

# A Generalization of Axiomatic Approach to Information Leakage

Mohammad A. Zarrabian, *Member, IEEE*, and Parastoo Sadeghi, *Senior Member, IEEE*

**Abstract**—In this paper, we extend the framework of quantitative information flow (QIF) to include adversaries that use Kolmogorov-Nagumo  $f$ -mean to infer secrets of a private system. Specifically, in our setting, an adversary uses Kolmogorov-Nagumo  $f$ -mean to compute its best actions before and after observing the system’s randomized outputs. This leads to generalized notions of prior and posterior vulnerability and generalized axiomatic relations that we will derive to elucidate how these  $f$ -mean based vulnerabilities interact with each other. We demonstrate usefulness of this framework by showing how some notions of leakage that had been derived outside of the QIF framework and so far seemed incompatible with it are indeed explainable via such extension of QIF. These leakage measures include  $\alpha$ -leakage, which is the same as Arimoto mutual information of order  $\alpha$ , maximal  $\alpha$ -leakage which is the  $\alpha$ -leakage capacity, and  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -leakage, which is a generalization of the above and captures local differential privacy as a special case. We also propose a new pointwise notion of gain function, which we coin pointwise information gain. We show that this pointwise information gain can explain Rényi divergence and Sibson mutual information of order  $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$  as the Kolmogorov-Nagumo average of the gain with a proper choice of function  $f$ .

## I. INTRODUCTION

Information leakage is a main concern in computing and data processing systems. As such, characterization of information leakage from the observable output of a private system about its input is an active research area [1]–[5]. Consider a random variable  $X$ , representing a secret to be protected from adversarial attacks. The secret can be a database held by a government agency, an individual’s unique typing pattern, a password, and so on. To protect  $X$ , a privacy-enhancing procedure, also known as a mechanism, takes  $X$  as the input and produces another random variable, denoted by  $Y$ , as the system output through a probabilistic mapping given by the conditional probability  $P_{Y|X}$ .

One of the early candidates to quantify information leakage between  $X$  and  $Y$  was Shannon mutual information [6] and related measures such as guessing entropy [7]. However, these measures cannot reliably interpret privacy risk. For instance, while the mutual information between  $X$  and  $Y$  can be arbitrarily low, a specific realization  $X = x'$  may have a large probability of occurring, which means there is a high chance of guessing  $x'$  correctly in one try. To address this shortcoming, *quantitative information flow* (QIF) [4], starting with the pioneering work of Smith [8], has focused on interpreting

privacy and the operational meaning of information leakage in a practical and meaningful way within a framework known as the adversarial threat model [1].

Operationally meaningful measures in QIF include *Bayes vulnerability* [8] (complement of min-entropy) and its generalized version  $g$ -vulnerability [2], where  $g$  is a gain function representing the guessing actions and rewards of the adversary. This approach quantifies the threat as a vulnerability by maximizing the expected gain functions before and after observing randomized data.<sup>1</sup> Henceforth, information leakage is defined as the additive or multiplicative difference between the posterior and prior vulnerability. A main strength of QIF is that worst-case threats can be quantified by taking the worst case of information leakage over all priors, gain functions, or both. This results in robust notions of leakage *capacity* [2].

In parallel with the QIF, other measures and frameworks to quantify privacy leakage have been developed and studied, including differential privacy (DP) [9], [10] and local differential privacy (LDP) [11], [12]. Connections between DP and LDP notions of privacy and operational quantities from QIF have been established in [13], [14]. In particular, it was revealed in [13] that LDP is the leakage capacity among all adversaries interested in maximum (worst-case) information leakage across all outputs.

Information-theoretic privacy measures have also been investigated in the past few years. A notable case is maximal leakage [5]. Indeed, maximal leakage and Bayes capacity in QIF are equal and coincide with the Sibson mutual information of order  $\alpha = \infty$ . Although maximal leakage is defined and motivated for adversaries who are interested in guessing a randomized function of  $X$  rather than  $X$  itself, this generalization does not model any additional risk of information leakage. This has been proved in works such as [14] and in [15] for general alphabets and risk-averse adversaries interested in minimizing their guessing cost. Since [5], there has been a growing research interest in information theoretical extensions of maximal leakage and its applications in machine learning. See selected papers [14]–[28]. Notably, the authors in [29] extended the notion of maximal leakage from [5] to  $\alpha$ -leakage and maximal  $\alpha$ -leakage. The  $\alpha$ -leakage measure is reduced to the Arimoto mutual information of order  $\alpha$ , and maximal  $\alpha$ -leakage is the worst-case  $\alpha$ -leakage over all randomized guesses of the secret and its prior.

Mohammad A. Zarrabian is with the College of Engineering, Computing, and Cybernetics, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia, e-mail: mohammad.zarrabian@anu.edu.au. Parastoo Sadeghi is with the School of Engineering and Technology, the University of New South Wales, Canberra, Australia, e-mail: p.sadeghi@unsw.edu.au.

<sup>1</sup>The threat can be alternatively expressed as the minimization of expected loss before and after observing randomized data, which results in an uncertainty measure [3].

### A. Motivation for This Paper

Inspired by the fact that maximal leakage in information theory and Bayes capacity in QIF are identical to Sibson mutual information of order  $\alpha = \infty$ , one may be inclined to look for finding  $g$ -vulnerabilities in QIF that can explain existing  $\alpha$ -based leakage measures for  $\alpha < \infty$ . However,  $\alpha$ -leakage, maximal  $\alpha$ -leakage, and their further extension to  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -leakage [19], [21] are yet to be explained and interpreted in the QIF framework. In other words, and to our best knowledge, no gain (or loss function) within the existing QIF framework is known that leads to an  $\alpha$ -based leakage measure. This raises questions about the operational meaning or the adversarial threats such measures may represent. Therefore, in this paper we are concerned with bridging the gap between QIF and leakage measures that have been derived outside of QIF with the aim to extend encompassing features of QIF framework.

### B. Contributions

Fortunately, it turns out that extended forms of prior and posterior vulnerability using the generalized Kolmogorov-Nagumo  $f$ -mean approach provide the key to explaining  $\alpha$ -leakage measures, and potentially much more, in the QIF framework. From a high level, the adversary applies a more advanced averaging technique via the Kolmogorov-Nagumo  $f$ -mean (compared to a “plain vanilla” averaging) to determine its best reward and corresponding action in guessing  $X$ . This leads to generalized vulnerabilities and leakages measures. To make these fully compatible with the existing QIF framework, we are also required to prove axiomatic relations for these quantities. Our contributions are listed as follows:

- 1) We propose extended forms of prior and posterior vulnerability using the generalized Kolmogorov-Nagumo  $f$ -mean approach. We will derive their axiomatic properties in the same spirit as [3]. This leads to a generalized QIF framework that naturally explains most threat models developed elsewhere.
- 2) We introduce a new gain function, which we coin *pointwise information gain*. This pointwise information gain is inspired by the information gain of Rényi [30].
- 3) Utilizing the above two results, we then unveil the operational privacy leakage meaning of Arimoto mutual information, Rényi divergence, Sibson mutual information, and  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -leakage within the generalized  $g$ -leakage framework.
- 4) We interpret the operational meaning for different ranges of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  values in  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -based leakage measures in accordance with vulnerability and uncertainty principles. In particular, we can explain Rényi local differential privacy and local differential privacy as generalized leakage measures within our extended QIF framework.

### C. Organization of Paper and Results

This paper is organized as follows. In Section II we introduce our notation and provide a brief background of the QIF framework and existing axioms of information leakage.

Section III introduces the generalized prior and posterior vulnerability and leakage based on the Kolmogorov-Nagumo  $f$ -mean approach. Section IV is devoted to presenting the axiomatic relations of these prior and posterior vulnerabilities. Section V is a bridging section between the extended QIF framework and information-theoretic measures that have so far focused on a guessing a randomized function of the secret  $X$ , denoted by  $U$ . Specifically, we show that guessing a randomized function of  $X$  does not add to the adversarial threat model beyond what the extended QIF can do and that the generalized  $g$ -leakage framework encompasses all such guessing adversaries. Finally, Section VI presents results on how the extended QIF framework encompasses leakage and capacity measures derived in information theory, namely  $\alpha$ -leakage, maximal  $\alpha$ -leakage, (maximal)  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -leakage, pointwise  $\alpha$ -leakage, and Sibson mutual information of order  $\alpha$ . Since maximal  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -leakage encompass Rényi local differential privacy and local differential privacy, our proposed framework also contains these leakage capacities as special cases.

## II. BACKGROUND

This section provides a concise overview of key concepts and terminology of quantitative information flow (QIF) as outlined in [3], which will be used throughout this paper. For more in-depth explanations, readers are referred to [3], [4].

The *secret*  $X$  represents the information that must be protected from adversaries who know  $X$  only via a prior probability distribution  $\pi$  defined over the alphabet  $\mathcal{X}$ . A system is characterized by the triple  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, C)$ , where  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  are finite sets of input and output symbols, respectively, and  $C = P_{Y|X}$  is a channel matrix of size  $|\mathcal{X}| \times |\mathcal{Y}|$ . The matrix  $C$  provides the conditional probability  $C_{x,y} = \Pr[Y = y|X = x] = p(y|x)$ , denoting the likelihood of observing output  $y$  given the input  $x$ . Each row of  $C$  is a probability distribution over  $\mathcal{Y}$ , with all elements being non-negative and summing to 1. If every entry in the channel matrix is either 0 or 1, the system is termed *deterministic*, meaning each input row contains exactly one ‘1’, corresponding to a unique output.

It is typically assumed that the adversary is aware of both the channel and the prior. Consequently, the adversary can compute the joint distribution  $p(x, y) = \pi_x C_{x,y}$ , marginals  $p(x) = \sum_y p(x, y)$  and  $p(y) = \sum_x p(x, y)$ , as well as posteriors  $p(x|y) = \frac{p(x,y)}{p(y)}$ , when  $p(y) \neq 0$ . The channel’s function, therefore, is to update the adversary’s knowledge about  $X$  from the prior  $\pi$  to a set of posterior distributions  $\delta^y = p(X|y)$ , each occurring with probability  $p(y)$ .

Let  $\mathbb{D}\mathcal{X}$  represent the set of distributions over  $\mathcal{X}$ , and  $[\pi]$  denote the support of  $\pi$ . The pair  $[\pi, C]$  yields the posterior  $\delta^y$  and corresponding  $p(y)$  for each  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ , which are referred to as the inner and outer distributions, respectively. Instead of treating  $p_Y$  as a distribution on  $\mathcal{Y}$ , it can be viewed as a distribution over the posteriors  $\delta^y$ . This creates a distribution over distributions, denoted by  $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{D}\mathcal{X}) = \mathbb{D}^2\mathcal{X}$ , also known as a hyper distribution. Let  $\Delta$  represent a general hyper-distribution, and  $[\pi, C]$  the hyper-distribution resulting from the channel  $C$  acting on the prior  $\pi$ . The support of the hyper-distribution is denoted by  $[\Delta]$ , and  $[\pi]$  indicates a point hyper that assigns probability 1 to  $\pi$ .

**Definition 1.** For a set of guesses  $\mathcal{W}$  (possibly infinite) that an adversary might make about  $X$ , the gain function  $g : \mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  measures the adversary's expected gain when it guesses  $w$  when the actual secret value is  $x$ . The  $g$ -vulnerability function assesses the threat by calculating the adversary's expected gain for an optimal choice of  $w$ . Accordingly, the threat by prior distribution is given by the **prior  $g$ -vulnerability** as

$$V_g(\pi) = \sup_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \pi_x g(w, x). \quad (1)$$

Moreover, the threat after observation of  $Y$  is given by the **posterior  $g$ -vulnerability**. The first class of posterior  $g$ -vulnerability is the **average (AVG)**, which is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{V}_g[\pi, C] &= \sum_y \sup_w \sum_x \pi_x C_{x,y} g(w, x) \\ &= \sum_y p(y) \sup_w \sum_x \delta_x^y g(w, x) = \sum_y p(y) V_g(\delta^y). \end{aligned}$$

The second class is the **maximum (MAX)**, which is given by

$$\widehat{V}_g^{\max}[\pi, C] = \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} V_g(\delta^y), \quad (2)$$

which measures the worst-case threat.

Similar to [4], we allow negative values for  $g(w, x)$  for expressing "losses" for guessing  $w$  when the secret is  $x$ . However, we require that the expected gain  $V_g$  should always be non-negative, so that a value of zero for it means no vulnerability. Also, we note that an alternative measure to interpret a threat is **uncertainty**, defined based on a loss function that the adversary wants to minimize. Accordingly, the prior uncertainty is defined as  $U_l(\pi) = \inf_w \sum_x \pi_x l(w, x)$ , where  $l(w, x)$  is the loss function.

#### A. Axioms of Prior Vulnerability

Generic vulnerability measures have been defined as functions of the following types:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Prior vulnerability : } \mathbb{V} : \mathbb{D}\mathcal{X} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+, \\ \text{Posterior vulnerability : } \widehat{\mathbb{V}} : \mathbb{D}^2\mathcal{X} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+. \end{aligned}$$

The following axioms are adopted specifically for  $\mathbb{V}$ :

- **Continuity (CNTY):** The vulnerability function  $\mathbb{V}$  is continuous with respect to  $\pi$  (in terms of the standard topology on  $\mathbb{D}\mathcal{X}$ ).
- **Convexity (CVX):** The vulnerability function  $\mathbb{V}$  is convex in  $\pi$ , meaning for all convex combinations  $\sum_i a_i \pi^i$ :

$$\mathbb{V} \left( \sum_i a_i \pi^i \right) \leq \sum_i a_i \mathbb{V}(\pi^i).$$

- **Quasi-convexity (Q-CVX):**  $\mathbb{V}$  is quasi-convex in  $\pi$  where for all convex combinations  $\sum_i a_i \pi^i$ :

$$\mathbb{V} \left( \sum_i a_i \pi^i \right) \leq \max_i \mathbb{V}(\pi^i).$$

Based on these axioms, the following results were proven [3].

**Theorem 1** ([3, Prop. 2, Thm. 3, Cor. 4]). Any  $g$ -vulnerability  $V_g$  satisfies CNTY and CVX.

**Theorem 2** ([3, Thm. 5]). Let  $\mathbb{V} : \mathbb{D}\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  be a vulnerability function satisfying CNTY and CVX. Then there exists a gain function  $g$  with a countable number of guesses such that  $\mathbb{V} = V_g$ .

According to Thm 1 and Thm 2, without loss of generality, we consider  $V_g(\pi)$  as the definition of prior vulnerability.

#### B. Axioms for Posterior Vulnerabilities

The following axioms are adopted specifically for posterior vulnerability.

- **Non-interference (NI):** The vulnerability of a point-hyper equals the vulnerability of the unique inner distribution of that hyper:

$$\forall \pi : \widehat{\mathbb{V}}[\pi] = \mathbb{V}(\pi).$$

- **Data-processing inequality (DPI):** Post-processing does not increase vulnerability:

$$\forall \pi, C, R : \widehat{\mathbb{V}}[\pi, C] \geq \widehat{\mathbb{V}}[\pi, CR],$$

where  $R$  is any valid channel.

- **Monotonicity (MONO):** Pushing a prior through a channel does not decrease vulnerability:

$$\forall \pi, C : \widehat{\mathbb{V}}[\pi, C] \geq \mathbb{V}(\pi).$$

It has been shown that both AVG and MAX definitions of posterior  $g$ -vulnerability satisfy the NI axiom. Then, for AVG, the axioms of CVX, MONO, and DPI axioms are equivalent, and for MAX, the Q-CVX, MONO, and DPI are equivalent. These results are shown in Fig. 1 [3, Fig. 2].

#### C. $g$ -leakage and Channel Capacity

**Definition 2.** Leakage measures can be either additive or multiplicative, which are defined as follows:

$$\text{Additive: } \mathcal{L}_g^+(\pi, C) = \widehat{V}_g[\pi, C] - V_g(\pi),$$

$$\text{Multiplicative: } \mathcal{L}_g^\times(\pi, C) = \log \left( \widehat{V}_g[\pi, C] / V_g(\pi) \right).$$

The minimum requirement for an information leakage (generally denoted by  $\mathcal{L}(X \rightarrow Y)$ ) is to satisfy the axiomatic properties of an information measure:

- 1) **Non-negativity:**  $\mathcal{L}(X \rightarrow Y) \geq 0$ .
- 2) **Independence:**  $\mathcal{L}(X \rightarrow Y) = 0 \iff X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y$ .




Fig. 1. Implications of axioms. The merging arrows indicate joint implication; for example, on the left-hand side, we have that MONO+AVG imply CVX [3].

- 3) **Data Processing inequality:** If  $X - Y - Z$  is a Markov chain then  $\mathcal{L}(X \rightarrow Z) \leq \mathcal{L}(X \rightarrow Y)$ .
- 4) **Additivity:** If  $X = X_1 \times X_2$  and  $Y = Y_1 \times Y_2$  then  $\mathcal{L}(X \rightarrow Y) = \mathcal{L}(X_1 \rightarrow Y_1) + \mathcal{L}(X_2 \rightarrow Y_2)$ .

**Remark 1.** The axioms of prior and posterior vulnerability imply that both additive and multiplicative leakage satisfy axioms of information measure.

Leakage capacities serve as a measure of the robustness of leakage by maximizing it over the prior  $\pi$ , the gain function  $g$ , or both. These maximizations account for our potential uncertainty regarding the prior knowledge or adversary's chosen gain function. In essence, capacities represent universal quantities that capture worst-case scenarios, defining the boundaries of maximum threat. There are six interpretations of capacity in total (three for each definition); however, since we focus exclusively on multiplicative leakage, we review the key theorems related to  $\mathcal{L}_g^\times(\pi, C)$ . The three definitions of capacity for  $\mathcal{L}_g^\times(\pi, C)$  are as follows:

- Supremum over prior  $\pi : \mathbb{D}\mathcal{X}$  with fixed  $g$ :

$$\mathcal{L}_g^\times(\forall, C) = \sup_{\pi: \mathbb{D}\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{L}_g^\times(\pi, C);$$

- Supremum over  $g$  with fixed  $\pi$ :

$$\mathcal{L}_\forall^\times(\pi, C) = \sup_g \mathcal{L}_g^\times(\pi, C);$$

- Supremum over both  $\pi$  and  $g$ :

$$\mathcal{L}_\forall^\times(\forall, C) = \sup_\pi \mathcal{L}_\forall^\times(\pi, C) = \sup_g \mathcal{L}_g^\times(\forall, C)$$

**Theorem 3.**  $\mathcal{L}_\forall^\times(\forall, C)$  is given by the Bayes capacity as follows

$$\mathcal{L}_\forall^\times(\forall, C) = \mathcal{ML}(C) = \log \sum_y \max_x C_{x,y}, \quad (3)$$

where equality is achieved by uniform prior and identity gain function [1], [31].

Note that Bayes capacity is known as maximal leakage in information theory [5] and both are equal to Sibson mutual information of order  $\alpha = \infty$ .

### III. GENERALIZED VULNERABILITY AND LEAKAGE

In this section, we use the Kolmogorov–Nagumo mean [32] (quasi-arithmetic mean or generalized  $f$ -mean) to propose generalized vulnerability, leakage, and capacity measures.

**Definition 3** (Kolmogorov–Nagumo mean). Given a set of real numbers  $t = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n\}$  with corresponding weights  $\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_n$ , where  $\omega_k > 0$  and  $\sum_{k=1}^n \omega_k = 1$ , the general form of a mean value is expressed as

$$\bar{t} = f^{-1} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^n \omega_k f(t_k) \right], \quad (4)$$

where  $f$  is a strictly monotonic and continuous function with the inverse function of  $f^{-1}$ .

#### A. Generalized Prior Vulnerability

**Definition 4.** For a given prior  $\pi : \mathbb{D}\mathcal{X}$ , a gain function  $g : \mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and any strictly monotonic and continuous function  $f$  with a **convex** inverse  $f^{-1}$ , the generalized prior vulnerability is defined as

$$V_{f,g}(\pi) := \sup_w f^{-1} \left( \sum_x \pi_x f(g(w, x)) \right). \quad (5)$$

#### B. Generalized Posterior Vulnerability

Here, we define generalized average and maximum posterior vulnerabilities. We start with the average case and then study the maximum case. Later in Section IV, we will prove that the corresponding axioms are satisfied.

**Definition 5.** For a hyper  $[\pi, C]$  and each  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ , the generalized vulnerability of each inner  $\delta^y$  is given by:

$$V_{f,g}(\delta^y) = \sup_w f^{-1} \left( \sum_x \delta_x^y f(g(w, x)) \right). \quad (6)$$

According to (6), the generalized average posterior vulnerability is defined as

$$\widehat{V}_{h,f,g}[\pi, C] := h^{-1} \left( \sum_y p(y) h(V_{f,g}(\delta^y)) \right), \quad (7)$$

where  $h$  is a strictly monotonic and continuous function that could potentially be different from  $f$ . If  $h \neq f$ , then we assume it is **convex** and **increasing** or **concave** and **decreasing**. These assumptions are sufficient for a DPI axiom for  $\widehat{V}_{h,f,g}[\pi, C]$ .

If  $h$  is affine, then  $h(t) = at + b$  and we have:

$$\widehat{V}_{h,f,g}[\pi, C] = \sum_y p(y) V_{f,g}(\delta^y). \quad (8)$$

For the special case of  $h = f$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \widehat{V}_{f,f,g}[\pi, C] \\ &= f^{-1} \left( \sum_y p(y) f \left( \sup_w f^{-1} \left( \sum_x \delta_x^y f(g(w, x)) \right) \right) \right) = \\ & \begin{cases} f^{-1} \left( \sum_y \sup_w \sum_x C_{x,y} \pi_x f(g(w, x)) \right), & f^{-1} \text{ incr.}, \\ f^{-1} \left( \sum_y \inf_w \sum_x C_{x,y} \pi_x f(g(w, x)) \right), & f^{-1} \text{ decr.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

When  $f^{-1}$  is increasing, we can move the  $\sup_w$  inside the function. Then  $f$  and  $f^{-1}$  cancel each other. For decreasing  $f^{-1}$ ,  $\sup_w$  becomes  $\inf_w$  when it is moved inside  $f^{-1}$ .

**Definition 6.** The generalized maximum posterior vulnerability is defined as follows:

$$\widehat{V}_{f,g}^{\max}[\pi, C] = \max_y V_{f,g}(\delta^y). \quad (10)$$

#### C. Generalized Leakage and Capacity Measures

**Definition 7.** Similar to [3], the generalized form of leakage measures is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Additive: } & \mathcal{L}_{h,f,g}^+(\pi, C) = \widehat{V}_{h,f,g}[\pi, C] - V_{f,g}(\pi), \\ \text{Multiplicative: } & \mathcal{L}_{h,f,g}^\times(\pi, C) = \log \left( \frac{\widehat{V}_{h,f,g}[\pi, C]}{V_{f,g}(\pi)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Accordingly, the generalized capacities are given by the supremum of generalized leakage over  $\pi$ ,  $g$ , or both.

#### IV. AXIOMATIC RELATIONS OF GENERALIZED VULNERABILITIES

We first study the axiomatic relations of the generalized prior vulnerability.

**Theorem 4.**  $V_{f,g}(\pi)$  satisfies axioms of prior vulnerability.

*Proof.* We follow similar steps in [3, Sec. IV.A]. Let

$$f \circ g_w(\pi) = f^{-1} \left( \sum_x \pi_x f(g(w, x)) \right),$$

which is the generalized expected gain for a specific guess  $w$ . Consider  $\pi = \sum_i a_i \pi^i$  for some priors  $\pi^1, \dots, \pi^n$  and non-negative reals  $a_i, \dots, a_n$  such that  $\sum_i a_i = 1$ . Due to the convexity of  $f^{-1}$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} f \circ g_w(\pi) &= f^{-1} \left( \sum_x \left( \sum_i a_i \pi_x^i \right) f(g(w, x)) \right) \\ &= f^{-1} \left( \sum_i a_i \sum_x \pi_x^i f(g(w, x)) \right) \\ &\leq \sum_i a_i f^{-1} \left( \sum_x \pi_x^i f(g(w, x)) \right) \\ &= \sum_i a_i f \circ g_w(\pi^i). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $f \circ g_w(\pi)$  is convex and continues w.r.t to  $\pi$ . Accordingly,  $V_{f,g}(\pi) = \sup_w f \circ g_w(\pi)$  is the supremum over a family of convex and continuous functions, so it is convex and continuous due to the argument in [3, Prop. 2, Thm. 3]. Note that the convexity of  $f^{-1}$  implies that  $f$  is either **convex** and **decreasing** or **concave** and **increasing**. The convexity of  $V_{f,g}(\pi)$  implies **quasi-convexity**. Note that if  $f$  is affine, i.e.,  $f(t) = at + b$  then  $V_{f,g}(\pi) = V_g(\pi)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2.** For the generalized uncertainty measure,  $f^{-1}$  should be concave to keep the concavity of  $U_{f,l}(\pi)$ .

**Remark 3.** Note that the assumption of  $f^{-1}$  convexity is a sufficient condition that makes the proof straightforward and may not be necessary. Thus, if the convexity of  $V_{f,g}(\pi)$  can be relaxed and only the basic properties of continuity and strict monotonicity of  $f$  are used, then a stronger result may potentially be obtained.

Now, we study the axiomatic relations of the generalized posterior vulnerability.

**Proposition 1** (AVG $\Rightarrow$ NI). If a pair of generalized prior/posterior vulnerabilities  $(V_{f,g}, \widehat{V}_{h,f,g})$  satisfy AVG then they also satisfy NI.

*Proof.* For a NI channel  $C$  we have  $\delta^y = \pi, \forall y \in \mathcal{Y}$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{V}_{h,f,g}[\pi, \bar{0}] &= h^{-1} \left( \sum_y p(y) h(V_{f,g}(\pi)) \right) \\ &= h^{-1} \left( h(V_{f,g}(\pi)) \sum_y p(y) \right) = V_{f,g}(\pi). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

**Proposition 2** (NI+DPI $\Rightarrow$ MONO). If a pair of generalized prior/posterior vulnerabilities  $(V_{f,g}, \widehat{V}_{h,f,g})$  satisfy NI and DPI, then they also satisfy MONO.

*Proof.* For any  $[\pi, C]$ , let  $\bar{0}$  denote a NI channel with one column and as many rows as the columns of  $C$ , then

$$\widehat{V}_{h,f,g}[\pi, C] \geq \widehat{V}_{h,f,g}[\pi, C\bar{0}] = \widehat{V}_{h,f,g}[\pi, \bar{0}] = V_{f,g}(\pi).$$

The inequality is due to DPI and  $C\bar{0} = 0$ .  $\square$

**Remark 4.** In [3, Prop. 8], it was shown that if a pair of prior/posterior vulnerabilities satisfy AVG and MONO, it implies CVX for the prior vulnerability. We decided not to include this property because it seems unnecessary, given that the convexity of the prior vulnerability  $\mathbb{V}$  is already assumed when we define  $\widehat{\mathbb{V}}$ . Additionally, proving this property in general case would require  $h^{-1}$  to be convex if  $h \neq f$ , while for the DPI, we need it to be concave, resulting in an affine  $h$  that is not useful for a generalized definition of posterior vulnerability.

**Proposition 3** (AVG+CVX $\Rightarrow$ DPI). If a pair of prior/posterior vulnerabilities  $(V_{f,g}, \widehat{V}_{h,f,g})$  satisfy AVG and CVX, then they also satisfy DPI.

*Proof.* Assume  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $\mathcal{Y}$ , and  $\mathcal{Z}$  are sets of possible values. Let  $\pi$  represent a prior distribution over  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $C$  denote a channel from  $\mathcal{X}$  to  $\mathcal{Y}$ , and  $R$  be a channel from  $\mathcal{Y}$  to  $\mathcal{Z}$ . The sequential combination of channels  $C$  and  $R$ , symbolized by  $CR$ , forms a new channel that maps  $\mathcal{X}$  to  $\mathcal{Z}$ . Consequently, the corresponding inner of  $[\pi, C]$  for each  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$  is  $\delta^y = p(X|y)$  and the corresponding inner of  $[\pi, CR]$  for each  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$  is  $\delta^z = p(X|z)$ . Define the joint probability distribution  $p(x, y, z)$  as  $p(x, y, z) = \pi_x C_{x,y} R_{y,z}$  for each  $(x, y, z) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Z}$ . This joint distribution makes a Markov chain  $X - Y - Z$ . Thus, we have  $p(z|x, y) = p(z|y)$  and  $p(x|z) = \sum_y p(x|y)p(y|z)$ .

First assume  $h \neq f$  and let  $h$  be either convex and increasing or concave and decreasing. In the following, we consider the first case:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{V}_{h,f,g}[\pi, C] &= h^{-1} \left( \sum_y p(y) h(V_{f,g}(p_{X|y})) \right) \\ &= h^{-1} \left( \sum_y \left( \sum_z p(z) p(y|z) \right) h(V_{f,g}(p_{X|y})) \right) \\ &= h^{-1} \left( \sum_z p(z) \left( \sum_y p(y|z) h(V_{f,g}(p_{X|y})) \right) \right) \quad (11) \end{aligned}$$

$$\geq h^{-1} \left( \sum_z p(z) h \left( \sum_y p(y|z) V_{f,g}(p_{X|y}) \right) \right) \quad (12)$$

$$\geq h^{-1} \left( \sum_z p(z) h \left( V_{f,g} \left( \sum_y p(y|z) p(x|y) \right) \right) \right) \quad (13)$$

$$= h^{-1} \left( \sum_z p(z) h(V_{f,g}(p_{X|z})) \right) = \widehat{V}_{h,f,g}[\pi, CR],$$

where (12) holds since  $h$  is convex and increasing which implies that  $h^{-1}$  is also increasing. Similarly, (13) is due to the convexity of  $V_{f,g}(p_{X|y})$  and  $h$  and  $h^{-1}$  being increasing. When  $h$  is concave and decreasing, the same inequalities hold.




Fig. 2. Implications of axioms for generalized prior and posterior. The merging arrows indicate joint implication: for example, in 2(b), we have  $\text{AVG}+\text{CVX}$  imply  $\text{DPI}$  and  $\text{NI}+\text{DPI}$  imply  $\text{MONO}$ .

When  $h = f$ , it can be either convex and decreasing or concave and increasing, which are duals of the case when  $h \neq f$ . However,  $\text{DPI}$  still holds due to (9). We prove  $\text{DPI}$  for increasing  $f$ . The same proof applies to the decreasing case.

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{V}_{f,f,g}[\pi, C] &= f^{-1}\left(\sum_y p(y)\left(\sup_w \sum_x \delta_x^y f(g(w, x))\right)\right) \\
&= f^{-1}\left(\sum_z p(z)\sum_y p(y|z)\left(\sup_w \sum_x p(x|y)f(g(w, x))\right)\right) \\
&\geq f^{-1}\left(\sum_z p(z)\left(\sup_w \sum_x \sum_y p(y|z)p(x|y)f(g(w, x))\right)\right) \\
&= f^{-1}\left(\sum_z p(z)\left(\sup_w \sum_x p(x|z)f(g(w, x))\right)\right) \\
&= \widehat{V}_{f,f,g}[\pi, CR],
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality is true since  $\left(\sup_w \sum_x p(x|y)f(g(w, x))\right)$  is convex according to the proof of Theorem 4.  $\square$

We now prove the axiomatic relations for the maximum posterior vulnerability.

**Proposition 4** ( $\text{MAX} \Rightarrow \text{NI}$ ). *If a pair of generalized prior/posterior vulnerabilities  $(\widehat{V}_{f,g}^{\max}, V_{f,g})$  satisfy  $\text{MAX}$ , they also satisfy  $\text{NI}$ .*

*Proof.* For a  $\text{NI}$  channel,  $\delta^y = \pi, \forall y \in \mathcal{Y}$ , thus we have:

$$\widehat{V}_{f,g}^{\max}[\pi] = \max_y V_{f,g}(\pi) = V_{f,g}(\pi). \quad \square$$

**Proposition 5** ( $\text{MAX}+\text{Q-CVX} \Rightarrow \text{DPI}$ ). *If a pair of generalized prior/posterior vulnerabilities satisfy  $\text{MAX}$  and  $\text{Q-CVX}$ , they also satisfy  $\text{DPI}$ .*

*Proof.* Consider a Markov chain similar to Proposition 3.

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{V}_{f,g}^{\max}[\pi, CR] &= \max_z V_{f,g}(p(X|z)) \\
&= \max_z V_{f,g}\left(\sum_y p(x|y)p(y|z)\right) \\
&\leq \max_z \left(\max_y V_{f,g}(p(x|y))\right) = \widehat{V}_{f,g}^{\max}[\pi, C]. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Note we dropped the implication of the convexity of the prior vulnerability from the posterior. This gives some somewhat different relationships between our axioms. See Fig. 2.

## V. ON GUESSING A RANDOMIZED FUNCTION OF SECRET

Subsequent to  $g$ -leakage in QIF, maximal leakage [5] was proposed as an alternative to characterizing adversarial threats. In this scenario, a randomized function of secret  $X$ , denoted by  $U$  is to be guessed. The leakage is defined as the supremum over all  $U$  and  $\hat{U}$  functions subject to the Markov chain  $U - X - Y - \hat{U}$ , where  $\hat{U}$  is the outcome of the guess and has the same alphabet as  $U$ . The leakage is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{\max}(X \rightarrow Y) &= \sup_{U-X-Y-\hat{U}} \frac{\Pr(U = \hat{U})}{\max_{u \in \mathcal{U}} p(u)} \\
&= \sup_{U-X-Y} \frac{\sum_y \max_u p(u, y)}{\max_{u \in \mathcal{U}} p(U)} = I_{\infty}^S(X; Y) = \mathcal{ML}(C).
\end{aligned}$$

Upon a closer look, we realize that maximal leakage has been defined for a special gain function  $g_{\text{id}} : \mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  where

$$g_{\text{id}}(w, u) = \begin{cases} 1, & w = u, \\ 0, & w \neq u. \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

Then we have

$$V_{g_{\text{id}}}(p_U) = \max_u p(u), \quad (15)$$

$$\widehat{V}_{g_{\text{id}}}[p_U, C] = \sum_y \max_u p(u, y). \quad (16)$$

Accordingly, maximal leakage is given as

$$\sup_{U-X-Y} \mathcal{L}_{g_{\text{id}}}^{\times}(p(U), C) = \sup_{U-X-Y} \frac{\widehat{V}_{g_{\text{id}}}[p_U, C]}{V_{g_{\text{id}}}(p_U)}. \quad (17)$$

Therefore, it is natural to extend maximal leakage by incorporating  $f, h$  functions, as well as a general gain function  $g$  into it as follows. We call this a generalized maximal leakage.

$$\sup_{U-X-Y} \mathcal{L}_{h,f,g}^{\times}(p(U), C) = \sup_{U-X-Y} \frac{\widehat{V}_{h,f,g}[p_U, C]}{V_{f,g}(p_U)}. \quad (18)$$

The generalized maximal leakage includes maximal leakage as a special case when  $f$  and  $h$  are affine and  $g = g_{\text{id}}$ . The main question is then which parts of the above formulation are essential to obtaining this generalized maximal leakage and which are superfluous and, hence, can be dropped without affecting the generality of results.

In the following, we prove that the generalized maximal leakage for any gain function  $g : \mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and for given  $f, h$  functions is equivalent to the generalized  $g$ -leakage capacity for the same gain function over the alphabet  $\mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{X}$  when we take the supremum over all priors in  $\mathbb{D}\mathcal{X}$ . For the main result, we need the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.** *For given  $f$ , any randomized function  $U$  of secret  $X$  and any gain function  $g : \mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  we have:*

$$\inf_{p(U|X)} \sum_{x,u} p(x, u) f(g(w, u)) = \sum_x \pi_x f(g(w, x)), \quad (19)$$

$$\sup_{p(U|X)} \sum_{x,u} p(x, u) f(g(w, u)) = \sum_x \pi_x f(g(w, x)). \quad (20)$$

*Proof.* We prove (19) by showing the RHS is both upper and lower bound of the LHS. Equation (20) is proven similarly.

Consider the following distribution:

$$q_{U|X}(u|x) = \begin{cases} 1, & u = x, \\ 0, & u \neq x. \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{p(U|X)} \sum_{x,u} p(x,u) f(g(w,u)) &\leq \sum_x \pi_x \sum_u q_{U|X}(u|x) f(g(w,u)) \\ &= \sum_x \pi_x f(g(w,x)). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

For any randomized function  $U$  and without loss of generality, let  $\mathcal{U}$  be defined as  $\mathcal{U} = \bigcup_{x \in [\pi]} \{(x, u_x) : u_x \in \{1, 2, \dots, k(x)\}\}$ , where  $k(x) \geq 1$ . Similar to [5], any gain function  $g(w, u)$  can be written as  $g(w, (x, u_x))$ . We assume the randomized function  $U$  is a surjective function of  $x \in [\pi]$ .

$$\begin{aligned} &\inf_{p(U|X)} \sum_{x,u} p(x,u) f(g(w,u)) \\ &= \inf_{p(U|X)} \sum_x \pi_x \sum_u p(u|x) f(g(w, (x, u_x))) \\ &\geq \sum_x \pi_x \inf_{p(U|x)} \sum_u p(u|x) f(g(w, (x, u_x))) \\ &= \sum_x \pi_x f(g(w,x)), \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where (23) is given by the following  $p(U|x)$

$$p(u|x) = \begin{cases} 1, & u \in \operatorname{argmin}_{u_x} f(g(w, (x, u_x))), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad \square$$

**Theorem 5.** For fixed  $f, h$ , the generalized maximal leakage for a given gain function  $g : \mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is equivalent to the generalized multiplicative leakage capacity of the same gain function  $g : \mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . That is,

$$\sup_{U-X-Y} \mathcal{L}_{h,f,g}^\times(p(U), C) = \sup_{\pi} \mathcal{L}_{h,f,g}^\times(\pi, C). \quad (24)$$

*Proof.* The distribution in (21) is used to show  $g$ -leakage capacity is a lower bound on the generalized maximal leakage.

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{U-X-Y} \mathcal{L}_{h,f,g}^\times(p(U), C) &= \sup_{U-X-Y} \frac{\widehat{V}_{h,f,g}[p(U), C]}{V_{f,g}(p(U))} \\ &= \sup_{\pi} \sup_{p_{U|X}} \frac{h^{-1}\left(\sum_y p(y) h(V_{f,g}(p_{U|y}))\right)}{\sup_w f^{-1}\left(\sum_u p(u) f(g(w,u))\right)} \\ &= \sup_{\pi} \sup_{p_{U|X}} \frac{h^{-1}\left(\sum_y p(y) h(V_{f,g}(\sum_x p(u|x) p(x|y)))\right)}{\sup_w f^{-1}\left(\sum_u (\sum_x \pi_x p(u|x)) f(g(w,u))\right)} \\ &\geq \sup_{\pi} \frac{h^{-1}\left(\sum_y p(y) h(V_{f,g}(\sum_x q(u|x) p(x|y)))\right)}{\sup_w f^{-1}\left(\sum_u (\sum_x \pi_x q(u|x)) f(g(w,u))\right)} \\ &= \sup_{\pi} \frac{h^{-1}\left(\sum_y p(y) h(V_{f,g}(\sum_x q(u|x) p(x|y)))\right)}{\sup_w f^{-1}\left(\sum_x \pi_x \sum_u q(u|x) f(g(w,u))\right)} \end{aligned}$$

$$= \sup_{\pi} \frac{h^{-1}\left(\sum_y p(y) h(V_{f,g}(p_{X|y}))\right)}{\sup_w f^{-1}\left(\sum_x \pi_x f(g(w,x))\right)} = \sup_{\pi} \mathcal{L}_{h,f,g}^\times(\pi, C)$$

For the upper bound, we write

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{U-X-Y} \mathcal{L}_{h,f,g}^\times(p(U), C) &= \sup_{U-X-Y} \frac{\widehat{V}_{h,f,g}[p(U), C]}{V_{f,g}(p(U))} \\ &= \sup_{\pi} \sup_{p_{U|X}} \frac{h^{-1}\left(\sum_y p(y) h(V_{f,g}(p_{U|y}))\right)}{\sup_w f^{-1}\left(\sum_u p(u) f(g(w,u))\right)} \\ &\leq \sup_{\pi} \frac{\sup_{p_{U|X}} h^{-1}\left(\sum_y p(y) h(V_{f,g}(p_{U|y}))\right)}{\inf_{p_{U|X}} \sup_w f^{-1}\left(\sum_u p(u) f(g(w,u))\right)} \quad (25) \\ &\leq \sup_{\pi} \frac{\sup_{p_{U|X}} h^{-1}\left(\sum_y p(y) h(V_{f,g}(p_{U|y}))\right)}{\sup_w \inf_{p_{U|X}} f^{-1}\left(\sum_u p(u) f(g(w,u))\right)} \quad (26) \\ &= \sup_{\pi} \frac{\sup_{p_{U|X}} h^{-1}\left(\sum_y p(y) h(V_{f,g}(p_{U|y}))\right)}{\sup_w f^{-1}\left(\inf_{p_{U|X}} \sum_u (\sum_x \pi_x p(u|x)) f(g(w,u))\right)} \\ &= \sup_{\pi} \frac{\sup_{p_{U|X}} h^{-1}\left(\sum_y p(y) h(V_{f,g}(p_{U|y}))\right)}{\sup_w f^{-1}\left(\inf_{p_{U|X}} \sum_u \sum_x \pi_x p(u|x) f(g(w,u))\right)} \\ &\leq \sup_{\pi} \frac{\sup_{p_{U|X}} h^{-1}\left(\sum_y p(y) h(V_{f,g}(p_{U|y}))\right)}{\sup_w f^{-1}\left(\sum_x \pi_x \inf_{p_{U|X}} \sum_u p(u|x) f(g(w,u))\right)} \quad (27) \\ &= \sup_{\pi} \frac{h^{-1}\left(\sum_y p(y) h(V_{f,g}(p_{X|y}))\right)}{\sup_w f^{-1}\left(\sum_x \pi_x f(g(w,x))\right)} = \sup_{\pi} \mathcal{L}_{h,f,g}^\times(\pi, C). \square \end{aligned}$$

## VI. $\alpha$ -VULNERABILITY AND INFORMATION LEAKAGE

It is natural to expect that the axiomatic QIF framework is the best candidate for a consistent framework for all privacy measures. However to our best knowledge,  $\alpha$ -based privacy measures have not been expressed consistently for all  $\alpha < \infty$  values within QIF. The only related  $\alpha$  information cases established in this framework have so far been min-entropy (Rényi entropy of order  $\infty$ ) and Sibson mutual information ( $\alpha = \infty$ ) as Bayes vulnerability and capacity, respectively.

Let us first recall existing work in this domain. The definition of  $\alpha$ -leakage in [29] seems quite intuitive, but some aspects such as the coefficient  $\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}$  leading the logarithm [33] have not been justified. In addition,  $\alpha$ -leakage was first defined for  $\alpha \in [1, \infty]$  only and then extended to  $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$  in [17]. However, the case of  $\alpha = 0$  had been still excluded with unknown reasons. In [33],  $f$ -mean approach has been used to cover these gaps to define  $\alpha$ -leakage based on a new definition of cross-entropy. In contrast, all  $\alpha$ -measures in information theory are consistently defined for the whole range of  $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$ . The underlying reason for such discrepancy has been unaddressed till now. In [3, Sec. VI], the authors

remarked on the issues arising from the use of Rényi entropy as prior and posterior uncertainty measures in defining an additive leakage by their differences. Specifically, the authors have identified that since  $H_\alpha(\pi)$  is not concave for  $\alpha > 2$ , the resulting  $\alpha$  leakage does not align with their axiomatic framework for information leakage.

In the rest of this section, we show how the generalized framework that we developed in Section III can be used to consistently represent measures of  $\alpha$ -vulnerability,  $\alpha$ -information leakage and even  $(\alpha, \beta)$  leakage in QIF.

#### A. $\alpha$ -vulnerability and Arimoto Information Leakage

In [2], a special gain function was proposed where  $\mathcal{W}$  is the set of all probability distributions  $w$  on  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $w : \mathbb{D}\mathcal{X}$ , and  $g(w, x) = \log w_x$ , where  $w_x \in [0, 1]$  and  $\sum_x w_x = 1$ . We use the exponential form of this gain function as

$$g(w, x) = w_x. \quad (28)$$

For  $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$ , the  $f$ -mean function and its inverse are

$$f_\alpha(t) = t^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}}, \quad f_\alpha^{-1}(s) = s^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}. \quad (29)$$

**Theorem 6.** For  $g(w, x)$  and  $f_\alpha$  in (28) and (29) and  $h = f_\alpha$ :

$$V_{f_\alpha, g}(\pi) = \exp(-H_\alpha(X)), \quad \alpha \in [0, \infty], \quad (30)$$

$$\widehat{V}_{f_\alpha, f_\alpha, g}[\pi, C] = \exp(-H_\alpha(X|Y)), \quad \alpha \in [0, \infty]. \quad (31)$$

*Proof.* For  $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$ ,  $f_\alpha^{-1}$  is convex and hence, is valid to be used in the generalized prior vulnerability (5). Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} V_{f_\alpha, g}(\pi) &= \sup_w f_\alpha^{-1} \left( \sum_x \pi_x f_\alpha(g(w, x)) \right) \\ &= \begin{cases} \left( \inf_w \sum_x \pi_x (w_x)^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}} \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}} & \alpha \in [0, 1), \\ \left( \sup_w \sum_x \pi_x (w_x)^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}} \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}} & \alpha \in [1, \infty]. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

For  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ ,  $f_\alpha^{-1}$  is decreasing and  $\sup_w$  becomes  $\inf_w$  when moved inside  $f_\alpha^{-1}$ . With  $f_\alpha$  being convex in this range, the optimization is also convex with the solution [29], [33]:

$$w_x^* = \frac{\pi_x^\alpha}{\sum_x \pi_x^\alpha}. \quad (33)$$

For  $\alpha \in [1, \infty]$ ,  $f_\alpha^{-1}$  is increasing and  $f_\alpha$  is concave. Thus, the optimization is still convex with the same solution in (33). Applying the optimal answer  $w_x^*$  in (32), we have:

$$V_{f_\alpha, g}(\pi) = \left( \sum_x \pi_x^\alpha \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}} = \exp(-H_\alpha(X)). \quad (34)$$

For  $\widehat{V}_{h, f_\alpha, g}[\pi, C]$ , let  $h = f_\alpha$  in (7) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{V}_{f_\alpha, f_\alpha, g}[\pi, C] &= f_\alpha^{-1} \left( \sum_y p(y) f_\alpha(V_{f_\alpha, g}(\delta_y)) \right) \\ &= \left( \sum_y p(y) \left( \sum_x (\delta_x^y)^\alpha \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}} \\ &= \left( \sum_y \left( \sum_x p^\alpha(x, y) \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}} = \exp(-H_\alpha(X|Y)). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

**Proposition 6.**  $V_{f_\alpha, g}(\pi)$  in (34) is convex for  $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$ .

*Proof.* We can write  $V_{f_\alpha, g}(\pi)$  as:

$$V_{f_\alpha, g}(\pi) = (\|\pi\|_\alpha)^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}} = f_\alpha^{-1}(\|\pi\|_\alpha). \quad (35)$$

The function  $f_\alpha^{-1}(s) = s^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}$  is convex in the whole range of  $\alpha$  and norm  $\|\pi\|_\alpha$  is convex and non-decreasing for  $\alpha \in [1, \infty]$  and concave and non-increasing for  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ . Thus, their composition is convex for  $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$ .  $\square$

**Remark 5.** In [33] an expected loss function  $\exp(H_\alpha(X))$  has been introduced in a similar vein as Thm. 6. As a loss function, it can be a candidate for uncertainty measure. However, it is not concave for  $0.5 \leq \alpha$ , which contradicts the axiom of prior uncertainty.

**Proposition 7** ( $\alpha$ -leakage as Arimoto mutual information). Using the multiplicative definition of leakage for  $V_{f_\alpha, g}(\pi)$  and  $\widehat{V}_{f_\alpha, f_\alpha, g}[\pi, C]$  in (30) and (31) we define  $\alpha$ -leakage as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{f_\alpha, f_\alpha, g}^\times(\pi, C) &= \log \frac{\widehat{V}_{f_\alpha, f_\alpha, g}[\pi, C]}{V_{f_\alpha, g}(\pi)} = \log \frac{\exp(-H_\alpha(X|Y))}{\exp(-H_\alpha(X))} \\ &= H_\alpha(X) - H_\alpha(X|Y) = I_\alpha^A(X, Y). \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

**Remark 6.** Equation (36) represents  $\alpha$ -leakage in [29] consistently within our generalized framework. Moreover, the maximal  $\alpha$ -leakage is given by:

$$\mathcal{L}_{f_\alpha, f_\alpha, g}^\times(\forall, C) = \sup_\pi I_\alpha^A(X, Y), \quad \alpha \in [0, \infty]. \quad (37)$$

Moreover, this interpretation extends  $\alpha$  to the whole  $[0, \infty]$  range as originally defined by Arimoto in [34].

Next, we show that the generalized framework can express another measure of privacy, namely maximal  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -leakage.

**Proposition 8** (Maximal  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -leakage [19]). Consider the same  $g$  and  $f_\alpha$  given in (28) and (29). Let  $h_{(\alpha, \beta)}(t) = t^{\frac{(\alpha-1)\beta}{\alpha}}$  and  $h_{(\alpha, \beta)}^{-1}(s) = s^{\frac{\alpha}{(\alpha-1)\beta}}$ , where  $\alpha \in (1, \infty]$  and  $\beta \in [1, \infty]$ . The generalized leakage is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{h_{(\alpha, \beta)}, f_\alpha, g}^\times(\pi, C) &= \frac{\alpha}{(\alpha-1)\beta} \log \sum_y p(y)^{1-\beta} \left[ \frac{\sum_x \pi_x^\alpha C_{x,y}^\alpha}{\sum_x \pi_x^\alpha} \right]^{\frac{\beta}{\alpha}}. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

And the maximal  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -leakage is given by the generalized capacity as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{h_{(\alpha, \beta)}, f_\alpha, g}^\times(\forall, C) = \sup_\pi \mathcal{L}_{h_{(\alpha, \beta)}, f_\alpha, g}^\times(\pi, C). \quad (39)$$

*Proof.* For the given functions, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{V}_{h_{(\alpha, \beta)}, f_\alpha, g}[\pi, C] &= h_{(\alpha, \beta)}^{-1} \left( \sum_y p(y) h_{(\alpha, \beta)}(V_{f_\alpha, g}(p_{X|Y})) \right) \\ &= \left( \sum_y p(y) \left( \sum_x p(x|y) \right)^{\frac{\beta}{\alpha}} \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{(\alpha-1)\beta}}. \end{aligned}$$

And the corresponding leakage  $\mathcal{L}_{h_{(\alpha, \beta)}, f_\alpha, g}^\times(\pi, C)$  is



$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{h_{(\alpha,\beta),f_{\alpha,g}}^{\times}}(\pi, C) &= \log \frac{\widehat{V}_{h_{(\alpha,\beta),f_{\alpha,g}}}[\pi, C]}{V_{f_{\alpha,g}}(\pi)} \\
&= \log \frac{\left( \sum_y p(y) \left( \sum_x p^{\alpha}(x|y) \right)^{\frac{\beta}{\alpha}} \right)^{\frac{1}{(\alpha-1)\beta}}}{\left( \sum_x \pi_x^{\alpha} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}}} \\
&= \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log \frac{\left( \sum_y p(y) \left( \sum_x p^{\alpha}(x|y) \right)^{\frac{\beta}{\alpha}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}}{\left( \sum_x \pi_x^{\alpha} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} \\
&= \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log \frac{\left( \sum_y p(y)^{1-\beta} \left( \sum_x p^{\alpha}(x, y) \right)^{\frac{\beta}{\alpha}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}}{\left( \sum_x \pi_x^{\alpha} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} \\
&= \frac{\alpha}{(\alpha-1)\beta} \log \sum_y p(y)^{1-\beta} \left[ \frac{\sum_x \pi_x^{\alpha} C_{x,y}^{\alpha}}{\sum_x \pi_x^{\alpha}} \right]^{\frac{\beta}{\alpha}}. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

**Remark 7.** To keep it consistent within our framework, we need to check the ranges of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  such that  $h$  is convex and increasing or concave and decreasing. We have :

$$\begin{aligned}
h'_{(\alpha,\beta)}(t) &= \frac{(\alpha-1)\beta}{\alpha} t^{\frac{(\alpha-1)\beta}{\alpha}-1}, \\
h''_{(\alpha,\beta)}(t) &= \left( \frac{(\alpha-1)\beta}{\alpha} \right) \left( \frac{(\alpha-1)\beta}{\alpha} - 1 \right) t^{\frac{(\alpha-1)\beta}{\alpha}-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

For  $\alpha \in (1, \infty]$  and  $\beta \in [1, \infty]$ ,  $h'_{\alpha,\beta}(t) \geq 0$  and it is increasing, thus  $h_{(\alpha,\beta)}$  should be convex. If  $\beta \geq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}$  then  $h''_{(\alpha,\beta)}(t) \geq 0$  and the function is convex.

**Remark 8.** We demonstrate that our generalized result can achieve all special cases of maximal  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -leakage as presented in [19].

- 1) Maximal  $\alpha$ -leakage ( $\beta = 1$ ): If  $\beta = 1$  then  $h(\alpha, 1) = f_{\alpha}$  and this case is given by Proposition 7 and Remark 6.
- 2) Maximal leakage ( $\alpha = \infty, \beta = 1$ ): This case is easily given by the maximal  $\alpha$ -leakage when  $\alpha = \infty$ .
- 3) Local Rényi differential privacy ( $\alpha = \beta$ ): In this case by (38) and (39) we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{h_{(\alpha,\alpha),f_{\alpha,g}}^{\times}}(\forall, C) &= \sup_{\pi} \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log \sum_y p(y)^{1-\alpha} \left[ \frac{\sum_x \pi_x^{\alpha} C_{x,y}^{\alpha}}{\sum_x \pi_x^{\alpha}} \right] \\
&= \sup_{\pi} \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log \sum_y \left( \sum_{x'} \pi_{x'} C_{x',y} \right)^{1-\alpha} \left[ \frac{\sum_x \pi_x^{\alpha} C_{x,y}^{\alpha}}{\sum_x \pi_x^{\alpha}} \right]. \quad (40)
\end{aligned}$$

To achieve the  $\sup_{\pi}$ , we apply the approach in [13, Thm. 3] as follows: Let  $x^* = \operatorname{argmax}_x C_{x,y}$ , and define a sequence of priors as

$$\pi_{x^*}^n = 1 - \frac{1}{n}, \quad \pi_x^n = \frac{1}{n(|\mathcal{X}| - 1)} \text{ for } x \neq x^*. \quad (41)$$

It is evident that  $\pi^n$  has full support, and also that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_x \pi_x C_{x,y} = \max_x C_{x,y}$ . Additionally, if we

let  $\pi_{\alpha} = \frac{(\pi_x)^{\alpha}}{\sum_x (\pi_x)^{\alpha}}$ , then we have:

$$\pi_{\alpha}^{n \rightarrow \infty} = \begin{cases} 1, & x = x^*, \\ 0, & x \neq x^*. \end{cases} \quad (42)$$

Applying  $\pi^n$  in (40), by (41) and (42) we get:

$$\mathcal{L}_{h_{(\alpha,\alpha),f_{\alpha,g}}^{\times}}(\forall, C) = \max_{x,x'} \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \sum_y C_{x',y}^{\alpha-1} C_{x,y}^{\alpha}. \quad (43)$$

- 4) Local differential privacy ( $\alpha = \beta = \infty$ ): It is easily given by local Rényi differential privacy for  $\alpha = \infty$ .

## B. Pointwise $\alpha$ -leakage and Sibson Information Leakage

The definition of Bayes and  $g$ -vulnerability in [2] have their roots in the concept of entropy and uncertainty in information theory. In [30], Rényi generalized Shannon entropy by relaxation of one of the five postulates considered for a measure of uncertainty to achieve new definitions of entropy. Moreover, he also generalized the characterization of the amount of information which led to Rényi divergence [30, Sec. 3]. In his seminal paper, [30, Sec. 3], Rényi provides elegant remarks, which we quote: “Entropy can be interpreted not only as a measure of uncertainty but also as a measure of information.” Then he continued by saying there are other ways to quantify the amount of information. “For instance, we may ask what is the amount of information concerning a random variable  $\zeta$  obtained from observing an event  $E$ , which is in some way connected with the random variable  $\zeta$ . If ( $P$  denotes the original (unconditional) distribution of the random variable  $\zeta$  and  $Q$  the conditional distribution of  $\zeta$  under the condition that the event  $E$  has taken place, we shall denote a measure of the amount of information concerning the random variable  $\zeta$  contained in the observation of the event  $E$  by  $I(Q|P)$ .” (In most subsequent literature,  $I(Q|P)$  has been changed to  $D(P|Q)$ .)

In this section, we are inspired by this interpretation to propose an operational meaning for Rényi divergence and Sibson mutual information for the whole range of  $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$  in the context of privacy. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time such interpretation is provided<sup>2</sup>.

By considering five postulates for the amount of information [30], Rényi proved that, the amount of information obtained about each  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  by a singleton observation  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$  is given by  $\log \frac{\delta_x^y}{\pi_x}$ . Accordingly, we propose a new gain function as an information gain, leading to a new leakage measure called *informative leakage*. By this definition, we quantify the information gain of each channel’s output  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$  according to its corresponding inner  $\delta^y$ . Interestingly, this definition of leakage satisfies axioms of information measure but is not given by separate prior and posterior vulnerabilities.

<sup>2</sup>We note that [35] made some progress in this direction and showed how Rényi divergence and Sibson mutual information can be interpreted as  $f$ -mean information gain measures. However, the current paper takes a more general approach and show how these measures fit within the proposed QIF generalized framework.

**Definition 8.** Let  $\mathcal{W}$  be the (uncountable infinite) set of all probability distributions  $w$  on  $\mathcal{X}$ . The pointwise information gain is defined as

$$\gamma(w, x) = \log \frac{w_x}{\pi_x}. \quad (44)$$

Then, for a given strictly monotonic and continuous functions  $\ell$ , the **generalized pointwise posterior leakage** is defined as

$$\mathcal{I}_{\ell, \gamma}(\pi, \delta^y) = \sup_w \ell^{-1} \left( \sum_x \delta_x^y \ell(\gamma(w, x)) \right). \quad (45)$$

In (45), we take the expectation w.r.t to  $\delta^y$  since  $w$  quantifies the information gain for each  $x$  after observation of  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ . Consequently, the **generalized average posterior leakage** is given by:

$$\mathcal{I}_{h, \ell, \gamma}(\pi, C) = h^{-1} \left( \sum_y p(y) h(\mathcal{I}_{\ell, \gamma}(\pi, \delta^y)) \right), \quad (46)$$

where  $h$  is strictly monotonic and continues to function. Since  $\mathcal{I}_{\ell, \gamma}(\pi, \delta^y)$  provides information leakage for each  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ , it is a proper candidate for the operational meaning of a class of privacy measures called pointwise measures. An example of pointwise measures is pointwise maximal leakage [23], which is an extension of maximal leakage that quantifies leakage for each  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$  and is given by:

$$\mathfrak{L}(X \rightarrow y) = \max_{x \in [\pi]} \frac{\delta_x^y}{\pi_x} = D_\infty(\delta_y \| \pi) = D_\infty(p_{X|y} \| \pi), \quad (47)$$

where  $D_\infty(\delta_y \| \pi)$  is Rényi divergence of order  $\infty$ . In [14], pointwise maximal leakage has been proposed in the  $U$  function framework; however, the authors also proved that this framework is equivalent to the  $g$ -leakage framework.

Here, we use informative leakage to propose the operational meaning of Rényi divergence and Sibson mutual information for a whole range of  $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$  for the first to the best of our knowledge. Then, pointwise maximal leakage is given as the special case of  $\alpha = \infty$ .

**Definition 9** (Pointwise  $\alpha$ -leakage). Let  $\ell_\alpha(t) = \exp(\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}t)$  with inverse  $\ell_\alpha^{-1}(s) = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log(s)$ . For each  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$  with inner  $\delta^y$  given by the hyper  $\Delta = [\pi, C]$ , pointwise  $\alpha$ -leakage is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{\ell_\alpha, \gamma}(\pi, \delta^y) &\triangleq \sup_w \ell_\alpha^{-1} \left( \sum_x \delta_x^y \ell_\alpha(\gamma(w, x)) \right) \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log \inf_w \sum_x \delta_x^y \left( \frac{w_x}{\pi_x} \right)^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}}, & \alpha \in [0, 1), \\ \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log \sup_w \sum_x \delta_x^y \left( \frac{w_x}{\pi_x} \right)^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}}, & \alpha \in [1, \infty]. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

**Theorem 7.** Pointwise  $\alpha$ -leakage is the Rényi divergence of order  $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$  between  $\delta^y$  and  $\pi$ :

$$\mathcal{I}_{\ell_\alpha, \gamma}(\pi, \delta^y) = \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log \sum_x (\delta_x^y)^\alpha \pi_x^{\alpha-1} = D_\alpha(\delta^y \| \pi). \quad (49)$$

*Proof.* In the similar vein with the proof of Theorem 6, both

optimizations in 48 are convex with solution:

$$w_x^* = \frac{(\delta_x^y)^\alpha / (\pi_x)^{\alpha-1}}{\sum_x (\delta_x^y)^\alpha / (\pi_x)^{\alpha-1}}. \quad (50)$$

By replacing  $w_x^*$  in (48), the result in (49) is achieved.  $\square$

**Proposition 9.** For  $h = \ell_\alpha$ , the generalized average of pointwise  $\alpha$ -leakage is Sibson mutual information:

$$\mathcal{I}_{\ell_\alpha, \ell_\alpha, \gamma}(\pi, C) = I_\alpha^S(X; Y) \quad (51)$$

*Proof.* We expand  $\mathcal{I}_{\ell_\alpha, \ell_\alpha, \gamma}(\pi, C)$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{\ell_\alpha, \ell_\alpha, \gamma}(\pi, C) &= \ell_\alpha^{-1} \left( \sum_y p(y) \ell_\alpha \left( \mathcal{I}_{\ell_\alpha, \gamma}(\pi, \delta^y) \right) \right) \\ &= \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log \left( \sum_y p(y) \left( \sum_x (\delta_x^y)^\alpha \pi_x^{\alpha-1} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \right) = I_\alpha^S(X; Y) \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. S. Alvim, K. Chatzikokolakis, C. Palamidessi, and G. Smith, "Measuring information leakage using generalized gain functions," in *Comput. Secur. Found. Symp.*, 2012, pp. 265–279.
- [2] M. S. Alvim, K. Chatzikokolakis, A. McIver, C. Morgan, C. Palamidessi, and G. Smith, "Additive and multiplicative notions of leakage, and their capacities," in *IEEE Computer Security Foundations Symposium*, 2014, pp. 308–322.
- [3] M. S. Alvim, K. Chatzikokolakis, A. McIver, C. Morgan, C. Palamidessi, and G. Smith, "Axioms for information leakage," in *IEEE Computer Security Foundations Symposium (CSF)*, 2016, pp. 77–92.
- [4] —, *The Science of Quantitative Information Flow*. Springer, 2020.
- [5] I. Issa, A. B. Wagner, and S. Kamath, "An operational approach to information leakage," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 66, no. 3, pp. 1625–1657, March 2020.
- [6] D. Clark, S. Hunt, and P. Malacaria, "Quantitative information flow, relations and polymorphic types," *Journal of Logic and Computation*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 181–199, 2005.
- [7] E. Arıkan, "An inequality on guessing and its application to sequential decoding," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 99–105, 1996.
- [8] G. Smith, "On the foundations of quantitative information flow," in *International Conference on Foundations of Software Science and Computational Structures*. Springer, 2009, pp. 288–302.
- [9] C. Dwork, F. McSherry, K. Nissim, and A. Smith, "Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis," in *Theory Cryptography*, S. Halevi and T. Rabin, Eds. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2006, pp. 265–284.
- [10] C. Dwork, "Differential privacy," in *Proc. 33rd Int. Colloq. Automata, Lang., Programming, part II (ICALP)*, ser. Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., vol. 4052. Springer Verlag, July 2006, pp. 1–12.
- [11] S. P. Kasiviswanathan, H. K. Lee, K. Nissim, S. Raskhodnikova, and A. Smith, "What can we learn privately?" *SIAM J. Comput.*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 793–826, 2011.
- [12] J. C. Duchi, M. I. Jordan, and M. J. Wainwright, "Local privacy and statistical minimax rates," in *IEEE Annu. Symp. Found. Comput. Sci.*, 2013, pp. 429–438.
- [13] N. Fernandes, A. McIver, and P. Sadeghi, "Explaining epsilon in differential privacy through the lens of information theory," 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2210.12916>
- [14] S. Saeidian, G. Cervia, T. J. Oechtering, and M. Skoglund, "Pointwise maximal leakage," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 69, no. 12, pp. 8054–8080, 2023.
- [15] S. Saeidian, L. Grosse, P. Sadeghi, M. Skoglund, and T. J. Oechtering, "Information density bounds for privacy," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.01167>
- [16] J. Liao, L. Sankar, O. Kosut, and F. P. Calmon, "Robustness of maximal  $\alpha$ -leakage to side information," in *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2019, pp. 642–646.
- [17] —, "Maximal  $\alpha$ -leakage and its properties," in *IEEE Conference on Communications and Network Security (CNS)*, 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [18] M. Diaz, H. Wang, F. P. Calmon, and L. Sankar, "On the robustness of information-theoretic privacy measures and mechanisms," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 66, no. 4, pp. 1949–1978, 2020.

- [19] A. Gilani, G. R. Kurri, O. Kosut, and L. Sankar, "An alphabet of leakage measures," in *IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*, 2022, pp. 458–463.
- [20] G. R. Kurri, L. Sankar, and O. Kosut, "An operational approach to information leakage via generalized gain functions," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, pp. 1–1, 2023.
- [21] A. Gilani, G. R. Kurri, O. Kosut, and L. Sankar, "Unifying privacy measures via maximal  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -leakage (mobel)," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 70, no. 6, pp. 4368–4395, 2024.
- [22] S. Saeidian, G. Cervia, T. J. Oechtering, and M. Skoglund, "Optimal maximal leakage-distortion tradeoff," in *IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*, 2021, pp. 1–6.
- [23] —, "Pointwise maximal leakage," in *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2022, pp. 626–631.
- [24] L. Grosse, S. Saeidian, and T. Oechtering, "Extremal mechanisms for pointwise maximal leakage," 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2310.07381>
- [25] S. Saeidian, G. Cervia, T. J. Oechtering, and M. Skoglund, "Pointwise maximal leakage on general alphabets," in *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2023, pp. 388–393.
- [26] L. Grosse, S. Saeidian, P. Sadeghi, T. J. Oechtering, and M. Skoglund, "Quantifying privacy via information density," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.12967>
- [27] N. Ding, M. A. Zarrabian, and P. Sadeghi, " $\alpha$ -information-theoretic privacy watchdog and optimal privatization scheme," in *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2021, pp. 2584–2589.
- [28] G. R. Kurri, M. Managoli, and V. M. Prabhakaran, "Maximal guesswork leakage," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.02585*, 2024.
- [29] J. Liao, O. Kosut, L. Sankar, and F. d. P. Calmon, "Tunable measures for information leakage and applications to privacy-utility tradeoffs," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 65, no. 12, pp. 8043–8066, 2019.
- [30] A. Rényi, "On measures of entropy and information," in *Proceedings of the Fourth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, Volume 1: Contributions to the Theory of Statistics*, vol. 4. University of California Press, 1961, pp. 547–562.
- [31] C. Braun, K. Chatzikokolakis, and C. Palamidessi, "Quantitative notions of leakage for one-try attacks," *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 249, pp. 75–91, 2009.
- [32] G. H. Hardy, J. E. Littlewood, and G. Pólya, *Inequalities*. Cambridge University Press, 1952.
- [33] N. Ding, M. A. Zarrabian, and P. Sadeghi, "A cross entropy interpretation of Rényi entropy for  $\alpha$ -leakage," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.00423*, 2024.
- [34] S. Arimoto, "Information measures and capacity of order  $\alpha$  for discrete memoryless channels," *Topics in Inf. Theory*, 1977.
- [35] N. Ding, M. A. Zarrabian, and P. Sadeghi, " $\alpha$ -leakage by Rényi divergence and sibson mutual information," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.00423*, 2024.

This figure "1.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/2409.04108v1>

This figure "2.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/2409.04108v1>