

# Response to Review on Paper

## *New Privacy Mechanism Design With Direct Access to the Private Data*

by Amirreza Zamani, Tobias J. Oechtering, Mikael Skoglund

We would like to express our sincere gratitude towards the reviewers for the thorough review and the helpful comments. Below, we respond all comments from the reviewers. The original comments are included in *italic* font. The answers are typed in normal font.

## Response to the Reviewer 1:

Thank you very much for thoroughly reading our paper and for your useful comments.

## Response to the comments:

- *This paper studies a data-privacy-preserving disclosure mechanism in an information-theoretic setup. The paper proposes a so-called separation technique and combines it with two other lemmas from the literature to produce tighter lower bounds on the privacy-utility trade-off. The paper also compares the proposed lower bounds with existing bounds to gain insights.*

Thanks for summarizing well our paper.

- *While the paper appears technically strong (the reviewer did not check the correctness of every single proof step and is giving deference to the author team due to their prior publications in the field), the presentation of the new technical results could be improved. Explanation about how and why the route of separation technique can help further strengthen the bound as compared to those in the literature is purely technical, i.e., choosing the best distribution of  $X_2$  instead of that of  $X$ . What is the intuitive explanation at the data level? A purely technical paper is a better fit for an information theory conference rather than WIFS, which consists of readers from various backgrounds. For the WIFS audience, it could be helpful to give real-world motivation examples of what  $X$ ,  $Y$ , and  $U$  may represent. Since  $X$ ,  $Y$ , and  $U$  are all assumed random variables (as in information theory), emphasis may need to justify why the quantity being modeled in a given real-world example can be considered a random variable rather than a fixed but unknown constant. Statisticians do a better job on this front. A quick read of the introductory chapters of McCulloch and Searle (2001) may help.*

Thank you for considering our results technically strong. In the final version we try to improve the presentation of the paper by adding more explanations for the motivations and results. Furthermore, we add more explanations about the real world examples. Please note that separating  $X$  does not help to improve the lower bounds in general. There are cases (as discussed in the paper) that the existing bounds are tighter. An intuition can be when part of  $X$  is more important than the other part we should separate the private data. For instance, we have found that when the leakage from  $X_2$  is larger than the other parts we can design a privacy design considering  $X_2$  instead of  $X$ . In fact these results were found when we were dealing with a problem with an additional constraint that the leakage from  $X_2$  is larger than the other part. We will discuss more about the separation technique in the final version and its intuition. Regarding real world example we can use our scheme in the cache-aided networks in the presence of an adversary. As an example, random variables can be motivated by the inaccurate outcome in patients experiments. In more detail consider a scenario where consider instead a scenario formed by patients under treatment. Here a specific example would be based on the CD4 lymphocyte level measured for a specific patient. When the value is low, then with high probability the patient is in the terminal stage of an HIV infection. However this is not the single cause for low CD4 values (for example being under chemotherapy would be another cause). On the other hand, a patient in the terminal stage of HIV can also have higher CD4 values. Then let  $Y$  corresponds to “CD4 is low/high” and “ $X$  to patient is in terminal stage of HIV.” Since in this example we are dealing with probabilities we need to model  $X$  and  $Y$  by random variables. For more details you can read our published paper “A design framework for strongly  $\chi^2$ -data disclosure.” Thank you for your suggestion and we will read more using this book.

- *The presentation of the paper is unbalanced and is not very satisfactory with more than half a page stating 4 lemmas from the literature. Please justify why they need to be included in full-text, instead of some form of condensed way such as sketches of proof or a comparison table.*

We apologize for the unbalanced presentation and in the final version we will improve it. Since our new design is based on different versions of the Functional Representation Lemma we prefer to keep them in the paper so that the reader can follow the design.

- *Strengths:*
  - + *The proposed "separation technique" is new and its combination with prior work can lead to tighter bounds.*
  - + *The new bounds are tighter.*
  - + *New bounds are compared and contrasted with the prior bounds.*

Thanks for acknowledging the strengths.

- *Weaknesses:*
  - *The organization of the paper needs to be improved. The main result could be strategically presented earlier. Unnecessary duplication of results from the literature, if not well justified, should be avoided.*
  - *Connection to real-world data privacy challenges is lacking, or the work is a better fit for information theory conferences. The introduction may be improved to include real-world motivations in addition to the technical notations and setups.*

Thanks for the comments. In the final version we will reorganize the paper for making it more clear and will remove the duplication. Moreover, we will add real world motivations and provide a practical example using our privacy design.

- *Misc:*
  - *In Remark 2, the notation of random vector  $X = (X_1, X_2)$  is inconsistent with an earlier definition in the paper that  $X$  is a random variable. In Remark 2, the authors could have written  $X = X_1 \times X_2$ . Note that in the Appendix, being able to write  $I(U; X) = I(U; X_1, X_2)$  does not justify the misuse of notion  $X = (X_1, X_2)$ .*
  - *Function  $h_0(\cdot)$  is undefined.*
  - *The expressions at the beginning of Section IV are inconsistent with those in Theorem 1. Once "min" is removed, the symbol  $L_n^\epsilon$  cannot be used. A new symbol has to be assigned.*
  - *LaTeX typesetting on parentheses, brackets, and braces can be improved to make the equations easier. Try to follow the rule of  $[( [ ( ) ] )]$  avoid using 3 levels of parentheses in one shot. Try to use *big*, *Big*, etc. to add extra space around parentheses to help the clarity of equations.*
  - *If possible, please cite any relevant sources that inspired this idea, e.g., number theory/abstract algebra textbook, when presenting the proposed separation technique.*
- Will be corrected.
- Will be added.
- They are not inconsistent, since from the beginning we assumed that  $X$  is divided into two parts. We will clarify it in the final version.
- Thanks for pointing this out. Will be corrected.
- Will be added.

## Response to the Reviewer 4:

Thank you very much for reviewing our paper and for your useful comments.

### Response to the comments:

- The "separation technique" is a notable strength, as it presents a new approach to representing a random variable by two correlated random variables.  
The ability to generalize results to various scenarios showcases the broad applicability and robustness of the approach. *Pros: The paper introduces novel concepts, applies established mathematical lemmas, and demonstrates improved results in privacy mechanism design.*  
*The "separation technique" is a notable strength, as it presents a new approach to representing a random variable by two correlated random variables.*  
*The ability to generalize results to various scenarios showcases the broad applicability and robustness of the approach.*

*Thanks for pointing out the strengths of the paper.*

- Cons: While the paper does contribute new insights and methods, it does not seem to present groundbreaking or revolutionary concepts. It could benefit from a more thorough comparison to existing methods and approaches in the field to highlight the novelty and advantages of the proposed approach.  
Discussing potential real-world applications or scenarios where the proposed privacy mechanism design could be applied would enhance the practical relevance

*-In the final version we will add more comparisons and discuss more about the novelty of our approach. In this paper we have tried to compare our results with the latest bounds in this field. For instance as long as we know the latest bounds are found by references [8] and [9].*  
*-In the final version we will add more discussions regarding practical examples in introduction and will provide an experiment to evaluate our design.*

## Response to the Reviewer 5:

Thank you very much for reviewing our paper and for your useful comments.

### Response to the comments:

- *The paper presents a statistical deduction of new lower bounds for privacy leakage. While the overall problem domain of the paper is relevant and interesting, the presentation of the paper is flawed.*

Thanks for summarizing our paper.

- *Strengths:*
  - \* *Interesting and relevant problem within privacy-enhancing computing*
  - \* *Solid mathematical presentation*
  - \* *Figure 1 is helpful for the reader to gain a first overview of the proposed system; however, further context is missing*

Thanks for pointing out the strengths.

- *Weaknesses:*
  - \* *Context and motivation are missing: the paper is hard to follow for the reader as little to no motivation for real-world applications is given in the introduction.*
  - \* *Comparison with related work: the paper does disclose that it builds upon [8] and [9] to construct its new mechanism, however, it is unclear to the reader what has been achieved in these previous works. A table summarizing key aspects of related works would help clarify the contribution. Consider dedicating a separate section to related work, and use the introduction to give more context to your work and argue for the significance of your contribution.*
  - \* *The paper is overall too short with less than 4 pages (excluding references and appendix). Please consider using this space to give more context to your contribution and make your paper more understandable to the reader.*

-In the final version we will add more discussions inside the introduction regarding the motivation considering real world examples. Furthermore, we will add more explanations to the result to enhance the readability.

-Thanks for your suggestion. As you suggested we will discuss more about the results found in [8] and [9] in a separate section to clarify the contribution.

-Will be done. In the final version we will add more discussions and explanations to make the contribution more clear.

- *Minor notes:* \* *The variable  $\chi$  is not introduced in the introduction - it only becomes clear in Section II that  $\chi$  refers to the alphabet of  $X$*   
Will be corrected.