

Differentially Private Distribution Estimation Using Functional Approximation

Ye Tao

*Dept. of Electrical and Computer Engineering
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
Piscataway, USA
yt371@rutgers.edu*

Anand D. Sarwate

*Dept. of Electrical and Computer Engineering
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
Piscataway, USA
ads221@rutgers.edu*

Abstract—The cumulative distribution function (CDF) is fundamental due to its ability to reveal information about random variables, making it essential in studies that require privacy-preserving methods to protect sensitive data. This paper introduces a novel privacy-preserving CDF method inspired by the functional analysis and functional mechanism. Our approach projects the empirical CDF into a predefined space, approximating it using specific functions, and protects the coefficients to achieve a differentially private empirical CDF. Compared to existing methods like histogram queries and adaptive quantiles, our method is preferable in decentralized settings and scenarios where CDFs must be updated with newly collected data.

Index Terms—Differential privacy, cumulative distribution function approximation

I. INTRODUCTION

The cumulative distribution function (CDF) is a fundamental object in statistical analysis, playing a pivotal role in various statistical and machine learning applications. For example, in hypothesis testing, test statistics are compared to critical values derived from the CDF to make decisions about hypotheses. CDFs are also valuable in risk assessment and decision-making under uncertainty, as they provide a comprehensive view of the entire distribution of possible outcomes.

Given that the CDF reveals significant information about a random variable and provides insights into its behavior and characteristics through its shape and properties, it is common to produce an empirical CDF or CDF estimate based on measured data. To protect the privacy of sensitive observations, the CDF must be used or disclosed in a manner that preserves privacy. For example, many studies require privacy-preserving mean, median, or other quantiles of the data [1]–[4], which can be derived from the CDF, for downstream tasks. Additionally, the CDF can facilitate privacy-preserving visualization [5]–[14]. For instance, in boxplots or scatter plots, we can resample data from the CDF and use this new data to create privacy-preserving visualizations.

In prior work, the empirical cumulative distribution function (eCDF) is commonly used to estimate the true CDF. The Dvoretzky-Kiefer-Wolfowitz (DKW) inequality [15] provides

bounds on how closely the eCDF approximates the CDF from which samples are drawn. Several methods have been developed to obtain a privacy-preserving CDF using differential privacy. These include the naive approach, which involves adding noise to each data point, and a refined variation that uses smooth sensitivity [16] instead of relying on global sensitivity. Additionally, methods like histogram queries and adaptive quantiles have been introduced for CDF approximation [17].

We propose a novel method called polynomial projection (PP) for privacy-preserving CDF estimation that uses families of orthogonal polynomials common in functional analysis [18]–[21], together with the functional mechanism for differential privacy [22]. The main idea is to define an appropriate space and project the eCDF into this space, thereby approximating the eCDF similar to standard signal decomposition techniques. We then protect the coefficients of these functions to achieve a differentially private eCDF. We show that our method outperforms histogram queries and has comparable performance to adaptive quantiles. Notably, our approach is particularly suitable for decentralized settings as compared to these other methods. Furthermore, when updating the CDF with newly collected data, our method performs better than others, primarily because it does not require the use of old data, thereby conserving the privacy budget.

II. DIFFERENTIAL PRIVACY AND CDF ESTIMATION

Differential privacy (DP) has been developed to enable statistical analyses on datasets while preserving the privacy of individuals included in the data. It is defined in terms of neighboring databases; two sets are considered neighboring if they differ by a single entry.

Definition 1 ((ϵ, δ) -DP [23]). *Let $\epsilon, \delta \geq 0$, a randomized algorithm $M : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is (ϵ, δ) -differentially private if for all $Y \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$ and for all neighboring datasets $D, D' \in \mathcal{D}$,*

$$\mathbb{P}[M(D) \in Y] \leq e^\epsilon \mathbb{P}[M(D') \in Y] + \delta.$$

The parameter ϵ represents the privacy budget, where a smaller value offers stronger privacy but may result in less accurate responses. The parameter δ indicates the probability of information leakage. To design a (ϵ, δ) -DP algorithm that approximates a desired function $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, a common approach is to add random noise of appropriate magnitude to the

output of $f(D)$. For example, when $\epsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$, the Gaussian mechanism is defined as $M(D) = f(D) + \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 \cdot I)$, where $\sigma = \Delta \sqrt{2 \log(1.25/\delta)}/\epsilon$ and $\Delta = \max_{D \sim D'} \|f(D) - f(D')\|_2$ represents ℓ_2 sensitivity of function f . Although various mechanisms have been proposed [24]–[30], this work focuses on the widely used analytic Gaussian mechanism for simplicity.

Differential privacy has several properties that make it particularly useful in application. The composition property [23], [31]–[35] allows for a modular design of mechanisms: if each component of a mechanism is differentially private, then their composition also preserves differential privacy. The post-processing property ensures the safety of conducting arbitrary computations on the output of a differentially private mechanism, eliminating any risk of compromising the privacy protection provided by the mechanism.

In this work, we focus on the problem of estimating a cumulative distribution function from observations of a random variable. Accurate CDF estimation under privacy constraints is crucial in many applications, and several techniques have been developed to achieve this goal while preserving differential privacy. Two commonly employed methods for differentially private CDF estimation are Histogram Queries (HQ) and Adaptive Quantiles (AQ) [17]. Both of these methods fall under the category of output perturbation techniques, where noise is introduced to the output to ensure privacy.

Histogram Queries. The HQ method partitions the data into a fixed number of uniformly spaced bins. The number of observations in each bin is counted, and noise is added to protect the privacy of these counts. The resulting noisy histogram can be used to estimate the CDF in a differentially private manner. To enhance accuracy, post-processing is applied by setting any negative noisy counts to 0, ensuring the estimated CDF is non-decreasing and non-negative.

Adaptive Quantiles. The AQ method provides a more refined approach by leveraging known quantiles to guide the estimation process. Initially, a set of known quantiles $Q = \{0 : a, 1 : b\}$ is established, where a and b represent the lower and upper bounds of the data range. The method proceeds by selecting an initial value $x_0 = (a+b)/2$, counting the number of observations above and below x_0 , and adding noise to these counts to preserve privacy. The corresponding quantile q is then computed and stored as $Q[q] = x_0$. This process is iteratively repeated, with each new candidate x_i selected as the midpoint of the largest interval between known quantiles until the privacy budget is exhausted. Due to the noise added during the process, situations may arise where $x_1 > x_2$ but $q_1 < q_2$. Post-processing is necessary, and one approach is to reorder the x and q values.

Our proposed method is inspired by the functional mechanism [22] and concepts from functional analysis [18]. We aim to decompose the CDF and represent it using a set of predefined functions, similar to signal decomposition techniques in signal processing. Instead of adding noise directly to the counts, we protect the coefficients of these predefined functions. By leveraging the functional mechanism, we seek to

improve the accuracy and efficiency of CDF estimation under differential privacy.

III. POLYNOMIAL PROJECTION

Given a set of N independent and identically distributed variables, denoted as $x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_N$, where each x_n lies within the interval $[-1, 1]$ for $n = 1, 2, \dots, N$, the empirical cumulative distribution function (eCDF) is defined as $F(x) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{1}_{x_n \leq x}$.

Consider the polynomial space \mathcal{P} spanned by the first $K+1$ Legendre polynomials¹ $\{P_0, P_1, \dots, P_K\}$, where each P_k is of degree k . Let $e_k(x) = \sqrt{\frac{2k+1}{2}} P_k(x)$ be the k -th orthonormal basis function and $(F|e_k)$ be the coefficient of $e_k(x)$ in the Legendre expansion of the eCDF $F(x)$. To achieve a privacy-preserving eCDF, we need to protect the coefficients $(F|e_k)$ by adding noise to the moments of the variables $\mu_i = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N x_n^i$ for $i \in [1, K+1]$. Given that the ℓ_2 sensitivity of $\mu = [\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_{K+1}]^\top$ is $\Delta = \sqrt{\frac{5K+8}{2N^2}}$ (see Section A in Appendix), the following Gaussian mechanism achieves (ϵ, δ) -DP for $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$:

$$\tilde{F} = \sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \sum_{i=0}^k (\beta_{k,i} (1 - \mu_{i+1} - z_{i+1})) e_k(x),$$

where $Z = [z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{K+1}] \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)$ with σ^2 obtained from Algorithm 1 [30], $\alpha_k = 2^k \sqrt{\frac{2k+1}{2}}$, and $\beta_{k,i} = \frac{1}{i+1} \binom{k}{i} \binom{k+i-1}{2}$. To evaluate the noisy approximation \tilde{F} , Theorem 1 provides an upper bound for the distance between the true CDF F^* and \tilde{F} . Specifically, Theorem 1 states that if the polynomial space \mathcal{P} is an appropriate approximation space, meaning $\check{F} \in \mathcal{P}$ is a good representative of the true CDF, then the noisy approximation of the eCDF will also be close to the true CDF.

Theorem 1 (Upper Bound for $\|F^* - \tilde{F}\|_2$). *Let F^* be the true CDF for a random variable with $x \in [-1, 1]$. If \check{F} is the optimal approximation of F^* in the polynomial space \mathcal{P} and $\|F^* - \check{F}\|_2 \leq \alpha$, then with probability at least $1 - 2 \exp\left(-\frac{N(\eta-\alpha)^2}{16}\right) - 2(K+1) \exp\left(-\frac{(\eta-\alpha)^2}{4(K+1)^4 \sigma^2}\right)$, we have $\|F^* - \tilde{F}\|_2 \leq \eta$ for $\eta > \alpha > 0$.*

Proof. Let F^* be the true CDF of a random variable with support $x \in [-1, 1]$, then $F^* \in L_\infty[-1, 1]$ and $F^* \in L_2[-1, 1]$. Let \check{F} be the optimal approximation of F^* in the polynomial space \mathcal{P} assuming $\|F^* - \check{F}\|_2 \leq \alpha$ for some $\alpha > 0$. The upper bound for $\|F^* - \tilde{F}\|_2$ is then given by

$$\begin{aligned} \|F^* - \tilde{F}\|_2 &\leq \|F^* - F\|_2 + \|F - \hat{F}\|_2 + \|\hat{F} - \tilde{F}\|_2 \\ &\leq \|F^* - F\|_2 + \|F - \check{F}\|_2 + \|\hat{F} - \check{F}\|_2 \\ &\leq \|F^* - \check{F}\|_2 + 2\|F^* - F\|_2 + \|\hat{F} - \check{F}\|_2 \\ &\leq \alpha + 2\sqrt{2}\|F^* - F\|_\infty + \sqrt{2}\|\hat{F} - \check{F}\|_\infty. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

¹Other polynomial families were also considered in our work; however, Legendre polynomials offer the most straightforward approach for sensitivity computation within the differential privacy framework.

The first and third inequalities are due to the triangle inequality, the second inequality is based on Theorem 2, and the final inequality follows from $\|f\|_2 \leq \sqrt{2}\|f\|_\infty$. By leveraging the triangle inequality and the fact that \tilde{F} is the optimal approximation of the true distribution, we avoid directly computing the difference between \tilde{F} and \hat{F} . Using the boundedness of the Legendere polynomials, we obtain the following bound for $\|\hat{F} - \tilde{F}\|_\infty$ (see Section C in Appendix):

$$\|\hat{F} - \tilde{F}\|_\infty \leq \frac{(K+1)^2}{2} \max_{k \in [1, K+1]} |z_k|. \quad (2)$$

By combining (1) and (2), we obtain the following result:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\|F^* - \tilde{F}\|_2 > \eta) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}(\alpha + 2\sqrt{2}\|F^* - F\|_\infty + \sqrt{2}\|\hat{F} - \tilde{F}\|_\infty > \eta) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\|F^* - F\|_\infty > \frac{\eta - \alpha}{4\sqrt{2}}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\|\hat{F} - \tilde{F}\|_\infty > \frac{\eta - \alpha}{2\sqrt{2}}\right) \\ & \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{N(\eta - \alpha)^2}{16}\right) + 2(K+1) \exp\left(-\frac{(\eta - \alpha)^2}{4(K+1)^4\sigma^2}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The inequality in the last step is due to the DKW inequality [15] and an upper bound for the the maxima of subgaussian random variables [36]. \square

Remark 1. Equation (3) indicates that the difference between the DP eCDF and the true CDF is governed by two bounds. The first term in (3) represents the distance between the true CDF and the eCDF, while the second term represents the distance between the approximation of the eCDF and its noisy counterpart. As the number of data points N increases, the first term decreases due to the convergence of the eCDF to the true CDF. The second term also decreases because the noise required diminishes as the sensitivity Δ decreases. A larger number of polynomials K does not necessarily lead to a better result. While a higher K may improve the approximation of the eCDF, it also increases the noise due to a higher sensitivity. Based on experimental results, $K = 5, 6$ or 7 is recommended.

Similar to HQ and AQ methods discussed earlier, our approach also requires post-processing, as we cannot ensure that the obtained \hat{F} is monotonically non-decreasing. We employ isotonic regression [37] as the post-processing method.

IV. EXPERIMENTS

A. Comparison among Methods

To evaluate the performance of our method, we conducted experiments across various distributions. Initially, if the sample range is outside $[-1, 1]$, we scale the data to fit this range, e.g., if the data range is $[-b, b]$, each x_i is divided by b . To determine the bounds, we can either assume prior knowledge of the range or use DP techniques to estimate the bounds [9], [14], which would require additional privacy budget. After obtaining the DP eCDF, we reverse this scaling. Figure 1 and Figure D.1 illustrate a comparative example of our method alongside two others. The first column shows the HQ method, the second column illustrates the AQ method, and the last

column depicts our proposed method. With a small bin number in the HQ method, noticeable discrepancies are observed between the CDF approximation (green solid line) and the true CDF (gray solid line), even without perturbation. The AQ method yields the most accurate CDF approximation (blue solid line), but its privacy-preserving counterpart (blue dashed line) tends to focus on regions with the steepest slope, as this area corresponds to the greatest quantile variation. Our method effectively fits the true CDF, regardless of whether privacy protection is considered.

To quantitatively compare the performance of different methods, we assess the distance between the CDF and its noisy approximation using three measures: the Kolmogorov-Smirnov distance [38], the Earth Mover's distance [39], and the energy distance [40]. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov distance is the maximum difference between the two functions. In contrast, the Earth Mover's distance, defined as $W(F_1, F_2) = \int |F_1 - F_2|$, measures the integral of the absolute difference between the CDFs. The energy distance, defined as $E(F_1, F_2) = \sqrt{2 \int (F_1 - F_2)^2}$, penalizes larger deviations between the distributions more heavily. Figure 2 and Figure D.2 present the experimental results across various distributions. It's evident that the HQ method performs the worst. For a low privacy cost, such as $\epsilon = 0.1$, our method performs comparably to AQ and even outperforms AQ for certain distributions, such as the beta distribution. However, in the low privacy regime, particularly when ϵ is larger, like $\epsilon = 1$, the AQ method slightly outperforms ours.

In addition to its effectiveness in the high privacy regime (small ϵ), our method offers two additional non-trivial benefits. First, it is well-suited for decentralized settings. Suppose S sites collect sensitive data and send it to an untrusted central server for CDF computation. If the AQ method is used, the central server and each site will need to communicate back and forth multiple times. In contrast, both the HQ method and our proposed method require only a single operation: sending the noisy histogram or the noisy values of $\mu_i, i \in [1, K+1]$ from each site to the central server. Figure 3 (a) - (c), based on a real dataset, and Figure D.3, using synthetic data generated from various distributions, demonstrate that different methods are suitable for different distributions. In general, our proposed PP method outperform the other two in high privacy regime and can achieve competitive performance in low privacy regime. Considering the simplicity of the operations mentioned earlier, the PP method is a strong candidate for decentralized settings.

The second benefit of our method is its ability to easily update the CDF approximation with newly collected data. We simply compute the noisy $\frac{1}{N_{\text{new}}} \sum_{n=1}^{N_{\text{new}}} x_n^i$ for the new data and, using the noisy $\frac{1}{N_{\text{old}}} \sum_{n=1}^{N_{\text{old}}} x_n^i$ from the old data, perform a weighted average to update $\frac{1}{N_{\text{new}} + N_{\text{old}}} \sum_{n=1}^{N_{\text{old}} + N_{\text{new}}} x_n^i$. The AQ method, on the other hand, requires revisiting the old data to update the CDF approximation, thereby increasing the privacy cost. While the HQ method does not initially require accessing the old data, if a finer histogram with more bins is needed, the old data must be used again. Figure 3 (d) -




Fig. 1: Apply different methods with the Gaussian mechanism to normal distribution using the following parameters: $N = 10^4$, $\epsilon = 0.1$, $\delta = N^{-3/2}$, $K = 6$. The bin number for HQ is set to 30, and the number of iterations for AQ is 50.




Fig. 2: Comparison of distances between different DP CDF methods and the true CDF using various measurement methods: (a) Kolmogorov-Smirnov Distance; (b) Earth Mover's Distance; and (c) Energy Distance. The experiment was run 50 times with $N = 10^4$, $\delta = N^{-3/2}$, $K = 6$. The bin number in HQ was set to 30, and the number of iterations in AQ was 50.




Fig. 3: The experiment was run 50 times using a **real weight dataset** with $N = 25000$, $\delta = N^{-3/2}$, and $K = 6$. The bin number in HQ was set to 30, and the number of iterations in AQ was 50. Distances were computed between the final DP CDF and the true CDF. (a) - (c) Decentralized setting with 10 sites; (d) - (f) Newly collected data setting, where the CDF was updated after every 2500 new data points, for a total of 10 rounds of updates.

(f) and Figure D.4 demonstrate that our method consistently outperforms the other two methods across various ϵ values when incorporating newly collected data. Additionally, our method has further advantages: to reconstruct the DP CDF,

only 5, 6, or 7 values, depending on K , need to be stored, whereas HQ and AQ methods usually require storing more values depending on the bin or iteration number. Moreover, our method provides direct access to moments information without additional calculations.

B. Application in Visualization

The DP CDF is crucial for various applications, particularly in the emerging field of DP visualization [5], [11]–[14]. Boxplots are widely used in data analysis, but directly displaying them can reveal sensitive user information, such as the maximum and minimum values of a group. Therefore, incorporating privacy protection into boxplot visualization is essential. In this work, we propose two strategies to address this issue: (1) Construct the boxplot using five privacy-preserving key components, namely the minimum, the first quartile, the median, the third quartile, and the maximum. While obtaining differentially private quantiles is straightforward using the exponential mechanism (see Algorithm 2 in [41]), deriving differentially private extreme values is more challenging due to the inherent characteristics of differential privacy. To address this, we estimate the upper and lower bounds of the data and use these bounds to represent the extreme values. We employ the sparse vector technique [42] to obtain differentially private bounds. (2) Generate the boxplot using privacy-preserving samples derived from the differentially private CDF produced by our proposed PP method.

Figure 4 presents visualization results using these two strategies. The first boxplot displays the original data, the second boxplot is generated through resampling with the differentially private CDF method, and the third boxplot is constructed using five differentially private key components. Qualitatively, the resampling method more accurately approximates the original boxplot, as it better captures outlier patterns.




Fig. 4: The experiment was conducted with $N = 10^4$, $\epsilon = 1$ using data from a standard normal distribution.

V. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The main idea of our work involves projecting the CDF function into a predefined space and then applying differential privacy to protect the estimated CDF. The quality of the resulting noisy CDF is closely tied to the characteristics of the selected space. The space we have chosen may be particularly well-suited for certain standard distributions, such as the normal distribution. In future work, we can explore

alternative spaces, including the use of different polynomials or application of dictionary learning to identify optimal vector representations. Additionally, this approach could be extended to high-dimensional settings. Another area for future work is a thorough examination of the utility impact of post-processing, which has not been fully analyzed in our current study.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Dwork, “Differential privacy: A survey of results,” in *International conference on theory and applications of models of computation*. Springer, 2008, pp. 1–19.
- [2] C. Dwork and J. Lei, “Differential privacy and robust statistics,” in *Proceedings of the forty-first annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, 2009, pp. 371–380.
- [3] J. Gillenwater, M. Joseph, and A. Kulesza, “Differentially private quantiles,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 3713–3722.
- [4] H. Kaplan, S. Schnapp, and U. Stemmer, “Differentially private approximate quantiles,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2022, pp. 10 751–10 761.
- [5] D. Zhang, A. Sarvghad, and G. Miklau, “Investigating visual analysis of differentially private data,” *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 1786–1796, 2020.
- [6] H. B. Lee, “Visualization and differential privacy,” Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2017.
- [7] L. Panavas, T. Crnovrsanin, J. L. Adams, J. Ullman, A. Sargavad, M. Tory, and C. Dunne, “Investigating the Visual Utility of Differentially Private Scatterplots,” *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 2023.
- [8] D. Zhang, M. Hay, G. Miklau, and B. O’Connor, “Challenges of visualizing differentially private data,” *Theory and Practice of Differential Privacy*, vol. 2016, pp. 1–3, 2016.
- [9] A. Liu, L. Xia, A. Duchowski, R. Bailey, K. Holmqvist, and E. Jain, “Differential privacy for eye-tracking data,” in *Proceedings of the 11th ACM Symposium on Eye Tracking Research & Applications*, 2019, pp. 1–10.
- [10] B. Ghazi, J. He, K. Kohlhoff, R. Kumar, P. Manurangsi, V. Navalpakkam, and N. Valliappan, “Differentially private heatmaps,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 37, no. 6, 2023, pp. 7696–7704.
- [11] D. Avraam, R. Wilson, O. Butters, T. Burton, C. Nicolaides, E. Jones, A. Boyd, and P. Burton, “Privacy preserving data visualizations,” *EPJ Data Science*, vol. 10, no. 1, p. 2, 2021.
- [12] P. Nanayakkara, J. Bater, X. He, J. Hullman, and J. Rogers, “Visualizing privacy-utility trade-offs in differentially private data releases,” *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, vol. 2022, no. 2, pp. 601–618, 2022.
- [13] M. Budiu, P. Thaker, P. Gopalan, U. Wieder, and M. Zaharia, “Overlook: Differentially Private Exploratory Visualization for Big Data,” *Journal of Privacy and Confidentiality*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2022.
- [14] Y. Tao, A. D. Sarwate, S. Panta, S. Plis, and V. D. Calhoun, “Privacy-Preserving Visualization of Brain Functional Network Connectivity,” in *2024 IEEE International Symposium on Biomedical Imaging (ISBI)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 1–5.
- [15] A. Dvoretzky, J. Kiefer, and J. Wolfowitz, “Asymptotic minimax character of the sample distribution function and of the classical multinomial estimator,” *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pp. 642–669, 1956.
- [16] K. Nissim, S. Raskhodnikova, and A. Smith, “Smooth sensitivity and sampling in private data analysis,” in *Proceedings of the thirty-ninth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, 2007, pp. 75–84.
- [17] A. McKenna. Estimating a cumulative distribution function with differential privacy. [Online]. Available: <https://medium.com/sarus/estimating-a-cumulative-distribution-function-with-differential-privacy-54433fab45c7>
- [18] D. G. Luenberger, *Optimization by vector space methods*. John Wiley & Sons, 1997.
- [19] L. V. Kantorovich and G. P. Akilov, *Functional analysis*. Elsevier, 2014.
- [20] K. Yosida, *Functional analysis*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012, vol. 123.

- [21] F. Alda and B. Rubinstein, “The bernstein mechanism: Function release under differential privacy,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 31, no. 1, 2017.
- [22] J. Zhang, Z. Zhang, X. Xiao, Y. Yang, and M. Winslett, “Functional mechanism: Regression analysis under differential privacy,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1208.0219*, 2012.
- [23] C. Dwork, A. Roth *et al.*, “The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy,” *Foundations and Trends® in Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 9, no. 3–4, pp. 211–407, 2014.
- [24] F. McSherry and K. Talwar, “Mechanism design via differential privacy,” in *48th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS’07)*. IEEE, 2007, pp. 94–103.
- [25] Q. Geng and P. Viswanath, “The optimal mechanism in differential privacy,” in *2014 IEEE international symposium on information theory*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 2371–2375.
- [26] F. Liu, “Generalized gaussian mechanism for differential privacy,” *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 747–756, 2018.
- [27] W. Alghamdi, S. Asoodeh, F. P. Calmon, O. Kosut, L. Sankar, and F. Wei, “Cactus mechanisms: Optimal differential privacy mechanisms in the large-composition regime,” in *2022 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 1838–1843.
- [28] Q. Geng, P. Kairouz, S. Oh, and P. Viswanath, “The staircase mechanism in differential privacy,” *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 9, no. 7, pp. 1176–1184, 2015.
- [29] P. Kairouz, S. Oh, and P. Viswanath, “Extremal mechanisms for local differential privacy,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 27, 2014.
- [30] B. Balle and Y.-X. Wang, “Improving the gaussian mechanism for differential privacy: Analytical calibration and optimal denoising,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2018, pp. 394–403.
- [31] P. Kairouz, S. Oh, and P. Viswanath, “The composition theorem for differential privacy,” in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2015, pp. 1376–1385.
- [32] I. Mironov, “Rényi differential privacy,” in *2017 IEEE 30th computer security foundations symposium (CSF)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 263–275.
- [33] J. Dong, A. Roth, and W. J. Su, “Gaussian differential privacy,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.02383*, 2019.
- [34] S. Gopi, Y. T. Lee, and L. Wutschitz, “Numerical composition of differential privacy,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 34, pp. 11 631–11 642, 2021.
- [35] J. Murtagh and S. Vadhan, “The complexity of computing the optimal composition of differential privacy,” in *Theory of Cryptography Conference*. Springer, 2015, pp. 157–175.
- [36] M. J. Wainwright, *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*. Cambridge university press, 2019, vol. 48.
- [37] M. Lavine and A. Mockus, “A nonparametric bayes method for isotonic regression,” *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 235–248, 1995.
- [38] H. W. Lilliefors, “On the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for normality with mean and variance unknown,” *Journal of the American statistical Association*, vol. 62, no. 318, pp. 399–402, 1967.
- [39] Y. Rubner, C. Tomasi, and L. J. Guibas, “A metric for distributions with applications to image databases,” in *Sixth international conference on computer vision (IEEE Cat. No. 98CH36271)*. IEEE, 1998, pp. 59–66.
- [40] M. L. Rizzo and G. J. Székely, “Energy distance,” *wiley interdisciplinary reviews: Computational statistics*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 27–38, 2016.
- [41] A. Smith, “Privacy-preserving statistical estimation with optimal convergence rates,” in *Proceedings of the forty-third annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, 2011, pp. 813–822.
- [42] J. P. Near and C. Abua, “Programming differential privacy,” URL: <https://uvm>, 2021.

APPENDIX

A. Sensitivity of μ

Let $D = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i, \dots, x_N\}$ and $D' = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x'_i, \dots, x_N\}$, where D and D' differ only in the i -th element.

$$\begin{aligned} \mu - \mu' &= [\mu_1 - \mu'_1, \mu_2 - \mu'_2, \dots, \mu_{K+1} - \mu'_{K+1}]^\top \\ &= \left[\frac{x_i - x'_i}{N}, \frac{x_i^2 - x_i'^2}{N}, \dots, \frac{x_i^{K+1} - x_i'^{K+1}}{N} \right]^\top. \end{aligned}$$

Given that $x_i, x'_i \in [-1, 1]$, if K is even, then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mu - \mu'\|_2 &= \sqrt{\left(\frac{x_i - x'_i}{N}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{x_i^2 - x_i'^2}{N}\right)^2 + \dots + \left(\frac{x_i^{K+1} - x_i'^{K+1}}{N}\right)^2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\left(\frac{2}{N}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{1}{N}\right)^2 + \dots + \left(\frac{2}{N}\right)^2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{5K+8}{2N^2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarity, if K is odd, $\|\mu - \mu'\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\frac{5K+5}{2N^2}}$. Thus, the ℓ_2 sensitivity of μ is $\sqrt{\frac{5K+8}{2N^2}}$.

B. Approximation with Legendre polynomials

Theorem 2 (The Classical Projection Theorem [18]). *Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space and \mathcal{P} a closed subspace of \mathcal{H} . Corresponding to any vector $F \in \mathcal{H}$, there is a unique vector $\hat{F} \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\|F - \hat{F}\| \leq \|F - F_P\|$ for all $F_P \in \mathcal{P}$. Furthermore, a necessary and sufficient condition that $\hat{F} \in \mathcal{P}$ be the unique minimizing vector is that $F - \hat{F}$ be orthogonal to \mathcal{P} .*

In the Hilbert space $L_2[-1, 1]$, we define a polynomial space \mathcal{P} with the basis $\{P_0, P_1, \dots, P_K\}$, where each P_k is a Legendre polynomial of degree k over the interval $[-1, 1]$. This space \mathcal{P} is equipped with an inner product defined as $(f|g) = \int_{-1}^1 f(x)g(x)dx$ and a norm $\|f\|_2 = (\int_{-1}^1 f(x)^2 dx)^{1/2}$. The Legendre polynomials are orthogonal to each other. Since every finite-dimensional inner product space is a Hilbert space, and the Legendre polynomials $\{P_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ form a complete orthogonal sequence in $L_2[-1, 1]$, \mathcal{P} is a closed subspace of $L_2[-1, 1]$. Given that $\int_{-1}^1 |F(x)|^2 dx < \infty$, the eCDF $F(x)$ belongs to the $L_2[-1, 1]$ space. According to the projection theorem, we can identify a unique vector \hat{F} in the space \mathcal{P} , which is the optimal approximation of the eCDF, as demonstrated in Theorem 3.

Theorem 3 (Optimal Approximation of eCDF). *Consider the polynomial space \mathcal{P} spanned by the Legendre polynomials $\{P_0, P_1, \dots, P_K\}$, where each P_k is of degree k . The optimal approximation \hat{F} of the eCDF within \mathcal{P} is given by*

$$\hat{F}(x) = \sum_{k=0}^K (F|e_k) e_k(x) = \sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \sum_{i=0}^k (\beta_{k,i} (1 - \mu_{i+1})) e_k(x),$$

where $\alpha_k = 2^k \sqrt{\frac{2k+1}{2}}$, $\beta_{k,i} = \frac{1}{i+1} \binom{k}{i} \binom{k+i-1}{k}$, $\mu_{i+1} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N x_n^{i+1}$ represents mean of the $(i+1)$ -th moment of the data, and $e_k = \sqrt{\frac{2k+1}{2}} P_k$ is the orthonormal basis of \mathcal{P} .

Proof. Because \mathcal{P} is spanned by the Legendre polynomials $\{P_0, P_1, \dots, P_K\}$ and these polynomials are orthogonal to each other, the orthonormal basis of \mathcal{P} is given by

$$e_k(x) = \sqrt{\frac{2k+1}{2}} P_k(x) = \sqrt{\frac{2k+1}{2}} 2^k \sum_{i=0}^k x^i \binom{k}{i} \binom{k+i-1}{k}.$$

Using the Gram-Schmidt procedure, we get

$$\hat{F}(x) = \sum_{k=0}^K (F|e_k) e_k(x). \tag{4}$$

It is ensured that $\hat{F}(x)$ is the optimal approximation because for all $k' \in [0, K]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} ((F - \hat{F})|e_{k'}) &= \left(\left(F - \sum_{k=0}^K (F|e_k)e_k \right) \Big| e_{k'} \right) \\ &= (F|e_{k'}) - \sum_{k=0}^K (F|e_k) \cdot (e_k|e_{k'}) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

To solve (4), we need to find the coefficients $(F|e_k)$ which are given by

$$\begin{aligned} (F|e_k) &= \int_{-1}^1 F(x)e_k(x)dx \\ &= 2^k \sqrt{\frac{2k+1}{2}} \int_{-1}^1 F(x) \sum_{i=0}^k x^i \binom{k}{i} \binom{\frac{k+i-1}{2}}{k} dx \\ &= 2^k \sqrt{\frac{2k+1}{2}} \sum_{i=0}^k \left(\binom{k}{i} \binom{\frac{k+i-1}{2}}{k} \int_{-1}^1 F(x)x^i dx \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

For any nonnegative integer i , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{-1}^1 F(x)x^i dx \\ &= \int_{x_1}^{x_2} \frac{x^i}{N} dx + \int_{x_2}^{x_3} \frac{2x^i}{N} dx + \dots + \int_{x_N}^1 \frac{Nx^i}{N} dx \\ &= \frac{x_2^{i+1} - x_1^{i+1}}{N(i+1)} + \frac{2(x_3^{i+1} - x_2^{i+1})}{N(i+1)} + \dots + \frac{N(1 - x_N^{i+1})}{N(i+1)} \\ &= \frac{1}{i+1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N x_n^{i+1} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Substituting (6) into (5), we obtain

$$\hat{F}(x) = \sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \sum_{i=0}^k (\beta_{k,i}(1 - \mu_{i+1}))e_k(x).$$

□

C. Approximation bound for $\|\hat{F} - \tilde{F}\|_\infty$

The bound for $\|\hat{F} - \tilde{F}\|_\infty$ is

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\hat{F} - \tilde{F}\|_\infty \\ &= \left\| \sum_{k=0}^K \alpha_k \sum_{i=0}^k (\beta_{k,i} \cdot z_{i+1})e_k(x) \right\|_\infty \\ &= \left\| \sum_{k=0}^K 2^{k-1}(2k+1) \sum_{i=0}^k (\beta_{k,i} \cdot z_{i+1})P_k(x) \right\|_\infty \\ &\leq \left\| \max_{k \in [1, K+1]} |z_k| \cdot \sum_{k=0}^K 2^{k-1}(2k+1) \sum_{i=0}^k \binom{k}{i} \binom{\frac{k+i-1}{2}}{k} \right\|_\infty \\ &= \left\| \max_{k \in [1, K+1]} |z_k| \cdot \sum_{k=0}^K \left(k + \frac{1}{2}\right) \right\|_\infty \\ &= \frac{(K+1)^2}{2} \max_{k \in [1, K+1]} |z_k|. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

The inequality stems from the property of Legendre polynomials, where $|P_k(x)| \leq 1$ for all $x \in [-1, 1]$. The equality following the inequality is due to the fact that $P_k(1) = 2^k \sum_{i=0}^k \binom{k}{i} \binom{\frac{k+i-1}{2}}{k} = 1$.

D. Additional Details on Experimental Results

Additional experimental results are presented in Figure D.1, D.2, D.3 and D.4. We performed experiments across various distributions for a thorough comparison.




Fig. D.1: Apply different methods with the Gaussian mechanism to various distributions using the following parameters: $N = 10^4$, $\epsilon = 0.1$, $\delta = N^{-3/2}$, $K = 6$. The bin number for HQ is set to 30, and the number of iterations for AQ is 50.




Fig. D.2: Comparison of distances between different DP CDF methods and the true CDF using various measurement methods: (a)(d) Kolmogorov-Smirnov Distance; (b)(e) Earth Mover's Distance; and (c)(f) Energy Distance. The experiment was run 50 times on various distributions with $N = 10^4$, $\delta = N^{-3/2}$, $K = 6$. The bin number in HQ is set to 30, and the number of iterations in AQ is 50.




Fig. D.3: The experiment was run 50 times on decentralized setting with $N = 10^4$, $\delta = N^{-3/2}$, $K = 6$, and 10 sites. The bin number in HQ was set to 30, and the number of iterations in AQ was 50. Distances were computed between the final DP CDF and the true CDF.




Fig. D.4: The experiment was run 50 times with $N = 10^4$, $\delta = N^{-3/2}$, and $K = 6$. The CDF was updated after every 1000 new data points, for a total of 10 rounds of updates. The bin number in HQ was set to 30, and the number of iterations in AQ was 50. Distances were computed between the final DP CDF and the true CDF.