

Convergence Analysis and System Design for Federated Learning over Wireless Networks

Shuo Wan^{1,2}, Jiaxun Lu², Pingyi Fan^{*1}, *Senior member, IEEE*, Yunfeng Shao², Chenghui Peng³,
and Khaled B. Ietaief⁴, *Fellow, IEEE*

¹Department of Electronic Engineering, Tsinghua University, Beijing, P.R. China

²Huawei Noah's Ark Lab

³Huawei Wireless Technology Lab

⁴Department of Electronic Engineering, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong

E-mail: wan-s17@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn, *fpy@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn, {lujiaxun, shaoyunfeng, pengchenghui}@huawei.com, eekhaled@ece.ust.hk

Abstract—Federated learning (FL) has recently emerged as an important and promising learning scheme in IoT, enabling devices to jointly learn a model without sharing their raw data sets. However, as the training data in FL is not collected and stored centrally, FL training requires frequent model exchange, which is largely affected by the wireless communication network. Therein, limited bandwidth and random package loss restrict interactions in training. Meanwhile, the insufficient message synchronization among distributed clients could also affect FL convergence. In this paper, we analyze the convergence rate of FL training considering the joint impact of communication network and training settings. Further by considering the training costs in terms of time and power, the optimal scheduling problems for communication networks are formulated. The developed theoretical results can be used to assist the system parameter selections and explain the principle of how the wireless communication system could influence the distributed training process and network scheduling.

Index Terms—Federated learning, Network scheduling, Coupling design, Convergence analysis, Edge computing

I. INTRODUCTION

WITH the emergence of data sets and the rapid growth of distributed computing, distributed learning has become a promising mode for deployment of large-scale machine learning [1]. Under such circumstances, due to data privacy and limited communication resources, it is very difficult to transmit all the raw data sets to a central server for learning, especially for applications with widely distributed intelligent clients. Thus, to implement machine learning with high efficiency, researchers started to focus on distributed learning schemes. In [2], the authors proposed the federated learning (FL) scheme for distributed data sets. Such a technique allows applications to collectively reap the benefits of shared models trained from the rich data while avoiding the need of central data collection.

However, implementation of FL could face constraints from insufficient communication network support, especially in a highly distributed system. Unlike conventional training with all resources on the cloud, FL training does not have direct access to all raw distributed data. Thus, it requires periodic exchange of model data over a wireless network among clients. Without sufficient message exchange, FL training could face severe

degradation compared with centralized training. Therefore, in FL scheme, network scheduling would largely affect the convergence of training process.

To support FL with high efficiency, the network design must be linked with FL training to consider their coupling properties. Conventional network design mainly considers the communication efficiency without considering the computation algorithms. However, since convergence of FL can be largely affected by message exchange, how to support such a training algorithm with limited network resources would rise up as an important problem. Under such circumstances, the performance gain of FL from network scheduling would build a bridge between communication and computation. By proper analysis of such a bridge, a coupled network design can be achieved.

The problem of wireless network scheduling for FL training takes two steps to be solved. Firstly, a theoretical analysis of its convergence is required. Secondly, based on the convergence analysis, a network model should be set up for FL implementation and the settings therein will be optimized accordingly. Although convergence analysis for distributed learning has been widely studied, the analysis considering the impact of network settings has not been investigated with general and precise results. To the best of our knowledge, former works mainly consider settings of computation, such as the accuracy threshold, batch size, etc. However, as discussed above, communication will affect the model aggregation, which leads to a degraded convergence. Therefore, to support FL in network settings, the convergence analysis considering network support is an essential bridge. Then by jointly considering its tradeoff with costs in the communication network by model analysis, the optimal settings will be derived. Meanwhile, FL implementation mainly depends on the cooperation among widely distributed clients. Degradation in some participating clients also leads to a worse performance of the whole training process. Under such circumstances, the resource scheduling among clients is also required.

A. Related works

Recently some works studied the convergence of FL training with several bounds [3–7]. Authors of [4] analyzed the general

converging speed of FL. Considering the impact of training parameters, [3] proposed an analytic bound. However, the background communication was not considered systematically and the bound still requires refinement with more explicit physical meanings. The work in [5] tried to improve the classical FL scheme based on theoretical analysis. Meanwhile, [6] analyzed FL convergence considering the tradeoff between the local epoch and global epoch. Based on this work, [7] further proposed a three-layer training scheme and discussed related control algorithms. However, in the proposed bounds, the tradeoff between training and communication is based on an additionally defined resource budget, which restricts the application range.

From the point of FL implementation, some works discussed the FL scheme and the scheduling algorithm therein [6, 8–13]. Authors of [13] proposed a multi-player game to study participants’ reactions under various incentive mechanisms in FL scenarios. [8] studied the effects of malicious clients on FL. Considering the time slot division in the TDMA protocol, a control algorithm for FL over a wireless network was proposed in [6]. Authors of [9] considered TDMA settings to jointly optimize the computation settings and time slot division in communication. However, the convergence analysis did not discuss the effects of communication network. As a result, the communication design becomes independent from training, without considering the tradeoff therein. Considering the package loss in communication, [10] analyzed the FL convergence rate and proposed a control algorithm. However, the convergence results are based on specific policies and can not provide more insights in general design. Besides, the local epoch, non-i.i.d. data set and partial participation were not considered, which restricts its generality. [11, 12] also considered the optimization of communication settings. Although their communication models are solid, the convergence analysis still needs to be improved.

B. Contributions

Previous works have implemented a set of basic analysis models and scheduling algorithms for FL implementation. Therein, the convergence analysis of FL training still needs more observations of the background wireless network. Besides, part of the inequalities should be handled more tightly to reflect the trend of some important parameters. From the network design for FL perspective, one needs to consider the coupling properties between communication and computation. To resolve such problems, our contributions are summarized as follows.

- 1) The convergence rate analysis of FL training will be cast into a joint optimization problem of computing (training) and communication, in a more general setting with non-i.i.d. data sets, local training epochs, partial client participation, limited bandwidth, and package loss. By taking into account training settings as well as the impacts of the communication network on model aggregation, the derived convergence bound can be clearly divided into a computation part and a communication part with explicit physical meaning. Meanwhile, the tightness of




Fig. 1: The structure of FL training over a wireless network.

the convergence bound is also improved. Thus, the impact of the intrinsic factors can be reflected with clearer physical meanings, fitting better in experiments.

- 2) Considering time and power consumption as the joint training cost, the general system cost for each training epoch is defined. By taking the convergence analysis as a bridge between FL training and wireless network, the overall setting for bandwidth and local training epoch are optimized with closed-form theoretical expressions. The result could fit the common knowledge of network and distributed learning, providing more insights of network settings for efficient FL. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first explicit result considering the tradeoff between computing (training) and communication in FL with closed-form principles for selecting hyper-parameters in a wireless network.
- 3) Considering the limitation of FL due to high level of distribution among clients, we propose network scheduling algorithms to enhance the cooperation among distributed clients. By adaptive resource scheduling, clients with varied capability and burden could achieve a better performance in synchronization. Given a specific network setting, the design could minimize the time and power cost accordingly. On the other hand, its derived costs will also affect the choice of the network hyper-parameters. Then by jointly considering the coupling factors, we set up an integrated design principle for FL implementation over wireless networks.

II. SYSTEM MODEL AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

The major focus is on a two-layer FL system composed of a central server and a set of N distributed intelligent clients ($\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$). As shown in Fig. 1, the server and clients are connected through a wireless network, where a cellular-based network is used as an example. Such a system could support various IoT applications such as environmental monitoring, health-care, etc.

A. Federated learning process

In the FL system, the data set of client j is $S_j = \{(x_1^{(j)}, y_1^{(j)}), (x_2^{(j)}, y_2^{(j)}), \dots, (x_{D_j}^{(j)}, y_{D_j}^{(j)})\}$ with D_j data sam-

TABLE I: The key notations

Notation	Definition
N	The total number of clients participating in FL training.
P_t	The current client set participating in model uploading.
K	Size of the randomly selected set P_t .
D	The average size of distributed data sets among clients.
E_l	Length of the local training epoch.
G_ϵ	Total global epochs to reach loss ϵ .
γ	The package loss rate in wireless network.
B	Total bandwidth for model uploading.
$\{a_j\}$	Ratio of bandwidth allocation among clients in P_t .
$\{f_j\}$	The processor frequency for local training.
$\{p_j^0\}$	The uploading power for unit bandwidth.
$\{p_j\}$	The model uploading power with $p_j = p_j^0 a_j B$.
r_j^0	The transmission rate with full bandwidth for client j .
C_u	The expected model uploading cost in one global epoch.
$C_{u,0}$	$E[\frac{1}{K}C_u]$: The expected uploading cost for unit K .
C_n	The expected computation cost in one global epoch.
$C_{n,0}$	$E[\frac{1}{E_l}C_n]$: The expected training cost for one local epoch.
l_0	Weight of power cost in C_u and C_n .
λ	Metric of non-i.i.d. extent in distributed data sets.
T_d	The time cost of model download.

ples. Before central aggregation, models are trained in distributed manner among clients. The loss function is

$$f_j(w) = \frac{1}{D_j} \sum_{i=1}^{D_j} l(w, (x_i^{(j)}, y_i^{(j)})), \quad (1)$$

where $l(w, (x_i^{(j)}, y_i^{(j)}))$ is the loss function for model weight w given $(x_i^{(j)}, y_i^{(j)})$. Denoting the weights of data set S_j as $Q = \{q_1, q_2, \dots, q_N\}$, the global loss function is

$$f(w) = \sum_{j=1}^n q_j f_j(w). \quad (2)$$

The training process is done periodically by global epochs, each with E_l local epochs. Let t be an arbitrary discrete time slot for training, then $(t_c = \lfloor \frac{t}{E_l} \rfloor E_l)$ should be the start slot of the current global epoch. At t_c , clients would receive renewed model weights \bar{w}_{t_c} from the central server. As $t \neq t_c$, the distributed local training proceeds as

$$w_{t_c+i+1}^j = w_{t_c+i}^j - \eta_{t_c+i} \nabla f_j(w_{t_c+i}^j), \quad (3)$$

where $i = 0, \dots, E_l - 1$, η_{t_c+i} is the learning rate and $\nabla f_j(w_{t_c+i}^j)$ is the stochastic gradient in one local epoch. As local training is completed at $t = t_c + E_l$, the system will uniformly choose a client set P_t ($|P_t| = K, K \leq N$) and aggregate their model weights ($w_t^j, j \in P_t$) at the server. Note that set P_t is renewed at every round, so that each participating client gets the chance to upload its model. If $K = N$, all clients will be participators in each global epoch. The received weights are averaged as

$$\bar{w}_t = \frac{N}{K} \sum_{j \in P_t} q_j w_t^j, \quad (4)$$

where $E[\frac{N}{K} \sum_{j \in P_t} q_j] = 1$. In this process, the latency involves model uploading, central aggregation and model broadcast. FL training will then come to a new global epoch.

B. Major problems and System Model

FL highly depends on the communication network for model exchange in the training process. Therein, more message exchanges in one round could reduce the total training epochs. However, due to limited bandwidth, it will also increase the data exchange time and power of each epoch. Meanwhile, scheduling of the highly distributed participators also affects the costs in model exchange.

In this case, crucial questions can be raised. How is FL training influenced by all the background network settings? What are the related principles to set the network parameters? How the network should be scheduled accordingly for implementation of a highly efficient FL training? In this paper, we try to answer these questions in theory and present related principles for the design and optimization of FL systems.

1) *Communication model*: Let us consider FL over an orthogonal frequency division multiple access (OFDMA) network, which is widely adopted by 4G and 5G. As known, the uploading noise in OFMDA network rises with the allocated bandwidth. Thus, to obtain a rather stable transmission rate, the uploading power p_j is set to be proportional to the allocated bandwidth. By denoting the total bandwidth as B , the transmission rate of client j is given by

$$r_j = a_j B \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{p_j h_j}{a_j B N_0} \right) = a_j B \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{p_j^0 h_j}{N_0} \right) \quad (5)$$

where a_j ($j \in P_t$) is the proportion of bandwidth allocated to client j with $\sum_{j \in P_t} a_j \leq 1$ and $p_j = p_j^0 a_j B$. Therein, p_j^0 shall denote the transmission power for unit bandwidth and h_j is the channel power gain of client j . The noise density in a wireless network is denoted as N_0 . Then by defining z_m as the required data size of transmitted model, the time cost of model uploading for client j should be

$$t_{u,j} = \frac{z_m}{r_j} = \frac{z_m}{a_j B \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{p_j^0 h_j}{N_0} \right)}. \quad (6)$$

Therein, the power consumption should be

$$p_{u,j} = p_j t_{u,j} = p_j \frac{z_m}{r_j}. \quad (7)$$

Note that the clients in set P_t are selected uniformly in each global epoch, which would change with global epochs. Therefore, considering the expectation of the cost on P_t , the uploading cost is defined as

$$C_u = E_{P_t} \left[\max_{j \in P_t} \left\{ \frac{z_m}{a_j B r_j^0} \right\} + l_0 \sum_{j \in P_t} p_j^0 \frac{z_m}{r_j^0} \right], \quad (8)$$

where $r_j^0 = \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{p_j^0 h_j}{N_0} \right)$ is the transmission rate with unit bandwidth and l_0 is the weight of the power cost. Due to the synchronization requirement in model aggregation, the time cost is affected by the slowest client.

Wireless connection typically endures a random package loss due to the independent fading of wireless channels. Let us assume K clients are uploading their model data simultaneously, and that K_γ of them will be successfully received. For simplicity and considering the worst case, $K_\gamma \geq K(1 - \gamma)$,

where $\gamma < 1$. Note that the lost packages also take resources for transmission. Thus, the package loss does not influence C_u . Meanwhile, since the model aggregation here only involves K_γ local models, FL training may take more global epochs to converge.

2) *Computation model*: It is straightforward to see that computation latency in distributed training is proportional to the local epoch length E_l . The computation latency of client j is

$$t_{n,j} = E_l \frac{z_{n,j}}{f_j}, \quad (9)$$

where f_j is the processor frequency and $z_{n,j}$ is the required processing cycles for one round of local training. The corresponding power consumption is

$$p_{n,j} = E_l \kappa_j f_j^2 z_{n,j}, \quad (10)$$

where κ_j is a parameter depending on the specific processor on client j .

In fact, more data in training usually requires more processing cycles. This means that $z_{n,j}$ is proportional to D_j . Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that $z_{n,j} = \alpha_0 D_j$ where α_0 is an empirical parameter depending on training model and softwares. Meanwhile, since distributed training is an entirely local operation, the local computation cost should be the major focus in network scheduling. Thus, the average power consumption is taken instead of the summation of all training powers. Therefore, the computation cost of one global epoch is given by

$$C_n = E_{P_t} [\max_{j \in P_t} \{E_l \frac{\alpha_0 D_j}{f_j}\} + l_0 \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j \in P_t} E_l \kappa_j f_j^2 \alpha_0 D_j]. \quad (11)$$

C. Problem formulation

We define T_d as the extra time cost in the model broadcast by base station, which is rather fixed and determined by central resources. The package loss rate γ is given as a background network parameter. Then from the definitions of C_u and C_n in (8) and (11), the joint optimization problem for FL implementation over a wireless network can be expressed as follows.

$$\min_{K, E_l, \{a_j\}, \{f_j\}} G_\epsilon [C_u + C_n + T_d], \quad (12)$$

$$s.t. \quad G_\epsilon = G_\epsilon(E_l, K, \gamma), \quad (12a)$$

$$E_l \geq 1, 0 \leq \gamma < 1, \quad (12b)$$

$$1 \leq K \leq N, |P_t| = K, \quad (12c)$$

$$\sum_{j \in P_t} a_j \leq 1, a_j > 0, j \in P_t, \quad (12d)$$

$$f_j^{\min} \leq f_j \leq f_j^{\max}, j \in P_t. \quad (12e)$$

In the above formulation, the parameter G_ϵ is the number of global epochs taken by FL to reach a loss ϵ , which will be given by convergence analysis. Constraint (12a) shows that G_ϵ is jointly affected by K , γ and E_l . There exists an important tradeoff between G_ϵ and C_u . If K increases with more clients uploading, G_ϵ will get smaller. However, from constraint

(12c), more clients in P_t leads to a smaller bandwidth for each client, which will in turn lead to a larger C_u . Therein, as the metric of FL training convergence, $G_\epsilon(E_l, K, \gamma)$ is actually an important bridge between AI training and the communication network. In the subsequent section, we will derive the specific closed-form expression of G_ϵ .

Constraints (12b), (12c), (12d) and (12e) are basic ranges in system settings. E_l is the local training epoch, which stands for input from computation in training. K is the size of P_t , representing the capability of model uploading provided by the wireless network. $\{a_j\}$ and $\{f_j\}$ are scheduling policies among clients, aimed at minimizing $(C_u + C_n)$. Note that K and E_l are the hyper-parameters determining the total bandwidth division and local epoch. Given such settings, $\{a_j\}$ and $\{f_j\}$ are scheduled accordingly. By minimizing the cost for an arbitrary P_t , the expectation of the cost on random client selection can also be minimized. Meanwhile, on the contrary, the expected cost will in turn affect selection of K and E_l , which can be reflected by theoretical results. By solving (12), the integrated principles for the selection of the hyper-parameters and resource scheduling will be obtained.

III. FL CONVERGENCE ANALYSIS

In the following, the analysis is based on the stochastic gradient descent (SGD) update. The training process is given in Section II-A and the general non-i.i.d. data distribution is considered. In fact, the ideal i.i.d. data distribution is a special case therein. Beforehand, some common assumptions and the metric of non-i.i.d. in FL are first introduced. Then the expression of G_ϵ will be given and discussed in detail.

A. Preparations

1) *Assumptions on loss function*: The common assumptions of the L-smooth and μ -Polyak-Lojasiewicz (PL) condition for the loss function are given as follows.

Assumption 1: (L-smooth [3, 4]) The loss function $f(\cdot)$ in FL training satisfies

$$f(y) \leq f(x) + (y-x)^T \nabla f(x) + \frac{L}{2} \|y-x\|^2. \quad (13)$$

Assumption 2: (μ -P-L condition [4, 14]) The loss function $f(\cdot)$ in FL training satisfies a general extension of the μ -strongly convex property, which is defined as

$$\|\nabla f(x)\|^2 \geq 2\mu[f(x) - f^*]. \quad (14)$$

Remark 1: The P-L condition in Assumption 2 may not fit globally in classical neural networks like CNN. However, viewing f^* as the local optimum, the assumption could still work. Therefore, it is reasonable to apply this in the convergence analysis. In our latter experiments with CNN, the rational of the assumption could be confirmed.

2) *Non-i.i.d. data*: In practice, independent observed data at distributed clients typically diverge in probability distribution. For instance, some clients may have more data of cats while others may observe dogs. To proceed with the analysis, a commonly adopted measure is introduced to quantify such a property.

Definition 1: [4, 15] Given N clients with weights $\{\pi_j\}$ ($\sum_{j=1}^N \pi_j = 1$) and $\{\nabla f_j(w)\}$ as their gradients, a measurement λ for non-i.i.d. in data set is defined as

$$\frac{\sum_{j=1}^N \pi_j \|\nabla f_j(w)\|^2}{\left\| \sum_{j=1}^N \pi_j \nabla f_j(w) \right\|^2} = \lambda \leq \lambda. \quad (15)$$

Remark 2: It is known that $\lambda \geq 1$ by Jensen's inequality [16]. Therein, $\lambda = 1$ represents the i.i.d. condition. Parameter λ reflects the non-i.i.d. extent of the stochastic gradients of N clients.

B. Results of G_ϵ

Theorem 1: Under Assumption 1), 2) and Definition 1, if we choose the learning rate η_t as $O(\frac{1}{t})$, $|P_t| = K$ and local epoch as E_t , G_ϵ is given by

$$G_\epsilon = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \frac{4L^2 G^2 \lambda}{\mu^2} \left[\frac{\lambda - 1}{K(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{2D} + \frac{(\lambda - 1)E_t}{2C_1 \phi_0} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{f_0}{E_t} \right], \quad (16)$$

where γ is the package loss rate in communication. Parameter $D = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N D_j$ is the average size of the training data and G^2 is defined as the gradient upper-bound. C_1 and σ^2 are constants related to the gradient variance in SGD and $(\phi_0 - 1) \propto \frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda}$. Specific definitions of parameter C_1 , σ^2 and ϕ_0 can be found in Appendix A with the proof shown in Appendix E.

In (16), $\frac{\lambda-1}{K(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{2D}$ and $(\frac{\lambda-1}{2C_1 \phi_0} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{f_0}{E_t})$ are two key terms with clear physical meanings, separately representing the impacts resulting from communication and computation. By observing $\frac{\lambda-1}{K(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{2D}$, we could see that K and $1-\gamma$ compensate with each other to speed up the convergence in the form of product. The communication term is also proportional to $(\lambda - 1)$. Thus, the extent of non-i.i.d. will influence the effects of the communication network. This can be observed from the experiments in Section V.

The effects of computation are reflected by $(\frac{\lambda-1}{2C_1 \phi_0} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{f_0}{E_t})$ in (16). The optimal E_t can be derived as $E_t^* = \sqrt{\frac{C_1 \phi_0 f_0}{2(\lambda-1)}}$. As E_t increases, the local training becomes more sufficient. But increasing E_t may also cause convergence failure due to the large diversity among the distributed data sets. Thus, a proper selection of E_t must be balanced to speed up the training. For the i.i.d. setting with $\lambda = 1$, E_t can be arbitrarily large, which would be limited by the capability of local processors.

It is note that a larger K naturally leads to a smaller allocated bandwidth. Thus C_u in (8) will definitely get larger. Combined with Theorem 1, the tradeoff between G_ϵ and C_u can be easily observed.

IV. DESIGN PRINCIPLE FOR FL

In this section, the joint design principle for parameter selection and resource scheduling will considered.

A. Sub-problems for hyper-parameters and scheduling policy

As known, the client set P_t for model uploading is renewed by uniform selection in each global epoch. Due to different conditions of the clients, the specific system cost in each global epoch may be varied. Thus, in the definition of C_u and C_n in

(8) and (11), the expectation on P_t is taken to get the expected cost for each global epoch.

As discussed in Section II-C, K and E_t are network hyper-parameters while $\{a_j\}$ and $\{f_j\}$ are scheduling policies based on a given setting. Thus, it is natural to see that finding solution of the hyper-parameters and scheduling policy should be decoupled. Before the decoupling, the expected costs C_u and C_n should first be transformed as a function of the hyper-parameters.

From the definition in (11), C_n is actually proportional to E_t . Therein, setting $C_n = E_t C_{n,0}$, the unit cost $C_{n,0}$ can be directly defined as

$$C_{n,0} = E_{P_t} [\max_{j \in P_t} \left\{ \frac{\alpha_0 D_j}{f_j} \right\} + \frac{l_0}{K} \sum_{j \in P_t} \kappa_j f_j^2 \alpha_0 D_j]. \quad (17)$$

Considering C_u , as K increases, more clients will be uploading their models simultaneously with less bandwidth for each client. Since the clients are chosen uniformly in P_t , then $E[\frac{1}{a_j}] \propto K$ holds for an arbitrary policy to allocate the bandwidth among K clients in P_t . That is, the expected allocated bandwidth for each client is inversely proportional to K . Then by observing the definition of C_u in (8), the uploading cost should be proportional to K in the form of $C_u = K C_{u,0}$.

Considering the full participation case with $K = N$, the uploading cost for an arbitrary scheduling policy can be given as $(\max_{j=1}^N \left\{ \frac{z_m}{a_j B r_j^0} \right\} + l_0 \sum_{j=1}^N p_j^0 \frac{z_m}{r_j^0})$. Then combined with $E[\frac{1}{a_j}] \propto K$, it is natural to see that the cost $E_{P_t} (\max_{j \in P_t} \left\{ \frac{z_m}{a_j B r_j^0} \right\} + l_0 \sum_{j \in P_t} \frac{p_j^0 z_m}{r_j^0})$ statistically equals to $\frac{K}{N} (\max_{j=1}^N \left\{ \frac{z_m}{a_j B r_j^0} \right\} + l_0 \sum_{j=1}^N p_j^0 \frac{z_m}{r_j^0})$ for an arbitrary scheduling policy of $\{a_j\}$. Thus, by dividing the full participation cost with N , $C_{u,0}$ could be derived as

$$C_{u,0} = \frac{1}{N} [\max_{j=1}^N \left\{ \frac{z_m}{a_j B r_j^0} \right\} + l_0 \sum_{j=1}^N p_j^0 \frac{z_m}{r_j^0}]. \quad (18)$$

By considering the expected cost in the form $(K C_{u,0} + E_t C_{n,0})$ for a given scheduling policy, the sub-problem for the optimal hyper-parameters is defined as follows.

$$\min_{K, E_t} G_\epsilon [K C_{u,0} + E_t C_{n,0} + T_d], \quad (19)$$

$$s.t. \quad G_\epsilon = G_\epsilon(E_t, K, \gamma), \quad (19a)$$

$$E_t \geq 1, 0 \leq \gamma < 1, \quad (19b)$$

$$1 \leq K \leq N. \quad (19c)$$

For an arbitrary P_t , K and E_t , the sub-problem for the optimal scheduling policy is defined as

$$\min_{\{a_j\}, \{f_j\}} C_{u,t} + C_{n,t}, \quad (20)$$

$$s.t. \quad C_{u,t} = \max_{j \in P_t} \left\{ \frac{z_m}{a_j B r_j^0} \right\} + l_0 \sum_{j \in P_t} p_j^0 \frac{z_m}{r_j^0}, \quad (20a)$$

$$C_{n,t} = \max_{j \in P_t} \left\{ E_t \frac{\alpha_0 D_j}{f_j} \right\} + \frac{l_0}{K} \sum_{j \in P_t} E_t \kappa_j f_j^2 \alpha_0 D_j, \quad (20b)$$

$$\sum_{j \in P_t} a_j \leq 1, a_j > 0, j \in P_t, \quad (20c)$$

$$f_j^{\min} \leq f_j \leq f_j^{\max}, j \in P_t. \quad (20d)$$

The coupling properties between sub-problems (19) and (20) can be explained as follows. Given K , P_t and E_l , the optimal $\{a_j\}$ and $\{f_j\}$ can be derived by solving sub-problem (20). That is, by taking the hyper-parameters as the input, it would give the optimal resource scheduling and the corresponding costs. In this sense, sub-problem (20) actually represents the optimal policy to minimize $C_{u,0}$ and $C_{n,0}$. The sub-problem (19) takes $C_{u,0}$ and $C_{n,0}$ as the input to get the optimal hyper-parameters. By representing the costs C_u and C_n as $KC_{u,0}$ and $E_l C_{n,0}$, the hyper-parameters would be optimized by considering tradeoff between G_ϵ and $C_u + C_n$. Therein, G_ϵ is given theoretically by Theorem 1.

The joint optimal design for FL implementation is given by combining the two sub-problems. Sub-problem (20) gives the scheduling policy for arbitrarily given parameters, while the expected costs given by such policy are taken as input to optimize the hyper-parameters in sub-problem (19). Given G_ϵ as the bridge between training and communication, the hyper-parameters would consider the coupling effects from AI training and the wireless network with an optimal balance. By properly setting the hyper-parameters and scheduling policy therein, FL training with minimum cost in time and power can be achieved.

B. Optimal hyper-parameters

By solving sub-problem (19) combined with Theorem 1, the principles for the optimal hyper-parameters can be derived.

1) Bandwidth setting:

Theorem 2: In FL training, the system cost related to E_l and K is given by $(KC_{u,0} + E_l C_{n,0} + T_d)$. Under Theorem 1, the optimal K in (12) for FL implementation is

$$K^* = \rho_0 \sqrt{\frac{E_l}{D(1-\gamma)}} \sqrt{\frac{C_{n,0} + T_d/E_l}{C_{u,0}}}, \quad (21)$$

where $\rho_0 = \sqrt[4]{\frac{2(\lambda-1)C_1\phi_0}{f_0}}$ is a multiplier related to the background training process. The proof is in Appendix F.

Viewing $\frac{T_d}{E_l}$ as the unit waiting time to begin local training, T_d can be considered as part of the computation cost. Thus, K^* is related to the ratio between $C_{n,0}$ and $C_{u,0}$. As $C_{u,0}$ gets larger, a higher communication cost would decrease K^* . Meanwhile, a larger $C_{n,0}$ is matched with larger K^* , so that more sufficient training will not be wasted by insufficient communication. In this case, the design achieves a balance by comparing costs in communication and computation.

The tendency of K^* in Theorem 2 could fit common insights of FL training over wireless networks. By observing that $\sqrt{\frac{E_l}{D(1-\gamma)}}$, K^* increases with E_l and decreases with $1-\gamma$. In non-i.i.d. data sets, increasing E_l results in a higher level of model divergence among distributed clients. It is then natural to expect a larger K . By considering the term $\sqrt{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}}$, a larger γ means a lower rate of successful transmission in a wireless channel. Thus, K should be increased for compensation.

The properties of the data sets and training algorithm also affect the network setting, reflected by ρ_0 . By referring to Definition 1, λ is the metric of non-i.i.d. case. As λ increases, the local gradients will become more diverged, which leads to a larger K for compensation. Meanwhile, C_1 , ϕ_0 and f_0 are related to the gradient variance and initial training loss, which also affect the need for model aggregation. The specific definitions of these parameters can be found in Appendix A and Appendix E.

As a coupled parameter in training and communication, K^* is jointly determined by the training algorithm and wireless network. The closed-form expression in Theorem 2 reflects the specific influence of the cost ratio, E_l , γ , D and λ . In system design, these factors should be jointly considered to adjust settings in wireless networks.

2) E_l setting: The setting of E_l is considered to minimize G_ϵ , with $E_l^* = \sqrt{\frac{C_1\phi_0f_0}{2(\lambda-1)}}$ as the optimum value. In FL training, the local epoch E_l is originally introduced to lower down the frequency of communication [2, 3]. This is due to the fact that computation resources are typically more sufficient. Meanwhile, local training can be organized locally without complexity in interaction. At local processors, some more rounds of training may not increase much cost compared with the whole process of model uploading and downloading. Thus, in FL training, it is reasonable to set E_l^* to minimize G_ϵ .

Though ϕ_0 , C_1 and f_0 makes it hard to directly compute E_l^* , experiments that shall be provided later will show that E_l^* does exist. Thus, assisted by the theory and estimation in experiments, E_l^* can be obtained as one empirical parameter.

By jointly considering the results of K^* and E_l^* and the background loss rate γ , the integrated principles for choosing hyper-parameters can be obtained. Such design could ensure a faster training convergence with less power cost, which is meaningful for FL implementation.

C. Scheduling policy

The principles for optimizing the hyper-parameters have been discussed theoretically in Section IV-B. Given K , E_l and a randomly selected client set P_t , the solution of sub-problem (20) for optimal $\{a_j\}$ and $\{f_j\}$ will be discussed in this subsection.

From (20), (20a) and (20b), the optimization objective of sub-problem (20) can be written as $[\max_{j \in P_t} (\frac{z_m}{a_j B r_j^0}) + \max_{j \in P_t} (\frac{E_l \alpha_0 D_j}{f_j}) + l_0 \sum_{j \in P_t} (\frac{z_m P_j^0}{r_j^0} + \frac{1}{K} E_l \alpha_0 \kappa_j D_j f_j^2)]$. Note that that in practice, once the local training is completed, a client may immediately upload the model without waiting for others. Thus, the computation time and uploading time can be combined together with the transformed objective as $[\max_{j \in P_t} (\frac{z_m}{a_j B r_j^0} + \frac{E_l \alpha_0 D_j}{f_j}) + l_0 \sum_{j \in P_t} (\frac{z_m P_j^0}{r_j^0} + \frac{1}{K} E_l \alpha_0 \kappa_j D_j f_j^2)]$. Then by defining parameter H with $\frac{z_m}{a_j B r_j^0} + \frac{E_l \alpha_0 D_j}{f_j} \leq H$ for arbitrary j in set P_t , the sub-problem (20) can be transformed as follows.

$$\min_{\{a_j\}, \{f_j\}} l_0 \sum_{j \in P_t} \left(\frac{z_m p_j^0}{r_j^0} + \frac{1}{K} E_l \alpha_0 \kappa_j D_j f_j^2 \right) + H, \quad (22)$$

$$\text{s.t. } H \geq \frac{z_m}{a_j B r_j^0} + \frac{E_l \alpha_0 D_j}{f_j}, \quad (22a)$$

$$\sum_{j \in P_t} a_j \leq 1, a_j > 0, j \in P_t, \quad (22b)$$

$$f_j^{\min} \leq f_j \leq f_j^{\max}, j \in P_t. \quad (22c)$$

It is straightforward to observe that (22) is a convex optimization problem. The corresponding Lagrange function can be defined as

$$\begin{aligned} L = & l_0 \sum_{j \in P_t} \left(\frac{z_m p_j^0}{r_j^0} + \frac{1}{K} E_l \alpha_0 \kappa_j D_j f_j^2 \right) + H \\ & + R \left(\sum_{j \in P_t} a_j - 1 \right) + \sum_{j \in P_t} \beta_j \left(\frac{z_m}{a_j B r_j^0} + \frac{E_l \alpha_0 D_j}{f_j} - H \right), \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where R and $\{\beta_j\}$ are dual variables. By KKT conditions on (23), the closed-form expression for a_j can be obtained by the following theorem.

Theorem 3: Given the transmission power p_j^0 , channel gain h_j and background noise density N_0 , then the bandwidth allocation is given by

$$a_j = \frac{\sqrt{\frac{\kappa_j f_j^3}{r_j^0}}}{\sum_{j \in P_t} \sqrt{\frac{\kappa_j f_j^3}{r_j^0}}}. \quad (24)$$

The proof is provided in Appendix G.

Based on Theorem 3, the scheduling policy in (20) is proposed as follows.

1) *Optimal centralized solution:* From Theorem 3, a_j in (20) can be substituted by f_j and (20) would be a convex problem for f_j . Then the optimal $\{f_j\}$ can be derived at the central server by applying convex optimization solvers and $\{a_j\}$ can be solved further.

Such a process could give an optimal solution by central scheduling. Therein, $\{a_j\}$ is the central bandwidth allocation, which is fitted for central scheduling. However, in the FL training mode, as the local processor frequency, it would be better for f_j to be determined by clients locally. That is, client j should directly schedule its own f_j without counting on control from a central server. Besides, since set P_t is renewed in each global epoch, frequently using optimization solvers to solve such a problem may cause much higher costs. Therefore, we propose a substitute method to solve for near-optimal $\{f_j\}$ in a distributed manner, which is rather simple and direct for FL engineering scenarios.

2) *Distributed scheduling policy:* Before optimization of f_j , the average processor frequency $\bar{f} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N f_j$ is first considered as the basis. From definition of C_n in (11), suppose that all clients take unified parameters $f_j = \bar{f}$, $D_j = D = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N D_j$ and $\kappa_j = \kappa = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \kappa_j$, \bar{f} is chosen to minimize




Fig. 2: The scheduling process for FL in wireless networks.

the averaged computation cost $(E_l \frac{\alpha_0 D}{\bar{f}} + l_0 E_l \kappa \bar{f}^2 \alpha_0 D)$. By simple calculation of its stationary point, the optimal \bar{f} is

$$\bar{f} = \sqrt[3]{\frac{1}{2l_0 \kappa}}. \quad (25)$$

Then due to the local data size D_j , f_j can be given by

$$f_j = \frac{D_j}{D} \bar{f} = \frac{D_j}{D} \sqrt[3]{\frac{1}{2l_0 \kappa}}. \quad (26)$$

Considering constraint $f_j^{\min} \leq f_j \leq f_j^{\max}$, the final f_j can be derived by taking the intersection between (26) and $[f_j^{\min}, f_j^{\max}]$. In this process, the employed \bar{f} in (25) considers the tradeoff between time and power in computation. With \bar{f} as the basic reference, clients will schedule f_j locally to achieve a balance of the distributed training time. Note that \bar{f} is a rather fixed parameter, which can be optimized beforehand and reported to clients for reference. Thus, f_j can be directly determined by clients in each round without counting on central control. Then, together with Theorem 3, the optimal a_j can be obtained.

D. Integrated scheduling process

Based on the principles for selecting the hyper-parameters in Section IV-B and the optimal scheduling policy in Section IV-C2, the proposed integrated scheduling process is shown in Fig. 2.

Before the learning process, the hyper-parameters E_l and K are first selected. E_l is adjusted due to the extent of non-i.i.d. in data sets by referring to Theorem 1 and discussions in Section IV-B2. From the scheduling policy in Section IV-C2, the unit computation cost $C_{n,0}$ in (17) for Theorem 2 can be given as $C_{n,0} = \frac{\alpha_0 D}{\bar{f}} + l_0 \bar{f}^2 \alpha_0 \kappa D$. By combining Section IV-C2 and Theorem 3, the bandwidth allocation policy can be taken in (18) to obtain $C_{u,0}$. Thus, by combining the cost from scheduling policy and the principles from the theoretical results, K can be adjusted due to the cost ratio, package loss rate γ , average data size D and E_l by referring to Theorem 2.

FL begins with initialization of the training model, data sets and channel state of distributed clients. Note that some clients may endure a very bad channel or process very little data. To achieve an efficient scheduling, such clients will be first removed from the candidate client set. That is, the client set P_t will exclude those in extremely bad conditions. Meanwhile, \bar{f} in (25) will be initialized and broadcast for local scheduling of f_j . Then the random set P_t will be selected before the training process begins. As the local training is conducted at distributed




Fig. 3: Trend of the total global epochs with respect to the bandwidth division and local epochs.

clients, the server will collect distributed states and allocate the bandwidth at the same time. Once the local training ends, the models will be uploaded and aggregated. Then P_t will be renewed and the next global begins. Note that $\{a_j\}$ and $\{f_j\}$ are renewed for set P_t in each global epoch. As shown in Fig. 2, the scheduling policy can be performed in parallel with the training process without much complexity.

V. EXPERIMENTS

A. Basic test settings

The database for training are selected as the classical MNIST and CIFAR10. The FL setting is the same as [2] and the models are based on CNN. To simulate the distributed data sets in FL, all samples in the training data set are distributed among N clients. As both MNIST and CIFAR10 are for multi-class classification, the non-i.i.d. data sets are realized by distributing the training data unevenly among the class labels. Meanwhile, the parameters for the communication channel are set as $B = 20\text{MHz}$ and $N_0 = 5 \times 10^{-20}$. The random channel power gain is generated following an exponential distribution, where $h_j = g_0(\frac{d_0}{d})^\theta \exp(1)$ with $g_0 = 10^{-4}$, $\theta = 4$, $d_0 = 1$, and $d = 200$.

B. FL convergence

Fig. 3(a), Fig. 3(b) and Fig. 3(c) show the trend of G_ϵ with respect to the parameters K and E_l in a non-i.i.d. setting. The target loss ϵ in the non-i.i.d. data sets is set as 1.88 for CIFAR and 0.81 for MNIST. For the i.i.d. case, it is set as 1.68 for CIFAR and 0.2 for MNIST. Total number of clients are set as 50 and 100. The size of the data sets in each client with $N = 50$ is twice as much as that with $N = 100$. Each point in the figure is obtained by running 20 times with Monte Carlo simulation. The stripe around the curves represents the confidence interval and the maximum global training epoch is set as 150 in each experiment.

As shown in Fig. 3(a), G_ϵ is approximately inversely proportional to K , consistent with the results in Theorem 1. For $N = 50$, G_ϵ gets smaller compared with G_ϵ for $N = 100$. By observing the result in Theorem 1, $N = 50$ corresponds to a larger D , which is consistent with such a trend.

In the i.i.d. setting, Fig. 3(b) shows that K has little effect on the convergence speed. By observing Theorem 1, as $\lambda = 1$, there is $\frac{\lambda-1}{K(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{2D} = 0$. Thus, the effects of K and D vanishes, which is consistent with the results listed in Fig. 3(b). Thus, in the i.i.d. setting, we could set a smaller K to save bandwidth.

Fig. 3(c) shows that G_ϵ has a minimum value with respect to the local epoch E_l . Such a tendency is consistent with the result in Theorem 1. As MNIST is a rather simple data set for CNN, it is not sensitive to E_l . For the results in Fig. 3(a) and Fig. 3(b), E_l is set as 20 to get a relatively lower frequency of the model uploading.




Fig. 4: Impact of the package loss rate γ on FL convergence.

Fig. 4 shows the impact of the package loss rate γ . From Fig. 4(a), as γ increases from 0 to 0.5, FL convergence keeps slowing down. Since MNIST is a rather simple data set, it is shown to be less sensitive to γ . By comparing G_ϵ for $\gamma = 0$ and $\gamma = 0.3$ with respect to K , Fig. 4(b) shows that the effects of package loss can be compensated by increasing K in proportion to γ . These results can be explained by the convergence analysis in Theorem 1.

C. Network scheduling

Based on the training loss for various K , we change the unit cost $C_{n,0}$ and $C_{u,0}$ to see the tendency of K^* with the cost ratio $\frac{E_l C_{n,0}}{C_{u,0}}$ ($E_l = 20$). In Fig. 5(a) and Fig. 5(b), K^* increases with the cost ratio. Meanwhile, both figures show that the curves of K^* with $N = 50$ are just below the curves with $N = 100$. This is because each client in $N = 50$ get more training data compared with that in $N = 100$. Then by observing Theorem 2, K^* will be reduced. Therefore, for the FL implementation




Fig. 5: Optimal K vs the cost ratio $\frac{E_l C_{n,0}}{C_{u,0}}$ in non-i.i.d. settings.

over wireless networks, the system need to jointly consider the cost ratio and size of local data sets in order to have an efficient usage of limited bandwidth.




Fig. 6: The system cost $C_u + C_n$ for different baseline settings.

The system cost $C_u + C_n$ in each global epoch is shown in Fig. 6. The curves are derived by the Monte Carlo method with independent simulations of 50 epochs. Therein, the parameters for computation are set as $z_m = 3 \times 10^4$, $\alpha_0 = 5 \times 10^5$ and $l_0 = 1$. Besides, Var is selected to represent variations of the parameter settings among all clients with $0 \leq Var < 1$. Therein, κ_j , p_j^0 , D_j are derived uniformly in the range $[\bar{\kappa}(1 - Var), \bar{\kappa}(1 + Var)]$, $[\bar{p}^0(1 - Var), \bar{p}^0(1 + Var)]$ and $[D(1 - Var), D(1 + Var)]$ with $\bar{\kappa} = 5 \times 10^{-27}$, $\bar{p}^0 = 4 \times 10^{-7}$ and $D = 500$.

By observing the curves with respect to K and E_l in Fig. 6(a) and Fig. 6(b), the former settings $C_u = KC_{u,0}$ and $C_n = E_l C_{n,0}$ can be directly validated. The evenly allocation policy in Fig. 6 refers to $a_j = \frac{1}{K}$ and $f_j = \bar{f}$. Compared with such a policy, the proposed network scheduling algorithm achieves a lower cost with less $C_{u,0}$ and $C_{n,0}$. Besides, by comparing the curves with $Var = 0.1$ and $Var = 0.5$, it is straightforward to see that the variation among clients can be handled well by the proposed policy without significant degradation in costs.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we investigated the implementation of FL training over wireless networks. Considering a general FL training process on non-i.i.d. data sets, we jointly considered the coupling problem between communication and computing (training) in FL and presented some theoretical results in principle on the FL design. Therein, the inequalities were handled more elegantly to derive bounds with clearer physical meaning. Viewing latency and power consumption as a

joint system cost, we discovered the tradeoff between FL convergence and system cost. The integrated design principles for FL implementation were also proposed in closed-form. Simulations on MNIST and CIFAR10 have demonstrated that the proposed convergence analysis and parameter selection principles have a good fit with the real recorded training loss. In particular, the work clearly pointed out how the wireless network and training settings would jointly influence FL convergence, which is meaningful for FL implementation in a wide range.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Bottou, F. E. Curtis, and J. Nocedal, "Optimization methods for large-scale machine learning," *Siam Review*, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 223–311, 2018.
- [2] B. McMahan, E. Moore, D. Ramage, S. Hampson, and B. A. y Arcas, "Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data," in *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 1273–1282, 2017.
- [3] X. Li, K. Huang, W. Yang, S. Wang, and Z. Zhang, "On the convergence of fedavg on non-iid data," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- [4] F. Haddadpour and M. Mahdavi, "On the convergence of local descent methods in federated learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.14425*, 2019.
- [5] A. K. Sahu, T. Li, M. Sanjabi, M. Zaheer, A. Talwalkar, and V. Smith, "On the convergence of federated optimization in heterogeneous networks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.06127*, vol. 3, 2018.
- [6] S. Wang, T. Tuor, T. Salonidis, K. K. Leung, C. Makaya, T. He, and K. Chan, "Adaptive federated learning in resource constrained edge computing systems," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 37, no. 6, pp. 1205–1221, 2019.
- [7] L. Liu, J. Zhang, S. Song, and K. B. Letaief, "Client-edge-cloud hierarchical federated learning," in *ICC 2020-2020 IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*, pp. 1–6, 2020.
- [8] A. N. Bhagoji, S. Chakraborty, P. Mittal, and S. Calo, "Analyzing federated learning through an adversarial lens," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 634–643, 2019.
- [9] C. T. Dinh, N. H. Tran, M. N. Nguyen, C. S. Hong, W. Bao, A. Y. Zomaya, and V. Gramoli, "Federated learning over wireless networks: convergence analysis and resource allocation," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, pp. 1–12, 2020.
- [10] M. Chen, Z. Yang, W. Saad, C. Yin, H. V. Poor, and S. Cui, "A joint learning and communications framework for federated learning over wireless networks," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, pp. 269–283, 2020.
- [11] S. Luo, X. Chen, Q. Wu, Z. Zhou, and S. Yu, "Hfel: Joint edge association and resource allocation for cost-efficient hierarchical federated edge learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.11343*, 2020.

- [12] J. Ren, G. Yu, and G. Ding, “Accelerating DNN training in wireless federated edge learning systems,” *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, pp. 219–232, 2020.
- [13] K. L. Ng, Z. Chen, Z. Liu, H. Yu, Y. Liu, and Q. Yang, “A multi-player game for studying federated learning incentive schemes,” in *Proceedings of the 29th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI 2020)*, pp. 5179–5281, 2020.
- [14] H. Karimi, J. Nutini, and M. Schmidt, “Linear convergence of gradient and proximal-gradient methods under the polyak-łojasiewicz condition,” in *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, pp. 795–811, Springer, 2016.
- [15] D. Yin, A. Pananjady, M. Lam, D. Papailiopoulos, K. Ramchandran, and P. Bartlett, “Gradient diversity: a key ingredient for scalable distributed learning,” in *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 1998–2007, 2018.
- [16] M. Kuczma, *An introduction to the theory of functional equations and inequalities: Cauchy’s equation and Jensen’s inequality*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2009.

APPENDIX A PREPARATIONS

The standard FL discussed in Section II-A chooses clients uniformly and averages the collected w_t^j by weight q_j . In this paper, for simplicity, an equivalent process for model aggregation is adopted similarly as in [3, 4], where clients are randomly selected in P_t by probability q_j and the global model is updated by

$$\bar{w}_t = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j \in P_t} w_t^j. \quad (27)$$

This training process considers weight q_j as the sampling probability in P_t for client j instead of the aggregation weight, which achieves an equivalent training as standard FL.

A. Shorthand notations

For simplicity, some shorthand notations are defined as follows.

w_t^j : The local model weight in client j at time t .

\tilde{g}_t^j : The local stochastic gradient of client j at time t due to random data ξ .

D : Average local data size among clients.

g_t^j : The expected gradient of client j at time t . Note that $E_{\xi}(\tilde{g}_t^j) = g_t^j$.

$P_{t,\gamma}$: Set of clients successfully uploading models without package loss in set P_t . Its size is denoted as $|P_{t,\gamma}| = K_{\gamma}$.

$E[\cdot]$ is the general expectation involving E_{ξ} and $E_{P_{t,\gamma}}$. In the following proof, without specific explanation, $E[\cdot]$ will be taken to denote expectations for short.

Based on these notations, some related terms of the global model and gradients are defined as follows.

Global aggregated model weight:

$$\bar{w}_t = \frac{1}{K_{\gamma}} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} w_t^j. \quad (28)$$

Global aggregated SGD gradient:

$$\tilde{g}_t = \frac{1}{K_{\gamma}} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \tilde{g}_t^j. \quad (29)$$

Expectation of global aggregated gradient:

$$\bar{g}_t = \frac{1}{K_{\gamma}} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} g_t^j. \quad (30)$$

Update of aggregated global model:

$$\bar{w}_{t+1} = \bar{w}_t - \eta_t \tilde{g}_t. \quad (31)$$

Note that t in (28) (29) (30) can be an arbitrary time slot, not necessarily to be $t = t_c = \left\lfloor \frac{t}{E_l} \right\rfloor E_l$. The aggregation terms are derived from virtually aggregated values without affecting the local training, while the real aggregation with feedback only occurs at t_c .

B. Assumptions of bounds on training gradients

Some assumptions on the SGD gradient are given by referring to [3, 4].

Assumption 3: The stochastic gradient on the local data set suffers a variance upper-bounded by

$$E[\|\tilde{g}_t^j - g_t^j\|^2] \leq \frac{C_1 \|g_t^j\|^2 + \sigma^2}{D} l_j, \quad (32)$$

where C_1 is the stochastic coefficient of the variation of gradients and σ^2 is the variance of noise in sampling. The gradient variance is inversely proportional to the local data size $D_j = \frac{D}{l_j}$, where D is the average data size and l_j is the specific ratio for client j . Taking client weight q_j as $q_j \propto D_j$, there is

$$\sum_{j=1}^n q_j l_j = 1. \quad (33)$$

Assumption 4: Given $\{\pi_j\}$ as general client weights with $\sum_{j=1}^n \pi_j = 1$ and λ in Definition 1, the weighted gradients are supposed to be upper-bounded by

$$C_1 \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N \pi_j g_k^j \right\|^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda} \leq G^2, \quad (34)$$

where $\sum_{j=1}^N \pi_j g_k^j$ is a weighted aggregation of the local model. Under Assumption 4, $C_1 \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N \pi_j g_k^j \right\|^2$ is upper-bounded by

$$C_1 \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N \pi_j g_k^j \right\|^2 \leq \frac{G^2}{\phi_0}, \quad (35)$$

where ϕ_0 is a parameter related to the ratio between G^2 and the weighted gradients, which is affected by σ^2 .

C. A lemma for summation in random set $P_{t,\gamma}$

Lemma 1: Given P_t with $|P_t| = K$ as set of clients for model aggregation, $P_{t,\gamma}$ with $|P_{t,\gamma}| = K_\gamma$ is the set of the actually received model by central server. Suppose that the package loss rate is i.i.d. in a wireless network with the uniform worst case $K_\gamma \geq K(1-\gamma)$, then the summation in random set $P_{t,\gamma}$ satisfies the following equations:

$$E_{P_{t,\gamma}} \left[\frac{1}{K_\gamma} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} x_j \right] = \sum_{j=1}^N q_j x_j, \quad (36)$$

$$E_{P_{t,\gamma}} \left[\frac{1}{K_\gamma^2} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} x_j \right] \leq \frac{1}{K(1-\gamma)} \sum_{j=1}^N q_j x_j, \quad (37)$$

where q_j is the probability of choosing client j in P_t and x_j denotes an arbitrary random variable from client j .

Proof A.1: Setting $f_0(K_\gamma)$ to be $\frac{1}{K_\gamma}$ or $\frac{1}{K_\gamma^2}$, then the summation can be deduced as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} E_{P_{t,\gamma}} [f_0(K_\gamma) \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} x_j] &= E_{P_t} E_\gamma [f_0(K^\gamma) \sum_{j \in P_t^\gamma} x_j] \\ &\stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{=} E_\gamma E_{P_t} [f_0(K^\gamma) \sum_{j \in P_t^\gamma} x_j] \\ &= E_\gamma [f_0(K^\gamma) E_{P_t} [\sum_{j \in P_t^\gamma} x_j]] \\ &= E_\gamma [f_0(K^\gamma) \sum_{l=1}^{K^\gamma} E_{P_t} [x_{j_l}]] \\ &\stackrel{\textcircled{2}}{=} E_\gamma [f_0(K^\gamma) K^\gamma \sum_{j=1}^N q_j x_j] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^N q_j x_j E_\gamma [f_0(K^\gamma) K^\gamma], \quad (38) \end{aligned}$$

where $\textcircled{1}$ is due to the assumption that γ is i.i.d. among the clients. By focusing on the worst case $K_\gamma \geq K(1-\gamma)$, such an assumption is reasonable. $\textcircled{2}$ is due to the assumption that client j is selected by probability q_j . By taking in $f_0(K_\gamma) = \frac{1}{K_\gamma}$ or $f_0(K_\gamma) = \frac{1}{K_\gamma^2}$, the proof is completed.

APPENDIX B LEMMA 2

Lemma 2: Suppose that clients are selected in P_t by probability $\{q_j\}$, under Assumption 3, Definition 1, (37), (29) and (30), then $E[\|\tilde{g}_t\|^2]$ is upper-bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} E[\|\tilde{g}_t\|^2] &\leq \\ &\frac{\lambda C_1}{DK(1-\gamma)} \sum_{j=1}^N \|q_j l_j g_t^j\|^2 + \frac{1}{K(1-\gamma)} \frac{\sigma^2}{D} + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^N \|q_j g_t^j\|^2. \quad (39) \end{aligned}$$

Proof:

It is natural to see that $\tilde{g}_t = E[\tilde{g}_t]$. Due to the basic properties of expectation, $E[\|\tilde{g}_t\|^2]$ can be transformed as

$$E[\|\tilde{g}_t\|^2] = E[\|\tilde{g}_t - E[\tilde{g}_t]\|^2] + \|E[\tilde{g}_t]\|^2$$

$$= E[\|\tilde{g}_t - \bar{g}_t\|^2] + \|\bar{g}_t\|^2. \quad (40)$$

$\|\tilde{g}_t\|^2$ in (40) can be upper-bounded as follows due to Jensen's inequality.

$$\|\tilde{g}_t\|^2 = \left\| \frac{1}{K_\gamma} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} g_t^j \right\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{K_\gamma} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \|g_t^j\|^2. \quad (41)$$

Under Assumption 3, considering expectation $E_\xi[\cdot]$ on the data sets, there is the following upper bound on $E[\|\tilde{g}_t - \bar{g}_t\|^2]$ in (40).

$$\begin{aligned} E_\xi [\|\tilde{g}_t - \bar{g}_t\|^2] &= E_\xi \left[\left\| \frac{1}{K_\gamma} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \tilde{g}_t^j - \frac{1}{K_\gamma} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} g_t^j \right\|^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{K_\gamma^2} E_\xi \left[\sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \left\| \tilde{g}_t^j - g_t^j \right\|^2 \right] \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \neq j} \langle \tilde{g}_t^i - g_t^i, \tilde{g}_t^j - g_t^j \rangle \\ &\stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{=} E_\xi \left[\frac{1}{K_\gamma^2} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \|\tilde{g}_t^j - g_t^j\|^2 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{K_\gamma^2} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} l_j \left(\frac{C_1}{D} \|g_t^j\|^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{D} \right), \quad (42) \end{aligned}$$

where $\textcircled{1}$ is from the common sense that the random local data sampling is independent among clients. That is, the error $\tilde{g}_t^i - g_t^i$ resulting from local sampling in client i is independent from $\tilde{g}_t^j - g_t^j$ in client j . Note that the gradients themselves are not independent among clients, though their errors are in fact independent. Then from (33) and Lemma 1, there is

$$\begin{aligned} E[\|\tilde{g}_t\|^2] &\leq \\ E_{P_{t,\gamma}} \left[\frac{1}{K_\gamma^2} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \frac{C_1}{D} \|g_t^j\|^2 + \frac{1}{K_\gamma} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \|g_t^j\|^2 + \frac{1}{K_\gamma} \frac{\sigma^2}{D} \right] &\leq \\ \frac{C_1}{DK(1-\gamma)} \sum_{j=1}^N q_j l_j \|g_t^j\|^2 + \frac{1}{K(1-\gamma)} \frac{\sigma^2}{D} + \sum_{j=1}^N q_j \|g_t^j\|^2. \quad (43) \end{aligned}$$

Taking in metric λ from Definition 1, the proof is completed.

APPENDIX C LEMMA 3

Lemma 3: Under Assumption 3), 1), Definition 1, (30), (29), (28) and (31), suppose clients are selected associated with weight $\{q_j\}$ and η_t diminishing by $O(\frac{1}{t})$, then $-\eta_t E[\langle \nabla f(\bar{w}_t), \tilde{g}_t \rangle]$ is upper-bounded as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} -\eta_t E[\langle \nabla f(\bar{w}_t), \tilde{g}_t \rangle] &\leq -\frac{1}{2} \|\nabla f(\bar{w}_t)\|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N q_j g_t^j \right\|^2 \\ &\quad + \eta_t^2 L^2 \lambda \frac{\lambda-1}{K(1-\gamma)} \frac{C_1}{2D} \sum_{k=t_c+1}^{t_c+E_t} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N q_j l_j g_k^j \right\|^2 + \\ &\quad \frac{E_t \eta_t^2 L^2 \sigma^2}{2D} \frac{\lambda-1}{K(1-\gamma)} + \frac{\lambda-1}{2} E_t \lambda L^2 \eta_t^2 \sum_{k=t_c+1}^{t_c+E_t} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N q_j g_k^j \right\|^2. \quad (44) \end{aligned}$$

Proof:

From the basic definitions (30), (29), (28) and (31), $-E[\langle \nabla f(\bar{w}_t), \tilde{g}_t \rangle]$ can be transformed as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
& -E[\langle \nabla f(\bar{w}_t), \tilde{g}_t \rangle] = -\langle \nabla f(\bar{w}_t), E[\frac{1}{K\gamma} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}^y} \tilde{g}_t^j] \rangle \\
& \stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{=} -\langle \nabla f(\bar{w}_t), \sum_{j=1}^N q_j g_t^j \rangle \stackrel{\textcircled{2}}{=} -\frac{1}{2} \|\nabla f(\bar{w}_t)\|^2 + \\
& \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla f(\bar{w}_t) - \sum_{j=1}^N q_j g_t^j\|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|\sum_{j=1}^N q_j g_t^j\|^2 \\
& = -\frac{1}{2} \|\nabla f(\bar{w}_t)\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\sum_{j=1}^N q_j (\nabla f_j(\bar{w}_t) - \nabla f_j(w_t^j))\|^2 \\
& - \frac{1}{2} \|\sum_{j=1}^N q_j g_t^j\|^2 \stackrel{\textcircled{3}}{\leq} -\frac{1}{2} [\|\nabla f(\bar{w}_t)\|^2 + \|\sum_{j=1}^N q_j g_t^j\|^2] \quad (45) \\
& + \frac{L^2}{2} \sum_{j=1}^N q_j \|\bar{w}_t - w_t^j\|^2, \quad (46)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\textcircled{1}$ is from Lemma 1 and $\textcircled{2}$ is from the common equation $ab = \frac{a^2+b^2-(a-b)^2}{2}$. $\textcircled{3}$ is due to the L-smooth properties of loss function and Jensen's inequality.

Next, the term $E[\sum_{j=1}^N q_j \|\bar{w}_t - w_t^j\|^2]$ therein will be estimated. In FL, model aggregation occurs in every E_l steps, with its corresponding time slot is $t_c = \lfloor \frac{t}{E_l} \rfloor E_l$. From (30), (29), (28) and (31), \bar{w}_t and distributed w_t^j in one local epoch are updated as follows.

$$\bar{w}_{t_c} = \frac{1}{K\gamma} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} w_{t_c}^j, \quad (47)$$

$$w_t^j = \bar{w}_{t_c} - \sum_{k=t_c+1}^{t-1} \eta_k \tilde{g}_k^j, \quad (48)$$

$$\bar{w}_t = \bar{w}_{t_c} - \frac{1}{K\gamma} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \sum_{k=t_c+1}^{t-1} \eta_k \tilde{g}_k^j. \quad (49)$$

Note again that \bar{w}_t is the virtually aggregated model weight for an arbitrary t . The real model aggregation and model broadcast only occurs at t_c . Then due to (47), (48) and (49), there is

$$\begin{aligned}
& E[\frac{1}{K\gamma} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \|\bar{w}_t - w_t^j\|^2] \\
& = E[\frac{1}{K\gamma} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \|\bar{w}_{t_c} - \frac{1}{K\gamma} \sum_{l \in P_{t,\gamma}} \sum_{k=t_c+1}^{t-1} \eta_k \tilde{g}_k^l - \bar{w}_{t_c} \\
& + \sum_{k=t_c+1}^{t-1} \eta_k \tilde{g}_k^j\|^2] = \\
& E[\frac{1}{K\gamma} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \|\sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k} \tilde{g}_{t_c+k}^j - \frac{1}{K\gamma} \sum_{l \in P_{t,\gamma}} \sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k} \tilde{g}_{t_c+k}^l\|^2] \\
& \stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{=} E[\frac{1}{K\gamma} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \|\sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k} \tilde{g}_{t_c+k}^j\|^2] - E[\|\frac{1}{K\gamma} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \\
& \sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k} \tilde{g}_{t_c+k}^j\|^2], \quad (50)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\textcircled{1}$ is due to $E\|x - E(x)\|^2 = E\|x\|^2 - [E(x)]^2$. The super index l is applied to differ from j , they both represent mark for a client.

In (50), $\sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k} \tilde{g}_{t_c+k}^j$ is the accumulated gradient, which is also a form of the local gradient $\nabla f_j(w)$. From (36) in Lemma 1, $E_{P_{t,\gamma}}[\frac{1}{K\gamma} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} x_j] = \sum_{j=1}^N q_j x_j$. Then $E[\frac{1}{K\gamma} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \|\sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k} \tilde{g}_{t_c+k}^j\|^2]$ and $E[\|\frac{1}{K\gamma} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k} \tilde{g}_{t_c+k}^j\|^2]$ can be separately represented as $\sum_{j=1}^N q_j \|\nabla f_j(w)\|^2$ and $\|\sum_{j=1}^N q_j \nabla f_j(w)\|^2$. From the non-i.i.d. metric in Definition 1, there is

$$\begin{aligned}
& E[\frac{1}{K\gamma} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \|\sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k} \tilde{g}_{t_c+k}^j\|^2] \\
& \leq \lambda E[\|\frac{1}{K\gamma} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k} \tilde{g}_{t_c+k}^j\|^2]. \quad (51)
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (50) leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
& E[\frac{1}{K\gamma} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \|\bar{w}_t - w_t^j\|^2] \\
& \leq (\lambda - 1) E[\|\frac{1}{K\gamma} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k} \tilde{g}_{t_c+k}^j\|^2]. \quad (52)
\end{aligned}$$

Then from $E\|x\|^2 = E\|x - E(x)\|^2 + [E(x)]^2$ and $E[\tilde{g}_t^j] = g_t^j$, (52) further leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
& E[\frac{1}{K\gamma} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \|\bar{w}_t - w_t^j\|^2] \leq \\
& (\lambda - 1) E[\|\frac{1}{K\gamma} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k} \tilde{g}_{t_c+k}^j \\
& - \frac{1}{K\gamma} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k} g_{t_c+k}^j\|^2 + \|\frac{1}{K\gamma} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k} \tilde{g}_{t_c+k}^j - \frac{1}{K\gamma} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k} g_{t_c+k}^j\|^2] \\
& = (\lambda - 1) E[\|\frac{1}{K\gamma} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k} (\tilde{g}_{t_c+k}^j - g_{t_c+k}^j)\|^2 \\
& + \|\frac{1}{K\gamma} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k} g_{t_c+k}^j\|^2] \\
& \stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{=} (\lambda - 1) E[\frac{1}{K\gamma^2} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k}^2 \|\tilde{g}_{t_c+k}^j - g_{t_c+k}^j\|^2 \\
& + \|\frac{1}{K\gamma} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k} g_{t_c+k}^j\|^2], \quad (53)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\textcircled{1}$ holds because $E_{\xi}(\tilde{g}_{t_c+k}^j - g_{t_c+k}^j) = 0$ and the gradient errors are independent among clients.

Then from $\|\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_j\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \|x_j\|^2$ (Jensen's inequality), Eq. (53) can be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{\leq} (\lambda - 1) E[\frac{1}{K\gamma^2} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k}^2 \|\tilde{g}_{t_c+k}^j - g_{t_c+k}^j\|^2 \\
& + \frac{r}{K\gamma} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k} \|g_{t_c+k}^j\|^2]. \quad (54)
\end{aligned}$$

Then under Assumption 3, considering expectation $E_{\xi}[\cdot]$, (54) can be bounded as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} & E_{\xi} \left[\frac{1}{K^{\gamma}} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \|\bar{w}_t - w_t^j\|^2 \right] \\ & \leq (\lambda - 1) \left[\frac{1}{K^2} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k}^2 l_j \left(\frac{C_1}{D} \|g_{t_c+k}^j\|^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{D} \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{r}{K^{\gamma}} \sum_{j \in P_{t,\gamma}} \sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k}^2 \|g_{t_c+k}^j\|^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

Then taking expectation $E_{P_{t,\gamma}}[\cdot]$ on both sides of (55) and applying Lemma 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=1}^N q_j \|\bar{w}_t - w_t^j\|^2 \leq \\ & (\lambda - 1) \left[\frac{1}{K(1-\gamma)} \sum_{j=1}^N q_j \sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k}^2 l_j \left(\frac{C_1}{D} \|g_{t_c+k}^j\|^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{D} \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + r \sum_{j=1}^N q_j \sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k}^2 \|g_{t_c+k}^j\|^2 \right] \\ & = (\lambda - 1) \left[\frac{C_1}{D} \frac{1}{K(1-\gamma)} \sum_{j=1}^N q_j \sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k}^2 l_j \|g_{t_c+k}^j\|^2 + \right. \\ & \quad \left. \frac{1}{K(1-\gamma)} \frac{\sigma^2}{D} \sum_{j=1}^N q_j l_j \sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k}^2 + r \sum_{j=1}^N q_j \sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k}^2 \|g_{t_c+k}^j\|^2 \right] \\ & \stackrel{\textcircled{1}}{\leq} \frac{\lambda - 1}{K(1-\gamma)} \frac{C_1}{D} \sum_{j=1}^N q_j l_j \sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k}^2 \|g_{t_c+k}^j\|^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{D} \sum_{j=1}^N q_j l_j \\ & \quad \frac{\lambda - 1}{K(1-\gamma)} \sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k}^2 + (\lambda - 1) E_l \sum_{j=1}^N q_j \sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k}^2 \|g_{t_c+k}^j\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

where $\textcircled{1}$ comes from the fact that $r \leq E_l$ in FL training. Then under (33), (56) is further transformed as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=1}^N q_j \|\bar{w}_t - w_t^j\|^2 \leq \\ & = \frac{\lambda - 1}{K(1-\gamma)} \frac{C_1}{D} \sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k}^2 \sum_{j=1}^N q_j l_j \|g_{t_c+k}^j\|^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{D} \\ & \quad \frac{\lambda - 1}{K(1-\gamma)} \sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k}^2 + (\lambda - 1) E_l \sum_{k=1}^r \eta_{t_c+k}^2 \sum_{j=1}^N q_j \|g_{t_c+k}^j\|^2 \\ & = \frac{\lambda - 1}{K(1-\gamma)} \frac{C_1}{D} \sum_{k=t_c+1}^{t-1} \eta_k^2 \sum_{j=1}^N q_j l_j \|g_k^j\|^2 + \\ & \quad \frac{\sigma^2}{D} \frac{\lambda - 1}{K(1-\gamma)} \sum_{k=t_c+1}^{t-1} \eta_k^2 + (\lambda - 1) E_l \sum_{k=t_c+1}^{t-1} \eta_k^2 \sum_{j=1}^N q_j \|g_k^j\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

where $\{q_j\}$ and $\{q_j l_j\}$ can both be viewed as set of weights with $\sum_{j=1}^N q_j = 1$ and $\sum_{j=1}^N q_j l_j = 1$. Then consider metrics

of non-i.i.d. data set in Definition 1, (57) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=1}^N q_j \|\bar{w}_t - w_t^j\|^2 \leq \\ & \quad \frac{\lambda - 1}{K(1-\gamma)} \frac{C_1}{D} \lambda \sum_{k=t_c+1}^{t-1} \eta_k^2 \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N q_j l_j g_k^j \right\|^2 + \\ & \quad \frac{\sigma^2}{D} \frac{\lambda - 1}{K(1-\gamma)} \sum_{k=t_c+1}^{t-1} \eta_k^2 + (\lambda - 1) E_l \lambda \sum_{k=t_c+1}^{t-1} \eta_k^2 \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N q_j g_k^j \right\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

Considering the limited diminishing speed of η_t , it is reasonable to have $\eta_k^2 \leq \eta_t (t_c + 1 \leq k \leq t)$. Besides, according to the definition of $t_c = \lfloor \frac{t}{E_l} \rfloor E_l$, the summation of k can be upper-bounded with a range from $t_c + 1$ to $t_c + E_l$. Then, (58) can be transformed as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=1}^N q_j \|\bar{w}_t - w_t^j\|^2 \leq \\ & \quad \frac{\lambda - 1}{K(1-\gamma)} \frac{C_1}{D} \eta_t \lambda \sum_{k=t_c+1}^{t_c+E_l} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N q_j l_j g_k^j \right\|^2 + \\ & \quad \frac{E_l \eta_t \sigma^2}{D} \frac{\lambda - 1}{K(1-\gamma)} + (\lambda - 1) E_l \lambda \eta_t \sum_{k=t_c+1}^{t_c+E_l} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N q_j g_k^j \right\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

By combining (59) with (45), the proof is completed.

APPENDIX D

LEMMA 4

Lemma 4: If $E[f(\bar{w}_{t+1})] - f^* \leq \eta_t^2 M + (1 - \mu \eta_t)[E[f(\bar{w}_t)] - f^*]$ holds and $\eta_t \propto O(\frac{1}{t})$, then the training loss converges as

$$E[f(\bar{w}_t)] - f^* = \frac{1}{t} \max\left\{ \frac{4}{\mu^2} M, 2L\lambda\Delta_1 \right\}, \quad (60)$$

where Δ_1 is the initial loss. L is from Assumption 1 and λ is the non-i.i.d. metric in Definition 1.

Proof:

Assume that the training loss function of FL satisfies the following form.

$$E[f(\bar{w}_{t+1})] - f^* \leq \eta_t^2 M + (1 - \mu \eta_t)[E[f(\bar{w}_t)] - f^*], \quad (61)$$

where M is short for a closed-form math expression. We denote $\Delta_t = E[f(\bar{w}_t)] - f^*$, then (61) can be simplified as follows.

$$\Delta_{t+1} \leq (1 - \mu \eta_t) \Delta_t + \eta_t^2 M. \quad (62)$$

Generally, the learning rate can be represented as $\eta_t = \frac{\nu}{(t+\beta)^\alpha}$, where ν and β are parameters from the initial η_0 and α represents its diminishing speed. If $\alpha \leq 1$, Δ_t is proved to be bounded in the form as follows.

$$\Delta_t \leq \frac{X}{(t+\beta)^\alpha}, \quad (63)$$

where X is short for a closed-form expression which will be defined in the following proof.

The proof is supported by mathematical induction method. If $\Delta_t \leq \frac{X}{(t+\beta)^\alpha}$ holds, we will prove that $\Delta_{t+1} \leq \frac{X}{(t+1+\beta)^\alpha}$ holds

only for $\alpha \leq 1$. By taking $\eta_t = \frac{v}{(t+\beta)^\alpha}$ and $\Delta_t \leq \frac{X}{(t+\beta)^\alpha}$ into (62), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{t+1} &\leq [1 - \frac{\mu v}{(t+\beta)^\alpha}] \Delta_t + [\frac{v}{(t+\beta)^\alpha}]^2 M \\ &\leq [1 - \frac{\mu v}{(t+\beta)^\alpha}] \frac{X}{(t+\beta)^\alpha} + [\frac{v}{(t+\beta)^\alpha}]^2 M \\ &= \frac{(t+\beta)^\alpha - \mu v}{(t+\beta)^{2\alpha}} X + \frac{v^2}{(t+\beta)^{2\alpha}} M \\ &= \frac{(t+\beta)^\alpha - 1}{(t+\beta)^{2\alpha}} X + [\frac{v^2 M}{(t+\beta)^{2\alpha}} - \frac{\mu v - 1}{(t+\beta)^{2\alpha}} X]. \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

If parameter X satisfies $X \geq \frac{v^2 M}{\mu v - 1}$, where $\mu v \geq 1$, there is $\frac{v^2 M}{(t+\beta)^{2\alpha}} - \frac{\mu v - 1}{(t+\beta)^{2\alpha}} X \leq 0$. Then, the following bound holds.

$$\Delta_{t+1} \leq \frac{(t+\beta)^\alpha - 1}{(t+\beta)^{2\alpha}} X. \quad (65)$$

Therefore, the problem reduces to proving $\frac{(t+\beta)^\alpha - 1}{(t+\beta)^{2\alpha}} \leq \frac{1}{(t+1+\beta)^\alpha}$. Denote $(t+\beta) = y$, there is $y \geq 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(t+\beta)^\alpha - 1}{(t+\beta)^{2\alpha}} &\leq \frac{1}{(t+1+\beta)^\alpha} \\ \Leftrightarrow y^{2\alpha} &\geq (y^\alpha - 1)(y+1)^\alpha \\ \Leftrightarrow 1 &\geq (1 - \frac{1}{y^\alpha})(1 + \frac{1}{y})^\alpha. \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

Define function $h(m) = (1-m^\alpha)(1+m)^\alpha$, where $0 \leq m \leq 1$. Proof of (66) corresponds to proving $h(m) \leq 1$. The derivative of $h(m)$ is

$$h'(m) = \alpha(1+m)^{\alpha-1}(1-2m^\alpha - m^{\alpha-1}). \quad (67)$$

From definition of y , $m = \frac{1}{t+\beta}$. Now let us observe (67). Firstly, $h(0) = 1$ holds. If $\alpha > 1$, $h'(m)$ is definitely positive as m approaches 0, which means $h(m) \leq 1$ does not hold for $0 \leq m \leq 1$. If $\alpha \leq 1$, $h'(m)$ remains negative for $m \in [0, 1]$, which ensures that bound (66) holds for $t \geq 1$. Therefore, it leads to the conclusion that $\Delta_t \leq \frac{X}{(t+\beta)^\alpha}$ leads to $\Delta_{t+1} \leq \frac{X}{(t+1+\beta)^\alpha}$ for $\alpha \leq 1$. Considering initial loss, let $\Delta_1 \leq \frac{X}{(1+\beta)^\alpha}$, parameter X should be

$$X = \max \left\{ \frac{v^2 M}{\mu v - 1}, (\beta + 1)^\alpha \Delta_1 \right\}. \quad (68)$$

Set $v = \frac{2}{\mu}$, $\beta + 1 = 2L\lambda$ and $\alpha = 1$, it gets to

$$E[f(\bar{w}_t)] - f^* \leq \frac{1}{t+\beta} \max \left\{ \frac{4}{\mu^2} M, 2L\lambda \Delta_1 \right\}. \quad (69)$$

Omitting the unimportant bias β , the proof is completed with results in Lemma 4.

APPENDIX E PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Under (31) and Assumption 1, the training loss function satisfies

$$E[f(\bar{w}_{t+1}) - f(\bar{w}_t)] \leq -\eta_t E[\langle \nabla f(\bar{w}_t), \tilde{g}_t \rangle] + \frac{\eta_t^2 L}{2} E[\|\tilde{g}_t\|^2]. \quad (70)$$

From Lemma 2 in Appendix B, $E[\|\tilde{g}_t\|^2]$ is bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} E[\|\tilde{g}_t\|^2] &\leq \\ &\frac{\lambda C_1}{DK(1-\gamma)} \sum_{j=1}^N \|q_j l_j g_t^j\|^2 + \frac{1}{K(1-\gamma)} \frac{\sigma^2}{D} + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^N \|q_j g_t^j\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

From Lemma 3 in Appendix C, $-\eta_t E[\langle \nabla f(\bar{w}_t), \tilde{g}_t \rangle]$ is upper-bounded as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} -\eta_t E[\langle \nabla f(\bar{w}_t), \tilde{g}_t \rangle] &\leq -\frac{1}{2} \|\nabla f(\bar{w}_t)\|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N q_j g_t^j \right\|^2 \\ &+ \eta_t^2 L^2 \lambda \frac{\lambda - 1}{K(1-\gamma)} \frac{C_1}{2D} \sum_{k=t_c+1}^{t_c+E_t} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N q_j l_j g_k^j \right\|^2 + \\ &\frac{E_t \eta_t^2 L^2 \sigma^2}{2D} \frac{\lambda - 1}{K(1-\gamma)} + \frac{\lambda - 1}{2} E_t \lambda L^2 \eta_t^2 \sum_{k=t_c+1}^{t_c+E_t} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N q_j g_k^j \right\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

By properties of μ -P-L condition in Assumption 2, term $-\frac{1}{2} \|\nabla f(\bar{w}_t)\|^2$ in Lemma 3 can be substituted by $-\mu[f(x) - f^*]$. Then applying Lemma 2 and 3 to (70), it gets to

$$\begin{aligned} E[f(\bar{w}_{t+1})] - f^* &\leq (1 - \mu \eta_t) [E[f(\bar{w}_t)] - f^*] \\ &- \frac{\eta_t}{2} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N q_j g_t^j \right\|^2 + \frac{\eta_t^2}{2} L \lambda \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N q_j g_t^j \right\|^2 + \frac{\lambda - 1}{2} E_t \lambda L^2 \eta_t^2 \\ &\sum_{k=t_c+1}^{t_c+E_t} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N q_j g_k^j \right\|^2 + \frac{\eta_t^2}{2} L \lambda \left(\frac{C_1}{DK(1-\gamma)} \right) \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N q_j l_j g_t^j \right\|^2 \\ &+ E_t \eta_t^2 L^2 \lambda \frac{\lambda - 1}{K(1-\gamma)} \frac{C_1}{2D} \sum_{k=t_c+1}^{t_c+E_t} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N q_j l_j g_k^j \right\|^2 \\ &+ \eta_t^2 L^2 \frac{\lambda - 1}{K(1-\gamma)} \frac{E_t \sigma^2}{2D} + \frac{\eta_t^2 L}{2} \frac{1}{K(1-\gamma)} \frac{\sigma^2}{D}. \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

Set the learning rate as $\eta_t \leq \frac{1}{L\lambda}$, it leads to $\frac{\eta_t^2}{2} L \lambda \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N q_j g_t^j \right\|^2 - \frac{\eta_t}{2} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N q_j g_t^j \right\|^2 \leq 0$. Then this term in the above upper-bound can be removed. Therefore, by simple transformation, (73) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} E[f(\bar{w}_{t+1})] - f^* &\leq (1 - \mu \eta_t) [E[f(\bar{w}_t)] - f^*] + \\ &\eta_t^2 L^2 \lambda \frac{\lambda - 1}{K(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{2D} \sum_{k=t_c+1}^{t_c+E_t} (C_1 \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N q_j l_j g_k^j \right\|^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda}) \\ &+ \frac{\eta_t^2}{2} L \lambda \frac{1}{DK(1-\gamma)} (C_1 \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N q_j l_j g_t^j \right\|^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda}) \\ &+ \eta_t^2 L^2 \lambda \frac{(\lambda - 1) E_t}{2C_1} C_1 \sum_{k=t_c+1}^{t_c+E_t} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N q_j g_k^j \right\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

Under (33) and Assumption 4, term $(C_1 \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N q_j l_j g_k^j \right\|^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda})$ is upper-bounded by G^2 . By definitions in (35), it has $C_1 \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N q_j g_k^j \right\|^2 \leq \frac{G^2}{\phi_0}$. Then it leads to

$$\begin{aligned} E[f(\bar{w}_{t+1})] - f^* &\leq (1 - \mu \eta_t) [E[f(\bar{w}_t)] - f^*] \\ &+ \eta_t^2 E_t G^2 L^2 \lambda \left[\frac{1}{2LKD(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{E_t} + \frac{\lambda - 1}{K(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{2D} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \eta_t^2 E_l G^2 L^2 \lambda \frac{(\lambda-1)E_l}{2C_1\phi_0}. \quad (75)$$

Based on (75), a shorthand notation is defined as $M = E_l G^2 L^2 \lambda \left[\frac{(\lambda-1)E_l}{2C_1\phi_0} + \frac{1}{2LKD(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{E_l} + \frac{\lambda-1}{K(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{2D} \right]$, (75) comes to

$$E[f(\bar{w}_{t+1})] - f^* \leq (1 - \mu\eta_t)[E[f(\bar{w}_t)] - f^*] + \eta_t^2 M. \quad (76)$$

Then from Lemma 4 in Appendix D, the training loss converges as

$$E[f(\bar{w}_t)] - f^* = \frac{1}{t} \max\left\{ \frac{4}{\mu^2} M, 2L\lambda\Delta_1 \right\}. \quad (77)$$

In (77), $2L\lambda\Delta_1$ represents the initial training loss. By properties of L-smooth, $\Delta_1 \leq \frac{L}{2} \|w_0 - w^*\|^2$. By μ -strongly convexity, $\mu \|w_0 - w^*\| \leq \|\nabla f(w_0) - \nabla f(w^*)\|$. Since $\nabla f(w^*) = 0$, it leads to $\|w_0 - w^*\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\mu^2} \|\nabla f(w_0)\|^2$. Suppose $\|\nabla f(w_0)\|^2 \leq f_0 G^2$, then $\|w_0 - w^*\|^2 \leq \frac{f_0}{\mu^2} G^2$. Therefore, $2L\lambda\Delta_1 \leq \frac{L^2 f_0 \lambda G^2}{\mu^2}$. Taking in $M = E_l G^2 L^2 \lambda \left[\frac{(\lambda-1)E_l}{2C_1\phi_0} + \frac{1}{2LKD(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{E_l} + \frac{\lambda-1}{K(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{2D} \right]$ together with Lemma 4 and (76), the training loss converges as

$$\begin{aligned} E[f(\bar{w}_t)] - f^* &\leq \\ &\frac{1}{t} \max\left\{ \frac{4}{\mu^2} L^2 \lambda E_l G^2 \left[\frac{(\lambda-1)E_l}{2C_1\phi_0} + \frac{1}{2LKD(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{E_l} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \frac{\lambda-1}{K(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{2D} \right], \frac{L^2 G^2 \lambda f_0}{\mu^2} \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{t} \frac{4L^2 G^2 \lambda}{\mu^2} \max\left\{ E_l \left[\frac{(\lambda-1)E_l}{2C_1\phi_0} + \frac{1}{2LKD(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{E_l} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \frac{\lambda-1}{K(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{2D} \right], \frac{1}{4} f_0 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

Term $\frac{1}{4} f_0$ represents error from initial loss. Adding the two elements together, the loss function converges as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} E[f(\bar{w}_{t+1})] - f^* &\leq \frac{1}{t} \frac{4E_l L^2 G^2 \lambda}{\mu^2} \\ &\quad \left[\frac{(\lambda-1)E_l}{2C_1\phi_0} + \frac{1}{2LKD(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{E_l} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{f_0}{E_l} + \frac{\lambda-1}{K(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{2D} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

Note that $\frac{1}{2LKD(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{E_l}$ is relatively small compared with $\frac{1}{4} \frac{f_0}{E_l}$, $\frac{(\lambda-1)E_l}{2C_1\phi_0}$ and $\frac{\lambda-1}{K(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{2D}$. Therefore, it can just be omitted for simplicity, which will not cause large effects to the tendency of training parameters. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} E[f(\bar{w}_{t+1})] - f^* &\leq \\ &\frac{1}{t} \frac{4E_l L^2 G^2 \lambda}{\mu^2} \left[\frac{(\lambda-1)E_l}{2C_1\phi_0} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{f_0}{E_l} + \frac{\lambda-1}{K(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{2D} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

Define t_ϵ as the time slot where $E[f(\bar{w}_{t_\epsilon+1})] - f^*$ reaches ϵ , the corresponding global training epoch $G_\epsilon = \frac{t_\epsilon}{E_l}$. From (80), it is straightforward to get

$$G_\epsilon = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \frac{4L^2 G^2 \lambda}{\mu^2} \left[\frac{\lambda-1}{K(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{2D} + \frac{(\lambda-1)E_l}{2C_1\phi_0} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{f_0}{E_l} \right]. \quad (81)$$

Here the proof is completed.

APPENDIX F PROOF OF THEOREM 2

Firstly observing results in Theorem 1, the optimal local epoch is $E_l^* = \sqrt{\frac{C_1 \phi_0 f_0}{2(\lambda-1)}}$. Putting E_l^* in to (16), an estimation of G_ϵ can be obtained as follows.

$$G_\epsilon = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{(\lambda-1)f_0}{8C_1\phi_0}} + \frac{\lambda-1}{2D(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{K}\right). \quad (82)$$

From (18) and (17), cost in one global epoch is

$$C_g = E_l(C_{n,0} + T_d/E_l) + K C_{u,0}. \quad (83)$$

Combining (82) and (83), the overall training cost can be obtained as

$$\begin{aligned} C_g G_\epsilon &= E_l(C_{n,0} + T_d/E_l) \sqrt{\frac{(\lambda-1)f_0}{8C_1\phi_0}} + \frac{C_{u,0}}{1-\gamma} \frac{\lambda-1}{2D} \\ &\quad + K C_{u,0} \sqrt{\frac{(\lambda-1)f_0}{8C_1\phi_0}} + \frac{\lambda-1}{2D(1-\gamma)} \frac{E_l(C_{n,0} + T_d/E_l)}{K}. \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

Therefore, the optimal K^* to minimize $C_g G_\epsilon$ is

$$K^* = \sqrt[4]{\frac{2(\lambda-1)C_1\phi_0}{f_0}} \sqrt{\frac{E_l}{D(1-\gamma)}} \sqrt{\frac{C_{n,0} + T_d/E_l}{C_{u,0}}}. \quad (85)$$

Here the proof is completed.

APPENDIX G PROOF OF THEOREM 3

From KKT conditions of the Lagrange function (23), the following equations can be derived.

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial a_j} = R - \frac{z_m \beta_j}{Br_j^0} \frac{1}{a_j^2} = 0, \quad (86)$$

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial f_j} = \frac{2l_0}{K} E_l \alpha_0 \kappa_j D_j f_j - \frac{\beta_j E_l \alpha_0 D_j}{f_j^2} = 0, \quad (87)$$

$$R\left(\sum_{j \in P_t} a_j - 1\right) = 0, \quad (88)$$

From (87) and (86), we get

$$R = \frac{\beta_j z_m}{Br_j^0} \frac{1}{a_j^2}, \quad (89)$$

$$\beta_j = \frac{2l_0}{K} \kappa_j f_j^3. \quad (90)$$

Combined with $\sum_{j \in P_t} a_j = 1$ from (88), (89) leads to

$$\sum_{j \in P_t} \sqrt{\frac{\beta_j z_m}{Br_j^0}} = \sqrt{R} = \sqrt{\frac{\beta_j z_m}{Br_j^0}} / a_j. \quad (91)$$

Taking in (90), the results in Theorem 3 can be derived.