

A New Mathematical Optimization-Based Method for the m -invariance Problem

Adrian Tobar, Jordi Castro, and Claudio Gentile

Abstract—The issue of ensuring privacy for users who share their personal information has been a growing priority in a business and scientific environment where the use of different types of data and the laws that protect it have increased in tandem. Different technologies have been widely developed for static publications, i.e., where the information is published only once, such as k -anonymity and ϵ -differential privacy. In the case where microdata information is published dynamically, although established notions such as m -invariance and τ -safety already exist, developments for improving utility remain superficial.

We propose a new heuristic approach for the NP-hard combinatorial problem of m -invariance and τ -safety, which is based on a mathematical optimization column generation scheme. The quality of a solution to m -invariance and τ -safety can be measured by the Information Loss (IL), a value in $[0,100]$, the closer to 0 the better. We show that our approach improves by far current heuristics, providing in some instances solutions with IL s of 1.87, 8.5 and 1.93, while the state-of-the art methods reported IL s of 39.03, 51.84 and 57.97, respectively.

Index Terms—Privacy, dynamic datasets, m -invariance, mathematical optimization, column generation

I. INTRODUCTION

THE statistical disclosure control [2] field is devoted to the private-preserving publication of multiple forms of data. In the microdata publication, a table with information at the individuals level is published. The existing mechanisms for protecting privacy and anonymity of respondents, that is, the users that shared their data, can be broadly classified by two main properties: the data publishing scenario and how they achieve privacy.

Syntactic notions are those that enforce a particular structure on the dataset. On the other hand, semantic notions are those that base their privacy on enforcing certain properties on the algorithms anonymizing the data. Since the inception of statistical disclosure control the most studied publishing scenario was the static data release. Examples of syntactic notions for this framework are k -anonymity [3], [4], 1-diversity

Jordi Castro and Adrian Tobar are with the Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Barcelona, Catalonia. E-mail:{jordi.castro, adrian.tobar}@upc.edu.

Claudio Gentile is with the Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Istituto di Analisi dei Sistemi ed Informatica "A. Ruberti" (IASI-CNR), Roma, Italia. E-mail:gentile@iasi.cnr.it.

Author Adrian Tobar had the original idea of updating the method in [1] to the m -invariance and τ -safety problem. All the authors equally contributed in the implementation of the method and in writing the paper.

©2023 IEEE. Personal use of this material is permitted. Permission from IEEE must be obtained for all other uses, in any current or future media, including reprinting/republishing this material for advertising or promotional purposes, creating new collective works, for resale or redistribution to servers or lists, or reuse of any copyrighted component of this work in other works

[5] and t -closeness [6], [7] and examples of semantic notions are ϵ -differential privacy [8]–[10] and their variations. A notable difference between each approach is that syntactic methods assume a classification of microdata in two types, quasi-identifiers, that is, data that is not sensitive to the users but may be used to partially identify them (age, sex, weight, marital status,...) and sensitive data, i.e., the information that, if associated with a user, would violate their privacy (medical records, criminal history, salary,...). Broadly speaking semantic methods assume stronger attackers and achieve better privacy guarantees but at the expense of worsening significantly data utility. On the other hand syntactic methods achieve a better trade-off between privacy and utility at the cost of assuming rigid attacker with limited information.

With the interest of using alternative data structures a new umbrella of publishing scenarios has appeared, in particular dynamic scenarios. These scenarios are defined by allowing editions of data and the partial or total republication of data in several independent publications.

Continuous data publishing [11] is a dynamic framework where a dataset is periodically published and in-between publications it is updated via insertion of new tuples, deletion of existing ones, updates of microdata and reinsertion of previously deleted tuples. There are three levels of dynamicity: incremental, the dataset can be increased adding new users, i.e., new rows; external dynamic, rows can be added and deleted but a row from a deleted user cannot be reinserted; fully dynamic, additions, deletions, reinsertions and updates of microdata are possible.

Since the first proposal for continuous data publishing due to Byun et. al. [11] several notions and algorithms have been proposed [12]–[18] to handle various attackers and publishing scenarios. Among them m -invariance [12] appeared as the first clear notion that bounds the capacity of an attacker. However m -invariance was limited to dynamic datasets, i.e., datasets which only update inserting and deleting tuples. To overcome these limitations, τ -safety [15], [19] was proposed. Fundamentally τ -safety strengthens m -invariance at the expense of stronger assumptions. The more recent advancements in continuous data publishing [16], [17], [20] are slight improvements of τ -safety and their implementations with the exception of [18] which present a new enforcement algorithm based on fuzzy clustering. Nevertheless the study of enforcing m -invariance and τ -safety has been barely non-existent and in most cases only improvements of the original algorithm of m -invariance have been carried out. Furthermore, no deep analysis of the combinatorial problem of obtaining m -invariance has been performed so far.

m -Invariance and τ -safety are related to the microaggre-

gation problem [21], a privacy preserving technique that guarantees k -anonymity. Briefly, given a set of points, the goal of microaggregation is to partition them into clusters of a minimum size k (k being a parameter of the problem) that minimize the *information loss* (IL) (to be defined later in Section III). A partition satisfying the constraint on cluster cardinality is referred as *feasible clustering*, and, of all the feasible clusterings, the one minimizing *IL* is named the *optimal clustering*. Microaggregation is known to be a NP-hard problem [22].

The purpose of m -invariance is also to find an optimal clustering (m being the minimum cluster cardinality) with the additional constraint that two points in the same cluster can not have the same value for a particular (sensitive) attribute. For instance, if this particular attribute is named the ‘‘color’’ of the point, m -invariance finds an optimal clustering where all the points of a cluster have a different color. If all the points of the dataset have initially a different color, then m -invariance reduces to microaggregation, and it is thus also a NP-hard problem.

II. m -INVARIANCE AND τ -SAFETY

m -Invariance and τ -safety are privacy notions designed to upper bound the probability that an attacker can correctly link a sensitive attribute to a user participating in a dynamic dataset. To present them we first introduce the necessary definitions.

A *dataset* T is a $p \times t$ matrix whose element i, j provides the value of the attribute V_j of user i . The attributes V_j with $1 \leq j < t$ are quasi-identifiers and V_t is considered to be the sensitive attribute.

The classes of a dataset T are each set of the partition of the rows of T in disjoint subsets such that all rows on each class have common quasi-identifiers, particularly, a class Q is a non-empty subset of users with common quantifiers. We denote as $SD(Q)$ the signature of Q , that is, the set of sensitive attributes of a class Q .

In general we denote T to refer to a dataset and T^* to refer to its anonymized version. If multiple publications of a changing dataset T are done, we denote as $\mathbf{T} = \{T_1, \dots, T_n\}$ the set of versions of T before each publication and $\mathbf{T}^* = \{T_1^*, \dots, T_n^*\}$ to the set of publications.

The row of microdata t , from now on tuple, of a user can belong to several versions of \mathbf{T} and \mathbf{T}^* . We denote as *lifespan* of a tuple h as a set $[x, y] = \{x, x + 1, \dots, y\}$ that satisfies $h \in T_i^*$ for all $i \in [x, y]$ and $h \notin T_{x-1}, T_{y+1}$. If a tuple is deleted and reinserted later, then it can have more than one lifespan. We also define $Q(h, T^*)$ as the class of h in T^* .

We say that a dataset has arbitrary updates if whenever a change of microdata is performed, it was not dependant on the previous values.

With this previous definitions we are now able to state the definitions of m -invariance.

Definition 2.1: (m -invariance) A dataset T^* is m -unique if each class in T contains at least m tuples, and all tuples in the class have different sensitive attributes. Let $\mathbf{T}^* = \{T_1^*, \dots, T_n^*\}$ be the distinct publications of an external dynamic dataset, then \mathbf{T}^* is m -invariant if the following conditions hold:

- T_i^* is m -unique for all $i \in [1, n]$.
- For any tuple h with lifespan $[x, y]$ it is satisfied $SD(Q(h, T_i^*)) = SD(Q(h, T_j^*))$ for all $i, j \in [x, y]$.

We state now the definition of τ -safety.

Definition 2.2: Let $\mathbf{T}^* = \{T_1^*, \dots, T_n^*\}$ be the distinct publications of a fully dynamic dataset with arbitrary updates, then \mathbf{T}^* is τ -safe if the following conditions hold:

- \mathbf{T}^* is m -invariant.
- For any tuple h with lifespans $[x, y], [z, t]$ it is satisfied $SD(Q(h, T_y^*)) = SD(Q(h, T_z^*))$.

The motivation behind these definitions is ensuring that the republication of data cannot allow the attacker to deduce sensitive information of any user participating in the dataset.

We illustrate previous ideas with the following example of intersection attack. Assume an attacker is searching information of a participant with *age* = 18. From Table I deduces that it has sensitive value HIV or FLU and from the Table II that it has HIV or ACNE. Intersecting both cases, the attacker deduces that the attacked tuple has HIV. Such attacks are avoidable using m -invariance, in this case, publishing Table III instead of Table II.

TABLE I
FIRST 2-DIVERSE PUBLICATION.

Id	AGE	S.V.
1	[18-20]	HIV
2	[18-20]	FLU

TABLE II
SECOND 2-DIVERSE BUT NOT 2-INVARIANT PUBLICATION.

Id	AGE	S.D.
1	[18-19]	HIV
3	[18-19]	ACNE
2	[20-21]	FLU
4	[20-21]	COUCH

TABLE III
SECOND 2-INVARIANT PUBLICATION.

Id	AGE	S.D.
1	[18-20]	HIV
2	[18-20]	FLU
3	[19-21]	ACNE
4	[19-21]	COUCH

A. Enforcing m -invariance and τ -safety

Most proposals to enforce m -invariance and τ -safety use the same bucketization algorithm: classification, balancing, assignment and partitioning. We present now the main ideas behind these algorithms and where does our proposal improve the state of the art.

A bucket is a data structure which uses the key values as the indices of the buckets, for instance, given a bucket B then $B[sd]$ are the tuples in B with sensitive value sd . A bucket B has signature $SD(B)$, the set of its keys. A bucket is balanced if for all keys it has the same number of tuples, otherwise it is unbalanced. The bucket algorithms to obtain m -invariance or τ -safety proceeds as follows.

- **Classification:** the tuples in the dataset are categorized as new (never published), and old (previously published). This yields two datasets T_{new} and T_{old} . Data from T_{old} is stored in multiple bucket datasets in the following manner: for each tuple h , if a bucket B with signature $SD(Q(h, T^*))^1$ exists, add h to B , otherwise create a bucket with that signature and add h to it.
- **Balancing:** for each bucket created in the classification step, if it is unbalanced, add tuples from T_{new} until it is balanced, if none available add counterfeits.
- **Assignment:** divide the remaining tuples of T_{new} in balanced buckets of at least signature size m .
- **Partitioning:** for each bucket B divide it in groups of tuples appropriately. Generalize each group into a class and publish the dataset.

This algorithm structure allows for a republication which does not increase drastically in time complexity as new versions are published.

The bulk of the utility lost is due to steps of assignment and partitioning. Only one method exists in the literature for the assignment phase presented by Xiao and Tao in [12]. Partitioning has two versions, being [15], [19] the only improvements of the original version in [12]. Our work is an alternative method that jointly performs the assignment and partitioning steps in a single stage. Performing assignment and partitioning together drastically improves the quality (i.e., reduction of IL) of the solutions computed.

III. INTEGER OPTIMIZATION MODELS

Here we adapt to m -invariance a formulation inspired by the clique partitioning problem with minimum clique size of [23]. Defining as $\mathcal{C}^* = \{C \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\} : m \leq |C| \leq 2m - 1, c(i) \neq c(j) \text{ for } i, j \in C\}$ the set of feasible clusters, where $c(i)$ is the color of element i , the m -invariance problem can be formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}^*} w_C x_C \\ \text{s. to} \quad & \sum_{\substack{C \in \mathcal{C}^* : i \in C \\ x_C \in \{0, 1\}}} x_C = 1 \quad i \in \{1, \dots, p\} \\ & C \in \mathcal{C}^*, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $x_C = 1$ means that feasible cluster C appears in the m -invariance provided solution, and the constraints guarantee that all the points are covered by some feasible cluster, and only once, that is, a point can not belong to two different clusters, thus having a partition of $\{1, \dots, p\}$.

A widely used measure for evaluating the quality of a clustering is its spread or *sum of squared errors* (SSE) [21]:

$$SSE = \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}^* : x_C = 1} SSE_C \quad (2)$$

where SSE_C is the spread of cluster C which is defined as

$$SSE_C = \sum_{i \in C} (a_i - \bar{a}_C)^\top (a_i - \bar{a}_C), \quad (3)$$

a_i being a point of the cluster and $\bar{a}_C = \frac{1}{|C|} \sum_{i \in C} a_i$ its centroid.

¹Signature of the class of the last publication of h .

The cost w_C of cluster C in the objective function of (1) is

$$w_C = \frac{1}{2|C|} \sum_{i \in C} \sum_{j \in C} D_{ij}, \quad (4)$$

where $D_{ij} = (a_i - a_j)^\top (a_i - a_j)$. Using, for every cluster C , the following well-known equivalence (see [1]):

$$\sum_{i \in C} (a_i - \bar{a}_C)^\top (a_i - \bar{a}_C) = \frac{1}{2|C|} \sum_{i \in C} \sum_{j \in C} (a_i - a_j)^\top (a_i - a_j), \quad (5)$$

we have that $w_C = SSE_C$, and then the objective function of (1) equals SSE .

Information loss IL is an equivalent measure to SSE , defined as

$$IL = \frac{SSE}{SST} \cdot 100, \quad (6)$$

where SST is the total sum of squared errors for all the points:

$$SST = \sum_{i=1}^p (a_i - \bar{a})^\top (a_i - \bar{a}) \quad \text{where } \bar{a} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^p a_i}{p}. \quad (7)$$

IL always takes values within the range $[0, 100]$; the smaller the IL , the better the clustering. Therefore, the optimal solution of (1) provides the feasible clustering that minimizes the information loss.

It is worth noting that in the definition of \mathcal{C}^* only clusters of cardinality $|C| \leq 2m - 1$ are considered, since, as proved in [21], a cluster of cardinality $|C| = 2m$ can be divided in two smaller clusters of m points, thus improving the IL .

The number of feasible clusters in \mathcal{C}^* —that is, the number of variables in the optimization problem (1)—can be huge, so its direct solution by optimization methods is unpractical at least for large sizes. Therefore we resort to heuristics based on two ingredients:

- decomposition,
- column generation,

that will be detailed in next two sections

IV. DECOMPOSITION

The decomposition heuristic is an extension of the heuristic initially developed for the microaggregation problem in [24].

The decomposition heuristic is based on partitioning the initial set of points $\mathcal{P} = \{1, \dots, p\}$ in s subsets $\mathcal{P}_k, k = 1, \dots, s$, such that $\cup_{k=1}^s \mathcal{P}_k = \mathcal{P}$, and $\mathcal{P}_k \cap \mathcal{P}_l = \emptyset$ for all $k, l : k \neq l$. This initial partitioning is obtained by first finding a feasible clustering using the two existing heuristics for m -invariance (namely, the classical approach [12] and the τ -safety proposal [15], [19]). Then, points in different clusters of this initial clustering are sequentially added, obtaining the initial partitioning $\mathcal{P}_k, k = 1, \dots, s$.

For each subset $\mathcal{P}_k, k = 1, \dots, s$, we then consider the (smaller) optimization problem (1) replacing the feasible set \mathcal{C}^* by $\mathcal{C}_k^* = \{C \subseteq \mathcal{P}_k : m \leq |C| \leq 2m - 1, c(i) \neq c(j) \text{ for } i, j \in C\}$. These s optimization problems, though smaller than the original problem (1), may still have a very large number of optimization variables and are solved using the column generation technique described below in Section V. Each of the s optimization problems will provide a set of

feasible clusters $\mathcal{O}_k \subseteq \mathcal{C}_k^*$ for the subset of points \mathcal{P}_k , and therefore its union $\mathcal{O} = \cup_{k=1}^s \mathcal{O}_k$ will be a feasible clustering for \mathcal{P} (suboptimal, but in general of good quality—that is, small information loss).

Additionally, the feasible clustering \mathcal{O} is further improved by applying a local search heuristic based on a two-swapping procedure. In short, this procedure analyzes all the feasible swappings between two points i and j located in different clusters C_i and C_j , such that $c(i) \neq c(h)$ for each $h \in C_j$ and $c(j) \neq c(h)$ for each $h \in C_i$, performing the swapping of the pair (i, j) that minimizes the objective function of (1). This is repeated until there is no improvement in the objective function. The cost per iteration of this procedure is $O(p^2/2)$.

The two-swapping heuristics can also be optionally used to obtain the initial partitioning \mathcal{P}_k , $k = 1, \dots, s$, of points. Indeed, two-swapping can be applied to the initial clustering found by the m -invariance heuristics, obtaining a new clustering with a smaller objective function. This new clustering is then used to obtain the initial partitioning.

The main steps of the decomposition heuristic can be summarized as follows:

- 1) Apply m -invariance heuristics to get an initial feasible clustering.
- 2) Optionally, apply the two-swapping heuristic to this initial feasible clustering.
- 3) Compute the initial partitioning \mathcal{P}_k , $k = 1, \dots, s$, of points from the initial feasible clustering.
- 4) Apply the column generation optimization algorithm to each set of points \mathcal{P}_k , obtaining a feasible clustering \mathcal{O}_k for all $k = 1, \dots, s$. Note that this step can be performed in parallel for all the sets $k = 1, \dots, s$.
- 5) Compute $\mathcal{O} = \cup_{k=1}^s \mathcal{O}_k$, which is a feasible clustering for \mathcal{P} .
- 6) Finally, apply the two-swapping heuristic to the feasible clustering \mathcal{O} .

V. COLUMN GENERATION APPROACH

Column generation is a well-known approach in mathematical optimization for the solution of linear programming problems with a large number of variables [25]. Given a general linear programming problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} c_j x_j \\ \text{s. to} \quad & \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} E_j x_j = b \\ & x_j \geq 0 \quad j \in \mathcal{V}, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $E_j \in \mathbb{R}^r$ is the vector with the contribution of variable x_j to the r constraints of the problem (we assume that $|\mathcal{V}| > r$), the simplex method optimizes (8) by finding a set of variables $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{V}$ (named set of basic variables) such that: (i) $|\mathcal{B}| = r$; (ii) the r vectors E_j , $j \in \mathcal{B}$, are linearly independent; (iii) and for any variable $j \in \mathcal{N} = \mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{B}$ (named set of nonbasic variables), we have that the values $\mu_j = c_j - \lambda^\top E_j$ (named reduced costs) are non-negative, where $\lambda = (E_{\mathcal{B}}^\top)^{-1} c_{\mathcal{B}} \in \mathbb{R}^r$ is the set of dual variables or Lagrange's multipliers of the constraints of (8), and $E_{\mathcal{B}}$ and $c_{\mathcal{B}}$ are respectively a matrix

and vector formed by the vectors E_j and coefficients c_j such that $j \in \mathcal{B}$.

When the number of variables $|\mathcal{V}|$ is very large, we can initially consider a subset $\bar{\mathcal{V}} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ of variables. Problem (8) can thus be solved with the simplex method replacing \mathcal{V} by $\bar{\mathcal{V}}$, obtaining the sets of basic and nonbasic variables $\bar{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{N}}$. The simplex method guarantees that $\mu_j \geq 0$ for $j \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}$. If in addition $\mu_j \geq 0$ for $j \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \bar{\mathcal{V}}$ we can certificate that the current solution is also optimal for (8). Otherwise, there is some $j \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \bar{\mathcal{V}}$ with $\mu_j < 0$. Column generation then solves the subproblem

$$\min c_j - \lambda^\top E_j, \quad j \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \bar{\mathcal{V}}, \quad (9)$$

where λ is the vector of dual variables provided by the previous solution of (8) using $\bar{\mathcal{V}}$, and c_j represents the cost of the variable associated to column E_j . The solution of (9) provides both a new column E_j and its associated reduced cost μ_j . If the reduced cost is non-negative, we conclude that the current solution $(x_{\bar{\mathcal{B}}}, x_{\bar{\mathcal{N}}})$ is optimal. Otherwise, if the reduced cost is negative, we add the new column E_j to the set of already generated columns (that is, $\bar{\mathcal{V}} \leftarrow \bar{\mathcal{V}} \cup \{j\}$), and reoptimize again (8). This procedure is repeated until (9) provides a non-negative reduced cost.

Applying the previous procedure to the m -invariance problem, the column generation approach enables us to solve the continuous relaxation of (1) considering only a subset $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$ of \mathcal{C}^* :

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{C \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}} w_C x_C \\ \text{s. to} \quad & \sum_{C \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}: i \in C} x_C = 1 \quad i \in \mathcal{P} \\ & x_C \in [0, 1] \quad C \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where the original binary constraints $x_C \in \{0, 1\}$ have been relaxed and replaced by $x_C \in [0, 1]$. At each iteration we test if the solution of (10) is optimal for the continuous relaxation of (1) by solving the following optimization problem for each size $\eta \in \{m, \dots, 2m-1\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \frac{1}{2\eta} \sum_{(i,j) \in A} D_{ij} z_{ij} - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{P}} \frac{\lambda_i}{\eta-1} y_i \\ \text{s. to} \quad & y_i = \sum_{(j,i) \in \delta_i^-} z_{ji} + \sum_{(i,j) \in \delta_i^+} z_{ij} \quad i \in \mathcal{P} \\ & \sum_{(i,j) \in A} z_{ij} = \eta(\eta-1)/2 \\ & y_i - (\eta-1)z_{ij} \geq 0 \quad ij \in A \\ & z_{ij} \in \{0, 1\} \quad ij \in A \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $A = \{(i, j) | i, j \in \mathcal{P}, i < j, c(i) \neq c(j)\}$, $\delta_i^+ = \{(i, j) \in A\}$, $\delta_i^- = \{(j, i) \in A\}$, and λ_i is the value of the dual variable with respect to constraint for point i in (10). The objective function (11) is the reduced cost of a new feasible cluster represented by binary variables z_{ij} (which are 1 if points i, j are in the cluster, and 0 otherwise).

Problem (11) is solved by adapting the method described in [1] to the m -invariance case by simply fixing to zero z_{ij} when $(i, j) \notin A$.

Within the decomposition approach of Section IV, problem (10) is solved for each subset of points \mathcal{P}_k , $k = 1, \dots, s$, and a subset A_k of A is defined accordingly.

The previous column generation algorithm provides an optimal solution to the continuous relaxation of (1). If all

the variables x_C are either 0 or 1, this solution is optimal for the integer optimization model (1). If some variables x_C are fractional, some rounding heuristic is needed to obtain a (suboptimal but in general good quality) binary solution. In most cases, the best binary solution was obtained by solving (10) with the last set of clusters \bar{C} computed, and replacing bounds $x_C \in [0, 1]$ by binary constraints $x_C \in \{0, 1\}$.

VI. COMPUTATIONAL TESTS

The column generation algorithm for m -invariance introduced in this paper has been implemented in C++. The solution of the linear optimization problems (10) and integer optimization subproblems (11) of the column generation algorithm were computed with the CPLEX solver. Alternatively, subproblems (11) can also be solved, for small values of m , using the implicit enumeration scheme of [26]. A parallel version of Step 4 of the decomposition approach of Section IV was implemented using OpenMP.

The implementation was tested with the “Adult” [27] and the “IPUMS USA” [28] datasets. Both datasets have been used in several previous works on syntactic privacy for dynamic data publishing. From the “Adult” dataset the attributes age, sex and education-num have been used as quasi-identifiers and occupation as sensitive attribute (that is, “occupation” is the “color” attribute according to the notation of Section III). For the “IPUMS” dataset we considered a data extract with columns sex, age, educ and occupation, using occupation as sensitive attribute and the rest as quasi-identifiers. We used samples of 1500 and 1000 randomly selected users for Adult and IPUMS respectively.

These two datasets were considered for their prevalent appearance in the related literature and to reflect two scenarios depending on the number of unique sensitive values. The Adult dataset has 13 unique sensitive values while IPUMS has 281 unique sensitive values. We tested the performance of our approach in comparison with the implementations of assignment and partitioning of [12] (denoted as “Classic”), and [19] (denoted as “Tau”). These implementations are the two main approaches in the existing literature.

A. Results

Tables IV and V show the results obtained for, respectively, the “Adult” and “IPUMS” datasets. Each dataset was solved for the cluster sizes $m \in \{3, 5, 7\}$ and number of subsets $s \in \{40, 20, 10, 5, 2\}$, which amounts to 15 runs of the algorithm with each dataset. The runs were carried out on a DELL PowerEdge R7525 with two 2.4 GHz AMD EPYC 7532 CPUs (128 total cores), under a GNU/Linux operating system (openSuse 15.3).

The columns of the tables provide results for the different steps of the decomposition algorithm: step 1: m -invariance heuristics (used to partition the set of points in step 3); step 4: optimization with column generation for each subset of points; step 5: two-swapping heuristic. The execution of the two state-of-the-art m -invariance heuristics (“Classic” and “Tau”) is independent of s , then the values of these columns are common to all the rows with the same m . For each step we

provide the computational time, and the information loss (IL) obtained (which monotonically decreases with the steps). For step 1, the results with the “Classic” and “Tau” heuristic are given; “Tau” always outperformed “Classic” in terms of IL , then it was chosen as the initial clustering to partition the set of points in s subsets. Executions of the optimization stage were multithreaded using OpenMP, the number of threads being equal to the number of subsets s . For this reason, times in the table refer to “wall-clock” time, instead of CPU time. We set a time limit of two hours for each column generation process, which was only reached in one of the most difficult instance (“Adult”, $m = 5$, $s = 2$).

From Tables IV and V it is seen that the current state-of-the-art heuristics “Classic” and “Tau” provide very poor solutions, with large IL values. The combination of the optimization step followed by the local search two-swapping heuristic significantly improves the quality of the m -invariance solution. When m is small it is observed that clusterings with IL close to 0 can be obtained. In general, the IL values computed for “IPUMS” are much better than for the “Adult” dataset; this is explained by the much larger number of values of the sensitive variable (281 vs 13). It is also seen, as expected, that the smaller s , the better IL , at the expense of a larger overall solution time.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

The new method suggested in this paper for the m -invariance and τ -safety NP-hard problems (based on a column generation technique used in mathematical optimization for the solution of large-scale problems) significantly outperformed current state-of-the-art heuristics in terms of quality of the solution (IL). A potential drawback of our approach is the excessive computational time of the optimization step when m is large and s is small. Reducing the solution time of the column generation algorithm would be part of the further work to be done.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Jordi Castro has been supported by the MCIN/AEI/FEDER project RTI2018-097580-B-I00.

Adrian Tobar has been supported by the Spanish Government under the project “Enhancing Communication Protocols with Machine Learning while Protecting Sensitive Data (COMPROMISE)” PID2020-113795RB-C31, funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033, and through the project “MOBILITYCS” (TED2021-129782B-I00), funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and the European Union “NextGenerationEU”/PRTR.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Castro, C. Gentile, and E. Spagnolo-Arrizabalaga, “An algorithm for the microaggregation problem using column generation,” *Comput. Oper. Res.*, vol. 144, p. 105817, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cor.2022.105817>
- [2] A. Hundepool, J. Domingo-Ferrer, L. Franconi, S. Giessing, E. S. Nordholt, K. Spicer, and P.-P. de Wolf, *Statistical Disclosure Control*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2012, pp. i–xv. [Online]. Available: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9781118348239.fmatter>

TABLE IV
COMPUTATIONAL RESULTS FOR THE ADULT DATASET

Dataset	Cluster Size m	m -Invariance Heuristics			Optimization			Two-Swapping				
		Algorithm	Time	IL	s	Time	IL	Time	IL			
Adult	3	Classic	0.14	66.76	40	0.08	15.60	41.12	2.36			
					20	0.20	10.49	37.36	2.17			
		Tau	0.02	39.03	10	4.02	7.47	33.62	2.15			
					5	18.21	5.49	27.22	2.14			
	5	Classic	0.07	81.46	40	2.66	29.73	89.49	8.86			
					20	89.08	23.83	87.72	9.61			
					Tau	0.14	51.84	10	2872.1	18.34	67.38	9.06
								5	5068.5	19.61	76.76	8.92
		7	Classic	0.37	88.73	40	989.26	50.82	197.97	22.25		
						20	1357.7	47.68	178.41	22.79		
			Tau	0.12	57.97	10	5543.0	46.81	147.25	22.58		
						5	5080.1	47.84	146.58	22.43		
2	3929.7	47.33	141.26	22.44								

TABLE V
COMPUTATIONAL RESULTS FOR THE IPUMS DATASET

Dataset	Cluster Size m	m -Invariance Heuristics			Optimization			Two-Swapping				
		Algorithm	Time	IL	s	Time	IL	Time	IL			
IPUMS	3	Classic	0.14	66.76	40	0.06	11.91	10.57	0.75			
					20	0.09	6.10	9.17	0.77			
		Tau	0.02	39.03	10	0.17	3.31	7.49	0.54			
					5	0.80	1.57	5.86	0.55			
	5	Classic	0.07	81.46	40	0.13	26.22	23.67	1.70			
					20	0.86	13.93	0.86	1.38			
					Tau	0.14	51.84	10	3.39	6.94	19.19	1.21
								5	48.61	3.63	14.45	1.19
		7	Classic	0.37	88.73	40	910.71	37.48	44.15	2.28		
						20	888.74	21.68	49.45	2.26		
			Tau	0.12	57.97	10	5105.6	15.62	37.7	2.36		
						5	5042.4	16.07	28.88	2.33		
2	3623.7	9.62	17.95	1.93								

- [3] L. Sweeney, "K-anonymity: A model for protecting privacy," vol. 10, no. 5, p. 557–570, Oct. 2002. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218488502001648>
- [4] P. Samarati, "Protecting respondents identities in microdata release," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 13, no. 6, pp. 1010–1027, 2001.
- [5] A. Machanavajhala, J. Gehrke, D. Kiefer, and M. Venkatasubramanian, "l-Diversity: Privacy beyond k-anonymity," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Data Eng. (ICDE)*, Atlanta, GA, Apr. 2006, p. 24.
- [6] N. Li, T. Li, and S. Venkatasubramanian, "t-Closeness: Privacy beyond k-anonymity and l-diversity," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Data Eng. (ICDE)*, Istanbul, Turkey, Apr. 2007, pp. 106–115.
- [7] D. Rebollo-Monedero, J. Forné, and J. Domingo-Ferrer, "From t-closeness-like privacy to postrandomization via information theory," *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, vol. 22, no. 11, pp. 1623–1636, 2010.
- [8] C. Dwork, "Differential privacy," in *Proc. Int. Colloq. Automata, Lang., Program.* Springer-Verlag, 2006, pp. 1–12.
- [9] C. Dwork, M. Naor, T. Pitassi, and G. N. Rothblum, "Differential privacy under continual observation," in *Proc. ACM Int. Symp. Theory Comput. (STOC)*. ACM, 2010, pp. 715–724.
- [10] C. Dwork and A. Roth, "The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy," *Found., Trends Theor. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 9, no. 3–4, pp. 211–407, Aug. 2014.
- [11] J.-W. Byun, Y. Sohn, E. Bertino, and N. Li, "Secure anonymization for incremental datasets," in *Secure Data Manage.*, 2006.
- [12] X. Xiao and Y. Tao, "M-invariance: Towards privacy preserving re-publication of dynamic datasets," in *Proc. 2007 ACM SIGMOD Int. Conf. Manage. Data*, ser. SIGMOD '07. New York, NY, USA: Assoc. for Comput. Machinery, 2007, p. 689–700. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1247480.1247556>
- [13] B. C. M. Fung, K. Wang, A. W.-C. Fu, and J. Pei, "Anonymity for continuous data publishing," in *Proc. 11th Int. Conf. Extending Database Technol.: Adv. Database Technol.*, ser. EDBT '08. New York, NY, USA: Assoc. for Comput. Machinery, 2008, p. 264–275. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1353343.1353378>
- [14] D. Riboni and C. Bettini, "Cor-split: Defending privacy in data re-publication from historical correlations and compromised tuples," in *Scient., Stat. Database Manage.*, M. Winslett, Ed. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2009, pp. 562–579.
- [15] A. Anjum and G. Raschia, "Anonymizing sequential releases under

- arbitrary updates,” in *Proc. Joint EDBT/ICDT 2013 Workshop*, ser. EDBT '13. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2013, p. 145–154. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2457317.2457342>
- [16] O. Temuujin, J. Ahn, and D.-H. Im, “Efficient l -diversity algorithm for preserving privacy of dynamically published datasets,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 122 878–122 888, 2019.
- [17] R. Khan, X. Tao, A. Anjum, S. Malik, S. Yu, A. Khan, W. Rehman, and H. Malik, “ (τ, m) -slicedbucket privacy model for sequential anonymization for improving privacy and utility,” *Transactions on Emerging Telecommunications Technologies*, 06 2022.
- [18] H. Attaullah, T. Kanwal, A. Anjum, G. Ahmed, S. Khan, D. B. Rawat, and R. Khan, “Fuzzy-logic-based privacy-aware dynamic release of IoT-enabled healthcare data,” *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 9, no. 6, pp. 4411–4420, 2022.
- [19] A. Anjum, G. Raschia, M. Gelgon, A. Khan, S. ur Rehman Malik, N. Ahmad, M. Ahmed, S. Suhail, and M. M. Alam, “ τ -safety: A privacy model for sequential publication with arbitrary updates,” *Comput. & Security*, vol. 66, pp. 20–39, 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167404817300019>
- [20] X. Ren, P. Zhang, and Y. Zhou, “Distinct model on privacy protection of dynamic data publication,” *Clust. Comput.*, vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 15 127–15 136, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10586-018-2506-3>
- [21] J. Domingo-Ferrer and J. M. Mateo-Sanz, “Practical data-oriented microaggregation for statistical disclosure control,” *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 14, no. 1, 2002.
- [22] A. Oganian and J. Domingo-Ferrer, “On the complexity of optimal microaggregation for statistical disclosure control,” *Statistical Journal of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe*, vol. 18, pp. 345–354, 2001.
- [23] X. Ji and J. E. Mitchell, “Branch-and-price-and-cut on the clique partitioning problem with minimum clique size requirement,” *Discr. Optim.*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 87–102, 2007.
- [24] J. Castro, C. Gentile, and E. Spagnolo-Arrizabalaga, “An optimization-based decomposition heuristic for the microaggregation problem,” in *Privacy in Statistical Databases*, ser. Lecture Notes Comput. Sci., J. Domingo-Ferrer and M. Laurent, Eds., vol. 13463. Springer, 2022, pp. 3–14.
- [25] J. Desrosiers and M. Lübbecke, “A primer in column generation,” in *Column Generation*, G. Desaulniers, J. Desrosiers, and M. M. Solomon, Eds. Springer, 2005, pp. 1–32.
- [26] A. Aloise, P. Hansen, C. Rocha, and E. Santi, “Column generation bounds for numerical microaggregation,” *J. Global Optim.*, vol. 60, pp. 165–182, 2014.
- [27] D. Dua and C. Graff, “UCI machine learning repository,” 2017. [Online]. Available: <http://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml>
- [28] S. Ruggles, S. Flood, M. Sobek, D. Brockman, G. Cooper, S. Richards, and M. Schouweiler, “Ipums usa: Version 13.0,” 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.18128/D010.V13.0>

VIII. BIOGRAPHY SECTION

Adrian Tobar received a four-year BSc degree in Mathematics (Extraordinary end-of-studies Award) from the Universitat de les Illes Balears, Palma de Mallorca, Balearic Islands, in 2019, and a MSc degree in Advanced Mathematics from the Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya in 2020. He is currently PhD student at Department of Networking Engineering at the Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya and assistant professor at the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science of the Universitat de les Illes Balears.

Jordi Castro received a five-year BSc-MSc degree in Computer Sciences (best mark of his class) from the Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Barcelona, Catalonia, in 1991, and a PhD degree in Computers Sciences (Operations Research) from the same university in 1995. From 1996 to 1999 he was associate professor at the Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Tarragona, Catalonia. He is currently full professor at the Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya. His research interests are in algorithms for large-scale optimization problems.

Claudio Gentile received a BSc-MSc degree in Computer Sciences (mark 110/110, with honors) from the Università di Pisa, and a Diploma from the Scuola Normale Superiore of Pisa, Italia, in 1995; he also received a PhD degree in Operations Research from University “La Sapienza”, Roma, Italia, in 2000. He is currently Research Director at Institute for System Analysis and Computer Science “A. Ruberti” (IASI) of the Italian National Research Council (CNR) where he spent all his scientific carrier. His main research interests are in Combinatorial Optimization, Polyhedral Theory, and Mixed-Integer Nonlinear Programming.