

# Time-Aware Projections: Truly Node-Private Graph Statistics under Continual Observation

Palak Jain\*      Adam Smith\*      Connor Wagaman\*

March 7, 2024

## Abstract

Releasing differentially private statistics about social network data is challenging: one individual’s data consists of a node and all of its connections, and typical analyses are sensitive to the insertion of a single unusual node in the network. This challenge is further complicated in the *continual release* setting, where the network varies over time and one wants to release information at many time points as the network grows. Previous work addresses node-private continual release by assuming an unenforced promise on the maximum degree in a graph; indeed, the algorithms from these works exhibit blatant privacy violations when the degree bound is not met.

In this work, we describe the first algorithms that satisfy the standard notion of node-differential privacy in the continual release setting (i.e., without an assumed promise on the input streams). These algorithms are accurate on sparse graphs, for several fundamental graph problems: counting edges, triangles, other subgraphs, and connected components; and releasing degree histograms. Our unconditionally private algorithms generally have optimal error, up to polylogarithmic factors and lower-order terms.

We provide general transformations that take a base algorithm for the continual release setting, which need only be private for streams satisfying a promised degree bound, and produce an algorithm that is unconditionally private yet mimics the base algorithm when the stream meets the degree bound (and adds only linear overhead to the time and space complexity of the base algorithm). To do so, we design new projection algorithms for graph streams, based on the batch-model techniques of [DLL16; BBDS13], which modify the stream to limit its degree. Our main technical innovation is to show that the projections are *stable*—meaning that similar input graphs have similar projections—when the input stream satisfies a privately testable safety condition. Our transformation then follows a novel online variant of the Propose-Test-Release framework [DL09], privately testing the safety condition before releasing output at each step.

---

\*Boston University, {palakj, ads22, wagaman}@bu.edu. Supported in part by NSF awards CCF-1763786 and CNS-2120667, Faculty Awards from Google and Apple, and Cooperative Agreement CB16ADR0160001 with the Census Bureau. The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and not those of the U.S. Census Bureau or any other sponsor.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	Our Results . . . . .	4
1.2	Techniques . . . . .	6
1.3	Related Work . . . . .	7
1.4	Organization of This Manuscript . . . . .	8
<b>2</b>	<b>Preliminaries</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Stable and Time-Aware Projections</b>	<b>10</b>
3.1	Stability of the Time-Aware Projection Algorithms . . . . .	11
3.2	Proof of Edge-to-Edge Stability for $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}$ . . . . .	16
3.3	Proof of Node-to-Node Stability for $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}$ and $\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}$ . . . . .	16
3.4	Proof of Node-to-Edge Stability for $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}$ . . . . .	17
3.5	Proof of Node-to-Edge Stability for $\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}$ . . . . .	18
3.5.1	(Pruned) Difference Graphs and Their Properties . . . . .	20
3.6	Proof of Edge-to-Edge Stability for $\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}$ . . . . .	25
<b>4</b>	<b>From <math>D</math>-restricted Privacy to Node Privacy</b>	<b>27</b>
4.1	Testing for Bad Graphs . . . . .	28
4.2	PTR in the Continual Release Setting . . . . .	30
4.3	Accuracy and Privacy of Algorithm 5 . . . . .	31
<b>5</b>	<b>Optimal Algorithms for <math>f_{\text{edges}}</math>, <math>f_{\text{triangles}}</math>, <math>f_{\text{CC}}</math>, <math>f_{\text{k-stars}}</math></b>	<b>35</b>
5.1	Upper Bounds on Error . . . . .	36
5.2	Lower Bounds on Error . . . . .	41
	<b>References</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>The Sparse Vector Technique</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Tightness of Stabilities in Theorem 3.3</b>	<b>51</b>

# 1 Introduction

Graphs provide a flexible and powerful way to model and represent relational data, such as social networks, epidemiological contact-tracing data, and employer-employee relationships. Counts of substructures—edges, nodes of a given degree, triangles, connected components—are fundamental statistics that shed light on a network’s structure and are the focus of extensive algorithmic study. For example, edge counts can quantify relationships in a social network; a function of triangle and 2-star counts called the “correlation coefficient” or “transitivity” of a network is of interest to epidemiologists for understanding disease spread [BS10; YJM+13]; and connected component counts have been used for determining the number of classes in a population [Goo49] and estimating fatalities in the Syrian civil war [CSS18].

When the graph contains sensitive information about individuals, one must balance the accuracy of released statistics with those individuals’ privacy. Differential privacy [DMNS16] is a widely studied and deployed framework for quantifying such a trade-off. It requires that the output of an algorithm reveal little about any single individual’s record (even hiding its presence or absence in the data set).

In this work, we study differentially private algorithms that continually monitor several fundamental statistics about a graph that evolves over time. We consider the *continual release* (or *continual observation*) model of differential privacy [DNPR10; CSS11] in which the input data is updated over time and statistics about it must be released continuously. (In contrast, in the *batch* model, input arrives in one shot and output is produced only once.)

There are two standard notions of differential privacy (DP) for algorithms that operate on graph data: (1) *edge DP* [NRS07], for which the algorithm must effectively obscure the information revealed by any individual edge (including its mere presence or absence), and (2) *node DP* [HLMJ09; BBDS13; KNRS13; CZ13], for which the algorithm must obscure the information revealed by a node’s entire set of connections (including even the node’s presence or absence).

Edge privacy is typically easier to achieve and more widely studied. However, in social networks and similar settings, nodes—rather than edges—correspond to individuals and so node privacy is more directly relevant. Indeed, existing attacks infer sensitive information about a person from aggregate information about their neighborhood in the network (e.g., sexuality can be inferred from an individual’s Facebook friends [JM09]), showing that privacy at the node level rather than only the edge level is important.

**Background: Node-differential Privacy.** To understand the challenges of designing node-private algorithms, consider the task of estimating the number of edges in a graph. For every graph  $G$  with  $n$  vertices, there is a node-neighboring graph  $G'$  with  $n$  more edges (obtained by adding a new, high-degree node connected to all existing nodes). A node private algorithm, however, must hide the difference between  $G$  and  $G'$ . Therefore, every node-private algorithm must have additive error  $\Omega(n)$  on either  $G$  or  $G'$ , which means large relative error when  $G$  and  $G'$  are sparse. It is thus impossible to get a useful worst-case accuracy guarantee for counting the edges in a graph or, for similar reasons, many other basic statistics.

As a result, node private algorithms are often tailored to specific families of inputs. In the batch model, instead of aiming for universal accuracy across all graph types, algorithms are designed to provide privacy for all possible graphs while providing accurate estimates for a select subset of “nice” graphs—for example, graphs that satisfy a degree bound—on which the statistic of interest is well behaved. There are now several techniques for achieving this type of guarantee in the batch model, notably projections [BBDS13; KNRS13; DLL16] and Lipschitz extensions [BBDS13; KNRS13; CZ13; RS16b; RS16a; DLL16; BCSZ18b; CD20; KRST23]. Broadly, these techniques start from an algorithm which is both private and accurate when restricted to a set of “nice” graphs, and find a new algorithm that mimics the base algorithm on the set of “nice” graphs while providing privacy for all possible graphs; such extensions exist under very general conditions [BCSZ18a; BCSZ18b].

The continual release setting complicates these approaches, causing tools for the batch setting to break down. Projections and Lipschitz extensions are harder to design: in the batch setting, the decision to remove an edge may propagate only across nodes; in the continual release setting, the change can also propagate through time, rendering existing batch-model solutions ineffective. Even the general existential result of [BCSZ18a] applies, at best, only to the offline version of continual release (in which the algorithm can

inspect the entire input stream before starting to produce output). In a nutshell, ensuring low sensitivity separately at each point in time does not guarantee the type of stability that is needed to get low error with continual release (e.g.,  $\ell_1$  stability of difference vectors [SLM+18]). For this reason, the only straightforward way to get node-private algorithms from existing batch model work is to use advanced composition [DRV10] and compose over  $T$  time steps. This potentially explains why prior works on node-private continual release of graph statistics assume restrictions on the input graphs to their private algorithms, providing privacy only in the case where the restriction is satisfied.

## 1.1 Our Results

**Truly Node-private Algorithms.** For several fundamental graph statistics, we obtain (the first) algorithms that satisfy the usual notion of node-differential privacy in the continual release setting—that is, they require no assumption on the input streams.

In contrast, previous work on node-private continual release of graph statistics [SLM+18; FHO21] develops algorithms for basic graph statistics that are accurate and private when the input graph stream has maximum degree at most a user-specified bound  $D$  but exhibit blatant privacy violations if the input graph stream violates the bound.<sup>1</sup> This conditional node-privacy is not standard in the literature: prior work on node-privacy in the batch model gives unconditional privacy guarantees (e.g., [BBDS13; KNRS13; CZ13; RS16b; RS16a; DLL16; BCSZ18b; CD20; KRST23]). To emphasize the conditional nature of the privacy guarantees for [SLM+18; FHO21], we say they satisfy *D-restricted node-DP*. (Similarly, algorithms whose edge-privacy depends on such an assumption satisfy *D-restricted edge-DP*.)

We consider an insertion-only model of graph streams, where an arbitrary subset of new nodes and edges arrives at each of  $T$  time steps (Definition 2.2). We do not assume any relationship between the size of the graph and  $T$ . The degree of a node  $u$  in the stream is the total number of edges adjacent to  $u$  in the stream (equivalently, in the final graph). The stream’s maximum degree is the largest of its nodes’ degrees; if this maximum is at most  $D$ , we say the stream is *D-bounded*.

Our main contribution is a black-box transformation that can take any *D-restricted-DP* “base” algorithm and transform it into an algorithm that is private on all graphs while maintaining the original algorithm’s accuracy on *D-bounded* graphs.

We then use this transformation to produce specific node-private algorithms for estimating several fundamental graph statistics and (in all but one case) show that the error incurred by these private algorithms is near optimal. Prior work either has accuracy that is exponentially worse in  $T$  for the same privacy guarantees (e.g., [BBDS13; CZ13; KNRS13; DLL16; KRST23]), or exhibits blatant privacy violations ([SLM+18; FHO21]) and is not actually node-DP. We generally use algorithms from previous work as our base, though for connected components the restricted-DP algorithm is new. Importantly for real-world applications, our algorithms are efficient: they add only linear overhead to the time and space complexity of the base algorithm.

Table 1 summarizes the bounds we obtain on additive error—worst-case over *D-bounded* graph streams of length  $T$ —for releasing the counts of edges ( $f_{\text{edges}}$ ), triangles ( $f_{\text{triangles}}$ ),  $k$ -stars<sup>2</sup> ( $f_{k\text{-stars}}$ ), and connected components ( $f_{\text{CC}}$ ), as well as degree histograms ( $f_{\text{degree-hist}}$ ); it also compares with previous results. The parameters  $\epsilon, \delta$  specify the privacy guarantee (Definition 2.8).

**Stable, Time-aware Projections.** Central to our approach is the design of *time-aware projection* algorithms that take as input an arbitrary graph stream and produce a new graph stream, in real time, that satisfies a user-specified degree bound  $D$ . “Time-aware” here refers to the fact that the projection acts on a stream, as opposed to a single graph; we drop this term when the context is clear. “Projection” comes from the additional requirement that the output stream be identical to the input on every prefix of the input that

---

<sup>1</sup>For example, suppose edges in the graph denote transmissions of a stigmatized disease like HIV and suppose the analyst knows that all the edges associated with one individual, Bob, arrive at a given time step  $t$  (and only those edges arrive). The outputs of the [FHO21] edge-counting algorithm at times  $t-1$  and  $t$  would together reveal how many disease transmissions Bob is involved in, up to error  $D/\epsilon$ , for privacy parameter  $\epsilon$ . When Bob’s degree is much larger than  $D$ , this is a clear violation of node privacy. One can argue using this example that the algorithms of [SLM+18; FHO21] do not satisfy  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -node differential privacy (Definition 2.8) for any finite  $\epsilon$  with  $\delta < 1$ .

<sup>2</sup>A  $k$ -star is a set of  $k$  nodes, each with an edge to a single common neighbor (which can be thought of as the  $k$ -star’s center).

	Lower bounds for $\varepsilon \geq \frac{\log T}{T}, \delta = O(\frac{1}{T})$	Reference	Additive $\ell_\infty$ error for $\varepsilon \leq 1, \delta = \Omega(\frac{1}{\text{poly}(T)})$	Node-DP guarantee
$f_{\text{edges}}$	$\Omega(D \log T/\varepsilon)$	BBDS/CZ/KNRS	$\tilde{O}(D\sqrt{T}/\varepsilon)^*$	$(\varepsilon, \delta)$
		[FHO21]	$O(D \log^{5/2} T/\varepsilon)$	$D$ -restricted $(\varepsilon, 0)$
		Our work	$O(D \log^{5/2} T/\varepsilon + \log^{7/2} T/\varepsilon^2)$	$(\varepsilon, \delta)$
$f_{\text{triangles}}$	$\Omega(D^2 \log T/\varepsilon)$	BBDS/CZ/KNRS	$\tilde{O}(D^2\sqrt{T}/\varepsilon)^*$	$(\varepsilon, \delta)$
		[FHO21]	$O(D^2 \log^{5/2} T/\varepsilon)$	$D$ -restricted $(\varepsilon, 0)$
		Our work	$O(D^2 \log^{5/2} T/\varepsilon + \log^{9/2} T/\varepsilon^3)$	$(\varepsilon, \delta)$
$f_{k\text{-stars}}$	$\Omega(D^k \log T/\varepsilon)$	BBDS/CZ/KNRS	$\tilde{O}(D^k\sqrt{T}/\varepsilon)^*$	$(\varepsilon, \delta)$
		[FHO21]	$O(D^k \log^{5/2} T/\varepsilon)$	$D$ -restricted $(\varepsilon, 0)$
		Our work	$O(D^k \log^{5/2} T/\varepsilon + \log^{k+5/2} T/\varepsilon^{k+1})$	$(\varepsilon, \delta)$
$f_{\text{degree-hist}}$	$\Omega(D \log T/\varepsilon)$	[DLL16]	$\tilde{O}(D^2\sqrt{T}/\varepsilon)^*$	$(\varepsilon, \delta)$
		[FHO21]	$\tilde{O}(D^2 \log^{5/2} T/\varepsilon)$	$D$ -restricted $(\varepsilon, 0)$
		Our work	$\tilde{O}(D^2 \log^{5/2} T/\varepsilon + \log^{9/2} T/\varepsilon^3)$	$(\varepsilon, \delta)$
$f_{\text{cc}}$	$\Omega(D \log T/\varepsilon)$	[KRST23]	$\tilde{O}(D\sqrt{T}/\varepsilon)^*$	$(\varepsilon, \delta)$
		Our work	$O(D \log^{5/2} T/\varepsilon + \log^{7/2} T/\varepsilon^2)$	$(\varepsilon, \delta)$

Table 1: Accuracy of our node-private algorithms, previously known *restricted* node-private algorithms, and node-private batch model algorithms on insertion-only,  $D$ -bounded graph streams of length  $T$ . “BBDS/CZ/KNRS” refers to [BBDS13; CZ13; KNRS13]; the error bounds with \* were computed by applying advanced composition [DRV10] to batch model algorithms. Error lower bounds for these problems are for sufficiently large  $T$ . See Section 5 for more detailed bounds.

is  $D$ -bounded. Ideally, we would simply run the restricted-DP algorithm on the projected graph stream and thus preserve the original algorithm’s accuracy on  $D$ -bounded streams.

The challenge is that the resulting process is only private if the projection algorithm is *stable*, meaning that neighboring input streams map to nearby projected streams. Specifically, the *node distance* between two streams  $S$  and  $S'$  is the minimum number of nodes that must be added to and/or removed from  $S$  to obtain  $S'$ . *Edge distance* is defined similarly (Definition 2.5). *Node-neighboring* streams are at node distance 1. The *node-to-node stability* of a projection is the largest node distance between the projections of any two node-neighboring streams; the *node-to-edge stability* is the largest edge distance among such pairs.

If we had a projection with good (that is, low) node-to-node stability, then running the restricted-DP algorithm on the projected graph stream would satisfy node privacy, and we would be done. Alas, we do not know if such a projection exists. (We show that such a transformation does exist for edge-DP—see the end of this section.) Instead, we give two simple, greedy projection algorithms that have good node-to-node and node-to-edge stability when the input graph stream satisfies a privately testable “safety” condition. The safety condition is that the stream has few large-degree vertices (Definition 3.2). Specifically, a graph (or stream) is  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded if it has at most  $\ell$  nodes of degree larger than  $D$ .<sup>3</sup>

We obtain a general transformations from  $D$ -restricted-DP algorithms to truly private ones by testing the safety condition using a novel online variant of the Propose-Test-Release framework of [DL09].

We explore two natural methods for time-aware projection, each based on a batch-model projection algorithm from the literature. Both time-aware projections greedily add edges while maintaining an upper

<sup>3</sup> $(D, \ell)$ -boundedness is a computationally efficient proxy for requiring that the stream be close in node-distance to a  $D$ -bounded stream. Testing the latter condition directly is NP-hard (by reduction from vertex cover); we instead efficiently compute the distance to the nearest *not*  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded stream—see Section 4.

	$\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}$	$\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}$
edge-to-edge	3	$2\ell + 1$
node-to-edge	$D + \ell$	$D + 2\ell\sqrt{\min\{D, \ell\}}$
node-to-node	$2\ell + 1$	$2\ell + 1$

Table 2: Stability of  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}$  and  $\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}$  on  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded input graph streams, from Theorem 3.3.

bound on each node’s degree. One of these methods bases its greedy choices on the degree of the nodes in the original graph stream (“BBDS”, [BBDS13]), while the other bases its choices on the degree of the nodes in the projection that it produces (“DLL”, [DLL16]). The results in Table 1 are obtained using the BBDS-based projection and our general transformation.

We give tight bounds on three measures of stability, summarized in Table 2. The table lists upper bounds; the lower bounds for the BBDS projection are identical up to small additive constants (and the edge-to-edge stability is identical), while the bounds for DLL are tight up to a constant multiplicative factor (see Appendix B). A graph in the batch model can be represented as a length-1 graph stream, so these projections’ stability properties also hold for graphs in the batch model.

The DLL projection preserves more edges than the BBDS projection when the input has some high-degree vertices (the graph returned by BBDS is a subgraph of that returned by DLL), which initially suggests that the DLL projection could be more useful. Indeed, in the batch setting, the authors of [DLL16] show that the projected degree distribution (and number of edges) has low sensitivity. This allows for the DLL projection to provide a better privacy-utility trade-off for these tasks in the batch model. However, this projection actually has worse stability when we measure node- or edge-distance between output graphs.<sup>4</sup> Therefore, more noise must be added when using the DLL projection for generic applications, as compared to the BBDS projection. In our uses, this ultimately means that the projection of [BBDS13] provides the better privacy-utility trade-off.

**Truly Edge-private Algorithms.** Although our focus is on node-privacy, we show along the way that the BBDS-based time-aware projection has edge-sensitivity 3, uniformly over all graphs. (This follows from a batch-model argument of [BBDS13] and a general “Flattening Lemma” (Lemma 3.8) that we establish for greedy, time-aware projections.) As a result, one can make  $D$ -restricted edge-private algorithms into truly private ones at almost no cost in accuracy. Some consequences are summarized in Theorem 5.2.

## 1.2 Techniques

**Stability Analyses.** The main technical contribution lies in defining time-aware versions of the two greedy projection algorithms (Algorithm 1), and leveraging that structure to analyze the sensitivity of the entire projected graph sequence (Theorem 3.3). Our analyses differ substantially from existing batch-model analyses, both because of the sequential nature of our problem and the stronger notions of stability we consider.

Section 3.1 contains a detailed overview of the arguments; we highlight here a few simple but useful ideas. The time-aware projections share two key features:

- *Shortsightedness*: the algorithm includes all nodes and makes a final decision about each edge at the time it arrives;
- *Opportunism*: if an edge connects vertices with degree at most  $D$  in the original graph stream, it will necessarily be included in the projection.

<sup>4</sup>This distinction is crucial in the continual-release setting. For example, even though the degree distribution of the DLL projection has node sensitivity  $O(D)$  in the batch setting, the sequence of degree distributions one gets when projecting a stream has unbounded sensitivity.

Such greedy structure is computationally convenient but also helps us analyze stability. To see why, consider two graph streams  $S, S'$  that differ in the presence of a node  $v^+$  and its edges, and let  $\Pi_D(S)$  and  $\Pi_D(S')$  denote the projected streams (where  $\Pi_D$  could be either of our two projections). We consider for each time step  $t$  the *difference graph*  $\Delta_t$  consisting of edges that have been added (at or before time  $t$ ) to one projected stream but not the other.

The first feature, shortsightedness, implies that this difference graph *grows monotonically*. (Such a statement need not hold for arbitrary projections.) This allows us to show a “Flattening Lemma” (Lemma 3.8), which states that the edge- and node-distance between  $\Pi_D(S)$  and  $\Pi_D(S')$  depend only on the final difference graph  $\Delta_T$  (or an intermediate graph  $\Delta_t$  in the case that we are considering only a prefix of the streams). Thus, shortsightedness allows us to ignore the sequential structure and reduce to a batch-model version of  $\Pi_D$  in which arrival times affect only the order in which edges are greedily considered.

The second feature, opportunism, allows us to take advantage of  $(D, \ell)$ -boundedness. If the larger stream has at most  $\ell$  vertices of degree more than  $D$ , we can show that  $\Delta_t$  will have a vertex cover of size at most  $\ell + 1$  (Lemma 3.9).

These structural results suffice to bound the node-to-node stability of both projections by  $2\ell + 1$ .

From this point, the analyses of the two projections diverge. Each inclusion rule leads to different structure in the difference graph  $\Delta_T$ . The most involved of these analyses proves a (tight) bound of  $D + 2\ell\sqrt{\min\{D, \ell\}}$  on the node-to-edge stability of the DLL-based projection. At a high level, that analysis proceeds by orienting the edges of  $\Delta_T$  to show that it is close in edge distance to a large DAG which is covered by at most  $\ell$  edge-disjoint paths and then bounding the possible size of such a DAG.

The node-to-edge analysis of the BBDS-based algorithm is also subtle, but different. The key point there is that all of the edges connected to  $v^+$  can potentially cause changes in the projected graph, even the edges which are not selected for inclusion in the projection themselves. We refer to Section 3.4 for further detail.

**Testing Distance to Unsafe Streams.** A second, less involved insight is that, although it is NP-hard to compute the node distance to the nearest stream that is not  $D$ -bounded,  $(D, \ell)$ -boundedness gives us a proxy that is much easier to work with. Specifically, we observe that  $D$ -bounded streams are always distance at least  $\ell + 1$  from the nearest non- $(D + \ell, \ell)$ -bounded stream; furthermore, this distance can be computed in linear time (Lemma 4.3). Since the distance to non- $(D + \ell, \ell)$ -boundedness at any given time step has low node-sensitivity, we can use a novel (to our knowledge) online variant of the PTR framework [DL09] based on the sparse vector technique [RR10; HR10] to monitor the distance and stop releasing outputs when the distance becomes too small. The privacy analysis of this part follows the argument of [DL09] but differs because, rather than making a binary decision to either release or not release an output, the testing process dynamically chooses to release outputs at up to  $T$  time steps (see Theorem 4.4). The resulting general transformations are summarized in Theorem 4.1.

### 1.3 Related Work

Our contributions draw most heavily from the literature on batch-model node-differentially private algorithms. Node privacy was first formulated by [HLMJ09]. The first nontrivial node-private algorithms emerged in three concurrent works [BBDS13; KNRS13; CZ13] that collectively identified two major families of (overlapping) approaches based on Lipschitz extensions [BBDS13; KNRS13; CZ13; RS16a; RS16b; DLL16; BCSZ18b; CD20; KRST23] on one hand, and projections [BBDS13; KNRS13; DLL16] on the other. These works provide algorithms with (tight) accuracy guarantees for  $D$ -bounded graphs for the statistics we consider here as well as families that arise in the estimation of stochastic block models and graph neural networks. They also consider other families of graphs on which their specific statistics are well behaved. Most relevant here is the batch-model projection of BBDS [BBDS13] with low edge-to-edge sensitivity, and the Lipschitz extension for degree distributions of DLL [DLL16]. This latter extension can be viewed algorithmically as a greedy projection for which the degree histogram is stable. We use their projection idea, analyzing the stability of the graph as a whole.

There is also an extensive literature on batch-model edge-private algorithms; we do not attempt to survey it here.

A second major tool we draw on is the  $D$ -restricted node- and edge-private algorithms of [SLM+18; FHO21] for continual release of graph statistics. These in turn use the widely-studied tree mechanism, whose use in the continual-release setting (for numerical data) dates back to the model’s introduction [DNPR10; CSS11]. Also relevant are the edge-private streaming algorithms of [Upa13; UUA21] for cuts and spectral clustering. (To the best of our understanding, the application of our transformations to their algorithms does not yield non-trivial utility guarantees.)

Finally, our work draws on the Propose-Test-Release framework of [DL09], combining it with the sparse vector mechanism [RR10; HR10; LSL17] to monitor the distance from the stream to the nearest non- $(D, \ell)$ -bounded stream.

## 1.4 Organization of This Manuscript

Section 2 lays out the model and basic definitions used in the remainder of the paper. Section 3 presents the time-aware projections and the results on their stability. Section 4 explains the general black-box transformation from  $D$ -restricted edge (or node) privacy to true node privacy. Section 5 develops the applications to basic graph statistics.

## 2 Preliminaries

**Definition 2.1** (Graph). A *graph*  $G = (V, E)$  consists of a set of vertices  $V$  (also known as nodes), and a set of edges  $E$ , where edge  $\{v_1, v_2\} \in E$  if and only if there is an edge between nodes  $v_1 \in V$  and  $v_2 \in V$ .

We use  $V(G)$  and  $E(G)$  to denote the vertex set and edge set of graph  $G$ , respectively. We use  $\deg_v(G)$  to denote the degree of a node  $v \in V(G)$ ; we drop  $G$  when the graph being referenced is clear.

**Definition 2.2** (Graph stream). Given a time horizon  $T$ , a *graph stream*  $S \in \mathcal{S}^T$  is a  $T$ -element vector, where each element of the vector contains some set of nodes and edges, or the symbol  $\perp$  if no nodes or edges arrive in that time step. At each time  $t \in [T]$ , either  $\perp$  arrives or some set of nodes and edges arrives. By convention, an edge’s endpoints arrive no later than the edge.

We denote by  $S_t$  the set of added nodes and edges which arrive in time step  $t$ . We use  $S_{[t]}$  to denote the sequence  $S_1, \dots, S_t$ .

**Definition 2.3** (Flattened graph). Let  $S \in \mathcal{S}^T$  be a graph stream of length  $T$ . The *flattened graph* of the first  $t$  terms  $S_{[t]}$  of a graph stream, denoted  $\text{flatten}(S_{[t]})$ , is the graph that can be formed by all of the nodes and edges which arrive at or before time  $t$ .

When the meaning is clear, we may refer to the graph stream through time  $t$  when stating a property of the flattened graph of the graph stream through time  $t$ . For example, when we say that  $S_{[t]}$  has maximum degree at most  $D$ , we mean that  $\text{flatten}(S_{[t]})$  has maximum degree at most  $D$ .

We next define neighboring graphs and graph streams. In privacy-preserving data analysis, the notion of neighboring datasets is important since privacy requires that evaluating a function on similar datasets produces indistinguishable outputs. There are two natural notions of neighboring graphs and graph streams: node neighbors differ on a node (and its associated edges), while edge neighbors differ on one edge. We denote node and edge neighbors with the relations  $\simeq_{node}$  and  $\simeq_{edge}$  respectively.

**Definition 2.4** (Neighboring graph streams). Two graphs (respectively, graph streams) are *node-neighbors* if one can be obtained from the other by removing a vertex and all of its adjacent edges. (For graph streams, the adjacent edges for the removed node may have been spread over many time steps.)

Similarly, two graphs (respectively, graphs streams) are *edge neighbors* if one can be obtained from the other by either removing one edge, removing an isolated node, or removing a node of degree 1 and its adjacent edge.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>Another way to define edge neighbors would be to take the set of nodes as fixed and public, and only consider changes to one edge. We adopt the more general definition since it simplifies our results on node-to-edge stability.

A generalization of node- and edge-neighboring graphs and graph streams is the notion of node and edge distance between graphs and graph streams. We note that node- and edge-neighboring datasets are at node and edge distance 1, respectively.

**Definition 2.5** (Node and edge distance). The *node-distance*  $d_{node}(G, G')$  is defined as the length  $d$  of the shortest chain of graphs (respectively, graph streams)  $G_0, G_1, \dots, G_d$  where  $G_0 = G$ ,  $G_d = G'$ , and every adjacent pair in the sequence is node neighboring.

The *edge-distance*  $d_{edge}(G, G')$  is defined as the length  $d$  of the shortest chain of graphs (respectively, graph streams)  $G_0, G_1, \dots, G_d$  where  $G_0 = G$ ,  $G_d = G'$ , and every adjacent pair in the sequence is edge neighboring.

Given two graphs with no isolated vertices  $G = (V, E)$  and  $G' = (V', E')$  (where  $V$  and  $V'$  may overlap), the edge distance between  $G$  and  $G'$  is exactly the size of the set  $E \Delta E'$ . (Isolated vertices that are not in both graphs add to the distance.)

**Differential Privacy in the Batch Model.** To define differential privacy in the batch model, we introduce the notion of  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -indistinguishability.

**Definition 2.6** ( $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -indistinguishability). We say that two random variables  $R_1, R_2$  over outcome space  $\mathcal{Y}$  are  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -indistinguishable (denoted  $R_1 \approx_{\epsilon, \delta} R_2$ ) if for all  $Y \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[R_1 \in Y] &\leq e^\epsilon \Pr[R_2 \in Y] + \delta; \\ \Pr[R_2 \in Y] &\leq e^\epsilon \Pr[R_1 \in Y] + \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Informally, a function is differentially private if applying the function to inputs which differ in the data of one individual results in outputs from similar distributions—more specifically, from distributions which are  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -indistinguishable. We use the definitions of node and edge neighbors presented above to formalize the notion of what it means for graphs or graph streams to differ in the data of one individual.

**Definition 2.7** (Differential privacy (DP) in the batch model [DMNS16]). A randomized algorithm  $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{S}^T \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  is  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -node-DP (respectively, edge-DP), if for all pairs of node-neighboring (respectively, edge-neighboring) graph streams  $S$  and  $S'$ , the distributions  $\mathcal{M}(S)$  and  $\mathcal{M}(S')$  are  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -indistinguishable:

$$\mathcal{M}(S) \approx_{\epsilon, \delta} \mathcal{M}(S').$$

The term *pure DP* refers to the case where  $\delta = 0$ , and *approximate DP* refers to the case where  $\delta > 0$ .

**Privacy under Continual Observation.** We now define privacy of graph statistics under continual observation; the general definition is borrowed from [JRSS23]. In the continual release setting, first explored by [CSS11; DNPR10], an algorithm receives a stream of inputs  $S = (S_1, \dots, S_T) \in \mathcal{S}^T$ . The definition of privacy requires indistinguishability on the distribution of the entire sequence, not just one output. For simplicity, in this version, we consider only the simpler, non-adaptive concept of differential privacy. We conjecture that all our algorithms and results extend verbatim to the adaptive version [JRSS23] (since the main components of our algorithm, the tree mechanism and sparse vector technique, are known to be adaptively private).

**Definition 2.8** (Privacy of a mechanism under continual observation). Define  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$  as the batch-model algorithm that receives a dataset  $x$  as input, runs  $\mathcal{M}$  on stream  $x$ , and returns the output stream  $y$  of  $\mathcal{M}$ . We say that  $\mathcal{M}$  is  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP in the non-adaptive setting under continual observation if  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$  is  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP in the batch model.

We borrow the definition of accuracy from [JRSS23], which bounds the error of a mechanism with respect to a target function  $f$ . The definition takes the maximum error over both time steps and the coordinates of the output of  $f$ . (Although most of the functions we approximate return a single real value, the degree histogram  $f_{\text{degree-hist}}$  returns a vector at each step and requires the extra generality.)

**Definition 2.9** (Accuracy of a mechanism). Given a set of allowable streams  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{X}^*$ , a mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  is  $(\alpha, T)$ -accurate with respect to  $\mathcal{S}$  for a function  $f : \mathcal{X}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  if, for all fixed (i.e., non-adaptively chosen) input streams  $S = (S_1, \dots, S_T) \in \mathcal{S}$ , the maximum  $\ell_\infty$  error over the outputs  $a_1, \dots, a_T$  of mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  is bounded by  $\alpha$  with probability at least 0.99; that is,

$$\Pr_{\text{coins of } \mathcal{M}} \left[ \max_{t \in [T]} \|S[t] - a_t\|_\infty \leq \alpha \right] \geq 0.99.$$

If the indistinguishability property of differential privacy holds conditioned on the promise that both node-neighbors (respectively, edge-neighbors) lie in the set of graph streams with maximum degree at most  $D$ , we say that the algorithm offers  $D$ -restricted  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -node-DP (respectively,  $D$ -restricted  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -edge-DP). This is the notion of privacy explored by all prior work on node-private graph statistics under continual observation [FHO21; SLM+18].

**Definition 2.10** ( $D$ -restricted DP). A randomized algorithm  $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  is  $D$ -restricted  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -node-DP (respectively, edge-DP) if Definition 2.7 holds when restricted to the set of node-neighboring (respectively, edge-neighboring) graph streams with maximum degree at most  $D$ .

Likewise,  $\mathcal{M}$  is  $D$ -restricted  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -node-DP under continual observation (respectively, edge-DP) if Definition 2.8 holds when restricted to the set of node-neighboring (respectively, edge-neighboring) graph streams with maximum degree at most  $D$ .

**Properties of Differential Privacy.** The definition of differential privacy extends to groups of individuals. If an algorithm is DP for one individual, it also offers a (differently parameterized) privacy guarantee for a collection of individuals. We borrow the formulation of this property from [Vad17].

**Lemma 2.11** (DP offers group privacy [DMNS16]). *Let  $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  be a randomized algorithm that is  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DP. Then, where  $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$  differ in the data of  $k$  individuals,  $\mathcal{A}(x)$  and  $\mathcal{A}(x')$  are  $(k \cdot \varepsilon, k \cdot e^{k\varepsilon} \cdot \delta)$ -indistinguishable. That is,*

$$\mathcal{A}(x) \approx_{k \cdot \varepsilon, k \cdot e^{k\varepsilon} \cdot \delta} \mathcal{A}(x').$$

This follows from a well-known “weak triangle inequality” for  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -indistinguishability:

**Lemma 2.12** (Weak triangle inequality). *For all  $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \delta_1, \delta_2 \geq 0$ : If random variables  $A, B, C$  satisfy  $A \approx_{\varepsilon_1, \delta_1} B$  and  $B \approx_{\varepsilon_2, \delta_2} C$ , then  $A \approx_{\varepsilon', \delta'} C$  for  $\varepsilon' = \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2$  and  $\delta' = \max(\delta_1 + e^{\varepsilon_1} \delta_2, \delta_2 + e^{\varepsilon_2} \delta_1) \leq e^{\varepsilon_2} \delta_1 + e^{\varepsilon_1} \delta_2$ .*

Differential privacy is robust to post-processing.

**Lemma 2.13** (DP is robust to post-processing [DMNS16]). *Let  $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  be a randomized algorithm that is  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DP. Let  $f : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$  be an arbitrary, randomized mapping. Then  $f \circ \mathcal{M} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$  is  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DP.*

### 3 Stable and Time-Aware Projections

In this section we present two *time-aware projection* algorithms  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBS}}$  and  $\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}$ , and prove Theorem 3.3 that presents their robust stability guarantees when run on  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded graph streams. The two projection algorithms follow very similar strategies at a high level and are presented together in Algorithm 1. Both take as input a graph stream  $S$  of length  $T \in \mathbb{N}$  and some user-specified value  $D \in \mathbb{N}$  and return a projected graph stream with maximum degree at most  $D$ . If the graph stream  $S$  is already  $D$ -bounded, then both algorithms output it unchanged. At each time step, both algorithms greedily choose and output some subset of the arriving edges to include in the projection.

Algorithm 1 takes parameter  $\mathbf{c}$ , called the *inclusion criterion*, that determines which of the two projections it executes. Let  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBS}}$  denote Algorithm 1 with inclusion criterion  $\mathbf{c} = \textit{original}$  and let  $\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}$  denote the version with  $\mathbf{c} = \textit{projected}$ . (We use the author initials of [BBS13; DLL16] to denote the algorithms inspired by their respective projections.)

---

**Algorithm 1**  $\Pi_D$  for time-aware graph projection by edge addition.

---

**Input:** Graph stream  $(S_1, \dots, S_T) = S \in \mathcal{S}^T$ , time horizon  $T \in \mathbb{N}$ , degree bound  $D \in \mathbb{N}$ , and inclusion criterion  $c \in \{\textit{original}, \textit{projected}\}$ .

$\triangleright c = \textit{original}$  yields BBDS-based projection  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}$ ;  $c = \textit{projected}$  yields DLL-based projection  $\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}$

**Output:** Graph stream  $(S_1^*, \dots, S_T^*) = S^* \in \mathcal{S}^T$

```
1: for  $t = 1$  to  $T$  do
2:   Parse  $S_t$  as  $(\partial V_t, \partial E_t)$ 
3:   for  $v$  in  $\partial V_t$  do  $d(v) = 0$ 
4:    $\partial E_t^{\text{proj}} = \emptyset$ 
5:   for  $e = \{u, v\}$  in  $\partial E_t$ , in consistent order, do
6:      $\text{add\_edge} \leftarrow (d(u) < D) \wedge (d(v) < D)$ 
7:     if  $\text{add\_edge}$  then
8:       set  $\partial E_t^{\text{proj}} = \partial E_t^{\text{proj}} \cup \{e\}$   $\triangleright$  add edge  $e = \{u, v\}$  to the projection
9:     else ignore  $e = \{u, v\}$ 
10:    if  $c = \textit{original}$  or  $\text{add\_edge}$  then
11:       $d(u) += 1, d(v) += 1$   $\triangleright$  increment degree counters for  $u, v$ 
12:    Output  $S_t^* = (\partial V_t, \partial E_t^{\text{proj}})$ 
```

---

The two algorithms differ from each other in terms of how they decide whether an edge should be added to the projection so far. The first algorithm  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}$  adds edge  $e = \{u, v\}$  if the degree of both end points  $u$  and  $v$  is less than  $D$  in the *original* graph stream so far (i.e.,  $S$  restricted to all edges considered before  $e$ ). The second algorithm  $\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}$  adds edge  $e = \{u, v\}$  if nodes  $u$  and  $v$  both have degree less than  $D$  in the *projection* so far (i.e.  $\Pi_D(S)$  restricted to all edges considered before  $e$ ).

**Consistent Ordering.** When multiple edges arrive in a time step, the projections must decide on the order in which to consider these edges. While the exact ordering does not matter, we assume a *consistent ordering* of the edges in the input graph stream. Consistency means that any pair of edges in neighboring graph streams should be considered for addition to the projection in the same relative order. A similar ordering assumption is made by [BBDS13; DLL16].

A simple implementation of such an ordering assumes that each node  $u$  has a unique string identifier  $\text{id}_u$ —a user name, for example—and orders edges according to their endpoints (so  $(u, v)$  gets mapped to  $(\text{id}_u, \text{id}_v)$ , where  $\text{id}_u < \text{id}_v$  and pairs are ordered lexicographically).

Since both projections process edges at the time they arrive, they end up considering edges according to a *time-aware version* of the ordering: edges end up being considered in the lexicographic order given by the triples  $(t, \text{id}_u, \text{id}_v)$ , where  $t$  is the edge’s arrival time.

Ordering the edges uniformly randomly within each time step would also suffice since one can couple the random orderings on two neighboring streams so they are consistent with each other. We omit a proof of this, and assume lexicographic ordering in the rest of this manuscript.

**Remark 3.1** (Running Algorithm 1 on static graphs). Algorithm 1 can also take a (static, not streamed) graph as input by interpreting the graph as a length-1 graph stream, where the first element of the graph stream is equal to the graph itself.

### 3.1 Stability of the Time-Aware Projection Algorithms

Our analysis of the projection algorithms differs significantly from the batch-model analyses of [BBDS13; DLL16]. First, we consider the stability of the entire projected sequence, and not a single graph. Second, Blocki et al. [BBDS13] consider only the edge-to-edge stability of their projection algorithm, while Day et al. [DLL16] only analyze the stability with respect to a particular function of the projected graph (namely, its degree distribution). We analyze several stronger notions of stability for the entire sequence produced by our projections. All but one of these stability guarantees hold for streams that are  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded.

**Definition 3.2** ( $(D, \ell)$ -bounded). We say that a graph  $G$  is  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded if it has at most  $\ell$  nodes of degree greater than  $D$ . Similarly, a graph stream  $S$  of length  $T$  is  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded through time  $t \in [T]$  if the flattened graph  $\text{flatten}(S_{[t]})$  is  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded (i.e., has at most  $\ell$  nodes of degree greater than  $D$ ).

We now present our theorem on the stability of Algorithm 1. These stabilities are summarized in Table 2.

**Theorem 3.3** (Stability of projections). *Let  $T \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $D \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ , and let  $\Pi_D^{BBDS}, \Pi_D^{DLL}$  be Algorithm 1 with inclusion criterion  $c = \text{original}$  and  $c = \text{projected}$ , respectively.*

1. (**Edge-to-edge stability.**) *If  $S \simeq_{\text{edge}} S'$  are edge-neighboring graph streams of length  $T$ , then for all time steps  $t \in [T]$ , the edge distances between the projections through time  $t$  satisfy the following:*

$$(a) \ d_{\text{edge}}\left(\Pi_D^{BBDS}(S)_{[t]}, \Pi_D^{BBDS}(S')_{[t]}\right) \leq 3.$$

$$(b) \ \text{If } S, S' \text{ are } (D, \ell)\text{-bounded through time } t, \text{ then } d_{\text{edge}}\left(\Pi_D^{DLL}(S)_{[t]}, \Pi_D^{DLL}(S')_{[t]}\right) \leq 2\ell + 1.$$

2. (**Node-to-edge stability.**) *If  $S \simeq_{\text{node}} S'$  are node-neighboring graph streams of length  $T$ , then for all time steps  $t \in [T]$ , the edge distances between the projections through time  $t$  satisfy the following:*

$$(a) \ \text{If } S, S' \text{ are } (D, \ell)\text{-bounded through time } t, \text{ then } d_{\text{edge}}\left(\Pi_D^{BBDS}(S)_{[t]}, \Pi_D^{BBDS}(S')_{[t]}\right) \leq D + \ell.$$

$$(b) \ \text{If } S, S' \text{ are } (D, \ell)\text{-bounded through time } t, \text{ then } d_{\text{edge}}\left(\Pi_D^{DLL}(S)_{[t]}, \Pi_D^{DLL}(S')_{[t]}\right) \leq \begin{cases} D + 2\ell^{3/2} & \text{if } D \geq \ell, \text{ and} \\ D + 2\ell\sqrt{D} & \text{if } D < \ell. \end{cases}$$

3. (**Node-to-node stability.**) *If  $S \simeq_{\text{node}} S'$  are node-neighboring graph streams of length  $T$ , then for all time steps  $t \in [T]$ , the node distances between the projections through time  $t$  satisfy the following:*

$$(a) \ \text{If } S, S' \text{ are } (D, \ell)\text{-bounded through time } t, \text{ then } d_{\text{node}}\left(\Pi_D^{BBDS}(S)_{[t]}, \Pi_D^{BBDS}(S')_{[t]}\right) \leq 2\ell + 1.$$

$$(b) \ \text{If } S, S' \text{ are } (D, \ell)\text{-bounded through time } t, \text{ then } d_{\text{node}}\left(\Pi_D^{DLL}(S)_{[t]}, \Pi_D^{DLL}(S')_{[t]}\right) \leq 2\ell + 1.$$

Furthermore, the bounds above are all tight in the worst case, either exactly (bound 1(a)), up to an additive constant of 2 (bounds 2(a) and 3(a)), or up to multiplicative constants.

The proofs that the bounds are tight are collected in Appendix B (see Lemma B.1). In this section, we focus on proving the upper bounds.

**Proof Sketch for Stability of Algorithm 1 (Theorem 3.3).** To analyze stability, we consider a pair of graphs streams  $S, S'$  that are either edge (part (1)) or node neighbors (parts (2) and (3)). Assume without loss of generality that  $S'$  is the larger of the two streams. When  $S'$  is larger by virtue of including an additional node, we use  $v^+$  to denote the additional node in  $S'$ .

Our proofs of stability rely heavily on two observations. First, the greedy nature of Algorithm 1 ensures that once an edge is added to the projection of a graph stream, that edge will not be removed from the projection at any future time step. Moreover, an edge may only be added to the projection at the time it arrives—it will not be added to the projection at any later time. This greedy behavior simplifies the analysis dramatically. It allows us to reason only about the distances between the flattened projected graphs at time  $t$ , rather than about the entire projected sequence: an edge that appears at some time  $t' < t$  in one projected sequence but not the other will still differ between the flattened graphs at time  $t$ . This fact is captured in the “Flattening Lemma” (Lemma 3.8), which we use throughout the remainder of the argument. (A different projection algorithm, for example one that recomputes a projection from scratch at each time step, would require us to more explicitly analyze the entire projected sequence.)

The other important observation for our analysis is the following. Consider two neighboring graphs, where one graph contains (at most) one additional node  $v^+$ . In the larger graph, if an edge is between two nodes of degree at most  $D$  and is not incident to the added node  $v^+$ , then it will be in both projections.

In other words, only edges that do not satisfy this condition may differ between projections. This idea is captured in Lemma 3.9.

**(Stability of  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDs}}$ .)** To prove edge-to-edge stability, we apply Lemma 3.8 and largely borrow the analysis of [BBDs13, Proof of Claim 13]. To prove node-to-node stability, we only need to consider the projections through times  $t \in [T]$  for which the graph streams  $S$  and  $S'$  are both  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded. We then use Lemma 3.8, in addition to the fact that only an edge with an endpoint node of degree greater than  $D$  in one of the original graphs may differ between projections of neighboring streams (Lemma 3.9) to see that all nodes and edges that differ between graph streams belong to a vertex cover of size at most  $\ell + 1$ . Therefore, we can obtain  $S_{[t]}$  from  $S'_{[t]}$  by removing  $v^+$  and changing the remaining  $\ell$  nodes in the vertex cover.

The node-to-edge stability also applies only through times  $t \in [T]$  for which the graph streams  $S$  and  $S'$  are both  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded. Its proof requires more careful analysis of exactly how many edges incident to nodes of degree greater than  $D$  may change, in addition to using Lemmas 3.8 and 3.9. We first show that at most  $D$  edges incident to the added node  $v^+$  may appear in the projection of  $S'$ ; these edges cannot appear in  $S$  or its projection.

We next consider whether any of the other edges differ between projections. First, consider an added edge  $e^+$  incident to  $v^+$  and some “high-degree” node  $u$  (i.e., with degree greater than  $D$  in  $S'$ ). The presence of  $e^+$  may mean exactly one edge incident to  $u$  that was included in the projection of  $S$  will now be dropped, since  $u$  may already have degree  $D$  when that edge is considered for addition. Now, suppose instead that  $e^+$  is incident to  $v^+$  and some “low-degree” node (i.e., with degree greater than  $D$  in  $S'$ ). None of the edges incident to  $u$  will be dropped from the projection due to the inclusion of  $e^+$ , because although the degree of  $u$  is now larger, it is still safely at or below the threshold of  $D$ . Of the remaining edges, then, only edges incident to high-degree nodes may change. Since there are at most  $\ell$  nodes with degree greater than  $D$ , there are at most  $\ell$  additional edges that differ between projections. Therefore, by combining this with the above observation that at most  $D$  edges incident to  $v^+$  appear in the projection of  $S'$ , we see that at most  $D + \ell$  edges differ between projections through time  $t$  for node-neighboring graph streams.

**(Stability of  $\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}$ .)** The analysis of this projection, especially its node-to-edge stability, is generally more complex. One exception is the proof of node-to-node stability, which follows from the same argument used to prove node-to-node stability for  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDs}}$ . All bounds on the stability of this projection only apply through times  $t \in [T]$  for which the graph streams  $S$  and  $S'$  are both  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded (note that the edge-to-edge stability for  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDs}}$  does not rely on this assumption).

The node-to-edge stability analysis of this algorithm is more involved, though it also relies on Lemma 3.8. We consider a pair of arbitrary node neighbors and leverage the greedy nature of our algorithm to iteratively construct a *difference graph* that tracks which edges differ between the projections of each graph. We show that the edge distance between the projections of neighboring graphs is exactly the number of edges in the difference graph (Lemma 3.16). If the difference graph on any two node neighbors were to form a DAG on  $\ell + 1$  nodes with at most  $k$  paths of length at most  $\ell$ , then we would be able to bound its edge count by  $2\ell\sqrt{k}$  and prove, by setting  $k = \min\{D, \ell\}$ , that the projections are at edge distance at most  $2\ell\sqrt{\min\{D, \ell\}}$  (Lemma 3.15).

In reality, we show that the difference graph is edge distance at most  $D$  from a DAG with this special structure (Lemma 3.19). This introduces an additive  $D$  term in the edge distance between the projections (which is to be expected since the projections of two node neighbors could differ in  $D$  edges that are incident to the differing node). The “pruning” argument, which shows how to remove edges from the difference graph to obtain the special DAG, and the construction of the resulting DAG form the most involved part of our analysis. In Section 3.5 we formally define a difference graph and prove Lemmas 3.15, 3.16, and 3.19.

The edge-to-edge stability of  $\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}$  also uses Lemma 3.8. If both graphs have maximum degree at most  $D$ , Algorithm 1 acts as the identity, and the projections differ in at most one edge. For graphs with at most  $\ell$  nodes of degree greater than  $D$ , we observe that all of the edges in the corresponding difference graph form two paths of length at most  $\ell$ , where all edges in each path are incident either to nodes with degree greater than  $D$  in  $S'$  or to the node with the added edge. Since there are at most  $\ell$  of these high-degree nodes, the path has length at most  $2\ell + 1$ .

**Useful Lemmas for Proving Stability.** As described in the proof sketch, Lemmas 3.8 and 3.9 are used

for proving many of the stability statements in Theorem 3.3. Before presenting the proofs of stability, we present those lemmas, along with definitions for terms that are used in the lemmas and their proofs.

The first definition is motivated by the observation that, if we run the algorithm on edge- or node-neighboring graph streams, edges are considered for inclusion in the output stream  $S^*$  in the same relative order for both graph streams (i.e., edge  $e_1$  is considered before edge  $e_2$  in stream  $S$  if and only if  $e_1$  is considered before  $e_2$  in stream  $S'$ ).

**Definition 3.4** (Projection stage of an edge). Let  $T \in \mathbb{N}$  be a time horizon,  $D \in \mathbb{N}$  be a degree bound,  $S$  be a graph stream of length  $T$ , and let  $\Pi_D \in \{\Pi_D^{\text{BBDs}}, \Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}\}$  denote one of the variants of Algorithm 1. An edge  $e$  in  $S$  is processed at projection stage  $i$  of algorithm  $\Pi_D(S)$  (denoted  $\text{ProjStage}(e) = i$ ) if  $e$  is the  $i^{\text{th}}$  edge to be considered by  $\Pi_D(S)$ .

In the proofs that follow, we are often interested in the value of a counter  $d(\cdot)$  (see Line 3 of Algorithm 1) in relation to a projection stage; we say that a counter  $d(u)$  has value  $j$  at projection stage  $i$  if, when the  $j^{\text{th}}$  edge is considered for inclusion in the projection,  $d(u) = j$  on Line 6.

Multiple edges may arrive in a time step, so the *projection stage* of an edge is related to but distinct from the *arrival time* of the edge. Knowing the projection stage of an edge is useful since it captures the order in which Algorithm 1 considers edges for inclusion in the output stream, which is a function of both an edge's arrival time and its placement in the consistent ordering on edges.

The second definition comes from the following observation. Consider a node  $u$  and counter  $d(u)$  in Algorithm 1. If an edge  $e$  incident to  $u$  is processed at a projection stage where Algorithm 1 has  $d(u) \geq D$ , then  $e$  will not be included in the output stream. Since no more edges incident to  $u$  will be included, node  $u$  can be thought of as being *saturated*. Definition 3.5 allows us to talk about the order in which this saturation occurs.

**Definition 3.5** (Saturation stage of a node). Let  $T \in \mathbb{N}$  be a time horizon,  $D \in \mathbb{N}$  be a degree bound,  $S$  be a graph stream of length  $T$ , and let  $\Pi_D \in \{\Pi_D^{\text{BBDs}}, \Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}\}$  denote one of the variants of Algorithm 1. A node  $u$  in  $S$  has *saturation stage*  $b$  (denoted  $\text{SatStage}_S(u) = b$ ) if  $b$  is the first projection stage such that  $d(u) \geq D$  by the end of Line 11 in  $\Pi_D(S)$ . We define  $\text{SatStage}_S(u) = \infty$  if there is no  $b$  for which the described condition holds.

**Definition 3.6** (Shortsighted algorithm). An algorithm  $\Pi : \mathcal{S}^T \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^T$  on graph streams of length  $T$  is a *shortsighted* algorithm if it

1. adds all input nodes to the output stream in the time when they first arrive and
2. adds some subset of input edges arriving in that time to the output stream (and does not add any other edges).

Observe that Algorithm 1 is a shortsighted algorithm for inclusion criterion  $\mathbf{c} = \textit{original}$  and  $\mathbf{c} = \textit{projected}$ .

**Definition 3.7** (Differing nodes and edges). An edge  $e$  (respectively, node  $v$ ) *differs* between a pair of graphs  $G$  and  $G'$  if  $e$  (resp.,  $v$ ) appears in one graph but not the other. We similarly say that an edge  $e$  (resp., node  $v$ ) differs between a pair of graph streams  $S$  and  $S'$  through time  $t$  if  $e$  (resp.,  $v$ ) arrives at time step  $i \in [t]$  in one graph stream, but either

- (a) fails to appear in the other graph stream through time  $t$  or
- (b) appears at time step  $j \neq i$  (where  $j \in [t]$ ) in the other graph stream.

**Lemma 3.8** (Flattening Lemma). Let  $\Pi_D \in \{\Pi_D^{\text{BBDs}}, \Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}\}$  be a shortsighted algorithm. For every edge- or node-neighboring pair of graph streams  $S$  and  $S'$  of length  $T$ , the edge- and node-distance between the projected streams through time  $t$  is the same as the edge- and node-distance between the flattened graphs through time  $t \in [T]$ :

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{edge}}(\Pi_D(S)_{[t]}, \Pi_D(S')_{[t]}) \\ = d_{\text{edge}}(\text{flatten}(\Pi_D(S)_{[t]}), \text{flatten}(\Pi_D(S')_{[t]})) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & d_{node}(\Pi_D(S)_{[t]}, \Pi_D(S')_{[t]}) \\ &= d_{node}(\text{flatten}(\Pi_D(S)_{[t]}), \text{flatten}(\Pi_D(S')_{[t]})). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

*Proof of Lemma 3.8.* Let  $S$  and  $S'$  be graph streams of length  $T$ , and let  $\Pi_D$  be a shortsighted algorithm. Let  $P_{[t]}, P'_{[t]}$  denote projected graph streams  $\Pi(S)_{[t]}$  and  $\Pi(S')_{[t]}$ . Also, let  $F_{[t]}, F'_{[t]}$  denote the flattened graphs  $\text{flatten}(\Pi(S)_{[t]})$  and  $\text{flatten}(\Pi(S')_{[t]})$ .

**(Proof of Expression 1.)** We first prove Expression 1, where  $S$  and  $S'$  are node-neighbors (and let  $S'$  be the larger graph stream—it contains an additional node  $v^+$  and associated edges). We see  $d_{edge}(F_{[t]}, F'_{[t]}) \leq d_{edge}(P_{[t]}, P'_{[t]})$  because if an edge differs between flattened graphs, then it must differ between the projections that were flattened to obtain the graphs (this same logic applies for isolated nodes that differ between flattened graphs). Note that this inequality holds for arbitrary (e.g., non-neighboring) graph streams.

We now need to show  $d_{edge}(P_{[t]}, P'_{[t]}) \leq d_{edge}(F_{[t]}, F'_{[t]})$ . This expression does not necessarily hold for arbitrary graph streams. For node-neighbors, though, the edges in the corresponding projections  $P_{[t]}$  or  $P'_{[t]}$  can only differ according to (a) and not (b) in Definition 3.7 (and similarly for isolated nodes that differ between projections). This holds for two reasons. First, all edges that arrive in  $S$  at time  $i$  must also arrive in  $S'$  at time  $i$ . Second,  $\Pi_D$  is a shortsighted algorithm, so if an edge arrives in one projected stream at time  $i$ , it either also appears in the other projected stream at time  $i$  or it never appears at all. Therefore, all edges that differ between graph streams must differ according to (a). If an edge differs between graph streams through time  $t$  according to (a), then it will also differ between the flattened versions of those graphs. This gives us  $d_{edge}(P_{[t]}, P'_{[t]}) \leq d_{edge}(F_{[t]}, F'_{[t]})$ , which yields the desired equality.

If  $S$  and  $S'$  are edge-neighbors (and let  $S'$  be the larger graph stream—it contains an additional edge), edges in the corresponding projections  $P_{[t]}$  or  $P'_{[t]}$  can also only differ according to (a) and not (b) since all edges that arrive in  $S$  at time  $i$  must also arrive in  $S'$  at time  $i$ , and since  $\Pi_D$  is a shortsighted algorithm (a similar statement applies to isolated nodes that differ between projections). This gives us  $d_{edge}(P_{[t]}, P'_{[t]}) \leq d_{edge}(F_{[t]}, F'_{[t]})$ . The node-neighboring argument for  $d_{edge}(F_{[t]}, F'_{[t]}) \leq d_{edge}(P_{[t]}, P'_{[t]})$  also applies to edge neighbors, completing the proof.

**(Proof of Expression 2.)** To show  $d_{node}(F_{[t]}, F'_{[t]}) \leq d_{node}(P_{[t]}, P'_{[t]})$ , the same argument as above applies (with the additional observation that nodes differing between graphs also differ between graph streams). We now show  $d_{node}(P_{[t]}, P'_{[t]}) \leq d_{node}(F_{[t]}, F'_{[t]})$ . Let  $V_{remove}$  and  $V_{add}$  be the sets of nodes (and edges incident to these nodes) that are removed from and added to  $F$  to obtain  $F'$ , such that  $|V_{remove}| + |V_{add}|$  is minimized.

Recall from the argument for Expression 1 that nodes and edges differ between edge- and node-neighboring graph streams according only to (a) and not (b) in Definition 3.7. Therefore, removing  $V_{remove}$  from  $P$  and adding  $V_{add}$  to  $P$  at the appropriate times (and also adding the edges at the appropriate times) gives us  $P'$ . This gives us  $d_{node}(P_{[t]}, P'_{[t]}) \leq |V_{remove}| + |V_{add}|$ , so we have  $d_{node}(P_{[t]}, P'_{[t]}) \leq d_{node}(F_{[t]}, F'_{[t]})$ , which completes the proof of Expression 2.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.9** (Edges between low-degree nodes remain in both projections). *Let  $\Pi_D \in \{\Pi_D^{BBS}, \Pi_D^{DLL}\}$  denote one of the variants of Algorithm 1. Consider a pair of edge- or node-neighboring graph streams  $S, S'$  of length  $T$ , where  $S'$  contains (at most) one additional node as compared to  $S$ . For all edges  $e = \{u, v\}$  that arrive in  $S$  at (or before) time step  $t \in [T]$ , if  $u$  and  $v$  have degree at most  $D$  in  $S'_{[t]}$ , then  $e$  is in both  $\Pi_D(S)$  and  $\Pi_D(S')$ .*

*Proof of Lemma 3.9.* Without loss of generality let  $S'$  be the larger graph stream (i.e., for node-neighbors,  $S'$  can be formed by adding a node  $v^+$  and associated edges to  $S$ ; and for edge-neighbors,  $S'$  contains an additional edge as compared to  $S$ ). Before proceeding with the proof, we note that all nodes and edges in  $S_{[t]}$  are in  $S'_{[t]}$ . Additionally, we see that for all nodes  $v$  in  $S'_{[t]}$ , the degree of  $v$  is at least as large in  $S'_{[t]}$  as in  $S_{[t]}$ —that is,  $\deg_v(S'_{[t]}) \geq \deg_v(S_{[t]})$ .

Let  $e = \{u, v\}$  be an edge that arrives in  $S$  at time  $t$ , and let  $u$  and  $v$  both have degree at most  $D$  in  $S'_{[t]}$ . We now consider Algorithm 1. We see from Lines 6–8 that, if the counters  $d(u)$  and  $d(v)$  are both less than  $D$  when we consider adding edge  $e$  to the projection, then  $e$  will be added. The counters are initialized to 0, and we see on Line 11 that, for all nodes  $w$  in the input,  $d(w)$  is incremented only if Algorithm 1 considers adding an edge incident to  $w$  to the projection.

This means that, prior to considering  $e = \{u, v\}$  in the for loop (Line 5), the counters  $d(u)$  and  $d(v)$  will have each been incremented fewer than  $D$  times when running  $\Pi_D$  on  $S$  or on  $S'$ . Therefore, Algorithm 1 will have  $d(u) < D$  and  $d(v) < D$  when the for loop considers  $e = \{u, v\}$  for addition to the projection, so  $e$  will be added to the projection. We see that this argument also holds if  $e$  arrives before time  $t$ .  $\square$

Lemma 3.9 has an important consequence: if  $U$  is the set of nodes that have degree more than  $D$  in  $S'_{[t]}$  (where  $S'$  is the larger of two neighboring graph streams), then  $U \cup \{v_+\}$  forms a vertex cover for the edges that differ between the projections  $\Pi_D(S)_{[t]}$  and  $\Pi_D(S')_{[t]}$ . We use this in the proof of Theorem 3.3 in a few ways. Most directly, if we have an upper bound of  $\ell + 1$  on the size of  $U$ , then we immediately obtain an upper bound of  $2\ell + 1$  on the node distance between the projections  $\Pi_D(S)_{[t]}$  and  $\Pi_D(S')_{[t]}$ , which gives us the proof of node-to-node stability. It is also the first step in the proofs of other stability statements.

### 3.2 Proof of Edge-to-Edge Stability for $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDs}}$

We begin by proving item (1a) of Theorem 3.3, which we repeat below for convenience. The proof follows immediately from Lemma 3.8 and the ideas from the proof of [BBDs13, Claim 13].

**Theorem 3.10** (Item (1a) of Theorem 3.3). *Let  $T \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $D \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ , and let  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDs}}$  be Algorithm 1 with inclusion criterion  $c = \text{original}$ . If  $S \simeq_{\text{edge}} S'$  are edge-neighboring graph streams of length  $T$ , then for all time steps  $t \in [T]$ , the edge distances between the projections through time  $t$  satisfy*

$$d_{\text{edge}}\left(\Pi_D^{\text{BBDs}}(S)_{[t]}, \Pi_D^{\text{BBDs}}(S')_{[t]}\right) \leq 3.$$

*Proof of Theorem 3.10.* Let  $S, S'$  be edge-neighboring graph streams (wlog, let  $S'$  be formed by adding one edge  $e^+ = \{u, v\}$  to  $S$ ). To simplify notation, let  $F_{[t]}, F'_{[t]}$  denote  $\text{flatten}(\Pi_D^{\text{BBDs}}(S)_{[t]})$  and  $\text{flatten}(\Pi_D^{\text{BBDs}}(S')_{[t]})$  respectively. By Lemma 3.8, we only need to consider how  $F$  and  $F'$  differ.

We consider three types of edges: edge  $e^+ = \{u, v\}$ , edges  $e$  incident to neither  $u$  nor  $v$ , and edges  $e_u$  and  $e_v$  incident to either  $u$  or  $v$  respectively. We first note that  $e^+$  may appear in  $F'_{[t]}$  and will not appear in  $F_{[t]}$ .

Next consider edges  $e = \{w, x\}$  incident to neither  $u$  nor  $v$ . An edge of this form will either appear in both  $F_{[t]}$  and  $F'_{[t]}$ , or it will appear in neither. This is because  $e^+$  will not affect the value of  $d(w)$  or  $d(x)$ , so the decision to add  $e$  to the output stream will be the same, regardless of whether  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDs}}$  is running on  $S$  or  $S'$ .

Now consider edges incident to either  $u$  or  $v$ . If  $e^+$  is processed at a projection stage where  $d(u) \geq D$  and  $d(v) \geq D$  in  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDs}}$  on  $S'$ , then the projections of both streams will be identical. However, if  $e^+$  is processed prior to this projection stage, then there may be one edge  $e_u$  incident to  $u$  that appears in  $F_{[t]}$  but does not appear in  $F'_{[t]}$ , due to having  $d(u) = D$  at the projection stage when  $e_u$  is processed for the case of running  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDs}}$  on  $S'$ , instead of having  $d(u) = D - 1 < D$  as is the case on  $S$ . Note that, if an edge incident to  $u$  is processed at a projection stage following that of  $e_u$ , then that edge will appear in neither  $F_{[t]}$  nor  $F'_{[t]}$ . This is because  $u$  is already saturated in  $S$  and  $S'$  when those edges are considered—that is,  $d(u) \geq D$ . Likewise, an edge incident to  $u$  that is processed at a projection stage prior to  $e_u$  will either appear in both  $F_{[t]}$  and  $F'_{[t]}$  or will appear in neither. Similarly, there may be one edge  $e_v$  incident to  $v$  that appears in  $F_{[t]}$  but does not appear in  $F'_{[t]}$ . Graphs  $F'_{[t]}$  and  $F_{[t]}$  differ on at most three edges—namely  $e^+$ ,  $e_u$ , and  $e_v$ —so  $d_{\text{edge}}(F_{[t]}, F'_{[t]}) \leq 3$ .  $\square$

### 3.3 Proof of Node-to-Node Stability for $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDs}}$ and $\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}$

We next prove item (3) of Theorem 3.3, which we repeat below for convenience. The proof follows from Lemmas 3.8 and 3.9, with the same approach applying for inclusion criterion  $c = \text{original}$  and  $c = \text{projected}$ .

**Theorem 3.11** (Item (3) of Theorem 3.3). *Let  $T \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $D \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ , and let  $\Pi_D^{BDS}, \Pi_D^{DLL}$  be Algorithm 1 with inclusion criterion  $\mathbf{c} = \text{original}$  and  $\mathbf{c} = \text{projected}$ , respectively. If  $S \simeq_{\text{node}} S'$  are node-neighboring graph streams of length  $T$ , then for all time steps  $t \in [T]$ , the node distances between the projections through time  $t$  satisfy the following:*

- (a) *If  $S, S'$  are  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded through time  $t$ , then  $d_{\text{node}}(\Pi_D^{BDS}(S)_{[t]}, \Pi_D^{BDS}(S')_{[t]}) \leq 2\ell + 1$ .*
- (b) *If  $S, S'$  are  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded through time  $t$ , then  $d_{\text{node}}(\Pi_D^{DLL}(S)_{[t]}, \Pi_D^{DLL}(S')_{[t]}) \leq 2\ell + 1$ .*

*Proof of Theorem 3.11.* Without loss of generality, let  $S'$  be the larger graph stream—that is, it contains an additional node  $v^+$  and associated edges. To simplify notation, let  $F_{[t]}, F'_{[t]}$  denote  $\text{flatten}(\Pi_D^{BDS}(S)_{[t]})$  and  $\text{flatten}(\Pi_D^{BDS}(S')_{[t]})$  respectively. Note that we only care to bound the node distance between projections for times  $t \in [T]$  where  $S_{[t]}, S'_{[t]}$  are  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded. By Lemma 3.8, we only need to bound  $d_{\text{node}}(F_{[t]}, F'_{[t]})$ .

Let  $U$  be the set of nodes with degree greater than  $D$  in  $S'_{[t]}$ . By Lemma 3.9, only edges incident to  $v^+$  or to nodes with degree greater than  $D$  in  $S'_{[t]}$  will differ between flattened graphs  $F_{[t]}$  and  $F'_{[t]}$ , so  $U \cup \{v^+\}$  forms a vertex cover for these differing edges. This means we can use the following process to obtain  $F_{[t]}$  from  $F'_{[t]}$ : first, delete  $v^+$  and all nodes in  $U$  from  $F'_{[t]}$ ; then, add all of the nodes in  $U$  to this graph, but instead of adding the edges incident to these nodes in  $F'_{[t]}$ , add the edges incident to these nodes in  $F_{[t]}$ . We removed  $\ell + 1$  nodes and added  $\ell$  nodes, which gives us the desired bound of  $d_{\text{node}}(F_{[t]}, F'_{[t]}) \leq 2\ell + 1$ .  $\square$

### 3.4 Proof of Node-to-Edge Stability for $\Pi_D^{BDS}$

Here we prove item (2a) of Theorem 3.3, which we repeat below for convenience. The proof uses Lemmas 3.8 and 3.9, though it requires a more careful analysis of the flattened graphs than the other stability proofs we have provided so far.

**Theorem 3.12** (Item (2a) of Theorem 3.3). *Let  $T \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $D \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ , and let  $\Pi_D^{BDS}$  be Algorithm 1 with inclusion criterion  $\mathbf{c} = \text{original}$ . If  $S \simeq_{\text{node}} S'$  are node-neighboring graph streams of length  $T$ , then for all time steps  $t \in [T]$  such that  $S$  and  $S'$  are  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded through time  $t$ , the edge distances between the projections through time  $t$  satisfy*

$$d_{\text{edge}}(\Pi_D^{BDS}(S)_{[t]}, \Pi_D^{BDS}(S')_{[t]}) \leq D + \ell.$$

*Proof of Theorem 3.12.* Without loss of generality, let  $S'$  be the larger graph stream—that is, it contains an additional node  $v^+$  and associated edges, which we represent with the set  $E^+$ . To simplify notation, let  $F_{[t]}, F'_{[t]}$  denote  $\text{flatten}(\Pi_D^{BDS}(S)_{[t]})$  and  $\text{flatten}(\Pi_D^{BDS}(S')_{[t]})$  respectively. Note that we only care to bound the node distance between projections for times  $t \in [T]$  where  $S_{[t]}, S'_{[t]}$  are  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded. By Lemma 3.8, we only need to bound  $d_{\text{edge}}(F_{[t]}, F'_{[t]})$ .

By Lemma 3.9, only edges incident (1) to  $v^+$  or (2) to nodes with degree greater than  $D$  in  $S'_{[t]}$  will differ between flattened graphs  $F_{[t]}$  and  $F'_{[t]}$ . We now count the number of edges in these categories that differ between  $F_{[t]}$  and  $F'_{[t]}$ .

We first bound the number of edges in (1). There are at most  $D$  edges incident to  $v^+$  in  $F'_{[t]}$  because  $F'_{[t]}$  has maximum degree at most  $D$ , and none of these edges show up in  $F_{[t]}$  since  $v^+$  is not in  $F_{[t]}$ . Therefore, there are at most  $D$  edges in category (1).

We next bound the number of edges in (2). Each flattened graph  $F_{[t]}$  and  $F'_{[t]}$  contains at most  $D \cdot \ell$  edges incident to nodes with degree greater than  $D$  in  $S'_{[t]}$ . However, we show that many of these edges will be the same in both flattened graphs. Let  $U$  denote the set of nodes, excluding  $v^+$ , that both have degree greater than  $D$  in  $S'_{[t]}$  and are incident to edges in  $E^+$ . Consider an edge  $e = \{u, v\}$ , where neither  $u$  nor  $v$  is in  $U$ . The added edges in  $E^+$  will not affect the values of  $d(u)$  or  $d(v)$ , so either  $e$  will be in both  $F_{[t]}$  and  $F'_{[t]}$ , or it will be in neither flattened graph.

Now consider edges  $e'$  incident to nodes in  $U$ . All edges in  $E^+$  are of the form  $e^+ = \{v^+, w\}$ . If  $e^+$  is processed at a projection stage where  $d(w) \geq D$  in  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBS}}$  on  $S'$ , then  $e^+$  will not cause any edges  $e'$  to differ between  $F_{[t]}$  and  $F'_{[t]}$ . However, if  $e^+$  is processed prior to this projection stage, then there may be one edge  $e_w$  incident to  $w$  that appears in  $F_{[t]}$  but does not appear in  $F'_{[t]}$ , due to having  $d(w) = D$  at the projection stage when  $e_w$  is processed instead of  $d(w) = D - 1 < D$  (as is the case when running  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBS}}$  on  $S$ ). Note that  $e^+$  will not affect the inclusion of other edges in the output stream: any edge incident to  $w$  that is processed at a projection stage after  $e_w$  will appear in neither flattened graph, and any edge that is processed at a projection stage prior to  $e_w$  will have  $d(w) < D$  when considered for inclusion in both output streams.

We see that each edge  $e = \{v^+, w\}$  in  $E^+$  causes at most one edge incident to  $w$  to differ between projections (in particular, to appear in  $F_{[t]}$  but not appear in  $F'_{[t]}$ ). Therefore, if we bound  $|E^+|$ , we can bound the number of edges in category (2). Since all edges in  $E^+$  are incident to  $v^+$  and a node in  $U$ , there are at most  $|U|$  edges in  $E^+$ . By the fact that the streams  $S_{[t]}$  and  $S'_{[t]}$  are  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded, there are at most  $\ell$  nodes in  $U$ . Therefore, the number of edges in category (2) is at most  $\ell$ .

Categories (1) and (2) contain a total of at most  $D + \ell$  edges, so at most  $D + \ell$  edges differ between  $F_{[t]}$  and  $F'_{[t]}$ , which is what we wanted to show.  $\square$

### 3.5 Proof of Node-to-Edge Stability for $\Pi_D^{\text{PLL}}$

In this section, we prove item (2b) of Theorem 3.3, which we repeat below for convenience. This proof of stability requires a more involved analysis than other proofs, so we describe our proof approach below before moving to the formal proof.

**Theorem 3.13** (Item (2b) of Theorem 3.3). *Let  $T \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $D \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ , and let  $\Pi_D^{\text{PLL}}$  be Algorithm 1 with inclusion criterion  $c = \text{projected}$ . If  $S \simeq_{\text{node}} S'$  are node-neighboring graph streams of length  $T$ , then for all time steps  $t \in [T]$  such that  $S$  and  $S'$  are  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded through time  $t$ , the edge distances between the projections through time  $t$  satisfy*

$$d_{\text{edge}}\left(\Pi_D^{\text{PLL}}(S)_{[t]}, \Pi_D^{\text{PLL}}(S')_{[t]}\right) \leq \begin{cases} D + 2\ell^{3/2} & \text{if } D \geq \ell, \text{ and} \\ D + 2\ell\sqrt{D} & \text{if } D < \ell. \end{cases}$$

The proof of stability begins from the observation—as in our other stability proofs—that we only need to show stability of the flattened graphs (Lemma 3.8). To show this stability of the flattened graphs, we construct a graph that contains exactly one edge for every edge that differs between projections, and we carefully label and direct each of these edges to create a *difference graph* (see Algorithm 2).

If the resulting difference graph were a DAG that satisfied the conditions of Lemma 3.15, then the difference graph would have at most  $2\ell\sqrt{k}$  edges (where  $\ell$  and  $k$  are as defined in Lemma 3.15, and we set  $k = \min\{D, \ell\}$ ). Unfortunately, the difference graph does not satisfy these conditions—but we can show that the difference graph is close to a graph that satisfies these conditions. More specifically, if we carefully remove at most  $D$  edges from the difference graph, we can obtain a *pruned difference graph* that has the special, highly structured form described in the conditions of Lemma 3.15. Therefore, the difference graph must contain at most  $D + 2\ell\sqrt{\min\{D, \ell\}}$  edges, so the edge distance between projected graph streams is at most  $D + 2\ell\sqrt{\min\{D, \ell\}}$ .

Before presenting Lemma 3.15 we define an *order-induced cut*, a method for creating cuts for a DAG.

**Definition 3.14** (Order-induced cut). Let  $G$  be a DAG on  $k$  nodes, and let  $v_1, \dots, v_k$  be a topological ordering of its nodes from left to right (i.e., when the nodes are lined up horizontally in this order, all edges in  $G$  go from left to right).

Given this ordering, the  $i^{\text{th}}$  *order-induced cut* of  $G$  is defined as the cut made by partitioning the nodes into the sets  $\{v_1, \dots, v_i\}$  and  $\{v_{i+1}, \dots, v_k\}$ . The  $i^{\text{th}}$  *order-induced cut set* of  $G$  is defined as the edges in the cut set of the resulting cut. The cuts and cut sets are depicted in Fig. 1.




Figure 1: Order-induced cuts. Let the nodes in the figure represent a left-to-right topological ordering of nodes. Each vertical line defines a distinct order-induced cut, where nodes to the left are in one part of a cut, nodes to the right are in the other part of the cut, and the cut-set for the cut defined by a vertical line is the set of edges intersected by that vertical line.

In the proof below, we will begin by proving the result in Lemma 3.15 about the number of edges in a highly structured DAG. We will then go about creating the difference graph, removing edges to obtain a pruned difference graph, and showing that the pruned difference graph shares the structure of the DAG whose edge count we upper bound. We conclude by upper bounding the number of edges that were removed to create the pruned difference graph.

**Lemma 3.15** (Number of edges in a structured DAG). *Let  $k, \ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ . A DAG  $G$  with both of the following properties has at most  $2\ell\sqrt{k}$  edges:*

1.  $G$  has at most  $\ell + 1$  nodes, and
2. every order-induced cut set of  $G$  has at most  $k$  edges.

*Proof of Lemma 3.15.* Let  $G$  be a DAG with the properties described in the statement of Lemma 3.15 above, and let  $k^* \leq k$  and  $\ell^* \leq \ell$  be an upper bound on the number of edges in order-induced cut sets in the DAG and one less than the number of nodes in the DAG, respectively. Because  $G$  is a DAG, it must have a topological ordering—that is, there is a way to order its nodes horizontally from left to right such that all edges in the graph go from left to right. We enumerate these sorted nodes from left to right as  $v_1, \dots, v_{\ell^*+1}$ .

Throughout this proof, we define the *length of edge*  $e = (v_j, v_{j'})$  in the DAG as  $j' - j$ . To bound the number of edges in this DAG, we bound the number of “short” edges and the number of “long” edges. More precisely, let  $F$  be the set of edges in the DAG, which we separate into the following two sets according to edge length:  $F_0$ , the set of edges with length at most  $\sqrt{k^*}$ ; and  $F_1$ , the set of edges with length greater than  $\sqrt{k^*}$ .

We first bound the cardinality of  $F_0$ . All of the edges in the DAG go from left to right and there are  $\ell^* + 1$  nodes, so there are  $\ell^*$  starting points for edges, and there are at most  $\sqrt{k^*}$  choices of endpoints for edges of length at most  $\sqrt{k^*}$  from each starting point. This gives us

$$|F_0| \leq \ell^* \sqrt{k^*}.$$

We next bound the cardinality of  $F_1$ . We use a probabilistic argument. Let  $F_1^s$  denote the set of edges in  $F_1$  that are in the  $s^{\text{th}}$  order-induced cut set. In other words,  $F_1^s$  denotes the number of edges in the  $s^{\text{th}}$  order-induced cut set that have length greater than  $\sqrt{k^*}$ . We now compute the expected cardinality of  $F_1^s$  for a uniformly random choice of  $s \in [\ell^*]$  (since there are  $\ell^*$  locations at which we could make a cut), and

we relate it to the cardinality of  $F_1$  to get a bound for  $|F_1|$ . Note that we have  $|F_1^s| \leq k^*$  by condition (2) of Lemma 3.15. This gives us the following series of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
k^* &\geq \mathbb{E}_s[|F_1^s|] \\
&= \sum_{e \in F_1} \Pr_s[e \in F_1^s] && \text{(law of total expectation)} \\
&> |F_1| \cdot \frac{\sqrt{k^*}}{\ell^*}. && (|F_1| \text{ edges, each in the cut set w.p. greater than } \frac{\sqrt{k^*}}{\ell^*})
\end{aligned}$$

Solving for  $|F_1|$  gives us  $|F_1| < \ell^* \sqrt{k^*}$ .

We now combine our bounds on  $|F_0|$  and  $|F_1|$  to get

$$\begin{aligned}
|F| &= |F_0| + |F_1| \\
&\leq 2\ell^* \sqrt{k^*} \\
&\leq 2\ell \sqrt{k},
\end{aligned}$$

which is what we wanted to show.  $\square$

### 3.5.1 (Pruned) Difference Graphs and Their Properties

We next show that the pruned difference graph has the structure described in Lemma 3.15. We begin by defining a difference graph. The algorithm for creating a difference graph is provided in Algorithm 2. On an input of two node-neighboring graph streams  $S \simeq_{node} S'$ , it returns a graph that encodes the edges that differ between the projections of  $S$  and  $S'$ . The resulting *difference graph* will consist of directed edges, each colored red or blue and labeled with an integer.




Figure 2: Edges in a difference graph

As shown in Fig. 2, red edges in the difference graph represent edges that appear in  $\Pi_D(S)$  and not  $\Pi_D(S')$ , while blue edges represent edges that appear in  $\Pi_D(S')$  and not  $\Pi_D(S)$ . The label on the edge corresponds to when the projection algorithm considers it for addition. An edge  $\{u, v\}$  is directed as  $(u, v)$  if  $u$  is saturated before  $v$  in the projection missing the edge, and is otherwise directed as  $(v, u)$ ; the details on directing edges are provided in Algorithm 2. All edges that differ between projections are contained in the difference graph (Lemma 3.16).

**Lemma 3.16** (The difference graph contains all differing edges). *Let  $S \simeq_{node} S'$  be a pair of node-neighboring graph streams of length  $T$ , let  $t \in [T]$ , and let  $\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}$  be Algorithm 1 with inclusion criterion  $\mathbf{c} = \text{projected}$ . An edge differs between  $\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}(S)_{[t]}$  and  $\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}(S')_{[t]}$  if and only if the edge is in  $\text{DG}((S, S'), D, t)$ .*

*Proof of Lemma 3.16.* By Lemma 3.8, we only need to consider how the flattened graphs differ.

---

**Algorithm 2** Algorithm DG for difference graphs.

---

**Input:** Node-neighboring graph streams  $S \simeq S'$  of length  $T$ , degree bound  $D \in \mathbb{N}$ , time  $t \in [T]$ . Let  $\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}$  be Algorithm 1 with  $\mathbf{c} = \text{projected}$ . (Without loss of generality, assume that  $S'$  is the “larger” graph stream with an additional node  $v^+$ .)

**Output:** Colored, directed graph  $\Delta$  with labeled edges, where  $V(\Delta) = V(S')$ .

- 1:  $E_{blue}, E_{red} \leftarrow \emptyset$
- 2:  $F \leftarrow \text{flatten}(\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}(S)_{[t]}), F' \leftarrow \text{flatten}(\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}(S')_{[t]})$
- 3:  $\text{SatStage}_S(v^+) \leftarrow -1$  ▷ Redefine  $\text{SatStage}_S(v^+)$  to evaluate to  $-1$
- 4: **for** projection stage  $i$  of  $\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}(S')$  **do**
- 5:   Consider edge  $e = \{u, v\}$  processed during projection stage  $i$
- 6:   **if**  $e \in F \cap F'$  **then** ignore  $e$
- 7:   **else if**  $e \in F$  **then** ▷ Directing red edges
- 8:     **if**  $\text{SatStage}_{S'}(u) < \text{SatStage}_{S'}(v)$  **then**
- 9:       add  $(u, v)$  with label  $i$  to  $E_{red}$
- 10:    **else**
- 11:      add  $(v, u)$  with label  $i$  to  $E_{red}$
- 12:    **else if**  $e \in F'$  **then** ▷ Directing blue edges
- 13:     **if**  $\text{SatStage}_S(u) < \text{SatStage}_S(v)$  **then**
- 14:       add  $(u, v)$  with label  $i$  to  $E_{blue}$
- 15:    **else**
- 16:      add  $(v, u)$  with label  $i$  to  $E_{blue}$
- 17: **return**  $V(F'), (E_{blue}, E_{red})$

---

We first show the  $\Rightarrow$  direction. By Line 6 of Algorithm 2, we only ignore an edge (i.e., don’t add it to the difference graph) if it appears in both flattened graphs. Therefore, if an edge differs between projections of node neighbors, then it appears in the difference graph, which is what we wanted to show.

We next show the  $\Leftarrow$  direction. By Line 6 edges in both flattened graphs are ignored, and by Lines 7 and 12 edges in one flattened graph but not the other are added to the difference graph.  $\square$

**Remark 3.17** (Interpreting a difference graph). Algorithm 2 returns three sets: a set  $V(\Delta)$  of vertices; a set  $E_{blue}$  of labelled, directed, blue edges; and a set  $E_{red}$  of labelled, directed, red edges. A difference graph is the directed graph formed on the vertices in  $V(\Delta)$ , where edges in  $E_{blue}$  are colored blue and labelled according to their labels, and edges in  $E_{red}$  are colored red and labelled according to their labels.

An additional property, which we prove in Claim 3.20, is that all out-edges from a node  $v$  in a difference graph have the same color. For a node  $v$ , we let  $\text{out-color}(v)$  denote this color of its out-edges.

**Definition 3.18** (Out color of a node). Let  $G$  be a difference graph, and for edge  $e$  in the difference graph, let  $\text{color}(e)$  denote its color. All out-edges  $e$  from a node in a difference graph have the same color  $\text{color}(e)$  (Claim 3.20). The *out color* of a node  $v$  in  $G$ , denoted  $\text{out-color}(v)$ , is the color of the out-edges from  $v$ .

Now that we have defined a difference graph, we can present the definition of a *pruned difference graph* (Algorithm 3), which we will later show has the same structure as the DAG described in Lemma 3.15. A pruned difference graph removes two types of edges from a difference graph: every edge that (1) is an in-edge to a node that, in the larger graph stream  $S'_{[t]}$ , has degree at most  $D$  or (2) is an in-edge to a node  $v$  and itself has color  $\text{out-color}(v)$  (all out-edges from a node in a difference graph have the same color—see Claim 3.20). We also remove all nodes in the difference graph that, after removing edges to create the pruned difference graph, have degree 0.

To show that Lemma 3.15 applies to a pruned difference graph produced by Algorithm 3, we need to prove the first three items of Lemma 3.19 below; the fourth item shows that the pruned difference graph differs in few edges from the original difference graph.

---

**Algorithm 3** Algorithm PDG for pruned difference graphs.

---

**Input:** Difference graph  $\Delta$  returned by Algorithm 2, time  $t$  and graph stream  $S'$  input to Algorithm 2.

**Output:** Colored, directed graph with labeled edges.

- 1: Parse difference graph  $\Delta$  as  $V, (E_{blue}, E_{red})$
  - 2:  $F' \leftarrow \text{flatten}(S'_{[t]})$
  - 3: **for** edge  $e = (u, v)$  in  $E_{blue} \cup E_{red}$  **do**
  - 4:     **if**  $\text{color}(e) = \text{out-color}(v)$  **then** ▷ see Definition 3.18.
  - 5:         Remove  $e$  from  $E_{\text{color}(e)}$
  - 6:     **if**  $\text{deg}_v(F') \leq D$  **then**
  - 7:         Remove  $e$  from  $E_{\text{color}(e)}$
  - 8:  $F_{prune} = \text{flatten}(V, E_{blue} \cup E_{red})$
  - 9: **for**  $v$  in  $V$  **do**
  - 10:    **if**  $\text{deg}_v(F_{prune}) = 0$  **then** remove  $v$  from  $V$
  - 11: Return  $V, (E_{blue}, E_{red})$
- 

**Lemma 3.19.** *Let  $T, D \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $S \simeq_{node} S'$  be a pair of node-neighboring graph streams of length  $T$ , where without loss of generality  $S'$  has one additional node  $v^+$  (and its associated edges) as compared to  $S$ , and let be  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded through time  $t \in [T]$ . Let  $\Delta$  be the difference graph output by Algorithm 2 when run with degree bound  $D$  and time  $t$  on graph streams  $S, S'$ , and let  $\Delta^*$  be the pruned difference graph returned by Algorithm 3 when run on  $\Delta, S'$ , and  $t$ .*

*The pruned difference graph  $\Delta^*$  has the following properties:*

1.  $\Delta^*$  is a DAG.
2.  $\Delta^*$  has at most  $\ell + 1$  nodes.
3. Every order-induced cut in  $\Delta^*$  contains at most  $\min\{D, \ell\}$  edges.
4. At most  $D$  edges were removed from  $\Delta$  to make  $\Delta^*$ .

Before proving Lemma 3.19, we show how its result can be used to complete the proof of Theorem 3.13. We then use the remainder of Section 3.5 to prove Lemma 3.19.

*Proof of Theorem 3.13.* By items (1), (2), and (3) of Lemma 3.19, we see that the pruned difference graph satisfies the conditions of Lemma 3.15. Therefore, the pruned difference graph has at most  $2\ell\sqrt{\min\{D, \ell\}}$  edges. Item (4) of Lemma 3.19 tells us that the pruned difference graph differs from the difference graph on at most  $D$  edges. By Lemma 3.16 the difference graph contains all differing edges, which means that at most  $D + 2\ell\sqrt{\min\{D, \ell\}}$  edges differ between the projections, through time  $t$ , of node-neighboring graph streams that are  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded through time  $t$ . This is what we wanted to show.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 3.19.* We prove each part of Lemma 3.19 below.

**Proof of item (1).** We will show that, in the pruned difference graph  $\Delta^*$ , the labels on all in-edges to nodes precede the labels on all out-edges from nodes. This means that the graph is acyclic, which will complete the proof of item (1). We first show that all out-edges from a node  $v$  have the same color.

**Claim 3.20** (Out-edges have the same color). *Let  $\Delta$  be as defined in Lemma 3.19. For every node  $v$  in  $\Delta$ , all of its out-edges must have the same color.*

*Proof of Claim 3.20.* Let  $S$  and  $S'$  be the node-neighboring graph streams described in Lemma 3.19. Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that a node in  $\Delta$  has out-edges with different colors. More precisely, assume that node  $u$  in  $\Delta$  has red edge  $e_{red} = (u, v)$  and blue edge  $e_{blue} = (u, w)$ .

There are two cases to consider:  $u = v^+$  and  $u \neq v^+$ . If  $u = v^+$ , then the claim follows immediately since all edges incident to  $v^+$  are in  $S'$  and not in  $S$ , and since  $\text{SatStage}_S(v^+)$  is less than  $\text{SatStage}_S$  for all other nodes by Line 3, so all edges incident to  $v^+$  in  $\Delta$  must be blue out-edges.

Now consider the case where  $u \neq v^+$ . The existence of  $e_{red}$  means the edge  $\{u, v\}$  is in  $S$  and not in  $S'$ , so we know that either  $\text{SatStage}_{S'}(u) < \text{SatStage}_S(u)$  or  $\text{SatStage}_{S'}(v) < \text{SatStage}_S(u)$ . By the direction of  $e_{red}$  and Line 8, we have that  $\text{SatStage}_{S'}(u) < \text{SatStage}_{S'}(v)$ , which tells us  $\text{SatStage}_{S'}(u) < \text{SatStage}_S(u)$ .

By a similar argument, the existence of  $e_{blue}$  tells us  $\text{SatStage}_S(u) < \text{SatStage}_{S'}(u)$ . However, this pair of inequalities is a contradiction, so our assumption must be false, which completes the proof.  $\square$

By Claim 3.20, we know that all out-edges have the same color. Additionally, by construction of the pruned difference graph (in particular, Line 4 or Algorithm 3), we see that if a node has out-edges, then all its in-edges have the opposite color. This leaves us with two cases for showing that the labels on all in-edges to every node  $v$  in  $\Delta^*$  precede the labels on all out-edges from  $v$ . We only consider the case where  $v \neq v^+$  since the claim follows trivially for  $v^+$  as there are no in-edges to  $v^+$ .

- (a) **All out-edges from  $v$  are red.** Let  $b$  be the smallest label on red out-edges from  $v$ , which means  $\text{SatStage}_{S'}(v) < b$ . Assume for contradiction that a blue in-edge to  $v$  has label  $b' > b$  (we are working with the pruned difference graph and  $\text{out-color}(v) = red$ , so all in-edges to  $v$  must be blue). The label on this blue edge tells us  $\text{SatStage}_{S'}(v) \geq b'$ , which is a contradiction since  $b' > b$  and  $\text{SatStage}_{S'}(v) < b$ .
- (b) **All out-edges from  $v$  are blue.** The proof of this case follows very similarly, except we look at  $\text{SatStage}_S(v)$ . Let  $b$  be the smallest label on blue out-edges from  $v$ , which means  $\text{SatStage}_S(v) < b$ . Assume for contradiction that a red in-edge to  $v$  has label  $b' > b$ . The label on this red edge tells us  $\text{SatStage}_S(v) \geq b'$ , which is a contradiction since  $b' > b$  and  $\text{SatStage}_S(v) < b$ .

For both cases, we showed that all labels on in-edges to a node  $v$  must precede labels on all out-edges from  $v$ , which completes the proof of item (1).

**Proof of item (2).** Item (2) follows readily from previously used ideas. To prove this item, we show that the only nodes appearing in the pruned difference graph  $\Delta^*$  are  $v^+$  and nodes  $v$  such that  $\deg_v(\text{flatten}(S'_{[t]})) > D$ . More precisely, we let  $V_{low}$  be the set of nodes  $v$  in  $S'$  that are not  $v^+$  and have  $\deg_v(\text{flatten}(S'_{[t]})) \leq D$ , and we show that no nodes  $v \in V_{low}$  are in the pruned difference graph. There are at most  $\ell$  nodes  $v$  such that  $\deg_v(\text{flatten}(S'_{[t]})) > D$ , so the set of nodes not in  $V_{low}$  has size at most  $\ell + 1$ . This proof relies on Claim 3.21.

**Claim 3.21.** *For all  $v \neq v^+$  in  $\Delta$ ,  $v$  cannot have an out-edge in  $\Delta$  if  $\deg_v(\text{flatten}(S'_{[t]})) \leq D$ .*

*Proof of Claim 3.21.* Let  $v \in V_{low}$ , and let  $b_{last}$  be the projection stage of the final edge in  $S'_{[t]}$  incident to  $v$ . Because  $\deg_v(\text{flatten}(S'_{[t]})) \leq D$ , we know that the saturation stage of  $v$  in  $S$  and  $S'$  must be at least  $b_{last}$ , so  $\text{SatStage}_S(v) \geq b_{last}$  and  $\text{SatStage}_{S'}(v) \geq b_{last}$ .

Assume for contradiction that there exists an out-edge  $e = (v, w)$  with label  $b$  in  $\Delta$ . Note that every edge incident to  $v$  in  $\Delta$  must have label at most  $b_{last}$ , so  $b \leq b_{last}$ . If this edge is red, then  $\text{SatStage}_{S'}(v) < b \leq b_{last}$ . Similarly, if this edge is blue, then  $\text{SatStage}_S(v) < b \leq b_{last}$ . However, this contradicts the fact that  $\text{SatStage}_S(v) \geq b_{last}$  and  $\text{SatStage}_{S'}(v) \geq b_{last}$ .  $\square$

By Claim 3.21, every  $v \in V_{low}$  has no out-edges in  $\Delta$ . We next note that, in the pruned difference graph  $\Delta^*$ , all in-edges to nodes in  $V_{low}$  are removed by Line 6 of Algorithm 3. Since all nodes with in-degree and out-degree 0 in the pruned difference graph are removed in Line 10, only the nodes in the set of size  $\ell + 1$  (i.e., the node  $v^+$  and the high-degree nodes  $v$  such that  $\deg_v(\text{flatten}(S'_{[t]})) > D$ ) are in the pruned difference graph.

**Proof of item (3).** To prove this item, we use Claim 3.22, which relates the in-degree of a node in the original difference graph to its out-degree in the pruned difference graph.

**Claim 3.22.** Consider a node  $v \neq v^+$  in the pruned difference graph  $\Delta^*$ . The number of out-edges from  $v$  in the original difference graph  $\Delta$  is at most the number of in-edges to  $v$  in the pruned difference graph  $\Delta^*$  (if  $v$  does not appear in  $\Delta^*$ , we say  $v$  has zero in-edges). This also means that the number of out-edges from  $v$  in  $\Delta^*$  is at most the number of in-edges to  $v$  in  $\Delta^*$ . In summary,

$$\text{out-degree of } v \text{ in } \Delta^* \leq \text{out-degree of } v \text{ in } \Delta \leq \text{in-degree of } v \text{ in } \Delta^*.$$

*Proof of Claim 3.22.* Consider a node  $v \neq v^+$  in the graphs  $\Delta, \Delta^*$ . Let  $k$  be the number of out-edges from  $v$  in  $\Delta$ , and let  $b$  be their smallest label. Let  $\text{out-color}(v) = \text{red}$  (a symmetric argument follows when  $\text{out-color}(v) = \text{blue}$ ).

By the construction of  $\Delta$ , and since  $\text{out-color}(v) = \text{red}$ , the out-edges of  $v$  are in  $\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}(S)_{[t]}$  and not in  $\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}(S')_{[t]}$ . Additionally, since the smallest of their labels is  $b$ , then after projection stage  $b-1$  the following is true: (1) the degree of  $v$  in the projection of  $S'$  is  $D$ , and (2) the degree of  $v$  in the projection of  $S$  is at most  $D-k$  (because if the degree were larger, then  $v$  could not have  $k$  red out-edges). This means that after projection stage  $b-1$ , the vertex  $v$  has at least  $k$  incident blue edges in the difference graph  $\Delta$ .

Finally, all out-edges from  $v$  are red and must all have the same color (Claim 3.20), so these incident blue edges must be in-edges to  $v$ . Additionally, because  $\deg_v(\text{flatten}(S'_{[t]})) > D$  and because  $\text{out-color}(v) = \text{red}$ , these blue edges will also be present in the pruned difference graph  $\Delta^*$ . Therefore, we see that the number of in-edges to  $v$  in  $\Delta^*$  is at least the number of out-edges from  $v$  in  $\Delta$ , which concludes the proof.  $\square$

By item (1), we know that  $\Delta^*$  is a DAG, so we can topologically order its nodes. We enumerate the nodes in the topological order as  $v_1, \dots, v_{\ell^*+1}$ , where  $\ell^* \leq \ell$ . By Claim 3.22 and by construction,  $v^+$  is the only node in  $\Delta^*$  with no in-edges, so we will necessarily have  $v_1 = v^+$ . For this ordering, let  $E_i$  denote the  $i^{\text{th}}$  order-induced cut set.

To complete the proof of item (3), we need to show Claim 3.23.

**Claim 3.23.** Let  $E_i$  denote the set of edges in the  $i^{\text{th}}$  order-induced cut set, and let  $\ell^* \leq \ell$  be defined as above (i.e., one less than the number of nodes in  $\Delta^*$ ). We have  $|E_1| \leq \min\{D, \ell\}$ , and  $|E_{i-1}| \geq |E_i|$  for all  $i \in \{2, \dots, \ell^*\}$ .

*Proof of Claim 3.23.* We begin by proving  $|E_1| \leq \min\{D, \ell\}$  (recall that  $v_1 = v^+$ ). Consider the case where  $D \leq \ell$ . Then  $v^+$  has at most  $D$  incident edges in the projection, so it has at most  $D$  out-edges in the difference graph. Now consider the case where  $D > \ell$ . All in-edges to nodes with degree at most  $D$  in  $S'_{[t]}$  are removed when creating the pruned difference graph (Line 6 of Algorithm 3), so since there are at most  $\ell$  nodes with degree greater than  $D$  in  $S'_{[t]}$ , we see that  $v^+$  has at most  $\ell$  out-edges in the pruned difference graph. Therefore,  $v^+$  has at most  $\min\{D, \ell\}$  edges, so  $|E_1| \leq \min\{D, \ell\}$ .

We next show  $|E_{i-1}| \geq |E_i|$  for all  $i \in \{2, \dots, \ell^*\}$ . If an edge is in  $E_{i-1}$ , then either it is in  $E_i$  or it is an in-edge to  $v_i$ . Let  $j$  be the number of in-edges to  $v_i$ . By Claim 3.22, there are at most  $j$  out-edges from  $v^+$ . This gives us  $|E_i| \leq |E_{i-1}| - j + j = |E_{i-1}|$ .  $\square$

Claim 3.23 tells us that we have  $|E_i| \leq \min\{D, \ell\}$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell^*\}$ , which is what we wanted to prove for item (3).

**Proof of item (4).** To prove this item, we categorize the edges that were removed from the difference graph to create the pruned difference graph, and we count the number of edges in each category. We consider the following categories: (a) edges from  $v^+$  that are incident to nodes  $v$  with  $\deg_v(S'_{[t]}) \leq D$  and (b) other edges that were removed when creating  $\Delta^*$  from  $\Delta$ . Let  $\ell^* \leq \ell$  be the number of out-edges from  $v^+$  to nodes  $v$  such that  $\deg_v(S'_{[t]}) > D$ . Therefore, category (a) has at most  $D - \ell^*$  edges.

We next show that category (b) has at most  $\ell^*$  edges. By Claim 3.22, all edges removed from  $\Delta$  to make the pruned difference graph  $\Delta^*$  are out-edges from nodes that appear in the pruned difference graph. (This is because, if an edge is an out-edge from a node that does not appear in the pruned difference graph  $\Delta^*$ , then this node's in-degree in the pruned difference graph is zero, so its out-degree in the original difference graph must be zero by Claim 3.22.) We use Claim 3.24 to establish another property about the edges that

were removed to make the pruned difference graph, which will allow us to bound the number of edges that are in category (b).

**Claim 3.24.** *Let  $E_i$  be defined as in the proof of item (3)—that is,  $E_i$  is the set of edges in the  $i^{\text{th}}$  order-induced cut. For all  $i \in \{2, \dots, \ell^*\}$ , if  $|E_{i-1}| = |E_i| + k_i$ , then at most  $k_i$  out-edges from  $v_i$  were removed by Algorithm 3.*

*Proof of Claim 3.24.* Suppose for contradiction that  $v_i$  has  $k'_i > k_i$  out-edges that were removed by Algorithm 3 (that is, there are  $k'_i$  out-edges from  $v_i$  that appear in  $\Delta$  and do not appear in  $\Delta^*$ ). Let  $j$  be the number of in-edges to  $v_i$  in  $\Delta^*$ .

By definition,  $|E_i|$  is at most  $|E_{i-1}|$  minus the number of in-edges to  $v_i$  in  $\Delta^*$ , plus the number of out-edges from  $v_i$  in  $\Delta^*$ . We next bound each of these edge counts. The number of in-edges to  $v_i$  in  $\Delta^*$  is  $j$ . The number of out-edges from  $v_i$  in  $\Delta$ , by Claim 3.22, is at most the in-degree of  $v_i$  in  $\Delta^*$ —that is,  $j$ . Therefore, there are at most  $j - k'_i$  out-edges from  $v_i$  in  $\Delta^*$ .

Substituting these quantities into our upper bound for  $|E_i|$  gives us  $|E_i| \leq |E_{i-1}| - j + (j - k'_i) = |E_{i-1}| - k'_i$ . This simplifies to  $|E_i| + k'_i \leq |E_{i-1}|$  which, since  $k'_i > k_i$ , contradicts the fact that  $|E_i| + k_i = |E_{i-1}|$ .  $\square$

We now observe, since  $v^+$  has  $\ell^*$  edges to high degree nodes  $v$  such that  $\deg_v(S'_{[t]}) \leq D$ , that  $|E_1| \leq \ell^*$ . Where we define  $k_i$  as the number of out-edges from  $v_i$  that appear in  $\Delta$  and do not appear in  $\Delta^*$ , combining this observation with Claims 3.23 and 3.24 gives us  $\sum_{i \in [\ell^*]} k_i \leq \ell^*$ . Therefore, there are at most  $\ell^*$  out-edges from nodes in the pruned difference graph that were removed from the original graph to obtain the pruned difference graph—that is, there are at most  $\ell^*$  edges in category (b). Since there are at most  $D - \ell^*$  edges in category (a) and at most  $\ell^*$  edges in category (b), we see that at most  $D$  edges were removed to obtain the pruned difference graph, which is what we wanted to show.  $\square$

### 3.6 Proof of Edge-to-Edge Stability for $\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}$

In this section, we prove item (1b) of Theorem 3.3, which we repeat below for convenience. The proof uses Lemma 3.8, along with some new ideas. At a high level, it follows from the observation that changing one edge in a graph (i.e., adding or removing it) can result in a path of edges that differ between projections. However—with the exception of the edge that differs between the edge-neighboring graph streams—the edges that differ between projections form a simple path. Moreover, all edges in the simple path must be incident to (at least) one node with degree greater than  $D$ . Because we only evaluate the stability statement through time steps for which the graph streams are  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded, we know there are  $\ell$  such high-degree nodes, which allows us to bound the length of the resulting simple path.

**Theorem 3.25** (Item (1b) of Theorem 3.3). *Let  $T \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $D \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ , and let  $\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}$  be Algorithm 1 with inclusion criterion  $\mathfrak{c} = \text{projected}$ . If  $S \simeq_{\text{edge}} S'$  are edge-neighboring graph streams of length  $T$ , then for all time steps  $t \in [T]$  such that  $S$  and  $S'$  are  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded through time  $t$ , the edge distances between the projections through time  $t$  satisfy*

$$d_{\text{edge}}\left(\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}(S)_{[t]}, \Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}(S')_{[t]}\right) \leq 2\ell + 1.$$

*Proof of Theorem 3.25.* To simplify notation, let  $F, F'$  denote  $\text{flatten}(\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}(S)_{[t]})$  and  $\text{flatten}(\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}(S')_{[t]})$  respectively. Note that we only care to bound the edge distance between projections for times  $t \in [T]$  where  $S_{[t]}, S'_{[t]}$  are  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded. By Lemma 3.8, we only need to bound  $d_{\text{edge}}(F, F')$ . Without loss of generality, let  $S'$  be the larger graph stream—that is, it contains an additional edge  $e^+ = \{u, v\}$  that arrives at projection stage  $b$ . This edge will increment both  $d(u)$  and  $d(v)$  by 1 at its projection stage.

In this proof of stability, we do a thought experiment where we first consider how the graph changes if only  $d(u)$  is incremented at the projection stage of  $e^+$  (and  $d(v)$  is not incremented); we call this graph  $F^u$ . We then consider the distance between  $F^u$  and  $F'$  (the graph where  $d(v)$  also changes), which allows us to bound the distance between  $F$  and  $F'$  using the triangle inequality. Our proof builds on the proof technique used by [DLL16] to show stability of their algorithm for degree histograms: we will show that the set of

edges that differ between  $F$  and  $F^u$  forms a path. More specifically, we show that each edge in the path must be incident to a node with degree greater than  $D$  in  $S'_{[t]}$ , and we show that (with the exception of the edge in the path that has the earliest projection stage) these edges form a simple path.

We first see how many edges differ between  $F$  and  $F^u$ . If  $d(u) \geq D$  when  $e^+$  is processed at projection stage  $b$  when running  $\Pi_D^{\text{PLL}}$  on  $S'$ , then  $F$  and  $F^u$  will be identical since  $e^+$  will not appear in the output stream and it was already the case that  $d(u) \geq D$  for edges that are considered after  $e^+$ . However, if  $d(u) < D$  before  $e^+$  is considered, then there may be an edge  $e_1 = \{u, 1\}$  incident to  $u$  with projection stage  $b_1 > b$  that appears in  $F$  but not  $F^u$  due to having  $d(u) = D$  at projection stage  $b_1$  in  $S'$  instead of  $d(u) = D - 1 < D$ . This removal of  $e_1 = \{u, 1\}$  can then result in having  $d(1) = D - 1 < D$ , which then allows for the addition of some edge  $e_2 = \{1, 2\}$  with projection stage  $b_2 > b_1$ . The presence of  $e_2$  will then cause  $d(2)$  to be incremented by 1, which can in turn cause an edge incident to node 2, with a projection stage greater than  $b_2$ , to not appear in  $F^u$ .

We now consider the size of this sequence  $\mathcal{D}$  of differing edges, where we order the edges in this sequence according to increasing projection stage in  $S'$ . Claim 3.26 describes conditions under which this sequence will end, and we show that these conditions mean the sequence  $\mathcal{D}$  of differences will have size at most  $\ell + 1$ .

**Claim 3.26.** *Consider a node  $v$  that appears in two edges that occur consecutively in the sequence of differing edges. Let these edges be  $e_x = \{v, x\}$  with projection stage  $b_x$  in  $S'$ , and  $e_y = \{v, y\}$  with projection stage  $b_y$  in  $S'$ . Additionally, let  $e_x$  appear in  $F^u$  and not in  $F$ , and let  $e_y$  appear in  $F$  and not in  $F^u$ . Node  $v$  has the following properties:*

1. *The degree of  $v$  in  $S'_{[t]}$  is bigger than  $D$ —that is,  $\deg_v(S'_{[t]}) > D$ .*
2. *The saturation stage of  $v$  is as follows:*
  - *If  $b_x < b_y$ , then  $\text{SatStage}_{S'}(v) < b_y$  and  $\text{SatStage}_S(v) = b_y$ .*
  - *If  $b_x > b_y$ , then  $\text{SatStage}_{S'}(v) = b_x$  and  $\text{SatStage}_S(v) < b_x$ .*

Note that  $b_x \neq b_y$ , so we do not need to consider that case.

*Proof of Claim 3.26.* We first prove item (1). Assume for contradiction that there exists some  $v$  incident to the described edges  $e_x$  and  $e_y$ , such that  $\deg_v(S'_{[t]}) \leq D$ . If  $b_x < b_y$ , the inclusion of  $e_x$  will increase  $d(v)$  by 1, but we will still have  $d(v) < D$  for both graph streams, so this will not cause  $e_y$  to be removed. Now consider the case where  $b_y < b_x$ . For both graph streams, we will have  $d(v) < D$  for the projection stage of  $e_x$ , so the decremented value of  $d(v)$  will not newly permit  $e_x$  to be added if it couldn't be added in  $F$ . This contradicts our assumption and proves item (1).

We next prove item (2). Let  $e_x$  and  $e_y$  be described as above, and consider the case where  $b_x < b_y$ . Since  $e_y$  appears in  $F$  but not in  $F^u$ , this means that the increment by 1 of  $d(v)$  caused  $v$  to go from non-saturated prior to the projection stage of  $b_y$  in  $S$  to saturated prior to the projection stage of  $b_y$  in  $S'$ , so it must be the case that  $\text{SatStage}_S(v) = b_y$ ; likewise,  $\text{SatStage}_{S'}(v) < b_y$ . Now, consider the case where  $b_x > b_y$ . The proof follows by a symmetric argument: the fact that  $d(v)$  wasn't incremented at step  $b_y$  in  $S'$  caused  $v$  to go from saturated to non-saturated prior to the projection stage of  $e_x$ , so it must be the case that  $\text{SatStage}_{S'}(v) = b_x$ ; likewise,  $\text{SatStage}_S(v) < b_x$ .  $\square$

We now explain how Claim 3.26 allows us to bound the number of edges that differ between  $F$  and  $F^u$ . Recall that the added edge is  $e^+ = \{u, v\}$ . By item (1), either  $\deg_u(S'_{[t]}) > D$  or  $e^+$  is the only edge that differs between  $F$  and  $F^u$ . We now analyze the case where  $\deg_u(S'_{[t]}) > D$ . Item (1) tells us that, if the sequence  $\mathcal{D}$  of differing edges includes a node  $w$  with  $\deg_w(S'_{[t]}) \leq D$ , then the edge containing this node will be the final node in the sequence. Consider the modified sequence  $\mathcal{D}'$  where we remove  $e^+$  from  $\mathcal{D}$ . By (1), if the first edge in  $\mathcal{D}'$  is incident on only one node with degree greater than  $D$  in  $S'_{[t]}$ , then it is the only node in  $\mathcal{D}'$ . We focus on the case where it is incident on two nodes with degree greater than  $D$  in  $S'_{[t]}$ . By item (2), we see that, if a node appears in two consecutive edges in the sequence  $\mathcal{D}$ , it cannot appear again in the sequence because it will already be saturated for both projections at or before the projection stage

of the second edge. Therefore, the edges in  $\mathcal{D}'$  form a simple path on the nodes in  $S'_{[t]}$ , and the first edge is between high-degree nodes with degree greater than  $D$  in  $S'_{[t]}$ , and all of the remaining nodes are incident on at least one high-degree nodes with degree greater than  $D$  in  $S'_{[t]}$ . Since there are at most  $\ell$  such nodes, this simple path contains at most  $\ell$  edges. When we also include  $e^+$ , we see that at most  $\ell + 1$  edges differ between  $F$  and  $F^u$ .

A symmetric argument can be used to show that at most  $\ell$  edges differ between  $F^u$  and  $F'$  (with the value being  $\ell$  instead of  $\ell + 1$  since either  $e^+$  appears in both  $F^u$  and  $F'$  or appears in neither). By the triangle inequality, then, the flattened graphs  $F$  and  $F'$  differ on at most  $2\ell + 1$  edges, which is what we wanted to show.  $\square$

## 4 From $D$ -restricted Privacy to Node Privacy

In this section, we present our general transformation from restricted edge- and node-DP algorithms to node-DP algorithms (Algorithm 5). As input, Algorithm 5 takes several user-specified parameters  $(\varepsilon_{\text{Test}}, \beta_{\text{Test}}, \beta, D, T)$ , a length- $T$  graph stream  $S$  of arbitrary degree, and black-box access to a base algorithm. At every time step, Algorithm 5 returns either the result of running one more step of the base algorithm on the projection of the graph stream, or a special symbol  $\perp$  denoting failure.

The following theorem encapsulates its privacy and accuracy properties, and its efficiency. Roughly, the overall algorithm is private for all graph streams as long as the base algorithm satisfies either edge or node variants of  $D$ -restricted DP. It is accurate on graph streams through all time steps that satisfy the assumed degree bound, and adds only linear overhead to the runtime of the base algorithm.

**Theorem 4.1** (Privacy for all graph streams and restricted accuracy). *Consider running Algorithm 5 with parameters  $\varepsilon_{\text{Test}}, \beta_{\text{Test}}, \beta, D, T$ , and let  $\ell = \left\lceil 8 \ln \left( \frac{T}{\beta \beta_{\text{Test}}} \right) / \varepsilon_{\text{Test}} \right\rceil$  and  $D' = D + \ell$  as in lines 2 and 3.*

1. **(Node privacy from restricted edge privacy.)** *Suppose  $\text{RestrictedPrivAlg}_{D'}$  satisfies  $D'$ -restricted  $(\varepsilon', \delta')$ -edge-DP under continual observation for graph streams of length  $T$ . Then Algorithm 5 satisfies (unrestricted)  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -node-DP under continual observation for graph streams of length  $T$ , with*

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &= \varepsilon_{\text{Test}} + \varepsilon' \cdot (D' + \ell) \quad \text{and} \\ \delta &= (1 + e^{\varepsilon_{\text{Test}}}) e^{\varepsilon} \beta_{\text{Test}} + \delta' \cdot e^{\varepsilon' \cdot (D' + \ell)} \cdot (D' + \ell) \quad (\text{which is } O(\beta_{\text{Test}} + \delta'(D + \ell)) \text{ when } \varepsilon \leq 1). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, for  $\varepsilon \leq 1$  and  $T \geq 2$ , it suffices to set  $\varepsilon_{\text{Test}} = \varepsilon/2$  and  $\beta_{\text{Test}} = \delta/30$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon' &= \Theta\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{B}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta' = \Theta\left(\frac{\delta}{B}\right), \\ \text{where } B &= D + \frac{\log(T/(\beta\delta))}{\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

2. **(Node privacy from restricted node privacy.)** *Suppose  $\text{RestrictedPrivAlg}_{D'}$  satisfies  $D'$ -restricted  $(\varepsilon', \delta')$ -node-DP under continual observation for graph streams of length  $T$ . Then Algorithm 5 satisfies (unrestricted)  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -node-DP under continual observation for graph streams of length  $T$ , with*

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &= \varepsilon_{\text{Test}} + \varepsilon' \cdot (2\ell + 1) \quad \text{and} \\ \delta &= (1 + e^{\varepsilon_{\text{Test}}}) e^{\varepsilon} \beta_{\text{Test}} + \delta' \cdot e^{\varepsilon' \cdot (2\ell + 1)} \cdot (2\ell + 1) \quad (\text{which is } O(\beta_{\text{Test}} + \delta'\ell) \text{ when } \varepsilon \leq 1). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, for  $\varepsilon \leq 1$  and  $T \geq 2$ , it suffices to set  $\varepsilon_{\text{Test}} = \varepsilon/2$  and  $\beta_{\text{Test}} = \delta/30$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon' &= \Theta\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{B}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta' = \Theta\left(\frac{\delta}{B}\right), \\ \text{where } B &= \frac{\log(T/(\beta\delta))}{\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

3. (**Accuracy.**) If the input graph stream  $S$  is  $(D, 0)$ -bounded through time step  $t'$ , then the output from  $\text{RestrictedPrivAlg}_{D'}$  is released at all time steps  $t \leq t'$  with probability at least  $1 - \beta$ .
4. (**Time and space complexity.**) Algorithm 5 adds linear overhead to the time and space complexity of  $\text{RestrictedPrivAlg}_{D'}$ . More formally, let  $R_{[t]}$  and  $S_{[t]}$  be the runtime and space complexity of  $\text{RestrictedPrivAlg}_{D'}$  through  $t$  time steps, and let  $n_{[t]}$  and  $m_{[t]}$  be the number of nodes and edges in the graph stream through time  $t$ . The total time complexity of Algorithm 5 through time  $t \in [T]$  is  $R_{[t]} + O(n_{[t]} + m_{[t]} + t)$ , and the total space complexity through time  $t$  is  $S_{[t]} + O(n_{[t]})$ .

The basic idea of the algorithm follows the Propose-Test-Release (PTR) framework of [DL09]: we use the sparse vector technique [DNR+09; RR10; HR10] to continually check that the conditions of Theorem 3.3 are met. As long as they are, we can safely run the base algorithm with parameters scaled according to the edge (or node) sensitivity of the projection so that, by group privacy, its outputs are  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -indistinguishable on all pairs of node-neighboring inputs, satisfying  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -node-DP.

In Section 4.1, we present a query with node-sensitivity 1 to test that a graph is  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded, the condition required in Theorem 3.3. In Section 4.2, we show how a novel, online variant of the PTR framework can be applied to the continual release setting. In Section 4.3, we present the black-box framework (Algorithm 5) for transforming restricted edge- or node-private algorithms to node-private algorithms, and analyze its privacy, accuracy, and efficiency (proof of Theorem 4.1).

## 4.1 Testing for Bad Graphs

To use the sparse vector technique, we need a stream of queries with (node) sensitivity 1. Below, we define a function  $\text{DistToGraph}$  with node-sensitivity 1 that returns the minimum, over all graphs, of the node distance between the input graph and a graph with at least  $\ell$  nodes of degree greater than  $D$ . In other words, it tells how close the input graph is to a graph that is *not*  $(D, \ell - 1)$ -bounded. This function can be used to make such a stream of node-sensitivity 1 queries for continually checking whether the conditions of Theorem 3.3 are satisfied.

**Definition 4.2** ( $\text{DistToGraph}_{D, \ell}$ ). Let  $\text{DistToGraph}_{D, \ell} : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$  return the minimum node distance between the input graph and a graph with at least  $\ell$  nodes of degree greater than  $D$ .

We now present some properties of  $\text{DistToGraph}$ , which we will use in the proof of privacy for the black-box framework described in Algorithm 5.

**Lemma 4.3** (Properties of  $\text{DistToGraph}$ ).  $\text{DistToGraph}_{D, \ell}$  has the following properties:

1.  $\text{DistToGraph}_{D, \ell}$  has node-sensitivity 1.
2. For an input graph  $G$  with  $|V|$  nodes and  $|E|$  edges,  $\text{DistToGraph}_{D, \ell}$  can be computed in time  $O(|V| + |E|)$ .  
Furthermore, given a graph stream  $S$ , one can determine the sequence of distances for all prefixes of the stream, online. With each node or edge arrival, the distance can be updated in constant time.
3. Let  $G \in \mathcal{G}$  be a  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded graph (i.e., with at most  $\ell$  nodes of degree greater than  $D$ ). Then  $\text{DistToGraph}_{D+k, \ell+k}(G) \geq k$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ .

*Proof of Lemma 4.3. Proof of item (1).*  $\text{DistToGraph}_{D, \ell}$  is defined in terms of the minimum number of nodes to add, so changing the graph by one node will change  $\text{DistToGraph}_{D, \ell}$  by at most 1.

**Proof of item (2).** We first describe a method for computing  $\text{DistToGraph}_{D, \ell}$  and prove this method's correctness, and then describe an efficient implementation. Given a graph  $G \in \mathcal{G}$ ,  $\text{DistToGraph}_{D, \ell}(G)$  can be computed as follows: first, check if  $G$  is  $(D, \ell - 1)$ -bounded. While that condition is satisfied, add a node to  $G$  with edges incident to all existing nodes and check  $(D, \ell - 1)$ -boundedness again. Return the number of nodes that have been added to  $G$  when the check first fails.

We prove that the quantity returned by this method is equal to  $\text{DistToGraph}_{D,\ell}(G)$ . First, observe that the method cannot underestimate the distance since, for the number  $\hat{k}$  it outputs, there is actually a graph within node distance  $\hat{k}$  of  $G$  that is not  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded. To see why the method never overestimates the distance, suppose  $\text{DistToGraph}_{D,\ell}(G) = k$ , and let  $H$  be a graph with at least  $\ell$  nodes of degree greater than  $D$  that is closest to  $G$  in node distance.  $H$  can be formed by removing some set of nodes  $B$  (and associated edges) from  $G$  and adding some set of nodes  $A$  (and associated edges) such that  $|A| + |B| = k$ . Now consider the graph  $H'$  which is formed by taking  $G$ , adding all nodes in  $A$  (along with the associated edges), and adding edges from every node in  $A$  to all other nodes in the graph that do not already have an edge from that node. We do not delete the nodes and edges that are in  $B$ .  $H$  is a subgraph of  $H'$ , so if  $H$  has at least  $\ell$  nodes of degree greater than  $D$ , then  $H'$  also has at least  $\ell$  nodes of degree greater than  $D$ . Additionally,  $H'$  is exactly the graph that will be formed by the method described above after at most  $k$  steps. Finally,  $H'$  is node distance  $|A| \leq k$  from  $G$ , and  $\hat{k} = |A|$  is the output returned by this method.

Naively, an algorithm for the above method can be implemented by storing a graph in memory and manipulating this graph with every pass through the while loop. However, storing the entire graph is not necessary. There is a linear-time algorithm that computes the same quantity as the method described above. To see why that is, let  $|V|$  be the number of nodes in  $G$ . After adding  $j$  nodes that have edges to all other nodes, the number of nodes with degree greater than  $D$  will be 0 if  $D \geq |V| + j - 1$  (a graph with  $|V| + j$  nodes has maximum degree  $|V| + j - 1$ ); and will otherwise be the number of nodes in  $G$  with degree greater than  $D - j$ , plus  $j$ . Therefore, it suffices to maintain a *cumulative degree histogram*  $\text{ch}_G(\cdot)$ , which we define below, and compute a value based on that.

Let  $\text{ch}_G(j)$  hold the number of nodes in  $G$  with degree at least  $j$ , and let  $\text{ch}_G(\cdot)$  have buckets for  $j \in \{0, \dots, D + 1\}$ . Given this cumulative degree histogram, we return *the smallest value of  $j \geq \max\{D - |V| + 2, 0\}$  such that*

$$j + \text{ch}_G(D - j + 1) \geq \ell. \quad (3)$$

Call this smallest such value  $k$ . We now show that, when a new node or edge arrives, we can update the value of  $k$  in constant time. To do this, we maintain the following data structures: a hash table  $H$  for node degrees that takes a node name as input and returns its degree (we assume unassigned values in the hash table are set to 0); a hash table  $C$  for the cumulative histogram that takes an integer  $i$  as input and returns the number of nodes with degree at least  $i$ ; a counter  $n$  that tracks the number of nodes in the graph, initialized to 0; and the current value  $k$  of  $\text{DistToGraph}_{D,\ell}(G)$ , which we initialize to  $k = \max\{D + 2, \ell\}$  when the graph is empty (since every node in a complete graph on  $D + 2$  nodes has degree greater than  $D$ , but  $\ell$  nodes are needed for a non- $(D, \ell)$ -bounded graph when  $\ell > D + 2$ ).

We first show that  $H, C, n$  can be updated in constant time when a new node or edge is added to  $G$ . When a new node  $v$  arrives, set  $H(v) = 0$ ,  $C(0) += 1$ , and  $n += 1$ . When a new edge  $\{u, v\}$  arrives, set  $H(u) += 1$  and  $H(v) += 1$ , and then set  $C(H(u)) += 1$  and  $C(H(v)) += 1$ .

We next show that the value of  $k$  (i.e., the smallest value of  $j$  such that (3) is satisfied) can be updated in constant time, assuming  $H$  and  $C$  are up to date. Recall that  $k$  is the value of  $\text{DistToGraph}_{D,\ell}$  that we want to update, and that this function has node sensitivity 1. This means that adding a node can change  $k$  by at most 1, and that adding an edge can change  $k$  by at most 2 since every graph with an edge  $e$  is node distance at most 2 from a graph without  $e$  (an edge  $e$  has a vertex cover of size 1, so to obtain an otherwise identical graph without that edge requires at most removing a vertex incident to  $e$  and then re-adding the vertex without  $e$ ). Moreover, the value of  $k$  cannot increase as nodes and edges are added since the old graph is a subgraph of the updated graph, so the new graph can be no further from a non- $(D, \ell - 1)$ -bounded graph than the old graph. Therefore, it suffices to check, for  $k' \in \{k, k - 1, k - 2\}$  whether  $k' + C(D - k' + 1) \geq \ell$  and  $k' \geq \max\{D - n + 2, 0\}$ , and then set  $k$  to the smallest value  $k'$  for which these conditions hold.

Since all of the updates to  $H, C, n$ , and  $k$  in response to the arrival of a node or edge are constant-time operations,  $\text{DistToGraph}_{D,\ell}(G)$  can be computed in time  $O(|V| + |E|)$  for a graph  $G = (V, E)$ .<sup>6</sup>

**Proof of item (3).** We know from the proof of item (2) that the shortest sequence of node-neighboring graphs, from  $G$  to the closest graph with at least  $\ell$  nodes of degree greater than  $D$ , consists of sequentially

---

<sup>6</sup>This linear-time algorithm assumes that the graph stream does not contain duplicate edges; to remove this assumption, a check for whether an edge is a duplicate can be performed in constant time (and that edge can then be ignored).

adding nodes to  $G$  that have all possible edges. Adding one node  $v^+$  to  $G$  increases the degree of each node in  $G$  by at most 1. Additionally, the added node  $v^+$  may have degree greater than  $D$ . Thus, if  $G$  is  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded, then adding one node yields a graph  $G^+$  that is  $(D + 1, \ell + 1)$ -bounded. The claim follows by induction on the number of added nodes.  $\square$

## 4.2 PTR in the Continual Release Setting

The high-level idea of our general transformation is to use a novel, online variant of the Propose-Test-Release framework (PTR) of [DL09]. To our knowledge, PTR has not been used previously for designing algorithms in the continual release setting. In this section, we show that PTR can, in fact, be applied in the continual release setting when the algorithm checking the safety condition is itself private under continual observation, as is the sparse vector algorithm.

**Theorem 4.4** (Privacy of PTR under Continual Observation). *Let  $\text{Base} : \mathcal{X}^T \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^T$  be a streaming algorithm and  $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathcal{X}^T$  a set of streams such that, for all neighbors  $S, S' \in \mathcal{Z}$ ,  $\text{Base}(S) \approx_{\varepsilon_{\text{Base}}, \delta_{\text{Base}}} \text{Base}(S')$ .*

*Let  $\text{Test} : \mathcal{X}^T \rightarrow \{\perp, \top\}$  be  $(\varepsilon_{\text{Test}}, \delta_{\text{Test}})$ -DP under continual observation such that for every stream  $S$ , if there is a time  $t$  such that  $S_{[t]}$  does not equal the  $t$ -element prefix of any item in  $\mathcal{Z}$ , then  $\text{Test}(S)$  outputs  $\perp$  w.p. at least  $1 - \beta_{\text{Test}}$  at or before time  $t$ .*

*If Algorithm 4 is initialized with  $\text{Test}$  and  $\text{Base}$ , it will satisfy  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DP under continual observation on all input streams  $x \in \mathcal{X}^T$ , for*

$$\varepsilon = \varepsilon_{\text{Base}} + \varepsilon_{\text{Test}} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta = \delta_{\text{Base}} + (1 + e^{\varepsilon_{\text{Base}} + \varepsilon_{\text{Test}}})\delta_{\text{Test}} + (1 + e^{\varepsilon_{\text{Test}}})e^{\varepsilon_{\text{Base}} + \varepsilon_{\text{Test}}}\beta_{\text{Test}}.$$

---

**Algorithm 4** Algorithm PTR for propose-test-release under continual observation.

---

**Input:** Stream  $x \in \mathcal{X}^T$ , streaming algorithms  $\text{Test} : \mathcal{X}^T \rightarrow \{\perp, \top\}^T$  and  $\text{Base} : \mathcal{X}^T \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^T$ .

**Output:** Stream in  $(\{\perp, \top\} \times \{\mathcal{Y}, \perp\})^T$ .

```

1: passed  $\leftarrow$  True
2:  $b_0 \leftarrow$  initial state of Base
3:  $s_0 \leftarrow$  initial state of Test
4: for all  $t \in [T]$  do
5:   ( $\text{verdict}, s_t$ )  $\leftarrow$  Test( $x_t; s_{t-1}$ )  $\triangleright$  Send  $x_t$  to Test, and set verdict to be its output
6:   Output verdict
7:   if verdict =  $\perp$  then passed  $\leftarrow$  False
8:   if passed = True then
9:     ( $y_t, b_t$ )  $\leftarrow$  Base( $x_t; b_{t-1}$ )  $\triangleright$  Send  $x_t$  to Base and output the result
10:    Output  $y_t$ 
11:  else output  $\perp$ 

```

---

While it is perhaps unsurprising that PTR applies to the continual release setting, the proof of Theorem 4.4 does not follow immediately from the standard PTR analysis: the standard analysis is binary (either release the output of the base algorithm, or don't), while the version we need releases a dynamically chosen prefix of the base algorithm's output.

Note that there is no completeness requirement for  $\text{Test}$ . Whereas completeness is useful for accuracy, our proof of privacy only requires soundness of  $\text{Test}$ . We now move to the proof of Theorem 4.4.

*Proof of Theorem 4.4.* Fix two neighboring streams  $x$  and  $x'$  in  $\mathcal{X}^T$ , and let  $t^* \in [T]$  be the smallest value such that either  $(x_1, \dots, x_{t^*})$  or  $(x'_1, \dots, x'_{t^*})$  does not equal the  $t^*$ -element prefix of any item in  $\mathcal{Z}$ . (If there is no such  $t^*$ , just set  $t^* = T + 1$ .) We consider the behavior of Algorithm 4 (denoted PTR) on inputs  $x$  and  $x'$ .

To analyze privacy, we also consider the behavior of two hypothetical algorithms  $\widetilde{\text{PTR}}$  and  $\widehat{\text{PTR}}$ , which we define below. (They are hypothetical because they have access to the value of  $t^*$ , which is defined with respect

to a pair of neighboring input streams.) We show indistinguishability relationships between  $\text{PTR}(x)$ ,  $\widetilde{\text{PTR}}(x)$ ,  $\widetilde{\text{PTR}}(x')$ , and  $\text{PTR}(x')$ ; we then apply the weak triangle inequality for indistinguishability (Lemma 2.12) to relate  $\text{PTR}(x)$  and  $\text{PTR}(x')$ .

Let  $\widetilde{\text{PTR}}$  be the algorithm that releases the outputs of **Test** and **Base** at all time steps less than  $t^*$ , and releases the output of **Test** and the symbol  $\perp$  at all time steps at and after  $t^*$ . (In the case that  $t^* = T + 1$ , the algorithm will release the output from **Base** at all time steps.) We see, by the indistinguishability properties of **Test** and **Base**, that

$$\widetilde{\text{PTR}}(x) \approx_{(\varepsilon_{\text{Base}} + \varepsilon_{\text{Test}}, \delta_{\text{Base}} + \delta_{\text{Test}})} \widetilde{\text{PTR}}(x'). \quad (4)$$

We now define another (hypothetical) algorithm,  $\widetilde{\text{PTR}}$ . Let  $t_{\perp}$  be the first time step at which **Test** returns  $\perp$ , setting  $t_{\perp} = T + 1$  if there is no such time step. Note that, whereas  $t^*$  is defined with respect to a pair of neighboring inputs,  $t_{\perp}$  is a random variable defined with respect to an execution of **Test** on a particular input. We define  $\widetilde{\text{PTR}}$  as the algorithm that releases the outputs of **Test** and **Base** at all time steps less than  $\min\{t^*, t_{\perp}\}$ , and releases the output of **Test** and the symbol  $\perp$  at all time steps at and after  $\min\{t^*, t_{\perp}\}$ . Observe that  $\widetilde{\text{PTR}}$  is a post-processed version of  $\widetilde{\text{PTR}}$ . By Expression (4), we get

$$\widetilde{\text{PTR}}(x) \approx_{(\varepsilon_{\text{Base}} + \varepsilon_{\text{Test}}, \delta_{\text{Base}} + \delta_{\text{Test}})} \widetilde{\text{PTR}}(x'). \quad (5)$$

We now compare  $\text{PTR}(x)$  and  $\widetilde{\text{PTR}}(x)$ . Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be the (bad) event that the output from **Base** is released at or after time step  $t^*$ . Without loss of generality, let  $x$  be the stream for which the first  $t^*$  elements are not equal to the  $t^*$ -element prefix of any item in  $\mathcal{Z}$ . Conditioned on  $\mathcal{B}$  not occurring,  $\text{PTR}(x)$  and  $\widetilde{\text{PTR}}(x)$  have the same probability distribution of outputs. The probability of  $\mathcal{B}$  is at most  $\beta_{\text{Test}}$  for both algorithms  $\text{PTR}(x)$  and  $\widetilde{\text{PTR}}(x)$ , so  $\text{PTR}(x) \approx_{(0, \beta_{\text{Test}})} \widetilde{\text{PTR}}(x)$ . Similarly, by the DP guarantee,  $\mathcal{B}$  occurs with probability at most  $e^{\varepsilon_{\text{Test}}}\beta_{\text{Test}} + \delta_{\text{Test}}$  on input  $x'$ , so  $\text{PTR}(x') \approx_{(0, e^{\varepsilon_{\text{Test}}}\beta_{\text{Test}})} \widetilde{\text{PTR}}(x')$ . Combining this with Expression (5) shows that

$$\text{PTR}(x) \approx_{(0, \beta_{\text{Test}})} \widetilde{\text{PTR}}(x) \approx_{(\varepsilon_{\text{Base}} + \varepsilon_{\text{Test}}, \delta_{\text{Base}} + \delta_{\text{Test}})} \widetilde{\text{PTR}}(x') \approx_{(0, e^{\varepsilon_{\text{Test}}}\beta_{\text{Test}} + \delta_{\text{Test}})} \text{PTR}(x').$$

Let  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_{\text{Base}} + \varepsilon_{\text{Test}}$  and  $\delta = \delta_{\text{Base}} + \delta_{\text{Test}} + e^{\varepsilon_{\text{Test}}}\beta_{\text{Test}} + \delta_{\text{Test}}$ . By the weak triangle inequality (Lemma 2.12),  $\text{PTR}(x) \approx_{(\varepsilon, \delta)} \text{PTR}(x')$ . Since this relationship applies for all pairs of neighboring streams  $x$  and  $x'$ , we see that  $\text{PTR}$  is  $(\varepsilon_{\text{Base}} + \varepsilon_{\text{Test}}, \delta_{\text{Base}} + (1 + e^{\varepsilon_{\text{Test}}})\delta_{\text{Test}} + (1 + e^{\varepsilon_{\text{Test}}})e^{\varepsilon_{\text{Test}}}\beta_{\text{Test}})$ -DP, as desired.  $\square$

### 4.3 Accuracy and Privacy of Algorithm 5

In Algorithm 5, we present our method for obtaining node-DP algorithms from restricted edge-DP and restricted node-DP algorithms.

Our algorithm works as follows. Where we set  $D' = D + \ell$  and  $\ell \approx \frac{\log(T/\delta)}{\varepsilon}$ , we initialize  $\text{PTR}$  (Algorithm 4) with (1) a **Base** algorithm that offers indistinguishability on neighbors from the set of  $(D', \ell)$ -bounded graphs and (2) a **Test** algorithm that uses sparse vector to ensure that  $\text{DistToGraph}_{D', \ell}$  is non-negative (i.e., that the graph stream is  $(D', \ell)$ -bounded), where  $\ell$  is an additive slack term to account for the error of the sparse vector technique. Specifically, **Base** is the composition of  $\text{RestrictedPrivAlg}_{D'}$  with  $\Pi_{D'}^{\text{BDS}}$ , where  $\text{RestrictedPrivAlg}_{D'}$  satisfies  $D'$ -restricted edge- or node-DP.

If **Test** succeeds, the projection will be stable with high probability, so we can safely release the result of running **Base** on the projected graph; if **Test** fails, the symbol  $\perp$  is released. Algorithm 5 post-processes the outputs from  $\text{PTR}$ , so it inherits the privacy properties of  $\text{PTR}$ . The privacy properties of Algorithm 5, stated in Theorem 4.1, follow from Theorem 4.4.

We now prove Theorem 4.1, which we repeat below for convenience.

**Theorem 4.1** (Privacy for all graph streams and restricted accuracy). *Consider running Algorithm 5 with parameters  $\varepsilon_{\text{Test}}, \beta_{\text{Test}}, \beta, D, T$ , and let  $\ell = \left\lceil 8 \ln \left( \frac{T}{\beta \beta_{\text{Test}}} \right) / \varepsilon_{\text{Test}} \right\rceil$  and  $D' = D + \ell$  as in lines 2 and 3.*

---

**Algorithm 5** BBRestrictedToNodePriv for transforming restricted-DP algorithms to node-DP algorithms.

---

**Input:** Privacy params  $\varepsilon_{\text{Test}} > 0$ ,  $\beta_{\text{Test}} \in (0, 1]$ ; accuracy param  $\beta \in (0, 1]$ ; degree bound  $D \in \mathbb{N}$ ; time horizon  $T \in \mathbb{N}$ ; graph stream  $S \in \mathcal{S}^T$ ; alg RestrictedPrivAlg (see Theorem 4.1 for possible assumptions on RestrictedPrivAlg).

**Output:** A stream, where each term is  $\perp$  or an estimate from RestrictedPrivAlg.

- 1:  $\tau = -8 \ln(1/\beta_{\text{Test}})/\varepsilon_{\text{Test}}$ .
  - 2:  $\ell = \lceil 8 \ln(T/(\beta\beta_{\text{Test}}))/\varepsilon_{\text{Test}} \rceil$ .
  - 3:  $D' = D + \ell$ .
  - 4: Base = RestrictedPrivAlg $_{D'}$   $\circ$   $\Pi_{D'}^{\text{BBDS}}$   $\triangleright \Pi_{D'}^{\text{BBDS}}$  is Algorithm 1 with  $c = \text{original}$
  - 5: **for all**  $t \in [T]$  **do**
  - 6:      $q_t(\cdot) = -1 \cdot \text{DistToGraph}_{D', \ell}(\text{flatten}(\cdot \upharpoonright_{[t]}))$
  - 7: Test =  $\begin{cases} \text{SVT with privacy param } \varepsilon_{\text{Test}}, \\ \text{thresh } \tau, \text{ queries } q_1, \dots, q_T \end{cases}$
  - 8:  $s_0 \leftarrow$  initial state for PTR
  - 9: Initialize PTR with algorithms Test and Base
  - 10: **for all**  $t \in [T]$  **do**
  - 11:     (Test-val, Base-val,  $s_t$ )  $\leftarrow$  PTR( $S_t$ ;  $s_{t-1}$ )
  - 12:     Output Base-val  $\triangleright$  Base-val will be  $\perp$  once the test fails
- 

1. **(Node privacy from restricted edge privacy.)** Suppose RestrictedPrivAlg $_{D'}$  satisfies  $D'$ -restricted  $(\varepsilon', \delta')$ -edge-DP under continual observation for graph streams of length  $T$ . Then Algorithm 5 satisfies (unrestricted)  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -node-DP under continual observation for graph streams of length  $T$ , with

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &= \varepsilon_{\text{Test}} + \varepsilon' \cdot (D' + \ell) \quad \text{and} \\ \delta &= (1 + e^{\varepsilon_{\text{Test}}})e^{\varepsilon} \beta_{\text{Test}} + \delta' \cdot e^{\varepsilon' \cdot (D' + \ell)} \cdot (D' + \ell) \quad (\text{which is } O(\beta_{\text{Test}} + \delta'(D' + \ell)) \text{ when } \varepsilon \leq 1). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, for  $\varepsilon \leq 1$  and  $T \geq 2$ , it suffices to set  $\varepsilon_{\text{Test}} = \varepsilon/2$  and  $\beta_{\text{Test}} = \delta/30$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon' &= \Theta\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{B}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta' = \Theta\left(\frac{\delta}{B}\right), \\ \text{where } B &= D + \frac{\log(T/(\beta\delta))}{\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

2. **(Node privacy from restricted node privacy.)** Suppose RestrictedPrivAlg $_{D'}$  satisfies  $D'$ -restricted  $(\varepsilon', \delta')$ -node-DP under continual observation for graph streams of length  $T$ . Then Algorithm 5 satisfies (unrestricted)  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -node-DP under continual observation for graph streams of length  $T$ , with

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &= \varepsilon_{\text{Test}} + \varepsilon' \cdot (2\ell + 1) \quad \text{and} \\ \delta &= (1 + e^{\varepsilon_{\text{Test}}})e^{\varepsilon} \beta_{\text{Test}} + \delta' \cdot e^{\varepsilon' \cdot (2\ell + 1)} \cdot (2\ell + 1) \quad (\text{which is } O(\beta_{\text{Test}} + \delta'\ell) \text{ when } \varepsilon \leq 1). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, for  $\varepsilon \leq 1$  and  $T \geq 2$ , it suffices to set  $\varepsilon_{\text{Test}} = \varepsilon/2$  and  $\beta_{\text{Test}} = \delta/30$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon' &= \Theta\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{B}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta' = \Theta\left(\frac{\delta}{B}\right), \\ \text{where } B &= \frac{\log(T/(\beta\delta))}{\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

3. **(Accuracy.)** If the input graph stream  $S$  is  $(D, 0)$ -bounded through time step  $t'$ , then the output from RestrictedPrivAlg $_{D'}$  is released at all time steps  $t \leq t'$  with probability at least  $1 - \beta$ .

4. (**Time and space complexity.**) Algorithm 5 adds linear overhead to the time and space complexity of  $\text{RestrictedPrivAlg}_{D'}$ . More formally, let  $R_{[t]}$  and  $S_{[t]}$  be the runtime and space complexity of  $\text{RestrictedPrivAlg}_{D'}$  through  $t$  time steps, and let  $n_{[t]}$  and  $m_{[t]}$  be the number of nodes and edges in the graph stream through time  $t$ . The total time complexity of Algorithm 5 through time  $t \in [T]$  is  $R_{[t]} + O(n_{[t]} + m_{[t]} + t)$ , and the total space complexity through time  $t$  is  $S_{[t]} + O(n_{[t]})$ .

*Proof of Theorem 4.1.* We prove each part below.

**Proof of items (1) and (2) in Theorem 4.1.** To prove items (1) and (2), we break our proof into the following claims about **Test** and **Base** as initialized in Algorithm 5, with the parameters specified in the statement of Theorem 4.1. Once we have shown the claims, the privacy properties follow immediately from Theorem 4.4.

Claim 4.5 deals with the indistinguishability properties of **Base**. Claim 4.6 deals with the privacy of **Test**, as well as its failure probability: where  $t$  is the first time step for which the input is not  $(D', \ell)$ -bounded, **Test** outputs  $\perp$  at or before time step  $t$  with probability at least  $1 - \beta_{\text{Test}}$ . Below, we use the term  $(D', \ell)$ -restricted privacy to refer to indistinguishability for neighbors drawn from the set of graphs with at most  $\ell$  nodes of degree greater than  $D'$ .

**Claim 4.5** (Indistinguishability of **Base**). *Let **Base** be parameterized as in Algorithm 5. If  $S$  and  $S'$  are node-neighboring datasets that are both  $(D', \ell)$ -bounded, then  $\text{Base}(S) \approx_{\varepsilon_{\text{Base}}, \delta_{\text{Base}}} \text{Base}(S')$  for the following values of  $\varepsilon_{\text{Base}}$  and  $\delta_{\text{Base}}$ :*

1. If  $\text{RestrictedPrivAlg}_{D'}$  satisfies  $D'$ -restricted  $(\varepsilon', \delta')$ -edge-DP, then

$$\varepsilon_{\text{Base}} = \varepsilon' \cdot (D' + \ell) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_{\text{Base}} = \delta' \cdot e^{\varepsilon_{\text{Base}}} \cdot (D' + \ell).$$

2. If  $\text{RestrictedPrivAlg}_{D'}$  satisfies  $D'$ -restricted  $(\varepsilon', \delta')$ -node-DP, then

$$\varepsilon_{\text{Base}} = \varepsilon' \cdot (2\ell + 1) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_{\text{Base}} = \delta' \cdot e^{\varepsilon_{\text{Base}}} \cdot (2\ell + 1).$$

*Proof of Claim 4.5.* Let  $S$  and  $S'$  be node-neighboring graph streams that are  $(D', \ell)$ -bounded. Group privacy (Lemma 2.11) tells us that if a mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  is  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DP, then its outputs on a pair of datasets which differ in at most  $k$  individuals are  $(k \cdot \varepsilon, k \cdot e^{k\varepsilon} \cdot \delta)$ -indistinguishable.

**Proof of item (1).** By item (2a) of Theorem 3.3, the projections of  $S$  and  $S'$  will have maximum degree at most  $D'$  and will be edge distance at most  $D' + \ell$  from each other, so group privacy tells us that the outputs from  $\text{RestrictedPrivAlg}_{D'}$  on the projections with maximum degree at most  $D'$  will be  $(\varepsilon_{\text{Base}}, \delta_{\text{Base}})$ -indistinguishable for

$$\varepsilon_{\text{Base}} = (D' + \ell) \cdot \varepsilon' \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_{\text{Base}} = (D' + \ell) \cdot e^{\varepsilon_{\text{Base}}} \delta',$$

which is what we wanted to show.

**Proof of item (2).** By item (3a) of Theorem 3.3, the projections of  $S$  and  $S'$  will have maximum degree at most  $D'$  and will be node distance at most  $2\ell + 1$  from each other, so group privacy tells us that the outputs from  $\text{RestrictedPrivAlg}_{D'}$  on the projections with maximum degree at most  $D'$  will be  $(\varepsilon_{\text{Base}}, \delta_{\text{Base}})$ -indistinguishable for

$$\varepsilon_{\text{Base}} = (2\ell + 1) \cdot \varepsilon' \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_{\text{Base}} = (2\ell + 1) \cdot e^{\varepsilon_{\text{Base}}} \delta',$$

which is what we wanted to show. □

**Claim 4.6** (Privacy and failure probability of **Test**). *Let **Test** be parameterized as in Algorithm 5. **Test** has the following properties:*

1. **Test** is  $(\varepsilon_{\text{Test}}, 0)$ -node-DP under continual observation.
2. For every input stream  $S$  and time  $t \in [T]$ , if  $S_{[t]}$  is not  $(D', \ell)$ -bounded, then  $\text{Test}(S)$  outputs  $\perp$  w.p. at least  $1 - \beta_{\text{Test}}$  at or before time  $t$ .

*Proof of Claim 4.6.* We prove each item below.

**Proof of item (1).** By Lemma 4.3, for all  $t \in [T]$  the query  $q_t = -1 \cdot \text{DistToGraph}_{D',\ell}(\text{flatten}(S_{[t]}))$  has node-sensitivity 1, so by Theorem A.1 the output of SVT is  $(\varepsilon_{\text{Test}}, 0)$ -node-DP under continual observation.

**Proof of item (2).** Let  $S$  be a graph stream of length  $T$ , and let  $t^* \in [T]$  be the smallest value such that  $S_{[t^*]}$  has at least  $\ell$  nodes of degree greater than  $D'$ , and set  $t^* = T + 1$  if there is no such value. (Note that this time  $t^*$  is less than or equal to the smallest value  $t$  such that  $S_{[t]}$  is not  $(D', \ell)$ -bounded.) By definition we have  $\text{DistToGraph}_{D',\ell}(\text{flatten}(S_{[t^*]})) = 0$ , so for  $q_{t^*} = -1 \cdot \text{DistToGraph}_{D',\ell}(\text{flatten}(S_{[t^*]}))$  we have  $q_{t^*} = 0$ . Equivalently, where we set  $\tau = -8 \ln(1/\beta_{\text{Test}})/\varepsilon_{\text{Test}}$  (as in Algorithm 5), we have

$$q_{t^*} = 8 \ln(1/\beta_{\text{Test}})/\varepsilon_{\text{Test}} + \tau.$$

By item (1) of Theorem A.2, then, in Algorithm 5 SVT outputs  $\perp$  at or before time step  $t^*$  with probability at least  $1 - \beta_{\text{Test}}$ , so we also have that Algorithm 5 outputs  $\perp$  at or before time  $t^*$  (and at all subsequent time steps) with probability at least  $1 - \beta_{\text{Test}}$ .  $\square$

From Claims 4.5 and 4.6, we see that **Base** and **Test** as defined in Algorithm 5 satisfy the conditions on **Base** and **Test** that are described in Theorem 4.4. Algorithm 5 is a post-processed version of PTR initialized with **Base** and **Test**, so it shares the privacy properties of PTR. Therefore, by applying Theorem 4.4, we see that Algorithm 5 has the following privacy guarantees:

1. If  $\text{RestrictedPrivAlg}_{D'}$  satisfies  $D'$ -restricted  $(\varepsilon', \delta')$ -**edge**-DP, then Algorithm 5 is  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DP for

$$\varepsilon = \varepsilon_{\text{Test}} + \varepsilon' \cdot (D' + \ell) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta = (1 + e^{\varepsilon_{\text{Test}}})e^{\varepsilon} \beta_{\text{Test}} + \delta' \cdot e^{\varepsilon' \cdot (D' + \ell)} \cdot (D' + \ell).$$

2. If  $\text{RestrictedPrivAlg}_{D'}$  satisfies  $D'$ -restricted  $(\varepsilon', \delta')$ -**node**-DP, then Algorithm 5 is  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DP for

$$\varepsilon = \varepsilon_{\text{Test}} + \varepsilon' \cdot (2\ell + 1) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta = (1 + e^{\varepsilon_{\text{Test}}})e^{\varepsilon} \beta_{\text{Test}} + \delta' \cdot e^{\varepsilon' \cdot (2\ell + 1)} \cdot (2\ell + 1).$$

These are the values for  $\varepsilon$  and  $\delta$  that we wanted to show. We now solve for  $\varepsilon'$  and  $\delta'$  to complete the proof for items (1) and (2) of Theorem 4.1. The asymptotic bounds that follow use the assumptions  $\varepsilon \leq 1$ ,  $\varepsilon_{\text{Test}} = \varepsilon/2$ , and  $\beta_{\text{Test}} = \delta/30$ ; we work out these bounds in detail below.

To solve for  $\varepsilon'$  and  $\delta'$ , we begin with the exact expressions for  $\varepsilon$  and  $\delta$  in item (1). Using our assumed bounds on  $\varepsilon$ ,  $\varepsilon_{\text{Test}}$ , and  $\beta_{\text{Test}}$ , we obtain

$$\varepsilon = \Theta(\varepsilon' \cdot (D' + \ell)),$$

so we have

$$\varepsilon' = \Theta\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{D' + \ell}\right). \tag{6}$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &= (1 + e^{\varepsilon_{\text{Test}}})e^{\varepsilon} \beta_{\text{Test}} + \delta' \cdot e^{\varepsilon' \cdot (D' + \ell)} \cdot (D' + \ell) \\ &\leq 2e^{2\varepsilon} \beta_{\text{Test}} + \delta' \cdot e^{\varepsilon' \cdot (D' + \ell)} \cdot (D' + \ell) \\ &= \Theta(\delta' \cdot (D' + \ell)), \end{aligned}$$

with the final line following from  $\varepsilon \leq 1$  and  $\beta_{\text{Test}} = \delta/30$ , so we have

$$\delta' = \Theta\left(\frac{\delta}{D' + \ell}\right). \tag{7}$$

We can expand  $D' + \ell$  as

$$\begin{aligned} D' + \ell &= D + \Theta(\ell) \\ &= D + \Theta\left(\frac{\log(T/(\beta\beta_{\text{Test}}))}{\varepsilon_{\text{Test}}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

By combining this with Expressions 6 and 7, we indeed obtain

$$\varepsilon' = \Theta\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{B}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta' = \Theta\left(\frac{\delta}{B}\right), \quad \text{where} \quad B = D + \frac{\log(T/(\beta\delta))}{\varepsilon}.$$

From the exact expressions in item (2), we can similarly obtain  $\varepsilon' = \Theta(\varepsilon/\ell)$  and  $\delta' = \Theta(\delta/\ell)$ . We can then write  $\ell = \Theta(\log(T/(\beta\beta_{\text{Test}}))/\varepsilon_{\text{Test}})$ , which gives us

$$\varepsilon' = \Theta\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{B}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta' = \Theta\left(\frac{\delta}{B}\right), \quad \text{where} \quad B = \frac{\log(T/(\beta\delta))}{\varepsilon}.$$

This completes the proof of items (1) and (2).

**Proof of item (3) in Theorem 4.1.** Let  $S$  be a graph stream of length  $T$ , and let  $t' \in [T]$  be the largest value such that  $S_{[t']}$  has maximum degree at most  $D$ , setting  $t' = 0$  if there is no such value. This proof mostly follows from item (2) of Theorem A.2. Let  $\ell$  and  $D'$  be defined as in Algorithm 5, so  $\ell = \lceil 8 \ln(T/(\beta\beta_{\text{Test}}))/\varepsilon_{\text{Test}} \rceil$  and  $D' = D + \ell$ . By Lemma 4.3, we have  $\text{DistToGraph}_{D',\ell}(\text{flatten}(S_{[t]})) \geq \ell$ , so for  $q_t = -1 \cdot \text{DistToGraph}_{D',\ell}(\text{flatten}(S_{[t]}))$  we have  $q_t \leq -\ell$ .

Equivalently, where we set  $\tau = -8 \ln(1/\beta_{\text{Test}})/\varepsilon_{\text{Test}}$  (as in Algorithm 5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} q_t &\leq -\ell \\ &\leq -8 \ln(T/(\beta\beta_{\text{Test}}))/\varepsilon_{\text{Test}} \\ &= -8 \ln(T/\beta)/\varepsilon_{\text{Test}} + \tau \\ &= 8 \ln(\beta/T)/\varepsilon_{\text{Test}} + \tau. \end{aligned}$$

By item (2) of Theorem A.2, then, in Algorithm 5 SVT outputs  $\top$  on  $q_1, \dots, q_{t'}$  with probability at least  $1 - \beta$ , so we also have that Algorithm 5 outputs the result from  $\text{RestrictedPrivAlg}_{D'}$  for all  $t \leq t'$  with probability at least  $1 - \beta$ .

**Proof of item (4) in Theorem 4.1.** On a given input stream  $S$ , let  $R_{[t]}$  be the runtime of  $\text{RestrictedPrivAlg}_{D'}$  through time  $t$  (on  $S_{[t]}$ ), and let  $n_{[t]}$  and  $m_{[t]}$  be the number of nodes and edges in the graph stream through time step  $t$ . At each time step, Algorithm 5 does several constant-time operations, an update to the projection, a call to  $\text{RestrictedPrivAlg}_{D'}$ , and a call to  $\text{Test}$ . The projection algorithm in Algorithm 1 has runtime linear in the number of (new) nodes and edges, so the runtime of this through  $t$  time steps is  $O(n_{[t]} + m_{[t]})$ . The  $t$  calls to  $\text{RestrictedPrivAlg}_{D'}$  have runtime  $R_{[t]}$ . By Lemma 4.3,  $\text{DistToGraph}$  can be updated in time linear in the number of new nodes and edges, so each call to SVT takes either constant time or time linear in the number of new nodes and edges. Therefore, the overall runtime of Algorithm 5 through time  $t \in [T]$  is  $R_{[t]} + O(n_{[t]} + m_{[t]} + t)$ .

We now compute the space complexity. The projection algorithm need only track the degree of each node, which takes space  $O(n_{[t]})$ ; the new nodes and edges that are added to the projection can be passed to the base algorithm  $\text{RestrictedPrivAlg}_{D'}$  at each time step, so this does not take additional space. By the proof of Lemma 4.3, we see that the algorithm for computing  $\text{Test}$  only requires a constant number of counters, along with two hash tables each with at most  $O(n_{[t]})$  entries. Therefore, our algorithm requires  $O(n_{[t]})$  additional space as compared to  $\text{RestrictedPrivAlg}_{D'}$ .  $\square$

## 5 Optimal Algorithms for $f_{\text{edges}}$ , $f_{\text{triangles}}$ , $f_{\text{CC}}$ , $f_{\text{k-stars}}$

We now use our transformation in Algorithm 5 to convert restricted edge- and node-DP algorithms for several fundamental problems into node-DP algorithms that achieve the same asymptotic error as the analogous restricted node-DP algorithms given by [SLM+18; FHO21], up to lower-order terms. Table 1 shows the additive error for privately counting edges ( $f_{\text{edges}}$ ), triangles ( $f_{\text{triangles}}$ ),  $k$ -stars ( $f_{\text{k-stars}}$ ), and connected components ( $f_{\text{CC}}$ ), and privately releasing degree histograms<sup>7</sup> ( $f_{\text{degree-hist}}$ ) of the input graph stream. Moreover,

<sup>7</sup>The degree histogram  $f_{\text{degree-hist}}(G)$  for a graph  $G$  with maximum degree at most  $D$  is the  $(D + 1)$ -element vector  $(a_0, \dots, a_D) \in \mathbb{R}^{D+1}$ , where  $a_i$  is the number of nodes with degree  $i$  in  $G$ .

for  $f_{\text{edges}}$ ,  $f_{\text{triangles}}$ ,  $f_{k\text{-stars}}$ , and  $f_{\text{CC}}$ , the accuracy of our algorithms is asymptotically optimal, up to lower order terms and polylogarithmic factors. We prove the upper bounds on error in Section 5.1 and the lower bounds in Section 5.2.

For  $f_{\text{edges}}$ ,  $f_{\text{triangles}}$ ,  $f_{k\text{-stars}}$ , and  $f_{\text{degree-hist}}$ , the errors for our transformation follow from substituting the  $\varepsilon'$  term from Theorem 4.1 into the error bounds for the restricted edge-DP algorithms of [FHO21] (algorithms with slightly worse lower-order terms follow from using restricted node-DP algorithms). The bound for  $f_{\text{CC}}$  follows from a new edge-DP algorithm based on the binary tree mechanism.

By item (1a) of Theorem 3.3, we can also immediately obtain  $(\varepsilon, 0)$ -edge-DP algorithms from restricted edge-private algorithms by using the projection  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDs}}$  and running the corresponding restricted edge-private algorithm with  $\varepsilon' = \varepsilon/3$  on the projection. This technique gives the first algorithms for  $f_{\text{triangles}}$ ,  $f_{k\text{-stars}}$ , and  $f_{\text{CC}}$  that are edge-private under continual observation for all graphs and, for graph streams with maximum degree at most  $D$ , have asymptotically optimal accuracy (up to polylogarithmic factors).

The lower bounds in Section 5.2 follow by reductions from a version of the  $\Omega(\log T/\varepsilon)$  lower bound for binary counting from [DNPR10], modified by us for the approximate-DP setting (Theorem 5.7).

## 5.1 Upper Bounds on Error

We first present our upper bounds on additive error. For  $f_{\text{edges}}$ ,  $f_{\text{triangles}}$ ,  $f_{k\text{-stars}}$ , and  $f_{\text{degree-hist}}$ , the errors for our transformation roughly follow by substituting the  $\varepsilon'$  term from Theorem 4.1 into the error bounds for restricted edge-DP algorithms of [FHO21] (with slight modifications for the  $\ell_\infty$  error setting). For  $f_{\text{CC}}$ , the error follows from a new edge-DP algorithm based on the binary tree mechanism; this algorithm and the accompanying proof are described in Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4.

The errors for our edge-private algorithms follow from item (1a) of Theorem 3.3, which says we can achieve  $(\varepsilon, 0)$ -edge-DP by roughly running the algorithms of [FHO21] for  $f_{\text{triangles}}$ ,  $f_{k\text{-stars}}$ ,  $f_{\text{degree-hist}}$  and  $f_{\text{triangles}}$  (modified for the  $\ell_\infty$  error setting), and our algorithm for  $f_{\text{CC}}$ , with privacy parameter  $\varepsilon' = \varepsilon/3$  on the output of  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDs}}$ .

**Theorem 5.1** (Accuracy of node-private algorithms). *Let  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ ,  $\delta > 0$ ,  $D \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $T \in \mathbb{N}$  where  $T \geq 2$ , and  $S$  be a length- $T$ , insertion-only graph stream. There exist  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -node-DP algorithms for the following problems whose error is at most  $\alpha$ , with probability 0.99, for all times steps  $t \in [T]$  where  $S_{[t]}$  has maximum degree at most  $D$ :*

1.  $f_{\text{edges}}$ ,  $\alpha = O\left(\left(D + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \log \frac{T}{\delta}\right) \frac{\log^{5/2} T}{\varepsilon}\right)$ .
2.  $f_{\text{triangles}}$ ,  $\alpha = O\left(\left(D^2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \log^2 \frac{T}{\delta}\right) \frac{\log^{5/2} T}{\varepsilon}\right)$ .
3.  $f_{\text{CC}}$ ,  $\alpha = O\left(\left(D + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \log \frac{T}{\delta}\right) \frac{\log^{5/2} T}{\varepsilon}\right)$ .
4.  $f_{k\text{-stars}}$ ,  $\alpha = O\left(\left(D^k + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^k} \log^k \frac{T}{\delta}\right) \frac{\log^{5/2} T}{\varepsilon}\right)$ .
5.  $f_{\text{degree-hist}}$ ,  $\alpha = \tilde{O}\left(\left(D^2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \log^2 \frac{T}{\delta}\right) \frac{\log^{5/2} T}{\varepsilon}\right)$  (maximum error over histogram entries and time steps).

As is standard, the  $\tilde{O}$  notation suppresses terms that are logarithmic in the argument—in this case, it suppresses  $\log D$  and  $\log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \log \frac{T}{\delta})$ .

**Theorem 5.2** (Accuracy of edge-private algorithms). *Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $D \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $T \in \mathbb{N}$  where  $T \geq 2$ , and  $S$  be a length- $T$ , insertion-only graph stream. There exist  $(\varepsilon, 0)$ -edge-DP algorithms for the following problems whose error is at most  $\alpha$ , with probability 0.99, for all times steps  $t \in [T]$  where  $S_{[t]}$  has maximum degree at most  $D$ :*

1.  $f_{\text{triangles}}$ ,  $\alpha = O\left(\frac{D \log^{5/2} T}{\varepsilon}\right)$ .

2.  $f_{\text{CC}}, \alpha = O\left(\frac{\log^{5/2} T}{\varepsilon}\right)$ .
3.  $f_{k\text{-stars}}, \alpha = O\left(\frac{D^{k-1} \log^{5/2} T}{\varepsilon}\right)$ .
4.  $f_{\text{degree-hist}}, \alpha = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{D \log^{5/2} T}{\varepsilon}\right)$  (maximum error over histogram entries and time steps).

As is standard, the  $\tilde{O}$  notation suppresses terms that are logarithmic in the argument—in this case, it suppresses  $\log D$ .

As described above, these upper bounds rely on the accuracy of restricted edge-private algorithms for the associated problems, all of which are based on the binary tree mechanism of [DNPR10; CSS11] and result from Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4.

These binary tree-based algorithms all follow from bounding the  $\ell_1$  sensitivity of the sequence of *increments* of a given function  $f$  over the stream  $S$ , first considered explicitly by [SLM+18]. Let  $x \in \mathcal{X}^T$ . Where  $f : \mathcal{X}^T \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^d)^T$  returns an output in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  at each time step, let  $\text{inc}_f(S) : \mathcal{X}^T \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^d)^T$  return, for each time step  $t \in [T]$ , the increment  $f(x)_t - f(x)_{t-1}$ , where we define  $f(x)_0 = 0^d$ . We define  $\text{IncEdgeSens}_D(f)$  as the  $\ell_1$  Lipschitz constant of  $\text{inc}_f$  when restricted to  $D$ -bounded, edge-neighboring graph streams:

$$\text{IncEdgeSens}_D(f) = \sup_{\substack{S \simeq_{\text{edge}} S' \text{ with} \\ \max \text{ degree} \leq D}} \|\text{inc}_f(S) - \text{inc}_f(S')\|_1.$$

We let  $\text{IncEdgeSens}(f)$  (without a value for  $D$ ) denote the sensitivity of  $\text{inc}_f$  over all neighboring graphs streams.

The tree mechanism of [DNPR10; CSS11] produces an edge-DP approximation to the sequence of values of  $f$  when the noise is scaled to  $\text{IncEdgeSens}_D(f)$ , and produces an algorithm with  $D$ -restricted edge-privacy when its noise is scaled to  $\text{IncEdgeSens}_D(f)$ . The following lemma is folklore; our formulation is a variation on statements in [DNPR10; CSS11; SLM+18; FHO21].

**Lemma 5.3** (following [DNPR10; CSS11; SLM+18; FHO21]). *Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $D \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $T \in \mathbb{N}$  where  $T \geq 2$ , and  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $f : \mathcal{S}^T \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^d)^T$  return a ( $d$ -dimensional) output in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  at each time step  $t \in [T]$ .*

*There exists a  $D$ -restricted  $(\varepsilon, 0)$ -edge-DP algorithm that, with probability at least  $1 - \beta$ , has  $\ell_\infty$  error*

$$\text{IncEdgeSens}_D(f) \cdot O\left(\frac{\log^{3/2} T}{\varepsilon} \cdot \log(dT/\beta)\right)$$

*on every dimension of the output.*

*The analogous statement holds for (unrestricted) differential privacy when its noise scaled to  $\text{IncEdgeSens}(f)$ . Additionally, analogous statements hold for restricted and unrestricted node sensitivity and node-DP.*

*Proof of Lemma 5.3.* By [FHO21, Corollary 14], which uses the binary tree mechanism of [CSS11; DNPR10] and the technique of difference sequences introduced by [SLM+18], there exists a  $D$ -restricted  $(\varepsilon, 0)$ -edge-DP algorithm that, with probability at least  $1 - \beta'$ , has error at most  $\text{IncEdgeSens}_D(f) \cdot O\left(\frac{\log^{3/2} T}{\varepsilon} \cdot \log(1/\beta')\right)$  per dimension at each time step.

By substituting  $\beta' = \frac{\beta}{dT}$  and taking a union bound over all  $d$  coordinates and  $T$  time steps, with probability at least  $1 - \beta$  the  $\ell_\infty$  error over all  $d$  coordinates and  $T$  time steps is at most  $\text{IncEdgeSens}_D(f) \cdot O\left(\frac{\log^{3/2} T}{\varepsilon} \cdot \log(dT/\beta)\right)$ , which is what we wanted to show (with analogous statements for  $\text{IncEdgeSens}(f)$  and unrestricted  $(\varepsilon, 0)$ -edge-DP; and for node-DP).  $\square$

**Lemma 5.4** (Edge sensitivity bounds). *For all  $D \in \mathbb{N}$ , the following bounds on incremental edge-sensitivity  $\text{IncEdgeSens}_D$  and  $\text{IncEdgeSens}$  hold (with some due to [SLM+18; FHO21]):*

1.  $\text{IncEdgeSens}(f_{\text{edges}}) = 1 = O(1)$ .
2.  $\text{IncEdgeSens}_D(f_{\text{triangles}}) = D - 1 = O(D)$ .
3.  $\text{IncEdgeSens}(f_{\text{CC}}) = 2 = O(1)$ .
4.  $\text{IncEdgeSens}_D(f_{k\text{-stars}}) = 2\binom{D-1}{k-1} = O(D^{k-1})$ .
5.  $\text{IncEdgeSens}_D(f_{\text{degree-hist}}) = 8D - 4 = O(D)$ .

*Except for  $f_{\text{degree-hist}}$ , these equalities hold even if we restrict our attention to streams of length  $T = 1$ . For  $f_{\text{degree-hist}}$ , the lower bound requires  $T \geq 2D$  (but the upper bound holds regardless of  $T$ ).*

*Proof.* With the exception of item (3), proofs of items similar to those listed above can be found in [FHO21, Lemma 15], though we tighten some of the sensitivities (analyses for  $D$ -restricted node sensitivity first appear in [SLM+18]). Specifically, for items (2) and (5) we tighten the exact sensitivities and provide strict equalities (the asymptotics are unchanged), and for item (4) we tighten the asymptotic expression by a factor of  $D$  (the exact expression in fact remains unchanged). We prove item (3) last since its proof is new and the most involved.

**Item (1).** The addition or removal of an edge changes the increment sequence of edge counts  $\text{inc}_{f_{\text{edges}}}$  by at most one [FHO21].

**Item (2).** Each edge is part of at most  $D - 1$  triangles (and can, in fact, be part of  $D - 1$  triangles), so adding or removing an edge will change the sequence of increments by at most  $D - 1$ .

**Item (4).** Each edge is part of at most  $2\binom{D}{k}$  different  $k$ -stars (and, if the edge is between two nodes with degree  $D$ , will be part of exactly  $2\binom{D}{k}$  different  $k$ -stars) so removing the edge will instead result in  $2\binom{D-1}{k}$  different  $k$ -stars. Therefore, the sequence of increments will change by at most  $2\left(\binom{D}{k} - \binom{D-1}{k}\right)$  [FHO21].

We additionally observe  $2\left(\binom{D}{k} - \binom{D-1}{k}\right) = 2\binom{D-1}{k-1} = O(D^{k-1})$ .

**Item (5).** We first consider how an additional edge  $e^+ = \{u, v\}$  in  $S'$  (as compared to an edge-neighboring stream  $S$ ) affects the degree of  $u$ ; we then apply a similar argument for the degree of  $v$ . At each time step, the degree of  $u$  is higher by at most one in  $S'$  as compared to  $S$ . In general, this means that the increment to each bucket due to a change in the degree of  $u$  will be earlier, and the decrement to each bucket due to a change in the degree of  $u$  will also be earlier. There are several exceptions to this idea: the increment to the bucket for degree 0 cannot be earlier, and there cannot be a decrement to the bucket for degree  $D$ . Additionally, there cannot be an increment in  $S$  for the bucket for degree  $D$  (since otherwise  $u$  would have degree  $D + 1$  in  $S'$ ); similarly, there cannot be a decrement for the bucket for degree  $D - 1$  in  $S$ .

Therefore, considering buckets not equal to 0,  $D - 1$ , or  $D$ , there are  $(D - 2)$  differently positioned increments and decrements—that is, the  $\ell_1$  sensitivity of the sequence of increments for these buckets is  $4(D - 2)$ ; and for  $D$  there is 1 change, for 0 there are 2 changes (when  $D - 1 > 0$ ), and for  $D - 1$  there is one less change than it would otherwise have (i.e., 1 change for  $D - 1 = 0$  and 3 changes otherwise). Therefore, the  $\ell_1$  sensitivity of the sequence of increments is  $4D - 2$  due to the change in the degree of  $u$ . A similar argument applies for changes due to the degree of  $v$ , which gives us a sensitivity of  $2 \cdot (4D - 2) = 8D - 4$ .

Note that this argument is tight when  $e^+$  arrives at a time step that is both (1) after  $u$  and  $v$  and (2) before all other edges, and when at most one edge incident to  $u$  arrives at each time step (likewise for  $v$ ).

**Item (3).** Let  $f_{\text{CC}}^+$  denote  $\text{inc}_{f_{\text{CC}}}$ . Without loss of generality, let  $S'$  be a graph stream that, as compared to  $S$ , has one additional edge  $e^+ = \{u, v\}$  that is inserted at time  $t_1$ .

When bounding  $\|f_{\text{CC}}^+(S) - f_{\text{CC}}^+(S')\|_1$ , we have to consider the following three cases. In  $S$ :

1. **(Case 1)** there is never a path between  $u$  and  $v$ .
2. **(Case 2)**  $t_0 \leq t_1$  is the first time step at which there exists a path between  $u$  and  $v$ .

3. (**Case 3**)  $t_3 > t_1$  is the first time step at which there exists a path between  $u$  and  $v$ .

We prove each case below.

**Case 2:** The outputs from  $f_{\text{CC}}(S)$  and  $f_{\text{CC}}(S')$  are identical, so the outputs from  $f_{\text{CC}}^+(S)$  and  $f_{\text{CC}}^+(S')$  are also identical, so we have  $\|f_{\text{CC}}^+(S) - f_{\text{CC}}^+(S')\|_1 = 0$ . We now consider the remaining cases.

**Case 1:** For all  $t_0 < t_1$  (that is, prior to the time step at which the graph streams differ) we have  $f_{\text{CC}}^+(S)_{t_0} = f_{\text{CC}}^+(S')_{t_0}$ . When the difference in graph streams occurs at  $t_1$ , we have  $f_{\text{CC}}^+(S)_{t_1} = f_{\text{CC}}^+(S')_{t_1} + 1$ . Only the components containing  $u$  and  $v$  are affected by this edge. By the assumption that there is never a path between  $u$  and  $v$  in  $S$ , no future edges affect the components containing  $u$  and  $v$ , so for all  $t_2 > t_1$  we have  $f_{\text{CC}}^+(S)_{t_2} = f_{\text{CC}}^+(S')_{t_2}$ . Therefore, in case 1 we have

$$\|f_{\text{CC}}^+(S) - f_{\text{CC}}^+(S')\|_1 \leq 1.$$

**Case 3:** As above, for all  $t_0 < t_1$  we have  $f_{\text{CC}}^+(S)_{t_0} = f_{\text{CC}}^+(S')_{t_0}$ . When the difference in graph streams occurs at  $t_1$ , we have  $f_{\text{CC}}^+(S)_{t_1} = f_{\text{CC}}^+(S')_{t_1} + 1$ . Only the components containing  $u$  and  $v$  are affected by the inclusion of edge  $e^+$ . By the assumption that, for all  $t_2 \in [t_1, t_3]$ , there is never a path between  $u$  and  $v$  in  $S$ , no edges arriving at such times  $t_2$  affect the components containing  $u$  and  $v$ , so we have  $f_{\text{CC}}^+(S)_{t_2} = f_{\text{CC}}^+(S')_{t_2}$ .

At time  $t_3$ , the edge forming a path between  $u$  and  $v$  arrives, which causes the number of connected components in  $S$  to decrease by 1 as compared to  $S'$ , so  $f_{\text{CC}}^+(S)_{t_3} = f_{\text{CC}}^+(S')_{t_3}$ . For all  $t_4 > t_3$ , the changes in counts will be the same for both graph streams, so  $f_{\text{CC}}^+(S)_{t_4} = f_{\text{CC}}^+(S')_{t_4}$ . Therefore, in case 3 we have

$$\|f_{\text{CC}}^+(S) - f_{\text{CC}}^+(S')\|_1 \leq 2,$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

We now move to the proofs of Theorems 5.1 and 5.2. Theorem 5.2 quickly follows from running the restricted edge-private algorithms that result from the sensitivities in Lemma 5.4 and the binary tree mechanism in Lemma 5.3 on the projection returned by  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDs}}$ , and either running the algorithm directly on the input for the problems with unrestricted sensitivity bounds, or running the algorithm with  $\varepsilon' = \varepsilon/3$  on the projection of  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDs}}$  for problems with restricted sensitivity bounds. Theorem 5.1 follows from running Algorithm 5 with access to the relevant restricted edge-private algorithm that results from Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4, and then determining the associated accuracy of that algorithm given the value of  $\varepsilon'$  specified by Theorem 4.1.

*Proof of Theorem 5.2.* This proof follows immediately from combining item (1a) of Theorem 3.3, which describes the edge-to-edge stability of Algorithm 1 that includes edges in the projection according to original degrees (we use  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDs}}$  to denote this projection), with the bounds on accuracy for edge-private algorithms that follow from the sensitivities in Lemma 5.4 and the binary tree mechanism in Lemma 5.3. More specifically, to obtain  $(\varepsilon, 0)$ -edge-DP under continual observation for the problems with  $D$ -restricted edge sensitivity, we run the  $D$ -restricted edge-private algorithms yielding these accuracy bounds with  $\varepsilon/3$  on the graph stream output by the projection algorithm  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDs}}$ ; and to obtain  $(\varepsilon, 0)$ -edge-DP under continual observation for the problems with unrestricted edge sensitivity, we run the resulting algorithm with  $\varepsilon$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 5.1.* We begin by calculating the value of  $\varepsilon'$  with which Algorithm 5 will run the (restricted) edge-private algorithm. For these calculations, set  $\varepsilon_{\text{Test}} = \varepsilon/2$  and  $\beta_{\text{Test}} = \delta/30$ . We also assume constant  $\beta$ . To have  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -node-DP, Theorem 4.1 tells us that Algorithm 5 will set

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon' &= \Theta\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{D + \frac{\log(T/(\beta\delta))}{\varepsilon}}\right) \\ &= \Theta\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{D} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\log(T/(\beta\delta))}\right). \end{aligned}$$

For constant  $\beta$ , we can simplify this further to

$$\varepsilon' = \Theta\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{D} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\log(T/\delta)}\right).$$

To compute accuracy, we will also need to know the value of  $D'$ . Using the conditions stated above on our variables, we can simplify  $D'$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} D' &= D + \ell \\ &= D + \Theta\left(\frac{\log(T/(\beta\beta_{\text{test}}))}{\varepsilon}\right) \\ &= D + \Theta\left(\frac{\log(T/\delta)}{\varepsilon}\right). \end{aligned}$$

**Proof of items (1) and (3).** We substitute the above value of  $\varepsilon'$  into the accuracy bounds that follow from Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4. We note that the accuracy expressions for  $f_{\text{edges}}$  and  $f_{\text{CC}}$  are the same, so we begin by proving the upper bounds on accuracy for these functions. By Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4, with probability  $1 - \beta$ , the edge-private algorithms for  $f_{\text{edges}}$  and  $f_{\text{CC}}$  have additive error at most  $O((\log^{3/2} T) \cdot (\log T + \log(1/\beta))/\varepsilon')$ . Since  $\beta$  is constant we can ignore the  $\log(1/\beta)$  term, so substituting for  $\varepsilon'$  gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\log^{5/2} T}{\varepsilon'} &= \Theta\left(\left(\frac{D}{\varepsilon} + \frac{\log(T/\delta)}{\varepsilon^2}\right) \cdot \log^{5/2} T\right) \\ &= \Theta\left(\left(D + \frac{\log(T/\delta)}{\varepsilon}\right) \cdot \frac{\log^{5/2} T}{\varepsilon}\right), \end{aligned}$$

which is the additive error we wanted to show.

**Proof of item (2).** By Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4, with probability  $1 - \beta$ , the edge-private algorithm for  $f_{\text{triangles}}$  has additive error at most  $O(D' \cdot (\log^{3/2} T) \cdot (\log T + \log(1/\beta))/\varepsilon')$ . Since  $\beta$  is constant we can ignore the  $\log(1/\beta)$  term. Substituting for  $\varepsilon'$  and  $D'$  gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{D' \log^{5/2} T}{\varepsilon'} &= \Theta\left(\left(D + \frac{\log(T/\delta)}{\varepsilon}\right) \cdot \log^{5/2} T \cdot \left(\frac{D}{\varepsilon} + \frac{\log T/\delta}{\varepsilon^2}\right)\right) \\ &= \Theta\left(\left(D + \frac{\log(T/\delta)}{\varepsilon}\right)^2 \cdot \frac{\log^{5/2} T}{\varepsilon}\right) \\ &= \Theta\left(\left(D^2 + \frac{\log^2(T/\delta)}{\varepsilon^2}\right) \cdot \frac{\log^{5/2} T}{\varepsilon}\right), \end{aligned}$$

which is the additive error we wanted to show.

**Proof of item (4).** By Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4, with probability  $1 - \beta$ , the edge-private algorithm for  $f_{\text{k-stars}}$  has additive error at most  $O(D'^{k-1} \cdot (\log^{3/2} T) \cdot (\log T + \log(1/\beta))/\varepsilon')$ . Since  $\beta$  is constant we can ignore the  $\log(1/\beta)$  term. Substituting for  $\varepsilon'$  and  $D'$  gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{D'^{k-1} \log^{5/2} T}{\varepsilon'} &= \Theta\left(\left(D + \frac{\log(T/\delta)}{\varepsilon}\right)^{k-1} \cdot \log^{5/2} T \cdot \left(\frac{D}{\varepsilon} + \frac{\log T/\delta}{\varepsilon^2}\right)\right) \\ &= \Theta\left(\left(D + \frac{\log(T/\delta)}{\varepsilon}\right)^k \cdot \frac{\log^{5/2} T}{\varepsilon}\right) \\ &= \Theta\left(\left(D^k + \frac{\log^k(T/\delta)}{\varepsilon^k}\right) \cdot \frac{\log^{5/2} T}{\varepsilon}\right), \end{aligned}$$

which is the additive error we wanted to show.

**Proof of item (5).** By Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4, with probability  $1 - \beta$ , the edge-private algorithm for  $f_{\text{degree-hist}}$  has additive error at most  $O(D' \cdot (\log^{3/2} T) \cdot (\log T + \log(1/\beta) + \log D')/\varepsilon')$  on every bin of the histogram. Since  $\beta$  is constant we can ignore the  $\log(1/\beta)$  term. Substituting for  $\varepsilon'$  and  $D'$  gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{D' \cdot (\log^{3/2} T) \cdot (\log T + \log D')}{\varepsilon'} &= \tilde{\Theta} \left( \left( D + \frac{\log(T/\delta)}{\varepsilon} \right) \cdot \log^{5/2} T \cdot \left( \frac{D}{\varepsilon} + \frac{\log T/\delta}{\varepsilon^2} \right) \right) \\ &= \tilde{\Theta} \left( \left( D + \frac{\log(T/\delta)}{\varepsilon} \right)^2 \cdot \frac{\log^{5/2} T}{\varepsilon} \right) \\ &= \tilde{\Theta} \left( \left( D^2 + \frac{\log^2(T/\delta)}{\varepsilon^2} \right) \cdot \frac{\log^{5/2} T}{\varepsilon} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where, as is standard, the  $\tilde{\Theta}$  notation suppresses terms that are logarithmic in the argument—in this case, it suppresses  $\log D$  and  $\log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \log \frac{T}{\delta})$ . This is the additive error we wanted to show.  $\square$

## 5.2 Lower Bounds on Error

We now present several lower bounds on the error necessary for privately releasing graph statistics in the approximate DP setting, for  $\delta = O(1/T)$ . The proofs of these bounds are based on a reduction from binary counting. For  $f_{\text{edges}}$  and  $f_{\text{degree-hist}}$ , our reductions from binary counting are similar to the constructions used by [FHO21]. Our reductions for  $f_{\text{triangles}}$ ,  $f_{\text{CC}}$ , and  $f_{k\text{-stars}}$  are different from those of [FHO21] and yield stronger lower bounds.

**Theorem 5.5** (Lower bounds for node-private algorithms). *For sufficiently large  $T \in \mathbb{N}$ , and all  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\delta = O(1/T)$ , and  $D \in \mathbb{N}$  (with  $D \geq 2$  for  $f_{\text{triangles}}$ ),<sup>8</sup> consider a mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  for each of the problems below that runs on length- $T$  graph streams with maximum degree at most  $D$ . If  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfies  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -node-DP and  $(\alpha, T)$ -accuracy for the specified task, then its additive error must be lower bounded in the following way:*

1.  $f_{\text{edges}}$ ,  $\alpha = \Omega \left( \min \left\{ \frac{D \log T}{\varepsilon}, DT \right\} \right)$ .
2.  $f_{\text{triangles}}$ ,  $\alpha = \Omega \left( \min \left\{ \frac{D^2 \log T}{\varepsilon}, D^2 T \right\} \right)$ .
3.  $f_{\text{CC}}$ ,  $\alpha = \Omega \left( \min \left\{ \frac{D \log T}{\varepsilon}, DT \right\} \right)$ .
4.  $f_{k\text{-stars}}$ ,  $\alpha = \Omega \left( \min \left\{ \frac{D^k \log T}{\varepsilon}, D^k T \right\} \right)$ .
5.  $f_{\text{degree-hist}}$ ,  $\alpha = \Omega \left( \min \left\{ \frac{D \log T}{\varepsilon}, DT \right\} \right)$  (maximum error over histogram entries and time steps).

**Theorem 5.6** (Lower bounds for edge-private algorithms). *For sufficiently large  $T \in \mathbb{N}$ , and all  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\delta = O(1/T)$ , and  $D \in \mathbb{N}$  (with  $D \geq 2$  for  $f_{\text{triangles}}$ ), consider a mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  for each of the problems below that runs on length- $T$  graph streams with maximum degree at most  $D$ . If  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfies  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -edge-DP and  $(\alpha, T)$ -accuracy for the specified task, then its additive error must be lower bounded in the following way:*

1.  $f_{\text{edges}}$ ,  $\alpha = \Omega \left( \min \left\{ \frac{\log T}{\varepsilon}, T \right\} \right)$ .

---

<sup>8</sup>A graph with maximum degree  $D = 1$  contains no triangles.

2.  $f_{\text{triangles}}$ ,  $\alpha = \Omega\left(\min\left\{\frac{D \log T}{\varepsilon}, DT\right\}\right)$ .
3.  $f_{\text{CC}}$ ,  $\alpha = \Omega\left(\min\left\{\frac{\log T}{\varepsilon}, T\right\}\right)$ .
4.  $f_{k\text{-stars}}$ ,  $\alpha = \Omega\left(\min\left\{\frac{D^{k-1} \log T}{\varepsilon}, D^{k-1}T\right\}\right)$ .
5.  $f_{\text{degree-hist}}$ ,  $\alpha = \Omega\left(\min\left\{\frac{\log T}{\varepsilon}, T\right\}\right)$  (maximum error over histogram entries and time steps).

We now present a lower bound on the error needed to privately release a binary count under continual observation. Note that, although this lower bound has previously been stated only for pure DP [DNPR10], we show that it also holds for the approximate-DP setting where  $\delta = O(1/T)$ . To prove Theorem 5.7, we use a packing argument, introduced by [HT10; BBKN14]. We use the version given by [Vad17].

**Theorem 5.7** (Approximate-DP lower bound for binary counting). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^T$  take a  $T$ -element binary stream  $S = S_1, \dots, S_T$  as input and release, at each time step  $t \in [T]$ , the sum  $\sum_{i \in [t]} S_i$ . Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be  $(\alpha, T)$ -accurate for  $f$  and  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DP under continual observation. If  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\delta = O(1/T)$ , and  $T$  is sufficiently large, then  $\mathcal{M}$  must have additive  $\ell_\infty$  error at least*

$$\alpha = \Omega\left(\min\left\{\frac{\log T}{\varepsilon}, T\right\}\right).$$

**Lemma 5.8** (Packing lower bound [HT10; BBKN14; Vad17]). *Let  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{X}^n$  be a collection of datasets all at Hamming distance at most  $m$  from some fixed dataset  $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}^n$ , and let  $\{\mathcal{G}_x\}_{x \in \mathcal{C}}$  be a collection of disjoint subsets of  $\mathcal{Y}$ . If there is an  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DP mechanism  $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  such that  $\Pr[\mathcal{M}(x) \in \mathcal{G}_x] \geq p$  for every  $x \in \mathcal{C}$ , then*

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}|} \geq p \cdot e^{-m\varepsilon} - m\delta.$$

*Proof of Theorem 5.7.* For the packing argument, we construct a collection of datasets similar to those used by [DNPR10]. Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^T$  be the function for binary counting described in Theorem 5.7.

We first construct a collection  $\mathcal{C}$  of  $k = \lfloor T/m \rfloor$  datasets in  $\{0, 1\}^T$ . We will construct all of these datasets to be at Hamming distance  $m$  from the all 0s dataset  $x_0 = 0^T$ .

The collection  $\mathcal{C}$  contains the following  $k$  datasets. For each  $i \in [k]$ , construct the  $i^{\text{th}}$  dataset  $x_i = 0^{m \cdot (i-1)} \circ 1^m \circ 0^{T-m \cdot i}$ . That is, each dataset is a set of  $k-1$  blocks of  $m$  consecutive 0s,<sup>9</sup> and one block of  $m$  consecutive 1s, where dataset  $i$  has its  $i^{\text{th}}$  block contain the consecutive 1s.

We see that all of these datasets are Hamming distance  $m$  from the all 0s dataset  $x_0$ . We also see that, for all  $x \neq x' \in \mathcal{C}$ ,

$$\|f(x) - f(x')\|_\infty > m/2. \tag{8}$$

Let  $\mathcal{G}_{x_i}$  be the closed  $\ell_\infty$  ball of radius  $\alpha = m/2$  around  $f(x_i)$ . By (8) we see that the collection of sets  $\{\mathcal{G}_{x_i}\}_{x_i \in \mathcal{C}}$  is disjoint.

If  $\mathcal{M}$  is  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DP and  $(\alpha, T)$ -accurate for the binary counting function  $f$ , then on input  $x_i$  it must give an answer in  $\mathcal{G}_{x_i}$  with probability  $p \geq 0.99$ . We can now use a packing argument to solve for  $\alpha$ . Lemma 5.8 tells us

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}|} &\geq p \cdot e^{-m\varepsilon} - m\delta \\ \frac{1}{k} &\geq \frac{e^{-m\varepsilon}}{2} - m\delta && (|\mathcal{C}| = k, p \geq 0.5) \\ \frac{e^{-m\varepsilon}}{2} &\leq \frac{1}{k} + m\delta. \end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>9</sup>The end of the stream may be padded with additional 0s to ensure it has length  $T$ .

Recall  $k = \lfloor T/m \rfloor$ , so  $k \geq (T - m)/m$ . Additionally, recall  $\alpha = m/2$  and by assumption  $\delta = O(1/T)$ . This gives us

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\alpha\varepsilon/2} &= O\left(\frac{m}{T-m} + m \cdot \frac{1}{T}\right) \\ &= O\left(\frac{\alpha}{T-\alpha}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the reciprocal of each side gives us

$$e^{\alpha\varepsilon/2} = \Omega\left(\frac{T-\alpha}{\alpha}\right),$$

and taking the log gives us

$$\alpha\varepsilon = \Omega(\log T - \log \alpha).$$

We want to solve for  $\alpha$  such that  $\alpha\varepsilon + \log \alpha = \Omega(\log T)$ . This leaves us with two cases:  $\alpha\varepsilon = \Omega(\log \alpha)$  and  $\alpha\varepsilon = O(\log \alpha)$ . In the first case,  $\alpha\varepsilon$  dominates, so we need  $\alpha = \Omega(\log T/\varepsilon)$ . In the second case,  $\log \alpha$  dominates, so we need  $\alpha = \Omega(T)$ . Therefore,

$$\alpha = \Omega\left(\min\left\{\frac{\log T}{\varepsilon}, T\right\}\right),$$

which is what we wanted to show.  $\square$

We now prove Theorems 5.5 and 5.6 through reductions from binary counting.

*Proof of Theorem 5.5.* Let  $x \in \{0, 1\}^T$  be a binary stream. Below, we describe functions that take  $x$  as input and return a graph stream where the count of some feature (e.g., triangles) at each time step  $t$  can be used to compute the corresponding prefix sum of the binary stream through time step  $t$ . Crucially, the functions described below map neighboring binary streams to node-neighboring  $(D, 0)$ -bounded graph streams (i.e., graph streams with maximum degree at most  $D$ ).

We use the following notation: let  $x_i$  and  $S_i$  denote the  $i^{\text{th}}$  index of the binary stream and graph stream, respectively. Additionally, the statements below assume  $\delta = O(1/T)$ . Note that our mappings from binary streams to  $f_{\text{edges}}$  and  $f_{\text{degree-hist}}$  are similar to the mappings used by [FHO21], though our other mappings are different and yield stronger lower bounds.

1. **(Edges.)** For each time step  $t \in [T]$ , let  $S_t$  contain  $D$  isolated nodes. If  $x_t = 1$ , also include a node  $v_t$  with edges to all other nodes that arrived in that time step. Therefore, each time step contains either 0 new edges or  $D$  new edges.

Assume for contradiction that there exists an  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -node-DP mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  for solving  $f_{\text{edges}}$  with  $(\alpha, T)$ -accuracy where  $\alpha = o\left(\min\left\{\frac{D \log T}{\varepsilon}, DT\right\}\right)$ . Then applying the transformation described above to a binary stream, running  $\mathcal{M}$  on the resulting stream, and dividing the output at each time step by  $D$  will solve binary counting with error  $\alpha = o\left(\min\left\{\frac{\log T}{\varepsilon}, T\right\}\right)$ , which contradicts Theorem 5.7.

2. **(Triangles.)** For each time step  $t \in [T]$ , let  $S_t$  contain a complete graph on  $D$  nodes. If  $x_t = 1$ , also include a node  $v_t$  with edges to all other nodes. Therefore, each time step contains either  $\binom{D}{3}$  new triangles or  $\binom{D+1}{3} = \binom{D}{3} + \binom{D}{2}$  new triangles.

Assume for contradiction that there exists an  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -node-DP mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  for solving  $f_{\text{triangles}}$  with  $(\alpha, T)$ -accuracy where  $\alpha = o\left(\min\left\{\frac{D^2 \log T}{\varepsilon}, D^2 T\right\}\right)$ . Then applying the transformation described above to a binary stream, running  $\mathcal{M}$  on the resulting stream, subtracting  $\binom{D}{3}$  from the output at each time step and dividing this result by  $\binom{D}{2} = \Theta(D^2)$  will solve binary counting with error  $\alpha = o\left(\min\left\{\frac{\log T}{\varepsilon}, T\right\}\right)$ , which contradicts Theorem 5.7.

3. **(Connected components.)** For each time step  $t \in [T]$ , let  $S_t$  contain  $D$  isolated nodes. If  $x_t = 1$ , also include a node  $v_t$  with edges to all other nodes that arrived in that time step. Therefore, each time step contains either 1 new connected component or  $D$  new connected components.

Assume for contradiction that there exists an  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -node-DP mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  for solving  $f_{\text{CC}}$  with  $(\alpha, T)$ -accuracy where  $\alpha = o\left(\min\left\{\frac{D \log T}{\varepsilon}, DT\right\}\right)$ . Then applying the transformation described above to a binary stream, running  $\mathcal{M}$  on the resulting stream, and dividing the output at each time step by  $D - 1$  will solve binary counting with error  $\alpha = o\left(\min\left\{\frac{\log T}{\varepsilon}, T\right\}\right)$ , which contradicts Theorem 5.7.

4. **( $k$ -stars.)** For each time step  $t \in [T]$ , let  $S_t$  contain  $D$  isolated nodes. If  $x_t = 1$ , also include a node  $v_t$  with edges to all other nodes that arrived in that time step. Therefore, each time step contains either 0 new  $k$ -stars or  $\binom{D}{k}$  new  $k$ -stars.

Assume for contradiction that there exists an  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -node-DP mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  for solving  $f_{k\text{-stars}}$  with  $(\alpha, T)$ -accuracy where  $\alpha = o\left(\min\left\{\frac{D^k \log T}{\varepsilon}, D^k T\right\}\right)$ . Then applying the transformation described above to a binary stream, running  $\mathcal{M}$  on the resulting stream, and dividing the output at each time step by  $\binom{D}{k} = \Theta(D^k)$  will solve binary counting with error  $\alpha = o\left(\min\left\{\frac{\log T}{\varepsilon}, T\right\}\right)$ , which contradicts Theorem 5.7.

5. **(Degree histograms.)** For each time step  $t \in [T]$ , let  $S_t$  contain  $D$  isolated nodes. If  $x_t = 1$ , also include a node  $v_t$  with edges to all other nodes that arrived in that time step. Therefore, the histogram bin for nodes of degree 1 increases each time step by either 0 new nodes or  $D$  new nodes.

Assume for contradiction that there exists an  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -node-DP mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  for solving  $f_{\text{degree-hist}}$  that has  $(\alpha, T)$ -accuracy for some bin with  $\alpha = o\left(\min\left\{\frac{D \log T}{\varepsilon}, DT\right\}\right)$ . Without loss of generality, let it be the bin for nodes of degree 1. Then applying the transformation described above to a binary stream, running  $\mathcal{M}$  on the resulting stream, and dividing the output for the bin for degree 1 at each time step by  $D$  will solve binary counting with error  $\alpha = o\left(\min\left\{\frac{\log T}{\varepsilon}, T\right\}\right)$ , which contradicts Theorem 5.7.  $\square$

The reductions from binary counting that we use to prove Theorem 5.6 are similar to the reductions above for proving Theorem 5.5, though they instead map neighboring binary streams to edge-neighboring graph streams.

*Proof of Theorem 5.6.* As above, let  $x \in \{0, 1\}^T$  be a binary stream. We describe functions that take  $x$  as input and return a graph stream where the count of some feature (e.g., triangles) at each time step  $t$  can be used to compute the corresponding prefix sum of the binary stream through time step  $t$ . Crucially, the functions described below map neighboring binary streams to edge-neighboring  $(D, 0)$ -bounded graph streams (i.e., graph streams with maximum degree at most  $D$ ).

We use the following notation: let  $x_i$  and  $S_i$  denote the  $i^{\text{th}}$  index of the binary stream and graph stream, respectively. Additionally, the statements below assume  $\delta = O(1/T)$ . Note that our mappings from binary streams to  $f_{\text{edges}}$  and  $f_{\text{degree-hist}}$  are similar to the mappings used by [FHO21], though our other mappings are different and yield stronger lower bounds.

1. **(Edges.)** For each time step  $t \in [T]$ , let  $S_t$  contain two isolated nodes  $u_t, v_t$ . If  $x_t = 1$ , also include an edge  $\{u_t, v_t\}$ . Therefore, each time step contains either 0 new edges or 1 new edge.

Assume for contradiction that there exists an  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -node-DP mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  for solving  $f_{\text{edges}}$  with  $(\alpha, T)$ -accuracy on each bin where  $\alpha = o\left(\min\left\{\frac{\log T}{\varepsilon}, T\right\}\right)$ . Then applying the transformation described above to a binary stream, running  $\mathcal{M}$  on the resulting stream, and releasing the result will solve binary counting with error  $\alpha = o\left(\min\left\{\frac{\log T}{\varepsilon}, T\right\}\right)$ , which contradicts Theorem 5.7.

2. **(Triangles.)** For each time step  $t \in [T]$ , let  $S_t$  contain the following structure:  $D - 1$  nodes  $w_t^1, \dots, w_t^{D-1}$ , and two nodes  $u_t, v_t$ , each with an edge to every node of the form  $w_t^i$ . If  $x_t = 1$ , also include an edge  $\{u_t, v_t\}$ . Therefore, each time step contains either 0 new triangles or  $D - 1$  new triangles.

Assume for contradiction that there exists an  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -edge-DP mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  for solving  $f_{\text{triangles}}$  with  $(\alpha, T)$ -accuracy where  $\alpha = o\left(\min\left\{\frac{D \log T}{\varepsilon}, DT\right\}\right)$ . Then applying the transformation described above to a binary stream, running  $\mathcal{M}$  on the resulting stream, and dividing the output at each time step by  $D - 1$  will solve binary counting with error  $\alpha = o\left(\min\left\{\frac{\log T}{\varepsilon}, T\right\}\right)$ , which contradicts Theorem 5.7.

3. **(Connected components.)** For each time step  $t \in [T]$ , let  $S_t$  contain two isolated nodes  $u_t, v_t$ . If  $x_t = 1$ , also include an edge  $\{u_t, v_t\}$ . Therefore, each time step contains either 1 new connected component or 2 new connected components.

Assume for contradiction that there exists an  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -edge-DP mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  for solving  $f_{\text{CC}}$  with  $(\alpha, T)$ -accuracy where  $\alpha = o\left(\min\left\{\frac{\log T}{\varepsilon}, T\right\}\right)$ . Then applying the transformation described above to a binary stream, running  $\mathcal{M}$  on the resulting stream, and subtracting 1 from the output at each time step will solve binary counting with error  $\alpha = o\left(\min\left\{\frac{\log T}{\varepsilon}, T\right\}\right)$ , which contradicts Theorem 5.7.

4. **( $k$ -stars.)** For each time step  $t \in [T]$ , let  $S_t$  contain a  $(D - 1)$ -star with center node  $c_t$ , plus one isolated node  $v_t$ . If  $x_t = 1$ , also include the edge  $\{c_t, v_t\}$ . Therefore, each time step contains either  $\binom{D-1}{k}$  new  $k$ -stars or  $\binom{D}{k} = \binom{D-1}{k} + \binom{D-1}{k-1}$  new  $k$ -stars.

Assume for contradiction that there exists an  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -edge-DP mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  for solving  $f_{k\text{-stars}}$  with  $(\alpha, T)$ -accuracy where  $\alpha = o\left(\min\left\{\frac{D^{k-1} \log T}{\varepsilon}, D^{k-1} T\right\}\right)$ . Then applying the transformation described above to a binary stream, running  $\mathcal{M}$  on the resulting stream, subtracting  $\binom{D-1}{k}$  from the output at each time step and dividing this result by  $\binom{D-1}{k-1} = \Theta(D^{k-1})$  will solve binary counting with error  $\alpha = o\left(\min\left\{\frac{\log T}{\varepsilon}, T\right\}\right)$ , which contradicts Theorem 5.7.

5. **(Degree histograms.)** For each time step  $t \in [T]$ , let  $S_t$  contain two isolated nodes  $u_t, v_t$ . If  $x_t = 1$ , also include an edge  $\{u_t, v_t\}$ . Therefore, the histogram bin for nodes of degree 1 increases each time step by either 0 new nodes or 2 new nodes.

Assume for contradiction that there exists an  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -node-DP mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  for solving  $f_{\text{degree-hist}}$  that has  $(\alpha, T)$ -accuracy for some bin with  $\alpha = o\left(\min\left\{\frac{\log T}{\varepsilon}, T\right\}\right)$ . Without loss of generality, let it be the bin for nodes of degree 1. Then applying the transformation described above to a binary stream, running  $\mathcal{M}$  on the resulting stream, and dividing the output for the bin for degree 1 at each time step by 2 will solve binary counting with error  $\alpha = o\left(\min\left\{\frac{\log T}{\varepsilon}, T\right\}\right)$ , which contradicts Theorem 5.7.  $\square$

## References

- [BBDS13] J. Blocki, A. Blum, A. Datta, and O. Sheffet, “Differentially private data analysis of social networks via restricted sensitivity,” in *Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science, ITCS ’13, Berkeley, CA, USA, January 9-12, 2013*, R. D. Kleinberg, Ed., ACM, 2013, pp. 87–96. DOI: [10.1145/2422436.2422449](https://doi.org/10.1145/2422436.2422449). [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2422436.2422449>.
- [BBKN14] A. Beimel, H. Brenner, S. P. Kasiviswanathan, and K. Nissim, “Bounds on the sample complexity for private learning and private data release,” *Mach. Learn.*, vol. 94, no. 3, pp. 401–437, 2014. DOI: [10.1007/S10994-013-5404-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/S10994-013-5404-1). [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10994-013-5404-1>.
- [BCSZ18a] C. Borgs, J. T. Chayes, A. D. Smith, and I. Zadik, “Private algorithms can always be extended,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/1810.12518, 2018. arXiv: [1810.12518](https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.12518). [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1810.12518>.
- [BCSZ18b] C. Borgs, J. T. Chayes, A. D. Smith, and I. Zadik, “Revealing network structure, confidentially: Improved rates for node-private graphon estimation,” in *Proceedings, IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, 2018, pp. 533–543. DOI: [10.1109/FOCS.2018.00057](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2018.00057).

- [BS10] J. Badham and R. Stocker, “The impact of network clustering and assortativity on epidemic behaviour,” *Theor. Popul. Biol.*, vol. 77, no. 1, pp. 71–75, Feb. 2010. [Online]. Available: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19948179/>.
- [CD20] R. Cummings and D. Durfee, “Individual sensitivity preprocessing for data privacy,” in *Proceedings, ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, 2020, pp. 528–547. DOI: [10.1137/1.9781611975994.32](https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611975994.32). [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611975994.32>.
- [CSS11] T. H. Chan, E. Shi, and D. Song, “Private and continual release of statistics,” *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst. Secur.*, vol. 14, no. 3, 26:1–26:24, 2011. DOI: [10.1145/2043621.2043626](https://doi.org/10.1145/2043621.2043626). [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2043621.2043626>.
- [CSS18] B. Chen, A. Shrivastava, and R. C. Steorts, “Unique entity estimation with application to the syrian conflict,” *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 1039–1067, 2018. DOI: [10.1214/18-AOAS1163](https://doi.org/10.1214/18-AOAS1163).
- [CZ13] S. Chen and S. Zhou, “Recursive mechanism: Towards node differential privacy and unrestricted joins,” in *Proceedings of the ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD 2013, New York, NY, USA, June 22-27, 2013*, K. A. Ross, D. Srivastava, and D. Papadias, Eds., ACM, 2013, pp. 653–664. DOI: [10.1145/2463676.2465304](https://doi.org/10.1145/2463676.2465304). [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2463676.2465304>.
- [DL09] C. Dwork and J. Lei, “Differential privacy and robust statistics,” in *Proceedings of the 41st Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2009, Bethesda, MD, USA, May 31 - June 2, 2009*, M. Mitzenmacher, Ed., ACM, 2009, pp. 371–380. DOI: [10.1145/1536414.1536466](https://doi.org/10.1145/1536414.1536466). [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1536414.1536466>.
- [DLL16] W. Day, N. Li, and M. Lyu, “Publishing graph degree distribution with node differential privacy,” in *Proceedings of the 2016 International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD Conference 2016, San Francisco, CA, USA, June 26 - July 01, 2016*, F. Özcan, G. Koutrika, and S. Madden, Eds., ACM, 2016, pp. 123–138. DOI: [10.1145/2882903.2926745](https://doi.org/10.1145/2882903.2926745). [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2882903.2926745>.
- [DMNS16] C. Dwork, F. McSherry, K. Nissim, and A. D. Smith, “Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis,” *J. Priv. Confidentiality*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 17–51, 2016. DOI: [10.29012/jpc.v7i3.405](https://doi.org/10.29012/jpc.v7i3.405). [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.29012/jpc.v7i3.405>.
- [DNPR10] C. Dwork, M. Naor, T. Pitassi, and G. N. Rothblum, “Differential privacy under continual observation,” in *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2010, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA, 5-8 June 2010*, L. J. Schulman, Ed., ACM, 2010, pp. 715–724. DOI: [10.1145/1806689.1806787](https://doi.org/10.1145/1806689.1806787). [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1806689.1806787>.
- [DNR+09] C. Dwork, M. Naor, O. Reingold, G. N. Rothblum, and S. P. Vadhan, “On the complexity of differentially private data release: Efficient algorithms and hardness results,” in *Proceedings of the 41st Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2009, Bethesda, MD, USA, May 31 - June 2, 2009*, M. Mitzenmacher, Ed., ACM, 2009, pp. 381–390. DOI: [10.1145/1536414.1536467](https://doi.org/10.1145/1536414.1536467). [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1536414.1536467>.
- [DRV10] C. Dwork, G. N. Rothblum, and S. P. Vadhan, “Boosting and differential privacy,” in *51th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2010, October 23-26, 2010, Las Vegas, Nevada, USA*, IEEE Computer Society, 2010, pp. 51–60. DOI: [10.1109/FOCS.2010.12](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2010.12). [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2010.12>.
- [FHO21] H. Fichtenberger, M. Henzinger, and W. Ost, “Differentially private algorithms for graphs under continual observation,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2106.14756, 2021. arXiv: [2106.14756](https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.14756). [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.14756>.
- [Goo49] L. A. Goodman, “On the estimation of the number of classes in a population,” *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 572–579, 1949, ISSN: 00034851. [Online]. Available: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2236312> (visited on 02/22/2024).

- [HLMJ09] M. Hay, C. Li, G. Miklau, and D. D. Jensen, “Accurate estimation of the degree distribution of private networks,” in *ICDM 2009, The Ninth IEEE International Conference on Data Mining, Miami, Florida, USA, 6-9 December 2009*, W. Wang, H. Kargupta, S. Ranka, P. S. Yu, and X. Wu, Eds., IEEE Computer Society, 2009, pp. 169–178. DOI: [10.1109/ICDM.2009.11](https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDM.2009.11). [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDM.2009.11>.
- [HR10] M. Hardt and G. N. Rothblum, “A multiplicative weights mechanism for privacy-preserving data analysis,” in *51th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2010, October 23-26, 2010, Las Vegas, Nevada, USA*, IEEE Computer Society, 2010, pp. 61–70. DOI: [10.1109/FOCS.2010.85](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2010.85). [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2010.85>.
- [HT10] M. Hardt and K. Talwar, “On the geometry of differential privacy,” in *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2010, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA, 5-8 June 2010*, L. J. Schulman, Ed., ACM, 2010, pp. 705–714. DOI: [10.1145/1806689.1806786](https://doi.org/10.1145/1806689.1806786). [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1806689.1806786>.
- [JM09] C. Jernigan and B. F. T. Mistree, “Gaydar: Facebook Friendships Expose Sexual Orientation,” *First Monday*, vol. 14, no. 10, 2009. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v14i10.2611>.
- [JRSS23] P. Jain, S. Raskhodnikova, S. Sivakumar, and A. D. Smith, “The price of differential privacy under continual observation,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2023, 23-29 July 2023, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA*, A. Krause, E. Brunskill, K. Cho, B. Engelhardt, S. Sabato, and J. Scarlett, Eds., ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, vol. 202, PMLR, 2023, pp. 14654–14678. [Online]. Available: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v202/jain23b.html>.
- [KNRS13] S. P. Kasiviswanathan, K. Nissim, S. Raskhodnikova, and A. D. Smith, “Analyzing graphs with node differential privacy,” in *Theory of Cryptography - 10th Theory of Cryptography Conference, TCC 2013, Tokyo, Japan, March 3-6, 2013. Proceedings*, A. Sahai, Ed., ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 7785, Springer, 2013, pp. 457–476. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-642-36594-2\\_26](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-36594-2_26). [Online]. Available: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-36594-2\\_26](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-36594-2_26).
- [KRST23] I. Kalemaj, S. Raskhodnikova, A. D. Smith, and C. E. Tsourakakis, “Node-differentially private estimation of the number of connected components,” in *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGAI Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, PODS 2023, Seattle, WA, USA, June 18-23, 2023*, F. Geerts, H. Q. Ngo, and S. Sintos, Eds., ACM, 2023, pp. 183–194. DOI: [10.1145/3584372.3588671](https://doi.org/10.1145/3584372.3588671). [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3584372.3588671>.
- [LSL17] M. Lyu, D. Su, and N. Li, “Understanding the sparse vector technique for differential privacy,” *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 637–648, 2017. DOI: [10.14778/3055330.3055331](https://doi.org/10.14778/3055330.3055331). [Online]. Available: <http://www.vldb.org/pvldb/vol10/p637-lyu.pdf>.
- [NRS07] K. Nissim, S. Raskhodnikova, and A. D. Smith, “Smooth sensitivity and sampling in private data analysis,” in *Proceedings of the 39th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, San Diego, California, USA, June 11-13, 2007*, D. S. Johnson and U. Feige, Eds., ACM, 2007, pp. 75–84. DOI: [10.1145/1250790.1250803](https://doi.org/10.1145/1250790.1250803). [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1250790.1250803>.
- [RR10] A. Roth and T. Roughgarden, “Interactive privacy via the median mechanism,” in *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2010, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA, 5-8 June 2010*, L. J. Schulman, Ed., ACM, 2010, pp. 765–774. DOI: [10.1145/1806689.1806794](https://doi.org/10.1145/1806689.1806794). [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1806689.1806794>.
- [RS16a] S. Raskhodnikova and A. D. Smith, “Differentially private analysis of graphs,” in *Encyclopedia of Algorithms*, 2016, pp. 543–547. DOI: [10.1007/978-1-4939-2864-4\\_549](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-2864-4_549).
- [RS16b] S. Raskhodnikova and A. D. Smith, “Lipschitz extensions for node-private graph statistics and the generalized exponential mechanism,” in *Proceedings, IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, 2016, pp. 495–504. DOI: [10.1109/FOCS.2016.60](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2016.60). [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1504.07912.pdf>.

- [SLM+18] S. Song, S. Little, S. Mehta, S. A. Vinterbo, and K. Chaudhuri, “Differentially private continual release of graph statistics,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/1809.02575, 2018. arXiv: [1809.02575](https://arxiv.org/abs/1809.02575). [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1809.02575>.
- [Upa13] J. Upadhyay, “Random projections, graph sparsification, and differential privacy,” in *ASIACRYPT (1)*, vol. 8269, 2013, pp. 276–295. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-642-42033-7\\_15](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-42033-7_15).
- [UUA21] J. Upadhyay, S. Upadhyay, and R. Arora, “Differentially private analysis on graph streams,” in *The 24th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, AISTATS 2021, April 13-15, 2021, Virtual Event*, A. Banerjee and K. Fukumizu, Eds., ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, vol. 130, PMLR, 2021, pp. 1171–1179. [Online]. Available: <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v130/upadhyay21a.html>.
- [Vad17] S. P. Vadhan, “The complexity of differential privacy,” in *Tutorials on the Foundations of Cryptography*, Y. Lindell, Ed., Springer International Publishing, 2017, pp. 347–450. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-319-57048-8\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-57048-8_7). [Online]. Available: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-57048-8\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-57048-8_7).
- [YJM+13] A. M. Young, A. B. Jonas, U. L. Mullins, D. S. Halgin, and J. R. Havens, “Network structure and the risk for HIV transmission among rural drug users,” *AIDS Behav.*, vol. 17, no. 7, pp. 2341–2351, Sep. 2013. [Online]. Available: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3600060/>.

## A The Sparse Vector Technique

In this section, we describe the sparse vector technique, introduced by [DNR+09] and refined by [RR10; HR10; LSL17], and some of its standard properties. We use the sparse vector technique to continually check that the input graph satisfies the conditions of Theorem 3.3. In Algorithm 6, we provide a version of the sparse vector technique described in [LSL17, Algorithm 1], and throughout the rest of Appendix A, we prove some useful properties of this algorithm. Theorem A.2 presents accuracy properties of Algorithm 6 that we use in our construction of the general transformation described in Section 4.3 from (restricted) private algorithms to node-private algorithms. To prove this statement, we use Lemmas A.4 and A.5, which present slight variations on standard theorems about accuracy guarantees for the sparse vector technique.

---

**Algorithm 6** Mechanism SVT for answering threshold queries with the sparse vector technique.

---

**Input:** Stream  $S \in \mathcal{S}^T$ ; queries  $q_1, q_2, \dots$  of sensitivity 1; cutoff  $c \in \mathbb{N}$ ; privacy parameter  $\varepsilon > 0$ ; threshold  $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ .  
**Output:** Stream of answers in  $\{\perp, \top\}$ .

- 1:  $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = \varepsilon/2$
- 2: **count** = 0
- 3: Draw  $Z \sim \text{Lap}(1/\varepsilon_1)$
- 4: **for** each time  $t \in 1, 2, \dots, T$  **do**
- 5:     Draw  $Z_t \sim \text{Lap}(2c/\varepsilon_2)$
- 6:     **if**  $q_t(S) + Z_t \geq \tau + Z$  and **count** <  $c$  **then**
- 7:         Output  $\perp$
- 8:         **count** += 1
- 9:     **else** output  $\top$

---

We now give some properties of Algorithm 6. We first provide a theorem on the privacy of Algorithm 6.

**Theorem A.1** (Privacy of SVT [LSL17]). *Algorithm 6 is  $(\varepsilon, 0)$ -DP under continual observation.*

We next provide a statement on the accuracy of Algorithm 6.

**Theorem A.2** (Separation needed for accurate answers). *Consider Algorithm 6, and let  $S \in \mathcal{S}^T$ ,  $c \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ .*

1. (**True answer is above the threshold.**) Fix  $\delta \in (0, 1]$ . To ensure that Algorithm 6 outputs  $\perp$  at or before time step  $t$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , it suffices to have

$$q_t(S) \geq 8c \ln(1/\delta)/\varepsilon + \tau.$$

2. (**True answer is below the threshold.**) Fix  $t' \in [T]$  and  $\beta \in (0, 1]$ . To ensure that Algorithm 6 outputs  $\top$  on all queries  $q_1, \dots, q_{t'}$  with probability at least  $1 - \beta$ , it suffices to have

$$q_t(S) \leq 8c \ln(\beta/T)/\varepsilon + \tau$$

for all  $t \leq t'$ .

To prove Theorem A.2, we use several lemmas presented below. The proof of Theorem A.2 appears at the end of this section.

**Lemma A.3.** Let  $S \in \mathcal{S}^T$ ,  $c \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = \varepsilon/2$ . Additionally, let  $Z \sim \text{Lap}(1/\varepsilon_1)$  and  $Z_t \sim \text{Lap}(2c/\varepsilon_2)$ . For all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and queries  $q_t$ ,

1. if  $x \geq 0$  and  $q_t(S) \geq x + \tau$ , then

$$\Pr [q_t(S) + Z_t \leq \tau + Z] \leq \exp\left(\frac{-|x| \cdot \varepsilon}{8c}\right).$$

2. if  $x \leq 0$  and  $q_t(S) \leq x + \tau$ , then

$$\Pr [q_t(S) + Z_t \geq \tau + Z] \leq \exp\left(\frac{-|x| \cdot \varepsilon}{8c}\right).$$

*Proof of Lemma A.3.* We begin by proving item (1). Assume that  $x \geq 0$  and  $q_t(S) \geq x + \tau$ . We have the following expressions:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr [q_t(S) + Z_t \leq \tau + Z] &\leq \Pr [x + \tau + Z_t \leq \tau + Z] && \text{(given } q_t(S) \geq x + \tau) \\ &= \Pr [x \leq Z - Z_t] \\ &= \Pr [x \leq Z + Z_t] && (Z_t \text{ and } Z \text{ are independent, symmetric r.v.s)} \\ &\leq \Pr [x/2 \leq Z \cup x/2 \leq Z_t] && \text{(at least one must occur for the line above)} \\ &\leq \Pr [x/2 \leq Z] + \Pr [x/2 \leq Z_t] && \text{(union bound)} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \exp\left(\frac{-x}{2} \cdot \varepsilon/2\right) + \frac{1}{2} \exp\left(\frac{-x}{2} \cdot \frac{\varepsilon/2}{2c}\right) && \text{(Laplace CDF, r.v.s are continuous)} \\ &\leq \exp\left(\frac{-x\varepsilon}{8c}\right), && \left(\exp\left(\frac{-x}{2} \cdot \frac{\varepsilon/2}{2c}\right) \geq \exp\left(\frac{-x}{2} \cdot \varepsilon/2\right), \text{ for } x \geq 0\right) \end{aligned}$$

which complete the proof of item (1).

The proof of item (2) follows from item (1), and from the symmetry of Laplace r.v.s and the fact that  $Z$  and  $Z_t$  are independent.  $\square$

Lemma A.4 uses Lemma A.3 to show a lower bound on the probability that Algorithm 6 returns  $\perp$  when the true answer to the query  $q_t$  is (at least) some value  $x \geq 0$  above the threshold  $\tau$ . Similarly, Lemma A.5 uses Lemma A.3 to show a lower bound on the probability that Algorithm 6 exclusively outputs values of  $\top$  when the threshold  $\tau$  is (at least) some value  $-x \geq 0$  above the true answer to each query  $q_1, \dots, q_{t'}$ .

**Lemma A.4** (Probability of  $\perp$  for  $q_t(S) \geq x + \tau$ ). Consider Algorithm 6, and let  $S \in \mathcal{S}^T$ ,  $c \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ . For all  $x \geq 0$  and queries  $q_1, q_2, \dots$ , if  $q_t(S) \geq x + \tau$ , then Algorithm 6 outputs  $\perp$  at or before time step  $t$  with probability at least

$$1 - \exp\left(\frac{-x\varepsilon}{8c}\right).$$

*Proof of Lemma A.4.* Consider the event that we have  $q_t(S) + Z_t \geq \tau + Z$ . If this event occurs, either  $\perp$  will be output, or  $\perp$  was output at some earlier time step. When the conditions in the theorem statement above hold, by item (1) of Lemma A.3 this event occurs with probability at least

$$1 - \exp\left(\frac{-x\varepsilon}{8c}\right),$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma A.5** (Probability of  $\top$  for stream  $q_1(S), \dots, q_{t'}(S) \leq x + \tau$ ). *Consider Algorithm 6, and let  $S \in \mathcal{S}^T$ ,  $c \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ . Fix  $t' \in [T]$ . For all  $x \leq 0$  and query streams  $q_1, q_2, \dots$ , if for all  $t \leq t'$  we have  $q_t(S) \leq x + \tau$ , then Algorithm 6 outputs  $\top$  for all time steps  $t \leq t'$  with probability at least*

$$1 - T \cdot \exp\left(\frac{x\varepsilon}{8c}\right).$$

*Proof of Lemma A.5.* Consider the event that, for all  $t \leq t'$ , we have  $q_t(S) + Z_t < \tau + Z$ . If this event occurs, the output at each time step  $t \leq t'$  is  $\top$ . We now consider the complement of this event. When the conditions in the theorem statement above hold, by item (2) of Lemma A.3 and the union bound, this complement occurs with probability at most

$$T \cdot \exp\left(\frac{x\varepsilon}{8c}\right).$$

Therefore, the event in which we're interested occurs with probability at least

$$1 - T \cdot \exp\left(\frac{x\varepsilon}{8c}\right),$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

Parts (1) and (2) of Theorem A.2 follow from Lemmas A.4 and A.5, respectively, and show how far above or below the threshold  $\tau$  it suffices to have the true query answers to ensure that Algorithm 6 outputs  $\perp$  or  $\top$  with some user-specified probability.

*Proof of Theorem A.2.* We prove each item below.

**(Item 1.)** Let  $A$  be the event that Algorithm 6 outputs  $\perp$  at or before time step  $t$ . We observe that we want  $\Pr[A] \geq 1 - \delta$ . Consider the case where we have  $q_t(S) \geq 8c \ln(1/\delta)/\varepsilon + \tau$ . By Lemma A.4, where we set  $x = 8c \ln(1/\delta)/\varepsilon$ , we have

$$\Pr[A] \geq 1 - \exp\left(\frac{-x\varepsilon}{8c}\right). \tag{9}$$

Substituting  $x = 8c \ln(1/\delta)/\varepsilon$  into Expression 9 gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[A] &\geq 1 - \exp\left(\frac{-\varepsilon \cdot 8c \ln(1/\delta)/\varepsilon}{8c}\right) \\ &= 1 - \exp(-\ln(1/\delta)) \\ &= 1 - \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have  $\Pr[A] \geq 1 - \delta$  when we have  $q_t(S) \geq 8c \ln(1/\delta)/\varepsilon + \tau$ , which is what we wanted to show.

**(Item 2.)** Let  $B$  be the event that Algorithm 6 outputs  $\top$  on all queries  $q_1, \dots, q_{t'}$ . We observe that we want  $\Pr[B] \geq 1 - \beta$ . Consider the case where, for all  $t \leq t'$ , we have  $q_t(S) \leq 8c \ln(\beta/T)/\varepsilon + \tau$ . By Lemma A.5,

$$\Pr[B] \geq 1 - T \cdot \exp\left(\frac{x\varepsilon}{8c}\right). \tag{10}$$

Substituting  $x = 8c \ln(\beta/T)/\varepsilon$  into Expression 10 gives us

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr[B] &\geq 1 - T \cdot \exp\left(\frac{\varepsilon \cdot 8c \ln(\beta/T)/\varepsilon}{8c}\right) \\
&= 1 - T \cdot \exp(\ln(\beta/T)) \\
&= 1 - T \cdot \beta/T \\
&= 1 - \beta.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have  $\Pr[B] \geq 1 - \beta$  when we have  $q_t(S) \leq 8c \ln(\beta/T)/\varepsilon + \tau$  for all  $t \in [t']$ , which is what we wanted to show.  $\square$

## B Tightness of Stabilities in Theorem 3.3

In Lemma B.1, we show that the upper bounds on stability in Theorem 3.3 are tight: the worst-case lower bounds on stability are tight up to small additive constants for  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}$ , and are tight up to constant multiplicative factors for  $\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}$ . The lower bounds given in Lemma B.1 are for input graphs. Recall from Remark 3.1 that Algorithm 1 treats an input graph as a length-1 graph stream, so graphs can be viewed as a special case of graph streams.

**Lemma B.1** (Tightness of Theorem 3.3). *Let  $D \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ , and let  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}, \Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}$  be Algorithm 1 with inclusion criterion  $c = \text{original}$  and  $c = \text{projected}$ , respectively.*

1. (**Edge-to-edge stability.**) *There exist*

- (a) *edge-neighboring graphs  $G, G'$  such that  $d_{\text{edge}}(\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}(G), \Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}(G')) = 3$ .*
- (b) *edge-neighboring,  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded graphs  $G, G'$  such that  $d_{\text{edge}}(\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}(G), \Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}(G')) = \ell + 1$ .*

2. (**Node-to-edge stability.**) *There exist*

- (a) *node-neighboring,  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded graphs  $G, G'$  such that  $d_{\text{edge}}(\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}(G), \Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}(G')) = D + \ell - 1$ .*
- (b) *node-neighboring,  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded graphs  $G, G'$  such that, for  $D$  and  $\ell$  sufficiently large,*

$$d_{\text{edge}}(\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}(G), \Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}(G')) = \begin{cases} D + \Omega(\ell^{3/2}) & \text{if } D \geq \ell, \text{ and} \\ D + \Omega(\ell\sqrt{D}) & \text{if } D < \ell. \end{cases}$$

3. (**Node-to-node stability.**) *There exist*

- (a) *node-neighboring,  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded graphs  $G, G'$  such that  $d_{\text{node}}(\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}(G), \Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}(G')) = 2\ell - 1$ .*
- (b) *node-neighboring,  $(D, \ell)$ -bounded graphs  $G, G'$  such that  $d_{\text{node}}(\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}(G), \Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}(G')) = \ell + 1$ .*

For the proof below, we construct pairs of graphs (each of which can be viewed as a length-1 graph stream) with the above-specified distances between their projections. Note that, for all  $T \in \mathbb{N}$ , the examples can be expanded to length- $T$  graph streams by having no nodes or edges arrive in the remaining  $T - 1$  time steps.

*Proof of Lemma B.1.* We prove each item below. We begin by proving the statements for  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}$  (i.e., the ‘‘a’’ items) and then prove the statements for  $\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}$  (i.e., the ‘‘b’’ items, with (2b) proved last since its proof is the most involved).

**(Item 1a.)** Consider a pair of edge-neighboring graphs  $G, G'$ , where  $G$  consists of two separate  $D$ -stars with centers  $u$  and  $v$ , and where  $G'$  is the same plus an additional edge  $e^+$  between  $u$  and  $v$ . Additionally, let  $e^+$  be the first edge in the consistent ordering. All edges in  $S$  are in  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}(G)$ . However,  $e^+$  is in  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}(G')$

but is not in  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}(G)$ . Additionally, one edge incident to  $u$  is not in  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}(G')$ , and one edge incident to  $v$  is not in  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}(G')$ —otherwise, the projection would have added new edges to  $u$  and  $v$  despite having counter values  $d(u) \geq D$  and  $d(v) \geq D$ .

**(Item 2a.)** We construct a pair of node-neighboring graphs  $G, G'$ . Graph  $G$  consists of a set of  $D$  nodes with no edges, and  $\ell - 1$  separate  $D$ -stars.  $G'$  is the same, plus an additional node  $v^+$  with an edge to each of the  $D$  empty nodes and each center of the  $D$ -stars. Additionally, let all of the edges incident to  $v^+$  appear before all other edges in the consistent ordering, and let the  $D$  edges incident to empty nodes appear before all the other edges incident to  $v^+$ .

All edges in  $G$  are in  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}(G)$ . However, all of the first  $D$  edges incident to  $v^+$  are in  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}(G')$  and are not in  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}(G)$ . Additionally, one edge incident to the center of each  $D$ -star is not in the projection because their counters are each at  $D$  prior to the projection stage of the final edge incident to each  $D$ -star's center. There are  $D$  edges incident to  $v^+$  that appear in  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}(G')$  and not  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}(G)$ ; and there are  $\ell - 1$  centers of  $D$ -stars, each of which is missing an edge in  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}(G')$  as compared to  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}(G)$ . We see, then, that the projections differ on  $D + \ell - 1$  edges.

**(Item 3a.)** Consider the same example used for the proof of item (2a). To obtain  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}(G')$  from  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}(G)$ , we see that it is necessary to add  $v^+$ . We also see that it is necessary to change the edges incident to one node in each of the  $D$ -stars. To change a node, it must be removed and then re-added with different edges. Since there are  $\ell - 1$  separate  $D$ -stars, there are  $2\ell - 2$  additions and removals of nodes in the  $D$ -stars, plus the addition of  $v^+$ . Therefore, we see that  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}(G)$  and  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}(G')$  are at node distance  $2\ell - 1$ .

**(Item 1b.)** Consider the following pair of edge-neighboring graphs  $G, G'$ . Graph  $G$  is constructed by taking two empty nodes  $v$  and  $w$ , and a set of  $\ell$  separate  $(D - 1)$ -stars, enumerating their centers  $u_1, \dots, u_\ell$ , and then adding edges between  $u_i$  and  $u_{i+1}$  for all  $i \in [\ell - 1]$ . Additionally, these edges should appear last in the consistent ordering, and they should appear such that, for all  $i \in [\ell - 2]$ , edge  $\{u_i, u_{i+1}\}$  precedes  $\{u_{i+1}, u_{i+2}\}$ . There should also be an edge  $\{u_\ell, w\}$  that appears last in the consistent ordering. Graph  $G'$  is constructed in the same way, except there is also an edge  $\{v, u_1\}$  that appears first in the consistent ordering.

In  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}(G)$ , the edge  $\{u_1, u_2\}$  appears because  $d(u_1) = D - 1$  and  $d(u_2) = D - 1$  at the projection stage of the edge. By contrast,  $\{u_2, u_3\}$  does not appear because  $d(u_2) = D$  at the projection stage of the edge. By similar logic  $\{u_3, u_4\}$  appears,  $\{u_4, u_5\}$  does not, and so on in this alternating fashion, with  $\{u_\ell, w\}$  appearing if and only if  $\ell$  is odd. On the other hand, for  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}(G')$  the edge  $\{v, u_1\}$  appears since  $d(v) = D - 1$  and  $d(u_1) = D - 1$  at the projection stage of this edge. By contrast,  $\{u_1, u_2\}$  does not appear since  $d(u_1) = D$  at the projection stage of this edge. Similarly,  $\{u_2, u_3\}$  appears,  $\{u_3, u_4\}$  does not, and so on, with  $\{u_\ell, w\}$  appearing if and only if  $\ell$  is even. We see that  $\ell + 1$  edges differ between  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}(G)$  and  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}(G')$ , which is what we wanted to show.

**(Item 3b.)** Consider the same example used for the proof of item (1b), with the modification that  $v$  does not appear in  $G$ . We see that to obtain  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}(G')$  from  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}(G)$  we need to—starting with  $v$ —remove every other node in the path  $v, u_1, \dots, u_\ell, w$ , and then add a modified version of each of these nodes (except for  $v$ ). There are  $\ell + 2$  nodes in the path, so we need to remove  $\lceil (\ell + 2)/2 \rceil \geq \ell/2 + 1$  nodes and add  $\lceil (\ell + 1)/2 \rceil \geq \ell/2$  nodes, so the node distance between  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}(G)$  and  $\Pi_D^{\text{BBDS}}(G')$  is at least  $\ell + 1$ .

**(Item 2b.)** Let  $k = \min\{D, \ell\}$ . Before describing  $G$  and  $G'$ , we construct a graph  $P$  that is a collection of paths and contains  $\Omega(\ell\sqrt{k})$  edges, and we then show how to construct  $G$  and  $G'$  such that all edges in  $P$  differ between the projections of  $G$  and  $G'$ . The high-level idea for  $P$  is to construct  $m = \lfloor k/4 \rfloor$  simple paths on  $\ell$  nodes, such that this collection of paths contains  $\Omega(\ell\sqrt{k})$  edges.

For the sake of exposition, we use directed edges to construct these paths; they can be replaced with undirected edges. Let  $(u_1, \dots, u_\ell)$  be some left-to-right ordering of an arbitrary set of  $\ell$  nodes, and let  $v^+$  be some additional node that is ordered to the left of  $u_1$ . All of the edges in our constructed paths will go from left to right. Let the *hop length* of an edge  $(u_i, u_{i'})$ , where  $i' > i$ , refer to the value  $i' - i$ .

We build  $m = \lfloor k/4 \rfloor$  simple paths on these nodes as follows; we denote by  $P$  the resulting graph of simple paths. Let  $p \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  enumerate these paths. For all paths  $p$ , the first edge is from  $v^+$  to some node  $u_{s_p}$ , where we define  $s_p = 2p - 1$ . We now describe the remaining edges in each path. For each odd integer  $h \in \{1, 3, 5, 7, \dots\}$ , construct  $(h + 1)/2$  paths, where we start with path  $p = 1$ , then path  $p = 2$ , and so on, up to and including path  $p = m$ . For a path  $p$  being made with value  $h$ , the

first edge is from  $v^+$  to  $u_{2p-1}$ ; and the remaining edges are edges of hop length  $h$ , except for the final edge which goes to a special node  $v_p$ . That is, where  $s_p = 2p - 1$ , path  $p$  with hop length  $h$  is the path  $v^+ \rightarrow u_{s_p} \rightarrow u_{s_p+h} \rightarrow u_{s_p+2h} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow u_{s_p+h \cdot \lfloor (\ell - s_p)/h \rfloor} \rightarrow v_p$ .

We now color the edges of  $P$  in the following way. On each path, make the edges alternate between red and blue edges: color all edges leaving  $v^+$  with blue, color the next edge on each path red, color the following edge blue, and so on. Because hops and start indices are odd, we maintain the following invariants:

1. all blue edges  $(u_i, u_{i'})$  have even  $i$  and odd  $i'$ , and
2. all red edges  $(u_i, u_{i'})$  have odd  $i$  and even  $i'$ .

These invariants mean that, for a given node  $u_i$ , all of its in-edges have the same color, and all of its out-edges have the same color (which is the opposite of the in-edges' color). We also note that, for all nodes  $u_i$ , the number of in-edges to  $u_i$  is equal to the number of out-edges from  $u_i$ . Additionally, all nodes  $v_p$  have one in-edge and zero out-edges.

We now show that  $G$  and  $G'$  can be constructed such that all edges in  $P$  will differ between projections of  $G$  and  $G'$ . More specifically, we describe a construction where all blue edges and no red edges will be in  $G'$ ; and all red edges and no blue edges will be in  $G$ . Below, we describe how to construct  $G'$ ; the graph  $G$  is constructed identically, except  $v^+$  and all edges from  $v^+$  are removed from the stream.

We construct  $G'$  by taking  $P$  and adding some additional nodes and edges, and imposing a consistent ordering on these edges. We first describe the additional nodes and edges to add. Let  $\deg_u(P)$  denote the degree of  $u$  in  $P$ . Add a set of  $D - \deg_{v^+}(P)$  isolated nodes, and add an edge between  $v^+$  and each of these nodes. For all  $i \in [\ell]$ , add a set of  $D - \deg_{u_i}(P)/2$  isolated nodes, and add an edge between  $u_i$  and each node in this set. Let all of these edges appear before all other edges in the consistent ordering.

We now describe how to order the remaining edges. For all  $i \in [\ell]$ , let all in-edges to  $u_i$  appear in the consistent ordering appear before all in-edges to  $u_{i'}$  for  $i' > i$ , and after all in-edges to  $u_{i''}$  for  $i'' < i$ . Additionally, let all in-edges to nodes of the form  $v_p$  appear in the consistent ordering after all of the edges already described.

We next use the following claim; we prove it at the end of this proof.

**Claim B.2.** *For all  $u_i$  in  $P$ ,  $\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}(G')$  contains the following edges in  $P$ :*

1. if  $i$  is odd, then the projection contains all in-edges to  $u_i$  in  $P$ , and no out-edges from  $u_i$  in  $P$ .
2. if  $i$  is even, then the projection contains no in-edges to  $u_i$  in  $P$ , and all out-edges from  $u_i$  in  $P$ .

By Claim B.2, we see that all edges from  $u_i$  with even  $i$ , and all edges to  $u_i$  with odd  $i$  are in  $\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}(G')$ , and that no other edges in  $P$  are in  $\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}(G')$ . This means that, by the two invariants provided above, all blue edges are in  $\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}(G')$  and no red edges are in  $\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}(G')$ . A symmetric claim and argument can be used to show that all red edges are in  $\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}(G)$  and no blue edges are in  $\Pi_D^{\text{DLL}}(G)$ . This means that all edges in  $P$  differ between the projections.

To prove the theorem, we use the following claim about the number of edges in  $P$ ; we prove it at the end of this proof.

**Claim B.3.** *The graph  $P$  contains  $\Omega(\ell\sqrt{k})$  edges.*

Recall from above that all edges in  $P$  differ between the projections. Note that, in addition to the edges in  $P$ , all of the additional  $D - \deg_{v^+}(P)$  edges from  $v^+$  appear in the projection of  $G'$  and do not appear in the projection of  $G$ . By this observation and Claim B.3,  $G$  and  $G'$  project to graph streams which differ in at least  $D - \deg_{v^+}(P) + \Omega(\ell\sqrt{k})$  edges.

We now show  $D - \deg_{v^+}(P) + \Omega(\ell\sqrt{k}) = D + \Omega(\ell\sqrt{k})$ . Recall that  $\deg_{v^+}(P) = m$ , where  $m = \lfloor k/4 \rfloor$ . We have two cases:  $D \geq \ell$  and  $D < \ell$ . For  $D < \ell$ , we have  $k = D$ , so  $m = \lfloor D/4 \rfloor = o(\ell\sqrt{D})$ , which means  $D - \deg_{v^+}(P) + \Omega(\ell\sqrt{k}) = D + \Omega(\ell\sqrt{k})$ . For  $D \geq \ell$ , we have  $m = \lfloor \ell/4 \rfloor$ , so  $m = o(\ell^{3/2})$ , which means  $D - \deg_{v^+}(P) + \Omega(\ell\sqrt{k}) = D + \Omega(\ell\sqrt{k})$ .

Therefore, the projections of the graph streams differ in at least  $D + \Omega(\ell\sqrt{k}) = D + \Omega(\ell\sqrt{\min\{D, \ell\}})$  edges, which is what we wanted to show and completes the proof.

We now provide proofs of the two claims used in the proof.

*Proof of Claim B.2.* To prove the claim, we induct on  $i$ . We prove the base case for  $i = 1$  and  $i = 2$ . For the base case, we see that the in-edge to  $u_1$ , namely  $(v^+, u_1)$ , is in the projection. Additionally, we see that the out-edge from  $u_1$ , namely  $(u_1, u_2)$ , is not in the projection since  $u_1$  already has degree  $D$  prior to considering  $(u_1, u_2)$  for inclusion in the projection. For  $u_2$ , we see that the in-edge to  $u_2$ , namely  $(u_1, u_2)$ , is not in the projection. Additionally, we see that the out-edge from  $u_2$ , namely  $(u_2, u_3)$ , is in the projection since  $u_2$  has degree  $D - 1$  prior to considering  $(u_2, u_3)$  for inclusion in the projection and  $u_3$  has at most  $D - 1$  edges that are considered for addition prior to  $(u_2, u_3)$ .

Assume the claim is true for all  $i < j$ . We now show the claim is true for  $j$ . One useful fact from the construction of  $G'$  is that, for all  $u_j$ , the number of in-edges to  $u_j$  in  $P$  is equal to the number of out-edges from  $u_j$  in  $P$ , and there are  $D - \deg_{u_j}(P)/2$  additional edges from  $u_j$  in  $G'$ .

We first consider the case where  $j$  is odd. The only in-edges to  $u_j$  are from  $v^+$  and from nodes  $u_i$  where  $i < j$  and  $i$  is even. By assumption, all out-edges from nodes of the form  $u_i$  for  $i < j$  where  $i$  is even are in the projection. Additionally,  $v^+$  has degree at most  $D$  by construction, so all of its edges can be in the projection; since there are  $D - \deg_{u_j}(P)/2$  edges from  $u_j$  to isolated nodes, and there are  $\deg_{u_j}(P)/2 - 1$  in-edges to  $u_j$  that are already included in the projection, the edge from  $v^+$  can also be included in the projection without exceeding the degree bound. However, once these edges are included in the projection, adding any more edges would cause the degree of  $u_j$  to  $D$  in the projection, so none of the remaining out-edges are included in the projection.

We next consider the case where  $j$  is even. The only in-edges to  $u_j$  are from nodes  $u_i$  where  $i < j$  and  $i$  is odd. By assumption, all out-edges from nodes of the form  $u_i$  for  $i < j$  where  $i$  is odd are *not* in the projection. Therefore, none of the in-edges to  $u_j$  are in the projection. We next show that all of the out-edges from  $u_j$  are in the projection. First, note that the  $D - \deg_{u_j}(P)/2$  edges from  $u_j$  to isolated nodes are all in the projection. Next, note that there are  $\deg_{u_j}(P)/2$  remaining out-edges from  $u_j$ , so they can all be included in the projection without exceeding the degree bound. We now consider the nodes to which they are in-edges. There are two cases for these edges. If the edge is an in-edge to some node of the form  $v_p$ , including this edge will not cause  $v_p$  to exceed its degree bound, so it will be included in the projection. Otherwise, it is an in-edge to a node of the form  $u_{i'}$  where  $i' > i$ . At most  $D - \deg_{u_{i'}}(P)/2$  edges are edges to the isolated nodes (all of these edges appear in the consistent ordering prior to the edge we are considering). At most  $\deg_{u_{i'}}(P)/2 - 1$  other edges (i.e., the other in-edges to  $u_{i'}$ ) appear in the consistent ordering prior to this edge. Therefore, including this edge will not cause  $u_{i'}$  to exceed its degree bound, so it will be included in the projection.  $\square$

*Proof of Claim B.3.* We now show that there are  $\Omega(\ell\sqrt{k})$  edges in  $P$ . To do this, we show the set of paths can be divided into  $\Omega(\sqrt{m})$  disjoint sets of  $\Omega(\ell)$  edges. We first show that, for all values of  $h$  where we make  $(h + 1)/2$  paths, there are at least  $\ell/4$  edges in the set of paths with length  $h$ . There are  $m = \lfloor k/4 \rfloor$  paths, so for all  $p$  we have  $s_p = 2p - 1 \leq \ell/2$ . This means a path  $p$  with hop length  $h$  contains at least  $\ell/(2h)$  edges, since there are at least  $\ell/(2h) - 2$  edges between nodes of the form  $u_i, u_j$  for  $i, j \geq s_p$ , and there is one edge  $v^+ \rightarrow u_{s_p}$  and one edge  $u_{s_p+h \cdot \lfloor (\ell-s_p)/h \rfloor} \rightarrow v_p$ . Since there are  $(h + 1)/2$  paths with hop length  $h$ , there are at least  $\ell/4$  edges in the set of paths with length  $h$ . We next show, roughly, that we create  $(h + 1)/2$  paths for all odd natural numbers  $h \leq \sqrt{m}$ . In other words, we determine the biggest value of  $h$  that is used in the procedure for making  $m = \lfloor k/4 \rfloor$  paths. Since there are at most  $m$  paths, we solve for  $x$  in

$$\sum_{h \in \{1, 3, 5, \dots\}} \frac{h + 1}{2} = \sum_{i \in [x]} i = m$$

and, using the identity  $\sum_{i \in [n]} i = n(n + 1)/2$ , find  $x \approx \sqrt{2m}$ . Therefore, the largest value of  $h$  is (roughly)  $\sqrt{8m}$ . Since there are  $h = \Omega(\sqrt{m})$  disjoint sets of  $\Omega(\ell)$  edges, we see that there are  $\Omega(\ell\sqrt{m}) = \Omega(\ell\sqrt{k})$  edges in the graph. (In this case, there are roughly  $\ell/4 \cdot \sqrt{2k}$  edges in the described graph.)  $\square\square$