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Abstract

Differential Privacy (DP) provides a formal framework for training machine learning models with individual example level privacy. Training models with DP protects the model against leakage of sensitive data in a potentially adversarial setting. In the field of deep learning, Differentially Private Stochastic Gradient Descent (DP-SGD) has emerged as a popular private training algorithm. Private training using DP-SGD protects against leakage by injecting noise into individual example gradients, such that the trained model weights become nearly independent of the use any particular training example. While this result is quite appealing, the computational cost of training large-scale models with DP-SGD is substantially higher than non-private training. This is further exacerbated by the fact that increasing the number of parameters leads to larger degradation in utility with DP. In this work, we zoom in on the ImageNet dataset and demonstrate that similar to the non-private case, pre-training over-parameterized models on a large public dataset can lead to substantial gains when the model is finetuned privately. Moreover, by systematically comparing private and non-private models across a range of huge batch sizes, we find that similar to non-private setting, choice of optimizer can further improve performance substantially with DP. By switching from DP-SGD to DP-LAMB we saw improvement of up to 20% points (absolute). Finally, we show that finetuning just the last layer for a single step in the full batch setting leads to both SOTA results of 81.7 % under a wide privacy budget range of $\varepsilon \in [4, 10]$ and $\delta = 10^{-6}$ while minimizing the computational overhead substantially.

1 Introduction

Despite significant amounts of research on Differential Privacy (DP) in machine learning, training ML models with DP remains challenging in practice, which limits its adoption. In an intuitive sense, DP bounds the change in model weights (and predictions) if a single training example is added or removed. This bound is parametrized by $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ which define a privacy budget. Small values of these parameters lead to a tighter privacy guarantee. Differential Privacy protects the model against privacy attacks where the attacker aims to extract the data that the model was trained on. Prior work illustrates that it is quite plausible to attack a variety of models not trained in this way, across modalities, to reveal individual example information [Shokri et al., 2017, Carlini et al., 2019, 2021, Choquette-Choo et al., 2020, Liu et al., 2021, Balle et al., 2022]. The risk of revealing this information increases greatly if the model was trained on sensitive user information such as demographics or personal photos which makes DP even more pertinent.
To prevent leakage of the individual examples, DP leverages randomness in the visitation of the dataset. This stops the model from encoding too much information from individual examples such that, individually, their presence (or absence) doesn’t change the predictions from the model. Formally we can define DP as follows:

**Definition 1.1 (Differential Privacy [Dwork and Roth, 2014])** A randomized algorithm \( A \) is \((\varepsilon,\delta)\)-differentially private if, for any pair of datasets \( D \) and \( D' \) differing in at most one example (called neighboring datasets) i.e., one example is added or removed, and for all events \( S \) in the output range of \( A \), we have

\[
Pr[A(D) \in S] \leq e^\varepsilon \cdot Pr[A(D') \in S] + \delta,
\]

where the probability is over the randomness of \( A \).

The most popular method for differentially private training in the field of deep learning is Differentially Private Stochastic Gradient Descent (DP-SGD) [Abadi et al., 2016]. The core recipe implements a common theme in DP: “fuzzing” an algorithm outputs with noise to obscure the contributions of any individual input. Computationally, DP-SGD requires access to the gradient for each individual example, clips them to a pre-selected norm, and finally adds Gaussian noise to them before passing the privatized mini-batch gradient to the optimizer.

In practice, DP training can be expensive or even ineffective for very large models. Not only does the cost of calculating the per-example gradient increase with parameter count, but the norm of the noise added also increases, which is believed to lead to worse model quality.

In this work, we focus on transfer learning as a strategy for improving the privacy-utility tradeoff in this large model regime. Transfer learning involves first pre-training a model on a large public dataset, and only then privately finetuning the model on the sensitive dataset and has emerged as a promising technique to improve the accuracy of private models. We specifically examine the effect of pre-training using public data followed by private finetuning on the popular ImageNet classification task. We show a trend of improved utility as the size of the model is increased combined with pretraining on the large public dataset JFT-300M and JFT-4B. In addition, scaling both model and pre-training dataset size reduces the gap between performance with and without privacy.

Since increasing batch size improves performance under DP [McMahan et al., 2018] [Kurakin et al., 2022] [De et al., 2022], we also consider a range of “huge” batch sizes (batch sizes within a small multiple of the full batch). With these huge batch sizes, similar to the non-private setting, the choice of optimizer leads to substantial improvements when training the model with privacy. For instance, ResNet50x4 (BiT) obtains 68.8\% test accuracy when trained with DP-LAMB compared to 47.1\% using DP-SGD with Momentum over a privacy guarantee of \((\varepsilon,\delta) = (10, 10^{-6})\).

Furthermore, we systematically explore the effect of other hyperparameters affecting DP performance. We found the scale of initialization of the last layer to be crucial for good results: initializing the last layer to zero yields significant improvements. By combining our observations (increased pretraining data and model size, huge batch size, DP-LAMB optimizer, zero initialization), we achieve state-of-the-art DP results on ImageNet through finetuning just the last layer of ViT-H/14-4b for a single step in the full batch setting. Our results outperform the previous state of the art of [Kurakin et al., 2022] and more recent work of [De et al., 2022] for all values of \(\varepsilon\) considered in both studies. In addition, since our results were obtained by finetuning the last layer for a single epoch on ImageNet, it significantly improves the cost-utility ratio of training a high-quality image classification model with DP.

## 2 Related Work

Differentially private training has grown in popularity over the years due to significant appealing properties including the ability to guarantee privacy against strong attacks by an adversary. In this section, we categorize and enumerate relevant contributions.

**Theoretical Understanding.** In the convex case, there has been quite a bit of progress in terms of methods and understanding [Chaudhuri et al., 2011] [Kifer et al., 2012] [Song et al., 2013] [Bassily et al., 2014] [Talwar et al., 2015] [Wu et al., 2016] [Feldman et al., 2020a] [Song et al., 2021] [Asi et al., 2021], almost to near optimal privacy-utility tradeoffs. In the context of large deep learning models,
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Figure 1: (a) Compares best models from our study with and without privacy on ImageNet across model and pre-training dataset sizes. Scaling the model and using a larger pre-training dataset (JFT-4b) decreases the gap in accuracy coming from addition of the privacy guarantee of \((\varepsilon = 10, \delta = 10^{-6})\).

(b) We finetune only the last layer of ViT-H/14-4b model for a single step in the full batch setting and vary \(\varepsilon \in [0.25, 10]\). The previous state of the art of Kurakin et al. [2022] obtains 47.9% accuracy on a privacy budget of \((10, 10^{-6})\) with 70 epochs of finetuning. More recently, concurrent work of De et al. [2022] obtain an impressive result of 81.1% on privacy budget of \((8, 8 \times 10^{-7})\) and 77.1% at \((1, 8 \times 10^{-7})\), with 2500 epochs. We present significant improvements on both studies at all \(\varepsilon\) values we tried with only 1 epoch of finetuning. Note that these results are average over 5 independent runs with different seeds. For reproducability purposes, we also make the exact hyperparameters available in the Appendix.

DP-SGD [Abadi et al., 2016] is still the most popular choice, probably due to the difficulty in privacy analyses from a theoretical standpoint. Other improvements include adaptive clipping [Andrew et al., 2021, Pichapati et al., 2019] and private aggregation of teacher ensembles [Papernot et al., 2018].

Transfer Learning. Starting with the DP-SGD paper [Abadi et al., 2016], several recent works demonstrate good results in the setting where we have access to a large public dataset of the same modality as the private data [Tramèr and Boneh, 2021, Yu et al., 2021, Li et al., 2022, Kurakin et al., 2022, Hoory et al., 2021]. Perhaps the direction most similar to ours is the concurrent work of De et al. [2022] which also employs JFT-300M as a public dataset to obtain high utility privately trained ImageNet models. It is encouraging to see an independent study corroborating some of the trends we observe as well. While the overall direction is similar, there are many notable differences including model families explored (ResNet (BiT) [Kolesnikov et al., 2020] and Vision Transformer [Dosovitskiy et al., 2021] vs NFResNet [Brock et al., 2021b]), batch size (full batch vs 16k) and choice of optimizers for best results (LAMB/ADAM vs Momentum) to name a few.

Large batch sizes. Outside the context of privacy, training difficulties with large batch sizes are well known. [Keskar et al., 2016] provide empirical evidence that increasing the batch size biases the trained model towards sharper minima with large positive eigenvalues of the Hessian, which, may damage generalization performance. Further, when keeping the number of epochs constant, one typically should increase the learning rate to compensate for the decrease in the number of iteration, which may lead to instabilities in the learning procedure. [Goyal et al., 2017] demonstrate learning rate warmup to be an effective strategy for inducing stability with large learning rates and were able to successfully train ResNet50 with a batch size of 8k. Further, [You et al., 2017] observe the ratio of the norm of the layer weights and norm of the gradients to be a predictor of training instability at high learning rates. They also observe that this ratio varies from layer to layer, which makes choosing a model-wide learning rate hyperparameter hard. To alleviate this, they propose Layerwise Adaptive learning Rate Scaling (LARS) algorithm which scales the learning rate of each layer by the ratio of the norm of the weights over the norm of the gradients. LARS enabled them to train ResNet-50 with batch size up to 32K without accuracy loss. Finally, [You et al., 2019] propose an improvement on LARS’s normalized gradient update which which empirically allowed for training of CNNs (ResNet50) and transformer networks (BERT) up to a maximum batch size of 32k.
study focuses on the even more extreme batch size range of 128k-1M which we denote as “huge batch size” range.

In the context of differential privacy, several recent papers advocate the use of large batch sizes [McMahan et al., 2018, Anil et al., 2021, Dormann et al., 2021, Hoory et al., 2021, Liu et al., 2021, Kurakin et al., 2022] in order to improve the privacy-utility tradeoff. We confirm this finding in our setting as well, except for a few cases where the degradation in utility due to batch size increase trumped the potential increase in utility.

3 Background

We start our discussion with optimization details in the non-private setting. Given a data set $D = \{(x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_n, y_n)\}$ with $(x_i, y_i) \in D$ a single iteration of training using Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) optimizes the loss function: $L : \mathbb{R}^d \times D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denoted as follows

$$L(\theta) \triangleq \frac{1}{|D|} \sum_{(x, y) \in D} \ell(\theta; (x, y))$$ (1)

In a single iteration, $N$ examples are chosen randomly from the dataset and passed to a model function parametrized by $\theta_t$ as a single mini batch $B_t$. The update rule for the next iterate comes from differentiating the loss with respect to model parameters $\theta_t$ as shown below:

$$g_t \leftarrow \frac{1}{|B_t|} \sum_{(x, y) \in B_t} \nabla \ell(\theta_t; (x, y))$$  \hspace{1em} $\theta_{t+1} = \theta_t - \eta_t g_t$ (2)

where $\eta_t$ denotes the learning rate used for for iteration $t$.

[Abadi et al., 2016] propose a private version of this algorithm, DP-SGD. In order to bound the sensitivity of each training example, one computes a gradient for each example separately and clips each a maximum norm of $C$ (a user-specified hyperparameter):

$$\tilde{g}_t \leftarrow \sum_{(x, y) \in B_t} \text{clip} \left( \nabla \ell(\theta_t; (x, y)) \right)$$ (3)

where $\text{clip}(v) = v \cdot \min \left\{ 1, \frac{C}{\|v\|_2} \right\}$. This is notably different from non-private training where the forward pass can be vectorized and only a single pre-accumulated gradient can be calculated and used per mini-batch. If implemented naively, this step alone increases the computational cost of DP training proportional to the batch size for a single step. After summing the clipped example gradients, a noise vector sampled from a Gaussian distribution with standard deviation $\sigma C$ is added, where $\sigma$ is a parameter that will specify the privacy guarantee via the Gaussian mechanism. The result is used to update the model parameters in place of the original $g_t$:

$$g_t \leftarrow \frac{g_t + \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma C)}{|B_t|}$$ (4)

Intuitively, since we bound the gradient norm first for every example and add proportional noise, this limits the contribution that a single example can make in the final model parameters and its predictions. Formally, any algorithm that uses the $g_t$ (not just SGD) will be private by the standard post-processing property of differential privacy.

**Privacy Analysis.** The privacy parameters $(\epsilon, \delta)$ are functions of $C$, $\sigma$, $|B_t|$, $|D|$, and the total number of iterations $T$. DP-SGD algorithm involves setting the right clipping norm $C$ and the noise multiplier $\sigma$ given a privacy budget, batch and dataset size. The $(\epsilon, \delta)$ guarantee is computed by analysis of the Gaussian Mechanism with privacy amplification by subsampling and composition across across iterations [Kasiviswanathan et al., 2008, Bassily et al., 2014, Abadi et al., 2016, Mironov, 2017, McMahan et al., 2017, Mironov et al., 2019, Erlingsson et al., 2019, Zhu and Wang, 2019, Feldman et al., 2020, Wang et al., 2020]. Our implementation relies on Tensorflow Privacy codebase for conversion of $(\epsilon, \delta)$ and clipping norm $C$ to/from noise multiplier $\sigma$.  

https://github.com/tensorflow/privacy
4 Experiments

Datasets. For employing transfer learning with DP, the model is first pre-trained using the large public dataset in the traditional non-private way - only at finetuning time do we resort to DP updates to ensure privacy guarantees from the fine-tuned model. Note that, in this setting, it is important to ensure that public and private data are mutually exclusive. If there are data points in common, the privacy guarantee breaks down since the pre-training was not done privately.

We use the ILSVRC-2012 ImageNet dataset [Deng et al., 2009] with 1k classes and 1.3M images (we refer to it as ImageNet in what follows) as our final evaluation dataset. We also refer to this as our private dataset which we want a privacy guarantee over. We use JFT [Sun et al., 2017] with 18k classes and 303M high-resolution images for pre-training as our public dataset. Note that JFT-300M dataset has been used extensively as a pre-training dataset in the non-private setting to obtain state-of-the-art results [Dosovitskiy et al., 2021, Brock et al., 2021a, Tolstikhin et al., 2021]. To make sure that are “public” and “private” datasets capture practical scenarios, we carefully de-duplicate the pre-training dataset w.r.t. all splits of ImageNet dataset. More details about this process can be found in the appendix. All our models are pre-trained with 224x224-sized JFT images. At finetuning stage, we use images of size 384x384 and employ the standard practice of data augmentation with Inception Crop [Szegedy et al., 2015] and horizontal flipping at train time.

Model variants. We evaluate the transfer learning capabilities of ResNet [He et al., 2016] and Vision Transformer (ViT) [Dosovitskiy et al., 2021] in our study. Note that in typical non-private training, ResNet employs batch normalization, which has a difficult-to-analyze effect on the sensitivity of the gradients and so therefore makes computing the privacy parameters $\varepsilon$ and $\delta$ difficult. Somewhat fortuitously, to improve transfer, Kolesnikov et al. [2020] replace Batch Normalization with Group Normalization and used standardized convolutions, which has a much simpler privacy analysis. We therefore follow the same practice and denote our modified model “Resnet (BiT)”. For Vision Transformer, we follow the standard notation to indicate the model size and the input patch size, for example, ViT-B/32 means the “Base” variant with 32x32 input patch size. Note that for ViT, compute requirements scales up as we reduce the patch size.

Training details. At the pre-training stage, we stick with the common practice of employing Adam optimizer (even for ResNet) [Kingma and Ba, 2014] with $\beta_1 = 0.9$ and $\beta_2 = 0.999$, with a batch size of 4096 and high weight decay of 0.1. We also use linear learning rate warmup until 10k steps and linearly decay it until the end. For our private finetuning experiments, we stick with a reasonably stringent privacy guarantee of $\varepsilon = 10$ and $\delta = 10^{-6}$, unless specified otherwise. We use DP-SGD privacy analysis to compute the noise multiplier. To limit other confounding factors we set the clipping norm $C$ to 1. Also, since training with DP-SGD is computationally expensive, we finetune on ImageNet for at most 10 epochs. Finally, when training the last layer with DP we found it to be crucial to initialize the last layer weights to zero (or a small value). We expand on this more in Section 5.

Training Framework. The core bottleneck of DP-SGD is the computational cost of computing per-example gradients. A naive implementation of per-example gradient calculation can lead to a dramatic reduction of throughput and an increase in memory usage (proportional to the batch size) compared to non-private training. Inspired by Subramani et al. [2020], we conduct all our experiments in Jax [Bradbury et al., 2018, Frostig et al., 2018], a framework that leverages just-in-time compilation using XLA and does auto-vectorization of the backward pass. We leverage this functionality throughout our experiments. Finally, we conduct our experiments on TPUv4 architecture.

4.1 DP-SGD with Huge Batch Sizes

There is an inherent tradeoff between privacy enforced by DP and utility obtained from the model when trained privately. The decrease in the quality of the model stems from the additional randomness added to the gradients as part of DP-SGD. Even though there is precedence for gradient noise leading to superior generalization ability [Neelakantan et al., 2015, Smith et al., 2020], more often than not, in the context of differential privacy it leads to substantial degradation in model quality [Song et al., 2013, Bassily et al., 2014, Abadi et al., 2016].
Table 1: Comparison of Top-1 test accuracies on Imagenet when trained using DP-SGD with Momentum when using various models with and without privacy. All models are pretrained on JFT-300M dataset. Note that we exclude ResNet50x4 full finetuning results since we did not see accuracies greater than 20% in in our hyperparameter range even without privacy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Tuning type</th>
<th>Without privacy</th>
<th>With privacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2^{17}$</td>
<td>$2^{18}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ViT-B/16 Full</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last layer</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>80.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResNet50x4 (BiT) Last layer</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DP-SGD procedure first adds per-example gradients in a mini-batch, then adds a noise vector to the accumulated gradient, and finally normalizes it using the batch size. Thus, increasing the batch size naively seems to decrease the noise added. The picture is actually more complicated: increasing batch size also decreases the effect of amplification by sampling, which means that this decrease in noise must be partially offset in order to maintain the same privacy guarantee. Regardless, even for large models, others [McMahan et al., 2018, Anil et al., 2021, Dormann et al., 2021, Hoory et al., 2021, Liu et al., 2021, Kurakin et al., 2022] have observed that employing relatively large batch size improves performance of DP-SGD. Similar to some, we use gradient accumulation to scale up to huge batch sizes. In our case, ImageNet contains roughly 1.3M examples; we perform finetuning in the range of 128k ($2^{17}$) - 1M ($2^{20}$) batch size across our exploration and use the full batch setting for the final results.

As shown in Table 1 as the batch size increases, performance in the non-private case decreases significantly as optimization quality degrades. However, with DP, we sometimes observe the reverse trend, even to the point where it is better than non-private training (ResNet50x4, batch size $2^{20}$). Perhaps surprisingly, our results also suggest that training the full model is not necessarily better than training just the last layer. This is true even without privacy. We postulate that this phenomenon can be attributed largely to the training difficulty in the huge batch size regime. However, in the extreme case of ResNet50x4, we were unable to get test accuracy surpassing 20% even at the lower end of our batch size range.

4.2 Optimization in Huge Batch Regime

Our results in Table 1 show that increasing the batch size improves the privacy-utility tradeoff (except for ViT-B/16-Full). However, without privacy, the performance seems to suffer as the batch size is increased in all cases. This phenomenon, outside the context of differential privacy, has been studied by others already [Krizhevsky, 2014, Li et al., 2014, Goyal et al., 2017, You et al., 2017, Hoffer et al., 2018]. Most notably, You et al. [2019] introduced LAMB optimizer to address this issue, which modifies AdamW [Loshchilov and Hutter, 2017] with a layer-wise adaptive learning rate correction. With LAMB, they trained both ResNet-50 and BERT with batch sizes up to 32k. In this work, we would like to train our models with huge batch sizes i.e. in the range of 128k-1M. Tuning only the


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Without privacy</th>
<th>With privacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tuning type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ViT-B/16</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResNet50x4</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last layer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Comparison of Top-1 test accuracies on ImageNet when trained using DP-LAMB when using various models with and without privacy. Similar to Table 1, all models are pretrained on JFT-300M dataset. The numbers in Best column are obtained by using Momentum Optimizer in non-private setting with batch size 512 and rest of the hyperparams reproduced from [Dosovitskiy et al., 2021].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Without privacy</th>
<th>With privacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tuning type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResNet152x4 (BiT)</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ViT-L/16</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ViT-H/14</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ViT-H/14 - 4B</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last layer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Comparison of Top-1 test accuracies on ImageNet when trained using DP-LAMB when using various models with and without privacy. Similar to Table 1, all models are pretrained on JFT-300M dataset. The numbers in Best column are obtained by using Momentum Optimizer in non-private setting with batch size 512 and rest of the hyperparams reproduced from [Dosovitskiy et al., 2021].

Switching from Momentum to LAMB provides improvements in several dimensions. First, without privacy, performance at the lower end of our batch size range comes quite close to that when trained with a much lower batch size of 512 (as proposed by [Dosovitskiy et al., 2021]). Most notably, we see a big jump in performance for ResNet-50x4 when training the full model. With Momentum, test accuracy did not surpass 20%, while with LAMB, it resulted in numbers comparable to ViT-B/16 across batch sizes. Second, the batch size most attractive in our context is $2^{20}$ (around 1M). Note this batch size is pretty close to the ImageNet training dataset size of around 1.28M. We observe a significant increase in accuracy when switching to LAMB for batch size $2^{20}$. Lastly, the increase in accuracies in the non-private setting helps when training the models privately across the board, to the extent that we obtain the best private finetuning numbers at the largest batch size of $2^{20}$.

4.3 Scaling Analysis

In this section, we systematically study the effect of scaling both the model size and the pre-training dataset. We follow [Dosovitskiy et al., 2021] and experiment with 3 additional models, namely ResNet152x4, ViT-L/16 and ViT-H/14. Similar to earlier experiments, we pretrain these models with JFT-300M. To study the effect of increasing pre-training data, we consider one more variant “ViT-H/14 - 4B” where we pre-train a ViT-H/14 model on JFT-4B dataset for a single epoch. Due to the excessive computational cost of running these experiments, we only consider a batch size of $2^{20}$ for all our results in this section.
As shown in Table 3, for both the model families, namely ResNet (BiT) and Vision Transformers, increasing the model size improves accuracy in both non-private and private settings. We find this to be the case regardless of whether we train the full model or just the last layer. Perhaps even more encouraging is the fact that the gap between the performance with privacy and best numbers without privacy also decreases as the model size increases. For instance, the gap for ViT-L/16 (last layer tuning) between the best non-private and private case is 7.5 percentage points and for ViT-H/14 in the same setting is 6.2 percentage points.

We also present results when the pre-training dataset size is increased when we train using a much larger JFT-4B dataset instead of JFT-300M. Note that in this case we only train for a single epoch with JFT-4B which results in a similar number of pre-training steps if we were to train with JFT-300M for 14 epochs. This means that changes in performance between ViT-H/14 and ViT-H/14-4b can be largely attributed to the diversity of examples seen and not necessarily “more” pre-training. As shown in the best column in Table 3, we notice moderate improvement (about half a percentage point) between ViT-H/14 and ViT-H/14-4b but when training with privacy at a much larger batch size we see an even larger improvement (a full percentage point).

Lastly, when comparing full finetuning and just last layer tuning on ViT-H/14-4b setting, we still see a noticeable gap in the best column (trained with 512 batch size) but when trained at a much larger batch size of 202, the difference vanishes regardless of whether it was trained with privacy or not. This is quite fortuitous since the computational cost of training with privacy is much larger when we finetune the full model vs finetuning just the last layer. In the former case, DP finetuning needs access to the per example gradient of the full model whereas when tuning only the last layer, the per example gradient of just the last layer would suffice. The difference can be even more striking when the models are made larger as shown in Table 3. Note that when tuning only the last layer we still perform a forward pass again every time an example is visited largely due to data augmentation. An alternative is to perform the forward pass for the whole dataset once and cache to features to be trained with DP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Tuning type</th>
<th>Speed Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ViT-B/16</td>
<td>Full 170</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last layer 25</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ViT-L/16</td>
<td>Full 25</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last layer 12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ViT-H/14</td>
<td>Full 25</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResNet50x4 (BiT)</td>
<td>Full 3</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Throughput (img/sec/core) comparison of DP-LAMB on various models trained on Imagenet. All models were trained using 64 TPUv4 cores.

5 Influence of other hyperparameters

In previous sections, we studied the influence of increasing batch size when privately finetuning on ImageNet. Noticing that at large batch sizes, performance, when trained with DP-SGD with Momentum, degrades significantly, we explored DP-LAMB optimizer which resulted in big gains in test accuracies even in the huge batch size regime. Across our exploration, the only hyperparameter we tuned was the learning rate. We did this to limit the scope of our exploration since each added variable would result in a multiplicative increase in compute.

Outside the context of differential privacy though, good performance on image classification task can depend on a lot of other factors, such as data augmentation [Perez and Wang, 2017], Cubuk et al. [2018], initialization [Hanin and Rolnick, 2018], [Zhang et al., 2019], [Mehta et al., 2021], Brock et al., [2021c], feature/data normalization [Ioffe and Szegedy, 2015], [Wu and He, 2018], resolution of the input image, training iterations etc. It is possible that when trained with privacy, the optimal choices of these settings are different. Thus, in this section, we systematically unpack a potentially mysterious bag of choices when training the model with a privacy guarantee. To do this, we take the best performing model so far i.e. ViT-H/14 - 4b, and change one hyperparameter at a time as shown
in Table 5. Note that since there was no performance difference between training the full model vs last layer tuning on ViT-H/14 - 4b (Table 3), we only tune the last layer for this study.

| Choice of optimizer. As shown in Table 5, switching from DP-LAMB to DP-Adam did not change at all in this setting, however, switching to DP-SGD with Momentum leads to a noticeable decrease in accuracy. This suggests that the layer-wise adaptation of the learning rate, as suggested by LAMB, is much less crucial than the contribution made by the Adam update. This is perhaps not surprising since we are only learning the last layer and the layerwise adaptivity provided by LAMB can be subsumed in the learning rate, which we tune.

| Initialization. From our results, the choice of initialization seems to be a crucial hyperparameter. Switching the last layer from Zero Initialization to Lecun Normal (default in Flax for dense layers) resulted in a complete lack of progress and random chance performance on the test set when we trained privately. In the non-private case, Zero initialization has a special property that the learning rate used in the first step can be decreased arbitrarily (up to precision limits) since it only affects how much the loss decreases and not the accuracy (since we use sigmoid cross-entropy loss). This is useful when training privately since the update is artificially made noisy for the privacy guarantee. In this case, the magnitude of the update can be controlled using the learning rate without changing the potential accuracy obtained by the original gradient before the noise was added. This argument is very similar in spirit to the one made by Bu et al. [2021] who show that that noise multiplier $\sigma$ vanishes and doesn’t affect the convergence in the gradient flow regime. Note that there is nothing special about initializing at absolute zero. As long as the initialization is small enough to allow setting small learning in the first step, we find, also leads to similar results as shown in Figure 2c.

| Number of epochs. Since every visitation of the dataset affects the privacy budget, training for less number of epochs requires a lower noise multiplier $\sigma$ for the same values of $(\varepsilon, \delta)$. Typically, the advantage with less noise is trumped by the gain in performance by training longer [Kurakin et al., 2022; De et al., 2022]. However, we observe that training for a single epoch performs slightly better than training for 10, as shown in Table 5.

| 5.1 Extreme case of full batch and single step update |

Since we observed best results when the model was trained for a single epoch, we consider an extreme case where we finetune the model for a single step in the full batch setting. We also combine all the positive changes from Table 5, namely 1) replacing Inception Crop with Central Crop and 2) changing the resolution of the input image from 384 to 256. As shown in Figure 1b, as we hoped, these changes provide almost orthogonal improvements through which we obtain SOTA results on ImageNet across all values of $\varepsilon$ we tried. Finally, we also provide results when evaluated on ImageNet-ReaL [Beyer et al., 2020] labels in Figure 3.
Figure 2: We consider ViT-H/14-4b model in the single step, full batch setting where only the last layer is finetuned and plot a more fine-grained relationship between a few important hyperparameters and test accuracy on ImageNet. (a) LAMB outperforms SGD with Momentum in non-private setting when only the last layer is finetuned. Note that in the first step since the norm of the weights is zero, LAMB is equivalent to Adam. (b) We find a non-trivial relationship between input resolution and large batch training where a sweet spot of 256x256 image resolution performs best. (c) Increase in scale of initialization of the last layer degrades test accuracy when trained with DP. With big enough initialization, test accuracy degenerates to random chance performance. Note that the phenomenon observed in (a) and (b) can be attributed to the huge batch regime and not necessarily DP but (c) is more tied to the use of DP.

Figure 3: Comparison of Top-1 accuracies on ImageNet-Real labels [Beyer et al., 2020] when varying privacy parameter $\varepsilon$

6 Conclusion

We demonstrate that large-scale pretraining on public dataset as an effective strategy for obtaining good results when finetuned privately. Moreover, scaling both model size and pre-training dataset improves performance of the private model and closes the gap between the accuracy obtained in the non-private setting. We also find that gains from transfer learning can be further amplified by switching to an optimizer that works well in huge batch size regime, DP-LAMB in our case. In addition, our exploration allowed us to obtain a significant improvement over existing results on training ImageNet privately across all values of $\varepsilon$ we tried with only 1 epoch of finetuning the last layer (Figure 1b). This significantly reduces the computational cost of training with privacy. Note that even though we solely experimented with ImageNet dataset, our insights may directly apply to other image datasets and even other modalities. We leave this interesting direction to future work.
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A Algorithmic details

We present below a generalized version of DP-SGD where the gradients get processed in the traditional DP-SGD fashion and are then passed to a first order optimizer as an input. This lets us instantiate DP versions of well known optimizers like SGD, Momentum, Adam and LAMB. We prepend the optimizer’s name with DP to denote that the gradients were first processed as shown in Algorithm 1 and then passed to the said optimizer.

Algorithm 1 Generalized First Order Differentially Private Algorithm

Require: Data set \( D = \{ (x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_n, y_n) \} \) with \( (x_i, y_i) \in \mathcal{D} \), loss function: \( \ell : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \), a first order optimizer \( \text{Opt} \), clipping norm: \( C \), number of iterations: \( T \), noise multiplier: \( \sigma \)

1: Randomly initialize \( \theta_0 \).
2: for \( t = 0, \ldots, T - 1 \) do
3: Select randomly without replacement a mini-batch of examples \( B_t \subseteq D \)
4: \( g_t \leftarrow \sum_{(x,y) \in B_t} \text{clip}(\nabla \ell(\theta_t; (x, y))) \), where \( \text{clip}(v) = v \cdot \min \left\{ 1, \frac{C}{\|v\|_2} \right\} \).
5: \( \tilde{g}_t \leftarrow \frac{1}{\|B_t\|} g_t + \mathcal{N}(0, (\sigma C)^2) \)
6: \( \theta_{t+1} \leftarrow \) single step of first order optimization with gradient \( \text{Opt}(\tilde{g}_t) \)
7: end for
8: return \( \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \theta_t \) or \( \theta_T \).

B Training details

We conduct all our experiment using JAX \cite{Bradbury2018} and use Scenic library \cite{Dehghani2021} for high quality reproducible implementations of both ResNet (BiT) and Vision Transformers. Scenic, in turn, uses Flax \cite{Heek2020} for many of the layer definitions. We will also open-source our implementation of DP-SGD and DP-LAMB which includes vectorized per-example gradient clipping in a distributed training setup for further auditing by the research community. For the privacy accounting, we rely on the default Rényi accountant implementation already open-sourced as part of Tensorflow Privacy library.

B.1 Model details

We use 2 competitive model families for our experiments. 1) ResNet (BiT) and 2) Vision Transformer.

ResNet (BiT). Originally proposed in \cite{Kolesnikov2020}, it modifies the original ResNet architecture \cite{He2016} by replacing Batch Normalization with Group Normalization \cite{Wu2018} and additionally using Weight Standardization for the convolutional layers \cite{Qiao2019}.

Vision Transformers. We use the exact architecture and notation proposed by \cite{Dosovitskiy2021}. Vision Transformer creates 2d input patches of images and applies the Transformer backbone typically used NLP tasks. In addition to the models trained in the original paper, we make one addition of ViT-H/14-4b, denoting ViT-H/14 size model pretrained on the larger JFT-4B dataset.

C Pretraining details

Datasets. We use 2 variants of JFT datasets for our pre-training. JFT-300M \cite{Sun2017} consists of 18k classes and 303M high-resolution images, while JFT-4B consists of 29.5k classes with 4B images.

Deduplication. In order to both not inflate our results and break privacy guarantee offered by finetuning privately on ImageNet, we extend the deduplication process proposed by \cite{Kolesnikov2020} and deduplicate both JFT-300M and JFT-4B with respect to all splits of ImageNet. We use a model based deduplication system which removes both exact and near-duplicates across common image transformation like crop, shift, resize etc.
Hyperparameters. At the pre-training stage, we stick with the common practice of employing Adam optimizer (even for ResNet) with \( \beta_1 = 0.9 \) and \( \beta_2 = 0.999 \), with a batch size of 4096 and high weight decay of 0.1. We also use linear learning rate warmup until 10k steps and linearly decay it until the end.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Epochs</th>
<th>Base LR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ViT-B/16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>( 8 \cdot 10^{-4} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ViT-L/16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>( 4 \cdot 10^{-4} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ViT-H/14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>( 3 \cdot 10^{-4} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ViT-H/14 - 4B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>( 3 \cdot 10^{-4} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResNet-50x4 (BiT)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>( 1 \cdot 10^{-3} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResNet-152x4 (BiT)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>( 6 \cdot 10^{-4} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Pre-training hyperparams. All models are trained on deduped JFT-300M with the exception of ViT-H/14-4B, which was trained on much larger JFT-4B dataset but for roughly the same number of steps as ViT-H/14. We used batch size of 4096, learning rate warmup of 10k steps and then linear decay. Additionally, we set dropout rate to 0.0, clip global norm to 1 and weight decay to 0.1. We use images of resolution 224x224.

D Finetuning details

We finetune on ImageNet train split and present the Top-1 accuracies we obtain from the official test split. Unless specified otherwise, we used images of input resolution 384x384 which is inception cropped [Szegedy et al., 2015] from a resolution of 448x448. In addition we perform horizontal flipping as data augmentation. These pre-processing steps exactly follow Kolesnikov et al. [2020], Dosovitskiy et al. [2021].

D.1 SGD with Momentum hyperparameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hyper parameters</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning rate</td>
<td>0.03, 0.06, 0.1, 0.4, 1.6, 6.4, 25.6, 102.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Finetuning hyperparams. Models are trained for 10 epochs, with 0.25 epochs for warmup and cosine decay, no weight decay, no dropout and grad clipping at global norm 1. Similar to previous art, we fine-tune at a higher resolution of 384. When training the models with DP, we replace the global clipping with per example clipping norm of 1.0.

D.2 LAMB hyperparameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hyper parameters</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning rate</td>
<td>0.0001, 0.0005, 0.001, 0.005, 0.01, 0.05, 0.1, 0.5, 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-trained layer LR multiplier ( \alpha )</td>
<td>( 1.0, 10^{-1}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-3}, 10^{-4}, 10^{-5} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Finetuning hyperparams. Models are trained for 10 epochs, with 0.25 epochs for warmup and linear decay, no weight decay, no dropout and grad clipping at global norm 1. Similar to previous art, we fine-tune at a higher resolution of 384. When training the models with DP, we replace the global clipping with per example clipping norm of 1.0. In our earlier results we found that sometimes finetuning the full model performed much worse than finetuning just the last layer with privacy. We added an additional hyperparameter \( \alpha \) which we multiply the global learning rate with for all layers except the last. The intuition is that since all layers except last have been pre-trained, the optimal choice of learning rate may be different for them compared to the last layer, which we start from scratch.
Table 9: We complement results from Table 1 with full finetuning of ViT-B/16 on smaller batch sizes as well. As shown in Table 1 we obtain best results with batch size $2^{17}$.

### D.3 Hyperparameters to Reproduce Figure 1b

In this setting, we only train the last layer for a single epoch in full batch setting. This amounts to a single update of the optimizer. We emphasize that we use the full dataset of around 1.28M training set as a single batch. This is different from using batch size of $2^{20}$ for 1 step, which leaves a subset of the images out. We initialize the last layer with zero and biases with -10 (default in Scenic). Additionally, we also changed the input resolution to 256x256 which is central cropped from an image of resolution 384x384. Finally, since we only make one update, we sweep over constant learning rate values $\in [10^{-4}, 10^{-3}]$ and make an update with DP-LAMB optimizer. Note that, for 1 step updates and zero initialization, LAMB is equivalent to Adam, thus we expect DP-Adam to produce similar results.

### E Supplementary Results

#### E.1 Lower than huge batch sizes

Since we get the highest accuracy with full finetuning of ViT-B/16 in Table 1 at the lower end of our batch size range, we also try batch sizes even lower than that to verify if that is indeed the maximum we could achieve. We verify this as shown in Table 9.

#### E.2 More stringent delta

We conducted all our experiments with $\delta = 1e-6$ in order for a fair comparison with Kurakin et al. [2022] but ImageNet dataset size is close to 1.28M. Here we re-did sweep over $\varepsilon$ on H/14-4b using the same hyperparameters used to obtain results in Figure 1b but with $\delta$ set to 8e-7. Note that De et al. [2022] also set $\delta$ to 8e-7. We find that the change in effective noise multiplier is small enough that our results don’t change at all across both values of $\delta$.

![Figure 4: Varying privacy parameter $\varepsilon$](image)