

# Concurrent Composition for Continual Mechanisms

<sup>1</sup>Monika Henzinger\*    <sup>1</sup>Roodabeh Safavi†    <sup>2</sup>Salil Vadhan‡

## Abstract

A series of recent works by Lyu, Wang, Vadhan, and Zhang (TCC ‘21, NeurIPS ‘22, STOC ‘23) showed that composition theorems for non-interactive differentially private mechanisms extend to the concurrent composition of interactive differentially private mechanism, when differential privacy is measured using  $f$ -DP and the adversary is adaptive. We extend their work to the *continual observation setting*, where the data is arriving online in a potentially adaptive manner. More specifically, we show that all composition theorems for non-interactive differentially private mechanisms extend to the concurrent composition of continual differentially private mechanism, where the adversary is adaptive. We show this result for  $f$ -DP, which also implies the result for pure DP and  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP.

## 1 Introduction

Differential privacy [7] is a popular measure of the privacy protection offered by an algorithm that performs statistical analysis on a sensitive dataset about individuals. While differential private mechanisms for the setting where the dataset is static (i.e., the *batch* setting) are well studied for a wide variety of problems, the setting where the dataset changes dynamically, i.e., where questions about

---

\*Institute of Science and Technology, Klosterneuburg, Austria (email: monika.henzinger@ista.ac.at).

†Institute of Science and Technology, Klosterneuburg, Austria (email: roodabeh.safavi@ista.ac.at).

‡Harvard University (email: salil.vadhan@harvard.edu).

<sup>1</sup>This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (Grant agreement No. 101019564) and the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) grant DOI 10.55776/Z422, grant DOI 10.55776/I5982, and grant DOI 10.55776/P33775 with additional funding from the netidee SCIENCE Stiftung, 2020–2024.

<sup>2</sup>This project is supported by NSF grant BCS-2218803, a grant from the Sloan Foundation, and a Simons Investigator Award.



the dataset and updates of the dataset are arbitrarily interleaved, has only recently received more attention. This setting was introduced in 2010 by Dwork, Naor, Pitassi, and Rothblum [8] and the corresponding privacy definition was called *differential privacy under continual observation*. These mechanisms are data structures (as they can (usually) process an arbitrary number of queries and updates) that are differentially private under continual observation. We call them *continual mechanisms* for short below.

In recent years, mechanisms that are differentially private under continual observation have been developed and analyzed for summing a sequence of (binary) numbers [8, 4, 9, 12, 1], weighted sums [2, 16], histograms and histogram-based queries [3, 14, 10], set cardinality [17, 15], various graph properties [6, 11, 12, 18], and clustering points in Euclidean space [20]. Some of these works are performed by reduction to another continual observation problem. That is, the continual mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  for the new problem uses a continual mechanism  $\mathcal{M}'$  for a previously studied problem mediate all of its access to the dataset.

Thus, all steps taken by the mechanism can be seen as post-processing the output of  $\mathcal{M}'$ , leading immediately to the guarantee that  $\mathcal{M}$  is differentially private under continual observation. However, for some of the above works (see e.g., [9, 14]), multiple continual mechanisms are used, i.e.,  $\mathcal{M}$  is interacting with multiple continual mechanisms  $\mathcal{M}', \mathcal{M}'', \dots$  in an arbitrary way. Thus, to guarantee privacy for  $\mathcal{M}$ , the *concurrent composition* of the involved continual mechanisms needs to be analyzed.

A series of recent works by Lyu, Wang, Vadhan, and Zhang ([21], [19], [21], [13]) analyzed the concurrent composition of *interactive* mechanisms in the setting where the dataset is static and unchanging (but there can be adaptive queries answered in a potentially stateful manner.) More specifically, they showed that all composition theorems for non-interactive differentially private mechanisms extend to the concurrent composition of interactive differentially private mechanism. The privacy definition used in their work encompasses  $f$ -differential privacy [5],  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -differential privacy, and pure differential privacy.

This paper analyzes the concurrent composition of *continual* mechanisms, where there are updates as well as queries, and shows the corresponding result: Composition theorems for non-interactive differentially private mechanisms extend to the concurrent composition of *continual* differentially private mechanism. As our theorem is based on their result, it applies to the same privacy definitions.

## 2 Basic Definitions

Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a family of datasets. A *randomized mechanism*  $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  is an algorithm that can be represented by a function that randomly maps a dataset  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  to an element of  $\mathcal{Y}$  (an answer). We call  $\mathcal{M}$  a *non-interactive mechanism* (*NIM*) since it halts immediately after returning an answer.

We define a *neighboring relation* to be a binary relation on the family of datasets  $\mathcal{X}$ . For example, two datasets  $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$  are neighboring if they are

identical except for the absence or presence of a single record. Differential privacy for non-interactive mechanisms is defined as follows.

**Definition 2.1** ( $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -Differential Privacy for NIMs [7]). *For  $\epsilon \geq 0$  and  $0 \leq \delta \leq 1$ , a randomized mechanism  $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  is  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -differentially private (or  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP for short) if for any two neighboring datasets  $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$  and any subset of answers  $T \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$ ,*

$$\Pr[\mathcal{M}(x) \in T] \leq e^\epsilon \Pr[\mathcal{M}(x') \in T] + \delta.$$

$\mathcal{M}$  is  $\epsilon$ -differentially private (or  $\epsilon$ -DP for short) if  $\delta = 0$ .

Unlike a non-interactive mechanism, an interactive mechanism continues interacting with the analyst and answers multiple adaptively asked queries. An interactive mechanism is defined formally as follows.

**Definition 2.2** (Interactive Mechanism (IM)). *An interactive mechanism (IM) is a stateful randomized algorithm (also known as a randomized state machine)  $\mathcal{M} : S_{\mathcal{M}} \times Q_{\mathcal{M}} \rightarrow S_{\mathcal{M}} \times A_{\mathcal{M}}$  that communicates with the external world through message passing. Here,  $S_{\mathcal{M}}$  represents the state space of  $\mathcal{M}$ ,  $Q_{\mathcal{M}}$  denotes the set of possible incoming messages or queries, and  $A_{\mathcal{M}}$  refers to the set of possible outgoing messages or answers from  $\mathcal{M}$ . Upon receiving a query  $m \in Q_{\mathcal{M}}$ ,  $\mathcal{M}$  updates its current state  $s \in S_{\mathcal{M}}$  to a new state  $s' \in S_{\mathcal{M}}$  and generates an answer  $m' \in A_{\mathcal{M}}$ , which is described by  $(s', m') = \mathcal{M}(s, m)$ . The set  $S_{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{init}} \subseteq S_{\mathcal{M}}$  denotes the set of possible initial states of  $\mathcal{M}$ . For  $s^{\text{init}} \in S_{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{init}}$ ,  $\mathcal{M}(s^{\text{init}})$  represents the interactive mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  with the initial state  $s^{\text{init}}$ .*

Two interactive mechanisms  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  satisfying  $Q_{\mathcal{M}_1} = A_{\mathcal{M}_2}$  and  $Q_{\mathcal{M}_2} = A_{\mathcal{M}_1}$  can interact with each other through message passing. For initial states  $s_1 \in S_{\mathcal{M}_1}^{\text{init}}$  and  $s_2 \in S_{\mathcal{M}_2}^{\text{init}}$ , the interaction between  $\mathcal{M}_1(s_1)$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2(s_2)$  is defined as follows: It starts with round 1. Mechanism  $\mathcal{M}_1(s_1)$  sends a message to  $\mathcal{M}_2(s_2)$  in the odd rounds, and  $\mathcal{M}_2(s_2)$  responds in the subsequent even rounds. The interaction continues until one of the mechanisms halts the communication. In the following, when discussing the interaction between  $\mathcal{M}_1(s_1)$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2(s_2)$ , we implicitly assume that  $Q_{\mathcal{M}_1} = A_{\mathcal{M}_2}$  and  $Q_{\mathcal{M}_2} = A_{\mathcal{M}_1}$ .

The *view* of the mechanism  $\mathcal{M}_1(s_1)$  in this interaction is represented by  $\text{View}(\mathcal{M}_1(s_1) \leftrightarrow \mathcal{M}_2(s_2)) = (r, m_1, m_2, m_3, \dots)$ , where  $r$  is the sequence of random coins used by  $\mathcal{M}_1(s_1)$ , and  $m_1, m_2, m_3, \dots$  is the finite sequence of messages exchanged during the interaction. The view of  $\mathcal{M}_2(s_2)$  is defined symmetrically.  $\Pi_{\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2}$  denotes the family of possible views of  $\mathcal{M}_1$  in the interaction between  $\mathcal{M}_1(s_1)$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2(s_2)$  for all initial states  $s_1 \in S_{\mathcal{M}_1}^{\text{init}}$  and  $s_2 \in S_{\mathcal{M}_2}^{\text{init}}$ .

In order to define differential privacy, we investigate the view of a so-called adversary interacting with a mechanism holding secret data. Specifically, an adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  is an interactive mechanism with initial state  $\lambda$ . For convenience, we write  $\mathcal{A}$  instead of  $\mathcal{A}(\lambda)$ . An instance of a responding mechanism is an interactive mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  initialized with a dataset  $x$ .  $\text{View}(\mathcal{A} \leftrightarrow \mathcal{M}(x))$  represents the view of the adversary.

In this paper, we repeatedly use the results of [21], [22], and [13]. In these works,  $S_{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{init}}$  is always a family of datasets for  $\mathcal{M}$ , i.e.,  $S_{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{init}} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ , and (as is usual) the neighboring relation is defined on these datasets. However, this is an unnecessary restriction. Their results also hold if we generalize the notion of the neighboring relation to be a binary relation on the set of all possible initial states  $S_{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{init}}$  (independent of whether they represent a dataset or not), which leads to the following definition of differential privacy for interactive mechanisms.

**Definition 2.3** ( $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -Differential Privacy for IMs). *For  $\epsilon \geq 0$  and  $0 \leq \delta \leq 1$ , an interactive mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  is  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -differentially private (or  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP for short) against an adaptive adversary if for every pair of neighboring initial states  $s_0, s_1 \in S_{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{init}}$ , any adaptive adversary  $\mathcal{A}$ , and every subset  $V \subseteq \Pi_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M}}$ ,*

$$\Pr[\text{View}(\mathcal{A} \leftrightarrow \mathcal{M}(s_0)) \in V] \leq e^\epsilon \Pr[\text{View}(\mathcal{A} \leftrightarrow \mathcal{M}(s_1)) \in V] + \delta.$$

$\mathcal{M}$  is  $\epsilon$ -differentially private (or  $\epsilon$ -DP for short) if  $\delta = 0$ .

For non-interactive mechanisms, a randomized post-processing function  $\mathcal{P} : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$  maps the output of a mechanism  $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  to an element of  $\mathcal{Z}$ . It is well-known that differential privacy is preserved under post-processing for non-interactive mechanisms. Haney et al. [13] generalize the definition of post-processing function to an *interactive post-processing mechanism* and show that interactive post-processing preserves the privacy guarantees for interactive mechanisms.

For technical reasons, which will become clear shortly, we will refer to interactive post-processing mechanisms in [13] as interactive pre-post-processing mechanisms in this paper.

**Definition 2.4** (Interactive Pre-Post-Processing Mechanism (IPPM) [13]). *An interactive pre-post-processing mechanism (IPPM) is a stateful randomized algorithm  $\mathcal{P} : S_{\mathcal{P}} \times \{Q, A\} \times M_{\mathcal{P}} \rightarrow S_{\mathcal{P}} \times \{Q, A\} \times M_{\mathcal{P}}$  that stands between two interactive mechanisms, typically an interactive mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  and an adversary  $\mathcal{A}$ , communicating with them through message passing.  $S_{\mathcal{P}}$  represents the state space of  $\mathcal{P}$ , and  $M_{\mathcal{P}}$  denotes the set of possible messages sent to and received from both  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$ . At each round of communication,  $\mathcal{P}$  receives its current state  $s \in S_{\mathcal{P}}$ , an indicator  $v \in \{Q, A\}$  (denoting whether the incoming message is a query from the adversary or an answer from the mechanism), and the message  $m \in M_{\mathcal{P}}$  and returns a new state  $s' \in S_{\mathcal{P}}$ , an indicator  $v' \in \{Q, A\}$  (indicating whether the outgoing message is a query to the mechanism or an answer for the adversary), and the message  $m' \in M_{\mathcal{P}}$ . Note that messages for the mechanism are not observable by the adversary, and vice versa.*

**Definition 2.5** (Pre-Post-Processing of an IM  $\mathcal{M}$  by an IPPM  $\mathcal{P}$  ( $\mathcal{P} \circ^* \mathcal{M}$ )). *Consider an interactive mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  and an interactive pre-post-processing mechanism  $\mathcal{P}$  satisfying  $Q_{\mathcal{M}}, A_{\mathcal{M}} \subseteq M_{\mathcal{P}}$ . The pre-post-processing of  $\mathcal{M}$  by  $\mathcal{P}$  is an interactive mechanism  $\mathcal{P} \circ^* \mathcal{M} : S_{\mathcal{P} \circ^* \mathcal{M}} \times M_{\mathcal{P}} \rightarrow S_{\mathcal{P} \circ^* \mathcal{M}} \times M_{\mathcal{P}}$  defined in Algorithm 1 with the set of possible initial states  $S_{\mathcal{P} \circ^* \mathcal{M}}^{\text{init}} = S_{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{init}} \times S_{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{init}}$ .*

---

**Algorithm 1** Pre-Post-Processing of  $\mathcal{M}$  by  $\mathcal{P}$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{P} \circ^* \mathcal{M}$ .

---

```

procedure  $(\mathcal{P} \circ^* \mathcal{M})(s, m)$ :
   $(s^{\mathcal{M}}, s^{\mathcal{P}}) \leftarrow s$ 
  if  $m = \lambda$  then ▷ Initialize  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{P}$ 
     $(s^{\mathcal{M}}, \cdot) \leftarrow \mathcal{M}(s^{\mathcal{M}}, \lambda)$ ,  $s^{\mathcal{P}} \leftarrow \mathcal{P}(s^{\mathcal{P}}, Q, \lambda)$ ,  $m \leftarrow \lambda$ 
  else
     $(s^{\mathcal{P}}, v, m) = \mathcal{P}(s^{\mathcal{P}}, Q, m)$ 
    while  $v = Q$  do
       $(s^{\mathcal{M}}, m') \leftarrow \mathcal{M}(s^{\mathcal{M}}, m)$ 
       $(s^{\mathcal{P}}, v, m) \leftarrow \mathcal{P}(s^{\mathcal{P}}, A, m')$ 
    end while
  end if
  return  $((s^{\mathcal{M}}, s^{\mathcal{P}}), m)$ 
end procedure

```

---

In Algorithm 1,  $\mathcal{P} \circ^* \mathcal{M}$  runs  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{P}$  internally and interacts with the external world. Essentially,  $\mathcal{P}$  stands between  $\mathcal{M}$  and the external world, controlling and modifying the messages exchanged. To answer a query,  $\mathcal{P}$  may communicate with  $\mathcal{M}$  multiple times or generate an answer itself, without involving  $\mathcal{M}$ .

Interactive post-processing in [13] is defined similarly to interactive pre-post-processing in Algorithm 1, with the key difference being that a query from the adversary is passed directly to the mechanism without involving the post-processing mechanism. Thus, the main difference between post-processing and pre-post-processing is that in the latter a query is processed by  $\mathcal{P}$  before being sent to the mechanism, while in the earlier it is not.

Consider an initial state  $s = (s^{\mathcal{M}}, s^{\mathcal{P}})$  for the interactive mechanism  $\mathcal{P} \circ^* \mathcal{M}$ .  $s^{\mathcal{M}}$  often represents an initial dataset for  $\mathcal{M}$ , while  $s^{\mathcal{P}}$  consists of parameters required by  $\mathcal{P}$ . Both  $s^{\mathcal{M}}$  and  $s^{\mathcal{P}}$  can be empty, each of them represented by the empty string  $\lambda$ .

### 3 Continual Mechanisms

In this section, we introduce continual mechanisms (CMs) supporting both (a) queries about the dataset, called *question queries*, and (b) updates, called *data-update queries*. We chose these names because our first crucial observation is that we can define continual mechanisms as a special case of interactive mechanisms: The reason is that the definition of queries in interactive mechanisms is general enough to allow changes to the dataset. Specifically, the dataset of a continual mechanism can be encoded as part of its state, which can change after each query. Moreover, the definition of interactive mechanisms puts no restrictions on the types of queries they can process, making it flexible enough to include both question and data-update queries.

**Definition 3.1** (Continual Mechanism (CM)). *A continual mechanism (CM)  $\mathcal{M}$  is an interactive mechanism whose state includes a dataset.  $\mathcal{M}$  receives two types of messages: question queries and data-update queries, both can have parameters. Question queries request information about the current dataset, while data-update queries consist of instructions for modifying the dataset. Upon receiving an invalid message,  $\mathcal{M}$  terminates the communication. For simplicity, we set the initial state space  $S_{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{init}}$  to  $\{\lambda\}$ .*

We define a *strongly adaptive adversary* to be an interactive mechanism that is supposed to adaptively take one of the following actions on their turn: asking a question query, sending a pair of data-update queries, or requesting to halt the communication. The first and second elements of the pairs of data-update queries must form neighboring sequences, which will be enforced by an interactive pre-post-processing mechanism, see below.

Here, the neighboring relation is a binary relation on the family of sequences of data-update queries. For example, two sequences could be defined to be neighboring if they are identical except for the absence or presence of a single data-update query. This is usually called *insert/delete event-level privacy*.

In order to establish communication between a CM and a strongly adaptive adversary and investigate the privacy of the CM, we introduce an interactive pre-post-processing mechanism called an Identifier. Although we cannot force the adversary to behave correctly, the design of the CM and the Identifier combined ensures that the interaction terminates if the adversary sends an invalid query.

**Definition 3.2** (Identifier). *An Identifier  $\mathcal{I}$  is an interactive pre-post-processing mechanism with initial state space  $S_{\mathcal{I}}^{\text{init}} = \{(0, \lambda, \lambda), (1, \lambda, \lambda)\}$ . For  $b \in \{0, 1\}$ , we denote  $\mathcal{I}((b, \lambda, \lambda))$  as  $\mathcal{I}(b)$ .  $\mathcal{I}(b)$  pre-post-processes a continual mechanism and filters pairs of data-update queries in a communication with a strongly adaptive adversary. Specifically,  $\mathcal{I}(b)$  forwards all messages unchanged except for pairs of data-update queries. For any pair of data-update queries  $(x_0, x_1)$ ,  $\mathcal{I}(b)$  only forwards  $x_b$  to the CM. Consider the two sequences formed by the first and second components of the requested pairs of data-update queries. Let  $\sim$  be a neighboring relation on the family of data-update sequences. Although the CM receives only one of these sequences (based on  $b$ ),  $\mathcal{I}(b)$  keeps track of both sequences and halts the communication if they cease to be neighboring. More details are provided in Algorithm 2.*

Recall that a continual mechanism supports single data-update queries, while a strongly adaptive adversary sends pairs. Thus, without an identifier  $\mathcal{I}$  in between, a CM and a strongly adaptive adversary cannot communicate. Moreover, as the initial state space of continual mechanisms consists of a single element, the definition of differential privacy for interactive mechanisms (Definition 2.3) implies that any continual mechanism is differentially private. Therefore, we define a continual mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  to be  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -differentially private if and only if the interactive mechanism  $\mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M}$  is  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -differentially private.

By definition,  $S_{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{init}} = \{\lambda\}$  and  $S_{\mathcal{I}}^{\text{init}} = \{(0, \lambda, \lambda), (1, \lambda, \lambda)\}$ , which implies that the set of possible initial states for  $\mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M}$  is  $S_{\mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M}}^{\text{init}} = \{(\lambda, (0, \lambda, \lambda)), (\lambda, (1, \lambda, \lambda))\}$ .

---

**Algorithm 2** Identifier  $\mathcal{I}$ 

---

```
procedure  $\mathcal{I}(s, v, m)$ :  
   $(b, s_0, s_1) \leftarrow s$   
  if  $m = \lambda$  then  
     $v \leftarrow A, m' \leftarrow \lambda$   
  else  
    if  $v = Q$  and  $m = (x_0, x_1)$  then  
       $s_0 \leftarrow s_0 x_0$   
       $s_1 \leftarrow s_1 x_1$   
      if  $s_0 \sim s_1$  then  
         $m' \leftarrow x_b$   
      else  
         $v \leftarrow A, m' \leftarrow \text{halt}$   
      end if  
    else  
       $m' \leftarrow m$   
    end if  
  end if  
  return  $((b, s_0, s_1), v, m')$   
end procedure
```

---

For  $b \in \{0, 1\}$ , we write  $(\mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M})(b)$  instead of  $(\mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M})((\lambda, (b, \lambda, \lambda)))$ . To define differential privacy for  $\mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M}$ , we require a neighboring relation on  $S_{\mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M}}^{\text{init}}$ . For that, we use the *universal relation* on  $S_{\mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M}}^{\text{init}}$ , where every element of  $S_{\mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M}}^{\text{init}}$  is related to every element of  $S_{\mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M}}^{\text{init}}$ . Therefore, by Definition 2.3, differential privacy for CMs is defined as follows.

**Definition 3.3** ( $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -Differential Privacy for CMs). *For  $\epsilon \geq 0$  and  $0 \leq \delta \leq 1$ , a continual mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  is  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -differentially private (or  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP for short) against a strongly adaptive adversary if for any strongly adaptive adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  and every subset  $V \subseteq \Pi_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M}}$ ,*

$$\Pr[\text{View}(\mathcal{A} \leftrightarrow (\mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M})(0)) \in V] \leq e^\epsilon \Pr[\text{View}(\mathcal{A} \leftrightarrow (\mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M})(1)) \in V] + \delta,$$

and

$$\Pr[\text{View}(\mathcal{A} \leftrightarrow (\mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M})(1)) \in V] \leq e^\epsilon \Pr[\text{View}(\mathcal{A} \leftrightarrow (\mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M})(0)) \in V] + \delta.$$

$\mathcal{M}$  is  $\epsilon$ -differentially private (or  $\epsilon$ -DP for short) if  $\delta = 0$ .

To avoid confusion, note that the neighboring relation  $\sim$  (on the family of data-updates sequences) in Definition 3.2 is the actual neighboring relation specified by the problem definition, while the universal relation on  $S_{\mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M}}^{\text{init}}$  is just for consistency. The definition of  $\sim$  is checked and enforced by  $\mathcal{I}$  and this is independent of the definition of the neighboring relation on  $S_{\mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M}}^{\text{init}}$  in Definition 3.3. The general definition of  $\sim$  in Definition 3.2 enables our results to be applied to both event-level and user-level differential privacy.

## 4 Composition

The composition of *non-interactive* mechanisms  $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k$  is a non-interactive mechanism  $\mathcal{M} = \text{Comp}[\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k]$  that takes a tuple of datasets  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$  as input and returns  $\mathcal{M}(x) = (\mathcal{M}_1(x_1), \dots, \mathcal{M}_k(x_k))$ . Two tuples  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$  and  $x' = (x'_1, \dots, x'_k)$  are neighboring if  $x_i$  and  $x'_i$  are neighboring for each  $1 \leq i \leq k$ . Differential privacy for  $\text{Comp}[\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k]$  follows the standard definition of differential privacy for non-interactive mechanisms (see Definition 2.1).

For the composition of *interactive* mechanisms, an adaptive adversary asks a query from one of the mechanisms based on the previous answers of all the mechanisms, which leads to the definition of *concurrent composition*. In this case, the adversary may either request to terminate the interaction or send a message in the form of  $(q, i)$  or  $((x_0, x_1), i)$ , where  $q$  is a question query,  $(x_0, x_1)$  is a pair of data-updates queries, and  $i$  is an integer in  $\{1, \dots, k\}$ , indicating which mechanism to query. To formalize this, Vadhan and Wang [21] introduced the “super-mechanism” ConComp that runs the IMs to-be-combined internally and interacts with an adversary.

**Definition 4.1** (Concurrent Composition of IMs [21]). *Given interactive mechanisms  $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k$  with the same set of possible initial states  $S^{\text{init}}$ , the concurrent composition of  $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k$  is an interactive mechanism, denoted by  $\text{ConComp}[\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k]$ , with initial state space  $(S^{\text{init}})^k$  and defined in Algorithm 4. Initial states  $s = (s_1, \dots, s_k) \in (S^{\text{init}})^k$  and  $s' = (s'_1, \dots, s'_k) \in (S^{\text{init}})^k$  are neighboring if  $s_i$  and  $s'_i$  are neighboring for each  $1 \leq i \leq k$ .*

---

### Algorithm 3 Concurrent composition of IMs

---

```

procedure CONCOMP[ $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k$ ]( $s, m$ ):
     $(s_1, \dots, s_k) \leftarrow s$ 
    if  $m = \lambda$  then ▷ initialization
        for  $i = 1, \dots, k$  do ▷ initialize each mechanism
             $(s_i, \cdot) = \mathcal{M}_i(s_i, \lambda)$ 
        end for
         $s' \leftarrow (s_1, \dots, s_k), m' \leftarrow \lambda$ 
    else
        if  $m = (j, q)$  where  $j = 1, \dots, k$  then
             $(s'_j, m') \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_j(s_j, q)$ 
             $s' \leftarrow (s_1, \dots, s'_j, \dots, s_k)$ 
        else ▷  $m$  cannot be parsed correctly
             $s' \leftarrow s, m' \leftarrow \text{halt}$ 
        end if
    end if
    return  $(s', m')$ 
end procedure

```

---



We next define differential privacy for the concurrent composition of interactive mechanisms.

**Definition 4.2** ( $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -Differential Privacy for Concurrent Composition of IMs [21]). *Given interactive mechanisms  $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k$  with the same set of possible initial states and privacy parameters  $\epsilon \geq 0$  and  $0 \leq \delta \leq 1$ , the concurrent composition of  $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k$  is  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -differentially private (or  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP for short) against an adaptive adversary if the interactive mechanism  $\text{ConComp}[\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k]$  is  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -differentially private against an adaptive adversary.*

Similar to Definition 3.3, in order to investigate the privacy of the concurrent composition of continual mechanisms  $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k$ , we need to consider the interaction between  $\text{ConComp}[\mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M}_k]$  (instead of  $\text{ConComp}[\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k]$ ) and the adversary. Note that  $\text{ConComp}[\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k]$  is a well-defined interactive mechanism; however, as was the case for a single continual mechanism, the concurrent composition of continual mechanism does not have a meaningful interaction with an adversary without the Identifiers.

Differential privacy for the concurrent composition of continual mechanisms is now defined as follows.

**Definition 4.3** ( $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -Differential Privacy for Concurrent Composition of CMs). *Given continual mechanisms  $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k$  and the privacy parameters  $\epsilon \geq 0$  and  $0 \leq \delta \leq 1$ , the concurrent composition of  $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k$  is  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -differentially private (or  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP for short) against a strongly adaptive adversary if  $\text{ConComp}[\mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M}_k]$  is  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -differentially private against a strongly adaptive adversary.*

## 5 $f$ -DP and Generalized $d$ - $\mathcal{D}$ -DP

The notion of  $f$ -differential privacy (or  $f$ -DP) is a generalization of  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -differential privacy. It takes a statistical point of view and uses trade-off functions to measure how indistinguishable the output distributions of a mechanism are for two neighboring datasets.

Consider a non-interactive mechanism  $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  and two neighboring datasets  $x_0, x_1 \in \mathcal{X}$ . Observing the outcome of  $\mathcal{M}$ , an analyst  $\mathcal{A}$  must decide whether the input dataset was  $x_0$  (null hypothesis  $H_0$ ) or  $x_1$  (alternative hypothesis  $H_1$ ). A *rejection rule*  $\phi : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  is a function that takes the answer of  $\mathcal{M}$  as input and decides whether to reject the null hypothesis or not. Thus, for  $b \in \{0, 1\}$ , the analyst  $\mathcal{A}$  chooses dataset  $x_b$  when  $\phi$  returns  $b$ .

To quantify the indistinguishability between  $\mathcal{M}(x_0)$  and  $\mathcal{M}(x_1)$ ,  $f$ -DP evaluates the error made by the analyst in selecting the correct hypothesis. Specifically, given a rejection rule  $\phi$ , the *type I error*  $\alpha_\phi = \mathbb{E}[\phi(\mathcal{M}(x_0))]$  is the probability of rejecting the null hypothesis  $H_0$  while  $H_0$  is true (i.e., guessing  $x_1$  when the dataset is  $x_0$ ). Similarly, the *type II error*  $\beta_\phi = 1 - \mathbb{E}[\phi(\mathcal{M}(x_1))]$  is the probability of not rejecting  $H_0$  while  $H_1$  is true (i.e., guessing  $x_0$  when the dataset is  $x_1$ ).

Although an analyst could achieve zero type II error by always rejecting the null hypothesis, when an upper bound on the type I error is set, the minimum achievable type II error reflects the difficulty of distinguishing between  $\mathcal{M}(x_0)$  and  $\mathcal{M}(x_1)$ . A trade-off function measures the optimal trade-off between the type I and type II errors.

**Definition 5.1** (Trade-off Function). *Let  $Y_0$  and  $Y_1$  be two random variables on the same domain  $\mathcal{Y}$ . The trade-off function between  $Y_0$  and  $Y_1$ , denoted  $T(Y_0, Y_1)$ , which maps  $[0, 1]$  to  $[0, 1]$ , is defined as:*

$$T(Y_0, Y_1)(\alpha) = \inf_{\phi} \{\beta_{\phi} : \alpha_{\phi} \leq \alpha\},$$

where the infimum is taken over all possible rejection rules.

**Definition 5.2** ( $f$ -Differential Privacy [5]). *Given a trade-off function  $f$ , a non-interactive mechanism  $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  is  $f$ -differentially private (or  $f$ -DP for short) if for any two neighboring datasets  $x_0, x_1 \in \mathcal{X}$ ,*

$$T(\mathcal{M}(x_0), \mathcal{M}(x_1)) \geq f.$$

For example, function  $f_{\epsilon, \delta}(\alpha) = \max\{0, 1 - \delta - \exp(\epsilon)\alpha, \exp(-\epsilon)(1 - \delta - \alpha)\}$  is a trade-off function, and  $f_{\epsilon, \delta}$ -DP is equivalent to  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP [5].

The (meta-)function  $T$  in Definition 5.1 is indeed a function that maps a pair of random variables to a trade-off function between these random variables. Let  $\mathcal{F}$  denote the family of all trade-off functions. We define a partial ordering  $\preceq$  on  $\mathcal{F}$  as follows: For  $f, f' \in \mathcal{F}$ ,  $f \preceq f'$  if and only if  $f(\alpha) \geq f'(\alpha)$  for all  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ .

Consider two pairs of random variables  $(X_0, X_1)$  and  $(Y_0, Y_1)$ , each defined over the same domain. Let  $f_x = T(X_0, X_1)$  and  $f_y = T(Y_0, Y_1)$ . Intuitively,  $f_x \preceq f_y$  means that  $X_0$  and  $X_1$  are closer to each other (harder to distinguish) than  $Y_0$  and  $Y_1$ .

Thus,  $(\mathcal{F}, \preceq, T)$  is a tool for measuring the distance (distinguishability) between two random variables. [22] introduced a more general definition of probability distance and showed that  $(\mathcal{F}, \preceq, T)$  satisfies the necessary conditions for such a distance.

**Definition 5.3** (Generalized Probability Distance [22]). *A generalized probability distance  $(\mathcal{D}, \preceq, D)$  is a measure for distinguishability between two random variables.  $(\mathcal{D}, \preceq, D)$  satisfies:*

1.  $(\mathcal{D}, \preceq)$  is a partially ordered set (poset).
2.  $D$  maps any pair of random variables over the same measurable space to an element of  $\mathcal{D}$ .
3. For every function  $g$ ,  $D(g(X), g(X')) \preceq D(X, X')$ .
4. Consider a collection of random variables  $(X_j, X'_j)_{j \in \mathcal{J}}$  and a random variable  $J$  distributed over the set of indices  $\mathcal{J}$ . If  $D(X_j, X'_j) \preceq d$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ , then  $D(X_J, X'_J) \preceq d$ .

Any generalized probability distance  $(\mathcal{D}, \preceq, D)$  provides us with a measure of distinguishability between distributions of answers, which leads to the definition of  $d$ - $\mathcal{D}$ -differential privacy.

**Definition 5.4** ( $d$ - $\mathcal{D}$ -Differential Privacy). *Consider a generalized probability distance  $(\mathcal{D}, \preceq, D)$ . Given  $d \in \mathcal{D}$ , a non-interactive mechanism  $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  is  $d$ - $\mathcal{D}$ -differentially private (or  $d$ - $\mathcal{D}$ -DP for short) if for any two neighboring datasets  $x_0, x_1 \in \mathcal{X}$ ,*

$$D(\mathcal{M}(x_0), \mathcal{M}(x_1)) \preceq d.$$

Similar to  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP, the definitions of  $f$ -DP and  $d$ - $\mathcal{D}$ -DP for non-interactive mechanisms can be extended to interactive and continual mechanisms. We do not repeat the definitions.

To state the main theorem, we require defining some properties for generalized probability distances, which we all take from [22].

**Definition 5.5** (Coupling Property). *A generalized probability distance  $(\mathcal{D}, \preceq, D)$  satisfies the coupling property if for any  $d \in \mathcal{D}$  and any two pairs of random variables  $(X_0, X_1)$  and  $(Y_0, Y_1)$  satisfying  $D(X_0, X_1) \preceq d$  and  $D(Y_0, Y_1) \preceq d$ , there exists a coupling of  $X_0$  and  $Y_0$  (a joint distribution  $(X_0, Y_0)$ ) and a coupling of  $X_1$  and  $Y_1$  (a joint distribution  $(X_1, Y_1)$ ) such that  $D((X_0, Y_0), (X_1, Y_1)) \preceq d$ .*

**Definition 5.6** (Supremum and Complete Poset). *In a partially ordered set  $(\mathcal{D}, \preceq)$ , the supremum of a non-empty subset  $S \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ , denoted  $\sup(S)$ , is the least upper bound of  $S$ , if it exists. Specifically,  $s \preceq \sup(S)$  for all  $s \in S$  (upper bound), and for any  $d \in \mathcal{D}$  satisfying  $s \preceq d$  for all  $s \in S$ , we have  $\sup(S) \preceq d$  (the least upper bound). The poset  $(\mathcal{D}, \preceq)$  is called complete if every non-empty subset of  $\mathcal{D}$  has a supremum.*

**Definition 5.7** (Continuous Function). *Let  $(\mathcal{D}, \preceq)$  and  $(\mathcal{E}, \preceq')$  be complete posets, and  $I$  be a set of size  $n$ . A function  $f : \mathcal{D}^I \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$  is continuous in each variable if for every  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , every  $d_1, \dots, d_{i-1}, d_{i+1}, \dots, d_n \in \mathcal{D}$ , and every non-empty subset  $S \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ ,*

$$f(d_1, \dots, d_{i-1}, \sup(S), d_{i+1}, \dots, d_n) = \sup(\{f(d_1, \dots, d_{i-1}, s, d_{i+1}, \dots, d_n) \mid s \in S\}).$$

**Definition 5.8** (Chain Rule [22]). *A generalized probability distance  $(\mathcal{D}, \preceq, D)$  satisfies the chain rule property if for every pair of random variables  $X_0$  and  $X_1$  with the same domain, there exists a function  $\text{ChainRule}_{X_0, X_1} : \mathcal{D}^{\text{supp}(X_0) \cap \text{supp}(X_1)} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$  that is continuous in each variable and satisfies the following: for every pair of joint distributions  $(X_0, Y_0)$  and  $(X_1, Y_1)$ , where  $Y_0$  and  $Y_1$  are random variables with the same domain,*

$$D((X_0, Y_0), (X_1, Y_1)) = \text{ChainRule}_{X_0, X_1}((D(Y_0 \mid X_0 = x, Y_1 \mid X_1 = x)_{x \in \text{supp}(X_0) \cap \text{supp}(X_1)})).$$

For example, KL-divergence function  $D_{\text{KL}}$  and the poset  $(\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}, \leq)$  form a generalized probability distance with the following chain rule for any

random variables  $X_0$  and  $X_1$ :

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{KL}}((X_0, Y_0) || (X_1, Y_1)) &= D_{\text{KL}}(X_0 || X_1) + D_{\text{KL}}(Y_0 | X_0 || Y_1 | X_1) \\ &= D_{\text{KL}}(X_0 || X_1) + \mathbb{E}_{x \sim X_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(Y_0 | X_0 = x || Y_1 | X_1 = x)] \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 5.9** ([22]). *Consider the function  $T$  from Definition 5.1. Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the family of trade-off functions. Given trade-off functions  $f, f' \in \mathcal{F}$ , say  $f \preceq f'$  if  $f(\alpha) \geq f'(\alpha)$  for every  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ .  $(\mathcal{F}, \preceq)$  is a complete poset, and  $(\mathcal{F}, \preceq, T)$  is a generalized probability distance satisfying the coupling and chain rule properties.*

## 6 $f$ -DP and $d$ - $\mathcal{D}$ -DP Composition of CMs

In this section, we apply the results of [22] on  $f$ -DP and  $d$ - $\mathcal{D}$ -DP concurrent composition of interactive mechanisms to continual mechanisms.

**Definition 6.1** (Finite Communication for IMs). *Consider an interactive mechanism  $\mathcal{M}$  with  $Q_{\mathcal{M}} = A_{\mathcal{M}} = \{0, 1\}^*$ . We say that  $\mathcal{M}$  has finite communication if there exists a constant  $c$  such that for any adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  interacting with  $\mathcal{M}$ , we have that the total length (the number of bits) of  $\mathcal{M}$ 's answers is bounded by  $c$ , and  $\mathcal{M}$  halts the interaction if  $\mathcal{A}$  asks a query with length larger than  $c$ , or if the total number of messages (queries and answers) exceeds  $c$ .*

**Theorem 6.2** ([22]). *Consider a complete poset  $(\mathcal{D}, \preceq)$  and a generalized probability distance  $(\mathcal{D}, \preceq, D)$  satisfying the coupling and chain rule properties. For  $d_1, \dots, d_k \in \mathcal{D}$ , let  $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k$  be interactive mechanisms such that for each  $1 \leq i \leq k$ ,  $Q_{\mathcal{M}_i} = A_{\mathcal{M}_i} = \{0, 1\}^*$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_i$  is  $d_i$ - $\mathcal{D}$ -DP against an adaptive adversary, and it has finite communication. If for any  $k$  non-interactive mechanisms  $\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_k$ , where  $\mathcal{N}_i$  is  $d_i$ - $\mathcal{D}$ -DP,  $\text{Comp}[\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_k]$  is  $d$ - $\mathcal{D}$ -DP, then  $\text{ConComp}[\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k]$  is also  $d$ - $\mathcal{D}$ -DP against an adaptive adversary.<sup>1</sup>*

A continual mechanisms pre-post-processed by an identifier is a special case of an interactive mechanism. Thus, the above theorem implies the following result for continual mechanisms.

**Corollary 6.3.** *Consider a complete poset  $(\mathcal{D}, \preceq)$  and a generalized probability distance  $(\mathcal{D}, \preceq, D)$  satisfying the coupling and chain rule properties. For  $d_1, \dots, d_k \in \mathcal{D}$ , let  $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k$  be continual mechanisms such that for every  $1 \leq i \leq k$ ,  $Q_{\mathcal{M}_i} = A_{\mathcal{M}_i} = \{0, 1\}^*$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_i$  is  $d_i$ - $\mathcal{D}$ -DP against a strongly adaptive adversary, and  $\mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M}_i$  has finite communication. If for any  $k$  non-interactive mechanisms  $\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_k$ , where  $\mathcal{N}_i$  is  $d_i$ - $\mathcal{D}$ -DP,  $\text{Comp}[\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_k]$  is  $d$ - $\mathcal{D}$ -DP, then  $\text{ConComp}[\mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M}_k]$  is also  $d$ - $\mathcal{D}$ -DP against a strongly adaptive adversary.*

*Proof.* Apply Theorem 6.2 to the interactive mechanisms  $\mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M}_k$ .  $\square$

<sup>1</sup>In the original theorem, the state space of  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  (and every IM) is assumed to be  $\{0, 1\}^*$ ; however, this assumption is never used in the proof, and the theorem holds more generally.

Combination of Lemma 5.9 and Corollary 6.3 gives the desired result for  $f$ -DP, namely that any composition theorem for non-interactive differentially private mechanisms extend to concurrent composition of continual differentially private mechanisms.

**Corollary 6.4.** *For  $f_1, \dots, f_k \in \mathcal{D}$ , let  $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k$  be continual mechanisms such that for every  $1 \leq i \leq k$ ,  $Q_{\mathcal{M}_i} = A_{\mathcal{M}_i} = \{0, 1\}^*$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_i$  is  $f_i$ -DP against a strongly adaptive adversary, and  $\mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M}_i$  has finite communication. If for any  $k$  non-interactive mechanisms  $\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_k$ , where  $\mathcal{N}_i$  is  $f_i$ -DP,  $\text{Comp}[\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_k]$  is  $f$ -DP, then  $\text{ConComp}[\mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M}_k]$  is also  $f$ -DP against a strongly adaptive adversary.*

## 7 Pure DP

The proof of Theorem 6.2 for  $d$ - $\mathcal{D}$ -DP relies on the fact that in the interaction between  $\mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M}$  and an analyst  $\mathcal{A}$ , the number of rounds and possible messages are bounded by some prefixed constants (finite communication). The following theorem presents a stronger result for  $\epsilon$ -DP where the query and answer spaces can be arbitrary sets, and the finite communication assumption is no longer required.

**Theorem 7.1** ([21]). *For  $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_k \geq 0$ , let  $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k$  be interactive mechanisms such that for each  $1 \leq i \leq k$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_i$  is  $\epsilon_i$ -DP against an adaptive adversary. For  $\epsilon \geq 0$  and  $0 \leq \delta \leq 1$ , if for any  $k$  non-interactive mechanisms  $\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_k$ , where  $\mathcal{N}_i$  is  $\epsilon_i$ -DP,  $\text{Comp}[\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_k]$  is  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP, then  $\text{ConComp}[\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k]$  is also  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP against an adaptive adversary.*

Consequently, for continual mechanisms we have:

**Corollary 7.2.** *For  $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_k \geq 0$ , let  $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k$  be continual mechanisms such that for each  $1 \leq i \leq k$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_i$  is  $\epsilon_i$ -DP against an adaptive adversary. For  $\epsilon \geq 0$  and  $0 \leq \delta \leq 1$ , if for any  $k$  non-interactive mechanisms  $\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_k$ , where  $\mathcal{N}_i$  is  $\epsilon_i$ -DP,  $\text{Comp}[\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_k]$  is  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP, then  $\text{ConComp}[\mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I} \circ^* \mathcal{M}_k]$  is also  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP against an adaptive adversary.*

## References

- [1] Joel Daniel Andersson and Rasmus Pagh. A smooth binary mechanism for efficient private continual observation. In Alice Oh, Tristan Naumann, Amir Globerson, Kate Saenko, Moritz Hardt, and Sergey Levine, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 - 16, 2023*, 2023.
- [2] Jean Bolot, Nadia Fawaz, S. Muthukrishnan, Aleksandar Nikolov, and Nina Taft. Private decayed predicate sums on streams. In *Proc. 16th ICDT*, pages 284–295, 2013.

- [3] T.-H. Hubert Chan, Mingfei Li, Elaine Shi, and Wenchang Xu. Differentially private continual monitoring of heavy hitters from distributed streams. In *Proc. 12th PETS*, pages 140–159, 2012.
- [4] 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.
- [5] Jinshuo Dong, Aaron Roth, and Weijie J Su. Gaussian differential privacy. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 84(1):3–37, 2022.
- [6] Wei Dong, Qiyao Luo, and Ke Yi. Continual observation under user-level differential privacy. In *Proc. 44th IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, pages 2190–2207, 2023.
- [7] Cynthia Dwork, Frank McSherry, Kobbi Nissim, and Adam Smith. Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis. In *Theory of Cryptography: Third Theory of Cryptography Conference, TCC 2006, New York, NY, USA, March 4-7, 2006. Proceedings 3*, pages 265–284. Springer, 2006.
- [8] Cynthia Dwork, Moni Naor, Toniann Pitassi, and Guy N. Rothblum. Differential privacy under continual observation. In *Proc. 42nd STOC*, pages 715–724, 2010.
- [9] Cynthia Dwork, Moni Naor, Omer Reingold, and Guy N. Rothblum. Pure differential privacy for rectangle queries via private partitions. In *Proc. 21st ASIACRYPT*, pages 735–751, 2015.
- [10] Alessandro Epasto, Jieming Mao, Andres Muñoz Medina, Vahab Mirrokni, Sergei Vassilvitskii, and Peilin Zhong. Differentially private continual releases of streaming frequency moment estimations. In Yael Tauman Kalai, editor, *Proc. 14th ITCS*, pages 48:1–48:24, 2023.
- [11] Hendrik Fichtenberger, Monika Henzinger, and Lara Ost. Differentially private algorithms for graphs under continual observation. In *Proc. 29th ESA*, pages 42:1–42:16, 2021.
- [12] Hendrik Fichtenberger, Monika Henzinger, and Jalaj Upadhyay. Constant matters: Fine-grained error bound on differentially private continual observation. In *Proc. 40th ICML*, pages 10072–10092. PMLR, 2023.
- [13] Samuel Haney, Michael Shoemate, Grace Tian, Salil Vadhan, Andrew Vyrros, Vicki Xu, and Wanrong Zhang. Concurrent composition for interactive differential privacy with adaptive privacy-loss parameters. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 1949–1963, 2023.
- [14] Monika Henzinger, A. R. Sricharan, and Teresa Anna Steiner. Differentially private data structures under continual observation for histograms and related queries. *CoRR*, abs/2302.11341, 2023.

- [15] Monika Henzinger, A. R. Sricharan, and Teresa Anna Steiner. Private counting of distinct elements in the turnstile model and extensions. In Amit Kumar and Noga Ron-Zewi, editors, *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques, AP-PROX/RANDOM 2024, August 28-30, 2024, London School of Economics, London, UK*, volume 317 of *LIPICs*, pages 40:1–40:21. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2024.
- [16] Monika Henzinger, Jalaj Upadhyay, and Sarvagya Upadhyay. A unifying framework for differentially private sums under continual observation. In David P. Woodruff, editor, *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2024, Alexandria, VA, USA, January 7-10, 2024*, pages 995–1018. SIAM, 2024.
- [17] Palak Jain, Iden Kalemaj, Sofya Raskhodnikova, Satchit Sivakumar, and Adam Smith. Counting distinct elements in the turnstile model with differential privacy under continual observation, 2023.
- [18] Palak Jain, Adam Smith, and Connor Wagaman. Time-aware projections: Truly node-private graph statistics under continual observation\*. In *2024 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 127–145, 2024.
- [19] Xin Lyu. Composition theorems for interactive differential privacy. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:9700–9712, 2022.
- [20] David Saulpic Max Dupré la Tour, Monika Henzinger. Making old things new: a unified algorithm for differentially private clustering. In *Proc. 41th ICML*, 2024.
- [21] Salil Vadhan and Tianhao Wang. Concurrent composition of differential privacy. In *Theory of Cryptography: 19th International Conference, TCC 2021, Raleigh, NC, USA, November 8–11, 2021, Proceedings, Part II 19*, pages 582–604. Springer, 2021.
- [22] Salil Vadhan and Wanrong Zhang. Concurrent composition theorems for differential privacy. In *55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, 2023.