
PRIVATE WASSERSTEIN DISTANCE WITH RANDOM NOISES

Wenqian Li
National University of Singapore

Haozhi Wang
Tianjin University

Zhe Huang
North China Electric Power University

Yan Pang
National University of Singapore

ABSTRACT

Wasserstein distance is a principle measure of data divergence from a distributional standpoint. However, its application becomes challenging in the context of data privacy, where sharing raw data is restricted. Prior attempts have employed techniques like Differential Privacy or Federated optimization to approximate Wasserstein distance. Nevertheless, these approaches often lack accuracy and robustness against potential attack. In this study, we investigate the underlying triangular properties within the Wasserstein space, leading to a straightforward solution named `TriangleWad`. This approach enables the computation of Wasserstein distance between datasets stored across different entities. Notably, `TriangleWad` is $20\times$ faster, making raw data information truly invisible, enhancing resilience against attacks, and without sacrificing estimation accuracy. Through comprehensive experimentation across various tasks involving both image and text data, we demonstrate its superior performance and generalizations.

1 Introduction

Optimal Transport (OT) is one of representative approaches that provides a geometric view that allows us to put a distance on the space of probability measures [1]. Specifically, it aims to find a coupling matrix that moves the source data to the target ones with smallest cost, and allows us to induce the Wasserstein distance. With advantageous analytical properties such as computationally tractable and computable from finite samples, it has been used in text document similarity measurement [2], domain adaption [3], labeled data measurement [4], generative adversarial networks [5], data selection [6, 7, 8]. However, optimizing OT problem requires access to both data, which may appear to be unacceptable for privacy sensitive parties (e.g. hospitals, banks). In collaborative training or data exchange platform, data is also not allowed to be shared due to privacy concerns, making such measurement difficult to be conducted. Recently, FedWad [9] takes the first step to approximate Wasserstein distance in Federated optimization. However, its privacy and robustness are not formally defined. In this paper, we propose a privacy-enhanced approach, that guarantees both efficiency and estimation precision.

Our contributions: (1) We theoretically analyze the geometric property in Wasserstein space, design a simple attack towards FedWad, and propose a new defense approach `TriangleWad`; (2) `TriangleWad` is very simple-to-use, fast, accurate and privacy-enhanced. Furthermore, it boosts the noisy data detection ability from server side in FL, which is more inline with real world; (4) We conduct extensive experiments on both image data and text data, with various applications such as data evaluation, noisy data detection, document similarity analysis, to show generalization ability.

Organization of the paper: Sec 2 provides related work and technical background of Wasserstein distance, its geodesics and interpolating measures. Sec 3 provides successful attack towards FedWad and estimation error of Differential Privacy, to show current bottlenecks on both privacy and accuracy. In Sec 4, we formalize `TriangleWad` with its theoretical insights, then provide complexity and privacy guarantee in Sec 5. In Sec 6, we conduct an empirical analysis with different use-cases.

2 Related Work and Preliminary

2.1 Related Work

Private Wasserstein Distance There are very few efforts to provide privacy guarantees for computing Wasserstein distance when raw data is forbidden to be shared. The first attempt is to apply Differential Privacy (DP) [10] with Johnson-Lindenstrauss transform. The following work [11] considers DP for Sliced Wasserstein distance, and [12] uses DP for graph embeddings. Recent proposed FedWad [9] develops a Federated way to approximate distance iteratively based on geodesics and interpolating measures, and FedBary [7] extends this approach to approximate data valuation and Wasserstein barycenter. However, DP might sacrifice the estimation accuracy, and Federated approach leaks data information. It is worthy to note that one latest work Wasserstein Differential Privacy [13] focuses computing privacy budgets through Wasserstein distance, which is not related to our applications.

Data Evaluation in FL Data quality valuation has gained more attentions in recent years since it has impact on the trained models and downstream tasks. Due to privacy issue, e.g. Federated Learning, only model gradients are shared for evaluation. Therefore, Shapley value (SV) [14, 15, 16, 17, 18] is mainly used to measure client contributions as it provides marginal contribution score. Recently, based on [9], FedBary [7] uses Wasserstein distance to measure dataset divergence as the score of client contribution, and it uses calibrated gradient from [6] to select valuable data points.

2.2 Preliminary

Definition 1 (Wasserstein distance) *The p -Wasserstein distance between measures μ and ν is*

$$\mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \nu) = \left(\inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}} d^p(x, x') d\pi(x, x') \right)^{1/p}, \quad (1)$$

where $d(x, x')$ is the pairwise distance metric, e.g. Euclidean distance. $\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)$ is the joint distribution of μ and ν , and any π attains such minimum is considered as an optimal transport plan.

In the discrete space, the two marginal measures are denoted as $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i \delta_{x_i}$, $\nu = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \delta_{x'_i}$, where δ is the dirac function, $\forall a_i, b_i \geq 0$, $\sum_{i=1}^m a_i = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i = 1$. Then $\Pi(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = \{\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m \times n} | \mathbf{P}\mathbf{1} = \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{1} = \mathbf{b}\}$ is the set of all transportation plans, and the p -Wasserstein distance is $\mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \nu) = (\min_{\mathbf{P} \in \Pi(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})} \langle \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{P} \rangle)^{1/p}$.

Property 1 *For any $p > 1$, \mathcal{W}_p is a metric on $\mathcal{P}_p(\mathcal{X})$ and it satisfies triangle inequality [19] as*

$$\forall \mu, \nu, \gamma \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathcal{X}), \mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \nu) \leq \mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \gamma) + \mathcal{W}_p(\gamma, \nu). \quad (2)$$

This formula will become an equality when γ is an interpolating measure between μ and ν ,

Definition 2 (Wasserstein geodesics, Interpolating measure [9, 20]) *Define $(\cdot)_{\#}\pi$ is the push-forward measure of the optimal transport plan $\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)$, $\forall t \in [0, 1]$, the Wasserstein geodesics between μ and ν is the curve $\tilde{\gamma}_t = (\gamma_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$ with $\gamma_t = (\pi_t)_{\#}\pi$, where $\pi_t(x, x') = (1-t)x + tx'$. Any point of this Wasserstein geodesics is an interpolating measure between μ and ν , which could be approximated efficiently based on [9] as*

$$\gamma_t = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \delta_{(1-t)x_i + tm(\pi \mathbf{x}^\nu)_i} \quad (3)$$

where x_i is i -th support from μ , \mathbf{x}^ν is the support matrix of ν .

Definition 3 *If Party A holds μ , Party B holds ν , γ is randomly initialized, then η_μ is a **local interpolating measure** between μ and γ computed by A, η_ν is a **local interpolating measure** between γ and ν computed by B. γ is defined as a **global interpolating measure**.*

Based on the triangle property 2, [9] proposes a Federated way to approximate distance between two measures μ and ν , without sharing raw data. Specifically, a ‘‘global interpolating measure’’ γ is randomly initialized, and two additional ‘‘local interpolating measures’’ η_μ and η_ν are introduced to optimize γ . With iterative optimizations of $\gamma, \eta_\mu, \eta_\nu$, when they are all interpolating measures between μ and ν (geometrically $\mu, \eta_\mu, \gamma, \eta_\nu, \nu$ are one the same plane), the Federated Wasserstein distance is equivalent to the true Wasserstein distance with enough support size. In k -th round, the Federated distance is the summation of four components on the right-hand side of the inequality

$$\mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \nu) \leq \mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \eta_\mu^{(k)}) + \mathcal{W}_p(\eta_\mu^{(k)}, \gamma^{(k)}) + \mathcal{W}_p(\gamma^{(k)}, \eta_\nu^{(k)}) + \mathcal{W}_p(\eta_\nu^{(k)}, \nu), \quad (4)$$




Figure 1: **Attack results (a,b)**: the attack data will gradually converge to the target data with identical distribution; **DP results (c)**: The difference $|\mathcal{W}_2(\mu, \nu) - \mathcal{W}_2(\mu_{\text{perturb}}, \nu)|$ on 2-dimensional Gaussian data results in different level of distance gap with different privacy budget.

where $\eta_\mu^{(k)}$ represents the interpolating measure between μ and $\gamma^{(k-1)}$, $\eta_\nu^{(k)}$ represents the interpolating measure between $\gamma^{(k-1)}$ and ν , $\gamma^{(k)}$ is an interpolating measure between $\eta_\mu^{(k)}$ and $\eta_\nu^{(k)}$. Due to privacy, only $\eta_\mu^{(k)}$, $\eta_\nu^{(k)}$, $\gamma^{(k)}$ are shared for approximations, the OT plan between μ and $\gamma^{(k)}$, OT plan between $\gamma^{(k)}$ and ν , and parameters t randomly set by both sides are not shared. [7] considers the potential risk of data leakage, thus proposing to hide $\eta_\mu^{(k)}$ in their applications of data valuation.

3 Toy Example

From the previous part, it seems that the privacy is protected as OT plans and t are not shared, which are the main elements for reconstructing raw data. However, the privacy guarantee from either theoretical analysis or empirical result is not provided, and a question raises: *when the equality holds, without those informative elements, is the Federated Wasserstein distance real privacy-friendly?*

In the following subsections, we will first show a very simple yet effective attack approach to learn the local distributions, in which we call it *identically distributional attack*. We find this distributional attack might leak raw data information, e.g. (1) reconstruct some samples almost identical to some raw samples in low-dimensional case; (2) extract the raw data in high-dimensional case visually, which is undesirable to some high-sensitive parties such as hospitals. Even without attack, for text data, the global interpolating measure itself will leak the original words (Figure 2). In common sense, the most straightforward way is to use Differential Privacy technique. However, in the second part, we will show its pitfalls when approximating Wasserstein distance.

3.1 Federated Wasserstein Distance is Not Privacy-Friendly

Suppose one side (Party B) is untrusted, and he wants to infer raw data of the other μ when 4 is an equality, after K rounds. Available information for the attacker is: $\mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \nu)$, $\mathcal{W}_p(\gamma^{(K)}, \nu)$, ν , $\eta_\nu^{(K)}$, and $\gamma^{(K)}$. We claim the relationship $\mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \nu) = \mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \gamma^{(K)}) + \mathcal{W}_p(\gamma^{(K)}, \nu)$ is enough for him to infer raw data μ of the other side. Specifically, the attacker initializes a learnable attack dataset D_{attack} , and computes the distance $\mathcal{W}_p(D_{\text{attack}}, \nu)$ and $\mathcal{W}_p(D_{\text{attack}}, \gamma^{(K)})$. When two conditions hold: $\mathcal{W}_p(D_{\text{attack}}, \nu) = \mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \nu)$ and $\mathcal{W}_p(D_{\text{attack}}, \gamma^{(K)}) = \mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \gamma^{(K)})$, then $\mathcal{W}_p(D_{\text{attack}}, \mu) \simeq 0$, which means the attack data and raw data are distributional identical. To make the attack dataset learnable, the loss objective is set as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{attack}} = \left| \mathcal{W}_p(D_{\text{attack}}, \nu) - \mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \nu) \right| + \left| \mathcal{W}_p(D_{\text{attack}}, \gamma^{(K)}) - \mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \gamma^{(K)}) \right|. \quad (5)$$

The attack procedure is shown in Appendix. Empirical results are shown in Figure 1 (a) and (b). For 2-dimensional Gaussian case, some of data points are overlapping. For CIFAR10 data, the left side two plots are γ in FedWad, visually we can find it is a kind of combination of two pictures. The right-side are our constructed attack data, and we successfully extract raw “cat” and “car” elements from γ , and both are originally stored in the local side.

3.2 Pitfalls of Differential Privacy

Differential Privacy constitutes nowadays a standard technique for privacy guarantees, which perturbs the datasets by adding controllable noises with sacrificing trivial utility.

Definition 4 (Differential Privacy) A randomized mechanism $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{X}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfies (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy if for any two datasets $X, X' \in \mathcal{X}^n$ differing by a single element and for any set of possible output $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \text{Range}(\mathcal{M})$:

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}(X) \in \mathcal{O}) \leq e^\epsilon \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}(X') \in \mathcal{O}) + \delta. \quad (6)$$




Figure 2: Our findings: Attacker can visualize meaningful data using interpolating measures and approximate target data using distance statistics. We propose a privacy-enhanced mechanism to accurately estimate Wasserstein distance without disclosing raw data, and attacker is limited to obtaining invalid information. This approach is applicable to both image and text datasets.

It is straightforward to add some noises to private data for the privacy-sensitive parties. However, there is still a trade-off between the data privacy and precise distance as shown in Figure 1(c). This is not desirable when accurate estimation of data divergence is necessary.

4 Methodology

We refrain from adding any modifications to the original raw data, and introduce an "virtual agent" for each party to assist in calculating the distance between two data distributions. Ideally, these virtual agents should conceal sensitive information so that attackers can only perceive noise in image data or irrelevant words in text data. Based on our exploration of the inherent characteristics behind geometric space, we have devised a simple and efficient way to create defense data (let's call it D_{defense}) and use it to construct these virtual agents. What we have found is quite interesting: We do not need K round iterations in Federated manner, but approximating the Wasserstein distance between two separately distributed measures μ and ν within one round as

$$t^p \mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \nu) = \mathcal{W}_p(\eta_\mu, \eta_\nu), \quad (7)$$

where η_μ and η_ν are interpolating measures between μ and D_{defense} , ν and D_{defense} respectively.

In the following structure, we will first introduce our theoretical insights in Sec 4.1. In Sec 4.2 we illustrate how the proposed approximation could help to protect privacy and evaluate data contribution in various applications. Finally, in Sec 4.3 we will apply techniques from OOTD [4] and Lava [6] into our approach, to evaluate labeled data and detect noisy individual data points in a private manner.

4.1 Measures supported on a geodesic

Our insights are mainly based on measures supported on a geodesic: when dilated from a point of the geodesic, such a measure has Euclidean expansion [21].

Suppose there are three measures $\mu = \{\mu_i\}_{i=1}^m$, $\nu = \{\nu_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and $\gamma = \{\gamma_i\}_{i=1}^m$, where $\{\cdot\}_{i=1}^m$ represents the support. We define $\eta_\mu = \{\eta_\mu^i\}_{i=1}^m$ is the interpolating measure between μ and γ , $\eta_\nu = \{\eta_\nu^i\}_{i=1}^m$ is the interpolating measure between ν and γ , then we have the following conclusion

Theorem 1 *In Wasserstein space, the approximation error $|\mathcal{W}_p^p(\eta_\mu, \eta_\nu) - t^p \mathcal{W}_p^p(\mu, \nu)|$ is bounded by σ_γ^p , which is the p -th sample moments of γ . The proof is shown in Appendix.*

Theorem 1 tells about an intrinsic triangle properties of Wasserstein metric, which provides a straightforward procedure to approximate divergence between μ and ν : randomly initialize a measure γ , and use the distance between two interpolating measures to approximate $\mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \nu)$. In order to avoid confusions, before further discussions, we define Federated distance and direct distance in Definition 5. The difference is whether they are calculated directly or through Federated way.

Definition 5 *If both measures μ and ν are available in one side, local calculated $\mathcal{W}_p^*(\mu, \nu)$ is defined as **direct distance**; If μ and ν are stored in two parties respectively, **Federated distance** $\mathcal{W}_p^\dagger(\mu, \nu)$ should be calculated via FedWad.*

In our empirical results, approximation error is relatively larger when two measures have similar distributions than when two measures are far away from each other. In addition, we find $\mathcal{W}_p^*(\mu, \nu) \leq \frac{1}{t^p} \mathcal{W}_p(\eta_\mu, \eta_\nu) \simeq \mathcal{W}_p^\dagger(\mu, \nu)$. However, based on Theorem 1, we could fill this gap by using identical values D_{ones} or D_{random} with small support as γ , to minimize the moments, which provides more accurate estimation. More discussions on choices of defense data are shown in Appendix.

4.2 Triangle: One Virtual Agent

Our approach could be applied in any privacy situation that aims to quantify data divergence. The defense data could be either initialized by the private party himself, or by a third-party, such as Server in FL or agent in data market place. We will show two different representative applications as examples: (1) Evaluate data contributions; (2) Measure peer to peer heterogeneous.

Evaluate data contribution In the collaboratively training or FL task, one of the representative applications is evaluating data and client contributions. Suppose server has a small size of validation dataset ν , and seeks for more datasets that could train a model with high accuracy on his validation data. Same to [7], $\mathcal{W}_p^\dagger(\mu, \nu)$ is computed for evaluation before training. However, it is the common case that the client do not trust Server for providing μ , as risk mentioned before. Therefore, the client could randomly initialize a defense dataset D_{defense} (e.g. random Gaussian noises), and calculates direct distance $\mathcal{W}_p^*(\mu, D_{\text{defense}})$ and direct interpolating measure η_P^* with hyperparameter t . As D_{defense} is uninformative noisy data, it could be shared with Server. Server computes direct distance $\mathcal{W}_p^*(D_{\text{defense}}, \nu)$ and direct interpolating measure η_ν^* with the same t . Finally, for $\mathcal{W}_p(\eta_\mu^*, \eta_\nu^*)$, both sides could share η_μ^* and η_ν^* for direct calculations, or keep them private for Federated calculation.

Measure peer to peer heterogeneous This procedure could also be applied to peer to peer heterogeneous measurement, which is another important application for clusterings task and decentralized FL. For example, estimating the Wasserstein distance between two datasets μ and ν stored in different parties, whilst a central server orchestrates the computations. Specifically, the defense dataset D_{defense} is initialized by Server and shared with two private parties. They compute direct interpolating measures η_μ^* and η_ν^* in local via interacting with D_{defense} . Server computes $\mathcal{W}_p^*(\eta_\mu^*, \eta_\nu^*)$ if η_μ^* and η_ν^* are shared, or Federated $\mathcal{W}_p^\dagger(\eta_\mu^*, \eta_\nu^*)$ in a decentralized way.

Algorithm 1 TriangleWad

Input: $(D_{\text{defense}}, \mu, \nu, t)$ For both sides, t should be the same

- 1: D_{defense} is initialized by client;
- 2: Client computes direct distance $\mathcal{W}_p^\dagger(\mu, D_{\text{defense}})$ and direct interpolating measure η_P^* ;
- 3: Server computes Federated distance $\mathcal{W}_p^*(D_{\text{defense}}, \nu)$ and η_ν^* ;
- 4: **if** η_μ^* and η_ν^* are shared **then**
- 5: Compute direct distance $\mathcal{W}_p^*(\eta_\nu^*, \eta_\mu^*)$;
- 6: **else**
- 7: Compute Federated distance $\mathcal{W}_p^\dagger(\eta_\nu^*, \eta_\mu^*)$;
- 8: **end if**

Output: $\mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \nu) = \mathcal{W}_p(\eta_\mu, \eta_\nu)/t^p$

Remark 1 (Main differences with previous work) The main difference between ours with FedWad and FedBary is: [9, 7] require iterative optimizations until that all η_μ, η_ν and γ (which is equivalent to D_{defense} in our paper) are interpolating measures between μ and ν , which results in additional K rounds optimizations, and privacy risk in Section 3. In contrast, our process does not have any iterative optimization procedure, because we request only two conditions: η_μ is the interpolating measures between μ and D_{defense} , and η_ν is the interpolating measures between ν and D_{defense} .

Remark 2 (Imbalanced Data) For imbalanced data, where $|\mu| = m < |\nu| = n$, initializing the defense data with the same dimension as $|\mu|$ can also yield satisfactory estimation precision.

Remark 3 (Private D_{defense} provides better Privacy) If D_{defense} is shared, a simple attack is to approximate $\hat{D}_\mu = \frac{1}{t}(\eta_\mu - t \times D_{\text{defense}})$. It can not reconstruct the raw data but may visualize the privacy information. Making it private is a more safe way. More discussions are in Sec 5.

4.3 Detect Noisy data points with OOTD

OOTD [4] introduces an effective way to augment data representations for calculating Wasserstein distance with labeled data. We use the same point-wise notion $z = (x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ for measurements,

$$\begin{aligned} d((x, y), (x', y')) &\triangleq (d(x, x') + \mathcal{W}_2^2(\alpha_y, \alpha_{y'}))^{1/2}, \\ \mathcal{W}_2^2(\alpha_y, \alpha_{y'}) &= \|m_y - m_{y'}\|_2^2 + \|\Sigma_y - \Sigma_{y'}\|_2^2, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $\alpha_{y'}$ is conditional feature distribution $P(\mathbf{x}|Y = y')$ that follows the Gaussian distribution with mean $m_{y'}$ and covariance $\Sigma_{y'}$. The constructed augmented representation of each dataset D , is a stacked vector $\mathbf{X}(D) := [\mathbf{x}; m_y; \text{vec}(\Sigma_y^{1/2})]$. Therefore, when conducting approximations, all datasets should be pre-processed into such form and the random initialisation of D_{defense} follows the same dimension. With abuse of notation, in this paper $\mathbf{X}(D)$ and D are equivalent.

Furthermore, we could take advantage of characteristics that the duality of optimal transport problem is a linear program, and construct the *calibrated gradient* [6], to make data points evaluation feasible,

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \nu)}{\partial P(z_l)} = f_l^* - \sum_{j \in \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus l} \frac{f_j^*}{m-1}, \quad (9)$$

which represents the rate of change in $\mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \nu)$ w.r.t. the given datum z_l in μ . [7] discovered that it is also applicable between the interpolating measures and the local dataset in FL. However, the detection capability of server is notably deficient. For instance, Server with validation data ν lacks awareness of the noisy proportion within μ , only the client can identify noisy points. In TriangleWad, introducing η_μ and η_ν engenders symmetrical capabilities in identifying noisy data, facilitating recognition by both the client and server. This enhancement aligns more closely with real-world scenarios: Server can select valuable data points or identify potential attacks from clients.

5 Complexity and Privacy Analysis

Complexity We only need to compute 3 OT plans in total for evaluating distance between two data datasets if local interpolating measures are shared, e.g., η_μ or η_ν in Algorithm 1. Each OT plan's complexity is based on the network simplex algorithm, which operates at $\mathcal{O}((n+m)nm \log(n+m))$. With barycentric mapping for approximating interpolating measures [9].

Privacy Guarantee Our approach enhances privacy without revealing any informative elements visually. We also outline challenges for potential attacks, to show the robustness of TriangleWad:

(1) Based on 3, we understand the local interpolating measure η_μ is not simply a combination of μ and D_{defense} . Consequently, attacker can not reconstruct μ solely by employing $\eta_\mu - t \times D_{\text{defense}}$, without an OT plan between D_{defense} and μ . (2) If D_{defense} remains undisclosed and Federated computation is performed, privacy is further strengthened. Even if an attack data $\tilde{D}_{\text{defense}}$ is constructed to yield $\mathcal{W}_p(\tilde{D}_{\text{attack}}, D_{\text{defense}}) \simeq 0$, they may appear to have identical distributions but possess significant discrepancies in numerical values across high-dimensional space.

Theorem 2 Suppose $D_{\text{defense}} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$, η_μ is an interpolating measure between μ and D_{defense} . If an attack dataset $\tilde{D}_{\text{attack}}$ is constructed such that $\mathcal{W}_p(D_{\text{defense}}, \tilde{D}_{\text{attack}}) < \epsilon$, with a very small value ϵ , then $\eta_\mu - t \times \tilde{D}_{\text{attack}}$ still follows a distribution similar to the Gaussian.

The proof of Theorem 2 is shown in Appendix. We visualize this result in Figure 3, and find each element in η_μ (Local IM) and $\eta_\mu - t \times \tilde{D}_{\text{defense}}$ (Attack) are uninformative noises. We also provide more empirical results in Figure 4 in our experiments.

(3) The attack strategy mentioned in Sec 3.1 is also impractical, as D_{defense} is randomly initialized, and the essential distance information $\mathcal{W}_p(D_{\text{defense}}, \mu)$ and $\mathcal{W}_p(D_{\text{defense}}, \eta_\mu)$ is unavailable to the attacker, who wants to construct an infer dataset D_{attack} such that $\mathcal{W}_p(\mu, D_{\text{attack}}) < \epsilon$.

6 Experiments

We will conduct experiments on both image datasets and text datasets, to show the efficiency and effectiveness in multiple tasks. For image datasets, we will focus on MNIST [22], Fashion [23], CIFAR10 and CIFAR100 [24] on data contribution evaluation task, and noisy data points detection task. As for text data, we use BBC data, to show the privacy guarantee of our approach.




Figure 3: Qualitative Visualizations with two different noises

CIFAR10	DirectWad			FedWad			TriangleWad($D^{\text{ones}}/D^{\text{random}}$)		
	100	500	1000	100	500	1000	100	500	1000
$\mathcal{W}_2(\mu, \nu)$	27.46	24.73	24.16	32.90	30.75	30.72	27.51/32.88	24.73/30.76	24.16/30.69
$\mathcal{W}_2(D_1^{\text{noise}}, \nu)$	571.73	216.54	141.68	571.99	217.50	143.08	571.74/572.01	216.54/217.02	141.68/143.68
$\mathcal{W}_2(D_2^{\text{noise}}, \nu)$	975.79	376.65	248.32	975.94	377.15	249.16	975.80/975.88	376.65/377.32	248.32/249.10
Avg. Gap	-	-	-	1.95	2.49	2.93	0.05	0.00	0.00
Avg. time (s)	-	-	-	2.55	34.23	92.46	0.17	1.38	3.26
Fashion	100	500	1000	100	500	1000	100	500	1000
$\mathcal{W}_2(\mu, \nu)$	12.68	10.94	10.45	15.59	14.30	15.22	12.68/15.67	10.94/15.77	10.45/15.34
$\mathcal{W}_2(D_1^{\text{noise}}, \nu)$	295.17	107.62	70.51	295.29	108.14	71.81	295.17/296.38	107.62/107.71	70.51/71.88
$\mathcal{W}_2(D_2^{\text{noise}}, \nu)$	687.70	269.77	178.21	687.76	270.06	179.22	687.70/688.40	269.78/270.88	178.21/179.17
Avg. Gap	-	-	-	1.02	1.39	2.35	0.00	0.00	0.00
Avg. time(s)	-	-	-	1.76	18.62	54.72	0.08	0.69	3.32
MNIST	100	500	1000	100	500	1000	100	500	1000
$\mathcal{W}_2(\mu, \nu)$	15.05	12.99	12.57	18.66	17.13	17.04	15.05/18.40	12.99/17.02	12.57/17.66
$\mathcal{W}_2(D_1^{\text{noise}}, \nu)$	290.19	114.30	75.81	290.37	115.12	76.90	290.19/290.88	114.30/115.13	75.81/76.88
$\mathcal{W}_2(D_2^{\text{noise}}, \nu)$	688.94	274.37	181.39	688.98	275.06	182.04	688.94/689.69	274.37/275.54	181.39/ 182.88
Avg. Gap	-	-	-	1.27	1.88	2.07	0.00	0.00	0.00
Avg. time(s)	-	-	-	1.44	17.22	65.33	0.07	2.44	9.71

Table 1: Quantitative Comparisons

6.1 Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis

In this section, we employ CIFAR10, Fashion, and MNIST datasets as case studies to provide both quantitative and qualitative analyses among DirectWad, FedWad, and TriangleWad. The quantitative analysis presents the approximation gap and average computation time, which are summarized in Table 1. For data processing, we randomly select subsets μ and ν with equal sizes (100/500/1000), and their distributions do not necessarily to be identical. We introduce two noisy datasets, D_1^{noise} and D_2^{noise} , derived from the clean dataset μ , where a subset of samples is corrupted by Gaussian noise in their features. Specifically, D_1^{noise} contains 20 noisy data points, while D_2^{noise} contains 50 noisy data points. For TriangleWad, we explore two defense data: D^{ones} , representing an all-ones matrix, and D^{random} , representing a matrix with values drawn from a normal distribution. We observe that with D^{ones} , TriangleWad exhibits no error gap with direct calculations as the sample size increases. With D^{random} , the distance is similar to FedWad. Additionally, it achieves an evaluation time that is 20 times faster than FedWad on average. These findings underscore the efficiency of our approach without compromising estimation precision.

The qualitative analysis aims to demonstrate the privacy guarantee, and we visualize the results with Gaussian defense data in Figure 4. The left-side plot illustrates the CIFAR10 data distributed in parties A and B, γ of FedWad between A and B (FedWad IM), η_μ and η_ν of TriangleWad (Local IM, Server IM), and randomly constructed defense data. Both Local IM and Server IM do not reveal any information about the data, while from FedWad IM, we can identify the class of each image. In the right-side histogram plot, we construct a statistical test to demonstrate that our local interpolating measure follows a Gaussian distribution, while FedWad IM would reveal statistical information.




Figure 4: Qualitative Visualizations with Gaussian Noises: the global interpolating measure γ in FedWad (FedWad IM) is visually informative, while in our approach, all interpolating measures (Local IM and Server IM) and defense data are visually noisy. In addition, the statistic plot in the right side shows Local IM indeed follows the Gaussian distribution while FedWad IM is similar to raw data.




Figure 5: Contribution evaluation of 5 parties with CIFAR10 data

6.2 Contribution Evaluation in FL

Datasets We use all image datasets mentioned before, and follow the same data settings in [16]: We simulate $N = 5$ parties and consider both iid and non-iid cases, with the same size of data as follows:

- (1) *Same Distribution*: All five parties possess the same number of images for each class;
- (2) *Different Distributions*: Party 1’s dataset contains 80% for two classes. The other parties evenly divide the remaining 20% of the samples. Similar procedures are applied to the rest;
- (3) *Mislabeled data*: Adopt Case (1) and randomly flip the labels with a pre-defined percentage.
- (4) *Noisy Features*: Adopt Case (1), and add different percentages of Gaussian noise into the input images. The ratios in both Case (3) and Case (4) are: 0%, 5%, 10%, 15% and 20%.

Baselines We consider 7 different baselines, in which all of them evaluate client contribution in FL: exact calculation *exactFed*, accelerated *GTG-Shapley* with its variants (*GTG-Ti/GTG-Tib*) [16], *MR* and *OR* [14], *DataSV* [25] and *FedBary* [7].

We consider *exactFed* as the ground truth since it precisely calculates the marginal contribution of adding model parameters from one party by considering all subsets, for example, 2^N for N parties. In previous quantitative comparisons, we found that the Wasserstein distances computed by Fedwad and our method have trivial differences with Gaussian noises. Shapley-based approaches provide marginal contributions, thus illustrating proportional contributions. On the other hand, FedBary and TriangleWad provide absolute values, so we normalize them to ensure all values fall within the range $[0, 1]$. Overall, Wasserstein-based approaches offer distributional views with correct contribution topology. For case (1), all client contributions are identical due to identical distributions. Case (2) and Case (3) resemble *exactFed*, while others are more sensitive. Due to computational methods, our approach is more sensitive to features, resulting in wider differences in contribution levels. MR and our method follow the same topology as *exactFed*, whereas other approximated approaches are completely wrong in this case, e.g. Party 5, with the most noise, has the highest contribution. We also present the evaluation time of various algorithms in Appendix.

6.3 Noisy Feature Detection

Datasets We randomly choose the proportion $p_{\text{noise}}\% \in \{5, 15, 30\}\%$ of the training dataset to perturb, adding standard Gaussian random noises to the original features.

Baselines As aforementioned, our approach performs noisy data detections without sharing any raw data. We conducted comparative evaluations with existing Wasserstein-based approaches *Lava* [6] and *FedBary* [7]. Note *Lava* could access

Raw Data	FedWad	TriangleWad
cabinet anger at brown cash raid ministers are unhappy about plans to use whitehall cash to keep council tax bills down local government minister nick raynsford has acknowledged. gordon brown reallocated 512m from central to local government budgets in his pre-budget report on thursday. mr raynsford said he had held some pretty frank discussions with fellow ministers over the plans.	Brown unhappy minister cash council Gordon government Budgets council tax	Volkswagen_Passats_amid Kapersky_Labs Neiman_Marcus_Saks PM_Boyko_Borisov Designer_Outlets_Fiuczynski Imperial_College broadcaster_Tommy_Heinsohn Jones occasional_flashes
low-budget film wins cesar a film that follows a group of alienated youth in a paris suburb as they prepare to perform an 18th century play has won france s top cinema award.	africa travails paris cinema featuring for french actor at wistful wanted show best for for an the cesar youth	By_DAVID_KINVIG awards grommet foul_mouthed_misanthrope Darr SuperNova_Acceleration_Probe unopened_envelopes_relating sara hero schoolteacher M5_Motorway Spotlighting

Figure 6: BBC Data: words in highlight are words retrieved by $e(\mu)$. We randomly choose words retrieved by embeddings of FedWad $e(\gamma)$ and embeddings of TriangleWad $e(\eta_\mu)$.

raw data, which could be the groundtruth, while FedBary and ours are private approaches. Visualization of experimental results are shown in appendix.

In FedBary, as previously discussed, we examine a more practical scenario in Federated Learning (FL): server selects noisy points rather than clients themselves. Consequently, we only report its detection rate on server side, utilizing the γ and test data ν and their measurement $\mathcal{W}_p(\gamma, \nu)$. Lava requires access to raw data, utilizing μ and ν , hence it's reasonable that it achieves a 100% success rate. TriangleWad prioritizes privacy with employing η_μ and η_ν , and achieves 75% detection accuracy, with a False Positive Rate (FPR) of 0, indicating that no clean data point is incorrectly classified as noisy. In contrast, FedBary performs poorly with only a 25% accuracy.

6.4 Measure Document Similarity with Privacy

Datasets We select BBC data processed by [26], and use Word2Vec model [27] to map raw data into embeddings $e(\cdot) \mapsto \mathbb{R}^k$. We remove stop words, which are generally category independent.

Baselines We compare *FedWad* [9], as it is the only approach that is fit to this case.

This experiment aims to demonstrate that using interpolating measures in FedWad raises more serious privacy concerns for text data compared to image data. In images, the interpolating measures merely offer a visual recognition of the image's content, rather than faithfully reproducing the original data. However, with text data, the interpolating measures can accurately retrieve words from the original data in embedding space, causing privacy leakage. Fortunately, with TriangleWad, we can circumvent this issue. For example, after computing the Wasserstein distance, we employ the `similar_by_vector` function to identify the most similar word with $e(\gamma)$ and $e(\eta_\mu)$ respectively. We found that the text retrieved from $e(\gamma)$ matches words in the raw data μ , but for $e(\eta_\mu)$, most words are unrelated. We define the matching rate as the proportion of words retrieved by $e(\cdot)$ that are identical to the words in the original text (words retrieved by $e(\mu)$). When comparing two different texts $\mathcal{W}_p(e(\mu), e(\nu))$, the matching rates for γ and η_μ are 69% and 4%. However, when comparing two identical texts $\mathcal{W}_p(e(\mu), e(\mu))$, the matching rates are 100% and 32%.

7 Conclusion

In summary, we introduced TriangleWad, a novel approach addressing privacy concerns in Wasserstein distance computation, with efficiency and accuracy. Through extensive experiments, we demonstrated its superior performance across various tasks involving image and text data.

References

- [1] Cédric Villani et al. *Optimal transport: old and new*, volume 338. Springer, 2009.
- [2] Matt Kusner, Yu Sun, Nicholas Kolkin, and Kilian Weinberger. From word embeddings to document distances. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 957–966. PMLR, 2015.
- [3] Nicolas Courty, Rémi Flamary, Devis Tuia, and Alain Rakotomamonjy. Optimal transport for domain adaptation. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 39(9):1853–1865, 2016.
- [4] David Alvarez-Melis and Nicolo Fusi. Geometric dataset distances via optimal transport. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:21428–21439, 2020.
- [5] Martin Arjovsky, Soumith Chintala, and Léon Bottou. Wasserstein generative adversarial networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 214–223. PMLR, 2017.
- [6] Hoang Anh Just, Feiyang Kang, Jiachen T Wang, Yi Zeng, Myeongseob Ko, Ming Jin, and Ruoxi Jia. Lava: Data valuation without pre-specified learning algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.00054*, 2023.
- [7] Wenqian Li, Shuran Fu, Fengrui Zhang, and Yan Pang. Data valuation and detections in federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.05304*, 2023.
- [8] Feiyang Kang, Hoang Anh Just, Anit Kumar Sahu, and Ruoxi Jia. Performance scaling via optimal transport: Enabling data selection from partially revealed sources. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [9] Alain Rakotomamonjy, Kimia Nadjahi, and Liva Ralaivola. Federated wasserstein distance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01973*, 2023.
- [10] Nam Lê Tien, Amaury Habrard, and Marc Sebban. Differentially private optimal transport: Application to domain adaptation. In *IJCAI*, pages 2852–2858, 2019.
- [11] Alain Rakotomamonjy and Ralaivola Liva. Differentially private sliced wasserstein distance. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8810–8820. PMLR, 2021.
- [12] Hongwei Jin and Xun Chen. Gromov-wasserstein discrepancy with local differential privacy for distributed structural graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.00808*, 2022.
- [13] Chengyi Yang, Jiayin Qi, and Aimin Zhou. Wasserstein differential privacy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.12436*, 2024.
- [14] Tianshu Song, Yongxin Tong, and Shuyue Wei. Profit allocation for federated learning. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*, pages 2577–2586. IEEE, 2019.
- [15] Ruoxi Jia, David Dao, Boxin Wang, Frances Ann Hubis, Nick Hynes, Nezihe Merve Gürel, Bo Li, Ce Zhang, Dawn Song, and Costas J Spanos. Towards efficient data valuation based on the shapley value. In *The 22nd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1167–1176. PMLR, 2019.
- [16] Zelei Liu, Yuanyuan Chen, Han Yu, Yang Liu, and Lizhen Cui. Gtg-shapley: Efficient and accurate participant contribution evaluation in federated learning. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)*, 13(4):1–21, 2022.
- [17] Xinyi Xu, Lingjuan Lyu, Xingjun Ma, Chenglin Miao, Chuan Sheng Foo, and Bryan Kian Hsiang Low. Gradient driven rewards to guarantee fairness in collaborative machine learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:16104–16117, 2021.
- [18] Xinyi Xu, Zhaoxuan Wu, Chuan Sheng Foo, and Bryan Kian Hsiang Low. Validation free and replication robust volume-based data valuation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:10837–10848, 2021.
- [19] Gabriel Peyré, Marco Cuturi, et al. Computational optimal transport: With applications to data science. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 11(5-6):355–607, 2019.
- [20] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Gigli, and Giuseppe Savaré. *Gradient flows: in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2005.
- [21] Benoît R Kloeckner et al. A geometric study of wasserstein spaces: isometric rigidity in negative curvature. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2016(5):1368–1386, 2016.
- [22] Yann LeCun. The mnist database of handwritten digits. <http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/>, 1998.
- [23] Han Xiao, Kashif Rasul, and Roland Vollgraf. Fashion-mnist: a novel image dataset for benchmarking machine learning algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.07747*, 2017.
- [24] Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. 2009.
- [25] Amirata Ghorbani and James Zou. Data shapley: Equitable valuation of data for machine learning. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2242–2251. PMLR, 2019.
- [26] Kevin Fu Jiang, Weixin Liang, James Zou, and Yongchan Kwon. Opendataval: a unified benchmark for data valuation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.10577*, 2023.
- [27] Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781*, 2013.