

# SLPerf: a Unified Framework for Benchmarking Split Learning

Tianchen Zhou<sup>\*1</sup>, Zhanyi Hu<sup>\*1</sup>, Bingzhe Wu<sup>2</sup> and Cen Chen<sup>†1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of data science & engineering, East China Normal University, Shanghai, China

<sup>2</sup>Tencent AI Lab, Shenzhen, China

{tianchen, zhanyihu223}@stu.ecnu.edu.cn, bingzhewu@tencent.com, cenchen@dase.ecnu.edu.cn

## Abstract

Data privacy concerns has made centralized training of data, which is scattered across silos, infeasible, leading to the need for collaborative learning frameworks. To address that, two prominent frameworks emerged, i.e., federated learning (FL) and split learning (SL). While FL has established various benchmark frameworks and research libraries, SL currently lacks a unified library despite its diversity in terms of label sharing, model aggregation, and cut layer choice. This lack of standardization makes comparing SL paradigms difficult. To address this, we propose SLPerf, a unified research framework and open research library for SL, and conduct extensive experiments on four widely-used datasets under both IID and Non-IID data settings. Our contributions include a comprehensive survey of recently proposed SL paradigms, a detailed benchmark comparison of different SL paradigms in different situations, and rich engineering take-away messages and research insights for improving SL paradigms. SLPerf can facilitate SL algorithm development and fair performance comparisons. The code is available at <https://github.com/Rainysponge/Split-learning-Attacks>.

## 1 Introduction

Deep learning has strong application value and potential in various fields such as computer vision [Krizhevsky *et al.*, 2017], disease diagnosis [Shickel *et al.*, 2018], financial fraud detection [Acevedo-Viloria *et al.*, 2021], and malware detection [Wang *et al.*, 2016]. However, a large amount of high-quality labeled data is often required to train an effective deep-learning model [Chervenak *et al.*, 2000]. Unfortunately, data are usually scattered across different silos or edge devices. Directly collecting them for training in a centralized fashion will inevitably introduce privacy issues. For instance, exchanging sensitive raw patient data between healthcare providers for machine learning could lead to serious privacy concerns [Huang *et al.*, 2019;

Liu *et al.*, 2017], which would no longer be permitted with the enforcement of data privacy laws [Alessandro and Mantelero, 2013]. Various collaborative learning methods have been proposed to facilitate joint model training without compromising data privacy [Konečný *et al.*, 2016; Vepakomma *et al.*, 2018], such as federated learning (FL) [McMahan *et al.*, 2016] and split learning (SL) [Gupta and Raskar, 2018; Poirot *et al.*, 2019]. FL enables collaboratively training a shared model while keeping all the raw data locally and exchanging only gradients. However, it often requires clients to have sufficient computational power for local training. To address the challenge of training heavy deep learning models on resource-constrained IoT devices, such as smartphones, wearables, or sensors, split learning is introduced. It splits the whole network into two parts that are computed by different participants (i.e., clients and a server), and necessary information is transmitted between them, including the data of the cut layer from clients and the gradients from the server.

Various benchmark frameworks or research libraries have been provided for FL such as FedML [He *et al.*, 2020], PySyft [Ryffel *et al.*, 2018], Flower [Beutel *et al.*, 2020] and LEAF [Caldas *et al.*, 2018]. However, unlike FL, there is no unified library for SL researchers yet. Therefore, despite significant progress made in SL research, there are several critical limitations that need to be addressed.

- **Lack of support for different SL paradigms.** SL has a high degree of diversity in terms of label sharing, model aggregation, etc. However, the lack of a comprehensive SL research library poses a problem for researchers to reinvent the wheel when comparing existing SL paradigms.
- **Lack of a standardized SL evaluation benchmark.** The lack of a standardized SL evaluation benchmark makes it difficult to compare different paradigms fairly. With more paradigms being proposed, some studies train on CV datasets, while others train on sequential/time-series data [Abuadba *et al.*, 2020]. Dataset partitioning also varies, such as dividing based on labels or Dirichlet distribution in Non-IID settings.

In this work, we systematically survey and compare different SL paradigms. We specifically classify these paradigms across various dimensions and present a unified research framework called SLPerf for benchmarking. To comprehen-

<sup>\*</sup>Equal contribution.

<sup>†</sup>Corresponding Author.




Figure 1: Overview of our proposed framework SLPerf.

sively verify the effectiveness of different SL paradigms, we conduct extensive experiments on four widely used datasets covering a wide range of tasks including computer vision, medical data analysis, tabular dataset, and drug discovery, under both IID and Non-IID data setting. By analyzing these empirical results, we provide rich engineering take-away messages for guiding ML engineers to choose appropriate SL paradigms according to their specific applications. We also provide research insights for improving the robustness and efficiency of current SL paradigms. Compared to previous works, our study compares the performance of different SL paradigms with various data partitioning, providing a multi-dimensional perspective for evaluating SL paradigms. Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- **Unified framework for different SL paradigms.** We introduce our framework SLPerf, an open research library and benchmark to facilitate SL algorithm development and fair performance.
- **Comprehensive survey of the recently proposed SL paradigms.** We conduct a survey of recently proposed SL paradigms and classified them according to their characteristics. We also provide some suggestions for which scenarios are suitable for each SL paradigm.
- **Detailed comparison of different SL paradigms.** Prior research lacks detailed experimental comparisons of different SL paradigms. In this paper, we conduct experiments to compare different SL paradigms in different situations and provide a benchmark for SL.
- **Applying SL to graph learning.** Sharing raw drug data is often not possible due to business concerns, making it challenging to build ML models. Our paper proposes using SL paradigms to solve this problem and has shown promising results on the Ogbg-molhiv dataset.

## 2 Framework

We propose SLPerf, an open research library for SL that offers various interfaces and methods to rapidly develop SL algorithms while enabling fair performance comparisons across different configurations. SLPerf supports various SL training configurations, including dataset partitioning methods, numbers of clients, and paradigms. It also provides standardized benchmarks with explicit evaluation metrics to validate baseline results, facilitating fair performance comparisons. Moreover, our framework includes standardized implementations of multiple SL paradigms, allowing users to familiarize themselves with our framework’s API.

Figure 1 provides an overview of our framework. We divide the framework into three modules: High-level SL API, Low-level SL API, and Tools. When conducting SL experiments, users will use the functions from High-level SL API by providing a configuration file that includes the selection of the paradigm, dataset, and data partitioning method. Then, using the corresponding factory, functions from Low-level SL API will be called to generate clients and server objects for training. Once the training is completed, the experimental results will be recorded in a log file that contains details such as accuracy, AUC, communication cost, and other pertinent information. Users can visualize and analyze the data using the code provided in the Tool Module. If users need to develop their own SL paradigms, they can utilize the interfaces provided in the Low-level SL API to customize. By overloading certain methods, such as determining whether to aggregate model weights, they can define the necessary communication information.

## 3 Paradigm

In this section, we will present an overview of various split learning (SL) paradigms. We will conduct a comprehensive comparison of these paradigms using Table 1, which lists mainstream SL paradigms and compares them based on various features. We categorize paradigms into three groups based on whether intermediate data or model weights are aggregated during training. The “model-split-only” group partitions the model architecture across participants without data or weight aggregation. The “weight aggregation-based” group uses techniques like FedAvg [McMahan *et al.*, 2016] to aggregate model weights from different devices. The “intermediate data aggregation-based” group aggregates intermediate data like gradients or smashed data. This categorization provides a clear understanding of SL approaches for researchers and practitioners.

### 3.1 Model-Split-Only

The Vanilla Split Learning paradigm [Gupta and Raskar, 2018] divides the original model into two parts: the server model and the client model. The client trains the model locally using its own data and then transmits the “Smashed Data” to the server for updating the server model. The server sends the backward-propagated gradients back to the client for updating the client model. And each client must wait for the previous client to complete a training round before interacting with the server. This paradigm has two setups: (1) cen-

Table 1: The comparison of SL paradigms.

	PARADIGMS	Reduce Communication Cost	Label Protection
Model-Split-Only	Vanilla[Gupta and Raskar, 2018]	×	×
	U-shape [Gupta and Raskar, 2018]	×	✓
	PSL[Jeon and Kim, 2020]	×	×
	AsyncSL[Chen et al., 2021]	✓	×
Weight Aggregation-based	SplitFed[Thapa et al., 2020]	×	×
	FSL[TURINA et al., 2021]	✓	×
	FeSTA[Park et al., 2021]	×	✓
	3C-SL[Cheng-Yen Hsieh, 2022]	✓	×
	HSFL[Liu et al., 2022]	✓	×
	CPSL[Wu et al., 2022]	✓	×
Intermediate Data Aggregation-based	SGLR[Pal et al., 2021]	×	×
	LocFedMix-SL[Oh et al., 2022]	×	×
	CutMixSL [Oh et al., 2022]	✓	×




Figure 2: The overview of the Vanilla SL paradigms: (a) Vanilla (centralized) (b) Vanilla (peer-to-peer)

tralized, where the client uploads model-weight-containing files to a server or trusted third party, and the next client downloads the weights and trains the model, as shown in Figure 2(a); (2) peer-to-peer (P2P), where the server sends the previous trained client’s address to the current client for transferring the weights, as shown in Figure 2(b). However, the Vanilla paradigm has a label leakage issue which is addressed by the U-shape paradigm [Gupta and Raskar, 2018]. The U-shape paradigm divides the original model into three parts: the head and tail on the client-side and the body on the server-side. The client only sends smashed data to the server, which forwards it for forward propagation and sends computed results back to the client. The tail calculates loss and gradient, updates with backpropagation, and sends the gradient to the server. The server updates the body and sends the backpropagation result to the client for updating the head.

The synchronous training properties of Vanilla SL may result in significant delays, which can be mitigated through parallel training. To address this issue, the Parallel Split Learning (PSL) [Jeon and Kim, 2020] paradigm has been proposed, as shown in Figure 3(b). In PSL, clients initiate forward propagation in parallel and transmit the smashed data  $z_i$  (where  $i$  denotes the index of the client node) to the server. Upon completion of forward and backward propagation, the server sends back the computed gradient  $g_i$  derived from  $z_i$  to the




Figure 3: The overview of Model-Split-Only paradigms: (a) U-shape (b) PSL

$i$ -th client, reducing the overall training time.

For reducing the communication cost, the Split Learning using Asynchronous Training (AsyncSL) [Chen et al., 2021] paradigm has been developed, which is a loss-based asynchronous training scheme that updates the client-side model less frequently and only sends/receives smashed data /gradients in selected epochs. When the state is A, clients send smashed data to the server, and receive the gradient from the server. In state B, only the client sends smashed data to the server, and the server does not send the gradient back. State C involves no exchange of information between clients and the server. Also to reduce the communication cost, the circular convolution-based batch-wise compression for SL (C3-SL) [Hsieh et al., 2022] is a paradigm combining circular convolution with SL. Clients use cyclic convolution [Plate and T., 1995] to compress multiple features into a single compressed feature, which is decoded on the server side through cyclic correlation [Plate and T., 1995]

### 3.2 Weight Aggregation-based

Weight Aggregation-based SL paradigms use Weight Aggregation to train a shared client model by aggregating locally trained models from clients. During the training process, some or all of the clients will send their models to the server or a trusted third party for model weight aggregation at a cer-




Figure 4: The overview of Weight Aggregation-based SL paradigms: (a) SplitFed (b) FeSTA.

tain stage, such as SplitFed[Thapa *et al.*, 2020], FSL[Turina *et al.*, 2021], HSFL[Liu *et al.*, 2022]. Weight Aggregation-based SL can handle resource-limited clients such as those found in IoT and is advantageous for addressing Non-i.i.d. data scenarios.

In SplitFed[Thapa *et al.*, 2020], the model is split into two parts and trained in a similar way to PSL. And after each client completes one round of training, its local model weights are transmitted to the server, which aggregates the local models using the FedAvg aggregation method. The process is illustrated in Figure 4(a). Additionally, the authors propose a variant, SplitFedv2[Thapa *et al.*, 2020], in which clients are trained linearly in order, rather than in parallel. In the context of Federated Split Learning (FSL) [Turina *et al.*, 2021], each client trains its local model in accordance with the SL paradigm in conjunction with its corresponding Edge Server, instead of interacting with a central server. Subsequent to the completion of one epoch, the model weights of the Edge Server are aggregated via the central server.

FeSTA [Park *et al.*, 2021] is a paradigm that utilizes the Vision Transformer and the concept of U-shape paradigms. In this paradigm, clients train various models and are divided into groups depending on their tasks and trained in parallel. After each training epoch, clients send the model head and tail parameters to the server, which aggregates the model parameters for the same task and returns them to the clients using techniques such as FedAvg. This paradigm is suitable for training models for multiple similar tasks as it has a shared Transformer body.

Hybrid Split and Federated Learning (HSFL) [Liu *et al.*, 2022] and Cluster-based Parallel SL (CPSL) [Wu *et al.*, 2022] are paradigms designed to address the practical constraints of power, bandwidth, and channel quality typically present in client devices. Both methods utilize greedy algorithms to optimize their problems.

### 3.3 Intermediate Data Aggregation-based

Unlike model weight aggregation, some SL paradigms aggregate intermediate data, such as gradients and smashed data, from different clients to enable the exchange of local data information and minimize communication costs.

In SGLR [Pal *et al.*, 2021], the server aggregates the local




Figure 5: The overview of Intermediate Data Aggregation-based SL paradigms: (a) SLGR (b) CutMixSL.

gradients of a subset of clients rather than the model parameters. This approach reduces the amount of information shared among clients and eliminates the client decoupling problem. The learning rate is also separated into two parts to improve the overall training performance and address the Server-Side Large Effective Batch Problem. The process is shown in Figure 5(a). Also, inspired by existing learning rate acceleration work [Goyal *et al.*, 2017], the learning rate is separated into two parts. The server model’s learning rate is accelerated to solve the Server-Side Large Effective Batch Problem [Pal *et al.*, 2021].

In LocFedMix-SL[Oh *et al.*, 2022], the server mixes up the smashed data from different clients to create new smashed data for forward propagation. This smashed data mixing increases the effective batch size at the model’s top layers to match its higher effective learning rate. Each client has an auxiliary network designed to maximize the mutual information between the smashed data and input data which can make the relationship between the smashed data and model input more tight, thereby improving model performance and training speed. In CutMixSL [Baek *et al.*, 2022], the authors combined SL with ViT and proposed a new type of data called CutSmashed. As shown in Figure 5(b), each client creates their own CutSmashed data by randomly masking a portion of their original smashed data. Then, clients send this partial data to a Mixer, which combines them and sends them to the server for training. This method reduces communication costs as clients only need to send a portion of their data, and the server can use multi-casting to send back the gradient. And CutSmashed data increases data privacy as adversaries find it difficult to reconstruct the untransmitted regions.

## 4 Evaluation

As the above sections show, our framework has implemented the current mainstream SL paradigms and support typical data splitting schemes including IID and Non-IID. In this part, we provide comprehensive empirical studies of these paradigms against a wide range of tasks including computer vision, medical data analysis, tabular dataset, and drug discovery. By summarizing and analyzing these empirical results, we provide rich engineering take-away messages for

Table 2: The overview of different SL paradigms on different settings. Centralized learning results are provided in bold.

PARADIGM	$\alpha$			MNIST(ACC = <b>0.9843</b> )			CIFAR-10(ACC = <b>0.9114</b> )			ADULT(ACC = <b>0.8173</b> )			MOLHIV(AUC = <b>0.7472</b> )	
	0	0.10	$+\infty$ (IID)	0	0.10	$+\infty$ (IID)	0	0.1	$+\infty$ (IID)	$+\infty$ (IID)	0.10			
SplitFed	0.9082	0.9768	0.9882	0.6155	0.7781	0.9089	0.7217	0.7832	0.8027	0.7374	0.6524			
PSL	0.3486	0.6764	0.9713	0.4023	0.6484	0.9139	0.5319	0.6042	0.8163	0.7341	0.7053			
Vanilla	0.1826	0.7288	0.9792	0.3424	0.3534	0.9008	0.5171	0.5612	0.7979	0.7428	0.7004			
U-shape	0.3297	0.7019	0.9728	0.3691	0.3513	0.9067	0.5239	0.5957	0.8078	-	-			
SGLR	0.3312	0.8603	0.9734	0.4588	0.6765	0.8954	0.5953	0.6101	0.7932	-	-			

guiding the ML engineer to choose appropriate SL paradigms according to their own applications. We also provide research insights for improving current SL paradigms from the dimension of robustness, efficiency, and privacy protection. As a summary, we first introduce evaluation setup in Section 4.1. Then we demonstrate empirical experimental results and provide detailed analysis in Section 4.2.

#### 4.1 Evaluation setup

We introduce the basic evaluation setup used in this paper including dataset/model setup, evaluation criteria, and runtime environment.

##### Dataset and model setup

To evaluate our framework, we conducted extensive experiments using various models and datasets. For all experiments, we trained the models using SGD with a fixed learning rate of 0.01 on minibatches of size 64. We evaluated different SL paradigms on four commonly-used datasets, namely, MNIST, CIFAR-10, UCI Adult, and Ogbg-molhiv, which cover a wide range of data types, including images, tabular data, and graphs.

**MNIST.** The MNIST dataset [Cun *et al.*, 1990] is a collection of handwritten digits from postal codes, with 70,000 samples divided into 60,000 training and 10,000 testing samples. The digits are centered on a 28x28 grid, and the goal is to classify them into 0-9. We trained the LeNet model on this dataset and split the network layers after the 2D MaxPool layer.

**CIFAR-10.** The CIFAR-10 dataset comprises 60,000 32x32 RGB color images with 10 exclusive class labels, divided into 50,000 training samples and 10,000 testing samples. The task is to classify objects in the images. ResNet56 [He *et al.*, 2016] is used for evaluation, with the model split at the first ReLU activation layer.

**Ogbg-molhiv.** The ogbg-molhiv dataset contains molecular samples and labels indicating their ability to inhibit HIV replication. This dataset is used to model a graph learning task, where the molecular data is represented as a graph with atoms as nodes and edges between them. This task is an example of molecular property prediction, which is crucial in the AI-drug domain.

**Adult Data Set.** The UCI Adult dataset [Kohavi, 1997] is a classic data mining benchmark with 48,842 instances from UC Irvine repository<sup>1</sup>. The dataset has 14 features such as country, age, education. The goal for this binary classification

task is to predict whether income exceeds 50K/yr based on the census information. We use a network consists of a fully connected (FC) layer, a ReLu activation layer and an other FC layer which is split at the first ReLu activation layer.

#### 4.2 Analysis

In this section, we demonstrate our empirical results and try to analyze them from the following dimensions:

- Comparison among different SL paradigms mentioned in Table 1. We provide the results of different SL paradigms when training on IID and Non-IID settings.
- Comparison with typical FL paradigm FedAvg [McMahan *et al.*, 2016].
- The comparison of the communication costs of different SL paradigms.
- Comparison with on-device local training.

##### Comparisons in the IID setting

First, we investigate the performance of different SL paradigms in the IID setting. The overall results are shown in Table 2. For most of the datasets we studied in this paper, all SL paradigms have achieved similar accuracy and are comparable with the centralized one. For example, on the CIFAR-10 dataset with 3 clients, the Vanilla SL paradigm has achieved an accuracy of 90.08% while the centralized training achieves 91.14%. In contrast, a commonly-used paradigm named U-shape has achieved the accuracy of centralized training. For the graph dataset, SL also have achieved a promising result, for example, vanilla achieved an AUC of 0.7428.

##### Comparisons in the Non-IID setting

In practice, the Non-IID setting is more frequently encountered than the IID setting. To simulate such Non-IID settings, we employ label-based splitting for the MNIST and CIFAR-10 datasets. For UCI-Adult dataset, we use attribute-based splitting based on relationship. Following prior work, we first sample  $p_{i,k}$  from Dirichlet distribution  $\text{Dir}(\alpha)$  and then assign  $p_{i,k}$  proportion of the samples of class/attribute  $k$  to client  $i$ , where we set  $\alpha$  from 0.05 to 0.3 to adjust the level of data heterogeneity in our experiments. The smaller the  $\alpha$ , the larger the data heterogeneity. When  $\alpha = 0$ , samples from different clients have non-overlap label/attribute spaces. For example, the MNIST dataset with 10 labels will be divided into five clients in this way, and each client will be assigned samples corresponding to two labels. And We will follow the evaluation settings in Section

<sup>1</sup><http://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/Census+Income>




Figure 6: The performance of three SL paradigms on different  $\alpha$  when the number of clients is 3 on the MNIST and CIFAR-10 datasets.

#### 4.1 to discuss the performance of paradigms on Non-IID data.

The overall results are shown in Table 2. In this table, we select two representative values of  $\alpha$  to demonstrate results of different paradigms on different datasets (i.e.,  $\alpha = 0$  and  $\alpha = 0.1$ ). The client number is set to 3 for all results in this table (More results with other client number are shown in the appendix). We summarize the following observations from the results:

- SL paradigms struggle to generalize to Non-IID settings, especially when data heterogeneity is high (small  $\alpha$ ). Table 2 shows that most paradigms perform poorly on the CIFAR-10 when  $\alpha = 0$ , with Vanilla achieving only 34.24% accuracy. When samples are not strictly divided by labels/attributes (e.g.,  $\alpha = 0.1$ ), most SL paradigms' accuracy are still worse than centralized learning.
- SplitFed has demonstrated higher robustness and higher performance compared to other methods. Figure 6(b) shows that SplitFed's performance remains stable when  $\alpha$  is small (e.g.,  $\alpha = 0.10$ ), achieving an accuracy of 97.68%. However, Vanilla and PSL's accuracy is low when  $\alpha$  is small, as shown in Figure 6(c) and Figure 6(a). Similar findings are shown in Figure 6(e)- 6(h) on the CIFAR-10 dataset. SplitFed allows clients to share information about their model, while SGLR shares information by averaging the local gradients of the cut layer, achieving better performance than other paradigms except for SplitFed when  $\alpha$  is small, such as an accuracy of 67.65% when  $\alpha = 0.1$ .
- Vanilla performs worse than other paradigms and even worse than local training in some cases. As shown in Table 2, Vanilla only achieves 18.26% accuracy when  $\alpha$  is 0. Vanilla's training pattern prevents the model from converging in these case.




Figure 7: The performance of FedAvg with different  $\alpha$  on the MNIST dataset and CIFAR-10 dataset. In (a)(b) we set the number of clients as 3, and in (c)(d) the number of clients is 5.

#### Comparison with typical FL paradigm

In this section, we compare the performance of FedAvg with that of SL paradigms on the MNIST and CIFAR-10 datasets. The experimental results of SL paradigms are shown in Figure 6, and those of FedAvg are shown in Figure 7.

First, we observe that on both two datasets SplitFed can always converge faster than FedAvg with the same data partitioning method, as shown in Figure 6(f) and Figure 7(b).

Second, Fedavg performs better than other SL paradigms when the dataset and model are simple on Non-IID setting, such as the MNIST dataset and LeNet-5. For example, as illustrated in Figure 6(a) -6(d) and Figure 7(a), when  $\alpha$  is small, FedAvg has shown superior accuracy compared to most SL paradigms, with the exception of SplitFed.

Table 3: The communication cost of training per epoch on MNIST when the number of clients is 3.

PARADIGM	SMALL(MB)		LARGE(MB)	
	SEND	RECEIVE	SEND	RECEIVE
SplitFed	18.33	197.59	4.04	58.70
half data	9.36	98.86	3.97	29.40
PSL	17.86	197.59	3.93	58.65
half data	8.79	98.89	3.88	29.42
AsyncSL	4.58	28.24	1.84	8.39
half data	2.43	15.43	1.03	4.32

However, when the data and models become more complex, FedAvg learns much more slowly than SL paradigms. For instance, on the CIFAR-10 dataset, most SL paradigms can achieve better accuracy than FedAvg, as shown in Figure 7(b) and 6(e)-6(h).

### The communication cost of different paradigms

We compared the communication cost of PSL, SplitFed, and AsyncSL, representing intermediate data aggregation, model aggregation, and reduced communication respectively. The communication cost is computed by the size of messages transferred between clients and the server. The  $loss_{threshold}$  [Chen et al., 2021] we set in AsyncSL is 0.10. We split the networks at different layers to compare the impact of the choice of the cut layer. In Table 3, the *small* indicates a network with one convolution-layer and *large* indicates a network with two convolution-layers.

- Dataset size affects communication cost. Table 3 shows that communication cost decreases significantly when only half of the dataset is used.
- Different SL paradigms result in different communication costs. For example, SplitFed sends more data than PSL because clients in SplitFed need to transmit local model parameters to the server. However, when the model is more complex or the number of clients is much larger, the communication cost of models cannot be ignored [Vepakomma et al., 2018].
- The choice of the cut layer may have an impact on the communication cost. Table 3 shows that when training on the MNIST dataset, communication cost decreases significantly when clients hold two convolution layers instead of one. This is because the choice of the cut layer affects the size of the smash data and gradients.

### Comparison with on-device local training

One of the primary objectives of SL is to enhance the model’s performance of each client without requiring the exchange of raw data. Therefore, this section aims to compare the performance of SL with on-device local training. Thus, we include an extra set of experiments to demonstrate the effectiveness of on-device local training. In these experiments, each client follows the same data partitioning process as in the other SL experiments and employs an incomplete dataset to train their local model without any communication.

**IID settings.** The results of local training and two SL paradigms under IID settings are presented in Figure 8(a). On




Figure 8: The effect of client number and  $\alpha$  on model accuracy.

the MNIST dataset, there is slight difference among the three algorithms, with only a small drop in local training accuracy at 10 clients. However, on the CIFAR-10 dataset, local training shows a significant drop, with an accuracy of only 71.47% at 10 clients, which is probably due to the complexity of the learning task. Unlike handwritten characters, CIFAR-10 contains real-world objects, necessitating a sufficient amount of training data. Both SL paradigms have shown promising results, indicating that they can improve each client’s model performance without exchanging the original data.

**Non-IID settings.** The performance of local training and two SL paradigms under varying  $\alpha$  in the Non-IID setting is presented in Figure 8(b). On the MNIST dataset, the performance of both Vanilla and local training decreases as  $\alpha$  decreases, but the overall performance of Vanilla is still higher than local training. When  $\alpha$  is 0, the accuracy of Vanilla also drops to a level similar to local training. On the CIFAR-10 dataset, Vanilla’s performance is lower than expected, when  $\alpha$  is less than 0.5, it has lower accuracy than local training.

SplitFed performs well on both datasets, but on the CIFAR-10 dataset, there is a large drop in accuracy when  $\alpha$  is below 0.1. At the most extreme Non-IID setting (i.e.,  $\alpha = 0$ ), SplitFed achieves an accuracy of 64.73%. SplitFed also has difficulty converging in this case, but overall its performance is still better than the other two paradigms. SplitFed can mitigate this problem by increasing the frequency of aggregation.

In general, Vanilla can help clients improve performance when data is evenly distributed. However, when the task is complex and the Non-IID distribution is extreme, we recommend using SplitFed to help local devices improve performance.

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose SLPerf, an open research library and benchmark designed for SL researchers to facilitate the development of SL paradigms. We summarize and categorize existing SL paradigms and compare their performance on

four widely-used datasets under both IID and Non-IID data settings. Our experiments demonstrate the importance of investigating how SL can perform better under Non-IID data settings and determining the optimal layer for model splitting.

## Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 62202170.

## References

- [Abuadba *et al.*, 2020] Sharif Abuadba, Kyuyeon Kim, Minki Kim, Chandra Thapa, Seyit Ahmet Çamtepe, Yansong Gao, Hyoungshick Kim, and Surya Nepal. Can we use split learning on 1d CNN models for privacy preserving training? *CoRR*, abs/2003.12365, 2020.
- [Acevedo-Viloria *et al.*, 2021] Jaime D. Acevedo-Viloria, Luisa Roa, Soji Adeshina, Cesar Charalla Olazo, Andrés Rodríguez-Rey, Jose Alberto Ramos, and Alejandro Correa Bahnsen. Relational graph neural networks for fraud detection in a super-app environment. *CoRR*, abs/2107.13673, 2021.
- [Alessandro and Mantelero, 2013] Alessandro and Mantelero. The eu proposal for a general data protection regulation and the roots of the 'right to be forgotten'. *Computer law & security report*, 29(3):229–235, 2013.
- [Baek *et al.*, 2022] S. Baek, J. Park, P. Vepakomma, R. Raskar, M. Bennis, and S. L. Kim. Visual transformer meets cutmix for improved accuracy, communication efficiency, and data privacy in split learning. *arXiv e-prints*, 2022.
- [Beutel *et al.*, 2020] Daniel J. Beutel, Taner Topal, Akhil Mathur, Xinchu Qiu, Titouan Parcollet, and Nicholas D. Lane. Flower: A friendly federated learning research framework. *CoRR*, abs/2007.14390, 2020.
- [Caldas *et al.*, 2018] Sebastian Caldas, Peter Wu, Tian Li, Jakub Konečný, H. Brendan McMahan, Virginia Smith, and Ameet Talwalkar. LEAF: A benchmark for federated settings. *CoRR*, abs/1812.01097, 2018.
- [Chen *et al.*, 2021] Xing Chen, Jingtao Li, and Chaitali Chakrabarti. Communication and computation reduction for split learning using asynchronous training. *CoRR*, abs/2107.09786, 2021.
- [Cheng-Yen Hsieh, 2022] An-Yeu (Andy) Wu Cheng-Yen Hsieh, Yu-Chuan Chuang. C3-sl: Circular convolution-based batch-wise compression for communication-efficient split learning. *CoRR*, abs/2207.12397, 2022.
- [Chervenak *et al.*, 2000] Ann Chervenak, Ian Foster, Carl Kesselman, Charles Salisbury, and Steven Tuecke. The data grid: Towards an architecture for the distributed management and analysis of large scientific datasets. *Journal of Network and Computer Applications*, 23(3):187–200, 2000.
- [Cun *et al.*, 1990] Y. L. Cun, B. Boser, J. S. Denker, D. Henderson, and L. D. Jackel. Handwritten digit recognition with a back-propagation network. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2(2):396–404, 1990.
- [Goyal *et al.*, 2017] Priya Goyal, Piotr Dollár, Ross B. Girshick, Pieter Noordhuis, Lukasz Wesolowski, Aapo Kyrola, Andrew Tulloch, Yangqing Jia, and Kaiming He. Accurate, large minibatch SGD: training imagenet in 1 hour. *CoRR*, abs/1706.02677, 2017.
- [Gupta and Raskar, 2018] Otkrist Gupta and Ramesh Raskar. Distributed learning of deep neural network over multiple agents. *CoRR*, abs/1810.06060, 2018.
- [He *et al.*, 2016] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- [He *et al.*, 2020] Chaoyang He, Songze Li, Jinhyun So, Mi Zhang, Hongyi Wang, Xiaoyang Wang, Praneeth Vepakomma, Abhishek Singh, Hang Qiu, Li Shen, Peilin Zhao, Yan Kang, Yang Liu, Ramesh Raskar, Qiang Yang, Murali Annamalai, and Salman Avestimehr. Fedml: A research library and benchmark for federated machine learning. *CoRR*, abs/2007.13518, 2020.
- [Hsieh *et al.*, 2022] Cheng-Yen Hsieh, Yu-Chuan Chuang, and An-Yeu Wu. C3-SL: circular convolution-based batch-wise compression for communication-efficient split learning. *CoRR*, abs/2207.12397, 2022.
- [Huang *et al.*, 2019] Li Huang, Andrew L. Shea, Huining Qian, Aditya Masurkar, Hao Deng, and Dianbo Liu. Patient clustering improves efficiency of federated machine learning to predict mortality and hospital stay time using distributed electronic medical records. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 99:103291, 2019.
- [Jeon and Kim, 2020] J. Jeon and J. Kim. Privacy-sensitive parallel split learning. In *2020 International Conference on Information Networking (ICOIN)*, 2020.
- [Kohavi, 1997] R. Kohavi. Scaling up the accuracy of naive-bayes classifiers: a decision-tree hybrid. *Proc of Kdd*, 1997.
- [Konečný *et al.*, 2016] Jakub Konečný, H. Brendan McMahan, Felix X. Yu, Peter Richtárik, Ananda Theertha Suresh, and Dave Bacon. Federated learning: Strategies for improving communication efficiency. *CoRR*, abs/1610.05492, 2016.
- [Krizhevsky *et al.*, 2017] Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E. Hinton. Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. *Commun. ACM*, 60(6):84–90, may 2017.
- [Liu *et al.*, 2017] Yun Liu, Krishna Gadepalli, Mohammad Norouzi, George E. Dahl, Timo Kohlberger, Aleksey Boyko, Subhashini Venugopalan, Aleksei Timofeev, Philip Q. Nelson, Gregory S. Corrado, Jason D. Hipp, Lily Peng, and Martin C. Stumpe. Detecting cancer metastases on gigapixel pathology images. *CoRR*, abs/1703.02442, 2017.



- [Liu *et al.*, 2022] Xiaolan Liu, Yansha Deng, and Toktam Mahmoodi. *Energy Efficient User Scheduling for Hybrid Split and Federated Learning in Wireless UAV Networks*. IEEE Communications Society, United States, 2022.
- [McMahan *et al.*, 2016] H. Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, and Blaise Agüera y Arcas. Federated learning of deep networks using model averaging. *CoRR*, abs/1602.05629, 2016.
- [Oh *et al.*, 2022] Seungeun Oh, Jihong Park, Praneeth Vepakomma, Sihun Baek, Ramesh Raskar, Mehdi Bennis, and Seong-Lyun Kim. Locfedmix-sl: Localize, federate, and mix for improved scalability, convergence, and latency in split learning. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022, WWW '22*, page 3347–3357, New York, NY, USA, 2022. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [Pal *et al.*, 2021] Shraman Pal, Mansi Uniyal, Jihong Park, Praneeth Vepakomma, Ramesh Raskar, Mehdi Bennis, Moongu Jeon, and Jinho Choi. Server-side local gradient averaging and learning rate acceleration for scalable split learning. *CoRR*, abs/2112.05929, 2021.
- [Park *et al.*, 2021] Sangjoon Park, Gwanghyun Kim, Jeong-sol Kim, Boah Kim, and Jong Chul Ye. Federated split vision transformer for covid-19cxr diagnosis using task-agnostic training, 2021.
- [Plate and T., 1995] Plate and A. T. Holographic reduced representations. *Neural Networks, IEEE Transactions on*, 1995.
- [Poirot *et al.*, 2019] Maarten G. Poirot, Praneeth Vepakomma, Ken Chang, Jayashree Kalpathy-Cramer, Rajiv Gupta, and Ramesh Raskar. Split learning for collaborative deep learning in healthcare. *CoRR*, abs/1912.12115, 2019.
- [Ryffel *et al.*, 2018] Théo Ryffel, Andrew Trask, Morten Dahl, Bobby Wagner, Jason Mancuso, Daniel Rueckert, and Jonathan Passerat-Palmbach. A generic framework for privacy preserving deep learning. *CoRR*, abs/1811.04017, 2018.
- [Shickel *et al.*, 2018] Benjamin Shickel, Patrick James Tighe, Azra Bihorac, and Parisa Rashidi. Deep ehr: A survey of recent advances in deep learning techniques for electronic health record (ehr) analysis. *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, 22(5):1589–1604, 2018.
- [Thapa *et al.*, 2020] Chandra Thapa, Mahawaga Arachchige Pathum Chamikara, and Seyit Camtepe. Splitfed: When federated learning meets split learning. *CoRR*, abs/2004.12088, 2020.
- [Turina *et al.*, 2021] Valeria Turina, Zongshun Zhang, Flavio Esposito, and Ibrahim Matta. Federated or split? a performance and privacy analysis of hybrid split and federated learning architectures. In *2021 IEEE 14th International Conference on Cloud Computing (CLOUD)*, pages 250–260, 2021.
- [Vepakomma *et al.*, 2018] Praneeth Vepakomma, Tristan Swedish, Ramesh Raskar, Otkrist Gupta, and Abhimanyu Dubey. No peek: A survey of private distributed deep learning. *CoRR*, abs/1812.03288, 2018.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2016] Qinglong Wang, Wenbo Guo, Kaixuan Zhang, Xinyu Xing, C. Lee Giles, and Xue Liu. Random feature nullification for adversary resistant deep architecture. *CoRR*, abs/1610.01239, 2016.
- [Wu *et al.*, 2022] W. Wu, M. Li, K. Qu, C. Zhou, Xuemin Shen, W. Zhuang, X. Li, and W. Shi. Split learning over wireless networks: Parallel design and resource management. *arXiv e-prints*, 2022.