

Statistical Inference for Privatized Data with Unknown Sample Size

Jordan Awan*

Department of Statistics, Purdue University

Andrés F. Barrientos†

Department of Statistics, Florida State University

Nianqiao Ju

Department of Statistics, Purdue University

Abstract

We develop both theory and algorithms to analyze privatized data in the *unbounded differential privacy* (DP), where even the sample size is considered a sensitive quantity that requires privacy protection. We show that the distance between the sampling distributions under unbounded DP and bounded DP goes to zero as the sample size n goes to infinity, provided that the noise used to privatize n is at an appropriate rate; we also establish that ABC-type posterior distributions converge under similar assumptions. We further give asymptotic results in the regime where the privacy budget for n goes to zero, establishing similarity of sampling distributions as well as showing that the MLE in the unbounded setting converges to the bounded-DP MLE. In order to facilitate valid, finite-sample Bayesian inference on privatized data in the unbounded DP setting, we propose a reversible jump MCMC algorithm which extends the data augmentation MCMC of Ju et al. (2022). We also propose a Monte Carlo EM algorithm to compute the MLE from privatized data in both bounded and unbounded DP. We apply our methodology to analyze a linear regression model as well as a 2019 American Time Use Survey Microdata File which we model using a Dirichlet distribution.

Keywords: differential privacy, reversible jump, maximum likelihood, expectation-maximization

*Jordan Awan gratefully acknowledges the support of NSF grant SES-2150615 to Purdue University.

†The research of Andrés F. Barrientos was supported by the National Science Foundation National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics [49100422C0008]

1 Introduction

Differential privacy (DP) (Dwork et al., 2006) is the leading framework in privacy protection. A randomized algorithm/mechanism satisfies DP if it ensures that for two “neighboring datasets,” the output distributions are “similar.” There have been many different variants of DP where the concepts of “neighboring” and “similar” are modified. Similarity is often measured in terms of either a divergence on the output distributions, or bounds on the probability of obtaining any particular output. The two most common choices for “neighboring datasets” are 1) *bounded DP*, where two datasets are neighbors if they have the same sample size and differ in one entry and 2) *unbounded DP*, where two datasets are neighbors if one can be obtained from the other by either adding or deleting an entry; in this case the sample sizes of the two datasets differ by 1. The main difference between these two frameworks is that in unbounded DP, the sample size itself is considered to be a sensitive quantity, requiring privacy protection, which makes statistical inference more challenging.

While there are many DP mechanisms designed for either bounded DP or unbounded DP, when conducting statistical inference on privatized outputs, previous literature has focused on the bounded DP cases, as it allows the sample size n to be available. For example, Bernstein and Sheldon (2018, 2019); Kulkarni et al. (2021); Ju et al. (2022) all develop MCMC samplers to simulate from either an exact or approximate posterior distribution given the privatized data, and all of these methods work in bounded DP. In the frequentist setting, Wang et al. (2018) developed an asymptotic regime to derive statistical approximating distributions, which is also tailored to the bounded DP setting. There have been several works on private confidence intervals, which also focus on the bounded DP settings (Karwa and Vadhan, 2018; Du et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2019; Drechsler et al., 2022; Covington et al., 2021; Awan and Wang, 2023). Works on DP hypothesis tests have similarly specialized in the bounded DP setting (Vu and Slavkovic, 2009; Gaboardi et al., 2016; Awan and Slavković, 2018; Barrientos et al., 2019; Awan and Slavković, 2020). Ferrando et al. (2022) propose using the parametric bootstrap for inference on privatized data, which similarly is designed for bounded DP. Brawner and Honaker (2018) and Wang et al. (2022) developed a non-parametric bootstrap for private inference in the bounded DP setting. The one statistical task that unbounded DP has seen substantial attention is in point estimation. Smith (2011) showed that for a general class of asymptotically normal statistics, there is a DP mechanism that can estimate the same quantity with the same asymptotic distribution; while the proposed mechanism is designed for bounded DP, Smith states that by Slutsky’s theorem, the same sort of result can be achieved in unbounded DP.

While it is true that in many settings, plugging in a privatized estimate for the sample size can still give consistent estimators, it is much more challenging to ensure valid statistical inference beyond point estimates – in both Bayesian and frequentist settings. This paper is the first to systematically investigate how to perform valid statistical inference in unbounded DP, with unknown n . Our contributions are as follows:

- We derive bounds for the privacy budget used to privatize n under which we show consistency of a sampling distribution for privatized data with unknown n relative to the sampling distribution for privatized data with known n as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We also show that ABC-type posterior distributions under bounded and unbounded DP approach

each other under similar assumptions.

- In the asymptotic regime where the privacy budget for n goes to infinity (less noise/privacy protection), we show that the unbounded DP sampling distribution approaches the bounded DP sampling distribution, and in particular, establish conditions for the MLE in unbounded DP to converge to the MLE for bounded DP.
- We extend the Metropolis-within-Gibbs algorithm of Ju et al. (2022) to the unbounded setting, using a reversible jump MCMC methodology. Similar to Ju et al. (2022) in the case of pure-DP, we have lower bounds on the acceptance probabilities in the algorithm. We also establish sufficient conditions for the Markov chain to be either ergodic or geometrically ergodic.
- We propose a Monte Carlo EM algorithm to compute the MLE in both bounded unbounded DP, using the MCMC method to approximate the expectation step.
- We apply our methodology to linear regression models, which we study through simulations, and analyze a 2019 American Time Use Survey Microdata File, which we model using a Dirichlet distribution.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: In Section 2.1 we review background on DP, especially on the distinction between bounded and unbounded DP, establish the notation for our asymptotic results, and clarify the problem of interest by specifying the distributions of interest. In Section 3, we develop our theory for posterior convergence under unbounded DP under either Kolmogorov-Smirnov or total variation distance. We express these convergence results in terms of both frequentist and Bayesian sampling distributions as well as “ABC-type” posterior distributions, where we condition on the observed DP summaries lying in an arbitrary rectangle. In Section 4 we conduct an asymptotic analysis as the privacy budget goes to infinity, showing convergence of sampling distributions as well as convergence of the MLE. We develop computational methods in Section 5, developing a reversible jump MCMC algorithm for Bayesian inference under unbounded DP in Section 5.1 and a Monte Carlo EM algorithm to approximate the MLE in Section 5.2. In Section 6 we conduct numerical experiments to study our computational methods, applying them to a simulated linear regression model and a 2019 American Time Use Survey Microdata File. We conclude in Section 7 with discussion and directions for future work. Proofs and technical details are found in the Supplementary Materials.

2 Preliminaries and problem setup

In this section we review the necessary background on differential privacy and asymptotics, which will be used in our results. We also set the notation for the paper and specify the quantities of interest in our theoretical and computational frameworks.

2.1 Differential privacy

Differential privacy, introduced by Dwork et al. (2006) is a probabilistic framework which quantifies the privacy protection of a given mechanism (randomized algorithm). Differential

privacy mechanisms require the introduction of randomness into the procedure, which is designed to obscure the contribution of any one individual. To satisfy differential privacy, we require that when applied to two “neighboring datasets,” the resulting distributions of outputs from the mechanism are “similar.” Given a space of input datasets, \mathcal{X} , as well as an metric d on \mathcal{X} , two datasets $X, X' \in \mathcal{X}$ are called *neighboring* if $d(X, X') \leq 1$.

Definition 2.1 (Differential privacy: Dwork et al., 2006). Let $\epsilon \geq 0$ and $\delta \in [0, 1]$. Let $M : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be a mechanism and let $d : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ be a metric. We say that M satisfies (ϵ, δ) -Differential Privacy (abbreviated as (ϵ, δ) -DP) if

$$P(M(x) \in S) \leq \exp(\epsilon)P(M(x') \in S) + \delta,$$

for all $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$, such that $d(x, x') \leq 1$ and all measurable sets of outputs $S \subset \mathcal{Y}$. If $\delta = 0$, we simply write ϵ -DP in place of $(\epsilon, 0)$ -DP.

In Definition 2.1, ϵ and δ are called the privacy parameters, which govern how strong the privacy guarantee is. Smaller ϵ and δ values give stronger privacy constraints. Typically, ϵ is a small constant often ≤ 1 , and δ is often chosen to be very small, such as $\delta \ll 1/n$.

Many databases can be expressed as an ordered sequence $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ for $x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$, where x_i exclusively contains the information for individual i . In this case, there are two main flavors of DP: *bounded DP*, which takes $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_1^n$ and uses the Hamming metric as the adjacency metric, and *unbounded DP*, which takes $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_1^* = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{X}_1^n$ and uses the add/delete metric, which counts how many entries must be added or deleted to transform one database into the other.

It is well known that if a mechanism satisfies ϵ -(unbounded)DP, then it satisfies 2ϵ -(bounded)DP. Note that in bounded DP, the sample size is baked into the privacy definition, and so it is implicitly a publicly available quantity, whereas in unbounded DP, the sample size is not publicly known and requires privacy protection.

2.2 Asymptotics

Recall that for two probability measures P and Q on a \mathbb{R}^d , the total variation distance between P and Q is $\text{TV}(P, Q) = \frac{1}{2}\|P - Q\| = \sup_S |P(S) - Q(S)|$. A weaker metric is the KS distance: $\text{KS}(P, Q) = \sup_R |P(R) - Q(R)|$, where the supremum is only over axis-aligned “rectangles,” rather than arbitrary subsets. The main weakness of KS distance is that, unlike total variation distance, it does not have the data processing inequality, which is important to ensure that transformations (such as estimators) also have similar distributions. Another version of the KS distance is defined in terms of the L_∞ distance between (multivariate) cdfs, which we denote as KS^∞ . As Smith (2011) pointed out, we have the following relation:

$$\text{KS}^\infty(P, Q) \leq \text{KS}(P, Q) \leq 2^d \text{KS}^\infty(P, Q). \quad (1)$$

We will write $P_n \stackrel{KS}{\sim} Q_n$ and $P_n \stackrel{TV}{\sim} Q_n$ if $\text{KS}(P_n, Q_n) \rightarrow 0$ or $\text{TV}(P_n, Q_n) \rightarrow 0$, respectively. Note that if a distribution P_n has an asymptotic limit (possibly with some rescaling), then if another distribution $Q_n \sim P_n$ in either sense, then it has the same asymptotic distribution. In cases where P_n and Q_n have respective densities $p_n(y)$ and

$q_n(y)$ with respect to a common base measure, then with some abuse of notation, we write $p_n(y) \stackrel{KS}{\sim} q_n(y)$, $p_n(y) \stackrel{TV}{\sim} q_n(y)$, $\text{KS}(p_n(y), q_n(y))$, or $\text{TV}(p_n(y), q_n(y))$ to mean $P_n \stackrel{KS}{\sim} Q_n$, $P_n \stackrel{TV}{\sim} Q_n$, $\text{KS}(P_n, Q_n)$, or $\text{TV}(P_n, Q_n)$, respectively.

2.3 Problem setup

In this section, we establish notation for the paper and state the distributions of interest.

The random variable x represents the sensitive dataset, which is no longer available after privacy protection. The true size of x is n , which is also unobserved with unbounded DP privacy protection. We assume that the privacy mechanism results in two outputs s and n_{dp} , where s is any DP summary and n_{dp} is a DP estimate of n , commonly achieved by applying an additive noise mechanism such as Laplace noise to n . Finally, θ is the parameter that generated x , which is a random variable with a prior distribution. We also assume a prior distribution on the unobserved n . Since we will consider both Bayesian and frequentist problems, for frequentist settings, we condition on θ and disregard the prior distribution.

Due to the large number of random variables in this problem, we will simply use p to denote the pdf/pmf of a random variable; for example $p(n_{\text{dp}}|n)$ is the density of the privacy mechanism which produces n_{dp} from a dataset with size n .

The joint Bayesian model for the parameters and observed values is $p(\theta, s, n, n_{\text{dp}}) = \int p(s|x)p(x|\theta, n)p(\theta)p(n_{\text{dp}}|n)p(n) dx$. The joint distribution of s and θ , given the true n is $p(\theta, s|n) = p(s|\theta, n)p(\theta)$, and the joint distribution given only n_{dp} is

$$\begin{aligned} p(\theta, s|n_{\text{dp}}) &= \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} p(s|\theta, n=k)p(\theta)p(n_{\text{dp}}|n=k)p(n=k)}{\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} p(n_{\text{dp}}|n=k)p(n=k)} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} p(\theta, s|n=k)p(n=k|n_{\text{dp}}), \end{aligned}$$

which is a mixture of the distributions $p(\theta, s|n)$, weighted by the posterior $p(n|n_{\text{dp}})$.

In terms of frequentist models, it is natural to consider n to be part of the data, rather than part of the parameter. As such, rather than a ‘‘prior’’ distribution for n , we would have a model $p(n|\lambda)$, where λ are the parameters that govern the distribution of n . In this case, we can also write the frequentist distribution for s given n_{dp} :

$$\begin{aligned} p(s|\theta, \lambda, n_{\text{dp}}) &= \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} p(s|\theta, n=k)p(n_{\text{dp}}|n=k)p(n=k|\lambda)}{\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} p(n_{\text{dp}}|n=k)p(n=k|\lambda)} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} p(s|\theta, n=k)p(n=k|n_{\text{dp}}, \lambda). \end{aligned}$$

In the remaining paper, we will prefer to write $p(n)$ rather than $p(n|\lambda)$ for simplicity, unless details of the specific distribution of n are needed.

In Section 3, we establish asymptotic results to assert under what conditions various distributions given the true $n = n_0$ differ from the related distribution given only $n_{\text{dp}} = n_0$; for example, relating $p(s|\theta, n = n_0)$ and $p(s|\theta, n_{\text{dp}} = n_0)$.

3 Asymptotic results as sample size increases

In this section, we consider the relation between distributions under bounded and unbounded DP, and investigate under what conditions these distributions have the same asymptotic properties. In Section 3.1, we explore conditions for $p(s|\theta, n = n_0) \approx p(s|\theta, n_{\text{dp}} = n_0)$ and $p(s, \theta | n = n_0) \approx p(s, \theta | n_{\text{dp}} = n_0)$, where “ \approx ” indicates that the KS or total variation distance between the distributions goes to zero as $n_0 \rightarrow \infty$. In Section 3.2 we consider ABC-type posterior distributions, where we condition on s belonging to a sequence of rectangles, and establish conditions for these distributions to converge in KS distance as well.

3.1 Convergence of sampling and joint distribution

In this section, we establish conditions for distributions under unbounded and bounded DP to converge in KS distance. The key conditions are specified in A1 and A2 below. Intuitively, A1 says that in bounded DP the random variable s has a Central Limit Theorem - type asymptotic distribution, where we allow an arbitrary rate of convergence to a general mean-zero continuous distribution. Furthermore, A2 requires that given n_{dp} , our uncertainty about n must not be too large. Interestingly, we find that the threshold for “too large” depends on the nature of the asymptotic distribution in A1.

- A1: The random variable $(s|\theta, n = n_0)$ has an asymptotic distribution: there exists $b > 0$, $a \in \mathbb{R}$, and a function $g : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $n_0^b(n_0^{-a}s - g(\theta)) \xrightarrow{d} X$, as $n_0 \rightarrow \infty$, where X is a mean-zero continuous random variable. (e.g., Central Limit Theorem: $b = 1/2$, $a = 1$ or $a = 0$, and $X \stackrel{d}{=} N(0, 1)$)
- A1’: A1 holds, but where convergence is in total variation.
- A2: We assume there exists a sequence a_{n_0} such that $(n - n_0|n_{\text{dp}} = n_0) = O_p(a_{n_0})$, where if $a = 0$ in A1, then $a_{n_0} = o(n_0)$, and if $a \neq 0$ in A1, then $a_{n_0} = o(n_0^{1-b})$.

While A1 is relatively intuitive, and can be easily verified for many DP summary statistics, A2 is less straightforward to verify, since it concerns itself with a posterior distribution. In the following lemma, we establish in the simple (yet common) case that we have a symmetric and discrete noise mechanism and a flat prior on n , then the rate of $(n - n_0|n_{\text{dp}} = n_0)$ is the same as $(n_{\text{dp}} - n_0|n = n_0)$. For example, either the discrete Laplace or discrete Gaussian mechanisms could be applied using the scale parameter of $O(a_{n_0})$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $p(n)$ be a flat prior on $\{1, 2, \dots\}$. Suppose that the privacy mechanism $\eta(n_{\text{dp}}|n) := p(n_{\text{dp}}|n)$ is a pmf where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n_{\text{dp}} \in \mathbb{Z}$, and satisfies $\eta(n_1|n_2) = \eta(n_2|n_1)$ for all $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$. Then if $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(n_{\text{dp}} - n_0|n = n_0) = O_p(a_{n_0})$, where $a_{n_0} = o(n_0)$, then $(n - n_0|n_{\text{dp}} = n_0) = O_p(a_{n_0})$ as well.*

The alternative assumption A1’ ensures that our convergence results hold in total variation, rather than only in distribution. Convergence in total variation is a stronger notion of convergence which, due to the data processing inequality, ensures that all transformations (such as statistics/estimators) of the random variables also convergence. If s is an additive

privacy mechanism applied to a sample mean, then under a number of common settings, A1' holds; see Lemma A.4 in the appendix for examples.

We are ready to state our first asymptotic result, which establishes that under assumptions A1 and A2, for unbounded or bounded DP, the distributions of the likelihood function is asymptotically the same. This result relies on a technical result, Lemma A.7 found in the Supplementary Materials, which first tackles the simpler problem of showing that $p(s|\theta, n = m) \stackrel{KS}{\approx} p(s|\theta, n = n_0)$ when $m - n_0 = O(a_{n_0})$. See the proof of Lemma A.7 to understand where the rates in A2 come into play.

Theorem 3.2. *Under assumptions A1 and A2, we have that $p(s|\theta, n = n_0) \stackrel{KS}{\approx} p(s|\theta, n_{dp} = n_0)$. If $p(\theta)$ is a proper prior, then $p(\theta, s|n = n_0) \stackrel{KS}{\approx} p(\theta, s|n_{dp} = n_0)$ as well. If A1' holds, then convergence is in total variation distance.*

Theorem 3.2 shows that whether we knew the true $n = n_0$ or the privatized $n_{dp} = n_0$ (for large n_0), we would expect to see similar observations s , as well as similar values of θ . The key result needed to extend the convergence from KS to total variation is from Parthasarathy and Sterneman (1985), which is similar to a Slutsky's theorem for convergence in total variation distance; the result is included as Lemma A.1 in the Supplementary Materials.

The strength of convergence in total variation is that it implies that any estimator which depends on s and n_0 also has the same asymptotic distribution under either $p(s|\theta, n = n_0)$ or $p(s|\theta, n_{dp} = n_0)$, whereas under KS convergence we cannot generally make this claim.

Corollary 3.3. *Suppose that A1' and A2 hold, and let g be any function. Then, $p(g(s)|\theta, n = n_0) \stackrel{TV}{\approx} p(g(s)|\theta, n_{dp} = n_0)$.*

Based on Theorem 3.2 and how it depends on assumptions A1 and A2, we investigate some DP examples where one could design s to have either $a = 0$ or $a = 1$ in A1.

Example 3.4. In this example, we consider two types of privacy mechanisms, which result in either $a = 0$ or $a = 1$ in assumption A1. We assume that $x_i \in [0, 1]$ and are interested in privately estimating the sample mean subject to ϵ -DP.

1. Laplace Mechanism: One of the most common privacy mechanisms, the Laplace mechanism produces $s = \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} x_i + L$, where $L \sim \text{Laplace}(0, 1/\epsilon)$ and s satisfies ϵ -DP. In this case, we see that $a = 1$ and $b = 1/2$. So, for A2, we require $n|(n_{dp} = n_0) = n_0 + o(\sqrt{n_0})$.
2. K -Norm Gradient (KNG) Mechanism (Reimherr and Awan, 2019): This mechanism is based on empirical risk minimization. The empirical risk for mean estimation is squared error: $\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - s)^2$, with gradient $\sum_{i=1}^n -2(x_i - s)$. Restricting $s \in [0, 1]$, the sensitivity of the gradient is 2. Then KNG samples s from the density proportional to

$$\exp\left(-(\epsilon/4) \left| 2 \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - s) \right| \right) I(s \in [0, 1]) = \exp(-(\epsilon n/2) |\bar{x} - s|) I(s \in [0, 1]),$$

which we identify as $s \sim \text{Laplace}_{[0,1]}(\bar{x}, 2/(\epsilon n))$, which is the truncated Laplace distribution on the interval $[0, 1]$. By Reimherr and Awan (2019), this mechanism also satisfies ϵ -DP. In this case we have $a = 0$ and $b = 1/2$. So, to satisfy A2, we require $n|(n_{dp} = n_0) = n_0 + o(n_0)$ a much more lenient restriction.

3.2 ABC posterior convergence

While we established results on the likelihood function in the previous section, a Bayesian analyst may be more interested in whether the posterior distributions $p(\theta|s, n = n_0)$ and $p(\theta|s, n_{\text{dp}} = n_0)$ are similar. While we were not able to get a direct result on these quantities, in Theorem 4.3, we establish that certain ‘‘ABC-type’’ posterior distributions do converge.

Theorem 3.5. *Assume that $p(\theta)$ is a proper prior distribution, and that there exists a sequence of rectangles R_{n_0} such that $p_{n_0} := P(s \in R_{n_0}|n = n_0)$ satisfies both $p_{n_0} > 0$ and $\text{KS}_{n_0}/p_{n_0} \rightarrow 0$, where $\text{KS}_{n_0} = \text{KS}(p(s, \theta|n = n_0), p(s, \theta|n_{\text{dp}} = n_0))$. Suppose further that there exists $b' > 0$, a sequence θ_{n_0} , and a random variable Y such that $n_0^{b'}(\theta - \theta_{n_0})|(n = n_0, s \in R_{n_0}) \xrightarrow{d} Y$, which has continuous cdf F_Y . Then $n_0^{b'}(\theta - \theta_{n_0})|(n_{\text{dp}} = n_0, s \in R_{n_0}) \xrightarrow{d} Y$ as well. Equivalently, $p(n_0^{b'}(\theta - \theta_{n_0})|n = n_0, s \in R_{n_0}) \stackrel{KS}{\sim} p(n_0^{b'}(\theta - \theta_{n_0})|(n_{\text{dp}} = n_0, s \in R_{n_0})$.*

Note that in Theorem 3.5, it is often the case that b' is usually equal to b defined in A1; see for example, Frazier et al. (2018).

Remark 3.6. In Theorem 3.5, the most common case is that $\theta|(s \in R_{n_0}, n = n_0)$ has a central limit theorem, in which case $b = 1/2$ and θ_{n_0} may be a constant, which is the value that $\theta|(s \in R_{n_0}, n = n_0)$ converges to in distribution. If s also has a central limit theorem, $\sqrt{n_0}(s - s_0)|(n = n_0) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \sigma^2)$, then one may take $R_{n_0} = R_{n_0}^0/\sqrt{n_0} + s_0$, where $R_{n_0}^0$ is a rectangle satisfying $P_{Z \sim N(0,1)}(\sigma Z \in R_{n_0}^0) > 0$. In this case, by assuming A1 and A2, we get that $\text{KS}_{n_0} \rightarrow 0$, which ensures that $\text{KS}_{n_0}/p_{n_0} \rightarrow 0$.

We interpret the posterior distributions in Theorem 3.5 as being similar to approximate Bayesian computing (ABC) posteriors, where we condition on the data lying in a certain set, rather than conditioning on the exact value (the rectangles would be most closely related to a weighted ℓ_∞ distance). Since the result holds for all rectangles, this gives some indication that the exact posteriors are similar, although we have not been able to formally prove this.

4 Convergence as privacy budget grows

In this section, we consider a different asymptotic regime, where n_0 is held fixed, but the privacy budget for n_{dp} goes to infinity (noise goes to zero).

4.1 Sampling and joint distributions

We will establish conditions for $\text{TV}(p(s|\theta, n = n_0), p(s|\theta, n_{\text{dp}} = n_0)) \rightarrow 0$, where the limit is in terms of the privacy budgets for s and n_{dp} . We will express the privacy budgets in terms of total variation DP (Barber and Duchi, 2014), which is equivalent to $(0, \delta)$ -DP. Total variation DP is one of the weakest notions of DP, and because of this, it is implied by all of the main-line DP definitions (e.g., Awan and Ramasethu, 2023). Lemma A.8 in the appendix establishes conversions from many popular DP definitions to $(0, \delta)$ -DP.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $p(s|x)$ be the distribution of a $(0, \delta)$ -DP mechanism, let $p(x|\theta, n)$ be a distribution for x , where x consists of n copies of i.i.d. variables, and let $p(n)$ be a (not*

necessarily proper) prior on n . Then

$$\text{TV}(p(s|\theta, n = n_0), p(s|\theta, n_{\text{dp}} = n_0)) \leq \delta \mathbb{E}_{n|n_{\text{dp}}=n_0} |n - n_0|.$$

If $p(\theta)$ is a proper prior on θ , then we similarly have

$$\text{TV}(p(s, \theta|n = n_0), p(s, \theta|n_{\text{dp}} = n_0)) \leq \delta \mathbb{E}_{n|n_{\text{dp}}=n_0} |n - n_0|.$$

In order for the total variation distances in Theorem 4.1 to go to zero, we need either $\delta \rightarrow 0$ or for $\mathbb{E}_{n|n_{\text{dp}}=n_0} |n - n_0| \rightarrow 0$. The first option is asking for the privacy guarantee on $p(s|x)$ to strengthen, in which case s “remembers” less about the data; the second requires that the scale of the random variable $n|n_{\text{dp}} = n_0$ goes to zero or equivalently that the privacy budget of $p(n_{\text{dp}}|n)$ increases. We focus our attention on the mechanism for n_{dp} .

In the Lemma 4.2, we consider two popular mechanisms for $p(n_{\text{dp}}|n)$: Laplace (equivalently discrete Laplace/geometric) mechanism and Gaussian (equivalently discrete Gaussian) mechanism, and assume a flat improper prior for $p(n)$. In these cases we verify that when the privacy parameter goes to infinity, the expectation in Theorem 4.1 goes to zero.

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose that $p(n)$ is a flat improper prior on $\{1, 2, \dots\}$.*

1. *If $p(n|n_{\text{dp}} = n_0) \propto \exp(-\epsilon|n - n_0|)$, then $\mathbb{E}_{n|n_{\text{dp}}=n_0} |n - n_0| \leq \frac{2}{\exp(\epsilon)-1}$.*
2. *If $p(n|n_{\text{dp}} = n_0) \propto \exp(-(\epsilon^2/2)(n - n_0)^2)$, then $\mathbb{E}_{n|n_{\text{dp}}=n_0} |n - n_0| \leq 2/\epsilon$.*

Note that both quantities go to zero when $\epsilon \rightarrow \infty$.

Similar to Theorem 3.5, we can prove convergence of ABC-type posterior distributions as the privacy budget for n_{dp} grows. With total variation convergence, we are not limited to rectangles as in Theorem 3.5, but can instead condition on arbitrary sets with positive probability.

Theorem 4.3. *Under the same setup as Theorem 4.1, call $\gamma = \mathbb{E}_{n|n_{\text{dp}}=n_0} |n - n_0|$. Then for any set S such that $P(s \in S|n = n_0) > 0$ and $P(s \in S|n_{\text{dp}} = n_0) > 0$ for all $\gamma > 0$, we have that $p(\theta|s \in S, n_{\text{dp}} = n_0) \stackrel{\text{TV}}{\sim} p(\theta|s \in S, n = n_0)$ as $\gamma \rightarrow 0$.*

Remark 4.4. If we instead want $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we need to choose S_δ such that $P_\delta(s \in S_\delta|n = n_0) > 0$ and $P_{\delta,\gamma}(s \in S_\delta|n_{\text{dp}} = n_0)$ for all $\delta > 0$ and $\gamma > 0$, and we can achieve a similar result. In fact, in either case, we can even allow the probability of S to decrease, as long as it is slower than the rate of γ (or δ).

4.2 Convergence of the MLE

In this section, we consider the maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) in the unbounded DP setting and show that as the privacy budget grows, this MLE converges to the MLE under bounded DP (under suitable regularity conditions).

Under bounded DP setting the true sample size n_0 is available, and the MLE of θ is

$$\hat{\theta}(n_0, s) = \arg \max_{\theta} p(s | n = n_0, \theta). \tag{2}$$

In unbounded DP, however, the sample size is unknown. Suppose that we use a prior distribution on n that yields a proper posterior distribution $p(n \mid n_{\text{dp}})$, then we can express the MLE of θ as

$$\hat{\theta}_{\text{dp}}(n_{\text{dp}}, s) = \arg \max_{\theta} p(s \mid \theta, n_{\text{dp}}) = \arg \max_{\theta} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} p(n = k \mid n_{\text{dp}}) p(s \mid n = k, \theta). \quad (3)$$

Here we show that the unbounded-DP MLE converges to the MLE we would get if the true sample size $n = n_0$ is known.

Theorem 4.5. *Fix sample size $n = n_0 > 0$. Suppose Θ is a metric space. Let the bounded DP likelihood be $L(\theta; s) := p(s \mid \theta, n = n_0)$. Write the unbounded DP likelihood as $L_{\epsilon}(\theta; s, n_{\text{dp}}) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} p(s \mid \theta, n = k) p_{\epsilon}(n = k \mid n_{\text{dp}})$, where $p_{\epsilon}(n \mid n_{\text{dp}})$ is a proper posterior distribution corresponding to privacy budget ϵ . Suppose that the following conditions hold.*

- *Unique bounded DP MLE: almost all sample paths $L(\theta; s)$ are upper semi-continuous and each has a unique maximum point $\hat{\theta}(n_0, s)$.*
- *Uniform convergence on compact sets: for every compact subset K of Θ , we have for all $\theta \in K$, $L_{\epsilon}(\theta; s, n_{\text{dp}}) \xrightarrow{d} L(\theta; s)$ in $\ell^{\infty}(K)$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow \infty$. The probabilities are over the randomness in both s and n_{dp} .*
- *For each ϵ , let $\hat{\theta}_{\epsilon}$ be a random element of Θ such that $L_{\epsilon}(\hat{\theta}_{\epsilon}; n_{\text{dp}}, s) \geq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} L_{\epsilon}(\theta; n_{\text{dp}}, s) - o_p(1)$. Here $\hat{\theta}_{\epsilon}$ is the approximate argmax of the unbounded-DP likelihood.*
- *Tightness condition: for every $c > 0$, there exists a compact set $K_c \subset \Theta$ such that*

$$\limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\epsilon}(\hat{\theta}_{\epsilon} \notin K_c) \leq c, \quad \mathbb{P}(\hat{\theta}(n_0, s) \notin K_c) \leq c.$$

We have $\hat{\theta}_{\epsilon} \xrightarrow{d} \hat{\theta}(n_0, s)$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow \infty$.

Remark 4.6. Intuitively, the tightness condition ensures that $\hat{\theta}_{\epsilon}$ and $\hat{\theta}_0$ lie in compact sets with arbitrarily large probability. Alternatively, we could have assumed that the parameter space Θ is compact.

Note that while we use ϵ as the *privacy budget*, we do not necessarily require ϵ -DP, or any other particular privacy definition, as long as the stated assumptions hold.

5 Computational techniques

In this section, we develop computational tools to perform principled statistical inference on privatized data in the unbounded DP setting. In Section 5.1, we develop a reversible jump MCMC for Bayesian inference and in Section 5.2, we develop a Monte Carlo EM algorithm to estimate the MLE in unbounded DP.

5.1 A reversible jump MCMC sampler for unbounded DP

The Metropolis-within-Gibbs sampler proposed by Ju et al. (2022) takes a data augmentation strategy and targets the private data posterior distribution $p(\theta | s)$, with a running time comparable to many non-private samplers. Their algorithm augments the parameter space with a latent database of size n and therefore is limited to bounded DP. While some unbounded DP particular problems can be expressed in a way that do not explicitly depend on n , such as the multinomial problem in Section B of the Supplementary Materials, in general there is a need to develop trans-dimensional MCMC methods to perform Bayesian inference under unbounded DP. We propose a modification to Ju et al. (2022)’s sampler for unbounded DP, based on reversible jumps, which enjoys 1) lower bounds on the acceptance probabilities when the privacy mechanisms satisfy ϵ -DP and 2) either ergodicity or geometric ergodicity under certain regularity conditions.

We aim to draw samples from the posterior distribution of $(n, \theta, x_{\{1:n\}})$ given the available information of (n_{dp}, s) . Since it is not possible to sample directly from this posterior distribution, we rely on MCMC algorithms. However, we first notice that this posterior distribution is defined on a space that is the union of spaces with different dimensions. This is because if n changes, the dimension of $(n, \theta, x_{\{1:n\}})$ also changes. Therefore, we need to rely on an MCMC algorithm that accounts for this aspect. For this reason, we opted to use reversible jump MCMC (Green, 1995). To our knowledge, this is the first implementation of reversible jump MCMC techniques for inference on privatized data.

For an introduction to reversible jump MCMC, we recommend Brooks et al. (2011, Chapter 3). Essentially, reversible jump MCMC consists of “within-model moves” and “between-model moves.” In our case, the *model* is determined by the sample size n .

- *Within-model move*: with a fixed n , perform an update to $(\theta, x_{\{1:n\}})$ according to any MCMC updating scheme. We simply use one cycle of the data augmentation MCMC method of Ju et al. (2022) with the current sample size n .
- *Between-models move*: we propose to either add or delete a row in the database, altering n by 1.

We present a single round of our proposed RJMCMC sampler in Algorithm 1.

In Algorithm 1, when we cannot sample directly from $p(\theta|x_{1:n})$, another MCMC scheme with the correct target distribution can be substituted in this step, at the cost of slower mixing.

Furthermore, to ensure that the time to execute a single round of the RJMCMC is $O(n)$, we assume that our privacy mechanism is *record-additive* (Ju et al., 2022):

- A3 (Record Additivity) The privacy mechanism can be written in the form $p(s | x) = g(s, \sum_{i=1}^n t_i(x_i, s))$ for some known and tractable functions g, t_i .

Many popular mechanisms are record-additive, such as additive noise to sufficient statistics (Foulds et al., 2016), as well as empirical risk minimization mechanisms, like objective perturbation (Chaudhuri et al., 2011). Record-additivity is an important property because it implies that when adding, deleting, or swapping a row of x , it only takes $O(1)$ time to

Algorithm 1 One iteration of the privacy-aware Reversible-Jump MCMC sampler

INPUT: Private summaries s and n_{dp} , functions t and g such that $p(s|x_{1:n}) = g(s, \sum_{i=1}^n t(s, x_i))$, samplers for $p(\theta|x)$ and $p(x_i|\theta)$, initial dataset $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and corresponding $t_x = \sum_i t(s, x_i)$.

1. Within-model moves using Algorithm 1 of Ju et al. (2022):

- (a) Update $\theta \sim p(\theta|x)$.
- (b) For $i = 1, \dots, n$, sequentially update $x_i | x_{-i}, \theta, s$ as follows:
 - i. Propose $x_i^* \sim p(x | \theta)$.
 - ii. Set $t_{x^*} = t_x - t(s, x_i) + t(s, x_i^*)$.
 - iii. Accept the proposed state x_i^* with probability

$$\min \left\{ 1, \frac{p(s|x^*)}{p(s|x)} \right\} = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{g(s, t_{x^*})}{g(s, t_x)} \right\}. \quad (4)$$

2. Between-models move:

- (a) Sample n^* from the pmf $q(n^*|n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n = 1 \text{ and } n^* = n + 1 \\ 1/2 & \text{if } n > 1 \text{ and } |n^* - n| = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$

- i. If $n^* = n + 1$,
 - A. sample $x_{n+1}^* \sim p(x|\theta)$,
 - B. set $x_{1:n^*}^* = (x_1, \dots, x_n, x_{n+1}^*)$,
 - C. set $t_{x^*} = t_x + t(s, x_{n+1}^*)$.
- ii. Else if $n^* = n - 1$,
 - A. set $x_{1:n^*}^* = (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$,
 - B. set $t_{x^*} = t_x - t(s, x_n)$ and $i \leq k \leq j$

- (b) Accept the move to $n = n^*$, $x_{1:n} = x_{1:n^*}^*$ and $t_x = t_{x^*}$ with probability

$$\min \left\{ 1, \frac{p(n^*)p(s|x^*)p(n_{\text{dp}}|n^*)q(n|n^*)}{p(n)p(s|x)p(n_{\text{dp}}|n)q(n^*|n)} \right\} = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{p(n^*)g(s, t_{x^*})p(n_{\text{dp}}|n^*)q(n|n^*)}{p(n)g(s, t_x)p(n_{\text{dp}}|n)q(n^*|n)} \right\}. \quad (5)$$

update the value of $p(s | x)$, by adding/subtracting at most two elements to $\sum_{i=1}^n t_i(x_i, s)$. See Remark 5.2 for more details.

In the case that the mechanisms for s and n_{dp} satisfy ϵ -DP, we obtain lower bounds on the acceptance probabilities in Algorithm 1, similar to those in Ju et al. (2022).

Proposition 5.1. *Suppose that s and n_{dp} satisfy ϵ_s -DP and ϵ_n -DP, respectively, in the unbounded sense. The following hold for Algorithm 1:*

1. *The acceptance probability (4) is lower bounded by $\exp(-2\epsilon_s)$.*
2. *If $p(n)$ is a flat (improper) prior, then the acceptance probability (5) is lower bounded by $\exp(-(\epsilon_s + \epsilon_n))$ for all $n \geq 2$. If $n = 1$ and $n^* = 2$, then the lower bound is instead $(1/2) \exp(-(\epsilon_s + \epsilon_n))$.*

Remark 5.2. Similar to the data augmentation MCMC of Ju et al. (2022), the use of record additivity allows us to ensure that one iteration of Algorithm 1 only takes $O(n)$ time. On the other hand, if record additivity did not hold, then evaluating $p(s|x_{1:n})$ in (4) and (5) could also take $O(n)$ time, giving a total runtime of $O(n^2)$. More precisely, in Algorithm 1, suppose that g , t , $p(n)$, and $p(n_{\text{dp}}|n)$ can all be evaluated in $O(1)$ time. Suppose further that $p(x|\theta)$ can be sampled in $O(1)$ time and $p(\theta|x_{1:n})$ can be sampled in $O(n)$ time. Then, one iteration of Algorithm 1 takes $O(n)$ time.

To ensure that a Markov chain has the correct limiting distribution and that empirical means from the chain have a Law of Large Numbers, it is important to establish that a chain is ergodic. In Proposition 5.3 we give a sufficient condition to satisfy this property.

Proposition 5.3. *Suppose that*

1. *the state space $\Theta \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{N}$ has a countably generated σ -algebra,*
2. *the following densities are bounded: $p(\theta)$, $p(x_i|\theta)$, and $p(s|x_{1:n})$,*
3. *for $i < j < k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, if $p(n = i) > 0$ and $p(n = k) > 0$, then $p(n = j) > 0$,*
4. *the supports of $p(x_i|\theta)$, $p(s|x_{1:n})$, and $p(n_{\text{dp}}|n)$ do not depend on the right hand side.*

Then, the RJMCMC of Algorithm 1 is ergodic on the joint space $(\theta, x_{1:n}, n) \in \Theta \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{Z}^+$, and has $p(\theta, x_{1:n}, n|s, n_{\text{dp}})$ as its unique limiting distribution.

If we also want to quantify the estimation error from our chain with a Central Limit Theorem, geometric ergodicity is needed. Qin (2023) established that under mild conditions, if a chain is geometrically ergodic on the within-model moves, and there are a finite number of models, then the reversible jump MCMC is also geometrically ergodic. Based on this, we give a sufficient condition for Algorithm 1 to be geometrically ergodic in Proposition 5.4, leveraging Ju et al. (2022, Theorem 3.4) which established geometric ergodicity for the within-model moves.

Proposition 5.4. *Suppose that the conditions in Proposition 5.3 hold, and further suppose*

1. *$p(\theta)$ is a proper prior,*

2. $p(s|x)$ and $p(n_{\text{dp}}|n)$ satisfy ϵ_s -DP and ϵ_n -DP, respectively,
3. there exists $a > 0$ such that $p(x_i|\theta) > a$ for all x_i and all θ , and
4. $p(n)$ has finite support.

Then, the RJMCMC of Algorithm 1 is geometrically ergodic.

Remark 5.5 (Data structure implementation). In terms of data structure, we propose to first guess an estimate of $N > n$, such as $N = 2n_{\text{dp}}$, and fill the first n entries of the array with x_i values and leave the last $N - n$ as NaNs. As we update n and x , if we delete a row, we simply update the value of n and ignore the old row; if we add a row, we place it's value in the first available spot and update $n = n + 1$. If we propose $n^* > N$, then we make a new array with size $2N$ and move our database to the new array. By doubling the size, we reduce the frequency of creating and copying large arrays.

Remark 5.6 (When n_{dp} is not explicitly available). Algorithm 1 assumes that n_{dp} is available and is independent of the other DP summaries s . While this is a common case, there are situations where there is no explicit n_{dp} term and s contains all of the private summaries. In this case, our Algorithm 1 can be modified by removing $p(n_{\text{dp}}|\cdot)$ from the acceptance probability.

5.2 Monte Carlo Expectation Maximization

In this section, we develop a Monte Carlo expectation maximization (MCEM) algorithm to compute the MLE of θ given (s, n_{dp}) . Since the method does not explicitly depend on the separation between s and n_{dp} , we will use s as shorthand for the pair (s, n_{dp}) in this section.

This method iterates between the E-step, which involves estimating an expectation over the joint posterior distribution $p(x_{1:n}, n|s, \theta^{(t)})$ which we approximate with our RJMCMC algorithm, and the M-step which maximizes the expectation calculated in the E-step or at least do a gradient step in the direction of maximization. The algorithm is summarized in Algorithm 2.

Since $x_{1:n}$ is unavailable due to privacy protection, the likelihood function

$$\log p(s | n, \theta) = \log \left(\sum_{x_{1:n} \in \mathcal{X}_1^n} p(s | x_{1:n}) p(x_{1:n} | n, \theta) \right)$$

is intractable due to the integration over \mathcal{X}_1^n . Also, since n is unknown, we additionally model n with some (prior) distribution $p(n)$ and the marginal likelihood function is

$$p(s | \theta) = \sum_n p(n) p(s | n, \theta) = \sum_n p(n) \int_{x_{1:n} \in \mathcal{X}_1^n} p(s | x_{1:n}) p(x_{1:n} | n, \theta) dx.$$

We propose using an EM algorithm to estimate the MLE, $\hat{\theta} = \arg \max p(s|\theta)$. The EM algorithm works with the complete data likelihood $p(s, x_{1:n}, n | \theta) = p(s | x_{1:n}) p_\theta(x_{1:n} | n) p(n)$. In the E-step, the Q-function is the conditional expectation of complete-data log-likelihood

given the current parameter estimate $\theta^{(t)}$:

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\theta; \theta^{(t)}) &= \mathbb{E}_{x_{1:n}, n \sim p(\cdot | s, \theta^{(t)})} [\log p(s, x_{1:n}, n | \theta)] \\ &= \sum_n \int_{\mathcal{X}_1^n} \log p(x_{1:n} | \theta) p(x_{1:n}, n | s, \theta^{(t)}) dx_{1:n} + \text{const.} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{x_{1:n}, n \sim p(\cdot | s, \theta^{(t)})} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \log p(x_i | \theta) \right] + \text{const.} \end{aligned}$$

As we can see, the E-step involves the joint posterior distribution $p(x_{1:n}, n | s, \theta^{(t)})$, which can be approximated with our reversible jump sampler. The MC approximation for Q is

$$Q_m(\theta) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \log p(x_{1:n^{(j)}}^{(j)} | \theta) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{i=1}^{n^{(j)}} \log p(x_i^{(j)} | \theta),$$

where for $j = 1, \dots, m$, each $(x_{1:n^{(j)}}^{(j)}, n^{(j)})$ is a sample from the joint posterior distribution $p(x_{1:n}, n | s, \theta^{(t)})$, from the RJMCMC sampler.

Then in the M-step, we approximate $\arg \max Q(\theta)$ with $\arg \max Q_m(\theta)$, resulting in $\theta^{(t+1)} = \arg \max Q_m(\theta)$. For non-trivial models, the M-step might require numerical methods such as `optim` in R.

Recall that it is sufficient to have $\theta^{(t+1)}$ such that $Q_m(\theta^{(t+1)}, \theta^{(t)}) > Q_m(\theta^{(t)}, \theta^{(t)})$ for convergence to a local maximum. As a result, we can instead use a gradient descent step:

$$\theta^{(t+1)} \leftarrow \theta^{(t)} + \tau_t \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{i=1}^{n^{(j)}} \partial_\theta \log p(x_i^{(j)} | \theta),$$

where τ_t is the learning rate sequence. Such a gradient descent step can be efficiently implemented for exponential family models for the data $x_{1:n}$. This gradient descent step imposes another assumption: The E-step requires us to sample from the model $p(x|\theta)$ and evaluate its density, and the M-step additionally requires us to evaluate the gradient of log density.

When we use MCMC to approximate $p(x_{1:n}, n | s, \theta^{(t+1)})$, we can initialize the chains with samples from $p(x_{1:n}, n | s, \theta^{(t)})$.

Algorithm 2 MCEM

Require: current estimate $\theta^{(t)}$ and learning rate sequence τ_t .

1. E-step: obtain the RJMCMC sample from the joint posterior distribution $p(x_{1:n}, n | s, \theta^{(t)})$.
 2. M-step: $\theta^{(t+1)} \leftarrow \theta^{(t)} + \tau_t \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{i=1}^{n^{(j)}} \partial_\theta \log p(x_i^{(j)} | \theta)$.
-

Example 5.7 (Exponential Family). $x_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} p(x | \theta) = h(x) \exp(\eta(\theta) \cdot T(x) + A(\theta))$. To implement the M-step efficiently, one needs to solve the equation $\nabla \eta(\theta) \left(\sum_j \sum_i T(x_i^{(j)}) \right) =$

$\nabla A(\theta)$. The gradient descent step is $\theta^{(t+1)} \leftarrow \theta^{(t)} + \tau_t \left[\nabla \eta(\theta^{(t)}) \left(\sum_j \sum_i T(x_i^{(j)}) \right) - \nabla A(\theta^{(t)}) \right]$.

Remark 5.8. While Algorithm 2 was designed for inference in unbounded DP, the method can be easily modified to estimate the MLE in bounded DP as well. The E-step can be changed to a sampler for $p(x_{1:n}|s, \theta^{(t)})$, such as the method in Ju et al. (2022); the M-step is the same except that $n^{(j)}$ is replaced with the public value of n .

6 Numerical experiments

In this section, we implement the RJMCMC and MCEM algorithms to explore their performance. We consider a simulated linear regression setting as well as a real data example using compositional data. The code for this section is available online at <https://github.com/anfebar/Statistical-Inference-for-Privatized-Data-with-Unknown-Sample-Size>.

6.1 Linear regression simulations

$\epsilon_N =$	0.001	0.01	0.1	1	10	Inf
$\mathbb{E}(\beta_1)$	-0.568	-0.507	-0.540	-0.551	-0.457	-0.523
$\text{Var}(\beta_1)$	5.559	1.024	1.053	0.942	0.936	0.879
$\mathbb{E}(\tau)$	1.052	1.057	1.025	1.042	1.026	1.052
$\text{Var}(\tau)$	0.633	0.623	0.531	0.548	0.535	0.544
$\mathbb{E}(N)$	1116.219	987.717	998.707	999.874	1000.000	1000.000
$\text{Var}(N)$	1005.443	762.425	145.776	1.924	0.005	0.000

$\epsilon_N =$	0.001	0.01	0.1	1	10	Inf
$\mathbb{E}(\beta_1)$	-0.921	-0.942	-0.952	-0.946	-0.947	-0.956
$\text{Var}(\beta_1)$	0.205	0.190	0.198	0.196	0.197	0.195
$\mathbb{E}(\tau)$	1.234	1.095	1.107	1.081	1.090	1.093
$\text{Var}(\tau)$	0.351	0.291	0.296	0.274	0.286	0.293
$\mathbb{E}(N)$	1217.458	1000.015	999.109	999.871	1000.000	1000.000
$\text{Var}(N)$	4051.367	258.795	66.134	1.665	0.005	0.000

Table 1: Linear regression posterior mean and variance simulation results using $\epsilon_s = .1$ (top) or $\epsilon_s = 1$ (bottom). Results are averaged over 100 replicates in each setting (one failed replicate for $\epsilon_N = .001$ with both $\epsilon_s = .1$ and $\epsilon_s = 1$). Chains were run with 10,000 iterations, and used a burn-in of 5,000. Note that $\epsilon_N = \text{Inf}$ corresponds to bounded DP.

In this section, we analyze a linear regression problem, in the setting of unbounded DP where the sample size N is not publicly known. The DP summary statistics are similar to those used in Ju et al. (2022), but unlike their example, we use a full prior model, whereas they assumed that the values of many nuisance parameters were known. Specifically, we model the original data as $y_i|x_i, \beta, \tau \sim N((1, x_i)\beta, \tau^{-1}I)$ and $x_i|\mu, \Phi \sim N_p(\mu, \Phi^{-1})$. We use priors $\beta|\tau \sim N_{p+1}(m, \tau^{-1}V^{-1})$, $\tau \sim \text{Gamma}(a/2, b/2)$ (using the shape-rate parametrization), $\Phi \sim \text{Wishart}_p(d, W)$, and $\mu \sim N(\theta, \Sigma)$. In total, the parameters are (β, τ, μ, Φ) , the

hyperparameters are $(m, V, a, b, \theta, \Sigma, d, W)$, and sufficient statistics are $(X^\top X, X^\top Y, Y^\top Y)$, where X is a matrix whose rows are $(1, x_i)$ and Y is a vector whose entries are the y_i 's.

Our DP summary statistics are produced by the following procedure. We assume that the data curator has some assumed bounds on the $x_{i,j}$'s and y_i 's, which for these simulations are set to be $[L, U]$ (while L and U could vary based on the covariate/response, we hold them fixed here for simplicity). We first clamp the data to lie within the pre-specified bounds and normalize the $x_{i,j}$'s and y_i 's to lie in $[-1, 1]$ using the following map: $f(x; L, U) = \frac{2([x]_L^U - L)}{U - L} - 1$, where $[x]_L^U = \min\{U, \max\{x, L\}\}$ is the clamping function. Call $\tilde{x}_{i,j}$ and \tilde{y}_i the output of this clamping-normalization procedure and call \tilde{X} the matrix whose rows are $(1, \tilde{x}_i)$ and \tilde{Y} the vector of the \tilde{y}_i 's. After this pre-processing, we add independent Laplace noise to each of the unique entries of $\tilde{X}\tilde{X}^\top$, $\tilde{X}\tilde{Y}$, and $\tilde{Y}^\top\tilde{Y}$, excluding the $(1, 1)$ entry of $\tilde{X}\tilde{X}^\top$, which encodes the sample size N . Using unbounded DP, the ℓ_1 sensitivity of these unique entries is $\Delta = p^2/2 + (5/2)p + 2$, where p is the number of covariates. Call s the result of adding independent Laplace $(0, \Delta/\epsilon_s)$ noise to the unique entries of $\tilde{X}\tilde{X}^\top$, $\tilde{X}\tilde{Y}$, and $\tilde{Y}^\top\tilde{Y}$, excluding the $(1, 1)$ entry of $\tilde{X}\tilde{X}^\top$. We separately privatize N as $n_{\text{dp}} = N + \text{Laplace}(1/\epsilon_N)$.

For the simulation, we used the following hyperparameters: $L = -5$, $U = 5$, $p = 2$, $m = (0, 0, 0)^\top$, $V = I_{p+1}$, $a = 2$, $b = 2$, $\theta = (0, 0)^\top$, $\Sigma = I_p$, $d = 2$, $W = I_p$. We consider either $\epsilon_s \in \{.1, 1\}$, and vary $\epsilon_N \in \{.001, .01, .1, 1, 10, \text{Inf}\}$, where by $\epsilon_N = \text{Inf}$, we mean that N is released without privacy protection (effectively $2\epsilon_s$ -DP under bounded DP). We use a sample size of $N = 1000$, run our RJMCMC for 10,000 iterations with a burn-in of 5,000, and averaged results over 100 replicates (each replicate consists of new data generation, new privacy noise, and a new Markov chain). There was one failed chain in both settings of $\epsilon_N = .001$, which were omitted in our summary. Results are summarized in Table 1, with Monte Carlo standard errors in Table C1 in the Supplementary Materials; note that in these tables, β_1 has the true fixed value of -1 .

In the top of Table 1, we have the results for $\epsilon_s = .1$, and see that the posterior means and variances of β and τ are very similar for $\epsilon_N \geq .01$. Only at $\epsilon_N = .001$ do we have a significantly inflated posterior variance for β . However, we do have significant uncertainty about N when using $\epsilon_N \leq .1$. In the bottom of Table 1, we see that for $\epsilon_s = 1$ the results are even more stable with the posterior means and variances for β and τ being similar for all ranges of ϵ_N considered. As in the $\epsilon_s = .1$ case, the greatest uncertainty is in N which appears for $\epsilon_N \leq .1$. Interestingly, by increasing ϵ_s from $.1$ to 1 , we see a reduction in the posterior variance of N even when holding ϵ_N fixed. This illustrates the ability of the Bayesian posterior to learn about N from the other DP summaries.

In Table 2 we conduct a similar experiment, focusing on the case $\epsilon_s = 1$, using the MCEM algorithm to estimate the model parameters β_0 , β_1 , β_2 , and τ . We see a similar trend to that in Table 1: the estimates are similar for $\epsilon_N \geq 0.1$ while the estimates at privacy level $\epsilon_N = 0.001$ have higher bias and more uncertainty.

6.2 Real data application

We analyze data from the publicly available 2019 American Time Use Survey (ATUS) Microdata File, which can be accessed at <https://www.bls.gov/tus/datafiles-2019.htm>. The ATUS dataset, collected and maintained by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, records

ϵ_N	β_0	β_1	β_2	τ
0.001	-0.400 (0.751)	-0.977 (0.579)	0.770 (0.702)	1.17 (0.710)
0.01	-0.192 (0.433)	-0.914 (0.408)	0.847 (0.390)	1.01 (0.426)
0.1	-0.111 (0.374)	-0.968 (0.345)	0.871 (0.365)	1.14 (0.562)
1	-0.115 (0.369)	-0.952 (0.338)	0.883 (0.387)	1.17 (0.664)
10	-0.131 (0.435)	-0.941 (0.352)	0.875 (0.465)	1.15 (0.571)
Inf	-0.167 (0.434)	-0.955 (0.385)	0.828 (0.483)	1.14 (0.554)

Table 2: Linear regression MLE for β and τ . For a fixed confidential dataset of size $N = 1000$, we generate (s, n_{dp}) using $\epsilon_S = 1$ and varying ϵ_N . We report the average and standard deviation (in parentheses) of MLE $\hat{\beta}$ and $\hat{\tau}$ values, over 100 replicates. The MCEM chains were run with 10,000 iterations, and used a burn-in of 30%. Note that $\epsilon_N = \text{Inf}$ corresponds to bounded DP.

the daily time allocation for various activities (such as personal care, household tasks, etc.) throughout 2019. The dataset is comprised of 9,435 records, released on July 22, 2021.

Guo et al. (2022) introduce differentially private Bayesian methods for analyzing compositional data, using the ATUS dataset. They focus on proportions of daily time spent on personal care (x_{i1}), eating and drinking (x_{i2}), and all other activities (x_{i3}), resulting in 6,656 observations after preprocessing. They model the data with a Dirichlet distribution with parameters $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$. We aim to compare their bounded DP approach with our unbounded one, using the same prior specification: $\alpha_j \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{Gamma}(1.0, 0.1)$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$. Following Guo et al. (2022), we define $s = \sum_{i=1}^n (\log(\max\{x_{i1}, a\}, \max\{x_{i2}, a\}, \max\{x_{i3}, a\}))$ with $a = \min_{ij} x_{ij}$ as if an oracle had provided us with such a value. This choice is made because the focus of this paper is on studying the effect of using n_{dp} (unbounded) versus n (bounded) rather than aspects of s .

For the numerical experiment, we work with fixed realizations of s , each one generated using a privacy budget $\epsilon_s \in \{1, 10\}$ and focus on how the results can vary under different realizations of n_{dp} . For n_{dp} , we employ a privacy budget of $\epsilon_n \in \{0.01, 0.1, 1, 10\}$ and generate 10 realizations. We use the Laplace mechanism with sensitivity equal to $3 \log(a)$ for s and 1 for n_{dp} . To sample from the posterior distribution for $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$ under bounded differential privacy, we utilize the algorithm outlined in Ju et al. (2022), while for unbounded differential privacy, we employ our proposed RJMCMC algorithm.

Figure 1 presents the obtained results. Since both bounded and unbounded DP use the same s , the only varying factor is the availability of n in the former and n_{dp} in the latter. Thus, the results for bounded DP serve as the benchmark for those under unbounded DP. In the first column of Figure 1, we observe that the posterior standard deviation of the parameters under unbounded DP decreases in ϵ_n , converging to those under bounded DP. Additionally, as ϵ_s increases, the results become more accurate, but the value of ϵ_n required for unbounded DP to match its benchmark must also increase. An interpretation of this phenomenon is that either ϵ_n or ϵ_s will be the ‘‘bottleneck.’’ In the second column of Figure 1, we show the posterior distribution of n under unbounded DP. As expected, we see that when ϵ_n increases, the uncertainty about n decreases. Interestingly, in the case of $\epsilon_n = .01$, we observe that the variability of the posterior distribution of n slightly decreases as ϵ_s goes




Figure 1: The first column displays the posterior standard deviations for α_1 , α_2 , and α_3 with varying ϵ_s and ϵ_n . The horizontal solid lines represent values under bounded DP, while the 10 dashed lines represent standard deviations for 10 realizations of n_{dp} . In the second column, boxplots depict the posterior distribution of n under unbounded DP, with the horizontal line indicating the actual sample size. Each boxplot combines draws for n from 10 posterior distributions, each corresponding to one of the 10 realizations of n_{dp} .

from 1 to 10, showing that there is some additional learning about n when s becomes more accurate. This result is consistent with the results of Section 6.1.

In Figure C2 of the supplementary materials, we visually compare the posterior distributions of α_1 , α_2 , and α_3 , and in Figure C3 we compare the predictive distribution for two compositional components. We observe that the predictive distributions are quite robust to

the specifications of ϵ_s and ϵ_n , a pattern that was also noted in Guo et al. (2022).

7 Discussion

This paper is the first to offer a comprehensive statistical analysis of unbounded DP, where the sample size is not publicly available. We have developed both theory and methodology to enable valid statistical inference in this setting. In our theory, we discovered an interesting relationship between the required uncertainty in n given n_{dp} and how it relates to the asymptotic distribution of s ; this discovery could lead to the design of better mechanisms in the unbounded DP case. Our RJMCMC and MCEM algorithms offer tractable computational methods for finite sample inference in the unbounded case.

Currently, our Bayesian theory as $n \rightarrow \infty$ is limited in that it only considers ABC-type posterior distributions. It would be more ideal to analyze the posterior distribution that directly conditions on the observation itself, rather than this type of event. It may be possible to use theory of the convergence of ABC posteriors to bridge this gap (Frazier et al., 2018), but we leave this to future researchers.

Another limitation of our theory is that the convergence of the MLE is only with respect to the privacy budget. We suspect that the MLE is also a consistent estimator as $n \rightarrow \infty$, but other analysis techniques are required to establish this claim.

In our RJMCMC algorithm, exact sampling directly from $p(\theta|x)$ can be replaced by a general MCMC sampler for the non-private posterior, as noted in Ju et al. (2022). However, it is not clear how this generalization affects the performance of the chain in practice.

References

- Awan, J. and Dong, J. (2022), ‘Log-concave and multivariate canonical noise distributions for differential privacy’, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **35**, 34229–34240.
- Awan, J. and Ramasethu, A. (2023), ‘Optimizing noise for f -differential privacy via anti-concentration and stochastic dominance’, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.08343* .
- Awan, J. and Slavković, A. (2018), ‘Differentially private uniformly most powerful tests for binomial data’, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **31**, 4208–4218.
- Awan, J. and Slavković, A. (2020), ‘Differentially private inference for binomial data’, *Journal of Privacy and Confidentiality* **10**(1).
- Awan, J. and Wang, Z. (2023), ‘Simulation-based, finite-sample inference for privatized data’, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.05328* .
- Bally, V. and Caramellino, L. (2016), ‘Asymptotic development for the clt in total variation distance’, *Bernoulli* **22**, 2442–2485.
- Barber, R. F. and Duchi, J. C. (2014), ‘Privacy and statistical risk: Formalisms and minimax bounds’, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.4451* .

- Barrientos, A. F., Reiter, J. P., Machanavajjhala, A. and Chen, Y. (2019), ‘Differentially private significance tests for regression coefficients’, *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* **28**(2), 440–453.
- Bernstein, G. and Sheldon, D. R. (2018), ‘Differentially private Bayesian inference for exponential families’, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **31**, 2919–2929.
- Bernstein, G. and Sheldon, D. R. (2019), ‘Differentially private Bayesian linear regression’, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **32**, 525–535.
- Brawner, T. and Honaker, J. (2018), ‘Bootstrap inference and differential privacy: Standard errors for free’, *Unpublished Manuscript* .
- Brooks, S., Gelman, A., Jones, G. and Meng, X.-L. (2011), *Handbook of Markov chain Monte Carlo*, CRC press.
- Canonne, C. L., Kamath, G. and Steinke, T. (2020), ‘The discrete Gaussian for differential privacy’, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **33**, 15676–15688.
- Chaudhuri, K., Monteleoni, C. and Sarwate, D. (2011), Differentially private empirical risk minimization, in ‘Journal of Machine Learning Research’, Vol. 12, pp. 1069–1109.
- Covington, C., He, X., Honaker, J. and Kamath, G. (2021), ‘Unbiased statistical estimation and valid confidence intervals under differential privacy’, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14465* .
- Drechsler, J., Globus-Harris, I., Mcmillan, A., Sarathy, J. and Smith, A. (2022), ‘Non-parametric differentially private confidence intervals for the median’, *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology* **10**(3), 804–829.
- Du, W., Foot, C., Moniot, M., Bray, A. and Groce, A. (2020), ‘Differentially private confidence intervals’, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.02285* .
- Dwork, C., McSherry, F., Nissim, K. and Smith, A. (2006), Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis, in ‘Theory of cryptography conference’, Springer, pp. 265–284.
- Ferrando, C., Wang, S. and Sheldon, D. (2022), Parametric bootstrap for differentially private confidence intervals, in ‘International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics’, PMLR, pp. 1598–1618.
- 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* .
- Frazier, D. T., Martin, G. M., Robert, C. P. and Rousseau, J. (2018), ‘Asymptotic properties of approximate Bayesian computation’, *Biometrika* **105**(3), 593–607.
- Gaboardi, M., Lim, H., Rogers, R. and Vadhan, S. (2016), Differentially private chi-squared hypothesis testing: Goodness of fit and independence testing, in ‘International conference on machine learning’, PMLR, pp. 2111–2120.

- Gavalakis, L. and Kontoyiannis, I. (2024), ‘Entropy and the discrete central limit theorem’, *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* **170**, 104294.
- Green, P. J. (1995), ‘Reversible jump Markov chain Monte Carlo computation and Bayesian model determination’, *Biometrika* **82**(4), 711–732.
- Guo, Q., Barrientos, A. F. and Peña, V. (2022), ‘Differentially private methods for compositional data’, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.06337*.
- Inusah, S. and Kozubowski, T. J. (2006), ‘A discrete analogue of the Laplace distribution’, *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* **136**(3), 1090 – 1102.
- Ju, N., Awan, J., Gong, R. and Rao, V. (2022), ‘Data augmentation MCMC for Bayesian inference from privatized data’, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **35**, 12732–12743.
- Karwa, V. and Vadhan, S. (2018), Finite sample differentially private confidence intervals, in ‘9th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2018)’, Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik.
- 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’, PMLR, pp. 5838–5849.
- Millier, U., Schick, A. and Wefelmeyer, W. (2016), Density estimators for the convolution of discrete and continuous random variables, in ‘Annales de l’ISUP’, Vol. 60, pp. 55–66.
- Parthasarathy, K. and Steerneman, T. (1985), ‘A tool in establishing total variation convergence’, *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* **95**(4), 626–630.
- Qin, Q. (2023), ‘Geometric ergodicity of trans-dimensional Markov chain Monte Carlo algorithms’, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.00139*.
- Reimherr, M. and Awan, J. (2019), ‘KNG: the K-norm gradient mechanism’, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **32**.
- Roberts, G. O. and Rosenthal, J. S. (2004), ‘General state space markov chains and mcmc algorithms’.
- Sen (2022), ‘A gentle introduction to empirical process theory and applications’.
- Smith, A. (2011), Privacy-preserving statistical estimation with optimal convergence rates, in ‘Proceedings of the forty-third annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing’, pp. 813–822.
- Van Der Vaart, A. W. and Wellner, J. A. (1996), *Weak convergence and empirical processes: with applications to statistics*, Springer New York.

Vu, D. and Slavkovic, A. (2009), Differential privacy for clinical trial data: Preliminary evaluations, in ‘2009 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining Workshops’, IEEE, pp. 138–143.

Wang, Y., Kifer, D. and Lee, J. (2019), ‘Differentially private confidence intervals for empirical risk minimization’, *Journal of Privacy and Confidentiality* **9**(1).

Wang, Y., Kifer, D., Lee, J. and Karwa, V. (2018), ‘Statistical approximating distributions under differential privacy’, *Journal of Privacy and Confidentiality* **8**(1).

Wang, Z., Cheng, G. and Awan, J. (2022), ‘Differentially private bootstrap: New privacy analysis and inference strategies’, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.06140*.

A Proofs and technical lemmas

A.1 Conditions for assumptions to be satisfied

Proof of Lemma 3.1. Let $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$. The posterior pmf of $n|n_{\text{dp}} = n_0$ is

$$\begin{aligned} p(n|n_{\text{dp}} = n_0) &= \frac{p(n_{\text{dp}} = n_0|n)p(n)}{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} p(n_{\text{dp}} = n_0|n = i)p(n = i)} \\ &= \frac{\eta(n|n_0)}{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \eta(i|n_0)} \\ &\geq \eta(n|n_0), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the symmetry of η , and the observation that $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \eta(i|n_0) = P(n_{\text{dp}} \geq 1|n = n_0) \leq 1$.

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. Since $(n_{\text{dp}} - n_0|n = n_0) = O_p(a_{n_0})$, there exists $M > 0$ and N_1 such that for all $n_0 \geq N$, $P(|n_{\text{dp}} - n_0| \leq Ma_{n_0}|n = n_0) \geq 1 - \epsilon/2$. Since $a_{n_0} = o(n_0)$, there exists N_2 such that for all $n_0 \geq N_2$, $P(|n_{\text{dp}} - n_0| \leq n_0 - 1|n = n_0) \geq 1 - \epsilon/2$. Set $N_3 = \max\{N_1, N_2\}$. Then for all $n_0 \geq N_3$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(|n - n_0| \leq Ma_{n_0}|n_{\text{dp}} = n_0) &= \sum_{\substack{i \text{ s.t. } |i-n_0| \leq Ma_{n_0} \\ \text{and } i \geq 1}} p(n = i|n_{\text{dp}} = n_0) \\ &\geq \sum_{\substack{i \text{ s.t. } |i-n_0| \leq Ma_{n_0} \\ \text{and } i \geq 1}} \eta(i|n_0) \\ &= P(|n_{\text{dp}} - n_0| \leq Ma_{n_0} \text{ and } n_{\text{dp}} \geq 1|n = n_0) \\ &\geq P(|n_{\text{dp}} - n_0| \leq Ma_{n_0}|n = n_0) + P(n_{\text{dp}} \geq 1|n = n_0) - 1 \\ &\geq P(|n_{\text{dp}} - n_0| \leq Ma_{n_0}|n = n_0) \\ &\quad + P(|n_{\text{dp}} - n_0| \leq n_0 - 1|n = n_0) - 1 \\ &\geq (1 - \epsilon/2) + (1 - \epsilon/2) - 1 \\ &\geq 1 - \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $(n - n_0 | n_{\text{dp}} = n_0) = O_p(a_{n_0})$. \square

The result below is a useful technical lemma which is similar to Slutsky's theorem for convergence in distribution. It is crucial to extend the results of Theorem 3.2 to the setting of convergence in total variation.

Lemma A.1 (Parthasarathy and Steerneman, 1985). *Suppose that $X_n \xrightarrow{\text{TV}} X$, where $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is an absolutely continuous random variable, $Y_n \xrightarrow{d} Y$ where $Y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $c_n \rightarrow c \neq 0$. Then, $c_n X_n + Y_n \xrightarrow{\text{TV}} cX + Y$.*

We also include two useful methods to assert convergence in total variation central limit style quantities. Lemma A.2 is an extension of an old result showing convergence in total variation in the one-dimensional case (Parthasarathy and Steerneman, 1985).

Lemma A.2 (Bally and Caramellino, 2016). *Let X_i be i.i.d. random variables in \mathbb{R}^d with mean zero and finite covariance matrix $C(X)$. Call $S_n = n^{-1/2} C^{-1/2}(X) \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$. Then, $\text{TV}(S_n, N(0, I)) \rightarrow 0$ if and only if there exists $n_0 \geq 1$ such that S_{n_0} has an absolutely continuous component: $S_{n_0} \stackrel{d}{=} \chi V + (1 - \chi)W$ where $\chi \sim \text{Bern}(p)$ for $p > 0$ and V absolutely continuous.*

A consequence of Lemma A.2 is that it is impossible for a sample mean of discrete random variables to converge in total variation to a Gaussian. However, recently it was shown that for integer-valued random variables, the sample mean does approach a discretized Gaussian (Gavalakis and Kontoyiannis, 2024); in fact this was shown to be equivalent to adding an appropriate uniform random variable to the sum of discrete RVs, which then converges in total variation to a continuous Gaussian.

Lemma A.3 (Gavalakis and Kontoyiannis, 2024). *Let X_i be i.i.d. random variables taking values in \mathbb{Z} , which have mean μ and finite variance σ^2 , and let $S_n = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$. Let $Z \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)$. Then, $\text{TV}(S_n, \lfloor Z \rfloor) \rightarrow 0$ and $\text{TV}(S_n + U, Z) \rightarrow 0$, where $U \sim \text{Unif}(-1/2, 1/2)$.*

In the following example, we summarize a few common DP settings where one may be able to ensure that assumption A1' holds, leveraging the lemmas above.

Lemma A.4 (Central limit theorem examples for A1'). *In the following, assume that N is an absolutely continuous random variable with mean zero and finite variance, and that $T(x_i)$ has finite mean and finite variance as well. Then, under any of the following settings, we have that s satisfies assumption A1':*

1. *Statistic with an absolutely continuous component: $s = \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} t(x_i) + N$, where $t(x_i) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ has an absolutely continuous component: $t(x_i) \stackrel{d}{=} \chi v + (1 - \chi)w$, where $\chi \sim \text{Bern}(p)$ for $p > 0$, v is absolutely continuous, and w is any random variable; furthermore, N is absolutely continuous. For example, if $t(x_i) = [\tilde{t}(x_i)]_i^u$ where $\tilde{t}(x_i)$ is absolutely continuous, then $t(x_i)$ has an absolutely continuous component.*
2. *Locally private additive mechanism with continuous noise: $s = \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} (t(x_i) + N_i)$, where N_i is absolutely continuous.*

3. *Integer-valued statistic with uniform noise:* $s = \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} t(x_i) + U + N$, where $t(x_i) \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $U \sim \text{Unif}(-1/2, 1/2)$. For example, when N is a discrete Laplace random variable (Inusah and Kozubowski, 2006), then $U + N$ has the truncated-uniform Laplace (tulap) distribution (Awan and Slavković, 2018) which satisfies ϵ -DP.

Proof. 1. This result follows from Lemmas A.2 and A.1.

2. The convolution of an absolutely continuous random variable with another is absolutely continuous (Millier et al., 2016); the result follows from Lemma A.2

3. This result follows from Lemmas A.3 and A.1. □

A.2 Main technical results

Lemma A.5. *[Multivariate Polya's Theorem] If $X_n \xrightarrow{d} X$, and $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a continuous random vector, then the convergence of the multivariate cdfs is uniform. It follows that $\text{KS}(p(x_n), p(x)) \rightarrow 0$.*

Proof. Let Φ be the cdf of $N(0, 1)$, and let $Y = \Phi(X)$, and $Y_n = \Phi(X_n)$, where Φ is applied elementwise. Since Φ is continuous and invertible, we have that $X_n \xrightarrow{d} X$ if and only if $Y_n \xrightarrow{d} Y$. We also have that $F_Y(t) = F_{X_n}(\Phi^{-1}(t))$. We see that F_{X_n} converges uniformly to F_X if and only if F_{Y_n} converges uniformly to F_Y . So, we will show the result for Y_n .

For $k \geq 1$, let \mathcal{B}_k^d be the set of regions, which decompose $[0, 1]^d$ into 2^{dk} disjoint, equally sized cubes (e.g., $\mathcal{B}_1^2 = \{[0, 1/2] \times [0, 1/2], [0, 1/2] \times [1/2, 1], [1/2, 1] \times [0, 1/2], [1/2, 1] \times [1/2, 1]\}$). Note that the \mathcal{B}_k^d are nested in the sense that for each $B_1 \in \mathcal{B}_k^d$, there exists $B_2 \in \mathcal{B}_{k+1}^d$ such that $B_1 \supset B_2$. For $B \in \mathcal{B}_k^d$, call U^B the vector with $U_i^B = \max_{t \in B} t_i$ and L^B the vector with $L_i^B = \min_{t \in B} t_i$. Note that U^B can be viewed as the upper right corner of B and L^B is the lower left corner of B . Call

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_k &= \max_{B \in \mathcal{B}_k^d} [\max_{t \in B} F_Y(t) - \min_{t \in B} F_Y(t)] \\ &= \max_{B \in \mathcal{B}_k^d} [F_Y(U^B) - F_Y(L^B)], \end{aligned}$$

by the monotonicity of F_Y . Note that γ_k is a decreasing sequence which converges to zero, by the definition of \mathcal{B}_k^d and by the continuity of F_Y .

Let $x \in [0, 1]^d$ be arbitrary, and let $B_k^x \in \mathcal{B}_k^d$ be the cube which contains x . Then

$$\begin{aligned} F_{Y_n}(x) - F_Y(x) &\leq F_{Y_n}(U^{B_k^x}) - F_Y(L^{B_k^x}) \\ &= F_{Y_n}(U^{B_k^x}) - F_Y(U^{B_k^x}) + F_Y(U^{B_k^x}) - F_Y(L^{B_k^x}) \\ &\leq F_{Y_n}(U^{B_k^x}) - F_Y(U^{B_k^x}) + \gamma_k. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} F_{Y_n}(x) - F_Y(x) &\geq F_{Y_n}(L^{B_k^x}) - F_Y(U^{B_k^x}) \\ &= F_{Y_n}(L^{B_k^x}) - F_Y(L^{B_k^x}) - \gamma_k. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\sup_{x \in [0,1]^d} |F_{Y_n}(x) - F_Y(x)| \leq \max_{B \in \mathcal{B}_k^d} \max_{\tilde{x} \in \{U^B, L^B\}} |F_{Y_n}(\tilde{x}) - F_Y(\tilde{x})| + \gamma_k.$$

Note that the two maximums are over a finite number of points; by pointwise convergence of F_{Y_n} to F_Y we have that $\max_{B \in \mathcal{B}_k^d} \max_{\tilde{x} \in \{U^B, L^B\}} |F_{Y_n}(\tilde{x}) - F_Y(\tilde{x})| \rightarrow 0$. Combining this with the fact that $\gamma_k \rightarrow 0$, we have the result. \square

Lemma A.6. *Suppose that $f_n(x|y) \stackrel{KS}{\sim} g_n(x|y)$ for almost all $(\pi) y$, where π is a probability distribution on y . Then,*

$$f_n(x|y)\pi(y) \stackrel{KS}{\sim} g_n(x|y)\pi(y).$$

The result also holds if KS is replaced with total variation distance.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KS}(f_n(x|y)\pi(y), g_n(x|y)\pi(y)) &= \sup_S \sup_R \left| \int_S \int_R f_n(x|y)\pi(y) - g_n(x|y)\pi(y) \, dx dy \right| \\ &\leq \sup_S \int \pi(y) \sup_R \left| \int_R f_n(x|y) - g_n(x|y) \, dx \right| dy \\ &= \sup_S \int_S \pi(y) \text{KS}(f_n(x|y), g_n(x|y)) \, dy \\ &\leq \int \text{KS}(f_n(x|y), g_n(x|y)) \pi(y) \, dy \\ &\rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

where R and S are rectangles, and in the last step, we used the fact that the KS distance is non-negative and bounded above by 1 and applied the dominated convergence theorem.

In the case of total variation distance, the proof is the same, except that R and S are arbitrary measurable sets. \square

Lemma A.7. *Under assumption A1 and if $m - n = O(a_n)$ where a_n is defined in A2, then $p(s|\theta, n) \stackrel{KS}{\sim} p(s|\theta, m)$. If A1' holds, then $p(s|\theta, n) \stackrel{TV}{\sim} p(s|\theta, m)$.*

Proof. We will view m as a function of n . Then

$$\text{KS}(p(s|\theta, n), p(s|\theta, m)) = \text{KS}(p(m^b(m^{-a}s - g(\theta))|\theta, n), p(m^b(m^{-a}s - g(\theta))|\theta, m)).$$

We know that $m^b(m^{-a}s - g(\theta))|\theta, m) \xrightarrow{d} X$ under $p(s|\theta, m)$. It suffices to show that $m^b(m^{-a}s - g(\theta)) \xrightarrow{d} X$ under $p(s|\theta, n)$.

First, in the case that $a = 0$, we have that

$$m^b(s - g(\theta)) = (m/n)^b n^b(s - g(\theta)) \rightarrow X,$$

so long as $m - n = o(n)$.

Next, if $a \neq 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
m^b(m^{-a}s - g(\theta)) &= (m/n)^b n^b \{(m/n)^{-a} n^{-a} s - g(\theta)\} \\
&= (m/n)^{b-a} n^b \{n^{-a} s - (m/n)^a g(\theta)\} \\
&= (m/n)^{b-a} n^b \{n^{-a} s - g(\theta) + g(\theta) - (m/n)^a g(\theta)\} \\
&= (m/n)^{b-a} n^b \{n^{-a} s - g(\theta)\} + (m/n)^{b-a} n^b \{g(\theta) - (m/n)^a g(\theta)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

At this point, we see that the first term converges in distribution to X as long as $m - n = o(n)$. It remains to show that the second term converges to 0. Recall from A2 that $a_n = o(n^{1-b})$, so $m = n + o(n^{1-b})$ or equivalently, $m/n = 1 + o(n^{-b})$. Substituting this into the second term above gives

$$\begin{aligned}
(m/n)^{b-a} n^b \{g(\theta) - (m/n)^a g(\theta)\} &= \{1 + o(n^{-b})\}^{b-a} n^b [1 - \{1 + o(n^{-b})\}^a] \\
&= \{1 + (b-a)o(n^{-b})\} n^b [1 - \{1 + (a)o(n^{-b})\}] \\
&= \{1 + o(n^{-b})\} n^b \{o(n^{-b})\} \\
&= o(1),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the series expansion of $(1+x)^p = 1 + px + O(x^2)$ at $x = 0$ to establish the second line. In conclusion, we have shown that $m^b(m^{-a}s - g(\theta)) \xrightarrow{d} X$ under $p(s|\theta, n)$, which by Lemma A.5 implies that $\text{KS}(p(s|\theta, n), p(s|\theta, m)) \rightarrow 0$.

If all instances of convergence in distribution and convergence in KS distance are replaced by convergence in total variation, then the same proof works, leveraging Lemma A.1. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.2. By assumption A2, given $\gamma_1 > 0$, there exists $M > 0$ and $N_1 > 0$ such that for all $n_0 \geq N$,

$$P(|n - n_0| > Ma_{n_0} | n_{\text{dp}} = n_0) < \gamma_1.$$

Call $B_{n_0, M, \gamma_1} = \{n \mid |n - n_0| \leq Ma_{n_0}\}$, which has probability $\geq (1 - \gamma_1)$ in $p(n|n_{\text{dp}} = n_0)$. Note that for all $m \in B_{n_0, M, \gamma_1}$, we have that $m - n_0 = O(a_{n_0})$.

Let $\gamma_2 > 0$. Then from Lemma A.7 since $p(s|\theta, n = n_0) \stackrel{KS}{\sim} p(s|\theta, n = m)$ when $m - n_0 = O(a_{n_0})$, there exists $N_2 > 0$ such that for all $n_0 \geq N_2$ and $m \in B_{n_0, M, \gamma_1}$, $\text{KS}(p(s|\theta, n = n_0), p(s|\theta, n = m)) < \gamma_2$ (note that we use the fact that B_{n_0, M, γ_1} contains a finite number of elements).

Taking $N = \max\{N_1, N_2\}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{KS}((p(s|\theta, n = n_0), p(s|\theta, n_{\text{dp}} = n_0))) &= \sup_R \left| \int_R \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} p(k|n_{\text{dp}} = n_0) p(s|\theta, n = k) - p(s|\theta, n = n_0) ds \right| \\
&= \sup_R \left| \int_R \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} p(k|n_{\text{dp}} = n_0) [p(s|\theta, n = k) - p(s|\theta, n = n_0)] ds \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} p(k|n_{\text{dp}} = n_0) \sup_R \left| \int_R p(s|\theta, n = k) - p(s|\theta, n = n_0) ds \right| \\
&= \sum_{k \notin B_{n_0, M, \gamma_1}} p(k|n_{\text{DP} = n_0}) \text{KS}(p(s|\theta, n = k), p(s|\theta, n = n_0)) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k \in B_{n_0, M, \gamma_1}} p(k|n_{\text{DP} = n_0}) \text{KS}(p(s|\theta, n = k), p(s|\theta, n = n_0)) \\
&\leq \sum_{k \notin B_{n_0, M, \gamma_1}} p(k|n_{\text{DP} = n_0}) + \sum_{k \in B_{n_0, M, \gamma_1}} p(k|n_{\text{DP} = n_0}) \gamma_2 \\
&\leq \gamma_1 + \gamma_2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the supremum is over all axis-aligned rectangles R . This establishes that $\text{KS}(p(s|\theta, n = n_0), p(s|\theta, n_{\text{dp}} = n_0)) \rightarrow 0$, as $n_0 \rightarrow \infty$, since the choices of γ_1 and γ_2 were arbitrary. The same argument works to show that $\text{KS}(p(s, \theta|n = n_0), p(s, \theta|n_{\text{dp}} = n_0)) \rightarrow 0$, but we will need to use the fact that $\pi(\theta)$ integrates to 1. If A1' holds, then replacing all instances of KS with TV, and having \sup_R over all measurable sets rather than only rectangles, we get the result in total variation distance. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.5. For two vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we write $x \leq y$ to indicate that $x_i \leq y_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, d$. We will also write $\int_x^y g(t) dt$ as shorthand for $\int_{x_1}^{y_1} \dots \int_{x_d}^{y_d} g(t_1, \dots, t_d) dt_1 \dots dt_d$.

Call $F_{n_0}(t) = P(n_0^b(\theta - \theta_{n_0}) \leq t | s \in R_{n_0}, n = n_0)$, which we know satisfies $F_{n_0}(t) \rightarrow F_Y(t)$ as $n_0 \rightarrow \infty$. Then, we consider the cdf of $n_0^b(\theta - \theta_{n_0}) | (s \in R_{n_0}, n_{\text{dp}} = n_0)$, and aim to show that it converges to $F_Y(t)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
P(n_0^b(\theta - \theta_{n_0}) \leq t | s \in R_{n_0}, n_{\text{dp}} = n_0) &= \frac{P(n_0^b(\theta - \theta_{n_0}) \leq t, s \in R_{n_0} | n_{\text{dp}} = n_0)}{P(s \in R_{n_0} | n_{\text{dp}} = n_0)} \\
&= \frac{\int_{-\infty}^t \int_{R_{n_0}} p(n_0^b(\theta - \theta_{n_0}) = x, s | n_{\text{dp}} = n_0) ds dx}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{R_{n_0}} p(n_0^b(\theta - \theta_{n_0}) = x, s | n_{\text{dp}} = n_0) ds dx} \\
&\leq \frac{P(n_0^b(\theta - \theta_{n_0}) \leq t, s \in R_{n_0} | n = n_0) + \text{KS}_{n_0}}{P(s \in R_{n_0} | n = n_0) - \text{KS}_{n_0}} \\
&= \frac{F_{n_0}(t) p_{n_0} + \text{KS}_{n_0}}{p_{n_0} - \text{KS}_{n_0}} \\
&= \frac{F_{n_0}(t) + \text{KS}_{n_0}/p_{n_0}}{1 - \text{KS}_{n_0}/p_{n_0}} \\
&\rightarrow F_Y(t),
\end{aligned}$$

since $F_{n_0}(t) \rightarrow F_Y(t)$, and $\text{KS}_{n_0}/p_{n_0} \rightarrow 0$. □

Lemma A.8. *Let $M : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be a privacy mechanism.*

1. *If M satisfies f -DP, then it satisfies $(0, 1 - 2c)$ -DP, where c is the unique fixed point of $f: f(c) = c$.*
2. *If M satisfies ϵ -DP, then it satisfies $\left(0, \frac{\exp(\epsilon)-1}{\exp(\epsilon)+1}\right)$ -DP.*
3. *If M satisfies (ϵ, δ) -DP, then it satisfies $\left(0, \frac{2\delta + \exp(\epsilon)-1}{\exp(\epsilon)+1}\right)$ -DP.*
4. *If M satisfies μ -GDP, then it satisfies $(0, 2\Phi(\mu/2) - 1)$ -DP.*
5. *If M satisfies ρ -zCDP, then it satisfies $\left(0, \min \left\{ \sqrt{\rho/2}, \sqrt{1 - \exp(-\rho)} \right\}\right)$ -DP.*
6. *If M satisfies (α, ϵ) -RDP, then it satisfies $\left(0, \min \left\{ \sqrt{\rho/2}, \sqrt{1 - \exp(-\rho)} \right\}\right)$ -DP.*

Proof. The first four properties are proved using f -DP. It is easy to see that if f has fixed point c , then $f_{0,1-2c} \leq f$. For properties 2-4, we will simply calculate c for the tradeoff functions $f_{\epsilon,0}$, $f_{\epsilon,\delta}$ and G_μ , and then apply property 1.

1. It is easy to see that if f has fixed point c , then $f_{0,1-2c} \leq f$, since this is the tangent line of the convex function f at the point (c, c) .
2. The fixed point of $f_{\epsilon,0}$ is the solution to the following equation: $1 - \exp(\epsilon)c = \exp(-\epsilon)(1 - c)$, which yields $c = 1/(1 + \exp(\epsilon))$.
3. The fixed point of $f_{\epsilon,\delta}$ is the solution to the following equation: $1 - \delta - \exp(\epsilon)c = \exp(-\epsilon)(1 - \delta - c)$, which yields $c = (1 - \delta)/(1 + \exp(\epsilon))$.
4. The fixed point c of $G_\mu(\alpha) = \Phi(\Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha) - \mu)$ satisfies $\left. \frac{d}{d\alpha} G_\mu(\alpha) \right|_{\alpha=c} = -1$. We calculate

$$\frac{d}{d\alpha} G_\mu(\alpha) = \frac{(-1)\phi(\Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha) - \mu)}{\phi(\Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha))}.$$

We can easily verify that $1 - \Phi(\mu/2)$ is the solution to $\frac{d}{d\alpha} G_\mu(\alpha) = -1$.

5. Recall that ρ -zCDP is equivalent to bounding the order α Rényi Divergence by $\rho\alpha$ for all $\alpha > 1$. Since Rényi divergences are monotonic: $D_{\alpha_1} \leq D_{\alpha_2}$ when $1 \leq \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2$, and D_1 is the KL-divergence, we have that the KL-divergence is bounded above by ρ . Pinsker's inequality implies that $\text{TV} \leq \sqrt{\rho/2}$, and Bretagnole & Huber's inequality implies that $\text{TV} \leq \sqrt{1 - \exp(-\rho)}$.
6. Recall that (α, ϵ) -RDP means that $D_\alpha \leq \epsilon$. Again, by the monotonicity of Rényi divergences, we have $\text{KL} \leq \epsilon$ and apply the same inequalities as in part 5.

□

Lemma A.9. Let $p(s|x)$ be the distribution of a $(0, \delta)$ -DP privacy mechanism, and let $p(x|\theta, n)$ be a distribution for x , where we assume that x consists of n copies of i.i.d. data. Then

$$\text{TV}(p(s|\theta, n), p(s|\theta, m)) \leq \delta|n - m|.$$

Proof. To clarify the notation, we use $f(x|\theta, n)$ to represent the density $p(x|\theta, n)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TV}(p(s|\theta, n), p(s|\theta, m)) &= \frac{1}{2} \int \left| p(s|\theta, n) - p(s|\theta, m) \right| ds \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int \left| \int p(s|x) f(x|\theta, n) dx - \int p(s|y) f(y|\theta, n) dy \right| ds \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, say that $m > n$. Then we can couple x and y such that $x \subset y$ and $y = (x, z)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TV}(p(s|\theta, n), p(s|\theta, m)) &= \frac{1}{2} \int \left| \int \int p(s|x) f(x|\theta, n) f(z|\theta, m-n) - p(s|(x, z)) f(x|\theta, n) f(z|\theta, m-n) dx dz \right| ds \\ &\leq \int \int \frac{1}{2} \int \left| p(s|x) - p(s|(x, z)) \right| ds f(x|\theta, n) f(z|\theta, m-n) dx dz \\ &\leq \int \int \delta|n - m| f(x|\theta, n) f(z|\theta, m-n) dx dz \\ &= \delta|n - m|, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that if M is a privacy mechanism that satisfies $(0, \delta)$ -DP for groups of size 1, then M satisfies $(0, \min\{1, k\delta\})$ -DP for groups of size k (Awan and Dong, 2022, Section 4.3). \square

Proof of Theorem 4.1. We will prove the result for $\text{TV}(p(s, \theta|n = n_0), p(s, \theta|n_{\text{dp}} = n_0))$. The other result has a nearly identical proof, except that we do not need to integrate over $p(\theta)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TV}(p(s, \theta|n = n_0), p(s, \theta|n_{\text{dp}} = n_0)) &= \frac{1}{2} \int \int \left| p(s|\theta, n_0) p(\theta) - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} p(s|\theta, k) p(\theta) p(n = k|n_{\text{dp}} = n_0) \right| ds d\theta \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int \int \left| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (p(s|\theta, n_0) - p(s|\theta, k)) p(n = k|n_{\text{dp}} = n_0) \right| ds p(\theta) d\theta \\ &\leq \int \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2} \int \left| p(s|\theta, n_0) - p(s|\theta, k) \right| ds p(n = k|n_{\text{dp}} = n_0) p(\theta) d\theta \\ &\leq \int \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \delta|k - n_0| p(n = k, n_{\text{dp}} = n_0) p(\theta) d\theta \\ &= \delta \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |k - n_0| p(n = k|n_{\text{dp}} = n_0) \\ &= \delta \mathbb{E}_{n|n_{\text{dp}}=n_0} |n - n_0|. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Lemma 4.2. 1. First, we suppose that $p(n|n_{\text{dp}} = n_0) \propto \exp(-\epsilon|n - n_0|)$, and calculate,

$$\mathbb{E}_{n|n_{\text{dp}}=n_0} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |k - n_0| \exp(-\epsilon|k - n_0|)}{\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \exp(-\epsilon|k - n_0|)}.$$

We can lower bound the denominator as follows:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \exp(-\epsilon|k - n_0|) \geq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \exp(-\epsilon j) = \frac{\exp(\epsilon)}{\exp(\epsilon) - 1}.$$

Then,

$$\mathbb{E}_{n|n_{\text{dp}}=n_0} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |k - n_0| \exp(-\epsilon|k - n_0|) \left(\frac{\exp(\epsilon) - 1}{\exp(\epsilon)} \right) \quad (6)$$

$$\leq \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} |k - n_0| \exp(-\epsilon|k - n_0|) \left(\frac{\exp(\epsilon) - 1}{\exp(\epsilon)} \right) \quad (7)$$

$$= \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} |j| \exp(-\epsilon j) \left(\frac{\exp(\epsilon) - 1}{\exp(\epsilon)} \right) \quad (8)$$

$$= (1 + \exp(-\epsilon)) \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \text{DLap}(\exp(-\epsilon))} |X| \quad (9)$$

$$= (1 + \exp(-\epsilon)) \left(\frac{2 \exp(-\epsilon)}{(1 + \exp(-\epsilon))(1 - \exp(-\epsilon))} \right) \quad (10)$$

$$= \frac{2}{\exp(\epsilon) - 1}, \quad (11)$$

where in (10), we use the formula for the first absolute moment of the discrete Laplace distribution (Inusah and Kozubowski, 2006, Proposition 2.2).

2. Next, we suppose that $p(n|n_{\text{dp}} = n_0) \propto \exp(-(\epsilon^2/2)(n - n_0)^2)$. First we will call

$$A = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \exp(-\epsilon^2 k^2 / 2),$$

and note that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \exp(-(\epsilon^2/2)(k - n_0)^2) \geq A,$$

and

$$\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(-(\epsilon^2/2)(k - n_0)^2) = 2A - 1 \leq 2A.$$

Then,

$$\mathbb{E}_{n|n_{\text{dp}}=n_0} |n - n_0| = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |k - n_0| \exp(-(\epsilon^2/2)(k - n_0)^2)}{\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \exp(-(\epsilon^2/2)(k - n_0)^2)} \quad (12)$$

$$\leq \frac{\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} |k - n_0| \exp(-(\epsilon^2/2)(k - n_0)^2)(2A)}{A \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(-(\epsilon^2/2)(k - n_0)^2)} \quad (13)$$

$$= \frac{2 \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} |k| \exp(-\epsilon^2 k^2/2)}{\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(-\epsilon^2 k^2/2)} \quad (14)$$

$$= 2 \mathbb{E}_{X \sim N_{\mathbb{Z}}(0, 1/\epsilon^2)} |X| \quad (15)$$

$$\leq 2 \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{X \sim N_{\mathbb{Z}}(0, 1/\epsilon^2)} X^2} \quad (16)$$

$$= 2 \sqrt{\text{Var}_{X \sim N_{\mathbb{Z}}(0, 1/\epsilon^2)}(X)} \quad (17)$$

$$\leq 2 \sqrt{1/\epsilon^2}, \quad (18)$$

$$= 2/\epsilon, \quad (19)$$

where in (13), we multiplied top and bottom by $\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(-(\epsilon^2/2)(k - n_0)^2)$ and applied the inequalities we established earlier, in terms of A ; in (14), we use the fact that $n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and reparametrized the sums; in (16) we use Jensen's inequality; in (17) we express the quantity in terms of the variance of the discrete Gaussian distribution (Canonne et al., 2020); for (18) we apply (Canonne et al., 2020, Corollary 9). \square

Proof of Theorem 4.3. We will write $P_{\gamma}(\theta \in A, s \in S | n_{\text{dp}} = n_0)$ in place of $P(\theta \in A, s \in S | n_{\text{dp}} = n_0)$ to emphasize where the limit as $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ applies. Let $A \subset \Theta$ be a measurable set. Then

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\gamma}(\theta \in A | s \in S, n_{\text{dp}} = n_0) &= \frac{P_{\gamma}(\theta \in A, s \in S | n_{\text{dp}} = n_0)}{P_{\gamma}(s \in S | n_{\text{dp}} = n_0)} \\ &\leq \frac{P(\theta \in A, s \in S | n = n_0) + \delta\gamma}{P(s \in S | n = n_0) - \delta\gamma} \\ &\rightarrow P(\theta \in A | s \in S, n = n_0), \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta\gamma$ is the upper bound on $\text{TV}(p_{\gamma}(\theta, s | n_{\text{dp}} = n_0), p(\theta, s | n = n_0))$, derived in Theorem 4.1, and the convergence is as $\gamma \rightarrow 0$. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.5. Our proof resembles that of the argmax continuous mapping theorem in empirical processes (Sen, 2022). According to the Portmanteau theorem [See Van Der Vaart and Wellner (1996, Theorem 1.3.4) or Sen (2022, Theorem 10.5)], it suffices to show that, for every closed set $F \subset \Theta$, we have

$$\limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\epsilon}(\hat{\theta}_{\epsilon} \in F) \leq \mathbb{P}(\hat{\theta}_0 \in F). \quad (20)$$

Let K be a compact subset of Θ . Since $L(\theta)$ is upper semi-continuous and has a unique

maximizer, we must have

$$L(\hat{\theta}(n_0, s); s) > \sup_{h \in K \cap G^c} L(\theta; s)$$

for every open set G containing $\hat{\theta}(n_0, s)$

We first observe that $\{\hat{\theta}_\epsilon \in F\} = \{\hat{\theta}_\epsilon \in F \cap K\} \cup \{\hat{\theta}_\epsilon \in F \cap K^c\}$ and the first set satisfies

$$\{\hat{\theta}_\epsilon \in F \cap K\} \subseteq \left\{ \sup_{\theta \in F \cap K} L_\epsilon(\theta) \geq \sup_{\theta \in K} L_\epsilon(\theta) + o_P(1) \right\}.$$

By the uniform convergence assumption and the continuous mapping theorem, we have

$$\sup_{\theta \in F \cap K} L_\epsilon(\theta) - \sup_{\theta \in K} L_\epsilon(\theta) + o_P(1) \xrightarrow{d} \sup_{\theta \in F \cap K} L(\theta) - \sup_{\theta \in K} L(\theta).$$

Therefore we have

$$\limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\epsilon \left(\hat{\theta}_\epsilon \in F \cap K \right) \leq \mathbb{P}_\epsilon \left(\sup_{\theta \in F \cap K} L(\theta) \geq \sup_{\theta \in K} L(\theta) \right).$$

We can divide the event on the right side by intersecting it with the partition $\{\hat{\theta}_0 \in K\}$ and $\{\hat{\theta}_0 \notin K\}$. Notice that $\{\sup_{\theta \in F \cap K} f_{n_0}(\theta) \geq \sup_{\theta \in K} f_{n_0}(\theta)\} \cap \{\hat{\theta}_0 \in K\} \subseteq \{\hat{\theta}_0 \in F\}$. So we have

$$\limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\epsilon \left(\hat{\theta}_\epsilon \in F \cap K \right) \leq \mathbb{P}(\hat{\theta}_0 \in F) + \mathbb{P}(\hat{\theta}_0 \notin K).$$

So far we have shown that

$$\limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\hat{\theta}_\epsilon \in F \right) \leq \mathbb{P}(\hat{\theta}_0 \in F) + \mathbb{P}(\hat{\theta}_0 \notin K) + \limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\epsilon(\hat{\theta}_\epsilon \notin K).$$

The tightness condition implies that the last two terms can be made arbitrarily small, and therefore establishes (20). \square

Proof of Proposition 5.1. 1. If a mechanism satisfies ϵ_s -DP in the unbounded notion, then it satisfies $2\epsilon_s$ -DP in bounded DP. This holds by the group privacy bound for groups of size 2, since swapping a row is equivalent to adding a new row and then deleting the old row. The lower bound follows from the definition of bounded DP.

2. We see that when $p(n)$ is a flat prior, these terms cancel out, and when $n \geq 2$, the transition probabilities for n and n^* also cancel. The bound on the ratio of the privacy mechanisms follows from the differential privacy guarantees. In the case that $n = 1$ and $n^* = 2$, we have an additional factor of $1/2$, from the ratio $q(1|2)/q(2|1) = 1/2$. \square

Proof of Proposition 5.3. Call π the distribution of $p(\theta, x_{1:n}, n|s, n_{\text{dp}})$. It suffices to show that the chain is aperiodic, is π -irreducible, and satisfies detailed balance for π . For example, see Roberts and Rosenthal (2004).

It follows from property 3 that the support of $p(\theta|x_{1:n}) \propto p(\theta)p(x_{1:n}|\theta)$ agrees with $p(\theta)$, provided that $p(x_{1:n}|\theta) > 0$. This implies that from almost every $x_{1:n}$ (with respect to

$p(x_{1:n}|\theta)$, $p(\theta|x_{1:n})$ can propose almost every θ (with respect to $p(\theta)$), which is accepted with probability 1.

Note that the chain is aperiodic, since for every set $A \subset \Theta$ with $P(\theta \in A) > 0$, $p(\theta|x)$ can propose $\theta \in A$ with positive probability, and the other moves in the chain always have a possibility of remaining at the current state. From properties 2 and 3, it follows from Green (1995) that our construction satisfies detailed balance.

To see that the chain is π -irreducible, we need to show that the chain can move from any starting state to a set A in a finite number of steps with positive probability, for any A such that $\pi(A) > 0$. By the note above, we have that $p(\theta|x) > 0$ for almost all θ . Furthermore, we have that $p(x_i|\theta) > 0$ for almost all x_i . By property 3, we can transition from n to n^* in $|n - n^*|$ cycles. By properties 2, 3, and 4, we have that all of the acceptance probabilities are positive with probability 1 (with respect to π). Thus, we see that we can move to A with positive probability in a finite number of steps. \square

Proposition 5.4 relies on Qin (2023, Theorem 1), which involves some technical language. In order to state a version of Qin (2023, Theorem 1) convenient to our setting, we will need to introduce some additional notation.

Consider a trans-dimensional Markov chain $X(t) = (K(t), Z(t))_{t=0}^{\infty}$ on $\mathsf{X} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \{k\} \times \mathsf{Z}_k$, where $(\mathsf{Z}_k, \mathcal{A}_k)$ is a non-empty measurable space with a probability measure Ψ_k and countably generated σ -algebra \mathcal{A}_k , and \mathcal{K} is a finite set. The space \mathcal{X} is equipped with the σ -algebra generated by $\{k\} \times A$ for $k \in \mathcal{K}$ and $A \in \mathcal{A}_k$. The target distribution is π , where $\pi(\{k\} \times A) = \frac{\Psi_k(A)}{\sum_{k' \in \mathcal{K}} \Psi_{k'}(\mathsf{Z}_{k'})}$. Note that the marginal probability of k under π is $\frac{\Psi_k(\mathsf{Z}_k)}{\sum_{k' \in \mathcal{K}} \Psi_{k'}(\mathsf{Z}_{k'})}$ and the conditional probability of $Z \in \mathsf{Z}_k$, given k , is $\Phi_k(Z) = \frac{\Psi_k(Z)}{\Psi_k(\mathsf{Z}_k)}$.

Lemma A.10 (Qin, 2023). *Let $X(t)$ be a trans-dimensional Markov chain satisfying the properties stated above. Assume for $k \in \mathcal{K}$, there exists a Markov transition kernel $P_k : \mathsf{Z}_k \times \mathcal{A}_k \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that*

1. *for any $k \in \mathcal{K}$, if $X(t) = (k, Z)$ for some $Z \in \mathsf{Z}_k$, then the chain stays at k with probability $\geq c_k > 0$ and makes within model moves according to P_k , which satisfies $\Phi_k P_k = \Phi_k$,*
2. *the chain associated with P_k is Φ_k -irreducible and Φ_k -a.e. geometrically ergodic and reversibly with respect to Φ_k ,*
3. *there exists $s \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that for all $k, k' \in \mathcal{K}$,*

$$\int_{\mathsf{Z}_k} \Phi_k(dz) P^s((k, z); (\{k'\} \times \mathsf{Z}_{k'})) > 0,$$

i.e., if $Z \sim \Psi_k$, then the chain starting from (k, z) can reach $\{k'\} \times \mathsf{Z}_{k'}$ after s iterations with positive probability,

then $X(t)$ is π -a.e. geometrically ergodic.

Proof. The result follows from Theorem 1, Lemma 2 and Lemma 3 of Qin (2023) along with some simplifying remarks in Section 1.1. \square

Proof of Proposition 5.4. For this proof, we will consider our Markov transition kernel to consist of *two* full cycles of Algorithm 1. This is more convenient to analyze, because it ensures a positive probability at remaining at the same value of n from one cycle to the next.

The proof consists of checking that the conditions of Qin (2023, Theorem 1) are satisfied, and using Ju et al. (2022, Theorem 3.4) to establish that the within-model moves are geometrically ergodic.

- Property 1 of Lemma A.10 holds, since Algorithm 1 alternates between within-model and between-model moves and there is a lower bound on the probability of remaining at the same value of n , by Proposition 5.1.
- The assumptions ensure that within-model moves are geometrically ergodic (Ju et al., 2022, Theorem 3.4), and Ju et al. (2022, Theorem 3.3) asserts that the other conditions in property 2 of Lemma A.10 hold as well.
- Property 3 of Lemma A.10 follows since $p(n)$ has finite support and Algorithm 1 is irreducible by Proposition 5.3.

□

B Multinomial data with unknown N

One of the most common DP situations is the release of noisy counts, which can be viewed as noisy multinomials. However, in the unbounded DP framework, we do not know the sample size N which is one of the parameters in the multinomial. We can use a clever relation between the multinomial and Poisson distributions to write an equivalent model that is much easier to perform inference on when N is unknown.

We begin with two facts:

- Let $X_i \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda_i)$ are independent for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Observe that $\sum_{i=1}^k X_i \sim \text{Pois}(\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i)$. Then, $\{X_i\} | \sum_{i=1}^k X_i = N \sim \text{Multi}(N, \{\frac{\lambda_i}{\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j}\})$.
- Let $\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^k | X = N \sim \text{Multi}(N, \{p_i\}_{i=1}^k)$ (that is $X = \sum_{j=1}^k Y_j$), and suppose that $X \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda)$. Then $Y_i \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda p_i)$ and are independent.

The two observations above indicate that if we are okay with viewing N as a random variable (with distribution $\text{Pois}(\lambda)$) rather than an unknown parameter, then we can model our multinomial counts as Poisson random variables.

Remark B.1. We argue that it makes more sense to view N as an unobserved random variable, than as an unknown parameter: typically parameters are considered to be population quantities, whereas latent/missing variables are related to the sample at hand, but are simply not observed. We can see that N is in fact a function of the (unobserved) sample, and so it makes more sense to treat it as a latent random variable.

We will proceed to write down two models that are equivalent.

Model 1:

$$\begin{aligned}
\{\alpha_i\}, \theta &\sim \text{hyper priors} \\
\lambda &\sim \text{Gamma}\left(\sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i, \theta\right) \\
\{p_i\}_{i=1}^k &\sim \text{Dirichlet}(\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^k) \\
N &\sim \text{Pois}(\lambda) \\
x_1, \dots, x_k \mid s &\sim \text{Multi}(N, \{p_i\}) \\
s &\sim p(s \mid x_1, \dots, x_k).
\end{aligned}$$

Model 2:

In the following, we use the change of variables: $\tilde{\lambda}_i = \lambda p_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\{\alpha_i\}, \theta &\sim \text{hyper priors} \\
\tilde{\lambda}_i &\sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha_i, \theta), \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, k \\
x_i &\sim \text{Pois}(\tilde{\lambda}_i), \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, k \\
s &\sim p(s \mid x_1, \dots, x_k),
\end{aligned}$$

Note that we can compute $\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^k \tilde{\lambda}_i$, $N = \sum_{i=1}^k x_k$, and $p_i = \tilde{\lambda}_i/\lambda$, yet none of these quantities need to be explicitly considered in the model. If we do not care about having a conjugate prior, instead of modeling $\tilde{\lambda}_i$ directly, we still have the option of separately modeling λ (the expected value and variance of N) and $\{p_i\}$. An empirical Bayes approach may estimate λ using a privatized estimator for N .

One quirk of this model is that by modeling $N \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda)$, we allow for $N \geq 0$ instead of $N \geq 1$ as assumed in the rest of the paper. In practice, this difference should not cause a significant difference in the resulting inference.

One major upside of this model is that whether we are doing an augmented MCMC sampler, or another type of simulation-based inference, there is no need for the memory or run-time to explicitly depend on N . For example, consider the following Metropolis-within-Gibbs sampler which is inspired by the data augmentation MCMC of Ju et al. (2022):

1. Update $\theta \mid x$
2. For $i = 1, \dots, k$, set $x'_i = x_i \pm 1$, with probability $p(x'_i \mid x_i)$ (could be w.p. 1/2 unless $x_i = 0$), and accept with probability

$$\frac{p(s \mid x') p(x'_i \mid \tilde{\lambda}_i) p(x'_i \mid x_i)}{p(s \mid x) p(x_i \mid \tilde{\lambda}_i) p(x'_i \mid x_i)} \Big]^{-1},$$

and notice that the first ratio is bounded between $e^{-\epsilon}$ and e^ϵ (since changing x_i to x'_i

can be achieved by adding/deleting a person), the second is a ratio of Poisson pdfs, which is either $\tilde{\lambda}/(x_i + 1)$ if $x'_i = x_i + 1$ or $x_i/\tilde{\lambda}$ if $x'_i = x_i$, and the final ratio is bounded between $1/2$ and 2 .

We see that a cycle only takes $O(k)$ time instead of $O(N)$ time, and there is no need to consider N in the sampler.

C Additional numerical results

In this section, we include additional numerical results corresponding to Section 6.

C.1 Linear regression

In Figure 2 we include a visual plot of a single chain for the linear regression experiment using $\epsilon_s = 1$ and $\epsilon_N = .01$. In the left portion, we plot the values of the β vector, which we see converge to a stationary distribution centered at the true values, indicated by horizontal lines. In the right portion, we plot the values for N , starting at $n_{\text{dp}} = 938$. We see that the chain quickly converges to a stationary distribution centered around the true value of 1000.

In Table 3 we include the Monte Carlo standard errors corresponding to the results in Table 1. We see that the standard errors for the estimates involving β_1 and τ are stable as ϵ_N varies, with the exception of $\text{Var}(\beta_1)$, which has an inflated standard error when $\epsilon_s = .1$ and $\epsilon_N = .001$. On the other hand, we see that the uncertainty in estimates involving N does vary significantly depending on the value of ϵ_N . These results suggest that the value of ϵ_N is not very important when learning about parameters other than N .

$\epsilon_N =$	0.001	0.01	0.1	1	10	Inf
$\mathbb{E}(\beta_1)\text{_SE}$	0.079	0.062	0.057	0.048	0.060	0.048
$\text{Var}(\beta_1)\text{_SE}$	3.593	0.109	0.137	0.100	0.102	0.094
$\mathbb{E}(\tau)\text{_SE}$	0.045	0.043	0.039	0.039	0.040	0.039
$\text{Var}(\tau)\text{_SE}$	0.042	0.048	0.036	0.042	0.037	0.032
$\mathbb{E}(N)\text{_SE}$	101.040	13.060	1.351	0.140	0.002	0.000
$\text{Var}(N)\text{_SE}$	96.843	47.688	9.806	0.027	0.002	0.000

$\epsilon_N =$	0.001	0.01	0.1	1	10	Inf
$\mathbb{E}(\beta_1)\text{_SE}$	0.027	0.030	0.028	0.029	0.028	0.028
$\text{Var}(\beta_1)\text{_SE}$	0.014	0.010	0.011	0.011	0.012	0.011
$\mathbb{E}(\tau)\text{_SE}$	0.043	0.030	0.030	0.029	0.030	0.031
$\text{Var}(\tau)\text{_SE}$	0.021	0.017	0.018	0.015	0.016	0.017
$\mathbb{E}(N)\text{_SE}$	76.632	1.328	0.627	0.129	0.002	0.000
$\text{Var}(N)\text{_SE}$	372.407	44.712	4.963	0.023	0.002	0.000

Table 3: Monte Carlo standard errors for the estimates in Table 1. Top: $\epsilon_s = .1$, Bottom: $\epsilon_s = 1$.




Figure 2: A plot of a single chain for the linear regression experiment, using $\epsilon_s = 1$ and $\epsilon_N = .01$. 10000 iterations were completed. While a burn in of 5000 is used for the calculations, all iterations of the chain are plotted here. The initial value for β is $(0, 0, 0)$ and the initial value for N is $n_{dp} = 938$. The true values of β are $(0, -1, 1)$, illustrated by the horizontal lines.

C.2 Real data application

In this section we include additional simulations corresponding to Section 6.2. In Figure 3, we visually compare the posterior distributions of α_1 , α_2 , and α_3 . Figure 4 displays the predictive distribution for two compositional components. We observe that the predictive distributions are quite robust to the specifications of ϵ_s and ϵ_n , a pattern that was also noted in Guo et al. (2022).




Figure 3: Posterior distributions for α_1 , α_2 , and α_3 with $\epsilon_s \in \{1, 10\}$ and $\epsilon_n \in \{0.01, 0.1, 1\}$. The solid and dashes lines represent the posterior distribution under bounded and unbounded differential privacy, respectively. The displayed densities for unbounded DP correspond to the densities obtained from one of the 10 realizations of n_{dp} . The results for the remaining realizations present similar patterns.




Figure 4: Predictive distributions for (x_1, x_2) with $\epsilon_s \in \{1, 10\}$ and $\epsilon_n = 0.01$. The displayed densities for unbounded DP correspond to the densities obtained from one of the 10 realizations of n_{dp} . The results for the remaining realizations present similar patterns.