

RESAMPLING METHODS FOR PRIVATE STATISTICAL INFERENCE

Karan Chadha¹ John C. Duchi^{1,2} Rohith Kuditipudi³Departments of ¹Electrical Engineering, ²Statistics, and ³Computer Science
Stanford University

May 2024

Abstract

We propose two private variants of the non-parametric bootstrap for privately computing confidence sets. Each privately computes the median of results of multiple “little” bootstraps, yielding asymptotic bounds on the coverage error of the resulting confidence sets. For a fixed differential privacy parameter ε , our methods enjoy the same error rates as the non-private bootstrap to within logarithmic factors in the sample size n . We empirically validate the performance of our methods for mean estimation, median estimation, and logistic regression, and our methods achieve similar coverage accuracy to existing methods (and non-private baselines) while providing notably shorter (about $10\times$) confidence intervals than previous approaches.

1 Introduction

To realize the promise of private data analysis, we must bring it into closer contact with the inferential goals of modern data analysis and statistics. Yet many challenges conflict with these goals: most work in (differential) privacy targets point estimates rather than valid confidence sets or other inferential tools [33, 13]; private estimators are typically bespoke, tailored to particular problems [8, 20, 18, 4]; and the fine-grained analysis necessary to evaluate variance-like properties of estimators, essential to applying classical inferential results using asymptotic normality [31, 24], remains out of reach for many private estimators. We lack generic procedures for privately completing the most basic inferential task, to construct confidence intervals around a given point estimate. We therefore develop tools, based on resampling methods, to do so for a broad collection of statistics.

Letting data $X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} P$ for a population distribution P , our goal is to provide a valid confidence set for a parameter $\theta(P)$ of interest. The sample mean $\theta(P) = \mathbb{E}_P[X]$ will provide an example we repeatedly revisit. Let $P_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{X_i}$ be the empirical distribution on the sample (which we sometimes simply identify as the sample), where $\mathbf{1}_x$ denotes a point mass at x , so that any estimator is a function of P_n . Then we wish to construct an asymptotically correct confidence set $C_\alpha(P_n)$ for $\theta(P)$, meaning that for each population P ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\theta(P) \in C_\alpha(P_n)) = 1 - \alpha, \quad (1)$$

where the probability is taken over the sample $X_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} P$ and randomness in $C_\alpha(P_n)$. Focusing on \mathbb{R} -valued parameters for simplicity (though this is not essential), typical methods [23, 24] achieve the coverage (1) by approximating the distribution of the centered statistic

$$U_n := \sqrt{n}(\theta - \theta(P_n)) \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{N}(0, \sigma^2),$$

and assuming an estimate $\hat{\sigma}_n \xrightarrow{P} \sigma$, the confidence interval $C_\alpha(P_n) = \theta(P_n) \pm z_{1-\alpha/2} \hat{\sigma}_n / \sqrt{n}$, where z_α is the usual α -quantile of the standard normal, gives asymptotic coverage.

We develop variants of Kleiner et al.’s Bag of Little Bootstraps (BLB) [21] to approximate the statistic U_n privately, both directly via resampling and by estimating the variance σ^2 and making a normal approximation. Key to both the theoretical and practical performance of our methods are that we aggregate information from resampling via private median-like algorithms, whose stability both improves accuracy and privacy. Our main theoretical results provide both general consistency results (1) as well as asymptotic rate guarantees that $\mathbb{P}(\theta(P) \in C_\alpha(P_n)) = 1 - \alpha + \tilde{O}(n^{-1/2})$, where \tilde{O} hides logarithmic factors and dependence on the privacy level ε ; this rate is similar to those achievable in non-private cases, though attaining the higher-order accuracy sometimes possible via bootstrap resampling methods [19] remains open.

By showing that the results of each “little” bootstrap concentrate around appropriate population-level values, we can use the strong error guarantees private median algorithms provide for concentrated inputs [4] to derive our error bounds. Summarizing, our main contributions follow:

- (1) We propose two private variants of the unstudentized non-parametric bootstrap. The first, Alg. 2 (BLBQUANT), constructs private confidence intervals by estimating quantiles of distribution of the estimators. The second, Alg. 3 (BLBVAR), estimates the squared error of an estimator, which then allows normal approximation.
- (2) We show consistency of the bootstrap procedures for sufficiently accurate private estimators, proving asymptotic bounds on the coverage error rates that match non-private bootstrap methods to within logarithmic factors.
- (3) We investigate the performance of our methods on both synthetic and real-world datasets (see Section 5). The results highlight the importance of both (i) strong baseline private estimators for good uncertainty estimation and (ii) newer median-based (as opposed to mean-based) aggregation methods.

1.1 Related Work

Whereas much early work on differential privacy focuses on the design of algorithms for privately querying data and constructing sample statistics [13, 33], a growing body of work seeks to marry differential privacy and statistical inference. Smith [30] shows that a large class of (asymptotically normal) statistical estimators admit private counterparts that asymptotically converge to the same Gaussian distribution. More recent work gives theoretical results on estimating variance and covariance, such as for univariate Gaussians [20], sub-Gaussian vectors [6], or empirical risk minimization [32, 5], which allows normal approximation to compute confidence intervals. But natural covariance estimates, for example, the standard inverse Hessian appearing in the covariance of classical empirical risk minimization and M-estimators [e.g. 31, Thm. 5.41], suffer instabilities, making practical private estimation challenging. Besides normal approximation, there is also work that studies confidence intervals for specific problems. For example, Sheffet [29] and Alabi et al. [3, 2] study differentially private linear regression and hypothesis testing for presence of linear relationships. Drechsler et al. [11] benchmark different methods for constructing differentially private confidence intervals for the median.

We lack non-parametric, fully data-driven mechanisms that generate private confidence intervals for broad classes of estimators. Ferrando et al. [17] propose mechanisms for privatizing the parametric bootstrap, but their validity guarantees rely on well-specified parametric data models. Evans et al. [16] and Covington et al. [9] propose bootstrap algorithms similar to ours, using these to estimate covariance of arbitrary estimators by aggregating results of little bootstraps via clipping and noise addition or CoinPress [6], which privately estimates means directly. However, they do not appear to provide accuracy guarantees, and—as we see especially in experiments—more careful aggregation via median-like mechanisms can yield much stronger performance.

2 Preliminaries and notation

Consider a parameter of interest $\theta(P) \in \mathbb{R}$; we address vector-valued parameters presently. For a sample P_n , i.e., the empirical distribution on n observations drawn i.i.d. from P , we (classically, without privacy) have an estimator $\theta(P_n)$ of $\theta(P)$, and wish to estimate the distribution of the centered statistic

$$U_n = \sqrt{n} (\theta(P) - \theta(P_n)). \quad (2)$$

We will typically assume we have the standard asymptotics that

$$U_n \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{N}(0, \sigma^2(\theta)),$$

where $\sigma^2(\theta)$ is the asymptotic variance for the particular parameter (we leave dependence on the estimator $\theta(P_n)$ implicit). Letting

$$\text{quant}_\beta(X) := \inf \{t \in \mathbb{R} \mid \mathbb{P}(X \leq t) \geq \beta\} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{quant}_\beta(P) := \inf \{t \in \mathbb{R} \mid \mathbb{P}((-\infty, t]) \geq \beta\}$$

denote the β -quantile of a random variable X or probability distribution P , respectively, it is then immediate that

$$C_\alpha^{\text{exact}}(P_n) := \left[\theta(P_n) + n^{-1/2} \text{quant}_{\alpha/2}(U_n), \theta(P_n) + n^{-1/2} \text{quant}_{1-\alpha/2}(U_n) \right]$$

is a $1 - \alpha$ confidence set. Normal approximations and bootstrap resampling methods approximate the distribution of U_n to mimic this exact confidence set.

We adapt the Bag-of-Little-Bootstraps (BLB) [21], which descends from Efron’s bootstrap [14, 15]. The BLB first constructs s subsamples of P_n , each of size $m = n/s$; let P_m^{sub} denote one of these subsamples. For each subsample, the BLB redraws an i.i.d. sample of size n to yield a resampled distribution $P_{m,n}^*$, the empirical distribution of the resample from the m points in the subsample. It then makes the approximation

$$U_n \stackrel{\text{dist}}{\approx} \sqrt{n} \left(\theta(P_m^{\text{sub}}) - \theta(P_{m,n}^*) \right) =: U_{m,n}^* \quad (3)$$

where Monte-Carlo sampling yields arbitrarily accurate estimates of the distribution of the right hand side. The approximation (3) holds so long as the estimates $\theta(P_n)$ have appropriate smoothness and convergence properties relative to the sampling distributions P_n , and demonstrating its accuracy forms the core of any argument for validity of confidence intervals. Assuming it holds, the confidence set

$$C_\alpha(P_n) := \left[\theta(P_n) + n^{-1/2} \text{quant}_{\alpha/2}(U_{m,n}^*), \theta(P_n) + n^{-1/2} \text{quant}_{1-\alpha/2}(U_{m,n}^*) \right]$$

satisfies $\mathbb{P}(\theta(P) \in C_\alpha(P_n)) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\theta(P) \in C_\alpha^{\text{exact}}(P_n)) = 1 - \alpha$. (See the sequel and Kleiner et al. [21] for more precision.) We may also construct confidence sets by directly leveraging the asymptotic normality of the centered statistic U_n : for *any* consistent estimate $\hat{\sigma}^2$ of the asymptotic variance $\sigma^2(\theta)$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\theta(P) \in \theta(P_n) \pm n^{-1/2}\hat{\sigma}^2 \cdot z_{1-\alpha/2}\right) \rightarrow 1 - \alpha,$$

where z_α is the α -quantile of a standard Gaussian. The BLB variance estimate $\hat{\sigma}^2 = \text{Var}(U_{m,n}^* | P_m)$ provides a natural proxy for this variance.

We use the standard definition of differential privacy [13]. We will typically use a tilde, $\tilde{\theta}$, to denote a private estimator and distinguish it from $\theta(\cdot)$. Such an estimator typically requires additional randomness independent of the sample P_n , which it uses to obfuscate the input distribution; to abstract this away, we simply call this random variable W . Then for $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$, $\tilde{\theta}$ is (ε, δ) -differentially private if for all P_n, P'_n differing in at most a single observation and all measurable sets O ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{\theta}(P_n, W) \in O\right) \leq \exp(\varepsilon) \cdot \mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{\theta}(P'_n, W) \in O\right) + \delta. \quad (4)$$

When the noise is clear from context we use $\tilde{\theta}(P_n)$ instead of $\tilde{\theta}(P_n, W)$. It will be convenient to write distributional closeness, where for random variables X, X' , we write $X \stackrel{d}{=}_\varepsilon X'$ to mean that $\mathbb{P}(X \in O) \leq e^\varepsilon \mathbb{P}(X' \in O)$ for all measurable sets A . Definition (4) with $\delta = 0$ is thus equivalent to $\tilde{\theta}(P_n) \stackrel{d}{=}_\varepsilon \tilde{\theta}(P'_n)$.

Notation. We use $[k]$ to denote the set of integers $\{1, \dots, k\}$ and $y_{1:s}$ to denote the tuple (y_1, \dots, y_s) . We let $x_{(1)} \leq x_{(2)} \leq \dots \leq x_{(n)}$ denote the order statistics of $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We use $\Phi(t)$ and $\phi(t)$ to denote the cumulative distribution and probability density of the standard normal at $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

3 Private Confidence Intervals

To construct confidence intervals with differential privacy, we replace the estimator in the centered statistic (2) and in the bootstrap resampling approximation (3) with a privatized counterpart, applying either the percentile or normal approximation (estimated via resampling) method. Using the notation of our differential privacy definition (4) with private estimator $\tilde{\theta}$, the new centered statistic becomes

$$\tilde{U}_n := \sqrt{n} \left(\theta(P) - \tilde{\theta}(P_n, W_n) \right). \quad (5)$$

Replacing $\theta(P_n)$ with $\tilde{\theta}(P_n, W_n)$ in the exact confidence set $C_\alpha^{\text{exact}}(P_n)$ evidently yields a finite sample $1 - \alpha$ confidence set, and so to develop private confidence sets, we develop private analogues of the resampling approximation (3).

We describe algorithms for constructing private confidence intervals using the percentile method in Section 3.2 and to estimate squared error and variance in Section 3.3, which we may use for normal approximation. The key to both the theoretical and practical performance of the methods is to use private median procedures to aggregate the information from bootstrap resampling, which we turn to now.

3.1 Private median algorithms

The basic building block of our percentile algorithms is to estimate the first index in a collection of vectors whose median passes a particular threshold. For an increasing sequence of sets I_1, I_2, \dots, I_T , we use this to estimate the smallest index t for which $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{U}_n \in I_t) \geq 1 - \alpha$. We develop a median-based private version of this process as Algorithm 1. In the algorithm, for a vector $y \in \mathbb{R}^k$ we let

$$\text{ORDST}(y, \xi) = \begin{cases} y_{(\lfloor \xi \rfloor)} & \text{if } 1 \leq \xi \leq k \\ -\infty \cdot 1\{\xi < 1\} + \infty \cdot 1\{\xi > k\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

be the $\lfloor \xi \rfloor$ th order statistic with limiting extremes.

Algorithm 1: Median Above Threshold ([ABOVETHR](#))

Input: data $y(t) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ for $t \in [T]$, threshold $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$
Noise: $\xi_t \in \mathbb{R}$ for $t \in [T]$
1 for $t \in [T]$ **do**
2 $\hat{v} \leftarrow \text{ORDST}(y(t); \xi_0 + \xi_t)$
3 **if** $\hat{v} \geq \tau$ **then**
4 | **return** t
5 return \perp

Given a sequence of T vectors $y(t) \in \mathbb{R}^k$, Algorithm 1 finds the index of the first query whose noisy median exceeds a threshold $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, returning \perp if no such query exists. We choose the noise variables ξ_0 and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^T$ so that that [ABOVETHR](#) satisfies ε -DP and $\mathbb{E}[\xi_0 + \xi_t] = \frac{k}{2}$.

Proposition 1. *Let $y(t)$ and $z(t) \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $t = 1, \dots, T$, be sequences of vectors satisfying $d_{\text{ham}}(y(t), z(t)) \leq 1$ for each t . Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\xi_0 \sim \text{Lap}(\frac{k}{2}, \frac{2}{\varepsilon})$ and $\xi_t \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Lap}(0, \frac{4}{\varepsilon})$ for $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Then for any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\text{ABOVETHR}(y, \tau, \xi) \stackrel{d}{=}_{\varepsilon} \text{ABOVETHR}(z, \tau, \xi).$$

When the vector $y \in \mathbb{R}^k$ appropriately concentrates, its order statistics do as well, which we can leverage in our private percentile-based BLB method to come. We formalize this via the following intermediate lemma, whose proof we defer to Appendix B.2.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $Y \in \mathbb{R}^k$ have independent entries, and assume for some $\omega < \infty$ there is $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(|Y_i - \mu| \leq \omega) \geq \frac{3}{4}$. Let $\xi_0 \sim \text{Lap}(\frac{k}{2}, b)$ and $\xi \sim \text{Lap}(0, 2b)$ for some $b > 0$. Then*

$$\mathbb{P}(|\text{ORDST}(Y, \xi_0 + \xi) - \mu| > \omega) \leq \frac{4}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{k}{16b}\right) + \exp\left(-\frac{k}{32}\right).$$

3.2 A private percentile bootstrap

We now present an ε -differentially private algorithm for finding a set providing a desired $1 - \alpha$ coverage level. The method uses an increasing sequence of sets I_1, I_2, \dots, I_T and (approximately) outputs the first in this sequence with estimated coverage at least $1 - \alpha$. Typical choices of the sets I_t for an \mathbb{R}^d -valued parameter $\theta(P)$ are $I_t = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \|u\|_2 \leq h \cdot t\}$ for a small resolution h , and recalling the definition (5) of \tilde{U}_n , we seek the smallest t with

$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{U}_n \in I_t) \geq 1 - \alpha$. The algorithm, **BLBQUANT**, follows the BLB methodology to first partition the data into $s = n/m$ disjoint subsets of size m , then uses bootstrap estimates of $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{U}_n \in I_t)$ calculated using each partition independently by resampling n points (with replacement) from the subset. It then uses **ABOVETHR** and these estimates to (approximately) find the first set I_t in the sequence with coverage probability at least $1 - \alpha$.

Algorithm 2: Private BLB quantile estimation (**BLBQUANT**)

Input: Sample P_n , sequence of sets of interest $I_{1:T}$, subset size m , privacy parameter ε , estimators $\theta(\cdot)$ and $\tilde{\theta}(\cdot)$

- 1 Draw $s = \lfloor n/m \rfloor$ disjoint subsamples $P_m^{\text{sub}(1)}, \dots, P_m^{\text{sub}(s)}$ of P_n of size m
- 2 **for** $i \in [s]$ **and** $t \in [T]$ **do**
- 3 $\hat{\theta} \leftarrow \theta(P_m)$ // saved plug-in estimator
- 4 **for** $j \in [N_{\text{mc}}]$ **do**
- 5 Draw resample of $P_{m,n}^*$ of size n i.i.d. with replacement from $P_m^{\text{sub}(i)}$
- 6 $\theta_j \leftarrow \tilde{\theta}(P_{m,n}^*)$
- 7 $\hat{p}_i(t) \leftarrow \frac{1}{N_{\text{mc}}} \sum_{j=1}^{N_{\text{mc}}} 1\{\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta} - \theta_j) \in I_t\}$ // coverage estimate
- 8 Draw $\xi_0 \sim \text{Lap}(n/2, 2/\varepsilon)$ and $\xi_{1:T} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Lap}(0, 4/\varepsilon)$
- 9 Set $\hat{t} = \text{ABOVETHR}(\{\hat{p}(1), \dots, \hat{p}(T)\}, 1 - \alpha, \xi)$
- 10 **return** $I_{\hat{t}}$

The privacy of **BLBQUANT** is relatively straightforward once we leverage privacy composition, but its utility requires more work. Here, we make the assumption that the bootstrap CDF estimation subroutine is accurate:

Assumption A1. Let $\hat{p}_i(t) \in [0, 1]$, $t = 1, \dots, T$ be the estimated coverage probabilities in Line 7 of Alg. 2. Let $\tilde{U}_n = \sqrt{n}(\theta(P) - \tilde{\theta}(P_n))$ as in (5) and $p(t) = \mathbb{P}(\tilde{U}_n \in I_t)$ be the true coverage probability. There exists $\omega_{\text{cdf}} < \infty$ such that for any collection of sets I_1, \dots, I_T ,

$$\mathbb{P}(|p(t) - \hat{p}_i(t)| \geq \omega_{\text{cdf}}) \geq \frac{3}{4},$$

where the probability is over the i.i.d. sampling to construct $P_m^{\text{sub}(i)}$, resampling of $P_{m,n}^*$, and any randomness in $\tilde{\theta}(\cdot)$.

The next theorem gives both a privacy guarantee, which holds unconditionally, and an accuracy guarantee under Assumption A1.

Theorem 1. Let I_1, \dots, I_T be an arbitrary sequence of sets. Then the output $I_{\hat{t}}$ of **BLBQUANT** is ε -differentially private. Additionally, let Assumption A1 hold, assume the sets $\{I_t\}$ are nondecreasing, and assume there exists an index t satisfying $1 - \alpha + \omega_{\text{cdf}} \leq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{U}_n \in I_t) \leq 1 - \alpha + 2\omega_{\text{cdf}}$. Let $\beta > 0$. Then if $s > 32 \max\{\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \log \frac{8T}{3\beta}, \log \frac{2T}{\beta}\}$, with probability at least $1 - \beta$ the output $I_{\hat{t}}$ of **BLBQUANT** satisfies

$$1 - \alpha - \omega_{\text{cdf}} \leq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{U}_n \in I_{\hat{t}}) \leq 1 - \alpha + 2\omega_{\text{cdf}}.$$

Proof To demonstrate privacy, recognize that for each $t = 1, \dots, T$, the vector $\hat{p}(t) = (\hat{p}_i(t))_{i=1}^s$ returns has entries computed on disjoint subsets of the sample P_n . For any samples P_n, P'_n differing in only a single observation and corresponding outputs \hat{p} and \hat{p}' , we thus

have $d_{\text{ham}}(\widehat{p}(t), \widehat{p}'(t)) \leq 1$ (we may use the same random seed to couple the sampling), and so **ABOVETHR** guarantees ε -differential privacy by Proposition 1.

To provide an accuracy guarantee, we use Lemma 3.1 and Assumption A1. With probability at least $1 - \beta$, we have

$$\left| \text{ORDST}([\widehat{p}_i(t)]_{i=1}^s, \xi_0 + \xi_t) - \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{U}_n \in I_t) \right| \leq \omega_{\text{cdf}} \text{ for each } t \in T$$

by a union bound, because $\widehat{p}(t)$ has independent entries. By assumption in the theorem that there exists an index t' such that $\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{U}_n \in I_{t'}) \in [1 - \alpha + \omega_{\text{cdf}}, 1 - \alpha + 2\omega_{\text{cdf}}]$, on this event, $\text{ORDST}(\widehat{p}(t'), \xi_0 + \xi_{t'}) \geq 1 - \alpha$. Then **ABOVETHR** necessarily outputs some index $\widehat{t} \leq t'$, and the preceding accuracy guarantee implies that $\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{U}_n \in I_{\widehat{t}}) \in [1 - \alpha - \omega_{\text{cdf}}, 1 - \alpha + 2\omega_{\text{cdf}}]$. \square

The output of **BLBQUANT** directly provides a natural private confidence set.

Corollary 3.1. *Let the conditions of Theorem 1 hold and $\widetilde{\theta}(\cdot)$ be an (ε, δ) -differentially private estimator. Let $I_{\widehat{t}}$ be the output of **BLBQUANT**, and define the confidence set*

$$C_\alpha(P_n) := \widetilde{\theta}(P_n) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} I_{\widehat{t}}.$$

Then $C_\alpha(P_n)$ is $(2\varepsilon, \delta)$ -differentially private, and

$$1 - \alpha - \omega_{\text{cdf}} \leq \mathbb{P}(\theta(P) \in C_\alpha(P_n)) \leq 1 - \alpha + 2\omega_{\text{cdf}}.$$

The scaling of the accuracy ω_{cdf} in Assumption A1 thus determines the accuracy of the confidence set $C_\alpha(P_n)$ that **BLBQUANT** yields, and we address this in the next section. Previewing the results, so long as the non-private and private estimators are close, we have at least $\omega_{\text{cdf}} \rightarrow 0$ as the sample size grows (see Corollary 4.1). Under mild regularity conditions on the non-private estimator $\theta(\cdot)$, we typically have the scaling $\omega_{\text{cdf}} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon\sqrt{n}}$ (see Example 2 and Corollary 4.3).

To make the types of sets we recover more concrete, consider the typical asymptotically normal case that both $U_n \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{N}(0, \Sigma)$ and $\widetilde{U}_n \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{N}(0, \Sigma)$ for some unknown covariance Σ (or, in the one-parameter case, a variance σ^2). In this case, a natural choice for the sets I_t is $I_t = \{u \mid \|u\|_2 \leq h \cdot t\}$, where we take $h \propto \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$ and $t \lesssim n$, yielding $I_n = \{u \mid \|u\|_2 \leq \sqrt{n}\}$, and then the confidence set in Corollary 3.1 gives

$$\mathbb{P}(\theta(P) \in C_\alpha(P_n)) = \mathbb{P}\left(\|\theta(P) - \widetilde{\theta}(P_n)\|_2 \leq \frac{\widehat{t}}{\sqrt{n}}\right) = 1 - \alpha + o(1),$$

where the final equality holds so long as the distributional approximation $\widetilde{U}_{m,n}^* \stackrel{\text{dist}}{\approx} \widetilde{U}_n$ holds, as $t \mapsto \mathbb{P}(\|z\|_2 \geq t)$ is \mathcal{C}^∞ for $Z \sim \mathbf{N}(0, \Sigma)$. The box-shaped sets $I_t = [-ht, ht]^d$ also provide natural confidence sets.

Because Theorem 1 shows the accuracy degrades only logarithmically in the number T of sets $\{I_t\}$, we typically choose the number of subsamples $s = K \frac{\log n}{\varepsilon}$ for some constant K . We comment more on the hyperparameter selection and sensitivity in Appendix E. Theorem 1 also highlights the importance of using median-like aggregation and **ABOVETHR**, where because the coverage estimates \widehat{p} concentrate, the failure probability decreases exponentially in the number of subsamples s .

3.3 Private error estimation and normal approximation

To construct confidence sets using direct estimates of estimator error, which often reduces to variance estimates we may use to make private normal approximations, we present a data-driven bootstrap-based private estimator for the mean-squared error (MSE) of \tilde{U}_n in Algorithm 3, **BLBVAR**. We now use the bag of little bootstraps (BLB) [21] to construct s estimates of the MSE on disjoint subsets of data and aggregates them using a private median mechanism (**PRIVMEDIAN**, Alg. 5 in Appendix A). Covington et al. [9] investigate a related algorithm, combining s variance estimates using the COINPRESS private mean estimation algorithm [6]. Because the mean is so challenging to make private—it is inherently unstable—using the more naturally robust median yields stronger performance. The private median mechanism requires a smoothing parameter ρ and interval $[R_l, R_u]$ in which the median should lie to which it is relatively insensitive; we usually take $\rho = n^{-1}$.

Algorithm 3: Private BLB variance estimation (**BLBVAR**)

Input: Estimators $\theta(\cdot)$ and $\tilde{\theta}(\cdot)$, sample P_n , subset size m , gross upper bound σ_{\max}^2 on second moment, smoothing parameter ρ , privacy budget ε

- 1 Draw $s = \lfloor n/m \rfloor$ disjoint subsamples $P_m^{\text{sub}(1)}, \dots, P_m^{\text{sub}(s)}$ of P_n of size m
- 2 **for** $i \in [s]$ **do**
- 3 $v_i \leftarrow \text{BOOTVAR}(\theta(\cdot), \tilde{\theta}(\cdot), P_m^{\text{sub}(i)}, n)$
- 4 **return** **PRIVMEDIAN**($v_{1:s}, \varepsilon, \rho, [0, \sigma_{\max}^2]$)

Algorithm 4: Bootstrap for mean-square-error estimation (**BOOTVAR**)

Input: Estimators $\theta(\cdot)$ and $\tilde{\theta}(\cdot)$, sample P_m , resample size n

- 1 $\hat{\theta} \leftarrow \theta(P_m)$ # saved plug-in estimator
- 2 **for** $i \in [N_{\text{mc}}]$ **do**
- 3 Draw resample $P_{m,n}^*$ of size n i.i.d. with replacement from P_m
- 4 $\tilde{u}_i \leftarrow \sqrt{n}(\tilde{\theta}(P_{m,n}^*) - \hat{\theta})$
- 5 **return** $\frac{1}{N_{\text{mc}}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{mc}}} \|\tilde{u}_i\|_2^2$

As we did in Theorem 1, we can provide utility guarantees for **BLBVAR** whenever the bootstrap variance estimate is reasonably accurate with constant probability.

Assumption A2. Let \hat{v} denote the output of **BOOTVAR** on an input sample of size m with resampling size n for the estimators $\theta(\cdot)$ and $\tilde{\theta}(\cdot)$, and let $\sigma_n^2 = n\mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{\theta}(P_n) - \theta(P)\|_2^2]$. There exists $\omega_{\text{var}} < \infty$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(|\sigma_n^2 - \hat{v}| \leq \omega_{\text{var}}) \geq \frac{3}{4}.$$

In our more explicit accuracy analyses in Section 4 (see the discussion following Proposition 5), we show that it is frequently the case that $\omega_{\text{var}} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon\sqrt{n}}$. More broadly, achieving $\omega_{\text{var}} = o(1)$ is not difficult, so that a normal approximation using \hat{v} provides an asymptotically valid confidence set as a corollary of the next theorem (see Corollary 4.2 in Section 4.1). Regardless, under Assumption A2, we have the following result, whose proof we defer to Appendix B.3.

Theorem 2. *The output of `BLBVAR` is ε -differentially private. Additionally, let Assumption A2 hold, and assume $\sigma_{\max} \geq \sigma_n$. Let $\beta > 0$. If the number of subsamples $s = \lfloor n/m \rfloor \geq \max\{\frac{16}{\varepsilon} \log \frac{\sigma_{\max}^2}{\beta \rho}, 32 \log \frac{1}{\beta}\}$, then with probability at least $1 - \beta$*

$$\left| \sigma_n^2 - \text{BLBVAR}(\theta(\cdot), \tilde{\theta}(\cdot), P_n, m, \sigma_{\max}, \rho, \varepsilon) \right| \leq \omega_{\text{var}} + \rho.$$

The choices of the particular constants Theorem 2 requires to guarantee `BLBVAR`'s performance are not particularly onerous. The bound σ_{\max}^2 on the possible variance σ_n^2 and the smoothing parameter ρ that the private median algorithm require appear only as logarithmic constraints on the number of subsamples; consequently, choosing them to be polynomially small (or large) in n has little effect. Practically, the choices $\rho = \frac{1}{n}$ and $\sigma_{\max}^2 = n^2$ are effective, with number of subsamples $s = K \frac{\log n}{\varepsilon}$ for a constant K . (In our experiments, we take $K = 10$.) We comment more on hyperparameters in Appendix E.

4 Validity and Asymptotic Rates

The utility results in Section 3 rely on the accuracy of bootstrapped private estimators (Assumptions A1 and A2). Here, we show that this holds for a wide class of private estimators for which there exist bootstrappable non-private estimators, so long as the (typical) distance between the private and non-private estimators are small. First, we show that such private estimators are asymptotically normal and their bootstrapped distributions are consistent estimates of their distribution (Proposition 2). For problems in which the non-private estimators admit Edgeworth expansions, we quantify error rates for bootstrapped private estimators, which in turn allows us to instantiate rates at which ω_{cdf} and $\omega_{\text{var}} \rightarrow 0$ as n grows in Assumptions A1 and A2, thus closing the loop on the performance of our proposed algorithms.

4.1 Asymptotic Normality and Consistency

We first define the consistency of resampling-based estimators of a distribution, where we let U_n^* denote an otherwise arbitrary quantity that is a function of only the empirical sample P_n ; the typical choice will be a resampled estimate $U_n^* = \sqrt{n}(\theta(P_m^{\text{sub}}) - \theta(P_{m,n}^*))$ as in the approximation (3) when we use the Bag of Little Bootstraps (BLB). We make many statements *conditionally almost surely*, which means that they hold conditional on the sequence $\{P_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of empirical distributions, for almost all sequences $\{P_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ when P_n is drawn i.i.d. P . (See van der Vaart [31, Ch. 23] for a discussion of these modes of convergence.) For vectors $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we write $u \leq v$ to mean $u_j \leq v_j$ for each j .

Definition 4.1. *A resampling-based estimator U_n^* is consistent relative to the Kolmogorov-Smirnov distance (KS-consistent) if*

$$\sup_u |\mathbb{P}(U_n \leq u) - \mathbb{P}(U_n^* \leq u | P_n)| \xrightarrow{P} 0$$

conditionally almost surely. It is L^2 -consistent if for some $\gamma > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|U_n^*\|^{2+\gamma} | P_n \right] = O_P(1)$$

conditionally almost surely.

The uniform integrability the second condition provides guarantees that if $U_n \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{N}(0, \Sigma)$, then

$$\mathbb{E} \left[U_n^* U_n^{*\top} \mid P_n \right] \xrightarrow{P} \Sigma$$

conditionally almost surely [28, Sec. 3.1.6]. As simple examples, BLB resampling estimators (3) are frequently KS-consistent, for example, for means and smooth functions of means, or the sampling distribution of suitably smooth M-estimators (see [21, Theorem 1] and [31, Thm. 23.4], as well as Section 4.3 to come), so long as the subsample size $m \rightarrow \infty$. We note in passing that for the BLB, our subsampling means we have the distributional equalities

$$U_{m,n}^* \mid P_n \stackrel{\text{dist}}{=} U_{m,n}^* \mid P_m \stackrel{\text{dist}}{=} U_{m,n}^* \mid P_m^{\text{sub}},$$

so we use them interchangeably. (And similarly for $\tilde{U}_{m,n}^*$.)

In the next theorem, to obtain KS-consistency of resampling estimators we require accuracy guarantees for the private estimators. In this case, let W_n be a sequence of random noise variables, so that for a sample size n , the private estimator takes the form $\tilde{\theta}(P_n) = \tilde{\theta}(P_n, W_n)$. We say that the estimator θ is *rate- \sqrt{n} -resampling consistent* for subsample size m if

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\tilde{\theta}(P_{m,n}^*, W_n) - \theta(P_{m,n}^*) \right) \xrightarrow{P} 0 \quad (6)$$

conditionally almost surely and $\tilde{\theta}(P_n) - \theta(P_n) = o_P(1/\sqrt{n})$, and that it is *L^2 -resampling consistent* for subsample size m if for some $\gamma > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \sqrt{n} (\tilde{\theta}(P_{m,n}^*, W_n) - \theta(P_{m,n}^*)) \right\|^{2+\gamma} \mid P_m \right] = O_P(1) \quad (7)$$

conditionally almost surely. The conditions (6) and (7) are abstract, so we provide one example here, providing more elaborate discussion on empirical risk minimization in Section 4.3.

Example 1 (Resampling consistency for mean estimation): Let $\theta(P) = \mathbb{E}_P[X] = \int x dP(x)$ be the mean of its argument, and assume that the data has support $[-b, b]$. Then the standard Laplace mechanism, for which $\tilde{\theta}(P_n, w) = P_n X + w = \bar{X}_n + w$, takes $W_n \sim \text{Lap}(0, \frac{2b}{\varepsilon n})$ and is ε -differentially private. Then

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\tilde{\theta}(P_{m,n}^*, W_n) - \theta(P_{m,n}^*) \right) = \sqrt{n} W_n \sim \text{Lap} \left(0, \frac{2b}{\varepsilon \sqrt{n}} \right).$$

This allows us to take $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_n$ decreasing to 0, and then so long as $\varepsilon \sqrt{n}$ increases to ∞ at a polynomial rate, the Borel-Cantelli lemmas immediately give that $\sqrt{n}(\theta(P_{m,n}^*, W_n) - \theta(P_{m,n}^*)) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$.

For the L^2 consistency (7), note that $\tilde{\theta}(P_{m,n}^*, W_n) - \theta(P_{m,n}^*) = W_n$ and for $\gamma > 0$,

$$n \mathbb{E} [|W_n|^{2+\gamma} \mid P_m] = \frac{(2b)^{2+\gamma}}{n^{1+\gamma} \varepsilon^{2+\gamma}} \Gamma(3 + \gamma).$$

The uniform integrability (7) thus holds as well. \diamond

More generally, ε -DP estimators induce private error roughly scaling as $\tilde{\theta}(P_n) - \theta(P_n) = O_P(\frac{1}{n\varepsilon})$. Additive noise mechanisms using global sensitivity, such the Laplace mechanism in Example 1, satisfy this, as do more sophisticated mechanisms in “typical” cases, such as the inverse-sensitivity mechanism [4]. The resampling consistency (6) is then frequently a byproduct of the privacy and accuracy analysis of a given mechanism (and see Sec. 4.3 to come). The assumptions on private and non-private estimators in the next proposition, which gives sufficient conditions under which our bootstrap-type methods yield asymptotically correct confidence sets, thus hold in most common cases.

Proposition 2. Let $\theta(P_n)$ satisfy $U_n = \sqrt{n}(\theta(P) - \theta(P_n)) \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{N}(0, \Sigma)$, and assume the BLB statistic $U_{m,n}^*$ is KS-consistent for U_n (Def. 4.1). Let $\tilde{\theta}(\cdot)$ be a \sqrt{n} -subsampling-consistent (6) estimator for $\theta(\cdot)$. Then $\sqrt{n}(\tilde{\theta}(P_n) - \theta(P)) \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{N}(0, \Sigma)$, the resampled statistic

$$\tilde{U}_{m,n}^* := \sqrt{n} \left(\theta(P_m^{\text{sub}}) - \tilde{\theta}(P_{m,n}^*) \right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{N}(0, \Sigma)$$

conditionally almost surely, and it is KS-consistent.

Proof The asymptotic normality of $\tilde{\theta}(P_n)$ is immediate, because

$$\sqrt{n}(\theta(P) - \tilde{\theta}(P_n)) = \sqrt{n}(\theta(P) - \theta(P_n)) + \underbrace{\sqrt{n}(\theta(P_n) - \tilde{\theta}(P_n))}_{\xrightarrow{P} 0} \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{N}(0, \Sigma_\theta)$$

by Slutsky's lemmas [31, Lemma 2.8]. To obtain the consistency of the resampled bootstrap distributions, it is sufficient to show that $\tilde{U}_{m,n}^* \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{N}(0, \Sigma)$ conditionally on $\{P_n\}$ almost surely [31, Eq. (23.2)]. For this, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{U}_{m,n}^* &= \sqrt{n} \left(\theta(P_m) - \tilde{\theta}(P_{m,n}^*) \right) = \sqrt{n} \left(\theta(P_m) - \theta(P_{m,n}^*) \right) + \sqrt{n} \left(\theta(P_{m,n}^*) - \tilde{\theta}(P_{m,n}^*) \right) \\ &= U_{m,n}^* + \sqrt{n} \left(\theta(P_{m,n}^*) - \tilde{\theta}(P_{m,n}^*) \right). \end{aligned}$$

By assumption, $U_{m,n}^* \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{N}(0, \Sigma_\theta)$ conditionally almost surely, while the assumption that $\tilde{\theta}$ is \sqrt{n} -resampling consistent (6) guarantees the rightmost term converges in probability to 0 conditionally almost surely. \square

Coupling Proposition 2 with Theorem 1 allows us to show the consistency of private confidence intervals. In the corollary, we take $I_t = \{u \mid \|u\|_2 \leq t/\sqrt{n}\}$ and $t \leq n$, though other choices are possible.

Corollary 4.1. Let $C_\alpha(P_n)$ be the confidence set in Corollary 3.1 and the conditions of Proposition 2 hold. Then $\mathbb{P}(\theta(P) \in C_\alpha(P_n)) \rightarrow 1 - \alpha$.

Proof By Proposition 2 and assumption, we have both

$$\sup_t \left| \mathbb{P}(U_{m,n}^* \in I_t \mid P_m) - \mathbb{P}(\tilde{U}_{m,n}^* \in I_t \mid P_m) \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad \sup_t \left| \mathbb{P}(U_{m,n}^* \in I_t \mid P_m) - \mathbb{P}(U_n \in I_t) \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

To show that the conditions of Assumption A1 hold, then, take $\hat{p} = \mathbb{P}(\tilde{U}_{m,n}^* \in I_t \mid P_m)$, the resampling estimate in Line 7 of Alg. 2 (assuming as usual there is no Monte Carlo sampling error). Then by the triangle inequality, for any $\omega_{\text{cdf}} > 0$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}(|\hat{p} - \mathbb{P}(U_n \in I_t)| \geq \omega_{\text{cdf}} \mid P_n) \xrightarrow{P} 0$$

conditionally almost surely, and Assumption A1 holds. It only remains to show that there exists an accurate enough set as Theorem 1 requires. But because $\tilde{U}_n \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{N}(0, \Sigma)$, we know that there are sequences of $t_n = O(\sqrt{n})$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\|\tilde{U}_n\|_2 \leq t_n/\sqrt{n}) \rightarrow 1 - \alpha$. \square

We can also give consistency of the moment estimators.

Proposition 3. *Let the conditions of Proposition 2 hold, and additionally assume that $U_{m,n}^*$ is L^2 -consistent (Def. 4.1). Assume that $\tilde{\theta}(\cdot)$ is L^2 -resampling consistent (7). Then the bootstrap second moment estimate*

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_{m,n}^* := n\mathbb{E} \left[(\tilde{\theta}(P_{m,n}^*) - \theta(P_m))(\tilde{\theta}(P_{m,n}^*) - \theta(P_m))^\top \mid P_m \right] \xrightarrow{P} \Sigma$$

conditionally almost surely.

Proof Because we already have KS-consistency (Proposition 2), all we require is the uniform integrability of $n\|\tilde{\theta}(P_{m,n}^*) - \theta(P_m)\|^2$ under the sequence of (random) measures P_m ; see Shao and Tu [28, Sec. 3.1.6]. But this follows because for some $\gamma > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\|\sqrt{n}(\tilde{\theta}(P_{m,n}^*) - \theta(P_m))\|^{2+\gamma} \mid P_m \right] \\ & \leq 2^{1+\gamma} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\|\sqrt{n}(\tilde{\theta}(P_{m,n}^*) - \theta(P_{m,n}^*))\|^{2+\gamma} \mid P_m \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\|\sqrt{n}(\theta(P_{m,n}^*) - \theta(P_m))\|^{2+\gamma} \mid P_m \right] \right) \end{aligned}$$

and each term on the right is $O_P(1)$ conditionally almost surely by assumption. \square

In passing, we note a corollary of Theorem 2 and Proposition 3 that is analogous to Corollary 4.1. In the corollary, which focuses on the one parameter case—though this may be a single parameter in a larger vector-valued model—we say that a private estimator $\tilde{\theta}(\cdot)$ has typical limiting behavior if for σ_n^2 and ω_{var} in Assumption A2, we have

$$\sqrt{n} \frac{\tilde{\theta}(P_n) - \theta(P)}{\sigma_n} \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{N}(0, 1) \quad \text{and} \quad \omega_{\text{var}} \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. See, for example, Smith [30] for the asymptotic normality; Proposition 3 guarantees that $\omega_{\text{var}} \rightarrow 0$. Then taking $\rho = \frac{1}{n}$ and $\sigma_{\text{max}}^2 = n^2$ in Algorithm 3, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 4.2. *Let $\tilde{\theta}(\cdot)$ be an (ε, δ) -differentially private estimator with typical limiting behavior for the population quantity $\theta(P)$, and let $m = m(n)$ be any subset size for which $m(n) \rightarrow \infty$ and $m(n) \ll \frac{n\varepsilon}{\log n}$. Let $\tilde{\sigma}_n^2$ be the output of BLBVAR, and define the confidence set*

$$C_\alpha(P_n) := \tilde{\theta}(P_n) + \left[-n^{-1/2}\tilde{\sigma}_n \cdot z_{1-\alpha/2}, n^{-1/2}\tilde{\sigma}_n \cdot z_{1-\alpha/2} \right].$$

Then $C_\alpha(P_n)$ is $(2\varepsilon, \delta)$ -differentially private, and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\theta(P) \in C_\alpha(P_n)) = 1 - \alpha.$$

4.2 Edgeworth expansions and asymptotic rates

Our goal in this section is to prove asymptotic rates for the error of our BLB private estimators. We work under the standard assumption that the non-private estimators admit Edgeworth expansions [19, 21], a standard technical tool for providing asymptotic guarantees for the bootstrap. For this section, we assume that the statistic θ is one-dimensional, as otherwise the notation becomes too cumbersome. Recall that a statistic $U_n \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ admits an Edgeworth expansion of order k if uniformly in $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{U_n}{\sigma} \leq t \right) = \Phi(t) + \left(\sum_{i=1}^k n^{-i/2} p_i(t) \right) \phi(t) + O \left(n^{-\frac{k+1}{2}} \right), \quad (8a)$$

where p_i is a polynomial of degree $3i-1$ depending on the first $i+2$ moments of P , which is even or odd as $i-1$ is even or odd (see, e.g., Hall [19, Chapter 2]). Similarly, the resampled statistic $U_{m,n}^*$ admits an Edgeworth expansion of order k if there is a sequence of variances $\sigma^2(P_m) = \sigma^2 + O_P(m^{-1/2})$ with $\sigma^2(P_m) > 0$ eventually (w.p. 1)¹ and for which $U_{m,n}^*/\sigma(P_m) \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{N}(0, 1)$ and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{U_{m,n}^*}{\sigma(P_m)} \leq t \mid P_m\right) = \Phi(t) + \left(\sum_{i=1}^k n^{-i/2} \widehat{p}_i(t)\right) \phi(t) + R_{n,k}(t), \quad (8b)$$

where $R_{n,k}(t) = O_P(n^{-\frac{k+1}{2}})$ uniformly in t . See [19, Ch. 3.3] and Kleiner et al. [21, Theorem 2] for justification of the expansion in power $n^{-i/2}$, which roughly follows because $U_{m,n}^*$ is based on a sample of size n drawn i.i.d. P_m . Here, \widehat{p}_i depend implicitly on the subsampled distribution P_m and are degree $3i-1$ polynomials.

If the private mechanisms $\tilde{\theta}$ have sufficient accuracy, we can leverage Edgeworth expansions of $\theta(P_n)$ to obtain stronger convergence properties for the BLB-resampled private estimator. We say a (private) estimator $\tilde{\theta}$ is (η, ν) -accurate for $\theta(\cdot)$ if

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\tilde{\theta}(P_n) - \theta(P_n)| \geq \eta\right) \leq \nu \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}\left(|\tilde{\theta}(P_{m,n}^*) - \theta(P_{m,n}^*)| \geq \eta \mid P_m\right) \leq \nu \quad \text{eventually.}$$

Returning to Example 1, we discuss how the sample mean admits these expansions.

Example 2 (The Laplace mechanism for the mean, Example 1 continued): Let X_i be data with $|X_i| \leq b$. For the mean $\theta(P) = \mathbb{E}_P[X]$, $\theta(P_n) = \bar{X}_n$, the Laplace mechanism sets $\tilde{\theta}(P_n) = \bar{X}_n + W_n$ for $W_n \sim \text{Lap}(0, \frac{2b}{n\varepsilon})$. Then we see that $\mathbb{P}(|W_n| \geq \eta) = 2 \exp(-\frac{n\varepsilon}{2b}\eta)$, so for any $\nu > 0$ the choice $\eta = \frac{2b}{n\varepsilon} \log \frac{2}{\nu}$ yields $\mathbb{P}(|\tilde{\theta}(P_n) - \theta(P_n)| \geq \eta) \leq \nu$.

For the resampling distributions, given a sample P_m , we can directly compute the variance $\sigma^2(P_m)$ in the Edgeworth expansion (8b): we have $\sigma^2(P_m) = \text{Var}_{P_m}(X) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m X_i^2 - \bar{X}_m^2$, and a calculation by the delta method shows that

$$\sqrt{m}(\sigma^2(P_m) - \sigma^2) \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{N}(0, \text{Var}(X^2) + 4\mathbb{E}[X]^2\sigma^2).$$

That is, $\sigma^2(P_m) = \sigma^2 + O_P(m^{-1/2})$. \diamond

As in our discussion of the percentile bootstrap in the previous section, we give a more elaborate example for M-estimators in Section 4.3 to come.

For sufficiently accurate private estimators, we then obtain the following convergence guarantee on the percentile bootstrap method.

Proposition 4. *Let U_n be the (unstudentized) statistic of an estimator $\theta(P_n)$ admitting Edgeworth expansions (8) of order $k = 1$. Let $\tilde{\theta}$ be (η, ν) -accurate for $\theta(P_n)$ and $\tilde{U}_{m,n}^* = \sqrt{n}(\theta(P_m) - \tilde{\theta}(P_{m,n}^*))$ as usual. Then for any interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\left| \mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{U}_n \in I\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{U}_{m,n}^* \in I \mid P_m\right) \right| \leq O_P\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} + \sqrt{n} \cdot \eta\right) + \nu.$$

See Appendix D.1 for a proof of this proposition.

By considering the “typical” scaling of the privacy errors η and probability of failure ν , we can show how Proposition 4 connects with the accuracy assumptions we have thus far used to obtain consistency. In this case, we say that $\tilde{\theta}$ is has *typical private error* if

$$\eta = O\left(\frac{\log n}{n\varepsilon}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \nu = \frac{1}{n}. \quad (9)$$

¹The accuracy assumption $\sigma^2(P_m) = \sigma^2 + O_P(m^{-1/2})$ is unique, but typically holds, as we discuss.

Example 2 shows this holds for the mean; Section 4.3 to come shows how this holds for empirical risk minimization.

Corollary 4.3. *Let the conditions of Proposition 4 hold, $\tilde{\theta}$ have typical private error (9), and $\varepsilon = O(1)$. Then the confidence set $C_\alpha(P_n)$ of Corollary 3.1 satisfies*

$$\mathbb{P}(\theta(P) \in C_\alpha(P_n)) = 1 - \alpha + O\left(\frac{\log n}{\varepsilon\sqrt{n}}\right).$$

Proof Proposition 4 shows that Assumption A1 holds with $\omega_{\text{cdf}} = O(1/\sqrt{m} + \log n/\varepsilon\sqrt{n})$. In Theorem 1, we take the number of subsamples $s = K\frac{\log n}{\varepsilon}$ for some numerical constant K , meaning that the subsample size is $m = \frac{n}{s} \gtrsim \frac{n\varepsilon}{\log n}$, then use that the Gaussian CDF is Lipschitz to verify its other conditions. \square

We can also give accuracy guarantees for the bootstrap second moment estimates. In this case, we leverage a k th order moment-based Edgeworth expansion in analogy to (8), where for $U_n \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{N}(0, \sigma^2)$

$$\mathbb{E}[U_n^2] = \sigma^2\left(1 - 4\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} n^{-j} \int_0^\infty tp_j(t)\phi(t)dt + O(n^{-k})\right), \quad (10a)$$

where p_j are polynomials, and for $\sigma(P_m)$ as in the equalities (8), we have

$$\mathbb{E}[(U_{m,n}^*)^2 | P_m] = \sigma^2(P_m)\left(1 - 4\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} n^{-j} \int_0^\infty t\hat{p}_j(t)\phi(t)dt + O_P(n^{-k})\right), \quad (10b)$$

conditionally almost surely (where \hat{p}_j are empirical polynomials).

Proposition 5. *Let U_n be the (unstudentized) statistic of an estimator $\theta(P_n)$ admitting Edgeworth variance expansions (10) of order $k = 1$. Let $\tilde{\theta}$ be any other estimator, and define the error $\Delta_{m,n} := \tilde{\theta}(P_{m,n}^*) - \theta(P_{m,n}^*)$. Then conditionally almost surely,*

$$\left|\sigma^2(P_m) - \text{BOOTVAR}(\theta(\cdot), \tilde{\theta}(\cdot), P_m, n)\right| = O_P\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} + \sqrt{n}\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\Delta_{m,n}^2 | P_m]}\right).$$

See Appendix D.2 for a proof.

As in the case of Proposition 4, we can control the typical scaling of the error $\Delta_{m,n}$, which in turn allows more concrete accuracy guarantees. In analogy to Corollary 4.3 and the conditions (9), we say that $\tilde{\theta}$ has *typical squared error* if

$$\mathbb{E}\left[(\tilde{\theta}(P_{m,n}^*) - \theta(P_{m,n}^*))^2 | P_m\right] = O_P\left(\frac{1}{n\varepsilon}\right).$$

Example 2 makes clear that the Laplace mechanism for the sample mean has this scaling; see also Section 4.3 to come on empirical risk minimization. By connecting this condition with Assumption A2 and applying Theorem 2, we can then obtain a concrete accuracy guarantee.

Corollary 4.4. *Let $\tilde{\theta}$ have typical squared error and take $\sigma_{\max}^2 = n^2$. Then there exists N such that $n \geq N$ implies with probability at least $1 - 1/n^2$,*

$$\left|\sigma_n^2 - \text{BLBVAR}(\theta(\cdot), \tilde{\theta}(\cdot), P_n, m, \sigma_{\max}, \rho, \varepsilon)\right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n\varepsilon}}.$$

Proof Let $v^2(P_m)$ be the output of **BOOTVAR** as in Proposition 5. Then by the proposition and the typical squared error condition, we see that for $\omega_{\text{var}} = O(1/\sqrt{m} + 1/\sqrt{n\varepsilon})$, there is some N such that $n \geq N$ implies $\mathbb{P}(|v^2(P_m) - \sigma^2(P_m)| \geq \omega_{\text{var}}) \leq \frac{1}{4}$. We also have $\sigma^2(P_m) = \sigma^2 + O_P(1/\sqrt{m})$ by the assumed Edgeworth expansions, so taking $s = K \frac{\log n}{\varepsilon}$ for a numerical constant K as in Theorem 2 yields $m = \frac{n}{s} = \frac{n\varepsilon}{\log n}$, and Assumption A2 holds. Substitute. \square

4.2.1 On higher-order accuracy and studentization

As a brief remark for readers familiar with the classical literature on Edgeworth expansions and bootstrap accuracy [19], when we seek symmetric sets $I_t = [-ht, ht]$, the classical bootstrap with studentization achieves coverage error $O(1/n)$ rather than the $O(1/\sqrt{n})$ above. The failure to achieve the faster rate follows because we do not assume we have a consistent variance estimate $\tilde{\sigma}$ of θ . Thus, comparing the estimates (8), we achieve roughly

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{U}_{m,n}^* \in [-t, t] \mid P_m) - \mathbb{P}(\tilde{U}_n \in [-t, t]) &= 2\Phi(t\sigma(P_m)) - 2\Phi(t\sigma) + O(1/n) \\ &= 2\phi(t\sigma)t \cdot (\sigma(P_m) - \sigma) + O((\sigma(P_m) - \sigma)^2 + 1/n) \end{aligned}$$

because p_1 is even. So the error necessarily scales with the difference $\sigma(P_m) - \sigma$, which typically is roughly of order $1/\sqrt{m}$. One could in principal use a private variance estimates $\tilde{\sigma}^2(P_m)$ for private estimators applied to $P_m^{\text{sub}(i)}$, plausibly computed via an adaptation of Algorithm 3, and resample the studentized statistic

$$\tilde{U}_{m,n}^{*,\text{student}} := \sqrt{n} \frac{\tilde{\theta}(P_{m,n}^*) - \theta(P_m)}{\tilde{\sigma}(P_m)} \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{N}(0, 1).$$

But this requires more care in the analysis, as we have multiple levels of variance estimation and resampling, so we leave it to future work.

4.3 Empirical risk minimization, objective perturbation, and accuracy

In this section, we provide a more sophisticated set of examples that depart from simple mean and other moment-based estimators, considering M-estimators (or empirical risk minimization). Here, for a convex loss $\ell_\theta(x)$ measuring the performance of a parameter θ for predicting on data $x \in \mathcal{X}$, the goal is to find $\theta(P)$ minimizing the population risk

$$L_P(\theta) := \mathbb{E}_P[\ell_\theta(X)] = P\ell_\theta,$$

where we use the empirical process notation $Pf = \int f(x)dP(x)$, so that for the empirical measure P_n , $P_n f = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i)$. The classical M-estimator choses $\theta(P_n) = \text{argmin}_\theta P_n \ell_\theta$. When ℓ_θ is suitably smooth in θ , then classical asymptotics [31, Ch. 5.6] give

$$\sqrt{n}(\theta(P_n) - \theta(P)) = -\sqrt{n}(P\ddot{\ell}_{\theta(P)})^{-1}P_n\dot{\ell}_{\theta(P)} + o_P(1)$$

where $\dot{\ell}$ and $\ddot{\ell}$ denote gradient and Hessian, respectively. For $H = \nabla^2 L_P(\theta(P))$, we then have $\sqrt{n}(\theta(P_n) - \theta(P)) \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{N}(0, H^{-1}\text{Cov}(\dot{\ell}_{\theta(P)})H^{-1})$, the optimal asymptotic convergence [12].

Because we develop results under privacy constraints, we require somewhat explicit smoothness assumptions.

Assumption A3. For each $x \in \mathcal{X}$, the loss $\theta \mapsto \ell_\theta(x)$ is convex, \mathcal{C}^2 , G_0 -Lipschitz continuous, and has G_i -Lipschitz i th derivatives, $i = 1, 2$. Additionally, $\nabla^2 \ell_\theta(x)$ is at most rank r .

Any generalized linear model loss has rank-1 Hessian, while smoothness properties follow on a per-loss basis. Logistic regression (which has inputs $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $y \in \{0, 1\}$) has loss

$$\ell_\theta(x, y) = \log(1 + \exp(\langle x, \theta \rangle)) - y\langle x, \theta \rangle,$$

and when $x \in \mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ has finite radius $\text{rad}_2(\mathcal{X}) = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \|x\|_2$, the loss has Lipschitz constants $G_0 = \text{rad}_2(\mathcal{X})$, $G_1 = \frac{1}{4}\text{rad}_2(\mathcal{X})^2$, and $G_2 \lesssim \text{rad}_2(\mathcal{X})^3$.

As the prototypical private estimator, we consider objective perturbation [8], which chooses $\tilde{\theta}$ to minimize a randomly tilted (and regularized) version of the empirical objective $P_n \ell_\theta$. To make dependence on the noise clear and allow us to provide a unified analysis, for a regularization $\lambda_{\text{reg}} \geq 0$ and tilting vector w , define

$$\theta_{\lambda_{\text{reg}}}(P_n, w) := \underset{\theta}{\text{argmin}} \left\{ P_n \ell_\theta + \frac{\lambda_{\text{reg}}}{2} \|\theta\|_2^2 + \langle w, \theta \rangle \right\}. \quad (11)$$

We let $\theta_\lambda(P_n) = \theta_\lambda(P_n, \mathbf{0})$ for shorthand. Then under appropriate conditions on the loss ℓ , regularization λ_{reg} , and noise W , $\theta_{\lambda_{\text{reg}}}(P_n, W_n)$ is (ε, δ) -differentially private. A recent analysis gives the following.

Corollary 4.5 (Lemmas 7 and 24, [1]). *Let Assumption A3 hold and $\varepsilon > 0$, and $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Then there is a numerical constant C such that if*

$$\sigma_n^2 \geq C \frac{G_0^2(d + \log \frac{1}{\delta})}{n^2 \varepsilon^2}, \quad W_n \sim \mathbf{N}(0, \sigma_n^2 I_d), \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_{\text{reg}, n} \geq C \cdot \min\{r, d\} \frac{G_1}{n\varepsilon}$$

the objective perturbation estimate $\theta_{\lambda_{\text{reg}, n}}(P_n, W_n)$ is (ε, δ) -differentially private.

In this case, we perform bootstrap resampling on the statistic $\theta_\lambda(P_{m,n}^*, W_n) - \theta_\lambda(P_m)$. The following proposition captures the asymptotic properties of the subsampling/resampling estimator (11), which also includes classical M-estimators with $w = \mathbf{0}$ and $\lambda_{\text{reg}} = 0$ as a special case.

Proposition 6. *Assume the subsample size $m \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then for any sequence of vectors $w_n \rightarrow 0$ and any bounded sequence of regularization values $\lambda = \lambda_{\text{reg}, n} \geq 0$,*

$$\theta_\lambda(P_n, w_n) - \theta_\lambda(P) = -(\nabla^2 L_P(\theta_\lambda(P)) + \lambda I)^{-1} (P_n \dot{\ell}_{\theta_\lambda(P)} + \lambda \theta_\lambda(P) + w_n) + R_n,$$

where for a problem-dependent constant $C < \infty$ and numerical constant $c > 0$, for all $t \leq cn$ the remainder R_n satisfies

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\|R_n\| \geq C \sqrt{\frac{t}{n}} \left(\|w_n\|_2 + \sqrt{\frac{t}{n}} \right) \right) \leq e^{-t}.$$

Additionally, we have the (conditional on P_n) almost sure expansions

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_\lambda(P_{n,m}^*, w_n) - \theta_\lambda(P_m^{\text{sub}}) &= -(H_m + \lambda_{\text{reg}} I)^{-1} (P_{n,m}^* \dot{\ell}_{\theta_\lambda(P_m^{\text{sub}})} + \lambda_{\text{reg}} \theta_\lambda(P_m) + w_n) + R_{n,m}^* \quad \text{and} \\ \theta_\lambda(P_{n,m}^*, w_n) - \theta_\lambda(P_{n,m}^*) &= -(H_m + \lambda_{\text{reg}} I)^{-1} w_n + R_n^*, \end{aligned}$$

where $H_m = P_m \ddot{\ell}_{\theta_\lambda(P_m)} \rightarrow \nabla^2 L_P(\theta_\lambda(P))$ conditionally almost surely. The remainders R_n^ and $R_{n,m}^*$ satisfy the same probabilistic guarantees as R_n conditional on P_m asymptotically almost surely.*

As Proposition 6 is not the main focus, we defer its proof to Appendix C.

4.3.1 Subsampling consistency for objective perturbation

We leverage Proposition 6 to show how objective perturbation meets the conditions of Propositions 2 and 4. Throughout this argument, we let the privacy levels $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_n$ decrease, but assume they satisfy $\varepsilon_n \geq n^{-\beta}$ for some $\beta < \frac{1}{2}$. We first argue that so long as the regularization $\lambda_{\text{reg},n} \rightarrow 0$ quickly enough, then the regularized (population) minimizers are equivalent to $\theta(P)$. A quick calculation with the implicit function theorem shows that if $\theta_\lambda = \operatorname{argmin}_\theta \{L_P(\theta) + \lambda \|\theta\|_2^2\}$, then

$$\theta_\lambda = \theta(P) - \lambda \nabla^2 L_P(\theta(P))^{-1} \theta(P) + O(\lambda^2) \quad (12)$$

as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$. Define the asymptotic covariance

$$\Sigma_P := \nabla^2 L_P(\theta(P))^{-1} \operatorname{Cov}_P(\dot{\ell}_{\theta(P)}) \nabla^2 L_P(\theta(P))^{-1}.$$

Then the choice $\lambda = \lambda_{\text{reg},n} = O(1/n\varepsilon)$ in Corollary 4.5 guarantees the asymptotic normality $\sqrt{n}(\theta_{\lambda_{\text{reg},n}}(P_n, W_n) - \theta(P)) \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{N}(0, \Sigma_P)$. Additionally, so long as $\lambda_{\text{reg},n} \ll 1/\sqrt{n}$, the resampled estimator

$$U_{m,n}^* := \sqrt{n}(\theta_\lambda(P_{m,n}^*) - \theta_\lambda(P_m)) = -\sqrt{n}(H_m + \lambda)^{-1} P_{n,m}^* \dot{\ell}_{\theta_\lambda(P_m)} + O_P(\lambda\sqrt{n}) + R_{m,n}^*$$

similarly satisfies $U_{m,n}^* \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{N}(0, \Sigma_P)$ conditionally almost surely by Slutsky's lemmas and the Lindeberg central limit theorem [cf. 31, Ch. 23]. That is, $U_{m,n}^*$ is KS-consistent (Def. 4.1) for $U_n = \sqrt{n}(\theta_\lambda(P) - \theta_\lambda(P_n))$, as Proposition 2 requires. That $\theta_\lambda - \theta_0 = O(\lambda) = O(\frac{1}{n\varepsilon})$ by the expansion (12) shows that so long as $\varepsilon \gg 1/\sqrt{n}$, the regularization has negligible asymptotic effect. We more explicitly give the resampling consistency (6) as an example:

Example 3 (Resampling consistency of objective perturbation): Let Assumption A3 hold on the losses, and assume the subsample size m is at least polynomial in n . Assume as above that the privacy $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_n \geq n^{-\beta}$ for some $\beta < \frac{1}{2}$. Then as in Corollary 4.5, we have $\sigma_n^2 = O(n^{-2(1-\beta)})$, and so $\sqrt{n} \|W_n\|_2 \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$. In particular, the remainder terms R_n and R_n^* in Proposition 6 satisfy $\sqrt{n} \max\{R_n, R_n^*\} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$, and so the objective perturbation estimator is rate- \sqrt{n} subsampling consistent (6).

Recalling Corollary 4.1, we see that if \hat{t} is the index `BLBQUANT` returns, then with the choices $\lambda_{\text{reg},n}$ and σ_n^2 in Corollary 4.5, the confidence set

$$C_\alpha(P_n) = \theta_{\lambda_{\text{reg},n}}(P_n, W_n) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} I_{\hat{t}}$$

is $(2\varepsilon, \delta)$ -differentially private, and satisfies $\mathbb{P}(\theta(P) \in C_\alpha(P_n)) \rightarrow 1 - \alpha$. \diamond

4.3.2 Consistency via Edgeworth expansions and objective perturbation

The Edgeworth expansions that Proposition 4 requires follow for M-estimators from the asymptotics in Proposition 6, so that $\theta(P_n)$ (taking $w_n = \mathbf{0}$) has an Edgeworth expansion [19]. We can then provide the following high-probability guarantees on deviation, where we are not explicit about constants.

Example 4 (Accuracy of objective perturbation): Let $\tilde{\theta}(P_n) = \theta_{\lambda_{\text{reg},n}}(P_n, W_n)$ for $W_n \sim \mathbf{N}(0, \sigma_n^2)$ and regularization $\lambda_{\text{reg},n}$ as in Corollary 4.5, and let $\theta(P_n) = \theta_0(P_n, \mathbf{0})$ be the standard M-estimator. We give a completely asymptotic expansion, taking $\lambda_{\text{reg},n} = O(1/n\varepsilon)$ and $\sigma_n^2 =$

$O(1/n^2\varepsilon^2)$, ignoring the privacy parameter $\delta > 0$ and other problem dependent constants. Define $\theta = \theta(P)$ and $\theta_\lambda = \operatorname{argmin}_\theta \{L_P(\theta) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\theta\|_2^2\}$, so that $\theta_\lambda = \theta + O(\lambda)$ as a consequence of the implicit function theorem, as above. Similarly, let $H = \nabla^2 L_P(\theta)$ and $H_\lambda = \nabla^2 L_P(\theta_\lambda) = H + O(\lambda)$, where we use the smoothness of $\dot{\ell}_\theta$ from Assumption A3.

We claim that for some $C < \infty$ depending only on the problem parameters in Assumption A3,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\|\tilde{\theta}(P_n) - \theta(P_n)\| \geq C \left(\frac{1}{n\varepsilon} + \frac{1}{n} \right) (1+t) \right) \leq e^{-t}$$

for all $0 \leq t \leq n$. As a consequence, the private estimator $\tilde{\theta}(P_n)$ is $(C \cdot \frac{\log n}{n\varepsilon}, \frac{1}{n^2})$ -accurate for $\theta(P_n)$. To see this claim, note that by Proposition 6,

$$\tilde{\theta}(P_n) - \theta(P_n) = -(H_{\lambda_{\text{reg},n}} + \lambda_{\text{reg},n}I)^{-1} (P_n \dot{\ell}_{\theta_{\lambda_{\text{reg},n}}} + \lambda_{\text{reg},n} \theta_{\lambda_{\text{reg},n}} + W_n) + H^{-1} P_n \dot{\ell}_\theta + R_n,$$

where $\|R_n\| \leq C \sqrt{t/n} (\|W_n\| + \sqrt{t/n})$ with probability at least $1 - e^{-t}$. Performing an asymptotic expansion that $(H_\lambda + \lambda I)^{-1} = (H + O(\lambda) + \lambda I)^{-1} = H^{-1} + O(\lambda)$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, we therefore obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\theta}(P_n) - \theta(P_n) &= H^{-1} (P_n \dot{\ell}_\theta - P_n \dot{\ell}_{\theta_{\lambda_{\text{reg},n}}} - W_n - \lambda_{\text{reg},n} \theta_{\lambda_{\text{reg},n}}) + O(\lambda_{\text{reg},n}) (P_n \dot{\ell}_{\theta_{\lambda_{\text{reg},n}}} + W_n) + R_n \\ &= -H^{-1} W_n + O(\lambda_{\text{reg},n}) (1 + W_n) + R_n, \end{aligned}$$

where we use that $\|\dot{\ell}_{\theta_{\lambda_{\text{reg},n}}} - \dot{\ell}_\theta\|_2 \leq G_1 \|\theta_{\lambda_{\text{reg},n}} - \theta\|_2 = O(\lambda_{\text{reg},n})$. In particular, because $W_n \sim \mathbf{N}(0, \sigma_n^2)$, there is some C such that $\mathbb{P}(\|W_n\|_2 \geq C \frac{1+t}{n\varepsilon}) \leq e^{-t^2}$ (cf. [22, Lemma 1]) for $t \geq 0$. Applying the triangle inequality a few times then gives the original claimed accuracy guarantee. \diamond

The Edgeworth expansions (8b) also require accuracy of a variance proxy $\sigma(P_m)$. For this, we have Proposition 6 again: let

$$\Sigma_{P_m} = (P_m \ddot{\ell}_{\theta_{\lambda_{\text{reg},n}}(P_m)} + \lambda_{\text{reg},n}I)^{-1} \operatorname{Cov}_{P_m}(\dot{\ell}_{\theta_{\lambda_{\text{reg},n}}(P_m)})(P_m \ddot{\ell}_{\theta_{\lambda_{\text{reg},n}}(P_m)} + \lambda_{\text{reg},n}I)^{-1}.$$

Then $U_{m,n}^* = \sqrt{n}(\theta(P_m) - \theta(P_{m,n}^*))$ satisfies $\Sigma_{P_m}^{-1/2} U_{m,n}^* \rightarrow \mathbf{N}(0, I)$ by an argument analogous to that preceding Example 3, and we certainly have $\sqrt{m}(\theta(P_m) - \theta(P)) \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{N}(0, \Sigma_P)$, so that $\Sigma_{P_m} = \Sigma_P + O_P(1/\sqrt{m})$. In particular, Corollary 4.3 applies, because the objective perturbation estimator $\theta_{\lambda_{\text{reg},n}}$ has typical private error (9), and so the confidence set $C_\alpha(P_n)$ centered around $\theta_{\lambda_{\text{reg},n}}(P_n, W_n)$ of Corollary 3.1 satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}(\theta(P) \in C_\alpha(P_n)) = 1 - \alpha + O\left(\frac{\log n}{\varepsilon \sqrt{n}}\right).$$

5 Experiments

We study the empirical performance of the proposed methods by constructing confidence intervals and estimating their coverage and widths on the following three tasks, which we choose to elucidate the performance of private estimators for estimators with different characteristics. As the confidence sets always center around a private estimator $\tilde{\theta}(P_n)$, we use a total privacy budget $\varepsilon_{\text{total}}$ that we divide evenly between $\tilde{\theta}(P_n)$ and the resampling methods. Appendix E includes more detail and additional ablation studies.




Figure 1: Coverage and confidence interval widths for all experiments. Each uses $\varepsilon_{\text{total}} = 8$.

- **Mean estimation:** (Figures 1a and 1d) We generate synthetic data from a Truncated Gaussian and use the sample mean with additive Laplace noise as the private estimator.
- **Median estimation:** (Figures 1b and 1e) We generate synthetic data from a Truncated Gaussian distribution, and use the sample median with the inverse sensitivity mechanism [4] as the private estimator. The median fails to satisfy the Edgeworth expansion assumption (8b), but it is resampling consistent.
- **Logistic regression:** (Figures 1c and 1f) We use the Adult income dataset [10], where the task is to predict whether the income of individuals is greater than a threshold given some of their features. To simulate sampling from a population distribution, we consider the ERM solution on the whole dataset to be the true parameter, and we draw samples of size n from the whole dataset. We use the inverse sensitivity mechanism [4, Sec 5.2] as the private estimator, estimating the multiplier on the **Sex** variable.

Methodology: We evaluate each method on each task by repeating the following individual trial N_{trials} times. Within each trial, we generate a confidence interval for the private statistic \tilde{U}_n (5), then record whether the true parameter lies in it and its width. To evaluate $\mathbb{P}(\theta(P) \in C_\alpha(P_n))$, we employ a computational shortcut. Recognizing that $C_\alpha(P_n) = \tilde{\theta}(P_n) + I_{\hat{t}}$, and $\tilde{\theta}$ and the index \hat{t} use independent randomness and so are conditionally independent given the sample P_n , we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\theta(P) \in C_\alpha(P_n) \mid P_n) = \mathbb{P}\left(\theta(P) \in \tilde{\theta}(P_n, W_n^{(*)}) + n^{-1/2}I_{\hat{t}} \mid P_n\right),$$

where $W_n^{(*)}$ is a resampled independent random variable that $\tilde{\theta}$ uses to guarantee privacy. Thus, for a given interval $I_{\hat{t}}$, we draw N_{resamp} independent copies of $W_n^{(*)}$ and compute the

frequency with which $\theta(P) \in \tilde{\theta}(P_n, W_n^{(*)}) + n^{-1/2}I_{\tilde{t}}$. Figures 1a–1c plot this coverage, while Figures 1d–1f plot average confidence interval widths.

We plot the performance of the following algorithms:

NONPRIVATEBASELINE: We use the non-private percentile method to approximate the distribution of the private statistic $\tilde{\theta}(P_n) - \theta(P)$ via directly bootstrapping $\theta(P_n^*) - \theta(P_n)$. Across all tasks, this has the lowest coverage error and its width serves as a baseline for the performance of the private methods.

PERCENTILE+BLBQUANT and **NORMAL+BLBVAR:** We use the private percentile method and private normal approximation, with the private quantile and variance estimators from Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3 respectively, as Corollaries 3.1 and 4.2 describe. Across the three tasks, we observe that both the coverage and the average width for these are similar to the NONPRIVATEBASELINE. Typically, the normal approximation via BLBVAR provides higher coverage and a larger confidence set than BLBQUANT, though there is no clear winner.

Figure 2 focuses on mean estimation and plots a histogram of confidence interval widths across trials. Both BLBQUANT and BLBVAR return confidence intervals with widths typically between .3 and .9, and the spread of reported confidence intervals is wider than the NONPRIVATEBASELINE, highlighting a cost to privacy. BLBVAR has an infrequent failure mode where it returns a grossly too large confidence set; by Theorem 2 this failure occurs with probability at most $(\sigma_{\max}^2/\rho) \exp(-c \cdot s\varepsilon)$, where s is the number of subsamples, so slightly increasing this can reduce this failure mode significantly. (See Appendix E for more details.)

GVDP (General Valid Differential Privacy) [9]: GVDP is a fully black box algorithm that uses the Sample-Aggregate [27] method to privatize a (potentially) non-private estimator, then uses COINPRESS [6] to aggregate BLB-subsampled results. We use the implementation of GVDP the authors provide. For mean and median estimation, the coverage of GVDP is as good as our proposed methods, but logistic regression (Fig. 1c) proves challenging. Likely because it is black box and because mean (as opposed to median) aggregation is inherently unstable, the confidence intervals it outputs are at least 10× wider than other procedures. While GVDP’s coverage is strong, the more robust median-based aggregation of Algorithms 2 and 3, which privately adapt to estimator accuracy, allows sharper confidence intervals, especially when paired with a known private estimator.

NORMAL+LAPLACEVARIANCE: In the special case of mean estimation with $\tilde{\theta}(P_n, w) = P_n X + w$ (see Example 1) for $x \in [-b, b]$, the sample variance

$$\sigma_n^2 := P_n X^2 - (P_n X)^2 = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i < j} (X_i - X_j)^2$$

is stable, with global sensitivity at most $\frac{4b^2}{n}$, so that $\tilde{\sigma}_n^2 = \sigma_n^2 + W_n^{(2)}$ with $W_n^{(2)} \sim \text{Lap}(0, \frac{8b^2}{n\varepsilon})$ is ε -differentially private. Thus, we may directly and privately estimate variance and give a normal confidence interval. The better performance of this ad-hoc method highlights that if it is possible to directly estimate estimator variance—which requires bespoke approaches—one can achieve stronger confidence sets.

6 Discussion and conclusions

We have introduced two general purpose data-driven methods for constructing private confidence sets and intervals given a private estimator for a parameter of interest. One challenge our experiments highlight is the challenge of obtaining useful confidence intervals under privacy. The more accurate a *private* estimator we have available, the tighter confidence intervals




Figure 2: Histogram of widths of confidence intervals constructed for mean estimation for $n = 300$

we can obtain. For example, our experiments with mean estimation and median achieve confidence set widths (at level $\alpha = .05$) of roughly .2 at sample size $n = 1000$, but for logistic regression, where effective private estimators are more challenging, the confidence intervals are of width roughly 1. Without a strong private estimator (see Figure 1f), confidence interval widths remain unusably large. At some level, then, our results highlight the need for practicable private algorithms for basic statistical estimation tasks, especially generalized linear models, for us to be able to tackle real-world problems.

It may be interesting to develop higher-order convergence guarantees for bootstrap and other resampling algorithms for privacy. It is plausible that by modifying Assumption A1 to something along the lines of $\mathbb{P}(|p - \hat{p}| \geq \omega_{\text{cdf}} \mid P_m) \geq \frac{1}{2} + \eta$ for some $\eta > 0$, which should hold with high probability over the subsample P_m , we might achieve higher-order accuracy in Edgeworth expansions, though this would require some more sophisticated conditioning arguments on a “good” event that subsamples are accurate enough. Our consistency results also rely on private estimators achieving rates of convergence comparable to non-private estimators; moving to analysis regimes where privacy induces substantial additional error could provide new insights. In scenarios where the private estimator simply adds noise independent of the underlying statistic $\theta(P_n)$, such as basic mean estimation problems (Examples 1 and 2), we can fairly trivially analyze coverage directly, as the estimator’s error simply decomposes, but moving beyond this will likely require new tools. We look forward to more work bringing privacy and the inferential goals of modern statistics together.

Acknowledgements

This work was partially supported by the Office of Naval Research Grant N00014-22-1-2669, the Stanford DAWN Consortium and National Science Foundation Grant IIS-2006777.

References

- [1] N. Agarwal, S. Kale, K. Singh, and A. Thakurta. Differentially private and lazy online convex optimization. In *Proceedings of the Thirty Sixth Annual Conference on Computational Learning Theory*, pages 195:1–195:34, 2023.
- [2] D. Alabi and S. Vadhan. Hypothesis testing for differentially private linear regression. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35*, 2022.
- [3] D. Alabi, A. McMillan, J. Sarathy, A. Smith, and S. Vadhan. Differentially private simple linear regression. *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, 2022, Mar. 2022.
- [4] H. Asi and J. Duchi. Near instance-optimality in differential privacy. *arXiv:2005.10630 [cs.CR]*, 2020.
- [5] M. Avella-Medina, C. Bradshaw, and P.-L. Loh. Differentially private inference via noisy optimization. *arXiv:2103.11003 [math.ST]*, 2021.
- [6] S. Biswas, Y. Dong, G. Kamath, and J. Ullman. CoinPress: Practical private mean and covariance estimation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33*, 2020.
- [7] S. Chatterjee. Stein’s method for concentration inequalities. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 138:305–321, 2007.
- [8] K. Chaudhuri, C. Monteleoni, and A. D. Sarwate. Differentially private empirical risk minimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12:1069–1109, 2011.
- [9] C. Covington, X. He, J. Honaker, and G. Kamath. Unbiased statistical estimation and valid confidence intervals under differential privacy. *arXiv:2110.14465 [stat.ME]*, 2021.
- [10] F. Ding, M. Hardt, J. Miller, and L. Schmidt. Retiring Adult: New datasets for fair machine learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34*, 2021.
- [11] J. Drechsler, I. Globus-Harris, A. McMillan, J. Sarathy, and A. Smith. Non-parametric differentially private confidence intervals for the median. *arXiv:2106.10333 [cs.CR]*, 2021.
- [12] J. C. Duchi and F. Ruan. Asymptotic optimality in stochastic optimization. *Annals of Statistics*, 49(1):21–48, 2021.
- [13] C. Dwork and A. Roth. The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy. *Foundations and Trends in Theoretical Computer Science*, 9(3 & 4):211–407, 2014.
- [14] B. Efron. Bootstrap methods: Another look at the jackknife. *Annals of Statistics*, 7(1): 1–26, 1979.
- [15] B. Efron and R. J. Tibshirani. *An Introduction to the Bootstrap*. Chapman & Hall, 1993.
- [16] G. Evans, G. King, M. Schwenzfeier, and A. G. Thakurta. Statistically valid inferences from privacy protected data. available at <https://gking.harvard.edu/files/gking/files/udp.pdf>, 2021.
- [17] C. Ferrando, S. Wang, and D. Sheldon. Parametric bootstrap for differentially private confidence intervals. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1598–1618, 2022.

- [18] M. Gaboardi, R. Rogers, and O. Sheffet. Locally private mean estimation: z -test and tight confidence intervals. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2019.
- [19] P. Hall. *The Bootstrap and Edgeworth Expansion*. Springer, 1992.
- [20] V. Karwa and S. Vadhan. Finite sample differentially private confidence intervals. In *Proceedings of the Ninth Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS)*, pages 44:1–44:9, 2018.
- [21] A. Kleiner, A. Talwalkar, P. Sarkar, and M. I. Jordan. A scalable bootstrap for massive data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, 76(4):795–816, 2014.
- [22] B. Laurent and P. Massart. Adaptive estimation of a quadratic functional by model selection. *Annals of Statistics*, 28(5):1302 – 1338, 2000.
- [23] E. L. Lehmann. *Elements of Large Sample Theory*. Springer, 1999.
- [24] E. L. Lehmann and J. P. Romano. *Testing Statistical Hypotheses, Third Edition*. Springer, 2005.
- [25] L. W. Mackey, M. I. Jordan, R. Y. Chen, B. Farrell, and J. A. Tropp. Matrix concentration inequalities via the method of exchangeable pairs. *arXiv:1201.6002 [math.PR]*, 2012. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1201.6002>.
- [26] F. McSherry and K. Talwar. Mechanism design via differential privacy. In *48th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, 2007.
- [27] K. Nissim, S. Raskhodnikova, and A. Smith. Smooth sensitivity and sampling in private data analysis. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Ninth Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing*, 2007.
- [28] J. Shao and D. Tu. *The Jackknife and Bootstrap*. Springer, 1995.
- [29] O. Sheffet. Differentially private ordinary least squares. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2017.
- [30] A. Smith. Privacy-preserving statistical estimation with optimal convergence rates. In *Proceedings of the Forty-Third Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing*, pages 813–822. ACM, 2011.
- [31] A. W. van der Vaart. *Asymptotic Statistics*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [32] Y. Wang, D. Kifer, and J. Lee. Differentially private confidence intervals for empirical risk minimization. *Journal of Privacy and Confidentiality*, 9(1), 2019.
- [33] L. Wasserman. Minimality, statistical thinking and differential privacy. *Journal of Privacy and Confidentiality*, 4(1), 2012.

A The private median algorithm

We recall Asi and Duchi’s private median algorithm [4], providing pseudocode for completeness in Alg. 5. The method takes as input a vector $v_{1:n} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, a privacy budget ε , and a smoothing constant ρ (which Asi and Duchi recommend taking to be $\rho \ll 1/n$), and upper and lower bounds R_u and R_l on the range of the data, and it outputs an ε -DP estimate of the median of $v_{1:n}$. The algorithm instantiates the inverse sensitivity mechanism [4], and uses the ρ -smoothed length function len^ρ (defined in Lines 2 and 3 in Algorithm 5) as the score function to sample a private median estimate using the exponential mechanism [26].

Algorithm 5: PRIVMEDIAN (from Asi and Duchi [4])

Input : data $v_{1:n}$, privacy budget ε , smoothing parameter ρ , interval $[R_l, R_u]$
Output: ε -DP estimate of the median of $v_{1:n}$

- 1 Set $\hat{v} \leftarrow \text{Med}(v_{1:n})$
- 2 Define $\text{len}(y; v_{1:n}) := \text{card}\{i \in [n] \mid v_i \in (y, \hat{v}] \cup [\hat{v}, y)\}$
- 3 Define $\text{len}^\rho(y; v_{1:n}) := \inf_{|z-y| < \rho} \text{len}(z; v_{1:n})$
- 4 **for** $\ell \in 1, \dots, \lceil n/2 \rceil$ **do**
- 5 | Define $\mathcal{I}_\ell = \{y \in [R_l, R_u] : \text{len}^\rho(y; v_{1:n}) = \ell\}$
- 6 Sample ℓ with probability proportional to $|\mathcal{I}_\ell| \exp(-\ell\varepsilon/2)$
- 7 **return** $v \sim \text{Uni}(\mathcal{I}_\ell)$

B Proofs related to percentile methods

B.1 Proof of Proposition 1

We demonstrate that for any $t \in [T] \cup \{\perp\}$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{ABOVETHR}(y, \tau, \xi) = t) \leq e^\varepsilon \mathbb{P}(\text{ABOVETHR}(y', \tau, \xi) = t). \quad (13)$$

We first show the result for $t \in [T]$, treating $t = \perp$ afterwards as a special case. We provide a particular coupling between noise values ξ and $\xi' = \pi(\xi)$, where $\xi' \stackrel{d}{=} \xi$ and $\text{ABOVETHR}(y, \tau, \xi) = \text{ABOVETHR}(y', \tau, \xi')$, which then implies the result (13), as

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{ABOVETHR}(y, \tau, \xi) = t) = \mathbb{P}(\text{ABOVETHR}(y', \tau, \xi') = t) \leq e^\varepsilon \mathbb{P}(\text{ABOVETHR}(y', \tau, \xi) = t).$$

The coupling follows here:

Observation 3. Define $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}$ by

$$\eta_i := \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } i = 0 \\ 2 & \text{if } i = t \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and define $\pi(\xi) := \xi + \eta$. Let $y(t), y'(t) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ satisfy $d_{\text{ham}}(y(t), y'(t)) \leq 1$ for each t . Then $\text{ABOVETHR}(x, \tau, \xi) = t$ implies $\text{ABOVETHR}(x', \tau, \pi(\xi)) = t$ for all $t \in [T]$.

Proof Observe that $\text{ABOVETHR}(y, \tau, \xi) = t$ if and only if the following conditions hold:

(C1) For each index $u < t$, $y(u)_{(\lfloor \xi_0 + \xi_u \rfloor)} < \tau$ or $\lfloor \xi_0 + \xi_u \rfloor < 1$, and

(C2) $y(t)_{(\lfloor \xi_0 + \xi_t \rfloor)} \geq \tau$ or $\lfloor \xi_0 + \xi_t \rfloor > k$.

Similarly $\text{ABOVETHR}(y', \tau, \xi') = t$ if and only if

(C1') For each index $u < t$, $y'(u)_{(\lfloor \xi'_0 + \xi'_u \rfloor)} < \tau$ or $\lfloor \xi'_0 + \xi'_u \rfloor < 1$, and

(C2') $y'(t)_{(\lfloor \xi'_0 + \xi'_t \rfloor)} \geq \tau$ or $\lfloor \xi'_0 + \xi'_t \rfloor > k$.

We show that condition (C1) implies (C1') and (C2) implies (C2'), from which the claim follows. For the first condition, we have by construction for all $u < t$ that $\lfloor \xi'_0 + \xi'_u \rfloor = \lfloor \xi_0 + \xi_u \rfloor - 1$. So if $\lfloor \xi_0 + \xi_u \rfloor < 1$ then certainly $\lfloor \xi'_0 + \xi'_u \rfloor < 1$. Otherwise, if $y(u)_{(\lfloor \xi_0 + \xi_u \rfloor)} < \tau$, then because $d_{\text{ham}}(y(u), y'(u)) \leq 1$ we have

$$y'(u)_{(\lfloor \xi'_0 + \xi'_u \rfloor)} = y'(u)_{(\lfloor \xi_0 + \xi_u \rfloor - 1)} \leq y(u)_{(\lfloor \xi_0 + \xi_u \rfloor)} < \tau.$$

Similarly, for the second condition (C2), we have by construction that $\lfloor \xi'_0 + \xi'_t \rfloor = \lfloor \xi_0 + \xi_t \rfloor + 1$ and so, given condition (C2), either $\lfloor \xi'_0 + \xi'_t \rfloor > k$ or the assumption that $d_{\text{ham}}(y(t), y'(t)) \leq 1$ implies $y(t)_{(\lfloor \xi'_0 + \xi'_t \rfloor)} \geq y(t)_{(\lfloor \xi_0 + \xi_t \rfloor)} > \tau$. \square

Observation 3 explicitly constructs $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}$ $\|\eta\|_1 \leq 3$ such that $\text{ABOVETHR}(y, \tau, \xi) = t$ implies $\text{ABOVETHR}(y', \tau, \xi + \eta) = t$. Letting $\pi(\xi) = \xi + \eta$, computing ratios of Laplace densities immediately implies that $\xi \stackrel{d}{=} \xi'$ for ξ constructed as in the statement of Proposition 1, and thus the claim (13) holds for $t \neq \perp$.

The special case $t = \perp$ follows from a similar argument: defining $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}$ by

$$\eta_i := \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } i = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

then $\text{ABOVETHR}(y, \tau, \xi) = \perp$ implies $\text{ABOVETHR}(y', \tau, \xi + \eta) = \perp$. Letting $\pi(\xi) = \xi + \eta$, we see again that $\xi \stackrel{d}{=} \xi'$.

B.2 Proof of Lemma 3.1

The following two technical lemmas form the keys for the proof.

Lemma B.1. *Let $\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^k$ be independent and satisfy $\mathbb{P}(|Y_i - \mu| \leq c) \geq \frac{1}{2} + \eta$ for all i , where $\eta > 0$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Then for $\alpha \geq 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|Y_{(i)} - \mu| \leq c \text{ for all } \frac{1-2\alpha}{2}k \leq i \leq \frac{1+2\alpha}{2}k\right) \geq 1 - \exp\left(-2k[\eta - \alpha]_+^2\right).$$

Proof Let $\eta_i = \mathbb{P}(|Y_i - \mu| \leq c) - \frac{1}{2}$, so that $\eta_i \geq \eta > 0$, let $Z_i = 1\{|Y_i - \mu| > c\}$ so that $Z_i \sim \text{Ber}(\frac{1}{2} - \eta_i)$ independently, and let $\mathcal{I} = \{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid \frac{1-2\alpha}{2}k \leq i \leq \frac{1+2\alpha}{2}k\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(|Y_{(i)} - \mu| > c \text{ for some } i \in \mathcal{I}\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^k 1\{|Y_i - \mu| > c\} \geq \frac{1-2\alpha}{2}k\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^k Z_i \geq \frac{1-2\alpha}{2}k\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \left(Z_i - \left(\frac{1}{2} - \eta_i\right)\right) \geq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \eta_i - \alpha\right). \end{aligned}$$

Because $\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \eta_i \geq \eta$, applying Hoeffding's concentration inequality gives the result. \square

Lemma B.2. *Let $X_1 \sim \text{Lap}(0, b_1)$ and $X_2 \sim \text{Lap}(0, b_2)$. Then $X_1 + X_2$ has density*

$$f_{X_1+X_2}(x) = \frac{b_1^2}{b_1^2 - b_2^2} \frac{1}{2b_1} \exp\left(-\frac{|x|}{b_1}\right) + \frac{b_2^2}{b_2^2 - b_1^2} \frac{1}{2b_2} \exp\left(-\frac{|x|}{b_2}\right),$$

and for $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(|X_1 + X_2| > t) = \frac{b_1^2}{b_1^2 - b_2^2} \exp\left(-\frac{t}{b_1}\right) + \frac{b_2^2}{b_2^2 - b_1^2} \exp\left(-\frac{t}{b_2}\right).$$

Proof Let f_{X_i} denote the density of X_i , so $f_{X_i}(x) = \frac{1}{2b_i} \exp\left(-\frac{|x|}{b_i}\right)$. Computing the convolution of f_{X_1} and f_{X_2} for $x \geq 0$ thus yields

$$\begin{aligned} f_{X_1+X_2}(x) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_{X_1}(y) f_{X_2}(x-y) dy \\ &= \frac{1}{4b_1 b_2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{|y|}{b_1}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{|x-y|}{b_2}\right) dy \\ &= \frac{1}{4b_1 b_2} \left(\int_{-\infty}^0 \exp\left(\frac{y}{b_1} + \frac{y-x}{b_2}\right) dy + \int_0^x \exp\left(\frac{-y}{b_1} + \frac{y-x}{b_2}\right) dy \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4b_1 b_2} \left(\int_x^{\infty} \exp\left(\frac{-y}{b_1} + \frac{x-y}{b_2}\right) dy \right) \\ &= \frac{b_1^2}{b_1^2 - b_2^2} \frac{1}{2b_1} \exp\left(-\frac{x}{b_1}\right) + \frac{b_2^2}{b_2^2 - b_1^2} \frac{1}{2b_2} \exp\left(-\frac{x}{b_2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Symmetry considerations give the lemma's first identity. The second follows by integrating. \square

We use Lemma B.1 coupled with the concentration guarantees for adding independent Laplace random variables in Lemma B.2. For a value $\alpha \geq 0$ to be determined, define the event

$$E_1 := \{|\xi_0 + \xi - \mathbb{E}[\xi]|\leq \alpha k\}.$$

Then because $\xi_0 - \mathbb{E}[\xi_0] \sim \text{Lap}(0, b)$ and $\xi \sim \text{Lap}(0, 2b)$, Lemma B.2 yields

$$\mathbb{P}(E_1^c) \leq \frac{4}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{k\alpha}{2b}\right) - \frac{1}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{k\alpha}{b}\right) < \frac{4}{3} \exp\left(-\frac{k\alpha}{2b}\right).$$

Because $Y \in \mathbb{R}^k$ has independent entries and is independent of E_1 ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|\text{ORDST}(Y, \xi_0 + \xi) - \mu| > \omega) &\leq \mathbb{P}(E_1^c) + \mathbb{P}(|\text{ORDST}(Y, \xi_0 + \xi) - \mu| > \omega \mid E_1) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(E_1^c) + \exp\left(-2k [1/4 - \alpha]_+^2\right) \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma B.1. Bound $\mathbb{P}(E_1^c) \leq \exp(-\frac{k\alpha}{2b})$ and set $\alpha = \frac{1}{8}$.

B.3 Proof of Theorem 2

The privacy of **BLBVAR** is immediate: the algorithm **PRIVMEDIAN** is ε -differentially private, and because at most one of its inputs may change when we change a single example (because at most a single subsample $P_m^{\text{sub}(i)}$ changes), **BLBVAR** is ε -differentially private.

To prove the utility of **BLBVAR**, we analyze the performance of the private median algorithm. First recall the equalities

$$\text{len}(v, v_{1:s}) = \text{card} \{i \mid \text{Med}(v_{1:s}) \leq v_i < v \text{ or } v < v_i \leq \text{Med}(v_{1:s})\}$$

and

$$\text{len}^\rho(v; v_{1:s}) := \inf_{|z-v| \leq \rho} \text{len}(v, v_{1:s}).$$

Let v be the output of **PRIVMEDIAN** on inputs and for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ to be chosen, define the event $\mathcal{E} := \{\text{len}^\rho(v; v_{1:s}) \leq k\}$. Then following Asi and Duchi [4, Sec. 5.1], we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}^c) &= \mathbb{P}(\text{len}^\rho(v, v_{1:s}) > k) = \frac{\int_{\text{len}^\rho(z; v_{1:s}) > k} \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon \text{len}^\rho(z; v_{1:s})}{2}\right) dz}{\int \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon \text{len}^\rho(z; v_{1:s})}{2}\right) dz} \\ &\leq \frac{\sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} \int_{\text{len}^\rho(z; v_{1:s})=j} e^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}j} dz}{\rho} \leq \frac{\sigma_{\max}^2}{\rho} \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}(k+1)\right), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where the first inequality follows because the denominator lower bound ρ as $\text{len}^\rho(z; v_{1:s}) = 0$ for $|z - \text{Med}(v_{1:s})| \leq \rho$, while the second follows because the support of z has width σ_{\max}^2 .

Now, take $k \leq \frac{s}{8}$. On the event \mathcal{E} , we have $v_{(s/2-k)} - \rho \leq v \leq v_{(s/2+k)} + \rho$, and so applying Lemma B.1 (along with Assumption A2 that $\mathbb{P}(|\sigma_n^2 - \text{BOOTVAR}| \geq \omega_{\text{var}}) \geq \frac{3}{4}$) with $c = \omega_{\text{var}}$, $\alpha = \frac{k}{s} \leq \frac{1}{8}$, and $\eta = \frac{3}{4}$ and noting that the values v_i that **BOOTVAR** returns are independent under the subsampling, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(|\sigma_n^2 - \text{PRIVMEDIAN}(v_{1:s}, \varepsilon, \rho, \sigma_{\max}^2)| > \omega_{\text{var}} + \rho, \mathcal{E}\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(|\sigma_n^2 - v_{(j)}| > \omega_{\text{var}} + \rho \text{ for each } \frac{s}{2} - k \leq j \leq \frac{s}{2} + k, \mathcal{E}\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(|\sigma_n^2 - v_{(j)}| > \omega_{\text{var}} + \rho \text{ for each } \frac{s}{2} - k \leq j \leq \frac{s}{2} + k\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{s}{32}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Using the shorthand $\tilde{\sigma}_n^2 = \text{BLBVAR}(\theta(\cdot), \tilde{\theta}(\cdot), P_n, m, \sigma_{\max}^2, \rho, \varepsilon)$ and combining this inequality with inequality (14), we therefore obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(|\sigma_n^2 - \tilde{\sigma}_n^2| \geq \omega_{\text{var}} + \rho\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(|\sigma_n^2 - \tilde{\sigma}_n^2| \geq \omega_{\text{var}} + \rho, \mathcal{E}\right) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}^c) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{s}{32}\right) + \frac{\sigma_{\max}^2}{\rho} \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}k\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{s}{32}\right) + \frac{\sigma_{\max}^2}{\rho} \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon s}{16}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Solving for the probability $\beta > 0$ gives the result.

C Proof of Proposition 6 and related results

Before we proceed with the proof of Proposition 6 proper (see Section C.3 below), we present a few necessary results on subsampling and matrix concentration, and we also develop results on perturbations of solutions of convex optimization problems (see Sec. C.2).

C.1 Results on matrix concentration with subsampling

Let \mathbb{H}^d denote the collection of $d \times d$ Hermitian matrices. Let $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n \in \mathbb{H}^d$ satisfy $\sum_{i=1}^n A_i = 0$, and let π be a permutation of n . Define the random matrix

$$X := \sum_{i=1}^m A_{\pi(i)},$$

that is, the sum of a random subset of m of the n matrices. We leverage the method of exchangeable pairs to show that X concentrates:

Proposition 7. *Let $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset \mathbb{H}^d$ and $X = \sum_{i=1}^m A_{\pi(i)}$ be as above, and additionally assume that $\|A_i - A_j\|_{\text{op}} \leq b$ for all i, j . Then*

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda_{\min}(X) \leq -t) \leq d \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{mb^2}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}(\lambda_{\max}(X) \geq t) \leq d \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{mb^2}\right).$$

By rescaling the matrices, the following result is evidently equivalent to the proposition: given any set of $d \times d$ Hermitian matrices A_1, \dots, A_n summing to zero and with $\|A_i - A_j\|_{\text{op}} \leq b$ for any pair i, j , we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\|\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m A_{\pi(i)}\right\|_{\text{op}} \geq t\right) \leq 2d \exp\left(-\frac{mt^2}{b^2}\right).$$

We also always have the Matrix-Hoeffding concentration inequality, a simple version of which we state here.

Corollary C.1 (Matrix-Hoeffding, Cor. 4.2 [25]). *Let $X_i \in \mathbb{H}^d$ be independent, mean zero, and satisfy $X_i^2 \preceq A_i^2$ for each i . Let $S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$. Then for all $t \geq 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\|S_n\|_{\text{op}} \geq t\right) \leq 2d \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \quad \text{where} \quad \sigma^2 = \left\|\sum_{i=1}^n A_i^2\right\|_{\text{op}}.$$

In the context of subsampled Hessians in an M-estimation problem, so long as $\nabla \ell$ is G_1 -Lipschitz, several consequences follow this result. First, observe that because $0 \preceq \ddot{\ell}_\theta(x) \preceq G_1 I_d$ for any θ and x , then no matter the distribution P ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\|P_n \ddot{\ell}_\theta - P \ddot{\ell}_\theta\right\|_{\text{op}} \geq t\right) \leq 2d \exp\left(-\frac{mt^2}{2G_1^2}\right).$$

Additionally, we obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\|P_m^{\text{sub}} \ddot{\ell}_\theta - P_n \ddot{\ell}_\theta\right\|_{\text{op}} \geq t \mid P_n\right) \leq 2d \exp\left(-\frac{mt^2}{G_1^2}\right),$$

because $0 \preceq \ddot{\ell}_\theta(x) \preceq G_1 I_d$ for any θ, x . Applying and applying the triangle inequality, Matrix-Hoeffding, and a union bound gives

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\|P_{n,m}^* \ddot{\ell}_\theta - P_n \ddot{\ell}_\theta\right\|_{\text{op}} \geq t \mid P_n\right) \leq 2d \left[\exp\left(-\frac{mt^2}{4G_1^2}\right) + \exp\left(-\frac{nt^2}{4G_1^2}\right) \right].$$

Said differently, conditional on P_n , for any θ and for any $\delta > 0$ we have

$$\left\| P_{n,m}^* \ddot{\ell}_\theta - P_n \ddot{\ell}_\theta \right\|_{\text{op}} \leq O(1) \frac{G_1}{\sqrt{m}} \sqrt{\log \frac{d}{\delta}}$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$ (over only the resampling $P_{n,m}^*$). Note that because this statement is conditional on P_n , we may take $\theta = \theta(P_n)$.

We can apply the same argument to subsampled gradient vectors, where by a dilation argument (cf. [25]), we obtain for any θ , $t \geq 0$, and $\delta > 0$, that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\left\| P_m^{\text{sub}} \dot{\ell}_\theta - P_n \dot{\ell}_\theta \right\|_2 \geq t \mid P_n \right) &\leq 2d \exp \left(-\frac{mt^2}{2G_0^2} \right) \\ \mathbb{P} \left(\left\| P_{n,m}^* \dot{\ell}_\theta - P_n \dot{\ell}_\theta \right\|_2 \geq t \mid P_n \right) &\leq 4d \exp \left(-\frac{mt^2}{4G_0^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Proposition 7: We now turn to the proof of the proposition. We leverage the method of exchangeable pairs for concentration inequalities, developed by Chatterjee [7] and Mackey et al. [25]. Recall that a pair (X, X') of Hermitian matrices in $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is a matrix Stein pair if for exchangeable random variables (Z, Z') , that is, a pair satisfying $(Z, Z') \stackrel{\text{dist}}{=} (Z', Z)$, we have $X = f(Z)$ and $X' = f(Z')$ for some function f and for some constant $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}[X - X' \mid Z] = \alpha X \quad \text{w.p. 1.}$$

The conditional variance $\Delta_X(Z) := \frac{1}{2\alpha} \mathbb{E}[(X - X')^2 \mid Z]$. We have

Corollary C.2 (Mackey et al. [25], Theorem 4.1). *Let (X, X') be a matrix Stein pair and assume that for some nonnegative c, v ,*

$$\Delta_X(Z) \preceq cX + vI_d.$$

Then for all $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda_{\min}(X) \leq -t) \leq d \exp \left(-\frac{t^2}{2v} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}(\lambda_{\max}(X) \geq t) \leq d \exp \left(-\frac{t^2}{2v + 2ct} \right).$$

Lemma C.1. *Let π' be a permutation that transposes two elements of π , chosen at random. Define $X' = \sum_{i=1}^m A_{\pi'(i)}$. Then the subsampling sum matrices X, X' form a matrix Stein pair with $\alpha = \frac{2}{n-1}$, i.e.,*

$$\mathbb{E}[X - X' \mid \pi] = \frac{2}{n-1} X.$$

Proof Because we condition on π , without loss of generality we may assume that π is the identity mapping with $\pi(i) = i$. Let J and K be the indices swapped in π' . Then we have $X = X'$ unless $J \leq m$ and $K > m$ or $J > m$ and $K \leq m$, as swapping two elements in the first m or the last $n - m$ indices changes nothing. Thus by symmetry

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X - X'] &= 2\mathbb{P}(J \leq m, K > m) \mathbb{E}[X - X' \mid J \leq m, K > m] \\ &= 2\mathbb{P}(J \leq m, K > m) \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^m A_i - \left(\sum_{i=1}^m A_i - A_J + A_K \right) \mid J \leq m, K > m \right] \\ &= 2\mathbb{P}(J \leq m, K > m) \mathbb{E}[A_J - A_K \mid J \leq m, K > m]. \end{aligned}$$

Now note that $\mathbb{E}[A_J | J \leq m] = (1/m) \sum_{i=1}^m A_i = (1/m)X$, while

$$\mathbb{E}[A_K | K > m] = \frac{1}{n-m} \sum_{i>m} A_i = \frac{1}{n-m} \sum_{i=1}^n A_i - \frac{1}{n-m} \sum_{i=1}^m A_i = -\frac{1}{n-m} \sum_{i=1}^m A_i = -\frac{1}{n-m}X,$$

because $\sum_{i=1}^n A_i = 0$ by assumption. Substituting above yields

$$\mathbb{E}[X - X'] = 2\mathbb{P}(J \leq m, K > m) \left(\frac{1}{m}X + \frac{1}{n-m}X \right) = 2\mathbb{P}(J \leq m, K > m) \frac{n}{n(n-m)}X.$$

Finally, we recognize that $\mathbb{P}(J \leq m, K > m) = \frac{m}{n} \frac{n-m}{n-1}$ and simplify. \square

Lemma C.2. *Assume that $\|A_i - A_j\|_{\text{op}} \leq b$ for all i, j . Then the conditional variance of X satisfies*

$$\Delta_X = \frac{1}{2\alpha} \mathbb{E}[(X - X')^2 | \pi] \preceq \frac{m(n-m)}{2n} b^2 I_d \preceq \frac{m}{2} b^2 I_d.$$

Proof We compute the conditional variance of X , noting that as in the proof of Lemma C.1 we may w.l.o.g. assume π is the identity permutation. Then again letting J and K denote the swapped indices,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(X - X')^2] &= 2\mathbb{P}(J \leq m, K > m) \mathbb{E}[(A_J - A_K)^2 | J \leq m, K > m] \\ &= \frac{2m(n-m)}{n(n-1)} \mathbb{E}[(A_J - A_K)^2 | J \leq m, K > m]. \end{aligned}$$

Because $u^\top (A_j - A_k)^2 u = \|(A_j - A_k)u\|_2^2 \leq \|A_j - A_k\|_{\text{op}}^2$ for $\|u\|_2 = 1$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[(X - X')^2] \preceq \frac{2m(n-m)}{n(n-1)} b^2 I_d.$$

Dividing by $2\alpha = \frac{4}{n-1}$ gives the result. \square

To finally prove Proposition 7, apply Corollary C.2 with $v = \frac{mb^2}{2}$.

C.2 Perturbation of convex minimizers

We first present a lemma on the localization of minimizers of general convex functions.

Lemma C.3. *Let L be a convex function with G_2 -Lipschitz continuous Hessian. Let θ be a point for which $\nabla^2 L(\theta) \succeq \lambda I$, and let w be any vector such that $\|\nabla L(\theta) + w\|_2 < \frac{\lambda^2}{6G_2}$. Then $\theta_w = \arg\min_{\theta} \{L(\theta) + \langle \theta, w \rangle\}$ satisfies*

$$\|\theta - \theta_w\|_2 \leq \frac{2\|\nabla L(\theta) + w\|_2}{\lambda}.$$

Proof Let $\gamma = \|\nabla L(\theta) + w\|_2$ for shorthand and u be any unit vector. By a Taylor approximation, for $t \geq 0$ we have

$$L(\theta + tu) + t\langle w, u \rangle \geq L(\theta) + t\langle \nabla L(\theta) + w, u \rangle + \frac{\lambda - G_2 t}{2} t^2 \geq L(\theta) - t\gamma + \frac{\lambda - G_2 t}{2} t^2.$$

By convexity, if we can show for some $t_0 > 0$ that

$$-\gamma t_0 + \frac{\lambda - G_2 t_0}{2} t_0^2 > 0,$$

then we immediately have $L(\theta + tu) + t\langle w, u \rangle > L(\theta)$ for all $t \geq t_0$, and so $\theta + tu$ cannot minimize $L(\cdot) + \langle w, \cdot \rangle$, that is, $\|\theta_w - \theta\|_2 \leq t_0$. To that end, let us temporarily assume that $t \leq \frac{2\lambda}{3G_2}$, so that

$$-\gamma t + \frac{\lambda - G_2 t}{2} t^2 \geq -\gamma t + \frac{\lambda}{6} t^2.$$

Evidently, any $t > \frac{6\gamma}{\lambda}$ implies that the right side is positive, so if there is some such t also satisfying $t \leq \frac{\lambda}{2G_2}$, that is, $\gamma < \frac{\lambda^2}{6G_2}$. Then we necessarily have $\|\theta_w - \theta\|_2 \leq \frac{6\gamma}{\lambda}$.

Now we give the sharper guarantee. Let $\Delta = \theta_w - \theta$. Then the optimality conditions for convex optimization guarantee

$$\langle \nabla L(\theta_w) + w, \theta - \theta_w \rangle \geq 0, \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \langle \nabla L(\theta_w) - \nabla L(\theta), \theta - \theta_w \rangle \geq \langle \nabla L(\theta) + w, \theta_w - \theta \rangle.$$

Define $h(t) = \langle \nabla L(\theta + t\Delta), \Delta \rangle$, so that $h'(t) = \langle \Delta, \nabla^2 L(\theta + t\Delta), \Delta \rangle$. Then the preceding inequality is equivalent to

$$\int_0^1 h'(t) dt = h(1) - h(0) = \langle \nabla L(\theta_w) - \nabla L(\theta), \theta_w - \theta \rangle \leq \langle \nabla L(\theta) + w, \theta - \theta_w \rangle.$$

But inspecting the last integral, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 h'(t) dt &= \langle \Delta, \nabla^2 L(\theta) \Delta \rangle + \left\langle \Delta, \int_0^1 (\nabla^2 L(\theta + t\Delta) - \nabla^2 L(\theta)) dt \Delta \right\rangle \\ &\geq \lambda \|\Delta\|_2^2 - G_2 \|\Delta\|_2^3 \int_0^1 t dt = \lambda \|\Delta\|_2^2 \left(1 - \frac{G_2 \|\Delta\|_2}{2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Then either $\|\Delta\|_2 \geq \frac{\lambda}{G_2}$, or we have

$$\frac{\lambda}{2} \|\Delta\|_2^2 \leq \langle \nabla L(\theta) + w, \theta - \theta_w \rangle \leq \gamma \|\Delta\|_2,$$

implying $\|\Delta\|_2 \leq \frac{2\gamma}{\lambda}$. In the former case, we already have that $\|\Delta\|_2 \leq \frac{6\gamma}{\lambda} < \frac{\lambda^2}{G_2\lambda} = \frac{\lambda}{G_2}$, a contradiction. \square

An alternative perturbation result is also sometimes useful.

Lemma C.4. *Let the conditions of Lemma C.3 hold, and let $\theta^* = \operatorname{argmin} L(\theta)$. If $\nabla^2 L(\theta^*) \succeq \lambda I$ and $\|w\|_2 < \frac{\lambda^2}{6G_2}$, then $\theta_w = \operatorname{argmin}_\theta \{L(\theta) + \langle w, \theta \rangle\}$ satisfies*

$$\|\theta_w - \theta^*\|_2 \leq \frac{2\|w\|_2}{\lambda}.$$

If L is λ -strongly convex (not necessarily differentiable), then $\|\theta_w - \theta^\|_2 \leq \frac{\|w\|_2}{\lambda}$ regardless.*

Proof Observe that $\nabla L(\theta^*) = 0$, so that Lemma C.3 gives the first claim. For the final inequality, note that there exist elements of the subdifferential (which we denote by $\nabla L(\theta) \in \partial L(\theta)$) such that

$$\langle \nabla L(\theta_w) + w, \theta^* - \theta_w \rangle \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \nabla L(\theta^*), \theta_w - \theta^* \rangle \geq 0.$$

Adding these and rearranging gives

$$\langle w, \theta^* - \theta_w \rangle \geq \langle \nabla L(\theta_w) - \nabla L(\theta^*), \theta_w - \theta^* \rangle \geq \lambda \|\theta_w - \theta^*\|_2^2,$$

where we used strong convexity. Divide by $\|\theta_w - \theta^*\|_2$ and apply Cauchy-Schwarz. \square

Using Lemma C.3, we can obtain various finite-sample-valid expansions of the minimizers. To do so, we give a general condition under which minimizers of tilted and sampled losses are close to minimizers of a loss based on a distribution P .

Definition C.1. A sample-vector pair (P_n, w) is (γ, η, λ) -accurate for P if for $\theta = \theta(P) = \operatorname{argmin}_\theta P\ell_\theta$, we have both

- (i) the well-conditioning $P\ddot{\ell}_\theta \succeq \lambda I$,
- (ii) the accuracy guarantees $\|P_n\dot{\ell}_\theta + w\|_2 \leq \gamma$, $\|(P_n - P)\ddot{\ell}_\theta\|_{\text{op}} \leq \eta$, and
- (iii) the parameter relations $\eta \leq \frac{\lambda}{6}$, and $\gamma \leq \frac{\lambda^2}{6G_2}$.

This definition, combined with Lemma C.3, gives a straightforward condition to check for accuracy of sample minimizers.

Lemma C.5. Let Assumption A3 hold and assume that (P_n, w) be (γ, η, λ) -accurate for P . Then $\theta(P_n, w) := \operatorname{argmin}_\theta \{P_n\ell_\theta + \langle w, \theta \rangle\}$ satisfies

$$\|\theta(P_n, w) - \theta(P)\|_2 \leq \frac{2\gamma}{\lambda}$$

and

$$\theta(P_n, w) - \theta(P) = -(P\ddot{\ell}_\theta)^{-1}(P_n\dot{\ell}_\theta + w) + E_w(P_n\dot{\ell}_\theta + w),$$

where the error matrix E_w satisfies $\|E_w\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{\eta}{\lambda^2} + \frac{2G_2\gamma}{\lambda^3}$.

Proof Lemma C.3 gives the first result. For the second let $\theta = \theta(P)$ and $\theta_w = \theta(P_n, w)$ for shorthand. As we are guaranteed the minimizer exists, we may perform a Taylor expansion to obtain

$$0 = P_n\dot{\ell}_{\theta_w} + w = P_n\dot{\ell}_\theta + w + (P_n\ddot{\ell}_\theta + E)(\theta_w - \theta)$$

where $\|E\|_{\text{op}} \leq G_2 \|\theta - \theta_w\| \leq \frac{2G_2\gamma}{\lambda} \leq \frac{1}{3}\lambda$ by definition C.1. Rearranging, we find that

$$\theta_w - \theta = -(P_n\ddot{\ell}_\theta + E)^{-1}(P_n\dot{\ell}_\theta + w) = -(P\ddot{\ell}_\theta + (P_n - P)\ddot{\ell}_\theta + E)^{-1}(P_n\dot{\ell}_\theta + w). \quad (15)$$

Now, we use a standard matrix identity, that for a matrix $H \succeq 0$ and D with $\|D\|_{\text{op}} < \lambda_{\min}(H)$, we have

$$(H + D)^{-1} = H^{-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (-1)^i (H^{-1}D)^i H^{-1}$$

Under the stronger condition that $\|D\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{1}{2}\lambda_{\min}(H)$, then

$$\|(H^{-1}D)^i\|_{\text{op}} \leq (\|D\|_{\text{op}}/\lambda_{\min}(H))^i \leq 2^{-i},$$

and so

$$(H + D)^{-1} = H^{-1} + E'H^{-1} \quad \text{where} \quad \|E'\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{\|D\|_{\text{op}}/\lambda_{\min}(H)}{1 - \|D\|_{\text{op}}/\lambda_{\min}(H)} \leq \frac{2\|D\|_{\text{op}}}{\lambda_{\min}(H)}.$$

Substituting this into the identity (15) with the definitions $H = P\ddot{\ell}_\theta$ and $D = (P_n - P)\ddot{\ell}_\theta + E$, because $\|(P_n - P)\ddot{\ell}_\theta + E\|_{\text{op}} \leq \eta + \frac{\lambda}{3} \leq \frac{1}{2}\lambda$ and $P\ddot{\ell}_\theta \succeq \lambda I$ by definition, we have

$$\theta_w - \theta = -(P\ddot{\ell}_\theta)^{-1}(P_n\dot{\ell}_\theta + w) + E_w(P_n\dot{\ell}_\theta + w),$$

where

$$\|E_w\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{2\|(P_n - P)\ddot{\ell}_\theta + E\|_{\text{op}}}{\lambda_{\min}(H)} \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}(H)} \leq \frac{\eta}{\lambda^2} + \frac{2G_2\gamma}{\lambda^3},$$

as desired. \square

The remainder of the proof simply demonstrates that the sampled and resampled empirical distributions are all accurate (Definition C.1) for their respective ‘‘initial’’ distributions, that is, we show that each of the following holds with high probability:

1. P_n is accurate for P
2. P_m^{sub} is accurate for P_n
3. $P_{m,n}^*$ is accurate for P_m^{sub}

Once each of the three of these holds, Proposition 6 is then more or less immediate.

Lemma C.6. *Let $\delta > 0$ and $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\lambda = \lambda_{\min}(P)$. Then with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over the draw of P_n , the pair (P_n, w) is (γ, η, λ) -accurate for P , where*

$$\gamma = O(1) \left(\frac{G_0 \sqrt{\log \frac{d}{\delta}}}{\sqrt{n}} + \|w\|_2 \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \eta = O(1) \frac{G_1 \sqrt{\log \frac{d}{\delta}}}{\sqrt{n}},$$

so long as γ and η satisfy the parameter relationships (iii) in Definition C.1.

Proof Apply Corollary C.1 and the discussion following it. \square

If we let \mathcal{E}_1 be the event that (P_n, w) is (γ, η, λ) -accurate for $\lambda = \lambda_{\min}(P)$, then we have

$$\lambda_{\min}(P_n) \geq \lambda_{\min}(P_n\ddot{\ell}_{\theta(P)}) - \frac{2G_1\gamma}{\lambda} \geq \lambda_{\min}(P) - \eta - \frac{2G_1\gamma}{\lambda} \geq \frac{1}{2}\lambda_{\min}(P)$$

by the inequalities (iii), and $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_1) \geq 1 - \delta$ so long as $\|w\|_2$ is small enough that γ, η satisfy these inequalities.

Lemma C.7. *Let $\delta > 0$ and $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\lambda = \lambda_{\min}(P_n)$. Then with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over the subsampling P_m^{sub} , the pair (P_m^{sub}, w) is (γ, η, λ) -accurate for P , where*

$$\gamma = O(1) \left(\frac{G_0 \sqrt{\log \frac{d}{\delta}}}{\sqrt{m}} + \|w\|_2 \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \eta = O(1) \frac{G_1 \sqrt{\log \frac{d}{\delta}}}{\sqrt{m}},$$

so long as γ and η satisfy the parameter relationships (iii) in Definition C.1.

Proof Apply Proposition 7. \square

As in the discussion following Lemma C.6, we see that if we let \mathcal{E}_2 be the event that (P_n, w) is (γ, η, λ) -accurate for $\lambda = \lambda_{\min}(P)$, then on \mathcal{E}_2 we have

$$\lambda_{\min}(P_m^{\text{sub}}) \geq \frac{1}{2}\lambda_{\min}(P_n)$$

in complete parallel with event \mathcal{E}_1 . Finally, note that Lemma C.6 applies equally to the sampling of $P_{m,n}^*$ from P_m^{sub} , and we therefore have the following summary lemma.

Lemma C.8. *There exists a numerical constant $C < \infty$ such that the following holds. Let $\delta > 0$. Assume that the vector w is small enough and sample sizes m, n are large enough that*

$$\gamma := \|w\|_2 + \frac{G_0 \sqrt{\log \frac{d}{\delta}}}{\sqrt{m}} \leq C \cdot \frac{\lambda_{\min}^2(P)}{G_2}.$$

Then with probability at least $1 - 3\delta$ over the draw of P_n from P , P_m^{sub} from P_n , and $P_{m,n}^$ from P_m^{sub} , there are remainders $R_n(w)$ and $R_{m,n}^*(w)$ satisfying*

$$\max \left\{ \|R_n(w)\|_2, \|R_{m,n}^*(w)\|_2 \right\} \leq O(1) \cdot \max \left\{ \frac{G_1}{\lambda^2}, \frac{G_0 G_2}{\lambda^3} \right\} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{\log \frac{d}{\delta}}}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot \left(\|w\|_2 + \frac{G_0 \sqrt{\log \frac{d}{\delta}}}{\sqrt{n}} \right),$$

such that the following equalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(P_n, w) - \theta(P) &= -(P \ddot{\ell}_{\theta(P)})^{-1} (P_n \dot{\ell}_{\theta(P)} + w) + R_n(w) \\ \theta(P_{m,n}^*, w) - \theta(P_m^{\text{sub}}) &= -(P_m^{\text{sub}} \ddot{\ell}_{\theta(P_m^{\text{sub}})})^{-1} (P_{m,n}^* \dot{\ell}_{\theta(P_m^{\text{sub}})} + w) + R_{m,n}^*(w). \end{aligned}$$

Additionally, $P_n \ddot{\ell}_{\theta(P)} \succeq \frac{3}{4} \lambda_{\min}(P)$, and $P_m^{\text{sub}} \ddot{\ell}_{\theta(P_m^{\text{sub}})} \succeq \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\min}(P)$.

Proof We simply track definitions and substitute constants from Lemmas C.6 and C.7. \square

C.3 Proof of Proposition 6

Apply Lemma C.8, noting that it is uniform over w , and replace the losses ℓ_θ with $\theta \mapsto \ell_\theta + \frac{\lambda_{\text{reg}}}{2} \|\theta\|_2^2$. By the implicit function theorem, $\theta_\lambda(P) := \operatorname{argmin}_\theta \{L_P(\theta) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\theta\|_2^2\}$ is locally \mathcal{C}^1 in λ , and so $\theta_\lambda(P)$ is bounded and the result follows.

D Proofs of results related to Edgeworth expansions

D.1 Proof of Proposition 4

Before proving the proposition proper, we provide a few auxiliary helper lemmas.

Lemma D.1. *Let p be a polynomial of finite degree and $c > 0$. Then $\sup_t p(t) e^{-ct^2} < \infty$. If p_i are polynomials of finite degree and $c_i > 0$, then $f(t) = \Phi(c_0 t) + \sum_{i=1}^k p_i(t) \phi(c_i t)$ is bounded, Lipschitz continuous, and has Lipschitz derivatives of all orders.*

Proof Using the Taylor series for $e^{ct^2} = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{c^i x^{2i}}{i!} \geq 1 + \frac{c^d x^{2d}}{d!}$, valid for any degree $d \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $p(t) e^{-t^2} \leq \frac{c^{-d} d! p(t)}{c^{-d} d! + t^{2d}}$. Let d be any value greater than half the degree of p . For the second claim, note that $\Phi'(ct) = c\phi(ct)$, and $\phi'(ct) = -ct\phi(ct)$ so that $\phi^{(k)}(ct) = \text{poly}_k(t)\phi(ct)$, where poly_k denotes a polynomial of degree k . Then $\sup_t |f^{(k)}(t)| < \infty$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ by the first claim of the lemma, giving the result. \square

Lemma D.2. *Let X, Y be random variables and $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $\mathbb{P}(|X - a| \leq |Y|, |Y| \leq \eta) \leq \mathbb{P}(X \in [a - \eta, a + \eta])$.*

Proof The event that $|X - a| \leq \eta$ contains the event $|X - a| \leq |Y|$ and $|Y| \leq \eta$. \square

Lemma D.3. Let $U_n = \sqrt{n}(\theta(P) - \theta(P_n))$ be asymptotically normal, with $U_n \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{N}(0, \sigma^2)$. Assume U_n and $U_{m,n}^*$ admit Edgeworth expansions (8) of order k , and assume that $\tilde{\theta}(P_n)$ is (η, ν) -accurate for $\theta(P_n)$. Let $\tilde{U}_n = \sqrt{n}(\theta(P) - \tilde{\theta}(P_n))$ and $\tilde{U}_{m,n}^* = \sqrt{n}(\theta(P_m) - \tilde{\theta}(P_{m,n}^*))$. Then there exists a constant C depending only on the polynomials p_i defining the Edgeworth expansion (8a) such that for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\left| \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{U}_n}{\sigma} \leq t\right) - \Phi(t) - \left(\sum_{i=1}^k n^{-i/2} p_i(t)\right) \phi(t) \right| \leq \nu + C \left(\sqrt{n} \cdot \eta + n^{-\frac{k+1}{2}}\right).$$

Additionally, there exists a constant \hat{C} depending only on the polynomials \hat{p}_i defining the Edgeworth expansion (8b) such that for a remainder $R_{n,k}(t) = O_P(n^{-\frac{k+1}{2}})$ uniformly in t ,

$$\left| \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{U}_{m,n}^*}{\sigma(P_m)} \leq t \mid P_m\right) - \Phi(t) - \left(\sum_{i=1}^k n^{-i/2} \hat{p}_i(t)\right) \phi(t) \right| \leq R_{n,k}(t) + \nu + C\sqrt{n} \cdot \eta.$$

Proof We prove the first expansion first. Without loss of generality, we assume $\sigma = 1$ to simplify notation. Adding and subtracting, we observe that

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{U}_n \leq t) = \mathbb{P}(U_n \leq t) + \left(\mathbb{P}(\tilde{U}_n \leq t) - \mathbb{P}(U_n \leq t)\right),$$

so that it suffices to bound the latter probability. For this, observe that for $W = \tilde{\theta}(P_n) - \theta(P_n)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{U}_n \leq t) - \mathbb{P}(U_n \leq t) &= \mathbb{P}(U_n \leq t + W\sqrt{n}) - \mathbb{P}(U_n \leq t) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(U_n \leq t + W\sqrt{n}, |W| \leq \eta) - \mathbb{P}(U_n \leq t, |W| \leq \eta) + \mathbb{P}(U_n \leq t + W\sqrt{n}, |W| > \eta) - \mathbb{P}(U_n \leq t, |W| > \eta) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(U_n \in [t, t + W\sqrt{n}], |W| \leq \eta) + \mathbb{P}(U_n \in [t, t + W\sqrt{n}], |W| > \eta). \end{aligned}$$

Now we use Lemma D.2 to observe that

$$\mathbb{P}(U_n \in [t, t + W\sqrt{n}], |W| \leq \eta) \leq \mathbb{P}(U_n \in [t - \eta\sqrt{n}, t + \eta\sqrt{n}]),$$

and by assumption $\mathbb{P}(|W| \geq \eta) \leq \nu$. So

$$\left| \mathbb{P}(\tilde{U}_n \leq t) - \mathbb{P}(U_n \leq t) \right| \leq \mathbb{P}(U_n \in [t - \eta\sqrt{n}, t + \eta\sqrt{n}]) + \nu.$$

Lastly, observe that by Lemma D.1 there is some constant C , depending on the polynomials defining the Edgeworth expansion (8a), for which $\mathbb{P}(U_n \in [t - \delta, t + \delta]) \leq C(\delta + n^{-\frac{k+1}{2}})$ simultaneously for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\delta \geq 0$.

For the second equality, the proof is *mutatis mutandis* completely analogous, except that we rely instead on the expansion (8b), and give the argument only on the (eventual) event that $\sigma^2(P_m) > 0$. \square

We can now give the proof of Proposition 4 proper. By Lemma D.3, we have

$$\left| \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{U}_n}{\sigma} \leq t\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{U}_{m,n}^*}{\sigma(P_m)} \leq t \mid P_m\right) \right| \leq \left| \Phi\left(\frac{t}{\sigma}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{t}{\sigma(P_m)}\right) \right| + O_P\left(n^{-1/2} + \sqrt{n} \cdot \eta\right) + \nu.$$

Because Φ has Lipschitz derivatives of all orders, that $\sigma^2(P_m) = \sigma^2 + O_P(m^{-1/2})$ then yields the proposition.

D.2 Proof of Proposition 5

Throughout this argument, we understand all steps to hold asymptotically conditionally (on the subsample P_m) almost surely, so we leave it tacit. Let $\tilde{U}_{m,n}^* = \sqrt{n}(\tilde{\theta}(P_{m,n}^*) - \theta(P_m))$ and $U_{m,n}^* = \sqrt{n}(\theta(P_{m,n}^*) - \theta(P_m))$ as usual. Then (ignoring Monte Carlo error), we have

$$\text{BOOTVAR}(\theta(\cdot), \tilde{\theta}(\cdot), P_m, n) = \mathbb{E}[(\tilde{U}_{m,n}^*)^2 \mid P_m],$$

so it is sufficient to control $\sigma^2(P_m) - \mathbb{E}[(\tilde{U}_{m,n}^*)^2 \mid P_m]$. We first observe that $\tilde{U}_{m,n}^* = U_{m,n}^* + \sqrt{n}\Delta_{m,n}$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(\tilde{U}_{m,n}^*)^2 - (U_{m,n}^*)^2 \mid P_m] &= n\mathbb{E}[\Delta_{m,n}^2 \mid P_m] + 2\sqrt{n}\mathbb{E}[U_{m,n}^*\Delta_{m,n} \mid P_m] \\ &\leq n\mathbb{E}[\Delta_{m,n}^2 \mid P_m] + 2\sqrt{n}\mathbb{E}[(U_{m,n}^*)^2 \mid P_m]^{1/2}\mathbb{E}[\Delta_{m,n}^2 \mid P_m]^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

by Cauchy-Schwarz. By the assumed Edgeworth expansions (10), we have $\mathbb{E}[(U_{m,n}^*)^2 \mid P_m] = O_P(1)$, and as we assume $n\mathbb{E}[\Delta_{m,n}^2 \mid P_m] \xrightarrow{P} 0$, we obtain

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[(\tilde{U}_{m,n}^*)^2 - (U_{m,n}^*)^2 \mid P_m] \right| \leq O_P(1)\sqrt{n\mathbb{E}[\Delta_{m,n}^2 \mid P_m]}.$$

Now we use the resampling Edgeworth expansions (10b), which give that

$$\mathbb{E}[(U_{m,n}^*)^2 \mid P_m] = \sigma^2(P_m) + O_P(1/n),$$

and using the standing Edgeworth assumption that $\sigma^2(P_m) = \sigma^2 + O_P(1/\sqrt{m})$, we obtain the result.

E Experimental Details

We detail our experimental methodology. We describe algorithms and hyperparameters in Appendix E.1, and we describe the synthetic and real datasets in Appendix E.2, providing additional ablation plots in Section E.3. We choose $\alpha = .05$ to target 95% confidence intervals for each.

E.1 Algorithms

As we mention in the experiments section, each trial uses a total privacy budget $\varepsilon_{\text{total}} = 2\varepsilon$, where we $\tilde{\theta}(P_n)$ is ε -differentially private, and the interval $I_{\hat{t}}$ is ε -differentially private.

E.1.1 NonprivateBaseline

We bootstrap $\tilde{U}_n^* := \sqrt{n}(\theta(P_n) - \tilde{\theta}(P_n^*))$, the standard bootstrap resample of P_n , reporting the actual percentiles of \tilde{U}_n^* conditional on P_n as the confidence set. We perform $N_{\text{mc}} = \min\{10000, \max\{100, \frac{n^{1.5}}{\log(n)}\}\}$ Monte Carlo iterations; increasing the number iterations beyond this value changes coverage little.




Figure 3: Hyperparameter sensitivity of **BLBVAR** on mean estimation with $\varepsilon_{\text{total}} = 8$

E.1.2 BLBvar

We use **BLBVAR** to estimate the second moment of the statistic $\tilde{U}_n = \sqrt{n}(\theta - \tilde{\theta}(P_n))$ and use normal approximation (Corollary 4.2) to construct the confidence interval. We use $N_{\text{mc}} = \min\{10000, \max\{100, \frac{n^{1.5}}{s \log(n)}\}\}$ Monte Carlo iterations for each little bootstrap.

To instantiate the algorithm, we need to set two other hyperparameters: the number of partitions of the dataset s and the upper bound on the variance σ_{max}^2 ; we let $R^2 = \sigma_{\text{max}}^2/\sigma^2$, where σ^2 is the true variance so that R^2 is the ratio of the upper bound used in the algorithm and the true variance. We choose $s \asymp \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \log n$ as Theorems 1 and 2 suggest, so that we vary the particular multiplier K in $s = \lfloor \frac{K \log n}{\varepsilon} \rfloor$. We investigate the effect of varying K in Figures 3a and 3b. For a ratio $R = \sigma_{\text{max}}/\sigma$ (10 in Figure 3a, indicating a 100 \times overestimate of the variance), all values of K have similar performance, with performance dropping slightly as we increase the value of K . For a larger R (300 in Figure 3b), we see that smaller values of K overestimate the variance and output very wide intervals with higher than required coverage. We also vary the upper bound $\sigma_{\text{max}}^2 = R^2 \sigma^2$ in Figures 4a and 4b. While a smaller value of R is obviously better for the performance of the algorithm at all values of K , the performance of the algorithm is stable for higher values of K (i.e., more subsamples s).

Because the optimal value of multiplier K varies, we default to $K = 10$ and $R \approx 50$ for illustration of results. The probability of catastrophic failure (outputting very wide confidence sets) of the private median subroutine has bound $\beta \leq nR^2\sigma^2 e^{-K \log(n)/(2\varepsilon)}$ when we set $s = \frac{K \log n}{\varepsilon}$ and use smoothing parameter $\rho = n^{-1}$ (again, see Theorem 2). Choosing higher K reduces the probability of catastrophic failure but simultaneously decreases the subsample size $m = \frac{n}{s}$ in each little bootstrap, which may reduce accuracy. Setting K slightly higher than 10 (say 12 or 14) allows compensation for poor bounds on the true variance.

E.1.3 BLBquant

We use **BLBQUANT** to estimate the quantiles of the distribution of the centered statistic $\tilde{U}_n = \sqrt{n}(\theta - \tilde{\theta}(P_n))$ and use the private percentile method to construct the confidence interval. We use $N_{\text{mc}} = \min\{10000, \max\{100, \frac{n^{1.5}}{s \log n}\}\}$ Monte Carlo iterations for each little bootstrap.

To instantiate the algorithm, we need to set the number of partitions s of the dataset and




Figure 4: Hyperparameter sensitivity of **BLBVAR** on mean estimation with $\varepsilon_{\text{total}} = 8$





Figure 5: Coverage rates for **BLBQUANT** on mean estimation with $\varepsilon_{\text{total}} = 8$. Each plot varies c in the interval sets $I_t = [-ct/\sqrt{n}, ct/\sqrt{n}]$, fixing multiplier K .

the sequence of sets I_t amongst which we find the first set with coverage more than $1 - \alpha$. We choose $I_t = [-th, th]$ for $t = 1, 2, \dots$ and $h = c/\sqrt{n}$ as we discuss after Theorem 1 and Corollary 3.1, studying the effect of varying c in Figs. 5a to 5c. Increasing c means that fewer sets are required to achieve coverage $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{U}_n \in I_t) \geq 1 - \alpha$, though too large of a c increases the increment between $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{U}_n \in I_t)$ and $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{U}_n \in I_{t+1})$, yielding overcoverage. As in the experiments with **BLBVAR**, larger values of the multiplier K in the choice $s = \lfloor \frac{K \log n}{\varepsilon} \rfloor$ yield more accurate coverage (see the vertical axes in Figure 5). We conduct all mean and median estimation experiments with $c = 1$ to remain agnostic as the plots suggest it is a reasonable default.


As we do for **BLBVAR**, we choose the number of partitions $s = \lfloor \frac{K \log n}{\varepsilon} \rfloor$, varying K in Figures 6a and 6b. As in the case of **BLBVAR**, beyond a threshold value for K , we find no significant improvement in the coverage error and below that value the sensitivity to the granularity c of the intervals I_t is much higher. We choose $K = 10$ for all problem settings.

E.1.4 Gvdp

We also compare against the ‘‘Generally Valid Differential Privacy’’ (GVDP) algorithm Covington et al. [9] propose. We use a slight modification of the authors’ implementation. We use



(a) Coverage for different K and R = 10



(b) Coverage for different K and R = 300

Figure 6: Hyperparameter sensitivity of **BLBQUANT** on mean estimation with $\varepsilon_{\text{total}} = 8$


the same hyperparameters as suggested in that code and run the mean estimation algorithm `CoinPress` for $t = 5$ iterations. We tune the number of subsets s and find that although the algorithm is sensitive to the number of subsets at small n values (in the range we consider), using $s = \sqrt{n}$ works well for the mean estimation setting. Since the algorithm is defined for ρ -concentrated DP we find a ρ_{tot} such that an algorithm satisfying $(\varepsilon_{\text{total}}, \delta)$ also satisfies ρ_{tot} -concentrated DP for $\delta = 1/n^{1.1}$. Lastly, since GVDP also uses an upper bound on the variance of the statistic, we set it to be 10 times the true variance.

E.2 Experimental Settings


Mean Estimation: For mean estimation, we do experiments on a synthetic dataset for which we sample from a truncated Gaussian distribution. We truncate a gaussian distribution with mean 0 and variance 4 at -6 and 4 , which induces some skewness in the distribution, and the resulting distribution has mean ≈ -0.1 and variance 3.49. We repeated these experiments for other truncated Gaussian distributions with more skewness, for symmetric truncated gaussian distributions with no skewness, and for truncated distributions with a triangular probability density function (see `scipy.stats.triang`) and obtained similar results to those for the truncated Gaussian distribution. We used an independent Laplace noise mechanism as a private estimator (Example 1). We use $N_{\text{trials}} = 160$ and $N_{\text{resamp}} = 625$.

Median Estimation: For median estimation, we do experiments on a synthetic dataset for which we again sample from the same Truncated Gaussian distribution as in mean estimation. We truncate a gaussian distribution with mean 0 and variance 4 at -6 and 4 , which induces some skewness in the distribution, and the resulting distribution has median ≈ -0.054 , and the sample median has asymptotic variance ≈ 5.99 . We use **PRIVMEDIAN**, Alg. 5 [4]. We use $N_{\text{trials}} = 80$ and $N_{\text{resamp}} = 625$.

Logistic Regression: For logistic regression, we [Ding et al.](#)'s updated *Adult Income* dataset [10] and their `folktables` package. We construct a dataset of $n_{\text{tot}} = 1587856$ datapoints with 4 features corresponding to age, school, working hours per week, sex of the individual, and an additional intercept (bias) term, normalizing all features to lie in $[0, 1]$. The task is to predict whether an individual earns more than \$30K per year, and to provide a confidence interval




(a) Mean estimation coverage




(b) Mean estimation width

Figure 7: Mean estimation with $\epsilon_{\text{total}} = 5$




(a) Mean estimation coverage




(b) Mean estimation width

Figure 8: Mean estimation with $\epsilon_{\text{total}} = 8$




(a) Mean estimation coverage




(b) Mean estimation width

Figure 9: Mean estimation with $\epsilon_{\text{total}} = 10$

for the parameter on the Sex variable. In our dataset, we have 53.8% positive labels. The non-private ERM solution using all the data has accuracy of 77.8%. We use this solution as




(a) Median estimation coverage




(b) Median estimation width

Figure 10: Median estimation with $\varepsilon_{\text{total}} = 5$




(a) Median estimation coverage




(b) Median estimation width

Figure 11: Median estimation with $\varepsilon_{\text{total}} = 8$



(a) Median estimation coverage



(b) Median estimation width

Figure 12: Median estimation with $\varepsilon_{\text{total}} = 10$

the “true solution” to calculate coverage.

We perform experiments on smaller sample sizes ($n = 2000$ to 8000) by sampling n points




Figure 13: Logistic Regression with $\epsilon_{\text{total}} = 5$




Figure 14: Logistic Regression with $\epsilon_{\text{total}} = 8$

from the whole dataset of n_{tot} points. We use an approximation to the inverse sensitivity mechanism [4, Section 5.2] to privately estimate the logistic regression problem. Asi and Duchi [4] give a first-order accurate approximation to the private estimator, which we use as the full sampling distribution requires a sophisticated Metropolis Hastings scheme, and our main focus is on the accuracy of intervals from the bootstrap rather than the initial estimator itself. We use $N_{\text{trials}} = 80$ and $N_{\text{resamp}} = 625$, studying coverage for the single parameter corresponding to the sex variable.

E.3 Ablations

We study the source of the loss in performance relative to non-private bootstrap estimation for both **BLBVAR** (Figures 15a to 15c) and **BLBQUANT** (Figures 16a to 16c). At a high level, the results here suggest that subsampling—by reducing the sample size—induces the main accuracy degradation, though the median above-threshold algorithm (Alg. 1) introduces some error, and finding better ways to release a threshold for the indexed confidence sets I_t may yield improvements.

For **BLBVAR**, across different total differential privacy values ϵ_{total} , we plot the coverage




Figure 15: Ablations for **BLBVAR** on mean estimation.




Figure 16: Ablations for **BLBQUANT** on mean estimation

for the following three algorithms in Figures 15c–15a:

- 1 **NORMAL + BLBVAR**: The z-score-based confidence interval we propose in Corollary 4.2.
- 2 **NONPRIVATE BLBVAR**: To measure the error of taking a private median (line 4 of **BLBVAR**), we aggregate using the true median instead of the private median in **BLBVAR**. All other algorithmic details remain identical.
- 3 **UPSAMPLED BLBVAR**: We perform s bootstrap resamples of the entire dataset instead of partitioning the data, that is, we run **BOOTVAR** on P_n instead of P_m^{sub} . Because the full sample P_n is re-used for each, this fails to satisfy differential privacy, and while nominally (if Monte Carlo sampling introduced no error) this should be equivalent to a single full bootstrap resample, because $N_{\text{mc}} < \infty$ there is some variability between the s resamples. This allows us to delineate whether the private median (Line 4) introduces substantial error.

NONPRIVATE BLBVAR (item 1) and **NORMAL + BLBVAR** (item 2) have similar performance for all values of ϵ_{total} . The full resampling procedure **UPSAMPLED BLBVAR** (item 3) has more accurate coverage, as we expect from the non-private baseline experiments it essentially mimics (recall Fig. 1 in the experiments, Section 5). The effective sample size reduction that subsampling introduces thus appears to be the main source of accuracy degradation.

For **BLBVAR**, across different total differential privacy values ϵ_{total} , we plot the coverage for the following three algorithms in Figures 16c–16a:

- 1 **PERCENTILE + BLBQUANT**: The quantile-based interval we propose in Corollary 3.1.

- 2 **NONPRIVATE BLBQUANT**: To study the error using the noisy order statistics in **ABOVETHR** induces (line 2), we use the true median in line 2. All other algorithmic details remain identical.
- 3 **UPSAMPLED BLBQUANT**: We perform s bootstrap resamples of the entire dataset instead of partitioning the data, that is, we replace the subsamples $P_m^{\text{sub}(i)}$ in line 1 of Alg. 2 with the sample P_n . Because the full sample P_n is re-used for each, this fails to satisfy differential privacy, and while nominally (if Monte Carlo sampling introduced no error) this should be equivalent to a single full bootstrap resample, because $N_{\text{mc}} < \infty$ there is some variability between the s resamples. This allows us to delineate whether using the private median-based above treshold algorithm (line 9 of **BLBQUANT**) introduces error.

As in our ablation experiments on **BLBVAR**, **UPSAMPLED BLBQUANT** (item 3) has the best accuracy, as we expect from our initial experiments. In this case, non-privately aggregating the results of the BLB subsamples—**NONPRIVATE BLBQUANT**, item 2—improves accuracy over **PERCENTILE + BLBQUANT**; the improvement is more substantial for smaller $\varepsilon_{\text{total}}$ (i.e., more privacy). This suggests that improving our ability to select the accurately covering set I_t , rather than relying on the noisy order statistics in **ABOVETHR**, could yield improvements, especially at smaller sample sizes.