

Publishing Search Logs – A Comparative Study of Privacy Guarantees

Michaela Götz Ashwin Machanavajhala Guozhang Wang Xiaokui Xiao
 Johannes Gehrke

December 13, 2018

Abstract

Search engine companies collect the “database of intentions”, the histories of their users’ search queries. These search logs are a gold mine for researchers. Search engine companies, however, are wary of publishing search logs in order not to disclose sensitive information.

In this paper we analyze algorithms to publish frequent keywords, queries and clicks of a search log. How do their formal disclosure limitation guarantees compare and how easy can they be attacked in practice? How much utility can they possibly provide theoretically and how useful are they for real world applications?

We conduct a thorough comparison that includes both theoretical results as well as an experimental evaluation. In particular, we show how proposals to achieve anonymity [1, 15, 27] can be attacked. The stronger guarantee of ϵ -differential privacy unfortunately does not provide any utility. We consider two relaxations. While for one of them an algorithm has been previously proposed [20] we show how to guarantee the other strictly stronger relaxation. An extensive experimental evaluation compares the utility of the algorithms for two applications targeted at search quality and search efficiency. We find that our proposal to achieve a relaxation of differential privacy yields comparable utility to a proposal that achieves anonymity while at the same time offering a much stronger guarantee.

1 Introduction

Civilization is the progress toward a society of privacy. The savage’s whole existence is public, ruled by the laws of his tribe. Civilization is the process of setting man free from men. — Ayn Rand.

My favorite thing about the Internet is that you get to go into the private world of real creeps without having to smell them. — Penn Jillette.

It is hard to imagine the Web today without the easy access to search engines that help us to any information. Whenever a user submits a search query, the search engine logs the query and other information associated with it (for example, what links the user clicked on). The contents of these *search logs* enable much valuable research. It can be used for finding trends, patterns, and anomalies in the search behavior of users. It also can be used to develop and test new algorithms to improve search performance. Today such research is mainly conducted within search engine companies. Search logs are not being released to the public or researchers outside these companies because of privacy concerns.

The concerns of releasing search logs came out clearly in the AOL debacle of 2007 when AOL published three months of search logs of 650,000 users. The only privacy protection was the replacement of user-ids with random numbers. However, the queries of a user usually contain identifying information such as searches for addresses and local events or even vanity searches for the user’s name. Such information

can be linked to external databases to re-identify the user. This is what the New York Times did to track down a user [6]. Through her queries they were able to identify Ms. Thelma Arnold from Lilburn, Georgia. Her queries not also contained enough identifying information but also sensitive information about her friends’ medical ailments. In general, users are concerned that the release of a search log reveals their life and personality through their searches for diseases, habits, lifestyle choices, personal tastes, and political affiliations.

The AOL debacle shows that the ad-hoc method of replacing user-ids with random numbers does not prevent such information disclosure.¹ Other ad-hoc methods have been studied and found to be insufficient, such as the removal of names, age, zip codes and other identifiers [16] and the replacement of keywords in search queries by random numbers [21].

In this paper, we investigate *principled ways* to control the disclosure when publishing search logs. We conduct a comparison of various methods for limiting disclosure and answer the following questions: What formal guarantees of limiting disclosure are desirable and appropriately address the privacy concerns? How can these guarantees be achieved and how much useful information can be preserved?

First we examine *k-anonymity* [32]. We find that proposals to achieve *k-anonymity* in search logs [1, 27, 15] are insufficient in the light of attackers who can *actively influence* the search log by creating accounts and submitting queries themselves.

Moreover, we illustrate with an example that *k-anonymity* does not prevent an attacker from learning that a particular user submitted a particular query (see Section 3).

Thus, we have to turn to a stronger privacy definition such as *differential privacy* [12]. It has been successfully applied to publish contingency tables [5] and to solve learning problems [7, 18]. In the context of search logs it limits what an attacker can learn from the published search log (even if the attacker has multiple accounts and submitted queries herself).

¹http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/AOL_search_data_scandal has more information, including links to the resignation of AOL’s CTO and the ongoing class action lawsuit against AOL resulting from the data release.

Unfortunately, we can show that it is impossible to achieve good utility for publishing frequent keywords, queries, etc. under this definition (see Section 4).

To overcome this impossibility result we have to relax ϵ -differential privacy. We consider two probabilistic relaxations: (ϵ, δ) -*probabilistic differential privacy* [24] and (ϵ, δ) -*indistinguishability* [11]. A simple algorithm has been developed independently by Korolova et al. [20] and us [13]. This algorithm was shown to guarantee (ϵ, δ) -indistinguishability [20]. We offer a new analysis of the parameter settings under which it also guarantees (ϵ, δ) -*probabilistic differential privacy* [24] in Section 5.2. This is interesting because probabilistic differential privacy is a strictly stronger guarantee (see Section 5 for a comparison of the two relaxations).

Finally, we compare the utility of anonymity and privacy in an extensive experimental evaluation in Section 8. In our application-oriented approach we implement two search log applications to improve both search experience and search performance, run these applications on the original, the anonymity-preserving and the privacy-preserving search log, and compare the results using application-specific metrics.

We believe that our findings are of interest for other problems than publishing search logs. Indeed instead of publishing frequent keywords and queries we can apply the findings to publish multi-basket data or frequent items/itemsets in general.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we introduce our model of a search log. We review guarantees that limit the disclosure of a search log and utility measures. This is an introduction to the problem of publishing frequent keywords, queries, clicks, etc. of search logs while at the same time limit the disclosure.

2.1 Search Logs

Search engines such as Bing, Google, or Yahoo enable users to ask keyword queries and return a ranked list of relevant websites. Users then click on one or more

of these links. Search engines have sophisticated ways to identify users; for example, users may be logged on to accounts provided by the search engine, or they might be identified via cookies and IP addresses. A search log is a collection of phsearch log entries that contain data about the users' queries and the links that they clicked on. We assume that a search log entry has the following schema:

⟨USER-ID, QUERY, TIME, CLICKS⟩,

where a USER-ID identifies a user, a QUERY is a set of keywords, and CLICKS is a list of phurls indicating that the user clicked on the given link (phurl). A phuser history consists of all search entries from a single user. Such a history is usually partitioned into phsessions containing queries with similar user intent; many details go into this partitioning that are orthogonal to all the techniques in this paper. phQuery pairs are two subsequent queries from the same user that are contained in the same session.

Search engines compute histograms, or counts of keywords, queries, etc., from the search log, and use these instead of the actual log for a variety of applications. A phkeyword histogram of a search log S records for each keyword k the number of users c_k in whose search history in S contains that keyword. A keyword histogram is thus a set of pairs (k, c_k) . We define the phquery histogram, the phquery pair histogram, and the phclick histogram analogously.

2.2 Disclosure Limitations for Publishing Search Logs

This section defines various disclosure limitation guarantees that have been proposed in the literature. We start with k -anonymity which prevents re-identifying the data of a user in the published data.

Definition 1 (k -anonymity [32]). *A search logs is k -anonymous if the search history of every individual is indistinguishable from the history of at least $k - 1$ other individuals in the published search log.*

Variants that require indistinguishability not at the level of whole search histories but at the level of sessions [27] or queries [1] have been proposed.

Next we continue with stronger privacy definitions. In the past couple of years two different privacy definitions have received a lot attention. The first privacy definition limits the information an attacker can infer about the queries of a user. Dwork [10] showed that it is impossible to provide any utility if this guarantee shall be given for all possible adversaries. Thus people have studied limited classes of adversaries [22, 23, 25, 31, 33]. We believe that none of these assumptions hold in practice in the case of search logs and it would be insufficient to protect against only these classes. A suitable class has yet to be proposed and analyzed.

In the remainder of the paper we focus on differential privacy [12]. It guarantees that an attacker learns roughly the same information about a user whether or not the search history of that user was included in the published search log. With this guarantee a user does not regret having used the particular search engine for his or her queries. Dwork et al. turned this idea into a formal privacy definition that we apply here to search logs:

Definition 2. [12] *An algorithm \mathcal{A} is ϵ -differentially private if for all search logs S and S' differing in the search history of a single user and for all output search logs O :*

$$Pr[\mathcal{A}(S) = O] \leq e^\epsilon Pr[\mathcal{A}(S') = O].$$

This definition ensures that a user has no reason to complain that the search engine published S , since S could have also arisen from a search log S' in which the search history of that user was replaced by arbitrary queries and clicks. We will refer to search logs that only differ in the search history of a single user as phneighboring search logs in the remainder of this paper.

We will also discuss two relaxations of differential privacy. A probabilistic version of differential privacy called (ϵ, δ) - phprobabilistic differential privacy that relaxes ϵ -differential privacy has been proposed by Machanavajjhala et al.:

Definition 3. [24] *An Algorithm \mathcal{A} satisfies (ϵ, δ) -probabilistic differential privacy if for all search logs S we can divide the output space Ω into to sets Ω_1, Ω_2*

such that

$$(1) \Pr[\mathcal{A}(S) \in \Omega_2] \leq \delta, \text{ and}$$

for all neighboring search logs S' and for all $O \in \Omega_1$:

$$(2) \Pr[\text{San}(S) = O] \leq e^\epsilon \Pr[\text{San}(S') = O] \text{ and} \\ \Pr[\text{San}(S') = O] \leq e^\epsilon \Pr[\text{San}(S) = O].$$

This definition guarantees that algorithm \mathcal{A} achieves ϵ -differential privacy with high probability ($\geq 1 - \delta$). The set Ω_2 contains all outputs that are considered a privacy breach according to ϵ -differential privacy. The probability of such an output is bounded by δ .

Another relaxation has been proposed by Dwork et al.:

Definition 4. [11] *Algorithm San is (ϵ, δ) -indistinguishable if for all search logs S, S' differing in one user history and for all subsets \mathcal{O} of the output space Ω :*

$$\Pr[\text{San}(S) \in \mathcal{O}] \leq e^\epsilon \Pr[\text{San}(S') \in \mathcal{O}] + \delta$$

We will compare these two definitions in Section 6. In particular, we will show that differential privacy implies indistinguishability. On the other hand the converse does not hold and we show that there exists an algorithm that is (ϵ', δ') -indistinguishable yet blatantly non-private (in the sense of both ϵ -differential privacy and (ϵ, δ) -probabilistic differential privacy).

2.3 Utility Measures

In this paper, we compare the utility of algorithms phtheoretically and phpractically by running applications on the sanitized search logs and comparing the results with application-specific metrics.

2.3.1 Formal Utility Measure of Frequent Items

In the context of search logs, we think of keywords, queries, consecutive queries, clicks as items. We propose a utility measure for algorithms that publish frequent items. Consider a discrete domain of items \mathcal{D} . Each user contributes a set of these items recorded in

a database S . Suppose we are interested in the frequent items. For simplicity, forget about the particular counts and assume we want to publish all items that occur at least τ times in the database. We denote by $f_d(S)$ this frequency.

We measure the inaccuracy of an algorithm as the expected number of items it gets wrong, i.e., it either includes in the output despite the fact that they are infrequent or it does not include them in the output despite the fact that they are frequent. We do not expect the algorithm to be perfect. It may make mistakes for items with frequency very close to τ which we neglect. The parameter ξ defines what closeness means. From now on we will refer to the items with frequency $\geq \tau + \xi$ as the phvery frequent items and the items with frequency $< \tau - \xi$ as the phvery infrequent items. We will measure the inaccuracy of an algorithm only as the ability to retain the phvery frequent items and filter out the phvery infrequent items. We exclude items with frequencies within $\tau \pm \xi$ from our utility measure and thus allow algorithms to make mistakes on these close cases.

Definition 5. *For algorithm \mathcal{A} on input S the (\mathcal{A}, S) -inaccuracy with slack ξ is defined as*

$$E[|\{d \in \mathcal{A}(S) | f_d(S) < \tau - \xi\} \cup \\ \{d \notin \mathcal{A}(S) | f_d(S) > \tau + \xi\}|]$$

The expectation is taken over the randomness of the algorithm. As a baseline consider the simple algorithm that always outputs an empty set. On input S it has an inaccuracy equal to the number of items with frequency greater than $\tau^* + \xi$.

For the results in the next sections it will be useful to distinguish the error of an algorithm on the very frequent items and the error on the very infrequent items. We can rewrite the inaccuracy as:

$$\sum_{d: f_d(S) > \tau + \xi} 1 - \Pr[d \in \mathcal{A}(S)] + \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}: f_d(S) < \tau - \xi} \Pr[d \in \mathcal{A}(S)]$$

Thus, the (\mathcal{A}, S) -inaccuracy with slack ξ can be rewritten as the sum of the inability to retain the frequent items plus the inability to filter out the very infrequent items. For example, the baseline algorithm has an inaccuracy on the very infrequent items of 0

and an inaccuracy on the very frequent items equal to the number of very frequent items.

Definition 6. *We say that an algorithm \mathcal{A} provides c -accuracy for the very frequent items, if there is a some $c > 0$ such that for any input database with a frequent item the probability of outputting this frequent item is $\geq c$.*

2.3.2 Experimental Utility Measures

Traditionally, the utility of a privacy-preserving algorithm has been evaluated by comparing the input of the algorithm with the output to see “how much information is lost” by comparing some statistics of the sanitized output with the original data. The choice of suitable statistics is a difficult problem as these statistics need to mirror the sufficient statistics of applications that will use the sanitized search log. As notable differences, Brickell et al. [8] measure the utility with respect to data mining tasks and Kifer and Gehrke [19] develop specific techniques to boost utility with respect to log-linear models. We picked two real applications from the information retrieval community to compare the utility of different algorithms: Index caching as a representative application for search performance, and query substitution as a representative application for search quality. Formal definitions can be found in Section 8.

In the next few Sections 3 to 5 we will analyze various algorithms in terms of their disclosure limitation guarantee and their theoretical utility. Then, in Section 8 we will compare the utility with respect to real world applications.

3 Algorithm – Anonymity

Let us first discuss algorithms that have been suggested to achieve different types of k -anonymity in search logs. Adar proposes the following algorithm: Given a search log partitioned into sessions, all queries are discarded that are associated with fewer than k different user-ids. In each session the user-id is substituted by a random number [1]. We call the output a k -query anonymous search log. Motwani and Nabar substitute in each session the user-id

by a random number and then add or delete keywords from sessions until each session contains the same keywords as at least $k - 1$ other sessions in the search log [27]. We call the output a k -session anonymous search log. He and Naughton generalize keywords by taking their prefix until each keyword is part of at least k search histories [15]. A histogram of the partially generalized keywords and their counts is then published. We call the output a k -keyword anonymous search log.

3.1 Utility Analysis

Recall that in Definition 5 we define the inaccuracy of an algorithm as the expected size of the symmetric set difference between the set of very frequent keywords and the output of the algorithm. We observe that a k -query anonymous search log provides perfect utility for frequent queries whenever $k \leq \tau^* + \xi$. It might not provide perfect utility for frequent keywords since a frequent keyword that shows up in many infrequent queries might not be contained in the output. However, a k -keyword anonymous search log provides perfect utility for frequent keywords but it has no utility for frequent queries or clicks. Only, k -session anonymity provides utility for clicks. However, since sessions are altered through addition and deletion of keywords, its precise utility for frequent keywords, queries or clicks depends on the input data.

Overall, k -anonymity provides extremely good utility according to our measure. This is because our target of publishing frequent items coincides with the guarantee of indistinguishability.

3.2 Attacks on k -Anonymity

We believe that in practice there is a need for a stronger guarantee than k -anonymity since k -anonymity does not prevent an attacker from learning sensitive information. We illustrate this through the following homogeneity attack [23] against a k -query anonymous search log. Homogeneity attacks against a k -session anonymous or a k -keyword anonymous search log can be constructed analogously.

Example 1. *Suppose 100 different users only asked the query “prescription drugs under the counter*

SmallTown, XY". This query is published in a 100-anonymous search log. It is not possible to link one of the occurrences of this query to a single user. But suppose only 100 of the 2000 inhabitants of the remote village *SmallTown, XY* have Internet access. Then an attacker concludes that each one of them shows the intention to buy prescription drugs illegally.

Moreover, there is a discrepancy between the ideal k -anonymity and the actual implementations. The concept of anonymity always refers to indistinguishability of individuals. However, in a search log there is no information about individuals only about user-ids. Since people can create multiple accounts or share accounts the implementations do not give rise to anonymity of individuals. In practice, an attacker can exploit this weakness and create multiple accounts and use them to link a search entry in the output of any of these algorithms to its data-owner as illustrated by the next example. Such an active attack has been carried out on social networks [3].

Example 2. *An attacker wants to learn whether his neighbor (living at address A_1) who just moved into the town visited the cancer hospital (at address A_2). The attacker initiates $k - 1$ accounts and asks the query "from: A_1 to: A_2 " with which her neighbor might try to calculate a route with a popular search engine. The attacker gets to see the k -anonymous search log. In case the query "from: A_1 to: A_2 " appears in the k -anonymous search log the attacker concludes that her neighbor has the intention of visiting the local cancer hospital. In practice, an attacker might try different formulations of this query to cover all possible ways his neighbor could express this query.*

This very simple and effective attack can be applied to a k -query-anonymous or k -session-anonymous search log. The attack shows that variations of k -anonymity do not actually prevent an attacker from linking sensitive information to an individual. Thus they fail to protect anonymity against active attacks.

Apart from the algorithms that have been suggested for search logs there are more algorithms achieving variants of k -anonymity that could be applied to search logs. Multi-relational k -anonymity

can be applied as a complement to k -query anonymity to publish clicks of a search log by encoding them as set-valued attributes [28]. FreeForm-anonymity can be used to strengthen k -anonymity by considering more attributes as sensitive (not just the user-id) [36]. However, all these extensions are still vulnerable to the active attack. Indeed any anonymization algorithm which can be successfully that tries to achieve indistinguishability at the phuser-id level instead of the phindividual level is vulnerable to the active attack. In practice, it is difficult to guarantee indistinguishability at the phindividual level because individuals can create multiple accounts and log-in using different IP-addresses.

Next, we will study privacy guarantees that are neither susceptible to the homogeneity attack nor to the active attack.

4 Algorithm – Privacy

The question is how can we publish a search log that preserves differential privacy (as in Definition 2)? Unfortunately, we show that it is impossible to guarantee differential privacy and provide some utility in the next section. As a way out of this misery we relax the privacy requirement a little bit and show that we can achieve it while providing good utility in Section 5.

4.1 Impossibility to Achieve Differential Privacy and Good Utility

In this section we will show that in order to achieve good utility it is actually phnecessary to relax ϵ -differential privacy. In the next section we will discuss relaxations that actually achieve good utility. This separation result reveals an interesting relation between ϵ -differential privacy and its probabilistic relaxation. It illustrates the exorbitant gain in utility when a small probability of a privacy breach can be tolerated. We measure the utility for publishing frequent items as defined in Section 2.3.1.

We consider a discrete domain \mathcal{D} . A database S contains for each user a set of at most m values in \mathcal{D} . The number of users is denoted by U and assumed

to be fixed. Thus, we can represent a database as a $U \cdot m$ -dimensional vector over $\mathcal{D} \cup \{\perp\}$. We can think of \mathcal{D} as the set keywords, queries, clicks, or consecutive queries and S as a search log for which we try to retain the frequent items.

The next theorem analyzes the balance between the retaining very frequent items and filtering out very infrequent items. No ϵ -differentially private algorithm can be good at both for all input databases. In particular, if an algorithm outputs one very frequent item d of a database then this item will also show up with some probability in the output of databases where the item is very infrequent. Thus if an algorithm manages to improve the accuracy of retaining a frequent item over the baseline algorithm then this will induce inaccuracy of filtering out that item in any database where it is infrequent.

Lemma 1. *Consider an ϵ -differentially private algorithm \mathcal{A} that retains a very frequent item $d \in \mathcal{D}$ of some database $S \in \mathcal{D}^U$ with probability p . Then d will also be included in the output of any database $S' \in \mathcal{D}^U$ with probability at least $p/(e^{L_1(S,S') \cdot \epsilon})$ even if that item is very infrequent in that database. Here $L_1(S,S')$ denotes the L_1 distance between S and S' , i.e., $L_1(S,S') = \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} |\text{frequency of } d \text{ in } S - \text{frequency of } d \text{ in } S'|$.*

The proof follows is a direct consequence from the privacy definition.

As a corollary we have that any ϵ -differentially private algorithm that is accurate for the very frequent items will be bad in filtering out low frequent items.

Corollary 1. *Consider an accuracy constant c , a threshold τ , a slack ξ and a very large domain \mathcal{D} of size $\geq \frac{Um}{\tau+\xi} (e^{\epsilon(\tau+\xi)}/c + 1)$. Any ϵ -differentially private algorithm \mathcal{A} that is c -accurate for the very frequent items as defined in Definition 6, will be bad in filtering out very infrequent items in all databases. In particular, its inaccuracy for any input database is greater than the inaccuracy of the baseline algorithm that always outputs the empty set.*

Proof. For contradiction assume that such an algorithm exist. Call this algorithm \mathcal{A}' . Fix some input S' . For each item $d \in \mathcal{D}$ construct S'_d by changing

$\tau + \xi$ of the items to d . That way d is very frequent (with frequency at least $\tau + \xi$) and $L_1(S, S'_d) = \tau + \xi$. By Definition 6, we have that

$$\Pr[d \in \mathcal{A}'(S'_d)] \geq c.$$

By Lemma 1 it follows that the probability of outputting d is at least $c/(e^{\epsilon(\tau+\xi)})$ for any input database. Hence, if we sum up this probability over all possible values $d \in \mathcal{D}$ that are infrequent in S we obtain $(|\mathcal{D}| - \frac{Um}{\tau+\xi}) c/(e^{\epsilon(\tau+\xi)})$. This means that for any database S' the inaccuracy of filtering out the infrequent items is worse than the baseline algorithm for very large domains. \square

In search logs we are dealing with a large domains. For example, publishing consecutive query pairs for which each query contains at most 3 keywords from a limited vocabulary of 900,000 words results in a domain size of 5.3×10^{35} . Corollary 1 implies that any ϵ -differentially private algorithm that is 0.01-accurate for very frequent queries provides less than the algorithm that outputs the empty set if we consider typical parameters of $\tau + \xi = 50, m = 10, U = 1,000,000, \epsilon = 1$. In the next section we are going to relax differential privacy to overcome this impossibility result.

5 Algorithm - Prob. Privacy

In this section we show how to achieve good utility in publishing frequent keywords, queries, etc. of a search log while at the same time guaranteeing a relaxed version of differential privacy.

This section reviews a simple privacy-preserving algorithm for publishing histograms from a search log that has been independently developed by [20] and us [13]. We call this algorithm ZEALOUS. Korolova et al. [20] offer an analysis of (ϵ', δ') -indistinguishability while we present an analysis of (ϵ, δ) -probabilistic differential privacy. Later in Section 6 we compare the two definitions and show that (ϵ, δ) -probabilistic differential privacy is strictly stronger.

One of the advantages of ZEALOUS is its simplicity: It uses a two-step process to eliminate the tail of

the search log, i.e., the keywords with low counts, to achieve a strong privacy guarantee. We give the pseudocode of ZEALOUS next; Figure 1 gives a pictorial description of ZEALOUS. For now, think of items as either keywords or queries. More details follow the algorithm.

Algorithm ZEALOUS for Publishing Frequent Items of a Search Log

Input: Search log \mathcal{S} , positive numbers m, λ, τ, τ'

1. For each user u select a set s_u of up to m distinct items from u 's search history in \mathcal{S} .
2. Create the item histogram of pairs (k, c_k) from the selected items. For each item k we report the number of users such that k occurs in their search history s_u . We call this histogram the phoriginal histogram.
3. Delete from the histogram the pairs (k, c_k) with count c_k less than τ .
4. For each pair (k, c_k) in the histogram sample a random number η_k from the distribution $\text{Lap}(\lambda)^2$ and add it to the count, resulting in a noisy count: $\tilde{c}_k \leftarrow c_k + \eta_k$.
5. Delete from the histogram the pairs (k, \tilde{c}_k) with noisy counts \tilde{c}_k that are no more than τ' .
6. Publish the remaining items and their noisy counts. We call this histogram the psanitized histogram.

Step 1., 2. and 4. of the algorithm are fairly standard. It is known that adding Laplacian noise to histogram counts achieves ϵ -differential privacy [12]. What is new is that we restrict the histogram to items with counts at least τ in Step 2. in order to be able to deal with large domains. This restriction leaks information and thus the output after Step 4. is not ϵ -differentially private. One can show that it is not even (ϵ, δ) -probabilistic differentially private (for $\delta < 1/2$). Step 5. disguises the information leaked in Step 3. in order to achieve probabilistic differential privacy.

²The Laplace distribution with scale parameter λ has the probability density function $\frac{1}{2\lambda} e^{-\frac{|x|}{\lambda}}$.




Figure 1: Privacy-Preserving Algorithm.

5.1 Indistinguishability Analysis

We can use ZEALOUS to publish frequent keywords, queries, or consecutive query pairs. To publish clicks Korolova et al. [20] suggest to first determine the frequent queries and then publish noisy counts of the clicks to their top-100 ranked documents. If we choose the noise of the click counts also to be $2m/\epsilon$ then publishing frequent queries and their click distribution is $(2\epsilon, \delta)$ -private.

Theorem 1. [20] *Given a search log S and positive numbers m, τ, τ' , and λ , ZEALOUS achieves (ϵ', δ') -indistinguishability, if*

$$\lambda \geq 2m/\epsilon, \text{ and} \tag{1}$$

$$\tau = 1 \tag{2}$$

$$\tau' \geq m \left(1 - \frac{\log(\frac{2\delta'}{m})}{\epsilon'} \right). \tag{3}$$

It is recommended to set $\delta' < 1/U$, where U denotes the number of users.

5.2 Probabilistic Diff. Privacy Analysis

The following theorem tells us how to set the parameters λ and τ' , given values for ϵ , δ , τ and m such that ZEALOUS guarantees (ϵ, δ) -probabilistic differential privacy.

Theorem 2. *Given a search log S and positive numbers m , τ , τ' , and λ , ZEALOUS achieves (ϵ, δ) -probabilistic differential privacy, if*

$$\lambda \geq 2m/\epsilon, \text{ and} \quad (4)$$

$$\tau' - \tau \geq \max \left(-\lambda \ln \left(2 - 2e^{-\frac{1}{\lambda}} \right), -\lambda \ln \left(\frac{2\delta}{U \cdot m/\tau} \right) \right), \quad (5)$$

where U denotes the number of users in S .

The proof can be found in the Appendix A.

Next, we will consider a few particular parameter settings to get a quantitative feeling for the theorems of this section.

5.3 Quantitative Comparison of Prob. Diff. Privacy and Indistinguishability for ZEALOUS

For fixed noise and threshold parameters the analysis of [20] stated in Theorem 1 lets us determine what level of (ϵ, δ') -indistinguishability can be guaranteed and our analysis stated in Theorem 2 lets us determine what level of (ϵ, δ) -probabilistic differential privacy can be guaranteed. The results can be found in Table 1. It gives us an impression of how the two privacy guarantees compare with respect to one particular algorithm. We fixed the number of users $U = 500k$ and their contributions to $m = 5$. This is a typical setting that we will explore in the experiments.

First we want to remark that the ϵ parameter is the same for indistinguishability and probabilistic differential privacy. This parameter is inverse proportional to the noise λ . This illustrates the tradeoff between utility and privacy: For higher values of λ the utility decreases, but the privacy guarantees get

stronger. Similarly, with increasing τ' the utility decreases since fewer items are being published but δ and δ' decrease yielding stronger privacy guarantees.

Not all settings in this table give good privacy guarantees. For example, consider $\tau' = 50, \lambda = 5$. Here our analysis does not allow to bound the probability of a privacy breach: $\delta = 1$. Also, $(2, 3.1 \times 10^{-4})$ -indistinguishability is considered an insufficient guarantee since it is recommended to set $\delta' < 1/U$, where U denotes the number of users [20]. In our case $\delta' = 3.1 \times 10^{-4} > 1/U$ when we consider $U = 500,000$. Hence, according to the two analyses it cannot be recommended to publish the query histogram. We observe that $\delta < \delta'$. Indeed, in the next section we will see that probabilistic differential privacy is a stronger guarantee than indistinguishability.

5.4 Utility Analysis

Next we analyze the accuracy of the ZEALOUS algorithm for publishing frequent items and itemsets.

Theorem 3. *Consider running ZEALOUS with parameters $\tau = \tau^* - \xi, \tau' = \tau^* + \xi$ and noise λ on some input DB .*

The inaccuracy with slack ξ is

$$\sum_{d: f_d(DB) > \tau + \xi} 1/2e^{-2\xi/\lambda} + \sum_{d \in D: f_d(DB) < \tau - \xi} 0$$

In particular, this means that ZEALOUS is $1 - 1/2e^{-\frac{\xi}{\lambda}}$ -accurate for the very frequent items (of frequency $\geq \tau^ + \xi$) and it provides perfect accuracy for the very infrequent items (of frequency $< \tau^* - \xi$).*

Proof. It is easy to see that the ZEALOUS' accuracy of filtering out infrequent items is perfect. Moreover, the probability of outputting a frequent item is at least

$$1 - 1/2e^{-\frac{\xi}{\lambda}}$$

which is the probability that the $\text{Lap}(\lambda)$ -distributed noise that is added to the count is at least $-\xi$. In this case a frequent item with count at least $\tau + \xi$ remains in the output of the algorithm. This probability is at least $1/2$. Hence, this algorithm is better at retaining

Privacy Guarantee	$\tau' = 50$	$\tau' = 100$	$\tau' = 150$	$\tau' = 200$
$\lambda = 1$ ($\epsilon, \epsilon' = 10$)	$\delta = 6.6 \times 10^{-16}$ $\delta' = 7.2 \times 10^{-20}$	$\delta = 1.3 \times 10^{-37}$ $\delta' = 1.4 \times 10^{-41}$	$\delta = 2.5 \times 10^{-59}$ $\delta' = 2.7 \times 10^{-63}$	$\delta = 4.7 \times 10^{-81}$ $\delta' = 5.2 \times 10^{-85}$
$\lambda = 5$ ($\epsilon, \epsilon' = 2$)	$\delta = 1$ $\delta' = 3.1 \times 10^{-4}$	$\delta = 3.2 \times 10^{-3}$ $\delta' = 1.4 \times 10^{-8}$	$\delta = 1.5 \times 10^{-7}$ $\delta' = 6.4 \times 10^{-13}$	$\delta = 6.5 \times 10^{-12}$ $\delta' = 2.9 \times 10^{-17}$

Table 1: (ϵ', δ') -indistinguishability vs. (ϵ, δ) -probabilistic differential privacy of releasing query counts. $U = 500k$, $m = 5$.

the frequent items. All in all it has higher accuracy than the basic algorithm on all inputs on which the basic algorithm has sub-optimal accuracy (i.e. on all inputs with frequent items). \square

This completes our separation result.

Theorem 4 (Separation Result). *Our (ϵ, δ) -probabilistic differentially private algorithm ZEALOUS is able to retain frequent items with probability at least $1/2$ while filtering out all infrequent items. On the other hand any ϵ -differentially private algorithm which is able to retain frequent items with non-zero probability (independent of the input database) will be more inaccurate for large domains than the baseline algorithm which always outputs the empty set.*

In the impossibility result of Section 4 we saw that every differentially private algorithm that retains very frequent items has to output any item with some small probability even when it is infrequent. In a large domain such a procedure will hide the true very frequent items and destroy the utility of the data. The reason why ZEALOUS can deal better with large domains is the filtering Step 3. which ensures perfect accuracy in filtering out infrequent items.

6 Comparing Indistinguishability with Prob. Differential Privacy

In this section we study the relationship between (ϵ, δ) -probabilistic differential privacy and (ϵ', δ') -indistinguishability. First we will prove that probabilistic differential privacy implies indistinguishability.

Then we will show that the converse is not true. We show that there exists an algorithm that is (ϵ', δ') -indistinguishable yet blatantly non-private (in the sense of both ϵ -differential privacy and (ϵ, δ) -probabilistic differential privacy). This fact might convince a data publisher to strongly prefer an algorithm that achieves (ϵ, δ) -probabilistic differential privacy over one that is only known to achieve (ϵ', δ') -indistinguishability. It also might convince researchers to analyze the probabilistic privacy guarantee of algorithms that are only known to be indistinguishable such as the algorithms in [11] or [29].

First we show that our definition implies (ϵ, δ) -indistinguishability.

Proposition 1. *If an algorithm \mathcal{A} is (ϵ, δ) -probabilistic differentially private then it is also (ϵ, δ) -indistinguishable.*

The proof can be found in the Appendix B.1.

The converse of Proposition 1 does not hold as illustrated in the next example.

6.1 A Separation of Indistinguishability and Prob. Differential Privacy

We will give an algorithm that is (ϵ', δ') -indistinguishable but not (ϵ, δ) -probabilistic differentially private for any choice of ϵ and $\delta < 1$. We already know from the previous section that probabilistic differential privacy offers a guarantee that is always at least as strong as indistinguishability. Now, we will see that in some cases it can actually provide a much stronger guarantee.

Example 3. *Consider the following algorithm that takes as input a search log S with a search history for*

each of the U users. Let us assume that these search histories all come from a finite domain \mathcal{D} of search histories of up to a certain length. This algorithm is given search histories for all users and it is going to return a search history that is unequal to the first user’s search history. Any search history with that property is returned with equal probability.

Algorithm \hat{A}

Input: Search log $S \in \mathcal{D}^U$

1. Sample uniformly at random a single search history from the set of all histories excluding the first user’s search history.
2. Return this search history.

The following proposition analyzes the privacy of Algorithm \hat{A} .

Proposition 2. For any finite domain of search histories \mathcal{D} Algorithm \hat{A} is $(\epsilon', 1/(|\mathcal{D}| - 1))$ -indistinguishable for all $\epsilon' > 0$ on inputs from \mathcal{D}^U .

The proof can be found in Appendix B.2.

The next proposition shows that every single output of the algorithm constitutes a privacy breach.

Proposition 3. For any search log S , the output of Algorithm \hat{A} constitutes a privacy breach according to ϵ -differentially privacy for any value of ϵ .

Proof. Fix an input S and an output O that is different from the search history of the first user. Consider the input S' differing from S only in the first user history, where $S'_1 = O$. Here

$$1/(|\mathcal{D}| - 1) = \Pr[\mathcal{A}(S) = O] \not\leq e^\epsilon \Pr[\mathcal{A}(S') = O] = 0$$

Thus the output S breaches the privacy of the first user according to ϵ -differentially privacy. \square

Corollary 2. Algorithm \hat{A} is $(\epsilon', 1/(|\mathcal{D}| - 1))$ -indistinguishable for all $\epsilon' > 0$. But it is not (ϵ, δ) -probabilistic differentially private for any $\epsilon > 0$ and any $\delta < 1$.

It was advised to set δ' smaller than the inverse of the number of users when setting the parameters for

τ	1	3	5	7	9
τ'	81.1205	78.7260	78.6827	79.3368	80.3316

Table 2: τ' as a function of τ for $m = 2$, $\epsilon = 1$, $\delta = 0.01$

an indistinguishable algorithm. Moreover, or corollary states that even if you set $\delta' = 1/(|\mathcal{D}| - 1)$ the probability that a privacy breach happens cannot be bounded. We would recommend to set δ' smaller than the inverse of the size.

7 Choosing Parameters

Apart from the privacy parameters ϵ and δ , ZEALOUS requires the data publisher to specify two more parameters: τ , the first threshold used to eliminate keywords with low counts (Step 3), and m , the number of contributions per user. These parameters affect both the noise added to each count as well as the second threshold τ' . Before we discuss the choice of these parameters we explain the general set-up of our experiments.

Data. In our experiments we work with a search log of user queries from the Yahoo! search engine collected from 500,000 users over a period of one month. This search log contains about one million distinct keywords, three million distinct queries, three million distinct query pairs, and 4.5 million distinct clicks.

Privacy Parameters. In all experiments we set $\delta = 0.001$. Thus the probability that the output of ZEALOUS could breach the privacy of any user is appropriately small. We explore different levels of (ϵ, δ) -probabilistic differential privacy by varying ϵ .

7.1 Choosing Threshold τ

We would like to retain as much information as possible in the published search log. A smaller value for τ' immediately leads to a histogram with higher utility because fewer items and their noisy counts are filtered out in the last step of ZEALOUS. Thus if we choose τ in a way that minimizes τ' we maximize the utility of the resulting histogram. Interestingly, choosing

$\tau = 1$ does not necessarily minimize the value of τ' . Table 2 presents the value of τ' for different values of τ for $m = 2$ and $\epsilon = 1$. As we can see, for our parameter setting τ' is minimized if $\tau = 4$. We can show the following optimality result which tells us how to choose τ optimally in order to maximize utility.

Proposition 4. *For fixed ϵ, δ and m choosing $\tau = \lceil 2m/\epsilon \rceil$ minimizes the value of τ' .*

The proof follows from taking the derivative of τ' as a function of τ (based on Equation (5)) to determine its minimum.

7.2 Choosing the Number of Contributions m

Proposition 4 tells us how to set τ in order to maximize utility. Next we will discuss how to set m optimally. We will do so by studying the effect of varying m on the coverage and the precision of the top- j most frequent items in the sanitized histogram. The *top- j coverage of a sanitized search log* is defined as the fraction of distinct items among the top- j most frequent items in the original search log that also appear in the sanitized search log. The *top- j precision of a sanitized search log* is defined as the distance between the relative frequencies in the original search log versus the sanitized search log for the top- j most frequent items. In particular, we study two distance metrics between the relative frequencies: the average L-1 distance and the KL-divergence.

As a first study of the coverage Table 3 shows the number of distinct items (recall that items can be keywords, queries, query pairs, or clicks) in the sanitized search log as m increases. We observe that coverage decreases as we increase m . Moreover, the decrease in the number of published items is more dramatic for larger domains than for smaller domains. The number of distinct keywords decreases by 55% while at the same time the number of distinct query pairs decreases by 96% as we increase m from 1 to 40. This trend has two reasons. First, from Theorem 2 and Proposition 4 we see that threshold τ' increases super-linearly in m . Second, as m increases the number of keywords contributed by the users increases only sub-linearly in m ; fewer users are able

(A) Distinct item counts with different m .					
m	1	4	8	20	40
keywords	6667	6043	5372	4062	2964
queries	3334	2087	1440	751	408
clicks	2813	1576	1001	486	246
query pairs	331	169	100	40	13

(B) Total item counts $\times 10^3$ with different m .					
m	1	4	8	20	40
keywords	329	1157	1894	3106	3871
queries	147	314	402	464	439
clicks	118	234	286	317	290
query pairs	8	14	15	12	7

Table 3:

	keyw.	queries	click	query p.
avg items/user	56	20	14	7

Table 4: Avg number of items per user in the original search log

to supply m items for increasing values of m . Hence, fewer items pass the threshold τ' as m increases. The reduction is larger for query pairs than for keywords, because the average number of query pairs per user is smaller than the average number of keywords per user in the original search log (shown in Table 4).

To understand how m affects precision, we measure the total sum of the counts in the sanitized histogram as we increase m in Table 3. Higher total counts offer the possibility to match the original distribution at a finer grain. We observe that as we increase m , the total counts increase until a tipping point is reached after which they start decreasing again. This effect is as expected for the following reason: As m increases, each user contributes more items, which leads to higher counts in the sanitized histogram. However, the total count increases only sub-linearly with m (and even decreases) due to the reduction in coverage we discussed above. We found that the tipping point where the total count starts to decrease corresponds approximately to the average number of items contributed by each user in the original search log (shown in Table 4). This suggests that we should

choose m to be smaller than the average number of items, because it offers better coverage, higher total counts and reduces the noise compared to higher values of m .

Let us take a closer look at precision and coverage of the histograms of the various domains in Figures 2 and 3. In Figure 2 we vary m between 1 and 40. Each curve plots the precision or coverage of the sanitized search log at various values of the top- j parameter in comparison to the original search log. We vary the top- j parameter but never choose it higher than the number of distinct items in the original search log for the various domains. The first two rows plot precision curves for the average L-1 distance (first row) and the KL-divergence (second row) of the relative frequencies. The lower two rows plot the coverage curves, i.e., the total (relative, respectively) number of top- j items in the original search log that do not appear in sanitized search log in the third row (fourth row, respectively). First, observe that the coverage decreases as m increases, which confirms our discussion about the number of distinct items. Moreover, we see that the coverage gets worse for increasing values of the top- j parameter. This illustrates that ZEALOUS gives better utility for the more frequent items. Second, note that for small values of the top- j parameter, values of $m > 1$ give better precision. However, when the top- j parameter is increased, $m = 1$ gives better precision because the precision of the top- j values degrades due to items no longer appearing in the sanitized search log due to the increased cutoffs.

Figure 3 shows the same statistics varying the top- j parameter on the x-axis. Each curve plots the precision for $m = 1, 2, 4, 8, 10, 40$, respectively. Note that $m = 1$ does not always give the best precision; for keywords, $m = 8$ has the lowest KL-divergence, and for queries, $m = 2$ has the lowest KL-divergence. As we can see from these results, there are two “regimes” for setting the value of m . If we are mainly interested in coverage, then m should be set to 1. However, if we are only interested in a few top- j items then we can increase precision by choosing a larger value for m ; and in this case we recommend the average number of items per user.

We will see this dichotomy again in our real applications of search log analysis: The index caching

application does not require high coverage because of its storage restriction. However, high precision of the top- j most frequent items is necessary to determine which of them to keep in memory. On the other hand, in order to generate many query substitutions a larger number of distinct queries and query pairs is required. Thus m should be set to a large value for index caching and to a small value for query substitution.

8 Application-Oriented Evaluation

In this section we compare the utility provided by algorithms guaranteeing privacy and anonymity. As a baseline we consider publishing the original search log. To be clear, our utility evaluation is not supposed to determine the better algorithm. When choosing an algorithm in practice one has to consider both utility and disclosure limitation guarantee of an algorithm. We have compared the guarantee offered by k -anonymity, differential privacy and its relaxation in Sections 3, 4, and 5. In this section we study the price we have to pay (in terms of decreased utility) when guaranteeing privacy as opposed to utility.

Algorithms. We experimentally compare the utility of ZEALOUS against a representative k -anonymity algorithm [1] for publishing search logs. This algorithm creates a k -query anonymous search log as follows: First all queries that are posed by fewer than k distinct users are eliminated. Then histograms of keywords, queries, and query pairs from the k -query anonymous search log are computed.

ZEALOUS can be used to achieve (ϵ', δ') -indistinguishability as well as (ϵ, δ) -probabilistic differential privacy. For the ease of representation we only documented the probabilistic differential privacy guarantee. But using Theorems 1 and 2 it is straightforward to compute the corresponding indistinguishability guarantee. For brevity, we refer to the (ϵ, δ) -probabilistic differentially private algorithm as ϵ -Differential in the figures.

Evaluation Metrics. We evaluate the performance




Figure 2: Effect on stats by varying m for several values of top- j .

of the algorithms in two ways. First, we measure how well the output of the algorithms preserves certain statistics of the original search log. Second, we pick two real applications from the information retrieval community to evaluate the utility of ZEALOUS: Index caching as a representative application for search performance, and query substitution as a representative application for search quality. This will help us to fully understand the performance of ZEALOUS in an application context.

We first describe our utility evaluation with statis-

tics in Section 8.1 and then with real applications in Sections 8.2 and 8.3.

8.1 General Statistics

We explore different statistics that measure the difference of sanitized histograms to the histograms computed using the original search log. We analyze the histograms of keywords, queries, and query pairs for both sanitization methods. For clicks we only consider ZEALOUS histograms since a k -query any-




Figure 3: Effect on Statistics Of Varying j in top- j for Different Values of m .

ous search log is not designed to publish click data.

In our first experiment we compare the distribution of the counts in the histograms. Note that a k -query anonymous search log will never have query and keyword counts below k , and similarly a ZEALOUS histogram will never have counts below τ' . We choose $\epsilon = 5, m = 1$ for which threshold $\tau' \approx 10$. Therefore we deliberately set $k = 10$ such that $k \approx \tau'$ for a comparable setting.

Figure 4 shows the distribution of the counts in the histograms on a log-log scale. We see that the power-law shape of the distribution is well preserved. However, the total frequencies are lower for the sanitized search logs than the frequencies in the original histogram because our sanitization methods filter out user contributions. We also see the cutoffs created by k and τ' . We observe that as the domain increases from keywords to clicks and query pairs the number

of infrequent items becomes larger for the original search log. For example, the number of clicks with count one is an order of magnitude larger than the number of keywords with count one.

While it is good to know that the shape of the count distribution is well preserved, we would also like to know whether the counts of frequent keywords, queries, query pairs, and clicks are also preserved and what impact the privacy parameters ϵ and the anonymity parameter k have.

Figure 5 shows the average differences to the counts in the original histogram. We scaled up the counts in sanitized histograms by a common factor so that the total counts were equal to the total counts of the original histogram, then we calculated the average difference between the counts. The average is taken over all keywords that have non-zero count in the original search log. As such this metric takes both




Figure 4: Distributions of counts in the histograms.




Figure 5: Average difference between counts in the original histogram and the probabilistic differential privacy-preserving histogram, and the anonymous histogram for varying privacy / anonymity parameters ϵ and k . Parameter m is fixed to 1.

coverage and precision into account.

As expected, with increasing ϵ the average difference decreases, since the noise added to each count decreases. Similarly, by decreasing k the accuracy increases because more queries will pass the threshold. Figure 5 shows that the average difference is comparable for the k anonymous histogram and our ZEALOUS histogram. For keywords we observe that the ZEALOUS histogram is more accurate than a k anonymous histogram for all values of $\epsilon > 2$. For queries we obtain roughly the same average difference for $k = 60$ and $\epsilon = 6$. For query pairs the k -query anonymous histogram provides better utility.

We also computed other metrics such as the root-mean-square value of the differences and the total variation difference; they all reveal similar qualitative trends. Despite the fact that ZEALOUS disregards many search log records (by throwing out all but m contributions per user and by throwing out

low frequent counts), ZEALOUS is able to preserve the overall distribution well.

8.2 Index Caching

Search engines maintain an inverted index which, in its simplest instantiation, contains for each keyword a posting list of identifiers of the documents in which the keyword appears. This index can be used to answer search queries, but also to classify queries for choosing sponsored search results. The index is too large to fit in memory, but maintaining a part of it in memory reduces response time for all these applications. In the index caching problem, we aim to store in memory a set S of posting lists that maximizes the hit-probability over all keywords (the formulation of the problem is from Baeza-Yates [4]). Given such a set S and a probability distribution over the likelihood of occurrence of keywords in a query, the *hit-probability* is the sum of the likelihoods of the key-




Figure 6: Hit probabilities.

words whose posting list are kept in memory.

In our experiments, we use an improved version of the algorithm developed by Baeza-Yates to decide which posting lists should be kept in memory [4]. This algorithm first assigns each keyword a score, which equals its frequency in the search log divided by the number of documents that contain the keyword. Keywords are chosen using a greedy bin-packing strategy where we sequentially add posting lists from the keywords with the highest score until the memory is filled. In our experiments we fixed the memory size to be 1 GB, and each document posting to be 8 Bytes (other parameters give comparable results). Our inverted index stores the document posting list for each keyword sorted according to their relevance which allows to retrieve the documents in the order of their relevance. We truncate this list in memory to contain at most 200,000 documents. Hence, for an incoming query the search engine retrieves the posting list for each keyword in the query either from memory or from disk. If the intersection of the posting lists happens to be empty, then less relevant documents are retrieved from disk for those keywords for which only the truncated posting list is kept on memory.

Figure 6 shows the hit-probabilities of the inverted index constructed using the original search log, the k -anonymous search log, and the ZEALOUS histogram with our greedy approximation algorithm. Figure 6(a) shows that our ZEALOUS histogram achieves better utility than the k -anonymous search log for a range of parameters. We note that the utility only suffers marginally when increasing the privacy

parameter or the anonymity parameter (at least in the range that we have considered).

As a last experiment we study the effect of varying m on the hit-probability in Figure 6(b). We observe that the hit probability for $m = 6$ is above 0.36 whereas the hit probability for $m = 1$ is less than 0.33. As discussed a higher value for m increases the accuracy, but reduces the coverage. Index caching really requires roughly the top 85 most frequent keywords that are still covered when setting $m = 6$. We also experimented with higher values of m and observed that the hit-probability decreases at some point. This confirms our findings about setting the value m from Figure 2: For this application, the sanitized data should accurately model the relative frequencies of the most frequent keywords in the original search log, and thus a larger value of m gives more accurate estimates of the hit-probability.

8.3 Query Substitution

Query Substitution studies how to rephrase a user query to match it to documents or advertisements that do not contain the actual keywords of the query but contain relevant information. Query substitution has applications in query refinement, sponsored search, and spelling error correction [17]. Algorithms for query substitution examine query pairs to learn how users re-phrase queries. We use an algorithm developed by Jones et al. in which related queries for a query are identified in two steps [17]. First, the query is partitioned into subsets of keywords, called *phrases*, based on their mutual information. Next, for each phrase, candidate query substitutions are determined based on the distribution of queries.

We run this algorithm to generate ranked substitution on the sanitized search logs. We then compare these rankings with the rankings produced by the original search log which serve as ground truth. To measure the quality of the query substitutions, we compute the precision/recall, MAP (mean average precision) and NDG (normalized discounted cumulative gain) of the top- j suggestions for each query; let us define these metrics next.

Consider a query q and its list of top- j ranked substitutions q'_0, \dots, q'_{j-1} computed based on a sanitized

search log. We compare this ranking against the top- j ranked substitutions q_0, \dots, q_{j-1} computed based on the original search log as follows. The *precision* of a query q is the fraction of substitutions from the sanitized search log that are also contained in our ground truth ranking:

$$\text{Precision}(q) = \frac{|\{q_0, \dots, q_{j-1}\} \cap \{q'_0, \dots, q'_{j-1}\}|}{|\{q'_0, \dots, q'_{j-1}\}|}$$

Note, that the number of items in the ranking for a query q can be less than j . The *recall* of a query q is the fraction of substitutions in our ground truth that are contained in the substitutions from the sanitized search log:

$$\text{Recall}(q) = \frac{|\{q_0, \dots, q_{j-1}\} \cap \{q'_0, \dots, q'_{j-1}\}|}{|\{q_0, \dots, q_{j-1}\}|}$$

MAP measures the precision of the ranked items for a query as the ratio of true rank and assigned rank:

$$\text{MAP}(q) = \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \frac{i+1}{\text{rank of } q_i \text{ in } [q'_0, \dots, q'_{j-1}] + 1},$$

where the rank of q_i is zero in case it does not contained in the list $[q'_0, \dots, q'_{j-1}]$ otherwise it is i' , s.t. $q_i = q'_{i'}$.

Our last metric called NDCG measures how the relevant substitutions are placed in the ranking list. It does not only compare the ranks of a substitution in the two rankings, but is also penalizes highly relevant substitutions according to $[q_0, \dots, q_{j-1}]$ that have a very low rank in $[q'_0, \dots, q'_{j-1}]$. Moreover, it takes the length of the actual lists into consideration. We refer the reader to the paper by Chakrabarti et al. [9] for details on NDCG.

The discussed metrics compare rankings for one query. To compare the utility of our algorithms, we average over all queries. For coverage we average over all queries for which the original search log produces substitutions. For all other metrics that try to capture the precision of a ranking, we average only over the queries for which the sanitized search logs produce substitutions. We generated query substitution only for the 100,000 most frequent queries of the original search log since the substitution algorithm only works well given enough information about a query.




Figure 8: Coverage of the privacy-preserving histograms for $m = 1$ and $m = 6$.

In Figure 7 we vary k and ϵ for $m = 1$ and we draw the utility curves for top- j for $j = 2$ and $j = 5$. We observe that varying ϵ and k has hardly any influence on performance. On all precision measures, ZEALOUS provides utility comparable to k -query-anonymity. However, the coverage provided by ZEALOUS is not good. This is because the computation of query substitutions relies not only on the frequent query pairs but also on the count of phrase pairs which record for two sets of keywords how often a query containing the first set was followed by another query containing the second set. Thus a phrase pair can have a high frequency even though all query pairs it is contained in have very low frequency. ZEALOUS filters out these low frequency query pairs and thus loses many frequent phrase pairs.

As a last experiment, we study the effect of increasing m for query substitutions. Figure 8 plots the average coverage of the top-2 and top-5 substitutions produced by ZEALOUS for $m = 1$ and $m = 6$ for various values of ϵ . It is clear that across the board larger values of m lead to smaller coverage, thus confirming our intuition outlined the previous section.

9 Beyond Search Logs

While the main focus of this paper are search logs, our results apply to other scenarios as well. For example, consider a retailer who collects customer transac-




Figure 7: Quality of the query substitutions of the privacy-preserving histograms, and the anonymous search log.

tions. Each transaction consists of a basket of products together with their prices, and a time-stamp. Our results also apply to publishing frequently purchased products or sets of products. This information can be used in a recommender system or in a market basket analysis to decide on the goods and promotions in a store [14].

Another example concerns monitoring the health of patients. Each time a patient sees a doctor the doctor records the diseases of the patient and the suggested treatment. It would be interesting to publish frequent combinations of diseases.

All of our results apply to the more general problem of publishing frequent items / itemsets / consecutive itemsets. Existing work on publishing frequent itemsets often only tries to achieve anonymity or makes strong assumptions about the background knowledge of an attacker [30, 26, 34, 35, 38, 2, 39, 37]. We explain how to protect (ϵ, δ) -probabilistic differential privacy against all possible attackers in Section 5. We also show that it is impossible to achieve ϵ -differential privacy and good utility and thus this probabilistic guarantee is the best we can hope for.

10 Conclusions

This paper contains a comparative study about publishing frequent keywords, queries, and clicks in search logs. We compare the disclosure limitation guarantees and the theoretical and practical utility of various approaches. Our com-

parison includes earlier work on anonymity and (ϵ', δ') -indistinguishability and our proposed solution to achieve (ϵ, δ) -probabilistic differential privacy in search logs. These results (negative as well as positive) apply more generally to the problem of publishing frequent (and possibly sequential) items or itemsets. In our comparison, we revealed interesting relationships between different variations of relaxations which might be of independent interest.

A topic of future work is the development of algorithms that allow to publish useful information about *infrequent* keywords, queries, and clicks in a search log.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank our colleagues Filip Radlinski and Yisong Yue for helpful discussions about the usage of search logs.

References

- [1] Eytan Adar. User 4xxxxx9: Anonymizing query logs. In *WWW Workshop on Query Log Analysis*, 2007.
- [2] Maurizio Atzori, Francesco Bonchi, Fosca Gianfanti, and Dino Pedreschi. Blocking anonymity threats raised by frequent itemset mining. In *ICDM*, 2005.

- [3] Lars Backstrom, Cynthia Dwork, and Jon Kleinberg. Wherefore art thou R3579x? Anonymized social networks, hidden patterns, and structural steganography. In *WWW*, 2007.
- [4] Roberto Baeza-Yates. Web usage mining in search engines. *Web Mining: Applications and Techniques*, 2004.
- [5] B. Barak, K. Chaudhuri, C. Dwork, S. Kale, F. McSherry, and K. Talwar. Privacy, accuracy and consistency too: A holistic solution to contingency table release. In *PODS*, 2007.
- [6] Michael Barbaro and Tom Zeller. A face is exposed for aol searcher no. 4417749. New York Times <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/08/09/technology/aol.html?ex=131276000&en=f6f61949c6da4d38ei=5090>, 2006.
- [7] Avrim Blum, Katrina Ligett, and Aaron Roth. A learning theory approach to non-interactive database privacy. In *STOC*, pages 609–618, 2008.
- [8] Justin Brickell and Vitaly Shmatikov. The cost of privacy: destruction of data-mining utility in anonymized data publishing. In *KDD*, 2008.
- [9] Soumen Chakrabarti, Rajiv Khanna, Uma Sawant, and Chiru Bhattacharyya. Structured learning for non-smooth ranking losses. In *KDD*, pages 88–96, 2008.
- [10] C. Dwork. Differential privacy. In *ICALP*, 2006.
- [11] Cynthia Dwork, Krishnaram Kenthapadi, Frank McSherry, Ilya Mironov, and Moni Naor. Our data, ourselves: Privacy via distributed noise generation. In *EUROCRYPT*, 2006.
- [12] Cynthia Dwork, Frank McSherry, Kobbi Nissim, and Adam Smith. Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis. In *TCC*, 2006.
- [13] Michaela Götz, Ashwin Machanavajjhala, Guozhang Wang, Xiaokui Xiao, and Johannes Gehrke. Privacy in search logs. *CoRR*, abs/0904.0682, 2009.
- [14] Jiawei Han and Micheline Kamber. *Data Mining: Concepts and Techniques*. Morgan Kaufmann, 1st edition, September 2000.
- [15] Yeye He and Jeffrey F. Naughton. Anonymization of set-valued data via top-down, local generalization. *PVLDB*, 2(1):934–945, 2009.
- [16] Rosie Jones, Ravi Kumar, Bo Pang, and Andrew Tomkins. "I know what you did last summer": query logs and user privacy. In *CIKM*, 2007.
- [17] Rosie Jones, Benjamin Rey, Omid Madani, and Wiley Greiner. Generating query substitutions. In *WWW*, 2006.
- [18] Shiva Prasad Kasiviswanathan, Homin K. Lee, Kobbi Nissim, Sofya Raskhodnikova, and Adam Smith. What can we learn privately? In *FOCS*, pages 531–540, 2008.
- [19] Daniel Kifer and Johannes Gehrke. Injecting utility into anonymized datasets. In *SIGMOD*, 2006.
- [20] Aleksandra Korolova, Krishnaram Kenthapadi, Nina Mishra, and Alexandros Ntoulas. Releasing search queries and clicks privately. To appear in *WWW* 2009.
- [21] Ravi Kumar, Jasmine Novak, Bo Pang, and Andrew Tomkins. On anonymizing query logs via token-based hashing. In *WWW*, 2007.
- [22] N. Li, T. Li, and S. Venkatasubramanian. t -closeness: Privacy beyond k -anonymity and ℓ -diversity. In *ICDE*, 2007.
- [23] Ashwin Machanavajjhala, Johannes Gehrke, Daniel Kifer, and Muthuramakrishnan Venkatasubramanian. ℓ -diversity: Privacy beyond k -anonymity. In *ICDE*, 2006.
- [24] Ashwin Machanavajjhala, Daniel Kifer, John Abowd, Johannes Gehrke, and Lars Vihuber. Privacy: From theory to practice on the map. In *ICDE*, 2008.

- [25] D. Martin, D. Kifer, A. Machanavajjhala, J. Gehrke, and J. Halpern. Worst case background knowledge for privacy preserving data publishing. In *ICDE*, 2007.
- [26] Amruta Mhatre, Mridula Verma, and Durga Toshniwal. Privacy preserving sequential pattern mining in progressive databases using noisy data. In *IV*, 2009.
- [27] Rajeev Motwani and Shubha Nabar. Anonymizing unstructured data. *arXiv*, 2008.
- [28] Mehmet Ercan Nergiz, Christopher Clifton, and Ahmet Erhan Nergiz. MultiRelational k-anonymity. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 99(1), 2008.
- [29] Kobbi Nissim, Sofya Raskhodnikova, and Adam Smith. Smooth sensitivity and sampling in private data analysis. In *STOC*, 2007.
- [30] Stanley R. M. Oliveira and Osmar R. Zaiane. Privacy preserving frequent itemset mining. In *CRPIT*, 2002.
- [31] Vibhor Rastogi, Dan Suciu, and Sungho Hong. The boundary between privacy and utility in data publishing. In *VLDB '07: Proceedings of the 33rd international conference on Very large data bases*, pages 531–542. VLDB Endowment, 2007.
- [32] Pierangela Samarati. Protecting respondents' identities in microdata release. *IEEE Trans. on Knowl. and Data Eng.*, 13(6):1010–1027, 2001.
- [33] Yufei Tao, Xiaokui Xiao, Jiexing Li, and Donghui Zhang. On anti-corruption privacy preserving publication. In *ICDE*, pages 725–734, 2008.
- [34] Adriano A. Veloso, Wagner Meira Jr., Srinivasan Parthasarathy, and Mrcio Bunte de Carvalho. Efficient, accurate and privacy-preserving data mining for frequent itemsets in distributed databases. In *In Proceedings of the Eighteenth Brazilian Symposium on Databases*, 2003.
- [35] Vassilios S. Verykios, Ahmed K. Elmagarmid, Elisa Bertino, Yucel Saygin, and Elena Dasseni. Association rule hiding. *IEEE Trans. on Knowl. and Data Eng.*, 16(4):434–447, 2004.
- [36] Ke Wang, Yabo Xu, Ada W.C. Fu, and Raymond C.W. Wong. FF-anonymity: When quasi-identifiers are missing. In *ICDE*, 2009.
- [37] Ting Wang and Ling Liu. Butterfly: Protecting output privacy in stream mining. In *ICDE*, 2008.
- [38] Yabo Xu, Benjamin C. M. Fung, Ke Wang, Ada W. C. Fu, and Jian Pei. Publishing sensitive transactions for itemset utility. In *ICDM*, 2008.
- [39] Yabo Xu, Ke Wang, Ada Wai-Chee Fu, and Philip S. Yu. Anonymizing transaction databases for publication. In *KDD*, 2008.

A Analysis of ZEALOUS: Proof of Theorem 2

Let H be the keyword histogram constructed by ZEALOUS in Step 2 when applied to S and K be the set of keywords in H whose count equals τ . Let Ω be the set of keyword histograms, that do not contain any keyword in K . For notational simplicity, let us denote ZEALOUS as a function Z . We will prove the theorem by showing that, given Equations (4) and (5),

$$Pr[Z(S) \notin \Omega] \leq \delta, \quad (6)$$

and for any keyword histogram $\omega \in \Omega$ and for any neighboring search log S' of S ,

$$e^{-\epsilon} \cdot Pr[Z(S') = \omega] \leq Pr[Z(S) = \omega] \leq e^{\epsilon} \cdot Pr[Z(S') = \omega]. \quad (7)$$

We will first prove that Equation (6) holds. Assume that the i -th keyword in K has a count \tilde{c}_i in

$Z(S)$ for $i \in [1, |K|]$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& Pr[Z(S) \notin \Omega] \\
&= Pr[\exists i \in [1, |K|], \tilde{c}_i > \tau'] \\
&= 1 - Pr[\forall i \in [1, |K|], \tilde{c}_i \leq \tau'] \\
&= 1 - \prod_{i \in [1, |K|]} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\tau' - \tau} \frac{1}{2\lambda} e^{-\frac{|x|}{\lambda}} dx \right) \\
&\quad (\text{the noise added to } \tilde{c}_i \text{ has to be } \geq \tau' - \tau) \\
&= 1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \cdot e^{-\frac{\tau' - \tau}{\lambda}} \right)^{|K|} \\
&\leq \frac{|K|}{2} \cdot e^{-\frac{\tau' - \tau}{\lambda}} \\
&\leq \frac{U \cdot m}{2\tau} \cdot e^{-\frac{\tau' - \tau}{\lambda}} \quad (\text{because } |K| \leq U \cdot m/\tau) \\
&\leq \frac{U \cdot m}{2\tau} \cdot e^{-\frac{-\lambda \ln(\frac{2\delta}{U \cdot m/\tau})}{\lambda}} \quad (\text{by Equation 5}) \\
&= \delta. \tag{8}
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we will show that Equation (7) also holds. Let S' be any neighboring search log of S . Let ω be any possible output of ZEALOUS given S , such that $\omega \in \Omega$. To establish Equation (7), it suffices to prove that

$$\frac{Pr[Z(S) = \omega]}{Pr[Z(S') = \omega]} \leq e^\epsilon, \text{ and} \tag{9}$$

$$\frac{Pr[Z(S') = \omega]}{Pr[Z(S) = \omega]} \leq e^\epsilon. \tag{10}$$

We will derive Equation (9). The proof of (10) is analogous.

Let H' be the keyword histogram constructed by ZEALOUS in Step 2 when applied to S' . Let Δ be the set of keywords that have different counts in H and H' . Since S and S' differ in the search history of a single user, and each user contributes at most m keywords, we have $|\Delta| \leq 2m$. Let k_i ($i \in [1, |\Delta|]$) be the i -th keyword in Δ , and d_i, d'_i , and d_i^* be the counts of k_i in H, H' , and ω , respectively. Since a user adds at most one to the count of a keyword (see Step 2.), we have $d_i - d'_i = 1$ for any $i \in [1, |\Delta|]$. To simplify notation, let E_i, E'_i , and E_i^*, E'_i^* denote

the event that k_i has counts d_i, d'_i, d_i^* in H, H' , and $Z(S), Z(S')$, respectively. Therefore,

$$\frac{Pr[Z(S) = \omega]}{Pr[Z(S') = \omega]} = \prod_{i \in [1, |\Delta|]} \frac{Pr[E_i^* | E_i]}{Pr[E_i'^* | E'_i]}.$$

In what follows, we will show that $\frac{Pr[E_i^* | E_i]}{Pr[E_i'^* | E'_i]} \leq e^{1/\lambda}$ for any $i \in [1, |\Delta|]$. We differentiate three cases: (i) $d_i \geq \tau, d_i^* \geq \tau$, (ii) $d_i < \tau$ and (iii) $d_i = \tau$ and $d_i^* = \tau - 1$.

Consider case (i) when d_i and d_i^* are at least τ . Then, if $d_i^* > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{Pr[E_i^* | E_i]}{Pr[E_i'^* | E'_i]} \\
&= \frac{\frac{1}{2\lambda} e^{-|d_i^* - d_i|/\lambda}}{\frac{1}{2\lambda} e^{-|d_i^* - d'_i|/\lambda}} \\
&= e^{(|d_i^* - d_i| - |d_i^* - d'_i|)/\lambda} \\
&\leq e^{|d_i - d'_i|/\lambda} \\
&= e^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}. \quad (\text{because } |d_i - d'_i| = 1 \text{ for any } i)
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if $d_i^* = 0$,

$$\frac{Pr[E_i^* | E_i]}{Pr[E_i'^* | E'_i]} = \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\tau' - d_i} \frac{1}{2\lambda} e^{-|x|/\lambda} dx}{\int_{-\infty}^{\tau' - d'_i} \frac{1}{2\lambda} e^{-|x|/\lambda} dx} \leq e^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}.$$

Now consider case (ii) when d_i is less than τ . Since $\omega \in \Omega$, and ZEALOUS eliminates all counts in H that are smaller than τ , we have $d_i^* = 0$, and $Pr[E_i^* | E_i] = 1$. On the other hand,

$$Pr[E_i'^* | E'_i] = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } d'_i \leq \tau \\ 1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{-|\tau' - d'_i|/\lambda}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{Pr[E_i^* | E_i]}{Pr[E_i'^* | E'_i]} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{-|\tau' - d'_i|/\lambda}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{-(\tau' - \tau)/\lambda}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{\ln(2 - 2e^{-\frac{1}{\lambda}})}} \quad (\text{by Equation 7}) \\
&= e^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Consider now case (iii) when $d_i = \tau$ and $d_i^* = \tau - 1$. Since $\omega \in \Omega$ we have $d_i^* = 0$. Moreover, since ZEALOUS eliminates all counts in H that are smaller than τ , it follows that $\Pr[E_i^* | E_i'] = 1$. Therefore,

$$\frac{\Pr[E_i^* | E_i]}{\Pr[E_i^* | E_i']} = \Pr[E_i^* | E_i] \leq e^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}.$$

In summary, $\frac{\Pr[E_i^* | E_i]}{\Pr[E_i^* | E_i']} \leq e^{1/\lambda}$. Since $|\Delta| \leq 2m$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\Pr[Z(S) = \omega]}{\Pr[Z(S') = \omega]} \\ &= \prod_{i \in [1, |\Delta|]} \frac{\Pr[E_i^* | E_i]}{\Pr[E_i^* | E_i']} \\ &\leq \prod_{i \in [1, |\Delta|]} e^{1/\lambda} \\ &= e^{|\Delta|/\lambda} \\ &\leq e^\epsilon \quad (\text{by Equation 6 and } |\Delta| \leq 2m). \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of the theorem.

B Proofs of the Comparison of Indistinguishability and Prob. Diff. Privacy

B.1 Proof of Proposition 1

Assume that, for all search logs S , we can divide the output space Ω into two sets Ω_1, Ω_2 , such that

$$(1) \Pr[\mathcal{A}(S) \in \Omega_2] \leq \delta, \text{ and}$$

for all search logs S' differing from S only in the search history of a single user and for all $O \in \Omega_1$:

$$(2) \Pr[\mathcal{A}(S) = O] \leq e^\epsilon \Pr[\mathcal{A}(S') = O] \text{ and} \\ \Pr[\mathcal{A}(S') = O] \leq e^\epsilon \Pr[\mathcal{A}(S) = O].$$

Consider any subset \mathcal{O} of the output space Ω of \mathcal{A} . Let $\mathcal{O}_1 = \mathcal{O} \cap \Omega_1$ and $\mathcal{O}_2 = \mathcal{O} \cap \Omega_2$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr[\mathcal{A}(S) \in \mathcal{O}] \\ &= \int_{O \in \mathcal{O}_2} \Pr[\mathcal{A}(S) = O] dO + \int_{O \in \mathcal{O}_1} \Pr[\mathcal{A}(S) = O] dO \\ &\leq \int_{O \in \mathcal{O}_2} \Pr[\mathcal{A}(S) = O] dO + e^\epsilon \int_{O \in \mathcal{O}_1} \Pr[\mathcal{A}(S') = O] dO \\ &\leq \delta + e^\epsilon \int_{O \in \mathcal{O}_1} \Pr[\mathcal{A}(S') = O] dO \\ &\leq \delta + e^\epsilon \cdot \Pr[\mathcal{A}(S') \in \Omega_1]. \end{aligned}$$

B.2 Proof of Proposition 2

We have to show that for all search logs S, S' differing in one user history and for all sets \mathcal{O} :

$$\Pr[\hat{\mathcal{A}}(S) \in \mathcal{O}] \leq \Pr[\hat{\mathcal{A}}(S') \in \mathcal{O}] + 1/(|\mathcal{D}| - 1).$$

Since Algorithm 1 neglects all but the first input this is true for neighboring search logs not differing in the first user's input. We are left with the case of two neighboring search logs S, S' differing in the search history of the first user. Let us analyze the output distributions of Algorithm 1 under these two inputs S and S' . For all search histories except the search histories of the first user in S, S' the output probability is $1/(|\mathcal{D}| - 1)$ for either input. For all search histories not in \mathcal{D} the output probability is zero. Only for the two search histories of the first user S_1, S'_1 the output probabilities differ: Algorithm 1 never outputs S_1 given S , but it outputs this search history with probability $1/(|\mathcal{D}| - 1)$ given S' . Symmetrically, Algorithm 1 never outputs S'_1 given S' , but it outputs this search history with probability $1/(|\mathcal{D}| - 1)$ given S . Thus, we have for all sets \mathcal{O}

$$\Pr[\hat{\mathcal{A}}(S) \in \mathcal{O}] = \sum_{d \in \mathcal{O} \cap (\mathcal{D} - S_1)} 1/(|\mathcal{D}| - 1) \quad (11)$$

$$\leq 1/(|\mathcal{D}| - 1) + \sum_{d \in \mathcal{O} \cap (\mathcal{D} - S_2)} 1/(|\mathcal{D}| - 1) \quad (12)$$

$$= \Pr[\hat{\mathcal{A}}(S) \in \mathcal{O}] + 1/(|\mathcal{D}| - 1) \quad (13)$$