.

Kamath, G., Mouzakis, A., Singhal, V., Steinke, T. & Ullman, J. (2021), 'A private and computationally-efficient estimator for unbounded Gaussians', *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.04609* .

Kothari, P. K., Manurangsi, P. & Velingker, A. (2021), 'Private robust estimation by stabilizing convex relaxations', *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.03548* .

Lai, K. A., Rao, A. B. & Vempala, S. (2016), 'Agnostic estimation of mean and covariance', *2016 IEEE 57th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)* pp. 665–674.

Lam-Weil, J., Laurent, B. & Loubes, J.-M. (2022), 'Minimax optimal goodness-of-fit testing for densities and multinomials under a local differential privacy constraint', *Bernoulli* **28**(1), 579–600.

Li, M., Berrett, T. B. & Yu, Y. (2022), 'Network change point localisation under local differential privacy', *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.07144* .

Liu, X., Kong, W., Kakade, S. & Oh, S. (2021), 'Robust and differentially private mean estimation', *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.09159* .

Lugosi, G. & Mendelson, S. (2019), 'Sub-Gaussian estimators of the mean of a random vector', *The Annals of Statistics* **47**(2), 783–794.

Lugosi, G. & Mendelson, S. (2021), 'Robust multivariate mean estimation: the optimality of trimmed mean', *The Annals of Statistics* **49**(1), 393–410.

Maronna, R. A., Martin, R. D., Yohai, V. J. & Salibián-Barrera, M. (2019), *Robust Statistics: Theory and Methods (with R)*, John Wiley & Sons.

Mironov, I. (2017), Rényi differential privacy, *in* '2017 IEEE 30th computer security foundations symposium (CSF)', IEEE, pp. 263–275.

Nemirovski, A., Juditsky, A., Lan, G. & Shapiro, A. (2009), 'Robust stochastic approximation approach to stochastic programming', *SIAM Journal on optimization* **19**(4), 1574–1609.

Pensia, A., Jog, V. & Loh, P.-L. (2020), 'Robust regression with covariate filtering: Heavy tails and adversarial contamination', *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.12976* .

Prasad, A., Suggala, A. S., Balakrishnan, S. & Ravikumar, P. (2020), 'Robust estimation via robust gradient estimation', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **82**(3), 601–627.

Rohde, A. & Steinberger, L. (2020), 'Geometrizing rates of convergence under local differential privacy constraints', *The Annals of Statistics* **48**(5), 2646–2670.

Tang, J., Korolova, A., Bai, X., Wang, X. & Wang, X. (2017), 'Privacy loss in Apple's implementation of differential privacy on MacOS 10.12', *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.02753* .

Tsybakov, A. B. (2009), *Introduction to Nonparametric Estimation*, Springer.

Uppal, A., Singh, S. & Póczos, B. (2019), 'Nonparametric density estimation & convergence rates for GANs under Besov IPM losses', *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **32**.

Uppal, A., Singh, S. & Poczos, B. (2020), 'Robust density estimation under Besov IPM losses', *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **33**.

Van Erven, T. & Harremos, P. (2014), 'Rényi divergence and Kullback-Leibler divergence', *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **60**(7), 3797–3820.

Vershynin, R. (2018), *High-Dimensional Probability: An Introduction With Applications in Data Science*, Vol. 47, Cambridge University Press.

Wainwright, M. J. (2019), *High-Dimensional Statistics: A Non-asymptotic Viewpoint*, Vol. 48, Cambridge University Press.

Warner, S. L. (1965), 'Randomized response: A survey technique for eliminating evasive answer bias', *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **60**, 63–69.

Wasserman, L. & Zhou, S. (2010), 'A statistical framework for differential privacy', *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **105**(489), 375–389.

Yatracos, Y. G. (1985), 'Rates of convergence of minimum distance estimators and Kolmogorov's entropy', *The Annals of Statistics* **13**, 768–774.

Appendices

All the technical details and some additional results are provided in the Appendices. Appendices A, B, C and D collect all the proofs of the results in Sections 1, 2, 3 and 4, respectively. Additional results on the two-point testing problem subject to a more general class of differential privacy constraints are presented in Appendix B.2. We consider the robust univariate median estimation problem under α-LDP in Appendix E, where a stochastic gradient descent type estimator is summoned to provide an optimal excess risk.

A Technical details of Section 1

Proof of Proposition 1. Since $\varepsilon \in [0,1)$, due to the definition of $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{P})$, we have that

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\theta(\mathcal{P}), \Phi \circ \rho, \varepsilon) \geq \mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\theta(\mathcal{P}), \Phi \circ \rho). \tag{32}$$

Using Lemma 9 we have that when $\mathrm{TV}(R_0, R_1) \leq \varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon)$, there exist distributions G_0 and G_1 such that

$$(1-\varepsilon)R_0 + \varepsilon G_0 = (1-\varepsilon)R_1 + \varepsilon G_1.$$

Writing $\widetilde{R}_i = (1-\varepsilon)R_i + \varepsilon G_i$ for $i = 0, 1$, it then holds that

$$\mathrm{TV}(\widetilde{R}_0, \widetilde{R}_1) = 0. \tag{33}$$

We therefore have

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\theta(\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon), \Phi \circ \rho) \geq \frac{\Phi(\omega(\varepsilon)/2)}{2}\left(1 - \sqrt{4n\alpha^2}\mathrm{TV}(\widetilde{R}_0, \widetilde{R}_1)\right) = \frac{\Phi(\omega(\varepsilon)/2)}{2}, \tag{34}$$

where the inequality is due to Proposition 1 in Duchi et al. (2018) – a private version of Le Cam's Lemma and the identity is due to (33).

Combining (32) and (34), we conclude the proof. □

Lemma 9 (Theorem 5.1 in Chen et al. (2018))**.** *Let R_1 and R_2 be two distributions on $\mathcal{X}$. If for some $\varepsilon \in [0,1)$, we have that $\mathrm{TV}(R_1, R_2) = \varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon)$, then there exists two distributions on the same probability space G_1 and G_2 such that*

$$(1-\varepsilon)R_1 + \varepsilon G_1 = (1-\varepsilon)R_2 + \varepsilon G_2. \tag{35}$$

Proof. This is from the proof of Theorem 5.1 in Chen et al. (2018). Let the densities of R_1 and R_2 be

$$r_1 = \frac{\mathrm{d}R_1}{\mathrm{d}(R_1 + R_2)} \quad \text{and} \quad r_2 = \frac{\mathrm{d}R_2}{\mathrm{d}(R_1 + R_2)}.$$

Then the following choices of G_1 and G_2

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}G_1}{\mathrm{d}(R_1 + R_2)} = \frac{(r_2 - r_1)\mathbb{1}\{r_2 \geq r_1\}}{\mathrm{TV}(R_1, R_2)} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\mathrm{d}G_2}{\mathrm{d}(R_1 + R_2)} = \frac{(r_1 - r_2)\mathbb{1}\{r_1 \geq r_2\}}{\mathrm{TV}(R_1, R_2)}$$

satisfy (35), following the calculations done in the proof of Theorem 5.1 in Chen et al. (2018). □

B Technical details of Section 2

B.1 Proofs of results in Section 2

Proof of Proposition 2. We use QM_0^n and QM_1^n to denote the joint distribution of $Z_1, \ldots, Z_n$, when $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ are generated from $M_0 \in \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(P_0)$ and $M_1 \in \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(P_1)$, respectively. We then have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\varepsilon) &\geq \inf_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}_\alpha} \inf_{\phi\in\Phi_Q} \{QM_0^n(\phi=1) + QM_1^n(\phi=0)\} \\
&= \inf_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}_\alpha} \inf_{\phi\in\Phi_Q} \{1 - [QM_0^n(\phi=0) - QM_1^n(\phi=0)]\} \geq \inf_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}_\alpha} \{1 - \mathrm{TV}(QM_0^n, QM_1^n)\} \\
&\geq \inf_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}_\alpha} \exp\{-\mathrm{KL}(QM_0^n, QM_1^n)\} \geq \exp\{-4n(e^\alpha - 1)^2 \mathrm{TV}^2(M_0, M_1)\},
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the definition of the total variation distance, the third inequality follows from Lemma 2.6 in Tsybakov (2009) and final inequality is due to Corollary 3 in Duchi et al. (2018).

Let $\eta = \mathrm{TV}(P_0, P_1)/\{1 + \mathrm{TV}(P_0, P_1)\}$ and suppose that $\eta \geq \varepsilon$. By Lemma 9, there exist probability distributions G_0 and G_1 with $(1-\eta)P_0 + \eta G_0 = (1-\eta)P_1 + \eta G_1$, so that we may write $G_0 - G_1 = (1-\eta)/\eta(P_1 - P_0)$. For $j = 0, 1$, define $M_j = (1-\varepsilon)P_j + \varepsilon G_j$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{TV}(M_0, M_1) &= \sup_S\{M_0(S) - M_1(S)\} = \sup_S[(1-\varepsilon)\{P_0(S) - P_1(S)\} + \varepsilon\{G_0(S) - G_1(S)\}] \\
&= \sup_S[\{1 - \varepsilon - \varepsilon(1-\eta)/\eta\}\{P_0(S) - P_1(S)\}] = (1 - \varepsilon/\eta)\mathrm{TV}(P_0, P_1) \\
&= (1-\varepsilon)\{\mathrm{TV}(P_0, P_1) - \varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon)\} \leq \mathrm{TV}(P_0, P_1) - \varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, when $\eta < \varepsilon$ we take $M_j = (1-\eta)P_j + \eta G_j$. Therefore, we have $\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\varepsilon) \geq \exp\left(-16n\alpha^2\{\mathrm{TV}(P_0, P_1) - \varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon)\}_+^2\right)$ when $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ since $e^\alpha - 1 < 2\alpha$. □

Proof of Theorem 3. The result follows from Lemma 10 since for any $P \in \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(P_0)$, we have

$$\mathrm{TV}(P_0, P) = \sup_A |P_0(A) - P(A)| = \varepsilon \sup_A |P(A) - G(A)| \leq \varepsilon,$$

and similarly for $P' \in \mathcal{P}'_\varepsilon(P_1)$. Therefore, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{P\in\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(P_0)} \mathbb{E}_{P,Q}[\tilde{\phi}] + \sup_{P'\in\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(P_1)} \mathbb{E}_{P',Q}[(1-\tilde{\phi})] \\
&\leq \sup_{P:\mathrm{TV}(P,P_0)\leq\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}_{P,Q}[\tilde{\phi}] + \sup_{P':\mathrm{TV}(P',P_1)\leq\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}_{P',Q}[(1-\tilde{\phi})] \leq 4\exp\Big\{-C\alpha^2 n\{\mathrm{TV}(P_0, P_1) - 2\varepsilon\}^2\Big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 10. *Assume* $\mathrm{TV}(P_0, P_1) > 2\varepsilon$, *and* $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, *then it holds that*

$$\sup_{P:\mathrm{TV}(P,P_0)\leq\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}_{P,Q}[\tilde{\phi}] \leq \exp\{-C\alpha^2 n\,(\mathrm{TV}(P_0, P_1) - 2\varepsilon)^2\} \tag{36}$$

and

$$\sup_{P':\mathrm{TV}(P',P_1)\leq\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}_{P',Q}[(1-\tilde{\phi})] \leq \exp\{-C\alpha^2 n\,(\mathrm{TV}(P_0, P_1) - 2\varepsilon)^2\}, \tag{37}$$

where $C > 0$ *is some absolute constant.*

Proof of Lemma 10. We only prove (36) since (37) follows using the same arguments. For any P such that $\mathrm{TV}(P, P_0) \leq \varepsilon$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{P,Q}[\tilde{\phi}] = \mathbb{P}\left(|\tilde{N}_0/n - P_0(A)| > |\tilde{N}_0/n - P_1(A)|\right)$$

$$= \mathbb{P}\left(2\{\widetilde{N}_0/n - P(A)\} < P_0(A) + P_1(A) - 2P(A)\right)$$
$$\leq \mathbb{P}\left(2\{\widetilde{N}_0/n - P(A)\} < -\mathrm{TV}(P_0, P_1) + 2\varepsilon\right),$$

where the last line is due to $\mathrm{TV}(P_0, P_1) = P_0(A) - P_1(A)$.

Note that

$$\mathbb{E}_{P,Q}\Big[\frac{\tilde{N}_0}{n}\Big] = \frac{e^\alpha + 1}{e^\alpha - 1}\left(\frac{\mathbb{E}_{P,Q}[\hat{N}_0]}{n} - \frac{1}{e^\alpha + 1}\right) = P(A),$$

since

$$\mathbb{E}_{P,Q}\Big[\frac{\hat{N}_0}{n}\Big] = \frac{e^\alpha}{e^\alpha + 1}\mathbb{P}(Y_1 = 0) + \frac{1}{e^\alpha + 1}\mathbb{P}(Y_1 = 1) = \frac{1}{e^\alpha + 1}\Big\{1 + (e^\alpha - 1)P(A)\Big\}.$$

Therefore, for some absolute constants C_0 and C, we have when $\mathrm{TV}(P_0, P_1) > 2\varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{P,Q}[\tilde{\phi}] &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{N}_0/n - P(A) < -\mathrm{TV}(P_0, P_1)/2 + \varepsilon\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left\{-C_0\left(\frac{e^\alpha - 1}{e^\alpha + 1}\right)^2 n\left(\mathrm{TV}(P_0, P_1)/2 - \varepsilon\right)^2\right\} \\ &\leq \exp\{-C\alpha^2 n\left(\mathrm{TV}(P_0, P_1) - 2\varepsilon\right)^2\},\end{aligned}$$

where we apply Hoeffding's inequality (e.g. Proposition 2.5 in Wainwright 2019) in the second line, since $\tilde{N}_0/n$ is a sub-Gaussian random variable with variance proxy $\sigma^2 \leq n^{-1}(e^\alpha + 1)^2(e^\alpha - 1)^{-2}$. □

We conclude this section by giving details of the calculations presented in Remark 1. Under H_0 we have that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}(\widetilde{N}_0/n) - \frac{1-\varepsilon}{2}\{P_0(A) + P_1(A)\} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = P(A) - \frac{1-\varepsilon}{2}\{P_0(A) + P_1(A)\} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \\ \geq &(1-\varepsilon)P_0(A) - \frac{1-\varepsilon}{2}\{P_0(A) + P_1(A)\} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \frac{1-\varepsilon}{2}\mathrm{TV}(P_0, P_1) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, under H_1 we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}(\widetilde{N}_0/n) - \frac{1-\varepsilon}{2}\{P_0(A) + P_1(A)\} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \\ \leq &(1-\varepsilon)P_1(A) + \varepsilon - \frac{1-\varepsilon}{2}\{P_0(A) + P_1(A)\} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \frac{\varepsilon}{2} - \frac{1-\varepsilon}{2}\mathrm{TV}(P_0, P_1).\end{aligned}$$

Using Hoeffding's inequality as in the proof of Lemma 10 we see that, under H_0,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{N}_0/n < \frac{1-\varepsilon}{2}\{P_0(A) + P_1(A)\} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \leq \exp\left\{-C\alpha^2 n(1-\varepsilon)^2\{\mathrm{TV}(P_0, P_1) - \varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon)\}_+^2\right\}.$$

Combining with an analogous bound under H_1, we see that

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\varepsilon) \leq 2\exp\left\{-C\alpha^2 n(1-\varepsilon)^2\{\mathrm{TV}(P_0, P_1) - \varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon)\}_+^2\right\},$$

and we can remove the $(1-\varepsilon)^2$ factor by noting that $\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\varepsilon) = 1$ for $\varepsilon > 1/2$, so we may restrict attention to $\varepsilon \leq 1/2$.

B.2 Rényi Differential Privacy

In this section we consider a family of more general notions of local privacy and show that the TV distance is still the natural measure of difficulty in the simple testing problem for each constraint in the family. Thus the TV distance arises more generally than just for LDP. There is no obvious link between the definition of the privacy constraints and the TV distance.

Following Mironov (2017) and Duchi & Ruan (2018) we consider the family of local privacy constraints known as Rényi local differential privacy. For $\gamma \geq 2$ and distributions P, Q define the γ-Rényi divergence

$$D_\gamma(P||Q) = \frac{1}{\gamma - 1} \log \int \Big(\frac{dP}{dQ}\Big)^\gamma \, \mathrm{d}Q.$$

We then say that a privacy mechanism Q is (γ, α^2)-Rényi locally differentially private (RDP) if for all $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$ and $z_{1:(i-1)} \in \mathcal{Z}^{i-1}$ we have

$$D_\gamma\big(Q(\cdot|x, z_{1:(i-1)}), Q(\cdot|x', z_{1:(i-1)})\big) \leq \alpha^2. \tag{38}$$

By the monotonicity of Rényi divergences (e.g. Theorem 3 in Van Erven & Harremos 2014) we have that (γ, α^2)-RDP implies (γ', α^2)-RDP for any $\gamma' \leq \gamma$. Hence, lower bounds over all $(2, \alpha^2)$-RDP mechanisms imply lower bounds over all (γ, α^2)-RDP mechanisms for any $\gamma \geq 2$. We would like to point out that the limit $\lim_{\gamma\to\infty} D_\gamma$ is the logarithm of the essential supremum of dP/dQ, and the limiting privacy constraint is therefore an LDP constraint (e.g. Theorem 6 in Van Erven & Harremos 2014). This explains that for $\gamma \in [2, \infty)$, (γ, α)-RDP is a less stringent constraint than the α-LDP constraint. The α dependence can be tightened by noting that α-LDP implies $(\gamma, 2\gamma\alpha^2)$-RDP for any $\gamma \geq 1$ (Duchi & Ruan 2018).

For the robust testing problem we considered in Section 2, we replace the LDP with the more general RDP and provide the following results.

Proposition 11. *Let $\mathcal{R}_{n,\gamma,\alpha}(\varepsilon)$ be the minimax testing risk for robust testing problem defined in (7) in Section 2, with $\mathcal{Q}_\alpha$ denoting all (γ, α^2)-RDP privacy mechanisms (38) with $\gamma \geq 2$. For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and the robust testing problem (6), it holds that*

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\gamma,\alpha}(\varepsilon) \geq \exp\big(-4n\alpha^2(1-\varepsilon)^2\{\mathrm{TV}(P_0, P_1) - \varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon)\}_+^2\big).$$

Proof. As discussed above, it suffices to study $\mathcal{R}_{n,2,\alpha}(\varepsilon)$ since we have that $\mathcal{R}_{n,\gamma,\alpha}(\varepsilon) \geq \mathcal{R}_{n,2,\alpha}(\varepsilon)$ whenever $\gamma \geq 2$. If Q is any sequentially-interactive $(2, \alpha^2)$-RDP mechanism then, by Corollary 11 of Duchi & Ruan (2018), we have

$$\mathrm{KL}(QM_0^n||QM_1^n) \leq 4n\alpha^2 \mathrm{TV}(M_0, M_1)^2,$$

where we use the same notation as in the proof of Proposition 2. Using the above inequality in the proof of Proposition 2 we immediately have

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\gamma,\alpha^2}(\varepsilon) \geq \inf_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}_{\gamma,\alpha}} \exp\{-\mathrm{KL}(QM_0^n||QM_1^n)\} \geq \exp\{-4n\alpha^2\mathrm{TV}(M_0, M_1)\}.$$

Choosing M_0, M_1 as before we have the lower bound

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\gamma,\alpha^2}(\varepsilon) \geq \exp\big(-4n\alpha^2(1-\varepsilon)^2\{\mathrm{TV}(P_0, P_1) - \varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon)\}_+^2\big)$$

as claimed. □

In Proposition 12 below, we show that the exponent in the lower bound is in fact optimal up to a factor depending only on γ.

Proposition 12. *Let $\mathcal{R}_{n,\gamma,\alpha}(\varepsilon)$ be the minimax testing risk for robust testing problem defined in (7) in Section 2, with $\mathcal{Q}_\alpha$ denoting all (γ,α^2)-RDP privacy mechanisms (38) with $\gamma \geq 2$. For $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and the robust testing problem (6), it holds that*

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\gamma,\alpha}(\varepsilon) \leq \exp\bigl(-c_\gamma n\alpha^2\{\mathrm{TV}(P_0,P_1)-\varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon)\}_+^2\bigr),$$

where $c_\gamma > 0$ is a constant depending only on γ.

Proof. We use a privatised Scheffé test as for differential privacy. Using similar notation as in (8) and the randomised response mechanism with parameter $p \in (1/2,1)$, i.e.

$$Z_i = \begin{cases} Y_i, & U_i \leq p, \\ 1-Y_i, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases},$$

we use the test

$$\phi' = \mathbb{1}\bigl\{2\tilde{N}_0/n < (1-\varepsilon)\{P_0(A)+P_1(A)\}+\varepsilon\bigr\}.$$

With almost exactly the same proof as before, the risk of this test is bounded above by

$$2\exp\bigl[-C(2p-1)^2 n\{\mathrm{TV}(P_0,P_1)-\varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon)\}_+^2\bigr] \tag{39}$$

where $C>0$ is a universal constant, provided $p \leq 3/4$, say. As previously, if ε is unknown we can use a simplified test at the cost of replacing $\varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon)$ by 2ε in the upper bound. Now, by Proposition 5 of Mironov (2017), this mechanism satisfies

$$\Bigl(\gamma, \frac{1}{\gamma-1}\log\bigl(p^\gamma(1-p)^{1-\gamma}+(1-p)^\gamma p^{1-\gamma}\bigr)\Bigr)\text{-RDP}.$$

It remains to choose p such that the mechanism satisfies (γ,α^2)-RDP and plug this choice of p into (39). Say that $p=(1+\eta)/2$ for some small $\eta>0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\gamma-1}\log\bigl(p^\gamma(1-p)^{1-\gamma}+(1-p)^\gamma p^{1-\gamma}\bigr) \\
&= \frac{1}{\gamma-1}\log\left(\frac{1}{2}\left\{(1-\eta)\Bigl(\frac{1+\eta}{1-\eta}\Bigr)^\gamma + (1+\eta)\Bigl(\frac{1+\eta}{1-\eta}\Bigr)^{-\gamma}\right\}\right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}\left[(1-\eta)\left\{\Bigl(\frac{1+\eta}{1-\eta}\Bigr)^\gamma - 1\right\} + (1+\eta)\left\{\Bigl(\frac{1+\eta}{1-\eta}\Bigr)^{-\gamma} - 1\right\}\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}\left[(1-\eta)\left\{\Bigl(\frac{1+\eta}{1-\eta}\Bigr)^\gamma - 1 - 2\gamma\eta\right\} + (1+\eta)\left\{\Bigl(\frac{1+\eta}{1-\eta}\Bigr)^{-\gamma} - 1 + 2\gamma\eta\right\} - 4\gamma\eta^2\right] \\
&\sim 2\gamma\eta^2
\end{aligned}$$

as $\eta \searrow 0$. It is now clear that there exists C_γ such that

$$\frac{1}{\gamma-1}\log\bigl(p^\gamma(1-p)^{1-\gamma}+(1-p)^\gamma p^{1-\gamma}\bigr) \leq C_\gamma^2\eta^2$$

for all $\eta \in [0,1/2]$. Hence, if $p = 1/2 + \alpha/(2C_\gamma)$ the mechanism satisfies (γ,α^2)-RDP. Thus

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\gamma,\alpha}(\varepsilon) \leq 2\exp\bigl[-(C/C_\gamma^2)n\alpha^2\{\mathrm{TV}(P_0,P_1)-\varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon)\}_+^2\bigr]$$

as claimed. □

C Technical details of Section 3

C.1 Proofs of results in Section 3

Proof of Proposition 4. In light of Proposition 1, it suffices to consider the minimax risk without contamination, denoted as $\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(0)$, and $\omega^2(\varepsilon)$, defined in (5), respectively.

Step 1. In this step, we are to lower bound $\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(0)$ in two aspects, with and without the effect of D, respectively.

Recalling the total variation modulus of continuity $\omega(\varepsilon)$, for $\eta > 0$, let

$$\omega'(\eta) = \omega\left(\frac{\eta}{1+\eta}\right) = \sup\{|\theta(R_0') - \theta(R_1')| : \mathrm{TV}(R_0', R_1') \le \eta,\ R_0',\ R_1' \in \mathcal{P}_k\}, \tag{40}$$

where $\theta(\cdot)$ denotes the expectation.

Consider the following distributions R_0 and R_1. Let

$$R_0(\{D-1\}) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} R_1(\{D-1\}) = 1-\eta, \\ R_1\left(\{D-1+(2\eta)^{-1/k}\}\right) = \eta, \end{cases} \qquad \eta \in (0,1),$$

which satisfy that $R_0, R_1 \in \mathcal{P}_k$, defined in (11). To be specific, as for R_0, it holds that $\mu_0 = \mathbb{E}_{R_0}(X) = D-1 \in [-D, D]$ and $\sigma_0^k = \mathbb{E}_{R_0}[|X-\mu_0|^k] = 0 < 1$; as for R_1, it holds that

$$\mu_1 = \mathbb{E}_{R_1}(X) = (1-\eta)(D-1) + \eta\left(\{D-1+(2\eta)^{-1/k}\}\right) = D - 1 + 2^{-1/k}\eta^{1-1/k} \le D$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_1^k = \mathbb{E}_{R_1}[|X-\mu_1|^k] &= (1-\eta)\left(2^{-1/k}\eta^{1-1/k}\right)^k + \eta\left\{(2\eta)^{-1/k} - (2^{-1/k}\eta^{1-1/k}\right\}^k \\ &= 2^{-1}(1-\eta)\eta^{k-1} + 2^{-1}(1-\eta)^k \le 1, \end{aligned}$$

since $\eta < 1 < 2^{1/k}$.

Notice that $\mathrm{TV}(R_0, R_1) = \eta$ by construction and $|\mu_1 - \mu_0| = 2^{-1/k}\eta^{1-1/k}$. We therefore have, due to the definition (40), that

$$\omega'(\eta) \ge 2^{-1/k}\eta^{1-1/k}. \tag{41}$$

Due to Corollary 3.1 in Rohde & Steinberger (2020), we have that for n larger than some absolute constant n_0,

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(0) \ge C_1\left\{\omega'(C_0(n\alpha^2)^{-1/2})\right\}^2 \gtrsim (n\alpha^2)^{1/k-1}, \tag{42}$$

where $C_0, C_1 > 0$ are absolute constants.

It follows from Lemma 13, we have that

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(0) \ge \frac{D^2}{32\exp\left(64n\alpha^2\right)}. \tag{43}$$

Combining (42) and (43), we have that

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(0) \gtrsim (n\alpha^2)^{1/k-1} \vee \frac{D^2}{\exp\left(64n\alpha^2\right)}. \tag{44}$$

Step 2. To apply Proposition 1, it suffices to lower bound $\omega^2(\varepsilon/2)$. We have that

$$\omega^2(\varepsilon/2) = \omega'\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2-\varepsilon}\right) \gtrsim \varepsilon^{2-2/k}, \tag{45}$$

where the inequality is due to (41).

Combining (44) and (45), in light of Proposition 1, we complete the proof. □

Lemma 13. *Under the same settings as those in Proposition 4 and assuming $\varepsilon = 0$, it holds that*

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(0) \geq \frac{D^2}{32\exp\left(64n\alpha^2\right)}$$

Proof. Let $M(\delta)$ denote the δ-packing number of the interval $[-D, D]$, i.e. the maximal cardinality of a set $\{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_M\} \subseteq [-D, D]$ such that $|\mu_i - \mu_j| > \delta$ for all distinct $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$. Let J be uniformly distributed on $\{1, \ldots, M(\delta)\}$ and $P_i \in \mathcal{P}_k$ be distribution with mean μ_i, for $i = 1, \ldots, M(\delta)$. We use QP_i^n to denote the marginal distribution of the private data $Z_1, \ldots, Z_n$, and define the mixture distribution $\overline{Q} = \{M(\delta)\}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{M(\delta)} QP_i^n$. Then using (15) in Duchi et al. (2018), we can upper bound the mutual information $I(Z_1^n; J)$ as

$$I(Z_1^n; J) = \frac{1}{M(\delta)} \sum_{i=1}^{M(\delta)} \mathrm{KL}(QP_i^n, \overline{Q}) \leq 4n(e^\alpha - 1)^2 \frac{1}{\{M(\delta)\}^2} \sum_{i,i'=1}^{M(\delta)} \mathrm{TV}(P_i, P_{i'}) \leq 4n(e^\alpha - 1)^2, \quad (46)$$

where the last inequality holds from upper bounding the total variation distance by 1. Then, applying Fano's inequality (e.g. Proposition 15.12 in Wainwright 2019) together with (46), we have that

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(0) \geq \frac{\delta^2}{4} \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha} \left\{1 - \frac{I(Z_1^n; J) + \log(2)}{\log(M(\delta))}\right\} \geq \frac{\delta^2}{4}\left\{1 - \frac{4n(e^\alpha - 1)^2 + \log(2)}{\log(M(\delta))}\right\}.$$

Writing $M^{-1}(x) = \inf\{\delta \in (0, \delta_0) : M(\delta) < x\}$, for some $\delta_0 > 0$ and $x > 1$, and note that when $D < \infty$, $M^{-1}(x) = 2D/(\lceil x \rceil - 1) \geq 2D/x$. Therefore, it holds that when $\alpha \in (0, 1)$

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(0) \geq \frac{1}{8}\left(M^{-1}\left(4e^{8n(e^\alpha - 1)^2}\right)\right)^2 \geq \frac{D^2}{32\exp\left(16n(e^\alpha - 1)^2\right)} \geq \frac{D^2}{32\exp\left(64n\alpha^2\right)},$$

where the last inequality is due to $e^\alpha - 1 < 2\alpha$ when $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. □

Proof of Theorem 5. Fix the data-generating distribution $P_{k,\varepsilon}$, write P_0 for the uncontaminated version, and let

$$\mathcal{J}_0 = \{j \in \mathcal{J} : P_{k,\varepsilon}(A_j) > \varepsilon + (1 - \varepsilon)(6/M)^k\}.$$

Since, by Chebyshev's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}(|X - \mu| \geq M/6) \leq \varepsilon + (1 - \varepsilon)(6/M)^k,$$

we must always have $|\mathcal{J}_0| \leq 2$. Again by Chebyshev's inequality there will always exist $j \in \mathcal{J}$ with $P_{k,\varepsilon}(A_j) \geq (1/2)\{1 - \varepsilon - (1 - \varepsilon)(6/M)^k\}$ so, since we have the condition $\varepsilon + (1 - \varepsilon)(6/M)^k \leq 1/12 < 1/3$, we must also have $|\mathcal{J}_0| \geq 1$, so that $|\mathcal{J}_0| \in \{1, 2\}$. Now, for $j \notin \mathcal{J}_0$ we can see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(j \in \hat{\mathcal{J}}) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{X_i \in A_j\}} + \frac{2}{\alpha} W_{ij}\right) \geq \tau\right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{X_i \in A_j\}} - P_{k,\varepsilon}(A_j) + \frac{2}{\alpha} W_{ij}\right) \geq 4\sqrt{2\log(12T/(M\delta))/(n\alpha^2)}\right) \\
&\leq \exp\left(-\frac{4\log(12T/(M\delta))}{\alpha^2}\right) + \exp\left(-\frac{1}{8}\min\left\{8\log(12T/(M\delta)), 4\sqrt{2n\log(12T/(M\delta))}\right\}\right) \\
&\leq 2\exp\big(-\log(12T/(M\delta))\big) = M\delta/(6T),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follow from Hoeffding's inequality (e.g. Theorem 2.26 in Vershynin 2018) and Bernstein's inequality (e.g. Theorem 2.8.1 in Vershynin 2018), and for the final

inequality we used the condition $n^{-1}\log(12T^3n\alpha^2/M) \leq 1/2$. Since $|\mathcal{J} \setminus \mathcal{J}_0| \leq 6T/M$ we therefore have that

$$\mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathcal{J}} \not\subseteq \mathcal{J}_0) \leq \delta. \tag{47}$$

We now show that $\hat{\mathcal{J}}$ is non-empty with high probability. Indeed, let $j \in \mathcal{J}$ be such that $P_{k,\varepsilon}(A_j) \geq (1/2)\{1-\varepsilon-(1-\varepsilon)(6/M)^k\}$. Then, using the same concentration inequality as above, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathcal{J}} = \emptyset) \leq \mathbb{P}(j \notin \hat{\mathcal{J}}) &= \mathbb{P}\biggl(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \bigl\{\mathbb{1}_{\{X_i \in A_j\}} + (2/\alpha)W_{ij}\bigr\} < \tau\biggr) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\biggl(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \bigl\{\mathbb{1}_{\{X_i \in A_j\}} - P_{k,\varepsilon}(A_j) + (2/\alpha)W_{ij}\bigr\} < \tau - (1/2)\{1-\varepsilon-(1-\varepsilon)(6/M)^k\}\biggr) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\biggl(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \bigl\{\mathbb{1}_{\{X_i \in A_j\}} - P_{k,\varepsilon}(A_j) + (2/\alpha)W_{ij}\bigr\} < -1/4\biggr) \\
&\leq \exp\Bigl(-\frac{n}{128}\Bigr) + \exp\Bigl(-\frac{1}{8}\min(n\alpha^2/64, n\alpha/4)\Bigr) \leq 2\exp\Bigl(-\frac{n\alpha^2}{512}\Bigr),
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

by using the conditions $\alpha \leq 1$, $\varepsilon + (1-\varepsilon)(6/M)^k \leq 1/12$ and $(n\alpha^2)^{-1}\log(12T^3n\alpha^2/M) \leq 1/512$.

With these bounds in place we turn to the mean squared error of our estimator, which we decompose as

$$\mathbb{E}\{(\hat{\mu}-\mu)^2\} = (\mathbb{E}\hat{\mu}-\mu)^2 + \mathrm{Var}\bigl(\mathbb{E}\{\hat{\mu}|J\}\bigr) + \mathbb{E}\bigl\{\mathrm{Var}(\hat{\mu}|J)\bigr\}. \tag{49}$$

The final term of (49) can be simply bounded by saying

$$\mathbb{E}\bigl\{\mathrm{Var}(\hat{\mu}|J)\bigr\} = \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\bigl\{\mathbb{1}_{\{\hat{\mathcal{J}}\neq\emptyset\}}\mathrm{Var}(Z^{(L)}_{(L+2)n}|L)\bigr\} \leq \frac{1}{n}\biggl(\frac{M^2}{4} + \frac{2M^2}{\alpha^2}\biggr) = \frac{9M^2}{4n\alpha^2}. \tag{50}$$

Bounds on the first two terms of (49) will follow from (47), (48) and control of $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}|J = j_0 - 1)$ for $j_0 \in \mathcal{J}_0$. Given a realisation $j_0 \in \mathcal{J}_0$ of $J+1$, write ℓ_0 for the associated realisation of L, so that $\ell_0 \equiv (j_0-1)(\mathrm{mod}3)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\bigl|\mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}|J = j_0-1) - \mu\bigr| &= \bigl|\mathbb{E}([R^{(\ell_0)}_{(\ell_0+2)n}]_0^M) + (j_0-2)M/3 - \mu\bigr| \\
&\leq \varepsilon\max\bigl(|(j_0+1)M/3-\mu|, |(j_0-2)M/3-\mu|\bigr) \\
&\qquad + (1-\varepsilon)\bigl|\mathbb{E}_{P_0}\bigl\{[R^{(\ell_0)}_{(\ell_0+2)n}]_0^M + (j_0-2)M/3 - X_{(\ell_0+2)n}\bigr\}\bigr|.
\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

Since $j_0 \in \mathcal{J}_0$, if it were the case that $\mu \notin [(j_0-3/2)M/3, (j_0+1/2)M/3)$ we would have the chain of inequalities

$$\varepsilon + (1-\varepsilon)(6/M)^k < P_{k,\varepsilon}(A_{j_0}) \leq \varepsilon + (1-\varepsilon)\mathbb{P}_{P_0}(|X-\mu| \geq M/6) \leq \varepsilon + (1-\varepsilon)(6/M)^k,$$

which is a contradiction. We therefore have $\mu \in [(j_0-3/2)M/3, (j_0+1/2)M/3)$ and so

$$\varepsilon\max\bigl(|(j_0+1)M/3-\mu|, |(j_0-2)M/3-\mu|\bigr) \leq 5\varepsilon M/2. \tag{52}$$

Now, again using the fact that $\mu \in [(j_0-3/2)M/3, (j_0+1/2)M/3)$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\bigl|\mathbb{E}_{P_0}\bigl\{[R^{(\ell_0)}_{(\ell_0+2)n}]_0^M + (j_0-2)M/3 - X_{(\ell_0+2)n}\bigr\}\bigr| \\
&\quad= \Bigl|\mathbb{E}_{P_0}\Bigl\{\mathbb{1}_{\{X_{(\ell_0+2)n} \notin [(j_0-2)M/3, (j_0+1)M/3)\}}\Bigl([R^{(\ell_0)}_{(\ell_0+2)n}]_0^M + (j_0-2)M/3 - X_{(\ell_0+2)n}\Bigr)\Bigr\}\Bigr| \\
&\quad\leq \mathbb{E}_{P_0}\Bigl\{\mathbb{1}_{\{X_{(\ell_0+2)n} < (j_0-2)M/3\}}\Bigl([R^{(\ell_0)}_{(\ell_0+2)n}]_0^M + (j_0-2)M/3 - X_{(\ell_0+2)n}\Bigr)\Bigr\}
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\quad + \mathbb{E}_{P_0}\Big\{\mathbb{1}_{\{X_{(\ell_0+2)n} \geq (j_0+1)M/3\}}\Big(X_{(\ell_0+2)n} - [R^{(\ell_0)}_{(\ell_0+2)n}]_0^M - (j_0-2)M/3\Big)\Big\} \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}_{P_0}\Big\{\mathbb{1}_{\{X_1-\mu<-M/6\}}\Big(M - \frac{M}{6} + \mu - X_1\Big)\Big\} \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}_{P_0}\Big\{\mathbb{1}_{\{X_1-\mu\geq M/6\}}\Big(X_1 - \mu + (j_0+1/2)M/3 - (j_0-2)M/3\Big)\Big\} \\
&= \frac{5M}{6}\mathbb{P}_{P_0}(|X_1-\mu| \geq M/6) + \mathbb{E}_{P_0}(\mathbb{1}_{\{|X_1-\mu|\geq M/6\}}|X_1-\mu|) \\
&\leq \frac{5M}{6}\Big(\frac{6}{M}\Big)^k + \Big(\frac{6}{M}\Big)^{k-1} = \frac{6^k}{M^{k-1}}. \qquad (53)
\end{aligned}
$$

Combining (51), (52) and (53) we see that, when $j_0 \in \mathcal{J}_0$, we have

$$
\big|\mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}|J = j_0 - 1) - \mu\big| \leq \frac{5}{2}\varepsilon M + (1-\varepsilon)\frac{6^k}{M^{k-1}}.
$$

First, we use this and the fact that $-T - M \leq \mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}|J) \leq T + M$ to see that

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\mathbb{E}\hat{\mu} - \mu| &\leq T\mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathcal{J}} = \emptyset) + (2T+M)\mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathcal{J}} \not\subseteq \mathcal{J}_0) + \Big|\sum_{j_0\in\mathcal{J}_0}\mathbb{P}(J = j_0-1)\big\{\mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}|J=j_0-1) - \mu\big\}\Big| \\
&\leq 2T\exp(-n\alpha^2/512) + \delta(2T+M) + \frac{5}{2}\varepsilon M + (1-\varepsilon)\frac{6^k}{M^{k-1}}, \qquad (54)
\end{aligned}
$$

which controls the bias of our estimator. In dealing with the variance of the conditional mean, it will be helpful to split into the two cases $|\mathcal{J}_0| = 1$ and $|\mathcal{J}_0| = 2$. In the first of these cases, writing $\mathcal{J}_0 = \{j_0\}$, we can say by (47) and (48) that

$$
\mathrm{Var}\big(\mathbb{E}\big\{\hat{\mu}|J\big\}\big) \leq \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big\{\mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}|J) - \mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}|J=j_0-1)\Big\}^2\Big] \leq (T+M)^2\delta + 8(T+M)^2\exp(-n\alpha^2/512). \qquad (55)
$$

In the second case, writing $\mathcal{J}_0 = \{j_0, j_0+1\}$, we can use (47) and (48) to say that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Var}\big(\mathbb{E}\big(\hat{\mu}|J\big)\big) &\leq \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big\{\mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}|J) - \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}_0}\mathbb{P}(J=j-1)\mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}|J=j-1)\Big\}^2\Big] \\
&\leq (T+M)^2\delta + 8(T+M)^2\exp(-n\alpha^2/512) + 2\big\{\mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}|J=j_0-1) - \mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}|J=j_0)\big\}^2 \\
&\leq (T+M)^2\delta + 8(T+M)^2\exp(-n\alpha^2/512) + 2\{5\varepsilon M + 2(1-\varepsilon)6^k M^{-(k-1)}\}^2 \\
&\leq (T+M)^2\delta + 8(T+M)^2\exp(-n\alpha^2/512) + 100\varepsilon^2M^2 + 16(1-\varepsilon)^2 36^k M^{-2(k-1)}. \qquad (56)
\end{aligned}
$$

Combining (49), (50), (54), (55) and (56), we see that we have

$$
\mathbb{E}\{(\hat{\mu}-\mu)^2\} \lesssim T^2\exp(-n\alpha^2/512) + \frac{M^2}{n\alpha^2} + \varepsilon^2M^2 + M^{-2(k-1)},
$$

as claimed.

□

C.2 Additional results

Lemma 14. *For $i = 1, \ldots, n$, write $Z_i = (Z_{i1}, \ldots, Z_{iJ})$, where Z_{ij}'s are defined in (13). Then Z_i satisfy α-LDP. For $i = n+1, \ldots, 4n$, $Z_i^{(\ell)}$ defined in (14) also satisfy α-LDP.*

Proof. For $i = n+1, \ldots, 4n$, $Z_i^{(\ell)}$ are obtained directly using the Laplace mechanism (Dwork et al. 2006) and satisfy α-LDP since $[R_i^{(\ell)}]_0^M \in [0, M]$ for any value x_i. For $i = 1, \ldots, n$, we have

$$
\frac{\mathbb{P}(Z_i = z_i|x_i)}{\mathbb{P}(Z_i = z_i|x_i')} = \prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}}\exp\left(\frac{|z_{ij} - \mathbb{1}_{x_i\in A_j}| - |z_{ij} - \mathbb{1}_{x_j'\in A_j}|}{2/\alpha}\right)
$$

$$\leq \prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \exp\left(\frac{|\mathbb{1}_{\{x_i\in A_j\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{x'_j\in A_j\}}|}{2/\alpha}\right) \leq \exp(\alpha),$$

where the last inequality holds since there are two most two j's in $\mathcal{J}$ such that $\mathbb{1}_{\{x_i\in A_j\}} \neq \mathbb{1}_{\{x'_j\in A_j\}}$. □

We conclude this section by an analysis of the robustness property of the following mean estimation procedure proposed by Duchi et al. (2018). For a truncation level $M > 0$ to be chosen, the privatised data Z_i's are obtained by

$$Z_i = [X_i]_M + \frac{2M}{\alpha} W_i,$$

where W_i, $i = 1\ldots, n$ are i.i.d. standard Laplace random variables, and the mean is estimated by

$$\hat{\mu} = n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n} Z_i.$$

Proposition 15. *Given i.i.d random variables $X_1, \ldots, X_n \sim P_{k,\varepsilon} = (1-\varepsilon)P_k + \varepsilon G$, where $P_k \in \mathcal{P}_k$. Suppose that $M > 2D$, then for $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, it holds that*

$$\mathbb{E}[|\hat{\mu} - \mu|^2] \lesssim \frac{M^2}{n\alpha^2} + \varepsilon^2 M^2 + \frac{D^2}{M^{2k-2}}. \tag{57}$$

With the choice of truncation parameter $M = D^{1/k}\left(\varepsilon^{-1/k} \wedge (n\alpha^2)^{1/(2k)}\right)$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[|\hat{\mu} - \mu|^2] \lesssim D^{2/k}\left((n\alpha^2)^{1/k-1} \vee \varepsilon^{2-2/k}\right).$$

Remark 3. From Proposition 15, we have when D is of constant order, $\hat{\mu}$ matches the minimax lower bound, but when D increases with n, this bound is sub-optimal.

Proof. We use the bias and variance decomposition $\mathbb{E}[|\hat{\mu} - \mu|^2] = (\mathbb{E}[\hat{\mu} - \mu])^2 + \mathrm{Var}(\hat{\mu})$ to bound the mean squared error. Due to the truncation, the variance of $\hat{\mu}$ can be bounded by

$$\mathrm{Var}(\hat{\mu}) \leq \frac{1}{n}\mathrm{Var}([X_i]_M]) + \frac{8M^2}{n\alpha^2} \leq \frac{9M^2}{n\alpha^2}.$$

As for the bias term, since W_i's have mean zero, it holds that

$$|\mathbb{E}[\hat{\mu} - \mu]| = |\mathbb{E}[[X_1]_M - \mu]| \leq \varepsilon(M + |\mu|) + (1-\varepsilon)|\mathbb{E}_{P_k}[[X]_M] - \mu| \leq \varepsilon|M + D| + |\mathbb{E}_{P_k}[[X]_M] - \mu|.$$

The final term is controlled in a way that is similar to equation (45) in Duchi et al. (2018). Provided that $M > 2D$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathbb{E}_{P_k}[[X]_M] - \mu| &\leq \mathbb{E}_{P_k}\big|[[X]_M - X]\big| \leq 2^{1/k}\mathbb{E}_{P_k}[|X|^k]^{1/k}\mathbb{P}(|X| > M)^{1/k'} \\ &\leq 2^{1+1/k}(1 + |\mu|)(M - \mu)^{1-k} \leq \frac{8D}{(M-D)^{k-1}} \lesssim \frac{D}{M^{k-1}}.\end{aligned}$$

where $k' = k/(k-1)$, and in the third inequality we used

$$\mathbb{E}_{P_k}[|X|^k]^{1/k} = \mathbb{E}_{P_k}[|X - \mu + \mu|^k]^{1/k} \leq 2(\mathbb{E}_{P_k}|X - \mu|^k + |\mu|^k)^{1/k} \leq 2(1 + D)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(|X| > M)^{1/k'} = \mathbb{P}(|X - \mu| > M - \mu)^{1/k'} \leq (M - \mu)^{1-k}$$

by Markov's inequality. Therefore, we have finally

$$\mathbb{E}[|\hat{\mu} - \mu|^2] \lesssim \frac{M^2}{n\alpha^2} + \varepsilon^2 M^2 + \frac{D^2}{M^{2k-2}}.$$

□

D Technical details of Section 4

D.1 Proofs of results in Section 4

Proof of Proposition 6. In light of Proposition 1, it suffices to consider the minimax risks without contamination, denoted as $\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\mathcal{F}_\beta, \|\cdot\|_2^2, 0)$ and $\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\mathcal{F}_\beta, \|\cdot\|_\infty, 0)$; and $\omega^2(\varepsilon)$, defined in (5).

Step 1. When $\varepsilon = 0$, claims (20) and (21) follow from Corollary 2.1 (or equation (1.6)) in Butucea et al. (2020) since Sobolev space is a special case of Besov space studied therein. Specifically, with s replaced by β and $p = 2$ in their result, we have

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\mathcal{F}_\beta, \|\cdot\|_2^2, 0) \gtrsim (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{2\beta+2}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\mathcal{F}_\beta, \|\cdot\|_\infty, 0) \gtrsim \left\{\frac{\log(n\alpha^2)}{n\alpha^2}\right\}^{\frac{2\beta-1}{4\beta+2}} \tag{58}$$

Note that although the statement of Corollary 2.1 in Butucea et al. (2020) does not include the case $r = \infty$, an inspection of the proof suggests that the $r = \infty$ case follows exactly the same arguments and corresponding result holds by first taking r-th root and then choose $r = \infty$.

Step 2. To obtain a lower bound on $\omega(\varepsilon)$, due to its definition, it suffices to have a lower bound on different losses of a particular pair of densities, satisfying the total variation distance upper bound. To be specific, we consider the densities $f_0 \in \mathcal{F}_\beta$ and $f_1 = f_0 + \gamma\psi_{jk}$, where the $f_0 \in \mathcal{F}_\beta$ satisfies $f_0 = c_0 > 0$ on some interval $[a, b] \subseteq [0, 1]$ and the function $\psi_{jk}(x) = 2^{j/2}\psi(2^j x - k)$ is a wavelet basis function that is support on $[a, b]$. Note that f_1 is a indeed a density function: (1) $\int_0^1 \psi_{jk}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = 0$, since (26); and (2) $f_1 \geq 0$, since with $\beta > 1/2$ and $c > 0$ sufficiently small, it holds that

$$f_1 \geq c_0 - \gamma\|\psi_{jk}\|_\infty = c_0 - c2^{-j(\beta-1/2)}\|\psi\|_\infty \geq c_0 - c\|\psi\|_\infty \geq 0.$$

In addition, due to the characterisation (28) of Sobolev space and the fact that $2^{j\beta}\gamma = c < \infty$, we have that $f_1 \in \mathcal{F}_\beta$.

Given that $f_0, f_1 \in \mathcal{F}_\beta$, we also have that

$$\mathrm{TV}(P_{f_0}, P_{f_1}) = \frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 |f_0(x) - f_1(x)|\,\mathrm{d}x = \frac{\gamma}{2}\int_0^1 |\psi_{jk}(x)|\,\mathrm{d}x = \frac{c}{2}\|\psi\|_1 2^{-j(\beta+1/2)}. \tag{59}$$

Note that $\|\psi\|_t = \left(\int_{-A}^A |\psi(x)|^t\,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{1/t} < \infty$ for any integer $t \geq 1$ due to our assumption $\|\psi\|_\infty < \infty$ in (26) and ψ is compactly supported on $[-A, A]$. With the choice $2^j = c_1\varepsilon^{-1/(\beta+1/2)}$, for some absolute constant c_1 large enough, (59) leads to that $\mathrm{TV}(P_{f_0}, P_{f_1}) \leq \varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon)$. Then for the t-th norm, with t to be specified, we have that

$$\|f_1 - f_0\|_t = \gamma 2^{j(1/2-1/t)}\|\psi\|_t \asymp \varepsilon^{\beta/(\beta+1/2)}\varepsilon^{(1/t-1/2)/(\beta+1/2)} = \varepsilon^{(\beta+1/t-1/2)/(\beta+1/2)}, \tag{60}$$

which serves as a lower bound on $\omega(\varepsilon)$ with $\rho = \|\cdot\|_t$.

Setting $t = 2$, (60) leads to

$$\omega(\varepsilon/2) \gtrsim \begin{cases} \varepsilon^{\frac{4\beta}{2\beta+1}}, & \text{for the squared-}L_2\text{-loss}, \\ \varepsilon^{\frac{2\beta-1}{2\beta+1}}, & \text{for the } L_\infty\text{-loss}. \end{cases} \tag{61}$$

Step 3. Combining (58) and (61), due to Proposition 1, we conclude the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 7. To simplify notation, let $\mathbb{E}$ denote the unconditional expectation $\mathbb{E}_{P_{f_\varepsilon}, Q}$. Using the Sobolev ellipsoid characterisation (23) with trigonometric functions (22), we write

$$f = \sum_{j=1}^\infty \theta_j\varphi_j = \sum_{j=1}^\infty \left\{\int_{[0,1]} f(x)\varphi_j(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\right\}\varphi_j.$$

Due to the orthonormality of the basis functions, we have that

$$\|\hat{f} - f\|_2^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{k} (\theta_j - \overline{Z}_j)^2 + \sum_{j>k} \theta_j^2 = (I) + (II). \tag{62}$$

For term (II), using (23), we have that

$$\sum_{j>k} \theta_j^2 = \sum_{j>k} j^{2\beta} \frac{\theta_j^2}{j^{2\beta}} \leq \frac{1}{k^{2\beta}} \sum_{j>k} j^{2\beta} \theta_j^2 \leq r^2 k^{-2\beta}. \tag{63}$$

For term (I), note that

$$\mathbb{E}(Z_{i,j}) = \mathbb{E}\Big\{\mathbb{E}_Q(Z_{i,j}|X_i)\Big\} = \mathbb{E}_{P_{f_\varepsilon}}\{\varphi_j(X_i)\} = (1-\varepsilon)\theta_j + \varepsilon \mathbb{E}_G\{\varphi_j(X_i)\}.$$

Since $\sup_{1\leq j\leq k} \|\varphi_j(\cdot)\|_\infty \leq B_0 = \sqrt{2}$, we have that

$$\left|\mathbb{E}\left(\overline{Z}_j - \theta_j\right)\right| = \left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \varepsilon(\mathbb{E}_g[\varphi_j(X_i)] - \theta_j)\right| \leq \varepsilon(B_0 + |\theta_j|).$$

Since $|Z_{i,j}| = B$, by the construction of privacy mechanism detailed in Appendix D.2, for any $i = 1, \ldots, n$ and $j = 1, \ldots, k$, we have that $\mathrm{Var}[Z_{i,j}] \leq B^2$. The independence of $Z_{1,j}, \ldots, Z_{n,j}$ leads to that

$$\mathbb{E}[(\theta_j - \overline{Z}_j)^2] = \left(\mathbb{E}[\overline{Z}_j] - \theta_j\right)^2 + \mathrm{Var}(Z_{i,j})/n \leq 2\varepsilon^2(B_0^2 + \theta_j^2) + B^2/n. \tag{64}$$

Combining (62), (63) and (64), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(\|\hat{f} - f\|_2^2) &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{k} \left\{2\varepsilon^2(B_0^2 + \theta_j^2) + \frac{B^2}{n}\right\} + \frac{r^2}{k^{2\beta}} \\
&\lesssim k\varepsilon^2 B_0^2 + \varepsilon^2 r^2 + \frac{B_0^2 k^2}{n\alpha^2} + \frac{r^2}{k^{2\beta}} \asymp k\varepsilon^2 + \frac{k^2}{n\alpha^2} + \frac{1}{k^{2\beta}},
\end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

where the second inequality is due to (23) and the choice of B in the privacy mechanism, and the final derivation is due to $B_0 = \sqrt{2} \asymp r$.

With the choice $k \asymp \varepsilon^{-\frac{2}{2\beta+1}} \wedge (n\alpha^2)^{\frac{1}{2\beta+2}}$, the upper bound in (65) reads as

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{f} - f\|_2^2] \lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{4\beta}{2\beta+1}} \vee (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{2\beta+2}},$$

which concludes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 8. In this proof, to simplify notation, let $\hat{f}$ denote the estimator $\hat{f}_{\mathrm{Lap}}$ and let $\mathbb{E}_W$ be the expectation with respect to the Laplace random variables and $\mathbb{E}$ for the unconditional expectation $\mathbb{E}_{P_{f_\varepsilon},Q}$.

In order to upper bound the L_∞-loss assuming the true density function $f \in \mathcal{F}_\beta$, in this proof, we upper bound the loss for a larger space of f. To be specific, by the Sobolev embedding theorem (Corollary 9.2 in Härdle et al. 2012), it holds that $\mathcal{F}_\beta \subseteq D_\infty^{\beta-1/2,\infty}$, where

$$D_\infty^{\beta-1/2,\infty} = \left\{f \in B_\infty^{\beta-1/2,\infty},\ f \geq 0,\ \mathrm{supp}(f) \subseteq [0,1],\ \int_{[0,1]} f(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = 1\right\},$$

with $B_\infty^{\beta-1/2,\infty}$ being a Besov space

$$B_\infty^{\beta-1/2,\infty} = \left\{f = \sum_{j\geq -1}\sum_{k\in\mathcal{N}_j} \beta_{jk}\psi_{jk},\ \sup_{j,k} 2^{j\beta}|\beta_{jk}| < \infty\right\}. \tag{66}$$

It then suffices to upper bound $\sup_{f\in D_\infty^{\beta-1/2,\infty}} \mathbb{E}(\|\hat{f}-f\|_\infty)$.

Since $f \in D_\infty^{\beta-1/2,\infty}$ is a density, using the representation in (66), the coefficients β_{jk}'s can only be non-zero if $-A \le -k \le 2^j - k \le A$, and so $|\mathcal{N}_j| \le 2^j + 2A + 1$. For each fixed value of x there are at most $2A+1$ values of k for which $\psi_{jk}(x)$ is non-zero.

It follows from Lemma 16 with $p=\infty$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\hat{f}-f\|_\infty &\le \sum_{j=-1}^{J} \sup_{x\in[0,1]} \left|\sum_{k\in\mathcal{N}_j} (\hat{\beta}_{jk}-\beta_{jk})\psi_{jk}(x)\right| + \sum_{j>J} \sup_{x\in[0,1]} \left|\sum_{k\in\mathcal{N}_j} \beta_{jk}\psi_{jk}(x)\right| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{j=-1}^{J} 2^{j/2} \max_{k\in\mathcal{N}_j} |\hat{\beta}_{jk}-\beta_{jk}| + \sum_{j=-1}^{J} 2^{j/2} \max_{k\in\mathcal{N}_j} |\beta_{jk}|.\end{aligned}$$

In Lemma 18, we show that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\max_{-1\le j\le J, k\in\mathcal{N}_j} \left|\hat{\beta}_{jk}-\beta_{jk}\right|\right] \lesssim \sigma_J\sqrt{\frac{J}{n}} + 2^{J/2}\sqrt{\frac{J}{n}} + \varepsilon 2^{J/2},$$

which then leads to that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{f}-f\|_\infty] &\lesssim \sum_{j=-1}^{J} 2^{j/2}\mathbb{E}\left[\max_{k\in\mathcal{N}_j}|\hat{\beta}_{jk}-\beta_{jk}|\right] + \sum_{j>J} 2^{j/2}\max_{k\in\mathcal{N}_j}|\beta_{jk}| \\ &\lesssim 2^{J/2}\left(\sigma_J\sqrt{\frac{J}{n}} + 2^{J/2}\sqrt{\frac{J}{n}} + \varepsilon 2^{J/2}\right) + \sum_{j>J} 2^{j(1/2-\beta)} \\ &\lesssim \frac{2^J}{\alpha}\sqrt{\frac{J}{n}} + \varepsilon 2^J + 2^{J(1/2-\beta)},\end{aligned}$$

where the second line uses (66) and the last line is due to the choice σ_J in (29) and $\beta > 1/2$. With the choice of $2^J \asymp \left(\frac{\log(n\alpha^2)}{n\alpha^2}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2\beta+1}} \wedge \varepsilon^{-\frac{2}{2\beta+1}}$, we have for any $f \in D_\infty^{\beta-1/2,\infty}$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{f}-f\|_\infty] &\lesssim \frac{2^J}{\alpha}\sqrt{\frac{\log(n\alpha^2)}{n}}\sqrt{\frac{J}{\log(n\alpha^2)}} + \varepsilon 2^J + 2^{J(1/2-\beta)} \\ &\lesssim \frac{2^J}{\alpha}\sqrt{\frac{\log(n\alpha^2)}{n}} + \varepsilon 2^J + 2^{J(1/2-\beta)} \lesssim \left(\frac{n\alpha^2}{\log(n\alpha^2)}\right)^{-\frac{2\beta-1}{4\beta+2}} \vee \varepsilon^{\frac{2\beta-1}{2\beta+1}},\end{aligned}$$

since $2^J \lesssim (n\alpha^2)^{\frac{1}{2\beta+1}}$ and $J \lesssim \log(n\alpha^2)$.

We then conclude the proof. □

Lemma 16 (Lemma 1 in Donoho et al. (1996)). *Let $\theta(x) = \theta_\psi(x) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} |\psi(x-k)|$ and $f(x) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \lambda_k 2^{j/2}\psi(2^j x - k)$. For $1 \le p \le \infty$, then*

$$2^{j(1/2-1/p)}\|\lambda\|_{l_p} \lesssim \|f\|_p \lesssim 2^{j(1/2-1/p)}\|\lambda\|_{l_p}$$

Lemma 17. *Let $\tilde{\beta}_{jk} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \psi_{jk}(X_i)$, then*

$$\mathbb{E}_W\left[\max_{-1\le j\le J, k\in\mathcal{N}_j}\left|\hat{\beta}_{jk}-\tilde{\beta}_{jk}\right|\right] \lesssim \sigma_J\sqrt{\frac{J}{n}}$$

Proof. Note that $\hat{\beta}_{jk} - \tilde{\beta}_{jk} = \frac{1}{n}\sigma_J\sum_{i=1}^n W_{ijk}$ and $\sigma_J W_{ijk}$ is a sub-exponential random variable with parameters $(2\sigma_J, 2\sigma_J)$ according to the definition of sub-Exponential random variables.

Since linear combination preserves sub-exponential property (e.g. Theorem 2.8.2 in Vershynin 2018), we have for each fixed $-1 \le j \le J, k \in \mathcal{N}_j$, $\hat{\beta}_{jk} - \tilde{\beta}_{jk}$ is a sub-exponential random variable with parameters $\left(\frac{2\sigma_J}{\sqrt{n}}, \frac{2\sigma_J}{n}\right)$. Now, applying standard maximal inequality for sub-exponential random variables (e.g. Corollary 2.6 in Boucheron et al. 2013) yields

$$\mathbb{E}_W\left[\max_{-1\le j\le J, k\in\mathcal{N}_j}\left|\hat{\beta}_{jk}-\tilde{\beta}_{jk}\right|\right] \lesssim \sigma_J\sqrt{\frac{\log(S)}{n}} + \sigma_J\frac{\log(S)}{n}$$

where $S = \sum_{j\le J}|\mathcal{N}_j|$ is the total number of terms considered. Since each $|\mathcal{N}_j| \le 2^j + 2A + 1$ we have $S \lesssim 2^J$, which leads to the claimed result. □

Lemma 18.

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\max_{-1\le j\le J, k\in\mathcal{N}_j}\left|\hat{\beta}_{jk}-\beta_{jk}\right|\right] \lesssim \sigma_J\sqrt{\frac{J}{n}} + 2^{J/2}\sqrt{\frac{J}{n}} + \varepsilon 2^{J/2}$$

Proof. A direct decomposition leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{-1\le j\le J, k\in\mathcal{N}_j}\left|\hat{\beta}_{jk}-\beta_{jk}\right| \\
\le &\max_{-1\le j\le J, k\in\mathcal{N}_j}\left|\hat{\beta}_{jk}-\tilde{\beta}_{jk}\right| + \max_{-1\le j\le J, k\in\mathcal{N}_j}\left|\tilde{\beta}_{jk}-\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\beta}_{jk}]\right| + \max_{-1\le j\le J, k\in\mathcal{N}_j}\left|\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\beta}_{jk}]-\beta_{jk}\right|.
\end{aligned}$$

The first term is dealt with in Lemma 17. For the second term, we notice that for each $\tilde{\beta}_{jk}$, it has sub-Gaussian parameter bounded by $\frac{2^{j/2}\|\psi\|_\infty}{\sqrt{n}} \vee \frac{\|\phi\|_\infty}{\sqrt{n}}$. We assume without loss of generality that $\|\phi\|_\infty \le \|\psi\|_\infty$ and use maximal inequality for sub-Gaussian random variables (e.g. Theorem 2.5 in Boucheron et al. 2013) to obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{f_\varepsilon}\left[\max_{-1\le j\le J, k\in\mathcal{N}_j}\left|\tilde{\beta}_{jk}-\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\beta}_{jk}]\right|\right] \lesssim 2^{J/2}\|\psi\|_\infty\sqrt{\frac{J}{n}}. \tag{67}$$

For the last term, we note that by the definition of $D_\infty^{\beta-1/2,\infty}$, we have $\max_{-1\le j\le J, k\in\mathcal{N}_j}|\beta_{jk}| \lesssim 1$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{-1\le j\le J, k\in\mathcal{N}_j}\left|\mathbb{E}_{f_\varepsilon}[\tilde{\beta}_{jk}]-\beta_{jk}\right| = \max_{-1\le j\le J, k\in\mathcal{N}_j}\varepsilon\left|\mathbb{E}_g[\tilde{\beta}_{jk}]-\beta_{jk}\right| = \max_{-1\le j\le J, k\in\mathcal{N}_j}\varepsilon\left|\mathbb{E}_g[\psi_{jk}]-\beta_{jk}\right| \\
\le &\max_{-1\le j\le J, k\in\mathcal{N}_j}\varepsilon\left|\mathbb{E}_g[\psi_{jk}]\right| + \varepsilon\max_{-1\le j\le J, k\in\mathcal{N}_j}|\beta_{jk}| \le \varepsilon 2^{J/2}\|\psi\|_\infty
\end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

Combining (67), (68) and Lemma 17, we obtain the claimed result.

□

D.2 Additional details in Section 4

We provide the detailed privacy mechanism used to generate (24). This is from Section 4.2.3 in Duchi et al. (2018), see where for more details. We present it here for completeness. Given a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^k$ with $\|v\|_\infty \le B_0 = \sqrt{2}$, generate the private version Z of v in two steps. Recall that $\sqrt{2}$ is an upper bound of the supremum norm of the trignometric basis functions. Generally speaking, for uniformly bounded basis functions, B_0 corresponds to the supremum norm of the chosen basis functions.

Step 1. Generate $\widetilde{V}$ according to

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{V} = B_0) = 1 - \mathbb{P}(\tilde{V} = -B_0) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{v_j}{2B_0}.$$

Step 2. Let T be a Bernoulli$(e^\alpha/(e^\alpha+1))$ random variable independent of $\widetilde{V}$ and the data. Generate Z according to

$$Z \sim \begin{cases} \text{Uniform}\Big(z \in \{-B,B\}^k \Big| \langle z, \tilde{V}\rangle \geq 0\Big), & T=1, \\ \text{Uniform}\Big(z \in \{-B,B\}^k \Big| \langle z, \tilde{V}\rangle \leq 0\Big), & T=0, \end{cases}$$

where

$$B = B_0 C_d \frac{e^\alpha+1}{e^\alpha-1} \quad \text{and} \quad C_d^{-1} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2^d-1}\binom{d-1}{(d-1)/2}, & d \equiv 1 \pmod 2, \\ \frac{2}{2^d+\binom{d}{d/2}}\binom{d-1}{d/2}, & d \equiv 0 \pmod 2. \end{cases}$$

E Robust one-dimensional median estimation under local differential privacy

Recall the general setup in Section 1.2, in this section we consider distributions supported on the real line, i.e. $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}$, with finite first central moment and median lying in $[-r, r]$. We are interested in estimating the median, i.e. $\theta(P) = \text{med}(P)$. To be specific, we let

$$\mathcal{P}_r = \{\text{distribution } P \text{ such that } |\text{med}(P)| \leq r,\ \mathbb{E}_P\{|X|\} < \infty\}, \tag{69}$$

where $r > 0$ is potentially a function of the sample size n.

This problem was studied in Section 3.2.2 in Duchi et al. (2018), after observing that the robust mean estimation studied in Section 3.2.1 in Duchi et al. (2018) (and a robust counterpart studied in Section 3) becomes harder when the moment parameter k decreases. In Duchi et al. (2018), when the moment parameter $k = 1$, i.e. a potentially rather heavy-tailed case, the focus is shifted to the median estimation, instead of estimating mean – a non-robust quantity. The privacy mechanism studied thereof is a sequentially interactive stochastic gradient decent method. Since median estimation is impossible for general distribution, the minimax optimality is studied based on an excess risk.

Medians are naturally robust quantities, especially robust against heavy-tailedness. In this section, we carry on the narrative of this paper, estimating medians subject to both the privacy constraints and Huber's contamination. To be specific, we assume the data are generated from Huber's contamination model (1). Let $\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be i.i.d. random variables with distribution $P_{r,\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{P}_r)$ and suppose that we are interested in estimating the median of the inlier distribution θ. The α-LDP minimax risk takes its specific form in the robust median estimation problem as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\varepsilon) &= \inf_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}_\alpha} \inf_{\widehat{\theta}} \sup_{P_{r,\varepsilon}\in\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{P}_r)} \mathbb{E}_{P_{r,\varepsilon},Q}\big\{R(\widehat{\theta}) - R(\theta(P))\big\} \\ &= \inf_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}_\alpha} \inf_{\widehat{\theta}} \sup_{P_{r,\varepsilon}\in\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{P}_r)} \mathbb{E}_{P_{r,\varepsilon},Q}\big\{\mathbb{E}_{X\sim P}\{|X - \widehat{\theta}(Z_1,\ldots,Z_n)|\} - \mathbb{E}_{X\sim P}\{|X-\theta(P)|\}\big\}, \end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

where

$$R(\cdot) = \mathbb{E}_{X\sim P}\{|X - \cdot|\} \tag{71}$$

is the excess risk defined on the inlier distribution P, the infimum over $\widehat{\theta}$ is taken over all measurable functions of the privatised data generated from any Huber contamination model $P_{r,\varepsilon}$ and some privacy mechanism $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha$. Note that this is slightly different from the α-LDP minimax risk defined (4), since we are interested in the excess risk here.

E.1 Lower bound

In Proposition 19 we show that, if either the privacy cost is high that $n\alpha^2 \lesssim r$ or the contamination proportion is high that $r\varepsilon \gtrsim 1$, then $\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\varepsilon) \gtrsim 1$.

Proposition 19. *Let $\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be i.i.d. random variables from $P_{r,\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{P}_r)$, with $\mathcal{P}_r$ defined in (69). For $\alpha \in (0,1]$ and $r > 0$, it holds that the α-LDP minimax excess risk defined in (70) satisfies*

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\varepsilon) \gtrsim \frac{r}{\sqrt{n\alpha^2}} \vee r\varepsilon.$$

We reiterate that the minimax risk considered here is regarding a form of excess risk, rather than the estimation risk. This handicaps a direct application of Proposition 1 on the part of the lower bound when there is no privacy constraints. We provide a detailed proof in Appendix E.3. Nevertheless, the result of Proposition 19 shares the same spirit of Proposition 1, that the minimax risk can be disentangled into the case of privacy and contamination. The term $r(n\alpha^2)^{-1/2}$ is indeed the minimax rate shown in Duchi et al. (2018) for the case when there is only privacy constraints.

E.2 Upper bound

In this section, we consider the stochastic gradient descent (SGD) procedure as used in Duchi et al. (2018). It is shown in Duchi et al. (2018) that this sequentially interactive privacy mechanism is optimal when estimating medians. In view of Q2 we raised in Section 1.1, we will show that this locally private procedure is automatically robust in the univariate median estimation problem.

Let $\theta_1 \in [-r, r]$ be arbitrary and $\{W_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with

$$\mathbb{P}\{W_1 = 1\} = 1 - \mathbb{P}\{W_1 = -1\} = \frac{e^\alpha}{e^\alpha + 1}.$$

The SGD procedure iterates according to

$$\theta_{i+1} = [\theta_i - \eta_i Z_i]_r, \tag{72}$$

where

$$Z_i = \frac{e^\alpha + 1}{e^\alpha - 1} W_i s(\theta_i - Y_i) \quad \text{and} \quad s(\theta_i - Y_i) \begin{cases} = \operatorname{sign}(\theta_i - Y_i), & \theta_i \neq Y_i, \\ \sim \operatorname{Unif}\{-1, 1\}, & \theta_i = Y_i, \end{cases}$$

with the truncation operator $[\cdot]_r = \max\{-r, \min\{\cdot, r\}\}$ and non-increasing step sizes sequence $\eta_i > 0$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Define the estimator $\widehat{\theta}$ as

$$\widehat{\theta} = \frac{1}{\sum_{j=1}^n \eta_j} \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i \theta_i. \tag{73}$$

Remark 4. We have that $\{Z_i\}_{i=1}^n$ satisfy α-LDP, by noticing that

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{ Z_i = \frac{e^\alpha + 1}{e^\alpha - 1} \middle| \theta_i(Z_{1:(i-1)}), Y_i \right\} = \frac{e^\alpha}{e^\alpha + 1} \mathbb{1}\{\theta_i > Y_i\} + \frac{1}{e^\alpha + 1} \mathbb{1}\{\theta_i < Y_i\} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{1}\{\theta_i = Y_i\}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{ Z_i = -\frac{e^\alpha + 1}{e^\alpha - 1} \middle| \theta_i(Z_{1:(i-1)}), Y_i \right\} = \frac{1}{e^\alpha + 1} \mathbb{1}\{\theta_i > Y_i\} + \frac{e^\alpha}{e^\alpha + 1} \mathbb{1}\{\theta_i < Y_i\} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{1}\{\theta_i = Y_i\}.$$

Proposition 20. *Given i.i.d. random variables $\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^n$ with distribution $P_{r,\varepsilon} = (1-\varepsilon)P + \varepsilon G$ where $P \in \mathcal{P}_r$ defined in (69), G is an arbitrary distribution supported on $\mathbb{R}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$. For*

$\alpha \in (0,1)$, *the estimator* $\widehat{\theta}$ *defined in* (73) *with constant step size* $\eta_i = \alpha r/\sqrt{n}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, *satisfies that*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\{Y_i, W_i\}_{i=1}^n}\{R(\widehat{\theta}) - R(\theta(P))\} \lesssim \frac{r}{\sqrt{n\alpha^2}} \vee \varepsilon r,$$

where $R(\cdot)$ *is the excess risk defined in* (71).

The upper bound we obtained in Proposition 20, combining with the lower bound result in Proposition 19, shows that the private SGD procedure retains minimax optimality in the presence of contamination, in a univariate median estimation problem.

E.3 Proofs of the results in Appendix E

Proof of Proposition 19. It follows from Corollary 2 in Duchi et al. (2018) that $\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\varepsilon) \gtrsim r/\sqrt{n\alpha^2}$ when $\varepsilon = 0$. It remains to show the other part in the lower bound.

Consider two distributions

$$R_0 : \mathbb{P}(X = r) = \frac{1+\delta}{2} = 1 - \mathbb{P}(X = -r)$$

and

$$R_1 : \mathbb{P}(X = r) = \frac{1-\delta}{2} = 1 - \mathbb{P}(X = -r).$$

We have that

$$\theta(R_0) = r, \quad \theta(R_1) = -r \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{TV}(R_0, R_1) = \delta.$$

For such R_0, R_1 the risk $\mathbb{E}_{X\sim R}(|X-\theta|)$ is always minimised for $\theta \in [-r, r]$, and for such θ we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{X\sim R_0}(|X-\theta|) = r - \delta\theta \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}_{X\sim R_1}(|X-\theta|) = r + \delta\theta.$$

Note also that we can write

$$R_0 = (1-\varepsilon)R_1 + \varepsilon P_r,$$

where P_r is a point mass at r and $\varepsilon = 2\delta/(1+\delta)$. Here $\delta = \varepsilon/(2-\varepsilon)$ and it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(\varepsilon) &\geq \inf_{\hat{\theta}} \max\big[\mathbb{E}_{Y_1,\ldots,Y_n\sim R_0}\mathbb{E}_{X\sim R_0}\{|\hat{\theta}(Y_1,\ldots,Y_n) - X| - |r - X|\}, \\
&\qquad \mathbb{E}_{Y_1,\ldots,Y_n\sim R_0}\mathbb{E}_{X\sim R_1}\{|\hat{\theta}(Y_1,\ldots,Y_n) - X| - |r + X|\}\big] \\
&= \inf_{\hat{\theta}} \max\big\{\mathbb{E}_{Y_1,\ldots,Y_n\sim R_0}\mathbb{E}_{X\sim R_0}|\hat{\theta}(Y_1,\ldots,Y_n) - X|, \\
&\qquad \mathbb{E}_{Y_1,\ldots,Y_n\sim R_0}\mathbb{E}_{X\sim R_1}|\hat{\theta}(Y_1,\ldots,Y_n) - X|\big\} - r(1-\delta) \\
&\geq \inf_{\hat{\theta}} \max\big\{\mathbb{E}_{Y_1,\ldots,Y_n\sim R_0}\mathbb{E}_{X\sim R_0}|[\hat{\theta}(Y_1,\ldots,Y_n)]_{-r}^{r} - X|, \\
&\qquad \mathbb{E}_{Y_1,\ldots,Y_n\sim R_0}\mathbb{E}_{X\sim R_1}|[\hat{\theta}(Y_1,\ldots,Y_n)]_{-r}^{r} - X|\big\} - r(1-\delta) \\
&= \inf_{\hat{\theta}} \max\big\{r - \delta\mathbb{E}_{Y_1,\ldots,Y_n\sim R_0}([\hat{\theta}(Y_1,\ldots,Y_n)]_{-r}^{r}), r + \delta\mathbb{E}_{Y_1,\ldots,Y_n\sim R_0}([\hat{\theta}(Y_1,\ldots,Y_n)]_{-r}^{r})\big\} - r(1-\delta) \\
&= r\delta + \delta\max\big\{-\mathbb{E}_{Y_1,\ldots,Y_n\sim R_0}([\hat{\theta}(Y_1,\ldots,Y_n)]_{-r}^{r}), \mathbb{E}_{Y_1,\ldots,Y_n\sim R_0}([\hat{\theta}(Y_1,\ldots,Y_n)]_{-r}^{r})\big\} \geq r\delta = \frac{r\varepsilon}{2-\varepsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

We therefore conclude the proof. □

Proof of Proposition 20. The analysis of SGD procedure follows similar lines as in Nemirovski et al. (2009). For notational simplicity, we let $\mathbb{E}_Y$ denote the expectation with respect to $(P_{r,\varepsilon}, Q)$, $\mathbb{E}_X$ denote the expectation with respect to $P \in \mathcal{P}_r$ and write θ for $\theta(P)$. For $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, let

$$A_j = 2^{-1}(\theta_j - \theta)^2 \quad a_j = \mathbb{E}_Y\{A_j\} = 2^{-1}\mathbb{E}\{(\theta_j - \theta)^2\}.$$

Let $\Pi_r(\cdot)$ be the projection to $[-r, r]$. Since $\theta \in [-r, r]$, we have that $\Pi_r(\theta) = \theta$. It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} A_{j+1} &= 2^{-1}\{\Pi_r(\theta_j - \eta_j Z_j) - \theta\}^2 = 2^{-1}\{\Pi_r(\theta_j - \eta_j Z_j) - \Pi_r(\theta)\}^2 \\ &\leq 2^{-1}(\theta_j - \eta_j Z_j - \theta)^2 = A_j + 2^{-1}\eta_j^2 Z_j^2 - \eta_j(\theta_j - \theta)Z_j. \end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

Since θ_j is independent of Y_j, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_Y\{(\theta_j - \theta)Z_j\} &= \mathbb{E}_Y\{(\theta_j - \theta)s(\theta_j - Y_j)\} = \mathbb{E}_Y\{(\theta_j - \theta)\mathbb{E}[s(\theta_j - Y_j)|\theta_j]\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_Y[(\theta_j - \theta)\{\mathbb{P}_{Y_j|\theta_j}(Y_j < \theta_j) - \mathbb{P}_{Y_j|\theta_j}(Y_j > \theta_j)\}]. \end{aligned}$$

In addition we have that

$$\mathbb{E}\{Z_j^2\} = \left(\frac{e^\alpha + 1}{e^\alpha - 1}\right)^2, \quad j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}.$$

Taking expectation of both sides of (74), we obtain that

$$a_{j+1} \leq a_j - \eta_j \mathbb{E}_Y[(\theta_j - \theta)\{\mathbb{P}_{Y_j|\theta_j}(Y_j < \theta_j) - \mathbb{P}_{Y_j|\theta_j}(Y_j > \theta_j)\}] + 2^{-1}\eta_j^2 \left(\frac{e^\alpha + 1}{e^\alpha - 1}\right)^2,$$

which is equivalent to

$$\eta_j \mathbb{E}_Y[(\theta_j - \theta)\{\mathbb{P}_{Y_j|\theta_j}(Y_j < \theta_j) - \mathbb{P}_{Y_j|\theta_j}(Y_j > \theta_j)\}] \leq a_j - a_{j+1} + 2^{-1}\eta_j^2 \left(\frac{e^\alpha + 1}{e^\alpha - 1}\right)^2. \tag{75}$$

It follows from the convexity of the absolute value function, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}_X\{|\theta_1 - X|\} \geq \mathbb{E}_X\{|\theta_2 - X|\} + (\theta_1 - \theta_2)\mathbb{E}_X\{\text{sign}(\theta_2 - X)\}.$$

It then holds that

$$\mathbb{E}_Y[(\theta_j - \theta)\mathbb{E}_X\{\text{sign}(\theta_j - X)\}] \geq \mathbb{E}_Y\{\mathbb{E}_X\{|\theta_j - X|\} - \mathbb{E}_X\{|\theta - X|\}\},$$

which is equivalent to

$$\eta_j \mathbb{E}_Y[(\theta_j - \theta)\{\mathbb{P}_{X|\theta_j}(X < \theta_j) - \mathbb{P}_{X|\theta_j}(X > \theta_j)\}] \geq \eta_j \mathbb{E}_Y\{\mathbb{E}_X\{|\theta_j - X|\} - \mathbb{E}_X\{|\theta - X|\}\}. \tag{76}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_Y[(\theta_j - \theta)\{\mathbb{P}_{Y_j|\theta_j}(Y_j < \theta_j) - \mathbb{P}_{Y_j|\theta_j}(Y_j > \theta_j)\}] \\ =&(1 - \varepsilon)\mathbb{E}_Y[(\theta_j - \theta)\{\mathbb{P}_{X|\theta_j}(X < \theta_j) - \mathbb{P}_{X|\theta_j}(X > \theta_j)\}] \\ &+ \varepsilon \mathbb{E}_Y[(\theta_j - \theta)\{\mathbb{P}_{R\sim G}(R < \theta_j) - \mathbb{P}_{R\sim G}(R > \theta_j)\}], \end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

where G is any arbitrary distribution on $\mathbb{R}$. Combining (75), (76) and (77), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\eta_j \mathbb{E}_Y\{\mathbb{E}_X\{|\theta_j - X|\} - \mathbb{E}_X\{|\theta - X|\}\} \\ \leq&(1 - \varepsilon)^{-1}\left\{a_j - a_{j+1} + 2^{-1}\eta_j^2 \left(\frac{e^\alpha + 1}{e^\alpha - 1}\right)^2\right\} \\ &+ \frac{\varepsilon \eta_j}{1 - \varepsilon}\left|\mathbb{E}_Y[(\theta_j - \theta)\{\mathbb{P}_{R\sim G}(R < \theta_j) - \mathbb{P}_{R\sim G}(R > \theta_j)\}]\right| \\ \leq&(1 - \varepsilon)^{-1}\left\{a_j - a_{j+1} + 2^{-1}\eta_j^2 \left(\frac{e^\alpha + 1}{e^\alpha - 1}\right)^2\right\} + \frac{2\varepsilon r \eta_j}{1 - \varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\sum_{j=1}^n \eta_j} \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i \left[\mathbb{E}_{X,Y}\{|X-\theta_i|\} - \mathbb{E}_X\{|X-\theta|\}\right] \\
\leq &\frac{1}{(1-\varepsilon)\sum_{j=1}^n \eta_j} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ a_i - a_{i+1} + 2^{-1}\eta_i^2 \left(\frac{e^\alpha+1}{e^\alpha-1}\right)^2 \right\} + \frac{2\varepsilon r}{1-\varepsilon} \\
\leq &\frac{1}{(1-\varepsilon)\sum_{j=1}^n \eta_j} \left\{ a_1 + 2^{-1}\left(\frac{e^\alpha+1}{e^\alpha-1}\right)^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i^2 \right\} + \frac{2\varepsilon r}{1-\varepsilon} \\
\leq &\frac{2}{(1-\varepsilon)\sum_{j=1}^n \eta_j} \left\{ r^2 + \left(\frac{e^\alpha+1}{e^\alpha-1}\right)^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i^2 \right\} + \frac{2\varepsilon r}{1-\varepsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the step sizes to be $\eta_i = \alpha r/\sqrt{n}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, we have that

$$\frac{1}{\sum_{j=1}^n \eta_j} \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i \left[\mathbb{E}_{X,Y}\{|X-\theta_i|\} - \mathbb{E}_X\{|X-\theta|\}\right] \leq \frac{2r}{1-\varepsilon}\left(\frac{1+(e+1)^2}{\sqrt{n\alpha^2}} + \varepsilon\right),$$

for $\alpha \leq 1$. Finally notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{X,Y}\{|X-\widehat{\theta}|\} - \mathbb{E}_X\{|X-\theta|\} = \mathbb{E}_{X,Y}\left\{\left|\frac{1}{\sum_{j=1}^n \eta_j}\sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i(X-\theta_i)\right|\right\} - \mathbb{E}_X\{|X-\theta|\} \\
\leq &\frac{1}{\sum_{j=1}^n \eta_j} \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i \left[\mathbb{E}_{X,Y}\{|X-\theta_i|\} - \mathbb{E}_X\{|X-\theta|\}\right] \leq \frac{2r}{1-\varepsilon}\left(\frac{17}{\sqrt{n\alpha^2}} + \varepsilon\right).
\end{aligned}$$

We therefore conclude the proof. □