

Fully Dynamic Graph Algorithms with Edge Differential Privacy

Sofya Raskhodnikova*

Teresa Anna Steiner†

Abstract

We study differentially private algorithms for analyzing graphs in the challenging setting of continual release with fully dynamic updates, where edges are inserted and deleted over time, and the algorithm is required to update the solution at every time step. Previous work has presented differentially private algorithms for many graph problems that can handle insertions only or deletions only (called *partially dynamic algorithms*) and obtained some hardness results for the fully dynamic setting. The only algorithms in the latter setting were for the edge count, given by Fichtenberger, Henzinger, and Ost (ESA '21), and for releasing the values of all graph cuts, given by Fichtenberger, Henzinger, and Upadhyay (ICML '23). We provide the first differentially private and fully dynamic graph algorithms for several other fundamental graph statistics (including the triangle count, the number of connected components, the size of the maximum matching, and the degree histogram), analyze their error and show strong lower bounds on the error for all algorithms in this setting. Previously, only lower bounds for algorithms with one of the privacy parameters, δ , set to 0 were known; our lower bounds give an exponential improvement in terms of the dependence on the number of time steps, while applying to algorithms with general δ .

We study two variants of *edge differential privacy* for fully dynamic graph algorithms: *event-level* and *item-level*. Under the former notion, two graph update sequences are considered neighboring if, roughly speaking, they differ in at most one update; under the latter notion, they can differ only in updates pertaining to one edge. Differential privacy requires that for any two neighboring inputs, the output distributions of the algorithm are close. We give upper and lower bounds on the error of both—event-level and item-level—fully dynamic algorithms for several fundamental graph problems. No fully dynamic algorithms that are private at the item-level (the more stringent of the two notions) were known before. In the case of item-level privacy, for several problems, our algorithms match our lower bounds.

*Boston University, Boston, MA, USA. Email: sofya@bu.edu

†DTU Compute, Technical University of Denmark, Kongens Lyngby, Denmark. Email: terst@dtu.dk

1 Introduction

Graph algorithms provide important tools for understanding networks and relationships. However, some graphs contain sensitive personal information that must be protected when results of statistical analyses performed on them are published. Differential privacy [DMNS16] has emerged as the standard for rigorous privacy guarantees. It has been adapted to graph data and widely investigated in the *static setting*, also referred to as the *batch setting*, where the input graph does not change (see [RS16a] for a survey of differentially private analysis of graphs in this setting). An additional challenge in studying graphs that capture information about people is that they evolve over time. Differential privacy was first studied in the setting of *continual release* (also called *continual observation*), where data changes over time and published statistics must be continually updated, by Dwork et al. [DNPR10] and Chan et al. [CSS11]. This difficult setting was adapted to graph data and investigated by Song et al. [SLM⁺18], Fichtenberger et al. [FHO21], and Jain et al. [JSW24]. In this setting, the algorithm receives a sequence of updates, one per time step, where each update is either an insertion or a deletion of an edge. *Fully dynamic* graph algorithms handle both insertions and deletions, whereas *partially dynamic* graph algorithms handle insertions only or deletions only. In this work, we study fully dynamic graph algorithms in the continual release model.

Differential privacy (DP), intuitively, guarantees that, for any two neighboring datasets, the output distributions of the algorithm are roughly the same. We consider *edge DP*, introduced in [NRS07], that uses the notion of *edge-neighboring graphs*. Two graphs are edge-neighboring if they differ in one edge. (There is also a stronger notion of *node DP*, first studied in [BBDS13, KNRS13, CZ13].) Differential privacy is defined with two parameters, ϵ and δ ; see Definitions 2.2 and 2.11. When $\delta = 0$, it is referred to as *pure DP*; the setting when $\delta > 0$ is called *approximate DP*.

The continual release model comes with two natural definitions of neighboring sequences and two corresponding variants of differential privacy: *event-level* and *item-level*, and we study both of them. Update sequences are *event-neighboring* if they differ in one update; they are *item-neighboring* if they differ on an arbitrary number of updates pertaining to one item. For edge DP, we adapt these definitions as follows. Two graph sequences are considered *event-level edge-neighboring* if one can be obtained from the other by replacing either one update with a no-op or two consecutive updates on the same edge with no-ops.¹ Two graph sequences are *item-level edge-neighboring* if they are the same on all updates, except updates on one edge. Event-level privacy is less stringent than item-level privacy. Note that there is no distinction between event-level and item-level edge DP for partially dynamic algorithms, because each edge can be updated at most once. But the picture is more nuanced for fully dynamic algorithms.

Our goal is to investigate the best error achievable by fully dynamic, edge differentially private (edge-DP) graph algorithms. We call an algorithm (α, β) -accurate if, with probability at least $1 - \beta$, it has additive error at most α at every time step. For algorithms that output real-valued vectors, the additive error is measured in terms of L_∞ , i.e., as the maximum over all coordinates of the vector. We express our error bounds in terms of the number of nodes in the graph, denoted by N ; the number of time steps, called the *time horizon* and denoted by T ; and sometimes also in terms of the bound D on the maximum degree.

The systematic investigation by Fichtenberger et al. [FHO21] provided partially dynamic private algorithms with additive error polylog T for numerous graph problems. The partially dynamic setting under node DP was further investigated by Jain et al. [JSW24]. The only fully dynamic graph algorithms in previous work were for the edge count, given by Fichtenberger et al. [FHO21], and for releasing the values of all graph cuts, given by Fichtenberger et al. [FHU23]. Both algorithms satisfy event-level, edge DP; the former algorithm has dependence $O(\log^{3/2} T)$ on the time horizon T in the additive error, whereas the latter algorithm has dependence $O(N^{3/2} \sqrt{\log N} \log^{3/2} T)$ on T and the number of nodes N . Fichtenberger et al. [FHO21] also obtained $\Omega(\log T)$ lower bounds for many graph problems in this setting and lower bounds in terms of

¹We consider two updates on the same edge e consecutive if the updates between them do not involve e . Consecutive updates on the same edge must be of different types: an insertion and a deletion (in either order). We allow up to *two* updates to be replaced, as opposed to one in the classical continual release setting, for a technical reason: since an edge can be inserted only when it is absent and deleted only when it is present, there exist update sequences for which changing any one update results in an invalid graph sequence. This happens, for example, if the updates alternate between inserting and deleting the same edge, ending in an insertion. As a result, our definition is more natural in the dynamic setting.

	Upper bounds	Lower bounds	Lower bounds output-determined	[FHO21] for $\delta = 0$
f_Δ	$\tilde{O}(\min(T^{4/3}, \sqrt{TN}, \sqrt[3]{TN}, N^3))$ Theorem 3.7	$\Omega(\min(T, \sqrt[3]{TN^2/3}, N^2))$ Theorem 3.1	same as lower bounds	$\Omega(\log T)$
$f_{CC}, f_{MM},$ $f_{\geq \tau}, f_{\text{degHist}}$	$\tilde{O}(\min(\sqrt[3]{T}, N))$ Table 2	$\Omega(\min(\sqrt[4]{T}, \sqrt{N}))$ Corollary 5.8	$\tilde{\Omega}(\min(\sqrt[3]{T}, N))$ Corollary 5.17	
f_{deg}	$O(\log T \log(TN))$ Lemma 4.2	$\Omega(\log T)$ Remark 5.14	same as lower bounds	—

Table 1: Bounds on error α for (α, β) -accurate, **event-level** (ε, δ) -edge-DP fully dynamic graph algorithms (suppressing factors polynomial in $\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \log \frac{1}{\delta\beta}$). We use $\tilde{O}(X)$ and $\tilde{\Omega}(X)$ to hide polylog X factors. Bounds that depend on T , but not N , hold only for sufficiently large N .

	Approximate DP ($\delta > 0$)		Pure DP ($\delta = 0$)		
	Upper bounds	Lower bounds	Upper bounds	Lower bounds	[FHO21]
f_Δ	$\tilde{O}(\min(T^{4/3}, \sqrt[3]{TN}, N^3))$ Corollary 4.7	$\tilde{\Omega}(\min(T^{\tau/6}, \sqrt[3]{TN}, N^3))$ Theorem 3.11	$\tilde{O}(\min(T^{1.5}, \sqrt{TN}, N^3))$ Corollary 4.7	$\tilde{\Omega}(\min(T^{5/4}, \sqrt{TN}, N^3))$ Theorem 3.11	$\Omega(N^3)$
$f_{CC}, f_{MM},$ $f_{\geq \tau}, f_{\text{degHist}}$	$\tilde{O}(\min(\sqrt[3]{T}, N))$ Corollary 4.6	$\tilde{\Omega}(\min(\sqrt[3]{T}, N))$ Corollary 5.11	$\tilde{O}(\min(\sqrt{T}, N))$ Corollary 4.6	$\tilde{\Omega}(\min(\sqrt{T}, N))$ Corollary 5.11	$\Omega(N)$
f_{deg}		as for f_{CC} Remark 5.14		as for f_{CC} Remark 5.14	—
f_{edges}	$\tilde{O}(\min(\sqrt[3]{T}, N^2))$ Corollary 4.6	$\Omega(\min(\sqrt[3]{T}, N^2))$ Theorem 5.12	$\tilde{O}(\min(\sqrt{T}, N^2))$ Corollary 4.6	$\Omega(\min(\sqrt{T}, N^2))$ Theorem 5.12	$\Omega(N^2)$

Table 2: Bounds on error α for (α, β) -accurate, **item-level** (ε, δ) -edge-DP fully dynamic graph algorithms (suppressing factors polynomial in $\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \log \frac{1}{\delta\beta}$). We use $\tilde{O}(X)$ and $\tilde{\Omega}(X)$ to hide factors polylogarithmical in X . Bounds from [FHO21] hold only for sufficiently large T .

N (that hold for large T) in the item-level DP setting. Their lower bounds are only for *pure DP*, that is, when $\delta = 0$. Fichtenberger et al. [FHU23] show a lower bound on the accuracy of continually releasing the value of the min cut with event-level, edge DP, but in a different model: they have parallel edges and allow multiple edges to be changed at every time step, both of which make the problem harder and lead to a lower bound on the error that is larger than our event-level upper bound for the value of min cut.

1.1 Our results

Our results on event-level and item-level edge-DP are summarized in Tables 1 and 2, respectively.

We give the *first fully dynamic*, differentially private algorithms for several fundamental graph statistics, including triangle count (f_Δ), the number of connected components (f_{CC}), the size of the maximum matching (f_{MM}), the number of nodes of degree at least τ ($f_{\geq \tau}$), the degree histogram (f_{degHist}), and the degree list (f_{deg}) with edge DP at both event level and item level. For the edge count (f_{edges}), we give the first item-level edge-DP algorithm. (See Definition 2.14 for problem definitions.) Our event-level algorithm for f_{deg} has additive error α polylogarithmic in T and N . All other algorithms have error polynomial in these parameters.

We also demonstrate that $f_\Delta, f_{CC}, f_{MM}, f_{\geq \tau}$, and f_{degHist} are fundamentally different from `EdgeCount` and `DegreeList` by showing that every event-level edge-DP algorithm for these five problems must have additive error polynomial in T and N (as opposed to polylogarithmic in these parameters), thus providing an exponential improvement on the previously known lower bounds of $\Omega(\log T)$ by [FHO21] in terms of the dependence on the time horizon T . Our lower bounds apply for general $\delta \in [0, 1)$, that is, even for approximate DP, whereas the lower bounds in [FHO21] hold only for pure DP. Specifically, we show that when N is sufficiently large, the additive error of event-level edge-DP algorithms must be between $O(T^{4/3})$

and $\Omega(T)$ for f_Δ and between $O(T^{1/3})$ and $\Omega(T^{1/4})$ for $f_{CC}, f_{MM}, f_{\geq\tau}, f_{\text{degHist}}$.

While there remains an intriguing gap between upper and lower bounds for these problems, we are able to eliminate it for $f_{CC}, f_{MM}, f_{\geq\tau}, f_{\text{degHist}}$ for a special class of algorithms, called *output-determined*, first considered in [HSS24], where the authors showed a lower bound for output-determined algorithms for counting the number of distinct elements in a stream. Output-determined algorithms have roughly the same output distributions on inputs with the same output sequences (see Definition 5.15.) All known algorithms for these four problems (all of which come from our work) are output-determined. Our lower bounds for output-determined algorithms demonstrate that we would need a different approach to improve the error.

We also give item-level lower bounds on the additive error for fully dynamic graph algorithms. For all problems listed in the table, except for the triangle count, our item-level lower bounds match the error of our algorithms up to polylogarithmic factors. Specifically, we show that when N is sufficiently large, the additive error of item-level (ϵ, δ) -edge-DP algorithms must be between $O(T^{4/3})$ and $\Omega(T^{7/6})$ for f_Δ and $\tilde{\Theta}(T^{1/3})$ for $f_{CC}, f_{MM}, f_{\geq\tau}, f_{\text{degHist}}$, and f_{deg} when $\delta > 0$. When $\delta = 0$, it is between $T^{3/2}$ and $T^{5/4}$ for f_Δ and $\Theta(\sqrt{T})$ for the remaining problems.

Putting our results together with the $O(\log^{3/2} T)$ event-level upper bound for f_{edges} by [FHO21], we see that f_{edges} and f_{deg} become much more difficult in the item-level setting; the error grows from $\text{polylog } T$ to $T^{1/2}$ or $T^{1/3}$ (depending whether we consider pure or approximate DP). For the remaining problems, while $f_{CC}, f_{MM}, f_{\geq\tau}, f_{\text{degHist}}$ behave similarly in terms of additive error of fully dynamic algorithms, the triangle count stands out. We further investigate it in the event-level setting by considering error bounds in terms of the maximum degree D and time horizon T . We prove the upper bound of $\tilde{O}(\min(\sqrt{TD}, \sqrt[3]{TD}))$ and the lower bound of $\Omega(\min(\sqrt[3]{TD^{2/3}}, \sqrt[4]{TD}))$ for this problem. We stress that our algorithms are differentially private even when the degree bound is violated, but the accuracy guarantees expressed in terms of D rely on the input graph being of degree at most D at every time step. Subroutines that are differentially private only when the input graphs have maximum degree at most D are called *D-restricted*. As shown by Jain et al. [JSW24], such subroutine can exhibit blatant failures of differential privacy on graphs that do not satisfy the promise if they are used as stand-alone algorithms.

1.2 Our Techniques

We prove first superlogarithmic lower bounds for dynamic differentially private algorithms for graph problems. Our starting point for proving lower bounds is the sequential embedding technique proposed by Jain et al. [JRSS23] and further developed by Jain et al. [JKR+23]. The main idea is to reduce from a problem in the batch setting that returns multiple outputs about the same individuals and use different time steps to extract answers that correspond to different outputs. In particular, [JRSS23] used a reduction from the 1-way marginals problem in the batch setting and then applied lower bounds of [HT10] and [BUV18] for releasing all 1-way marginals; [JKR+23] used a reduction from the Inner Product problem in the batch setting and applied the lower bounds for this problem from [DN03, DMT07, MMNW11, De12].

Lower bounds via Submatrix Queries. To prove our event-level lower bounds for `TriangleCount` (stated in Theorem 3.1), we reduce from the Submatrix Query problem, which has not been used in the context of continual release before. It was defined by Eden et al. [ELRS23] for studying the local model of differential privacy, where each party holds their own private data and interacts with the rest of the world using differentially private algorithms. In the submatrix query problem, the input is an $n \times n$ matrix Y of random bits, each belonging to a different individual. Each submatrix query is specified by two vectors $a, b \in \{0, 1\}^n$. The answer to the query (a, b) is $a^T Y b = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n a[i] Y[i, j] b[j]$. A submatrix query is a type of a *linear query*. The answer to a linear query is a dot product of the secret dataset (viewed as a vector; in our case, of length n^2) and a query vector of the same length (in our case, a vectorization of the outer product of vectors a and b). Dinur and Nissim [DN03], in the paper that laid foundations for establishing the field of differential privacy, show that answering many random linear queries too accurate leads to blatant privacy violations. Eden et al. [ELRS23] extended their attack to submatrix queries. Implicitly, they showed differentially private algorithms for answering $\Omega(n^2)$ submatrix queries on $n \times n$ datasets must have additive error $\Omega(n)$.

We use this lower bound together with our reduction from Submatrix Queries to triangle counting with event-level edge-DP.

Our reduction transforms a dataset Y and a set Q of submatrix queries into a dynamic graph sequence \mathcal{S} . It ensures that the answers to different submatrix queries in Q correspond to triangle counts in \mathcal{S} at different time steps. Moreover, the transformations of neighboring datasets Y and Y' (with the same query set Q) return event-level, edge-neighboring graph sequences. Our reduction encodes the secret dataset Y as edges of a bipartite graph. Then it crucially uses insertions and deletions by first inserting and then deleting edges that encode each query. The main advantage of using submatrix queries instead of arbitrary linear queries in our reduction is that they can be encoded efficiently, i.e., with fewer edges. This creates shorter dynamic graph sequences, leading to stronger lower bounds in terms of the time horizon T .

General lower bound framework. We provide a general lower bound framework for fully dynamic graph algorithms, which we employ to prove nearly all our lower bounds (with the notable exception of event-level triangle counting, for which we use the submatrix queries method described above). The framework is based on the existence of a small graph gadget with two special edges such that the value of the target function (e.g., f_{MM}) remains the same when only one of the special edges is removed, but changes by a specific amount when both special edges are removed. We call such a gadget *2-edge distinguishing for f* (see Figure 5.1). We show how to use a 2-edge distinguishing gadget for f to obtain a reduction from the Inner Product problem (see Definition 5.5) in the batch setting to the continual release of f in the fully dynamic, event-level setting. We also show how to use a slightly simpler gadget for f to obtain a reduction from 1-way Marginals (see Definition 3.12) in the batch setting to the continual release of f in the fully dynamic, item-level setting. Finally, 2-edge distinguishing gadgets are used in the general reduction from 1-way Marginals to get event-level lower bounds in the output-determined setting. We then apply our general framework to obtain numerous lower bounds for specific problems.

Transformation from D -restricted to general algorithms in the event-level setting. One of the most common methods for obtaining DP graph algorithms is to start by designing an algorithm that is tailored to a specific graph family, typically graphs of degree at most D . The reason for this is that some graph statistics have much lower sensitivity on bounded degree graphs. E.g., if one edge in an N -node graph is added or removed, the triangle count can change by $N - 2$; however, in a graph of degree at most D , it can change by at most $D - 1$. In the batch setting, many techniques (notably, based on graph projections [BBDS13, KNRS13, DLL16] and Lipschitz extensions [BBDS13, KNRS13, CZ13, RS16b, RS16a, DLL16, KRST23]) have been developed for transforming algorithms tailored to bounded-degree graphs to algorithms that are private on *all graphs* without noticeably increasing their error on bounded-degree graphs. For dynamic graph algorithms, D -restricted algorithms were studied in [SLM⁺18, FHO21]. For the insertions-only setting, Jain et al. [JSW24] present a general projection which transforms a D -restricted algorithm into an algorithm which is differentially private on the universe of *all* input graph sequences, with similar error guarantees depending on the maximum degree of the input sequence (up to log factors).

We obtain a similar result in the fully dynamic setting for event-level edge-DP: i.e., if for all D there exists an event-level D -restricted edge-DP algorithm for estimating a function on all dynamic graph sequences of maximum degree D , with an error bound depending on D , then there exists an event-level edge-DP algorithm on *all* dynamic graph sequences, with an error bound depending on the maximum degree of the sequence. The error bounds are the same as for the D -restricted case, up to factors in logarithmic in TN and small dependence on the privacy parameters and the failure probability β .

One of the tools in our transformation is our event-level algorithm for degree list, which is based on the continual histograms algorithm from [FHU23]. We use the degree-list algorithm to keep a running estimate of the maximum degree. We run the corresponding degree restricted mechanism until the maximum degree increases significantly. We then re-initialize a new restricted mechanism with a higher degree bound.

Fully dynamic algorithm for triangle count. Our event-level algorithm for triangle count uses our transformation from D -restricted to general algorithms. To get a D -restricted algorithm, we use a binary-

tree-based mechanism for counting on the difference sequence for f_Δ (i.e., a sequence that records the change in f_Δ between time steps) and then add noise using the Gaussian mechanism. To bound the error of our mechanism, we give a careful analysis of the L_2 -sensitivity of the counts stored in the binary tree.

1.3 Additional Prior Work

The two concurrent works [DNPR10, CSS11] that initiated the investigation of the continual release model, also proposed the binary-tree mechanism for computing sums of bits, a.k.a. continual counting. The problem of continual counting was further studied in [DNRR15, FHU23, HUU23, DLY23, CLN⁺24]. The binary-tree mechanism has been extended to work for sums of real values [PAK19], weighted sums [BFM⁺13], counting distinct elements [BFM⁺13, EMM⁺23, GKNM23, JKR⁺23, HSS24] and, most relevantly, partially dynamic algorithms for graph statistics [FHO21].

The first lower bound in the continual release model was an $\Omega(\log T)$ bound on the additive error of continual counting, shown by [DNPR10]. The first lower bounds that depended polynomially on T were proved by Jain et al. [JRSS23] and applied to the problems of releasing the value and index of the attribute with the highest sum, given a dataset that stores whether each individual possesses a given attribute. They pioneered the sequential embedding technique that reduces multiple instances of a static problem to a dynamic problem. Like in that paper, we also reduce from the 1-way marginals problem to obtain some of our lower bounds. However, our lower bound for the triangle count is proved by a reduction from a different problem, and our reductions use the specific structure of the graph problems we consider.

First edge-DP algorithms were presented in [NRS07]; they handled the cost of the minimum spanning tree and the triangle count. Since then differentially private graph algorithms have been designed for a variety of tasks, including estimating subgraph counts [BBDS13, KNRS13, CZ13, KRSY14, DZBJ18, LML20], degree list [KS12], degree and triangle distributions [HLMJ09, RS16b, DLL16, LML20], the number of connected components [KRST23], spectral properties [WWW13, AU19], parameters in stochastic block models [BCS15, BCSZ18, SU21]; training of graph neural networks [DMS⁺21]; and generating synthetic graphs [KS12, ZNF20], and many other [BBDS12, GRU12, Upa13, WWZX13, PGM14, LM14, ZCP⁺15, MCB15, NIR16, RRT19, ZN19, ALJ20, BGM22, DLR⁺22].

1.4 Discussion and Open Questions

Our transformation from D -restricted to general edge-DP algorithms works in the event-level setting. Can one design such a transformation for item-level setting (with a small error blowup)?

Our error bounds for $f_{CC}, f_{MM}, f_{\geq\tau}$, and f_{degHist} exhibit similar dependence on T as the bounds in [JKR⁺23] on counting the number of distinct elements in turnstile streams in the continual release model. Unlike in our setting, where an edge can be added only if it is present and deleted only if it is absent, turnstile streams might have an element added or deleted no matter what the current count for this element is. Only elements with positive counts are included in the current distinct element count. Interestingly, [HSS24] show that when elements can only be added when absent and deleted when present (i.e., in the so-called “likes” model), the additive error drops down to polylogarithmic in T . We conjecture that improving the bounds for Distinct Elements in the event-level setting would lead to better bounds for graph problems as well.

1.5 Organization of Technical Sections

We start by giving definitions and the background on differential privacy and continual release in Section 2. In Section 3, we collect all our results on triangle counting that require specialized techniques. Section 4 presents general algorithmic tools: the transformation from degree-restricted to general event-level algorithms in Section 4.1, and algorithms based on recomputation at regular intervals in Section 4.2. It also applies these tools to get most upper bounds on the error presented in Tables 1 and 2. Finally, Section 5 presents our lower bound framework and most lower bounds on the error from the tables.

2 Preliminaries

We use \log to denote the logarithm base 2 and \ln to denote the natural logarithm. Let $[T]$ denote the set $\{1, 2, \dots, T\}$. Let \mathcal{U} be a universe of data items and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. A *dataset over \mathcal{U} of size n* is an n -tuple of elements from \mathcal{U} . We use \mathcal{U}^* to denote the set of all datasets (of all sizes) over \mathcal{U} .

Definition 2.1 (Neighboring datasets). *Two datasets $x, y \in \mathcal{U}^n$ are neighboring, denoted $x \sim y$, if there is an $i \in [n]$ such that $x[i] \neq y[i]$, and $x[j] = y[j]$ for all $j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}$.*

Definition 2.2 (Differential privacy [DMNS06, DKM⁺06]). *Let \mathcal{A} be an algorithm which takes as input a dataset over \mathcal{U} . Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta \in [0, 1]$. Algorithm \mathcal{A} is (ε, δ) -differentially private $((\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DP) if for all neighboring datasets $x, y \in \mathcal{U}^*$ and all $\text{Out} \subseteq \text{range}(\mathcal{A})$,*

$$\Pr[\mathcal{A}(x) \in \text{Out}] \leq e^\varepsilon \Pr[\mathcal{A}(y) \in \text{Out}] + \delta.$$

If \mathcal{A} is (ε, δ) -differentially private for $\delta = 0$, it is also called ε -differentially private (ε -DP).

Definition 2.3 (Sensitivity). *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and $f : \mathcal{U}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ be a function. Let $p \in \{1, 2\}$. The L_p -sensitivity of f , denoted by Δ_p , is defined as $\Delta_p = \max_{x \sim y} \|f(x) - f(y)\|_p$.*

Lemma 2.4 (Laplace Mechanism [DMNS06]). *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ and $f : \mathcal{U}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ be a function with L_1 -sensitivity Δ_1 . The Laplace mechanism is defined as $\mathcal{A}(x) = f(x) + (Y_1, \dots, Y_k)$, where $Y_i \sim \text{Lap}(\Delta_1/\varepsilon)$ are independent random variables for all $i \in [k]$. The Laplace mechanism is ε -differentially private. Further, for every $x \in \mathcal{U}^*$ and every $\beta \in (0, 1)$, it satisfies $\|\mathcal{A}(x) - f(x)\|_\infty \leq \frac{\Delta_1}{\varepsilon} \ln \frac{k}{\beta}$ with probability at least $1 - \beta$.*

Lemma 2.5 (Gaussian mechanism [BDMN05, BS16]). *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f : \mathcal{U}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ be a function with L_2 -sensitivity Δ_2 . Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, $\delta \in (0, 1)$, $c^2 > 2 \ln(1.25/\delta)$, and $\sigma \geq c\Delta_2/\varepsilon$. The Gaussian mechanism is defined as $\mathcal{A}(x) = f(x) + (Y_1, \dots, Y_k)$, where $Y_i \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ are independent random variables for all $i \in [k]$. The Gaussian mechanism is (ε, δ) -differentially private. Further, for every $x \in \mathcal{U}^*$, every $\beta \in (0, 1)$, and $\sigma = \sqrt{2 \ln(2/\delta)} \Delta_2/\varepsilon$, it satisfies $\|\mathcal{A}(x) - f(x)\|_\infty \leq \frac{2\Delta_2}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\ln(2/\delta)} \ln(2k/\beta)$ with probability at least $1 - \beta$.*

Lemma 2.6 (Gaussian tail bound). *Let $Y \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ and $t \geq 0$. Then $\Pr[|Y - \mu| \geq \sigma t] \leq 2e^{-t^2/2}$.*

Lemma 2.7 (Simple composition [DL09, DRV10, DKM⁺06]). *Let $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 > 0$ and $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in [0, 1]$. Let \mathcal{A}_1 be an $(\varepsilon_1, \delta_1)$ -differentially private algorithm $\mathcal{U}^* \rightarrow \text{range}(\mathcal{A}_1)$ and \mathcal{A}_2 an $(\varepsilon_2, \delta_2)$ -differentially private algorithm $\mathcal{U}^* \times \text{range}(\mathcal{A}_1) \rightarrow \text{range}(\mathcal{A}_2)$. Then $\mathcal{A}_1 \circ \mathcal{A}_2$ is $(\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2, \delta_1 + \delta_2)$ -differentially private.*

2.1 Graph Sequences

For a set of nodes V , let $\mathcal{G}(V)$ denote the set of all simple graphs on V . The symmetric difference of two sets S and S' , denoted $\Delta(S, S')$, is $(S \setminus S') \cup (S' \setminus S)$.

Definition 2.8 (Edge-neighboring). *Graphs $G = (V, E)$ and $H = (V, E')$ are edge-neighboring, denoted by $G \sim H$, if E and E' differ in at most one element, i.e., $|\Delta(E, E')| \leq 1$.*

Definition 2.9 (Dynamic graph sequence). *Let V be a set of nodes and $T \in \mathbb{N}$. For all $t \in \{0\} \cup [T]$, let G_t be a graph (V, E_t) with some edge set $E_t \subseteq V \times V$ and $E_0 = \emptyset$. Then $\mathcal{S} = (G_1, \dots, G_T)$ is a dynamic graph sequence of length T if $|\Delta(E_t, E_{t-1})| \leq 1$ for all $t \in [T]$. That is, every two consecutive graphs in the sequence differ by at most one edge insertion or deletion.*

To denote the edge difference sets, for all $t \in [T]$, we use $dE_t^- = E_{t-1} \setminus E_t$ and $dE_t^+ = E_t \setminus E_{t-1}$, as well as $dE_t = dE_t^- \cup dE_t^+ = \Delta(E_t, E_{t-1})$.

We say \mathcal{S} has maximum degree D if G_t has maximum degree D for all $t \in [T]$.

Continual release graph algorithms Let V be a set of nodes and $T, k \in \mathbb{N}$. A *continual release graph algorithm* $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{G}(V)^T \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^k)^T$ receives as input² a dynamic graph sequence $\mathcal{S} = (G_1, \dots, G_T)$ and, at every time step $t \in [T]$, produces an output $a_t = \mathcal{A}(G_1, \dots, G_t) \in \mathbb{R}^k$.

Definition 2.10 (Item-level and event-level neighbors). Let V be a set of nodes and $T \in \mathbb{N}$. Let \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{S}' be two dynamic graph sequences of length T . Let dE_t^+, dE_t^- and dE_t be the edge difference sets as in Definition 2.9, and $dE_t^{+'}, dE_t^{-'}$ and dE_t' be the corresponding sets for \mathcal{S}' . We say \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{S}' are item-level, edge-neighboring if they differ in updates pertaining to at most one edge. That is, there exists an edge $e^* \in V^2$ such that $dE_t^+ \setminus \{e^*\} = dE_t^{+'} \setminus \{e^*\}$ and $dE_t^- \setminus \{e^*\} = dE_t^{-'} \setminus \{e^*\}$ for all $t \in [T]$.

We say \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{S}' are event-level, edge-neighboring if they differ in at most one edge insertion (or deletion) and the next deletion (or insertion) of the same edge.¹ That is, there exists an edge $e^* \in V^2$ and a time interval $[t_1, t_2]$ with $t_1 \in [1, T]$ and $t_2 \in [2, T + 1]$ such that³

1. $dE_t^+ = dE_t^{+'}$ and $dE_t^- = dE_t^{-'}$ for all $t \in [T] \setminus \{t_1, t_2\}$.
2. $e^* \notin dE_t$ for all $t \in (t_1, t_2)$.
3. a) $dE_{t_1}^+ = dE_{t_2}^- = \{e^*\}$ and $dE_{t_1}' = dE_{t_2}' = \emptyset$ or b) $dE_{t_1}^- = dE_{t_2}^+ = \{e^*\}$ and $dE_{t_1}' = dE_{t_2}' = \emptyset$ or c) $dE_{t_1}^{+'} = dE_{t_2}^{-'} = \{e^*\}$ and $dE_{t_1} = dE_{t_2} = \emptyset$ or d) $dE_{t_1}^{-'} = dE_{t_2}^{+'} = \{e^*\}$ and $dE_{t_1} = dE_{t_2} = \emptyset$.

Note that if $\mathcal{S} = (G_1, \dots, G_T)$ and $\mathcal{S}' = (G'_1, \dots, G'_T)$ are event-level edge-neighboring, then they are also item-level edge-neighboring; if they are item-level edge-neighboring, then the graphs G_t and G'_t are edge-neighboring for every $t \in [T]$.

Definition 2.11 (Item-level and event-level edge-DP). Let V be a set of nodes and $T, k \in \mathbb{N}$. Let \mathcal{A} be a continual release graph algorithm $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{G}(V)^T \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^k)^T$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta \geq 0$. The algorithm \mathcal{A} is item-level (respectively, event-level), (ε, δ) -edge-DP, if for all item-level (respectively, event-level) edge-neighboring dynamic graph sequences $\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{G}(V)^T$ and $\mathcal{S}' \in \mathcal{G}(V)^T$ and all $\text{Out} \subseteq (\mathbb{R}^k)^T$:

$$\Pr[(\mathcal{A}(G_1, \dots, G_t))_{t \leq T} \in \text{Out}] \leq e^\varepsilon \Pr[(\mathcal{A}(G_1, \dots, G_t))_{t \leq T} \in \text{Out}] + \delta. \quad (1)$$

We use ε -edge-DP as a shorthand for $(\varepsilon, 0)$ -edge-DP.

In many works on DP graph algorithms, the first step is to design algorithms that require a promise on the degree of the graph for the privacy guarantee. Jain et al. [JSW24] call such algorithms *D-restricted*.

Definition 2.12 (*D-restricted differential privacy*). Let V be a set of nodes and $k, D, T \in \mathbb{N}$. Let \mathcal{A} be a continual release graph algorithm $\mathcal{G}(V)^T \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^k)^T$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta \geq 0$. The algorithm \mathcal{A} is *D-restricted, event-level, (ε, δ) -edge differentially private (*D-rest. (ε, δ) -edge-DP)*, if for all event-level edge-neighboring dynamic graph sequences $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}' \in \mathcal{G}(V)^T$ of maximum degree D and every $\text{Out} \subseteq (\mathbb{R}^k)^T$:*

$$\Pr[(\mathcal{A}(G_1, \dots, G_t))_{t \leq T} \in \text{Out}] \leq e^\varepsilon \Pr[(\mathcal{A}(G_1, \dots, G_t))_{t \leq T} \in \text{Out}] + \delta.$$

The definition of *D-restricted item-level* is analogous.

(α, β) -accuracy for graph functions Let $f : \mathcal{G}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$. Let $\mathcal{S} = (G_1, \dots, G_T)$ with $G_t \in \mathcal{G}(V)$ be a dynamic graph sequence. A continual release graph algorithm \mathcal{A} is (α, β) -accurate for f on \mathcal{S} if $\Pr[\max_{t \in [T]} \|\mathcal{A}(G_1, \dots, G_t) - f(G_t)\|_\infty > \alpha] \leq \beta$.

Definition 2.13 (Difference sequence). Let $f : \mathcal{G}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$. Let $\mathcal{S} = (G_1, \dots, G_T)$ be a dynamic graph sequence on vertex set V and $G_0 = (V, \emptyset)$. The difference sequence for f is $(df(\mathcal{S}, t))_{t \in [T]}$, where for $t \in [T]$,

$$df(\mathcal{S}, t) = f(G_t) - f(G_{t-1}).$$

²We assume T is given to the algorithm. By a standard reduction [CSS11], all our error bounds hold if T is not known in advance, up to polylogarithmic factors in T .

³To represent the case when e^* is not updated after time step t_1 , we set t_2 to $T + 1$. In that case, the requirements for this time step in Item 3 should be ignored.

2.2 Problem Definitions

We consider the following functions on (simple) graphs. We use $\deg(v)$ to denote the degree of a node v .

Definition 2.14 (Graph functions). *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with $|V| = N$.*

- **EdgeCount:** *The function f_{edges} maps a graph G to the number of edges $|E|$.*
- **TriangleCount:** *The function f_{Δ} maps a graph G to the number of triangles in G : i.e., $f_{\Delta}((V, E)) = |\{\{x, v, u\} \in V^3 : (x, u), (u, v), (v, x) \in E\}|$.*
- **HighDegree(τ):** *For each $\tau \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}$, the function $f_{\geq \tau}$ maps a graph G to the number of nodes in G of degree at least τ , i.e., $f_{\geq \tau}(G) = |\{v \in V : \deg(v) \geq \tau\}|$.*
- **DegreeList:** *The function f_{deg} maps a graph G to the list of node degrees: $f_{\text{deg}}(G) = (\deg(v))_{v \in V}$.*
- **DegreeHist:** *The function f_{degHist} maps a graph G to the histogram $(h_0, h_1, \dots, h_{N-1})$ of node degrees, where $h_j = |\{v \in V : \deg(v) = j\}|$ for all $j = \{0, \dots, N-1\}$.*
- **MaximumMatching:** *The function f_{MM} maps a graph G to the size of the maximum matching in G .*
- **ConnectedComponents:** *The function f_{CC} maps a graph G to the number of connected components in G .*

3 Fully Dynamic Private Triangle Counting

This section presents algorithms and lower bounds for triangles counting with event-level privacy and a lower bound for item-level privacy.

3.1 Lower Bounds for Event-Level TriangleCount via Submatrix Queries

In this section, we prove the following theorem on the lower bounds on the error of fully dynamic, event-level, edge-DP algorithms for TriangleCount.

Theorem 3.1 (Lower bounds for event-level TriangleCount). *Let $T, N, D \in \mathbb{N}$ be sufficiently large. Then every event-level $(0.1, 0.02)$ -edge-DP algorithm for TriangleCount which is $(\alpha, 1/6)$ -accurate on all dynamic graph sequences with N nodes and length T satisfies $\alpha = \Omega(\min(T, T^{1/3}N^{2/3}, N^2))$.*

If the accuracy condition holds instead for all dynamic graph sequences with maximum degree D and length T then $\alpha = \Omega(\min(T^{1/3}D^{2/3}, T^{1/4}D))$.

As discussed in Section 1.2, our reduction relies on submatrix queries, defined next.

Definition 3.2 (Submatrix Query Problem). *In the submatrix query problem, the data universe is $\mathcal{U} = \{0, 1\}$. A dataset $Y \in \mathcal{U}^M$, where $M = n^2$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, can be seen as an $n \times n$ binary matrix, where one data bit corresponds to one entry in the matrix. A submatrix query on \mathcal{U}^M is defined by two vectors $a, b \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and maps $Y \in \mathcal{U}^M$ to $a^T Y b = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n a[i] Y[i, j] b[j]$. The problem Submatrix(n, k) is the problem of answering k submatrix queries of the form (a, b) , where $a, b \in \{0, 1\}^n$.*

Definition 3.3 (Accuracy for batch algorithms). *Let $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let \mathcal{U} be a universe and $f : \mathcal{U}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ a function. A randomized algorithm \mathcal{A} is (α, β) -accurate for f , if for all datasets $y \in \mathcal{U}^n$ and $z = f(y)$, it outputs a_1, \dots, a_k such that $\Pr[\max_{i \in [k]} |a_i - z_i| > \alpha] \leq \beta$, where the probability is taken over the random coin flips of the algorithm.*

The following lower bound is implicitly proved in [ELRS23] (Claim 3.5, Lemmas 3.8-3.10).

Lemma 3.4 (Submatrix Query lower bound). *There exist constants $c_1 \geq 1$ and $c_2 > 0$ such that, for all large enough $n \in \mathbb{N}$, every $(0.1, 0.02)$ -differentially private and $(\alpha, 1/6)$ -accurate algorithm for Submatrix($n, c_1 n^2$) satisfies $\alpha > c_2 n$.*




Figure 3.1: An example of the construction in the proof of Lemma 3.5 for $n = 4$ and $w = 5$. The input matrix is $Y = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$; the dashed lines show the edges inserted and then deleted for the query (a, b) with $a = [0, 0, 1, 0]$ and $b = [0, 1, 0, 1]$. There are 5 triangles between x_3, v_4 , and z_1, \dots, z_5 , and $(3, 4)$ is the only pair (i, j) satisfying $Y[ij] = a[i] = b[j] = 1$.

Lemma 3.5 (Reduction from submatrix queries to TriangleCount). *Let $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $Y \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$ be a dataset and $Q = ((a^{(m)}, b^{(m)}))_{m \in [k]}$, where each $a^{(m)}, b^{(m)} \in \{0, 1\}^n$, be a sequence of k submatrix queries. Then for all $w \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a transformation from (Y, Q) to a dynamic graph sequence (G_1, \dots, G_T) of N -node graphs, where $N = 2n + w$ and $T = n^2 + 4knw$, such that:*

- For neighboring datasets $Y, Y' \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$ and a query sequence Q , the transformations of (Y, Q) and (Y', Q) give graph sequences which are event-level, edge-neighboring;
- For all $m \in [k]$, the triangle count $f_{\Delta}(G_{t_m}) = w \cdot (a^{(m)})^T Y b^{(m)}$, where $t_m = n^2 + 2nw(2m - 1)$.

Proof. Given a dataset $Y \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$, we construct a graph sequence on $2n + w$ nodes $x_1, \dots, x_n, v_1, \dots, v_n$, and z_1, \dots, z_w , starting from graph G_0 with no edges. We begin with an initialization phase of n^2 time steps: For all $i, j \in [n]$, we insert the edge (x_i, v_j) at time $ni + j$ if $Y[i, j] = 1$; otherwise, we do not perform an update at time $ni + j$.

Next, for each $m \in [k]$, we use $4nw$ time steps to process query $(a^{(m)}, b^{(m)})$ as follows. Let $s_m = n^2 + 4nw(m - 1)$ be the time step right before we start processing this query. For all $i \in [n]$, if $a^{(m)}[i] = 1$, then, for all $\ell \in [w]$, we insert the edge (x_i, z_{ℓ}) at time $s_m + (i - 1)w + \ell$ and delete it at time $s_m + 2nw + (i - 1)w + \ell$. Analogously, for all $j \in [n]$, if $b^{(m)}[j] = 1$, then, for all $\ell \in [w]$, we insert the edge (v_j, z_{ℓ}) at time $s_m + nw + (j - 1)w + \ell$ and delete it at time $s_m + 3nw + (j - 1)w + \ell$. See Figure 3.1.

Correctness. If Y and Y' differ in coordinate $(i, j) \in [n] \times [n]$, then the corresponding constructed graph sequences differ only in the presence or absence of the initial insertion of edge (x_i, v_j) at time step $in + j$. Thus, they are event-level, edge-neighboring. For each $m \in [k]$, at time step $t_m = n^2 + 4nw(m - 1) + 2nw = s_m + 2nw$, the constructed graph has all edges (x_i, z_{ℓ}) corresponding to the 1-entries of $a^{(m)}$ and all edges (v_j, z_{ℓ}) corresponding to the 1-entries of $b^{(m)}$. Further, there exists an edge (x_i, v_j) if and only if $Y[i, j] = 1$. Thus, the number of triangles at time t_m is equal to w times the number of pairs (i, j) satisfying $a^{(m)}[i] = Y[i, j] = b^{(m)}[j] = 1$. That is, $f_{\Delta}(G_{t_m}) = w \cdot a^{(m)} Y b^{(m)}$.

Analysis. The initialization phase uses n^2 time steps. Processing of each query uses $4nw$ time steps. Thus, $T = n^2 + 4knw$. \square

Lemma 3.6 (Reduction from submatrix queries to TriangleCount, bounded degree). *Let $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $Y \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$ be an input dataset and $Q = ((a^{(m)}, b^{(m)}))_{m \in [k]}$, where each $a^{(m)}, b^{(m)} \in \{0, 1\}^n$, be a sequence of k submatrix queries. Then for all $w, B \in \mathbb{N}$, where B divides n , there exists a transformation from (Y, Q) to a dynamic graph sequence (G_1, \dots, G_T) of N -node graphs of maximum degree $D = 2B + w$, where $N = \frac{2n^2}{B} + \frac{n^2 w}{B^2}$ and $T = n^2 + \frac{4kwn^2}{B}$, such that:*

- For neighboring datasets $Y, Y' \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$ and a query sequence Q , the transformations of (Y, Q) and (Y', Q) give graph sequences which are event-level, edge-neighboring;




Figure 3.2: An example of the construction in the proof of Lemma 3.6 for $n = 4$, $B = 2$ and $w = 5$. The input matrix is $Y = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$; the dashed lines show the edges inserted and then deleted for the query (a, b) with $a = [0, 0, 1, 0]$ and $b = [0, 1, 0, 1]$.

- For all $m \in [k]$, the triangle count $f_{\Delta}(G_{t_m}) = w \cdot a^{(m)} Y b^{(m)}$, where $t_m = n^2 + (m-1) \frac{4n^2 w}{B} + \frac{2n^2 w}{B}$.

Proof. Given a dataset $Y \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$ and $B, w \in \mathbb{N}$, we construct a graph sequence on $\frac{n^2}{B^2} \times (2B + w)$ nodes, starting from graph G_0 with no edges. At a high level, we divide the matrix Y into submatrices of size $B \times B$, and for each submatrix, we build a graph as in Lemma 3.5. Specifically, for all $p_1, p_2 \in [\frac{n}{B}]$, define $Y^{(p_1, p_2)}$ as the $B \times B$ matrix with $Y^{(p_1, p_2)}[i, j] = Y[(p_1 - 1)B + i, (p_2 - 1)B + j]$ for all $i, j \in [B]$. We create a *gadget* for each $(p_1, p_2) \in [\frac{n}{B}]^2$ by allocating $2n + w$ nodes for it. In the initialization phase, each gadget is updated by running the initialization phase from the proof of Lemma 3.5 for $Y^{(p_1, p_2)}$ and w . The initialization phase uses $(\frac{n}{B})^2 B^2 = n^2$ time steps.

Then, for each $m \in [k]$, to process query $(a^{(m)}, b^{(m)})$, we run the processing procedure from the proof of Lemma 3.5 for every $p_1, p_2 \in [\frac{n}{B}]$ for $(a^{(m)}[(p_1 - 1)B + 1, p_1 B], b^{(m)}[(p_2 - 1)B + 1, p_2 B])$ within the gadget for (p_1, p_2) . That is, for all $p_1 \in [\frac{n}{B}]$, we use $Bw \frac{n}{B}$ time steps to insert the edges corresponding to $a^{(m)}[(p_1 - 1)B + 1, p_1 B]$ into all gadgets for (p_1, p_2) for all $p_2 \in [\frac{n}{B}]$. Similarly, for all $p_2 \in [\frac{n}{B}]$, we insert the edges corresponding to $b^{(m)}[(p_2 - 1)B + 1, p_2 B]$ into all gadgets for (p_1, p_2) for all $p_1 \in [\frac{n}{B}]$. This uses in total $2 \frac{n^2 w}{B}$ time steps. Afterwards, we use $2 \frac{n^2 w}{B}$ time steps to delete the edges corresponding to the m th query for all gadgets (as in the proof of Lemma 3.5).

Correctness. For every pair $(i, j) \in [n]^2$, there exists exactly one pair (p_1, p_2) such that $i \in [(p_1 - 1)B + 1, p_1 B]$ and $j \in [(p_2 - 1)B + 1, p_2 B]$. Thus, if Y and Y' differ in entry (i, j) , then only the gadget for (p_1, p_2) will differ in the initial insertion of the corresponding edge. We finish inserting all edges corresponding to query $(a^{(m)}, b^{(m)})$ at time step $t_m = n^2 + (m-1) \frac{4n^2 w}{B} + 2n^2 w/B$. For each pair $(p_1, p_2) \in [\frac{n}{B}] \times [\frac{n}{B}]$, the number of triangles in the gadget for (p_1, p_2) at time t_m is $w a^{(m)}[(p_1 - 1)B + 1, p_1 B] Y^{(p_1, p_2)} b^{(m)}[(p_2 - 1)B + 1, p_2 B]$, and $\sum_{p_1, p_2 \in [\frac{n}{B}]} w a^{(m)}[(p_1 - 1)B + 1, p_1 B] Y^{(p_1, p_2)} b^{(m)}[(p_2 - 1)B + 1, p_2 B] = w a^{(m)} Y^{(p_1, p_2)} b^{(m)}$.

Analysis. The total number of nodes is $\frac{n^2}{B^2} \times (2B + w) = \frac{2n^2}{B} + \frac{n^2 w}{B^2}$. The degree of each G_t is at most $2B + w$.

Initialization takes n^2 time steps, and each query uses $4 \cdot \frac{n^2}{B} \cdot w$ time steps. Thus, $T = n^2 + 4k \cdot \frac{n^2}{B} \cdot w$. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Let c_1 be as in Lemma 3.4. First, we prove the lower bound in terms of T and N . Set $w = \lfloor \min(\frac{N}{3}, \frac{T-1}{4}) \rfloor$ and $n = \lfloor \min(\frac{N}{3}, (\frac{T}{4wc_1+1})^{1/3}) \rfloor$. For answering $k = c_1 n^2$ queries, the construction in Lemma 3.5 has $2n + w \leq N$ nodes and $n^2 + 4c_1 n^3 w \leq (4c_1 w + 1)n^3 \leq T$ time steps. We add $N - (2n + w)$ dummy nodes and $T - (n^2 + 4c_1 n^3)$ time steps without updates in order to get a dynamic graph sequence of N nodes and T time steps. Let \mathcal{A} be an event-level $(0.1, 0.01)$ -edge DP algorithm for `TriangleCount` which is $(\alpha, \frac{1}{6})$ -accurate for this graph sequence. Then Lemma 3.5 gives an algorithm which, with probability at least $\frac{5}{6}$, has additive error at most $\frac{\alpha}{w}$ on all submatrix queries. Thus, by Lemma 3.4, we have $\frac{\alpha}{w} > c_2 n$ and therefore $\alpha > c_2 n w$, where c_2 is as in Lemma 3.4. Consider three cases:

1. $T \leq N$: Then $w = \Theta(T)$ and $n = \Theta(1)$, and the lower bound is $\Omega(nw) = \Omega(T)$.
2. $T \in (N, N^4)$: Then $w = \Theta(N)$ and $n = \Theta(\frac{T}{N})^{1/3}$, and the lower bound is $\Omega(nw) = \Omega(T^{1/3} N^{2/3})$.
3. $T \geq N^4$: Then $N \leq T$ and $N \leq (\frac{T}{N})^{1/3}$, so $w = n = \Theta(N)$, and the lower bound is $\Omega(nw) = \Omega(N^2)$.

In all three cases, the lower bound is $\Omega(nw) = \Omega(\min(T, T^{1/3} N^{2/3}, N^2))$.

Now we prove the lower bound in terms of T and D . Set $w = \lfloor D/3 \rfloor$ and $n' = \lfloor \min(\sqrt[4]{\frac{T}{5c_1}}, \sqrt[3]{\frac{3T}{5Dc_1}}) \rfloor$. If $n' \leq \lfloor D/3 \rfloor$, let $n = n'$, else, let n be an integer in $[n' - \lfloor D/3 \rfloor, n']$ such that $\lfloor D/3 \rfloor$ divides n . Let $B = \min(n, \lfloor D/3 \rfloor)$. For answering $k = c_1 n^2$ queries, the construction from Lemma 3.6 gives a graph sequence of maximum degree D and length $n^2 + \frac{4c_1 n^4 w}{B} \leq \frac{5c_1 n^4 w}{B} \leq T$. We add extra dummy time steps to get a graph sequence of length T . Let \mathcal{A} be an event-level $(0.1, 0.02)$ -edge DP algorithm for `TriangleCount` which is $(\alpha, 1/6)$ -accurate for this graph sequence. Then Lemma 3.6 gives a $(0.1, 0.01)$ -DP algorithm with additive error at most $\frac{\alpha}{w}$ on all submatrix queries. Then Lemma 3.4 implies $\alpha > c_2 w n$, where c_2 is as in Lemma 3.4. Thus, $\alpha = \Omega(\min(T^{1/4} D, T^{1/3} D^{2/3}))$. \square

3.2 Event-Level Private Algorithm for Triangle Count

In this section, we present our fully dynamic event-level, edge-DP algorithm for triangle counting. Our algorithmic results on this problem are summarized in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.7 (Upper bound for event-level `TriangleCount`). *For all $\varepsilon, \delta, \beta \in (0, 1)$ and $T, N \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists an event-level (ε, δ) -edge-DP algorithm which is (α, β) -accurate for `TriangleCount` on all dynamic graph sequences with N nodes and length T , where $\alpha = O\left(\min\left(\frac{\sqrt{TN}}{\varepsilon} (\ln \frac{1}{\delta}) \log^{3/2} \frac{T}{\beta}, N \left(\frac{T}{\varepsilon^2} (\ln \frac{1}{\delta}) \ln \frac{T}{\beta}\right)^{1/3}, N^3\right)\right)$. Further, for all dynamic graph sequences with degree at most D , for $D \in \mathbb{N}$ and $D \leq N$, the algorithm satisfies $\alpha = O\left(\min\left(\sqrt{TD}, DT^{1/3}, ND^2\right) \cdot \text{poly}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \log \frac{TN}{\beta\delta}\right)\right)$.*

The minimum expressions in the bounds in Theorem 3.7 are the result of selecting the best algorithm for each setting of parameters. Later (in Corollary 4.7), we will present item-level (and thus also event-level) algorithms for triangle counting. The algorithm in this section, whose performance is summarized in Theorem 3.8, has better error than the item-level edge-DP algorithm for the same problem in Corollary 4.7 when the number of nodes is large: specifically, $N \geq T^{1/3}$.

Theorem 3.8 (Event-level DP triangle count). *For all $\varepsilon, \delta, \beta \in (0, 1)$ and $T, N, D \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an event-level (ε, δ) -edge-DP algorithm which is (α, β) -accurate for `TriangleCount` on all dynamic graph sequences with N nodes, maximum degree D and length T , where $\alpha = O(\sqrt{TD} \cdot \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \log \frac{TN}{\beta\delta}))$.*

Theorem 3.8 follows from Lemma 3.9 that gives a D -restricted version of the algorithm and Theorem 4.1 that gives a transformation from D -restricted to general algorithms. The D -restricted version of the algorithm is based on running a binary tree mechanism on the difference sequence, combined with a careful analysis of the L_2 -sensitivity of the partial sums used by the mechanism.

Lemma 3.9 (*D*-restricted private triangle count). *Let $\varepsilon, \delta, \beta \in (0, 1)$ and $T, D \in \mathbb{N}$. There exists an event-level D -rest. (ε, δ) -edge-DP algorithm which is (α, β) -accurate for `TriangleCount` on all dynamic graph sequences of maximum degree D and length T , where $\alpha = O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{TD \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \log^{3/2} \frac{T}{\beta}\right)$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{S} = (G_t)_{t \in [T]}$ be a dynamic graph sequence of degree at most D . Recall that $f_\Delta(G)$ returns the number of triangles in graph G . Let $(df_\Delta(\mathcal{S}, t))_{t \in [T]}$ be the difference sequence for f_Δ . (See Definition 2.13).

Our general strategy is to run a counting mechanism similar to the binary tree mechanism by Dwork et al. [DNPR10] to compute a running estimate on $f_\Delta(G_t) = \sum_{t' \in [t]} df_\Delta(\mathcal{S}, t')$. However, we use Gaussian noise to compute the noisy counts for nodes in the binary tree. We show that when building the binary tree over df_Δ , the L_2 -sensitivity of the vector of the counts of the binary tree nodes is $O(\sqrt{TD \log T})$. We next describe this approach in detail.

Let $\mathcal{I}_\ell = \{[j \cdot 2^\ell + 1, (j+1)2^\ell], 0 \leq j \leq \lceil T/2^\ell \rceil - 1\}$ for all (integer) levels $\ell \in [0, \log T]$ and $\mathcal{I} = \bigcup_{0 \leq \ell \leq \lceil \log T \rceil} \mathcal{I}_\ell$. For an interval $[a, b]$ in \mathcal{I} , define $s_{[a,b]}(\mathcal{S}) = \sum_{a \leq t \leq b} df_\Delta(\mathcal{S}, t)$. We first obtain a private estimate of $s_{[a,b]}$ for all intervals $[a, b] \in \mathcal{I}$, by computing $\tilde{s}_{[a,b]} = s_{[a,b]} + Y_{[a,b]}$, where $Y_{[a,b]}$ is independently drawn from $N(0, \sigma^2)$ with $\sigma = 12\sqrt{TD \ln \frac{2}{\delta}} \log T$. For any interval $[1, t]$, there exists a set $I_t \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ such that (i) $\bigcup_{[a,b] \in I_t} [a, b] = [1, t]$, (ii) $\bigcap_{[a,b] \in I_t} [a, b] = \emptyset$, and (iii) $|I_t| \leq \lceil \log T \rceil + 1$. We compute an estimate of $f_\Delta(G_t)$ as $\tilde{f}_\Delta(G_t) = \sum_{[a,b] \in I_t} \tilde{s}_{[a,b]} = \sum_{[a,b] \in I_t} s_{[a,b]} + Y_{[a,b]}$.

Claim 3.10. *The L_2 -sensitivity of $(s_{[a,b]})_{[a,b] \in \mathcal{I}}$ is at most $6\sqrt{TD \log T}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{S} = (G_t)_{t \in [T]}$ and $\mathcal{S}' = (G'_1, \dots, G'_T)$ be two event-level, edge-neighboring dynamic graph sequences of degree at most D . Let t_1 be the first time step where \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{S}' differ. W.l.o.g., suppose an edge $e^* = (u^*, v^*)$ is inserted into G_{t_1} , but $G'_{t_1} = G'_{t_1-1}$. Let t_2 be the time step where e^* is deleted from \mathcal{S} but not \mathcal{S}' (set $t_2 = T + 1$ if e^* is not deleted in \mathcal{S} after t_1). Then $|df_\Delta(\mathcal{S}, t_1) - df_\Delta(\mathcal{S}', t_1)| \leq D - 1$ and, if $t_2 \leq T$ then $|df_\Delta(\mathcal{S}, t_2) - df_\Delta(\mathcal{S}', t_2)| \leq D - 1$, since e^* can be involved in at most $D - 1$ triangles. For all $t \in (t_1, t_2)$, if edge $e = (u, v)$ is inserted at step t , it can form at most one triangle with e^* . Thus, $|df_\Delta(\mathcal{S}, t) - df_\Delta(\mathcal{S}', t)| \leq 1$ for all $t \notin \{t_1, t_2\}$.

Now, fix a level $\ell \in \{0, \dots, \lceil \log T \rceil\}$. For each interval $[a, b] \in \mathcal{I}_\ell$ (which has length 2^ℓ), we have $|s_{[a,b]}(\mathcal{S}) - s_{[a,b]}(\mathcal{S}')| \leq D + 2^\ell$ if $t_1 \in [a, b]$ or $t_2 \in [a, b]$, and $|s_{[a,b]}(\mathcal{S}) - s_{[a,b]}(\mathcal{S}')| \leq 2^\ell$, otherwise.

For all $t \in [T]$, the total triangle count can differ by at most $D - 1$ for G_t and G'_t , that is, $|f_\Delta(G_t) - f_\Delta(G'_t)| \leq D - 1$. For each interval $[a, b] \in \mathcal{I}$, we have $s_{[a,b]}(\mathcal{S}) = f_\Delta(G_b) - f_\Delta(G_a)$ and $|s_{[a,b]}(\mathcal{S}) - s_{[a,b]}(\mathcal{S}')| = |f_\Delta(G_b) - f_\Delta(G_a) - f_\Delta(G'_b) + f_\Delta(G'_a)| \leq |f_\Delta(G_b) - f_\Delta(G'_b)| + |f_\Delta(G'_a) - f_\Delta(G_a)| \leq 2D$.

There are at most two intervals $I \in \mathcal{I}_\ell$ such that $t_1 \in I$ or $t_2 \in I$. For such an interval I , we have $|s_I(\mathcal{S}) - s_I(\mathcal{S}')| \leq D + \min(D, 2^\ell)$. For all other intervals $[a, b] \in \mathcal{I}_\ell$, we have $|s_{[a,b]}(\mathcal{S}) - s_{[a,b]}(\mathcal{S}')| \leq \min(2D, 2^\ell)$. Since \mathcal{I}_ℓ contains at most $T/2^\ell$ intervals, the L_2 -sensitivity of $(s_{[a,b]})_{[a,b] \in \mathcal{I}_\ell}$ is at most

$$2D + \sqrt{\frac{T}{2^\ell}} \min(2D, 2^\ell) \leq 2D + \sqrt{\frac{T}{\min(2D, 2^\ell)}} \min(2D, 2^\ell) \leq 2D + \sqrt{T \cdot \min(2D, 2^\ell)} \leq 2D + \sqrt{2TD},$$

which is at most $4\sqrt{TD}$, since $D \leq T$. Thus, the L_2 -sensitivity of $(s_{[a,b]})_{[a,b] \in \mathcal{I}}$ is at most $\sqrt{\sum_{\ell=0}^{\lceil \log T \rceil} 16TD} \leq 6\sqrt{TD \log T}$. \square

By Lemma 2.5, the algorithm that returns $\tilde{s}_{[a,b]} = s_{[a,b]} + Y_{[a,b]}$, where every $Y_{[a,b]}$ is independently drawn from $N(0, \sigma^2)$, is (ε, δ) -DP. Recall that $\tilde{f}_\Delta(G_t) = \sum_{[a,b] \in I_t} \tilde{s}_{[a,b]} = \sum_{[a,b] \in I_t} s_{[a,b]} + Y_{[a,b]}$ and note that $\sum_{[a,b] \in I_t} s_{[a,b]} = f_\Delta(G_t)$. The random variable $Z_t = \sum_{[a,b] \in I_t} Y_{[a,b]}$ has distribution $N(0, \hat{\sigma}^2)$, where $\hat{\sigma}^2 \leq (\lceil \log T \rceil + 1)\sigma^2$. By Lemma 2.6, for all $\beta \in (0, 1)$, we have that $\Pr[|Z_t| \geq \hat{\sigma} \sqrt{2 \ln(T/\beta)}] \leq \beta/T$. By a union bound over the T time steps, with probability at least $1 - \beta$, estimates returned at all steps have error at most $O(\hat{\sigma} \sqrt{\log(T/\beta)})$. Thus, the algorithm is (α, β) -accurate, for

$$\alpha = O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{TD \left(\ln \frac{1}{\delta}\right) \log T \sqrt{\log T} \sqrt{\log(T/\beta)}}\right) = O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{TD \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \log^{3/2} \frac{T}{\beta}\right). \quad \square$$

3.3 Lower Bound for Item-Level TriangleCount

In this section, we prove the following theorem that gives a lower bound on triangle counting with item-level edge-DP.

Theorem 3.11 (Item-level lower bound for triangle count). *For all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, $\delta \in [0, 1)$, and sufficiently large $T, N \in \mathbb{N}$, every item-level, (ε, δ) -edge DP algorithm for f_Δ which is $(\alpha, \frac{1}{3})$ -accurate on all dynamic graph sequences with N nodes and length T satisfies*

1. if $\delta > 0$ and $\delta = o(\frac{1}{T})$, then $\alpha = \Omega\left(\min\left(\frac{T^{7/6}}{(\varepsilon \log T)^{1/3}}, \frac{NT^{1/3}}{\varepsilon^{2/3} \log^{2/3} T}, N^3\right)\right)$.
2. if $\delta = 0$, then $\alpha = \Omega\left(\min\left(\frac{T^{5/4}}{\varepsilon^{1/4}}, N\sqrt{\frac{T}{\varepsilon}}, N^3\right)\right)$.

To prove the theorem, we give a reduction from the *1-way marginals problem* in the batch model, defined next.

Definition 3.12 (1-way marginals). *Let $d, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\mathcal{U} = \{0, 1\}^d$. In the Marginals(n, d) problem, the input is a dataset $Y = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n) \in \mathcal{U}^n$, and the goal is to compute the vector $(q_1(Y), \dots, q_d(Y))$, where $q_j(Y) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i[j]$ for all $j \in [d]$.*

A randomized algorithm \mathcal{A} is (α, β) -accurate for Marginals(n, d), if for all datasets $Y \in \{\{0, 1\}^d\}^n$, it outputs a_1, \dots, a_k such that

$$\Pr[\max_{j \in [k]} |a_j - q_j(Y)| > \alpha] \leq \beta,$$

where the probability is taken over the random coin flips of the algorithm.

The following lower bound is taken from [JRSS23], which in turn is based on [BUV18, HT10].

Lemma 3.13 (Lower bound for Marginals [BUV18, HT10, JRSS23]). *For all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, $\delta \in [0, 1)$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, and $d, n \in \mathbb{N}$, every (ε, δ) -DP algorithm that is $(\alpha, \frac{1}{3})$ -accurate for Marginals(n, d) satisfies:*

- if $\delta > 0$ and $\delta = o(\frac{1}{n})$, then $\alpha = \Omega\left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{n\varepsilon \log d}\right)$.
- if $\delta = 0$, then $\alpha = \Omega\left(\frac{d}{n\varepsilon}\right)$.

Lemma 3.14 (Reduction from Marginals to TriangleCount). *Let $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $Y \in \{\{0, 1\}^d\}^n$. Then for all $w \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a transformation from Y to a dynamic graph sequence (G_1, \dots, G_T) of N -node graphs, where $T = 2\lceil\sqrt{n}\rceil w + 2nd$ and $N = 2\lceil\sqrt{n}\rceil + w$, such that*

- The transformations of neighboring $Y, Y' \in \{\{0, 1\}^d\}^n$ give item-level, edge-neighboring graph sequences;
- Let $t_0 = 2\lceil\sqrt{n}\rceil w$. For all $j \in [d]$ and $t_j = t_0 + (2j - 1)n$, we have $f_\Delta(G_{t_j}) = w \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i[j]$.

Proof. We define a set $V = V_0 \cup V_1 \cup W$, where V_0, V_1 and W are pairwise disjoint, $|V_0| = |V_1| = \lceil\sqrt{n}\rceil$, and $|W| = w$. There are at least n node pairs $(v_0, v_1) \in V_0 \times V_1$. We give them an arbitrary order $e_1, \dots, e_{\lceil\sqrt{n}\rceil 2}$. In particular, there exist the node pairs e_1, \dots, e_n .

In the initialization phase, we insert edge (v, u) for all $v \in V_0 \cup V_1$ and all $u \in W$, in an arbitrary but fixed order. This takes $2\lceil\sqrt{n}\rceil w$ time steps. Then, for all $j \in [d]$ and $i \in [n]$, if $Y_i[j] = 1$ then we insert e_i at time $t_0 + 2(j - 1)n + i$ and delete e_i at time $t_0 + (2j - 1)n + i$; otherwise, we do nothing at these time steps. This takes $2nd$ time steps, and $T = 2\lceil\sqrt{n}\rceil w + 2nd$ for the whole construction.

Correctness. If Y and Y' are neighboring input data sets differing in row i^* , then the resulting graph sequences for Y and Y' differ only in insertions and deletions related to e_{i^*} . Thus, they are item-level, edge-neighboring. The only triangles that can form have to include an edge from W to V_0 , from V_0 to V_1 , and from V_1 to W . Let $G_t = (V, E_t)$. Since every node in W is connected to every node $V_0 \cup V_1$, the number of triangles is exactly $w|\{e_i : e_i \in E_t\}|$. At time step $t_j = t_0 + (2j - 1)n$, the graph G_{t_j} includes an edge e_i if and only if $Y_i[j] = 1$. Thus, the total triangle count is equal to $w \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i[j]$. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.11. Case $\delta > 0$: Given T and N , we set $d = \lfloor (T\varepsilon \log(T\varepsilon))^{2/3} \rfloor$, and $n = \lfloor \min\left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{6\varepsilon \log d}, \frac{N^2}{16}\right) \rfloor$ and $w = \lfloor \min\left(\frac{N}{2}, \frac{T}{4\lfloor\sqrt{n}\rfloor}\right) \rfloor$. The reduction from Lemma 3.14 gives a sequence with at most N nodes and $T/2 + 2nd$ updates, where

$$2nd = \frac{d^{3/2}}{3\varepsilon \log d} \leq \frac{T\varepsilon \log(T\varepsilon)}{3\varepsilon \cdot \frac{2}{3} \log(T\varepsilon \log(T\varepsilon))} \leq \frac{T}{2}.$$

We can add dummy nodes and dummy time steps to get a dynamic N -node graph sequence of length T . If we can estimate $f_\Delta(G_t)$ with error up to α at all time steps with probability at least $2/3$, then for all $j \in [d]$, we can estimate the j th marginal given by $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in n} Y_i[j] = \frac{1}{nw} f_\Delta(G_{t_j})$ up to error $\frac{2\alpha}{nw}$.

Lemma 3.13 gives $\alpha = \Omega\left(nw \cdot \min\left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{n\varepsilon \log d}, 1\right)\right) = \Omega(nw) = \Omega\left(\min\left(\frac{T^{7/6}}{(\varepsilon \log T)^{1/3}}, \frac{NT^{1/3}}{\varepsilon^{2/3} \log^{2/3} T}, N^3\right)\right)$.

Case $\delta = 0$: Given T and N , set $d = \lfloor \sqrt{T\varepsilon} \rfloor$ and $n = \lfloor \min\left(\frac{d}{2\varepsilon}, \frac{N^2}{4}\right) \rfloor$ and $w = \lfloor \min\left(\frac{N}{2}, \frac{T}{4\lfloor\sqrt{n}\rfloor}\right) \rfloor$. The reduction from Lemma 3.14 gives a sequence with at most N nodes and at most T updates, and we can add dummy nodes and dummy time steps to get a dynamic N -node graph sequence of length T . By Lemma 3.13, we have $\alpha = \Omega\left(nD_0 \cdot \min\left(\frac{d}{n\varepsilon}, 1\right)\right) = \Omega(nw) = \Omega\left(\min\left(\frac{T^{5/4}}{\varepsilon^{1/4}}, N\sqrt{\frac{T}{\varepsilon}}, N^3\right)\right)$. \square

4 General Algorithmic Tools for DP Fully Dynamic Algorithms

This section presents general algorithmic tools that can be used for all graph problems we discussed.

4.1 Transformation from Degree-Restricted to Private

We start with our general transformation in the event-level setting from a D -restricted edge-DP algorithm with an error bound that depends on D to an edge-DP algorithm for *all* dynamic graph sequences and has an error bound depending on the maximum degree of the sequence. The error bounds are the same as for the D -restricted case, up to factors in $\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \log\left(\frac{TN}{\beta\delta}\right)$.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $T, N, k \in \mathbb{N}$, let f be a function $\mathcal{G}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$, and let $\alpha : \mathbb{N} \times (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be non-decreasing in the first parameter and nonincreasing in the second. If for all $\beta \in (0, 1)$, $\varepsilon > 0$, $D \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\delta \in [0, 1)$, there is a event-level D -rest. (ε, δ) -edge-DP algorithm \mathcal{A}_D which is $(\alpha(D, \beta), \beta)$ -accurate for f on all dynamic graph sequences with N nodes, maximum degree D and length T , then for all $D' \in \mathbb{N}$, $\varepsilon' > 0$ and $\delta' \in (0, 1)$ and $\beta' \in (0, 1)$, there exists an event-level (ε', δ') -edge DP algorithm for f which is $\left(\alpha\left(D'', \min\left(\frac{\delta'}{2+2e^{\varepsilon'}}, \frac{\beta'}{2+\log N}\right)\right), \beta'\right)$ -accurate on all dynamic graph sequences with N nodes, maximum degree D' , and length T , where $D'' = O\left(D' + \frac{\log T \cdot \log N}{\varepsilon'} \log \frac{TN \log N}{\beta' \delta'}\right)$. The value D' does not need to be given to the algorithm.*

As one of the main tools, we first give an algorithm for accurately estimating the degree list of a dynamic graph sequence. It is based on computing a running sum of the difference sequence (see Definition 2.13), i.e., the change of the function value between two time steps, via known counting mechanisms. A similar strategy was used in [FHO21] for other graph functions.

Lemma 4.2 (Algorithm for DegreeList). *For all $T, N, D \in \mathbb{N}$, $\varepsilon > 0$, and $\beta \in (0, 1)$, there exists an event-level ε -edge-DP algorithm for DegreeList which is (α, β) -accurate on all dynamic N -node graph sequences of length T , where $\alpha = O\left(\frac{\log T}{\varepsilon} \log \frac{TN}{\beta}\right)$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{S} = (G_1, \dots, G_T)$ be a dynamic graph sequence on a node set V with $|V| = N$. For every node $v \in V$, we compute an event-level edge-DP estimate of its degree using a continual counting algorithm. For $t \in [T]$, let $f_v(G) = \deg_G(v)$, where $\deg_G(v)$ denotes the degree of v in G . We use a continual counting algorithm on the difference sequence $(df_v(\mathcal{S}, t))_{t \in [T]}$ (recall Definition 2.13). We have that $df_v(\mathcal{S}, t) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ for all $v \in V$ and all $t \in [T]$. Additionally, for each $t \in [T]$, the vector $(df_v(\mathcal{S}, t))_{v \in V}$ has at most 2 nonzero entries,

corresponding to the endpoints of the edge updated at time step t . Further, for all neighboring sequences \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{S}' , the resulting difference sequences differ in at most two time steps. Using Lemma A.6, Item 1, the lemma follows. \square

Next, we prove Lemma 4.4, which is the key lemma of this section. The main idea is to keep a running estimate of the maximum degree, and run the corresponding degree restricted mechanism, until the maximum degree increases significantly. We then re-initialize a new restricted mechanism with a higher degree bound. To get Theorem 4.1 from Lemma 4.4, we plug in the parameters to get an event-level (ε', δ') -edge-DP algorithm and an error bound that holds with probability at least $1 - \beta'$, where $\varepsilon' > 0$, $\delta' \in (0, 1)$ and $\beta' \in (0, 1)$ can be chosen freely.

In the proof of the following lemma, we use the notion of (ε, δ) -indistinguishability:

Definition 4.3 ((ε, δ) -indistinguishability). *Let \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{Y} be two sets. Random variables Y and Y' , mapping \mathcal{U} to \mathcal{Y} , are (ε, δ) -indistinguishable if for all $\text{Out} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$,*

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr[Y \in \text{Out}] &\leq e^\varepsilon \Pr[Y' \in \text{Out}] + \delta; \\ \Pr[Y' \in \text{Out}] &\leq e^\varepsilon \Pr[Y \in \text{Out}] + \delta.\end{aligned}$$

We denote that Y and Y' are (ε, δ) -indistinguishable by $Y \approx_{\varepsilon, \delta} Y'$.

That is, an algorithm \mathcal{A} is (ε, δ) -DP if and only if $\mathcal{A}(x) \approx_{\varepsilon, \delta} \mathcal{A}(y)$ for all neighboring x and y .

Lemma 4.4 (Transformation from degree-restricted privacy). *Let $T, N, k \in \mathbb{N}$, let f be a function $\mathcal{G}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$, and let $\alpha : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a nondecreasing function. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta \in [0, 1)$ and $\beta, \beta_s \in (0, 1)$. Assume that for every $D \in \mathbb{N}$, there is an event-level D -rest. (ε, δ) -edge-DP algorithm \mathcal{A}_D which is $(\alpha(D), \beta)$ -accurate for f on all dynamic graph sequences with N nodes, maximum degree D and length T . Then there exists an event-level $(\varepsilon(2 + \log N), \delta(1 + \log N) + \beta_s(1 + e^\varepsilon))$ -edge DP algorithm which is $(\alpha(D'), \beta(1 + \log N) + \beta_s)$ -accurate for f on all dynamic graph sequences with N nodes, maximum degree D , and length T , where $D' = O(D + \frac{\log T}{\varepsilon} \log \frac{TN}{\beta_s})$ for all $D \in \mathbb{N}$. The value D does not need to be given to the algorithm.*

Proof. We run the event-level ε -edge-DP algorithm for estimating the degree sequence from Lemma 4.2 with failure probability set to β_s and keep track of the maximum (noisy) degree $\tilde{d}_{\max}^{(t)}$ seen up until time t . By Lemma 4.2, this algorithm is (γ, β_s) -accurate with $\gamma = O(\frac{\log T}{\varepsilon} \log \frac{TN}{\beta_s})$. Let $\hat{N} = 2^{\lceil \log N \rceil} < 2N$. Note $\log \hat{N} = \lceil \log N \rceil < \log N + 1$. We set $D_j = \gamma + 2^j$ and $\tau_j = 2^j$ for all $j \in [\log \hat{N}]$. For all time steps t such that $\tau_{j-1} \leq \tilde{d}_{\max}^{(t)} < \tau_j$, we run \mathcal{A}_{D_j} .

Accuracy. Let $\mathcal{S} = (G_1, \dots, G_T)$ and $\hat{D}^{(t)}$ be the maximum degree of (G_1, \dots, G_t) for all $t \in [T]$. With probability at least $1 - \beta_s$, at all time steps $t \in [T]$, we have that $\hat{D}^{(t)} \in [\tilde{d}_{\max}^{(t)} - \gamma, \tilde{d}_{\max}^{(t)} + \gamma]$. Call that event C . Conditioning on C , then for $j \in [\log \hat{N}]$, at all time steps t where we run \mathcal{A}_{D_j} , we have $\tilde{d}_{\max}^{(t)} \in [\tau_{j-1}, \tau_j)$, and therefore $\hat{D}^{(t)} \in [\tau_{j-1} - \gamma, \tau_j + \gamma) = [D_j/2 - \gamma, D_j)$. Conditioning on C , with probability at least $1 - \beta$, for a fixed $j \in [\log \hat{N}]$, algorithm $\mathcal{A}(D_j)$ has error at most $\alpha(D_j)$ for all time steps t where we run $\mathcal{A}(D_j)$. Thus, by a union bound, for all $j \in [\log \hat{N}]$, we have that with probability at least $1 - \beta_s - \beta(1 + \log N)$, the error at every time step t where we run $\mathcal{A}(D_j)$ is bounded by $\alpha(D_j) = \alpha(O(\hat{D}^{(t)} + \gamma)) = \alpha(O(\hat{D}^{(T)} + \gamma))$.

Privacy. The algorithm implicitly partitions $[T]$ into intervals $I_1, \dots, I_{\log \hat{N}}$, such that we run \mathcal{A}_{D_j} on I_j for $j \in [\log \hat{N}]$. Call \mathcal{A}_{Int} the algorithm which takes as input a graph sequence \mathcal{S} and outputs the interval partition. Since it is post-processing of the algorithm from Lemma 4.2, \mathcal{A}_{Int} is event-level ε -edge-DP.

Let $\mathcal{S} = (G_1, \dots, G_T)$ and $\mathcal{S}' = (G'_1, \dots, G'_T)$ be two neighboring input sequences. Let $\mathcal{I} = (I_1, \dots, I_{\log \hat{N}})$ be an interval partition such that for all $j \in [\log \hat{N}]$, the interval $I_j = [t_j, t_{j+1})$ and the maximum degrees of G_t and G'_t are bounded by D_j for all $t \in I_j$. We get

$$\mathcal{A}_{D_j}(G_{t_j}, \dots, G_{t_{j+1}-1}) \approx_{\varepsilon, \delta} \mathcal{A}_{D_j}(G'_{t_j}, \dots, G'_{t_{j+1}-1})$$

for all $j \in [\log \hat{N}]$, by definition of \mathcal{A}_{D_j} . Thus,

$$\left(\mathcal{A}_{D_j}(G_{t_j}, \dots, G_{t_{j+1}-1})\right)_{j \in [\log \hat{N}]} \approx_{\varepsilon', \delta'} \left(\mathcal{A}_{D_j}(G'_{t_j}, \dots, G'_{t_{j+1}-1})\right)_{j \in [\log \hat{N}]},$$

where $\varepsilon' = \varepsilon(1 + \log N)$ and $\delta' = \delta(1 + \log N)$ by Lemma 2.7.

Let $\mathcal{A}_{\text{all}D}$ be the algorithm that takes as input a sequence \mathcal{S} and an interval partition $\mathcal{I} = (I_1, \dots, I_{\log \hat{N}})$, and runs \mathcal{A}_{D_j} on $G_{t_j}, \dots, G_{t_{j+1}-1}$ for each $I_j = [t_j, t_{j+1})$ and $j \in [\log \hat{N}]$. Our full algorithm can be seen as $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{S}) := \mathcal{A}_{\text{all}D}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}_{\text{Int}}(\mathcal{S}))$. Let B be the set of all interval sequences $\mathcal{I} = (I_1, I_2, \dots, I_{\log \hat{N}})$, where $I_j = [t_j, t_{j+1})$ for all $j \in [\log \hat{N}]$, such that the maximum degrees of $G_{t_j}, \dots, G_{t_{j+1}-1}$ and $G'_{t_j}, \dots, G'_{t_{j+1}-1}$ are bounded by D_j , for all $j \in [\log \hat{N}]$. Let H be the set of intervals where the degree bound is violated for \mathcal{S} , and H' be the set of intervals where the degree bound is violated for \mathcal{S}' , such that $B = \overline{H \cup H'}$. By the properties of \mathcal{A}_{Int} , we have $\Pr[\mathcal{A}_{\text{Int}}(\mathcal{S}) \in H] \leq \beta_s$ and $\Pr[\mathcal{A}_{\text{Int}}(\mathcal{S}) \in H'] \leq e^\varepsilon \Pr[\mathcal{A}_{\text{Int}}(\mathcal{S}') \in H'] \leq e^\varepsilon \beta_s$. Thus, by a union bound, $\Pr[\mathcal{A}_{\text{Int}}(\mathcal{S}) \in H \cup H'] \leq \beta_s + e^\varepsilon \beta_s$ and therefore $\Pr[\mathcal{A}_{\text{Int}}(\mathcal{S}) \in B] \geq 1 - \beta_s - e^\varepsilon \beta_s$. For every $\text{Out} \in \text{range}(\mathcal{A})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{S}) \in \text{Out}] &= \Pr[\mathcal{A}_{\text{all}D}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}_{\text{Int}}(\mathcal{S})) \in \text{Out}] \\ &\leq \Pr[\mathcal{A}_{\text{all}D}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}_{\text{Int}}(\mathcal{S})) \in \text{Out} | \mathcal{A}_{\text{Int}}(\mathcal{S}) \in B] \cdot \Pr[\mathcal{A}_{\text{Int}}(\mathcal{S}) \in B] + \beta_s(1 + e^\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

We further bound the first summand:

$$\begin{aligned} &\Pr[\mathcal{A}_{\text{all}D}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}_{\text{Int}}(\mathcal{S})) \in \text{Out} | \mathcal{A}_{\text{Int}}(\mathcal{S}) \in B] \cdot \Pr[\mathcal{A}_{\text{Int}}(\mathcal{S}) \in B] \\ &= \sum_{\mathcal{I} \in B} \Pr[\mathcal{A}_{\text{all}D}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{I}) \in \text{Out}] \Pr[\mathcal{A}_{\text{Int}}(\mathcal{S}) = \mathcal{I}] \\ &\leq \sum_{\mathcal{I} \in B} \left(e^{\varepsilon(\log N + 1)} \Pr[\mathcal{A}_{\text{all}D}(\mathcal{S}', \mathcal{I}) \in \text{Out}] + \delta(\log N + 1) \right) \Pr[\mathcal{A}_{\text{Int}}(\mathcal{S}) = \mathcal{I}] \\ &\leq \sum_{\mathcal{I} \in B} e^{\varepsilon(\log N + 2)} \Pr[\mathcal{A}_{\text{all}D}(\mathcal{S}', \mathcal{I}) \in \text{Out}] \Pr[\mathcal{A}_{\text{Int}}(\mathcal{S}') = \mathcal{I}] + \delta(\log N + 1) \\ &= e^{\varepsilon(\log N + 2)} \Pr[\mathcal{A}_{\text{all}D}(\mathcal{S}', \mathcal{A}_{\text{Int}}(\mathcal{S}')) \in \text{Out} | \mathcal{A}_{\text{Int}}(\mathcal{S}') \in B] \Pr[\mathcal{A}_{\text{Int}}(\mathcal{S}') \in B] + \delta(\log N + 1) \\ &\leq e^{\varepsilon(\log N + 2)} \Pr[\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{S}') \in \text{Out}] + \delta(\log N + 1), \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality follows since for each $\mathcal{I} \in B$, we have that $\mathcal{A}_{\text{all}D}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{I}) \approx_{\varepsilon', \delta'} \mathcal{A}_{\text{all}D}(\mathcal{S}', \mathcal{I})$ with $\varepsilon' = \varepsilon(\log N + 1)$ and $\delta' = \delta(\log N + 1)$, as argued above. The second inequality follows since \mathcal{A}_{Int} is ε -DP.

Together, this gives

$$\Pr[\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{S}) \in \text{Out}] \leq e^{\varepsilon(\log N + 2)} \Pr[\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{S}') \in \text{Out}] + \delta(\log N + 1) + \beta_s(1 + e^\varepsilon). \quad \square$$

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Apply Lemma 4.4 with $\varepsilon = \frac{\varepsilon'}{\log N + 2}$, $\delta = \frac{\delta'}{2(1 + \log N)}$, and $\beta = \beta_s = \min\left(\frac{\delta'}{2 + 2e^{\varepsilon'}}, \frac{\beta'}{2 + \log N}\right)$. Note that $\frac{\delta'}{2 + 2e^{\varepsilon'}} \leq \frac{\delta'}{2 + 2e^\varepsilon}$. \square

4.2 Algorithms Based on Recomputing at Regular Intervals

In this section, we collect error bounds which follow from the *recomputing strategy*, i.e., recomputing the answer every fixed number of time steps and returning the most recently computed answer at ever time step. First, we prove Theorem 4.5 on item-level algorithms for functions with known sensitivity. It generalizes Theorems E.2 and E.5 in [JRSS23] (stated there for functions of sensitivity 1) to higher-dimensional functions and adapts them for graph functions.

Theorem 4.5 (Releasing low sensitivity functions). *Let V be a set of nodes, $r > 0$ be a range parameter, and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be the dimension. Let f be a function $f : \mathcal{G}(V) \rightarrow [0, r]^k$ of L_p -sensitivity Δ_p (w.r.t. the edge-neighboring metric in static graphs) for all $p \in \{1, 2\}$. For all $\varepsilon > 0$, $\delta \in [0, 1)$, $\beta \in (0, 1)$, there exists an item-level (ε, δ) -edge-DP algorithm which is (α, β) -accurate for estimating f on all dynamic graph sequences of length $T \in \mathbb{N}$, satisfying the following accuracy guarantee:*

1. if $\delta = 0$, then $\alpha = O\left(\min\left(\Delta_1 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{T}{\varepsilon} \ln \frac{Tk}{\beta}}, r\right)\right)$;
2. if $\delta > 0$, then $\alpha = O\left(\min\left(\Delta_2 \cdot \sqrt[3]{\frac{T}{\varepsilon^2} (\ln \frac{Tk}{\beta}) \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}, r\right)\right)$.

Proof sketch. The second term in the minimum expression (for both items) comes from the trivial algorithm that always outputs $f(G_0)$, where $G_0 = (V, \emptyset)$, without looking at the data. It remains to analyze the first term. For all $p \in \{1, 2\}$ and every function f with L_p -sensitivity Δ_p , the rescaled function $f' = f/\Delta_p$ has sensitivity 1. Therefore, it suffices to analyze the first term in the minimum for functions with $\Delta_p = 1$.

The algorithm for the first term uses an edge-DP algorithm to recompute the function value every B time steps, and does not update the output in between. That is, we divide the time line into *blocks* of the form $[1, B], [B+1, 2B], \dots, [(\lceil \frac{T}{B} \rceil - 1)B + 1, T]$. Denote $t_1, \dots, t_{\lceil T/B \rceil}$ the last time step in each block, i.e., $t_i = i \cdot B$ for all $i \in [\lceil T/B \rceil - 1]$ and $t_{\lceil T/B \rceil} = T$. Since f has L_p -sensitivity 1, and all G_i, G_{i+1} are edge-neighboring, we have that $\|f(G_{t_{i+1}}) - f(G_{t_i})\|_\infty \leq B$ for all $i \in [\lceil T/B \rceil - 2]$. We first set the output to 0. At every time step t_i , we compute an estimate of $f(G_{t_i})$ using a differentially private mechanism, and within a block, we do not update the output. That is, for ε -differential privacy, we run the Laplace mechanism on $\lceil \frac{T}{B} \rceil$ inputs $G_{t_1}, \dots, G_{t_{\lceil T/B \rceil}}$, and for every $t_i < t < t_{i+1}$, we output the same value as in the previous time step. Since for each of these inputs and every item-level edge-neighboring sequence G'_1, \dots, G'_T , we have that G_{t_j} and G'_{t_j} are neighboring, the L_1 -sensitivity of $(f(G_{t_1}), \dots, f(G_{t_{\lceil T/B \rceil}}))$ is $\lceil \frac{T}{B} \rceil$. The value of α follows by balancing B with the error of the Laplace mechanism: By Lemma 2.4, the Laplace mechanism has error at most $\lceil \frac{T}{B} \rceil \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \ln \frac{kT}{\beta}$. Setting $B = \Theta\left(\sqrt{\frac{T}{\varepsilon} \ln \frac{Tk}{\beta}}\right)$ gives the claimed bound α . Similarly, for (ε, δ) -differential privacy, we run the Gaussian mechanism on $\lceil \frac{T}{B} \rceil$ inputs $G_{t_1}, \dots, G_{t_{\lceil T/B \rceil}}$. Since for each of these inputs and every item-level neighboring sequence G'_1, \dots, G'_T , we have that G_{t_j} and G'_{t_j} are neighboring, the L_2 -sensitivity of $(f(G_{t_1}), \dots, f(G_{t_{\lceil T/B \rceil}}))$ is $\sqrt{\lceil T/B \rceil}$. The value of α follows by balancing B with the error of the Gaussian mechanism: By Lemma 2.5, the Gaussian mechanism has error at most $\sqrt{\lceil T/B \rceil} \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\ln(2/\delta) \ln(2Tk/\beta)}$. Setting $B = \Theta\left(\sqrt[3]{\frac{T}{\varepsilon^2} (\ln \frac{Tk}{\beta}) \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}\right)$ gives the claimed bound α . \square

Theorem 4.5 immediately yields the following corollary for functions with constant sensitivity, including EdgeCount, HighDegree, MaximumMatching, MinCut, ConnectedComponents, DegreeHist, DegreeList.

Corollary 4.6 (Item-level algorithms). *Let \mathcal{C} be the class of functions of constant sensitivity from graphs to $[0, N]$ (that includes $f_{\geq \tau} \forall \tau \in \mathbb{N}, f_{MM}, f_{MC}$, and f_{CC}) and \mathcal{C}_N be the class of functions from graphs to real-valued vectors of length $O(N)$ with entries in $[0, N]$ (that includes DegreeHist and DegreeList). For all $\varepsilon > 0, \delta \in [0, 1), \beta \in (0, 1), \tau \in \mathbb{N}$ and $T \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f \in \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{C}_N$, there exists an item-level (ε, δ) -edge-DP algorithm which is (α, β) -accurate for f on all dynamic graph sequences of length T such that*

1. if $\delta = 0$, then error $\alpha = O\left(\min\left(\sqrt{\frac{T}{\varepsilon} \ln \frac{T}{\beta}}, N^2\right)\right)$ for f_{edges} , error $\alpha = O\left(\min\left(\sqrt{\frac{T}{\varepsilon} \ln \frac{T}{\beta}}, N\right)\right)$ for all $f \in \mathcal{C}$, and $\alpha = O\left(\min\left(\sqrt{\frac{T}{\varepsilon} \ln \frac{TN}{\beta}}, N\right)\right)$ for $f \in \mathcal{C}_N$.
2. if $\delta > 0$, then error $\alpha = O\left(\min\left(\sqrt[3]{\frac{T}{\varepsilon^2} (\ln \frac{T}{\beta}) \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}, N^2\right)\right)$ for f_{edges} , error $\alpha = O\left(\min\left(\sqrt[3]{\frac{T}{\varepsilon^2} (\ln \frac{T}{\beta}) \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}, N\right)\right)$ for all $f \in \mathcal{C}$, and $\alpha = O\left(\min\left(\sqrt[3]{\frac{T}{\varepsilon^2} (\ln \frac{TN}{\beta}) \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}, N\right)\right)$ for all $f \in \mathcal{C}_N$.

By Theorem 4.5, there exists a D -restricted item-level (and therefore also event-level), ε -edge-DP algorithm for fully dynamic triangle count which is (α, β) -accurate with $\alpha = O\left(D \sqrt{\frac{T}{\varepsilon} \ln \frac{T}{\beta}}\right)$, and a D -restricted, event-level, (ε, δ) -edge-DP algorithm for fully dynamic triangle count which is (α, β) -accurate with $\alpha = O\left(D \cdot \sqrt[3]{\frac{T}{\varepsilon^2} (\ln \frac{T}{\beta}) \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}\right)$. (Observe that when D is set to N , every D -restricted algorithm becomes edge-DP because the promise on the degree becomes vacuous.) Together with Lemma 4.4, we get the following corollary.




Figure 5.1: 2-edge distinguishing gadgets for f_{MM} , f_{CC} and $-f_{\geq 1}$ of constant size and weight. Note that for f_{MM} , we have $e_1, e_2 \notin E'$, and for f_{CC} and $-f_{\geq 1}$, we have $e_1, e_2 \in E'$.

Corollary 4.7 (Triangle count, recomputing bound). *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta, \beta \in (0, 1)$. Let $T, N, D \in \mathbb{N}$. There exist an event-level (ε, δ) -edge-DP algorithm which is (α, β) -accurate for **TriangleCount** on all dynamic graph sequences with N nodes, maximum degree D and length T , where*

$$\alpha = O\left(T^{1/3}D \cdot \text{poly}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \log \frac{TN}{\delta\beta}\right)\right).$$

*There exist an item-level (ε, δ) -edge-DP algorithm which is (α, β) -accurate for **TriangleCount** on all dynamic graph sequences with N nodes and length T , where*

1. *if $\delta = 0$, then $\alpha = O\left(\min\left(\min(T, N) \cdot \sqrt{\frac{T}{\varepsilon} \ln \frac{T}{\beta}}, N^3\right)\right)$.*
2. *if $\delta > 0$, then $\alpha = O\left(\min\left(\min(T, N) \cdot \sqrt[3]{\frac{T}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\ln \frac{T}{\beta}\right) \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}, N^3\right)\right)$.*

5 A Lower Bound Framework for DP Fully Dynamic Algorithms

We start this section by defining terminology and gadgets used in our lower bound framework. In Section 5.1 (respectively, Section 5.2), we present a general theorem for proving event-level (respectively, item-level) lower bounds for fully dynamic graph algorithms.

Let \mathcal{G} denote the set of all graphs, and let $f : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a real-valued graph function.

Definition 5.1 (Distinguishing gadget). *Let $H = (V', E')$ be a graph and $e_1, e_2 \in V' \times V'$. Set $n_g = |V'|$ and $m_g = |E'|$. The pair (H, e_1) is called a 1-edge distinguishing gadget for f of size (n_g, m_g) and weight w if either*

- $e_1 \notin E'$ and $f((V', E' \cup \{e_1\})) = f(H) + w$ or
- $e_1 \in E'$ and $f((V', E' \setminus \{e_1\})) = f(H) + w$.

The triple (H, e_1, e_2) is called a 2-edge distinguishing gadget for f of size (n_g, m_g) and weight w , if either

- $e_1, e_2 \notin E'$ and $f((V', E' \cup \{e_1, e_2\})) = f(H) + w$ and $f((V', E' \cup \{e_1\})) = f((V', E' \cup \{e_2\})) = f(H)$ or
- $e_1, e_2 \in E'$ and $f((V', E' \setminus \{e_1, e_2\})) = f(H) + w$ and $f((V', E' \setminus \{e_1\})) = f((V', E' \setminus \{e_2\})) = f(H)$.

If there exists a distinguishing gadget for f , we say that f has a distinguishing gadget.

Examples of distinguishing gadgets are illustrated in Figure 5.1.

Lemma 5.2. *If f has a 2-edge distinguishing gadget of size (n_g, m_g) and weight w , then f also has a 1-edge distinguishing gadget of size $(n_g, m_g + 1)$ or $(n_g, m_g - 1)$ and weight w .*

Our framework applies to additive graph functions, defined next.

Definition 5.3 (Additive graph function). *A function f is additive if for each graph G consisting of the connected components C_1, \dots, C_m , we have $f(G) = \sum_{i \in [m]} f(C_i)$.*

5.1 Framework for Event-Level Lower Bounds

In this section, we state and prove Theorem 5.4 that encapsulates our lower bound framework for event-level DP. We also apply our framework to specific problems, stating the resulting lower bounds in Corollary 5.8.

Theorem 5.4 (Event-level lower bound for 2-edge distinguishing). *Let $f : \mathcal{G}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an additive function with a 2-edge distinguishing gadget of size (n_g, m_g) and weight w for some $n_g, m_g, w \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, for all sufficiently large $T, N \in \mathbb{N}$, every event-level, $(1, 1/3)$ -edge DP algorithm which is $(\alpha, 0.01)$ -accurate for f on all dynamic graph sequences with N nodes and length T has error $\alpha = \Omega\left(w \cdot \min\left(T^{1/4}, \sqrt{\frac{T}{m_g}}, \sqrt{\frac{N}{n_g}}\right)\right)$.*

We prove Theorem 5.4 via a reduction to the inner product problem, defined next.

Definition 5.5 (Inner product). *In the inner product problem, the data universe is $\mathcal{U} = \{0, 1\}$. An inner product query on \mathcal{U}^n is defined by a vector $q \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and maps $y \in \mathcal{U}^n$ to $q \cdot y$. The problem InnerProd(n, k) is the problem of answering k inner product queries $q^{(1)}, \dots, q^{(k)} \in \{0, 1\}^n$.*

The following formulation of the lower bound is based on [JKR⁺23], which is in turn based on [DN03, DMT07, MMNW11, De12].

Lemma 5.6 (Inner Product lower bound). *There exist constants $c_1 \geq 1$ and $c_2 > 0$ such that, for all large enough $n \in \mathbb{N}$, every $(1, 1/3)$ -DP and $(\alpha, 0.01)$ -accurate algorithm for InnerProd($n, c_1 n$) satisfies $\alpha > c_2 \sqrt{n}$.*

Lemma 5.7 (Reduction from Inner Product for event-level). *Let $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $y \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and $Q = (q^{(i)})_{i \in [k]}$, where each $q^{(i)} \in \{0, 1\}^n$, be a sequence of k inner product queries. Then for all $n_g, m_g, w \in \mathbb{N}$ and each additive function $f : \mathcal{G}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with a 2-edge distinguishing gadget of size (n_g, m_g) and weight w , there exists a transformation from (y, Q) to a dynamic graph sequence (G_1, \dots, G_T) of N -node graphs, where $T = (m_g + 2k)n$ and $N = n_g n$, such that*

- For neighboring $y, y' \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and the same query sequence Q , the transformations of (y, Q) and (y', Q) give event-level, edge-neighboring graph sequences;
- Let $t_0 = (m_g + 1)n$. For all $\ell \in [k]$ and $t_\ell = (m_g + 2\ell)n$, we have $f(G_{t_\ell}) - f(G_{t_0}) = w y \cdot q^{(\ell)}$.

Proof. Let $H = (V', E')$ and (H, e_1, e_2) be a 2-edge distinguishing gadget of size (n_g, m_g) of weight w for f . W.l.o.g. assume $e_1, e_2 \notin E'$. We define a graph sequence on $n \cdot n_g$ nodes as follows: In an *initialization phase*, we build n copies of H , denoted $H^{(1)}, \dots, H^{(n)}$, using $m_g n$ time steps. For a vertex pair e in H and $j \in [n]$, let $e^{(j)}$ denote the copy of e in $H^{(j)}$. For every $j \in [n]$, if $y[j] = 1$, insert edge $e_1^{(j)}$ at time step $m_g n + j$ (otherwise, do nothing at that time step).

For each query vector $q^{(\ell)}$, where $\ell \in [k]$, we first have an *insertion phase*, where for all $j \in [n]$, if $q^{(\ell)}[j] = 1$, then we insert edge $e_2^{(j)}$ into $H^{(j)}$ at time $t_0 + 2(\ell - 1)n + j$; otherwise, we do nothing at that time step. For all but the last query, the insertion phase is followed by the *deletion phase*, where the edges that were inserted in the insertion phase are deleted over n time steps.

Correctness. If $y, y' \in \{0, 1\}^n$ are neighboring input vectors differing in coordinate i^* , then the resulting graph sequences for (y, Q) and (y', Q) differ only in the absence or presence of the initial insertion of $e_1^{(i^*)}$. Thus, they are event-level, edge-neighboring. The insertion phase for the ℓ th query ends at time step $t_\ell = (m_g + 2\ell)n$. At that time step, for all $i \in [n]$, the copy $H^{(i)}$ contains both $e_1^{(i)}$ and $e_2^{(i)}$ if and only if $y[i] = q^{(\ell)}[i] = 1$. Thus, $f(G_{t_\ell}) = f(G_{t_0}) + w \cdot y \cdot q^{(\ell)}$.

Analysis. The initialization phase uses $(m_g + 1)n$ time steps. Each of the k insertion phases and $k - 1$ deletion phases uses n time steps. Thus, $T = (m_g + 2k)n$. There are $n \cdot n_g$ nodes in the graph. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.4. Let c_1, c_2 be as in Lemma 5.6. Given T and N , set $n = \min\left(\sqrt{\frac{T}{4c_1}}, \frac{T}{2m_g}, \frac{N}{n_g}\right)$. Then for each $y \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and k -query sequence Q , where $k = c_1 n$, the transformation in Lemma 5.7 gives a sequence with at most $2c_1 n^2 + m_g n \leq T$ time steps and at most N nodes. We can add dummy nodes and time steps to get a sequence of exactly T time steps and N nodes. If we can estimate $f(G_t)$ up to error α at all time steps with probability at least $1 - 0.01$, then with the same probability, we can estimate $y \cdot q^{(m)} = \frac{f(G_{t_w}) - f(G_{t_0})}{w}$ up to error $\frac{2\alpha}{w}$ for all $m \in [k]$. Thus, $\alpha \geq w \cdot \sqrt{n} \cdot \frac{c_2}{2} = \Omega\left(w \cdot \min\left(T^{1/4}, \sqrt{\frac{T}{m_g}}, \sqrt{\frac{N}{n_g}}\right)\right)$. \square

5.1.1 Event-Level Lower Bounds for Specific Problems

Theorem 5.4 yields the following corollary for MaximumMatching, ConnectedComponents, HighDegree(τ), and DegreeHist.

Corollary 5.8 (Event-level lower bounds). *Let $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f \in \{f_{MM}, f_{CC}, f_{\geq \tau}, f_{\text{degHist}}\}$. Then, for all sufficiently large $T, N \in \mathbb{N}$, every event-level, $(1, 1/3)$ -edge DP algorithm which is $(\alpha, 0.01)$ -accurate for f on all dynamic graph sequences with N nodes and length T has error $\alpha = \Omega\left(\min\left(T^{1/4}, \sqrt{N}\right)\right)$.*

Proof. Using the gadgets illustrated in Figure 5.1 in Theorem 5.4 gives the stated bound for MaximumMatching, ConnectedComponents, and HighDegree(1). The lower bound for DegreeHist is inherited from the lower bound on HighDegree(1): one of the entries in the degree histogram of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is the number of isolated nodes, which is $|V| - f_{\geq 1}(G)$.

Finally, the lower bound for $f_{\geq \tau}$ for $\tau \geq 2$ is inherited from the lower bound for $f_{\geq 1}$. Fix $\tau \geq 2$. We can reduce from fully dynamic $f_{\geq 1}$ to fully dynamic $f_{\geq \tau}$ as follows. Let $\mathcal{S} = (G_1, \dots, G_T)$ be a dynamic graph sequence on vertex set V of size $N \geq 2$. We construct a new graph sequence \mathcal{S}_τ on nodes $V \cup U$, where U is disjoint from V and $|U| = \tau - 1$. We initialize \mathcal{S}_τ by inserting a complete bipartite graph on $U \times V$ and a complete graph on U . This takes $t_0 = (\tau - 1)(N + \frac{\tau - 2}{2})$ time steps. Then we proceed with the same updates on V as in \mathcal{S} . The resulting sequence \mathcal{S}_τ is on graphs with $N_\tau = N + \tau$ nodes and has length $T_\tau = t_0 + T$. Let $\mathcal{S}_\tau = (H_1, \dots, H_{T_\tau})$.

In H_{t_0} (at the end of initialization), all vertices from U have degree $\tau + |V| - 2 \geq \tau$, and all vertices from V have degree $\tau - 1$. For all $t \in [T]$, we have $f_{\geq 1}(G_t) = f_{\geq \tau}(H_{t_0+T}) - (\tau - 1)$. This transformation preserves event-level (as well as item-level) edge-neighboring relationship. Since $N_\tau = \Theta(N)$ and $T_\tau = \Theta(T)$, the additive error lower bound for $f_{\geq 1}$ applies to $f_{\geq \tau}$. \square

5.2 Framework for Item-Level Lower Bounds

In this section, we state and prove Theorem 5.9 that encapsulates our lower bound framework for event-level DP. We also apply our framework to specific problems in Section 5.2.1.

Theorem 5.9 (Item-level lower bound for 1-edge distinguishing). *Let $f : \mathcal{G}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an additive function with a 1-edge distinguishing gadget of size (n_g, m_g) and weight w for some $n_g, m_g, w \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, $\delta \in [0, 1)$, and sufficiently large $T, N \in \mathbb{N}$, every item-level, (ε, δ) -edge DP algorithm which is $(\alpha, \frac{1}{3})$ -accurate for f on all dynamic graph sequences with N nodes and length T satisfies*

1. if $\delta > 0$ and $\delta = o(\frac{1}{T})$, then $\alpha = \Omega\left(w \cdot \min\left(\frac{T^{1/3}}{\varepsilon^{2/3} \log^{2/3} T}, \frac{T}{m_g}, \frac{N}{n_g}\right)\right)$.
2. if $\delta = 0$, then $\alpha = \Omega\left(w \cdot \min\left(\sqrt{\frac{T}{\varepsilon}}, \frac{T}{m_g}, \frac{N}{n_g}\right)\right)$.

We prove Theorem 5.9 by reducing from the Marginals problem (Definition 3.12).

Lemma 5.10 (Reduction from Marginals for item-level). *Let $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $Y \in \{\{0, 1\}^d\}^n$. Then for all $n_g, m_g, w \in \mathbb{N}$ and each additive function $f : \mathcal{G}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with a 1-edge distinguishing gadget of size (n_g, m_g) and weight w , there exists a transformation from Y to a dynamic graph sequence (G_1, \dots, G_T) of N -node graphs, where $T = (m_g + 2d)n$ and $N = n_g n$, such that*

- The transformations of neighboring $Y, Y' \in \{\{0, 1\}^d\}^n$ give item-level, edge-neighboring graph sequences;
- Let $t_0 = (m_g + 1)n$. For all $j \in [d]$ and $t_j = (m_g + 2j)n$, we have $f(G_{t_j}) - f(G_0) = w \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i[j]$.

Proof. Let $H = (V', E')$ and (H, e_1) be a 1-edge distinguishing gadget of size (n_g, m_g) of weight w for f . W.l.o.g. assume $e_1 \notin E'$. We define a graph sequence on $n \cdot n_g$ nodes as follows: In an *initialization phase*, we build n copies of H , denoted $H^{(1)}, \dots, H^{(n)}$, using $m_g n$ time steps. For a vertex pair e in H and $i \in [n]$, let $e^{(i)}$ denote the copy of e in $H^{(i)}$.

For all $j \in [d]$, we first have an *insertion phase*, where for all $i \in [n]$, if $Y_i[j] = 1$, then we insert $e_1^{(i)}$ into $H^{(i)}$ at time $m_g n + 2(j - 1)n + i$; otherwise, we do nothing at that time step. For all but the last phase, the

insertion phase is followed by a *deletion phase*, where the edges that were inserted in the insertion phase are deleted.

Correctness. If Y and Y' are neighboring input data sets differing in the row $i^* \in [n]$, then the resulting graph sequences differ only in insertions and deletions related to $e_1^{(i^*)}$. Thus, they are item-level, edge-neighboring. The insertion phase for the j th query ends at time step $t_j = (m_g + 1)n + 2(j - 1)n + n$. At that time steps, the $H^{(i)}$ contains $e_1^{(i)}$ if and only if $Y_i[j] = 1$. Thus, $f(G_{t_j}) = f(G_{t_0}) + w \cdot \sum_{i \in [n]} Y_i[j]$.

Analysis. The initialization phase uses $(m_g + 1)n$ time steps. Each of the d insertion phases and $d - 1$ deletion phases uses n time steps. Thus, $T = (m_g + 2d)n$. There are $N = n \cdot n_g$ nodes in the graph. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.9. Case $\delta > 0$: Given T and N , set $d = \lfloor (T\varepsilon \log T\varepsilon)^{2/3} \rfloor$ and $n = \lfloor \min\left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{6\varepsilon \log d}, \frac{T}{2m_g}, \frac{N}{n_g}\right) \rfloor$. The reduction from Lemma 5.10 gives a sequence with at most N nodes and $2nd + T/2$ updates, where

$$2nd \leq \frac{d^{3/2}}{3\varepsilon \log d} \leq \frac{T\varepsilon \log(T\varepsilon)}{3\varepsilon \cdot \frac{2}{3} \log(T\varepsilon \log(T\varepsilon))} \leq \frac{T}{2}.$$

We can add dummy nodes and dummy time steps to get a dynamic N -node graph sequence of length T . If we can estimate $f(G_t)$ with error up to α at all time steps with probability at least $2/3$, then for all $j \in [d]$, we can estimate the j th marginal given by $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} Y_i[j] = \frac{f(G_{t_j}) - f(G_{t_0})}{nw}$ up to error $\frac{2\alpha}{nw}$. Lemma 3.13 gives $\alpha = \Omega\left(wn \cdot \min\left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{n\varepsilon \log d}, 1\right)\right) = \Omega\left(w \cdot \min\left(\frac{T^{1/3}}{\varepsilon^{2/3} \log^{2/3} T}, \frac{T}{m_g}, \frac{N}{n_g}\right)\right)$.

Case $\delta = 0$: Given T and N , set $d = \lfloor \sqrt{T\varepsilon} \rfloor$ and $n = \lfloor \min\left(\frac{T}{(m_g+1)}, \frac{N}{n_g}, \frac{d}{4\varepsilon}\right) \rfloor$. The reduction from Lemma 5.10 gives a sequence with at most N nodes and at most T updates, and we can add dummy nodes and dummy time steps to get a dynamic N -node graph sequence of length T . By Lemma 3.13, we have $\alpha = \Omega\left(wn \cdot \min\left(\frac{d}{n\varepsilon}, 1\right)\right) = \Omega\left(w \cdot \min\left(\sqrt{\frac{T}{\varepsilon}}, \frac{T}{m_g}, \frac{N}{n_g}\right)\right)$. \square

5.2.1 Item-Level Lower Bounds for Specific Problems

Using the 2-edge distinguishing gadgets from Figure 5.1 together with Lemma 5.2 on converting 2-edge distinguishing gadgets to 1-edge distinguishing, we immediately get the following corollary for **MaximumMatching**, **ConnectedComponents**, and **HighDegree(1)** from Theorem 5.9. By the same reasoning as in the proof of Corollary 5.8, this lower bound also applies to **DegreeHist** and to **HighDegree(τ)** for $\tau \geq 2$.

Corollary 5.11 (Item-level lower bounds). *Let $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f \in \{f_{MM}, f_{CC}, f_{\geq \tau}, f_{\text{degHist}}\}$. Then, for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, $\delta \in [0, 1)$, and sufficiently large $T, N, D \in \mathbb{N}$, every item-level, (ε, δ) -edge DP algorithm which is $(\alpha, \frac{1}{3})$ -accurate for f on all dynamic graph sequences with N nodes and length T satisfies*

1. if $\delta > 0$ and $\delta = o(\frac{1}{T})$, then $\alpha = \Omega\left(\min\left(\frac{T^{1/3}}{\varepsilon^{2/3} \log^{2/3} T}, T, N\right)\right)$.
2. if $\delta = 0$, then $\alpha = \Omega\left(\min\left(\sqrt{\frac{T}{\varepsilon}}, T, N\right)\right)$.

Next, we prove the item-level lower bound for **EdgeCount**. It cannot be obtained as a direct corollary of Theorem 5.9 because the gadgets we use for this problem overlap, but otherwise it follows a similar proof strategy and yields a similar-looking (albeit not exactly the same) bound.

Theorem 5.12 (Item-level lower bound for edge count). *For all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, $\delta \in [0, 1)$, and sufficiently large $T, N \in \mathbb{N}$, every item-level, (ε, δ) -edge DP algorithm for f_{edges} which is $(\alpha, \frac{1}{3})$ -accurate on all dynamic graph sequences with N nodes and length T satisfies*

1. if $\delta > 0$ and $\delta = o(\frac{1}{T})$, then $\alpha = \Omega\left(\min\left(\frac{T^{1/3}}{\varepsilon^{2/3} \log^{2/3} T}, N^2\right)\right)$.
2. if $\delta = 0$, then $\alpha = \Omega\left(\min\left(\sqrt{\frac{T}{\varepsilon}}, N^2\right)\right)$.

As in the general framework of Theorem 5.9, we reduce from Marginals (recall Definition 3.12).

Lemma 5.13 (Reduction from Marginals to EdgeCount). *Let $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $Y \in \{\{0, 1\}^d\}^n$. Then there exists a transformation from Y to a dynamic graph sequence (G_1, \dots, G_T) of N -node graphs, where $T = 2nd$ and $N = \lceil \sqrt{n} \rceil$, such that*

- *The transformations of neighboring $Y, Y' \in \{\{0, 1\}^d\}^n$ give item-level, edge-neighboring graph sequences;*
- *For all $j \in [d]$, we have $f_{\text{edges}}(G_{t_j}) = \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i[j]$, where $t_j = (2j - 1)n$.*

Proof. We define a set V of $\lceil \sqrt{n} \rceil$ nodes. V has at least n node pairs. We give them an arbitrary order $e_1, \dots, e_{\lceil \sqrt{n} \rceil^2}$. In particular, there exist the node pairs e_1, \dots, e_n .

For all $j \in [d]$ and all $i \in [n]$, if $Y_i[j] = 1$, then we insert e_i at time $2(j - 1)n + i$; otherwise, we do nothing at that time step. For all $j \in [d - 1]$ and all $i \in [n]$, we delete e_i at time $(2j - 1)n + i$.

Correctness. If Y and Y' are neighboring input data sets differing in row i^* , then the resulting graph sequences for Y and Y' differ only in insertions and deletions related to e_{i^*} . Thus, they are item-level, edge-neighboring. At time step $t_j = (2j - 1)n$, the graph G_{t_j} includes an edge e_i if and only if $Y_i[j] = 1$. Thus, the total edge count is equal to $\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i[j]$. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.12. Case $\delta > 0$: Given T and N , set $d = \lfloor (T\varepsilon \log T\varepsilon)^{2/3} \rfloor$ and $n = \lfloor \min\left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{3\varepsilon \log d}, N^2\right) \rfloor$. The reduction from Lemma 5.13 gives a sequence with at most N nodes and $2nd$ updates, where

$$2nd = \frac{2d^{3/2}}{3\varepsilon \log d} \leq \frac{2T\varepsilon \log(T\varepsilon)}{3\varepsilon \cdot \frac{2}{3} \log(T\varepsilon \log(T\varepsilon))} \leq T.$$

We can add dummy nodes and dummy time steps to get a dynamic N -node graph sequence of length T . If we can estimate $f_{\text{edges}}(G_t)$ with error up to α at all time steps with probability at least $2/3$, then for all $j \in [d]$, we can estimate the j th marginal given by $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} Y_i[j] = \frac{1}{n} f_{\text{edges}}(G_{t_j})$ up to error $\frac{\alpha}{n}$. Lemma 3.13 gives $\alpha = \Omega\left(n \cdot \min\left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{n\varepsilon \log d}, 1\right)\right) = \Omega\left(\min\left(\frac{T^{1/3}}{\varepsilon^{2/3} \log^{2/3} T}, N^2\right)\right)$.

Case $\delta = 0$: Given T and N , set $d = \lfloor \sqrt{T\varepsilon} \rfloor$ and $n = \lfloor \min\left(N^2, \frac{d}{2\varepsilon}\right) \rfloor$. The reduction from Lemma 5.13 gives a sequence with at most N nodes and at most T updates, and we can add dummy nodes and dummy time steps to get a dynamic N -node graph sequence of length T . By Lemma 3.13, we have $\alpha = \Omega\left(n \cdot \min\left(\frac{d}{n\varepsilon}, 1\right)\right) = \Omega\left(\min\left(\sqrt{\frac{T}{\varepsilon}}, N^2\right)\right)$. \square

Remark 5.14. DegreeList inherits lower bounds from EdgeCount, except that N gets replaced with \sqrt{N} . This holds both for event-level and item-level edge DP. This is because there is a direct reduction from fully dynamic f_{edges} to fully dynamic DegreeList that converts each dynamic graph sequences \mathcal{S} on N nodes of length T to a dynamic graph sequences \mathcal{S}' on $\binom{N}{2} + 1$ nodes of the same length. Given a vertex set V of \mathcal{S} , the vertex set V' of \mathcal{S}' is defined as $\{u\} \cup \{v_e : e \in V \times V\}$. Then each update on an edge e in \mathcal{S} is replaced with the same time of update on the edge (u, v_e) in \mathcal{S}' . At every time step, the degree of u in \mathcal{S}' is equal to the edge count in \mathcal{S} . Moreover, this reduction preserves event-level and item-level neighbor relationships.

5.3 Framework for Event-Level Output-Determined Lower Bounds

In this section, we show better lower bounds for a special class of algorithms, called *output-determined*, namely, those that depend only on the output sequence of the true function: If two sequences have the same output sequences, then the algorithm behaves in (roughly) the same way. Note that all algorithms for $f_{\text{degHist}}, f_{\geq \tau}, f_{MM}, f_{CC}$ proposed in this work are in that class. The lower bounds we present in this section show that for $f_{\text{degHist}}, f_{\geq \tau}, f_{MM}, f_{CC}$, event-level privacy for output-determined algorithms is essentially as hard as item-level privacy, thus, our algorithms are essentially optimal within the class of output-determined algorithms. Hence, if there exist algorithms that have a polynomially better accuracy for event-level, they must use more information about the input sequences, than just the true function values.

Definition 5.15 (Output-determined algorithms [HSS24]). Let $\gamma \in [0, 1]$. Let f be a function on \mathcal{U}^T . An algorithm $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{U}^T \rightarrow \text{range}(\mathcal{A})$ is (f, γ) -output-determined if, for every two sequences $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2 \in \mathcal{U}^T$ satisfying $f(\mathcal{S}_1) = f(\mathcal{S}_2)$ and for all $\text{Out} \in \text{range}(\mathcal{A})$,

$$\Pr[\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{S}_1) \in \text{Out}] \leq \Pr[\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{S}_2) \in \text{Out}] + \gamma.$$

The lower bounds are proved via reductions from the 1-way marginals problem (see Definition 3.12).

Theorem 5.16. Let $f : \mathcal{G}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an additive function with a 2-edge distinguishing gadget of size (n_g, m_g) and weight w for some $n_g, m_g, w \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ and $\gamma, \delta \in (0, 1)$ with $\gamma \leq \delta$, and sufficiently large $T, N \in \mathbb{N}$, every (f, γ) -output-determined event-level (ε, δ) -edge-DP algorithm which is $(\alpha, \frac{1}{3})$ -accurate for f on all dynamic graph sequences with N nodes and length T satisfies

- if $\delta > 0$ and $\delta = o(\frac{1}{N})$, then $\alpha = \Omega\left(w \cdot \min\left(\frac{T^{1/3}}{\varepsilon^{2/3} \log^{2/3} T}, \frac{T}{m_g}, \frac{N}{n_g}\right)\right)$.
- if $\delta = 0$, then $\alpha = \Omega\left(\min\left(\sqrt{\frac{T}{\varepsilon}}, \frac{T}{m_g}, \frac{N}{n_g}\right)\right)$.

Proof. Let n, d be in \mathbb{N} to be fixed later. We reduce from Marginals(n, d). Let $H = (V', E')$ and (H, e_1, e_2) be a 2-edge distinguishing gadget of size (n_g, m_g) of weight w for f . W.l.o.g. assume $e_1, e_2 \notin E'$. Given an input Y to Marginals(n, d), we define a graph sequence $\mathcal{S}(Y) = (G_1, \dots, G_T)$ with $n \cdot n_g$ nodes and length $T = (m_g + 2d)n$ as follows: In the *initialization phase*, we build n copies of H , denoted $H^{(1)}, \dots, H^{(n)}$, using $m_g n$ time steps. For a vertex pair e in H and $i \in [n]$, let $e^{(i)}$ denote the copy of e in $H^{(i)}$. For all $i \in [n]$, we insert edge $e_1^{(i)}$ at time step $m_g n + i$. We set $t_0 = (m_g + 1)n$ and record $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{S}(Y))_{t_0} = a_0$.

For each $j \in [d]$, we first have an *insertion phase*, where for all $i \in [n]$, if $Y_i[j] = 1$, then we insert $e_2^{(i)}$ into $H^{(i)}$ at time $(m_g + 1)n + 2(j - 1)n + i$; otherwise, we do nothing at that time step. We then set $t_j = (m_g + 1)n + 2(j - 1)n + n$ and $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{S}(Y))_{t_j} = a_j$. We return $(a_j - a_0)/(wn)$ as an estimate for the j th marginal. For all but the last phase, the insertion phase is followed by a *deletion phase*, where the edges that were inserted in the insertion phase are deleted.

Privacy. Let Y' be an input to Marginals(n, d) with $Y \sim Y'$, such that $Y_{i^*} \neq Y'_{i^*}$ for some $i^* \in [n]$. Let X be the dynamic graph sequence which is equal to $G(Y)$, except that the edge $e_1^{(i^*)}$ is never inserted. Then $\mathcal{S}(Y)$ and X are event-level edge-neighboring. Similarly, let X' be the same graph sequence as $\mathcal{S}(Y')$, except that $e_1^{(i^*)}$ is never inserted. Then $G(Y')$ and X' are event-level edge-neighboring. Sequences X and X' differ only in edge insertions of $e_2^{(i^*)}$. However, for both X and X' , the edge $e_1^{(i^*)}$ is always missing. Thus, X and X' produce the same output sequences for f . Then, for all $U \in \text{range}(\mathcal{A})$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{S}(Y)) \in U] &\leq e^\varepsilon \Pr[\mathcal{A}(X) \in U] + \delta \\ &\leq e^\varepsilon \Pr[\mathcal{A}(X') \in U] + \delta + \gamma \\ &\leq e^{2\varepsilon} \Pr[\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{S}(Y')) \in U] + \delta(1 + e^\varepsilon) + \gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\gamma \leq \delta$, the resulting algorithm for Marginals is $(2\varepsilon, \delta(2 + e^\varepsilon))$ -DP.

Accuracy. Let $\mathcal{S}(Y) = (G_1, \dots, G_T)$. At time t_j in $\mathcal{S}(Y)$, both $e_1^{(i)}$ and $e_2^{(i)}$ are in $H^{(i)}$ if and only if $Y_i[j] = 1$. Thus, $f(G_{t_j}) = f(G_{t_0}) + w \cdot \sum_{i \in [n]} Y_i[j]$. If \mathcal{A} has error at most α at all time steps with probability at least $1 - \beta$, then the resulting algorithm for marginals has error at most $\eta = \frac{2\alpha}{nw}$ with the same probability.

Parameter settings.

Case $\delta > 0$: Given T and N , set $d = \lfloor (T\varepsilon \log T\varepsilon)^{2/3} \rfloor$ and $n = \lfloor \min\left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{6\varepsilon \log d}, \frac{T}{2m_g}, \frac{N}{n_g}\right) \rfloor$. The construction above gives a sequence with at most N nodes and $2nd + T/2$ updates, where

$$2nd \leq \frac{d^{3/2}}{3\varepsilon \log d} \leq \frac{T\varepsilon \log(T\varepsilon)}{3\varepsilon \cdot \frac{2}{3} \log(T\varepsilon \log(T\varepsilon))} \leq \frac{T}{2}.$$

We can add dummy nodes and dummy time steps to get a dynamic N -node graph sequence of length T . If we can estimate $f(G_t)$ with error up to α at all time steps with probability at least $2/3$, then for all

$j \in [d]$, we can estimate the j th marginal given by $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in n} Y_i[j] = \frac{f(G_{t_j}) - f(G_{t_0})}{nw}$ up to error $\frac{2\alpha}{nw}$ with the same probability. Lemma 3.13 gives $\alpha = \Omega\left(wn \cdot \min\left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{n\varepsilon \log d}, 1\right)\right) = \Omega\left(w \cdot \min\left(\frac{T^{1/3}}{\varepsilon^{2/3} \log^{2/3} T}, \frac{T}{m_g}, \frac{N}{n_g}\right)\right)$.

Case $\delta = 0$: Given T and N , set $d = \lfloor \sqrt{T\varepsilon} \rfloor$ and $n = \lfloor \min\left(\frac{T}{(m_g+1)}, \frac{N}{n_g}, \frac{d}{4\varepsilon}\right) \rfloor$. The construction above gives a sequence with at most N nodes and at most T updates, and we can add dummy nodes and dummy time steps to get a dynamic N -node graph sequence of length T . By Lemma 3.13, we have $\alpha = \Omega\left(wn \cdot \min\left(\frac{d}{n\varepsilon}, 1\right)\right) = \Omega\left(w \cdot \min\left(\sqrt{\frac{T}{\varepsilon}}, \frac{T}{m_g}, \frac{N}{n_g}\right)\right)$. \square

5.3.1 Output-Determined Lower Bounds for Specific Problems

Using the 2-edge distinguishing gadgets from Figure 5.1 in Theorem 5.16, we immediately get the following corollary for `MaximumMatching`, `ConnectedComponents`, and `HighDegree(1)` from Theorem 5.9. By the same reasoning as in the proof of Corollary 5.8, this lower bound holds for `DegreeHist` and `HighDegree(τ)` for $\tau \geq 2$.

Corollary 5.17 (Output-determined event-level lower bounds). *Let $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f \in \{f_{MM}, f_{CC}, f_{\geq \tau}, f_{\text{degHist}}\}$. Then, for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, $\gamma, \delta \in [0, 1]$ with $\gamma \leq \delta$, and sufficiently large $T, N, D \in \mathbb{N}$, every (f, γ) -output-determined event-level, (ε, δ) -edge DP algorithm which is $(\alpha, \frac{1}{3})$ -accurate for f on all dynamic graph sequences with N nodes and length T satisfies*

1. if $\delta > 0$ and $\delta = o(\frac{1}{T})$, then $\alpha = \Omega\left(\min\left(\frac{T^{1/3}}{\varepsilon^{2/3} \log^{2/3} T}, T, N\right)\right)$.
2. if $\delta = 0$, then $\alpha = \Omega\left(\min\left(\sqrt{\frac{T}{\varepsilon}}, T, N\right)\right)$.

References

- [ALJ20] Faraz Ahmed, Alex X. Liu, and Rong Jin. Publishing social network graph eigenspectrum with privacy guarantees. *IEEE Transactions on Network Science and Engineering*, 7(2):892–906, 2020.
- [AU19] Raman Arora and Jalaj Upadhyay. On differentially private graph sparsification and applications. 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 13378–13389, 2019.
- [BBDS12] Jeremiah Blocki, Avrim Blum, Anupam Datta, and Or Sheffet. The Johnson-Lindenstrauss transform itself preserves differential privacy. In *Proceedings, IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 410–419, 2012.
- [BBDS13] Jeremiah Blocki, Avrim Blum, Anupam Datta, and Or Sheffet. Differentially private data analysis of social networks via restricted sensitivity. In Robert D. Kleinberg, editor, *Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science, ITCS ’13, Berkeley, CA, USA, January 9–12, 2013*, pages 87–96. ACM, 2013.
- [BCS15] Christian Borgs, Jennifer T. Chayes, and Adam D. Smith. Private graphon estimation for sparse graphs. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, pages 1369–1377, 2015.
- [BCSZ18] Christian Borgs, Jennifer T. Chayes, Adam D. Smith, and Ilias Zadik. Revealing network structure, confidentially: Improved rates for node-private graphon estimation. In *Proceedings, IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 533–543, 2018.

- [BDMN05] Avrim Blum, Cynthia Dwork, Frank McSherry, and Kobbi Nissim. Practical privacy: the SuLQ framework. In Chen Li, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-fourth ACM SIGACT-SIGMOD-SIGART Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, June 13-15, 2005, Baltimore, Maryland, USA*, pages 128–138. ACM, 2005.
- [BFM⁺13] Jean Bolot, Nadia Fawaz, S. Muthukrishnan, Aleksandar Nikolov, and Nina Taft. Private decayed predicate sums on streams. In *International Conference on Database Theory (ICDT)*, page 284–295, 2013.
- [BGM22] Jeremiah Blocki, Elena Grigorescu, and Tamalika Mukherjee. Privately estimating graph parameters in sublinear time. In *Proceedings, International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP)*, volume 229, pages 26:1–26:19, 2022.
- [BS16] Mark Bun and Thomas Steinke. Concentrated differential privacy: Simplifications, extensions, and lower bounds. In *Proceedings, Theory of Cryptography Conference (TCC)*, volume 9985, pages 635–658, 2016.
- [BUV18] Mark Bun, Jonathan Ullman, and Salil Vadhan. Fingerprinting codes and the price of approximate differential privacy. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 47(5):1888–1938, 2018.
- [CLN⁺24] Edith Cohen, Xin Lyu, Jelani Nelson, Tamás Sarlós, and Uri Stemmer. Lower bounds for differential privacy under continual observation and online threshold queries. Cryptology ePrint Archive, Paper 2024/373, 2024. <https://eprint.iacr.org/2024/373>.
- [CSS11] T.-H. Hubert Chan, Elaine Shi, and Dawn Song. Private and continual release of statistics. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst. Secur.*, 14(3):26:1–26:24, 2011.
- [CZ13] Shixi Chen and Shuigeng Zhou. Recursive mechanism: towards node differential privacy and unrestricted joins. In Kenneth A. Ross, Divesh Srivastava, and Dimitris Papadias, editors, *Proceedings of the ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD 2013, New York, NY, USA, June 22-27, 2013*, pages 653–664. ACM, 2013.
- [De12] Anindya De. Lower bounds in differential privacy. In *Proceedings, Theory of Cryptography Conference (TCC)*, volume 7194, pages 321–338, 2012.
- [DKM⁺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.
- [DL09] Cynthia Dwork and Jing Lei. Differential privacy and robust statistics. In *Proc. 41st STOC*, pages 371–380, 2009.
- [DLL16] Wei-Yen Day, Ninghui Li, and Min Lyu. Publishing graph degree distribution with node differential privacy. In Fatma Özcan, Georgia Koutrika, and Sam Madden, editors, *Proceedings of the 2016 International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD Conference 2016, San Francisco, CA, USA, June 26 - July 01, 2016*, pages 123–138. ACM, 2016.
- [DLR⁺22] Laxman Dhulipala, Quanquan C. Liu, Sofya Raskhodnikova, Jessica Shi, Julian Shun, and Shangdi Yu. Differential privacy from locally adjustable graph algorithms: k-core decomposition, low out-degree ordering, and densest subgraphs. In *Proceedings, IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 754–765, 2022.
- [DLY23] Wei Dong, Qiyao Luo, and Ke Yi. Continual observation under user-level differential privacy. In *44th SP*, pages 2190–2207, 2023.

- [DMNS06] Cynthia Dwork, Frank McSherry, Kobbi Nissim, and Adam D. Smith. Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis. In *Proc. 3rd TCC*, volume 3876, pages 265–284. Springer, 2006.
- [DMNS16] Cynthia Dwork, Frank McSherry, Kobbi Nissim, and Adam D. Smith. Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis. *J. Priv. Confidentiality*, 7(3):17–51, 2016.
- [DMS⁺21] Ameya Daigavane, Gagan Madan, Aditya Sinha, Abhradeep Guha Thakurta, Gaurav Aggarwal, and Prateek Jain. Node-level differentially private graph neural networks, 2021.
- [DMT07] Cynthia Dwork, Frank McSherry, and Kunal Talwar. The price of privacy and the limits of LP decoding. In *Proc. 39th STOC*, pages 85–94, 2007.
- [DN03] Irit Dinur and Kobbi Nissim. Revealing information while preserving privacy. In *Proc. 22nd SIGACT-SIGMOD-SIGART*, pages 202–210, 2003.
- [DNPR10] Cynthia Dwork, Moni Naor, Toniann Pitassi, and Guy N. Rothblum. Differential privacy under continual observation. In *Proceedings, ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 715–724, 2010.
- [DNRR15] Cynthia Dwork, Moni Naor, Omer Reingold, and Guy N. Rothblum. Pure differential privacy for rectangle queries via private partitions. In Tetsu Iwata and Jung Hee Cheon, editors, *Advances in Cryptology - ASIACRYPT 2015 - 21st International Conference on the Theory and Application of Cryptology and Information Security, Auckland, New Zealand, November 29 - December 3, 2015, Proceedings, Part II*, volume 9453 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 735–751. Springer, 2015.
- [DRV10] Cynthia Dwork, Guy N Rothblum, and Salil Vadhan. Boosting and differential privacy. In *2010 IEEE 51st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 51–60, 2010.
- [DZBJ18] Xiaofeng Ding, Xiaodong Zhang, Zhifeng Bao, and Hai Jin. Privacy-preserving triangle counting in large graphs. In *Proceedings of the ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM)*, pages 1283–1292. ACM, 2018.
- [ELRS23] Talya Eden, Quanquan C. Liu, Sofya Raskhodnikova, and Adam D. Smith. Triangle counting with local edge differential privacy. In *Proc. 50th ICALP*, pages 52:1–52:21, 2023.
- [EMM⁺23] Alessandro Epasto, Jieming Mao, Andres Muñoz Medina, Vahab Mirrokni, Sergei Vassilvitskii, and Peilin Zhong. Differentially private continual releases of streaming frequency moment estimations. In *Proceedings, Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science (ITCS)*, volume 251, pages 48:1–48:24, 2023.
- [FHO21] Hendrik Fichtenberger, Monika Henzinger, and Lara Ost. Differentially private algorithms for graphs under continual observation. In Petra Mutzel, Rasmus Pagh, and Grzegorz Herman, editors, *29th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms, ESA 2021, September 6-8, 2021, Lisbon, Portugal (Virtual Conference)*, volume 204 of *LIPICs*, pages 42:1–42:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021.
- [FHU23] Hendrik Fichtenberger, Monika Henzinger, and Jalaj Upadhyay. Constant matters: Fine-grained error bound on differentially private continual observation. In Andreas Krause, Emma Brunskill, Kyunghyun Cho, Barbara Engelhardt, Sivan Sabato, and Jonathan Scarlett, editors, *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2023, 23-29 July 2023, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 10072–10092. PMLR, 2023.

- [GKNM23] Badih Ghazi, Ravi Kumar, Jelani Nelson, and Pasin Manurangsi. Private counting of distinct and k -occurring items in time windows. In *Proceedings, Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science (ITCS)*, volume 251, pages 55:1–55:24, 2023.
- [GRU12] Anupam Gupta, Aaron Roth, and Jonathan Ullman. Iterative constructions and private data release. In *Proceedings, Theory of Cryptography Conference (TCC)*, volume 7194, pages 339–356, 2012.
- [HLMJ09] Michael Hay, Chao Li, Gerome Miklau, and David D. Jensen. Accurate estimation of the degree distribution of private networks. In *Proceedings, SIAM International Conference on Data Mining (ICML)*, pages 169–178, 2009.
- [HSS24] Monika Henzinger, A. R. Sricharan, and Teresa Anna Steiner. Private counting of distinct elements in the turnstile model and extensions. In *Proc. 28th RANDOM*, 2024.
- [HT10] Moritz Hardt and Kunal Talwar. On the geometry of differential privacy. In *Proceedings, ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 705–714, 2010.
- [HUU23] Monika Henzinger, Jalaj Upadhyay, and Sarvagya Upadhyay. Almost tight error bounds on differentially private continual counting. In Nikhil Bansal and Viswanath Nagarajan, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2023, Florence, Italy, January 22-25, 2023*, pages 5003–5039. SIAM, 2023.
- [JKR⁺23] Palak Jain, Iden Kalemaj, Sofya Raskhodnikova, Satchit Sivakumar, and Adam D. Smith. Counting distinct elements in the turnstile model with differential privacy under continual observation. In *Proc. 36th NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [JRSS23] Palak Jain, Sofya Raskhodnikova, Satchit Sivakumar, and Adam D. Smith. The price of differential privacy under continual observation. In *Proc. 40th ICML*, pages 14654–14678, 2023.
- [JSW24] Palak Jain, Adam Smith, and Connor Wagaman. Time-aware projections: Truly node-private graph statistics under continual observation. *CoRR*, abs/2403.04630, 2024.
- [KNRS13] Shiva Prasad Kasiviswanathan, Kobbi Nissim, Sofya Raskhodnikova, and Adam D. Smith. Analyzing graphs with node differential privacy. In Amit Sahai, editor, *Theory of Cryptography - 10th Theory of Cryptography Conference, TCC 2013, Tokyo, Japan, March 3-6, 2013. Proceedings*, volume 7785 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 457–476. Springer, 2013.
- [KRST23] Iden Kalemaj, Sofya Raskhodnikova, Adam D. Smith, and Charalampos E. Tsourakakis. Node-differentially private estimation of the number of connected components. In Floris Geerts, Hung Q. Ngo, and Stavros Sintos, editors, *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGAI Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, PODS 2023, Seattle, WA, USA, June 18-23, 2023*, pages 183–194. ACM, 2023.
- [KRSY14] Vishesh Karwa, Sofya Raskhodnikova, Adam D. Smith, and Grigory Yaroslavtsev. Private analysis of graph structure. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.*, 39(3):22:1–22:33, 2014.
- [KS12] Vishesh Karwa and Aleksandra B. Slavkovic. Differentially private graphical degree sequences and synthetic graphs. In *Privacy in Statistical Databases*, volume 7556, pages 273–285. Springer, 2012.
- [LM14] Wentian Lu and Gerome Miklau. Exponential random graph estimation under differential privacy. In *ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 921–930. ACM, 2014.
- [LML20] Ganghong Liu, Xuebin Ma, and Wuyungerile Li. Publishing node strength distribution with node differential privacy. *IEEE Access*, 8:217642–217650, 2020.

- [MCB15] Yvonne Mülle, Chris Clifton, and Klemens Böhm. Privacy-integrated graph clustering through differential privacy. In *Proceedings of the Workshops of the EDBT/ICDT 2015 Joint Conference*, volume 1330, pages 247–254, 2015.
- [MMNW11] Darakhshan Mir, S. Muthukrishnan, Aleksandar Nikolov, and Rebecca N. Wright. Pan-private algorithms via statistics on sketches. In *Proceedings, ACM Symposium on Principles of Database Systems (PODS)*, page 37–48, 2011.
- [NIR16] Hiep H. Nguyen, Abdessamad Imine, and Michaël Rusinowitch. Detecting communities under differential privacy. In *Proceedings of the ACM Workshop on Privacy in the Electronic Society (WPES@CCS)*, pages 83–93, 2016.
- [NRS07] Kobbi Nissim, Sofya Raskhodnikova, and Adam D. Smith. Smooth sensitivity and sampling in private data analysis. In David S. Johnson and Uriel Feige, editors, *Proceedings of the 39th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, San Diego, California, USA, June 11-13, 2007*, pages 75–84. ACM, 2007.
- [PAK19] Victor Perrier, Hassan Jameel Asghar, and Dali Kaafar. Private continual release of real-valued data streams. In *Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS)*, 2019.
- [PGM14] Davide Proserpio, Sharon Goldberg, and Frank McSherry. Calibrating data to sensitivity in private data analysis. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 7(8):637–648, 2014.
- [RRT19] Leyla Roohi, Benjamin I. P. Rubinstein, and Vanessa Teague. Differentially-private two-party egocentric betweenness centrality. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Communications (INFOCOM)*, pages 2233–2241, 2019.
- [RS16a] Sofya Raskhodnikova and Adam Smith. *Differentially Private Analysis of Graphs*, pages 543–547. Springer New York, New York, NY, 2016.
- [RS16b] Sofya Raskhodnikova and Adam D. Smith. Lipschitz extensions for node-private graph statistics and the generalized exponential mechanism. In *Proceedings, IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 495–504, 2016.
- [SLM⁺18] Shuang Song, Susan Little, Sanjay Mehta, Staal A. Vinterbo, and Kamalika Chaudhuri. Differentially private continual release of graph statistics. *CoRR*, abs/1809.02575, 2018.
- [SU21] Adam Sealfon and Jonathan R. Ullman. Efficiently estimating Erdos-Renyi graphs with node differential privacy. *J. Priv. Confidentiality*, 11(1), 2021.
- [Upa13] Jalaj Upadhyay. Random projections, graph sparsification, and differential privacy. In *ASIACRYPT (1)*, volume 8269, pages 276–295, 2013.
- [WWW13] Yue Wang, Xintao Wu, and Leting Wu. Differential privacy preserving spectral graph analysis. In *Advances in Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining Pacific-Asia Conference (PAKDD)*, volume 7819, pages 329–340, 2013.
- [WWZX13] Yue Wang, Xintao Wu, Jun Zhu, and Yang Xiang. On learning cluster coefficient of private networks. *Social Network Analysis and Mining*, 3(4):925–938, 2013.
- [ZCP⁺15] Jun Zhang, Graham Cormode, Cecilia M. Procopiuc, Divesh Srivastava, and Xiaokui Xiao. Private release of graph statistics using ladder functions. In *Proceedings, ACM International Conference on Management of Data (SIGMOD)*, pages 731–745, 2015.
- [ZN19] Sen Zhang and Weiwei Ni. Graph embedding matrix sharing with differential privacy. *IEEE Access*, 7:89390–89399, 2019.

[ZNF20] Sen Zhang, Weiwei Ni, and Nan Fu. Community preserved social graph publishing with node differential privacy. In *Proceedings, SIAM International Conference on Data Mining (ICML)*, pages 1400–1405, 2020.

A Additional Privacy Background

Continual release model. Let $T \in \mathbb{N}$. In the continual release model, the input is given by a stream x_1, \dots, x_T , where $x_t \in \mathcal{U}$ for all $t \in [T]$. An algorithm \mathcal{A} in the continual release model receives at every time step $t \in [T]$ an input x_t and produces an output $a^t = \mathcal{A}(x_1, \dots, x_t)$.

Definition A.1 (Event-neighboring streams). Let $T \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $x = (x_1, \dots, x_T)$ with $x_t \in \mathcal{U}$ for all $t \in [T]$ and $y = (y_1, \dots, y_T)$ with $y_t \in \mathcal{U}$ for all $t \in [T]$ be two input streams. The streams x and y are event-neighboring, denoted $x \sim y$, if there exists a time t^* such that $x_t = y_t$ for all $t \neq t^*$.

Definition A.2 (Event-level differential privacy). Let $T \in \mathbb{N}$ and \mathcal{A} be an algorithm in the continual release model on \mathcal{U}^T . Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta \in [0, 1)$. The algorithm \mathcal{A} is event-level (ε, δ) -differentially private $((\varepsilon, \delta)$ -DP) if for all $\text{Out} \subseteq \text{range}(\mathcal{A}^T)$ and all event-neighboring streams $x, y \in \mathcal{U}^T$ we have

$$\Pr[(\mathcal{A}(x_1, \dots, x_t))_{t \leq T} \in \text{Out}] \leq e^\varepsilon \Pr[(\mathcal{A}(y_1, \dots, y_t))_{t \leq T} \in \text{Out}] + \delta.$$

If $\delta = 0$ then \mathcal{A} is event-level ε -differentially private (ε -DP).

Definition A.3 $((\alpha, \beta)$ -accuracy). Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and \mathcal{U} be a universe of data items. Let f be a function $\mathcal{U}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$. Let $x = (x_1, \dots, x_T)$ be a stream of elements from \mathcal{U} . A continual release algorithm \mathcal{A} is (α, β) -accurate for estimating f on x if $\Pr[\max_{t \in [T]} \|\mathcal{A}(x_1, \dots, x_t) - f(x_1, \dots, x_t)\|_\infty > \alpha] \leq \beta$.

A.1 Continual Histogram and Continual Counting

Definition A.4 (Continual counting). Let $T \in \mathbb{N}$. For an input stream $x = (x_1, \dots, x_T)$ with $x_t \in \{0, 1\}$ for all $t \in [T]$, the continual counting problem is to compute $\sum_{t' \in [t]} x_{t'}$ at every time step $t \in [T]$.

Definition A.5 (b -bounded continual histogram). Let $T, d, b \in \mathbb{N}$ with $b \leq d$. Let $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \{-1, 0, 1\}^d$ be the set of vectors in $\{-1, 0, 1\}^d$ which have at most b nonzero entries. For an input stream $x = (x_1, \dots, x_T)$ with $x_t \in \mathcal{U}$ for all $t \in [T]$, the b -bounded continual histogram problem is to compute $s_i^t = \sum_{t' \leq t} x_{t'}[i]$ for all $i \in [d]$ at every time step $t \in [T]$.

The continual counting problem and continual histogram problem are well studied [DNPR10, CSS11, DNRR15, FHU23, HUU23, CLN⁺24]. In the following lemma, the first bound follows from composing d binary counters from [DNPR10] and the analysis in [CSS11]; the second bound (for $\delta > 0$) is from [FHU23]. Note that while solutions for continual counting are usually formulated for the universe $\{0, 1\}$, inputs over $\{-1, 0, 1\}$ can be reduced to that case by running a separate counter for entries from $\{-1, 0\}$ and $\{0, 1\}$ and subtracting the first from the second.

Lemma A.6 (Algorithm for b -bounded continual histogram). Let $T, d, b \in \mathbb{N}$ with $b \leq d$, and let \mathcal{U} be as in Definition A.5. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $\delta \in [0, 1)$. There exists an (ε, δ) -differentially private algorithm for b -bounded continual histogram which is (α, β) -accurate for all input streams from \mathcal{U}^T , where

1. if $\delta = 0$, then $\alpha = O\left(\frac{b}{\varepsilon} \log^2\left(\frac{dT}{\beta}\right)\right)$.
2. if $\delta > 0$, then $\alpha = O\left(\frac{\log T}{\varepsilon} \left(\ln \frac{1}{\delta}\right) \sqrt{b \ln(dT)}\right)$.