

EFFICIENCY IN LOCAL DIFFERENTIAL PRIVACY

BY LUKAS STEINBERGER^{1,a}

¹University of Vienna, Department of Statistics and OR, ^alukas.steinberger@univie.ac.at

We develop a theory of asymptotic efficiency in regular parametric models when data confidentiality is ensured by local differential privacy (LDP). Even though efficient parameter estimation is a classical and well-studied problem in mathematical statistics, it leads to several non-trivial obstacles that need to be tackled when dealing with the LDP case. Starting from a standard parametric model $\mathcal{P} = (P_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$, $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$, for the iid unobserved sensitive data X_1, \dots, X_n , we establish local asymptotic mixed normality (along subsequences) of the model

$$Q^{(n)}\mathcal{P} = (Q^{(n)}P_\theta^n)_{\theta \in \Theta}$$

generating the sanitized observations Z_1, \dots, Z_n , where $Q^{(n)}$ is an arbitrary sequence of sequentially interactive privacy mechanisms. This result readily implies convolution and local asymptotic minimax theorems. In case $p = 1$, the optimal asymptotic variance is found to be the inverse of the supremal Fisher-Information $\sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha} I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P}) \in \mathbb{R}$, where the supremum runs over all α -differentially private (marginal) Markov kernels. We present an algorithm for finding a (nearly) optimal privacy mechanism \hat{Q} and an estimator $\hat{\theta}_n(Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$ based on the corresponding sanitized data that achieves this asymptotically optimal variance.

1. Introduction. Consider iid data X_1, \dots, X_n from a probability distribution P_θ belonging to a regular parametric model $\mathcal{P} = (P_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$, with parameter space $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$, sample space $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ and with Fisher-Information $I_\theta(\mathcal{P}) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$. If the data owners are to be protected by (non-interactive) *local* differential privacy, the analyst who wants to estimate the unknown parameter θ does not get to see these original data but only observes sanitized versions Z_1, \dots, Z_n such that individual i was able to generate Z_i using its sensitive data X_i and drawing from a (publicly known) Markov kernel $Z_i|X_i = x \sim Q(dz|x)$ obeying the α -differential privacy constraint

$$(1.1) \quad Q(A|x) \leq e^\alpha \cdot Q(A|x'),$$

for all A in a sigma algebra \mathcal{G} on some sample space \mathcal{Z} and for all x, x' in the original sample space \mathcal{X} . Thus, the observed data Z_1, \dots, Z_n are iid from QP_θ , where $[QP_\theta](A) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} Q(A|x)P_\theta(dx)$. We will see below that the resulting statistical model $Q\mathcal{P} = (QP_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ is again regular with Fisher-Information denoted by $I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P})$. Hence, under standard regularity conditions, the MLE in $Q\mathcal{P}$ is asymptotically distributed as $N(0, I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P})^{-1})$ and it is well known to be efficient, i.e., this asymptotic covariance matrix is the smallest (in the partial Loewner ordering) that any (regular) estimator in the model $Q\mathcal{P}$ can achieve. However, we are actually free to choose the privacy mechanism Q , as long as it satisfies (1.1). It is therefore natural to ask, at least in the case $p = 1$, what is the mechanism Q that leads to the smallest asymptotic variance, or, in other words, to look for solutions of the optimization problem

$$(1.2) \quad \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha} I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P}),$$

MSC2020 subject classifications: Primary 62F12, 62F30; secondary 62B15, 62L05.

Keywords and phrases: local differential privacy, efficiency, Fisher-Information, local asymptotic mixed normality.

where $\mathcal{Q}_\alpha := \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X}) := \bigcup_{(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{G})} \left\{ Q : \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, 1] \mid Q \text{ is a Markov kernel satisfying (1.1)} \right\}$ is the set of all α -private marginal data release mechanisms. The problem (1.2) is challenging, because the constraint set is an infinite dimensional set of Markov kernels with even unspecified domain. Moreover, a global maximizer may not even exist at all. Furthermore, a (near) maximizer will typically depend on the unknown parameter θ and the resulting privacy mechanism, Q_θ say, is also unknown and can not be given to the data owners to generate sanitized data $Z_i, i = 1, \dots, n$.

In this paper we develop the theory of statistical efficiency for local differential privacy, extending the classical approach due to Le Cam (1960), Hájek (1970) and Jeganathan (1980). We study regularity properties of locally private models, prove a general local asymptotic mixed normality result and derive a private convolution theorem. Finally, we prove exact attainability of the asymptotic lower bound. In particular, we develop an algorithm based on discretization of the model \mathcal{P} and a linear program proposed by Kairouz, Oh and Viswanath (2016) to find a privacy mechanism (Markov kernel) \hat{Q}_θ such that $I_\theta(\hat{Q}_\theta \mathcal{P}) \approx \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha} I_\theta(Q \mathcal{P})$. We employ a two-step (sequentially interactive) procedure that first consistently estimates θ in an α -private way with an estimator $\tilde{\theta}_{n_1}$ based on a subsample Z_1, \dots, Z_{n_1} generated by some preliminary privacy mechanism Q_0 . The individuals in the second part of the sample then use $\hat{Q}_{\tilde{\theta}_{n_1}}$ to generate Z_{n_1+1}, \dots, Z_n in an α -private way. The MLE $\hat{\theta}_{n_2}$ in the model $(\hat{Q}_{\tilde{\theta}_{n_1}} \mathcal{P})^{n_2}$ is finally shown to have asymptotic distribution $N(0, [\sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha} I_\theta(Q \mathcal{P})]^{-1})$ (see Figure 4.3 for a graphical representation of this procedure). Notice that since this procedure is sequentially interactive rather than simply non-interactive (i.e., the local randomization mechanism $\hat{Q}_{\tilde{\theta}_{n_1}}$ used by each individual in the second group depends on the outcome of previous randomizations), it is no longer clear whether the reciprocal of (1.2) is indeed the smallest possible asymptotic variance. Thus, to establish asymptotic efficiency, we prove local asymptotic mixed normality (along subsequences) for every model of the form $Q^{(n)} \mathcal{P}^n = (Q^{(n)} P_\theta^n)_{\theta \in \Theta}$, $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$, where \mathcal{P} is regular (differentiable in quadratic mean) and $Q^{(n)}$ is an arbitrary sequence of sequentially-interactive α -differential privacy mechanisms. This result implies convolution and local asymptotic minimax theorems which show that the reciprocal of the expression in (1.2) is, indeed, the minimal asymptotic variance.

The paper is organized as follows. We finish this section with a discussion of related literature and the necessary notation for our exposition. In Section 2 we consider two very basic statistical models, the Bernoulli(θ) and the Binomial($2, \theta$) model, to illustrate some of the challenges a theory of statistical efficiency is facing under local differential privacy. In Section 3 we study how differentiability in quadratic mean (DQM) of statistical models for original sensitive data X_i is inherited to the model describing the sanitized data Z_i in the non-interactive case. We then establish local asymptotic mixed normality (LAMN) along subsequences for every model $Q^{(n)} \mathcal{P}^n$, where \mathcal{P} is DQM and $Q^{(n)}$ is any sequence of sequentially interactive privacy mechanisms. Given this result, we can connect to the classical literature on LAMN models and immediately obtain asymptotic convolution and local asymptotic minimax theorems. Finally, in Section 4 we show that the lower bounds of the convolution and local minimax theorems can actually be attained by a two-step MLE approach. The crucial step to this end is to approximately solve (1.2). Most technical results and proofs are collected in appendices.

1.1. *Related literature.* Differential privacy and its *local* version, where there is no need for a trusted third party, has originated some 20 years ago in the computer science literature (cf. Dinur and Nissim, 2003; Dwork, 2008; Dwork and Nissim, 2004; Dwork et al., 2006;

(Evfimievski, Gehrke and Srikant, 2003) as a means for privacy protection that is insusceptible to any type of adversary. It took a few years until mathematical statisticians started to investigate the new notion, which is an inherently statistical one, and groundbreaking first contributions are Wasserman and Zhou (2010) and Duchi, Jordan and Wainwright (2018). Recently, however, the statistical literature on differential privacy has exploded. Consider, for example, Acharya et al. (2022); Butucea, Rohde and Steinberger (2022); Butucea et al. (2020); Cai, Wang and Zhang (2021); Duchi and Ruan (2023); Dunsche, Kutta and Dette (2022); Lalanne, Garivier and Gribonval (2022); Rohde and Steinberger (2020), to mention only a few of the most recent contributions. Nevertheless some of the most basic statistical questions are still open under differential privacy. One such question is that of asymptotically efficient parameter estimation. In the central paradigm of differential privacy, efficient estimation has been addressed early on by works of Smith (2008, 2011). However, in the statistically more challenging local paradigm, where there is no trusted data curator available, no analog to the classical theory of statistical efficiency has been available so far. An interesting contribution towards such a direction is Barnes, Chen and Özgür (2020), who investigate and bound Fisher-Information when original data are perturbed using a differentially private randomization mechanism. But those authors have not attempted to find an optimal randomization mechanism or a subsequent estimation procedure. The work probably closest to our own approach is Duchi and Ruan (2023). They investigate the local minimax risk when data are subject to a local differential privacy constraint. They develop a new information quantity they call the L^1 -information and use it to characterize the local minimax risk in the regular parametric case. However, while they are more ambitious than our present investigations in that they aim also at potentially non-parametric models, they can only characterize the difficulty of a regular parametric estimation problem up to certain numerical constants and thus all their attainability results are also only up to numerical factors. Hence, the question of existence and construction of asymptotically efficient (minimum variance) locally private estimation procedures is still open. In this paper we begin to develop the statistical theory of asymptotic efficiency for local differential privacy by starting with simple regular statistical models. This objective already poses several non-trivial challenges that need to be carefully addressed. For traditional results on statistical efficiency we mainly rely on the well established theory as presented in van der Vaart (2007) and Höpfner (2014).

1.2. *Preliminaries and notation.* Let $(\mathcal{Z}_1, \mathcal{G}_1), \dots, (\mathcal{Z}_n, \mathcal{G}_n), (\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{G}), (\mathcal{Z}', \mathcal{G}')$ and $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ be measurable spaces and write $\mathcal{Z}^{(n)} := \mathcal{Z}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{Z}_n$ and $\mathcal{G}^{(n)} := \mathcal{G}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{G}_n$. Let $\mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{Z}) = \mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{G})$ be the set of all probability measures on $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{G})$ and $\mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z})$ be the set of all Markov kernels $Q : \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ from $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ to $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{G})$. Note that we can always think of a Markov kernel $Q \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z})$ as a linear mapping from $\mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{X})$ to $\mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{Z})$ by defining $P \mapsto QP$ as $[QP](dz) := \int_{\mathcal{X}} Q(dz|x) P(dx)$. In the same sense we can also consider compositions $[QR](dz|x) = \int_{\mathcal{Z}'}, Q(dz|z') R(dz'|x)$ of Markov kernels $R \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}')$ and $Q \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{Z}' \rightarrow \mathcal{Z})$. For a statistical model $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{X})$ we also write $Q\mathcal{P} = \{QP : P \in \mathcal{P}\}$ for the model obtained by transforming all original probability measures by Q . Notice that any measurable function $T : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ can also be represented as a (degenerate) Markov kernel $R_T \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z})$ by defining $R_T(dz|x)$ to be the Dirac measure $\delta_{T(x)}$ at $T(x)$. Hence, we sometimes write $T\mathcal{P} := R_T\mathcal{P}$ which is easily seen to coincide with the push-forward model $\{PT^{-1} : P \in \mathcal{P}\}$, since $[R_TP](A) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \delta_{T(x)}(A) P(dx) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbb{1}_{T^{-1}(A)}(x) P(dx) = PT^{-1}(A)$. Similarly, we can also make sense of the composition of a Markov kernel $Q \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{Z}' \rightarrow \mathcal{Z})$ and the measurable function $T : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}'$, by setting $[QT](dz|x) := [QR_T](dz|x) = Q(dz|T(x))$. Throughout, we write J_p for the $p \times p$ identity matrix and $\|\cdot\|$ for the euclidean norm as well as for the induced matrix norm (i.e., the spectral norm). Other norms will be distinguished by appropriate subscripts, and we write $\|\cdot\|_r$ to denote the ℓ_r as well as the $L_r(\mu)$ norm

whenever the meaning is clear from the context. If $\mathcal{P} = (P_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ is a parametric model with $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ that is dominated by μ , we write $p_\theta = \frac{dP_\theta}{d\mu}$ and \mathbb{E}_θ for the expectation operator with respect to P_θ .

1.2.1. *Sequentially interactive and non-interactive differential privacy.* For $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}^n$, define $d_0(x, x') := |\{i : x_i \neq x'_i\}|$ to be the Hamming distance, i.e., the number of differing components in x and x' . Recall that for $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$, a Markov kernel $Q \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{Z})$ is called α -*differentially private*, if, for all $A \in \mathcal{G}$ and for all $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}^n$ with $d_0(x, x') = 1$, we have

$$(1.3) \quad Q(A|x) \leq e^\alpha Q(A|x').$$

We sometimes also refer to such a Markov kernel as a *privacy mechanism* or a *channel*. Note that this definition implies that the probability measures $Q(dz|x)$, for different $x \in \mathcal{X}^n$, are mutually absolutely continuous (equivalent). In particular, if $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{X}^n)$ is a statistical model on \mathcal{X}^n , then all the measures QP , for $P \in \mathcal{P}$, are equivalent and they are also equivalent to $Q(dz|x)$, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}^n$. We now turn to *local differential privacy*, i.e., the situation where there is no trusted data curator available and each individual is enabled to generate a sanitized version Z_i of their sensitive data X_i on their *local* machine without ever sharing X_i with anybody else.

First, we define the set of marginal α -differentially private channels by

$$(1.4) \quad \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}) := \{Q \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}) : Q(A|x) \leq e^\alpha Q(A|x'), \forall A \in \mathcal{G}, x, x' \in \mathcal{X}\}.$$

When searching for an optimal privacy mechanism, we want to impose no a priori restrictions on the space $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{G})$ from which the sanitized observations are drawn. Thus, we also consider the union over all possible output spaces

$$(1.5) \quad \mathcal{Q}_\alpha := \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X}) := \bigcup_{(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{G})} \{Q \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}) : Q \text{ satisfies (1.1)}\}.$$

The elements of \mathcal{Q}_α are the basic building blocks of locally private channels, because they can be executed by a single individual independently of anybody else, using only their own information $X_i = x$ and producing a sanitized version $Z_i \sim Q(dz|x)$. We also introduce two specific classes of α -locally differentially private mechanisms. A Markov kernel $Q \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}^{(n)})$ is said to be *sequentially interactive* if the following condition is satisfied: For every $i = 1, \dots, n$, there exists a Markov kernel $Q_i \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Z}^{(i-1)} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_i)$, such that for all $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$(1.6) \quad Q\left(dz_{1:n} \middle| x_1, \dots, x_n\right) = Q_{z_{1:n-1}}(dz_n|x_n) Q_{z_{1:n-2}}(dz_{n-1}|x_{n-1}) \cdots Q_\emptyset(dz_1|x_1),$$

where $Q_{z_{1:i-1}}(dz_i|x_i) := Q_i(dz_i|x_i, z_{1:i-1})$, $z_{1:0} = \emptyset$ and $z_{1:i} = (z_1, \dots, z_i)^T \in \mathcal{Z}^{(i)}$. Here, the idea is that individual i can only use X_i and previous Z_j , $j < i$, in its local privacy mechanism, thus leading to the sequential structure in the above definition. If, in addition, for all $i \in [n]$ and for all $z_{1:i-1} \in \mathcal{Z}^{(i-1)}$ we have $Q_{z_{1:i-1}} \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_i)$, then, by the usual approximation of integrands by simple functions, it is easy to see that Q in (1.6) is α -differentially private (i.e., satisfies (1.3)), in which case we call it α -*sequentially interactive*. This notion coincides with the definition of sequentially interactive channels in [Duchi, Jordan and Wainwright \(2018\)](#) and [Rohde and Steinberger \(2020\)](#).

An important subclass of sequentially interactive mechanisms are the so called *non-interactive* mechanisms $Q \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}^{(n)})$ that are of product form

$$(1.7) \quad Q\left(dz_{1:n} \middle| x_1, \dots, x_n\right) = \bigotimes_{i=1}^n Q_i(dz_i|x_i), \quad \forall x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathcal{X},$$

for some marginal kernels $Q_i \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_i)$. Clearly, a non-interactive mechanism Q satisfies (1.3) if, and only if, for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, $Q_i \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha$. In that case it is also called α -non-interactive.

2. Two simple illustrative examples. We begin our exposition by considering two very basic statistical models and investigate the possibility of efficient parameter estimation in these special cases in order to highlight some of the obstacles a general theory of efficiency has to overcome.

2.1. Bernoulli data. Perhaps one of the most basic models of statistics is the simple Bernoulli experiment with unknown success probability $\theta \in \Theta = (0, 1)$ and (marginal) sample space $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}$, that is, $p_\theta(x) = \theta^x(1 - \theta)^{1-x}$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$. The model $\mathcal{P} = (p_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ is regular in the sense of differentiability in quadratic mean (see Definition 1 below) with score s_θ and has Fisher-Information $I_\theta(\mathcal{P}) = [\theta(1 - \theta)]^{-1}$. For arbitrary $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X})$, the model $Q\mathcal{P}$ of the sanitized data Z is also regular with Fisher-Information denoted by $I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P})$ (cf. Lemma 3.1 below). We now show that the α -private channel $Q_0 \in \mathfrak{P}(\{0, 1\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\})$ defined by its matrix representation

$$Q_0 \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} e^\alpha & 1 \\ 1 & e^\alpha \end{pmatrix} \frac{1}{e^\alpha + 1},$$

that is, $Q_0(0|0) = \frac{e^\alpha}{e^\alpha + 1} = Q_0(1|1)$, maximizes the Fisher-Information $Q \mapsto I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P})$ over all of \mathcal{Q}_α and for every $\theta \in (0, 1)$. The channel Q_0 actually coincides with Warner's original randomized response mechanism (Warner, 1965). The following argument is inspired by Kairouz, Oh and Viswanath (2016, Theorem 18).

Fix a mechanism $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X})$. For $\nu(dz) := Q(dz|0)$, choose ν -densities $q(z|0)$ and $q(z|1)$ of $Q(dz|0)$ and $Q(dz|1)$, respectively. In particular, $q(z|0) = 1$. Consider the formal matrix inverse of the randomized response mechanism Q_0 , i.e.,

$$Q_0^{-1} \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} e^\alpha & -1 \\ -1 & e^\alpha \end{pmatrix} \frac{1}{e^\alpha - 1}.$$

Even though Q_0^{-1} does not define a Markov kernel (as it contains negative values), we can still study the composition $\bar{Q} := QQ_0^{-1}$, which we define by its ν -densities $\bar{q}(z|x) := \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}} q(z|y)Q_0^{-1}(y|x) = \frac{1}{e^\alpha - 1} [q(z|x)e^\alpha - q(z|1 - x)]$. Thus, $\bar{Q}(A|x) = \frac{1}{e^\alpha - 1} [Q(A|x)e^\alpha - Q(A|1 - x)] \geq 0$, $\bar{Q}(\mathcal{Z}|x) = 1$ and $A \mapsto \bar{Q}(A|x)$ is σ -additive, i.e., \bar{Q} is a Markov kernel. Lemma 3.1 yields that both $Q_0\mathcal{P}$ and $Q\mathcal{P}$ are regular with score r_θ and t_θ , say. By construction $QQ_0 = Q$, which means that $(Z, X) \sim Q(dz|x)P_\theta(dx)$ is the (Z, X) -marginal distribution of $(Z, Y, X) \sim \bar{Q}(dz|y)Q_0(dy|x)P_\theta(dx)$. Moreover, X and Z are conditionally independent given Y . Thus, in view of Lemma 3.1,

$$\begin{aligned} I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P}) &= \text{Var}(t_\theta(Z)) = \text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[s_\theta(X)|Z]) = \text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[s_\theta(X)|Y, Z]|Z]) \\ &= \text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[s_\theta(X)|Y]|Z]) = \text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[r_\theta(Y)|Z]) \\ &= \text{Var}(r_\theta(Y)) - \mathbb{E}[\text{Var}(r_\theta(Y)|Z)] \leq \text{Var}(r_\theta(Y)) = I_\theta(Q_0\mathcal{P}). \end{aligned}$$

Since Q was arbitrary, optimality of Q_0 is established.

It is easy to see that

$$I_\theta(Q_0\mathcal{P}) = \left[\frac{e^\alpha}{(e^\alpha - 1)^2} + \theta(1 - \theta) \right]^{-1}.$$

Moreover, if Z_1, \dots, Z_n are i.i.d. from $Q_0 P_\theta$ (note that such a sample can be generated in an α -non-interactive way by letting all n individuals use the same Q_0 independently to generate $Z_i \sim Q_0(dz|x = X_i)$), then the estimator

$$\hat{\theta}_{\text{priv}} := \frac{e^\alpha + 1}{e^\alpha - 1} \left(\bar{Z}_n - \frac{1}{e^\alpha + 1} \right),$$

is UMVUE among all non-interactive α -private procedures, reaching the (minimal) Cramér-Rao lower bound of $I_\theta(Q_0 \mathcal{P})^{-1}$, which is the smallest lower bound we can hope for in view of our choice Q_0 . Thus, in the simple Bernoulli model, efficient estimation is possible even in finite samples.

2.2. Binomial $(2, \theta)$ data. Suppose now that the model $\mathcal{P} = (p_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ is only slightly more complicated than above and defined by $p_\theta(x) = \binom{2}{x} \theta^x (1-\theta)^{2-x}$, for $x \in \mathcal{X} = \{0, 1, 2\}$ and $\theta \in \Theta = (0, 1)$. By analogy with the Bernoulli model, an intuitively appealing candidate for the optimal α -private channel distribution in this case is

$$Q_0 \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} e^\alpha & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & e^\alpha & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & e^\alpha \end{pmatrix} \frac{1}{e^\alpha + 2}.$$

However, at least for certain values of the parameter θ , this can be improved. In fact, [Hucke \(2019\)](#) showed (using results from [Kairouz, Oh and Viswanath, 2016](#)) that the following mechanism maximizes $Q \mapsto I_\theta(Q \mathcal{P})$ over all α -private channels with finite state space \mathcal{Z} :

$$(2.1) \quad Q_\theta^* = \begin{cases} \begin{pmatrix} e^\alpha & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & e^\alpha & e^\alpha \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \frac{1}{e^\alpha + 1}, & \text{if } 0 < \theta \leq \frac{1}{2} - c_\alpha, \\ \begin{pmatrix} e^\alpha & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & e^\alpha & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & e^\alpha \end{pmatrix} \frac{1}{e^\alpha + 2}, & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} - c_\alpha < \theta < \frac{1}{2} + c_\alpha, \\ \begin{pmatrix} e^\alpha & e^\alpha & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & e^\alpha \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \frac{1}{e^\alpha + 1}, & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} + c_\alpha \leq \theta < 1, \end{cases}$$

for a constant $c_\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$ that satisfies $c_\alpha = 0$ if, and only if, $\alpha \leq \log(3)$. In view of Lemmas 4.7 and 4.8 to come, the channel Q_θ^* is even optimal among all α -private mechanisms in $\mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X})$. [Hucke \(2019\)](#) also showed that if $\alpha < \log(3)$, then $I_\theta(Q_0 \mathcal{P}) < I_\theta(Q_\theta^* \mathcal{P})$, for all $\theta \in (0, 1)$, showing that in the high privacy regime the intuitive choice Q_0 is suboptimal at every point of the parameter space. Furthermore, whatever the value of $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$, there can not be another channel $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X})$ that is independent of θ and satisfies $I_\theta(Q \mathcal{P}) = I_\theta(Q_\theta^* \mathcal{P})$, for all $\theta \in (0, 1)$. To see this last claim, we first note that [Hucke \(2019\)](#) also established that $\theta \mapsto I_\theta(Q_\theta^* \mathcal{P})$ is not differentiable at $\frac{1}{2} - c_\alpha$ and $\frac{1}{2} + c_\alpha$. However, Lemma C.1 in the appendix shows that $\theta \mapsto I_\theta(Q \mathcal{P})$ is differentiable on $(0, 1)$ for every channel $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X})$.

This analysis leads to two conclusions. First, somewhat surprisingly, it can be beneficial to consider channels with smaller output/state space \mathcal{Z} than input/sample space \mathcal{X} , at least in some parts of the parameter space, as is the case in (2.1), where for θ close to zero and one, Q_θ^* has an entire row containing only zeros. Second, no non-interactive α -differentially private mechanism with identical marginals can be optimal for estimation over the entire parameter space. The optimal (marginal) choice Q_θ^* necessarily depends on the unknown parameter θ

and any a priori choice $Q_{\theta_0}^*$ will be suboptimal for certain other parameters $\theta \neq \theta_0$. The last observation naturally leads to the idea of a data dependent choice of channel

$$Q_{\tilde{\theta}_{n_1}}^*$$

based on some preliminary α -private estimator $\tilde{\theta}_{n_1}$ from sanitized data Z_1, \dots, Z_{n_1} . Thus, the randomization mechanism used by the second group $i = n_1 + 1, \dots, n$ of the data owners must depend on sanitized data from the first group of data providers. In other words, if we want to (asymptotically) reach the minimal variance $I_\theta(Q_\theta^*)^{-1}$, we have to consider sequentially interactive mechanisms.

Notice, however, that turning to sequentially interactive procedures, we have left the class of statistical procedures within which we were trying to find an optimal one. In this section so far we had only considered iid models for data vectors $X = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ of the form $\mathcal{P}^n = (P_\theta^n)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ and marginal mechanisms $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha$ that can be used by each data owner independently. Hence, we only considered non-interactive channels with identical marginals $Q^{(n)} = \otimes_{i=1}^n Q_i$, $Q_i = Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha$. Therefore, the model of the sanitized observations $Z = (Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$ was again an iid model $Q^{(n)}\mathcal{P}^n = (Q^{(n)}P_\theta^n)_{\theta \in \Theta} = ([QP_\theta]^n)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ and the joint Fisher-Information is simply $I_\theta(Q^{(n)}\mathcal{P}^n) = nI_\theta(Q\mathcal{P})$. So the question arises if it may be possible to carefully pick an α -sequentially-interactive channel $Q^{(n)}$ such that $\frac{1}{n}I_\theta(Q^{(n)}\mathcal{P}^n) > \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha} I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P})$. However, if the original data model is of the iid form \mathcal{P}^n , this hope is not justified, because one easily shows that

$$\frac{1}{n}I_\theta(Q^{(n)}\mathcal{P}^n) \leq \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha} I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P}).$$

Nevertheless, in what follows, we develop all our lower bound results for the larger class of α -sequentially-interactive channels, since our efficient estimation procedure will also be of this type. We find that, indeed, the optimal asymptotic variance among all α -sequentially-interactive procedures is given by

$$\left[\sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha} I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P}) \right]^{-1}.$$

3. Asymptotic lower bounds for estimation in locally private models. In this section we show that the sequence of experiments $\mathcal{E}_n = (\mathcal{Z}^{(n)}, \mathcal{G}^{(n)}, Q^{(n)}\mathcal{P}^n)$, $n \geq 1$, is locally asymptotically mixed normal (LAMN, cf. [Jeganathan, 1980, 1982](#)), provided only that $Q^{(n)}$ is α -sequentially-interactive and \mathcal{P} is differentiable in quadratic mean (DQM). To be precise, we show a little bit less than that, namely, that every subsequence n' has a further subsequence n'' along which $\mathcal{E}_{n''}$ is LAMN. This result will be sufficient to connect to the existing literature on convolution and local asymptotic minimax theorems for LAMN experiments. In the next subsection we begin by studying regularity properties of the marginal models \mathcal{P} and $Q\mathcal{P}$, for $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha$. In Subsection 3.2 we then present our LAMN result and discuss its implications in Subsection 3.3.

3.1. Regularity of locally private models. Consider a statistical model $\mathcal{P} = (P_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ on the sample space $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ with parameter space $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$. In the iid setting we consider here, the final data generating model will then simply be the n -fold product $\mathcal{P}^n = (P_\theta^n)_{\theta \in \Theta}$, and a common way to define regularity of such a model and study issues of asymptotic efficiency is by means of differentiability in quadratic mean (DQM). We recall the following classical definition.

DEFINITION 1 (Differentiability in Quadratic Mean). A model $\mathcal{P} = (P_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ with $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$, sample space $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ and $(\sigma$ -finite) dominating measure μ is called differentiable in quadratic mean (DQM) at the point $\theta \in \Theta$, if θ is an interior point of Θ and the μ -densities $p_\theta = \frac{dP_\theta}{d\mu}$ satisfy

$$\Psi_\theta(h) := \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(\sqrt{p_{\theta+h}(x)} - \sqrt{p_\theta(x)} - \frac{1}{2} h^T s_\theta(x) \sqrt{p_\theta(x)} \right)^2 \mu(dx) = o(\|h\|^2)$$

as $h \rightarrow 0$, for some measurable vector valued function $s_\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$. The function s_θ is called the score at θ .

We say that a model is DQM or simply *regular*, if it is DQM at every point $\theta \in \Theta$. For convenience we sometimes write dx instead of $\mu(dx)$. We also recall that if the model is DQM at θ , then the score satisfies $\mathbb{E}_\theta[s_\theta] = 0$ and the Fisher information matrix $I_\theta := \mathbb{E}_\theta[s_\theta s_\theta^T] \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ exists and is finite (see [van der Vaart, 2007](#), Theorem 7.2). The cited theorem also implies that the sequence of resulting product experiments $\mathcal{E}_n = (\mathcal{X}^n, \mathcal{F}^n, \mathcal{P}^n)$ is locally asymptotically normal (LAN). It is known ([Bickel et al., 1993](#), Proposition A.5) that if $\mathcal{P} = (P_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ is DQM and $T : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ is measurable, then $T\mathcal{P} = (P_\theta T^{-1})_{\theta \in \Theta}$, that is, the model of the transformed data $T(X)$, is also DQM with score $t_\theta(z) = \mathbb{E}[s_\theta(X) | Z = z]$, where $(X, Z) \sim (X, T(X))$ under P_θ . In the differential privacy setting we need to consider randomized functions T , or equivalently, Markov kernels. The following lemma provides the necessary extension. It is a simple consequence of a more refined result that we deferred to [Appendix A](#).

LEMMA 3.1. Fix $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$. Suppose the model $\mathcal{P} = (P_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ is DQM at $\theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$, with score function s_θ , and $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z})$ is a privacy mechanism dominated by a σ -finite measure ν on $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{G})$.¹ Then the model $Q\mathcal{P} = (QP_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ is also DQM at θ (for the dominating measure ν) with score function

$$t_\theta(z) := \mathbb{E}[s_\theta(X) | Z = z],$$

i.e., a regular conditional expectation of $s_\theta(X)$ given $Z = z$, where the joint distribution of X and Z is determined by $X \sim P_\theta$ and $(Z | X = x) \sim Q(dz|x)$. Furthermore, a version of the score can be chosen such that $\sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \|t_\theta(z)\| \leq e^{2\alpha} \sqrt{\text{trace } I_\theta(\mathcal{P})}$ and the Fisher-Information matrix $I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P})$ in the model $Q\mathcal{P}$ satisfies

$$I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P}) = \text{Var}[\mathbb{E}[s_\theta(X) | Z]] = I_\theta(\mathcal{P}) - \mathbb{E}[(s_\theta(X) - t_\theta(Z))(s_\theta(X) - t_\theta(Z))^T].$$

PROOF. The first assertion follows immediately from [Lemma A.1](#). The second claim follows from the representation of the score in [Lemma A.1](#) and the third claim is an immediate consequence of the variance decomposition formula $I_\theta(\mathcal{P}) = \text{Var}[s_\theta(X)] = \text{Var}[\mathbb{E}[s_\theta(X) | Z]] + \mathbb{E}[\text{Var}[s_\theta(X) | Z]]$. \square

3.2. LAMN along subsequences and asymptotic lower bounds. Recall from the discussion at the end of [Section 2](#) that we need to work with sequentially interactive mechanisms $Q^{(n)}$ in order to have any hope of achieving the asymptotic variance $[\sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha} I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P})]^{-1}$. This, however, requires us to consider dependent and possibly non-identically distributed sanitized observations Z_1, \dots, Z_n . The corresponding model $Q^{(n)}\mathcal{P}^n$ will therefore typically

¹This means that $Q(dz|x) \ll \nu(dz)$, $\forall x \in \mathcal{X}$. Recall that such a dominating (probability) measure always exists by α -differential privacy of Q , but it may be sometimes more convenient to consider a specific σ -finite dominating measure instead.

no longer be LAN. The necessary generalization is given by the notion of local asymptotic mixed normality (LAMN, cf. [Jeganathan, 1980, 1982](#)). For a given parameter space $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$, let $\mathcal{E}_n = (\Omega_n, \mathcal{A}_n, \{R_{n,\theta} : \theta \in \Theta\})$, $n \geq 1$, be a sequence of statistical experiments, that is, $R_{n,\theta}$ is a probability measure on the measurable space $(\Omega_n, \mathcal{A}_n)$. For $\theta, \theta_0 \in \Theta$, define the associated log-likelihood ratio $\Lambda_n(\theta, \theta_0) := \log \frac{dR_{n,\theta}}{dR_{n,\theta_0}}$, where $\frac{dR_{n,\theta}}{dR_{n,\theta_0}}$ is the Radon-Nikodym derivative of the absolutely continuous part of $R_{n,\theta}$ with respect to R_{n,θ_0} and set $\Lambda_n(\theta, \theta_0) := \Lambda_n(\theta_0, \theta) = 0$ if $\theta \notin \Theta$.

DEFINITION 2 (Local Asymptotic Mixed Normality). *Fix a parameter space $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ and a sequence $(\delta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of positive definite $p \times p$ matrices with $\|\delta_n\| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We say the sequence of statistical experiments $\mathcal{E}_n = (\Omega_n, \mathcal{A}_n, \{R_{n,\theta} : \theta \in \Theta\})$ satisfies the LAMN condition at $\theta \in \Theta$, if θ is an interior point of Θ and the following two conditions hold:*

1. *There exists a sequence $(\Delta_{n,\theta})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of random vectors $\Delta_{n,\theta} : \Omega_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ and a sequence $(\Sigma_{n,\theta})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of random nonnegative-definite matrices $\Sigma_{n,\theta} : \Omega_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$, such that*

$$\Lambda_n(\theta + \delta_n h, \theta) - \left(h^T \Delta_{n,\theta} - \frac{1}{2} h^T \Sigma_{n,\theta} h \right)$$

converges to zero in $R_{n,\theta}$ probability for every $h \in \mathbb{R}^p$.

2. *We have*

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Delta_{n,\theta} \\ \Sigma_{n,\theta} \end{pmatrix} \overset{R_{n,\theta}}{\rightsquigarrow} \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_\theta^{1/2} \Delta \\ \Sigma_\theta \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\Delta \sim N(0, J_p)$ is independent of Σ_θ .

If the limiting matrix Σ_θ in the above definition is non-random, the LAMN property reduces to the more classical notion of local asymptotic normality (LAN). It is a classical result (cf. [van der Vaart, 2007](#), Theorem 7.2) that if the model $\mathcal{P} = (P_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ on sample space \mathcal{X} is DQM at $\theta \in \Theta$, then the sequence of experiments $\mathcal{E}_n = (\mathcal{X}^n, \mathcal{F}^n, \{P_\theta^n : \theta \in \Theta\})$ is LAN at θ with $\delta_n = J_p / \sqrt{n}$ and Σ_θ equal to the Fisher-Information matrix $I_\theta(\mathcal{P})$, which is non-random. An immediate consequence is the following simple contiguity result that holds for any sequence $Q^{(n)}$ of Markov kernels from $(\mathcal{X}^n, \mathcal{F}^n)$ to $(\mathcal{Z}^n, \mathcal{G}^n)$.

LEMMA 3.2. *Consider a model \mathcal{P} on sample space $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ that is DQM at $\theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$. Fix $h \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and an arbitrary Markov kernel $Q^{(n)}$ from $(\mathcal{X}^n, \mathcal{F}^n)$ to $(\mathcal{Z}^n, \mathcal{G}^n)$. Then $R_{n,\theta} = Q^{(n)} P_\theta^n$ and $R_{n,\theta+h/\sqrt{n}} = Q^{(n)} P_{\theta+h/\sqrt{n}}^n$ are mutually contiguous.*

PROOF. Write $\theta_n := \theta + h/\sqrt{n}$. The LAN property of \mathcal{P} implies $P_{\theta_n}^n \triangleleft\triangleright P_\theta^n$ ([van der Vaart, 2007](#), Example 6.5). Now fix a sequence of events $A_n \in \mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ such that $R_{n,\theta}(A_n) \rightarrow 0$, i.e., for $T_n(x) := Q^{(n)}(A_n|x) \in [0, 1]$, we have $\mathbb{E}_{P_\theta^n}[T_n] = R_{n,\theta}(A_n) \rightarrow 0$, or, equivalently, $T_n \rightarrow 0$ in P_θ^n -probability. But by contiguity we get $T_n \rightarrow 0$ in $P_{\theta_n}^n$ -probability, which implies $R_{n,\theta_n}(A_n) = \mathbb{E}_{P_{\theta_n}^n}[T_n] \rightarrow 0$. Reversing the roles of θ and θ_n finishes the proof. \square

Now, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, consider an α -sequentially-interactive privacy mechanism $Q^{(n)}$ from \mathcal{X}^n to $(\mathcal{Z}^{(n)}, \mathcal{G}^{(n)})$, and a (marginal) model $\mathcal{P} = (P_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ on \mathcal{X} . The statistical experiment generating the sanitized observations is therefore given by $\mathcal{E}_n = (\mathcal{Z}^{(n)}, \mathcal{G}^{(n)}, \{Q^{(n)} P_\theta^n : \theta \in \Theta\})$. The following theorem shows that this sequence of experiments possesses the LAMN property, provided that the underlying data generating model \mathcal{P} is DQM and an appropriate sequence of nonnegative-definite matrices $\Sigma_{n,\theta}$ has a stochastic (weak) limit Σ_θ .

THEOREM 3.3. Fix $\alpha > 0$ and for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $Q^{(n)}$ be α -sequentially-interactive (1.6) from $(\mathcal{X}^n, \mathcal{F}^n)$ to $(\mathcal{Z}^{(n)}, \mathcal{G}^{(n)})$. Suppose the model $\mathcal{P} = (P_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ on sample space $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ is DQM at $\theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$. Define

$$\Sigma_{n,\theta}(z_{1:n-1}) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I_\theta(Q_{z_{1:i-1}} \mathcal{P}), \quad z_{1:n-1} = (z_1, \dots, z_{n-1}) \in \mathcal{Z}^{(n-1)},$$

and suppose that $\Sigma_{n,\theta} \overset{Q^{(n)} P_\theta^n}{\rightsquigarrow} \Sigma_\theta$ for some random symmetric $p \times p$ matrix Σ_θ . If $I_\theta(\mathcal{P}) \neq 0$, then the sequence $\mathcal{E}_n = (\mathcal{Z}^{(n)}, \mathcal{G}^{(n)}, \{Q^{(n)} P_\theta^n : \theta \in \Theta\})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is LAMN at θ with $\delta_n = J_p / \sqrt{n}$, $\Sigma_{n,\theta}$ as defined above and

$$\Delta_{n,\theta}(z_{1:n}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{n,\theta}[s_\theta(X_i) | Z_{1:i} = z_{1:i}],$$

where s_θ is the score in the model \mathcal{P} .

The regularity assumptions of Theorem 3.3 are natural. The only condition that might bother us at first sight is the weak convergence of $\Sigma_{n,\theta}$. It is clearly a necessary condition for LAMN and it may indeed fail if we choose a very erratic sequence $Q^{(n)}$ (cf. Example 3.5 at the end of this subsection). Notice, however, that in view of $0 \preceq I_\theta(Q_{z_{1:i-1}} \mathcal{P}) \preceq I_\theta(\mathcal{P})$ (cf. Lemma 3.1), we see that $(\Sigma_{n,\theta})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded and hence tight. Thus, by Prokhorov's theorem, for every subsequence n' there is a further subsequence n'' such that $\Sigma_{n'',\theta}$ is weakly convergent and Theorem 3.3 yields that $(\mathcal{E}_{n''})_{n'' \in \mathbb{N}}$ is LAMN at θ . We will show next that this LAMN property along subsequences is all we need to derive asymptotic lower bound results.

REMARK 3.4. To prove Theorem 3.3, one may use one of the several sets of sufficient conditions for the LAMN property that are available in the literature. Those in Jeganathan (1982), however, require even $\Sigma_{n,\theta} \rightarrow \Sigma_\theta$ in probability (on some extended probability space on which we can define Σ_θ). However, it is not clear if this stronger assumption can be satisfied (along subsequences) in the present setting of α -sequentially interactive privacy without restricting the class of possible privacy mechanisms. In contrast, Basawa and Scott (1983) require only weak convergence to establish the LAMN property, but they work with classical differentiability assumptions rather than with DQM. We therefore provide a slightly different argument, combining ideas from Jeganathan (1982) and Basawa and Scott (1983), that requires only weak convergence of $\Sigma_{n,\theta}$ and DQM of the original model; see Appendix A for the proof of Theorem 3.3.

EXAMPLE 3.5. Consider the Bernoulli model of Subsection 2.1, i.e., $\mathcal{P} = (p_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$, $p_\theta(x) = \theta^x (1 - \theta)^{1-x}$, $x \in \mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}$, $\theta \in \Theta = (0, 1)$. For a privacy parameter $\alpha > 0$, let $Q_{0,\alpha}$ be the optimal privacy mechanism from that subsection generating sanitized data in $\mathcal{Z} = \{0, 1\}$ and define the sequentially interactive mechanism from \mathcal{X}^n to \mathcal{Z}^n by $Q^{(n)}(dz|x) := Q_{z_1,n}(dz_n|x_n) Q_{z_1,n}(dz_{n-1}|x_{n-1}) \dots Q_{z_1,n}(dz_2|x_2) Q_{\emptyset,n}(dz_1|x_1)$, where $Q_{\emptyset,n}(dz_1|x_1) := \text{Bernoulli}(\frac{1}{3})$ if n is even and $Q_{\emptyset,n}(dz_1|x_1) = \text{Bernoulli}(\frac{2}{3})$ if n is odd, and $Q_{z_1,n}(dz_i|x_i) := Q_{0,\alpha}(dz_i|x_i)$, if $z_1 = 1$ and $Q_{z_1,n}(dz_i|x_i) := Q_{0,\alpha/2}(dz_i|x_i)$, if $z_1 = 0$, $i = 2, \dots, n$. Since the marginal channels $Q_{z_1,n}$ and $Q_{\emptyset,n}$ are elements of \mathcal{Q}_α , we see that $Q^{(n)}$ is α -differentially private. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{n,\theta}(z) &= \frac{1}{n} ((n-1)I_\theta(Q_{z_1,n} \mathcal{P}) + I_\theta(Q_{\emptyset,n} \mathcal{P})) \\ &= \frac{n-1}{n} [z_1 I_\theta(Q_{0,\alpha} \mathcal{P}) + (1-z_1) I_\theta(Q_{0,\alpha/2} \mathcal{P})], \end{aligned}$$

but the distribution of Z_1 is either Bernoulli($\frac{1}{3}$) or Bernoulli($\frac{2}{3}$), depending on whether n is even or odd, and hence it does not settle down at any fixed distribution for $n \rightarrow \infty$.

3.3. A private convolution theorem.

THEOREM 3.6. *Fix $\alpha > 0$ and for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $Q^{(n)}$ be α -sequentially-interactive (1.6) from $(\mathcal{X}^n, \mathcal{F}^n)$ to $(\mathcal{Z}^{(n)}, \mathcal{G}^{(n)})$. Suppose the model $\mathcal{P} = (P_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ on sample space $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ is DQM at $\theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ and let $\Sigma_{n,\theta}$ be defined as in Theorem 3.3. Define $R_{n,\theta} := Q^{(n)}P_\theta^n$ and suppose that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $R_{n,\theta}(\Sigma_{n,\theta} \text{ is positive definite}) = 1$ and every weak accumulation point Σ_θ of $(\Sigma_{n,\theta})_n$ under $R_{n,\theta}$ is almost surely positive definite. Let $\hat{\theta}_n : \mathcal{Z}^{(n)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an estimator sequence and D_θ a random p -vector, such that*

$$(3.1) \quad \sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\theta} - [\theta + h/\sqrt{n}] \right) \stackrel{R_{n,\theta+h/\sqrt{n}}}{\rightsquigarrow} D_\theta, \quad \forall h \in \mathbb{R}^p.$$

Then the limiting distribution D_θ admits the representation

$$P(D_\theta \in A) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{p \times p}} [N(0, \sigma^{-1}) \star L_{\Sigma_\theta}(\sigma)](A) P_{\Sigma_\theta}(d\sigma), \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^p),$$

where P_{Σ_θ} is the distribution of any weak accumulation point Σ_θ , $\{L_{\Sigma_\theta}(\sigma) : \sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}\}$, is a family of probability distributions on \mathbb{R}^p possibly depending on P_{Σ_θ} and \star denotes convolution.

PROOF. Fix $h \in \mathbb{R}$. Notice that any subsequence of

$$D_n := D_{n,\theta+h/\sqrt{n}} := \sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\theta} - [\theta + h/\sqrt{n}] \right)$$

under $R_{n,\theta+h/\sqrt{n}}$ has limiting distribution equal to D_θ . By boundedness of $\Sigma_n := \Sigma_{n,\theta}$, the sequence $(\Sigma_n)_n$ is tight under $R_{n,\theta+h/\sqrt{n}}$. Since marginal tightness implies joint tightness, also $(\Sigma_n, D_n)_n$ is tight under $R_{n,\theta+h/\sqrt{n}}$. Thus,

$$(\Sigma_{n'}, D_{n'}) \stackrel{R_{n',\theta+h/\sqrt{n'}}}{\rightsquigarrow} (\Sigma_\theta, D_\theta),$$

along a subsequence (n') . This verifies the regularity condition 7.8(b) of Höpfner (2014). By contiguity (cf. Lemma 3.2) we also have

$$\Sigma_{n'} \stackrel{R_{n',\theta}}{\rightsquigarrow} \Sigma_\theta.$$

Because $\Sigma_{n,\theta} \preceq I_\theta(\mathcal{P})$ and the lower bound is positive definite (a.s.), we have $I_\theta(\mathcal{P}) \neq 0$ and Theorem 3.3 shows that $\mathcal{E}_{n'} = (\mathcal{Z}^{(n')}, \mathcal{G}^{(n')}, \{Q^{(n')}P_\theta^{n'} : \theta \in \Theta\})$, $n' \in \mathbb{N}$, is LAMN at θ . In view of the positive definiteness assumptions our definition of LAMN coincides with the one of Höpfner (2014). The proof is now finished by an application of Theorem 7.10(b) of Höpfner (2014). \square

Now consider the case $p = 1$. Notice that since $\Sigma_{n,\theta} \leq \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha} I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P})$ we must have $P(\Sigma_\theta \leq \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha} I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P})) = 1$, for every weak accumulation point Σ_θ , and thus the most concentrated limiting distribution in the sense of Anderson's Lemma (see, e.g., Corollary 5.7 in Höpfner, 2014) is

$$N \left(0, \left[\sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha} I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P}) \right]^{-1} \right).$$

Hence, a regular estimator, in the sense of (3.1), achieving this limiting distribution is called efficient. In Section 4 (see especially Theorem 4.11) to come we exhibit such an α -sequentially interactive estimation procedure.

In a similar way, one can derive an almost sure version of the convolution theorem, holding for Lebesgue–almost all $\theta \in \Theta$ and avoiding the regularity assumption (3.1). Moreover, one can derive a local asymptotic minimax theorem. See Theorem 2 of Jeganathan (1981) and Theorem 7.12 of Höpfner (2014) for the corresponding classical results requiring only the LAMN property.

REMARK 3.7. Notice that we consider the case $p = 1$ only in order for the maximization of Fisher-Information

$$\sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha} I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P}),$$

or the equivalent minimization of asymptotic variance

$$\inf_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha} [I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P})]^{-1} = \left[\sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha} I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P}) \right]^{-1},$$

to be well defined. In case of general $p \in \mathbb{N}$, it would be desirable to minimize $Q \mapsto [I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P})]^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ in the partial Loewner ordering. However, we currently don't know if there even exists such a minimal element. Of course, one can always fix a functional of interest $\eta : \mathbb{R}^{p \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such as the determinant or the trace, and try to solve

$$\inf_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha} \eta \left([I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P})]^{-1} \right).$$

We will consider this and other extensions elsewhere.

4. Efficiency of the private two-step MLE. Finally, at least in the single parameter case $p = 1$, we develop an α -sequentially interactive procedure that is regular and achieves the asymptotically optimal variance obtained in Subsection 3.3, i.e., we present an efficient differentially private estimation procedure. As explained in the introductory example Section 2, we rely on a two-step sample splitting procedure where the first (much smaller) part of the data is used in a differentially private way to consistently estimate (not necessarily at \sqrt{n} -rate) the unknown parameter $\theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. Based on this preliminary estimate, the second (larger) part of the data is then used to construct an α -private MLE that has minimal asymptotic variance.

4.1. *Consistent non-interactive α -private estimation.* An important part of our efficient two-step procedure is a consistent and private preliminary estimator. We now present two different ways for how to obtain such consistent α -private estimators. Throughout, we consider a parametric model $\mathcal{P} = (P_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$, with parameter space $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ and sample space $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$, that is dominated by μ with corresponding densities p_θ .

4.1.1. *Maximum Likelihood.* Fix a (marginal) channel $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X})$, pick $\nu(dz) := Q(dz|x_0)$ and $q(z|x)$ as in Lemma C.2 (with $n = 1$ and $\mu_1 = \mu$) and write $q_\theta(z) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} q(z|x)p_\theta(x)\mu(dx)$ for ν -densities of the model $Q\mathcal{P}$. In particular, we have $q_\theta(z) \in [e^{-\alpha}, e^\alpha]$. The log-likelihood of the observed (non-interactively) sanitized data is given by

$$\theta \mapsto \ell_n(\theta) := \ell_n(\theta; z_1, \dots, z_n) := \sum_{i=1}^n \log q_\theta(z_i),$$

and we define the corresponding non-interactive α -private MLE $\hat{\theta}_n$ to be a measurable maximizer. For ease of reference, we first recall Wald's classical consistency result as presented in [van der Vaart \(2007, Theorem 5.14\)](#).

THEOREM 4.1. *Fix $\theta_0 \in \Theta$. Let $\theta \mapsto \log p_\theta(x)$ be upper-semicontinuous on Θ for P_{θ_0} almost all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and suppose that for every sufficiently small interval $U \subseteq \Theta$ the function $x \mapsto \sup_{\theta \in U} \log p_\theta(x)$ is measurable and satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta_0} \left[\sup_{\theta \in U} \log p_\theta \right] < \infty.$$

If $\theta \mapsto \mathbb{E}_{\theta_0}[\log p_\theta]$ has a unique maximizer at θ_0 , then any estimator $\hat{\theta}_n$ that maximizes the log-likelihood $\theta \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^n \log p_\theta(x_i)$ satisfies

$$P_{\theta_0}^n(|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0| > \varepsilon \wedge \hat{\theta}_n \in K) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and every compact set $K \subseteq \Theta$.

This can be translated into the following α -private version.

THEOREM 4.2. *If \mathcal{P} is DQM at every $\theta \in \Theta$ (in particular, Θ is open) and the channel $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X})$ is such that the model QP is identifiable, then a non-interactive α -private MLE satisfies*

$$(QP_{\theta_0})^n(|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0| > \varepsilon \wedge \hat{\theta}_n \in K) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

for every $\theta_0 \in \Theta$, every $\varepsilon > 0$ and every compact set $K \subseteq \Theta$.

PROOF. We check the assumptions of [Theorem 4.1](#) with q_θ instead of p_θ . We can even establish continuity of $\theta \mapsto \log q_\theta(z)$ for every $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, by using the DQM property to get

$$\begin{aligned} & |q_{\theta+h}(z) - q_\theta(z)| \\ &= \left| \int_{\mathcal{X}} q(z|x) \left[\sqrt{p_{\theta+h}(x)} - \sqrt{p_\theta(x)} \right] \left[\sqrt{p_{\theta+h}(x)} + \sqrt{p_\theta(x)} \right] \mu(dx) \right| \\ &\leq e^\alpha 2 \sqrt{\int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(\sqrt{p_{\theta+h}(x)} - \sqrt{p_\theta(x)} \right)^2 \mu(dx)} \xrightarrow{h \rightarrow 0} 0. \end{aligned}$$

This also implies that $z \mapsto \sup_{\theta \in U} \log q_\theta(z)$ is measurable for any interval $U \subseteq \Theta$, because the supremum can be replaced by a countable one. QP_{θ_0} -integrability of the supremum is now trivial, in view of $\log q_\theta(z) \in [-\alpha, \alpha]$. Uniqueness of the maximizer of $\theta \mapsto \mathbb{E}_{QP_{\theta_0}}[\log q_\theta]$ follows, for example, from [van der Vaart \(2007, Lemma 5.35\)](#). \square

4.1.2. Method of moments. Consider first the case where the original data X_1, \dots, X_n are observed. If, for some measurable function $g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow G$ (often a power function $g(x) = (x, x^2, \dots, x^k)$ with range $G = \{g(x) : x \in \mathcal{X}\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$, the function $f : \Theta \rightarrow G$, $f(\theta) := \mathbb{E}_\theta[g]$ has a continuous inverse $f^{-1} : G \rightarrow \Theta$, then the moment estimator $\hat{\theta}_n := f^{-1}(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i))$ is consistent. We can turn this into a non-interactive α -private procedure by considering the truncation operation $\Pi_\tau(y) := y \mathbb{1}_{\{\|y\|_1 \leq \tau\}}$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^k$.

THEOREM 4.3. *Suppose that there exists a measurable function $g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow G$ with range $G \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$, such that the function $f : \Theta \rightarrow G$, $f(\theta) := \mathbb{E}_\theta[g]$ has a continuous inverse $f^{-1} : G \rightarrow \Theta$. Generate $Z_i := \Pi_{\tau_n}[g(X_i)] + \frac{2\tau_n}{\alpha} W_i$, for independent random k -vectors W_i with iid standard Laplace components $W_{ij} \sim \text{Lap}(1)$. If $\tau_n \rightarrow \infty$ and $\tau_n^2/n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then the estimator*

$$\hat{\theta}_n = f^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \right)$$

is non-interactive α -private and consistent.

PROOF. For α -privacy, simply notice that a conditional Lebesgue density of Z_i given X_i is given by $q(z|x) = \frac{\alpha}{4\tau_n} \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha}{2\tau_n} \|z - \Pi_{\tau_n}(x)\|_1\right)$, which is easily seen to satisfy $q(z|x)/q(z|x') \leq e^\alpha$, using the reverse triangle inequality.

Now $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \Pi_{\tau_n}[g(X_i)] + \frac{2\tau_n}{\alpha} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_i$. The mean of the noise term $\frac{2\tau_n}{\alpha} \bar{W}_n$ is zero and its components have variance equal to $\frac{8\tau_n^2}{n\alpha^2}$, which converges to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For the X_i term note that $\Pi_{\tau_n}[g(X_i)] - g(X_i) = -g(X_i) \mathbb{1}_{\{\|g(X_i)\|_1 > \tau_n\}}$. Hence,

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\Pi_{\tau_n}[g(X_i)] - g(X_i) \right] \right\|_1 \leq \mathbb{E} \|g(X_1) \mathbb{1}_{\{\|g(X_1)\|_1 > \tau_n\}}\|_1 \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

by dominated convergence. Hence $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i) + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ converges in probability to $f(\theta)$ and the proof is finished by an application of the continuous mapping theorem. \square

4.2. Consistent estimation of the optimal privacy mechanism. Recall that in order to privately estimate $\theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ from i.i.d. $Z_1, \dots, Z_n \sim QP_\theta$, we would ideally like to choose $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X})$ such that $I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P}) \in \mathbb{R}$ is maximal. However, as we have seen in Section 2, a maximizer, if it exists, will typically depend on the unknown parameter θ . In the previous section we saw how θ can be consistently estimated in a locally differentially private way, given that a preliminary privacy mechanism $Q_0 \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha$ can be found such that the model $Q_0\mathcal{P}$ is identifiable. We will use such a consistent α -private estimator $\hat{\theta}_{n_1}$ to construct a sequence $\hat{Q}_{n_1} \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha$ such that $I_\theta(\hat{Q}_{n_1}\mathcal{P}) \rightarrow \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha} I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P})$ in $(Q_0P_\theta)^{n_1}$ -probability, as the size n_1 of the first part of the sample grows to infinity. An ad-hoc idea to obtain \hat{Q}_{n_1} would be to solve $\sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha} I_{\hat{\theta}_{n_1}}(Q\mathcal{P})$. However, direct optimization over the vast set \mathcal{Q}_α is numerically challenging. Instead, we go through several reduction and approximation steps.

For a given, sufficiently small error level $\varepsilon > 0$, we construct a discretization $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_\varepsilon = T_\varepsilon\mathcal{P}$ of the model \mathcal{P} , which has a finite sample space \mathcal{X}_ε (for an appropriate mapping $T_\varepsilon : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_\varepsilon$; see details below) and solve the optimization problem

$$(4.1) \quad \max_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X}_\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_\varepsilon)} I_{\hat{\theta}_{n_1}}(Q\bar{\mathcal{P}}_\varepsilon),$$

using the LP formulation of [Kairouz, Oh and Viswanath \(2016\)](#), to obtain $\hat{Q}_{n_1, \varepsilon} \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X}_\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_\varepsilon)$. We then show that

$$(4.2) \quad I_\theta(\hat{Q}_{n_1, \varepsilon_{n_1}} T_{\varepsilon_{n_1}} \mathcal{P}) \rightarrow \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X})} I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P}), \quad \text{in } (Q_0P_\theta)^{n_1}\text{-probability,}$$

as $n_1 \rightarrow \infty$, for any null sequence ε_{n_1} . Thus, given this channel $\hat{Q}_{n_1, \varepsilon_{n_1}}$ (constructed using sanitized data from a first group of individuals $i = 1, \dots, n_1$) and their private data $X_i = x_i$

that was generated by P_θ , the second group of data owners ($i = n_1 + 1, \dots, n$) can locally generate Z_i by first discretizing their data x_i to get $y_i = T_{\varepsilon_{n_1}}(x_i) \in \mathcal{X}_{\varepsilon_{n_1}}$ and then draw Z_i from $\hat{Q}_{n_1, \varepsilon_{n_1}}(dz_i | y_i)$ (cf. Figure 4.3). It is equivalent to using the local mechanism $[\hat{Q}_{n_1, \varepsilon_{n_1}} T_{\varepsilon_{n_1}}]$. That efficient estimation based on these Z_i is indeed possible will be established in the next section. In what follows we rigorously prove the consistency claim in (4.2).

For the approximation step $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_\varepsilon \approx \mathcal{P}$ we need to impose a few regularity conditions on \mathcal{P} . We aim only at existence of an appropriate $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_\varepsilon$ to keep the assumptions as general as possible. For practically relevant explicit constructions of $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_\varepsilon$ one may have to consider more specific modeling situations.

LEMMA 4.4. *Consider a model $\mathcal{P} = (P_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$, $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, on sample space $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ that is DQM at $\theta \in \Theta$ with score s_θ and a dominating measure μ that is finite on compact sets. Moreover, suppose that $x \mapsto p_\theta(x)$ and $x \mapsto s_\theta(x)p_\theta(x)$ from \mathcal{X} to \mathbb{R} are continuous. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $k = k_\varepsilon^{(\theta)} \in \mathbb{N}$ and a measurable partition B_0, B_1, \dots, B_k of \mathcal{X} , depending on θ , such that the following holds:*

Let $T_\varepsilon^{(\theta)} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_\varepsilon^{(\theta)} := [k] \cup \{0\}$ be defined by $T_\varepsilon^{(\theta)}(x) := j$, if, and only if, $x \in B_j$. For $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z})$ with ν -densities $q(z|x)$ as in Lemma C.2 (with $n = 1$ and $\mu_1 = \mu$), define the Markov kernel $Q_\varepsilon^{(\theta)} \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{X}_\varepsilon^{(\theta)} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z})$ by its ν -densities $q_\varepsilon(z|j) := \frac{1}{\mu(B_j)} \int_{B_j} q(z|x)\mu(dx)$, if $\mu(B_j) \in (0, \infty)$, and $q_\varepsilon(z|j) := 1$, else.

Then $Q_\varepsilon^{(\theta)} \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X}_\varepsilon^{(\theta)} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z})$ and $\left| I_\theta(Q_\varepsilon^{(\theta)} T_\varepsilon^{(\theta)} \mathcal{P}) - I_\theta(Q \mathcal{P}) \right| \leq (I_\theta(\mathcal{P}) \vee 1)\varepsilon$.

REMARK 4.5. Notice that for typical discrete sample spaces $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$, continuity of p_θ and $s_\theta p_\theta$ is trivially satisfied.

REMARK 4.6. Notice that by *local pre-processing* (Lemma C.4), the channel $Q_\varepsilon^{(\theta)} T_\varepsilon^{(\theta)}$ is actually α -private.

At first sight, one may think that Lemma 4.4 is already sufficient to reduce the infinite dimensional optimization problem

$$\sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X})} I_{\hat{\theta}_{n_1}}(Q \mathcal{P})$$

to the parametric problem (4.1). However, the channel Q_ε in that lemma still uses a generic (possibly infinite dimensional) output space \mathcal{Z} , rather than generating sanitized observations from the finite (!) input space \mathcal{X}_ε , like those in (4.1). Thus, we still have to show that it actually suffices to consider only α -private channels in $\mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X}_\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_\varepsilon)$. Fortunately, this is only a technical step which requires some work but no further assumptions. We begin with two definitions.

DEFINITION 3.

- a) *The class $\mathcal{Q}_\alpha^*(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X})$ consists of all $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X})$ which satisfy the following property: For every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist $\ell_m \in \mathbb{N}$, $x^{(m)} \in \mathcal{X}$ and a partition $C_1^{(m)}, \dots, C_{\ell_m}^{(m)} \in \mathcal{G}$ of \mathcal{Z} , with the property that*

$$(4.3) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\ell_m} \int_{C_j^{(m)}} \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left| q_m(z|x) - \frac{Q(C_j^{(m)}|x)}{Q(C_j^{(m)}|x^{(m)})} Q(dz|x^{(m)}) \right| \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

$Q(C_j^{(m)}|x^{(m)}) > 0$

where $q_m(\cdot|x)$ is a $Q(dz|x^{(m)})$ -density of $Q(dz|x)$ and $\ell_m \rightarrow \infty$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$.

- b) We write $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\alpha(\mathcal{X})$ for the set of all α -private channels Q from \mathcal{X} to some finite state space \mathcal{Z} , that is, $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\alpha(\mathcal{X}) = \bigcup_{\mathcal{Z}: |\mathcal{Z}| < \infty} \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z})$.

It is easy to see that we have $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{Q}_\alpha^*$. For $Q \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\alpha$ with finite state space $\mathcal{Z} = \{z_1, \dots, z_k\}$ and $m \geq k$ simply choose the partition $C_j^{(m)} = \{z_j\}$ if $j \leq k$ and $C_j^{(m)} = \emptyset$, else. Then the left hand side of (4.3) is exactly equal to zero. The next result shows that for the purpose of maximizing the Fisher Information it suffices to look for optimal channels within the smaller set $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\alpha$.

LEMMA 4.7. *Fix $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$ and suppose that the model $\mathcal{P} = (P_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ is DQM at $\theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. Then we have*

$$\sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha^*(\mathcal{X})} I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P}) = \sup_{Q \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\alpha(\mathcal{X})} I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P}).$$

If we consider a model on a finite sample space \mathcal{X} , such as, e.g., $T_\varepsilon^{(\theta)}\mathcal{P}$ of Lemma 4.4, then we can show that restricting to $\mathcal{Q}_\alpha^*(\mathcal{X})$ is actually no restriction at all.

LEMMA 4.8. *If $|\mathcal{X}| < \infty$, then $\mathcal{Q}_\alpha^*(\mathcal{X})$ of Definition 3.a contains all α -differentially private marginal channels, that is, $\mathcal{Q}_\alpha^*(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X})$.*

Taken together, Lemma 4.7 and Lemma 4.8 show that for a regular model \mathcal{P} on a finite sample space \mathcal{X} , searching over all α -private channels that produce sanitized output data on a finite set \mathcal{Z} is sufficient for maximizing $I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P})$ over all of $\mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X})$. A result by [Kairouz, Oh and Viswanath \(2016, Theorem 2\)](#) then shows that it is even enough to further restrict to channels that produce outputs from a set of size equal to the input space \mathcal{X} . Since the topological structure of \mathcal{Z} is completely irrelevant, we can even choose $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{X}$. Moreover, Markov kernels between finite spaces can be represented by stochastic matrices, and we have thus turned the infinite dimensional optimization problem (1.2) into the finite dimensional one of (4.1). The following lemma summarizes a few convenient properties of this finite dimensional optimization problem.

LEMMA 4.9. *Consider a DQM model $\mathcal{P} = (P_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$, $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, with finite sample space \mathcal{X} and score $s_\theta(x)$ and write $k = |\mathcal{X}|$, $p_\theta := (P_\theta(\{x\}))_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and $\dot{p}_\theta := (s_\theta(x)p_\theta(x))_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \in \mathbb{R}^k$.*

- i) *The set $\mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z})$ with $\ell := |\mathcal{Z}| < \infty$ can be identified with the set $\mathcal{M}_\alpha(\ell, k)$ of $\ell \times k$ column stochastic matrices Q with the following property: Two elements Q_{ij} and $Q_{ij'}$ of any given row i of Q satisfy $e^{-\alpha}Q_{ij'} \leq Q_{ij} \leq e^\alpha Q_{ij'}$.*
- ii) *$\mathcal{M}_\alpha(\ell, k) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\ell \times k}$ is a compact polytope. (Lemma 23 of [Kairouz, Oh and Viswanath, 2016](#))*
- iii) *Consider the convex cone $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(k) := \{v \in \mathbb{R}^k : 0 \leq v_j \leq 1, v_j \leq e^\alpha v_{j'}, j, j' \in [k]\}$. For $\theta \in \Theta$ and $v \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha(k)$, define $g_\theta(v) := \frac{(v^T \dot{p}_\theta)^2}{v^T p_\theta}$, $g_\theta(0) := 0$. Then $I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P}) = \sum_{i=1}^\ell g_\theta(Q_i)$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{M}_\alpha(\ell, k)$, and g_θ is continuous, convex and sublinear on $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(k)$. Here, Q_i denotes the i -th row of the matrix Q .*

The main result of this subsection, the formal version of (4.2), can now be stated and proved.

THEOREM 4.10. *Consider a model $\mathcal{P} = (P_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$, $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, on sample space $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ that is DQM at all $\theta \in \Theta$ with score s_θ and a dominating measure μ that is finite on compact sets. Moreover, suppose that $x \mapsto p_\theta(x)$ and $x \mapsto s_\theta(x)p_\theta(x)$ from \mathcal{X} to \mathbb{R} are continuous for every $\theta \in \Theta$. Let $T_\varepsilon^{(\theta)} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_\varepsilon^{(\theta)}$ be the discretization map of Lemma 4.4 with $k := k_\varepsilon^{(\theta)} := |\mathcal{X}_\varepsilon^{(\theta)}|$. Let $\hat{\theta}_n : \Omega \rightarrow \Theta$ be a sequence of random variables on a probability space (Ω, \mathcal{A}, P) converging in P -probability to some $\theta_0 \in \Theta$, fix a null sequence $\varepsilon_n > 0$, and write $\hat{T}_n := T_{\varepsilon_n}^{(\hat{\theta}_n)}$ and $\hat{k}_n := k_{\varepsilon_n}^{(\hat{\theta}_n)}$. If the mappings $\theta \mapsto s_\theta p_\theta$ from Θ to $L_1(\mu)$ and $\theta \mapsto I_\theta(\mathcal{P})$ from Θ to \mathbb{R} are continuous, then for every measurable maximizer \hat{Q}_n of $Q \mapsto I_{\hat{\theta}_n}(Q\hat{T}_n\mathcal{P})$ over $\mathcal{M}_\alpha(\hat{k}_n) := \mathcal{M}_\alpha(\hat{k}_n, \hat{k}_n)$ (cf. Lemma 4.9(i)) we have*

$$I_{\theta_n}(\hat{Q}_n\hat{T}_n\mathcal{P}) \rightarrow \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X})} I_{\theta_0}(Q\mathcal{P}), \quad \text{in } P\text{-probability,}$$

for every sequence $\theta_n \rightarrow \theta_0$.

4.3. Asymptotic efficiency of the sequentially interactive α -private MLE. We begin by describing the complete locally private and efficient estimation procedure. Given are private data $X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} P_{\theta_0}$, $\theta_0 \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, from a regular statistical model $\mathcal{P} = \{P_\theta : \theta \in \Theta\}$ on sample space $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ dominated by μ .

1. Fix a preliminary privacy mechanism $Q_0 \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X})$, such that $Q_0\mathcal{P}$ is identifiable.
2. Consider a non-interactive α -private preliminary estimator $\tilde{\theta}_{n_1}$ based on sanitized versions Z_1, \dots, Z_{n_1} of X_1, \dots, X_{n_1} generated from Q_0 , which is consistent for θ_0 (cf. Subsection 4.1), i.e., such that

$$[Q_0 P_{\theta_0}]^{n_1} \left(|\tilde{\theta}_{n_1} - \theta_0| > \varepsilon \right) \xrightarrow{n_1 \rightarrow \infty} 0, \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0.$$

3. Let \hat{k}_{n_1} , \hat{T}_{n_1} and \hat{Q}_{n_1} be defined as in Theorem 4.10 with $\hat{\theta}_n = \tilde{\theta}_{n_1}$. In particular, $\hat{T}_{n_1} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, \hat{k}_{n_1}\}$ is the discretization map and \hat{Q}_{n_1} is a maximizer of $Q \mapsto I_{\tilde{\theta}_{n_1}}(Q\hat{T}_{n_1}\mathcal{P})$ over $\mathcal{M}_\alpha(\hat{k}_{n_1}) := \mathcal{M}_\alpha(\hat{k}_{n_1}, \hat{k}_{n_1})$ (cf. Lemma 4.9(i)) and we have

$$(4.4) \quad [Q_0 P_{\theta_0}]^{n_1} \left(\left| I_{\theta_0}(\hat{Q}_{n_1}\hat{T}_{n_1}\mathcal{P}) - \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X})} I_{\theta_0}(Q\mathcal{P}) \right| > \varepsilon \right) \xrightarrow{n_1 \rightarrow \infty} 0, \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0.$$

4. Generate Z_{n_1+1}, \dots, Z_n non-interactively from X_{n_1+1}, \dots, X_n using the mechanism $\hat{Q}_{n_1}\hat{T}_{n_1}$, i.e., individual $i \in \{n_1 + 1, \dots, n\}$ computes $Y_i = \hat{T}_{n_1}(X_i)$ and generates $Z_i \in \{1, \dots, \hat{k}_{n_1}\}$ from $\hat{Q}_{n_1}(dz|Y_i)$.
5. Let $\hat{\theta}_{n_2}$ be an MLE in the model $[\hat{Q}_{n_1}\hat{T}_{n_1}\mathcal{P}]^{n_2}$, i.e., a measurable maximizer of the conditional log-likelihood


$$\theta \mapsto \ell_{n_2}(\theta) := \ell_{n_2}(\theta; z_{n_1+1}, \dots, z_n | z_1, \dots, z_{n_1}) := \frac{1}{n_2} \sum_{i=n_1+1}^n \log \hat{q}_\theta(z_i),$$

$$z_1, \dots, z_{n_1} \in \mathcal{Z}, \quad z_{n_1+1}, \dots, z_n \in \{1, \dots, \hat{k}_{n_1}\},$$

over Θ , where $n_2 = n - n_1$, $\hat{q}(z|x) := \sum_{j=1}^{\hat{k}_{n_1}} [\hat{Q}_{n_1}]_{z,j} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\hat{T}_{n_1}^{-1}(\{j\})}(x)$ and

$$\hat{q}_\theta(z) := \int_{\mathcal{X}} \hat{q}(z|x)p_\theta(x)\mu(dx) = \sum_{j=1}^{\hat{k}_{n_1}} [\hat{Q}_{n_1}]_{z,j} \cdot P_\theta \left(\hat{T}_{n_1}^{-1}(\{j\}) \right).$$

FIG 1. Graphical representation of the efficient two-step α -sequentially interactive channel and estimation procedure.



Notice that steps 1-4 above define a privacy mechanism $Q^{(n)}$ releasing a locally private view Z_1, \dots, Z_n of X_1, \dots, X_n . Given the graphical representation of $Q^{(n)}$ in Figure 4.3, it is easy to see that it is α -sequentially interactive as defined in Section 1.2.1. Specifically, conditional on Z_1, \dots, Z_{n_1} , the Z_{n_1+1}, \dots, Z_n are iid with counting density (pmf) \hat{q}_θ and $\hat{Q}_{n_1} \hat{T}_{n_1} \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, \hat{k}_{n_1}\})$.

THEOREM 4.11. Consider a model $\mathcal{P} = (P_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$, $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, on sample space $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ that is DQM at all $\theta \in \Theta$ with score s_θ and a dominating measure μ that is finite on compact sets. Moreover, suppose that $x \mapsto p_\theta(x)$ and $x \mapsto s_\theta(x)p_\theta(x)$ from \mathcal{X} to \mathbb{R} are continuous for every $\theta \in \Theta$.² Suppose that $\theta \mapsto s_\theta p_\theta$ from Θ to $L_1(\mu)$ and $\theta \mapsto I_\theta(\mathcal{P})$ from Θ to \mathbb{R} are continuous and $p_\theta(x)$ is three times continuously differentiable with respect to θ for μ -almost all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and such that $\theta \mapsto \|\dot{p}_\theta\|_1$, $\theta \mapsto \|\ddot{p}_\theta\|_1$ and $\theta \mapsto \|\ddot{p}_\theta\|_1$ are continuous and finite and $\theta \mapsto \ddot{p}_\theta$ is continuous as a function from $\Theta \rightarrow L_1(\mu)$. If $I_{\alpha, \theta_0}^* := \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha} I_{\theta_0}(Q\mathcal{P}) > 0$ for $\theta_0 \in \Theta$, $n_1 = n_1(n) \rightarrow \infty$, $n_1/n \rightarrow 0$ and the two-step MLE $\hat{\theta}_{n_2}$ is consistent for θ_0 (under $Q^{(n)} P_{\theta_0}^n$), then it is also regular and efficient, i.e.,

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\theta}_{n_2} - [\theta_0 + h/\sqrt{n}] \right) \stackrel{Q^{(n)} P_{\theta_0 + h/\sqrt{n}}^n}{\rightsquigarrow} N \left(0, [I_{\alpha, \theta_0}^*]^{-1} \right), \quad \forall h \in \mathbb{R},$$

where $Q^{(n)}$ is the two-step α -sequentially interactive mechanism generating Z_1, \dots, Z_n as described above.

PROOF. For $h \in \mathbb{R}$ write $\theta_n := \theta_0 + h/\sqrt{n}$, $P_n = Q^{(n)} P_{\theta_n}^n$ for the joint distribution of Z_1, \dots, Z_n under θ_n and \mathbb{E}_n for the corresponding expectation operator. We begin with deterministic considerations, keeping the sample Z_1, \dots, Z_n fixed. First, notice that \hat{Q}_{n_1} may contain zero entries, but by the α -differential privacy and positivity constraints we have $0 \leq (\hat{Q}_{n_1})_{z,j} \leq e^\alpha (\hat{Q}_{n_1})_{z,j'}$, for all z, j, j' , and hence all entries in the same row of a zero entry must also be equal to zero. Thus, without loss of generality, we can redefine $\hat{q}(z|x) := 1$ for those $z \in [\hat{k}_{n_1}]$ corresponding to zero rows of \hat{Q}_{n_1} , because data Z_i with the corresponding z values will never be generated. Furthermore, it is no loss of generality to replace $\hat{q}(z|x)$ by $\hat{q}(z|x)/\hat{q}(z|x_0)$ for some $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$, because the resulting log-likelihood equals the original one up to an additive constant independent of θ . We keep writing simply $\hat{q}(z|x)$ for this

²Notice that this continuity assumption is trivial for discrete distributions with $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$.

rescaled conditional density, which now satisfies $e^{-\alpha} \leq \hat{q}(z|x) \leq e^\alpha$, in view of the privacy constraint on \hat{Q}_{n_1} .

Note that in view of Lemma C.6, $\theta \mapsto \hat{q}_\theta(z)$ is three times continuously differentiable for all $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ with derivatives $\dot{\hat{q}}_\theta(z) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \hat{q}(z|x) \dot{p}_\theta(x) \mu(dx)$, $\ddot{\hat{q}}_\theta(z) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \hat{q}(z|x) \ddot{p}_\theta(x) \mu(dx)$ and $\dddot{\hat{q}}_\theta(z) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \hat{q}(z|x) \dddot{p}_\theta(x) \mu(dx)$. In particular, all three functions are bounded in absolute value by e^α times the $L_1(\mu)$ -norm of the corresponding partial derivative of p_θ . Next, expand the conditional log-likelihood ℓ_{n_2} as follows:

$$0 = \dot{\ell}_{n_2}(\hat{\theta}_{n_2}) = \dot{\ell}_{n_2}(\theta_n) + \ddot{\ell}_{n_2}(\theta_n)(\hat{\theta}_{n_2} - \theta_n) + \frac{1}{2} \dddot{\ell}_{n_2}(\bar{\theta}_n)(\hat{\theta}_{n_2} - \theta_n)^2,$$

for an intermediate value $\bar{\theta}_n$ between θ_n and $\hat{\theta}_{n_2}$. Now

$$\ddot{\ell}_{n_2}(\bar{\theta}_n) = \frac{1}{n_2} \sum_{i=n_1+1}^n \frac{\partial^3}{\partial \theta^3} \log \hat{q}_\theta(z_i) \Big|_{\theta=\bar{\theta}_n} = \frac{1}{n_2} \sum_{i=n_1+1}^n \left[\frac{\ddot{\hat{q}}_{\bar{\theta}_n}}{\hat{q}_{\bar{\theta}_n}} - \frac{3\dot{\hat{q}}_{\bar{\theta}_n} \ddot{\hat{q}}_{\bar{\theta}_n}}{\hat{q}_{\bar{\theta}_n}^2} + \frac{2\dot{\hat{q}}_{\bar{\theta}_n}^3}{\hat{q}_{\bar{\theta}_n}^3} \right] (z_i),$$

which is bounded in absolute value by $e^{2\alpha} \|\ddot{p}_{\bar{\theta}_n}\|_1 + 3e^{4\alpha} \|\dot{p}_{\bar{\theta}_n}\|_1 \|\ddot{p}_{\bar{\theta}_n}\|_1 + 2e^{6\alpha} \|\dot{p}_{\bar{\theta}_n}\|_1^3$. To see that this is a $O_{P_n}(1)$, first note that by contiguity (cf. Lemma 3.2), $\hat{\theta}_{n_2}$ is also consistent for θ_0 (and hence also for θ_n) under the sequence of local alternatives P_n . Now recall our continuity assumptions and the fact that $\bar{\theta}_n$ is an intermediate value between θ_n and $\hat{\theta}_{n_2}$. Thus

$$-\dot{\ell}_{n_2}(\theta_n) = \left[\ddot{\ell}_{n_2}(\theta_n) + \frac{1}{2} \dddot{\ell}_{n_2}(\bar{\theta}_n)(\hat{\theta}_{n_2} - \theta_n) \right] (\hat{\theta}_{n_2} - \theta_n) = \left[\ddot{\ell}_{n_2}(\theta_n) + o_{P_n}(1) \right] (\hat{\theta}_{n_2} - \theta_n).$$

Moreover,

$$\ddot{\ell}_{n_2}(\theta_n) = \frac{1}{n_2} \sum_{i=n_1+1}^n \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \log \hat{q}_\theta(Z_i) \Big|_{\theta=\theta_n} = \frac{1}{n_2} \sum_{i=n_1+1}^n \left[\frac{\ddot{\hat{q}}_{\theta_n}}{\hat{q}_{\theta_n}} - \frac{\dot{\hat{q}}_{\theta_n}^2}{\hat{q}_{\theta_n}^2} \right] (Z_i).$$

Conditional on Z_1, \dots, Z_{n_1} , this is an average of iid terms, each of which is bounded in absolute value by $e^{2\alpha} \|\ddot{p}_{\theta_n}\|_1 + e^{4\alpha} \|\dot{p}_{\theta_n}\|_1^2$ and has conditional expectation

$$\sum_{z=1}^{\hat{k}_{n_1}} \left[\frac{\ddot{\hat{q}}_{\theta_n}(z)}{\hat{q}_{\theta_n}(z)} - \frac{\dot{\hat{q}}_{\theta_n}(z)^2}{\hat{q}_{\theta_n}(z)^2} \right] = \left[\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \sum_{z=1}^{\hat{k}_{n_1}} \hat{q}_\theta(z) \right]_{\theta=\theta_n} - I_{\theta_n}(\hat{Q}_{n_1} \hat{T}_{n_1} \mathcal{P}) = -I_{\theta_n}(\hat{Q}_{n_1} \hat{T}_{n_1} \mathcal{P}),$$

which converges to $-I_{\alpha, \theta_0}^* \in [-I_{\theta_0}(\mathcal{P}), 0)$ by Lemma 4.10 in P_n -probability, using contiguity again. Thus, by the conditional Markov inequality, $\ddot{\ell}_{n_2}(\theta_n) \rightarrow -I_{\alpha, \theta_0}^*$ in P_n -probability. We therefore arrive at

$$\dot{\ell}_{n_2}(\theta_n) = [I_{\alpha, \theta_0}^* + o_{P_n}(1)] (\hat{\theta}_{n_2} - \theta_n),$$

or, since $I_{\alpha, \theta_0}^* > 0$, at least on an event of probability converging to 1, we have

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_{n_2} - \theta_n) = \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{n_2}} [I_{\alpha, \theta_0}^* + o_{P_n}(1)]^{-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_2}} \sum_{i=n_1+1}^n \frac{\dot{\hat{q}}_{\theta_n}(Z_i)}{\hat{q}_{\theta_n}(Z_i)}.$$

We conclude the proof by studying the cdf

$$P_n \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_2}} \sum_{i=n_1+1}^n \frac{\dot{\hat{q}}_{\theta_n}(Z_i)}{\hat{q}_{\theta_n}(Z_i)} \leq t \right) = \mathbb{E}_n \left[P_n \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_2}} \sum_{i=n_1+1}^n \frac{\dot{\hat{q}}_{\theta_n}(Z_i)}{\hat{q}_{\theta_n}(Z_i)} \leq t \mid Z_1, \dots, Z_{n_1} \right) \right].$$

Conditionally, we are dealing with a scaled sample mean of iid random variables with mean zero, variance equal to $I_{\theta_n}(\hat{Q}_{n_1}\hat{T}_{n_1}\mathcal{P})$ and absolute third moment bounded by $e^{6\alpha}\|\dot{p}_{\theta_n}\|_1^3$. Thus, by the Berry-Esseen bound, we have for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\left| P_n \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_2}} \sum_{i=n_1+1}^n \frac{\dot{q}_{\theta_n}(Z_i)}{\hat{q}_{\theta_n}(Z_i)} \leq t \cdot \sqrt{I_{\theta_n}(\hat{Q}_{n_1}\hat{T}_{n_1}\mathcal{P})} \middle| Z_1, \dots, Z_{n_1} \right) - \Phi(t) \right| \leq \frac{C(\alpha, \theta_n)}{\sqrt{n_2}},$$

at least on the event $\{I_{\theta_n}(\hat{Q}_{n_1}\hat{T}_{n_1}\mathcal{P}) > 0\}$ of probability converging to 1 and where Φ is the cdf of the standard normal distribution. Since the (deterministic) sequence $C(\alpha, \theta_n)$ is bounded by a constant multiple of $e^{6\alpha}\|\dot{p}_{\theta_n}\|_1^3$, this finishes the proof. \square

Funding. This research was supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF): I 5484-N, as part of the Research Unit 5381 of the German Research Foundation.

APPENDIX A: TECHNICAL LEMMAS AND PROOFS OF SECTION 3

LEMMA A.1. Fix $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$ and consider a measurable spaces $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$, $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{G})$ and probability measures P_0, P_1 on $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ that are both dominated by a σ -finite measure μ . Furthermore, let $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z})$ be an α -private mechanism and let $s : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ be a measurable function with $c := \mathbb{E}_{P_0}[\|s\|^2] < \infty$. Write $p_j(x) = \frac{dP_j}{d\mu}(x)$ and $\nu(dz) = Q(dz|x^*)$, for some arbitrary $x^* \in \mathcal{X}$, and choose $q(z|x)$ as in Lemma C.2 (with $n = 1$ and $\mu_1 = \mu$) such that for all $(x, z) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Z}$, $e^{-\alpha} \leq q(z|x) \leq e^\alpha$. Set $q_j(z) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} q(z|x)p_j(x)\mu(dx)$. Then, a version of the regular conditional expectation

$$t(z) := \mathbb{E}[s(X_0)|Z = z] = \int_{\mathcal{X}} s(x) \frac{q(z|x)p_0(x)}{q_0(z)} dx$$

of $s(X_0)$ given $Z = z$ exists and is finite for all $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, where the joint distribution of (Z, X_0) is given by $Q(dz|x)P_0(dx)$. Moreover, for all $h \in \mathbb{R}^p$ with $\|h\|\sqrt{c} < e^{-2\alpha}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \left(\sqrt{q_1(z)} - \sqrt{q_0(z)} - \frac{1}{2}h^T t(z) \sqrt{q_0(z)} \right)^2 d\nu(z) \\ & \leq 2e^{3\alpha} \left[2\Psi(h) + \frac{1}{2}\|h\|^2 c \left(\Psi(h) + \frac{1}{4}\|h\|^2 c \right) \right] \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{32}(e^{-\alpha} - e^\alpha\|h\|\sqrt{c})^{-3}\|h\|^4 e^{4\alpha} c^2, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Psi(h) := \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(\sqrt{p_1(x)} - \sqrt{p_0(x)} - \frac{1}{2}h^T s(x) \sqrt{p_0(x)} \right)^2 d\mu(x).$$

PROOF. First, note that $q_j(z) := \int_{\mathcal{X}} q(z|x)p_j(x)dx \in [e^{-\alpha}, e^\alpha]$, $j \in \{0, 1\}$. Now,

$$f_{X_0|Z=z}(x) := \frac{q(z|x)p_0(x)}{q_0(z)}$$

is a conditional density of X_0 given $Z = z$ and $t(z) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} s(x)f_{X_0|Z=z}(x) dx$ is a version of the conditional expectation of $s(X_0)$ given $Z = z$. Notice that $t(z)$ is well defined and finite, because $\int_{\mathcal{X}} \|s(x)\|^2 f_{X_0|Z=z}(x) dx \leq e^{2\alpha} \mathbb{E}_{P_0}[\|s\|^2] < \infty$.

For sufficiently small $\|h\|$ as in the statement of the lemma, we have $q_0(z) + h^T t(z) q_0(z) \geq e^{-\alpha} - e^\alpha \|h\| \mathbb{E}_{P_0}[\|s\|] \geq e^{-\alpha} - e^\alpha \|h\| \sqrt{c} > 0$. Now, for fixed $z \in \mathcal{Z}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sqrt{q_1(z)} - \sqrt{q_0(z) + h^T t(z) q_0(z)} \right| = \left| \frac{q_1(z) - q_0(z) - h^T t(z) q_0(z)}{\sqrt{q_1(z)} + \sqrt{q_0(z) + h^T t(z) q_0(z)}} \right| \\ & \leq e^{\alpha/2} \int_{\mathcal{X}} q(z|x) |p_1(x) - p_0(x) - h^T s(x) p_0(x)| dx \\ & \leq e^{3\alpha/2} \int_{\mathcal{X}} |p_1 - p_0 - h^T s p_0| d\mu \\ & \leq e^{3\alpha/2} \left[\int_{\mathcal{X}} \left| p_1 - p_0 - \frac{1}{2} h^T s \sqrt{p_0} (\sqrt{p_1} + \sqrt{p_0}) \right| d\mu \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left| \frac{1}{2} h^T s \sqrt{p_0} (\sqrt{p_1} - \sqrt{p_0}) \right| d\mu \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left| p_1 - p_0 - \frac{1}{2} h^T s \sqrt{p_0} (\sqrt{p_1} + \sqrt{p_0}) \right| d\mu \\ & = \int_{\mathcal{X}} |\sqrt{p_1} + \sqrt{p_0}| \left| \sqrt{p_1} - \sqrt{p_0} - \frac{1}{2} h^T s \sqrt{p_0} \right| d\mu \\ & \leq \sqrt{\int_{\mathcal{X}} |\sqrt{p_1} + \sqrt{p_0}|^2 d\mu} \sqrt{\int_{\mathcal{X}} \left| \sqrt{p_1} - \sqrt{p_0} - \frac{1}{2} h^T s \sqrt{p_0} \right|^2 d\mu} \\ & \leq 2\sqrt{\Psi(h)}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left| \frac{1}{2} h^T s \sqrt{p_0} (\sqrt{p_1} - \sqrt{p_0}) \right| d\mu \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\int_{\mathcal{X}} |h^T s \sqrt{p_0}|^2 d\mu} \sqrt{\int_{\mathcal{X}} |\sqrt{p_1} - \sqrt{p_0}|^2 d\mu} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \|h\| \sqrt{c} \sqrt{\int_{\mathcal{X}} \left| \sqrt{p_1} - \sqrt{p_0} - \frac{1}{2} h^T s \sqrt{p_0} \right|^2 d\mu} + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left| \frac{1}{2} h^T s \sqrt{p_0} \right|^2 d\mu \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \|h\| \sqrt{c} \sqrt{\Psi(h) + \frac{1}{4} \|h\|^2 c}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sqrt{q_1(z)} - \sqrt{q_0(z) + h^T t(z) q_0(z)} \right| \\ \text{(A.1)} \quad & \leq e^{3\alpha/2} \left[2\sqrt{\Psi(h)} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \|h\| \sqrt{c} \sqrt{\Psi(h) + \frac{1}{4} \|h\|^2 c} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we do a second order expansion of the square root $\sqrt{q_0(z) + h^T t(z) q_0(z)}$ around $q_0(z)$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\sqrt{q_0(z) + h^T t(z) q_0(z)} - \sqrt{q_0(z)} - \frac{1}{2} h^T t(z) \sqrt{q_0(z)} \right)^2 \\ &= \left(-\frac{1}{8} \zeta(z)^{-3/2} [h^T t(z) q_0(z)]^2 \right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{64} \zeta(z)^{-3} \|h\|^4 e^{4\alpha} (\mathbb{E}_{P_0}[\|s\|^2])^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\zeta(z)$ is an intermediate value between $q_0(z) + h^T t(z) q_0(z)$ and $q_0(z)$. At the beginning of the proof we already had $q_0(z) + h^T t(z) q_0(z) \geq e^{-\alpha} - e^\alpha \|h\| \sqrt{c} > 0$, and thus

$$|\zeta(z)^{-3/2}| \leq (e^{-\alpha} - e^\alpha \|h\| \sqrt{c})^{-3/2}.$$

Since ν is a probability measure, we therefore arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \left(\sqrt{q_1(z)} - \sqrt{q_0(z)} - \frac{1}{2} h^T t(z) \sqrt{q_0(z)} \right)^2 d\nu(z) \\ &\leq 2 \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \left(\sqrt{q_1(z)} - \sqrt{q_0(z) + h^T t(z) q_0(z)} \right)^2 d\nu(z) \\ &\quad + 2 \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \left(\sqrt{q_0(z) + h^T t(z) q_0(z)} - \sqrt{q_0(z)} - \frac{1}{2} h^T t(z) \sqrt{q_0(z)} \right)^2 d\nu(z) \\ &\leq 2e^{3\alpha} \left[4\Psi(h) + \frac{1}{2} \|h\|^2 c \left(\Psi(h) + \frac{1}{4} \|h\|^2 c \right) \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{32} (e^{-\alpha} - e^\alpha \|h\| \sqrt{c})^{-3} \|h\|^4 e^{4\alpha} c^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

A.1. Proof of Theorem 3.3. We begin with part 1 of Definition 2 and fix $h \in \mathbb{R}^p$. By definition of α -sequential interaction (cf. Section 1.2.1) and in view of Lemma C.2 (applied with general n as well as with $n = 1$ and $\mu_1 = \mu$), for all $x \in \mathcal{X}^n$, $Q^{(n)}(dz|x)$ is absolutely continuous w.r.t. $\nu(dz) := Q^{(n)}(dz|x^*)$, for some fixed $x^* \in \mathcal{X}^n$, and $Q_{z_{1:i-1}}(dz_i|x_i) \ll \nu_{z_{1:i-1}}(dz_i) := Q_{z_{1:i-1}}(dz_i|x_i^*)$, for all $z_{1:i-1} \in \mathcal{Z}^{(i-1)}$, with $\nu_{z_{1:i-1}}$ -density $q_i(z_i|x_i, z_{1:i-1}) \in [e^{-\alpha}, e^\alpha]$. In particular $q(z|x) := \prod_{i=1}^n q_i(z_i|x_i, z_{1:i-1})$ is a ν -density of $Q^{(n)}(dz|x)$, because

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{A_1 \times \dots \times A_n} q(z|x) \nu(dz) &= \int_{A_1} \dots \int_{A_n} \prod_{i=1}^n q_i(z_i|x_i, z_{1:i-1}) \nu_{z_{1:n-1}}(dz_n) \dots \nu_{\emptyset}(dz_1) \\ &= \int_{A_1} \dots \int_{A_n} Q_{z_{1:n-1}}(dz_n|x_n) \dots Q_{\emptyset}(dz_1|x_1) = Q^{(n)}(A_1 \times \dots \times A_n|x), \end{aligned}$$

and $q(z|x) \in [e^{-n\alpha}, e^{n\alpha}]$. Moreover, for all $\theta' \in \Theta$, $R_{n,\theta'} \ll \nu$ with density $z \mapsto \prod_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathcal{X}} q_i(z_i|x_i, z_{1:i-1}) p_{\theta'}(x_i) \mu(dx_i) \in [e^{-n\alpha}, e^{n\alpha}]$ and abbreviate $q_{i,\theta'}(z_i|z_{1:i-1}) := \int_{\mathcal{X}} q_i(z_i|x_i, z_{1:i-1}) p_{\theta'}(x_i) \mu(dx_i)$, $h_n := h/\sqrt{n}$ and

$$\eta_{i,\theta,h_n}(z_{1:i}) := \sqrt{\frac{q_{i,\theta+h_n}(z_i|z_{1:i-1})}{q_{i,\theta}(z_i|z_{1:i-1})}} - 1 \in [e^{-\alpha} - 1, e^\alpha - 1] > -1.$$

Now expand $x \mapsto \log(1+x)$ around 0 to third order to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda_n(\theta + h_n, \theta)(z) &= \log \frac{dR_{n, \theta + h_n}}{dR_{n, \theta}}(z) = \log \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\int_{\mathcal{X}} q_i(z_i | x_i, z_{1:i-1}) p_{\theta + h_n}(x_i) \mu(dx_i)}{\int_{\mathcal{X}} q_i(z_i | x_i, z_{1:i-1}) p_{\theta}(x_i) \mu(dx_i)} \\
&= 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \log(1 + \eta_{i, \theta, h_n}(z_{1:i})) \\
\text{(A.2)} \quad &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_{i, \theta, h_n}(z_{1:i}) - \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_{i, \theta, h_n}(z_{1:i})^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{2}{3[1 + \xi_{i, \theta, h_n}(z_{1:i})]^3} \eta_{i, \theta, h_n}(z_{1:i})^3,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\xi_{i, \theta, h_n}(z_{1:i})$ is an intermediate value between 0 and $\eta_{i, \theta, h_n}(z_{1:i}) \geq e^{-\alpha} - 1$. Thus, $\frac{2}{3}[1 + \xi_{i, \theta, h_n}(z_{1:i})]^{-3} \leq \frac{2}{3}e^{3\alpha}$ and the last term in the previous display is bounded in absolute value by

$$\text{(A.3)} \quad \frac{2}{3}e^{3\alpha} \max_{j=1, \dots, n} |\eta_{j, \theta, h_n}(z_{1:j})| \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_{i, \theta, h_n}(z_{1:i})^2.$$

Let $t_{i, \theta'}(z_i | z_{1:i-1}) = \mathbb{E}_{n, \theta'}[s_{\theta'}(X_i) | Z_i = z_i, Z_{1:i-1} = z_{1:i-1}]$ denote the score in the model $(Q_{z_{1:i-1}} P_{\theta})_{\theta \in \Theta}$ at θ' , the latter being DQM in view of Lemma 3.1, for all $z_{1:i-1} \in \mathcal{Z}^{(i-1)}$. The same lemma also entails that $\|t_{i, \theta}(z_i | z_{1:i-1})\| \leq e^{2\alpha} \sqrt{\text{trace } I_{\theta}(\mathcal{P})}$. Now, with $U_i := \eta_{i, \theta, h_n} - \frac{1}{2}h_n^T t_{i, \theta} = (\sqrt{q_{i, \theta + h_n}} - \sqrt{q_{i, \theta}} - \frac{1}{2}h_n^T t_{i, \theta} \sqrt{q_{i, \theta}}) / \sqrt{q_{i, \theta}}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
R_{n, \theta} \left(\max_{i=1, \dots, n} |\eta_{i, \theta, h_n}| > \varepsilon \right) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n R_{n, \theta} (|\eta_{i, \theta, h_n}| > \varepsilon) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \left[R_{n, \theta} \left(\left| \eta_{i, \theta, h_n} - \frac{1}{2}h_n^T t_{i, \theta} \right| > \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) + R_{n, \theta} \left(\left| \frac{1}{2}h_n^T t_{i, \theta} \right| > \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) \right] \\
&\leq \left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon} \right)^2 \mathbb{E}_{n, \theta} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{n, \theta} [U_i^2 | Z_{1:i-1}] + n \mathbf{1}_{\{e^{2\alpha} \sqrt{\text{trace } I_{\theta}(\mathcal{P})} \|h\| > \varepsilon \sqrt{n}\}}.
\end{aligned}$$

For all sufficiently large n , the last term in the previous display is constant equal to zero. Moreover, $\mathbb{E}_{n, \theta} [U_i^2 | Z_{1:i-1}]$ is bounded independent of i by a deterministic quantity that is $o(\|h_n\|^2) = o(n^{-1})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in view of Lemma A.1, DQM of \mathcal{P} and the fact that $c_{\theta} := \mathbb{E}_{P_{\theta}}[\|s_{\theta}\|^2] = \text{trace } I_{\theta}(\mathcal{P}) \in (0, \infty)$. We conclude that $\max_{i=1, \dots, n} |\eta_{i, \theta, h_n}| = o_P(1)$.

For the sum of squared η_{i, θ, h_n} we write

$$\text{(A.4)} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_{i, \theta, h_n}(z_{1:i})^2 - \frac{1}{4}h_n^T \Sigma_{n, \theta}(z_{1:n-1})h$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\eta_{i, \theta, h_n}(z_{1:i})^2 - \frac{1}{4}h_n^T I_{\theta}(Q_{z_{1:i-1}} \mathcal{P})h_n \right] \\
\text{(A.5)} \quad &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\eta_{i, \theta, h_n}(z_{1:i})^2 - \left(\frac{1}{2}h_n^T t_{i, \theta}(z_{1:i}) \right)^2 \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\text{(A.6)} \quad + \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\left(\frac{1}{2}h_n^T t_{i, \theta}(z_{1:i}) \right)^2 - \frac{1}{4}h_n^T I_{\theta}(Q_{z_{1:i-1}} \mathcal{P})h_n \right].$$

For the summands in (A.5) use Lemma C.3 to bound their expected absolute value by

$$(1 + \gamma) \mathbb{E}_{n,\theta} \left[\left| \eta_{i,\theta,h_n} - \frac{1}{2} h_n^T t_{i,\theta} \right|^2 \right] + \frac{1}{\gamma} \mathbb{E}_{n,\theta} \left[\left(\frac{1}{2} h_n^T t_{i,\theta}(z_{1:i}) \right)^2 \right].$$

But we already showed that the first of these expectations is bounded independently of i by $o(n^{-1})$. For the second we use the previously established bound $\|t_{i,\theta}\| \leq e^{2\alpha} \sqrt{\text{trace } I_\theta(\mathcal{P})}$ and $\|h_n\|^2 = \|h\|^2/n$. Thus,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_{n,\theta}(|(\text{A.5})|) \leq \frac{\|h\|^2 e^{4\alpha} \text{trace } I_\theta(\mathcal{P})}{4\gamma} \xrightarrow{\gamma \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

For (A.6), write $Y_i := \left(\frac{1}{2} h_n^T t_{i,\theta}(z_{1:i})\right)^2 - \frac{1}{4} h_n^T I_\theta(Q_{z_{1:i-1}} \mathcal{P}) h_n$ and notice that $I_\theta(Q_{z_{1:i-1}} \mathcal{P}) = \mathbb{E}_{n,\theta} [t_{i,\theta}(Z_{1:i}) t_{i,\theta}(Z_{1:i})^T | Z_{1:i-1}]$, so $\mathbb{E}_{n,\theta}[Y_i | Z_1, \dots, Z_{i-1}] = 0$, for $i < j$ we have $\mathbb{E}_{n,\theta}[Y_i Y_j] = \mathbb{E}_{n,\theta}(Y_i \mathbb{E}_{n,\theta}[Y_j | Z_1, \dots, Z_{j-1}]) = 0$ and $Y_i^2 \leq \frac{1}{8} \|h_n\|^4 (e^{8\alpha} + 1) [\text{trace } I_\theta(\mathcal{P})]^2 = O(n^{-2})$. Hence (A.4) converges to zero in $R_{n,\theta}$ -probability. Since the second term of (A.4) is bounded by $\frac{1}{4} h^T I_\theta(\mathcal{P}) h$, we also see that $\sum_{i=1}^n \eta_{i,\theta,h_n}^2 = o_P(1)$ and thus (A.3) is $o_P(1)$. Altogether we have already proven that

$$\Lambda_n(\theta + h_n, \theta) = 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_{i,\theta,h_n} - \frac{1}{4} h^T \Sigma_{n,\theta} h + o_P(1).$$

Finally, write

$$\begin{aligned} & 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_{i,\theta,h_n} - \left(h^T \Delta_{n,\theta} - \frac{1}{4} h^T \Sigma_{n,\theta} h \right) \\ (\text{A.7}) \quad & = 2 \sum_{i=1}^n (U_i - \mathbb{E}_{n,\theta}[U_i | Z_{1:i-1}]) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\mathbb{E}_{n,\theta}[U_i | Z_{1:i-1}] + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{n,\theta} \left[\left(\frac{1}{2} h_n^T t_{i,\theta} \right)^2 \middle| Z_{1:i-1} \right] \right). \end{aligned}$$

The first sum has mean zero and variance bounded by the expectation of $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{n,\theta}[U_i^2 | Z_{1:i-1}]$ of which we already showed that it is deterministically bounded by $n \cdot o(n^{-1})$. For the second sum, notice that $\mathbb{E}_{n,\theta}[U_i | Z_{1:i-1}] = \mathbb{E}_{n,\theta}[\eta_{i,\theta,h_n} | Z_{1:i-1}] - \frac{1}{2} h_n^T \mathbb{E}_{n,\theta}[t_{i,\theta} | Z_{1:i-1}]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{n,\theta}[t_{i,\theta} | Z_{1:i-1}] &= \int_{\mathcal{Z}} t_{i,\theta}(z | Z_{1:i-1}) q_{i,\theta}(z | Z_{1:i-1}) \nu_{Z_{1:i-1}}(dz) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} s_\theta(x) \frac{q_i(z|x, z_{1:i-1}) p_\theta(x)}{q_{i,\theta}(z | Z_{1:i-1})} \mu(dx) q_{i,\theta}(z | Z_{1:i-1}) \nu_{Z_{1:i-1}}(dz) = \mathbb{E}_\theta[s_\theta] = 0 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{n,\theta}[\eta_{i,\theta,h_n} | Z_{1:i-1}] &= \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \eta_{i,\theta,h_n}(Z_{1:i-1}, z) q_{i,\theta}(z | Z_{1:i-1}) \nu_{Z_{1:i-1}}(dz) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \sqrt{q_{i,\theta+h_n}(z | Z_{1:i-1}) q_{i,\theta}(z | Z_{1:i-1})} \nu_{Z_{1:i-1}}(dz) - 1 \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{Z}} q_{i,\theta+h_n}(z | Z_{1:i-1}) - 2 \sqrt{q_{i,\theta+h_n}(z | Z_{1:i-1}) q_{i,\theta}(z | Z_{1:i-1})} + q_{i,\theta}(z | Z_{1:i-1}) \nu_{Z_{1:i-1}}(dz) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \left[\sqrt{q_{i,\theta+h_n}(z | Z_{1:i-1})} - \sqrt{q_{i,\theta}(z | Z_{1:i-1})} \right]^2 \nu_{Z_{1:i-1}}(dz) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{n,\theta} \left[\eta_{i,\theta,h_n}^2 \middle| Z_{1:i-1} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\mathbb{E}_{n,\theta}[U_i|Z_{1:i-1}] = -\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{n,\theta}[\eta_{i,\theta,h_n}^2|Z_{1:i-1}]$ and the second sum in (A.7) can be handled in the exact same way as (A.5). We conclude that

$$\Lambda_n(\theta + h_n, \theta) = h^T \Delta_{n,\theta} - \frac{1}{2}h^T \Sigma_{n,\theta} h + o_P(1)$$

as required for the first part of Definition 2.

For the second part, recall that because of $0 \preceq I_\theta(Q_{z_{1:i-1}} \mathcal{P}) \preceq I_\theta(\mathcal{P})$ the entries of $\Sigma_{n,\theta}$ are uniformly bounded by a finite deterministic constant, C_θ , say. Moreover, since, as above, $\mathbb{E}_{n,\theta}[t_{i,\theta}|Z_{1:i-1}] = 0$ and $|h^T t_{i,\theta}| \leq \|h\| e^{2\alpha} \sqrt{I_\theta(\mathcal{P})}$, Hoeffding's lemma yields

$$\mathbb{E}_{n,\theta}[\exp(h^T t_{i,\theta}/\sqrt{n})|Z_{1:i-1}] \leq \exp\left(\frac{\|h\|^2 e^{4\alpha} I_\theta(\mathcal{P})}{2n}\right).$$

Because of $\Delta_{n,\theta} = \sum_{i=1}^n t_{i,\theta}/\sqrt{n}$ we therefore get

$$\mathcal{M}_\Delta(h) := \mathbb{E}_{n,\theta}[\exp(h^T \Delta_{n,\theta})] = \mathbb{E}_{n,\theta}\left[\prod_{i=1}^n \exp(h^T t_{i,\theta}/\sqrt{n})\right] \leq \exp\left(\frac{\|h\|^2 e^{4\alpha} I_\theta(\mathcal{P})}{2}\right).$$

Thus, the joint moment generating function of $(\Delta_{n,\theta}, \Sigma_{n,\theta})$,

$$\mathcal{M}_n(\tilde{h}) := \mathbb{E}_{n,\theta}\left[\exp\left(\sum_{l=1}^p \tilde{h}_l [\Delta_{n,\theta}]_l + \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{k=1}^j \tilde{h}_{p+(j-1)j/2+k} [\Sigma_{n,\theta}]_{j,k}\right)\right]$$

is finite for all $\tilde{h} \in \mathbb{R}^{p+p(p+1)/2}$. In particular, this can be written as $\mathcal{M}_n(\tilde{h}) = \mathbb{E}_{n,\theta}[u(\Sigma_{n,\theta}) \exp(h^T \Delta_{n,\theta})]$, where $u: \mathbb{R}^{p \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous and bounded function and $h \in \mathbb{R}^p$ are the first p entries of \tilde{h} . Next, abbreviate $\Gamma_{n,\theta} := \Lambda_n(\theta + h_n, \theta) - h^T \Delta_{n,\theta} + \frac{1}{2}h^T \Sigma_{n,\theta} h$, of which we already know that it is $o_P(1)$ under $R_{n,\theta}$. With this notation we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_n(\tilde{h}) &= \mathbb{E}_{n,\theta+h_n} [u(\Sigma_{n,\theta}) \exp(h^T \Delta_{n,\theta} - \Lambda_n(\theta + h_n, \theta))] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{n,\theta+h_n} \left[u(\Sigma_{n,\theta}) \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}h^T \Sigma_{n,\theta} h\right) \exp(-\Gamma_{n,\theta}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $u(\Sigma_{n,\theta}) \exp(\frac{1}{2}h^T \Sigma_{n,\theta} h) = v(\Sigma_{n,\theta})$ for a bounded continuous function $v: \mathbb{R}^{p \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of $\Sigma_{n,\theta}$ and by our weak convergence assumption on $\Sigma_{n,\theta}$, we have $\mathbb{E}_{n,\theta}[v(\Sigma_{n,\theta}) - \mathbb{E}[v(\Sigma_\theta)]] \rightarrow 0$. In view of mutual contiguity of $R_{n,\theta}$ and $R_{n,\theta+h_n}$ (cf. Lemma 3.2) and LeCam's first lemma (cf. part (iv) of Lemma 6.4 in van der Vaart, 2007) we also have $\mathbb{E}_{n,\theta+h_n}[v(\Sigma_{n,\theta}) - \mathbb{E}[v(\Sigma_\theta)]] \rightarrow 0$. Thus, if we can show that $\exp(-\Gamma_{n,\theta}) \rightarrow 1$ in $L_1(R_{\theta+h_n})$, we obtain $\mathcal{M}_n(\tilde{h}) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[v(\Sigma_\theta)] = \mathbb{E}[u(\Sigma_\theta) \exp(\frac{1}{2}h^T \Sigma_\theta h)]$. But the latter expression is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[u(\Sigma_\theta) \exp(h^T \Sigma_\theta^{1/2} \Delta)\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[u(\Sigma_\theta) \mathbb{E}\left[\exp(h^T \Sigma_\theta^{1/2} \Delta) \middle| \Sigma_\theta\right]\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[u(\Sigma_\theta) \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}h^T \Sigma_\theta h\right)\right], \end{aligned}$$

for a random vector $\Delta \sim N(0, I_p)$ independent of Σ_θ . In other words, the joint moment generating function of $(\Delta_{n,\theta}, \Sigma_{n,\theta})$, which is finite, converges to the joint moment generating function of (Δ, Σ_θ) , which implies the desired weak convergence. Thus, it remains to show $\exp(-\Gamma_{n,\theta}) \rightarrow 1$ in $L_1(R_{\theta+h_n})$. By contiguity, $\Gamma_{n,\theta} = o_P(1)$ under $R_{n,\theta+h_n}$. To get the desired L_1 -convergence, it remains to show uniform integrability of $\exp(-\Gamma_{n,\theta})$ with respect to $R_{\theta+h_n}$. Since $\frac{1}{2}h^T \Sigma_{n,\theta} h$ is bounded by a finite constant uniformly in n , it actually suffices

to show uniform integrability of $V_n := \exp(-\Lambda_n(\theta + h_n, \theta) + h^T \Delta_{n,\theta})$. Sufficient conditions for this to be the case are (i) uniform boundedness of the expected values and (ii) for any sequence of events B_n with probability converging to zero we have $\mathbb{E}_{n,\theta+h_n}[V_n \mathbb{1}_{B_n}] \rightarrow 0$. For (i) simply observe

$$\mathbb{E}_{n,\theta+h_n}[V_n] = \mathbb{E}_{n,\theta+h_n} \left[\exp(h^T \Delta_{n,\theta}) \frac{dR_{n,\theta}}{dR_{n,\theta+h_n}} \right] = \mathbb{E}_{n,\theta} [\exp(h^T \Delta_{n,\theta})],$$

which was already shown to be bounded by $\exp(\|h\|^2 e^{4\alpha} I_\theta(\mathcal{P})/2)$. Similarly, for (ii) write

$$\mathbb{E}_{n,\theta+h_n}[V_n \mathbb{1}_{B_n}] = \mathbb{E}_{n,\theta} [\exp(h^T \Delta_{n,\theta}) \mathbb{1}_{B_n}] \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{n,\theta} [\exp(2h^T \Delta_{n,\theta})] R_{n,\theta}(B_n)},$$

the upper bound now converging to zero in view of contiguity $R_{n,\theta} \triangleleft R_{n,\theta+h_n}$. \square

APPENDIX B: PROOFS OF SECTION 4.2 ON ESTIMATION OF THE OPTIMAL PRIVACY MECHANISM

B.1. Proof of Lemma 4.4. Fix $\alpha, \varepsilon > 0$ and $\gamma_0(\varepsilon) = (5e^{5\alpha})^{-2\frac{\varepsilon}{3}}$. Take a closed cube $K_\varepsilon = K_{\varepsilon,\theta} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ such that $P_\theta(K_\varepsilon) \geq 1 - \gamma_0(\varepsilon)$. By uniform continuity, for $\gamma_1(\varepsilon) := (3e^{5\alpha} \mu(K_\varepsilon))^{-1\frac{\varepsilon}{3}}$, there exists $\delta_\varepsilon > 0$ such that for all $x, y \in K_\varepsilon$ with $|x - y| \leq \delta_\varepsilon$ we have $\max\{|p_\theta(x) - p_\theta(y)|, |\dot{p}_\theta(x) - \dot{p}_\theta(y)|\} \leq \gamma_1(\varepsilon)$, where $\dot{p}_\theta(x) := s_\theta(x)p_\theta(x)$. Now partition K_ε into $k_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ measurable sets B_j (e.g., cubes intersected with \mathcal{X}) of diameter at most δ_ε and add $B_0 := \mathcal{X} \setminus K_\varepsilon$ to obtain the desired partition of \mathcal{X} . Notice that $\mu(B_j) \leq \mu(K_\varepsilon) < \infty$, for $j = 1, \dots, k_\varepsilon$, by our assumption that μ is finite on compact sets.

To see α -privacy of $Q_\varepsilon^{(\theta)}$, fix $A \in \mathcal{G}$ and $j, j' \in \mathcal{X}_\varepsilon^{(\theta)} = [k] \cup \{0\}$. Consider first the case where $\mu(B_j)$ and $\mu(B_{j'})$ are both positive and finite. We can pick $x' \in B_{j'}$ such that $Q(A|x') \leq \frac{1}{\mu(B_{j'})} \int_{B_{j'}} Q(A|x)\mu(dx) = Q_\varepsilon(A|j')$, by choosing x' to (nearly) minimize $x \mapsto Q(A|x)$. Thus,

$$Q_\varepsilon(A|j) = \frac{1}{\mu(B_j)} \int_{B_j} Q(A|x)\mu(dx) \leq e^\alpha Q(A|x') \leq e^\alpha Q_\varepsilon(A|j').$$

Furthermore, for every $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$, we have $e^{-\alpha} \leq q(z|x) \leq e^\alpha$, and this entails

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\alpha} q_\varepsilon(z|j) &\leq 1 = q_\varepsilon(z|j^*) = \frac{1}{\mu(B_j)} \int_{B_j} e^\alpha e^{-\alpha} \mu(dx) \\ &= e^\alpha \frac{1}{\mu(B_j)} \int_{B_j} e^{-\alpha} \mu(dx) \leq e^\alpha q_\varepsilon(z|j), \end{aligned}$$

for all j^* with $\mu(B_{j^*}) \in \{0, \infty\}$.

For the approximation part, we write $Q_\varepsilon = Q_\varepsilon^{(\theta)}$, $T_\varepsilon = T_\varepsilon^{(\theta)}$ and, as always, $q_\theta(z) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} q(z|x)p_\theta(x)\mu(dx)$ and

$$t_\theta(z) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} s_\theta(x) \frac{q(z|x)p_\theta(x)}{q_\theta(z)} \mu(dx) = \frac{1}{q_\theta(z)} \int_{\mathcal{X}} q(z|x)\dot{p}_\theta(x)\mu(dx),$$

for the score of the model $Q\mathcal{P}$ at θ (cf. Lemma 3.1). Using that Q_ε is α -private, (local) pre-processing preserves α -privacy (cf. Lemma C.4) and Lemma 3.1, we see that the model $Q_\varepsilon T_\varepsilon \mathcal{P} = [Q_\varepsilon T_\varepsilon] \mathcal{P}$ is also DQM at θ . In view of Bayes rule and composition of Markov kernels, we write

$$u_\theta(z) := \int_{\mathcal{X}} s_\theta(x) \frac{\sum_{j=0}^k q_\varepsilon(z|j) \mathbb{1}_{T_\varepsilon^{-1}(\{j\})}(x) p_\theta(x)}{\bar{q}_\theta(z)} \mu(dx)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int_{\mathcal{X} \setminus K_\varepsilon} s_\theta(x) \frac{p_\theta(x)}{\bar{q}_\theta(z)} \mu(dx) + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \mu(B_j) > 0}}^k \int_{K_\varepsilon} s_\theta(x) \frac{q_\varepsilon(z|j) \mathbb{1}_{B_j}(x) p_\theta(x)}{\bar{q}_\theta(z)} \mu(dx) \\
&= \frac{1}{\bar{q}_\theta(z)} \int_{\mathcal{X} \setminus K_\varepsilon} \dot{p}_\theta(x) \mu(dx) + \frac{1}{\bar{q}_\theta(z)} \int_{K_\varepsilon} q(z|y) \int_{K_\varepsilon} \bar{r}_\varepsilon(y|x) \dot{p}_\theta(x) \mu(dx) \mu(dy) \\
&= \frac{1}{\bar{q}_\theta(z)} \int_{\mathcal{X} \setminus K_\varepsilon} \dot{p}_\theta(x) \mu(dx) + \frac{1}{\bar{q}_\theta(z)} \int_{K_\varepsilon} q(z|y) \dot{p}_\theta(y) \mu(dy)
\end{aligned}$$

for the corresponding score function, where

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{r}_\varepsilon(y|x) &:= \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \mu(B_j) > 0}}^k \frac{1}{\mu(B_j)} \mathbb{1}_{B_j^2}(x, y), \\
\dot{p}_\theta(x) &:= \int_{K_\varepsilon} \bar{r}_\varepsilon(x|y) \dot{p}_\theta(y) \mu(dy)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{q}_\theta(z) &:= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \sum_{j=0}^k q_\varepsilon(z|j) \mathbb{1}_{B_j}(x) p_\theta(x) \mu(dx) \\
&= P_\theta(\mathcal{X} \setminus K_\varepsilon) + \int_{K_\varepsilon} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \mu(B_j) > 0}}^k \frac{1}{\mu(B_j)} \int_{B_j} q(z|y) \mu(dy) \mathbb{1}_{B_j}(x) p_\theta(x) \mu(dx) \\
&= P_\theta(\mathcal{X} \setminus K_\varepsilon) + \int_{K_\varepsilon} q(z|y) \int_{K_\varepsilon} \bar{r}_\varepsilon(y|x) p_\theta(x) \mu(dx) \mu(dy) \\
&= P_\theta(\mathcal{X} \setminus K_\varepsilon) + \int_{K_\varepsilon} q(z|y) \bar{p}_\theta(y) \mu(dy),
\end{aligned}$$

with $\bar{p}_\theta(y) := \int_{K_\varepsilon} \bar{r}_\varepsilon(y|x) p_\theta(x) \mu(dx)$. Note that, by the choice of $q(z|x) \in [e^{-\alpha}, e^\alpha]$ and the construction of $q_\varepsilon(z|j)$, $|u_\theta(z)|$ is well defined and bounded by $e^{2\alpha}$ times $\int_{\mathcal{X}} |s_\theta(x)| p_\theta(x) \mu(dx) \leq \sqrt{I_\theta(\mathcal{P})} < \infty$. The same holds for $|t_\theta(z)|$. First, write

$$\begin{aligned}
&|I_\theta(Q_\varepsilon T_\varepsilon \mathcal{P}) - I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P})| = \left| \int_{\mathcal{Z}} u_\theta^2(z) \bar{q}_\theta(z) - t_\theta^2(z) q_\theta(z) \nu(dz) \right| \\
\text{(B.1)} \quad &\leq \int_{\mathcal{Z}} |u_\theta^2(z) - t_\theta^2(z)| \bar{q}_\theta(z) \nu(dz) + \int_{\mathcal{Z}} t_\theta^2(z) |\bar{q}_\theta(z) - q_\theta(z)| \nu(dz),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
|q_\theta(z) - \bar{q}_\theta(z)| &= \left| \int_{\mathcal{X} \setminus K_\varepsilon} [q(z|x) - 1] p_\theta(x) \mu(dx) + \int_{K_\varepsilon} q(z|x) [p_\theta(x) - \bar{p}_\theta(x)] \mu(dx) \right| \\
&\leq (e^\alpha - 1) \gamma_0(\varepsilon) + e^\alpha \|\mathbb{1}_{K_\varepsilon}(\bar{p}_\theta - p_\theta)\|_{L_1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now observe

$$\begin{aligned}
|u_\theta^2(z) - t_\theta^2(z)| \bar{q}_\theta(z) &= |u_\theta(z) - t_\theta(z)| |u_\theta(z) + t_\theta(z)| \bar{q}_\theta(z) \\
&\leq 2e^{2\alpha} \sqrt{I_\theta(\mathcal{P})} |u_\theta(z) - t_\theta(z)| \bar{q}_\theta(z)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq 2e^{2\alpha} \sqrt{I_\theta(\mathcal{P})} \left| \int_{\mathcal{X} \setminus K_\varepsilon} \dot{p}_\theta(x) \mu(dx) \frac{q_\theta(z) - \bar{q}_\theta(z)}{q_\theta(z)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_{K_\varepsilon} q(z|x) \left[\dot{\bar{p}}_\theta(x) - \dot{p}_\theta(x) \frac{\bar{q}_\theta(z)}{q_\theta(z)} \right] \mu(dx) \right| \\
&\leq 2e^{2\alpha} \sqrt{I_\theta(\mathcal{P})} \left[(e^{2\alpha} - 1) \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{X} \setminus K_\varepsilon}(x) |s_\theta(x)| P_\theta(dx) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + e^\alpha \|\mathbb{1}_{K_\varepsilon} \dot{\bar{p}}_\theta - \dot{p}_\theta\|_{L_1} + e^\alpha \int_{K_\varepsilon} |s_\theta(x)| p_\theta(x) \mu(dx) \frac{q_\theta(z) - \bar{q}_\theta(z)}{q_\theta(z)} \right] \\
&\leq 2e^{2\alpha} \sqrt{I_\theta(\mathcal{P})} \left[(e^{2\alpha} - 1) \sqrt{I_\theta(\mathcal{P})} P_\theta(\mathcal{X} \setminus K_\varepsilon) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + e^\alpha \|\mathbb{1}_{K_\varepsilon} \dot{\bar{p}}_\theta - \dot{p}_\theta\|_{L_1} + e^{2\alpha} \sqrt{I_\theta(\mathcal{P})} |q_\theta(z) - \bar{q}_\theta(z)| \right] \\
&\leq 2e^{2\alpha} \sqrt{I_\theta(\mathcal{P})} \left[e^{2\alpha} \sqrt{I_\theta(\mathcal{P})} \gamma_0(\varepsilon) + e^\alpha \|\mathbb{1}_{K_\varepsilon} (\dot{\bar{p}}_\theta - \dot{p}_\theta)\|_{L_1} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + e^{2\alpha} \sqrt{I_\theta(\mathcal{P})} \left(e^\alpha \gamma_0(\varepsilon) + e^\alpha \|\mathbb{1}_{K_\varepsilon} (\bar{p}_\theta - p_\theta)\|_{L_1} \right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we arrive at the bound

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_\theta(Q_\varepsilon T_\varepsilon \mathcal{P}) - I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P})| &\leq I_\theta(\mathcal{P}) 5e^{5\alpha} \sqrt{\gamma_0(\varepsilon)} + I_\theta(\mathcal{P}) 3e^{5\alpha} \|\mathbb{1}_{K_\varepsilon} (\bar{p}_\theta - p_\theta)\|_{L_1} \\
&\quad + 2e^{3\alpha} \sqrt{I_\theta(\mathcal{P})} \|\mathbb{1}_{K_\varepsilon} (\dot{\bar{p}}_\theta - \dot{p}_\theta)\|_{L_1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, recalling that on B_j the function p_θ can not vary by more than $\gamma_1(\varepsilon)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbb{1}_{K_\varepsilon} (\bar{p}_\theta - p_\theta)\|_{L_1} &= \int_{K_\varepsilon} \left| \int_{K_\varepsilon} \bar{r}_\varepsilon(x|y) p_\theta(y) \mu(dy) - p_\theta(x) \right| \mu(dx) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \mu(B_j) > 0}}^k \int_{B_j} \left| \frac{1}{\mu(B_j)} \int_{B_j} p_\theta(y) \mu(dy) - p_\theta(x) \right| \mu(dx) \\
&\leq \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \mu(B_j) > 0}}^k \int_{B_j} \frac{1}{\mu(B_j)} \int_{B_j} |p_\theta(y) - p_\theta(x)| \mu(dy) \mu(dx) \leq \gamma_1(\varepsilon) \mu(K_\varepsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

In the exact same way, we get $\|\mathbb{1}_{K_\varepsilon} (\dot{\bar{p}}_\theta - \dot{p}_\theta)\|_{L_1} \leq \gamma_1(\varepsilon) \mu(K_\varepsilon)$. Hence, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_\theta(Q_\varepsilon T_\varepsilon \mathcal{P}) - I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P})| &\leq I_\theta(\mathcal{P}) 5e^{5\alpha} \sqrt{\gamma_0(\varepsilon)} + I_\theta(\mathcal{P}) 3e^{5\alpha} \mu(K_\varepsilon) \gamma_1(\varepsilon) \\
&\quad + 2e^{3\alpha} \sqrt{I_\theta(\mathcal{P})} \mu(K_\varepsilon) \gamma_1(\varepsilon) \\
&\leq (I_\theta(\mathcal{P}) \vee 1) \varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

□

B.2. Proof of Lemma 4.7. It suffices to show that for every $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha^*$, there exists a sequence $\tilde{Q}_m \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\alpha$ such that $I_\theta(\tilde{Q}_m \mathcal{P}) \rightarrow I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P})$. For a given $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha^*$ and arbitrary $m \in \mathbb{N}$, take $x^{(m)} \in \mathcal{X}$ and a partition $C_1^{(m)}, \dots, C_{\ell_m}^{(m)} \in \mathcal{G}$ of \mathcal{Z} as in Definition 3.a, that is, such

that

$$(B.2) \quad \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ Q(C_j^{(m)}|x^{(m)})>0}}^{\ell_m} \int_{C_j^{(m)}} \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left| q_m(z|x) - \frac{Q(C_j^{(m)}|x)}{Q(C_j^{(m)}|x^{(m)})} Q(dz|x^{(m)}) \right| \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Without loss of generality, we choose the densities $q_m(z|x)$ such that $q_m(z|x) \in [e^{-\alpha}, e^\alpha]$, as in Lemma C.2 with $n = 1$, $\mu_1 = \mu$ and $\nu(dz) = Q(dz|x^{(m)})$. For convenience, in what follows, we suppress the dependence on m and write $q(z|x) = q_m(z|x)$, and $C_j = C_j^{(m)}$. As usual, we write $q_\theta(z) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} q(z|x)p_\theta(x) dx$ and

$$t_\theta(z) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} s_\theta(x) \frac{q(z|x)p_\theta(x)}{q_\theta(z)} dx$$

for the score function of the model $(QP_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ at θ (cf. Lemma 3.1). Let $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}} \subseteq [\ell_m]$ be the subset of $[\ell_m]$ such that $\tilde{\nu}(\{j\}) := \nu(C_j) > 0$, for all $j \in \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$. Next, define the channel \tilde{Q}_m on $(\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}, 2^{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}})$ by its $\tilde{\nu}$ -densities $\tilde{q}(j|x) := Q(C_j|x)/\tilde{\nu}(\{j\}) = \int_{C_j} q(z|x)d\nu(z)/\tilde{\nu}(\{j\})$, for $j \in \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$. By our choice of $q(z|x)$ we have $e^{-\alpha} \leq \tilde{q}(j|x) \leq e^\alpha$. The channel \tilde{Q}_m belongs to $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\alpha$, because, for any $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\tilde{q}(j|x) \leq e^\alpha \cdot Q(C_j|x')/\tilde{\nu}(\{j\}) = e^\alpha \cdot \tilde{q}(j|x').$$

Now, write $\tilde{t}_\theta(j) := \int_{\mathcal{X}} s_\theta(x) \frac{\tilde{q}(j|x)p_\theta(x)}{\tilde{q}_\theta(j)} dx$, where $\tilde{q}_\theta(j) := \int_{\mathcal{X}} \tilde{q}(j|x)p_\theta(x) dx \geq e^{-\alpha}$, and note that \tilde{t}_θ is the score function of the DQM model $\tilde{Q}_m \mathcal{P}$, in view of Lemma 3.1. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} |I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P}) - I_\theta(\tilde{Q}_m \mathcal{P})| &= \left| \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}} t_\theta^2(z) q_\theta(z) d\nu(z) - \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}} \tilde{t}_\theta^2(z) \tilde{q}_\theta(z) d\tilde{\nu}(z) \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{j=1}^m \int_{C_j} t_\theta^2(z) q_\theta(z) d\nu(z) - \sum_{z \in \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}} \tilde{t}_\theta^2(z) \tilde{q}_\theta(z) \tilde{\nu}(\{z\}) \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{j=1}^m \int_{C_j} t_\theta^2(z) d[QP_\theta](z) - \sum_{j \in \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}} \tilde{t}_\theta^2(j) [QP_\theta](C_j) \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{j \in \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}} \int_{C_j} [t_\theta^2(z) - \tilde{t}_\theta^2(j)] d[QP_\theta](z) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{j \in \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}} \int_{C_j} |t_\theta(z) - \tilde{t}_\theta(j)| |t_\theta(z) + \tilde{t}_\theta(j)| d[QP_\theta](z) \\ &\leq 2e^{2\alpha} \mathbb{E}_\theta[|s_\theta|] \sum_{j \in \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}} \int_{C_j} |t_\theta(z) - \tilde{t}_\theta(j)| d[QP_\theta](z). \end{aligned}$$

Now, for $j \in \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ and $z \in C_j$,

$$\begin{aligned} |t_\theta(z) - \tilde{t}_\theta(j)| &\leq \int_{\mathcal{X}} |s_\theta(x)| \left| \frac{q(z|x)}{q_\theta(z)} - \frac{\tilde{q}(j|x)}{\tilde{q}_\theta(j)} \right| p_\theta(x) dx \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_\theta[|s_\theta|] \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left| \frac{q(z|x)}{q_\theta(z)} - \frac{\tilde{q}(j|x)}{q_\theta(z)} + \frac{\tilde{q}(j|x)}{q_\theta(z)} - \frac{\tilde{q}(j|x)}{\tilde{q}_\theta(j)} \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \mathbb{E}_\theta[|s_\theta|] \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} (e^\alpha |q(z|x) - \tilde{q}(j|x)| + e^{3\alpha} |q_\theta(z) - \tilde{q}_\theta(j)|) \\
&\leq 2e^{3\alpha} \mathbb{E}_\theta[|s_\theta|] \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |q(z|x) - \tilde{q}(j|x)|.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
&|I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P}) - I_\theta(\tilde{Q}_m\mathcal{P})| \\
&\leq 4e^{6\alpha} I_\theta(\mathcal{P}) \sum_{j \in \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}} \int_{C_j^{(m)}} \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |q(z|x) - \tilde{q}(j|x)| \nu(dz) \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} 0,
\end{aligned}$$

in view of (B.2). \square

B.3. Proof of Lemma 4.8. Write $\mathcal{X} = \{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}\}$, fix a channel $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X})$ and write $\nu(dz) := Q(dz|x_0)$. Choose densities $q(z|x) \in [e^{-\alpha}, e^\alpha]$ as in Lemma C.2 (with $n = 1$ and μ_1 the uniform distribution on $\{0, \dots, k-1\}$) and, for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $i \in [k]$ and $j \in [\lceil 2^m(e^\alpha - e^{-\alpha}) \rceil]$ define

$$B_{i,j,m} := \{z \in \mathcal{Z} : e^{-\alpha} + 2^{-m}(j-1) \leq q(z|x_{i-1}) < e^{-\alpha} + 2^{-m}j\},$$

where $\lceil y \rceil$ denotes the smallest integer strictly larger than y . Notice that for fixed i and m , $(B_{i,j,m})_j$ is a partition of \mathcal{Z} . Now, for $j_0, j_1, \dots, j_{k-1} \in [\lceil 2^m(e^\alpha - e^{-\alpha}) \rceil]$ define $C_{j_0, \dots, j_{k-1}} := \bigcap_{i=0}^{k-1} B_{i,j_i,m}$. These are $\ell_m := \lceil 2^m(e^\alpha - e^{-\alpha}) \rceil^k$ sets which, by construction, still partition all of \mathcal{Z} . We enumerate them, writing $C_j^{(m)}$, $j \in [\ell_m]$. Finally, note that if $z \in C_j^{(m)}$, then there exists j_0, \dots, j_{k-1} such that for all $i \in [k]$, we have

$$e^{-\alpha} + 2^{-m}(j_i - 1) \leq q(z|x_{i-1}) < e^{-\alpha} + 2^{-m}j_i.$$

Therefore, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ Q(C_j^{(m)}|x_0) > 0}}^{\ell_m} \int_{C_j^{(m)}} \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left| q(z|x) - \frac{Q(C_j^{(m)}|x)}{Q(C_j^{(m)}|x_0)} \right| Q(dz|x_0) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ Q(C_j^{(m)}|x_0) > 0}}^{\ell_m} \int_{C_j^{(m)}} \max_{i \in [k]} \left| q(z|x_{i-1}) - \frac{\int_{C_j^{(m)}} q(z|x_{i-1}) \nu(dz)}{Q(C_j^{(m)}|x_0)} \right| \nu(dz) \\
&\leq \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ Q(C_j^{(m)}|x_0) > 0}}^{\ell_m} \int_{C_j^{(m)}} \max_{i \in [k]} (2^{-m}j_i - 2^{-m}(j_i - 1)) \nu(dz) = 2^{-m}.
\end{aligned}$$

\square

REMARK B.1. Notice that the argument in the proof of Lemma 4.8 fails in case of infinite \mathcal{X} , because then the required partition $(C_j^{(m)})$ of \mathcal{Z} would no longer be finite but even uncountable.

B.4. Proof of Lemma 4.9. For Part i, simply notice that a channel from $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ to $\mathcal{Z} = \{z_1, \dots, z_\ell\}$ is a collection of k discrete probability measures on \mathcal{Z} , each of which can be represented by a column ℓ -vector of probabilities that sum to one, that is, we set $Q_{ij} = Q(\{z_i\}|x_j)$, $i = 1, \dots, \ell$, $j = 1, \dots, k$.

For Part [iii](#), notice that $Q_{i\cdot} \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha(k)$ and, if $Q_{ij} = 0$ for some $i, j \in [k]$ then also $Q_{ij'} = 0$ for all $j' \in [k]$. By [Lemma 3.1](#) we can express the Fisher-Information of the model $Q\mathcal{P}$ with $Q \in \mathcal{M}_\alpha(\ell, k)$ (referring to the representation in [Part i](#)) as

$$\begin{aligned} I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P}) &= \sum_{\substack{i \in [\ell] \\ Q_{i1} > 0}} \left(\sum_{j \in [k]} s_\theta(x_j) \frac{Q_{ij} p_\theta(x_j)}{q_\theta(i)} \right)^2 q_\theta(i) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{i \in [\ell] \\ \|Q_{i\cdot}\|_2 > 0}} \frac{\left(\sum_{j \in [k]} Q_{ij} s_\theta(x_j) p_\theta(x_j) \right)^2}{\sum_{j \in [k]} Q_{ij} p_\theta(x_j)} = \sum_{i \in [\ell]} g_\theta(Q_{i\cdot}), \end{aligned}$$

where $g_\theta(i) = [QP_\theta](\{z_i\}) = \sum_{j \in [k]} Q_{ij} p_\theta(x_j)$. The only point where continuity of g_θ might fail is $v = 0$, because except for division by $v^T p_\theta$, we are only dealing with compositions of continuous functions. For $v \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha(k)$ we have $v^T p_\theta \geq \min_j v_j \geq e^{-\alpha} \|v\|_\infty \geq e^{-\alpha} \|v\|_2$ and thus, $g_\theta(v) \leq \|v\|_2 \|\dot{p}_\theta\|_2^2 e^\alpha \rightarrow 0$ as $v \rightarrow 0$. For convexity, pick $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, $v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha(k)$ and consider

$$g_\theta(\lambda v_1 + (1 - \lambda)v_2) = \frac{(\lambda v_1^T \dot{p}_\theta + (1 - \lambda)v_2^T \dot{p}_\theta)^2}{\lambda v_1^T p_\theta + (1 - \lambda)v_2^T p_\theta}.$$

If either one of v_1 or v_2 is equal to the null vector, we even have equality $g_\theta(\lambda v_1 + (1 - \lambda)v_2) = \lambda g_\theta(v_1) + (1 - \lambda)g_\theta(v_2)$. Otherwise, $v_1^T p_\theta$ and $v_2^T p_\theta$ are strictly positive and [Lemma C.5](#) yields the desired inequality $g_\theta(\lambda v_1 + (1 - \lambda)v_2) \leq \lambda g_\theta(v_1) + (1 - \lambda)g_\theta(v_2)$. For sub-linearity, simply note that $g_\theta(cv) = \frac{c^2 (v^T \dot{p}_\theta)^2}{c (v^T p_\theta)} = c g_\theta(v)$, for every $c > 0$, $v \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha(k)$, and use convexity to get $g_\theta(v_1 + v_2) = g_\theta(2[\frac{1}{2}v_1 + \frac{1}{2}v_2]) = 2g_\theta(\frac{1}{2}v_1 + \frac{1}{2}v_2) \leq 2[\frac{1}{2}g_\theta(v_1) + \frac{1}{2}g_\theta(v_2)] = g_\theta(v_1) + g_\theta(v_2)$. \square

LEMMA B.2. Consider a model $\mathcal{P} = (P_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$, $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$, on sample space \mathcal{X} that is [DQM](#) at the points $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$ with scores s_θ and $s_{\theta'}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X})} |I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P}) - I_{\theta'}(Q\mathcal{P})| \\ \text{(B.3)} \quad &\leq e^{2\alpha} (I_\theta(\mathcal{P}) \vee I_{\theta'}(\mathcal{P}) \vee 1) [2\|\dot{p}_\theta - \dot{p}_{\theta'}\|_{L_1(\mu)} + 3\|p_\theta - p_{\theta'}\|_{L_1(\mu)}] =: \varphi(\theta, \theta'), \end{aligned}$$

with $\dot{p}_\theta(x) := s_\theta(x)p_\theta(x)$.

PROOF. Fix $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X})$ and use [Lemmas 3.1](#) and [C.2](#) (with $n = 1$, yielding ν -densities $e^{-\alpha} \leq q(z|x) \leq e^\alpha$), to write

$$\begin{aligned} t_\theta(z) &:= \mathbb{E}[s_\theta(X)|Z = z] = \int_{\mathcal{X}} s_\theta(x) \frac{q(z|x)p_\theta(x)}{q_\theta(z)} \mu(dx) \\ &= \frac{1}{q_\theta(z)} \int_{\mathcal{X}} q(z|x) \dot{p}_\theta(x) \mu(dx) \end{aligned}$$

for the score of model $Q\mathcal{P}$ at θ , where $q_\theta(z) := \int_{\mathcal{X}} q(z|x)p_\theta(x)\mu(dx) \geq e^{-\alpha}$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} |I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P}) - I_{\theta'}(Q\mathcal{P})| &= \left| \int_{\mathcal{Z}} t_\theta^2(z) q_\theta(z) - t_{\theta'}^2(z) q_{\theta'}(z) \nu(dz) \right| \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{Z}} |t_\theta^2(z) - t_{\theta'}^2(z)| q_\theta(z) \nu(dz) + \int_{\mathcal{Z}} t_{\theta'}^2(z) |q_\theta(z) - q_{\theta'}(z)| \nu(dz), \end{aligned}$$

and $|q_\theta(z) - q_{\theta'}(z)| \leq e^\alpha \|p_\theta - p_{\theta'}\|_{L_1(\mu)}$. Hence, $\int_{\mathcal{Z}} t_{\hat{\theta}}^2(z) |q_\theta(z) - q_{\theta'}(z)| \nu(dz) \leq e^{2\alpha} \|p_\theta - p_{\theta'}\|_{L_1(\mu)} I_{\theta'}(Q\mathcal{P}) \leq e^{2\alpha} \|p_\theta - p_{\theta'}\|_{L_1(\mu)} I_{\theta'}(\mathcal{P})$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} |t_{\hat{\theta}}^2(z) - t_{\hat{\theta}'}^2(z) | q_\theta(z) &= |t_\theta(z) - t_{\theta'}(z)| q_\theta(z) \cdot |t_\theta(z) + t_{\theta'}(z)| \\ &= |t_\theta(z) + t_{\theta'}(z)| |t_\theta(z) q_\theta(z) - t_{\theta'}(z) q_{\theta'}(z) + t_{\theta'}(z) [q_{\theta'}(z) - q_\theta(z)]| \\ &\leq |t_\theta(z) + t_{\theta'}(z)| [e^\alpha \|\dot{p}_\theta - \dot{p}_{\theta'}\|_{L_1(\mu)} + |t_{\theta'}(z)| e^\alpha \|p_\theta - p_{\theta'}\|_{L_1(\mu)}]. \end{aligned}$$

The integral with respect to ν of this upper bound can be further bounded by

$$2e^{2\alpha} (I_\theta(\mathcal{P}) \vee I_{\theta'}(\mathcal{P}) \vee 1) [\|\dot{p}_\theta - \dot{p}_{\theta'}\|_{L_1(\mu)} + \|p_\theta - p_{\theta'}\|_{L_1(\mu)}].$$

□

B.5. Proof of Theorem 4.10. By Lemma B.2 we have

$$(B.4) \quad I_\theta(\hat{Q}\hat{T}_n\mathcal{P}) \geq I_{\hat{\theta}_n}(\hat{Q}\hat{T}_n\mathcal{P}) - \varphi(\theta, \hat{\theta}_n).$$

By Proposition A.5 of [Bickel et al. \(1993\)](#), $\hat{T}_n\mathcal{P}$ is DQM at all $\theta \in \Theta$ and therefore Lemma 4.7 and Lemma 4.8 show that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X}_{\varepsilon_n}^{(\hat{\theta}_n)})} I_{\hat{\theta}_n}(Q\hat{T}_n\mathcal{P}) &= \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha^*(\mathcal{X}_{\varepsilon_n}^{(\hat{\theta}_n)})} I_{\hat{\theta}_n}(Q\hat{T}_n\mathcal{P}) \\ &= \sup_{Q \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\alpha(\mathcal{X}_{\varepsilon_n}^{(\hat{\theta}_n)})} I_{\hat{\theta}_n}(Q\hat{T}_n\mathcal{P}) = \sup_{Q \in \bigcup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{M}_\alpha(\ell, \hat{k}_n)} I_{\hat{\theta}_n}(Q\hat{T}_n\mathcal{P}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the representation of Lemma 4.9(i). Now, Theorem 2(a) of [Kairouz, Oh and Viswanath \(2016\)](#) shows that the last supremum over $\bigcup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{M}_\alpha(\ell, \hat{k}_n)$ is actually achieved within the smaller set $\mathcal{M}_\alpha(\hat{k}_n)$, and \hat{Q} is a maximizer, hence,

$$\sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X}_{\varepsilon_n}^{(\hat{\theta}_n)})} I_{\hat{\theta}_n}(Q\hat{T}_n\mathcal{P}) = I_{\hat{\theta}_n}(\hat{Q}\hat{T}_n\mathcal{P}).$$

Combining this with (B.4), we have

$$I_\theta(\hat{Q}\hat{T}_n\mathcal{P}) \geq \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X}_{\varepsilon_n}^{(\hat{\theta}_n)})} I_{\hat{\theta}_n}(Q\hat{T}_n\mathcal{P}) - \varphi(\theta, \hat{\theta}_n).$$

Now Lemma 4.4 yields

$$\sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X}_{\varepsilon_n}^{(\hat{\theta}_n)})} I_{\hat{\theta}_n}(Q\hat{T}_n\mathcal{P}) \geq \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X})} I_{\hat{\theta}_n}(Q\mathcal{P}) - (I_{\hat{\theta}_n}(\mathcal{P}) \vee 1)\varepsilon_n.$$

Finally, applying Lemma B.2 again, we arrive at the bound

$$I_\theta(\hat{Q}\hat{T}_n\mathcal{P}) \geq \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X})} I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P}) - (I_{\hat{\theta}_n}(\mathcal{P}) \vee 1)\varepsilon_n - 2\varphi(\theta, \hat{\theta}_n).$$

The proof is now finished upon noting that φ from Lemma B.2 is continuous by our continuity assumptions and since DQM of \mathcal{P} implies continuity of $\theta \mapsto p_\theta$ from Θ to $L_1(\mu)$. □

APPENDIX C: TECHNICAL LEMMAS

LEMMA C.1. *Let $\mathcal{P} = (P_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ be a statistical model with open parameter space $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and a finite sample space \mathcal{X} . Write $p_\theta(x) = P_\theta(\{x\})$ for the corresponding probability mass functions. If $\theta \mapsto p_\theta(x)$ is twice differentiable on Θ for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X})$ is an arbitrary α -private channel on \mathcal{X} , then $\theta \mapsto I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P})$ is differentiable on Θ .*

PROOF. For given $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha(\mathcal{X})$, let $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{G})$ denote the measurable space on which the private data are generated, i.e., for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $Q(\cdot|x)$ is a probability measure on $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{G})$. For simplicity, write $I_\theta = I_\theta(Q\mathcal{P})$. We will show that for every $\theta \in \Theta$ the quotient $\frac{I_{\theta+h} - I_\theta}{h}$ has a limit as $h \rightarrow 0$. First, let $q(z|x)$ be a ν -density of $Q(\cdot|x)$ as in Lemma C.2 (with $n = 1$ and μ_1 the uniform distribution of the finite set \mathcal{X}). In particular, ν is a probability measure on $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{G})$ and $e^{-\alpha} \leq q(z|x) \leq e^\alpha$, for all $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. The model $Q\mathcal{P}$ can thus be described by its ν densities $q_\theta(z) := \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} q(z|x)p_\theta(x) \geq e^{-\alpha}$. Clearly, these are twice differentiable with $\dot{q}_\theta(z) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} q(z|x)\dot{p}_\theta(x)$ and $\ddot{q}_\theta(z) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} q(z|x)\ddot{p}_\theta(x)$ and we have $I_\theta = \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \left(\frac{\dot{q}_\theta(z)}{q_\theta(z)} \right)^2 q_\theta(z) \nu(dz)$. Now consider the quotient

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{I_{\theta+h} - I_\theta}{h} &= \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \frac{1}{h} \left[\frac{\dot{q}_{\theta+h}^2(z)}{q_{\theta+h}(z)} - \frac{\dot{q}_\theta^2(z)}{q_\theta(z)} \right] \nu(dz) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \frac{\dot{q}_{\theta+h}^2(z) - \dot{q}_\theta^2(z)}{h} \frac{1}{q_\theta(z)} \frac{q_\theta(z)}{q_{\theta+h}(z)} + \dot{q}_\theta^2(z) \frac{q_\theta(z) - q_{\theta+h}(z)}{h q_{\theta+h}(z) q_\theta(z)} \nu(dz). \end{aligned}$$

For every $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, the integrand converges to

$$\frac{2\dot{q}_\theta(z)\ddot{q}_\theta(z)}{q_\theta(z)} - \frac{\dot{q}_\theta^2(z)\dot{q}_\theta(z)}{q_\theta^2(z)},$$

as $h \rightarrow 0$, which is clearly ν -integrable. To see boundedness of the integrand by a ν -integrable function independent of h , first note that $e^{-\alpha} \leq q_\theta(z) \leq e^\alpha$. Next, notice that $h \mapsto D(h) := \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{h} [p_{\theta+h}(x) - p_\theta(x)]$ is continuous on a compact neighborhood of zero, say U , and thus attains its maximum. Therefore,

$$\sup_{h \in U} \left| \frac{q_{\theta+h}(z) - q_\theta(z)}{h} \right| \leq e^\alpha \sup_{h \in U} |D(h)| < \infty.$$

Similarly, with $\dot{D}(h) := \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{h} [\dot{p}_{\theta+h}(x) - \dot{p}_\theta(x)]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{h \in U} \left| \frac{\dot{q}_{\theta+h}^2(z) - \dot{q}_\theta^2(z)}{h} \right| &= \sup_{h \in U} \left| \frac{[\dot{q}_{\theta+h}(z) - \dot{q}_\theta(z) + \dot{q}_\theta(z)]^2 - \dot{q}_\theta^2(z)}{h} \right| \\ &= \sup_{h \in U} \left| \frac{\dot{q}_{\theta+h}(z) - \dot{q}_\theta(z)}{h} [\dot{q}_{\theta+h}(z) - \dot{q}_\theta(z)] + 2\dot{q}_\theta(z) \frac{\dot{q}_{\theta+h}(z) - \dot{q}_\theta(z)}{h} \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{h \in U} \left(e^{2\alpha} |h| |\dot{D}(h)|^2 + 2e^\alpha |\dot{D}(h)| \right) < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is now finished by the dominated convergence theorem, recalling the fact that ν is a probability measure. \square

LEMMA C.2. *Let $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and Q be α -differentially private from $(\mathcal{X}^n, \mathcal{F}^n)$ to some measurable space $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{G})$ as in (1.3). If $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}^n$ and $\nu(dz) := Q(dz|x_0)$, then $Q(\cdot|x) \ll \nu$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}^n$. Moreover, if $\mathcal{P} = (P_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ is a statistical model on sample space $(\mathcal{X}^n, \mathcal{F}^n)$ dominated by the σ -finite measure μ_n with corresponding densities $p_\theta = \frac{dP_\theta}{d\mu_n}$, then there exists a measurable function $q : \mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow [e^{-n\alpha}, e^{n\alpha}]$, such that for every $\theta \in \Theta$, $(z, x) \mapsto q(z, x)p_\theta(x)$ is a $\nu \otimes \mu_n$ -density of the probability measure $R_\theta(dz, dx) := Q(dz|x)P_\theta(dx)$ on $(\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{X}^n, \mathcal{G} \otimes \mathcal{F}^n)$. Thus, we use the notation $q(z|x) := q(z, x)$ suggestive of conditioning.*

PROOF. For $x \in \mathcal{X}^n$ and $A \in \mathcal{G}$, we have $Q(A|x) \leq e^{n\alpha} Q(A|x_0)$ and hence $Q(\cdot|x) \ll \nu$. For the second claim, define the measures $R(dz, dx) := Q(dz|x)\mu_n(dx)$, $R_0 := \nu \otimes \mu_n$ and,

for $\theta \in \Theta$, $S_\theta := \nu \otimes P_\theta$ on $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{G} \otimes \mathcal{F}^n$. For $C \in \mathcal{C}$, we have $R(C) = \int_{\mathcal{X}^n} Q(C_x|x)\mu_n(dx) \leq e^{n\alpha} \int_{\mathcal{X}^n} Q(C_x|x_0)\mu_n(dx) = e^{n\alpha} \int_{\mathcal{X}^n} \nu(C_x)\mu_n(dx) = e^{n\alpha} R_0(C)$ and thus, $R \ll R_0$. Furthermore, R_0 is the product of two σ -finite measures and hence σ -finite. Now take $\tilde{q} := \frac{dR}{dR_0} : \mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, which is clearly measurable and independent of θ , and notice that for arbitrary $C \in \mathcal{G} \otimes \mathcal{F}^n$,

$$(C.1) \quad \int_C \tilde{q}(z, x) p_\theta(x) R_0(dz, dx) = \int_C \frac{dR}{dR_0} p_\theta dR_0 = \int_C p_\theta dR = R_\theta(C).$$

Hence, $\tilde{q}(z, x) p_\theta(x)$ is an R_0 -density of R_θ . Furthermore, for arbitrary $A \in \mathcal{G}$ and $B \in \mathcal{F}^n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{A \times B} e^{-n\alpha} dR_0 &= \int_B e^{-n\alpha} Q(A|x_0) \mu_n(dx) \leq \int_B Q(A|x) \mu_n(dx) = R(A \times B) \\ &= \int_{A \times B} \tilde{q} dR_0 = \int_B Q(A|x) \mu_n(dx) \leq \int_B e^{n\alpha} Q(A|x_0) \mu_n(dx) = \int_{A \times B} e^{n\alpha} dR_0. \end{aligned}$$

Since cylinder sets generate the product σ -field, we have $e^{-n\alpha} \leq \tilde{q}(z, x) \leq e^{n\alpha}$, for R_0 -almost all $(z, x) \in \mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{X}^n$. Now set \tilde{q} equal to 1 on the corresponding R_0 -null set to obtain q , which does not have an effect on the validity of (C.1) and also the desired boundedness property is satisfied. \square

LEMMA C.3. *For $\gamma > 0$ and $c, d \in \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$|c^2 - d^2| \leq (1 + \gamma)(c - d)^2 + \frac{c^2 \wedge d^2}{\gamma}.$$

PROOF. Without loss of generality, let $|c| > |d| > 0$ and define

$$f(\gamma) := (1 + \gamma)(c - d)^2 + d^2(1 + \gamma^{-1}) - c^2.$$

We need to show that $f(\gamma) \geq 0$. For both $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ and $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$ we have $f(\gamma) \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, we only need to show that f is non-negative at its minimum. The first order condition for a minimum is

$$f'(\gamma) = (c - d)^2 - \gamma^{-2} d^2 = 0,$$

which is achieved at $\gamma^* = \frac{d}{c-d}$. But

$$f(\gamma^*) = \left(\frac{c-d}{c-d} + \frac{d}{c-d} \right) (c-d)^2 + d^2 \left(\frac{d}{d} + \frac{c-d}{d} \right) - c^2 = c(c-d) + cd - c^2 = 0,$$

which finishes the proof. \square

LEMMA C.4. *Let $(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{E})$, $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$, $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{G})$ and $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{H})$ be measurable spaces and consider $R \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{X})$, $Q \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y})$ and $T \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z})$. If Q is α -private, then so are QR and TQ .*

PROOF. Clearly $QR \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y})$. Fix $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $w, w' \in \mathcal{W}$ and pick $x' \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $Q(F|x') \leq \int_{\mathcal{X}} Q(F|x)R(dx|w')$. To see that this is possible, first consider the case where $\inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} Q(F|x)$ is attained. In that case we can simply take x' to be the minimizer. Otherwise, we have $\inf_{\bar{x} \in \mathcal{X}} Q(F|\bar{x}) < Q(F|x)$, for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. By strict monotonicity of the integral, this implies $\inf_{\bar{x} \in \mathcal{X}} Q(F|\bar{x}) < QR(F|w')$. Since the infimum can be approximated to arbitrary precision, we can find the desired x' . Therefore, using α -privacy of Q , we have $QR(F|w) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} Q(F|x)R(dx|w) \leq e^\alpha Q(F|x') \leq e^\alpha QR(F|w')$.

To establish α -privacy of $TQ \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z})$, fix $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$, $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$. Notice that for any $Y \in \mathcal{G}$, we have $\int_{\mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{1}_Y(y)Q(dy|x) = Q(Y|x) \leq e^\alpha Q(Y|x') = e^\alpha \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{1}_Y(y)Q(dy|x')$ and approximate the integrand $y \mapsto T(Z|y)$ in $TQ(Z|x) = \int_{\mathcal{Y}} T(Z|y)Q(dy|x)$ by simple functions. \square

LEMMA C.5. *Let $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, $x, y > 0$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$. Then*

$$\frac{(\lambda a + (1 - \lambda)b)^2}{\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y} \leq \lambda \frac{a^2}{x} + (1 - \lambda) \frac{b^2}{y}.$$

PROOF. We expand the square and multiply both sides by $\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y$ to obtain, after simplifying, the equivalent inequality

$$2ab \leq a^2 \frac{y}{x} + b^2 \frac{x}{y}.$$

Now define $h(a) := a^2 \frac{y}{x} + b^2 \frac{x}{y} - 2ab$. We want to show that $h(a) \geq 0$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $h'(a) = 2a \frac{y}{x} - 2b$ and $h''(a) = 2 \frac{y}{x} > 0$, we easily see that h is strictly convex and attains its unique minimum at $a^* = b \frac{x}{y}$. Since $h(a) \geq h(a^*) = 0$ the claim follows. \square

LEMMA C.6. *For an open subset $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and a measure space $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$, let $f : \Theta \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuously differentiable in its first argument and such that $x \mapsto f(\theta, x)$ and $x \mapsto \dot{f}(\theta, x) := \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f(\theta, x)$ are μ -integrable and $\theta \mapsto \|\dot{f}(\theta, \cdot)\|_{L_1(\mu)}$ is continuous and finite. Let $q : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be measurable and bounded. Then $\theta \mapsto \hat{q}(\theta) := \int_{\mathcal{X}} q(x) f(\theta, x) \mu(dx)$ is differentiable with derivative $\frac{d}{d\theta} \hat{q}(\theta) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} q(x) \dot{f}(\theta, x) \mu(dx)$. If, in addition, $\theta \mapsto \dot{f}(\theta, \cdot)$ is continuous as a function from Θ to $L_1(\mu)$, then the derivative $\theta \mapsto \frac{d}{d\theta} \hat{q}(\theta)$ is also continuous.*

PROOF. For $h \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\theta \in \Theta$, write $g_h(x) := \frac{1}{h} [f(\theta + h, x) - f(\theta, x)] \rightarrow \dot{f}(\theta, x)$ as $h \rightarrow 0$, and note that

$$\frac{1}{h} [\hat{q}(\theta + h) - \hat{q}(\theta)] = \int_{\mathcal{X}} q(x) g_h(x) \mu(dx).$$

By the fundamental theorem of calculus, $g_h(x) = \int_0^1 \dot{f}(\theta + uh, x) du$ and thus $\|g_h\|_{L_1(\mu)} \leq \int_0^1 \|\dot{f}(\theta + uh, \cdot)\|_{L_1(\mu)} du$. By assumption, the integral in the upper bound is finite and continuous as a function in h on a closed neighborhood U of 0 and thus also uniformly bounded on U . By the dominated convergence theorem the integral converges to $\|\dot{f}(\theta, \cdot)\|_{L_1(\mu)}$ as $h \rightarrow 0$. We conclude that $\limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \|g_h\|_{L_1(\mu)} \leq \|\dot{f}(\theta, \cdot)\|_{L_1(\mu)}$. Thus, Proposition 2.29 in van der Vaart (2007) yields $\|g_h - \dot{f}(\theta, \cdot)\|_{L_1(\mu)} \rightarrow 0$, as $h \rightarrow 0$, and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{h} [\hat{q}(\theta + h) - \hat{q}(\theta)] - \int_{\mathcal{X}} q(x) \dot{f}(\theta, x) \mu(dx) \right| &\leq \int_{\mathcal{X}} |q(x)| |g_h(x) - \dot{f}(\theta, x)| \mu(dx) \\ &\leq \|q\|_\infty \|g_h - \dot{f}(\theta, \cdot)\|_{L_1(\mu)} \xrightarrow{h \rightarrow 0} 0. \end{aligned}$$

For the continuity claim, simply note that

$$\left| \int_{\mathcal{X}} q(x) \dot{f}(\theta', x) \mu(dx) - \int_{\mathcal{X}} q(x) \dot{f}(\theta, x) \mu(dx) \right| \leq \|q\|_\infty \|\dot{f}(\theta', \cdot) - \dot{f}(\theta, \cdot)\|_{L_1(\mu)} \xrightarrow{\theta' \rightarrow \theta} 0.$$

\square

REFERENCES

- ACHARYA, J., CANONNE, C. L., TYAGI, H. and SUN, Z. (2022). The role of interactivity in structured estimation. In *Conference on Learning Theory* 1328–1355. PMLR.
- ATKINSON, A. C. and DONEV, A. N. (1992). *Optimum experimental designs. Oxford Statistical Science Series* **8**.
- BARNES, L. P., CHEN, W.-N. and ÖZGÜR, A. (2020). Fisher information under local differential privacy. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory* **1** 645–659.
- BASAWA, I. V. and SCOTT, D. J. (1983). *Asymptotic optimal inference for non-ergodic models. Lecture Notes in Statistics* **17**. Springer.
- BICKEL, P. J., KLAASSEN, A. J. C., RITOV, Y. and WELLNER, A. J. (1993). *Efficient and Adaptive Estimation for Semiparametric Models*. Springer, New York. ISBN: 978-0-387-98473-5.
- BUTUCEA, C., ROHDE, A. and STEINBERGER, L. (2022). Interactive versus non-interactive locally differentially private estimation: Two elbows for the quadratic functional. *arXiv:2003.04773*.
- 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.
- CAI, T. T., WANG, Y. and ZHANG, L. (2021). The cost of privacy: Optimal rates of convergence for parameter estimation with differential privacy. *Ann. Statist.* **49** 2825–2850.
- DINUR, I. and NISSIM, K. (2003). Revealing information while preserving privacy. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART Symposium on Principles of Database Systems* 202–210. ACM.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.2017.1389735>
- DUCHI, J. C. and RUAN, F. (2023). The right complexity measure in locally private estimation: It is not the Fisher information. *Ann. Statist.* **forthcoming**.
- DUNSCHE, M., KUTTA, T. and DETTE, H. (2022). Multivariate Mean Comparison Under Differential Privacy. In *Privacy in Statistical Databases: International Conference, PSD 2022* 31–45. Springer.
- DWORK, C. (2008). Differential privacy: A survey of results. In *International Conference on Theory and Applications of Models of Computation* 1–19. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-79228-4>
- DWORK, C. and NISSIM, K. (2004). Privacy-preserving datamining on vertically partitioned databases. In *Annual International Cryptology Conference* 528–544. Springer.
- DWORK, C., MCSHERRY, F., NISSIM, K. and SMITH, A. (2006). Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis. In *Theory of Cryptography* (S. HALEVI and T. RABIN, eds.). *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 265–284. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/11681878>
- EVFIMIEVSKI, A., GEHRKE, J. and SRIKANT, R. (2003). Limiting privacy breaches in privacy preserving data mining. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART Symposium on Principles of Database Systems* 211–222. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/773153.773174>
- HÁJEK, J. (1970). A characterization of limiting distributions of regular estimates. *Z. Wahrsch. verw. Gebiete* **14** 323–330. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00533669>
- HÖPFNER, R. (2014). *Asymptotic statistics: With a view to Stochastic Processes. De Gruyter Textbook*. De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110250282>
- HUCKE, U. (2019). Local Differential Privacy and Estimation in the Binomial Model., Master’s thesis, University of Freiburg.
- JEGANATHAN, P. (1980). Asymptotic theory of estimation when the limit of the log-likelihood ratios is mixed normal, PhD thesis, Indian Statistical Institute-Kolkata.
- JEGANATHAN, P. (1981). On a decomposition of the limit distribution of a sequence of estimators. *Sankhya A* **26**–36.
- JEGANATHAN, P. (1982). On the asymptotic theory of estimation when the limit of the log-likelihood ratios is mixed normal. *Sankhya A* **44** 173–212.
- KAIROUZ, P., OH, S. and VISWANATH, P. (2016). Extremal mechanisms for local differential privacy. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* **17** 492–542.
- LALANNE, C., GARIVIER, A. and GRIBONVAL, R. (2022). On the Statistical Complexity of Estimation and Testing under Privacy Constraints. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02215*.
- LE CAM, L. (1960). Locally asymptotically normal families of distributions. *Univ. California Publ. Statist.* **3** 37–98.
- PUKELSHEIM, F. (2006). *Optimal design of experiments*. SIAM.
- ROHDE, A. and STEINBERGER, L. (2020). Geometrizing rates of convergence under local differential privacy constraints. *Ann. Statist.* **48** 2646–2670. <https://doi.org/10.1214/19-AOS1901>
- SMITH, A. (2008). Efficient, differentially private point estimators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0809.4794*.

- SMITH, A. (2011). Privacy-preserving statistical estimation with optimal convergence rates. In *Proceedings of the Forty-Third Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing* 813–822. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1993636.1993743>
- VAN DER VAART, A. W. (2007). *Asymptotic Statistics*, 8th ed. *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- WARNER, S. L. (1965). Randomized response: A survey technique for eliminating evasive answer bias. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **60** 63–69. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1965.10480775>
- WASSERMAN, L. and ZHOU, S. (2010). A statistical framework for differential privacy. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **105** 375–389. <https://doi.org/10.1198/jasa.2009.tm08651>