

On Rényi Differential Privacy in Statistics-Based Synthetic Data Generation

Takayuki Miura¹, Toshiki Shibahara¹, Masanobu Kii¹, Atsunori Ichikawa¹,
Juko Yamamoto¹, and Koji Chida²

¹ NTT Social Informatics Laboratories, Japan, tkyk.miura@ntt.com

² Gunma University, Faculty of Informatics, Japan

Abstract. Privacy protection with synthetic data generation often uses differentially private statistics and model parameters to quantitatively express theoretical security. However, these methods do not take into account privacy protection due to the randomness of data generation. In this paper, we theoretically evaluate Rényi differential privacy of the randomness in data generation of a synthetic data generation method that uses the mean vector and the covariance matrix of an original dataset. Specifically, for a fixed $\alpha > 1$, we show the condition of ε such that the synthetic data generation satisfies (α, ε) -Rényi differential privacy under a bounded neighboring condition and an unbounded neighboring condition, respectively. In particular, under the unbounded condition, when the size of the original dataset and synthetic dataset is 10 million, the mechanism satisfies $(4, 0.576)$ -Rényi differential privacy. We also show that when we translate it into the traditional (ε, δ) -differential privacy, the mechanism satisfies $(4.00, 10^{-10})$ -differential privacy.

Keywords: synthetic data generation · Rényi differential privacy · privacy protection

1 Introduction

Personal data is expected to be utilized in various fields such as finance, health-care, and medicine, but sharing personal data collected by one organization with another organization requires attention to individual privacy. Traditional anonymization techniques such as k -anonymization [40] and randomized response [43] have struggled to find a good trade-off between utility and privacy for high-dimensional data [2]. In contrast, a synthetic data generation technique has emerged as a privacy protection method that preserves data utility even for high-dimensional data such as images and tabular data with multi-attributes [6]. In synthetic data generation, values, which we call **generative parameters**, are extracted from the original raw dataset, and then synthetic data are generated randomly as shown in Fig. 1(a). The synthetic data are the same format as the original data and statistically similar to them. Typical generative parameters are statistics of original data and trained parameters of deep neural




Fig. 1. (a) Output = Only synthetic data: The generative parameters are discarded after data are generated. We evaluate privacy protection by the randomness in generation. (b) Output = Generative parameters: By computing or training generative parameters with intentional randomness, we obtain differentially private generative parameters that also generate differentially private synthetic data.

networks [5, 15, 17, 24, 26, 30, 36, 38, 44–46]. After the synthetic data are generated, they are shared with other organizations, but the generative parameters are typically discarded without being disclosed.

To guarantee privacy protection theoretically, differential privacy [11] is used as a standard framework. By adding randomness in generative parameter calculation, the generative parameters become differentially private [1, 29, 45]. The post-processing property of differential privacy guarantees that synthetic data generated with differentially private generative parameters also satisfy differential privacy as shown in Fig. 1(b). Although the synthetic data generated with non-differentially private generative parameters have high utility, those with differentially private parameters are known to have lower utility [41].

We address this problem by evaluating differential privacy of randomness in data generation when using non-differentially private generative parameters. As mentioned above, in the context of anonymization, the generative parameters are often discarded without disclosing them to the public. When the output is not generative parameters but only synthetic data, we can consider that it has already been protected by the randomness even if the generative parameters are not protected with differential privacy as shown in Fig. 1(a). If privacy protection in data generation is quantitatively evaluated, theoretically guaranteed synthetic data can be obtained without degrading the utility. Moreover, by incorporating this result into traditional methods, we expect to keep the same level of secu-

ity with smaller additional randomness; that is, we can obtain higher utility synthetic data.

In this paper, we regard a record as a d -dimensional vector and focus on a synthetic data generation mechanism with the mean vector and the covariance matrix of the original dataset shown in Fig. 2. We theoretically evaluate Rényi differential privacy [34], which is a relaxed concept of differential privacy, by randomness in generation for the method. We explicitly derive the condition of ε such that the synthetic data generation mechanism satisfies (α, ε) -Rényi differential privacy for a fixed $\alpha > 1$ under the unbounded neighboring condition (Theorem 3.1) and the bounded neighboring condition (Corollary 3.2). Furthermore, we conduct a numerical evaluation with reference to the Adult dataset [9] and compute ε concretely. We demonstrate that when the size of original dataset is 10 million and the mechanism outputs data the same size as the input dataset, it satisfies $(4, 0.576)$ -Rényi differential privacy under the unbounded condition and $(4, 2.307)$ -Rényi differential privacy under the bounded condition (Table 1). If they are translated into the traditional (ε, δ) -differential privacy, the mechanism satisfies $(4.00, 10^{-10})$ and $(7.88, 10^{-10})$ differential privacy under the unbounded and bounded condition, respectively (Table 2). These values are mostly similar to ones used by Apple [4] and US Census [42].

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we introduce basic notations and concepts for later discussion.

2.1 Notations

In this paper, we denote the determinant of a square matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ by $|A| := \det A$. The transposes of a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d_2}$ are denoted by ${}^t x$ and ${}^t A$. We assume that datasets are tabular but all discussions can be applied to other datasets such as images since we consider records as vectors. In a tabular dataset, a record is expressed as a combination of several attribution values. Each attribution value is a numerical value and normalized into a range $[-1, 1]$. Thus, a record is regarded as a vector $x \in [-1, 1]^d$, and a dataset with n records is regarded as $D = \{x_i\}_{i=1, \dots, n} \in [-1, 1]^{d \times n} =: \mathcal{D}$.

2.2 Differential Privacy

In this subsection, we introduce (ε, δ) -differential privacy and (α, ε) -Rényi differential privacy. First, we define neighboring datasets.

Definition 2.1 (Neighboring datasets) *Datasets $D, D' \in \mathcal{D}$ are **neighboring datasets** if D and D' are different only in one record. When datasets have a fixed size n , we call the neighboring condition a **bounded condition** [23]. In this case, neighboring means changing the value of exactly one record. When datasets*

have no such restriction, we call the neighboring condition an **unbounded condition** [23]. In this case, neighboring means either adding or removing one record.³

(ε, δ) -differential privacy [11] is defined as follows.

Definition 2.2 (differential privacy [11]) A randomized function $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ satisfies (ε, δ) -differential privacy $((\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DP) if for any neighboring $D, D' \in \mathcal{D}$ and $S \subset \mathcal{Y}$

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

In particular, \mathcal{M} satisfies ε -DP if it satisfies $(\varepsilon, 0)$ -DP.

Next, we define Rényi divergence, which is necessary to define Rényi differential privacy.

Definition 2.3 (Rényi Divergence) Let P, Q be probability distributions on \mathbb{R}^d . For $\alpha > 1$, the **Rényi Divergence** of order α is

$$D_\alpha(P||Q) := \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} P(x)^\alpha Q(x)^{1-\alpha} dx \right).$$

Definition 2.4 (Rényi differential privacy [34]) For $\alpha > 1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, a randomized function $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfies (α, ε) -**Rényi differential privacy** $((\alpha, \varepsilon)$ -RDP) if for neighboring datasets $D, D' \in \mathcal{D}$,

$$D_\alpha(\mathcal{M}(D)||\mathcal{M}(D')) \leq \varepsilon.$$

The smaller ε is, the stronger the protection, and the larger α is, the stronger the protection. To satisfy (α, ε) -RDP for any α is equivalent to ε -DP.

The composition theorem [12, 22] holds for Rényi differential privacy as well as (ε, δ) -DP. Furthermore, Rényi differential privacy can be translated into (ε, δ) -DP.

Proposition 2.5 (Composition of Rényi differential privacy [34]) Let $\mathcal{M}_1 : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$ be (α, ε_1) -RDP and $\mathcal{M}_2 : \mathcal{D} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$ (α, ε_2) -RDP. Then the mechanism $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$ defined as $\mathcal{M}(D) = (\mathcal{M}_1(D), \mathcal{M}_2(D, \mathcal{M}_1(D)))$ satisfies $(\alpha, \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2)$ -RDP.

Proposition 2.6 (Translation from (α, ε) -RDP to (ε, δ) -DP [34]) If \mathcal{M} is an (α, ε) -RDP mechanism, it also satisfies $(\varepsilon + \frac{\log \frac{1}{\delta}}{\alpha - 1}, \delta)$ -DP for any $0 < \delta < 1$.

By the following lemma, the result with the unbounded condition can be reduced to the bounded condition.

Lemma 2.7 (Weak triangle inequality [34]) Let P, Q, R be probability distributions on \mathbb{R}^d . For $\alpha > 1$ and $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$, it holds

$$D_\alpha(P||Q) \leq \frac{\alpha - \frac{1}{p}}{\alpha - 1} D_{p\alpha}(P||R) + D_{q(\alpha - \frac{1}{p})}(R||Q).$$

³ This difference is important for the sensitivity of queries. For example, the sensitivity of the mean value query under the bounded condition is twice as large as that under the unbounded condition.




Fig. 2. Synthetic data generation algorithms \mathcal{M}_G and \mathcal{M}_G^n

2.3 Synthetic Data Generation with Mean Vector and Covariance Matrix

In this paper, we focus on a simple synthetic data generation with the mean vector and the covariance matrix of the original dataset $\mathcal{M}_G : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow [-1, 1]^d$ as shown in Fig. 2. This method is identical to the Gaussian copula [38] with the assumption that the marginal distributions are all normal distributions.

The mechanism \mathcal{M}_G generates synthetic data as follows. First, for dataset $D = \{x_i\}_{i=1, \dots, n} \in \mathcal{D}$, the mean vector $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and the covariance matrix $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ are computed:

$$\mu := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i, \quad \Sigma := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x^t x - \mu^t \mu.$$

Next, a sample is drawn from a multivariate normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$, and its values are cut into the range $[-1, 1]^d$.

We denote by $\mathcal{M}_G^n : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow [-1, 1]^{d \times n}$ the mechanism that simultaneously outputs n records by \mathcal{M}_G . By Proposition 2.5, we see that if \mathcal{M}_G satisfies (α, ε) -RDP, then \mathcal{M}_G^n also satisfies $(\alpha, n\varepsilon)$ -RDP.

2.4 Properties of Symmetric Matrices

We explain properties of symmetric matrices for the proof of the main theorem.

Definition 2.8 (symmetric matrix) *A square matrix A is called **symmetric** if $A = {}^t A$ holds.*

Definition 2.9 (positive-definite, semi-positive definite) *For a d -dimensional symmetric matrix A , the following two conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) *For all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$, it holds ${}^t x A x > 0$ (≥ 0);*

(2) All eigenvalues of A are positive (non-negative).

If A satisfies these conditions, then A is called **positive-definite** (**positive semi-definite**).

The following two lemmas are well-known facts [18].

Lemma 2.10 *Let A, B be positive-definite symmetric matrices. If AB is symmetric, then AB is also positive-definite.*

Lemma 2.11 *Let A be a positive-definite symmetric matrix. For an invertible matrix S that is the same size as A , tSAS is also positive-definite.*

Proposition 2.12 *Let A, B, C be positive-definite symmetric real matrices. If ABC is symmetric, then ABC is also positive-definite.*

Proof. Set $D := ABC = CBA$. Since C is positive-definite, we can obtain the spectral decomposition $C := \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \theta_i {}^t \theta_i$, where $\lambda_i > 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, d$. Then we set $S := \sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{\lambda_i} \theta_i {}^t \theta_i$. We see that S is symmetric and $C = S^2$ holds. We have

$$S^{-1}DS^{-1} = S^{-1}AS^{-1}SBS = SBSS^{-1}AS^{-1}.$$

By applying $S^{-1}AS^{-1}$ and SBS to Lemma 2.10 and Lemma 2.11, we see that $S^{-1}DS^{-1}$ is positive-definite. Thus, D is also positive-definite.

3 Main Theorem

In this paper, we prove the upper bound of ε such that the mechanism \mathcal{M}_G satisfies (α, ε) -Rényi differential privacy for a fixed α . We assume that all datasets have a limitation for the minimum eigenvalue of their covariance matrices. Specifically, for a fixed $\sigma > 0$, we define the set of datasets as

$$\mathcal{D}_\sigma := \{D \in [-1, 1]^{n \times d} \mid z \in S^{d-1}, {}^t z \Sigma_D z \geq \sigma\}.$$

We also set $\tau := \frac{4d}{\sigma}$.

First, the result under the unbounded condition is the following theorem. We assume that the number of records in an original dataset is n and that in its neighboring dataset is $n + 1$.

Theorem 3.1 *Under the unbounded condition, let $\alpha > 1$. We assume that*

$$\frac{n}{n+1} < \tau, \quad \alpha < \min \left\{ n+1, \frac{n^2}{\tau(n+1)-n} \right\}. \quad (1)$$

Then, the synthetic data generation mechanism \mathcal{M}_G satisfies $(\alpha, \varepsilon_\alpha)$ -RDP for $\varepsilon_\alpha := \max\{\varepsilon_{\alpha 1}, \varepsilon_{\alpha 2}\}$. Here,

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{\alpha 1} = & \frac{\alpha}{2} \cdot \frac{\tau}{(n+1)(n+1-\alpha)} + \frac{\alpha d}{2(\alpha-1)} \log \frac{n}{n+1} - \frac{d}{2(\alpha-1)} \log \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{n+1} \right) \\ & - \frac{1}{2(\alpha-1)} \log \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1 + \alpha \frac{n\tau}{(n+1)(n+1-\alpha)}}{(1 + \frac{\tau}{n+1})^\alpha} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{\alpha 2} = & \frac{\alpha}{2} \cdot \frac{\tau}{n(n+\alpha) - \alpha(n+1)\tau} + \frac{\alpha d}{2(\alpha-1)} \log \frac{n+1}{n} - \frac{d}{2(\alpha-1)} \log \left(1 + \frac{\alpha}{n}\right) \\ & - \frac{1}{2(\alpha-1)} \log \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1 - \frac{\alpha(n+1)\tau}{(n+\alpha)n}}{(1 - \frac{\tau}{n})^\alpha} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, under the bounded condition, we obtain the following statement as a corollary of Theorem 3.1.

Corollary 3.2 *Under the bounded condition, let $\alpha > 1$. We set*

$$c := \min \left\{ n+1, \frac{n^2}{\tau(n+1) - n} \right\}$$

and assume that

$$\alpha < \frac{c^2}{2c-1}. \quad (2)$$

Then, the synthetic data generation mechanism \mathcal{M}_G satisfies $(\alpha, \varepsilon_\alpha)$ -RDP for the following ε :

$$\varepsilon_\alpha = \inf_{\frac{c-1}{c-\alpha} < p < \frac{c}{\alpha}} \frac{\alpha - \frac{1}{p}}{\alpha - 1} \varepsilon(p\alpha, n) + \varepsilon\left(\frac{p\alpha - 1}{p - 1}, n + 1\right), \quad (3)$$

where $\varepsilon(\alpha, n)$ is the ε in Theorem 3.1.

Proof. For any neighboring datasets D_1, D_2 under the bounded condition, there exists a dataset D_3 such that D_1 and D_3 are neighboring and D_2 and D_3 are neighboring under the unbounded condition. Then, to obtain Equation (3), we use Lemma 2.7. Here, the weak triangle inequality holds for all $p > 1$, and the following condition is necessary:

$$\max \left\{ p\alpha, \frac{p\alpha - 1}{p - 1} \right\} < c.$$

This is equivalent to

$$\frac{c-1}{c-\alpha} < p < \frac{c}{\alpha}.$$

The existence of p is equivalent to Equation (2).

4 Proof of Theorem 3.1

In this section, we prove Theorem 3.1. The following proposition is essential.

Proposition 4.1 (Gil et al. [16]) *Let $\alpha > 1$ and $\mathcal{N}(\mu_1, \Sigma_1)$, $\mathcal{N}(\mu_2, \Sigma_2)$ be multivariate normal distributions. If a matrix*

$$T_\alpha := \alpha \Sigma_1^{-1} + (1 - \alpha) \Sigma_2^{-1}$$

is positive-definite, then it holds

$$\begin{aligned} & D_\alpha(\mathcal{N}(\mu_1, \Sigma_1) || \mathcal{N}(\mu_2, \Sigma_2)) \\ &= \frac{\alpha}{2} {}^t(\mu_1 - \mu_2) \Sigma_\alpha^{-1} (\mu_1 - \mu_2) - \frac{1}{2(\alpha - 1)} \log \frac{|\Sigma_\alpha|}{|\Sigma_1|^{1-\alpha} |\Sigma_2|^\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Sigma_\alpha := (1 - \alpha) \Sigma_1 + \alpha \Sigma_2$.

For neighboring datasets $D_1, D_2 \in \mathcal{D}_\sigma$, we set the mean vectors as μ_1, μ_2 and the covariance matrices as Σ_1, Σ_2 . If $D_\alpha(\mathcal{N}(\mu_1, \Sigma_1) || \mathcal{N}(\mu_2, \Sigma_2)) \leq \varepsilon$, the mechanism \mathcal{M}_G satisfies (α, ε) -RDP. Here we set

$$L_1 := {}^t(\mu_1 - \mu_2) \Sigma_\alpha^{-1} (\mu_1 - \mu_2), \quad L_2 := \frac{|\Sigma_\alpha|}{|\Sigma_1|^{1-\alpha} |\Sigma_2|^\alpha}.$$

Then we see

$$D_\alpha(\mathcal{N}(\mu_1, \Sigma_1) || \mathcal{N}(\mu_2, \Sigma_2)) = \frac{\alpha}{2} L_1 - \frac{1}{2(\alpha - 1)} \log L_2.$$

Thus, an upper bound ε is described by the maximum of L_1 and the minimum of L_2 . The outline of proof is as follows. First, by using the different record, we represent the difference between mean vectors and the difference between covariance matrices (Lemma 4.2). Next, we determine the positive-definiteness of T_α (Lemma 4.3). Finally, we compute the upper bound of L_1 (Lemma 4.4) and the lower bound of L_2 (Lemma 4.5).

Set $\#D_1 = n$ and $\#D_2 = n + s$, where $s = 1$ when we "add" a record and $s = -1$ when we "remove" a record. The common records are denoted by $x_1, \dots, x_n \in [-1, 1]^d$ and the different record by $x \in [-1, 1]^d$. We set each mean vector as μ_1, μ_2 and covariance matrix as Σ_1, Σ_2 . We also denote by σ_{min} the minimum eigenvalue of Σ_1 . Note that $\sigma_{min} \geq \sigma$ by the assumption.

Lemma 4.2 (Representations of difference) *The following equations hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_d &:= \mu_2 - \mu_1 = \frac{s}{n+s} x - \frac{s}{n(n+s)} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i, \\ X &:= \Sigma_2 - \frac{n}{n+s} \Sigma_1 = \frac{ns}{(n+s)^2} (x - \mu_1) {}^t(x - \mu_1). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. It is easily shown by calculation.

The rank of X is one. X is semi-positive definite when $s = 1$ and semi-negative definite when $s = -1$.

Lemma 4.3 (Positive-definiteness of T_α) *If the following two inequalities hold, T_α is positive-definite:*

$$\frac{n-1}{n} < \tau, \quad \alpha < \min \left\{ n+1, \frac{(n-1)^2}{\tau n - (n-1)} \right\}. \quad (4)$$

Proof. Since $T_\alpha = \Sigma_1 \Sigma_\alpha \Sigma_2 = \Sigma_2 \Sigma_\alpha \Sigma_1$, by Lemma 2.12, the positive-definiteness of T_α is reduced to the positive-definiteness of Σ_α . By Lemma 4.2, we have

$$\Sigma_\alpha = (1-\alpha)\Sigma_1 + \alpha \left(\frac{n}{n+s}\Sigma_1 + X \right) = \left(1 - \frac{s\alpha}{n+s} \right) \Sigma_1 + \alpha X.$$

When $s = 1$, since Σ_1 is positive-definite and X is semi-positive definite, it is enough to be $\alpha < n+1$. We consider the case when $s = -1$. For an arbitrary vector $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ whose norm is one, we seek a condition where the minimum of ${}^t z \Sigma_\alpha z$ is positive. Here we can consider that the vector $x - \mu_1$ is contained in a ball with a radius $2\sqrt{d}$. Thus, we obtain the minimum when the following two conditions hold:

- z is parallel to the eigenvector of the minimum eigenvalue σ_{min} of Σ_1 ;
- $x - \mu_1$ is parallel to z .

Hence we see that Σ_α is positive-definite if

$$\begin{aligned} {}^t z \Sigma_\alpha z &= \left(1 + \frac{\alpha}{n-1} \right) \sigma_{min} - \alpha \frac{n}{(n-1)^2} 4d \\ &= \sigma_{min} - \alpha \cdot \frac{4dn - (n-1)\sigma_{min}}{(n-1)^2} \\ &\geq \sigma - \alpha \cdot \frac{4dn - (n-1)\sigma}{(n-1)^2} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

When the inequalities in Equation (4) hold, this inequality also holds.

Lemma 4.4 (Upper bound of L_1) *If $s = 1$, then we have*

$$L_1 \leq \frac{\tau}{(n+1)(n+1-\alpha)},$$

and if $s = -1$, then we have

$$L_1 \leq \frac{\tau}{(n-1)(n-1+\alpha) - \alpha n \tau}.$$

Proof. Now μ_d is contained in a ball with a radius $\frac{2\sqrt{d}}{n+s}$ by Lemma 4.2 and Σ_α is positive-definite by Lemma 4.3. By multiplying the reciprocal of the minimum of ${}^t z \Sigma_\alpha z$ for a unit vector $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ by $\frac{4d}{(n+s)^2}$, we can obtain the maximum of ${}^t \mu_d \Sigma_\alpha^{-1} \mu_d$. Here, we see

$${}^t z \Sigma_\alpha z = {}^t z \left(1 - \frac{s\alpha}{n+s} \right) \Sigma_1 z + \frac{s\alpha n}{(n+s)^2} ({}^t z (x - \mu_1))^2.$$

Hence when $s = 1$, the minimum is

$$\left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{n+1}\right) \sigma_{min}.$$

When $s = -1$, since $x - \mu_1$ is contained in a ball with a radius $2\sqrt{d}$, the minimum is

$$\left(1 + \frac{\alpha}{n-1}\right) \sigma_{min} - \frac{\alpha n}{(n-1)^2} \cdot 4d.$$

Thus, we obtain the inequality.

Lemma 4.5 (Lower bound of L_2) *It holds*

$$L_2 \geq \frac{\left(1 - \frac{s\alpha}{n+s}\right)^d}{\left(\frac{n}{n+s}\right)^{\alpha d}} \cdot \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1 + \frac{\alpha n s \tau}{(n+s-s\alpha)(n+s)}}{\left(1 + \frac{s\tau}{n+s}\right)^\alpha} \right\}.$$

Proof. We see that

$$L_2 := \frac{|(1 - \frac{s\alpha}{n+s})\Sigma_1 + \alpha X|}{|\Sigma_1|^{1-\alpha} |\frac{n}{n+s}\Sigma_1 + X|^\alpha} = \frac{\left(1 - \frac{s\alpha}{n+s}\right)^d |I + \frac{n+s}{n+s-s\alpha} \alpha \Sigma_1^{-1} X|}{\left(\frac{n}{n+s}\right)^{\alpha d} |I + \frac{n+s}{n} \Sigma_1^{-1} X|^\alpha}.$$

Since the rank of X is one and Σ_1^{-1} is invertible, the rank of $\Sigma_1^{-1}X$ is also one. Thus, there is only one non-zero eigenvalue, and it is set as λ . We also set $A := \left(1 - \frac{s\alpha}{n+s}\right)^d / \left(\frac{n}{n+s}\right)^{\alpha d}$. Since the other eigenvalues are all zero, we see

$$L_2 = \frac{1 + \frac{n+s}{n+s-s\alpha} \alpha \lambda}{\left(1 + \frac{n+s}{n} \lambda\right)^\alpha} \cdot A.$$

By differentiating this equation with respect to λ , we obtain

$$\frac{\partial L_2}{\partial \lambda} = \alpha(\alpha - 1) \frac{n+s}{n(n+s-s\alpha)} \cdot \frac{s - (n+s)\lambda}{\left(1 + \frac{n+s}{n} \lambda\right)^{\alpha+1}} \cdot A.$$

We see that $\frac{\partial L_2}{\partial \lambda} > 0$ when $\frac{s}{n+s} < \lambda$ and $\frac{\partial L_2}{\partial \lambda} < 0$ when $\frac{s}{n+s} > \lambda$. Hence the minimum of L_2 is obtained at the edges of the range of λ .

Next, we will find the range of λ , which is the only one non-zero eigenvalue of $\Sigma_1^{-1}X$. Since Σ_1 is positive-definite, we can obtain the spectral decomposition of Σ_1 :

$$\Sigma_1 = \sum_{i=1}^d \sigma_i p_i p_i^t,$$

where $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_d$ are the eigenvalues of Σ_1 and p_1, \dots, p_d are their eigenvectors whose norms are one. Since p_1, \dots, p_d is a basis of \mathbb{R}^d , there exist $r_1, \dots, r_d \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$x - \mu_1 = \sum_{i=1}^d r_i p_i.$$

Squaring both sides, we obtain a condition $4d \geq \sum_{i=1}^d r_i^2 > 0$. Set $e_1 := \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{r_i}{\sigma_i} p_i$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_1^{-1} X e_1 &= \Sigma_1^{-1} \frac{ns}{(n+s)^2} \sum_{i=1}^d r_i p_i ((x - \mu_1) \cdot e_1) \\ &= \frac{ns}{(n+s)^2} ((x - \mu_1) \cdot e_1) e_1 \\ &= \frac{ns}{(n+s)^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \frac{r_i^2}{\sigma_i} \right) e_1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have $\lambda = \frac{ns}{(n+s)^2} \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{r_i^2}{\sigma_i}$. Therefore, we have $0 < \lambda \leq \frac{4dn}{(n+1)^2 \sigma_{min}} \leq \frac{4dn}{(n+1)^2 \sigma}$ when $s = 1$, and $-\frac{4dn}{(n-1)^2 \sigma} \leq -\frac{4dn}{(n-1)^2 \sigma_{min}} \leq \lambda < 0$ when $s = -1$.

5 Numerical Evaluations

In Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.2, we obtain the concrete upper bounds. Thus, in this section, we compute the value ε concretely and observe the results.

5.1 Setting of Numerical Parameters

We set $d = 6$, $\sigma = 0.01$ since the number of numerical attributions in Adult Dataset [9] is six and the minimum eigenvalue for the data normalized into $[-1, 1]$ is $\sigma_{min} = 0.01$.

5.2 Relation between α and ε

The relations between α and ε are shown in Fig. 3 (α - ε curves). For all curves, ε is monotonically increasing with respect to α . We also see that as n increases exponentially, ε becomes smaller at equal intervals on a logarithmic scale. In particular, if $n = 10^4$, the condition in Equation (1) is

$$\alpha < c := \min \left\{ n + 1, \frac{n^2}{\tau(n+1) - n} \right\} \doteq 4.1679$$

and the condition in Equation (2) is

$$\alpha < \frac{c^2}{2c - 1} \doteq 2.3680.$$

Thus, the curves stop at these values.




Fig. 3. α - ε curve ($d = 6$, $\sigma = 0.01$) : Vertical axis is logarithmic scale. The curves are drawn for each of the four sample sizes n .

Table 1. Values of ε in the case that input and output are the same size n . ($\alpha = 4$, $d = 6$, $\sigma = 0.01$)

n	10^4	10^5	10^6	10^7
Unbounded ε	3535.17	62.5859	5.8064	0.5764
Bounded ε	-	266.7349	23.3577	2.3071

5.3 The Case Input and Output are the Same Sizes

For $\alpha = 4$, the values of ε for which the mechanism \mathcal{M}_G^n satisfies (α, ε) -RDP are shown in Table 1. By the composition theorem in Proposition 2.5, the values of ε are ones in Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.2 multiplied by n . We can show that values of ε are within a practical range when $n \geq 10^6$ under both conditions. In particular, under the unbounded condition, $\varepsilon = 0.5764$ when $n = 10^7$, which is very small. We also see that ε 's under the unbounded condition are four times larger than those under the bounded condition.

5.4 Translation into (ε, δ) -DP

By Proposition 2.6, we see that (α, ε) -RDP can be translated into (ε, δ) -DP.

The values translated into (ε, δ) -DP under the unbounded condition are shown in Table 2. When $\delta = 0.01$, we see that $\varepsilon = 7.341$ for $n = 10^6$ and $\varepsilon = 1.777$ for $n = 10^7$. When $\delta = 10^{-10}$, we also see that $\varepsilon = 13.482$ for $n = 10^6$ and $\varepsilon = 4.001$ for $n = 10^7$. These values are reasonable [4, 42].

The results under the bounded condition are shown in Table 2. When $\delta = 0.01$, we see that $\varepsilon = 16.209$ for $n = 10^6$ and $\varepsilon = 3.842$ for $n = 10^7$. When $\delta = 10^{-10}$, we also see that $\varepsilon = 31.033$ for $n = 10^6$ and $\varepsilon = 7.879$ for $n = 10^7$.

The values of ε under the bounded condition are about twice as large as those under the unbounded condition.

Table 2. Values of ε in (ε, δ) -DP with under **unbounded condition** and **bounded condition** ($d = 6, \sigma = 0.01$)

Case : $n = 10^6$

δ	Unbounded condition					Bounded condition				
	10^{-2}	10^{-5}	10^{-10}	10^{-15}	10^{-20}	10^{-2}	10^{-5}	10^{-10}	10^{-15}	10^{-20}
$\alpha = 2$	7.499	14.407	25.920	37.433	48.946	16.209	23.116	34.629	46.142	57.655
$\alpha = 4$	7.341	9.644	13.482	17.319	21.157	24.893	27.195	31.033	34.871	38.708
$\alpha = 7$	10.978	12.130	14.048	15.967	17.886	42.046	43.198	45.116	47.035	48.954
$\alpha = 10$	15.170	15.937	17.217	18.496	19.775	60.070	60.838	62.117	63.396	64.675
$\alpha = 20$	30.046	30.410	31.016	31.622	32.228	123.482	123.846	124.452	125.058	125.663
$\alpha = 30$	45.624	45.863	46.260	46.657	47.054	191.710	191.948	192.345	192.742	193.139

Case : $n = 10^7$

δ	Unbounded condition					Bounded condition				
	10^{-2}	10^{-5}	10^{-10}	10^{-15}	10^{-20}	10^{-2}	10^{-5}	10^{-10}	10^{-15}	10^{-20}
$\alpha = 2$	4.893	11.801	23.314	34.827	46.340	5.758	12.666	24.179	35.692	47.205
$\alpha = 4$	2.112	4.414	8.252	12.089	15.927	3.842	6.145	9.982	13.820	17.658
$\alpha = 7$	1.777	2.928	4.847	6.766	8.685	4.809	5.960	7.879	9.798	11.717
$\alpha = 10$	1.954	2.722	4.001	5.280	6.559	6.291	7.058	8.337	9.617	10.896
$\alpha = 20$	3.132	3.496	4.102	4.708	5.313	11.838	12.201	12.807	13.413	14.019
$\alpha = 30$	4.500	4.739	5.136	5.533	5.930	17.608	17.846	18.243	18.640	19.037

5.5 Summary of Results

To sum up the results of numerical evaluations, we see the following:

- We see that ε is monotonically increasing with respect to α . This result is intuitive.
- If n increases exponentially, the curve becomes smaller at equal intervals on a logarithmic scale.
- When $n = 10^4$, a range where α satisfies the assumption of being very narrow. When $n = 10^7$, the value of ε is practical.

6 Related Work

In this section, we describe the related work and mention the difference from our result.

6.1 Differentially Private Synthetic Data Generation

In synthetic data generation, the post-processing property of differential privacy guarantees that synthetic data generated from differentially private generative parameters also satisfy differential privacy as shown in Fig. 1(b). Methods to generate differentially private synthetic data for tabular data are classified to two types.

The first type is also called a “select-measure-generate” scheme [29]. Statistics and (conditional) probability distributions are used as the generative parameters. Typical statistics are mean vectors and covariance matrices of original datasets. In particular, synthetic data generation with copulas has been researched actively [5, 15, 26, 38]. To learn conditional distributions, graphical models such as Bayesian networks have been applied to synthetic data generation [30, 31, 45, 46].

In the second type, generative models with deep neural networks are used to generate synthetic data. The model parameters trained with the original data are regarded as the generative parameters. By training deep neural networks with differentially private stochastic gradient descent (DP-SGD) [1], we obtain differentially private model parameters. Methods based on generative adversarial networks (GAN) such as CTGAN [44], DPCTGAN [13], CTAB-GAN [47], and CTAB-GAN+ [48], are widely used. A method based on diffusion model such as TabDDPM [25] has also attracted attention recently.

In both types of approaches, generative parameters are computed by various differentially private mechanisms [1, 32] (Fig. 1(b)). In contrast, we evaluate differential privacy of randomness in data generation when using non-differentially private generative parameters.

6.2 Privacy Attacks against Synthetic Data Generation

Many methods empirically evaluate the privacy protection of synthetic data generations from attack success rates of membership inference attacks [37] and attribute inference attacks [14]. Most of them assume that an adversary has access to the target trained model such as GAN [8, 19, 20] and diffusion models [7, 10, 21, 28].

On the other hands, there are several methods where an adversary only has access to output synthetic data. Stadler et al. [39] discussed membership inference attacks and attribute inference attacks for tabular data in such setting, and Oprisanu et al. [35] applied such attacks to genomic data. Annamalai et al. [3] conducted attribute inference with linear reconstruction in this setting.

Although these studies and ours share a common perspective in that they focus on the privacy protection of generated synthetic data alone, these studies differ from ours in that they experimentally evaluate synthetic data generation from an attack perspective. In contrast, our perspective is to prove Rényi differential privacy theoretically.

6.3 Differential Privacy of Randomness in Synthetic Data Generation

To the best of our knowledge, only Lin et al. [27] have evaluated the privacy protection by the randomness in outputs of synthetic data generations. They theoretically evaluated probabilistic differential privacy [33] of GAN-sampled data. However, the concretely evaluated bound is hard to compute since it needs a GAN’s generalization error. In addition, they assume that training datasets are far larger than the number of model parameters. Thus, their main contribution

is to give the theoretical bound, but we cannot compute the bound as a concrete numerical value.

In contrast, although we focus on only a simple synthetic data generation, we give the concretely computable bound.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we evaluated the privacy protection due to the randomness of synthetic data generation without adding intentional randomness. We proved Rényi differential privacy of a synthetic data generation with a mean vector and covariance matrix (Theorem 3.1, Corollary 3.2). We also conducted numerical evaluations using the Adult dataset as a model case. Concretely, we demonstrated that the mechanism \mathcal{M}_G^n satisfies $(4, 0.576)$ -RDP under the unbounded condition and $(4, 2.307)$ -RDP under the bounded condition (Table 1). If they are translated into (ϵ, δ) -DP, \mathcal{M}_G^n satisfies (ϵ, δ) -DP for a practical ϵ (Table 2). In future work, we will apply our evaluation method to more advanced synthetic data generation algorithms.

References

- [1] Martin Abadi, Andy Chu, Ian Goodfellow, H Brendan McMahan, Ilya Mironov, Kunal Talwar, and Li Zhang. Deep learning with differential privacy. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*, pages 308–318, 2016.
- [2] Charu C Aggarwal. On k-anonymity and the curse of dimensionality. In *VLDB*, volume 5, pages 901–909, 2005.
- [3] Meenatchi Sundaram Muthu Selva Annamalai, Andrea Gadotti, and Luc Rocher. A linear reconstruction approach for attribute inference attacks against synthetic data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.10053*, 2023.
- [4] Apple. Apple differential privacy technical overview. https://www.apple.com/privacy/docs/Differential_Privacy_Overview.pdf. Accessed: 2023-02-22.
- [5] Hassan Jameel Asghar, Ming Ding, Thierry Rakotoarivelo, Sirine Mrabet, and Dali Kaafar. Differentially private release of datasets using gaussian copula. *Journal of Privacy and Confidentiality*, 10(2), 2020.
- [6] Sam Bond-Taylor, Adam Leach, Yang Long, and Chris G Willcocks. Deep generative modelling: A comparative review of vaes, gans, normalizing flows, energy-based and autoregressive models. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 2021.
- [7] Nicholas Carlini, Jamie Hayes, Milad Nasr, Matthew Jagielski, Vikash Sehwal, Florian Tramèr, Borja Balle, Daphne Ippolito, and Eric Wallace. Extracting training data from diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.13188*, 2023.
- [8] Dingfan Chen, Ning Yu, Yang Zhang, and Mario Fritz. Gan-leaks: A taxonomy of membership inference attacks against generative models. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*, pages 343–362, 2020.
- [9] Dheeru Dua and Casey Graff. UCI machine learning repository, 2017.

- [10] Jinhao Duan, Fei Kong, Shiqi Wang, Xiaoshuang Shi, and Kaidi Xu. Are diffusion models vulnerable to membership inference attacks? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.01316*, 2023.
- [11] Cynthia Dwork. Differential privacy. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 1–12. Springer, 2006.
- [12] Cynthia Dwork, Aaron Roth, et al. The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy. *Found. Trends Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 9(3-4):211–407, 2014.
- [13] Mei Ling Fang, Devendra Singh Dhama, and Kristian Kersting. Dp-ctgan: Differentially private medical data generation using ctgans. In *Artificial Intelligence in Medicine: 20th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Medicine, AIME 2022, Halifax, NS, Canada, June 14–17, 2022, Proceedings*, pages 178–188. Springer, 2022.
- [14] Matthew Fredrikson, Eric Lantz, Somesh Jha, Simon Lin, David Page, and Thomas Ristenpart. Privacy in pharmacogenetics: An end-to-end case study of personalized warfarin dosing. In *23rd {USENIX} Security Symposium ({USENIX} Security 14)*, pages 17–32, 2014.
- [15] Sébastien Gams, Frédéric Ladouceur, Antoine Laurent, and Alexandre Roy-Gaumont. Growing synthetic data through differentially-private vine copulas. *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, 2021(3):122–141, 2021.
- [16] Manuel Gil, Fady Alajaji, and Tamas Linder. Rényi divergence measures for commonly used univariate continuous distributions. *Information Sciences*, 249:124–131, 2013.
- [17] Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Generative adversarial nets. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 27, 2014.
- [18] David A Harville. Matrix algebra from a statistician’s perspective, 1998.
- [19] Jamie Hayes, Luca Melis, George Danezis, and Emiliano De Cristofaro. LOGAN: membership inference attacks against generative models. *Proceedings of Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, 2019(1):133–152, 2019.
- [20] Aoting Hu, Renjie Xie, Zhigang Lu, Aiqun Hu, and Minhui Xue. Tablegan-mca: Evaluating membership collisions of gan-synthesized tabular data releasing. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 2096–2112, 2021.
- [21] Hailong Hu and Jun Pang. Membership inference of diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.09956*, 2023.
- [22] Peter Kairouz, Sewoong Oh, and Pramod Viswanath. The composition theorem for differential privacy. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1376–1385. PMLR, 2015.
- [23] Daniel Kifer and Ashwin Machanavajjhala. No free lunch in data privacy. In *Proceedings of the 2011 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of data*, pages 193–204, 2011.
- [24] Diederik P. Kingma and Max Welling. Auto-encoding variational bayes. In Yoshua Bengio and Yann LeCun, editors, *2nd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2014, Banff, AB, Canada, April 14-16, 2014, Conference Track Proceedings*, 2014.
- [25] Akim Kotelnikov, Dmitry Baranchuk, Ivan Rubachev, and Artem Babenko. Tabddpm: Modelling tabular data with diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.15421*, 2022.
- [26] Haoran Li, Li Xiong, Lifan Zhang, and Xiaoqian Jiang. Dpsynthesizer: Differentially private data synthesizer for privacy preserving data sharing. In *Proceedings*

- of the VLDB Endowment International Conference on Very Large Data Bases, volume 7, page 1677. NIH Public Access, 2014.
- [27] Zinan Lin, Vyas Sekar, and Giulia Fanti. On the privacy properties of gan-generated samples. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1522–1530. PMLR, 2021.
 - [28] Tomoya Matsumoto, Takayuki Miura, and Naoto Yanai. Membership inference attacks against diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.03262*, 2023.
 - [29] Ryan McKenna, Gerome Miklau, and Daniel Sheldon. Winning the nist contest: A scalable and general approach to differentially private synthetic data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.04978*, 2021.
 - [30] Ryan McKenna, Brett Mullins, Daniel Sheldon, and Gerome Miklau. Aim: An adaptive and iterative mechanism for differentially private synthetic data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.12677*, 2022.
 - [31] Ryan McKenna, Daniel Sheldon, and Gerome Miklau. Graphical-model based estimation and inference for differential privacy. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4435–4444. PMLR, 2019.
 - [32] Frank McSherry and Kunal Talwar. Mechanism design via differential privacy. In *48th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'07)*, pages 94–103. IEEE, 2007.
 - [33] Sebastian Meiser. Approximate and probabilistic differential privacy definitions. *Cryptology ePrint Archive*, 2018.
 - [34] Ilya Mironov. Rényi differential privacy. In *2017 IEEE 30th Computer Security Foundations Symposium (CSF)*, pages 263–275. IEEE, 2017.
 - [35] Bristena Oprisanu, Georgi Ganev, and Emiliano De Cristofaro. On utility and privacy in synthetic genomic data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.03314*, 2021.
 - [36] Danilo Rezende and Shakir Mohamed. Variational inference with normalizing flows. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1530–1538. PMLR, 2015.
 - [37] Reza Shokri, Marco Stronati, Congzheng Song, and Vitaly Shmatikov. Membership inference attacks against machine learning models. In *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 3–18. IEEE, 2017.
 - [38] M Sklar. Fonctions de repartition an dimensions et leurs marges. *Publ. inst. statist. univ. Paris*, 8:229–231, 1959.
 - [39] Theresa Stadler, Bristena Oprisanu, and Carmela Troncoso. Synthetic data–anonymisation groundhog day. In *31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22)*, pages 1451–1468, 2022.
 - [40] Latanya Sweeney. k-anonymity: A model for protecting privacy. *International Journal of Uncertainty, Fuzziness and Knowledge-Based Systems*, 10(05):557–570, 2002.
 - [41] Yuchao Tao, Ryan McKenna, Michael Hay, Ashwin Machanavajjhala, and Gerome Miklau. Benchmarking differentially private synthetic data generation algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.09238*, 2021.
 - [42] United States Census Bureau. Census bureau sets key parameters to protect privacy in 2020 census results. <https://www.census.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2021/2020-census-key-parameters.html>. Accessed: 2023-02-22.
 - [43] Stanley L Warner. Randomized response: A survey technique for eliminating evasive answer bias. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 60(309):63–69, 1965.

- [44] Lei Xu, Maria Skoularidou, Alfredo Cuesta-Infante, and Kalyan Veeramachaneni. Modeling tabular data using conditional gan. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.
- [45] Jun Zhang, Graham Cormode, Cecilia M. Procopiuc, Divesh Srivastava, and Xiaokui Xiao. Privbays: Private data release via bayesian networks. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.*, 42(4), October 2017.
- [46] Zhikun Zhang, Tianhao Wang, Jean Honorio, Ninghui Li, Michael Backes, Shibo He, Jiming Chen, and Yang Zhang. Privsyn: Differentially private data synthesis. 2021.
- [47] Zilong Zhao, Aditya Kunar, Robert Birke, and Lydia Y Chen. Ctab-gan: Effective table data synthesizing. In *Asian Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 97–112. PMLR, 2021.
- [48] Zilong Zhao, Aditya Kunar, Robert Birke, and Lydia Y Chen. Ctab-gan+: Enhancing tabular data synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.00401*, 2022.