

# A Study on Privacy Preserving Methodologies in Big Data

J. Vinothkumar\* and V. Santhi

School of Computer Science and Engineering, Vellore Institute of Technology University, Vellore - 632014, Tamil Nadu, India; jvinoth.kumar2015@vit.ac.in, vsanthinadhan@gmail.com

## Abstract

**Objectives:** Massive collection of individuals' information in big data has its own confidentiality threats which results in leakage of sensitive data. **Methods/Statistical Analysis:** In order to get the benefits of analytics without degrading confidentiality, it is necessary to include data protection techniques as core element of big data analytics. The requirement to change the debate from big data and confidentiality to big data with confidentiality, implementing the confidentiality and data safeguarding schemes as a vital value of big data for the advantage of the stakeholders and big data analytics is substantiated. **Findings:** Some confidentiality models incorporating the confidentiality requirements in big data processing are described. Then, detailed and familiar confidentiality enhancing technologies for the big data are offered. **Application/Improvements:** Techniques such as anonymization, encryption, confidentiality preserving computations, access control schemes, transparency and accountability are analyzed.

**Keywords:** Access Control and Transparency, Anonymization, Big Data, Privacy Preserving

## 1. Introduction

In recent years, big data has grown to a level where modernization permits for innovative methods to compact with massive extents of data generated in real time by an array of fronts such as mobile equipment's, Internet of Thing sensing devices, mobile audio and video, social applications. Big data can deliver analytics that can obtain value from the vast information, evading restrictions of organized data stores and recognizing correspondences. Big data analytics can deal from exploration to online transactions and service delivery in daily life<sup>1</sup>. This has been documented by several international Commissions, which worries

the requisite for a data-oriented society, backing civilians' prosperity and economic progress<sup>2</sup>. And, these can have adopted for climate change prediction, endemic or epidemics control or medicinal effects, they stance threats to confidentiality and the safety of subjective information. These threats have been discussed by the certain confidentiality community and have led to challenge the very notion of a data-driven economy of humanity<sup>3,4</sup>. Though analytics has its merits, it comes at a cost for confidentiality. There exists a trade-off between big data and individual' confidentiality. This work concentrates on determining testability by emphasizing confidentiality as part of massive data and exploring by what method that

\*Author for correspondence

shall be added onto big data. The focus is at subsidizing to the massive data by outlining confidentiality by scheme approaches and important confidentiality improving technologies, which may permit merits of analytics short of conceding the safeguard of private information. In section 2, necessity to change the concept from massive data and confidentiality into massive data with confidentiality, clarifying in what way confidentiality threats in the big data should be addressed to get the success of both the big data analytics and individuals has been presented. Section 3 suggests confidentiality by scheme as a means for solving threats in massive data bound environment. Then, specific confidentiality by scheme policies in each stage of big data, with the successive technical employment methods has been examined. Section 4 makes an outline of the main confidentiality augmenting technologies for massive data. Encryption, transparency, access control strategies and anonymization have been focused. Section 5 contains inferences on the assimilation of confidentiality by scheme in massive data and the rule requirements for such an approach.

## 2. Background

When dealing with confidentiality concerns of big data, researchers see there is existence of a conflict between them which cannot be settled. In other words, confidentiality was a hindrance to novelty in massive data, where massive data will get termination of confidentiality, a violation for the sake of technological improvement. This conflict is similar to each time a technology change occurs, associated problem arises at its initial stage. At the completion, it is a conflict between those who only realize the risks and those who only observe the merits<sup>2</sup>.

### 2.1 An Insight on Big Data

Big data is defined as large volume, large-velocity, and large-variety data resources that mandate cheaper data mining for value-added decision analytics and understanding<sup>3</sup>. These are the three measurements of big data also called as the 3Vs. Volume refers to massive amounts of data in the range of zeta bytes. It is said that Facebook Inc., absorbs 600 TBs of information a day<sup>5</sup>. Other estimate made by IBM Corp.,

each day close to 2 billion bytes of information is prepared. Also, it may hike to 5 zeta bytes of information globally in 2018 and more expansion shall rise with the 100s of millions of sensors making their way by 2020<sup>6</sup>. Velocity refers to live streams of multi-media information arising from multiple sources says sensors on Battlefield or Urban Surveillance or logical sensors from media, such as Facebook, Instagram and Twitter information. Information from internet shall be grouped and taken at millions of events a minute. Analytics motive is to deal market movements and foretell user activities in a couple of seconds. Sensors create colossal making of logs. But these constitute fewer instances of analytics arising in real time day-to-day activities. Variety refers to data from an enormous range of sensors and systems, in diverse types and formats. Numerical data, categorical data, geospatial data, three dimensional data, multimedia data, structure less data, complicated formats like social media and log files, all belong to the big data ecosystem.

### 2.2 Data Management Lifecycle of Big Data

Big data mining discusses entire information supervision lifecycle of accumulating, combining, examining information to extract rules, to foretell and to apprehend behaviors. And deployment embraces number of stages which starts from acquiring to last rule extraction. Data acquiring is the practice of collecting, riddling and scrubbing information before being stored in information warehouse in which information mining shall be performed later. Cases of such repositories are group networks, mobile applications, online retail applications, smart devices, public registries such as National Population Register, National Identity Register etc. Data investigation is the practice related to allowing the accumulated information for inferring resolution and its specific usage in corresponding domain. The strategic task of data exploration is for discovering anything that is categorically beneficial. An important element is designed for associating information from heterogeneous fronts so as to derive rules which otherwise shall not be mined. Data curation is another critical element of managing data above its maturation to make sure whether it runs into the class necessities for actual usage. This comprises

jobs such as content generation, choosing, ordering, conversion, authentication and maintenance. Data storage is about loading and handling data inaccessible way fulfilling necessities of analysis that need admission into the information. For most of cases, Cloud storage is the trend but now there exist some cases of distributed storage solutions attractive for stream data. Data usage is involving the use of the information by participants and in need of data processing. For a case made on highly used apps shall be presented for public or service guarantor who ordered the revision. Big data analytics is used in daily activities as results in analytics which in turn driven by some businesses. Such cases where-in, patients' notable symbols shall be equated against past information to find extracts and deliver prized information for timely exposure and handling of ailments. Google's automatic car is evaluating colossal volumes of data from cameras and sensors in live mode to stay carefully on the road<sup>6</sup>. Smart TVs shall monitor whatever we look and offer some suggestions consequently or advertisements built on preferences<sup>7</sup>. It is evident from above models, range of participants are part in phases of big data processing, including devices, applications, operating system providers, service providers such as social networks, telecom operators, cloud resource providers, analytic engine providers and public owned authorities. These shareholders can assume distinct persons in a big data engines and network with other collaborator in different ways.

## 2.2 Privacy and Big Data: Issues of Conflict

Their must not be a collision of analytics with confidentiality and data protection values. The motive is that the data protection must be regulated in which ones' own data shall be analyzed in relation to persons' private information. It is the size of big data engineering which carries current confidentiality menaces into a different level. Some major confidentiality goals aligned with big data are data inference and re-identification and profiling. Data inference is another constituent for big data analytics is opportunity to combine information to get new knowledge from multiple sources. This leads to risks, such as relating more than one sources may allow patterns related to persons being identified. For an instance,

it is possible to infer some data related to a person by combining non-personal information<sup>8</sup>. If such inferences are high, it shall be termed as unintentional analytics of confidential data turns out is a problem. Advanced analytics on anonymized data sets may lead to revealing of a person by mining and joining several fragments of information<sup>9</sup>. In Profiling, big data can be applied to massive data sets in order to build profiles for persons that can be used in smart decision makers e.g. for including them for some products or services. Such a profiling results in discrimination in the form of price variation, without giving them the chances to contest decisions. Profiling of incomplete data leads to false assumptions, depriving persons from their respective rights. An example for profiling is internet advertising, which is meticulously connected to bill variation<sup>10</sup>.

## 2.3 Privacy as an Element of Big Data

Big data and confidentiality are contradictory in their goals. The processing's requirement for information reusability drives against the tenacity restriction, need for data gathering goes against information minimization and participation of several participants and tedious collaboration among them creates challenges in mechanism and transparency.

### 2.3.1 Big Data, Privacy and their Contradiction

Let us consider the situation where there is massive data without confidentiality such as huge amount of inference making without controllability for personal data safety. Apart from confidentiality issues, it is possible that such a situation would lead to commoditization of person's data<sup>11</sup>. But if personal data were accessible without any protection, their value will turn low. For a case in point, society shall start being extra unwilling in giving their data to get the services they need without determining their identity<sup>12</sup>. In environments where personal data are commoditized, there is less chances in innovation. This would affect the quality of data. This contradicts the notion of big data and confidentiality as personal data are vital to analytics and are challenging which inversely affect each person's life. In another loose end, re-commoditization of information is an enormous opportunity coming from the persons who produce inference information<sup>13</sup>.

### 2.3.2 Privacy Ensures Reliability in Big Data

In view of contradictions, confidentiality is a component of the trust between service providers and users in big data has been contended. None profits from disruption of this specific reliance: if handlers perceive that their information unsecure, they may transit towards results that rectify this issue. A case that validates this is advertisers built on cookies. Also, advertisers misunderstood customer supportive mechanisms, the customers transited towards ad blockers<sup>14,15</sup>. Confidentiality shall build reliance in big data decision making for users and big data providers. According to the confidentiality of restriction, managers who adopt information for analytic shall guarantee that exploration are relevant to information. It is vital that uncertainty is detached when describing about the processing<sup>11</sup>. Therefore, clearness to persons and tools to prompt their select can be methods to achieve information reuse in addition to achieve users' faith on the big data. Another instance is data inference, with approaches, and methods and calculating power at removal of any aggressor. Enormous data breaks like the Ashley Madison incident of late, display that expose of data can be catastrophic for both the persons and the managers<sup>14</sup>. As it is developing from capacities, big data will trail a phenomenon of interest called black swan effect, where the influence to persons will be factored<sup>15</sup>. Hence, searching for correlations, one of the demands of big data cannot be stressed where it develops into a threat than an advantage. An additional instance is the context collapse including classifying and symbolizing a person, beyond the instant of its formation and are existing and searchable by anyone<sup>16</sup>. In order to negate threat, certain studies have indicated the multi-dimensional basis of individuals, which can't be controlled in those representations<sup>17</sup>. Limpidity on the use of one's own information is crucial and given utmost importance. Multiple costs on data providers happen with biased features if a decision process is automatic<sup>18</sup>. This hints to the detected bubble effect by which information providers will made accessible to information which approves values and attitudes, with less chances of unintentional discovery<sup>16,19</sup>. Data providers will respond to these cases, but industry shall be concerned by accidental

profiling. Looking at inclinations of the marketing incomes in the shops, it is weaker whether economics of promotion balances old advertising<sup>17</sup>.

### 2.3.3 Tools for Ensuring Privacy in Big Data

Several countries have legal framework for safeguard of own information which includes new rights applicable to the big data<sup>20</sup>. Hence, although regulation is important in applying rules; it must not be lone method for security of information. So, procedures for the safeguard of subjective information should be allowed to size-up with big data. There exists some confidentiality preserving tools which shall be applied in context of big data processing and shall be traversed for use in near future. The concept of confidentiality and data protection together will be the focus in the next section that follows.

## 3. Privacy as Part of Scheme in Big Data

Determining the suitable tools to device confidentiality in the big data is efficient model to avoid an overlap between confidentiality and big data. Hence, the concept of confidentiality and data protection together must be the tool to solve the confidentiality risks from commencement and apply required confidentiality preserving results in the big data analytics. By this means, confidentiality can be an instrument for authorizing persons in big data processing and also assisting the managers' accountability.

### 3.1 Privacy as Part of Scheme Strategies

Confidentiality by scheme was offered by Ann Cavoukian and refers to inserting confidentiality measures and confidentiality improving technologies into design of data systems<sup>20</sup>. It is observed as multi-layered concept in legal domain on one side, it is defined as an overall principle; by engineers on other side it is associated with use of confidentiality improving technologies. The concept of confidentiality by scheme as an engineering approach is discussed<sup>6</sup>. In addition to that, confidentiality by scheme approaches are expected in stabilizing assured confidentiality goals is also studied.

**Table 1.** Privacy by scheme strategies

	PRIVACY BY SCHEME STRATEGY	DESCRIPTION
1	Minimize	Individual data should be restricted to the least possible quantity.
2	Hide	Private data must be concealed from unauthorized view.
3	Separate	Private data must be interpreted in separate partitions.
4	Aggregate	Private data should be treated with a better level of aggregation.
5	Inform	Data providers should be notified when their data is taken up.
6	Control	Data providers should have the control over their data.
7	Enforce	A privacy strategy conforming to legal requirements should be used.
8	Demonstrate	Data managers must be able to validate privacy policy and any authorized actions.

Following the confidentiality by schemes in Table 1, confidentiality improving technologies for realizing the policies have been analyzed. Such tools include validation, authorization, confidentiality preserving communications, and anonymization, confidentiality in databases, statistical information control mechanism, and confidentiality preserving mining, secure information retrieval, cryptographic computations, and transparency improving computations.

### 3.2 Privacy by Scheme in Big Data Analytics

Confidentiality by scheme is constructing confidentiality features at core of the big data. It shall also permit for implementation of related controls for defending the persons' private data. In big data, as data sent for inference is having multiplicity, several tasks are required. At first, so as identify patterns, the presented data sets in big data should be massive. Data minimization in data is an essential part of confidentiality by scheme methodology. Some instances of big data arise from large volume of information by person's usage of technologies and taken up for exploration<sup>21</sup>. The merger of data from large count of sources is a vital quantity of big data, which shall be seen as against the distributed processing of data. The prospects to gather information and notice again persons by associated data

falsify the notion of information hiding<sup>22</sup>. Use of private information in big data is unanalyzed with better level of collection. Hence, is confidentiality by scheme feasible in big data? In spite of arguing that this is not promising, our methodology is to return the question: Can big data accept the confidentiality by scheme method? A conflict between big data and confidentiality will not yield any profits according to some experiments<sup>18,23</sup>. In the following, validating how confidentiality by scheme approaches shall become apt in big data has been attempted via Table 2 with an overview of the confidentiality by scheme and their employment in each of the stages of the big data.

**Table 2.** Privacy techniques in big data

1	Data Collection	Minimize	Define data before collecting; such as defining controls and removing information.
		Aggregate	Anonymization at the source itself.
		Hide	Privacy improving encryption, identity hiding.
		Inform	Provide notice to persons before their use.
		Control	Mechanisms for stating consent such as opt-out tools and data stores.
2	Data Analysis & Data Curation	Aggregate	K-anonymity and differential privacy.
		Hide	Query based searchable encryption and confidentiality computations.
3	Data Storage	Mask or Hide	Enciphering of data and access control tools.
		Separate	Distributed de-centralised analytics.
4	Data Use	Aggregate	Anonymization and data provenance.
5	All Phases	Enforce and Demonstrate	Automatic policy definition and application tools.

## 4. Privacy Improving Technologies in Big Data

In this section summary of confidentiality technologies allied to big data is studied. Most of these technologies are obtainable and can be applied processing of personal

data<sup>6</sup>. Anonymization is presented, which has been the oldest method in the direction of data analytics, with new experiments in era of big data. An analysis in cryptography and search based on encryption, which shall permit for confidentiality preserving analytics with no revealing of sensitive data, is studied. Also, confidentiality by security such as access control tool is offered. Transparency and control tools are vital to offer information to the persons. Hence, notice and consent tools trusting on users' confidentiality and their usability issues are suggested.

## 4.1 Anonymization in Big Data

Anonymization alters private data where persons shall not be de-identified and nil information shall be found<sup>19</sup>. It is applied in data analysis, such as Statistical Disclosure Control<sup>24</sup>. Perfect anonymization in big data is difficult because of size and variability of information. Low level anonymization is not sufficient to guarantee non-identifiability<sup>25</sup>. Strong anonymization may stop associating data on the same person that rise from diverse locations and prevents many assistances of massive data stores. An analysis on anonymization trade-offs have been done. Most of the concepts include de-identification and attribute disclosure<sup>13</sup>. There are subsequent features of anonymization which should be maintained in big data. Controlled linkability is about preventing linking of records while approving little linkability is having importance in big data<sup>13</sup>. Anonymization in big data shall be with connecting data from numerous sanitized data sources. In decentralized anonymization, the data provider anonymizes his data at the source, before freeing that information to the manager. This decreases necessity for reliance by data providers to manager. There are two methods of decentralization based anonymization which are local-level anonymization and group-level anonymization has been evaluated.

### 4.1.1 Utility and Privacy

As anonymization schemes change original information to stop revelation of private data, a contradiction rises between utility and confidentiality. Task is to defend confidentiality with no higher accuracy loss clients should track their validation on transformed information without trailing precision with deference to results of those studies when executed on the original data. Methodologies using

graphs can also be employed to analyze social networks<sup>26</sup>. These procedures shall be adopted to estimate data loss and information usefulness of graphs.

#### 4.1.1.1 Linkability as a Detailed Efficacy Measure in Big Data

Linkability is important for getting data from combination of information composed by numerous sources. In big data, data about a person is gathered from independent data sources. Hence, the capability to link records that belong to the same person is essential in big data. While linkability is needed for the utility, it is also a confidentiality risk as the accuracy of associations should be less in anonymized data sets compared to original data sets<sup>27</sup>.

#### 4.1.1.2 Utility-specific and Confidentiality-specific Approach

There are basically two methods for sanitization to pact with trade-off between utility and confidentiality. They are namely utility-specific anonymization and confidentiality-specific anonymization. Utility-specific anonymization consists of a heuristic factor and utility protection properties are applied on the micro-data records and then risk of leak is calculated. As an example, risk of re-identification shall be assessed by trying tuple linkage between actual and the sanitized data sets<sup>28</sup>. If the existing risk is believed to be more, sanitization technique shall be re-executed with confidentiality restrictions with greater utility loss. In confidentiality-first anonymization mode, a confidentiality model is applied with parameter that assurances restrict on re-identification expose threat and on attribute expose threat. Model execution is attained by model-specific anonymization scheme with restricts from the parameters. Some other models include k-anonymity and its types, in addition to e-differential confidentiality. If utility of resultant sanitized information is less, then confidentiality model shall either be applied with alternate anonymization method that is low utility-hampering, or feeble confidentiality parameter shall be chosen. The confidentiality-specific method, based on anonymization models, has been offered by researchers employed in confidentiality. Some challenges at using confidentiality models in authentic data issues have developed as differential privacy and k-anonymity with bound ranges reducing

confidentiality in order for realistic utility being attainable<sup>29,30</sup>.

#### 4.1.2 Adversary Models

In anonymization, confidentiality can be bargained by two types of leak which are identity leak and attribute leak. Most attacks and confidentiality models focus on any one single attack. In Identity leak, invader is capable to connect data in a published data set with a specific person. In attribute leak, Invaders increase their knowledge on the value of an attribute of a person. Attribute leak can also be measured in the case of an invader who finds out that a person's data are encompassed in a database<sup>31</sup>. Data release should raise knowledge for specific persons in addition to general population. For an instance, a model from an unrestricted data-set has sufficient detail so that it allows increasing accuracy on values of specific features for specified persons<sup>32</sup>. There are opinions that threat of identity leak is overstated and leak risk shall not stop information release<sup>33</sup>.

#### 4.1.3 Anonymization based Models

Confidentiality models are of two broad groups. A first group includes k-anonymity and its modifications like p-sensitive k-anonymity, t-closeness, l-diversity, (n, t)-closeness<sup>34</sup>. The second group is built on e-differential confidentiality with variations like crowd-blending confidentiality<sup>35</sup>.

##### 4.1.3.1 k-Anonymity and its Variants

K-anonymity simulations are built on an attribute association of data set into several non-disjoint types. Identifiers are columns in original data tuples that find person to whom a tuple finds a match. Examples are passport ID, name etc. Identifiers are cut-off as an in order for obtaining an anonymized data set. Quasi-identifiers are columns in the original data tuples in combination, with them may aid re-identify the persons to whom the record in original data tuples finds a match. Cases are name of job, person's age and state of residence. Sensitive attributes are columns that hold secret information of the person. Examples are health condition or specific ailment, religion, salary. In this, data set has to fulfill k-anonymity with k having value of greater than one, for all grouping of semi-identifier column fields; at least k tuples occur

in data set allocation the same. But, k-anonymity fails to defend against attribute leak; In p-sensitive k-anonymity, a data set is supposed to fulfil p-sensitive k-anonymity for k greater than one and p less than or equal to k, if it satisfies k-anonymity for all collection of tuples with same grouping of pseudo-identifier attributes, number of discrete values for all private field within group at least p. In L-Diversity, tuples are told to fulfill l-diversity if, for all collection of tuples sharing a grouping of pseudo-identifier attributes, there are minimum of l number of well-represented values for all private column. A number of classifications of L-diversity are suggested<sup>34</sup>: a) values of L are simply distinct; b) Shannon's entropy of private attributes in each collection is not less than  $\log 2l$ ; c) recursive L-diversity, which necessitates that most common values do look like less repeatedly and least repeated values do look as if commonly. L-diversity and P-Sensitive k-anonymity are susceptible to similarity attacks. In skewness attack, there are diverse values of L, but this consists of values which are skewed. In similarity attack, there are L diverse values, but majority of them are same from semantics narrative as shown<sup>35,36</sup>. Such kind of breaches is better answered using t-closeness. In t-Closeness, tuples are said to fulfill t-closeness if, for all collection of records having in common a grouping of pseudo-identifier attributes, distance between spreading of private attribute in group and spreading of attribute in whole data tuples does not exceed than bound t. In (n,t)-Closeness, for each collection of tuples having in common a grouping of pseudo-identifier attributes, distance between spreading of confidential attribute in group and spreading in superset of group with minimum n tuples does not exceeds than bound t.

##### 4.1.3.2 Differential Privacy and its Associated Models

Differential privacy is a confidentiality model that pursues to restrict effect of person's involvement on result of analysis. The idea was to sanitize answers to queries given to tuple set, rather than sanitizing tuple sets. Hence this is having specific interest to privacy in big data. In  $\epsilon$ -differential privacy, randomized function  $\epsilon$ , for all data sets D1 and D2 that vary in one tuple, and all  $S \in \text{Range}(\epsilon)$ , it fulfils that  $\Pr(\kappa(D1 \in S)) \leq \exp(\epsilon) \times \Pr(\kappa(D2 \in S))$ . Numerous changes have been made to produce differentially pri-

vate data sets<sup>37</sup>. They follow two key methods. One is generating synthetic tuple set from a differentially private criterion for tuple set. Other one is enhance noise to hide values of original records. A demerit of  $\epsilon$ -differential privacy is that it distributes strong confidentiality at cost of utility loss. If occurrence of original tuple wants to be hidden in exp ( $\epsilon$ ) in sanitized data set, it is tough to reserve any utility unless  $\epsilon$  is big, in which confidentiality is no longer that robust<sup>38</sup>. Crowd-blending confidentiality is a differential confidentiality inspired on k-anonymity to refine utility. Tuple set with k-crowd blending confidentiality is said to fulfil if all tuple in data set mix with k other tuple J in the data set, such that outcome of query function  $\epsilon$  is vague if I is substituted by record J. Hence, in a way t-closeness modified into (n, t)-closeness, differential confidentiality is changed into crowd-blending confidentiality by changing the need that only a collection of tuples consisting a specific tuple. Blowfish shall be described as simplification of differential privacy. It practices same logic, but it varies neighboring tuple sets definition. In actual differential privacy adjacent tuple sets D1 and D2 are well-defined as those different in a single tuple; in Blowfish any explanation of adjacency can be taken. Hence, this resulting into number of neighbours is subset of those in differential privacy, which can be called a reduction. To increase utility in differential confidentiality, micro aggregation-based multivariate k-anonymity can be introduced. It was revealed how differential privacy may be extended from t-closeness<sup>39</sup>.

#### 4.1.4 Anonymization Models and Big Data

Linkability, composability and computability are the necessities that a confidentiality model must fulfil in the anonymization of big data<sup>40</sup>. K-anonymity offers linkability at the collection level but not the composability. For example, consider two different k-anonymous tuple sets from two clinics including pin code, DOB and ailment, it is likely to classify a certain person in set, by someone who knows that this person visited both clinics and his DOB and locality are identified. K-anonymity may not assure confidentiality if sensitive values in tuple set do not satisfy diversity and additional knowledge is known to the invader<sup>41</sup>.  $\epsilon$ -differential confidentiality is said to be composable which

means combining a  $\epsilon_1$ -differentially private tuple set and another  $\epsilon_2$ -differentially private tuple set produces a  $\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2$ -differentially private tuple set. Differentially private tuple sets are not linkable if noise totaling is used, but shall be made linkable using synthetic tuple set creation. K-anonymity and differential confidentiality are sometimes opposing utilization of big data. K-anonymity has recognized disapproval concerning its flaws and differential privacy has been obtainable as answer to this problem<sup>42</sup>. K-anonymity concentrates on anonymizing a data set before publishing the data. Differential confidentiality is about executing queries on data subsequent to a fixed type of analysis in which responses may not disrupt confidentiality. It is found that the differential privacy's query dependent approaches is better than release and forget approach of k-anonymity and hence its real-world application is not conceivable in data analytics scenario<sup>43</sup>.

#### 4.1.5 Anonymization Methods

There are two types of micro data sanitization, like masking and synthesis. Former makes a reformed version X' of actual micro data set X, and it may be perturbative masking or non-perturbative masking. Synthesis is about making synthetic data X' that defend pre-chosen properties of actual data X. Above approaches are given a comprehensive survey<sup>13,24</sup>.

#### 4.1.6 Flaws of Anonymization

In attacker's background, the utility-specific method and confidentiality-specific method built on-anonymity group, rules are required to be made on the opponent's background knowledge. In e-differential confidentiality, no rules are made but perturbation is mandatory in the anonymized data.

#### 4.1.7 Centralized and Decentralized Obfuscation

Some merits and demerits are presented as part of this section along with the concept of local and global anonymization which is also described.

##### 4.1.7.1 Merits and Demerits of Centralized Anonymization

Statistical leak control emphases on centralized anonymization, whereby a data manager will have an access to complete actual tuple set. This centralized methodology

has its own benefits<sup>24</sup>. Persons may not requisite to sanitize data tuples they deliver. Data manager with further computational assets and further sanitization knowledge may be allowed to sanitize the entire tuple set. Data manager has overall assessment of actual tuple set and is able to adjust trade-off between data utility and leak risk.

#### 4.1.7.2 Local Anonymization

Local anonymization is a leak restriction model where the persons do not trust the data manager collecting data. Every individual sanitizes his private data before offering them to information manager. In centralized anonymization, local-level anonymization leads to higher loss of information as every person wants to shelter his information with no one knowing other persons' data, so it is tough to bargain a trade-off between leak risk restriction and loss of information. Many standards SDC procedures may be useful like generalization, noise addition and coding. Among methods aimed for local-level anonymization, oldest one is randomized response<sup>45</sup>. In randomized response, the person tosses a coin before solving a question. If coin turns up as tail sided, person replies yes, or else he replies truth. This guards the confidentiality of persons, because data manager shall not decide whether reply yes is random or not random, but he recognizes that no replies are straight, so it is to evaluate actual fraction of no as double experiential fraction. FRAPP shall be found as generalization of randomized response<sup>46</sup>. In FRAPP, person indicates his actual value with a possibility and else precedes an arbitrary value from a known distribution.

#### 4.1.7.3 Global Anonymization

Centralized anonymization has a problem if a person may not depend on information manager to practice and sanitize his data, as he could give false data or no data at all. Complications of local anonymization are control required in amount of masking an individual record in isolation which produces respectable trade-off between leak risk and loss of information. The goal is to produce sanitized tuple set that fulfils conditions such as no loss of information than tuple set that shall be acquired with centralized approach for equivalent confidentiality level, neither information providers nor information manager increase familiarity about attributes of other specific

individual than familiarity limited in sanitized tuple set. Protocol is defined whereby couple of information provider can manage k-anonymity<sup>47</sup>.

### 4.1.8 More Anonymization Challenges in Big Data

In big data it is significant for differentiating between anonymization procedures that deal with sizes of information, dynamic publishing and streaming data.

#### 4.1.8.1 Large Volumes of Data

The subsequent sections offer an outline of such methods. There is masking methods for dealing with typical data of large sizes which are defined where special significance is given for efficiency. Micro aggregation approaches for huge numerical tuple sets with capable technique for k-anonymity and how to quantify leak risk for enormous tuple sets has been found<sup>48</sup>. In social media based networks, there have been diverse anonymization methods. Perturbative methods such as random noise, micro aggregation and generalization where noise added to edges and vertices of social network<sup>49</sup>. Intruder has data on neighbours of vertex and their relationships<sup>50</sup>. K-neighbourhood can be called anonymous when graph vertices are k-anonymous with deference to information. Differential privacy has been useful to social media based networks with two types of differential privacy being presented<sup>51</sup>. Some methods are constructed on credentials of locations, determining confidential words and replacing them by general and meaningfully related ones<sup>52</sup>. Other implementations put effort on k-sanitized vectors of terms that could be employed for data retrieval systems. Related outcomes have been attained for anonymization of information in locality-based services. Locality privacy via generalization and differential privacy is also implemented<sup>53</sup>.

#### 4.1.8.2 Dynamic Data

In dynamic data, a dataset alters with deference to time and data needs to be released frequently. Hence in dynamic data leak is not a problem if the releases do not take into account that some data has been accessible already. The limitations of dynamic data publishing are presented along with the algorithms for the same can be seen<sup>54</sup>. Masking approaches for dynamic data publishing for documents are given<sup>55</sup>.

#### 4.1.8.3 Streaming Data

Data streams pose new risks to participants occupied in big data from privacy context. First one is incompleteness of data as arrival of information into system is discrete and is unstructured cycle; assessment of privacy preservation schemes is hard. The second one is a way that represent from the information is studied which occurs increasingly and is reorganized, which changes anonymizing in-effective. For an example, a phrase “if winter arrives and snow comes along, and few people may commute by bike” has been illustrated as pitfall for the above problem<sup>56</sup>. By recognizing that an individual arrives to place of working in bike and getting GPS traces, it is ineffective to find the person in summer, when motorcyclists are more, but can be done in winter. All the schemes of differential privacy and k-anonymity, there are perturbative methods too<sup>57,58</sup>. Some of the k-anonymity and perturbative procedures are built on sliding window concept, where a modified masking technique is employed.

#### 4.1.9 Future Challenges for Big Data Anonymization

Anonymization methods for static and structured data sets have limitations associated to comparability, verifiability, attack model, and transparency. Big data presents challenges to these properties, as data are temporary and structure less, such as data from bio and seismic sensors or images from medical operations. The earlier release-and-forget scheme has its limits in big data and there are many cases of high-dimensional data sets being de-identified<sup>59</sup>, e.g. in the context of cell phones, IoT data, transportation, genealogy, online banking. Then, an issue that justifies examination is the rationality of anonymization methods for big data. The risks related with cell phone and advanced sensors is when mobile phone data if combined with optimal machine learning schemes can reveal somebody’s sexual liking based on Facebook likes or his personality from mobile phone data<sup>60</sup>.

## 4.2 Encryption Methods in Big Data

Encryption is security technique, which alters information in a means that selected approved parties could examine it, and a security measure for personal data. Its role could useful in big data, till it has been achieved using

apt encryption practices and key sizes, and encryption keys are secured<sup>61</sup>. In this section, advances in the field of encryption are analyzed.

### 4.2.1 Database Encryption

Encryption is a cryptography based technique used in cloud computing and other environments. Local encrypted storage is offered by some big data solutions. For an instance, Apache Hadoop ecosystem, tool known as Rhino provides flexible encryption to HDFS and HBase records of the scheme which is provided by Protegrity<sup>62,63</sup>. It could be quantified that symmetric encryption systems are employed in big data and cloud contexts, due to their safety and effectiveness. But, some more drawbacks are there which are linked to scalable and secure key administration. Public key encryption systems are challenging in field of computational assets and are employed in hybrid systems for dispensing keys of secret nature. Hybrid schemes are techniques where it has both the benefits of public key practice in scalability and key administration with storage and speed benefits of symmetric key practices. They are deployed in mobile device constituted environments with many users and low transmission of data<sup>64</sup>. Attribute-Based-Encryption (ABE) is a developing technique, for distributing information among groups of user, while conserving users’ confidentiality. In specific, ABE joins access control scheme with public-key practice, in way that secret key employed for encryption and cipher text based upon some particular attributes<sup>65</sup>. In this means, decryption of cipher text could be achieved only if attributes sets given are same as the attributes of the cipher text. The lightest modeling of ABE is that of identity based ciphering, where both cipher text and secret key are linked with identities and decryption is possible when the identities are equal<sup>66</sup>.

### 4.2.2 Encrypted Search

Searching is a vital operation in information retrieval. Encrypted searching is a vital tool for big data analytics, permitting complete search feature with no need to issue any private information. For a case in point, it may be valuable in context of querying and answering systems, where required information is recovered with no retrieving the actual data. In principle the foundation of search and encryption may be incon-

sistent; there is an approach that attains ‘searchable encryption’. There are solutions which attain distinct trade-offs between privacy, effectiveness and query expressiveness can be found<sup>67</sup>. When rising performance and query expressiveness, useful technique is Property Preserving Encryption which can be found<sup>67</sup>. PPE is built on notion of encrypting information in a method that attribute is conserved. It is of the form if a is higher than b, then encryption of a is also higher than the encryption of b. Lightest form is encryption that conserves equality. More variants include order-preserving encryption and orthogonality preserving encryption. PPE deals better search functionalities and has been accepted in specific solutions, like CryptDB<sup>68</sup>. But the delimiting factor is that human properties are of low entropy, PPE is susceptible to attacks of data inference type and can increase security and confidentiality concerns<sup>69</sup>. When rising privacy and performance, Boolean keyword based search on ciphered information can provide a better methodology. These are built on structured encryption, using either symmetric or asymmetric methodology. Symmetric Searchable Encryption makes cipher text for database by a symmetric encryption technique and permits for lateral matching if a keyword is given<sup>70</sup>. It is sustainable when object that searches over information is also one that produces it. Also, data structure is created that allows relatively quick search on the tuple set and is ciphered by SSE system. The tuple set is ciphered by a symmetric encryption practice. Hence to query information, it is required to query ciphered data structure. Examination in the big data context revealed the usefulness of cipher text search for large and distributed tuple sets<sup>71</sup>. It was found that SSE in correlation rule analysis in smaller clinical datasets is useful to calculate negative impacts of specific ailments. Public Key Searchable Encryption makes cipher text for database using public key practice and permits keyword search<sup>24,72</sup>.

#### 4.2.2.1 Privacy Preserving Computations

When raising confidentiality and query expressiveness fully homomorphic encryption and oblivious RAM are found to be better schemes. These types of methods are part of privacy preserving computations and are developing research areas or fields. Their effectiveness is less to be allowed for their

adaptation including Fully Homomorphic system. Oblivious RAM-based schemes have better efficiency while in big data it is inefficient<sup>67</sup>. In homomorphic encryption, analysis could be achieved in cipher text in same way as in plaintext with nothing being revealed including secret key. There are two homomorphic encryption types are available namely fully homomorphic encryption and partial homomorphic encryption. Former supports an unrestricted number of calculations with loss of efficiency, whereas PHE permits a less number of actions with an improved effectiveness than FHE. One major issue in FHE is noise that happens each time inaction on the cipher text is completed. A new approach for FHE where to avoid the noise problem via training and attaining an adaptation of a fully homomorphic system has been proposed<sup>73</sup>. It is accepted that FHE scheme may provide to re-solving confidentiality problems in big data and enable taking over of cloud computing technologies. This has led to FHE being analyzed by both academics and industry which has been reported<sup>74</sup>. Most of the systems in use are either PHE or FHE over a less number of operations<sup>75</sup>. Another tool that is of interest is Oblivious RAM<sup>76</sup>. It is built on notion that encryption in singularity may not safeguard data differencing, as order of storage locations retrieved by client could leak private information. Oblivious RAM mechanisms permit a client to collect huge sizes of information while masking the identities of objects being retrieved<sup>77</sup>. Secure multi-party computation is an area of cryptography intended at allowing participants to calculate a function depending on their inputs, with no revealing the standalone inputs. For a case in point, if three individuals p, q, r wants to determine who has the maximum salary without disclosing to every other their specific salaries. This simple scenario could be generalized to where entities have numerous inputs and outputs, and the function yields distinct values to distinct entities<sup>78</sup>. SMC includes cryptographic tools, such as Yao’s millionaire protocol, oblivious transfer. In big data and cloud context, MPC proposes less powerful security than FHE, when several untrusted participants are involved. In that scenario, every party may not study anything from information; it has been revealed that if multiple stakeholders are tainted by a masquerader and group their data, they could disrupt confidentiality<sup>79</sup>.

### 4.3 Security and Accountability Control Mechanisms

Security is an important part of privacy protection in big data. So as to attain a suitable level of security, practices must be in place at multiple levels of big data. Older tools to information security flop in big data, as they are meant for static information. According to Cloud Security Alliance, security and confidentiality issues that require research in big data include secure computations in distributed computing, scalable privacy-preserving analytics, Cryptography based access control tools, secure communication tools, Granular access control schemes and data provenance<sup>80</sup>.

#### 4.3.1 Granular Access Control

Access control is among the important security measures that are valid to specific application, guaranteeing that official processes only can get right to retrieve information. In big data, where information is categorized by diversity and confidentiality necessitates, old methods like access control lists and role-based access restrict mechanism are not feasible. There are methods that could enable fine grained access restrict strategies in big data built on attributes that are assessed dynamically, like Attribute Based Access Control<sup>81</sup>. Instead of having the role of a participant of a tuple set to choose whether or not to allow access, ABAC could turn a context-aware decision by grouping of several features. The rules based on these features can exemplify contextual confidentiality requirements as outsourcing limitations and information reduction. It has been found that fine-grained access control has a higher computation overhead for such systems. Also, use of attributes has implications and could lead to profiling, subject to the context in which it is applied<sup>82</sup>.

#### 4.3.2 Privacy Policy Enforcement

The auto-tiering mechanism in big data permits for automatic transiting of information between multiple layers, which gives performance and cost management<sup>80</sup>. In such a situation, crucial information may be moved to lower level security tiers. This indicates to a privacy problem in big data such as moving, copying and transferring of data between multiple systems and result in affecting the protection individual data.

So, security and privacy rules are abandoned in big data. Automatic security application tools could be important and there exists related features in existing big data models, related to data ending strategies<sup>38</sup>. Automatic data and log scanning is obtainable in database systems. A work based on virtualization and trusted computing is proposed<sup>38</sup>. Trusted computing makes use of fault-resistant hardware memory and machine language strategies and makes encryption of information more than once where outer level could be decrypted by trusted hardware, whereas inner level could be decrypted by programs and comes across the policy requirements. Implementing privacy as part of these tools is a challenge concerning access control policies, data provider consent. Practice of semantics, policy making and dictionary or metadata are useful tools and has been used in big data environments<sup>83</sup>.

#### 4.3.3 Audit and Accountability Techniques

Accountability is a model in data safety and needs to be strengthened in background of Data Safety Regulations. It is associated to implementation and execution of confidentiality rules ensuring that such a rule is enforced properly. So as to allow for a responsible system it is required to have automatic and scalable control and auditing schemes that can assess the level of confidentiality policy against the machine-readable rules. Several types of measures that include this are logging and observing controls, which are part of big data systems. Different measures are not adequate and the need for a detailed accountability for privacy is a developing field based on tools such as proper accountability prototypes, computer systems design and cryptographic methods<sup>84</sup>. An accountable system must involve automatic policy compliance schemes, provenance management, and detection of violations and restore mechanisms<sup>85</sup>. In this context, A4Cloud project that asserts that it delivers a combined responsibility context for security and reliance in cloud services by increase in transformations between contracts and evidence collected from logging and user-oriented tools is one such example.

#### 4.3.4 Data Provenance

There are definitions of data provenance, based on ownership, supervision and location of information<sup>86</sup>. In big data, where processing alters distributed raw

information into beneficial and insightful outputs, data provenance can confirm information origin and authenticity certify statements and defend startling results. It is a part of a process involving auditing, accountability and compliance process. This can be valuable both for information analyzer and information providers, as data provenance schemes could permit him to check how information is being processed<sup>87</sup>. Provenance data related to health information might be sufficient to find out specific individuals, if combined with other information. Access control schemes and query and answer models could be a solution though it is challenging to find the correct trade-off between effectiveness and privacy<sup>88</sup>.

#### 4.4 Transparency and Access Control Techniques

Transparency is an important issue in data processing, in order to let persons to know how their information is being treated and to create related informed choices. In big data clearness is required, as analytics is based on information that persons intentionally provide about themselves, in addition to data perceived from internet based social events, locations and smart devices. So, clearness needs to expand at data collection and persons should be able to know about criteria applied in the environment of big data. Textual information may not survive with development of services and to notify users on processing of information in big data. It was displayed in order for normal customer to study confidentiality strategies for web services visited; he may require devoting around 60 working days a year<sup>89</sup>. To increase effectiveness of information, layered approaches have been recommended which could offer data to customers at several stages. Usability is an important feature in this method, like the layered information which is offered in plain language and simple announcements<sup>90</sup>.

#### 4.5 Consent, Ownership and Control

User control in big data could be extended by a multi-mode approach<sup>90</sup>. Consent is one potential choice fulfilling the requirement. Other approaches and tools can help by safeguarding audits and defining the agreement of managers with rules. Instance of such a scheme is classifying every unit of individual information with metadata explaining information defense

requirements. This is view of semantic web, placing tags and procedures on information is an overpriced activity which will necessitate a multi-participant effort<sup>91</sup>. Schemes that set information provider in place of handling their information are an encouraging and evolving research arena.

##### 4.5.1 Consent Mechanisms

Reuse of managed tuple sets has made the older consent representations inadequate and outdated in big data. This created opinions against relevance of consent. Consent is an important information securing element and it has to familiarize to technological advancement of big data. Also, consent is a hindrance to service usability, consent mechanisms are required by the industry and collecting consent does not create obstacles for service, as is found by Google consent policy<sup>33</sup>. Its unacceptance appears to be inner obstacle. User pleasant consent tools have been offered by Data Safety Authorities<sup>33</sup>.

## 5. Conclusion

This paper focused on technology for big data confidentiality. Contradictory policy requirements can result in undermining both persons' confidentiality and big data results quality simultaneously. Hence, big data analytics should incorporate confidentiality preservation technologies a core element. Accordingly, this survey has elaborated techniques such as variants of anonymization, schemes based on encryption, multi-party computation, access control tools, transparency and policy enforcements tools and consent mechanisms. In coming years, the main focus must be on rectifying the challenges of big data technology with chances of confidentiality technology for profit of all involved participants.

## 6. References

1. Big Data. Nature [Internet]. [cited 2016 Dec 27]. Available from: <http://www.nature.com/news/specials/bigdata/index.html>.
2. The age of big data. New York Times [Internet]. [cited 2016 Dec 27]. Available from: <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/12/sunday-review/bigdatas-impact-in-the-world.html>.

3. International working group on data protection in communications. Working Paper on Big Data and Privacy.
4. European Parliament, Big Data and Smart Devices and their Impact on Privacy [Internet]. [cited 2016 Dec 27]. Available from: [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2015/536455/IPOL\\_STU%282015%29536455\\_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2015/536455/IPOL_STU%282015%29536455_EN.pdf).
5. Gartner. Inc. IT Glossary - Big Data [Internet]. [cited 2016 Dec 27]. Available from: <https://www.gartner.com/it-glossary/big-data>.
6. Meeker M. Internet trends 2014—code conference.
7. Huang T. Surveillance video: The biggest big data. *Computing Now*; 2014. p. 82–91.
8. Smith M, Szongott C, Henne B, von Voigt G. Big data privacy issues in public social media. 6th IEEE International Conference on Digital Ecosystems and Technologies; 2012 Jun. p. 1–6.
9. Wang X, Zhao R. Person re-identification: System design and evaluation overview. *Person re-identification*. Springer; 2014. p. 351–70.
10. Tene O, Polonetsky J. Big data for all: Privacy and user control in the age of analytics. *Northwestern Journal of Technology and Intellectual Property*. 2012; 11(1).
11. Reimann M, Schilke O, Thomas J. Toward an understanding of industry commoditization: Its nature and role in evolving marketing competition. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*. 2010; 27(2):188–97.
12. Article 29 data protection working party. Opinion 4/2007 on the concept of personal data [Internet]. [cited 2016 Dec 27]. Available from: [http://ec.europa.eu/justice/dataprotection/article29/documentation/opinionrecommendation/files/2007/wp136\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/justice/dataprotection/article29/documentation/opinionrecommendation/files/2007/wp136_en.pdf).
13. Muntès-Mulero V, Nin J. Privacy and anonymization for very large datasets. *Proceedings of the 18th ACM Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*. 2009 Nov 2. p. 2117–18.
14. Bond R. The EU e-privacy directive and consent to cookies. *The Business Lawyer*. 2012 Nov 1; 68(1):215–23.
15. Page Fair and Adobe. The cost of ad blocking [Internet]. [cited 2016 Dec 27]. Available from: [http://downloads.pagefair.com/reports/2015\\_report\\_the\\_cost\\_of\\_ad\\_blocking.pdf](http://downloads.pagefair.com/reports/2015_report_the_cost_of_ad_blocking.pdf).
16. Boyd D. Why youth lean to social network sites: The role of networked publics in teenage social life. *MacArthur foundation series on digital learning—Youth, identity, and digital media volume*. p. 119–42.
17. Rodota S. *IL diritto di avere diritti*: Laterza; 2013.
18. Gangadharan EB, Eubanks V, Barocas S. *Data and discrimination*. New America Foundation; 2015.
19. Parise. E. *The filter bubble: What the Internet is hiding from you*. New York: The Penguin Press; 2011.
20. Cavoukian A. Privacy by scheme [Internet]. [cited 2016 Dec 28]. Available from: <https://www.ipc.on.ca/images/resources/resources/privacybydesign.pdf>.
21. Eagle N, Pentland AS, Lazer D. Inferring friendship network structure by using mobile phone data. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*. 2009; 106(36):4–8.
22. De Montjoye YA, Hidalgo CA, Verleysen M, Blondel VD. Unique in the crowd: The privacy bounds of human mobility. *Scientific Reports*. 2013; 25:3.
23. Mon EE, Naing TT. The privacy-aware access control system using attribute-and role-based access control in private cloud. *Broadband Network and Multimedia Technology*. *Proceedings of 4th IEEE International Conference*; 2011. p. 447–51.
24. Poljicak M, Stancic H. Statistical microdata—Production of safe datasets, transparent presentation of contents and advanced services for users through metadata authorization system. *Information and Communication Technology, Electronics and Microelectronics*. *Proceedings of 37th International Convention*; 2014. p. 1527–32.
25. Korolova A, Kenthapadi K, Mishra N, Ntoulas A. Releasing search queries and clicks privately. *Proceedings of the 18th international conference on World Wide Web*; 2009. p. 171–80.
26. Ketkar NS, Holder LB, Cook DJ. Subdue: Compression-based frequent pattern discovery in graph data. *Proceedings of the 1st International Workshop on Open Source Data Mining: Frequent Pattern Mining Implementations*; 2005. p. 71–6.
27. Han J, Haiphong E, Le G, Du J. Survey on NoSQL database. *Pervasive computing and applications*. 2011 6th International Conference; 2011. p. 363–6.
28. Skinner C, Shlomo N. Assessing identification risk in survey microdata using log-linear models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*. 2011:989–1001.
29. Kifer D, Machanavajjhala A. No free lunch in data privacy. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Management of Data*; 2011. p. 193–204.
30. Bergeat M, Cuppens-Boulahia N, Cuppens F, Jess N, Dupont F, Oulmakhzoune S, De Peretti G. A french anonymization experiment with health data. *PSD: Privacy in Statistical Databases*; 2014.
31. Duncan GT, Mukherjee S. Optimal disclosure limitation strategy in statistical databases: Detering tracker attacks through additive noise. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*. 2000:1–9.
32. Vaidya J, Clifton C. Privacy preserving association rule mining in vertically partitioned data. *Proceedings of the Eighth ACM SIGKDD International Conference On Knowledge Discovery AND Data Mining*; 2002. p. 639–44.

33. Bambauer JR. Tragedy of the data commons. *Harvard Journal of Law and Technology*. 2011; 4(25).
34. Wang J, Luo Y, Zhao Y, Le J. A survey on privacy preserving data mining. *First International Workshop on Database Technology and Applications*; 2009. p. 111–14.
35. Gehrke J, Hay M, Lui E, Pass R. Crowd-blending privacy. *32nd Annual Cryptology Conference, Santa Barbara*; 2012. p. 479–96.
36. Shokri R, Troncoso C, Diaz C, Freudiger J, Hubaux JP. Unraveling an old cloak: k-anonymity for location privacy. *Proceedings of the 9th Annual ACM Workshop on Privacy in the Electronic Society*. 2012. p. 115–18.
37. Mohammed N, Chen R, Fung B, Yu PS. Differentially private data release for data mining. *Proceedings of the 17th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*; 2011. p. 493–501.
38. Muralidhar K, Sarathy R. Does differential privacy protect terry gross' privacy. *International Conference on Privacy in Statistical Databases*; 2010. p. 200–9.
39. Domingo-Ferrer J, Soria-Comas J. From t-closeness to differential privacy and vice versa in data anonymization. *Knowledge-based Systems*. 2014; 74(1):151–8.
40. Soria-Comas J, Domingo-Ferrer J. Big data privacy: Challenges to privacy principles and models. *Data Science and Engineering*; 2016. p. 21–8.
41. Laurila JK, Gatica-Perez D, Aad I, Bornet O, Do TM, Dousse O, Eberle J, Miettinen M. The mobile data challenge: Big data for mobile computing research. In *Pervasive Computing*; 2012.
42. Giannotti F, Pedreschi D. *Mobility, data mining and privacy: Geographic knowledge discovery*. Springer Science and Business Media; 2008.
43. Narayanan A, Shmatikov V. Robust de-anonymization of large sparse datasets. *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*; 2008. p. 111–25.
44. Kinney SK, Karr AF, Gonzalez JF. Data confidentiality: the next five years summary and guide to papers. *Journal of Privacy and Confidentiality*. 2010; 1(2):1.
45. Mangat NS. An improved randomized response strategy. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*. 1995; 1:93–5.
46. Agrawal S, Haritsa JR. A framework for high-accuracy privacy-preserving mining. *21st International Conference on Data Engineering*; 2004. p. 193–204.
47. Domingo-Ferrer J, Sánchez D, Soria-Comas J. Co-utility. *Progress in Artificial Intelligence*. 2016; 5(2):105–10.
48. Gajanayake R, Iannella R, Sahama T. Sharing with care: An information accountability perspective. *IEEE Internet Computing*. 2011; 15(4):31–8.
49. Herranz J, Nin J, Sole M. Kd-trees and the real disclosure risks of large statistical databases. *Information Fusion*. 2012; 13(4):260–73.
50. Zhou B, Pei J. Preserving privacy in social networks against neighborhood attacks. *IEEE 24th International Conference on Data Engineering*; 2008. p. 506–15.
51. Zhou B, Pei J. Preserving privacy in social networks against neighborhood attacks. *Proceedings of IEEE 24th International Conference on Data Engineering*; 2008. p. 506–15.
52. Abawajy J, Ninggal MI, Herawan T. Vertex re-identification attack using neighborhood pair properties. *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience*; 2015.
53. Erola A, Castella-Roca J, Navarro-Arribas G, Torra V. Semantic micro-aggregation for the anonymization of query logs. *Proceedings of International Conference on Privacy in Statistical Databases*; 2010. p. 127–37.
54. Campan A, Truta TM. Extended p-sensitive k-anonymity. *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai Informatica*. 2006; 51(2):19–30.
55. Stokes K, Torra V. Multiple releases of k-anonymous data sets and k-anonymous relational databases. *International Journal of Uncertainty, Fuzziness and Knowledge-Based Systems*. 2012; 20(06):839–53.
56. Kottke D, Kreml G, Spiliopoulou M. Probabilistic active learning in data streams. *International Symposium on Intelligent Data Analysis*; 2015. p. 145–15.
57. Friedman A, Sharfman I, Keren D, Schuster A. Privacy-preserving distributed stream monitoring. *NDSS*; 2014.
58. Papadimitriou S, Li F, Kollios G, Yu PS. Time series compressibility and privacy. *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Very Large Data Bases*; 2014. p. 459–70.
59. Song Y, Dahlmeier D, Bressan S. Not so unique in the crowd: A simple and effective algorithm for anonymizing location data. *Conference PIR@SIGIR*; 2014.
60. Cavoukian A, Tapscott D. *Who knows: Safeguarding your privacy in a networked world*. McGraw-Hill Professional; 1994.
61. Murphy MH. Technological solutions to privacy questions: what is the role of law. *Information and Communications Technology Law*. 2016 Jan 2; 25(1):4–31.
62. Project Rhino [Internet]. [cited 2016 Dec 28]. Available from: <https://github.com/intel-hadoop/project-rhino>.
63. Protegrity [Internet]. [cited 2016 Dec 28]. Available from: <http://www.protegrity.com/secure-big-data>.
64. Soria-Comas J, Domingo-Ferrer J. Big data privacy: Challenges to privacy principles and models. *Data Science and Engineering*. 2016; 1(1):21–8.
65. Ostrovsky R, Sahai A, Waters B. Attribute-based encryption with non-monotonic access structures. *Proceedings of the*

- 14th ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security; 2007. p. 195–203.
66. Boneh D, Franklin M. Identity-based encryption from the Weil pairing. Annual International Cryptology Conference; 2012. p. 213–29.
67. Kamara S. Encrypted Search [Internet]. 2015. Available from: <http://research.microsoft.com/enus/um/people/senyk/pubs/esearch.pdf>.
68. Crypt DB [Internet]. [cited 2016 Dec 28]. Available from: <https://github.com/CryptDB/cryptdb>.
69. Cash D, Grubbs P, Perry J, Ristenpart T. Leakage-abuse attacks against searchable encryption. Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security; 2012. p. 668–79.
70. Chang YC, Mitzenmacher M. Privacy preserving keyword searches on remote encrypted data. Proceedings of International Conference on Applied Cryptography and Network Security; 2005. p. 442–55.
71. Wee H. Functional encryption and its impact on cryptography. Proceedings of International Conference on Security and Cryptography for Networks; 2014. p. 318–23.
72. Task C, Clifton C. Defining differential privacy for social network analysis. State of the Art Applications of Social Network Analysis; 2014. p. 139–61.
73. Van Dijk M, Gentry C, Halevi S, Vaikuntanathan V. Fully homomorphic encryption over the integers. Proceedings of Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques; 2012. p. 24–43.
74. Gentry C, Halevi S. Public challenges for fully-homomorphic encryption [Internet]. [cited 2016 Dec 28]. Available from: [http://researcher.watson.ibm.com/researcher/view\\_group.php?id=1548](http://researcher.watson.ibm.com/researcher/view_group.php?id=1548).
75. Gentry C. Toward basing fully homomorphic encryption on worst-case hardness. Annual Cryptology Conference; 2010. p. 116–37.
76. Goldreich O, Ostrovsky R. Software protection and simulation on oblivious RAMs. Journal of the ACM. 1996; 43(3):431–73.
77. Gentry C. Optimizing ORAM and using it efficiently for secure computation. Proceedings of 13th International Symposium; 2013. p. 1–18.
78. Aumann Y, Lindell Y. Security against covert adversaries: Efficient protocols for realistic adversaries. Theory of Cryptography Conference; 2007. p. 137–56.
79. Ikhlaiq S, Keswani B. Computation of big data in Hadoop and cloud environment [Internet]. 2015. Available from: [iosrjen.org/Papers/vol6\\_issue1%20\(part-4\)/F06143139.pdf](http://iosrjen.org/Papers/vol6_issue1%20(part-4)/F06143139.pdf).
80. Cloud security alliance. Top ten big data security and privacy challenges [Internet]. [cited 2016 Dec 28]. Available from: [https://downloads.cloudsecurityalliance.org/initiatives/bdwg/Expanded\\_Top\\_Ten\\_Big\\_Data\\_Security\\_and\\_Privacy\\_Challenges.pdf](https://downloads.cloudsecurityalliance.org/initiatives/bdwg/Expanded_Top_Ten_Big_Data_Security_and_Privacy_Challenges.pdf).
81. Elkhodr M, Shahrestani S, Cheung H. A semantic obfuscation technique for the Internet of Things. Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Communications Workshops; 2014. p. 448–53.
82. Koning M, Korenhol P, Alpar G, Hoepman JH. The ABC of ABC - An analysis of attribute-based credentials in the light of data [Internet]. [cited 2016 Dec 28]. Available from: <https://www.petsymposium.org/2014/papers/Koning.pdf>.
83. Yu P, Sendor J, Serme G, Santana de Oliveira A. Automating privacy enforcement in cloud platforms. 7th International Workshop on Data Privacy Management; 2012. p. 160–73.
84. President's council of advisors on science and technology. Big data and privacy: A technological perspective [Internet]. 2014. [cited 2016 Dec 28]. Available from: [https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/PCAST/pcast\\_big\\_data\\_and\\_privacy\\_may\\_2014.pdf](https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/PCAST/pcast_big_data_and_privacy_may_2014.pdf).
85. Cavoukian A, Taylor S, Abrams ME. Privacy by scheme: Essential for organizational accountability and strong business practices. Identity in the Information Society. 2012; 3(2):405–13.
86. Ram S and Liu J. A semiotics framework for analyzing data provenance research. Journal of computing Science and Engineering. 2008:221–48.
87. Asghar MR, Ion M, Russello G, Crispo B. Securing data provenance in the cloud. Open Problems in Network Security; 2012. p. 145–60.
88. Tan YS, Ko RK, Holmes G. Security and data accountability in distributed systems: A provenance survey. High Performance Computing and Communications and IEEE International Conference on Embedded and Ubiquitous Computing. Proceedings of IEEE 10th International Conference; 2013. p. 1571–8.
89. Jensen C, Potts C. Privacy policies as decision-making tools: An evaluation of online privacy notices. Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems; 2004. p. 471–78.
90. Cheung AS. Location privacy: The challenges of mobile service devices. Computer Law and Security Review. 2014; 30(1):41–54.
91. Ghayekhloo S, Bayram Z. A novel rubric and feature-based appraisal and comparison framework for the evaluation of semantic web services composition approaches. Indian Journal of Science and Technology. 2015; 8(36).