

OPTIMIZING NOISE FOR f -DIFFERENTIAL PRIVACY VIA ANTI-CONCENTRATION AND STOCHASTIC DOMINANCE

BY JORDAN AWAN^{1,a} AND AISHWARYA RAMASETHU^{1,b}

¹*Department of Statistics, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47906,*

^a*jawan@purdue.edu,* ^b*aramaset@purdue.edu*

In this paper, we establish anti-concentration inequalities for additive noise mechanisms which achieve f -differential privacy (f -DP), a notion of privacy phrased in terms of a tradeoff function (a.k.a. ROC curve) f which limits the ability of an adversary to determine which individuals were in the database. We show that *canonical noise distributions* (CNDs), proposed by [Awan and Vadhan \(2023\)](#), match the anti-concentration bounds at half-integer values, indicating that their tail behavior is near-optimal. We also show that all CNDs are sub-exponential, regardless of the f -DP guarantee. In the case of log-concave CNDs, we show that they are the stochastically smallest noise compared to any other noise distributions with the same privacy guarantee. In terms of integer-valued noise, we propose a new notion of discrete CND and prove that a discrete CND always exists, can be constructed by rounding a continuous CND, and that the discrete CND is unique when designed for a statistic with sensitivity 1. We further show that the discrete CND at sensitivity 1 is stochastically smallest compared to other integer-valued noises. Our theoretical results shed light on the different types of privacy guarantees possible in the f -DP framework and can be incorporated in more complex mechanisms to optimize performance.

1. Introduction. Differential privacy (DP), introduced by [Dwork et al. \(2006a\)](#), is the state-of-the-art framework for formal privacy protection. DP methods require the introduction of noise into data analyses, which obscures the contribution of any particular individual. Since its inception, DP has grown in popularity and is now employed by leading tech giants like Google ([Erlingsson, Pihur and Korolova, 2014](#)) and Apple ([Tang et al., 2017](#)), as well as by the US Census Bureau ([Abowd, 2018](#)).

While there have been several variants of DP proposed, they all quantify the privacy risk in terms a similarity measure between the distribution of outputs, when the mechanism is run on two databases differing in a single individual’s contribution. The differences between these variants is primarily in how the “similarity” is measured. Recently, [Dong, Roth and Su \(2022\)](#) proposed f -DP, which is rooted in hypothesis testing. The f parameter in f -DP is a function which offers a more expressive quantification of the privacy risk compared to other notions of DP. f -DP has the benefit of being able to losslessly being converted to the popular (ϵ, δ) -DP, as well as divergence-based notions of DP ([Bun and Steinke, 2016](#); [Mironov, 2017](#)).

The most basic technique for achieving DP is independent noise addition to a statistic of interest. Popular examples of such noise distributions are Laplace and Gaussian. In this paper, we investigate the limitation of what noise can be used to satisfy f -DP, and optimize the noise distributions in different settings.

Our Contributions: To understand the limits on the magnitude of noise required to satisfy f -DP, we develop an anti-concentration inequality, which gives an upper limit on the concentration of the noise distribution about its the center. This upper bound is determined by the

MSC2020 subject classifications: Primary 68P27; secondary 60E15.

Keywords and phrases: canonical noise distribution, total variation, discrete distribution, log-concave distribution.

total variation distance between the noise distribution and a shifted version of itself, which can be bounded in terms of the f -DP guarantee

We show that canonical noise distributions (CNDs), proposed by [Awan and Vadhan \(2023\)](#) match our anti-concentration bound, which implies that their tail behavior is near-optimal. We also show that all CNDs are sub-exponential, indicating that it is never necessary to use heavier-tailed distributions to achieve f -DP. In the special case of log-concave CNDs, a subclass previously investigated by [Awan and Dong \(2022\)](#), we show that the log-concave CND is stochastically smaller than any other additive noise with the same privacy guarantee.

Lastly, we propose a new concept of discrete CND, which generalizes CNDs to integer-valued noises. Unlike continuous CNDs, which are solely defined in terms of a trade-off function f , a discrete CND is also defined for a specific sensitivity. We show that a discrete CND always exists for any f and any sensitivity, and that one can be constructed by rounding a continuous CND to integer values. In the case that the sensitivity is 1, we prove that there is a unique discrete CND for each trade-off function and that this noise mechanism is stochastically smaller than any other integer-centered discrete noise satisfying f -DP.

Organization: In Section 1.1 we discuss the related literature. In Section 2, we review the basics of f -differential privacy. In Section 3 we develop our general anti-concentration inequality for additive noise. In Section 4 we consider the case of continuous noise. We review background on CNDs in Section 4.1, show that CNDs are near-optimal in Section 4.2, establish that CNDs are sub-exponential in Section 4.3, and derive optimality results for log-concave CNDs in Section 4.4. In Section 5, we introduce the concept of discrete CNDs. In Section 5.1, we establish existence and construction of discrete CNDs, as well as the uniqueness of the discrete CND at sensitivity 1. In Section 5.2, we prove the optimality of the discrete CND at sensitivity 1. We conclude with discussion in Section 6. Technical details and proofs are postponed to the appendix.

1.1. *Related Work.* Various ways to optimize noise for differential privacy have been previously explored. [Ghosh, Roughgarden and Sundararajan \(2012\)](#) search for discrete noise that maximise the utility by in the Bayesian framework under $(\epsilon, 0)$ -differential privacy. They establish that the truncated geometric mechanism is best suited to minimise accuracy loss in count queries. [Gupte and Sundararajan \(2010\)](#) minimize the worst-case cost (minimax) for single query mechanisms in $(\epsilon, 0)$ -DP. They establish that like the previous work, the geometric mechanism optimizes the utility. [Qin et al. \(2022a\)](#) consider necessary conditions for general discrete distributions to satisfy either $(\epsilon, 0)$ -DP or (ϵ, δ) -DP. In the extended version, [Qin et al. \(2022b\)](#), they optimize the Wasserstein distance between the mechanism’s input and output distributions, and show that a discrete staircase distribution is optimal.

[Geng and Viswanath \(2015a\)](#) focus on the minimization of loss function in $(\epsilon, 0)$ -DP, particularly the mean absolute error and mean squared error losses. They established an optimal noise-adding mechanism which they call the staircase mechanism. [Geng and Viswanath \(2015b\)](#) consider optimizing the same loss functions in (ϵ, δ) -DP, and found that discrete Laplace and uniform noise were nearly optimal in the high privacy regime. [Soria-Comas and Domingo-Ferrer \(2013\)](#) construct an optimal data-independent noise adding mechanism under ϵ -DP, where the optimality is measured by moving the most probability mass towards zero. Their solution results in a staircase distribution, similar to [Geng and Viswanath \(2015a\)](#).

The literature above is focused on finding the optimal noise under either $(\epsilon, 0)$ -DP or (ϵ, δ) -DP. f -Differential Privacy ([Dong, Roth and Su, 2022](#)) is a more generalized privacy framework. [Awan and Vadhan \(2023\)](#) was the first work to build a noise adding mechanism for arbitrary f -DP, which they called a canonical noise distribution (CND). CNDs were designed to tightly match the f -DP privacy bound and were shown to lead to optimal hypothesis tests ([Awan and Vadhan, 2023](#)). [Awan and Dong \(2022\)](#) extended these results by establishing the existence and construction of both log-concave CNDs and multivariate CNDs.

2. Differential Privacy Background. Differential privacy is a framework that ensures that an adversary cannot accurately determine whether an individual’s data is present in a database, based on the output of a privacy mechanism. A privacy mechanism M is a randomized algorithm that takes as input a database D and outputs a random variable $M(D)$. We write $M : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ to indicate that it takes in a database $D \in \mathcal{D}$ and the random variable $M(D)$ takes values in \mathcal{Y} , where \mathcal{D} is the space of possible databases. A mechanism M satisfies differential privacy if for two databases D and D' , differing in one entry, formalized in terms of an *adjacency metric* $d(D, D') \leq 1$, the distributions of $M(D)$ and $M(D')$ are similar. While the similarity of $M(D)$ and $M(D')$ was previously formalized in terms of divergences on probability measures, [Dong, Roth and Su \(2022\)](#) established that it is most natural to use the language of hypothesis testing, using the concept of a *tradeoff function*.

For two distributions P and Q , the *tradeoff function* between P and Q is $T(P, Q) : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$, where $T(P, Q)(\alpha) = \inf\{1 - \mathbb{E}_Q(\phi) \mid \mathbb{E}_P(\phi) \leq 1 - \alpha\}$, where the infimum is over all measurable tests ϕ . The tradeoff function returns the smallest type II error for testing $H_0 = P$ versus $H_1 = Q$ at specificity (one minus type I error) α , and captures the difficulty of distinguishing between P and Q . The tradeoff function is closely related to the *receiver operator characteristic curve* (ROC curve), which evaluates sensitivity/power (one minus type II error) as a function of type I error.¹

We say that a function $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a tradeoff function if there exists distributions P and Q such that $f(\alpha) = T(P, Q)(\alpha)$ for all $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. A function $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a tradeoff function if and only if f is convex, continuous, non-decreasing, and $f(x) \leq x$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$ ([Dong, Roth and Su, 2022](#), Proposition 2.2). We say that a tradeoff function f is *nontrivial* if $f(\alpha) < \alpha$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

DEFINITION 2.1 (f -DP: [Dong, Roth and Su, 2022](#)). Let f be a tradeoff function. A mechanism M satisfies f -DP if $T(M(D), M(D')) \geq f$, for all $D, D' \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $d(D, D') \leq 1$.

If M satisfies f -DP, where $f = T(P, Q)$, then intuitively determining whether the database is D or D' is at least as hard as distinguishing between P and Q . Thus, if P and Q are difficult to distinguish, then the individual’s private data is unlikely to be compromised. Since the differential privacy guarantee is symmetric (i.e., both $T(M(D), M(D'))$ and $T(M(D'), M(D))$ must be greater than f), it suffices to restrict the f -DP guarantee to *symmetric* tradeoff functions, meaning that if $f = T(P, Q)$, then $f = T(Q, P)$. Due to this, we limit the scope of the paper to symmetric tradeoff functions. Similar to other notions of differential privacy, f -DP has a number of important properties:

Group privacy The guarantee of f -DP is implicitly for *groups of size 1*, since the adjacent databases differ in one entry. However, if M satisfies f -DP, then it also satisfies $f^{\circ k}$ -DP for groups of size k (where $d(D, D') \leq k$), where $f^{\circ k} := f \circ \dots \circ f$ and f appears k times. Note that while this guarantee is tight in general, for a specific f -DP mechanism there may exist a stronger guarantee for groups.

Composition Another property of f -DP is that it can quantify the cumulative privacy cost of multiple privacy mechanisms. Specifically, if M_1, \dots, M_k each satisfy f_1 -DP, \dots , f_k -DP, respectively, then the joint release of $(M_1(D), \dots, M_k(D))$ satisfies $f_1 \otimes \dots \otimes f_k$ -DP, where “ \otimes ” is the *tensor product* of tradeoff functions: if $f = T(P_1, Q_1)$ and $g = T(P_2, Q_2)$, then $f \otimes g = T(P_1 \times P_2, Q_1 \times Q_2)$.

¹In [Dong, Roth and Su \(2022\)](#), the tradeoff function was originally defined as the smallest type II error as a function of type I error. Our choice to flip the tradeoff function along the x -axis follows that of [Awan and Dong \(2022\)](#) and is for mathematical convenience.

Invariance to Postprocessing If $M : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ satisfies f -DP and $T : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ is a (possibly randomized) function, then $T \circ M : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ also satisfies f -DP. This property is important to ensure that the privacy guarantee cannot be “undone” by a data-independent attack.

While f -DP consists of a wide variety of privacy guarantees, depending on the tradeoff function chosen, two important sub-families are worth pointing out. The common (ϵ, δ) -DP version of differential privacy is a special case of f -DP: let $\epsilon \in [0, \infty)$ and $\delta \in [0, 1]$, then M satisfies (ϵ, δ) -DP if and only if it satisfies $f_{\epsilon, \delta}$ -DP, where $f_{\epsilon, \delta} = \max\{0, 1 - \delta - \exp(\epsilon) + \exp(\epsilon)\alpha, \exp(-\epsilon)(\alpha - \delta)\}$. When $\delta = 0$, we call $(\epsilon, 0)$ -DP *pure DP*, which was the original definition of differential privacy. When $\epsilon = 0$, then $f_{0, \delta}$ -DP can be thought of as δ -Total Variation DP, as it is equivalent to bounding the total variation distance between $M(D)$ and $M(D')$ by δ – for two distributions P and Q , the *total variation distance* is $\text{TV}(P, Q) = \sup_A |P(A) - Q(A)|$.

Another sub-family of f -DP is Gaussian DP (GDP). We say that M satisfies μ -GDP if it satisfies G_μ -DP, where $G_\mu = T(N(0, 1), N(\mu, 1))$. Besides offering the intuitive appeal of being defined in terms of shifted Gaussians, GDP also has a number of useful technical properties: the family G_μ -DP is closed under group privacy and composition, and these operations commute under G_μ -DP. Furthermore, [Dong, Roth and Su \(2022\)](#) established a “central limit theorem for composition,” which showed that under mild conditions the composition of many DP mechanisms asymptotically satisfies μ -GDP for some μ .

For a symmetric tradeoff function f , denote by c_f the unique value such that $f(1 - c_f) = c_f$, which can be visualized as the intersection of f with the line $1 - \alpha$. The value c_f is a central concept to many of the results in this paper; we highlight a few basic properties here.

LEMMA 2.2. *Let f be a symmetric tradeoff function. Then*

1. $c_f \in [0, 1/2]$ and if f is nontrivial then $c_f \in [0, 1/2)$,
2. if $f = T(P, Q)$, then $\text{TV}(P, Q) = 1 - 2c_f$,
3. $f_{0, (1-2c_f)} \leq f \leq f_{\epsilon_f, 0}$, where $\epsilon_f = \log\left(\frac{1-c_f}{c_f}\right)$.

Property 2 of Lemma 2.2 makes explicit the connection between the tradeoff function and the total variation distance, which will be heavily used throughout the paper. By property 3 of Lemma 2.2, for a given symmetric tradeoff function f , we can construct nontrivial upper and lower bounds for f using only the value c_f .

Additive mechanisms The class of privacy mechanisms that we study in this paper are *additive mechanisms*, which add noise scaled to the *sensitivity* of a statistic. A statistic $S : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has sensitivity $\Delta > 0$ if $|S(X) - S(X')| \leq \Delta$ for all $d(X, X') \leq 1$ and all statistics S with sensitivity Δ . An additive f -DP mechanism at sensitivity Δ is a random variable $N \sim F$ which satisfies $T(S(X) + N, S(X') + N) \geq f$ for all $d(X, X') \leq 1$. More succinctly, this is equivalent to $T(N, N + m) \geq f$ for all $m \in [-\Delta, \Delta] \cap \text{Range}(S)$. If N is a continuous noise, then we can rescale both S and N by Δ .

Two of the most common additive mechanisms are the Laplace and Gaussian mechanisms: adding $\text{Laplace}(0, \Delta/\epsilon)$ to a real-valued statistic S with sensitivity Δ satisfies $(\epsilon, 0)$ -DP, and adding $N(0, \Delta^2/\mu^2)$ to the same statistic satisfies μ -GDP.

3. A General Anti-Concentration Inequality. Concentration inequalities such as Markov, Chebyshev, and Bernstein, give upper bounds on the amount of mass in the tails of a distribution. In this section, we establish *anti-concentration inequalities* for additive f -DP mechanisms, which instead give upper bounds on how much mass is near the center of the distribution. Our inequalities establish these bounds in terms of total variation distance and f -DP tradeoff functions. The most basic version of our anti-concentration inequality is in Lemma 3.1, which bounds the amount of mass in the center of the distribution in terms of the total variation distance between the random variable and a shifted version of itself.




Fig 1: Illustration of Lemma 3.1, and the connection to hypothesis testing. When testing $H_0 : N$ versus $H_1 : N + t$, and using the rejection region $(a + t/2, \infty)$, the type I error probability is illustrated by the vertically shaded red region and the type II error probability is given by the horizontally shaded blue region.

LEMMA 3.1. [Anti-Concentration] Let N be a real-valued random variable. Then for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}$, $\sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} P(-t/2 < N - a \leq t/2) \leq \text{TV}(N, N + t)$.

PROOF SKETCH. We consider a hypothesis test of $H_0 : N$ versus $H_1 : N + t$, using the rejection region $(a + t/2, \infty)$. The type I and type II errors of this test correspond to the tail probabilities $P(N - a > t/2)$ and $P(N - a \leq t/2)$; see Figure 1. Combining this with the inequality (type I) + (type II) $\leq 1 - \text{TV}(N, N + t)$ gives the result. \square

REMARK 3.2. Since total variation is a symmetric relation, and translation-invariant, it follows that $\text{TV}(N, N + t) = \text{TV}(N + t, N) = \text{TV}(N, N - t)$, which are alternative expressions for the right side of Lemma 3.1.

If a random variable N is an additive noise mechanism at sensitivity 1 for f -DP, then $T(N, N + 1) \geq f$. The following theorem establishes that in this case, we can express the upper bound $\text{TV}(N, N + t)$ from Lemma 3.1 in terms of evaluations of f .

THEOREM 3.3. [Anti-Concentration for Additive Noise] Let N be a random variable such that $T(N, N + 1) \geq f$ for a symmetric nontrivial tradeoff function f . Then for $t \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$,

$$\sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} P(-t/2 < N - a \leq t/2) \leq \begin{cases} 1 - 2f^{\circ k}(c_f) & \text{if } t = 2k + 1 \\ 1 - 2f^{\circ k}(1/2) & \text{if } t = 2k, \end{cases}$$

where the notation $f^{\circ k}$ represents $f \circ \dots \circ f$, where f appears k times.

PROOF SKETCH. By Lemma A.4, we have that $T(N, N + t) \geq f^{\circ t}$. Then we apply the formula $\text{TV}(N, N + t) \geq 1 - 2c_{f^{\circ t}}$ to the result of Lemma 3.1. Finally, Lemma A.2 gives the more explicit formula for $c_{f^{\circ t}}$, which depends on the parity of t . Note that Lemmas A.2 and A.4 appear in the appendix. \square

Theorem 3.3 establishes that at all half-integer values, an additive noise distribution can only be so concentrated around zero. This result provides a minimum on the magnitude of

noise that must be added to achieve f -DP. Lemma 3.1 and Theorem 3.3 are similar to anti-concentration inequalities of Lévy’s concentration function (Krishnapur, 2016), which are usually of the form $\sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} P(|X - a| \leq t) \leq g(t)$ for some function of t . Note that when N is continuous, the results of Lemma 3.1 and Theorem 3.3 simplify to this form.

REMARK 3.4. In Lemma 3.1 and Theorem 3.3, we could have written the probabilities as $P(-t/2 \leq N - a < t/2)$. In fact, a more general version of these anti-concentration inequalities is as follows: for any $c \in [0, 1]$ and any $a \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$cP(N - a = -t/2) + P(-t/2 < N - a < t/2) + (1 - c)P(N - a = t/2) \leq \text{TV}(N, N + 1),$$

where the “ c ” corresponds to the randomized test $\phi(x) = I(x > a + t/2) + cI(x = a + t/2)$ of $H_0 : N$ versus $H_1 : N + t$.

In the following sections, we will see that different *canonical noise distributions* (Awan and Vadhan, 2023) actually match the bounds of Lemma 3.1 and Theorem 3.3, indicating that they are near-optimal to achieve f -DP.

4. Continuous Canonical Noise Distributions. While f -DP was introduced by Dong, Roth and Su (2022), the first method of constructing a privacy mechanism for an arbitrary f -DP guarantee was proposed by Awan and Vadhan (2023). Awan and Vadhan (2023) proposed the concept of a *canonical noise distribution* (CND), which captured the idea that the noise distribution satisfies f -DP and the privacy guarantee is tight. They also gave a construction for a CND for an arbitrary tradeoff function, and showed that CNDs are connected to certain optimal hypothesis tests. In this section, we review background on CNDs, show that they match the inequality of Theorem 3.3, prove that CNDs are sub-exponential, and establish the optimality properties of log-concave CNDs.

4.1. *Background on Canonical Noise Distributions.* In this section, we review some of the key results of Awan and Vadhan (2023). A canonical noise distribution is an additive mechanism, which tightly matches the f -DP bound and has other desirable properties such as a monotone likelihood ratio for testing $T(N, N + 1)$ and symmetry. Awan and Vadhan (2023) proposed the following definition to capture these desirable properties:

DEFINITION 4.1 (Canonical noise distribution: Awan and Vadhan (2023)). Let f be a symmetric tradeoff function, and let N be a continuous random variable with cumulative distribution function (cdf) F . Then, F is a *canonical noise distribution* (CND) for f if

1. For any $m \in [0, 1]$, $T(N, N + m) \geq f$,
2. $f(\alpha) = T(N, N + 1)(\alpha)$ for all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,
3. $T(N, N + 1)(\alpha) = F(F^{-1}(\alpha) - 1)$ for all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,
4. $F(x) = 1 - F(-x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$; that is, N is symmetric about zero.

In Definition 4.1, the four properties can be interpreted as follows: 1) adding ΔN to a statistic of sensitivity Δ satisfies f -DP, 2) if $S(D)$ and $S(D')$ differ by exactly the sensitivity Δ , then the tradeoff function $T(S(D) + N, S(D') + N) = f$ showing that the privacy guarantee is tight, 3) for the same $S(D)$ and $S(D')$ in part 2, an optimal rejection region is of the form $[x, \infty)$, which implies a monotone likelihood ratio property, and 4) since the privacy guarantee f -DP is symmetric, it is sensible to restrict attention to symmetric distributions.

The following recurrence is an important technical property of CNDs:

LEMMA 4.2 (Awan and Vadhan (2023)). *Let f be a symmetric nontrivial tradeoff function and let F be a CND for f . Then $F(x) = 1 - f(1 - F(x - 1))$ when $F(x - 1) > 0$ and $F(x) = f(F(x + 1))$ when $F(x + 1) < 1$.*

Lemma 4.2 implies that if a CND is specified on an interval of length 1, then it is fully determined by the recurrence. Awan and Vadhan (2023) showed that the above recurrence relation can be used to construct a CND for any nontrivial symmetric tradeoff function, by starting with a certain linear function on the interval $[-1/2, 1/2]$.

PROPOSITION 4.3 (CND construction: Awan and Vadhan (2023)). *Let f be a symmetric nontrivial tradeoff function. We define $F_f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as*

$$F_f(x) = \begin{cases} f(F_f(x + 1)) & x < -1/2 \\ c_f(1/2 - x) + (1 - c_f)(x + 1/2) & -1/2 \leq x \leq 1/2 \\ 1 - f(1 - F_f(x - 1)) & x > 1/2. \end{cases}$$

Then $N \sim F_f$ is a canonical noise distribution for f .

Proposition 4.3 demonstrates that CNDs exist for any symmetric nontrivial tradeoff function, and gives an explicit construction. Furthermore, Awan and Vadhan (2023) give an algorithm to sample from the constructed CND, enabling it to be employed in practice.

4.2. *Near-Optimality of CNDs.* While Awan and Vadhan (2023) demonstrated that CNDs are essential to constructing optimal hypothesis testing procedures, they did not give any direct results to show that CNDs add a minimal amount of noise. In this section, we show the concentration of a CND about zero is equal to the upper bound given in Theorem 3.3 at all $t \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$. This implies that at half-integer values, the CND is more concentrated than any alternative additive noise satisfying f -DP. We also show that the mass of any other f -DP noise distribution is no more than a radius of 1/2 closer to its center than a CND.

Lemma 4.4 gives an explicit formula for the concentration of a CND, which we see matches the bound in Theorem 3.3.

LEMMA 4.4. *Let f be a symmetric, nontrivial tradeoff function, and let $N \sim F_N$ be a CND for f . Then for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$,*

$$P(|N| \leq t/2) = \begin{cases} 1 - 2f^{\circ k}(c_f) & \text{if } t = 2k + 1 \\ 1 - 2f^{\circ k}(1/2) & \text{if } t = 2k. \end{cases}$$

Combining Lemma 4.4 with Theorem 3.3, we get the following corollary, indicating that at half-integer values, CNDs are more concentrated than any alternative f -DP noise mechanism.

COROLLARY 4.5. *Let f be a symmetric, nontrivial tradeoff function. Let $N \sim F$ be a CND for f , and let N' be a random variable such that $T(N', N' + 1) \geq f$. Then for every $t \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$,*

$$P(|N| \leq t/2) \geq \sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} P(-t/2 < N' - a \leq t/2).$$

It is important to acknowledge the limitations of Corollary 4.5, as the inequality need not hold at values which are not half-integers. See Example 4.6 below:




Fig 2: Comparison of central probabilities for Tulap and Laplace distributions, as ϵ varies. Left: $P(|\cdot| \leq 1/2)$, Right: $P(|\cdot| \leq 1/4)$. See Example 4.6 for details.

EXAMPLE 4.6. Recall from Awan and Dong (2022) that $\text{Tulap}(0, \exp(-\epsilon), 0)$ is the unique CND for $(\epsilon, 0)$ -DP, and it is common knowledge that $\text{Laplace}(0, 1/\epsilon)$ is another additive noise that can be used to satisfy $(\epsilon, 0)$ -DP. Let $N \sim \text{Tulap}(0, \exp(-\epsilon), 0)$ and let $L \sim \text{Laplace}(0, 1/\epsilon)$. We see in the left plot of Figure 2 that $P(|N| \leq 1/2) \geq P(|L| \leq 1/2)$ for all values of ϵ . On the other hand, the right plot of Figure 2 shows that while $P(|N| \leq 1/4) \geq P(|L| \leq 1/4)$ for small values of ϵ , when $\epsilon > 2$, $P(|N| \leq 1/4) \leq P(|L| \leq 1/4)$. This indicates that the result of Corollary 4.5 cannot be extended for non-integer values of t .

A consequence of Corollary 4.5 is that the mass of a competing f -DP noise distribution is no more than a radius of $1/2$ closer to its center than a CND, as shown in Corollary 4.7. This shows that CNDs are nearly optimal compared to any other noise distribution, in terms of their concentration about their center.

COROLLARY 4.7. Let f be a symmetric, nontrivial tradeoff function. Let $N \sim F$ be a CND for f , and let N' be a random variable such that $T(N', N' + 1) \geq f$. Then,

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}} \left(\frac{\sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} P(-t < N' - a \leq t)}{P(|N| \leq t + 1/2)} \right) \leq 1.$$

4.3. *CNDs are Sub-Exponential.* In addition to comparing CNDs with other distributions, we can also directly analyze the tail behavior of CNDs. In the following result, we establish that all CNDs are sub-exponential, implying that their tail behavior has at slowest an exponential decay. As demonstrated in Example 4.9 this result indicates that even if the target f -DP guarantee is designed in terms of a heavier tailed distribution (such as Cauchy), a CND only requires sub-exponential tails.

Tail behavior of a noise mechanism is important to understand the dispersion, the probability of obtaining extreme values, and whether moments exist. With heavy-tailed distributions, such as the Cauchy distribution, it is possible that the moments do not exist. On the other hand, for sub-exponential random variables, all moments are guaranteed to be finite.

A random variable X with mean μ is (σ^2, α) -sub-exponential if $\mathbb{E} \exp(\lambda(X - \mu)) \leq \exp(\lambda^2 \sigma^2 / 2)$ for all $|\lambda| < 1/\alpha$. The bound on the moment generating function, implies an exponential decaying bound on the tails of the distribution by the Chernoff bound.

THEOREM 4.8. *Let f be a symmetric nontrivial tradeoff function and let $N \sim F$ be a CND for f . Set $\epsilon_f = \log((1 - c_f)/c_f)$. Then the following hold:*

1. $P(|N| > t) \leq \exp(-\epsilon \lfloor t \rfloor) \leq \exp(-\epsilon_f(t - 1))$
2. $\mathbb{E}|N|^n \leq \epsilon_f^{-n} \exp(\epsilon_f)n!$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$
3. N is $(2 \exp(\epsilon_f)/\epsilon_f, 2/\epsilon_f)$ -sub-exponential.

PROOF SKETCH. Using part 3 of Lemma 2.2, we upper bound f with a piece-wise linear tradeoff function $f_{\epsilon_f, 0}$. Using this along with the recurrence in Lemma 4.2 we obtain the inequality in part 1. Part 2 is obtained by integrating the result of part 1, and part 3 is obtained from part 2 by using the Bernstein condition for sub-exponential random variables. \square

An interesting consequence of Theorem 4.8 is that there is no privacy-relevant reason to add noise with tails heavier than exponential. We explore this in terms of ‘‘Cauchy-DP’’

EXAMPLE 4.9 (Cauchy-DP). For $m \geq 0$, let $C_m = T(\text{Cauchy}(0, 1), \text{Cauchy}(m, 1))$. Intuition suggests that C_m -DP is a stronger notion of DP than $(\epsilon_L, 0)$ -DP, since Cauchy noise has heavier tails than Laplace or Tulap noise. However in this example, we establish that C_m -DP is equivalent to $(\epsilon, 0)$ -DP, up to a change of variables.

Reimherr and Awan (2019, Example 6) previously proved that an elliptical t -distribution satisfies $(\epsilon_m, 0)$ -DP, where

$$\epsilon_L(m) = \log \left(\frac{4 + (m + \sqrt{m^2 + 4})^2}{4 + (m - \sqrt{m^2 + 4})^2} \right)$$

(while their result is stated for multivariate t -distributions with degrees of freedom $\nu > 1$, the argument also works for the Cauchy distribution, which is a univariate t -distribution with 1 degree of freedom). This implies that $C_m \geq f_{\epsilon_L(m), 0}$. This means that ‘‘Cauchy-DP’’ is a stronger notion of privacy than $(\epsilon, 0)$ -DP, which agrees with our intuition.

On the other hand, using part 3 of Lemma 2.2, we have that $C_m \leq f_{\epsilon_U(m), 0}$, where $\epsilon_U(m) = \log((1 - c_f)/c_f)$. We know that $1 - 2c_f = \text{TV}(\text{Cauchy}(m_1, s_1), \text{Cauchy}(m_2, s_2)) = (2/\pi) \arctan\left(\frac{|m_2 - m_1|}{2\sqrt{s_1 s_2}}\right)$ (Nielsen and Okamura, 2022). It follows that

$$\epsilon_U(m) = \log \left(\frac{3\pi - \arctan(m/2)}{2 \arctan(m/2) - \pi} \right).$$

In Figure 3, we plot C_1 as well as $f_{\epsilon_U, 0}$ and $f_{\epsilon_L, 0}$. Theorem 4.8 tells us that any CND for C_m will have sub-exponential tails, indicating that a CND can obtain the same privacy guarantee as the Cauchy distribution, but with less noise.

4.4. Optimality of Log-Concave CNDs. An important type of additive noise are log-concave distributions. Log-concave CNDs are also continuous CNDs and because of this inherit all of the properties of Sections 4.2 and 4.3. In this section, we give a new construction for the (unique) log-concave CND, when it exists, and we also show that log-concave CNDs are stochastically smallest among additive noises with the same privacy guarantee.

A continuous random variable is log-concave if its density can be expressed in the form $g(x) \propto \exp(C(x))$, where C is a concave function. Log-concave distributions have many




Fig 3: Tradeoff function $C_1 = T(\text{Cauchy}(0, 1), \text{Cauchy}(1, 1))$ as well as $f_{\epsilon_U, 0}$ and $f_{\epsilon_L, 0}$, from Example 4.9.

nice properties. In particular, a random variable N with cdf F satisfies $T(N, N + t)(\alpha) = F(F^{-1}(\alpha) - t)$ for every $t > 0$ if and only if it is log-concave [Dong, Roth and Su \(2022\)](#). This is equivalent to stating that log-concave distributions have the monotone likelihood ratio property when testing between any two shifted versions of N .

[Awan and Vadhan \(2023\)](#) established conditions for the existence and construction of log-concave CNDs in terms of whether a tradeoff function is *infinitely divisible*. A collection of tradeoff functions $\{f_t | t \geq 0\}$ is infinitely divisible if it has the following properties: 1) $f_s \circ f_t = f_{s+t}$ for all $s, t \geq 0$, 2) f_s is nontrivial for all $s > 0$, and 3) $f_s \rightarrow f_0 = \text{Id}$ as $s \downarrow 0$, where $\text{Id}(\alpha) = \alpha$. Infinite divisibility formalizes whether the tradeoff functions in the collection can be achieved by group privacy. [Awan and Dong \(2022\)](#) showed that a symmetric nontrivial tradeoff function has a log-concave CND if and only if it belongs to an infinitely divisible collection of tradeoff functions. Furthermore, [Awan and Dong \(2022\)](#) gave a construction for the unique log-concave CND of an infinitely divisible collection of tradeoff functions, which was expressed as a limit of CNDs constructed via Proposition 4.3. In the following lemma, we give a more explicit construction of the same log-concave distribution. Interestingly, the log-concave CND only depends on a single value from each of the f_t 's: $f_t(1/2) = c_{f_{2t}}$.

LEMMA 4.10. *Let $\{f_t | t \geq 0\}$ be an infinitely divisible collection of tradeoff functions, and let F be the log-concave CND for f_1 . Then, for $t \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}$, $F(-t) = f_t(1/2) = c_{f_{2t}}$.*

Lemma 4.10 can be used to construct the log-concave CND F from the family of tradeoff functions, but it can also be used to compute the value c_{f_t} , when f_t is log-concave:

EXAMPLE 4.11 (Laplace c_f). Let $f_t(\alpha) = T(\text{Laplace}(0, 1), \text{Laplace}(t, m))$, which is infinitely divisible, with log-concave CND $\text{Laplace}(0, 1)$ for f_1 . Then, we can calculate $c_{f_t} = F(-t/2) = (1/2) \exp(-t/2)$, which is simply an evaluation of the Laplace cdf.

In Theorem 4.12, we establish that the log-concave CND N is the stochastically smallest, compared to any other noise distribution which satisfies $T(N', N' + t) \geq f_t$ for all $t \geq 0$. In order to formalize this, we need to review the concept of *stochastic dominance*.

Let X and Y be two random variables. Stochastic dominance of random variables is a partial order, which asserts that one variable takes larger values compared to another. The following are equivalent definitions of (first order) stochastic dominance (Levy, 1992): 1) X stochastically dominates Y , 2) $F_X(t) \leq F_Y(t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, 3) for every non-decreasing function ϕ , $\mathbb{E}\phi(X) \geq \mathbb{E}\phi(Y)$, 4) there exists a random variable W (not necessarily independent of Y) such that $X \stackrel{d}{=} Y + W$.

THEOREM 4.12. *Let $\{f_t|t \geq 0\}$ be an infinitely divisible collection of tradeoff functions, and let F be the (unique) log-concave CND for f_1 . Let $N \sim F$ and let N' be any random variable such that $T(N', N' + t) \geq f_t$ for $t \geq 0$. Then $|N' - a|$ stochastically dominates $|N|$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$. It follows that*

- $P(|N| \leq t) \geq P(|N' - a| \leq t)$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $t \in \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$,
- For any non-decreasing function ϕ , $\mathbb{E}_N \phi(|N|) \leq \mathbb{E}_{N'} \phi(|N' - a|)$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$,
- There exists a non-negative, random variable W such that $|N'| \stackrel{d}{=} |N| + W$. If N' is symmetric about zero, then $N' \stackrel{d}{=} N + \text{sign}(N) \cdot W$.

While the condition $T(N', N' + t) \geq f_t$ is not required to achieve f -DP (it is only required that $T(N', N' + t) \geq f$ for $t \in [-1, 1]$), this condition is related to *individual privacy accounting* (Rogers et al., 2016; Feldman and Zrnic, 2021; Koskela, Tobaben and Honkela, 2022), which tracks each individual’s privacy budget along several sequential compositions, such as in DP stochastic gradient descent. By using infinitely divisible tradeoff functions along with the condition $T(N', N' + t) \geq f_t$, we can use f_t as a lower bound for privacy accounting withing the $\{f_t|t \geq 0\}$ family. Theorem 4.12 shows that among these types of noise distributions, the log-concave CND is optimal.

Stochastic dominance is a very strong ordering of random variables. While most prior works focus on a specific objective criterion to optimize (e.g., mean absolute and mean squared error (Geng and Viswanath, 2015b), optimal hypothesis testing Awan and Slavković (2018), Wasserstein distance (Qin et al., 2022a)), stochastic dominance implies that the mechanism optimizes all symmetric objectives centered at the non-private value, which are non-decreasing away from the center.

EXAMPLE 4.13. Examples of log-concave distributions include Gaussian, Laplace, Logistic, Uniform, and Beta, as well as truncated versions of these distributions. Of these, Gaussian is the log-concave CND for GDP, Laplace is the log-concave CND for Laplace-DP (Awan and Dong, 2022), and uniform is the log-concave CND for $(0, \delta)$ -DP (Awan and Dong, 2022). Dong (2020) showed that the logistic tradeoff function is a lower bound for exponential mechanisms (McSherry and Talwar, 2007), but has not been studied further.

5. Discrete Canonical Noise Distributions. In Section 4, the canonical noise distributions we considered were all continuous, as were those considered in the previous literature (Awan and Vadhan, 2023; Awan and Dong, 2022). However, there are also important use-cases where integer-valued noise is preferable. For example, the US Census used the discrete Gaussian mechanism (Canonne, Kamath and Steinke, 2020) to privatize the 2020 US Census products. Other papers have advocated for discrete noise such as the Skellam distribution (Agarwal, Kairouz and Liu, 2021), binomial distribution (Dwork et al., 2006b; Agarwal et al., 2018), and discrete Laplace/geometric mechanism (Ghosh, Roughgarden and Sundararajan, 2012). Even when one may theoretically prefer a continuous noise distribution, there may still be a benefit of using a discrete noise distribution, to ensure that an implementation on finite




Fig 4: Tradeoff function of 1-GDP as well as the tradeoff function $T(N, N + 1)$, where N is the unique discrete CND for 1-GDP at sensitivity 1.

computers has guaranteed privacy properties (e.g., floating point calculations are vulnerable to privacy attacks: (Mironov, 2012)).

In this section, we propose a definition for a “discrete CND”, which captures the idea that 1) it is an integer-valued distribution, 2) for integer-valued statistics of finite-sensitivity, it can be used to achieve f -DP, 3) the privacy guarantee is “tight”, and 4) a monotone-likelihood ratio property analogous to property 3 in Definition 4.1.

DEFINITION 5.1. Let $\Delta \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$, let f be a symmetric tradeoff function, and let N be a random variable with cdf F . Then F is a discrete CND for f at sensitivity Δ if

1. $T(N, N + t) \geq f$, for all $t \in \{-\Delta, \dots, \Delta\}$,
2. $f(F(t + \Delta)) = F(t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, such that $F(t + \Delta) < 1$,
3. N takes values in \mathbb{Z} , and is symmetric about zero.

Property 1 of Definition 5.1 implies that for an integer-valued statistic $S(X)$, with sensitivity Δ , $T(S(D) + N, S(D') + N) \geq f$ for any adjacent databases D , and D' . Property 2 implies a monotone likelihood ratio property for N , and that the tradeoff function for the discrete CND is “tight” for f . Essentially using the rejection set (t, ∞) , the type I error for $T(N - \Delta, N)$ is $1 - F(t + \Delta)$ and type II error is $F(t)$.

Note that in property 2) of Definition 5.1, the tradeoff function $T(N, N + \Delta)$ only matches f at rejection regions of the form (t, ∞) . In general, this means that the tradeoff function $T(N, N + \Delta)$ agrees with f at the “sharp points,” but may be greater than f at other values of α . See Figure 4 for an illustrative example.

REMARK 5.2. One key difference between Definition 5.1 and Definition 4.1 for continuous CNDs is the dependence on the sensitivity. For continuous CNDs, the sensitivity was not included in the definition, as the noise can simply be scaled up or down according to the sensitivity. However, in the discrete case, scaling affects the support of the distribution. For example, if N takes values on the integers and we try to scale it by 2 to adjust for statistics of sensitivity 2, then $2N$ takes values on the even numbers. In this case, when shifting by a smaller amount, we fail to guarantee f -DP: $T(2N, 2N + 1) = 0$. Instead, the discrete CND must be designed for a specific sensitivity, as indicated in Definition 5.1.

5.1. *Existence, Construction, and Uniqueness of Discrete CNDs.* In Proposition 5.3, we demonstrate that a discrete CND exists for any nontrivial symmetric tradeoff function and any sensitivity, and that we can construct a discrete CND by rounding a re-scaled continuous CND. In the case of sensitivity 1, we show in Proposition 5.6 that the discrete CND is *unique*.

PROPOSITION 5.3 (Existence and Construction via Rounding). *Let N_c be a (continuous) CND for f with cdf F , and let $\Delta \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$. Then $N = \text{round}(\Delta N_c)$, which has cdf $F_N(t) = F_{N_c}(\lfloor t + 1/2 \rfloor / \Delta)$, is a discrete CND for f at sensitivity Δ .*

In particular, combining Proposition 5.3 with Proposition 4.3, we have an explicit construction for a discrete CND, and by using Awan and Vadhan (2023, Proposition F.6), we also have a sampling algorithm for this discrete CND.

EXAMPLE 5.4 (Staircase distribution). In the case of (ϵ, δ) -DP, the discrete CND constructed by rounding the constructed CND of Proposition 4.3 has a staircase shape, which has been identified in other DP literature as a near-optimal distribution (Geng and Viswanath, 2015a; Qin et al., 2022b). The pmf of this distribution is illustrated in Figure 5.

EXAMPLE 5.5 (Discrete CNDs not by Rounding). While Proposition 5.3 tells us that we can construct a discrete CND by rounding a continuous CND, there are also discrete CNDs that do not arise in this manner. Recall that for $(\epsilon, 0)$ -DP, the unique (continuous) CND is the Tulap distribution (Awan and Dong, 2022). It follows that there is a unique discrete CND for $(\epsilon, 0)$ -DP at each ϵ and Δ , which is generated by rounding the continuous CND. However, in the case of $\epsilon = 1$ and $\Delta = 2$, we demonstrate that there is an infinite family of discrete CNDs:

In the case of $\Delta = 2$, constraints 2 and 3 of Definition 5.1 leave only one degree of freedom: the choice of $F(0)$; this is because symmetry enforces that $F(-1) = 1 - F(0)$ and the recurrence of 2 fixes all other values of F . One can then verify that for

$$0.5938455 \approx \frac{2 \exp(\epsilon)}{3 \exp(\epsilon) + 1} \leq F(0) \leq \frac{\exp(\epsilon) + 1}{\exp(\epsilon) + 3} \approx 0.6502446,$$

one obtains a discrete CND for $(1, 0)$ -DP. Since there is more than one discrete CND for $(1, 0)$ -DP at $\Delta = 2$, and there is only one continuous CND for $(1, 0)$ -DP, it follows that not all discrete CNDs are a rounding of continuous CNDs.

Interestingly, for the special case of $\Delta = 1$, Proposition 5.6 below establishes that there is a *unique* discrete CND for a nontrivial symmetric tradeoff function.

PROPOSITION 5.6 (Uniqueness). *If $\Delta = 1$, then there is a unique discrete CND for a symmetric nontrivial tradeoff function f . Furthermore, it can be realized by rounding any (continuous) CND for f , and has pmf $P(N = x) = f^{\circ|x|}(1 - c_f) - f^{\circ|x|}(c_f)$, $x \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

This result follows from the observation that once $F(0)$ is chosen, the recurrence of property 2 of Definition 5.1 fully determines the cdf, and the symmetry via property 3 of Definition 5.1 removes the freedom in the choice of $F(0)$. Note further that combining Propositions 5.3 and 5.6 tells us that rounding any CND (including the one constructed in Proposition 4.3) will result in the unique discrete CND at sensitivity 1.

EXAMPLE 5.7 (Discrete Laplace). The unique discrete CND for $f_{\epsilon, 0}$, with sensitivity 1 is the discrete Laplace / geometric mechanism, with pmf

$$P(N = x) = \frac{\exp(\epsilon) - 1}{\exp(\epsilon) + 1} \exp(-\epsilon|x|), x \in \mathbb{Z}.$$




Fig 5: Discrete staircase distribution, which is a discrete CND for $(1, .05)$ -DP at $\Delta = 6$.

This distribution is well-known in the differential privacy literature, and has been identified as the optimal noise-adding mechanism in pure differential privacy (Ghosh, Roughgarden and Sundararajan, 2012) for count statistics (which have sensitivity 1).

EXAMPLE 5.8 (Rounded Gaussian versus Discrete Gaussian). According to Proposition 5.3, rounding a Gaussian distribution results in a discrete CND for Gaussian-DP (since Gaussian noise is a CND). Furthermore, by Proposition 5.6, the rounded Gaussian is the unique discrete CND at sensitivity 1. The rounded Gaussian has been referred to as the discrete Normal distribution, and has been independently studied in the statistics literature (Roy, 2003), and has pmf $P(N = x) = \Phi((x + 1/2)/\sigma) - \Phi((x - 1/2)/\sigma)$. On the other hand, the Discrete Gaussian distribution (Canonne, Kamath and Steinke, 2020) (also sometimes called the discrete Normal distribution (Kemp, 1997)) has gained popularity as a privacy mechanism, and has been employed in the 2020 Decennial Census. The Discrete Gaussian with parameter $\mu = 0$ and scale parameter σ has pmf

$$P(N = x) = \frac{\exp(-x^2/(2\sigma^2))}{\vartheta_3(0, \exp(-1/(2\sigma^2)))},$$

where $\vartheta_3(0, q) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} q^{k^2}$ is a Jacobi theta function (Szabłowski, 2001).

In this example, we demonstrate that while the Discrete Gaussian distribution with parameter $\sigma^2 = 2/\rho$ satisfies ρ -zCDP for integer-valued statistics of sensitivity 1 (the same zCDP guarantee as the continuous Gaussian mechanism with the same scale parameter, Canonne, Kamath and Steinke, 2020), the discrete Gaussian with $\sigma = 1/\mu$ does not satisfy μ -GDP. For example, with $\mu = \sigma = 1$, and setting $f_{DG} = T(N, N + 1)$, where N is a discrete Gaussian with $\sigma = 1$, we have by the monotone likelihood ratio property of the discrete Gaussian that

$$c_{f_{DG}} = (1/2)(1 - P(N = 0)) = (1/2)(1 - [\vartheta_3(0, \exp(-1/2(\sigma^2)))]^{-1}) \approx 0.301,$$

which is smaller than $c_{G_1} = \Phi(-1/2) \approx 0.309$, which implies that $f_{DG} \not\preceq G_1$; see Figure 6.

REMARK 5.9. While a tradeoff function has a unique discrete CND for sensitivity 1, there may be multiple tradeoff functions with the same discrete CND for sensitivity 1. In




Fig 6: Tradeoff function for $T(N, N + 1)$, where N is a discrete Gaussian distribution with $\mu = 0$ and $\sigma = 1$, against the tradeoff function G_1 , as well as the discrete CND for G_1 at sensitivity 1. Note that $T(N, N + 1)$ is below G_1 at some values, violating the GDP guarantee.

particular, we see from Proposition 5.3 that the discrete CND only depends on $\{f^{on}(1 - c_f)\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ or equivalently $\{f^{on}(c_f)\}_{n=-1}^{\infty}$. So, if two tradeoff functions agree on these points, then they will have the same discrete CND for sensitivity 1.

5.2. Optimality of Discrete CND at Sensitivity 1. In this section, we establish a special case of Theorem 3.3 for integer-valued noise, and show that the unique discrete CND at $\Delta = 1$ matches the bound. Using this result, we establish that the discrete CND at $\Delta = 1$ is stochastically smaller than any other integer-centered discrete noise.

While Theorem 3.3 offers an anti-concentration inequality for any additive noise, the inequality is not enforced at all values of the support. For integer-valued noises for statistics with sensitivity 1, Theorem 3.3 can give an inequality at every integer.

COROLLARY 5.10. *Let N be an integer-valued random variable such that $T(N, N + 1) \geq f$, where f is a nontrivial symmetric tradeoff function. Then for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$,*

$$\sup_{a \in \mathbb{Z}} P(|N - a| \leq t) \leq 1 - 2f^{ot}(c_f).$$

Similar to Lemma 4.4, Lemma 5.11 shows that the unique discrete CND at sensitivity 1 matches the bound of Corollary 5.10.

LEMMA 5.11. *Let N be the unique discrete CND for a symmetric nontrivial tradeoff function f at sensitivity $\Delta = 1$. Then for $t \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$, $P(|N| \leq t) = 1 - 2f^{ot}(c_f)$.*

It follows from Lemma 5.11 that the unique discrete CND is stochastically smaller than any alternative DP noise, a similar result to Theorem 4.12.

THEOREM 5.12. *[Stochastic Optimality of Discrete CND for Sensitivity 1] Let N be the unique discrete CND for a symmetric nontrivial tradeoff function f at sensitivity $\Delta = 1$, and let N' be any integer-valued random variable such that $T(N', N' + 1) \geq f$. Then, $|N' - a|$ stochastically dominates $|N|$ for all $a \in \mathbb{Z}$. This implies that,*

- $P(|N| \leq t) \geq P(|N' - a| \leq t)$ for all $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ and all $t \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$,
- For any non-decreasing function ϕ , $\mathbb{E}_N \phi(|N|) \leq \mathbb{E}_{N'} \phi(|N' - a|)$ for all $a \in \mathbb{Z}$,
- There exists a non-negative, integer-valued, random variable W such that $|N'| \stackrel{d}{=} |N| + W$.
If N' is symmetric about zero, then $N' \stackrel{d}{=} N + \text{sign}(N) \cdot W$.

Theorem 5.12 is similar to the results of Ghosh, Roughgarden and Sundararajan (2012). The key differences are 1) our results are for general f -DP instead of only $(\epsilon, 0)$ -DP, and 2) our results are phrased in terms of stochastic dominance rather than universal utility maximizers. In the case of $(\epsilon, 0)$ -DP both our Theorem 5.12 and the results of Ghosh, Roughgarden and Sundararajan (2012) suggest that the discrete Laplace mechanism, discussed in Example 5.7 is the optimal discrete noise for count statistics.

EXAMPLE 5.13. Let T be an integer-valued statistic with sensitivity 1. Suppose that we are considering two privacy mechanisms $M_1(X) = T(X) + N$ and $M_2(X) = T(X) + N'$, where N is the discrete CND for f at sensitivity 1 and N' is another noise distribution satisfying $T(N', N' + 1) \geq f$.

- Let ψ be a symmetric loss function, which is increasing away from zero (e.g., $\psi(x) = |x|$ or $\psi(x) = x^2$). Then by Theorem 5.12 $\mathbb{E}\psi(M_1(X) - T(X)) \leq \mathbb{E}\psi(M_2(X) - T(X))$. This is a similar result to Ghosh, Roughgarden and Sundararajan (2012); Geng and Viswanath (2015a), indicating that the discrete CND at sensitivity 1 is a universal utility optimizer.
- If $\mathbb{E}(N') = 0$, then $\text{Var}(N) \leq \text{Var}(N')$, by taking $\phi(x) = x^2$ in Theorem 5.12.

EXAMPLE 5.14 (Rounded Gaussian versus Discrete Gaussian, continued). In Example 5.8, we saw that the discrete Gaussian with $\sigma = 1/\mu$ does not satisfy μ -GDP for sensitivity 1 statistics. Even if there were a different scale parameter $\sigma(\mu)$, for which the discrete Gaussian does satisfy μ -GDP, Theorem 5.12 tells us that the rounded Gaussian, the discrete CND at sensitivity 1 for μ -GDP, will be stochastically smaller than the discrete Gaussian.

EXAMPLE 5.15 (Non-integer-valued center). If the noise N' in Theorem 5.12 does not have an integer-valued mean, then the results of Theorem 5.12 no longer imply that $\text{Var}(N) \leq \text{Var}(N')$. Recall that $U(-1, 1)$ is a CND for $f_{0,1/2}$ (Awan and Dong, 2022). Then $N = \text{round}(U)$ is the discrete CND for $f_{0,\delta}$ at sensitivity 1 and $N' = \text{floor}(U)$ is another integer-valued noise distribution which satisfies $T(N', N' + 1) \geq f$ by postprocessing. We can calculate that $P(N = -1) = P(N = 1) = 1/4$, $P(N = 0) = 1/2$ and $P(N' = 0) = P(N' = -1) = 1/2$. From this, we see that $\text{Var}(N) = 1/2 > 1/4 = \text{Var}(N')$. This counter-example demonstrates that the result of Theorem 5.12 cannot be extended to permit non-integer values of a , and that the variance may not be minimized by the discrete CND at sensitivity 1 if a competing discrete noise has a non-integer mean.

EXAMPLE 5.16 (Non-optimality for continuous CNDs). While Theorem 5.12 may seem intuitive, it is worth pointing out that the analogous result does *not* hold for continuous CNDs. Recall that $\text{Tulap}(0, e^{-\epsilon}, 0)$ is the unique CND for $f_{\epsilon,0}$ (Awan and Dong, 2022). Recall further that $L \sim \text{Laplace}(1/\epsilon)$ is an additive mechanism that can be used to satisfy $f_{\epsilon,0}$ -DP. However, there is no stochastic dominance relationship between Tulap and Laplace. For example, at $\epsilon = 5$, the variance of the Tulap is ≈ 0.097 , whereas the variance of the Laplace is ≈ 0.08 . On the other hand, $P(|N| \leq 1/2)$ is equal to $(\exp(\epsilon) - 1)/(\exp(\epsilon) + 1) \approx .987$ for Tulap and $1 - \exp(-\epsilon/2) \approx .918$ for Laplace. Furthermore, Geng and Viswanath (2015a) derived the minimum variance and minimum mean absolute error additive (continuous) mechanisms for $(\epsilon, 0)$ -DP, which are not canonical noise distributions. So, while a (continuous) CND optimizes the privacy budget, and matches the anti-concentration inequality (Lemma 4.4) at half-integer values, it does not necessarily optimize other objectives.

6. Conclusions. Additive noise is one of the most fundamental techniques to achieve differential privacy, often either being employed by itself, or as part of a more complex privacy mechanism. Due to this, it is essential to understand the limits of what types of noise can be used to achieve differential privacy, and to optimize the noise.

In this paper, we have explored the constraints of noise distributions under differential privacy, establishing upper bounds on the amount of mass that can be concentrated near the center of the distribution. We showed that canonical noise distributions (CNDs) match these bounds, which leads to their near-optimality. To address integer-valued statistics, we proposed a definition of a discrete CND which extended the original canonical noise distribution definition. We showed that discrete CNDs always exist and give an explicit construction. In the case that they are being added to a statistic of sensitivity 1, we showed that the discrete CND is unique and the smallest of any other integer-centered discrete noise.

6.1. Limitations and Future Work. For continuous additive noise, the upper bounds on anti-concentration hold only in half-integer values. It would be worth exploring whether other bounds can be derived at other values. Alternatively, it would be interesting to investigate specific objective criteria, such as mean squared error, or mean absolute error, which have not been studied in the f -DP framework.

The investigations of this paper were limited to univariate noise distributions. Future researchers may develop a multivariate extension to Lemma 3.1, and explore whether there are optimality properties of the multivariate CNDs proposed by [Awan and Dong \(2022\)](#).

In terms of discrete noise, our definition of a discrete CND imposed that the distribution be symmetric about zero. The optimality result of Theorem 5.12 also only compared against other noise distributions centered at an integer value. Future research could weaken the discrete CND definition to not require symmetry about zero. While introducing a bias, this would allow for a wider range of noise mechanisms to be considered.

We also point out that the optimality of the discrete CND, Theorem 5.12, only applies in the sensitivity 1 case. Near-optimality results similar to Corollaries 4.5 and 4.7 can likely be derived for the discrete CND when when sensitivity is greater than 1.

While this paper focused on additive noise mechanisms, our results can be used to optimize the performance of more complex mechanisms which use noise addition as an intermediate step (e.g., stochastic gradient descent ([Abadi et al., 2016](#)), objective perturbation ([Chaudhuri, Monteleoni and Sarwate, 2011](#); [Kifer, Smith and Thakurta, 2012](#))). Future researchers may investigate these privacy mechanisms to determine whether optimizing the additive noise distributions results in improved performance of the complete privacy mechanism.

APPENDIX: PROOFS AND TECHNICAL DETAILS

In this section, we include the proofs and technical details for the results in the paper.

LEMMA 2.2. *Let f be a symmetric tradeoff function. Then*

1. $c_f \in [0, 1/2]$ and if f is nontrivial then $c_f \in [0, 1/2)$,
2. if $f = T(P, Q)$, then $\text{TV}(P, Q) = 1 - 2c_f$,
3. $f_{0, (1-2c_f)} \leq f \leq f_{\epsilon_f, 0}$, where $\epsilon_f = \log\left(\frac{1-c_f}{c_f}\right)$.

PROOF. 1. Since $f(0) = 0$, $f(1) \geq 0$, and f is an increasing convex function, it follows that there is a unique solution $f(1 - c_f) = c_f$. Since $f(\alpha) \leq \alpha$, it follows that $c_f \in [0, 1/2]$. Furthermore, if $c_f = 1/2$, then by convexity, it follows that $f(\alpha) = \alpha$ for all α , implying that it is not nontrivial.

2. Recall the equivalence between total variation and $f_{0,\delta}$: if δ is the smallest value such that $f_{0,\delta} \leq f$, then $\text{TV}(P, Q) = \delta$. Recall that the $f_{0,\delta}$ curves have slope 1 and have value $1 - \delta$ at $\alpha = 1$. Since f is symmetric, we see that the tightest $f_{0,\delta}$ curve supports f at the point $(1 - c_f, c_f)$. We calculate that the line with point $(1 - c_f, c_f)$ with slope 1 has value $2c_f$ at $\alpha = 1$. We conclude that $\text{TV}(P, Q) = 1 - 2c_f$.
3. It is clear that $f_{0,1-2c_f}$ has fixed point c_f . For $f_{\epsilon,0}$, we can calculate that $c_\epsilon = (1 + e^\epsilon)^{-1}$, which implies that $\epsilon = \log\left(\frac{1-c_\epsilon}{c_\epsilon}\right)$. Finally, since all tradeoff functions are convex, non-decreasing, and $f(0) = 0$, it follows that $f_{\log((1-c_f)/c_f),0}$ is the highest tradeoff function with fixed point c_f , and $f_{0,1-2c_f}$ is the smallest tradeoff function with fixed point c_f . \square

LEMMA A.1. [Lemma A.5: [Awan and Dong, 2022](#)] Let F be a *CND* for a nontrivial symmetric tradeoff function f . Then $F(k \cdot)$ is a *CND* for $f^{\circ k}$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$.

LEMMA A.2. Let f be a nontrivial tradeoff function, and let $t \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$. Then

$$c_{f^{\circ t}} = \begin{cases} f^{\circ k}(c_f) & \text{if } t = 2k + 1 \\ f^{\circ k}(1/2) & \text{if } t = 2k. \end{cases}$$

PROOF. Let F_f be the constructed *CND* for f , by Proposition 4.3. Then by Lemma A.1, we know that $F_f(t \cdot)$ is a *CND* for $f^{\circ t}$. By construction, we have that $F_f(-t/2) = c_{f^{\circ t}}$. Using the recursive definition in Proposition 4.3, we can also write

$$\begin{aligned} c_{f^{\circ t}} &= F_f(-t/2) \\ &= \begin{cases} F_f(-k - 1/2) & \text{if } t = 2k + 1 \\ F_f(-k) & \text{if } t = 2k \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} f^{\circ k}(F_f(-1/2)) & \text{if } t = 2k + 1 \\ f^{\circ k}(F_f(0)) & \text{if } t = 2k \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} f^{\circ k}(c_f) & \text{if } t = 2k + 1 \\ f^{\circ k}(1/2) & \text{if } t = 2k, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where we substituted $F_f(-1/2) = c_f$ and $F_f(0) = 1/2$ by Proposition 4.3. \square

LEMMA 3.1. [Anti-Concentration] Let N be a real-valued random variable. Then for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}$, $\sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} P(-t/2 < N - a \leq t/2) \leq \text{TV}(N, N + t)$.

PROOF. Let $a \in \mathbb{R}$ be given. Let $N' \stackrel{d}{=} N - a$. For the hypothesis $H_0 : N'$ versus $H_1 : N' + t$, consider the following rejection region $(t/2, \infty)$. The type I and type II errors are $P(N' > t/2)$ and $P(N' + t \leq t/2) = P(N' \leq -t/2)$ respectively. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(A.1)} \quad & P(-t/2 < N - a \leq t/2) = P(-t/2 < N' \leq t/2) \\ \text{(A.2)} \quad & = 1 - P(N' > t/2) - P(N' \leq -t/2) \\ \text{(A.3)} \quad & = 1 - \text{type I} - \text{type II} \\ \text{(A.4)} \quad & \leq \text{TV}(N', N' + t) \\ \text{(A.5)} \quad & = \text{TV}(N, N + t) \end{aligned}$$

where (A.4) uses the inequality: type I + type II $\geq 1 - \text{TV}(N', N' + t)$, and (A.5) uses the fact that total variation is translation-invariant. \square

LEMMA A.3 (Lemma A.5: Dong, Roth and Su, 2022). *Let f and g be tradeoff functions. If $T(P, Q) \geq f$ and $T(Q, R) \geq g$, then $T(P, R) \geq g \circ f$.*

LEMMA A.4. *Let N be a real-valued random variable, and call $f = T(N, N + 1)$ (not necessarily symmetric). Then for $t \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$, $T(N, N + t) \geq f^{\circ t}$, where the notation $f^{\circ k}$ represents $f \circ \dots \circ f$, where f appears k times.*

PROOF. We consider the sequence of tradeoff functions $T(N, N + 1), T(N + 1, N + 2), \dots, T(N + t - 1, N + t)$, which all have the tradeoff function $T(N, N + 1) \geq f$. By Dong, Roth and Su (2022, Lemma A.5), $T(N, N + t) \geq f^{\circ t}$. \square

THEOREM 3.3. [Anti-Concentration for Additive Noise] *Let N be a random variable such that $T(N, N + 1) \geq f$ for a symmetric nontrivial tradeoff function f . Then for $t \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$,*

$$\sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} P(-t/2 < N - a \leq t/2) \leq \begin{cases} 1 - 2f^{\circ k}(c_f) & \text{if } t = 2k + 1 \\ 1 - 2f^{\circ k}(1/2) & \text{if } t = 2k, \end{cases}$$

where the notation $f^{\circ k}$ represents $f \circ \dots \circ f$, where f appears k times.

PROOF. We begin with Lemma 3.1:

$$(A.6) \quad \sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} P(-t/2 < N - a \leq t/2) \leq \text{TV}(N, N + t)$$

$$(A.7) \quad \leq 1 - 2c_{f^{\circ t}}$$

$$(A.8) \quad = \begin{cases} 1 - 2f^{\circ k}(c_f) & \text{if } t = 2k + 1 \\ 1 - 2f^{\circ k}(1/2) & \text{if } t = 2k, \end{cases}$$

where (A.7) uses Lemma A.4 to lower bound $T(N, N + t) \geq f^{\circ t}$ and property 2 of Lemma 2.2 to get $\text{TV}(N, N + t) \leq 1 - 2c_{f^{\circ t}}$. Finally, (A.8) applies Lemma A.2. \square

LEMMA A.5. *Let F be a CND for a symmetric nontrivial tradeoff function f . Then $F(-1/2) = c_f$.*

PROOF. Let $N \sim F$.

- (Case 1) If $F(-1/2) = 0$, then by symmetry we have that $F(1/2) = 1$. Consider the rejection region $[1/2, \infty)$ to test $T(N, N + 1)$, which has type I error $P(N > 1/2) = 1 - F(1/2) = 0$ and type II error $P(N + 1 < 1/2) = P(N < -1/2) = F(-1/2) = 0$. We see that the tradeoff function includes the point $(1 - 0, 0)$, implying that $T(N, N + 1) = 0$. This implies that $c_f = 0 = F(-1/2)$.
- (Case 2) Suppose that $F(-1/2) > 0$, which implies that $F(1/2) < 1$. Then, by Lemma 4.2, we have that $F(-1/2) = f(F(1/2)) = f(1 - F(-1/2))$ by symmetry. We see that $F(-1/2) = c_f$, since this is the unique solution to $c_f = f(1 - c_f)$. \square

LEMMA 4.4. *Let f be a symmetric, nontrivial tradeoff function, and let $N \sim F_N$ be a CND for f . Then for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$,*

$$P(|N| \leq t/2) = \begin{cases} 1 - 2f^{\circ k}(c_f) & \text{if } t = 2k + 1 \\ 1 - 2f^{\circ k}(1/2) & \text{if } t = 2k. \end{cases}$$

PROOF. We calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
P(|N| \leq t/2) &= P(-t/2 \leq N \leq t/2) \\
&= 1 - 2F_N(-t/2) \\
&= 1 - 2 \begin{cases} f^{\circ k}(F_N(-1/2)) & \text{if } t = 2k + 1 \\ f^{\circ k}(F_N(0)) & \text{if } t = 2k \end{cases} \\
&= \begin{cases} 1 - 2f^{\circ k}(c_f) & \text{if } t = 2k + 1 \\ 1 - 2f^{\circ k}(1/2) & \text{if } t = 2k, \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we used Lemma A.5 to replace $F_N(-1/2) = c_f$, and symmetry to justify that $F_N(0) = 1/2$. \square

COROLLARY 4.5. *Let f be a symmetric, nontrivial tradeoff function. Let $N \sim F$ be a CND for f , and let N' be a random variable such that $T(N', N' + 1) \geq f$. Then for every $t \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$,*

$$P(|N| \leq t/2) \geq \sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} P(-t/2 < N' - a \leq t/2).$$

PROOF. The result follows by combining Lemma 4.4 with Theorem 3.3. \square

COROLLARY 4.7. *Let f be a symmetric, nontrivial tradeoff function. Let $N \sim F$ be a CND for f , and let N' be a random variable such that $T(N', N' + 1) \geq f$. Then,*

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}} \left(\frac{\sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} P(-t < N' - a \leq t)}{P(|N| \leq t + 1/2)} \right) \leq 1.$$

PROOF. We reparametrize the problem in terms of $s = 2t$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}} \left(\frac{\sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} P(-s/2 < N' \leq s/2)}{P(|N| \leq (s + 1)/2)} \right) &\leq \sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}} \left(\frac{\sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} P(-\lceil s \rceil/2 < N' \leq \lceil s \rceil/2)}{P(|N| \leq \lceil s \rceil/2)} \right) \\
&\leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}} \left(\frac{\sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} P(-n/2 < N' \leq n/2)}{P(|N| \leq n/2)} \right) \\
&\leq 1,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the facts that $s \leq \lceil s \rceil$ and $s + 1 \geq \lceil s \rceil$, we reparametrized the supremum in terms of $n = \lceil s \rceil$, and the final inequality follows from Corollary 4.5. \square

Lemma A.6 is a condition to establish that a random variable is sub-exponential.

LEMMA A.6 (Bernstein Condition). *If $\mathbb{E}|X - \mu|^k \leq \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2\alpha^{k-2}k!$, for all $k \geq 2$, then*

1. $\mathbb{E} \exp(\lambda(X - \mu)) \leq \exp\left(\frac{\lambda^2\sigma^2}{2(1-\alpha|\lambda|)}\right)$ for all $|\lambda| < 1/\alpha$, and
2. X is $(\sigma^2/2, \alpha/2)$ -sub-exponential.

PROOF. Part 1 is proved in Zhang and Chen (2020, Corollary 5.2). For part 2, let $\lambda < 1/2\alpha$. Then, $1/(1 - \alpha|\lambda|) < 2$. With part 1, we have $\mathbb{E} \exp(\lambda(X - \mu)) < \exp(\sigma^2\lambda^2)$. \square

THEOREM 4.8. *Let f be a symmetric nontrivial tradeoff function and let $N \sim F$ be a CND for f . Set $\epsilon_f = \log((1 - c_f)/c_f)$. Then the following hold:*

1. $P(|N| > t) \leq \exp(-\epsilon \lfloor t \rfloor) \leq \exp(-\epsilon_f(t-1))$
2. $\mathbb{E}|N|^n \leq \epsilon_f^{-n} \exp(\epsilon_f)n!$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$
3. N is $(2 \exp(\epsilon_f)/\epsilon_f, 2/\epsilon_f)$ -sub-exponential.

PROOF. 1. Recall, by part 3 of Lemma 2.2, that $f \leq f_{\epsilon_f,0}$, where $\epsilon_f = \log\left(\frac{1-c_f}{c_f}\right)$. Then, $f(1/2) \leq f_{\epsilon_f,0}(1/2) = (1/2) \exp(-\epsilon_f)$, since $c_f \leq 1/2$. Recall that by Lemma 4.2 and symmetry, all CNDs satisfy $F_N(-z) = f^{\circ z}(F(0)) = f^{\circ z}(1/2)$ for $z \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$. So,

$$F_N(-z) = f^{\circ z}(1/2) \leq f_{\epsilon_f,0}^{\circ z}(1/2) = (1/2)(\exp(-\epsilon_f))^z = (1/2) \exp(-\epsilon_f z).$$

Now let $t \geq 0$ (not necessarily an integer). Then,

$$(A.9) \quad P(|N| > t) \leq P(|N| > \lfloor t \rfloor)$$

$$(A.10) \quad = 2F_N(-\lfloor t \rfloor)$$

$$(A.11) \quad \leq 2(1/2) \exp(-\epsilon_f \lfloor t \rfloor)$$

$$(A.12) \quad \leq \exp(-\epsilon_f(t-1)),$$

where (A.10) used symmetry of CNDs and (A.11) used our earlier result.

2. Next, we calculate for $n \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$,

$$(A.13) \quad \mathbb{E}|N|^n = \int_0^\infty nx^{n-1}P(|N| > x) dx$$

$$(A.14) \quad \leq \int_0^\infty nx^{n-1} \exp(-\epsilon_f(x-1)) dx$$

$$(A.15) \quad = \epsilon_f^{-1} \exp(\epsilon_f)n \mathbb{E}X^{n-1}, \quad \text{where } X \sim \text{Exp}(\epsilon_f)$$

$$(A.16) \quad = \epsilon_f^{-1} \exp(\epsilon_f)n \cdot (n-1)! \epsilon_f^{-(n-1)}$$

$$(A.17) \quad = \epsilon_f^{-n} \exp(\epsilon_f)n!,$$

where (A.13) uses Ross (2019, Self-Test Exercise 7.20). By Jensen's inequality, we also have $|\mathbb{E}N^n| \leq \frac{\exp(\epsilon_f)n!}{\epsilon_f^n}$.

3. Recall that the Bernstein condition for mean-zero sub-exponential random variables states that if $|\mathbb{E}N^n| \leq (1/2)n!\sigma^2b^{n-2}$, then N is $(2\sigma^2, 2b)$ -sub-exponential. Comparing our result with this, we see that the CND N is $(2 \exp(\epsilon_f)/\epsilon_f, 2/\epsilon_f)$ -sub-exponential. \square

LEMMA 4.10. *Let $\{f_t | t \geq 0\}$ be an infinitely divisible collection of tradeoff functions, and let F be the log-concave CND for f_1 . Then, for $t \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}$, $F(-t) = f_t(1/2) = c_{f_{2t}}$.*

PROOF. Recall that $F_t(\cdot) := F(t \cdot)$ is a CND for f_t (Awan and Dong, 2022). Since $F(0) = 1/2$, we have that $F(-t) = F_t(-1) = f_t(1/2)$. It remains to establish the connection with $c_{f_{2t}}$.

Case 1: If $f_t(1/2) = 0$, then by symmetry of f_t , we have that $f_t(1) \leq 1/2$. It follows that

$$f_{2t}(1-0) = f_t^{\circ 2}(1) \leq f_t(1/2) = 0.$$

Since tradeoff functions are non-negative, we have that $f_{2t}(1-0) = 0$ and conclude $c_{f_{2t}} = 0 = f_t(1/2)$.

Case 2: If $f_t(1/2) > 0$, then consider the following:

$$(A.18) \quad f_{2t}(1 - f_t(1/2)) = f_t^{\circ 2}(1 - F_t(-1))$$

$$(A.19) \quad = f_t^{\circ 2}(F_t(1))$$

$$(A.20) \quad = F_t(-1)$$

$$(A.21) \quad = F(-t)$$

$$(A.22) \quad = f_t(1/2),$$

where in (A.20), we use the fact that $F_t(1) = 1 - F_t(-1) = 1 - F(-t) = 1 - f_t(1/2) < 1$ and apply the recursion Lemma 4.2 of CNDs. \square

THEOREM 4.12. *Let $\{f_t | t \geq 0\}$ be an infinitely divisible collection of tradeoff functions, and let F be the (unique) log-concave CND for f_1 . Let $N \sim F$ and let N' be any random variable such that $T(N', N' + t) \geq f_t$ for $t \geq 0$. Then $|N' - a|$ stochastically dominates $|N|$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$. It follows that*

- $P(|N| \leq t) \geq P(|N' - a| \leq t)$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $t \in \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$,
- For any non-decreasing function ϕ , $\mathbb{E}_N \phi(|N|) \leq \mathbb{E}_{N'} \phi(|N' - a|)$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$,
- There exists a non-negative, random variable W such that $|N'| \stackrel{d}{=} |N| + W$. If N' is symmetric about zero, then $N' \stackrel{d}{=} N + \text{sign}(N) \cdot W$.

PROOF. Let $t \in \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ and let $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Then,

$$(A.23) \quad P(|N' - a| < t) \leq P(-t < N' - a \leq t)$$

$$(A.24) \quad \leq \text{TV}(N', N' + 2t)$$

$$(A.25) \quad \leq 1 - 2c_{f_{2t}}$$

$$(A.26) \quad = 1 - 2F_N(-t)$$

$$(A.27) \quad = -F(-t) + F(t)$$

$$(A.28) \quad = P(|N| < t),$$

where in (A.24) we apply Lemma 3.1, in (A.25) we use the assumption that $T(N', N' + 2t) \geq f_{2t}$ which implies that $\text{TV}(N', N' + 2t) \leq 1 - 2c_{f_{2t}}$, in (A.26) we use Lemma 4.10, and (A.27) and (A.28) use the symmetry and continuity of F_N . Finally, we have that

$$P(|N' - a| \leq t) = \lim_{s \downarrow t} P(|N' - a| < s) \leq \lim_{s \downarrow t} P(|N| < s) = P(|N| \leq t).$$

The other statements follow as standard properties of stochastic dominance. \square

PROPOSITION 5.3 (Existence and Construction via Rounding). *Let N_c be a (continuous) CND for f with cdf F , and let $\Delta \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$. Then $N = \text{round}(\Delta N_c)$, which has cdf $F_N(t) = F_{N_c}(\lfloor t + 1/2 \rfloor / \Delta)$, is a discrete CND for f at sensitivity Δ .*

PROOF. Property 1 of Definition 5.1 follows from fact that $T(\Delta N_c, \Delta N_c + \Delta) \geq f$ and the postprocessing property of tradeoff functions. For property 2 of Definition 5.1, note that

$$\begin{aligned} P(N = x) &= P(x - 1/2 \leq \Delta N_c \leq x + 1/2) \\ &= F_{\Delta N_c}(x + 1/2) - F_{\Delta N_c}(x - 1/2). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $F_N(t) = P(N \leq t) = F_{\Delta N_c}(t + 1/2)$ for all integers t . By Lemma 4.2, we know that $f(F_{N_c}(t + 1)) = F_{N_c}(t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $F_{N_c}(t + 1) < 1$, or equivalently, $f(F_{\Delta N_c}(t + \Delta)) = F_{\Delta N_c}(t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $F_{\Delta N_c}(t + \Delta) < 1$. Property 3 follows immediately from the symmetry of N_c . \square

PROPOSITION 5.6 (Uniqueness). *If $\Delta = 1$, then there is a unique discrete CND for a symmetric nontrivial tradeoff function f . Furthermore, it can be realized by rounding any (continuous) CND for f , and has pmf $P(N = x) = f^{\circ|x|}(1 - c_f) - f^{\circ|x|}(c_f)$, $x \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

PROOF. Properties 2 and 3 of Definition 5.1 uniquely determine the cdf, so there is at most one discrete CND. Since Proposition 5.3 established that the rounding of any continuous CND gives a discrete CND, which must be the unique discrete CND at sensitivity 1.

Let N_c be any CND for f . Note that $F_{N_c}(1/2) = 1 - c_f$ and $F_{N_c}(-1/2) = c_f$, by Lemma A.5. By the recursion in Lemma 4.2 it follows that for an integer $x \leq 0$, $F_{N_c}(x + 1/2) = f^{\circ x}(1 - c_f)$ and $F_{N_c}(x - 1/2) = f^{\circ x}(c_f)$. Using the expression from the proof of Proposition 5.3, we have that for an integer $x \leq 0$,

$$P(N = x - 1) = F_{N_c}(x - 1 + 1/2) - F_{N_c}(x - 1 - 1/2) = f^{\circ x}(1 - c_f) - f^{\circ x}(c_f).$$

Finally, we have that $P(N = x)$ is symmetric with the desired formula:

$$\begin{aligned} P(N = -x) &= F_{N_c}(-x + 1/2) - F_{N_c}(-x - 1/2) \\ &= 1 - F_{N_c}(x - 1/2) - 1 + F_{N_c}(x + 1/2) \\ &= F_{N_c}(x + 1/2) - F_{N_c}(x - 1/2) \\ &= P(N = x), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that F_{N_c} is symmetric (i.e., $F(-x) = 1 - F(x)$). \square

COROLLARY 5.10. *Let N be an integer-valued random variable such that $T(N, N + 1) \geq f$, where f is a nontrivial symmetric tradeoff function. Then for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$,*

$$\sup_{a \in \mathbb{Z}} P(|N - a| \leq t) \leq 1 - 2f^{\circ t}(c_f).$$

PROOF. Since N takes integer values, we can write

$$\sup_{a \in \mathbb{Z}} P(|N - a| \leq t) = \sup_{a \in \mathbb{Z}} P\left(- (2t + 1)/2 < N - a \leq (2t + 1)/2\right) \leq 1 - 2f^{\circ t}(c_f),$$

where the inequality uses Theorem 3.3. \square

LEMMA 5.11. *Let N be the unique discrete CND for a symmetric nontrivial tradeoff function f at sensitivity $\Delta = 1$. Then for $t \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$, $P(|N| \leq t) = 1 - 2f^{\circ t}(c_f)$.*

PROOF. Let F_f be the CND constructed in Proposition 4.3, and recall that $F_N(t) = F_f(t + 1/2)$ for $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, by Proposition 5.6. Then,

$$(A.29) \quad P(|N| \leq t) = P(-t \leq N \leq t)$$

$$(A.30) \quad = 1 - 2F_f(-t - 1/2)$$

$$(A.31) \quad = 1 - 2f^{\circ t}(F(-1/2))$$

$$(A.32) \quad = 1 - 2f^{\circ t}(c_f),$$

where in (A.30), we use the fact that F_f is the cdf of a symmetric continuous random variable, in (A.31) we use the recurrence in Proposition 4.3, and in (A.32) we use the construction in Proposition 4.3 that $F_f(-1/2) = c_f$. \square

THEOREM 5.12. [*Stochastic Optimality of Discrete CND for Sensitivity 1*] Let N be the unique discrete CND for a symmetric nontrivial tradeoff function f at sensitivity $\Delta = 1$, and let N' be any integer-valued random variable such that $T(N', N' + 1) \geq f$. Then, $|N' - a|$ stochastically dominates $|N|$ for all $a \in \mathbb{Z}$. This implies that,

- $P(|N| \leq t) \geq P(|N' - a| \leq t)$ for all $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ and all $t \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$,
- For any non-decreasing function ϕ , $\mathbb{E}_N \phi(|N|) \leq \mathbb{E}_{N'} \phi(|N' - a|)$ for all $a \in \mathbb{Z}$,
- There exists a non-negative, integer-valued, random variable W such that $|N'| \stackrel{d}{=} |N| + W$.
If N' is symmetric about zero, then $N' \stackrel{d}{=} N + \text{sign}(N) \cdot W$.

PROOF. Let $t \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$. Then, $\sup_{a \in \mathbb{Z}} P(|N' - a| \leq t) \leq 1 - 2f^{ot}(c_f) = P(|N| \leq t)$, where the inequality used Corollary 5.10 and the equality used Lemma 5.11. The first two bullets follow from properties of stochastic dominance. Using $a = 0$, we get the third bullet. \square

Acknowledgments. We are thankful to Zhanyu Wang for feedback and discussion on an early draft of this manuscript.

Funding. This work was supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. SES-2150615.

REFERENCES

- ABADI, M., CHU, A., GOODFELLOW, I., MCMAHAN, H. B., MIRONOV, I., TALWAR, K. and ZHANG, L. (2016). Deep learning with differential privacy. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security* 308–318.
- ABOWD, J. M. (2018). The US Census Bureau adopts differential privacy. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining* 2867–2867.
- AGARWAL, N., KAIROUZ, P. and LIU, Z. (2021). The Skellam mechanism for differentially private federated learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **34** 5052–5064.
- AGARWAL, N., SURESH, A. T., YU, F. X. X., KUMAR, S. and MCMAHAN, B. (2018). cpSGD: Communication-efficient and differentially-private distributed SGD. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **31**.
- AWAN, J. and DONG, J. (2022). Log-concave and multivariate canonical noise distributions for differential privacy. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **35** 34229–34240.
- AWAN, J. and SLAVKOVIĆ, A. (2018). Differentially private uniformly most powerful tests for binomial data. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **31**.
- AWAN, J. and VADHAN, S. (2023). Canonical noise distributions and private hypothesis tests. *Annals of Statistics* **51** 547–572.
- BUN, M. and STEINKE, T. (2016). Concentrated differential privacy: Simplifications, extensions, and lower bounds. In *Theory of Cryptography Conference* 635–658. Springer.
- CANONNE, C. L., KAMATH, G. and STEINKE, T. (2020). The discrete Gaussian for differential privacy. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **33** 15676–15688.
- CHAUDHURI, K., MONTELEONI, C. and SARWATE, A. D. (2011). Differentially private empirical risk minimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **12**.
- DONG, J. (2020). Gaussian differential privacy and related techniques, PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania.
- DONG, J., ROTH, A. and SU, W. J. (2022). Gaussian differential privacy. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* **84** 3–37.
- DWORK, C., MCSHERRY, F., NISSIM, K. and SMITH, A. (2006a). Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis. In *Theory of cryptography conference* 265–284. Springer.
- DWORK, C., KENTHAPADI, K., MCSHERRY, F., MIRONOV, I. and NAOR, M. (2006b). Our data, ourselves: Privacy via distributed noise generation. In *Advances in Cryptology-EUROCRYPT 2006: 24th Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques, St. Petersburg, Russia, May 28-June 1, 2006. Proceedings* 25 486–503. Springer.
- ERLINGSSON, Ú., PIHUR, V. and KOROLOVA, A. (2014). Rappor: Randomized aggregatable privacy-preserving ordinal response. In *Proceedings of the 2014 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security* 1054–1067.

- FELDMAN, V. and ZRNIC, T. (2021). Individual privacy accounting via a Rényi filter. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **34** 28080–28091.
- GENG, Q. and VISWANATH, P. (2015a). The optimal noise-adding mechanism in differential privacy. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **62** 925–951.
- GENG, Q. and VISWANATH, P. (2015b). Optimal noise adding mechanisms for approximate differential privacy. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **62** 952–969.
- GHOSH, A., ROUGHGARDEN, T. and SUNDARARAJAN, M. (2012). Universally utility-maximizing privacy mechanisms. *SIAM Journal on Computing* **41** 1673–1693.
- GUPTA, M. and SUNDARARAJAN, M. (2010). Universally optimal privacy mechanisms for minimax agents. In *Proceedings of the twenty-ninth ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART symposium on Principles of database systems* 135–146.
- KEMP, A. W. (1997). Characterizations of a discrete normal distribution. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* **63** 223–229.
- KIFER, D., SMITH, A. and THAKURTA, A. (2012). Private convex empirical risk minimization and high-dimensional regression. In *Conference on Learning Theory* 25–1. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings.
- KOSKELA, A., TOBABEN, M. and HONKELA, A. (2022). Individual privacy accounting with Gaussian differential privacy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.15596*.
- KRISHNAPUR, M. (2016). Anti-concentration inequalities. *Lecture notes*.
- LEVY, H. (1992). Stochastic dominance and expected utility: Survey and analysis. *Management science* **38** 555–593.
- MCSherry, F. and TALWAR, K. (2007). Mechanism design via differential privacy. In *48th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'07)* 94–103. IEEE.
- MIRONOV, I. (2012). On significance of the least significant bits for differential privacy. In *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM conference on Computer and communications security* 650–661.
- MIRONOV, I. (2017). Rényi differential privacy. In *2017 IEEE 30th computer security foundations symposium (CSF)* 263–275. IEEE.
- NIELSEN, F. and OKAMURA, K. (2022). On f -divergences between Cauchy distributions. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*.
- QIN, S., HE, J., FANG, C. and LAM, J. (2022a). Differential private discrete noise adding mechanism: Conditions and properties. In *2022 American Control Conference (ACC)* 946–951. IEEE.
- QIN, S., HE, J., FANG, C. and LAM, J. (2022b). Differential private discrete noise adding mechanism: Conditions, properties and optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.10323*.
- REIMHERR, M. and AWAN, J. (2019). Elliptical perturbations for differential privacy. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **32**.
- ROGERS, R. M., ROTH, A., ULLMAN, J. and VADHAN, S. (2016). Privacy odometers and filters: Pay-as-you-go composition. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **29**.
- ROSS, S. (2019). *First Course in Probability*, A, 10th ed. Pearson Higher Ed.
- ROY, D. (2003). The discrete normal distribution. *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods* **32** 1871–1883.
- SORIA-COMAS, J. and DOMINGO-FERRER, J. (2013). Optimal data-independent noise for differential privacy. *Information Sciences* **250** 200–214.
- SZABŁOWSKI, P. J. (2001). Discrete normal distribution and its relationship with Jacobi theta functions. *Statistics & probability letters* **52** 289–299.
- TANG, J., KOROLOVA, A., BAI, X., WANG, X. and WANG, X. (2017). Privacy loss in Apple’s implementation of differential privacy on macOS 10.12. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.02753*.
- ZHANG, H. and CHEN, S. X. (2020). Concentration inequalities for statistical inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.02258*.