

Representation Transfer for Differentially Private Drug Sensitivity Prediction

Teppo Niinimäki¹, Mikko Heikkilä², Antti Honkela^{2,3,4,*}, and Samuel Kaski^{1,*}

¹Helsinki Institute for Information Technology HIIT, Department of Computer Science, Aalto University, Finland,

²Helsinki Institute for Information Technology HIIT, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Helsinki, Finland,

³Department of Public Health, University of Helsinki, Finland and

⁴Helsinki Institute for Information Technology HIIT, Department of Computer Science, University of Helsinki, Finland.

Abstract

Motivation: Human genomic datasets often contain sensitive information that limits use and sharing of the data. In particular, simple anonymisation strategies fail to provide sufficient level of protection for genomic data, because the data are inherently identifiable. Differentially private machine learning can help by guaranteeing that the published results do not leak too much information about any individual data point. Recent research has reached promising results on differentially private drug sensitivity prediction using gene expression data. Differentially private learning with genomic data is challenging because it is more difficult to guarantee the privacy in high dimensions. Dimensionality reduction can help, but if the dimension reduction mapping is learned from the data, then it needs to be differentially private too, which can carry a significant privacy cost. Furthermore, the selection of any hyperparameters (such as the target dimensionality) needs to also avoid leaking private information.

Results: We study an approach that uses a large public dataset of similar type to learn a compact representation for differentially private learning. We compare three representation learning methods: variational autoencoders, PCA and random projection. We solve two machine learning tasks on gene expression of cancer cell lines: cancer type classification, and drug sensitivity prediction. The experiments demonstrate significant benefit from all representation learning methods with variational autoencoders providing the most accurate predictions most often. Our results significantly improve over previous state-of-the-art in accuracy of differentially private drug sensitivity prediction.

1 Introduction

Privacy-preserving machine learning has the potential to enable the research use of many sensitive datasets, that would otherwise be out of reach for the community. This is especially the case for medical data, which almost always contain sensitive information traceable back to the data subjects. As an example, it has been shown that individuals can be identified from genomic data (Gymrek *et al.*, 2013) including mixtures from several individuals (Homer *et al.*, 2008). It is likely that functional genomics data such as gene expression data are also identifiable. While different anonymisation strategies (Sweeney, 2002; Machanavajjhala *et al.*, 2007; Li *et al.*, 2007) can protect the privacy of the data subjects to some degree, they do not have formal guarantees and can fail to provide sufficient protection in practice (Ganta *et al.*, 2008).

Differential privacy (DP) (Dwork *et al.*, 2006; Dwork and Roth, 2014) is a framework that guarantees strict bounds for the amount of leaked private information, even in the presence of arbitrary side information. The guarantees are obtained by adding specific forms of randomisation to the computation process. In a machine learning context this usually means adding noise either directly to the input of the algorithm (*input perturbation*), to the output (*output perturbation*), or modifying the algorithm itself, for instance, by perturbing the optimisation objective (*objective perturbation*).

*These authors jointly supervised the work.

The privacy guarantee is controlled by a “privacy budget” parameter, usually denoted by $\epsilon > 0$; smaller ϵ means stricter guarantees, and can be achieved by increasing the amount of noise. Formally, a randomised mechanism \mathcal{M} is said to be ϵ -*differentially private*, if for all pairs of *neighbouring* datasets X, X' differing¹ on a single sample and all measurable subsets S of possible outputs,

$$\Pr(\mathcal{M}(X) \in S) \leq e^\epsilon \Pr(\mathcal{M}(X') \in S).$$

Intuitively, this means that changing one sample in the dataset can change the output distribution only by a factor e^ϵ .

As an extension, \mathcal{M} is said to be (ϵ, δ) -*differentially private*, if

$$\Pr(\mathcal{M}(X) \in S) \leq e^\epsilon \Pr(\mathcal{M}(X') \in S) + \delta,$$

for all measurable S and all neighbouring datasets X, X' . The condition with nonzero $\delta > 0$ is often easier to achieve than pure ϵ -DP.

In this article we are interested in DP learning for drug sensitivity prediction using gene expression data. First proposed by Staunton *et al.* (2001), the drug sensitivity prediction problem has attracted significant attention recently, including from a DREAM challenge in 2012 (Costello *et al.*, 2014) that provided standardised evaluation metrics. The scale of the cytotoxicity assays needed has kept the sizes of the available data sets relatively small from a machine learning perspective. Honkela *et al.* (2018) were the first to apply DP learning to this problem. They needed to specifically limit the sensitivity of the learning and the dimensionality of the input data to make the learning feasible.

In abstract terms, our goal in this problem is DP learning of predictive models with high-dimensional input data, where both input and output variables need DP protection. This is a case where DP methods tend to run into trouble with moderate dataset sizes: the amount of noise that needs to be added usually increases quickly with the dimensionality, leading to output that is dominated by the noise. This warrants the use of dimensionality reducing methods with the aim of finding a good low-dimensional representation of the original data. However, unless one uses a random projection or some other “dummy” method that does not depend on the data, finding a good representation can also leak private information. For this reason, the dimension reduction method itself would also need to be made differentially private, which can completely invalidate the noise magnitude savings obtained in any downstream task like prediction.

Different solutions have been proposed for various special cases: Kifer *et al.* (2012) solve sparse linear regression problems by using an ϵ -DP feature selection algorithm. Honkela *et al.* (2018) utilise external knowledge to select a relevant subset of features. Kasiviswanathan and Jin (2016) show theoretical results on using random projections to improve DP learning on high-dimensional problems. Differentially private versions of methods such as PCA (Chaudhuri *et al.*, 2012; Dwork *et al.*, 2014) or deep learning (Abadi *et al.*, 2016; Acs *et al.*, 2018) exist and could be used to learn a representation, but the noise cost can be impractically large for small but high-dimensional datasets.

We study a straightforward solution based on feature representation transfer, similar to self-taught learning of Raina *et al.* (2007). By using an additional non-sensitive dataset to learn the representation, we can apply more advanced representation learning methods. This approach has many advantages: we do not need labels for the additional data set, although in our case we make use of labels for a different task; and only the main learning algorithm needs to be differentially private, while the representation can be learned using any non-DP method. Additionally, the public data can also be used for optimising any hyperparameters for the representation learning. In this article, we consider PCA and variational autoencoders.

Differentially private transfer learning was recently considered by Wang *et al.* (2019) in a hypothesis transfer setting, where models trained on several related source domains are used to improve learning in the desired target domain. While related, this approach is not directly applicable to our problem because the setup is different.

Another related approach was considered by Papernot *et al.* (2017), who propose differentially private semi-supervised knowledge transfer that uses an ensemble of “teacher” models trained on private data to label unlabeled public data, which is then used to train a “student” model that will be released. The method is flexible in a sense that it can use any “black-box” model as teachers and student. However, it is limited to classification tasks. In addition, it seems to require a rather large private dataset in addition to a small public dataset—a setting that is somewhat different from what we are interested in.

¹There are two slightly different definitions of neighbouring datasets. In *bounded* case, the value of one sample is allowed to change. In *unbounded* case, the addition or removal of one sample is allowed. Unbounded ϵ -DP guarantee implies bounded 2ϵ -DP guarantee. This article uses the bounded case.

Yet another strategy is to learn a differentially private unsupervised generative model for the data (including the target variable for the prediction task of interest), use it to generate a synthetic version of the data, and use a non-DP algorithm for the actual learning task of interest. Several methods have been proposed for differentially private data sharing (Zhang *et al.*, 2017; Xie *et al.*, 2018; Acs *et al.*, 2018) that could be used for generative model learning and data generation. For the problem we are considering, however, this approach is problematic as it requires solving a more general and difficult learning task, good solution of which would typically require orders of magnitude more private data than a direct solution of the original prediction task.

The rest of this article is organised as follows: In Section 2 we formalise the problem setting and give an overview of our proposed approach. Section 3 gives more details on the implementation of different parts of the proposed approach. And finally, in Section 4 we conduct experiments with the approach on two different prediction tasks on genomic data.

2 Approach

We assume a setting where we have a private dataset containing a high-dimensional $n \times d$ feature matrix X_{priv} and an $n \times 1$ target vector Y_{priv} , where n is the number of samples and d is the number of features. The goal is to learn a differentially private predictor from X_{priv} to Y_{priv} . As learning to predict Y_{priv} from high-dimensional X_{priv} directly is typically not feasible, with moderate sample size and a reasonable privacy budget, we opt for using public data to learn a low-dimensional representation for X_{priv} . Therefore, we also assume a publicly available dataset of an $m \times d$ feature matrix X_{pub} and an $m \times 1$ auxiliary target vector Y'_{pub} for a related auxiliary prediction task. While a representation can be learned with X_{pub} only, the availability of Y'_{pub} is useful for selecting the size of the representation and any other hyperparameters.

We make the following informal assumptions about the relation of the public and the private data: (1) X_{priv} and X_{pub} contain the same set of features and are either draws from the same distribution or otherwise distributed similarly enough that using the same mapping to compute a representation is reasonable. (2) Y'_{pub} may or may not be of the same type as Y_{priv} , but the prediction tasks should resemble each other enough that the prediction of Y'_{pub} can be used for optimising the hyperparameters for the main task of predicting Y_{priv} .

We propose the following procedure:

1. Use the public data to learn a dimension-reducing representation mapping $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^r$, where $r \ll d$, such that $f^{-1}(f(X_{\text{pub}})) \approx X_{\text{pub}}$.
2. Obtain a low-dimensional representation Z_{priv} of the private feature data by applying f to X_{priv} .
3. Learn a differentially private predictor g such that $g(Z_{\text{priv}}) \approx Y_{\text{priv}}$.
4. Publish $g \circ f$.

An overview of the learning process is shown in Figure 1.

It is easy to see that the proposed process has the same DP-guarantees as the learning algorithm of step 3:

Theorem 1. *If step 3 is (ϵ, δ) -DP w.r.t. Z_{priv} and Y_{priv} , then the whole process is also (ϵ, δ) -DP w.r.t. X_{priv} and Y_{priv} .*

Proof. As the learning of f does not use private data, it does not leak any private information. Since each row of Z_{priv} depends only on the corresponding row of X_{priv} , (ϵ, δ) -guarantees w.r.t. Z_{priv} translate directly to guarantees w.r.t. X_{priv} . \square

In the following section we give some methods that can be used to implement the DP predictor g and the representation mapping f . In addition, we describe a procedure for tuning the hyperparameters of f .

3 Methods

3.1 Differentially private prediction

Later in Section 4 we will consider prediction tasks that are either real-valued regression or binary classification tasks. Linear regression will be applied to the former and logistic regression to the latter. For now, denote by X the feature matrix and by y the prediction target vector (either real-valued or binary $\{-1, 1\}$)




Figure 1: The process of learning f and g . Since the learning of g is DP, the leakage of information outside of the “privacy wall” is controlled.

Logistic regression can be made differentially private with objective perturbation. The usual non-DP version of the problem can be solved by minimising the regularised negative log-likelihood $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \log(1 + e^{y_i w^T x_i}) + \lambda w^T w$ with respect to the weight vector w , where x_i and y_i denote the i th sample in X and y respectively and λ controls the strength of L_2 regularisation. In a method presented by Chaudhuri and Monteleoni (2009), ϵ -DP privacy is obtained by adding a random bias term $b^T w/n$ (where b is a random vector drawn from a distribution with density proportional to $e^{-\epsilon \|b\|/2}$) to the optimisation objective. The method requires that the samples in the input feature data are bounded into a 1-sphere.

Like DP logistic regression, also a DP linear regression algorithm can be obtained with an analogous objective perturbation method (Kifer *et al.*, 2012). However, since the underlying model belongs to the exponential family, there is also an alternative output-perturbation based ϵ -DP method that does not require iterative optimisation: Compute the sufficient statistics ($X^T X$, $X^T y$ and $y^T y$) and add noise to them via the Laplace-mechanism (Foulds *et al.*, 2016). We use Bayesian linear regression with sufficient statistic perturbation and data clipping as described by Honkela *et al.* (2018).

3.2 Representation learning

Random projection (see e.g. Bingham and Mannila, 2001) projects the d -dimensional data to an r -dimensional subspace by multiplying it with a random $d \times r$ projection matrix. This transformation has been shown to preserve approximately the distances between data points (Johnson and Lindenstrauss, 1984), which is often a desired property for dimensionality reduction methods.

Principal component analysis (PCA) finds an orthogonal linear transformation that converts the data to coordinates that are uncorrelated and whose variance decreases from first to last coordinate. When used for dimensionality reduction, only the first r coordinates are kept—these correspond to the r orthogonal directions in which the variance of the original data is the highest.

Variational autoencoder (VAE) (Kingma and Welling, 2014) learns a generative decoder model $p_\theta(x|z)$, where z is a latent representation of x , and an encoder model $q_\xi(z|x)$ that approximates the posterior distribution $p_\theta(z|x)$. Both p_θ and q_ξ are implemented as neural networks (typically MLPs) and optimised




Figure 2: The process of hyperparameter optimisation. In this example the auxiliary prediction task is assumed to be classification with multiple classes (denoted by a, b, \dots, n), which are partitioned into subsets that consist of two classes each. These are then used in a cross-validation-like hyperparameter optimisation procedure.

concurrently with variational inference.

We fix z to be low-dimensional, in which case the learned encoder q_ξ can be used for dimensionality reduction by setting $f(x) = E_{z \sim q_\xi(\cdot|x)}[z]$. (As usual, define $q_\xi(\cdot|x)$ as a multivariate Gaussian distribution parametrised by mean $\mu_\xi(x)$ and diagonal covariance $\Sigma_\xi(x)$, in which case $f(x) = \mu_\xi(x)$.)

3.3 Optimisation of hyperparameters

For selecting the dimension of the representation and any other hyperparameters of the representation-learning algorithm, we propose a combination of any parameter optimisation approach (such as Bayesian optimisation, random search or grid search) and a cross-validation-like procedure for optimising an auxiliary task of predicting Y'_{pub} from X_{pub} . As no private data are used, the parameter optimisation phase does not consume any of the available privacy budget. In addition, if the auxiliary prediction task uses the same method as the main prediction task, then the hyperparameters could be optimised at the same time.

First the (public) data are divided into k disjoint subsets. Instead of using one of the subsets as “validation” data and the rest as “training” data as in cross-validation, we use one of the subsets to simulate the private data and the rest to simulate the public data. From now on, these are referred to as *pseudo-private* and *pseudo-public* sets. The proposed framework (from Section 2) is then applied to these, that is, a representation mapping f is learned from the pseudo-public data, f is applied to the features of pseudo-private data, a predictor g is learned for the pseudo-private target variable and its accuracy is measured. As in k -fold cross-validation, this is repeated for all k possible selections of the pseudo-private subset. For measuring the accuracy of g , (actual) cross-validation can be used, i.e., the pseudo-private data can be further divided into different learning and validation sets.

To mimic the case in which the public and private data do not have exactly the same distribution, we also want the pseudo-public and pseudo-private data to be sufficiently different. This guides the optimiser towards selecting conservative hyperparameters that are more likely to work well on a wide range of different private datasets. If the auxiliary prediction task is classification and Y'_{pub} has multiple classes, the subset division can be based on the classes: Form each subset by selecting the samples from two (or more) classes. This strategy is based on the assumption that samples belonging to different classes have different distributions. Otherwise, for instance clustering (based on either X_{pub} , Y'_{pub} or both) could be used for finding a good subset division. An overview of the proposed hyperparameter optimisation method is shown in Figure 2.

Table 1: The list of cancer type pairs ordered in descending order by the difficulty of classification. The pairs selected to be tested are numbered.

Case	First cancer type	Second cancer type
1	lung squamous cell carcinoma	head & neck squamous cell carcinoma
2	bladder urothelial carcinoma	cervical & endocervical cancer
3	colon adenocarcinoma	rectum adenocarcinoma
4	stomach adenocarcinoma	esophageal carcinoma
5	kidney clear cell carcinoma	kidney papillary cell carcinoma
6	glioblastoma multiforme	sarcoma
-	adrenocortical cancer	uveal melanoma
-	testicular germ cell tumor	uterine carcinosarcoma
-	lung adenocarcinoma	pancreatic adenocarcinoma
7	ovarian serous cystadenocarcinoma	uterine corpus endometrioid carcinoma
-	brain lower grade glioma	pheochromocytoma & paraganglioma
-	skin cutaneous melanoma	mesothelioma
-	liver hepatocellular carcinoma	kidney chromophobe
8	breast invasive carcinoma	prostate adenocarcinoma
-	acute myeloid leukemia	diffuse large B-cell lymphoma
-	thyroid carcinoma	cholangiocarcinoma

Table 2: Representation dimensions (repr-dim) and other selected hyperparameters (log learning rate, the number of hidden layers, the size of hidden layers) for different cases on cancer type classification.

case	RP	PCA	VAE			
	repr-dim			log-lr	layers	layer-dim
1	7	10	5	-3.5	1	755
2	7	14	5	-4.8	1	1925
3	8	10	5	-5.3	2	2370
4	8	14	5	-5.3	2	1270
5	7	8	4	-4.3	1	260
6	8	10	5	-4.5	1	330
7	7	12	5	-3.7	2	1510
8	5	7	4	-3.8	1	88

4 Results

We conducted experiments with two prediction tasks using cancer cell line gene expression data: cancer type classification and drug sensitivity prediction.

4.1 Representation learning for DP cancer type classification

We first demonstrate the method by classifying TCGA pan-cancer samples according to the annotated cancer type (e.g. lung squamous cell carcinoma) using RNA-seq gene expression data. In this task we use the data from The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) project (The TCGA authors, 2016) as both the private and public datasets. We use this example because it can be performed within the large TCGA dataset. Because most cancer type pairs are quite easy to identify, we focus on a number of most difficult pairs.

We used preprocessed TCGA pan-cancer RNA-seq data available at <https://xenabrowser.net/datapages/>. After further preprocessing (filtering out low-expression genes, applying RLE normalisation) the dataset contains 10534 samples, 14796 genes and 33 distinct cancer types. We pick two cancer types as private data and the remaining cancer types form the public dataset. The main and auxiliary prediction tasks are therefore both cancer type classification tasks, but for distinct classes. For prediction we use the differentially private logistic regression algorithm by Chaudhuri and Monteleoni (2009).

While the split to private and public data could be done in multiple ways, the prediction task would be quite easy in many of those. Hence, we use the following procedure to produce several of these splits: (1) Consider all $\binom{33}{2}$ possible splits and run a non-DP version of the pipeline (as in Figure 1) with PCA-based reduction to eight-dimensional space. (2) Build a sequence of cancer-type pairs by picking the pair that was the hardest to predict (i.e. has lowest classification accuracy), then from the remaining cancer types again the pair that was hardest, and so on. The result is a sequence of 16 pairs ordered by the prediction difficulty (see Table 1). (3) Of these pairs, select the 6 hardest, as well as those 2 of the remaining pairs that had at least 200 samples in both classes.

The full testing pipeline, including the hyperparameter optimisation phase, was then run separately




Figure 3: Logistic regression prediction accuracy (the fraction of correctly classified samples) with $\epsilon = 1.0$ in 8 cancer type classification tasks (see Table 1). Data: TCGA. Error bars show the standard deviation of the mean accuracy over 9 independent runs of the testing phase.

for each of the 8 selected pairs as a private dataset. In each case, the remaining 15 pairs form the $k = 15$ subsets that were used for optimising the hyperparameters.

Methods We compare three different representation learning methods: random projection (RP), principal component analysis (PCA) and variational autoencoder (VAE) (Kingma and Welling, 2014). VAE was implemented with PyTorch (Paszke *et al.*, 2017) and uses 1–3 hidden layers with ReLU activation functions for both the encoder and the decoder. The learning phase uses the Adam optimiser (Kingma and Ba, 2015) and is given one hour of GPU time with early stopping. The size of the representation (for RP, PCA and VAE) and other hyperparameters for VAE (the number of layers, layer sizes, learning rate) are optimised with GPyOpt (The GPyOpt authors, 2016). We also experimented with optimising a much larger set of hyperparameters, 12 in total, but GPyOpt had difficulties in obtaining similar levels of performance.

For each of the 8 test cases we ran the hyperparameter optimisation phase once, giving it 5 days of time. Then with the best found hyperparameters we ran the final testing 9 times with different RNG seeds, and report the mean prediction accuracy as well as the standard deviation of the mean. In measuring the prediction accuracy (both for hyperparameter optimisation and for final testing) we use 10-fold cross-validation.

Results Figure 3 shows the final prediction accuracy in the selected 8 cases for $\epsilon = 1$. While none of the methods fully dominates the others, VAE seems to get some edge, being clearly the best in about half




Figure 4: Logistic regression classification accuracy in cancer type classification as a function of ϵ for case 1. The error bars denote the standard error of the mean when repeating the DP learning but do not cover the uncertainty from hyperparameter selection.

of the cases and doing decent job in the rest of the cases too. The selected hyperparameters are listed in Table 2. Interestingly, VAE seems to always end up with lower dimensionality of the representation than the other two methods. This could be due to the fact that VAE allows nonlinear transformations which can help to compress the relevant information in the data into a smaller number of dimensions. On the other hand, it is not clear why RP also always chooses lower dimension than PCA.

The prediction accuracy as a function of ϵ in the case 1 is shown in Figure 4 and the corresponding hyperparameters are shown in Table 3. As expected, larger ϵ results in better accuracy. There is some variability compared to case 1 in Figure 3, which is mostly likely due to the results having been computed with different hyperparameters. Due to the high computational cost, variability due to hyperparameter adaptation is not included in the error bars.

4.2 Representation learning for DP drug sensitivity prediction

Our main learning task is to predict the sensitivities of cancer cell lines to certain drugs. In this task we use data from the Genomics of Drug Sensitivity in Cancer (GDSC) project (Yang *et al.*, 2013) as private data. After preprocessing the data contains 985 samples, 11714 genes and 265 drugs. The data are sparse in the sense that not all drugs have been tested on all samples. For prediction we use the differentially private Bayesian linear regression algorithm by Honkela *et al.* (2018). The DP linear regression is applied for each drug separately, using the full ϵ budget as if it was the only drug we are interested in. We then measure and report the average prediction accuracy over all drugs.

As public data we use the gene expression measurements from the TCGA data with cancer type classification as the auxiliary prediction task. The private and public datasets are unified by removing genes not appearing in both datasets. In addition, since the TCGA gene expression data are RNA-seq-

Table 3: Selected hyperparameters for different values of ϵ in the case 1 of cancer type classification. See Table 2 for explanation of the columns.

ϵ	RP	PCA	VAE			
	repr-dim			log-lr	layers	layer-dim
0.5	5	5	5	-4.6	1	725
0.7	6	14	5	-4.6	1	880
1	14	14	5	-4.1	1	395
1.5	9	9	5	-4.9	1	1570
2	10	11	10	-4.0	1	680

based while GDSC data are based on microarrays, we apply quantile normalisation to each gene in the TCGA data to make it match the distribution of the gene in the GDSC data. (While this operation theoretically breaks the privacy guarantees, in practice we can avoid the issue by assuming that the expression distributions obtained with the microarray technology are public knowledge.)

Methods In addition to RP, PCA and VAE, we also compare to DP feature selection by Sample and Aggregate framework (SAF) as presented by Kifer *et al.* (2012), as well as to using a set of 10 preselected genes that were used by Honkela *et al.* (2018) in the same prediction task. In the case of SAF half of the privacy budget is reserved for feature selection.

RP, PCA and VAE learning was performed in a similar manner as in the cancer type classification task. For selecting the size of the representation of SAF, we simply ran it with all possible sizes and select the best result (which is obviously unfair for the other methods and would yield a weaker privacy guarantee).

Results Figure 5 shows the average prediction performance, measured by Spearman’s rank correlation. Here PCA and VAE are the best by some margin, both improving significantly over the previous state-of-the-art with preselected genes. On the other hand, SAF is clearly the worst as the DP feature selection is essentially random due to small privacy budget, and since it leaves only half of the privacy budget for the main prediction task.

5 Discussion

Our results clearly demonstrate that representation learning with public data can significantly improve the accuracy of differentially private learning, compared to using a set of preselected dimensions or doing differentially private feature selection. Whether it is beneficial to use more advanced representation learning methods such as variational autoencoders instead of simple methods such as PCA or random projections, depends on the task. On some tasks that certainly seems to be the case.

In our current approach, the representation is learned in an unsupervised manner and the auxiliary supervised task is only used for hyperparameter selection. A natural question, that we leave for further work, is whether representation learning would also benefit from having an integral auxiliary prediction task that would be learned concurrently with the representation. The optimisation target would in that case be a combination of unsupervised reconstruction error and supervised prediction error. This approach would require an auxiliary target variable, as is the case in this work with hyperparameter optimisation.

In general, we believe DP learning can be important in opening genomic and other biomedical datasets to broader use. This can significantly advance open science and open data, and lead to more accurate models for precision medicine. So far, the accuracy of DP learning in most practical applications is not comparable to realistic non-private alternatives. Our present work makes an important contribution toward making DP learning practical.

In the present work the representation learning was not performed under DP. This is a clear limitation if the other data set also needs privacy protection. This can in theory be addressed easily, by simply training the representation model under DP, but this will likely have an impact on the accuracy of the final model. Ultimately we believe that a clever combination of private and non-private data such as in our paper can lead to the best results.




Figure 5: The accuracy of drug sensitivity prediction (Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient between the measured ranking of the cell lines and the ranking predicted by the models) with differentially private linear regression ($\epsilon = 1.0$) on the GDSC data.

Acknowledgements

We thank the reviewers of an earlier workshop version of this article for helpful comments.

Funding

This work has been supported by the Academy of Finland [Finnish Center for Artificial Intelligence FCAI and grants 292334, 294238, 303815, 303816, 313124].

References

- Abadi, M., Chu, A., Goodfellow, I., McMahan, H. B., Mironov, I., Talwar, K., and Zhang, L. (2016). Deep learning with differential privacy. In *Proc. 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conf. on Computer and Communications Security (CCS 2016)*, pages 308–318.
- Acs, G., Melis, L., Castelluccia, C., and Cristofaro, E. D. (2018). Differentially private mixture of generative neural networks. *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.* doi:10.1109/TKDE.2018.2855136.
- Bingham, E. and Mannila, H. (2001). Random projection in dimensionality reduction: Applications to image and text data. In *Proc. Seventh ACM SIGKDD Int. Conf. on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD 2001)*, pages 245–250.

- Chaudhuri, K. and Monteleoni, C. (2009). Privacy-preserving logistic regression. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 21*, pages 289–296.
- Chaudhuri, K., Sarwate, A., and Sinha, K. (2012). Near-optimal differentially private principal components. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 25*, pages 989–997.
- Costello, J. C. *et al.* (2014). A community effort to assess and improve drug sensitivity prediction algorithms. *Nat. Biotechnol.*, **32**(12), 1202–1212.
- Dwork, C. and Roth, A. (2014). The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy. *Found. Trends Theor. Comput. Sci.*, **9**(3–4), 211–407.
- Dwork, C., McSherry, F., Nissim, K., and Smith, A. (2006). Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis. In *Theory of Cryptography (TCC 2006)*, pages 265–284.
- Dwork, C., Talwar, K., Thakurta, A., and Zhang, L. (2014). Analyze Gauss: Optimal bounds for privacy-preserving principal component analysis. In *Proc. 46th Ann. ACM Symp. on Theory of Computing (STOC 2014)*, pages 11–20.
- Foulds, J., Geumlek, J., Welling, M., and Chaudhuri, K. (2016). On the theory and practice of privacy-preserving Bayesian data analysis. In *Proceedings of the 32nd Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence (UAI 2016)*, pages 192–201.
- Ganta, S. R., Kasiviswanathan, S. P., and Smith, A. (2008). Composition attacks and auxiliary information in data privacy. In *Proc. 14th ACM SIGKDD Int. Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD 2008)*, pages 265–273.
- Gymrek, M., McGuire, A. L., Golan, D., Halperin, E., and Erlich, Y. (2013). Identifying personal genomes by surname inference. *Science*, **339**(6117), 321–324.
- Homer, N., Szlinger, S., Redman, M., Duggan, D., Tembe, W., Muehling, J., Pearson, J. V., Stephan, D. A., Nelson, S. F., and Craig, D. W. (2008). Resolving individuals contributing trace amounts of DNA to highly complex mixtures using high-density SNP genotyping microarrays. *PLOS Genetics*, **4**(8), 1–9.
- Honkela, A., Das, M., Nieminen, A., Dikmen, O., and Kaski, S. (2018). Efficient differentially private learning improves drug sensitivity prediction. *Biology Direct*, **13**(1).
- Johnson, W. B. and Lindenstrauss, J. (1984). Extensions of Lipschitz mappings into a Hilbert space. In *Conference in modern analysis and probability (New Haven, Conn., 1982)*, volume 26 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 189–206. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI.
- Kasiviswanathan, S. P. and Jin, H. (2016). Efficient private empirical risk minimization for high-dimensional learning. In *Proc. 33rd Int. Conf. on Machine Learning (ICML 2016)*, pages 488–497.
- Kifer, D., Smith, A., and Thakurta, A. (2012). Private convex empirical risk minimization and high-dimensional regression. In *Proc. 25th Ann. Conf. on Learning Theory (COLT 2012)*, pages 25.1–25.40.
- Kingma, D. and Ba, J. (2015). Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In *Proc. 3rd Int. Conf. for Learning Representations (ICLR 2015)*.
- Kingma, D. and Welling, M. (2014). Auto-encoding variational Bayes. In *Proc. 2nd Int. Conf. on Learning Representation (ICLR 2014)*.
- Li, N., Li, T., and Venkatasubramanian, S. (2007). t-closeness: Privacy beyond k-anonymity and l-diversity. In *IEEE 23rd Int. Conf. on Data Engineering (ICDE 2007)*, pages 106–115.
- Machanavajjhala, A., Kifer, D., Gehrke, J., and Venkatasubramanian, M. (2007). l-diversity: Privacy beyond k-anonymity. *ACM Trans. Knowl. Discovery Data*, **1**(1).
- Papernot, N., Abadi, M., Erlingsson, U., Goodfellow, I., and Talwar, K. (2017). Semi-supervised knowledge transfer for deep learning from private training data. In *Proc. 5th Int. Conf. on Learning Representations (ICLR 2017)*.

- Paszke, A., Gross, S., Chintala, S., Chanan, G., Yang, E., DeVito, Z., Lin, Z., Desmaison, A., Antiga, L., and Lerer, A. (2017). Automatic differentiation in PyTorch. NIPS 2017 Workshop.
- Raina, R., Battle, A., Lee, H., Packer, B., and Ng, A. Y. (2007). Self-taught learning. In *Proc. 24th Int. Conf. on Machine Learning (ICML 2007)*. ACM Press.
- Staunton, J. E., Slonim, D. K., Collier, H. A., Tamayo, P., Angelo, M. J., Park, J., Scherf, U., Lee, J. K., Reinhold, W. O., Weinstein, J. N., Mesirov, J. P., Lander, E. S., and Golub, T. R. (2001). Chemosensitivity prediction by transcriptional profiling. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, **98**(19), 10787–10792.
- Sweeney, L. (2002). k-anonymity : A model for protecting privacy. *Int. J. Uncertainty Fuzziness Knowledge Based Syst.*, **10**(5), 557–570.
- The GPyOpt authors (2016). GPyOpt: A Bayesian optimization framework in Python. <http://github.com/SheffieldML/GPyOpt>.
- The TCGA authors (2016). Data published by TCGA research network. <http://cancergenome.nih.gov/>.
- Wang, Y., Gu, Q., and Brown, D. (2019). Differentially private hypothesis transfer learning. In *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases (ECML PKDD 2018)*, volume 11052 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 811–826. Springer International Publishing.
- Xie, L., Lin, K., Wang, S., Wang, F., and Zhou, J. (2018). Differentially private generative adversarial network. arXiv:1802.06739 [cs.LG].
- Yang, W., Soares, J., Greninger, P., Edelman, E. J., Lightfoot, H., Forbes, S., Bindal, N., Beare, D., Smith, J. A., Thompson, I. R., Ramaswamy, S., Futreal, P. A., Haber, D. A., Stratton, M. R., Benes, C., McDermott, U., and Garnett, M. J. (2013). Genomics of drug sensitivity in cancer (GDSC): a resource for therapeutic biomarker discovery in cancer cells. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **41**(D4), D955–D961.
- Zhang, J., Cormode, G., Procopiuc, C. M., Srivastava, D., and Xiao, X. (2017). PrivBayes: Private data release via Bayesian networks. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.*, **42**(4), 25:1–25:41.