

# Decentralized Privacy Preservation for Critical Connections in Graphs

Conggai Li, Wei Ni, *Fellow, IEEE*, Ming Ding, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Youyang Qu, *Member, IEEE*, Jianjun Chen, David Smith, *Member, IEEE*, Wenjie Zhang, *Senior Member, IEEE*, and Thierry Rakotoarivelo, *Senior Member, IEEE*

**Abstract**—Many real-world interconnections among entities can be characterized as graphs. Collecting local graph information with balanced privacy and data utility has garnered notable interest recently. This paper delves into the problem of identifying and protecting critical information of entity connections for individual participants in a graph based on cohesive subgraph searches. This problem has not been addressed in the literature. To address the problem, we propose to extract the critical connections of a queried vertex using a fortress-like cohesive subgraph model known as  $p$ -cohesion. A user's connections within a fortress are obfuscated when being released, to protect critical information about the user. Novel merit and penalty score functions are designed to measure each participant's critical connections in the minimal  $p$ -cohesion, facilitating effective identification of the connections. We further propose to preserve the privacy of a vertex enquired by only protecting its critical connections when responding to queries raised by data collectors. We prove that, under the decentralized differential privacy (DDP) mechanism, one's response satisfies  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DDP when its critical connections are protected while the rest remains unperturbed. The effectiveness of our proposed method is demonstrated through extensive experiments on real-life graph datasets.

**Index Terms**—Differential privacy, query release, critical connections,  $p$ -cohesion.



## 1 INTRODUCTION

GRAPHS have been widely used to model relationships among entities, *e.g.*, social networks and protein interactions. Connections among entities in graphs might reveal individual participants' private information [1], [2]. A serious privacy concern arises when graphs are probed and queried; *e.g.*, queries, such as subgraph counting [3], may be raised. Replies to these queries can adversely affect the privacy of individuals on the graphs, especially in the face of powerful graph analytic tools, *e.g.*, graph neural networks and graph convolutional networks, that can be misused to recover the structures of graphs and excavate private information based on queries, *e.g.*, subgraph counting queries. Several mechanisms have been proposed to enhance the privacy of entities involved in a graph and their associated vertices and edges [4]. For example, specific noises can be added to perturb the replies for such graph analytics [5], with limited success because of several unresolved issues.

One of the key challenges in privacy-enhanced graph analytics is correctly identifying critical connections of a vertex that are vulnerable to privacy leakage, and effectively obfuscating such sensitive information. In many cases, a

cohesive subgraph regarding a vertex captures noteworthy transactional interactions among the vertex and its peers that are particularly important to it. A variety of cohesive subgraph models has been developed in the literature to find core connections from a whole graph, such as  $k$ -core [6], [7],  $k$ -truss [8], [9], clique [10], [11], and  $p$ -cohesion [12], [13], [14], [15]. Among these,  $p$ -cohesion provides a fortress-like cohesive subgraph, which has been shown effective in applications such as modelling the epidemic's spread into the finite user group [14], [16], [17]. Given a graph  $G$  and a critical number  $p \in (0, 1)$ , the  $p$ -cohesion refers to a connected subgraph, in which every vertex has at least a fraction  $p$  of its neighbors within the subgraph [12]. These connections, identified by the critical number  $p$ , are called critical connections and can disclose sensitive information about a user, such as infection status [14], and therefore, should not be released without proper obfuscation. Users outside the fortress contain less sensitive information and can be disclosed without compromising the users within the fortress. The minimal  $p$ -cohesion of a vertex, an elementary unit of a  $p$ -cohesion, is not only cohesive but dense as well, containing the most critical information/relationship regarding the vertex in the graph.

However, there are no existing solutions specifically designed to protect the privacy of critical connections. In [5], Extended Local View (ELV) was proposed as an elementary unit for graph data protection, which only focuses on the proximity of a vertex enquired and does not capture the critical connections of the vertex. This technique cannot be directly applied to protect the privacy of the critical connection. Rigorous qualification and validation are required.

In this paper, we propose to protect the privacy of a vertex by giving priority to protecting its critical connec-

- C. Li, W. Ni, M. Ding, Y. Qu, D. Smith, T. Rakotoarivelo are with the Data 61, Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO), Sydney, NSW 2016. E-mail: {conggai.li, wei.ni, ming.ding, youyang.qu, david.smith, thierry.rakotoarivelo}@data61.csiro.au.
- J. Chen is with the Australian Artificial Intelligence Institute, University of Technology Sydney, Sydney, NSW 2007. Email: jianjun.chen@student.uts.edu.au.
- W. Zhang is with the School of Computer Science and Engineering, University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW 2052. E-mail: zhangw@cse.unsw.edu.au.

Manuscript received; revised.




Fig. 1: Motivating Example

tions. The critical connections of a vertex collect the edges forming a dense subgraph centered around the vertex, and can capture essential interactions between the vertex and others, potentially containing sensitive information about the vertex. We propose to identify the critical connections of a vertex as a dense minimal  $p$ -cohesion that includes the vertex enquired. To achieve this, we propose new merit and penalty score functions to identify the minimal  $p$ -cohesion, *i.e.*, critical connections, for each vertex. The functions find  $p$ -cohesions with higher densities and stronger cohesiveness. To protect the privacy of the identified critical connections, we formulate a differentially private query release problem ( $k$ -clique counting) under the Decentralized Differential Privacy (DDP) mechanism, where a two-phase framework [5] is applied. We qualify the use of the  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DDP for preserving the privacy of targeted vertices upon query releases on the minimal  $p$ -cohesions.

**Example 1.** Suppose that we have a small social network  $G$  with 17 users, which is illustrated in Fig. 1. For each user  $u_i \in G$ , the number of neighbors required in a  $p$ -cohesion is shown with a grey-filled dotted line square, when  $p = 0.5$ . User  $u_0$ 's  $p$ -cohesion  $C_p$  is enclosed in a dashed oval, encompassing all relationships. By contrast,  $u_0$ 's critical relationships (a minimal  $p$ -cohesion  $MC_p$ ) are marked within a grey-filled dashed circle—these connections are heavily interconnected. Applying the DDP mechanism to protect  $u_0$ 's all connections would introduce excessive noise and deteriorate the data utility. By contrast, protecting  $u_0$ 's connections with a focus on those critical, *i.e.*,  $MC_p$ , under the same mechanism can balance data utility and privacy.

**Contributions.** The main contributions are as follows:

- **Identify critical connections.** To identify the critical connections, we propose new score functions to effectively extract minimal  $p$ -cohesions (*i.e.*, critical connections) from a graph with different scales. Those score functions are proposed based on graph density, which is conducive to finding minimal  $p$ -cohesions with higher densities and strong cohesiveness.
- **Privacy preservation for critical connections in response to queries.** To protect the identified critical connections of a vertex in response to a query (*i.e.*,  $k$ -clique counting), we adopt the DDP mechanism and prove that  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DDP can be satisfied by only protecting the information of those identified critical connections.
- **Experimental Verification.** We conduct comprehensive experiments on real-life graph datasets. For  $k$ -clique counting, we demonstrate our proposed framework provides  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DDP guarantee to protect the critical connections of vertices and achieves higher data utility

TABLE 1: Summary of Notations

Notation	Definition
$G$	An unweighted and undirected graph
$V(G), E(G)$	The vertex set and the edge set of the graph $G$
$u(v)$	A vertex in the graph
$n, m$	Numbers of vertices and edges in $G$
$N(v, G)$	The set of adjacent vertices (neighbors) of $v$ in $G$
$\mathcal{F}$	A subgraph model
$N_{1h}^v(G)$	The set of 1-hop neighbors of $v$ in $G$ , <i>i.e.</i> , $N(v, G)$
$deg(v, G)$	The degree of $v$ in $G$ , <i>i.e.</i> , $deg(v, G) =  N(v, G) $
$C_p(v, G)$	A $p$ -cohesion containing $v$ in $G$
$MC_p(v, G)$	A minimal $p$ -cohesion containing $v$ in $G$
$d(G)$	The density of graph $G$
$\Gamma_S(v)$	The count of shape $S$ containing $v$ in graph $G$
$\Gamma_{S_{in}}(v)$	The count of shape $S$ containing $v$ that entirely in $MC_p(v, G)$
$\Gamma_{S_{out}}(v)$	The count of shape $S$ containing $v$ that are partially or entirely outside $MC_p(v, G)$ , <i>i.e.</i> , $\Gamma_{S_{out}}(v) = \Gamma_S(v) - \Gamma_{S_{in}}(v)$

than the ELV-based solution [5].

The remainder of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, we present the preliminary knowledge for this paper, followed by problem formulation and high-level solution in Section 3. The procedure for identifying critical connections is shown in Section 4, which is the foundation of the differentially private query release proposed in Section 5. The performance of the model is evaluated in Section 6. Related studies are reviewed in Section 7. A conclusion is reached in Section 8.

## 2 PRELIMINARY

Given an undirected and unweighted graph  $G = (V, E)$ , where  $V$  (*resp.*  $E$ ) is the set of vertices (*resp.* edges), we use  $n = |V|$  and  $m = |E|$  to denote the number of vertices and edges, respectively. Suppose  $N(v, G)$  is the neighbor of  $v$  in  $G$ , we use  $deg(v, G)$  to denote the degree of  $v$  in  $G$ , where  $|N(v, G)| = deg(v, G)$ . Let  $S$  denote a subgraph of  $G$ . We use  $V(S)$  to represent the vertices of  $S$ . When the context is clear, we may omit the target graph in notations, *e.g.*, using  $N(v)$  (*resp.*,  $S$ ) instead of  $N(v, G)$  (*resp.*,  $V(S)$ ). Table 1 summarizes the notations.

**$p$ -Cohesion.** In [15], it is shown that  $p$ -cohesion is a fortress-like cohesive subgraph, in which, every vertex has at least a fraction  $p$  of its neighbors in the subgraph, *i.e.*, at most a fraction  $(1 - p)$  of its neighbors outside. In other words, a  $p$ -cohesion can ensure inner cohesiveness.

**Definition 1. ( $p$ -Cohesion).** Given a graph  $G$ , a real value  $p \in (0, 1)$ , and a connected subgraph  $S$ , if for any vertex  $v \in S$  with  $deg(v, S) \geq \lceil p \times deg(v, G) \rceil$ , we say  $S$  is a  $p$ -cohesion, denoted by  $C_p(G)$ .

Let  $C_p(v, G)$  be the  $p$ -cohesion containing  $v$ . We use  $C_p(v)$  instead of  $C_p(v, G)$  when the context is clear.

**Minimal  $p$ -cohesion.** A subgraph  $S$  is a minimal  $p$ -cohesion if no proper subgraph  $S' \subset S$  that qualifies as a  $p$ -cohesion. For example, irrespective of the chosen  $p$  value, for every vertex in graph  $G$ , the whole graph  $G$  is a  $p$ -cohesion but not minimal. Since minimal  $p$ -cohesion is the elementary unit of a  $p$ -cohesion, we concentrate on determining the minimal  $p$ -cohesion that includes a specific vertex  $v$ . For a  $p$ -cohesion  $C_p(v)$ , by deleting every redundant vertex in  $C_p(v)$  except  $v$ , we can obtain the minimal  $p$ -cohesion that includes  $v$ , denoted by  $MC_p(v, G)$ . In the following, when we say “the  $p$ -cohesion containing  $v$ ”, we mean the minimal one.

**Definition 2. (Critical Connection).** Given a graph  $G$  and a vertex  $v$ , we say the connections identified by the minimal  $p$ -cohesion containing  $v$  are  $v$ 's critical connections.

**Differential Privacy.** Differential Privacy (DP) was first introduced by Dwork *et al.* [18], and has been widely used in the privacy-enhanced release and analysis of data.

**Definition 3. (DP).** A randomization mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  is  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -differentially private if, for any two neighboring datasets  $D$  and  $D'$  that differs by one record and for all  $S \subseteq \text{Range}(\mathcal{M})$ ,

$$\Pr[\mathcal{M}(D) \in S] \leq \Pr[\mathcal{M}(D') \in S] \cdot e^\varepsilon + \delta, \quad (1)$$

where  $\varepsilon$  is the privacy budget that controls the strength of privacy protection, and  $\delta \in [0, 1]$  denotes a failure probability. When  $\delta = 0$ ,  $\mathcal{M}$  is  $\varepsilon$ -differentially private.

**Neighboring Graph.** Given a graph  $G = (V, E)$  with vertex (*resp.* edge) set is  $V$  (*resp.*  $E$ ), its neighboring graph  $G' = (V', E')$  can be generated by either adding/removing an isolated vertex in  $V$  or by adding/removing an edge in  $E$  [5], [19]. In this paper, we focus on the edge privacy model, *i.e.*,  $V = V'$  and  $\|E\| - \|E \cap E'\| = 1$ .

**Neighboring Subgraph.** Given a graph  $G = (V, E)$ , its neighboring graph  $G' = (V, E')$  and a subgraph model  $\mathcal{F}$  (*e.g.*,  $p$ -cohesion). For a vertex  $v \in V$ , under model  $\mathcal{F}$ , its subgraph on  $G$  is denoted by  $S = \mathcal{F}(v, G)$ . The neighboring subgraph  $S'$  of  $S$  on  $G'$  is  $S' = \mathcal{F}(v, G')$ , which may be different in both edges and vertices.

**Decentralized Differential Privacy (DDP).** In a graph, each vertex can release its own information to non-trusted parties using DDP.

**Definition 4. (DDP).** Given a vertex set  $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$  with  $n$  nodes, a subgraph model  $\mathcal{F}$ , a set of randomization mechanisms  $\{\mathcal{M}_i, 1 \leq i \leq n\}$  satisfy  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DDP, if

$$\Pr[\mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{F}(v_1, G)) \in \mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_n(\mathcal{F}(v_n, G)) \in \mathcal{S}_n] \leq \Pr[\mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{F}(v_1, G')) \in \mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_n(\mathcal{F}(v_n, G')) \in \mathcal{S}_n] \cdot e^\varepsilon + \delta, \quad (2)$$

for any two neighboring graphs  $G = (V, E)$  and  $G' = (V, E')$  and for all subsets  $\{\mathcal{S}_i \subseteq \text{Range}(\mathcal{M}), 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ .

**Definition 5. (Local Sensitivity under DDP [5]).** Given a graph  $G = (V, E)$  with  $n$  nodes, its arbitrary neighboring graph is  $G' = (V, E')$ , where  $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ , a subgraph model  $\mathcal{F}$ , and a function  $f$ , the local sensitivity of  $f$  is defined as:

$$LS(f) = \max_{G, G'} \sum_{i=1}^n |f(\mathcal{F}(v_i, G)) - f(\mathcal{F}(v_i, G'))| \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathcal{F}(v_i, G)$  and  $\mathcal{F}(v_i, G')$  ( $1 \leq i \leq n$ ) are the neighboring subgraphs with respect to  $G$  and  $G'$ , respectively.

### 3 PROBLEM AND APPROACH OVERVIEW

We study the differentially private critical connection protection problem in a graph under the client-server model. Specifically, under the DDP mechanism, we aim to protect a vertex's critical connections when responding to queries (*i.e.*, subgraph counting) raised by data analysts. The subgraph counting is to count the occurrences of a user-specified shape (or subgraph)  $S$  (*e.g.*, triangle) containing a target vertex  $v$  in graph  $G$ .

**Problem Statement.** Given an undirected unweighted graph  $G = (V, E)$ , a critical number  $p \in (0, 1)$ , a privacy budget  $\varepsilon$ , an invalidation probability  $\delta$ , a set of randomization mechanisms  $\{\mathcal{M}_i, 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ , and a user-specified shape  $S$ ; for each vertex  $v_i \in V$ , subgraphs counting under DDP for critical connections protection is to

- identify  $v_i$ 's critical connections from the minimal  $p$ -cohesion containing  $v_i$ .  $MC_p(v_i, G)$  denotes the induced subgraph of  $v_i$ 's critical connections from  $G$ ;
- count the occurrences of  $S$  shapes containing  $v_i$  in  $MC_p(v_i, G)$ .  $\Gamma_{S_{in}}(v_i)$  denotes the count;
- perturb the count  $\Gamma_{S_{in}}(v_i)$  using  $\mathcal{M}_i$ . The perturbed count is denoted by  $\Gamma_{S_{in}}^*(v_i)$ ;
- count the occurrences of  $S$  shapes containing  $v_i$  in the complementary part of  $MC_p(v_i, G)$  in  $G$ . The count is denoted by  $\Gamma_{S_{out}}(v_i)$ ; and
- report the total count  $\Gamma_S(v_i) = \Gamma_{S_{in}}^*(v_i) + \Gamma_{S_{out}}(v_i)$  to the data analyst, which ensures  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DDP.

#### 3.1 Overview of Our Approach

We propose the following techniques to solve the problem.

- **Identifying critical connections using minimal  $p$ -cohesions.** As mentioned earlier,  $p$ -cohesion is an important cohesive subgraph model [15], which can be used to identify one's critical connections. The  $p$ -cohesion forms a fortress; *i.e.*, the vertices inside a  $p$ -cohesion are more connected than those outside. Considering the elegant fortress property of minimal  $p$ -cohesion, for a vertex  $v_i$ , we use  $v_i$ 's minimal  $p$ -cohesion to identify its critical connections that need to be protected. We prove that our solution can protect the privacy of the target and its critical connections, and as a result, can provide better data utilities than the existing ELV-based solution developed in [5]. More details are shown in Section 4.
- **Protecting critical connections identified by minimal  $p$ -cohesions.** We propose a tailored  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DDP mechanism, which reduces the amount of injected noises and improves the data utility by only perturbing the query results generated from one's minimal  $p$ -cohesion and keeping the following response as it is. For the subgraph counting query problem, the function  $f$  counts the occurrence of such shapes (or subgraphs)  $S$  containing a vertex  $v_i$ . Let  $MC_p(v_i)$  be a minimal  $p$ -cohesion of vertex  $v_i$ , which contains its critical connections and the corresponding vertices. Let  $\Gamma_{S_{in}}(v_i)$  denote the number of occurrences of  $S$  shape containing  $v_i$  within  $MC_p(v_i)$ . This implies that both the vertices and the connections that form  $S$  shape are entirely within  $MC_p(v_i)$ . Let  $\Gamma_{S_{out}}(v_i)$  denote the number of  $S$  shape that are partially or entirely outside  $MC_p(v_i)$ , and let  $\Gamma_S(v_i)$  denote the total count of  $S$  shape within the entire graph  $G$ , we have  $\Gamma_S(v_i) = \Gamma_{S_{in}}(v_i) + \Gamma_{S_{out}}(v_i)$ . We only perturb  $\Gamma_{S_{in}}(v_i)$  in response to the query regarding  $v_i$ , *i.e.*, reporting  $\Gamma_S^*(v_i) = \Gamma_{S_{in}}^*(v_i) + \Gamma_{S_{out}}(v_i)$  to the data analyst, where  $\Gamma_{S_{in}}^*(v_i)$  gives the perturbed counts of the user-given shape  $S$  in the minimal  $p$ -cohesion, *i.e.*,  $\Gamma_{S_{in}}^*(v_i) = \Gamma_{S_{in}}(v_i) + \text{Lap}(\lambda)$ . In Section 5, we prove that perturbed response  $\Gamma_S^*(v_i)$  from  $v_i$  still satisfies  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DDP for given  $\varepsilon$  and  $\delta$ .

## 4 CRITICAL CONNECTION IDENTIFICATION

We identify critical connections with minimal  $p$ -cohesion. According to Definition 1, any connected component is a  $p$ -cohesion, which could be large. We devise an expand-shrink framework: Given a vertex, we repeatedly expand it into a  $p$ -cohesion and then shrink it to its minimal form.

### 4.1 Expand Procedure

Starting from a queried vertex  $q$ , this procedure finds a  $p$ -cohesion subgraph for  $q$  in a bottom-up manner. Suppose  $V_p$  is the vertex set of a partial  $p$ -cohesion that includes  $q$ , we repeatedly expand the vertices in  $V_p$  to form a  $p$ -cohesion.

---

#### Algorithm 1 *Expand* ( $G, q, p$ )

---

**Input** :  $G$  : a graph,  $q$  : a queried vertex,  
 $p$  : a real number in  $(0, 1)$   
**Output** : a  $p$ -cohesive subgraph containing  $q$

- 1:  $V_p := \{q\}$ ;  $\mathcal{Q} := \emptyset$ ;  $\triangleright \mathcal{Q}$ : maximal priority queue
- 2: put all  $v \in V_p$  to  $\mathcal{Q}$  with key on  $\deg(v, G(V_p))$
- 3:  $s(u) \leftarrow$  calculate a score for each vertex  $u$  within  $G$
- 4: **while**  $\mathcal{Q} \neq \emptyset$  **do**
- 5:    $u \leftarrow \mathcal{Q}.pop()$ ;  $\mathcal{N} := \emptyset$ ;  $\triangleright \mathcal{N}$ : maximal priority queue
- 6:   put all  $w \in N(u, G) - V_p$  to  $\mathcal{N}$  with key on  $s(w)$
- 7:    $b := \max(\lceil \deg(u, G) \times p \rceil - \deg(u, G(V_p)), 0)$
- 8:    $T \leftarrow$  top  $b$  elements in  $\mathcal{N}$ ;  $V_p := V_p \cup T$
- 9:   **for**  $w \in T$  **do**
- 10:     **if**  $\deg(w, G(V_p)) < \lceil \deg(w, G) \times p \rceil$  **then**  $\mathcal{Q}.push(w)$
- 11:   update score  $s(v)$  for each  $v \in V(G)$
- 12: **Return**  $G(V_p)$

---

Algorithm 1 outlines the **Expand** procedure for finding a  $p$ -cohesion containing query vertex  $q$ . The set  $V_p$  records the vertices included to form a  $p$ -cohesion, starting initially with  $V_p = \{q\}$  (Line 1). For each vertex  $u \in V_p$ , it's necessary to add  $\lceil \deg(u, G) \times p \rceil - \deg(u, G(V_p))$  additional vertices to  $V_p$  to ensure  $u$ 's inclusion in a  $p$ -cohesion. Here,  $\deg(u, G)$  and  $\deg(u, G(V_p))$  represent the number of  $u$ 's neighbors in  $V(G)$  and  $V_p$ , respectively. A priority queue  $\mathcal{Q}$  represents vertices within  $V_p$  that do not yet meet  $p$  constraint (Line 1), ordered by  $\deg(v, G(V_p))$  in a descending order (Line 2). If two vertices have the same degree, the one with the smaller identifier is prioritized in  $\mathcal{Q}$ . For each vertex  $u$ , we calculate a score  $s(u)$  (Line 3).

In each iteration (Lines 4-11), the vertex  $u \in \mathcal{Q}$  with the maximum  $\deg(u, G(V_p))$  is removed from the queue at Line 5. At Lines 5-6, we generate a maximal priority queue  $\mathcal{N}$  to store the candidates that can help  $u$  to reach the  $p$  constraint, i.e.,  $u$ 's neighbors outside  $V_p$  (i.e.,  $N(u, G) - V_p$ ). For each  $w \in \mathcal{N}$ , its key is the score  $s(w)$  in descending order (Line 6). For two vertices with the same score  $s$ , the vertex with a smaller identifier will be placed at the top of the queue. For the chosen  $u$ , we add its additional  $b$  neighbors to  $V_p$ , where  $b$  is the number of  $u$ 's neighbors that  $u$  needs to meet the  $p$  constraint (Line 7). Let  $T$  be the top  $b$  vertices in  $\mathcal{N}$  with the largest scores (Line 8). At Line 8, all vertices in  $T$  are added to  $V_p$ . For any  $w \in T$  that do not satisfy  $p$  constraint, we add it to  $\mathcal{Q}$  for further expansion (Lines 9-10). All vertices' scores are updated after one-round processing at Line 11. The algorithm will return at Line 12 if  $\mathcal{Q}$  is empty. In other words,  $G(V_p)$  is a  $p$ -cohesion.

*Time complexity.* For  $G(V_p)$ , let  $\tilde{n}$  and  $\tilde{m}$  represent the number of its vertices and edges, respectively. The number of to-expand vertices pushed into  $\mathcal{Q}$  is  $\tilde{n}$  (Line 4). To retrieve value  $b$  for each vertex, we need to visit its neighbors, which requires  $\mathcal{O}(m + n)$ . Meanwhile, updating scores  $s(\cdot)$  for the neighbors of  $u$  requires  $\mathcal{O}(\deg(u, G) \times \log(\deg(u, G)))$ . Algorithm 1's time complexity is  $\mathcal{O}(\tilde{n}(m + n))$ .

*Space complexity.* Sets  $V_p$ ,  $\mathcal{Q}$ ,  $\mathcal{N}$ ,  $s(\cdot)$ , and  $\deg(\cdot)$  each require  $\mathcal{O}(n)$  space. Similarly,  $G$  and  $N(\cdot)$  require  $\mathcal{O}(m+n)$  space each. Algorithm 1's space complexity is  $\mathcal{O}(m+n)$ .

**Score Function.** In Algorithm 1, at Lines 6-8, we add  $b$  of  $u$ 's neighbors with the largest scores to  $V_p$ . We define two new scores: *merit* and *penalty*, since adding one vertex  $w \notin V_p$  to  $V_p$  may need to include more of  $w$ 's neighbors to help  $w$  stay in a  $p$ -cohesion. A vertex that can better balance the trade-off between merit and penalty should be added to  $V_p$ .

*Density.* As mentioned in Section 3.1, for a queried vertex  $q$ , we search for a subgraph containing  $q$  with higher density. We first define the concept of graph density. Given an undirected graph  $G = (V, E)$ , the density is defined as:

$$d(G) = 2|E|/(|V|(|V| - 1)), \quad (4)$$

where  $|V|$  (resp.  $|E|$ ) is the number of vertices (resp. edges) in  $G$ , and  $0 < d(G) \leq 1$ .  $d(G) = 1$  means the graph  $G$  is fully connected, i.e., the graph is the densest.

Given the partial vertex set  $V_p$  of a  $p$ -cohesion that includes queried vertex  $q$ , let  $G(V_p)$  and  $E(G(V_p))$  be its induced subgraph and the corresponding edge set, respectively. We have  $E(G(V_p)) = \{(u, v) | (u, v) \in E, u \in V_p, v \in V_p\}$ . Based on Eq. (4), the density of  $G(V_p)$  is given by:

$$d(G(V_p)) = 2|E(G(V_p))|/(|V_p|(|V_p| - 1)). \quad (5)$$

When adding a vertex  $w \notin V_p$  to  $V_p$ , the density is:

$$d(G(V_p \cup \{w\})) = \frac{2(|E(G(V_p))| + \deg(w, G(V_p)))}{(|V_p| + 1)|V_p|}. \quad (6)$$

By adding a candidate  $w$  with larger  $\deg(w, G(V_p))$ , the density of the resulting subgraph can be increased.

Furthermore, we may need to include additional neighbors of  $w$  into  $V_p$  to maintain  $p$ -cohesion. Let  $l$  be the number of neighbors required for  $w$  to maintain a  $p$ -cohesion. We have  $l = \max(\lceil \deg(w, G) \times p \rceil - \deg(w, G(V_p)), 0)$ . Let  $N_c(w) = \{o_1, o_2, \dots, o_l\}$  ( $o_i \in N(w, G - G(V_p))$ ) be  $w$ 's neighbors (outside  $V_p$ ) chosen to be expanded to  $V_p$ , and  $\tilde{V}_p = V_p \cup \{w\} \cup N_c(w)$ . The potential density of  $G(\tilde{V}_p)$  is:

$$d(G(\tilde{V}_p)) \approx \frac{2}{(|V_p| + 1 + l)(|V_p| + l)} \times (|E(G(V_p))| + \deg(w, G(V_p)) + \sum_{i=1}^l (1 + \deg(o_i, G(V_p)))). \quad (7)$$

Generally speaking, the potential density depends primarily on  $d' = \frac{\deg(w, G(V_p)) + \sum_{i=1}^l 1 + \deg(o_i, G(V_p))}{l(l+1)}$ . A higher  $d'$  value will result in a higher subgraph density: the vertex  $w$  with larger  $\deg(w, G(V_p))$  and more neighbors in common with  $q$  in  $V_p$  should be chosen. In light of this, we propose the following merit score.

*Merit.* The inclusion of a vertex  $w \notin V_p$  should (i) increase the density of  $G(V_p)$  and (ii) contribute to the decrease of the number of  $w$ 's neighbors  $u$  in  $V_p$  with  $\deg(u, G(V_p)) < \lceil \deg(u, G) \times p \rceil$ . We define the merit score of  $w$  as follows:

$$s^+(w) = \frac{\deg(w, G(V_p))}{\deg(w, G)} \times \frac{|N_{cn}(w, q, G(V_p))|}{\deg(w, G)} \times \frac{|N_{ctri}(w, G(V_p))|}{\deg(w, G)}, \quad (8)$$

where  $N_{cn}(w, q, G(V_p))$  is the common neighbors between  $w$  and  $q$  in  $V_p$ , and  $N_{cn}(w, q, G(V_p)) = \{u | u \in N(q, G(V_p)), u \in N(w, G(V_p)), w \notin V_p\}$ . Similarly,  $N_{ctri}(w, G(V_p))$  is the set of  $w$ 's neighbor  $u$  in  $V_p$  that do not satisfy the  $p$  constraint, i.e.,  $N_{ctri}(w, G(V_p)) = \{u | u \in N(w, G(V_p)), \deg(u, G(V_p)) < \lceil \deg(u, G) \times p \rceil\}$ . The first two parts of  $s^+(w)$  account for the influence on the  $G(V_p)$  density when adding  $w$  to  $V_p$ . The third part of  $s^+(w)$  is  $w$ 's contribution to the increase in the degrees of some vertices within  $V_p$ . To eliminate the influence of dimension between indicators, we normalize each part of  $s^+(w)$  by  $\deg(w, G)$  in Eq. (8).

*Penalty.* To expand a vertex  $u \in V_p$ , adding its neighbor  $w \notin V_p$  will have A penalty effect: (i)  $w$  may need more neighbors to meet  $p$  constraint, and (ii)  $d(G(\widetilde{V}_p))$  may be no larger than  $d(G(V_p))$  if adding both  $w$  and its outside neighbors  $N_c(w)$ . To quantify this effect, we propose the penalty score:

$$s^-(w) = \frac{\overline{\deg}(w, G(V_p))}{\deg(w, G)} / \left( \sum_{i=1}^l \frac{\deg(o_i, G(V_p))}{\deg(w, G)} \right), \quad (9)$$

where  $\overline{\deg}(w, G(V_p)) = \max(0, \lceil \deg(w, G) \times p \rceil - \deg(w, G(V_p)))$  is the number of  $w$ 's neighbors that is required to meet the  $p$  constraint, and  $l = \overline{\deg}(w, G(V_p))$ .  $o_i$  is  $w$ 's neighbor outside  $V_p$  (i.e.,  $o_i \in N(w, G - G(V_p))$ ). Adding  $w$  may need more vertices to be added to  $V_p$ , which may decrease the density. To lessen this effect, we place  $\overline{\deg}(w, G(V_p))$  at the numerator. Besides, as shown in Eq. (7), including a vertex  $o_i$  with larger  $\deg(o_i, G(V_p))$  could result in a larger density. To enlarge  $o_i$ 's effect, we place  $\deg(o_i, G(V_p))$  at the denominator. We also normalize each part by  $\deg(w, G)$ .

Considering both merit and penalty, we propose the overall score for each vertex outside  $V_p$  as follows:

$$s(w) = s^+(w) - s^-(w). \quad (10)$$

The score  $s(\cdot)$  can help to decide which vertex should be added to  $V_p$  in Line 6 of Algorithm 1

**Example 2.** For the graph  $G$  in Fig. 1, suppose  $q = u_0$ , in Algorithm 1,  $u_0$  will be popped in the first iteration, i.e.,  $u = u_0$  (Line 5). The candidates will be  $\mathcal{N} = \{u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4, u_5, u_6\}$  (Line 6), and  $b = 3$ . We may first choose  $u_1, u_5$ , and  $u_6$  to  $V_p$  in Lines 7-8, i.e.,  $V_p = \{u_0, u_1, u_5, u_6\}$ .  $u_1$  will be pushed into  $\mathcal{Q}$  in Lines 9-10 since it does not satisfy  $p$  constraint. In the second iteration,  $u_1$  will be popped for further process, i.e.,  $u = u_1$ . The candidates for  $u_1$  are  $\mathcal{N} = \{u_2, u_4, u_7, u_8\}$ , from which,  $u_2$  and  $u_7$  will be expanded, i.e.,  $V_p = \{u_0, u_1, u_5, u_6, u_2, u_7\}$ . Since  $u_1$ 's  $b = \max(3-1, 0) = 2$  and,  $u_2, u_7$  are with the top two largest score in  $\mathcal{N}$ , i.e.,  $s(u_2) = s^+(u_2) - s^-(u_2) = \frac{2}{5} - \frac{3-2}{5} = -\frac{3}{5}$ ,  $s(u_7) = \frac{4}{3}$ ,  $s(u_4) = -\frac{3}{5}$ ,  $s(u_8) = -\frac{4}{5}$ .  $u_2$  will be pushed into  $\mathcal{Q}$  for further expansion in Lines 9-10. In the next two iterations,  $u_3$  and  $u_4$  will be expanded respectively, i.e.,  $V_p = \{u_0, u_1, u_5, u_6, u_2, u_7, u_3, u_4\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{Q}$  will be empty. Algorithm 1 returns the subgraph induced by  $V_p = \{u_0, u_1, u_5, u_6, u_2, u_7, u_3, u_4\}$ .

## 4.2 Shrink Procedure

The expanded  $p$ -cohesion containing  $q$  returned by Algorithm 1 may include redundant vertices. To further mini-

mize the vertices number in  $p$ -cohesion and identify  $q$ 's close connections, redundancies need to be removed.

---

### Algorithm 2 Shrink ( $C_p(q, G)$ , $q, p$ )

---

**Input:**  $C_p(q, G)$  : a  $p$ -cohesion of graph  $G$  containing  $q$ ,  
 $q$  : a queried vertex,  $p$  : a real value within  $(0, 1)$   
**Output :** a minimal  $p$ -cohesive subgraph containing  $q$

- 1:  $S \leftarrow C_p(G); M_q := \{q\} \triangleright M_q$ : a must included vertex set
- 2:  $Tag \leftarrow [0] * |V(S)|; Tag[q] := 2;$
- 3: **while**  $0 \in Tag$  **do**
- 4:     **for**  $v \in S$  **do**
- 5:         **if**  $Tag[v] > 0$  **then** continue
- 6:          $S' \leftarrow S; Tag' \leftarrow Tag$
- 7:          $S \leftarrow S - \{v \cup E(v)\}; Tag[v] := 1$
- 8:         **while**  $\exists u \in S$  with  $\deg(u, S) < \lceil \deg(u, G) \times p \rceil$  **do**
- 9:              $S \leftarrow S - \{u \cup E(u, S)\}; Tag[u] := 1$
- 10:         **if**  $\exists u \in M_q \& u \notin S$  **then**
- 11:              $S \leftarrow S'; Tag \leftarrow Tag'; M_q \leftarrow M_q \cup \{v\}; Tag[v] := 2$
- 12: **Return**  $S$

---

Algorithm 2 shows the pseudo-code of **Shrink** procedure, which finds a minimal  $p$ -cohesion that includes the queried vertex  $q$ . Here,  $C_p(q, G)$  represents a  $p$ -cohesion containing  $q$ , which is obtained from the output of Algorithm 1. We use  $M_q$  to record vertices that must be included in a minimal  $p$ -cohesion that includes  $q$ . Initially  $M_p = \{q\}$  (Line 1).  $S$  is a back-up of  $C_p(q, G)$  (Line 1). The set  $Tag$  ensures the deletion of each selected vertex only once. Initially, all vertices in  $S$  have  $Tag[i] = 0$  ( $1 \leq i \leq |V(S)|$ ), except for the queried vertex  $q$  ( $Tag[q] = 2$ ).  $Tag[i] = 0$  means the vertex  $i$  has not been proceeded,  $Tag[i] = 1$  means vertex  $i$  has been deleted, and  $Tag[i] = 2$  (Line 2) means vertex  $i$  must be included in the minimal  $p$ -cohesion.

We proceed to delete vertex  $v \in S$  with  $Tag[v] = 0$  (Lines 3-11). Sets  $S'$  and  $Tag'$  are used for recovering, since  $v$ 's removal may result in the removal of vertices in  $M_q$  (Lines 10-11). After removing  $v$ , its corresponding edges will be removed and its tag will be set as  $Tag[v] = 1$  (Line 7). The removal of  $v$  may cause the  $p$ -cohesion violation for some vertices in  $S$ , we remove those vertices and their corresponding edges at Lines 8-9. If  $v$ 's removal will result in the deletion of any vertex in  $M_q$ , we will roll back  $S, Tag$  and put  $v$  into  $M_q$ , which means  $v$  cannot be removed and must be included in the minimal  $p$ -cohesion that includes  $q$  (Lines 10-11). After trying each vertex's removal, the algorithm returns the minimal  $p$ -cohesion that includes  $q$ .

*Time complexity.* We use  $\tilde{n}$  and  $\tilde{m}$  to represent the number of vertices and edges in  $S$ , respectively. Visiting every vertex in  $S$  and  $Tag$  takes  $\mathcal{O}(\tilde{n})$  (Lines 3-4). In then case when a vertex  $v$  is removed in Line 7 or Line 9, its neighbors may breach the  $p$  constraint (Line 8). Consequently, each vertex in  $S$  is visited once for removal and each edge is traversed once for degree updating, which needs  $\mathcal{O}(\tilde{m} + \tilde{n})$ . The recovery of  $S$  and  $Tag$  requires  $\mathcal{O}(\tilde{m} + \tilde{n})$  (Line 11). Algorithm 2's time complexity is  $\mathcal{O}(\tilde{n}^2(\tilde{m} + \tilde{n}))$ .

*Space complexity.* Sets  $M_q, Tag$ , and  $\deg(\cdot)$  require  $\mathcal{O}(n)$  space each, while  $G$  and  $S$  require  $\mathcal{O}(m + n)$  space each. Algorithm 2's space complexity is  $\mathcal{O}(m + n)$ .

## 5 DIFFERENTIALLY PRIVATE QUERY RELEASE OVER CRITICAL CONNECTIONS

### 5.1 Qualification of DDP on Critical Connections

In this section, we prove that by only protecting each participant's close connections (identified by the minimal  $p$ -cohesion), the query response satisfies  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DDP. In the following, we focus on the fundamental problem of DP-based graph data release, *i.e.*, subgraph counting. Based on the description of  $p$ -cohesion and minimal  $p$ -cohesion, not all connections of a participant are included. We only perturb the subgraph count within the minimal  $p$ -cohesions. It is prudent to qualify the validity of DDP for the subgraph count obtained on minimal  $p$ -cohesion.

Given graph  $G$ , let  $N_{1h}^{v_i}(G)$  be the one-hop neighbors of  $v_i$  in  $G$ . Given a vertex  $v_i \in G$ , and its minimal  $p$ -cohesion  $MC_p(v_i, G)$ , we have  $N_{1h}^{v_i}(MC_p(v_i)) \subseteq N_{1h}^{v_i}(G)$ . Given a query function  $f$  and a noise scale  $\lambda$ ,  $v_i$  reports its perturbed response  $\Gamma_S^*(v_i) = \Gamma_{S_{in}}^*(v_i) + \Gamma_{S_{out}}(v_i)$  to the data collector, where the response generated from its critical connections in  $MC_p(v_i)$  is  $\Gamma_{S_{in}}^*(v_i) = \Gamma_{S_{in}}(v_i) + Lap(\lambda)$ ,  $\Gamma_{S_{in}}(v_i) = f(MC_p(v_i))$ , and the response generated from the complementary part of  $MC_p(v_i, G)$  in  $G$  is  $\Gamma_{S_{out}}$ . We show that applying a randomization mechanism  $\mathcal{M}_i(MC_p(v_i, G))$  to the query response  $\Gamma_S(v_i)$  satisfies DDP.

**Theorem 1.** *Given a graph  $G$ , a vertex  $v_i$ , its minimal  $p$ -cohesion  $MC_p(v_i)$ , and a noise scale  $\lambda$ , we can assert that  $\Gamma_S^*(v_i) = \Gamma_{S_{in}}(v_i) + Lap(\lambda) + \Gamma_{S_{out}}(v_i)$  ensures  $\frac{LS(\Gamma_S^*)}{\lambda}$ -DDP, where  $LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}})$  is the maximum local sensitivity of all  $\Gamma_{S_{in}}(v_i)$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .*

*Proof.* Haipei *et al.* [5] proved that when considering all connections of  $v_i$  to generate a query response, the perturbed response  $\Gamma_S^*(v_i)$  satisfies  $\frac{LS(\Gamma_S^*)}{\lambda}$ -DDP. In this case,  $\Gamma_S^*(v_i) = \Gamma_{S_{in}}(v_i) + Lap(\lambda) + 0$  and  $LS(\Gamma_S) = LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}})$ .

For a vertex  $v_i \in G$ , we identify critical connections to be protected using the minimal  $p$ -cohesion (*i.e.*,  $MC_p(v_i)$ ), rather than all connections. According to Definition 1,  $deg(v_i, MC_p(v_i)) \geq \lceil deg(v_i, G) \times p \rceil$ . We can show that, for different  $p$  values, our results satisfy  $\frac{LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}})}{\lambda}$ -DDP, as follows.

When  $p$  is large enough, *i.e.*,  $N_{1h}^{v_i}(MC_p(v_i)) = N_{1h}^{v_i}(G)$ , all connections of  $v_i$  are in its minimal  $p$ -cohesion  $MC_p(v_i)$ , *i.e.*,  $deg(v_i, MC_p(v_i)) = deg(v_i, G)$ . The query response from the complementary part of the minimal  $p$ -cohesion is  $\Gamma_{S_{out}}(v_i) = 0$  since all connections of  $v_i$  are critical with larger  $p$  values. Thus,  $\Gamma_S^*(v_i) = \Gamma_{S_{in}}(v_i) + Lap(\lambda)$ , satisfying  $\frac{LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}})}{\lambda}$ -DDP.

When  $p$  is small, *i.e.*,  $N_{1h}^{v_i}(MC_p(v_i)) \subset N_{1h}^{v_i}(G)$ , not all adjacent vertices of  $v_i$  are included in  $MC_p(v_i)$ . According to Definition 1,  $deg(v_i, MC_p(v_i)) < deg(v_i, G)$ , and  $N_{1h}^{v_i}(MC_p(v_i)) \subset N_{1h}^{v_i}(G)$ . In this case, the targeted query subgraphs containing  $v_i$  that situate outside  $MC_p(v_i)$  may not be empty; *i.e.*,  $\Gamma_{S_{out}}(v_i) \geq 0$ . The final query response reported by vertex  $v_i$  is  $\Gamma_S^*(v_i) = \Gamma_{S_{in}}(v_i) + Lap(\lambda) + \Gamma_{S_{out}}(v_i)$ . Since we do not perturb the response  $\Gamma_{S_{out}}$ , the response  $\Gamma_S^*(v_i)$  is a post-processed version of  $\Gamma_{S_{in}}^*(v_i)$ . According to the post-processing composition property of DP [20],  $\Gamma_S^*(v_i)$  satisfies  $\frac{LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}})}{\lambda}$ -DDP.  $\square$

In practice, the local sensitivity of the graph  $G$  may not be available and needs to be estimated based on the feedback of all participants,  $v_i, \forall i$ . We adopt a two-phase framework as in [5] to estimate local sensitivity, decide noise scale, and perturb responses to subgraph counting queries. Specifically, Phase-1 requires each participant  $v_i$  to obfuscate its local sensitivity  $LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}}(v_i))$ , and reports the obfuscated local sensitivity  $LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}}(v_i))$  to the data collector using  $(\varepsilon_1, \delta_1)$ -DDP. Then, the data collector can evaluate the local sensitivity of the entire graph  $G$  with  $LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}}) = \max_{i=1}^n LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}}(v_i))$ , which also satisfies  $(\varepsilon_1, \delta_1)$ -DDP. Here,  $\varepsilon_1$  is the privacy budget, and  $\delta_1$  is the violation probability, *i.e.*, the probability of privacy protection being violated. In the case of the Laplace mechanism,  $\delta_1$  is the probability of  $LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}}(v_i)) > LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}}(v_i))$ , *i.e.*, the estimated local sensitivity of vertex  $v_i$  is smaller than the ground truth  $LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}}(v_i))$ .

In Phase-2, the data collector can decide the noise scale  $\lambda$  based on  $LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}})$ , and send  $\lambda$  to the participants. Then, each participant obfuscates its subgraph count by injecting Laplace noise  $Lap(\lambda)$  to satisfy  $(\varepsilon_2, \delta_2)$ -DDP, and reports the obfuscated subgraph count in response to the subgraph counting queries of the data collector. The Laplace mechanism [20] is adopted. By definition,  $\lambda = \frac{LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}})}{\varepsilon_2}$ , and  $\delta_2$  is the probability of  $\lambda > \frac{LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}})}{\varepsilon_2}$ ; *i.e.*, the estimated noise scale of  $G$  is smaller than the ground truth,  $\lambda$ , and consequently, privacy is violated [5, Lemma 4.1].

**Theorem 2.** *Under the two-phase framework, the response to subgraph counting queries, with critical connections protected, satisfies  $(\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2, \delta_1 + \delta_2)$ -DDP.*

*Proof.* For illustration convenience, this proof is based on triangle counting. The key step of counting triangles is to count common neighbors between two endpoints of a connection. Let  $\varphi(v_i)$  (*resp.*,  $\varphi_{in}(v_i)$ ) be  $v_i$ 's maximum common neighbors with others in graph  $G$  (*resp.*,  $MC_p(v_i)$ ). Let  $Y_i$  be the random variables drawn from  $Lap(\cdot)$  for  $v_i$ . In Phase-1, we have  $\varphi_{in}^*(v_i) = \varphi_{in}(v_i) + Y_i$ , based on which the noise scale for Phase-2 can be identified, *i.e.*,  $\lambda = \max_{v_i \in G} \varphi_{in}^*(v_i) / \varepsilon_2$ . With at least  $(1 - \delta_2)$  probability, we have  $\lambda \geq LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}}) / \varepsilon_2$ , since  $LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}}) \leq \max_{v_i \in G} \varphi_{in}^*(v_i)$ .

We verify that, for any neighboring graphs  $G$  and  $G'$  and for any subgraph counts set  $\Gamma_S^*$ , we have

$$\Pr[\Gamma_S^* \in \mathcal{S}_{\Gamma_S}, \lambda \in \mathcal{S}_\lambda | G] \leq e^\varepsilon \cdot \Pr[\Gamma_S^* \in \mathcal{S}_{\Gamma_S}, \lambda \in \mathcal{S}_\lambda | G'] + \delta. \quad (11)$$

where  $\mathcal{S}_\lambda$  (*resp.*,  $\mathcal{S}_{\Gamma_S}$ ) is an arbitrary set of outputs from Phase-1 (*resp.*, Phase-2).

We use  $\mathcal{S}'_\lambda$  to denote the subset of  $\mathcal{S}_\lambda$  that satisfies

$$\mathcal{S}'_\lambda = \{\lambda | \lambda \in \mathcal{S}_\lambda \ \& \ \lambda \geq LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}}) / \varepsilon_2\}. \quad (12)$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr[\Gamma_S^* \in \mathcal{S}_{\Gamma_S}, \lambda \in \mathcal{S}_\lambda | G] \\ &= \Pr[\Gamma_S^* \in \mathcal{S}_{\Gamma_S}, \lambda \in \mathcal{S}'_\lambda | G] + \Pr[\Gamma_S^* \in \mathcal{S}_{\Gamma_S}, \lambda \in \mathcal{S}_\lambda \setminus \mathcal{S}'_\lambda | G] \\ &\leq \Pr[\Gamma_S^* \in \mathcal{S}_{\Gamma_S}, \lambda \in \mathcal{S}'_\lambda | G] + \delta_2, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

since Phase-1 ensures  $\lambda \geq LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}}) / \varepsilon_2$  with at least  $1 - \delta_2$  probability. That is, in Phase-1,  $\lambda$  is estimated using an  $(\varepsilon_1, \delta_1)$ -DDP. Thus, we have

$$\Pr[\lambda \in \mathcal{S}'_\lambda | G] \leq e^{\varepsilon_1} \cdot \Pr[\lambda \in \mathcal{S}'_\lambda | G'] + \delta_1. \quad (14)$$

Combining with Eq. (14), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr[\Gamma_S^* \in \mathcal{S}_{\Gamma_S}, \lambda \in \mathcal{S}'_\lambda | G] \\ &= \Pr[\Gamma_S^* \in \mathcal{S}_{\Gamma_S} | \lambda \in \mathcal{S}'_\lambda, G] \cdot \Pr[\lambda \in \mathcal{S}'_\lambda | G] \\ &\leq \Pr[\Gamma_S^* \in \mathcal{S}_{\Gamma_S} | \lambda \in \mathcal{S}'_\lambda, G] \cdot (e^{\varepsilon_1} \cdot \Pr[\lambda \in \mathcal{S}'_\lambda | G'] + \delta_1) \\ &\leq e^{\varepsilon_1} \cdot \Pr[\Gamma_S^* \in \mathcal{S}_{\Gamma_S} | \lambda \in \mathcal{S}'_\lambda, G] \cdot \Pr[\lambda \in \mathcal{S}'_\lambda | G'] + \delta_1. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Next, we show: for any  $\lambda \geq LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}})/\varepsilon_2$  and any noisy subgraph count set  $\chi$ ,

$$\Pr[\Gamma_S^* = \chi | G] \leq e^{\varepsilon_2} \cdot \Pr[\Gamma_S^* = \chi | G'], \quad (16)$$

which leads to

$$\Pr[\Gamma_S^* \in \mathcal{S}_{\Gamma_S} | \lambda \in \mathcal{S}'_\lambda, G] \leq e^{\varepsilon_2} \cdot \Pr[\Gamma_S^* \in \mathcal{S}_{\Gamma_S} | \lambda \in \mathcal{S}'_\lambda, G']. \quad (17)$$

For vertex  $v_i$ , let  $\Gamma_S(v_i)$  and  $\Gamma'_S(v_i)$  be its triangle numbers in  $G$  and  $G'$ , respectively; where  $\Gamma_S(v_i) = \Gamma_{S_{in}}(v_i) + \Gamma_{S_{out}}(v_i)$  and  $\Gamma'_S(v_i) = \Gamma'_{S_{in}}(v_i) + \Gamma_{S_{out}}(v_i)$ . We have,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\Pr(\Gamma_S^* = \chi | \lambda, G)}{\Pr(\Gamma_S^* = \chi | \lambda, G')} \\ &= \frac{\frac{1}{2\lambda} \exp(-\frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{i=1}^n (|\Gamma_S^*(v_i) - \Gamma_S(v_i)|))}{\frac{1}{2\lambda} \exp(-\frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{i=1}^n (|\Gamma_S^*(v_i) - \Gamma'_S(v_i)|))} \\ &= \frac{\frac{1}{2\lambda} \exp(-\frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{i=1}^n (|\Gamma_S^*(v_i) - (\Gamma_{S_{in}}(v_i) + \Gamma_{S_{out}}(v_i))|))}{\frac{1}{2\lambda} \exp(-\frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{i=1}^n (|\Gamma_S^*(v_i) - (\Gamma'_{S_{in}}(v_i) + \Gamma_{S_{out}}(v_i))|))} \\ &\leq \exp(\frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{i=1}^n |\Gamma'_{S_{in}}(v_i) + \Gamma_{S_{out}}(v_i) - (\Gamma_{S_{in}}(v_i) + \Gamma_{S_{out}}(v_i))|) \\ &\leq \exp(LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}})/\lambda) \leq e^{\varepsilon_2}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Eq. (16) is proved, and the two-phase framework under our setting ensures  $(\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2, \delta_1 + \delta_2)$ -DDP.  $\square$

## 5.2 Differentially Private Query Release

In this section, we investigate the differentially private query release problem for a graph:  $k$ -clique counting. To protect critical connections when releasing responses, for each vertex, the minimal  $p$ -cohesion is used to detect those relationships that need to be protected. In the following, we show how to protect the critical connections identified by minimal  $p$ -cohesion when releasing local  $k$ -clique counts.

In Theorem 2, we have proved that the two-phase framework for subgraph counting ensures  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DDP whenever  $\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 \leq \varepsilon$  and  $\delta_1 + \delta_2 \leq \delta$ . Let  $LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}})$  be the estimation of the local sensitivity under the edge privacy model [19], which should be larger than the true local sensitivity  $LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}})$ . The  $\lambda = \frac{LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}})}{\varepsilon_2} \geq \frac{LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}})}{\varepsilon_2}$  would be a possible noise scale. In Phase-2, each vertex would report the subgraph number by injecting Laplace noise.

We proceed to estimate  $LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}})$ , *i.e.*, the local sensitivity for counting  $k$ -cliques inside the minimal  $p$ -cohesions.

**$k$ -Clique.**  $k$ -Clique is a subgraph with exact  $k$  vertices, and any two distinct vertices in the subgraph are adjacent.

For  $k$ -cliques counting, under the edge privacy model [19], estimating the local sensitivity  $LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}})$  is to estimate the common neighbors that inside a minimal  $p$ -cohesion between the two endpoints of a connection. For a vertex  $v_i$ , to estimate its  $LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}}(v_i))$ , it should be one of the endpoints of the updating edge. Updating edge  $(v_i, v_j)$  will only affect the  $k$ -cliques containing both  $v_i$  and  $v_j$ . We use  $\dot{N}_{cn}(v_j, v_i, MC_p(v_i))$  to denote the common neighbors

between  $v_i$  and  $v_j$  in  $v_i$ 's minimal  $p$ -cohesion. The common neighbor set is defined as  $\dot{N}_{cn}(v_j, v_i, MC_p(v_i)) = \{u | u \in N(v_i, MC_p(v_i)), u \in N(v_j, MC_p(v_i)), v_j \in MC_p(v_i)\}$ . When updating edge  $(v_i, v_j)$ , the affected number of  $k$ -cliques containing  $v_i$  and  $v_j$  should be no more than  $(\dot{N}_{cn}(v_j, v_i, MC_p(v_i)))_{k-2}$ , since those  $k$ -cliques consist of  $v_i, v_j$  and  $k-2$  of their common neighbors. Each  $k$ -clique will be reported  $k$  times (by each of the vertices in the  $k$ -clique), and the estimated local sensitivity should be

$$LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}}) = \max_{v_i \in G, v_j \in MC_p(v_i), v_j \neq v_i} k \cdot (\dot{N}_{cn}(v_j, v_i, MC_p(v_i)))_{k-2}, \quad (19)$$

where  $\dot{N}_{cn}(v_j, v_i, MC_p(v_i))$  is the probabilistic upper bound ([5, Lemma 4.1]) of  $\dot{N}_{cn}(v_j, v_i, MC_p(v_i))$ . For each  $v_i \in G$  with some noise scale  $\lambda_c$  and  $\delta_c$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{N}_{cn}(v_j, v_i, MC_p(v_i)) &= \dot{N}_{cn}(v_j, v_i, MC_p(v_i)) \\ &\quad + Lap(\lambda_c) + \lambda_c \cdot \log(\frac{1}{2\delta_c}). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Counting common neighbors of two vertices is time-consuming. For any vertex  $v_i \in G$ , we have  $deg(v_i, MC_p(v_i)) \geq \max_{v_j \in MC_p(v_i)} \dot{N}_{cn}(v_j, v_i, MC_p(v_i))$ . The degree of a vertex can be treated as a loose upper bound for its maximum common neighbors with others. However, the local sensitivity based on the degree can be too large, leading to adding excessive noises. Replacing  $\max_{v_j \in MC_p(v_i)} \dot{N}_{cn}(v_j, v_i, MC_p(v_i))$  with  $deg(v_i, MC_p(v_i))$  for some  $v_i$  can balance the efficiency and effectiveness [5]. For  $v_i \in G$  with some  $\lambda_d$  and  $\delta_d$ , we have

$$deg^T(v_i, MC_p(v_i)) = deg(v_i, MC_p(v_i)) + Lap(\lambda_d) + \lambda_d \log(\frac{1}{2\delta_d}). \quad (21)$$

For vertices with the top  $h$  largest  $deg^T$  values, they would report "min(max  $\dot{N}_{cn}^T(\cdot), deg^T(\cdot)$ )" [5]. Let  $V_D$  (*resp.*  $V_N$ ) be the set of vertices reporting  $deg^T$  (*resp.* max  $\dot{N}_{cn}^T$ ). We have  $u_d = \max_{v_i \in V_D} deg^T(v_i, MC_p(v_i))$  and  $u_n = \max_{v_i \in V_N, v_j \in MC_p(v_i), v_j \neq v_i} \dot{N}_{cn}^T(v_j, v_i, MC_p(v_i))$  and  $LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}}) = k \cdot (\frac{\max(u_d, u_n)}{k-2})$ . As proved in [5, Lemma 4.2], with  $\lambda_d = \frac{2}{0.5\varepsilon_1}$ ,  $\lambda_c = \frac{h}{0.5\varepsilon_1}$ , and  $\delta_d = \delta_c = \frac{\delta}{2h+2}$ , the following algorithm satisfies  $(\varepsilon_1, \delta)$ -DDP and the returned noise scale  $\lambda = \frac{LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}})}{\varepsilon_2}$  for Phase-2 satisfies  $\lambda \geq \frac{LS(\Gamma_{S_{in}})}{\varepsilon_2}$ .

The pseudo-code of Phase-1 on  $k$ -clique counting is given in Algorithm 3. We use set  $U$  (Line 2) to denote the upper bounds for each vertex's maximum common neighbors with all others in its minimal  $p$ -cohesion  $MC_p(v_i)$ . By running Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2, for each vertex  $v$ , we identify the minimal  $p$ -cohesion  $R$  containing its critical connections, and then store it in a family set  $\mathcal{R}$  (Lines 4-6). In Line 7, we compute the loose upper bound based on its degree in  $R$ . Vertices in  $G$  with the first  $h$  largest upper bounds, denoted by  $T$ , report their tight upper bounds (Lines 8-9). For each  $v \in T$ , we compute its maximum common neighbors with vertices in its  $R$ , denoted by  $cn$  (Line 12). Its upper bound is the minimal value between  $cn^*$  and its loose upper bound  $U(v)$  (Lines 13-14). Finally, the local sensitivity  $LS$  and noise scale  $\lambda$  are generated for Phase-2 based on set  $U$  (Lines 15-16).

**Algorithm 3** Phase-1 on  $k$ -clique  $(G, p, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \delta, h, k)$ 


---

**Input** :  $G$  : a graph,  $p$  : a real value in  $(0, 1)$ ,  
 $\varepsilon_1$  : privacy budget for Phase-1,  
 $\varepsilon_2$  : privacy budget for Phase-2,  
 $\delta$  : invalidation probability,  $h$  : an int value,  
 $k$  : the vertices constraint for  $k$ -clique

**Output** : noise scale  $\lambda$

---

```

1:  $\lambda_d := \frac{2}{0.5\varepsilon_1}$ ;  $\delta' := \frac{\delta}{2h+2}$ ;  $\lambda_c := \frac{h}{0.5\varepsilon_1}$            ▷ Server
2:  $U \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;  $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;                               ▷  $\mathcal{R}$ : a family of  $R$ 
3: for  $v \in G$  do
4:    $R' := \text{Expand}(G, v, p)$                                      ▷ Algorithm 1, Client
5:    $R := \text{Shrink}(R', v, p)$                                    ▷ Algorithm 2, Client
6:    $\mathcal{R}.push(R)$ 
7:    $U(v) := deg(v, R) + Lap(\lambda_d) + \lambda_d \cdot \log(\frac{1}{2\delta'})$    ▷ Client
8: put all  $v \in G$  into a maximal priority queue  $\mathcal{Q}$  with key  $U(v)$    ▷ Server
9:  $T \leftarrow$  the top  $h$  elements in  $\mathcal{Q}$                                ▷ Server
10: for  $v \in T$  do
11:    $R := \mathcal{R}(v)$ ;  $cn := 0$ 
12:   for  $u \in R$  do  $cn := \max(\dot{N}_{cn}(u, v, R), cn)$            ▷ Client
13:    $cn^* := cn + Lap(\lambda_c) + \lambda_c \cdot \log(\frac{1}{2\delta'})$          ▷ Client
14:    $U(v) := \min(cn^*, U(v))$                                    ▷ Server
15:  $\widetilde{LS} := k \cdot (\max_{v \in G} U(v))^{k-2}$                        ▷ Server
16: Return  $\lambda = \frac{\widetilde{LS}}{\varepsilon_2}$                                        ▷ Server

```

---

## 6 EVALUATION

### 6.1 Experimental Setting

**Datasets.** We used 9 real-life graph datasets, as described in Table 2. The Celegans and WIKIVote datasets are from [21] and the remaining ones are from [22]. The Celegans and Yeast are two biological graphs. Celegans (*resp.* Yeast) contains the metabolic reactions (*resp.* interactions) between two substrates (*resp.* proteins). WIKIVote contains all the Wikipedia voting data from the inception of Wikipedia. USAirport contains the flights between two US airports. Bitcoin is a user–user trust/distrust network from the Bitcoin Alpha platform. Gnutella08 contains the connections between two Gnutella hosts from August 08, 2022. HepTh (*resp.* HepPh) is a co-authorship graph from arXiv, which contains the collaborations between authors who submit their papers to High Energy Physics - Theory (*resp.* Phenomenology). SisterCity contains the “Sister City” relationships between two cities of the world. Directed edges are transferred to undirected edges.

TABLE 2: Statistics of Datasets

Dataset	Nodes	Edges	$d_{avg}$	$d_{max}$
Celegans [21]	453	2,025	8.94	237
WIKIVote [21]	889	2,914	6.56	102
USAirport [22]	1,574	17,215	21.87	314
Yeast [22]	1,876	2,203	2.39	56
Bitcoin [22]	3,783	14,214	7.47	511
Gnutella08 [22]	6,301	20,777	6.59	97
HepTh [22]	9,875	25,973	5.26	65
SisterCity [22]	14,274	20,573	2.88	99
HepPh [22]	34,546	420,877	24.37	846

**Algorithms.** To the best of our knowledge, no existing work has attempted to protect the privacy of critical connections of a vertex in a graph. We implement our algorithms for

$p$ -cohesion and minimal  $p$ -cohesion computation with new score functions and evaluate the effectiveness for privacy preservation under DDP.

**Settings.** For  $p$ -cohesion computation, in our experiments,  $p$  ranges from 0.1 to 0.8 with the default value of 0.1. For privacy protection of critical connections, we count  $k$ -cliques under  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DDP, utilizing the two-phase framework. Each result is averaged over 100 runs. The privacy budget  $\varepsilon$  ranges from 1 to 12. The default value of privacy budget  $\varepsilon_1$  (*resp.*  $\varepsilon_2$ ) for Phase-1 (*resp.* Phase-2) is  $\varepsilon_1 = 0.1\varepsilon$  (*resp.*  $\varepsilon_2 = 0.9\varepsilon$ ). The  $h$  (Line 9 of Algorithm 3) varies from 1 to 12. Following the setting in [5], [23], the default value for  $\delta$  is  $\frac{1}{n}$ , where  $n$  is the vertices number of the graph. All programs are implemented in Python on a Linux machine.





### 6.2 Statistical Evaluation for Minimal $p$ -Cohesions

#### 6.2.1 Minimal $p$ -Cohesions with Different Score Functions

For each vertex  $v$ , we identify its minimal  $p$ -cohesion with Algorithms 1 and 2. Different score functions (Line 3 of Algorithm 1) result in different  $p$ -cohesions and minimal  $p$ -cohesions. In the following, we show the performance of Algorithms 1 and 2 in both density and size.  $p$ -Cohesion denotes Algorithm 1 running (10) followed by Algorithm 2.  $p$ -Cohesion\* replaces (10) in  $p$ -Cohesion with [15, Eq. (7)].

**Density.** Fig. 2 reports the graph density distribution of minimal  $p$ -cohesions with different score functions.  $p$ -Cohesion uses Eq. (8) and Eq. (9), and  $p$ -Cohesion\* uses [15, Eqs. (5) & (6)]. Fig. 2 displays the result over 9 datasets at  $p = 0.3$ . As expected, the  $p$ -Cohesion outperforms  $p$ -Cohesion\*, because both the merit and penalty consider the advantage and disadvantage when including a new vertex  $w$  to  $V_p$ . For example, on *Yeast* and *HepTh*, all minimal  $p$ -cohesions returned by  $p$ -Cohesion are with larger density than the minimal  $p$ -cohesions returned by  $p$ -Cohesion\*. Figs. 2b and 2c report the result of two different score functions, with varying values of  $p$  ranging from 0.1 to 0.8 for *Gnutella08* and *HepPh*, respectively. Both figures illustrate the density distributions of the minimal  $p$ -cohesions returned by  $p$ -Cohesion and  $p$ -Cohesion\* become similar as  $p$  increases, since higher values of  $p$  inherently entail a greater number of vertices within a  $p$ -cohesion subgraph. Consequently, both  $p$ -Cohesion and  $p$ -Cohesion\* tend to yield comparable vertex sets. As  $p$  reaches large magnitudes, the results exhibit similarity due to the near-complete inclusion of the connected component.

**Size.** We show size distributions of all minimal  $p$ -cohesions returned by  $p$ -Cohesion and  $p$ -Cohesion\* in Fig. 3. Fig. 3a represents the result for 9 datasets at  $p = 0.3$ . On most of the datasets, the minimal  $p$ -cohesions returned by  $p$ -Cohesion have similar sizes to  $p$ -Cohesion\*. On some graphs, *i.e.*, *Yeast* and *HepTh*, our methods can find much smaller sizes minimal  $p$ -cohesions. Figs. 3b and 3c report the size distributions with the two different score functions on *Gnutella08* and *HepPh*, respectively. Both figures show that the sizes of minimal  $p$ -cohesions returned by the two methods increase as  $p$  grows. This is because a larger value  $p$  necessitates a greater number of vertices in a  $p$ -cohesion.



### 6.2.2 Minimal $p$ -Cohesion v.s. Extended Local View

Haipei *et al.* [5] used ELV as the local view for subgraph counting. But they could not capture critical connections. We denote the connections identified by their two-hop ELV [5, Definition 2.2] as ELV. From the distributions of density and size, we compare the difference between minimal  $p$ -cohesion and ELV. Here,  $p$ -Cohesion denotes the Algo-

rithm 1 equipped with Eq. (10), followed by Algorithm 2.

Density. Fig. 4 reports the density distributions comparison between  $p$ -Cohesion and ELV. Fig. 4a displays the result across 9 datasets at  $p = 0.3$ . The  $p$ -Cohesion significantly outperforms ELV in the subgraph density because the  $p$ -Cohesion can identify a subgraph induced by the critical connections of a vertex. For example, on *USAirport*,

all vertices' subgraphs returned by  $p$ -Cohesion have larger densities than ELV. Figs. 4b and 4c depict the result of distinct methods, showcasing variations in  $p$  values ranging from 0.1 to 0.8 for *USAirport* and *SisterCity*, respectively. Both figures illustrate that when  $0.1 \leq p \leq 0.7$ , many vertices' minimal  $p$ -cohesions are with larger density than ELV. The density of  $p$ -Cohesion decreases as  $p$  increases, as a larger value of  $p$  inherently necessitates a greater number of vertices in a  $p$ -cohesion. However, when  $p > 0.7$ , the minimal  $p$ -cohesions of most vertices exhibit lower densities compared to their ELVs. This is because a large  $p$  value results in the retrieval of nearly the entire graph.

**Size.** In Fig. 5, we report the size distributions of  $p$ -Cohesion and ELV. Fig. 5a reports the result over 9 datasets with  $p = 0.3$ . On all datasets and all vertices, all minimal  $p$ -cohesions returned by  $p$ -Cohesion are with smaller sizes than ELV. Figs. 5b and 5c report the size distributions of the two methods on *WIKIVote* and *Yeast*, as  $p$  increases from 0.1 to 0.8. Similarly, within both figures, the sizes of minimal  $p$ -cohesions yielded by  $p$ -Cohesion exhibit growth as  $p$  increases. This phenomenon arises due to the greater number of vertices required for a larger  $p$  in a  $p$ -cohesion. When  $p$  is large enough, *i.e.*,  $p > 0.5$  (*resp.*  $p > 0.6$ ) on *WIKIVote* (*resp.* *Yeast*), the  $p$ -Cohesion will return larger subgraphs than ELV since the minimal  $p$ -cohesion needs more vertices to meet the  $p$  constraint.

### 6.3 $k$ -Clique Counting Under DDP

In this section, we focus on the influence of  $h$ ,  $p$ ,  $\varepsilon$ , and  $\varepsilon_1$  over  $k$ -clique counting. We use Mean Relative Error (MRE) to evaluate the performance when releasing responses, based on two different connection groups, for subgraphs counting queries. We use  $p$ -Cohesion (*resp.* ELV) to denote the method for counting subgraphs, under the  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DDP, based on the minimal  $p$ -cohesions (ELVs). For subgraph  $S$  counting, we have  $\text{MRE} = \frac{|\Gamma_S^* - \Gamma_S|}{\Gamma_S}$ , where  $\Gamma_S$  is the real subgraph number and  $\Gamma_S^*$  is the perturbed value regarding  $\Gamma_S$ . Each MRE reported is averaged over 100 runs.

#### 6.3.1 3-Clique Counting

We evaluate our algorithms for 3-clique counting.

**$p$  Selection.** Fig. 6 shows the average MRE under the  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DDP for 3-clique counting based on the subgraphs returned by  $p$ -Cohesion and ELV on *HepTh* when  $p$  varies from 0.1 to 0.8. We show the results with  $h = 1, 3, 10$  and  $\varepsilon = 3.0, 10.0$  for all  $p$  values. As expected, when  $p < 0.7$ , the  $p$ -Cohesion outperforms ELV. The average MRE of  $p$ -Cohesion increases when  $p$  becomes larger. When  $p > 0.4$ , the MRE grows slowly because, for almost all the vertices,  $p$  is large enough to include their connections within their corresponding minimal  $p$ -cohesions. When  $p \geq 0.7$ , the ELVs will be subsets of the corresponding minimal  $p$ -cohesions. It implies a reasonable  $p$  can balance the data utility and privacy protection.

**$h$  Selection.** In Algorithm 3, to balance the efficiency and effectiveness for noise scale  $\lambda$  estimation,  $h$  vertices need to report their common neighbors, instead of degree (Lines 9-14). Fig. 7 reports the upper bound of the local sensitivity generated by  $p$ -Cohesion and ELV on *Celegans* when  $h$




Fig. 6:  $p$  Selection for 3-Clique Counting on HepTh











Fig. 7:  $h$  Selection for 3-Clique Counting on Celegans,  $p = 0.1$

(a) All Datasets with  $h = 3, \varepsilon = 10$  ( $\varepsilon_1 = 1$ )(a) All Datasets with  $h = 3, \varepsilon_1 = 0.5$  ( $\varepsilon = 5$ )(b)  $h = 1$  ( $\varepsilon_1 = 0.1\varepsilon$ )(c)  $h = 3$  ( $\varepsilon_1 = 0.1\varepsilon$ )(d)  $h = 5$  ( $\varepsilon_1 = 0.1\varepsilon$ )(e)  $h = 10$  ( $\varepsilon_1 = 0.1\varepsilon$ )Fig. 8:  $\varepsilon$  Selection for 3-Clique Counting on USAirport,  $p = 0.1$ (b)  $h = 3, \varepsilon = 5$ (c)  $h = 5, \varepsilon = 5$ (d)  $h = 7, \varepsilon = 5$ (e)  $h = 10, \varepsilon = 5$ Fig. 9:  $\varepsilon_1$  Selection for 3-Clique Counting on Celegans,  $p = 0.1$ 

varies from 1 to 12 with a step size of 1. We choose  $p = 0.1$  for the minimal  $p$ -cohesions computation. For Phase-1, the privacy budget is chosen as  $\varepsilon_1 = 0.1\varepsilon$  for different  $\varepsilon$  values. For different privacy budgets  $\varepsilon$ , the upper bounds returned by  $p$ -Cohesion show similar trends as ELV. When  $h = 2, 3$ , the upper bounds are optimal for almost all  $\varepsilon$  values. Compared to ELV, with the increase of  $\varepsilon$ , our  $p$ -Cohesion can find more optimal upper bounds for  $LS(\Gamma_S)$ .

**$\varepsilon$  Selection.** Fig. 8a reports the average MRE returned by  $p$ -Cohesion and ELV on all datasets with  $p = 0.1, h = 3$ , and  $\varepsilon = 10$  (i.e.,  $\varepsilon_1 = 1.0$ ). On all datasets,  $p$ -Cohesion outperforms ELV. For example, on *SisterCity*, the  $p$ -Cohesion is two orders of magnitude smaller than ELV in terms of the average MRE. That is because our approach injects less noise into the real response and estimates tighter local sensitivity. Fig. 8b - Fig. 8e report the average MRE over  $p$ -Cohesion and ELV on *USAirport* when  $\varepsilon$  varies from 1 to 12 with a step size of 1. We choose  $p = 0.1$  for minimal  $p$ -cohesions computation. For all  $\varepsilon$ , the privacy budget  $\varepsilon_1$  for Phase-1 is chosen as  $\varepsilon_1 = 0.1\varepsilon$ . Our  $p$ -Cohesion shows similar trends as ELV under all  $h$  but reports increasingly better performance in terms of MRE with  $\varepsilon$  growing.

**$\varepsilon_1$  Selection.** Fig. 9 depicts the influence of privacy budget  $\varepsilon_1$  of Phase-1 on MRE. For all  $\varepsilon_1$ , the total privacy budget is  $\varepsilon = 5.0$ , and we choose  $p = 0.1$  for the minimal  $p$ -cohesion computation. The MREs represent the average values obtained from 100 independent tests. Fig. 9a shows the average MRE returned by  $p$ -Cohesion and ELV on all datasets with  $p = 0.1, h = 3, \varepsilon_1 = 0.5$ , and  $\varepsilon = 5.0$ . Under the current setting, on all datasets, our  $p$ -Cohesion outperforms ELV. Consistent with the previous result, on *SisterCity*, the  $p$ -Cohesion is two orders of magnitude smaller than ELV in the average MRE. Fig. 9b - Fig. 9e report the average MRE over  $p$ -Cohesion and ELV on *Celegans* when  $\varepsilon_1$  varies from 0.1 to 4.9 with a step size of 0.1. For all  $\varepsilon_1$ , our  $p$ -Cohesion outperforms ELV in terms of the average MRE. When  $\varepsilon_1 < 1.5$ , the average MRE decreases with the growth of  $\varepsilon_1$  since a larger  $\varepsilon_1$  results in a smaller upper bound for the local sensitivity  $LS(\Gamma_S)$ . The average MRE reaches the bottom ( $\varepsilon_1 \approx 1.5$ ),  $\varepsilon_1$  and  $\varepsilon_2$  reach the balance point, where  $\varepsilon_2 = \varepsilon - \varepsilon_1$ . When  $\varepsilon_1 > 1.5$ , the average MRE increases as  $\varepsilon_1$  grows since the balance is broken and more noises are injected.



Fig. 10:  $p$  Selection for 4-Clique Counting on Bitcoin

### 6.3.2 4-Clique Counting

Under DDP, we study the influence of  $p$ , and  $\varepsilon$  over 4-clique counting. In Algorithm 3, at Line 14, the estimated local sensitivity is controlled by the  $k$  value. We use  $k = 3$  as the building block for 4-clique counting, i.e., the  $\lambda_4$  (resp.  $\lambda_3$ ) returned by Algorithm 3 for  $k = 4$  (resp.  $k = 3$ ) is  $\lambda_4 = \frac{\lambda_3 * 4}{3}$ . We do not regenerate  $\lambda$  for 4-clique by Algorithm 3.

**$p$  Selection.** Fig. 10 reports the average MRE results for  $p$ -Cohesion and ELV over 100 runs on *Bitcoin* when  $p$  varies from 0.1 to 0.8. We show results with  $h = 1, 3, 10$  and  $\varepsilon = 3.0, 10.0$  for all  $p$  values. When  $p < 0.8$ , the  $p$ -Cohesion outperforms ELV. The average MRE of  $p$ -Cohesion increases when  $p$  becomes larger since more noises are injected into the response. Similar to the result for 3-clique, when  $p > 0.4$ , the MRE grows slowly. This is because, for almost all vertices,  $p$  is large enough to include all their connections to the minimal  $p$ -cohesions. When  $p \geq 0.8$ , ELVs will be subsets of the corresponding minimal  $p$ -cohesions.

**$\varepsilon$  Selection.** Fig. 11a reports average MRE returned by  $p$ -Cohesion and ELV on all datasets with  $p = 0.1$ ,  $h = 3$ , and  $\varepsilon = 10$  (i.e.,  $\varepsilon_1 = 1.0$ ). On all datasets, our  $p$ -Cohesion outperforms ELV. Figs. 11b to 11e report the average MRE over  $p$ -Cohesion and ELV on *USAirport* when  $\varepsilon$  varies from 1 to 12. We choose  $p = 0.1$  for the minimal  $p$ -cohesion

(a) All Datasets with  $h = 3, \varepsilon = 10$  ( $\varepsilon_1 = 1$ )Fig. 11:  $\varepsilon$  Selection for 4-Clique Counting on USAirport,  $p = 0.1$ 

computation. For all  $\varepsilon$ , the privacy budget of Phase-1 is  $\varepsilon_1 = 0.1\varepsilon$ . Our  $p$ -Cohesion shows similar trends as ELV under all  $h$  values, but better MRE for all  $\varepsilon$  values.

## 7 BACKGROUND AND RELATED WORK

We present related work from perspectives of cohesive subgraph search and graph analysis with DP.

**Cohesive subgraph search.** A cohesive subgraph search aims to identify subgraphs that contain a specific query for a given scenario. Several cohesive subgraph models have been proposed. A clique is a subgraph with the highest density, where every pair of vertices is connected [24], [25]. However, due to the restrictive nature of cliques, some relaxed models have been introduced. These include the  $k$ -core model [6], [26], [27],  $k$ -truss model [28], [29],  $k$ -ecc model [30], [31],  $p$ -cohesive model [12], [15], and others [32], [33], [34]. In [15], minimal  $p$ -cohesions were detected through an expand-shrink structure and two relatively intuitive score functions. When including one vertex in a partial  $p$ -cohesion, the merit score considers the contribution of a vertex to increasing the degrees of some vertices in the partial  $p$ -cohesion. The penalty score captures the need for extra neighbors outside the partial  $p$ -cohesion to

meet the  $p$  constraint. Using these score functions, minimal  $p$ -cohesions captured may not be dense; *i.e.*, more vertices with fewer mutually connected edges are often captured.

We design new criteria (including a new merit function and a new penalty function) to effectively identify minimal  $p$ -cohesions with increased densities. While adopting the generic expand-shrink framework as in [15], our new score functions help find minimal  $p$ -cohesions with much higher density than the method developed in [15].

**Graph analysis with DP.** Many recent contributions proposed DP-based solutions for the release and/or the analysis of graph data [4]. They were based either on centralized DP (CDP) [35], [36], local DP (LDP) [37], [38], [39], DDP [5], or relationship local DP (RLDP) [40]. Traditional DP techniques were primarily designed for centralized settings, where a trusted central entity collects and analyzes data. However, graph analysis under CDP requires the data holder to have full information about the graph. Answering questions related to graphs under LDP requires to collect information from individuals [41], which may ruin the property (lower the data utility) of the raw graph [38].

To solve this problem, Haipei *et al.* [5] proposed privacy preservation in the context of DDP using the ELV. Their approach ensures each participant's privacy concerning their connections in its ELV. Yuhan *et al.* [40] tried to solve the problem under the RLDP mechanism and using the ELV. However, these approaches solely focused on the proximity of a queried vertex and did not capture the critical connections of the vertex within the subgraph. While adopting the two-phase framework as in [5], our algorithm is different in the sense that we identify the critical conditions of vertices, which are denser and more cohesive and often part of the ELVs. We also prioritize the critical conditions for privacy protection by dedicating the privacy budget to those connections. As demonstrated experimentally, our approach can offer better data utility than the existing work with all connections obfuscated, *e.g.*, [5].

## 8 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we investigated the problem of identifying and protecting critical connections' information for individual participants on graphs, using minimal  $p$ -cohesion. New score functions were proposed to help effectively search the critical connections. We also analytically qualified the use of the  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DDP to protect the privacy of the identified critical connections. Extensive experiments confirmed the effectiveness of the new score functions, as well as the better trade-off between utility and privacy compared to the existing ELV-based methods.

## REFERENCES

- [1] G. Cormode, D. Srivastava, S. Bhagat, and B. Krishnamurthy, "Class-based graph anonymization for social network data," *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 766–777, 2009.
- [2] C. Brandt and J. Leskovec, "Status and friendship: mechanisms of social network evolution," in *Proc. WWW 2014*, pp. 229–230.
- [3] V. T. Chakaravarthy, M. Kapralov, P. Murali, F. Petrini, X. Que, Y. Sabharwal, and B. Schieber, "Subgraph counting: Color coding beyond trees," in *IPDPS 2016*, pp. 2–11.
- [4] Y. Li, M. Purcell, T. Rakotoarivelo, D. Smith, T. Ranbaduge, and K. S. Ng, "Private graph data release: A survey," *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 55, no. 11, pp. 1–39, 2021.
- [5] H. Sun, X. Xiao, I. Khalil, Y. Yang, Z. Qin, W. H. Wang, and T. Yu, "Analyzing subgraph statistics from extended local views with decentralized differential privacy," in *CCS 2019*, pp. 703–717.
- [6] S. B. Seidman, "Network structure and minimum degree," *Social networks*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 269–287, 1983.
- [7] B. Yang, D. Wen, L. Qin, Y. Zhang, L. Chang, and R. Li, "Index-based optimal algorithm for computing  $k$ -cores in large uncertain graphs," in *ICDE 2019*, pp. 64–75.
- [8] F. Zhang, L. Yuan, Y. Zhang, L. Qin, X. Lin, and A. Zhou, "Discovering strong communities with user engagement and tie strength," in *DASFAA 2018*, vol. 10827, pp. 425–441.
- [9] X. Huang, H. Cheng, L. Qin, W. Tian, and J. X. Yu, "Querying  $k$ -truss community in large and dynamic graphs," in *SIGMOD 2014*, pp. 1311–1322.
- [10] Y. Fang, R. Cheng, S. Luo, and J. Hu, "Effective community search for large attributed graphs," *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, vol. 9, no. 12, pp. 1233–1244, 2016.
- [11] L. Yuan, L. Qin, X. Lin, L. Chang, and W. Zhang, "Diversified top- $k$  clique search," *The VLDB Journal*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 171–196, 2016.
- [12] S. Morris, "Contagion," *The Review of Economic Studies*, vol. 67, no. 1, pp. 57–78, 2000.
- [13] D. J. Watts, "A simple model of global cascades on random networks," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 99, no. 9, pp. 5766–5771, 2002.
- [14] R. Pastor-Satorras, C. Castellano, P. Van Mieghem, and A. Vespignani, "Epidemic processes in complex networks," *Reviews of modern physics*, vol. 87, no. 3, p. 925, 2015.
- [15] C. Li, F. Zhang, Y. Zhang, L. Qin, W. Zhang, and X. Lin, "Discovering fortress-like cohesive subgraphs," *Knowl. Inf. Syst.*, vol. 63, no. 12, pp. 3217–3250, 2021.
- [16] D. H. Zanette, "Critical behavior of propagation on small-world networks," *Physical Review E*, vol. 64, no. 5, p. 050901, 2001.
- [17] K. Sun, W. Wang, L. Gao, Y. Wang, K. Luo, L. Ren, Z. Zhan, X. Chen, S. Zhao, Y. Huang *et al.*, "Transmission heterogeneities, kinetics, and controllability of sars-cov-2," *Science*, vol. 371, no. 6526, p. eabe2424, 2021.
- [18] C. Dwork, F. McSherry, K. Nissim, and A. D. Smith, "Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis," in *Proc. TCC 2006*, vol. 3876, pp. 265–284.
- [19] M. Hay, C. Li, G. Miklau, and D. D. Jensen, "Accurate estimation of the degree distribution of private networks," in *ICDM 2009*, pp. 169–178.
- [20] C. Dwork, F. McSherry, K. Nissim, and A. D. Smith, "Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis," in *Proc. TCC*, vol. 3876. Springer, 2006, pp. 265–284.
- [21] R. A. Rossi and N. K. Ahmed, "The network data repository with interactive graph analytics and visualization," in *Proc. AAAI*, 2015.
- [22] J. Kunegis, "KONECT – The Koblenz Network Collection," in *Proc. WWW*, 2013, pp. 1343–1350.
- [23] C. Dwork and A. Roth, "The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy," *Found. Trends Theor. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 9, no. 3-4, pp. 211–407, 2014.
- [24] M. Danisch, O. Balalau, and M. Sozio, "Listing  $k$ -cliques in sparse real-world graphs," in *Proc. WWW 2018*, pp. 589–598.
- [25] S. Mihara, S. Tsugawa, and H. Ohsaki, "Influence maximization problem for unknown social networks," in *Proc. ASONAM 2015*, pp. 1539–1546.
- [26] V. Batagelj and M. Zaversnik, "An  $o(m)$  algorithm for cores decomposition of networks," *CoRR*, vol. cs.DS/0310049, 2003.
- [27] L. Dhulipala, Q. C. Liu, S. Raskhodnikova, J. Shi, J. Shun, and S. Yu, "Differential privacy from locally adjustable graph algorithms:  $k$ -core decomposition, low out-degree ordering, and densest subgraphs," in *IEEE FOCS 2022*, pp. 754–765.
- [28] J. Cohen, "Trusses: Cohesive subgraphs for social network analysis," *National security agency technical report*, vol. 16, no. 3.1, 2008.
- [29] K. Saito, T. Yamada, and K. Kazama, "Extracting communities from complex networks by the  $k$ -dense method," *IEICE Trans. Fundam. Electron. Commun. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 91-A, no. 11, pp. 3304–3311, 2008.
- [30] G. K. Manacher, "Algorithmic graph theory (alan gibbons)," *SIAM Rev.*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 145–147, 1989.
- [31] J. Hu, X. Wu, R. Cheng, S. Luo, and Y. Fang, "On minimal steiner maximum-connected subgraph queries," *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, vol. 29, no. 11, pp. 2455–2469, 2017.
- [32] J. Chen, S. Cai, S. Pan, Y. Wang, Q. Lin, M. Zhao, and M. Yin, "Nuqlq: An effective local search algorithm for maximum quasi-clique problem," in *Proc. AAAI 2021*, pp. 12 258–12 266.


- [33] K. Wang, W. Zhang, X. Lin, Y. Zhang, and S. Li, "Discovering hierarchy of bipartite graphs with cohesive subgraphs," in *ICDE 2022*, pp. 2291–2305.
- [34] K. Wang, G. Zhao, W. Zhang, X. Lin, Y. Zhang, Y. He, and C. Li, "Cohesive subgraph discovery over uncertain bipartite graphs," *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, 2023.
- [35] L. Fan, L. Xiong, and V. Sunderam, "Differentially private multi-dimensional time series release for traffic monitoring," in *Data and Applications Security and Privacy XXVII: 27th Annual IFIP WG 11.3 Conference, DBSec 2013. Proceedings 27*, pp. 33–48.
- [36] L. Fan and L. Xiong, "An adaptive approach to real-time aggregate monitoring with differential privacy," *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, vol. 26, no. 9, pp. 2094–2106, 2014.
- [37] G. Cormode, S. Jha, T. Kulkarni, N. Li, D. Srivastava, and T. Wang, "Privacy at scale: Local differential privacy in practice," in *SIGMOD 2018*, pp. 1655–1658.
- [38] Z. Qin, T. Yu, Y. Yang, I. Khalil, X. Xiao, and K. Ren, "Generating synthetic decentralized social graphs with local differential privacy," in *CCS 2017*, pp. 425–438.
- [39] J. Imola, T. Murakami, and K. Chaudhuri, "Communication-efficient triangle counting under local differential privacy," in *USENIX Security 2022*, pp. 537–554.
- [40] Y. Liu, S. Zhao, Y. Liu, D. Zhao, H. Chen, and C. Li, "Collecting triangle counts with edge relationship local differential privacy," in *ICDE 2022*, pp. 2008–2020.
- [41] S. P. Kasiviswanathan, H. K. Lee, K. Nissim, S. Raskhodnikova, and A. D. Smith, "What can we learn privately?" *SIAM J. Comput.*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 793–826, 2011.



**Conggai Li** is a CERC Fellow at Data61, Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO). She received her Doctoral degree from the Australian Artificial Intelligence Institute within the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology, the University of Technology Sydney, Australia. She received her M.S. degree and B.S. degree both from Taiyuan University of Technology, China. Her research interests include graph database analytics, efficient query algorithms, and differential privacy.



**Wei Ni** [Fellow, IEEE] received the B.E. and Ph.D. degrees from Fudan University, Shanghai, China, in 2000 and 2005, respectively. He is a Principal Research Scientist at CSIRO, Sydney, Australia, and a Conjoint Professor at the University of New South Wales. He is also an Adjunct Professor at the University of Technology Sydney and an Honorary Professor at Macquarie University. His research interests include machine learning, cybersecurity, network security, and privacy, as well as their applications to 6G/B6G system efficiency and integrity. Dr. Ni has served as an Editor for IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications since 2018, IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology since 2022, and IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security and IEEE Communications Surveys and Tutorials since 2024. He served first as the Secretary, then the Vice-Chair and Chair of the IEEE VTS NSW Chapter from 2015 to 2022, Track Chair for VTC-Spring 2017, Track Co-chair for IEEE VTC-Spring 2016, Publication Chair for BodyNet 2015, and Student Travel Grant Chair for WPMC 2014.



**Ming Ding** [SM'17] received B.S., M.S., the Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degrees from Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China, in 2004, 2007, and 2011, respectively. Currently, he is a Principal Research Scientist at Data61, CSIRO, in Sydney, NSW, Australia. His research interests include information technology, data privacy and security, and machine learning and AI. He has authored more than 200 papers in IEEE journals and conferences, all in recognized venues, around 20 3GPP standardization contributions, as well as two books, 21 US patents, and has co-invented another 100+ patents on 4G/5G technologies. He is an editor of IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications and IEEE Communications Surveys and Tutorials. He has served as a guest editor/co-chair/co-tutor/TPC member for multiple IEEE top-tier journals/conferences and received several awards for his research work and professional services, including the prestigious IEEE Signal Processing Society Best Paper Award in 2022.



**Youyang Qu** [M'19] is currently a research scientist at CSIRO, Australia. He received his B.S. degree in 2012 and M.S. degree in 2015 from the Beijing Institute of Technology, respectively. He received his Ph.D. degree from Deakin University in 2019. His research interests focus on Machine Learning, Big Data, IoT, blockchain, and corresponding security and customizable privacy issues. He has over 70 publications, including high-quality journal and conference papers such as *IEEE TII*, *IEEE TSC*, *ACM Computing Surveys*, *IEEE IOTJ*, etc. He is active in the research society and has served as an organizing committee member in SPDE 2020, BigSecurity 2021, and Tridentcom 2021/2022.



**Jianjun Chen** is working toward the Ph.D. degree in the Australian Artificial Intelligence Institute within the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology, University of Technology Sydney, Australia. He received the B.S. degree in software engineering and M.S. degree in computer science from the Taiyuan University of Technology, China. His research interests include Federated Learning, Cooperative Perception, and 3D Object Detection.



**David Smith** [Member, IEEE] received the B.E. degree from the University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, in 1997, and the M.E. (research) and Ph.D. degrees from the University of Technology, Sydney, Australia, in 2001 and 2004, respectively. He is currently a Principal Research Scientist with CSIRO. He has a variety of industry experience in electrical and telecommunications engineering. He has published over 150 technical refereed papers. His research interests are data privacy, distributed systems privacy and edge computing data privacy, distributed machine learning, data privacy for supply chains, wireless body area networks, game theory for distributed networks, 5G/6G networks, disaster tolerant networks, and distributed optimization for smart grid. He has made various contributions to IEEE standardization activity in personal area networks. He is an Area Editor for IET Smart Grid and has served on the technical program committees of several leading international conferences in the fields of communications and networks. He was a recipient of four conferences of best paper awards.



**Wenjie Zhang** received the PhD degree in computer science and engineering from the University of New South Wales, in 2010. She is currently a professor and ARC Future fellow in the School of Computer Science and Engineering, the University of New South Wales, Australia. Since 2008, she has published more than 100 papers in SIGMOD, VLDB, ICDE, TODS, the IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering, and the VLDB Journal.



**Thierry Rakotoarivelo** is the group leader of the Information Security and Privacy group at CSIRO. His research focuses on the design and use of frameworks for privacy risk assessment, the development of privacy-enhancing technologies, and the study of trade-offs in responsible use of data in specific application domains. He led several projects on data privacy in the Government, EdTech, and Energy sectors, where he designed and delivered novel technologies in areas such as confidentiality risk quantification or provably private synthetic data generation. He received his PhD degree from the University of New South Wales, Australia. His thesis received the Prix Léopold Escande award from INPT in 2007.