# Measuring Identification Risk in Microdata Release and Its Control by Post-randomization

Tapan Nayak, Cheng Zhang

The George Washington University

godeau@gwu.edu

November 6, 2015

## Disclosure Control

research the issues of privacy and confidentiality that arise in the process collecting data from the public and disclosing the data to a certain group of people.

## Statistical Disclosure Control

explores disclosure control issues from a statistical point of view, including (but not limited to) proper measures of privacy and confidentiality, statistical techniques of perturbing the microdata, inference after the perturbation, etc.

- The law requires confidentiality to be preserved, even without publishing the data.
- The need for sharing more microdata with public is becoming stronger than ever.
- Inference issues with the perturbed data.

- Gouweleeuw, J.M., Kooiman, P., Willenborg, L.C.R.J. and De Wolf, P.-P. (1998). "Post randomization for statistical disclosure control: Theory and implementation." J. Official Statist., 14, 463.
- Shlomo, N. and Skinner, C.J. (2012). "Privacy protection from sampling and perturbation in survey microdata." J. Privacy Confidentiality, 4, 155.

- We focus on identity disclosure based on categorical key variables.
- A new measure for identification risk and a associated disclosure control goal.
- A method that accomplishes the preceding goal, using Post-Randomization (PRAM).
- Effects of our method upon the inference issues.

Assumptions

- Intruder knows the key variable value of the target.
- Units are non-differentiable with the same key variable values, and the intruder would pick one at random as the record of the target.

## Identity Disclosure: Correct Match

A correct match happens to a unit when the intruder correctly matches the unit's record of non-key variable value, among all the units that share the same key variable value with the target.

We measure the risk of identity disclosure by the probability of a unit being correctly matched.

	Key Variable			Non-key variable	
Name	Sex	Race	Residency	VIN	Cross-classification of keys
John	М	White	VA	а	c1
Mike	М	Black	MD	b	c2
Larry	М	Black	VA	с	c3
Susan	F	White	MD	d	c4
Jane	F	Other	MD	е	c5
Rachel	F	White	MD	f	c4

#### For example,

If the original data is released after the removal of names,

 $P{\text{John is correctly matched}} = 1$ 

 $P{Susan is correctly matched} = 0.5$ 

$$P(CM|S_j = a, X_B = c_j) \le \xi$$

for all a > 0 and j = 1, 2, ...., k.

- *CM* stands for the event that the target unit *B* is correctly matched in the aforementioned scenario and matching scheme.
- $c_1, c_2, ..., c_k$  are all the cells (values of the cross-classified variable formed by all key variables).
- $S_i$  is the count of  $c_i$  in the perturbed released data.
- The intruder knows the target's key variable value,  $X_B = c_j$

#### What is PRAM

In a nutshell, PRAM is the randomization mechanism of a categorical variable using a transition probability where the transition probability is a function of the data, instead of being predetermined.

EX: A Bernoulli dataset with 10 observations  $X_1, X_2, ..., X_{10}$ . A PRAM transition matrix could be

$$\mathcal{P}=\left(egin{array}{ccc} 1-rac{1}{T_0}&rac{1}{T_0}\ rac{1}{T_1}&1-rac{1}{T_1}\end{array}
ight)$$

where  $T_i$  is the count of i, and  $p_{ij} = P\{j \to i\}$ . If  $X_1 = 0$ , then change  $X_1$  to 1 with probability  $\frac{1}{T_0}$ .

Our choice of PRAM matrix Let a group contain cells  $c_1, c_2, ..., c_k$ . Then the transition probability matrix is  $P = ((p_{ij}))$  where

$$p_{ii} = 1 - \frac{\theta}{T_i}, p_{ji} = \frac{\theta}{(k-1)T_i}$$

for i, j = 1, 2, ..., k,  $i \neq j$ ,  $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$ , and  $T_i$  is the count of  $c_i$  in the original dataset.

Physical interpretation of  $\theta$ :

E(number of units moving out of cell i)=  $T_i - E(\text{number of units of does not change in cell i})$ =  $T_i - T_i \times p_{ii} = \theta$ 

Being independent of  $\theta$ , this applies to all cells.

#### Example:

	Key Variable			Non-key variable	
Name	Sex	Race	Residency	VIN	Cross-classification of keys
John	М	White	VA	а	c1
Mike	М	Black	MD	b	c2
Larry	М	Black	VA	с	c3
Susan	F	White	MD	d	c4
Jane	F	Other	MD	е	c5
Rachel	F	White	MD	f	c4

$$\begin{pmatrix} c_1 & c_2 & c_3 & c_4 & c_5 \\ 1 - \theta & \theta/4 & \theta/4 & \theta/8 & \theta/4 \\ \theta/4 & 1 - \theta & \theta/4 & \theta/8 & \theta/4 \\ \theta/4 & \theta/4 & 1 - \theta & \theta/8 & \theta/4 \\ \theta/4 & \theta/4 & \theta/4 & 1 - \frac{\theta}{2} & \theta/4 \\ \theta/4 & \theta/4 & \theta/4 & \theta/8 & 1 - \theta \end{pmatrix}$$

Image: Image:

э

Pro:

- Easy to operate: reducing the choosing matrix problem to choosing one parameter for each group
- Unbiased estimators:  $E(S_i|T_i) = T_i$
- PRAM matrix, being dependent on the original data, is hard to retrieve;

Con:

• Simple structure costs unnecessary perturbation

• limited to  $\xi \geq \frac{1}{3}$ 

- We set  $\xi \geq \frac{1}{3}$
- Solve for a common  $\theta$  for all group.
- Solve for the minimum group size k.
- Subset only the singleton and doubleton cells. Partition the subset into groups of at least *k* cells.
- PRAM each group independently.

## Solution of $\theta$ and k

ultimate goal: 
$$P(CM|S_j = a, X_B = c_j) \leq \xi$$
  
 $\uparrow$   
 $P(CM|S_j = a, X_B = c_j, T = t) \leq \xi$ ,  
where T is the vector of all cells' counts  
 $\uparrow$   
 $P(CM|S_j = 1, X_B = c_j, T = t) \leq \xi$ ,  
 $P(CM|S_j = 2, X_B = c_j, T = t) \leq \xi$ ,  
 $\xi \geq \frac{1}{3}$   
 $\uparrow$   
 $P(CM|S_j = 2, X_B = c_j, T = t) \leq \phi(\theta)$   
 $\phi(\theta) = \phi(\theta) = \frac{T_j - \theta}{T_j(T_j - \theta) + \theta^2} \leq \xi$ 

#### Solution

Solve  $\phi(\theta) \leq \xi$  for  $\theta$ . Then plug  $\theta$  in  $P(CM|S_j = 2, X_B = c_j, T = t) \leq P(CM|S_j = 1, X_B = c_j, T = t)$  to solve the smallest possible k.

Tapan Nayak, Cheng Zhang (GWU)

The exploration on data quality serves mostly as a guide of how to partition all categories into groups, so that the groups are formed in the way that it has a total variation as small as possible. Numerical findings:

• Total variation from perturbing using PRAM, i.e.

 $\sum var(S_i|T_i),$ 

is ignorable compared to the total variation from sampling.

• Dividing all cells into more groups with smallest possible group size is optimal in terms of lowering the total variation from perturbation.

- $\xi < \frac{1}{3}$
- Different form of block transition matrix
- Sampling weights
- Other partitioning criteria
- Variation on the joint distribution between key and non-key variables

# Thank You

Image: A image: A

2