From Easy to Hard: Building a Shortcut for Differentially Private Image Synthesis

Kecen Li^{†§‡}, Chen Gong, Xiaochen Li, Yuzhong Zhao[§], Xinwen Hou[‡], Tianhao Wang University of Virginia, [§]University of Chinese Academy of Sciences

[‡]Institute of Automation, Chinese Academy of Sciences

Abstract—Differentially private (DP) image synthesis aims to generate synthetic images from a sensitive dataset, alleviating the privacy leakage concerns of organizations sharing and utilizing synthetic images. Although previous methods have significantly progressed, especially in training diffusion models on sensitive images with DP Stochastic Gradient Descent (DP-SGD), they still suffer from unsatisfactory performance.

In this work, inspired by curriculum learning, we propose a two-stage DP image synthesis framework, where diffusion models learn to generate DP synthetic images from easy to hard. Unlike existing methods that directly use DP-SGD to train diffusion models, we propose an easy stage in the beginning, where diffusion models learn simple features of the sensitive images. To facilitate this easy stage, we propose to use 'central images', simply aggregations of random samples of the sensitive dataset. Intuitively, although those central images do not show details, they demonstrate useful characteristics of all images and only incur minimal privacy costs, thus helping early-phase model training. We conduct experiments to present that on the average of four investigated image datasets, the fidelity and utility metrics of our synthetic images are 33.1% and 2.1% better than the state-of-the-art method. The replication package and datasets can be accessed online¹.

1. Introduction

Various previous works proposed that current AI systems face the serious security concerns [1], and directly conducting statistical analysis on datasets can leak data privacy [2], [3], [4]. An effective approach is to generate synthetic datasets that satisfy *Differential privacy (DP)* [5] privacy protections, providing a solution for various statistical tasks [6]. DP offers a theoretical framework to quantify the risk of inferring information about the training dataset from the synthetic dataset, establishing it as a gold standard for privacy preservation [5]. In recent years, a range of DP data synthesis methods have been proposed, spanning various data types such as tabular data [4], [7], [8], text [2], [3], [9], [10], and images [11], [12], [13], [14], [15]. These works strive to maintain similarity between the synthetic dataset while ensuring strict DP guarantees.

This paper focuses on DP image synthesis. One promising approach for DP image synthesis is to train generative models with DP Stochastic Gradient Descent (DP-SGD) [16], which adds Gaussian noise to the training gradients of synthesizers. Researchers evaluate various generative models such as GANs [17], [18], [19], [20], diffusion models [11], [12], [21], [22], and VAEs [23], [24], among which the diffusion model performs the best. In particular, Dockhorn et al. [12] train lightweight diffusion models using a modified DP-SGD, which achieves SOTA performance on standard image synthesis benchmarks. However, they still suffer from unsatisfactory performance degradation on some complex image datasets and strong privacy parameters due to the slow convergence of DP-SGD.

Recent studies show that pre-training a generative model with non-sensitive public datasets, which are released on open-source platforms and without privacy concerns, can accelerate the subsequent DP-SGD training and significantly enhance the utility and fidelity of synthetic images [11], [14], [21], [22]. However, previous works reveal that whether the model benefits from pre-training relies on the similarity between the public and sensitive datasets to some extent [11], [25], which is also verified in our experiments (Section 5.2). This naturally raises the question: *how to promote DP image synthesis when an appropriate public dataset is not accessible?*

Our Proposal. Instead of considering how to use an inappropriate public dataset more effectively, we solve this question in another way. In Curriculum Learning [26], decomposing complex tasks into multiple steps and learning from easy to hard, are significantly useful in many machine learning tasks [27]. In the DP training of diffusion models, we can apply this idea by breaking down the training process of generating complex images into two stages: (1) the first stage involves training models to learn basic knowledge about the images, such as the general outline, basic color information, and other simple features. We refer to this process as Warm-up. After the warm-up, the diffusion models can generate rough and statistically imperfect images. (2) Subsequently, we refine the models to learn the more complex content of the images to generate more realistic images. We name our proposed framework DP-FETA, which stands for DP training From Easy To hArd.

For the first stage, DP-FETA obtains some simple features of the sensitive images for diffusion models to learn. To achieve this, we introduce 'central images'. Central images are the central tendency measures [28] of the sensitive data. Common central tendency measures include mean, mode, median, etc. We find that the central tendency of image data

^{†.} Kecen did this work as a remote intern at UVA.

^{1.} https://github.com/SunnierLee/DP-FETA

can capture their simple features very well. As shown in Figure 8, our two types of central images contain rough outlines of the object and basic color information. The central images are injected with Gaussian noise to ensure DP guarantees. We warm up the diffusion model by pre-training it on these noisy central images. For the second stage, we fine-tune the diffusion model on the original sensitive images to learn more complex content of the images. To achieve DP, we add Gaussian noise to the model gradient and use the noisy gradient to update the model parameters following standard DP-SGD [16].

Our Evaluations. We compared our proposed DP-FETA with existing methods. Compared to the state-of-the-art approach using only the sensitive dataset (DPDM [12]), the fidelity and utility metrics of our synthetic images are 33.1% and 2.1% better. Even when compared to models pre-trained on real public datasets, our proposed method shows competitive performance, particularly with respect to more 'sensitive'² data domains. We also find that the central images are effective for warming up diffusion models because they exist in the high probability area of the sensitive dataset. Specifically, we use t-SNE to perform dimensionality reduction on images and find that the distribution of sensitive images is close to that of our queried central images and even closer than that of public images.

We analyze the impact of the hyper-parameter, specifically the number of queried central images, on the performance. We find that the optimal number of central images is usually much smaller than the number of sensitive images on all our investigated datasets. These results suggest that the warm-up process requires minimal computational resources, presenting the practical applicability in real-world scenarios. **Contributions.** We list our contributions as follows:

- We propose a two-stage DP images synthesis framework, DP-FETA, where diffusion models learn to generate DP images from easy to hard.
- Although the warm-up process of DP-FETA only introduces a minimal amount of computational resource consumption, synthesizers can effectively capture the simple features of sensitive images.
- Experiments show that DP-FETA can significantly accelerate the learning of diffusion models and achieves SOTA fidelity and utility metrics on four image datasets without using an additional public dataset.

2. Background

2.1. Differential Privacy

Definition. Differential privacy (DP) [5] protects each individual's privacy by requiring any single data in the dataset to have a limited impact on the output. It is defined as follows.

Definition 2.1 (DP [5]). A randomized algorithm M satisfies (ε, δ) -differential privacy, where $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, if and only if, for any two adjacent datasets D and D', it holds that,

$$\Pr[M(D) \in O] \le e^{\varepsilon} \Pr[M(D') \in O] + \delta,$$

where O denotes the set of all possible outputs of the algorithm M.

The privacy budget ε is a non-negative parameter that measures the privacy loss in the sensitive data. A smaller ε indicates better privacy. As usual, we consider D, D' are adjacent, denoted $D \simeq D'$, if D can be obtained from D' by adding or removing one element. This paper also uses the above definition to define two neighboring image datasets as previous works [11], [29], e.g., one image dataset can be obtained from its neighboring image dataset by adding or removing just one image.

Sub-sampled Gaussian Mechanism and Rényi Differential Privacy. This paper uses Sub-sampled Gaussian Mechanism (SGM) [30], to sanitize central images (introduced in Section 3.1) and use Rényi DP (RDP) [31] to track the privacy loss.

Definition 2.2 (SGM [30]). Let $f : D_s \subseteq D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be query function with sensitivity $\Delta_f = \max_{D \simeq D'} \|f(D) - f(D')\|_2$. SGM is parameterized with a sampling rate $q \in (0, 1]$ and noise standard deviation $\sigma > 0$. The SGM is defined as,

$$SGM_{f,q,\sigma}\left(D\right) \stackrel{\Delta}{=} f\left(S\right) + \mathcal{N}\left(0,\sigma^{2}\Delta_{f}^{2}\mathbf{I}\right)$$

where $S = \{x | x \in D \text{ selected independently with probability } q\}$ and $f(\emptyset) = 0$.

Definition 2.3 (Rényi DP [30]). A randomized mechanism M is (α, γ) -RDP with order $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$, if $D_{\alpha}(M(D) || M(D')) < \gamma$ holds for any adjacent dataset D, D', where

$$D_{\alpha}\left(Y \| N\right) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln \mathbb{E}_{x \sim N} \left[\frac{Y(x)}{N(x)}\right]^{\alpha}.$$

Then, we obtain the privacy bound of (α, γ) -RDP by calculating $D_{\alpha} ([(1 - q) p_0 + qp_1] || p_0)$. RDP has a nice linearly composability property: For two mechanisms M_1 and M_2 satisfying (α, γ_1) -RDP and (α, γ_2) -RDP, respectively, the composition (M_1, M_2) satisfies $(\alpha, \gamma_1 + \gamma_2)$ -RDP. RDP can quantify the privacy loss of SGM accurately:

Theorem 2.1 (RDP for SGM [30]). Let p_0 and p_1 denote the PDF of $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 \Delta_f^2)$ and $\mathcal{N}(1, \sigma^2 \Delta_f^2)$ respectively. A $SGM_{M,q,\sigma}(D)$ satisfies (α, γ) -RDP for any γ such that,

$$\gamma \ge D_{\alpha} \left(\left[(1-q) \, p_0 + q p_1 \right] \, \| p_0 \, \right). \tag{1}$$

RDP privacy cost (α, γ) can be converted to the (ε, δ) -DP privacy cost as follows.

Theorem 2.2 (From (α, γ) -RDP to (ϵ, δ) -DP [31]). If M is an (α, γ) -RDP mechanism, it also satisfies (ϵ, δ) -DP, for any $0 < \delta < 1$, where $\epsilon = \gamma + \frac{\log 1/\delta}{\alpha - 1}$.

Therefore, we can try different (α, γ) satisfying Theorem 2.1 to obtain the smallest ϵ according to Theorem 2.2 for a tight privacy bound.

^{2.} More 'sensitive' means less similar to available public data.

2.2. DP Image Synthesis

To generate new images using an available image dataset, the commonly used approach is to query useful information from the training images to estimate the distribution of image data, and then sample new images from the estimated data distribution. For DP image synthesis, where training images are sensitive, the query results used to estimate the data distribution must be injected with suitable noise to satisfy DP. Although previous works have proposed to query the distribution feature [32], [33], [34], [35], they fail to achieve great synthesis performance on complex image datasets.

Given the success of modern deep generative models, a more promising approach leverages deep generative models to generate DP images. To train a generative model, we optimize the model parameters θ to minimize a defined objective function \mathcal{L} on a training dataset as,

$$\theta \leftarrow \theta - \eta \left(\frac{1}{|b|} \sum_{i \in b} \mathcal{L}(\theta, x_i) \right),$$

where η is the learning rate, and $\nabla \mathcal{L}(\theta, x_i)$ is the gradient of the loss function \mathcal{L} with respect to the model parameters θ for the data point x_i in a randomly sampled batch bwith the sample ratio q. Therefore, we can add noise to the gradient of generative models to satisfy DP. A widely adopted method is Differentially Private Stochastic Gradient Descent (DP-SGD) [16], which modifies the parameters update as follows,

$$\theta \leftarrow \theta - \eta \left(\frac{1}{|b|} \sum_{i \in b} \operatorname{Clip}\left(\nabla \mathcal{L}(\theta, x_i), C\right) + \frac{C}{|b|} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}) \right),$$

where $\operatorname{Clip}(\nabla \mathcal{L}, C) \leftarrow \min\left\{1, \frac{C}{||\nabla \mathcal{L}||_2}\right\} \nabla \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}$ refers to a function that clips the gradient vector $\nabla \mathcal{L}$ such that its ℓ_2 norm under the constraint of C, and $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)$ is the Gaussian noise with the variance σ . DP-SGD ensures the generative model does not overly learn some specific data points and does not focus on unusual details that might jeopardize privacy.

2.3. Diffusion Models

Diffusion models [36], [37], [38] are a class of likelihood-based generative models that learn to reverse a process that gradually degrades the training data structure. Thus, diffusion models consist of two phases.

Forward Process. Given an uncorrupted training sample $x_0 \sim p(x_0)$, diffusion models corrupt x_0 by adding Gaussian noise, and output the noised version $\{x_1, \ldots, x_T\}$. This process can be obtained according to the following Markov process,

$$p(x_t | x_{t-1}) = \mathcal{N}\left(x_t; \sqrt{1 - \beta_t} x_{t-1}, \beta_t \mathbf{I}\right), \forall t \in \{1, \dots, T\},$$

where T is the number of noising steps and $\beta_t \in [0,1)$ regulates the magnitude of the added noise at each step. I

denotes the identity matrix with the same data dimensions. We denote $\bar{\alpha}_t := \prod_{s=1}^t (1 - \beta_s)$, and an important property is that the distribution of x_t has another closed form [36],

$$p(x_t | x_0) = \mathcal{N}(x_t; \sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_t} x_0, (1 - \bar{\alpha}_t) \mathbf{I}).$$

With this equation, we can sample any noisy version x_t via just a single step as,

$$x_t = \sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_t} x_0 + e\sqrt{1 - \bar{\alpha}_t}, e \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}).$$
⁽²⁾

We usually design a proper $\{\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_T\}$ to have $\bar{\alpha}_T \approx 0$. Thus, as t increases, the data becomes progressively noisier, gradually resembling Gaussian noise more closely and deviating further from the original data sample with each step.

Reverse Process. Since the forward process is a Markov process, if we know the noise e at each step, we can generate new data from $p(x_0)$ through progressively denoising a Gaussian noise x_T from $\mathcal{N}(0, I)$. Thus, we can train a neural network e_{θ} parameterized with θ to predict the noise. Formally, the objective function is defined by [12] as,

$$\mathcal{L}_{DM} = \mathbb{E}_{t \sim \mathcal{U}(1,T)} \mathbb{E}_{x_0 \sim p(x_0)} \mathbb{E}_{e \sim \mathcal{N}(0,I)} \|e - e_\theta\left(x_t, t\right)\|^2.$$
(3)

During the generation, we first sample Gaussian noise x_T from $\mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I})$. With the predicted noise $e_{\phi}(x_T, T)$ and Equation 2, we can estimate clean data x_0 . Adding noise to x_0 following Equation 2, we can obtain less noisy data x_{T-1} , which can be used to estimate cleaner data x_0 . Repeating the above process, we use the clean data x_0 estimated from x_1 as our final synthetic data.

3. DP-FETA

This section details our proposed DP-FETA. As shown in Figure 1, DP-FETA is a two-stage DP image synthesis framework. In the first stage, DP-FETA queries a central image dataset from the sensitive data with DP guarantees, which is used to warm up the diffusion model to learn some simple features of sensitive images. In the second stage, DP-FETA fine-tunes the model on the original sensitive images using DP-SGD to generate more realistic images.

3.1. Stage-I: Warm-up Training

In the Stage-I, DP-FETA aims to construct a central image dataset $D_c = \{x_i^c\}_{i=1}^{N_c}$ consisting of N_c central images x_i^c , from the sensitive image dataset $D_s = \{x_i^s\}_{i=1}^{N_s}$ composed of N_s sensitive images, to warm up the diffusion model. We introduce two types of central images, mean images and mode images, from typical central tendency measures [28]. We consider these central images to capture some simple features of the sensitive images, which can be used to warm up diffusion models by learning starting from easy. We first introduce how to construct these two types of central images and then detail how to use these images for warm-up.



Figure 1: The overflow of DP-FETA. In the first stage, DP-FETA queries central images from the sensitive images with Gaussian noise injected for DP guarantees. The diffusion model is warmed up on these noisy central images to learn some simple features. In the second stage, the model is fine-tuned with DP-SGD on the original sensitive images to learn more complex features.

3.1.1. Mean Images. In order to query a mean image, we first sample B_c sensitive images $D_s^{sub} = \{x_i^s\}_{i=1}^{B_c}$ from the sensitive dataset D_s using Poisson sub-sampling with the sampling probability q_c . Similar to DP-SGD [16], B_c is unknown, and we have the expected number $B_c^* = q_c N_s$. We then clip each sensitive image for a controllable bound as follows:

$$x_i^{s,c} = \min\left\{1, \frac{C_c}{||x_i^s||_2}\right\} \cdot x_i^s,$$
(4)

where C_c is a hyper-parameter and the norm of all clipped images is smaller than C_c . The mean image is defined as

$$x^{\text{mean}} = \frac{1}{B_c^*} \sum_{i=1}^{B_c} x_i^{s,c}.$$
 (5)

We inject suitable Gaussian noise into the mean image as the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. The query of mean image x^{mean} has global sensitivity $\Delta_{mean} = C_c/B_c^*$. For any $\alpha > 1$, incorporating noise $\mathbb{N}\left(0, \sigma_c^2 \Delta_{mean}^2 \mathbb{I}\right)$ into the mean image x^{mean} makes the query results satisfy (α, γ) -RDP, where $\gamma \geq D_\alpha\left(\left[(1-q_c) p_0 + q_c p_1\right] \| p_0\right)$.

We put the proof of Theorem 3.1 in Appendix A. Therefore, the final mean image \tilde{x}^{mean} is defined as

$$\frac{1}{B_c^*} \sum_{i=1}^{B_c} \min\left\{1, \frac{C_c}{||x_i^s||_2}\right\} \cdot x_i^s + \mathcal{N}\left(0, \sigma_c^2 \Delta_{\text{mean}}^2 \mathbb{I}\right).$$
(6)

Alg	gorithm 1: Query Mean Image								
I	nput : Sensitive dataset D_s , number of mean								
	images N_c , noise scale σ_c , size of sample								
	subset B_c , image norm bound C_c .								
0	Dutput: Noisy mean image set D_c								
1 F	'unction meanImageQuery(D_s , N_c , σ_c):								
2	Init central dataset $D_c = \emptyset$;								
3	while $len(D_c) < N_c$ do								
4	Sample subset $\{x_i^s\}_{i=1}^{B_c}$ from D_s								
5	Clip images $x_i^{s,c} = \min\left\{1, \frac{C_c}{ x_i^s _2}\right\} \cdot x_i^s$								
	// Aggregation								
6	Calculate mean $x^{\text{mean}} = \frac{1}{B_c^*} \sum_{i=1}^{B_c} x_i^{s,c}$								
7	Add noise								
	$\tilde{x}^{\text{mean}} = x^{\text{mean}} + \mathcal{N}\left(0, \sigma_c^2 C^2 / B_c^{*2} \mathbb{I}\right)$								
8	$D_c = D_c \cup \{\tilde{x}^{\text{mean}}\}$								
9	end								
10	return: D _c								

Repeating the above process N_c times, we can obtain the noisy mean image dataset. Algorithm 1 elaborates the process of constructing the noisy mean image dataset.

3.1.2. Mode Images. Similar to querying mean images, we first use Poisson sub-sampling with the sampling probability q_c to sample B_c sensitive images from sensitive images D_s : $D_s^{sub} = \{x_i^s\}_{i=1}^{B_c}, x_i^s \in \mathbb{R}^{W \times H \times C_x}$, where W and H are the width and height of the image respectively, and C_x is the number of color channels (e.g., its resolution is $W \times H$). However, it is not feasible to directly query the mode image of D_s^{sub} like DP-FETA_e for its extremely large global sensitivity. Therefore, we propose to query the histogram of each pixel to obtain the final mode image. For simplicity, we introduce how to query the mode value of one dimension in the image, which can be easily scaled to querying the whole mode image.

Given a set of pixels³ $D_p = \{p_i\}_{i=1}^{B_c}$, which contains B_c pixels $p_i \in [0, p_{\max}]$, we first get its frequency histogram $H_p \in [0, B_c]^{\text{bins}}$. $H_p[k]$ represents the number of pixels belonging to $((k-1) \cdot \frac{p_{\max}}{\text{bins}}, k \cdot \frac{p_{\max}}{\text{bins}}]$, where $k \in \{1, \ldots, \text{bins}\}$. The value of 'bins' is a hyperparameter, which divides $[0, p_{\max}]$ into equal parts. For example, commonly used unsigned 8-bit RGB images have 256-pixel values and $p_{\max} = 255$. To satisfy DP, we inject Gaussian noise into the frequency histogram using the following theorem.

Theorem 3.2. The query of frequency histogram H_p has global sensitivity $\Delta_p = 1$. For any $\alpha > 1$, incorporating noise $\mathbb{N}(0, \sigma_c^2 \mathbb{I})$ into the frequency histogram H_p makes the query results satisfy (α, γ) -RDP, where $\gamma \geq D_{\alpha}([(1-q_c)p_0+q_cp_1] \| p_0)$.

We put the proof of Theorem 3.2 in Appendix A. Given the noisy frequency histogram $\tilde{H}_p = H_p + \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_c^2 \mathbb{I})$, the final

^{3.} We use one pixel to represent the value in one dimension of the image.



Figure 2: An example of querying the mode pixel from the pixel set $\{1, 3, 3, 4\}$.

mode pixel value is obtained as,

$$\tilde{p}^{\text{mode}} = \frac{k^* + k^* - 1}{2} \cdot \frac{p_{\text{max}}}{\text{bins}} = \frac{2k^* - 1}{2} \cdot \frac{p_{\text{max}}}{\text{bins}}, \quad (7)$$

where $k^* = \operatorname{argmax}(\hat{H}_p)$ is the maximum index in \hat{H}_p . Consider that the pixel values range from 0 to p_{\max} , divided into bins equal intervals (or bins). Each bin represents a subrange of pixel values, and \hat{H}_p counts the frequency of pixels in each bin, perturbed by noise. The width of each bin is $\frac{p_{\max}}{b_{\min}}$, meaning that the bin k covers the range $\left[(k-1)\cdot\frac{p_{\max}}{2},k\cdot\frac{p_{\max}}{2}\right]$. The index k^* identifies the bin with the highest frequency, and we aim to estimate the mode pixel value as a representative point within this bin. The term $\frac{k^*+k^*-1}{2} = \frac{2k^*-1}{2}$ computes the midpoint of bin k^* in terms of the bin indices. This midpoint index is then scaled by $\frac{p_{\max}}{b_{\min}}$, the bin width, to convert it into the actual pixel value scale. Thus, \tilde{p}^{mode} represents the central pixel value of the bin with the highest noisy frequency, approximating the true mode under noise.

We provide an example of querying the mode pixel in Figure 2. We set $p_{\text{max}} = 4$ and bins = 2. The pixel 1 belongs to (0, 2], and 3, 3, 4 belong to (2, 4]. After obtaining the noisy frequency histogram, we have the index of its maximum 2.4, $k^* = 2$. Following Equation 7, we have the mode pixel $\tilde{p}^{\text{mode}} = \frac{2 \times 2 - 1}{2} \cdot \frac{4}{2} = 3$. To query the whole mode image, we just need to query the frequency histogram of all dimensions $H \in [0, B_c]^{W \times H \times C_x \times \text{bins}}$ and sanitize H with the following theorem,

Theorem 3.3. The query of frequency histogram of all dimensions H has global sensitivity $\Delta_{mode} = \sqrt{WHC_x}$. For any $\alpha > 1$, incorporating noise $\mathbb{N}\left(0, WHC_x\sigma_c^2\mathbb{I}\right)$ into the frequency histogram H makes the query results satisfy (α, γ) -RDP, where $\gamma \ge D_{\alpha}\left(\left[(1 - q_c)p_0 + q_cp_1 \| p_0\right]\right)$.

We provide the proof of Theorem 3.3 in Appendix A. After querying the final frequency histogram $\tilde{H} = H + \mathcal{N}\left(0, WHC_x\sigma_c^2\mathbb{I}\right)$, we obtain all the mode pixel values, which compose our mode image. By repeating the query N_c times, we can get N_c noisy mode images. Algorithm 2 elaborates on the process of querying the mode image dataset. Since mode images are calculated from the histogram, which needs to discretize the sensitive data, we consider that mode images could better capture the information of simple images. For example, for a black-and-white image (e.g., MNIST) where values take only 0 or 255, the mode values belong to $\{0, 255\}$, while the mean values might deviate significantly from 0 or 255.

Alg	gorithm 2: Query Mode Image
I	nput : Sensitive dataset D_s where each image
	$x_i^c \in \mathbb{R}^{W \times H \times C_x}$, number of mean images
	N_c , noise scale σ_c , size of sample subset
	B_c , dimension of histogram 'bins'.
C	Dutput: Noisy mode image set D_c
1 F	' $unction$ <code>meanImageQuery</code> (D_s , N_c , σ_c^2):
2	while $ D_c < N_c$ do
	// Query Pixel Histogram
3	Sample subset $\{x_i^s\}_{i=1}^{B_c}$ from D_s
4	for $j \leftarrow 1, \dots, \widetilde{WHC_x}$ do
5	for $i \leftarrow 1, \ldots, B_c$ do
6	Obtain index k from $x_i^s[j]$
7	H[j,k] = H[j,k] + 1
8	end
9	end
10	Add noise $\tilde{H} = H + \mathcal{N}\left(0, WHC_x \sigma_c^2 \mathbb{I}\right)$
	// Obtain Mode Image
11	Init mode image $x^{\text{mode}} \leftarrow O_{WHC_x \times 1}$
12	for $j \leftarrow 1, \dots, W \times H \times C_x$ do
13	$k^* = \operatorname{argmax}(\tilde{H}_p)$
14	Mode pixel $\tilde{p}^{\text{mode}} = \frac{2k^* - 1}{2} \cdot \frac{p_{\text{max}}}{\text{bins}}$
15	$x^{\text{mode}}[j] = \tilde{p}^{\text{mode}}$
16	end
17	$D_c = D_c \cup \{\tilde{x}^{\text{mode}}\}$
18	end
19	return: D _c

If data labels are available, which usually hold in the conditional generation task, we can partition D_s into multiple disjoint subsets based on labels and query a central dataset for each subset. Specifically, we group D_s by category, then extract the central images for each subset, representing its key features with minimal privacy cost. The DP guarantee is derived using the parallel composition property [5], which ensures that querying disjoint subsets independently maintains privacy. All resulting central images are then used for the subsequent warm-up. Figure 8 presents examples of central images, which capture simple features, such as the general outline of the face.

3.1.3. Warm-up. After querying the central image dataset, we use it to warm up the diffusion models. Specifically, we pre-train models on these central images. However, since the privacy budget is limited, the number of central images we can obtain is small. In our experiments (Section 5.2), we find that diffusion models can easily overfit on these few central images, and the subsequent private fine-tuning can not benefit from the warm-up and even achieves worse performance. Therefore, we consider it important to postenhance the noisy central image dataset to avoid the overfitting of the warm-up training. In deep learning, there have been many advanced approaches to mitigating overfitting. We adopt data augmentation, which has been commonly used in many computer vision tasks [39], [40].

TABLE 1: The data split and number of categories of four image datasets used in our experiments.

Dataset	Training	Validation	Test	Category
MNIST	55,000	5,000	10,000	10
F-MNIST	55,000	5,000	10,000	10
CelebA	162,770	19,867	19,962	2
Camelyon	302,436	34,904	85,054	2

To formalize our post-enhancement, we first define an augmentation algorithm bag $\mathcal{B}_a = \{\mathcal{A}_i\}_{i=1}^{N_a}$, which contains N_a different non-deterministic augmentation algorithms, and each algorithm \mathcal{A}_i transforms an input image into a different one. A naive way is to use each of these algorithms to augment each central image. However, this still produces only a small number of images, since there are very few central images. We consider sequentially augmenting central images. Formally, during the warm-up, given a central image x^c , we augment it as follows,

$$x_a^c = \mathcal{A}(x^c) = \mathcal{A}_{a_1} \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{A}_{a_k}(x_i^c), a_i \in \{1 \dots N_a\}.$$
(8)

This equation means that we randomly sample k augmentation algorithms from \mathcal{B} to sequentially transform the input central image. According to the post-processing mechanism [5], using the noisy central images for warm-up will not introduce any additional privacy cost. Therefore, we can warm up our diffusion models using normal training algorithms for any needed iterations.

3.2. Stage-II: Private Fine-tuning

In the Stage-II, we fine-tune the diffusion model on the original sensitive images to learn more complex content of the images. To achieve DP, we add Gaussian noise to the model gradient and use the noisy gradient to update the model parameters following standard DP-SGD [16]. Formally, we sample B_f sensitive images $D_s^{sub} = \{x_i^s\}_{i=1}^{B_f}$ from the sensitive dataset D_s with sampling probability q_f and the expected number $B_f^* = q_f N_s$. The parameters θ of the diffusion model are updated as follows

$$\theta \leftarrow \theta - \eta \left(\frac{1}{B_f^*} \sum_{i=1}^{B_f} \operatorname{Clip}\left(\nabla \mathcal{L}(\theta, x_i^s), C_f\right) + \frac{C_f}{B_f^*} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_f^2 \mathbf{I}) \right), \quad (9)$$

where \mathcal{L} is the objective function of diffusion models, and η is the learning rate and σ_f^2 is the variance of Gaussian noise. $\operatorname{Clip}(\nabla \mathcal{L}, C_f) = \min\left\{1, \frac{C_f}{||\nabla \mathcal{L}||_2}\right\} \nabla \mathcal{L}$ clips the norm of gradient smaller than the hyper-parameter C_f .

Algorithm 3 elaborates on the two-stage process of DP-FETA. We first query a central image dataset D_c following Algorithm 1 and 2 for mean and mode images, respectively. This dataset D_c is used to warm up the diffusion model with an augmentation algorithm bag. Second, we fine-tune the model on the original sensitive image dataset D_s using standard DP-SGD. We name DP-FETA that queries mean images and mode images DP-FETA_e and DP-FETA_o.

Algorithm 3: DP-FETA Workflow **Input** : Diffusion model e_{θ} parameterized with θ , sensitive dataset D_s , type of central image t_c , number of central images N_c , noise scale σ_c . **Output:** Trained diffusion model e_{θ} **1 Function** DP-FETA $(e_{\theta}, D_s, \sigma_c^2)$: // Stage-I: Warm-up Training if $t_c ==$ 'mean' then 2 $D_c \leftarrow \text{meanImageQuery}(D_s, N_c, \sigma_c^2)$ 3 end 4 5 if $t_c ==$ 'mode' then $D_c \leftarrow modeImageQuery(D_s, N_c, \sigma_c^2)$ 6 7 end Pre-train the model e_{θ} on D_c 8 // Stage-II: Private Fine-tuning Fine-tune the model e_{θ} on D_s using Eq. 9 9 **return**: e_{θ} 10

3.3. Privacy Cost

In DP-FETA, two processes consume the privacy budget: (1) querying the central images for warm-up training and (2) fine-tuning the warmed-up diffusion model on the sensitive dataset using DP-SGD. According to Theorem 2.1, these two processes satisfy (α, γ_w) -RDP and (α, γ_f) -RDP, respectively. Specifically, (α, γ_w) is determined by the number of central images N_c , sample ratio q_c and noise scale σ_c according to Theorem 3.1 and 3.3. (α, γ_f) is determined by the fine-tuning iteration t_f , sample ratio q_f and noise scale σ_f [16]. According to the RDP composition theorem [31], DP-FETA satisfies $(\alpha, \gamma_w + \gamma_f)$ -RDP. Although more advanced privacy accounting approaches, such as PRV [41], have been proposed, this paper adopts RDP to ensure a fair comparison with existing methods [12]. We explore how DP-FETA performs with a better privacy accounting approach. The experimental results in Appendix C.3 present that DP-FETA only gains limited improvement.

To make DP-FETA satisfy a given (ε, δ) -DP, we determine privacy parameters following three steps: (1) We set the number of central images N_c , sample ratio q_c and noise scale σ_c to obtain the RDP cost (α, γ_w) of querying central images following Theorem 3.1 and 3.3 according to the type of central image. (2) We fix the fine-tuning iterations t_f and sample ratio q_f , and then the RDP cost of DP-SGD is a function of noise scale σ_f as $(\alpha, \gamma_f(\sigma_f))$. (3) We try different σ_f to obtain the corresponding (ε, δ) -DP following Theorem 2.2, until meeting the given privacy budget.

4. Experimental Setup

Investigated Datasets. We perform experiments on four image datasets, MNIST [43], Fashion-MNIST (F-MNIST) [44], CelebA [45] and Camelyon [46]. It is noticed that the investigated datasets are prevalently used

TABLE 2: FID and Acc of DP-FETA and five baselines on MNIST, F-MNIST, CelebA and Camelyon with $\varepsilon = 1$ and 10. The best performance values in each column are highlighted using the bold font. DP-FETA_e and DP-FETA_o denote the two versions of DP-FETA that query the mean images and the mode images as central images, respectively.

		$\varepsilon = 1$							$\varepsilon = 10$							
Method	MNI	ST	F-MN	IST	Cele	ebA	Came	lyon	MNI	ST	F-MN	IST	Cele	ebA	Came	Lyon
	FID	Acc	FID	Acc	FID	Acc	FID	Acc	FID	Acc	FID	Acc	FID	Acc	FID	Acc
DP-MERF [32]	118.3	80.5	104.2	73.1	219.4	57.6	229.3	51.8	121.4	82.0	110.4	73.2	211.1	64.0	160.0	60.0
G-PATE [42]	153.4	58.8	214.8	58.1	293.2	70.2	328.1	56.2	150.6	80.9	171.9	69.3	305.9	70.7	294.0	64.4
DataLens [29]	186.1	71.2	195.0	64.8	297.7	70.6	343.5	50.0	173.5	80.7	167.7	70.6	320.8	72.9	381.6	50.0
DP-Kernel [35]	29.5	93.4	49.5	78.8	81.8	86.2	216.5	74.3	17.7	96.4	38.1	82.0	78.5	87.4	209.9	76.4
DPDM [12]	23.4	93.4	37.8	73.6	77.1	84.8	57.1	81.1	5.0	97.3	18.6	84.9	24.0	92.1	45.8	81.7
DP-FETA _o	8.2	96.4	28.8	80.4	42.8	83.8	53.0	82.2	2.8	98.5	13.3	86.6	17.0	93.6	44.0	82.3
$\mathtt{DP}\text{-}\mathtt{FETA}_e$	8.5	96.5	25.6	82.1	41.5	86.5	52.8	82.8	2.9	98.5	12.4	87.1	16.1	93.7	42.5	83.1

in previous works to verify the effectiveness of DP image synthesis methods [12], [13], [21].

MNIST contains 60,000 handwritten digits in gray images, from 0 to 9. Similar to MNIST, F-MNIST comprises 60,000 images of 10 different products. Compared to MNIST and F-MNIST, CelebA and Camelyon are more "sensitive" image datasets. CelebA contains more than 202,599 face images of 10,177 celebrities, each with 40 attributes. Following previous studies, we choose the "Gender" to divide CelebA into male and female images. Camelyon comprises 455,954 histopathological image patches of human tissue, and all images are labeled whether at least one pixel has been identified as a tumor cell. As presented in Table 1, all datasets are divided into a training set, a validation set, and a test set.

Baselines. This paper selects DP-MERF [32], G-PATE [42], DataLens [29], DPDM [12] and DP-Kernel [35] as baselines. These DP image synthesis methods generate synthetic image datasets without using public data. The implementations are based on their open-source codes. For more details about these methods, please refer to Appendix B.1.

Evaluation Metrics. We respectively evaluate the fidelity and utility of the synthetic dataset using two metrics: Fréchet Inception Distance (FID) and downstream classification accuracy (Acc), as commonly employed in prior studies [12], [15], [35]. Please refer to Appendix B.5 for more details.

Implementation. All image generative methods are realized with Python 3.8 on a server with 4 NVIDIA GeForce A100 and 512GB of memory. We replicate all five baselines using their open-source implementation repositories. For the warm-up training of DP-FETA, we query 50 central images for MNIST and F-MNIST, and 500 central images for CelebA and Camelyon. The number of augmentation algorithms N_a is set as 14. Since DPDM [12] also trains diffusion models with DP-SGD for image synthesis, we use the same settings of private fine-tuning as DPDM for a fair comparison. We recommend readers refer to Appendix B for more implementation details.

5. Results Analysis

This section evaluates the effectiveness of DP-FETA by answering three Research Questions (RQs),

- **RQ1.** Does DP-FETA outperform the five baseline methods across the four investigated image datasets?
- **RQ2.** How does the warm-up training aid in better training diffusion models with DP-SGD?
- **RQ3.** How do the hyper-parameters of DP-FETA affect the synthesis performance?

It is noticed that DP-FETA_e and DP-FETA_o denote the two versions of DP-FETA that query the mean images and the mode images as central images.

5.1. RQ1: Comparison with Existing Methods

This RQ explores whether DP-FETA can generate synthetic images with higher fidelity and utility than baselines. We compare our DP-FETA_e and DP-FETA_o with five baselines on four investigated image datasets as described in Section 4, under the privacy budget $\varepsilon = \{10, 1\}$.

Table 2 shows the FID and Acc of DP-FETA and five baselines. DP-FETA outperforms all baselines in terms of the FID and Acc of downstream classification tasks using synthetic images on four investigated datasets. When $\varepsilon = 10$, both DP-FETA_e and DP-FETA_o achieve better synthesis performance. Specifically, compared to the SOTA method DPDM [12], on average, the FID and Acc of the synthetic images from DP-FETA_e are 28.8% lower and 1.6%higher respectively, and DP-FETA_o obtains 26.4% lower FID and 1.3% higher Acc. As ε decreases to 1, DP-FETA_e still remains the SOTA results and obtains 37.4% lower FID and 3.8% higher Acc than DPDM on the average. DP-FETA_o</sub> achieves the best synthesis results except for the Acc of synthetic CelebA images, which is only 1.0% lower than DPDM. Compared to DP-FETA_o using mode images for warm-up training, DP-FETA_e, using mean images, achieves better synthesis performance. We explore the reasons in Section 6.2.

Examples of synthetic images, under $\varepsilon = 1$, from various methods are present in Figure 3. The comparison on $\varepsilon = 10$ is put in Figure 9 of the Appendix for space limitation. We only show the top-2 methods, e.g., DP-Kernel and DPDM, in the baselines for space limitation. On four image datasets, both our DP-FETA_o and DP-FETA_e generate more realistic synthetic images than DP-Kernel and DPDM.



Figure 3: Examples of synthetic images from four different methods, DP-Kernel [35], DPDM [12] and our DP-FETA_o and DP-FETA_e, on four investigated image datasets, MNIST, F-MNIST, CelebA and Camelyon, with $\varepsilon = 1$. The last row of images are real image samples from each image dataset.



Figure 4: FID (top row) and Acc (bottom row) of DP-FETA_e, DP-FETA_o and four baselines, which are introduced in Section 5.2, on MNIST, F-MNIST, CelebA and Camelyon with $\varepsilon = 1$.

Specifically, the generation quality of DP-Kernel is inconsistent, as shown in its synthetic images on CelebA and Camelyon. The images generated by DPDM are blurry, especially on F-MNIST, while the images generated by our DP-FETA_o and DP-FETA_e have clear object contours. This is because diffusion models with central images for warmup training can more accurately learn the distribution of training images (e.g., clear contours), while DPDM suffers from slower convergence of DP-SGD and can only learn some relatively coarse image features.

Answers to RQ1: Synthetic images produced by DP-FETA exhibit greater fidelity and utility compared to all baseline methods with two distinct privacy budgets. On average, the FID and Accuracy (Acc) of the downstream classification task of synthetic images from DP-FETA is 33.1% lower and 2.1% higher than the SOTA method.

5.2. RQ2: Effective Warm-up Training

We explore how our warm-up training improves the DP-SGD training of diffusion models. We introduce four baselines in this experiment as follows:

- DP-FETA_{II}: DP-FETA_{II} only involves the second stage of DP-FETA, and does not query central images to warm up diffusion models, which is the same as DPDM.
- DP-FETA_{e-r}: DP-FETA_{e-r} uses the mean images for warmup, but the images are not post-enhanced by our augmentation algorithm bag.
- DP-FETA_{o-r}: Similar to DP-FETA_{e-r}, DP-FETA_{o-r} warms up diffusion models using the mode images, which are not post-enhanced by the augmentation algorithm bag.
- DP-FETA_{pub}: DP-FETA_{pub} warms-up diffusion models with a real image datasets, ImageNet [47], which has been used as the public dataset by previous works [13], [21].

Figure 4 shows the FID (top row) and Acc (bottom row) of DP-FETA_e, DP-FETA_o, and four baselines on four investigated datasets with $\varepsilon = 1$. Compared to DP-FETA_{II}, which does not involve warm-up training, on average, both DP-FETA_e and DP-FETA_o achieve better performance with 32.8% lower FID, 3.3% higher Acc, and 30.6% lower FID, 2.0% higher Acc, respectively. This indicates that it is valuable to allocate a small privacy budget to querying the central images for warm-up training rather than directly allocating the whole privacy budget to the DP-SGD training.



Figure 5: The t-SNE visualizations depict the distribution of the sensitive, queried central, public, and random images.

Compared to DP-FETA_{*e*-*r*} and DP-FETA_{*o*-*r*}, which do not post-enhance the queried central images with the augmentation algorithm bag, DP-FETA_{*e*} and DP-FETA_{*o*} obtain better FID and Acc. On average, the FID and Acc of synthetic images from DP-FETA_{*e*} is 12.4% lower and 1.4% higher than DP-FETA_{*e*-*r*}, respectively. Consistently, DP-FETA_{*o*} obtains 21.9% lower FID and 1.2% higher Acc than DP-FETA_{*o*-*r*}.

Compared to DP-FETA_{pub}, which requires an additional real image dataset for warm-up training, DP-FETAe and DP-FETA_o achieve competitive results. On MNIST and F-MNIST, which contains only gray images, using colorful images from ImageNet to warm up diffusion models does not bring great benefits to subsequent fine-tuning, and even has a negative impact on the utility of synthetic images. On average, DP-FETA_{pub} obtains a 21.9% lower FID, but 4.4% lower Acc than DP-FETA_{II}. DP-FETA obtains 22.4% lower FID and 7.4% higher Acc than DP-FETA_{pub} on the average of two versions of DP-FETA. On CelebA and Camelyon, which are also composed of colorful images, DP-FETA_{pub} achieves competitive performance. On the face image dataset CelebA, DP-FETA_{pub} obtains 17.3% lower FID and 1.0% higher Acc than DP-FETA_e, which may benefit from the face images within ImageNet [11]. On Camelyon, which consists of human tissue images and differs from ImageNet greater [11], the benefit decreases. Although the FID of synthetic images from DP-FETA_{pub} is still lower than DP-FETA, the Acc of DP-FETA_{pub} is 0.4%and 1.0% lower than DP-FETA_o and DP-FETA_e, respectively. A natural question is whether we can utilize both central images and public images together to achieve a better synthesis, which will be discussed in Section 6.1.

Additionally, to further validate the effectiveness of our queried central images, we investigate the distribution characteristics of four different types of images as follows:

- **Sensitive Image:** We randomly sample 500 real images from each sensitive image dataset.
- **Central Image:** We query 500 mean images from each sensitive image dataset following Equation 6.
- **Public Image:** We randomly sample 500 real images from the public image dataset ImageNet.
- Random Image: We randomly generate 500 Gaussian images to represent the randomly initialized diffusion model.

The mean and variance of the Gaussian distribution are set as 0 and 1, respectively.

We use t-SNE to visualize all images in a twodimensional space, which is present in Figure 5. In this figure, we observe that compared to public images, our central images from MNIST and Fashion-MNIST-both grayscale datasets-are projected into 10 distinct clusters, closely aligned with the 10 categories of the sensitive images. Diffusion models warmed up on central images can learn to generate images of different categories more easily. On CelebA and Camelyon, which contain colorful images, our central images are still projected into 2 clusters, which explains why the synthetic images generated by DP-FETA are still more useful for training classifiers. However, because of the diversity of colorful images, many sensitive images are not covered by the clusters of our central images. Therefore, diffusion models still need many training iterations to learn those uncovered sensitive images than on two gray image datasets.

Answers to RQ2: Querying central images for warm-up training significantly promotes the DP-SGD training of diffusion models. Public images are not always useful for warm-up training, especially when a large domain shift exists between the public and sensitive datasets.

5.3. RQ3: Hyper-parameters Analysis

This experiment investigates how the number of queried central images (e.g., N_c in Section 3.1) for warm-up impacts the performance of DP-FETA_o and DP-FETA_e. We explore the numbers of central images of 0, 50, 500, 750, 1000, and 1250 for all investigated image datasets with $\varepsilon = 1$.

Figure 6 shows that querying a small number of central images for warm-up training is a more appropriate choice for all four investigated image datasets. Specifically, on MNIST and F-MNIST, the best number of central images for warming-up is just 50 for both DP-FETA_o and DP-FETA_e. When the number of central images increases, the FID and Acc get worse. This is because, given a limited privacy budget, if we allocate too much privacy budget to query-ing central images, the budget allocated to private fine-



Figure 6: The first and second rows of figures present the effect of different numbers of queried central images on the FID and Acc of DP-FETA across four investigated datasets with $\varepsilon = 1$ respectively. The black dashed line represents the diffusion models without using central images for warm-up training.



Figure 7: Convergence performance of DP-FETA with $\varepsilon = 1$, when querying different number of mode images. The black dashed line means the FID at the end of training of diffusion models without using central images for warm-up training.

tuning gets less. Therefore, we need to inject larger noise into the gradient during fine-tuning, which slows down the convergence of diffusion models. We conduct a quantitative analysis of the effect of querying central images on the noise scale of DP-SGD in Section 6.3.

On CelebA and Camelyon, the best number of central images for warming up increases. On CelebA, DP-FETA_o achieves the best Acc when querying 750 central images, while DP-FETA_e obtains the best Acc when querying 500 images. On Camelyon, DP-FETA_o achieves the best Acc when querying 1000 central images, while DP-FETA_e obtains the best Acc when querying 500 images. We consider this because when the number of sensitive images is large, or the

distribution of images is complex, a small number of central images can only capture a small part of simple features, and diffusion models warmed up on these central images can not quickly learn the distribution of the sensitive data, especially those data point which are far from the cluster of central images. However, when the number of queried central images continues to increase, the performance of both DP-FETA_o and DP-FETA_e still drops. The best number of querying images for synthesizers warm-up indicates that DP-FETA only needs to warm up on a very small central image dataset, which can save computational resources compared to using millions of public images for pre-training [11], [21]. We present the examples in Appendix C.2.

Figure 7 presents the FID⁴ of DP-FETA during the finetuning of diffusion models with $\varepsilon = 1$, when querying different numbers of mode images. Across all datasets examined, diffusion models pre-trained on central images exhibit slower FID improvement during the initial stages of finetuning, suggesting that our warm-up has already learned the initial features of sensitive images before fine-tuning. On average, our DP-FETA achieves the same FID while only using 18% of the fine-tuning iterations of diffusion models, which are not warmed up.

Answers to RQ3: The optimal number of central images is significantly smaller than the number of sensitive images and may grow as the quantity and complexity of the sensitive image data distribution increase.

4. The FID during the private fine-tuning is calculated from 5,000 synthetic images for training efficiency and could be a little higher than our reported FID, which is calculated from 60,000 synthetic images.

TABLE 3: FID and Acc of DP-FETA_e, DP-FETA_o and six baselines which use public images on four investigated image datasets with $\varepsilon = 1$. The best performance in each column is highlighted using a bold font.

Method	MNIST		F-M1	NIST	Cel	ebA	Camelyon	
Wiethou	FID	Acc	FID	Acc	FID	Acc	FID	Acc
P-DPDM	11.4	87.5	33.2	75.4	34.4	80.6	42.4	81.8
PrivImage	10.9	93.1	26.9	79.2	26.8	80.6	39.1	82.0
PE	50.5	33.7	32.1	51.3	22.5	69.8	69.8	61.2
$DP-FETA_o$	8.2	96.4	28.8	80.4	42.8	83.8	53.0	82.2
$DP-FETA_e$	8.5	96.5	25.6	82.1	41.5	86.5	52.8	82.8
P-DPDM _o	9.0	95.9	28.4	80.8	35.1	86.2	40.4	81.0
$P-DPDM_e$	9.6	96.1	24.0	81.7	32.8	86.8	42.7	81.8
PrivImage _o	9.9	95.5	25.1	80.1	27.7	83.3	43.5	84.4
$PrivImage_e$	8.0	96.6	23.8	82.1	27.4	84.7	46.2	83.1

6. Discussion

This section discusses (1) how DP-FETA performs when using public images, (2) the reason why mean is better than mode, (3) the privacy cost of central images, (4) the time cost of DP-FETA, and (5) the inherent limitations of DP-FETA.

6.1. Combining Central Image with Public Image

In Section 5.2, we find that, on MNIST and F-MNIST, using central images for warm-up is better than using public images (e.g. ImageNet), while on CelebA and Camelyon, the public images are more useful for warm-up training. This section investigates whether combining public datasets pre-training and central images warm-up can benefit synthesis performance and also compares our DP-FETA with existing SOTA methods using public images. We introduce six baselines as follows:

- **P-DPDM [21]:** P-DPDM trains diffusion models with a large batch size to enhance the stability and convergence speed of the model training under the noise from DP-SGD. Besides, they leverage the public dataset to pre-train diffusion models, benefiting the models from a broader knowledge base.
- **PrivImage** [11]: Compared to P-DPDM, which directly uses the whole public dataset, PrivImage queries the semantics distribution of the sensitive data and selects a part of public data for pre-training.
- **PE** [13]: Private Evolution (PE) is an algorithm that progressively guides a foundation model to generate synthetic images similar to a private dataset without the need for fine-tuning.
- **P-DPDM**_e: Instead of just using ImageNet for pretraining, P-DPDM_e combines the queried mean images and public images from ImageNet into one training set to pre-train diffusion models.
- **P-DPDM**_o: Like P-DPDM_e, P-DPDM_o combines the queried mode images and public images from ImageNet into one training set to pre-train diffusion models.
- **PrivImage**_e: Given pre-trained diffusion models from PrivImage, we fine-tune it on our queried mean images first and then on the sensitive images with DP-SGD.

 PrivImage_o: Similar to PrivImage_e, given pre-trained diffusion models from PrivImage, we fine-tune it on our queried mode images and then fine-tune it on the sensitive images with DP-SGD.

For a fair comparison, we implement all tuning-needed baselines using the same diffusion model as DP-FETA. For PE, we use the pre-trained model released by Nichol et al. [48]⁵, which is also trained on ImageNet for the fair comparison. Table 3 presents the FID and Acc of DP-FETA₀, DP-FETA_e, and above seven methods with $\varepsilon = 1$. It is interesting that, on MNIST and F-MNIST, both DP-FETA_o and DP-FETA_e surpass P-DPDM and PrivImage a lot, which once again validates the superiority of central images when the sensitive images are not similar to the public images. PE only demonstrates effectiveness on the FID for two RGB image datasets due to the same limitation: when the sensitive dataset diverges too significantly from the foundation model's training data, PE struggles to generate useful synthetic images without fine-tuning [15]. However, it seems that using both central and public images for pre-training diffusion models is not always better than using only central images.

For the two variants of P-DPDM, on MNIST, both P-DPDM_o and P-DPDM_e obtain better FID and Acc than DP-FETA_o and DP-FETA_e, respectively. On F-MNIST and Camelyon, although using public images enables DP-FETA_o and DP-FETA_e to obtain lower FID, their Accs decrease a little. However, on CelebA, both FID and Acc of DP-FETA become better. Especially, P-DPDM_o obtains 18.0% lower FID and 2.4% higher Acc. Therefore, directly mixing the central images and public images to pre-train the diffusion model could not be the best way.

For the two variants of PrivImage, they seem to obtain better performance. PrivImage_e obtains the lowest FID and highest Acc among all these eight methods on both MNIST and F-MNIST, while PrivImage_o obtains the highest Acc on Camelyon. Besides, both variants obtain very competitive FIDs compared to PrivImage. We consider the reason why the variants of PrivImage are better than that of P-DPDM is that the number of central images is small compared to that of public images; the benefits of central images are easily overshadowed by public images. PrivImage selects 1% of public datasets for pre-training, which greatly reduces the size of pre-training datasets. Therefore, $PrivImage_e$ can better utilize the benefit of central images. However, $PrivImage_e$ still achieves suboptimal performance on CelebA and Camelyon. This may stem from its sequential pre-training on public images followed by central images. In this process, public datasets (e.g., ImageNet) provide a broad but distant feature base, while central images shift the model toward their simpler, privacy-preserving distribution. Since the later phase dominates, the stronger influence of central images may prioritize coarse characteristics over fine details, which are more critical for CelebA (faces) and Camelyon (human tissues). Considering the potential of these variants, especially PrivImage, we believe

^{5.} https://github.com/openai/improved-diffusion

TABLE 4: Three metrics, FID-p, Loss-p, and FID-f (as introduced in Section 6.2), of the diffusion model using different types of central images for warm-up training on four investigated image datasets with $\varepsilon = 1$.

Centra	al Type	MNIST	F-MNIST	CelebA	Camelyon
	FID-p	123	141	346	215
Mode	Loss-p	0.19	0.37	0.32	0.27
	FID-f	8.2	28.8	42.8	53.0
	FID-p	281	230	226	203
Mean	Loss-p	0.24	0.35	0.30	0.24
	FID-f	8.5	25.6	41.5	52.8

that how to leverage two types of images together for pretraining can be a hopeful future work.

6.2. Why is Mean Better than Mode?

In Section 5.1, we observe that our DP-FETA_e achieves better performance than DP-FETA_o on most investigated image datasets. To further explore the reason, we calculate three different metrics as follows:

- **FID-p:** The FID of synthetic images generated by DP-FETA without fine-tuning on sensitive images and only warmed up.
- Loss-p: The loss value of Equation 3 on the sensitive datasets from the diffusion model, which has only been warmed up like above.
- **FID-f:** The FID of synthetic images generated by our DP-FETA with the two-stage training.

Table 4 presents the three metrics on four investigated image datasets with $\varepsilon = 1$. For Loss-p, on all four investigated datasets, diffusion models that are warmed up on the mean images obtain a lower loss value of the objective function than on the mode images. Thus, they learn the distribution of sensitive data from a better starting point and obtain a lower FID after private fine-tuning. For FID-p, this phenomenon seems to be consistent except for the FID-p on F-MNIST. Specifically, the diffusion model using mode images for warm-up obtains an extremely lower FID than using mean images. However, its FID after fine-tuning gets higher than the synthesizers using mean images for warm-up.

Figure 8 presents the examples of two types of central images. On MNIST and F-MNIST, both mean and mode images depict the general shapes of different categories. On CelebA, which contains colorful images of human faces, two types of central images depict the general outline of human faces. On Camelyon composed of images of human tissue, although these central images do not contain any morphological features of the tissue cells, they have captured the overall color of these tissue images, pink. Our central images have captured some low-level features of the sensitive images to a greater or lesser extent, so the diffusion models pre-trained on these central images. These results indicate that our central images can be simple and

TABLE 5: The Acc of synthetic images from diffusion models warmed up with two types of central images and the noise scale σ_f of DP-SGD on four investigated image datasets with $\varepsilon = 1$, when querying different numbers of central images. The best Acc in each column is highlighted using the bold font.

Centra	1 Type	MN	IST	F-MI	NIST	CelebA		Camelyon		
Centra	riype	Acc	σ_{f}	Acc	σ_{f}	Acc	σ_{f}	Camelyoi Acc σ_f 81.1 1.8 81.4 1.8 82.2 1.9 82.0 1.9 82.4 1.9 81.1 2.0 1000 81.1 82.2 1.8 82.2 1.8 82.2 1.8 82.8 1.9 81.6 1.9 81.8 1.9	σ_{f}	
	0	94.1	12.8	77.7	12.8	81.9	5.9	81.1	1.85	
	50	96.4	13.2	80.4	13.2	83.7	6.0	81.4	1.86	
Mada	500	$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	82.2	1.91						
Mode	750	96.2	19.1	78.5	19.1	84.2	7.3	82.0	1.95	
	1000	95.1	24.4	76.9	24.4	82.8	8.1	82.4	1.99	
	1250	93.3	40.0	75.2	40.0	81.7	9.2	81.1	2.05	
	Best 50		5	0	750		1000			
	0	94.1	12.8	77.7	12.8	81.9	5.9	81.1	1.85	
	50	96.5	13.2	82.1	13.2	84.0	6.0	82.2	1.86	
Moon	500	96.1	16.1	80.7	16.1	86.5	6.8	82.8	1.91	
Mean	750	96.2	19.1	79.5	19.1	85.2	7.3	81.6	1.95	
	1000	95.1	24.4	78.5	24.4	81.4	8.1	81.8	1.99	
	1250	93.3	40.0	77.4	40.0	81.2	9.2	81.2	2.05	
	Best	5	0	5	50		500		500	

useful features for warm-up training. However, compared to mode images, mean images seem to more stably capture these useful features from sensitive images, such as the sixth column of mode images queried from F-MNIST.

Besides, the query results of mode images are more easily affected by the injected Gaussian noise on color images. For example, the background of mode images queried from CelebA is much noisier than that of mean images. However, since mode images are obtained through calculating the histogram of images, theoretically, querying mode data can be extended more naturally to discrete data, such as text, while querying mean data can not.

6.3. Privacy Cost of Central Images

In DP-FETA, two processes consume the privacy budget: (1) querying the central images for warm-up training and (2) fine-tuning the warmed-up diffusion model using DP-SGD. This section explores how the privacy cost of querying central images impacts DP-SGD. As introduced in the Privacy Cost of Section 3.1, we fix the privacy-related hyperparameters except for the noise scale σ_f of DP-SGD, and try different σ_f to meet the required DP budget. Therefore, the number of queried central images has an impact on σ_f , which affects the private fine-tuning.

Table 5 presents the Acc of diffusion models using mean or mode images for a warm-up and the according σ_f used in DP-SGD at different numbers of queried central images. As the number of central images increases, the σ_f also increases for less privacy budget allocated to DP-SGD, and then the gradient gets noisier. Despite more noisy gradients, diffusion models warm up on central images and still generate synthetic images of much more utility. The benefits brought by using central images for warm-up mitigate the performance degradation caused by DP-SGD even under more noisy gradients. For example, on CelebA, although



Figure 8: Examples of mean and mode images from queried from four investigated image datasets, MNIST, F-MNIST, CelebA and Camelyon. The last row of images is real image samples from each image dataset.

TABLE 6: Running time of DP-FETA. Since DP-FETA_e and DP-FETA_o differ only in the query of different central images, their two stages cost the same time.

Dataset	Module	$DP-FETA_o$	DP-FETA $_e$
MNIST &	Stage-I	0.1h	0.1h
F-MNIST	Stage-II	12.2h	12.2h
Coloba	Stage-I	0.3h	0.3h
CETEDA	Stage-II	54.5h	54.5h
Camaluan	Stage-I	0.3h	0.3h
Calleryon	Stage-II	12.1h	12.1h

the noise scale of DP-SGD increases 23.7%, the Acc of synthetic images generated by DP-FETA using queried mode images still increases 2.3%.

6.4. Time Cost of DP-FETA

DP-FETA is composed of two stages, including warm-up training and private fine-tuning. Table 6 presents the time cost of DP-FETA_o and DP-FETA_e on these stages. Since the hyper-parameters on MNIST and F-MNIST are the same, the time consumption of DP-FETA is the same. Compared to directly fine-tuning the model using DP-SGD, the warm-up training in the Stage-I only introduces an average of 1.1% additional training-time cost, while bringing a 33.1% and 2.1% increase in fidelity and utility metrics.

6.5. Limitations

The warm-up training of DP-FETA relies on querying central images from the sensitive dataset. The central images include two types, mean images and mode images, which need to be calculated using the mean and histogram of a randomly sampled image subset, respectively. However, if the data dimensions of sensitive images (e.g., resolution) are not all the same, we need to consider how to define the mean and mode. Besides, when the variance of the sampled subset is large, the mean and mode image could be very noisy and can hardly capture some useful features, making it ineffective for warm-up training. One potential solution is to perform DP clustering [49] on the sampled images and use the weighted centroid of the largest cluster as the central image. Future works should consider how to combine central images with public images for more effective pre-training.

7. Related Work

This section discusses two main types of DP image data synthesis works, distinguishing between those that use public datasets for pre-training and those that do not. In the field of DP image synthesis, a public image dataset refers to a dataset that does not contain any data point existing in our sensitive dataset, and we can use these public images without any privacy concerns.

Training without Pre-training. Based on the theoretical foundations, a private kernel means embedding estimation approach for database release [50], Harder et al. showed DP-MERF [32], which uses the random Fourier features to represent each sensitive image and takes the Maximum Mean Discrepancy (MMD) [51] as the distribution distance between the synthetic and real datasets. Seng et al. [34] suggested substituting the MMD with the characteristic function distance, which uses Fourier transformation to obtain the feature vectors of sensitive images, and proposed PEARL to improve generalization capability. Jiang et al. [35] applied functional RDP to functions in the reproducing kernel Hilbert space to propose DP-Kernel, which achieves SOTA results on the utility of synthetic images. Yang et al. [33] considered using the features of empirical neural tangent kernels to replace the random Fourier features and achieved better synthesis performance.

The aforementioned methods exhibit poor synthetic performance on complex datasets, e.g., CelebA [45]. With the rapid development of deep generative models for addressing complex image generation, various works sanitize the training process (e.g., gradients calculation) of popular generative models, like GANs [17], [18], [19], [20], [29], [42], [52] and diffusion models [11], [12], [21], [22]. Based on the Private Aggregation of Teacher Ensembles (PATE) framework, Long et al. [42] proposed G-PATE, which modified the standard training process of GANs via PATE. Wang et al. [29] proposed Datalens, which compressed the gradients before aggregation, allowing injecting less noise for better performance. Another type of method applied DP-SGD [16] to sanitize the training process of deep generative models. Dockhorn et al. [12] proposed DP Diffusion Models (DPDM). To alleviate the impact of injected noise, they proposed noise multiplicity, a powerful modification of DP-SGD tailored to the training of diffusion models, and achieved SOTA performance on standard benchmarks.

Training with Pre-training. Recently, various methods use a non-sensitive to pre-train the existing generative models. For example, based on DP-MERF [32], Harder et al. introduced DP-MEPF [53], a method that leverages the public data to transform each sensitive image into a more useful perceptual feature vector. These feature vectors calculate their random Fourier features for MMD like DP-MERF. Based on DPDM [12], Ghalebikesabi et al. [21] proposed to first pre-train the diffusion model on a large public image dataset and then fine-tune it on the sensitive dataset with DP-SGD. Instead of directly fine-tuning the whole diffusion model via DP-SGD, Lyu et al. [22] found that fine-tuning only a small part of the parameters was more effective, especially the attention modules in the neural networks. To improve training effectiveness, Li et al. [11] proposed PrivImage, which queried the semantic distribution of the sensitive data to select a minimal amount of public data for pre-training. PrivImage achieved new SOTA results on common image synthesis benchmarks. Despite this, finetuning using DP-SGD still consumes a huge amount of GPU memory for its need for the sample-wise gradient. Lin et al. [13] proposed a fine-tuning-free method, PE. PE progressively guided a diffusion model, which has been pretrained on the public images, to generate synthetic images similar to the sensitive ones in feature space.

8. Conclusion

This paper proposes a two-stage DP image synthesis framework, DP-FETA. Compared to directly training diffusion models on the sensitive data using DP-SGD, DP-FETA leverages a two-stage training, where diffusion models can learn from easy to hard. In DP-FETA, diffusion models can learn the distribution of sensitive data much better than existing one-stage training methods. In order to combine DP-FETA with using public images, we try to use both the central images and public images for warm-up training, which is not always better than using just central images. We believe that leveraging these two types of images together for warm-up could be a hopeful future work.

References

- C. Gong, Z. Yang, Y. Bai, J. He, J. Shi, K. Li, A. Sinha, B. Xu, X. Hou, D. Lo, *et al.*, "Baffle: Hiding backdoors in offline reinforcement learning datasets," in 2024 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP), pp. 2086–2104, IEEE, 2024.
- [2] J. Mattern, Z. Jin, and et al., "Differentially private language models for secure data sharing," in *EMNLP*, pp. 4860–4873, 2022.
- [3] Z. Tian, Y. Zhao, and et al., "Seqpate: Differentially private text generation via knowledge distillation," in *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [4] Z. Zhang, T. Wang, N. Li, and et al., "Privsyn: Differentially private data synthesis," in *30th USENIX Security Symposium*, pp. 929–946, 2021.
- [5] C. Dwork, F. McSherry, K. Nissim, and A. D. Smith, "Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis," in *TCC*, pp. 265–284, 2006.
- [6] X. Li, T. Li, Y. Cheng, C. Gong, K. Ren, Z. Qin, and T. Wang, "Spas: Continuous release of data streams under w-event differential privacy," *Proc. ACM Manag. Data*, vol. 3, Feb. 2025.

- [7] R. McKenna, B. Mullins, D. Sheldon, and G. Miklau, "AIM: an adaptive and iterative mechanism for differentially private synthetic data," *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, vol. 15, no. 11, pp. 2599–2612, 2022.
- [8] K. Cai, X. Lei, J. Wei, and X. Xiao, "Data synthesis via differentially private markov random fields," *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, vol. 14, no. 11, p. 2190–2202, 2021.
- [9] X. Yue, H. A. Inan, and et al., "Synthetic text generation with differential privacy: A simple and practical recipe," in ACL, pp. 1321– 1342, 2023.
- [10] C. Xie, Z. Lin, A. Backurs, et al., "Differentially private synthetic data via foundation model apis 2: Text," in *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.
- [11] K. Li, C. Gong, and et al., "Privimage: Differentially private synthetic image generation using diffusion models with semantic-aware pretraining," in 33rd USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security, 2024.
- [12] T. Dockhorn, T. Cao, A. Vahdat, and K. Kreis, "Differentially Private Diffusion Models," *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023.
- [13] Z. Lin, S. Gopi, J. Kulkarni, and et al., "Differentially private synthetic data via foundation model apis 1: Images," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2305.15560, 2023.
- [14] H. Wang, S. Pang, and et al., "dp-promise: Differentially private diffusion probabilistic models for image synthesis," in 33rd USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security, 2024.
- [15] C. Gong, K. Li, Z. Lin, and T. Wang, "Dpimagebench: A unified benchmark for differentially private image synthesis," arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.14681, 2025.
- [16] M. Abadi, A. Chu, I. J. Goodfellow, and et al., "Deep learning with differential privacy," in *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pp. 308–318, 2016.
- [17] S. Augenstein, H. B. McMahan, and et al., "Generative models for effective ML on private, decentralized datasets," in 8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR, 2020.
- [18] D. Chen, S. S. Cheung, C. Chuah, and et al., "Differentially private generative adversarial networks with model inversion," in *IEEE International Workshop on Information Forensics and Security, WIFS*, pp. 1–6, 2021.
- [19] Y. Liu, J. Peng, J. J. Q. Yu, and et al., "PPGAN: privacy-preserving generative adversarial network," in 25th IEEE International Conference on Parallel and Distributed Systems, ICPADS, pp. 985–989, 2019.
- [20] R. Torkzadehmahani, P. Kairouz, and B. Paten, "DP-CGAN: differentially private synthetic data and label generation," in *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops, CVPR Workshops*, pp. 98–104, 2019.
- [21] S. Ghalebikesabi, L. Berrada, S. Gowal, and et al., "Differentially private diffusion models generate useful synthetic images," *CoRR*, 2023.
- [22] S. Lyu, M. Vinaroz, and et al., "Differentially private latent diffusion models," *CoRR*, 2023.
- [23] D. Jiang, G. Zhang, M. Karami, and et al., "Dp²-vae: Differentially private pre-trained variational autoencoders," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2208.03409, 2022.
- [24] B. Pfitzner and B. Arnrich, "Dpd-fvae: Synthetic data generation using federated variational autoencoders with differentially-private decoder," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2211.11591, 2022.
- [25] H. Pham, Z. Dai, G. Ghiasi, and et al., "Combined scaling for zeroshot transfer learning," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2111.10050, 2021.
- [26] Y. Bengio, J. Louradour, R. Collobert, and J. Weston, "Curriculum learning," in *Proceedings of the 26th Annual International Conference* on Machine Learning, ICML, 2009.

- [27] X. Wang, Y. Chen, and W. Zhu, "A survey on curriculum learning," IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell., 2022.
- [28] S. Manikandan et al., "Measures of central tendency: Median and mode," J Pharmacol Pharmacother, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 214–215, 2011.
- [29] B. Wang, F. Wu, and et al., "Datalens: Scalable privacy preserving training via gradient compression and aggregation," in ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, pp. 2146– 2168, 2021.
- [30] I. Mironov, K. Talwar, and L. Zhang, "Rényi differential privacy of the sampled gaussian mechanism," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1908.10530, 2019.
- [31] I. Mironov, "Rényi differential privacy," in 2017 IEEE 30th computer security foundations symposium (CSF), pp. 263–275, IEEE, 2017.
- [32] F. Harder, K. Adamczewski, and M. Park, "DP-MERF: differentially private mean embeddings with randomfeatures for practical privacypreserving data generation," in *AISTATS*, pp. 1819–1827, 2021.
- [33] Y. Yang, K. Adamczewski, and et al, "Differentially private neural tangent kernels for privacy-preserving data generation," vol. abs/2303.01687, 2023.
- [34] S. P. Liew, T. Takahashi, and M. Ueno, "PEARL: data synthesis via private embeddings and adversarial reconstruction learning," in *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [35] D. Jiang, S. Sun, and Y. Yu, "Functional renyi differential privacy for generative modeling," in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 2023.
- [36] J. Ho, A. Jain, and P. Abbeel, "Denoising diffusion probabilistic models," in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 2020.
- [37] Y. Song and S. Ermon, "Generative modeling by estimating gradients of the data distribution," in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, pp. 11895–11907, 2019.
- [38] A. Q. Nichol and P. Dhariwal, "Improved denoising diffusion probabilistic models," in *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference* on Machine Learning, ICML, pp. 8162–8171, 2021.
- [39] M. Xu, S. Yoon, A. Fuentes, and D. S. Park, "A comprehensive survey of image augmentation techniques for deep learning," *Pattern Recognit.*, vol. 137, p. 109347, 2023.
- [40] K. Li, B. Dai, J. Fu, and X. Hou, "DAS3D: dual-modality anomaly synthesis for 3d anomaly detection," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2410.09821, 2024.
- [41] S. Gopi, Y. T. Lee, and L. Wutschitz, "Numerical composition of differential privacy," in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 2021.
- [42] Y. Long, B. Wang, and et al., "G-PATE: scalable differentially private data generator via private aggregation of teacher discriminators," in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 2021.
- [43] Y. LeCun, L. Bottou, Y. Bengio, and et al., "Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 86, no. 11, pp. 2278–2324, 1998.
- [44] H. Xiao, K. Rasul, and R. Vollgraf, "Fashion-mnist: a novel image dataset for benchmarking machine learning algorithms," CoRR, 2017.
- [45] Z. Liu, P. Luo, X. Wang, and et al., "Deep learning face attributes in the wild," in 2015 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision, ICCV 2015,, pp. 3730–3738, 2015.
- [46] P. Bándi, O. Geessink, Q. Manson, and et al., "From detection of individual metastases to classification of lymph node status at the patient level: The CAMELYON17 challenge," *IEEE Trans. Medical Imaging*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 550–560, 2019.
- [47] J. Deng, W. Dong, R. Socher, and et al., "Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database," in *IEEE Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition CVPR*, pp. 248–255, 2009.
- [48] A. Q. Nichol and P. Dhariwal, "Improved denoising diffusion probabilistic models," in *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference* on Machine Learning, ICML, pp. 8162–8171, 2021.

- [49] D. Su, J. Cao, N. Li, E. Bertino, and H. Jin, "Differentially private k-means clustering," in *Proceedings of the Sixth ACM on Conference* on Data and Application Security and Privacy, pp. 26–37, 2016.
- [50] M. Balog, I. O. Tolstikhin, and B. Schölkopf, "Differentially private database release via kernel mean embeddings," in *the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 423–431, 2018.
- [51] A. Gretton, K. M. Borgwardt, M. J. Rasch, B. Schölkopf, and A. J. Smola, "A kernel two-sample test," *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, vol. 13, pp. 723–773, 2012.
- [52] D. Chen, T. Orekondy, and M. Fritz, "GS-WGAN: A gradientsanitized approach for learning differentially private generators," in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 2020.
- [53] F. Harder, M. Jalali, D. J. Sutherland, and et al., "Pre-trained perceptual features improve differentially private image generation," *Trans. Mach. Learn. Res.*, vol. 2023, 2023.
- [54] I. J. Goodfellow, J. Pouget-Abadie, M. Mirza, and et al., "Generative adversarial nets," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 2672–2680, 2014.
- [55] E. D. Cubuk, B. Zoph, and et al., "Randaugment: Practical automated data augmentation with a reduced search space," in *Annual Confer*ence on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS, 2020.
- [56] J. Song, C. Meng, and S. Ermon, "Denoising diffusion implicit models," in 9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR, 2021.
- [57] A. Brock, J. Donahue, and K. Simonyan, "Large scale GAN training for high fidelity natural image synthesis," in 7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR, 2019.

Appendix A. Missing Proofs

Proof of Theorem 3.1: The query of mean image x^{mean} has global sensitivity $\Delta_{mean} = C_c/B_c^*$. For any $\alpha > 1$, incorporating noise $\mathcal{N}\left(0, \sigma_c^2 \Delta_{mean}^2 \mathbb{I}\right)$ into the mean image x^{mean} makes the query results satisfies (α, γ) -RDP, where $\gamma \geq D_{\alpha}\left(\left[(1-q_c) p_0 + q_c p_1 \| p_0\right]\right)$.

Proof. For any two neighboring image subsets $D_{s1} = \{x_i^s\}_{i=1}^{B_c}$ and $D_{s2} = \{x_i^s\}_{i=1}^{B_c-1}$ with $\|x_i^{s,c}\|_2 \leq C_c$, we have

$$\begin{split} \Delta_{\text{mean}} &= \|x_1^{\text{mean}} - x_2^{\text{mean}}\|_2 \\ &= \left\| \frac{1}{B_c^*} \sum_{i=1}^{B_c} x_i^{s,c} - \frac{1}{B_c^*} \sum_{i=1}^{B_c-1} x_i^{s,c} \right\|_2 \\ &= \left\| \frac{1}{B_c^*} \sum_{i=1}^{B_c-1} x_i^{s,c} \right\|_2 \\ &\leq \frac{C_c}{B_c^*} \end{split}$$

Proof of Theorem 3.2: The query of frequency histogram H_p has global sensitivity $\Delta_p = 1$. For any $\alpha > 1$, incorporating noise $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_c^2 \mathbb{I})$ into the frequency histogram H_p makes the query results satisfies (α, γ) -RDP, where $\gamma \geq D_{\alpha}([(1 - q_c) p_0 + q_c p_1 || p_0]).$

Proof. We prove that querying the frequency histogram H_p has global sensitivity $\Delta_p = 1$. A frequency histogram $H_p \in [0, B_c]^{1 \times bins}$ is calculated from a pixel set $D_p = \{p_i\}_{i=1}^{B_c}$,

Hyper-parameter		Mean	n Image		Mode Image				
Tryper-parameter	MNIST	F-MNIST	CelebA	Camelyon	MNIST	F-MNIST	CelebA	Camelyon	
Batch size	6K	6K	12K	12K	6K	6K	12K	12K	
Noise scale	5	5	10	10	5	5	10	10	
Image norm bound	28.0	28.0	55.5	55.5	-	-	-	-	
Histogram dimension	-	-	-	-	2	2	16	16	

TABLE 7: Hyper-parameters for querying central images.

TABLE 8: Hyper-parameters for training diffusion models.

Hyper-parameter		Warm-u	p Training		Private Fine-tuning			
riyper-parameter	MNIST	F-MNIST	CelebA	Camelyon	MNIST	F-MNIST	CelebA	Camelyon
Learning rate	3×10^{-4}	3×10^{-4}	3×10^{-4}	3×10^{-4}				
Iterations	2K	2K	2.5K	2.5K	2.2K	2.2K	13.4K	1.5K
Batch size	64	64	64	64	4096	4096	2048	2048
Parameters	1.5M	1.5M	1.5M	1.8M	1.5M	1.5M	1.5M	1.8M

which contains B_c pixels $p_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and each pixel only contributes to adding one in H_p . Therefore, for two frequency histograms H_{p1} and H_{p2} , where H_{p1} is obtained by adding or removing one pixel from its pixel set D_p1 . It is obviously that the global sensitivity $\Delta_p = ||H_{p1} - H_{p2}||_2 = 1$.

Proof of Theorem 3.3: The query of frequency histogram of all pixels H has global sensitivity $\Delta_{mode} = \sqrt{WHC_x}$. For any $\alpha > 1$, incorporating noise $\mathcal{N}\left(0, WHC_x\sigma_c^2\mathbb{I}\right)$ into the frequency histogram H makes the query results satisfies (α, γ) -RDP, where $\gamma \ge D_{\alpha}\left(\left[(1-q_c)p_0 + q_cp_1 \| p_0\right]\right)$.

Proof. We first prove querying the frequency histogram of all pixels $H \in [0, B_c]^{WHC_x \times bins}$ has global sensitivity $\Delta_{\text{mode}} = \sqrt{WHC_x}$. In the proof of Theorem 3.2, we have the frequency histogram sensitivity of one pixel in the image $\Delta_p = ||H_{p1} - H_{p2}||_2 = 1$. For two frequency histograms H_1 and H_2 , where H_1 is obtained by adding or removing one image from its sensitive dataset D_{s1} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^2_{\text{mode}} &= \|H_1 - H_2\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{WHC_x} \|H_{p1}^i - H_{p2}^i\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{WHC_x} \|H_{p1} - H_{p2}\|_2^2 \\ &= WHC_x \|H_{p1} - H_{p2}\|_2^2 \\ &= WHC_x \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have $\Delta_{\text{mode}} \leq \sqrt{WHC_x}$.

Appendix B. Implementation Details

This section provides detailed information on the baselines, offers an in-depth explanation of DP-FETA, and outlines the metrics used.

B.1. Details of Baselines

We implement all baselines using their open-source codes in our experiments as follows:

- **DP-MERF** [32]: DP-MERF uses the random feature representation of kernel mean embeddings with MMD [51] to minimize the distribution distance between the true data and synthetic data for DP data generation. We use their open-source codes to implement DP-MERF⁶. We conduct experiments on Camelyon using the same hyperparameter setting as their setting on CelebA.
- **G-PATE** [42]: G-PATE leverages generative adversarial nets [54] to generate data. They train a student data generator with an ensemble of teacher discriminators and propose a novel private gradient aggregation mechanism to ensure DP. We use their open-source codes to implement G-PATE⁷. We conduct experiments on Camelyon using the same hyper-parameter setting as their setting on CelebA.
- DataLens [29]: To further accelerate the convergence of data generator in G-PATE, DataLens introduces a novel dimension compression and aggregation approach, which exhibits a better trade-off on privacy and convergence rate. We use their open-source codes to implement DataLens⁸. We conduct experiments on Camelyon using the same hyper-parameter setting as their setting on CelebA.
- **DP-Kernel [35]:** DP-Kernel develops the functional RDP and privatizes the loss function of data generator in a reproducing kernel Hilbert space for DP image synthesis. We use their open-source codes to implement DataLens⁹. We conduct experiments on Camelyon using the same hyper-parameter setting as their setting on CelebA.
- **DPDM** [12]: DPDM trains the diffusion models on sensitive images with DP-SGD [16]. They propose noise multiplicity, a modification of DP-SGD, to alleviate the impact of injected noise to gradients. We use their open-source codes to implement DataLens¹⁰. The hyper-parameters of training are the same as present in Table 7.

^{6.} https://github.com/ParkLabML/DP-MERF

^{7.} https://github.com/AI-secure/G-PATE

^{8.} https://github.com/AI-secure/DataLens

^{9.} https://github.com/dihjiang/DP-kernel

^{10.} https://github.com/nv-tlabs/DPDM

B.2. Details of Querying Central Image

Table 7 presents the hyper-parameters of querying central images used in our experiments. Since two colorful image datasets contain more images, which means we can obtain a smaller sample ratio given the same batch size, we use a larger batch size on CelebA and Camelyon than MNIST and F-MNIST. We set the image norm bound as the upper bound of images. Since all the sensitive images are scaled into $[0, 1]^{W \times H \times C_x}$, where W and H are the width and height of the image respectively, and C_x is the number of color channels, the image norm is always smaller than $\sqrt{W \times H \times C_x}$. The $W \times H \times C_x$ of MNIST and F-MNIST is $28 \times 28 \times 1$, and that of CelebA and Camelyon is $32 \times 32 \times 3$. For the histogram dimension of mode images, we use 2 and 16 for gray image datasets and colorful image datasets, respectively.

B.3. Details of Augmentation

We implement the augmentation algorithm bag as introduced in 3.1.3 using 14 image augmentation algorithms proposed by Cubuk et al. [55], which can be accessed at the repository¹¹. For all investigated image datasets, we randomly sample 2 augmentation algorithms from the bag to sequentially transform the input central images during the pre-training.

B.4. Details of Model Training

Table 8 presents the hyper-parameters of warm-up training and private fine-tuning used in our experiments. All the hyper-parameters of fine-tuning are the same as DPDM [12], and we find their setting works well. For warm-up training, we use the same learning rate on all four investigated image datasets. Since the number of queried central images is small, we warm up diffusion models for a small number of iterations, and use a small batch size.

B.5. Details of Metrics

- Fréchet Inception Distance (FID): FID has been widely used to assess the fidelity of synthetic images generated by Generative models [36], [56], [57]. A lower FID suggests that the generated images are higher quality and more akin to the real dataset. We generate 60,000 synthetic images to calculate FID.
- Acc: We assess the utility of synthetic images on the image classification task. Following DPDM, we train a CNN classifier on the synthetic images, and the Acc is tested on the sensitive test dataset. We generate 60,000 synthetic images to train the classifier.

For FID, we use the pre-trained Inception $V1^{12}$ as DPDM [12] to extract the feature vectors of images. For

TABLE 9: FID, Acc and σ_f of DP-FETA_e on MNIST and F-MNIST under $\varepsilon = 1$ with two different privacy accountant, RDP and PRV.

Account		MNIST		F	-MNIS	Т
Account	FID	Acc	σ_{f}	FID	Acc	σ_{f}
RDP	8.0	96.6	13.2	23.8	82.1	13.2
PRV	7.9	96.3	12.2	23.6	82.5	12.2

Acc, the model architecture of the CNN classifier is taken from the repository ¹³ as DPDM.

Appendix C. More Results

C.1. Visualization Comparison

Examples of synthetic images from DP-Kernel [35], DPDM [12], DP-FETA_o and DP-FETA_e on MNIST, F-MNIST, CelebA, and Camelyon are present in Figure 9 with $\varepsilon = 10$. With a larger privacy budget $(1 \rightarrow 10)$, the fidelity of synthetic images from DPDM is competitive with ours. However, on more complex datasets, CelebA and Camelyon, our DP-FETA still surpasses DPDM. For example, DPDM sometimes fails to generate complete facial images (the second row), and on Camelyon, DPDM generates some very similar images, reducing the diversity of the synthetic dataset. In spite of an increase in the privacy budget, the images generated by DP-Kernel are still blurry across all four datasets.

C.2. More Synthetic Images from DP-FETA

Figure 10 and 11 present the synthetic images from DP-FETA_e and DP-FETA_o, when querying different numbers of central images for pre-training. On MNIST and F-MNIST, two variants of DP-FETA, achieves suboptimal synthesis performance when the number of queries is too small or too large. On two colorful image datasets, CelebA and Camelyon, the diversity of the synthetic images is poor when no central images are used for pre-training. For example, some synthetic Camelyon images are very similar to each other. When the number of sensitive images is large, querying more central images could be better.

C.3. More Advanced Privacy Accounting

In this paper, we use the RDP to track the privacy cost of DP-FETA for fair comparison with existing methods. We also explore using a more advanced privacy accountant, Privacy loss Random Variables (PRV) [41]. As shown in Table 9, the noise scale σ_f of DP-FETA_e can be reduced by 7.8% with PRV. With less noisy gradients, DP-FETA_e performs better, but this improvement is slight.

^{11.} https://github.com/tensorflow/tpu/blob/master/models/official/efficientnet/autoaugment.py

^{12.} https://api.ngc.nvidia.com/v2/models/nvidia/research/stylegan3/versions/1/files/metrics/inception-2015-12-05.pkl

^{13.} https://github.com/nv-tlabs/DP-Sinkhorn_code



Figure 9: Examples of synthetic images from four different methods, DP-Kernel [35], DPDM [12] and our DP-FETA_o and DP-FETA_e, on four investigated image datasets, MNIST, F-MNIST, CelebA and Camelyon, with $\varepsilon = 10$. The last row of images are real image samples from each image dataset.



Figure 10: Examples of synthetic images from DP-FETA_e on four investigated image datasets, MNIST, F-MNIST, CelebA and Camelyon, with $\varepsilon = 1$, when querying different numbers of mean images.



Figure 11: Examples of synthetic images from DP-FETA_o on four investigated image datasets, MNIST, F-MNIST, CelebA and Camelyon, with $\varepsilon = 1$, when querying different numbers of mode images.

Appendix D. Meta-Review

The following meta-review was prepared by the program committee for the 2025 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P) as part of the review process as detailed in the call for papers.

D.1. Summary

This paper proposes a new method for training differentially-private machine learning models. The core idea is to first train models on aggregate DP features of the dataset. Then, they fine-tune using SGD. The approach demonstrates a better privacy-utility tradeoff than prior methods.

D.2. Scientific Contributions

- Establishes a new research direction
- Provides a Valuable Step Forward in an Established Field

D.3. Reasons for Acceptance

- 1) This approach is interesting and novel. To our knowledge, it has not be tried before.
- 2) The empirical results appear to be rather promising.