

Private Rank Aggregation in Central and Local Models

Daniel Alabi^{*1}, Badih Ghazi², Ravi Kumar², and Pasin Manurangsi²

¹Harvard School of Engineering and Applied Sciences

²Google Research, Mountain View, CA

alabid@g.harvard.edu, {badihghazi, ravi.k53}@gmail.com, pasin@google.com

Abstract

In social choice theory, (Kemeny) rank aggregation is a well-studied problem where the goal is to combine rankings from multiple voters into a single ranking on the same set of items. Since rankings can reveal preferences of voters (which a voter might like to keep private), it is important to aggregate preferences in such a way to preserve privacy. In this work, we present differentially private algorithms for rank aggregation in the pure and approximate settings along with distribution-independent utility upper and lower bounds. In addition to bounds in the central model, we also present utility bounds for the local model of differential privacy.

^{*}Work done while an intern at Google Research.

1 Introduction

The goal of rank aggregation is to find a central ranking based on rankings of two or more voters. Rank aggregation is a basic formulation that is studied in diverse disciplines ranging from social choice [Arrow, 1963], voting [Young and Levenglick, 1978, Young, 1995], and behavioral economics to machine learning [Wistuba and Pedapati, 2020], data mining [Dwork et al., 2001], recommendation systems [Pennock et al., 2000], and information retrieval [Mansouri et al., 2021]. The problem has a long and rich algorithmic history [Conitzer et al., 2006, Meila et al., 2007, Kenyon-Mathieu and Schudy, 2007, Mandhani and Meila, 2009, Schalekamp and van Zuylen, 2009, Ailon et al., 2008].

In many rank aggregation applications such as voting, it is imperative to find a central ranking such that the privacy of the voters who contributed the rankings is preserved. A principled way to achieve this is to view the problem through the lens of the rigorous mathematical definition of differential privacy (DP) [Dwork et al., 2006b,a]. As in other privacy settings, it is then important to understand the trade-off between privacy and utility, i.e., the quality of the aggregation.

DP rank aggregation has been studied in a few recent papers [Hay et al., 2017, Yan et al., 2020, Liu et al., 2020]. While the algorithms in these works are guaranteed to be DP, their utility is provably good only under generative settings such as the Mallows model [Mallows, 1957, Fligner and Verducci, 1986] or with other distributional assumptions. The question we ask in this work is: can one circumvent such stylized settings and obtain a DP rank aggregation algorithm with provably good utility in the worst case? We answer this affirmatively by providing a spectrum of algorithms in the central and local DP models.

In the central model of DP, a trusted curator holds the *non-private* exact rankings from all users and aggregates them into a single ranking while ensuring privacy. In the local model of DP, this process would be done without collating the *exact* rankings of the users. As an example, consider a distributed recommendation system that can be used to determine a central ranking based on individual user rankings. Suppose there are at least four users in a recommendation system. Each user wishes to visit a state with at least one Google office. In addition, each user has their own criteria for deciding which office to visit. The candidate Google offices are: Mountain View (M), San Francisco (S), New York (N), Cambridge (C), and Accra (A). In Table 1, we show each user’s ranking of the candidate offices based on different criteria. Evidently, since each user wishes to visit a state or city for a different reason, every user’s ranking on the candidate offices is also not the same. The goal of our work is to aggregate user preferences into one single ranking on the candidate offices while preserving the privacy of each user.

1.1 Background

Let $[m] = \{1, \dots, m\}$ be the universe of items to be ranked (we assume this is public information) and let \mathcal{S}_m be the group of rankings (i.e., permutations) on $[m]$. For example, the universe of items could be the set of all restaurants in New York. Let $\Pi = \{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n\}$ be a given set of rankings,

User	Criteria	Ranking
1	Visit a relative in California	$M < S < N < C < A$
2	Go on vacation at an African Safari	$A < M < N < C < S$
3	Take pictures of the Statue of Liberty	$N < C < S < M < A$
4	Touch the Android Lawn Statues	$M < S < C < N < A$

Table 1: Aggregating Preferences on Offices to Visit. $X < Y$ denotes preference for X over Y .

where n is the number of users and each $\pi_k \in \mathbb{S}_m$ gives an ordering on the m items. We assume that the lower the position $\pi(j)$ of an item $j \in [m]$ in a ranking π , the higher our preference for that item j . For $i, j \in [m]$ such that $i \neq j$, define $w_{ij}^\Pi = \Pr_{\pi \sim \Pi}[\pi(i) < \pi(j)]$, i.e., w_{ij}^Π is the fraction of rankings that rank item i before j . As noted by Ailon et al. [2008], for a graph on m nodes, when the weight of each edge (i, j) is w_{ij}^Π , rank aggregation reduces to the weighted version of the minimum Feedback Arc Set in Tournaments (FAST) problem.

Rank aggregation is based on the *Kendall tau* metric:

$$K(\pi_1, \pi_2) = |\{(i, j) : \pi_1(i) < \pi_1(j) \text{ but } \pi_2(i) > \pi_2(j)\}|,$$

for any two rankings $\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \mathbb{S}_m$. In other words, $K(\pi_1, \pi_2)$ is the number of pairwise disagreements between the two permutations π_1 and π_2 . Note that $K(\pi, \pi) = 0$ for any permutation π and the maximum value of $K(\cdot, \cdot)$ is $\binom{m}{2}$. For example, if $\pi_1 = (1, 2, 3, 4)$ and $\pi_2 = (2, 3, 1, 4)$, then $K(\pi_1, \pi_2) = 2$.

We also define the *average Kendall tau* distance (or the *Kemeny Score*) to a set $\Pi = \{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n\}$ of rankings as $K(\sigma, \Pi) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n K(\sigma, \pi_i)$. We use $\text{OPT}(\Pi)$ to denote $\min_{\sigma} K(\sigma, \Pi)$. We say that a randomized algorithm \mathcal{A} obtains an (α, β) -*approximation* for the (Kemeny) rank aggregation problem if, given Π , it outputs σ such that $\mathbb{E}_{\sigma} [K(\sigma, \Pi)] \leq \alpha \cdot \text{OPT}(\Pi) + \beta$, where α is the approximation ratio and β is the additive error. When $\beta = 0$, we call \mathcal{A} an α -*approximation* algorithm.

Differential Privacy. We consider two sets $\Pi = \{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n\}, \Pi' = \{\pi'_1, \dots, \pi'_n\}$ of rankings to be *neighboring* if they differ on a single ranking. In this work, we consider both the *central* and *local* models of DP. For $\epsilon > 0, \delta \geq 0$, a randomized algorithm $\mathcal{A} : (\mathbb{S}_m)^n \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_m$ is (ϵ, δ) -*differentially private (DP) in the central model* if for all neighboring sets Π, Π' of rankings and for all $S \subseteq \mathbb{S}_m$,

$$\Pr[\mathcal{A}(\Pi) \in S] \leq e^{\epsilon} \Pr[\mathcal{A}(\Pi') \in S] + \delta.$$

In other words, in the central model the algorithm \mathcal{A} can access all the input rankings and only the output aggregated ranking is required to be private.

In the (interactive) local model of DP [Kasiviswanathan et al., 2011], the users retain their rankings and the algorithm \mathcal{A} is a randomized protocol between the users; let $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}}$ denote the transcript of the protocol¹. An algorithm \mathcal{A} is (ϵ, δ) -*differentially private (DP) in the local model* if for all neighboring sets Π, Π' of rankings and for all sets S of transcripts,

$$\Pr[\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi) \in S] \leq e^{\epsilon} \Pr[\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}}(\Pi') \in S] + \delta.$$

We say that \mathcal{A} is a pure-DP algorithm (denoted ϵ -DP) when $\delta = 0$ and is an approximate-DP algorithm otherwise.

1.2 Our Results

We obtain polynomial-time pure- and approximate-DP approximation algorithms for rank aggregation in the central and local models. Note that by using the exponential mechanism of McSherry and Talwar [2007], one can obtain an algorithm with approximation ratio of 1 and additive error of $\tilde{O}(m^3/n)$; however this algorithm is computationally inefficient [Hay et al., 2017].

Our algorithms are based on two generic reductions. In our first reduction, we show that using standard DP mechanisms for aggregation (e.g., Laplace or Gaussian in the central model) to

¹We refer the readers to [Duchi and Rogers, 2019] for a more detailed formalization and discussion on interactivity in the local model.

estimate the values of w_{ij} 's and then running an off-the-shelf approximation algorithm for rank aggregation (that is not necessarily private), preserves the approximation ratio and achieves additive errors of $O(m^4/n)$ for pure-DP in the central model, $O(m^3/n)$ for approximate-DP in the central model, and $O(m^3/\sqrt{n})$ in the local model. In the second reduction, we show how to improve the additive errors to $\tilde{O}(m^3/n)$, $\tilde{O}(m^{2.5}/n)$, and $\tilde{O}(m^{2.5}/\sqrt{n})$ respectively, while obtaining an approximation ratio of almost 5. This reduction utilizes the query pattern properties of the KwikSort algorithm of Ailon et al. [2008], which only needs to look at $O(m \log m)$ entries w_{ij} 's. Roughly speaking, this means that we can add a smaller amount of noise per query, leading to an improved error bound. Our results are summarized in Tables 2 and 3.

We remark that the idea of adding a smaller amount of noise when the algorithm uses fewer queries of w_{ij} 's was also suggested and empirically evaluated for the KwikSort algorithm by Hay et al. [2017]. However, they did not prove any theoretical guarantee of the algorithm. Furthermore, our algorithm differs from theirs when KwikSort exceeds the prescribed number of queries: ours outputs the DP ranking computed using the higher-error algorithm that noises all m^2 entries whereas theirs just outputs the sorted ranking so far where the unsorted part is randomly ordered. The latter is insufficient to get the additive error that we achieve because leaving even a single pair unsorted can lead to error as large as $\Omega(1)$; even if this event happens with a small probability of $1/m^{O(1)}$, the error remains at $\Omega(1/m^{O(1)})$, which does not converge to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

In addition to our algorithmic contributions, we also prove lower bounds on the additive error that roughly match the upper bounds for $n \geq \tilde{O}(m)$ in the case of pure-DP and for $n \geq \tilde{O}(\sqrt{m})$ for approximate-DP, even when the approximation ratio is allowed to be large. Our lower bounds proceed by reducing from the 1-way marginal problem and utilizing existing lower bounds for pure- and approximate-DP for the 1-way marginals problem [Hardt and Talwar, 2010, Bun et al., 2018, Steinke and Ullman, 2015, Dwork et al., 2015, Steinke and Ullman, 2017].

	α	β
ϵ -DP	$5 + \xi$	$\frac{m^3 \log m}{\epsilon n}$ (Corollary 6)
(ϵ, δ) -DP		$\frac{m^{2.5} \sqrt{\log m}}{\epsilon n} \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta}}$ (Corollary 7)
ϵ -DP	$1 + \xi$	$\frac{m^4}{\epsilon n}$ (Corollary 3)
(ϵ, δ) -DP		$\frac{m^3}{\epsilon n} \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta}}$ (Corollary 4)
ϵ -DP	1	$\frac{m^3}{\epsilon n} \log m$ (Hay et. al., 2017)

Table 2: Guarantees of different (α, β) -approximation algorithms in the *central* model; here ξ can be any positive constant. We drop the big-O notation in β for brevity. All of our algorithms run in $\text{poly}(nm)$ time, whereas the exponential mechanism (Hay et. al., 2017) runs in $O(m! \cdot n)$ time.

	α	β
ϵ -DP	$1 + \xi$	$\frac{m^3}{\epsilon \sqrt{n}}$ (Corollary 9)
ϵ -DP	$5 + \xi$	$\frac{m^{2.5} \log m}{\epsilon \sqrt{n}}$ (Corollary 12)

Table 3: Guarantees of (α, β) -approximation algorithms in the *local* model. As before, we drop the big-O notation in β .

2 Notation

Let \mathbf{w}^Π denote the $[m] \times [m]$ matrix whose (i, j) th entry is w_{ij}^Π . Note that the average Kendall tau distance can also be written as

$$K(\sigma, \Pi) = \sum_{i, j \in [m]} \mathbb{1}[\sigma(i) \leq \sigma(j)] \cdot w_{ji}^\Pi,$$

where $\mathbb{1}[\cdot]$ is the binary indicator function. Hence, we may write $K(\sigma, \mathbf{w}^\Pi)$ to denote $K(\sigma, \Pi)$ and $\text{OPT}(\mathbf{w}^\Pi)$ to denote $\text{OPT}(\Pi)$. When σ or Π are clear from the context, we may drop them for brevity.

To the best of our knowledge, all known rank aggregation algorithms only use \mathbf{w} and do not directly require the input rankings Π . The only assumption that we will make throughout is that the w_{ij} 's satisfy the *probability constraint* [Ailon et al., 2008], which means that $w_{ij} \geq 0$ and $w_{ij} + w_{ji} = 1$ for all $i, j \in [m]$ where $i \neq j$. Again, the non-private algorithms of [Ailon et al., 2008, Kenyon-Mathieu and Schudy, 2007] that we will use in this paper obtained approximation ratios under this assumption.

In fact, many algorithms do not even need to look at all of \mathbf{w} . Due to this, we focus on algorithms that allow *query* access to \mathbf{w} . Besides these queries, the algorithms do not access the input otherwise. Our generic reductions below will be stated for such algorithms.

3 Algorithms in the Central Model

In this section we present pure- and approximate-DP algorithms for rank aggregation in the central model of DP. Our algorithms follow from two generic reductions: for noising queries and for reducing the additive error.

Noising Queries. To achieve DP, we will have to add noise to the query answers. In this regard, we say that a query answering algorithm \mathcal{Q} incurs *expected error* e if for every i, j the answer \tilde{w}_{ij} returned by \mathcal{Q} satisfies $\mathbb{E}[|\tilde{w}_{ij} - w_{ij}|] \leq e$. Furthermore, we assume that \mathcal{Q} computes the estimate \tilde{w}_{ij} for all $i, j \in [m]$ (non-adaptively) but only a subset of \tilde{w}_{ij} is revealed when queried by the ranking algorithm; let $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ denote the resulting matrix of \tilde{w}_{ij} 's. In this context, we say that \mathcal{Q} satisfies (ϵ, δ) -DP for q (adaptive) queries if \mathcal{Q} can answer q such \tilde{w}_{ij} 's while respecting (ϵ, δ) -DP. In our algorithms, we only use \mathcal{Q} that adds independent Laplace or Gaussian noise to each w_{ij} to get \tilde{w}_{ij} but we state our reductions in full generality as they might be useful in the future.

3.1 Reduction I: Noising All Entries

We first give a generic reduction from a *not necessarily private* algorithm to DP algorithms. A simple form is:

Theorem 1. *Let $\alpha > 1, e, \epsilon > 0, q \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\delta \in [0, 1]$. Suppose that there exists a polynomial-time (not necessarily private) α -approximation algorithm \mathcal{A} for the rank aggregation problem that always makes at most q queries. Furthermore, suppose that there exists a polynomial-time query answering algorithm \mathcal{Q} with expected error e that is (ϵ, δ) -DP for answering at most q queries.*

Then, there exists a polynomial-time (ϵ, δ) -DP $(\alpha, (\alpha + 1)m^2e)$ -approximation algorithm \mathcal{B} for rank aggregation.

This follows from an easy fact below that the error in the cost is at most the total error from querying all pairs of i, j .

Fact 2. For any $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{w}$ and $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_m$, we have $|K(\sigma, \mathbf{w}) - K(\sigma, \tilde{\mathbf{w}})| \leq \sum_{i,j \in [m]} |w_{ji} - \tilde{w}_{ji}|$.

Proof of Theorem 1. Our algorithm \mathcal{B} simply works by running \mathcal{A} , and every time \mathcal{A} queries for a pair i, j , it returns the answer using the algorithm \mathcal{Q} . The output ranking σ is simply the output from \mathcal{A} . Since only \mathcal{Q} is accessing the input directly and from our assumption, it immediately follows that \mathcal{B} is (ϵ, δ) -DP.

Since we may view \mathcal{A} as having the input instance $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ (obtained by querying \mathcal{Q}), the α -approximation guarantee of \mathcal{A} implies that

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma[K(\sigma, \tilde{\mathbf{w}})] \leq \alpha \cdot \text{OPT}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}). \quad (1)$$

By applying Fact 2 twice, we then arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\sigma, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}}[K(\sigma, \mathbf{w})] \\ & \text{(Fact 2)} \leq m^2 e + \mathbb{E}_{\sigma, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}}[K(\sigma, \tilde{\mathbf{w}})] \\ & \text{(4)} \leq m^2 e + \alpha \cdot \text{OPT}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}) \\ & \text{(Fact 2)} \leq m^2 e + \alpha \cdot (\text{OPT}(\mathbf{w}) + m^2 e) \\ & = \alpha \cdot \text{OPT}(\mathbf{w}) + (\alpha + 1)m^2 e. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

The above reduction itself can already be applied to several algorithms, although it does not yet give the optimal additive error. As an example, we may use the (non-private) PTAS of Kenyon-Mathieu and Schudy [2007]; the PTAS requires *all* w_{ij} 's meaning that $q \leq m^2$ and thus we may let \mathcal{Q} be the algorithm that adds $\text{Lap}\left(0, \frac{m^2}{\epsilon n}\right)$ noise to each query². This immediately implies the following:

Corollary 3. For any $\xi, \epsilon > 0$, there exists an ϵ -DP $\left(1 + \xi, O_\xi\left(\frac{m^4}{\epsilon n}\right)\right)$ -approximation algorithm for the rank aggregation problem in the central model.

Similarly, if we instead add Gaussian noise with standard deviation $O\left(\frac{m}{\epsilon n} \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta}}\right)$ to each query, we arrive at the following result:

Corollary 4. For any $\xi, \epsilon, \delta > 0$, there exists an (ϵ, δ) -DP $\left(1 + \xi, O_\xi\left(\frac{m^3}{\epsilon n} \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta}}\right)\right)$ -approximation algorithm for the rank aggregation problem in the central model.

3.2 Reduction II: Improving the Additive Error

A drawback of the reduction in Theorem 1 is that it requires the algorithm to always make at most q queries. This is a fairly strong condition and it cannot be applied, e.g., to QuickSort-based algorithms that we will discuss below. We thus give another reduction that works even when the algorithm makes at most q queries *with high probability*. The specific guarantees are given below.

Theorem 5. Let $\alpha, e, \epsilon > 0, q \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\zeta, \delta \in [0, 1]$. Suppose that there exists a polynomial-time (not necessarily private) α -approximation algorithm \mathcal{A} for rank aggregation that, with probability $1 - \frac{\zeta}{m^4}$, makes at most q queries. Furthermore, suppose that there exists a polynomial-time query answering algorithm \mathcal{Q} with expected error e that is $(\epsilon/2, \delta)$ -DP for answering at most q queries.

Then, there exists a polynomial-time (ϵ, δ) -DP $(\alpha + \zeta, \beta)$ -approximation algorithm \mathcal{B} for the rank aggregation problem where $\beta = O_\alpha\left(m^2 e + \frac{1}{\epsilon n}\right)$.

²More precisely, to satisfy the probability constraints, we actually add the noise to each w_{ij} only for all $i < j$ and clip it to be between 0 and 1 to arrive at \tilde{w}_{ij} . We then let $\tilde{w}_{ji} = 1 - \tilde{w}_{ij}$.

Proof of Theorem 5. Our algorithm \mathcal{B} simply works by running \mathcal{A} , and every time \mathcal{A} queries for a pair i, j , it returns the answer using the algorithm \mathcal{Q} . If \mathcal{A} ends up using at most q queries, then it returns the output $\sigma^{\mathcal{A}}$ of \mathcal{A} . Otherwise, it runs the $\epsilon/2$ -DP algorithm from Corollary 3 with $\xi = 1$ and return its output σ^* . The (ϵ, δ) -DP guarantee of the algorithm is immediate from the assumptions and the basic composition property of DP (see, e.g., Dwork and Roth [2014]).

We next analyze the expected Kendall tau distance of the output. To do this, let \mathcal{E}_q denote the event that \mathcal{A} uses more than q queries. From our assumption, we have $\Pr[\mathcal{E}_q] \leq \zeta/m^4$. Furthermore, observe that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\sigma^{\mathcal{A}}}[K(\sigma^{\mathcal{A}}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}})] \geq \Pr[\mathcal{E}_q] \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\sigma^{\mathcal{A}}}[K(\sigma^{\mathcal{A}}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}) \mid \mathcal{E}_q]. \quad (2)$$

Now, let σ denote the output of our algorithm \mathcal{B} . We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\sigma, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}}[K(\sigma, \tilde{\mathbf{w}})] \\ & \leq \Pr[\mathcal{E}_q] \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\sigma^{\mathcal{A}}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}}[K(\sigma^{\mathcal{A}}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}) \mid \mathcal{E}_q] + \Pr[\neg \mathcal{E}_q] \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\sigma^*}[K(\sigma^*, \tilde{\mathbf{w}})] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_{\sigma^{\mathcal{A}}}[K(\sigma^{\mathcal{A}}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}})] + \frac{\zeta}{m^4} \cdot \left(2 \cdot \text{OPT}(\mathbf{w}) + O_\alpha \left(\frac{m^4}{\epsilon n} \right) \right) \\ & \leq \alpha \cdot \text{OPT}(\mathbf{w}) + O_\alpha(m^2 e) + \frac{2\zeta}{m^4} \cdot \text{OPT}(\mathbf{w}) + O_\alpha \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon n} \right) \\ & \leq (\alpha + \zeta) \cdot \text{OPT}(\mathbf{w}) + O_\alpha \left(m^2 e + \frac{1}{\epsilon n} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from (2) and the approximation guarantee of the algorithm from Corollary 3, the third inequality follows from similar computations as in the proof of Theorem 1, and the last inequality follows because we may assume w.l.o.g. that $m \geq 2$. \square

3.2.1 Concrete Bounds via KwikSort.

Ailon et al. [2008] devise an algorithm *KwikSort*, inspired by QuickSort, to determine a ranking on m candidates and they show that this algorithm yields a 5-approximation for rank aggregation. It is known in the classic sorting literature that with high probability, QuickSort (and by extension, KwikSort) performs $O(m \log m)$ comparisons on m candidates to order these m items. Specifically, with probability at least $1 - \xi/m^4$, the number of comparisons between items would be at most $q = O_\xi(m \log m)$. Plugging this into Theorem 5 where \mathcal{Q} adds Lap $(0, \frac{q}{\epsilon n})$ noise to each query, we get:

Corollary 6. *For any $\xi, \epsilon > 0$, there is an ϵ -DP $\left(5 + \xi, O_\xi \left(\frac{m^3 \log m}{\epsilon n} \right)\right)$ -approximation algorithm for the rank aggregation problem in the central model.*

If we use Gaussian noise with standard deviation $O\left(\frac{\sqrt{q}}{\epsilon n} \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta}}\right)$ instead of the Laplace noise, then we get:

Corollary 7. *For any $\xi, \epsilon, \delta > 0$, there exists an (ϵ, δ) -DP $\left(5 + \xi, O_\xi \left(\frac{m^{2.5} \sqrt{\log m}}{\epsilon n} \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right)\right)$ -approximation algorithm for the rank aggregation problem in the central model.*

Although the approximation ratios are now a larger constant (arbitrarily close to 5), the above two corollaries improve upon the additive errors in Corollaries 3 and 4 by a factor of $\tilde{\Theta}(m)$ and $\tilde{\Theta}(\sqrt{m})$ respectively.

For concreteness, we present the idea in Corollaries 6 and 7 as Algorithm 1. We use a global counter c to keep track of how many comparisons have been done. Once $c > q$ (which happens with negligible probability when we set $q = \Omega(m \log m)$), we default to using a PTAS with privacy budget of $\epsilon/2$ (Corollary 3). If $\delta > 0$, we let \mathcal{N} be the Gaussian noise with standard deviation $O_\xi\left(\frac{\sqrt{m \log m}}{\epsilon n} \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta}}\right)$ and if $\delta = 0$, we let \mathcal{N} be drawn from $\text{Lap}\left(0, O_\xi\left(\frac{m \log m}{\epsilon n}\right)\right)$.

Algorithm 1: DPKwikSort.

Parameters: $\epsilon, \delta \in (0, 1], q \in \mathbb{N}$
Input: $\Pi = \{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n\}, \mathcal{U} \subseteq [m], c \leftarrow 0$
if $\mathcal{U} = \emptyset$ **then**
 \perp **return** \emptyset
 $\mathcal{U}_L, \mathcal{U}_R \leftarrow \emptyset$
Pick a pivot $i \in \mathcal{U}$ uniformly at random
for $j \in \mathcal{U} \setminus \{i\}$ **do**
 $c \leftarrow c + 1$
 if $c > q$ **then**
 \perp Return PTAS with privacy budget of $\epsilon/2$ as final output ▷ See Corollary 3
 $\tilde{w}_{ji} \leftarrow w_{ji}^\Pi + \mathcal{N}$ ▷ See text
 if $\tilde{w}_{ji} > 0.5$ **then**
 \perp Add j to \mathcal{U}_L
 else
 \perp Add j to \mathcal{U}_R
return $\text{DPKwikSort}(\Pi, \mathcal{U}_L, c), i, \text{DPKwikSort}(\Pi, \mathcal{U}_R, c)$

4 Algorithms in the Local Model

We next consider the local model [Kasiviswanathan et al., 2011], which is more stringent than the central model. We only focus on pure-DP algorithms in the local model since there is a strong evidence³ that approximate-DP does not help improve utility in the local model [Bun et al., 2019, Joseph et al., 2019].

4.1 Reduction I: Noising All Entries

Similar to our algorithms in the central model, we start with a simple reduction that works for any non-private ranking algorithm by noising each w_{ji} . This is summarized below.

Theorem 8. *Let $\alpha > 1, \epsilon > 0$, and $\delta \in [0, 1]$. Suppose that there exists a polynomial-time (not necessarily private) α -approximation algorithm \mathcal{A} for the rank aggregation problem. Then, there exists a polynomial-time ϵ -DP $\left(\alpha, O_\alpha\left(\frac{m^3}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}}\right)\right)$ -approximation algorithm \mathcal{B} for the rank aggregation problem in the local model.*

The proof of Theorem 8 is essentially the same as that of Theorem 1 in the central model, except that we use the query answering algorithm of Duchi et al. [2014], which can answer all the

³Bun et al. [2019], Joseph et al. [2019] give a generic transformation from any *sequentially interactive* local approximate-DP protocols to a pure-DP one while retaining the utility. However, this does not apply to the full interaction setting.

m^2 entries with expected error of $O\left(\frac{m}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}}\right)$ per entry; this indeed results in $O\left(\frac{m^3}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}}\right)$ additive error in the above theorem. We remark that if one were to naively use the randomized response algorithm on each entry, the resulting error would be $O\left(\frac{m^2}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}}\right)$ per entry; in other words, Duchi et al. [2014] saves a factor of $\Theta(m)$ in the error. The full proof of Theorem 8 is deferred to the Supplementary Material (SM).

Plugging the PTAS of Kenyon-Mathieu and Schudy [2007] into Theorem 8, we arrive at the following:

Corollary 9. *For any $\xi, \epsilon > 0$, there exists an ϵ -local DP $\left(1 + \xi, O_\xi\left(\frac{m^3}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}}\right)\right)$ -approximation algorithm for the rank aggregation problem in the local model.*

4.2 Reduction II: Improving the Additive Error

Similar to the algorithm in the central model, intuitively, it should be possible to reveal only the required queries while adding a smaller amount of noise. Formalizing this, however, is more challenging because the algorithm of Duchi et al. [2014] that we use is *non-interactive* in nature, meaning that it reveals the information about the entire vector at once, in contrast to the Laplace or Gaussian mechanisms for which we can add noise and reveal each entry as the algorithm progresses. Fortunately, Bassily [2019] provides an algorithm that has accuracy similar to Duchi et al. [2014] but also works in the adaptive setting. However, even Bassily’s algorithm does not directly work in our setting yet: the answers of latter queries depend on that of previous queries and thus we cannot define $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ directly as we did in the proof of Theorem 5.

4.2.1 Modifying Bassily’s Algorithm.

We start by modifying the algorithm of Bassily [2019] so that it fits in the “query answering algorithm” definition we used earlier in the central model. However, while the previous algorithms can always support up to q queries, the new algorithm will only be able to do so with high probability. That is, it is allowed to output \perp with a small probability. This is formalized below.

Lemma 10. *For any $\epsilon, \zeta > 0$ and $q > 10m \log m$, there exists an ϵ -DP query-answering algorithm \mathcal{Q} in the local model such that*

- *If we consider \perp as having zero error, its expected error per query is at most $O\left(\frac{q}{\epsilon\sqrt{nm}}\right)$.*
- *For any (possibly adaptive) sequence i_1j_1, \dots, i_qj_q of queries, the probability that \mathcal{Q} outputs \perp on any of the queries is at most $\exp(-0.1q/m)$.*

For simplicity of the presentation, we assume that n is divisible by m . We remark that this is without loss of generality as otherwise we can imagine having “dummy” $t < m$ users so that $n + t$ is divisible by m , where these dummy users do not contribute to the queries.

The algorithm is simple: it randomly partitions the n users into sets $\mathcal{P}_1, \dots, \mathcal{P}_m$. Then, on each query ji , it uses a *random* set to answer the query (via the *Randomized Response* mechanism [Warner, 1965]) with ϵ_0 -DP where $\epsilon_0 = 0.5em/q$. Finally, the algorithm outputs \perp if that particular set has already been used at least $2q/m$ times previously.

We remark that the main difference between the original algorithm of Bassily [2019] and our version is that the former partitions the users into q sets and use the t th set to answer the t th query. This unfortunately means that an answer to a query ji may depend on which order it was asked, which renders our utility analysis of DP ranking algorithms invalid because $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ is not well

defined. Our modification overcomes this issue since the partition used for each ji (denoted by $\ell(j, i)$ below) is independently chosen among the m sets.

Proof of Lemma 10. The full algorithm is described in Algorithm 2; here $(\mathcal{P}_1, \dots, \mathcal{P}_m)$ is a random partition where each set consists of n/m users and $\ell(j, i)$ is i.i.d. uniformly at random from $[m]$. Moreover, c is a vector of counters, where $c(p)$ is initialized to zero for all $p \in [m]$.

Algorithm 2: ϵ -DP Adaptive Query Answering Algorithm in the Local Model.

Parameters: $\epsilon > 0, q \in \mathbb{N}$, Partition $(\mathcal{P}_1, \dots, \mathcal{P}_m)$ of $[n]$, $\ell : [m] \times [m] \rightarrow [m]$

Input: $\Pi = \{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n\}, c : [m] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$

$\epsilon_0 \leftarrow 0.5\epsilon m/q$

$d_\epsilon \leftarrow \frac{\epsilon^{\epsilon_0} + 1}{\epsilon^{\epsilon_0} - 1}$

for user $k \in \mathcal{P}_{\ell(j,i)}$ **do**

$c(\ell(j, i)) \leftarrow c(\ell(j, i)) + 1$
if $c(\ell(j, i)) > 2q/m$ **then**
 \perp **return** \perp
 $w_{ji}^k = \mathbb{1}[\pi_k(j) < \pi_k(i)]$
 Let $\tilde{w}_{ji}^k \leftarrow \begin{cases} d_\epsilon & \text{w.p. } 1/2 \cdot (1 + w_{ji}^k/d_\epsilon) \\ -d_\epsilon & \text{w.p. } 1/2 \cdot (1 - w_{ji}^k/d_\epsilon) \end{cases}$

return $\tilde{w}_{ji} := \frac{m}{n} \cdot \sum_{k \in \mathcal{P}_{\ell(j,i)}} \tilde{w}_{ji}^k$

We will now prove the algorithm's privacy guarantee. Let us consider a user k ; suppose that this user belongs to \mathcal{P}_ℓ . By definition of the algorithm, this user applies the Randomized Response algorithm at most $2q/m$ times throughout the entire run. Since each application is ϵ_0 -DP (see, e.g., [Kasiviswanathan et al., 2011]), basic composition of DP ensures that the entire algorithm is $(2q/m) \cdot \epsilon_0 = \epsilon$ -DP.

We next analyze its accuracy guarantee. Fix a query ji . For every user $k \in [n]$, let B_k denote $\mathbb{1}[k \in \mathcal{P}_{\ell(j,i)}]$. Notice that $\tilde{w}_{ji} = \sum_{k \in [n]} \frac{m}{n} \cdot B_k \cdot \tilde{w}_{ji}^k$ and $\mathbb{E}[B_k \cdot \tilde{w}_{ji}^k] = \frac{1}{m} \cdot w_{ji}^k$. Thus, we have $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{w}_{ji}] = w_{ji}$. Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(\tilde{w}_{ji}) &= \left(\frac{m}{n}\right)^2 \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in [n]} \text{Var}(B_k \cdot \tilde{w}_{ji}^k) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{1 \leq k < k' \leq n} \text{Cov}(B_k \cdot \tilde{w}_{ji}^k, B_{k'} \cdot \tilde{w}_{ji}^{k'}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Observe that $\text{Var}(B_k \cdot \tilde{w}_{ji}^k) \leq \mathbb{E}[(B_k \cdot \tilde{w}_{ji}^k)^2] = d_\epsilon^2/m = O\left(\frac{1}{m\epsilon_0^2}\right) = O\left(\frac{q^2}{m^3\epsilon^2}\right)$. Moreover, since \mathcal{P}_ℓ is a random subset of n/m users, B_k and $B_{k'}$ are negatively correlated, meaning that $\text{Cov}(B_k \cdot \tilde{w}_{ji}^k, B_{k'} \cdot \tilde{w}_{ji}^{k'}) \leq 0$. Plugging these back into (3) yields $\text{Var}(\tilde{w}_{ji}) \leq O\left(\frac{q^2}{nm\epsilon^2}\right)$. This, together with the fact that \tilde{w}_{ji} is an unbiased estimator of w_{ji} , implies that $\mathbb{E}[|\tilde{w}_{ji} - w_{ji}|] \leq O\left(\frac{q}{\epsilon\sqrt{nm}}\right)$ as desired.

Finally, we bound the probability that the algorithm outputs \perp . Since the $\ell(j, i)$'s are i.i.d. drawn from $[m]$, we can apply the Chernoff bound and the union bound (over the m partitions) to conclude that the probability that any sequence of q queries will trigger the algorithm to return \perp is at most $m \cdot \exp(-q/(3m)) \leq \exp(-0.1q/m)$, where the inequality follows from our assumption that $q \geq 10m \log m$. \square

4.2.2 The Reduction.

Having described and analyzed the modified version of Bassily’s algorithm, we can now describe the main properties of the second reduction in the local model:

Theorem 11. *Let $\alpha, \epsilon > 0, q \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\zeta, \delta \in [0, 1]$ such that $q \geq 10m \log(m/\zeta)$. Suppose that there exists a polynomial-time (not necessarily private) α -approximation algorithm \mathcal{A} for the rank aggregation problem that with probability $1 - \frac{\zeta}{m^\delta}$ makes at most q queries.*

Then, there is a polynomial-time ϵ -DP $(\alpha + \zeta, \beta)$ -approximation algorithm \mathcal{B} for the rank aggregation problem where $\beta = O_\alpha \left(\frac{m^{1.5}q}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}} \right)$ in the local model.

The proof of Theorem 11 follows its counterpart in the central model (Theorem 5); the main difference is that, instead of stopping after q queries previously, we stop upon seeing \perp (in which case we run the PTAS from Corollary 9). The full proof is deferred to SM.

As in the central model, if we apply the concrete bounds for the KwikSort algorithm (which yields 5-approximation and requires $O(m \log m)$ queries w.h.p.) to Theorem 11, we arrive at the following corollary:

Corollary 12. *For any $\xi, \epsilon > 0$, there is an ϵ -DP $\left(5 + \xi, O_\xi \left(\frac{m^{2.5} \log m}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}} \right)\right)$ -approximation algorithm for the rank aggregation problem in the local model.*

For concreteness, we also provide the full description in Algorithm 3. Again, similar to the setting of Algorithm 2, we pick $(\mathcal{P}_1, \dots, \mathcal{P}_m)$ to be a random partition where each set consists of n/m users and $\ell(j, i)$ i.i.d. uniformly at random from $[m]$, and we initialize $c(p) = 0$ for all $p \in [m]$. Here τ is the threshold that is set to be $\Omega(\log m)$.

Algorithm 3: LDPKwikSort.

Parameters: $\epsilon > 0, \tau > 0$, Partition $(\mathcal{P}_1, \dots, \mathcal{P}_m)$ of $[n]$, $\ell \leftarrow [m] \times [m] \rightarrow [m]$
Input: $\Pi = \{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n\}, \mathcal{U} \subseteq [m], c : [m] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$
if $\mathcal{U} = \emptyset$ **then**
 return \emptyset
 $\mathcal{U}_L, \mathcal{U}_R \leftarrow \emptyset$
Pick a pivot $i \in \mathcal{U}$ uniformly at random
for $j \in \mathcal{U} \setminus \{i\}$ **do**
 for user $k \in \mathcal{P}_{\ell(j,i)}$ **do**
 $c(\ell(j, i)) \leftarrow c(\ell(j, i)) + 1$
 if $c(\ell(j, i)) > \tau$ **then**
 Run (local) PTAS with privacy budget of $\epsilon/2$ ▷ See Corollary 9
 $\tilde{w}_{ji}^k \leftarrow \begin{cases} d_\epsilon & \text{w.p. } 1/2 \cdot (1 + w_{ji}^k/d_\epsilon) \\ -d_\epsilon & \text{w.p. } 1/2 \cdot (1 - w_{ji}^k/d_\epsilon) \end{cases}$
 $\tilde{w}_{ji} \leftarrow \frac{m}{n} \cdot \sum_{k \in \mathcal{P}_{\ell(j,i)}} \tilde{w}_{ji}^k$
 if $\tilde{w}_{ji} > 1/2$ **then**
 Add j to \mathcal{U}_L
 else
 Add j to \mathcal{U}_R
return LDPKwikSort(Π, \mathcal{U}_L, c), i , LDPKwikSort(Π, \mathcal{U}_R, c)

5 Lower Bounds

To describe our lower bounds, recall that the “trivial” additive error that is achieved by outputting an *arbitrary* ranking is $O(m^2)$. In this sense, our algorithms achieve “non-trivial” additive error when $n \geq \tilde{O}(m/\epsilon)$ for pure-DP (Corollary 6) and $n \geq \tilde{O}(\sqrt{m}/\epsilon)$ for approximate-DP (Corollary 7) in the central model and when $n \geq \tilde{O}(m/\epsilon^2)$ in the local model (Corollary 12). In this section we show that this is essentially the best possible, even when the multiplicative approximation ratio is allowed to be large. Specifically, we show the following results for pure-DP and approximate-DP respectively in the *central* model.

Theorem 13. *For any $\alpha, \epsilon > 0$, there is no ϵ -DP $(\alpha, 0.01m^2)$ -approximation algorithm for rank aggregation in the central model for $n = o(m/\epsilon)$.*

Theorem 14. *For any constant $\alpha > 0$ and any $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$, there exists $c > 0$ (depending on α) such that there is no $(1, o(1/n))$ -DP (α, cm^2) -approximation algorithm for rank aggregation in the central model for $n = o(\sqrt{m}/\epsilon)$.*

We stress that any lower bound in the central model also applies to DP algorithms in the local model. Specifically, the sample complexity in Theorem 13 also matches that in Corollary 12 to within a factor of $O(1/\epsilon)$.

Due to space constraints, we will only describe high-level ideas here. The full proofs are deferred to SM.

Proof Overview: Connection to (1-Way) Marginals. We will describe the intuition behind the proofs of Theorems 13 and 14. At the heart of the proofs, we essentially reduce from the 1-way marginal problem. For $d, t \in \mathbb{N}$, let $x \mapsto \pi_{d,t}^x$ denote the mapping from $\{-1, +1\}^d$ to \mathbb{S}_{2d+t} defined by $\pi_{d,t}^x(\ell) = \ell$ for all $\ell \in \{d+1, \dots, d+t\}$ and

$$\pi_{d,t}^x(j) := \begin{cases} j & \text{if } x_j = 1 \\ j + d + t & \text{if } x_j = -1, \end{cases}$$

$$\pi_{d,t}^x(j + d + t) := \begin{cases} j + d + t & \text{if } x_j = 1 \\ j & \text{if } x_j = -1, \end{cases}$$

for all $j \in [d]$. In words, $\pi_{d,t}^x$ is an ordering where we start from the identity and switch the positions of j and $j + d + t$ if $x_j = +1$.

Recall that in the *(1-way) marginal problem*, we are given vectors $x^1, \dots, x^n \in \{-1, +1\}^d$ and the goal is to determine $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} x^i$. The connection between this problem and the rank aggregation problem is that a “good” aggregated rank on $\pi_{d,t}^{x^1}, \dots, \pi_{d,t}^{x^n}$ must “correspond” to a d -dimensional vector whose sign is similar to the 1-way marginal. To formalize this, let us define the “inverse” operation of $x \mapsto \pi_{d,t}^x$, which we denote by $\rho_{d,t} : \mathbb{S}_{2d+t} \rightarrow \{-1, +1\}^d$ as follows:

$$\rho_{d,t}(\pi)_j = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } \pi(j) < \pi(j + d + t) \\ +1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The aforementioned observation can now be formalized:

Observation 15. For any $x^1, \dots, x^n \in \{-1, +1\}^d$ and any $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_{2d}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & K(\sigma, \{\pi_{d,t}^{x^1}, \dots, \pi_{d,t}^{x^n}\}) \\ & \geq t \left(\frac{d}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \rho_{d,t}(\sigma), \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} x^i \right\rangle \right). \end{aligned}$$

The “inverse” of the above statement is not exactly true, since we have not accounted for the inversions of elements in $\{1, \dots, d+1, d+t+1, \dots, 2d+t\}$. Nonetheless, this only contributes at most $2d^2$ to the number of inversions and we can prove the following:

Observation 16. For any $x^1, \dots, x^n, y \in \{\pm 1\}^d$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & K(\pi_{d,t}^y, \{\pi_{d,t}^{x^1}, \dots, \pi_{d,t}^{x^n}\}) \\ & \leq t \left(\frac{d}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \left\langle y, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} x^i \right\rangle \right) + 2d^2. \end{aligned}$$

Ignoring the additive $2d^2$ term, Observations 16 and 15 intuitively tell us that if the 1-way marginal is hard for DP algorithms, then so is rank aggregation.

Pure-DP For pure-DP, it is now relatively simple to apply the packing framework of Hardt and Talwar [2010] for proving a DP lower bound: we can simply pick $x^1 = \dots = x^n$ to be a codeword from an error-correcting code. Observation 15 tells us that this is also a good packing for the Kendall tau metric, which immediately implies Theorem 13.

Approximate-DP Although there are multiple lower bounds for 1-way marginals in the approximate-DP setting (e.g., [Bun et al., 2018, Steinke and Ullman, 2015, Dwork et al., 2015, Steinke and Ullman, 2017]), it does not immediately give a lower bound for the rank aggregation problem because our observations only allow us to recover the *signs* of the marginals, but not their *values*. Fortunately, it is known that signs are already enough to violate privacy [Dwork et al., 2015, Steinke and Ullman, 2017] and thus we can reduce from these results⁴. Another complication comes from the additive $O(d^2)$ term in Observation 16. However, it turns out that we can overcome this by simply picking t to be sufficiently large so that this additive factor is small when compared to the optimum.

6 Other Related Work

In many disciplines (especially in social choice), rank aggregation appears in many different forms with applications to collaborative filtering and more general social computing [Cohen et al., 1999, Pennock et al., 2000, Dwork et al., 2001]. It has been shown previously by Arrow [1963] that no voting rule (on at least three candidates) can satisfy certain criteria at once. To circumvent such impossibility results, we could rely on relaxed criteria such as the Condorcet [Young and Levenglick, 1978, Young, 1995] condition, where we pick a candidate that beats all others in head-to-head comparisons. The Kemeny ranking [Kemeny and Snell, 1962] can be used to obtain a Condorcet

⁴Another advantage of [Dwork et al., 2015, Steinke and Ullman, 2017] is that their the marginal distributions are flexible; indeed, we need distributions which have large standard deviation (i.e., mean is close to -1 or $+1$) in order to get a large approximation ratio.

winner (if one exists) and also rank candidates in such a way as to minimize disagreements between the rankings from the voters. The Kemeny ranking problem is NP-hard even for four voters [Bartholdi et al., 1989, Cohen et al., 1999, Dwork et al., 2001]. To overcome this, computationally efficient approximation algorithms have been devised [de Borda, 1781, Diaconis and Graham, 1977, Conitzer et al., 2006, Kenyon-Mathieu and Schudy, 2007, Ailon et al., 2008]. Our results rely on such algorithms.

In correlation clustering [Bansal et al., 2004], we are given a graph whose edges are labeled green or red. The goal is to find a clustering that minimizes the number of pairwise disagreements with the input graph, i.e., the number of intra-cluster red edges and inter-cluster green edges. Correlation clustering is closely related to ranking problems (see e.g., [Ailon et al., 2008]). Bun et al. [2021] recently tackled correlation clustering under DP constraints, although their notion of neighboring datasets—roughly corresponding to changing an edge—is very different than ours.

7 Conclusion & Future Work

In this work, we have provided several DP algorithms and lower bounds for the rank aggregation problem in the central and local models. Since each of our algorithms achieves either the near-optimal approximation ratio or the near-optimal additive error (but not both), an immediate open question here is if one can get the best of both worlds.

Furthermore, recall that our local DP algorithm in Corollary 12 requires interactivity, which seems inherent for any QuickSort-style algorithms. It is interesting if one can achieve similar guarantees with a *non-interactive* local DP algorithm. We point out that separations between interactive and non-interactive local models are known (see, e.g., [Dagan and Feldman, 2020] and the references therein); thus, it is possible that such a separation exists for rank aggregation. Lastly, it is interesting to see if we can extend our results to other related problems—such as consensus and correlation clustering—that rely on the (weighted) minimum FAST problem for their non-private approximation algorithms.

References

- Nir Ailon, Moses Charikar, and Alantha Newman. Aggregating inconsistent information: Ranking and clustering. *J. ACM*, 55(5):23:1–23:27, 2008.
- K.J. Arrow. *Social Choice and Individual Values*. Wiley, 1963.
- Nikhil Bansal, Avrim Blum, and Shuchi Chawla. Correlation clustering. *Mach. Learn.*, 56(1-3): 89–113, 2004. URL <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:MACH.0000033116.57574.95>.
- J. Bartholdi, C. A. Tovey, and M. A. Trick. Voting schemes for which it can be difficult to tell who won the election. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 6(2):157–165, 1989. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00303169>.
- Raef Bassily. Linear queries estimation with local differential privacy. In *AISTATS*, pages 721–729, 2019. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v89/bassily19a.html>.
- Mark Bun, Jonathan R. Ullman, and Salil P. Vadhan. Fingerprinting codes and the price of approximate differential privacy. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 47(5):1888–1938, 2018. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/15M1033587>.
- Mark Bun, Jelani Nelson, and Uri Stemmer. Heavy hitters and the structure of local privacy. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 15(4):51:1–51:40, 2019. doi: 10.1145/3344722. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3344722>.
- Mark Bun, Marek Eliás, and Janardhan Kulkarni. Differentially private correlation clustering. In *ICML*, volume 139, pages 1136–1146. PMLR, 2021. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v139/bun21a.html>.
- William W. Cohen, Robert E. Schapire, and Yoram Singer. Learning to order things. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, 10:243–270, 1999. URL <https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.587>.
- Vincent Conitzer, Andrew J. Davenport, and Jayant Kalagnanam. Improved bounds for computing Kemeny rankings. In *AAAI*, pages 620–626, 2006. URL <http://www.aaai.org/Library/AAAI/2006/aaai06-099.php>.
- Yuval Dagan and Vitaly Feldman. Interaction is necessary for distributed learning with privacy or communication constraints. In *STOC*, pages 450–462. ACM, 2020. doi: 10.1145/3357713.3384315. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3357713.3384315>.
- Jean-Charles de Borda. Mémoire sur les élections au scrutin. *Histoire de l’Académie Royale des Sciences*, 1781.
- Persi Diaconis and R. L. Graham. Spearman’s footrule as a measure of disarray. *JRS Series B (Methodological)*, 39(2):262–268, 1977. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1977.tb01624.x>.
- John Duchi and Ryan Rogers. Lower bounds for locally private estimation via communication complexity. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1161–1191, 2019.
- John C. Duchi, Michael I. Jordan, and Martin J. Wainwright. Local privacy, data processing inequalities, and statistical minimax rates, 2014.

- Cynthia Dwork and Aaron Roth. The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy. *Foundations and Trends in Theoretical Computer Science*, 9(3-4):211–407, 2014.
- Cynthia Dwork, Ravi Kumar, Moni Naor, and D. Sivakumar. Rank aggregation methods for the Web. In *WWW*, pages 613–622, 2001. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/371920.372165>.
- Cynthia Dwork, Krishnaram Kenthapadi, Frank McSherry, Ilya Mironov, and Moni Naor. Our data, ourselves: Privacy via distributed noise generation. In *EUROCRYPT*, pages 486–503, 2006a. doi: 10.1007/11761679_29. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/11761679_29.
- Cynthia Dwork, Frank McSherry, Kobbi Nissim, and Adam D. Smith. Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis. In *TCC*, pages 265–284, 2006b.
- Cynthia Dwork, Adam D. Smith, Thomas Steinke, Jonathan R. Ullman, and Salil P. Vadhan. Robust traceability from trace amounts. In *FOCS*, pages 650–669, 2015. doi: 10.1109/FOCS.2015.46. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2015.46>.
- M. A. Fligner and J. S. Verducci. Distance based ranking models. *JRS Series B (Methodological)*, 48(3):359–369, 1986. ISSN 00359246. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2345433>.
- Moritz Hardt and Kunal Talwar. On the geometry of differential privacy. In *STOC*, pages 705–714, 2010. doi: 10.1145/1806689.1806786. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/1806689.1806786>.
- Michael Hay, Liudmila Elagina, and Gerome Miklau. Differentially private rank aggregation. In *SDM*, pages 669–677, 2017.
- Matthew Joseph, Jieming Mao, Seth Neel, and Aaron Roth. The role of interactivity in local differential privacy. In *FOCS*, pages 94–105. IEEE Computer Society, 2019. doi: 10.1109/FOCS.2019.00015. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2019.00015>.
- Shiva Prasad Kasiviswanathan, Homin K. Lee, Kobbi Nissim, Sofya Raskhodnikova, and Adam D. Smith. What can we learn privately? *SIAM J. Comput.*, 40(3):793–826, 2011. doi: 10.1137/090756090. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/090756090>.
- John G. Kemeny and James Laurie Snell. *Mathematical Models in the Social Sciences*. MIT Press, 1962.
- Claire Kenyon-Mathieu and Warren Schudy. How to rank with few errors. In *STOC*, pages 95–103, 2007. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/1250790.1250806>.
- Ao Liu, Yun Lu, Lirong Xia, and Vassilis Zikas. How private are commonly-used voting rules? In *UAI*, pages 629–638, 2020.
- C. L. Mallows. Non-null ranking models. I. *Biometrika*, 44(1/2):114–130, 1957. ISSN 00063444. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2333244>.
- Bhushan Mandhani and Marina Meila. Tractable search for learning exponential models of rankings. In *AISTATS*, pages 392–399, 2009. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v5/mandhani09a.html>.
- Behrooz Mansouri, Richard Zanibbi, and Douglas W. Oard. Learning to rank for mathematical formula retrieval. In *SIGIR*, pages 952–961, 2021. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3404835.3462956>.

Frank McSherry and Kunal Talwar. Mechanism design via differential privacy. In *FOCS*, pages 94–103, 2007.

Marina Meila, Kapil Phadnis, Arthur Patterson, and Jeff A. Bilmes. Consensus ranking under the exponential model. In *UAI*, pages 285–294, 2007. URL https://dslpitt.org/uai/displayArticleDetails.jsp?mmnu=1&smnu=2&article_id=1701&proceeding_i

David M. Pennock, Eric Horvitz, and C. Lee Giles. Social choice theory and recommender systems: Analysis of the axiomatic foundations of collaborative filtering. In *AAAI*, pages 729–734, 2000. URL <http://www.aaai.org/Library/AAAI/2000/aaai00-112.php>.

Frans Schalekamp and Anke van Zuylen. Rank aggregation: Together we’re strong. In *ALLENEX*, pages 38–51, 2009. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611972894.4>.

Thomas Steinke and Jonathan Ullman. Tight lower bounds for differentially private selection. In *FOCS*, pages 552–563, 2017.

Thomas Steinke and Jonathan R. Ullman. Interactive fingerprinting codes and the hardness of preventing false discovery. In *COLT*, pages 1588–1628, 2015. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v40/Steinke15.html>.

Thomas Steinke and Jonathan R. Ullman. Between pure and approximate differential privacy. *J. Priv. Confidentiality*, 7(2), 2016. doi: 10.29012/jpc.v7i2.648. URL <https://doi.org/10.29012/jpc.v7i2.648>.

Stanley L. Warner. Randomized response: A survey technique for eliminating evasive answer bias. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 60(309):63–69, 1965.

Martin Wistuba and Tejaswini Pedapati. Learning to rank learning curves. In *ICML*, pages 10303–10312, 2020. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v119/wistuba20a.html>.

Ziqi Yan, Gang Li, and Jiqiang Liu. Private rank aggregation under local differential privacy. *Int. J. Intell. Syst.*, 35(10):1492–1519, 2020.

H. P. Young and A. Levenglick. A consistent extension of Condorcet’s election principle. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 35(2):285–300, 1978. ISSN 00361399.

Peyton Young. Optimal voting rules. *J. Econ. Persp.*, 9(1):51–64, March 1995. doi: 10.1257/jep.9.1.51.

Supplementary Material

A Missing Proofs from Section “Algorithms in the Local Model”

A.1 Proof of Theorem 8

To prove Theorem 8, we need the following algorithm for estimating an aggregated vector, due to Duchi et al. [2014].

Lemma 17 (Duchi et al. [2014]). *Suppose that each user i 's input is a vector $\mathbf{v}^i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\|\mathbf{v}^i\|_2 \leq C$. Then, there exists an ϵ -local DP algorithm that calculates an estimate $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}$ of the average of the input vectors $\mathbf{s} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{v}^i$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{s} - \tilde{\mathbf{s}}\|_2^2] \leq O\left(\frac{C^2 d}{\epsilon^2 n}\right).$$

Proof of Theorem 8. Each user ℓ 's view of its own ranking π_ℓ is an m^2 -dimensional vector \mathbf{v}^ℓ whose (j, i) -entry is $\mathbf{1}[\pi_\ell(j) < \pi_\ell(i)]$; we have $\|\mathbf{v}^\ell\|_2 \leq m$ for $d = m^2$. Notice that the average of these vectors is exactly \mathbf{w} . We can thus use the ϵ -local DP algorithm in Lemma 17 to compute its estimate $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$. Finally, we run \mathcal{A} on $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ and output the ranking found.

The privacy guarantee of the algorithm follows from that of Lemma 17 and the post-processing property of DP.

The α -approximation guarantee of \mathcal{A} implies that

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma[K(\sigma, \tilde{\mathbf{w}})] \leq \alpha \cdot \text{OPT}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}). \quad (4)$$

Furthermore, we may use the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality together with the utility guarantee of Lemma 17 to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i,j \in [m]} |w_{ji} - \tilde{w}_{ji}|\right] &\leq m \cdot \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{w} - \tilde{\mathbf{w}}\|_2^2]} \\ &\stackrel{\text{(Lemma 17)}}{\leq} m \cdot \sqrt{O\left(\frac{m^2 \cdot m^2}{\epsilon^2 n}\right)} \\ &= O\left(\frac{m^3}{\epsilon \sqrt{n}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

We may now finish the proof similar to that of Theorem 1 where $e := O\left(\frac{m^3}{\epsilon \sqrt{n}}\right)$. By applying Fact 2 twice, we then arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{\sigma, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}}[K(\sigma, \mathbf{w})] \\ &\stackrel{\text{(Fact 2)}}{\leq} e + \mathbb{E}_{\sigma, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}}[K(\sigma, \tilde{\mathbf{w}})] \\ &\stackrel{(4)}{\leq} m^2 e + \alpha \cdot \text{OPT}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}) \\ &\stackrel{\text{(Fact 2)}}{\leq} e + \alpha \cdot (\text{OPT}(\mathbf{w}) + e) \\ &= \alpha \cdot \text{OPT}(\mathbf{w}) + (\alpha + 1)e. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

A.2 Proof of Theorem 11

Before we prove Theorem 11, we remark that, in the regime of large $q = \omega(m \log m)$, it is possible to improve the error guarantees in Lemma 10 and Theorem 11 to $O\left(\frac{\sqrt{q \log m}}{\epsilon \sqrt{n}}\right)$ and $O\left(\frac{m^2 \sqrt{q \log m}}{\epsilon \sqrt{n}}\right)$, respectively. This can be done by partitioning the users into $\Theta(q/\log m)$ sets instead of m sets as currently done. However, this improvement does not effect our final additive error bound in Corollary 12 (which only uses $q = O(m \log m)$) and thus we choose to present a simpler version where the number of sets in the partition is fixed to m .

Proof of Theorem 11. Our algorithm \mathcal{B} simply works by running \mathcal{A} , and every time \mathcal{A} queries for a pair i, j , we return the answer using the $\epsilon/2$ -DP algorithm \mathcal{Q} from Lemma 10. If \mathcal{Q} never returns \perp , then we return the output $\sigma^{\mathcal{A}}$ of \mathcal{A} . Otherwise, we run the $\epsilon/2$ -DP algorithm from Corollary 9 with $\xi = 1$ and return its output σ^* . The ϵ -DP guarantee of the algorithm is immediate from the assumptions and the basic DP composition.

We next analyze the expected Kendall tau distance of the output. Notice that, for the purpose of accuracy analysis, we may view Algorithm 2 as producing \tilde{w}_{ji} for all $j, i \in [m]$ (even those not queried); thus we may view the algorithm \mathcal{A} as running on this $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ whenever it does not receive \perp from \mathcal{Q} . Let \mathcal{E}_q denote the event that \mathcal{A} uses more than q queries and let \mathcal{E}_\perp denote the event that \mathcal{Q} outputs \perp on one of the queries. From our assumption, we have $\Pr[\mathcal{E}_q] \leq \zeta/m^4$; moreover, Lemma 10 states that $\Pr[\mathcal{E}_\perp \mid \mathcal{E}_q] \leq \exp(-0.1q/m) \leq \zeta/m^4$. Combining these, we have that $\Pr[\mathcal{E}_\perp] \leq 2\zeta/m^4$. Furthermore,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\sigma^{\mathcal{A}}}[K(\sigma^{\mathcal{A}}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}})] \geq \Pr[\mathcal{E}_\perp] \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\sigma^{\mathcal{A}}}[K(\sigma^{\mathcal{A}}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}) \mid \mathcal{E}_\perp]. \quad (5)$$

Now, let σ denote the output of our algorithm \mathcal{B} . We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\sigma, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}}[K(\sigma, \tilde{\mathbf{w}})] \\ & \leq \Pr[\mathcal{E}_\perp] \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\sigma^{\mathcal{A}}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}}[K(\sigma^{\mathcal{A}}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}) \mid \mathcal{E}_\perp] + \Pr[\neg \mathcal{E}_\perp] \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\sigma^*}[K(\sigma^*, \tilde{\mathbf{w}})] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_{\sigma^{\mathcal{A}}}[K(\sigma^{\mathcal{A}}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}})] + \frac{2\zeta}{m^4} \cdot \left(2 \cdot \text{OPT}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}) + O_\alpha\left(\frac{m^3}{\epsilon \sqrt{n}}\right)\right) \\ & \leq \alpha \cdot \text{OPT}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}) + O_\alpha\left(m^2 \cdot \frac{q}{\epsilon \sqrt{nm}}\right) + \frac{2\zeta}{m^4} \cdot \text{OPT}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}) \\ & \leq (\alpha + \zeta) \cdot \text{OPT}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}) + O_\alpha\left(\frac{m^{1.5}q}{\epsilon \sqrt{n}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from (5) and the approximation guarantee of the algorithm from Corollary 3, the third inequality follows from similar computations as in the proof of Theorem 1 but with the accuracy guarantee from Lemma 10 and the last inequality follows because we may assume w.l.o.g. that $m \geq 2$. \square

B Missing proofs from Section “Lower Bounds”

B.1 Proofs of Observations 15 and 16

Proof of Observation 15. Consider $K(\sigma, \pi_{d,t}^{x^i})$. Notice that $\rho_{d,t}(\sigma)_j \neq x_j^i$ iff r_j, r_{j+d} occurs in different orders in r compared to $\pi_{d,t}^{x^i}$. When this occurs, it contributes to at least t inversions (of the middle fixed elements). As a result, we can conclude that

$$K(\sigma, \pi_{d,t}^{x^i}) \geq \sum_{j \in [d]} t \cdot \mathbf{1}[\rho_{d,t}(\sigma)_j \neq x_j^i]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{j \in [d]} t \cdot \frac{1}{2} (1 - \rho_{d,t}(\sigma)_j \cdot x_j^i) \\
&= t \left(\frac{d}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \langle \rho_{d,t}(\sigma), x^i \rangle \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the average over all $i \in [n]$ yields the claimed bound. \square

Proof of Observation 16. This follows from observing that the proof of Observation 15 already exactly counts all inversions except those between the elements $\{1, \dots, d+1, d+t+1, \dots, 2d+t\}$, and the latter contributes at most $2d^2$ inversions. \square

B.2 Lower Bound for Pure-DP in the Central Model

The pure DP case (in the central model) is the easiest to handle, as we can simply apply a packing argument with $x^1 = \dots = x^n$ being a codeword in an error-correcting code, which already circumvents the two “issues” discussed above.

Proof of Theorem 13. We assume w.l.o.g. that m is divisible by 3, and let $d = t = m/3$. Let $a_1, \dots, a_T \in \{-1, +1\}^d$ denote an error-correcting code with distance at least $0.49d$; it is known that there exists such a code with $T = \exp(\Omega(d))$.

Now, let \mathcal{A} be any ϵ -DP $(\alpha, 0.01m^2)$ -approximation algorithm for the rank aggregation problem. Let D^i denote the dataset that includes n copies of $\pi_{d,t}^{a^i}$. Notice that $\text{OPT}(D^i) = 0$; thus we have $\mathbb{E}_{\sigma \sim \mathcal{A}(D^i)}[K(\sigma, D^i)] \leq 0.01m^2$. Define $S^i := \{\sigma \mid K(\sigma, D^i) \leq 0.02m^2\}$. From Markov’s inequality, we have $\Pr_{\sigma \sim \mathcal{A}(D^i)}[\sigma \in S^i] \geq 0.5$. Now, consider any distinct $i, i' \in [T]$ and $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_m$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&K(\sigma, D^i) + K(\sigma, D^{i'}) \\
\text{(Observation 15)} &\geq d \left(d + \frac{1}{2} \langle \rho_{d,t}(\sigma), a^i + a^{i'} \rangle \right) \\
&\geq d \left(d - \frac{1}{2} \|\rho_{d,t}(\sigma)\|_\infty \|a^i + a^{i'}\|_1 \right) \\
&= d \left(d - \frac{1}{2} \|a^i + a^{i'}\|_1 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Now, from the distance guarantee of the error-correcting code, we have $\|a^i + a^{i'}\|_1 \leq 2(0.51d)$. Plugging this back into the above, we have

$$K(\sigma, D^i) + K(\sigma, D^{i'}) \geq 0.49d^2 > 0.04m^2.$$

This means that $S^i, S^{i'}$ are disjoint. As such, we have

$$1 \geq \sum_{i \in [T]} \Pr_{\sigma \sim \mathcal{A}(\emptyset)}[\sigma \in S^i] \geq \sum_{i \in [T]} e^{-\epsilon n} \Pr_{\sigma \sim \mathcal{A}(D^i)}[\sigma \in S^i] \geq \sum_{i \in [T]} e^{-\epsilon n} \cdot 0.5 = 0.5T \cdot e^{-\epsilon n},$$

where the second inequality follows from the assumption that \mathcal{A} is ϵ -DP. The above inequality, together with $T \geq \exp(\Omega(d))$, implies that $n \geq \Omega(d/\epsilon) = \Omega(m/\epsilon)$ as desired. \square

B.3 Lower Bound for Approximate-DP in the Central Model

As stated earlier, we will reduce from the lower bound for the 1-way marginal problem from [Steinke and Ullman, 2017]. To state their result, we use $\text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta)$ to denote the beta distribution with parameter α, β . For notational convenience, we assume that the Bernoulli distribution $\text{Ber}(q)$ is over $\{-1, +1\}$ instead of $\{0, 1\}$. For a vector $\mathbf{q} \in [0, 1]^d$, we use $\text{Ber}(\mathbf{q})$ as a shorthand for $\text{Ber}(q_1) \times \cdots \times \text{Ber}(q_d)$.

Theorem 18 ([Steinke and Ullman, 2017, Theorem 3]). *Let $\beta, \gamma > 0$ and $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$. Let \mathcal{B} be any $(1, \gamma/n)$ -DP algorithm whose output belongs to $\{-1, +1\}^d$. Let q_1, \dots, q_d be drawn i.i.d. from $\text{Beta}(\beta, \beta)$ and x^1, \dots, x^n be i.i.d. drawn from $\text{Ber}(\mathbf{q})$. If*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{q}, x^1, \dots, x^n, w \sim \mathcal{A}(x^1, \dots, x^n)} \left[\sum_{j \in [d]} w_j \cdot (q_j - 0.5) \right] \geq \gamma d, \quad (6)$$

then $n \geq \gamma \beta \sqrt{d}$.

We will now prove our lower bound (Theorem 14). In fact, it suffices to only prove the statement for $\epsilon = 1$, from which, using the standard group privacy-based techniques (see e.g., [Steinke and Ullman, 2016] for more details), we can get the lower bound in Theorem 14 for $\epsilon \leq 1$ where the number of required users grow with $1/\epsilon$.

Lemma 19. *For any constant $\alpha > 0$, there exists $c > 0$ (depending on α) such that there is no $(1, o(1/n))$ -DP (α, cm^2) -approximation algorithm for the rank aggregation problem for $n = o(\sqrt{m})$.*

Proof. We assume w.l.o.g. that α is an integer and that $n \geq 25$. Let $\beta > 0$ be sufficiently small so that the following holds:

$$\mathbb{E}_{q \sim \text{Beta}(\beta, \beta)} [|2q - 1|] > 1 - 0.5/\alpha.$$

Note that this exists because as $\beta \rightarrow 0$, the left hand side term converges to 1.

Let $\gamma = 0.05$ and $c = 0.00001\alpha$. Note that β, γ, c are constants depending only on α (but not n). Furthermore, we may assume that $n > 25$.

Now, consider any $(1, \gamma/n)$ -DP (α, cm^2) -approximation algorithm \mathcal{A} for the rank aggregation problem. Again, assume w.l.o.g. that m is divisible by $40\alpha + 2$ and let $d = m/(40\alpha + 2)$ and $t = 40\alpha d$. Now, let $q^1, \dots, q^d, x^1, \dots, x^n$ be sampled as in the statement of Theorem 18. For notational brevity, we will simply write π^x and ρ instead of $\pi_{d,t}^x$ and $\rho_{d,t}$. Furthermore, let $s \in \{-1, +1\}^d$ be such that $s_j = (-1)^{\mathbb{1}[q^j > 1/2]}$ for all $j \in [d]$.

From the guarantee of \mathcal{A} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\sigma \sim \mathcal{A}(\pi^{x^1}, \dots, \pi^{x^n})} [K(\sigma, \{\pi^{x^1}, \dots, \pi^{x^n}\})] \\ & \leq \alpha \cdot \text{OPT}(\{\pi^{x^1}, \dots, \pi^{x^n}\}) + cm^2 \\ & \leq \alpha \cdot K(\pi^s, \{\pi^{x^1}, \dots, \pi^{x^n}\}) + cm^2 \\ \text{(Observation 16)} & \leq \alpha \left(t \left(\frac{d}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \left\langle s, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} x^i \right\rangle \right) + 2d^2 \right) + cm^2 \\ & = \alpha \left(t \left(\frac{d}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in [d]} (-1)^{\mathbb{1}[q^j < 1/2]} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} x_j^i \right) \right) + (2\alpha d^2 + cm^2). \end{aligned}$$

Now, let the \mathcal{B} denote the algorithm that takes in $x^1, \dots, x^n \in \{-1, +1\}^d$, runs \mathcal{A} to get σ and then output $w = -\rho(\sigma)$. Using Observation 15 together with the above inequality, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_w \left[t \left(\frac{d}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \left\langle w, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} x^i \right\rangle \right) \right] \\ & \leq \alpha \left(t \left(\frac{d}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \left\langle s, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} x^i \right\rangle \right) + 2d^2 \right) + cm^2 \\ & = \alpha \left(t \left(\frac{d}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in [d]} (-1)^{\mathbb{1}[q^j < 1/2]} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} x_j^i \right) \right) + (2\alpha d^2 + cm^2). \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging, we arrive at

$$\mathbb{E}_w \left[\left\langle w, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} x^i \right\rangle \right] \geq d - \alpha \cdot \left(d - \sum_{j \in [d]} (-1)^{\mathbb{1}[q^j < 1/2]} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} x_j^i \right) - \frac{4\alpha d^2 + 2cm^2}{t}. \quad (7)$$

We will now take expectation on both sides w.r.t. x^1, \dots, x^n sampled i.i.d. from $\text{Ber}(\mathbf{q})$. On the right hand side, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{x^1, \dots, x^n} \left[d - \alpha \left(d - \sum_{j \in [d]} (-1)^{\mathbb{1}[q^j < 1/2]} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} x_j^i \right) - \frac{4\alpha d^2 + 2cm^2}{t} \right] \\ & = d - \alpha \left(d - \sum_{j \in [d]} (-1)^{\mathbb{1}[q^j < 1/2]} \cdot (2q_j - 1) \right) - \frac{4\alpha d^2 + 2cm^2}{t} \\ & = d - \alpha \left(d - \sum_{j \in [d]} |2q_j - 1| \right) - \frac{4\alpha d^2 + 2cm^2}{t}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

For the left hand side, notice that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} x_j^i - (2q_j - 1) \right| \right] \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}. \quad (9)$$

From this, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{x^1, \dots, x^n, w} \left[\sum_{j \in [d]} w_j \cdot (q_j - 0.5) \right] = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{x^1, \dots, x^n, w} \left[\sum_{j \in [d]} w_j \cdot (2q_j - 1) \right] \\ & = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{x^1, \dots, x^n, w} \left[\left\langle w, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} x^i \right\rangle \right] - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{x^1, \dots, x^n, w} \left[\sum_{j \in [d]} w_j \cdot \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} x_j^i - (2q_j - 1) \right) \right] \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{x^1, \dots, x^n, w} \left[\left\langle w, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} x^i \right\rangle \right] - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{x^1, \dots, x^n, w} \left[\sum_{j \in [d]} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} x_j^i - (2q_j - 1) \right| \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{x^1, \dots, x^n, w} \left[\left\langle w, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} x^i \right\rangle \right] - \frac{d}{2\sqrt{n}}, \quad (10)$$

where the first inequality follows from $w_j \in \{-1, +1\}$ and the second one follows from (9).

Combining (7), (8) and (10), we arrive at

$$\mathbb{E}_{x^1, \dots, x^n, w} \left[\sum_{j \in [d]} w_j \cdot (q_j - 0.5) \right] \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(d - \alpha \left(d - \sum_{j \in [d]} |2q_j - 1| \right) - \frac{4\alpha d^2 + 2cm^2}{t} \right) - \frac{d}{2\sqrt{n}}.$$

Taking the expectation over $q^1, \dots, q^d \sim \text{Beta}(\beta, \beta)$ on both side and using our choice of β , we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{q}, x^1, \dots, x^n, w} \left[\sum_{j \in [d]} w_j \cdot (q_j - 0.5) \right] &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left(d - \alpha (d - (1 - 0.5/\alpha)d) - \frac{4\alpha d^2 + 2cm^2}{t} \right) - \frac{d}{2\sqrt{n}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(0.5d - \frac{4\alpha d^2 + 2cm^2}{t} \right) - \frac{d}{2\sqrt{n}} \geq \frac{1}{2} (0.5d - 0.1d - 0.1d) - 0.1d \geq 0.05d = \gamma d, \end{aligned}$$

where the second-to-last inequality follows from our choices of t, c and our assumption that $n \geq 25$.

As a result, we can conclude via Theorem 18 that $n \geq \Omega(\sqrt{d})$ as desired. \square