

---

# Reinforcement Learning as a Catalyst for Robust and Fair Federated Learning: Deciphering the Dynamics of Client Contributions

---

Jialuo He<sup>1,2</sup> Wei Chen<sup>3</sup> Xiaojin Zhang<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

Recent advancements in federated learning (FL) have produced models that retain user privacy by training across multiple decentralized devices or systems holding local data samples. However, these strategies often neglect the inherent challenges of statistical heterogeneity and vulnerability to adversarial attacks, which can degrade model robustness and fairness. Personalized FL strategies offer some respite by adjusting models to fit individual client profiles, yet they tend to neglect server-side aggregation vulnerabilities. To address these issues, we propose Reinforcement Federated Learning (RFL), a novel framework that leverages deep reinforcement learning to adaptively optimize client contribution during aggregation, thereby enhancing both model robustness against malicious clients and fairness across participants under non-identically distributed settings. To achieve this goal, we propose a meticulous approach involving a Deep Deterministic Policy Gradient-based algorithm for continuous control of aggregation weights, an innovative client selection method based on model parameter distances, and a reward mechanism guided by validation set performance. Empirically, extensive experiments demonstrate that, in terms of robustness, RFL outperforms the state-of-the-art methods, while maintaining comparable levels of fairness, offering a promising solution to build resilient and fair federated systems.

---

<sup>1</sup>National Engineering Research Center for Big Data Technology and System, Services Computing Technology and System Lab, Cluster and Grid Computing Lab, School of Computer Science and Technology, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, 430074, China <sup>2</sup>School of Microelectronics and Communication Engineering, Chongqing University, Chongqing 400044, China <sup>3</sup>School of Software Engineering, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, China. Correspondence to: Xiaojin Zhang <xiaojinzhang@hust.edu.cn>.

*Proceedings of the 41<sup>st</sup> International Conference on Machine Learning*, Vienna, Austria. PMLR 235, 2024. Copyright 2024 by the author(s).

## 1. Introduction

Federated learning (FL) is an emerging paradigm that enables collaborative model training while preserving the privacy of each participant’s data (McMahan et al., 2017). Despite its potential, FL faces challenges stemming from data heterogeneity across clients and susceptibility to malicious attacks. These factors can lead to suboptimal global models that favor certain clients over others or models that are not robust to adversarial behaviors, undermining the core principles of FL.

Traditional FL approaches, such as FedAvg (McMahan et al., 2017), aggregate local client updates into a global model without accounting for the diverse and possibly skewed nature of client data distributions. This one-size-fits-all strategy often results in biased models that perform well on average but are unfair to clients with minority data representations. Furthermore, the aggregation process in FedAvg provides avenues for Byzantine clients to introduce harmful updates, posing a significant threat to model integrity and performance.

Personalized FL (PFL), represented by ditto and Ip-proj (Li et al., 2021; Lin et al., 2022), emerged as a response to these challenges, tailoring models to individual client characteristics (Kulkarni et al., 2020; Tan et al., 2022). Nonetheless, personalization typically focuses on the client level and does not adequately mitigate risks during the server-led aggregation phase. Similarly, existing works that incorporate notions of robustness (Chen et al., 2017; Blanchard et al., 2017; Xie et al., 2018; Mohri et al., 2019; Hu et al., 2022) and fairness (Li et al., 2019; Ezzeldin et al., 2023; Li et al., 2020a) often do so separately, lacking an integrated approach that addresses both concerns simultaneously.

In this paper, we present Reinforced Federated Learning (RFL), a unified framework that employs deep reinforcement learning (DRL) to dynamically adjust the influence of each client’s update during aggregation, thus balancing robustness and fairness at the server level. Our contributions are three-fold:

- Firstly, we develop an innovative client selection algorithm Algorithm 1 that determines the most represen-

tative clients for aggregation based on the Euclidean distance among their model parameters. This selection process not only reduces the impact of potentially malicious updates but also promotes fairness by considering the geometry of model parameters in the aggregation.

- Secondly, we leverage a DDPG-based (Lillicrap et al., 2015) algorithm to allow for continuous control over client aggregation weights, offering fine-tuned adjustments that discrete control mechanisms cannot achieve. The DDPG algorithm’s actor-critic structure elegantly handles the complexity of the FL environment (Konda and Tsitsiklis, 1999), where actions directly influence future states in a non-stationary manner.
- Lastly, we design a reward strategy that evaluates the aggregated global model using a fair held-out validation set. This approach ensures that the model performs well across diverse data distributions, inherently encouraging actions that lead toward more fair outcomes across all clients.

Our extensive experimental evaluations show that RFL enhances test accuracy by an absolute improvement of 5%, surpassing the SOTA methods. RFL represents a significant step toward realizing the full potential of federated learning in real-world applications, where robustness and fairness are not just desirable but essential attributes for deployment.

We organize the remainder of this paper as follows: Section 2 reviews background in the domains of FL, and DRL. Section 3 details the proposed RFL framework, including the client selection algorithm, the DDPG-based optimization process, and the reward formulation. In Section 4, we present our experimental setup and results, followed by a discussion of related works in Section 5. Finally, we conclude and suggest directions for future research in Section 6.

## 2. Background

### 2.1. Robustness in Federated Learning

There are general two kinds of attacks: data poisoning and model poisoning. Data poisoning is a critical concern in FL, involving the injection of misleading or false information into the training dataset (Biggio et al., 2012; Li et al., 2016; Rubinstein et al., 2009; Jagielski et al., 2018; Suciú et al., 2018; Fang et al., 2020; Dai and Li, 2023). On the other hand, model poisoning, also known as Byzantine attacks, allows an  $\alpha$ -fraction (typical  $\alpha < 0.5$ ) of clients to act as attackers. These malicious clients corrupt the model by sending arbitrary updates during aggregation. Byzantine robustness can be achieved through robust aggregation rules (Chen et al., 2017; Blanchard et al., 2017; Xie et al., 2018). In this paper, we follow the definition of robustness given by Li et al. (2021).

**Definition 1** (Robustness). In the case of a certain Byzantine attack, if model  $w_1$  achieves higher mean test accuracy across benign clients compared to model  $w_2$ , then we say that model  $w_1$  is more robust than model  $w_2$ . We employ three common attack methods to evaluate the robustness of our model. We use  $\tilde{w}_k$  to represent the malicious messages sent by client  $k$ .

- **Same-value attacks:** Malicious client  $k$  sends parameters can be denoted as  $\tilde{w}_k = m\mathbf{1}$ , where  $m \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \tau^2)$  represents the intensity of attack,  $\mathbf{1}$  is a vector of ones, with the same size of parameters as the benign clients.
- **Sign-flipping attacks:** Byzantine client  $k$  sends sign-flipped and scaled messages, which can be represented as  $\tilde{w}_k = -|m|\tilde{w}'_k$ , where  $\tilde{w}'_k$  denotes the correct updates,  $m \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \tau^2)$  represents the intensity of attack.
- **Gaussian attacks:** The messages sent by Byzantine client  $k$  follow a Gaussian distribution, which can be formulated as  $\tilde{w}_k \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \tau^2\mathbf{I})$ .

### 2.2. Fairness in Federated Learning

There exist three types of fairness: performance fairness, collaboration fairness, and model fairness (Zhou et al., 2021). In this paper, we focus on the performance fairness. When dealing with highly heterogeneous client data, a model may not achieve optimal performance across all clients. The issue of heterogeneity is a significant concern within the FL. Following Li et al. (2021), the formal definition of fairness is provided:

**Definition 2** (Performance Fairness). In the case of a heterogeneous federated network, if model  $w_1$  achieves a lower standard deviation (std) of test performance across  $N$  clients than model  $w_2$ , i.e.,  $\text{std} \{F_k(w_1)\}_{k \in [N]} < \text{std} \{F_k(w_2)\}_{k \in [N]}$ , where  $F_k(\cdot)$  represents the test loss of client  $k \in [N]$ , then we say that model  $w_1$  is more fair than model  $w_2$ .

### 2.3. Deep Reinforcement Learning

We consider a commonly used reinforcement learning scenario. At timestep  $t$ , an agent observes the environment and obtains a state  $s(t)$ , then the agent makes an action  $a(t)$ , and gets a reward  $r(t)$ . The state  $s(t)$  then will transit to  $s(t+1)$ . The objective of DRL is to maximize the expectation of cumulative discounted return  $R = \sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^{t-1} r(t)$ , where  $\gamma \in (0, 1]$  is a discount factor.

Previous work on DRL in FL has largely been built upon DQN, an algorithm for discrete action control. In contrast, we introduce a new framework utilizing deep deterministic policy gradient (DDPG) to address the continuous action control problems (Lillicrap et al., 2015).

DDPG is an actor-critic framework-based (Konda and Tsitsiklis, 1999) DRL algorithm. In DDPG, there is an actor network denoted as  $\pi(s|\theta^\pi)$  and a critic network represented as  $Q(s, a|\theta^Q)$ . Here,  $\theta^\pi$  and  $\theta^Q$  are the parameters of the actor and the critic networks, respectively. To enhance test performance and stabilize convergence, the experience replay and target network (Mnih et al., 2015) are adopted. Once a transition  $(s(i), a(i), r(i), s(i+1))$  is obtained, it is saved into a replay buffer. During each network update, a batch of experiences is drawn from the buffer for updating the network. Additionally, the target actor network  $\pi'(s|\theta^{\pi'})$  and the target critic network  $Q'(s, a|\theta^{Q'})$  share the same network architecture with actor network  $\pi(s|\theta^\pi)$  and critic network  $Q(s, a|\theta^Q)$ . These two target networks play a crucial role in computing updates and stabilizing the training process.

The objectives of actor and critic networks are different. For actor networks, its objective is to acquire a policy. This policy is optimized to maximize the expected return  $J$  from the start distribution in the environment, which can be updated by gradient ascent using the following gradient:

$$\nabla_{\theta^\pi} J \approx \frac{1}{N_d} \sum_i \nabla_a Q(s(i), \pi(s(i)|\theta^\pi)|\theta^Q) \nabla_{\theta^\pi} \pi(s(i)|\theta^\pi), \quad (1)$$

where  $N_d$  represents the batch size. For critic networks, its objective is to learn the action-value function  $Q(s, a|\theta^Q)$ , estimating the expected return when taking the state  $s_t$  and action  $a_t$  as input. The critic networks can be optimized by minimizing the loss function:

$$L = \frac{1}{N_d} \sum_i (y(i) - Q(s(i), a(i)|\theta^Q))^2, \quad (2)$$

$$y(i) = r(i) + \gamma Q'(s(i+1), \pi'(s(i+1)|\theta^{\pi'})|\theta^{Q'}). \quad (3)$$

The target networks are updated by the equation  $\theta' \leftarrow \varepsilon\theta + (1 - \varepsilon)\theta'$ , with  $\varepsilon \ll 1$  (Lillicrap et al., 2015).

### 3. Methodology

In this section, we first give the general FL optimization problem, (e.g. FedAvg (McMahan et al., 2017)), and then we propose our framework, Reinforcement Federated Learning (RFL). Finally, we introduce the details of RFL and the intuition of the tradeoff process.

FedAvg (McMahan et al., 2017) aims to train a global model that fits all clients. It can be formulated as follows:

$$\min_w f(w) = \sum_{k=1}^N p_k F_k(w) = \mathbb{E}_k[F_k(w)], \quad (4)$$

where  $N$  is the number of clients,  $p_k \geq 0$  and  $\sum_k p_k = 1$ .  $F_k$  is the local optimization problem for client  $k$ , i.e.,  $F_k :=$

$\mathbb{E}_{x_k \in \mathcal{D}_k}[f(w, x_k)]$ . Each client has  $n_k$  samples. Therefore, we can derive  $p_k = \frac{n_k}{n}$ , where  $n = \sum_k n_k$  is the total number of samples.

In a more practical setting, the data is statistically heterogeneous across all clients. Therefore, personalized FL is introduced to enhance the learning of more effective individual models. Furthermore, some works take robustness and fairness into account (Li et al., 2021; Lin et al., 2022). However, they only consider robustness at the client level, which, in the case of a strong attack during aggregation, would result in the collapse of personalized models.

In this work, we propose a DRL-based framework aimed at offering robustness and fairness at the server level. Within the framework, we operate local updates, and we select  $M\%$  clients based on a novel client selection algorithm introduced in Section 3.1.1. Then the server is treated as an agent, and based on the proposed client selection algorithm, the state  $s$  is obtained as input for the DDPG algorithm. The agent proceeds to generate an action  $a$  (output), which denotes the aggregation weights of the selected  $M\%$  clients. We then use the aggregation weights and their corresponding updates to form the global updates.

#### 3.1. Deep Reinforcement learning

We give a detailed explanation of the concepts of **state**, **action**, and **reward**.

##### 3.1.1. STATE

In the application of DRL to FL, the most straightforward idea is to consider the parameters of each client's model as states and input them into the actor network. However, when the client's model is a neural network, the parameter size becomes exceedingly large, rendering this idea unfeasible.

---

#### Algorithm 1 Client Selection

---

**Input:** client models  $w_{all} = [w_1, \dots, w_N]$ , an  $N \times N$  distance matrix  $\mathbf{C}$  filled with zeros.

**Output:** state  $s$ , top- $M\%$  clients' model  $w_{top}$ .

- 1: Flatten parameters of each client model to  $w'_1, \dots, w'_N$
  - 2: **for**  $i = 1$  **to**  $N$  **do**
  - 3:   **for**  $j = 1$  **to**  $N$  **do**
  - 4:      $\mathbf{C}_{i,j} = \|w'_i - w'_j\|_2$
  - 5:   **end for**
  - 6: **end for**
  - 7: Summing the rows of matrix  $\mathbf{C}$  and selecting the top- $M\%$  rows with the minimum sums.
  - 8: The sum of selected  $M\%$  rows forms a distance vector  $s = [d_m, \dots, d_M]$  as the state.
- 

Inspired by the idea of FABA (Xia et al., 2019), there is a strong likelihood that the Euclidean distance among

the model parameters of benign clients is closer than the distance between the model parameters of benign clients and malicious clients. Based on this observation, we propose a novel method for client selection and apply it to the generation of states. The details are shown in Algorithm 1. Through this algorithm, we can simultaneously obtain state  $s = [d_m, \dots, d_M]$  and top-M% clients' model  $w_{top} = [w_m, \dots, w_M]$ . These clients are the M% clients whose model parameters have the minimum total distance from the model parameters of all other clients. Notably, we perform normalization on the state  $s$  to get a stable training process. Further, the reason we do not directly use the distance matrix  $\mathbf{C}$  as input is that, if we consider 100 clients, the state will be in a 10,000-dimensional space, which would significantly increase computational costs.

### 3.1.2. ACTION

Compared to the FAVOR (Wang et al., 2020), which constrains its action space to discrete numbers ranging from 1 to  $N$ , representing the IDs of selected clients, our proposed DDPG-based algorithm enjoys a continuous control feature. The actor network will generate a continuous action  $a = [a_m, \dots, a_M]$ ,  $\sum_i a_i = 1$  based on the input state  $s$ . In our algorithm, we set the action as the aggregation weights of selected top-M% clients.

### 3.1.3. REWARD

When the server aggregates the parameters of selected M% clients, the server will get a reward  $r$  as feedback. The actor network performs gradient ascent to optimize its action for a higher expected cumulative reward. Hence, the design of the reward will guide the optimization direction of the actor network. Here, we construct a fair held-out validation set at the server and use the test accuracy of the aggregated global model  $w_g$  on this validation as the reward. We adopt this approach for several reasons: testing at the server does not incur additional communication overhead, and it allows training an unbiased global model. Specifically, taking the example of MNIST, we construct a validation set at the server with 100 images for each digit, totaling 1000 images. Achieving higher rewards on such a validation set incentivizes the agent to make actions that are more fair to each client, unlike FedAvg, which assigns higher weights to clients with more images, which may lead to significant unfairness in a non-identically distributed (non-IID) setting.

## 3.2. Algorithm

In this section, we provide a comprehensive overview of the DDPG-based training process. The optimization of RFL is composed of two components: (i) within the DRL workflow, the agent updates its actor and target networks; (ii) clients solve their local problems. The details are shown

in Algorithm 2.

---

### Algorithm 2 RFL: Reinforcement Federated Learning

---

**Input:**  $w_g(0)$ ,  $\pi(s|\theta^\pi)$ ,  $Q(s, a|\theta^Q)$ ,  $\theta^{\pi'}$ ,  $\theta^{Q'}$ , experience replay buffer  $\mathcal{U}$ ,  $T$ ,  $N$ ,  $R$ .

- 1: Server(Agent) sends global model  $w_g(0)$  to all clients.
  - 2:  $s(0), w_{top}(0) \leftarrow \text{ClientSelection}(w_{all}, \mathbf{C})$
  - 3: **for**  $t = 0$  **to**  $T - 1$  **do**
  - 4:   Server observes the state  $s(t)$ , and makes action  $a(t) = \pi(s(t)|\theta^\pi) + \mathcal{N}$  ( $\mathcal{N}$  is an exploration noise).
  - 5:   Update global model  $w_g(t) \leftarrow \sum_i a_i(t) \cdot w_{top_i}(t)$ .
  - 6:    $r(t) \leftarrow \text{Evaluation}(w_g(t))$ .
  - 7:   Server sends  $w_g(t)$  to all  $N$  clients.
  - 8:   **for**  $k = 1$  **to**  $N$  **do**
  - 9:     Client  $k$  solves its local problem for  $R$  rounds.
  - 10:   **end for**
  - 11:    $s(t+1), w_{top}(t+1) \leftarrow \text{ClientSelection}(w_{all}, \mathbf{C})$
  - 12:   Store  $(s(t), a(t), r(t), s(t+1))$  in the experience replay buffer  $\mathcal{U}$ .
  - 13:   Sample a batch of experience from  $\mathcal{U}$  to update  $\theta^\pi, \theta^Q$ .
  - 14:   Soft update  $\theta^{\pi'}, \theta^{Q'}$ .
  - 15: **end for**
- 

The RFL algorithm is a bi-level optimization problem. The global object is  $\min_{w_g} G(F_1(w_g), \dots, F_N(w_g))$ , where  $G(\cdot)$  is the aggregation function,  $w_g$  represents the global model. In this context, we adopt DRL to acquire an aggregation function to trade off robustness and fairness. After initialization, the RFL algorithm progresses through sequential steps. At each step  $t$ , the server (acting as an agent) observes the current state  $s(t)$ , derived through the process of **Client Selection**. It then makes a deterministic action and performs aggregation, thereby generating a new global model  $w_g(t)$ . Then, an evaluation of the fair held-out dataset serves as the reward  $r(t)$ . The server then broadcasts the updated global model to all clients, who then solve local subproblems for  $R$  rounds. Following this training phase, a new round of **Client Selection** takes place to obtain the next state  $s(t+1)$  for the subsequent iteration. The acquired transition  $(s(t), a(t), r(t), s(t+1))$  will be preserved in the replay buffer for subsequent network updates. The actor and critic networks update at every step  $t$ , while the target actor and critic networks update once every two steps (soft update). The slow-updating target networks provide a stable learning process (Lillicrap et al., 2015).

**Trade-off Between Robustness and Fairness.** In previous works (Li et al., 2021; Lin et al., 2022), the local model is susceptible to collapse under strong attacks (such as sign flipping). This can be explained by the insufficient robustness of the global model. In contrast, our proposed RFL can simultaneously offer robustness and fairness at the server level. Specifically, when there is a certain fraction

Table 1. Summary of datasets and configurations. (The symbol  $\triangle$  represents the data partitioning scheme within the synthetic dataset. Specifically, we calculate the sample size for each client and denote the minimum as  $n$ . Then, each client uploads  $0.1n$  samples to the server.)

DATASET	NUMBER OF CLIENTS	M	SAMPLE SIZE AT THE SERVER	TASKS	MODELS
MNIST	100	30	10 CATEGORIES, EACH WITH 100 IMAGES	10-CLASS CLASSIFICATION	1-HIDDEN-LAYER NN
CIFAR10	100	30	10 CATEGORIES, EACH WITH 100 IMAGES	10-CLASS CLASSIFICATION	CNN
FASHIONMNIST	100	30	10 CATEGORIES, EACH WITH 100 IMAGES	10-CLASS CLASSIFICATION	CNN
EMNIST	300	90	62 CATEGORIES, EACH WITH 100 IMAGES	62-CLASS CLASSIFICATION	2-HIDDEN-LAYERS NN
SYNTHETIC(0,0)	100	30	$\triangle$	10-CLASS CLASSIFICATION	LOGISTIC
SYNTHETIC(1,1)	100	30	$\triangle$	10-CLASS CLASSIFICATION	LOGISTIC

$\alpha$  ( $\alpha < 0.5$ ) of Byzantine clients present, we can control the percentage  $M\%$  of clients participating in aggregation to trade off robustness and fairness. The intuition is that: when we adopt a larger value of  $M$ , it also increases the risk of introducing Byzantine clients during aggregation. However, simultaneously, introducing more client parameters in non-IID situations can enhance the generalization capability of the global model, implicitly promoting fairness across the clients.

**Selections of State, Action, and Reward.** Note that, within DRL, the design of **states**, **actions**, and **rewards** is highly personalized and not standardized. It can differ depending on the specific objectives of different algorithms, allowing for various setups of states, actions, and rewards. The algorithm proposed in this paper, based on DDPG, only presents a framework capable of continuous control within the context of FL. There is considerable potential for further exploration and development in subsequent work.

## 4. Numerical Experiments

In this section, we present extensive evaluation results on six datasets to demonstrate that RFL can achieve superior test accuracy, robustness, and comparable fairness compared to SOTA methods. We summarize the datasets, models, and other configurations used in this paper in Table 1. We compare RFL with two SOTA approaches in robustness and fairness, namely Ditto (Li et al., 2021), lp-proj (Lin et al., 2022), and a baseline FedAvg (McMahan et al., 2017).

- **FedAvg** stands for the straightforward yet powerful approach within the FL. It enables clients to participate in a distributed learning process without direct data sharing. However, the robustness of FedAvg is relatively poor.
- **Ditto** is the first framework that simultaneously offers robustness and fairness and mitigates the tension between the two criteria under a statistical heterogeneity scenario.
- **lp-proj** unifies the previous work on Ditto and projects the update process into lower dimensions. Depending on the different norms of the proximal term to the local

subproblem, it can be categorized into lp-proj-1 and lp-proj-2.

We then exhibit the tradeoff capability between the robustness and fairness of RFL. Finally, we conduct supplementary experiments regarding the reward design to illustrate the feasibility of RFL. Due to space limitations, we present representative results in this section, with the complete results provided in the Appendix A.2.

### 4.1. Experimental Setup

We conduct experiments on six datasets, MNIST (LeCun et al., 1998), CIFAR10 (Krizhevsky et al., 2009), FASHIONMNIST (Xiao et al., 2017), EMNIST (Cohen et al., 2017), and two synthetic datasets (Shamir et al., 2014). For the first four real data sets, we extract 100 instances from each class, creating a held-out dataset at the server, ensuring fairness across all clients. The remaining dataset is divided into non-IID datasets for each client utilizing Dirichlet sampling with a parameter of  $\alpha = 0.1$ . Further division into train/test sets is then performed on each client. For generating Synthetic datasets, we follow Shamir et al. (2014); Li et al. (2020b); Lin et al. (2022). The dataset is denoted as SYNTHETIC( $\alpha, \beta$ ), where  $\alpha$  controls the discrepancy of each client’s model, while  $\beta$  controls the discrepancy of each client’s data. In this context, we generate SYNTHETIC(0,0) and SYNTHETIC(1,1). Specifically, for client  $k$  with sample size  $n_k$ , the corresponding data samples  $(X_k, Y_k)$  can be generated according to  $y = \operatorname{argmax}(\operatorname{softmax}(W_k x + b_k))$  with  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{60}$ ,  $W_k \in \mathbb{R}^{10 \times 60}$  and  $b_k \in \mathbb{R}^{10}$ . We model  $W_k \in \mathcal{N}(u_k, 1)$ ,  $b_k \in \mathcal{N}(u_k, 1)$ ,  $u_k, 1 \in \mathcal{N}(0, \alpha)$ , and  $(x_k)_j \in \mathcal{N}(v_k, \frac{1}{j^{1.2}})$  with  $v_k \in \mathcal{N}(\mu_k, 1)$  and  $\mu_k \in \mathcal{N}(0, \beta)$ . We set the parameter  $M$  to 30% in experiments unless otherwise specified.

**Model architectures** The performance of RFL and a suit of baselines are evaluated on both convex and non-convex models. In consideration of the scale of the datasets and the complexity of the tasks, we employed distinct neural network architectures to handle different datasets. Specifically, a 1-layer neural network and a 2-layer neural network are utilized for the MNIST and EMNIST datasets, respectively. In contrast, for the CIFAR10 and FASHIONMNIST

Table 2. The mean test accuracy under three attacks, on the CIFAR10, EMNIST, and SYNTHETIC(0,0) datasets with  $M = 30\%$ . We have bolded the highest test accuracy. The numbers within parentheses represent the variance, and  $\star$  on the cell means in that case, the model will collapse.

DATASET	METHODS	CLEAR	SAME VALUE		SIGN FLIPPING		GAUSSIAN	
			20%	40%	20%	40%	20%	40%
CIFAR10	FEDAVG	0.377(0.048)	0.120(0.065)	0.149(0.070)	0.123(0.055)	$\star$	0.146(0.024)	0.158(0.029)
	LOCAL	0.852(0.028)	0.871(0.017)	0.866(0.019)	<b>0.871(0.017)</b>	0.866(0.019)	0.871(0.017)	0.866(0.019)
	GLOBAL	0.276(0.152)	0.319(0.157)	0.351(0.101)	0.319(0.176)	0.331(0.138)	0.309(0.157)	0.311(0.146)
	DITTO	<b>0.867(0.019)</b>	0.824(0.044)	0.820(0.042)	0.854(0.024)	$\star$	0.815(0.045)	0.820(0.042)
	LP-PROJ-2	0.866(0.021)	0.854(0.016)	0.852(0.021)	0.857(0.019)	$\star$	0.822(0.032)	0.820(0.025)
	LP-PROJ-1	<b>0.867(0.021)</b>	0.834(0.026)	0.859(0.014)	0.860(0.020)	0.853(0.017)	0.822(0.032)	0.820(0.026)
	RFL	<b>0.867(0.037)</b>	<b>0.889(0.031)</b>	<b>0.876(0.030)</b>	<b>0.871(0.025)</b>	<b>0.876(0.030)</b>	<b>0.871(0.026)</b>	<b>0.876(0.024)</b>
EMNIST	FEDAVG	0.666(0.032)	0.057(0.014)	0.059(0.013)	0.058(0.011)	$\star$	0.064(0.001)	0.057(0.001)
	LOCAL	0.853(0.018)	0.853(0.018)	0.853(0.018)	0.853(0.018)	0.853(0.018)	0.853(0.018)	0.853(0.018)
	GLOBAL	0.710(0.010)	0.732(0.010)	0.762(0.010)	0.743(0.010)	0.767(0.010)	0.726(0.010)	0.771(0.010)
	DITTO	0.881(0.003)	0.478(0.003)	0.509(0.001)	0.718(0.003)	$\star$	0.599(0.003)	0.582(0.001)
	LP-PROJ-2	0.904(0.002)	0.802(0.002)	0.888(0.001)	0.904(0.002)	$\star$	0.588(0.002)	0.581(0.001)
	LP-PROJ-1	0.901(0.002)	0.875(0.002)	0.888(0.001)	0.905(0.002)	0.903(0.001)	0.874(0.002)	0.883(0.001)
	RFL	<b>0.934(0.003)</b>	<b>0.936(0.002)</b>	<b>0.941(0.002)</b>	<b>0.938(0.002)</b>	<b>0.940(0.002)</b>	<b>0.938(0.002)</b>	<b>0.941(0.002)</b>
SYNTHETIC(0,0)	FEDAVG	0.749(0.091)	0.499(0.145)	0.402(0.124)	0.321(0.071)	$\star$	0.176(0.045)	0.189(0.041)
	LOCAL	0.877(0.017)	0.871(0.018)	0.857(0.019)	0.871(0.018)	0.857(0.019)	0.871(0.018)	0.857(0.019)
	GLOBAL	0.470(0.064)	0.523(0.074)	0.570(0.086)	0.523(0.074)	0.565(0.092)	0.523(0.074)	0.565(0.092)
	DITTO	0.851(0.018)	0.859(0.015)	0.869(0.014)	0.859(0.016)	$\star$	0.803(0.035)	0.814(0.036)
	LP-PROJ-2	<b>0.940(0.002)</b>	0.918(0.004)	0.920(0.004)	0.925(0.003)	$\star$	0.898(0.007)	0.906(0.005)
	LP-PROJ-1	0.924(0.004)	0.919(0.004)	0.918(0.004)	<b>0.940(0.003)</b>	0.884(0.009)	0.896(0.007)	0.902(0.007)
	RFL	0.932(0.163)	<b>0.939(0.148)</b>	<b>0.943(0.159)</b>	0.939(0.146)	<b>0.950(0.131)</b>	<b>0.939(0.145)</b>	<b>0.950(0.132)</b>

datasets, we use convolutional neural networks. As for the SYNTHETIC datasets, a logistic regression model is employed. Due to space limitations, we give the models used in our experiments in Appendix A.1.

### 4.2. Results

In this section, we present representative results to illustrate RFL offering superior robustness and similar fairness compared to SOTA methods.




Figure 1. The figures in the first line represent robustness performance (i.e. mean test accuracy across benign clients) of three different datasets subjected to three different attacks. The figures in the second line depict the performance of three different datasets with no malicious clients.

**Robustness and fairness** Following the definition of robustness (Li et al., 2021), we provide empirical results on three different datasets, under three different attacks: same-

value attack, sign-flipping attack, and Gaussian attack, with the parameter  $\tau$  set to  $\{100, 10, 100\}$  respectively. In the absence of malicious clients, Figure 1 demonstrates that RFL achieves performance similar to SOTA methods on CIFAR10 and EMNIST datasets. However, it shows a slight inferiority compared to Ditto (Li et al., 2021) on FASHIONMNIST. Furthermore, under the same value attack, the performance of Ditto and lp-proj (Lin et al., 2022) slightly decreases with the increasing number of malicious clients. While RFL shows a slight improvement. Additionally, under two other types of attacks, Ditto and lp-proj-2 perform poorly. Specifically, subjected to Gaussian attacks, both algorithms exhibit a notable deterioration in performance. In the case of a strong attack, i.e. sign flipping, Ditto and lp-proj-2 collapse when the fraction of malicious clients exceeds 0.2.




Figure 2. The tradeoff between test accuracy and fairness within different methods. The closer the approach is to the lower right corner, the better.

The tradeoff between test accuracy and variance for different baselines is illustrated in Figure 2. We have examined two scenarios: one involving a malicious client and one without.

As shown in Figure 2, RFL achieves superior accuracy. However, its variance is marginally higher compared to other approaches. This can be mitigated by tuning M which will be discussed later.

Furthermore, we provide Table 2, illustrating the tradeoff between the robustness and fairness of CIFAR10, EMNIST, and SYNTHETIC(0,0) datasets under three different attacks. Due to the space limitation, we show full results in Appendix A.2. We note that in Table 2, RFL offers robustness and fairness simultaneously. In particular, on CIFAR10, under Gaussian attack, RFL achieves 87.1% mean test accuracy with the lowest variance of 0.026. This represents a performance improvement of 4.9% compared to the strongest SOTA method. Despite the highest test accuracy, we see that RFL performs slightly poorly in fairness under the other two attacks. This is because, when choosing the value of M, the server faces the challenge of dealing with an unknown number of Byzantine clients in real-world scenarios. In practice, a more resilient decision is often made by selecting a smaller M rather than a larger one, leading to a comparatively less fair model.

Numerous experimental results demonstrate that RFL can provide robustness and fairness. Then, we present some analysis of the underlying reasons. As mentioned in Ditto (Li et al., 2021), superior results can be achieved through the execution of local fine-tuning for 50 epochs on the global model after specific communication rounds. However, determining the optimal 'point' for early stopping during training poses a challenge, especially in the presence of a fraction of malicious clients corrupting the global model. In contrast, RFL can constantly provide a relatively robust global model through a robust client selection algorithm. Meanwhile, the server, also referred to as the agent, aims to maximize the expected accumulative reward. It optimizes the aggregation weights in each round and learns a policy to make better decisions. In non-IID scenarios, an aggregation function that involves interaction with clients and incorporates feedback for continuous learning demonstrates superior performance compared to FedAvg (McMahan et al., 2017), which determines aggregation weights simply based on the sample size in each round.

**Tradeoff between robustness and fairness in RFL.** Experiments are conducted on CIFAR10, while in the presence of different percentages of malicious clients, all subjected to the same value attack. We set the number of clients participating in aggregation, M, ranging from 10% to 100%. Specifically, there exists a certain threshold, i.e. if there are 100 clients with 20% being malicious clients, then the threshold is set at 80. Results are shown in Figure 3. We see that, under different percentages of malicious clients, there is a certain pattern in the changes of test accuracy and variance. Specifically, as the value of M continuously




Figure 3. The performance and tradeoff between robustness and fairness of different M (The numbers on the x-axis in the figures represent the corresponding M%, e.g. 80 means M = 80%).

increases, test accuracy initially oscillates upward, reaching its maximum at the threshold, and then experiences a sharp decline. In contrast, variance exhibits the opposite pattern, with a continuous increase in M leading to initial oscillations downward, reaching its minimum at the threshold, and then rapidly rising. Taking the example of 20% malicious client, under the same value attack, M = 80% achieves the highest mean test accuracy of 90.3% and the lowest variance of 0.013 (complete results are available in Table 4).

The experimental results validate the initial proposition of RFL, indicating that we can provide a tradeoff between robustness and fairness by controlling the number of participating clients M in aggregation. To elaborate further, when the server encounters an attack at first, it may receive lower rewards. In subsequent network updates, the server learns to assign lower aggregation weights to clients suspected of being malicious, thereby enhancing robustness. Additionally, in order to attain higher rewards, the server also learns how to allocate weights among benign clients to ensure fairness.

Figure 4 illustrates the effectiveness of carefully designed rewards. The figure depicts the convergence process in test accuracy for each digit. To enhance clarity, we separate odd and even digits into two separate figures. From Figure 4, it is evident that most digits converge to similar ranges, except for digits 5 and 9, which converge around 65%. These results are deemed fair for the majority of clients. However, it presents a relative unfairness for clients primarily composed of digits 5 and 9. This issue can be mitigated by refining the design of rewards in future work.

As can be seen in Table 3, the impact of different hidden layer dimensions in the actor and critic networks within DRL




Figure 4. The convergence curve of reward  $r$  of each class at the server, under the same value attack.

Table 3. Using the CIFAR-10 dataset, we provide the test accuracy of different hidden layer dimensions in DRL. In this paper, we set the hidden layer dimensions to 256. (The numbers within parentheses represent the variance.)

HIDDEN DIMENSION	SAME VALUE	
	20%	40%
256	<b>0.889(0.031)</b>	<b>0.876(0.030)</b>
128	0.887(0.029)	0.873(0.028)
64	0.883(0.028)	0.874(0.027)

on test accuracy is limited. We will discuss in future work the relationship between the introduced additional overhead from DRL and the achieved performance improvement.

## 5. Related Work

Previous researches extensively explore the concepts of robustness (Chen et al., 2017; Blanchard et al., 2017; Xie et al., 2018; Mohri et al., 2019; Hu et al., 2022) and fairness (Li et al., 2019; Ezzeldin et al., 2023; Li et al., 2020a). Moreover, there has been a recent introduction of DRL into FL (Wang et al., 2020; Zhuo et al., 2019).

**Robustness and Fairness.** We observe various reweighting techniques (Li et al., 2019; Ezzeldin et al., 2023; Li et al., 2020a) that aim to enhance fairness in machine learning models. The proposed approach by Li et al. (2019) involves assigning higher weights to low-performance clients to sacrifice mean test accuracy to achieve a more fair model. However, these works may not exhibit robustness when facing malicious attacks. Previous works offer the tradeoff between robustness and fairness (Li et al., 2021; Lin et al., 2022; Hu et al., 2022). Li et al. (2021) introduce Ditto as a solution, providing both robustness and fairness. Building upon this, Lin et al. (2022) unify the previous work on Ditto and project the update process into lower dimensions to achieve a lower bytes budget.

Yet, these studies typically focus on the tradeoff at the client level. Our observation highlights that if the global model lacks sufficient robustness, the local models will collapse.

In this paper, we examine the tradeoff between robustness and fairness at the server level, providing a more robust model in the presence of  $\alpha$ -fraction (typical  $\alpha < 0.5$ ) of Byzantine clients.

**Deep Reinforcement Learning.** We note that there are numerous applications of DRL in FL. Wang et al. (2020) introduce a deep Q-learning (DQN)-based algorithm (FAVOR) to select clients to participate in the aggregation process. Zhuo et al. (2019) propose a DQN-based FedRL and evaluate on a Grid-World domain with an action space  $\{east, south, west, north\}$ . However, it is important to note that the action spaces of FAVOR and FedRL are discrete. Since DQN relies on a greedy policy, updating the continuous and unconstrained  $a(t)$  within a large action space at each step could pose significant challenges. This heavily limits the generalizability and applicability of algorithms similar to FAVOR.

## 6. Conclusion and Discussion

In this paper, we model each communication round in the FL as an MDP and propose a simple framework RFL, that seamlessly integrates DDPG into distributed learning with the capability of continuous action control. In addition, we reveal the tension between robustness and fairness at the server level. RFL can simultaneously deliver superior performance, robustness, and comparable fairness. To attain this objective, we propose a novel client selection algorithm and offer the tradeoff by regulating the number  $M$  of clients participating in the aggregation.

**Limitations.** Due to the objective of maximizing cumulative rewards in DRL, this may result in non-convex optimization problems, rendering the training process susceptible to influences from factors such as initialization, and hyperparameter selection, especially evident when dealing with synthetic datasets. Another limitation is that, under strong attacks such as sign flipping, the proportion of Byzantine clients cannot exceed 50% for RFL, whereas lp-proj (Lin et al., 2022) can tolerate up to 80%. This difference arises from the fact that RFL and lp-proj are two distinct frameworks. In lp-proj, it is possible to reduce the joint optimization problem to pure local training, allowing for a higher setting of malicious client numbers.

In future work, the integration of DRL into frameworks similar to Ditto and lp-proj could yield more robust models. Furthermore, through careful design of states, actions, and rewards, DRL can be applied to problems that are challenging for traditional approaches to handle. In addition, DRL may require a substantial number of transitions for training to unleash its optimal performance. Therefore, future endeavors could explore the pre-training of a robust DRL model capable of accurately identifying Byzantine

clients, assigning them lower aggregation weights. Simultaneously, by leveraging the distance relationships between models, adaptive weight allocation can be achieved to yield fairer results. Therefore, the trade-off between the resulting overhead and performance enhancement is a noteworthy consideration for further contemplation.

## Impact Statement

The introduction of the Reinforced Federated Learning (RFL) framework aims to advance the field of Machine Learning by addressing two major concerns in federated learning: fairness and robustness against adversarial attacks. While RFL strives to enhance model performance equitably across heterogeneous data, it also intensifies the integrity of collaborative learning efforts. Ethically, our work recognizes the potential implications of deploying such technology in sensitive areas, where biased outcomes can lead to societal harm. In the future, if adopted widely, RFL could influence societal structures by improving decision-making processes that are more inclusive and secure. However, we also understand the necessity of careful oversight to prevent any misuse or unintended negative consequences of this technology. In line with this, we advocate for ongoing ethical assessment as RFL evolves and integrates into various domains, ensuring that its societal impact remains aligned with principles of equity and trustworthiness.

## References

- Battista Biggio, Blaine Nelson, and Pavel Laskov. Poisoning attacks against support vector machines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1206.6389*, 2012.
- Peva Blanchard, El Mahdi El Mhamdi, Rachid Guerraoui, and Julien Stainer. Machine learning with adversaries: Byzantine tolerant gradient descent. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- Yudong Chen, Lili Su, and Jiaming Xu. Distributed statistical machine learning in adversarial settings: Byzantine gradient descent. *Proceedings of the ACM on Measurement and Analysis of Computing Systems*, 1(2):1–25, 2017.
- Gregory Cohen, Saeed Afshar, Jonathan Tapson, and Andre Van Schaik. Emnist: Extending mnist to handwritten letters. In *2017 international joint conference on neural networks (IJCNN)*, pages 2921–2926. IEEE, 2017.
- Yanbo Dai and Songze Li. Chameleon: Adapting to peer images for planting durable backdoors in federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12961*, 2023.
- Yahya H Ezzeldin, Shen Yan, Chaoyang He, Emilio Ferrara, and A Salman Avestimehr. Fairfed: Enabling group fairness in federated learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, pages 7494–7502, 2023.
- Minghong Fang, Xiaoyu Cao, Jinyuan Jia, and Neil Gong. Local model poisoning attacks to {Byzantine-Robust} federated learning. In *29th USENIX security symposium (USENIX Security 20)*, pages 1605–1622, 2020.
- Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- Zeou Hu, Kiarash Shaloudegi, Guojun Zhang, and Yao-liang Yu. Federated learning meets multi-objective optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Network Science and Engineering*, 9(4):2039–2051, 2022.
- Matthew Jagielski, Alina Oprea, Battista Biggio, Chang Liu, Cristina Nita-Rotaru, and Bo Li. Manipulating machine learning: Poisoning attacks and countermeasures for regression learning. In *2018 IEEE symposium on security and privacy (SP)*, pages 19–35. IEEE, 2018.
- Vijay Konda and John Tsitsiklis. Actor-critic algorithms. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 12, 1999.
- Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. 2009.
- Viraj Kulkarni, Milind Kulkarni, and Aniruddha Pant. Survey of personalization techniques for federated learning. In *2020 Fourth World Conference on Smart Trends in Systems, Security and Sustainability (WorldS4)*, pages 794–797. IEEE, 2020.
- Yann LeCun, Léon Bottou, Yoshua Bengio, and Patrick Haffner. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 86(11):2278–2324, 1998.
- Bo Li, Yining Wang, Aarti Singh, and Yevgeniy Vorobeychik. Data poisoning attacks on factorization-based collaborative filtering. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29, 2016.
- Tian Li, Maziar Sanjabi, Ahmad Beirami, and Virginia Smith. Fair resource allocation in federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.10497*, 2019.
- Tian Li, Ahmad Beirami, Maziar Sanjabi, and Virginia Smith. Tilted empirical risk minimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.01162*, 2020a.
- Tian Li, Anit Kumar Sahu, Manzil Zaheer, Maziar Sanjabi, Ameet Talwalkar, and Virginia Smith. Federated

- optimization in heterogeneous networks. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, 2:429–450, 2020b.
- Tian Li, Shengyuan Hu, Ahmad Beirami, and Virginia Smith. Ditto: Fair and robust federated learning through personalization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6357–6368. PMLR, 2021.
- Timothy P Lillicrap, Jonathan J Hunt, Alexander Pritzel, Nicolas Heess, Tom Erez, Yuval Tassa, David Silver, and Daan Wierstra. Continuous control with deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.02971*, 2015.
- Shiyun Lin, Yuze Han, Xiang Li, and Zhihua Zhang. Personalized federated learning towards communication efficiency, robustness and fairness. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:30471–30485, 2022.
- Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Aguera y Arcas. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 1273–1282. PMLR, 2017.
- Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, David Silver, Andrei A Rusu, Joel Veness, Marc G Bellemare, Alex Graves, Martin Riedmiller, Andreas K Fidjeland, Georg Ostrovski, et al. Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *nature*, 518(7540):529–533, 2015.
- Mehryar Mohri, Gary Sivek, and Ananda Theertha Suresh. Agnostic federated learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4615–4625. PMLR, 2019.
- Benjamin IP Rubinstein, Blaine Nelson, Ling Huang, Anthony D Joseph, Shing-hon Lau, Satish Rao, Nina Taft, and J Doug Tygar. Antidote: understanding and defending against poisoning of anomaly detectors. In *Proceedings of the 9th ACM SIGCOMM Conference on Internet Measurement*, pages 1–14, 2009.
- Ohad Shamir, Nati Srebro, and Tong Zhang. Communication-efficient distributed optimization using an approximate newton-type method. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1000–1008. PMLR, 2014.
- Octavian Suciu, Radu Marginean, Yigitcan Kaya, Hal Daume III, and Tudor Dumitras. When does machine learning {FAIL}? generalized transferability for evasion and poisoning attacks. In *27th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 18)*, pages 1299–1316, 2018.
- Alysa Ziyang Tan, Han Yu, Lizhen Cui, and Qiang Yang. Towards personalized federated learning. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2022.
- Hao Wang, Zakhary Kaplan, Di Niu, and Baochun Li. Optimizing federated learning on non-iid data with reinforcement learning. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2020-IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*, pages 1698–1707. IEEE, 2020.
- Qi Xia, Zeyi Tao, Zijiang Hao, and Qun Li. Faba: an algorithm for fast aggregation against byzantine attacks in distributed neural networks. In *IJCAI*, 2019.
- Han Xiao, Kashif Rasul, and Roland Vollgraf. Fashion-mnist: a novel image dataset for benchmarking machine learning algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.07747*, 2017.
- Cong Xie, Oluwasanmi Koyejo, and Indranil Gupta. Generalized byzantine-tolerant sgd. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.10116*, 2018.
- Zirui Zhou, Lingyang Chu, Changxin Liu, Lanjun Wang, Jian Pei, and Yong Zhang. Towards fair federated learning. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pages 4100–4101, 2021.
- Hankz Hankui Zhuo, Wenfeng Feng, Yufeng Lin, Qian Xu, and Qiang Yang. Federated deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.08277*, 2019.

## A. Appendix

### A.1. Implementation Details

We give the details of the models as follows:

- **1-hidden-layer neural network for MNIST.** The model consists of one fully connected (FC) layer with 100 neurons serving as the hidden layer, employing the ReLU as the activation function. In total, there are 79,510 parameters.
- **2-hidden-layer neural network for EMNIST.** The model consists of two fully connected layers with 100 neurons serving as the hidden layer. For each FC layer, we use the ReLU as the activation function. In total, there are 94,862 parameters.
- **CNN for CIFAR10.** The model consists of two convolutional layers and three fully connected layers. In total, there are 62,006 parameters. The details are as follows:
  - Convolutional layer 1: input channel: 3, output channel: 6, kernel size: 5.
  - ReLU activation function, max pooling: kernel size: 2, stride: 2.
  - Convolutional layer 2: input channel: 6, output channel: 16, kernel size: 5.
  - ReLU activation function, max pooling: kernel size: 2, stride: 2.
  - Fully connected layer 1: input features: 400, output features: 120.
  - Fully connected layer 1: input features: 120, output features: 84.
  - Fully connected layer 1: input features: 84, output features: 10.
- **CNN for FASHIONMNIST.** The model we implement in this paper is modified from Resnet (He et al., 2016), which consists of one convolutional layer, two Resnet blocks, and a fully connected layer. In total, there are 678,794 parameters. The details are as follows:
  - Convolutional layer: input channel: 1, output channel: 64, kernel size: 7, stride: 2, padding: 3.
  - Batch normalization, ReLU activation function, max pooling: kernel size: 3, stride: 2, padding: 1.
  - Resnet block 1: input channel: 64, output channel: 64, 2 residuals.
  - Resnet block 2: input channel: 64, output channel: 128, 2 residuals.
  - Average pooling.
  - Fully connected layer: input features: 128, output features: 10.

### A.2. Full Results

Table 4. Mean test accuracy and variance for different percentages of aggregating clients participating in aggregation, under the condition of same value attack, on the CIFAR10 dataset. (The numbers within parentheses represent the variance.)

M(%)	SAME VALUE			
	10%	20%	30%	40%
10	0.871(0.043)	0.879(0.039)	0.874(0.029)	0.870(0.041)
20	0.879(0.029)	0.884(0.029)	0.880(0.030)	0.878(0.035)
30	0.880(0.031)	0.889(0.031)	0.874(0.025)	0.876(0.030)
40	0.889(0.026)	0.892(0.018)	0.889(0.025)	0.890(0.024)
50	0.891(0.022)	0.894(0.017)	0.897(0.022)	0.895(0.021)
60	0.892(0.021)	0.895(0.019)	0.895(0.021)	<b>0.900(0.017)</b>
70	0.895(0.022)	0.899(0.014)	<b>0.902(0.016)</b>	0.834(0.063)
80	0.898(0.020)	<b>0.903(0.013)</b>	0.832(0.066)	0.838(0.064)
90	<b>0.900(0.015)</b>	0.856(0.059)	0.838(0.063)	0.840(0.064)
100	0.832(0.064)	0.857(0.058)	0.827(0.060)	0.836(0.064)




Figure 5. The tradeoff between test accuracy and fairness under the same value attack. The closer the M is to the lower right corner, the better. (The numbers in the figure correspond to the percentages participating in aggregation, e.g. 80 means  $M = 80\%$ )

Table 5. Complete test accuracy results under the attack of same-value. (The numbers within parentheses represent the variance.)

DATASET	METHODS	CLEAR	10%	20%	30%	40%
MNIST	FEDAVG	0.904(0.014)	0.124(0.054)	0.125(0.053)	0.132(0.053)	0.145(0.049)
	LOCAL	0.965(0.007)	0.966(0.007)	0.965(0.008)	0.962(0.009)	0.962(0.010)
	GLOBAL	0.874(0.101)	0.871(0.098)	0.859(0.093)	0.766(0.157)	0.784(0.126)
	DITTO	0.972(0.005)	0.811(0.030)	0.778(0.033)	0.796(0.024)	0.769(0.027)
	LP-PROJ-2	0.969(0.007)	0.967(0.006)	0.964(0.007)	0.968(0.006)	0.967(0.007)
	LP-PROJ-1	0.971(0.007)	0.968(0.005)	0.969(0.005)	0.967(0.006)	0.969(0.007)
	RFL	<b>0.977(0.006)</b>	<b>0.977(0.003)</b>	<b>0.979(0.002)</b>	<b>0.973(0.003)</b>	<b>0.971(0.006)</b>
CIFAR10	FEDAVG	0.377(0.048)	0.113(0.062)	0.120(0.065)	0.133(0.067)	0.149(0.070)
	LOCAL	0.852(0.028)	0.852(0.028)	0.871(0.017)	0.866(0.018)	0.866(0.019)
	GLOBAL	0.276(0.152)	0.299(0.136)	0.319(0.157)	0.297(0.172)	0.351(0.101)
	DITTO	<b>0.867(0.019)</b>	0.817(0.048)	0.824(0.044)	0.815(0.043)	0.820(0.042)
	LP-PROJ-2	0.866(0.021)	0.845(0.027)	0.854(0.016)	0.830(0.025)	0.852(0.021)
	LP-PROJ-1	<b>0.867(0.021)</b>	0.851(0.024)	0.834(0.026)	0.847(0.018)	0.859(0.014)
	RFL	<b>0.867(0.037)</b>	<b>0.880(0.031)</b>	<b>0.889(0.031)</b>	<b>0.874(0.025)</b>	<b>0.876(0.030)</b>
FASHIONMNIST	FEDAVG	0.762(0.069)	0.152(0.052)	0.167(0.053)	0.187(0.053)	0.190(0.052)
	LOCAL	0.966(0.010)	0.963(0.010)	0.965(0.011)	0.966(0.011)	0.967(0.012)
	GLOBAL	0.442(0.201)	0.424(0.208)	0.555(0.183)	0.562(0.215)	0.561(0.213)
	DITTO	<b>0.973(0.003)</b>	0.814(0.045)	0.803(0.046)	0.829(0.048)	0.858(0.048)
	LP-PROJ-2	0.969(0.004)	0.964(0.004)	0.964(0.003)	0.966(0.004)	0.964(0.005)
	LP-PROJ-1	0.969(0.004)	0.966(0.004)	0.966(0.003)	0.968(0.004)	0.967(0.004)
	RFL	0.969(0.032)	<b>0.968(0.026)</b>	<b>0.970(0.028)</b>	<b>0.971(0.019)</b>	<b>0.972(0.019)</b>
EMNIST	FEDAVG	0.666(0.032)	0.054(0.014)	0.057(0.014)	0.062(0.014)	0.059(0.013)
	LOCAL	0.853(0.018)	0.852(0.018)	0.853(0.018)	0.852(0.018)	0.853(0.018)
	GLOBAL	0.710(0.010)	0.711(0.010)	0.732(0.010)	0.741(0.010)	0.762(0.010)
	DITTO	0.881(0.003)	0.487(0.003)	0.478(0.003)	0.502(0.001)	0.509(0.001)
	LP-PROJ-2	0.904(0.002)	0.863(0.002)	0.802(0.002)	0.884(0.001)	0.888(0.001)
	LP-PROJ-1	0.901(0.002)	0.874(0.002)	0.875(0.002)	0.884(0.001)	0.888(0.001)
	RFL	<b>0.934(0.003)</b>	<b>0.936(0.003)</b>	<b>0.936(0.002)</b>	<b>0.939(0.002)</b>	<b>0.941(0.002)</b>
SYNTHETIC(0,0)	FEDAVG	0.749(0.091)	0.553(0.139)	0.499(0.145)	0.431(0.129)	0.402(0.124)
	LOCAL	0.877(0.017)	0.873(0.018)	0.871(0.018)	0.857(0.018)	0.857(0.019)
	GLOBAL	0.470(0.064)	0.489(0.069)	0.523(0.074)	0.560(0.084)	0.570(0.086)
	DITTO	0.851(0.018)	0.851(0.018)	0.859(0.015)	0.861(0.014)	0.869(0.014)
	LP-PROJ-2	<b>0.940(0.002)</b>	0.916(0.004)	0.918(0.004)	0.911(0.005)	0.920(0.004)
	LP-PROJ-1	0.924(0.004)	0.914(0.005)	0.919(0.004)	0.911(0.005)	0.918(0.004)
	RFL	0.932(0.163)	<b>0.937(0.160)</b>	<b>0.939(0.148)</b>	<b>0.946(0.135)</b>	<b>0.943(0.159)</b>
SYNTHETIC(1,1)	FEDAVG	0.741(0.127)	0.533(0.168)	0.419(0.154)	0.381(0.140)	0.362(0.133)
	LOCAL	0.899(0.025)	0.901(0.025)	0.906(0.024)	0.890(0.026)	0.894(0.029)
	GLOBAL	0.160(0.046)	0.185(0.051)	0.195(0.056)	0.210(0.055)	0.244(0.063)
	DITTO	0.879(0.021)	0.875(0.021)	0.871(0.021)	0.878(0.018)	0.869(0.019)
	LP-PROJ-2	<b>0.949(0.013)</b>	0.910(0.016)	0.911(0.015)	0.909(0.017)	0.909(0.017)
	LP-PROJ-1	0.945(0.013)	0.915(0.016)	0.925(0.015)	0.923(0.017)	0.920(0.018)
	RFL	0.936(0.147)	<b>0.937(0.147)</b>	<b>0.938(0.140)</b>	<b>0.937(0.160)</b>	<b>0.920(0.140)</b>

Table 6. Complete test accuracy results under the attack of sign-flipping. (The numbers within parentheses represent the variance, and \* on the cell means in that case, the model will collapse.)

DATASET	METHODS	CLEAR	10%	20%	30%	40%
MNIST	FEDAVG	0.904(0.014)	0.395(0.052)	0.511(0.048)	*	*
	LOCAL	0.965(0.007)	0.966(0.007)	0.965(0.008)	0.962(0.009)	0.962(0.010)
	GLOBAL	0.874(0.101)	0.729(0.203)	0.808(0.102)	0.863(0.078)	0.763(0.140)
	DITTO	0.972(0.005)	0.930(0.010)	0.948(0.010)	*	*
	LP-PROJ-2	0.969(0.008)	0.971(0.008)	0.972(0.008)	*	*
	LP-PROJ-1	0.971(0.007)	0.969(0.008)	0.971(0.007)	0.968(0.007)	0.969(0.006)
	RFL	<b>0.977(0.005)</b>	<b>0.972(0.010)</b>	<b>0.973(0.006)</b>	<b>0.974(0.002)</b>	<b>0.981(0.03)</b>
CIFAR10	FEDAVG	0.377(0.048)	0.115(0.057)	0.123(0.055)	*	*
	LOCAL	0.852(0.028)	0.852(0.028)	<b>0.871(0.017)</b>	0.866(0.018)	0.866(0.019)
	GLOBAL	0.276(0.152)	0.293(0.157)	0.319(0.176)	0.320(0.152)	0.331(0.138)
	DITTO	<b>0.867(0.019)</b>	0.860(0.022)	0.854(0.024)	*	*
	LP-PROJ-2	0.866(0.021)	0.859(0.021)	0.857(0.019)	*	*
	LP-PROJ-1	<b>0.867(0.021)</b>	0.858(0.022)	0.860(0.020)	0.850(0.023)	0.853(0.017)
	RFL	<b>0.867(0.037)</b>	<b>0.872(0.031)</b>	<b>0.871(0.025)</b>	<b>0.875(0.025)</b>	<b>0.876(0.030)</b>
FASHIONMNIST	FEDAVG	0.762(0.069)	0.139(0.053)	0.172(0.052)	*	*
	LOCAL	0.966(0.010)	0.963(0.010)	0.965(0.011)	0.966(0.011)	0.967(0.012)
	GLOBAL	0.442(0.201)	0.449(0.208)	0.439(0.183)	0.578(0.230)	0.658(0.214)
	DITTO	<b>0.973(0.003)</b>	0.956(0.006)	0.939(0.015)	*	*
	LP-PROJ-2	0.969(0.004)	0.968(0.004)	0.968(0.003)	*	*
	LP-PROJ-1	0.969(0.004)	0.967(0.004)	0.967(0.003)	0.966(0.004)	0.965(0.005)
	RFL	0.969(0.032)	<b>0.969(0.020)</b>	<b>0.971(0.031)</b>	<b>0.971(0.023)</b>	<b>0.972(0.026)</b>
EMNIST	FEDAVG	0.666(0.032)	0.055(0.012)	0.058(0.011)	*	*
	LOCAL	0.853(0.018)	0.852(0.018)	0.853(0.018)	0.852(0.018)	0.853(0.018)
	GLOBAL	0.710(0.010)	0.732(0.010)	0.743(0.010)	0.756(0.010)	0.767(0.010)
	DITTO	0.881(0.003)	0.767(0.003)	0.718(0.003)	*	*
	LP-PROJ-2	0.904(0.002)	0.902(0.002)	0.904(0.002)	*	*
	LP-PROJ-1	0.901(0.002)	0.902(0.002)	0.905(0.002)	0.905(0.001)	0.903(0.001)
	RFL	<b>0.934(0.003)</b>	<b>0.934(0.003)</b>	<b>0.938(0.002)</b>	<b>0.939(0.002)</b>	<b>0.940(0.002)</b>
SYNTHETIC(0,0)	FEDAVG	0.749(0.091)	0.362(0.079)	0.321(0.071)	0.128(0.057)	*
	LOCAL	0.877(0.017)	0.873(0.018)	0.871(0.018)	0.857(0.018)	0.857(0.019)
	GLOBAL	0.470(0.064)	0.489(0.069)	0.523(0.074)	0.560(0.084)	0.565(0.092)
	DITTO	0.851(0.018)	0.849(0.018)	0.859(0.016)	0.832(0.023)	*
	LP-PROJ-2	<b>0.940(0.002)</b>	0.922(0.004)	0.925(0.003)	0.869(0.013)	*
	LP-PROJ-1	0.924(0.004)	0.922(0.004)	<b>0.940(0.003)</b>	0.857(0.015)	0.884(0.009)
	RFL	0.932(0.163)	<b>0.937(0.160)</b>	0.939(0.146)	<b>0.945(0.134)</b>	<b>0.950(0.131)</b>
SYNTHETIC(1,1)	FEDAVG	0.741(0.127)	0.317(0.089)	0.236(0.079)	0.113(0.046)	*
	LOCAL	0.899(0.025)	0.901(0.025)	0.906(0.024)	0.890(0.026)	0.894(0.029)
	GLOBAL	0.160(0.046)	0.185(0.051)	0.195(0.056)	0.210(0.055)	0.244(0.063)
	DITTO	0.879(0.021)	0.878(0.022)	0.871(0.022)	0.854(0.030)	*
	LP-PROJ-2	<b>0.949(0.013)</b>	0.920(0.008)	0.911(0.009)	0.862(0.024)	*
	LP-PROJ-1	0.945(0.013)	0.914(0.010)	0.910(0.009)	0.866(0.019)	0.876(0.013)
	RFL	0.936(0.147)	<b>0.938(0.133)</b>	<b>0.935(0.153)</b>	<b>0.938(0.161)</b>	<b>0.939(0.169)</b>

Table 7. Complete test accuracy results under the attack of Gaussian. (The numbers within parentheses represent the variance.)

DATASET	METHODS	CLEAR	10%	20%	30%	40%
MNIST	FEDAVG	0.904(0.014)	0.216(0.020)	0.208(0.021)	0.203(0.019)	0.205(0.022)
	LOCAL	0.965(0.007)	0.966(0.007)	0.965(0.008)	0.962(0.009)	0.962(0.010)
	GLOBAL	0.874(0.101)	0.744(0.134)	0.773(0.132)	0.786(0.120)	0.824(0.122)
	DITTO	0.972(0.005)	0.881(0.013)	0.879(0.015)	0.869(0.013)	0.862(0.014)
	LP-PROJ-2	0.969(0.008)	0.960(0.008)	0.961(0.008)	0.959(0.008)	0.953(0.009)
	LP-PROJ-1	0.971(0.007)	0.962(0.007)	0.962(0.010)	0.962(0.008)	0.963(0.008)
	RFL	<b>0.977(0.005)</b>	<b>0.973(0.008)</b>	<b>0.972(0.009)</b>	<b>0.973(0.006)</b>	<b>0.977(0.003)</b>
CIFAR10	FEDAVG	0.377(0.048)	0.131(0.018)	0.146(0.024)	0.147(0.026)	0.158(0.029)
	LOCAL	0.852(0.028)	0.852(0.028)	<b>0.871(0.017)</b>	0.866(0.018)	0.866(0.019)
	GLOBAL	0.276(0.152)	0.290(0.181)	0.309(0.157)	0.331(0.146)	0.311(0.146)
	DITTO	<b>0.867(0.019)</b>	0.814(0.048)	0.815(0.045)	0.815(0.042)	0.820(0.042)
	LP-PROJ-2	0.866(0.021)	0.822(0.034)	0.822(0.033)	0.821(0.024)	0.820(0.025)
	LP-PROJ-1	<b>0.867(0.021)</b>	0.823(0.031)	0.822(0.032)	0.819(0.026)	0.820(0.026)
	RFL	<b>0.867(0.037)</b>	<b>0.872(0.030)</b>	<b>0.871(0.026)</b>	<b>0.876(0.028)</b>	<b>0.876(0.024)</b>
FASHIONMNIST	FEDAVG	0.762(0.069)	0.183(0.046)	0.205(0.044)	0.181(0.047)	0.174(0.044)
	LOCAL	0.966(0.010)	0.963(0.010)	0.965(0.011)	0.966(0.011)	0.967(0.012)
	GLOBAL	0.442(0.201)	0.395(0.208)	0.408(0.218)	0.545(0.172)	0.634(0.210)
	DITTO	<b>0.973(0.003)</b>	0.814(0.044)	0.803(0.056)	0.827(0.049)	0.853(0.057)
	LP-PROJ-2	0.969(0.004)	0.960(0.005)	0.968(0.004)	0.965(0.004)	0.960(0.005)
	LP-PROJ-1	0.969(0.004)	0.959(0.005)	0.959(0.004)	0.964(0.004)	0.960(0.005)
	RFL	0.969(0.032)	<b>0.967(0.024)</b>	<b>0.970(0.020)</b>	<b>0.971(0.021)</b>	<b>0.972(0.024)</b>
EMNIST	FEDAVG	0.666(0.032)	0.063(0.001)	0.064(0.001)	0.058(0.002)	0.057(0.001)
	LOCAL	0.853(0.018)	0.852(0.018)	0.853(0.018)	0.852(0.018)	0.853(0.018)
	GLOBAL	0.710(0.010)	0.730(0.010)	0.726(0.010)	0.744(0.008)	0.771(0.010)
	DITTO	0.881(0.003)	0.618(0.003)	0.599(0.003)	0.584(0.001)	0.582(0.001)
	LP-PROJ-2	0.904(0.002)	0.588(0.002)	0.588(0.002)	0.561(0.001)	0.581(0.001)
	LP-PROJ-1	0.901(0.002)	0.851(0.002)	0.874(0.002)	0.881(0.001)	0.883(0.001)
	RFL	<b>0.934(0.003)</b>	<b>0.936(0.003)</b>	<b>0.938(0.002)</b>	<b>0.937(0.002)</b>	<b>0.941(0.002)</b>
SYNTHETIC(0,0)	FEDAVG	0.749(0.091)	0.191(0.045)	0.176(0.045)	0.184(0.042)	0.189(0.041)
	LOCAL	0.877(0.017)	0.873(0.018)	0.871(0.018)	0.857(0.018)	0.857(0.019)
	GLOBAL	0.470(0.064)	0.489(0.069)	0.523(0.074)	0.560(0.084)	0.565(0.092)
	DITTO	0.851(0.018)	0.795(0.039)	0.803(0.035)	0.814(0.032)	0.814(0.036)
	LP-PROJ-2	<b>0.940(0.002)</b>	0.897(0.007)	0.898(0.007)	0.902(0.007)	0.906(0.005)
	LP-PROJ-1	0.924(0.004)	0.892(0.007)	0.896(0.007)	0.893(0.008)	0.902(0.007)
	RFL	0.932(0.163)	<b>0.936(0.159)</b>	<b>0.939(0.145)</b>	<b>0.952(0.165)</b>	<b>0.950(0.132)</b>
SYNTHETIC(1,1)	FEDAVG	0.741(0.127)	0.181(0.051)	0.189(0.059)	0.195(0.054)	0.206(0.056)
	LOCAL	0.899(0.025)	0.901(0.025)	0.906(0.024)	0.890(0.026)	0.894(0.029)
	GLOBAL	0.160(0.046)	0.185(0.051)	0.195(0.056)	0.210(0.055)	0.244(0.063)
	DITTO	0.879(0.021)	0.847(0.040)	0.834(0.042)	0.820(0.044)	0.808(0.045)
	LP-PROJ-2	<b>0.949(0.013)</b>	0.898(0.012)	0.896(0.011)	0.898(0.011)	0.896(0.011)
	LP-PROJ-1	0.945(0.013)	0.897(0.013)	0.903(0.010)	0.891(0.012)	0.897(0.011)
	RFL	0.936(0.147)	<b>0.934(0.148)</b>	<b>0.935(0.150)</b>	<b>0.942(0.138)</b>	<b>0.939(0.157)</b>