

Resource Aware Clustering for Tackling the Heterogeneity of Participants in Federated Learning

Rahul Mishra, Member IEEE, Hari Prabhat Gupta, Senior Member IEEE, and Garvit Banga

Abstract—Federated Learning is a training framework that enables multiple participants to collaboratively train a shared model while preserving data privacy and minimizing communication overhead. The heterogeneity of devices and networking resources of the participants delay the training and aggregation in federated learning. This paper proposes a federated learning approach to manoeuvre the heterogeneity among the participants using resource aware clustering. The approach begins with the server gathering information about the devices and networking resources of participants, after which resource aware clustering is performed to determine the optimal number of clusters using Dunn Indices. The mechanism of participant assignment is then introduced, and the expression of communication rounds required for model convergence in each cluster is mathematically derived. Furthermore, a master-slave technique is introduced to improve the performance of the lightweight models in the clusters using knowledge distillation. Finally, experimental evaluations are conducted to verify the feasibility and effectiveness of the approach and to compare it with state-of-the-art techniques.

Index Terms—Federated learning, Heterogeneity, Master-slave technique, Resource aware clustering.

I. INTRODUCTION

Federated Learning (FL) is a newly emerging paradigm that enables a distributed training framework where data collection and model training occur locally for each participant. Thus, it preserves data privacy and reduces communication overhead of transmitting data to the server [1]. Unlike traditional distributed training frameworks that require consensus after each local iteration, either through server or peer communication, FL minimizes the frequency of consensus among distributed participants. FL is initiated by the central server, which broadcasts a randomly initialized model to all participants. Each participant trains the received model using their local dataset and sends the Weight Parameter Matrices (WPM) to the server. The server then aggregates the WPM received from multiple participants and sends back the aggregated one, generating a robust and generalized model for each participant [2].

FL participants exhibit significant heterogeneity in terms of devices and networking resources, including processing speed, available memory, and data transmission rate. Each participant uses its resources to load the model and train it locally. The

availability of device resources among participants depends on their respective configurations and installed services, leading to irregular intervals between WPM generation. Furthermore, the data transmission rate affects the time required to upload WPM from participants to the server. Consequently, participant heterogeneity hinders the simultaneous transmission and aggregation of WPM. In other words, slower participants (i.e., stragglers) delay the entire training process. The server can mitigate this issue by setting a Maximum Allowable Response (MAR) time for training to minimize the delay caused by stragglers. However, using a fixed MAR time can result in inadequate training due to a reduced number of local updates across communication rounds on stragglers.

Previous researches on FL have addressed the issue of heterogeneity among participants by excluding stragglers from the training process [3]–[5]. However, removing stragglers from the training process deprives the system of their valuable datasets, which in turn reduces the model’s generalization ability. Additionally, it also prevents the potential performance improvement of these stragglers using FL. Cluster-based techniques have been proposed in prior studies to address the heterogeneity among participants in FL. These techniques utilize the relationship between local datasets [4], [5], the similarity of local updates [6], and social relationships between participants [7] to form clusters. Nevertheless, these studies did not consider the devices and networking resources of participants during clustering. In their work [8], the authors pointed out the issue of heterogeneous devices in FL that restricts the size of the global model to accommodate stragglers. Similarly, in [9], the authors proposed a technique called HeteroFL to handle variations in computational and communication resources by generating multiple sized models and selecting the best one for each participant. Despite these benefits, neither [8] and [9] have addressed the issue of improving performance of the lightweight models used by participants with limited resources. Additionally, earlier works [10]–[12] employed Knowledge Distillation (KD) to enhance the performance of the lightweight model by leveraging insights from the large-sized; but, these methods were confined to centralized training.

This paper presents a novel approach called Fed-RAC (short for Federated learning with Resource Aware Clustering) to address the negative impact of participant heterogeneity in Federated Learning. We investigate the effect of participant heterogeneity and determine an expression for the required communication rounds per cluster. Fed-RAC is also designed to estimate the error caused by inconsistent objective functions in the presence of heterogeneous devices and networking resources. In particular, we focus on investigating the following

Rahul Mishra is with the Department of Information and Communication Technology, Dhirubhai Ambani Institute of Information and Communication Technology (DA-IICT), Gujrat, Gandhinagar, e-mail: rahul_mishra@daiict.ac.in

Hari Prabhat Gupta is with the Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Institute of Technology (BHU) Varanasi, India, e-mail: hariprabhat.cse@iitbhu.ac.in

Garvit Banga is with the the Department of Metallurgical Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology (BHU) Varanasi, India, e-mail: garvit.banga.met17@iitbhu.ac.in

problem: “How can we achieve satisfactory performance while training local models on heterogeneous participants in FL within the given MAR?” To this end, the major contributions and novelty of this work are as follows:

- *Resource aware clustering*: The first contribution is to conduct resource-aware clustering for identifying the most suitable number of clusters based on the devices and networking resources available to the participants. The server first gathers information regarding the processing speed, data transmission rate, and available memory of all participants to create resource vectors. These vectors are then subjected to unit-based normalization to bring their values within the range of $[0, 1]$. To determine the optimal number of clusters, the server calculates the Dunn Indices [13] among the normalized resource vectors of all participants.
- *Participants assignment to the clusters*: The next contribution is the allocation of participants to the identified clusters, ensuring that the model training within each cluster is performed within a specified maximum allowable response time and communication rounds. Additionally, a mathematical analysis is carried out to derive the expression for the communication round and error caused by an inconsistent objective function in the presence of heterogeneous participants.
- *Master-slave technique*: Further, our approach introduces the master-slave technique to enhance the performance of the generic model in low-configuration clusters (slaves) by leveraging the model of the highest configuration cluster (master). In this technique, the master model is initially trained, and then it guides the training of slave models using knowledge distillation to improve their performance.
- *Experimental validation*: In the end, we conduct experimental evaluations to confirm the effectiveness of the Fed-RAC approach. We validate our proposed method by comparing it with existing baseline techniques [9], [14]–[16], using various evaluation metrics and established datasets [17]–[20]. The results demonstrate that the proposed approach achieves better performance in the presence of heterogeneous participants.

Paper Organization: Section II provides an overview of the related literature. Section III outlines the preliminary information and problem statement of our proposed approach. Section IV details the Fed-RAC approach. Section V evaluates the performance of our approach, while Section VI presents the discussion and future directions for this work. Finally, Section VII concludes the paper.

II. BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATION

In this section, we provide a description of prior studies that focus on the heterogeneity of participants, clustering in FL, and knowledge distillation to enhance performance.

- *Heterogeneous participants in FL*: FL involves a significant number of participant devices with varying resources, leading to degraded performance and increased convergence time when running the same model on all participants [3], [21]–[24]. In [3], the authors proposed a system that selects participants for global aggregation and simultaneously generates WPM. The system discards straggling participants from the aggregation. To account for the slower computational speed

of stragglers, the authors in [21] proposed reducing the CPU frequency of faster participants in the federation. The authors in [8] identified the problem of heterogeneous devices in FL, which limits the size of the global model to accommodate low-resource or slow participants. They proposed a dynamically adaptive approach to model size called ordered dropout, FjORD. In [16], the authors presented a specialized technique called Oort, which prioritizes participant selection in FL. The authors in [14] introduced a framework called FedProx to handle the issue of data/task heterogeneity in FL. FedProx used a proximal term to minimize the impact of local updates.

In previous studies, various mechanisms have been proposed to address the issue of stragglers in FL, including asynchronous [25], [26] and semi-synchronous [27] global update approaches. The authors in [25] introduced an asynchronous algorithm to optimize the FL-based training for stragglers. The algorithm solved the local regularization to ensure convergence in finite time and performed a weighted average to update the global model. Similarly, the authors in [26] introduced the mechanism of asynchronous learning and weighted temporal aggregation on participants and server, respectively. To overcome the problem of higher waiting time in the asynchronous global updates, the authors in [27] introduced the semi-asynchronous mechanism, where the server aggregates the weight parameters from a set of participants as per their arrival order in each communication round.

- *Clustering in FL*: The prior studies utilized the relationship between local datasets [4], [5], the similarity of local updates [6], and social relationship between the participants [7] to form clusters in FL. Authors in [4] exploited the intrinsic relationship between local datasets of multiple participants and proposed a similarity-aware system, namely ClusterFL. The system generated various clusters based on the similarity among local datasets. Similar to [4], the authors in [5] created various groups of participants as per the similarity among their local datasets. The group formation led to a minor loss over all the participants and provided communication efficiency. In [6] authors introduced a modified FL approach, where hierarchical clustering is performed as per the similarity of local updates. The authors in [9] introduced the technique to handle variation in computational and communication resources. They named the technique as HeteroFL.

- *KD based performance improvement*: The existing literature introduced various techniques to improve the performance of the lightweight model using a large-size model via KD [10], [12], [28], [29]. The concept of KD was first introduced by the authors in [10], where the knowledge of a large-size model (teacher) is utilized to improve the performance of the lightweight model (student). The authors in [28] proposed the concept of simultaneous training of scratch teacher and student, which provided a soft target of logits to estimate the distillation loss. Finally, the authors in [12] introduced the concept of pre-trained teacher and scratch teacher-guided KD technique to improve the performance of student.

Motivation: We observed the following limitations in existing literature. Prior studies discarded stragglers from the training to cope up with the heterogeneity of the resources among participants in FL [3]–[5]. When the stragglers are discarded,

their available local datasets are not utilized during training, which reduces the generalization ability of all the participants. In addition, discarding slow participants hampered their performance improvement via FL. Reducing the processing power of the participant device during training of the model slowdown the aggregation process [21]. The asynchronous federated learning mechanisms [25], [26] demand the server to wait for stragglers, leading to significant waiting time. The semi-asynchronous global aggregation mechanism [27] is more effective than synchronous, but it discards some participants in each communication round. Suppressing the communication round for aggregation [23] also increases the stale models at participants. The existing work exploited clustering in FL but did not consider the devices and networking resources during clustering [4]–[7]. The prior studies [10], [12], [28], [29] helped in improving the performance of the lightweight model using knowledge from the large-size model. However, these techniques were limited to centralized training.

In summary, the existing FL approaches avoid straggler devices during aggregation at the central server. The asynchronous global update leads to higher weighting time at the server. The existing clustering mechanism in FL did not consider the resources of the participants, like memory, processing speed, and communication channel. Additionally, the existing work on KD to improve the performance of lightweight models are limited to centralized training.

III. PRELIMINARIES AND PROBLEM STATEMENT

This section describes the terminologies and notations, followed by the problem of the heterogeneous participants.

A. Preliminaries

This work considers a set \mathcal{P} of N participants and a central server, where $\mathcal{P} = \{p_1, \dots, p_N\}$. We consider a multi-class classification problem with a set Q of c classes, i.e., $Q = \{1, \dots, c\}$. Each participant p_i has local dataset \mathcal{D}_i with n_i number of instances and set of Q classes, where $1 \leq i \leq N$. Let $(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, y_{ij})$ denotes an instance of dataset \mathcal{D}_i , where $1 \leq j \leq n_i$. During training the model on the participant p_i learn the mapping between \mathbf{x}_{ij} and y_{ij} , $\forall j \in \{1 \leq j \leq n_i\}$, to build a classifier Π_i . The classifier recognizes the class label of unidentified instances in testing. Let B_i denotes the batch-size used for training model on p_i . Further, let τ_i represents the number of Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) operations performed in one round of training on p_i . τ_i is estimated as: $\tau_i = \lfloor En_i/B_i \rfloor$, where E is the number of local epochs to train on p_i . We can change B_i and n_i to change τ_i .

B. FL with heterogeneous participants

FL begins with the generation and random initialization of a model at the central server that further broadcasts the initialized model to all the participants. Each participant p_i receives and trains the model using local dataset \mathcal{D}_i with n_i instances, where $1 \leq i \leq N$. p_i performs training for E number of local epochs on a batch size of B_i over n_i instances using SGD operations τ_i . The participant minimizes the local

loss function $\mathcal{L}_i(\mathbf{w}_i)$, where \mathbf{w}_i is the WPM of p_i . $\mathcal{L}_i(\mathbf{w}_i)$ is estimated as: $\mathcal{L}_i(\mathbf{w}_i) = \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j \leftarrow 1}^{n_i} \mathcal{L}_{ij}(\mathbf{w}_{ij})$, where $\mathbf{w}_{ij} \in \mathbf{w}_i$, $1 \leq j \leq n_i$, and $1 \leq i \leq N$. The participant transfers estimated $\mathcal{L}_i(\cdot)$ and \mathbf{w}_i to the server for global aggregation. Upon receiving local loss and WPM from all the participants, the server estimates global loss ($\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w})$) and WPM (\mathbf{w}) as:

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{i \leftarrow 1}^N \left(\frac{n_i}{n_1 \dots n_N} \right) \mathcal{L}_i(\mathbf{w}_i), \mathbf{w} = \sum_{i \leftarrow 1}^N \left(\frac{n_i}{n_1 \dots n_N} \right) \mathbf{w}_i.$$

The server broadcasts \mathbf{w} for next round of training. The process of local training and aggregation are orchestrated for \mathcal{R} iterations to achieve a trained model for all the participants. At each global iteration $t \in \mathcal{R}$ the local loss function and WPM are denoted as $\mathcal{L}_i^t(\mathbf{w}_i^t)$ and \mathbf{w}_i^t for participant p_i , respectively, where $1 \leq i \leq N$. \mathbf{w}_i^t at global iteration t ($t \in \mathcal{R}$) of participant p_i is updated as: $\mathbf{w}_i^t = \mathbf{w}_i^{t-1} - \eta \nabla \mathcal{L}_i^t(\mathbf{w}_i^t)$, where η is the learning rate. Using above equation, we can define the objective function of FL as follows:

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}^{\mathcal{R}}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}^{\mathcal{R}}) = \sum_{t \leftarrow 1}^{\mathcal{R}} \sum_{i \leftarrow 1}^N \left(\frac{n_i}{n_1 + \dots + n_N} \right) \mathcal{L}_i^t(\mathbf{w}_i^t). \quad (1)$$

1) *Heterogeneous participants*: The heterogeneous participants in FL require non-identical training and communication time. Let T_i denotes training and communication time of p_i , estimated as: $T_i = T_i^a \cdot E + T_i^c, \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$, where T_i^a is the training time for one local epoch, and T_i^c is the per-round communication time for sharing WPM from p_i to server. The participants train local model and communicate WPM in parallel. Thus, for each iteration $t \in \mathcal{R}$ the training and communication time T^t depends on the slowest participant, where $T^t = \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \{T_i\}$. We obtain total training time, denoted as $\mathbb{T}(N, E, \mathcal{R})$, as:

$$\mathbb{T}(N, E, \mathcal{R}) = \sum_{t \leftarrow 1}^{\mathcal{R}} T^t = \sum_{t \leftarrow 1}^{\mathcal{R}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \{T_i\}. \quad (2)$$

2) *Objective inconsistency*: The server has a fixed MAR time to complete the global iterations, which reduces the training delay due to slow processing and communication of stragglers. It also minimizes the idle time of faster participants. However, the number of local SGD operations vary over heterogeneous participants within the fixed MAR time. The faster participants perform more local updates in contrast with stragglers. In addition, the number of local updates on the participants also vary across the communication rounds. The objective function of FL given in (1) relies upon the assumptions that the number of local updates, τ_i for $p_i \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$, remain same for all participants ($\tau_i = \tau$). However, the variation in the local updates on the heterogeneous participants results in an inconsistent objective function for FL [30]. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{\mathcal{R}})$ denotes the inconsistent objective function, where $\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{\mathcal{R}}$ is the aggregated WPM generated after \mathcal{R} global iterations. The error (*err*) between actual and inconsistent objective function is defined as: $err = |\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{\mathcal{R}}) - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}^{\mathcal{R}})|$. Thus, it is required to minimize error to mitigate the negative impact of heterogeneous participants.

Example 1. Let $p_1 - p_{10}$ denote 10 participants in FL. In the absence of information about available resources, we

can assume homogeneous participants with an equal number of data instances to estimate their local loss functions. It implies $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathbf{w}_1) = \mathcal{L}_2(\mathbf{w}_2) = \dots = \mathcal{L}_{10}(\mathbf{w}_{10}) = l_1$. Let $l_1 = 0.027$; thus, the objective function given in (1) attains the value of $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}^{\mathcal{R}}) = 0.027$. However, the participants may be heterogeneous; thus, the inconsistent objective function may obtain 0.036, which implies $err = 0.009$.

C. Problem statement and solution overview

The fundamental challenges encountered while developing an FL approach to mitigate the heterogeneity are: 1) how to reduce the training and communication time of the stragglers in FL?, 2) how to achieve adequate performance within the fixed time interval for communication?, and 3) how to minimize the error gap between actual and inconsistent objective functions due to heterogeneous participants? In this work, we investigate and solve the problem of training the local model on all the heterogeneous participants within a given maximum allowable response time, achieving adequate performance and minimizing error due to inconsistent objective function.

Apart from the standard FL workflow, the Fed-RAC trains the local models on all the participants despite higher heterogeneity and reduces training time without compromising performance. Fed-RAC starts with the estimation of the optimal number of clusters to accommodate all N heterogeneous participants. We named the step as *resource aware clustering* (Section IV-A). During clustering, a set \mathcal{K} of k clusters is first identified (Section IV-A1), followed by the generation of a generic model for each cluster (Section IV-A2). Next, the participants are assigned to the empty clusters using *participant assignment mechanism* (Section IV-B). Further, we introduce *master-slave technique* (Section IV-C) to enhance the performance of the generic models using KD.

IV. FED-RAC: FEDERATED LEARNING VIA RESOURCE AWARE CLUSTERING

In this section, we first cover the details of the Federated learning approach to mitigate the heterogeneity of participants using Resource Aware Clustering (Fed-RAC). The workflow of the Fed-RAC is shown in Fig. 1.

A. Resource aware clustering

This sub-section describes the mechanism of dividing the set of N participants into k disjoint clusters. The clustering is performed on the server to preserve the resources of the participants. In doing so, the server fetches three resources from all the participants, *i.e.*, processing speed, data transmission rate, and available memory, denoted as s_i , r_i , and a_i for p_i ($1 \leq i \leq N$), respectively. s_i and a_i are the machine-dependent parameters that rely upon the configuration of the devices. The data transmission rate r_i depends on the bandwidth, channel coefficient, and path loss between participant and server and is estimated using technique discussed in [31]. The static information of s_i , r_i , and a_i from the participants are used to initialize the Fed-RAC approach. Afterward, the approach provides the opportunity to upgrade or downgrade

the cluster depending on the available dynamic resources of the participants. If a participant is in the smallest cluster and its resources are dynamically reduced then Fed-RAC sets batch-size and local epochs to continue the training, as discussed in Section IV-B3. It implies the Fed-RAC can easily tackle the dynamic resources of the participants in FL.

All the participants of a cluster possess similar processing speed, transmission rate, and memory. However, it is tedious to determine the similarity among the three independent resources. Thus, we use a vector $v_i = [s_i, r_i, a_i]$ for participant p_i ($1 \leq i \leq N$) to estimate similarity among resources. We use normalized vector $\bar{v}_i = [\bar{s}_i, \bar{r}_i, \bar{a}_i]$ in place of v_i , to eliminate impact of biasness of high values. The bias value \bar{s}_i is estimated as: $\bar{s}_i = \frac{s_i - \min\{s_i\}_{i=1}^N}{\max\{s_i\}_{i=1}^N - \min\{s_i\}_{i=1}^N}$, \bar{r}_i and \bar{a}_i are also estimated similarly. We further estimate the similarity (\mathcal{S}_{ij}) among any two participant p_i and p_j using normalized vectors \bar{v}_i and \bar{v}_j , respectively, $\forall i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ using Euclidean distance. \mathcal{S}_{ij} is estimated as: $\mathcal{S}_{ij} = \sqrt{\lambda_1(\bar{s}_i - \bar{s}_j)^2 + \lambda_2(\bar{r}_i - \bar{r}_j)^2 + \lambda_3(\bar{a}_i - \bar{a}_j)^2}$, where λ_1 , λ_2 and λ_3 are the contributions of processing capacity, transmission rate, and memory, respectively, $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = 1$. λ_1 , λ_2 , and λ_3 can be obtained from analysis given in [32], [33].

1) *Estimating optimal number of cluster k*: We introduce a modified version of the conventional Dunn and Dunn-like Indices [13] to estimate the optimal number of clusters using similarity. We use k -means clustering to determine the optimal number of clusters. Dunn index identifies an optimal number of clusters that hold compactness and provide good separation. Let C_f and C_g denote clusters in \mathcal{K} ($C_f, C_g \in \{C_1, \dots, C_k\}, C_f \neq C_g$). The least distance $\text{dist}(C_f, C_g)$ among C_f and C_g is given as:

$$\text{dist}(C_f, C_g) = \min_{p_i \in C_f, p_j \in C_g, C_f \neq C_g} \mathcal{S}_{ij}. \quad (3)$$

The diameter $\text{dia}(C_f)$ of cluster $C_f \in \{C_1, \dots, C_k\}$ is the maximum distance between any two participants in C_f . Let p_l^f and p_q^f be the two participants in C_f ($p_l^f \neq p_q^f$), $\text{dia}(C_f)$ is estimated as:

$$\text{dia}(C_f) = \max_{p_l^f, p_q^f \in C_f, p_l^f \neq p_q^f} \mathcal{S}_{lq}^f. \quad (4)$$

Using Equations 3 and 4, we estimate Dunn Index ($DI(k)$) as:

$$DI(k) = \min_{\forall C_f \in \mathcal{K}} \left[\min_{\forall C_g \in \mathcal{K}, C_f \neq C_g} \left(\frac{\text{dist}(C_f, C_g)}{\max_{\forall C_f \in \mathcal{K}} \text{dia}(C_f)} \right) \right]. \quad (5)$$

A high positive value of $DI(\cdot)$ indicates compact and adequate number of clusters. The divergence-based Dunn and Dunn-like Indices starts with $k = 2$ and terminates when $DI(\cdot)$ achieves a higher positive value. We use the maximum number of clusters $k_{max} \leq \sqrt{N}$ as rule of thumb, inspired from [34]. The complete steps to obtain optimal number of clusters are given in Procedure 1.

Example 2. Let there are 10 participants denoted as p_1, \dots, p_{10} . The resource and normalized vectors of the example are shown in Table I. Using Procedure 1 with $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 1/3$, we obtain $k = 3$ as optimal clusters.




Fig. 1: Workflow for Fed-RAC approach. ① – ④ steps for resource aware clustering, ⑤ generating generic model for each cluster, ⑥ participants assignment to the clusters, and ⑦ master-slave technique to improve performance.

TABLE I: An illustration of example scenario having 10 participants with resource vectors and normalized resource vectors.

Participant	Resource vector	Normalized resource vector
p_1	$v_1 = [100, 10, 20]$	$\bar{v}_1 = [0.5, 0.375, 0.5]$
p_2	$v_2 = [50, 15, 30]$	$\bar{v}_2 = [0, 1, 1]$
p_3	$v_3 = [75, 8, 25]$	$\bar{v}_3 = [0.25, 0.125, 0.75]$
p_4	$v_4 = [125, 10, 15]$	$\bar{v}_4 = [0.25, 0.625, 0.75]$
p_5	$v_5 = [150, 7, 10]$	$\bar{v}_5 = [1, 0, 0]$
p_6	$v_6 = [110, 10, 25]$	$\bar{v}_6 = [0.6, 0.375, 0.75]$
p_7	$v_7 = [125, 15, 20]$	$\bar{v}_7 = [0.75, 1, 0.5]$
p_8	$v_8 = [80, 10, 10]$	$\bar{v}_8 = [0.30, 0.375, 0]$
p_9	$v_9 = [75, 15, 20]$	$\bar{v}_9 = [0.25, 1, 0.5]$
p_{10}	$v_{10} = [50, 10, 30]$	$\bar{v}_{10} = [0, 0.375, 1]$

Procedure 1: Optimal number of clusters

Input: Set of N participants \mathcal{P} in FL;
Output: Optimal set of k clusters $\mathcal{K} = \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k\}$;

- 1 Initialization: $j \leftarrow 0$, $C_s \leftarrow \emptyset$, $\mathcal{K} = \{\}$, $k \leftarrow 2$; l *starting with 2 /*
- 2 **for** each participant $p_i \in \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_N\}$ **do**
- 3 Server extracts information of s_i , r_i , and a_i from p_i ;
- 4 Estimate resource vector v_i ;
- 5 **for** each participant $p_i \in \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_N\}$ **do**
- 6 Estimate \bar{s}_i , \bar{r}_i , and \bar{a}_i for p_i ;
- 7 Determine normalized resource vector \bar{v}_i ;
- 8 **while** $k \leq \sqrt{N}$ **do**
- 9 Perform k -mean clustering on set \mathcal{P} ;
- 10 Estimate similarity among the normalized vectors;
- 11 Preserve information about the k clusters;
- 12 **for** each pair $C_f, C_g \in \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k\}, C_f \neq C_g$ **do**
- 13 Estimate Dunn index ($DI(k)$) using (5);
- 14 $C_s \leftarrow \text{append}(DI(k))$, $k \leftarrow k + 1$;
- 15 $j \leftarrow \arg \max(C_s)$, $k \leftarrow j + 1$; l *Optimal number of clusters*/
- 16 **return** $\mathcal{K} = \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k\}$;

Apart from k -means clustering, we also consider density-based clustering to obtain the optimal number of clusters using normalized resource vectors. We use Density-Based Spatial Clustering of Applications with Noise (DBSCAN) and Ordering points to identify the clustering structure (OP-

TICS) [35] during the experiment. Table II illustrates the DI-values and accuracy for different k using k -means, DBSCAN, and OPTICS using the resource vectors, discussed in Section V-F1. From the results in the table, we observe that for DBSCAN clustering, the DI value decreases with increasing k ; thus, it predicts $k = 2$ as an optimal number of the cluster. However, the difference between resources among the participants within a cluster is high, which results in lower accuracy. Moreover, some participants with the least resources can not accommodate a large-size model assigned to the cluster. We can draw similar observations for OPTICS, which gives the optimal number of clusters $k = 3$. k -means clustering results in $k = 5$ optimal number of clusters, where inter-cluster and intra-cluster distances are high and low, respectively. It narrows down the gaps between the resources of the participants within a cluster. Thus, all the participants can easily accommodate the assigned model to a cluster. Such narrow gapping also prevents the bucket effect, where a large model is assigned to the participant with the smallest resources.

TABLE II: Impact of clustering techniques on DI values and accuracy at different values of k using MNIST dataset.

Cluster technique	DI values				
	$k = 2$	$k = 3$	$k = 4$	$k = 5$	$k = 6$
k-means	0.1517	0.1965	0.2165	0.2317	0.1750
DBSCAN	0.2231	0.1819	0.1642	0.1419	0.1236
OPTICS	0.1165	0.1208	0.1037	0.0839	0.0673
Accuracy (± 0.30)	94.39%	95.07%	96.32%	97.73%	95.67%

2) *Generic model for each cluster and compaction of clusters:* This work considers three resources, *i.e.*, processing speed, data transmission rate, and available memory, to obtain k clusters. However, the cumulative resources are unequal among all the clusters. Therefore, the size of the model on the clusters would be non-identical in FL. This work develops a generic model for each cluster and performs cluster compaction afterward. In doing so, we arrange the k clusters in descending order of their available resources. In other words,

the participants in cluster C_1 can train a large-size model and quickly transfer WPM to the server, whereas C_k can train the smallest model and requires the huge time to share WPM.

Let M denotes the initial model generated and randomly initialized by the server. We assume M can directly accommodate on C_1 , i.e., training and communication can be performed within the given time. Let M_1 denotes the size of model for C_1 , where $M = M_1$. Beyond C_1 other clusters require some compression to train the model and share WPM. Let M_2 denotes the compressed version of M that can be deployed on the participants in C_2 , consuming less training and communication time. Similarly, $M_3 - M_k$ are generated for remaining $k - 2$ clusters. In this work, we consider the model of any cluster C_i is α times smaller than C_{i-1} , i.e., $M_{i-1} = \alpha M_i$, where $\alpha < 1$. It implies $M_k = \alpha^{k-1} M_1 \implies M_k = \alpha^{k-1} M$.

• **Cluster compaction:** The estimated k clusters and corresponding models suit the resources of the participants; however, higher compression of the model results in performance compromise. Thus, it is beneficial if all the participants can accommodate in fewer clusters than k . However, it introduces the *straggler effect*, where slow participants do not participate. To overcome the straggler effect, we merge some clusters out of k to obtain m clusters, where $k < m$.

B. Participants assignment to the clusters

This sub-section describes the mechanism of assigning N participants to the m clusters. We first deduce the expression to estimate the communication rounds required for the generic model in m different clusters. Next, we define the optimization error due to the heterogeneity of participants. Notably, FedRAC initially checks the possibilities of assigning participants to the higher cluster, decreasing as per the assignment criteria.

From Section IV-A2, we have m different models M_1, M_2, \dots, M_m for clusters C_1, C_2, \dots, C_m , respectively, where the size of models $M_1 > M_2 > \dots > M_m$ and $M_m = \alpha^{m-1} M_1 = \alpha^{m-1} M$. The server decides $\mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2, \dots, \mathcal{R}_m$ communication rounds for training local models of the participants in clusters C_1, C_2, \dots, C_m , respectively. We first determine the expression for communication rounds \mathcal{R}_f for cluster C_f , where $1 \leq f \leq m$.

1) *Communication rounds per cluster:* Let \mathcal{P}_f denotes the set of F participants to be assigned in C_f , where $\mathcal{P}_f = \{p_1, \dots, p_F\}$, having loss functions $\mathcal{L}_1, \dots, \mathcal{L}_F$, respectively. We consider the assumptions given in [36], [37] and applied on $\mathcal{L}_1, \dots, \mathcal{L}_F$ to estimate the round \mathcal{R}_f for cluster C_f .

Assumption 1. Loss $\mathcal{L}_j \in \{\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2, \dots, \mathcal{L}_F\}$ is L -smooth; therefore, for any two WPM \mathbf{w}_a and \mathbf{w}_b on $p_j \in \mathcal{P}_f$, following inequality holds: $\mathcal{L}_j(\mathbf{w}_a) \leq \mathcal{L}_j(\mathbf{w}_b) + (\mathbf{w}_a - \mathbf{w}_b)^T \nabla \mathcal{L}_j(\mathbf{w}_b) + \frac{L}{2} \|\mathbf{w}_a - \mathbf{w}_b\|^2$, where $1 \leq j \leq F$.

Assumption 2. \mathcal{L}_j is μ -strongly convex; the inequality holds: $\mathcal{L}_j(\mathbf{w}_a) \geq \mathcal{L}_j(\mathbf{w}_b) + (\mathbf{w}_a - \mathbf{w}_b)^T \nabla \mathcal{L}_j(\mathbf{w}_b) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|\mathbf{w}_a - \mathbf{w}_b\|^2$.

Assumption 3. Let ε_j^t denotes the uniformly and randomly selected sample from the local dataset \mathcal{D}_j of participant p_j on communication round t , where $1 \leq t \leq \mathcal{R}_f$. Let $\nabla \mathcal{L}_j(\varepsilon_j^t, \mathbf{w}_j^t)$ and $\nabla \mathcal{L}_j(\mathbf{w}_j^t)$ denote the gradients of loss function $\mathcal{L}_j(\cdot)$ on ε_j^t samples and entire samples of the local dataset, respectively.

The variance of gradients on participant p_j is bounded as: $\mathbb{E} \|\nabla \mathcal{L}_j(\varepsilon_j^t, \mathbf{w}_j^t) - \nabla \mathcal{L}_j(\mathbf{w}_j^t)\|^2 \leq \sigma_f^2$.

Assumption 4. Expected square norm of loss gradient is uniformly bounded as: $\mathbb{E} \|\nabla \mathcal{L}_j(\phi_j^t, \mathbf{w}_j^t)\|^2 \leq G_f^2$, $1 \leq t \leq \mathcal{R}_f$ and $1 \leq j \leq F$.

Using Assumptions 1 – 4, we obtain a relation between desired precision (q_o^f), local epoch count E_f , and global iterations \mathcal{R}_f of cluster C_f . The precision is defined as: $q_o^f = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}^{\mathcal{R}_f})] - \mathcal{L}_f^*$, where $\mathbf{w}^{\mathcal{R}_f}$ is the aggregated weight at final global epoch \mathcal{R}_f and \mathcal{L}_f^* is minimum and unknown value of \mathcal{L}_f at the server. Let \mathcal{L}_j^* is the minimum value of \mathcal{L}_j at p_j , where $\forall j \in \{1 \leq j \leq F\}$. In this work, we assume i.i.d datasets on the participants; thus, $\Gamma = \mathcal{L}_f^* - \sum_{i=1}^F \mathcal{L}_i^* = 0$, as given [36]. Γ quantifies the degree of non-i.i.d and it goes to zero for i.i.d. Let ϵ_j denotes the weight contribution of participant $p_j \in \mathcal{P}_f$. Let $\beta = \max\{8L/\mu, E_f\}$ and T_f is the total SGD operations on a participant then we obtain following relation of desired precision (q_o^f) for cluster C_f [36], [38]:

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}^{\mathcal{R}_f})] - \mathcal{L}_f^* \leq \frac{L/2\mu^2}{\beta + T_f - 1} \left(4B + \mu^2 \beta \mathbb{E} \|\cdot\|^2 \right), \quad (6)$$

where, $B = \sum_{j=1}^F \epsilon_j^2 \sigma_f^2 + 8(E - 1)^2 G_f^2$. Using upper bound of q_o^f and $T_f = \mathcal{R}_f E_f$, we obtain number of communication round (\mathcal{R}_f) for cluster C_f ($1 \leq f \leq m$) as follows:

$$\mathcal{R}_f = \frac{1}{E_f} \left[\frac{L}{2\mu^2 q_o^f} \left(4B + \mu^2 \beta \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{w}_1 - \mathbf{w}_f^*\|^2 \right) + 1 - \beta \right]. \quad (7)$$

From (7), we have fixed communication rounds \mathcal{R}_f for given precision threshold q_o^f and local epochs E_f for cluster C_f , where $1 \leq f \leq m$. In addition, we have $E_f = \frac{B_j \tau_j}{n_j}$; it implies we can change value of B_j , τ_j , and n_j in such a manner, where E_f and \mathcal{R}_f remains fixed for $p_j \in \mathcal{P}_f$ and q_o^f changes. We set a threshold over q_o^f , denoted as δ_f for C_f .

Example 3. Let $\mu = 0.7$, $L = 1.5$, $B = 1$, $\mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{w}_1 - \mathbf{w}_f^*\| = 0.08$ and $E_f = 20$ for cluster C_f . We obtain $\beta = \max\{8 \times 1.5/0.7, 20\} = 20$ using E_f , μ , and L . Further, we estimate $\mathcal{R}_f = 6$ using (7) and values of parameters given above.

2) *Optimization error due to participants heterogeneity:* The set of participants \mathcal{P}_f to be assigned in cluster C_f posses low inter-cluster and high intra-cluster heterogeneity. Therefore, we obtain inconsistency in the objective function of a cluster, discussed in Section III-B2, due to intra-cluster heterogeneity despite using an effective clustering mechanism. To estimate the value of error err_f for cluster C_f , where $C_f \in \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_m\}$, we use the assumptions given in [30]. The previous assumptions, i.e., Assumption 1 and Assumption 2 are same for estimating err_f . However, we need to define a new assumption (Assumption 5) to calculate err_f .

Assumption 5. Let $\{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_F\}$ denote a set of weighted contribution of participants in set \mathcal{P}_f of cluster C_f , where $\sum_{j=1}^F \epsilon_j = 1$ and $C_f \in \{C_1, \dots, C_m\}$. There exists two constants $h_1 \geq 1$ and $h_2 \geq 0$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^F \epsilon_j \|\nabla \mathcal{L}_j(\mathbf{w}_j)\|^2 \leq h_1^2 \|\sum_{j=1}^F \epsilon_j \nabla \mathcal{L}_j(\mathbf{w}_j)\|^2 + h_2^2$.

Using Assumptions 1, 2, and 5, we derive the expression for err_f of cluster C_f . In doing so, let \mathbf{o}_j denotes a non-negative vector and defines how stochastic gradients are locally accumulated. For example, $\mathbf{o}_j = [1, \dots, 1] \in \mathbb{R}^{\tau_j}$ for FedAvg [39], [40]. $\|\mathbf{o}_j\|_1$ is the l_1 -norm of \mathbf{o}_j and $o_{[j,-1]}$ is the last element in vector \mathbf{o}_j . $\tau_e = \sum_{j=1}^F \tau_j / F$, $\tau_j = \lfloor E_f n_j / B_j \rfloor$ and η is the learning rate, where $1 \leq j \leq F$.

$$err_f = \min_{t \in \mathcal{R}_f} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla \bar{\mathcal{L}}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}^t)\|^2 \right] \\ \leq \frac{4b_1}{\eta \tau_e \mathcal{R}_f} + \frac{4\eta L \sigma_f^2 b_2}{F} + 6\eta^2 L^2 \sigma_f^2 b_3 + 12\eta^2 L^2 h_2^2 b_4, \quad (8)$$

where $b_1 = [\bar{\mathcal{L}}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}^0) - \mathcal{L}_f^*]$, $b_2 = F \tau_e \sum_{j=1}^F \frac{\epsilon_j^2 \|\mathbf{o}_j\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{o}_j\|_1^2}$, $b_3 = \sum_{j=1}^F \epsilon_j (\|\mathbf{o}_j\|_2^2 - [o_{[j,-1]}]^2)$, $b_4 = \max_j \{ \|\mathbf{o}_j\|_1 (\|\mathbf{o}_j\|_1 - [o_{[j,-1]}]) \}$. A small err_f indicates lower intra-heterogeneity among the participants. We set error bound for each cluster, i.e., error $err_f \leq \theta_f$ for C_f , where $1 \leq f \leq m$ and $err_f \leq \theta_f$.

3) *Participants assignment*: Fed-RAC assigns each participant to an optimal cluster per the available device and networking resources. Such assignment facilitates easier and faster (within MAR time) training and inference of the local model on each participant assigned to a specific cluster. In other words, each participant trains the local model in R_f communication rounds ((7)) for cluster C_f , $1 \leq f \leq m$. The assignment verifies two conditions: a) precision (6) of cluster C_f must be less than the threshold ($q_o^f \leq \delta_f$) and b) optimization error (8) $err_f \leq \theta_f$. Further, we get two possible cases for assigning participants in each cluster:

- **Case 1 (Cluster is empty)**: p_i assigns to empty cluster C_f , if p_i can train the model M_f in given epochs E_f and communication round R_f . The local epoch E_f is high for a single participant as one communication round is required to train the model without multiple participants. In this case, the condition of $q_o^f < \delta_f$ is only verified and the optimization error is zero. It is because the constraint for homogeneity becomes zero with a single participant in (8). If the participant is unable to train M_f in MAR and R_f , it uses the following two steps:

- 1) p_i reduces τ_i and n_i , while satisfying $q_o^f \leq \delta_f$.
- 2) If $q_o^f \geq \delta_f$ for C_f then the participant switches to the lower cluster and repeats Step 1.

- **Case 2 (Cluster is non-empty)**: We initially estimate q_o^f (6). Upon adding p_i to C_f , q_o^f should be less than threshold δ_f . Similar to Case 1, if p_i is incompetent in training M_f in MAR, τ_i and n_i are adjusted until $q_o^f < \delta_f$; otherwise participant switches to the lower cluster. Next, the error (8) is also estimated upon adding p_i to C_f . If estimated $err_f \leq \theta_f$ then p_i is added to C_f , else p_i switches to lower cluster.

After successfully executing these two cases, N participants are assigned to the m clusters. The assigned participants achieve desired precision and optimization errors less than the corresponding thresholds. The server optimally allocates each participant to a specific cluster as per the resource, precision threshold, and error threshold. Procedure 2 summarizes the steps involved in assigning participants to the clusters.

Procedure 2: Participants assignment to the clusters

Input: Set of clusters $\{C_1, \dots, C_m\}$ with generic models $\{M_1, \dots, M_m\}$. Set of participants $\mathcal{P} = \{p_1, \dots, p_N\}$;
Output: Optimal participants in each cluster $C_f, \forall 1 \leq f \leq m$;

```

1 Initialization:  $i \leftarrow 1, f \leftarrow 1$ ;
2 for each participant  $p_i \in \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_N\}$  do
3   for each cluster  $C_f \in \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_m\}$  do
4     /*Case 1 for assigning participant*/
5     if isEmpty( $C_f$ ) == True then
6       if  $p_i$  can accommodate  $M_f$  then
7         Check: Estimate precision  $q_o^f$  using (6);
8         if  $q_o^f \leq \delta_f$  then
9           Assign  $p_i$  to  $C_f$ ;
10        else
11           $f \leftarrow f + 1$ ;
12      else
13        Reduce  $\tau_i$  and  $n_i$  s.t.,  $p_i$  can run  $M_f$ ;
14        Goto Check;
15    /*Case 2 for assigning participant*/
16    else
17      if  $p_i$  can accommodate  $M_f$  then
18        Check-I: Estimate precision  $q_o^f$  using (6);
19        Calculate error  $err_f$  using (8);
20        if  $q_o^f \leq \delta_f$  and  $err_f \leq \theta_f$  then
21          Assign  $p_i$  to  $C_f$ ;
22        else
23           $f \leftarrow f + 1$ ;
24      else
25        Reduce  $\tau_i$  and  $n_i$  s.t.,  $p_i$  can run  $M_f$ ;
26        Goto Check-I;
27  return Optimal participants in each cluster  $C_f, \forall 1 \leq f \leq m$ ;
```

C. Master-slave technique

This sub-section introduces the technique of improving the performance of lightweight models M_2, \dots, M_m in clusters $\{C_2, \dots, C_m\}$ using generalization ability (or knowledge) of large-size model M_1 in cluster C_1 . We utilize the assumption that the cluster C_1 is the fastest cluster and can accommodate the server's model without compression, i.e., $M_1 = M$. We use the term *master* for M_1 and *slave* for models $M_2 - M_m$, thus, named the technique as *master-slave for performance improvement*. The technique involve KD technique [10], [41], [42] to improve the performance of slave model using trained master model. MAR time (\mathbb{T}_{max}) for training models on all N participants and can be further divided as: $\mathbb{T}_{max} = T_1 + \max\{T_2, T_3, \dots, T_m\}$, where T_f is the MAR time for training M_f on the participants of C_f , $1 \leq f \leq m$. Since C_m is the slowest cluster and C_1 is the fastest cluster; thus, we can consider the following relation similar to generic models: $T_{f-1} = \kappa T_f$, where $1 \leq f \leq m$ and $\kappa < 1$. It implies $T_1 = \kappa^{m-1} T_m$ then we obtain:

$$\mathbb{T}_{max} = \kappa^{m-1} T_m + \max\{\kappa^{m-2} T_m, \kappa^{m-3} T_m, \dots, T_m\}, \\ = \kappa^{m-1} T_m + T_m = (\kappa^{m-1} + 1) T_m. \quad (9)$$

In special case, where M_1 is master of M_2 , M_2 is master of M_3 , and so on, i.e., the FL-based training is performed

Algorithm 1: Fed-RAC Algorithm.

Input: Set \mathcal{P} of N participants with their local datasets;
1 Call **Procedure 1** to determine a set \mathcal{K} of k clusters;
2 Merge clusters to obtain m clusters in \mathcal{K} , $\{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_m\}$;
3 Generate m model for each cluster, $\{M_1, M_2, \dots, M_m\}$;
4 /*Participants assignment to the clusters*/
5 Call **Procedure 2** to assign optimal number of participants to all the m clusters;
6 **for** each cluster $C_f \in \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_m\}$ **do**
7 **if** $f == 1$ **then**
8 **while** communication rounds $r \leq R_1$ **do**
9 Train local models in cluster C_1 ;
10 $r \leftarrow r + 1$;
11 Obtained train model M_1 for participants in cluster C_1 ;
12 **else**
13 **while** communication rounds $r \leq R_f$ **do**
14 Train local models in cluster C_f under the guidance of model M_1 ;
15 $r \leftarrow r + 1$;
16 Obtained train model M_f for participants in cluster C_f ;
17 **return** Trained model on each participant;

sequentially for each cluster. In this case, \mathbb{T}_{max} is defined as:

$$\mathbb{T}_{max} = \kappa^{m-1}T_m + \kappa^{m-2}T_m + \kappa^{m-3}T_m + \dots + T_m, \\ = \{\kappa^{m-1} + \kappa^{m-3} + \dots + 1\}T_m = \frac{1 - \kappa^m}{1 - \kappa}, \text{ where } \kappa < 1.$$

This work starts FL based training from the fastest cluster C_1 with the adequate devices and networking resources to train M_1 . We train M_1 for E_1 local epochs on the participants of C_1 using \mathcal{R}_1 communication rounds. The logits of trained M_1 is next supplied to all the remaining clusters to improve the performance of their generic models using the KD. Algorithm 1 summarizes steps involved in the Fed-RAC.

Fed-RAC approach trains the lightweight models of the smaller clusters using the knowledge distillation (master-slave) technique. It may lead to biased learning because knowledge extracted from the data samples in the larger cluster is utilized more times than those in smaller ones. To avoid such biasness, we adopt the resampling and reweighting scheme. It resolves the trade-off between minor and frequently chosen data instances for model training on the larger cluster. In other words, the participants of the largest cluster sample nearly equal number of data instances for all the classes during training in each communication round.

V. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

This section describes the task of study, datasets, and models, followed by the baselines. We consider the different tasks, including Locomotion Mode Recognition (LMR), Human Activity Recognition (HAR), Handwritten Digit Recognition (HDR), and Image Classification (IC).

A. Datasets and models

This work uses four public datasets, including MNIST [17], HAR [18], CIFAR-10 [19], and SHL [20]. These datasets were selected due to free accessibility, real-life acquisition, and correct annotations. MNIST is a handwritten digit dataset

containing 50000 images of different digits from 0 – 9 for training. MNIST also has 10000 images for testing. HAR was collected using the smartphone (Samsung Galaxy S II) sensors, including a tri-axial accelerometer and gyroscope. The dataset contains sensory instances of six different activities; walking, standing, lying, sitting, walking upstairs, and walking downstairs. CIFAR-10 comprises 60000 images of ten different classes. The dataset is balanced and correctly annotated with 6000 images for each class and contained 50000 images for training and 10000 for testing. SHL [20] dataset was collected from the onboard sensors of HUAWEI Mate 9 smartphones to recognize the locomotion modes of the users.

We use a simplified arrangement of Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN) and Dense layers to obtain a model as: $C(128) - C(64) - C(128) - C(256) - C(512) - D(classes_count)$, where $C(X)$ indicates the convolutional layer with X filter units and $D(Y)$ is the dense layer having Y neurons. We use ResNet-18 [43] and DeepZero [44], [45] for training on CIFAR-10 and the SHL datasets, respectively.

B. Baselines

We considered the existing techniques [9], [14]–[16] as baselines, noted as HeteroFL [9], FedProx [14], FedAvg [15], and Oort [16], to evaluate and compare the performance. HeteroFL [9] partitioned the heterogeneous participants into various clusters depending on the different computational complexities. FedProx [14] handled the problem of heterogeneity by introducing a proximal term. The term minimized the impact of local updates and restricted such updates close to global model. FedAvg [15] is the benchmark and most classical FL learning technique. Oort [16] selected a set of participants that achieved adequate accuracy and quickly trained the model. It is a participant selection mechanism that performed cherry-picking of the participants.

C. System implementation

We implemented the Fed-RAC algorithm and procedures using Python programming language. The considered models are implemented using the functional API of Keras in Python language to friendly support developers. Additionally, we reimplemented all the baselines to perform a fair comparison. During the experiment, we set the loss function to “categorical cross-entropy”, batch size to 200 and other settings as discussed in [46]–[48]. We set \mathcal{L}^* between 0.01 – 0.05 and the number of participants $N = 40$. The local epochs vary over the dataset, *i.e.*, $E = 1 - 5$ for MNIST and HAR, while $E = 10 - 40$ for CIFAR-10 and SHL. The communication rounds were set to 200 for all the clusters during the experiment. We varied the learning rate between 0.001 to 0.010 and set the proximal term in FedProx to 0.001. We only compress the convolutional layers to obtain slave models. We use the dropout of 0.5, *i.e.*, $M_2 = 0.5(M_1)$, $M_3 = 0.5(M_2)$, *etc.* inspired from [49]–[51].

D. Evaluation strategy

The primary motive of FL is to improve the local performance and generalization ability. We adopt these strategies:

(1) **Local performance:** It determines: *how well the local model is trained on the dataset of the participants?*

(2) **Cluster performance:** It estimates: *how well the participants can improve the cluster-wise performance through the aggregation of WPM?*

(3) **Global performance:** It is the simple average over cluster performance and helps to determine: *how much deviation is observed in the cluster performance from the average value?*

E. Evaluation metrics

We use the standard metrics, including **accuracy** and **F1-score**, to evaluate the performance of the Fed-RAC. We also introduce a new performance metric, namely **rounds-to-reach $x\%$** . Let $I(x\%)$ denotes the symbolic representation of the metric. $I(x\%)$ counts the number of iterations (or rounds) required for achieving the performance of $x\%$. We finally use **leave-one-out-test** metric that trains the model for all class labels except for one randomly chosen class label. .

TABLE III: Available resources set \mathcal{P} of 40 participants. R. Vector = Resource vector = [processing, transmission rate, and memory].

\mathcal{P}	R. Vector						
p_1	[1.6, 10.88, 8]	p_{11}	[1.6, 12.54, 6]	p_{21}	[1.6, 40, 1]	p_{31}	[3.1, 18.04, 6]
p_2	[2.8, 4.1, 3]	p_{12}	[0.8, 1.2, 6]	p_{22}	[1.1, 11.4, 6]	p_{32}	[2.5, 44.13, 6]
p_3	[1.1, 1.13, 6]	p_{13}	[1.3, 28.41, 6]	p_{23}	[2.5, 25, 6]	p_{33}	[2.3, 6.5, 6]
p_4	[1.6, 11.45, 3]	p_{14}	[1.3, 21.9, 3]	p_{24}	[2.2, 30, 4]	p_{34}	[2.1, 60.21, 6]
p_5	[3.2, 8.9, 3]	p_{15}	[3.1, 25.99, 6]	p_{25}	[1.6, 9.62, 6]	p_{35}	[2.1, 61.3, 8]
p_6	[2.2, 2, 4]	p_{16}	[3.2, 19.43, 4]	p_{26}	[2.2, 23.27, 6]	p_{36}	[3.2, 19, 6]
p_7	[3.1, 8.7, 1]	p_{17}	[1.0, 20.98, 3]	p_{27}	[1.5, 49.79, 6]	p_{37}	[2.7, 32.05, 6]
p_8	[1.8, 60, 3]	p_{18}	[1.6, 30, 3]	p_{28}	[1.7, 37.65, 6]	p_{38}	[2.9, 6.52, 6]
p_9	[2.7, 8.89, 3]	p_{19}	[1.0, 12, 2]	p_{29}	[3.1, 15.71, 6]	p_{39}	[0.8, 38.8, 6]
p_{10}	[1.4, 34.5, 8]	p_{20}	[2.7, 10, 6]	p_{30}	[2.6, 3, 6]	p_{40}	[2.1, 32, 6]

F. Results

1) **Impact of resource aware clustering:** This experiment aims to assess the efficacy of resource-aware clustering. The resource vectors of the devices used in the experiment are shown in Table III. The resource vector comprises processing capacity, transmission rate, and memory, and is obtained from a survey conducted on 128 smartphone users, with prior permission obtained from the relevant authorities. From this survey, we randomly select 40 users to create different clusters using the Fed-RAC approach, as discussed in Section IV-A. Communication rounds are set to 200, and other parameters are described in Section V-C. The effectiveness of resource-aware clustering is evaluated using three types of resource vectors. The first type uses unnormalized resource vectors of the participants, whereas the second type uses normalized vectors with $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 1/3$. The third type is similar to the second, but with $\lambda_1 = 0.4$, $\lambda_2 = 0.4$, and $\lambda_3 = 0.2$.

Table IV presents the results of evaluating the impact of normalizing resource vectors on estimating the optimal number of clusters. The findings show that un-normalized vectors yield a limited number of clusters, namely 4 ($C_1 - C_4$), using Dunn Indices. This is due to the dominance of the transmission rate resource over other resources, resulting in non-optimal clusters. By applying unit-based normalization, all resource values are scaled into the range of [0, 1]. The normalized values generate an optimal number of clusters using Dunn Indices, as it removes resource biasness. We obtained

6 clusters ($C_1 - C_6$) by assigning equal contributions of all resources, i.e., λ_1 (processing capacity) = λ_2 (transmission rate) = λ_3 (memory) = $1/3$. When we set the contribution based on the analysis given in [33], $\lambda_1 = 0.4$, $\lambda_2 = 0.4$, and $\lambda_3 = 0.2$, we obtained 5 clusters ($C_1 - C_5$).

Table IV presents the performance achieved by the Fed-RAC approach using different types of resource vectors on MNIST, HAR, CIFAR-10, and SHL datasets. The results show that normalizing the resource vector leads to improved performance compared to using unnormalized vectors. The normalization process is essential because when using unnormalized vectors, clustering relies on the dominating resource, leading to non-optimal clusters. These clusters may contain participants with non-identical resources that converge at irregular intervals, resulting in reduced cluster performance. Moreover, when the contributions of processing capacity (λ_1) and transmission rate (λ_2) are greater than memory (λ_3), i.e., $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0.4 > \lambda_3 = 0.2$, the cluster performance is high. *Observation: The first observation is that the normalization of the resource vector is essential to determine the optimal number of clusters. We next observed that processing capacity and transmission rate are more crucial than available memory while estimating the optimal number of clusters.*

2) **Impact of clusters compaction:** Table V illustrates the impact of cluster compaction on the performance of Fed-RAC using MNIST, HAR, CIFAR-10, and SHL datasets. Table V(a) demonstrates the cluster accuracy when all five clusters, estimated in Section V-F1, are available. The results depicted that the slave clusters, $C_2 - C_5$, achieved comparable performance in contrast with C_1 (master cluster). Moreover, cluster C_3 achieved a higher performance than C_1 . This performance enhancement is due to the distillation of knowledge from master to slave clusters during training. The details experiment on the impact of using knowledge distillation is elaborated in Section V-F4. Apart from Table V(a), Table V(b) illustrates the performance of different clusters on considered datasets after compaction. The results showed a clear margin of improvement in the global and cluster-wise performance while using the clusters compaction in the Fed-RAC. It is due to the increment in the number of participants in each cluster. *Observation: An interesting observation from this experiment is that the performance of models in each cluster improves with cluster compaction. Moreover, the improvement in performance is more significant for clusters with a larger number of participants compared to those with fewer participants.*

3) **Impact of communication rounds:** This experiment investigates the impact of different datasets on the convergence of the Fed-RAC and considered baselines. All 40 participants were involved in the FL operation, and thus FedAvg and FedProx utilized the smallest slave model to ensure deployment and training on all participants. The communication rounds for Fed-RAC were determined as the rounds required for the convergence of the master model plus the maximum rounds required for the convergence of the slowest slave model.

Fig. 2 shows the impact of the considered datasets, namely MNIST, HAR, CIFAR-10, and SHL, on the convergence of Fed-RAC, FedAvg, HeteroFL, FedProx, and Oort. The learning curve depicted in the figure displays a classic shape with a

TABLE IV: Impact of resource aware clustering on considered MNIST, HAR, CIFAR-10, and SHL datasets using different types of resource vectors. The reported results depicts the global accuracy and F1-score achieved by the different models.

Types of resource vectors	Number of clusters	Datasets							
		MNIST		HAR		CIFAR-10		SHL	
		Accuracy	F1-score	Accuracy	F1-score	Accuracy	F1-score	Accuracy	F1-score
Unnormalized	$\mathcal{K} = 4$	97.13 \pm 0.30	98.06 \pm 0.25	91.56 \pm 0.45	92.47 \pm 0.35	90.12 \pm 0.60	90.83 \pm 0.30	89.23 \pm 0.30	90.41 \pm 0.40
Normalized { $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 1/3$ }	$\mathcal{K} = 6$	97.41 \pm 0.25	98.19 \pm 0.25	92.46 \pm 0.40	93.38 \pm 0.30	90.67 \pm 0.45	91.41 \pm 0.30	89.59 \pm 0.25	90.83 \pm 0.40
Normalized { $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0.4, \lambda_3 = 0.2$ }	$\mathcal{K} = 5$	97.73 \pm 0.40	98.37 \pm 0.30	93.54 \pm 0.50	94.26 \pm 0.40	91.01 \pm 0.30	92.13 \pm 0.40	90.27 \pm 0.30	91.19 \pm 0.40

TABLE V: Impact of cluster compaction on accuracy of the Fed-RAC using different datasets (MNIST, HAR, CIFAR-10, and SHL).

(a) Accuracy without compaction (cluster count = 5).

Clusters	Accuracy (in %) on datasets			
	MNIST	HAR	CIFAR-10	SHL
C_1	98.58 \pm 0.50	93.31 \pm 0.50	92.23 \pm 0.30	91.43 \pm 0.25
C_2	98.18 \pm 0.60	93.68 \pm 0.40	91.55 \pm 0.25	90.17 \pm 0.30
C_3	98.14 \pm 0.30	94.19 \pm 0.20	91.23 \pm 0.40	91.76 \pm 0.30
C_4	97.04 \pm 0.50	93.55 \pm 0.50	90.58 \pm 0.25	89.88 \pm 0.40
C_5	96.71 \pm 0.60	93.01 \pm 0.60	89.45 \pm 0.60	87.82 \pm 0.40
Global	97.73 \pm 0.40	93.54 \pm 0.30	91.01 \pm 0.45	90.27 \pm 0.30

(b) Accuracy with compaction (clusters count = 4).

Clusters	Accuracy (in %) on datasets			
	MNIST	HAR	CIFAR-10	SHL
C_1	98.76 \pm 0.30	93.47 \pm 0.60	92.41 \pm 0.40	91.52 \pm 0.30
C_2	98.73 \pm 0.50	93.76 \pm 0.50	92.37 \pm 0.25	92.53 \pm 0.40
C_3	98.78 \pm 0.20	94.92 \pm 0.40	92.69 \pm 0.35	92.02 \pm 0.40
C_4	98.63 \pm 0.60	94.17 \pm 0.50	91.73 \pm 0.30	91.26 \pm 0.35
Global	98.72 \pm 0.25	94.08 \pm 0.35	92.30 \pm 0.30	91.83 \pm 0.30

(c) Accuracy with compaction (cluster count = 3).

Clusters	Accuracy (in %) on datasets			
	MNIST	HAR	CIFAR-10	SHL
C_1	98.37 \pm 0.45	93.11 \pm 0.40	91.81 \pm 0.30	91.22 \pm 0.40
C_2	97.49 \pm 0.35	92.26 \pm 0.25	90.36 \pm 0.35	89.77 \pm 0.40
C_3	95.42 \pm 0.40	89.47 \pm 0.35	87.41 \pm 0.50	86.82 \pm 0.30
Global	97.09 \pm 0.40	91.62 \pm 0.30	89.90 \pm 0.40	89.27 \pm 0.35

two-step behavior. Initially, the performance improves steeply until it reaches a plateau value after some communication rounds. Then, the accuracy increases with more communication rounds. Fed-RAC outperforms the existing approaches on all communication rounds during the experiment. The participants in the master cluster (C_1) quickly converge due to sufficient resources to train a large size model. The Fed-RAC approach also incorporates KD to train the models at the participants, leading to well-behaved optimization steps compared to non-KD based training and reduced communication rounds. On the MNIST dataset, all approaches achieved convergence at lower rounds with marginal improvement afterwards, as shown in Fig. 2. This is due to the balanced and sufficient number of instances for all classes in MNIST. FedAvg achieved slower convergence with minimal accuracy due to incompetence in handling heterogeneity among the participants and using a small size model to accommodate all 40 participants during training. HeteroFL achieved comparable performance to the Fed-RAC due to the strategy in addressing heterogeneity.

Observation: Firstly, the convergence curve of training exhibits a typical trend, with a steep increase in performance at the start, followed by a gradual plateau. Secondly, KD has a significant impact on the model's performance.

4) *Impact of master-slave technique:* In this experiment, we aim to evaluate the performance improvement of the slave models assigned to each cluster (other than the master cluster) using the master-slave technique discussed in Section IV-C. We consider the four clusters, $C_1 - C_4$, obtained from the compaction in the previous result. The communication round is fixed at 200. However, to ensure brevity, we only present




Fig. 2: Illustration of impact of datasets on the convergence rounds of Fed-RAC, FedAvg, HeteroFL, FedProx, and Oort.

the results on HAR and CIFAR-10.

Fig. 3 illustrates the impact of the master slave technique on the performance of models in different slave clusters. Clusters $C_2 - C_4$ gain significant improvement in performance due to the distillation of knowledge from the master model in C_1 , as shown in Fig. 3(b) and Fig. 3(d). The results demonstrated that the improvement in the model's performance is significant at low resource clusters (C_4) and reduced gradually to C_2 . It is because if the size of the cluster model is small then the logits difference between master and slave is higher. Contrarily, if the difference between the size of the cluster model and the master model is less, the logit difference is limited; thus, the performance gain is low. Cluster C_4 gains accuracy of $\approx 8\%$ for HAR and $\approx 11\%$ for CIFAR-10 datasets, whereas the performance gain for C_2 is $\approx 2\%$ for both datasets. Furthermore, in FL-based training, we considered participants with heterogenous resources; thus, participants with the highest and lowest resources, respectively, achieved colossal and most minor performances. It also creates a significant difference between the performance of the models in the largest and smallest clusters, which aggregately results in performance compromise despite clustering. Therefore, KD is incorporated to enhance the performance of models in the smaller clusters.

Observation: An interesting observation from our experiment is that the master-slave technique leads to a significant improvement in the performance in the slave clusters. Furthermore, the extent of improvement in the performance of the slave clusters depends on their respective model sizes.

5) *Impact of rounds-to-reach $x\%$:* The objective of this experiment is to investigate the effectiveness of the proposed Fed-RAC in achieving a global accuracy of $x\%$ within a certain number of communication rounds. To achieve this, we




Fig. 3: Impact of master slave technique on the performance of models in different clusters using HAR and CIFAR-10 datasets.

have set the value of x to be 96, 92, 88, and 85 for MNIST, HAR, CIFAR-10, and SHL datasets, respectively, taking into account the convergence rates of these datasets. Fed-RAC involves training the model in the master cluster followed by parallel training of models in the slave clusters. As such, we define the Total Required Rounds (TRR) for complete training as the sum of rounds required to train the model in the master cluster (C_1) and the maximum rounds required to train the model in any of the slave clusters ($\max\{C_2, C_3, C_4\}$).

Table VI presents the results of the rounds-to-reach $x\%$ performance metric on the considered datasets and illustrates the impact of this metric on the Fed-RAC approach. The results indicate that the Fed-RAC approach (cluster-wise with KD) outperforms the baseline approaches, including cluster-wise without KD. This can be attributed to two main reasons. Firstly, the participants in the master cluster (C_1) have sufficient resources to train large models, which leads to quicker convergence. Secondly, the Fed-RAC approach incorporates KD to train the models at the participants, resulting in well-behaved optimization steps compared to non-KD.

Regarding the convergence of *cluster-wise without KD*, the results are not reported for models in clusters C_3 and C_4 on HAR, CIFAR-10, and SHL datasets. This is because, in the absence of KD, the participants in clusters C_3 and C_4 are unable to achieve the desired $x\%$ accuracy within the cap of 200 communication rounds. Furthermore, we used small models in FedAvg, Oort, and FedProx to involve all 40 participants. Although the use of KD appears to incur higher computational costs compared to the baselines that do not incorporate KD, Fed-RAC achieves the desired performance in fewer communication rounds, thus reducing the overall computational cost. Moreover, the number of local epochs required for convergence decreases with the cluster size, which also reduces the computational cost in Fed-RAC.

Observation: We observe that KD from the large-size model to the lightweight model not only improves the performance but also reduces the communication rounds for convergence.

6) *Leave-one-out*: The objective of this experiment was to assess the overall performance of Fed-RAC and several baseline approaches in a scenario where instances of a randomly

TABLE VI: Illustration of impact of rounds-to-reach $x\%$ global accuracy on considered datasets. TRR=Total Required Rounds= rounds(C_1)+max rounds $\{C_2, C_3, C_4\}$, A1= FedAvg, A2=HetroFL, A3=FedProx, and A4=Oort

Dataset	$x\%$	Fed-RAC (proposed)								A1	A2	A3	A4		
		Cluster w/o KD				Cluster w KD									
		C_1	C_2	C_3	C_4	TRR	C_1	C_2	C_3					C_4	TRR
MNIST	96	2	2	5	9	11	2	2	3	5	7	9	11	8	9
HAR	92	36	47	-	-	83	36	17	29	41	77	92	102	89	86
CIFAR-10	88	51	59	-	-	110	51	23	37	53	104	112	121	108	115
SHL	86	67	74	-	-	141	67	34	39	61	128	137	146	135	137

selected class label were not included in the training but appeared in the testing. The class label with the highest number of instances was selected as the leave-out class during the experiment. The communication rounds were set to 200, and the parameters and local epochs were determined according to the implementation details discussed in Section V-C.

In Fig. 4, the impact of removing instances of one class label from the training of all participants in FL is demonstrated. The results show that Fed-RAC outperforms the existing approaches, which is consistent with the performance pattern observed in previous results. The approach that does not use KD clustering (referred to as the "without KD clustering approach") achieved the lowest performance, likely due to the small size models trained on slave clusters with a limited number of participants in each cluster. This negatively impacted the overall performance of the approach. The MNIST dataset achieved the highest performance due to the large number of instances for classes other than the excluded one. Conversely, the SHL dataset had the lowest performance due to the excluded class having the highest number of instances. *Observation: An interesting observation is that excluding training instances for certain class labels leads to a deterioration in performance. The decline in performance is more pronounced when a class with a large number of instances is excluded. Furthermore, the absence of KD results in a more rapid degradation in performance compared to the KD.*




Fig. 4: Impact of leave-one-out test metric on MNIST, HAR, CIFAR-10, and SHL datasets using Fed-RAC (without KD), Fed-RAC (with KD), FedAvg, HeteroFL, FedProx, and Oort approaches.

7) *Learning rate*: This experiment aimed to investigate how the learning rate affects the performance of Fed-RAC. MNIST, HAR, CIFAR-10, and SHL datasets were used, and the communication rounds were set to 5, 10, 20, and 20, respectively. The rounds were restricted as the approach converged at any learning rate at higher communication rounds.

Table VII depicts the impact of distinct learning rates on the accuracy of model in the master cluster of the Fed-RAC using MNIST, HAR, CIFAR-10, and SHL datasets. The results demonstrated the efficacy of the Fed-RAC on a smaller learning rate (e.g., 0.002). We obtained the lowest accuracy for the learning rate of 0.010 due to faster convergence. The

model converged sub-optimally at higher learning rate; thus, it suffered from performance compromise. Fed-RAC converged faster for the MNIST; hence, we achieved accuracy beyond 90% for all the datasets at different learning rates only at 5 communication rounds. The achieved accuracy of the Fed-RAC approach follows a linear pattern for all the datasets; however, we also observed plateaued behavior for learning rates between 0.006 to 0.008. Additionally, the difference between cluster accuracy at the learning rate of 0.002 and 0.010 is more than 8%, which signifies the importance of selecting an optimal learning rate during training.

Observation: The results indicated that the learning rate is a critical factor in achieving higher performance. A smaller learning rate is beneficial for longer communication rounds, while a larger learning rate is better for shorter rounds.

TABLE VII: Impact of learning rate on the accuracy of the model in master cluster. CR=Communication rounds.

Datasets	CR	Accuracy (in %) on learning rates				
		0.002	0.004	0.006	0.008	0.010
MNIST	5	98.07	96.44	93.32	92.97	90.37
HAR	10	89.93	87.24	86.05	83.75	79.24
CIFAR-10	20	84.41	83.73	81.29	80.73	77.12
SHL	20	82.14	80.71	79.64	79.32	74.23

VI. DISCUSSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this section, various issues are discussed that need to be addressed in future work in conjunction with the proposed approach. The approach uses a master-slave technique where logits from the master cluster model are sent to the remaining clusters. However, this could potentially expose private training data or enable participants to reconstruct models. To address these privacy concerns, future work on incorporating security aspects is necessary, as motivated by previous work on differential privacy in FL [52]. Furthermore, while Fed-RAC considers participant heterogeneity, it does not account for noise in data instances and labels. Therefore, future work will involve incorporating such noise in the model training process. Additionally, the approach independently trains a local model for each cluster without leveraging information from models in other clusters, except for logit vectors from the master cluster model. To address this limitation, future work will focus on developing mechanisms for aggregating information on trained models from different clusters.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, a federated learning approach called Fed-RAC is proposed to address the negative impact of heterogeneous participants. Unlike previous studies, Fed-RAC trains local models on all participants despite differences in heterogeneity and training time. The approach first identifies the optimal number of clusters based on available devices and networking resources, then generates and randomly initializes a model that is used for compression to obtain models for all clusters. A participant assignment mechanism and a master-slave technique are introduced to improve the performance of lightweight models using knowledge distillation. Experimental evaluation is conducted to verify the approach's effectiveness

on existing datasets, leading to several key findings: successful federated learning requires proper management of participant heterogeneity, resource-aware clustering helps identify the optimal number of clusters, the number of data instances significantly affects cluster performance, and the master-slave technique enhances performance based on model size.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Yang, M. Xu, Q. Wang, Z. Chen, K. Huang, Y. Ma, K. Bian, G. Huang, Y. Liu, X. Jin, and X. Liu, "Flash: Heterogeneity-aware federated learning at scale," *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, pp. 1–18, 2022, doi: 10.1109/TMC.2022.3214234.
- [2] L. Qu, Y. Zhou, P. P. Liang, Y. Xia, F. Wang, E. Adeli, L. Fei-Fei, and D. Rubin, "Rethinking architecture design for tackling data heterogeneity in federated learning," in *Proc. CVPR*, June 2022, pp. 10 061–10 071.
- [3] Z. Chai, A. Ali, S. Zawad, S. Truex, A. Anwar, N. Baracaldo, Y. Zhou, H. Ludwig, F. Yan, and Y. Cheng, "Tiff: A tier-based federated learning system," in *Proc. ACM HPDC*, 2020, p. 125–136.
- [4] X. Ouyang, Z. Xie, J. Zhou, J. Huang, and G. Xing, "Clusterfl: A similarity-aware federated learning system for human activity recognition," in *Proc. MobiSys*, 2021, p. 54–66.
- [5] M. Xie, G. Long, T. Shen, T. Zhou, X. Wang, J. Jiang, and C. Zhang, "Multi-center federated learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.08647*, 2021.
- [6] C. Briggs, Z. Fan, and P. Andras, "Federated learning with hierarchical clustering of local updates to improve training on non-iid data," in *Proc. IJCNN*, 2020, pp. 1–9.
- [7] L. U. Khan, Z. Han, D. Niyato, and C. S. Hong, "Socially-aware-clustering-enabled federated learning for edge networks," *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 2641–2658, 2021.
- [8] S. Horvath, S. Laskaridis, M. Almeida, I. Leontiadis, S. Venieris, and N. Lane, "Fjord: Fair and accurate federated learning under heterogeneous targets with ordered dropout," 2021, pp. 12 876–12 889.
- [9] E. Diao, J. Ding, and V. Tarokh, "Heteroff: Computation and communication efficient federated learning for heterogeneous clients," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.01264*, 2020.
- [10] G. Hinton, O. Vinyals, and J. Dean, "Distilling the knowledge in a neural network," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02531*, 2015.
- [11] T. Li, J. Li, Z. Liu, and C. Zhang, "Few sample knowledge distillation for efficient network compression," in *Proc. CVPR*, 2020, pp. 14 639–14 647.
- [12] H. Zhao, X. Sun, J. Dong, C. Chen, and Z. Dong, "Highlight every step: Knowledge distillation via collaborative teaching," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, pp. 1–12, 2020, doi:10.1109/TCYB.2020.3007506.
- [13] R. Xu, J. Xu, and D. C. Wunsch, "A comparison study of validity indices on swarm-intelligence-based clustering," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part B (Cybernetics)*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 1243–1256, 2012.
- [14] T. Li, A. K. Sahu, M. Zaheer, M. Sanjabi, A. Talwalkar, and V. Smith, "Federated optimization in heterogeneous networks," *Proc. MLSys*, pp. 429–450, 2020.
- [15] B. McMahan, E. Moore, D. Ramage, S. Hampson, and B. A. y Arcas, "Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data," in *Proc. AISTATS*, 2017, pp. 1273–1282.
- [16] F. Lai, X. Zhu, H. V. Madhyastha, and M. Chowdhury, "Oort: Efficient federated learning via guided participant selection," in *Proc. USENIX OSDI*, 2021, pp. 19–35.
- [17] Y. LeCun, L. Bottou, Y. Bengio, and P. Haffner, "Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 86, no. 11, pp. 2278–2324, 1998.
- [18] D. Anguita, A. Ghio, L. Oneto, X. Parra Perez, and J. L. Reyes Ortiz, "A public domain dataset for human activity recognition using smartphones," in *Proc. ESANN*, 2013, pp. 437–442.
- [19] A. Krizhevsky, G. Hinton *et al.*, "Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images," 2009.
- [20] SHL Challenge, 2022. [Online]. Available: <http://www.shl-dataset.org/activity-recognition-challenge/>
- [21] Y. Zhan, P. Li, and S. Guo, "Experience-driven computational resource allocation of federated learning by deep reinforcement learning," in *Proc. IEEE IPDPS*, 2020, pp. 234–243.

- [22] Y. Jin, L. Jiao, Z. Qian, S. Zhang, S. Lu, and X. Wang, "Resource-efficient and convergence-preserving online participant selection in federated learning," in *Proc. IEEE ICDCS*, 2020, pp. 606–616.
- [23] 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.
- [24] Z. Wang, H. Xu, J. Liu, H. Huang, C. Qiao, and Y. Zhao, "Resource-efficient federated learning with hierarchical aggregation in edge computing," in *Proc. IEEE INFOCOM*, 2021, pp. 1–10.
- [25] C. Xie, S. Koyejo, and I. Gupta, "Asynchronous federated optimization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.03934*, 2019.
- [26] Y. Chen, X. Sun, and Y. Jin, "Communication-efficient federated deep learning with layerwise asynchronous model update and temporally weighted aggregation," *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, vol. 31, no. 10, pp. 4229–4238, 2019.
- [27] Q. Ma, Y. Xu, H. Xu, Z. Jiang, L. Huang, and H. Huang, "Fedsa: A semi-asynchronous federated learning mechanism in heterogeneous edge computing," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 39, no. 12, pp. 3654–3672, 2021.
- [28] A. Mishra and D. Marr, "Apprentice: Using knowledge distillation techniques to improve low-precision network accuracy," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.05852*, 2017.
- [29] F. Y. C. R. B. W. Z. X. . G. K. Zhou, G., "Rocket launching: A universal and efficient framework for training well-performing light net," in *Proc. AAAI*, 2018, pp. 1–8.
- [30] J. Wang, Q. Liu, H. Liang, G. Joshi, and H. V. Poor, "Tackling the objective inconsistency problem in heterogeneous federated optimization," in *Proc. NeurIPS*, 2020, pp. 7611–7623.
- [31] J. Zou, T. Hao, C. Yu, and H. Jin, "A3c-do: A regional resource scheduling framework based on deep reinforcement learning in edge scenario," *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, vol. 70, no. 2, pp. 228–239, 2021.
- [32] S. Jin, S. Di, X. Liang, J. Tian, D. Tao, and F. Cappello, "Deepsz: A novel framework to compress deep neural networks by using error-bounded lossy compression," in *Proc. ACM HPDC*, 2019, p. 159–170.
- [33] S. Yao, Y. Zhao, H. Shao, S. Liu, D. Liu, L. Su, and T. Abdelzaher, "Fastdeepiot: Towards understanding and optimizing neural network execution time on mobile and embedded devices," in *Proc. ACM SenSys*, 2018, p. 278–291.
- [34] J. C. Bezdek and N. R. Pal, "Some new indexes of cluster validity," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part B (Cybernetics)*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 301–315, 1998.
- [35] G. H. Shah, "An improved dbscan, a density based clustering algorithm with parameter selection for high dimensional data sets," in *Proc. NUiCONE*, 2012, pp. 1–6.
- [36] X. Li, K. Huang, W. Yang, S. Wang, and Z. Zhang, "On the convergence of fedavg on non-iid data," in *Proc. ICLR*, 2019, pp. 1–26.
- [37] R. Mishra, H. P. Gupta, T. Dutta, and S. K. Das, "Suppressing noise from built environment datasets to reduce communication rounds for convergence of federated learning," 2022.
- [38] R. Mishra and H. P. Gupta, "Designing and training of lightweight neural networks on edge devices using early halting in knowledge distillation," 2022.
- [39] B. McMahan, E. Moore, D. Ramage, S. Hampson, and B. A. y Arcas, "Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data," in *Proc. AISTATS*, 2017, pp. 1273–1282.
- [40] R. Mishra, H. P. Gupta, and T. Dutta, "Noise-resilient federated learning: Suppressing noisy labels in the local datasets of participants," in *IEEE INFOCOM 2022 - IEEE Conference on Computer Communications Workshops (INFOCOM WKSHPS)*, 2022, pp. 1–2.
- [41] R. Mishra and H. Gupta, "Transforming large-size to lightweight deep neural networks for iot applications," *ACM Comput. Surv.*, vol. 55, no. 11, 2023.
- [42] C. Singh, R. Mishra, H. P. Gupta, and G. Banga, "A federated learning-based patient monitoring system in internet of medical things," *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems*, pp. 1–7, 2022.
- [43] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, "Deep residual learning for image recognition," in *Proc. CVPR*, 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [44] R. Mishra, A. Gupta, H. P. Gupta, and T. Dutta, "A sensors based deep learning model for unseen locomotion mode identification using multiple semantic matrices," *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, pp. 1–1, 2020. doi: 10.1109/TMC.2020.3015546.
- [45] R. Mishra, A. Gupta, and H. P. Gupta, "Locomotion mode recognition using sensory data with noisy labels: A deep learning approach," *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 3460–3471, 2023.
- [46] A. Gupta and H. P. Gupta, "Yogahelp: Leveraging motion sensors for learning correct execution of yoga with feedback," *IEEE Transactions on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 362–371, 2021.
- [47] R. Mishra and D. Singh, "Fault tolerant energy efficient power management system for smart room," in *Proceedings of 2nd International Conference on Advanced Computing and Software Engineering (ICACSE)*, 2019.
- [48] R. Kumar, R. Mishra, and H. P. Gupta, "A federated learning approach with imperfect labels in lora-based transportation systems," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, pp. 1–9, 2023.
- [49] H. Salehinejad and S. Valaee, "Ising-dropout: A regularization method for training and compression of deep neural networks," in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2019, pp. 3602–3606.
- [50] R. Mishra, H. P. Gupta, P. Kumari, D. Y. Suh, and M. J. Piran, "A task offloading and reallocation scheme for passenger assistance using fog computing," *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 3032–3047, 2022.
- [51] R. Mishra, H. P. Gupta, and T. Dutta, "A road health monitoring system using sensors in optimal deep neural network," *IEEE Sensors Journal*, pp. 1–1, 2020.
- [52] S. Truex, L. Liu, K.-H. Chow, M. E. Gursoy, and W. Wei, "Ldp-fed: Federated learning with local differential privacy," in *Proc. EdgeSys*, 2020, p. 61–66.