Private Analysis of Graph Structure

Grigory Yaroslavtsev http://grigory.us

With Vishesh Karwa, Sofya Raskhodnikova and Adam Smith Pennsylvania State University

Publishing network data

Many data sets can be represented as a graph:

- Friendship in online social network
- Financial transactions
- Romantic relationships



- Publish information about a graph
- Preserve privacy of relationships



Naïve approach: anonymization

Publishing network data

Goal: Publish structural information about a graph



- Anonymization not sufficient [Backström, Dwork, Kleinberg '07, Narayanan, Shmatikov '09, Narayanan, Shi, Rubinstein '11]
- Ideal: Algorithms with rigorous privacy guarantee, no assumptions about attacker's prior information/algorithm

Differential privacy

[Dwork, McSherry, Nissim, Smith '06]

 Limits incremental information by hiding presence/absence of an individual relationship



- Neighbors: Graphs G and G' that differ in one edge
- Answers on neighboring graphs should be similar

Differential privacy for relationships ϵ -differential privacy (edge privacy) For all pairs of neighbors G, G' and all events **S**: $Pr[A(G) \in S] \leq e^{\epsilon} Pr[A(G') \in S]$

- Probability is over the randomness of A
- Definition requires that the distributions are close:



Subgraph counts

For graphs G and H: # of occurrences of H in G



Subgraph counts

- Subgraph counts are used in:
 - Exponential random graph models
 - Descriptive graph statistics, e.g.:

Clustering coefficient =



• Our focus: efficient differentially private algorithms for releasing subgraph counts

Previous work

- Smooth Sensitivity [Nissim, Raskhodnikova, Smith '07]
 - Differentially private algorithm for triangles
 - Open: private algorithms for other subgraphs?
- Private queries with joins [Rastogi, Hay, Miklau, Suciu '09]
 - Works for a wide range of subgraphs
 - Weaker privacy guarantee, applies only for specific class of adversaries
- Private degree sequence [Hay, Li, Miklau, Jensen '09]
 - Guarantees differential privacy
 - Works for k-stars, but not for other subgraphs

Laplace Mechanism and Sensitivity [Dwork, McSherry, Nissim, Smith '06]

• Add noise: mean = 0, standard deviation $\sim (S_f/\epsilon)$, where S_f is sensitivity => ϵ -differential privacy:

$$f'(G) = f(G) + Lap(S_f/\epsilon)$$

- Local sensitivity ([NRS'07], not differentially private!): $LS_{f}(G) = \max_{\substack{G': \text{ Neighbor of } G}} |f(G) - f(G')|$
- Previous work (mostly): Global sensitivity $S_f = GS_f = \max_G LS_f(G) \Rightarrow$ differentially private!

Instance-Specific Noise

 G_n = set of all graphs on *n* vertices. d(G,G') = # edges in which G and G' differ.



- Add Cauchy noise: median = 0, median absolute value $\propto S_{f,\beta}^* (G)/\beta$ (where $\beta = c \cdot \epsilon$) => ϵ -differential privacy: $f'(G) = f(G) + Cauchy(S_{f,\beta}^*/\beta)$
- Naïve computation requires exponential time
- [NRS'07]: Compute smooth sensitivity for triangles

Our contributions

- Differentially private algorithms for k-stars and k-triangles
 - Efficiently compute smooth sensitivity for k-stars
 - NP-hardness for k-triangles and k-cycles
 - Different approach for k-triangles
- Average-case analysis in G(n,p)
- Theoretical comparison with previous work
- Experimental evaluation

Smooth Sensitivity for k-stars (

This paper: near-linear time algorithm for smooth sensitivity

- Algorithm also reveals structural results, e.g.:
 - Proposition:

If ($\epsilon < 1$) and (maximum degree > $const \cdot k/\epsilon$) then (smooth sensitivity) = (local sensitivity)

- Algorithm optimal for large class of graphs
 Proposition: error > const ·(local sensitivity)
- Compared to [HLMJ'09] (private degree sequence):
 - Our error never worse by more than a constant factor
 - For 2-stars, our error can be better by $\Omega(\sqrt{n/\epsilon})$ factor

Private Approximation to Local Sensitivity: k-triangles (

Approximate differential privacy, (ϵ, δ) -privacy

[Dwork, Kenthapadi, McSherry, Mironov, Naor '06]:

 $\Pr[A(G) \in S] \le e^{\epsilon} \Pr[A(G') \in S] + \delta$

Idea: Private upper bound on local sensitivity (\widetilde{LS}) . **Release:** $A(G) = (\widetilde{LS}, f(G) + Lap(\widetilde{LS}/\epsilon))$.

lf

- \widetilde{LS} is ϵ -differentially private and
- $\Pr[\widetilde{LS} \ge LS] \ge 1 \delta$

Then A is $(2\epsilon, e^{\epsilon}\delta)$ -differentially private.

Evaluating our algorithms

- Theoretical evaluation in G(n,p) model
 - All of our algorithms have relative error -> 0
 when the average degree = np grows
- Empirical evaluation
 - Synthetic graphs from G(n,p) model
 - Variety of real data sets

Experimental results for G(n,p) $\log n$ Comparison with previous work for $\mathbf{p} =$ n 10 **2-Stars** → LS Barrier Relative Median Error Our algorithms 1 0.1 0.01 --- Relative Error = 1 0.001 --- 5 % Relative Error 500 1000 () Nodes

• Comparison with previous work for $\mathbf{p} = \frac{\log n}{n}$



Experimental results for G(n,p)

• Comparison with [RHMS'09] for $\mathbf{p} = \frac{\log n}{m}$



Experimental results (SNAP)



Experimental results (SNAP)



Summary

- Private algorithms for subgraph counts
 - Rigorous privacy guarantee (differential privacy)
 - Running time close to best algorithms for computing the subgraph counts
- Improvement in accuracy and (for some graph counts) in privacy over previous work
- Techniques:
 - Fast computation of smooth sensitivity
 - Differentially private upper bound on local sensitivity