

Non-Euclidean Differentially Private Stochastic Convex Optimization: Optimal Rates in Linear Time*

Raef Bassily[†] Cristóbal Guzmán[‡] Anupama Nandi[§]

Abstract

Differentially private (DP) stochastic convex optimization (SCO) is a fundamental problem, where the goal is to approximately minimize the population risk with respect to a convex loss function, given a dataset of n i.i.d. samples from a distribution, while satisfying differential privacy with respect to the dataset. Most of the existing works in the literature of private convex optimization focus on the Euclidean (i.e., ℓ_2) setting, where the loss is assumed to be Lipschitz (and possibly smooth) w.r.t. the ℓ_2 norm over a constraint set with bounded ℓ_2 diameter. Algorithms based on noisy stochastic gradient descent (SGD) are known to attain the optimal excess risk in this setting.

In this work, we conduct a systematic study of DP-SCO for ℓ_p -setups under a standard smoothness assumption on the loss. For $1 < p \leq 2$, under a standard smoothness assumption, we give a new, linear-time DP-SCO algorithm with optimal excess risk. Previously known constructions with optimal excess risk for $1 < p < 2$ run in super-linear time in n . For $p = 1$, we give an algorithm with nearly optimal excess risk. Our result for the ℓ_1 -setup also extends to general polyhedral norms and feasible sets. Moreover, we show that the excess risk bounds resulting from our algorithms for $1 \leq p \leq 2$ are attained with high probability. For $2 < p \leq \infty$, we show that existing linear-time constructions for the Euclidean setup attain a nearly optimal excess risk in the low-dimensional regime. As a consequence, we show that such constructions attain a nearly optimal excess risk for $p = \infty$. Our work draws upon concepts from the geometry of normed spaces, such as the notions of regularity, uniform convexity, and uniform smoothness.

1 Introduction

Stochastic Convex Optimization (SCO) is one of the most fundamental problems in optimization, statistics, and machine learning. In this problem, the goal is to minimize the expectation of a convex loss with respect to a distribution given a dataset of i.i.d. samples from that distribution. A closely related problem is known as Empirical Risk Minimization (ERM), where the goal is to minimize the empirical average of a loss with respect to a dataset (see Section 2 for a more formal description).

There has been a long line of works that studied the differentially private analogs of these problems known as DP-SCO and DP-ERM, e.g., [13, 14, 24, 22, 8, 33, 35, 6, 21]. Nevertheless, the existing theory does not capture a satisfactory understanding of private convex optimization in non-Euclidean settings, and particularly with respect to general ℓ_p norms. Almost all previous works that studied the general formulations of DP-ERM and DP-SCO under general convex losses focused on the *Euclidean setting*, where both the constraint set and the subgradients of the loss are assumed to have a bounded ℓ_2 -norm. In this setting, algorithms with optimal error rates are known for DP-ERM [8] and DP-SCO [6, 21, 5]. On the other hand, [33, 34] is the only work we are aware of that studied non-Euclidean settings under a fairly general setup in the context of DP-ERM (see “Other Related Work” section below for other works that studied special cases of this problem). However, this work

*This work is an extension of [7].

[†]Department of Computer Science & Engineering, Translational Data Analytics Institute (TDAI), The Ohio State University. bassily.1@osu.edu

[‡]Department of Applied Mathematics, University of Twente and Institute for Mathematical and Computational Engineering, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile c.guzman@utwente.nl

[§]Department of Computer Science & Engineering, The Ohio State University. nandi.10@osu.edu

does not address DP-SCO; moreover, for $p > 1$, it only provides upper bounds on the error rate for DP-ERM.

Without privacy constraints, convex optimization in these settings is fairly well-understood in the classical theory. In particular, there exists a universal algorithm that attains optimal rates for ERM as well as SCO over general ℓ_p spaces, namely, the stochastic mirror descent algorithm [28, 27]. A key insight from this line of work is that the flexibility of non-Euclidean norms permits polynomial (in the dimension) acceleration for stochastic first-order methods (see, e.g., discussions in [31, Sec. 5.1.1]).

ℓ_p -setup	Upper Bound	Lower bound
$p = 1$	$\tilde{O}\left(\frac{\log(d)}{\varepsilon\sqrt{n}}\right)$ (*)	$\Omega\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n}}\right)$ (ABRW'12)
$1 < p < 2$	$\tilde{O}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\kappa}{n}} + \frac{\kappa\sqrt{d}}{\varepsilon n}\right)$	$\Omega\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{(p-1)\sqrt{d}}{\varepsilon n}\right)$
$2 < p \leq \infty$	$\tilde{O}\left(\frac{d^{1/2-1/p}}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{d^{1-1/p}}{\varepsilon n}\right)$	$\Omega\left(\min\left\{\frac{d^{1/2-1/p}}{\sqrt{n}}, \frac{1}{n^{1/p}}\right\}\right)$ (NY'83,ABRW'12)
$p = \infty$	$O\left(\sqrt{\frac{d}{n}}\right)$	$\Omega\left(\sqrt{\frac{d}{n}}\right)$ (ABRW'12)

Table 1: Bounds for excess risk of (ε, δ) -DP-SCO. Here d is dimension, n is sample size, and $\kappa = \min\{1/(p-1), 2\ln d\}$; dependence on other parameters is omitted. $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ hides polylogarithmic factors in n and $1/\delta$. Existing lower bounds are for nonprivate SCO: NY'83 [28], ABRW'12 [1]. (*): Bound shown for ℓ_1 -ball feasible set.

Recent work, including our conference paper [2, 7], established nearly tight upper and lower bounds on the excess risk of DP-SCO in ℓ_p setups (see Table 1). Some of the major open questions left open in those works are whether there are linear-time (in the dataset size) algorithms for the case $1 < p < 2$, and whether these algorithms directly provide high-probability guarantees for the optimal excess risk rather than the weaker expectation guarantees shown in the prior works.

1.1 Overview of Results

We formally study DP-SCO beyond Euclidean setups. More importantly, we identify the appropriate structures that suffice to attain nearly optimal rates in these settings. A crucial ingredient of our algorithms and lower bounds are the concepts of uniform convexity and uniform smoothness in a normed space. More concretely, we use the notion of κ -regularity of a normed space [23], which quantifies how (close to) smooth is its squared norm (see Section 2 for a formal definition). This concept has been applied in (nonprivate) convex optimization to design strongly convex regularizers, and to bound the deviations of independent sums and martingales in normed spaces. In this work, we make use of these ideas and we further show that κ -regular spaces have a natural noise addition DP mechanism that we call the *generalized Gaussian mechanism* (see Section 3). We remark that this mechanism may be of independent interest.

Now, we focus on ℓ_p -setups and describe our results for the different values of $1 \leq p \leq \infty$:

Case of $1 < p \leq 2$: This regime of p is interesting to investigate given the fact that the dependence of the optimal excess risk on the dimension of the problem is logarithmic in the ℓ_1 -setup [7, 3] and polynomial in the Euclidean setup [6]. Our work provides nearly tight upper and lower bounds on the excess risk of DP-SCO in this regime. Our lower bound shows a surprising phenomenon: there is a *sharp phase transition* of the excess risk around $p = 1$. In fact, when $1 + \Omega(1) < p < 2$, our lower bound is essentially the same as those of the ℓ_2 case. This shows that the dependence on \sqrt{d} is necessary in this regime, thus solving an open question posed in [34]. Our upper bound is attained via a new, linear-time algorithm. The best known previous construction for this problem for $1 < p < 2$ [2] runs in super-linear, namely, $O(\min\{n^{3/2}, n^2/\sqrt{d}\})$ time.

Our algorithm is based on a new variant of variance-reduced *Stochastic Frank-Wolfe* (SFW) algorithm with noisy gradient estimates. The noisy gradient estimates are generated using our novel generalized Gaussian mechanism. This algorithm enjoys many attractive features: it is projection free and makes implicit use of gradients through a linear optimization oracle. The structure of our algorithm is significantly different from the non-private variants [20, 36], and crucially uses the

regularity of the dual space to control the bias of the noisy gradient estimates. In particular, our algorithm involves a binary-tree-based variance reduction technique proposed by Asi et al. [3]. The binary tree is constructed such that more samples (larger batch sizes) are assigned to vertices that are closer to the root and a gradient estimate at each vertex is then calculated using the samples of that vertex and the prior gradient estimates along the path to the root. The tree-based structure and batch sizing, together with carefully tuned step sizes, effectively control the privacy budget while limiting the down stream influence of the error in the gradient estimates. Moreover, our algorithm makes a single pass on the input sample, i.e., it runs in linear time. The resulting excess risk of our algorithm is nearly optimal, namely, $\tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\sqrt{d}}{\varepsilon n})$. Furthermore, we show that our upper bound is attained with high probability over the input sample and the internal randomness of the algorithm.

Case of $p = 1$: We provide an algorithm that attains nearly-optimal excess population risk with high probability. Our algorithm here is based on the variance-reduced one-sample stochastic Frank-Wolfe algorithm [36]. This algorithm uses a single data point per iteration, allowing for larger number of iterations; and it achieves the optimal excess risk in non-private SCO in the Euclidean setting. Despite its advantages, this algorithm does not immediately apply to DP-SCO for the ℓ_1 -setup. The most important reason being that this algorithm was designed for the ℓ_2 -setup, so our first goal is to show that a recursive gradient estimator used in [36] (which is a variant of the Stochastic Path-Integrated Differential Estimator, SPIDER [20]) does indeed work in the ℓ_1 -setup. Similarly to the previous case, by making use of the regularity of the ℓ_∞ -norm to obtain variance bound on the gradient estimator, we are able to extend the SFW method to the ℓ_1 -setup. A second challenge comes from the requirement of differential privacy. First, we use the fact that at each iteration, only a linear optimization oracle is required, and when the feasible set is polyhedral, we can construct such an oracle privately by the report noisy max mechanism [18, 10]. This technique was first used by [34] in their construction for the DP-ERM version of this problem which was based on “ordinary” full-batch FW. However, the recursive estimator in our construction is queried multiple times where a growing batch is used each time. This requires a different privacy analysis that entails bounding the sensitivity of the gradient estimator by analyzing a recursive bound on the same. The analysis crucially relies on the fact that our construction, unlike the non-private SFW, uses a constant step size and uses a large batch at the first iteration to reduce the sensitivity.

Case of $2 < p \leq \infty$: Another interesting question is what happens in the range of $p > 2$. For comparison, it is known that non-privately the excess risk behaves as $\Theta(\frac{1}{n^{1/p}} + \frac{d^{1/2-1/p}}{\sqrt{n}})$. We show that in the low dimensional regime, $d \lesssim n$, the randomized smoothing algorithm of [25] attains nearly optimal excess risk for general convex losses, and the phased stochastic gradient descent algorithm of [21] attains nearly optimal excess risk for smooth convex losses. This implies that for $p = \infty$, these algorithms attain nearly optimal excess risk for general and smooth losses, respectively. Note that the algorithm of [25] runs in $O(n^{5/4}d^{1/8})$ time, whereas that of [21] runs in linear time. To conclude our overview, we note that the SFW-based algorithms for the cases $p = 1$ and $1 < p \leq 2$ run in time *linear in the dataset size n* and are *projection-free*, which are desirable properties for large dataset and high-dimensional regimes. Moreover, all of our SFW-style algorithms enjoy high-probability excess risk guarantees. Instrumental to these guarantees is the use of concentration properties of martingale difference sequences in regular spaces [23].

In independent work,¹ Asi et al. [2] provide sharp upper bounds for DP-SCO in ℓ_1 setting, for both smooth and nonsmooth objectives. Their algorithm for the smooth case is similar to our polyhedral Stochastic Frank-Wolfe method, where their improvements are obtained by a careful privacy accounting using a binary-tree technique. On the other hand, for the ℓ_p setting, when $1 < p < 2$, they give an algorithm that combines the iterative localization approach of Feldman et al. [21] and regularized mirror descent. Their algorithm attains nearly optimal excess risk, however, it runs in super-linear ($O(\min\{n^{3/2}, n^2/\sqrt{d}\})$) time which is prohibitive in practice. To conclude our comparison, we observe that our Generalized Gaussian mechanism allows us to substantially extend the applicability of the Noisy Stochastic Frank-Wolfe method (in Section 5.1) to arbitrary normed spaces with a regular dual.

¹This work is also concurrent to the conference paper [7].

Other Related Work: Before [34], there have been a few works that studied DP-ERM and DP-SCO in special cases of the ℓ_1 setting. The works [24] and [30] studied DP-ERM for ℓ_1 regression problems; however, they make strong assumptions about the model (e.g., restricted strong convexity). DP-ERM and DP-SCO for generalized linear models (GLMs) was studied in [22]. Their bound for DP-ERM was suboptimal, and their generalization error bound relies on special structure of GLMs, where such a bound can be obtained by standard uniform-convergence arguments. We note that such an argument does not lead to optimal bounds for general convex losses.

Comparison to our conference paper [7]: This work is a substantial extension of results published at the Conference on Learning Theory [7]. Some of the main innovations upon its conference version include the first linear time algorithm for DP-SCO for ℓ_p setup when $1 < p < 2$, and high-probability guarantees for the variance-reduced SFW algorithms (both for $p = 1$ and $1 < p \leq 2$). Importantly, we have unified and strengthened our gradient estimator bias bounds to yield high-probability guarantees (see Section 4). This new analysis is also tighter, which leads to better dependence of the resulting excess risk on the regularity parameter, shaving off some polylogarithmic factors in d for ℓ_p setups. We emphasize as well the generality of these results, as being applicable to arbitrary spaces with a regular dual. In particular, we show that under κ -regularity of the dual space, DP-SCO with smooth losses is solvable in linear time with excess risk $O(\sqrt{\frac{\kappa}{n}} + \frac{\kappa\sqrt{d}}{\varepsilon n})$. Finally, for ℓ_p setups we propose a fast sampling method for the generalized Gaussian mechanism (see Remark 1).

2 Preliminaries

Normed Spaces and Regularity. Let $(\mathbf{E}, \|\cdot\|)$ be a normed space of dimension d , and let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ an arbitrary inner product over \mathbf{E} (not necessarily inducing the norm $\|\cdot\|$). Given $x \in \mathbf{E}$ and $r > 0$, let $\mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|}(x, r) = \{y \in \mathbf{E} : \|y - x\| \leq r\}$. The dual norm over \mathbf{E} is defined as usual, $\|y\|_* := \max_{\|x\| \leq 1} \langle y, x \rangle$. With this definition, $(\mathbf{E}, \|\cdot\|_*)$ is also a d -dimensional normed space. As a main example, consider the case of $\ell_p^d \triangleq (\mathbb{R}^d, \|\cdot\|_p)$, where $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and $\|x\|_p \triangleq (\sum_{j \in [d]} |x_j|^p)^{1/p}$. As a consequence of the Hölder inequality, one can prove that the dual of ℓ_p^d corresponds to ℓ_q^d , where $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ is the conjugate exponent of p , determined by $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$.

The algorithms we consider in this work can be applied to general spaces whose dual has a sufficiently smooth norm. To quantify this property, we use the notion of *regular spaces*, following [23]. Given $\kappa \geq 1$, a normed space $(\mathbf{E}, \|\cdot\|)$ is κ -regular if there exists $1 \leq \kappa_+ \leq \kappa$ and a norm $\|\cdot\|_+$ such that $(\mathbf{E}, \|\cdot\|_+)$ is κ_+ -smooth, i.e.,

$$\|x + y\|_+^2 \leq \|x\|_+^2 + \langle \nabla(\|\cdot\|_+^2)(x), y \rangle + \kappa_+ \|y\|_+^2 \quad (\forall x, y \in \mathbf{E}), \quad (1)$$

and $\|\cdot\|$ and $\|\cdot\|_+$ are equivalent with constant $\sqrt{\kappa/\kappa_+}$:

$$\|x\|^2 \leq \|x\|_+^2 \leq (\kappa/\kappa_+) \|x\|^2 \quad (\forall x \in \mathbf{E}). \quad (2)$$

As basic example, Euclidean spaces are 1-regular. Other examples of regular spaces are ℓ_q^d where $2 \leq q \leq \infty$: these spaces are κ -regular with $\kappa = \min\{q - 1, 2e \log(d)\}$; in this case, $\|x\|_+ = \|x\|_r$ with $r = \min\{q, 2 \log(d) + 1\}$ and $\kappa_+ = (r - 1)$ [23, 15] (smoothness of this norm squared is proved e.g. in [9, Example 5.11]). Finally, consider a polyhedral norm $\|\cdot\|$ with unit ball $\mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|} = \text{conv}(\mathcal{V})$. Then $(\mathbf{E}, \|\cdot\|_*)$ is $(2e \ln |\mathcal{V}|)$ -regular. More precisely, note that $\|x\|_* = \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}} |\langle v, x \rangle|$, hence the norm $\|x\|_+ := (\sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} |\langle v, x \rangle|^q)^{1/q}$, with $q = 2 \ln |\mathcal{V}| + 1$, satisfies (1) with $\kappa_+ = (q - 1)$ (e.g., follows from [9, Example 5.11]), and satisfies (2) with $\sqrt{\kappa/\kappa_+} \leq \sqrt{e}$ (using the equivalence of $\|\cdot\|_q$ and $\|\cdot\|_\infty$), thus $\kappa = e\kappa_+ = 2e \ln |\mathcal{V}|$.

An interesting property of regular spaces are the variance and concentration bounds of their vector-valued martingales [23]. These will allow us to naturally extend some estimators proposed in Euclidean settings to non-Euclidean regular settings.

Proposition 2.1 (Theorem 2.1 in [23] restated). *Let $\psi^\infty = \{\psi_i > 0\}_{i=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of (deterministic) positive reals. Let $(\mathbf{E}, \|\cdot\|)$ be a κ -regular space, and let $\mathbf{n}^\infty = \{\mathbf{n}_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ be a martingale-difference with values in \mathbf{E} , w.r.t. a filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_t$. Suppose that $\forall i \geq 1$, \mathbf{n}_i satisfy*

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp\{(\|\mathbf{n}_i\|/\psi_i)^2\}|\mathcal{F}_{i-1}] \leq \exp\{1\} \quad \text{almost surely.}$$

Let $\mathbf{d}_T = \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{n}_i$, then for all $T \geq 1, \tau \geq 0$:

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\|\mathbf{d}_T\| \geq (\sqrt{2e\kappa} + \sqrt{2\tau}) \left(\sum_{i \leq T} \psi_i^2\right)^{1/2}\right] \leq 2 \exp\{-\tau^2/3\}.$$

Definition 2.2 (Differential Privacy [16, 17, 18]). *Let $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$. A (randomized) algorithm $M : \mathcal{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ is (ε, δ) -differentially private (also denoted (ε, δ) -DP) if for all pairs of datasets $S, S' \in \mathcal{Z}$ that differ in exactly one entry, and every measurable $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathcal{R}$, we have:*

$$\Pr(M(S) \in \mathcal{O}) \leq e^\varepsilon \cdot \Pr(M(S') \in \mathcal{O}) + \delta.$$

When $\delta = 0$, M is referred to as ε -differentially private.

Lemma 2.3 (Advanced composition [19, 18]). *For any $\varepsilon > 0, \delta \in [0, 1]$, and $\delta' \in (0, 1)$, the class of (ε, δ) -DP algorithms satisfies $(\varepsilon', k\delta + \delta')$ -differential privacy under k -fold adaptive composition, for $\varepsilon' = \varepsilon\sqrt{2k \log(1/\delta')} + k\varepsilon(e^\varepsilon - 1)$.*

Differentially Private Stochastic Convex Optimization. Let $(\mathbf{E}, \|\cdot\|)$ be a normed space, and $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbf{E}$ a closed convex set of diameter $M > 0$. Given $L_0, L_1 > 0$, denote $\mathcal{C}(L_0, L_1)$ the class of functions $f : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ which are convex; L_0 -Lipschitz, $f(x) - f(y) \leq L_0\|x - y\|$, for all $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$; and L_1 -smooth, $\|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\|_* \leq L_1\|x - y\|$, for all $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$. Given a loss function $f : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Z} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ s.t. $f(\cdot, z) \in \mathcal{C}(L_0, L_1)$ for all $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, and a distribution \mathcal{D} over \mathcal{Z} , the SCO problem corresponds to the minimization of the population risk, $F_{\mathcal{D}}(x) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{z \sim \mathcal{D}}[f(x, z)]$ over \mathcal{X} . Let, $F_{\mathcal{D}}^* \triangleq \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} F_{\mathcal{D}}(x)$. Given an algorithm $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{Z}^n \mapsto \mathbf{E}$, define its excess population risk as

$$\mathcal{E}[\mathcal{A}] = F_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{A}(S)) - F_{\mathcal{D}}^*. \quad (3)$$

Our guarantees on the excess population risk will be expressed in terms of upper bounds on (3) that hold with high probability over the randomness of both S and the random coins of the algorithm. Additionally, the expected excess population risk of \mathcal{A} is defined as $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}[\mathcal{A}] = \mathbb{E}_{S \sim \mathcal{D}^n, \mathcal{A}}[\mathcal{E}[\mathcal{A}]]$.

The DP-SCO problem in the $(\mathbf{E}, \|\cdot\|)$ -setup corresponds to the setting above, where algorithms are constrained to satisfy (ε, δ) -differential privacy. We distinguish the problem above from its empirical counterpart (DP-ERM), where we are interested in the minimization of the empirical average of the loss w.r.t. the input dataset.

3 Generalized Gaussian Distribution and Mechanism

One important requirement for the application of DP stochastic first-order methods is designing the proper private mechanism for an iterative method. If we want to achieve privacy by adding noise to gradients, then we need to do it in a way to achieve privacy from *gradient sensitivity*, w.r.t. the dual norm. With this purpose in mind, we design a new noise addition mechanism that leverages the regularity of the dual space $(\mathbf{E}, \|\cdot\|_*)$.

Definition 3.1 (Generalized Gaussian distribution and mechanism). *Let $(\mathbf{E}, \|\cdot\|_*)$ be a d -dimensional κ -regular space with smooth norm $\|\cdot\|_+$. We define the generalized Gaussian (GG) distribution $\mathcal{GG}_{\|\cdot\|_+}(\mu, \sigma^2)$, as the one with density $g(z) = C(\sigma, d) \exp\{-\|z - \mu\|_+^2/[2\sigma^2]\}$, where $C(\sigma, d) = [\text{Area}(\{\|x\|_+ = 1\}) \frac{(2\sigma^2)^{d/2}}{2} \Gamma(d/2)]^{-1}$, and Area is the $((d-1)$ -dim) surface measure on \mathbb{R}^d .*

Given an algorithm $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{Z}^n \mapsto \mathbf{E}$ with bounded $\|\cdot\|_$ -sensitivity: $\sup_{S \simeq S'} \|\mathcal{A}(S) - \mathcal{A}(S')\|_* \leq s$, we define the generalized Gaussian mechanism of \mathcal{A} with variance σ^2 as $\mathcal{A}_{GG}(S) \sim \mathcal{GG}_{\|\cdot\|_+}(\mathcal{A}(S), \sigma^2)$.*

We first list some basic properties.

Proposition 3.2. (a) For any $m \geq 1$, if $z \sim \mathcal{GG}_{\|\cdot\|_+}(0, \sigma^2)$, then $\mathbb{E}[\|z\|_+^m] \leq (2\sigma^2)^{m/2} \Gamma(\frac{m+d}{2}) / \Gamma(\frac{d}{2})$. In particular, $\mathbb{E}[\|z\|_*^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[\|z\|_+^2] \leq d\sigma^2$.

(b) For any $\nu \geq 0$, if $z \sim \mathcal{GG}_{\|\cdot\|_+}(0, \sigma^2)$, then $\mathbb{E}[\exp\{\|z\|_*^2/\nu^2\}] \leq \exp\{\frac{d\sigma^2}{\nu^2 - 2\sigma^2}\}$. In particular, if $\nu = \sigma\sqrt{d+2}$, then $\mathbb{E}[\exp\{\frac{\|z\|_*^2}{\nu^2}\}] \leq \mathbb{E}[\exp\{\frac{\|z\|_+^2}{\nu^2}\}] \leq \exp(1)$.

(c) For any $\alpha > 1$, $D_\alpha(\mathcal{GG}_{\|\cdot\|_+}(\mu_1, \sigma^2) \|\mathcal{GG}_{\|\cdot\|_+}(\mu_2, \sigma^2)) \leq \frac{\kappa\alpha^2}{2\sigma^2(\alpha-1)} \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_*^2$, where D_α is the α -Rényi divergence.

The last property exhibits a behavior analogous to the Gaussian r.v.s in the ℓ_2 -setup.

Proof. (a) Notice that for any m (below $\Gamma(\cdot)$ is the Gamma function),

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \exp\left\{-\frac{r^2}{2\sigma^2}\right\} r^m dr = \frac{(2\sigma^2)^{m+1/2}}{2} \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-u} u^{m-1/2} du = \frac{(2\sigma^2)^{(m+1)/2}}{2} \Gamma\left(\frac{m+1}{2}\right).$$

This implies that the m -th moment w.r.t. $\|\cdot\|_+$ can be computed as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|z\|_+^m] &= C(\sigma, d) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|z\|_+^m \exp\left\{-\frac{\|z\|_+^2}{2\sigma^2}\right\} dz \\ &= C(\sigma, d) \text{Area}(\{\|x\|_+ = 1\}) \int_0^\infty r^{m+d-1} \exp\left\{-\frac{r^2}{2\sigma^2}\right\} dr \\ &= (2\sigma^2)^{m/2} \Gamma\left(\frac{m+d}{2}\right) / \Gamma\left(\frac{d}{2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

We conclude using that $\|z\|_* \leq \|z\|_+$. On the other hand, the bounds for the second moment are obtained by using that $\Gamma(1+d/2) = (d/2)\Gamma(d/2)$.

(b) Using $\|z\|_* \leq \|z\|_+$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left\{\frac{\|z\|_*^2}{\nu^2}\right\}\right] &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left\{\frac{\|z\|_+^2}{\nu^2}\right\}\right] = C(\sigma, d) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp\left\{\frac{\|z\|_+^2}{\nu^2}\right\} \exp\left\{-\frac{\|z\|_+^2}{2\sigma^2}\right\} dz \\ &= C(\sigma, d) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp\left\{\|z\|_+^2 \left(\frac{1}{\nu^2} - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2}\right)\right\} dz = C(\sigma, d) / C\left(\left(\frac{1}{\sigma^2} - \frac{2}{\nu^2}\right)^{-1/2}, d\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{\nu^2}{\nu^2 - 2\sigma^2}\right)^{d/2} = \left(1 + \frac{2\sigma^2}{\nu^2 - 2\sigma^2}\right)^{d/2} \\ &\leq \exp\left\{\frac{d}{2} \frac{2\sigma^2}{\nu^2 - 2\sigma^2}\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that, this is upper bounded by $\exp(1)$ when $\nu = \sigma\sqrt{d+2}$.

(c) Let $\mathbb{P} = \mathcal{GG}(\mu_1, \sigma^2)$ and $\mathbb{Q} = \mathcal{GG}(\mu_2, \sigma^2)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \exp\{(\alpha-1)D_\alpha(\mathbb{P} \|\mathbb{Q})\} &= C(\sigma, d) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\frac{d\mathbb{P}}{d\mathbb{Q}}\right)^\alpha d\mathbb{Q} \\ &= C(\sigma, d) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp\left\{-\frac{\alpha}{2\sigma^2} \|z - \mu_1\|_+^2 + \frac{\alpha-1}{2\sigma^2} \|z - \mu_2\|_+^2\right\} dz \\ &= C(\sigma, d) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp\left\{-\frac{\alpha}{2\sigma^2} \|z - \mu_1 + \mu_2\|_+^2 + \frac{\alpha-1}{2\sigma^2} \|z\|_+^2\right\} dz. \end{aligned}$$

Let now $\mu = \mu_1 - \mu_2$ and $p(\cdot) = \|\cdot\|_+^2$. Now, by convexity and smoothness of $\|\cdot\|_+^2$

$$-\alpha \|z - \mu\|_+^2 \leq -\alpha \|z\|_+^2 + \langle \nabla p(z), \alpha\mu \rangle \leq -\alpha \|z\|_+^2 + [\|z\|_+^2 - \|z - \alpha\mu\|_+^2 + \kappa_+ \|\alpha\mu\|_+^2].$$

Plugging this in the integral above, we get

$$e^{(\alpha-1)D_\alpha(\mathbb{P}|\mathbb{Q})} \leq \exp\left\{\frac{\kappa_+\alpha^2}{2\sigma^2}\|\mu\|_+^2\right\}C(\sigma, d)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\exp\left\{-\frac{\|z-\alpha\mu\|_+^2}{2\sigma^2}\right\}dz \leq \exp\left\{\frac{\kappa\alpha^2}{2\sigma^2}\|\mu\|_*^2\right\},$$

$$\text{Hence, } D_\alpha(\mathbb{P}|\mathbb{Q}) \leq \frac{\kappa\alpha^2}{2\sigma^2(\alpha-1)}\|\mu\|_*^2.$$

□

We now provide a short summary of consequences of the GG mechanism.

Corollary 3.3. *The generalized Gaussian mechanism applied to a function with $\|\cdot\|_*$ -sensitivity bounded by $s > 0$ is (α, ρ) -RDP, where $\rho = \kappa\alpha^2s^2/[2\sigma^2(\alpha-1)]$. In particular, choosing $\sigma^2 = 2\kappa\log(1/\delta)s^2/\varepsilon^2$, the GG mechanism is (ε, δ) -DP.*

Proof. The first part follows directly from Proposition 3.2. The second part can be obtained from the first part, together with the DP/RDP reduction in [26, Propos. 3]. □

Remark 1. *Of particular interest in this work is the space ℓ_q^d where $2 \leq q < \infty$. These spaces are κ -regular with $\kappa = \min\{q-1, 2e\log d\}$, and the corresponding κ_+ -smooth norm is $\|x\|_r$, where $r = \min\{q, 2\log(d)+1\}$ thus $\kappa_+ = r-1$. In this case, implementing the GG mechanism can be done in linear (in the dimension) time, assuming access to a sampler from the Gamma distribution. For this, we use the decomposition $X = RU$ for a random vector X with independent coordinates with density proportional to e^{-t^p} [29]. This polar-type decomposition corresponds to $U = X/\|X\|_p$ (uniformly distributed on the $\|\cdot\|_p$ sphere) and $R = \|X\|_p$ (with cdf $\Gamma(d/p, r^p/[2\sigma]^2)/\Gamma(d/p)$), which are independent. On the other hand, it is easy to see that the GG distribution has a similar decomposition $Z = RU$, where $U = Z/\|Z\|_p$ is uniform on the $\|\cdot\|_p$ sphere, but R follows a centered chi distribution. Hence, sampling from X as above, and transforming its radial component from the cdf of $\|X\|_p$ to a centered chi distribution (see discussion in [29]), provides an exact GG sampler.*

4 High Probability Bias of Recursive Gradient Estimators

Our DP-SCO algorithms in the ℓ_p setups when $1 \leq p \leq 2$, are based on the variance-reduced stochastic Frank-Wolfe algorithm variants. These algorithms use a variant of the following recursive gradient estimator:

$$\tilde{\nabla}_t = (1-\alpha)(\tilde{\nabla}_{t-1} + \Delta_t) + \alpha\nabla_t + \mathbf{g}_t \quad (4)$$

For any t , let \mathbf{B}_t denote a mini-batch of data points drawn from the input dataset without replacement. Note that, since the input dataset consists of i.i.d. draws from an unknown distribution \mathcal{D} , the mini-batches $\{\mathbf{B}_0, \dots, \mathbf{B}_t\}$ are disjoint and independent. Here, given a mini-batch \mathbf{B}_t , ∇_t is the unbiased gradient estimator given by $\nabla_t = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{B}_t|}\sum_{z \in \mathbf{B}_t}\nabla f(x^t, z)$, and Δ_t is the gradient variation given by $\Delta_t = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{B}_t|}\sum_{z \in \mathbf{B}_t}[\nabla f(x^t, z) - \nabla f(x^{t-1}, z)]$. Here $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ is an averaging factor. Finally, \mathbf{g}_t is the noise, which is a centered random variable, $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{g}_t] = 0$, and satisfies a light-tail property

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp\{\|\mathbf{g}_t\|^2/\nu_t^2\}] \leq \exp(1) \quad (\exists \nu_t \geq 0). \quad (5)$$

Recall that \mathcal{X} is a closed convex set of diameter $M > 0$, and for any datapoint z in the input dataset, we have the following properties:

- Unbiasedness: $\mathbb{E}_{z \in \mathcal{D}}[\nabla f(x, z)] = \nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x)$
- Boundedness: $\|\nabla f(x, z)\|_* \leq L_0$, a.s..
- Smoothness: $\|\nabla f(x, z) - \nabla f(y, z)\|_* \leq L_1\|x - y\|$.

We will use Proposition 2.1 and the above properties to derive high probability bounds on the variance of the recursive gradient estimator $\tilde{\nabla}_t$, which is given by the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and step sizes, $\eta_t \in (0, 1)$, $\forall t$. Let $(\mathbf{E}, \|\cdot\|)$ be a normed space such that $(\mathbf{E}, \|\cdot\|_*)$ is κ -regular. Suppose the noise \mathbf{g}_t , is a centered random variable, $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{g}_t] = 0$, and satisfies (5) for some $\nu_t \geq 0$. For any $0 < \beta < 1$, with probability at least $1 - \beta$, the recursive gradient estimate $\tilde{\nabla}_t$ satisfies for all $t \in [T]$:

$$\|\tilde{\nabla}_t - \nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^t)\|_* \leq C_\beta \left[\frac{(1-\alpha)^t L_0}{\sqrt{|\mathbf{B}_0|}} + (L_1 M \eta_t + \alpha L_0) \sum_{s < t} \frac{(1-\alpha)^{t-(s+1)}}{\sqrt{|\mathbf{B}_s|}} + \sum_{s < t} (1-\alpha)^{t-(s+1)} \nu_s \right],$$

where $C_\beta = (\sqrt{e\kappa} + \sqrt{3 \log(2T/\beta)})$.

Proof. Note that, the recursive gradient estimator is given by 4. Now, to prove a high probability bound on $\|\tilde{\nabla}_t - \nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^t)\|_*$, we unravel this bias in terms of a martingale difference sequence. Below, for a compact notation, let $\bar{\Delta}_t \triangleq \nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^t) - \nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^{t-1})$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{\nabla}_t - \nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^t) \\ &= (1-\alpha) [\tilde{\nabla}_{t-1} - \nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^{t-1})] + (1-\alpha) \nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^{t-1}) - \nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^t) + (1-\alpha) \Delta_t + \alpha \nabla_t + \alpha \mathbf{g}_t \\ &= (1-\alpha) [\tilde{\nabla}_{t-1} - \nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^{t-1})] + [\Delta_t - \bar{\Delta}_t] + \alpha [\nabla_t - \nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^t) + \mathbf{g}_t] \\ &= (1-\alpha)^t (\tilde{\nabla}_0 - \nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^0)) + \sum_{j=1}^t (1-\alpha)^{t-(j+1)} [(\Delta_j - \bar{\Delta}_j) + \alpha (\nabla_{j-1} - \nabla F(x^{j-1}) + \mathbf{g}_j)]. \end{aligned}$$

Given $t \in [T]$ and $z \in \mathbf{B}_t$, let $\mathcal{F}_{< z, t}$ be the σ -algebra induced by all datapoints preceding z (in the order used by the algorithm), as well as $(\mathbf{g}_s)_{s < t}$. Here, we assume that $\tilde{\nabla}_t - \nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^t)$ is a sum of martingale-difference terms and hence, we need to establish the following bounds for each summand in the estimators.

1. First term: $\tilde{\nabla}_0 - \nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^0)$.

For the initial batch \mathbf{B}_0 , we have that

$$\tilde{\nabla}_0 - \nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^0) = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{B}_0|} \sum_{z \in \mathbf{B}_0} [\nabla f(x^0, z) - \nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^0)]$$

Moreover, $\|\nabla f(x^0, z) - \nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^0)\|_* \leq 2L_0$, for each $z \in \mathbf{B}_0$, a.s.

In particular, each summand of the first term satisfies, for $\psi_0^2 = 4L_0^2(1-\alpha)^{2t}/|\mathbf{B}_0|^2$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ (1-\alpha)^{2t} \|\nabla f(x^0, z) - \nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^0)\|_*^2 / [\psi_0 \mathbf{B}_0]^2 \right\} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{< z, 0} \right] \leq \exp(1).$$

2. Second term: $[\Delta_j - \bar{\Delta}_j] + \alpha [\nabla_{j-1} - \nabla F(x^{j-1})]$.

Given a mini-batch \mathbf{B}_j , we can write this term as follows

$$\begin{aligned} [\Delta_j - \bar{\Delta}_j] + \alpha [\nabla_{j-1} - \nabla F(x^{j-1})] &= \frac{1}{|\mathbf{B}_j|} \sum_{z \in \mathbf{B}_j} \left[(\nabla f(x^j, z) - \nabla f(x^{j-1}, z) - \bar{\Delta}_j) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \alpha (\nabla f(x^{j-1}, z) - \nabla F(x^{j-1})) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Now, using that $f(\cdot, z)$ is L_0 -Lipschitz and L_1 -smooth, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla f(x^j, z) - \nabla f(x^{j-1}, z) - \bar{\Delta}_j\|_* &\leq 2L_1 M \eta_j \\ \|\nabla f(x^{j-1}, z) - \nabla F(x^{j-1})\|_* &\leq 2L_0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the dual norm of each summand is a.s. bounded by $2L_1 M \eta_j + 2\alpha L_0$. Finally, choosing

$$\psi_j^2 = \frac{4}{|\mathbf{B}_j|^2} (1-\alpha)^{2t-2(j+1)} [L_1 M \eta_j + \alpha L_0]^2,$$

for each summand of the second term, using datapoint $z \in \mathbf{B}_j$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ \frac{1}{(\psi_t |\mathbf{B}_j|)^2} (1-\alpha)^{2t-2(j+1)} \left\| (\nabla f(x^j, z) - \nabla f(x^{j-1}, z) - \bar{\Delta}_j) \right. \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \left. + \alpha [\nabla f(x^{j-1}, z) - \nabla F(x^{j-1})] \right\|_*^2 \right\} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{< z, j} \right] \leq \exp(1), \end{aligned}$$

3. Third term: \mathbf{g}_j

It is given that \mathbf{g}_j is a centered random variable, $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{g}_t] = 0$, and it satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp\{\|\mathbf{g}_t\|^2/\nu_t^2\}] \leq \exp(1).$$

Therefore, by Proposition 2.1, we have that for every t and any $\beta \in (0, 1)$:

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\|\tilde{\nabla}_t - \nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^t)\|_* \geq \sqrt{2}C'_\beta \left(|\mathbf{B}_0|\psi_0^2 + \sum_{s<t} (1-\alpha)^{2t-2(s+1)} [|\mathbf{B}_s|\psi_s^2 + \nu_s^2]\right)^{1/2}\right] \leq \beta,$$

where $C'_\beta = (\sqrt{e\kappa} + \sqrt{3\log(2/\beta)})$. Using Jensen's inequality and union bound over t , with probability $1 - \beta$, the recursive gradient estimate $\tilde{\nabla}_t$ satisfies for all $t \in [T]$ (letting $C_\beta = (\sqrt{e\kappa} + \sqrt{3\log(2T/\beta)})$):

$$\|\tilde{\nabla}_t - \nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^t)\|_* \leq C_\beta \left[\frac{(1-\alpha)^t L_0}{\sqrt{|\mathbf{B}_0|}} + (L_1 M \eta_t + \alpha L_0) \sum_{s<t} \frac{(1-\alpha)^{t-(s+1)}}{\sqrt{|\mathbf{B}_s|}} + \sum_{s<t} (1-\alpha)^{t-(s+1)} \nu_s \right].$$

□

5 Differentially Private SCO: ℓ_p -setup for $1 < p \leq 2$

5.1 Noisy Variance-Reduced Stochastic Frank-Wolfe

In this section, we study DP-SCO in the ℓ_p -setup when $1 < p \leq 2$ and provide a high probability upper bound on the excess risk. We give a differentially private stochastic Frank-Wolfe algorithm that is based on the variance reduction proposed in [36]. In our algorithm we combine a binary-tree-based variance reduction technique proposed by Asi et al. for the ℓ_1 setup [2] with privacy-preserving gradient noise addition by our generalized Gaussian mechanism. Our algorithm has T phases, where in each phase $t \in 1, \dots, T$ we construct a binary tree of depth t . Next, the algorithm traverses through the vertices of the tree according to the Depth-First-Search (DFS) approach. Following the notation in [2], vertices are denoted by $u_{t,s}$ where $s \in \{0, 1\}^{\leq t}$ is the path to the vertex. Each vertex $u_{t,s}$ is associated with a parameter $x_{t,s}$, a gradient estimate $\tilde{\nabla}_{t,s}$, and a set of samples $S_{t,s}$. At a high level, each phase t starts by computing a fresh estimate for the gradient of the population risk at root vertex (i.e. $s = \emptyset$) based on a large batch of samples. Next the vertices are traversed according to the Depth-First-Search approach and the gradient at each vertex is estimated using the samples of that vertex and the gradients along the path to the root. When a left child is visited, the parent node passes the parameter $x_{t,s}$ and gradient estimate $\tilde{\nabla}_{t,s}$ with no update. At every right child, the algorithm improves the gradient estimate using the estimate at the parent node. When a leaf vertex is visited in the DFS order, the algorithm updates the current iterate using the Frank-Wolfe step with the gradient estimate at the leaf. The vertices that are closer to the root are assigned more samples, i.e. each vertex is associated with a sample of size $\frac{b}{2^j}$, where j is the depth of the vertex. Hence, the variance of the gradient estimate is reduced along the path to the root.

Following are some of the notations we use in this section for convenience. Let $\text{DFS}(t)$ denote the DFS order of the vertices in a binary tree of depth t (root not included). For $s \in \{0, 1\}^t$, let $\ell(s) \in [0, 2^t - 1]$ denote the integer whose binary representation is s . In the description of the algorithm, let $x_{t,s}$ denote the iterates, where t is the phase and $s \in \{0, 1\}^t$ is the path from the root. Our algorithm, denoted by $\mathcal{A}_{\text{noisySFW}}$, is provided in pseudocode in Algorithm 1.

Theorem 5.1 (Privacy Guarantee of $\mathcal{A}_{\text{noisySFW}}$). *Let $\eta_{t,s} = \frac{1}{2^{t-1+\ell(s)+1}} \forall s, t$. Then, Algorithm 1 is (ε, δ) -differentially private.*

Proof. Let $S, S' \in \mathcal{Z}^n$ be neighboring datasets. Let $\tilde{\nabla}_{t,s}$ and $\tilde{\nabla}'_{t,s}$ denote the private gradient estimates corresponding to S and S' , respectively. For a phase t , let $\nabla_{t,\emptyset} = \frac{1}{b} \sum_{z \in S_{t,\emptyset}} \nabla f(x_{t,\emptyset}, z)$ be the gradient estimator for the root of the tree which has a sample size of b . Note that the global

Algorithm 1 $\mathcal{A}_{\text{noisySFW}}$: Noisy Private Stochastic Frank-Wolfe Algorithm

Require: Private dataset: $S = (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathcal{Z}^n$, privacy parameters: (ε, δ) , convex set: \mathcal{X} , number of phases: T , batch size: b ;

- 1: Choose an arbitrary initial point $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$. Set $x_{0, \ell(0)} \rightarrow x_0$
 - 2: Set $\kappa := \min\{1/(p-1), 2e \ln(d)\}$
 - 3: **for** $t = 1$ to T **do**
 - 4: Set $x_{t, \emptyset} = x_{t-1, \ell(t-1)}$
 - 5: Draw a batch $S_{t, \emptyset}$ of b data points without replacement from S .
 - 6: Set $\sigma_{t, \emptyset}^2 := \frac{8\kappa L_0^2 \log(1/\delta)}{b^2 \varepsilon^2}$.
 - 7: Compute $\tilde{\nabla}_{t, \emptyset} = \frac{1}{b} \sum_{z \in S_{t, \emptyset}} \nabla f(x_{t, \emptyset}, z) + \mathbf{g}_{t, \emptyset}$, where $\mathbf{g}_{t, \emptyset} \sim \mathcal{GG}_{\|\cdot\|_+}(\mathbf{0}, \sigma_{t, \emptyset}^2)$.
 - 8: **for** $u_{t, s} = \text{DFS}[2^t]$ **do**
 - 9: Let $s = \hat{s}c$, where $c \in \{0, 1\}$.
 - 10: **if** $c = 0$ **then**
 - 11: $\tilde{\nabla}_{t, s} = \tilde{\nabla}_{t, \hat{s}}$.
 - 12: $x_{t, s} = x_{t, \hat{s}}$.
 - 13: **else**
 - 14: Draw a batch $S_{t, s}$ of $\frac{b}{2^{|s|}}$ data points without replacement from S .
 - 15: Set noise variance $\sigma_{t, s}^2 := \frac{128\kappa L_1^2 M^2 \log(1/\delta)}{b^2 \varepsilon^2}$.
 - 16: Compute $\tilde{\Delta}_{t, s} = \frac{2^{|s|}}{b} \sum_{z \in S_{t, s}} (\nabla f(x_{t, s}, z) - \nabla f(x_{t, \hat{s}}, z)) + \mathbf{g}_{t, s}$, where $\mathbf{g}_{t, s} \sim \mathcal{GG}_{\|\cdot\|_+}(\mathbf{0}, \sigma_{t, s}^2)$.
 - 17: $\tilde{\nabla}_{t, s} = \tilde{\nabla}_{t, \hat{s}} + \tilde{\Delta}_{t, s}$.
 - 18: **if** $|s| = t$ **then**
 - 19: Let s^+ be the next vertex in the DFS iteration.
 - 20: Set $\eta_{t, s} := \frac{2}{2^{t-1} + \ell(s) + 1}$
 - 21: Compute $v_{t, s} = \arg \min_{v \in \mathcal{X}} \langle \tilde{\nabla}_{t, s}, v \rangle$.
 - 22: $x_{t, s^+} \leftarrow (1 - \eta_{t, s})x_{t, s} + \eta_{t, s}v_{t, s}$.
 - 23: **Output** the final iterate $x_{2^T + 1}$.
-

$\|\cdot\|_*$ -sensitivity of $\nabla_{t, \emptyset}$ is bounded by $\frac{2L_0}{b}$. Hence, by Corollary 3.3 we obtain that Step 7 in Algorithm 1 is (ε, δ) -differentially private..

Next, for the iterate $x_{t, s}$, let $S_{t, s}$ denote the mini-batch given in Step 14 of Algorithm 1. Let $\Delta_{t, s} = \frac{2^{|s|}}{b} \sum_{z \in S_{t, s}} (\nabla f(x_{t, s}, z) - \nabla f(x_{t, \hat{s}}, z))$. Also, let $S'_{t, s}, \Delta'_{t, s}$ denote the corresponding quantities for Algorithm $\mathcal{A}_{\text{noisySFW}}$ when the input dataset is S' . Suppose that $S_{t, s}$ and $S'_{t, s}$ differ in at most one data point, say $z_{i^*} \neq z'_{i^*}$. Then

$$\|\Delta_{t, s} - \Delta'_{t, s}\|_* = \frac{2^{|s|}}{b} \|\nabla f(x_{t, s}, z_{i^*}) - \nabla f(x_{t, \hat{s}}, z_{i^*}) - (\nabla f(x_{t, s}, z'_{i^*}) - \nabla f(x_{t, \hat{s}}, z'_{i^*}))\|_*.$$

Here for the current iterate $x_{t, s}$, $x_{t, \hat{s}}$ denotes the iterate of its parent vertex. Recall that whenever the algorithm visits a leaf node, it applies a Frank-Wolfe step to calculate the next iterate and puts its value in the next vertex in the DFS order. Hence, the total number of (consecutive) iterates between $x_{t, s}$ and $x_{t, \hat{s}}$ is at most the number of leaf vertices visited between these two vertices. In particular, these are leaf vertices that are descendants of the vertex $u_{t, s}$, which is $2^{t-|s|}$, where $|s|$ denotes the depth of the vertex. By the smoothness of f w.r.t. $\|\cdot\|$, the global $\|\cdot\|_*$ sensitivity of $\Delta_{t, s}$ is bounded by $\frac{2^{|s|} 2^{t-|s|} \eta_{t, \hat{s}} L_1 M}{b}$. Given the setting of $\eta_{t, \hat{s}}$, we obtain that the global $\|\cdot\|_*$ sensitivity of $\Delta_{t, s}$ is bounded by $\frac{8L_1 M}{b}$. Again, using Corollary 3.3 we have that Step 16 in Algorithm 1 is (ε, δ) -differentially private.

Note that at any given iterate $x_{t, s}$, the gradient estimate $\tilde{\nabla}_{t, \hat{s}}$ from the parent iterate $x_{t, \hat{s}}$ is already computed privately. Since differential privacy is closed under post-processing, the current iterate $x_{t, s}$ is (ε, δ) -DP. The sample set $S_{t, s}$ is used to calculate the gradient estimate for at most $2^{t-|s|}$ contiguous sequence of iterates i.e. the leaves of the tree of depth t , but the batches of the

dataset used in different iterations are disjoint. Hence, by parallel composition, Algorithm $\mathcal{A}_{\text{noisySFW}}$ is (ε, δ) -differentially private. \square

Theorem 5.2 (Accuracy Guarantee of $\mathcal{A}_{\text{noisySFW}}$). *For $p \in (1, 2)$, consider the ℓ_p -setup of DP-SCO. Setting $\kappa = \min\{\frac{1}{p-1}, 2e \ln(d)\}$, $T = \frac{\log(n)}{2}$, and $b = \frac{4n}{\log^2(n)}$, for any distribution \mathcal{D} supported on \mathcal{Z} and any $\beta \in (0, 1)$, $\mathcal{A}_{\text{noisySFW}}$ satisfies with probability at least $1 - \beta$:*

$$\mathcal{E}[\mathcal{A}_{\text{noisySFW}}] = O\left(\left(\sqrt{\kappa} + \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{n}{\beta}\right)}\right) (L_0 M + L_1 M^2) \left(\frac{\log^2(n)}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\log^3(n) \sqrt{\kappa d \log(1/\delta)}}{n\varepsilon}\right)\right).$$

In order to prove the excess risk guarantee of Algorithm 1, we start by proving a recursive bound on the first moment of the gradient estimator.

Lemma 5.3. *Let \mathcal{D} be a distribution over \mathcal{Z} , $S \sim \mathcal{D}^n$ be the input to Algorithm 1, and $\kappa = \min\{\frac{1}{p-1}, 2e \ln(d)\}$. Then, for any $\beta \in (0, 1)$, w.p. at least $1 - \beta$, for all $t \in [1, T]$ and $s \in \{0, 1\}^t$:*

$$\|\tilde{\nabla}_{t,s} - \nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x_{t,s})\|_* \leq 2 \left(\sqrt{e\kappa} + \sqrt{3 \log\left(\frac{2^t}{\beta}\right)}\right) \left(\frac{L_0 + L_1 M}{\sqrt{b}} + \frac{(2L_0 + 8L_1 M t) \sqrt{\kappa d \log(1/\delta)}}{b\varepsilon}\right).$$

Proof. Consider any phase $t \geq 1$ of $\mathcal{A}_{\text{noisySFW}}$. In Step 7 and Step 16 of $\mathcal{A}_{\text{noisySFW}}$, we add GG noise $\mathbf{g}_{t,s}$ with $\sigma_{t,\emptyset}^2 := \frac{8\kappa L_0^2 \log(1/\delta)}{b^2 \varepsilon^2}$ and $\sigma_{t,s}^2 := \frac{128\kappa L_1^2 M^2 \log(1/\delta)}{b^2 \varepsilon^2}$, respectively. Then, by property (b) in Proposition 3.2 we have that for $\nu_{t,s} = \sigma_{t,s} \sqrt{d+2}$, $\mathbb{E}[\exp\{\|\mathbf{g}_{t,s}\|_*^2 / \nu_{t,s}^2\}] \leq \exp(1)$. Recall that every right child computes the gradient estimate using the estimate at the parent vertex. Hence, the gradient estimate is updated using the gradients along the path to the root and the total number of gradient estimate updates in phase t is at most 2^t . Now given, $|S_{t,\emptyset}| = b$, $|S_{t,s}| = \frac{2^{|s|}}{b}$, and the recursive gradient estimator in Steps 16-17, Lemma 4.1 and taking union bound over all (t, s) the following event has probability $\geq 1 - \beta$ (below $C_\beta := \sqrt{e\kappa} + \sqrt{3 \log\left(\frac{2^t}{\beta}\right)}$)

$$\|\tilde{\nabla}_{t,s} - \nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x_{t,s})\|_* \leq 2C_\beta \left(\frac{L_0}{\sqrt{b}} + L_1 M \eta_{t,s} \sum_{j < t} \frac{2^{j/2}}{\sqrt{b}} + \frac{(2L_0 + \sum_{j < t} 8L_1 M) \sqrt{\kappa d \log(1/\delta)}}{b\varepsilon}\right).$$

Using the above bounds and the setting of $\eta_{t,s} = \frac{1}{2^{t-1} + \ell(s) + 1}$, we can finally arrive at

$$\|\tilde{\nabla}_{t,s} - \nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x_{t,s})\|_* \leq 2 \left(\sqrt{e\kappa} + \sqrt{3 \log\left(\frac{2^t}{\beta}\right)}\right) \left(\frac{L_0 + L_1 M}{\sqrt{b}} + \frac{(2L_0 + 8L_1 M t) \sqrt{\kappa d \log(1/\delta)}}{b\varepsilon}\right).$$

\square

Proof of Theorem 5.2. Here we use an equivalent representation $m = 2^{t-1} + \ell(s)$ for a leaf vertex $u_{t,s}$, where $\ell(s)$ is the integer whose binary representation is s . Note that a contiguous sequence of iterates in phase t are the leaves of the tree of depth t from left to right. Since $t \leq T$, we get that $m \in \{1, \dots, 2^T\}$. Hence, for $m \in [1, 2^T]$, by smoothness and convexity of $F_{\mathcal{D}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\mathcal{D}}(x_{m+1}) &\leq F_{\mathcal{D}}(x_m) + \langle \nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x_m), x_{m+1} - x_m \rangle + \frac{L_1}{2} \|x_{m+1} - x_m\|^2 \\ &\leq F_{\mathcal{D}}(x_m) + \langle \nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x_m) - \tilde{\nabla}_m, x_{m+1} - x_m \rangle + \frac{L_1 M^2 \eta_m^2}{2} + \langle \tilde{\nabla}_m, x_{m+1} - x_m \rangle \\ &\leq F_{\mathcal{D}}(x_m) + 2\eta_m M \|\nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x_m) - \tilde{\nabla}_m\|_* + \frac{L_1 M^2 \eta_m^2}{2} + \eta_m \langle \nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x_m), x^* - x^t \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get

$$F_{\mathcal{D}}(x_{m+1}) - F_{\mathcal{D}}^* \leq (1 - \eta_m) (F_{\mathcal{D}}(x_m) - F_{\mathcal{D}}^*) + 2\eta_m M \|\nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x_m) - \tilde{\nabla}_m\|_* + \frac{L_1 M^2 \eta_m^2}{2}.$$

Letting $\Gamma_m = F_{\mathcal{D}}(x_m) - F_{\mathcal{D}}^*$, we get the following recursion:

$$\Gamma_{m+1} \leq (1 - \eta_m) \Gamma_m + 2\eta_m M \|\nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x_m) - \tilde{\nabla}_m\|_* + \frac{L_1 M^2 \eta_m^2}{2}.$$

Note that here $\eta_m = \frac{2}{m+1}$. Now letting $C_m = 2M\|\nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x_m) - \tilde{\nabla}_m\|_* + \frac{L_1 M^2 \eta_m}{2}$, and expanding the above recursion we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_{2^T+1} &\leq \prod_{m=1}^{2^T} (1 - \eta_m) \Gamma_0 + \sum_{m=1}^{2^T} \eta_m C_m \prod_{i>m} (1 - \eta_i) \leq \sum_{m=1}^{2^T} \eta_m C_m \frac{(m-1)m}{2^T(2^T+1)} \\ &\leq \sum_{m=1}^{2^T} \eta_m C_m \frac{m^2}{2^{2T}}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, using Lemma 5.3 and taking union bound over all $m \in [1, 2^T]$, we obtain the following bound with probability at least $1 - \beta$

$$\Gamma_{2^T+1} \leq 4 \left(\sqrt{e\kappa} + \sqrt{3 \log\left(\frac{2^{2T}}{\beta}\right)} \right) \left(\frac{L_0 M + L_1 M^2}{\sqrt{b}} + \frac{(2L_0 M + 8L_1 M^2 T) \sqrt{\kappa d \log(1/\delta)}}{b\varepsilon} \right) + \frac{L_1 M^2}{2^T}.$$

Setting $T = \frac{\log(n)}{2}$, and $b = \frac{4n}{\log^2(n)}$ we get w.p. $\geq 1 - \beta$ (below $C_\beta := \sqrt{e\kappa} + \sqrt{3 \log\left(\frac{n}{\beta}\right)}$)

$$\Gamma_{2^T+1} \leq 4C_\beta \log^2(n) \left(\frac{(L_0 M + L_1 M^2)}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{(2L_0 M + 8L_1 M^2 \log(n)) \sqrt{\kappa d \log(1/\delta)}}{n\varepsilon} \right) + \frac{L_1 M^2}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Hence, we conclude that w.p. $\geq 1 - \beta$

$$F_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{A}_{\text{noisySFW}}(S)) - F_{\mathcal{D}}^* = O \left(C_\beta (L_0 M + L_1 M^2) \left(\frac{\log^2(n)}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\log^3(n) \sqrt{\kappa d \log(1/\delta)}}{n\varepsilon} \right) \right).$$

□

5.2 Lower Bound for DP-SCO in the ℓ_p setup for $1 < p < 2$

We provide lower bounds on the excess risk for DP-SCO in the ℓ_p setting for $1 < p < 2$. In our argument, we first prove a lower bound on DP-ERM, then use the reduction in [6, Appendix C] to assert that essentially the same lower bound (up to a logarithmic factor in $1/\delta$) holds for DP-SCO. A crucial step in our proof to construct a lower bound for DP-ERM is to transform a lower bound on the ℓ_p distance to the minimizer into a lower bound on the excess risk. We remark that this step requires new tools than what is readily available in the Euclidean setting (considered in the lower bound of [8]). In particular, it relies on the strong convexity property of ℓ_p spaces for $1 < p < 2$ [4]. Next, we prove a reduction from DP-ERM in this setting to privately estimating 1-way marginals using the fingerprinting code argument from [12]. Our final lower bound for DP-SCO follows from combining the lower bound on DP-ERM with the non-private $\Omega(1/\sqrt{n})$ lower bound for SCO when $1 < p < 2$ [28]. Below, we formally state our lower bound for DP-SCO. We defer the full details of our construction and the statement of the lower bound for DP-ERM to Appendix A.

Theorem 5.4 (Lower Bound for DP-SCO for $p \in (1, 2)$). *Let $p \in (1, 2)$ and $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{n^{1+\Omega(1)}}$. Let $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{B}_p^d$, where \mathcal{B}_p^d is the unit ℓ_p ball in \mathbb{R}^d , and $\mathcal{Z} = \left\{ -\frac{1}{d^{1/q}}, \frac{1}{d^{1/q}} \right\}^d$, where $q = \frac{p}{p-1}$. There exists a distribution \mathcal{D} over \mathcal{Z} such that for any (ε, δ) -DP-SCO algorithm $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, we have*

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}[\mathcal{A}] = \tilde{\Omega} \left(\max \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}, (p-1) \frac{\sqrt{d}}{\varepsilon n} \right) \right).$$

6 Private Stochastic Frank-Wolfe with Variance Reduction for Polyhedral Setup

In this section, we consider DP-SCO in the *polyhedral* setup. Let K be a positive integer, and consider $(\mathbf{E}, \|\cdot\|)$ a normed space, where the unit ball of the norm, $\mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|} = \text{conv}(\mathcal{V})$ is a polytope with at most K vertices. Further, the feasible set \mathcal{X} is a polytope with at most K -vertices and

$\|\cdot\|$ -diameter $M > 0$. Notice that since the norm is polyhedral, its dual norm is also polyhedral. Moreover, $(\mathbf{E}, \|\cdot\|_*)$ is $O(\ln K)$ -regular.

We describe another variant of the variance-reduced stochastic Frank-Wolfe algorithm that is based on the variance reduction approach proposed in [36]. This algorithm differs from the noisy SFW algorithm (Algorithm 1) in various ways: first since the feasible set is polyhedral, the linear optimization oracle at each iteration is privatized using the report noisy max mechanism [18, 10]; second, it uses a single data point per iteration, allowing for larger number of iterations; and third, the recursive gradient estimator in this algorithm is the one used in [36]. We construct the private unbiased gradient estimator as follows:

$$\mathbf{d}_t \triangleq (1 - \rho_t) (\mathbf{d}_{t-1} + \Delta_t) + \rho_t \nabla f(x^t, z_t), \quad (6)$$

where, $\Delta_t(z_t) \triangleq \nabla f(x^t, z_t) - \nabla f(x^{t-1}, z_t)$ is the gradient variation for a given sample point $z_t \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $x^t, x^{t-1} \in \mathcal{X}$. Here, for all t we choose $\rho_t = \eta$, where η is the step size. We compute a private version of \mathbf{d}_t via the Report Noisy Max mechanism [18, 10]. Given step size η , gradient estimate \mathbf{d}_t , set of vertices \mathcal{V} , and global sensitivity of $\langle v, \mathbf{d}_t \rangle$, that we call s_t , we have the following private Frank-Wolfe update step:

$$\begin{aligned} x^{t+1} &= (1 - \eta)x^t + \eta v_t, & \text{where} \\ v_t &= \arg \min_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \{\langle v, \mathbf{d}_t \rangle + u_v^t\}, & u_v^t \sim \text{Lap}(2s_t \sqrt{n \log(1/\delta)}/\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

We provide a pseudocode of the algorithm in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 $\mathcal{A}_{\text{polySFW}}$: Private Polyhedral Stochastic Frank-Wolfe Algorithm

Require: Private dataset $S = (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathcal{Z}^n$, privacy parameters (ε, δ) , polyhedral set \mathcal{X} with a set of K vertices $\mathcal{V} = (v_1, \dots, v_K)$

- 1: Set step size $\eta := \frac{\log(n/\log(K))}{n}$
 - 2: Choose an arbitrary initial point $x^0 \in \mathcal{X}$
 - 3: Let $B_0 = (z_1^0, \dots, z_{n/2}^0)$ be an initial batch of $\frac{n}{2}$ data points from S
 - 4: Compute $\mathbf{d}_0 = \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n/2} \nabla f(x^0, z_i^0)$
 - 5: $v_0 = \arg \min_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \{\langle v, \mathbf{d}_0 \rangle + u_v^0\}$, where $u_v^0 \sim \text{Lap}\left(\frac{4L_0M\sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon\sqrt{n}}\right)$
 - 6: $x^1 \leftarrow (1 - \eta)x^0 + \eta v_0$
 - 7: Let $\hat{S} = (z_1, \dots, z_{n/2})$ be the remaining $\frac{n}{2}$ data points in S that are not in B_0
 - 8: **for** $t = 1$ to $\frac{n}{2}$ **do**
 - 9: Set $s_t := \max\left\{(1 - \eta)^t \cdot \frac{2L_0M}{n}, 2\eta(L_1M^2 + L_0M)\right\}$
 - 10: Compute $\Delta_t(z_t) = \nabla f(x^t, z_t) - \nabla f(x^{t-1}, z_t)$
 - 11: $\mathbf{d}_t = (1 - \eta) (\mathbf{d}_{t-1} + \Delta_t(z_t)) + \eta \nabla f(x^t, z_t)$
 - 12: $\forall v \in \mathcal{V}, \gamma_v \leftarrow \langle v, \mathbf{d}_t \rangle + u_v^t$, where $u_v^t \sim \text{Lap}\left(\frac{2s_t\sqrt{n\log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon}\right)$
 - 13: Compute $v_t = \arg \min_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \gamma_v$
 - 14: $x^{t+1} \leftarrow (1 - \eta)x^t + \eta v_t$
 - 15: **Output** $x^{\text{priv}} = x^{n/2+1}$
-

Next, we will briefly describe our analysis for the privacy guarantee and excess population risk of Algorithm 2. First, we upper bound the global $\|\cdot\|_*$ sensitivity of \mathbf{d}_t . By Step 4 in Algorithm 2, we have that for $t = 0$, the $\|\cdot\|_*$ sensitivity of \mathbf{d}_0 is at most $\frac{2L_0}{n}$. For $t \geq 1$, by expanding the recursion 6 and using that $f(\cdot, z)$ is L_0 -Lipschitz and L_1 -smooth w.r.t $\|\cdot\|$, we obtain the following lemma:

Lemma 6.1. *For Algorithm 2 (Algorithm $\mathcal{A}_{\text{polySFW}}$), let s_t be the global sensitivity of $\langle v, \mathbf{d}_t \rangle$, namely $s_t = \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \max_{S \simeq S'} |\langle v, \mathbf{d}_t - \mathbf{d}'_t \rangle|$. Then*

$$s_t \leq \max\left\{(1 - \eta)^t \cdot \frac{2L_0M}{n}, 2\eta(L_1M^2 + L_0M)\right\} \quad (\forall t \in [n/2]).$$

Next, by the privacy guarantee of the Report Noisy Max mechanism [18, 10], Step 5 of Algorithm 2 is $\frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{n \log(1/\delta)}}$ -DP and Steps 9-14 are $\frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{n \log(1/\delta)}}$ -DP. Thus, by the advanced composition theorem (Lemma 2.3), Algorithm $\mathcal{A}_{\text{polySFW}}$ is (ε, δ) -DP.

Next, we turn to the analysis of the excess risk of $\mathcal{A}_{\text{polySFW}}$. We first show that the variance of the gradient estimator is bounded with high probability. In Algorithm 2, we use a large batch in the first iteration, i.e. $|B_0| = \frac{n}{2}$, and use a single data point to compute the gradient estimate in the remaining $n/2$ iterations. Recall that, here we do not add any noise to the gradient estimator. Hence, plugging the values for B_0, \dots, B_t , and \mathbf{g}_t in Lemma 4.1 and for all $t \in [0, \frac{n}{2}]$ iterations, we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 6.2. *Let \mathcal{D} be any distribution over \mathcal{Z} . Let $S \sim \mathcal{D}^n$ be the input dataset of $\mathcal{A}_{\text{polySFW}}$ (Algorithm 2). For any $\beta \in (0, 1)$, with probability $\geq 1 - \beta$, for all $t \in [0, \frac{n}{2}]$*

$$\|\mathbf{d}_t - \nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^t)\|_* \leq 2[e\sqrt{2\log(K)} + \sqrt{3\log(n/\beta)}] \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}(1-\eta)^t L_0}{\sqrt{n}} + \eta\sqrt{t} (L_1 M + L_0) \right).$$

Now, the remaining ingredient in our analysis is to show that the noise added due to privacy in Step 12 is bounded with high probability.

Let $\nu_t \triangleq \langle v_t, \mathbf{d}_t \rangle - \min_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \langle v, \mathbf{d}_t \rangle$. The Report Noisy Max mechanism computes ν_t by finding the maximum over K vertices of the convex polytope. Standard results for the tail bound of the maximum of K Laplace random variables, imply that for some $\beta' > 0$, $\mathbb{P} \left[\nu_t \geq \frac{2s_t \sqrt{n \log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon} \left(\log\left(\frac{Kn}{\beta'}\right) \right) \right] \leq \beta'$. In particular, for $n/2$ iterations, we get obtain that the following event has probability $1 - \beta$

$$\nu_t = O \left(\frac{s_t \sqrt{n \log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon} \log\left(\frac{Kn}{2\beta}\right) \right) \quad \forall t \in [n/2]. \quad (7)$$

Finally we have all the components to state and prove the private and accuracy guarantees of Algorithm $\mathcal{A}_{\text{polySFW}}$.

Theorem 6.3. *Let $\beta \in (0, 1)$, and \mathcal{D} be any distribution over \mathcal{Z} . Then, for the polyhedral setup, Algorithm 2 is (ε, δ) -DP and, with probability at least $1 - \beta$, satisfies:*

$$\mathcal{E}[\mathcal{A}_{\text{polySFW}}] = O \left(\frac{L_1 M^2 + L_0 M}{\varepsilon \sqrt{n}} \log\left(\frac{n}{\log(K)}\right) \log\left(\frac{Kn}{\beta}\right) \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)} \right).$$

Proof. By smoothness and convexity of $F_{\mathcal{D}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^{t+1}) &\leq F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^t) + \langle \nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^t), x^{t+1} - x^t \rangle + \frac{L_1}{2} \|x^{t+1} - x^t\|^2 \\ &\leq F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^t) + \eta \langle \nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^t) - \mathbf{d}_t, v_t - x^t \rangle + \frac{L_1 \eta^2 M^2}{2} + \eta \langle \mathbf{d}_t, v_t - x^t \rangle \\ &\leq F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^t) + 2\eta M \|\nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^t) - \mathbf{d}_t\|_* + \frac{L_1 \eta^2 M^2}{2} + \eta (F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^*) - F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^t)) + \eta \nu_t. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get

$$F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^{t+1}) - F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^*) \leq (1 - \eta) (F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^t) - F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^*)) + 2\eta M \|\nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^t) - \mathbf{d}_t\|_* + \frac{L_1 \eta^2 M^2}{2} + \eta \nu_t.$$

Letting $\Gamma_t = F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^t) - F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^*)$, we get the following recursion:

$$\Gamma_{t+1} \leq (1 - \eta) \Gamma_t + 2\eta M \|\nabla F_{\mathcal{D}}(x^t) - \mathbf{d}_t\|_* + \frac{L_1 \eta^2 M^2}{2} + \eta \nu_t.$$

Note that, $t \in [0, \frac{n}{2}]$. By expanding the above recursion and using Lemma 6.2 and (7), we have w.p. at least $1 - \beta$ (taking $C_\beta := e\sqrt{2\log(K)} + \sqrt{3\log(\frac{n}{\beta})}$ below):

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{t+1} &\leq (1 - \eta)^{\frac{n}{2}+1} \Gamma_0 + 4\eta M C_\beta \left(\frac{(1 - \eta)^{\frac{n}{2}} L_0}{\sqrt{n}} + \sqrt{n} (L_1 M + L_0) \right) + \frac{L_1 \eta M^2}{2} \\ &\quad + \frac{2 \log\left(\frac{Kn}{2\beta}\right) \sqrt{n \log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon} \cdot \max \left\{ (1 - \eta)^{\frac{n}{2}} \frac{2L_0 M}{n}, 2\eta (L_1 M^2 + L_0 M) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $\eta = \frac{1}{n} \log\left(\frac{n}{\log(K)}\right)$, we get w.p. at least $1 - \beta$:

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_{t+1} &\leq L_0 M \sqrt{\frac{\log(K)}{n}} + 4L_0 M \sqrt{\log(K)} \log\left(\frac{n}{\log(K)}\right) \left(\frac{C_\beta}{n} + \frac{\log\left(\frac{Kn}{\beta}\right) \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon n}\right) \\ &\quad + 4(L_1 M^2 + L_0 M) \log\left(\frac{n}{\log(K)}\right) \left(\frac{C_\beta}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\log\left(\frac{Kn}{\beta}\right) \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon \sqrt{n}}\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{L_1 M^2}{2n} \log\left(\frac{n}{\log(K)}\right).\end{aligned}$$

By assuming $n > \log(K)$ (which is necessary to achieve non-trivial error even in the non-private setting), we obtain w.p. $\geq 1 - \beta$:

$$\mathcal{E}[\mathcal{A}_{\text{polySFW}}] = O\left(\frac{L_1 M^2 + L_0 M}{\varepsilon \sqrt{n}} \log\left(\frac{n}{\log(K)}\right) \log\left(\frac{Kn}{\beta}\right) \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}\right).$$

□

7 Differentially Private SCO: ℓ_p -setup for $2 < p \leq \infty$

The proposed analyses, when applied to ℓ_p -settings, only appear to provide useful bounds when $1 \leq p \leq 2$. This limitation comes from the fact that when $p > 2$ the regularity constant of the dual, ℓ_q , grows polynomially on the dimension, more precisely as $d^{1-2/p}$. This additional factor in the analysis substantially degrades the resulting excess risk bounds, unless $p \approx 2$. This leaves the question of what are the optimal rates for DP-SCO in such settings.

It is instructive to recall the optimal excess risk bounds for nonprivate SCO [28, 1]. These bounds have the form $\Theta(\min\{\frac{d^{1/2-1/p}}{\sqrt{n}}, \frac{1}{n^{1/p}}\})$, and are attained by the combination of two different algorithms:

- Stochastic Gradient Descent, for low dimensions $d \leq n$, with rate $O(\frac{d^{1/2-1/p}}{\sqrt{n}})$.
- Stochastic Mirror Descent, for high dimensions $d > n$, with rate $O(\frac{1}{n^{1/p}})$.

In this section, we show that existing private stochastic gradient methods [6, 21, 5, 25] that attain optimal excess risk in the Euclidean setting can also achieve nearly optimal excess risk in the low dimensional regime. For example, the *phased stochastic gradient descent* [21, Algorithm 2] attains the optimal excess population risk in Euclidean setting and runs in linear time. We will now show that in the low dimensional case, this algorithm attains nearly optimal excess risk in the ℓ_p -setup where $2 < p \leq \infty$.

Proposition 7.1. *Consider the problem of DP-SCO in the $\ell_p = (\mathbb{R}^d, \|\cdot\|_p)$ -setup, with $2 < p \leq \infty$. The phased SGD algorithm $\mathcal{A}_{\text{PhasedSGD}}$ [21, Algorithm 2] runs in linear time and attains expected excess population risk*

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}[\mathcal{A}_{\text{PhasedSGD}}] = O\left(L_0 M \left(\frac{d^{1/2-1/p}}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{d^{1-1/p} \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon n}\right)\right).$$

Proof. We start by bounding the $\|\cdot\|_2$ -diameter and Lipschitz constant for the ℓ_p -setup. First, since the $\|\cdot\|_p$ -diameter of \mathcal{X} is bounded by M , then the $\|\cdot\|_2$ -diameter of \mathcal{X} is bounded by $d^{1/2-1/p} M$. Next, if f is L_0 -Lipschitz w.r.t. $\|\cdot\|_p$, i.e. $\bigcup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \partial f(x) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|_p^*}(0, L_0)$, then f is also L_0 -Lipschitz w.r.t. $\|\cdot\|_2$. Therefore, [21, Theorem 1.1] implies

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}[\mathcal{A}_{\text{noisySGD}}] &= d^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p}} L_0 M \cdot O\left(\max\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}, \frac{\sqrt{d \log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon n}\right\}\right) \\ &= L_0 M \cdot O\left(\frac{d^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p}}}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{d^{1-\frac{1}{p}} \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon n}\right).\end{aligned}$$

□

We conclude this section observing that in the low-dimensional regime, i.e., $d \lesssim n$, the above upper bound is optimal since it matches the optimal non-private lower bound of $\Omega\left(\frac{d^{1/2-1/p}}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$ [1]. Note that in the ℓ_∞ setting, the low-dimensional regime is the only interesting regime since the excess risk is $\Omega(1)$ if $d > n$. Hence, our result implies that phased SGD [21] attains nearly optimal excess risk for DP-SCO in the ℓ_∞ setting. We formally state this observation below.

Corollary 7.2. *Let $2 < p \leq \infty$ and $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|_p}(0, M)$. Let $d \log(1/\delta)/\varepsilon^2 \leq n$. The phased SGD algorithm $\mathcal{A}_{\text{PhasedSGD}}$ [21, Algorithm 2] runs in linear time and attains the optimal excess population risk for DP-SCO in the ℓ_p -setup. For $p = \infty$, this algorithm attains nearly optimal excess population risk.*

Remark 2. *Our results here are based on the excess risk guarantees of [21], which are expectation guarantees rather than high-probability guarantees. However, we note that it is possible to provide high-probability guarantees for the phased SGD algorithm $\mathcal{A}_{\text{PhasedSGD}}$ [21, Algorithm 2] by slightly modifying the algorithm (where the mini-batch size in each phase is larger by a logarithmic factor) together with a more careful analysis that uses a standard martingale argument to show high-probability convergence guarantee for the projected SGD invoked in each phase of $\mathcal{A}_{\text{PhasedSGD}}$.*

Note that, for general losses, Kulkarni et. al. [25] give an algorithm for DP-SCO in the Euclidean setup that attains the optimal excess population risk. Their algorithm runs in $O(\min\{n^{5/4}d^{1/8}, \frac{n^{3/2}}{d^{1/8}}\})$ time. This algorithm combines a DP-ERM algorithm [25, Algorithm 4] with an iterative localization approach from [21]. Following the same argument as in the smooth case, we have the following result for general convex losses.

Proposition 7.3. *For general convex losses, consider the problem of DP-SCO in the $\ell_p = (\mathbb{R}^d, \|\cdot\|_p)$ -setup, with $2 < p \leq \infty$. Let $\mathcal{A}_{\text{RndSmth}}$ denote the algorithm proposed in [25]. Then, $\mathcal{A}_{\text{RndSmth}}$ attains expected excess population risk*

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}[\mathcal{A}_{\text{RndSmth}}] = O\left(L_0 M \left(\frac{d^{1/2-1/p}}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{d^{1-1/p} \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon n} \right)\right)$$

and runs in $O(\min\{n^{5/4}d^{1/8}, n^{3/2}/d^{1/8}\})$ time.

Moreover, as in Corollary 7.2, when $d \log(1/\delta)/\varepsilon^2 \leq n$, this algorithm attains the optimal excess risk for any ℓ_p setup, where $p > 2$. Hence, when $p = \infty$, this algorithm attains nearly optimal excess risk.

Acknowledgements

RB's and AN's research is supported by NSF Award AF-1908281, NSF Award 2112471, Google Faculty Research Award, and the OSU faculty start-up support. CG's research is partially supported by INRIA through the INRIA Associate Teams project and FONDECYT 1210362 project.

References

- [1] A. AGARWAL, P. L. BARTLETT, P. RAVIKUMAR, AND M. J. WAINWRIGHT, *Information-theoretic lower bounds on the oracle complexity of stochastic convex optimization*, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, 58 (2012), pp. 3235–3249, <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2011.2182178>, <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2011.2182178>.
- [2] H. ASI, V. FELDMAN, T. KOREN, AND K. TALWAR, *Private stochastic convex optimization: Optimal rates in ℓ_1 geometry*, in Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning, M. Meila and T. Zhang, eds., vol. 139 of Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, PMLR, 18–24 Jul 2021, pp. 393–403, <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v139/asi21b.html>.

- [3] H. ASI, V. FELDMAN, T. KOREN, AND K. TALWAR, *Private stochastic convex optimization: Optimal rates in l_1 geometry*, CoRR, abs/2103.01516 (2021), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.01516>, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.01516>.
- [4] K. BALL, E. A. CARLEN, AND E. H. LIEB, *Sharp uniform convexity and smoothness inequalities for trace norms*, *Inventiones mathematicae*, 115 (1994), pp. 463–482.
- [5] R. BASSILY, V. FELDMAN, C. GUZMÁN, AND K. TALWAR, *Stability of stochastic gradient descent on nonsmooth convex losses*, in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual, 2020.
- [6] R. BASSILY, V. FELDMAN, K. TALWAR, AND A. G. THAKURTA, *Private stochastic convex optimization with optimal rates*, in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019, pp. 11282–11291.
- [7] R. BASSILY, C. GUZMÁN, AND A. NANDI, *Non-euclidean differentially private stochastic convex optimization*, in *Proceedings of Thirty Fourth Conference on Learning Theory*, M. Belkin and S. Kpotufe, eds., vol. 134 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, PMLR, 15–19 Aug 2021, pp. 474–499, <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v134/bassily21a.html>.
- [8] R. BASSILY, A. SMITH, AND A. THAKURTA, *Private empirical risk minimization: Efficient algorithms and tight error bounds*, in *IEEE 55th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS 2014)*. (arXiv preprint arXiv:1405.7085), 2014, pp. 464–473.
- [9] A. BECK, *First-order methods in optimization / Amir Beck, Tel-Aviv University, Tel-Aviv, Israel.*, MOS-SIAM series on optimization, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Mathematical Optimization Society, Philadelphia, 2017.
- [10] R. BHASKAR, S. LAXMAN, A. SMITH, AND A. THAKURTA, *Discovering frequent patterns in sensitive data*, in *Proceedings of the 16th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, 2010, pp. 503–512.
- [11] M. BUN, K. NISSIM, U. STEMMER, AND S. VADHAN, *Differentially private release and learning of threshold functions*, in *Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 2015 IEEE 56th Annual Symposium on*, IEEE, 2015, pp. 634–649.
- [12] M. BUN, J. ULLMAN, AND S. VADHAN, *Fingerprinting codes and the price of approximate differential privacy*, *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 47 (2018), pp. 1888–1938.
- [13] K. CHAUDHURI AND C. MONTELEONI, *Privacy-preserving logistic regression*, in *NIPS*, D. Koller, D. Schuurmans, Y. Bengio, and L. Bottou, eds., MIT Press, 2008.
- [14] K. CHAUDHURI, C. MONTELEONI, AND A. D. SARWATE, *Differentially private empirical risk minimization*, *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12 (2011), pp. 1069–1109.
- [15] L. DÜMBGEN, S. A. VAN DE GEER, M. VERAAR, AND J. A. WELLNER, *Nemirovski’s inequalities revisited*, *Am. Math. Mon.*, 117 (2010), pp. 138–160.
- [16] C. DWORK, K. KENTHAPADI, F. MCSHERRY, I. MIRONOV, AND M. NAOR, *Our data, ourselves: Privacy via distributed noise generation.*, in *EUROCRYPT*, 2006.
- [17] C. DWORK, F. MCSHERRY, K. NISSIM, AND A. SMITH, *Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis*, in *Theory of Cryptography Conference*, Springer, 2006, pp. 265–284.
- [18] C. DWORK AND A. ROTH, *The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy*, *Foundations and Trends® in Theoretical Computer Science*, 9 (2014), pp. 211–407.
- [19] C. DWORK, G. N. ROTHBLUM, AND S. P. VADHAN, *Boosting and differential privacy*, in *FOCS*, 2010.

- [20] C. FANG, C. J. LI, Z. LIN, AND T. ZHANG, *SPIDER: near-optimal non-convex optimization via stochastic path-integrated differential estimator*, in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2018, NeurIPS 2018, December 3-8, 2018, Montréal, Canada, 2018, pp. 687–697.
- [21] V. FELDMAN, T. KOREN, AND K. TALWAR, *Private stochastic convex optimization: optimal rates in linear time*, in Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, 2020, pp. 439–449.
- [22] P. JAIN AND A. THAKURTA, *(near) dimension independent risk bounds for differentially private learning*, in ICML, 2014.
- [23] A. JUDITSKY AND A. NEMIROVSKI, *Large deviations of vector-valued martingales in 2-smooth normed spaces*, Rapport de recherche hal-00318071, HAL, 2008.
- [24] D. KIFER, A. SMITH, AND A. THAKURTA, *Private convex empirical risk minimization and high-dimensional regression*, Journal of Machine Learning Research, 1 (2012), p. 41.
- [25] J. KULKARNI, Y. T. LEE, AND D. LIU, *Private non-smooth empirical risk minimization and stochastic convex optimization in subquadratic steps*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.15352, (2021).
- [26] I. MIRONOV, *Rényi differential privacy*, in 30th IEEE Computer Security Foundations Symposium, CSF 2017, Santa Barbara, CA, USA, August 21-25, 2017, IEEE Computer Society, 2017, pp. 263–275, <https://doi.org/10.1109/CSF.2017.11>, <https://doi.org/10.1109/CSF.2017.11>.
- [27] A. NEMIROVSKI, A. JUDITSKY, G. LAN, AND A. SHAPIRO, *Robust stochastic approximation approach to stochastic programming*, SIAM J. on Optimization, 19 (2009), p. 1574–1609.
- [28] A. NEMIROVSKI AND D. YUDIN, *Problem complexity and method efficiency in optimization.*, (1983).
- [29] F. H. SINZ, S. GERWINN, AND M. BETHGE, *Characterization of the p -generalized normal distribution*, J. Multivar. Anal., 100 (2009), pp. 817–820.
- [30] A. SMITH AND A. THAKURTA, *Differentially private feature selection via stability arguments, and the robustness of the lasso*, in COLT, 2013.
- [31] S. SRA, S. NOWOZIN, AND S. J. WRIGHT, *Optimization for Machine Learning*, The MIT Press, 2011.
- [32] T. STEINKE AND J. ULLMAN, *Between pure and approximate differential privacy*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1501.06095, (2015).
- [33] K. TALWAR, A. THAKURTA, AND L. ZHANG, *Private empirical risk minimization beyond the worst case: The effect of the constraint set geometry*, CoRR, abs/1411.5417 (2014).
- [34] K. TALWAR, A. THAKURTA, AND L. ZHANG, *Nearly optimal private lasso*, in NIPS, 2015.
- [35] D. WANG, M. YE, AND J. XU, *Differentially private empirical risk minimization revisited: Faster and more general*, in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 2017, pp. 2722–2731.
- [36] M. ZHANG, Z. SHEN, A. MOKHTARI, H. HASSANI, AND A. KARBASI, *One sample stochastic frank-wolfe*, in International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, PMLR, 2020, pp. 4012–4023.

A Lower Bound for the ℓ_p Setup for $1 < p < 2$

In this section, we give lower bounds on the excess risk of DP-SCO and DP-ERM in the ℓ_p setting for $1 < p < 2$. Our lower bound for DP-SCO has the form $\tilde{\Omega}\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}, (p-1)\frac{\sqrt{d}}{\varepsilon n}\right)\right)$. The first term follows directly from the non-private lower bound for SCO in the same setting [28]. To establish a lower bound with the second term, we show a lower bound of essentially the same order (up to a logarithmic factor in $1/\delta$) on the excess empirical error for DP-ERM in the ℓ_p setup (Theorem A.2). By the reduction in [6, Appendix C], we conclude the claimed lower bound on DP-SCO.

Problem setup: Let $p \in (1, 2)$ and $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{B}_p^d$, where \mathcal{B}_p^d is the unit ℓ_p ball in \mathbb{R}^d , and let $\mathcal{Z} = \left\{-\frac{1}{d^{1/q}}, \frac{1}{d^{1/q}}\right\}^d$ where $q = \frac{p}{p-1}$. Let $f : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ defined as:

$$f(x, z) = -\langle x, z \rangle, \quad x \in \mathcal{X}, z \in \mathcal{Z}.$$

Note that for every $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, $f(\cdot, z)$ is convex, smooth, and 1-Lipschitz w.r.t. $\|\cdot\|_p$ over \mathcal{X} . Recall that for any distribution \mathcal{D} over \mathcal{Z} , we define the population risk of $x \in \mathcal{X}$ w.r.t. \mathcal{D} as $F_{\mathcal{D}}(x) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{z \sim \mathcal{D}} [f(x, z)]$, and for any dataset $S = (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathcal{Z}^n$, we define the empirical risk of $x \in \mathcal{X}$ w.r.t. S as $F_S(x) \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(x, z_i)$.

Our lower bound for DP-SCO is formally stated in the following theorem.

Theorem A.1. *Let $p \in (1, 2)$ and $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{n^{1+\Omega(1)}}$. Let \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Z} , and f be as defined in the setup above. There exists a distribution \mathcal{D} over \mathcal{Z} such that for any (ε, δ) -DP-SCO algorithm $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_{S \sim \mathcal{D}^n, \mathcal{A}} [F_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{A}(S))] - \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} F_{\mathcal{D}}(x) = \tilde{\Omega}\left(\max\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}, (p-1)\frac{\sqrt{d}}{\varepsilon n}\right)\right).$$

As mentioned earlier, given the reduction from [6], it suffices to prove a lower bound of essentially the same order for DP-ERM w.r.t. the problem described above. The rest of this section will be devoted to this goal; namely, to prove the following.

Theorem A.2. *Under the same setup in Theorem A.1, there exists a dataset $S \in \mathcal{Z}^n$ such that for any (ε, δ) -DP-ERM algorithm $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}} [F_S(\mathcal{A}(S))] - \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} F_S(x) = \Omega\left((p-1)\frac{\sqrt{d \log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon n}\right).$$

Proof. Let the spaces \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Z} , and the loss function f be as defined in the problem setup above. For any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, let x_j denote the j -th coordinate of x , where $j \in [d]$. Let $S = (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathcal{Z}^n$, and let z_{ij} denote the j -th coordinate of z_i , where $i \in [n], j \in [d]$. Define $\bar{z} \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n z_i$, and similarly, let \bar{z}_j denote the j -th coordinate of \bar{z} .

Let $x^* \triangleq \arg \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} F_S(x) = \arg \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \langle x, \bar{z} \rangle$. Note that we have

$$x_j^* = (|\bar{z}_j|^{q-1} / \|\bar{z}\|_q^{q-1}) \text{sign}(\bar{z}_j), \quad j \in [d], \quad (8)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_q$ denote the ℓ_q norm (recall that $q \triangleq \frac{p}{p-1}$). To see this, note that by Hölder's inequality $\forall x \in \mathcal{X}$, $F_S(x) \geq -\|\bar{z}\|_q$, and on the other hand, note that $x^* \in \mathcal{X}$ since $\|x^*\|_p = 1$ and $F_S(x^*) = -\|\bar{z}\|_q$. Next, we make the following claim.

Claim A.3. *Let $\alpha > 0$. Let $\hat{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ be such that $F_S(\hat{x}) - F_S(x^*) \leq \alpha$. Then, $\|\hat{x} - x^*\|_p \leq \sqrt{\frac{8\alpha}{(p-1)\|\bar{z}\|_q}}$.*

The proof of this claim relies on the uniform convexity property of the ℓ_p norms for $p \in (1, 2]$ (see [4]). We formally restate this property below:

Fact A.4 (see Eq. (1.6) in [4]). *Let x, y be any elements of an ℓ_p -normed space $(\mathbf{E}, \|\cdot\|_p)$, where $1 < p \leq 2$. We have $\|\frac{x+y}{2}\|_p \leq 1 - \frac{p-1}{8}\|x-y\|_p^2$.*

Now, observe that for any $\hat{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $F_S(\hat{x}) - F_S(x^*) \leq \alpha$, we have

$$1 - \frac{\alpha}{2\|\bar{z}\|_q} \leq \left\langle \frac{\hat{x} + x^*}{2}, \frac{\bar{z}}{\|\bar{z}\|_q} \right\rangle \leq \left\| \frac{\hat{x} + x^*}{2} \right\|_p \leq 1 - \frac{p-1}{8} \|\hat{x} - x^*\|_p^2,$$

where the last inequality follows from the above fact. Rearranging terms leads to the above claim.

Fix values for ε and δ as in the theorem statement. Next, we will show the existence of a dataset $S = (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathcal{Z}^n$ with $\|\bar{z}\|_q = \Omega\left(\frac{\sqrt{d \log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon n}\right)$ such that for any (ε, δ) -DP-ERM algorithm for the above problem that outputs a vector $\hat{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, we must have $\|\hat{x} - x^*\|_p = \Omega(1)$ with probability $2/3$ over the algorithm's random coins. Note that, by Claim A.3, this implies the desired lower bound. To see this, suppose, for the sake of a contradiction, that there exists an (ε, δ) -DP-ERM algorithm \mathcal{A} that outputs $\hat{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{x} \leftarrow \mathcal{A}} [F_S(\hat{x})] - F_S(x^*) = o\left((p-1)\frac{\sqrt{d \log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon n}\right)$. Then, by Markov's inequality, with probability ≥ 0.9 , we have $F_S(\hat{x}) - F_S(x^*) = o\left((p-1)\frac{\sqrt{d \log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon n}\right)$. Hence, Claim A.3 would imply that, with probability ≥ 0.9 , $\|\hat{x} - x^*\|_p = o(1)$, which contradicts with the claimed $\Omega(1)$ lower bound on $\|\hat{x} - x^*\|$. Hence, to conclude the proof of Theorem A.2, it remains to show the claimed lower bound on $\|\hat{x} - x^*\|$, which we do next.

In the final step of the proof, we resort to a construction based on the fingerprinting code argument due to [12]. We use the following lemma, which is implicit in the constructions of [11, 32].

Lemma A.5. *Let $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{n^{1+\Omega(1)}}$. Let $\mathcal{T} = \{-1, 1\}^d$. There exists a dataset $T = (v_1, \dots, v_n) \in \mathcal{T}^n$ where $\|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v_i\|_\infty \leq c \frac{\sqrt{d \log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon n}$ for some universal constant $c > 0$ such that for any (ε, δ) -differentially private algorithm $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{T}^n \rightarrow [-1, 1]^d$, the following is true with probability $2/3$ over the random coins of \mathcal{M} : $\exists J \subseteq [d]$ with $|J| = \Omega(d)$ such that*

$$(\forall j \in J), \quad \left| \mathcal{M}_j(T) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v_{ij} \right| = \Omega\left(\frac{\sqrt{d \log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon n}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \sum_{i=1}^n v_{ij} \right| = c \cdot \frac{\sqrt{d \log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon n},$$

where $\mathcal{M}_j(T)$ and v_{ij} denote the j -th coordinates of $\mathcal{M}(T)$ and v_i , respectively.

We consider a normalized version of the dataset $T = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$ in the above lemma. Namely, we consider a dataset $S = (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathcal{Z}^n$, where $z_i = \frac{v_i}{d^{1/q}}$, $i \in [n]$. Note that the above lemma implies the existence of a subset $J \subseteq [d]$ with $|J| = \Omega(d)$ such that for all $j \in J$, $|\bar{z}_j| = \frac{c}{d^{1/q}} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{d \log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon n}$ for some universal constant $c > 0$. Note also that $\forall j \in [d] \setminus J$, $|\bar{z}_j| \leq \frac{c}{d^{1/q}} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{d \log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon n}$ since $\|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v_i\|_\infty \leq c \frac{\sqrt{d \log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon n}$. This implies that

$$\frac{|J|}{d} c^q \left(\frac{\sqrt{d \log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon n} \right)^q \leq \|\bar{z}\|_q^q \leq c^q \left(\frac{\sqrt{d \log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon n} \right)^q,$$

which, given the fact that $|J| = \Omega(d)$, implies that $\|\bar{z}\|_q^q = c' \frac{\sqrt{d \log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon n}$ for some universal constant $c' > 0$. Hence, by the fact that $q > 2$, we have $\|\bar{z}\|_q = \Theta\left(\frac{\sqrt{d \log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon n}\right)$. Moreover, note that for all $j \in [J]$, we have $\frac{|\bar{z}_j|^{q-1}}{\|\bar{z}\|_q^{q-1}} = \frac{\left(\frac{c}{d^{1/q}}\right)^{1-\frac{1}{q}}}{d^{1-\frac{1}{q}}} = \frac{c''}{d^{1/p}}$ for some universal constant c'' , where the last equality follows from the fact that $q > 2$ and $\frac{1}{q} = 1 - \frac{1}{p}$.

Let $\bar{v} \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v_i$, and let \bar{v}_j denote the j -th coordinate of \bar{v} for $j \in [d]$. Given the above observations and the expression of the minimizer x^* in eq. 8, it is not hard to see that for all $j \in J$,

$$x_j^* = \frac{c''}{d^{1/p}} \text{sign}(\bar{v}_j) = \frac{c''}{d^{1/p}} \cdot \frac{\bar{v}_j}{|\bar{v}_j|} = \frac{c''}{c} \cdot \frac{\varepsilon n}{d^{1/2+1/p} \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}} \bar{v}_j. \quad (9)$$

Let \mathcal{A} be any (ε, δ) -DP-ERM algorithm that takes the dataset S described above as input, and let $\hat{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ denote its output. Construct an (ε, δ) -differentially private algorithm \mathcal{M} for the dataset

T of Lemma A.5 by first running \mathcal{A} on $S = \frac{1}{d^{1/q}} \cdot T$, which outputs \hat{x} , then releasing $\mathcal{M}(T) = \frac{c}{c'} \cdot \frac{d^{1/2+1/p} \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon n} \cdot \hat{x}$. Now, using 9 and given the description of \mathcal{M} , observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{x} - x^*\|_p &\geq \frac{c''}{c} \cdot \frac{\varepsilon n}{d^{1/2+1/p} \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}} \cdot \left(\sum_{j \in J} |\mathcal{M}_j(T) - \bar{v}_j|^p \right)^{1/p} \\ &= \Omega \left(\frac{\varepsilon n}{d^{1/2+1/p} \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}} d^{1/p} \frac{\sqrt{d \log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon n} \right) \\ &= \Omega(1) \end{aligned}$$

where the third step follows from Lemma A.5 and the fact that \mathcal{M} is (ε, δ) -DP. This establishes the desired lower bound on $\|\hat{x} - x^*\|_p$, and hence by the argument described earlier, the proof of Theorem A.2 is now complete. \square