

# SoK: Challenges and Opportunities in Federated Unlearning

Hyejun Jeong  
University of Massachusetts Amherst  
Amherst, Massachusetts, USA  
hjeong@umass.edu

Shiqing Ma  
University of Massachusetts Amherst  
Amherst, Massachusetts, USA  
shiqingma@umass.edu

Amir Houmansadr  
University of Massachusetts Amherst  
Amherst, Massachusetts, USA  
amir@cs.umass.edu

## ABSTRACT

Federated learning (FL), introduced in 2017, facilitates collaborative learning between non-trusting parties with no need for the parties to explicitly share their data among themselves. This allows training models on user data while respecting privacy regulations such as GDPR and CPRA. However, emerging privacy requirements may mandate model owners to be able to *forget* some learned data, e.g., when requested by data owners or law enforcement. This has given birth to an active field of research called *machine unlearning*. In the context of FL, many techniques developed for unlearning in centralized settings are not trivially applicable! This is due to the unique differences between centralized and distributed learning, in particular, interactivity, stochasticity, heterogeneity, and limited accessibility in FL. In response, a recent line of work has focused on developing unlearning mechanisms tailored to FL.

This SoK paper aims to take a deep look at the *federated unlearning* literature, with the goal of identifying research trends and challenges in this emerging field. By carefully categorizing papers published on FL unlearning (since 2020), we aim to pinpoint the unique complexities of federated unlearning, highlighting limitations on directly applying centralized unlearning methods. We compare existing federated unlearning methods regarding influence removal and performance recovery, compare their threat models and assumptions, and discuss their implications and limitations. For instance, we analyze the experimental setup of FL unlearning studies from various perspectives, including data heterogeneity and its simulation, the datasets used for demonstration, and evaluation metrics. Our work aims to offer insights and suggestions for future research on federated unlearning.

## KEYWORDS

Federated unlearning, federated learning, machine unlearning

## 1 INTRODUCTION


The “Right to be Forgotten” (RTBF) has gained attention upon its official recognition in 2014 [9], aligning closely with privacy preservation mandates. The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) further stipulated the right to erasure [14], empowering individuals to request the removal of personal data from authorities. Various reasons drive data owners to want their data to be forgotten from machine learning (ML) models, including privacy, security, or usability concerns. Specifically, data providers/owners should be able to request to eliminate their identifiable information and

the influence on a model if they no longer consent to the privacy policy or terms of service. Furthermore, if a model is trained on compromised/faulty data samples, such as backdoor or poisoned data samples, the model owner would want to remove malicious data (to improve security) or faulty data (to improve utility) [5]. This has motivated an active line of work referred to as *Machine Unlearning* (MU), which aims to enable the removal of data (e.g., sensitive or faulty) from ML models trained on them.

The trivial way to unlearn is to retrain the model from scratch, excluding the data to be removed. However, this is not only expensive (overhead in time, memory, and resource consumption), but it may also not be feasible in various practical scenarios (e.g., the data to be unlearned may not be known to public). Therefore, the community has worked on developing unlearning mechanisms that aim not only to effectively but also to efficiently erase the requested data and its influence on the target model as if it had never used the data [4] while maintaining a minimal impact on the model’s performance. Unlearning algorithms are initiated after or during a model reaches sufficient training or convergence and continue until some evaluation metrics are satisfied, resulting in the *unlearned model* [49].

**Unlearning in Federated Learning:** Federated Learning (FL) [44] is a distributed machine learning framework that emerged in 2017 to comply with stringent privacy policies. It enables multiple clients to collaboratively train a model while maintaining their data locally. This paradigm preserves data privacy by design, reducing the risk of privacy breaches from third parties eavesdropping or misuse by data-collecting entities. In FL, a server initializes a global model and distributes the parameters to clients. Each client then trains a local model with private data and sends it back to the server. The server aggregates these local models to update the global model. This iterative process continues until a stopping criterion is met.

In the context of FL, many techniques developed for unlearning in centralized settings are not trivially applicable! This is due to the unique differences between centralized and distributed learning, in particular, interactivity, stochasticity, heterogeneity, and limited accessibility in FL. Once a model is trained in a federated manner, unlearning must also be performed in a federated setting. When a client requests to unlearn its data and remove its influence from the global and other clients’ local models, it may locally perform centralized unlearning and send the unlearned updates to the server for aggregation. However, due to the interactivity inherent in FL, the unlearning effect is trivial if the server simply aggregates all the local models by averaging. To address this, the target client, the server, and the remaining clients must collaborate to amplify the unlearning effect, even without access to the raw target data. Consequently, a recent line of work has emerged focused on developing unlearning mechanisms tailored to FL [36].

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, PO Box 1866, Mountain View, CA 94042, USA.  
  
*Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies YYYY(X)*, 1–23  
© YYYY Copyright held by the owner/author(s).  
<https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

**Table 1: Comparisons to other surveys. Full, partial, and no coverage are represented by ●, ◐, and ○, respectively.**

Ref.	Year	FU	Unlearning								Insight			
			Federated context	Complexity specific to FL	Non-IID Data & simulation	Taxonomy	Who unlearns	Implication	Influence removal	Performance recovery	Limitation	Evaluation metrics	Dataset statistics	Research direction
Nguyen et al.	2022	◐	◐	○	○	●	○	●	●	○	◐	●	●	●
Tang et al.	2023	○	○	○	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Qu et al.	2023	○	○	◐	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Xu et al.	2023	◐	◐	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Shaik et al.	2023	◐	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Wu et al.	2023	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Wang et al.	2023	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Yang and Zhao	2023	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Liu et al.	2023	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
<b>Ours</b>	2024	●	●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○


### 1.1 Contributions of This SoK

This SoK paper aims to provide a comprehensive view of the state of Federated Unlearning (FU) literature, offering insights and recommendations for future research on this topic. In summary, our contribution can be summarized as follows:

- We highlight the unique complexities of unlearning in the federated setting, demonstrating the need for tailored unlearning mechanisms for FL (Section 4).
- We identify and compare the assumptions made in existing FU literature. This includes the entities undertaking unlearning, specifications regarding data distributions, dataset usage, models utilized, and aggregation methods employed, and we elaborate on their research implications (Section 5).
- We compare unlearning targets in different works (Section 3), categorize existing FU techniques regarding influence removal and performance recovery, and discuss their limitations (Section 6). We also compare the evaluation objectives and metrics used in the FU literature (Section 7).
- We provide suggestions for future research on FU based on lessons and insights from our investigation of the existing FU literature (Section 8).

### 1.2 Comparison to Other Surveys in Unlearning

In Table 1 we compare several recent surveys on Machine Unlearning [49, 52, 55, 59, 74] and Federated Unlearning [41, 61, 71, 76] regarding various dimensions. As can be seen, while some surveys have considered unlearning in the federated context, not all addressed the unique complexities of FU, often overlooking factors such as data heterogeneity in FL. Furthermore, because FU involves multiple parties with varying knowledge and capabilities, disclosing raw original and unlearning model parameters to all participants could potentially facilitate adversaries in inferring the removed information. Thus, identifying the parties involved in unlearning and implementing robust safeguards is one of the necessary aspects



**Figure 1: Number of Federated Unlearning Publications.**

to be considered, although only a few surveys [41, 61] have taken security aspects into account.

Compared to the standard machine unlearning, federated unlearning is in its infancy. By searching on Google Scholar, we try to identify all works related to the keywords “unlearning” and “federated” or “distributed” at the same time. Figure 1 summarizes the number of FU papers published each year until May 13th, 2024 (i.e., 52 in total). The table shows the rising attention to FU, motivating our SoK to work on trying to identify research gaps and challenges for future research.

*1.2.1 Comparison to a concurrent survey [41].* The work most closely aligned with ours is [41], a concurrent survey primarily reviewing existing FU techniques, including unlearner, methodology, limitations, and evaluation methods. As our SoK aims ultimately to provide insights for future work, we identify room for improvement in addition to analyzing existing literature in diverse dimensions. Specifically, our work delves deep into the practicality of each literature, including assumptions on data distribution and its simulation, along with dataset usage and research implications. We extract key takeaways from each part while exploring various concepts, properties, and methodologies. At the end of the paper, we provide valuable insights based on the takeaways to offer readers a clear understanding of the insights.

## 2 PRELIMINARIES

We provide preliminary information on FU, including definitions, brief introductions to FL and MU, and the inherent complexities.

### 2.1 Federated Learning

FL [44] trains a model in a privacy-preserving way by distributing model updates to the participating clients instead of collecting sensitive data in a centralized location. The workflow is as follows:

- Step 1.** A central server initializes a global model  $w^0$ .
- Step 2.** The server advertises the global model  $w^t$  and selects  $K = C \times N$  clients, a random fraction  $C$  of clients out of a total of  $N$  clients that will participate in the current training round.
- Step 3.** Each of the  $K$  local clients computes an update  $g_k^t$  (as Eq. 2) based on the current global model  $w^t$  with its local training dataset  $\mathcal{D}_k$ . Then, they send the updates  $g_k^t$  to the server.

$$F_k(w^t) = \frac{1}{D_k} \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}_k} f_d(w_k^t) \tag{1}$$

$$g_k = \nabla F_k(w_t) \tag{2}$$

where  $\mathcal{D}_k$  is the set of data points with a size of  $D_k$  a client  $k$  has,  $w_k^t$  is the local model weight at round  $t$ ,  $f_d$  is the loss of the prediction on sample  $d$ , and  $F_k$  is the average loss over the set of data points.




Figure 2: FL Training Workflow.

**Step 4.** The server aggregates  $K$  received updates and creates an updated global model  $w^{t+1}$  (as Eq. 3).

$$w^{t+1} \leftarrow w^t - \eta \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K g_k \quad (3)$$

where  $\eta$  is the learning rate.

**Step 2 to Step 4** are repeated until the pre-set stopping criterion is met. The aggregation method in the description above is FedAvg [44] that averages the local updates but can differ, such as the Federated SGD (FedSGD) or FedBuff.

**2.1.1 Components.** As illustrated in Figure 2, a global server and multiple local clients comprise an FL process. The global server, assumed to be equipped with more powerful computation and memory resources, is responsible for aggregating local clients’ model updates to create an updated global model. Nonetheless, as it cannot access raw data, its knowledge is limited to the model parameters but not training data. Similarly, local clients can access their own training dataset, not each other’s. Key terminologies related to FL are summarized in Table 8 in Appendix A.

## 2.2 Machine Unlearning

MU aims to remove specific samples, classes, or features from a trained model upon request. A naive approach is to retrain the model from scratch, excluding the data to forget [5]. Nonetheless, this is often impractical due to its time overhead, especially when the model has been trained with a huge dataset. As such, efficient unlearning methods have been explored, effectively forgetting the data while maintaining performance on remaining data faster than *retraining*. The main objective is to make the unlearned model ( $w_{un}$ ) perform as similar as possible to the retrained one ( $w_{re}$ ):

$$w_{un} \simeq w_{re} \quad (4)$$

MU methods are broadly categorized into data-driven [49, 74] approaches including data partition [3], obfuscation [21], augmentation [24], or influence [5, 51], and the model manipulation [74] approaches include model shifting, pruning, and replacement.

The evaluation metrics are various [49]. Broadly categorized, there are performance-based (accuracy or error rates), time-related (time for unlearning and relearning), distance-based (KL divergence, L2 distance, or cosine similarity to *retrain*), and attack-based (attack success rate of backdoor or membership inference attacks) metrics. Many of these metrics overlap with those used for FU.

**2.2.1 Complexities in Machine Unlearning.** Erasing the sample itself (*target removal*) is straightforward, but eliminating its influence is uneasy. These challenges stem from factors like the stochastic nature of training with randomly ordered batches, the incremental nature of training, and catastrophic forgetting, leading to significant performance degradation on the remaining data [49].

## 3 INTRODUCING FEDERATED UNLEARNING

Figure 3 depicts the overall FU flow. During or after training an FL model, either a server or clients request to remove certain target information. The target samples or clients are first removed from the learning process upon request. Then, unlearners begin unlearning to remove the influence of the target from the learned global model, followed by performance recovery to restore remembering information. Note that the two steps can occur sequentially or concurrently. The unlearning model is monitored based on some evaluation metrics, and the process continues until it meets a predefined stopping criterion to complete unlearning.


**What is Unlearned?** Unlearning target refers to the data or information we want the model to forget. Upon request, the target(s) are removed from the training set (*target removal*).

**Sample** removal involves eliminating particular data points (i.e., removing mistakenly uploaded photos and their influence) extending beyond just erasing private ones [13, 72]. It includes sanitizing the training dataset by removing polluted samples, such as poisoned or compromised [1, 30, 32, 67, 69] or outdated samples [65, 71, 74].

**Class** removal aims at removing all samples labeled as the target class. Think of backdoor attacks; compromised clients hold trigger-injected samples labeled as a certain class (e.g., “9”) while other clients hold normal data. Here, the target to unlearn would be the class, 9. Additionally, depending on how samples are distributed across clients, it can also be treated as a client removal problem.

**Client** removal involves erasing all data owned by specific clients from the model [20, 36, 40, 50, 57, 70, 75, 83]. It overlaps with sample removal if all data owned by a specific client are subject to be removed [4, 18, 22, 26, 32, 64, 80, 86] and class removal when each client has a distinct class of samples [19, 20, 78]. It is analogous to feature removal with vertical or cross-silo FL [10, 39, 82].

**Feature** removal is forgetting specific features from the training data. The feature could represent data heterogeneity in the federated context, as seen in [12], where the scanner bias was set as the feature to be removed from medical images collected from different sites. It overlaps with sample removal, especially when eliminating samples with poison-indicating features, and client removal in vertical FL [10] that each client has a dataset of distinct features [77].



**Figure 3: Federated Unlearning Workflow.** The server or clients initiate target removal during or after FL model training. The unlearner excludes the target, erases its contribution, and recovers performance. The requesting client verifies the proper elimination using evaluation metrics, completing unlearned model generation.

## 4 UNIQUE CHALLENGES OF FEDERATED UNLEARNING

The federated context brings unique complexities to FU, in addition to those in centralized unlearning, described in Section 2.1.1. In this section, we explore why MU methods cannot be directly applied to FU and investigate the inherent difficulties involved. Note that the complexities described below are not orthogonal nor mutually exclusive, but they are often linked; to address one concern, the other might also need to be resolved. It makes FU much more complex to achieve.

**Interactive and iterative training** embeds information in a model [36, 71]. The subsequent training rounds accumulate all the information propagated throughout global and local models [40]. In addition to the information forwarding coupling in parameter updates, interactivity further adds many more difficulties. FL interactively trains a model by iteratively aggregating local models on the server, diminishing the impact of a local model upon aggregation. It then means that removing the information and influence from only one local model, analogous to that in MU, is no longer feasible in the federated context as it soon becomes ineffective after it is aggregated.

**Information isolation** characterizes FL that allows privacy-preserving training by keeping data local to clients, unlike centralized (un)learning, where a single entity has access to all data. FU involves three parties with varying levels of data accessibility: the server, target clients, and remaining clients. When the server or remaining clients perform unlearning, it is different from centralized unlearning and more complicated as they do not have access to raw data. Moreover, unlearning methods utilizing raw data (e.g., data partition [3], augmentation [24], or influence [51]) become inapplicable due to limited access to local data from the server or other clients [49, 71].

**Non-IID data** across distinct clients, one of the famous open problems in FL [27], adds difficulty to FU. In contrast to centralized ML, each FL client separately trains a local model based on their training data that could vary in the amount of data, features, locations, time scales, or sample space (non-IID). Fused with the information isolation, the degree of non-IID is also not presumable. This complication in data distribution makes FU more challenging

**Table 2: Accessible knowledge depending on who unlearns.** The columns “Global,” “Own local,” “All local,” and “Raw data” refer to the global model updates, own local model updates, all local model updates, and raw data to forget, respectively.

Unlearner	Global	Own local	All local	Raw data
Server	✓		✓	
Target client	✓	✓		✓
Remaining clients	✓	✓		

than MU, separating and eliminating the influence of target data from the trained model.

**Stochastic client selection** introduces an additional layer of uncertainty in FL, as the server randomly chooses participating clients in every global round, receiving updates from the arbitrarily selected clients [40, 71]. It extends the stochasticity in training caused by randomly ordered training batches (i.e., the challenge in MU) [49]. These uncertainties limit the unlearning entities to gather each client’s and each data sample’s impact, making the exact modification of model parameters impossible.

**T-1. Takeaways on Unique Challenges of FU.** Unlike MU, which unlearns information within accessible raw data in a central location, FU cannot solely rely on the target client to unlearn due to the diminishing impact from individual clients upon aggregation. Isolated information, limited accessibility to data and its distribution, and extra uncertainty stemming from client selection introduce additional challenges to FU, as not all participants consistently have access to raw data.

## 5 COMPARISON OF EXISTING SYSTEM MODELS FOR FU

We overview and compare the system models used in the existing FU literature from various dimensions.

### 5.1 Who Unlearns?

“Who unlearns” differentiates FU from MU and FL. In the federated context, the entities performing unlearning have knowledge and capabilities that depend on who they are. Table 2 summarizes the knowledge available to each unlearner. Each client has its local and global model updates but no updates from the others. Thus, if

only the remaining clients unlearn, they must rely on the global model updates they have received. When the target client performs unlearning, it can additionally leverage its raw training data. On the other hand, if the server performs unlearning, it has access to the global model and updates from all clients' models. As indicated in the "Unlearner" column of Table 3, most works chose to perform unlearning on the target clients, given their access to raw data to unlearn. The server, accessible to all local updates and identifying target clients, often takes charge of unlearning. Nonetheless, in scenarios where target clients request removal and leave, remaining clients often cooperate with the server.

**T-2. Takeaways on Who Unlearns.** The clients' flexibility to dynamically join and leave poses a risk of malicious clients joining FU. Furthermore, if the target client has left the system and/or the unlearning performer is not the target client, unlearning would not be properly completed, leaving residuals for the early-leaving client. Consequently, it could leave room for potential exploitation by the compromised parties, who unlearn in what way matters to assure complete removal, distinct from FL.

## 5.2 What Data Distribution?

Another crucial consideration is "under what data distribution," which is how data are distributed across clients. Data distribution and its simulation are summarized in the column "Data Dist." and "NIID sim." of Table 3. Heterogeneous data, a more practical assumption in the distributed nature, often interferes with FL models from convergence [85]. Similarly, an FU method designed for and demonstrated with IID data only would be highly unlikely to work as expected in practice with real-world data. Some works [50, 57, 65] naturally achieved it using real-world datasets, such as FEMNIST, Tiny-Shakespeare, or MovieLens-100k. The majority of the authors adopted prior probability shifts, as well as covariate shifts and concept drift. Below is a brief introduction to the three types and their implementation. For a more detailed description of non-IID data, refer to Section 3.1 in [27].

**Prior probability shift**, a variation in label distributions across clients, is frequently simulated using three primary methods:

- **Dirichlet Distribution:** This method quantifies the degree of non-IIDness using a concentration parameter,  $\alpha$  (within the interval  $(0, \infty)$ <sup>1</sup>. As  $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ , it mimics IID, while  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$  imitates a higher degree of non-IID. Widely recognized for its ability to emulate real-world scenarios, many works employed this approach [11, 16, 18, 30, 57, 64, 86].
- **Fang's Method [15]:** In this unique approach, clients are divided into  $L$  groups, where  $L$  denotes the number of classes in a dataset. Training instances with label  $l$  are assigned to the  $l$ -th group with probability  $p$  and to any other group with a probability of  $\frac{1-p}{L-1}$ . This method is adopted by [4, 63].
- **Unique Class Assignment:** [19, 20, 78] assign unique classes to each client such that each client exclusively holds data samples of one or two classes out of ten.

<sup>1</sup>For a visual representation, refer to Figure 4 in [58]

**Covariate shift**, or feature distribution skew, occurs when each client has different features of data instances with the same label shared across clients. An example is the dataset that FedHarmony [12] used. They wanted to unlearn site-specific bias from medical images so that the model could focus solely on biological features.

**Concept drift** refers to the changing input data distribution over time. When a sample is removed from the training dataset, the distribution shifts from its original state. With each subsequent sample removal, the distribution changes again, transitioning to a different state. FRAMU [54] views unlearning as a continual learning process from distinct training datasets after each removal, so it adapts to these dynamic and evolving distributions.

**T-3. Takeaways on Data Distribution.** Despite the significance of data distribution in the federated context, only about half of the FU literature emulated non-IID settings. Furthermore, while the simulation through Dirichlet distribution is recognized for its ability to mimic real-world datasets,  $\alpha$ , controlling degree of non-IID, varies across the literature, and what value reflects the real-world dataset the most remains unclear.

## 5.3 On What Dataset?

Existing FU methods demonstrated their effectiveness in diverse types of training data and for various tasks, such as image classification, object detection, regression, sentiment analysis, recommendation, and clustering. Nonetheless, as depicted in Figure 4, 32 out of 54 studies demonstrated its effectiveness primarily on simple image datasets like MNIST [29] and CIFAR10 [28] while fewer works were experimented on more complex image datasets such as CelebA [42], CIFAR100 [28], or EMNIST [8]. Also, Table 4 depicts image datasets were used 109 times, 74% of the entire usage, and multi-modal datasets<sup>2</sup> were used twice in a single work, [50]. Only a few works were experimented on complex datasets such as Shakespeare (text), Pix3D (3D modeling), or VRHP (video).

**T-4. Takeaways on Dataset Usage.** Like the early stages of FL, FU is yet predominantly focused on vision tasks with simple image datasets. Nonetheless, the practicality of FU should not be limited to basic datasets like MNIST. For FU to fully leverage the advantages offered by AI and FL, it should extend its scope to include diverse datasets for more sensitive tasks beyond vision tasks on images.

## 5.4 Configurations

As detailed in Table 5, images are the most used data type for vision tasks in FU, so convolution networks were employed the most. Model architectures vary from shallower designs (2- to 4-layer CNN) to more complex structures, including LeNet, AlexNet, VGG, ResNet, DenseNet, MobileNet, and RegNet. Liu et al., Zhang et al. employed tree architectures such as Random Forest and Gradient Boosted Decision Tree. For Bayesian FU implementations, as seen in works like [19, 67], the Bayesian Neural Network (BNN) architecture was used. Zhu et al. employed knowledge graph embedding models

<sup>2</sup>TCGA <https://www.cancer.gov/ccg/research/genome-sequencing/tcga>  
TMI <https://opencas.webarchiv.kit.edu/?q=tmidataset>


**Table 3: Unlearner and Data Simulation.** Columns “Target” and “Remain” refer to the target and remaining clients. “NIID sim.” indicates non-IID data simulation methods: “Dirichlet,” “Fang,” “unique,” and “random” refer to Dirichlet distribution, Fang et al.’s approach, limited class assignments, and random assignment, respectively. “n/d” denotes not disclosed.

Ref.	Unlearner			Data Dist.	NIID sim.
	Server	Target	Remain		
RevFRF[39]	●			n/d	n/d
Exact-Fun[73]		●	●	Non-IID	random
FATS[60]	●			Non-IID	Dirichlet
R2S[68]	●			n/d	-
Shao et al.[56]	●			Non-IID	unique
Wang et al.[66]			●	IID	-
FedRecover[4]	●		●	Non-IID	Fang
Wu et al.[69]	●			n/d	n/d
Fu et al.[17]	●			IID, Non-IID	Fang
FedRecovery[83]	●			IID	-
MetaFul[64]	●			IID, Non-IID	Dirichlet
Deng et al.[10]	●			IID	-
Starfish[43]	●●			n/d	-
Crab[25]	●			n/d	-
FedEraser[36]			●	n/d	n/d
FRU[80]	●	●	●	n/d	n/d
SIFU[16]	●		●	IID, Non-IID	Dirichlet
FedRemover[81]	●			n/d	-
FedUnlearn[48]	●			IID	-
SecForget[38]		●		n/d	n/d
FFMU[6]		●		n/d	n/d
FedFilter[65]	●			Non-IID	-
UKRL[75]		●		IID, Non-IID	random
MoDe[86]	●	●		Non-IID	Dirichlet
FRAMU[54]		●	●	Non-IID	concept drift
VeriFi[18]	●			Non-IID	Dirichlet
Lin et al.[35]	●			n/d	-
FC[50]	●			IID, Non-IID	n/d
Wang et al.[63]	●	●	●	IID, Non-IID	Fang
SecureCut[82]		●		n/d	n/d
FAST[22]	●			IID, Non-IID	random
ElBedoui et al.[13]		●		IID	-
2F2L[26]		●		IID	-
Liu et al.[40]		●		IID	-
FedME2[72]		●	●	n/d	n/d
Alam et al.[1]		●		IID	-
BFU[67]		●		n/d	n/d
FedHarmony[12]		●	●	Non-IID	covariate shift
Chen et al.[7]	●			IID, Non-IID	n/d
Goldfish[62]	●			Non-IID	random
FedLU[87]	●	●	●	Non-IID	unique
FedAF[32]		●		n/d	n/d
HDUS[78]			●	Non-IID	unique
EWC-SGA[70]		●		IID, Non-IID	unique
SFU[30]	●	●	●	IID, Non-IID	Dirichlet
Halimi et al.[23]		●		IID	-
QuickDrop[11]		●	●	IID, Non-IID	Dirichlet
forget-SVGD[19]		●		Non-IID	unique
forget-SVGD[20]		●		Non-IID	unique
KNOT[57]	●	●	●	Non-IID	Dirichlet
Lin et al.[33]			●	IID, Non-IID	random
Lin et al.[34]	●			IID, Non-IID	n/d

**Table 4: Counts of data types used for experiments.**

Data Type	Count	Modality	Count
Image	109	Uni-modal	123
Tabular	22	Multi-modal	2
Text	7	*Other* include 4 time-series, 3 sensors, 1 graph, and 1 other datasets.	
Other	9		

\* The total count is 147.



**Figure 4: Dataset choice for experiments.**

(TransE, ComplEx, and RotE) specifically tailored for graph-type datasets. In a different domain, FRU [80], a federated unlearning method in recommender systems, opted for graph-based models like NCF and LightGCN. MetaFul [64] utilized LSTM to train a model on the video dataset.

The prevailing aggregation method in FU remains FedAvg, strategically weighing each client’s gradient based on their dataset size and averaging them to ensure proportional impact. To address asynchronous FU, Dinsdale et al. introduced FedBuff for integrating client updates. Additionally, some works [4, 18] involved Byzantine-robust aggregation algorithms—Krum, Trimmed-Mean, and Median. These algorithms effectively handle outliers by excluding the most deviating updates, trimming a specific percentage of extreme updates, or computing the median, respectively.

**T-5. Takeaways on Configurations.** Less work adopted pre-trained models while using them is more common and practical in image classification or NLP tasks. Regarding aggregation, over 90% of them relied on the simplest FedAvg, although weighted averaging clients’ updates could lead to intolerance to Byzantine failures or system heterogeneity.

### 5.5 Research Implication of Prior Works

As summarized in Table 5, authors primarily considered efficacy, fidelity, and efficiency when designing FU methods. However, the distributed nature of FL and the emergent vulnerability of FU compelled them to pursue theoretical guarantees on convergence [16, 70, 72] and performance [6, 39, 50, 83], scalability to the number of clients [11, 57, 78, 80], adaptivity to changing data distribution [54], asynchronous parameter upload timing [57] and model architectures [40, 78, 80], and security against data leakage [1, 4, 10, 16, 18, 30, 39, 50, 75, 82, 83]. Note that security, adaptivity, and scalability are merely theoretically guaranteed in their respective papers, in contrast to efficacy, fidelity, and efficiency. Security aspects also mainly relied on adding techniques like Homomorphic Encryption [10, 82], or Differential Privacy [1, 30, 83], or placing a trusted third party between the server and clients [75] instead of theoretical security analysis, except for RevFRF [39].

**Table 5: Dataset types and model architectures used, with implications of the method. 'im,' 'ta,' 'tx,' and 'ot' refer to image, tabular, text, and other datasets. 'efc,' 'fid,' 'efn,' 'sec,' 'gua,' 'ada,' and 'sca' represent efficacy, fidelity, efficiency, security, guarantee, adaptivity, and scalability. 'Med,' 'TrMean', and 'n/d' indicate Median, Trimmed mean[79], and not disclosed, respectively.**

Ref.	Data Type				Model Architecture	Aggregation Method	Implication							
	im	ta	tx	ot			efc	fid	efn	sec	gua	ada	sca	
RevFRF[39]	●	●			Random Forest	n/d	●	●	●	●				
Exact-Fun[73]	●				3-, 4-layer CNN	FedAvg	●	●	●					
FATS[60]	●		●		CNN, pretrained VGG16, LSTM	FedAvg	●	●	●		●			
R2S[68]	●		●		LeNet5, ResNet18, 34, M5, pointConv	n/d	●	●	●		●	●		
Shao et al.[56]	●				LeNet5	Weighted Avg	●	●	●		●			
Wang et al.[66]				●	Linear model	FedAvg	●	●	●					
FedRecover[4]	●	●			3-layer CNN, FCNN	FedAvg, Med, TrMean	●	●	●	●				
Wu et al.[69]	●				2-layer CNN, VGG11, AlexNet	FedAvg	●	●	●					
Fu et al.[17]	●				2-layer CNN, ResNet18	n/d	●	●	●					
FedRecovery[83]	●				pre-trained CNN	FedAvg	●	●	●	●	●			
MetaFul[64]	●			●	VGG16, LSTM	FedAvg	●	●	●	●				
Deng et al.[10]	●	●			CNN	n/d	●	●	●	●				
Starfish[43]	●				3-, 4-layer CNN	FedAvg	●	●	●	●	●			
Crab[25]	●		●		n/d	FedAvg	●	●	●					
FedEraser[36]	●	●			MLP, 4-layer CNN	FedAvg	●	●	●					
FRU[80]			●		NCF, LightGCN	FedAvg	●	●	●			●	●	
SIFU[16]	●				Regression model, CNN	FedAvg	●	●	●	●	●			
FedRemover[81]	●				n/d	n/d	●	●	●	●		●		
FedUnlearn[48]	●				3-layer CNN, ResNet18	FedAvg	●	●	●					
FFMU[6]	●				CNN, LeNet, ResNet18	FedAvg	●	●	●		●			
FedFilter[65]			●		4-layer CNN	Avg. base layers	●	●	●					
UKRL[75]	●				DNN	FedAvg	●	●	●	●				
MoDe[86]	●				ResNet	FedAvg	●	●	●					
FRAMU[54]	●	●	●	●	n/d	FedAvg	●	●	●			●		
VeriFi[18]	●		●		LeNet5, ResNet18, CNN, DenseNet121	FedAvg, Krum, Median	●	●	●	●				
Lin et al.[35]	●				3-, 4-layer CNN	Weighted Avg	●	●	●	●		●		
FC[50]	●	●	●		DC-KMeans	SCMA	●	●	●	●	●			
Wang et al.[63]	●				ResNet, pre-trained VGG	FedAvg	●	●	●					
SecureCut[82]		●			Gradient Boosted Decision Tree (GBDT)	n/d	●	●	●	●				
FAST[22]	●				MLP, 2-layer CNN, VGG11, MobileNet	FedAvg	●	●	●	●				
Elbedoui et al.[13]				●	3-layer CNN	FedAvg	●	●	●					
2F2L[26]	●				3-layer CNN	FedAvg	●	●	●					
Liu et al.[40]	●				3-layer CNN, AlexNet, ResNet	FedAvg	●	●	●		●	●		
FedME2[72]	●				MobileNetv3-large, ResNet50, RegNet-8gf	FedAvg	●	●	●	●				
Alam et al.[1]	●				VGG11, ResNet18	FedAvg	●	●	●					
BFU[67]	●				3-layer BNN, ResNet18	FedAvg	●	●	●					
FedHarmony[12]	●				VGG-based CNN	FedEqual	●	●	●					
Chen et al.[7]	●			●	3-layer CNN, LeNet5	n/d	●	●	●					
Goldfish[62]	●				LeNet5, ResNet32, 56	n/d	●	●	●					●
FedLU[87]				●	TransE, ComplEx, RotE	FedAvg	●	●	●	●				
FedAF[32]	●				3-layer CNN, ResNet10	FedAvg	●	●	●	●				
HDUS[78]	●				ResNet8, 18, 50, MobileNet-S, -M, -L	n/d	●	●	●		●	●		
EWC-SGA[70]	●				n/d	FedAvg	●	●	●					
SFU[30]	●				MLP, 3-layer CNN, ResNet18	n/d	●	●	●	●				
Halimi et al.[23]	●				3-layer CNN	FedAvg	●	●	●					
QuickDrop[11]	●				3-layer CNN	FedAvg	●	●	●					
forget-SVGD[19]	●				1-layer BNN	n/d	●	●	●					
Cforget-SVGD[20]	●				MLP	FedAvg	●	●	●					
KNOT[57]	●	●	●		VGG16, LeNet5, MLP, GPT2	FedAvg, FedBuff	●	●	●		●	●		
Lin et al.[33]	●		●		3-layer CNN, NanoGPT	FedAvg	●	●	●		●	●	●	
Lin et al.[34]	●				n/d	FedAvg	●	●	●					

**T-6. Takeaways on Research Implications.** Most works aim to achieve efficacy, fidelity, or efficiency, with a few additional focuses on security, guarantee, scalability, and adaptability. However, given the increased risk of privacy breaches due to the accessibility to both learned and unlearned models and the dynamic nature of client participation, it becomes imperative to consider the other implications actively.

## 6 EXISTING UNLEARNING TECHNIQUES

Unlearning methods are classified into two categories: exact and approximate. Exact unlearning ensures exact indistinguishability of the distributions between unlearned and retrained models, while approximate unlearning guarantees only approximately [74], often due to imprecise estimation of data influence [32].

Despite its precision, exact unlearning comes with substantial computational and storage costs compared to approximate one. It necessitates the computation and storage of multiple sub-models during initial training, which can also hinder its adaptability to

<sup>3</sup>The model updates to be subtracted are calculated only on the target data.

**Table 6: Unlearning targets, influence removal methods, and performance recovery methods define an unlearning mechanism. Each refers to what we want the model to forget, how the model can forget, and how to maintain the performance on the remembered dataset, respectively. sp, cs, ct, and ft refer to sample, class, client, and feature, respectively.**

Ref.	Target				Unlearning Method	
	sp	cs	ct	ft	Influence removal	Performance recovery
RevFRF[39]	●				Remove the node of the target client and all the child nodes	-
Exact-Fun[73]	●				Retrain the remaining clients using a quantized model	-
FATS[60]	●	●			Retrain only if sampling probability changes after removal	-
R2S[68]		●			Retrain from historically saved local model checkpoints	Automatic optimizer control for generalization
Shao et al.[56]		●			Recover from historically saved local updates	Add a penalty term derived from projected gradients
Wang et al.[66]		●			Recover from historically saved local model updates	-
FedRecover[4]		●			Recover from historically saved remaining clients' updates	Pre- and Post-training
Wu et al.[69]	●				Recover from historically saved remaining clients' updates	KD: transfer remembered knowledge
Fu et al.[17]		●			Recover from historically saved local updates by projection	Post KD iterations on auxiliary data in the server
FedRecovery[83]		●			Recover from historically saved local model updates	Add Gaussian noise
MetaFul[64]		●			Recover from saved updates and subtract target ones	Fine-tuning using the direction of the target updates
Deng et al.[10]		●	●		Recover from saved target model updates at the last round by subtracting them from the global model	Constraints on intermediate local model parameter during training
Starfish[43]		●			Recover from least-affected local updates	Recompute the local updates with large approx error
Crab[25]		●			Recover from selectively saved least-affected local updates	-
FedEraser[36]		●			Recover from periodically saved local model updates	Post-training: a few training rounds after unlearning
FRU[80]		●			Restore certain global model updates saved historically	Gradient manipulation: direction
SIFU[16]		●			Restore and perturb certain global models, saved historically	-
FedRemover[81]		●			Adjust direction from historically saved local updates only if the model performance drops	-
FedUnlearn[48]		●			Perturb target label to the fake one	-
SecForget[38]	●				Perturbation addition to the target client	Add a regularization term: L1 norm
FFMU[6]	●				Perturbation addition to the target client	-
FedFilter[65]	●				Perturbing target update by generating a reverse gradient	SGD to minimize impact on the model accuracy
UKRL[75]		●			Perturbing target updates by training it on noised input	-
MoDe[86]		●	●		Scale down on the target data points	Guided fine-tuning on remaining data points
FRAMU[54]	●				Scale up/down using an attention mechanism	-
VeriFi[18]		●			Scale up/down on remaining/target clients' updates	-
Lin et al.[35]		●			Scale up/down on remaining clients' updates	-
FC[50]		●			Scale to zero on the target clients' updates	-
Wang et al.[63]		●			Prune the channel of gradients corresponding to the target	Fine-tuning: few FL training without regularization
SecureCut[82]	●		●		Prune the nodes of their local model and retrain it	Post-training: a few training rounds after unlearning
FAST[22]		●			Subtract target model updates from the global model	Fine-tuning with a small-size IID dataset
ElBedoui et al.[13]	●		●		Subtract target model updates from the global model <sup>3</sup>	-
2F2L[26]		●			Loss function approximation	-
Liu et al.[40]		●			Loss function approximation using diagonal FIM	Apply Momentum technique to Hessian diagonal
FedME2[72]		●			Multi-task learning: data erasure and remembrance	Add a regularization term: L2 norm
Alam et al.[1]	●				Multi-task learning: data erasure and remembrance	Dynamic penalization
BFU[67]	●				Multi-task learning: data erasure	Multi-task learning: maintaining performance
FedHarmony[12]		●			Multi-task learning: data erasure and remembrance	-
Chen et al.[7]	●				Multi-task learning: minimize KLD between the predicted distribution of forget and arbitrary data	Multiply the loss by a scaling factor to balance between efficacy and fidelity
Goldfish[62]	●				KD & Multi-task learning: minimize bias between the prediction within forget set and transfer only retaining knowledge	Multi-task learning: maintaining performance
FedLU[87]	●				KD: transfer knowledge to be remembered	Fine-tuning: suppressing activation of the target data
FedAF[32]	●	●	●		KD: transfer fake knowledge	EWC training, using a Hessian matrix as a regularizer
HDUS[78]		●			Ensemble remaining clients' knowledge-distilled seed models	-
EWC-SGA[70]	●	●	●		Reverse training: stochastic gradient ascent	EWC training, using FIM as a regularizer
SFU[30]	●				Reverse training: Gradient Ascent (GA)	Project the target updates into the subspace
Halimi et al.[23]		●			Reverse training: maximizing local loss	Post-training: a few training rounds after unlearning
QuickDrop[11]		●	●		Reverse training (stochastic GA) on the distilled dataset	Fine-tuning with a few original data samples
forget-SVGD[19]		●			Variational inference, maximizing local loss	Post-training: a few training rounds after unlearning
Cforget-SVGD[20]	●	●	●		Variational inference, quantization and sparsification method	Post-training: a few training rounds after unlearning
KNOT[57]		●			Cluster based on their similarity and retrain one cluster	-
Lin et al.[33]		●			Clustering: retrain the cluster containing the target	-
Lin et al.[34]		●			Cluster based on their similarity and calibrate the gradient by step length and direction	Dynamically select remaining clients possessing unbalanced local data

dynamically changing data [74]. Additionally, it is constrained to simpler models due to scalability reasons [53] because it often relies on partition-aggregation frameworks [32].

In contrast, approximate unlearning methods offer greater time efficiency gains; for instance, the computational burden is reduced through calculations on sampled parameters instead of computing over all parameters [26, 40]. Also, model utility can be restored during the performance recovery process.

## 6.1 Influence Removal

This stage eliminates the unlearning targets' influences from the trained model, such that the unlearned model behaves as if it has never seen the target data. The gray boxes summarize the concepts and limitations.



**6.1.1 Historical Information.** The server stores historical local model updates for potential model restoration or estimation before engaging in target unlearning. In SIFU [16], the server identified and restored an optimal FL iteration without the target information, similar to Starfish[43] and R2S[68]. Only using historically saved remaining clients’ updates, Shao et al. and FedRecover [4] estimated the unlearned model, and Wang et al. calibrated the remaining clients’ gradients by approximating the direction of updates to generate a calibrated model by weighted average. Zhang et al. subtracted a weighted sum of gradient residuals from the global model using historical local updates, weighing them by clients’ contribution in decreasing global loss. MetaFul [64] and Wu et al. subtracted historically averaged target updates from the global model to eliminate its contribution. Similarly, Deng et al. sent the negatives of target updates to remaining clients for subtraction. Interestingly, Fu et al. also recovered from the historically saved local model updates but projected them to a low-dimensional subspace inspired by that client-specific information are embedded in their higher-dimensional space.

However, storing all updates is often infeasible, especially for those adapting large models or for cross-device FL with millions of clients. Some works, thus, store updates periodically [36] or selectively [25, 80, 81], to relax the memory overhead. Similar to Wang et al., FedEraser [36] took a direction calibration approach but only using recent sets of updates. Crab [25] and FRU [80] used a rollback mechanism, as in DBMS. Crab [25] only stored high-contributing clients in which the gradients have large KL divergence and high cosine similarity to the global model and identified the least affected gradients to start calibration from, while FRU [80] stored important updates with negative sampling and restored the state before the target engagement. Monitoring the sampling probability, FATS [60] recomputed gradients only when changes occurred after deleting a target to minimize parameter update frequency.

**T-7. Takeaways on historical information:** Unlearning using historical information could increase the correctness of the unlearned model, as the unlearned model is likely to converge. Nonetheless, as the model size or the number of epochs gets larger, saving all model updates is infeasible due to its high memory requirement. Now, the most important consideration would be the sampling method, finding the parameters that represent and affect the model the most.

### 6.1.2 Gradient Manipulation.

**Perturbation:** FFMU [6] added Gaussian noise to smooth all local models’ gradients, treating them as perturbations during server aggregation, while FedRecovery [83] introduced it on the unlearned model to make retrained and unlearned models indistinguishable. UKRL [75], on the other hand, perturbed target model updates by training on noised inputs. SecForget [38] incorporated a trainable dummy gradient generator for each client to simulate the neurons of a model to eliminate the memorization of the specific data, while in FedFilter [65], the server generated a random reverse gradient and performed SGD to maximize the elimination effect.

**Scaling:** In Verifi [18], target clients’ gradients were downscaled, and remaining clients’ gradients were upscaled, causing gradual vanishment of the target’s influence. MoDe [86] constructed a

shadow model of the global model, sent exclusively to and trained on remaining clients. The unlearning model reduced discrimination towards target data points by adding  $(1 - \lambda)$  scaled weights of the shadow model to the  $\lambda$ , within the range  $[0, 1]$ , scaled unlearning model. FRAMU [54] involved clients in calculating and sending attention scores with local model updates. These scores were utilized on the server to assign less weight to model updates corresponding to the target data. Similarly, Lin et al. adaptively assessed the remaining clients’ contributions while training the model, and the server performed a weighted average on the remaining clients’ updates based on the contribution score.

**Pruning:** Wang et al. calculated relevant scores between channels and categories using TF-IDF and pruned the most discriminative channels of the target category. In SecureCut [82], the target clients pruned the nodes of their tree-structured local models and retrained them. ElBedoui computed model parameters only using the target data and sent it to the server, subtracting it from the global model.

**T-8. Takeaways on Gradient Manipulation:** Models are perturbed such that they fail to achieve the task for the target information. Local updates are scaled differently to minimize and maximize the importance of the target model and retaining knowledge, respectively. Pruning refines the gradients or nodes containing the target knowledge. Nonetheless, all gradient manipulation methods incur additional complexity in finding precise perturbation, scaling factors, and pruning information because the model will not converge otherwise.

**6.1.3 Loss Function Approximation.** Loss functions are approximated by calculating the inverse Hessian matrix as if the unlearned model has not been trained on the target data. The inverse Hessian, a square weighting matrix, scales gradients based on second-order partial derivatives between the training set mean point and the sample of interest [45]. It describes the local curvature of the loss function over the entire training dataset such that the optimizer takes a more aggressive step in shallow one [46]. Nonetheless, directly calculating the inverse Hessian incurs substantial memory and computational complexity, making it infeasible in practice [37].

To this end, efficient approximation methods were explored. Liu et al. uses the Quasi-Newton method, computing the Hessian matrix with the diagonal empirical Fisher Information Matrix. 2F2L [26] relies on Taylor expansion, optimizing quadratic loss functions using neural tangent kernels and performing a Newton step for optimal weights based on the remaining dataset.

**T-9. Takeaways on loss function approximation:** Although an inverse Hessian allows scaling the gradients by approximating the loss function, naively calculating it incurs an expensive computational burden. Researchers thus approximate the inverse Hessian to reduce the computational complexity, although there remains more room for improvement to find a more efficient and more accurate approximation.

**6.1.4 Knowledge Distillation (KD).** In contrast to Goldfish [62] that used KD in the server to only distill the retaining knowledge to the unlearned (student) model, in FedAF [32], the target client adopted a teacher-student learning pattern, where a teacher model generates fake labels, and the student model learns the manipulated

knowledge. Eventually, the teacher model, which had not seen the original feature-label pair, became an unlearned model, avoiding data leakage. FedLU [87] introduced a loss function based on retroactive inference theory, employing mutual knowledge distillation to for unlearning while handling covariate drift between local optimization and global convergence during training. In a fully decentralized FU framework, HDUS [78], all clients collaboratively generated a shared reference dataset that contained unlabeled and non-client-specific data. The remaining clients then trained their seed models on this dataset and achieved unlearning by a model ensemble. The use of seed models addressed concerns in the federated context, reducing the communication burden and the risk of data leakage and allowing local models to have distinct architectures.

**T-10. Takeaways on knowledge distillation:** Knowledge distillation reduces the training dataset or model size so that it achieves better efficiency than retraining. It is especially beneficial in that the teacher model does not have the original pair of knowledge, there would be the least residual information about the target data, providing security along efficacy.

**6.1.5 Multi-task Learning.** Multi-task learning balances retaining essential knowledge while discarding target knowledge in three ways. First, the unlearned models aim to maximize indistinguishability within a forget set as in Goldfish [62] or between it and an arbitrary dataset [7]. For another line of work, BFU [67] leveraged hard-parameter sharing and variational Bayesian unlearning to optimize an approximate posterior of the remaining dataset. Similarly, Alam et al. focused on eliminating compromised data, augmenting loss separately for benign and spoiled data to preserve non-malicious behavior while unlearning trigger patterns. Finally, FedME2 [72] optimized the local model to ensure both classification accuracy and a memory evaluation loss, derived from a lightweight evaluation model within each client, detecting whether data to be forgotten is remembered. FedHarmony [12] was trained for three tasks: to update the label predictor, to discriminate between sites, and to remove the site-specific knowledge by penalizing deviation in the probability of the outputs from a uniform distribution.

**T-11. Takeaways on multi-task learning:** The tasks in multi-task learning are related to the removal efficacy and model fidelity. It can be achieved sequentially or in parallel, where the latter achieves better time efficiency.

**6.1.6 Reverse Training.** Gradient ascent, instead of descent, is employed either stochastically by the server on the global model [70] or by the target client on the local model [23, 30] to reverse the original training. This approach is different from subtraction of historically stored parameters in that it trains a target model to achieve maximal loss by ascent. Halimi et al., for example, utilized projected gradient ascent to maximize local empirical loss. In QuickDrop [11], each client generates a distilled dataset—a small synthetic dataset condensing critical information during the learning phase. They subsequently fine-tuned the gradients computed from this distilled data to align with their original local datasets.

**T-12. Takeaways on reverse training:** Reverse training, represented by (projected/stochastic) gradient ascent, gives the most intuition for unlearning by optimizing the loss to be maximal. It is often accompanied by performance recovery due to its degradation in model fidelity (normal performance).

**6.1.7 Clustering.** The server clustered clients to maintain the number of clients to perform retraining to be minimal, limited to the only cluster to which the requesting client belonged. Lin et al. clustered the clients into multiple shards prior to training and adopted coded computation to reduce the storage overhead by compressing the model parameters across distinct shards. Similarly, Lin et al. and KNOT [57] grouped clients based on their similarities in model disparity (angle) and in short training time to reduce the number of computations.

**T-13. Takeaways on clustering:** Clustering methods group clients to maintain a cluster of clients to be retrained as small as possible. It provides more time efficiency than retraining the whole client, but it could be challenging to find an optimal clustering and easily be infeasible with frequent unlearning requests by random clients.

## 6.2 Performance Recovery

Removing influence from a trained model could deteriorate its performance on the remaining dataset because target erasure often involves undoing specific parameters [74], thereby leaving other parameters incomplete [63]. These performance drops become more noticeable when the model parameters are manipulated to remove influence. As such, additional approaches are explored to restore the performance of the unlearned model on the remaining dataset.

**6.2.1 Post Training.** Some approaches [4, 19, 20, 23, 82] post-trained the unlearning model after the influence removal. The remaining clients and the server performed a few additional global rounds of normal FL training without the target of completing influence removal to restore performance. Note that post-training does not involve additional data points.

**6.2.2 Fine-tuning.** Wang et al. fine-tuned the unlearned model by taking the regularization term out and training it until the target accuracy was achieved. Inspired by a passive decay theory in neurology that memory traces fade and disappear, Zhu et al. suppressed the activation of the forgotten knowledge to recover the performance drop. Similar to MetaFul [64] that fine-tuned the unlearned model toward a certain direction, Zhao et al. performed guided fine-tuning on modified data points. During training, the server sent a target client a degradation model, along with the global model. The degradation model guided the local training by outputting pseudo labels on the local dataset to restore its discriminability on remaining data. The remaining clients fine-tuned the unlearned model with a few original samples into the distilled dataset in QuickDrop [11] or a small-sized IID benchmark dataset in FAST [22], by performing a few rounds of post-training to recover performance.

**6.2.3 Gradient Manipulation.** Some achieved performance recovery by directly manipulating the direction of gradients. In FRU [80],

the remaining clients run additional local training from the latest global unlearning model, and the server combined the original local updates with the direction of the new updates to construct calibrated updates to be aggregated with other updates. Li et al. manipulated the target client’s gradients; the server projected them into the orthogonal subspace of input space for a minimal drop in global model performance. Nonetheless, with this method, precise manipulation is key to preventing the model from diverging.

**6.2.4 Regularization.** Regularization or penalty terms were applied to the unlearning model to prevent overfitting to unlearning tasks. L1 norm [38], L2 norm [72], FIM [70], and the Hessian matrix [32] were used as the regularization term to penalize over-unlearning and maintain the performance. Chen et al., for instance, applied a scaling factor to distinct loss terms to balance them. [1] took a dynamic penalization approach, and [40] applied a momentum technique to penalize over-unlearning information not associated with trigger patterns. [10] used each client’s intermediate parameters to minimize the sum of all clients’ parameters for quick model convergence after forgetting. They avoided computational overhead by using Elastic Weight Consolidation (EWC) to train a model to learn non-target while unlearning target data. Similarly, Shao et al. used a penalty term derived from projecting an intermediate-term on the tangent space of the aggregated updates. [32, 70] used FIM and the Hessian matrix, respectively, to limit the magnitude of parameter updates, ensuring minimal changes to important parameters.

**6.2.5 Knowledge Distillation.** Wu et al. employed knowledge distillation to train the skewed unlearning model (student model) by leveraging the original global model as a teacher model, thereby enhancing the generalization of the unlearned model, aiming for improved performance and security. The server utilized unlabeled data to train the unlearning model to rectify the skew introduced by the subtraction process during influence removal. Inspired by that the backdoor behavior is only activated when input at test time contains backdoor patterns, backdoor behavior is not transferred to the student model because no backdoor input is present during the knowledge distillation process. Similarly, Fu et al. performed a few post KD iterations on auxiliary data in the server.

**T-14. Takeaways on Performance Recovery:** Performance recovery restores the model performance tampered while forgetting. It is conducted sequentially or in parallel to influence removal: post-training, fine-tuning, and gradient manipulation are followed by the influence removal, while regularization using momentum or an additional term is applied during unlearning and thereafter. Note that knowledge distillation improves not only performance by generalization but security.

## 7 COMPARISON OF EVALUATION METRICS

Unlearning methods are typically evaluated across three dimensions: precision and effectiveness in unlearning/forgetting target information (efficacy), accuracy in maintaining performance on remaining data (fidelity), and efficiency compared to retraining from scratch. These objectives—efficacy, fidelity, and efficiency—are assessed by comparing unlearned and retrained models. A variety of evaluation metrics is summarized in Table 7 and in Appendix B.

**Table 7: A summary of Evaluation Metrics**

Objective	Category	Metric
Efficacy	Performance	Accuracy on the target set Loss and errors on the target set MSE and MAE
	Parameter difference	L2 distance KLD Error rate (SAPE, ECE) Angular deviation 1st Wasserstein distance
	Indiscrimination quality	ASR, precision, and recall on BA ASR, precision, and recall on MIA Multi-task learning Influence function
Fidelity	Performance	Accuracy on test set Accuracy on remaining dataset Loss and errors on remaining set
Efficiency	Complexity	Time taken for unlearning Speed-up ratio Memory in MB

### 7.1 Efficacy

The efficacy of an unlearning model is defined by how accurately or effectively the unlearned model forgot the target information.

**7.1.1 Performance Metrics.** Accuracy [7, 11, 16, 18, 19, 22, 23, 26, 36, 63, 67, 70, 75, 83, 86], loss [18, 36], and error [6] on forget set measure efficacy of the influence removal. Statistical metrics (i.e., MSE or MAE) were also used [39, 54]. In addition to NDCG@10 that Wang et al. measured, Yuan et al. employed HR@10.

**7.1.2 Parameter Differences.** Kullback–Leibler divergence [18, 67], L2 distance [54, 67], the first Wasserstein distance [82], and the angular difference [35, 36, 48] between the unlearned and retrained models implies unlearning ability. Liu et al. measured angular deviation between the last layers of the unlearned and retrained model. Liu et al., Wang et al. calculated Symmetric Absolute Percentage Error (SAPE) defined as  $\frac{|Acc_{test}^u - Acc_{test}^*|}{|Acc_{test}^u| + |Acc_{test}^*|}$  where  $Acc_{test}^u$  and  $Acc_{test}^*$  denote test accuracy of retrained and unlearned model, respectively. Gong et al. used Expected Calibration Error (ECE) to measure the capacity of a model to quantify uncertainty utilizing the difference between actual test accuracy and confidence level output by the model, similar to [13] that measures the L2 norm between confidence. Shao et al. designed their own metric based on the performance difference between the unlearned and retrained model.

**7.1.3 Indiscrimination Quality.** The most used metric in this category is based on attacks, assessing efficacy by how effectively the unlearned models mitigate Backdoor Attacks (BAs) or Membership Inference Attacks (MIAs). In BAs, a backdoor trigger is injected into a portion of training data, and the samples are re-labeled to a pre-determined one, designating them as targets. Then, an FL model is trained to perform two tasks: a backdoor task (misprediction on the compromised samples) and a main task (normal behavior on all other samples). With this setting, the unlearning model aims to forget backdoor-triggered data and associated information embedded in the model. Instead of using simple BAs, Alam et al. employed

stealthier and long-lasting BAs, Constraint-and-scale [2] and Neurotoxin [84]. MIAs test the unlearning model’s ability to identify whether the target was in the training dataset.

Attack Success Rate (ASR) is calculated as the fraction of successful attacks over total attempts. It is a fraction of correct mispredictions on backdoor-triggered data for BAs [1, 6, 10, 17, 23, 25, 26, 30, 32, 43, 48, 62, 67, 69, 86] and incorrect predictions on membership information for MIAs [7, 11, 17, 23, 25, 26, 43, 60, 63, 83]. Precision [35, 36, 60, 81], recall [35, 36, 81], and F1 score [33, 34] were also used. Successful unlearning leads the values to zero.

Meanwhile, FedHarmony [12] minimized the domain classification accuracy while maximizing the prediction accuracy. Gao et al. employed *influence function* to assess target samples’ continued influence on the unlearned model. Zhu et al. measured average Hits@N and Mean Reciprocal Rank for entity link prediction, where smaller values on the forgetting set indicate better efficacy.

### 7.2 Fidelity

Maintaining performance is as important as precise unlearning because otherwise, the unlearned model becomes useless. **Performance metrics** (i.e., accuracy, loss, and error rates) on the remaining dataset or test dataset were used to evaluate the model’s fidelity. Specifically, the former is to show no drop in accuracy [1, 7, 11, 17, 26, 30, 34, 62, 68, 70, 72, 75, 81, 83, 86], or no rise in errors [6, 43] on the remaining dataset, and the latter is to ensure its overall performance, including generalization capability [4, 6, 10, 13, 16, 20, 23, 25, 26, 32, 33, 35, 36, 57, 60, 64, 65, 69, 70, 78, 82, 86]. The higher accuracy or lower loss indicates better fidelity.

### 7.3 Efficiency

Computational or communications overheads are measured by comparing the time or memory taken for unlearning and retraining. **Time taken** were measured in the number of rounds [16, 25, 60], in seconds [6, 7, 11, 17, 18, 22, 23, 32, 33, 35, 36, 40, 57, 81, 83], in minutes [78], or in CPU time [22]. A speed-up ratio can be used; similar to Zhao et al., Cao et al., Wang et al. calculated the average cost-saving percentage calculated by  $\frac{T - T_r}{T} \times 100$ , where  $T$  denotes the number of rounds to retrain a model, and  $T_r$  refers to that taken to train the unlearned model. **Memory** in MB [18, 22, 33, 39] or GB [43] was measured to see if the unlearning method did not incur memory overhead.

**T-15. Takeaways on Evaluation Metrics.** Evaluations rely on indirect measurements, comparing performance, parameters, indiscriminability quality, and complexity between unlearned and retrained models. The absence of a benchmark or unified metric for “unlearnability” hampers fair comparisons across different unlearning methods using diverse architecture or aggregation methods.

**T-16. Takeaways on Attacks Used.** Evaluations using simple BAs are limited due to the vanishing attacks over training rounds and Byzantine-robust aggregation removing those influences. Thus, relying solely on simple BAs may obscure the impact of unlearning, making it challenging to determine its effectiveness or whether the attack has naturally diminished.




Figure 5: Emergence of the Research Focus over Time.

## 8 GAPS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Observing Figure 5, we can see that the research focus in this area is getting diverse and deeper. Followed by the first work [38] in 2020, FU techniques have evolved from simple ML models, including few-layer CNN and Random Forest. As time passes, in addition to demonstrating the effectiveness of the technique in non-IID settings, which is a common assumption in FL, more data types and, thus, more model architectures are being used. This year, authors are using more practical datasets and beginning to use them for LLMs, along with considering a wider range of research implications, such as fairness. This section summarizes research gaps and challenges that have not sufficiently been explored and potential direction.

**Lack of realistic non-IID data (T-1, T-2, T-3).** When deploying FU methods to practical non-IID data, the unlearned model that had successfully demonstrated its ability only on IID data will likely fail to forget properly or converge, hampering efficacy and fidelity. The same as FL, information is diversely distributed across multiple clients, and any other clients or a central server are neither accessible to raw data nor the extent of the data deviation. Nevertheless, about 53% of works (28 out of 52) have experimented with their methods in the non-IID setting. Current approaches to creating non-IID settings often rely on simulated distributions of IID datasets. One predominantly used simulation method is Dirichlet distribution, which controls the degree of non-IID by  $\alpha$ , recognized for its utility in mimicking real-world datasets [31]. Still, the optimal value representing true real-world non-IID data is not clearly understood, as the chosen values range from 0.1 to 5 (Appendix C).

*Potential Direction:* Those simulation methods, however, remain as emulated rather than true representations. Exploring optimal  $\alpha$  values, utilizing real-world datasets such as FEMNIST, Shakespeare, or StackOverflow, or generating a realistic non-IID dataset with generative models could be a promising starting point.

**Limited application of FU methods beyond vision tasks (T-1, T-3, T-4).** As depicted in Figure 4, Table 4, and Table 5, current research predominantly focuses on vision tasks, particularly image classification, overlooking the broader potential applications of FU. Despite the emergence of models like GPT-4, which can generate images based on input text, only a few studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of FU in language datasets or models. Moreover, only one had leveraged a multi-variate dataset, revealing a significant gap in research.

*Potential Direction:* Expanding FU methods beyond vision tasks and incorporating diverse datasets from various domains is imperative. For instance, extending FU to tasks like next-word prediction for personal devices (text) and analyzing sensitive medical data (text and/or image, multi-variate) could benefit from its privacy-preserving nature and efficiency gain over retraining.

**Difficulties in unlearning the closed-source LLMs (T-1, T-4).** Proprietary LLMs have undergone training processes that demand

substantial computational resources and extensive training data, both public and private. To protect private or copyrighted data, neither the training data nor the model parameters are revealed, even though many companies are undergoing lawsuits for training the model with copyrighted data. Given the continuous data evolution and removal request, relying solely on fine-tuning the pre-trained model afterward would likely be less effective than unlearning due to memorization issues. Retraining is not a feasible option due to the massive size of training datasets and models.

*Potential Direction:* The trajectory of LLM development is expected to shift towards ensembling multiple pre-trained and/or new models, leveraging the powerful capabilities of different closed-source models without unveiling their privacy-sensitive training data. Given that, a small, well-trained model on copyrighted data could be treated as a target client, with the original LLM being a global model. FU could then be employed to forget private data from the original LLM, enhancing efficiency compared to retraining and effectiveness compared to fine-tuning.

**Exposed to the risk of data leakage (T-2, T-5, T-6).** While FU serves as a means to enhance privacy protection by removing data, it could paradoxically lead to privacy leaks due to the disclosure of learned and unlearned models among all participants. Adversaries can exploit the discrepancies between the models to infer the unlearned information via inference or gradient inversion attacks.

*Example Attack Scenario:* Assuming the remaining clients and server are at least honest but curious, what party involved in unlearning matters because no one other than the target client can assure whether the target information is properly unlearned. Remaining clients could send random or manipulated parameters to infer the unlearned data such that the server aggregates those updates, unconsciously aiding a malicious client in inferring the forgotten data. If a malicious server sends manipulated updates to the rest, data is more at high risk, as it could infer not only the forgotten but all the data the remaining clients have.

*Potential Direction:* Inevitable parameter sharing in FU underscores the importance of minimizing the exact information leaked by the model to protect against inference attacks. Nonetheless, no works have analyzed how vulnerable they are. While some solutions adapted Homomorphic Encryption or differential privacy to obfuscate the exact information, setting a trusted third party or execution environment [47] could be another option.

**Limited adoption of advanced FL techniques (T-3, T-5).** Section 4 outlined the unique challenges of unlearning in the federated context. While some of these challenges, such as data heterogeneity and Byzantine failure, are being addressed in FL through advanced aggregation methods, many remain unexplored in FU. Notably, most existing works in FU yet rely on a simplistic approach, FedAvg, averaging all clients' gradients. Only a handful of works, FedHarmony [12], FedLU [87], and KNOT [57], adopted FedProx, FedBuff, and FedEqual; FedRecover [4] and VeriFi [18] incorporated Byzantine-robust aggregation algorithms, such as Krum, trimmed-mean.

*Potential Direction:* Only a couple of works employed existing solutions in FL; the benefit of distinct aggregation algorithms in unlearning is not yet sufficiently disclosed. It is prudent to assess whether previously explored techniques in FL could also alleviate the challenges in FU before exploring more complex methods.

**Lacking consideration on scalability and fairness challenges in FU (T-6).** In the federated context, where the participating clients could range up to a hundred (cross-silo) or up to millions (cross-device), communication or computation bottlenecks would be a huge issue for the performance of a system. In this regard, scalability is a key caveat to consider. Another chronic issue is fairness and adaptability. The clients frequently join and leave the system for various reasons, including unstable network connections (or to exploit the instability). Even in that case, any relevant models should completely unlearn the target.

*Potential Direction:* To prevent malicious attempts of dropouts and joining, there has been a stem of research about fairness in the FL field, which includes incentivizing/penalizing more/less contributing clients to promote voluntary good-will participation. Similarly, FU also needs a scalable and fair unlearning mechanism.

**Absence of a common benchmark (T-15).** The absence of unified evaluation metrics limits the comparison between multiple FU methods. Currently, there is no standardized approach for comparing multiple FU methods, which limits the ability to assess their efficacy, fidelity, and efficiency comprehensively. Existing evaluations of FU methods often rely on indirect comparisons between retraining and unlearning performance. However, the use of distinct model architectures, aggregation methods, or hyperparameters across studies introduces discrepancies that hinder fair comparisons. As summarized in Table 5, these variations significantly affect a model's performance, making it difficult to establish a consensus on method superiority.

*Potential Direction:* There is a need to develop standardized benchmarking and evaluation metrics for FU methods. By establishing consistent criteria for assessing efficacy, fidelity, and efficiency, researchers can facilitate fair comparisons between different approaches. This would enable the community to identify the most effective FU methods and advance the field more rapidly.

**Unreliable assessment using naive backdoor attacks (T-16).** Existing evaluations of methods utilizing BAs often relied on simple attacks. Nevertheless, as their impacts naturally decline with each training round, relying solely on them can obscure the effectiveness of unlearning. This makes it challenging to discern whether unlearning was effective or if the attack itself naturally diminished over time. While some attacks break Byzantine-robust aggregation methods, identifying and excluding malicious clients' gradients, only one study [1] evaluated efficacy using more sophisticated BAs like constraint-and-scale [2] and Neurotoxin [84].

*Potential Direction:* Incorporating advanced BAs is essential to clearly demonstrate the effectiveness of unlearning, thereby eliminating other potential explanations for the gradual disappearance of attack effects. Future research in FU should focus on evaluating methods using a broader range of advanced BAs to provide a more comprehensive assessment of their efficacy and robustness.

**Underexplored FU methods and settings** Most explored works assumed HFL, exchanging local model parameters, and VFL, where intermediate outputs are exchanged, remains relatively unexplored in the context of unlearning. VFL is particularly relevant for building collaborative models with joint interests across different industries, such as banks, insurance companies, or e-commerce platforms. Despite its potential, only a handful of studies have investigated unlearning under Vertical FL and fully decentralized FL settings.

**Potential Direction:** Future studies could focus on exploring unlearning techniques applicable to various types of FL, including VFL or fully decentralized settings. Expanding research on the efficacy and feasibility of unlearning in varying FL could unlock new opportunities for collaborative information sharing across diverse industries without actually exchanging the raw data. This direction holds promise for advancing the capabilities of FU and addressing real-world challenges in collaborative data analysis.

## 9 CONCLUSION

While the right to be forgotten inspired MU and FU, systematic reviews of FU methods are currently limited in their number and depth. In this paper, we give special attention to the "federated" context, highlighting unique complexities, and explore the existing literature in multiple dimensions, including the entity initiating unlearning, methodologies, and limitations. We also highlight challenges in heterogeneity simulation, implications, and dataset usage statistics. This paper also provides valuable insights and future research direction in the intricate landscape of FU.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Manaar Alam, Hithem Lamri, and Michail Maniatakos. 2023. Get Rid Of Your Trail: Remotely Erasing Backdoors in Federated Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10638* (2023).
- [2] Eugene Bagdasaryan, Andreas Veit, Yiqing Hua, Deborah Estrin, and Vitaly Shmatikov. 2020. How to backdoor federated learning. In *International conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*. PMLR, 2938–2948.
- [3] Lucas Bourtole, Varun Chandrasekaran, Christopher A Choquette-Choo, Hengrui Jia, Adelin Travers, Baiwu Zhang, David Lie, and Nicolas Papernot. 2021. Machine unlearning. In *2021 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 141–159.
- [4] Xiaoyu Cao, Jinyuan Jia, Zaixi Zhang, and Neil Zhenqiang Gong. 2023. Fedrecovery: Recovering from poisoning attacks in federated learning using historical information. In *2023 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 1366–1383.
- [5] Yinzhi Cao and Junfeng Yang. 2015. Towards making systems forget with machine unlearning. In *2015 IEEE symposium on security and privacy*. IEEE, 463–480.
- [6] Tianshi Che, Yang Zhou, Zijie Zhang, Lingjuan Lyu, Ji Liu, Da Yan, Dejing Dou, and Jun Huan. 2023. Fast Federated Machine Unlearning with Nonlinear Functional Theory. (2023).
- [7] Kongyang Chen, Yaping Chai, Weibin Zhang, Shaowei Wang, Jiaxing Shen, et al. 2024. Federated Unlearning for Human Activity Recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.03659* (2024).
- [8] Gregory Cohen, Saeed Afshar, Jonathan Tapson, and Andre Van Schaik. 2017. EMNIST: Extending MNIST to handwritten letters. In *2017 international joint conference on neural networks (IJCNN)*. IEEE, 2921–2926.
- [9] Court of Justice of the European Union. 2014. *Google Spain SL and Google Inc. v Agencia Española de Protección de Datos*. Judgment of the Court (Grand Chamber), 13 May 2014. Case C-131/12..
- [10] Zihao Deng, Zhaoyang Han, Chuan Ma, Ming Ding, Long Yuan, Chunpeng Ge, and Zhe Liu. 2023. Vertical Federated Unlearning on the Logistic Regression Model. *Electronics* 12, 14 (2023), 3182.
- [11] Akash Dhasade, Yaohong Ding, Song Guo, Anne-marie Kermauer, Martijn De Vos, and Leijie Wu. 2023. QuickDrop: Efficient Federated Unlearning by Integrated Dataset Distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.15603* (2023).
- [12] Nicola K Dinsdale, Mark Jenkinson, and Ana IL Namburete. 2022. FedHarmony: unlearning scanner bias with distributed data. In *International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention*. Springer, 695–704.
- [13] Khaoula ElBedoui. 2023. ECG Classification Based on Federated Unlearning. In *2023 International Symposium on Networks, Computers and Communications (ISNCC)*. IEEE, 1–5.
- [14] European Parliament and Council of the European Union. 2016. *Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (General Data Protection Regulation)*. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2016/679/oj> Art. 17 - Right to erasure ('right to be forgotten').
- [15] Minghong Fang, Xiaoyu Cao, Jinyuan Jia, and Neil Gong. 2020. Local model poisoning attacks to {Byzantine-Robust} federated learning. In *29th USENIX security symposium (USENIX Security 20)*. 1605–1622.
- [16] Yann Fraboni, Martin Van Waerebeke, Kevin Scaman, Richard Vidal, Laetitia Kameni, and Marco Lorenzi. 2024. SIFU: Sequential Informed Federated Unlearning for Efficient and Provable Client Unlearning in Federated Optimization. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR, 3457–3465.
- [17] Chaohao Fu, Weijia Jia, and Na Ruan. 2024. Client-Free Federated Unlearning via Training Reconstruction with Anchor Subspace Calibration. In *ICASSP 2024-2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 9281–9285.
- [18] Xiangshan Gao, Xingjun Ma, Jingyi Wang, Youcheng Sun, Bo Li, Shouling Ji, Peng Cheng, and Jiming Chen. 2024. Verifi: Towards verifiable federated unlearning. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing* (2024).
- [19] Jinu Gong, Joonhyuk Kang, Osvaldo Simeone, and Rahif Kassab. 2022. Forget-svd: Particle-based bayesian federated unlearning. In *2022 IEEE Data Science and Learning Workshop (DSLW)*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [20] Jinu Gong, Osvaldo Simeone, and Joonhyuk Kang. 2022. Compressed particle-based federated bayesian learning and unlearning. *IEEE Communications Letters* 27, 2 (2022), 556–560.
- [21] Laura Graves, Vineel Nagisetty, and Vijay Ganesh. 2021. Amnesiac machine learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 35. 11516–11524.
- [22] Xintong Guo, Pengfei Wang, Sen Qiu, Wei Song, Qiang Zhang, Xiaopeng Wei, and Dongsheng Zhou. 2023. FAST: Adopting Federated Unlearning to Eliminating Malicious Terminals at Server Side. *IEEE Transactions on Network Science and Engineering* (2023).
- [23] Anisa Halimi, Swanand Kadhe, Ambrish Rawat, and Nathalie Baracaldo. 2022. Federated unlearning: How to efficiently erase a client in fl? *arXiv preprint arXiv:207.05521* (2022).
- [24] Hanxun Huang, Xingjun Ma, Sarah Monazam Erfani, James Bailey, and Yisen Wang. 2021. Unlearnable Examples: Making Personal Data Unexploitable. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=iAmZUo0DxC0>
- [25] Yu Jiang, Jiyuan Shen, Ziyao Liu, Chee Wei Tan, and Kwok-Yan Lam. 2024. Towards Efficient and Certified Recovery from Poisoning Attacks in Federated Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.08216* (2024).
- [26] Ruinan Jin, Minghui Chen, Qiong Zhang, and Xiaoxiao Li. 2023. Forgettable Federated Linear Learning with Certified Data Removal. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02216* (2023).
- [27] Peter Kairouz, H Brendan McMahan, Brendan Avent, Aurélien Bellet, Mehdi Bennis, Arjun Nitin Bhagoji, Kallista Bonawitz, Zachary Charles, Graham Cormode, Rachel Cummings, et al. 2021. Advances and open problems in federated learning. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning* 14, 1–2 (2021), 1–210.
- [28] Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. 2009. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. (2009).
- [29] Yann LeCun, Léon Bottou, Yoshua Bengio, and Patrick Haffner. 1998. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proc. IEEE* 86, 11 (1998), 2278–2324.
- [30] Guanghao Li, Li Shen, Yan Sun, Yue Hu, Han Hu, and Dacheng Tao. 2023. Subspace based Federated Unlearning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12448* (2023).
- [31] Qibin Li, Yiqun Diao, Quan Chen, and Bingsheng He. 2022. Federated learning on non-iid data silos: An experimental study. In *2022 IEEE 38th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. IEEE, 965–978.
- [32] Yuyuan Li, Chaohao Chen, Xiaolin Zheng, and Jiaming Zhang. 2023. Federated unlearning via active forgetting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.03363* (2023).
- [33] Yijing Lin, Zhipeng Gao, Hongyang Du, Dusit Niyato, Gui Gui, Shuguang Cui, and Jinke Ren. 2024. Scalable Federated Unlearning via Isolated and Coded Sharding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.15957* (2024).
- [34] Yijing Lin, Zhipeng Gao, Hongyang Du, Dusit Niyato, Jiawen Kang, and Xiaoyuan Liu. 2024. Incentive and Dynamic Client Selection for Federated Unlearning. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*. 2936–2944.
- [35] Yijing Lin, Zhipeng Gao, Hongyang Du, Jinke Ren, Zhiqiang Xie, and Dusit Niyato. 2024. Blockchain-enabled Trustworthy Federated Unlearning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.15917* (2024).
- [36] Gaoyang Liu, Xiaoqiang Ma, Yang Yang, Chen Wang, and Jiangchuan Liu. 2021. Federaser: Enabling efficient client-level data removal from federated learning models. In *2021 IEEE/ACM 29th International Symposium on Quality of Service (IWQoS)*. IEEE, 1–10.
- [37] Junxu Liu, Mingsheng Xue, Jian Lou, Xiaoyu Zhang, Li Xiong, and Zhan Qin. 2023. Muter: Machine unlearning on adversarially trained models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 4892–4902.
- [38] Yang Liu, Zhuo Ma, Ximeng Liu, Jian Liu, Zhongyuan Jiang, Jianfeng Ma, Philip Yu, and Kui Ren. 2020. Learn to forget: Machine unlearning via neuron masking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.10933* (2020).
- [39] Yang Liu, Zhuo Ma, Yilong Yang, Ximeng Liu, Jianfeng Ma, and Kui Ren. 2021. Revfrf: Enabling cross-domain random forest training with revocable federated learning. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing* 19, 6 (2021), 3671–3685.
- [40] Yi Liu, Lei Xu, Xingliang Yuan, Cong Wang, and Bo Li. 2022. The right to be forgotten in federated learning: An efficient realization with rapid retraining. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2022-IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*. IEEE, 1749–1758.
- [41] Ziyao Liu, Yu Jiang, Jiyuan Shen, Minyi Peng, Kwok-Yan Lam, and Xingliang Yuan. 2023. A Survey on Federated Unlearning: Challenges, Methods, and Future

- Directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.20448* (2023).
- [42] Ziwei Liu, Ping Luo, Xiaogang Wang, and Xiaoou Tang. 2015. Deep learning face attributes in the wild. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*. 3730–3738.
- [43] Ziyao Liu, Huanyi Ye, Yu Jiang, Jiyuan Shen, Jiale Guo, Ivan Tjuawinata, and Kwok-Yan Lam. 2024. Privacy-Preserving Federated Unlearning with Certified Client Removal. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.09724* (2024).
- [44] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Aguera y Arcas. 2017. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR, 1273–1282.
- [45] Ronak Mehta, Sourav Pal, Vikas Singh, and Sathya N Ravi. 2022. Deep unlearning via randomized conditionally independent Hessians. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 10422–10431.
- [46] Siddharth Misra and Yaokun Wu. 2019. Machine learning assisted segmentation of scanning electron microscopy images of organic-rich shales with feature extraction and feature ranking. *Machine learning for subsurface characterization* 289, 3 (2019), 4.
- [47] Fan Mo, Hamed Haddadi, Kleomenis Katevas, Eduard Marin, Diego Perino, and Nicolas Kourtellis. 2021. PPFL: privacy-preserving federated learning with trusted execution environments. In *Proceedings of the 19th annual international conference on mobile systems, applications, and services*. 94–108.
- [48] Thai-Hung Nguyen, Hong-Phuc Vu, Dung Thuy Nguyen, Tuan Minh Nguyen, Khoa D Doan, and Kok-Seng Wong. 2024. Empirical Study of Federated Unlearning: Efficiency and Effectiveness. In *Asian Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 959–974.
- [49] Thanh Tam Nguyen, Thanh Trung Huynh, Phi Le Nguyen, Alan Wee-Chung Liew, Hongzhi Yin, and Quoc Viet Hung Nguyen. 2022. A survey of machine unlearning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.02299* (2022).
- [50] Chao Pan, Jin Sima, Saurav Prakash, Vishal Rana, and Olga Milenkovic. 2022. Machine Unlearning of Federated Clusters. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.16424* (2022).
- [51] Alexandra Peste, Dan Alistarh, and Christoph H Lampert. 2021. SSSE: Efficiently Erasing Samples from Trained Machine Learning Models. In *NeurIPS 2021 Workshop Privacy in Machine Learning*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=GRMKEx3kEo>
- [52] Youyang Qu, Xin Yuan, Ming Ding, Wei Ni, Thierry Rakotoarivelo, and David Smith. 2023. Learn to Unlearn: A Survey on Machine Unlearning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.07512* (2023).
- [53] Sebastian Schelter. 2019. amnesia—towards machine learning models that can forget user data very fast. In *1st International Workshop on Applied AI for Database Systems and Applications (AIDB19)*.
- [54] Thanveer Shaik, Xiaohui Tao, Lin Li, Haoran Xie, Taotao Cai, Xiaofeng Zhu, and Qing Li. 2024. Framu: Attention-based machine unlearning using federated reinforcement learning. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* (2024).
- [55] Thanveer Shaik, Xiaohui Tao, Haoran Xie, Lin Li, Xiaofeng Zhu, and Qing Li. 2023. Exploring the Landscape of Machine Unlearning: A Survey and Taxonomy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06360* (2023).
- [56] Jiaqi Shao, Tao Lin, Xuanyu Cao, and Bing Luo. 2024. Federated Unlearning: a Perspective of Stability and Fairness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01276* (2024).
- [57] Ningxin Su and Baochun Li. 2023. Asynchronous federated unlearning. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2023-IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*. IEEE, 1–10.
- [58] Jianwu Tang, Xuefeng Ding, Dasha Hu, Bing Guo, Yuncheng Shen, Pan Ma, and Yuming Jiang. 2023. FedRAD: Heterogeneous Federated Learning via Relational Adaptive Distillation. *Sensors* 23, 14 (2023), 6518.
- [59] Yonghao Tang, Zhipeng Cai, Qiang Liu, Tongqing Zhou, and Qiang Ni. 2023. Ensuring User Privacy and Model Security via Machine Unlearning: A Review. *Computers, Materials & Continua* 77, 2 (2023).
- [60] Youming Tao, Cheng-Long Wang, Miao Pan, Dongxiao Yu, Xiuzhen Cheng, and Di Wang. 2024. Communication Efficient and Provable Federated Unlearning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.11018* (2024).
- [61] Fei Wang, Baochun Li, and Bo Li. 2023. Federated Unlearning and Its Privacy Threats. *IEEE Network* (2023).
- [62] Houzhe Wang, Xiaojie Zhu, Chi Chen, and Paulo Esteves-Verissimo. 2024. Goldfish: An Efficient Federated Unlearning Framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.03180* (2024).
- [63] Junxiao Wang, Song Guo, Xin Xie, and Heng Qi. 2022. Federated unlearning via class-discriminative pruning. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*. 622–632.
- [64] Pengfei Wang, Zongzheng Wei, Heng Qi, Shaohua Wan, Yunming Xiao, Geng Sun, and Qiang Zhang. 2023. Mitigating Poor Data Quality Impact with Federated Unlearning for Human-Centric Metaverse. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications* (2023).
- [65] Pengfei Wang, Zhaohong Yan, Mohammad S Obaidat, Zhiwei Yuan, Leyou Yang, Junxiang Zhang, Zongzheng Wei, and Qiang Zhang. 2023. Edge Caching with Federated Unlearning for Low-latency V2X Communications. *IEEE Communications Magazine* (2023).
- [66] Shuyi Wang, Bing Liu, and Guido Zuccon. 2024. How to Forget Clients in Federated Online Learning to Rank?. In *European Conference on Information Retrieval*. Springer, 105–121.
- [67] Weiqi Wang, Zhiyi Tian, Chenhan Zhang, An Liu, and Shui Yu. 2023. BFU: Bayesian Federated Unlearning with Parameter Self-Sharing. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 567–578.
- [68] Zichen Wang, Xiangshan Gao, Cong Wang, Peng Cheng, and Jiming Chen. 2024. Efficient Vertical Federated Unlearning via Fast Retraining. *ACM Transactions on Internet Technology* 24, 2 (2024), 1–22.
- [69] Chen Wu, Sencun Zhu, and Prasenjit Mitra. 2023. Unlearning Backdoor Attacks in Federated Learning. In *ICLR 2023 Workshop on Backdoor Attacks and Defenses in Machine Learning*.
- [70] Leijie Wu, Song Guo, Junxiao Wang, Zicong Hong, Jie Zhang, and Yaohong Ding. 2022. Federated unlearning: Guarantee the right of clients to forget. *IEEE Network* 36, 5 (2022), 129–135.
- [71] Leijie Wu, Song Guo, Junxiao Wang, Zicong Hong, Jie Zhang, and Jingren Zhou. 2023. On Knowledge Editing in Federated Learning: Perspectives, Challenges, and Future Directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.01431* (2023).
- [72] Hui Xia, Shuo Xu, Jiaming Pei, Rui Zhang, Zhi Yu, Weitao Zou, Lukun Wang, and Chao Liu. 2023. Fedme 2: Memory evaluation & erase promoting federated unlearning in dtm. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications* (2023).
- [73] Zuobin Xiong, Wei Li, Yingshu Li, and Zhipeng Cai. 2023. Exact-Fun: An Exact and Efficient Federated Unlearning Approach. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*. IEEE.
- [74] Heng Xu, Tianqing Zhu, Lefeng Zhang, Wanlei Zhou, and Philip S Yu. 2023. Machine unlearning: A survey. *Comput. Surveys* 56, 1 (2023), 1–36.
- [75] Rui-Zhen Xu, Sheng-Yi Hong, Po-Wen Chi, and Ming-Hung Wang. 2023. A Revocation Key-based Approach Towards Efficient Federated Unlearning. In *2023 18th Asia Joint Conference on Information Security (AsiaJCS)*. IEEE, 17–24.
- [76] Jiayi Yang and Yang Zhao. 2023. A Survey of Federated Unlearning: A Taxonomy, Challenges and Future Directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.19218* (2023).
- [77] Qiang Yang, Yang Liu, Tianjian Chen, and Yongxin Tong. 2019. Federated machine learning: Concept and applications. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)* 10, 2 (2019), 1–19.
- [78] Guanhua Ye, Quoc Viet Hung Nguyen, and Hongzhi Yin. 2023. Heterogeneous Decentralized Machine Unlearning with Seed Model Distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.13269* (2023).
- [79] Dong Yin, Yudong Chen, Ramchandran Kannan, and Peter Barlett. 2018. Byzantine-robust distributed learning: Towards optimal statistical rates. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 5650–5659.
- [80] Wei Yuan, Hongzhi Yin, Fangzhao Wu, Shijie Zhang, Tiek He, and Hao Wang. 2023. Federated unlearning for on-device recommendation. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*. 393–401.
- [81] Yanli Yuan, BingBing Wang, Chuan Zhang, Zehui Xiong, Chunhai Li, and Liehuang Zhu. 2024. Towards Efficient and Robust Federated Unlearning in IoT Networks. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* (2024).
- [82] Jian Zhang, Bowen Li Jie Li, and Chentao Wu. 2023. SecureCut: Federated Gradient Boosting Decision Trees with Efficient Machine Unlearning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.13174* (2023).
- [83] Lefeng Zhang, Tianqing Zhu, Haibin Zhang, Ping Xiong, and Wanlei Zhou. 2023. Fedrecovery: Differentially private machine unlearning for federated learning frameworks. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* (2023).
- [84] Zhengming Zhang, Ashwinee Panda, Linyue Song, Yaoqing Yang, Michael Mahoney, Prateek Mittal, Ramchandran Kannan, and Joseph Gonzalez. 2022. Neurotoxin: Durable backdoors in federated learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 26429–26446.
- [85] Yue Zhao, Meng Li, Liangzhen Lai, Naveen Suda, Damon Civin, and Vikas Chandra. 2018. Federated learning with non-iid data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.00582* (2018).
- [86] Yian Zhao, Pengfei Wang, Heng Qi, Jianguo Huang, Zongzheng Wei, and Qiang Zhang. 2023. Federated Unlearning With Momentum Degradation. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* (2023).
- [87] Xiangrong Zhu, Guangyao Li, and Wei Hu. 2023. Heterogeneous federated knowledge graph embedding learning and unlearning. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023*. 2444–2454.

## A KEY TERMINOLOGIES RELATED TO FL

Table 8 summarizes the key terminologies and descriptions related to FL, including FL components, various types of FL, data distribution, and some common privacy-preserving techniques.

**Table 8: Key Terminology Related to FL**

Terminology	Description
FL	A decentralized ML where multiple devices train a shared model without sharing raw data.
Server	A central entity orchestrates FL by distributing the global model, aggregating updates, and coordinating training.
Client	Individual devices or endpoints participating in FL. Each client possesses local data to train a local model.
Global Model	A model generated by aggregating clients' local model updates.
Local Model	A model trained on individual clients' data, updated locally during FL rounds.
Aggregation	A method to combine local model updates to create a global model
FedAvg	An aggregation method averaging model parameters from participating clients.
Asynchronous FL	Allows clients to update the global model without synchronization at different timings.
Cross-silo FL	A type of FL that trains a global model across 2-100 data silos.
Cross-device FL	A type of FL that trains a global model up to $10^{10}$ clients (mobile or IoT devices).
VFL	A type of FL that trains a global model across vertically partitioned data sources with different features but shared sample IDs.
HFL	A type of FL that trains a global model across horizontally partitioned data sources with the same features but different samples.
IID data	Data sampled from the identical and independent distribution.
Non-IID data	Data sampled from not identical or not independent distribution across clients. Also known as heterogeneous data.
HE	Homomorphic Encryption. A cryptographic technique that allows computation on the encrypted model parameters.
DP	Differential Privacy. Ensures the presence or absence of an individual's data does not significantly affect the output.

## B EVALUATION METRIC

In Table 9, we included the reference for each metric. The predominant metric used for evaluating efficacy was accuracy on the target dataset, followed by the attack success rate on backdoor attacks. For assessing fidelity, the majority of works measured accuracy on the test dataset, while efficiency was predominantly evaluated based on time reduction in seconds or the number of rounds.

## C A COMPREHENSIVE TABLE

Across Table 10, Table 11, Table 12, and Table 13, Table 14, we summarized all the literature on FU in multiple dimensions of assumptions, unlearning methods, their configurations, and links to the code, if released. It would give the readers a more comprehensive view of all the works and make it easy to compare them.

<sup>4</sup>Adult, bank market, drug consumption, wine quality (classification), superconduct, appliance energy, insurance company, news popularity (regression)

<sup>5</sup>ImageNet and VGGFace are ImageNet\_mini, VGGFace\_mini

<sup>6</sup>Synthetic dataset generated by a GMM

<sup>7</sup>MobileNetV3-large, ResNet-50, RegNet-8gf (DTMN's typical small, med, and large size ML models)



**Table 9: A summary of Evaluation Metrics with References**

<b>Objective</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Metric</b>	<b>Reference</b>
Efficacy	Performance	Accuracy on the target set	[7, 11, 16, 18, 19, 22, 23, 26, 36, 63, 67, 70, 75, 83, 86]
		Loss and errors on the target set	[6, 18, 36]
		MSE and MAE	[39, 54]
	Difference	L2 distance	[13, 54, 67]
		KLD	[18, 67]
		Error rate (SAPE, ECE)	[20, 40, 68]
		Angular deviation	[4, 35, 48]
		Wasserstein distance	[82]
	Indiscrimination quality	ASR, precision, or recall on BA	[1, 4, 6, 10, 17, 23, 25, 26, 30, 32, 43, 48, 62, 67, 69, 86]
		ASR, precision, or recall on MIA	[7, 11, 17, 23, 25, 33–36, 43, 60, 63, 81, 83]
Multi-task learning		[12]	
	Influence function	[18]	
Fidelity	Performance	Accuracy on test set	[4, 6, 7, 10, 13, 16, 17, 20, 23, 25, 26, 32–36, 57, 60, 62, 64, 65, 68, 69] [70, 78, 81, 82, 86]
		Accuracy on remaining dataset	[1, 7, 11, 26, 30, 63, 70, 72, 75, 83, 86]
		Loss and errors on remaining set	[6]
Efficiency	Complexity	Time taken (in # rounds, s, min)	[6, 7, 11, 16–18, 22, 23, 25, 32, 33, 35, 36, 40, 43, 57, 60, 68, 78, 81, 83]
		Speed-up ratio	[4, 86]
		Memory in MB/GB	[18, 22, 33, 39, 43]

**Table 10: A comprehensive table summarizing the literature on FU. "Remaining Acc." and "Target Acc." are short for accuracy on remaining and target data, respectively. "n/d" represents not disclosed within the paper, and "-" indicates none. The numbers in brackets in the "Data Dist." column indicate the range of the concentration parameter they used. Evaluation metrics for each objective are separated by ";". Note that we added links to the code if they are released.**

Ref.	Unlearner	Target	Influence removal	Performance recovery	Implication	Eval. Metric	Dataset	Data Dist.	Agg. Method	Model Arch.	Code
[39]	Server	Client	Remove the node of the target client and all the child nodes	-(removing only a few ( $\leq 5$ ) clients does not influence the efficacy of RevFRF)	Efficacy, Fidelity, Security, Guarantee	MSE, MAE, R-Square; Remaining Acc., recall, F1; time(s), memory(MB)	UCI tabular datasets <sup>4</sup>	n/d	n/d	Random forest	-
[73]	All clients	Sample	Retrain the remaining clients (except unlearning) using a quantized learning model	-	Efficacy, Fidelity, Efficiency	ASR (MIA), SAPE on the unlearned model; Speed up ratio	fMNIST, CIFAR10	Non-IID (random)	FedAvg	3, 4-layer CNN	[link]
[60]	Server	Sample, Client	Retrain only if sampling probability changes after removal	-	Efficacy, Fidelity, Efficiency, Guarantee	ASR (MIA), precision (MIA); Test Acc.; time(#rounds)	MNIST, fMNIST, CIFAR10, CIFAR100, FEMINIST, Shakespear	Non-IID (Dirichlet $\alpha=0.5$ )	FedAvg	CNN, pretrained VGG-16, LSTM	-
[68]	Server	Feature	Retrain from historically saved local model checkpoints	Automatic optimizer control for generalization	Efficacy, Efficiency, Guarantee, Adaptivity	SAPE; Test Acc.; Speed-up ratio	MNIST, CIFAR10, Speech-command, ImageNet, BrainTumorMRI, ModelNet	n/d	n/d	LeNet5, ResNet18, M5, ResNet34, pointConv	-
[56]	Server	Client	Recover from historically saved local updates by applying weighted averages to them	Add a penalty term derived from gradients calculated by projecting remaining gradients plus the loss onto the tangent space of the aggregated gradient	Efficacy, Fidelity, Efficiency, Guarantee, Fairness	Their own metrics for efficacy, fidelity and fairness	MNIST	Non-IID (unique)	FedAvg	LeNet5	-
[66]	Remaining clients	Client	Calibrate the local update using the stored historical local updates' direction	-	Efficacy, Fidelity	NDCG@10	MQ2007, MSLR-WEB10k, Yahoo, IStella-S	IID	FedAvg	Linear model	[link]
[4]	Server, Remaining clients	Client	Recover from historically saved remaining local model updates	Pre- and Post-training: the remaining clients train and send the updates in the first and last several rounds	Efficacy, Efficiency, Security	ASR (BA); Test error; time saved % (# rounds)	MNIST, fMNIST, Pur-chase, HAR	Non-IID (Fang [0.1,1])	FedAvg, median, trimmed-mean	3-layer CNN, FCNN	-
[69]	Server	Sample	Recover from historically saved remaining local model updates by averaging them and subtracting the target clients' update	KD: using the old global model as a teacher model, transfer remembered knowledge to the skewed unlearning model (student model)	Efficacy, Fidelity	ASR (BA); Test Acc	MNIST, CIFAR10, GT-SRB	n/d	FedAvg	2-layer CNN, VGG11, AlexNet	-

Table 11: A comprehensive table summarizing the literature on FU. (continued)

Ref.	Unlearner	Target	Influence removal	Performance recovery	Implication	Eval. Metric	Dataset	Data Dist.	Agg. Method	Model Arch.	Code
[83]	Server	Sample	Recover from historically saved local model updates by removing a weighted sum of them from the global model	Add Gaussian noise for indistinguishability of the retrained and unlearned model	Efficacy, Fidelity, Efficiency, Security, Guarantee	Target Acc., ASR (MIA); Remaining Acc.; time (s)	SVHN, USFS	IID	FedAvg	pre-trained CNN	-
[10]	Server	Client, Feature	Recover from saved target model updates at the last round by subtracting them from the global model	Constraints on intermediate local model parameter during unlearning	Efficacy, Fidelity, Efficiency, Security	ASR (data poisoning); acc on test dataset; time (# rounds)	Cood-RNA, Iris, Adult, Breast-cancer	IID	n/d	CNN	-
[43]	2 Servers	Client	Recover from least-affected local updates	Recompute the local updates with large approx error	Efficacy, Fidelity, Efficiency, Guarantee, Security	ASR (BA, MIA); Test error; Speed up ratio, memory (GB)	MNIST, fM-NIST, CIFAR10	n/d	FedAvg	3-, 4-layer CNN	-
[64]	Target Client	Sample, Client	Recover from historically saved updates and subtract the target model updates	Fine-tune the unlearned model using the direction of the target updates	Efficacy, Fidelity, Efficiency, Adaptivity	MAPE, Test Acc. and Loss	Pix3D, VRHP	IID, Non-IID (Dirichlet 0.1)	FedAvg	VGG16, LSTM	-
[25]	Server	Client	Recover from selectively saved local model based on large KLD and high cosine similarity	-	Efficacy, Fidelity, Efficiency	ASR (BA, ASR (MIA)); Test Acc.; time(#round), mem(Big-O)	MNIST, fM-NIST, CIFAR10	n/d	FedAvg	n/d	-
[36]	Remaining clients	Client	Recover from periodically saved local model updates by applying weighted averages to them	Post-training: a few training rounds after unlearning to redirect the updates without the target client	Efficacy, Fidelity, Efficiency	Prediction difference, attack precision and recall (MIA), Target Acc., loss; Remaining Acc., loss; time(s)	Adult, Purchase, MNIST, CIFAR10	n/d	FedAvg	2-, 3-layer NN, 4-layer CNN	[link]
[80]	Server, All clients	Client	Restore certain global model updates to roll back to the point before the target client joined	Gradient manipulation: calibrate the unlearning model to the historical model updates' direction	Efficacy, Fidelity, Efficiency, Scalability	HR@10, NDCG@10	MovieLens-100k, Steam-200k	n/d	FedAvg	NCF, LightGCN	-
[16]	Server, Remaining clients	Client	Restore and perturb the global model of an optimal iteration	-	Efficacy, Fidelity, Efficiency, Security, Guarantee	Target Acc.; time (# rounds)	MNIST, CIFAR, CelebA	IID, Non-IID (Dirichlet $\alpha = 1$ )	FedAvg	Logistic regression model, CNN	[link]
[81]	Server	Client	Adjust direction from historically saved local updates only if the model performance drops	-	Efficacy, Fidelity, Efficiency, Adaptivity	Prec., Recall (MIA); Test Acc., Time (s)	MNIST, CIFAR10, SVHN	n/d	n/d	n/d	-

Table 12: A comprehensive table summarizing the literature on FU. (continued)

Ref.	Unlearner	Target	Influence removal	Performance recovery	Implication	Eval. Metric	Dataset	Data Dist.	Agg. Method	Model Arch.	Code
[48]	Server	Client	Perturb target label to the fake one	-	Efficacy, Fidelity	ASR (BA), Co-sine simm.	MINIST, CIFAR10, CIFAR100	IID	FedAvg	3-layer CNN, ResNet18	[link]
[38]	Target clients	Sample	Perturb the target client's update using a dummy gradient generator	Add a regularization term: L1 norm to the loss function	n/d	n/d	n/d	n/d	SecAgg	n/d	-
[6]	Target client	Sample	Perturbation (Gaussian noise) to the target client	-	Efficacy, Fidelity, Efficiency, Guarantee	Errors on target data; errors on remaining/test data, Test Acc.; time (s)	fMNIST, CIFAR10, SVHN	n/d	FedAvg	CNN, LeNet, ResNet18	-
[65]	Server	Sample	Perturbing target update by generating a reverse gradient	SGD to minimize the impact on the model accuracy	Efficacy	Test Acc.	MovieLens-100k	Non-IID	Avg. base layers	4-layer CNN	-
[75]	Target client	Client	Perturbing target updates by training it on noised input	-	Efficacy, Efficiency, Security	Target Acc.; Remaining Acc.	MNIST	Non-IID (random)	FedAvg	DNN	-
[86]	Server, target client	Class, Client	Scale down on the target data points gradually using the momentum technique	Guided fine-tuning on remaining data points' direction	Efficacy, Fidelity, Efficiency	Target Acc., ASR (BA); Remaining Acc.; speed up ratio	MNIST, fMNIST, CIFAR10, CIFAR100	Non-IID (Dirichlet)	FedAvg	ResNet18, ResNet50	-
[54]	All clients	Sample	Scale up/down using an attention mechanism to assign reduced weights to the target data	-	Efficacy, Fidelity, Adaptivity	MSE, MAE, L2 distance	AMPds2, METR-LA, MIMIC-III, NYPD, MIMIC-CXR, SHED	Non-IID (concept drift)	FedAvg	n/d	-
[18]	Server	Client	Scale up/down on remaining/target clients' updates	-	Efficacy, Fidelity, Efficiency, Security	Target Acc. and loss, IF, KLD; time (s), space (MB)	MNIST, CIFAR10, SpeechCom-mand, ISIC, COVID, ImageNet, VGGFace5	IID, Non-IID (Dirichlet), [0.5, 0.9]	FedAvg, Krum, Median	LeNet5, ResNet18, CNN-LSTM, DenseNet121, ResNet18	-
[35]	Server	Client	Scale up/down on remaining clients' updates based on their contribution	-	Efficacy, Fidelity, Efficiency, Security, Adaptivity	Precision (MIA), recall (MIA), parameter deviation, Test Acc. and loss; time(s)	MNIST, fMNIST, CIFAR10	n/d	Weighted Avg	3-, 4-layer CNN	-
[50]	Target clients	Sample, Client	Scale to zero on the target clients' updates	-	Efficacy, Fidelity, Efficiency, Security, Guarantee	Clustering loss ratio, time (s)	Synthetic <sup>6</sup> , cellype, covtype, FEMINIST, TMI, TCGA	IID, Non-IID	SCMA	DC-KMeans	[link]

Table 13: A comprehensive table summarizing the literature on FU. (continued)

Ref.	Unlearner	Target	Influence removal	Performance recovery	Implication	Eval. Metric	Dataset	Data Dist.	Agg. Method	Model Arch.	Code
[63]	Server and all clients	Class	Prune the channel of gradients corresponding to the target	Fine-tuning: few FL training with remaining clients without regularization	Efficacy, Fidelity, Efficiency	Target Acc., ASR (MIA); Remaining Acc.; speed up ratio	CIFAR10, CIFAR100	IID, Non-IID (Fang)	FedAvg	ResNet, pre-trained VGG	[link]
[82]	Target clients	Sample, Feature	Prune the nodes of the target's local model and retrain it	Post-training: a few training rounds after unlearning	Efficacy, Fidelity, Security	1st Wasserstein distance; Test Acc.	Give credit, optDigits, Epsilon	n/d	n/d	GBDT	-
[22]	Server	Client	Subtract target updates from the global model	Fine-tuning with a small (1/8) sized IID benchmark dataset	Efficacy, Fidelity, Efficiency, Security	Target Acc., F1 score; Test Acc., loss; time(CPU, s), memory(MB)	MNIST, FMNIST, CIFAR10, SVHN	IID, Non-IID (random)	FedAvg	MLP, 2-layer CNN, VGG11, MobileNet	-
[13]	Target client	Sample, Client	Subtract target model updates computed only using the target data from the global model	-	Efficacy	L2 distance in confidence; Test Acc., loss	MIT-BIH, BIDMC	IID	FedAvg	3-layer CNN	-
[26]	Target client	Client	Loss function approximation using Hessian matrix calculated on data the server owns	-	Efficacy, Fidelity	Target Acc., ASR (MIA, BA); Remaining Acc., Test Acc.	MNIST, FMNIST, NIST	IID	FedAvg	3-layer CNN	-
[40]	Target client	Client	Loss function approximation relying on Hessian using diagonal FIM	Apply momentum techniques to the Hessian Diagonal	Efficacy, Fidelity, Efficiency, Guarantee, Flexibility	SAPE; Remaining Acc.; time (s)	MNIST, FMNIST, CIFAR10, CelebA	IID	FedAvg	3-layer CNN, AlexNet, ResNet	[link]
[72]	All clients	Feature	Multi-task learning: data erasure and remembrance by optimizing local model loss using MIA-like evaluation model	Add a regularization term: L2 norm between the local and global models	Efficacy, Efficiency, Guarantee	Target Acc.; Remaining Acc.	SVHN, CelebA	n/d	FedAvg	MobileNetV3, ResNet, RegNet7	-
[1]	Target clients	Sample	Multi-task learning: data erasure and remembrance	Dynamic penalization to penalize over-unlearning info not associated with trigger patterns	Efficacy, Fidelity, Security	ASR (BA) on test data, main task Acc.	CIFAR10, CIFAR100	IID	FedAvg	VGG11, ResNet18	-
[67]	Target client	Sample	Multi-task: The target client performs multi-task learning (data erasure).	Multi-task: The target client performs multi-task learning (maintaining acc on the remaining set)	Efficacy, Fidelity, Efficiency	ASR (BA), L2 norm distance, KLD; Test Acc.; time (s)	MNIST, CIFAR10	n/d	FedAvg	3-layer BNN, ResNet18	[link]
[12]	All clients	Feature	Multi-task learning: data erasure using losses to discriminate between the sites and to remove site-specific information	Multi-task learning: remembrance using main task loss for classification	Efficacy	MAE, SCA	ABIDE	Non-IID (covariate shift)	FedEqual	VGG-based CNN	[link]
[7]	Server	Sample	Multi-task learning: minimize KLD between the predicted distribution of forget and arbitrary data	Multiply the loss by a scaling factor to balance between efficiency and fidelity	Efficacy, Fidelity, Efficiency	ASR (MIA), Test Acc. on forget/re-main set; time(s)	MNIST, HAR70+, HARTH	IID, Non-IID	n/d	3-layer CNN, LeNet5	-

Table 14: A comprehensive table summarizing the literature on FU. (continued)

Ref.	Unlearner	Target	Influence removal	Performance recovery	Implication	Eval. Metric	Dataset	Data Dist.	Agg. Method	Model Arch.	Code
[62]	Server	Sample	KD & Multi-task learning: minimize bias between the prediction within forget set and transfer only retaining knowledge	Multi-task learning: maintaining performance	Efficacy, Fidelity, Efficiency, Compatibility	ASR (BA); Test Acc.	MNIST, FMNIST, CIFAR10, FAR10, CelebA	non-IID (random)	LeNet, ResNet32, ResNet56	[link]	
[87]	Server, All clients	Sample	Knowledge distillation: transfer knowledge to be remembered	Fine-tuning: passive decay by suppressing the activation of the target data	Efficacy, Fidelity, Efficiency	Average Hits@N, MRR	FBI5k-237	Non-IID (unique)	FedAvg	TransE, ComplEx, RoE	[link]
[32]	Target clients	Sample, Class, Client	Knowledge distillation: the target client's student model distills knowledge from manipulated data (fake labels with original features) that teacher models generated.	EWC training, using a Hessian matrix as a regularizer	Efficacy, Fidelity, Efficiency	ASR (BA); Test Acc.; time(s)	MNIST, CIFAR10, CelebA	n/d	FedAvg	3-layer CNN, ResNet10	-
[78]	Remaining clients	Class	Ensemble remaining clients' knowledge-distilled reference models	-	Efficacy, Scalability, Flexibility	Test Acc., time (min)	MNIST, FMNIST, CIFAR10	Non-IID (unique)	n/d	ResNet, MobileNet	-
[70]	Target client	Sample, Class, Client	Reverse training: stochastic gradient ascent	EWC training, limit the magnitude of parameters through FIM as a regularizer	Efficacy, Fidelity	Target Acc.; Remaining and Test Acc.	MNIST, CIFAR10	IID, Non-IID (unique)	FedAvg	n/d	-
[30]	Server, All clients	Sample	Reverse training: gradient ascent	Server projecting the target updates into the orthogonal subspace calculated from remaining clients' representation matrices	Efficacy, Fidelity, Security	ASR (BA); Test Acc.	MNIST, CIFAR10, FAR100	IID, Non-IID (Dirichlet [0.1, 0.6])	n/d	MLP, 3-layer CNN, ResNet18	-
[23]	Target client	Client	Reverse training: maximizing local loss bounded by an L2-norm ball around a reference model	Post-training: a few training rounds after unlearning	Efficacy, Fidelity, Efficiency	ASR (MIA); Test Acc.; # rounds to retrain target	MNIST, EMNIST, FAR10	IID	FedAvg	3-layer CNN	[link]
[11]	All clients	Class, Client	Reverse training (stochastic gradient ascent) on the distilled dataset that each client has created	Fine-tuning the unlearned model by including a few original data samples into the training dataset	Efficacy, Fidelity, Efficiency, Scalability	Target Acc., Target ASR (MIA); Remaining ASR (MIA); time (s)	MNIST, CIFAR10, SVHN	IID, Non-IID (Dirichlet $\alpha = 0.1$ )	FedAvg	3-layer ConvNet	-
[19]	Target client	Sample	Variational inference, maximizing local loss	Post-training: a few training rounds after unlearning	Efficacy, Fidelity	variational posterior distribution, Target Acc.	MNIST	Non-IID (unique)	n/d	1-layer BNN	-
[20]	Target client	Sample, Class, Client	Variational inference, quantization and sparsification method to reduce communication overhead	Post-training: a few training rounds after unlearning remaining clients	Efficacy, Fidelity, Efficiency	Target Acc., ECE; Remaining Acc.	FMNIST	Non-IID (unique)	FedAvg	NN	-
[57]	Server, Target client, Some remaining clients	Client	Cluster clients based on their similarity (training time and low model disparity) and retrain the only cluster that contains the target client.	-	Efficacy, Fidelity, Efficiency, Scalability	Test Acc.; time (s)	CIFAR10, EMNIST, Purchase 100, Tiny Shakespear	Non-IID (Dirichlet $\alpha = 5$ )	FedAvg, FedBuff	VGG16, LeNet5, MLP, GPT2	[link]

Table 15: A comprehensive table summarizing the literature on FU. (continued)

Ref.	Unlearner	Target	Influence removal	Performance recovery	Implication	Eval. Metric	Dataset	Data Dist.	Agg. Method	Model Arch.	Code
[33]	Server	Sample, Client	Retrain the cluster containing the target with coded computation	-	Efficacy, Fidelity, Efficiency, Guarantee, Adaptivity, Scalability	F1 (MIA); Test Acc. and loss; time(s), memory (MB)	MINIST, fM-NIST, CI-FAR10, Tiny Shakespear	IID, Non-IID (random)	FedAvg	3-layer CNN, NanoGPT	-
[34]	Server	Client	Cluster based on their similarity and calibrate the gradient by step length and direction	Dynamically select remaining clients possessing unbalanced local data	Efficacy, Fidelity, Fairness	F1 (MIA); Test Acc.	MINIST, fM-NIST, CI-FAR10	IID, Non-IID	FedAvg	n/d	-