

Differential Privacy for Adaptive Weight Aggregation in Federated Tumor Segmentation

Muhammad Irfan Khan¹, Esa Alhoniemi¹, Elina Kontio¹, Suleiman A. Khan¹, and Mojtaba Jafaritadi¹

Abstract—Federated Learning (FL) is a distributed machine learning approach that safeguards privacy by creating an impartial global model while respecting the privacy of individual client data. However, the conventional FL method can introduce security risks when dealing with diverse client data, potentially compromising privacy and data integrity. To address these challenges, we present a differential privacy (DP) federated deep learning framework in medical image segmentation. In this paper, we extend our similarity weight aggregation (SimAgg) method to DP-SimAgg algorithm, a differentially private similarity-weighted aggregation algorithm for brain tumor segmentation in multi-modal magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). Our DP-SimAgg method not only enhances model segmentation capabilities but also provides an additional layer of privacy preservation. Extensive benchmarking and evaluation of our framework, with computational performance as a key consideration, demonstrate that DP-SimAgg enables accurate and robust brain tumor segmentation while minimizing communication costs during model training. This advancement is crucial for preserving the privacy of medical image data and safeguarding sensitive information. In conclusion, adding a differential privacy layer in the global weight aggregation phase of the federated brain tumor segmentation provides a promising solution to privacy concerns without compromising segmentation model efficacy. By leveraging DP, we ensure the protection of client data against adversarial attacks and malicious participants.

Clinical relevance— This approach fosters the development of secure and robust AI technologies, driving advancements in clinical research and healthcare while respecting the sensitivity of data. Our framework incorporates cutting-edge central differential privacy techniques, enhancing privacy guarantees while maintaining segmentation model performance.

I. INTRODUCTION

Medical information is immensely delicate from data governance point of view and hence medical data sharing is strongly limited or even illegitimate [1]. On the other hand, in many medical applications, machine learning (ML) models could significantly support and speed up the diagnosis process of medical data. A specific application area that can especially benefit from ML models is the segmentation of medical images, which typically contain a lot of information and many details that need to be carefully considered [2]. Today, medical images are routinely used to support various clinical diagnoses but are typically analyzed manually or

in a computer-assisted manner by radiologists via a labor intensive process. Brain tumor segmentation challenge [3] highlights an example where AI/ML assisted detection and precise identification of brain tumors like glioblastoma in the early stage could enhance the process and affect patients' care tremendously by even improving the prognosis.

An absolute requirement for training an ML segmentation model is a large amount of high quality data, which in this context means a large set of images annotated by an expert. Unfortunately, often the number of such images within one organization is limited, and for rare diseases extremely limited to construct an accurate model [4].

In this situation, Federated Learning (FL) comes into play; FL has become momentous and gained traction as a collaborative learning paradigm to largely facilitate model training in a distributed construct without actual data transfer from local data storages to a central data trove [5]. FL enables institutional cross-cooperation for robust and generalizable machine learning models for a swarm of application domains. Basically, a server and a set of cooperating computing resources, with local data, constitute an FL configuration [6]. Intuitively, in a pristine FL process, task planning is done at the server and bulk processing takes place at the heterogeneous collaborators. Local model training is performed at the collaborators and the learned model parameters are dashed to the central server. The server aggregates the learned parameters from the individual collaborators via mutexes or semaphores [7] and shares the collectively learned aggregated parameters back to the collaborators via synchronization primitives [8]. The strategic advantage of the FL architecture is a collegiate ML model training with cybersecurity: data confidentiality does not breach in comparison to submitting raw data over the internet. Moreover, FL allows for coalescing compute power which leads to collective resource optimization. However, vanilla FL implementation is insufficient as a privacy preservation concept [9] because side information exploitation via parameter piracy and parameter bootlegging by adversarial linkage attacks on parameters acquired from collaborators in FL settings can be decompiled and reverse engineered to decode and re-identify the patients [10].

The concept of differential privacy (DP) offers a solid foundation for safeguarding data privacy by mathematical and logical reckoning [11]. With noise injection, the exact contributions of individual collaborator models and patients therein become impossible to quantify. Injected noise can be randomly drawn from Gaussian or Laplace distribution [12] and it can be added to original data records (local DP), or

*This work was supported by Business Finland under Grant 33961/31/2020. We thank the CSC-Puhti super-computer for their support and computational resources.

¹M. I. Khan, E. Alhoniemi, E. Kontio, S. A. Khan, and M. Jafaritadi are with the Faculty of Engineering and Business, School of ICT, Turku University of Applied Sciences, 20520 Turku, Finland

at the server to the learned parameters (global DP) [13], [14]. Generally speaking, DP is the process of retaining the data set’s overall statistical properties while removing personally identifiable information recognized as a digital fingerprint [15]. Hence, using advanced compositional bounds, DP coupled with FL provides a robust shield and impregnable defense against model parameter stealing, data feature reconstruction, model inversion hacks, membership inference attacks, and back-door attacks [16], [17]. However, there are various challenges regarding DP implementation. The precise amount of added noise has the potential to contaminate data and poison model training leading to declension in accurate prediction quality. The magnitude of noise disruption required in the DP process is parametrized by sensitivity, and the estimation of proper sensitivity on a particular data set is subject to experimentation. And - most critically - it’s uncertain how exactly to incorporate DP with imaging data [13], [18].

This paper presents the DP-SimAgg algorithm, a differentially private similarity-weighted aggregation algorithm for brain tumor segmentation in multi-modal MRI imaging of Glioblastoma. Our investigation involves a comprehensive audit of various DP privacy budget options, aiming to evaluate their effectiveness and implications. By exploring and analyzing these options, we shed light on the intricate interplay between privacy and the algorithmic performance of DP-SimAgg.

II. METHODS

A. Dataset

The training data used in the study was based on partitioning 2 (with 33 collaborators) of the Federated Tumor Segmentation (FeTS) 2022 challenge and it included altogether 1251 scanned subjects with gliomas. All the mpMRI scans, provided as NIFTI files (.nii.gz), had four 240×240×155 structural MRI images including native (T1), post-contrast T1-weighted (T1Gd), T2-weighted (T2), and T2 FLuid Attenuated Inversion Recovery (FLAIR) volumes.

Annotations comprise the pathologically confirmed segmentation labels with a similar volume size of 240×240×155 including the GD-enhancing tumor (ET - label 4), the peritumoral edematous/invaded tissue (ED - label 2), and the necrotic tumor core (NCR - label 1). All the provided MRI scans were collected from multiple institutions and certain preprocessing steps such as rigid registration, brain extraction, alignment, 1×1×1 mm resolution re-sampling, and skull stripping were applied as described in [19], [20], [21].

We deployed Intel’s Federated Learning (OpenFL) [22] framework for training brain tumor segmentation model — an encoder-decoder U-shape type of convolutional neural network (see e.g. [23]) provided by FeTS2022 challenge — using the data-private collaborative learning paradigm of FL. OpenFL considers two main components: 1) the collaborator which uses a local data set to train the global model and 2) the aggregator which receives model updates from each collaborator and fuses them to form the global model. At each FL round, we used 20 percent of the total

available collaborators hosting the data, but the combination of collaborators at each FL round was unique. Moreover, the experiments were performed on a cluster workstation with NVIDIA TITAN V100 GPU and 350 GB memory.

B. Differential Privacy and Federated Learning

Let us first revisit SimAgg algorithm [24], where at FL round r , the parameters p_{C^r} of the participating collaborators C^r are collected at the server. The average of these parameters is calculated as:

$$\hat{p} = \frac{1}{|C^r|} \sum_{i \in C^r} p_i. \quad (1)$$

Then we calculate the similarity of each collaborator $c \in C^r$ with the average parameter values from all collaborators using

$$sim_c = \frac{\sum_{i \in C^r} |p_i - \hat{p}|}{|p_c - \hat{p}| + \epsilon}, \quad (2)$$

where $\epsilon = 1e - 5$ (small positive constant) and normalize to obtain similarity weights as follows:

$$u_c = \frac{sim_c}{\sum_{i \in C^r} sim_i}. \quad (3)$$

We then compute a second weighting factor that favors collaborators with larger samples sizes:

$$v_c = \frac{N_c}{\sum_{i \in C^r} N_i} \quad (4)$$

where N_c is the number of examples in collaborator c .

Using the weights obtained using Eqs. 3 and 4, the similarity weighted parameter values (p^m) are computed as:

$$w_c = \frac{u_c + v_c}{\sum_{i \in C^r} (u_i + v_i)}, \quad (5)$$

and the parameters are finally aggregated as follows:

$$p^m = \frac{1}{|C^r|} \cdot \sum_{i \in C^r} (w_i \cdot p_i). \quad (6)$$

The normalized aggregated parameters p^m are then dispatched to the next set of collaborators in the successive federation rounds.

In the proposed setting, artificial noise is added to the collaborator’s model parameters at the server side at aggregation. At the server, the model aggregates are perturbed by adding Gaussian noise to each participating collaborator’s model parameters before the actual aggregation was performed. In this global differential privacy setup, privacy guarantees are adaptable and robust as the privacy budget and sensitivity can be tuned according to data, which is practical for privacy-preserving brain MRI lesion segmentation. It is also notable that the collaborators remain simple since they don’t need to implement any kind of privacy preservation mechanism, but on the other hand, the accurate and possibly sensitive model information cannot leak from one collaborator to another.

Our DP-SimAgg algorithm is formally presented in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 DP-SimAgg aggregation algorithm

```

1: procedure DP-SIMAGG( $C^r, \rho_{C^r}$ )
2:    $\epsilon \leftarrow [0.1, 1, 10]$  ▷ Init DP noise
3:    $\delta \leftarrow 1e-5$  (small positive constant)
4:    $\hat{\rho} = \text{average}(\rho_{C^r})$  by using Eq. 1 ▷  $\rho_{C^r} =$ 
   parameters of the collaborators in  $C^r$ 
5:   for  $c$  in  $C^r$  do
6:     Compute similarity weights  $u_c$  using Eqs. 2 and
3
7:     Compute sample weights  $v_c$  using Eq. 4
8:     sensitivity  $\leftarrow 2/(\sum_{i \in C^r} N_i \cdot \delta)$ 
9:     scale  $\leftarrow$  sensitivity /  $\epsilon$ 
10:    for  $c$  in  $C^r$  do
11:      Compute aggregation weights  $w_c$  using Eq. 5
12:       $p_c^r \leftarrow \rho_c^r + \text{Gamma}(1/|C^r|, \text{scale})$  ▷ Add noise
to all collaborators
13:       $\rho_{master} = \frac{1}{|C^r|} \sum_{c \in C^r} \rho_c^r$  ▷ Compute master
model
14:    return  $\rho_{master}$ 

```

C. Evaluation of the privacy preservation vs. accuracy

Epsilon (ϵ), the privacy budget parameter, can be fine-tuned to strong-hold noise accuracy trade-off. Typically, strict privacy requirements call for an epsilon value of less than one. However, it's not unusual to find epsilon values up to 10 being employed in some applications.

We varied the epsilon from loose (10) to strict (0.1) privacy budget. The value of epsilon is indirectly proportional to the degree of privacy preservation and directly proportional to accuracy. Hence, with a small epsilon, the degree of privacy preservation increases while data accuracy decreases and vice versa. The Delta parameter is the probability of information accidentally being leaked, and it was chosen to be small (1e-05).

III. RESULTS

We assess the performance of an image segmentation 3D U-net model trained on FeTS 2022 data in federated settings using our methodology named as DP-SimAgg. For model comparison, model training was performed for 20 federation rounds for SimAgg and different values of the epsilon parameters for privacy measures in DP-SimAgg. The total simulation training time is roughly 7 hours per one FL round for both, DP inclusive and DP exclusive, SimAgg methods. So, adding DP is computationally inexpensive and hence doesn't affect the computational load in practice.

In Fig. 1 the convergence of the training process using different metrics is shown. The convergence of the algorithm appears to be rapid since the final performance level is roughly achieved already after 10 rounds.

The performance of the SimAgg and DP-SimAgg models (with different epsilon) using external and previously unseen validation data with 219 scans has been summarized in Table I and visualized in Fig. 2. The model performance appears




Fig. 1. Training convergence of DP SimAgg algorithm for different values for ϵ (and also without DP denoted by "No DP") using different metrics and for different tumor regions (labels 0, 1, 2, 4).

to not be significantly impacted and affected by the value of ϵ in DP-SimAgg.

IV. DISCUSSION

This paper introduces a novel and generic framework for distributed differentially private (DP) learning within the context of federated learning. Unlike existing frameworks, our method is exclusively server-based, providing a unique DP solution. Through empirical evaluation, we demonstrate that our approach achieves comparable results to non-private models, highlighting its effectiveness in maintaining privacy while preserving model performance.

In addition to privacy preservation, our framework leverages the OpenFL platform, which ensures secure communication and trust among participating entities in the federated learning system. By utilizing certification-based hand-shake protocols between the aggregator and collaborators, our approach aligns with the mainstream practice of authorized membership, enhancing the overall system's security.

Furthermore, our server-based methodology is platform agnostic, allowing for its adaptation and deployment in




Fig. 2. Validation results of DP SimAgg algorithm for different values for ϵ (and also without DP denoted by "No DP") using different metrics and for different tumor regions (ET = Enhanced tumor, WT = Whole Tumor, TC = Tumor Core).

TABLE I
PERFORMANCE ON EXTERNAL VALIDATION DATA

Metric	DP-SimAgg ($\epsilon=0.1$)	DP-SimAgg ($\epsilon=1.0$)	DP-SimAgg ($\epsilon=10$)	SimAgg
DICE ET	0.650	0.701	0.686	0.741
DICE TC	0.625	0.684	0.702	0.723
DICE WT	0.756	0.798	0.781	0.806
Hausdorff (95%) ET	27.521	29.092	37.603	26.676
Hausdorff (95%) TC	30.516	36.208	31.555	29.834
Hausdorff (95%) WT	35.372	24.658	35.268	14.326
Sensitivity ET	0.584	0.649	0.650	0.717
Sensitivity TC	0.555	0.628	0.671	0.683
Sensitivity WT	0.780	0.783	0.790	0.757
Specificity ET	0.999	0.999	0.999	0.999
Specificity TC	0.999	0.999	0.999	0.999
Specificity WT	0.998	0.999	0.999	0.999

various federated learning architectures. This versatility and effectiveness make our approach promising not only in the medical field but also in other domains where privacy preservation is of utmost importance.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Our framework provides a robust solution for distributed differentially private learning in federated settings. By addressing privacy concerns while maintaining model performance, our approach contributes to overcoming obstacles in the wider adoption of privacy preservation methods. It holds significant potential to empower researchers and practitioners in leveraging privacy-enhancing techniques for improved data privacy and security in various domains.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. May, "HIPAA2 legislation means more delicate handling of data," *Nature Medicine*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 250–251, 2010.
- [2] G. Varoquaux and V. Cheplygina, "Machine learning for medical imaging: methodological failures and recommendations for the future," *NPJ digital medicine*, vol. 5, no. 1, p. 48, 2022.
- [3] M. J. Sheller, B. Edwards, G. A. Reina, J. Martin, S. Pati, A. Kotrotsou, M. Milchenko, W. Xu, D. Marcus, R. R. Colen, et al., "Federated learning in medicine: facilitating multi-institutional collaborations without sharing patient data," *Scientific reports*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 1–12, 2020.
- [4] D. Ng, X. Lan, M. M.-S. Yao, W. P. Chan, and M. Feng, "Federated learning: a collaborative effort to achieve better medical imaging models for individual sites that have small labelled datasets," *Quantitative Imaging in Medicine and Surgery*, vol. 11, no. 2, p. 852, 2021.

- [5] B. McMahan, E. Moore, D. Ramage, S. Hampson, and B. A. y Arcas, "Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data," in *Artificial intelligence and statistics*, pp. 1273–1282, PMLR, 2017.
- [6] H. Wang, M. Yurochkin, Y. Sun, D. Papaliopoulos, and Y. Khazaeni, "Federated learning with matched averaging," Feb 2020.
- [7] V. Mugunthan, A. Péraire-Bueno, and L. Kagal, "Privacyfl: A simulator for privacy-preserving and secure federated learning," Jul 2020.
- [8] K. Bonawitz, H. Eichner, W. Grieskamp, D. Huba, A. Ingerman, V. Ivanov, C. Kiddon, J. Konečný, S. Mazzocchi, H. B. McMahan, and et al., "Towards federated learning at scale: System design," Mar 2019.
- [9] N. Truong, K. Sun, S. Wang, F. Guitton, and Y. Guo, "Privacy Preservation in Federated Learning: An insightful survey from the GDPR Perspective," Mar. 2021. arXiv:2011.05411 [cs].
- [10] N. Rodríguez-Barroso, D. Jiménez-López, M. V. Luzón, F. Herrera, and E. Martínez-Cámara, "Survey on federated learning threats: Concepts, taxonomy on attacks and defences, experimental study and challenges," *Information Fusion*, vol. 90, pp. 148–173, 2023.
- [11] C. Dwork, "Differential privacy," in *Automata, Languages and Programming* (M. Bugliesi, B. Preneel, V. Sassone, and I. Wegener, eds.), (Berlin, Heidelberg), pp. 1–12, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2006.
- [12] J. Dong, A. Roth, and W. J. Su, "Gaussian differential privacy," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1905.02383, 2019.
- [13] G. A. Kaissis, M. R. Makowski, D. Rückert, and R. F. Braren, "Secure, privacy-preserving and federated machine learning in medical imaging," Jun 2020.
- [14] P. Kairouz, S. Oh, and P. Viswanath, "The composition theorem for differential privacy," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 63, no. 6, pp. 4037–4049, 2017.
- [15] C. Dwork and A. Roth, "The Algorithmic Foundations of Differential Privacy," *Foundations and Trends in Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 9, no. 2013, pp. 211–407, 2014.
- [16] R. Shokri, M. Stronati, and V. Shmatikov, "Membership inference attacks against machine learning models," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1610.05820, 2016.
- [17] J. Geiping, H. Bauermeister, H. Dröge, and M. Moeller, "Inverting gradients – how easy is it to break privacy in federated learning?," 2020.
- [18] C. Dwork, N. Kohli, and D. Mulligan, "Differential privacy in practice: Expose your epsilons!," *Journal of Privacy and Confidentiality*, vol. 9, 10 2019.
- [19] S. Bakas, H. Akbari, A. Sotiras, M. Bilello, M. Rozycki, J. S. Kirby, J. B. Freymann, K. Farahani, and C. Davatzikos, "Advancing The Cancer Genome Atlas glioma MRI collections with expert segmentation labels and radiomic features," *Sci Data*, vol. 4, p. 170117, Dec. 2017.
- [20] S. Bakas, H. Akbari, A. Sotiras, M. Bilello, M. Rozycki, J. Kirby, J. Freymann, K. Farahani, and C. Davatzikos, "Segmentation Labels for the Pre-operative Scans of the TCGA-GBM collection," 2017. Type: dataset.
- [21] S. Bakas, H. Akbari, A. Sotiras, M. Bilello, M. Rozycki, J. Kirby, J. Freymann, K. Farahani, and C. Davatzikos, "Segmentation Labels for the Pre-operative Scans of the TCGA-LGG collection," 2017. Type: dataset.
- [22] G. A. Reina, A. Gruzdev, P. Foley, O. Perepelkina, M. Sharma, I. Davidiyuk, I. Trushkin, M. Radionov, A. Mokrov, D. Agapov, J. Martin, B. Edwards, M. J. Sheller, S. Pati, P. N. Moorthy, S.-h. Wang, P. Shah, and S. Bakas, "OpenFL: An open-source framework for Federated Learning," *Phys. Med. Biol.*, Oct. 2022. arXiv:2105.06413 [cs].
- [23] O. Ronneberger, P. Fischer, and T. Brox, "U-Net: Convolutional Networks for Biomedical Image Segmentation," May 2015. arXiv:1505.04597 [cs].
- [24] M. I. Khan, M. Jafaritadi, E. Alhoniemi, E. Kontio, and S. A. Khan, "Adaptive weight aggregation in federated learning for brain tumor segmentation," in *Brainlesion: Glioma, Multiple Sclerosis, Stroke and Traumatic Brain Injuries: 7th International Workshop, BrainLes 2021, Held in Conjunction with MICCAI 2021, Virtual Event, September 27, 2021, Revised Selected Papers, Part II*, pp. 455–469, Springer, 2022.