
DECENTRALIZED MATRIX FACTORIZATION WITH HETEROGENEOUS DIFFERENTIAL PRIVACY

Wentao Hu, Hui Fang

Research Institute for Interdisciplinary Sciences and School of Information Management and Engineering
Shanghai University of Finance and Economics
stevenhwt@gmail.com, fang.hui@mail.shufe.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

Conventional matrix factorization relies on centralized collection of users' data for recommendation, which might introduce an increased risk of privacy leakage especially when the recommender is untrusted. Existing differentially private matrix factorization methods either assume the recommender is trusted, or can only provide a uniform level of privacy protection for all users and items with untrusted recommender. In this paper, we propose a novel Heterogeneous Differentially Private Matrix Factorization algorithm (denoted as HDPMF) for untrusted recommender. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to achieve heterogeneous differential privacy for decentralized matrix factorization in untrusted recommender scenario. Specifically, our framework uses modified stretching mechanism with an innovative rescaling scheme to achieve better trade-off between privacy and accuracy. Meanwhile, by allocating privacy budget properly, we can capture homogeneous privacy preference within a user/item but heterogeneous privacy preference across different users/items. Theoretical analysis confirms that HDPMF renders rigorous privacy guarantee, and exhaustive experiments demonstrate its superiority especially in strong privacy guarantee, high dimension model and sparse dataset scenario.

Keywords untrusted recommender · decentralized matrix factorization · heterogeneous differential privacy · heterogeneous privacy preference

1 Introduction

Recommender systems have yielded immense success in alleviating information overload and providing personalized contents and services for users on various online commercial platforms. Despite their effectiveness, they usually need to take full control of users' data to provide better recommendations, which may introduce serious privacy leakage since the recommender itself can be untrusted. An abundance of studies [1, 2] have revealed that an attacker can infer victims' sensitive information such as health conditions [3], political inclinations and sex inclinations from their ratings on products. The situation gets even worse if the untrusted recommender itself acts as an attacker. Therefore, a privacy-preserving recommender system which can simultaneously provide accurate recommendations and prevent the untrusted recommender from abusing users' ratings is very crucial and necessary in practice.

Among the prevailing collaborative filtering methods for building recommender systems, matrix factorization (MF) [4, 5] is the most popular and successful one and is being used in many real-world recommender systems which makes privacy-preserving MF become a research hotspot in recent years. Previous attempts for privacy-preserving MF include data obfuscation [6], anonymisation [7], differential privacy [8, 9] and encryption [2]. However, most of them suffer from following limitations. First, a vast majority of existing works [10, 11, 9] simply assume the recommender is trusted and neglect the fact that the recommender itself may be untrusted and conduct malicious attacks. Second, data obfuscation and anonymisation methods cannot provide a formal privacy guarantee. Meanwhile, other works relying on encryption cannot prevent attackers inferring sensitive information about victim users based on their influence on the final results [1]. Third, most of differentially private MF approaches assume all users and items have the same privacy requirement and thus can only provide uniform privacy protection, which will lead to insufficient protection for some records and over-protection for others, causing dramatic utility loss [12]. A handful of efforts [10, 9] shed light

on personalized differentially private matrix factorization, nevertheless, they only consider the centralized and trusted recommender scenario. The most similar work to ours is [13], their framework relies on a part of public non-sensitive ratings to infer users' preference. Though different noises are added on sensitive and non-sensitive ratings, the method only satisfies a uniform not truly personalized privacy guarantee for sensitive ratings.

In this paper, we consider all ratings are heterogeneously sensitive, then propose a novel decentralized matrix factorization framework named HDPMF that satisfies heterogeneous differential privacy across different ratings and prevents untrusted recommender abusing users' sensitive data for profits. Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

1. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to achieve truly heterogeneous differential privacy for decentralized matrix factorization in untrusted recommender scenario.
2. We tackle the abnormal scale problem [12] caused by shrinking procedure in original stretching mechanism [14] with an innovative and efficient rescaling scheme. And the modified stretching mechanism not only satisfies personalized differential privacy but also achieves better trade-off between privacy and accuracy than other mechanisms in matrix factorization.
3. We allocate privacy budgets for ratings by multiplying privacy preference of the corresponding user and item, thus our method is able to capture homogeneous privacy preference within the same user/item but heterogeneous privacy preference across different users/items.
4. Both theoretical analysis and empirical evaluation verify the effectiveness of our approach. Specifically, empirical evaluation on four real-world datasets demonstrates the superiority of HDPMF over state-of-the-art differentially private matrix factorization methods, especially in strong privacy guarantee, high dimension model and sparse dataset scenario.

2 Related Work

Our work relates to three-fold of studies: *differentially private recommender systems*, *personalized differential privacy* and *federated matrix factorization*.

2.1 Differentially private recommender systems

Differential privacy [15] has been introduced into recommender systems since [1], followed by a series of works dedicated on differentially private recommender systems. Nevertheless, most of them [16, 11, 9, 10] simply posit that recommender is trusted and takes full control of all users' data. They aim to prevent outside attackers not the recommender from inferring sensitive ratings by injecting noise into the gradients or final output. [8] is the first to cope with differentially private recommender system in untrusted recommender scenario. They propose a differentially private matrix factorization approach for untrusted recommender, it decouples computations upon users' sensitive ratings from central recommender to users and only allows the recommender to aggregate local gradients in a privacy-preserving way. However, this method can only provide a uniform privacy guarantee for all ratings. [13] further considers ratings can be divided into sensitive and non-sensitive ones in untrusted recommender scenario. They allow to disclose non-sensitive ratings and add different magnitudes of noise on these two kinds of ratings. At last, they can prevent sensitive ratings from being leaked from the exposed non-sensitive ones, but it is still a uniform privacy guarantee. Therefore, it remains a challenging and unexplored problem to provide truly personalized differential privacy guarantees for users and items in untrusted recommender scenario.

2.2 Personalized differential privacy

A uniform privacy protection for all records may hamper the performance of differentially private recommender system, since it is common that users have quite personalized privacy expectations for their data meanwhile items have different privacy properties [14]. Consequently, uniform differential privacy may lead to insufficient privacy protection for some records, whilst over-protecting others. [14] is the first work to consider various preferences of users and items under differential privacy. It designs a stretching mechanism that satisfies heterogeneous differential privacy by modifying input values according to their privacy weights and adding noise to final output. However, [12] points out that shrinking procedure in stretching mechanism distorts normal scale information and brings significant utility loss. So they propose a novel sample mechanism to achieve personalized differential privacy. It works by first sampling a subset of records based on their personalized privacy budgets. Then, the sampled records will participate in the algorithm and others are left out. Finally, noise is added on the final output to provide personalized privacy guarantee for all records. Later, [17] devises a utility-aware sample mechanism to explicitly include utility in the design objective and further decrease utility losses of sample mechanism. It is noteworthy that we use personalized differential privacy (PDP) and heterogeneous

differential privacy (HDP) interchangeably in our work as their definitions are mathematically equivalent. They are two different expressions of the same thing, the only difference is that in PDP, each record directly has a privacy budget; whereas in HDP, a maximum privacy budget for all records is first defined and each record gets privacy budget by multiplying its privacy weight with the maximum privacy budget.

As sample mechanism only use sampled records and leaves out unsampled ones, it aggravates the sparsity problem in recommender system. Besides, it adds noise based on the average privacy budget of all records. Whilst, the stretching mechanism replaces the sampling process with a novel shrinking procedure and adds noise according to the maximum privacy budget. So stretching mechanism fits better in sparse dataset and adds less noise, we select it as our privacy tool. However, directly using original stretching mechanism does not bring satisfying performance as the shrinking procedure distorts normal scale information. To handle this problem, we design an innovative rescaling scheme at prediction stage to get a normal scale prediction and reduce utility loss.

2.3 Federated Matrix Factorization

As one of the most representative decentralized matrix factorization system, federated matrix factorization has attracted much attention in recent years. [18] is the first one to implement federated matrix factorization. They assume it is safe to share gradients without taking any specific privacy protection technique [18, 19]. However, [20, 21, 22] point out that original data can be leaked from unprotected gradients in federated learning. To prevent the leakage from shared gradients in federated matrix factorization, an abundance of work rely on cryptography techniques such as homomorphic encryption [23, 24, 25] and secure aggregation [26, 27, 28]. Nevertheless, they bring huge amount of computation overhead and still cannot escape the vulnerability to inference attacks [29, 27]. On the other hand, a handful of works borrow the idea of meta learning to implement and accelerate federated matrix factorization [30, 31]. But they cannot provide rigorous privacy guarantee.

Combining the promising characteristics of provable resistance to inference attacks and rigorous privacy guarantee, differential privacy (DP) [15] has been used to protect federated learning [32, 33, 34, 35]. [27] is the pioneering one to provide rigorous privacy guarantee for federated matrix factorization with the help of DP. They combine DP with secure aggregation to protect the communication between users and the server in cross-device setting. Thus, they can finally achieve a uniform privacy guarantee across different users. On the contrary, our HDPMF framework can provide personalized privacy guarantees for different users in such decentralized matrix factorization scenario and it can be integrated with other cryptography tools just like [27], we leave it as future work as it is out of the scope of our paper.

3 Preliminaries

3.1 Differential Privacy

Differential Privacy [36, 15] is a powerful technique for providing strong and rigorous privacy guarantees, and introducing fewer computation overheads. It ensures that output of any computation is insensitive to the change of a single record by injecting proper noise to intermediate process or final output. We formally give the definition of differential privacy [14] as below:

Definition 1. ϵ -differential privacy. A randomized function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be ϵ -differentially private, if for all neighboring datasets that differ only on a single record i , denoted as $\vec{d} \sim \vec{d}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and for all outputs $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the following statement holds:

$$\Pr[f(\vec{d}) = t] \leq \exp(\epsilon) \Pr[f(\vec{d}^{(i)}) = t] \quad (1)$$

where the probability is taken over the randomness of f . Privacy budget ϵ is a positive number, and a smaller ϵ means a stronger privacy guarantee.

Laplace mechanism [15] is the most commonly used method to satisfy ϵ -differential privacy. It works by adding i.i.d. noise from $Laplace(S(f)/\epsilon)$ to each dimension of output. Here, global sensitivity $S(f) = \max_{\vec{d}, \vec{d}^{(i)}} \|f(\vec{d}) - f(\vec{d}^{(i)})\|_1$ is the maximum change of output caused by any single record i in the input \vec{d} .

Definition 2. heterogeneous (ϵ, \vec{v}) -differential privacy. For all semi-balanced sets D , a randomized function $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be (ϵ, \vec{v}) -differentially private if for all records i and all neighboring datasets $\vec{d} \sim \vec{d}^{(i)} \in D$, and for all outputs $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the following statement holds:

$$\Pr[f(\vec{d}) = t] \leq \exp(\epsilon v_i) \Pr[f(\vec{d}^{(i)}) = t] \quad (2)$$

where semi-balanced set D means that for any $\vec{x} \in D$, then $A\vec{x} \in D$, where A is a diagonal shrinkage matrix whose diagonal elements are in the range of $(0, 1]$. Rating matrix can be flattened into a non-negative vector, it is then

apparently in a semi-balanced set. $\vec{v} \in (0, 1]^n$ is the privacy weight vector associated with records in dataset \vec{d} and ϵ is the maximum privacy budget of all records.

3.2 Matrix Factorization

In our paper, we consider the standard matrix factorization model with regularization term [4]. $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ is the full rating matrix, in which each of n users rates a small subset of m items. We denote user i 's rating on item j as \mathbf{R}_{ij} and \mathbf{I} is a indicator matrix that $\mathbf{I}_{ij} = 1$ when user i has rated item j , otherwise $\mathbf{I}_{ij} = 0$. In this basic form, we can decompose rating matrix \mathbf{R} into user latent matrix $\mathbf{U} = [\mathbf{u}_i]_{i \in [1, n]} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times n}$ and item latent matrix $\mathbf{V} = [\mathbf{v}_j]_{j \in [1, m]} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times m}$, where each user i is characterized by a user latent vector $\mathbf{u}_i \in \mathbb{R}^K$ and each item j is characterized by a item latent vector $\mathbf{v}_j \in \mathbb{R}^K$, K is the dimension of all latent vectors. Finally, the matrix factorization model can be expressed as minimizing the loss function \mathcal{L} :

$$\min_{\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}} \mathcal{L} = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{I}_{ij} (\mathbf{R}_{ij} - \mathbf{u}_i^T \mathbf{v}_j)^2 + \lambda (\|\mathbf{U}\|_F^2 + \|\mathbf{V}\|_F^2)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_F^2$ is the Frobenius norm and λ is regularization coefficient. We use stochastic gradient descent with learning rate η to minimize the objective function.

3.3 Problem Statement

In a basic recommender system, there are two types of roles: users and the recommender. We consider the recommender is untrusted, which means that it is curious about users' sensitive ratings and even misuses them for profits. And, all ratings are considered heterogeneously sensitive, that is, when user i rates item j (i.e. $\mathbf{I}_{ij}=1$), it will also specify a non-public privacy weight $\mathbf{W}_{ij} \in (0, 1]$ for rating \mathbf{R}_{ij} according to user i 's own privacy preference and privacy property of item j . That is to say, the absolute privacy budget of rating \mathbf{R}_{ij} is $\epsilon_{ij} = \mathbf{W}_{ij} \cdot \epsilon$, where ϵ is the maximum privacy budget allowed for all ratings.

Our objective is to design a differentially private matrix factorization framework that takes each rating's privacy weight \mathbf{W}_{ij} into consideration and satisfies heterogeneous differential privacy. As the recommender is untrusted, it can only access to the item latent matrix \mathbf{V} , whereas user latent matrix \mathbf{U} and all ratings \mathbf{R}_{ij} are kept on users' devices privately. When updating model parameters, the recommender needs to distribute item latent matrix \mathbf{V} to users' devices. Combining with its own latent vector \mathbf{u}_i , user i can make predictions by computing $\mathbf{u}_i^T \mathbf{V}$ locally and only upload a noisy local gradient to the recommender without privacy leakage.

4 Our HDPMF Approach

The aim of our HDPMF framework is to provide personalized privacy protection for different ratings in \mathbf{R} under heterogeneous differential privacy. To solve this challenging problem, we integrate *stretching mechanism* [14] with objective perturbation [37]. The key component of *stretching mechanism* is to find a proper diagonal shrinkage matrix $T(\vec{v})$ with all diagonal values in $(0, 1]$ based on its input \vec{d} and corresponding privacy weight vector $\vec{v} \in (0, 1]^n$. Suppose we want to make a function f satisfy heterogeneous differential privacy, after getting the proper shrinkage matrix $T(\vec{v})$, we then need to modify the input values \vec{d} by multiplying it with $T(\vec{v})$. Thus, the modified computation can be denoted as $R(f, \vec{v})(\vec{d}) = f(T(\vec{v}) \cdot \vec{d})$. After that, the *stretching mechanism* can be expressed as: $\mathcal{SM}(\vec{d}, \vec{v}, \epsilon) = R(f, \vec{v})(\vec{d}) + \text{Laplace}(S(f)/\epsilon)$, where $S(f)$ is global sensitivity of f . As heterogeneous differential privacy also involves the exact influence of the change of record i in \vec{d} on the final output, we then rely on the notion of *modular global sensitivity* [38] to denote it.

Definition 3. modular global sensitivity. The modular global sensitivity $S_i(f)$ is the global sensitivity of f when \vec{d} and $\vec{d}^{(i)}$ are neighboring datasets that differ on exactly the record i .

With the help of *modular global sensitivity*, Theorem 1 guarantees that *stretching mechanism* satisfies heterogeneous differential privacy in Definition 2.

Theorem 1. Given a privacy weight vector \vec{v} , if the shrinkage matrix $T(\vec{v})$ satisfies $S_i(R(f, \vec{v})) \leq v_i S(f)$, where $R(f, \vec{v})(\vec{d}) = f(T(\vec{v}) \cdot \vec{d})$, then the *stretching mechanism* $\mathcal{SM}(\vec{d}, \vec{v}, \epsilon) = R(f, \vec{v})(\vec{d}) + \text{Laplace}(S(f)/\epsilon)$ satisfies heterogeneous (ϵ, \vec{v}) -differential privacy.

Proof. Please see Appendix. □

As the gradient $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \mathbf{u}_i}$ only involves \mathbf{u}_i and \mathbf{V} , each user i can update its own latent vector \mathbf{u}_i locally instead of centrally on the recommender, then user latent vector \mathbf{u}_i can be kept private on the user side. Therefore, as long as all the item latent vectors \mathbf{v}_j satisfying differential privacy, the user latent vectors \mathbf{u}_i derived from them must satisfy differential privacy as well [8]. Similarly, as heterogeneous differential privacy has the nice property of post-processing [14], if the derived item latent matrix \mathbf{V} satisfies heterogeneous (ϵ, \vec{v}) -differential privacy, then correspondingly the user latent vectors derived from them will also satisfy heterogeneous (ϵ, \vec{v}) -differential privacy.

In HDPMF framework, we modify the learning process of \mathbf{v}_j according to the requirements of *stretching mechanism* to make it satisfy heterogeneous differential privacy. We first flatten the rating matrix \mathbf{R} into the input vector \vec{d} and flatten the privacy weight matrix \mathbf{W} into the privacy weight vector \vec{v} . Meanwhile, we let the shrinkage matrix $T(\vec{v}) = \text{diag}(\vec{v})$, which means that we modify the input rating matrix \mathbf{R} through element-wise product with \mathbf{W} . After that, some calibrated Laplace noise is added to satisfy heterogeneous differential privacy. The effect of these processes is equivalent to a modified objective perturbation method whose objective function can be formulated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}} \tilde{\mathcal{L}} = & \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{I}_{ij} ((\mathbf{W}_{ij} \mathbf{R}_{ij} - \mathbf{u}_i^T \mathbf{v}_j)^2 + \mathbf{v}_j^T \mathbf{x}_j^i) \\ & + \lambda (\|\mathbf{U}\|_F^2 + \|\mathbf{V}\|_F^2) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{x}_j = \sum_i \mathbf{x}_j^i \in \mathbb{R}^K$ denotes noise vector.

We can derive the gradients of Equation (3) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \tilde{\mathcal{L}}}{\partial \mathbf{v}_j} = & 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{I}_{ij} (\mathbf{u}_i^T \mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{W}_{ij} \mathbf{R}_{ij}) \mathbf{u}_i + \mathbf{x}_j + 2\lambda \mathbf{v}_j \\ \frac{\partial \tilde{\mathcal{L}}}{\partial \mathbf{u}_i} = & 2 \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{I}_{ij} (\mathbf{u}_i^T \mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{W}_{ij} \mathbf{R}_{ij}) \mathbf{v}_j + 2\lambda \mathbf{u}_i \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Theorem 2. *If each element in \mathbf{x}_j is independently and randomly sampled from $Laplace(2\sqrt{K}\Delta/\epsilon)$, where $\Delta = \max \mathbf{R}_{ij} - \min \mathbf{R}_{ij}$, then the derived item latent matrix \mathbf{V} satisfies heterogeneous (ϵ, \vec{v}) -differential privacy.*

Proof. Please see Appendix. □

Theorem 2 shows that the final learned item latent matrix \mathbf{V} from Equation (3) can satisfy heterogeneous (ϵ, \vec{v}) -differential privacy. The only problem left is how can users independently pick \mathbf{x}_j^i and make sure that $\mathbf{x}_j = \sum_i \mathbf{x}_j^i \sim Laplace(2\sqrt{K}\Delta/\epsilon)$. We can utilize Theorem 3 to achieve this goal. The recommender first picks $\mathbf{h}_j \in \mathbb{R}^K \sim Exp(1)$ and distributes it to the set of users \mathcal{R}_j who have rated item j . Then, each user in \mathcal{R}_j independently selects $\mathbf{c}_j^i \in \mathbb{R}^K \sim N(0, 1/|\mathcal{R}_j|)$ and takes $\mathbf{x}_j^i = 2\Delta \sqrt{2K} \mathbf{h}_j \odot \mathbf{c}_j^i / \epsilon$, where \odot means element-wise product. According to Theorem 3, $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}_j} \mathbf{x}_j^i \sim Lap(2\Delta\sqrt{K}/\epsilon)$.

Theorem 3. *If random number $h \sim Exp(1)$, and random number $c \sim N(0, 1)$ is independent of h , then for any real number $b > 0$, $X = b\sqrt{2}hc \sim Laplace(b)$ [39].*

The framework of HDPMF is depicted in Figure 1 and its pseudo-code is shown in Algorithm 1. In HDPMF framework, users first stretch ratings according to the personalized privacy weight allocated for the rating on their devices. And then, they use the stretched ratings to calculate local gradients with respect to item embedding matrix \mathbf{V} . After adding the aforementioned noise \mathbf{x}_j^i , noisy local gradients are sent to the untrusted recommender. It is worth noting that \mathbf{x}_j^i is inversely proportional to the maximum privacy budget ϵ of all ratings. On the contrary, in sample mechanism, the noise added on the gradient is inversely proportional to the average privacy budget of all ratings in the training set which is apparently larger. With the collected noisy local gradients sent from users, the untrusted recommender updates item latent matrix \mathbf{V} and distributes it to users. After that, users update their own latent vector \mathbf{u}_i privately on their devices with shared item latent matrix \mathbf{V} .

As [12] points out that stretching the rating matrix distorts the normal scale information and causes significant utility loss, so we design an innovative rescaling scheme at prediction stage to get a normal scale prediction and mitigate the negative effect on accuracy brought by stretching procedure. The rescaling scheme runs on users' side privately, so it will not breach users' privacy and it is shown in lines 13 through lines 17 in Algorithm 1. In rescaling scheme, if user i wants to predict its preference on item j , it must first rescale the shared item latent vector \mathbf{v}_j and user latent vector \mathbf{u}_i based on personalized privacy weight \mathbf{W}_{ij} . After that, it multiplies rescaled \mathbf{v}_j and \mathbf{u}_i to get normal scale prediction. We will empirically demonstrate the effectiveness of rescaling scheme for reducing utility loss in the ablation study.




Figure 1: The framework of HDPMF. Users first stretch ratings on their devices and use the stretched ratings to calculate gradient with respect to V . After adding noise, the noisy gradient is sent to untrusted recommender, where item embedding V is updated and distributed to users. User embedding U is updated privately on users' devices. In the prediction stage, users first rescale user embedding u_i , item embedding v_j based on personalized privacy budgets and then predict the rating.

Algorithm 1: HDPMF

Input: $R, W, \epsilon, K, \eta, \lambda, T$

Output: predicted rating matrix \hat{R}

```

1 initialize  $U, V$ 
2 for  $t$  from 1 to  $T$  do
3   for  $j = 1, \dots, m$  do
4     for  $i$  in  $\mathcal{R}_j$  do
5       Send  $2(u_i^T v_j - W_{ij} R_{ij})u_i + x_j^i$  to the recommender
6     end
7     ▷ on recommender's side
8     Update  $v_j$ :  $v_j = v_j - \eta \frac{\partial \tilde{\mathcal{L}}}{\partial v_j}$ 
9   end
10  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  do
11    ▷ on user  $i$ 's side
12    Update  $u_i$ :  $u_i = u_i - \eta \frac{\partial \tilde{\mathcal{L}}}{\partial u_i}$ 
13  end
14  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  do
15    ▷ rescale on user  $i$ 's side
16    for  $j = 1, \dots, m$  do
17       $\hat{R}_{ij} = u_i^T v_j / W_{ij}$ 
18    end
19  end
20 return  $\hat{R}$ 
    
```

5 Experimental Evaluation

In this section, we conduct extensive experiments to validate the effectiveness of HDPMF framework in untrusted recommender scenario. Our code will be released upon acceptance. We use four common datasets: MovieLens 100K (ML-100K)¹, MovieLens 1M (ML-1M), Douban-book (Douban)² and Yelp³ for experiments. In all datasets, we filter out users who have rated less than 20 items following ML-100K and ML-1M. The range of all ratings is $[1, 5]$. Table 1 demonstrates detailed statistics of these four datasets after preprocessing.

¹grouplens.org/datasets/movielens/

²kaggle.com/datasets/fengzhujoey/douban-datasetratingreviewside-information

³kaggle.com/datasets/yelp-dataset/yelp-dataset

Table 1: Statistics of datasets after preprocessing

| Dataset | #users | #items | #ratings | #density |
|---------|--------|---------|-----------|----------|
| ML-100K | 1,682 | 943 | 100,000 | 4.26e-2 |
| ML-1M | 6,040 | 3,883 | 1,000,209 | 6.30e-2 |
| Douban | 1,403 | 94,651 | 221,195 | 1.67e-3 |
| Yelp | 36,997 | 147,435 | 1,888,380 | 3.46e-3 |

5.1 Experimental Settings

5.1.1 Evaluation Metrics.

We divide the whole dataset into training and validation sets using 5-fold cross validation for hyperparameter selection. Following ML-100K⁴, at final test stage, each user leaves 10 ratings as test dataset, and the rest ratings as training dataset. As we focus on the rating prediction problem, we adopt mean square error (MSE) and mean absolute error (MAE) as evaluation metrics, which are defined as $\sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{R}} (\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{ij} - \mathbf{R}_{ij})^2 / |\mathcal{R}|$ and $\sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{R}} |\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{ij} - \mathbf{R}_{ij}| / |\mathcal{R}|$ respectively, \mathcal{R} denotes ratings in test dataset. Each evaluation is repeated 5 times using different random seeds.

5.1.2 Baselines and hyperparameters.

We compare HDPMF with state-of-the-art differentially private matrix factorization methods and non-private method.

- **PDPMF**: [10] proposes a personalized differentially private matrix factorization method in trusted recommender scenario with sample mechanism [12]. It first samples each rating \mathbf{R}_{ij} with probability $\pi(\mathbf{R}_{ij}, t)$ defined in Eq. (5), where t is the average privacy budget of ratings in the training set. Then only sampled ratings will participate in matrix factorization and others are left out. Finally, a single centralized noise vector is added to the gradient of \mathbf{V} , whose scale is inversely proportional to t .

$$\pi(\mathbf{R}_{ij}, t) = \begin{cases} \frac{e^{\epsilon_{ij}} - 1}{e^t - 1} & \text{if } \epsilon_{ij} < t \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

We modify this approach by decomposing the single centralized noise vector to multiple decentralized noise vectors for each user. With the help of Theorem 3, we can make the element-wise sum of all users' noise vectors follow the same distribution as the single centralized noise vector. After that, it will fit in untrusted recommender scenario and we regard it as the state-of-the-art (SOTA) differentially private matrix factorization method. Naturally, after modification, this method can be regarded as a federated matrix factorization method that resorts to personalized differential privacy achieved by sample mechanism to protect gradients.

- **DPMF**: a decentralized and non-personalized differentially private matrix factorization method that adds equal noise for all ratings [8]. The noise scale is inversely proportional to the strongest privacy guarantee of all ratings. Similarly, it is equivalent to a simplified version of federated matrix factorization method from [27] with only uniform differential privacy to protect gradients but without the secure aggregation part in cross-device setting.
- **MF**: a non-private and centralized matrix factorization method that decomposes rating matrix without adding any noise.

For all the methods, regularization coefficient λ is picked from $\{0.01, 0.001\}$. The learning rate η stays the same as initial learning rate in the first 25% of the epochs and is divided by 5 after that, then is divided by 5 again after 75% of the epochs, which is similar to the decay scheme in [40]. We test initial learning rate from $\{0.05, 0.01, 0.005, 0.001\}$ for HDPMF, PDPMF, MF and $\{0.005, 0.001, 0.0005, 0.0001\}$ for DPMF. The model dimension K is 10 in default setting following [13], we also test $K = 5$. The number of epochs is set as $T = 100$ for all experiments.

5.1.3 Privacy Specification.

To capture homogeneous privacy preference within the same user/item but heterogeneous privacy preference across different users/items. We assume each user i has a personalized privacy weight β_i , then the user privacy weight vector $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_n)$. Similarly, each item j has a privacy weight γ_j and item privacy weight vector can be expressed as $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_m)$. Finally, we let the privacy weight matrix $\mathbf{W} = \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \boldsymbol{\gamma}$.

⁴files.grouplens.org/datasets/movielens/ml-100k-README.txt

In real-world application of HDPMF, users can stretch ratings on their devices without disclosing personal privacy weights, so we cannot collect them directly. We borrow the idea from [12, 10] to use random allocation to simulate personalized privacy specification setting. Notably, their division of different privacy-sensitive user groups are based on real-world investigation data from [41, 42]. Following their simulation, we set the maximum privacy budget $\epsilon = 1$. And users are divided into 3 groups: *conservative*, *moderate* and *liberal* whose privacy concern is high, medium, low respectively and their corresponding ratios are f_{uc} , f_{mc} and $1 - f_{uc} - f_{mc}$, respectively. Based on [41, 42], in our default setting, $f_{uc} = 0.54$ and $f_{mc} = 0.37$. Similarly, items can also be divided into 3 groups which are highly, moderately and least sensitive with corresponding ratio f_{ic} , f_{im} and $1 - f_{ic} - f_{im}$. We take $f_{ic} = \frac{1}{3}$, $f_{im} = \frac{1}{3}$ as default. The privacy weight for the users in *conservative* and *moderate* groups are randomly and uniformly drawn from the ranges $[\epsilon_{uc}, \epsilon_{um})$ and $[\epsilon_{um}, \epsilon_{ul})$, whilst the privacy weight is fixed at $\epsilon_{ul} = \epsilon = 1$ for *liberal* group. The defaults of ϵ_{uc} and ϵ_{um} are 0.1 and 0.5 respectively. As for the privacy weights of items, we draw uniformly at random from $[\epsilon_{ic}, \epsilon_{im})$ and $[\epsilon_{im}, \epsilon_{il})$ for highly and moderately sensitive items where $\epsilon_{ic} = 0.1$, $\epsilon_{im} = 0.5$ are taken as default. Similarly, privacy weights are fixed at $\epsilon_{il} = \epsilon = 1$ for least sensitive items. The overview of personalized privacy specification parameters and their default values are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Privacy specification parameters and their default values. conservative, moderate, liberal group are abbreviated as con, mod, lib.

| | group | ratio | default | weight | default |
|------|-------|-----------------------|---------|----------------------------------|--------------|
| user | con | f_{uc} | 0.54 | $[\epsilon_{uc}, \epsilon_{um})$ | $[0.1, 0.5)$ |
| | mod | f_{um} | 0.37 | $[\epsilon_{um}, \epsilon_{ul})$ | $[0.5, 1)$ |
| | lib | $1 - f_{uc} - f_{um}$ | 0.09 | ϵ_{ul} | 1 |
| item | con | f_{ic} | 0.33 | $[\epsilon_{ic}, \epsilon_{im})$ | $[0.1, 0.5)$ |
| | mod | f_{im} | 0.33 | $[\epsilon_{im}, \epsilon_{il})$ | $[0.5, 1)$ |
| | lib | $1 - f_{ic} - f_{im}$ | 0.34 | ϵ_{il} | 1 |

5.2 Experimental Results

5.2.1 Recommendation accuracy.

To compare the effectiveness of these four methods, we evaluate their recommendation accuracy under the default privacy specification setting. The results are shown in Table 3. First, we can observe that non-personalized DPMF performs much worse than personalized HDPMF and PDPMF in all experiments. This finding demonstrates that it is crucial to provide personalized privacy protection for different ratings, or we will face an intolerable utility loss. Second, our proposed HDPMF has a significantly smaller average MSE and MAE than the SOTA PDPMF on all datasets with different dimensions, which verifies the superiority of our HDPMF framework. Third, when dimension $K = 10$, HDPMF outperforms PDPMF by 5.97%, 5.00%, 9.61%, 8.15% relatively on MSE and 3.19%, 3.28%, 6.56%, 4.49% on MAE for ML-100K, ML-1M, Douban and Yelp dataset respectively. Besides, the relative gaps between them are 1.75%, 2.40%, 15.44%, 1.98% on MSE and 1.26%, 1.75%, 11.06%, 1.97% on MAE respectively when dimension $K = 5$. Except on Douban dataset, the relative gap between HDPMF and SOTA PDPMF is apparently larger when dimension $K = 10$ than dimension $K = 5$. Thus, we can conclude that HDPMF achieves a better trade-off between privacy and accuracy than PDPMF, especially when conducting matrix factorization with a higher dimension.




Figure 2: Average and standard deviation MSE of PDPMF and HDPMF with different ϵ_{uc} when model dimension $K = 10$. DPMF performs much worse than PDPMF and HDPMF, the performance of MF stays the same as Table 3, so DPMF and MF are not shown for conciseness.

Table 3: Average and standard deviation of MSE and MAE on 5 repeated evaluations at the default privacy specification setting. Bold number means HDPMF outperforms PDPMF on the average of MSE or MAE. *** means HDPMF outperforms PDPMF at 99% confidence level in t-test for means of paired two sample and ** means 95%, * means 90% confidence level correspondingly.

| metrics | | MSE | | MAE | |
|-----------|-------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| dimension | | 10 | 5 | 10 | 5 |
| ML-100K | MF | 0.9269 ± 0.0042 | 0.9231 ± 0.0065 | 0.7617 ± 0.0015 | 0.7609 ± 0.0031 |
| | HDPMF | 1.4690 ± 0.0369*** | 1.2257 ± 0.0187* | 0.9356 ± 0.0124*** | 0.8606 ± 0.0045*** |
| | PDPMF | 1.5623 ± 0.0244 | 1.2475 ± 0.0214 | 0.9664 ± 0.0057 | 0.8715 ± 0.0078 |
| | DPMF | 4.9264 ± 0.3218 | 4.4484 ± 0.2955 | 1.8811 ± 0.0783 | 1.7685 ± 0.0719 |
| ML-1M | MF | 0.7906 ± 0.0012 | 0.8067 ± 0.0021 | 0.7027 ± 0.0007 | 0.7104 ± 0.0010 |
| | HDPMF | 1.0262 ± 0.0057*** | 0.9174 ± 0.0063*** | 0.7869 ± 0.0028*** | 0.7501 ± 0.0023*** |
| | PDPMF | 1.0801 ± 0.0192 | 0.9399 ± 0.0060 | 0.8136 ± 0.0065 | 0.7635 ± 0.0018 |
| | DPMF | 1.8032 ± 0.0271 | 1.3912 ± 0.0114 | 1.0350 ± 0.0078 | 0.9166 ± 0.0035 |
| Douban | MF | 1.5403 ± 0.0057 | 1.5143 ± 0.0079 | 0.9569 ± 0.0017 | 0.9481 ± 0.0020 |
| | HDPMF | 4.5616 ± 0.1013*** | 3.6169 ± 0.0843*** | 1.7451 ± 0.0296*** | 1.4929 ± 0.0232*** |
| | PDPMF | 5.0464 ± 0.1215 | 4.2775 ± 0.0676 | 1.8677 ± 0.0277 | 1.6786 ± 0.0155 |
| | DPMF | 5.9369 ± 0.0574 | 6.1115 ± 0.0614 | 2.0250 ± 0.0138 | 2.0746 ± 0.0154 |
| Yelp | MF | 1.9080 ± 0.0098 | 1.9141 ± 0.0317 | 1.0795 ± 0.0030 | 1.0784 ± 0.0081 |
| | HDPMF | 3.5206 ± 0.0184*** | 2.8944 ± 0.0220** | 1.4661 ± 0.0052*** | 1.3062 ± 0.0055*** |
| | PDPMF | 3.8329 ± 0.0341 | 2.9528 ± 0.0324 | 1.5351 ± 0.0068 | 1.3325 ± 0.0079 |
| | DPMF | 6.3687 ± 0.0081 | 6.5986 ± 0.0241 | 2.0512 ± 0.0021 | 2.1211 ± 0.0074 |




Figure 3: Average and standard deviation MSE of PDPMF and HDPMF with different ϵ_{uc} when model dimension $K = 5$.

5.2.2 Impact of privacy specification

In order to obtain a more comprehensive comparison between HDPMF and baselines, we also conduct various experiments by changing privacy specification parameter ϵ_{uc} in $\{0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4\}$ and f_{uc} in $\{0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.54\}$. The other privacy specification parameters stay the same as their default values in Table 2 when varying ϵ_{uc} or f_{uc} .

The average MSE with different ϵ_{uc} is presented in Figure 2 and Figure 3. Figure 2 corresponds to the situation when model dimension $K = 10$ and Figure 3 corresponds to model dimension $K = 5$. As non-personalized DPMF performs much worse than personalized HDPMF or PDPMF in all experiments, just like Table 3 suggests and the performance of non-private MF will not be affected by varying privacy parameter ϵ_{uc} , it stays the same as the one in Table 3, so these two methods are not presented in Figure 2 and Figure 3 for conciseness. Also, due to space limitation and the same trend as MSE, we do not show the similar results in terms of MAE. From Figure 2 and Figure 3, we can observe that HDPMF defeats PDPMF in most cases, especially when ϵ_{uc} is small (PDPMF performs slightly better only in several cases when ϵ_{uc} is relatively large), indicating that our HDPMF approach performs better than PDPMF when privacy guarantee is strong. And we can also know HDPMF outperforms PDPMF in more cases when dimension $K = 10$ than dimension $K = 5$. It again verifies better performance of HDPMF than PDPMF in higher dimension matrix factorization.

The results with different f_{uc} are shown in Figure 4 and Figure 5. For the same reason as varying ϵ_{uc} , we do not present performance of DPMF and MF or results in terms of MAE when varying f_{uc} . It should be noted that a larger f_{uc} means that there are more conservative users so ratings have overall stronger privacy guarantees. From Figure 4 and Figure 5, we can find that HDPMF always outperforms PDPMF on average MSE with different f_{uc} . And the gap between HDPMF and PDPMF tends to become larger with a higher f_{uc} in most cases. It further confirms the superiority of HDPMF over SOTA PDPMF in *strong privacy guarantee scenario*.




Figure 4: Average and standard deviation MSE of PDPMF and HDPMF with different f_{uc} when model dimension $K = 10$. DPMF performs much worse than PDPMF and HDPMF, the performance of MF stays the same as Table 3, so DPMF and MF are not shown for conciseness.




Figure 5: Average and standard deviation MSE of PDPMF and HDPMF with different f_{uc} when model dimension $K = 5$.

5.2.3 Impact of sparsity

As we can see from Equation (5) that sample mechanism in PDPMF may further deteriorate the sparsity problem and impair the performance of MF model. While our modified stretching mechanism in HDPMF gets rid of such a problem. Thus, we also conduct experiments to test the impact of data sparsity on the performance of different methods. We change the sparsity of all datasets through sampling $\{20, 40, 60, 80, 100\}$ percentage of training ratings user by user. Because some users may have less than 10 ratings after sampling, we use leave-one-out evaluation for these experiments. As for the privacy specification parameters, all of them stay the same as their default values in Table 2.

The results of changing sparsity experiments are shown in Figure 6 and Figure 7. Also, non-personalized DPMF is not presented because of much worse performance than personalized methods. And the performance of non-private MF will be affected by dataset sparsity, so its performance is shown at this time. In Figure 6 and Figure 7, it is obvious that the performance of all the three methods degrades when dataset becomes sparser, because the user preferences are harder to capture with less ratings. Besides, except very few cases on Yelp, HDPMF always outperforms PDPMF with different sparsity, and their performance gap tends to enlarge when the dataset becomes sparser. It further demonstrates the superiority of HDPMF over PDPMF, especially in *sparse dataset scenario*.

5.2.4 Ablation study

Our HDPMF framework utilizes an innovative rescaling scheme to tackle the abnormal scale problem [12] of original stretching mechanism and mitigate the negative effect on accuracy brought by the stretching procedure. To verify the effectiveness of rescaling scheme, we conduct ablation study under default privacy specification setting. We derive




Figure 6: Average and standard deviation MSE of PDPMF and HDPMF with different dataset sparsity parameter $fraction$ when model dimension $K = 10$. A smaller $fraction$ means a sparser training dataset. DPMF performs much worse than the other three methods, so it is not shown.




Figure 7: Average and standard deviation MSE of PDPMF and HDPMF with different dataset sparsity parameter $fraction$ when model dimension $K = 5$.

the variant of HDPMF by removing rescaling scheme in the prediction stage and denotes it as "HDPMF-R". The performance of this variant and other baselines are presented in Figure 8, where the left subfigure shows the results when model dimension $K = 10$ and the right subfigure shows the results when $K = 5$. According to the performance of HDPMF and HDPMF-R, it is easy to know that removing rescaling scheme causes dramatic increase on average MSE. HDPMF-R even performs worse than the non-personalized DPMF method. A possible explanation is that in HDPMF-R, it uses distorted embeddings learned from stretched rating matrix to make predictions, thus the predicted ratings will have abnormal scale and bring huge error. It indicates that rescaling scheme is indispensable for getting normal scale rating predictions and achieving satisfying recommendation performance.




Figure 8: Average MSE of HDPMF, HDPMF-R and other baselines under default privacy specification setting. (a) shows results when model dimension $K = 10$; (b) shows results when model dimension $K = 5$.

6 Conclusion and Future Work

To achieve personalized differential privacy in untrusted recommender scenario, we present the design and evaluation of a heterogeneously differentially private matrix factorization framework, denoted as HDPMF. It can satisfy personalized privacy requirements of different ratings through stretching mechanism. And a novel rescaling scheme is designed to achieve better trade-off between privacy and accuracy. In HDPMF, we can capture homogeneous privacy preference within the same user/item but heterogeneous privacy preference across different users/items with properly allocated privacy budgets. Theoretical analysis and empirical evaluation demonstrate the superiority of our proposed framework.

Several promising directions can be further investigated. First, instead of point-wise model, we consider to extend our framework to pair-wise one [43]. Second, beyond the static setting in this paper, we will explore the dynamic setting which allows users to leave and join in the future. Third, we are interested in extending our framework to deep neural networks such as NCF [44] and NGCF [45]. Because the idea of using stretched input to guide model training and rescaling at prediction stage to get normal scale prediction is also applicable in deep neural networks.

A Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. Suppose Laplace distribution centered at 0 with scale parameter σ has probability density function $h(x) = \frac{1}{2\sigma} \exp(-\frac{|x|}{\sigma})$. Then for all neighboring datasets $\vec{d}, \vec{d}^{(i)}$ and all outputs $t \in \mathbb{R}$ of the randomized function f we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Pr[\mathcal{SM}(\vec{d}, \vec{v}, \epsilon) = t]}{\Pr[\mathcal{SM}(\vec{d}^{(i)}, \vec{v}, \epsilon) = t]} &= \frac{h(t - R(f, \vec{v})(\vec{d}))}{h(t - R(f, \vec{v})(\vec{d}^{(i)}))} \\ &\leq \exp\left(\frac{\epsilon |R(f, \vec{v})(\vec{d}) - R(f, \vec{v})(\vec{d}^{(i)})|}{S(f)}\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(\frac{\epsilon S_i(R(f, \vec{v}))}{S(f)}\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(\frac{\epsilon v_i S(f)}{S(f)}\right) = \exp(\epsilon v_i) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the *stretching mechanism* $\mathcal{SM}(\vec{d}, \vec{v}, \epsilon) = R(f, \vec{v})(\vec{d}) + \text{Laplace}(S(f)/\epsilon)$ satisfies heterogeneous (ϵ, \vec{v}) -differential privacy \square

B Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. Let $f(\mathbf{R}) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \mathbf{v}_j} = 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{I}_{ij} (\mathbf{u}_i^T \mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{R}_{ij}) \mathbf{u}_i + 2\lambda \mathbf{v}_j$. \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}' are neighboring datasets that differ only on the rating \mathbf{R}_{pq} (or \mathbf{R}'_{pq}). We flatten \mathbf{R} into the input vector \vec{d} and flatten \mathbf{W} into the privacy weight vector \vec{v} , where $\mathbf{R}_{ij} = \vec{d}_k, \mathbf{W}_{ij} = v_k, k = m(i-1) + j$. And we take $T(\vec{v}) = \text{diag}(\vec{v})$, then $R(f, \vec{v})(\vec{d}) = f(T(\vec{v}) \cdot \vec{d}) = f(\text{diag}(\vec{v}) \cdot \vec{d}) = f(\mathbf{W} \odot \mathbf{R})$, so the stretching mechanism for our framework is formulated as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{SM}(\vec{d}, \vec{v}, \epsilon) &= R(f, \vec{v})(\vec{d}) + \mathbf{x}_j = f(\mathbf{W} \odot \mathbf{R}) + \mathbf{x}_j = \frac{\partial \tilde{\mathcal{L}}}{\partial \mathbf{v}_j} \\ &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{I}_{ij} (\mathbf{u}_i^T \mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{W}_{ij} \mathbf{R}_{ij}) \mathbf{u}_i + \mathbf{x}_j + 2\lambda \mathbf{v}_j \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{x}_j \sim \text{Laplace}(2\sqrt{K}\Delta/\epsilon)$ denotes noise vector and \odot is element-wise product.

From the neighboring datasets \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}' , we obtain the same derived \mathbf{V} . Since the derived \mathbf{V} are optimized through gradient descent, we then have $\frac{\partial \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{R})}{\partial \mathbf{v}_j} = \frac{\partial \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{R}')}{\partial \mathbf{v}_j}$. So we can know,

$$\begin{aligned} &2 \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{I}_{ij} (\mathbf{u}_i^T \mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{W}_{ij} \mathbf{R}_{ij}) \mathbf{u}_i + \mathbf{x}_j \\ &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{I}_{ij} (\mathbf{u}_i^T \mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{W}_{ij} \mathbf{R}'_{ij}) \mathbf{u}_i + \mathbf{x}'_j \end{aligned}$$

As \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}' differs only on the rating \mathbf{R}_{pq} (or \mathbf{R}'_{pq}), and we let $l = m(p-1) + q$, thus $\mathbf{W}_{pq} = v_l$, then we can get.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}'_j &= 2(\mathbf{W}_{pq}\mathbf{R}_{pq} - \mathbf{W}_{pq}\mathbf{R}'_{pq})\mathbf{u}_p \\ &= 2\mathbf{W}_{pq}(\mathbf{R}_{pq} - \mathbf{R}'_{pq})\mathbf{u}_p\end{aligned}$$

Considering $|\mathbf{R}_{pq} - \mathbf{R}'_{pq}| \leq \Delta$ and $\|\mathbf{u}_p\|_2 \leq 1$, we can know $\|\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}'_j\|_2 \leq 2\mathbf{W}_{pq}\Delta = 2v_l\Delta$.

We then formulate the probability that we get the same derived \mathbf{V} with the neighboring datasets \mathbf{R} and \mathbf{R}' . For each vector \mathbf{v}_j of \mathbf{V} , we have.

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\Pr[\mathbf{v}_j|\mathbf{R}]}{\Pr[\mathbf{v}_j|\mathbf{R}']} &= \frac{\prod_{u \in \{1,2,\dots,K\}} \Pr(\mathbf{x}_{ju})}{\prod_{u \in \{1,2,\dots,K\}} \Pr(\mathbf{x}'_{ju})} \\ &= \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon \sum_u |\mathbf{x}_{ju}|}{2\Delta\sqrt{K}}\right) / \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon \sum_u |\mathbf{x}'_{ju}|}{2\Delta\sqrt{K}}\right) \\ &= \exp\left(\frac{\epsilon \sum_u (|\mathbf{x}'_{ju}| - |\mathbf{x}_{ju}|)}{2\Delta\sqrt{K}}\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(\frac{\epsilon \sum_u |\mathbf{x}_{ju} - \mathbf{x}'_{ju}|}{2\Delta\sqrt{K}}\right) = \exp\left(\frac{\epsilon \|\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}'_j\|_1}{2\Delta\sqrt{K}}\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(\frac{\epsilon\sqrt{K}\|\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}'_j\|_2}{2\Delta\sqrt{K}}\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(\frac{\epsilon\sqrt{K}2v_l\Delta}{2\Delta\sqrt{K}}\right) = \exp(\epsilon v_l)\end{aligned}$$

So, we conclude that the derived item latent matrix \mathbf{V} satisfies heterogeneous (ϵ, \vec{v}) -differential privacy. \square

Acknowledgments

We greatly acknowledge the support of National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 72192832), the Natural Science Foundation of Shanghai (Grant No. 21ZR1421900), and Graduate Innovation Foundation of Shanghai University of Finance and Economics (Grant No. CXJJ-2022-366).

References

- [1] Frank McSherry and Ilya Mironov. Differentially private recommender systems: Building privacy into the netflix prize contenders. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 627–636, 2009.
- [2] Valeria Nikolaenko, Stratis Ioannidis, Udi Weinsberg, Marc Joye, Nina Taft, and Dan Boneh. Privacy-preserving matrix factorization. In *Proceedings of the 2013 ACM SIGSAC conference on Computer & communications security*, pages 801–812, 2013.
- [3] Matthew Fredrikson, Eric Lantz, Somesh Jha, Simon Lin, David Page, and Thomas Ristenpart. Privacy in pharmacogenetics: An end-to-end case study of personalized warfarin dosing. In *23rd USENIX Security Symposium*, pages 17–32, 2014.
- [4] Yehuda Koren, Robert Bell, and Chris Volinsky. Matrix factorization techniques for recommender systems. *Computer*, 42(8):30–37, 2009.
- [5] Emmanuel J Candès and Benjamin Recht. Exact matrix completion via convex optimization. *Foundations of Computational mathematics*, 9(6):717–772, 2009.
- [6] Yu Xin and Tommi S. Jaakkola. Controlling privacy in recommender systems. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2618–2626, 2014.

- [7] Erika Duriakova, Elias Z Tragos, Barry Smyth, Neil Hurley, Francisco J Peña, Panagiotis Symeonidis, James Geraci, and Aonghus Lawlor. Pdmfrec: a decentralised matrix factorisation with tunable user-centric privacy. In *RecSys*, pages 457–461, 2019.
- [8] Jingyu Hua, Chang Xia, and Sheng Zhong. Differentially private matrix factorization. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 1763–1770, 2015.
- [9] Ziqi Liu, Yu-Xiang Wang, and Alexander J. Smola. Fast differentially private matrix factorization. In Hannes Werthner, Markus Zanker, Jennifer Golbeck, and Giovanni Semeraro, editors, *RecSys*, pages 171–178, 2015.
- [10] Shun Zhang, Laixiang Liu, Zhili Chen, and Hong Zhong. Probabilistic matrix factorization with personalized differential privacy. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 183:104864, 2019.
- [11] Arnaud Berlioz, Arik Friedman, Mohamed Ali Kaafar, Roksana Boreli, and Shlomo Berkovsky. Applying differential privacy to matrix factorization. In *RecSys*, pages 107–114, 2015.
- [12] Zach Jorgensen, Ting Yu, and Graham Cormode. Conservative or liberal? personalized differential privacy. In *31st IEEE International Conference on Data Engineering, ICDE 2015*, pages 1023–1034. IEEE, 2015.
- [13] Xuying Meng, Suhang Wang, Kai Shu, Jundong Li, Bo Chen, Huan Liu, and Yujun Zhang. Personalized privacy-preserving social recommendation. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2018.
- [14] Mohammad Alaggan, Sébastien Gambs, and Anne-Marie Kermarrec. Heterogeneous differential privacy. *J. Priv. Confidentiality*, 7(2), 2016.
- [15] Cynthia Dwork, Frank McSherry, Kobbi Nissim, and Adam Smith. Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis. In *Theory of cryptography conference*, pages 265–284. Springer, 2006.
- [16] Ashwin Machanavajjhala, Aleksandra Korolova, and Atish Das Sarma. Personalized social recommendations - accurate or private? *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 4(7):440–450, 2011.
- [17] Ben Niu, Yahong Chen, Boyang Wang, Zhibo Wang, Fenghua Li, and Jin Cao. Adapdp: Adaptive personalized differential privacy. In *IEEE INFOCOM*, pages 1–10, 2021.
- [18] Muhammad Ammad-Ud-Din, Elena Ivannikova, Suleiman A Khan, Were Oyomno, Qiang Fu, Kuan Eeik Tan, and Adrian Flanagan. Federated collaborative filtering for privacy-preserving personalized recommendation system. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.09888*, 2019.
- [19] Shuai Wang, Richard Cornelius Suwandi, and Tsung-Hui Chang. Demystifying model averaging for communication-efficient federated matrix factorization. In *ICASSP 2021-2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 3680–3684. IEEE, 2021.
- [20] Ligeng Zhu, Zhijian Liu, and Song Han. Deep leakage from gradients. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- [21] Luca Melis, Congzheng Song, Emiliano De Cristofaro, and Vitaly Shmatikov. Exploiting unintended feature leakage in collaborative learning. In *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 691–706. IEEE, 2019.
- [22] Dashan Gao, Ben Tan, Ce Ju, Vincent W Zheng, and Qiang Yang. Privacy threats against federated matrix factorization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.01587*, 2020.
- [23] Sungwook Kim, Jinsu Kim, Dongyoung Koo, Yuna Kim, Hyunsoo Yoon, and Junbum Shin. Efficient privacy-preserving matrix factorization via fully homomorphic encryption. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM on Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 617–628, 2016.
- [24] Di Chai, Leye Wang, Kai Chen, and Qiang Yang. Secure federated matrix factorization. *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, 36(5):11–20, 2020.
- [25] Yongjie Du, Deyun Zhou, Yu Xie, Jiao Shi, and Maoguo Gong. Federated matrix factorization for privacy-preserving recommender systems. *Applied Soft Computing*, 111:107700, 2021.
- [26] Keith Bonawitz, Vladimir Ivanov, Ben Kreuter, Antonio Marcedone, H Brendan McMahan, Sarvar Patel, Daniel Ramage, Aaron Segal, and Karn Seth. Practical secure aggregation for privacy-preserving machine learning. In *proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 1175–1191, 2017.
- [27] Zitao Li, Bolin Ding, Ce Zhang, Ninghui Li, and Jingren Zhou. Federated matrix factorization with privacy guarantee. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 15(4):900–913, 2021.
- [28] Xicheng Wan, Yifeng Zheng, Qun Li, Anmin Fu, Mang Su, and Yansong Gao. Towards privacy-preserving and verifiable federated matrix factorization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.01601*, 2022.

- [29] Irit Dinur and Kobbi Nissim. Revealing information while preserving privacy. In *Proceedings of the twenty-second ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART symposium on Principles of database systems*, pages 202–210, 2003.
- [30] Yujie Lin, Pengjie Ren, Zhumin Chen, Zhaochun Ren, Dongxiao Yu, Jun Ma, Maarten de Rijke, and Xiuzhen Cheng. Meta matrix factorization for federated rating predictions. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 981–990, 2020.
- [31] Karan Singhal, Hakim Sidahmed, Zachary Garrett, Shanshan Wu, John Rush, and Sushant Prakash. Federated reconstruction: Partially local federated learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34, 2021.
- [32] Robin C Geyer, Tassilo Klein, and Moin Nabi. Differentially private federated learning: A client level perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.07557*, 2017.
- [33] Aleksei Triastcyn and Boi Faltings. Federated learning with bayesian differential privacy. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*, pages 2587–2596. IEEE, 2019.
- [34] Kang Wei, Jun Li, Ming Ding, Chuan Ma, Howard H Yang, Farhad Farokhi, Shi Jin, Tony QS Quek, and H Vincent Poor. Federated learning with differential privacy: Algorithms and performance analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 15:3454–3469, 2020.
- [35] Junxu Liu, Jian Lou, Li Xiong, Jinfei Liu, and Xiaofeng Meng. Projected federated averaging with heterogeneous differential privacy. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 15(4):828–840, 2021.
- [36] Cynthia Dwork. Differential privacy. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 1–12, 2006.
- [37] Kamalika Chaudhuri, Claire Monteleoni, and Anand D Sarwate. Differentially private empirical risk minimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12(3), 2011.
- [38] Pranav Dandekar, Nadia Fawaz, and Stratis Ioannidis. Privacy auctions for inner product disclosures. *CoRR*, abs/1111.2885, 2011.
- [39] Samuel Kotz, Tomasz Kozubowski, and Krzysztof Podgórski. *The Laplace distribution and generalizations: a revisit with applications to communications, economics, engineering, and finance*. Number 183. Springer Science & Business Media, 2001.
- [40] Martin Abadi, Andy Chu, Ian Goodfellow, H Brendan McMahan, Ilya Mironov, Kunal Talwar, and Li Zhang. Deep learning with differential privacy. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*, pages 308–318, 2016.
- [41] Alessandro Acquisti and Jens Grossklags. Privacy and rationality in individual decision making. *IEEE security & privacy*, 3(1):26–33, 2005.
- [42] Bettina Berendt, Oliver Günther, and Sarah Spiekermann. Privacy in e-commerce: Stated preferences vs. actual behavior. *Communications of the ACM*, 48(4):101–106, 2005.
- [43] Steffen Rendle, Christoph Freudenthaler, Zeno Gantner, and Lars Schmidt-Thieme. BPR: bayesian personalized ranking from implicit feedback. In *UAI*, pages 452–461, 2009.
- [44] Xiangnan He, Lizi Liao, Hanwang Zhang, Liqiang Nie, Xia Hu, and Tat-Seng Chua. Neural collaborative filtering. In *WWW*, pages 173–182, 2017.
- [45] Xiang Wang, Xiangnan He, Meng Wang, Fuli Feng, and Tat-Seng Chua. Neural graph collaborative filtering. In *SIGIR*, pages 165–174, 2019.