

On rate optimal private regression under local differential privacy

László Györfi* Martin Kroll**

June 2, 2022

Abstract

We consider the problem of estimating a regression function from anonymised data in the framework of local differential privacy. We propose a novel partitioning estimate of the regression function, derive a rate of convergence for the excess prediction risk over Hölder classes, and prove a matching lower bound. In contrast to the existing literature no extra assumption on the design distribution as compared to the setup without anonymisation is needed.

AMS Classification: 62G08, 62G20.

Key words and phrases: nonparametric regression, local differential privacy, partitioning estimate, rate of convergence, minimax lower bound

1 Introduction

Let $(X, Y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ be a pair of random variables with explanatory variable $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and real-valued response Y satisfying $\mathbf{E}[Y^2] < \infty$. We denote by μ the distribution of X , that is, $\mu(A) = \mathbf{P}(X \in A)$ for all measurable sets $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. Then, the *regression function*

$$m(x) = \mathbf{E}[Y|X = x]$$

*Department of Computer Science and Information Theory, Budapest University of Technology and Economics, Magyar Tudósok krt. 2., Budapest, H-1117, Hungary. gyorfi@cs.bme.hu

**Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Fakultät für Mathematik, Universitätsstraße 150. D-44801 Bochum. martin.kroll-k9x@rub.de

is well-defined for μ -almost all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. For any measurable function $g: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ one has

$$\mathbf{E}[(g(X) - Y)^2] = \mathbf{E}[(m(X) - Y)^2] + \mathbf{E}[(m(X) - g(X))^2],$$

and therefore, setting

$$L^* = \mathbf{E}[(m(X) - Y)^2],$$

it follows that

$$\mathbf{E}[(g(X) - Y)^2] = L^* + \int (m(x) - g(x))^2 \mu(dx).$$

Measuring the performance of an estimator \hat{m} of m through the loss function

$$L(m, \hat{m}) = \int (m(x) - \hat{m}(x))^2 \mu(dx),$$

may thus be interpreted as the excess prediction risk for a new observation X .

In this paper, we consider piecewise constant estimators of the regression function m based on cubic partitions of the sampling domain. Let $\mathcal{P}_h = \{A_{h,1}, A_{h,2}, \dots\}$ be such a cubic partition of \mathbb{R}^d with cubic cells $A_{h,j}$ of volume h^d . The raw data \mathcal{D}_n are assumed to be i.i.d. copies of the random vector (X, Y) ,

$$\mathcal{D}_n = \{(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)\}. \quad (1)$$

Put

$$\nu_n(A_{h,j}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i \mathbf{1}_{\{X_i \in A_{h,j}\}}$$

and

$$\mu_n(A_{h,j}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{X_i \in A_{h,j}\}}.$$

Then, a standard regression estimate is defined by

$$m_n(x) = \frac{\nu_n(A_{h,j})}{\mu_n(A_{h,j})}$$

for any $x \in A_{h,j}$. Theorem 4.3 in the monograph (Györfi, Kohler, Krzyżak, and Walk, 2002) states an upper bound on the rate of convergence for this partitioning estimate for Lipschitz continuous regression functions. Its extension to the more general case of Hölder continuous functions is straightforward, and yields the following result.

Theorem 1.1. *If the function*

$$\sigma^2(x) = \mathbf{Var}(Y|X = x)$$

is bounded, m is (β, C) -Hölder smooth with index $0 < \beta \leq 1$, that is,

$$|m(x) - m(z)| \leq C\|x - z\|^\beta, \quad x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (2)$$

and X is bounded, then

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\int (m(x) - m_n(x))^2 \mu(dx) \right] = O\left(\frac{1}{nh^d}\right) + O(h^{2\beta}). \quad (3)$$

In particular, the choice $h = h_n \asymp n^{-1/(2\beta+d)}$ realises the best compromise of the two antagonistic terms on the right-hand side of (3), and the resulting rate is $n^{-2\beta/(2\beta+d)}$. Standard arguments for nonparametric lower bounds, for instance based on Assouad’s lemma, show that this rate is indeed the optimal one.

The main purpose of this paper is to give an analogue of Theorem 1.1 in the case when the raw data \mathcal{D}_n are not directly accessible but only a suitably anonymised surrogate. More precisely, the anonymised data must satisfy a *local differential privacy* (LDP) condition. Our work is motivated by the recent paper (Berrett, Györfi, and Walk, 2021) where a first step in this direction was done. In that paper the authors considered a private partitioning estimate and derived the upper bound $n^{-1/(d+1)}$ on the rate of convergence for Lipschitz continuous functions ($\beta = 1$). However, the rate was only established under quite a restrictive assumption (called *strong density assumption* (SDA) in (Berrett, Györfi, and Walk, 2021)) on the design distribution μ . Moreover, it was conjectured that the rate of convergence can be arbitrarily slow when the SDA is not fulfilled. In this paper, we will show that this conjecture does not hold. Quite the contrary, we will even introduce an estimator that nearly attains the rate $n^{-\beta/(\beta+d)}$ without further assumptions concerning the design distribution. We emphasize that

the existence of a Lebesgue density for μ will not be postulated in the sequel. We complement the upper bound by proving a minimax lower bound showing that the rate $n^{-\beta/(\beta+d)}$ is indeed optimal which is in accordance with what can be expected from similar nonparametric problems like density estimation under privacy constraints.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows: for the sake of self-containedness we recap the notion of LDP in Section 2 and introduce a suitable anonymisation of the raw data \mathcal{D}_n that generates locally differentially private data. In Section 3 we introduce a modification of the classical partitioning estimate of the regression function that is only based on the availability of the anonymised data and derive a convergence rate for this estimator. In Section 4 we prove a matching lower bound that nearly coincides with the upper one. All proofs are gathered in Section 5.

2 Anonymisation of the raw data

In this section, we briefly recall the definition of LDP before we describe our privacy mechanism. In the language of probability theory, a privacy mechanism is a conditional distribution Q that draws Z from a measurable space $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z})$. More precisely, given the raw data $X_i = x_i$, one samples Z according to the probability measure given by $Q(A|X_1 = x_1, \dots, X_n = x_n)$ for any $A \in \mathcal{Z}$. In the local setting one further assumes that

$$(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z}) = \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{Z}_i, \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{Z}_i \right),$$

and that the output $Z = (Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$ is produced sequentially as follows: Z_1 is generated via Q_1 based on knowledge of X_1 only, and for $i = 2, \dots, n$ one generates Z_i given X_i and Z_1, \dots, Z_{i-1} via Q_i . Note that this potentially interactive dependence structure relies on an ordering of the raw data which may be unrealistic in many real-life situations. Hence, so-called *non-interactive* mechanisms, where any Z_i depends on X_i only, are preferable.

For a privacy parameter $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$, any privacy mechanism satisfying the local privacy constraint is said to be an α -*locally differentially private* mechanism if the condition

$$\frac{Q_i(A|X_i = x, Z_1 = z_1, \dots, Z_{i-1} = z_{i-1})}{Q_i(A|X_i = x', Z_1 = z_1, \dots, Z_{i-1} = z_{i-1})} \leq \exp(\alpha)$$

is satisfied for any $A \in \mathcal{Z}_i$, $z_j \in \mathcal{Z}_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, i - 1$, and all potential values x, x' of the raw data. The set of all α -locally differentially private mechanisms will be denoted by \mathcal{Q}_α .

Let us now state the privacy mechanism that we consider in this work for the anonymisation of the raw data \mathcal{D}_n in (1). Our approach follows the technique of Laplace perturbation already considered in (Duchi, Jordan, and Wainwright, 2018, Berrett and Butucea, 2019, Butucea, Dubois, Kroll, and Saumard, 2020, Berrett, Györfi, and Walk, 2021). In order to define the anonymised data, we first choose a non-decreasing sequence (B_n) of closed Euclidean balls centred at the origin. We denote with $(r_n) > 0$ the corresponding sequence of radii, that is, $B_n = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \|x\| \leq r_n\}$. Let further $A_{h,1}, A_{h,2}, \dots$ be a partition of \mathbb{R}^d consisting of cubic cells with volume h^d . Without loss of generalisation we can assume that the cells are numbered such that $A_{h,j} \cap B_n \neq \emptyset$ when $j \leq N_n$ for some non-negative integer N_n , and $A_{h,j} \cap B_n = \emptyset$ otherwise. In our privacy setup, the dataholder of the i -th datum X_i generates and transmits to the statistician the data

$$Z_{ij} = Y_i \mathbf{1}_{\{X_i \in A_{h,j}\}} + \sigma_Z \varepsilon_{ij}, \quad j = 1, \dots, N_n \quad (4)$$

and

$$W_{ij} = \mathbf{1}_{\{X_i \in A_{h,j}\}} + \sigma_W \zeta_{ij}, \quad j = 1, \dots, N_n, \quad (5)$$

with noise levels $\sigma_Z, \sigma_W > 0$, and $\varepsilon_{ij}, \zeta_{ij}$ ($i = 1, \dots, n, j = 1, \dots, N_n$) are independent centred Laplace random variables with unit variance. This means that individual i generates noisy data for any cell $A_{h,j}$ the has non-trivial intersection with the ball B_n . The noise levels σ_Z and σ_W have to be chosen sufficiently large in dependence on the desired privacy level α in order to make the overall mechanism satisfy α -LDP. Assuming that Y is bounded by some constant $T > 0$, it has been shown in (Berrett, Györfi, and Walk, 2021), p. 2438, that the choices

$$\sigma_W^2 = 32/\alpha^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_Z^2 = 32T^2/\alpha^2 \quad (6)$$

ensure α -LDP.

3 Rate of convergence

For a threshold $t > 0$, (Berrett, Györfi, and Walk, 2021) considered the estimator

$$\tilde{m}_n(x) = \frac{\tilde{\nu}_n(A_{h,j})}{\tilde{\mu}_n(A_{h,j})} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{\mu}_n(A_{h,j}) \geq t\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{j \leq N_n\}} \quad \text{when } x \in A_{h,j}, \quad (7)$$

where

$$\tilde{\nu}_n(A_{h,j}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_{ij} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mu}_n(A_{h,j}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{ij}.$$

In (Berrett, Györfi, and Walk, 2021) the convergence rate $n^{-1/(d+1)}$ was derived (up to a logarithmic term) for Lipschitz continuous functions by specialising (7) with $h = h_n \asymp n^{-1/(2d+2)}$ and $t = t_n \asymp h_n^d / \sqrt{\log n}$. However, the proof given in that paper is essentially based on the validity of the strong density assumption (SDA), which means that if $\mu(A_{h,j}) > 0$, then

$$\mu(A_{h,j}) \geq ch^d \quad j = 1, \dots, N_n, \quad (8)$$

for some constant $c > 0$. Moreover, instead of taking (8) as an assumption it was deduced mistakenly from the existence of a density that is lower bounded from below on its support. Apart from this minor flaw given in the proof, imposing (8) seems to be quite artificial since it is not only a condition on the design distribution μ alone but rather on the relationship between the distribution and the sets $A_{h,j}$ from the chosen partition. Since this condition seems difficult to verify in general, it is desirable to eliminate it from the prerequisites. In general, without the SDA the convergence rate $n^{-1/(d+1)}$ is not satisfied (see Remark 3.2 below).

In the sequel we introduce a novel estimator and bound the private rate of convergence without assuming anything more on the distribution of X than in the non-private Theorem 1.1. This disproves the conjecture from (Berrett, Györfi, and Walk, 2021) where it was guessed that the rate of convergence of any estimate can be arbitrarily slow in the absence of the SDA.

The idea for the general estimator is to include a further modification that in some sense enforces condition (8) to hold (see Remark 3.3 below for more details). We again depart from the privatised data (4) and (5). This already guarantees LDP since no further data that depend on the raw data are used in what follows.

In order to define our novel estimator, let λ_n denote the uniform distribution on $A_n = \bigcup_{j=1}^{N_n} A_{h,j}$, that is, for any Borel set A ,

$$\lambda_n(A) = \frac{\lambda(A \cap A_n)}{\lambda(A_n)},$$

where λ denotes the Lebesgue measure. We now define our estimator by

$$\widehat{m}_n(x) = \frac{\widetilde{\nu}_n(A_{h,j})}{\widehat{\mu}_n(A_{h,j})} \mathbf{1}_{\{\widehat{\mu}(A_{h,j}) \geq t\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{j \leq N_n\}} \quad \text{when } x \in A_{h,j}, \quad (9)$$

with

$$\widehat{\mu}_n(A_{h,j}) = \frac{3}{4} \widetilde{\mu}_n(A_{h,j}) + \frac{1}{4} \lambda_n(A_{h,j}).$$

The following result states an upper risk bound for the estimator \widehat{m}_n . Its proof is deferred to Section 5.1.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $B_n \uparrow \mathbb{R}^d$. Assume that m satisfies (2) with $0 < \beta \leq 1$ and that both X and Y are bounded. Consider the estimator \widehat{m}_n defined in (9) with $t = t_n = \lambda_n(A_{h,1})/8$. Then, for n sufficiently large,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \left[\int (m(x) - \widehat{m}_n(x))^2 \mu(dx) \right] &= O \left(\frac{1}{nh_n^d} \right) + O(h_n^{2\beta}) \\ &+ O \left(\frac{\sigma_W^2 \vee \sigma_Z^2}{nt_n^2} \right) + O \left(\exp \left(-\frac{8nt_n^2}{9} \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

In particular, taking $h_n \asymp (r_n^{2d}/n)^{1/(2\beta+2d)}$ and σ_W, σ_Z as in (6), yields

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\int (m(x) - \widehat{m}_n(x))^2 \mu(dx) \right] = O \left(\frac{r_n^{2d}}{n\alpha^2} \right)^{\frac{\beta}{\beta+d}}. \quad (11)$$

Remark 3.2. For the estimate \widetilde{m}_n defined by (7) one cannot achieve the rate of convergence in (11) without the SDA. In order to see this, consider the particular case when there is no privatisation and we are given constant, noiseless observations, that is, $Y = C$ a.s. with a constant $C \neq 0$. Then, the

estimator \tilde{m}_n satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int \mathbf{E}[(m(x) - \tilde{m}_n(x))^2] \mu(dx) \\
&= C^2 \sum_{j=1}^{N_n} \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\{\mu_n(A_{h,j}) < t_n\}}] \mu(A_{h,j}) \\
&\geq C^2 \sum_{j=1}^{N_n} \mathbf{P}(\mu_n(A_{h,j}) < t_n) \mathbf{1}_{\{\mu(A_{h,j}) < 2t_n\}} \mu(A_{h,j}) \\
&\geq C^2 \sum_{j=1}^{N_n} \mathbf{P}(\mu_n(A) - \mu(A) < -t_n) \mathbf{1}_{\{\mu(A_{h,j}) < 2t_n\}} \mu(A_{h,j}).
\end{aligned}$$

Application of Hoeffding's inequality or normal approximation easily shows that the probability in the last line is bounded from below by $1/2$ for n sufficiently large. Consider now the case $d = 1$ and assume that the distribution μ has a density f on $[0, 1]$ satisfying $f(x) = x$ for $0 \leq x \leq \delta$ with some $\delta > 0$. Let the regular partition be given by $[0, h_n), [h_n, 2h_n), \dots$. For n sufficiently large we have $\mathbf{1}_{\{\mu(A_{h,j}) < 2t_n\}} = 1$ at least for those cells contained in $[0, \delta]$ where $xh_n < 2t_n$ holds.

Consequently, with the choice $t_n \asymp h_n/\sqrt{\log n}$ as suggested in (Berrett, Györfi, and Walk, 2021) we obtain the lower bound

$$\begin{aligned}
\int \mathbf{E}[(m(x) - \tilde{m}_n(x))^2] \mu(dx) &\geq \frac{C^2}{2} \int_0^{[\delta/h_n] \cdot h_n} \mathbf{1}_{\{xh_n < 2t_n\}} x dx \\
&= \frac{C^2}{2} \int_0^{[\delta/h_n] \cdot h_n} \mathbf{1}_{\{x < 2/\sqrt{\log n}\}} x dx \\
&= \frac{C^2}{2} \int_0^{2/\sqrt{\log n}} x dx \\
&\geq \frac{C^2}{\log n},
\end{aligned}$$

which is a much slower rate than the one in (11).

Remark 3.3. The rationale behind the construction of the estimator \hat{m}_n comes from the auxiliary model obtained by replacing the raw data \mathcal{D}_n with

$$\mathcal{D}'_n = \{(X'_1, Y'_1), \dots, (X'_n, Y'_n)\}$$

where with probability 3/4 one has $(X'_i, Y'_i) = (X_i, Y_i)$, and with probability 1/4 one has $X'_i \sim \lambda_n$ and $Y'_i = 0$ independently for each $i = 1, \dots, n$. In this mixture model condition (8) holds by construction. Recently, in the context of density estimation under local differential privacy the derivation of optimal convergence rates has also been reduced to such a mixture model (see the proof of Proposition 7 in (Sart, 2022)). The definition of our estimator \widehat{m}_n is motivated by this approach but our definition does not rely on any additional randomisation and replacing $\widetilde{\mu}$ by $\widehat{\mu}$ in the definition of \widehat{m}_n may be interpreted as a regularisation.

Remark 3.4. If one *a priori* knew a set S containing the support of the distribution μ it would be sufficient to generate anonymised data in (4) and (5) only for those cells $A_{h,j}$ with $A_{h,j} \cap S \neq \emptyset$. In this case, the quantity r_n appearing in the upper bound could be replaced by a constant depending on the support of μ . The rate in (11) would reduce to $(n\alpha^2)^{-\beta/(\beta+d)}$ then. In the following section we will prove a matching lower bound for this case.

4 Lower bound

In order to prove a lower bound, we restrict ourselves to a specific instance of the general regression model (1). This submodel will be chosen already sufficiently complex to rule out inference with an essentially faster rate than the one obtained in Theorem 3.1. More precisely, we consider the regression model with a generic observation $(X, Y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ obeying the model

$$Y = m(X) + \eta \tag{12}$$

where X is uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]^d$, the noise η is uniformly distributed on $[-1/2, 1/2]$, and the regression function m belongs to the Hölder class $\mathcal{F}(\beta, C)$ defined as the set of functions satisfying (2) and support contained in $[0, 1]^d$. In this setup, we can prove the following lower bound result. Its proof, which is based on Assouad's lemma, is given in Section 5.2.

Theorem 4.1. *It holds*

$$\inf_{\substack{\widetilde{m} \\ Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha}} \sup_{m \in \mathcal{F}(\beta, C)} \mathbf{E} \left[\int (\widetilde{m}(x) - m(x))^2 dx \right] \gtrsim (n(e^\alpha - 1)^2)^{-\beta/(\beta+d)}.$$

where the supremum is taken over all admissible regression functions from the Hölder class and the infimum is taken over all estimators \widetilde{m} based on a

private sample of size n with raw data from model (12) and all, potentially sequentially interactive, privacy mechanisms $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha$.

In light of Theorem 4.1 and Remark 3.4, the rate of convergence derived in Theorem 3.1 above is essentially optimal.

5 Proofs

5.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1 (Upper bound)

Consider the decomposition

$$\widehat{m}_n = \widehat{m}'_1 + \widehat{m}'_2$$

where, for $x \in A_{h,j}$, we set

$$\widehat{m}'_1(x) = \frac{\frac{\sigma_Z}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_{ij}}{\widehat{\mu}_n(A_{h,j})} \mathbf{1}_{\{\widehat{\mu}_n(A_{h,j}) \geq t_n\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{j \leq N_n\}}$$

and

$$\widehat{m}'_2(x) = \frac{\nu_n(A_{h,j})}{\widehat{\mu}_n(A_{h,j})} \mathbf{1}_{\{\widehat{\mu}_n(A_{h,j}) \geq t_n\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{j \leq N_n\}}.$$

With this notation, proving (10) reduces to show that

$$\int \mathbf{E}[(\widehat{m}'_1(x))^2] \mu(dx) = O\left(\frac{\sigma_Z^2}{nt_n^2}\right) \quad (13)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int \mathbf{E}[(m(x) - \widehat{m}'_2(x))^2] \mu(dx) &= O\left(\frac{1}{nt_n^2}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{nh_n^d}\right) \\ &\quad + O(h_n^{2\beta}) + O\left(\exp\left(-\frac{8nt_n^2}{9}\right)\right). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Proof of (13): One has

$$\begin{aligned} \int \mathbf{E}[(\widehat{m}'_1(x))^2] \mu(dx) &= \sum_{j=1}^{N_n} \mathbf{E} \left[\frac{\left(\frac{\sigma_Z}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_{ij}\right)^2}{\left(\widehat{\mu}_n(A_{h,j})\right)^2} \mathbf{1}_{\{\widehat{\mu}_n(A_{h,j}) \geq t_n\}} \right] \mu(A_{h,j}) \\ &\leq \frac{\sigma_Z^2}{nt_n^2} \sum_{j=1}^{N_n} \mu(A_{h,j}) \\ &\leq \frac{\sigma_Z^2}{nt_n^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of (14): Let m'_n be the modification of m_n where μ_n is replaced by $\mu'_n = \frac{3}{4}\mu_n + \frac{1}{4}\lambda_n$. Then, following along the lines of the proof of Theorem 4.3 in (Györfi, Kohler, Krzyżak, and Walk, 2002) one can show that

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\int (m(x) - m'_n(x))^2 \mu(dx) \right] = O \left(\frac{1}{nh_n^d} \right) + O(h_n^{2\beta}),$$

and in order to show (14) it is sufficient to show that

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\int (\widehat{m}'_2(x) - m'_n(x))^2 \mu(dx) \right] \leq \exp \left(-\frac{8nt_n^2}{9} \right) + O \left(\frac{\sigma_W^2}{nt_n^2} \right). \quad (15)$$

In order to prove this bound, note that

$$\int (\widehat{m}'_2(x) - m'_n(x))^2 \mu(dx) \leq \frac{4}{3} J_n + T^2 \mu \left(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \cup_{j=1}^{N_n} A_{h,j} \right), \quad (16)$$

where

$$J_n = \sum_{j=1}^{N_n} (\nu_n(A_{h,j}))^2 \left(\frac{1}{\mu'_n(A_{h,j})} - \frac{1}{\widehat{\mu}_n(A_{h,j})} \mathbf{1}_{\{\widehat{\mu}_n(A_{h,j}) \geq t_n\}} \right)^2 \mu(A_{h,j}).$$

Since X is bounded and $B_n \uparrow \mathbb{R}^d$, the support of μ is contained in A_n for all n sufficiently large, and consequently the second term on the right-hand side of (16) eventually becomes zero. Therefore it is sufficient to find a bound for $\mathbf{E}[J_n]$. Using that $\frac{3}{4}\mu_n(A_{h,j}) \leq \mu'_n(A_{h,j})$,

$$\begin{aligned} J_n &\leq T^2 \sum_{j=1}^{N_n} (\mu_n(A_{h,j}))^2 \left(\frac{1}{\mu'_n(A_{h,j})} - \frac{1}{\widehat{\mu}_n(A_{h,j})} \mathbf{1}_{\{\widehat{\mu}_n(A_{h,j}) \geq t_n\}} \right)^2 \mu(A_{h,j}) \\ &\leq T^2 \sum_{j=1}^{N_n} \left(1 - \frac{\mu'_n(A_{h,j})}{\widehat{\mu}_n(A_{h,j})} \mathbf{1}_{\{\widehat{\mu}_n(A_{h,j}) \geq t_n\}} \right)^2 \mu(A_{h,j}) \\ &= T^2 \sum_{j=1}^{N_n} \mathbf{1}_{\{\widehat{\mu}_n(A_{h,j}) < t_n\}} \mu(A_{h,j}) \\ &\quad + T^2 \sum_{j=1}^{N_n} \left(1 - \frac{\mu'_n(A_{h,j})}{\widehat{\mu}_n(A_{h,j})} \right)^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{\widehat{\mu}_n(A_{h,j}) \geq t_n\}} \mu(A_{h,j}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbf{E}[J_n] \leq \mathbf{E}[J_{n,1}] + \mathbf{E}[J_{n,2}] \quad (17)$$

where, setting $\mu' = \frac{3}{4}\mu + \frac{1}{4}\lambda_n$,

$$J_{n,1} = \frac{4T^2}{3} \sum_{j=1}^{N_n} \mathbf{1}_{\{\widehat{\mu}_n(A_{h,j}) < t_n\}} \mu'(A_{h,j}), \quad \text{and}$$

$$J_{n,2} = T^2 \sum_{j=1}^{N_n} \left(1 - \frac{\mu'_n(A_{h,j})}{\widehat{\mu}_n(A_{h,j})}\right)^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{\widehat{\mu}_n(A_{h,j}) \geq t_n\}} \mu(A_{h,j}).$$

In order to deal with the expectation of $J_{n,1}$, note that $\mu'(A_{h,j}) \geq \frac{1}{4}\lambda_n(A_{h,j}) \geq 2t_n$ holds for our choice of t_n by definition, for n sufficiently large. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(\widehat{\mu}_n(A_{h,j}) < t_n) &= \mathbf{P}(\widehat{\mu}_n(A_{h,j}) < t_n, \mu'(A_{h,j}) \geq 2t_n) \\ &\leq \mathbf{P}(\mu'(A_{h,j}) - \widehat{\mu}_n(A_{h,j}) \geq t_n) \\ &\leq P_{1,j} + P_{2,j} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$P_{1,j} = \mathbf{P}\left(\mu(A_{h,j}) - \mu_n(A_{h,j}) \geq \frac{2t_n}{3}\right),$$

$$P_{2,j} = \mathbf{P}\left(\frac{\sigma_W}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \zeta_{ij} \geq \frac{2t_n}{3}\right).$$

Application of Hoeffding's inequality in the formulation taken from (Boucheron, Lugosi, and Massart, 2013), Theorem 2.8 yields

$$P_{1,j} \leq \exp\left(-\frac{8nt_n^2}{9}\right),$$

whereas Chebyshev's inequality implies that

$$P_{2,j} \leq \frac{9\sigma_W^2}{4nt_n^2}.$$

Hence,

$$\mathbf{E}[J_{n,1}] \leq \frac{4T^2}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{8nt_n^2}{9}\right) + \frac{3T^2\sigma_W^2}{nt_n^2}$$

Furthermore, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}[J_{n,2}] &= T^2 \sum_{j=1}^{N_n} \mathbf{E} \left\{ \left(\frac{\widehat{\mu}_n(A_{h,j}) - \mu'_n(A_{h,j})}{\widehat{\mu}_n(A_{h,j})} \right)^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{\widehat{\mu}_n(A_{h,j}) \geq t_n\}} \right\} \mu(A_{h,j}) \\
&\leq \frac{T^2}{t_n^2} \sum_{j=1}^{N_n} \mathbf{E}[(\widehat{\mu}_n(A_{h,j}) - \mu'_n(A_{h,j}))^2] \mu(A_{h,j}) \\
&\leq \frac{9T^2 \sigma_W^2}{16nt_n^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Putting the bounds obtained for $\mathbf{E}[J_{n,1}]$ and $\mathbf{E}[J_{n,2}]$ into (17) yields (15) which proves (10). (11) follows from (10) by taking into account that

$$t_n \asymp \lambda_n(A_{h,1}) = h_n^d / \lambda(A_n) \asymp h_n^d / r_n^d,$$

and that the term $O(\exp(-8nt_n^2/9))$ in (10) is negligible.

5.2 Proof of Theorem 4.1 (Lower bound)

We start by introducing some notation that will be used throughout the proof. Let $K_0: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a C^∞ -function such that (2) is satisfied with $C = 1$ and $\text{supp}(K_0) \subseteq [0, 1]$. For $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in [0, 1]^d$, define the function $K: [0, 1]^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ via $K(x) = \min_{i=1, \dots, d} K_0(x_i)$. We restrict the complexity of the whole problem by restricting ourselves to a finite set of hypotheses parameterised by $\theta \in \Theta = \{0, 1\}^{k^d}$ for some positive integer k that will be specified below. For any $j = (j_1, \dots, j_d) \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}^d$ define the function K_j by

$$K_j(x) = Ck^{-\beta} K(kx_1 - j_1, \dots, kx_d - j_d).$$

It is readily checked that $\text{supp}(K_j) \subseteq B_j = \times_{i=1}^d [j_i/k, (j_i + 1)/k]$. For any $\theta \in \Theta$, we consider the candidate regression function

$$m_\theta = \sum_j \theta_j K_j,$$

where the sum is taken over all multi-indices $j \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}^d$. By construction m_θ belongs to $\mathcal{F}(\beta, C)$ for any $\theta \in \Theta$. Let us now assume that the raw data have been anonymised by means of an arbitrary privacy mechanism

$Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha$, and let \tilde{m} be any estimator defined in terms of the outcome Z of Q . We denote with \mathbf{P}_θ the distribution of the tuple (X_1, Y_1) and with $Q\mathbf{P}_\theta^n$ the distribution of $Z = (Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$ when the true regression function is m_θ . We also write \mathbf{E}_θ for the expectation operator in this case.

After these preliminaries we start the proof with the observation that for any $\theta \in \Theta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}_\theta \left[\int_{[0,1]^d} (\tilde{m}(x) - m_\theta(x))^2 dx \right] &= \sum_j \mathbf{E}_\theta \left[\int_{B_j} (\tilde{m}(x) - m_\theta(x))^2 dx \right] \\ &= \sum_j \mathbf{E}_\theta [\rho_j^2(\tilde{m}, \theta_j)], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\rho_j(\tilde{m}, \theta_j) = \left(\int_{B_j} (\tilde{m}(x) - \theta_j K_j(x))^2 dx \right)^{1/2}.$$

Putting $\hat{\theta}_j = \arg \min_{t \in \{0,1\}} \rho_j(\tilde{m}, t)$, we have

$$\rho_j(\tilde{m}, \theta_j) \geq \frac{\|K_j\|_2}{2} \cdot |\hat{\theta}_j - \theta_j|.$$

Hence, using that $\|K_j\|_2^2 = C^2 k^{-2\beta-d} \|K\|_2^2$, we obtain

$$\mathbf{E}_\theta \left[\int_{[0,1]^d} (\tilde{m}(x) - m_\theta(x))^2 dx \right] \geq \frac{C^2 \|K\|_2^2}{4} k^{-2\beta-d} \mathbf{E}_\theta [\rho(\hat{\theta}, \theta)]$$

where $\hat{\theta} = (\hat{\theta}_j)$ and $\rho(\theta, \theta')$ denotes the Hamming distance between θ and θ' . Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{m \in \mathcal{F}(\beta, C)} \mathbf{E} \left[\int_{[0,1]^d} (\tilde{m}(x) - m(x))^2 dx \right] \\ &\geq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbf{E}_\theta \left[\int_{[0,1]^d} (\tilde{m}(x) - m_\theta(x))^2 dx \right] \\ &\geq \frac{C^2 \|K\|_2^2}{4} k^{-2\beta-d} \inf_{\hat{\theta}} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbf{E}_\theta [\rho(\hat{\theta}, \theta)]. \end{aligned}$$

In order to bound the quantity $\inf_{\hat{\theta}} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbf{E}_\theta [\rho(\hat{\theta}, \theta)]$, we use Statement (iv) of Theorem 2.12 in (Tsybakov, 2009) which relies on a finite bound on the

Kullback-Leibler distance $K(Q\mathbf{P}_\theta^n, Q\mathbf{P}_{\theta'}^n)$ for θ, θ' such that $\rho(\theta, \theta') = 1$. In order to obtain such a bound, first note that Equation (14) in (Duchi, Jordan, and Wainwright, 2018) yields

$$K(Q\mathbf{P}_\theta^n, Q\mathbf{P}_{\theta'}^n) \leq 4n(e^\alpha - 1)^2 V^2(\mathbf{P}_\theta, \mathbf{P}_{\theta'}) \quad (18)$$

where $V(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q})$ denotes the total variation distance between two probability measures. Thus, it remains to find a bound for $V(\mathbf{P}_\theta, \mathbf{P}_{\theta'})$. In order to bound this quantity, note that under model (12) the vector (X, Y) has a Lebesgue density φ_m that is equal to 1 on the set

$$\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} : x \in [0, 1]^d, y \in [m(x) - 1/2, m(x) + 1/2]\},$$

and equal to 0 otherwise. Now, let θ, θ' be such that $\rho(\theta, \theta') = 1$. Then, a direct calculation using Scheffé's Theorem yields

$$\begin{aligned} V(\mathbf{P}_\theta, \mathbf{P}_{\theta'}) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} |\varphi_{m_\theta}(x, y) - \varphi_{m_{\theta'}}(x, y)| dx dy \\ &\leq k^{-d} \|K_j\|_\infty \\ &= Ck^{-d-\beta} \|K\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this bound with (18) for $k \asymp (n(e^\alpha - 1))^{1/(2\beta+2d)}$ yields

$$K(Q\mathbf{P}_\theta^n, Q\mathbf{P}_{\theta'}^n) \lesssim 1.$$

By application of (Tsybakov, 2009), Theorem 2.12, Statement (iv), we obtain

$$\sup_{m \in \mathcal{F}(\beta, C)} \mathbf{E} \left[\int_{[0,1]^d} (\tilde{m}(x) - m(x))^2 dx \right] \gtrsim (n(e^\alpha - 1)^2)^{-\beta/(\beta+d)},$$

which implies the claim since Q and \tilde{m} were arbitrary.

Funding information

The research of Martin Kroll was supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG) under the grant DFG DE 502/27-1.

References

- Berrett, T. B. and Butucea, C. (2019). Classification under local differential privacy. *Pub. Inst. Stat. Univ. Paris, Special issue in honour of Denis Bosq's 80th birthday* 63, 191–205.
- Berrett, T. B., Györfi, L., and Walk, H. (2021). Strongly universally consistent nonparametric regression and classification with privatised data. *Electron. J. Stat.* 15, 2430–2453.
- Boucheron, S., Lugosi, G., and Massart, P. (2013). *Concentration inequalities. A nonasymptotic theory of independence*, With a foreword by Michel Ledoux. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. x+481.
- Butucea, C., Dubois, A., Kroll, M., and Saumard, A. (2020). Local differential privacy: elbow effect in optimal density estimation and adaptation over Besov ellipsoids. *Bernoulli* 26, 1727–1764.
- Duchi, J. C., Jordan, M. I., and Wainwright, M. J. (2018). Minimax optimal procedures for locally private estimation. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 113, 182–201.
- Györfi, L., Kohler, M., Krzyżak, A., and Walk, H. (2002). *A distribution-free theory of nonparametric regression*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer-Verlag, New York, pp. xvi+647.
- Sart, M. (2022). Density estimation under local differential privacy and Hellinger loss. Preprint. Available at <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-03471018/>.
- Tsybakov, A. B. (2009). *Introduction to nonparametric estimation*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer, New York, pp. xii+214.