

# Quantized Hierarchical Federated Learning: A Robust Approach to Statistical Heterogeneity

Seyed Mohammad Azimi-Abarghouyi and Viktoria Fodor

## Abstract

This paper presents a novel hierarchical federated learning algorithm within multiple sets that incorporates quantization for communication-efficiency and demonstrates resilience to statistical heterogeneity. Unlike conventional hierarchical federated learning algorithms, our approach combines gradient aggregation in intra-set iterations with model aggregation in inter-set iterations. We offer a comprehensive analytical framework to evaluate its optimality gap and convergence rate, comparing these aspects with those of conventional algorithms. Additionally, we develop a problem formulation to derive optimal system parameters in a closed-form solution. Our findings reveal that our algorithm consistently achieves high learning accuracy over a range of parameters and significantly outperforms other hierarchical algorithms, particularly in scenarios with heterogeneous data distributions.

## Index Terms

Federated learning, hierarchical systems, quantization, statistical heterogeneity

## I. INTRODUCTION

Federated learning (FL) is the preferred solution for learning tasks, whenever the data collected by a group of clients is costly to collect, or data collection would raise privacy concerns [1], [2]. It is also an efficient approach to speed up the learning process, since learning is performed simultaneously at several clients [3]. FL can be implemented through peer-to-peer information exchange [4], [5], through a central server [1], or as recently suggested through a hierarchy of servers [3], [6]. This paper focuses on this last category, hierarchical FL.

In FL, the training data is distributed across the participating clients, either because each of the clients collects data individually, or because the data is distributed carefully to allow parallel processing. Clients perform one or more local learning round, and then exchange and

The authors are with the School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden (emails: {seyaa,vjfodor}@kth.se).

aggregate model parameters or gradients, directly, or via an edge server. In hierarchical FL, several edge servers collaborate, again via direct connections, or most typically by aggregating model parameters at the cloud server.

The use of this hierarchical structure has been proposed for and can be beneficial in several scenarios. The most obvious reason to implement hierarchical structures is the large geographic span of the involved clients. In wireless networks, a hierarchical structure can improve the quality of the transmissions over the wireless channels [7], and localizing the part of the learning saves communication resources and time [3], [8]. Clustering clients could be useful also to deal with device or network heterogeneity [9], [10], keep data traffic localized within an administrative unit or social groups [11], or simply adjust to the topology of the interconnections in mobile networks, over internet, or in computing infrastructures [3], [5].

#### A. *State of the art*

Efficient FL needs to cope with several challenges [12], such as non-i.i.d. or heterogeneous data distribution [13], heterogeneous devices and networks [14] and the efficient use of network resources [15]. Hierarchical FL comes with additional challenges. The placement of the aggregators and the optimal formation of the client sets are addressed in [8], [13], and the sharing of resources among parallel FL sessions is discussed in [16]. The limited transmission capacity is considered in several works, for example [7], [17], while [5], [6] focus on the scenario with limited connectivity among the edge servers and [9] addresses the scenario of limited edge-to-cloud network resources. Learning based resource allocation under dynamically changing computing and transmission resources are considered in [18]. The effect of the distortion of the transmitted model and gradient parameters due to wireless inter-cell interference is considered in [19], [20], while [21] evaluates the consequences of quantization on the learning convergence. These works show that the distortion of the parameters leads non-diminishing learning loss.

Local gradient descent, aggregation at the edge, and aggregation at the cloud can be organized in various ways. As of now, no general results are available that dictate a specific learning structure. In [22], various combinations of local gradient descent, gradient parameter aggregation, and model parameter aggregation at the edge are compared within a single-cell FL. It is shown that initially employing multiple-step gradient descent with model aggregation at the edge, followed by iterations of single-step gradient descent with gradient aggregation, yields best performance among the considered combinations. In hierarchical FL, model parameters are

aggregated at both the edge servers and the cloud server for example in [6], [21], [23], while gradient aggregation is applied on both levels in [7], [8]. The mix of gradient and model parameter aggregation is proposed in [19], [20], where gradient aggregation is performed at the intra-set iterations and model aggregation at the inter-set iterations. The scheme is deployed for interference-limited scenarios. It is demonstrated that the approach leads to convergent learning, when high interference leads to significant uplink and downlink transmission errors, and conventional hierarchical FL [21] with multiple-step gradient descent and model aggregation at both edge server and cloud server becomes unstable.

### *B. Contributions*

This work extends the state of art, by introducing a novel hierarchical FL framework that integrates quantization for communication-efficient implementation and tackles the challenges of statistical heterogeneity in FL. Our main contributions are outlined below:

*Learning Approach:* We propose a new iterative learning method called QHetFed, which employs a dual-level aggregation process. This process combines intra-set gradient and inter-set model parameter aggregations during intra- and inter-set iterations, respectively. Additionally, the method incorporates multi-step gradient descent at the end of each inter-set iteration to expedite the learning procedure. Based on the results of [19], [20], we expect this approach to exhibit strong resilience to non-i.i.d. data.

*Heterogeneity-Aware Convergence Analysis:* Our work offers a unique perspective on learning convergence by deriving optimality gap parametrized by a data heterogeneity metric. In contrast to other studies in this field that often overlook heterogeneous data, we include a metric to assess the impact of statistical heterogeneity in our analysis, resulting in a more thorough examination. We also apply this metric in the convergence analysis of the conventional hierarchical FL method, as referenced in [21]. Through a comprehensive analytical comparison, we explore the advantages and potential of our method relative to the conventional approach. We also recommend useful remarks and special cases.

*System Optimization:* To determine the optimal numbers of intra-set iterations and gradient descent steps, we analyze the convergence rate of our method. We then formulate an optimization problem using the error term in the convergence rate as the objective, while adhering to a specified runtime deadline. This approach leads to deriving optimal values of the learning parameters in a closed-form solution.

*Insights:* The experimental results demonstrate the significant superiority of QHetFed over its conventional hierarchical counterpart under heterogeneous data distributions. However, under homogeneous data distribution, the performance is slightly lower in initial iterations. Additionally, increasing the quantization levels improves learning accuracy. We demonstrate, via both analytical and experimental results, that when the total number of local learning steps per inter-set iteration remains constant, a high variance in quantization error favors fewer intra-set iterations for improved performance. Conversely, when the quantization error variance is lower, increasing the number of intra-set iterations enhances performance.

## II. PROPOSED HIERARCHICAL SCHEME

In situations where gradient and model parameters are affected by quantization noise or client heterogeneity, the consequent errors tend to amplify through successive local steps. This is because each step involves computations on imprecise or altered parameters. Specifically, near the optimum, some client gradients might diverge from the optimum, as the local models approach the local optimal solutions instead of the global one. Similar phenomena, highlighting significant performance declines in FedAvg [1] under noisy conditions or with non-i.i.d. data, are documented in [22], [26]. Conversely, QHetFed, the learning algorithm proposed in this work, implements a single local step in intra-set iterations, where the gradient is derived from aggregated data rather than local computations, potentially mitigating the impact of noise or deviations. We draw inspiration from [27], [28], which showcases the resilience of gradient aggregation against interference, and from [22] that demonstrates its effectiveness with non-i.i.d. data.

### A. Learning Algorithm

Assume that there are one cloud server,  $C$  edge servers with disjoint client sets  $\{\mathcal{C}^l\}_{l=1}^C$ , each set  $\mathcal{C}^l$  including  $N_l$  clients with distributed datasets  $\{\mathcal{D}_n^l\}_{n=1}^{N_l}$ . The learning model is parametrized by the parameter vector  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , where  $d$  denotes the learning model size. Then, the local loss function of the model parameter vector  $\mathbf{w}$  over  $\mathcal{D}_n^l$  is

$$F_n^l(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{D_n^l} \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{D}_n^l} \ell(\mathbf{w}, \xi), \quad (1)$$

where  $D_n^l = |\mathcal{D}_n^l|$  is the dataset size and  $\ell(\mathbf{w}, \xi)$  is the sample-wise loss function that measures the prediction error of  $\mathbf{w}$  on a sample  $\xi$ . Then, the global loss function on the distributed datasets  $\cup_l \cup_n \mathcal{D}_n^l$  is computed as

$$F(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{\sum_l \sum_n D_n^l} \sum_l \sum_n D_n^l F_n^l(\mathbf{w}). \quad (2)$$

Therefore, the goal of the learning process is to find a desired model parameter vector  $\mathbf{w}$  that minimizes  $F(\mathbf{w})$  as

$$\mathbf{w}^* = \min_{\mathbf{w}} F(\mathbf{w}). \quad (3)$$

We propose a new hierarchical algorithm called QHetFed to tackle (3). Our approach involves two levels. Within  $T$  global inter-set iterations, each iteration  $t$  comprises  $\tau$  intra-set iterations. During a specific intra-set iteration  $i$ , every client  $n$  in a set  $l$  computes the local gradient of the loss function in (1) from its local dataset, identified by the indices  $\{i, t\}$ , as

$$\mathbf{g}_{n,i,t}^l = \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_n^l, \xi_n^l), \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathbf{w}_n^l$  is its parameter vector and  $\xi_n^l$  with the size  $B$  is the local mini-batch chosen uniformly at random from  $\mathcal{D}_n^l$ . Then, clients apply a quantizer operator  $Q_1(\cdot)$  on their local gradients and upload the results to their edge servers for edge aggregation. For this, the server  $l$  averages of the local gradients from its clients as

$$\mathbf{g}_{i,t}^l = \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} Q_1(\mathbf{g}_{n,i,t}^l). \quad (5)$$

Following the broadcast of the edge aggregated gradients  $\mathbf{g}_{i,t}^l, \forall l$  to their clients by the servers, each client  $n$  within any set  $l$  proceeds to update its local model by implementing a one-step gradient descent as

$$\mathbf{w}_{n,i+1,t}^l = \mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l - \mu \mathbf{g}_{i,t}^l, \quad (6)$$

where  $\mu$  is the learning rate. Upon finishing  $\tau$  intra-set iterations, every client then performs a  $\gamma$ -step gradient descent as

$$\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,0,t}^l = \mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,t}^l, \quad (7)$$

$$\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l = \mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j-1,t}^l - \mu \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j-1,t}^l, \xi_{n,\tau,j-1,t}^l), \quad j = \{1, \dots, \gamma\}. \quad (8)$$

This local multi-step update facilitates acceleration in the learning process. To start the global inter-set iteration, each client  $n \in \mathcal{C}^l$  applies the quantizer operator  $Q_1(\cdot)$  on the difference

between its updated model  $\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,\gamma,t}^l$  to  $\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,t}^l$  and upload the result to its server. Consequently, each server  $l$  calculates an intra-set model parameter vector using the following average

$$\mathbf{w}_{t+1}^l = \mathbf{w}_{\tau,t}^l + \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_n Q_1(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,\gamma,t}^l - \mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,t}^l). \quad (9)$$

where  $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,t}^l = \mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,t}^l, \forall n \in \mathcal{C}^l$ , this denotes what the edge server  $l$  can track from (6). Then, each edge server  $l$  applies a quantizer operator  $Q_2(\cdot)$  on its model  $\mathbf{w}_{t+1}^l$  subtracted from the current global model and forwards the result to the cloud server for cloud aggregation as

$$\mathbf{w}_{t+1} = \mathbf{w}_t + \frac{1}{N} \sum_l N_l Q_2(\mathbf{w}_{t+1}^l - \mathbf{w}_t). \quad (10)$$

where  $N = \sum_{l=1}^C N_l$  is the total number of clients. Then, each client  $n \in \mathcal{C}^l, \forall l$  updates  $\mathbf{w}_{n,0,t+1}^l = \mathbf{w}_{t+1}$  for the next global iteration  $t + 1$ . This global update synchronizes all the local training processes over different sets. This procedure is detailed in Algorithm 1.

We describe the quantization functions  $Q_i$ , for  $i = \{1, 2\}$ , with two parameters, the number of quantization levels  $s_i$  and the variance of the quantization error  $q_i$ . We assume the following characteristics for these functions.

**Assumption 1 (Unbiased Quantization):** The quantizer  $Q$  is unbiased and its variance grows with the squared of  $l_2$ -norm of its argument, as

$$\mathbb{E}\{Q(\mathbf{x})|\mathbf{x}\} = \mathbf{x}, \quad (11)$$

$$\mathbb{E}\{\|Q(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x}\|^2|\mathbf{x}\} \leq q\|\mathbf{x}\|^2, \quad (12)$$

for any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and positive real constant  $q$  as the variance of quantization error.

**Example for Quantizer [24].** For any variable  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , the quantizer  $Q^s: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  is defined as below

$$Q^s(\mathbf{x}) = \text{sign}\{\mathbf{x}\} \|\mathbf{x}\| \zeta(\mathbf{x}, s), \quad (13)$$

where the  $i$ -th element of  $\zeta(\mathbf{x}, s)$ , i.e.,  $\zeta_i(\mathbf{x}, s)$ , is a random variable as

$$\zeta_i(\mathbf{x}, s) = \frac{l}{s} \text{ with probability } 1 - v\left(\frac{|x_i|}{\|\mathbf{x}\|}, s\right) \text{ and } \frac{l+1}{s} \text{ with probability } v\left(\frac{|x_i|}{\|\mathbf{x}\|}, s\right), \quad (14)$$

where  $x_i$  is the  $i$ -th element of  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $v(a, s) = as - l$  for any  $a \in [0, 1]$ . In above, the tuning parameter  $s$  corresponds to the number of quantization levels and  $l \in [0, s)$  is an integer such that  $\frac{|x_i|}{\|\mathbf{x}\|} \in [\frac{l}{s}, \frac{l+1}{s}]$ .

---

**Algorithm 1** QHetFed algorithm
 

---

Initialize the global model  $\mathbf{w}_0$

**for** inter-set iteration  $t = 1, \dots, T$  **do**

Each client updates its model by  $\mathbf{w}_t$

**for** intra-set iteration  $i = 1, \dots, \tau$  **do**

Each client obtains its local gradient from  $\mathbf{g}_{n,i,t}^l = \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l, \xi_{n,i,t}^l)$

Each edge server obtains its intra-set gradient from  $\mathbf{g}_{i,t}^l = \frac{1}{N_i} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^i} Q_1(\mathbf{g}_{n,i,t}^l)$

Each client updates its local model as  $\mathbf{w}_{n,i+1,t}^l = \mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l - \mu \mathbf{g}_{i,t}^l$

**if**  $i = \tau$  **do**

Each client updates its local model as

$$\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,0,t}^l = \mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,t}^l, \quad \mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l = \mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j-1,t}^l - \mu \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j-1,t}^l, \xi_{n,\tau,j-1,t}^l), \quad j = \{1, \dots, \gamma\}$$

Each edge server obtains its intra-set model from  $\mathbf{w}_{\tau,t}^l = \mathbf{w}_{\tau,t}^l + \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_n Q_1(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,\gamma,t}^l - \mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,t}^l)$

Cloud server obtains global model from  $\mathbf{w}_{t+1} = \mathbf{w}_t + \frac{1}{N} \sum_l N_l Q_2(\mathbf{w}_{\tau,t}^l - \mathbf{w}_t)$

---

### B. Convergence Analysis

The theorem presented next provides the convergence performance of QHetFed in terms of the optimality gap. This is contextualized within the framework of client heterogeneity and widely recognized assumptions prevalent in the literature, as detailed below.

**Definition 1:** The heterogeneity of the local data distributions  $\mathcal{D}_n^l, \forall n, l$  is captured by a popular notion of client heterogeneity,  $G^2$ , defined as follows [22].

$$G^2 = \max_{n,l} \sup_{\mathbf{w}} \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}) - \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w})\|^2. \quad (15)$$

**Assumption 2 (Lipschitz-Continuous Gradient):** The gradient of the loss function  $F(\mathbf{w})$ , as represented in (2), exhibits Lipschitz continuity with a positive constant  $L > 0$ . This means that for every two model vectors  $\mathbf{w}_1$  and  $\mathbf{w}_2$ , the following holds.

$$F(\mathbf{w}_2) \leq F(\mathbf{w}_1) + \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_1)^T (\mathbf{w}_2 - \mathbf{w}_1) + \frac{L}{2} \|\mathbf{w}_2 - \mathbf{w}_1\|^2, \quad (16)$$

$$\|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}_2) - \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_1)\| \leq L \|\mathbf{w}_2 - \mathbf{w}_1\|. \quad (17)$$

**Assumption 3 (Gradient Variance Bound):** The local mini-batch stochastic gradient  $\mathbf{g}$  serves as an unbiased estimator of the actual gradient  $\nabla F(\mathbf{w})$ , possessing a variance that is limited as follows.

$$\mathbb{E} \{\|\mathbf{g} - \nabla F(\mathbf{w})\|^2\} \leq \frac{\sigma^2}{B}. \quad (18)$$

**Assumption 4 (Polyak-Lojasiewicz Inequality):** Let  $F^* = F(\mathbf{w}^*)$  be from problem (3). There exists a constant  $\delta \geq 0$  for which the subsequent condition holds.

$$\|\nabla F(\mathbf{w})\|^2 \geq 2\delta (F(\mathbf{w}) - F^*). \quad (19)$$

The inequality presented in (19) is significantly more expansive and general than the mere assumption of convexity [25].

**Theorem 1:** Under the following conditions on the learning rate  $\mu$ :

$$1 - L^2\mu^2 \left( \tau\gamma + \frac{\tau(\tau-1)}{2} + q_1(\tau+\gamma) \max_l \frac{1}{N_l} \right) - L\mu \left( \tau + \frac{q_1}{N} + \frac{q_2 q_1}{N} + \frac{\tau q_2 \max_l N_l}{N} \right) \geq 0, \quad (20)$$

and

$$1 - L^2\mu^2 \frac{\gamma(\gamma-1)}{2} - L\mu\gamma \left( 1 + \frac{(1+q_2)q_1}{N} + \frac{q_2 \max_l N_l}{N} \right) \geq 0, \quad (21)$$

the optimality gap of QHetFed is characterized as

$$\mathbb{E}\{F(\mathbf{w}_T)\} - F^* \leq c^T \left( \mathbb{E}\{F(\mathbf{w}_0)\} - F^* \right) + \frac{1 - c^T}{1 - c} e, \quad (22)$$

where

$$c = 1 - \mu(\tau + \gamma)\delta, \quad (23)$$

$$e = \frac{L\mu^2 \sigma^2}{2} \frac{1}{B} \left( \frac{L\mu}{N} C(1+q_1)\tau \left[ \frac{\tau-1}{2} + \gamma \right] + L\mu \frac{\gamma(\gamma-1)}{2} + \frac{1}{N}(\tau+\gamma)(1+q_2)(1+q_1) \right) + \frac{\mu(\tau+\gamma)}{2} G^2. \quad (24)$$

*Proof:* See Appendix A. ■

*Remark 1:* The term  $c$  in the optimality gap indicates the speed of convergence. On the other hand, the term  $e$  in the optimality gap denotes the error measure, i.e., the persistent bias post-convergence, stemming from imperfections in the learning procedure, including quantization errors, client heterogeneity, and mini-batch stochastic computations.

*Remark 2:* The maximum and minimum values of  $N_l, \forall l$  have critical roles in determining the learning rate. Consequently, sets of same size allow the highest learning rate.

*Remark 3:* Higher client heterogeneity  $G^2$  and quantization noises  $q_i, \forall i$  lead to higher optimality gap, however, their effects are independent from each other.

In the subsequent corollary, we evaluate how  $q_1$  influences the impact of  $\tau$  and  $\gamma$  on performance.



**Corollary 1:** Given a constant sum for  $\tau + \gamma$ , if  $q_1 < \frac{N}{C} - 1$ , then a higher  $\tau$  leads to a reduced optimality gap. On the other hand, if  $q_1 > \frac{N}{C} - 1$ , decreasing  $\tau$  results in a smaller optimality gap.

*Proof:* Only the following term of  $e$  in the optimality gap (22) is not a function of  $\tau + \gamma$ , which we set to  $\beta$ .

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{C}{N}(1+q_1)\tau \left[ \frac{\tau-1}{2} + \gamma \right] + \frac{\gamma(\gamma-1)}{2} = \frac{C}{N}(1+q_1)\tau \left[ \frac{\tau-1}{2} + \beta - \tau \right] + \frac{(\beta-\tau)(\beta-\tau-1)}{2} \\ & = \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 - \frac{C}{N}(1+q_1) \right] \tau^2 - \left( \beta - \frac{1}{2} \right) \left[ 1 - \frac{C}{N}(1+q_1) \right] \tau \\ & = \left[ 1 - \frac{C}{N}(1+q_1) \right] \left[ \frac{1}{2}\tau^2 - \left( \beta - \frac{1}{2} \right) \tau \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Given that  $\beta - \frac{1}{2} = \tau + \gamma - \frac{1}{2} > \tau$ , it follows that when the scaling factor  $1 - \frac{C}{N}(1+q_1) > 0$ , an increase in  $\tau$  results in a reduction of  $\frac{1}{2}\tau^2 - \left( \beta - \frac{1}{2} \right) \tau$ , thereby diminishing the optimality gap. ■

*Remark 4:* The result in Corollary 1 denotes that under a high level quantization, it is better to have more intra-set iterations, while under a lower level quantization it is better to transmit less and increase the number of gradient descent steps within each global iteration.

In systems with high bandwidth, the parameters at each client or edge server are transmitted perfectly, i.e.,  $q_1 = q_2 = 0$ . Then, the optimality gap is simplified as follows.

**Corollary 2:** Without quantization and under the following conditions on the learning rate  $\mu$ :

$$1 - L^2\mu^2 \left( \tau\gamma + \frac{\tau(\tau-1)}{2} \right) - L\mu\tau \geq 0, \quad (26)$$

and

$$1 - L^2\mu^2 \frac{\gamma(\gamma-1)}{2} - L\mu\gamma \geq 0, \quad (27)$$

the error term in the optimality gap is as

$$e = \frac{L\mu^2\sigma^2}{2} \frac{1}{B} \left( \frac{L\mu}{N} C\tau \left[ \frac{\tau-1}{2} + \gamma \right] + L\mu \frac{\gamma(\gamma-1)}{2} + \frac{1}{N}(\tau+\gamma) \right) + \frac{\mu(\tau+\gamma)}{2} G^2. \quad (28)$$

In the special case of clients with low computational capabilities, it is necessary to minimize local computations by limiting it to just a single step of local training. That is,  $\gamma = 1$  and  $\tau$  is arbitrary. In this case, the edge servers are aware of the model parameters within their sets at the end of the intra-set iterations, which allows the following simplified hierarchical algorithm: The edge servers and the clients perform one-step gradient descent as (6) for  $\tau + 1$  intra-set iterations. Then, the edge servers forward the model parameters to the cloud server, and cloud

aggregation is performed according to (10). The specialized optimality gap is given in the next corollary.

**Corollary 3:** Under  $\gamma = 1$  and the following condition on the learning rate  $\mu$ :

$$1 - L^2\mu^2 \left( \tau + \frac{\tau(\tau - 1)}{2} + q_1(\tau + 1) \max_l \frac{1}{N_l} \right) - L\mu(1 + q_2) \left( \frac{\tau \max_l N_l}{N} + \frac{q_1}{N} \right) \geq 0, \quad (29)$$

the error term in the optimality gap is as

$$e = \frac{L\mu^2 \sigma^2}{2} \frac{1}{B} \left( \frac{L\mu}{N} C(1 + q_1) \frac{(\tau + 1)\tau}{2} + \frac{1}{N} (\tau + 1)(1 + q_2)(1 + q_1) \right) + \frac{\mu(\tau + 1)}{2} G^2. \quad (30)$$

*Proof:* This is achieved by setting  $\gamma = 1$  and the fact that the condition from (21), specifically  $1 - L\mu \left( 1 + \frac{(1+q_2)q_1}{N} + \frac{q_2 \max_l N_l}{N} \right) \geq 0$ , holds true when the condition (29) is met.  $\blacksquare$

QHetFed, with its periodic aggregation of gradients and model parameters is a novel concept even for standard FL systems that lack a hierarchical structure, i.e., single-cell FL, and is expected to provide resilience against client heterogeneity, as the hierarchical scheme. In that case, the edge server and the cloud server are the same physical units, and the simplified optimality gap is as follows.

**Corollary 4:** When  $C = 1$  and  $q_2 = 0$ , under the following conditions on the learning rate  $\mu$ :

$$1 - L^2\mu^2 \left( \tau\gamma + \frac{\tau(\tau - 1)}{2} + \frac{q_1(\tau + \gamma)}{N} \right) - L\mu \left( \tau + \frac{q_1}{N} \right) \geq 0, \quad (31)$$

and

$$1 - L^2\mu^2 \frac{\gamma(\gamma - 1)}{2} - L\mu\gamma \left( 1 + \frac{q_1}{N} \right) \geq 0, \quad (32)$$

the error term in the optimality gap is as

$$e = \frac{L\mu^2 \sigma^2}{2} \frac{1}{B} \left( \frac{L\mu}{N} (1 + q_1)\tau \left[ \frac{\tau - 1}{2} + \gamma \right] + L\mu \frac{\gamma(\gamma - 1)}{2} + \frac{1}{N} (\tau + \gamma)(1 + q_1) \right) + \frac{\mu(\tau + \gamma)}{2} G^2. \quad (33)$$

### III. COMPARISON WITH THE CONVENTIONAL HIERARCHICAL SCHEME

The primary hierarchical FL algorithm integrating quantization, named Hier-Local-QSGD, is introduced in [21] and detailed in Algorithm 2. This algorithm, Hier-Local-QSGD, conducts model parameter aggregation at both hierarchical levels. Its key distinction from QHetFed lies in the intra-set update phase, denoted by  $*$ , which now includes successive local steps. We present the analytical comparison of the two approaches, the proposed QHetFed and Hier-Local-QSGD. First, the optimality gap of Hier-Local-QSGD is derived, under the conditions described in

Subsection II. B. Based on this, subsequent remarks compare the learning performance of the schemes.

**Lemma 1:** Under the following single condition on  $\mu$ :

$$1 - L^2\mu^2 \left( \frac{\gamma(\gamma-1)}{2} + \gamma\tau \left( \frac{\tau(\tau-1)}{2} + q_1\tau \right) \right) - L\mu(1+q_2) \left( \gamma\tau + \frac{q_1\gamma}{N} \right) \geq 0, \quad (34)$$

the optimality gap of Hier-Local-QSGD is characterized as

$$\mathbb{E} \{F(\mathbf{w}_T)\} - F^* \leq \bar{c}^T \left( \mathbb{E} \{F(\mathbf{w}_0)\} - F^* \right) + \frac{1 - \bar{c}^T}{1 - \bar{c}} \bar{e}, \quad (35)$$

where

$$\bar{c} = 1 - \mu\tau\gamma\delta, \quad (36)$$

$$\bar{e} = \frac{L\mu^2\sigma^2}{2} \frac{1}{B} \left( \frac{L\mu}{N} C(1+q_1) \frac{\gamma^2\tau(\tau-1)}{2} + L\mu \frac{\tau\gamma(\gamma-1)}{2} + \frac{1}{N} \tau\gamma(1+q_2)(1+q_1) \right) + \frac{\mu\tau\gamma}{2} G^2. \quad (37)$$

*Proof:* Theorem 1 in [21] presents a convergence rate analysis that is limited to i.i.d. data and excludes a term for data heterogeneity. By adopting the methodology outlined in the Appendix of [21] and making necessary adjustments to incorporate client heterogeneity according to our approach in Appendix A, we can derive the convergence rate of Hier-Local-QSGD. Subsequently, by implementing the final step described in Appendix A, (86), the corresponding optimality gap can be determined. While new, the detailed proof is omitted here because of space limitations. ■

*Remark 5:* While the optimality gap in Corollary 3 is the same with the one for Hier-Local-QSGD when  $\gamma = 1$ , the conditions on  $\mu$  are different, with QHetFed permitting a higher value of  $\mu$ . This underscores the novelty of our convergence analysis, even for the specialized case of  $\gamma = 1$ , which is notably simpler than the general case of  $\gamma$ .

*Remark 6:* For Hier-Local-QSGD, the convergence speed is scaled by  $\gamma\tau$ , whereas in QHetFed, it is boosted by  $\tau + \gamma$ . This distinction arises because Hier-Local-QSGD incorporates  $\gamma$  local steps in each intra-set iteration. In contrast, QHetFed has a single step for local updates in the intra-set iterations. Thus, it is evident that Hier-Local-QSGD is faster than QHetFed in achieving convergence.

Although the convergence speed is crucial for ensuring low latency learning, in many learning systems, the error measure is prioritized over convergence speed. This is because the primary goal of any learning task is accuracy.

The difference in the error terms for the two methods is as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = \bar{e} - e &= \frac{L\mu^2 \sigma^2}{2} \frac{1}{B} \left( \frac{L\mu}{N} C(1+q_1) \frac{\gamma^2 \tau(\tau-1)}{2} + L\mu \frac{\tau\gamma(\gamma-1)}{2} + \frac{1}{N} \tau\gamma(1+q_2)(1+q_1) \right) + \\ &\frac{\mu\tau\gamma}{2} G^2 - \frac{L\mu^2 \sigma^2}{2} \frac{1}{B} \left( \frac{L\mu}{N} C(1+q_1) \tau \left[ \frac{\tau-1}{2} + \gamma \right] + L\mu \frac{\gamma(\gamma-1)}{2} + \frac{1}{N} (\tau+\gamma)(1+q_2)(1+q_1) \right) \\ &- \frac{\mu(\tau+\gamma)}{2} G^2 = \frac{L\mu^2 \sigma^2}{2} \frac{1}{B} \left( \frac{L\mu}{N} C(1+q_1) \left( \frac{\gamma^2 \tau(\tau-1)}{2} - \frac{\tau(\tau-1)}{2} - \tau\gamma \right) + \right. \\ &\left. \frac{1}{N} (1+q_2)(1+q_1) (\tau\gamma - \tau - \gamma) + L\mu \frac{(\tau-1)\gamma(\gamma-1)}{2} \right) + \frac{\mu}{2} G^2 (\tau\gamma - \tau - \gamma), \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

which is positive, denoting a consistently higher error for Hier-Local-QSGD in comparison to QHetFed. This increase comprises four different parts:

i) Increase because of quantization layer 1 as

$$\Delta^{Q_1} = \frac{L^2 \mu^3 \sigma^2}{2N} \frac{1}{B} C(1+q_1) \left( \frac{(\gamma^2 - 1)\tau(\tau-1)}{2} - \tau\gamma \right). \quad (39)$$

ii) Increase because of quantization layer 2 as

$$\Delta^{Q_2} = \frac{L\mu^2 \sigma^2}{2N} \frac{1}{B} (1+q_2)(1+q_1) (\tau\gamma - \tau - \gamma). \quad (40)$$

iii) Increase because of stochastic local computations as

$$\Delta^{\text{local-comp}} = \frac{L^2 \mu^3 \sigma^2}{2} \frac{1}{B} \frac{(\tau-1)\gamma(\gamma-1)}{2}. \quad (41)$$

iv) Increase because of client heterogeneity as

$$\Delta^{\text{het}} = \frac{\mu}{2} G^2 (\tau\gamma - \tau - \gamma). \quad (42)$$

*Remark 7:* The increase term  $\Delta$  intensifies when there is an increase in any of the parameters such as  $\gamma$ ,  $\tau$ ,  $q_1$ ,  $q_2$ ,  $C$ ,  $\frac{\sigma^2}{B}$ , or  $G^2$ . This underlines the effectiveness of QHetFed particularly in scenarios where these parameters have sufficiently high values.

*Remark 8:* The Hier-Local-QSGD outperforms QHetFed under i.i.d. data and low quantization errors.

#### IV. SYSTEM OPTIMIZATION

The values of the number of intra-set iterations and gradient descent steps,  $\tau$  and  $\gamma$ , can be chosen to minimize the optimality gap, as the most beneficial metric for achieving the highest learning accuracy. However, due to its complex form, we choose to consider a more tractable alternative metric which is based on the convergence rate of QHetFed, given in the next lemma.

---

**Algorithm 2** Hier-Local-QSGD algorithm
 

---

Initialize the global model  $\mathbf{w}_0$

**for** inter-set iteration  $t = 1, \dots, T$  **do**

Each client updates its model by  $\mathbf{w}_{n,1,0,t}^l = \mathbf{w}_t$

**for** intra-set iteration  $i = 1, \dots, \tau$  **do**

\*Each client updates its local model as  $\mathbf{w}_{n,i,j,t}^l = \mathbf{w}_{n,i,j-1,t}^l - \mu \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,j-1,t}^l, \xi_{n,i,j-1,t}^l)$ ,  $j = \{1, \dots, \gamma\}$

Each edge server obtains its intra-set model vector from  $\mathbf{w}_{i+1,t}^l = \mathbf{w}_{i,t}^l + \frac{1}{N_i} \sum_n Q_1(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,\gamma,t}^l - \mathbf{w}_{n,i,0,t}^l)$

Each client updates its model by  $\mathbf{w}_{n,i+1,0,t}^l = \mathbf{w}_{i+1,t}^l$

Each edge server obtains its intra-set model from  $\mathbf{w}_{t+1}^l = \mathbf{w}_t^l + \frac{1}{N_i} \sum_n Q_1(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,\gamma,t}^l - \mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,0,t}^l)$

Cloud server obtains global model from  $\mathbf{w}_{t+1} = \mathbf{w}_t + \frac{1}{N_i} \sum_l N_l Q_2(\mathbf{w}_{t+1}^l - \mathbf{w}_t)$

---

The convergence rate has been extensively utilized for optimizations in other FL research works, e.g., [29]–[32].

**Lemma 2:** Under the conditions (20) and (21) on  $\mu$ , the convergence rate of QHetFed is characterized as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \{ \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t)\|^2 \} &\leq \frac{2(F(\mathbf{w}_0) - F^*)}{\mu(\tau + \gamma)T} + \\ \frac{L^2 \mu^2 \sigma^2}{2} \frac{1}{B} &\left( \frac{C}{N} (1 + q_1) \tau \left( 1 + \frac{\gamma - 1}{\tau + \gamma} \right) + \frac{\gamma(\gamma - 1)}{\tau + \gamma} \right) + L\mu \frac{\sigma^2}{B} \frac{1}{N} (1 + q_2) (1 + q_1) + G^2. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

*Proof:* After performing a telescoping sum over (83) in Appendix A for the global iterations  $t \in \{0, \dots, T - 1\}$  and using the fact  $\mathbb{E} \{F(\mathbf{w}_T)\} \geq F^*$ , we reach the conclusion of the proof. ■

The goal of the parameter optimization then would be to minimize (43), considering that the learning process can run until a deadline  $T_d$ . For QHetFed,  $T_d$  needs to cover the computation and communication times as

$$T_d = T((\tau + \gamma)t_{\text{CP}} + \tau t_{\text{DE}} + t_{\text{EC}}), \quad (44)$$

where  $t_{\text{CP}}$  represents the computational time at each client, while  $t_{\text{DE}}$  and  $t_{\text{EC}}$  denote the communication times between each client and its respective edge server and between each edge server and the cloud server, respectively, with  $t_{\text{EC}} \gg t_{\text{DE}}$ . From [21], these parameters can be obtained as  $t_{\text{CP}} = \frac{cD}{f}$ ,  $t_{\text{DE}} = \frac{d_b}{B \log_2 \left( 1 + \frac{hP}{N_0} \right)}$ , where  $c$  is the number of CPU cycles to execute one sample of data,  $f$  is the CPU cycle frequency,  $D$  is the number of data bits involved in one

local iteration,  $d_b$  is the model size in bits,  $B$  is the channel bandwidth,  $h$  is the channel gain,  $p$  is the transmission power, and  $N_0$  is the noise power.

The first term of the right-hand side (RHS) of (43), i.e.,  $\frac{2(F(\mathbf{w}_0) - F^*)}{\mu(\tau + \gamma)T}$ , complicates the accurate assessment of the RHS. This complexity arises because determining the values of  $F^*$ ,  $L$ , and  $\sigma^2$  in (43) requires prior statistical knowledge of the local learning models and data statistics, which is unavailable in many applications. Therefore, we suggest to select the second term as our optimization objective. This term represents the error in the  $l_2$  norm of the global gradient, which is a key factor in progressing towards convergence. Moreover,  $T_d$  in (44) incorporates  $T(\tau + \gamma)$ , and thus the convergence rate according to the disregarded first term of (43).

Based on this, we suggest to select the value of  $\tau$  and  $\gamma$  by solving the following optimization problem.

$$\min_{\tau, \gamma} \frac{C}{N}(1 + q_1)\tau \left(1 + \frac{\gamma - 1}{\tau + \gamma}\right) + \frac{\gamma(\gamma - 1)}{\tau + \gamma}, \quad (45)$$

subject to

$$T((\tau + \gamma)t_{\text{CP}} + \tau t_{\text{DE}} + t_{\text{EC}}) = T_d.$$

From (45), we have

$$\tau + \gamma = \frac{T_d}{Tt_{\text{CP}}} - \frac{t_{\text{DE}}}{t_{\text{CP}}}\tau - \frac{t_{\text{EC}}}{t_{\text{CP}}}, \quad \gamma = \frac{T_d}{Tt_{\text{CP}}} - \left(1 + \frac{t_{\text{DE}}}{t_{\text{CP}}}\right)\tau - \frac{t_{\text{EC}}}{t_{\text{CP}}}, \quad (46)$$

whereby the optimization problem becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\tau} \frac{C}{N}(1 + q_1)\tau \left(1 + \frac{\gamma - 1}{\tau + \gamma}\right) + \frac{\gamma(\gamma - 1)}{\tau + \gamma} = \\ & \frac{C}{N}(1 + q_1)\tau \left(2 - \frac{1 + \tau}{\frac{T_d}{Tt_{\text{CP}}} - \frac{t_{\text{DE}}}{t_{\text{CP}}}\tau - \frac{t_{\text{EC}}}{t_{\text{CP}}}}\right) + \left(\frac{T_d}{Tt_{\text{CP}}} - \left(1 + \frac{t_{\text{DE}}}{t_{\text{CP}}}\right)\tau - \frac{t_{\text{EC}}}{t_{\text{CP}}}\right) \times \\ & \left(1 - \frac{1 + \tau}{\frac{T_d}{Tt_{\text{CP}}} - \frac{t_{\text{DE}}}{t_{\text{CP}}}\tau - \frac{t_{\text{EC}}}{t_{\text{CP}}}}\right) = \left(1 - \frac{1 + \tau}{\frac{T_d}{Tt_{\text{CP}}} - \frac{t_{\text{DE}}}{t_{\text{CP}}}\tau - \frac{t_{\text{EC}}}{t_{\text{CP}}}}\right) \times \\ & \left(\left(\frac{C}{N}(1 + q_1) - 1 - \frac{t_{\text{DE}}}{t_{\text{CP}}}\right)\tau + \frac{T_d}{Tt_{\text{CP}}} - \frac{t_{\text{EC}}}{t_{\text{CP}}}\right) + \frac{C}{N}(1 + q_1)\tau \triangleq J(\tau). \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

This problem can be solved by taking derivative from its objective with respect to  $\tau$  as

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{C}{N}(1 + q_1) - 1 - \frac{t_{\text{DE}}}{t_{\text{CP}}}\right) \left(1 - \frac{1 + \tau}{\frac{T_d}{Tt_{\text{CP}}} - \frac{t_{\text{DE}}}{t_{\text{CP}}}\tau - \frac{t_{\text{EC}}}{t_{\text{CP}}}}\right) \\ & + \frac{-\frac{T_d}{Tt_{\text{CP}}} + \frac{t_{\text{EC}}}{t_{\text{CP}}} - \frac{t_{\text{DE}}}{t_{\text{CP}}}}{\left(\frac{T_d}{Tt_{\text{CP}}} - \frac{t_{\text{DE}}}{t_{\text{CP}}}\tau - \frac{t_{\text{EC}}}{t_{\text{CP}}}\right)^2} \left(\left(\frac{C}{N}(1 + q_1) - 1 - \frac{t_{\text{DE}}}{t_{\text{CP}}}\right)\tau + \frac{T_d}{Tt_{\text{CP}}} - \frac{t_{\text{EC}}}{t_{\text{CP}}}\right) + \frac{C}{N}(1 + q_1) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

TABLE I: Algorithm Parameters

$C$	$N_i, \forall i$	$\tau$	$\gamma$	$\mu$	$B$	$s_1$	$s_2$
3	20	12	3	0.01	100	4	10

which is equal to  $a_0\tau^2 + b_0\tau + c_0 = 0$ , where

$$a_0 = \left( \frac{C}{N}(1 + q_1) - 1 - \frac{t_{DE}}{t_{CP}} \right) \left( \frac{t_{DE}^2}{t_{CP}^2} + \frac{t_{DE}}{t_{CP}} \right) + \frac{C}{N}(1 + q_1) \frac{t_{DE}^2}{t_{CP}^2}, \quad (49)$$

$$b_0 = \left( \frac{C}{N}(1 + q_1) - 1 - \frac{t_{DE}}{t_{CP}} \right) \left( \frac{t_{DE}}{t_{CP}} + \frac{t_{EC}}{t_{CP}} - \frac{T_d}{Tt_{CP}} - 2 \left( \frac{T_d}{Tt_{CP}} - \frac{t_{EC}}{t_{CP}} \right) \frac{t_{DE}}{t_{CP}} \right) \\ + \left( -\frac{T_d}{Tt_{CP}} + \frac{t_{EC}}{t_{CP}} - \frac{t_{DE}}{t_{CP}} \right) \left( \frac{C}{N}(1 + q_1) - 1 - \frac{t_{DE}}{t_{CP}} \right) - 2 \frac{C}{N}(1 + q_1) \left( \frac{T_d}{Tt_{CP}} - \frac{t_{EC}}{t_{CP}} \right) \frac{t_{DE}}{t_{CP}}, \quad (50)$$

$$c_0 = \left( \frac{C}{N}(1 + q_1) - 1 - \frac{t_{DE}}{t_{CP}} \right) \left( \left( \frac{T_d}{Tt_{CP}} - \frac{t_{EC}}{t_{CP}} \right)^2 - \frac{T_d}{Tt_{CP}} + \frac{t_{EC}}{t_{CP}} \right) \\ + \left( -\frac{T_d}{Tt_{CP}} + \frac{t_{EC}}{t_{CP}} - \frac{t_{DE}}{t_{CP}} \right) \left( \frac{T_d}{Tt_{CP}} - \frac{t_{EC}}{t_{CP}} \right) + \frac{C}{N}(1 + q_1) \left( \frac{T_d}{Tt_{CP}} - \frac{t_{EC}}{t_{CP}} \right)^2. \quad (51)$$

Thus, the optimum value of  $\tau$  is  $\tau_{\text{opt}} = \arg \min_{\left\{ 1, \frac{-b_0 \pm \sqrt{b_0^2 - 4a_0c_0}}{2a_0} \right\}} J(\tau)$ . Then, the optimum value of  $\gamma$  is obtained from (46) as  $\gamma_{\text{opt}} = \frac{T_d}{Tt_{CP}} - \left( 1 + \frac{t_{DE}}{t_{CP}} \right) \tau_{\text{opt}} - \frac{t_{EC}}{t_{CP}}$ .

## V. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

We consider a learning task that involves classifying images from the dataset CIFAR-10 with the parameter values given in Table I, unless otherwise stated. We have constructed the classifier using a Convolutional Neural Network (CNN). This CNN consists of four  $3 \times 3$  convolution layers with ReLU activation (the first two with 32 channels, the second two with 64), each two followed by a  $2 \times 2$  max pooling; a fully connected layer with 128 units and ReLU activation; and a final softmax output layer. Both i.i.d. and non-i.i.d. distributions of dataset samples among clients are considered. For the non-i.i.d. scenario, each client contains samples exclusively from two classes, and the sample count differs from one client to another. Performance is gauged by the learning accuracy in relation to the test dataset throughout the global iteration count, denoted by  $t$ . The outcome for performance is determined by averaging 20 realization samples.

Fig. 1 displays the accuracy for varying numbers of intra-set iterations  $\tau$  in the i.i.d. setting. It is observed that increasing  $\tau$  or  $t$  boosts the learning performance. However, the margin of improvement narrows at higher values of  $\tau$  or  $t$ . Furthermore, elevating  $\tau$  leads to faster




Fig. 1: Test accuracy as a function of global iterations (i.i.d.)




Fig. 2: Test accuracy as a function of global iterations (i.i.d.)




Fig. 3: Test accuracy as a function of global iterations (non-i.i.d.)




Fig. 4: Test accuracy as a function of global iterations (i.i.d.)






Fig. 5: Test accuracy as a function of global iterations (non-i.i.d.)




Fig. 6: Test accuracy as a function of global iterations (non-i.i.d.)

convergence in terms of  $t$ , indicating that a minimum quantity of both intra- and inter-set iterations is sufficient to achieve satisfactory performance.

Fig. 2 presents the accuracy across various number of local iterations  $\gamma$  within the i.i.d. setting. There is an enhancement in performance as  $\gamma$  increases, though the improvement gap diminishes at higher levels of  $\gamma$ . This highlights the vital importance of conducting multiple-step local learning at the conclusion of each inter-set iteration in our approach.

In Fig. 3, the impact of varying the number of quantization levels  $s_1$  in the quantization function  $Q_1$  is explored in the non-i.i.d. setting. It is observed that an increase in  $s_1$  results in enhanced performance, attributable to more accurate transmission. Nonetheless, the improvement gap narrows with higher values of  $s_1$ . This suggests that a minimum level of  $s_1$  is adequate for achieving satisfactory performance.

TABLE II: Test accuracy at  $t = 100$ .

	$q_1 = 149.3$		$q_1 = 11.9$		
	$(\tau, \gamma)$	$(15,5)$	$(10,10)$	$(15,5)$	$(10,10)$
i.i.d. case		0.7234	0.7579	0.8213	0.8108
non-i.i.d. case		0.6742	0.6835	0.7477	0.7290

TABLE III: Run-time parameters

$B$	$p$	$N_0$	$c$	$h$	$f$	$t_{EC}$
1 MHz	0.5 W	$10^{-10}$ W	20 cycles/bit	$10^{-8}$	1 GHz	$10t_{DE}$

Table II presents the accuracy at  $t = 100$  for various  $\tau$ ,  $\gamma$ , and  $q_1$ , adhering to the constraint  $\tau + \gamma = 20$ , in both i.i.d. and non-i.i.d. settings. It is noted that a higher  $\gamma$  enhances performance when  $q_1$  is high. Conversely, an increased  $\tau$  leads to improved performance when  $q_1$  is low. It justifies Corollary 1 and *Remark 4*.

In Figs 4 and 5, the learning performance of QHetFed is compared with the conventional hierarchical FL (Hier-Local-QSGD) in [21] in both the i.i.d. and non-i.i.d. settings. For a fair comparison, the accuracy is plotted against the algorithm runtime, which is derived from (44) for QHetFed and is specified for Hier-Local-QSGD as follows.

$$t(\tau\gamma t_{CP} + \tau t_{DE} + t_{EC}), \forall t. \quad (52)$$

The parameters used to assess (44) and (52) are in Table III.

As observed, although both algorithms achieve similar performance post-convergence under the i.i.d. data distribution, QHetFed significantly surpasses Hier-Local-QSGD under the non-i.i.d. setting. The degraded performance of Hier-Local-QSGD stems from the propagation of errors due to client heterogeneity across multiple local steps in each intra-set iteration, leading local models to converge towards local optima rather than the global optimum. Conversely, QHetFed employs robust gradient aggregation during intra-set iterations. It strategically applies multiple-step local training only at the end of each inter-set iteration, incorporating all clients across all sets in the aggregation process.

Fig. 6 illustrates the accuracy achieved with the optimized selection of  $\tau$  and  $\gamma$ , as described in Section IV, alongside a random selection of these parameters with the latency per iteration  $(\tau + \gamma)t_{CP} + \tau t_{DE} + t_{EC} = 156$  s in the non-i.i.d. setting, utilizing the parameters listed in Table III and  $q_1 = 11.9$ . As observed, the optimized parameters result in a notable improvement, emphasizing the significance of the proposed system optimization.

## VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we proposed a new two-level federated learning algorithm tailored to enhance the functionality of hierarchical network structures with multiple sets, employing quantization for effective communication and specifically addressing the statistical heterogeneity challenges

inherent in federated learning. This algorithm employs a novel approach to aggregation, utilizing intra-set gradient and inter-set model parameter aggregation. Additionally, we developed a comprehensive mathematical methodology that integrates a statistical heterogeneity metric into the optimality gap analysis of our algorithm. The analytic results demonstrate the enhanced robustness of our approach compared to conventional hierarchical federated learning algorithms, which typically rely on model parameter aggregation for both intra- and inter-set iterations. Experimental evidence further highlighted a marked enhancement in learning accuracy with our algorithm, especially in environments characterized by heterogeneous data distributions, compared to conventional ones. Furthermore, we conducted the convergence rate analysis of the algorithm. Utilizing the error term derived from this analysis, we formulated an optimization problem, and determined the optimal intra- and inter-set parameters from this problem, further refining the algorithm's efficiency.

## APPENDIX A

### PROOF OF THEOREM 1

The update of the learning model at the global inter-set iteration  $t + 1$  is represented as

$$\mathbf{w}_{t+1} = \mathbf{w}_t + \frac{1}{N} \sum_l N_l Q_2 \left( \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_n -\mu \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \mathbf{g}_{i,t}^l - Q_1 \left( \mu \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right) \right). \quad (53)$$

From  $L$ -Lipschitz continuous property in Assumption 2, we have

$$F(\mathbf{w}_{t+1}) - F(\mathbf{w}_t) \leq \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t)^\top (\mathbf{w}_{t+1} - \mathbf{w}_t) + \frac{L}{2} \|\mathbf{w}_{t+1} - \mathbf{w}_t\|^2. \quad (54)$$

Proceeding by applying the expectation to both sides of (54), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \{F(\mathbf{w}_{t+1}) - F(\mathbf{w}_t)\} \leq \mathbb{E} \{ \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t)^\top (\mathbf{w}_{t+1} - \mathbf{w}_t) \} + \frac{L}{2} \mathbb{E} \{ \|\mathbf{w}_{t+1} - \mathbf{w}_t\|^2 \}. \quad (55)$$

Next, we can expand the first term of the RHS in (55) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \{ \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t)^\top (\mathbf{w}_{t+1} - \mathbf{w}_t) \} = \\ & \mathbb{E} \left\{ \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t)^\top \frac{1}{N} \sum_l N_l Q_2 \left( \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_n -\mu \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \mathbf{g}_{i,t}^l - Q_1 \left( \mu \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right) \right) \right\} = \\ & -\mu \frac{1}{N} \sum_l N_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \mathbb{E} \{ \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t)^\top \mathbf{g}_{i,t}^l \} - \mu \frac{1}{N} \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \mathbb{E} \{ \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t)^\top \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \}, \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \{ \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t)^\top \mathbf{g}_{i,t}^l \} &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t)^\top \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} Q_1(\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l, \xi_{n,i,t}^l)) \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \{ \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t)^\top \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l, \xi_{n,i,t}^l) \} = \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \{ \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t)^\top \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) \}.\end{aligned}\quad (57)$$

Applying the equality  $\|\mathbf{a}_1 - \mathbf{a}_2\|^2 = \|\mathbf{a}_1\|^2 + \|\mathbf{a}_2\|^2 - 2\mathbf{a}_1^\top \mathbf{a}_2$  to any vectors  $\mathbf{a}_1$  and  $\mathbf{a}_2$ , we can express the term within the sum (57) as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \{ \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t)^\top \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) \} &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \{ \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t)\|^2 \} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \{ \|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l)\|^2 \} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \{ \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t) - \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l)\|^2 \}.\end{aligned}\quad (58)$$

Based on Assumption 2 and the definition of client heterogeneity, the final term in (58) is bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \{ \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t) - \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l)\|^2 \} &= \mathbb{E} \{ \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t) - \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_t) + \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_t) - \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l)\|^2 \} \leq \\ G^2 + L^2 \mathbb{E} \{ \|\mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l\|^2 \} &= G^2 + L^2 \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| -\mu \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \mathbf{g}_{j,t}^l \right\|^2 \right\} = G^2 + L^2 \mu^2 \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \mathbf{g}_{j,t}^l \right\|^2 \right\}.\end{aligned}\quad (59)$$

Utilizing the equality  $\mathbb{E} \{ \|\mathbf{a}\|^2 \} = \|\mathbb{E} \{ \mathbf{a} \} \|^2 + \mathbb{E} \{ \|\mathbf{a} - \mathbb{E} \{ \mathbf{a} \} \|^2 \}$  for any vector  $\mathbf{a}$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \mathbf{g}_{j,t}^l \right\|^2 \right\} &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} Q_1(\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,j,t}^l)) \right\|^2 \right\} = \\ \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} &+ \\ \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} (Q_1(\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,j,t}^l)) - \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,j,t}^l)) \right\|^2 \right\},\end{aligned}\quad (60)$$

where the first term of RHS can be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} i \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} i \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,j,t}^l)\|^2 \right\},\end{aligned}\quad (61)$$

where (a) is derived from the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality, specifically,  $(\sum_{i=1}^I a_i)^2 \leq I \sum_{i=1}^I a_i^2$ , and (b) results from the convexity of the  $\|\cdot\|^2$  function. The second term of RHS in (60) can be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} (Q_1(\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,j,t}^l)) - \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,j,t}^l)) \right\|^2 \right\} \stackrel{(c)}{=} \\
& \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \frac{1}{N_l^2} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| Q_1(\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,j,t}^l)) - \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} \\
& + \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \frac{1}{N_l^2} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,j,t}^l) - \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} \\
& \stackrel{(d)}{\leq} \frac{q_1}{N_l^2} \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{\sigma^2}{B} \frac{i}{N_l}, \tag{62}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \\
& \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,j,t}^l) - \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} \leq \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{\sigma^2}{B}. \tag{63}
\end{aligned}$$

The step (c) comes from the independence conditioned on batches  $\xi_{n,j,t}^l$  for any two distinct values of  $n, l, j$ , or  $t$ . Then, (d) comes from the Assumptions 1 and 3. Replacing (61) and (62) in (60) and then replacing the result in (59), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t) - \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} \leq \\
& G^2 + L^2 \mu^2 \left( \frac{i}{N_l} + \frac{q_1}{N_l^2} \right) \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + L^2 \mu^2 (1 + q_1) \frac{\sigma^2}{B} \frac{i}{N_l}, \tag{64}
\end{aligned}$$

and then replacing (64) in (58) and replacing the result in (57), we obtain the following bound

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\mu \frac{1}{N} \sum_l N_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t)^\top \mathbf{g}_{i,t}^l \right\} \leq -\frac{\mu \tau}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t) \right\|^2 \right\} \\
& -\frac{\mu}{2N} \sum_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_n \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{\mu \tau}{2} G^2 \\
& + \frac{L^2 \mu^3}{2N} \sum_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \left( i + \frac{q_1}{N_l} \right) \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \sum_n \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{L^2 \mu^3}{2N} C (1 + q_1) \frac{\sigma^2}{B} \frac{\tau(\tau-1)}{2}. \tag{65}
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we can bound the second term in RHS of (56) as follows.

$$-\mu \frac{1}{N} \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t)^\top \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\}$$

$$= -\mu \frac{1}{N} \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t)^\top \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\}, \quad (66)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t)^\top \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\} &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t)\|^2 \right\} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l)\|^2 \right\} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t) - \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l)\|^2 \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

where from Definition 1

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t) - \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l)\|^2 \right\} \leq G^2 + L^2 \mu^2 \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \mathbf{g}_{i,t}^l + \sum_{p=0}^{j-1} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,p,t}^l, \xi_{n,\tau,p,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\}, \quad (68)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \mathbf{g}_{i,t}^l + \sum_{p=0}^{j-1} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,p,t}^l, \xi_{n,\tau,p,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} = \\ &\mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} Q_1(\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l, \xi_{n,i,t}^l)) + \sum_{p=0}^{j-1} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,p,t}^l, \xi_{n,\tau,p,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} = \\ &\mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) + \sum_{p=0}^{j-1} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,p,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \\ &\frac{1}{N_l^2} \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|Q_1(\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l, \xi_{n,i,t}^l)) - \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l)\|^2 \right\} + \\ &\sum_{p=0}^{j-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,p,t}^l, \xi_{n,\tau,p,t}^l) - \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,p,t}^l)\|^2 \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

where from the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) + \sum_{p=0}^{j-1} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,p,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} \leq \\ &\tau \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + j \sum_{p=0}^{j-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,p,t}^l)\|^2 \right\} \leq \\ &\tau \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l)\|^2 \right\} + j \sum_{p=0}^{j-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,p,t}^l)\|^2 \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{N_l^2} \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| Q_1(\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l, \xi_{n,i,t}^l)) - \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} = \\
& \frac{1}{N_l^2} \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| Q_1(\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l, \xi_{n,i,t}^l)) - \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l, \xi_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \\
& \frac{1}{N_l^2} \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l, \xi_{n,i,t}^l) - \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} = \frac{q_1}{N_l^2} \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l, \xi_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} \\
& + \frac{\sigma^2}{B} \frac{\tau}{N_l} = \frac{q_1}{N_l^2} \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{\sigma^2}{B} \frac{\tau}{N_l} (1 + q_1). \tag{71}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\mu \frac{1}{N} \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t)^\top \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\} = -\frac{\mu\gamma}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t) \right\|^2 \right\} - \mu \frac{1}{2N} \times \\
& \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{L^2 \mu^3}{2N} \tau \gamma \sum_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{L^2 \mu^3}{2N} \times \\
& \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} j \sum_{p=0}^{j-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,p,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{L^2 \mu^3}{2N} q_1 \gamma \sum_l \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} \\
& + \frac{L^2 \mu^3}{2N} \tau \gamma C \frac{\sigma^2}{B} (1 + q_1) + \frac{L^2 \mu^3}{2} \frac{\sigma^2}{B} \frac{\gamma(\gamma-1)}{2} + \frac{\mu\gamma}{2} G^2. \tag{72}
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we bound the second term of the RHS in (55) as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \mathbf{w}_{t+1} - \mathbf{w}_t \right\|^2 \right\} \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_l N_l Q_2 \left( \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_n -\mu \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \mathbf{g}_{i,t}^l - Q_1 \left( \mu \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right) \right) \right\|^2 \right\} \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_l \sum_n -\mu \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \mathbf{g}_{i,t}^l - Q_1 \left( \mu \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right) \right\|^2 \right\} \\
& + \frac{q_2}{N^2} \sum_l \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \sum_n -\mu \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \mathbf{g}_{i,t}^l - Q_1 \left( \mu \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right) \right\|^2 \right\} \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| -\frac{\mu}{N} \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \mathbf{g}_{i,t}^l - \frac{\mu}{N} \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} \\
& + \frac{q_1}{N^2} \sum_l \sum_n \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| -\mu \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{q_2}{N^2} \sum_l \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| -\mu \sum_n \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \mathbf{g}_{i,t}^l - \mu \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} \\
& + \frac{q_2 q_1}{N^2} \sum_l \sum_n \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| -\mu \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| -\frac{\mu}{N} \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \mathbf{g}_{i,t}^l - \frac{\mu}{N} \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} \\
& + \frac{q_2}{N^2} \sum_l \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| -\mu \sum_n \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \mathbf{g}_{i,t}^l - \mu \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} \\
& + \frac{(1+q_2)q_1}{N^2} \sum_l \sum_n \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| -\mu \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\}, \tag{73}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| -\frac{\mu}{N} \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \mathbf{g}_{i,t}^l - \frac{\mu}{N} \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} \\
& = \frac{\mu^2}{N^2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \mathbf{g}_{i,t}^l \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{\mu^2}{N^2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} = \frac{\mu^2}{N^2} \\
& \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \sum_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} Q_1(\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l, \xi_{n,i,t}^l)) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{\mu^2}{N^2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} \\
& = \frac{\mu^2}{N^2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \sum_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{\mu^2}{N^2} \sum_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \\
& \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| Q_1(\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l, \xi_{n,i,t}^l)) - \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l, \xi_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{\mu^2}{N^2} \sum_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \\
& \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l, \xi_{n,i,t}^l) - \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{\mu^2}{N^2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} \\
& + \frac{\mu^2}{N^2} \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) - \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} \\
& = \frac{\mu^2}{N} \tau \sum_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{\mu^2}{N^2} q_1 \sum_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{\mu^2}{N} q_1 \tau \frac{\sigma^2}{B}
\end{aligned}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{\mu^2 \sigma^2}{N B} \tau + \frac{\mu^2}{N} \gamma \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{\mu^2 \sigma^2}{N B} \gamma = \frac{\mu^2}{N} (\tau + \frac{q_1}{N}) \sum_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \\
& \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{\mu^2}{N} \gamma \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{\mu^2 \sigma^2}{N B} (\tau + q_1 \tau + \gamma), \quad (74)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{q_2}{N^2} \mu^2 \sum_l \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \sum_n \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \mathbf{g}_{i,t}^l + \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} = \frac{q_2}{N^2} \mu^2 \\
& \sum_l \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} Q_1(\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l, \xi_{n,i,t}^l)) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{q_2}{N^2} \mu^2 \sum_l \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} \\
& = \frac{q_2}{N^2} \mu^2 \sum_l \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{q_2}{N^2} \mu^2 \sum_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \\
& \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| Q_1(\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l, \xi_{n,i,t}^l)) - \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l, \xi_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{q_2}{N^2} \mu^2 \sum_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \\
& \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l, \xi_{n,i,t}^l) - \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{q_2}{N^2} \mu^2 \sum_l \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \\
& \frac{q_2}{N^2} \mu^2 \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) - \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} = \frac{q_2}{N^2} \mu^2 \tau \sum_l N_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \\
& \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{q_2 q_1}{N^2} \mu^2 \sum_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{q_2 q_1}{N} \tau \mu^2 \frac{\sigma^2}{B} \\
& + \frac{q_2}{N} \tau \mu^2 \frac{\sigma^2}{B} + \frac{q_2}{N^2} \gamma \mu^2 \sum_l N_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{q_2}{N} \gamma \mu^2 \frac{\sigma^2}{B} \\
& = \frac{q_2}{N^2} \mu^2 \tau \sum_l N_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{q_2 q_1}{N^2} \mu^2 \sum_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} \\
& + \frac{q_2}{N^2} \gamma \mu^2 \sum_l N_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{q_2}{N} (\tau + q_1 \tau + \gamma) \mu^2 \frac{\sigma^2}{B}, \quad (75)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{(1 + q_2) q_1}{N^2} \mu^2 \sum_l \sum_n \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} \\
& = \frac{(1 + q_2) q_1}{N^2} \mu^2 \sum_l \sum_n \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{(1+q_2)q_1}{N^2} \mu^2 \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l, \xi_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) - \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} \\
& = \frac{(1+q_2)q_1}{N^2} \gamma \mu^2 \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{(1+q_2)q_1}{N} \gamma \mu^2 \frac{\sigma^2}{B}. \tag{76}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain (73) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \mathbf{w}_{t+1} - \mathbf{w}_t \right\|^2 \right\} & = \frac{\mu^2}{N} \left( \tau + \frac{q_1}{N} \right) \sum_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{\mu^2}{N} \gamma \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \\
& \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{\mu^2 \sigma^2}{N B} \left( \tau + q_1 \tau + \gamma \right) + \frac{q_2}{N^2} \mu^2 \tau \sum_l N_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \\
& \frac{q_2 q_1}{N^2} \mu^2 \sum_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{q_2}{N^2} \gamma \mu^2 \sum_l N_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \\
& \frac{q_2}{N} \left( \tau + q_1 \tau + \gamma \right) \mu^2 \frac{\sigma^2}{B} + \frac{(1+q_2)q_1}{N^2} \gamma \mu^2 \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{(1+q_2)q_1}{N} \gamma \mu^2 \frac{\sigma^2}{B} \\
& = \frac{\mu^2}{N} \left( \left( \tau + \frac{q_1}{N} \right) + \frac{q_2 q_1}{N} \right) \sum_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{\mu^2}{N^2} \tau q_2 \sum_l N_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \\
& \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{\mu^2}{N} \gamma \left( 1 + \frac{(1+q_2)q_1}{N} \right) \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \\
& \frac{q_2}{N^2} \gamma \mu^2 \sum_l N_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{\mu^2 \sigma^2}{N B} \left( \tau + \gamma \right) (1+q_2) (1+q_1). \tag{77}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, replacing (65) and (72) in (56), and replacing the result with (77) in (55), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left\{ F(\mathbf{w}_{t+1}) - F(\mathbf{w}_t) \right\} & \leq -\frac{\mu\tau}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t) \right\|^2 \right\} - \frac{\mu}{2N} \sum_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_n \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} \\
& + \frac{L^2 \mu^3}{2N} \sum_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \left( i + \frac{q_1}{N_l} \right) \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \sum_n \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{L^2 \mu^3}{2N} C(1+q_1) \frac{\sigma^2 \tau(\tau-1)}{2} + \\
& \frac{\mu\tau}{2} G^2 - \frac{\mu\gamma}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t) \right\|^2 \right\} - \mu \frac{1}{2N} \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{L^2 \mu^3}{2N} \tau \gamma \\
& \sum_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{L^2 \mu^3}{2N} \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} j \sum_{p=0}^{j-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,p,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} \\
& + \frac{L^2 \mu^3}{2N} q_1 \gamma \sum_l \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l) \right\|^2 \right\} + \frac{L^2 \mu^3}{2N} \tau \gamma C \frac{\sigma^2}{B} (1+q_1) + \frac{L^2 \mu^3 \sigma^2}{2} \frac{\gamma(\gamma-1)}{2}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{L\mu^2}{2N} \left( (\tau + \frac{q_1}{N}) + \frac{q_2 q_1}{N} \right) \sum_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l)\|^2 \right\} + \frac{L\mu^2}{2N^2} \tau q_2 \sum_l N_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \\
& \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l)\|^2 \right\} + \frac{L\mu^2}{2N} \gamma \left( 1 + \frac{(1+q_2)q_1}{N} \right) \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l)\|^2 \right\} + \\
& \frac{Lq_2}{2N^2} \gamma \mu^2 \sum_l N_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l)\|^2 \right\} + \frac{L\mu^2}{2N} \frac{\sigma^2}{B} (\tau + \gamma) (1 + q_2) (1 + q_1) + \frac{\mu\gamma}{2} G^2 \\
& = -\frac{\mu(\tau + \gamma)}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t)\|^2 \right\} - \frac{\mu}{2N} \left( 1 - L^2 \mu^2 \tau \gamma - L\mu \left( (\tau + \frac{q_1}{N}) + \frac{q_2 q_1}{N} \right) \right) \times \\
& \sum_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_n \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l)\|^2 \right\} + \frac{L^2 \mu^3}{2N} \sum_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \left( i + \frac{q_1}{N_l} \right) \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \sum_n \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,j,t}^l)\|^2 \right\} \\
& + \frac{L^2 \mu^3}{2N} q_1 \gamma \sum_l \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l)\|^2 \right\} + \frac{L\mu^2}{2N^2} \tau q_2 \sum_l N_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l)\|^2 \right\} \\
& - \mu \frac{1}{2N} \left( 1 - L\mu\gamma \left( 1 + \frac{(1+q_2)q_1}{N} \right) \right) \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l)\|^2 \right\} + \frac{Lq_2}{2N^2} \gamma \mu^2 \\
& \sum_l N_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l)\|^2 \right\} + \frac{L^2 \mu^3}{2N} \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} j \sum_{p=0}^{j-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,p,t}^l)\|^2 \right\} \\
& + \frac{L\mu^2}{2} \frac{\sigma^2}{B} \left( \frac{L\mu}{N} C(1+q_1) \frac{\tau(\tau-1)}{2} + \frac{L\mu}{N} \tau \gamma C(1+q_1) + L\mu \frac{\gamma(\gamma-1)}{2} + \right. \\
& \left. \frac{1}{N} (\tau + \gamma) (1 + q_2) (1 + q_1) \right) + \frac{\mu(\tau + \gamma)}{2} G^2. \tag{78}
\end{aligned}$$

Then, using the bounds

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} i \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \sum_n \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,j,t}^l)\|^2 \right\} \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} i \times \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_n \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l)\|^2 \right\} \\
& = \frac{\tau(\tau-1)}{2} \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_n \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l)\|^2 \right\}, \tag{79}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} j \sum_{p=0}^{j-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,p,t}^l)\|^2 \right\} \leq \frac{\gamma(\gamma-1)}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \sum_{p=0}^{j-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,p,t}^l)\|^2 \right\}, \tag{80}$$

$$\sum_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \sum_n \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,j,t}^l)\|^2 \right\} \leq \max_l \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \sum_n \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,j,t}^l)\|^2 \right\}, \tag{81}$$

and

$$\sum_l N_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_n \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l)\|^2 \right\} \leq \max_l N_l \sum_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_n \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l)\|^2 \right\}, \tag{82}$$

the following bound on (78) is obtained.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \{F(\mathbf{w}_{t+1}) - F(\mathbf{w}_t)\} &\leq -\frac{\mu(\tau + \gamma)}{2} \mathbb{E} \{\|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t)\|^2\} - \frac{\mu}{2N} \left(1 - L^2\mu^2\tau\gamma - L\mu \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left( (\tau + \frac{q_1}{N}) + \frac{q_2q_1}{N} \right) \right) \sum_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_n \mathbb{E} \{\|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l)\|^2\} + \frac{L^2\mu^3}{2N} \frac{\tau(\tau-1)}{2} \sum_l \sum_{j=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_n \\
&\quad \mathbb{E} \{\|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,j,t}^l)\|^2\} + \frac{L^2\mu^3}{2N} q_1\tau \max_l \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_l \sum_{j=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_n \mathbb{E} \{\|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,j,t}^l)\|^2\} \\
&\quad + \frac{L^2\mu^3}{2N} q_1\gamma \max_l \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \mathbb{E} \{\|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l)\|^2\} + \frac{L\mu^2}{2N^2} \tau q_2 \max_l N_l \sum_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}^l} \\
&\quad \mathbb{E} \{\|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l)\|^2\} - \mu \frac{1}{2N} \left(1 - L\mu\gamma \left(1 + \frac{(1+q_2)q_1}{N}\right)\right) \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \mathbb{E} \{\|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l)\|^2\} \\
&\quad + \frac{Lq_2}{2N^2} \gamma\mu^2 \max_l N_l \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \mathbb{E} \{\|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l)\|^2\} + \frac{L^2\mu^3}{2N} \frac{\gamma(\gamma-1)}{2} \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{p=0}^{\gamma-1} \\
&\quad \mathbb{E} \{\|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,p,t}^l)\|^2\} + \frac{L\mu^2}{2} \frac{\sigma^2}{B} \left( \frac{L\mu}{N} C(1+q_1) \frac{\tau(\tau-1)}{2} + \frac{L\mu}{N} \tau\gamma C(1+q_1) + L\mu \frac{\gamma(\gamma-1)}{2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{N} (\tau + \gamma)(1+q_2)(1+q_1) \right) = -\frac{\mu(\tau + \gamma)}{2} \mathbb{E} \{\|\nabla F(\mathbf{w}_t)\|^2\} - \frac{\mu}{2N} \times \\
&\quad \left(1 - L^2\mu^2(\tau\gamma + \frac{\tau(\tau-1)}{2} + q_1(\tau + \gamma) \max_l \frac{1}{N_l}) - L\mu \left( (\tau + \frac{q_1}{N}) + \frac{q_2q_1}{N} + \frac{\tau q_2 \max_l N_l}{N} \right) \right) \times \\
&\quad \sum_l \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_n \mathbb{E} \{\|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,i,t}^l)\|^2\} - \frac{\mu}{2N} \left(1 - L\mu\gamma \left(1 + \frac{(1+q_2)q_1}{N} + \frac{q_2 \max_l N_l}{N}\right) - L^2\mu^2 \frac{\gamma(\gamma-1)}{2}\right) \\
&\quad \sum_l \sum_n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma-1} \mathbb{E} \{\|\nabla F_n^l(\mathbf{w}_{n,\tau,j,t}^l)\|^2\} + \frac{L\mu^2}{2} \frac{\sigma^2}{B} \left( \frac{L\mu}{N} C(1+q_1) \frac{\tau(\tau-1)}{2} + \frac{L\mu}{N} \tau\gamma C(1+q_1) + \right. \\
&\quad \left. L\mu \frac{\gamma(\gamma-1)}{2} + \frac{1}{N} (\tau + \gamma)(1+q_2)(1+q_1) \right) + \frac{\mu(\tau + \gamma)}{2} G^2. \tag{83}
\end{aligned}$$

Given the conditions

$$1 - L^2\mu^2(\tau\gamma + \frac{\tau(\tau-1)}{2} + q_1(\tau + \gamma) \max_l \frac{1}{N_l}) - L\mu \left( (\tau + \frac{q_1}{N}) + \frac{q_2q_1}{N} + \frac{\tau q_2 \max_l N_l}{N} \right) \geq 0, \tag{84}$$

and

$$1 - L\mu\gamma \left(1 + \frac{(1+q_2)q_1}{N} + \frac{q_2 \max_l N_l}{N}\right) - L^2\mu^2 \frac{\gamma(\gamma-1)}{2} \geq 0, \tag{85}$$

the second and third terms in RHS of (83) are negative, and after applying Assumption 4, we can write for any  $t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\{F(\mathbf{w}_{t+1})\} - F^* &\leq (1 - \mu\delta(\tau + \gamma))(\mathbb{E}\{F(\mathbf{w}_t)\} - F^*) + \frac{L\mu^2\sigma^2}{2} \frac{1}{B} \left( \frac{L\mu}{N} C(1 + q_1) \frac{\tau(\tau - 1)}{2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{L\mu}{N} \tau\gamma C(1 + q_1) + L\mu \frac{\gamma(\gamma - 1)}{2} + \frac{1}{N}(\tau + \gamma)(1 + q_2)(1 + q_1) \right) + \frac{\mu(\tau + \gamma)}{2} G^2. \end{aligned} \quad (86)$$

This bound links the steps  $t + 1$  and  $t$ . To determine the bound specified in Theorem 1, we can substitute  $\mathbb{E}\{F(\mathbf{w}_t)\} - F^*$  on the RHS with the equivalent one-step bound for the steps  $t$  and  $t - 1$ . By consistently applying this procedure over the interval  $\{t - 1, \dots, 0\}$ , the proof is complete.

## REFERENCES

- [1] B. McMahan, E. Moore, D. Ramage, S. Hampson, and B. A. Arcas, "Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data," *AISTATS*, pp. 1273-1282, 2017.
- [2] H. Hellstrom, J. M. B. da Silva Jr, M. Mohammadi Amiri, M. Chen, V. Fodor, H. V. Poor, and C. Fischione, "Wireless for machine learning: A survey," *Found. and Trends@ in Signal Process.*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 290-399, 2022.
- [3] S. Gupta, W. Zhang, and F. Wang, "Model accuracy and runtime tradeoff in distributed deep learning: A systematic study," *IEEE ICDM*, Barcelona, Spain, Dec. 2016.
- [4] A. Lalitha, O. C. Kilinc, T. Javidi, and F. Koushanfar, "Peer-to-peer federated learning on graphs," available on arXiv: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1901.11173>, 2019.
- [5] Z. Zhang, Z. Gao, Y. Guo, and Y. Gong, "Scalable and low-latency federated learning with cooperative mobile edge networking," *IEEE Trans. Mobile Comp.*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 812-822, Jan. 2024.
- [6] T. Castiglia, A. Das, and S. Patterson, "Multi-level local SGD: Distributed SGD for heterogeneous hierarchical networks," *ICLR*, pp. 1-36, 2021.
- [7] W. Wen, Z. Chen, H. H. Yang, W. Xia, and T. Q. S. Quek, "Joint scheduling and resource allocation for hierarchical federated edge learning," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 21, no. 8, pp. 5857-5872, Aug. 2022.
- [8] S. Luo, X. Chen, Q. Wu, Z. Zhou, and S. Yu, "HFEL: Joint edge association and resource allocation for cost-efficient hierarchical federated edge learning," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 19, no. 10, pp. 6535-6548, Oct. 2020.
- [9] F. P. C. Lin, S. Hosseinalipour, N. Michelusi, and C. G. Brinton, "Delay-aware hierarchical federated learning," *IEEE Trans. Cogn. Commun. Netw.*, early access, 2023.
- [10] Q. Wu, X. Chen, T. Ouyang, Z. Zhou, X. Zhang, S. Yang, and J. Zhang, "HiFlash: Communication-efficient hierarchical federated learning With adaptive staleness control and heterogeneity-aware client-edge association," *IEEE Trans. Parallel Distrib. Syst.*, vol. 34, no. 5, pp. 1560-1579, May 2023.
- [11] X. Zhou, X. Ye, K. I. Wang, W. Liang, N. K. C. Nair, S. Shimizu, Z. Yan, and Q. Jin, "Hierarchical federated learning with social context clustering-based participant selection for internet of medical things applications," *IEEE Trans. Comput. Soc.*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 1742-1751, Aug. 2023.
- [12] T. Li, A. K. Sahu, A. Talwalkar, and V. Smith, "Federated learning: Challenges, methods, and future directions," *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 50-60, May 2020.

- [13] S. Liu, G. Yu, X. Chen, and M. Bennis, "Joint user association and resource allocation for wireless hierarchical federated learning with IID and non-IID data," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 21, no. 10, pp. 7852-7866, Oct. 2022.
- [14] N. H. Tran, W. Bao, A. Zomaya, M. N. H. Nguyen, and C. S. Hong, "Federated learning over wireless networks: Optimization model design and analysis," *IEEE INFOCOM*, pp. 1387-1395, Apr. 2019.
- [15] M. Mohammadi Amiri and D. Gunduz, "Federated learning over wireless fading channels," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 3546-3557, May 2020.
- [16] W. Y. Lim, J. S. Ng, Z. Xiong, J. Jin, Y. Zhang, D. Niyato, C. Leung, and C. Miao, "Decentralized edge intelligence: A dynamic resource allocation framework for hierarchical federated learning," *IEEE Trans. Parallel Distrib. Syst.*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 536-550, Mar. 2022.
- [17] O. Aygun, M. Kazemi, D. Gunduz, and T. M. Duman, "Hierarchical over-the-air federated edge learning," *IEEE ICC*, Seoul, Korea, May 2022.
- [18] L. Su, R. Zhou, N. Wang, J. Chen, and Z. Li, "Low-latency hierarchical federated learning in wireless edge networks," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, early access, 2023.
- [19] S. M. Azimi-Abarghouyi and V. Fodor, "Scalable hierarchical over-the-air federated learning," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, early access.
- [20] S. M. Azimi-Abarghouyi and V. Fodor, "Hierarchical over-the-air federated learning with awareness of interference and data Heterogeneity," *IEEE WCNC*, Dubai, UAE, April 2024.
- [21] L. Liu, J. Zhang, S. H. Song, and K. B. Letaief, "Hierarchical federated learning with quantization: Convergence analysis and system design," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 2-18, Jan 2023.
- [22] C. Hou, K. K. Thekumparampil, G. Fanti, and S. Oh, "FeDChain: Chained algorithms for near-optimal communication cost in federated learning," *ICLR*, pp. 1-49, Oct. 2022.
- [23] J. Wang, S. Wang, R. Chen, and M. Ji, "Demystifying why local aggregation helps: Convergence analysis of hierarchical SGD," *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2020.
- [24] D. Alistarh, D. Grubic, J. Li, R. Tomioka, and M. Vojnovic, "Qsgd: Communication efficient sgd via gradient quantization and encoding" *NeurIPS*, pp. 1709-1720, 2017.
- [25] H. Karimi, J. Nutini, and M. Schmidt, "Linear convergence of gradient and proximal-gradient methods under the Polyak-Lojasiewicz condition," in *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases* (Lecture Notes in Computer Science), pp. 795-811, 2016.
- [26] A. Upadhyay and A. Hashemi, "Improved convergence analysis and SNR control strategies for federated learning in the presence of noise," *IEEE Access*, vol. 11, pp. 63398-63416, June 2023.
- [27] Z. Lin, X. Li, V. K. N. Lau, Y. Gong, and K. Huang, "Deploying federated learning in large-scale cellular networks: Spatial convergence analysis," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 1542-1556, Mar. 2022.
- [28] H. H. Yang, Z. Chen, T. Q. S. Quek, and H. V. Poor, "Revisiting analog over-the-air machine learning: The blessing and curse of interference," *IEEE J. Sel. Top. Signal Process.*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 406-419, Apr. 2022.
- [29] S. Liu, G. Yu, R. Yin, and J. Yuan, "Adaptive network pruning for wireless federated learning," *IEEE Wireless Commun. Lett.*, vol. 10, no. 7, pp. 1572-1576, July 2021.
- [30] S. Chen, C. Shen, L. Zhang, and Y. Tang, "Dynamic aggregation for heterogeneous quantization in federated learning," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 20, no. 10, pp. 6804-6819, Oct. 2021.
- [31] Q. Zeng, Y. Du, and K. Huang, "Wirelessly powered federated edge learning: Optimal tradeoffs between convergence and power transfer," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 680-695, Jan 2022.
- [32] S. Liu, G. Yu, R. Yin, J. Yuan, L. Shen, and C. Liu, "Joint model pruning and device selection for communication-efficient federated edge learning," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 70, no. 1, pp. 231-244, Jan. 2022.