

# Differentially Private Release of Israel's National Registry of Live Births

Shlomi Hod\*      Ran Canetti\*

May 2, 2024

## Abstract

In February 2024, Israel's Ministry of Health released microdata of live births in Israel in 2014. The dataset is based on Israel's National Registry of Live Births and offers substantial value in multiple areas, such as scientific research and policy-making. At the same time, the data was processed so as to protect the privacy of 2014's mothers and newborns. The release was co-designed by the authors together with stakeholders from both inside and outside the Ministry of Health. This paper presents the methodology used to obtain that release. It also describes the considerations involved in choosing the methodology and the process followed.

We used differential privacy as our formal measure of the privacy loss incurred by the released dataset. More concretely, we prove that the released dataset is differentially private with privacy loss budget  $\epsilon = 9.98$ . We extensively used the private selection algorithm of Liu and Talwar (STOC 2019) to bundle together multiple steps such as data transformation, model generation algorithm, hyperparameter selection, and evaluation. The model generation algorithm selected was PrivBayes (Zhang et al., SIGMOD 2014). The evaluation was based on a list of acceptance criteria, which were also disclosed only approximately so as to provide an overall differential privacy guarantee. We also discuss concrete challenges and barriers that appear relevant to the next steps of this pilot project, as well as to future differentially private releases.

---

\*Department of Computer Science, Boston University. {shlomi, canetti}@bu.edu  
Supported by DARPA under Agreement No. HR00112020021.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1	Summary of our Contributions . . . . .	6
1.2	Organization of this Paper . . . . .	7
<b>2</b>	<b>Stakeholders' Requirements and Expectations</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Solution Concept and Scheme Design</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1	Scheme Overview . . . . .	9
3.2	Formal Notion of Privacy . . . . .	11
3.3	Synthetic Data . . . . .	12
3.4	Acceptance Criteria . . . . .	12
3.5	Trust in Differentially Private Synthetic Data . . . . .	13
3.5.1	Faithfulness . . . . .	13
3.5.2	Face privacy . . . . .	15
3.6	Configurations . . . . .	15
3.7	Private Selection . . . . .	16
<b>4</b>	<b>Implementation</b>	<b>17</b>
4.1	Terminology . . . . .	17
4.2	Summary of Results . . . . .	17
4.3	Registry Data . . . . .	18
4.3.1	Releasing a single year . . . . .	18
4.3.2	Selecting data fields . . . . .	18
4.4	Differential Privacy Choices . . . . .	18
4.4.1	Releasing singleton births only . . . . .	18
4.4.2	Treating the total number of live births as public information . . . . .	19
4.4.3	Opting for pure differential privacy . . . . .	19
4.4.4	Setting the privacy loss budget $\epsilon$ . . . . .	19
4.5	Acceptance Criteria Details . . . . .	20
4.5.1	Preliminaries . . . . .	21
4.5.2	Maximal error of marginals . . . . .	22
4.5.3	Maximal error in conditional means . . . . .	27
4.5.4	Linear regression . . . . .	31
4.5.5	Faithfulness . . . . .	34
4.6	Face Privacy and Dataset Projection . . . . .	35
4.7	Configuration Spaces . . . . .	38
4.7.1	Data transformation space . . . . .	39
4.7.2	Hyperparameter space . . . . .	39
4.7.3	Data projection space . . . . .	41
4.8	Cleaning and Constraint Filtering . . . . .	41
4.8.1	Raw data constraints . . . . .	42
4.8.2	Synthetic data constraints . . . . .	42
4.9	Private Selection Details . . . . .	43

4.10	Leveraging Public Data . . . . .	43
4.11	Software . . . . .	44
4.11.1	Overall design . . . . .	45
4.11.2	Risk management . . . . .	45
4.11.3	Randomness . . . . .	46
4.12	Execution Environments . . . . .	47
4.13	Public-facing Documentation . . . . .	47
4.14	Post-Production Improvements . . . . .	48
4.14.1	Saving privacy budget for linear regression acceptance criteria . . . . .	48
4.14.2	Wrong global sensitivity calculation for MAE acceptance criterion . . . . .	48
4.14.3	Simpler dataset projection algorithm . . . . .	48
<b>5</b>	<b>Related Work</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>52</b>
	<b>Acknowledgement</b>	<b>53</b>

# 1 Introduction

The Israeli National Registry of Live Births is the official source of all live births in Israel. According to officials in the Ministry of Health, it holds data that is extremely valuable for research and policy-making in many areas, including demography, economy and health. Therefore, making the Registry accessible to the public has a significant value in public health and policy development.

In February 2024 the Israeli Ministry of Health released selected data fields (columns) from the Registry of singleton births (births with only a single newborn) from 2014 [MoH24]. The data was processed so as to protect the privacy of mothers and newborns. The Ministry of Health is treating this release as a pilot, and anticipates releasing additional fields and data from more recent years based on feedback from the project’s stakeholders. More generally, the project aims to test the viability of making government data available to the public using Privacy Enhancing Technologies (PETs) [Dre23].

The Registry comprises 167K records of all singleton live births in Israel during 2014 (The total number of births is public information, provided by the Israeli Central Bureau of Statistics [Cen14].) Six data fields per live birth were chosen to be included in the release because of their potential values to various data users (see Table 1).

The release was co-designed by the authors together with a number of stakeholders, including TIMNA (Israel’s National Health Research Platform) who managed the project. This paper documents the process that led to this release. We present the requirements defined by the stakeholders, the algorithms, mechanisms and tools we used, and the considerations behind our design choices.

Table 1: **The metadata of the released dataset of singleton live births in 2014** ( $n = 165,915$ ).

Column	Description	Possible Values
birth_month	Month of birth in 2014	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12
mother_age	Age of mother in full years at birth	<18, 18-19, 20-24, 25-29, 30-34, 35-36, 37-39, 40-42, 43-44, 44<
parity	Mother’s number of live births so far	1, 2-3, 4-6, 7-10, 10<
gestation_week	The week of pregnancy when the birth took place	<29, 29-31, 32-33, 34-36, 37-41, 41<
birth_sex	Sex assigned at birth	M (male), F (female)
birth_weight	Newborn weight at birth in grams	<1500, 1500-1599, ..., 4400-4499, 4499<

The Registry contains national-level sensitive information about mothers and newborns. The release of such sensitive data is regulated by Article 7 of the of the Basic Law: Human Dignity and Liberty (1992) [Isr92], Israel’s Patient’s Rights Law (1996) [Isr96], and Protection of Privacy Law (1981) [Isr81]. Indeed, releasing national birth data without taking appropriate privacy-protection measures could lead to serious privacy harms as discussed, e.g., in [Sol08, CS22, Har21].

To balance potential benefits and possible privacy harms (both perceived and actual ones), we used a collection of mechanisms that provide strong empirical guarantees regarding the quality of the data, and at the same time provide a variety of privacy guarantees. The latter are made rigorous via *Differential Privacy* (DP) [DMNS06], a measure of privacy loss in data analysis that is in rapidly growing use, including in data releases by the US government [Abo18, Mik22, BEK<sup>+</sup>19], big tech companies [WZL<sup>+</sup>20, FD20] and other organizations [ABD<sup>+</sup>23, fM22]. (In a nutshell, an algorithm that outputs the result of some statistical computation, applied to a given dataset, provides differential privacy if the influence of any single record from the dataset on the algorithm’s output is controlled. Differential Privacy quantifies this influence with a parameter often called *privacy loss budget* and denoted  $\epsilon$ .)

A core requirement, elicited from our stakeholders, is that the release should be in the format of microdata, i.e. as a table  $x$  that contains individual records. In light of this requirement and our decision to use differential privacy, we chose to produce the release with *synthetic data*. We stress that synthetic data is not used as a privacy protection measure as suggested by others [Rub93, NRD16, DH23, GGN<sup>+</sup>23], but rather as a design choice resulting from the stakeholders’ requirement to have microdata format [SOT22].

Synthetic data is typically generated by sampling records from a statistical generative model trained on the original data [JSH<sup>+</sup>22]. All computations involving the original data should adhere to differential privacy to ensure the desired level of privacy protection. This not only includes learning the generative model but also extends to additional steps that may rely on private data — such as data transformations, model selection, hyperparameter search, post-processing, and evaluation. If these steps are not conducted under differential privacy, the resulting release may not be differentially private or may offer ineffective privacy protection [LT19, PS22, XWW24].

Our scheme integrates all the steps mentioned above into a single mechanism which is then used to produce the released dataset. This is done by applying a private selection algorithm (as in [LT19]) to identify a sufficiently high-quality configuration of models, hyperparameters, and data transformations, all while providing with rigorous differential privacy guarantees.

The released dataset is primarily designed to answer the following queries: contingency tables (k-way marginals), mean aggregation with group-by (conditional means), mean aggregation with group-by (conditional medians) and linear regressions. According to our stakeholders, contingency tables and central tendency queries (means, medians) carry a lot of value. To guarantee the quality of the released dataset with respect to the above queries, we set a collection of *acceptance criteria* that are assessed empirically as part of our

scheme. Passing an acceptance criterion means that the a statistical query executed on the released dataset is sufficiently close, as defined by the stakeholders, to the same query applied on the original dataset. In addition, we also release (with differential privacy guarantees) the actual error obtained. We note that the obtained error is often significantly better than the corresponding criterion that was set in advance.

It is stressed that quality guarantees are limited to those evaluated via the acceptance criteria. The released data has no similar assurance for other types of analysis, such as hypothesis testing, outliers analysis and machine learning training. We also take measures to clarify this fact to potential users to mitigate the misleading affordance<sup>1</sup> of microdata.

Through the co-design process, we identified two additional non-statistical requirements from our stakeholders regarding the perceived trustworthiness of the release. The first requirement, *faithfulness*, asks for record-level similarity between the original and the released datasets. While meeting the faithfulness requirement may not enhance the quality of the released dataset, the release guarantees that it will not detract from it either. The second requirement, *face privacy* captures expectations articulated by stakeholders regarding the characteristics of a privacy-protected release, such as the absence of unique rows. Responding adequately to these two requirements within, while preserving an adequate level of differential privacy, was critical to the eventual approval of the release.

The model used to generate the synthetic data was produced using the PrivBayes algorithm [ZCP<sup>+</sup>14] with  $\epsilon = 4$ ; the evaluation of the dataset with a list of predefined of acceptance criteria required  $\epsilon = 0.99$ ; and a factor 2 is applied due to the private selection process [LT19]. Therefore, the overall privacy loss budget spent on releasing the data is  $\epsilon = 9.98$ . Considering past real-world differentially private releases as a benchmark [Des21], we aimed to an end-to-end privacy loss budget of  $\epsilon < 10$ . To narrow down the space of configuration with reasonable success probability, we utilized public birth data from the US CDC [Cen].

The stakeholders were pleased with the quality of the released dataset, as evident from the fact that all acceptance criteria were met, and furthermore from the level of actual errors obtained, see Table 2. (For instance, in accordance with the first and the most important acceptance criterion, the released dataset demonstrates a maximal error in histograms and contingency tables of less than 0.5% out of the total number of rows in the original data, smaller than the pre-set limit of 1%.)

The release dataset, together with documentation tailored to different audiences [MoH24], and the code<sup>2</sup> used to produce the release are publicly available.

## 1.1 Summary of our Contributions

The most immediate impact of this work is the actual release of the 2014 birth data, which, to the best of our knowledge, is the first of its kind in the medical domain. (We aware

---

<sup>1</sup>Following Norman (2013), we use the term *affordance* to represent the set of possibilities for using the data, as perceived by the data user [Nor13].

<sup>2</sup><https://github.com/shlomihod/synthflow>

of only one other differently private release with synthetic data, in the context of human trafficking [fM22].)

More generally, this work demonstrates the feasibility of using differential privacy as a privacy protection measure for the release of government data, specifically within the medical domain. The release represents the successful outcome of a co-design process involving various stakeholders. It also demonstrates how incorporating context-specific requirements regarding the stakeholders' expectations of accuracy and privacy within the overall scheme can be critical to the success of such release.

On a more technical level, this work demonstrates how the private selection algorithm of [LT19] can be used to generate a synthetic-data release that satisfies a diverse set of properties while providing an overall differential privacy guarantee. In particular, our approach allows separating the process of designing collection of the desired properties and determining their feasibility from the actual processing of the data — that, crucially, takes place only once.

## 1.2 Organization of this Paper

We first present the stakeholders' requirements (Section 2). Second, we outline our solution concepts (Section 3) and describe in detail the implementation specifics of the scheme (Section 4). Finally, we review related work (Section 5) and discuss future research directions (Section 6).

## 2 Stakeholders' Requirements and Expectations

The release was initiated as a pilot project for evaluating the feasibility of differential privacy for governmental data in the Israeli Ministry of Health. The following stakeholders took part in the development of the release:

1. TIMNA, Israel's National Health Research Platform, Ministry of Health: **the primary stakeholders**
  - (a) Epidemiology team lead
  - (b) De-identification team lead
2. Other organizations in the Ministry of Health
  - (a) Chief Data Officer
  - (b) Head of data stewardship department
  - (c) Birth Registry steward
3. Universities and Research Institutes
  - (a) Biostatistician researcher with expertise in birth data
  - (b) Pediatrician and medical researcher

The primary stakeholders, with whom we worked closely, listed three core requirements at the inception of the project: (1) providing meaningful notion of privacy protection with differential privacy; (2) allowing accurate statistical analysis; and (3) releasing in micro-data format (tabular data).

Considering the first (privacy) and third (microdata format) requirements together, we proposed differently private synthetic data as the solution concept. Initially, the primary stakeholders rejected this solution concept because synthetic data has a negative reputation within the medical research community. The stakeholders were not familiar with successful usage of synthetic data for statistical analysis. In addition, synthetic data might raise a transparency concern when it is officially released by the government. Some might consider such data as “fake”, and treat it as an attempt of the government to “hide” information. Through a deliberated dialogue with the stakeholder, we were able to pin down the reason behind these statements: *the lack of record-level alignment between the original and synthetic datasets*. To address this concern, we proposed the notion of *faithfulness*, which was considered as an acceptance criterion (see more details in Section 3.5.1).

In a later stage of the project the head of data stewardship department and the Birth Registry steward introduced an additional requirement à la  $k$ -anonymity [Swe02]. Following a discussion with the stakeholders, the requirement converged into this statement: *private governmental data released to the public cannot contain unique records under any circumstances, even if it is synthetic data generated with differential privacy*. We introduce the notion of *face privacy* to address this issue (Section 3.5.2).

We refined and specified the requirement of the accurate statistical analysis, by guiding the stakeholders to define intended use of the released dataset, and establish a collection of queries that the resulting synthetic data should answer with sufficient accuracy. We incorporate these queries into our solution concept as *acceptance criteria* (Section 3.4).

Another concern regarding synthetic data as a solution concept is the risk of misleading affordance. Indeed, as shown by Ullman and Vadhan (2011), it is in general impossible to efficiently generate synthetic data that is differentially private while also preserving the accuracy of all statistical queries [UV11]. In fact, even preserving the accuracy of all two-way marginals is impossible. However, due to the tabular format, synthetic data has the same affordance as the original data, and so suggests to the data user that they could execute any computation on the synthetic data and expect similar results to the original data. This is problematic, because the synthetic data was designed to answer accurately only a subset of possible computations, as defined with the stakeholder. Together with primary stakeholders, we decided to address this important concern via documentation which is treated as inseparable part of the release. In section 4.13 we present the design of the documentation for data users and data subjects.



### Summary of stakeholders' requirements

1. **FORMAT:** The data should be presented in tabular form of individual records.
2. **QUALITY:** Accuracy with respect to a broad set of statistical measures.
3. **FAITHFULNESS:** There should be row-level mapping between the released and the original data.
4. **PRIVACY:** Protecting the privacy of mothers and newborns. This requirement came in two flavors: first, differential privacy as rigorous state-of-the-art privacy criteria must be met; in addition, some face privacy requirements were made (e.g., unique rows are not allowed).
5. **TRANSPARENCY:** The intended and unintended uses of the dataset should be clearly documented, particularly detailing which statistical queries carry accuracy guarantees and which are not.

## 3 Solution Concept and Scheme Design

In this section, we present our solution concept for addressing the requirements of the stakeholders (Section 2). To provide a concise overview, we defer many of the Live Birth Registry specific implementation details related to the to subsequent Section 4.

We start with an overview of the scheme (Section 3.1) and then elaborate on different aspects of the scheme.

### 3.1 Scheme Overview

This section describes the overall scheme, designed to meet the stakeholders' requirements. The scheme is illustrated in Figure 1 and summarized in Algorithm 1.

We assume that the dataset provided as input to the scheme, referred to as the original dataset, has been preprocessed and cleansed from the raw dataset (e.g., the dataset extracted from the registry).

In the scheme, we first use the original dataset to train a generative model. We then sample records from this model, filtering them based on predefined plausibility constraints to create a synthetic dataset (see Section 3.3). The training process includes various configurations, such as data transformations, model family selection, and hyperparameter tuning (see Section 3.6).

We then perform a dataset projection on the synthetic dataset, creating a release-candidate dataset. (This is done to guarantee face privacy, discussed and formally defined in Section 3.5),

Finally, we compare this release-candidate dataset to the original dataset, using a set of acceptance criteria to gauge quality (Section 3.4). One criterion evaluates record-level faithfulness, ensuring a one-to-one row similarity between the datasets (see Section 3.5




Figure 1: Schematic overview of the end-to-end differentially private scheme for microdata data release. A red arrow ( $\rightarrow$ ) represents a computation done with differential privacy.

---

**Algorithm 1** End-to-end differentially private scheme for microdata data release.

---

**Require:** Original dataset  $\mathcal{O}$ , privacy loss budget for generative model  $\varepsilon_x > 0$ , privacy loss budget for acceptance criteria  $\varepsilon_q > 0$ , list of experiment configurations  $\mathcal{C}$ , list of constraints  $\mathcal{F}$ , list of acceptance criteria  $\mathcal{A}$

- 1: **while** True **do**
  - 2:     Uniformly sample a configuration  $c$  from  $\mathcal{C}$
  - 3:     Create transformed dataset  $\mathcal{R}$  using data transformations specified by  $c$
  - 4:     Fit an  $\varepsilon_x$ -DP generative model  $G$  using hyperparameters from  $c$
  - 5:     **repeat**
  - 6:         Sample a synthetic record  $s$  from  $G$
  - 7:         Retain  $s$  if it satisfies all constraints in  $\mathcal{F}$ ; otherwise, discard it
  - 8:     **until** Collected  $|\mathcal{R}|$  synthetic records
  - 9:     Apply dataset projection specified by  $c$  to obtain release-candidate dataset  $\mathcal{S}$
  - 10:     Compute  $\varepsilon_q$ -DP acceptance criteria  $\mathcal{A}$  between  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{S}$
  - 11:     Store the acceptance criteria results in  $Q$
  - 12:     Test if all acceptance criteria in  $Q$  are met; if yes, exit the loop
  - 13: **end while**
  - 14: The algorithm's output includes: (1) the candidate dataset  $\mathcal{S}$ ; (2) the acceptance criteria results  $Q$ ; and (3) the chosen configuration  $c$ .
-

again). Each additional criterion comprises an error measure and a corresponding threshold. The release-candidate dataset must meet these criteria—based on error measures for stakeholder-specific statistical queries—to be accepted.

The overall differential privacy guarantee of the scheme builds upon the differential privacy of both the generative model training and the acceptance criteria evaluation, along with the private selection algorithm. In particular, the private selection algorithm allows iterative pipeline execution, sampling configurations until all acceptance criteria are met, while still preserving meaningful differential privacy guarantees (Section 3.7).

The scheme is designed to be algorithm-agnostic, concerning both the learning algorithm of the generative model and the acceptance criteria. When paired with the private selection included in the scheme, it essentially implements a differentially private variation of random search. This search aims to find a configuration that meets all the acceptance criteria in the space of hyperparameters and data transformations.

If the scheme halts upon meeting all acceptance criteria, we publicly release the corresponding release-candidate dataset, along with the differentially private acceptance criterion results and the selected configuration.

## 3.2 Formal Notion of Privacy

We recall the notion of Differential Privacy, which provides a rigorous and quantifiable measure of privacy [DMNS06]. Importantly, rather than considering the privacy loss caused by a specific piece of data, the measure assesses the level of privacy loss incurred by a given *mechanism* (or, algorithm) for releasing information about the datasets. The definition considers very powerful and general adversaries, thus resulting in a strong privacy protection for each record in the dataset.

**Definition 1** (Bounded Neighboring Datasets). *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be the universe of records. Two datasets  $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}' \in \mathcal{X}^n$  of size  $n$  are neighbors if they differ only in a single record.*

**Definition 2** (Differential Privacy [DMNS06]). *A randomized mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  is  $\epsilon$ -differentially private (DP) if for all pairs of neighboring datasets  $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}'$  and all events  $Y$  in the output space of  $\mathcal{M}$*

$$\Pr[\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}) \in Y] \leq e^\epsilon \Pr[\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}') \in Y].$$

It is readily apparent that meaningful differentially private mechanisms must be randomized; in other words, they create a distribution over their outputs. Furthermore, there is a clear tension between the level of privacy provided by the mechanism and the accuracy of statistics on the data that are given in (or can be inferred from) the mechanism’s output. This tension is commonly referred to as the privacy-accuracy trade-off.

Two very useful properties of Differential privacy mechanisms, that are central in finding an effective “compromise” between privacy and accuracy, are composition and post-processing:

**Proposition 1** (Differential Privacy Basic Composition [DKM<sup>+</sup>06]). *Let  $\{\mathcal{M}_i\}_{i=1}^k$  be a collection of  $\{\varepsilon_i\}_{i=1}^k$ -differentially private mechanisms, respectively. Then their combination mechanism,  $\mathcal{M}$ , defined to be  $\mathcal{M}(x) = (\mathcal{M}_1(X), \dots, \mathcal{M}_k(x))$  is  $(\sum_{i=1}^k \varepsilon_i)$ -differentially private.*

**Proposition 2** (Differential Privacy Post-Processing [DMNS06]). *Let  $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow Z$  be a  $\varepsilon$ -differentially private mechanism. Let  $f : Z \rightarrow Z'$  be an arbitrary randomized mapping. Then  $f \circ \mathcal{M} : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow Z'$  is  $\varepsilon$ -differentially private.*

Because of the composition property of differential privacy, the privacy parameter  $\varepsilon$  is also called the *privacy loss budget*.

Differential privacy underpins the privacy guarantees in our scheme. All computations that take the original dataset as input must be differentially private. In our approach, this requirement extends to both the training of the generative model and the calculations of the acceptance criteria.

### 3.3 Synthetic Data

The generation of synthetic data is the core step of the scheme. It involves transforming the original dataset into synthetic dataset through four sub-steps: (1) applying data transformations, such as binning, based on the configuration; (2) training a differentially private generative model; (3) sampling records from the model; and (4) filtering the samples according to a predefined set of constraints.

Our approach treats the generative model training algorithm as a black box in the second sub-step, making it compatible with any existing differentially private synthetic data algorithm.

Due to the structure of many generative models and the noise introduced by differential privacy, the model may assign probability mass to implausible or impossible records. For instance, live births with a gestation week shorter than 29 and a birth weight over 3000 grams are biologically implausible. To avoid such samples, one can employ reject sampling [PWV16]. That is, the scheme applies a set of constraints that every synthetic record must meet; if a sampled record violates any these constraints, it is discarded. The sampling process from the generative model continues until the required number of valid records has been generated. The list of constraints is predefined, and in this release, by subject-matter experts.

### 3.4 Acceptance Criteria

Each data release occurs in a specific context, that encompasses, among other factors, the needs and expectations of the data users. For the release to be successful, it must be evaluated in a way that respects its specific context [AN20]. To achieve this, we have constructed a set of **acceptance criteria** to ensure the release meets the data users' requirements.

**Definition 3** (Acceptance criterion). *An acceptance criterion  $AC := (\mathcal{E}, T)$  is a pair of an error measure between two datasets of the same size  $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and a threshold  $T \in \mathbb{R}$ . We say that an acceptance criteria is met for datasets  $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S}$  if  $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S}) < T$ .*

An acceptance criterion consists of an error measure paired with a threshold. A release-candidate dataset is considered to pass this criterion if the error metric, which takes also the original dataset, falls below the specified threshold. We only accept the release-candidate dataset if it meets all such criteria. These acceptance criteria, comprising error metrics and thresholds, are publicly pre-established by stakeholders, drawing on their subject-matter expertise and existing literature.

Acceptance criteria allow us to test any property of the released data, including quality-related properties, as long as it can be computed in a differentially private way. This is true regardless of the synthetic data generator used, whether it includes theoretical quality guarantees for a collection of statistical queries (such as MWEM for contingency tables [HLM12]) or not (such as PATE-GAN [JYvdS19] and PrivBayes [ZCP+14]). These theoretical quality guarantees might be insufficient because they are either too loose or not aligned with the intended use of the synthetic data [AN20].

To preserve the end-to-end differential privacy property of the scheme, all acceptance criteria are computed with differential privacy because they take the original dataset as an input. Consequently, we publicly release the differentially private metric results alongside its differential privacy associated parameters (budget, mechanism, sensitivity and variance). The metric results, thresholds and information about the noise for each acceptance criterion deliver additional value for the data users because they can assess whether the released dataset errors are adequate for their needs. This benefit is further enhanced by the fact that the metric results could be significantly lower, as we observed in our release, than the thresholds, which indicates stronger quality guarantees. (Indeed, releasing metric results without differential privacy could potentially leak information about individual records, leading to an unacceptable privacy risk [GC23].)

### 3.5 Trust in Differentially Private Synthetic Data

The stakeholders set two additional requirements related to the tabular format of the release. First, due to the use of synthetic data generation, there should be a record-level matching between the released dataset and original dataset (faithfulness). Second, the released dataset cannot contain unique records, based on the assumption that people expect it from any privacy-protecting release (face privacy). Our analysis suggests that fulfilling these two requirements would neither increase the data quality nor improve the level of differential privacy protection; nonetheless it would increase the trust of stakeholders in the release because satisfying these two requirements meets their expectations regarding governmental and medical data.

#### 3.5.1 Faithfulness

We defined a new notion called (record-level) *faithfulness* to address the first requirement. Faithfulness assesses whether the released dataset resemble the original dataset in a record-level granularity. Similarly to data quality evaluation, faithfulness is also a property of the relationship between the original dataset and released dataset. Data quality ensures that analyzing the released dataset as a whole produces similar statistical results as

performing the same analysis on the original dataset. However, the faithfulness criterion considers much finer granularity and requires that each released dataset record “looks like” one distinct original dataset record. Namely, there is a 1-to-1 matching between the records of released dataset and the records of the original dataset: each released record is matched with an original record.

The stakeholders motivated this requirement as follows. First, there is a lack of trust in synthetic data within the medical community, according to the stakeholders’ understanding. Second, there is concern that government data releases would be considered “misleading” due to the use of synthetic data. To cater these concerns, we have defined a new technical specification that quantifies the existence of one-to-one matching between the released and original data.

**Definition 4** ( $(\alpha, \beta)$ -faithfulness). *Let  $c : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  a cost function between two records. We say that a dataset  $\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  is  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -faithful with respect to a dataset  $\mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  and a cost function  $c$  if there exists a 1-1 matching (bijection)  $\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$  where*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}[c(s_i, r_{\pi(i)}) \leq \alpha] \geq \beta.$$

In words, there are at most  $(1 - \beta)n$  released records that are not 1-1 matched to similar-enough original records.

For a given  $\alpha$ , the cost function can be scaled by a factor of  $1/\alpha$ , so we can assume that  $\alpha = 1$ , and rephrase the definition with a single parameter as  **$\beta$ -faithfulness**. The actual matching is not very important for the purpose of faithfulness, but its existence and value of  $\beta$  matter.

**Definition 5** (Maximal- $\beta$ -faithfulness). *The maximal faithfulness of a dataset  $\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  with respect to a dataset  $\mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  and a cost function  $c$  is*

$$\beta_{\max}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S}) = \max_{\text{matching } \pi} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}[c(s_i, r_{\pi(i)}) \leq 1].$$

$\beta$  can be efficiently maximized by solving the maximum-cardinality matching problem on the bipartite graph: nodes correspond to original and released records; an edge between original and released nodes exists if the cost function is smaller or equal to 1.

By convention, lower values of acceptance criteria mean more desirable released dataset  $\mathcal{S}$ . Therefore, we transform  $\beta_{\max}$  to follow this convention. The **acceptance criteria of faithfulness** has the following error measure

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{ff}}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S}) := 1 - \beta_{\max}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S}).$$

The cost function is elicited from the stakeholder. We note that the  $\beta$ -faithfulness definition does not depends on the exact values of the cost function  $c$ ; rather, it depends only on whether the cost between two records is less or equal to one.

### 3.5.2 Face privacy

A synthetic dataset sampled from a differential private generative model enjoys formal privacy guarantees. Nonetheless, stakeholders might have a different expectation of how privacy-protected data might look like. For example, one might expect that no row appears only once. We call such expectations *face privacy*, regardless of whether these expectations contribute to mitigating privacy risks such as reconstruction and attribute inference attacks. The term is inspired by the term “face validity” from Psychometrics. Face validity is the appropriateness or sensibility of a test as they appear to the test-taker. It is subjective and distinct from the technical notion of validity — whether a test measures what it is supposed to measure [WC10].

As part of our scheme, we apply *dataset projections* that transform the synthetic dataset, sampled from the generative model, into a release-candidate dataset that meets the face privacy expectations. The projections might also depend on hyperparameters, such as the minimum number of appearances for each row. It implies that the dataset projections are handled as a post-processing stage on top of already differentially private synthetic data, without taking original dataset as an input. Consequently, we do not need to allocate a privacy loss budget for the computation of the projection, although it may be required for tuning its hyperparameters. Note that the projection could be a function of the entire dataset and not necessarily applied on a per-row basis (like constraint filtering).

## 3.6 Configurations

Some components in our scheme require additional information for instantiation, such as hyperparameters and data transformations, which we refer to as *configuration*. They are represented by a list of key-value entries.

This sub-section presents the broad categories of entries within configurations, and the rationale for including them.

One of the first step in creating a synthetic dataset is selecting the *family* of generative mechanisms to utilize. Typically, mechanisms ensuring differential privacy involve running a learning algorithm to produce a model that can subsequently be sampled in order to generate synthetic data. Options include collecting marginals, GANs, and Bayesian networks. In addition, these learning algorithms and the resulting generative models tend to have *hyperparameters*, namely parameters set by the user to control the learning process and the model structure. For example, consider the learning rate for GANs or maximal node degree in a Bayesian network. Depending on the data, some hyperparameters might work well and others might lead to models that produce low-quality synthetic data.

Our method approaches the creation of a released dataset through synthetic data generation as an empirical process, akin to the prevalent method in machine learning. That is, choosing a sufficiently good configuration relies on empirical experimentation among a set of possible configurations. (Indeed, it may be hard to guess in advance which mechanism and hyperparameters will be the most effective for the given data.)

Another crucial design choice is defining how to represent the data. For example, should

---

**Algorithm 2** Private selection with a known threshold algorithm [LT19]

---

**Require:** a dataset  $D$ , a differently private algorithm  $\mathcal{M}$  that takes a dataset and returns an output  $x$  and a quality score  $q \in \mathbb{R}$ , a threshold  $\tau$ , a budget  $\gamma \leq 1$  and  $\varepsilon_0 \leq 1$ , number of steps  $T \geq \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\gamma} \ln \frac{2}{\varepsilon_0}, 1 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon\gamma} \right\}$ , and sampling access to  $Q(D)$ .

- 1: **for**  $j = 1, \dots, T$  **do**
  - 2:     draw  $(x, q) \sim \mathcal{M}(D)$
  - 3:     if  $q \geq \tau$  then output  $(x, q)$  and halt;
  - 4:     flip a  $\gamma$ -biased coin: with probability  $\gamma$ , output  $\perp$  and halt;
  - 5: **end for**
  - 6: Output  $\perp$  and halt.
- 

we treat the column `birth_weight` as a continuous or categorical variable? Perhaps the `gestation_week` column should be transformed using a finer or coarser binning? These design choices might yield different data quality outcomes; for example, if the privacy loss budget is fixed, finer binning might allow finer statistical queries by a user, but it might also be less accurate because relatively more noise is added due to bins with smaller counts.

The synthetic dataset sampled from the generative model may require additional post-processing steps with hyperparameters, such as data projections for face privacy, before being evaluated against the acceptance criteria.

### 3.7 Private Selection

Executing a single iteration of our scheme requires allocating a privacy loss budget for both the generative model and the acceptance criteria. Conducting multiple iterations to search over configurations until success would lead to a linear accumulation of the privacy loss budget if done straightforwardly with simple composition. The private selection algorithm with a known threshold (Algorithm 2) addresses this issue by enabling multiple iterations until success, while consuming only a constant factor of a single iteration's privacy loss budget. This is in contrast to a factor dependent on  $T$  number of attempts with composition [LT19]. Here, the mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  corresponds to a single iteration of our scheme, where  $x$  and  $q$  represent the release-candidate dataset and the results of the acceptance criteria, respectively. The following theorem describes this property.

**Theorem 1** (Private selection with a known threshold [LT19] (informal)). *Fix any  $\varepsilon_1 > 0, \varepsilon_0 \in [0, 1], \gamma \in [0, 1]$ . For sufficiently large integer  $T$ , if  $\mathcal{M}$  is  $\varepsilon_1$ -DP, then Algorithm 2 is  $(2\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_0)$ -DP.*

The theorem also holds for  $\gamma = 0, T = \infty$  and  $\varepsilon_0 = 0$ , meaning the algorithm is run indefinitely until achieving good-enough output. We used these parameter values in our scheme.



## 4 Implementation

First, we present a summary of the results from applying our scheme to the original data (Section 4.2). Second, we delve into the implementation details for each step of our scheme: data preparation (Section 4.3), differential privacy-related choices such as privacy loss budget allocation (Section 4.4), acceptance criteria (Section 4.5), dataset projection for face privacy (Section 4.6), configuration (Section 4.7), constraint filtering (Section 4.8), and the private selection algorithm (Section 4.9). Third, we explain the role of public data in this project (Section 4.10). Fourth, we elaborate on the software and environments used to execute the scheme (Sections 4.11 and 4.12). Fifth, we introduce the documentation that accompanies the released dataset (Section 4.13). Finally, we conclude this section with potential improvements identified *after* the scheme was executed, which could not be integrated into the differentially private release dataset (Section 4.14).

### 4.1 Terminology

Throughout this section, we refer to various datasets, with a more nuanced distinction than described in Section 3. We use the following terminology. The *raw dataset* consists of records exported directly from the Registry, provided to us by the Ministry of Health’s IT department (Section 4.3). We perform data cleaning of records with missing or probably-erroneous values to produce a dataset that we call the *original dataset* (Section 4.8). We consider this dataset to be as the input for our scheme. In each iteration of the scheme, the configuration determines the data transformation to be applied (Section 4.7), resulting in the *transformed dataset*. This step includes the binning of data according to the configuration. The *synthetic dataset* consists of records sampled from the trained generative model that meet the predefined constraints (Section 4.8). This dataset, after undergoing the projection step (Section 4.6), is termed the *released-candidate dataset*. The dataset chosen to be released, having passed all acceptance criteria (Section 4.5), is called the *released dataset*.

### 4.2 Summary of Results

We executed our scheme on live birth data from the year 2014, sourced from Israel’s Live Birth Registry. We allocated privacy loss budgets of  $\epsilon = 4$  for fitting the generative model and  $\epsilon = 0.99$  for computing the acceptance criteria. The differential privacy guarantee of the private selection algorithm yields an end-to-end privacy loss budget of  $\epsilon = 9.98$ . The released dataset successfully met all acceptance criteria (Table 2), and the project’s stakeholders are satisfied with the outcome. For some of the acceptance criteria, the actual results of the error metrics were much lower than the predefined upper thresholds, showing a higher quality of the released dataset.

Based on experiments conducted on public data (see Section 4.10), we narrowed down the range of possible configurations, all of which employed the PrivBayes algorithm for training the generative model [ZCP<sup>+</sup>14]. When running the scheme on the data from the Registry, a configuration featuring the data transformations outlined in Table 1 was selected.

The released dataset, accompanied by a README document for data users and this paper, was made public in February 2024 [MoH24].

### 4.3 Registry Data

The Live Birth Registry is the official source of live births occurring in Israel, provided that at least one parent holds an Israeli identity card, excluding the births of Israelis that occur abroad [MoH23].

We turn to discuss two design choices regarding the preparation of the data: which year and fields to release.

#### 4.3.1 Releasing a single year

Although we have access to data from recent years, which data users generally consider more valuable, we decided to release data from the earliest year available to us, 2014, in this pilot project. This choice was made for two reasons. First, it eliminates the need to release an additional year column and reduces the amount of statistical relationships that need to be learned. Second, post-release feedback from stakeholders can be incorporated into subsequent releases of more valuable years.

#### 4.3.2 Selecting data fields

The Birth Registry contains dozens of data fields for each birth. Before our collaboration with the Ministry of Health began, the primary stakeholders had already identified which data fields were planned for release, guided by the data minimization principle: selecting the smallest possible subset of fields that still delivers sufficient value to users. The pre-selected fields were also suitable for piloting with differential privacy synthetic data because they were diverse in terms of type and statistical properties (e.g., binary, categorical, continuous) and were relatively clean and complete. We considered adding one more data field (`group_population`) but decided against it due to the high number of missing values. We will leave the release of this and other data fields for future research.

### 4.4 Differential Privacy Choices

Here we discuss design choices related to the differential privacy guarantees.

#### 4.4.1 Releasing singleton births only

What constitutes the unit of privacy within the Birth Registry context? How should neighboring datasets be defined? At least three levels are discernible: (1) a newborn in a birth; (2) a birth, whether it involves one newborn or more; and (3) a mother.

For simplicity in this pilot project, together with the primary stakeholders, we decided to release only singleton births (births involving a single newborn), thereby obliterating the distinction between levels (1) and (2). According to primary stakeholders, the release

of singleton birth data already holds significant value. Multiple births are infrequent ( $\approx 4.6\%$  in 2014, as per the Israel Central Bureau of Statistics public data [Cen14]), and are typically analyzed separately from singleton births in biostatistics and medical literature.

Consequently, we set the unit of privacy to a single singleton birth.

This is sidestepping the necessity for more intricate differential privacy algorithms designed for multiple record settings (such as [LSY<sup>+</sup>20]). Moreover, it is plausible to presume that a mother may have at most two pregnancies within a calendar year, with other scenarios being exceedingly rare. Hence, the vast majority of mothers will have privacy protection on the basis of birth. For a minority of mothers, protection is accorded through the composition of a group of size two.

#### 4.4.2 Treating the total number of live births as public information

As articulated by several stakeholders, data users anticipate that the total number of births in the disclosed dataset aligns with the actual figure. Any discrepancy could undermine the trustworthiness of the release. Therefore, we treat the total number of live birth *after applying constrain filtering on the raw data* (Section 4.8) as public information. By doing so, we discard the requirement to execute a counting query and allocate privacy loss budget for it.

#### 4.4.3 Opting for pure differential privacy

Conveying the assurance of differential privacy to non-experts is a challenging task [CKR21, NSC<sup>+</sup>23]. The definition encapsulates the worst-case probabilistic divergence between two world states, encompassing several non-intuitive concepts such as probability, worst-case scenarios, and hypothetical worlds [WAB<sup>+</sup>18]. This communicational hurdle is inescapable for those intending to release data under differential privacy. We aspire to mitigate this challenge by favoring pure differential privacy mechanisms, characterized by a singular parameter  $\varepsilon$ , for the synthetic data generator as well as the acceptance criteria. Predominantly, we employed the simplest mechanism for acceptance criteria: noise addition from the Laplace distribution.

#### 4.4.4 Setting the privacy loss budget $\varepsilon$

Differential privacy theory imparts a meaningful interpretation to the protection afforded by privacy loss budget of  $\varepsilon \leq 1$  [DR14]. Nonetheless, our empirical experimentation on publicly available data (Section 4.10) revealed that such a value does not yield adequate data quality with our methodology. Beyond this range, no explicit guidelines exist for selecting  $\varepsilon$ .

To surmount this, we adhered to three heuristics to balance privacy and utility.

1. Opt for the lowest  $\varepsilon$  feasible for the acceptance criteria evaluation, provided the perturbation in the error metric due to differential privacy is relatively diminutive compared to the threshold.

Table 2: List of acceptance criteria used for evaluation (refer to Section 4.5). Total privacy loss budget of acceptance criteria’s release is  $\epsilon = 0.99$ . Recall that the total number of records in the dataset is  $n = 165,915$ .

Type	Metric	Threshold	Result	$\epsilon$	Mechanism	$[L, U]$	$\Delta$	$\sigma$
Maximal error of marginals	Absolute all k-way	1%	0.440%	0.01	Laplace	[0, 1]	0.001	> 0.001
	Relative 1-way	$\times 1.4$	$\times 1.284$	0.30	Laplace	[1, 2]	0.029	0.135
Maximal error of conditional means	parity	0.3 live births	-0.014	0.01	Laplace	[1, 11]	0.001	> 0.044
	birth weight	100 grams	28.634	0.17	Laplace	[1400, 4600]	0.459	3.821
	gestation week	1 week	0.062	0.02	Laplace	[28, 43]	0.001	> 0.033
Linear Regression	Max coefficient error	30	27.185	0.43	Functional			
	Absolute prediction error	5 grams	0.351	0.04	Laplace	[1400, 4600]	0.039	1.364
Faithfulness	Record-level matching error	5%	3.876%	0.01	Laplace	[0, 1]	0.001	> 0.001

2. Select the lowest  $\epsilon$  feasible for the generative model training, as long as the synthetic data has not too small probability ( $\geq 10\%$ ) to satisfy all acceptance criteria.
3. The aggregate  $\epsilon$  should not exceed 10, positioning it within the mid range of privacy loss budgets utilized in previous real-world deployments [Des21].

The actual allocation of the privacy loss budget was conducted according to the heuristics applied to empirical experiments on publicly available data (Section 4.10). The chosen allocation is outlined in Section 4.2. Table 2 presents the breakdown per criterion.

## 4.5 Acceptance Criteria Details

At the planning phase of the project we defined, together with the stakeholders, a collection of statistical queries that the synthetic data is designed to answer: (1) contingency tables (k-way marginals), (2) conditional mean/median, and with a lesser extent, also (3) linear regressions. We defined eight acceptance criteria to assess whether the release candidate dataset is fit-to-purpose.

Recall that an acceptance criterion  $AC := (\mathcal{E}, T)$  is a pair of an error measure  $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and a threshold  $T \in \mathbb{R}$  (Definition 3). The measure  $\mathcal{E}$  quantifies the error of a query between the original and released datasets. We say that an acceptance criteria is met for datasets  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  if  $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S}) < T$ .

In our scheme (Algorithm 1), the acceptance criteria are designed to plug in into the private selection (Algorithm 2) that requires calculating the quality evaluation metrics under differential privacy.

There are four types of acceptance criteria (refer to Table 2):

1. Maximal error in contingency tables (marginals): absolute (all  $k$ -way) and relative (1-way)
2. Maximal error in conditional means: parity, birth\_weight, gestation\_week
3. Linear regression errors: coefficients ( $\ell_1$ ) and predictions (MAE)

#### 4. Faithfulness

Recall that before training a generative model and sampling a synthetic dataset, we apply data transformations (such as clipping and binning) to the original dataset. We refer to the resulting dataset as the *transformed dataset*. This dataset serves as the baseline for evaluating the synthetic dataset, as it incorporates the bias introduced by the data transformations.

We present the implementation details of the eight acceptance criteria organized by type (Table 2). We start with preliminaries (Section 4.5.1), then move to the marginals-related criteria (Section 4.5.2), conditional means-related criteria (Section 4.5.3), linear regression-related criteria (Section 4.5.4), and finally, the faithfulness criterion (Section 4.5.5).

##### 4.5.1 Preliminaries

Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be the universe of records. Let  $d$  be the dimension of  $\mathcal{X}$ , i.e., number of data fields. Let  $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{X}^n$  be the transformed and release-candidate datasets, respectively. When the acceptance criteria are computed in our scheme, we assume that the release-candidate dataset  $\mathcal{S}$  is public and fixed (e.g., it was released with another differential privacy mechanism), but the transformed dataset  $\mathcal{R}$  is private.

Let  $M_k$  be the set of all  $k$ -way marginals *count* queries (contingency tables) on a dataset with records from  $\mathcal{X}$ .

**Definition 6** (Clipping Function). *The clipping function between  $L$  and  $U$ , denoted  $[\cdot]_L^U : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , is defined as follows:*

$$[x]_L^U = \max\{\min\{x, U\}, L\}.$$

A common blueprint for building a differentially private version of a computation on a dataset (e.g., count or mean) is to add sufficient random noise to the result [DMNS06, DKM<sup>+</sup>06]. Intuitively, the noise should be in the same magnitude as the contribution of a single record to the computation. The notion of global sensitivity quantifies this idea.

**Definition 7** (Global Sensitivity). *The global sensitivity of a function  $f : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is*

$$\Delta_f = \max_{\text{neighbors } \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}'} |f(\mathcal{D}) - f(\mathcal{D}')|$$

**Theorem 2** (Laplace Mechanism [DMNS06]). *Let  $f : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a function with global sensitivity  $\Delta$ , and let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then the algorithm  $\mathcal{M}$ , that given an dataset  $\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{X}^n$ , outputs  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}) = f(\mathcal{D}) + Z$ , where  $Z$  is a Laplace random variable with scale parameter  $\Delta/\varepsilon$ , is  $\varepsilon$ -DP.*

We proceed to bound the sensitivity of our acceptance criteria. Since most of these criteria are based on taking the maximum over multiple queries, we first provide a general bound on the global sensitivity of the maximum query.

**Proposition 3.** *Let  $(f_i : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R})_{i=1}^k$  be a collection of functions with global sensitivity values  $(\Delta_i)_{i=1}^k$ , respectively. Then the global sensitivity of the maximum function  $f_{\max}(\mathcal{D}) = \max_i f_i(\mathcal{D})$  is upper bounded by  $\Delta_{\max} = \max_i \Delta_i$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2$  be neighbor datasets. Let  $f_i$  and  $f_j$  be the functions that achieve the maximum value on  $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2$ , respectively (if more than one function achieve it, choose arbitrary). In other words,  $f_{\max}(\mathcal{D}_1) = f_i(\mathcal{D}_1)$  and  $f_{\max}(\mathcal{D}_2) = f_j(\mathcal{D}_2)$ . Without loss of generality  $f_{\max}(\mathcal{D}_1) \geq f_{\max}(\mathcal{D}_2)$ . Then

$$|f_{\max}(\mathcal{D}_1) - f_{\max}(\mathcal{D}_2)| = |f_i(\mathcal{D}_1) - f_j(\mathcal{D}_2)| \leq |f_i(\mathcal{D}_1) - f_i(\mathcal{D}_2)| \leq \Delta_i \leq \Delta_{\max}$$

We get the first inequality because  $f_j$  achieve the maximal value on  $\mathcal{D}_2$ , and the second inequality — by the definition of the global sensitivity  $\Delta_i$  of a function  $f_i$ . We finish the proof by taking the maximum of the global sensitivities over all  $i \in [n]$ , which is exactly  $\Delta_{\max} = \max_i \Delta_i$ . □

In the following subsections, we present the acceptance criteria. Specifically, for each criterion, we define the error measure  $\mathcal{E}$ , the threshold  $T$  and how to compute the error measure with differential privacy.

#### 4.5.2 Maximal error of marginals

We consider two criteria for capturing the maximal error of marginals. The first is the **maximal absolute error** of all  $k$ -way marginal counts, with the following error measure

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{abs}}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S}) := \frac{1}{n} \max_{k \in [d]} \max_{q \in M_k} |q(\mathcal{R}) - q(\mathcal{S})|$$

and threshold  $T_{\text{abs}} = 0.01$  as set by the stakeholders.

It is anticipated that count and frequencies will be the most valuable queries to the users, so this is the most important acceptance criterion. This measure is a maximum over all  $q \in M_k$  for all  $k \in [d]$ . Each query  $q$  has low sensitivity of 1, so the overall global sensitivity is  $1/n$ . The error measure is released with the Laplace mechanism.

The second acceptance criterion is the **maximal relative error** of 1-marginal counts with smoothing, with the following error measure

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{rel}}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S}) := \max_{q \in M_1} \max \left\{ \frac{\hat{q}(\mathcal{R})}{\hat{q}(\mathcal{S})}, \frac{\hat{q}(\mathcal{S})}{\hat{q}(\mathcal{R})} \right\}$$

where  $\hat{q}(\mathcal{D}) := q(\mathcal{D}) + 1$  is the smooth count query of a count query  $q$ . The stakeholders set the threshold to be  $T_{\text{rel}} = 2$ .

However, as we will see (Proposition 4),  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{rel}}$  has high global sensitivity. To mitigate this, we use a common technique for reducing the sensitivity of a function: We clip its value

to a bounded interval. Specifically, we modify the definition of the error measure  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{rel}}$  to include clipping of each component into the interval  $[1, \lambda]$  for  $\lambda > 1$  as follows:

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{rel}}^\lambda(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S}) := \max_{q \in M_1} \max \left\{ \left[ \frac{\hat{q}(\mathcal{R})}{\hat{q}(\mathcal{S})} \right]_1^\lambda, \left[ \frac{\hat{q}(\mathcal{S})}{\hat{q}(\mathcal{R})} \right]_1^\lambda \right\}$$

where  $[\cdot]_L^U$  is the clipping function. Given that the two ratios are reciprocal of each other, to find the maximum the relative error, it is sufficient to confine them within the interval of  $[1, \lambda]$  and not  $[1/\lambda, \lambda]$ .

We also adopt a threshold of  $T_{\text{rel}} = 1.4$ , which is slightly more conservative than what was set by the stakeholders. This adjustment, as elaborated in detail later, aims to decrease the probability of a false positive, where the criterion are incorrectly deemed met due to the noise added for differential privacy.

Prior to discussing the sensitivity analysis of the two variations of the error measure, we briefly present its significance in terms of data quality guarantees. Assuming "nice" univariate distributions (for instance, those characterized by a single mode and diminishing tails), and in conjunction with the first criterion, the 1-way maximal relative error acceptance criterion essentially imposes a bound on the error in the tails of these distributions between the transformed and the released-candidate datasets. Details follow:

#### Unclipped flavor $\mathcal{E}_{\text{rel}}$ has high global sensitivity.

**Proposition 4.** *Assuming  $\mathcal{S}$  is public and fixed, the global sensitivity of  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{rel}}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S})$  with respect to  $\mathcal{R}$  is  $\frac{s_{\max}+1}{2}$  where  $s_{\max} = \max_{q \in M_1} q(\mathcal{S})$ .*

*Proof.* Based on Proposition 3 it is sufficient to find the maximal global sensitivity of

$$q'(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S}) = \frac{\hat{q}(\mathcal{R})}{\hat{q}(\mathcal{S})}$$

and

$$qq''(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S}) = \frac{\hat{q}(\mathcal{S})}{\hat{q}(\mathcal{R})}$$

for all  $q \in M_1$ .

First, we observe that  $q'$  is an affine transformation of the count query  $q(\mathcal{R})$ , so  $q'$  has low global sensitivity equals to

$$\max_{q \in M_1} 1/\hat{q}(\mathcal{S}) = \frac{1}{s_{\min} + 1}$$

where  $s_{\min} = \min_{q \in M_1} q(\mathcal{S})$ .

Second, for any  $\hat{q}(\mathcal{S})$ , the sensitivity of  $q''$  is maximized when  $\hat{q}(\mathcal{R})$  is minimal, i.e.  $\hat{q}(\mathcal{R}) = 1$ , because

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{q''} &= \max_{\hat{q}(\mathcal{S}), \hat{q}(\mathcal{R})} \left| \frac{\hat{q}(\mathcal{S})}{\hat{q}(\mathcal{R})} - \frac{\hat{q}(\mathcal{S})}{\hat{q}(\mathcal{R}) + 1} \right| \\
&= \left( \max_{\hat{q}(\mathcal{S})} \hat{q}(\mathcal{S}) \right) \left( \max_{\hat{q}(\mathcal{R})} \left| \frac{1}{\hat{q}(\mathcal{R})} - \frac{\hat{q}(\mathcal{S})}{\hat{q}(\mathcal{R}) + 1} \right| \right) \\
&= (s_{\max} + 1) \cdot \left| \frac{1}{1} - \frac{1}{1+1} \right| \\
&= \frac{s_{\max} + 1}{2},
\end{aligned}$$

where  $s_{\max} = \max_{q \in M_1} q(\mathcal{S})$ .

Taking the maximum between  $q$  and  $q''$ , we get that the global sensitivity is  $\frac{s_{\max}+1}{2}$ .  $\square$

The proposition shows that the global sensitivity of  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{rel}}$  is at the same magnitude of the criterion's values, i.e.  $\Theta(n)$ . Therefore, adding Laplace noise would wipe out any signal and render a useless result.

**Clipped-flavor  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{rel}}^\lambda$  has low global sensitivity.** Recall that we apply clipping on each term of  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{rel}}^\lambda$  into the interval  $[1, \lambda]$  for  $\lambda > 1$ .

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{rel}}^\lambda(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S}) := \max_{q \in M_1} \max \left\{ \left[ \frac{\hat{q}(\mathcal{R})}{\hat{q}(\mathcal{S})} \right]_1^\lambda, \left[ \frac{\hat{q}(\mathcal{S})}{\hat{q}(\mathcal{R})} \right]_1^\lambda \right\}$$

Recall also that a release-candidate dataset pass an acceptance criterion only if its result is smaller than the threshold. Because this acceptance criterion is designed to control the 1-way marginal tails, we are interested only in lower values of this ratio, which are smaller than the threshold  $T_{\text{rel}} = 2$ . Therefore the loss of information due to clipping is insignificant for this purpose as long as  $\lambda \geq T_{\text{rel}}$ .

In the following proposition shows that  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{rel}}^\lambda$  has much lower sensitivity than  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{rel}}$ .

**Proposition 5.** Fix  $\lambda > 1 + \frac{1}{s_{\max}}$ . The global sensitivity of the acceptance criterion of the  $\lambda$ -clipped maximal relative error of 1-marginal frequencies  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{rel}}^\lambda$  is  $\Delta = \max \left\{ \frac{1}{s_{\min}+1}, \lambda - \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\lambda} + \frac{1}{s_{\min}+1}} \right\}$ , where  $s_{\min} = \min q \in M_1 q(\mathcal{S})$ .

*Proof.* Based on Proposition 3 it is sufficient to find the maximal global sensitivity of

$$q'(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S}) = \left[ \frac{\hat{q}(\mathcal{R})}{\hat{q}(\mathcal{S})} \right]_1^\lambda$$

and

$$qq''(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S}) = \left[ \frac{\hat{q}(\mathcal{S})}{\hat{q}(\mathcal{R})} \right]_1^\lambda.$$



Let  $\mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2$  be two neighbor datasets. Assume that they differ by one on the count query  $q$ , without loss of generality  $\hat{q}(\mathcal{R}_2) = \hat{q}(\mathcal{R}_1) + 1$ . Recall that in the evaluation step we consider  $\mathcal{S}$  fixed and public. Denote  $s = \hat{q}(\mathcal{S})$  and  $r = \hat{q}(\mathcal{R}_1)$ ; therefore,  $\hat{q}(\mathcal{R}_2) = r + 1$ .

We define the functions  $f$  and  $g$  given  $r$  and  $s$  corresponding to the sensitivity of  $q'$  and  $q''$ , respectively:

$$f(r, s) = \left[ f'(r, s) \right]_1^\lambda - \left[ f''(r, s) \right]_1^\lambda \text{ where } f'(r, s) = \frac{r+1}{s} \text{ and } f''(r, s) = \frac{r}{s}$$

and

$$g(r, s) = \left[ g'(r, s) \right]_1^\lambda - \left[ g''(r, s) \right]_1^\lambda \text{ where } g'(r, s) = \frac{s}{r} \text{ and } g''(r, s) = \frac{s}{r+1}$$

Observe that in both cases, the first term ( $f', g'$ ) is always larger or equal to the second term ( $f'', g''$ ) for  $s, r \geq 1$ , so functions  $f$  and  $g$  are always non-negative in that domain. Moreover,  $g$  is monotonously decreasing in  $r$ .

Our goal is to find the supremum values of these functions which is equal to the global sensitivity of  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{rel}}^\lambda$ .

**Maximizing  $f$ .** We have five cases to consider based on whether  $f'$  and  $f''$  hit the upper or lower clipping boundaries. Recall that  $f'(r, s) \geq f''(r, s)$ .

1. If  $f'(r, s), f''(r, s) \in [1, \lambda]$ , then we are in the same setting of Proposition 4, and  $\max f(r, s) = \frac{1}{s_{\min}+1}$ .
2. If  $f'(r, s) = f''(r, s)$ , and they are both  $> \lambda$  or  $< 1$ , then  $f(r, s) = 0$ .
3. If  $f'(r, s) > \lambda$ , but  $f''(r, s) \in [1, \lambda]$ , so  $\frac{r+1}{s} > \lambda$  and  $\frac{r}{s} \leq \lambda$ . Consequently,  $r \in (\lambda s - 1, \lambda s]$ , so  $\sup_{r,s} f(r, s) = \sup_{r,s} \left\{ \lambda - \frac{r}{s} \right\} = \sup_s \left\{ \lambda - \frac{\lambda s - 1}{s} \right\} = \lambda - \lambda + \sup_s \frac{1}{s} = \frac{1}{s_{\min}+1}$ .
4. If  $f'(r, s) \in [1, \lambda]$ , but  $f''(r, s) < 1$ , so  $\frac{r+1}{s} \geq 1$  and  $\frac{r}{s} < 1$ . Consequently,  $r = s - 1$ , so  $\max_{r,s} f(r, s) = \max_{r,s} \left\{ \frac{r+1}{s} - 1 \right\} = \max_s \left\{ \frac{s-1+1}{s} - \frac{1}{\lambda} \right\} = 1 - 1 = 0$ .
5. If  $f'(r, s) > \lambda$  and  $f''(r, s) < 1$ , so  $\frac{r+1}{s} > \lambda$  and  $\frac{r}{s} < 1$ . Consequently,  $\lambda s - 1 < r < s$ , so  $\lambda < 1 + 1/s$ , in contradiction to the requirement on  $\lambda > 1 + 1/s_{\max}$ . Hence this case is invalid.

Therefore, we conclude that the  $\Delta_{q'} = \max_{r,s} f(r, s) \leq \frac{1}{s_{\min}+1}$  for all cases, and this is the global sensitivity of  $q'$ .

**Maximizing  $g$ .** We have five cases to consider based on whether  $g'$  and  $g''$  hit the upper or lower clipping boundaries. Recall that  $g'(r, s) \geq g''(r, s)$ .

1. If  $g'(r, s), g''(r, s) \in [1, \lambda]$ , then  $\frac{s}{r} \in [1, \lambda]$  and  $\frac{s}{r+1} \in [1, \lambda]$ , so we have the constrain  $r \in [s/\lambda, s - 1]$ .  $g$  is monotonically decreasing in  $r$ , so it is maximized with  $r = s/\lambda$ . Therefore,  $\max_{r,s} g(r, s) = \max_s \left\{ \frac{s}{s/\lambda} - \frac{s}{s/\lambda+1} \right\} = \max_s \left\{ \lambda - \frac{1}{1/s+1/\lambda} \right\} = \lambda - \frac{1}{\frac{1}{s_{\min}+1} + \frac{1}{\lambda}}$ .

2. If  $g'(r, s) = g''(r, s)$ , and they are both  $> \lambda$  or  $< 1$ , then  $g(r, s) = 0$ .
3. If  $g'(r, s) > \lambda$ , but  $g''(r, s) \in [1, \lambda]$ , so  $\frac{s}{r} > \lambda$  and  $\frac{s}{r+1} \leq \lambda$ . Consequently,  $r \in [s/\lambda - 1, s/\lambda)$ . We want  $\max_{r,s} g(r, s) = \lambda - \min_{r,s} g''(r, s)$ . For each  $s$ ,  $g''(r, s)$  is monotonously decreasing, so it is minimized with  $r = s/\lambda$ , which gives us the same expression as in (1).
4. If  $g'(r, s) \in [1, \lambda]$ , but  $g''(r, s) < 1$ , so  $\frac{s}{r} \geq 1$  and  $\frac{s}{r+1} < 1$ . Consequently,  $r = s$ , so  $\max_{r,s} g(r, s) = \max_{r,s} \frac{s}{r} - 1 = \max_s \frac{s+1}{s} - 1 = 1 + \max_s \frac{1}{s} - 1 = \max_s \frac{1}{s} = \frac{1}{s_{\min}+1}$ .
5. If  $g'(r, s) > \lambda$  and  $g''(r, s) < 1$ , so  $\frac{s}{r} > \lambda$  and  $\frac{s}{r+1} < 1$ . Consequently,  $s - 1 < r < s/\lambda$ , so  $\lambda < 1 + \frac{1}{s-1}$ , in contradiction to the requirement on  $\lambda > 1 + 1/s_{\max}$ . Hence this case is invalid.

Therefore, we conclude that the  $\Delta_{q''} = \max_{r,s} g(r, s) = \left\{ \lambda - \frac{1}{\frac{1}{s_{\min}+1} + \frac{1}{\lambda}}, \frac{1}{s_{\min}+1} \right\}$  for all cases, and this is the global sensitivity of  $q''$ .

In conclusion, we showed that the global sensitivity of  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{rel}}^\lambda$  is  $\Delta = \max\{\Delta_{q'}, \Delta_{q''}\} \leq \max\left\{\frac{1}{s_{\min}+1}, \lambda - \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\lambda} + \frac{1}{s_{\min}+1}}\right\}$ .  $\square$

**Determining the parameters for  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{rel}}^\lambda$ .** Recall that a release-candidate dataset pass an accepted criterion only if the result of the error measure is lower than an predefined threshold. The primary stakeholder set the threshold for this acceptance criteria at  $T_{\text{rel}} = 2$ . The acceptance criteria  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{rel}}^\lambda$  is released via the Laplace mechanism. How  $\lambda$  should be chosen?

Note that the global sensitivity goes down if  $\lambda$  is lower. Because the release-candidate dataset does not pass the acceptance criterion if the measure value is above the threshold, we could set  $\lambda = T_{\text{rel}}$ . Nonetheless, in that case, all the unacceptable values of the criterion collapse to a single value, namely  $T_{\text{rel}}$ . Consider a false positive event where the acceptance criteria is not met with the true value of the error measure, it is met when the measure is calculated with the noise addition of the Laplace mechanism. If  $\lambda = T_{\text{rel}}$ , then the false positive event is devastating because the true measure result could be much higher than  $T_{\text{rel}}$ .

Let's apply Proposition 5. Based on the experiments with the public data (see Section 4.10), we conservatively assume that  $s_{\min} = 50$ . For example, if the clipping factor is  $\lambda = 2.5$ , the global sensitivity is  $\Delta \approx 0.119$ . With  $\varepsilon = .3$ , the standard deviation of the additive noise is  $\sigma = \sqrt{2}\Delta/\varepsilon \approx 0.561$ . This is quite large noise compared to the threshold, and there is a high probability of a false positive event. For that reason, we proposed dropping this criterion, but the primary stakeholder assured us of its importance for data users. We could spend more privacy loss budget, but  $\varepsilon = .3$  seems already quite high for this purpose.

To reduce sensitivity, we decided to set  $\lambda = 2$ . In order to avoid a false positive collapse, we opted to use a more conservative threshold  $T'_{\text{rel}} < \lambda = T_{\text{rel}}$ . The false positive probability  $p$  is the probability that an acceptance criterion result that is clipped to  $\lambda$  would be shifted to a value lower than the threshold  $T'_{\text{rel}} < \lambda$  due to the additive differentially private Laplace

mechanism. We can calculate the appropriate threshold  $T'_{\text{rel}}$  according to the desired  $p$  with the following statement.

**Proposition 6.** *Let  $\lambda > 1, \eta > 0$ . Let  $Z = \lambda + \text{Lap}(\eta)$  be a random variable and  $p = \Pr[Z \leq T']$  for  $T' \leq \lambda$ . Then*

$$T' = \lambda + \eta \ln(2p).$$

*Proof.* According the definition of the CDF of the Laplace distribution, we have

$$p = \Pr[Z \leq T'] = \Pr[\lambda + \text{Lap}\left(\frac{\Delta}{\varepsilon}\right) \leq T'] = \Pr[\text{Lap}(\eta) \leq T' - \lambda] = \frac{1}{2} \exp\left(\frac{T' - \lambda}{\eta}\right).$$

By rearranging the terms, we get the statement.  $\square$

For  $p = .05$ ,  $s_{\min} = 50$ ,  $\lambda = 2$ , , it follows that  $\Delta < 0.077$ . Set  $\varepsilon = .3$ . Hence  $\eta = \Delta/\varepsilon < .257$ , and we get that  $T'_{\text{rel}} > 1.4$ , which is the actual threshold we have used for this acceptance criterion. Note the values of  $\Delta$  and  $\sigma$  in Table 2 are slightly smaller because they are calculated from  $s_{\min}$  taken from the release-candidate dataset.

### 4.5.3 Maximal error in conditional means

After frequency and count queries, measures of central tendency are the second most important set of considerations for users, according to stakeholder discussions.

Medians, as opposed to means, are the preferred statistics for analyzing binned data like the released dataset. The stakeholders also anticipate the inclusion of median queries in data users' analysis. However, we choose to assess the release-candidate dataset using means for the following reasons. First, the mechanisms for computing means with differential privacy are simpler than those for medians. We favor simplicity, under the assumption that these mechanisms (noise addition based) are easier to explain to the public. Second, in "nice" distributions, the error in a mean query between the original and release-candidate datasets often acts as an upper limit for the error in medians, since medians are less affected by extreme values. Indeed, experiments on the public data were consistent with this assertion (Section 4.10).

**Preliminaries.** A conditional mean query  $q_{a|b \leftarrow v}$  over column  $a$  by value  $v$  in column  $b$  calculates the mean of column  $a$  (averaging column) at value  $v$  (group-by value) in the grouped-by column  $b$  (group-by column).  $b$  could be also the "none" column  $\perp$ , and then  $q_{a|\perp}$  represents the mean of column  $a$  without any grouping. Let  $C(a)$  be a set of pre-defined group-by columns for an averaging column  $a$  and the none column  $\perp$ , and let  $V(b)$  be a set of all values of column  $b$ . The maximal error of column  $a$ 's conditional mean acceptance criterion has the following error measure:

$$\mathcal{E}_{\bar{a}}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S}) := \max_{b \in C(a)} \max_{v \in V(b)} |q_{a|b \leftarrow v}(\mathcal{R}) - q_{a|b \leftarrow v}(\mathcal{S})|.$$

Three acceptance criteria are defined in this family:

Averaging column $a$	Group-by columns $C(a)$
parity	{mother age, $\perp$ }
birth weight	{sex, parity, gestation week, mother age, $\perp$ }
gestation week	{parity, mother age, $\perp$ }

**Releasing with differential privacy.** To release  $\mathcal{E}_{\bar{a}}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S})$  with differential privacy via the Laplace mechanism, an upper bound on its global sensitivity is required. According to Proposition 3, the sensitivity of the error measure  $\mathcal{E}_{\bar{a}}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S})$  is bounded by the maximum over the sensitivities of the conditional means queries  $q_{a|b \leftarrow v}$  for each  $b \in C(a)$  and each  $v \in V(b)$ . The global sensitivity of a query  $q_{a|b \leftarrow v}$  is  $(U_a - L_a)/n_{b \leftarrow v}$ , where  $U_a, L_a$  are the upper and lower edges of values in column  $a$ , respectively, and  $n_{b \leftarrow v}$  is the number of records in  $\mathcal{R}$  having the value  $v$  in column  $b$ . While  $U_a$  and  $L_a$  are publicly known,  $n_{b \leftarrow v}$  is not. Thus, without a lower bound on  $n_{b \leftarrow v}$ , releasing the error measure via the Laplace mechanism is not feasible.

Note that  $q_{a|b \leftarrow v}$  is a quotient of two simpler queries: a sum (numerator: sum of column  $a$  for records with value  $v$  in column  $b$ ) and a count (denominator: number of such records). A common strategy for releasing such composite queries is to independently compute the simpler queries with differential privacy (e.g. use the Laplace mechanism to separately compute the nominator and the denominator) Then, the results are divided, achieving privacy via post-processing. This strategy, while straightforward, has two drawbacks. First, noise added to the count (denominator) can significantly distort the final result. Second, given that we are interested only in the maximum value among the  $q_{a|b \leftarrow v}$  queries for  $b \in C(a)$  and  $v \in V(b)$ , this method expends privacy loss budget on calculations we do not intend to release.

Therefore, we adopt OpenDP's approach<sup>3</sup> of computing the mean of a dataset of unknown size by applying a resize transformation (Algorithm 3) [HGV20].

Let  $X_{\mathcal{R}} = (x_1, \dots, x_{n_{b \leftarrow v}})$  be the values of column  $a$  for records with value  $v$  in column  $b$ . Using this notation,  $q_{a|b \leftarrow v}(\mathcal{R}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_{b \leftarrow v}} x_i / n_{b \leftarrow v}$ . We set a size  $m$ , independent of  $\mathcal{R}$ , and "resize"  $X_{\mathcal{R}}$  to create a new dataset with a publicly known size  $m$ . The mean of column  $a$  is then computed as detailed in Algorithm 3, and we denote the result by  $q_{a|b \leftarrow v}^{\hat{m}_{b \leftarrow v}}(\mathcal{R})$  where  $\hat{m}_{b \leftarrow v}$  corresponds to the resize parameter and the randomness is sampled from its distribution. The following proposition outlines its global sensitivity.

**Proposition 7** (Global sensitivity of Algorithm 3). *Let  $X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be a private dataset of unknown size  $n$ . Let  $L$  and  $U$  be the publicly known lower and upper bounds of the values in dataset  $X$ , respectively. Let  $\mathcal{A}(X; m, w, r)$  be the output of Algorithm 3 for dataset  $X$ , public*

<sup>3</sup><https://github.com/opendp/opendp/blob/c79ef2268bdc09cf733aba08b005b241ca63b365/docs/source/examples/unknown-dataset-size.ipynb>

<sup>4</sup><https://github.com/opendp/opendp/blob/c79ef2268bdc09cf733aba08b005b241ca63b365/rust/src/transformations/resize/mod.rs#L46>

---

**Algorithm 3** Resized Mean (based on OpenDP implementation<sup>4</sup>)

---

**Require:** Dataset  $X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , resize parameter  $m$ , constant value  $w \in [L_a, U_a]$ , randomness  $r$ .

- 1:  $s \leftarrow 0$
  - 2: **if**  $m = n$  **then**
  - 3:      $s \leftarrow \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$
  - 4: **else if**  $m > n$  **then**
  - 5:      $s \leftarrow \sum_{i=1}^n x_i + (m - n) \times w$
  - 6: **else if**  $m < n$  **then**
  - 7:     Sample  $m$  indices  $\{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$  from  $X$  using randomness  $r$
  - 8:      $s \leftarrow \sum_{j=1}^m x_{i_j}$
  - 9: **end if**
  - 10: **return**  $s/m$ .
- 

resize parameter  $m$ , public constant value  $w \in [L_a, U_a]$  and randomness  $r$ . Then for any  $m, w, r$  the global sensitivity of  $\mathcal{A}(\cdot; m, w, r)$  is  $(U - L)/m$ .

*Proof.* Let  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  be two neighboring datasets. Note that  $\mathcal{A}(X; m, w, r)$  is always the mean of  $m$  in the range  $[L, U]$ , even with sampling or imputation. Let  $s_i$  be the sum of the  $m$  chosen elements by the algorithm for dataset  $X_i$ .

- If  $m = n$ , then the sums  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  are taken over all the elements in the respective datasets, so they differ by a single element. Therefore  $|s_1 - s_2| \leq U - L$ .
- If  $m > n$ , then each sum include all the elements in the respective dataset and additional  $m - n$  copies of  $w$ , so  $|s_1 - s_2| \leq U - L$ .
- If  $m < n$ , then the same indices  $\{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$  are sampled because the randomness  $r$  is fixed. Therefore the sums might differ by at most one element, so  $|s_1 - s_2| \leq U - L$ .

In conclusion,  $|\mathcal{A}(X_1; m, w, r) - \mathcal{A}(X_2; m, w, r)| = |s_1/m - s_2/m| \leq (U - L)/m$ .  $\square$

Fix  $m, w$ , and let  $\mathcal{M}_r(X) = \mathcal{A}(X; m, w, r) + \text{Lap}\left(\frac{U-L}{m\varepsilon}\right)$  be the  $\varepsilon$ -differentially private release of  $\mathcal{A}$  with the Laplace mechanism according to the global sensitivity from Proposition 7. Ultimately, we would uniformly sample  $r$  to compute  $\mathcal{A}$ , resulting with the following mechanism:  $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\cdot) = \mathcal{M}_r(\cdot)$  where  $r \sim R$ . The following proposition shows that  $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}$  is also  $\varepsilon$ -differentially private.

**Proposition 8.** Let  $\{\mathcal{M}_r\}_{r \in R}$  where  $\mathcal{M}_r : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  be a family of  $\varepsilon$ -differentially private mechanisms. Then the mechanism  $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\cdot) := \mathcal{M}_r(\cdot)$  where  $r \sim R$  is also an  $\varepsilon$ -differentially private mechanism.

*Proof.* The proof is straightforward: any property of  $\mathcal{M}_r$  that holds for all  $r$  will hold for a

random  $r$  as well. To elaborate, let  $\mathcal{D}_1$  and  $\mathcal{D}_2$  be two neighboring datasets.

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr[\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{D}_1) = y] &= \sum_{r \in \text{supp}(R)} \Pr[R = r] \Pr[\mathcal{M}_r(\mathcal{D}_1) = y] \\
&\leq e^\varepsilon \sum_{r \in \text{supp}(R)} \Pr[R = r] \Pr[\mathcal{M}_r(\mathcal{D}_2) = y] \\
&= e^\varepsilon \sum_{r \in \text{supp}(R)} \Pr[R = r] \Pr[\mathcal{M}_r(\mathcal{D}_2) = y] \\
&= e^\varepsilon \Pr[\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{D}_2) = y]
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality holds because  $\mathcal{M}_r(\cdot)$  is  $\varepsilon$ -differentially private.  $\square$

**Setting the resize parameter  $\widehat{m}_{b \leftarrow v}$ .** The impact of the resize transformation on the accuracy of mean estimation depends on the gap between  $\widehat{m}_{b \leftarrow v}$  and the actual size  $n_{b \leftarrow v}$ . When  $\widehat{m}_{b \leftarrow v}$  is smaller, the estimation error arises from sampling. If  $\widehat{m}_{b \leftarrow v}$  is larger, the imputed values introduce error. Note that these errors behave differently: the estimator for  $m < n_{b \leftarrow v}$  is unbiased, but the same cannot be said for the case  $\widehat{m}_{b \leftarrow v} > n_{b \leftarrow v}$  without additional information about column  $a$ . From a quality perspective, it is generally preferable to set  $\widehat{m}_{b \leftarrow v}$  as close to the actual dataset size as possible; if an error must be made, it is better for  $\widehat{m}_{b \leftarrow v}$  to be smaller.

Thanks to the first acceptance criterion, which is based on the maximum absolute error of all  $k$ -marginal counts, we can derive a lower bound for the actual dataset size with high probability. We set  $\widehat{m}_{b \leftarrow v}$  to this lower bound. Let  $T_{\text{abs}}$  be the predefined threshold of the first acceptance criterion. If a release-candidate dataset passes the first acceptance criterion, then any  $k$ -way marginal count query has an absolute error of up to  $n_{b \leftarrow v} \cdot T_{\text{abs}}$  when compared to the original dataset. Thus, we can estimate the number of records with value  $v$  in column  $b$  without spending any privacy loss budget, as the release-candidate dataset is considered publicly fixed at this stage of our scheme. The chosen resize parameter for the query  $q_{a|b \leftarrow v}^{\widehat{m}_{b \leftarrow v}}(\mathcal{R})$  is then  $\widehat{m}_{b \leftarrow v} := \max\{1, q_{b \leftarrow v}(\mathcal{S}) - n_{b \leftarrow v} \cdot T_{\text{abs}}\}$ , where  $q_{b \leftarrow v}(\mathcal{S})$  represents the number of occurrences of value  $v$  in column  $b$  in the release-candidate dataset  $\mathcal{S}$ .

**Putting it all together.** We modify the acceptance criterion to include the resize transformation,

$$\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_{\bar{a}}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S}) := \max_{b \in C(a)} \max_{v \in V(b)} |q_{a|b \leftarrow v}^{\widehat{m}_{b \leftarrow v}}(\mathcal{R}) - q_{a|b \leftarrow v}(\mathcal{S})|.$$

Observe that  $\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_{\bar{a}}$  is a maximum taken over all  $b \in C(a)$  and  $v \in V(b)$ . Therefore, we can apply Proposition 3 to find the global sensitivity. The global sensitivity of an individual term defined by  $(b, v)$  is  $\Delta_{b \leftarrow v} = (U_a - L_a) / \widehat{m}_{b \leftarrow v}$  according to Proposition 7, so

$$\Delta_{\max} = \max_{b,v} \Delta_{b \leftarrow v} = \max_{b,v} \frac{U_a - L_a}{\widehat{m}_{b \leftarrow v}} = \frac{U_a - L_a}{\min_{b,v} \widehat{m}_{b \leftarrow v}}$$

Note that  $\min_{b,v} \widehat{m}_{b \leftarrow v}$  is the minimal occurrence of any value in column  $b$  with additional margin in the release-candidate dataset  $\mathcal{R}$ . Therefore,  $\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_{\bar{a}}$  is released with the Laplace mechanism with global sensitivity  $\Delta_{\max}$ .

## Additional Technical Details

**Converting binned columns to numeric values.** Calculating the mean of a binned column presents challenges. We employ the following heuristic to convert a bin into a single numerical value:

1. If the bin contains only a single value (e.g., 1), that value is used (1).
2. If the bin has defined bounds (e.g., 2-3), the average of the boundary values is used (2.5).
3. If the bin is unbounded (e.g., >10), the specified edge value is used (10).

**Coarse binning for group-by columns.** Rather than using the group-by columns as given, we transform them to create coarser bins. They were chosen to mimic anticipated group-by queries by data users. The bins were created by the stakeholders based on their expertise and the literature.

1. mother\_age:  $\leq 24, 25-29, 30-34, 35 \leq$
2. parity: 1, 2-3,  $4 \leq$
3. gestation\_week:  $< 37, 37 \leq$
4. sex: M, F
5. birth\_weight:  $< 2500, 2500-3999, 4000 \leq$

### 4.5.4 Linear regression

Linear Regressions allow us to succinctly describe the relationship between multiple variables by assuming a simple structure. Even though linear regressions may not capture complex dependencies as with multi-way marginals, they could drive deeper insights by quantifying the effect of each feature variable on the target variable. When appropriate, Linear Regressions have the advantage of considering the distance between values of a column (e.g., parity 1 is closer to 2 than 4), in contrast to multi-way marginal queries.

Linear Regressions is a typical analysis done on birth data, particularly with the birth weight as the target variable. Linear regression could be used to serve two purposes: description and prediction [Shm10]. In descriptive modeling, an analyst aims to summarize data, and in the context of Linear Regression, descriptive modeling corresponds to finding the coefficients. Prediction modeling aims to propose a value of the target variable given the other feature variables. We defined two acceptance criteria in accordance to those two purposes.

**Preliminaries.** Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a dataset of  $d+1$  columns. Without loss of generality, the dataset may or may not have a column of all 1s. Let  $w_c(\mathcal{D}) \in \mathbb{R}^k$  be the coefficient of a linear regression trained on  $\mathcal{D}$  to predict the last column  $c$  based on the rest of the columns with the standard OLS optimization. If the same linear regression model is trained with  $\varepsilon$ -differentially private Functional Mechanism [ZZX<sup>+</sup>12], we denote the model coefficient with  $w_c^\varepsilon(\mathcal{D}) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ .

The binned data is transformed into real numbers with the transformation used for the conditional means acceptance criteria (Section 4.5.3). To make the error in the coefficients' entries comparable to each other, they are standardized using the mean and variance calculated on the synthetic data, so no privacy loss budget is consumed.

Recall that  $[x, ]_L^U := \max\{\min\{x, U, \}, L\}$  is the clipping function within the boundaries  $L < U$ . The (clipped) Maximum Average Error (MAE) of a linear regression with coefficients  $w$  on a dataset  $\mathcal{D}$  with  $L, U$  as the boundaries of the target variable  $y \in [L, U]$  is

$$\text{MAE}_{\mathcal{D}}(w) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{D}} |y - [w^\top \cdot x]_L^U|$$

Together with the primary stakeholders, we choose  $c = \text{birth\_data}$  for the target column, i.e., the column  $y$  that the linear regression predicts.

**Descriptive modeling: coefficient error.** For descriptive modeling, the acceptance criterion of the **max coefficient error** of a linear regression has the following error measure

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{lr-coef}}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S}) := \|w_c^\varepsilon(\mathcal{R}) - w_c(\mathcal{S})\|_1$$

with threshold  $T_{\text{lr-coef}} = 30$ .

We chose the  $\ell_1$  distance because it bounds both the max and total errors, if the threshold is set to a relatively low value.

After producing the released data, we observed that we could save  $\varepsilon = .43$  privacy loss budget spent on this acceptance criteria. Refer to Section 4.14.1 for details.

**Predictive modeling: absolute prediction error.** For prediction modeling, we follow the "Train on Synthetic, Test on Real" (TSTR) approach to evaluate the quality of prediction [EHR17]. We assess whether training a linear regression on the synthetic data produces accurate predictions on the *transformed data*. Our baseline is a linear regression trained directly on the transformed data.

The acceptance criterion of the **absolute prediction error** of a linear regression has the following error measure

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{lr-mae}}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S}) := |\text{MAE}_{\mathcal{R}}(w_c^\varepsilon(\mathcal{R})) - \text{MAE}_{\mathcal{R}}(w_c(\mathcal{S}))|$$

with threshold  $T_{\text{lr-mae}} = 5$ .



To release this metric with differential privacy, we consider the coefficients of the linear regression  $w_c^e(\mathcal{R})$  as public thanks to their release in the previous acceptance criterion. Also  $w_c(\mathcal{S})$  is consider public because it is computed from the previously released synthetic data. As shown in the Proposition below, the metric  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{lr-mae}}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S})$  has a relatively small sensitivity, so it is released with the Laplace mechanism.

**Proposition 9.** *Let  $w_{\mathcal{R}}$  and  $w_{\mathcal{S}}$  be two public linear regression coefficients. Let  $L$  and  $U$  be the lower and upper bounds of the target variable. The global sensitivity of the error measure  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{lr-mae}}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S})$  is  $2(U - L)/n$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2$  be neighbor datasets differ in one element, without loss of generality, the last one  $(x_{1,n}, y_{1,n}) \neq (x_{2,n}, y_{2,n})$ . The global sensitivity is bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathcal{E}_{\text{lr-mae}}(\mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{S}) - \mathcal{E}_{\text{lr-mae}}(\mathcal{R}_2, \mathcal{S}) \right| \\
&= \left| \left| MAE_{\mathcal{R}_1}(w_{\mathcal{R}}) - MAE_{\mathcal{R}_1}(w_{\mathcal{S}}) \right| - \left| MAE_{\mathcal{R}_2}(w_{\mathcal{R}}) - MAE_{\mathcal{R}_2}(w_{\mathcal{S}}) \right| \right| \\
&\leq \left| MAE_{\mathcal{R}_1}(w_{\mathcal{R}}) - MAE_{\mathcal{R}_1}(w_{\mathcal{S}}) - MAE_{\mathcal{R}_2}(w_{\mathcal{R}}) + MAE_{\mathcal{R}_2}(w_{\mathcal{S}}) \right| \\
&= \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |y_{1,i} - [w_{\mathcal{R}}^{\text{T}} \cdot x_{1,i}]_L^U| - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |y_{1,i} - [w_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{T}} \cdot x_{1,i}]_L^U| \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |y_{2,i} - [w_{\mathcal{R}}^{\text{T}} \cdot x_{2,i}]_L^U| + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |y_{2,i} - [w_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{T}} \cdot x_{2,i}]_L^U| \right| \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \left| |y_{1,n} - [w_{\mathcal{R}}^{\text{T}} \cdot x_{1,n}]_L^U| - |y_{1,n} - [w_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{T}} \cdot x_{1,n}]_L^U| \right. \\
&\quad \left. - |y_{2,n} - [w_{\mathcal{R}}^{\text{T}} \cdot x_{2,n}]_L^U| + |y_{2,n} - [w_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{T}} \cdot x_{2,n}]_L^U| \right| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n} \left| |y_{1,n} - [w_{\mathcal{R}}^{\text{T}} \cdot x_{1,n}]_L^U| - |y_{1,n} - [w_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{T}} \cdot x_{1,n}]_L^U| \right| \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{n} \left| - |y_{2,n} - [w_{\mathcal{R}}^{\text{T}} \cdot x_{2,n}]_L^U| + |y_{2,n} - [w_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{T}} \cdot x_{2,n}]_L^U| \right| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n} \left| y_{1,n} - [w_{\mathcal{R}}^{\text{T}} \cdot x_{1,n}]_L^U - y_{1,n} + [w_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{T}} \cdot x_{1,n}]_L^U \right| \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{n} \left| - y_{2,n} + [w_{\mathcal{R}}^{\text{T}} \cdot x_{2,n}]_L^U + y_{2,n} - [w_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{T}} \cdot x_{2,n}]_L^U \right| \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \left| [w_{\mathcal{R}}^{\text{T}} \cdot x_{1,n}]_L^U - [w_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{T}} \cdot x_{1,n}]_L^U \right| + \frac{1}{n} \left| [w_{\mathcal{R}}^{\text{T}} \cdot x_{2,n}]_L^U - [w_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{T}} \cdot x_{2,n}]_L^U \right| \\
&\leq 2(U - L)/n.
\end{aligned}$$

The reverse triangle inequality gives the first and third inequalities. The triangle inequality gives the second inequality. The last inequality is given because each term is between  $U$  and  $L$ .

□

### 4.5.5 Faithfulness

Section 3.5.1 offers a comprehensive overview of the faithfulness acceptance criterion. Here we present the technical details related to the threshold and the cost function in this release. We also detail the specifics of the differentially private mechanism used for this criterion.

Recall that the faithfulness acceptance criterion has the following error measure

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{ff}}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S}) := 1 - \beta_{\text{max}}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S}),$$

where  $\beta_{\text{max}}$  stands for the maximal- $\beta$ -faithfulness

$$\beta_{\text{max}}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S}) = \max_{\text{matching } \pi} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}[c(s_i, r_{\pi(i)}) \leq 1].$$

First, the stakeholders set the threshold at  $T_{\text{ff}} = 0.05$ . In words, no more than 5% of the records in  $\mathcal{S}$  would remain unmatched to records in  $\mathcal{R}$ .

Second, observe that the definition of maximal- $\beta$ -faithfulness is independent of the exact value of the cost function  $c$ . It relies solely on whether the cost between two records is less than or equal to one. The criteria under which the cost function between two records does not exceed 1 were predefined by the stakeholder, drawing on subject-matter expertise. These conditions are detailed below.

Third, the  $\beta_{\text{max}}$  has low sensitivity, so it is released with the Laplace mechanism.

**Proposition 10.** *The global sensitivity of the faithfulness acceptance criteria  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{ff}}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S}) = 1 - \beta_{\text{max}}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S}) = 1 - \max_{\pi} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}[c(s_i, r_{\pi(i)}) \leq 1]$  is  $1/n$ , where  $\mathcal{S}$  is public.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2$  be neighbor datasets that, without loss of generality, differ in the last element  $r_{1,n} \neq r_{2,n}$ . Let  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$  be their matchings that realize the optimal value. Let  $\sigma_1 = \pi_1^{-1}, \sigma_2 = \pi_2^{-1}$  and assume  $|S| = |R_1| = |R_2|$ . Without loss of generality,  $\beta_{\text{max}}(\mathcal{R}_1) \geq \beta_{\text{max}}(\mathcal{R}_2)$ . Then the global sensitivity is

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \mathcal{E}_{\text{ff}}(\mathcal{R}_2) - \mathcal{E}_{\text{ff}}(\mathcal{R}_1) \right| &= \left| \left(1 - \beta_{\max}(\mathcal{R}_2)\right) - \left(1 - \beta_{\max}(\mathcal{R}_1)\right) \right| \\
&= \left| \beta_{\max}(\mathcal{R}_1) - \beta_{\max}(\mathcal{R}_2) \right| \\
&= \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}[c(s_i, r_{1, \pi_1(i)}) \leq 1] - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}[c(s_i, r_{2, \pi_2(i)}) \leq 1] \right| \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{1}[c(s_{\sigma_1(j)}, r_{1,j}) \leq 1] - \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{1}[c(s_{\sigma_2(j)}, r_{2,j}) \leq 1] \right| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{1}[c(s_{\sigma_1(j)}, r_{1,j}) \leq 1] - \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{1}[c(s_{\sigma_1(j)}, r_{2,j}) \leq 1] \right| \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \left( \mathbb{1}[c(s_{\sigma_1(j)}, r_{1,j}) \leq 1] - \mathbb{1}[c(s_{\sigma_1(j)}, r_{2,j}) \leq 1] \right) \right| \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \left| \mathbb{1}[c(s_{\sigma_1(n)}, r_{1,n}) \leq 1] - \mathbb{1}[c(s_{\sigma_1(n)}, r_{2,n}) \leq 1] \right| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n}.
\end{aligned}$$

The first inequality holds because  $\sigma_2$  is the maximizer of  $\beta_{\max}(\mathcal{R}_2)$ , and the second inequality holds because  $\mathbb{1}[\cdot]$  can evaluate to either 0 or 1. □

- The following columns must have identical values between the two records: birth\_month, parity, birth\_sex.
- These columns can differ by one bin either up or down, but only for one column: mother\_age<sup>5</sup>, gestation\_week, birth\_weight.

## 4.6 Face Privacy and Dataset Projection

Face privacy formalizes an expectation, articulated by the stakeholders, regarding the expected perception of the privacy protection provided by the release.

The concern was first raised by one of the stakeholders by putting forth the following requirement, which can be seen as a stringent variant of  $k$ -anonymity [Swe02]. For each column  $c$  and each set  $B$  of  $b$  other columns, treat  $c$  as a sensitive column, treat the columns in  $B$  as quasi-identifier columns and require that this configuration satisfy  $k$ -anonymity. In other words, for all possible choices of values for the columns in  $B$ , each value configuration appears at least within  $k$  rows. The requirement was made with  $k = 5$  and  $b = 5$ , namely one less than the overall number of columns.

---

<sup>5</sup>Based on input from the primary stakeholder, there is a unique exception to this rule. If the value 37, which is clinically meaningful, falls within a bin and not at its edges, that bin must be an exact match. This is only relevant for one binning alternative of the mother\_age column (see Section 4.7).

This is a strong requirement which, to the best of our knowledge, was not presented before in the literature even with respect to non-synthetic data.

Still, it was argued that an official release in microdata format that contains “potentially identifiable rows” run the risk of undermining the public perception that privacy is preserved — and that this holds true even when the data is synthetic.

In a follow-up discussion with the stakeholders, we concluded that, while the specific requirement described above is overly stringent, and while we do not have concrete studies regarding the public perception of privacy in such cases, we should *avoid the occurrence unique rows in the released dataset*.

Indeed, the identification and elicitation of privacy expectations in such releases is an important topic for future work on the public perception of privacy.

To achieve the “no unique rows” expectation as part of our scheme, we apply a specific *dataset projection* on the synthetic dataset. The output of this projection also satisfies complete  $k$ -anonymity. The projection manipulates this dataset only and does not sample new rows from the generative model. From a differential privacy prospective, the dataset projection is a post-processing step, so it does not consume any privacy loss budget. The output of the projection is the release-candidate dataset, that is evaluated against the acceptance criteria.

Algorithm 4 presents the projection for minimal occurrence, i.e., it outputs a dataset of which each record appears at least `min_count` times. Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a multiset (dataset)  $\mathcal{D} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{0+}$ , and let  $|\mathcal{D}| := \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathcal{D}(x)$ . Let  $\text{Rec}(\mathcal{D})$  be the set of all records that appears at least once in  $\mathcal{D}$ , i.e.,  $\text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}) := \{x \in \mathcal{X} \mid \mathcal{D}(x) > 0\}$ . Define also the set  $\text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# = k) := \{x \in \mathcal{X} : \mathcal{D}(x) = k\}$  for a multiset  $\mathcal{D}$  and denote its size with  $n_k^{\mathcal{D}} := |\text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# = k)|$ .

---

#### Algorithm 4 Dataset Projection for Minimal Occurrence

---

**Require:** a multiset (dataset)  $\mathcal{D}$ , a minimum count of records  $m$ .

- 1: **for**  $k = 1, \dots, m - 1$  **do**
  - 2:      $R_k \leftarrow$  Sample without replacement  $\lfloor \frac{k}{m} n_k^{\mathcal{D}} \rfloor$  records from  $\text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# = k)$
  - 3:      $\mathcal{D}'_k \leftarrow \{(x, m) : x \in R_k\}$
  - 4: **end for**
  - 5:  $\mathcal{D}'_{<m} \leftarrow \cup_{k=1}^{m-1} \mathcal{D}'_k$
  - 6:  $\mathcal{D}'_{=m} \leftarrow \{(x, \mathcal{D}(x)) : x \in \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}(x) = m\}$
  - 7:  $\mathcal{D}'_{>m} \leftarrow \{(x, \mathcal{D}(x)) : x \in \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}(x) > m\}$
  - 8:  $\mathcal{D}' \leftarrow \mathcal{D}'_{<m} \cup \mathcal{D}'_{=m} \cup \mathcal{D}'_{>m}$
  - 9: **return**  $\mathcal{D}'$ .
- 

After applying Algorithm 4, the records of the output dataset are a subset of the input dataset. All records in the output dataset appear least  $m$  times, and the total count of the of records appearing  $k \leq m$  times in the input dataset is preserved. We prove these properties in the following proposition.

**Proposition 11.** *Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a multiset (dataset) of size  $n$  and  $\mathcal{D}'$  be the multiset corresponding to the*

output of Algorithm 4 when running it on  $\mathcal{D}$  with a minimum count of records  $m$  ( $min\_count$ ). Assume  $\forall k \in [m - 1] : m | (k \cdot n_k^{\mathcal{D}})$ . Then the following holds:

1.  $\text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}') \subseteq \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D})$ ,
2. For all  $k > m$ ,  $\text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}', \# = k) = \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# = k)$ ,
3.  $\text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# = m) \subseteq \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}', \# = m)$ ,
4.  $\text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}', \# < m) = \emptyset$ ,
5. For all  $k < m$ ,  $\sum_{x \in \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# = k)} \mathcal{D}'(x) = \sum_{x \in \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# = k)} \mathcal{D}(x)$ .
6.  $|\mathcal{D}'| = |\mathcal{D}|$ ,

*Proof.* Statement (1) is straightforward; the algorithm does not add a new record  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  that is not already present in  $\mathcal{D}$ .

To show that statements (2), (3) and (4) hold, note that  $\mathcal{D}'$  is a union of three disjoint sets:  $\mathcal{D}'_{>m}$ ,  $\mathcal{D}'_{=m}$  and  $\mathcal{D}'_{<m}$ .

$\mathcal{D}'_{>m}$  is an exact copy of the records in  $\mathcal{D}$  that appears  $m + 1$  times or more, so for all  $k > m$ ,  $\text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}', \# = k) = \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# = k)$ . Similarly,  $\mathcal{D}'_{=m}$  contains a copy of the records in  $\mathcal{D}$  that appears exactly  $m$  times, so  $\text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# = m) \subseteq \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}', \# = m)$ . Finally, each record of  $\mathcal{D}'_{<m}$  appears exactly  $m$  times in  $\mathcal{D}'$ . Putting it all together, there is no record in  $\mathcal{D}'$  that appears less than  $m$  times. Hence  $\text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}', \# < m) = \emptyset$ .

For  $k < m$ ,  $|R_k| = \lfloor \frac{k}{m} n_k^{\mathcal{D}} \rfloor = \frac{k}{m} n_k^{\mathcal{D}}$  because we assume that  $m | (k \cdot n_k^{\mathcal{D}})$ . Therefore,

$$|\mathcal{D}'_k| = m \cdot |R_k| = m \cdot \frac{k}{m} n_k^{\mathcal{D}} = k \cdot n_k^{\mathcal{D}}.$$

Consequently

$$\sum_{x \in \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# = k)} \mathcal{D}'(x) = \sum_{x \in R_t} \mathcal{D}'(x) + \sum_{x \in \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# = k) \setminus R_t} \mathcal{D}'(x) = |\mathcal{D}'_k| + \sum_{x \in \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# = k) \setminus R_t} 0 = k \cdot n_k^{\mathcal{D}}.$$

Then, we derive statement (5) because  $\sum_{x \in \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# = k)} \mathcal{D}(x) = k \cdot |\text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# = k)| = k \cdot n_k^{\mathcal{D}}$ .

Finally, statement (6) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{D}'| &= |\mathcal{D}'_{>m}| + |\mathcal{D}'_{=m}| + |\mathcal{D}'_{<m}| \\ &= \sum_{x \in \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# > m)} \mathcal{D}'(x) + \sum_{x \in \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# = m)} \mathcal{D}'(x) + \sum_{x \in \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# < m)} \mathcal{D}'(x) \\ &= \sum_{x \in \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# > m)} \mathcal{D}(x) + \sum_{x \in \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# = m)} \mathcal{D}(x) + \sum_{x \in \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# < m)} \mathcal{D}(x) \\ &= |\mathcal{D}|. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Remark 1.** If  $\exists k \in [m - 1]$  that  $m \nmid (k \cdot n_k^{\mathcal{D}})$ , then the size of the output dataset  $\mathcal{D}'$  would be smaller than the size of the input dataset  $\mathcal{D}$ . To overcome that,  $|\mathcal{D}| - |\mathcal{D}'|$  records from  $\mathcal{D}'$  should be duplicated. If  $m$  is rather small (e.g.,  $m \in \{2, 3\}$ , as in our release), the impact of this change is negligible.

**Remark 2.** In the actual execution of our scheme to produce the released dataset, we used a slightly different version of Algorithm 4 of which statement (5) from Proposition 11 holds in expectation. Only after producing the released dataset, which consumed the privacy loss budget, we realized that the implemented algorithm could be improved to Algorithm 4. Refer to Section 4.14 for additional information.

The parameter `min_count` is part of the experiment configurations for our scheme, and need to be tuned (Section 4.7).

## 4.7 Configuration Spaces

Our scheme consists of multiple steps. Nonetheless, the core component is the differentially private mechanism that produces synthetic data. The mechanism learns some private representation of the data distribution and outputs a generative model. We choose to work with three families of differentially private synthetic data mechanisms: (1) Marginals-based (PrivBayes) [ZCP<sup>+</sup>14]; (2) Query-based (MWEM, PEP) [HLM12, LVW21] and (3) Deep Learning (DPCTGAN, PATECTGAN) [RLP<sup>+</sup>20, XSCV19, JYvdS19]. Generally speaking, private marginals-based mechanisms seem to perform well in practice in settings similar to ours [TMH<sup>+</sup>21, GXC23], query-based mechanisms tend to have theoretical utility guarantees, and deep learning approach are more common in non-differentially private settings [JSH<sup>+</sup>22, QCvdS23].

Within each family, the specific mechanisms were included in the scheme only if they were available in the well-maintained open-source package *SmartNoise* [Mic20]. There were two exceptions to this rule: PrivBayes and PEP. PrivBayes is widely regarded as a solid baseline for differentially private synthetic data generation, with its original implementation in C extensively used across various packages [ZCP<sup>+</sup>14]. PEP is a more sophisticated query-based mechanism that outperforms MWEM and shows better empirical results than other query-based mechanisms in a similar setting to ours [LVW21]. Other potential candidates for a marginal-based mechanism include the MST [MMS21] or AIM [MMSM22] algorithms, which have demonstrated top performances in recent benchmark analyses [TMH<sup>+</sup>21, MMSM22, MMS21]; however, they were only added to *SmartNoise* at a later stage of our project.

Before fitting a generative model and evaluating its samples, it can be challenging to determine with experiments which model family will perform best and what hyperparameters should be used. For instance, the training process of GANs with differential privacy is sensitive to both GAN-related and DP-related hyperparameters.

In many use cases, there might be more than one option acceptable by the stakeholders

to preprocess the data, so no single “correct” transformation exists. We elicited a space of possible data transformations and representations elicited from the stakeholders. For example, a date column could be represented at the resolution of months or weeks, and both could carry value to the users. The data transformations also interact with the model family and its hyperparameters in a way that might not be predictable ahead of time.

Therefore, in this work, we performed a search within the Cartesian space spanned by the model hyperparameters and the data transformations, as detailed in the following.

#### 4.7.1 Data transformation space

For each column there is one or more data transformations alternatives.

Column	Transformation Alternatives
birth_month	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12
mother_age	<18, 18-19, 20-24, 25-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40-42, 43-44, 44<
	<18, 18-19, 20-24, 25-29, 30-34, 35-36, 37-39, 40-42, 43-44, 44<
	<18, 18, 19, 20, ..., 42, 43, 44, 44<
parity	1, 2-3, 4-6, 7-10, 10<
	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 10<
gestation_week	<29, 29-31, 32-33, 34-36, 37-41, 41<
	<29, 29, 31, 32, ..., 38, 39, 40, 41<
birth_sex	M, F
birth_weight	<1500, 1500-1599, 1600-1699, ..., 4300-4399, 4400-4499, 4499<

#### 4.7.2 Hyperparameter space

**PrivBayes.** PrivBayes [ZCP+14] is a differentially private Bayesian Network based mechanism. Some portion of the privacy loss budget is allocated to learning the network structure with a greedy algorithm, and the other portion is devoted to learning the conditional distribution for each node.

The code is taken from the original implementation with a few modifications. We added a new hyperparameter (`epsilon_split`) that determined how to divide the privacy loss budget between structure and distribution learning. The original PrivBayes mechanism has a single hyperparameter, `theta`, that heuristically tunes each node’s degree (number of dependencies). We created a second flavor with a hyperparameter, `degree`, that set the maximum degree directly.

	Hyperparameters	Possible Values
All models	<code>epsilon_split</code>	0.1, 0.25, 0.5, 0.7
Theta flavor only	<code>theta</code>	2, 4, 8, 16, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 50, 60, 100
Degree flavor only	<code>degree</code>	2, 3, 4

**MWEM & PEP.** MWEM [HLM12] and PEP [LVW21] are query-based mechanisms that learn a representation of the universe of records distribution induced by the transformed data. First, a pool of counting queries is randomly generated (`num_query`). Second, for multiple iterations (`num_iteration`), the most poorly performing counting query on the representation is selected and evaluated in a differentially private way. Then, this query result updates the representation multiple times (`num_inner_updates`). The code of PEP has an additional hyperparameter, `marginal`, that sets the order of the marginal queries.

Hyperparameter combinations where `num_query < num_iterations` are excluded.

	Hyperparameters	Possible Values
All models	<code>num_query</code>	128, 512, 1024, 4096
	<code>num_iterations</code>	100, 500, 1000
	<code>num_inner_updates</code>	25, 100
PEP only	<code>marginal</code>	2, 3, 4

**DPCTGAN & PATECTGAN.** Both DPCTGAN and PATECTGAN [RLP+20, JYvdS19] are variants of the CTGAN model [XLW+18]; the former use DP-SGD for training CTGAN directly, while the latter embeds it within the PATE framework [PAE+17, PSM+18a]. Unless otherwise specified, hyperparameters default to the values in SmartNoise.

The parameter `epochs` denotes the maximum number of training epochs, applicable even if the privacy loss budget remains unexhausted. `batch_size` defines the size of each training batch. Learning rates and weight decays for generator and discriminator networks are configured by `generator_lr`, `discriminator_lr`, `generator_decay`, and `discriminator_decay`, respectively.

The hyperparameter `noise_multiplier` adjusts the amount of noise injected into the DP-SGD and PATE-GAN algorithms. The `max_per_sample_grad_norm` hyperparameter, which is specific to DP-SGD, set the gradient clipping threshold.



	Hyperparameters	Possible Values
All models	epochs	300
	batch_size	500
	generator_lr	2e-4, 2e-5
	discriminator_lr	2e-4, 2e-5
	generator_decay	1e-6
	discriminator_decay	1e-6
	noise_multiplier	0.001, 0.1, 1, 5
	discriminator_decay	1e-6
	batch_size	500
DPCTGAN only	noise_multiplier	0.001, 0.1, 1, 5
	loss	cross_entropy, wasserstein
	max_per_sample_grad_norm	0.1, 1, 5
PATECTGAN only	loss	cross_entropy
	regularization	none, dragan

### 4.7.3 Data projection space

The hyperparameter `min_count` of the minimal occurrence data projection (Algorithm 4) is treated as an hyperparameter for our scheme with two possible values  $\{2, 3\}$  set together with our stakeholders.

## 4.8 Cleaning and Constraint Filtering

Real-world data often suffer from erroneous values for a variety of reasons, and the Israeli National Registry of Live Births is no exception. Errors may be introduced when values are manually entered into the registry, and glitches may occur during past database migrations or software updates. Additionally, the original data may contain extreme yet realistic records. A few outlier values can hinder model fitting and exaggerate errors in the evaluation.

These issues are also pertinent to synthetic data generation. Even with clean and “nice” original data, the trained generative model might still produce biologically implausible samples because it learns “soft” statistical relationships.

Therefore, we established a list of record-level constraints that must be satisfied by *both the raw and synthetic data*. Records not adhering to these constraints are filtered out (1) from the original data before preprocessing, and (2) from the synthetic samples. The initial list was created without the original data, based on published reference charts and established data processing practices in the biostatistics community regarding birth data. *We acknowledge that one author and one primary stakeholder expanded the constraint list after examining the raw data exported from the Ministry of Health database.*

#### 4.8.1 Raw data constraints

After exporting the singleton live birth data from the Registry database, the following records were removed for quality assurance or because they were rare, extreme, and implausible, which might hinder the learning of the generation model. In total, no more than 1.5% of the records were removed.

1. Records with missing values in one field or more
2. Records with `birth_weight` smaller than 500 (strict) OR greater than 5500 (strict)
3. Records with `gestation_week` smaller than 22 (strict) OR greater than 44 (strict)
4. Records with a `mother_age` smaller than 23 (strict) AND a parity greater than 6 (strict)
5. Records with a `mother_age` smaller than 20 (strict) AND a parity greater than 3 (strict)
6. Records with a `gestation_week` smaller than 26 (strict) AND a `birth_weight` greater than 1499 (strict)
7. Records with a `gestation_week` smaller than 29 (strict) AND a `birth_weight` greater than 2999 (strict)
8. Records with a `gestation_week` smaller than 34 (strict) AND a `birth_weight` greater than 3999 (strict)
9. Records with a `birth_weight` smaller than 600 (strict) AND a `gestation_week` greater than 29 (strict)
10. Records with a `birth_weight` smaller than 700 (strict) AND a `gestation_week` greater than 32 (strict)

#### 4.8.2 Synthetic data constraints

The following constraints were removed from the synthetic data because they are rare, extreme and implausible, so they might exaggerate errors in the evaluation (corresponds to the raw data constraints 3, 4, 7, 8 and 9).

1. Records with a `mother_age` smaller than 23 (strict) AND a parity greater than 6 (strict)
2. Records with a `mother_age` smaller than 20 (strict) AND a parity greater than 3 (strict)
3. Records with a `gestation_week` smaller than 29 (strict) AND a `birth_weight` greater than 2999 (strict)
4. Records with a `gestation_week` smaller than 34 (strict) AND a `birth_weight` greater than 3999 (strict)

## 4.9 Private Selection Details

Our scheme (Algorithm 1) is built on top the private selection algorithm (Algorithm 2). Here,  $x$  denotes the generated release-candidate dataset (i.e., the synthetic dataset produced after constraint filtering and projection), and  $q \in 0, 1$  indicates whether  $x$  meets all acceptance criteria, setting the success threshold at  $\tau = 1$ . The mechanism  $\mathcal{M}(D)$  selects a configuration for the experiment (data transformations and model hyperparameters) from a predefined public list and calculates differentially private  $x$  and  $q$ . The mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  achieves 4.99-differential privacy (DP), as  $\varepsilon_x = 4$  is allocated for training a generative model (where sampling does not expend any privacy loss budget), and  $\varepsilon_q = 0.99$  is used for the acceptance criteria assessment. According to Theorem 3, which gives the total privacy loss budget among other properties, this theorem is also valid for an infinite horizon, with parameters  $T = \infty$ ,  $\gamma = 0$ , and  $\varepsilon_0 = 0$ . Therefore, the total privacy loss budget used for producing the release is  $\varepsilon_{\text{total}} = 2(\varepsilon_x + \varepsilon_q) = 9.98$ .

**Theorem 3** (Private selection with a known threshold [LT19]). *Fix  $\varepsilon_1, \delta_1 > 0, \varepsilon_0 \in [0, 1], \gamma \in [0, 1]$ . Let  $T$  be any integer such that  $T \geq \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\gamma} \ln \frac{2}{\varepsilon_0}, 1 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon\gamma} \right\}$ , and let  $p_1 = \Pr_{q \sim Q(D)}[q \geq \tau]$ , then Algorithm 2 with these parameters satisfies the following:*

1. Let  $A_{\text{out}}(D)$  be the output of Algorithm 2 on input  $D$ . Then there exists a constant  $C$  such that for any  $q \geq \tau$  we have

$$\Pr[A_{\text{out}}(D) = (x, q)] = C \cdot \Pr_{(\tilde{x}, \tilde{q}) \sim Q(D)}[(\tilde{x}, \tilde{q}) = (x, q)].$$

2. If  $\mathcal{M}$  is  $\varepsilon_1$ -DP, then the output is  $(2\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_0)$ -DP.
3. Let  $\tilde{T}$  be the number of iterations of the algorithm, then

$$\mathbb{E}\tilde{T} \leq \frac{1}{p_1(1 - \gamma) + \gamma} \leq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{p_1}, \frac{1}{\gamma} \right\}.$$

4. Furthermore,  $\Pr[A_{\text{out}}(D) = \perp] \leq \frac{(1-p_1)(1+\varepsilon_0/2)}{p_1}\gamma$ .

## 4.10 Leveraging Public Data

Any access or computation on the Israeli National Registry of Live Births data is restricted to an enclave environment (Section 4.12) with limited computational resources. However, the prior space of possible data transformation and model hyperparameters is large (Section 4.7) and cannot be exhausted in the enclave environment in a reasonable amount of time. Not only that, if none of the configurations passes the acceptance criteria, the private selection with a known threshold algorithm would run forever, and the privacy loss budget would be consumed for nothing. That fact still holds if we set the algorithm parameters to return “failure”  $\perp$  with a non-zero probability ( $\gamma > 0$ ). Altogether, these two issues could make our scheme infeasible in practice.

One option is to leverage available resources (e.g., cloud computing) to run a grid search with multiple attempts for each configuration if one had public data similar to the private

data. Hopefully, one or more configurations would pass all acceptance criteria with a not-too-small probability. Then, the collection of configuration with at least one success could be used on the private data in the enclave environment.

The underlying assumption is that the structural characteristics of the data distribution would be similar between the private and public data. So if a configuration, i.e., the collection of specific values for data transformations and model hyperparameters, is accepted for the public data, it would probably be accepted also for the private data, perhaps after a few attempts.

It should be underscored that even if the assumption regarding structural similarity is incorrect, this will not impact the empirical quality guarantees of the released data or the level of privacy protection. The only potential negative consequence is that generating the released dataset might demand more computational resources than expected, or our scheme might fail to terminate, resulting in no output.

We note that the public data could have been utilize further for seeding the generation models (e.g., MWEM, GAN, Bayesian Networks) with the public data. We leave this optimization for future work.

To the best of our knowledge, no existing birth datasets are publicly available except for those from the US. The National Vital Statistics System (NVSS) [Cen], maintained by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), which gathers various datasets from US states. This collection includes detailed records of births, categorized by state and month. The NVSS data has been accessible to the public for several decades. All six fields planned for release in the Israeli National Registry of Live Births are present in the NVSS data. The NVSS data contains individual-level birth events. Throughout the years, various privacy-protection measures were taken, such as the removal of Personal Identifiable Information (PII). Since 2005, the data has been released at a national level, lacking geographical details such as state, county, and city. Since 1989, dates of birth have been provided only with the year, month, and day of the week, omitting exact birth dates.

We conducted the above-described experiment using a 2019 public data sample that corresponds to the approximate number of births in Israel in 2014, based on data from the Israel Central Bureau of Statistics [Cen14]. Our findings revealed that the PrivBayes mechanism [ZCP<sup>+</sup>14] surpassed all others in performance, as detailed in Section 4.7. Additionally, we identified several configurations with an acceptance probability of at least 10%. Consequently, our scheme was implemented on the private data using the PrivBayes mechanism and the successful configurations identified within the public NVSS data.

## 4.11 Software

Releasing official national-level data, even with formal privacy protection, entails significant responsibility. This responsibility is further underscored by known challenges and vulnerabilities associated with implementing differential privacy systems [Mir12, HDH<sup>+</sup>22, SOT22, TTS<sup>+</sup>22, JMRO22, CSVW22, KMR<sup>+</sup>20, GC23]. In this section, we delineate the overall design of our system, addressing the risks arising from discrepancies between (1)

theoretical presentations of our algorithms and (2) their actual code implementation.

#### 4.11.1 Overall design

We have developed a Python package called `synthflow` for this release. Its core functionality is to execute a *flow*, which corresponds to a single iteration of our scheme. Given a configuration, the code transforms the data, trains a generative model, samples records, filters rows based on constraints, applies projection, and performs evaluation according to acceptance criteria. Additionally, it can span the configuration space based on its dimensions and orchestrate the execution of a private selection algorithm. The package also collect the full transcript of all randomness and noise used in the its execution. The logic specific to the implementation details of Israel’s National Registry of Live Birth is separate from the flow’s general logic.

#### 4.11.2 Risk management

The scheme used in this paper fulfil differential privacy with respect to its the theoretical presentation. Implementation of differential privacy algorithms are pruned to bugs that could nullify the theoretical guarantees [Mir12, KMR<sup>+</sup>20, JMRO22, SOT22, HDH<sup>+</sup>22, TTS<sup>+</sup>22, CSVW22].

We did not have the resources to deploy end-to-end formal verification or conduct a complete differential privacy auditing. Given the available resources to us, we aimed to manage and reduce the risk of misalignment between the implementation and the theoretical framework presented in this paper. The following points summarize the measures we took.

**Keep it simple.** As a general principle, we preferred simple code design that is easier to test and maintain.

**Applying best practices of software engineering.** Testing, linting, documentation and reviewing were integral to the development workflow. While insufficient to identify potential bugs with differential privacy, these practices are the first line measure for mitigating risk. In particular, we carefully examine each manipulation and query on the original data (e.g., definition of columns’ boundaries) and calculations of parameter values.

**Using differentially private algorithm from established open source packages; not implementing new algorithms.** Because it requires great effort to implement differential privacy mechanisms correctly with a production quality level, we avoided writing our own implementation. We opt to use existing open source packages that are either well and actively maintained, SmartNoise<sup>67</sup> which is part of OpenDP ecosystem [HGV20] and

---

<sup>6</sup>Synthesizers: <https://github.com/opensdp/smartnoise-sdk>

<sup>7</sup>We patched the MWEM implementation in SmartNoise to allow the exponential mechanism to choose the same query; because otherwise, the code got into an infinite loop on the NVSS data)

Diffprivlib<sup>8</sup> [HBAL19], or that are used by other projects and undergone a code review by us (PrivBayes from SDGym<sup>9</sup>). *Nonetheless, these packages are susceptible to floating point vulnerabilities<sup>1011</sup> and underestimation of the sensitivity vulnerabilities, and consequently, also our release.* This issue is one of the reasons why we decided against releasing the generative model with the full-precision float probabilities, opting instead to make only the final dataset publicly available. We plan to resolve this issue in future releases of the Registry.

**Perform only essential patching of code for differential privacy mechanisms.** We patched the PrivBayes code for three purposes.

First, we addressed the bug reported by [SOT22]: we now take the upper and lower bounds of each column as predefined inputs from the configuration, rather than calculating them directly from the original dataset in a non-private manner.

Second, we transitioned to a CSPRNG (cryptographically secure pseudo-random number generator) as discussed in Section 4.11.3.

Third, we added functionality to collect the transcript of all random and noise used in fitting the Bayesian network. However, this transcript is neither exported from the enclave nor released but may be used for future research.

**Considering synthetic data and data transformations as fallbacks, but not as privacy guarantees.** Our privacy protection in this released is given by differential privacy. Synthetic data and transformations are not privacy guarantees, but by adopting defence in depth approach, they serve as a secondary layer of protection by limiting the precision and amount of information released. We stress that data the projection of face privacy is not considered a fallback.

### 4.11.3 Randomness

High-quality randomness is essential for the differential privacy guarantee to hold — a requirement it shares with cryptographic applications. For an in-depth discussion on the role of randomness in differential privacy and a detailed comparison with cryptography, refer to [GL20].

To tackle this requirement, we ensured that the implementations of differentially private mechanisms use high-quality Cryptographically Secure Pseudo-Random Number Generators (CSPRNG): (1) the PrivBayes algorithm; (2) the Laplace and Functional mechanisms for acceptance criteria; and (3) configuration sampling in the private selection algorithm. It is best practice to use the operating system’s CSPRNG. As the release produced in

---

<sup>8</sup>Laplace mechanism and private linear regression; <https://github.com/IBM/differential-privacy-library>

<sup>9</sup><https://github.com/sdv-dev/SDGym/tree/c9e274c1c1be7e8fec6fcd1d6f88e95b38a44d14/privbayes>

<sup>10</sup>The Diffprivlib package has the implementation of the Snapping mechanism [Mir12], but due to dependency issue, it could not work as-is in the OS used in the enclave environment (Windows).

<sup>11</sup>At the time of producing the released data, SmartNoise used NumPy to generate the Laplace noise.

a Windows-based enclave environment (see Section 4.12), the random generator utilized is the Cryptographic Service Provider [Mic21].

To utilize Windows' CSPRG, we modified the PrivBayes implementation to use `random_device` from the boost library as its random generator, instead of the standard C library's insecure generator from `random.h`. For the acceptance criteria and the private selection algorithm, the implementations make use of the `secrets` package from Python's standard library.

We leave to future research to explore the properties required from a random generator for the secure deployment of differential privacy.

## 4.12 Execution Environments

The execution of our scheme was conducted in an enclave environment managed by TIMNA, Israel's National Health Research Platform. Only the final release-candidate dataset with the differentially private results of its acceptance criteria were exported from the environment.

The experiments on the public data (see Section 4.10) were run on Boston University Shared Computing Cluster (SCC)<sup>12</sup>.

## 4.13 Public-facing Documentation

In addition to this technical document, it's essential to communicate the release details and usage guidelines to various audiences, particularly data subjects and data users. Communication should cater to the diverse interests, needs, and knowledge levels of these groups.

We've created a comprehensive README document (pdf format), developed in collaboration with key stakeholders. This document accompanies the data release (csv format) and is available via the Israeli Government Open Data Portal [MoH24].

The README structure draws from Open Government Data best practices [Tau14] and dataset transparency initiatives like Datasheets for Datasets [GMV+21], Dataset Nutrition Label [HHN+18], and Data Cards [PZK22]. It consists of two parts: The first part addresses both data subjects and data users, offering metadata, intended usage, and a request for feedback. The second part focuses on technical details for data users, including data quality, privacy considerations, and production process.

As discussed in Section 2, since the data is presented in a tabular format, it may give data users the impression that they can perform any type of analysis on it. However, it is important to note that the released dataset has been specifically designed to address predefined, albeit broad, statistical queries outlined in the acceptance criteria. We cannot guarantee the quality or accuracy of the results obtained from other types of analyses, such as more complex machine learning tasks or anomaly detection. To mitigate this risk of inappropriate analysis, we rely on the README document as our primary method of communication, particularly through the inclusion of the *intended usage* section.

---

<sup>12</sup><https://www.bu.edu/tech/support/research/computing-resources/scc>

We plan to produce additional materials for the general public and data subjects in Israel in a more engaging way, such as short video(s) about the potential utility of releasing this data to the public and the measures taken to protect the privacy of the data subjects.

## 4.14 Post-Production Improvements

In this section, we discuss enhancements to our implementation identified after the dataset was released. The composition property of differential privacy means that re-running our scheme would exceed the total privacy loss budget that the stakeholders and we were willing to accept. However, these enhancements had minimal or no effect on the privacy guarantee (potentially saving  $\varepsilon = .43$  of the privacy loss budget). Thanks to the acceptance criteria, the data quality, as operationalized by the stakeholders, remained unaffected.

### 4.14.1 Saving privacy budget for linear regression acceptance criteria

In the implementation of the acceptance criteria, we calculated the linear regression coefficients for the transformed dataset in each iteration of the scheme, even though it is not dependent on the configuration (Section 4.5.4). We could compute the differentially private linear regression just once before initiating the loop in our scheme. This change would save  $\varepsilon = .43$  in the privacy loss budget by circumventing the doubling of the privacy loss budget induced by the private selection algorithm (Theorem 3). It's important to note that this improvement does not apply to other acceptance criteria since their computations directly involve the transformed and synthetic datasets.

### 4.14.2 Wrong global sensitivity calculation for MAE acceptance criterion

In the implementation of the Mean Absolute Error (MAE) acceptance criteria, we used a global sensitivity that was half the correct value (Section 4.5.4). The MAE was perturbed using the Laplace mechanism, where the added noise depends on the ratio between global sensitivity  $\Delta$  and the privacy loss budget  $\varepsilon$ :  $\Delta/\varepsilon$ . To rectify the incorrect sensitivity value, we doubled the allocated privacy loss budget from  $\varepsilon = .02$  to  $\varepsilon = .04$ . This adjustment would have been made even if the sensitivity had been correctly calculated, since the privacy loss budget was determined based on the standard deviation of the noise, ensuring the accuracy of the evaluation.

The error has been corrected in the code accompanying with this paper.

### 4.14.3 Simpler dataset projection algorithm

The algorithm for dataset projection described in Section 4.6 is an improved version of the actual algorithm used to produce the release dataset. We realized that it could be improved only after consuming the privacy loss budget for running our scheme on the Live Birth Registry data.

In this section we describe the implemented algorithm (Algorithm 5) and its properties in Proposition 12, which is very similar to Proposition 11.



The use of Algorithm 5 instead of Algorithm 4 has no impact on privacy as well as the data quality with respect to the acceptance criteria.

---

**Algorithm 5** Dataset Projection for Minimal Occurrence (Implementation Version)

---

**Require:** a multiset (dataset)  $\mathcal{D}$ , a minimum count of records  $m$ .

- 1:  $R_0 \leftarrow \emptyset$
  - 2: **for**  $k = 1, \dots, m - 1$  **do**
  - 3:      $R'_k \leftarrow R_{k-1} \cup \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# = k)$
  - 4:      $R_k \leftarrow \text{Sample without replacement a proportion of } \lfloor \frac{k}{k+1} \rfloor \text{ records from } R'_k$
  - 5: **end for**
  - 6:  $\mathcal{D}'_{<m} \leftarrow \{(x, m) : x \in R_{m-1}\}$
  - 7:  $\mathcal{D}'_{=m} \leftarrow \{(x, \mathcal{D}(x)) : x \in \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}(x) = m\}$
  - 8:  $\mathcal{D}'_{>m} \leftarrow \{(x, \mathcal{D}(x)) : x \in \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}(x) > m\}$
  - 9:  $\mathcal{D}' \leftarrow \mathcal{D}'_{<m} \cup \mathcal{D}'_{=m} \cup \mathcal{D}'_{>m}$
  - 10: **return**  $\mathcal{D}'$
- 

**Proposition 12.** Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a multiset (dataset) and  $\mathcal{D}'$  be the multiset corresponding to the output of Algorithm 5 when running it on  $\mathcal{D}$  with a minimum count of records  $m$ . Assume  $\forall k \in [m - 1] : \frac{m!}{k!} |n_k^{\mathcal{D}}|$ . Then the following holds:

1.  $\text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}') \subseteq \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D})$ ,
2. For all  $k > m$ ,  $\text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}', \# = k) = \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# = k)$ ,
3.  $\text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# = m) \subseteq \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}', \# = m)$ ,
4.  $\text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}', \# < m) = \emptyset$ ,
5. For all  $k < m$ ,  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{x \in \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# = k)} \mathcal{D}'(x) \right] = \sum_{x \in \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# = k)} \mathcal{D}(x)$
6.  $|\mathcal{D}'| = |\mathcal{D}|$ ,

*Proof.* Statements (1)-(4) holds according to the same arguments as in Proposition 11.

The proof of statement (6) here is parallel to its proof in Proposition 11. It differs in showing that  $|\mathcal{D}'_{<m}| = \sum_{x \in \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# < m)} \mathcal{D}(x)$ . Note that  $|\mathcal{D}'_{<m}| = m \cdot |R_{m-1}|$  according its definition.

The following lemma helps us to calculate  $|R_{m-1}|$ .

**Lemma 1.** If  $\forall k \in [m - 1] : \frac{m!}{k!} |n_k^{\mathcal{D}}|$ , then

$$|R_k| = \frac{1}{k+1} \sum_{t=1}^k t \cdot n_t^{\mathcal{D}}.$$

*Proof.* By induction on  $k$ . For  $k = 1$ ,  $|R_1| = \frac{1}{2} |\text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# = 1)| = \frac{1}{2} n_1^{\mathcal{D}}$  by the definition of  $R_1$  and  $n_1^{\mathcal{D}}$ .

We assume that the claim holds for  $k - 1$  and prove it for  $k$ . By definition,  $R_k$  is a  $\frac{k}{k+1}$  proportion of  $R'_k = R_{k-1} \cup \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# = k)$ , a union of two disjoint sets, so

$$|R_k| = \frac{k}{k+1} |R'_k| = \frac{k}{k+1} (|R_{k-1}| + |\text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# = k)|) = \frac{k}{k+1} |R_{k-1}| + \frac{k}{k+1} n_k^{\mathcal{D}}.$$

.

Plugging in the induction hypothesis, we get the required

$$|R_k| = \frac{k}{k+1} \cdot \frac{1}{k} \sum_{t=1}^{k-1} t \cdot n_t^{\mathcal{D}} + \frac{k}{k+1} n_k^{\mathcal{D}} = \frac{1}{k+1} \left( \sum_{t=1}^{k-1} t \cdot n_t^{\mathcal{D}} + k \cdot n_k^{\mathcal{D}} \right) = \frac{1}{k+1} \sum_{t=1}^k t \cdot n_t^{\mathcal{D}}.$$

.

Note that we can ignore the floor function  $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$  in the sampling from  $R'_k$  thanks to the lemma condition. □

Consequently,

$$|\mathcal{D}'_{< m}| = m \cdot |R_{m-1}| = m \cdot \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} k \cdot n_k^{\mathcal{D}} = \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} k \cdot n_k^{\mathcal{D}} = \sum_{x \in \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# < m)} \mathcal{D}(x).$$

For statement (5) note that for  $k < m$ , the probability of including an  $x \in \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# = k)$  in  $\mathcal{D}'$  is  $\frac{m-1}{m} \cdot \frac{m-2}{m-1} \cdot \dots \cdot \frac{k+1}{k+2} \cdot \frac{k}{k+1} = \frac{k}{m}$ ; and if  $x$  is included, then  $\mathcal{D}'(x) = m$ , otherwise  $\mathcal{D}'(x) = 0$ .

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{x \in \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# = k)} \mathcal{D}'(x) \right] &= \sum_{x \in \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# = k)} \mathbb{E} [\mathcal{D}'(x)] \\ &= \sum_{x \in \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# = k)} \left( \frac{k}{m} \cdot m + \frac{m-k}{m} \cdot 0 \right) \\ &= \sum_{x \in \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# = k)} k \\ &= n_k^{\mathcal{D}} \cdot k = \sum_{x \in \text{Rec}(\mathcal{D}, \# = k)} \mathcal{D}(x). \end{aligned}$$

□

## 5 Related Work

**Differentially private synthetic data generation.** Tao et al. (2021) proposed a categorization of differential privacy synthetic data algorithms [TMH<sup>+</sup>21]: (1) Marginal-based methods, which privately select and measure a collection of marginals before generating records from the induced distribution; (2) Workload-based methods that iteratively and adaptively refine the model based on the error of a set of queries; and (3) GAN-based methods that employ a generative adversarial network (GAN) with differential privacy. Among these, marginal-based algorithms like AIM [MMSM22], MST [MMS21], and PrivBayes [ZCP<sup>+</sup>14] perform best in similar settings like ours according to comprehensive evaluations [TMH<sup>+</sup>21, GXC23] and recent NIST competition results [Nat18, Nat20]. Liu et al. (2021) developed a framework that unifies the presentation of workload-based algorithms [LVW21], including MWEM [HLM12], DualQuery [GAH<sup>+</sup>14], PEP, and RAP [ABK<sup>+</sup>21]. Various GAN variants exist, either employing DP-SGD [ACG<sup>+</sup>16] or the PATE framework [PSM<sup>+</sup>18b] for training non-private GAN models for tabular data [XLW<sup>+</sup>18, JYvdS19, RLP<sup>+</sup>20].

**Differential Privacy real-world releases.** Desfontaines (2021) offers an extensive list of real-world data releases and systems employing differential privacy [Des21]. To the best of our knowledge, this list is the most current and well-maintained. Here, we highlight only a few deployments that have significantly influenced or inspired this release. For a comprehensive list, consult [Des21]. Most differential privacy deployments have been carried out by the US Government or big tech companies. For instance, the US Census has released several data products incorporating differential privacy, notably the 2020 Census Redistricting Data [AAC<sup>+</sup>22]. Other releases include the Post-Secondary Employment Outcomes of college graduates [FMM19] as well as OnTheMap [MKA<sup>+</sup>08], which marked the first real-world application of differential privacy. The Wikimedia Foundation, in collaboration with Tumult Labs, recently published differentially private statistics detailing daily visits to Wikipedia pages by country [ABD<sup>+</sup>23]. During the COVID-19 pandemic, Google consistently released differentially private aggregate statistics on changing trends in mobility patterns over time, segmented by geography and across various categories of places [ABC<sup>+</sup>20]. Only a single release in the list of Desfontaines (2021) uses synthetic data [Des21]: the Global Victim-Perpetrator dataset prepared in collaboration between the International Organization for Migration and Microsoft [fM22]. The dataset provides first-hand information on the relationships between victims and perpetrator in human trafficking.

**Communication of Differential Privacy guarantees.** In recent years, the question of how to effectively communicate differential privacy guarantees to various stakeholders has received significant attention, recognized as an essential factor for successful DP releases. Studies based on surveys and interviews have been conducted to assess the intelligibility and perception of different communication strategies for DP and, consequently, the willingness of users to share information. Cummings et al. (2021) proposed a framework to evaluate how descriptions of DP influence this willingness [CKR21]. Franzen et al.

(2022) designed quantitative risk notifications based on communication formats from the medical field [FvVS+22]. Xiong et al. (2022) used illustrations to explain three modes of DP: central, local, and shuffle [XWW+22], and Karegar (2022) examined the effectiveness of metaphors [KAF22]. Nuñez von Voigt explored how well users understood DP explanations, using an explanation of  $k$ -anonymity as a baseline [vVMT24]. Nanayakkara et al. (2023) focused on explaining the value of the privacy parameter  $\epsilon$  [NSC+23].

## 6 Discussion

In this work, we documented the development of a differentially private release of the Israeli National Registry of Live Births in 2014. We identified four requirements elicited from our stakeholders: (1) tabular format; (2) data quality; (3) faithfulness; and (3) privacy. We designed an end-to-end differentially private scheme for producing a release that fulfil these requirements.

We have identified six key direction for future research.

First, we were fortunate to find similar public data to mark which configurations have a higher chance of passing the acceptance criteria. However, not for every dataset, similar public data might be available. Note that the public data is not used here to seed an algorithm for learning a generation model. What could be done if we don't have an access to a public data? We hypothesize that for the purpose of narrowing down the space of configuration, only partial knowledge about the target distribution (e.g., in the format of statistical facts) might be sufficient

Second, data quality statements, as expressed via acceptance criteria, are significantly valued by the data users. We anticipate that data users would like to run additional queries beyond what is covered by our criteria. Is it possible to bound the error of other queries given the result of the acceptance criteria we released? How could one choose a list of differentially private acceptance criteria that "span" a more extensive set of bounds on other desired queries?

Third, most of our acceptance criteria consider maximum error. We choose such form of criteria because it delivers a bound on any other type of error. Perhaps users would be interested in different kinds of bounds, such as average error, confidence intervals or tail error (like faithfulness).

We believe that after releasing the data, we will be able to collect more informed feedback about the structure and content of desired acceptance criteria from the data users.

Fourth, the meaning of the differential privacy guarantee must be understood within the context of the release. For example, which  $\epsilon$  a data curator should use? How a data subject should understand the protection of  $\epsilon = 9.98$  [GAP18, WAB+18, CKR21, FvVS+22, NSC+23]? In this work, we adopted a heuristic approach for choosing the value of the privacy parameter based on previous releases [Des21], but a more principled and interpretable way is needed.

Fifth, the released dataset is designed to answer accurately only a subset of statistical queries, such as  $k$ -way marginals. However, the affordance of synthetic data “invite” the user to run other type of queries, without data quality empirical guarantees. Assuming tabular format is a non-negotiable requirement, which measures a curator should take to prevent out of band analysis?

Sixth, when the government releases national data, issues of trust should be addressed meticulously. For instance, in this release, we incorporated the principles of faithfulness and face privacy to serve this purpose. How can the data curator assure a distrustful stakeholder that the release was produced as claimed? What additional properties should the release possess to promote trust?

## Acknowledgement

We would like to express our gratitude to Meytal Avgil Tsadok and Roy Cohen from TIMNA (Israel’s National Health Research Platform, Ministry of Health) for their valuable contributions to this project. We extend our thanks to Orly Manor, Ziona Haklai, and Deena Zimmerman for their helpful feedback, and to Barak Shukrun for his support. We extend our gratitude to Adam Smith for his invaluable advice, insightful feedback, and keen eye for flaws in our design. We appreciate the guidance from Andrew Sellars and his team at the BU/MIT Technology Law Clinic. Special thanks to Idan Kalamaj, Gavin Brown, Niva Elkin-Koren and Salil Vadhan for helpful discussions.

## References

- [AAC<sup>+</sup>22] John M. Abowd, Robert Ashmead, Ryan Cumings-Menon, Simson L. Garfinkel, Micah Heineck, Christine Heiss, Robert Johns, Daniel Kifer, Philip Leclerc, Ashwin Machanavajjhala, Brett Moran, William Sexton, Matthew Spence, and Pavel Zhuravlev. The 2020 census disclosure avoidance system topdown algorithm. *CoRR*, abs/2204.08986, 2022.
- [ABC<sup>+</sup>20] Ahmet Aktay, Shailesh Bavadekar, Gwen Cossoul, John Davis, Damien Desfontaines, Alex Fabrikant, Evgeniy Gabrilovich, Krishna Gadepalli, Bryant Gipson, Miguel Guevara, Chaitanya Kamath, Mansi Kansal, Ali Lange, Chinmoy Mandayam, Andrew Oplinger, Christopher Pluntke, Thomas Roessler, Arran Schlosberg, Tomer Shekel, Swapnil Vispute, Mia Vu, Gregory Wellenius, Brian Williams, and Royce J. Wilson. Google COVID-19 community mobility reports: Anonymization process description (version 1.0). *CoRR*, abs/2004.04145, 2020.
- [ABD<sup>+</sup>23] Temilola Adeleye, Skye Berghel, Damien Desfontaines, Michael Hay, Isaac Johnson, Cléo Lemoisson, Ashwin Machanavajjhala, Tom Magerlein, Gabriele Modena, David Pujol, Daniel Simmons-Marengo, and Hal Trieman. Publishing wikipedia usage data with strong privacy guarantees. *CoRR*, abs/2308.16298, 2023.

- [ABK<sup>+</sup>21] Sergül Aydıre, William Brown, Michael Kearns, Krishnaram Kenthapadi, Luca Melis, Aaron Roth, and Amaresh Ankit Siva. Differentially private query release through adaptive projection. In Marina Meila and Tong Zhang, editors, *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2021, 18-24 July 2021, Virtual Event*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 457–467. PMLR, 2021.
- [Abo18] John M. Abowd. The U.S. census bureau adopts differential privacy. In Yike Guo and Faisal Farooq, editors, *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining, KDD 2018, London, UK, August 19-23, 2018*, page 2867. ACM, 2018.
- [ACG<sup>+</sup>16] Martín Abadi, Andy Chu, Ian J. Goodfellow, H. Brendan McMahan, Ilya Mironov, Kunal Talwar, and Li Zhang. Deep learning with differential privacy. In Edgar R. Weippl, Stefan Katzenbeisser, Christopher Kruegel, Andrew C. Myers, and Shai Halevi, editors, *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, Vienna, Austria, October 24-28, 2016*, pages 308–318. ACM, 2016.
- [AN20] Christian Arnold and Marcel Neunhoeffler. Really useful synthetic data - A framework to evaluate the quality of differentially private synthetic data. *CoRR*, abs/2004.07740, 2020.
- [BEK<sup>+</sup>19] Leonard E Burman, Alex Engler, Surachai Khitatrakun, James R Nunns, Sarah Armstrong, John Iselin, Graham MacDonald, and Philip Stallworth. Safely expanding research access to administrative tax data: creating a synthetic public use file and a validation server. *Technical report US, Internal Revenue Service*, 2019.
- [Cen] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). National vital statistics system (nvss). <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nvss/index.htm>.
- [Cen14] Central Bureau of Statistics of Israel (CBS). Newborns in single and multiple births, by mother’s population group, religion, and age, 2014. <https://www.cbs.gov.il/he/publications/doclib/2020/%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%93%D7%95%D7%AA-%D7%97%D7%992019/tab14-2016.pdf>.
- [CKR21] Rachel Cummings, Gabriel Kaptchuk, and Elissa M. Redmiles. "i need a better description": An investigation into user expectations for differential privacy. In Yongdae Kim, Jong Kim, Giovanni Vigna, and Elaine Shi, editors, *CCS '21: 2021 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, Virtual Event, Republic of Korea, November 15 - 19, 2021*, pages 3037–3052. ACM, 2021.
- [CS22] Danielle Keats Citron and Daniel J. Solove. Privacy harms. *Boston University Law Review*, 102:793, 2022. GWU Legal Studies Research Paper No. 2021-11, GWU Law School Public Law Research Paper No. 2021-11.

- [CSVW22] Sílvia Casacuberta, Michael Shoemate, Salil P. Vadhan, and Connor Wagaman. Widespread underestimation of sensitivity in differentially private libraries and how to fix it. In Heng Yin, Angelos Stavrou, Cas Cremers, and Elaine Shi, editors, *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS 2022, Los Angeles, CA, USA, November 7-11, 2022*, pages 471–484. ACM, 2022.
- [Des21] Damien Desfontaines. A list of real-world uses of differential privacy - Ted is writing things — desfontain.es. <https://desfontain.es/privacy/real-world-differential-privacy.html>, 2021.
- [DH23] Jörg Drechsler and Anna-Carolina Haensch. 30 years of synthetic data. *CoRR*, abs/2304.02107, 2023.
- [DKM<sup>+</sup>06] Cynthia Dwork, Krishnaram Kenthapadi, Frank McSherry, Ilya Mironov, and Moni Naor. Our data, ourselves: Privacy via distributed noise generation. In Serge Vaudenay, editor, *Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT 2006, 25th Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques, St. Petersburg, Russia, May 28 - June 1, 2006, Proceedings*, volume 4004 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 486–503. Springer, 2006.
- [DMNS06] Cynthia Dwork, Frank McSherry, Kobbi Nissim, and Adam D. Smith. Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis. In Shai Halevi and Tal Rabin, editors, *Theory of Cryptography, Third Theory of Cryptography Conference, TCC 2006, New York, NY, USA, March 4-7, 2006, Proceedings*, volume 3876 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 265–284. Springer, 2006.
- [DR14] Cynthia Dwork and Aaron Roth. The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy. *Found. Trends Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 9(3-4):211–407, 2014.
- [Dre23] Jörg Drechsler. Differential privacy for government agencies - are we there yet? *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 118(541):761–773, 2023.
- [EHR17] Cristóbal Esteban, Stephanie L. Hyland, and Gunnar Rätsch. Real-valued (medical) time series generation with recurrent conditional gans. *CoRR*, abs/1706.02633, 2017.
- [FD20] Jen Fitzpatrick and Karen DeSalvo. Helping public health officials combat covid-19. <https://blog.google/technology/health/covid-19-community-mobility-reports/>, 2020.
- [fM22] International Organization for Migration. The global victim-perpetrator synthetic dataset. <https://www.ctdatacollaborative.org/global-victim-perpetrator-synthetic-dataset>, 2022.
- [FMM19] Andrew David Foote, Ashwin Machanavajjhala, and Kevin McKinney. Releasing earnings distributions using differential privacy - disclosure avoidance system for post-secondary employment outcomes (PSEO). *J. Priv. Confidentiality*, 9(2), 2019.

- [FvVS<sup>+</sup>22] Daniel Franzen, Saskia Nuñez von Voigt, Peter Sörries, Florian Tschorsch, and Claudia Müller-Birn. Am I private and if so, how many?: Communicating privacy guarantees of differential privacy with risk communication formats. In Heng Yin, Angelos Stavrou, Cas Cremers, and Elaine Shi, editors, *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS 2022, Los Angeles, CA, USA, November 7-11, 2022*, pages 1125–1139. ACM, 2022.
- [GAH<sup>+</sup>14] Marco Gaboardi, Emilio Jesús Gallego Arias, Justin Hsu, Aaron Roth, and Zhiwei Steven Wu. Dual query: Practical private query release for high dimensional data. In *Proceedings of the 31th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2014, Beijing, China, 21-26 June 2014*, volume 32 of *JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings*, pages 1170–1178. JMLR.org, 2014.
- [GAP18] Simson L. Garfinkel, John M. Abowd, and Sarah Powazek. Issues encountered deploying differential privacy. In David Lie, Mohammad Mannan, and Aaron Johnson, editors, *Proceedings of the 2018 Workshop on Privacy in the Electronic Society, WPES@CCS 2018, Toronto, ON, Canada, October 15-19, 2018*, pages 133–137. ACM, 2018.
- [GC23] Georgi Ganey and Emiliano De Cristofaro. On the inadequacy of similarity-based privacy metrics: Reconstruction attacks against "truly anonymous synthetic data". *CoRR*, abs/2312.05114, 2023.
- [GGN<sup>+</sup>23] Simson Garfinkel, Barbara Guttman, Joseph Near, Aref Dajani, and Phyllis Singer. De-identifying government datasets: Techniques and governance. *JNIST Special Publication: NIST SP 800-188*, 2023.
- [GL20] Simson L. Garfinkel and Philip Leclerc. Randomness concerns when deploying differential privacy. In Jay Ligatti, Xinming Ou, Wouter Lueks, and Paul Syverson, editors, *WPES'20: Proceedings of the 19th Workshop on Privacy in the Electronic Society, Virtual Event, USA, November 9, 2020*, pages 73–86. ACM, 2020.
- [GMV<sup>+</sup>21] Timnit Gebru, Jamie Morgenstern, Briana Vecchione, Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, Hanna M. Wallach, Hal Daumé III, and Kate Crawford. Datasheets for datasets. *Commun. ACM*, 64(12):86–92, 2021.
- [GXC23] Georgi Ganey, Kai Xu, and Emiliano De Cristofaro. Understanding how differentially private generative models spend their privacy budget. *CoRR*, abs/2305.10994, 2023.
- [Har21] Woodrow Hartzog. What is privacy? that’s the wrong question. *The University of Chicago Law Review*, 88:1677, 2021. Available at SSRN.
- [HBAL19] Naoise Holohan, Stefano Braghin, Pól Mac Aonghusa, and Killian Levacher. Diffprivlib: The IBM differential privacy library. *CoRR*, abs/1907.02444, 2019.



- [HDH<sup>+</sup>22] Samuel Haney, Damien Desfontaines, Luke Hartman, Ruchit Shrestha, and Michael Hay. Precision-based attacks and interval refining: how to break, then fix, differential privacy on finite computers. *CoRR*, abs/2207.13793, 2022.
- [HGV20] Michael Hay, Marco Gaboardi, and Salil Vadhan. A programming framework for opendp. *6th Workshop on the Theory and Practice of Differential Privacy (TPDP 2020)*, 2020.
- [HHN<sup>+</sup>18] Sarah Holland, Ahmed Hosny, Sarah Newman, Joshua Joseph, and Kasia Chmielinski. The dataset nutrition label: A framework to drive higher data quality standards. *CoRR*, abs/1805.03677, 2018.
- [HLM12] Moritz Hardt, Katrina Ligett, and Frank McSherry. A simple and practical algorithm for differentially private data release. In Peter L. Bartlett, Fernando C. N. Pereira, Christopher J. C. Burges, Léon Bottou, and Kilian Q. Weinberger, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 25: 26th Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2012. Proceedings of a meeting held December 3-6, 2012, Lake Tahoe, Nevada, United States*, pages 2348–2356, 2012.
- [Isr81] Protection of privacy law. Laws of the State of Israel (LSI) (5741–1981), 1981. Unofficial English translation available at: <https://www.gov.il/BlobFolder/legalinfo/legislation/en/ProtectionofPrivacyLaw57411981unofficialtranslatio.pdf>.
- [Isr92] Basic law: Human dignity and liberty. Laws of the State of Israel (LSI) (5752–1992), 1992. Unofficial English translation available at: <https://m.knesset.gov.il/EN/activity/documents/BasicLawsPDF/BasicLawLiberty.pdf>.
- [Isr96] Patient’s rights law. Laws of the State of Israel (LSI) (5756–1996), 1996. Unofficial English translation available at: [https://hamoked.org/files/2013/155880\\_eng.pdf](https://hamoked.org/files/2013/155880_eng.pdf).
- [JMRO22] Jiankai Jin, Eleanor McMurtry, Benjamin I. P. Rubinstein, and Olga Ohrimenko. Are we there yet? timing and floating-point attacks on differential privacy systems. In *43rd IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2022, San Francisco, CA, USA, May 22-26, 2022*, pages 473–488. IEEE, 2022.
- [JSH<sup>+</sup>22] James Jordon, Lukasz Szpruch, Florimond Houssiau, Mirko Bottarelli, Giovanni Cherubin, Carsten Maple, Samuel N. Cohen, and Adrian Weller. Synthetic data - what, why and how? *CoRR*, abs/2205.03257, 2022.
- [JYvdS19] James Jordon, Jinsung Yoon, and Mihaela van der Schaar. PATE-GAN: generating synthetic data with differential privacy guarantees. In *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019, New Orleans, LA, USA, May 6-9, 2019*. OpenReview.net, 2019.

- [KAF22] Farzaneh Karegar, Ala Sarah Alaqra, and Simone Fischer-Hübner. Exploring user-suitable metaphors for differentially private data analyses. In Sonia Chiasson and Apu Kapadia, editors, *Eighteenth Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security, SOUPS 2022, Boston, MA, USA, August 7-9, 2022*, pages 175–193. USENIX Association, 2022.
- [KMR<sup>+</sup>20] Daniel Kifer, Solomon Messing, Aaron Roth, Abhradeep Thakurta, and Danfeng Zhang. Guidelines for implementing and auditing differentially private systems. *CoRR*, abs/2002.04049, 2020.
- [LSY<sup>+</sup>20] Yuhan Liu, Ananda Theertha Suresh, Felix X. Yu, Sanjiv Kumar, and Michael Riley. Learning discrete distributions: user vs item-level privacy. In Hugo Larochelle, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Raia Hadsell, Maria-Florina Balcan, and Hsuan-Tien Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*, 2020.
- [LT19] Jingcheng Liu and Kunal Talwar. Private selection from private candidates. In Moses Charikar and Edith Cohen, editors, *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2019, Phoenix, AZ, USA, June 23-26, 2019*, pages 298–309. ACM, 2019.
- [LVW21] Terrance Liu, Giuseppe Vietri, and Steven Wu. Iterative methods for private synthetic data: Unifying framework and new methods. In Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Alina Beygelzimer, Yann N. Dauphin, Percy Liang, and Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2021, NeurIPS 2021, December 6-14, 2021, virtual*, pages 690–702, 2021.
- [Mic20] Microsoft. Smartnoise: Differential privacy toolkit, 2020.
- [Mic21] Microsoft. Cryptgenrandom function (wincrypt.h), 2021. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows/win32/api/wincrypt/nf-wincrypt-cryptgenrandom>.
- [Mik22] Gerome Miklau. Negotiating Privacy/Utility Trade-Offs under differential privacy. In *USENIX Conference on Privacy Engineering Practice and Respect, PEPR ’22, Santa Clara, CA, 2022*.
- [Mir12] Ilya Mironov. On significance of the least significant bits for differential privacy. In Ting Yu, George Danezis, and Virgil D. Gligor, editors, *the ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS’12, Raleigh, NC, USA, October 16-18, 2012*, pages 650–661. ACM, 2012.
- [MKA<sup>+</sup>08] Ashwin Machanavajjhala, Daniel Kifer, John M. Abowd, Johannes Gehrke, and Lars Vilhuber. Privacy: Theory meets practice on the map. In Gustavo Alonso, José A. Blakeley, and Arbee L. P. Chen, editors, *Proceedings of the 24th*

*International Conference on Data Engineering, ICDE 2008, April 7-12, 2008, Cancún, Mexico*, pages 277–286. IEEE Computer Society, 2008.

- [MMS21] Ryan McKenna, Gerome Miklau, and Daniel Sheldon. Winning the NIST contest: A scalable and general approach to differentially private synthetic data. *J. Priv. Confidentiality*, 11(3), 2021.
- [MMSM22] Ryan McKenna, Brett Mullins, Daniel Sheldon, and Gerome Miklau. AIM: an adaptive and iterative mechanism for differentially private synthetic data. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 15(11):2599–2612, 2022.
- [MoH23] Government of Israel, Ministry of Health. Births in israel - reports, 2023. <https://www.gov.il/he/departments/publications/reports/live-birth-in-israel>.
- [MoH24] Government of Israel, Ministry of Health. Israel’s national registry of live births, February 2024. Official Hebrew repository: <https://data.gov.il/dataset/birth-data>. Unofficial English version website maintained by the authors: <https://birth.dataset.pub>.
- [Nat18] National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). Differential privacy synthetic data challenge, 2018. <https://www.nist.gov/ctl/pscr/open-innovation-prize-challenges/past-prize-challenges/2018-differential-privacy-synthetic>.
- [Nat20] National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). Differential privacy temporal map challenge, 2020. <https://www.nist.gov/ctl/pscr/open-innovation-prize-challenges/past-prize-challenges/2020-differential-privacy-temporal>.
- [Nor13] Don Norman. *The design of everyday things: Revised and expanded edition*. Basic books, 2013.
- [NRD16] Beata Nowok, Gillian M. Raab, and Chris Dibben. synthpop: Bespoke creation of synthetic data in r. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 74:1–26, 2016.
- [NSC<sup>+</sup>23] Priyanka Nanayakkara, Mary Anne Smart, Rachel Cummings, Gabriel Kaptchuk, and Elissa M. Redmiles. What are the chances? explaining the epsilon parameter in differential privacy. In Joseph A. Calandrino and Carmela Troncoso, editors, *32nd USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2023, Anaheim, CA, USA, August 9-11, 2023*, pages 1613–1630. USENIX Association, 2023.
- [PAE<sup>+</sup>17] Nicolas Papernot, Martín Abadi, Úlfar Erlingsson, Ian J. Goodfellow, and Kunal Talwar. Semi-supervised knowledge transfer for deep learning from private training data. In *5th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2017, Toulon, France, April 24-26, 2017, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net, 2017.

- [PS22] Nicolas Papernot and Thomas Steinke. Hyperparameter tuning with renyi differential privacy. In *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2022, Virtual Event, April 25-29, 2022*. OpenReview.net, 2022.
- [PSM<sup>+</sup>18a] Nicolas Papernot, Shuang Song, Ilya Mironov, Ananth Raghunathan, Kunal Talwar, and Úlfar Erlingsson. Scalable private learning with PATE. In *6th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2018, Vancouver, BC, Canada, April 30 - May 3, 2018, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net, 2018.
- [PSM<sup>+</sup>18b] Nicolas Papernot, Shuang Song, Ilya Mironov, Ananth Raghunathan, Kunal Talwar, and Úlfar Erlingsson. Scalable private learning with PATE. In *6th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2018, Vancouver, BC, Canada, April 30 - May 3, 2018, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net, 2018.
- [PWV16] Neha Patki, Roy Wedge, and Kalyan Veeramachaneni. The synthetic data vault. In *2016 IEEE International Conference on Data Science and Advanced Analytics, DSAA 2016, Montreal, QC, Canada, October 17-19, 2016*, pages 399–410. IEEE, 2016.
- [PZK22] Mahima Pushkarna, Andrew Zaldivar, and Oddur Kjartansson. Data cards: Purposeful and transparent dataset documentation for responsible AI. In *FAccT '22: 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, Seoul, Republic of Korea, June 21 - 24, 2022*, pages 1776–1826. ACM, 2022.
- [QCvdS23] Zhaozhi Qian, Bogdan-Constantin Cebere, and Mihaela van der Schaar. Synthcity: facilitating innovative use cases of synthetic data in different data modalities. *CoRR*, abs/2301.07573, 2023.
- [RLP<sup>+</sup>20] Lucas Rosenblatt, Xiaoyan Liu, Samira Pouyanfar, Eduardo de Leon, Anuj Desai, and Joshua Allen. Differentially private synthetic data: Applied evaluations and enhancements. *CoRR*, abs/2011.05537, 2020.
- [Rub93] Donald B Rubin. Statistical disclosure limitation. *Journal of official Statistics*, 9(2):461–468, 1993.
- [Shm10] Galit Shmueli. To Explain or to Predict? *Statistical Science*, 25(3):289 – 310, 2010.
- [Sol08] Daniel J Solove. *Understanding privacy*. Harvard University Press, May, 2008.
- [SOT22] Theresa Stadler, Bristena Oprisanu, and Carmela Troncoso. Synthetic data - anonymisation groundhog day. In Kevin R. B. Butler and Kurt Thomas, editors, *31st USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2022, Boston, MA, USA, August 10-12, 2022*, pages 1451–1468. USENIX Association, 2022.
- [Swe02] Latanya Sweeney. k-anonymity: A model for protecting privacy. *Int. J. Uncertain. Fuzziness Knowl. Based Syst.*, 10(5):557–570, 2002.

- [Tau14] Joshua Tauberer. *Open government data: The book*. Joshua Tauberer, 2014.
- [TMH<sup>+</sup>21] Yuchao Tao, Ryan McKenna, Michael Hay, Ashwin Machanavajjhala, and Gerome Miklau. Benchmarking differentially private synthetic data generation algorithms. *CoRR*, abs/2112.09238, 2021.
- [TTS<sup>+</sup>22] Florian Tramèr, Andreas Terzis, Thomas Steinke, Shuang Song, Matthew Jagielski, and Nicholas Carlini. Debugging differential privacy: A case study for privacy auditing. *CoRR*, abs/2202.12219, 2022.
- [UV11] Jonathan R. Ullman and Salil P. Vadhan. Pcps and the hardness of generating private synthetic data. In Yuval Ishai, editor, *Theory of Cryptography - 8th Theory of Cryptography Conference, TCC 2011, Providence, RI, USA, March 28-30, 2011. Proceedings*, volume 6597 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 400–416. Springer, 2011.
- [vVMT24] Saskia Nuñez von Voigt, Luise Mehner, and Florian Tschorsch. From theory to comprehension: A comparative study of differential privacy and  $k$ -anonymity. *CoRR*, abs/2404.04006, 2024.
- [WAB<sup>+</sup>18] Alexandra Wood, Micah Altman, Aaron Bembenek, Mark Bun, Marco Gaboardi, James Honaker, Kobbi Nissim, David R O’Brien, Thomas Steinke, and Salil Vadhan. Differential privacy: A primer for a non-technical audience. *Vand. J. Ent. & Tech. L.*, 21:209, 2018.
- [WC10] Irving B Weiner and W Edward Craighead. *The corsini encyclopedia of psychology*. John Wiley & Sons, 2010.
- [WZL<sup>+</sup>20] Royce J. Wilson, Celia Yuxin Zhang, William Lam, Damien Desfontaines, Daniel Simmons-Marengo, and Bryant Gipson. Differentially private SQL with bounded user contribution. *Proc. Priv. Enhancing Technol.*, 2020(2):230–250, 2020.
- [XLW<sup>+</sup>18] Liyang Xie, Kaixiang Lin, Shu Wang, Fei Wang, and Jiayu Zhou. Differentially private generative adversarial network. *CoRR*, abs/1802.06739, 2018.
- [XSCV19] Lei Xu, Maria Skoularidou, Alfredo Cuesta-Infante, and Kalyan Veeramachaneni. Modeling tabular data using conditional GAN. In Hanna M. Wallach, Hugo Larochelle, Alina Beygelzimer, Florence d’Alché-Buc, Emily B. Fox, and Roman Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2019, NeurIPS 2019, December 8-14, 2019, Vancouver, BC, Canada*, pages 7333–7343, 2019.
- [XWW<sup>+</sup>22] Aiping Xiong, Chuha Wu, Tianhao Wang, Robert W. Proctor, Jeremiah Blocki, Ninghui Li, and Somesh Jha. Using illustrations to communicate differential privacy trust models: An investigation of users’ comprehension, perception, and data sharing decision. *CoRR*, abs/2202.10014, 2022.

- [XWW24] Zihang Xiang, Chenglong Wang, and Di Wang. How does selection leak privacy: Revisiting private selection and improved results for hyper-parameter tuning. *CoRR*, abs/2402.13087, 2024.
- [ZCP<sup>+</sup>14] Jun Zhang, Graham Cormode, Cecilia M. Procopiuc, Divesh Srivastava, and Xiaokui Xiao. Privbayes: private data release via bayesian networks. In Curtis E. Dyreson, Feifei Li, and M. Tamer Özsu, editors, *International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD 2014, Snowbird, UT, USA, June 22-27, 2014*, pages 1423–1434. ACM, 2014.
- [ZZX<sup>+</sup>12] Jun Zhang, Zhenjie Zhang, Xiaokui Xiao, Yin Yang, and Marianne Winslett. Functional mechanism: Regression analysis under differential privacy. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 5(11):1364–1375, 2012.