

Differentially Private Histogram, Predecessor, and Set Cardinality under Continual Observation

Monika Henzinger^{*1}, A. R. Sricharan², and Teresa Anna Steiner^{† 3}

¹Institute of Science and Technology Austria (ISTA), Klosterneuburg, Austria

²University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

²UniVie Doctoral School of Computer Science DoCS

³Technical University of Denmark, Lyngby, Denmark

Abstract

Differential privacy is the de-facto privacy standard in data analysis. The classic model of differential privacy considers the data to be static. The dynamic setting, called *differential privacy under continual observation*, captures many applications more realistically. In this work we consider several natural *dynamic data structure problems* under continual observation, where we want to maintain information about a changing data set such that we can answer certain sets of queries at any given time while satisfying ϵ -differential privacy. The problems we consider include (a) maintaining a histogram and various extensions of histogram queries such as quantile queries, (b) maintaining a predecessor search data structure of a dynamically changing set in a given ordered universe, and (c) maintaining the cardinality of a dynamically changing set. For (a) we give new error bounds parameterized in the maximum output of any query c_{\max} : our algorithm gives an upper bound of $O(d \log^2 dc_{\max} + \log T)$ for computing histogram, the maximum and minimum column sum, quantiles on the column sums, and related queries. The bound holds for unknown c_{\max} and T . For (b), we give a general reduction to orthogonal range counting. Further, we give an improvement for the case where only insertions are allowed. We get a data structure which for a given query, returns an interval that contains the predecessor, and at most $O(\log^2 u \sqrt{\log T})$ more elements, where u is the size of the universe. The bound holds for unknown T . Lastly, for (c), we give a parameterized upper bound of $O(\min(d, \sqrt{K \log T}))$, where K is an upper bound on the number of updates. We show a matching lower bound. Finally, we show how to extend the bound for (c) for unknown K and T .

1 Introduction

Differential privacy is a well-studied and widely applied privacy standard for data analysis. Its definition is due to [Dwork et al. \[2006\]](#). For any $\epsilon > 0$, a randomized algorithm is ϵ -*differentially private* if the output distributions differ by at most a factor of e^ϵ for any two *neighboring* input data sets, i.e., data sets that differ only in at most *one* data item. A relaxation called (ϵ, δ) -*differential privacy* additionally allows the output distributions to differ in an additive term $\delta > 0$.

*

This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (Grant agreement No. 101019564 “The Design of Modern Fully Dynamic Data Structures (MoDynStruct)”) and from the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) project Z 422-N, project “Static and Dynamic Hierarchical Graph Decompositions”, I 5982-N, and project “Fast Algorithms for a Reactive Network Layer (ReactNet)”, P 33775-N, with additional funding from the *netidee SCIENCE Stiftung*, 2020–2024.



[†]This work was supported by a research grant (VIL51463) from VILLUM FONDEN. Part of this work was done while the author was visiting the Institute of Science and Technology Austria (ISTA), Klosterneuburg, Austria.

The classic model of differential privacy considers the data to be static. The dynamic setting, called *differential privacy under continual observation (or release)*, captures many applications more realistically and was first studied by [Dwork et al. \[2010\]](#). Here the data arrives in a stream of length T , and the problem is to answer queries about the data at each of the T time steps. There are two definitions of differential privacy in this setting: *event-level* differential privacy, where two neighboring data sets differ in the data of a single update; and *user-level* differential privacy, where two neighboring data sets differ in the data of *all updates* corresponding to the same data entry. Clearly, user-level privacy is stronger and in most cases harder to achieve.

In the binary counting problem for differential privacy under continual observation (*continual binary counting*), one data row is either a 0 or a 1 and the goal is to estimate the total sum at every time step. The best known upper bounds for binary counting for ϵ -differential privacy is an error of $O(\log^2 T)$, while the highest known lower bound is $\Omega(\log T)$, where T is an upper bound on the number of time steps in a stream and does not need to be known by the algorithm ([Dwork et al. \[2010\]](#), [Chan et al. \[2011\]](#)).

The algorithm achieving an error of $O(\log^2 T)$ is called the binary tree mechanism and is used as a black-box subroutine for a number of applications ([Fichtenberger et al. \[2021, 2022\]](#), [Jain et al. \[2021\]](#), [Cardoso and Rogers \[2022\]](#)). It can be seen as a very simple dynamic data structure, namely a binary counter. In this work, we consider several natural and more general *dynamic data structure problems* under continual observation, where we want to maintain information about a changing data set such that we can answer certain sets of queries at any given time while satisfying ϵ -differential privacy. The problems we consider include (a) maintaining a histogram and various extensions of histogram queries such as quantile queries, (b) maintaining a predecessor search data structure of a dynamically changing set in a given ordered universe, and (c) maintaining the cardinality of a dynamically changing set. For all of these, no prior work is known and we achieve better error bounds than can be achieved by naively applying existing techniques such as the binary tree mechanism or the sparse vector technique. Our results are summarized in [Table 1](#). To achieve these results, we significantly extend and generalize the sparse vector technique introduced by [Dwork et al. \[2010\]](#) and combine it with ideas from dynamic data structures. For example, for our new histogram results, we combine the sparse vector technique with differentially private histograms against an adaptive adversary.

In all our bounds, T denotes the number of time steps for which we monitor the data, such that at any time step we can either update the data and/or ask any subset of possible queries. We consider two different models for updates, the *partially dynamic model*, where only insertions are allowed, and the *fully dynamic model*, also called the *turnstile model*, where both insertions and deletions are allowed.

Most of these bounds hold independently of whether T is known at the beginning of the input, only for SETCARDINALITY the bound is a factor of $\sqrt{\log T}$ worse if T is not known. To allow our algorithms to work for an infinite time line we use an approach from [Qiu and Yi \[2022\]](#). Next we describe the problems we consider and the results we achieve in more detail.

1.1 Overview of results

Histograms and histogram queries. In this problem, every data row is an element of $\{0, 1\}^d$ for $d \in \mathbb{N}$, and at every time step, exactly one such row may be inserted (we do not consider deletions). We want to be able to answer queries about the column sums, i.e., the sum of the i th coordinate in each data row up to the current point in time, for $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. We consider *event-level* privacy, which means that two neighboring data streams differ in the insertion of one row. Note that this is a direct generalization of the binary counting problem. Examples of such queries are selecting the top- k elements and computing quantiles, which are widely used in data analysis [[Ilyas et al., 2008](#)] and as subroutines in statistical methods [[Kruskal and Wallis, 1952](#), [Huber, 1992](#)]. Due to the wide range of applications of these queries in analyzing potentially sensitive data, static versions of these queries have been considered in a large body of prior work [[Qiao et al., 2021](#), [Carvalho et al., 2020](#), [Durfee and Rogers, 2019](#), [Gillenwater et al., 2021](#), [Kaplan et al., 2022](#), [Durfee, 2023](#), [Aliakbarpour et al., 2023](#), [Cohen et al., 2023a](#)].

In recent work, [Jain et al. \[2021\]](#) showed upper and lower bounds on the error for computing the maximum column sum over a stream of rows from $\{0, 1\}^d$ (MAXSUM), as well as selecting the index of the maximum column sum (SUMSELECT) under differential privacy. Here and in the following, all stated error bounds hold

Problem	existing techniques	our upper	lower	comment
Histogram Queries	$O(d \log T \log(dT))$ (Binary Tree Mech.)	$O(d \log^2(dc_{\max}) + \log T)$	$\Omega(d + \log T)$	c_{\max} is an upper bound on the output
Set Cardinality	$O(\min(d, K \log^2 T))$ (Binary Tree Mech.)	$O(\min(d, \sqrt{K \log T}))$	$\Omega(\min(d, \sqrt{K \log \frac{T}{K}}))$	K is an upper bound on number of updates; user-level dp
Fully Dynamic Predecessor	-	$O(\log^2 u \log^{3/2} T)$	$\Omega(\log T + \log u)$	fully dynamic; u is the size of the universe
Partially Dynamic Predecessor	-	$O(\log^2 u \sqrt{\log T})$	$\Omega(\log T + \log u)$	partially dynamic; u is the size of the universe
d -dim. Above Threshold	$O(d \log T + d \log d)$ (Sparse Vector Tech.)	$O(d \log^2 d + \log T)$	$\Omega(d + \log T)$	

Table 1: Summary of results for known T . For unknown T , the same bounds hold except for SETCARDINALITY, which becomes $O(\min(d, \sqrt{K \log T})$. For simplicity, the bounds are stated here for constant ϵ and β .

with constant probability. Clearly, the lower bound for binary counting immediately extends to the problem of top- k selection and computing all column sums (HISTOGRAM). However, the bounds of Jain et al. [2021] leave a gap: For MAXSUM and ϵ -differential privacy, their lower bound is $\Omega(\min(\sqrt{T}, d, T))$, while their upper bound is $O(\min(\sqrt{T}, d \cdot \log^2 T, T))$. Similarly, for SUMSELECT and ϵ -differential privacy, their lower bound is $\Omega(\min(\sqrt{T \log(d/T)}, d, T))$, while their upper bound is $O(\min(\sqrt{T \log(dT)}, d \log d \log^3 T, T))$. We focus on the bounds that are subpolynomial in T . Note that the d term in the lower bound can be strengthened to $d + \log T$, because of the $\Omega(\log T)$ lower bound on the error of binary counting by Dwork et al. [2010]. The $O(d \log d \log^3 T)$ upper bound comes from computing a full histogram by composing d binary tree mechanisms for binary counting under continual observation [Dwork et al., 2010, Chan et al., 2011]. Using the result by Dwork et al. [2015] for binary counting, the error for computing a d -dimensional histogram under continual observation can be improved to $\tilde{O}(d \log^2 n_{\max} + d \log T)$ ¹, where n_{\max} is an upper bound on the number of ones in any column. In Dwork et al. [2015], the value n_{\max} is considered to be given; however, as pointed out by Qiu and Yi [2022], this result also holds when n_{\max} is not known beforehand, by combining it with the two-level mechanism in Chan et al. [2011] and using carefully chosen error probabilities for subroutines. Despite this improvement, a natural question remains: “Is an error of $\Omega(d \cdot \log T)$ necessary?”

In this work we show how to break the $\Omega(d \cdot \log T)$ -barrier in the case where the maximum output of a query is much smaller than the stream length. Specifically, we show new parameterized upper bounds for computing HISTOGRAM, MAXSUM, and SUMSELECT under continual observation, as well as a larger class of queries with similar properties including the median column sum and the minimum column sum, with error $O(d \log^2 c_{\max} + \log T)$, where c_{\max} is an upper bound on the *maximum query value on the given input at any time step*. In our bound there are two improvements over prior work: (a) We replace n_{\max} by c_{\max} . For example, if the query asks for the minimum column sum, c_{\max} would be the minimum column sum in the final histogram, which might be much smaller than n_{\max} . (b) We replace $d \log T$ by $\log T$. Thus we achieve a reduction in the additive error for all streams where $\log^2 c_{\max} = o(\log T)$, i.e., where $c_{\max} = 2^{o(\sqrt{\log T})}$.

Our algorithms do not need to be given c_{\max} at initialization. Also note that there is no hope of removing the dependency on d altogether, because of the previously stated lower bound by Jain et al. [2021].

The following theorem summarizes our main result for histograms. To state it, we need the notion of *sensitivity* of a function, which is the maximum difference between the outputs on any two neighboring data

¹For simplicity, we use $\tilde{O}(X) = O(X \text{polylog}(X))$.

sets. For a formal definition of sensitivity see Definition 4.

Theorem 1. *Let $x = x^1, \dots, x^T$ be a stream of elements $x^t \in \{0, 1\}^d$. For any positive integer k , let q_1, \dots, q_k be functions $q_i : \{\{0, 1\}^d\}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ with the following properties: For all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ each $q_i(x)$ depends only on the column sums of x , is monotonically increasing in t , has sensitivity at most 1, and its value at any time step is at most c_{\max} . Further, $q_i(0^d) = 0$ for all $i \in [k]$. Then there exists*

1. *an ϵ -differentially private algorithm that can answer q_1, \dots, q_k at all time steps with error at most $\alpha = O\left((d \log^2(dkc_{\max}/\beta) + k \log(kc_{\max}/\beta) + \log T)\epsilon^{-1}\right)$ with probability at least $1 - \beta$,*
2. *an (ϵ, δ) -differentially private algorithm that can answer q_1, \dots, q_k at all time steps with error at most $\alpha = O\left(\left(\sqrt{d} \log^{3/2}(dkc_{\max}/\beta) + \sqrt{k} \log(kc_{\max}/\beta) + \log T\right)\epsilon^{-1} \log(1/\delta)\right)$ with probability at least $1 - \beta$.*

Thus, our strategy allows us to change the logarithmic dependency on the maximum column sum n_{\max} to a logarithmic dependency on the *maximum query value* for any of the k queries, which can be much smaller as n_{\max} , e.g. for computing the minimum column sum or the median. Of course, we can also use our Theorem 1 to output the full histogram using $k' = d$ queries, since, by assumption all queries q_i can be computed once all the column sums are known. Thus the bounds given in the theorem can be improved to consist of the minimum of the two, i.e., to $\tilde{O}\left((\min\{d \log^2 c_{\max} + k \log c_{\max}, d \log^2 n_{\max}\} + \log T)\epsilon^{-1}\right)$ for ϵ -differential privacy, and a bound of $\tilde{O}\left(\left(\min\left\{\sqrt{d} \log^{3/2} c_{\max} + \sqrt{k} \log c_{\max}, \sqrt{d} \log^{3/2} n_{\max}\right\} + \log T\right)\epsilon^{-1} \log(1/\delta)\right)$ for (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy.

The queries MAXSUM and HISTOGRAM fulfill the conditions of Theorem 1 with $c_{\max} = n_{\max}$. Other such queries are TOPK, i.e., outputting the top- k column sums and QUANTILE $_q$, i.e. computing the q -quantile on the column sums for $q \in [0, 1]$. Furthermore, any algorithm for differentially private continuous histogram can answer SUMSELECT and TOP- k -SELECT, i.e. releasing the indices of the top- k column sums, within the same error bounds.

Corollary 1. *Let $x = x^1, \dots, x^T$ be a stream of elements $x^t \in \{0, 1\}^t$. Let $n_{\min}, n_{\max}, n_{\text{median}}$ denote the value of the minimum, maximum, and median column sum of x , respectively. Then there exists*

- *an ϵ -differentially private algorithm that can answer MAXSUM, SUMSELECT, HISTOGRAM, TOPK, and TOP- k -SELECT at all time steps t with error at most $\alpha = O\left((d \log^2(dn_{\max}/\beta) + \log T)\epsilon^{-1}\right)$ with probability at least $1 - \beta$.*
- *an ϵ -differentially private algorithm that can answer QUANTILE $_{1/2}$ at all time steps t with error at most $\alpha = O\left((d \log^2(dn_{\text{median}}/\beta) + \log T)\epsilon^{-1}\right)$ with probability at least $1 - \beta$.*
- *an ϵ -differentially private algorithm that can answer MINSUM at all time steps t with error at most $\alpha = O\left((d \log^2(dn_{\min}/\beta) + \log T)\epsilon^{-1}\right)$ with probability at least $1 - \beta$.*

The corresponding results also hold for (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy by plugging $n_{\min}, n_{\max}, n_{\text{median}}$ into the bound in Theorem 1, 2. The previous best theoretical error bounds known for these problems were either polynomial in T , or had an error of $\tilde{O}(d \log^2 n_{\max} + d \log T)$ for ϵ -differential privacy resp. $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d} \log^{3/2} n_{\max} + \sqrt{d} \log T)$ for (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy. Thus, for these queries, we reduce the additive term of $O(d \log T)$ for ϵ -differential privacy and the additive term of $O(\sqrt{d} \log T)$ for (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy to an additive term of $O(\log T)$.

Further, we consider the problem of d -DIM ABOVETHRESH, where we have a threshold K_i for each column $i \in [d]$ and want to privately return at every time step for every coordinate whether or not the i -th column sum exceeds its threshold. In detail, if c_i is the i -th column sum, we want to answer YES for coordinate i whenever $c_i > K_i + \alpha$, and NO whenever $c_i < K_i - \alpha$, with high probability while preserving differential privacy, where α is the additive error. Note that composing d independent AboveThreshold algorithms (which is a subroutine of the sparse vector technique) for each column gives an error of $\alpha = O(d(\log d + \log T))$. We show that as a corollary of our algorithm for histogram queries, we can obtain an algorithm for d -DIM ABOVETHRESH with

error that is just a polylogarithmic factor in d away from the lower bound of $\Omega(d + \log T)$, which follows from a packing argument (see Appendix C.1).

Corollary 2. *Let $x = x^1, \dots, x^T$ be a stream of elements $x^t \in \{0, 1\}^d$, and let $\{K_i\}_{i \in [d]}$ be arbitrary thresholds for each column. Then there exists an ϵ -differentially private algorithm that can answer d -DIM ABOVE THRESH at all time steps t with error at most $\alpha = O((d \log^2(d/\beta) + \log T)\epsilon^{-1})$ with probability at least $1 - \beta$.*

Dynamic Predecessor. We study a differentially private version of the dynamic predecessor problem, which is one of the most fundamental data structures problems. Here, we need to maintain a set D of elements from an ordered universe, and for a query q , return the largest x satisfying $x \leq q$, if it exists. To the best of our knowledge this problem has not been studied under differential privacy before at all. A possible reason for this is that it is not obvious how a differentially private version of this problem should look like - clearly, the answer to any query depends heavily on the existence or non-existence of any one element in D .

We propose study the following relaxation of the predecessor problem: At time step t , an element of the universe can be inserted or deleted from D . Additionally, we allow a query operation of the following form: Given an arbitrary query value q output some x in the universe, such that there is *at least* one element y in D with $x \leq y \leq q$ and at most α_t such elements, where α_t is the additive error. The algorithm can answer \perp if there are at most α_t elements smaller than q in the data set. Symmetrically, the algorithm can find an approximate successor x' , such that there is at least one element above q , and at most α_t between x' and q . Thus, the algorithm might not return the predecessor of q , but it can decide that either there are not too many elements smaller than q in the data set or we return an interval that contains the predecessor, and it does not contain too many more elements. Similar relaxations have been used in the differential privacy literature for computing threshold functions and quantiles, see e.g. Kaplan et al. [2022], Bun et al. [2015], Kaplan et al. [2020], Cohen et al. [2023b].

This algorithm can be used to compute the approximate distance from q to its nearest neighbor in D : We use the above to find both x and x' fulfilling the stated properties and return $d = \min(|x - q|, |x' - q|)$. Then d is at least the distance from q to its nearest neighbor and it is at most the distance to its $(2\alpha_t + 1)$ th nearest neighbor.

An $\Omega(\log u + \log T)$ lower bound for this problem holds for ϵ -differential privacy by a standard packing argument, even in the partially dynamic case. In the static setting, an $\Omega(\log u)$ lower bound holds for ϵ -differential privacy, and a matching upper bound follows from the sparse vector technique. In this work, we consider both the fully dynamic case (i.e., both insertions and deletions are allowed), which is also called the *turnstile model*, and the partially dynamic case (only insertions are allowed) of the problem under ϵ -differential privacy. For the fully dynamic case, we reduce the problem to dynamic range counting, which can be solved using a generalized version of the binary tree mechanism. Then we show a better bound in the partial dynamic case. All bounds hold for unknown time bound T .

Theorem 2. *Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $\epsilon = O(1)$.*

1. *There exists an ϵ -differentially private algorithm for the FULLY DYNAMIC PREDECESSOR problem with $\alpha_t = O(\epsilon^{-1}(\log u \log t)^{3/2} \sqrt{\log(ut/\beta)})$ for all t with probability at least $1 - \beta$;*
2. *There exists an ϵ -differentially private algorithm for the PARTIALLY DYNAMIC PREDECESSOR problem with $\alpha_t = O((1 + \epsilon^{-1}) \log u \log(u/\beta) \sqrt{\log(t/\beta)})$ for all t with probability at least $1 - \beta$.*

To compare the two bounds for the partially dynamic setting, note that in the partially dynamic setting $t = O(u)$. Thus, for constant β , the improvement in 2 compared to 1 is a factor of $\log t$.

Set Cardinality. In this problem, the goal is to maintain the cardinality of a set D of elements from a universe while elements are inserted and deleted such that at any point in time, we can approximately answer how many elements are in set D . Here we assume that there is only a single copy of any element, i.e.,

multiple insertions of the same element are ignored. This model is motivated by applications like counting the number of edges in a simple graph, or monitoring the number of people who possess a certain changing property (e.g., if they reside within a given country). Again we consider a fully dynamic (or turnstile) model, where at any time step an arbitrary subset of the universe may be inserted or deleted, or we query the size of D . For event-level privacy, standard techniques give an upper bound of $O(\log^2 T)$ for this problem, as noted in Erlingsson et al. [2019] and further discussed at the beginning of Section 5. Erlingsson et al. [2019] give a parameterized upper bound of $O(\sqrt{dk} \log^2 T)$ in the stronger *local model* of differential privacy, and for *user-level* privacy, where d is the universe size and k is an upper bound on the allowed insertions / deletions per user. We extend their work to the central model of differential privacy; we use a different parameterization K , which is an upper bound on the *total* number of insertions and deletions. This is a natural parameter to consider: If the insertions and deletions are equally distributed among all d users, then $K = dk$. Else, K can give tighter bounds - notice that the previous bound by Erlingsson et al. [2019] depends on dk , so getting a bound that depends on K instead is stronger. We give the following upper and lower bounds for this problem:

Theorem 3. *Let K be an upper bound on the total number of insertions / deletions. Then the following statements hold for user-level privacy:*

- *any ϵ -differentially private algorithm for the SETCARDINALITY problem which has error at most α at all time steps with probability at least $2/3$ must have $\alpha = \Omega(\min(d, K, \sqrt{\epsilon^{-1} K \log(T/K)}))$. This bound holds even if K and T are known at the beginning of processing the input, and if updates are limited to singleton sets.*
- *If T is known at the beginning and K is unknown, there is an ϵ -differentially private algorithm for the SETCARDINALITY problem with error at most $\alpha = O(\min(d, K, \log K \sqrt{\epsilon^{-1} K \log(T/\beta)}))$ with probability at least $1 - \beta$;*
- *If neither T nor K are known at the beginning, there is an ϵ -differentially private algorithm for the SETCARDINALITY problem with error at most $\alpha = O(\min(d, K, \log K \sqrt{\epsilon^{-1} K \log(t/\beta)}))$ at all time steps t with probability at least $1 - \beta$.*

Note that the upper bound for known T matches the lower bound up to a $\log K$ factor. The $\log K$ factor comes from estimating an upper bound on K , and for known K and known T , the upper bound is tight. To compare our results with the upper bound by Erlingsson et al. [2019], we note that $K \leq dk$, so our upper bound gives a bound parameterized in k by replacing K with dk . Their algorithm needs to know both k and T at the beginning and for that setting we achieve an improvement of a factor of $\log^{1.5} T$ in the additive error. Further, the same approach as our lower bound with parameter K can be used to show a lower bound of $\Omega(\min(d, \epsilon^{-1}(k \log(T/k))))$ for the setting with parameter k .

1.2 Technical Overview

In the following, for simplicity, we state all bounds for constant β and ϵ .

Histogram and related queries. For histogram queries, our idea is inspired and significantly extends the technique of Dwork et al. [2015]. They use a differentially private algorithm to partition the stream into intervals such that every interval has at least $\Omega(\alpha)$ ones and at most $O(\alpha)$ ones, for some suitable α , with probability at least $1 - \beta$. Then they use a standard differentially private continual counting mechanism on those intervals, and only update the output at the end of each interval. Note that for any fixed partitioning, the inputs to the counting mechanism are neighboring, in the sense that the count of at most one interval can differ by at most 1. Thus, composition gives privacy. For accuracy, denote by n the total number of ones in the input. The lower bound on the number of ones in each interval guarantees that there are no more than n intervals; the upper bound guarantees that the output does not change by more than α within each interval. Then the continual counting algorithm on at most n intervals has an error of at most $O(\log^2 n)$.

Further, there is a partitioning algorithm (e.g., the sparse vector technique by [Dwork et al. \[2010\]](#)) that can create such a partitioning with $\alpha = O(\log T)$. Overall, this gives an error of $O(\log^2 n + \log T)$.

In our setting, we would like to partition the stream into intervals, such that in every interval the *maximum change in any query answer* can be bounded by $O(\alpha')$ from above and $\Omega(\alpha')$ from below. We then feed the counts for every interval and every coordinate into a standard differentially private continual histogram algorithm, e.g., the one given by [Fact 5](#). Then, at the end of each interval, we use the histogram algorithm to compute an approximate histogram and update the output. Again we have the property that for any fixed partitioning, the input of at most one interval can change by at most one for every coordinate. The partitioning would yield that we can bound the number of intervals by k times the maximum change in any query answer over the entire stream, where k is the number of queries. Thus, the histogram algorithm from [Fact 5](#) gives an error of roughly $O(d \log^2(k \cdot c_{\max}))$, where c_{\max} is the maximum query answer. Further, within an interval, the output changes by at most α' . However, there is an extra challenge here: The query answers at any time step may depend on *all the past updates and on all coordinates!* So naively, using them to partition the stream incurs a privacy loss of $\epsilon' = dc_{\max}\epsilon$, i.e., the algorithm is only ϵ' -differentially private.

The idea to overcome this difficulty is to use the output of the differentially private histogram algorithm at the end of an interval for the decision of when to end the next interval, i.e., at every time step, we compute the approximate sums for all coordinates using the histogram output at the end of the previous interval, and the updates that happened in between. Thus, the decision to end an interval depends on updates that happened in previous intervals, i.e., *before* the current interval, in a differentially private way. We use these approximate sums as input to a similar partitioning algorithm as the sparse vector technique. Now, however, at the end of each interval, the histogram algorithm is given as input the count for the current interval for every coordinate, which in turn depend on when the current interval is closed, which is a function of the *past outputs* of the same histogram algorithm. Thus, we have to use a histogram algorithm that is private against an *adaptive adversary* to achieve privacy. As the interaction between the histogram algorithm and the partitioning algorithm is intricate, it requires that we prove privacy from scratch.

Next, we give some more details on the partitioning algorithm we use. We want to partition according to the maximum change in any query answer. Recall that the query answers for k different queries can be very different, and the query which actually incurs the maximum change can be different for every interval. Thus, for our version of the sparse vector technique, we maintain a different threshold for each query, which we update regularly, namely whenever we are sure that the corresponding query answer had a significant change. However, if we would check whether a significant change occurred for every query separately at every time step, we would get an error of $\Omega(k \log T)$, where k is the number of queries. We avoid this as follows: We run a sparse vector technique on all k queries simultaneously, i.e. we close an interval if *at least one of them* crosses its current threshold, without specifying which one. Then once we know we closed an interval we compute which of the thresholds need to be updated. Thus we only check which thresholds to update for each query after we already know that we close an interval, and we can bound the number of times that this happens by kc_{\max} . This gives an additional error of $O(k \log(kc_{\max}))$. The α' value depends on both the error of the histogram output, which is roughly $O(d \log^2(kc_{\max}))$, and the error incurred by our sparse vector technique algorithm, which is roughly $O(\log T + k \log(kc_{\max}))$. Overall, this strategy yields the desired error bound stated in [Theorem 1](#).

We show how to do all of this even if we do not know T and c_{\max} at the beginning of the input processing, by building on the strategies from [Qiu and Yi \[2022\]](#): Our parameters in the algorithm at a given time t and within an interval j depend on some probabilities β'_j and β'_t , which are the probabilities that the random variables used for privacy exceed certain predetermined bounds. So we want that the sum of all β'_j and β'_t for all time steps t and all intervals j are bounded by β . Now, if c_{\max} and T are known, one can just use $\beta'_j = \beta/(2c_{\max})$ and $\beta'_t = \beta/(2T)$. However, this only works if T and c_{\max} are known. [Qiu and Yi \[2022\]](#) use a simple trick to extend the bound from [Dwork et al. \[2010\]](#) for unknown T : at any time step t , they use $\beta_t = \beta/(t^2 6\pi^2)$, since then, $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \beta_t = \beta$. Similarly, using $\beta_t = (\beta/t^2)$ and $\beta_j = (\beta/j^2)$ allows us to define our algorithm parameters independently from c_{\max} and T and get the same error guarantees.

Dynamic Predecessor. For the dynamic predecessor problem, we first show that it reduces to the *dynamic range counting* problem: In the dynamic range counting problem, at every point in time, we may insert or delete an element from the universe $\mathcal{U} = \{1, \dots, u\}$ into a data set D . A query consists of a subinterval of \mathcal{U} , and we want to give the number of elements in D which fall into that interval. An ϵ -differentially private data structure for fully dynamic range counting with error $O(\epsilon^{-1}(\log u \log T)^{3/2} \sqrt{\log(uT/\beta)})$ follows from known techniques and the same error can be achieved for the fully dynamic predecessor problem.

Our main technical contribution for this problem lies in our improvement for the *partially dynamic predecessor problem*: Similarly to the binary tree mechanism by [Dwork et al. \[2010\]](#), we start by dividing the universe into dyadic intervals. We use the sparse vector technique to maintain information about which intervals I from the dyadic decomposition have at least a certain number of elements in $I \cap D$. We then use that information to answer any predecessor query. Note that since we are in the partially dynamic case, the property that there is at least a certain number of elements in $I \cap D$ cannot change - the number can only increase. The first observation is that we do not need to run the sparse vector technique for all intervals at the same time, but we can do a top-down approach: If an interval $[a, b]$ does not yet contain “enough” elements, then we do not have to consider any of its sub-intervals, since sub-intervals contain fewer elements than $[a, b]$. Thus we only “activate” an interval, i.e. start a sparse vector technique on it, once the number of elements in its parent’s interval has crossed a threshold. If we mark an interval that has crossed the threshold as “finished”, we can get the following guarantees, which hold for all time steps combined with probability $1 - \beta$ (for simplicity, we state all bounds for the case of a finite known T and ignore the dependencies on ϵ and β):

1. Any interval I that is finished has at least 1 element in $D \cap I$.
2. Any interval I that is unfinished has at most α' elements in $D \cap I$ for $\alpha' = O(\log u \log T)$.

We can answer any predecessor query q by returning the left border of a finished interval I which lies fully to the left of q , and by choosing the shortest such interval where the end of the interval is closest to q . By the properties of the dyadic decomposition, the interval between the right border of I and q can be covered by at most $2 \log u$ disjoint intervals of the dyadic decomposition. We call this the *cover* of the interval. By the choice of I , none of its subintervals and none of the intervals in the cover of the interval between the right border of I and q are finished. Thus, combined with property 2 it follows that there are at most $O(\log u \alpha') = O(\log^2 u \log T)$ many elements in D which fall between the left border of I and q , and by guarantee 1, we have that there is at least 1 element between the left border of I and q .

The next improvement is achieved by considering two thresholds for each node: additionally to the threshold marking an interval “finished” (which fulfills the same properties as before), we add a smaller threshold, which marks an interval “heavy”, and which depends on some parameter $k \leq \log u$ to be optimized. We get the following guarantees for “heavy” intervals at all time steps with probability $1 - \beta$:

- i) Any k intervals corresponding to disjoint, heavy nodes have at least 1 element in D which falls into the union of their intervals.
- ii) Any collection of at most $2 \log u$ intervals which are not heavy have at most $\alpha'' = O(k^{-1} \log^3 u)$ elements in D which fall into the union of their intervals.

Guarantees **i** and **ii** utilize the bound on the sum of Laplace variables (see [Lemma 2](#)), which allows us to give tighter bounds for groups of intervals, than if we would consider them separately.

To answer a query, let I be as before. Now, we only return the left border of I if there are no more than k heavy nodes in the cover of the interval between the right border of I and q ; then there are at most $O(k\alpha' + \alpha'')$ elements in the interval between the left border of I and q by properties **2** and **ii**. Again, by property **1**, there is at least one element in I , thus between the left border of I and q . Else, we return the start of the k farthest heavy interval J out of the cover of the interval between the right border of I and q . By guarantee **i**, we have that there is at least 1 element in the interval from the left border of J to q . Again, there are at most $O(k\alpha' + \alpha'')$ elements in the interval between the left border of J and q by properties **2** and **ii**. Optimizing for k yields the error bound claimed in [Theorem 2](#).

Set Cardinality. For the set cardinality problem, we can give (almost) matching upper and lower bounds. For the lower bound, we use a packing argument, which generalizes even for the case where updates are restricted to singleton sets. For our upper bound, we use the sparse vector technique from [Dwork et al. \[2010\]](#) to track changes in the output, and update the output whenever there was a significant change. We can use our parameter K to bound the number of times a significant change in the output happens. Denote that number by S . However, S depends on both K and T , and the thresholds we use for the sparse vector technique depend on S . To construct an algorithm that works for unknown T , we use a similar strategy to [Qiu and Yi \[2022\]](#) to remove the dependency from T on the thresholds, and from S . To construct an algorithm that works for unknown K , we use a similar idea to [Chan et al. \[2011\]](#), in that we guess a constant estimate for K , and if it turns out it was too low, we double it. However, there is an extra difficulty: in this problem we consider *user-level* differential privacy, so whenever we restart the algorithm for a new K , we incur a new privacy loss which adds up over all instances! To circumvent this, we use a similar idea as [Qiu and Yi \[2022\]](#), however instead of varying β , we use different values of ϵ for every instance. That is, for the j th instance of the algorithm, we choose $\epsilon_j = \epsilon / (6\pi^2 j^2)$, and since $\sum_j \epsilon_j = \epsilon$, we can guarantee ϵ -differential privacy no matter how large K turns out to be. Since j is bounded by $\log K$, the claimed bound follows.

1.3 Related work

Histograms and related queries In terms of HISTOGRAM and related queries, we already mentioned the work by [Jain et al. \[2021\]](#), which give upper and lower bounds on computing MAXSUM and SUMSELECT under continual observation under both ϵ -differential privacy and (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy. Further, [Cardoso and Rogers \[2022\]](#) consider computing HISTOGRAM and TOPK under continual observation in different settings, depending on whether the domain of items (in our case $\{1, \dots, d\}$) is known or not, and whether or not we bound the L_0 -norm (i.e., number of non-zero elements) of the row in which two neighboring streams may differ. The setting we consider in this paper corresponds to their *known domain, unrestricted L_0 -sensitivity* setting. They provide two algorithms for this setting, the “Meta Algorithm” which is based on the binary tree mechanism, and runs a static top- k algorithm for each node, i.e., interval, of the binary tree; however, such an algorithm can have a multiplicative error linear in the number of nodes that are used to answer a query, which could be $\log T - 1$ in the binary tree mechanism, even in the non-differentially private setting.

Their second algorithm is based on the sparse vector technique. The accuracy of the algorithm, which they only analyze for $k = 1$, depends on a parameter s , which can be seen as a bound on the number of times that there is a “significant” change in the maximum element. The error in that case is $O(\tau\sqrt{s} \log^{3/2}(dT s))$ for (k/τ^2) -zCDP, which corresponds to an error of roughly $O(\epsilon^{-1}\sqrt{k \cdot s \cdot \ln(1/\delta)} \log^{3/2}(dT s))$ for (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy. However, there is no good theoretical bound on s , and it can be as large as $\Omega(T)$ for worst-case streams. For the *known-domain, restricted L_0 -sensitivity* setting, [Fichtenberger et al. \[2022\]](#) used a different mechanism for the continual setting achieving an additive error of $C_{\epsilon, \delta}(1 + \frac{\ln(T)}{\pi})\sqrt{d \ln(6dT)}$,

where $C_{\epsilon, \delta} = \frac{2}{\epsilon} \sqrt{\frac{4}{9} + \ln(\frac{1}{\delta} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}})}$ for (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy.

Predecessor queries To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to study a predecessor data structure with differential privacy. However, the related problem of data structures for range counting queries, has been widely studied. In the following, let u be the universe size. We summarize previous work on differential privacy for *orthogonal* range queries.

For ϵ -differential privacy, [Chan et al. \[2011\]](#) give an ϵ -differentially private data structure for d -dimensional range queries. They mention that one dimension can be seen as time, though they assume that the universe and the timeline have the same size. They achieve an error bound of $O(\epsilon^{-1} \log^{1.5d} u \log(1/\beta))$ for any one time step with probability $1 - \beta$ (not for all queries simultaneously). Further, [Dwork et al. \[2015\]](#) show an upper bound on the error for ϵ -differentially private d -dimensional range counting parameterized in the number of points n which is $O(\epsilon^{-1}(d^2 \log u + (\log n)^{O(d)} \log(1/\beta)))$ for all queries with probability at least $1 - \beta$.

For static (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy range counting, [Muthukrishnan and Nikolov \[2012\]](#) give an $\Omega(\log^{1-d} n)$

lower bound for orthogonal d -dimensional range counting, where n is the number of data points. For static one-dimensional range counting with (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy there has been an ongoing effort to close the gap between lower and upper bound (Bun et al. [2015], Kaplan et al. [2020], Cohen et al. [2023b]), where the current state is a lower bound of $\Omega(\log^* u)$ and an upper bound of $\tilde{O}(\log^* u)$.

Set Cardinality As far as the authors are aware, Erlingsson et al. [2019] is the only prior work studying the exact formulation of our version of monitoring set cardinality.

Very recently and in independent work, Jain et al. [2023] studied the problem of counting distinct elements in a stream with insertions and deletions under event and user level differential privacy. While similar, this problem is different from the problem we consider in our work: They allow multiple copies of every element and a deletion only deletes one copy of an element. The goal is to output the number of elements with a count larger than 0. Thus, their upper bounds, which are parameterized in the number of times an element can switch from a count > 0 to 0 or the other way. Note that this corresponds to k in our setting. They give an (ϵ, δ) -differential private algorithm with an error of roughly $O(\epsilon^{-1}\sqrt{k} \text{polylog } T\sqrt{\log(1/\delta)})$ for both event and user-level privacy. This bound also holds for our problem. Note that it is not a contradiction to our lower bound of $\Omega(\min(d, \epsilon^{-1}(k \log T - k \log k)))$ since we consider ϵ -differential privacy. They do not give any upper bounds for ϵ -differential privacy, though they do give an $\Omega(\min(k, \sqrt{T}))$ lower bound. On the other hand, their lower bounds do *not* apply to the problem we study here, as can be seen for the event-level privacy case, where the binary tree based upper bound achieves an error of $O(\log^2 T)$, while they show a $\min(k, T^{1/4})$ lower bound even for (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy. Prior works which studied the formulation of the problem of Jain et al. [2023] are Bolot et al. [2013], Epasto et al. [2023], Ghazi et al. [2023].

Differentially private sketches Related work also includes work on *differentially private sketching*, i.e., computing small data summaries over a stream to compute certain queries, while preserving differential privacy. The main difference to the model considered in this work is that the summaries need to use sublinear space, hence, the accuracy results will generally be worse and are incomparable. The queries considered in this model which are most related to our work are counting of distinct elements (Pagh and Stausholm [2020], Hehir et al. [2023], Stanojevic et al. [2017], Choi et al. [2020], Zhao et al. [2022], Smith et al. [2020], Mir et al. [2011], Wang et al. [2022]) and computing heavy hitters (Zhao et al. [2022], Böhler and Kerschbaum [2021], Lebeda and Tetek [2023], Mir et al. [2011], Chan et al. [2012]).

Other work on differentially private continual observation. Other related works include the papers by Qiu and Yi [2022] and Cummings et al. [2018], which study linear queries under continual observation. Fichtenberger et al. [2021] study graph algorithms under continual observation. They also show how the sparse vector technique can be used for monotone functions to get smaller additive error at the cost of an additional multiplicative error.

2 Preliminaries

Notation. We denote the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ by $[n]$.

Dyadic interval decomposition We give a decomposition of $[u]$ into a hierarchy of intervals of length 2^ℓ for $0 \leq \ell \leq \lceil \log u \rceil$.

Definition 1 (Dyadic interval decomposition). *For an interval $[u]$, we define the dyadic interval decomposition \mathcal{I}_u to be the set containing all intervals of the form $[(k-1)2^\ell + 1, \min(k2^\ell, u)]$, for all $\ell = 0, \dots, \lceil \log u \rceil$ and all $k = 1, \dots, \lceil \frac{u}{2^\ell} \rceil$ and call 2^ℓ the length of the interval. The interval I of length $2^{\ell+1}$ containing an interval I' of length 2^ℓ is called the parent of I' and I' is the child of I .*

Fact 1. *Let $[u]$ be an interval. It holds that $|\mathcal{I}_u| \leq 2u$ and, for any $x \in [u]$, $|\{I \in \mathcal{I}_u : x \in I\}| \leq \log u$. Further, for any interval $[a, b] \subseteq [u]$ there exist a partition of $[a, b]$ into intervals $I_1, \dots, I_m \in \mathcal{I}_u$ with*

Game 1: Privacy game $\Pi_{M,Adv}$ for the adaptive continual release model

Input: Stream length $T \in \mathbb{N}$, side $\in \{L, R\}$ (not known to Adv and M)

```

1 for  $t \in [T]$  do
2    $Adv$  outputs  $\text{type}_t \in \{\text{challenge}, \text{regular}\}$ , where challenge is only chosen for exactly one value of  $t$ .
3   if  $\text{type}_t = \text{regular}$  then
4      $Adv$  outputs  $x_t \in \chi$  which is sent to  $M$ 
5   end
6   if  $\text{type}_t = \text{challenge}$  then
7      $Adv$  outputs  $(x_t^{(L)}, x_t^{(R)}) \in \chi^2$ ;  $x_t^{(\text{side})}$  is sent to  $M$ 
8   end
9    $M$  outputs  $a_t$ 
10 end

```

1. $m \leq 2 \log u$,
2. $\bigcap_{j=1}^m I_j = \emptyset$,
3. $\bigcup_{j=1}^m I_j = [a, b]$.

We say that intervals $I_1, \dots, I_m \in \mathcal{I}_u$ cover $[a, b]$.

2.1 Differential Privacy Preliminaries

Data Universe. We denote the data universe by χ .

Continual observation model. In the continual observation model, at every time step t , we add an element $x^t \in \chi$ to the current data set. This is the partially dynamic (incremental) setting. The entire stream of insertions is of length T , which might be unknown to the algorithm.

Fully dynamic model. In the fully dynamic model, at every time step t , we either add or remove an element $x^t \in \chi$ from the current data set.

Continuous observation algorithm. An algorithm A in the continuous observation model gets an element insertion at every time step t , and it then produces an output $a^t = A(x^1, \dots, x^t)$ which may only rely on x^1 to x^t . Denote by $A^T(x) = (a^1, a^2, \dots, a^T)$ the collection of the outputs at all time steps $\leq T$.

Definition 2 (Differential privacy [Dwork et al., 2006]). *A randomized algorithm A on a domain χ^T is (ϵ, δ) -differentially private $((\epsilon, \delta)$ -dp) if for all $S \in \text{range}(A)$ and all neighboring $x, y \in \chi^T$ we have*

$$\Pr[A(x) \in S] \leq e^\epsilon \Pr[A(y) \in S] + \delta.$$

If $\delta = 0$ then A is ϵ -differentially private (ϵ -dp).

Fact 2 (Composition Theorem). *Let A_1 be an ϵ_1 -differentially private algorithm $\chi \rightarrow \text{range}(A_1)$ and A_2 an ϵ_2 -differentially private algorithm $\chi \times \text{range}(A_1) \rightarrow \text{range}(A_2)$. Then $A_1 \circ A_2$ is $\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2$ -differentially private.*

In the *adaptive continual release model* the mechanism M interacts with a *randomized adversarial process* Adv that runs for T time steps and has no restrictions regarding time or space complexity. It knows all input and output of M up to the current time step as well as M itself, but *not* M 's random coin flips. Based on this knowledge at each time step t , Adv chooses the input for M for time t .

However, to model neighboring inputs for event-level privacy in the adaptive continual release model the behavior of Adv needs to be slightly refined. There are two types of time steps: regular and challenge. The adversary can determine for each $t \in [T]$ which type a time step is, under the constraint that exactly one

time step can be a challenge time step. If a time step is regular, Adv outputs one value, and if it is challenge, Adv outputs two values. In the latter setting an external entity, called an oracle, then uses one of them and sends it to M . The oracle has decided before the beginning of the game whether it will send the first or the second value to M . Note that this decision is not known to Adv and also not to M and the goal of the adversary is to determine which decision was made, while the goal of the mechanism is to output the result of the computation, e.g., output a histogram, such that Adv does not find out which decision was made by the oracle.

More formally the relationship between Adv and M is modeled as a game between adversary Adv and algorithm M , given in Game 1.

Definition 3 (Differential privacy in the adaptive continual release model [Jain et al., 2021]). *Given a mechanism M the view of the adversary Adv in game $\Pi_{M,Adv}$ (Game 1) consists of Adv 's internal randomness, as well as the outputs of both Adv and M . Let $V_{M,Adv}^{(side)}$ denote Adv 's view at the end of the game run with input side $\in \{L, R\}$. Let \mathcal{V} be the set of all possible views. Mechanism M is (ϵ, δ) -differentially private in the adaptive continual release model if, for all adversaries Adv and any $S \subseteq \mathcal{V}$,*

$$\Pr(V_{M,Adv}^{(L)} \in S) \leq e^\epsilon \Pr(V_{M,Adv}^{(R)} \in S) + \delta$$

and

$$\Pr(V_{M,Adv}^{(R)} \in S) \leq e^\epsilon \Pr(V_{M,Adv}^{(L)} \in S) + \delta.$$

We also call such a mechanism adaptively (ϵ, δ) -differentially private.

We say that two probabilities p and q are (ϵ, δ) -close if they satisfy $p \leq e^\epsilon q + \delta$ and $q \leq e^\epsilon p + \delta$. For $\delta = 0$ we say p and q are e^ϵ -close.

Definition 4 (L_p -sensitivity). *Let f be a function $f : \chi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$. The L_p -sensitivity of f is defined as*

$$\max_{x, y \text{ neighboring}} \|f(x) - f(y)\|_p. \quad (1)$$

If $k = 1$, then $\|f(x) - f(y)\|_p = |f(x) - f(y)|$ for all p . In that case, we also call (1) the sensitivity of f .

Definition 5 (Laplace Distribution). *The Laplace distribution centered at 0 with scale b is the distribution with probability density function*

$$f_{\text{Lap}(b)}(x) = \frac{1}{2b} \exp\left(\frac{-|x|}{b}\right).$$

We use $X \sim \text{Lap}(b)$ or sometimes just $\text{Lap}(b)$ to denote a random variable X distributed according to $f_{\text{Lap}(b)}(x)$.

Fact 3 (Theorem 3.6 in Dwork and Roth [2014]: Laplace Mechanism). *Let f be any function $f : \chi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ with L_1 -sensitivity Δ_1 . Let $Y_i \sim \text{Lap}(\Delta_1/\epsilon)$ for $i \in [k]$. The mechanism defined as:*

$$A(x) = f(x) + (Y_1, \dots, Y_k)$$

satisfies ϵ -differential privacy.

As a subroutine, we use a continuous histogram algorithm that works against an adaptive adversary. The specific continuous histogram algorithm we use is the composition of d continuous counting mechanisms. We formally define the two problems next.

Definition 6 (Continuous Counting). *In the continuous counting problem, the input consists of T and a stream of T numbers x^1, \dots, x^T with $x^t \in \mathbb{N}$ for all $t \in [T]$. Two streams $x = x^1, \dots, x^T$ and $y = y^1, \dots, y^T$ are neighboring if there is a time step t^* such that $|x^{t^*} - y^{t^*}| \leq 1$ and $x^t = y^t$ for all $t \neq t^*$. The goal is to approximate at every time step t the sum of all inputs seen so far, i.e., $\sum_{l=1}^t x^l$.*

Definition 7 (Continuous Histogram). *In the continuous histogram problem, the input consists of T and a stream of T vectors x^1, \dots, x^T with $x^t \in \mathbb{N}^d$ for all $t \in [T]$. Two streams $x = x^1, \dots, x^T$ and $y = y^1, \dots, y^T$ are neighboring if there is a time step t^* such that $\|x^{t^*} - y^{t^*}\|_\infty \leq 1$ and $x^t = y^t$ for all $t \neq t^*$. The goal is to approximate at every time step t the sum of all inputs seen so far, i.e., $\sum_{l=1}^t x^l$.*

Denisov et al. [2022] show that ϵ -differential privacy under continual observation implies ϵ -differential privacy against an adaptive adversary:

Fact 4 (Proposition 2.1 in Denisov et al. [2022]). *Every mechanism that is ϵ -differentially private in the continual release model is ϵ -differentially private in the adaptive continual release model.*

To apply this to our definition of continuous histogram, we have to align the neighboring definitions, i.e. require $\|x_t^{(L)} - x_t^{(R)}\|_\infty \leq 1$ in Algorithm 1. Using this and standard composition of ϵ -differentially private algorithms, we get that any ϵ -differentially private continuous counting algorithm with error $O(\alpha/\epsilon)$ gives an ϵ -differentially private continuous histogram algorithm against an adaptive adversary with error $O(d\alpha/\epsilon)$. The binary counting mechanism from Chan et al. [2011] gives an error bound of $O(\epsilon^{-1} \log(1/\beta) \cdot \log^{2.5} T)$ for continuous counting with ϵ -differential privacy, even when T is not known. At any fixed time step t , the error is $O(\epsilon^{-1} \sqrt{\log t} \log(1/\beta) + (\log t)^{1.5} \sqrt{\log(1/\beta)})^2$. For continuous histogram, we can use d binary counting mechanisms in parallel, yielding the following fact:

Fact 5 (ϵ -differentially private continuous histogram against an adaptive adversary). *There is an algorithm solving the continuous histogram problem while preserving ϵ -differential privacy in the adaptive continual release model, such that with probability $1 - \beta$, the error is bounded by $O(\epsilon^{-1} d \log T \log(dT/\beta))$. At any single time step t , the error is bounded by $O(\epsilon^{-1} d \cdot (\sqrt{\log t} \log(d/\beta) + (\log t)^{1.5} \sqrt{\log(d/\beta)}))$ with probability $1 - \beta$.*

In Section 4, we reduce our formulation of fully dynamic histogram to a fully dynamic, 1-dimensional range counting data structure (defined in Section 2.3). Using the same strategy as Chan et al. [2011] and Dwork et al. [2015], one can obtain the following results for this problem (for completeness, a proof is given in Appendix B):

Lemma 1. *There is an algorithm for the FULLY DYNAMIC RANGE COUNT with error at most $\alpha = O(\epsilon^{-1} (\log u \log T)^{3/2} \sqrt{\log(uT/\beta)})$ with probability at least $1 - \beta$. For unknown T , there is an algorithm for the FULLY DYNAMIC RANGE COUNT with error at most $\alpha = O(\epsilon^{-1} (\log u \log t)^{3/2} \sqrt{\log(ut/\beta)})$ at all time steps t with probability at least $1 - \beta$.*

2.2 Probability Preliminaries

Lemma 2. *Let Y_1, \dots, Y_k be independent variables with distribution $\text{Lap}(b)$ and let $Y = \sum_{i=1}^k Y_i$. Then*

$$P(|Y| > 2b\sqrt{2\ln(2/\beta_S)} \max(\sqrt{k}, \sqrt{\ln(2/\beta_S)}) \leq \beta_S.$$

Proof. Apply Corollary 12.3 in Dwork and Roth [2014] to $b_1 = \dots = b_k = b$. □

Fact 6. *Let Y be distributed according to $\text{Lap}(b)$. Then*

$$P(|Y| \geq t \cdot b) = \exp(-t)$$

Lemma 3. *For a random variable $X \sim D$, if $\Pr[|X| > \alpha] \leq \beta$, then for $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k \sim D$ i.i.d., we have $\Pr[\max_i |X_i| > \alpha] \leq k \cdot \beta$.*

²This bound is obtained by plugging in Theorem 3.6 and Theorem 4.6 of Chan et al. [2011] into Theorem 4.7 of Chan et al. [2011].

We use $f_X(x)$ to denote the probability density function of a continuous random variable X . For our privacy proofs, we repeatedly use the fact that if X and Y are independent random variables with joint probability density function $f_{X,Y}(x,y)$, then $f_{X,Y}(x,y) = f_X(x) \cdot f_Y(y)$. Thus for any event $A(X,Y)$, we have

$$\int_{x,y} \mathbf{1}[A(x,y)] f_{X,Y}(x,y) dx dy = \int_y \Pr_X[A(X,y)] f_Y(y) dy$$

2.3 Problem Definitions

We first define the query class that we consider for histogram queries.

Definition 8 (monotone histogram query with sensitivity 1). *Let $x = x^1, \dots, x^t$ be a stream of elements $x^t \in \{0,1\}^d$ and let the histogram be the function $h^t(x) = (\sum_{t'=1}^t x_{i}^{t'})_{i \in [d]}$. We say that $q : \{\{0,1\}^d\}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a monotone histogram query with sensitivity 1 if*

1. *The function q is a function of the histogram, i.e., it depends only on $h^t(x)$. Abusing notation, we use $q(h^t(x))$ to denote $q(x^1, \dots, x^t)$ and consider q as a function from \mathbb{N}^d to \mathbb{R} from now on.*
2. *The function q is monotone in t , i.e., $q(h^{t-1}(x)) \leq q(h^t(x))$*
3. *The function q has sensitivity 1, i.e., for two d dimensional vectors v_x and v_y such that $\|v_y - v_x\|_\infty \leq 1$ it holds that $|q(v_y) - q(v_x)| \leq 1$ for all $i \in [k]$.*
4. *It outputs 0 for the zero vector, i.e., $q(0, \dots, 0) = 0$.*

HISTOGRAM QUERIES

Given monotone histogram queries q_1, \dots, q_k with sensitivity 1, build a data structure D that supports the following operations:

- **Insert** an element $x \in \{0,1\}^d$ into D ,

such that the following queries can be answered while satisfying ϵ -differential privacy:

- **Query** all queries $\{q_i\}_{i \in [k]}$: Answer $q_i(h_1, \dots, h_k)$ for all $i \in [k]$ where (h_1, \dots, h_k) is the histogram

Neighboring definition: two neighboring inputs differ in one **Insert** operation

FULLY DYNAMIC PREDECESSOR

Given $u > 0$, build a data structure D that supports the following operations:

- **Insert** an element $x \in [u]$ into D
- **Delete** an element $x \in [u]$ from D

such that the following queries can be answered while satisfying ϵ -differential privacy:

- **Query** $q \in [u]$: return $x \in [u]$ such that $1 \leq \sum_{i=x}^q X_i(D) \leq \alpha_t$, or return $x = \perp$, in which case $\sum_{i=1}^q X_i(D) \leq \alpha_t$. Here, $X_i(D)$ is the function that is 1 if and only if $i \in D$. The bound α_t may depend on the current time t .

Neighboring definition: two neighboring inputs I and I' differ in one **Insert** or one **Delete** operation

PARTIALLY DYNAMIC PREDECESSOR

Given $u > 0$, build a data structure D that supports the following operations:

- **Insert** an element $x \in [u]$ into D ,

such that the following queries can be answered while satisfying ϵ -differential privacy:

- **Query** $q \in u$: return $x \in [u]$ such that $1 \leq \sum_{i=x}^q X_i(D) \leq \alpha_t$, where $X_i(D)$ is the function that is 1 if and only if $i \in D$. The bound α_t may depend on the current time t .

Neighboring definition: two neighboring inputs I and I' differ in one **Insert** operation

SETCARDINALITY

Given a set of users $[d]$, build a data structure D that supports the following operations:

- **Insert** a subset of users $I \subseteq [d]$ into D
- **Delete** a subset of users $I \subseteq [d]$ from D

such that the following queries can be answered while satisfying ϵ -differential privacy:

- **Query** return the number of users in D at the current time step

Neighboring definition: two neighboring data sets differ in all data of one user $i \in [d]$ (user-level privacy)

Condition: total number of insertions / deletions is bounded by K

FULLY DYNAMIC RANGE COUNT

Given $u > 0$, build a data structure D that supports the following operations:

- **Insert** an element $x \in [u]$ into D
- **Delete** an element $x \in [u]$ from D

such that the following queries can be answered while satisfying ϵ -differential privacy:

- **Query** $[a, b] \subseteq [u]$: return the number of elements in $D \cap [a, b]$ at the current time step

Neighboring definition: two neighboring inputs I and I' differ in one **Insert** or one **Delete** operation

d -DIM ABOVE THRESH

Given $\kappa > 0$, build a data structure D that supports the following operations:

- **Insert** an element $x \in \{0, 1\}^d$ into D ,

such that the following queries can be answered while satisfying ϵ -differential privacy:

- **Query** an element $i \in [d]$: Answer YES or NO such that we answer
 - YES if $\sum_{x \in D} x_i \geq \kappa + \alpha$,
 - NO if $\sum_{x \in D} x_i \leq \kappa - \alpha$.

Neighboring definition: two neighboring inputs differ in one **Insert** operation

2.3.1 Examples of histogram queries

Recall that we are given an integer $d > 0$ and the input is a stream $x = x^1, \dots, x^T$ with elements $x^t \in \{0, 1\}^d$. Let the *column sum* c_i^t at time step t be equal to $\sum_{t'=1}^t x_i^{t'}$. Let $c_{\max}^t = \max_i c_i^t$ be the maximum column sum at time t . Our histogram queries result implies new parameterized upper bounds for the following problems in the continual observation setting:

- HISTOGRAM: Compute at every time step t all column sums of x^1, \dots, x^t , i.e., $(c_i^t)_{i \in [d]}$.
- MAXSUM: Compute at every time step t the maximum column sum of x^1, \dots, x^t , i.e., $\max_{i \in [d]} c_i^t$.
- SUMSELECT: Compute at every time step t the index $i \in [d]$ of the maximum column sum of x^1, \dots, x^t , i.e., $\operatorname{argmax}_{i \in [d]} c_i^t$.
- QUANTILE $_q$ for $q \in (0, 1]$: Compute at every time step t the smallest c_j^t such that $|\{i \in [1, d] : c_i^t \leq c_j^t\}| \geq qd$.
- TOPK: Compute at every time step t the k largest column sums.
- TOP- k -SELECT: Compute at every time step t the indices of the k largest column sums.

Note that in the continual observation setting the HISTOGRAM problem for $d = 1$ is also known as the *continual counting problem*. We first show an auxiliary lemma.

Lemma 4. *Let $q \in (0, 1]$. Further, let $s = (s_1, \dots, s_d)$ and $c = (c_1, \dots, c_d)$ be such that $\max_{i=1 \dots d} |s_i - c_i| \leq \alpha$. Then $|\operatorname{QUANTILE}_q(s) - \operatorname{QUANTILE}_q(c)| \leq \alpha$.*

Proof. For a given q , denote $s^* = \operatorname{QUANTILE}_q(s)$ and $c^* = \operatorname{QUANTILE}_q(c)$.

- We have $|\{i \in [1, d] : c_i \leq c^*\}| \geq qd$, which implies that $|\{i \in [1, d] : s_i \leq c^* + \alpha\}| \geq qd$. Thus, $s^* \leq c^* + \alpha$
- Further, $|\{i \in [1, d] : c_i \geq c^*\}| \geq (d - \lceil qd \rceil + 1)$, which implies $|\{i \in [1, d] : s_i \geq c^* - \alpha\}| \geq (d - \lceil qd \rceil + 1)$. Thus, $s^* \geq c^* - \alpha$

It follows that $c^* - \alpha \leq s^* \leq c^* + \alpha$, as desired. \square

Lemma 4 implies that QUANTILE $_q$ has L_1 -sensitivity 1 for all $q \in (0, 1]$. In particular, this means that MAXSUM = QUANTILE $_1$, as well as any QUANTILE $_{i/d}$ for $i \in [d]$ has sensitivity 1. Note that for any integer $k > 0$ it holds that TOPK = (f_1, \dots, f_k) for $f_i = \operatorname{QUANTILE}_{(d+1-i)/d}$ with $1 \leq i \leq k$.

For HISTOGRAM, MAXSUM, QUANTILE $_q$, TOPK and the class of queries specified in Theorem 1, we use the following error definition:

General error definition Let q_1, \dots, q_k be functions $q_i : \{\{0, 1\}^d\}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for $i \in [k]$. For an algorithm A , let $a^t = A(x^1, \dots, x^t)$. We define the error for algorithm A at time t as

$$\operatorname{err}^t(A) = \max_{t' \in [t]} \max_{i \in [k]} |q_i(x^1, \dots, x^{t'}) - a^{t'}|$$

We say A is (α^t, β) -accurate for q_1, \dots, q_k if $\Pr[\exists t \in \mathbb{N}, \operatorname{err}^t(A) > \alpha^t] < \beta$. We say A is α^t -accurate if it is (α^t, β) -accurate for $\beta = 1/3$.

Note that SUMSELECT and TOP- k -SELECT require a different error definition, since it does not make sense to compare the output indices to the indices of the maximum column sum or top- k elements directly. Instead, we compare the corresponding column sum values.

Error definition for Top- k -Select and SumSelect. Let $i_1^1, \dots, i_k^1, \dots, i_1^T, \dots, i_k^T$ be the answers to algorithm A . Let $c_{j_l}^t$ be the l th largest c_i at time t . We define the error for algorithm A as

$$\text{err}_{\text{TOP-}k\text{-SELECT}}^t(A) = \max_{t' \in [t]} \max_{l \in [k]} |c_{j_l}^{t'} - c_{i_{t'}^l}|.$$

We say A is (α^t, β) -accurate for TOP- k -SELECT if $\Pr[\exists t \in \mathbb{N}, \text{err}_{\text{TOP-}k\text{-SELECT}}^t(A) > \alpha^t] < \beta$.

3 Histogram queries

We give a short overview of how the algorithm works on an input stream. For all columns $i \in [d]$, the algorithm maintains the column counts *within* an interval as c_i and also maintains a noisy histogram of the entire stream as s_i . It also maintains thresholds L_i^t for each query q_i , which is used to bound the query value on the true histogram. On input x^t , the algorithm adds the input to the maintained sums (c_i and s_i for all $i \in [d]$), and privately checks if any of the queries evaluated on the current noisy histogram s crosses its threshold L_i^t using the sparse vector technique. If there is such a query, then the current interval is closed, and the column counts c_i within the interval are inserted into the histogram mechanism and then reset to 0 for the next interval.

At this point of time, the algorithm only knows that *there exists* a query which crossed the threshold, but does not know the identity of those queries. Thus, it then privately determines which subset of queries to update the threshold for, while also ensuring that at least one query has its threshold updated in this step with high probability. The noisy histogram s_i is then replaced by the output from H , to remove dependence on the data from previous time steps when starting the next interval. The algorithm then computes the query values evaluated on this output from H , and outputs these same values at every subsequent time step until the next interval is closed (at which point of time, the query values are recomputed on the newly returned output of H for the following interval). The algorithm is presented in Algorithm 2.

3.1 Privacy

Lemma 5. *Let $\epsilon > 0$. If H is an $(\epsilon/3)$ -differentially private continuous histogram mechanism, then Algorithm 2 satisfies ϵ -differential privacy. This holds independently of the initial setting of (s_1, \dots, s_d) , L_i^t , K_j^t , and C_j^t s.*

Proof. Let x and y be two neighboring streams that differ at time t^* . Notice that the outputs of Algorithm 2 at any time step are a post-processing of the interval partitioning and the outputs (s_1, \dots, s_d) of the histogram algorithm H for each interval. Thus, to argue privacy, we consider an algorithm $\mathcal{A}(x)$ which outputs the interval partitions and outputs of H for each interval with input stream x . Let S be any subset of possible outputs of \mathcal{A} . We show that

$$\Pr[\mathcal{A}(x) \in S] \leq e^\epsilon \cdot \Pr[\mathcal{A}(y) \in S]$$

The arguments also hold when swapping the identities of x and y since they are symmetric, which gives us the privacy guarantee. Thus we focus on proving the inequality above.

We first argue that Algorithm 2 acts like an adversarial process in the adaptive continual release model towards the histogram algorithm H . From our assumption on H it then follows that the output of H is $\epsilon/3$ -differentially private. We will combine this fact with an analysis of the modified sparse vector technique Dwork et al. [2010] (which determines when to close an interval) plus the properties of the Laplace mechanism (which determines when a threshold is updated) to argue that the combined mechanism consisting of the partitioning and the histogram algorithm is ϵ -differentially private.

Recall that an adversary in the adaptive continual release model presented in Section 2 is given by a privacy game, whose generic form is presented in Game 1. Due to the complicated interaction between the partitioning and H , the specification of such an adversarial process in our setting is given in Game 3. Call $[p_{\ell-1}, p_\ell)$ the ℓ -th interval. The basic idea is as follows: Let t^* be the time step at which x and y differ. Conditioned on identical choices for the random variables before time step t^* , we have that all the intervals

Algorithm 2: Algorithm for answering k histogram queries privately

Input: Stream $x^1, x^2, \dots \in \{0, 1\}^d$, an adaptively $\epsilon/3$ -differentially private continuous histogram mechanism H , failure probability β , additive error bound $\text{err}(t, \beta)$ that holds with probability $\geq 1 - \beta$ for the output of H at time step t .

Output: Estimate of $q_i(h(t))$ for all $i \in [k]$ and all $t \in \mathbb{N}$

```
1 /* Initialization of all parameters */
2 Initialize an adaptively  $\epsilon/3$ -differentially private continuous histogram mechanism  $H$ 
3  $\beta' = 6\beta/\pi^2$ ,  $\beta_t = \beta'/t^2$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ 
4  $\alpha_\mu^t \leftarrow 12\epsilon^{-1} \ln(2/\beta_t)$ ,  $\alpha_\tau^j \leftarrow 6\epsilon^{-1} \ln(6/\beta_j)$ ,  $\alpha_\gamma^j \leftarrow 3\epsilon^{-1} k \ln(6k/\beta_j)$ ,  $\alpha_H^j \leftarrow \text{err}(j, \beta_j/6)$  for any  $t, j \in \mathbb{N}$   $\triangleright$  Shorthand
5  $C_j^t \leftarrow \alpha_\mu^t + \alpha_\tau^j + \alpha_\gamma^j$  and  $K_j^t \leftarrow 3(C_j^t + \alpha_H^j)$  for any  $t, j \in \mathbb{N}$ 
6  $L_i^1 \leftarrow K_1^1$  for all  $i \in [k]$ 
7  $c_i \leftarrow s_i \leftarrow 0$  for all  $i \in [d]$ 
8  $p_0 \leftarrow 0$ ,  $j \leftarrow 1$ 
9  $\text{out} \leftarrow (q_1(\mathbf{0}), q_2(\mathbf{0}), \dots, q_k(\mathbf{0}))$ 
10  $\tau_1 \leftarrow \text{Lap}(6/\epsilon)$ 
11 /* Process the input stream */
12 for  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  do
13    $c_i \leftarrow c_i + x_i^t$ ,  $s_i \leftarrow s_i + x_i^t$  for all  $i \in [d]$ 
14    $\mu_t \leftarrow \text{Lap}(12/\epsilon)$ 
15   if  $\exists i \in [k] : q_i(s) + \mu_t > L_i^t + \tau_j$  then
16      $p_j \leftarrow t$   $\triangleright$  Close the current interval
17     insert  $(c_1, \dots, c_d)$  into  $H$ , reset  $c_i \leftarrow 0$  for all  $i \in [d]$ 
18     for  $i \in [k]$  do
19        $\gamma_i^j \leftarrow \text{Lap}(3k/\epsilon)$ 
20       if  $q_i(s) + \gamma_i^j > L_i^t - C_j^t$  then
21          $L_i^t \leftarrow L_i^t + K_j^t$   $\triangleright$  if  $q_i(s)$  is "close" to threshold, increase threshold
22       end
23     end
24      $j \leftarrow j + 1$ 
25      $L_i^t \leftarrow L_i^t - K_{j-1}^t + K_j^t$  for all  $i \in [k]$   $\triangleright$  update threshold for the new interval
26      $\tau_j \leftarrow \text{Lap}(6/\epsilon)$   $\triangleright$  pick fresh noise for the new interval
27      $(s_1, \dots, s_d) \leftarrow \text{output}(H)$ 
28      $\text{out} \leftarrow (q_1(s), \dots, q_k(s))$ 
29   end
30   output out
31    $L_i^{t+1} \leftarrow L_i^t - K_j^t + K_j^{t+1}$  for all  $i \in [k]$ 
32 end
33  $p_j \leftarrow \infty$ 
```

Game 3: Privacy game $\Pi_{H, Adv(x,y)}$ for the adaptive continual release model and k queries for histogram mechanism H

Input: Streams $x = x^1, x^2, \dots \in \{0, 1\}^d$ and $y = y^1, y^2, \dots \in \{0, 1\}^d$ such that x and y are neighboring and differ in time t^* , initial values s_1, \dots, s_d , values $\{K_j^t\}_{j \leq t, j, t \in \mathbb{N}}$, values $\{C_j^t\}_{j \leq t, j, t \in \mathbb{N}}$

```

1 ChallengeOver = False
2  $c_i^x \leftarrow 0, c_i^y \leftarrow 0$  for all  $i \in [d]$ 
3  $s_i^x \leftarrow 0, s_i^y \leftarrow 0$  for all  $i \in [d]$ 
4  $p_0 \leftarrow 0, j \leftarrow 1$ 
5  $\tau_1 \leftarrow \text{Lap}(6/\epsilon)$ 
6  $L_i^1 \leftarrow K_1^1$  for all  $i \in [k]$ 
7 for  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  do
8    $c_i^x \leftarrow c_i^x + x_i^t, c_i^y \leftarrow c_i^y + y_i^t$  for all  $i \in [d]$ 
9    $s_i^x \leftarrow s_i^x + x_i^t$  for all  $i \in [d]$ 
10   $\mu_t \leftarrow \text{Lap}(12/\epsilon)$ 
11  if  $\exists i \in [k] : q_i(s) + \mu_t > L_i^t + \tau_j$  then
12     $p_j \leftarrow t$ 
13    if  $p_j \geq t^*$  and ChallengeOver=False then
14      typej = challenge
15      output  $(c^x, c^y)$ 
16      ChallengeOver = True
17    end
18    else
19      typej = regular
20      output  $c^x$ 
21    end
22    for  $i \in [k]$  do
23       $\gamma_i^j \leftarrow \text{Lap}(3k/\epsilon)$ 
24      if  $q_i(s) + \gamma_i^j > L_i^t - C_j^t$  then
25         $L_i^t \leftarrow L_i^t + K_j^t$ 
26      end
27    end
28     $j \leftarrow j + 1$ 
29     $L_i^t \leftarrow L_i^t - K_{j-1}^t + K_j^t$  for all  $i \in [k]$ 
30     $\tau_j \leftarrow \text{Lap}(6/\epsilon)$ 
31    reset  $c_i^x \leftarrow 0, c_i^y \leftarrow 0$  for all  $i \in [d]$ 
32    receive  $(s_1, \dots, s_d) \leftarrow \text{output}(H)$ 
33  end
34   $L_i^{t+1} \leftarrow L_i^t - K_j^t + K_j^{t+1}$  for all  $i \in [k]$ 
35 end
36  $p_j \leftarrow \infty$ 

```

that the algorithm creates and also the values that the algorithm (in its role as an adversary) gives to the histogram mechanism, are identical for x and y before time step t^* . These are regular time steps in the game. The value for the first interval ending at or after time t^* can differ and constitutes the challenge step. All remaining intervals lead to regular steps in Game 3.

Note that the end of the intervals, i.e., the partitioning of the stream, is computed by the adversary. This partitioning is based on the “noisy” histogram (the s_i values), which are computed from the output of H (which can depend on x and y , depending on side) and the values of the input stream x in the current interval - for *either value* of side, since the adversary does not know side. We denote the adversary with input streams x and y by $Adv(x, y)$, and the corresponding game, Game $\Pi_{H, Adv(x, y)}$. Our discussion above implies that $Adv(x, y)$ does not equal $Adv(y, x)$.

The important observation from this game is that there is only one interval, i.e., only one time step for H , where the adversary outputs two values, and in all other time steps it outputs only one value. Also, at the challenge time step where it sends two values c^x and c^y , these values differ by at most 1. Thus the adversarial process that models the interaction between the partitioning algorithm and H fulfills the condition of the adaptive continual release model. As we assume that H is $\epsilon/3$ -differentially private in that model it follows that for all possible neighboring input streams x and y for $\Pi_{H, Adv(x, y)}$ and all possible sides L and R it holds that

$$\Pr(V_{H, Adv(x, y)}^{(L)} \in S) \leq e^{\epsilon/3} \Pr(V_{H, Adv(x, y)}^{(R)} \in S)$$

and

$$\Pr(V_{H, Adv(x, y)}^{(R)} \in S) \leq e^{\epsilon/3} \Pr(V_{H, Adv(x, y)}^{(L)} \in S),$$

where we use the definition of a view $V_{H, Adv(x, y)}^{(L)}$ and $V_{H, Adv(x, y)}^{(R)}$ from Definition 3. The same also holds with the positions of x and y switched. Since the choice of L/R merely decides whether the counts c^x or c^y are sent by the game to H , we abuse notation and specify directly which count is sent to H , as $V_{H, Adv(x, y)}^{(x)}$ or $V_{H, Adv(x, y)}^{(y)}$.

Recall that the view of the adversary in Game $\Pi_{H, Adv(x, y)}$ consists of its internal randomness as well as its outputs and the output of H for the whole game, i.e., at the end of the game. The behavior of $Adv(x, y)$ is completely determined by its inputs consisting of x, y , the outputs of H , the thresholds K_j^t and the values C_j^t , as well as by the functions q_i and the random coin flips. However, for the privacy analysis only the partitioning and the output of H matter since the output of Algorithm 2 only depends on those. Thus, we ignore the other values in the view and say that a view V of the adversary $Adv(x, y)$ in Game $\Pi_{H, Adv(x, y)}$ satisfies $V \in S$, if the partitioning and the streams of (s_1, \dots, s_d) returned from H for all intervals match the output sequences in S . Let C_j^t and K_j^t be as in the algorithm. Assume Game $\Pi_{H, Adv(x, y)}$ is run with those settings of C_j^t and K_j^t . By the definition of $\Pi_{H, Adv(x, y)}$, we have

$$\Pr(\mathcal{A}(x) \in S) = \Pr(V_{H, Adv(x, y)}^{(x)} \in S), \text{ and } \Pr(\mathcal{A}(y) \in S) = \Pr(V_{H, Adv(y, x)}^{(y)} \in S)$$

We will prove below that

$$\Pr(V_{H, Adv(x, y)}^{(x)} \in S) \leq e^{2\epsilon/3} \Pr(V_{H, Adv(y, x)}^{(x)} \in S). \quad (2)$$

Privacy then follows, since

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\mathcal{A}(x) \in S) &= \Pr(V_{H, Adv(x, y)}^{(x)} \in S) \\ &\leq e^{2\epsilon/3} \Pr(V_{H, Adv(y, x)}^{(x)} \in S) \\ &\leq e^\epsilon \Pr(V_{H, Adv(y, x)}^{(y)} \in S) \\ &= e^\epsilon \Pr(\mathcal{A}(y) \in S), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

which completes the proof.

We now prove (2). Recall that when we run $Adv(x, y)$ on side x , the interval partitioning is created according to x and the outputs of H . Also for each interval, the input given to H is based on the counts for x , as we consider side x . When we run $Adv(y, x)$ on side x , then the interval partitioning is created according to y and for each interval we give the counts for x as input to H . Thus in both cases the input given to H is based on the counts for x , and hence, to prove inequality 2, it suffices to show that *when running $Adv(x, y)$ on side x and $Adv(y, x)$ on side x , the probabilities of getting a given partition and thresholds are $e^{2\epsilon/3}$ -close*. To simplify notation, we denote running $Adv(x, y)$ on side x as $\text{run}(x)$, and $Adv(y, x)$ on side x as $\text{run}(y)$.

Recall that $[p_{\ell-1}, p_\ell]$ is the ℓ^{th} interval. Denote the interval that t^* belongs to as the j -th interval. Note that the probabilities of computing any fixed sequence of intervals $[p_0, p_1), \dots, [p_{j-2}, p_{j-1})$ with $p_{j-1} < t^*$ are the same on both $\text{run}(x)$ and $\text{run}(y)$, since the streams are equal at all time steps before t^* .

We want to argue two things: (A) fixing a particular time $\lambda > p_{j-1}$, the probability of $p_j = \lambda$ is $e^{\epsilon/3}$ -close on $\text{run}(x)$ and $\text{run}(y)$; and (B) the probabilities of updating the thresholds, i.e., executing line 25 in Game 3 at time p_j for any subset of $[d]$, is $e^{\epsilon/3}$ -close on $\text{run}(x)$ and $\text{run}(y)$. Then we show that this implies that (C) all the thresholds L_i^t maintained by adversary are the same at the end of the interval.

(A) Fixing a particular time $\lambda > p_{j-1}$, we first show that the probability of interval j ending at λ (i.e., $p_j = \lambda$) is $e^{\epsilon/3}$ -close on $\text{run}(x)$ and $\text{run}(y)$. Fixing some notation, let $\mu_t \sim \text{Lap}(12/\epsilon)$ and $\tau_j \sim \text{Lap}(6/\epsilon)$ be as in the algorithm, let $s^t(x)$ denote the vector of $(s_i)_{i \in [d]}$ at time t for stream x , and f_X denote the density function of the random variable X . For the interval j to close at time λ on $\text{run}(x)$, there must exist an $i \in [k]$ with $q_i(s^\lambda(x)) + \mu_\lambda > L_i^t + \tau_j$ at time λ , and $q_\ell(s^t(x)) + \mu_t \leq L_\ell^t + \tau_j$ for all $p_{j-1} < t < \lambda$ and $\ell \in [k]$.

Note that conditioning on all the random variables being the same on x and y before p_{j-1} , we have that any s_i at time $t \leq p_j$ can differ by at most 1 on x and y . Therefore $q_i(s^t(x))$ and $q_i(s^t(y))$ can also differ by at most 1 by sensitivity of q_i . Therefore, for $p_{j-1} < t < \lambda$, any $\ell \in [k]$ and any fixed value $z \in \mathbb{R}$ that τ_j can take, we have

$$\Pr[q_\ell(s^t(x)) + \mu_t \leq L_\ell^t + z] \leq \Pr[q_\ell(s^t(y)) + \mu_t \leq L_\ell^t + z + 1]$$

Also, for fixed $z \in \mathbb{R}$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$ that τ_j resp. μ_λ can take,

$$\Pr[q_i(s^\lambda(x)) + c > L_i^t + z] \leq \Pr[q_i(s^\lambda(y)) + c + 2 > L_i^t + z + 1].$$

Now integrating over the distributions of τ_j and μ_λ , and using the properties of the Laplace distribution, gives:

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr[p_j = \lambda \text{ on } x] \\ &= \Pr[\forall t \in (p_{j-1}, \lambda), \forall i \in [k] \ q_i(s^t(x)) + \mu_t \leq L_i^t + \tau_j \ \wedge \ \exists i : q_i(s^\lambda(x)) + \mu_\lambda > L_i^\lambda + \tau_j] \\ &= \int_z \int_c \Pr_{\mu_{p_{j-1}}, \dots, \mu_{\lambda-1}} [\forall t \in (p_{j-1}, \lambda), \forall i \in [k] \ q_i(s^t(x)) + \mu_t \leq L_i^t + z \ \wedge \ \exists i : q_i(s^\lambda(x)) + c > L_i^\lambda + z] \\ &\cdot f_{\tau_j}(z) \cdot f_{\mu_\lambda}(c) \, dz \, dc \\ &\leq \int_z \int_c \Pr_{\mu_{p_{j-1}}, \dots, \mu_{\lambda-1}} [\forall t \in (p_{j-1}, \lambda) \forall i \in [k] \ q_i(s^t(y)) + \mu_t \leq L_i^t + (z + 1) \ \wedge \ \exists i : q_i(s^\lambda(y)) + (c + 2) > L_i^\lambda + (z + 1)] \\ &\cdot f_{\tau_j}(z) \cdot f_{\mu_\lambda}(c) \, dz \, dc \\ &\leq e^{\epsilon/6} \cdot e^{2\epsilon/12} \cdot \int_z \int_c \Pr[\forall t \in (p_{j-1}, \lambda) \forall i \in [k] \ q_i(s^t(y)) + \mu_t \leq L_i^t + z \ \wedge \ \exists i : q_i(s^\lambda(y)) + c > L_i^\lambda + z] \\ &\cdot f_{\tau_j}(z) \cdot f_{\mu_\lambda}(c) \, dz \, dc \\ &= e^{\epsilon/3} \Pr[p_j = \lambda \text{ on } y]. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that the probability of $p_j = \lambda$ is $e^{\epsilon/3}$ -close on $\text{run}(x)$ and $\text{run}(y)$.

(B) Next, conditioned on all previous outputs of H being the same and p_j being equal, we argue that the probabilities of updating any subset of thresholds are close for both runs at time p_j . Note that when

they are updated at the same time, they are updated in the same way. Since $q_i(s^{p_j}(x))$ and $q_i(s^{p_j}(y))$ can differ by at most 1 for each $i \in [k]$, adding $\gamma_i^j \sim \text{Lap}(3k/\epsilon)$ to every $q_i(s^{p_j}(y))$ in line 24 ensures that the distributions of $q_i(s^{p_j}(x)) + \gamma_i^j$ and $q_i(s^{p_j}(y)) + \gamma_i^j$ are $e^{\epsilon/3}$ -close for all $i \in [k]$ by composition. Since the condition in line 25 only depends on those, this implies that the probabilities of updating the threshold (i.e., executing line 25) on any subset of $[d]$ on $\text{run}(x)$ and $\text{run}(y)$ are $e^{\epsilon/3}$ -close.

(C) *Up to interval $j - 1$* : We already argued in (A) that conditioned on all random variables being the same on x and y before interval j , the executions of $\text{run}(x)$ and $\text{run}(y)$ are identical and, thus, all thresholds are updated in the same way. *Interval j and up*: For any $\ell \geq j$ denote by E_ℓ the event that for $\text{run}(x)$ and $\text{run}(y)$, all the intervals until interval ℓ end at the same time step, all the thresholds L_i^t for $t \leq p_\ell$ are identical, and the random variables used after time p_ℓ take the same values on both runs. We will next argue that conditioned on event E_ℓ , event $E_{\ell+1}$ holds. Note that event E_j holds by (B), and by definition, $\text{run}(x)$ and $\text{run}(y)$ both use the counts from stream x to compute the input for H . Inductively assume that event E_ℓ holds. Event E_ℓ implies that all intervals $\leq \ell$ were closed at the same time on both runs and hence the same counts were given as input to H . Since (a) the streams x and y are identical for all $t > p_\ell$, (b) the thresholds and the outputs of H are identical at the end of interval ℓ , and (c) the random variables used after p_ℓ are identical (which follows from event E_ℓ), we have that the $\ell + 1$ -st interval ends at the same time on both runs, and that the same thresholds are updated, and by the same amount at time $p_{\ell+1}$. This shows that event $E_{\ell+1}$ holds, as required.

Thus, the probabilities that the j -th interval ends at the same time *and* that the thresholds are updated in the same way in all intervals in $\text{run}(x)$ and $\text{run}(y)$ are $e^{2\epsilon/3}$ -close. This implies that the probabilities $\Pr(V_{H,Adv(x,y)}^{(x)} \in S)$ and $\Pr(V_{H,Adv(y,x)}^{(x)} \in S)$ are $e^{2\epsilon/3}$ -close for any subset S of possible outputs. Thus, (2) and therefore (3) follow. \square

3.2 Accuracy

After processing the input at time step t , let h^t be the actual histogram and let s^t be the value of s stored by Algorithm 2. Suppose t belongs to interval j , i.e., $t \in [p_{j-1}, p_j]$. Since the algorithm outputs $q_i(s^{p_{j-1}})$ at time t , our goal is to bound the additive error $|q_i(h^t) - q_i(s^{p_{j-1}})|$ at all times $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and for all queries $i \in [k]$. We do this as follows:

1. Use Laplace concentration bounds to bound the maximum value attained by the random variables used by the algorithm (Lemma 6).
2. Show that if query i crosses the threshold L_i^t , then q_i on the true histogram is not too much smaller than the threshold (Lemma 8).
3. Show that if query i crosses the threshold L_i^t , then q_i on the true histogram is not too much larger than the threshold (Lemma 9).
4. Bound the number of intervals produced by the algorithm (Lemma 10).
5. Use all the above to bound the error of the algorithm (Lemma 11).

We define the random variables (RVs) $\mu_t, \tau_j, \gamma_i^j$ as in the algorithm. The variables $\alpha_\mu^t, \alpha_\tau^j, \alpha_\gamma^j$ used in the algorithm are defined such that they bound with good probability (‘good’ will be formalized below) the corresponding RVs. In the rest of the section, we condition that the bounds hold on the random variables used in the algorithm.

Lemma 6 (RV Bounds). *The following bounds hold simultaneously with probability $\geq 1 - \beta$ for all $t, j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i \in [k]$*

$$|\mu_t| \leq \alpha_\mu^t, \quad |\tau_j| \leq \alpha_\tau^j, \quad |\gamma_i^j| \leq \alpha_\gamma^j, \quad \max_{t \in [p_{j-1}, p_j]} \|s^t - h^t\|_\infty \leq \alpha_H^j \quad \forall t \in [p_{j-1}, p_j]$$

where

$$\alpha_\mu^t = 12\epsilon^{-1} \ln(2/\beta_t), \quad \alpha_\tau^j = 6\epsilon^{-1} \ln(6/\beta_j), \quad \alpha_\gamma^j = 3\epsilon^{-1} k \ln(6k/\beta_j),$$

$$\alpha_H^j = O(\epsilon^{-1} d \cdot (\sqrt{\log j \log(d/\beta)} + (\log j)^{1.5} \sqrt{\log(d/\beta)}))$$

From the final bound above, we get the following lemma which bounds the error of the query values when computed on the noisy histogram s stored by the algorithm.

Lemma 7. *Let $t \in [T]$ be any time step, and suppose $t \in [p_{j-1}, p_j]$. Then for all $i \in [k]$,*

$$|q_i(s^t) - q_i(h^t)| \leq \alpha_H^j.$$

Since our output at time t is $q_i(s^{p_{j-1}})$, our error is $|q_i(h^t) - q_i(s^{p_{j-1}})|$, which we bound as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |q_i(h^t) - q_i(s^{p_{j-1}})| &\leq |q_i(h^t) - q_i(h^{p_{j-1}})| + |q_i(h^{p_{j-1}}) - q_i(s^{p_{j-1}})| \\ &\leq |q_i(h^t) - q_i(h^{p_{j-1}})| + \alpha_H^j && \text{(by Lemma 7)} \\ &\leq q_i(h^t) - q_i(h^{p_{j-1}}) + \alpha_H^j, && \text{(since } q_i \text{ and } h \text{ are monotone and } t \geq p_{j-1}) \end{aligned}$$

our accuracy bound reduces to giving an upper bound on $q_i(h^t)$ and a lower bound on $q_i(h^{p_{j-1}})$.

We say i *crosses the threshold at time t* if line 21 of the algorithm is executed for i at time t . Note that then $t = p_j$ for some j . Our lower bound on $q_i(h^{p_j})$ will be based on the fact that i crosses the threshold at time p_j . At time steps where i did not cross the threshold, our upper bound on $q_i(h^t)$ will follow from a complementary argument to the above lower bound.

For an upper bound on $q_i(h^{p_j})$ at time steps when i crosses the threshold, we first show that i did not cross the threshold at time $p_j - 1$ as follows: Let $p_\ell < p_j$ be the last time step before p_j when i crosses the threshold, and never in between p_ℓ and p_j . Then by definition of the algorithm, $L_i^{p_j} - L_i^{p_\ell} = K_j^{p_j}$. We use this to show that q_i must have increased by more than 1 between p_ℓ and p_j . The latter fact implies two things: first, that $j \leq kc_{\max}$; second, that i did not cross the threshold at time $p_j - 1$. The latter can be used to get an upper bound on $q_i(h^{p_{j-1}})$ and, by the 1-sensitivity of q_i , also on $q_i(h^{p_j})$. For the first interval, there does not exist any such p_ℓ where the threshold was crossed previously. For this, we prove an auxiliary lemma that says that $p_1 > 1$, and hence no threshold was crossed at time $p_1 - 1$, and the rest of the analysis follows.

Combining the two gives an upper bound on $q_i(h^t) - q_i(h^{p_{j-1}})$ of $O(K_j^t + \alpha_\mu^t + \alpha_\tau^j + \alpha_\gamma^j)$, which is the crucial bound needed to upper bound $|q_i(h^t) - q_i(s^{p_{j-1}})|$.

Our first lemma shows that whenever i crosses the threshold, the query value on the true histogram is not too small compared to the threshold.

Lemma 8 (lower bound). *Let $i \in [k]$ and suppose i crosses a threshold at time $t = p_j$.*

$$q_i(h^{p_j}) \geq L_i^{p_j} - \left(\alpha_\mu^{p_j} + \alpha_\tau^j + 2\alpha_\gamma^j + \alpha_H^j \right).$$

Using the strategy mentioned above, we then prove that the query value on the true histogram is never too large compared to the threshold. Along the way, we also show that every time i crosses the threshold, the query value on the true histogram must increase.

Lemma 9 (upper bound). *Let $i \in [k]$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}$.*

$$q_i(h^t) < L_i^t + \left(\alpha_\mu^t + \alpha_\tau^j + \alpha_\gamma^j + \alpha_H^j + 1 \right).$$

Further, suppose i crosses the threshold at time $t = p_j$. Then denoting by p_ℓ the last time before p_j that i crossed a threshold, it also holds that $p_j - p_\ell > 1$ and $|q_i(h^{p_j}) - q_i(h^{p_\ell})| > 1$.

We use the second part of the above lemma to bound the number of intervals created by the algorithm, where c_{\max}^t is the maximum query output at time t .

Lemma 10. *Algorithm 2 creates at most kc_{\max}^t many segments at time t .*

Lemma 11. *Let $t \in \mathbb{N}$ be any time step, and suppose $t \in [p_{j-1}, p_j]$. Then Algorithm 2 is α_j^t -accurate at time t , where*

$$\alpha_j^t = O\left(\alpha_\mu^t + \alpha_\tau^j + \alpha_\gamma^j + \alpha_H^j\right)$$

In particular, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$, Algorithm 2 is α^t -accurate, where

$$\alpha^t = O\left(\alpha_\mu^t + \alpha_\tau^{kc_{\max}^t} + \alpha_\gamma^{kc_{\max}^t} + \alpha_H^{kc_{\max}^t}\right).$$

The accuracy proofs for Algorithm 2 then follows since we show that the Lemma 6 hold for the corresponding values in the algorithm, and plugging them into the above lemma.

Corollary 3. *Algorithm 2 with the histogram mechanism from Fact 5 is (α^t, β) -accurate at time t for $\alpha^t = O\left(\epsilon^{-1} \cdot (d \log^2(dkc_{\max}^t/\beta) + k \log(kc_{\max}^t/\beta) + \log(t/\beta))\right)$.*

For constant β , this reduces to $\tilde{O}(\epsilon^{-1}(d \log^2 kc_{\max}^t + \log t))$ as stated.

3.3 Accuracy proofs

Lemma 6 (RV Bounds). *The following bounds hold simultaneously with probability $\geq 1 - \beta$ for all $t, j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i \in [k]$*

$$|\mu_t| \leq \alpha_\mu^t, \quad |\tau_j| \leq \alpha_\tau^j, \quad |\gamma_i^j| \leq \alpha_\gamma^j, \quad \max_{t \in [p_{j-1}, p_j]} \|s^t - h^t\|_\infty \leq \alpha_H^j \quad \forall t \in [p_{j-1}, p_j]$$

$$\text{where } \alpha_\mu^t = 12\epsilon^{-1} \ln(2/\beta_t), \quad \alpha_\tau^j = 6\epsilon^{-1} \ln(6/\beta_j), \quad \alpha_\gamma^j = 3\epsilon^{-1} k \ln(6k/\beta_j), \\ \alpha_H^j = O(\epsilon^{-1} d \cdot (\sqrt{\log j} \log(d/\beta) + (\log j)^{1.5} \sqrt{\log(d/\beta)}))$$

Proof. Using Fact 6 gives us the first three bounds below:

1. $\mu_t \sim \text{Lap}(12/\epsilon)$ satisfies $|\mu_t| < 12\epsilon^{-1} \ln(2/\beta_t)$ with probability $\geq 1 - \beta_t/2$.
2. $\tau_j \sim \text{Lap}(6/\epsilon)$ satisfies $|\tau_j| < 6\epsilon^{-1} \ln(6/\beta_j)$ with probability $\geq 1 - \beta_j/6$.
3. $\gamma_i^j \sim \text{Lap}(3k/\epsilon)$ satisfies $|\gamma_i^j| \leq 3\epsilon^{-1} k \ln(6k/\beta_j)$ for all $i \in [k]$ simultaneously with probability $\geq 1 - \beta_j/6$.
4. By assumption, the output of H at time p_{j-1} has additive error at most $\text{err}(j, \beta_j/6)$ with probability at least $1 - \beta_j/6$. In particular, the histogram mechanism from Fact 5 guarantees $\text{err}(j, \beta) = O(\epsilon^{-1} d \cdot (\sqrt{\log j} \log(d/\beta) + (\log j)^{1.5} \sqrt{\log(d/\beta)}))$.

By a union bound, all the four bounds hold at every time step with probability at least $1 - \sum_{t=1}^\infty \beta_t/2 - \sum_{j=1}^\infty \beta_j/2 = 1 - \beta$. \square

Lemma 7. *Let $t \in [T]$ be any time step, and suppose $t \in [p_{j-1}, p_j]$. Then for all $i \in [k]$,*

$$|q_i(s^t) - q_i(h^t)| \leq \alpha_H^j.$$

Proof. This follows, since

$$|q_i(s^t) - q_i(h^t)| \leq \|s^t - h^t\|_\infty \leq \alpha_H^j$$

where the first inequality is a consequence of q_i having sensitivity one, and the second is from the Lemma 6. \square

Lemma 8 (lower bound). *Let $i \in [k]$ and suppose i crosses a threshold at time $t = p_j$.*

$$q_i(h^{p_j}) \geq L_i^{p_j} - \left(\alpha_\mu^{p_j} + \alpha_\tau^j + 2\alpha_\gamma^j + \alpha_H^j\right).$$

Proof. This follows from the sensitivity of q_i and the fact that i crosses the threshold at time p_j .

$$\begin{aligned}
q_i(h^{p_j}) &\geq q_i(s^{p_j}) - \alpha_H^j && \text{(by Lemma 7)} \\
&\geq q_i(s^{p_j}) + \gamma_i^j - \alpha_\gamma^j - \alpha_H^j && \text{(by definition of } \alpha_\gamma^j) \\
&\geq L_i^{p_j} - C_j^{p_j} - \alpha_\gamma^j - \alpha_H^j && \text{(since } i \text{ crosses the threshold)} \\
&\geq L_i^{p_j} - \alpha_\mu^t - \alpha_\tau^j - 2\alpha_\gamma^j - \alpha_H^j && \text{(by definition of } C_j^{p_j})
\end{aligned}$$

as required. \square

Lemma 12. *Let $i \in [k]$ and suppose i did not cross the threshold at time t . Then*

$$q_i(h^t) < L_i^t + \left(\alpha_\mu^t + \alpha_\tau^j + \alpha_\gamma^j + \alpha_H^j \right).$$

Proof. Since i did not cross the threshold at time t , either the condition in line 15 was false or the condition in line 20 was false for i at time t . Thus, one of the following holds

$$\begin{aligned}
q_i(s^t) < L_i^t + \alpha_\mu^t + \alpha_\tau^j < L_i^t + \alpha_\mu^t + \alpha_\tau^j + \alpha_\gamma^j && \text{if line 15 was false, or} \\
q_i(s^t) < L_i^t - C_j^t + \alpha_\gamma^j < L_i^t + \alpha_\mu^t + \alpha_\tau^j + \alpha_\gamma^j && \text{if line 20 was false.}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this with Lemma 7 gives the required bound. \square

Lemma 13. *No interval is closed on the first time step, i.e., $p_1 > 1$.*

Proof. Note that $C_j^t = \alpha_\mu^t + \alpha_\tau^j + \alpha_\gamma^j$. Thus, if the condition in line 15 is true at time p_j , then the condition in line 20 is also true for some i . Said differently, whenever we end a segment, there also exists an i such that i crosses the threshold. Using Lemma 8 with $t = p_1$ gives us that

$$q_i(h^{p_1}) \geq L_i^{p_1} - (\alpha_\mu^{p_1} + \alpha_\tau^1 + 2\alpha_\gamma^1 + \alpha_H^1).$$

Note that since $K_1^{p_1} > \alpha_\mu^{p_1} + \alpha_\tau^1 + 2\alpha_\gamma^1 + \alpha_H^1$, this implies $q_i(h^{p_1}) > 1$. As q_i increases by at most 1 per time step and $q_i(0, \dots, 0) = 0$, it follows that $p_1 > 1$. \square

Lemma 9 (upper bound). *Let $i \in [k]$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}$.*

$$q_i(h^t) < L_i^t + \left(\alpha_\mu^t + \alpha_\tau^j + \alpha_\gamma^j + \alpha_H^j + 1 \right).$$

Further, suppose i crosses the threshold at time $t = p_j$. Then denoting by p_ℓ the last time before p_j that i crossed a threshold, it also holds that $p_j - p_\ell > 1$ and $|q_i(h^{p_j}) - q_i(h^{p_\ell})| > 1$.

Proof. If i did not cross the threshold at time t , then the bound follows from Lemma 12. Thus assume i crosses the threshold at time $t = p_j$. The first part of the claim follows if we show that i did not cross the threshold at time $p_j - 1$, and $p_j - 1 \geq 1$, since then Lemma 12 holds at time $p_j - 1$ and q_i has sensitivity one. We show the claim by induction over the number of times i crosses the threshold.

Case 1: p_j is the first time i crosses the threshold. Since p_j is the first time i crosses the threshold, clearly, i did not cross the threshold at time $p_j - 1$. Further, Lemma 13 gives us that $p_j \geq p_1 > 1$ and therefore $p_j - 1 \geq 1$. Using Lemma 12 with $t = p_j - 1$, and the fact that q_i has sensitivity one gives the required bound.

Case 2: p_j is not the first time i crosses the threshold. Clearly $p_j - 1 \geq 1$ holds in this case. Then let p_ℓ be the last time at which i crosses the threshold before p_j . By induction, we have for p_ℓ that

$$\begin{aligned} q_i(h^{p_\ell}) &< L_i^{p_\ell} + \alpha_\mu^{p_\ell} + \alpha_\tau^\ell + \alpha_\gamma^\ell + \alpha_H^\ell + 1 \\ &\leq L_i^{p_j} - K_j^{p_j} + \alpha_\mu^{p_j} + \alpha_\tau^j + \alpha_\gamma^j + \alpha_H^j + 1 \end{aligned}$$

Since i crosses the threshold at time p_j , Lemma 8 with $t = p_j$ gives

$$q_i(h^{p_j}) \geq L_i^{p_j} - (\alpha_\mu^{p_j} + \alpha_\tau^j + 2\alpha_\gamma^j + \alpha_H^j)$$

Putting both these inequalities together, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |q_i(h^{p_j}) - q_i(h^{p_\ell})| &> \left(L_i^{p_j} - (\alpha_\mu^{p_j} + \alpha_\tau^j + 2\alpha_\gamma^j + \alpha_H^j) \right) - \left(L_i^{p_j} - K_j^{p_j} + (\alpha_\mu^{p_j} + \alpha_\tau^j + \alpha_\gamma^j + \alpha_H^j + 1) \right) \\ &= K_j^{p_j} - \left(2\alpha_\mu^{p_j} + 2\alpha_\tau^j + 3\alpha_\gamma^j + 2\alpha_H^j + 1 \right) > 1, \end{aligned}$$

since $K_j^t \geq 3(C_j^t + \alpha_H^j)$ and $C_j^t = \alpha_\mu^t + \alpha_\tau^j + \alpha_\gamma^j$. As q_i has sensitivity one, we have $p_j - p_\ell > 1$, and thus, i did not cross the threshold at time $p_j - 1$. Lemma 12 with $t = p_j - 1$ and the sensitivity of q_i then gives the required bound. \square

Lemma 10. *Algorithm 2 creates at most kc_{\max}^t many segments at time t .*

Proof. Since $C_j^t = \alpha_\mu^t + \alpha_\tau^j + \alpha_\gamma^j$, whenever the condition in line 15 is true, then the condition in line 20 is also true for some i , i.e., i crosses the threshold. By Lemma 9, the query value of q_i on the true histogram grows by at least one every time i crosses the threshold. Since c_{\max}^t bounds the maximum number of times any query answer can increase before time t , there can be at most kc_{\max}^t many threshold crossings for all $i \in [k]$ combined, and thus the lemma follows. \square

Lemma 11. *Let $t \in \mathbb{N}$ be any time step, and suppose $t \in [p_{j-1}, p_j)$. Then Algorithm 2 is α_j^t -accurate at time t , where*

$$\alpha_j^t = O\left(\alpha_\mu^t + \alpha_\tau^j + \alpha_\gamma^j + \alpha_H^j\right)$$

In particular, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$, Algorithm 2 is α^t -accurate, where

$$\alpha^t = O\left(\alpha_\mu^t + \alpha_\tau^{kc_{\max}^t} + \alpha_\gamma^{kc_{\max}^t} + \alpha_H^{kc_{\max}^t}\right).$$

Proof. Once we prove the first part, the second follows from Lemma 10. Since $t \in [p_{j-1}, p_j)$, the output of the algorithm at time t is $q_i(s^{p_{j-1}})$. Thus the error at time t is

$$\begin{aligned} |q_i(h^t) - q_i(s^{p_{j-1}})| &\leq |q_i(h^t) - q_i(h^{p_{j-1}})| + |q_i(h^{p_{j-1}}) - q_i(s^{p_{j-1}})| \\ &\leq |q_i(h^t) - q_i(h^{p_{j-1}})| + \alpha_H^j && \text{(by Lemma 7)} \\ &\leq q_i(h^t) - q_i(h^{p_{j-1}}) + \alpha_H^j && \text{(since } q_i \text{ monotone and } t \geq p_{j-1}) \end{aligned}$$

Our task reduces to giving an upper bound on $q_i(h^t)$, and a lower bound on $q_i(h^{p_{j-1}})$. We have two cases depending on whether i has previously crossed a threshold. Let $t_{\text{first}}(i)$ be the first time in the whole input sequence that i crosses the threshold.

Case 1: $t < t_{\text{first}}(i)$. Since the histogram is empty before the first input arrives, $q_i(h^{p_0}) = 0$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} q_i(h^t) - q_i(h^{p_{j-1}}) &\leq q_i(h^t) - q_i(h^{p_0}) \\ &< L_i^t + (\alpha_\mu^t + \alpha_\tau^j + \alpha_\gamma^j + \alpha_H^j + 1) && \text{(by Lemma 9)} \\ &= K_j^t + (\alpha_\mu^t + \alpha_\tau^j + \alpha_\gamma^j + \alpha_H^j + 1) && \text{(since } L_i^t = K_j^t) \\ &= O(\alpha_\mu^t + \alpha_\tau^j + \alpha_\gamma^j + \alpha_H^j) && \text{(since } K_j^t = 3(\alpha_\mu^t + \alpha_\tau^j + \alpha_\gamma^j + \alpha_H^j)) \end{aligned}$$

Case 2: $t \geq t_{\text{first}}(i)$. Let p_ℓ be the largest time step before t when i crosses the threshold. Then

$$\begin{aligned} q_i(h^t) &\leq L_i^t + (\alpha_\mu^t + \alpha_\tau^j + \alpha_\gamma^j + \alpha_H^j + 1) && \text{(by Lemma 9)} \\ \text{and } q_i(h^{p_\ell}) &\geq L_i^{p_\ell} - (\alpha_\mu^{p_\ell} + \alpha_\tau^\ell + 2\alpha_\gamma^\ell + \alpha_H^\ell) && \text{(by Lemma 8)} \\ &\geq L_i^t - K_j^t - (\alpha_\mu^t + \alpha_\tau^j + 2\alpha_\gamma^j + \alpha_H^j) \end{aligned}$$

Putting these together, we get

$$\begin{aligned} q_i(h^t) - q_i(h^{p_\ell}) &\leq q_i(h^t) - q_i(h^{p_\ell}) \\ &= O(\alpha_\mu^t + \alpha_\tau^j + \alpha_\gamma^j + \alpha_H^j) && \text{(since } K_j^t = 3(\alpha_\mu^t + \alpha_\tau^j + \alpha_\gamma^j + \alpha_H^j)) \end{aligned}$$

which proves the lemma. \square

Corollary 3. *Algorithm 2 with the histogram mechanism from Fact 5 is (α^t, β) -accurate at time t for $\alpha^t = O(\epsilon^{-1} \cdot (d \log^2(dkc_{\max}^t/\beta) + k \log(kc_{\max}^t/\beta) + \log(t/\beta)))$.*

Proof. Lemma 6 and Lemma 11 together give us that Algorithm 2 is α^t -accurate at time t , where

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_\mu^t &= O(\epsilon^{-1} \log(2t/\beta)), & \alpha_\tau^j &= O(\epsilon^{-1} \log(j/\beta)), & \alpha_\gamma^j &= O(\epsilon^{-1} k \log(kj/\beta)), \\ \alpha_H^j &= \text{err}(j, \beta / (\pi j)^2) = O\left(\epsilon^{-1} d \cdot \left(\sqrt{\log j} \log(dj/\beta) + (\log j)^{1.5} \sqrt{\log(dj/\beta)}\right)\right) \\ &= O(\epsilon^{-1} d \log^2(dj/\beta)), \text{ and} \\ \alpha^t &= O\left(\alpha_\mu^t + \alpha_\tau^j + \alpha_\gamma^j + \alpha_H^j\right) \text{ with } j \leq kc_{\max}^t \end{aligned}$$

which simplifies to

$$\alpha^t = O(\epsilon^{-1} \cdot (d \log^2(dkc_{\max}^t/\beta) + k \log(kc_{\max}^t/\beta) + \log(t/\beta)))$$

as claimed. \square

3.4 Extensions

For (ϵ, δ) -dp, we use an adaptively differentially private continuous histogram mechanism H and the Gaussian mechanism for γ_i^j , which gives an error bound of

$$\alpha^t = O\left(\epsilon^{-1} \log(1/\delta) \cdot \left(\sqrt{d} \log^{3/2}(dkc_{\max}^t/\beta) + \sqrt{k} \log(kc_{\max}^t/\beta) + \log(t/\beta)\right)\right)$$

for (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy. We defer technical details to Appendix D.

Further, we show that similar techniques also give an algorithm for d -DIM ABOVE THRESH with an error guarantee $O(\epsilon^{-1}(d \log^2(d/\beta) + \log(t/\beta)))$ at time t . This is only a $\log^2 d$ factor away from the lower bound of $\Omega(\epsilon^{-1}(d + \log T))$, in contrast with the upper bound of $\epsilon^{-1}(d(\log d + \log T))$ bound obtained by composing d independent AboveThreshold instantiations. We present both the lower and the upper bounds in Appendix C.

4 Dynamic Predecessor

In this section, we study a differentially private version of the classic predecessor problem. The predecessor problem is to maintain a set D of elements from some ordered universe U , such that we can answer queries of the following form: Given $q \in U$, return the largest element $x \in D$ such that $x \leq q$, or \perp , if no such element of D exists. Note that this problem in its nature depends heavily on the existence of any one element $x \in D$, thus, in order to get useful results while satisfying differential privacy, we study a relaxation of the problem: Instead of outputting the largest element $x \in D$ such that $x \leq q$, we output an $x \in U \cup \{\perp\}$ such that with probability at least $1 - \beta$,

- If $x \in U$, there is at least one element in $[x, q] \cap D$, and there are not too many elements in $[x, q] \cap D$.
- If $x = \perp$, then there are not too many elements in $[1, q]$.

We will define what we mean by “not too many” formally later.

We study this problem *dynamically*, that is: At any point in time, we allow insertion or deletion of any element in U into the data set D (the data set may also stay the same). In our case, D is a set, therefore we ignore an insertion if the element is already in D . Alternatively, we could have considered a model, where insertions of elements already in D are not allowed. Note that any ϵ -differentially private mechanism in the latter model is a $\Theta(\epsilon)$ -differentially private mechanism in the earlier model, and vice versa.

At time step t we allow asking *any set of queries* $Q_t \subseteq U$, and for a query $q \in Q_t$ the algorithm gives an output $x_{t,q}$ such that there is at least one element in $[x_{t,q}, q]$ (except with failure probability β over all time steps t). Let D_t be the set D at time step t after processing the t -th update operation. We define the error α_t up to time step t as $\max_{t' \leq t} \max_{q \in Q_{t'}} |D_{t'} \cap [x_{t',q}, q]|$.

We start by considering the *fully dynamic* case (i.e. with insertions and deletions), which can be reduced to the FULLY DYNAMIC RANGE COUNT problem, as we show in Lemma 14. This gives a bound of $O(\epsilon^{-1}(\log u \log T)^{3/2} \sqrt{\log(uT/\beta)})$ with failure probability β . Next, we show how we can improve this bound for the *partially dynamic* case using a combination of a binary tree structure together with the sparse vector technique, achieving a bound of $O(\epsilon^{-1} \log u \log(u/\beta) \sqrt{\log(T/\beta)})$. Note that in the partially dynamic case $T \leq u$. Thus, this essentially gives an improvement over the bound for the fully dynamic case by a factor of $\log T$ for constant β . All bounds also hold for unknown T . Note that even for known T and the partially dynamic case, an $\Omega(\epsilon^{-1}(\log u + \log T))$ lower bound can be shown using a standard packing argument.

4.1 Fully Dynamic Predecessor

FULLY DYNAMIC PREDECESSOR

Given $u > 0$, build a data structure D that supports the following operations:

- **Insert** an element $x \in [u]$ into D
- **Delete** an element $x \in [u]$ from D

such that the following queries can be answered while satisfying ϵ -differential privacy:

- **Query** $q \in [u]$: return $x \in [u]$ such that $1 \leq \sum_{i=x}^q X_i(D) \leq \alpha_t$, or return $x = \perp$, in which case $\sum_{i=1}^q X_i(D) \leq \alpha_t$. Here, $X_i(D)$ is the function that is 1 if and only if $i \in D$. The bound α_t may depend on the current time t .

Neighboring definition: two neighboring inputs I and I' differ in one **Insert** or one **Delete** operation

First, we show a reduction from the FULLY DYNAMIC PREDECESSOR problem to the FULLY DYNAMIC RANGE COUNT problem:

Lemma 14. *If there is an ϵ -differentially private algorithm for the FULLY DYNAMIC RANGE COUNT with additive error at most α' with probability at least $1 - \beta$, then there is an ϵ -differentially private algorithm for FULLY DYNAMIC PREDECESSOR with additive error at most $\alpha_t = 2\alpha'$ at all time steps t with probability at least $1 - \beta$.*

Proof. We maintain an ϵ -differentially private algorithm D' for FULLY DYNAMIC RANGE COUNT with error at most α' to build an ϵ -differentially private algorithm D for FULLY DYNAMIC PREDECESSOR. We treat $[u]$ as a 1-dimensional interval and whenever an element is updated in D , we perform the corresponding update in D' . Now we can answer a query q for FULLY DYNAMIC PREDECESSOR at any given time step as follows: We query the FULLY DYNAMIC RANGE COUNT data structure for $[x, q]$ for all $x = q, q - 1, \dots$, until the first x^* such that the query outputs a count which is larger than α' , and then we output x^* . If it does not

exist, then we output \perp , and set $x^* = 1$. Conditioning on the error of FULLY DYNAMIC RANGE COUNT being at most α' , it follows that

- $\sum_{i=x^*}^q X_i(D) \geq 1$, and
- $\sum_{i=x^*}^q X_i(D) \leq \sum_{i=x^*+1}^q X_i(D) + 1 \leq 2\alpha' + 1$,

where the last inequality holds as the answer for query $[x^* + 1, q]$ in D' was at most α' and D' has additive error at most α' . \square

Using Lemma 1 and 14, we get the following:

Corollary 4. *There is an algorithm for the FULLY DYNAMIC PREDECESSOR that, with probability at least $1 - \beta$, has additive error*

$$\alpha_t = O(\epsilon^{-1}(\log u \log t)^{3/2} \sqrt{\log(ut/\beta)})$$

at all time steps t .

4.2 Improvement for Partially Dynamic Predecessor

PARTIALLY DYNAMIC PREDECESSOR

Given $u > 0$, build a data structure D that supports the following operations:

- **Insert** an element $x \in [u]$ into D ,

such that the following queries can be answered while satisfying ϵ -differential privacy:

- **Query** $q \in u$: return $x \in [u]$ such that $1 \leq \sum_{i=x}^q X_i(D) \leq \alpha_t$, where $X_i(D)$ is the function that is 1 if and only if $i \in D$. The bound α_t may depend on the current time t .

Neighboring definition: two neighboring inputs I and I' differ in one **Insert** operation

As before we divide the universe into dyadic intervals, similar to before, but now we also use the sparse vector technique (Dwork et al. [2010], Appendix A) to maintain information about which intervals I have at least a certain number of elements in $I \cap D$. We then use that information to answer any predecessor query. The main ideas for the improvement in the partially dynamic case are as follows: (1) The first observation is that we do not need to run the sparse vector technique for all intervals at the same time, but we can do a top-down approach: If an interval $[a, b]$ does not yet contain “enough” elements, then we do not have to consider any of its sub-intervals, since the sub-intervals contain fewer elements than $[a, b]$. Such an interval is “light”. Thus, we only “activate” an interval in the dyadic decomposition once its parent interval has at least a certain number of elements that are in D . (2) The second idea is to use two thresholds on the number of elements of D that fall into the interval of the node, a smaller one to mark an interval “heavy”, and a larger one to mark an interval “finished”. A finished interval provides the guarantee that it contains at least one element in D . A heavy interval does not provide such a guarantee by itself. However, a group of k non-overlapping heavy intervals guarantees the existence of one interval among them that contains an element in D where we choose an optimal value of k in the algorithm. This guarantee follows from bounds on sums of Laplace variables, which also helps to bound the number of elements in “unfinished” and “light” intervals.

Theorem 4. *There is an ϵ -differentially private algorithm for PARTIALLY DYNAMIC PREDECESSOR satisfying $\alpha_t = O((\epsilon^{-1} + 1) \log u \log(u/\beta) \sqrt{\log(t/\beta)})$ with probability at least $1 - \beta$.*

Data Structure. We construct a binary tree BT_u corresponding to the dyadic intervals \mathcal{I}_u of $[u]$ as follows:

- The root of BT_u corresponds to interval $[u]$.

- Let ℓ^* be the largest value ℓ' such that $|I_v| > 2^{\ell'}$. Let v be a node corresponding to an interval $I_v = [\text{start}(v), \text{end}(v)] = [(k-1)2^\ell + 1, \min(k2^\ell, u)] \in \mathcal{I}_u$. If $\ell < \ell^*$, then the children of v correspond to the children intervals of I_v , i.e., if $\min(k2^\ell, u) = k2^\ell$, then $\text{children}(v) = (v_1, v_2)$, where v_1 corresponds to $I_{v_1} = [(k-1)2^\ell + 1, (k-1)2^\ell + 2^{\ell-1}]$ and v_2 corresponds to $I_{v_2} = [(k-1)2^\ell + 2^{\ell-1} + 1, k2^\ell]$. Otherwise the children $(v) = (v_1, v_2)$, where v_1 corresponds to $I_{v_1} = [(k-1)2^\ell + 1, (k-1)2^\ell + 2^{\ell^*}]$ and v_2 corresponds to $I_{v_2} = [(k-1)2^\ell + 2^{\ell^*} + 1, u]$.

Algorithms 4 and 5 build a data structure, which consists of BT_u and over time marks some nodes in the tree as *active*, some as *heavy*, and some as *finished*. We call nodes which are not active *inactive*, nodes which are not heavy *light*, and nodes which are not finished *unfinished*. Assume for the moment that β is constant. The intuition of our definitions is as follows: If a node is finished (resp. unfinished) then with constant probability the interval represented by the node contains $\Omega(\epsilon^{-1} \log u)$ (resp. $O(\epsilon^{-1} \log u)$) many elements. We do not know such a lower bound for the other nodes. However, we also can show that if there are “enough” non-overlapping intervals whose nodes are heavy, then with “good” probability there is at least 1 element and at most $\Omega(\epsilon^{-1} \log^2 u)$ elements in the union of these intervals.

In the following we use a parameter $k_t := \lfloor \log u / (\sqrt{\ln(1/\beta_t)}) \rfloor$.

Answering queries. Given the tree BT_u together with the markings for each node, at time t we answer any query q as follows:

Case 1: First, assume there is a node x which is finished and satisfies $\text{end}(x) \leq q$. Then, we choose the finished node x such that:

1. $\text{end}(x) \leq q$;
2. $\text{start}(x)$ is the maximum of $\text{start}(v)$ for all finished nodes v satisfying $\text{end}(v) \leq q$;
3. x is the deepest node in BT_u satisfying 1 and 2.

Then by Fact 1, the interval $(\text{end}(x), q]$ can be covered with $m \leq 2 \log u$ nodes v_1, \dots, v_m . We differentiate between two cases:

- **Case 1a:** If less than k_t of them are heavy, return $\text{start}(x)$.
- **Case 1b:** Else, let $v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}, \dots, v_{i_{m'}}$ be the heavy nodes out of v_1, \dots, v_m , sorted such that $\text{start}(v_{i_1}) < \text{start}(v_{i_2}) < \dots < \text{start}(v_{i_{m'}})$. Return the start of the interval corresponding to the k_t -th farthest heavy node from q , that is, $\text{start}(y)$ for $y = v_{i_{m'-k_t}}$.

Case 2: If there is no node x which is finished and satisfies $\text{end}(x) \leq q$, let v_1, \dots, v_m be the cover of $[1, q]$ given by Fact 1. Then we again differentiate between two cases:

- **Case 2a:** If less than k_t of them are heavy, return \perp .
- **Case 2b:** Else, let $v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}, \dots, v_{i_{m'}}$ be the heavy nodes out of v_1, \dots, v_m , sorted such that $\text{start}(v_{i_1}) < \text{start}(v_{i_2}) < \dots < \text{start}(v_{i_{m'}})$. Return the start of the interval corresponding to the k_t farthest heavy node from q , that is, $\text{start}(y)$ for $y = v_{i_{m'-k_t}}$.

Lemma 15. *Algorithms 4 and 5 together are 2ϵ -differentially private.*

Proof. To argue that the algorithm is ϵ -differentially private, note that if we release the tree BT_u together with the markings heavy and finished, then the query outputs are merely post-processing on these markings. To compute those markings, for each node v , we compute:

- an approximate count of the corresponding interval when it is activated: For this, we use the Laplace mechanism with privacy parameter $\epsilon' = \epsilon / (3 \log u)$.

Algorithm 4: Activate

Input: a node v of level ℓ corresponding to interval $I_v \in \mathcal{I}_u$, data set D , time stamp t , parameters ϵ and β

```
1 mark  $v$  active;
2 let  $C_1 = 250(1 + \epsilon)$ ,  $C_2 = 50(1 + \epsilon)$ 
3  $\nu = \text{Lap}(3 \log u/\epsilon)$ 
4 Let  $D_t$  be the data set consisting of all elements that have been inserted up to time  $t$ ;
5  $\tilde{c}_v = \sum_{x \in D_t \cap I_v} 1 + \nu$ 
6  $\tau_1 = \text{Lap}(6 \log u/\epsilon)$ ,  $\tau_2 = \text{Lap}(6 \log u/\epsilon)$ 
7 for stream  $x^{t+1}, x^{t+2}, \dots$ , while  $v$  is not marked finished do
8    $t = t + 1$ 
9    $\beta_t = \beta/(6\pi^2 t^2)$ 
10  if  $x^t \in I_v$  then
11     $\tilde{c}(v) = \tilde{c}(v) + 1$ 
12  end
13   $k_t = \lfloor \log u/(\sqrt{\ln(1/\beta_t)}) \rfloor$ 
14   $K_1^t = (C_1/(k_t \epsilon)) \log u \log(2u/\beta_t)$ 
15   $K_2^t = (C_2/\epsilon) \log u \log(2/\beta_t)$ 
16   $\mu_1^t = \text{Lap}(12 \log u/\epsilon)$ ,  $\mu_2^t = \text{Lap}(12 \log u/\epsilon)$ 
17  if  $\tilde{c}(v) + \mu_1^t > K_1^t + \tau_1$  and  $v$  is not heavy then
18    Activate(children( $v$ )); mark  $v$  heavy;
19  end
20  if  $\tilde{c}(v) + \mu_2^t > K_2^t + \tau_2$  then
21    if  $v$  not heavy then
22      Activate(children( $v$ )); mark  $v$  heavy;
23    end
24    mark  $v$  finished
25    Abort
26  end
27 end
```

Algorithm 5: Build data structure

Input: stream $D = x^1, x^2, \dots$; universe size u , parameters ϵ and β

```
1  $t = 0$ 
2 construct binary tree  $BT_u$ 
3 for  $x^t$  do
4    $t = t + 1$ 
5   if  $t > 2 \log u$  then
6     Activate(root,  $D$ ,  $t$ ,  $\epsilon$ ,  $\beta$ )
7     Stop
8   end
9 end
```

- when to mark it heavy: For this, we use an instantiation of the AboveThresh algorithm (Algorithm 8 in Appendix A) with privacy parameter $\epsilon' = \epsilon/(3 \log u)$.
- when to mark it finished: For this, we use another instantiation of the AboveThresh algorithm (Algorithm 8 in Appendix A) with privacy parameter $\epsilon' = \epsilon/(3 \log u)$.

Note that for fixed v , one insertion can change the count of $D_t \cap I_v$ by at most 1 for any t . Thus, the sensitivity for the Laplace mechanism and both AboveThresh algorithms is 1, and each of them is $\epsilon/(3 \log u)$ -differentially private by Fact 3 and Lemma 24. Together, the algorithm `Activate`(v) for any node v is $(\epsilon/\log u)$ -differentially private. Now note that since by Fact 1, any $x \in [u]$ is in at most $2 \log u$ dyadic intervals, and it can influence the computation of at most $2 \log u$ nodes v . The entire algorithm thus preserves 2ϵ -differential privacy. \square

4.2.1 Accuracy

Let $\beta_t = \beta'/t^2$ and $\beta' = \beta/(6\pi^2)$ as in the algorithm. Note that $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \beta_t = \beta$. We will use the following lemmas to prove our accuracy bounds.

Lemma 16. *With probability at least $1 - \beta$ it holds that at any time t , there are at most t^3 active nodes.*

Lemma 17. *Assume the bound from Lemma 16 holds. Then, with probability at least $1 - \beta$ it holds that at any time t , the interval I_v for any node v that is not finished contains at most $O(\epsilon^{-1} \log u \log(1/\beta_t))$ many elements. Any node v that is finished contains at least $\Omega(\epsilon^{-1} \log u \log(1/\beta))$ many elements.*

Lemma 18. *Assume the bounds from Lemma 17 holds. At any time t , fix some choice of $m \leq 2 \log u$ intervals that correspond to unfinished nodes, with at most k_t of them being heavy. Then, with probability at least $1 - \beta_t/u$, it holds that the total number of elements in these m intervals is at most $O(\epsilon^{-1} \log u \log(u/\beta) \sqrt{\log(1/\beta_t)})$*

Lemma 19. *Suppose $k_t \leq \log u$. At any time t , with probability at least $1 - \beta_t/u$, the total number of elements in k_t non-overlapping intervals which correspond to k_t heavy nodes is at least 1.*

Before we prove the lemmas, we first show how they imply the claimed error bound.

Lemma 20. *Algorithms 4 and 5 together are $\alpha_t = O(\epsilon^{-1} \log u \log(u/\beta) \sqrt{\log(1/\beta_t)})$ accurate with failure probability β .*

Proof. We assume the bounds from Lemma 16 and Lemma 17 hold at every time step t . Note that Lemma 16 holds with probability at least $1 - \beta$ and the probability that Lemma 16 and 17 hold together is at least $(1 - \beta)^2 \geq 1 - 2\beta$.

Let x be the node returned by the query algorithm as described above. We discuss accuracy in all four query cases.

Cases 1a. and 2a. In Case 1a., there is a finished node with $\text{end}(x) \leq q$ and less than k_t of the nodes in the cover of $(\text{end}(x), q]$ are heavy.

Lower bound in Case 1a. We first note that since x is finished, Lemma 17 implies that there is at least one element in $[\text{start}(x), \text{end}(x)] \subseteq [\text{start}(x), q]$.

Upper bound in Case 1a. Further, Lemma 17 also gives us that there are at most $O(\epsilon^{-1} \log u \log(1/\beta_t))$ elements in $[\text{start}(x), \text{end}(x)]$, since both children of x are not finished by choice of x . Fact 1 implies that the interval $(\text{end}(x), q]$ can be covered by at most $2 \log u$ intervals and, by the definition of x , none of them is finished. Thus, by Lemma 18, there are at most $O(\log^2 u \sqrt{\log(1/\beta_t)})$ elements in $(\text{end}(x), q]$ with probability at least $1 - \beta_t/u$. Since the number of distinct queries we can make at any fixed time t is bounded by u , this implies that the accuracy guarantee holds for all of these simultaneously with probability $1 - \beta_t$. Using the union bound over all time steps, we get that the bound holds for all queries which fall into Case 1a with probability at least $1 - \beta$, conditioned on the bounds from Lemma 16 and Lemma 17.

Upper bound in Case 2a. Similarly, Lemma 18 gives that there are at most $O(\log^2 u \sqrt{\log(1/\beta_t)})$ elements in $[1, q]$ for all queries which fall into Case 2a with probability at least $1 - \beta$, conditioned on the bounds from Lemma 16 and Lemma 17.

Lower bound in Case 2a. We cannot show any lower bound on the number of elements in $[1, q]$ and the algorithm returns \perp , i.e., it is not claiming any lower bound.

Cases 1b. and 2b.

Upper bound. In these cases, Lemma 18 gives that there are at most $O(\log^2 u \sqrt{\log(1/\beta_t)})$ elements in $[\text{start}(y), q]$ with probability at least $1 - \beta_t/u$ conditioned on the bounds from Lemma 16 and Lemma 17.

Lower bound. Lemma 19 gives that there is at least one element in $[\text{start}(y), q]$ with probability at least $1 - \beta_t/u$.

Since the number of distinct queries we can make at any fixed time t is bounded by u , this gives that the accuracy guarantees (upper and lower bound) hold for all of these simultaneously with probability $1 - 2\beta_t$. Using the union bound over all time steps, we get that the bound holds for all queries which fall into Case 1b or 2b with probability at least $1 - 2\beta$, conditioned on the bounds from Lemma 16 and Lemma 17.

Recall that the conditions in Lemma 16 and Lemma 17 hold together with probability at least $1 - 2\beta$. Conditioned on that, the upper and lower bounds hold for all queries that are answered by Case 1a with probability at least $1 - \beta$, for all queries that are answered by Case 2a with probability at least $1 - \beta$, for all queries that are answered by Case 1b or 2b with probability at least $1 - 2\beta$. As every query falls into one of these cases, it follows that the bounds hold for all queries with probability at least $1 - 4\beta$, conditioned on the conditions in Lemma 16 and Lemma 17 holding. Thus, it follows that the bounds hold for all queries with probability at least $(1 - 4\beta)(1 - 2\beta) \geq 1 - 6\beta$. Thus, with probability at least $1 - 6\beta$, we have $1 \leq \sum_{i=x}^q X_i(D) \leq \alpha_t$ for all possible queries q at all time steps t , which proves the lemma by scaling β to $\beta/6$ in the algorithm. \square

Now we prove Lemmata 16, 17, 18 and 19.

Proof of Lemma 16. For $t \leq 2 \log u$, Algorithm 5 guarantees that there are no active nodes, so the statement trivially holds. So let's assume that $t > 2 \log u$ and let m' be the number of nodes that get activated at time t . We will prove that with probability at least $1 - \beta_t$, $m' \leq t^2$. This implies that with probability at least $1 - \beta$, at all timesteps T , the number of active nodes is no more than $\sum_{t=1}^T t^2 = O(T^3)$.

Any node that gets activated at time t has a parent that is declared heavy at time t . This means that there are $m = m'/2$ nodes that are declared heavy at time t . Call them v_1, \dots, v_m . Now, note that if $m \leq k_t^2 = \lceil \log u / \sqrt{\log(1/\beta_t)} \rceil^2 \leq \log^2 u$, then clearly $m' = 2m \leq t^2$, so at most t^2 elements are activated at time t .

Thus, we are left with analyzing the case $m \geq k_t^2$. Since node v_i is declared heavy at time t , it means that either the condition in line 17 or the condition in line 20 in Algorithm 4 is true for v_i at time t . Note that $K_1^t = (C_1/(k_t \epsilon)) \log u \log(2u/\beta_t) \geq (C_1/(k_t \epsilon)) \log u \ln(2/\beta_t)$. Further, $K_2^t = (C_2/\epsilon) \log u \log(2/\beta_t) \geq (C_2/(k_t \epsilon)) \log u \ln(2/\beta_t)$. Denote $K_{\min}^t = k_t^{-1} \epsilon^{-1} \min(C_1, C_2) \log u \ln(2/\beta_t)$. Note that $K_{\min}^t \leq \min(K_1^t, K_2^t)$. Now, let ν_i , μ_i^t and τ_i be the values of ν , μ_1^t and τ_1 in the run of $\text{Activate}(v_i)$ at time t , respectively, if the condition in line 17 is true for v_i at time t . Else, let ν_i , μ_i^t and τ_i be the values of ν , μ_2^t and τ_2 in the run of $\text{Activate}(v_i)$ at time t . Further, let $c^t(v_i)$ be the true count of elements in I_{v_i} at time t . Then for every $i \in [m]$ we have

$$c^t(v_i) + \nu_i + \mu_i^t > K_{\min}^t + \tau_i$$

and thus

$$\sum_{i=1}^m c^t(v_i) \geq K_{\min}^t \cdot m - \left| \sum_{i=1}^m (\nu_i + \tau_i + \mu_i^t) \right|,$$

where the last inequality holds since the Laplace noise is symmetric around 0. Now, let $Y = \sum_{i=1}^m (\nu_i + \tau_i + \mu_i^t)$. By Lemma 2, we have

$$\Pr[|Y| > \frac{12 \log u}{\epsilon} 2 \ln(2/\beta_t) \sqrt{3m}] \leq \beta_t$$

Note that any element can contribute to the count of at most $\log u$ nodes, and there are exactly t elements in the set at time t . With probability at least $1 - \beta_t$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \log u \cdot t &\geq \sum_i c^t(v_i) \geq K_{\min}^t \cdot m - \frac{12 \log u}{\epsilon} 2 \ln(2/\beta_t) \sqrt{3m} \\ &= \frac{\min(C_1, C_2)m}{k_t \epsilon} \log u \ln(2/\beta_t) - \frac{24 \log u}{\epsilon} \ln(2/\beta_t) \sqrt{3m} \end{aligned}$$

Now, since $m \geq k_t^2$ we have $m/k_t \geq \sqrt{m}$, and thus

$$\log u \cdot t \geq \frac{\min(C_1, C_2)\sqrt{m}}{\epsilon} \log u \ln(2/\beta_t) - \frac{24\sqrt{3m}}{\epsilon} \log u \ln(2/\beta_t) \geq \log u \cdot \sqrt{2m},$$

for $\min(C_1, C_2) \geq \max(1, \epsilon) \cdot 24\sqrt{3} + \sqrt{2}$. Thus, $t^2 \geq 2m = m'$, and at most t^2 elements are activated at time t with probability at least $1 - \beta_t$. This concludes the proof. \square

We next state two simple properties of the labeling of the nodes.

Claim 1. *Every node always has an active ancestor. Furthermore, every light node has an active ancestor that is light.*

Proof. By the stopping condition of Algorithm 4 the root is active throughout Algorithm 4, which implies that every node always has an active ancestor. Next, let u be a light node and consider the lowest active node u' on the path from u to the root. Note that u' cannot be heavy, as all children of a heavy node are active as well. Thus, u' is light. \square

Proof of Lemma 17. Let A_t be the number of active nodes at time t . Note that $A_t \geq 1$ as the root is active throughout Algorithm 4. By Lemma 16, $A_t = O(t^3)$. Consider a fixed node v that is active at a given time t . Let ν , τ_2 , $\mu_2^{t'}$ be the values of the corresponding random variables in Algorithm 4 executed on v at a time $t' \leq t$.

By the Laplace tailbounds we have:

- $|\nu| \leq (3 \log u/\epsilon) \log(3A_t/\beta_t)$ with probability at least $1 - \beta_t/(3A_t)$;
- $|\mu_2^{t'}| \leq (12 \log u/\epsilon) \log(3tA_t/\beta_t)$ with probability at least $1 - \beta_t/(3tA_t)$ for any $t' \leq t$;
- $|\tau_2| \leq (6 \log u/\epsilon) \log(3A_t/\beta_t)$ with probability at least $1 - \beta_t/(3A_t)$;

Thus, by the union bound, all of these random variables are bounded by $12(\log u/\epsilon) \log(3tA_t/\beta_t) \leq 12(\log u/\epsilon) \log((1/\beta_t)^4) \leq 48(\log u/\epsilon) \log(1/\beta_t)$ with probability $1 - \beta_t/A_t$. By a second application of the union bound, the bounds on the random variables hold simultaneously for all active nodes at time t with probability at least $1 - \beta_t$, and, thus, for all active nodes at all time steps with at least probability $1 - \beta$.

Given these bounds on the random variables, note that any active but unfinished node at time t has a true count of at most $K_2^t + (6 \log u/\epsilon) \log(3t^3/\beta_t) = O(\log u/\epsilon) \log(1/\beta_t)$. Any inactive node u has an ancestor u' which is active but not finished, so the fact that the bound holds for u' also implies that it holds for its descendent u , i.e., it holds for any inactive node. Any node that is finished at time t was marked finished at some time step $t' \leq t$. At that time, it had a true count of at least $K_2^{t'} - 48(\log u/\epsilon) \log(1/\beta_{t'}) = \Omega((\log u/\epsilon) \log(1/\beta_{t'})) = \Omega((\log u/\epsilon) \log(1/\beta))$ for $C_2 \geq 50$. \square

Proof of Lemma 18. Let v_1, \dots, v_m be $m \leq 2 \log u$ unfinished nodes at time t . Let $v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_\ell}$, $\ell \leq k_t$ of them be heavy. Since $v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_\ell}$ are, by assumption, not finished, their total count is at most $O(k_t \epsilon^{-1} \log u \log(1/\beta_t)) = O(\epsilon^{-1} \log^2 u \sqrt{\log(1/\beta_t)})$ by the choice of $k_t = \lfloor \log u / (\sqrt{\ln(1/\beta_t)}) \rfloor$. by Lemma 17.

Let v_{j_1}, \dots, v_{j_m} be the nodes which are light out of v_1, \dots, v_m . By Claim 1 any of them which is not active has an active ancestor which is light and has at least the same count. Thus, there is a set of

nodes $w_1, \dots, w_{m''}$ which are active and light, have at least the same total count as $v_{j_1}, \dots, v_{j_{m''}}$ and satisfy $m'' \leq m' \leq m \leq 2 \log u$.

Let $\nu_j, \mu_{1,j}^t$ and $\tau_{1,j}$ be the values of ν, μ_1^t and τ_1 in the run for node w_j at time t , for $j \in [m'']$. Further, let $c^t(w_j)$ be the true count of interval I_{w_j} at time t . Since for every $j \in \{1, \dots, m''\}$ the node w_j is light, we have

$$c^t(w_j) + \nu_j + \mu_{1,j}^t < K_1^t + \tau_j,$$

thus

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m''} c^t(w_j) < m'' K_1^t + \left| \sum_{j=1}^{m''} (\tau_j + \mu_j + \mu_{1,j}^t) \right|.$$

Now, let $Y = \sum_{j=1}^{m''} (\tau_j + \mu_j + \mu_{1,j}^t)$. By Lemma 2, we have

$$\Pr[|Y| > \frac{12 \log u}{\epsilon} 2\sqrt{2 \ln(2u/\beta_t)} \max(\sqrt{3m''}, \sqrt{\ln(2u/\beta_t)})] \leq \beta_t/u$$

Since $m'' \leq 2 \log u = O(\ln(u/\beta_t))$, we have that $\frac{12 \log u}{\epsilon} 2\sqrt{2 \ln(2u/\beta_t)} \max(\sqrt{3m''}, \sqrt{\ln(2u/\beta_t)}) = O(\epsilon^{-1} \log u \ln(u/\beta_t))$. This implies that with probability at least $1 - \beta_t/u$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{m''} c^t(w_j) &\leq m'' K_1^t + O(\epsilon^{-1} \log u \ln(u/\beta_t)) \\ &= O\left(\frac{m''}{k_t \epsilon} \log u \log(u/\beta_t) + \epsilon^{-1} \log u \ln(u/\beta_t)\right) \\ &= O(\epsilon^{-1} (\log u \ln(u/\beta_t) \sqrt{\log(1/\beta_t)} + \log u \ln(u/\beta_t))) \\ &= O(\epsilon^{-1} \log u \log(u/\beta) \sqrt{\log(1/\beta_t)}). \end{aligned}$$

For the last step, note that the number of insertions is bounded by u , hence $t \leq u$ and $\log(u/\beta_t) = O(\log(u/\beta))$. □

Proof of Lemma 19. Fix a time t . Let v_1, \dots, v_{k_t} be k_t heavy nodes at time t . Since none of them is finished, we have for every $v_j, j \in [k_t]$, that line 17 was true at some time $t_j \leq t$. Let $c^t(v_j)$ be the true count of v_j at time t . Further, let $\nu_j, \mu_{1,j}^t$ and $\tau_{1,j}$ be the values of ν, μ_1^t and τ_1 in the execution of Algorithm 4 for node v_j . Since for every $j \in [k_t]$, node v_j is heavy, we have

$$c^t(v_j) \geq c^{t_j}(v_j) > K_1^{t_j} + \tau_j - \nu_j + \mu_{1,j}^{t_j},$$

where t_j is the time where v_j was declared heavy. Thus

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k_t} c^t(v_j) > k_t K_1^{t^*} - \left| \sum_{j=1}^{k_t} (\tau_j + \mu_j + \mu_{1,j}^{t_j}) \right|,$$

where $t^* = \min_{j=1, \dots, k_t} t_j$. Now, let $Y = \sum_{j=1}^{k_t} (\tau_j + \mu_j + \mu_{1,j}^{t_j})$. By Lemma 2, we have

$$\Pr[|Y| > \frac{12 \log u}{\epsilon} 2\sqrt{\ln(2u/\beta_t)} \max(\sqrt{3k_t}, \sqrt{\ln(2u/\beta_t)})] \leq \beta_t/u.$$

Since $k_t \leq \log u$ we have that the above is bounded by $\frac{12 \log u}{\epsilon} 2\sqrt{\ln(2u/\beta_t)} \max(\sqrt{3 \log u}, \sqrt{\ln(2u/\beta_t)}) < 24\sqrt{3}(\log u/\epsilon) \ln(2u/\beta_t)$. This implies, with probability at least $1 - \beta_t/u$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=1}^{k_t} c^t(v_j) &> k_t K_1^{t*} - \left| \sum_{j=1}^{k_t} (\tau_j + \mu_j + \mu_{1,j}^{t_j}) \right| \\
&= \frac{C_1}{\epsilon} \log u \log(2u/\beta_{t*}) - \frac{24\sqrt{3}}{\epsilon} \log u \ln(2u/\beta_t) \\
&> \frac{C_1}{\epsilon} \log u \log(2u/\beta) - \frac{24\sqrt{3}}{\epsilon} \log u \ln(2u/\beta_t) && \text{(since } \log(1/\beta_{t*}) > \log(1/\beta)\text{)} \\
&> \frac{C_1}{\epsilon} \log u \log(2u/\beta) - \frac{144\sqrt{3}}{\epsilon} \log u \log(2u/\beta) && \text{(since } t \leq u \text{ and } \ln(2u/\beta_t) < 6 \log(2u/\beta)\text{)} \\
&> 1
\end{aligned}$$

for $C_1 > 250$. □

5 Set Cardinality

In this section we study the following generalization of continual counting. Given a universe \mathcal{U} we want to maintain a subset $D \subset \mathcal{U}$ and allow at each time step either (1) to modify D through the insertion or deletion of any subset of elements or (2) to leave D unchanged. The mechanism returns at each time step the cardinality of S in a differentially private manner. In the same way as in binary counting it is not known whether a 0 or 1 was inserted, it is not known whether at a time step an update happened or not, and if an update happened, which update it was. We consider D to be a set, thus, we ignore insertions of an element that is already in D at any given time. Alternatively, we could have considered a model, where insertions of elements already in D are not allowed. Note that any ϵ -differentially private mechanism in the latter model is a $\Theta(\epsilon)$ -differentially private mechanism in the earlier model, and vice versa. This model makes sense for problems where there can only be at most one copy of every item, i.e. monitoring the number of edges in a simple graph or keeping track of a certain changing property for a set of users of some service (i.e., being abroad).

Event-level privacy. In the event-level differential privacy setting for this problem two input sequences are neighboring if they differ in the insertion or deletion of at most one user at one time step, i.e., a neighboring sequence can have one more or one less element starting from the operation where the sequences differ. This problem can be reduced to continuous counting as follows: for every time step t , define $a_i^t = 1$, if i gets inserted at time t , $a_i^t = -1$, if it gets deleted, and $a_i^t = 0$, else. Then at every time step t , we insert $\sum_i a_i^t$ into the counting mechanism. Note that for two neighboring data sets, the resulting streams differ by at most 1 at at most one time step, therefore, the binary tree mechanism by [Dwork et al. \[2010\]](#), [Chan et al. \[2011\]](#) gives an upper bound of $O(\log^2 T)$.

User-level privacy. For *user-level* privacy, two input sequences are neighboring if they differ in all the updates affecting one of the elements of \mathcal{U} . Let $d = |\mathcal{U}|$. Note that [Fichtenberger et al. \[2021\]](#) shows a lower bound for counting the number of edges in a graph for user-level differential privacy which translates into a $\Omega(d)$ in our setting requiring $\Theta(d)$ many updates. We show that if we parameterize the problem by the number K of update operations then we give asymptotically matching upper and lower bounds of $\Omega(\min(d, K, \sqrt{\epsilon^{-1} K \log(T/K)}))$. Since our lower bound holds even in the setting where we allow at most one insertion or deletion at every time step, this improves on the lower bound of [Fichtenberger et al. \[2021\]](#).

Restricted number of updates per user. [Erlingsson et al. \[2019\]](#) study this problem parameterized in an upper bound k on the number of updates *per user*. They achieve an upper bound on the error of $O(\sqrt{dk} \log^2 T)$ in the stronger *local* model of differential privacy. Note that our algorithm below can be modified to give an upper bound of $O(\min(d, \epsilon^{-1} k \log T \log(T/\beta), \sqrt{\epsilon^{-1} dk \log(T/(k\beta))})$ on the additive error. The $O(\epsilon^{-1} k \log T \log(T/\beta))$ upper bound is achieved by using the same algorithm described for event-level

privacy and noting that with a lower bound k on number of changes per user, two neighboring data sets in the user-level setting are k -neighboring in the event-level setting. We can also achieve a lower bound of $\Omega(\min(d, \epsilon^{-1}(k \log T - k \log k)))$ by the same techniques as the lower bound parameterized in K .

Comparison to COUNTDISTINCT Very recently and independently, Jain et al. [2023] studied the problem of counting distinct elements in a stream with insertions and deletions under event and user level differential privacy. While similar, this problem is different from our work: They allow multiple copies of every element and a deletion only deletes one copy of an element. The goal is to output the number of elements with a count larger than 0. Thus, their upper bounds, which are parameterized in k and achieve (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy with an error of roughly $O(\epsilon^{-1} \sqrt{k} \text{polylog } T \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)})$ for both event and user-level privacy, also hold for our problem, but are not necessarily tight (the upper bound is not a contradiction to our lower bound of $\Omega(\min(d, \epsilon^{-1}(k \log T - k \log k)))$ since we consider ϵ -differential privacy). On the other hand, their lower bounds do *not* apply to the problem we study here, as can be seen for the event-level privacy case, where the binary tree based upper bound achieves an $O(\log^2 T)$ upper bound, while they show a $\min(k, T^{1/4})$ lower bound even for (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy.

SETCARDINALITY

Given a set of users $[d]$, build a data structure D that supports the following operations:

- **Insert** a subset of users $I \subseteq [d]$ into D
- **Delete** a subset of users $I \subseteq [d]$ from D

such that the following queries can be answered while satisfying ϵ -differential privacy:

- **Query** return the number of users in D at the current time step

Neighboring definition: two neighboring data sets differ in all data of one user $i \in [d]$ (user-level privacy)

Condition: total number of insertions / deletions is bounded by K

Lemma 21. *Let K be an upper bound on the total number of insertions / deletions and T an upper bound on the number of time steps. Then any ϵ -differentially private algorithm to the SETCARDINALITY problem with user-level privacy and error at most α at all time steps with probability at least $2/3$ must satisfy $\alpha = \Omega(\min(d, K, \sqrt{\epsilon^{-1} K \log(T/K)}))$. This lower bound even holds if updates are restricted to singleton sets.*

Proof. Assume there is an ϵ -differentially private algorithm \mathcal{A} for the SETCARDINALITY problem with error smaller than α at all time steps with probability at least $2/3$. Assume $\alpha \leq \min(d/2, K/2)$. Else, the error is at least $\Omega(\min(d, K))$. Let $m = 2\alpha \leq \min(d, K)$.

Next, assume wlog that m divides both T and K such that $k := K/m$ is an even, positive integer. If this is not the case increase both T by $O(m)$ and K by $O(K)$ to make it true. Partition the timeline into T/m blocks of length m : $B_1 = [1, m]$, $B_2 = [m + 1, 2m]$, \dots . Now, for any $I = (i_1, \dots, i_k)$ with $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k \leq T/m$, define an input sequence D_I as follows: For any user $i \in [m]$, insert i into D_I at time step $B_{i_1}[i] = (i_1 - 1)m + i$, delete i from D_I at $B_{i_2}[i] = (i_2 - 1)m + i$, insert i into D_I again at $B_{i_3}[i]$, and so on. In all other time steps no updates are performed. Thus, all users $i \in [m]$ are in D_I for all time steps $t \in [i_{2p-1}m, (i_{2p} - 1)m]$, for all $p \leq k/2$, and not in the set for all time steps $t \in [i_{2p}m, (i_{2p+1} - 1)m]$. Any user $i \in [d] \setminus [m]$ never gets inserted into D_I . In total, there are K/m insertions or deletions per user $i \in [m]$, thus K insertions or deletions in total. This defines $\ell = \binom{T/m}{K/m}$ different input sequences.

Now let E_I , for $I = (i_1, \dots, i_k)$ with $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k \leq T/m$, be the set of output sequences where \mathcal{A} outputs a value of $m/2$ or larger for all time steps $t \in [i_{2p-1}m, (i_{2p} - 1)m]$, for all $1 \leq p \leq k/2$, and smaller than $m/2$ for all time steps t such that (1) $t < i_1m$, or (2) $t \in [i_{2p}m, (i_{2p+1} - 1)m]$ for some $0 \leq p < k/2$, or (3) $t \geq i_k m$ and arbitrary values at all other time steps. Note that for an input sequence D_I every output sequence where \mathcal{A} has additive error smaller than $\alpha = m/2$ must belong to E_I . As the algorithm is correct with probability at least $2/3$, $\Pr[\mathcal{A}(D_I) \in E_I] \geq 2/3$.

Two sequences D_I and D_J with $I \neq J$ differ in at most $2K$ operations. As two sequences are neighboring if they differ in the data of at most one user, and D_I and D_J differ in the data of at most m users, it follows by group privacy that $\Pr[\mathcal{A}(D_J) \in E_I] \geq e^{-m\epsilon} 2/3$ for any $J = (j_1, \dots, j_k)$ with $1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_k \leq T/m$. Also note that the E_I are disjoint, since for each multiple of m (i.e., the end of a block), it is clearly defined whether the output is at least $m/2$ or smaller than $m/2$, and as such the i_1, \dots, i_k can be uniquely recovered.

Since the E_I are disjoint, we have:

$$1 \geq \binom{T/m}{K/m} e^{-m\epsilon} 2/3 \geq \frac{(T/m)^{K/m}}{(K/m)^{K/m}} e^{-m\epsilon} 2/3 = \frac{T^{K/m}}{K^{K/m}} e^{-m\epsilon} 2/3$$

which gives

$$m \geq \epsilon^{-1} ((K/m) \log(T/K) + \log(2/3))$$

and thus

$$m = \Omega(\sqrt{\epsilon^{-1} K \log(T/K)})$$

Since $\alpha = m/2$, we get $\alpha = \Omega(\sqrt{\epsilon^{-1} K \log(T/K)})$, as claimed. \square

Lemma 22. *Let K be an upper bound on the total number of insertions / deletions which is given. Let T be a known upper bound on the number of time steps. Then there is an ϵ -differentially private algorithm for the SETCARDINALITY problem with error at most $\alpha = O(\min(d, K, \sqrt{\epsilon^{-1} K \log(T/\beta)}))$ at all time steps with probability at least $1 - \beta$.*

Algorithm 6: Set Cardinality, known T

Input: Data Set $D = x^1, x^2, \dots$, parameters ϵ and β , stream length bound T , stopping parameter S

```

1  $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon/2$ 
2 count = 1
3  $\tau_1 = \text{Lap}(2S/\epsilon_1)$ 
4  $\nu_1 = \text{Lap}(S/\epsilon_1)$ 
5 out =  $\sum_{i=1}^d x_i^1 + \nu_1$ 
6 Thresh =  $24S\epsilon_1^{-1}(\log(2T/\beta))$ 
7 for  $t = 2, \dots$ , do
8    $\mu_t = \text{Lap}(4S/\epsilon_1)$ 
9   if  $|\text{out} - \sum_{i=1}^d x_i^t| + \mu_t > \text{Thresh} + \tau_{\text{count}}$  then
10     count = count + 1
11     if count >  $S$  then
12       Abort
13     end
14      $\nu_{\text{count}} = \text{Lap}(S/\epsilon_1)$ 
15      $\tau_{\text{count}} = \text{Lap}(2S/\epsilon_1)$ 
16     out =  $\sum_{i=1}^d x_i^t + \nu_{\text{count}}$ 
17   end
18   output out
19 end

```

Proof. The $O(\min(d, K))$ bound follows from the fact that the algorithm that outputs 0 at every time step is ϵ -differentially private and has error at most $\min(d, K)$ for any ϵ .

For the last bound, assume $K > \epsilon^{-1}(8 \log(2T/\beta))$ since otherwise, $O(\min(K, \sqrt{\epsilon^{-1} K \log(T/\beta)})) = O(K)$. Our algorithm is based on the sparse vector technique (Algorithm 8 in Appendix A). Let S be some parameter

to be chosen later. Define $x_i^t = 1$ if and only if user i is in D at time step t , and $x_i^t = 0$ otherwise. Notice then that the data set D can be interpreted as a stream of elements from $\{0, 1\}^d$. Now consider Algorithm 6.

Claim 2. *Algorithm 6 is ϵ -differentially private.*

Proof. Note that Algorithm 6 performs the following procedure at most S times:

1. It computes the output out via the Laplace mechanism (Fact 3) with $\epsilon' = \epsilon_1/S$ on $\sum_{i=1}^d x_i^t$, which has sensitivity 1.
2. It runs an instantiation of AboveThreshold (Algorithm A) with parameter $\epsilon' = \epsilon_1/S$ and $\Delta = 1$ and queries q_i of the form $|\text{out} - \sum_{i=1}^d x_i^t|$, which have sensitivity 1 for any fixed value of out.

By the properties of the Laplace mechanism, computing out in step 1 is ϵ_1/S -differentially private. By Lemma 24 and the composition theorem (Fact 2), computing out in step 1 and performing the following instantiating of AboveThreshold in step 2 together fulfill $(2\epsilon_1/S)$ -differential privacy. As the composition of at most S procedures which are each $(2\epsilon_1/S)$ -differentially private, Algorithm 6 is $2\epsilon_1 = \epsilon$ -differentially private. \square

Claim 3. *There exists an S such that algorithm 6 has error at most $O(\sqrt{\epsilon^{-1}K \log(T/\beta)})$ with probability at least $1 - \beta$.*

Proof. Let $\alpha = (8S/\epsilon_1)(\log T + \log(2/\beta)) = (16S/\epsilon)(\log T + \log(2/\beta)) = 3 \cdot \text{Thresh}$. Note that by the Laplace tailbounds (Fact 6), at every time step t we have:

- $|\tau_{\text{count}}| \leq (2S/\epsilon_1)(\log T + \log(2/\beta)) = \alpha/4$ with probability at least $1 - \beta/(2T)$ and
- $|\mu_t| \leq (4S/\epsilon_1)(\log T + \log(2/\beta)) = \alpha/2$ with probability at least $1 - \beta/(2T)$.

Thus, with probability at least $1 - \beta$ over all time steps, we have at any time step t :

- Whenever the condition in line 9 is true at time t , then $|\text{out} - \sum_{i \in [d]} x_i^t| > \text{Thresh} - \alpha = 2\alpha$ and
- Whenever the condition in line 9 is false at time t , then $|\text{out} - \sum_{i \in [d]} x_i^t| < \text{Thresh} + \alpha = 4\alpha$.

Further, the random variable ν_ℓ for $\ell \in [S]$ is distributed as $\text{Lap}(S/\epsilon_1)$ and is added to $\sum_{i \in [d]} x_i^t$ at time step 1 and every time step t where out is updated. For a time step t , let p_ℓ be the last time step at which the value of out was updated. Recall that after the processing of any such time step p_ℓ has finished, it holds that $|\text{out} - \sum_{i \in [d]} x_i^{p_\ell}| = \nu_\ell$. By the Laplace tail bound (Fact 6), ν_ℓ , and, thus, $|\text{out} - \sum_{i \in [d]} x_i^{p_\ell}|$, is bounded for all $\ell \in [S]$ by $\epsilon_1^{-1} S \log(S/\beta) = \alpha/8$ with probability at least $1 - \beta$.

Altogether, all of these bounds hold simultaneously with probability at least $1 - 2\beta$. Condition on all these bounds being true.

Assume the algorithm has not terminated yet at time step t and let out be the value of out at the beginning of time step t . Recall that $\text{out} = \sum_{i \in [d]} x_i^{p_\ell} + \nu_\ell$ for $\nu_\ell = \text{Lap}(S/\epsilon_1)$ and that by assumption, $\nu_\ell < \alpha$. If the condition in line 9 is true at time t we have

$$\left| \sum_{i \in [d]} x_i^{p_\ell} - \sum_{i \in [d]} x_i^t \right| \geq \left| \sum_{i \in [d]} x_i^t - \text{out} \right| - \left| \text{out} - \sum_{i \in [d]} x_i^{p_\ell} \right| \geq 2\alpha - \alpha = \alpha.$$

Thus, between two time steps where the value of out is updated, there is a change of at least $\alpha = 8S\epsilon^{-1} \log(2T/\beta)$ in the sum value, i.e. at least α insertions or deletions have taken place. Since there are at most K insertions and deletions in total, to guarantee (under the noise conditions), that the algorithm does not terminate before we have seen the entire stream, it is enough to choose S such that $S > K/\alpha = K\epsilon/(8S \log(2T/\beta))$. Thus we choose $S = \sqrt{K\epsilon/(\log(T/\beta))}$.

Now we are ready to show the accuracy bound: Consider any time step t and let out be the output at time t . If the condition in line 9 is false, we showed above that $|\text{out} - \sum_{i \in [d]} x_i^t| < 4\alpha$. If the condition is true at time t , we have $\text{out} = \sum_{i \in [d]} x_i^t + \nu_\ell$ for some $\ell \in [S]$, and, thus, $|\text{out} - \sum_{i \in [d]} x_i^t| < \alpha$. Since $\alpha = (16S/\epsilon)(\log T + \log(2/\beta)) = O(\sqrt{K\epsilon^{-1}(\log(T/\beta))})$, the claim follows. \square

\square

Lemma 23. *Let K be an upper bound on the total number of insertions / deletions which is given. Let T be infinite or unknown. Then there is an ϵ -differentially private algorithm for the SETCARDINALITY problem with error at most $O(\min(d, K, \sqrt{\epsilon^{-1}K \log t}))$ for all time steps t with probability at least $1 - \beta$.*

Algorithm 7: Set Cardinality, unknown T

Input: Data Set $D = x^1, x^2, \dots$, parameters ϵ and β , stopping parameter S

```

1  $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon/2$ 
2 count = 1
3  $\tau_1 = \text{Lap}(2S/\epsilon_1)$ 
4  $\nu_1 = \text{Lap}(S/\epsilon_1)$ 
5 out =  $\sum_{i=1}^d x_i^1 + \nu_1$ 
6 for  $t = 2, \dots$ , do
7    $\beta_t = \beta/(6\pi^2 t^2)$ 
8    $\text{Thresh}_t = 24S\epsilon_1^{-1}(\log(2/\beta_t))$ 
9    $\mu_t = \text{Lap}(4S/\epsilon_1)$ 
10  if  $|\text{out} - \sum_{i=1}^d x_i^t| + \mu_t > \text{Thresh}_t + \tau_{\text{count}}$  then
11    count = count + 1
12    if count >  $S$  then
13      Abort
14    end
15     $\nu_{\text{count}} = \text{Lap}(S/\epsilon_1)$ 
16     $\tau_{\text{count}} = \text{Lap}(2S/\epsilon_1)$ 
17    out =  $\sum_{i=1}^d x_i^t + \nu_{\text{count}}$ 
18  end
19 output out
20 end

```

Proof. The $O(\min(d, K))$ bound follows from the fact that the algorithm that outputs 0 at every time step is ϵ -differentially private and has error at most $\min(d, K)$ for any ϵ .

The algorithm for our last bound is based on the sparse vector technique (Algorithm 8 in Appendix A). Let S be some parameter to be chosen later. Define $x_i^t = 1$ if and only if user i is in D at time step t , and $x_i^t = 0$ else. Note that the data set D can be interpreted as a stream of elements from $\{0, 1\}^d$. The algorithm is given in Algorithm 7. Note that the only difference to Algorithm 6 is the fact that we use a different threshold Thresh_t at every time step, since the value of Thresh in Algorithm 6 depends on T which we do not know.

Claim 4. *Algorithm 7 is ϵ -differentially private.*

Proof. Note that Algorithm 7 performs the following procedure at most S times:

1. It computes out via the Laplace mechanism (Fact 3) with $\epsilon' = \epsilon_1/S$ on $\sum_{i=1}^d x_i^t$, which has sensitivity 1.
2. It runs an instantiation of AboveThreshold (Algorithm A) with parameter $\epsilon' = \epsilon_1/S$ and queries $|\text{out} - \sum_{i=1}^d x_i^t|$, which have sensitivity 1 for fixed out.

By Lemma 24 and the composition theorem (Fact 2), computing out and performing the subsequent instantiation of AboveThreshold (Algorithm A) together fulfill (ϵ/S) -differential privacy. As the composition of at most S procedures which are all (ϵ/S) -differentially private, Algorithm 7 is ϵ -differentially private. \square

Claim 5. *There exists an S such that algorithm 7 has error at most $O(\sqrt{\epsilon^{-1}K} \log(t/\beta))$ at all time steps t with probability at least $1 - \beta$.*

Proof. Let $\beta' = \beta/(6\pi^2)$ and let $\beta_t = \beta'/t^2$. Notice that $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \beta_t = \beta$. Let $\alpha_t = (8S/\epsilon_1)(\log(2/\beta_t)) = (16S/\epsilon)(\log(2/\beta_t))$, which is monotonically increasing in t . By the Laplace tailbounds (Fact 6), at every time step t we have:

- $|\tau_{\text{count}}| \leq (2S/\epsilon_1)(\log(2/\beta_t))$ with probability at least $1 - \beta_t/2$ and
- $|\mu_t| \leq (4S/\epsilon_1)(\log(2/\beta_t))$ with probability at least $1 - \beta_t/2$.

Since $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \beta_t = \beta$, we have with probability $1 - \beta$ over all time steps, at any time step t :

- Whenever the condition in line 10 is true at time t , then at the beginning of time step t , $|\text{out} - \sum_{i \in [d]} x_i^t| \geq \text{Thresh}_t - \alpha_t = 2\alpha_t$ and
- Whenever the condition in line 10 is false at time t , then $|\text{out} - \sum_{i \in [d]} x_i^t| \leq \text{Thresh}_t + \alpha_t = 4\alpha_t$.

Further, by the Laplace tail bound (Fact 6), the noise added to $\sum_{i \in [d]} x_i^t$ is bounded by $\epsilon_1^{-1} S \log(1/\beta_t) < \alpha_t$ with probability at least $1 - \beta_t$ at any time step t where out is updated. For a time step t , let p_ℓ be the last time step at which the value of out was updated. Recall that after the processing of any such time step p_ℓ has finished, it holds that $|\text{out} - \sum_{i \in [d]} x_i^{p_\ell}| = \nu_\ell$. By the Laplace tail bound (Fact 6), ν_ℓ , and, thus, $|\text{out} - \sum_{i \in [d]} x_i^{p_\ell}|$, is bounded for all $\ell \in [S]$ by $\epsilon_1^{-1} S \log(S/\beta_{p_\ell}) = \alpha_{p_\ell}/8$ with probability at least $1 - \beta$.

Altogether, all of these bounds hold simultaneously with probability at least $1 - 2\beta$. Condition on all these bounds being true.

Assume the algorithm has not terminated yet at time step t and let out be the value of out at the beginning of time step t , which equals its value at the end of time step p_ℓ . Recall that $\alpha_t > \alpha_{p_\ell}$. If the condition in line 10 is true at time t we have

$$\left| \sum_{i \in [d]} x_i^{p_\ell} - \sum_{i \in [d]} x_i^t \right| \geq \left| \sum_{i \in [d]} x_i^t - \text{out} \right| - \left| \text{out} - \sum_{i \in [d]} x_i^{p_\ell} \right| \geq 2\alpha_t - \alpha_{p_\ell} \geq \alpha_t.$$

Thus, between two time steps where the value of out is updated, there is a change of at least $\alpha_t = 8S\epsilon^{-1} \log(2/\beta_t) \geq 8S\epsilon^{-1}$ in the sum value, i.e. at least $8S\epsilon^{-1}$ insertions or deletions have taken place. Since there are at most K insertions and deletions in total, to guarantee (under the noise conditions), that the algorithm does not terminate before we have seen the entire stream, it is enough to choose S such that $S > K\epsilon/(8S)$. Thus we choose $S = \sqrt{K\epsilon}$.

Now let out be the output at time t . For any time step t where the condition in line 10 is false, we have $|\text{out} - \sum_{i \in [d]} x_i^t| < 4\alpha_t$. If the condition is true, we have at the end of the time step that $|\text{out} - \sum_{i \in [d]} x_i^t| < \alpha_t$. Since $\alpha_t = (16S/\epsilon)(\log(2/\beta_t)) = O(\sqrt{\epsilon^{-1}K} \log(t/\beta))$, the claim follows. \square

Note that the above bounds can be extended to the case where K is not known beforehand using standard techniques and a similar idea to Qiu and Yi [2022] for ϵ instead of β : We start by guessing a constant estimate for K and run the Algorithm 6 resp. Algorithm 7. Once the sparse vector technique aborts, we know that our estimate of K was too low, so we double it and restart the algorithm. This gives at most $\log K$ instances of Algorithm 6 resp. Algorithm 7. However, since we consider user-level privacy, the privacy loss becomes $\log K\epsilon$. To avoid this, we run the j th instance of the algorithm with privacy parameter $\epsilon_j = \epsilon/((6\pi^2)j^2)$. Since $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \epsilon_j = \epsilon$, this achieves ϵ -differential privacy, no matter how large K

is. The new error bound becomes $O(\sqrt{\log^2 K \epsilon^{-1} K \log(T/\beta)}) = O(\log K \sqrt{\epsilon^{-1} K \log(T/\beta)})$ for known T and $O(\log K \sqrt{\epsilon^{-1} K} \log(t/\beta))$ at all time steps t for unknown T .

References

- Maryam Aliakbarpour, Rose Silver, Thomas Steinke, and Jonathan Ullman. Differentially private medians and interior points for non-pathological data, 2023. (Cited on page 2)
- Jonas Böhler and Florian Kerschbaum. Secure multi-party computation of differentially private heavy hitters. In *Proc. 27th CCS*, pages 2361–2377, 2021. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3460120.3484557>. (Cited on page 10)
- Jean Bolot, Nadia Fawaz, S. Muthukrishnan, Aleksandar Nikolov, and Nina Taft. Private decayed predicate sums on streams. In *Proc. 16th ICDT*, pages 284–295, 2013. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2448496.2448530>. (Cited on page 10)
- Mark Bun, Kobbi Nissim, Uri Stemmer, and Salil P. Vadhan. Differentially private release and learning of threshold functions. In Venkatesan Guruswami, editor, *IEEE 56th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2015, Berkeley, CA, USA, 17-20 October, 2015*, pages 634–649. IEEE Computer Society, 2015. doi: 10.1109/FOCS.2015.45. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2015.45>. (Cited on pages 5 and 10)
- Adrian Rivera Cardoso and Ryan Rogers. Differentially private histograms under continual observation: Streaming selection into the unknown. In Gustau Camps-Valls, Francisco J. R. Ruiz, and Isabel Valera, editors, *Proc. 25th AISTATS*, pages 2397–2419, 2022. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v151/rivera-cardoso22a.html>. (Cited on pages 2 and 9)
- Ricardo Silva Carvalho, Ke Wang, Lovedeep Gondara, and Chunyan Miao. Differentially private top-k selection via stability on unknown domain. In *Proc. 36th UAI*, pages 1109–1118, 2020. (Cited on page 2)
- T.-H. Hubert Chan, Elaine Shi, and Dawn Song. Private and continual release of statistics. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst. Secur.*, 14(3):26:1–26:24, 2011. (Cited on pages 2, 3, 9, 13, 36, and 46)
- T.-H. Hubert Chan, Mingfei Li, Elaine Shi, and Wenchang Xu. Differentially private continual monitoring of heavy hitters from distributed streams. In *Proc. 12th PETS*, pages 140–159, 2012. (Cited on page 10)
- Seung Geol Choi, Dana Dachman-Soled, Mukul Kulkarni, and Arkady Yerukhimovich. Differentially-private multi-party sketching for large-scale statistics. *Proc. Priv. Enhancing Technol.*, 2020(3):153–174, 2020. URL <https://doi.org/10.2478/popets-2020-0047>. (Cited on page 10)
- Edith Cohen, Xin Lyu, Jelani Nelson, Tamás Sarlós, and Uri Stemmer. Generalized private selection and testing with high confidence. In *Proc. 14th ITCS*, pages 39:1–39:23, 2023a. URL <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.ITCS.2023.39>. (Cited on page 2)
- Edith Cohen, Xin Lyu, Jelani Nelson, Tamás Sarlós, and Uri Stemmer. Optimal differentially private learning of thresholds and quasi-concave optimization. In *Proc. 55th STOC*, pages 472–482, 2023b. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3564246.3585148>. (Cited on pages 5 and 10)
- Rachel Cummings, Sara Krehbiel, Kevin A. Lai, and Uthaipon Tao Tantipongpipat. Differential privacy for growing databases. In *Proc. 31st NeurIPS*, pages 8878–8887, 2018. (Cited on page 10)
- Sergey Denisov, H. Brendan McMahan, Keith Rush, Adam Smith, and Abhradeep Thakurta. Improved differential privacy for sgd via optimal private linear operators on adaptive streams. In *Proc. 36th NeurIPS*, 2022. (Cited on pages 13 and 50)

- David Durfee. Unbounded differentially private quantile and maximum estimation, 2023. (Cited on page 2)
- David Durfee and Ryan M. Rogers. Practical differentially private top-k selection with pay-what-you-get composition. In *Proc. 33rd NeurIPS*, pages 3527–3537, 2019. (Cited on page 2)
- Cynthia Dwork and Aaron Roth. The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy. *Found. Trends Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 9(3-4):211–407, 2014. (Cited on pages 12, 13, 45, and 50)
- Cynthia Dwork, Frank McSherry, Kobbi Nissim, and Adam D. Smith. Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis. In Shai Halevi and Tal Rabin, editors, *Theory of Cryptography, Third Theory of Cryptography Conference, TCC 2006, New York, NY, USA, March 4-7, 2006, Proceedings*, volume 3876 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 265–284. Springer, 2006. doi: 10.1007/11681878_14. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/11681878_14. (Cited on pages 1 and 11)
- Cynthia Dwork, Moni Naor, Toniann Pitassi, and Guy N. Rothblum. Differential privacy under continual observation. In Leonard J. Schulman, editor, *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2010, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA, 5-8 June 2010*, pages 715–724. ACM, 2010. doi: 10.1145/1806689.1806787. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/1806689.1806787>. (Cited on pages 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 17, 29, 36, and 45)
- Cynthia Dwork, Moni Naor, Omer Reingold, and Guy N. Rothblum. Pure differential privacy for rectangle queries via private partitions. In *Proc. 21st ASIACRYPT*, pages 735–751, 2015. doi: 10.1007/978-3-662-48800-3_30. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-48800-3_30. (Cited on pages 3, 6, 9, and 13)
- Alessandro Epasto, Jieming Mao, Andres Muñoz Medina, Vahab Mirrokni, Sergei Vassilvitskii, and Peilin Zhong. Differentially private continual releases of streaming frequency moment estimations. In Yael Tsafran Kalai, editor, *Proc. 14th ITCS*, pages 48:1–48:24, 2023. URL <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.ITCS.2023.48>. (Cited on page 10)
- Úlfar Erlingsson, Vitaly Feldman, Ilya Mironov, Ananth Raghunathan, Kunal Talwar, and Abhradeep Thakurta. Amplification by shuffling: From local to central differential privacy via anonymity. In *Proc. 30th SODA*, pages 2468–2479, 2019. (Cited on pages 6, 10, and 36)
- Hendrik Fichtenberger, Monika Henzinger, and Wolfgang Ost. Differentially private algorithms for graphs under continual observation. In *Proc. 29th ESA*, pages 42:1–42:16, 2021. (Cited on pages 2, 10, and 36)
- Hendrik Fichtenberger, Monika Henzinger, and Jalaj Upadhyay. Constant matters: Fine-grained complexity of differentially private continual observation using completely bounded norms. *CoRR*, abs/2202.11205, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.11205>. (Cited on pages 2, 9, and 50)
- Badih Ghazi, Ravi Kumar, Jelani Nelson, and Pasin Manurangsi. Private counting of distinct and k-occurring items in time windows. In *Proc. 14th ITCS*, pages 55:1–55:24, 2023. URL <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.ITCS.2023.55>. (Cited on page 10)
- Jennifer Gillenwater, Matthew Joseph, and Alex Kulesza. Differentially private quantiles. In *Proc. 38th ICML*, pages 3713–3722, 2021. (Cited on page 2)
- Jonathan Hehir, Daniel Ting, and Graham Cormode. Sketch-flip-merge: Mergeable sketches for private distinct counting, 2023. (Cited on page 10)
- Peter J. Huber. *Robust Estimation of a Location Parameter*, pages 492–518. Springer New York, New York, NY, 1992. (Cited on page 2)
- Ihab F. Ilyas, George Beskales, and Mohamed A. Soliman. A survey of top- k query processing techniques in relational database systems. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 40(4):11:1–11:58, 2008. (Cited on page 2)

- Palak Jain, Sofya Raskhodnikova, Satchit Sivakumar, and Adam D. Smith. The price of differential privacy under continual observation. *CoRR*, abs/2112.00828, 2021. (Cited on pages 2, 3, 9, and 12)
- Palak Jain, Iden Kalemaj, Sofya Raskhodnikova, Satchit Sivakumar, and Adam Smith. Counting distinct elements in the turnstile model with differential privacy under continual observation, 2023. (Cited on pages 10 and 37)
- Haim Kaplan, Katrina Ligett, Yishay Mansour, Moni Naor, and Uri Stemmer. Privately learning thresholds: Closing the exponential gap. In *Proc. 33rd COLT 2020*, pages 2263–2285, 2020. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v125/kaplan20a.html>. (Cited on pages 5 and 10)
- Haim Kaplan, Shachar Schnapp, and Uri Stemmer. Differentially private approximate quantiles. In *Proc. 39th ICML*, pages 10751–10761, 2022. (Cited on pages 2 and 5)
- William H. Kruskal and W. Allen Wallis. Use of ranks in one-criterion variance analysis. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, 47(260):583–621, 1952. (Cited on page 2)
- Christian Janos Lebeda and Jakub Tetek. Better differentially private approximate histograms and heavy hitters using the misra-gries sketch. In *Proc. 42nd PODS*, pages 79–88, 2023. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3584372.3588673>. (Cited on page 10)
- Min Lyu, Dong Su, and Ninghui Li. Understanding the sparse vector technique for differential privacy. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 10(6):637–648, 2017. URL <http://www.vldb.org/pvldb/vol10/p637-lyu.pdf>. (Cited on page 45)
- Darakhshan J. Mir, S. Muthukrishnan, Aleksandar Nikolov, and Rebecca N. Wright. Pan-private algorithms via statistics on sketches. In *Proc. 30th PODS*, pages 37–48, 2011. (Cited on page 10)
- Shanmugavelayutham Muthukrishnan and Aleksandar Nikolov. Optimal private halfspace counting via discrepancy. In *Proc. 44th STOC*, pages 1285–1292, 2012. (Cited on page 9)
- Rasmus Pagh and Nina Mesing Stausholm. Efficient differentially private f_0 linear sketching, 2020. (Cited on page 10)
- Gang Qiao, Weijie J. Su, and Li Zhang. Oneshot differentially private top-k selection. In *Proc. 38th ICML*, pages 8672–8681, 2021. (Cited on page 2)
- Yuan Qiu and Ke Yi. Differential privacy on dynamic data, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.01387>. (Cited on pages 2, 3, 7, 9, 10, 41, and 46)
- Adam D. Smith, Shuang Song, and Abhradeep Thakurta. The flajolet-martin sketch itself preserves differential privacy: Private counting with minimal space. In *Proc. 33rd NeurIPS*, 2020. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/hash/e3019767b1b23f82883c9850356b71d6-Abstract.html>. (Cited on page 10)
- Rade Stanojevic, Mohamed Nabeel, and Ting Yu. Distributed cardinality estimation of set operations with differential privacy. In *Proc. PAC 2017*, pages 37–48, 2017. URL <https://doi.ieeecomputersociety.org/10.1109/PAC.2017.43>. (Cited on page 10)
- Lun Wang, Iosif Pinelis, and Dawn Song. Differentially private fractional frequency moments estimation with polylogarithmic space. In *Proc. 10th ICLR*, 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=7I8LPkcx8V>. (Cited on page 10)
- Fuheng Zhao, Dan Qiao, Rachel Redberg, Divyakant Agrawal, Amr El Abbadi, and Yu-Xiang Wang. Differentially private linear sketches: Efficient implementations and applications. In *NeurIPS*, 2022. URL http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/hash/525338e0d98401a62950bc7c454eb83d-Abstract-Conference.html. (Cited on page 10)

A The sparse vector technique

The sparse vector technique was first described in [Dwork et al. \[2010\]](#). The version described in Algorithm 8 is from [Lyu et al. \[2017\]](#) for $c = 1$ (the main difference is that it allows different thresholds for every query).

Algorithm 8: AboveThreshold

Input: Data Set D , Sensitivity bound Δ , thresholds K_1, K_2, \dots , and queries q_1, q_2, \dots which have sensitivity at most Δ

```

1  $\tau = \text{Lap}(2\Delta/\epsilon)$ 
2 for  $i = 1, \dots$ , do
3    $\mu_i = \text{Lap}(4\Delta/\epsilon)$ 
4   if  $q_i(D) + \mu_i > K_i + \tau$  then
5     output  $a_i = \text{YES}$ 
6     Abort
7   end
8   else
9     output  $a_i = \text{NO}$ 
10  end
11 end

```

Lemma 24 ([Lyu et al. \[2017\]](#), [Dwork et al. \[2010\]](#)). *Algorithm 8 is ϵ -differentially private.*

Lemma 25 ([Dwork and Roth \[2014\]](#), [Lyu et al. \[2017\]](#)). *Algorithm 8 fulfills the following accuracy guarantees for $\alpha = \frac{8(\ln k + \ln(2/\beta))}{\epsilon}$: For any sequence q_1, \dots, q_k of queries it holds with probability at least $1 - \beta$,*

1. *for i such that $a_i = \text{YES}$ we have*

$$q_i(D) \geq K_i - \alpha,$$

2. *for all i such that $a_i = \text{NO}$ we have*

$$q_i(D) \leq K_i + \alpha.$$

B Dynamic Range Counting

Lemma 26. *Given an upper bound T on the maximum time step, there is an algorithm for the FULLY DYNAMIC RANGE COUNT with error at most $\alpha = O(\epsilon^{-1}(\log u \log T)^{3/2} \sqrt{\log(uT/\beta)})$ with probability at least $1 - \beta$.*

Proof. The binary tree mechanism by [Dwork et al. \[2010\]](#) builds a dyadic decomposition \mathcal{I}_T of over the timeline $[T]$ and computes a noisy count using the Laplace mechanism (Fact 3) for each interval $J \in \mathcal{I}_T$. We now build such a decomposition for every interval $I \in \mathcal{I}_u$ and compute a noisy count for each $(I, J_I) \in \mathcal{I}_u \times \mathcal{I}_T$. Now any insertion or deletion can influence the counts of at most $\log u \log T$ intervals $(I, J_I) \in \mathcal{I}_u \times \mathcal{I}_T$ by at most 1. Thus, using Fact 3, adding Laplace noise scaled with $\log u \log T / \epsilon$ to the count of each (I, J_I) fulfills ϵ -differential privacy.

To answer any query we have to add up at most $O(\log u \log T)$ such counts. For the error of any one query we get with probability $1 - \beta'$ the following asymptotic upper bound by Lemma 2:

$$O(\epsilon^{-1} \log u \log T \sqrt{\ln(1/\beta')} \max(\sqrt{\log u \log T}, \sqrt{\ln(1/\beta')}).$$

Now note that for any time step t , we can ask at most $O(u^2)$ distinct queries, thus $O(Tu^2)$ distinct queries in total. Choosing $\beta' = \beta/(Tu^2)$, we get that all queries have error at most α with probability at least $1 - \beta$ with

$$\alpha = O(\epsilon^{-1} \log u \log T \sqrt{\ln(Tu^2/\beta)} \max(\sqrt{\log u \log T}, \sqrt{\ln(Tu^2/\beta)}) = O(\epsilon^{-1} (\log u \log T)^{3/2} \sqrt{\ln(Tu/\beta)}),$$

assuming $\ln(1/\beta) = O(\log u \log T)$. □

B.1 Extension to unknown T

Lemma 27. *For unknown T , there is an algorithm for the FULLY DYNAMIC RANGE COUNT with error at most $\alpha = O(\epsilon^{-1}(\log u \log t)^{3/2} \sqrt{\log(ut/\beta)})$ at all time steps t with probability at least $1 - \beta$.*

An extension of the above can be achieved using techniques similar to [Chan et al. \[2011\]](#) and [Qiu and Yi \[2022\]](#): We set $T_0 = 0$ and start by guessing an upper bound T_1 on T , and once the number of operations has crossed T_1 , we double the guess, i.e. $T_2 = 2T_1$, and so on, and we call $(T_{j-1}, T_j]$ the *segment* \mathcal{T}_j . Note that there are $\log T$ segments until time step T .

First, we compute the dyadic interval decomposition \mathcal{I}_u of $[u]$. Now, for each segment \mathcal{T}_j , $j = 1, \dots$, we run the following algorithm:

1. We maintain the data structure D_j from [Lemma 26](#) for the known time bound $T_j - T_{j-1}$ during the segment.
2. For every interval $I \in \mathcal{I}_u$, we keep a running count of insertions that happened into this interval during segment \mathcal{T}_j . That is, at time T_{j-1} , we set $c_I^j = 0$ for all $I \in \mathcal{I}_u$, and for every x^t that is inserted with $t \in \mathcal{T}_j$, we set $c_I^j = c_I^j + 1$ if and only if $x^t \in I$.
3. After processing the T_j th input, we add Laplace noise scaled with $\log u/\epsilon$ to all c_I^j , $I \in \mathcal{I}$, and keep them.

To answer a query $[a, b]$ at a given time step $t = T_{j-1} + t_j$ with $t_j \leq T_j - T_{j-1}$, we first find the intervals I_1, \dots, I_m , $m \leq 2 \log u$, which cover $[a, b]$ as given by [Fact 1](#). Then we compute the output of D_j for $[a, b]$ and denote it out_j . We output $\sum_{\ell=1}^{j-1} \sum_{I \in I_1, \dots, I_m} c_I^\ell + \text{out}_j$.

We first argue that the given algorithm is 2ϵ -differentially private: Note that all c_I^j , $I \in \mathcal{I}_u$, and for all j together have sensitivity bounded by $\log u$: A single insertion can only influence the counts of a fixed j , and by [Fact 1](#), it can only change c_I^j for at most $\log u$ choices of I (by at most one). Hence, after adding Laplace noise scaled with $\log u/\epsilon$, outputting all c_I^j satisfies ϵ -differential privacy. Further, by [Lemma 26](#), the outputs of D_j for a single j satisfy ϵ -differential privacy. Since again a single insertion only influences the input to a single D_j , we have that the D_j for all j together satisfy ϵ -differential privacy.

Next we argue accuracy. Let $\beta_t = \beta/(6\pi^2 t^2)$. Note that by [Lemma 2](#), the total error for $\sum_{\ell=1}^{j-1} \sum_{I \in I_1, \dots, I_m} c_I^\ell$ is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & (2 \log u/\epsilon) \sqrt{2 \ln(2/\beta')} \max(\sqrt{m \cdot (j-1)}, \sqrt{\ln(2/\beta')}) \\ & \leq (2 \log u/\epsilon) \sqrt{2 \ln(2/\beta')} \max(\sqrt{2 \log u \log t}, \sqrt{\ln(2/\beta')}) \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - \beta'$. Since there are at most u distinct queries at time t , we set $\beta' = \beta_t/u$ and get an error of at most

$$O(\epsilon^{-1} \log^2 u \ln(t/\beta))$$

with probability at least $1 - \beta_t$.

Further, by [Lemma 1](#), the error for D_j is at most

$$O(\epsilon^{-1} (\log u \log T_j)^{3/2} \sqrt{\log(ut_j/\beta_j)}) = O(\epsilon^{-1} (\log u \log t)^{3/2} \sqrt{\log(ut/\beta)})$$

with probability at least $1 - \beta_j$. Thus, the total error is bounded by at most $O(\epsilon^{-1} (\log u \log t)^{3/2} \sqrt{\log(ut/\beta)})$ at all time steps t together with probability at least $1 - \beta$.

C Multidimensional AboveThreshold

Recall the d -dimensional AboveThreshold problem.

d -DIM ABOVETHRESH

Given thresholds $K_1, K_2, \dots, K_d > 0$, build a data structure D that supports the following operations:

- **Insert** an element $x \in \{0, 1\}^d$ into D ,

such that the following queries can be answered while satisfying ϵ -differential privacy:

- **Query** an element $i \in [d]$: Answer YES or NO such that we answer

- YES if $\sum_{x \in D} x_i \geq K_i + \alpha$,
- NO if $\sum_{x \in D} x_i \leq K_i - \alpha$.

Neighboring definition: two neighboring inputs differ in one **Insert** operation

We first show a lower bound of $\epsilon^{-1}(d + \log T)$ for d -DIM ABOVETHRESH.

C.1 Lower bound

Lemma 28. *Any ϵ -differentially private algorithm for d -DIM ABOVETHRESH must satisfy*

$$\alpha = \Omega(\epsilon^{-1} \cdot (d + \log T))$$

if it has failure probability $\leq 1/3$.

Proof. Let α be a parameter specified later, and let T be a multiple of α . We divide the timeline into blocks $B_1 = [1, \dots, \alpha]$, $B_2 = [\alpha + 1, \dots, 2\alpha]$, \dots , $B_m = [T - \alpha + 1, T]$. Note that $m = T/\alpha$. Let $S = \{0, 1\}^d \setminus \{0^d\}$ be the set of all non-zero d -dimensional binary vectors. Note that $|S| = 2^d - 1$. For every $v \in S$ and $j \in [m]$, define $D_{v,j}$ to be the input such that

- For every $t \in B_i$, $i \neq j$, we insert $x = 0^d$.
- For every $t \in B_j$, we insert $x = v$.

Note that we can convert a $D_{v,j}$ to any another $D_{v',j'}$ by changing the input for 2α timesteps. Thus all the inputs defined above are 2α -neighboring. Also note that there are $|S \times [m]| \geq (2^d - 1) \cdot (T/\alpha)$ many inputs defined above. Now suppose that after every α insertions we query for every coordinate $i \in [d]$ for threshold $\alpha/2$. Let $E_{v,j}$ be the event that we answer YES for exactly the coordinates i satisfying $v_i = 1$ for the first time in the j th round of queries, and for all other coordinates, we always answer NO.

Suppose there exists an ϵ -dp algorithm Alg with error less than $\alpha/2$ such that the error bound holds with probability at least $2/3$. Then $P(\text{Alg}(D_{v,j}) \in E_{v,j}) \geq 2/3$, and since $D_{v',j'}$ is 2α -neighboring to $D_{v,j}$ for any v', j' , $\Pr[\text{Alg}(D_{v',j'}) \in E_{v,j}] \geq 2e^{-2\epsilon\alpha}/3$. Since the $\{E_{v,j}\}$ are disjoint, we get

$$1 \geq \sum_{v \in S, j \in [m]} \Pr[\text{Alg}(D_{v',j'}) \in E_{v,j}] \geq (2^d - 1) \cdot \frac{T}{\alpha} \cdot e^{-2\epsilon\alpha} \cdot \frac{2}{3}$$

and therefore

$$\alpha \geq (2\epsilon)^{-1} \cdot (d - 1 + \log(T/\alpha) + \log(2/3))$$

This does not hold for $\alpha < (8\epsilon)^{-1} \cdot (d + \log T)$ and large enough T , which proves the lemma. \square

C.2 Upper bound

We work with constant failure probability β for the informal discussion below. Recall that a single instantiation of 1-dimensional AboveThreshold (Algorithm 8) gives a differentially private algorithm with error $O(\epsilon^{-1} \log T)$. Thus for d -DIM ABOVETHRESH, composing d individual instantiations of 1-dimensional AboveThreshold gives a differentially private algorithm with error $O(\epsilon^{-1} d(\log d + \log T))$. This is because we need to replace ϵ with ϵ/d for maintaining ϵ -dp, and $\log 1/\beta$ by $\log d/\beta$ to ensure that the accuracy guarantees hold simultaneously for all instantiations. The lower bound as shown in Lemma 28 was $O(\epsilon^{-1}(d + \log T))$, which on the other hand had no multiplicative dependence between the d and the $\log T$ terms. In this section, we show how to separate this dependence of d and $\log T$ by providing a differentially private algorithm with error $O(\epsilon^{-1}(d \log^2 d + \log T))$, which is $\tilde{O}(\epsilon^{-1}(d + \log T))$ and thus within a polylogarithmic factor of the lower bound.

We present a version of the algorithm closest to Algorithm 2 for continuity. Our algorithm maintains a noisy version of the sums $\sum_{x \in D} x_i$ as s_i . In line 15, we check if there exists *at least a single column* $i \in [d]$ that crosses the threshold. This is in contrast to the independent composition of mechanisms described above, which does not interact between the columns, and checks if each column crosses the threshold *separately*. The former method requires lesser noise than the latter, since intuitively, there is lesser information to privatize. We then insert the counts within this interval into the histogram mechanism H , to privatize the column counts until now.

Once we know that there exists at least one column which crosses the threshold, we then privately check which columns cross the threshold in line 20. We then return YES for those columns and remove them from the set of columns to consider for future insertions (by setting all future thresholds to ∞). We set C_j^t large enough so that every time line 15 is crossed, at least one column crosses the threshold (and thus is removed from future consideration) as well. It then follows that line 15 is crossed at most d times, which bounds the number of segments created by the algorithm by $d + 1$.

Theorem 5. *There is an ϵ -differentially private algorithm for d -DIM ABOVETHRESH that has error*

$$\alpha^t = O(\epsilon^{-1} \cdot (d \log^2(d/\beta) + \log(t/\beta)))$$

at time t , with failure probability β .

Theorem 6. *Algorithm 9 is ϵ -differentially private.*

Proof. Note that Algorithm 9 is exactly the same as Algorithm 2, but with a different setting of L_i^t s. Further, note that at each time t , the choice of L_i^t in Algorithm 9 does not depend on the data directly and only depends on whether the threshold was crossed. Since the privacy proof of Algorithm 2 is independent of the choice of L_i^t (and only depends on whether the threshold was crossed at a particular time step), the lemma follows. \square

Lemma 29. *Algorithm 9 is α^t -accurate at time t with failure probability β , where*

$$\alpha^t = O(\epsilon^{-1} \cdot (d \log^2(d/\beta) + \log(t/\beta)))$$

Proof. Note that each column only crosses the threshold at most once, since we set the threshold to be ∞ once it crosses the threshold once. Thus there are at most $d + 1$ intervals created. The bounds on the random variables in Lemma 6 also hold. If $\sum_{t' \leq t} x_i^{t'}$ is the true column sums at time t and t belongs to the j -th interval, we have that $\max_i |\sum_{t' \leq t} x_i^{t'} - s_i^t| \leq \alpha_H^j$. Further, we get that Lemmas 8 and 12 hold since they do not depend on the value of K_j^t . By Lemma 12, whenever we return NO,

$$\sum_{t' \leq t} x_i^{t'} \leq K_i + \alpha_\mu^j + \alpha_\tau^j + \alpha_\gamma^j + \alpha_H^j.$$

Algorithm 9: Algorithm for d -DIM ABOVETHRESH

Input: Insertions $x^1, x^2, \dots \in \{0, 1\}^d$, thresholds K_i for $i \in [d]$, an adaptively $\epsilon/3$ -differentially private continuous histogram mechanism H , failure probability β , additive error bound $\text{err}(t, \beta)$ that holds with probability $\geq 1 - \beta$ for the output of H at time step t .

Output: For each $i \in [d]$, whether $\sum_{x \in D} x_i \geq K_i$

```
1 /* Initialization of all parameters */
2 Initialize an adaptively  $\epsilon/3$ -differentially private continuous histogram mechanism  $H$ 
3  $\beta' = 6\beta/\pi^2$ ,  $\beta_t = \beta'/t^2$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ 
4  $\alpha_\mu^t \leftarrow 12\epsilon^{-1} \ln(2/\beta_t)$ ,  $\alpha_r^j \leftarrow 6\epsilon^{-1} \ln(6/\beta_j)$ ,  $\alpha_\gamma^j \leftarrow 3\epsilon^{-1} k \ln(6k/\beta_j)$ ,  $\alpha_H^j \leftarrow \text{err}(j, \beta_j/6)$  for any  $t, j \in \mathbb{N}$   $\triangleright$  Shorthand
5  $C_j^t \leftarrow \alpha_\mu^t + \alpha_r^j + \alpha_\gamma^j$  for any  $t, j \in \mathbb{N}$ 
6  $L_i^1 \leftarrow K_i$  for all  $i \in [d]$ 
7  $c_i \leftarrow s_i \leftarrow 0$  for all  $i \in [d]$ 
8  $p_0 \leftarrow 0$ ,  $j \leftarrow 1$ 
9  $q_i \leftarrow \text{NO}$  for all  $i \in [d]$ , and  $\text{out} \leftarrow (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_d)$ 
10  $\tau_1 \leftarrow \text{Lap}(6/\epsilon)$ 
11 /* Process the input stream */
12 for  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  do
13    $c_i \leftarrow c_i + x_i^t$ ,  $s_i \leftarrow s_i + x_i^t$  for all  $i \in [d]$ 
14    $\mu_t \leftarrow \text{Lap}(12/\epsilon)$ 
15   if  $\exists i \in [d] : s_i + \mu_t > L_i^t + \tau_j$  then
16      $p_j \leftarrow t$   $\triangleright$  Close the current interval
17     insert  $(c_1, \dots, c_d)$  into  $H$ , reset  $c_i \leftarrow 0$  for all  $i \in [d]$ 
18     for  $i \in [d]$  do
19        $\gamma_i^j \leftarrow \text{Lap}(3d/\epsilon)$ 
20       if  $s_i + \gamma_i^j > L_i^t - C_j^t$  then
21          $q_i \leftarrow \text{YES}$ 
22          $L_i^t \leftarrow \infty$   $\triangleright$   $i$  has crossed the threshold
23       end
24     end
25      $j \leftarrow j + 1$ 
26      $\tau_j \leftarrow \text{Lap}(6/\epsilon)$   $\triangleright$  pick fresh noise for the new interval
27      $(s_1, \dots, s_d) \leftarrow \text{output}(H)$ 
28      $\text{out} \leftarrow (q_1(s), \dots, q_k(s))$ 
29   end
30   output out
31    $L_i^{t+1} \leftarrow L_i^t$  for all  $i \in [k]$ 
32 end
33  $p_j \leftarrow \infty$ 
```

By Lemma 8, when we return YES for the first time,

$$\sum_{t' \leq t} x_i^{t'} > K_i - (\alpha_\mu^{pj} + \alpha_\tau^j + 2\alpha_\gamma^j + \alpha_H^j).$$

Thus we are done if we show that when we return YES for the first time, $\sum_{t' \leq t} x_i^{t'} \leq K_i - (\alpha_\mu^t + \alpha_\tau^j + \alpha_\gamma^j + \alpha_H^j) + 1$. We will show that if $K_i > \alpha_\mu^{p1} + \alpha_\tau^1 + 2\alpha_\gamma^1 + \alpha_H^1 + 1$, then we return NO for i on time step 1. The claim then follows since there is always a time step before the first time we return YES. At that time step, we have that

$$\sum_{t' \leq t} x_i^{t'} \leq K_i + \alpha_\mu^t + \alpha_\tau^j + \alpha_\gamma^j + \alpha_H^j,$$

then we use 1-sensitivity of column sums to get the required bound. Now we prove the remaining claim. Suppose we return YES for i at time 1. Then by Lemma 8 and since $x_i^1 \leq 1$,

$$1 \geq x_i^1 > K_i - (\alpha_\mu^{pj} + \alpha_\tau^j + 2\alpha_\gamma^j + \alpha_H^j)$$

Thus $K_i < \alpha_\mu^{pj} + \alpha_\tau^j + 2\alpha_\gamma^j + \alpha_H^j + 1$, which is what we needed. Since there are at most $d + 1$ intervals, plugging in the values for all the α_X s, we get that Algorithm 9 is α^t -accurate for d -DIM ABOVETHRESH at time t with failure probability β , where

$$\alpha^t = O(\epsilon^{-1} \cdot (d \log^2(d/\beta) + \log(t/\beta)))$$

as required. □

D Extension to (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy

We will use noise drawn from the Normal distribution for our algorithm. The mechanism constructed using noise drawn from the Normal distribution is known as the Gaussian mechanism, which satisfies (ϵ, δ) -dp.

Definition 9 (Normal Distribution). *The normal distribution centered at 0 with variance σ^2 is the distribution with the probability density function*

$$f_{N(0, \sigma^2)}(x) = \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)$$

We use $X \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ or sometimes just $N(0, \sigma^2)$ to denote a random variable X distributed according to $f_{N(0, \sigma^2)}$.

Fact 7 (Theorem A.1 in Dwork and Roth [2014]: Gaussian mechanism). *Let f be any function $f : \chi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ with L_2 -sensitivity Δ_2 . Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, $c^2 > 2 \ln(1.25/\delta)$, and $\sigma \geq c\Delta_2(f)/\epsilon$. Let $Y_i \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ for $i \in [k]$. Then the mechanism defined as:*

$$A(x) = f(x) + (Y_1, \dots, Y_k)$$

satisfies (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy.

We use the following continuous histogram mechanism H introduced by Fichtenberger et al. [2022], which achieves an error of $O(\epsilon^{-1} \log(1/\delta) \log T \sqrt{d \ln(dT)})$. Since their algorithm fulfills the conditions of Theorem 2.1 in Denisov et al. [2022], that theorem yields that the same privacy guarantees hold in the adaptive continual release model.

Fact 8 ((ϵ, δ) -differentially private continuous histogram against an adaptive adversary). *There is an (ϵ, δ) -differentially private algorithm in the adaptive continual release model for continuous histogram that with probability $\geq 1 - \beta$, has error bounded by $O(\epsilon^{-1} \log(1/\delta) \log t \sqrt{d \ln(dt/\beta)})$ at time t .*

Changes. We make the following changes to the algorithm to obtain an (ϵ, δ) -dp algorithm for histogram queries.

1. Initialize an $(\epsilon/3, \delta/(2e^{2\epsilon/3}))$ -adaptively dp continuous histogram mechanism H .
2. Sample $\gamma_i^j \sim N(0, 18k \ln(4e^{2\epsilon/3}/\delta)/\epsilon^2)$.
3. Set α_γ^j to $6\epsilon^{-1} \sqrt{k \ln(12e^{2\epsilon/3}k/(\delta\beta_j))}$.

Privacy. We detail the changes to the privacy proof from the ϵ -dp case. As in the ϵ -dp case, we need to now show that

$$\Pr[\mathcal{A}(x) \in S] \leq e^\epsilon \cdot \Pr[\mathcal{A}(y) \in S] + \delta$$

Since H is $(\epsilon/3, \delta/(2e^{2\epsilon/3}))$ -adaptively differentially private, we get that

$$\Pr(V_{H, Adv(x,y)}^{(x)} \in S) \leq e^{\epsilon/3} \Pr(V_{H, Adv(x,y)}^{(y)} \in S) + \delta/(2e^{2\epsilon/3})$$

and

$$\Pr(V_{H, Adv(x,y)}^{(y)} \in S) \leq e^{\epsilon/3} \Pr(V_{H, Adv(x,y)}^{(x)} \in S) + \delta/(2e^{2\epsilon/3}).$$

Thus all we would need to show would be

$$\Pr(V_{H, Adv(x,y)}^{(x)} \in S) \leq e^{2\epsilon/3} \Pr(V_{H, Adv(y,x)}^{(x)} \in S) + \delta/2, \quad (4)$$

since then

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\mathcal{A}(x) \in S) &= \Pr(V_{H, Adv(x,y)}^{(x)} \in S) \\ &\leq e^{2\epsilon/3} \Pr(V_{H, Adv(y,x)}^{(x)} \in S) + \delta/2 \\ &\leq e^\epsilon \Pr(V_{H, Adv(y,x)}^{(y)} \in S) + \delta \\ &= e^\epsilon \Pr(\mathcal{A}(y) \in S) + \delta \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The partitioning is still $e^{\epsilon/3}$ -close by the same arguments since we use the same random variables as in the ϵ -dp case. For the thresholds, note that conditioned on all previous outputs of H and p_j being equal, $g_i(s^{p_j}(x))$ and $g_i(s^{p_j}(y))$ can differ by at most 1 for each $i \in [k]$. Thus the L_2 difference between the two vectors is at most \sqrt{k} . By Fact 7 for the Gaussian mechanism, adding $N(0, 18k \ln(4e^{2\epsilon/3}/\delta)/\epsilon^2)$ noise to every $g_i(s^{p_j}(y))$ ensures that the distributions of $g_i(s^{p_j}(x)) + \gamma_i^j$ and $g_i(s^{p_j}(y)) + \gamma_i^j$ are $(e^{\epsilon/3}, \delta/2e^{2\epsilon/3})$ -close for all $i \in [k]$. Since the condition in line 20 only depends on those, this implies that the probabilities of executing line 20 on any subset of $[d]$ on $\text{run}(x)$ and $\text{run}(y)$ are $(e^{\epsilon/3}, \delta/2e^{\epsilon/3})$ -close, as required.

Accuracy. We have that Lemma 6 holds with $\alpha_\mu^t, \alpha_\tau^j$ as earlier, $\alpha_\gamma^j = 6\epsilon^{-1} \sqrt{k \ln(12e^{2\epsilon/3}k/(\delta\beta_j))}$ and $\alpha_H^j = O(\epsilon^{-1} \log(1/\delta) \log j \sqrt{d \ln(dj/\beta)})$. Thus by Lemma 11, the algorithm is α^t -accurate at time t with failure probability β , where

$$\alpha^t = O\left(\epsilon^{-1} \log(1/\delta) \cdot \left(\sqrt{d} \log^{3/2}(dkc_{\max}^t/\beta) + \sqrt{k} \log(kc_{\max}^t/\beta) + \log(t/\beta)\right)\right)$$

as required.