

Training Differentially Private Ad Prediction Models with Semi-Sensitive Features

Lynn Chua¹, Qiliang Cui¹, Badih Ghazi¹, Charlie Harrison¹, Pritish Kamath¹, Walid Krichene¹, Ravi Kumar¹, Pasin Manurangsi¹, Krishna Giri Narra¹, Amer Sinha¹, Avinash Varadarajan¹, Chiyuan Zhang¹,

¹Google

Abstract

Motivated by problems arising in digital advertising, we introduce the task of training differentially private (DP) machine learning models with semi-sensitive features. In this setting, a subset of the features is known to the attacker (and thus need not be protected) while the remaining features as well as the label are unknown to the attacker and should be protected by the DP guarantee. This task interpolates between training the model with *full* DP (where the label and all features should be protected) or with *label* DP (where all the features are considered known, and only the label should be protected). We present a new algorithm for training DP models with semi-sensitive features. Through an empirical evaluation on real ads datasets, we demonstrate that our algorithm surpasses in utility the baselines of (i) DP stochastic gradient descent (DP-SGD) run on all features (known and unknown), and (ii) a label DP algorithm run only on the known features (while discarding the unknown ones).

Introduction

In recent years, large-scale machine learning (ML) algorithms have been adopted and deployed for different ad modeling tasks, including the training of predicted click-through rates (a.k.a. pCTR) and predicted conversion rates (a.k.a. pCVR) models. Roughly speaking, pCTR models predict the likelihood that an ad shown to a user is clicked, and pCVR models predict the likelihood that an ad clicked (or viewed) by the user leads to a *conversion*—which is defined as a useful action by the user on the advertiser site or app, such as the purchase of the advertised product.

Heightened user expectations around privacy have led different web browsers (including Apple Safari (Wilander 2020), Mozilla Firefox (Wood 2019), and Google Chrome (Schuh 2020)) to the deprecation of third-party cookies, which are cross-site identifiers that had hitherto allowed the joining in the clear of the datasets on which the pCTR and pCVR models are trained. More precisely, third-party cookies previously allowed determining the conversion label for pCTR models as well as the construction of features (for pCTR and pCVR models) that depend on the user’s behavior on sites other than the publisher where the ad was shown.

The 5th AAAI Workshop on Privacy-Preserving Artificial Intelligence. Copyright © 2024, Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (www.aaai.org). All rights reserved.

In order to support essential web functionalities that are affected by the deprecation of third-party cookies, different web browsers have been building privacy-preserving APIs, including for ads measurement and modeling such as the Interoperable Private Attribution (IPA) developed by Mozilla and Meta (Thomson 2022), Masked LARK from Microsoft (Pfeiffer III et al. 2021; Microsoft 2021), the Attribution Reporting API, available on both the Chrome browser (Nalpas and White 2021) and the Android operating system (Android 2023a), and the Private Click Measurement (PCM) (Wilander 2021) and Private Ad Measurement (PAM) APIs (Winstrom 2023) from Apple. The privacy guarantees of several of these APIs rely on *differential privacy* (a.k.a. DP) (Dwork et al. 2006a,b), which is a strong and robust notion of privacy that has in recent years gained significant popularity for data analytics and modeling tasks.

Two main DP variants have been studied in the context of supervised ML. So-called *full* DP protects each individual training example (features and label) and has been extensively studied, e.g., Abadi et al. (2016). On the other hand, *label* DP (e.g., Chaudhuri and Hsu (2011); Ghazi et al. (2021); Malek Esmaeili et al. (2021)) only protects the label of each training example, and is thus a suitable option in settings where the adversary already has access to the features.

Label DP is a natural fit for the case where the features of the pCVR problem do not depend on cross-site information. However, a common setting, including that of the Protected Audience API on Chrome (Dutton and Lee 2022) and Android (Android 2023b), is where some features depend on cross-site information whereas the remaining features do not. An example is the remarketing use case where a feature could indicate whether the same user previously expressed interest in the advertised product (e.g., added it to their cart) but did not purchase it. Revealing a row of the database which has both contextual features (e.g., the publisher site, or the time of day the ad was served) with features derived on the advertiser (e.g., user presence on a particular remarketing list) could allow an attacker to track a user across sites. In the Protected Audience API, these sensitive features are protected by multiple privacy mechanisms including feature-level randomized response.

The focus of this work is to analyze this setting from DP perspective; we refer to it as *DP model training with semi-sensitive features*. We formalize this setting, present an al-

gorithm for training private ML models with semi-sensitive features, and evaluate it on real ad prediction datasets, showing that it compares favorably to natural baselines.

Related Work

We note that an evaluation of DP-SGD for ad prediction models in the full DP setting has been done by Denison et al. (2023). We also point out that a stronger privacy guarantee than the DP with semi-sensitive features notion that we study, but that is still weaker than full DP, was recently introduced by Krichene et al. (2023). In their “DP with a public feature set” setting, the adversary is assumed to know the set of values that a certain subset of features takes, while it ignores the correspondence between each example and its specific value. In a concurrent work (Shen et al. 2023), an algorithm based on AdaBoost is proposed for a similar setting, referred to as learning with “partially private features”. One key difference is that in their setting, the labels are considered public.

DP Learning with Semi-Sensitive Features

We consider the setting of supervised learning, where we assume an underlying (unknown) distribution \mathcal{D} over $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, where \mathcal{X} denotes the set of possible inputs and \mathcal{Y} denotes the set of possible labels. In our work, we focus on the binary classification setting where $\mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1\}$. Our goal is to learn a predictor $F : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that maps the input space \mathcal{X} to \mathbb{R} with the goal of minimizing the expected loss $\mathcal{L}(F; \mathcal{D}) := \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \ell(F(x), y)$, where $\ell(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a suitable loss function, e.g., the binary cross entropy loss.

To capture the setting of *semi-sensitive features*, let $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}^\circ \times \mathcal{X}^\bullet$, where \mathcal{X}° is the set of possible *non-sensitive feature values*, and \mathcal{X}^\bullet is the set of possible *sensitive feature values*. We denote a dataset as $D = ((x_i^\circ, x_i^\bullet, y_i))_{i \in [n]}$, where x_i° denotes the non-sensitive feature value, x_i^\bullet is the sensitive feature value and y_i is the corresponding (sensitive) label. We use x_i to denote (x_i°, x_i^\bullet) for short. Some problems that motivate the setting above are in ads modeling tasks, where the features can include non-sensitive features such as the browser class, publisher website, category of the mobile app etc., sensitive features such as how long ago and how many times a user showed interest in an advertised product etc., and sensitive labels such as whether the user converted on the ad.

We say that two datasets D, D' are *adjacent*, denoted $D \sim D'$ if one dataset can be obtained from the other by changing the sensitive features and/or the label for a single example, namely replacing $(x_i^\circ, x_i^\bullet, y_i)$ with $(x_i^\circ, \tilde{x}_i^\bullet, \tilde{y}_i)$ for some $(\tilde{x}_i^\bullet, \tilde{y}_i) \in \mathcal{X}^\bullet \times \mathcal{Y}$.

Definition 1 (DP; Dwork et al. (2006b)). For $\varepsilon, \delta \geq 0$, a randomized mechanism \mathcal{M} satisfies (ε, δ) -DP if for all pairs D, D' of adjacent datasets, and for all outcome events E , it holds that $\Pr[\mathcal{M}(D) \in E] \leq e^\varepsilon \cdot \Pr[\mathcal{M}(D') \in E] + \delta$.

For an extensive overview of DP, we refer the reader to the monograph of Dwork and Roth (2014). We use the following key properties of DP.

Proposition 2 (Composition). *If \mathcal{M}_1 satisfies $(\varepsilon_1, \delta_1)$ -DP, and \mathcal{M}_2 satisfies $(\varepsilon_2, \delta_2)$ -DP, then the mechanism \mathcal{M} that*

on dataset D returns $(\mathcal{M}_1(D), \mathcal{M}_2(D))$ satisfies $(\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2, \delta_1 + \delta_2)$ -DP. Furthermore, this holds even in the adaptive case, when \mathcal{M}_2 can use the output of \mathcal{M}_1 .

Proposition 3 (Post-Processing). *If \mathcal{M} satisfies (ε, δ) -DP, then for all (randomized) algorithms \mathcal{A} , it holds that $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}(\cdot))$ satisfies (ε, δ) -DP.*

Randomized Response. Perhaps the simplest mechanism that satisfies DP, even predating its definition, is the *Randomized Response* mechanism. We state the mechanism in our context as releasing the known features along with the corresponding randomized label.

Definition 4 (Randomized Response; Warner (1965)). For $\varepsilon > 0$, the mechanism RR_ε on dataset $D = ((x_i^\circ, x_i^\bullet, y_i))_{i \in [n]}$ returns $((x_i^\circ, \hat{y}_i))_{i \in [n]}$ where each \hat{y}_i is set to y_i with prob. $\frac{e^\varepsilon}{1+e^\varepsilon}$ and set to $1 - y_i$ with prob. $\frac{1}{1+e^\varepsilon}$.

Proposition 5. RR_ε satisfies $(\varepsilon, 0)$ -DP.

SGD and DP-SGD. Let F_w be a parameterized model (e.g., a neural network) with trainable weights w , and $\{(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_B, y_B)\}$ be a random mini-batch of training examples. Let $L_i = \ell(F_w(x_i), y_i)$ be the loss on the i th example and let the average loss be $\bar{L} := \frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B L_i$. Recall that standard training algorithms compute the *average gradient* $\nabla_w \bar{L}$ and update w with an optimizer such as SGD or Adam. Even though various optimizers could be used, we will refer to this class of (non-private) methods as SGD.

DP-SGD (Abadi et al. 2016) is widely used for DP training of deep neural networks, wherein the per-example gradients $\nabla_w L_i$ are computed, and then re-scaled to have an ℓ_2 -norm of at most C , as $g_i := \nabla_w L_i \cdot \min\{1, \frac{C}{\|\nabla_w L_i\|}\}$. Gaussian noise $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, C^2 \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})$ is then added to the average $\frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B g_i$ and subsequently passed to the optimizer. As shown by Abadi et al. (2016), DP-SGD satisfies (ε, δ) -DP where ε, δ depend on σ , the batch size and number of training steps; this can be computed using privacy accounting.

User-level DP. In settings where a single-user may contribute more than one example to a dataset, it can be important to respect privacy at the user-level. To define this setting, it is assumed that x° contains a unique user identifier, and two datasets are said to be *user-level adjacent* if we can get one dataset from the other by changing the sensitive features and/or labels for one or more examples corresponding to a single user. A randomized mechanism is said to satisfy (ε, δ) -*user-level-DP* if the (ε, δ) -DP definition holds for user-level adjacent datasets D, D' . Any mechanism \mathcal{M} that satisfies (ε, δ) -DP can be transformed into a mechanism that satisfies user-level-DP, by limiting the number of examples corresponding to any user. Namely, let $\mathcal{M}^{(k)}$ be a mechanism that first processes the dataset by retaining at most k examples corresponding to any single user (by applying an arbitrary rule that only considers the examples of that user), and then applies \mathcal{M} to it.

Proposition 6 (Group Privacy; e.g., Vadhan (2017)). *If \mathcal{M} satisfies (ε, δ) -DP then for all $k \geq 1$, any $\mathcal{M}^{(k)}$ as defined above satisfies $(k\varepsilon, \delta \frac{e^{k\varepsilon} - 1}{e^\varepsilon - 1})$ -user-level-DP.*

Algorithms

We now describe the family of algorithms we use for DP training with semi-sensitive features. We use a parameterized model, such as a deep neural network that is parameterized by $w = (w^\circ, w^\bullet, w^c)$ corresponding to a *non-sensitive* tower, a *sensitive* tower, and a *common* tower respectively. The architecture we use has the following high-level structure:

$$F_w(x^\circ, x^\bullet) := f_{w^c}(g_{w^\circ}(x^\circ) \circ h_{w^\bullet}(x^\bullet)),$$

where $g_{w^\circ} : \mathcal{X}^\circ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_\circ}$, $h_{w^\bullet} : \mathcal{X}^\bullet \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_\bullet}$, $f_{w^c} : \mathbb{R}^{d_\circ+d_\bullet} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $u \circ v$ denotes concatenation of the vectors u and v . We also consider a *truncated model* that uses the same parameters w° and w^c , but does not depend on w^\bullet , by eliminating the dependence on x^\bullet , defined as follows:

$$F_{w^\circ, w^c}(x^\circ) := f_{w^c}(g_{w^\circ}(x^\circ) \circ \mathbf{0}),$$

where $\mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\bullet}$. For ease of notation, we use the following notation for the losses of each of these models:

$$\begin{aligned} L(w; x, y) &:= \ell(F_w(x), y) \\ L(w^\circ, w^c; x, y) &:= \ell(F_{w^\circ, w^c}(x^\circ), y) \end{aligned}$$

Without privacy constraints, we can consider training F_w using SGD as described earlier. Given a total privacy budget of (ε, δ) , we consider learning algorithms that execute two phases sequentially that satisfy $(\varepsilon_1, 0)$ -DP and (ε_2, δ) -DP respectively such that $\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 = \varepsilon$ and hence by Proposition 2, the algorithm satisfies (ε, δ) -DP. We refer to this algorithm as Hybrid, and these phases are as follows:

Label-DP Phase. In this phase, we train the truncated model $F_{w^\circ, w^c}(\cdot)$ for one or more epochs of mini-batch SGD using noisy labels obtained by applying $\text{RR}_{\varepsilon_1}$, which returns $((x_i^\circ, \hat{y}_i))_{i \in [n]}$, i.e., a dataset where the x_i^\bullet 's are removed and the labels are randomized. By Proposition 3, this phase satisfies $(\varepsilon_1, 0)$ -DP.

To remove the bias introduced by the noisy labels, we define $p := 1/(1 + e^{-\varepsilon_1})$ and modify the training loss as follows:

$$\frac{L(w^\circ, w^c; x_i^\circ, 1 - \hat{y}_i) - p \sum_{y' \in \{0,1\}} L(w^\circ, w^c; x_i^\circ, y')}{1 - 2p}$$

DP-SGD Phase. In this phase, we train the entire model $F_w(\cdot)$ for one or more epochs of DP-SGD on F_w . The noise parameter σ is chosen appropriately so that this phase satisfies (ε_2, δ) -DP; in our work, we do this accounting using Rényi DP (Abadi et al. 2016; Mironov 2017).

Summary of Results

We consider two natural baselines: DP-SGD (where all features are treated as sensitive) and RR on the truncated model (where the sensitive features are discarded and only the labels are protected). Note that both can be viewed as special cases of Hybrid, where we use all the privacy budget in one of the phases: DP-SGD corresponds to setting $\varepsilon_1 = 0$ and $\varepsilon_2 = \varepsilon$ and RR corresponds to setting $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon$ and $\varepsilon_2 = 0$.

The main algorithm Hybrid uses a different split between the two phases. Given a privacy budget of (ε, δ) , the precise




Figure 1: Number of examples per user in the Criteo Attribution dataset.

split as $(\varepsilon_1, 0)$ and (ε_2, δ) between the two phases has a significant impact on the model's utility. We observed that as ε_1 decreases beyond 3, the RR utility deteriorates rapidly compared to DP-SGD. So when $\varepsilon \approx 3$, we assign most of it to ε_1 . Beyond $\varepsilon_1 = 4$, we observed that it is best to assign the remaining ε to DP-SGD, i.e., ε_2 . The precise split we use is as follows:

$$\varepsilon_1 := \min\{0.6 \cdot \varepsilon, 3\} \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon_2 := \varepsilon - \varepsilon_1$$

We train binary classification models with binary cross entropy loss for all three datasets and report the test *AUC loss-%* with respect to the non-private baseline, i.e., $100 \cdot ((1 - \text{AUC}) - (1 - \text{AUC}_{\text{np}})) / (1 - \text{AUC}_{\text{np}})$, averaged over three runs with different random seeds. See the Appendix for more details about model architectures and training.

Criteo Attribution Modeling for Bidding Dataset. This publicly available dataset (Diemert et al. 2017) consists of 16M impressions from 30 days of Criteo live traffic. We consider the task of predicting the Boolean conversion value (using last-touch attribution) using the impression attributes consisting of campaign and categorical features `cat[1-9]`. Since the precise interpretation of `cat[1-9]` is not available, we arbitrarily treat `cat1` and `cat2` as sensitive, and the remaining `cat[3-9]` and `campaign` as non-sensitive.

We randomly partition the dataset into 80%/20% train/test splits and report the results on the test split. We evaluate with both (example-level) DP as well as user-level-DP (using the transformation in Proposition 6). For user-level-DP, each user has varying numbers of examples, as illustrated in Figure 1. We cap the number of examples per user, and sample examples with replacement up to the cap for each user. As a result, the size of the training datasets change with the cap. Hence instead of fixing the number of epochs for the DP-SGD phase, we fix the number of training steps for each cap to be the same as for the largest cap trained with 1 epoch.

For this dataset, the AUC loss of the non-privately trained model is 0.15879. We plot the relative AUC loss with respect to this baseline in Figure 2(i) for (example-level) DP, and in Figure 2(ii) for user-level-DP.




Figure 2: Relative AUC loss (%) of models trained under various privacy budget ϵ on the Criteo Attribution dataset with (i) example-level DP and (ii) user-level DP, where for each ϵ , the lowest loss among the different example caps is plotted.




Figure 3: Relative AUC loss (%) of models trained under various privacy budget ϵ on the (i) Criteo pCTR dataset and (ii) proprietary pCVR dataset.

Criteo Display Ads pCTR Dataset. This publicly available dataset (Jean-Baptiste Tien 2014) contains around 40 million examples. The dataset has a labeled training set and an unlabeled test set. We only use the labeled training set and split it chronologically into a 80%/10%/10% partition of train/validation/test sets. The reported metrics are on this labeled test split. Each example consists of 13 integer features `int-feature-[1-13]` and 26 categorical features `categorical-feature-[14-39]`. Since the precise interpretation of these features is not available, we arbitrarily consider all even-numbered features as sensitive and all odd-numbered features as non-sensitive.

For this dataset, the AUC loss of the non-privately trained model is 0.19422. We plot the relative AUC loss with respect to this baseline in Figure 3(i).

Proprietary pCVR Dataset. This is a proprietary dataset from a commercial mobile app store. Each example in this dataset corresponds to an ad click and the task is to predict whether a conversion takes place after the click. We plot the relative AUC loss with respect to this baseline in Figure 3(ii).

For all datasets, we find that Hybrid improves over RR and

DP-SGD across a wide range of privacy budgets. We see that the gap increases for $\epsilon \geq 3$. We believe this is because the utility of the RR algorithm deteriorates for small ϵ .

Conclusion and Future Directions

In this work, we studied training DP models with semi-sensitive features, and presented an algorithm that improves over two natural baselines on real ad modeling datasets.

A variant of DP training with semi-sensitive features that is interesting to explore is where the label is non-sensitive. Another interesting direction is to determine the utility gap (if any) between “DP with semi-sensitive features” studied in this work and “DP with a public feature set” from (Krichene et al. 2023). Finally, it would be interesting to explore label DP primitives beyond RR, e.g., (Ghazi et al. 2021; Malek Esmaeili et al. 2021), particularly ones that perform better for smaller ϵ , for the label-DP phase of DP training with semi-sensitive features.

References

Abadi, M.; Chu, A.; Goodfellow, I.; McMahan, H. B.; Mironov, I.; Talwar, K.; and Zhang, L. 2016. Deep learn-

- ing with differential privacy. In *CCS*, 308–318.
- Android. 2023a. Attribution Reporting. <https://developer.android.com/design-for-safety/privacy-sandbox/attribution>.
- Android. 2023b. Protected Audience API on Android developer guide. <https://developer.android.com/design-for-safety/privacy-sandbox/guides/protected-audience>.
- Chaudhuri, K.; and Hsu, D. 2011. Sample complexity bounds for differentially private learning. In *COLT*, 155–186.
- Denison, C.; Ghazi, B.; Kamath, P.; Kumar, R.; Manurangsi, P.; Narra, K. G.; Sinha, A.; Varadarajan, A.; and Zhang, C. 2023. Private Ad Modeling with DP-SGD. In *AdKDD*.
- Diemert, E.; Meynet, J.; Galland, P.; and Lefortier, D. 2017. Attribution modeling increases efficiency of bidding in display advertising. In *AdKDD*, 1–6.
- Dutton, S.; and Lee, K. K. 2022. Protected Audience API: On-device ad auctions to serve remarketing and custom audiences, without cross-site third-party tracking. <https://developer.chrome.com/docs/privacy-sandbox/protected-audience>.
- Dwork, C.; Kenthapadi, K.; McSherry, F.; Mironov, I.; and Naor, M. 2006a. Our Data, Ourselves: Privacy Via Distributed Noise Generation. In *EUROCRYPT*, 486–503.
- Dwork, C.; McSherry, F.; Nissim, K.; and Smith, A. D. 2006b. Calibrating Noise to Sensitivity in Private Data Analysis. In *TCC*, 265–284.
- Dwork, C.; and Roth, A. 2014. The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy. *Foundations and Trends® in Theoretical Computer Science*, 9(3–4): 211–407.
- Ghazi, B.; Golowich, N.; Kumar, R.; Manurangsi, P.; and Zhang, C. 2021. Deep learning with label differential privacy. *NeurIPS*, 27131–27145.
- Jean-Baptiste Tien, O. C., joycenv. 2014. Display Advertising Challenge.
- Krichene, W.; Mayoraz, N.; Rendle, S.; Song, S.; Thakurta, A.; and Zhang, L. 2023. Private Learning with Public Features. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.15454*.
- Loshchilov, I.; and Hutter, F. 2017. SGDR: Stochastic gradient descent with warm restarts. In *ICLR*.
- Malek Esmaeili, M.; Mironov, I.; Prasad, K.; Shilov, I.; and Tramer, F. 2021. Antipodes of label differential privacy: PATE and ALIBI. *NeurIPS*, 34: 6934–6945.
- Microsoft. 2021. MaskedLARK. <https://github.com/microsoft/maskedlark>.
- Mironov, I. 2017. Rényi Differential Privacy. In *CSF*, 263–275.
- Nalpas, M.; and White, A. 2021. Attribution Reporting. <https://developer.chrome.com/en/docs/privacy-sandbox/attribution-reporting/>.
- Pfeiffer III, J. J.; Charles, D.; Gilton, D.; Jung, Y. H.; Parsana, M.; and Anderson, E. 2021. Masked LARK: Masked learning, aggregation and reporting workflow. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14794*.
- Schuh, J. 2020. Building a more private web: A path towards making third party cookies obsolete. <https://blog.chromium.org/2020/01/building-more-private-web-path-towards.html>.
- Shen, Z.; Krishnaswamy, A.; Kulkarni, J.; and Munagala, K. 2023. Classification with Partially Private Features. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.07583*.
- Thomson, M. 2022. Privacy Preserving Attribution for Advertising. <https://blog.mozilla.org/en/mozilla/privacy-preserving-attribution-for-advertising/>.
- Vadhan, S. P. 2017. The Complexity of Differential Privacy. In *Tutorials on the Foundations of Cryptography*, 347–450. Springer International Publishing.
- Warner, S. L. 1965. Randomized response: a survey technique for eliminating evasive answer bias. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 60 309: 63–69.
- Wilander, J. 2020. Full Third-Party Cookie Blocking and More. <https://webkit.org/blog/10218/full-third-party-cookie-blocking-and-more/>.
- Wilander, J. 2021. Introducing Private Click Measurement, PCM. <https://webkit.org/blog/11529/introducing-private-click-measurement-pcm/>.
- Winstrom, L. 2023. A proposal for privacy preserving ad attribution measurement using Prio-like architecture. <https://github.com/patcg/proposals/issues/17>.
- Wood, M. 2019. Today’s Firefox Blocks Third-Party Tracking Cookies and Cryptomining by Default. <https://blog.mozilla.org/en/products/firefox/todays-firefox-blocks-third-party-tracking-cookies-and-cryptomining-by-default/>.
- Zaheer, M.; Reddi, S.; Sachan, D.; Kale, S.; and Kumar, S. 2018. Adaptive methods for nonconvex optimization. In *NIPS*.

Training Details

Criteo Display Ads pCTR Dataset. We use a six layer neural network as our model. The first layer consists of feature transforms for each individual feature. For categorical features, we map the category into a dense feature vector using an embedding layer. We set the embedding dimension using the heuristic rule $\text{int}[2V^{0.25}]$, where V is the number of unique tokens in each categorical feature. For int features, we apply a log transform. For our baseline model, all of these features are concatenated and fed into four fully connected layers, each containing 598 hidden units and using a ReLU activation function. The final output is obtained using another fully connected layer which produces a scalar logit prediction. For our Hybrid model, we employ the same architecture and only consider the parameters in the sensitive categorical features’ embedding layers as sensitive. There are a total of around 78M trainable parameters in our model.

We use the Yogi optimizer (Zaheer et al. 2018) with a base learning rate of 0.01 and a batch size of 1024 for our baseline and for the RR phase of training. We use SGD with a base learning rate of 0.1, momentum 0.9, and batch size of 16384 for the DP-SGD phase of training. For both, we scale

ε	RR	DP-SGD	Hybrid
1	14.139 \pm 0.001	22.106 \pm 0.002	15.396 \pm 0.007
3	9.921 \pm 0.000	20.134 \pm 0.001	9.008 \pm 0.002
5	9.467 \pm 0.000	19.485 \pm 0.001	7.724 \pm 0.001
10	9.368 \pm 0.000	18.295 \pm 0.002	7.643 \pm 0.002
20	9.333 \pm 0.000	17.586 \pm 0.001	7.592 \pm 0.002
30	9.380 \pm 0.000	17.573 \pm 0.001	7.615 \pm 0.001
50	9.380 \pm 0.001	17.007 \pm 0.001	7.628 \pm 0.002

Table 1: Relative AUC loss (%) of models trained under various privacy budget ε on the Criteo pCTR dataset.

the base learning rate with a cosine decay (Loshchilov and Hutter 2017). For the baseline, we train for five epochs. We only tune the norm bound $C \in \{1, 10, 30, 50\}$, RR epochs $E_{RR} \in \{1, 3, 50\}$, and DP-SGD epochs $E_{DP-SGD} \in \{1, 3\}$, for each ε separately.

Criteo Attribution Modeling for Bidding Dataset. The first layer of the model consists of feature transforms for each feature. For the categorical features, we map them into feature vectors using an embedding layer with embedding dimension 8. These features are concatenated with the float features, and we use a layer to mask out sensitive features. These are fed into two layers of 128 and 64 hidden units. The final output is obtained using a fully-connected layer which produces a scalar logit prediction. There are a total of around 0.5M trainable parameters in the model.

For the training, we use the RMSprop optimizer with a learning rate of 0.0001 and a batch size of 8192 for our baseline and for the RR training phase. We use the Adam optimizer with a learning rate of 0.0001 and a batch size of 16384 for the DP-SGD training phase. For both, we scale the base learning rate with a cosine decay. For the baseline, we train for 50 epochs. We tune the norm bound $C \in \{1, 5, 10, 50, 100\}$, RR epochs $E_{RR} \in \{1, 3, 5, 10, 50, 200\}$, example caps $k \in \{1, 2, 5, 10\}$, for each ε separately. For the Hybrid training, we set the example cap to be 1 for the RR phase and we vary it as $k \in \{1, 2, 5, 10\}$ for the DP-SGD phase. For (example-level) DP, we tune the DP-SGD epochs $E_{DP-SGD} \in \{1, 3\}$. For user-level-DP, we sample examples independently with replacement up to the example cap for each user, and we fix the number of training steps for each cap to be the same as for the largest cap trained with one epoch. The relative AUC losses with respect to the non-private baseline are in Figure 2(i), Table 2 for (example-level) DP and in Figure 2(ii), Table 3 for user-level-DP.

Hyperparameter Tuning We do not perform extensive hyperparameter tuning for these experiments and rely on past experience and intuition to set hyperparameters unless otherwise stated. We use existing baselines to set our baseline hyperparameters. For the RR phase, we find that these same hyperparameters work well. For the DP-SGD phase, we rely on the work of Denison et al. (2023) for setting hyperparameters for the Criteo pCTR dataset. For Criteo Attribution, we tune the hyperparameters with different optimizers, learning rates and batch sizes. We did not do any

ε	RR	DP-SGD	Hybrid
1	22.481 \pm 0.879	15.068 \pm 0.779	9.919 \pm 0.448
3	12.658 \pm 0.418	11.007 \pm 0.299	5.343 \pm 0.418
5	11.054 \pm 0.418	9.983 \pm 0.642	3.322 \pm 0.217
10	10.616 \pm 0.477	8.477 \pm 0.669	2.650 \pm 0.409
20	10.599 \pm 0.344	7.778 \pm 0.784	2.166 \pm 0.308
30	10.625 \pm 0.412	6.814 \pm 0.385	1.953 \pm 0.480
50	10.523 \pm 0.398	5.965 \pm 0.434	1.867 \pm 0.398

Table 2: Relative AUC loss (%) of models trained under various privacy budget ε on the Criteo Attribution dataset.

ε	Example cap	RR	DP-SGD	Hybrid
1	1	33.510 \pm 0.678	12.433 \pm 0.830	11.369 \pm 0.446
1	2	29.602 \pm 0.967	13.882 \pm 1.199	11.959 \pm 0.536
1	5	46.503 \pm 0.804	19.259 \pm 0.668	13.886 \pm 0.377
1	10	82.281 \pm 3.847	21.776 \pm 0.326	15.197 \pm 0.533
3	1	14.675 \pm 0.400	8.827 \pm 0.129	4.040 \pm 0.394
3	2	19.346 \pm 0.079	10.097 \pm 0.250	4.259 \pm 0.413
3	5	22.287 \pm 0.317	13.312 \pm 0.382	4.582 \pm 0.434
3	10	37.793 \pm 2.093	14.913 \pm 1.048	5.220 \pm 0.433
5	1	13.878 \pm 0.364	8.280 \pm 0.355	3.118 \pm 0.390
5	2	14.894 \pm 0.325	8.957 \pm 0.533	3.174 \pm 0.392
5	5	17.145 \pm 0.326	11.664 \pm 0.285	3.482 \pm 0.316
5	10	23.605 \pm 0.644	13.859 \pm 0.975	4.156 \pm 0.371
10	1	13.299 \pm 0.466	7.225 \pm 0.222	2.878 \pm 0.391
10	2	13.145 \pm 0.442	8.012 \pm 0.515	2.959 \pm 0.461
10	5	14.438 \pm 0.353	10.250 \pm 0.316	3.107 \pm 0.377
10	10	15.735 \pm 0.490	11.618 \pm 1.220	3.341 \pm 0.369
20	1	13.322 \pm 0.407	6.083 \pm 0.243	2.782 \pm 0.325
20	2	12.936 \pm 0.465	7.484 \pm 0.417	2.825 \pm 0.429
20	5	13.235 \pm 0.380	8.843 \pm 0.456	2.974 \pm 0.448
20	10	13.515 \pm 0.425	10.601 \pm 0.269	3.087 \pm 0.367
30	1	13.394 \pm 0.432	5.594 \pm 0.344	2.812 \pm 0.315
30	2	12.971 \pm 0.476	7.152 \pm 0.309	2.776 \pm 0.402
30	5	12.880 \pm 0.433	9.002 \pm 0.374	2.929 \pm 0.388
30	10	13.076 \pm 0.603	9.767 \pm 0.165	3.106 \pm 0.367
50	1	13.293 \pm 0.396	5.411 \pm 0.710	2.663 \pm 0.402
50	2	12.956 \pm 0.372	6.598 \pm 0.349	2.669 \pm 0.389
50	5	12.893 \pm 0.374	7.993 \pm 0.154	2.926 \pm 0.348
50	10	12.718 \pm 0.381	9.872 \pm 1.159	3.085 \pm 0.403

Table 3: Relative AUC loss (%) of models trained under various privacy budget ε on the Criteo Attribution dataset.

ϵ	RR	DP-SGD	Hybrid
1	11.595 ± 0.009	9.371 ± 0.003	8.840 ± 0.001
3	6.418 ± 0.001	7.940 ± 0.001	4.491 ± 0.003
5	5.775 ± 0.005	7.266 ± 0.001	3.308 ± 0.000
10	5.783 ± 0.003	6.595 ± 0.001	2.992 ± 0.000
20	5.754 ± 0.001	5.971 ± 0.002	2.862 ± 0.001
30	5.595 ± 0.001	5.799 ± 0.002	2.732 ± 0.000
50	5.652 ± 0.004	5.137 ± 0.001	2.631 ± 0.001

Table 4: Relative AUC loss (%) of models trained under various privacy budget ϵ on the proprietary pCVR dataset.




Figure 4: Relative AUC loss (%) of models trained under various privacy budget ϵ on the Criteo pCTR dataset with 64 epochs for DP-SGD phase.

hyperparameter tuning for the pCVR dataset but relied on past experience with the dataset.

Large Epoch Training for DP-SGD

Due to limited compute and the high cost of DP-SGD training, we only evaluated models where the DP-SGD phase of training runs for at most three epochs. We find that for large datasets such as our proprietary pCVR dataset, we are not practically able to run more epochs of training. To directly compare our algorithm with that of Denison et al. (2023) which uses 64 epochs for their DP-SGD training on the Criteo pCTR dataset, we also repeated the experiments on this dataset with DP-SGD training run for 64 epochs. All other hyperparameters remain the same. We find that this allows DP-SGD to perform much better but our algorithm Hybrid still outperforms it for $\epsilon \geq 3$. We plot the relative AUC loss with respect to the baseline in Figure 4 and add the AUC loss values in Table 5.

ϵ	RR	DP-SGD	Hybrid
1	14.139 ± 0.001	9.666 ± 0.002	12.918 ± 0.004
3	9.921 ± 0.000	7.854 ± 0.002	6.415 ± 0.002
5	9.467 ± 0.000	7.557 ± 0.002	4.968 ± 0.000
10	9.368 ± 0.000	7.291 ± 0.001	4.298 ± 0.001
20	9.333 ± 0.000	7.203 ± 0.001	4.142 ± 0.002
30	9.380 ± 0.000	7.129 ± 0.001	4.175 ± 0.001
50	9.380 ± 0.001	6.999 ± 0.001	4.123 ± 0.001

Table 5: Relative AUC loss (%) of models trained under various privacy budget ϵ on the Criteo pCTR dataset with 64 epochs for DP-SGD phase.