

FLASH: Federated Learning Across Simultaneous Heterogeneities

Xiangyu Chang, Sk Miraj Ahmed, Basak Guler, Srikanth V. Krishnamurthy, Ananthram Swami, Samet Oymak, Amit K. Roy-Chowdhury

Abstract—The key premise of federated learning (FL) is to train ML models across a diverse set of data-owners (clients), without exchanging local data. An overarching challenge to this date is client heterogeneity, which may arise not only from variations in data distribution, but also in data quality, as well as compute/communication latency. An integrated view of these diverse and concurrent sources of heterogeneity is critical; for instance, low-latency clients may have poor data quality, and vice versa. In this work, we propose FLASH (Federated Learning Across Simultaneous Heterogeneities), a lightweight and flexible *client selection* algorithm that outperforms state-of-the-art FL frameworks under extensive sources of heterogeneity, by trading-off the statistical information associated with the client’s data quality, data distribution, and latency. FLASH is the first method, to our knowledge, for handling all these heterogeneities in a unified manner. To do so, FLASH models the learning dynamics through contextual multi-armed bandits (CMAB) and dynamically selects the most promising clients. Through extensive experiments, we demonstrate that FLASH achieves substantial and consistent improvements over state-of-the-art baselines—as much as 10% in absolute accuracy—thanks to its unified approach. Importantly, FLASH also outperforms federated aggregation methods that are designed to handle highly heterogeneous settings and even enjoys a performance boost when integrated with them.

Index Terms—Federated learning, Client heterogeneity, Client selection, Multi-armed Bandits, Noise-robust training, Communication

arXiv:2402.08769v1 [cs.LG] 13 Feb 2024

1 INTRODUCTION

Federated Learning (FL) is a distributed learning paradigm where multiple clients collaborate to train a model without exchanging raw data. Training is typically coordinated by a central server, who selects a subset of clients in each training round to update the (global) model [1], [2]. The selected clients train the model using their local data, and send their updates to the server, who then aggregates the local updates for the next training round. The process is repeated until convergence. In doing so, FL offers distinct advantages to conventional centralized learning paradigms, including enhanced privacy, reduced communication costs, and scalability [3]. On the other hand, FL also presents several unique challenges due to its distributed nature, most importantly handling heterogeneity across clients, ensuring fairness and robustness, and balancing global model accuracy and privacy. Practical challenges surrounding FL have motivated a growing body of work to improve the efficiency of optimization [3], [4], communication [5], [6], [7], and resource allocation [8], [9], as well as to address heterogeneity across the clients [10], [11], including recent work [12], [13], [14].

Client heterogeneity is a central challenge in FL which utilizes a diverse set of sources: Each client has unique characteristics in terms of its non-homogeneous label distribution [13], [15], unreliable label assignment [14], and latency [16], [17], [18]. Heterogeneity degrades model accuracy [16], [19], [20] and increases the time and resources required to achieve the desired performance [17], [18], [21]. This drives the need for schemes that account for and handle the differences among the participating clients. Existing research suggests that informed client selection can ameliorate the




Fig. 1: Problem setup for FLASH: Building upon the standard federated learning setup of a global model learned from updates from local clients, we consider the setting where the labels of the data at the clients are imprecise (mismatched colors for the labels), the distribution of the data classes across the clients is non-uniform (height of the bars for each label class at each client), and the latencies of clients are variable (e.g. diverse devices, varying communication distance, etc.). We term these variations as heterogeneities in the data. FLASH is built upon a contextual multi-armed bandit approach which selects the optimal set of users to update the global model with the context vectors of clients represent their various heterogeneities. The main steps (1-4) of FLASH are illustrated in the figure.

bias introduced by heterogeneity and speed up convergence [22]. Literature on FL heterogeneity can be divided into client aggregation methods [14], [15], [24], [25], [26], [27], and client selection methods [13], [16], [17], [18], [28], [29]. Among the latter, existing methods can handle mostly one or at most

| | FedAvg [23] | FedProx [15] | FedBiO [24] | FedDF [25] | FedNova [26] | SCAFFOLD [27] | RHFL [14] | Average |
|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|
| Random [23] | 41.9 ± 2.4 | 47.9 ± 2.5 | 50.4 ± 2.3 | 48.2 ± 2.7 | 51.4 ± 2.3 | 48.0 ± 2.6 | 53.2 ± 2.1 | 48.7 |
| Oort [17] | 42.6 ± 1.6 | 44.9 ± 1.8 | 46.8 ± 2.3 | 51.9 ± 1.7 | 49.5 ± 1.9 | 54.8 ± 2.1 | 57.0 ± 1.8 | 49.6 |
| PyramidFL [18] | 48.5 ± 2.1 | 49.3 ± 1.7 | 50.3 ± 1.4 | 51.3 ± 1.6 | 52.1 ± 1.8 | 49.9 ± 1.8 | 50.6 ± 1.5 | 50.3 |
| Restless bandit [28] | 42.8 ± 2.3 | 44.9 ± 3.1 | 42.9 ± 3.5 | 40.6 ± 2.7 | 43.3 ± 2.6 | 41.7 ± 2.7 | 47.3 ± 3.1 | 43.4 |
| Neural bandit [29] | 50.8 ± 2.1 | 54.5 ± 2.3 | 60.1 ± 2.3 | 47.8 ± 2.1 | 49.9 ± 1.6 | 51.5 ± 1.5 | 51.7 ± 1.6 | 52.3 |
| FedCor [13] | 55.5 ± 1.7 | 53.2 ± 1.7 | 49.4 ± 2.3 | 61.5 ± 2.4 | 58.7 ± 1.8 | 57.8 ± 1.8 | 60.2 ± 1.9 | 56.6 |
| FEEL [16] | 54.1 ± 1.5 | 49.0 ± 1.5 | 47.7 ± 1.8 | 49.3 ± 1.4 | 53.3 ± 1.9 | 53.0 ± 2.1 | 51.3 ± 1.4 | 51.1 |
| FLASH (Ours) | 56.6 ± 1.4 | 58.0 ± 1.6 | 61.2 ± 1.8 | 61.8 ± 1.5 | 57.9 ± 1.2 | 57.2 ± 1.4 | 60.5 ± 1.5 | 59.0 |

| | FedAvg [23] | FedProx [15] | FedBiO [24] | FedDF [25] | FedNova [26] | SCAFFOLD [27] | RHFL [14] | Average |
|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|
| Random [23] | 38.9 ± 2.2 | 45.7 ± 2.3 | 49.8 ± 2.5 | 47.6 ± 2.3 | 50.9 ± 2.6 | 47.0 ± 2.2 | 50.6 ± 2.1 | 47.2 |
| Oort [17] | 39.9 ± 2.4 | 42.3 ± 2.1 | 43.6 ± 1.6 | 48.8 ± 2.0 | 46.2 ± 1.8 | 53.7 ± 1.9 | 50.8 ± 2.1 | 46.4 |
| PyramidFL [18] | 44.4 ± 1.9 | 46.5 ± 2.1 | 47.1 ± 1.8 | 47.9 ± 1.7 | 50.0 ± 2.3 | 46.8 ± 2.1 | 48.3 ± 2.7 | 47.2 |
| Restless bandit [28] | 40.6 ± 2.5 | 41.3 ± 2.2 | 41.7 ± 2.4 | 38.3 ± 2.6 | 40.6 ± 2.3 | 37.6 ± 2.7 | 41.9 ± 3.2 | 40.3 |
| Neural bandit [29] | 47.6 ± 2.1 | 49.0 ± 2.6 | 46.7 ± 2.6 | 44.3 ± 2.1 | 52.2 ± 2.2 | 51.0 ± 2.1 | 48.8 ± 3.4 | 48.5 |
| FedCor [13] | 51.4 ± 2.1 | 54.8 ± 1.5 | 56.5 ± 1.5 | 59.9 ± 1.9 | 48.4 ± 2.2 | 47.8 ± 2.0 | 57.4 ± 1.6 | <u>53.7</u> |
| FEEL [16] | 50.4 ± 1.5 | 46.7 ± 1.2 | 43.2 ± 1.4 | 45.3 ± 1.9 | 51.0 ± 1.4 | 50.5 ± 1.4 | 48.9 ± 1.7 | 48.0 |
| FLASH (Ours) | 52.1 ± 1.6 | 58.3 ± 1.3 | 58.1 ± 1.4 | <u>58.8 ± 1.6</u> | 54.0 ± 1.5 | 53.2 ± 1.6 | <u>56.4 ± 1.4</u> | 55.8 |

TABLE 1: One of our main results: Combining selection-based algorithms with aggregation-based algorithms, we compare the performance of FLASH on FEMNIST dataset. Upper: 30% non-IIDness, Lower: 15% label noise. Rows are client selection strategies, columns are aggregation strategies. We highlighted the **best** and second best one in each column. The average shows that our client selection strategy works better than other selection strategies when combined with a variety of aggregation methods.

two types of heterogeneities [16], [17], [18]. Thus, while in real-world FL applications multiple heterogeneities coexist, existing client selection methods don’t account for diverse concurrent heterogeneities. There is also a need for client selection algorithms that can be seamlessly integrated with federated aggregation strategies with no loss in performance. These highlight a clear need for a new framework that can handle a range of heterogeneities while also being easily extensible. Motivated by this, we ask:

Q: How can we select clients systematically under diverse and concurrent sources of heterogeneity to facilitate faster training and better accuracy? Can we combine the benefits of our client selection method with existing aggregation methods?

Main contribution. Our algorithm FLASH addresses this problem by explicitly modeling the heterogeneous nature of each client as a client context. Context is represented as a feature vector that summarizes a client’s characteristics/metadata, e.g., distributional heterogeneity, label noise, and straggler latency, and is defined precisely in Section 2.3. FLASH utilizes context information to select clients based on Contextual Multi-Armed Bandits (CMAB): it treats each client as an arm and selects, in each round, the clients that yield the highest estimated improvement in the global optimization objective. Importantly, it can augment existing federated optimization schemes (as shown in Sec. 3.5) and leads to synergistic improvements. To summarize, FLASH has three key features to enable FL under heterogeneous environments with substantial performance gains.

- **Simultaneous and diverse heterogeneities:** FLASH addresses general heterogeneities across clients by explicitly modeling them as contextual variables. We consider latencies to the server, variations in label qualities, and distributional heterogeneity in data, and demonstrate FLASH’s *best of all worlds* performance in terms of latency and accuracy. We are not aware of other works that consider all these *simultaneous* sources of heterogeneity - an important step towards practical FL algorithms. Our approach facilitates optimal trade-offs

between diverse heterogeneities and is applicable to complex scenarios (e.g. clients that have low latency may not have good data quality and vice versa).

- **Contextual and interpretable framework:** FLASH incorporates a novel CMAB framework that employs contextual features to represent client heterogeneity and to predict the contributions of individual clients to the global accuracy. Extensive ablation studies show that FLASH is easy to interpret as it indeed automatically emphasizes the relevant contextual features as the nature and degree of heterogeneity changes (see ablation analysis in Section 3.5).

- **Significant Performance Improvement.** Through extensive experiments, we show that FLASH outperforms existing client selection methods, with up to **10% improvement** in accuracy over state-of-the-art baselines (see Figure 3(c)). Furthermore, when combined with various federated learning aggregation methods, FLASH delivers the best average performance, thereby demonstrating its utility as a generalized client selection strategy (see Table 2).

1.1 Related Works

Non-identical data distributions and label noise pose significant challenges to the efficiency and effectiveness of FL as stated by [19]. Heterogeneity in data is often prevalent when the clients are distributed, and the extent to which noise affects data can vary across clients. [30] suggested that client sampling can help mitigate the impact of these variabilities. In recent years, various client scheduling studies have been conducted using convex optimization techniques, such as those by Zeng et al. [31] and Ren et al. [16], demonstrating the feasibility of optimizing the performance of FL systems. In parallel, aggregation algorithms such as FedNova [26], SCAFFOLD [27], FedDC [12], FedProx [15], FedBiO [24], FedDF [25], RHFL [14] have been developed to mitigate the impact of the local model or label noise on the global model, resulting in better accuracy and faster convergence.

Client scheduling and client selection are also often used to optimize the performance of federated learning. During the training process of FL, planning the participation of clients in each round can effectively mitigate the performance degradation caused by the above heterogeneities. This includes reducing the impact of delays on training [16], [17], [18], [32], the impact of label noise on training [14], and the impact of non-uniform distribution on training [13], [16]. At the same time, the associated selection algorithms are also different, such as Multi-armed bandit [17], [18], [29], and Importance Sampling [16]. We remark that diverse heterogeneities can arise beyond federated learning, such as in multiclass datasets where individual classes (rather than clients) exhibit different statistics in terms of their sample size, label fraction, and label noise [33], [34], [35], [36].

The recent papers mentioned above are either focused on global aggregation [14], [15], [24], [25], [26], [27], [37], [38] *or* client selection [13], [16], [17], [18], [19], [28], [29]. However, in FL applications, we inevitably hope to holistically optimize both the client selection phase and the model aggregation phase, rather than just one aspect. Moreover, from the three heterogeneities mentioned above (non-IIDness, label noise, latency), these works only focus on one or two sources of heterogeneity. For example, the recent paper [13] analyzed client selection only in cases with heterogeneous data distribution. Not accounting for the plurality of heterogeneities holistically can lead to convergence times that are often lower than what could be viable if all the sources of heterogeneity were considered. This inspired us to design a comprehensive client selection strategy that can accommodate all of these challenges in a unified manner, through the design of “tunable” context vectors that automatically adapt to the type and degree of heterogeneity, as demonstrated through our experimental analysis.

2 METHODOLOGY: FLASH ALGORITHM

Our goal is to efficiently select clients to train a global model subject to multiple sources of client heterogeneity. The key idea of our client selection mechanism is that, in each round, the central server can use the contextual information of each client (defined precisely in Sec. 2.3) to select those that most improve the accuracy of the global model. Since the central server does not have a priori knowledge of the latencies of the various clients, the extent of diversity in their data/models, or the label noise at each client, it has to dynamically select the clients that most contribute to the global model, while de-emphasizing those causing a negative impact.

For such decision making problems, Multi-Armed Bandits (MAB) [39] provide a rich algorithmic framework to explore and exploit the informativeness of each client. Importantly, the client selection policy has to be determined concurrently with training, which renders approaches with higher sample complexity, such as reinforcement learning, infeasible, as it takes longer to learn complex policies. Indeed, experimentally, we find that more complex approaches (e.g. using neural net-based bandits rather than linear ones) can slow down optimization and even harm eventual accuracy (see Fig 4). These motivates us to choose a sample-efficient contextual MAB (CMAB) framework. Our approach

can rapidly adapt to the federated optimization dynamics by incorporating client’s heterogeneity statistics as well as its prior reward, i.e., history information, in its context vector (see Section 2.3). *The resulting general-purpose CMAB-based approach addresses all of the heterogeneities with state-of-the-art competitiveness.*

We first describe the context-aware client selection process (Sec. 2.1), followed by the noise robust training process (Sec. 2.2), and then define the context vector precisely (Sec 2.3).

2.1 Contextual MAB with Thompson-Sampling

The MAB problem is one of the flagship decision-making problems, where a learner should decide, in each time slot, which arm to pull [40], where an arm pull refers to an action, and a reward (payoff) is observed upon taking an action. A MAB problem aims to make sequential decisions to maximize the total reward obtained from a sequence of actions. For client-selection, the core of the MAB problem is to achieve a good exploration-exploitation tradeoff and quickly identify the most beneficial clients.

Let us denote the set of clients by $[m] := \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. Let \mathcal{S}_t be the set of all feasible subsets of arms, that correspond to clients in $[m]$, in round t . Let M_t be the number of clients to select in round t . Each set of arms $S \in \mathcal{S}_t$, with cardinality $|S| = M_t$, is called a super arm. At round t , a learner observes m d -dimensional context vectors (which will be defined in the following section) $\{\mathbf{x}_t(1), \dots, \mathbf{x}_t(m)\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ corresponding to the m arms. Then, the learner is asked to choose a super arm $S_t \in \mathcal{S}_t$ to play. Once a super arm S_t is played, the learner observes the rewards of the arms $\mathbf{r}_t = \{r_t(i)\}_{i \in S_t}$ and receives a total reward of $R_t(S_t) = \sum_{i \in S_t} r_t(i)$. For linear bandits, the expected reward of each arm $i \in [m]$ is linear in the context vector and follows

$$\mathbb{E}[r_t(i) \mid \mathbf{x}_t(i)] = \boldsymbol{\theta}_*^\top \mathbf{x}_t(i). \quad (1)$$

Here $\boldsymbol{\theta}_*$ is a parameter unknown to the learner. This linear model provides a reasonable first-order approximation for combining the contextual variables. Note that one can alternatively employ more expressive kernel or neural contextual bandits [41] as the base CMAB approach in FLASH (Algorithm 1). In Sec 3.5, we compare neural and linear bandits, which reveals that linear FLASH is just as accurate *and* converges up to two times faster. Indeed, since FLASH learns the bandit model on-the-fly, it is perhaps not surprising that a less complex linear model is preferable. Thus, our exposition follows the linear CMAB.

The goal of the learner is to maximize its expected cumulative reward $\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t \in [n]} R_t(S_t) \right]$ without knowing $\boldsymbol{\theta}_*$. Since $\boldsymbol{\theta}_*$ is unknown and should be estimated on-the-fly, a typical approach is to construct a confidence interval for the true parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}_*$, which motivates us to use the *Thompson Sampling* (TS, [42]) algorithm. Till round t , the confidence interval is constructed from the context matrices $(\mathbf{X}_k)_{k=0}^t$, each of dimension $\mathbb{R}^{M_k \times d}$ (the rows of \mathbf{X}_k are the context vectors of arms selected in round k) and observed rewards of the selected arms $\mathbf{r}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{M_k}$ from previous rounds $k \leq t$. We arrange all \mathbf{r}_k and \mathbf{X}_k vertically into a concatenated vector $\mathbf{r}_t^{\text{all}} \in \mathbb{R}^M$ and matrix $\mathbf{X}_t^{\text{all}} \in \mathbb{R}^{M^{(t)} \times d}$. Here $M^{(t)} = \sum_{k=0}^t M_k$ is the total sample size at round t .

Algorithm 1 FLASH: Heterogeneity-aware Client Selection

```

1: Input: Initial model  $w^0$ , Initial MAB parameter  $\hat{\theta}_0 = 0$ ,
   # of rounds  $n$ , Local datasets  $(\mathcal{T}_i, \mathcal{V}_i)_{i=1}^m$ , Local training
   epochs  $(\mathcal{E}_i)_{i=1}^m$ , # of clients to select  $(M_t)_{t=0}^n$ ,  $S_0 = [m]$ ,
   Exploration strength  $\alpha \geq 0$ 
2: Output: Final model  $w^n$ 
3: for rounds  $t = 0, 1, \dots, n - 1$  do
4:   Server: Send  $w^t$  to all clients  $i \in [m]$ 
5:   for client  $i \in S_t$  do
6:     Download global model  $w^t$ 
7:      $w_i^{t+1} \leftarrow \text{LocalTraining}(w^t, \mathcal{T}_i, \mathcal{E}_i)$ 
8:     Calculate the transmission + training time  $\tau$ 
9:      $x_{t+1}(i) \leftarrow \text{GetContext}(\mathcal{V}_i, \mathcal{T}_i, \tau)$ 
10:  end for
11:   $\text{FedAvg}: w^{t+1} \leftarrow \sum_{i \in S_t} (N_i/N) w_i^{t+1}$ 
12:   $X_{t+1} \leftarrow (x_{t+1}(i))_{i \in S_t}$ 
13:   $r_{t+1} \leftarrow \text{GlobalModelEvaluation}(\mathcal{V}, w^{t+1})$ 
14:   $X_{t+1}^{\text{all}} \leftarrow (X_{t+1}, X_t^{\text{all}})$ ,  $r_{t+1}^{\text{all}} \leftarrow (r_{t+1}, r_t^{\text{all}})$ 
15:   $\text{scores}_t, \hat{\theta}_{t+1} \leftarrow \text{TSSCORES}(X_{t+1}^{\text{all}}, r_{t+1}^{\text{all}}, \lambda, \hat{\theta}_t)$ 
16:   $S_{t+1} \leftarrow \text{top\_}M_{t+1}\text{\_indices}(\text{scores}_t)$ 
17: end for
18: return Final model  $w^n$ 
19: // Final model is evaluated on a global test dataset  $\mathcal{G}$ 

```

Algorithm 2 TSSCORES: Thompson Sampling-based client scores

```

1: Input: Data  $\{x_i\}_{i \in S_t}, \{r_i\}_{i \in S_t}$ , current parameter  $V, b$ ,
   exploration strength  $\alpha \geq 0$ 
2: Output: Client selection scores  $\in \mathbb{R}^m$ 
3:  $V \leftarrow V + \sum_{i \in S_t} x_i x_i^\top$ 
4:  $b \leftarrow b + \sum_{i \in S_t} r_i x_i$ 
5:  $\hat{\theta} \leftarrow V^{-1} b$ 
6:  $\hat{\theta}_{\text{new}}$  is sampled from  $\mathcal{N}(\hat{\theta}, \alpha^2 V^{-1})$ 
7: for all clients  $i \in [m]$  do
8:    $x(i) \leftarrow \text{GetContext}(\mathcal{V}_i, \mathcal{T}_i)$ 
9:    $\text{scores}(i) \leftarrow \hat{\theta}_{\text{new}}^\top x(i)$ 
10: end for
11: return scores,  $\hat{\theta}_{\text{new}}$ 

```

Thompson Sampling Procedure (Algorithm 2). At time t , we need to choose S_t based on the context vectors $x_t(i)$ and the history of all previous choices until time $t-1$ namely $\{(S_\tau)_{\tau=1}^{t-1}, X_{t-1}^{\text{all}}, r_{t-1}^{\text{all}}\}$. Let $\lambda \geq 0$ be the regularization strength. Using $(X_{t-1}^{\text{all}}, r_{t-1}^{\text{all}})$, we estimate θ_* via ridge regression to choose $\hat{\theta}_t$ as:

$$\hat{\theta}_t = V_t^{-1} X_{t-1}^{\text{all}\top} r_{t-1}^{\text{all}} \quad \text{where } V_t = X_{t-1}^{\text{all}\top} X_{t-1}^{\text{all}} + \lambda I. \quad (2)$$

To proceed, Thompson Sampling uses a Gaussian prior and models the likelihood of reward $r_t(i)$ as a normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(\hat{\theta}_t^\top x_t(i), \alpha_t^2)$ with $\alpha_t = \lambda^{1/2} + \sqrt{d \ln(\frac{1+t}{\delta})}$ [43], where δ is a confidence hyperparameter in the range $(0, 1)$. Similarly, the distribution of θ at time t is modeled as $\mathcal{N}(\hat{\theta}_t, \alpha_t^2 V_t^{-1})$. We draw a sample $\hat{\theta}_{\text{new}}$ from this distribution to score clients by estimating their expected rewards.

Selecting new clients. After obtaining the arm scores $\hat{r}_t(i) = x_t(i)^\top \hat{\theta}_{\text{new}}$ derived from the clients' context vectors for $1 \leq i \leq m$, the central server selects clients based on these scores, i.e., S_t is the set of clients with the top M_t

scores. It then updates the global model by aggregating the model updates from these clients. During runtime, to save computational overhead, it computes the variables $\hat{\theta}_t$ and V_t in (2) incrementally as more data arrives in subsequent rounds. Algorithms 1 and 2 depict the pseudo-code of the algorithm. It can be seen that the intermediate variable V is computed using the entire set of context vectors X^{all} that come from **all** the previous selections. However, the matrix multiplication can be computationally costly as X^{all} grows, and most of the computations in this matrix multiplication are unnecessary. An alternative and more efficient way to implement this is to introduce two global variables V and b (which are of fixed sizes), and instead of updating V as $V \leftarrow X^{\text{all}\top} X^{\text{all}} + \lambda I$, a more efficient way to update is to set $V_0 \leftarrow \lambda I$ update with $V_{t+1} \leftarrow V_t + \sum_{i \in S_t} x_i x_i^\top$

Properties of FLASH. Here we discuss a few important properties of the proposed framework. In FLASH, the actions (i.e., the selected clients) affect the global model and hence, both the reward as well as the context vectors change in the next round. As such, FLASH learns the best client selection policy under a given set of contexts, but as the context vector of each client changes over time, the *best clients* are not fixed, and may change over time. This is unlike conventional contextual multi-armed bandit settings [44], where the actions do not affect the context in the next round. When FLASH samples a client a sufficient number of times (i.e., model learns from that client), the context vector of that client changes (e.g., the local loss decreases), and the algorithm becomes more likely to select a different client. By doing so, FLASH avoids selecting only a fixed set of clients throughout the training. This is in line with the objective of the underlying learning task, that is, after a sufficient number of rounds, selecting the same client becomes *less useful* from a learning perspective. As such, FLASH provides a flexible and efficient solution for client selection.

2.2 Noise Robust Training

FLASH does not assume that the dataset used for training is correctly labeled. To reduce the impact of noisy labels on the global model, pseudo-labeling techniques [45], [46] are applied in the design of FLASH. We measure model performance on both actual (possibly noisy) labels and pseudo-labels, and reduce overfitting on noisy labels with the help of Reverse Cross-Entropy [47]. This, in turn, affects the elements of the context vector defined in Sec. 2.3.

For a K -class classification problem with noisy labels, for a certain dataset \mathcal{D} (where $\mathcal{D} = \{a^i, y^i\}_{i=1}^n$, denoting $a \in \mathcal{X}$ as the input features, and $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ as the corresponding label), we aim to learn a classifier $p(\cdot; w^t) : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ parameterized by w^t . At each FL training round t , on the local dataset $\mathcal{D}_{i=1}^m = (\mathcal{T}_i, \mathcal{V}_i)_{i=1}^m$, we generate pseudo-labels $z := \arg \max_k [p(a; w^t)]_k, z \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ for the data samples from local training set $(a, \cdot) \in \mathcal{T}_i$, and denote these (a, z) pairs as \mathcal{P}_i . The local model performs parameter updates by minimizing a certain (specified below) loss function \mathcal{L} on the local dataset \mathcal{D}_i :

$$\min_{w_i^t} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_i|} \sum_{(a, y) \in \mathcal{D}_i} \mathcal{L}(p(a; w_i^t), y).$$

The loss function used by FLASH takes advantage of the noise robustness brought by pseudo-labeling, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L}_{robust}(\mathcal{D}_i) = \mathcal{L}_{CE}(\mathcal{T}_i) + \alpha \mathcal{L}_{CE}(\mathcal{P}_i) + \beta \mathcal{L}_{RCE}(\mathcal{T}_i, \mathcal{P}_i).$$

For a certain data sample (\mathbf{a}, y) , the Reverse cross-entropy loss \mathcal{L}_{RCE} and the the regular cross-entropy loss \mathcal{L}_{CE} , are defined as

$$\mathcal{L}_{RCE}(\mathbf{a}, y) = - \sum_{k=1}^K [p(\mathbf{a}; \mathbf{w}_i^t)]_k \log[y]_k,$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{CE}(\mathbf{a}, y) = - \sum_{k=1}^K [y]_k \log[p(\mathbf{a}; \mathbf{w}_i^t)]_k,$$

where $[\cdot]_k$ is the k -th entry of the vector. As the ground truth distribution $[y]_k$ is now inside of the logarithm, this could cause computational problems when labels are one-hot. To solve this issue, we define $\log 0 = A$ [47], where $A < 0$ is some constant. We will show the performance of FLASH for some (α, β, A) combinations in Sec. 3.3, and we'll show how to determine optimal (α, β, A) .

2.3 Reward and Context Vector for FLASH

Reward function of FLASH. We define the *average pseudo-label CE loss change rate* as the reward of the contextual MAB. The expression for the reward is

$$r_t = \frac{|\mathcal{L}_{robust}^t - \mathcal{L}_{robust}^{t-1}|}{\tau_{t-1}}.$$

τ is round duration and is defined below.

Context vector of FLASH. We now describe the elements used to construct the context vector (for client i in round t): $\mathbf{x}_t(i) = [\mathcal{L}_{robust}^t / \mathcal{L}_{robust}^1, \mathcal{L}_{CE}^t(\mathcal{V}) / \mathcal{L}_{CE}^1(\mathcal{V}), \tau_{t-1}, r_{t-1}]$.

- **Local training loss** $\mathcal{L}_{robust}^t / \mathcal{L}_{robust}^1$. We normalize the training loss at time t with the training loss at the first round, to reflect the relative change in training loss. Adaptive client selection that is cognizant of the training progress of clients is widely adopted. Such biased client selection strategies can accelerate error convergence in heterogeneous environments by preferentially selecting clients with higher local loss values. This idea has been explored in recent empirical studies [48], [49]. [50] present the first convergence analysis of FL with biased client selection that is cognizant of the training progress at each client.
- **Local validation loss** $\mathcal{L}_{CE}^t(\mathcal{V}) / \mathcal{L}_{CE}^1(\mathcal{V})$. We randomly sample 10% of the local samples in each client dataset as the local validation set. It does not participate in local training and equips us with a less biased performance estimate compared to training loss while minimally harming the training process. Additionally the gap between validation and training loss provides a measure of overfitting, as well as a proxy for data heterogeneity of the client.
- **Duration** τ_{t-1} . In cross-device contexts, lightweight clients with more examples take longer to compute/transmit, leading to latencies. We simulated runtimes duration for federated algorithms using a shifted-exponential distribution, similar to models used in distributed systems. [51], [52].

- **Previous reward** r_{t-1} . At each CMAB round, we set the observed reward of the previous round as a context vector element. This way the remaining elements only need to predict the relative reward change making the prediction of CMAB more accurate. In light of reinforcement learning, previous reward can be perceived as a *state*, thus making FLASH more RL-like while preserving its simplicity. Existing MAB algorithms based on residual bootstrap exploration [53], [54] also theoretically show that prediction of the linear bandit reward residual is beneficial for the MAB convergence and reducing regrets.

3 EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION

We analyze the performance of FLASH under different conditions. This section, first, describes the datasets used in the evaluation and how to model heterogeneity. Thereafter, we present the main results and analyze performance in terms of heterogeneity, generalizability and ablation analysis. In all experiments and for all algorithms, we report the *early-stop accuracy* that the model achieves during federated optimization (over all epochs).

3.1 Datasets, Heterogeneity Models, and Baselines

Datasets. We will demonstrate the performance of FLASH with two datasets that have been widely used to evaluate model performance in other relevant efforts on FL. **CIFAR-10** [55]: CIFAR-10 is a labeled dataset that consists of 60,000 32x32 colour images in 10 classes, with 6,000 images per class. There are 50,000 training images and 10,000 test images.

FEMNIST [56]: Federated Extended MNIST (FEMNIST) is a hand-written digits dataset built by partitioning the data in Extended MNIST based on the writer of the digit. It consists of 62 different classes (10 digits, 26 lowercase, 26 uppercase), and 28x28 (optionally 128x128) images.

Modeling Heterogeneity. Heterogeneity is modeled in terms of the dataset distribution, label noise and latencies. We explain below how these are implemented in our experiments.

"Non-IIDness" refers to a non-homogeneous distribution of data across clients. In the non-IID CIFAR-10 and FEMNIST experiments, a percentage of clients are made heterogeneous by assigning a dominant class of data distribution to *determine the non-IIDness*. For these clients, 80% of the data come from a certain class, while the remaining 20% come from other classes, whereas homogeneous clients have the uniform label distribution.

To capture the effect of label noise on FL, some correct labels are replaced with other labels in the dataset. The noise ratio, which is random for each client, is controlled by the ratio α/β in a Beta distribution parameterized as $B(\alpha, \beta)$, which takes values on the $[0,1]$ interval. We call this ratio the "Noise level" and use it to control the proportion of noisy labels. This follows the approach in some other works (e.g., [57], [58]) which use the Beta distribution as an appropriate representation of the noise.

We perform numerical simulations to study the impact of latency on the convergence of the global model. We assume that the execution time of each device follows the shift exponential distribution [59], [60].

| | FedAvg [23] | FedProx [15] | FedBiO [24] | FedDF [25] | FedNova [26] | SCAFFOLD [27] | RHFL [14] | Average |
|----------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|------------|--------------|---------------|------------|---------|
| Random [23] | 57.1 ± 2.4 | 64.3 ± 2.5 | 65.2 ± 2.7 | 65.5 ± 3.5 | 67.8 ± 3.2 | 69.3 ± 2.6 | 64.7 ± 2.7 | 64.8 |
| Oort [17] | 65.3 ± 1.6 | 66.5 ± 1.4 | 67.2 ± 1.1 | 70.1 ± 1.2 | 67.2 ± 1.1 | 69.0 ± 1.4 | 65.2 ± 1.4 | 67.2 |
| PyramidFL [18] | 67.1 ± 1.1 | 68.7 ± 1.0 | 69.1 ± 1.3 | 68.0 ± 1.5 | 69.3 ± 1.3 | 70.1 ± 1.6 | 66.5 ± 1.2 | 68.4 |
| Restless bandit [28] | 66.6 ± 2.9 | 63.2 ± 2.2 | 66.1 ± 2.5 | 67.6 ± 2.4 | 62.4 ± 2.3 | 63.2 ± 1.6 | 64.3 ± 2.0 | 64.7 |
| Neural bandit [29] | 69.3 ± 2.6 | 71.2 ± 1.8 | 69.3 ± 2.3 | 70.4 ± 2.4 | 69.0 ± 2.1 | 71.8 ± 2.2 | 65.9 ± 2.5 | 69.6 |
| FedCor [13] | 70.1 ± 1.4 | 73.2 ± 1.5 | 73.8 ± 1.2 | 69.5 ± 1.6 | 71.8 ± 1.6 | 72.8 ± 1.4 | 64.8 ± 1.6 | 70.8 |
| FEEL [16] | 65.5 ± 1.1 | 69.4 ± 1.5 | 67.3 ± 1.6 | 69.7 ± 1.3 | 70.4 ± 1.4 | 64.6 ± 1.2 | 65.3 ± 1.5 | 67.4 |
| FLASH (Ours) | 70.3 ± 1.1 | 71.6 ± 1.3 | 72.7 ± 1.2 | 72.2 ± 1.1 | 73.5 ± 1.4 | 73.7 ± 1.3 | 69.2 ± 1.3 | 71.8 |

| | FedAvg [23] | FedProx [15] | FedBiO [24] | FedDF [25] | FedNova [26] | SCAFFOLD [27] | RHFL [14] | Average |
|----------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|------------|--------------|---------------|------------|---------|
| Random [23] | 57.6 ± 2.7 | 61.1 ± 3.1 | 61.3 ± 3.4 | 60.3 ± 2.5 | 59.6 ± 3.1 | 57.2 ± 2.2 | 68.3 ± 2.4 | 60.8 |
| Oort [17] | 61.4 ± 1.8 | 66.8 ± 1.4 | 66.4 ± 1.2 | 67.6 ± 1.3 | 65.8 ± 1.2 | 66.3 ± 1.5 | 69.4 ± 1.4 | 66.3 |
| PyramidFL [18] | 63.9 ± 1.2 | 66.1 ± 1.1 | 65.7 ± 1.2 | 64.5 ± 1.4 | 65.7 ± 1.4 | 66.6 ± 1.6 | 70.0 ± 1.3 | 66.0 |
| Restless bandit [28] | 60.5 ± 3.0 | 60.7 ± 2.6 | 64.1 ± 2.4 | 58.9 ± 2.3 | 54.3 ± 1.9 | 60.2 ± 1.6 | 69.0 ± 2.1 | 61.1 |
| Neural bandit [29] | 63.6 ± 2.4 | 68.7 ± 2.2 | 66.8 ± 2.4 | 63.4 ± 2.1 | 67.6 ± 2.0 | 68.2 ± 1.7 | 71.4 ± 2.5 | 67.1 |
| FedCor [13] | 66.6 ± 1.5 | 71.4 ± 1.3 | 66.4 ± 1.2 | 63.6 ± 1.8 | 67.9 ± 1.4 | 70.3 ± 1.7 | 69.1 ± 1.8 | 67.9 |
| FEEL [16] | 62.5 ± 1.4 | 64.9 ± 1.7 | 59.2 ± 1.5 | 67.0 ± 1.6 | 65.5 ± 2.1 | 62.3 ± 2.3 | 71.5 ± 1.5 | 64.7 |
| FLASH (Ours) | 68.2 ± 1.2 | 69.0 ± 1.4 | 71.5 ± 1.4 | 72.2 ± 1.2 | 69.8 ± 1.3 | 71.9 ± 1.4 | 74.2 ± 1.5 | 70.9 |

TABLE 2: This table is same as above however evaluations are on CIFAR dataset.




Fig. 2: Best global model test accuracy on CIFAR10 (a-b) and FEMNIST (c-d) dataset for different selection algorithms (with FedAvg aggregation) as the noise level (a,c), and non-IIDness of the data distribution (a,d) are varied.

Baseline methods. As mentioned earlier, the existing methods for optimizing FL can be mainly divided into two categories: aggregation methods, which aim to design better optimization methods for model aggregation [25], [26], [27] and reduce the influence of client drift [14], [15], [24]; and selection methods, which aim to select clients in each round based on their contribution to the global model [16], [29], to lower client drift [13], and to reduce communication delay [17], [18]. We consider all possible combinations of recent client selection strategies with aggregation strategies and compare with FLASH.

3.2 Early stopping

We compare the performance of early stopping of different algorithms at the optimal round that maximizes their test

accuracies. This requires hindsight knowledge of the test accuracy which may not be available in practice. Here, we will demonstrate that FLASH enables an intelligent early-stop criterion, which can automatically halt at a near-optimal point.

As shown in Section 2.1, FLASH permits the number of participating clients M_t to vary with each round t . When the communication or data quality is poor, fixing the number of participating clients in each round (i.e., $M_{t+1} = M_t = \dots = M_0$) may affect the accuracy and convergence speed of the model. To address this issue, we propose the following early-stop criteria:

1. Calculate the Thompson sampling score $\text{score}_t(i) = \hat{\theta}_t^\top x_t(i)$ for each client at each round t .
2. If the prediction for a client is smaller than the actual next-




Fig. 3: Heatmaps demonstrate the best test accuracy that FLASH and FedCor (state-of-the-art) can achieve under varying levels of combination of two heterogeneities with FedAvg aggregation: (a) FLASH, (b) FedCor, and (c) FLASH-FedCor. The larger the area of the red and orange regions, the better the corresponding algorithm performs on more heterogeneities. The advantage of FLASH over FedCor is more visible when the problem involves both label noise and non-IIDness. The improvement is 3.76% improvement on average over all noise/non-IID levels and can be more than 10%.




Fig. 4: (a-b) Test accuracy for FLASH (with FedAvg) applying different types of multi-armed bandits under different settings of heterogeneity on CIFAR dataset: (a) under noisy setting (b) under non-IID setting. These figures depict the training time required and the achieved global model accuracy when replacing FLASH’s linear bandit with other types of bandit. It is clear that FLASH achieves the same accuracy with far less training time. (c-d) Ablation studies of the context vector elements of FLASH (with FedAvg) on CIFAR: Best global model test accuracy as the (c) non-IIDness, (d) noise level of the data distribution is varied. These figures illustrate the potential performance degradation of the global model when specific context vector elements are removed.

round reward obtained by selecting it through FLASH for a consecutive number of rounds (denoted as N), i.e., $\text{score}_t(i) < r_{t+1}$, then the client will no longer be selected in the future rounds.

3. Stop the training and output the current global model when all clients have been stopped being selected based on the above rule.

The number of stopping rounds N typically ranges from 0.5% to 1% of the total number of rounds, depending on the dataset. In Fig. 5, we demonstrate that setting $N = 5$ for CIFAR10 and $N = 8$ for FEMNIST yields the best early stopping global model performance for a 1000-round FL training. We also demonstrate the performance of FLASH and FedCor as an example in Fig.5 under different levels of noise after training for 1000 rounds, and the degradation of performance due to overfitting to noisy labels, as well as the performance of FLASH with early stopping. It can be observed that FLASH with early stopping exhibits robustness to noisy labels [61].

For other algorithms without a designed early stopping strategy, we employed the following early stopping approach: we monitored their validation loss and training loss over consecutive rounds (same stopping rounds N as FLASH). If the validation loss consistently increased while the training loss kept decreasing during these rounds, we terminate the training process.

3.3 Different combinations of (α, β, A) in \mathcal{L}_{robust}

The loss function used by FLASH takes advantage of the noise robustness brought by pseudo-labeling and reverse cross-entropy (RCE), i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L}_{robust}(\mathcal{D}_i) = \mathcal{L}_{CE}(\mathcal{T}_i) + \alpha \mathcal{L}_{CE}(\mathcal{P}_i) + \beta \mathcal{L}_{RCE}(\mathcal{T}_i, \mathcal{P}_i).$$

There are three (hyper)parameters in this \mathcal{L}_{robust} , (α, β, A) , with α on the overfitting issue of CE while β for flexible exploration on the robustness of RCE [47]. $A < 0$ is a constant replacement for $\log 0 = A$ to avoid computational problems. However, in the \mathcal{L}_{robust} it can be shown that tuning β is relevant to A in a K -class classification:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{RCE}(\mathbf{a}, y) &= - \sum_{k=1}^K [p(\mathbf{a}; \mathbf{w}_i^t)]_k \log[y]_k \\ &= - [p(\mathbf{a}; \mathbf{w}_i^t)]_{k=y} \log 1 - \sum_{k \neq y} [p(\mathbf{a}; \mathbf{w}_i^t)]_k A \quad \text{It} \\ &= -A \sum_{k \neq y} [p(\mathbf{a}; \mathbf{w}_i^t)]_k \\ &= -A(1 - [p(\mathbf{a}; \mathbf{w}_i^t)]_{k=y}) \end{aligned}$$

can be seen from above that tuning A is equivalent to proportionally tuning β . Thus in the results we only tune β and α , and keep $A = -4$ fixed.

As for parameter α , setting a relatively large value of α can cause overfitting, while a relatively small value of α can alleviate overfitting in \mathcal{L}_{CE} . However, setting α to a very small value can lead to slow convergence, similar




Fig. 5: Test accuracy for FLASH (with early-stop criteria) and FedCor(SOTA) after 1000 rounds of FL training on varying label noise levels. Both the best accuracy these two algorithm can achieve and final global model accuracy are evaluated on (a) CIFAR10 (b) FEMNIST




Fig. 6: Test accuracy for FLUSH (with FedAvg), applying different combinations of (α, β) in $\mathcal{L}_{robust.A} = -4$ is fixed for all the dataset: (a-b) CIFAR10, (c-d) FEMNIST.

to using only \mathcal{L}_{RCE} as the loss function. Therefore, it is recommended to use a moderately large value of α , which can aid in convergence for challenging datasets such as FEMNIST.

As for parameter β , the choice of it is dependent on the challenge level of the dataset as well as the selection of α . On relatively easy datasets (e.g., CIFAR10), when α is appropriately chosen, the model will neither underfit nor overfit, and in this case, the selection of β does not significantly affect the training results, as shown in Fig. 6(b) for $\beta = 1, 2, 4$. However, when training on challenging datasets (e.g., FEMNIST) or when the parameter α is not properly selected resulting in model overfitting, the training results are more sensitive to the choice of β . This is shown in Fig. 6(b) for $\alpha = \beta = 1$ or in Fig. 6(d).

3.4 Latency-related discussion

We calculate simulated runtimes for federated algorithms using a version of the probabilistic straggler model referenced in [60]. In this model, each client's runtime is represented as a random variable, following a shifted exponential distribution [52], [60]. This modeling approach has been proven effective in depicting runtimes in specific applications, such as file queries in cloud storage systems [62] and mini-batch SGD within distributed computing systems [60].

We assume that the duration a client needs for local training is a fixed ratio based on the number of examples they have, added to an exponential random variable. To put it in formal terms, let N_i represent the count of examples with a specific client i , and T_i (in milliseconds) indicate the

time needed by client i for their local training. Then we assume that there exists $\alpha, \lambda \geq 0$ such that

$$T_i - \alpha N_i \sim \text{Exp} \frac{1}{\lambda N_i}$$

Where λ is the straggler parameter, and larger λ means larger expected client runtimes: recall that if $X \sim \text{Exp}(1/\lambda)$, then $\mathbf{E}[x] = \lambda$. Therefore, we assume that the expected runtime of client i equal αN plus some random variable whose expected value is λN . Since FLASH requires all clients to finish before updating its global model, we model the duration τ_t of round t as $\tau_t = \max_{i \in \mathcal{S}_t} \{T_i\}$

For simplicity, we assume $\alpha = 1$ in all experiments, and vary λ over $\{1, 10, 100\}$. Fig.7 shows that increasing the λ ratio, i.e., increasing latency, can slow down the convergence speed of the global model. By introducing the Duration context element, it can be seen that the convergence speed is significantly improved compared to FLASH without Duration. This improvement is more pronounced as the λ ratio increases. Fig. 7 demonstrates the effectiveness of the Duration context element in accelerating the convergence of the global model.

3.5 Results and Analysis

Generalizability of FLASH. In Tables 2 and 1, we compare the performance of FLASH with all possible combinations of recent client selection and aggregation methods. We see that FLASH, combined with different aggregation strategies, provides better average performance. While FedCor [13] gives better performance when combined with certain specific




Fig. 7: Test accuracy of FLASH on CIFAR10, under varying λ ratios that correspond to different levels of latency. We keep $\alpha = 1$ fixed. We analyze how λ affects the global model’s convergence speed and examine the impact of the `Duration` context element on FLASH given different dataset heterogeneities:(a-c) Under non-IID setting (d-f) Under noisy setting

aggregation strategies, it is not consistent across different aggregation strategies or heterogeneity conditions. Also, its average performance across different aggregation strategies is lower than FLASH on both datasets and heterogeneity conditions. This demonstrates the generalizability of FLASH. Results with other levels of heterogeneity are in the supplementary material and yield similar conclusions.

Analysis of heterogeneity levels. To demonstrate the capability of FLASH in handling various heterogeneity levels, we present the best global model test accuracy achieved by a number of recent algorithms under a single type heterogeneity (label noise or non-IIDness) (Fig. 2) and multiple types of heterogeneities simultaneously (Fig. 3). Fig. 3 is derived from Fig. 2 (for the CIFAR dataset) but presents multiple heterogeneities together as a heatmap. The numbers indicate the accuracy as reported in Fig. 2. We compare against a recent method [13] (which was the closest to FLASH as per Tables 2 and 1) and one of the earliest ones [23] in the FL literature. The larger the area of the red and orange regions, the better the corresponding algorithm performs on more heterogeneities. The figures reveal that although some algorithms (e.g., FedCor [13]) slightly outperform FLASH in specific heterogeneity setups, FLASH outperforms other algorithms where multiple heterogeneities exist (Fig. 3). This also adds additional evidence to the generalizability of FLASH.

Comparison against other bandit algorithms. As stated in Sec. 2, we adopt the linear contextual multi-armed bandit (MAB) based on Thompson Sampling [39], [63] for client selection. Compared to more complex MAB models, such as Neural Bandit [29], [64] and Restless Bandit [28], we need to balance the trade-off between computational efficiency and performance in FL client selection. To this end, we retain the context information and loss function defined

in Sec. 2 and replace the Linear Bandit with Neural Bandit [29] and Restless Bandit [28]. As shown in Fig. 4, replacing with more complex MAB algorithms does not benefit the global model performance of FL. Instead, it brings additional computational overhead (e.g., the need for extra estimation of the Markov transition matrix in [28]), slowing down the convergence speed of the model.

Ablation studies of context vector elements. In Section 2.3, we used the context vector of FLASH as the input of the MAB to establish the relationship between the context and reward, and used this to predict the reward that the next round of client selection will bring. This application implies that each context element plays an important role in the prediction. Local training and validation loss represent the fit of the client to the local dataset. Previous reward allows the linear MAB to only predict the relative reward changes for each round of FL, increasing the accuracy of the prediction. In Fig. 4, we remove one contextual element from the context vector for each curve and observe the performance degradation caused by this removal. It can be seen that local training loss is more important on noisy datasets due to its noise-robustness, while local validation loss plays a more important role in the non-IID setting. Previous round reward contributes to a stable improvement in global model test accuracy under various settings. Finally, in further experiments, we found that FLASH can also seamlessly address latency heterogeneity via the “Duration” feature of the context vector.

4 CONCLUSIONS

We have addressed an open, but critically important, problem in federated learning, namely how to simultaneously deal with multiple kinds of heterogeneities that arise across local clients. These include latencies, noisy labels at the clients, and

varying data distributions across the clients. We proposed FLASH – a flexible client selection algorithm that automatically incorporates rich contextual information associated with the heterogeneity at the clients via contextual multi-armed bandits. On two of the most commonly-used datasets, FLASH shows significant performance improvements over existing client selection methods, especially when multiple heterogeneities are present simultaneously. Moreover, we showed the generalizability of FLASH when combined with a variety of global aggregation methods.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Konečný, B. McMahan, and D. Ramage, “Federated optimization: Distributed optimization beyond the datacenter,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.03575*, 2015.
- [2] B. McMahan, E. Moore, D. Ramage, S. Hampson, and B. A. y Arcas, “Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data,” in *Artificial intelligence and statistics*. PMLR, 2017, pp. 1273–1282.
- [3] T. Li, A. K. Sahu, A. Talwalkar, and V. Smith, “Federated learning: Challenges, methods, and future directions,” *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 50–60, 2020.
- [4] W. Liu, L. Chen, Y. Chen, and W. Zhang, “Accelerating federated learning via momentum gradient descent,” *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, vol. 31, no. 8, pp. 1754–1766, 2020.
- [5] J. Hamer, M. Mohri, and A. T. Suresh, “Fedboost: A communication-efficient algorithm for federated learning,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 3973–3983.
- [6] J. Konečný, H. B. McMahan, F. X. Yu, P. Richtarik, A. T. Suresh, and D. Bacon, “Federated learning: Strategies for improving communication efficiency,” in *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems: Workshop on Private Multi-Party Machine Learning*, 2016.
- [7] J. Xu and H. Wang, “Client selection and bandwidth allocation in wireless federated learning networks: A long-term perspective,” *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 1188–1200, 2020.
- [8] L. U. Khan, S. R. Pandey, N. H. Tran, W. Saad, Z. Han, M. N. Nguyen, and C. S. Hong, “Federated learning for edge networks: Resource optimization and incentive mechanism,” *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 58, no. 10, pp. 88–93, 2020.
- [9] T. Li, M. Sanjabi, A. Beirami, and V. Smith, “Fair resource allocation in federated learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.10497*, 2019.
- [10] Z. Chai, H. Fayyaz, Z. Fayyaz, A. Anwar, Y. Zhou, N. Baracaldo, H. Ludwig, and Y. Cheng, “Towards taming the resource and data heterogeneity in federated learning,” in *2019 {USENIX} Conference on Operational Machine Learning (OpML 19)*, 2019, pp. 19–21.
- [11] M. G. Arivazhagan, V. Aggarwal, A. K. Singh, and S. Choudhary, “Federated learning with personalization layers,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.00818*, 2019.
- [12] L. Gao, H. Fu, L. Li, Y. Chen, M. Xu, and C.-Z. Xu, “Feddc: Federated learning with non-iid data via local drift decoupling and correction,” 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.11751>
- [13] M. Tang, X. Ning, Y. Wang, J. Sun, Y. Wang, H. Li, and Y. Chen, “Fedcor: Correlation-based active client selection strategy for heterogeneous federated learning,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2022, pp. 10 102–10 111.
- [14] X. Fang and M. Ye, “Robust federated learning with noisy and heterogeneous clients,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2022, pp. 10 072–10 081.
- [15] T. Li, A. K. Sahu, M. Zaheer, M. Sanjabi, A. Talwalkar, and V. Smith, “Federated optimization in heterogeneous networks,” 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1812.06127>
- [16] J. Ren, Y. He, D. Wen, G. Yu, K. Huang, and D. Guo, “Scheduling for cellular federated edge learning with importance and channel awareness,” *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 19, no. 11, pp. 7690–7703, 2020.
- [17] F. Lai, X. Zhu, H. V. Madhyastha, and M. Chowdhury, “Oort: Efficient federated learning via guided participant selection.” in *OSDI*, 2021, pp. 19–35.
- [18] C. Li, X. Zeng, M. Zhang, and Z. Cao, “Pyramidfl: A fine-grained client selection framework for efficient federated learning,” in *Proceedings of the 28th Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing And Networking*, 2022, pp. 158–171.
- [19] B. Xu, W. Xia, J. Zhang, T. Q. Quek, and H. Zhu, “Online client scheduling for fast federated learning,” *IEEE Wireless Communications Letters*, 2021.
- [20] W. Xia, W. Wen, K.-K. Wong, T. Q. Quek, J. Zhang, and H. Zhu, “Federated-learning-based client scheduling for low-latency wireless communications,” *IEEE Wireless Communications*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 32–38, 2021.
- [21] J. Perazzone, S. Wang, M. Ji, and K. S. Chan, “Communication-efficient device scheduling for federated learning using stochastic optimization,” in *IEEE INFOCOM 2022-IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 1449–1458.
- [22] H. Wang, Z. Kaplan, D. Niu, and B. Li, “Optimizing federated learning on non-iid data with reinforcement learning,” in *IEEE INFOCOM 2020-IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1698–1707.
- [23] H. B. McMahan, E. Moore, D. Ramage, S. Hampson, and B. A. y Arcas, “Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data,” in *Int. Conf. on Artificial Int. and Stat. (AISTATS)*, 2017, pp. 1273–1282.
- [24] J. Li, F. Huang, and H. Huang, “Communication-efficient federated bilevel optimization with local and global lower level problems,” 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.06701>
- [25] T. Lin, L. Kong, S. U. Stich, and M. Jaggi, “Ensemble distillation for robust model fusion in federated learning,” 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.07242>
- [26] J. Wang, Q. Liu, H. Liang, G. Joshi, and H. V. Poor, “Tackling the objective inconsistency problem in heterogeneous federated optimization,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 33, pp. 7611–7623, 2020.
- [27] S. P. Karimireddy, S. Kale, M. Mohri, S. Reddi, S. Stich, and A. T. Suresh, “Scaffold: Stochastic controlled averaging for federated learning,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 5132–5143.
- [28] M. Yemini, A. Leshem, and A. Somekh-Baruch, “The restless hidden markov bandit with linear rewards and side information,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 69, pp. 1108–1123, 2021.
- [29] H. Cao, Q. Pan, Y. Zhu, and J. Liu, “Birds of a feather help: Context-aware client selection for federated learning,” in *International Workshop on Trustable, Verifiable and Auditable Federated Learning in Conjunction with AAAI (FL-AAAI)*, 2022.
- [30] Y. Chen, X. Yang, X. Qin, H. Yu, B. Chen, and Z. Shen, “Focus: Dealing with label quality disparity in federated learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.11359*, 2020.
- [31] Q. Zeng, Y. Du, K. Huang, and K. K. Leung, “Energy-efficient radio resource allocation for federated edge learning,” in *2020 IEEE International Conference on Communications Workshops (ICC Workshops)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [32] S. Hong and J. Chae, “Communication-efficient randomized algorithm for multi-kernel online federated learning,” *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 44, no. 12, pp. 9872–9886, 2022.
- [33] A. K. Menon, S. Jayasumana, A. S. Rawat, H. Jain, A. Veit, and S. Kumar, “Long-tail learning via logit adjustment,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.07314*, 2020.
- [34] M. Li, X. Zhang, C. Thrampoulidis, J. Chen, and S. Oymak, “Autobalance: Optimized loss functions for imbalanced data,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 34, pp. 3163–3177, 2021.
- [35] X. Zhang, M. Li, J. Chen, C. Thrampoulidis, and S. Oymak, “Class-attribute priors: Adapting optimization to heterogeneity and fairness objective,” in *AAAI*, 2024.
- [36] B. Chen, S. Xia, Z. Chen, B. Wang, and G. Wang, “Rsmote: A self-adaptive robust smote for imbalanced problems with label noise,” *Information Sciences*, vol. 553, pp. 397–428, 2021.
- [37] X. Zhang, M. Li, X. Chang, J. Chen, A. K. Roy-Chowdhury, A. T. Suresh, and S. Oymak, “Fedyolo: Augmenting federated learning with pretrained transformers,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.04905*, 2023.
- [38] J. Sun, T. Chen, G. B. Giannakis, Q. Yang, and Z. Yang, “Lazily aggregated quantized gradient innovation for communication-efficient federated learning,” *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 44, no. 4, pp. 2031–2044, 2020.

- [39] M. N. Katehakis and H. Robbins, "Sequential choice from several populations." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, vol. 92, no. 19, p. 8584, 1995.
- [40] N. Cesa-Bianchi and P. Fischer, "Finite-time regret bounds for the multiarmed bandit problem." in *ICML*, vol. 98. Citeseer, 1998, pp. 100–108.
- [41] D. Zhou, L. Li, and Q. Gu, "Neural contextual bandits with ucb-based exploration," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 11 492–11 502.
- [42] S. Agrawal and N. Goyal, "Thompson sampling for contextual bandits with linear payoffs," in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2013, pp. 127–135.
- [43] Y. Gai, B. Krishnamachari, and R. Jain, "Combinatorial network optimization with unknown variables: Multi-armed bandits with linear rewards," 2010.
- [44] W. Chu, L. Li, L. Reyzin, and R. Schapire, "Contextual bandits with linear payoff functions," in *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2011, pp. 208–214.
- [45] D. Tanaka, D. Ikami, T. Yamasaki, and K. Aizawa, "Joint optimization framework for learning with noisy labels," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018, pp. 5552–5560.
- [46] K. Yi and J. Wu, "Probabilistic end-to-end noise correction for learning with noisy labels," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 7017–7025.
- [47] Y. Wang, X. Ma, Z. Chen, Y. Luo, J. Yi, and J. Bailey, "Symmetric cross entropy for robust learning with noisy labels," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2019, pp. 322–330.
- [48] J. Goetz, K. Malik, D. Bui, S. Moon, H. Liu, and A. Kumar, "Active federated learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.12641*, 2019.
- [49] X. Li, K. Huang, W. Yang, S. Wang, and Z. Zhang, "On the convergence of fedavg on non-iid data," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.02189*, 2019.
- [50] Y. J. Cho, J. Wang, and G. Joshi, "Towards understanding biased client selection in federated learning," in *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR, 2022, pp. 10 351–10 375.
- [51] C. Zhou, J. Liu, J. Jia, J. Zhou, Y. Zhou, H. Dai, and D. Dou, "Efficient device scheduling with multi-job federated learning," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 36, 2022, pp. 9971–9979.
- [52] Z. Charles, Z. Garrett, Z. Huo, S. Shmulyian, and V. Smith, "On large-cohort training for federated learning," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 34, pp. 20 461–20 475, 2021.
- [53] E. Mammen, "Bootstrap and wild bootstrap for high dimensional linear models," *The annals of statistics*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 255–285, 1993.
- [54] C.-H. Wang, Y. Yu, B. Hao, and G. Cheng, "Residual bootstrap exploration for bandit algorithms," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.08436*, 2020.
- [55] A. Krizhevsky, G. Hinton *et al.*, "Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images," *.*, 2009.
- [56] S. Caldas, S. M. K. Duddu, P. Wu, T. Li, J. Konečný, H. B. McMahan, V. Smith, and A. Talwalkar, "Leaf: A benchmark for federated settings," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.01097*, 2018.
- [57] D. Ortego, E. Arazo, P. Albert, N. E. O'Connor, and K. McGuinness, "Towards robust learning with different label noise distributions," in *2020 25th International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 7020–7027.
- [58] P. Albert, D. Ortego, E. Arazo, N. E. O'Connor, and K. McGuinness, "Addressing out-of-distribution label noise in webly-labelled data," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, 2022, pp. 392–401.
- [59] W. Shi, S. Zhou, and Z. Niu, "Device scheduling with fast convergence for wireless federated learning," in *ICC 2020-2020 IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [60] K. Lee, M. Lam, R. Pedarsani, D. Papailiopoulos, and K. Ramchandran, "Speeding up distributed machine learning using codes," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 1514–1529, 2017.
- [61] M. Li, M. Soltanolkotabi, and S. Oymak, "Gradient descent with early stopping is provably robust to label noise for overparameterized neural networks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.11680*, 2019.
- [62] G. Liang and U. C. Kozat, "Tofec: Achieving optimal throughput-delay trade-off of cloud storage using erasure codes," in *IEEE INFOCOM 2014-IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 826–834.
- [63] S. Agrawal and N. Goyal, "Analysis of thompson sampling for the multi-armed bandit problem," in *Conference on learning theory. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings*, 2012, pp. 39–1.
- [64] P. Xu, Z. Wen, H. Zhao, and Q. Gu, "Neural contextual bandits with deep representation and shallow exploration," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.01780*, 2020.