

PRIVACY GUARANTEES IN POSTERIOR SAMPLING UNDER CONTAMINATION

BY SHENGGANG HU^{1,a}, LOUIS ASLETT^{2,c}, HONGSHENG DAI^{3,d},
MURRAY POLLOCK^{3,e}, AND GARETH O. ROBERTS^{1,b}

¹Department of Statistics, University of Warwick, ^ashenggang.hu@warwick.ac.uk; ^bgareth.o.roberts@warwick.ac.uk

²Department of Mathematical Sciences, Durham University, ^clouis.aslett@durham.ac.uk

³School of Mathematics, Statistics and Physics, Newcastle University, ^dhongsheng.dai@newcastle.ac.uk;
^emurray.pollock@newcastle.ac.uk

In recent years, differential privacy has been adopted by tech-companies and governmental agencies as the standard for measuring privacy in algorithms. We study the level of differential privacy in Bayesian posterior sampling setups. As opposed to the common privatization approach of injecting Laplace/Gaussian noise into the output, Huber's contamination model is considered, where we replace at random the data points with samples from a heavy-tailed distribution. We derived bounds for the differential privacy level (ϵ, δ) for our approach while lifting the common restriction on assuming bounded observation and parameter space seen in the existing literature. We further consider the effect of sample size on privacy level and the convergence rate of (ϵ, δ) to zero. Asymptotically, the contamination approach is fully private at no cost of information loss. We also provide some examples depicting inference models that our setup is applicable to with a theoretical estimation of convergence rate.

1. Introduction. With the rapid growth of smart electronic devices in recent decades, the amount of data generated and collected every day has increased by magnitudes. What was also raised in this age of big data is the awareness of personal privacy and concerns about privacy leakage as a consequence of utilizing the collected data in studies. In recent years, differential privacy has become of significant interest to computer scientists, statisticians and others for studying the properties and trade-offs in designing algorithms that protect the privacy of individuals, and also being increasingly adopted by tech-companies, for instance, Google (Erlingsson, Pihur and Korolova, 2014; Aktay et al., 2020), Microsoft (Ding, Kulkarni and Yekhanin, 2017; Pereira et al., 2021), Apple (Apple, 2017), or government agencies (Machanavajjhala et al., 2008; Abowd, 2018).

Differential privacy, as defined in Dwork et al. (2006, 2014), asserts the difference in response of a randomized algorithm $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \Omega$ when being supplied two neighbouring datasets of size n , i.e., one dataset is a modification of the other dataset by changing only one data point. In particular, the response pattern should satisfy the following inequality for any measurable set $S \subset \Omega$ and any neighbouring datasets \mathbf{X} and $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathcal{X}^n$,

$$(1) \quad \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) \in S) \leq \exp(\epsilon)\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{Z}) \in S) + \delta.$$

For simplicity, in this paper, we consider \mathcal{X} to be \mathbb{R}^d or a convex subset of \mathbb{R}^d . The algorithm is considered "more private" when ϵ and δ are smaller, in the sense that an arbitrarily large change in a single data point does not incur a significant change in the response pattern.

MSC2020 subject classifications: Primary 62F15; secondary 62J12.

Keywords and phrases: Huber's Contamination Model, Posterior Sampling, Bayesian Inference, Differential Privacy.

1.1. *Related Literature.* In most cases, differential privacy is achieved by purposefully injecting noise into the computation process which perturbs the final outcome. The injection of noise can happen in two places, either at the individual level before data collection or after data collection before releasing the result. The most studied mechanism for privatizing Bayesian inference is the latter, where the outcome is perturbed for privacy. Mainly, there are two types of problems being targeted: direct estimation problems (Foulds et al., 2016; Wang, Fienberg and Smola, 2015; Zhang, Rubinstein and Dimitrakakis, 2016; Bernstein and Sheldon, 2019; Kulkarni et al., 2021) and sampling problems (Dimitrakakis et al., 2013; Zhang, Rubinstein and Dimitrakakis, 2016; Foulds et al., 2016; Heikkilä et al., 2019; Yıldırım and Ermiş, 2019).

The typical approach for privatizing estimation problems is to directly inject Laplacian noise into the steps or the output (Wang, Fienberg and Smola, 2015; Foulds et al., 2016; Zhang, Rubinstein and Dimitrakakis, 2016). Bernstein and Sheldon (2019); Kulkarni et al. (2021) considered the injection of noise after moment approximations of the sufficient statistics to achieve privacy. Gaussian/Laplacian mechanisms suffer from the limitation that the bandwidth of the noise scales with the sensitivity, defined as the maximal difference in response with respect to a pair of neighbouring datasets of the target function. In most applications, the sensitivity is not bounded unless the observation space is bounded.

It is worth noting that the definition of "Bayesian Differential Privacy" in Triastcyn and Faltings (2019, 2020) describes a different problem compared to the previously mentioned papers studying differential privacy in Bayesian inference following Dwork et al. (2006)'s definition. Triastcyn and Faltings (2019, 2020)'s work treats the dissimilar data point z as a random variable, which is marginalized, as opposed to in (1) where both \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Z} are considered as arbitrary but fixed.

In this paper, we consider the differential privacy property of Bayesian posterior sampling problem $\theta \sim \pi_n(\cdot|\mathbf{X})$ where π_n is the posterior distribution given the dataset $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{X}^n$ of size n , modelled by likelihood function $f(x; \theta)$, $\theta \in \Omega$ and prior $\pi_0(\theta)$. Thereafter, we will call \mathcal{X} the observation (or data) space where the input data resides and Ω the parameter space where the model parameter θ takes values in.

As noted in Dimitrakakis et al. (2013), Bayesian posterior sampling is itself a differentially private mechanism without additional noise under the condition that the log density is Lipschitz continuous in data with respect to some pseudo metric ρ for any fixed parameter θ . The level of privacy can be quantified by the pseudo distance ρ between the dissimilar data points $\rho(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$. However, allowing the level of privacy to depend on $\rho(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ implies the algorithm can be arbitrarily non-private when the observation space is unbounded, which links back to the problem of having unbounded sensitivity. This limitation is shared by the line of studies following Dimitrakakis et al. (2013) on posterior sampling due to having a similar setup (Wang, Fienberg and Smola, 2015; Foulds et al., 2016; Heikkilä et al., 2019; Yıldırım and Ermiş, 2019).

An additional difficulty in bounding the privacy level of posterior sampling comes from the dependency of sensitivity on the parameter space. The sensitivity of the posterior sampling problem is determined by the sensitivity of the log-posterior density function which depends directly on the sample θ . Thus, the sensitivity could also be unbounded if the parameter space is unbounded (Zhang, Rubinstein and Dimitrakakis, 2016; Foulds et al., 2016; Heikkilä et al., 2019; Yıldırım and Ermiş, 2019; Zhang and Zhang, 2023).

1.2. *Our contributions.* The novel contribution of this work is we derive the differential privacy properties of a general posterior sampling problem under Huber's contamination model **without** assuming bounded parameter space or observation space, which are conditions that often appear explicitly or implicitly in the existing literature to ensure finite sensitivity. We also characterise the rate of convergence for the differential privacy cost (ϵ, δ) with the number of data points n which, to the best of our knowledge, is yet to be answered.

In contrast to adding noise at the outcome level, we consider Huber’s contamination model (Huber, 2004) as a differential privacy mechanism, which randomly replaces data points in the dataset with samples from another distribution with some fixed probability p . To be specific, given the original model with likelihood function $f(\mathbf{x}; \theta)$, the p -contaminated model with contamination distribution $g(\cdot)$ models the contaminated dataset with the new likelihood function:

$$k_p(\mathbf{x}; \theta) := (1 - p)f(\mathbf{x}; \theta) + pg(x),$$

where $g(\cdot)$ is chosen to have a sufficiently heavy tail which we will discuss in Section 3. A collection of literature exists in quantifying the trade-off between privacy and efficiency statistical inference through minimax risk (Rohde and Steinberger, 2020; Cai, Wang and Zhang, 2021; Kroll, 2021; Li, Berrett and Yu, 2022). However, to the best of our knowledge, the quantification of (ϵ, δ) for algorithms under Huber’s contamination model in connection with the size of the dataset n is yet to be answered. In this paper, we attempt to answer the question under the setting of Bayesian posterior sampling, where the differential privacy property of the Bayesian posterior sampling algorithm is considered as a whole, taking into account all the subsequent steps after privatized data is collected.

The requirement of bounded parameter/observation spaces in differential privacy under Bayesian settings (Dimitrakakis et al., 2013; Foulds et al., 2016; Zhang, Rubinstein and Dimitrakakis, 2016; Bernstein and Sheldon, 2019; Kulkarni et al., 2021; Heikkilä et al., 2019; Yıldırım and Ermiş, 2019) root from the fact that the model density ratio between two arbitrary data points $\frac{f(\mathbf{x}; \theta)}{f(\mathbf{z}; \theta)}$ is unbounded for any fixed θ . However, by refactoring the inequality (1), we instead link ϵ to the sensitivity of the function $d(\mathbf{x}; \theta) := \frac{f(\mathbf{x}; \theta)}{f(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*)}$, the density ratio between the sampled parameter and the true parameter. By contaminating the data points with a suitably heavy-tailed distribution, the ratio function $d(\mathbf{x}; \theta)$ has finite upper and lower bounds, thus lifting the restriction of having a bounded observation space.

The assumption on bounded parameter space is addressed by bounding the tail probability of the posterior distribution by following the results of Shen and Wasserman (2001) and Wong and Shen (1995). Under a set of mild assumptions on the prior and likelihood function defined later in Section 3.2, we informally state our main result:

THEOREM 1. *Under mild assumptions on the set of density functions k_p and prior π_0 (Assumptions 1-5 defined in Section 3.2), then there exists a sequence of contamination probability $p_n \rightarrow 0$, such that $\forall S$ measurable, $\epsilon, \delta > 0$, for which any pair of neighbouring datasets \mathbf{X} and $\mathbf{Z} \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^n$ with size n large enough, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}(S|\mathbf{X}) \leq \exp(\epsilon)\mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}(S|\mathbf{Z}) + \delta,$$

with probability one, where π_n denotes the posterior distribution. In addition, the entries of Fisher information also converges to the true model

$$I_{p_n}(\theta^*) \rightarrow I(\theta^*).$$

where I_{p_n} is the Fisher information matrix for the contaminated likelihood when the contamination rate is p_n and $I(\cdot) = I_0(\cdot)$.

We will see in Section 4 that these assumptions can be satisfied in general in various applications. In other words, the upper bounds of (ϵ, δ) converge to zero with probability one for all datasets large enough. This can be achieved with the proportion of data contamination diminishing to zero as the size of the dataset grows, and thus the cost of privacy, in terms of Fisher information, is also asymptotically zero.

In addition to the asymptotic result stated above, we also provide a *finite sample* result which characterises precisely and uniformly the convergence rate of ϵ and δ in Theorem 5. We show in Section 4 how our criterion for the differential privacy guarantees is verified in practice.

REMARK 1. The impact on the performance of the algorithm under the contaminated model is only implicitly linked with the (ϵ, δ) budget through the choice of contamination rate p and contamination density $g(\cdot)$. To analyze the impact, one should decide on the choice of p and $g(\cdot)$ based on (ϵ, δ) , see Theorem 5, and refer to results like the Bernstein von Mises Theorem which links the (asymptotic) impact with the Fisher information matrix.

1.3. *Organization of the Paper.* This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the setup of differential privacy and data contamination mechanism with other necessary notations. Following that, we present our main results on the privacy level of p -contaminated posterior sampling in Section 3 with the proofs in the appendix and the supplementary material (Hu et al., 2024). We aim to lift both restrictions on having bounded parameter space and bounded observation space and derive a uniform bound for privacy level that shrinks with n in Section 3.2 subject to some mild constraints. Section 4 presents a non-exhaustive list of models where our results are applicable and we also provide some guidance on how each assumption can be checked, some with routine practices. The proofs for Section 3.2 are contained in the Appendix at the end of this manuscript and all other proofs and technical lemmas are contained in the supplementary material (Hu et al., 2024).

2. Preliminaries. In this section, we first introduce the setup of differential privacy in Bayesian posterior sampling and our contamination mechanism. We also introduce some definitions needed for deriving the tail bounds of the posterior distribution in a generalized narrative, following the work of Shen and Wasserman (2001) and Wong and Shen (1995).

2.1. *Differential Privacy in Bayesian Inference.* In a typical Bayesian inference setting, we have access to a dataset of size n , $\mathcal{D} \in (\mathcal{X})^n$ where \mathcal{X} is the space of all possible observations, modelled by a density function $f(\mathbf{x}; \theta) : \mathcal{X} \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with parameter θ . The parameter θ is a random variable with prior density $\pi_0(\theta)$ defined on the measurable space $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}(\Omega))$. Then the posterior distribution for θ given the dataset \mathcal{D} can be expressed as

$$(2) \quad \pi_n(\theta|\mathcal{D}) = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n f(\mathbf{x}_i; \theta)\pi_0(\theta)}{\int_{\Omega} \prod_{i=1}^n f(\mathbf{x}_i; \theta)\pi_0(\theta)d\theta}.$$

Throughout this paper, we assume the following:

- The posterior distribution is weakly consistent at θ^* (e.g., Definition 6.1 Ghosal and Van der Vaart (2017));
- The likelihood functions $f(\mathbf{x}; \theta)$ and $k_p(\mathbf{x}; \theta)$ are jointly continuous in x and θ , and the contamination likelihood $g(x)$ has full support over the observation space;
- The observation space \mathcal{X} and the parameter space Ω are both convex subsets of the Euclidean space, but not necessarily bounded or of the same dimension.

DEFINITION 1 ((ϵ, δ) -Differentially Private Posterior Sampling). The direct sampling from the posterior distribution in (2) is considered to be (ϵ, δ) -differentially private if for any two datasets $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} \in \mathcal{X}^n$ differ by at most one entry, for all $S \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$,

$$(3) \quad \mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}(S|\mathbf{X}) \leq \exp(\epsilon)\mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}(S|\mathbf{Z}) + \delta.$$

DEFINITION 2 (Neighbouring Datasets). Two datasets \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Z} are neighbours to each other if and only if $\exists \mathcal{D}$ and $x, z \notin \mathcal{D}$ such that $\mathbf{X} = \mathcal{D} \cup \{x\}$, $\mathbf{Z} = \mathcal{D} \cup \{z\}$.

REMARK 2. Definition 2 is perhaps the most adopted definition for neighbouring datasets in the differential privacy literature where the two datasets are explicitly required to have the same cardinality.

In some places, it is alternatively defined as one dataset is a proper subset of the other with strictly one less element, for instance, in Dwork (2008). To avoid ambiguity, we call two datasets \mathcal{D} and \mathbf{X} *strictly adjacent* if $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{X} \cup \{z\}$ and $z \notin \mathbf{X}$. Our result transports easily to the strictly adjacent case which is discussed in Appendix C in the supplementary material.

REMARK 3. In general, Bayesian posterior sampling is not differentially private. For instance, modelling the likelihood using a Gaussian distribution with known variance 1 and a Gaussian prior $\mathcal{N}(\mu_0, 1)$ on the mean μ . Let \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} be neighbouring datasets with $\mathcal{D} = \mathbf{X} \cap \mathbf{Z}$, $\mathbf{X} = \mathcal{D} \cup \{x\}$, $\mathbf{Z} = \mathcal{D} \cup \{z\}$, where $\mathcal{D} := \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$. Then

$$\log \left(\frac{\pi(\mu|\mathbf{X})}{\pi(\mu|\mathbf{Z})} \right) = -\frac{1}{2(n+1)}(x^2 - z^2) + (x - z) \left(\mu - \frac{1}{n+2} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i + \mu_0) \right),$$

which is unbounded in μ, x and z .

2.2. *p-Contaminated Data.* To improve privacy, usually, some noise is injected into the process. For instance, noise can be injected directly into the posterior distribution to contaminate the output sample. Here, we consider the injection of noise before the inference stage where for any data point y in the dataset \mathcal{D} , we replace it with $\mathcal{C}(y)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{y}) &= 1 - p, \\ \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{x}) &= p, \end{aligned}$$

where $0 < p < 1$, $\mathbf{x} \sim g(\cdot)$ and $g(\cdot)$ is the density function which has a heavier tail than $f(\mathbf{x}; \theta), \forall \theta$. Thus, the likelihood function of the contaminated dataset is given by $k_p(\mathbf{x}; \theta) = (1 - p)f(\mathbf{x}; \theta) + pg(\mathbf{x})$. The contamination procedure itself does not need to be part of the randomized algorithm \mathcal{A} , in which case the contaminated datasets $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{X})$ and $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{Z})$ are still neighbouring datasets and the analysis can be vastly simplified.

REMARK 4. As opposed to our pre-contaminated setup, where $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{X})$ and $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{Z})$ is essentially fixed in the inference, one may also consider the dynamic contamination approach that treats data contamination as part of the randomized algorithm where $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{X})$ and $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{Z})$ are random variables and their realizations don't need to be neighbouring to each other. It is not hard to show that if the pre-contaminated sampling algorithm is (ϵ, δ) -DP, then dynamic contamination will be at least (ϵ, δ) -DP. However, since $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{X})$ and $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{Z})$ in dynamic contamination are not necessarily neighbouring data sets, the resulting problem is more complicated to analyze. Either way, one should treat the contamination density $g(\cdot)$ and the contamination rate p as public knowledge to avoid having model identifiability issues (Mu and Xiong, 2023).

To avoid over-complicating the notation, hereafter, we disregard the presence of the contamination mapping \mathcal{C} and treat the contaminated dataset $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{D})$ as the original dataset \mathcal{D} , and conduct the Bayesian inference directly with density $k_p(\mathbf{x}; \theta)$.

2.3. *Hellinger Distance and Bracketing Entropy.* When the parameter space is non-compact, we need some control over the space complexity of density functions to compute the tail bound for the posterior distribution, which will act as an upper bound of δ . In empirical processes, covering numbers and bracketing numbers are often used to quantify the size and complexity of a metric space.

DEFINITION 3 (Hellinger Distance). Let p, q be two density functions defined on a measurable space $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$, then the (squared) Hellinger distance between p and q is defined as

$$h^2(p, q) := \frac{1}{2} \left\| \left(p^{1/2} - q^{1/2} \right)^2 \right\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\sqrt{p(\mathbf{x})} - \sqrt{q(\mathbf{x})} \right)^2 d\mathbf{x}.$$

Throughout this paper, the **Hellinger distance** will be used as the **preferred metric** for computing **bracketing numbers**, unless specifically stated. We hereafter omit the inclusion of metric choice in the notations.

When the context is clear, we will use $h(\theta_1, \theta_2)$ to denote the distance between two contaminated density functions $h(k_p(\cdot; \theta_1), k_p(\cdot; \theta_2))$, and replace the function space using the parameter space Ω .

Let Ξ denote the set of non-negative integrable functions on \mathbb{R}^d and $\mathcal{P} \subset \Xi$ be the set of density functions of our interest.

DEFINITION 4 (ϵ -Hellinger Bracketing). A set of function pairs $\{[L_j, U_j], j = 1, \dots, N\} \subset \Xi \times \Xi$ is a **ϵ -Hellinger bracketing** of the space \mathcal{P} , if

$$h(L_j, U_j) \leq \epsilon \text{ for all } j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$$

and

$$\forall p \in \mathcal{P}, \exists j \in \{1, \dots, N\} \text{ such that } L_j(\mathbf{x}) \leq p(\mathbf{x}) \leq U_j(\mathbf{x}), \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

An ϵ -bracket is a pair $[L_j, U_j]$ with $h(L_j, U_j) \leq \epsilon$.

REMARK 5. The Hellinger distance is a metric on density functions, but it also generalizes easily to a metric on the space of non-negative integrable functions for the purpose of the above definition.

DEFINITION 5 (Hellinger Bracketing Number). The **ϵ -Hellinger bracketing number** is size of the smallest ϵ -bracketing, defined as

$$N_{[]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{P}) := \min\{|B| : B \text{ is an } \epsilon\text{-Hellinger bracketing of } \mathcal{P}\}.$$

The **ϵ -Hellinger bracketing entropy** is the log of the bracketing number

$$H_{[]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{P}) := \log N_{[]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{P}).$$

3. Main Result.

3.1. *Posterior Decomposition.* Let $d(\mathbf{x}, \theta) := \frac{k_p(\mathbf{x}, \theta)}{k_p(\mathbf{x}, \theta^*)}$ where θ^* is the true parameter. If X is a dataset with n data points $x_i, i = 1, \dots, n$, then for $A \subset \Omega$, denote

$$m_n(A, \mathbf{X}) = \int_A \prod_{i=1}^n d(\mathbf{x}_i, \theta) \pi_0(\theta) d\theta.$$

Now, we can write the posterior distribution function $\pi_n(\cdot | \mathbf{X})$ in terms of $m_n(\cdot, \mathbf{X})$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}(A | \mathbf{X}) = \frac{\int_A \prod_{i=1}^n d(\mathbf{x}_i, \theta) \pi_0(d\theta)}{\int_{\Omega} \prod_{i=1}^n d(\mathbf{x}_i, \theta) \pi_0(d\theta)} = \frac{m_n(A, \mathbf{X})}{m_n(\Omega, \mathbf{X})}.$$

Let $A_n := \{\theta \in \Omega : h(\theta, \theta^*) \leq \phi_n\}$, with a positive sequence $\phi_n \rightarrow 0$. Then

$$\mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}(S | \mathbf{X}) = \mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}(S \cap A_n | \mathbf{X}) + \mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}(S \cap A_n^c | \mathbf{X})$$

where we aim to bound $\mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}(S \cap A_n^c | \mathbf{X})$ by δ , so that ϵ is only required to be upper bounded within a compact set A_n .

PROPOSITION 2. *Let X and Z be neighbouring datasets, i.e., $X = \mathcal{D} \cup \{\mathbf{x}\}$, $Z = \mathcal{D} \cup \{\mathbf{z}\}$, $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \notin \mathcal{D}$. Then for any $\theta \in A_n$,*

$$(4) \quad \mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}(S | \mathbf{X}) \leq \eta_n \left[\eta_n + \frac{m_n(A_n^c, \mathbf{Z})}{m_n(\Omega, \mathbf{X})} \right] \mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}(S | \mathbf{Z}) + \frac{m_n(A_n^c, \mathbf{X})}{m_n(\Omega, \mathbf{X})}$$

where

$$(5) \quad \eta_n = \sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{X}} \sup_{\theta \in A_n} \frac{d(\mathbf{x}; \theta)}{d(\mathbf{z}; \theta)}.$$

Now it suffices to find the upper bounds for $m_n(A_n^c, \mathbf{X})$, $m_n(A_n^c, \mathbf{Z})$ and η_n , and the lower bound for $m_n(\Omega, \mathbf{X})$ to upper bound the above expression.

3.2. *Non-compact Parameter Space.* For $A \subset \Omega$, denote the set of density functions $f(\mathbf{x}; \theta)$ indexed by $\theta \in A$ by $\mathcal{F}(A) := \{f(\cdot; \theta) : \theta \in A\}$. Similarly, $\mathcal{K}_p(A) := \{k_p(\cdot; \theta) : \theta \in A\}$.

ASSUMPTION 1. *There exists a positive sequence $\phi_n \rightarrow 0$ with $n\phi_n^2 \rightarrow \infty$, constants $c > 0$ with a sequence of subsets $\Omega_1 \subset \Omega_2 \subset \dots \subset \Omega$ such that*

$$(6) \quad \int_{\phi_n^2/2^{10}}^{\phi_n} H_{\square}^{1/2}(u, \mathcal{F}(\Omega_n)) du \leq c\sqrt{n}\phi_n^2.$$

Assumption 1 measures the space complexity of the density functions $f(\cdot; \theta)$. Note that $H_{\square}(u, \mathcal{F}(\Omega_n)) \leq c^2 n \phi_n^2, \forall u \in (\phi_n^2/2^{10}, \phi_n)$ implies (6), then this condition can be verified easily with the following lemma.

LEMMA 3. *Let $\Omega_1 \subset \Omega_2 \subset \dots \subset \Omega$ be a sequence of subsets and Ω has dimension d . Let R_n denote the radius of the space Ω_n which grows at most polynomial order with n . If the set of density functions $\mathcal{F}(\Omega_n)$ is locally Lipschitz in the sense that*

$$\left| \sqrt{f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})} - \sqrt{f_{\vartheta}(\mathbf{x})} \right| \leq M_{\vartheta, u}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}) \|\theta - \vartheta\|_{\infty},$$

for some function $M_{\vartheta, u}^{(n)} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}, \theta, \vartheta \in \Omega_n, \|\theta - \vartheta\|_{\infty} \leq u$. Let

$$M_u^{(n)} := \sup_{\vartheta \in \Omega_n} \|M_{\vartheta, u}^{(n)}\|_2$$

which is a constant depending on R_n . If there exists a constant $q \in (0, 1)$, such that $\forall u \in (0, \phi_0)$ for some constant ϕ_0 ,

$$(7) \quad \frac{\log \log M_u^{(n)}}{\log n} \leq q,$$

then there exists positive sequence $\phi_0 > \phi_n \rightarrow 0$ with $\phi_n > n^{-\frac{1-q}{4}}$ such that (6) holds.

REMARK 6. We may see later in the examples that $M_u^{(n)}$ grows with u , so usually it suffices to just check (7) for only $u = \phi_0$.

DEFINITION 6. Define for $\alpha \in (0, 1]$,

$$\rho_{p,\alpha}(\theta, \vartheta) := \frac{1}{\alpha} \int \left[\left(\frac{k_p(\mathbf{x}; \theta)}{k_p(\mathbf{x}; \vartheta)} \right)^\alpha - 1 \right] k_p(\mathbf{x}; \theta) d\mathbf{x}.$$

For $t > 0$, $p \in (0, 1)$, define the $\rho_{p,\alpha}$ neighbourhood around θ^* by

$$S_{p,\alpha}(t) := \{\theta : \rho_{p,\alpha}(\theta^*, \theta) \leq t\}.$$

ASSUMPTION 2. There exists a positive sequence $\phi_n \rightarrow 0$, and constants $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, $c_3 > 0$ such that

$$(8) \quad \mathbb{P}_{\pi_0}(S_{0,\alpha}(t_n)) \geq c_3 e^{-2nt_n},$$

where $t_n := c_1 \phi_n^2 / 8$ and $\frac{nt_n}{\log n} > \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\alpha}, \frac{c_1}{8c_2} \right\}$, $\forall n > 0$, c_2 is a constant in Lemma 10.

REMARK 7. For ϕ_n small enough, it's reasonable to approximate the set $S_{0,\alpha}(t_n)$ as an L_2 -ball around θ^* with its volume shrinking polynomially with t_n . For a any prior that has a non-vanishing density around θ^* , it's not hard to see that $\mathbb{P}_{\pi_0}(S_{0,\alpha}(t_n))$ also shrinks polynomially with t_n , thus Assumption 2 is not hard to satisfy in general.

ASSUMPTION 3. There exists positive sequence $\phi_n \rightarrow 0$ and constant $c_4 > 0$ such that

$$(9) \quad \mathbb{P}_{\pi_0}(\Omega_n^c) \leq c_4 \exp(-2c_1 n \phi_n^2).$$

Assumptions 2 and 3 control the prior concentration on the center and the tails respectively. The first three assumptions are needed in order to control the δ term in (3). Note that Assumptions 1-3 feature the same symbol ϕ_n for the sequence. In the proof for the main result, we need the same sequence ϕ_n to satisfy these three assumptions simultaneously.

DEFINITION 7. Denote that supremum of the directional derivative of $f(\mathbf{x}; \theta)$ in θ at (\mathbf{x}, θ) by $\tilde{\nabla}_\theta f(\mathbf{x}; \theta)$,

$$\tilde{\nabla}_\theta f(\mathbf{x}; \theta) = \sup_{\|\vec{u}\|_2=1} \lim_{\xi \downarrow 0} \frac{f(\mathbf{x}; \theta + \xi \vec{u}) - f(\mathbf{x}; \theta)}{\xi}.$$

ASSUMPTION 4. All the directional derivatives of the density function $f(\mathbf{x}; \theta)$ in θ exist and bounded, and the contamination density g has a tail no lighter than $\tilde{\nabla}_\theta f(\mathbf{x}; \theta)$ in every direction, i.e., for any fixed $\theta \in \Omega$,

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \left\| \frac{\tilde{\nabla}_\theta f(\mathbf{x}; \theta)}{g(\mathbf{x})} \right\|_2 < \infty,$$

REMARK 8. We assume a weaker condition than total differentiability to accommodate the use of absolute value $|\cdot|$ in density functions, e.g., the Laplace distribution.

When g is continuous and has full support over the support of $\tilde{\nabla}_\theta f$, then the assumption holds trivially whenever g has a suitably heavy tail.

ASSUMPTION 5. For every $\psi > 0$,

$$(10) \quad \inf_{\|\theta - \theta^*\|_2 > \psi} h(f(\cdot; \theta), f(\cdot; \theta^*)) > 0$$

REMARK 9. Assumption 5 is similar to one of the conditions in Thm 9.13 Wasserman (2004), except stronger, since we stated it in Hellinger distance rather than in KL divergence. The condition directly implies the identifiability of the model. See also Condition 2 in the lecture notes Wasserman (2020).

PROPOSITION 4. If Assumption 5 holds, then for any sequence $\phi_n \rightarrow 0$, and decreasing sequence $1 > p_n \rightarrow 0$, there exists sequence $\psi_n \rightarrow 0$ such that

$$(11) \quad h(k_{p_n}(\cdot; \theta), k_{p_n}(\cdot; \theta^*)) \leq \phi_n \implies \|\theta - \theta^*\|_2 \leq \psi_n.$$

THEOREM 5 ((ϵ, δ)-Privacy). Suppose that there exists a decreasing sequence $\phi_n > 0$ that satisfies the conditions in Assumptions 1-3 and that Assumptions 4, 5 also hold. For $p_0 \in (0, 1)$ fixed, there exists positive constants (or sequence of constants) $T_n, c_1, c_2, \dots, C_1, C_2, \dots$, such that $\forall S \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$, for any pair of neighbouring datasets \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} of size n and any sequence $p_0 \geq p_n \downarrow 0$,

$$(12) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}(S|\mathbf{X}) \leq e^{\epsilon_n} \mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}(S|\mathbf{Z}) + \delta_n\right) \geq \begin{cases} 1 - C_1 e^{-nc_5 \phi_n^2}, & \text{for } nc_2 \phi_n^2 \geq \log 2, \\ 1 - (C_2 + C_3 (\log \phi_n)^2) e^{-nc_5 \phi_n^2}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

with

$$\epsilon_n := \epsilon_n + \log(\delta_n + \exp(\epsilon_n)), \quad \epsilon_n := 2(1 - p_n)T_n \psi_n / p_n, \quad \delta_n := \frac{4}{c_3} e^{-\frac{1}{2}c_1 n \phi_n^2},$$

where $t_n = c_1 \phi_n^2 / 8$, and ψ_n is defined in Proposition 4, and $c_5 = \min\{c_1 \alpha / 8, c_2\}$. In other words,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}(S|\mathbf{X}) \leq \exp(\epsilon_n) \mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}(S|\mathbf{Z}) + \delta_n$$

holds for all large n with probability one.

REMARK 10. Note that ϕ_n usually can take values of $O(n^{-1/q})$, $q > 0$.

THEOREM 6 (Fisher Information). Let $p_n \rightarrow 0$ be a sequence of positive real numbers. Let $I_p(\theta)$ denote the Fisher information matrix for a single data point with respect to the density $k_p(\cdot; \theta)$ and $I(\theta)$ denote the Fisher information matrix with respect to $f(\cdot; \theta)$. Then

$$I_{p_n}(\theta^*) \rightarrow I(\theta^*).$$

PROOF OF THEOREM 1. Under Assumptions 1-5, Theorem 5 holds for any decreasing $p_n \rightarrow 0$, $p_n \leq p_0 < 1$, especially for n large enough,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}(S|\mathbf{X}) \leq \exp(\epsilon_n) \mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}(S|\mathbf{Z}) + \delta_n\right) \geq 1 - C e^{-nc_5 \phi_n^2},$$

where

$$\epsilon_n := \epsilon_n + \log(\delta_n + \exp(\epsilon_n)), \quad \epsilon_n := 2(1 - p_n)T_n \psi_n / p_n, \quad \delta_n := \frac{4}{c_3} e^{-\frac{1}{2}c_1 n \phi_n^2},$$

Thus by picking $p_n \rightarrow 0$ such that $\psi_n / p_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, both δ_n and ϵ_n converges to zero. Thus the algorithm is also asymptotically differentially private for any pair of (ϵ, δ) . Since $p_n \rightarrow 0$, the convergence in the Fisher information follows from Theorem 6. \square

3.3. *Privacy in Non-identifiable Models.* Throughout the paper, we assumed that the posterior is consistent at θ^* , which implies the model is identifiable.

DEFINITION 8 (Identifiability). A set of likelihood functions $f(\mathbf{x}; \theta) : \mathcal{X} \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ indexed by $\theta \in \Omega$ is *identifiable* if and only if for any likelihood function in the set is *distinguishable* from the rest of the set. We also call the models that adhere to that set of likelihood functions *identifiable*.

Assuming identifiability does not change the level of differential privacy measured in (ϵ, δ) . However, to determine the convergence rate for (ϵ, δ) in Theorem 5 requires sufficient knowledge of the model, including how the density functions are indexed.

In other words, it is not crucial to have an identifiable parameterization, in order for the model to be differentially private. In fact, under suitable regularity conditions, the level of privacy in terms of ϵ or (ϵ, δ) is intrinsic to the model, regardless of how its parameter space and likelihood function take form. The level of privacy is preserved by applying a suitable transformation (not necessarily bijective) to the parameter space and the prior. Hence, the resulting model can be considered as a reparameterization of the original model.

To see this invariance, we first consider a simple case where the parameter space is transformed by a diffeomorphism (a differentiable bijective mapping), where the change of measure can be easily deduced.

PROPOSITION 7. Let $(\Omega_\psi, \Sigma_\psi, \mathbf{d}\psi)$ and $(\Omega_\theta, \Sigma_\theta, \mathbf{d}\theta)$ be two measure spaces and a diffeomorphism $t : \Omega_\psi \rightarrow \Omega_\theta$ such that t^{-1} is well-defined and differentiable. Then the differential privacy level of model $f_\psi(\mathbf{x}; \psi)$ parameterized by Ω_ψ with prior $\pi_0(\psi)$ is the same as the privacy level of model $f_\theta(\mathbf{x}; \theta)$ parameterized by Ω_θ with prior $\tilde{\pi}_0(\theta)$,

$$f_\theta(\mathbf{x}; \theta) = f_\psi(\mathbf{x}; t^{-1}(\theta)) \cdot |J_{t^{-1}}(\theta)|, \quad \tilde{\pi}_0(\theta) = \pi_0(t^{-1}(\psi)) \cdot |J_{t^{-1}}(\theta)|$$

where $J_{t^{-1}}(\theta)$ is the Jacobian of the inverse function.

Similarly, it is also possible to link a non-identifiable model in Ω_ψ to the identifiable version of itself in Ω_θ while preserving the privacy level. To begin with, we need to reduce the redundancy in the non-identifiable space Ω_ψ . Consider the following relation \sim such that

$$\psi_1 \sim \psi_2 \iff \nexists A \subset \mathcal{X}, \mu(A) > 0 \text{ such that } \forall \mathbf{x} \in A, f(\mathbf{x}; \psi_1) \neq f(\mathbf{x}; \psi_2).$$

That is ψ_1 and ψ_2 lead to two likelihood functions that are equal almost everywhere. Since equal a.e. could create an issue in the DP inequality since the worst case could land on the discontinuity, we consider $f(\mathbf{x}; \psi)$ to be continuous in \mathbf{x} . In which case, $\psi_1 \sim \psi_2$ if and only if they represent the same likelihood function on the whole of \mathcal{X} .

Denote $\Omega_\theta := \Omega_\psi / \sim$ and consider the quotient map

$$\begin{aligned} t : \Omega_\psi &\rightarrow \Omega_\theta \\ \psi &\mapsto [\psi] \end{aligned}$$

and if there is a way to choose every representative $[\psi]$ such that t is measurable, then we have the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 8. Let $(\Omega_\psi, \Sigma_\psi, \mathbf{d}\psi)$ be a measure space such that the model with likelihood function $f_\psi(\mathbf{x}; \psi)$ and prior $\pi_0(\psi)$ is non-identifiable. Suppose that the quotient map $t : \Omega_\psi \rightarrow \Omega_\theta \subset \Omega_\psi$ that reparameterizes the model onto the measure space $(\Omega_\theta, \Sigma_\theta, \mathbf{d}\theta)$ is measurable, then the model parameterized in Ω_θ has the same level of differential privacy as the model parameterized in Ω_ψ .

REMARK 11. The forward invariance in differential privacy level through mapping t essentially follows from the post-processing property (Dwork et al., 2014), though note that the mapping has to be measurable for the equations to be well-defined.

4. Examples. We shall give a few examples for which Theorem 5 is applicable. The verification of Assumptions 1 to 3 across different models shares a few common procedures. Assumption 4 is trivially satisfied by correctly choosing a heavy-tailed contamination density g , and Assumption 5 is usually easy to check for linear models.

Firstly, we assume a common model parameter θ to be a d -dimensional real vector that denotes the position/mean of the model, $\theta \in \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and the prior on θ is set to $\pi_0(\cdot) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$. Assumption 1 will be verified with the help of Lemma 3.

In the case when $\rho_\alpha(\theta^*, \theta) \preceq \|\theta^* - \theta\|_2$ for θ is close to θ^* , Assumptions 2 and 3 result to computing the prior mass $\mathbb{P}_{\pi_0}(\bar{S}(r))$, for some r , where $\bar{S}(r) := \{\theta \in \Omega : \|\theta^* - \theta\|_2 \leq r\}$ and $\pi_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$. Note that r takes value of ϕ_n in Assumption 2 ($r \rightarrow 0$), and $\text{Radius}(\Omega_n)$ in Assumption 3 ($r \rightarrow \infty$).

REMARK 12. The closeness of θ to θ^* can be decided by imposing an upperbound for ϕ_0 and then choosing the sequence ϕ_n that satisfies Assumptions 1 - 3. A choice of ϕ_n will induce the values of constants in Theorem 5. In principle, everything can be estimated after the choice of Ω_n and ϕ_n are fixed.

LEMMA 9. Let $\pi_0(\cdot)$ and $\bar{S}(r)$ be defined as above, we have two separate lower bounds for the prior mass

$$\mathbb{P}_{\pi_0}(\bar{S}(r)) \geq \begin{cases} \frac{\exp(-\lambda/2)}{\Gamma(d/2)} \gamma(d/2, r^2/2) & \text{for any } r \\ \frac{1}{\Gamma(d/2)} \gamma(d/2, R^2/2) & \text{for } r > \|\theta^*\|_2. \end{cases}$$

where $\lambda = \|\theta^*\|_2^2$, $R = r - \|\theta^*\|_2$ and

$$\gamma(\alpha, r) = \int_0^r u^{\alpha-1} \exp(-u) du$$

is the incomplete gamma function.

REMARK 13. For r small, we use the first inequality to verify Assumption 2

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\gamma(\alpha, r)}{\Gamma(\alpha)} &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^r w^{\alpha-1} e^{-w} dw \\ &\geq \frac{e^{-r}}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^r w^{\alpha-1} dw \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2\pi} e^\alpha \alpha^{-\alpha-\frac{1}{2}} r^\alpha e^{-r} \end{aligned}$$

where the last step is due to Stirling's approximation, (see, for instance, (3.9) page 24 of Artin (1964)).

For r large, to verify Assumption 3, we use the second inequality with the approximation $\Gamma(\alpha) - \gamma(\alpha, r) \sim r^{\alpha-1} e^{-r}$, or

$$\frac{\gamma(\alpha, r)}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \sim 1 - \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} r^{\alpha-1} e^{-r}$$

and hence,

$$1 - \mathbb{P}_{\pi_0}(\bar{S}(r)) \leq r^{d-2} \exp(-(r - \|\theta^*\|_2)^2/2).$$

where

1. $f(x) \sim u(x)$ if $f/u \rightarrow 1$ as $x \rightarrow L$, or the leading term of $f(x)$ is $u(x)$ as $x \rightarrow L$;
2. $f_n(x_n) \leq u_n(x_n)$ if there exists constant $C > 0$ independent of x_n and n such that $f_n(x_n) \leq C u_n(x_n)$.

4.1. *Linear Regression.* Let

$$Y_i = \theta^\top X_i + e_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n$$

where e_i are assumed to be i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ random variables with unknown variance σ^2 and X_i are d -dimensional i.i.d. random variables following some density function $f_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$. Then the joint distribution of (X_i, Y_i) can be written as

$$f_{\theta, \sigma}(\mathbf{x}, y) = f_{\theta, \sigma}(y|\mathbf{x})f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) = (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-1/2} \exp\left(-\frac{(y - \theta^\top \mathbf{x})^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Requirement: In order for the divergence $\rho_{0, \alpha}$ to be integrable, we need $f_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$ to have a tail no lighter than a Gaussian distribution such that $\exp(r\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2)f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})$ is integrable for small r .

Firstly, we shall address condition (6) in Assumption 1. To avoid singularity, we choose

$$\Omega_n := \{(\theta, \sigma) \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|\theta^* - \theta\|_2 \leq R_n, |\sigma - \sigma^*| < R_n, \sigma > 1/R_n\}$$

where $R_n \rightarrow \infty$ is defined later.

By Lemma 22, we have for any $(\theta, \sigma), (\vartheta, \varsigma) \in \Omega_n$, $\|(\theta, \sigma) - (\vartheta, \varsigma)\|_\infty \leq r$,

$$\left| \sqrt{f_{\theta, \sigma}(\mathbf{x}, y)} - \sqrt{f_{\vartheta, \varsigma}(\mathbf{x}, y)} \right| \leq M_{\vartheta, \varsigma, r}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}, y) \|\theta - \vartheta\|_\infty$$

with

$$M_{\vartheta, \varsigma, r}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}, y) = \frac{R_n^2}{2} \left(d\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 + R_n(|y| + M_n\|\mathbf{x}\|_2) \right) (|y| + M_n\|\mathbf{x}\|_2) \left(\frac{R_n^2}{2\pi} \right)^{1/4} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{4R_n^2} \min_{\varphi \in B_r(\vartheta)} (y - \varphi^\top \mathbf{x})^2\right) \sqrt{f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})}$$

where $M_n = \|\theta^*\|_2 + R_n$. By the requirement, $f_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$ has a finite fifth-order moment, $\|M_{\vartheta, \varsigma, r}^{(n)}\|_2^2 \leq M_n^{12}$, $\forall (\vartheta, \varsigma) \in \Omega_n$ (Lemma 24) which satisfies the requirement of Lemma 3.

Since $\log M_r^{(n)} = O(\log M_n)$, the condition (6) is satisfied by taking

$$\phi_n = n^{-1/q}, \quad M_n = n^k,$$

for some $q > 4$ and $k > 0$ to be chosen for the sake of Assumptions 3.

With Lemma 25, we show that if $\exp(r\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2)f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})$ is integrable for small r , then

$$\rho_\alpha((\theta^*, \sigma^*), (\theta, \sigma)) \leq \|(\theta^*, \sigma^*) - (\theta, \sigma)\|_2$$

for (θ, σ) close enough to (θ^*, σ^*) , which means the set $S_{0, \alpha}(t_n)$ in (8) contains an L_2 -neighbourhood around θ^* , i.e.,

$$\bar{S}(at_n) := \{\theta \in \Omega : \|\theta - \theta^*\|_2 \leq at_n\} \subseteq S_{0, \alpha}(t_n).$$

for some constant a that possibly depends on θ^* . For Assumptions 2 and 3, consider an ordinary Gaussian prior distribution on the parameter (θ, σ) , $\pi_0(\theta, \sigma) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_{d+1})$. By Lemma 9 and Remark 13,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\pi_0}(S_{0,\alpha}(t_n)) \geq \mathbb{P}_{\pi_0}(\bar{S}(at_n)) \succeq t_n^d \exp(-a^2 t_n^2/2).$$

Hence any $t_n \rightarrow 0$ will satisfy (8). Moreover, for R_n large,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\pi_0}(\Omega_n^c) = 1 - \mathbb{P}_{\pi_0}(\Omega_n) \sim R_n^{d-2} e^{-R_n^2/2}.$$

Recall that $M_n = R_n + \|\theta^*\|_2$ and $\phi_n = n^{-1/q}$, this gives the restriction that

$$M_n^2 = n^{2k} \approx R_n^2 \geq 4c_1 n \phi_n^2 = 4c_1 n^{(q-2)/q}$$

which can be satisfied by choosing $k > (q-2)/2q$. Finally, Lemma 26 shows that the pair of sequences ϕ_n and ψ_n in Proposition 4 can be chosen (up to a multiplicative constant) to diminish at the same rate when (θ, σ) is close to (θ^*, σ^*) . Therefore ψ_n can also be chosen to be $\propto \phi_n = n^{-1/q}$. By choosing p_n to converge at a rate slower than $n^{-1/q}$, e.g., $p_n = n^{-1/2q}$, then

$$\epsilon_n = O(n^{-1/2q}), \quad \delta_n = O(\exp(-\frac{1}{2}c_1 n^{1-2/q}))$$

where c_1 is a fixed constant and $q > 4$.

4.2. *Logistic Regression.* Consider the following linear logistic regression model,

$$Y_i \sim \text{Bern}(p_i), \quad p_i = \Phi(\theta^\top X_i), \quad \theta, X_i \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where $\Phi(z) = (1 + e^{-z})^{-1}$. Again, we assume the observations X_i are i.i.d. following density $f_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$, then

$$f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}, y) = f_{\theta}(y|\mathbf{x})f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) = \Phi(\theta^\top \mathbf{x})^y \Phi(-\theta^\top \mathbf{x})^{1-y} f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Requirement: For the subsequent expressions to be integrable, we need $f_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$ to have a finite second-order moment.

Note that

$$\left| \sqrt{f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}, y)} - \sqrt{f_{\vartheta}(\mathbf{x}, y)} \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \sqrt{f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})} \|\theta - \vartheta\|_2.$$

So we can apply Lemma 3 with $M_{\vartheta,r}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}, y) = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \sqrt{f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})}$. Hence $\|M_{\vartheta,r}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}, y)\|_2^2$ is bounded by a uniform constant given the requirement on the moment of $f_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$. Thus, Assumption 1 can be satisfied with

$$\phi_n = n^{-1/q}, \quad R_n = n^k$$

for some $q > 4$ and $k > 0$ to be chosen for Assumption 3. Again, we can show that $\rho_{\alpha}(\theta^*, \theta) \preceq \|\theta^* - \theta\|_2$ for θ close enough to θ^* (Lemma 27). Moreover, for R_n large,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\pi_0}(\Omega_n^c) = 1 - \mathbb{P}_{\pi_0}(\Omega_n) \sim R_n^{d-2} e^{-R_n^2/2}.$$

Recall that $M_n = R_n + \|\theta^*\|_2$ and $\phi_n = n^{-1/q}$, this gives the restriction again that

$$M_n^2 = n^{2k} \approx R_n^2 \geq 4c_1 n \phi_n^2 = 4c_1 n^{(q-2)/q}$$

which can be satisfied by choosing $k > (q-2)/2q$ similar to the previous example.

Finally, Lemma 28 shows that the pair of sequences ϕ_n and ψ_n in Proposition 4 can be chosen (up to a multiplicative constant) to diminish at the same rate when θ is close to θ^* . Therefore ψ_n can also be chosen to be $\propto \phi_n = n^{-1/q}$. By choosing p_n to converge at a rate slower than $n^{-1/q}$, e.g., $p_n = n^{-1/2q}$, then

$$\epsilon_n = O(n^{-1/2q}), \quad \delta_n = O(\exp(-\frac{1}{2}c_1 n^{1-2/q}))$$

where c_1 is a fixed constant and $q > 4$.

4.3. *Cauchy Regression.* Consider the following Cauchy regression model,

$$Y_i = \theta^\top X_i + e_i,$$

where $e_i \sim \text{Cauchy}(0, \gamma)$ is Cauchy random variable with unknown dispersion parameter γ . Assuming X_i are i.i.d. following density $f_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$. Then the joint distribution is given by

$$f_{\theta, \gamma}(\mathbf{x}, y) = \frac{\sqrt{\gamma}}{\pi} \left(1 + \frac{(y - \theta^\top \mathbf{x})^2}{\gamma} \right)^{-1} f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Requirement: For ρ_α to be integrable, we need $f_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$ to have all of its moments finite as a sufficient condition.

By Cauchy's mean value theorem, we can show (as in Lemma 29 that for any $(\theta, \gamma_1), (\vartheta, \gamma_2) \in \Omega_n := \{(\vartheta, \gamma) \in \Omega : \|\vartheta - \theta^*\|_2 \leq R_n, |\gamma - \gamma^*| < R_n, \gamma > R_n^{-1}\}$, such that $\|(\theta, \gamma_1) - (\vartheta, \gamma_2)\|_\infty \leq r$,

$$\left| \sqrt{f_{\theta, \gamma_1}(\mathbf{x}, y)} - \sqrt{f_{\vartheta, \gamma_2}(\mathbf{x}, y)} \right| \leq M_{\vartheta, \gamma_2, r}^{(n)} \|(\theta, \gamma_1) - (\vartheta, \gamma_2)\|_\infty$$

where

$$M_{\vartheta, \gamma_2, r}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}, y) = \frac{d}{\sqrt{\pi}} \left(1 + \min_{\varphi \in B_r(\vartheta)} (y - \varphi^\top \mathbf{x})^2 / R_n \right)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \cdot \left[R_n^{\frac{3}{4}} (|y| + M_n \|\mathbf{x}\|_2) \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 + \frac{1}{4} R_n^{\frac{3}{4}} + R_n^{\frac{7}{4}} (|y| + M_n \|\mathbf{x}\|_2)^2 \right] \sqrt{f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})}$$

where $M_n = \|\theta^*\|_2 + R_n$, $B_r(\vartheta)$ is the L_2 -ball around ϑ . Lemma 30 shows $\|M_{\vartheta, r}\|_2^2 \leq M_n^9$ if $f_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$ has a finite fifth-order moment. Thus, similar to the first example, $\log M_r^{(n)} = O(\log M_n)$ and Assumption 1 can be satisfied by taking

$$\phi_n = n^{-1/q}, \quad M_n = n^k$$

for some $q > 4$ and $k > 0$ to be chosen for Assumption 3. By Lemma 31 and the requirement on the moments of $f_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$, $\rho_\alpha(\theta^*, \theta) \leq \|\theta^* - \theta\|_2$. Thus there exists some constant a such that

$$\bar{S}(at_n) \subseteq S_{0, \alpha}(t_n).$$

The requirement of $f_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$ having all finite moments is a crude requirement for the sake of computational simplicity and is not the minimum condition for Lemma 31 to hold. For instance, when $\alpha = 1$, the series expansion in Lemma D.11 can be omitted and the result only requires $f_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$ to have a finite second-order moment. Again, by Lemma 9,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\pi_0}(\bar{S}(at_n)) &\geq \frac{\gamma(d/2, a^2 t_n^2/2)}{\Gamma(d/2)} \\ &\geq t_n^d \exp(-a^2 t_n^2/2). \end{aligned}$$

which means t_n can be chosen freely as long as $t_n \rightarrow 0$ to satisfy (8). Thus Assumption 3 can be checked using the same procedure as in the Linear regression example which again gives $k > \frac{1}{4}$.

Finally, Lemma 32 shows that the pair of sequences ϕ_n and ψ_n in Proposition 4 can be chosen (up to a multiplicative constant) to diminish at the same rate when θ is close to θ^* . Therefore ψ_n can also be chosen to be $\propto \phi_n = n^{-1/q}$. By choosing p_n to converge at a rate slower than $n^{-1/q}$, e.g., $p_n = n^{-1/2q}$, then

$$\epsilon_n \sim n^{-1/2q}, \quad \delta_n \sim \exp(-\frac{1}{2}c_1 n^{1-2/q})$$

where c_1 is a fixed constant, and $q > 4$.

4.4. *Bayesian Quantile Regression.* In quantile regression, one would like to estimate the τ -th quantile, denoted $q_\tau(Y|X)$ of the random variable Y conditioned on the observation X . Due to [Koenker and Bassett Jr \(1978\)](#), solving the quantile regression problem is equivalent to solving the following optimization problem:

$$\min_{\theta} \sum_i Q_\tau(y_i - \theta^\top \mathbf{x}_i)$$

where

$$Q_\tau(u) = \frac{1}{2}(|u| + (2\tau - 1)u) = \begin{cases} (\tau - 1)u, & u \leq 0 \\ \tau u, & u > 0 \end{cases}.$$

This is equivalent to maximizing the likelihood

$$\max_{\theta} \prod_i f_\tau(y_i; \mathbf{x}_i, \theta)$$

where the probability density function

$$f^\tau(y; \mathbf{x}, \theta) = \tau(1 - \tau) \exp\left(-Q_\tau(y - \theta^\top \mathbf{x})\right)$$

describes the asymmetric Laplace distribution. Please refer to [Yu and Moyeed \(2001\)](#) for more details on Bayesian quantile regression.

Thus, our joint density is given by

$$f_\theta^\tau(\mathbf{x}, y) = \tau(1 - \tau) \exp\left(-Q_\tau(y - \theta^\top \mathbf{x})\right) f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Requirement: For the subsequent expressions to be integrable, we need $f_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$ to have a sufficiently light tail such that the density function proportional to $\exp(\tau^*|(\theta^* - \theta)^\top \mathbf{x}|)f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})$ has a finite second-order moment, whenever θ is close to θ^* .

Following a similar argument as the previous examples, we showed that ([Lemma 33](#)), for any $\theta, \vartheta \in \Omega_n := \{\theta \in \Omega : \|\theta - \theta^*\|_2 \leq R_n\}$, such that $\|\theta - \vartheta\|_\infty \leq r$,

$$\left| \sqrt{f_\theta^\tau(\mathbf{x}, y)} - \sqrt{f_\vartheta^\tau(\mathbf{x}, y)} \right| \leq M_{\vartheta, r}(\mathbf{x}, y) \|\theta - \vartheta\|_\infty$$

where $\tau^* = \max\{\tau, 1 - \tau\}$, $M_n = R_n + \|\theta^*\|_2$ and

$$M_{\vartheta, r}(\mathbf{x}, y) = \frac{d}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{1 - \tau^*}{2} \min_{\varphi \in B_r(\vartheta)} |y - \varphi^\top \mathbf{x}|\right) \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \sqrt{f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})}.$$

It can be shown that in [Lemma 34](#),

$$\|M_{\vartheta, r}\|_2^2 = \frac{d^2}{2(1 - \tau^*)} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2] + \frac{d^2 r}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^3] = O(1)$$

since $f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})$ has a finite third-order moment. Thus [Assumption 1](#) is satisfied with

$$\phi_n = n^{-1/q}, R_n = n^k$$

for some $q > 4$ and $k > 0$ to be chosen for [Assumption 3](#). Again, we can show that $\rho_\alpha(\theta^*, \theta) \preceq \|\theta^* - \theta\|_2$ for θ close enough to θ^* ([Lemma 35](#)). This leads to the same result as in the Logistic regression case and we need to choose $k > \frac{1}{4}$.

Finally, [Lemma 36](#) also shows that ϕ_n and ψ_n in [Proposition 4](#) can be chosen to diminish at the same rate, similar to the conclusions as in the previous examples. Thus, we can choose $\psi_n \propto n^{-1/q}$ and $p_n = n^{-1/2q}$ which gives

$$\epsilon_n \sim n^{-1/2q}, \quad \delta_n \sim \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}c_1 n^{1-2/q}\right)$$

where c_1 is a fixed constant and $q > 4$.

5. Discussion. Differential privacy mechanisms in statistical inference can be roughly divided into two categories:

1. Local models, where data are privatized before collection and inference is conducted on the perturbed dataset;
2. Central models, where data are collected and processed without noise but the result is privatized before release.

Due to the potential confusion in the definition of "local model" and "local differential privacy", despite the relevance to our approach, we refrained from mentioning these in the Introduction. The phrases "local model" and "central model" explicitly point to the privatization mechanism, whereas "local differential privacy", as defined in [Erlingsson, Pihur and Korolova \(2014\)](#), quantifies the level of differential privacy provided by the mechanism implemented in "local models", namely the DP with one data point. Since the DP properties of local mechanisms are usually simple to derive, the main focus in the literature on local models is the trade-off between privacy and information loss. Our work, however, is fundamentally a **central model** despite using a local privatization mechanism. Notably, the local differential privacy level only depends on the contamination probability p_n , which we would like to approach 0. From the local privacy perspective, our setup will be asymptotically non-private as $n \rightarrow \infty$. However, from the central model perspective, with a trusted curator, our approach can ensure full differential privacy with asymptotically zero contamination rate.

Huber's contamination model for robust estimation by contaminating the dataset with a heavy-tailed distribution also introduces a level of differential privacy in posterior sampling similar to central models that directly inject Laplace/Gaussian noise into the output. By contaminating the dataset with a heavy-tailed distribution, we can lift the assumption on bounded observation space. We further extend the result, through a probabilistic argument, to lift the bound on the parameter space and upper-bound the rate of convergence for ϵ and δ . The result also leads to an asymptotic bound as $N \rightarrow \infty$ that holds almost surely through the Borel-Cantelli Lemma.

Despite having a couple of non-trivial assumptions, we show in Section 4, how the assumptions could be verified and how the convergence rate of ϵ and δ can be derived under a few common regression setups. All four examples lead to similar convergence results despite requiring slightly different moment assumptions. However, it is somewhat not surprising since the parameter space indexed the likelihood function space in a rather regular way.

Although our main result (Theorem 5) in principle holds uniformly for all data size n as long as the assumptions are satisfied, for small n the setup might not yield useful results due to the constants in the assumptions. Shall the constants be improved will extend the practicality of our results and we would like to leave this as future work.

APPENDIX A: PROOFS FOR SECTION 3.2

Based on Assumption 1, we shall state an intermediate result that is useful for proving the main theorem. We will provide a full proof in the supplementary material with minor corrections to their original result.

LEMMA 10 (Theorem 1 ([Wong and Shen, 1995](#))). *Let $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n$ be i.i.d. random variables following density $k_p(\cdot; \theta^*)$. Let $d(\mathbf{x}, \theta)$ denote the likelihood ratio between θ and θ^* at \mathbf{x} , $d(\mathbf{x}, \theta) = k_p(\mathbf{x}; \theta) / k_p(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*)$. Then $\forall \phi_n > 0$, $\Omega_n \subset \Omega$, if*

$$(13) \quad \int_{\phi_n^2/2^{10}}^{\phi_n} H_{\square}^{1/2}(u, \mathcal{K}_p(\Omega_n)) \, \mathrm{d}u \leq c\sqrt{n}\phi_n^2,$$

then

$$\mathbb{P}_{\theta^*}^* \left(\sup_{\theta \in A_n^c \cap \Omega_n} \prod_{i=1}^n d(\mathbf{x}_i, \theta) \geq \exp(-c_1 n \phi_n^2) \right) \leq (1 + L(\phi_n))(1 + N(\phi_n)) \exp(-c_2 n \phi_n^2)$$

where $\mathbb{P}_{\theta^*}^*$ denotes the outer measure with respect to $\mathbf{X}_i \sim k_p(\cdot; \theta^*)$, $A_n := \{\theta \in \Omega : h(\theta^*, \theta) \leq \phi_n\}$, and c, c_1, c_2 are positive constants independent of n and ϕ_n .

If in addition that

$$\exp(-c_2 n \phi_n^2) \leq \frac{1}{2},$$

then

$$\mathbb{P}_{\theta^*}^* \left(\sup_{\theta \in A_n^c \cap \Omega_n} \prod_{i=1}^n d(\mathbf{x}_i, \theta) \geq \exp(-c_1 n \phi_n^2) \right) \leq 4 \exp(-c_2 n \phi_n^2).$$

PROOF. See Appendix B.1 in the supplementary material. In our choice of constants, we have $(1 + L(\phi_n))(1 + N(\phi_n)) \leq 20 \max\{-\log_2(\phi_n), (\log_2(\phi_n))^2\}$. \square

DEFINITION 9 (*u-cover under $\|\cdot\|_\infty$*). A *u-cover* of the set Ω is a set $\{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that for any $\theta \in \Omega$, there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $\|\theta - \theta_i\|_\infty \leq u$.

DEFINITION 10 (*Covering Number*). The *u-covering number* of Ω under $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ is

$$N(u, \Omega) := \min\{N \in \mathbb{N} : \exists \text{ a } u\text{-cover under } \|\cdot\|_\infty \text{ of size } N\}.$$

DEFINITION 11 (*u-separated points under $\|\cdot\|_\infty$*). A set of points $\{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k\} \subset \Omega$ is *u-separated* if $\|\theta_i - \theta_j\|_\infty > u, \forall i \neq j$.

DEFINITION 12 (*Packing Number*). The *u-packing number* of Ω under $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ is

$$D(u, \Omega) := \min\{N \in \mathbb{N} : \exists \text{ a set of } N \text{ points that is } u\text{-separate under } \|\cdot\|_\infty\}.$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 3. The first half of this proof is based on several results commonly seen in Empirical processes literature (with some variation), see, for instance, Section 2.8 of [Van der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#).

To deduce (6), we first prove the following bound on N_{\square} ,

$$(14) \quad N_{\square}(uM_u^{(n)}, \mathcal{F}(\Omega_n)) \leq C_d \text{Vol}(\tilde{\Omega}_n) u^{-d}$$

where $\tilde{\Omega}_n := \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d : \exists \phi \in \Omega_n, \|\theta - \phi\|_\infty \leq u/2\}$.

Let $\{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k\}$ be an *u-cover* of Ω_n with respect to $\|\cdot\|_\infty$. Consider the following functions, for $i = 1, \dots, k$,

$$\tilde{L}_i(\mathbf{x}) := \max \left\{ \sqrt{f_{\theta_i}(\mathbf{x})} - uM_{\theta_i, u}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}), 0 \right\}, \quad \tilde{U}_i := \sqrt{f_{\theta_i}(\mathbf{x})} + uM_{\theta_i, u}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}),$$

and $L_i(\mathbf{x}) := \tilde{L}_i(\mathbf{x})^2, U_i := \tilde{U}_i(\mathbf{x})^2$. Since

$$|\sqrt{f_\theta(\mathbf{x})} - \sqrt{f_{\theta_i}(\mathbf{x})}| \leq M_{\theta_i, u}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}) \|\theta - \theta_i\|_\infty,$$

we have, for any θ such that $\|\theta - \theta_i\|_\infty \leq u$,

$$\tilde{L}_i(\mathbf{x}) \leq \sqrt{f_\theta(\mathbf{x})} \leq \tilde{U}_i(\mathbf{x}).$$

Moreover, recall that $M_u^{(n)} := \sup_{\vartheta \in \Omega_n} \|M_{\vartheta, u}^{(n)}\|_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} h^2(L_i, U_i) &= \frac{1}{2} \iint \left(\sqrt{L_i} - \sqrt{U_i} \right)^2 \mathbf{d}\mathbf{x} \\ &\leq \iint u^2 M_{\theta_i, u}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})^2 \mathbf{d}\mathbf{x} \leq u^2 (M_u^{(n)})^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the set of $[L_i, U_i]$ form a $uM_u^{(n)}$ -bracketing for $\mathcal{F}(\Omega_n)$ under the Hellinger distance $h(\cdot, \cdot)$, hence,

$$N_{[]} (uM_u^{(n)}, \mathcal{F}(\Omega_n)) \leq N(u, \Omega_n).$$

To complete (14), we recall that $N(u, \Omega_n) \leq D(u, \Omega_n)$ always holds. If $\{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k\}$, $k := D(u, \Omega_n)$, is a set of u -separated points, then the balls of radius $u/2$ centred at $\{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k\}$ are disjoint and contained in $\tilde{\Omega}_n := \{\theta : \exists \phi \in \Omega_n, \|\theta - \phi\| \leq u/2\}$. Thus $D(u, \Omega_n)$ is upper bounded by the ratio between the volume of the space $\tilde{\Omega}_n$ and the k -collection ball of radius $u/2$. Let v_d denote the volume of a unit ball and define $C_d := 2^d/v_d$ then

$$N_{[]} (uM_u^{(n)}, \mathcal{F}(\Omega_n)) \leq N(u, \Omega) \leq D(u, \Omega) \leq C_d \text{Vol}(\tilde{\Omega}_n) u^{-d}.$$

Recall that R_n is the radius of Ω_n and ϕ_0 is the upper bound for the sequence ϕ_n , then $\text{Vol}(\tilde{\Omega}_n) = O((R_n + \phi_0)^d)$, and

$$(15) \quad H_{[]} (u, \mathcal{F}(\Omega_n)) \leq \log C^* + d \log(R_n + \phi_0) + d \log M_u^{(n)} - d \log u.$$

Since $H_{[]} (u, \mathcal{F}(\Omega_n))$ decreases with u but $cn u^2$ increases with u , it suffices to check

$$H_{[]} (\phi_n^2/2^{10}, \mathcal{F}(\Omega_n)) \leq c^2 n \phi_n^2$$

to prove that

$$H_{[]} (u, \mathcal{F}(\Omega_n)) \leq c^2 n \phi_n^2, \quad \forall u \in (\phi_n^2/2^{10}, \phi_n).$$

Due to the restriction that $n\phi_n^2 \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\phi_n^{-1} = o(n^{1/2})$, thus every term in the right-hand side of (15) are of order $\log n$, apart from $\log M_u^{(n)}$. By assumption, there exists $q \in (0, 1)$ such that $\forall u \in (0, \phi_0)$,

$$\frac{\log \log M_u^{(n)}}{n} < q,$$

then $\log M_u^{(n)} = o(n^q)$, and we can choose $\phi_n > n^{-\frac{1-q}{2}}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} H_{[]} (\phi_n^2/2^{10}, \mathcal{F}(\Omega_n)) &\leq \log C^* + d \log(R_n + \phi_0) + d \log M_{\phi_n^2/2^{10}}^{(n)} - 4d \log \phi_n \\ &< c^2 n^q \leq c^2 n \phi_n^2. \end{aligned}$$

for n sufficiently large which implies (6). \square

LEMMA 11. *Let $p \in [0, 1)$, $A \subset \Omega$, $\mathcal{F}(A) := \{f(\cdot; \theta) : \theta \in A\}$ and $\mathcal{K}_p(A) := \{k_p(\cdot; \theta) : \theta \in A\}$. Suppose that $1 > p \geq p'$, then*

$$(16) \quad H_{[]} \left(u \sqrt{\frac{1-p}{1-p'}}, \mathcal{K}_p(A) \right) \leq H_{[]} (u, \mathcal{K}_{p'}(A)).$$

Setting $p' = 0$, and we have

$$(17) \quad H_{[]} (u, \mathcal{K}_p(A)) \leq H_{[]} \left(u \sqrt{1-p}, \mathcal{K}_p(A) \right) \leq H_{[]} (u, \mathcal{F}(A)).$$

PROOF. It is enough to check that a u -bracket for $\mathcal{K}_{p'}(A)$ is also a $u\sqrt{\frac{1-p}{1-p'}}$ -bracketing for $\mathcal{K}_p(A)$, where $1 > p \geq p'$. Suppose that $\{[L'_i, U'_i], i = 1, \dots, N\}$ is a u -bracketing for $\mathcal{K}_{p'}(A)$. Pick an arbitrary $\theta \in A$, there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ such that the u -bracket $[L'_i, U'_i]$ forms an envelope for $k_{p'}(\mathbf{x}; \theta)$, i.e.,

$$L'_i(\mathbf{x}) \leq (1-p')f(\mathbf{x}; \theta) + p'g(\mathbf{x}) \leq U'_i(\mathbf{x}),$$

for which $h(L'_i, U'_i) \leq u$. Note that by direct multiplication and addition to the preceding inequality, we can find L_i and U_i such that

$$L_i(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{1-p}{1-p'}L'_i(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{p-p'}{1-p'}g(\mathbf{x}) \leq k_p(\mathbf{x}; \theta) \leq \frac{1-p}{1-p'}U'_i(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{p-p'}{1-p'}g(\mathbf{x}) =: U_i(\mathbf{x}).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} h^2(L_i, U_i) &= \frac{1}{2} \int \left(\sqrt{L_i(\mathbf{x})} - \sqrt{U_i(\mathbf{x})} \right)^2 d\mathbf{x} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int \left(\sqrt{\frac{1-p}{1-p'}L'_i(\mathbf{x})} - \sqrt{\frac{1-p}{1-p'}U'_i(\mathbf{x})} \right)^2 d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \frac{1-p}{1-p'} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \int \left(\sqrt{L'_i(\mathbf{x})} - \sqrt{U'_i(\mathbf{x})} \right)^2 d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \frac{1-p}{1-p'} u^2 \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is by noting that for any $a \geq b \geq 0, c \geq 0$, $\sqrt{a+c} - \sqrt{b+c} \leq \sqrt{a} - \sqrt{b}$. Thus $\{[L_i, U_i], i = 1, \dots, N\}$ is an $u\sqrt{\frac{1-p}{1-p'}}$ -bracketing for $\mathcal{K}_p(A)$.

For the second statement, note that $H_{\square}(u, \mathcal{F})$ is decreasing as u increases and $\mathcal{F}(A) = \mathcal{K}_0(A)$. \square

LEMMA 12 (Shen and Wasserman (2001)). *Let t_n be a sequence of positive numbers and $\alpha \in (0, 1]$. For any fixed $p \in [0, 1)$,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(m_n(\Omega, \mathbf{X}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{P}_{\pi_0}(S_{p,\alpha}(t_n)) e^{-2nt_n} \right) \leq 2e^{-n\alpha t_n}.$$

PROOF. See Lemma 2 of Shen and Wasserman (2001), the proof holds for any fixed $p \in [0, 1)$. \square

LEMMA 13. *For $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, $S_{p,\alpha}(t) = \{\rho_{p,\alpha}(\theta^*, \theta) \leq t\}$, then $S_{0,\alpha}(t) \subseteq S_{p,\alpha}(t)$.*

PROOF. Recall that

$$\rho_{p,\alpha}(\theta^*, \theta) := \frac{1}{\alpha} \int \left[\left(\frac{k_p(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*)}{k_p(\mathbf{x}; \theta)} \right)^\alpha - 1 \right] k_p(\mathbf{x}; \theta) d\mathbf{x}.$$

Note that the above expression is a special case of the f -divergence with convex function

$$f(u) = \frac{1}{\alpha} (u^{-\alpha} - 1),$$

and to emphasize this fact, we will rewrite the expression as

$$\rho_\alpha(k_p(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*) \| k_p(\mathbf{x}; \theta)) := \frac{1}{\alpha} \int \left[\left(\frac{k_p(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*)}{k_p(\mathbf{x}; \theta)} \right)^\alpha - 1 \right] k_p(\mathbf{x}; \theta) d\mathbf{x}.$$

By joint convexity of f -divergence,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{p,\alpha}(\theta^*, \theta) &= \rho_\alpha \left((1-p)f(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*) + pg(\mathbf{x}) \middle\| (1-p)f(\mathbf{x}; \theta) + pg(\mathbf{x}) \right) \\ &\leq (1-p)\rho_\alpha \left(f(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*) \middle\| f(\mathbf{x}; \theta) \right) + p\rho_\alpha \left(g(\mathbf{x}) \middle\| g(\mathbf{x}) \right) \\ &= (1-p)\rho_\alpha \left(f(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*) \middle\| f(\mathbf{x}; \theta) \right) \\ &\leq \rho_{0,\alpha}(\theta^*, \theta)\end{aligned}$$

Thus $S_{0,\alpha}(t) \subseteq S_{p,\alpha}(t)$. \square

LEMMA 14. *Under Assumption 2, we have for any $p \in [0, 1]$*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(m_n(\Omega, \mathbf{X}) \leq \frac{c_3}{2} e^{-4nt_n} \right) \leq 2e^{-n\alpha t_n}.$$

PROOF. By Lemma 13 and Assumption 2,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\pi_0} \left(S_{p,\alpha}(t_n) \right) \geq \mathbb{P}_{\pi_0} \left(S_{0,\alpha}(t_n) \right) \geq c_3 e^{-2nt_n}.$$

Then apply Lemma 12 with the above inequality to give the bound. \square

LEMMA 15. *Recall that $A_n := \{\theta \in \Omega : h(\theta, \theta^*) \leq \phi_n\}$. Under Assumptions 1 and 3, we have for any $p \in (0, 1)$, $n > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(m_n(A_n^c, \mathbf{X}) \geq 2e^{-c_1 n \phi_n^2} \right) \leq C(n, \phi_n) e^{-c_2 n \phi_n^2} + c_4 e^{-nc_1 \phi_n^2}.$$

where

$$C(n, \phi_n) = \begin{cases} 4, & \text{for } nc_2 \phi_n^2 \geq \log 2. \\ 20 \max\{-\log_2(\phi_n), (\log_2(\phi_n))^2\}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

PROOF. Note that $m_n(A_n^c, \mathbf{X}) = m_n(A_n^c \cap \Omega_n, \mathbf{X}) + m_n(A_n^c \cap \Omega_n^c, \mathbf{X})$. From Lemma 10 and 11, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\theta^*}^* \left(\sup_{\theta \in A_n^c \cap \Omega_n} \prod_{i=1}^n d(\mathbf{x}_i, \theta) \geq e^{-c_1 n \phi_n^2} \right) \leq C(n, \phi_n) e^{-c_2 n \phi_n^2}.$$

Also, by

$$m_n(A_n^c \cap \Omega_n, \mathbf{X}) \leq \sup_{\theta \in A_n^c \cap \Omega_n} \prod_{i=1}^n d(\mathbf{x}_i, \theta),$$

we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(m_n(A_n^c \cap \Omega_n, \mathbf{X}) \geq e^{-c_1 n \phi_n^2} \right) \leq C(n, \phi_n) e^{-c_2 n \phi_n^2}.$$

By Markov's inequality, Fubini's Theorem and Assumption 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P} \left(m_n(A_n^c \cap \Omega_n^c, \mathbf{X}) \geq e^{-c_1 n \phi_n^2} \right) &\leq e^{c_1 n \phi_n^2} \iint_{A_n^c \cap \Omega_n^c} \prod_{i=1}^n d(\mathbf{x}_i, \theta) \pi_0(\theta) d\theta d\mathbb{P}_{\theta^*}(\mathbf{X}) \\ &= e^{c_1 n \phi_n^2} \int_{A_n^c \cap \Omega_n^c} \int \prod_{i=1}^n d(\mathbf{x}_i, \theta) d\mathbb{P}_{\theta^*}(\mathbf{X}) \pi_0(\theta) d\theta \\ &= e^{c_1 n \phi_n^2} \mathbb{P}_{\pi_0}(A_n^c \cap \Omega_n^c) \leq c_4 e^{-c_1 n \phi_n^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\mathbb{P}\left(m_n(A_n^c, \mathbf{X}) \geq 2e^{-c_1 n \phi_n^2}\right) \leq C(n, \phi_n)e^{-c_2 n \phi_n^2} + c_4 e^{-nc_1 \phi_n^2}.$$

□

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4. If Assumption 5 holds, then the same assumption holds for the set of density functions $k_p(\mathbf{x}; \theta)$ for any $p \in (0, 1)$. So it suffices to prove the proposition holds for f given Assumption 5, then the same argument can be used to prove this proposition holds for any k_p , $p \in (0, 1)$.

Recall that by Assumption 5, $\forall \psi > 0$,

$$\inf_{\|\theta - \theta^*\|_2 > \psi} h(f(\cdot; \theta), f(\cdot; \theta^*)) > 0.$$

Denote

$$A(\psi) := \inf_{\|\theta - \theta^*\|_2 > \psi} h(f(\cdot; \theta), f(\cdot; \theta^*))$$

and $M = \sup_{\psi} A(\psi) > 0$. Note that $A(\psi)$ is non-decreasing and right-continuous since the infimum is taken over the set excluding $\|\theta - \theta^*\| = \psi$. Then $\forall \phi < M$, $\exists \psi$ such that $\psi = \min\{\psi' : \phi \leq A(\psi')\}$. Therefore, $\forall \phi_n \rightarrow 0$, $\exists \psi_n$ non-increasing such that $\phi_n \leq A(\psi_n)$ and we may choose $\psi_n := \min\{\psi : \phi_n \leq A(\psi)\}$. Suppose for contradiction that $\psi_n \not\rightarrow 0$, then $\forall m > 0$, $\exists N > 0$ such that $\forall n > N$,

$$\inf\{\psi : \phi_n \leq A(\psi)\} > m.$$

Thus, $\forall \psi' \leq m$, we have $A(\psi') < \phi_n$, but since $\phi_n \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\inf_{\|\theta - \theta^*\|_2 > m} h(f(\cdot; \theta), f(\cdot; \theta^*)) = 0,$$

which contradicts the assumption. Hence $\psi_n \rightarrow 0$ and the proof is completed. □

LEMMA 16. *Under Assumptions 4 and 5, there exists a sequence $T_n < \infty$ such that for any sequence $p_n \rightarrow 0$*

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \sup_{\theta \in A_n} |\log d(\mathbf{x}; \theta)| \leq \frac{1 - p_n}{p_n} T_n \psi_n.$$

where $d(\mathbf{x}; \theta) = k_{p_n}(\mathbf{x}; \theta) / k_{p_n}(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*)$. Thus in (4), $\eta_n = \exp(2(1 - p_n)T_n \psi_n / p_n)$.

PROOF. Since $f(\mathbf{x}; \theta)$ has all directional derivatives. Let $\phi(\alpha) = \theta + \alpha(\theta^* - \theta)$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, note that

$$\log k_{p_n}(\mathbf{x}; \theta) - \log k_{p_n}(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*) \leq \sup_{\alpha \in (0, 1)} \|\tilde{\nabla}_{\theta} \log k_{p_n}(\mathbf{x}; \phi(\alpha))\|_2 \|\theta - \theta^*\|_2$$

where $\tilde{\nabla}$ operator is defined in Definition 7. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\nabla}_{\theta} \log k_{p_n}(\mathbf{x}; \theta)\|_2 &= \left\| \frac{(1 - p_n) \tilde{\nabla}_{\theta} f(\mathbf{x}; \theta)}{(1 - p_n) f(\mathbf{x}; \theta) + p_n g(\mathbf{x})} \right\|_2 \\ &\leq \frac{1 - p_n}{p_n} \left\| \frac{\tilde{\nabla}_{\theta} f(\mathbf{x}; \theta)}{g(\mathbf{x})} \right\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Since by Assumption 4, $\|\tilde{\nabla}_\theta f(\mathbf{x}; \theta)/g(\mathbf{x})\|_2$ is bounded as $\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \rightarrow \infty$ in all directions, we have $\tilde{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}; \theta)/g(\mathbf{x})$ is bounded on $\mathbb{R}^d \times A$ for any compact set $A \subset \Omega$. Thus there exists a sequence $T_n < \infty$ such that,

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \sup_{\theta \in A_n} \left\| \frac{\tilde{\nabla}_\theta f(\mathbf{x}; \theta)}{g(\mathbf{x})} \right\|_2 \leq T_n$$

Thus

$$|\log d(\mathbf{x}; \theta)| \leq \frac{1-p_n}{p_n} T_n \psi_n$$

and

$$\eta_n = \sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \sup_{\theta \in A_n} \frac{d(\mathbf{x}; \theta)}{d(\mathbf{z}; \theta)} \leq e^{2(1-p_n)T_n \psi_n / p_n}.$$

□

PROOF OF THEOREM 5. By Lemma 14 and 15, and recall $t_n = c_1 \phi_n^2 / 8$ defined in Assumption 2,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{m_n(A_n^c, \mathbf{X})}{m_n(\Omega, \mathbf{X})} \geq \frac{4}{c_3} e^{-\frac{1}{2} c_1 n \phi_n^2} \right) &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{m_n(A_n^c, \mathbf{X})}{m_n(\Omega, \mathbf{X})} \geq \frac{4}{c_3} e^{-c_1 n \phi_n^2 + 4nt_n} \right) \\ &\leq 2e^{-nc_1 \alpha \phi_n^2 / 8} + C(n, \phi_n) e^{-c_2 n \phi_n^2} + c_4 e^{-c_1 n \phi_n^2} \end{aligned}$$

Recall from (4) that for any measurable $S \subset \Omega$

$$\mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}(S|\mathbf{X}) \leq \eta_n \left[\eta_n + \frac{m_n(A_n^c, \mathbf{Z})}{m_n(\Omega, \mathbf{X})} \right] \mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}(S|\mathbf{Z}) + \frac{m_n(A_n^c, \mathbf{X})}{m_n(\Omega, \mathbf{X})},$$

and from Lemma 16 that

$$\eta_n \leq e^{2(1-p_n)T_n \psi_n / p_n}.$$

Let $\delta_n = \frac{4}{c_3} e^{-\frac{1}{2} c_1 n \phi_n^2}$, $\varepsilon_n = 2(1-p_n)T_n \psi_n / p_n$ and

$$\epsilon_n = \varepsilon_n + \log(\delta_n + \exp(\varepsilon)).$$

Note that since \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Z} has the same cardinality, we apply Lemma 15 again to $m_n(A_n^c, \mathbf{Z})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}(S|\mathbf{X}) \leq e^{\epsilon_n} \mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}(S|\mathbf{Z}) + \delta_n \right) &\geq 1 - \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{m_n(A_n^c, \mathbf{X})}{m_n(\Omega, \mathbf{X})} \geq \frac{4}{c_3} e^{-\frac{1}{2} c_1 n \phi_n^2} \right) \\ &\geq 1 - 2e^{-nc_1 \alpha \phi_n^2 / 8} - C(n, \phi_n) e^{-c_2 n \phi_n^2} - c_4 e^{-c_1 n \phi_n^2} \\ &\geq 1 - C'(n, \phi_n) e^{-nc_5 \phi_n^2} \end{aligned}$$

where $c_5 = \min\{c_1 \alpha / 8, c_2\}$ and $C'(n, \phi_n) = 2 + C(n, \phi_n) + c_4$. Note by definition of $C(n, \phi_n)$ from Lemma 15, $C'(n, \phi_n) = 20(\log_2 n)^2$. On the other hand, if n is large enough, then $C'(n, \phi_n) = 6 + c_4$ is independent of n , and the proof is complete. □

PROOF OF THEOREM 6.

$$\begin{aligned} I_{p_n}(\theta^*) &= \mathbb{E}_{k_{p_n}} \left[(\nabla_\theta \log k_{p_n}(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*)) (\nabla_\theta \log k_{p_n}(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*))^\top \right] \\ &= (1-p_n)^2 \int \frac{[\nabla_\theta f(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*)] [\nabla_\theta f(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*)]^\top}{k_{p_n}(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*) f(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*)} f(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*) d\mathbf{x}. \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$H(\mathbf{x}) := [\nabla_{\theta} f(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*)] [\nabla_{\theta} f(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*)]^{\top}$$

and let $[H(\mathbf{x})]_{i,j}$ denote its (i, j) -th entry. Consider the sets $A_{i,j} := \{\mathbf{x} : [H(\mathbf{x})]_{i,j} \geq 0\}$, we have

$$0 < \left| \frac{[H(\mathbf{x})]_{i,j}}{k_{p_n}(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*) f(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*)} \right| \leq \frac{[H(\mathbf{x})]_{i,j}}{(1-p_n) f^2(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*)}, \text{ for } \mathbf{x} \in A_{i,j}$$

and

$$0 < \left| \frac{[H(\mathbf{x})]_{i,j}}{k_{p_n}(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*) f(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*)} \right| \leq -\frac{[H(\mathbf{x})]_{i,j}}{(1-p_n) f^2(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*)}, \text{ for } \mathbf{x} \in A_{i,j}^c.$$

Note that $A_{i,j}$ and $A_{i,j}^c$ are both measurable with

$$[I(\theta^*)]_{i,j} = \int_{A_{i,j} \cup A_{i,j}^c} \frac{[H(\mathbf{x})]_{i,j}}{f^2(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*)} \mathbf{d}x.$$

Thus, apply dominated convergence theorem on both $A_{i,j}$ and $A_{i,j}^c$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [I_{p_n}(\theta^*)]_{i,j} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (1-p_n)^2 \left(\int_{A_{i,j}} \frac{[H(\mathbf{x})]_{i,j}}{k_{p_n}(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*) f(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*)} f(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*) \mathbf{d}x \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{A_{i,j}^c} \frac{[H(\mathbf{x})]_{i,j}}{k_{p_n}(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*) f(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*)} f(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*) \mathbf{d}x \right) \\ &= \int_{A_{i,j} \cup A_{i,j}^c} \frac{[H(\mathbf{x})]_{i,j}}{f^2(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*)} f(\mathbf{x}; \theta^*) \mathbf{d}x \\ &= [I(\theta^*)]_{i,j}. \end{aligned}$$

□

APPENDIX B: ADDITIONAL PROOFS FOR SECTION 3

B.1. Proofs Related to Lemma 10. Recall that $d(x; \theta) := k_p(x; \theta)/k_p(x; \theta^*)$ where θ^* is the true paramter. For $\tau > 0$ to be chosen later, let

$$\tilde{Z}_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) := \max\{-\tau, \log d(\mathbf{x}, \theta)\}$$

and

$$\nu_n(f) := n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\mathbf{X}_i) - \mathbb{E} \mathbf{X}_i.$$

THEOREM 17 (One-sided Bernstein's Inequality). *Let X_1, \dots, X_n be i.i.d. random variables, then the following holds:*

- If $|X_i - \mathbb{E} X_i| \leq T, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $\text{Var}(X_i) \leq v$, then

$$(18) \quad \mathbb{P}^* \left(n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mathbb{E} X_i) > M \right) \leq \exp \left(-\frac{M^2}{2(v + MT/3n^{1/2})} \right);$$

- If $\mathbb{E}|X_i|^j \leq j! b^{j-2} v/2$ for any $j \geq 2$, then

$$(19) \quad \mathbb{P}^* \left(n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mathbb{E} X_i) > M \right) \leq \exp \left(-\frac{M^2}{2(v + bM/n^{1/2})} \right)$$

where \mathbb{P}^* denotes the outer measure with respect to the measure of \mathbf{X}_i s.

PROOF. See [Bennett \(1962\)](#). □

LEMMA 18 (Lemma 7 ([Wong and Shen, 1995](#))). *Let $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n$ be i.i.d. random variables following density $k_p(\cdot; \theta^*)$. For any $t > 0$, $0 < k < 1$, $M > 0$, let*

$$\Psi(M, t^2, n) := \frac{M^2}{4(8c_0 t^2 + M/n^{1/2})}$$

where

$$c_0 := \frac{\exp(\tau/2) - 1 - \tau/2}{(1 - \exp(-\tau/2))^2}, \quad M := kn^{1/2}t^2,$$

and $\tau > 0$ is a constant to be chosen. Let

$$s(t) := \frac{kM}{16\sqrt{2n} \exp(\tau/2)} = \frac{k^2 t^2}{2^{4.5} \exp(\tau/2)}.$$

If

$$(20) \quad \int_{s(t)/4}^t H_{\square}^{1/2}(u, \mathcal{K}_p(\Omega_n)) du \leq \frac{\sqrt{3}k^{3/2}M}{2^{10} \exp(\tau/2)} = \frac{\sqrt{3}k^{5/2}n^{1/2}t^2}{2^{10} \exp(\tau/2)}$$

then

$$\mathbb{P}^* \left(\sup_{\substack{h(\theta, \theta^*) \leq t \\ \theta \in \Omega_n}} \nu(\tilde{Z}_\theta) \geq M \right) \leq (1 + N(t)) \exp(-(1 - k)\Psi(M, t^2, n))$$

where

$$N(t) := \min\{x \in \mathbb{N} : 2^x s(t) > t\}$$

PROOF. The proof follows from a similar chaining argument as in [Shen and Wong \(1994\)](#). In this proof only, we will also consider the bracketing entropy computed in L_2 -norm denoted by $H_{\square}(u, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_2)$. To make further distinction, we will denote the Hellinger bracketing entropy by $H_{\square}(u, \mathcal{F}, h)$.

Recall that for $\theta \in \Omega_n$, we define $\tilde{Z}_\theta(\mathbf{x}) := \max\{-\tau, \log d(\mathbf{x}, \theta)\}$. Let $\mathcal{G} := \mathcal{K}_p(\Omega_n)$ denote the space of density functions of interest, and let $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}} := \{\tilde{Z}_\theta : \theta \in \Omega_n\}$ be the space of lower-truncated log-likelihood ratios. Note that the two spaces are linked, in the sense that the Hellinger bracketing entropy of \mathcal{G} is related to the L_2 -bracketing entropy of $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ by

$$H_{\square}(2\sqrt{2} \exp(\tau/2)\epsilon, \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}, \|\cdot\|_2) \leq H_{\square}(\epsilon, \mathcal{G}, h),$$

see Lemma 3 of [Shen and Wong \(1994\)](#) or noting that

$$(21) \quad \|\tilde{Z}_{\theta_1} - \tilde{Z}_{\theta_2}\|_2^2 \leq 4 \exp(\tau) \|k_p^{1/2}(\cdot; \theta_1) - k_p^{1/2}(\cdot; \theta_2)\|_2^2 = 8 \exp(\tau) h^2(\theta_1, \theta_2).$$

Provided that (which we will prove directly later)

$$(22) \quad H_{\square}(t, \mathcal{G}, h) \leq \frac{k}{4} \Psi(M, t^2, n),$$

we can construct a sequence of bracketings on the space \mathcal{G} and $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$. Let $t \geq \delta_0 > \delta_1 > \dots > \delta_N > 0$, and $\mathcal{F}_0, \dots, \mathcal{F}_N$ denote the set of Hellinger bracketings of \mathcal{G} with bracket size $\delta_0, \dots, \delta_N$ respectively. We may choose δ_j such that

$$\delta_0 := \max\{\delta \leq t : H_{\square}(\delta, \mathcal{G}, h) \leq \frac{k}{4} \Psi(M, t^2, n)\}$$

and for $j = 0, \dots, N - 1$,

$$\delta_{j+1} := \max\{s(t), \sup\{\delta \leq \delta_j/2 : H_{\square}(\delta, \mathcal{G}, h) \geq 4H_{\square}(\delta_j, \mathcal{G}, h)\}\},$$

with $N := \min\{j : \delta_j \leq s\}$. Furthermore, let

$$\tilde{\delta}_0 := \left(\sup\{\tilde{\delta} \leq 2\sqrt{2}\delta_0 \exp(\tau/2) : H_{\square}(\tilde{\delta}, \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}, \|\cdot\|_2) = H_{\square}(\delta_0, \mathcal{G}, h)\} \right)^{-}$$

and $\tilde{\delta}_j := 2\sqrt{2}\delta_j \exp(\tau/2)$, then

$$H_{\square}(\tilde{\delta}_j, \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}, \|\cdot\|_2) \leq H_{\square}(\delta_j, \mathcal{G}, h)$$

Note that the entropy function H_{\square} is decreasing and right-continuous. We want to evaluate $H_{\square}(\tilde{\delta}_0, \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}, \|\cdot\|_2)$ at the left limit $(\tilde{\delta}_0)^-$ if a jump happens at $\tilde{\delta}_0$, so that $H_{\square}(\tilde{\delta}_0, \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}, \|\cdot\|_2) = H_{\square}(\tilde{\delta}_0, \mathcal{G}, h)$.

The space $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ can be obtained by transforming elements of \mathcal{G} through mapping $f \mapsto \max\{-\tau, \log(f/k_p(\cdot; \theta^*))\}$, we may assume the choice of bracketing in one space induces another for the case $j = 0$.

For each $\theta \in \Omega_n$, there exists a bracket $[\tilde{Z}_{j,\theta}^L, \tilde{Z}_{j,\theta}^U]$ for every j such that $\tilde{Z}_{j,\theta}^L \leq \tilde{Z}_{\theta} \leq \tilde{Z}_{j,\theta}^U$ and $\|\tilde{Z}_{j,\theta}^L - \tilde{Z}_{j,\theta}^U\|_2 \leq \tilde{\delta}_j$. Define a sequence of shrinking envelop functions for each θ by

$$u_j(\theta) := \min_{i \leq j} \tilde{Z}_{i,\theta}^U, \quad l_j(\theta) := \max_{i \leq j} \tilde{Z}_{i,\theta}^L.$$

Then $l_j(\theta) \leq \tilde{Z}_{\theta} \leq u_j(\theta)$, and $\|u_j - l_j\|_2 \leq \tilde{\delta}_k$. For notional simplicity, we hide the dependency of $u_j(\theta), l_j(\theta)$ on θ and write them directly as u_j and l_j as functions of \mathbf{X}_i . Finally, define sequences $a_1 > \dots > a_N, \eta_0, \dots, \eta_N$ by

$$(23) \quad a_j := \frac{\sqrt{n}\tilde{\delta}_{j-1}^2}{\eta_{j-1}}, \quad \eta_j := \frac{4\tilde{\delta}_j}{\sqrt{3k}} \left(\sum_{i \leq j+1} H_{\square}(\tilde{\delta}_i, \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}, \|\cdot\|_2) \right)^{1/2}, \quad \eta_N := 0.$$

We may decompose \tilde{Z}_{θ} on a partition on the sample space B_0, \dots, B_N

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Z}_{\theta} &= u_0 + \sum_{j=0}^N (u_j I_{B_j} - u_0 I_{B_j}) + \left(\tilde{Z}_{\theta} - \sum_{j=0}^N u_j I_{B_j} \right) \\ &= u_0 + \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^j (u_i - u_{i-1}) I_{B_j} + \sum_{j=0}^N (\tilde{Z}_{\theta} - u_j) I_{B_j} \\ (24) \quad &= u_0 + \sum_{j=1}^N (u_j - u_{j-1}) I_{\cup_{i \geq j} B_i} + \sum_{j=0}^N (\tilde{Z}_{\theta} - u_j) I_{B_j} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} B_0 &:= \{(u_0 - l_0) \geq a_1\}, \\ B_j &:= \{(u_j - l_j) \geq a_{j+1}, (u_i - l_i) < a_{i+1}, i = 1, \dots, j-1\}, \\ B_N &:= \left(\cup_{j=0}^{N-1} B_j \right)^c. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=0}^N \eta_j &= \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} 4\tilde{\delta}_j(3k)^{-1/2} \left(\sum_{i \leq j+1} H_{\square}(\tilde{\delta}_i, \tilde{Z}, \|\cdot\|_2) \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq \frac{4\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{3k}} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \tilde{\delta}_j (H(\delta_{j+1}, \mathcal{G}, h))^{1/2} \\
&\leq \frac{2^7}{\sqrt{3k}} \exp(\tau/2) \int_{s/4}^t H_{\square}^{1/2}(u, \mathcal{G}, h) du \\
&\leq \frac{kM}{8}
\end{aligned}$$

where the second-last step is by Lemma 3.1 of [Alexander \(1984\)](#) and the last step is by (20). Thus, through the decomposition of (24), we note

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}^* \left(\sup_{\substack{h(\theta, \theta^*) \leq t \\ \theta \in \Omega_n}} \nu(\tilde{Z}_\theta) \geq M \right) &\leq \mathbb{P}^* \left(\sup_{h(\theta, \theta^*) \leq t} \nu_n(u_0) > (1 - \frac{3k}{8})M \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \mathbb{P}^* \left(\sup_{h(\theta, \theta^*) \leq t} \nu_n(u_{j+1} - u_j) I_{i \geq j+1} B_i > \eta_j \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \mathbb{P}^* \left(\sup_{h(\theta, \theta^*) \leq t} \nu_n(\tilde{Z}_\theta - u_j) I_{B_j} > \eta_j \right) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{P}^* \left(\sup_{h(\theta, \theta^*) \leq t} \nu_n(\tilde{Z}_\theta - u_N) I_{B_N} > \frac{kM}{8} + \eta_N \right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}_1 + \mathbb{P}_2 + \mathbb{P}_3 + \mathbb{P}_4
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_1 &:= |\mathcal{F}_0| \sup_{h(\theta, \theta^*) \leq t} \mathbb{P}(\nu_n(u_0) > (1 - \frac{3k}{8})M) \\
\mathbb{P}_2 &:= \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \prod_{l_1=0}^j |\mathcal{F}_{l_1}| \prod_{l_2=0}^{j+1} |\mathcal{F}_{l_2}| \sup_{h(\theta, \theta^*) \leq t} \mathbb{P}(\nu_n(u_{j+1} - u_j) I_{\cup_{i \geq j+1} B_i} > \eta_j) \\
\mathbb{P}_3 &:= \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \mathbb{P}^* \left(\sup_{h(\theta, \theta^*) \leq t} \nu_n(\tilde{Z}_\theta - u_j) I_{B_j} > \eta_j \right) \\
\mathbb{P}_4 &:= \mathbb{P}^* \left(\sup_{h(\theta, \theta^*) \leq t} \nu_n(\tilde{Z}_\theta - u_N) I_{B_N} > \frac{kM}{8} + \eta_N \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Before bounding \mathbb{P}_i , we can quickly check (22). Note that Hellinger distance has an upper bound of 1, so we may assume $t \leq 1$. Then by definition of $s(t)$, $s(t) \leq t/2\sqrt{2} \leq t/2$, so by $H_{\square}(u, \mathcal{G}, h)$ decreasing,

$$H_{\square}(t, \mathcal{G}, h) \leq \left(\frac{1}{t - t/8} \int_{s/4}^t H_{\square}^{1/2}(u, \mathcal{G}, h) du \right)^2 \leq \frac{3k^5 nt^2}{2^{14} \cdot 49 \exp(\tau)} \leq \frac{k^3 nt^2}{2^7 c_0 + 16k} = \frac{k}{4} \Psi(M, t^2, n).$$

for any $2^7 c_0 + 16k \leq 2^{14} \cdot 49/3$, which can be easily satisfied by a wide range of choices, including the value choice we will use in the proof for main results.

- To bound \mathbb{P}_1 , we use (19). By Lemma 5 (Wong and Shen, 1995), we have

$$\mathbb{E}|u_0|^j \leq j! 2^j c_0 \|w^{1/2}(\cdot) - k_p^{1/2}(\cdot, \theta^*)\|_2^2, \quad \forall j \geq 2,$$

where $w(x) := \exp(u_0(x))k_p(x, \theta^*)$. Note that

$$\|w^{1/2}(\cdot) - k_p^{1/2}(\cdot, \theta^*)\|_2^2 \leq \|w^{1/2} - k_p^{1/2}(\cdot, \theta)\|_2^2 + h^2(\theta, \theta^*) \leq 2t^2.$$

Thus, recall Bernstein's inequality (19) and letting $b := 2$, $v := 8c_0 \|w^{1/2}(\cdot) - k_p^{1/2}(\cdot, \theta^*)\|_2^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_1 &\leq |\mathcal{F}_0| \mathbb{P}(\nu_n(u_0) > (1 - \frac{3k}{8})M) \\ &\leq \exp(H_{\square}(\delta_0, \mathcal{G}, h) - \Psi((1 - \frac{3k}{8})M, t^2, n)) \\ &\leq \exp(\frac{k}{4}\Psi(M, t^2, n) - (1 - \frac{3k}{8})^2\Psi(M, t^2, n)) \\ &\leq \exp(-(1 - k)\Psi(M, t^2, n)), \end{aligned}$$

where we use (22) to bound $H_{\square}(\delta_0, \mathcal{G}, h)$ at the second step.

$$\mathbb{P}_2 := \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \prod_{l_1=0}^j |\mathcal{F}_{l_1}| \prod_{l_2=0}^{j+1} |\mathcal{F}_{l_2}| \sup_{h(\theta, \theta^*) \leq t} \mathbb{P}(\nu_n(u_{j+1} - u_j) I_{\cup_{i \geq j+1} B_i} > \eta_j)$$

By the definition of B_j , on the set $\cup_{i \geq j+1} B_j$, we have $-a_{j+1} < l_j - u_j < u_{j+1} - u_j < 0$, thus

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}((u_{j+1} - u_j) I_{\cup_{i \geq j+1} B_i}) &\leq \mathbb{E}[(u_{j+1} - u_j)^2 I_{\cup_{i \geq j+1} B_i}] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[(u_{j+1} - u_j)^2] \leq \tilde{\delta}_j^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by the one-sided Bernstein's inequality for bounded random variables (18),

$$\mathbb{P}(\nu_n(u_{j+1} - u_j) I_{\cup_{i \geq j+1} B_i} > \eta_j) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\eta_j^2}{2(\tilde{\delta}_j^2 + a_{j+1}\eta_j/3n^{1/2})}\right).$$

For $j = 0$, note that

$$(u_1 - u_0) I_{\cup_{j \geq 1} B_j} - \mathbb{E}[(u_1 - u_0) I_{\cup_{j \geq 1} B_j}] \leq |\mathbb{E}[(u_1 - u_0) I_{\cup_{j \geq 1} B_j}]| \leq \tilde{\delta}_0,$$

hence by (18) again,

$$\mathbb{P}(\nu_n(u_1 - u_0) I_{\cup_{i \geq 1} B_i} > \eta_0) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\eta_0^2}{2(\tilde{\delta}_0^2 + \tilde{\delta}_0\eta_0/3n^{1/2})}\right).$$

Recall from (23), for $j = 0, \dots, N-1$,

$$\eta_j := 4\tilde{\delta}_j k^{-1/2} \left(\sum_{i \leq j+1} H_{\square}(\tilde{\delta}_i, \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}, \|\cdot\|_2) \right)^{1/2}$$

Now, by $\eta_0 \leq \sum \eta_j \leq kM/8 = k^2 n^{1/2} t^2/8$, we have

$$\frac{\eta_0^2}{2(\tilde{\delta}_0^2 + \tilde{\delta}_0\eta_0/3n^{1/2})} \geq \frac{3\eta_0^2}{2(3\tilde{\delta}_0^2 + \tilde{\delta}_0 k^2 t^2/8)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq \frac{16}{6 + k^2 t^2 / 4\tilde{\delta}_0} \cdot \frac{\sum_{j \leq 1} H(\tilde{\delta}_j, \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}, \|\cdot\|_2)}{k} \\
&\geq 2 \sum_{j \leq 1} \frac{H(\tilde{\delta}_j, \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}, \|\cdot\|_2)}{k},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step is due to $\tilde{\delta}_0 \geq 2\sqrt{2} \exp(\tau/2)s = k^2 t^2 / 8$. For $j \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\eta_j^2}{2(\tilde{\delta}_j^2 + a_{j+1}\eta_j/3n^{1/2})} &\geq \frac{3\eta_j^2}{6\tilde{\delta}_j^2 + 2a_{j+1}\eta_j/\sqrt{n}} \\
&\geq \frac{3\eta_j^2}{8\tilde{\delta}_j^2} \geq 2 \sum_{i \leq j+1} \frac{H(\tilde{\delta}_i, \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}, \|\cdot\|_2)}{k}
\end{aligned}$$

which follows directly from the definition of a_{j+1} and η_j . Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_2 &:= \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \prod_{l_1=0}^j |\mathcal{F}_{l_1}| \prod_{l_2=0}^{j+1} |\mathcal{F}_{l_2}| \sup_{h(\theta, \theta^*) \leq t} \mathbb{P}(\nu_n(u_{j+1} - u_j) I_{\cup_{i \geq j+1} B_i} > \eta_j) \\
&\leq \exp \left(2 \sum_{j \leq 1} H(\tilde{\delta}_j, \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}, \|\cdot\|_2) - \frac{\eta_0^2}{2(\tilde{\delta}_0^2 + \tilde{\delta}_0 \eta_0 / 3n^{1/2})} \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \exp \left(2 \sum_{i \leq j+1} H(\tilde{\delta}_i, \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}, \|\cdot\|_2) - \frac{\eta_j^2}{2(\tilde{\delta}_j^2 + a_{j+1}\eta_j/3n^{1/2})} \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \exp \left(-2 \frac{1-k}{k} \sum_{i \leq j+1} H(\tilde{\delta}_i, \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}, \|\cdot\|_2) \right) \\
(25) \quad &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \exp(-2(1-k)4^j \Psi(M, t^2, n)) \leq N(t) \exp(-(1-k)\Psi(M, t^2, n)).
\end{aligned}$$

- For \mathbb{P}_3 and \mathbb{P}_4 , we try to show that they are both 0.

$$\mathbb{P}_3 := \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \mathbb{P}^* \left(\sup_{h(\theta, \theta^*) \leq t} \nu_n(\tilde{Z}_\theta - u_j) I_{B_j} > \eta_j \right)$$

Note that by the definition of ν_n

$$\nu_n(\tilde{Z}_\theta - u_j) I_{B_j} \leq n^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^n (\tilde{Z}_\theta(\mathbf{X}_i) - u_j(\mathbf{X}_i)) I_{B_j} + n^{1/2} \sup_{h(\theta, \theta^*) \leq t} \mathbb{E}[(u_j - l_j) I_{B_j}].$$

On B_j , $u_j - l_j \geq a_{j+1}$, thus $\mathbb{P}(B_j) \leq \mathbb{E}[(u_j - l_j)^2] / a_{j+1}^2 \leq \tilde{\delta}_j^2 / a_{j+1}^2$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{h(\theta, \theta^*) \leq t} \mathbb{E}[(u_j - l_j) I_{B_j}] &= \sup_{h(\theta, \theta^*) \leq t} (\mathbb{E}[(u_j - l_j)^2] \mathbb{E}[I_{B_j}])^{1/2} \\
&\leq \frac{\tilde{\delta}_j^2}{a_{j+1}} \leq \frac{\eta_j}{\sqrt{n}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $\nu_n(\tilde{Z}_\theta - u_j) I_{B_j} \leq \eta_j$, and $\mathbb{P}_3 = 0$.

• Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_n(\tilde{Z}_\theta - u_N)I_{B_N} &\leq n^{1/2} \sup_{h(\theta, \theta^*) \leq t} \mathbb{E}[(u_N - l_N)I_{B_N}] \\ &\leq n^{1/2} \tilde{\delta}_N = 2\sqrt{2}n^{1/2} \exp(\tau/2)s(t) = \frac{kM}{8}, \end{aligned}$$

therefore, $\mathbb{P}_4 = 0$.

Sum through \mathbb{P}_1 to \mathbb{P}_4 completes the proof. \square

COROLLARY 19. *With the same definitions as in Lemma 18, if in addition that*

$$(26) \quad \exp(-(1-k)\Psi(M, t^2, n)) \leq \frac{1}{2},$$

then

$$\mathbb{P}^* \left(\sup_{\substack{h(\theta, \theta^*) \leq t \\ \theta \in \Omega_n}} \nu(\tilde{Z}_\theta) \geq M \right) \leq 2 \exp(-(1-k)\Psi(M, t^2, n)).$$

PROOF. With the same proof as in Lemma 18, but (25) can be instead bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \exp(-2(1-k)4^j\Psi(M, t^2, n)) \\ &\leq \exp(-(1-k)\Psi(M, t^2, n))^2 \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \exp(-(1-k)4^j\Psi(M, t^2, n)) \right) \\ &\leq \exp(-(1-k)\Psi(M, t^2, n)) \times \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{16}{15} \\ &\leq \exp(-(1-k)\Psi(M, t^2, n)). \end{aligned}$$

due to the additional assumption (26). \square

PROOF FOR LEMMA 10. By the choice of τ and k we use later, we see that $t^2/2^{10} < s(t)$, thus (13) implies (20). If (13) holds for some $t > 0$, then it holds for any $\tilde{t} \geq t$. Thus if (13) holds, we may apply the result of Lemma 18 on any $\tilde{t} \geq t$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}^* \left(\sup_{\substack{h(\theta, \theta^*) \leq \tilde{t} \\ \theta \in \Omega_n}} \nu(\tilde{Z}_\theta) \geq M(\tilde{t}) \right) &\leq (1 + N(\tilde{t})) \exp(-(1-k)\Psi(M, \tilde{t}^2, n)) \\ &\leq (1 + N(t)) \exp\left(-\frac{(1-k)k^2}{2^5 c_0 + 4k} n \tilde{t}^2\right) \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 4 (Wong and Shen, 1995),

$$\mathbb{E} \tilde{Z}_\theta \leq -2(1-\varrho)h^2(\theta, \theta^*)$$

where $\varrho := 2\exp(-\tau/2)/(1 - \exp(-\tau/2))^2$. Let $A_{\tilde{t}} := \{\theta \in \Omega_n : \tilde{t} \leq h(\theta, \theta^*) \leq \sqrt{2}\tilde{t}\}$, we have for any $\tilde{t} > t$,

$$\left\{ \sup_{A_{\tilde{t}}} \sum_{i=1}^n \log d(\mathbf{x}_i, \theta) \geq -2(1-\varrho - k/2)n\tilde{t}^2 \right\} \subseteq \left\{ \sup_{A_{\tilde{t}}} \nu_n(\tilde{Z}_\theta) \geq k\sqrt{n}\tilde{t}^2 \right\}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
(27) \quad & \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{A_{\tilde{t}}} \prod_{i=1}^n d(\mathbf{x}_i, \theta) \geq \exp(-2(1 - \varrho - k/2)n\tilde{t}^2) \right) \\
& \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{A_{\tilde{t}}} \nu_n(\tilde{Z}_\theta) \geq k\sqrt{n\tilde{t}^2} \right) \\
& \leq (1 + N(t)) \exp \left(-\frac{(1-k)k^2}{2^5 c_0 + 4k} n\tilde{t}^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Let $L(t) := \min\{x \in \mathbb{N} : 2^{x+1}t^2 > 1\}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}^* \left(\sup_{A^c \cap \Omega_n} \prod_{i=1}^n d(\mathbf{x}_i, \theta) \geq \exp(-2(1 - \varrho - k/2)nt^2) \right) \\
& = \sum_{j=0}^L \mathbb{P}^* \left(\sup_{2^j t^2 \leq h(\theta, \theta^*) < 2^{j+1} t^2} \prod_{i=1}^n d(\mathbf{x}_i, \theta) \geq \exp(-2(1 - \varrho - k/2)nt^2) \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{j=0}^L \mathbb{P}^* \left(\sup_{2^j t^2 \leq h(\theta, \theta^*) < 2^{j+1} t^2} \prod_{i=1}^n d(\mathbf{x}_i, \theta) \geq \exp(-2(1 - \varrho - k/2)n2^{j+1}t^2) \right) \\
(28) \quad & \leq \sum_{j=0}^L (1 + N(t)) \exp \left(-\frac{(1-k)k^2}{2^5 c_0 + 4k} n2^j t^2 \right) \\
& \leq (L(t) + 1)(N(t) + 1) \exp \left(-\frac{(1-k)k^2}{2^5 c_0 + 4k} nt^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

To derive the choice of constants, we follow the suggestion of [Wong and Shen \(1995\)](#) and choose $k = 2/3$, $\exp(\tau/2) = 5$, then $c_0 = 25(4 - \tau/2)/16 \approx 3.74$, $c_1 = 1/12$, $c_2 = 4/27(32c_0 + 8/3) \approx 1.212 \times 10^{-3}$ and $c = 2^{-7.5} * 3^{-1.5}/5 \approx 2^{-13}$. Also, for uniform bound, $N \leq \lceil 8 + \log_2(t^{-1}) \rceil$ and $L = \lceil 2 \log_2(t^{-1}) - 1 \rceil$, in which case $(1 + L)(1 + N) \leq 20 \max\{-\log_2(t), (\log_2(t))^2\}$.

For the last result, note that $\exp(-c_2 nt^2) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ implies (22), thus by Corollary 19, we can replace $(1 + N)$ by 2 in (28) and get

$$\sum_{j=0}^L 2 \exp(-c_2 n 2^j t^2) \leq 4 \exp(-c_2 nt^2).$$

Finally, relabel t as ϕ_n to get the expression in the statement of the Lemma. \square

B.2. Proof for Section 3.3.

PROOF FOR PROPOSITION 7. Recall that $f_\psi(\mathbf{x}; \psi)$ and $\pi_0(\psi)$ are the likelihood and the prior with respect to the parameter space Ω_ψ , and,

$$f_\theta(\mathbf{x}; \theta) = f_\psi(\mathbf{x}; t^{-1}(\theta)) \cdot |J_{t^{-1}}(\theta)|, \quad \tilde{\pi}_0(\theta) = \pi_0(t^{-1}(\psi)) \cdot |J_{t^{-1}}(\theta)|$$

where $J_{t^{-1}}(\theta)$ is the Jacobian of the inverse function. Note that f_θ and $\tilde{\pi}_0$ are derived from f_ψ , π_0 through change of measure under mapping t .

For any quintuples $(S, \epsilon, \delta, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z})$, where $S \in \Sigma_\theta$, $\epsilon, \delta \geq 0$, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} are neighbouring datasets, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\pi_\theta}(S|\mathbf{X}) &\leq e^\epsilon \mathbb{P}_{\pi_\theta}(S|\mathbf{Z}) + \delta \\ \implies \mathbb{P}_{\pi_\psi}(t^{-1}(S)|\mathbf{X}) &\leq e^\epsilon \mathbb{P}_{\pi_\psi}(t^{-1}(S)|\mathbf{Z}) + \delta \end{aligned}$$

and vice versa, since the integral is preserved through the change of measure. Therefore, a pair of (ϵ, δ) holds for a model parameterized in Ω_ψ if and only if it holds for that model parameterized in Ω_θ through the diffeomorphism t . \square

PROOF FOR PROPOSITION 8. We will prove that if t is measurable,

$$(\epsilon, \delta) \text{ holds for } \Omega_\psi \iff (\epsilon, \delta) \text{ holds for } \Omega_\theta$$

under the same construction of the quotient map t , pushforward measure $t_*(\mathbb{P}_{\pi_0})$ and its density $\tilde{\pi}_0$ with respect to $d\theta$ as in the previous proof. Since the pushforward measure and the design of the quotient ensure any integrals are preserved, the \implies direction is trivial.

For the \impliedby direction, assume that (ϵ, δ) holds for Ω_θ , hence for any $S \in \Sigma_\theta$, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}

$$\mathbb{P}_{\pi_\theta}(S|\mathbf{X}) \leq e^\epsilon \mathbb{P}_{\pi_\theta}(S|\mathbf{Z}) + \delta,$$

equivalently, for any $S \in \Sigma_\theta$, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} ,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\pi_\psi}(t^{-1}(S)|\mathbf{X}) \leq e^\epsilon \mathbb{P}_{\pi_\psi}(t^{-1}(S)|\mathbf{Z}) + \delta.$$

Note the following identities

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\pi_\psi}(A|\mathbf{X}) &= \int_A \pi_\psi(\psi|\mathbf{X}) d\psi \\ &= \int_A \frac{\pi_\psi(\psi|\mathbf{X})}{\pi_\psi(\psi|\mathbf{Z})} \pi_\psi(\psi|\mathbf{Z}) d\psi \\ &= \int_A \left(\frac{\pi_\psi(\psi|\mathbf{X})}{\pi_\psi(\psi|\mathbf{Z})} - e^\epsilon \right) \pi_\psi(\psi|\mathbf{Z}) d\psi + e^\epsilon \mathbb{P}_{\pi_\psi}(A|\mathbf{Z}). \end{aligned}$$

For (ϵ, δ) to hold for Ω_ψ , we need

$$\int_A \left(\frac{\pi_\psi(\psi|\mathbf{X})}{\pi_\psi(\psi|\mathbf{Z})} - e^\epsilon \right) \pi_\psi(\psi|\mathbf{Z}) d\psi \leq \delta.$$

Suppose there exists $B \subset A$ such that

$$\frac{\pi_\psi(\psi|\mathbf{X})}{\pi_\psi(\psi|\mathbf{Z})} < e^\epsilon, \quad \forall \psi \in B$$

then

$$\mathbb{P}_{\pi_\psi}(A \setminus B|\mathbf{X}) - e^\epsilon \mathbb{P}_{\pi_\psi}(A \setminus B|\mathbf{Z}) \geq \mathbb{P}_{\pi_\psi}(A|\mathbf{X}) - e^\epsilon \mathbb{P}_{\pi_\psi}(A|\mathbf{Z}).$$

Without loss of generality, it is now sufficient to check that (ϵ, δ) hold for all sets $A \in \Sigma_\psi$ such that

$$(29) \quad \frac{\pi_\psi(\psi|\mathbf{X})}{\pi_\psi(\psi|\mathbf{Z})} \geq e^\epsilon, \quad \forall \psi \in A,$$

since any other sets require a smaller δ for the differential privacy inequality to hold.

For any set $A \in \Sigma_\psi$ such that (29) holds. Let $S = t(A)$, note that any $\psi \in t^{-1}(S) \supseteq S$ also satisfies (29),

$$\mathbb{P}_{\pi_\psi}(t^{-1}(S)|\mathbf{X}) = \int_{t^{-1}(S)} \underbrace{\left(\frac{\pi_\psi(\psi|\mathbf{X})}{\pi_\psi(\psi|\mathbf{Z})} - e^\epsilon \right)}_{\geq 0} \pi_\psi(\psi|\mathbf{Z}) d\psi + e^\epsilon \mathbb{P}_{\pi_\psi}(t^{-1}(S)|\mathbf{Z}).$$

Since $A \subset t^{-1}(S)$,

$$\delta \geq \mathbb{P}_{\pi_\psi}(t^{-1}(S)|\mathbf{X}) - e^\epsilon \mathbb{P}_{\pi_\psi}(t^{-1}(S)|\mathbf{Z}) \geq \mathbb{P}_{\pi_\psi}(A|\mathbf{X}) - e^\epsilon \mathbb{P}_{\pi_\psi}(A|\mathbf{Z}).$$

and hence \Leftarrow direction is proved. \square

APPENDIX C: FOR STRICTLY ADJACENT DATASET

DEFINITION 13. Two datasets \mathcal{D} and \mathbf{X} are *strictly adjacent* if and only if $\exists \mathbf{x} \notin \mathcal{D}$ such that $\mathbf{X} = \mathcal{D} \cup \{\mathbf{x}\}$.

REMARK 14. Another definition for *neighbouring datasets* exists in the literature where one is a subset of another, and the larger dataset contains exactly one more entry.

Using the notation above, $\mathbf{X} = \mathcal{D} \cup \{\mathbf{x}\}$, so \mathcal{D} and \mathbf{X} is a pair of neighbouring datasets. In this case, (4) becomes either

$$\mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}(S|\mathbf{X}) \leq \sqrt{\eta_n} \left[\sqrt{\eta_n} + \frac{m_{n-1}(A_n^c, \mathcal{D})}{m_n(\Omega, \mathbf{X})} \right] \mathbb{P}_{\pi_{n-1}}(S|\mathcal{D}) + \frac{m_{n-1}(A_n^c, \mathcal{D})}{m_n(\Omega, \mathbf{X})}.$$

or

$$\mathbb{P}_{\pi_{n-1}}(S|\mathcal{D}) \leq \sqrt{\eta_n} \left[\sqrt{\eta_n} + \frac{m_n(A_n^c, \mathbf{X})}{m_{n-1}(\Omega, \mathcal{D})} \right] \mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}(S|\mathbf{X}) + \frac{m_n(A_n^c, \mathbf{X})}{m_{n-1}(\Omega, \mathcal{D})}.$$

COROLLARY 20. Under Assumptions 1-5 for any pair of strictly adjacent datasets \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Z} , regardless of which one is a larger set. With slight abuse of notation, let π_* denote the appropriate posterior distribution π_n or π_{n-1} depending on the size of the given dataset, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{P}_{\pi_*}(S|\mathbf{X}) \leq \exp(\epsilon_{n-1}) \mathbb{P}_{\pi_*}(S|\mathbf{Z}) + \delta_{n-1}\right) \geq 1 - Ce^{-nc_5 \phi_{n-1}^2},$$

where ϵ_n is defined with respect to $\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_n$ and δ_n , while $\epsilon_n, \delta_n, t_n, c_5$ are defined as in Theorem 5.

PROOF. Let $n = \max\{|\mathbf{X}|, |\mathbf{Z}|\}$. Recall that the term $m_n(\Omega, \cdot)$ only depend on the sequence t_n and $m_n(A_n^c, \cdot)$ only depend on ϕ_n . Denote the lagged sequences $Lt_n = t_{n-1}$, $L\phi_n = \phi_{n-1}$, and the scaled sequences $\tilde{t}_n = \frac{n}{n-1}t_n$, $\tilde{\phi}_n = \sqrt{\frac{n}{n-1}}\phi_n$. For instance, if we want to evaluate $\frac{m_{n-1}(A_n^c, \mathcal{D})}{m_n(\Omega, \mathbf{X})}$, we can evaluate the $m_n(\Omega, \mathbf{X})$ on Lt_n but $m_{n-1}(A_n^c, \mathcal{D})$ on $\tilde{\phi}_{n-1}$, then the indices in the obtained result are synchronized to $n-1$.

Since only one sequence needs to be lagged, without loss of generality, we can always synchronize $n-1$ and thus the rest follows. \square

APPENDIX D: TECHNICAL PROOFS FOR SECTION 4

LEMMA 21. For $r \geq 0$ and any integrable function f ,

$$\int_{\sum_{i=1}^d x_i^2 \leq r^2} f\left(\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^d x_i^2}\right) dx_1 \cdots dx_d = r^d \frac{\pi^{d/2}}{\Gamma(d/2)} \int_0^1 u^{d/2-1} f(r\sqrt{u}) du$$

PROOF. Consider the ordinary variable transformation from Euclidean coordinate to spherical coordinate with

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &= u \cos \theta_1 \\ x_2 &= u \sin \theta_1 \cos \theta_2 \\ &\vdots \\ x_{d-1} &= u \sin \theta_1 \cdots \sin \theta_{d-2} \cos \theta_{d-1} \\ x_d &= u \sin \theta_1 \cdots \sin \theta_{d-2} \sin \theta_{d-1} \end{aligned}$$

where $u \in [0, \infty)$, $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d-2} \in [0, \pi)$ and $\theta_{d-1} \in [0, 2\pi)$. The determinant of the Jacobian matrix is given by, (see for instance, [Blumenson \(1960\)](#))

$$|J_d| = u^{d-1} \prod_{k=1}^{d-2} \sin^k \theta_{d-1-k}.$$

Perform change of variable from Euclidean to spherical followed by $t = (u/r)^2$, the integral becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\sum_{i=1}^d x_i^2 \leq r^2} f\left(\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^d x_i^2}\right) dx_1 \cdots dx_d \\ &= \int_0^r u^{d-1} f(u) du \cdot \prod_{k=1}^{d-2} \int_0^\pi \sin^k \theta_{d-1-k} d\theta_{d-1-k} \cdot \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta_{d-1} \\ (30) \quad &= r^d \int_0^1 t^{d/2-1} f(r\sqrt{t}) dt \cdot \pi \prod_{k=1}^{d-2} \int_0^\pi \sin^k \theta d\theta. \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$I_k := \int_0^\pi \sin^k \theta d\theta,$$

then

$$P_d := \prod_{k=1}^{d-2} \int_0^\pi \sin^k \theta d\theta = \prod_{k=1}^{d-2} I_k.$$

Using integration by parts, we deduce the recursive relation that

$$I_k = \frac{k-1}{k} I_{k-2}.$$

Since $I_0 = \pi$, $I_1 = 2$, we deduce

$$I_{2k} = \frac{\pi}{2^k k!} \prod_{j=1}^k (2j-1), \quad I_{2k-1} = 2^k (k-1)! \left(\prod_{j=1}^k (2j-1) \right)^{-1}.$$

Note that

$$I_{2k} \cdot I_{2k-1} = \frac{1}{k} \pi, \quad I_{2k+1} \cdot I_{2k} = \frac{2}{2k+1} \pi.$$

Recall that $\Gamma(1/2) = \pi^{1/2}$, straight computation gives

$$\pi P_2 = \pi, \quad \pi P_3 = 2\pi = \frac{\pi^{3/2}}{\frac{1}{2}\Gamma(1/2)}, \quad \text{and } \pi P_4 = \pi^2 = \frac{\pi^{4/2}}{\Gamma(4/2)}.$$

Hence, we want to prove the following by induction

$$(31) \quad \pi P_n = \frac{\pi^{n/2}}{\Gamma(n/2)}.$$

Assume the preceding identity is true up to $2k$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \pi P_{2k+1} &= I_{2k-1} \cdot I_{2k-2} \cdot \pi P_{2k-1} \\ &= \frac{2}{2k-1} \pi \cdot \frac{\pi^{\frac{2k-1}{2}}}{\Gamma(\frac{2k-1}{2})} = \frac{\pi^{\frac{2k+1}{2}}}{\Gamma(\frac{2k+1}{2})} \\ \pi P_{2k+2} &= I_{2k} \cdot I_{2k-1} \cdot \pi P_{2k} \\ &= \frac{1}{k} \pi \cdot \frac{\pi^k}{\Gamma(k)} = \frac{\pi^{k+1}}{\Gamma(k+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Substitute (31) back into (30) completes the proof. \square

PROOF OF LEMMA 9. Recall that $\bar{S}(r) := \{\theta \in \Omega : \|\theta^* - \theta\|_2 \leq r\}$ and the prior distribution on θ is $\pi_0(\theta) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$. Let θ_i denote the i th dimension of vector θ , then

$$\mathbb{P}_{\pi_0}(\bar{S}(r)) = \int_{\|\theta^* - \theta\|_2 \leq r} (2\pi)^{-d/2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^d \theta_i^2\right) d\theta_1 \cdots d\theta_d.$$

1. For the case when r is small, let $w_i = \theta_i - \theta_i^*$, then $w_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta_i^*, 1)$. Thus $\sum_i w_i^2$ is a non-central χ^2 distribution with d degrees of freedom and non-centrality parameter $\lambda = \|\theta^*\|_2^2$ with probability density function given by (Patnaik, 1949)

$$f_{\chi^2}(x; d, \lambda) = \frac{1}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{x+\lambda}{2}\right) \left(\frac{x}{\lambda}\right)^{(d-2)/4} I_{d/2-1}(\sqrt{\lambda x})$$

where $I_\nu(x)$ is the modified Bessel function of the first kind,

$$I_\nu(x) = (x/2)^\nu \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{(x^2/4)^j}{j! \Gamma(\nu + j + 1)}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\pi_0}(\bar{S}(r)) &= \mathbb{P}(\chi^2(d, \lambda) \leq r^2) \\ &= \int_0^{r^2} \frac{1}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{x+\lambda}{2}\right) \left(\frac{x}{\lambda}\right)^{(d-2)/4} I_{d/2-1}(\sqrt{\lambda x}) dx \\ &\geq \int_0^{r^2} \frac{1}{2\Gamma(d/2)} \exp\left(-\frac{x+\lambda}{2}\right) \left(\frac{x}{\lambda}\right)^{(d-2)/4} \left(\frac{\sqrt{\lambda x}}{2}\right)^{d/2-1} dx \\ &= \frac{2^{-d/2} \exp(-\lambda/2)}{\Gamma(d/2)} \int_0^{r^2} x^{d/2-1} \exp(-x/2) dx \\ &= \frac{\exp(-\lambda/2)}{\Gamma(d/2)} \gamma(d/2, r^2/2). \end{aligned}$$

2. For the case where $r > \|\theta^*\|_2$, note that

$$\{\theta \in \Omega : \|\theta\|_2^2 \leq (r - \|\theta^*\|_2)^2\} \subseteq \{\theta \in \Omega : \|\theta^* - \theta\|_2^2 \leq r^2\}.$$

Denote $R = r - \|\theta^*\|_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\pi_0}(\bar{S}(r)) &\geq \mathbb{P}(\chi^2(d, 0) \leq R^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(d/2)} \gamma(d/2, R^2/2). \end{aligned}$$

□

D.1. Linear Regression Case.

LEMMA 22. *Let*

$$f_{\theta, \sigma}(\mathbf{x}, y) := (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-1/2} \exp(-(y - \theta^\top \mathbf{x})^2 / (2\sigma^2)) f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}),$$

where $(\theta, \sigma) \in \Omega_n := \{(\theta, \sigma) \in \Omega : \|\theta - \theta^*\|_2 \leq R_n, |\sigma^* - \sigma| \leq R_n, \sigma > 1/R_n\}$, for some $R_n > 0$. If $(\theta, \sigma), (\vartheta, \varsigma) \in \Omega_n$ with $\|(\theta, \sigma) - (\vartheta, \varsigma)\|_\infty \leq r$ then

$$\left| \sqrt{f_{\theta, \sigma}(\mathbf{x}, y)} - \sqrt{f_{\vartheta, \varsigma}(\mathbf{x}, y)} \right| \leq M_{\vartheta, \varsigma, r}(\mathbf{x}, y) \|(\theta, \sigma) - (\vartheta, \varsigma)\|_\infty$$

where function $M_{\vartheta, \varsigma, r}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\vartheta, \varsigma, r}(\mathbf{x}, y) &:= \frac{R_n^2}{2} \left(d \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 + R_n(|y| + M_n \|\mathbf{x}\|_2) \right) (|y| + M_n \|\mathbf{x}\|_2) \\ &\quad \left(\frac{R_n^2}{2\pi} \right)^{1/4} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{4R_n^2} \min_{\varphi \in B_r(\vartheta)} (y - \varphi^\top \mathbf{x})^2 \right) \sqrt{f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})} \end{aligned}$$

where $M_n = \|\theta^*\|_2 + R_n$.

PROOF. Recall that

$$f_{\theta, \sigma}(\mathbf{x}, y) = (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-1/2} \exp(-(y - \theta^\top \mathbf{x})^2 / (2\sigma^2)) f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}),$$

Then, by Cauchy's Mean Value Theorem and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, there exists some $a \in (0, 1)$, $\varphi = \vartheta + a(\theta - \vartheta)$, $\zeta = \sigma_2 + a(\sigma_2 - \sigma_1)$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \sqrt{f_{\theta, \sigma}(\mathbf{x}, y)} - \sqrt{f_{\vartheta, \varsigma}(\mathbf{x}, y)} \right| \\ &= \frac{y - \varphi^\top \mathbf{x}}{2\zeta^2} f_{\varphi, \zeta}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{x}, y) (\theta - \vartheta)^\top \mathbf{x} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{(y - \varphi^\top \mathbf{x})^2}{\zeta^3} - \zeta^{-1} \right) f_{\varphi, \zeta}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{x}, y) (\sigma_1 - \sigma_2) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\zeta^2} \left((y - \varphi^\top \mathbf{x}) d \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 + \frac{(y - \varphi^\top \mathbf{x})^2}{\zeta} \right) f_{\varphi, \zeta}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{x}, y) \|(\theta, \sigma) - (\vartheta, \varsigma)\|_\infty \\ &\leq \frac{R_n^2}{2} \left(d \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 + R_n(|y| + M_n \|\mathbf{x}\|_2) \right) (|y| + M_n \|\mathbf{x}\|_2) \\ &\quad \times \left(\frac{R_n^2}{2\pi} \right)^{1/4} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{4R_n^2} \min_{\varphi \in B_r(\vartheta)} (y - \varphi^\top \mathbf{x})^2 \right) \sqrt{f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})} \|(\theta, \sigma), (\vartheta, \varsigma)\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

The last step is by noting the following upper bounds since $(\varphi, \zeta) \in \Omega_n$

$$|y - \varphi^\top \mathbf{x}| \leq |y| + M_n \|\mathbf{x}\|_2, \quad \frac{1}{\zeta} \leq R_n.$$

□

LEMMA 23. For $0 < R, \alpha \leq M, k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,

$$\int_0^\infty y^k \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi R^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{(y - \alpha x)^2}{2R^2}\right) dx \leq \beta_k(x) M^k$$

where

$$\beta_k(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \left[2 \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor} \binom{k}{2j} 2^{j-1} x^{k-2j} \Gamma\left(\frac{2j+1}{2}\right) + \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor} \binom{k}{2j-1} 2^{\frac{2j-1}{2}-1} x^{k-2j+1} \Gamma(j) \right].$$

PROOF. First, we compute the following integral

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty \frac{w^k}{\sqrt{2\pi R^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{w^2}{2R^2}\right) dw \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_0^\infty (2R^2 t)^{\frac{k-1}{2}} R \exp(-t) dt \quad [t = \frac{w^2}{2R^2}] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} 2^{k/2-1} R^k \Gamma\left(\frac{k+1}{2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty y^k \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi R^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{(y - \alpha x)^2}{2R^2}\right) dy \\ &= \int_{-\alpha x}^\infty (w + \alpha x)^k \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi R^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{w^2}{2R^2}\right) dx \quad [w = y - \alpha x] \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor} \binom{k}{2j} \int_0^\infty w^{2j} (\alpha x)^{k-2j} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi R^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{w^2}{2R^2}\right) dw \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor} \binom{k}{2j-1} \int_0^\infty w^{2j-1} (\alpha x)^{k-2j+1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi R^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{w^2}{2R^2}\right) dw \\ &\leq \beta_k(x) M^k \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\beta_k(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \left[2 \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor} \binom{k}{2j} 2^{j-1} x^{k-2j} \Gamma\left(\frac{2j+1}{2}\right) + \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor} \binom{k}{2j-1} 2^{\frac{2j-1}{2}-1} x^{k-2j+1} \Gamma(j) \right].$$

□

LEMMA 24. Define

$$\Omega_n := \{(\theta, \sigma) \in \Omega : \|\theta - \theta^*\|_2 \leq R_n, |\sigma^* - \sigma| \leq R_n, \sigma > 1/R_n\},$$

for some $R_n > 0$. For $(\vartheta, \varsigma) \in \Omega_n$, let

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\vartheta, \varsigma, r}(\mathbf{x}, y) &:= \frac{R_n^2}{2} \left(d\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 + R_n(|y| + M_n\|\mathbf{x}\|_2) \right) (|y| + M_n\|\mathbf{x}\|_2) \\ &\quad \left(\frac{R_n^2}{2\pi} \right)^{1/4} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{4R_n^2} \min_{\varphi \in B_r(\vartheta)} (y - \varphi^\top \mathbf{x})^2\right) \sqrt{f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})}, \end{aligned}$$

where $M_n = \|\theta^*\|_2 + R_n$. If $f_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$ has a finite fifth-order moment, then

$$\|M_{\vartheta, \varsigma, r}(\mathbf{x}, y)\|_2^2 \leq M_n^{12}.$$

PROOF.

$$\|M_{\vartheta, \varsigma, r}(\mathbf{x}, y)\|_2^2 = \iint M_{\vartheta, \varsigma, r}^2(\mathbf{x}, y) \mathrm{d}y \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}.$$

We first consider the inner integral with respect to y , where one needs to compute explicitly the value of

$$\min_{\varphi \in B_r(\vartheta)} (y - \varphi^\top \mathbf{x})$$

Note that $\varphi = \vartheta + \tilde{r}\mathbf{v}$ for some $\tilde{r} < r$ and unit vector \mathbf{v} . When \mathbf{x} is fixed, $\varphi^\top \mathbf{x}$ takes value within the interval (u_-, u_+) where

$$u_- := \vartheta^\top \mathbf{x} - r\|\mathbf{x}\|_2, \quad u_+ := \vartheta^\top \mathbf{x} + r\|\mathbf{x}\|_2,$$

with the infimum and the supremum attained at $\vartheta - \frac{r\mathbf{x}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2}$ and $\vartheta + \frac{r\mathbf{x}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2}$ respectively. Then

$$\min_{\varphi \in B_r(\vartheta)} (y - \varphi^\top \mathbf{x})^2 = \begin{cases} (y - \vartheta^\top \mathbf{x} + r\|\mathbf{x}\|_2)^2, & y < u_-; \\ 0, & u_- \leq y \leq u_+; \\ (y - \vartheta^\top \mathbf{x} - r\|\mathbf{x}\|_2)^2, & y > u_+; \end{cases}$$

Write

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} M_{\vartheta, \varsigma, r}^2(\mathbf{x}, y) \mathrm{d}y = \int_{-\infty}^{u_-} + \int_{u_-}^{u_+} + \int_{u_+}^{\infty} M_{\vartheta, \varsigma, r}^2(\mathbf{x}, y) \mathrm{d}y.$$

Firstly, by noting that $|u_+| \leq M_n \|\mathbf{x}\|_2$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{u_-}^{u_+} M_{\vartheta, \varsigma, r}^2(\mathbf{x}, y) \mathrm{d}y \\ &= \frac{g(\mathbf{x}) R_n^5}{\sqrt{2\pi} 4} \int_{u_-}^{u_+} \left(d\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 + R_n(|y| + M_n \|\mathbf{x}\|_2) \right)^2 (|y| + M_n \|\mathbf{x}\|_2)^2 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2R_n^2}\right) \mathrm{d}y \\ &\leq \frac{g(\mathbf{x}) M_n^5}{\sqrt{2\pi} 4} (d + 2M_n^2)^2 \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 (2M_n \|\mathbf{x}\|_2)^2 2r \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \\ &\leq M_n^{11} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^5 f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\int_{-\infty}^{u_-} M_{\vartheta, \varsigma, r}^2(\mathbf{x}, y) \mathrm{d}y$ is comprised of summing integrals of form

$$\int_{-\infty}^{u_-} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi R_n^2}} |y|^k \exp\left(-\frac{(y - u_-)^2}{2R_n^2}\right) \mathrm{d}y.$$

By Lemma 23,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{-\infty}^{u_-} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi R_n^2}} |y|^k \exp\left(-\frac{(y - u_-)^2}{2R_n^2}\right) \mathrm{d}y \\ &\leq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi R_n^2}} |y|^k \exp\left(-\frac{(y - u_-)^2}{2R_n^2}\right) \mathrm{d}y \\ &\leq 2 \int_0^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi R_n^2}} y^k \exp\left(-\frac{(y - |u_-|)^2}{2R_n^2}\right) \mathrm{d}y \\ &\leq 2\beta_k (\|\mathbf{x}\|_2) M_n^k. \end{aligned}$$

Since $|u_-|, |u_+| \leq M_n \|\mathbf{x}\|_2$, the integrals $\int_{-\infty}^{u_-} M_{\vartheta, \varsigma, r}^2(\mathbf{x}, y) dy$ and $\int_{u_-}^{\infty} M_{\vartheta, \varsigma, r}^2(\mathbf{x}, y) dy$ share the same upper bound as above (see by change of variable $w = -y$). If $f_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$ has a finite fourth-order moment, then

$$\int \int_{-\infty}^{u_-} M_{\vartheta, \varsigma, r}^2(\mathbf{x}, y) dy dx \preceq M_n^{12},$$

and thus $\|M_{\vartheta, \varsigma, r}^2(\mathbf{x}, y)\|_2^2 \preceq M_n^{12}$. □

LEMMA 25. *Let*

$$f_{\theta, \sigma}(\mathbf{x}, y) := (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-1/2} \exp\left(-\frac{(y - \theta^\top \mathbf{x})^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}),$$

where $(\theta, \sigma) \in \Omega$. If $f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})$ has a tail decaying fast enough such that $\exp(r\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2) f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})$ is integrable for all r small enough, then we have for (θ, σ) close to (θ^*, σ^*) ,

$$\rho_\alpha((\theta^*, \sigma^*), (\theta, \sigma)) \preceq \|(\theta^*, \sigma^*) - (\theta, \sigma)\|_2.$$

PROOF. Recall that

$$\rho_\alpha((\theta^*, \sigma^*), (\theta, \sigma)) = \frac{1}{\alpha} \iint \left(\frac{f_{\theta^*, \sigma^*}(\mathbf{x}, y)}{f_{\theta, \sigma}(\mathbf{x}, y)} \right)^\alpha f_{\theta^*, \sigma^*}(\mathbf{x}, y) d\mathbf{x} dy - \frac{1}{\alpha}.$$

Some simplification gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{f_{\theta^*, \sigma^*}(\mathbf{x}, y)}{f_{\theta, \sigma}(\mathbf{x}, y)} \right)^\alpha f_{\theta^*, \sigma^*}(\mathbf{x}, y) \\ &= \left(\frac{\sigma}{\sigma^*} \right)^\alpha \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^{*2}}} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\sigma^2} (y - \theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x})^2 - \frac{\alpha+1}{\sigma^{*2}} (y - \theta^\top \mathbf{x})^2 \right)\right] f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \left(\frac{\sigma}{\sigma^*} \right)^\alpha \frac{\sqrt{A}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left[-\frac{A}{2} (y^2 - 2B^\top \mathbf{x} y + (B^\top \mathbf{x})^2)\right] \\ & \quad \times \frac{1}{\sigma^* \sqrt{A}} \exp\left[\frac{1}{2} \left(A(B^\top \mathbf{x})^2 + \frac{\alpha}{\sigma^2} (\theta^\top \mathbf{x})^2 - \frac{\alpha+1}{\sigma^{*2}} (\theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x})^2 \right)\right] f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}), \\ &= \left(\frac{\sigma}{\sigma^*} \right)^\alpha \frac{\sqrt{A}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left[-\frac{A}{2} (y^2 - 2B^\top \mathbf{x} y + (B^\top \mathbf{x})^2)\right] \\ & \quad \times \frac{1}{\sigma^* \sqrt{A}} \exp\left[\frac{\alpha(\alpha+1)}{2\zeta} \left((\theta^* - \theta)^\top \mathbf{x} \right)^2\right] f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$A = \frac{\zeta}{\sigma^2 \sigma^{*2}}, \quad B = \frac{1}{\zeta} ((\alpha+1)\sigma^2 \theta^* - \alpha \sigma^{*2} \theta), \quad \zeta = (\alpha+1)\sigma^2 - \alpha \sigma^{*2}.$$

Note that

$$\frac{1}{\sigma^* \sqrt{A}} = \left(1 + \alpha \frac{\sigma^2 - \sigma^{*2}}{\sigma^2} \right)^{-1/2} \leq \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{\sigma^2} |\sigma^2 - \sigma^{*2}| \right)^{-1/2}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \rho_\alpha((\theta^*, \sigma^*), (\theta, \sigma)) \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha} \left(\frac{\sigma}{\sigma^*} \right)^\alpha \frac{1}{\sigma^* \sqrt{A}} \int \exp \left[\frac{\alpha(\alpha+1)}{2\zeta} \left((\theta^* - \theta)^\top \mathbf{x} \right)^2 \right] f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{\alpha} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \left(1 + \frac{\sigma - \sigma^*}{\sigma^*} \right)^\alpha \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{\sigma^2} |\sigma^2 - \sigma^{*2}| \right)^{-1/2} \int \exp \left[\frac{\alpha(\alpha+1)}{2\zeta} \|\theta^* - \theta\|_2^2 \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \right] f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

By assumption, the integral is integrable when (θ, σ) is close to (θ^*, σ^*) , then

$$\int \exp \left[\frac{\alpha(\alpha+1)}{2\zeta} \|\theta^* - \theta\|_2^2 \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \right] f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} - 1 \leq \|\theta^* - \theta\|_2^2.$$

and

$$\rho_\alpha((\theta^*, \sigma^*), (\theta, \sigma)) \preceq \|\theta^* - \theta\|_2^2 + |\sigma^* - \sigma| \preceq \|(\theta^*, \sigma^*) - (\theta, \sigma)\|_2.$$

□

LEMMA 26. *Let*

$$f_{\theta, \sigma}(\mathbf{x}, y) := (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-1/2} \exp \left(-\frac{(y - \theta^\top \mathbf{x})^2}{2\sigma^2} \right) f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Then we have for (θ, σ) close to (θ^*, σ^*) , there exists positive constant C independent of (θ, σ) such that

$$h((\theta^*, \sigma^*), (\theta, \sigma)) \leq \phi_n \implies \|(\theta^*, \sigma^*) - (\theta, \sigma)\|_2 \leq C\phi_n$$

PROOF. Recall that by Cauchy's mean value theorem, there exists $\varphi = \theta^* + \alpha(\theta - \theta^*)$, $\xi = \sigma^* + \alpha(\sigma - \sigma^*)$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & f_{\theta, \sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{x}, y) - f_{\theta^*, \sigma^*}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{x}, y) \\ &= f_{\varphi, \xi}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{x}, y) \left[\frac{y - \varphi^\top \mathbf{x}}{2\xi^2} (\theta - \theta^*)^\top \mathbf{x} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{(y - \varphi^\top \mathbf{x})^2}{\xi^3} - \xi^{-1} \right) (\sigma - \sigma^*) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $z := (y - \varphi^\top \mathbf{x})/\xi$, then

$$\begin{aligned} h^2((\theta^*, \sigma^*), (\theta, \sigma)) &:= \frac{1}{2} \iint \left(f_{\theta, \sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{x}, y) - f_{\theta^*, \sigma^*}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{x}, y) \right)^2 dy d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \frac{1}{8\xi^2} \iint f_{\varphi, \xi}(\mathbf{x}, y) \left[z(\theta - \theta^*)^\top \mathbf{x} + (z^2 - 1)(\sigma - \sigma^*) \right]^2 dy d\mathbf{x}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that in the above integral with respect to y , z is a standard normal random variable and $f_{\varphi, \xi}(\mathbf{x}, y) = f_z(z) f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})$. There exists constant λ depending only on the (maximum) distance between (θ, σ) and (θ^*, σ^*) such that

$$\begin{aligned} h^2((\theta^*, \sigma^*), (\theta, \sigma)) &\geq \lambda \int f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) \left[(\theta - \theta^*)^\top \mathbf{x} + (\sigma - \sigma^*) \right]^2 d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \lambda \left[(\theta - \theta^*)^\top \int f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) (\mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}^\top) d\mathbf{x} (\theta - \theta^*) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2(\sigma - \sigma^*) \theta^\top \int f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{x} d\mathbf{x} + (\sigma^* - \sigma)^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \lambda \left[(\theta - \theta^*)^\top (\mathbb{E}_{f_{\mathbf{x}}}[X] \mathbb{E}_{f_{\mathbf{x}}}[X]^\top + \text{Cov}(X)) (\theta - \theta^*) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2(\sigma - \sigma^*) (\theta - \theta^*)^\top \mathbb{E}_{f_{\mathbf{x}}}[X] + (\sigma - \sigma^*)^2 \right] \\
&= \lambda \begin{bmatrix} \theta - \theta^* \\ \sigma - \sigma^* \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E}_{f_{\mathbf{x}}}[X] \mathbb{E}_{f_{\mathbf{x}}}[X]^\top + \text{Cov}(X) & \mathbb{E}_{f_{\mathbf{x}}}[X] \\ \mathbb{E}_{f_{\mathbf{x}}}[X]^\top & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \theta - \theta^* \\ \sigma - \sigma^* \end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

For any symmetric positive definite matrix S , there exists an orthogonal matrix Q and a diagonal matrix D with positive diagonal entries such that $S = QDQ^\top$ (the singular value decomposition). Since

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E}_{f_{\mathbf{x}}}[X] \mathbb{E}_{f_{\mathbf{x}}}[X]^\top + \text{Cov}(X) & \mathbb{E}_{f_{\mathbf{x}}}[X] \\ \mathbb{E}_{f_{\mathbf{x}}}[X]^\top & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

is symmetric and positive definite. Let λ_{\min} denote its smallest eigenvalue (also the smallest diagonal entry in D) and we have

$$h^2((\theta^*, \sigma^*), (\theta, \sigma)) \geq \lambda \lambda_{\min} \|(\theta, \sigma) - (\theta^*, \sigma^*)\|_2^2.$$

□

D.2. Logistic Regression Case.

LEMMA 27. *Let*

$$f_\theta(\mathbf{x}, y) := \Phi(\theta^\top \mathbf{x})^y \Phi(-\theta^\top \mathbf{x})^{1-y} f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}),$$

where $\Phi(z) := (1 + e^{-z})^{-1}$ and $\theta \in \Omega$, $y \in \{0, 1\}$. If $f_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$ is a density function, we have for θ close to θ^* ,

$$\rho_\alpha(\theta^*, \theta) \leq \|\theta^* - \theta\|_2.$$

PROOF. Since y is discrete,

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_\alpha(\theta^*, \theta) &= \frac{1}{\alpha} \int \left(\frac{\Phi(\theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x})}{\Phi(\theta^\top \mathbf{x})} \right)^\alpha \Phi(\theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x}) f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\alpha} \int \left(\frac{1 - \Phi(\theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x})}{1 - \Phi(\theta^\top \mathbf{x})} \right)^\alpha (1 - \Phi(\theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x})) f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{\alpha}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\frac{\Phi(\theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x})}{\Phi(\theta^\top \mathbf{x})} = \frac{1 + \exp(-\theta^\top \mathbf{x})}{1 + \exp(-\theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x})} = 1 + \frac{\exp(-\theta^\top \mathbf{x}) - \exp(-\theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x})}{1 + \exp(-\theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x})}$$

and $\Phi(z) = 1 - \Phi(-z)$. For θ close to θ^* , apply the first-order expansion gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_\alpha(\theta^*, \theta) &\sim 2 \int \frac{\exp(\theta^\top \mathbf{x}) - \exp(\theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x})}{(1 + \exp(\theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x}))^2} f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \\
&= \int \frac{\exp(\theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x})}{(1 + \exp(\theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x}))^2} \left[\exp((\theta - \theta^*)^\top \mathbf{x}) - 1 \right] f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\|\theta^* - \theta\|_2^j}{j!} \int \frac{\exp(\theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x})}{(1 + \exp(\theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x}))^2} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^j f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \\
&\leq \|\theta^* - \theta\|_2.
\end{aligned}$$

The last step is due to the fact that $\frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^j \exp(\theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x})}{(1 + \exp(\theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x}))^2} f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})$ is always integrable for $j > 0$. \square

LEMMA 28. *Let*

$$f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}, y) := \Phi(\theta^{\top} \mathbf{x})^y \Phi(-\theta^{\top} \mathbf{x})^{1-y} f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})$$

where $\Phi(x) = (1 + e^{-x})^{-1}$. Then we have for θ close to θ^* , there exists positive constant C independent of θ such that

$$h(\theta^*, \theta) \leq \phi_n \implies \|\theta^* - \theta\|_2 \leq C \phi_n$$

PROOF. Note that

$$\nabla_{\theta} f_{\theta}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{x}, y) = \left(\frac{y}{2} \Phi(\theta^{\top} \mathbf{x})^{\frac{y}{2}} \Phi(-\theta^{\top} \mathbf{x})^{\frac{3-y}{2}} - \frac{1-y}{2} \Phi(\theta^{\top} \mathbf{x})^{\frac{y+2}{2}} \Phi(-\theta^{\top} \mathbf{x})^{\frac{1-y}{2}} \right) f_{\mathbf{x}}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{x}.$$

Then there exists $\varphi = \theta^* + \alpha(\theta - \theta^*)$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\sum_{y=0}^1 \left(f_{\theta^*}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{x}, y) - f_{\theta}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{x}, y) \right)^2 = \frac{1}{4} \Phi(\varphi^{\top} \mathbf{x}) \Phi(-\varphi^{\top} \mathbf{x}) f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) \left((\theta - \theta^*)^{\top} \mathbf{x} \right)^2.$$

Since $\Phi(\varphi^{\top} \mathbf{x}) \Phi(-\varphi^{\top} \mathbf{x}) f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})$ is always integrable with respect to \mathbf{x} , as long as $f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})$ itself is integrable,

$$h^2(\theta^*, \theta) = \int \frac{1}{8} \Phi(\varphi^{\top} \mathbf{x}) \Phi(-\varphi^{\top} \mathbf{x}) f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) \left((\theta - \theta^*)^{\top} \mathbf{x} \right)^2 d\mathbf{x} \geq C d_{\min}(\varphi) \|\theta^* - \theta\|_2^2$$

where $d_{\min}(\varphi)$ is the smallest eigenvalue of $\mathbb{E}[X] \mathbb{E}[X]^{\top} + \text{Cov}(X)$ taking the expectations with respect to a density proportional to $\Phi(\varphi^{\top} \mathbf{x}) \Phi(-\varphi^{\top} \mathbf{x}) f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})$. Since θ is assumed to be close to θ^* , φ takes value in a compact set, which means $d_{\min}(\varphi)$ has a non-zero minimum and hence $\exists C > 0$ such that

$$h(\theta^*, \theta) \geq C \|\theta^* - \theta\|_2.$$

\square

D.3. Cauchy Regression Case.

LEMMA 29. *Let*

$$f_{\theta, \gamma}(\mathbf{x}, y) := \frac{\sqrt{\gamma}}{\pi} (1 + (y - \theta^{\top} \mathbf{x})^2 / \gamma)^{-1} f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}),$$

where $(\theta, \gamma) \in \Omega_n := \{(\theta, \gamma) \in \Omega : \|\theta - \theta^*\|_2 \leq R_n, |\gamma - \gamma^*| < R_n, \gamma > R_n^{-1}\}$, $R_n > 0$. If $\|(\theta, \gamma_1) - (\vartheta, \gamma_2)\|_{\infty} \leq r$ then

$$\left| \sqrt{f_{\theta, \gamma_1}(\mathbf{x}, y)} - \sqrt{f_{\vartheta, \gamma_2}(\mathbf{x}, y)} \right| \leq M_{\vartheta, \gamma_2, r}(\mathbf{x}, y) \|(\theta, \gamma_1) - (\vartheta, \gamma_2)\|_{\infty}$$

where function $M_{\vartheta, \gamma_2, r}$ is given by

$$M_{\vartheta, \gamma_2, r}(\mathbf{x}, y) := \frac{d}{\sqrt{\pi}} \left(1 + \min_{\varphi \in B_r(\vartheta)} (y - \varphi^{\top} \mathbf{x})^2 / R_n \right)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \cdot \left[R_n^{\frac{3}{4}} (|y| + M_n \|\mathbf{x}\|_2) \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 + \frac{1}{4} R_n^{\frac{3}{4}} + R_n^{\frac{7}{4}} (|y| + M_n \|\mathbf{x}\|_2)^2 \right] \sqrt{f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})}$$

where $M_n = \|\theta^*\|_2 + R_n$, $B_r(\vartheta)$ is the L_2 -ball around ϑ .

PROOF.

$$\nabla_{\theta} \sqrt{f_{\theta, \gamma}(\mathbf{x}, y)} = \gamma^{\frac{1}{4}} \pi^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + (y - \theta^{\top} \mathbf{x})^2 / \gamma\right)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \frac{y - \theta^{\top} \mathbf{x}}{\gamma} \sqrt{f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})} \mathbf{x}$$

$$\nabla_{\gamma} \sqrt{f_{\theta, \gamma}(\mathbf{x}, y)} = \frac{1}{4} \gamma^{-\frac{7}{4}} \pi^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + (y - \theta^{\top} \mathbf{x})^2 / \gamma\right)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \left[\gamma + 3(y - \theta^{\top} \mathbf{x})^2\right] \sqrt{f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})}$$

By Cauchy's mean value theorem, there exists $\varphi = \vartheta + \alpha(\theta - \vartheta)$, $\xi = \gamma_2 + \alpha(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sqrt{f_{\theta, \gamma_1}(\mathbf{x}, y)} - \sqrt{f_{\vartheta, \gamma_2}(\mathbf{x}, y)} \right| \\ &= \xi^{\frac{1}{4}} \pi^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + (y - \varphi^{\top} \mathbf{x})^2 / \xi\right)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \frac{y - \varphi^{\top} \mathbf{x}}{\xi} \sqrt{f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})} (\theta - \vartheta)^{\top} \mathbf{x} \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{4} \xi^{-\frac{7}{4}} \pi^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + (y - \varphi^{\top} \mathbf{x})^2 / \xi\right)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \left[\xi + 3(y - \varphi^{\top} \mathbf{x})^2\right] \sqrt{f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})} (\gamma_1 - \gamma_2) \\ &\leq \frac{d}{\sqrt{\pi}} \left(1 + \min_{\varphi \in B_r(\vartheta)} (y - \varphi^{\top} \mathbf{x})^2 / R_n\right)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \cdot \|(\theta, \gamma_1) - (\vartheta, \gamma_2)\|_{\infty} \\ & \quad \cdot \left[R_n^{\frac{3}{4}} (|y| + M_n \|\mathbf{x}\|_2) \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 + \frac{1}{4} R_n^{\frac{3}{4}} + R_n^{\frac{7}{4}} (|y| + M_n \|\mathbf{x}\|_2)^2 \right] \sqrt{f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})} \end{aligned}$$

□

LEMMA 30. For $(\theta, \gamma) \in \Omega_n := \{(\theta, \gamma) \in \Omega : \|\theta - \theta^*\|_2 \leq R_n, \gamma \in [R_n^{-1}, R_n]\}$, $R_n > 0$, let

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\vartheta, \gamma_2, r}(\mathbf{x}, y) &:= \frac{d}{\sqrt{\pi}} \left(1 + \min_{\varphi \in B_r(\vartheta)} (y - \varphi^{\top} \mathbf{x})^2 / R_n\right)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \\ & \quad \cdot \left[R_n^{\frac{3}{4}} (|y| + M_n \|\mathbf{x}\|_2) \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 + \frac{1}{4} R_n^{\frac{3}{4}} + R_n^{\frac{7}{4}} (|y| + M_n \|\mathbf{x}\|_2)^2 \right] \sqrt{f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})} \end{aligned}$$

where $M_n = \|\theta^*\|_2 + R_n$, $B_r(\vartheta)$ is the L_2 -ball around ϑ . If $f_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$ has a finite fifth-order moment, then

$$\|M_{\vartheta, r}(\mathbf{x}, y)\|_2^2 \leq M_n^9.$$

PROOF. Similar to Lemma 24, we consider the value of $\min_{\varphi \in B_r(\vartheta)} (y - \varphi^{\top} \mathbf{x})^2$ in different configurations of $(y, \mathbf{x}, \vartheta)$. Since $\varphi = \vartheta + \tilde{r}v$ for some $\tilde{r} < r$ and some unit vector v , when x is fixed, $\varphi^{\top} \mathbf{x}$ takes value within the interval (u_-, u_+) where

$$u_- := \vartheta^{\top} \mathbf{x} - r \|\mathbf{x}\|_2, \quad u_+ := \vartheta^{\top} \mathbf{x} + r \|\mathbf{x}\|_2,$$

with the infimum and supremum attained at $\vartheta - \frac{r\mathbf{x}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2}$ and $\vartheta + \frac{r\mathbf{x}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2}$ respectively. Therefore $(y - \varphi^{\top} \mathbf{x})^2$ is minimized by choosing $\varphi = \vartheta - r\mathbf{x}$ when $y < u_-$ and $\varphi = \vartheta + r\mathbf{x}$ when $y > u_+$. When $y \in (u_-, u_+)$, $(y - \varphi^{\top} \mathbf{x})^2$ has minimum zero. Thus, computing the inner integral of $\|M_{\vartheta, r}(\mathbf{x}, y)\|_2^2$ with respect to y and omitting the terms only depends on x ,

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\pi} \left(1 + \min_{\varphi \in B_r(\vartheta)} (y - \varphi^{\top} \mathbf{x})^2 / R_n\right)^{-3} \left[R_n^{\frac{3}{4}} (|y| + M_n \|\mathbf{x}\|_2) \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 + \frac{1}{4} R_n^{\frac{3}{4}} + R_n^{\frac{7}{4}} (|y| + M_n \|\mathbf{x}\|_2)^2 \right]^2 dy.$$

For simplicity, let

$$S(\mathbf{x}, y) = \left[R_n^{\frac{3}{4}} (|y| + M_n \|\mathbf{x}\|_2) \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 + \frac{1}{4} R_n^{\frac{3}{4}} + R_n^{\frac{7}{4}} (|y| + M_n \|\mathbf{x}\|_2)^2 \right]^2.$$

Again, this integral can be evaluated separately in three intervals $\int_{-\infty}^{u_-} + \int_{u_-}^{u_+} + \int_{u_+}^{\infty}$. By noting that $\max\{|u_-|, |u_+|\} \leq (\|\vartheta\|_2 + r) \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \leq M_n \|\mathbf{x}\|_2$,

$$\int_{u_-}^{u_+} \frac{1}{\pi} \left(1 + \min_{\varphi \in B_r(\vartheta)} (y - \varphi^\top \mathbf{x})^2 / R_n \right)^{-3} S(x, y) \mathrm{d}y \preceq M_n^{\frac{17}{2}} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^5.$$

Moreover, since the integrand is non-negative, for $k \leq 4$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{-\infty}^{u_-} \frac{1}{\pi} \left(1 + \min_{\varphi \in B_r(\vartheta)} (y - \varphi^\top \mathbf{x})^2 / R_n \right)^{-3} |y|^k \mathrm{d}y \\ & \leq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\pi} (1 + (y - u_-)^2 / R_n)^{-3} |y|^k \mathrm{d}y \\ & = \int_0^{\infty} \frac{1}{\pi} (1 + (y - u_-)^2 / R_n)^{-3} y^k \mathrm{d}y + \int_0^{\infty} \frac{1}{\pi} (1 + (y + u_-)^2 / R_n)^{-3} y^k \mathrm{d}y \\ & \preceq M_n^{k+\frac{1}{2}} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^k. \end{aligned}$$

The last step is by computing the integral

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{\infty} \frac{1}{\pi} (1 + (y - a)^2 / R_n)^{-3} y^k \mathrm{d}y \\ & = \int_0^{\infty} \frac{1}{\pi} (1 + w^2 / R_n)^{-3} (w + a)^k \mathrm{d}w \quad [w = y - a] \\ & \leq 2 \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor} \binom{k}{2j} \int_0^{\infty} w^{2j} a^{k-2j} \frac{1}{\pi} (1 + w^2 / R_n)^{-3} \mathrm{d}w \\ & \quad + \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor} \binom{k}{2j-1} \int_0^{\infty} w^{2j-1} a^{k-2j-1} \frac{1}{\pi} (1 + w^2 / R_n)^{-3} \mathrm{d}w \\ & \preceq \max\{a, R_n\}^{k+\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

while noting

$$\int_0^{\infty} \frac{1}{\pi} w^k (1 + w^2 / R_n)^{-3} \mathrm{d}w \leq R_n^{\frac{k+1}{2}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\int_{-\infty}^{u_-} \frac{1}{\pi} \left(1 + \min_{\varphi \in B_r(\vartheta)} (y - \varphi^\top \mathbf{x})^2 / R_n \right)^{-3} S(x, y) \mathrm{d}y \preceq M_n^9 \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^4.$$

The same upper bound applies to

$$\int_{u_+}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\pi} \left(1 + \min_{\varphi \in B_r(\vartheta)} (y - \varphi^\top \mathbf{x})^2 / R_n \right)^{-3} S(x, y) \mathrm{d}y.$$

Hence, if $f_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$ has a finite fifth moment,

$$\iint M_{\vartheta, \gamma_2, r}(\mathbf{x}, y) \mathrm{d}y \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \preceq M_n^9.$$

□

LEMMA 31. *Let*

$$f_{\theta, \gamma}(\mathbf{x}, y) := \frac{\sqrt{\gamma}}{\pi} (1 + (y - \theta^\top \mathbf{x})^2 / \gamma)^{-1} f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}),$$

where $(\theta, \gamma) \in \Omega$. If all the moments of $f_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$ are finite, we have for θ close to θ^* ,

$$\rho_{\alpha}((\theta^*, \gamma^*), (\theta, \gamma)) \leq \|(\theta^*, \gamma^*) - (\theta, \gamma)\|_2.$$

PROOF. Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} & \rho_{\alpha}((\theta^*, \gamma^*), (\theta, \gamma)) \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha} \iint \left(\frac{f_{\theta^*, \gamma^*}(\mathbf{x}, y)}{f_{\theta, \gamma}(\mathbf{x}, y)} \right)^{\alpha} f_{\theta^*, \gamma^*}(\mathbf{x}, y) \mathrm{d}y \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{\alpha} \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha} \iint \left(\frac{\gamma^*}{\gamma} \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \left(\frac{1 + \frac{(y - \theta^\top \mathbf{x})^2}{\gamma}}{1 + \frac{(y - \theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x})^2}{\gamma^*}} \right)^{\alpha} \frac{\sqrt{\gamma^*}}{\pi (1 + (y - \theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x})^2 / \gamma^*)} \mathrm{d}y f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\theta} \left(\frac{1 + \frac{(y - \theta^\top \mathbf{x})^2}{\gamma}}{1 + \frac{(y - \theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x})^2}{\gamma^*}} \right)^{\alpha} &= \alpha \left(\frac{1 + \frac{(y - \theta^\top \mathbf{x})^2}{\gamma}}{1 + \frac{(y - \theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x})^2}{\gamma^*}} \right)^{\alpha-1} \frac{2(y - \theta^\top \mathbf{x}) / \gamma}{1 + (y - \theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x})^2 / \gamma^*} \mathbf{x}, \\ \nabla_{\gamma} \left(\frac{1 + \frac{(y - \theta^\top \mathbf{x})^2}{\gamma}}{1 + \frac{(y - \theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x})^2}{\gamma^*}} \right)^{\alpha} &= -\alpha \left(\frac{1 + \frac{(y - \theta^\top \mathbf{x})^2}{\gamma}}{1 + \frac{(y - \theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x})^2}{\gamma^*}} \right)^{\alpha-1} \frac{(y - \theta^\top \mathbf{x})^2 / \gamma^2}{1 + (y - \theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x})^2 / \gamma^*}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the first term in the expansion is

$$\left(\frac{1 + \frac{(y - \theta^\top \mathbf{x})^2}{\gamma}}{1 + \frac{(y - \theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x})^2}{\gamma^*}} \right)^{\alpha} - 1 \sim \frac{\alpha}{1 + (y - \theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x})^2 / \gamma^*} \left(\frac{2(y - \theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x})}{\gamma^*} (\theta - \theta^*)^\top \mathbf{x} - \frac{(y - \theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x})^2}{\gamma^{*2}} (\gamma - \gamma^*) \right).$$

Thus if all the moments of $f_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$ are finite, then for (θ, γ) close to (θ^*, γ^*) ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \rho_{\alpha}((\theta^*, \gamma^*), (\theta, \gamma)) \\ & \leq |\gamma - \gamma^*| + \iint \frac{\sqrt{\gamma^*} f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})}{\pi \left(1 + \frac{(y - \theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x})^2}{\gamma^*} \right)^2} \left(\frac{2(y - \theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x})}{\gamma^*} \|\theta - \theta^*\|_2 \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 + \frac{(y - \theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x})^2}{\gamma^{*2}} |\gamma - \gamma^*| \right) \mathrm{d}y \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \\ & \leq \|\theta - \theta^*\|_2 + |\gamma - \gamma^*| \\ & \leq \|(\theta, \gamma) - (\theta^*, \gamma^*)\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

The inner integral with respect to $(y - \theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x}) / \gamma^*$ will result in a constant multiple of γ^* which is fixed. □

LEMMA 32. *Let*

$$f_{\theta, \gamma}(\mathbf{x}, y) := \frac{\sqrt{\gamma}}{\pi} (1 + (y - \theta^\top \mathbf{x})^2 / \gamma)^{-1} f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Then we have for (θ, γ) close to (θ^*, γ^*) , there exists positive constant C independent of (θ, γ) such that

$$h((\theta^*, \gamma^*), (\theta, \gamma)) \leq \phi_n \implies \|(\theta^*, \gamma^*) - (\theta, \gamma)\|_2 \leq C \phi_n$$

PROOF.

$$h^2((\theta^*, \gamma^*), (\theta, \gamma)) = \frac{1}{2} \int f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) \int \left(\sqrt{\frac{\sqrt{\gamma^*}}{\pi(1 + (y - \theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x})^2/\gamma^*)}} - \sqrt{\frac{\sqrt{\gamma}}{\pi(1 + (y - \theta^\top \mathbf{x})^2/\gamma)}} \right)^2 dy d\mathbf{x}.$$

Recall the grad of $\sqrt{f_{\theta, \gamma}}$ computed in Lemma 29.

$$\nabla_{\theta} \sqrt{f_{\theta, \gamma}(\mathbf{x}, y)} = \gamma^{\frac{1}{4}} \pi^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + (y - \theta^\top \mathbf{x})^2/\gamma \right)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \frac{y - \theta^\top \mathbf{x}}{\gamma} \sqrt{f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})} \mathbf{x}$$

$$\nabla_{\gamma} \sqrt{f_{\theta, \gamma}(\mathbf{x}, y)} = \frac{1}{4} \gamma^{-\frac{7}{4}} \pi^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + (y - \theta^\top \mathbf{x})^2/\gamma \right)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \left[\gamma + 3(y - \theta^\top \mathbf{x})^2 \right] \sqrt{f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})}$$

Apply Cauchy's mean value theorem and compute the inner integral with respect to y , there exists $\varphi = \theta^* + \alpha(\theta - \theta^*)$, $\xi = \gamma^* + \alpha(\gamma - \gamma^*)$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \left(\sqrt{\frac{\sqrt{\gamma^*}}{\pi(1 + (y - \theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x})^2/\gamma^*)}} - \sqrt{\frac{\sqrt{\gamma}}{\pi(1 + (y - \theta^\top \mathbf{x})^2/\gamma)}} \right)^2 dy \\ &= \int \frac{\sqrt{\xi}}{\pi} \left(1 + \frac{(y - \varphi^\top \mathbf{x})^2}{\xi} \right)^{-3} \left[\frac{y - \varphi^\top \mathbf{x}}{\xi} (\theta - \theta^*)^\top \mathbf{x} + \frac{\gamma - \gamma^*}{4\xi} + \frac{3}{\xi^2} (y - \varphi^\top \mathbf{x})^2 (\gamma - \gamma^*) \right]^2 dy \\ &\succeq \left((\theta - \theta^*)^\top \mathbf{x} \right)^2 + (\gamma - \gamma^*)^2. \end{aligned}$$

The last step is due to the integral with respect to $\frac{y - \varphi^\top \mathbf{x}}{\xi}$ is only dependent on ξ which is 'close' to γ^* and thus has a defined lower and upper bound. Thus, using the same last argument as in Lemma 26,

$$\begin{aligned} h^2((\theta^*, \gamma^*), (\theta, \gamma)) &\succeq \int \left((\theta - \theta^*)^\top \mathbf{x} \right)^2 f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} + (\gamma - \gamma^*)^2 \\ &\succeq \|(\theta, \gamma) - (\theta^*, \gamma^*)\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

D.4. Quantile Regression Case.

LEMMA 33. *Let*

$$f_{\theta}^{\tau}(\mathbf{x}, y) := \tau(1 - \tau) \exp\left(-Q_{\tau}(y - \theta^\top \mathbf{x})\right) f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}),$$

where $\theta \in \Omega_n := \{\theta \in \Omega : \|\theta - \theta^*\|_2 \leq R_n\}$, for some $R_n > 0$,

$$Q_{\tau}(u) := \begin{cases} (\tau - 1)u, & u \leq 0 \\ \tau u, & u > 0. \end{cases}$$

If $\theta, \vartheta \in \Omega_n$ with $\|\theta - \vartheta\|_{\infty} \leq r$ then

$$\left| \sqrt{f_{\theta}^{\tau}(\mathbf{x}, y)} - \sqrt{f_{\vartheta}^{\tau}(\mathbf{x}, y)} \right| \leq M_{\vartheta, r}(\mathbf{x}, y) \|\theta - \vartheta\|_{\infty}$$

where function $M_{\vartheta, r}$ is given by

$$M_{\vartheta, r}(\mathbf{x}, y) := \frac{1}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{1 - \tau^*}{2} \min_{\varphi \in B_r(\vartheta)} |y - \varphi^\top \mathbf{x}|\right) \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \sqrt{f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})}.$$

where $M_n = \|\theta^*\|_2 + R_n$, $\tau^* = \max\{\tau, 1 - \tau\}$.

PROOF. Note that

$$\nabla_{\theta} \sqrt{f_{\theta}^{\tau}(\mathbf{x}, y)} = \begin{cases} -\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)}(1-\tau) \exp\left(-\frac{\tau-1}{2}(y-\theta^{\top} \mathbf{x})\right) x \sqrt{f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})}, & y \leq \theta^{\top} \mathbf{x} \\ -\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)}\tau \exp\left(-\frac{\tau}{2}(y-\theta^{\top} \mathbf{x})\right) x \sqrt{f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})}, & y > \theta^{\top} \mathbf{x}. \end{cases}$$

Using the same argument as in Lemma 20, recall the $\tilde{\nabla}$ operator from Definition 9 for the supremum of all direction derivatives. Let $\varphi = \theta + \alpha(\vartheta - \theta)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{f_{\theta}^{\tau}(\mathbf{x}, y)} - \sqrt{f_{\vartheta}^{\tau}(\mathbf{x}, y)} &\leq \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \left\| \tilde{\nabla}_{\theta} \sqrt{f_{\varphi}^{\tau}(\mathbf{x}, y)} \right\|_2 \|\theta - \vartheta\|_2 \\ &\leq \sup_{\varphi \in B_r(\vartheta)} \frac{d\tau^*}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\tau^*}{2}|y - \varphi^{\top} \mathbf{x}|\right) \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \|\theta - \vartheta\|_{\infty} \sqrt{f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can take

$$M_{\vartheta, r}(\mathbf{x}, y) = \frac{d}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\tau^*}{2} \min_{\varphi \in B_r(\vartheta)} |y - \varphi^{\top} \mathbf{x}|\right) \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \sqrt{f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})}.$$

□

LEMMA 34. *Define*

$$\Omega_n := \{\theta \in \Omega : \|\theta - \theta^*\|_2 \leq R_n\}$$

for some $R_n > 0$. For $(\vartheta, \varsigma) \in \Omega_n$, let

$$M_{\vartheta, r}(\mathbf{x}, y) := \frac{d}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{1-\tau^*}{2} \min_{\varphi \in B_r(\vartheta)} |y - \varphi^{\top} \mathbf{x}|\right) \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \sqrt{f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})},$$

where $\tau^* = \max\{\tau, 1-\tau\}$. If $f_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$ has a finite third-order moment, then

$$\|M_{\vartheta, r}(\mathbf{x}, y)\|_2^2 = \frac{d^2}{2(1-\tau^*)} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2] + \frac{d^2 r}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^3] = O(1).$$

PROOF.

$$\|M_{\vartheta, r}\|_2^2 = \frac{d^2}{4} \int f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \int \exp\left(-(1-\tau^*) \min_{\varphi \in B_r(\vartheta)} |y - \varphi^{\top} \mathbf{x}|\right) dy d\mathbf{x}.$$

The integral can be treated similarly to the Gaussian or the Cauchy case by considering the value of $\min_{\varphi \in B_r(\vartheta)} |y - \varphi^{\top} \mathbf{x}|$ in different cases. Define

$$u_- := \vartheta^{\top} \mathbf{x} - r\|\mathbf{x}\|_2, \quad u_+ := \vartheta^{\top} \mathbf{x} + r\|\mathbf{x}\|_2.$$

Then $u_- \leq \varphi^{\top} \mathbf{x} \leq u_+$ and thus

$$\min_{\varphi \in B_r(\vartheta)} |y - \varphi^{\top} \mathbf{x}| = \begin{cases} u_- - y, & y \leq u_- \\ 0, & u_- < y \leq u_+ \\ y - u_+, & y > u_+. \end{cases}$$

Now, we just compute separately $\int_{-\infty}^{u_-}$, $\int_{u_-}^{u_+}$ and $\int_{u_+}^{\infty}$.

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{-\infty}^{u_-} \exp\left(-(1-\tau^*) \min_{\varphi \in B_r(\vartheta)} |y - \varphi^{\top} \mathbf{x}|\right) dy \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{u_-} \exp(-(1-\tau^*)(u_- - y)) dy \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\tau^*}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{u_-}^{u_+} \exp\left(- (1 - \tau^*) \min_{\varphi \in B_r(\vartheta)} |y - \varphi^\top \mathbf{x}|\right) \mathrm{d}y \\ &= u_+ - u_- = 2r \|\mathbf{x}\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{u_+}^{\infty} \exp\left(- (1 - \tau^*) \min_{\varphi \in B_r(\vartheta)} |y - \varphi^\top \mathbf{x}|\right) \mathrm{d}y \\ &= \int_{u_+}^{\infty} \exp(-(1 - \tau^*)(y - u_+)) \mathrm{d}y \\ &= \frac{1}{1 - \tau^*}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|M_{\vartheta, r}\|_2^2 &= \frac{d^2}{4} \int f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \left[\frac{2}{1 - \tau^*} + 2r \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \right] \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \\ &= \frac{d^2}{2(1 - \tau^*)} \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2] + \frac{d^2 r}{2} \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^3]. \end{aligned}$$

If $f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})$ has a finite third-order moment, then the above expression does not depend on the radius of the space Ω_n and hence a constant order value. \square

LEMMA 35. *Let*

$$f_{\theta}^{\tau}(\mathbf{x}, y) := \tau(1 - \tau) \exp\left(-Q_{\tau}(y - \theta^\top \mathbf{x})\right) f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}),$$

where $\theta \in \Omega$. If $f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})$ has a sufficiently light tail such that, the density function proportional to $\exp(\tau^* |(\theta - \theta^*)^\top \mathbf{x}|) f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})$ has a finite first-order moment, then for θ close enough to θ^* ,

$$\rho_{\alpha}(\theta^*, \theta) \preceq \|\theta^* - \theta\|_2.$$

PROOF.

$$\rho_{\alpha}(\theta^*, \theta) = \frac{1}{\alpha} \iint \left(\frac{f_{\theta^*}^{\tau}(\mathbf{x}, y)}{f_{\theta}^{\tau}(\mathbf{x}, y)} \right)^{\alpha} f_{\theta^*}^{\tau}(\mathbf{x}, y) \mathrm{d}y \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{\alpha}.$$

For simplicity, denote

$$\mathcal{R}_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}, y) := \left(\frac{f_{\theta^*}^{\tau}(\mathbf{x}, y)}{f_{\theta}^{\tau}(\mathbf{x}, y)} \right)^{\alpha}$$

The strategy is to simplify $\mathcal{R}_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}, y) - 1$ using Cauchy's mean value theorem to introduce a term of order $\|\theta^* - \theta\|_2$. The difficulty here is the density function has a single point of discontinuity. In order to apply Cauchy's mean value theorem, we will compute the expansions and integrals in different sub-regions of (\mathbf{x}, y) where the integrands are locally continuous.

Divide the space of \mathbf{x} into two regions, $\theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x} \leq \theta^{\top} \mathbf{x}$ and $\theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x} > \theta^{\top} \mathbf{x}$ and consider first $\theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x} \leq \theta^{\top} \mathbf{x}$.

(i) When $y \leq \theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x}$,

$$\mathcal{R}_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}, y) = \mathcal{R}_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) = \exp(-\alpha(\tau - 1)(\theta - \theta^*)^{\top} \mathbf{x}),$$

and

$$\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{R}_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) = -\alpha(\tau - 1) \mathcal{R}_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{x}.$$

Thus there exists $\varphi_1 = \theta + a_1(\theta^* - \theta)$ for some constant $a_1 \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\mathcal{R}_\theta(\mathbf{x}) - 1 = -\alpha(\tau - 1)\mathcal{R}_{\varphi_1}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{x}^\top(\theta - \theta^*),$$

and

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\theta^{*\top}\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{R}_{\varphi_1}(\mathbf{x})f_{\theta^*}^\top(\mathbf{x}, y)\mathrm{d}y = \tau\mathcal{R}_{\varphi_1}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Therefore

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\theta^{*\top}\mathbf{x}} (\mathcal{R}_{\varphi_1}(\mathbf{x}) - 1)f_{\theta^*}^\top(\mathbf{x}, y)\mathrm{d}y = \alpha\tau(1 - \tau)\mathcal{R}_{\varphi_1}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{x}^\top(\theta - \theta^*).$$

(ii) When $y > \theta^\top\mathbf{x}$,

$$\mathcal{R}_\theta(\mathbf{x}, y) = \mathcal{R}_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = \exp(-\alpha\tau(\theta - \theta^*)^\top\mathbf{x}),$$

and

$$\nabla_\theta\mathcal{R}_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = -\alpha\tau\mathcal{R}_\theta(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{x}.$$

Thus there exists $\varphi_2 = \theta + a_2(\theta^* - \theta)$ for some constant $a_2 \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\mathcal{R}_\theta(\mathbf{x}) - 1 = -\alpha\tau\mathcal{R}_{\varphi_2}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{x}^\top(\theta - \theta^*),$$

and

$$\int_{\theta^\top\mathbf{x}}^{\infty} \mathcal{R}_{\varphi_2}(\mathbf{x})f_{\theta^*}^\top(\mathbf{x}, y)\mathrm{d}y = (1 - \tau)\mathcal{R}_{\varphi_2}(\mathbf{x})\exp(-\tau(\theta - \theta^*)^\top\mathbf{x}).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\theta^\top\mathbf{x}}^{\infty} (\mathcal{R}_{\varphi_2}(\mathbf{x}) - 1)f_{\theta^*}^\top(\mathbf{x}, y)\mathrm{d}y \\ &= -\alpha\tau(1 - \tau)\mathcal{R}_{\varphi_2}(\mathbf{x})\exp(-\tau(\theta - \theta^*)^\top\mathbf{x})\mathbf{x}^\top(\theta - \theta^*). \end{aligned}$$

(iii) When $\theta^{*\top}\mathbf{x} < y \leq \theta^\top\mathbf{x}$,

$$\mathcal{R}_\theta(\mathbf{x}, y) = \exp[-\alpha(y - (\tau\theta^* + (1 - \tau)\theta)^\top\mathbf{x})],$$

and

$$\nabla_\theta\mathcal{R}_\theta(\mathbf{x}, y) = \alpha(1 - \tau)\mathcal{R}_\theta(\mathbf{x}, y)\mathbf{x}.$$

Denote

$$S_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\theta^{*\top}\mathbf{x}}^{\theta^\top\mathbf{x}} (\mathcal{R}_\theta(\mathbf{x}, y) - 1)f_{\theta^*}^\top(\mathbf{x}, y)\mathrm{d}y.$$

By Leibniz integral rule, we have

$$\nabla_\theta S_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = (\mathcal{R}_\theta(\mathbf{x}, \theta^\top\mathbf{x}) - 1)f_{\theta^*}^\top(\mathbf{x}, \theta^\top\mathbf{x})\mathbf{x} + \int_{\theta^{*\top}\mathbf{x}}^{\theta^\top\mathbf{x}} \nabla_\theta\mathcal{R}_\theta(\mathbf{x}, y)f_{\theta^*}^\top(\mathbf{x}, y)\mathrm{d}y.$$

Compute each term separately,

$$\begin{aligned} A(\theta) &:= (\mathcal{R}_\theta(\mathbf{x}, \theta^\top\mathbf{x}) - 1)f_{\theta^*}^\top(\mathbf{x}, \theta^\top\mathbf{x}) \\ &= [\exp(-\alpha\tau(\theta - \theta^*)^\top\mathbf{x}) - 1]\tau(1 - \tau)\exp(-\tau(\theta - \theta^*)^\top\mathbf{x}), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
B(\theta)x &:= \int_{\theta^{*\top}\mathbf{x}}^{\theta^\top\mathbf{x}} \nabla_\theta \mathcal{R}_\theta(\mathbf{x}, y) f_{\theta^*}^\tau(\mathbf{x}, y) \mathrm{d}y \\
&= \mathbf{x} \int_{\theta^{*\top}\mathbf{x}}^{\theta^\top\mathbf{x}} \alpha(1-\tau) \exp[-\alpha(y - (\tau\theta^* + (1-\tau)\theta)^\top\mathbf{x})] \tau(1-\tau) \exp(-\tau(y - \theta^{*\top}\mathbf{x})) \mathrm{d}y \\
&= \frac{\alpha\tau(1-\tau)^2}{\alpha+\tau} \left[\exp(-\alpha(1-\tau)(\theta^* - \theta)^\top\mathbf{x}) - \exp(-(\alpha+1)\tau(\theta - \theta^*)^\top\mathbf{x}) \right] \mathbf{x}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then there exists $\varphi_3 = \theta + a_3(\theta^* - \theta)$ for some constant $a_3 \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$S_\theta = S_{\theta^*} + \nabla_\theta S_{\varphi_3}^\top(\theta - \theta^*) = (A(\varphi_3) + B(\varphi_3))\mathbf{x}^\top(\theta - \theta^*).$$

Note that for the case of $\theta^{*\top}\mathbf{x} > \theta^\top\mathbf{x}$, the result is similar except for the appearances of τ is replaced by $(1-\tau)$ and, $\nabla_\theta S_\theta = -A(\theta) - B(\theta)$. Thus, under the assumption that $\exp(\tau^*|(\theta - \theta^*)^\top\mathbf{x}|)f_\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{x})$ has a finite first-order moment and noting $\mathbf{x}^\top(\theta - \theta^*) \leq \|\mathbf{x}\|_2\|\theta - \theta^*\|_2$, the integral with respect to x converges and

$$\rho_\alpha(\theta^*, \theta) = \alpha \iint (\mathcal{R}_\theta(\mathbf{x}, y) - 1) f_{\theta^*}^\tau(\mathbf{x}, y) \mathrm{d}y \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \leq \|\theta - \theta^*\|_2$$

when θ is close to θ^* . \square

LEMMA 36. *Let*

$$f_\theta^\tau(\mathbf{x}, y) := \tau(1-\tau) \exp\left(-Q_\tau(y - \theta^\top\mathbf{x})\right) f_\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{x}),$$

where $\theta \in \Omega$. If $f_\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{x})$ has a sufficiently light tail such that, the density function proportional to $\exp(\tau^*|(\theta - \theta^*)^\top\mathbf{x}|)f_\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{x})$ has a finite second-order moment, then for θ close enough to θ^* , there exists positive constant C independent of θ such that

$$h(\theta^*, \theta) \leq \phi_n \implies \|\theta^* - \theta\|_2 \leq C\phi_n.$$

PROOF. Recall that

$$h^2(\theta, \theta^*) = \frac{1}{2} \iint \left(\sqrt{f_\theta^\tau(\mathbf{x}, y)} - \sqrt{f_{\theta^*}^\tau(\mathbf{x}, y)} \right)^2 \mathrm{d}y \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}$$

and

$$\nabla_\theta \sqrt{f_\theta^\tau(\mathbf{x}, y)} = \begin{cases} -\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)} \frac{1-\tau}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{\tau-1}{2}(y - \theta^\top\mathbf{x})\right) \sqrt{f_\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{x})}\mathbf{x}, & y \leq \theta^\top\mathbf{x} \\ \sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)} \frac{\tau}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{\tau}{2}(y - \theta^\top\mathbf{x})\right) \sqrt{f_\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{x})}\mathbf{x}, & y > \theta^\top\mathbf{x}. \end{cases}$$

Consider the integrand in the following two cases:

- (i) When $y \leq \theta^{*\top}\mathbf{x} \leq \theta^\top\mathbf{x}$, there exists $\varphi_1 = \theta + a_1(\theta^* - \theta)$ for some constant $a_1 \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\sqrt{f_\theta^\tau(\mathbf{x}, y)} - \sqrt{f_{\theta^*}^\tau(\mathbf{x}, y)} = \sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)} \frac{\tau-1}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{\tau-1}{2}(y - \varphi_1^\top\mathbf{x})\right) \mathbf{x}^\top(\theta - \theta^*) \sqrt{f_\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{x})}.$$

Thus

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\theta^{*\top}\mathbf{x}} \left(\sqrt{f_\theta^\tau(\mathbf{x}, y)} - \sqrt{f_{\theta^*}^\tau(\mathbf{x}, y)} \right)^2 \mathrm{d}y$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int_{-\infty}^{\theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x}} \frac{\tau(1-\tau)^3}{4} \exp\left(-(\tau-1)(y - \varphi_1^\top \mathbf{x})\right) (\mathbf{x}^\top (\theta - \theta^*))^2 \mathrm{d}y \\
&= \frac{\tau(1-\tau)^2}{4} (\mathbf{x}^\top (\theta - \theta^*))^2 \exp(-(\tau-1)(\theta^* - \varphi_1)^\top \mathbf{x}) f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}).
\end{aligned}$$

(ii) When $\theta^\top \mathbf{x} \leq \theta^{*\top} \mathbf{x} \leq y$, there exists $\varphi_2 = \theta + a_2(\theta^* - \theta)$ for some constant $a_2 \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\sqrt{f_{\theta}^\top(\mathbf{x}, y)} - \sqrt{f_{\theta^*}^\top(\mathbf{x}, y)} = \sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)} \frac{\tau}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{\tau}{2}(y - \varphi_2^\top \mathbf{x})\right) \mathbf{x}^\top (\theta - \theta^*) \sqrt{f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\theta^\top \mathbf{x}}^{\infty} \left(\sqrt{f_{\theta}^\top(\mathbf{x}, y)} - \sqrt{f_{\theta^*}^\top(\mathbf{x}, y)}\right)^2 \mathrm{d}y \\
&= \int_{\theta^\top \mathbf{x}}^{\infty} \frac{\tau^3(1-\tau)}{4} \exp\left(-\tau(y - \varphi_2^\top \mathbf{x})\right) (\mathbf{x}^\top (\theta - \theta^*))^2 \mathrm{d}y \\
&= \frac{\tau^2(1-\tau)}{4} (\mathbf{x}^\top (\theta - \theta^*))^2 \exp(-\tau(\theta^* - \varphi_2)^\top \mathbf{x}) f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}).
\end{aligned}$$

Since the integrand in $h(\theta^*, \theta)$ is non-negative, the integral is lower-bounded by the integral computed only on the regions described in the above two cases. Under the assumption that $\exp(\tau^* |(\theta - \theta^*)^\top \mathbf{x}|) f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})$ has a finite second-order moment, when θ is close to θ^* ,

$$\begin{aligned}
h^2(\theta^*, \theta) &\geq \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{\tau^*(1-\tau^*)^2}{4} (\mathbf{x}^\top (\theta - \theta^*))^2 \exp(-\tau^* a_3 (\theta^* - \theta)^\top \mathbf{x}) f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \\
&\succeq \|\theta - \theta^*\|_2^2
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tau^* = \max\{\tau, 1-\tau\}$, $a_3 = \max\{1-a_1, 1-a_2\}$. The last step is by applying the covariance SVD argument as in the end of Lemma 26. \square

Funding. All authors were supported by the EPSRC research grant "Pooling Inference and Combining Distributions Exactly: A Bayesian approach (PINCODE)", reference (EP/X028100/1, EP/X028119/1, EP/X028712/1, EP/X027872/1).

LA, HD, MP and GOR were also supported by the UKRI grant, "On intelligence And Networks (OCEAN)", reference (EP/Y014650/1).

GOR was also supported by EPSRC grants Bayes for Health (R018561), CoSiNES (R034710), and EP/V009478/1.

REFERENCES

- ABOWD, J. M. (2018). The US Census Bureau adopts differential privacy. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining* 2867–2867.
- AKTAY, A., BAVADEKAR, S., COSSOUL, G., DAVIS, J., DESFONTAINES, D., FABRIKANT, A., GABRILOVICH, E., GADEPALLI, K., GIPSON, B., GUEVARA, M. et al. (2020). Google COVID-19 community mobility reports: anonymization process description (version 1.1). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.04145*.
- ALEXANDER, K. S. (1984). Probability inequalities for empirical processes and a law of the iterated logarithm. *The Annals of Probability* 1041–1067.
- APPLE (2017). Learning with Privacy at Scale. [Online; accessed 13-September-2023].
- ARTIN, E. (1964). *The gamma function*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- BENNETT, G. (1962). Probability inequalities for the sum of independent random variables. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 57 33–45.
- BERNSTEIN, G. and SHELDON, D. R. (2019). Differentially private bayesian linear regression. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 32.

- BLUMENSON, L. (1960). A derivation of n-dimensional spherical coordinates. *The American Mathematical Monthly* **67** 63–66.
- CAI, T. T., WANG, Y. and ZHANG, L. (2021). The cost of privacy: Optimal rates of convergence for parameter estimation with differential privacy. *The Annals of Statistics* **49** 2825–2850.
- DIMITRAKAKIS, C., NELSON, B., MITROKOTSA, A., RUBINSTEIN, B. et al. (2013). Bayesian differential privacy through posterior sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1306.1066*.
- DING, B., KULKARNI, J. and YEKHANIN, S. (2017). Collecting telemetry data privately. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **30**.
- DWORK, C. (2008). Differential privacy: A survey of results. In *International conference on theory and applications of models of computation* 1–19. Springer.
- DWORK, C., ROTH, A. et al. (2014). The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy. *Foundations and Trends® in Theoretical Computer Science* **9** 211–407.
- DWORK, C., MCSHERRY, F., NISSIM, K. and SMITH, A. (2006). Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis. In *Theory of Cryptography: Third Theory of Cryptography Conference, TCC 2006, New York, NY, USA, March 4-7, 2006. Proceedings 3* 265–284. Springer.
- ERLINGSSON, Ú., PIHUR, V. and KOROLOVA, A. (2014). Rappor: Randomized aggregatable privacy-preserving ordinal response. In *Proceedings of the 2014 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security* 1054–1067.
- FOULDS, J., GEUMLEK, J., WELLING, M. and CHAUDHURI, K. (2016). On the theory and practice of privacy-preserving Bayesian data analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.07294*.
- GHOSAL, S. (1997). A review of consistency and convergence of posterior distribution. In *Varanashi Symposium in Bayesian Inference, Banaras Hindu University*. Citeseer.
- GHOSAL, S. and VAN DER VAART, A. (2017). *Fundamentals of nonparametric Bayesian inference* **44**. Cambridge University Press.
- HEIKKILÄ, M., JÄLKÖ, J., DIKMEN, O. and HONKELA, A. (2019). Differentially private markov chain monte carlo. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **32**.
- HU, S., ASLETT, L., DAI, H., POLLOCK, M. and ROBERTS, G. (2024). Supplement to "Privacy Guarantees in Posterior Sampling under Contamination".
- HUBER, P. J. (2004). *Robust statistics* **523**. John Wiley & Sons.
- KOENKER, R. and BASSETT JR, G. (1978). Regression quantiles. *Econometrica: journal of the Econometric Society* 33–50.
- KROLL, M. (2021). On density estimation at a fixed point under local differential privacy.
- KULKARNI, T., JÄLKÖ, J., KOSKELA, A., KASKI, S. and HONKELA, A. (2021). Differentially private Bayesian inference for generalized linear models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning* 5838–5849. PMLR.
- LI, M., BERRETT, T. B. and YU, Y. (2022). On robustness and local differential privacy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.00751*.
- MACHANAVAJJHALA, A., KIFER, D., ABOWD, J., GEHRKE, J. and VILHUBER, L. (2008). Privacy: Theory meets practice on the map. In *2008 IEEE 24th international conference on data engineering* 277–286. IEEE.
- MU, W. and XIONG, S. (2023). On Huber’s contaminated model. *Journal of Complexity* **77** 101745.
- PATNAIK, P. (1949). The non-central χ^2 - and F-distribution and their applications. *Biometrika* **36** 202–232.
- PEREIRA, M., KIM, A., ALLEN, J., WHITE, K., FERRES, J. L. and DODHIA, R. (2021). US broadband coverage data set: a differentially private data release. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.14035*.
- ROHDE, A. and STEINBERGER, L. (2020). Geometrizing rates of convergence under local differential privacy constraints.
- SHEN, X. and WASSERMAN, L. (2001). Rates of convergence of posterior distributions. *The Annals of Statistics* **29** 687–714.
- SHEN, X. and WONG, W. H. (1994). Convergence rate of sieve estimates. *The Annals of Statistics* 580–615.
- TRIASTCYN, A. and FALTINGS, B. (2019). Federated learning with bayesian differential privacy. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)* 2587–2596. IEEE.
- TRIASTCYN, A. and FALTINGS, B. (2020). Bayesian differential privacy for machine learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning* 9583–9592. PMLR.
- VAN DER VAART, A. W. and WELLNER, J. (1996). *Weak convergence and empirical processes: with applications to statistics*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- WANG, Y.-X., FIENBERG, S. and SMOLA, A. (2015). Privacy for free: Posterior sampling and stochastic gradient monte carlo. In *International Conference on Machine Learning* 2493–2502. PMLR.
- WASSERMAN, L. (2004). *All of statistics: a concise course in statistical inference* **26**. Springer.
- WASSERMAN, L. (2020). Lecture Note 15, Intermediate Statistics, Fall 2020. [Online; accessed 19-October-2023].

- WONG, W. H. and SHEN, X. (1995). Probability inequalities for likelihood ratios and convergence rates of sieve MLEs. *The Annals of Statistics* 339–362.
- YILDIRIM, S. and ERMIŞ, B. (2019). Exact MCMC with differentially private moves: revisiting the penalty algorithm in a data privacy framework. *Statistics and Computing* **29** 947–963.
- YU, K. and MOYEEED, R. A. (2001). Bayesian quantile regression. *Statistics & Probability Letters* **54** 437–447.
- ZHANG, Z., RUBINSTEIN, B. and DIMITRAKAKIS, C. (2016). On the differential privacy of Bayesian inference. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* **30**.
- ZHANG, W. and ZHANG, R. (2023). DP-Fast MH: Private, Fast, and Accurate Metropolis-Hastings for Large-Scale Bayesian Inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.06171*.