

# Robust Federated Learning Mitigates Client-side Training Data Distribution Inference Attacks

Yichang Xu\*

University of Science and Technology of China  
xuyichang@mail.ustc.edu.cn

Minghong Fang

Duke University  
minghong.fang@duke.edu

Ming Yin\*

University of Science and Technology of China  
mingyin@mail.ustc.edu.cn

Neil Zhenqiang Gong

Duke University  
neil.gong@duke.edu

## ABSTRACT

Recent studies have revealed that federated learning (FL), once considered secure due to clients not sharing their private data with the server, is vulnerable to attacks such as client-side training data distribution inference, where a malicious client can recreate the victim's data. While various countermeasures exist, they are not practical, often assuming server access to some training data or knowledge of label distribution before the attack.

In this work, we bridge the gap by proposing InferGuard, a novel Byzantine-robust aggregation rule aimed at defending against client-side training data distribution inference attacks. In our proposed InferGuard, the server first calculates the coordinate-wise median of all the model updates it receives. A client's model update is considered malicious if it significantly deviates from the computed median update. We conduct a thorough evaluation of our proposed InferGuard on five benchmark datasets and perform a comparison with ten baseline methods. The results of our experiments indicate that our defense mechanism is highly effective in protecting against client-side training data distribution inference attacks, even against strong adaptive attacks. Furthermore, our method substantially outperforms the baseline methods in various practical FL scenarios.

## CCS CONCEPTS

• Security and privacy → Systems security.

## KEYWORDS

Federated Learning, Inference Attacks, Robustness

## ACM Reference Format:

Yichang Xu, Ming Yin, Minghong Fang, and Neil Zhenqiang Gong. 2024. Robust Federated Learning Mitigates Client-side Training Data Distribution Inference Attacks. In *Companion Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2024 (WWW '24 Companion)*, May 13–17, 2024, Singapore, Singapore. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 4 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3589335.3651555>

\*Equal contribution.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution International 4.0 License.

WWW '24 Companion, May 13–17, 2024, Singapore, Singapore  
© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).  
ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-0172-6/24/05.  
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3589335.3651555>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Federated learning (FL) [14] is an innovative distributed machine learning paradigm that has gained significant attention recently, allowing individuals to train a global machine learning model collaboratively without sharing their private training data with others. FL usually consists of one server and multiple clients. During the FL training process, each client performs local training using the current global model and its local training data, then sends its local model update to the server. Upon receiving model updates from all clients, the server leverages a specific aggregation rule to combine the received model updates and further update the global model. The updated global model is then distributed to all clients for the next round of training. For instance, the FedAvg [14] aggregation rule calculates the average of model updates to obtain the global model and is commonly employed in non-adversarial scenarios.

A benefit of FL compared with centralized learning is that clients no longer need to send their private training data to the server. Some cryptographic approaches have been proposed to protect the FL system from information leakage in network security level [5]. However, methods reliant on cryptography often incur large computation and communication overhead [27]. Recent studies [2, 8] have shown that FL is vulnerable to poisoning attacks, where malicious clients could send carefully crafted model updates to the server to manipulate the final learned global model. Moreover, some works studied the privacy of FL and found that FL is not as sound as expected in privacy—even awful. These works explored the possibility of privacy both on the server and client sides. On the server side, they found that the server can reconstruct images or properties of data from a specific client [26]. The most influential for client-side inference attacks is the GAN attack proposed by Hitaj et al. [12]. Taking advantage of the dynamic nature of the learning process, this form of attack enables adversaries to leverage a Generative Adversarial Network (GAN) [11] to produce similar samples from the targeted training set, initially intended to remain undisclosed. The models generated by the GAN aim to align closely with the same data distribution as the training data.

Client-side inference attacks are considerably more feasible than server-side ones, as the attacker involved in a client-side attack is a participating client in FL, and does not need to compromise the server to carry out its malicious actions. Certain defense mechanisms have been specifically designed to defend against client-side inference attacks. For instance, Netzer et al. [23] developed a method that utilizes differential privacy mechanisms to mitigate

arXiv:2403.03149v2 [cs.CR] 4 Apr 2024

such attacks. Nevertheless, our later experiments revealed that such approaches are ineffective in defending against inference attacks.

**Our work:** We first observe that existing Byzantine-robust aggregation rules [4, 6, 9, 15, 25] could only mitigate client-side inference attacks to some extent. However, they are still vulnerable to inference attacks in certain circumstances, as demonstrated in our experiments. Based on this motivation, we propose a new Byzantine-robust aggregation rule called InferGuard to defend against inference attacks. In our proposed InferGuard, after receiving model updates from all clients, the server calculates the Median [25] of these updates. If a received model update deviates substantially from the computed Median, it is identified as malicious.

**InferGuard can defend against client-side training data distribution inference attacks:** We extensively evaluate our proposed InferGuard on five datasets, including MNIST [13], Fashion-MNIST [24], AT&T [19], SVHN [17], and GTSRB [21]. We compared InferGuard with several existing Byzantine-robust aggregation rules, including AFA [16], Multi-Krum [4], Bulyan [15], Trimmed mean [25], Median [25], FLTrust [6], along with model update post-processing mechanisms such as compression [3], sparsification [1], and differential privacy [23]. Our findings demonstrate the robustness of InferGuard against client-side inference attacks, whereas the aforementioned Byzantine-robust aggregation rules and other defense mechanisms exhibit vulnerability in specific scenarios.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows:


- We find that existing Byzantine-robust aggregation rules could mitigate the client-side inference attacks on FL to some extent. However, their effect is not optimal because we can still recognize the content in generated images.
- We introduce InferGuard, an innovative defense framework designed to protect against inference attacks on the client side of FL. InferGuard effectively mitigates malicious clients' influence while preserving the FL system's utility.
- We thoroughly evaluate our defense framework using five benchmark datasets. Our results demonstrate that InferGuard effectively safeguards against client-side inference attacks, and outperforms baseline methods.

## 2 THREAT MODEL AND DEFENSE GOALS

**Attacker's Goal:** Following [12], we consider a client-side data reconstruction attack. We assume that an attacker controls some malicious clients. The attacker's goal is to reconstruct images of a specific label that it initially did not possess.

**Attacker's Capabilities:** The attacker achieves his goal via sending carefully crafted model updates to the server. Malicious clients can exchange local model updates amongst themselves, and each malicious client knows other malicious clients' local training data. Malicious clients can initiate the attack at any global round. Note that the server is trustworthy, and there is no collusion between the attacker and the server.

**Defense Goals:** Our goal is to create an aggregation rule for FL systems that is secure against client-side inference attacks and maintains robustness, fidelity, and efficiency. This rule should prevent attackers from accessing clients' local data, ensure the global



**Figure 1: MNIST dataset, whether a malicious model update is chosen in each round.**

model's accuracy is as close to FedAvg's as possible without attacks, and be computationally efficient without additional costs.

## 3 OUR METHOD

Suppose we have  $n$  clients, in global training round  $t$ , each client  $i$  submits its local model update  $\mathbf{g}_i^t$  to the server, where  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Upon receiving local model updates from all clients, the server first computes the coordinate-wise median of  $n$  local model updates, denoted as  $\mathbf{g}_{\text{med}}^t$ , as the following:

$$\mathbf{g}_{\text{med}}^t = \text{Median}\{\mathbf{g}_1^t, \mathbf{g}_2^t, \dots, \mathbf{g}_n^t\}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\text{Median}\{\mathbf{g}_1^t, \mathbf{g}_2^t, \dots, \mathbf{g}_n^t\}$  is the coordinate-wise median [25] of these  $n$  model updates.

Subsequently, the server determines whether  $\mathbf{g}_i^t$  should be considered a benign local model update based on the following:

$$\|\mathbf{g}_i^t - \mathbf{g}_{\text{med}}^t\|_2 \leq \lambda \|\mathbf{g}_{\text{med}}^t\|_2. \quad (2)$$

During the global training round  $t$ , the set of clients whose model updates satisfy Eq. (2) is denoted as  $\mathcal{H}$ . The final aggregated local model update is then calculated as the average of the local model updates of all the clients in  $\mathcal{H}$  as  $\frac{1}{|\mathcal{H}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}} \mathbf{g}_i^t$ . If  $|\mathcal{H}| = 0$ , then we choose the model update whose  $\|\mathbf{g}_i^t - \mathbf{g}_{\text{med}}^t\|_2$  is the smallest.

We experiment on the MNIST dataset to verify our idea (refer to Section 4.1 for experimental settings). We aim to check whether the model update from the malicious client is chosen at each global round. Multi-Krum is adopted as our baseline. The results are shown in Figure 1. In Figure 1, if the "Indicator" equals one, it represents that the server mistakenly selects the malicious model update in a specific training round. In contrast, zero represents that it does not. From Figure 1, we observe that for Multi-Krum, the server chooses the malicious model update almost every training round. However, in our method, after the attacker starts to attack at the 50th training round (following prior work [12], we assume that the attacker starts to attack from a specific training round), the server does not select the malicious model update anymore.

## 4 EXPERIMENTS

### 4.1 Experimental Setup

**4.1.1 Datasets.** We use MNIST [13], Fashion-MNIST [24], AT&T [19], SVHN [17] and GTSRB [21] datasets in our experiments.

**4.1.2 Evaluation Metrics.** Following [10, 26, 30], we use Learned Perceptual Image Patch Similarity (LPIPS) [28], Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio (PSNR) [7], and Structural Similarity Index Measure (SSIM) [22] as evaluation metrics. Larger LPIPS or lower PSNR/SSIM



(a) No attack (b) Multi-Krum (c) InferGuard  
Figure 2: Reconstruction samples on MNIST dataset.

indicates better defense performance. According to [18], SSIM can be considered as the primary index to measure the defense effect.

**4.1.3 Compared Methods.** We compare with our proposed InferGuard with 10 baselines, includes 7 aggregation rules (FedAvg [14], adaptive federated average (AFA) [16], Multi-Krum [4], Bulyan [15], coordinate-wise trimmed mean (Trim) [25], coordinate-wise median (Median) [25], FLTrust [6]), and 3 post-processing defenses (sparsification [1], compression [3], differential privacy (DP) [23]).

**4.1.4 Parameter Settings.** We train 300 rounds on MNIST, Fashion-MNIST, AT&T, GTSRB datasets, and 150 rounds on SVHN, with each client training locally for one epoch per round. In a FL setup with 10 clients, where one is malicious following the approach in [12], we simulate non-i.i.d. data by uniformly distributing each label to 5 clients, leading to distinct class distributions per client. In all datasets, we suppose that the last client is the malicious client. In MNIST, Fashion-MNIST, GTSRB, and SVHN datasets, the malicious client steals images of label 3, which he does not own. In AT&T, the malicious client steals images of label 11. The malicious client initiates data distribution inference attacks targeting specific labels not owned by them, starting from round 50 for MNIST, Fashion-MNIST, AT&T, and GTSRB, and round 20 for SVHN. For the  $\lambda$  parameter, we set  $\lambda = 2.0$  for MNIST,  $\lambda = 1.8$  for Fashion-MNIST,  $\lambda = 2.8$  for AT&T,  $\lambda = 3.0$  for SVHN and  $\lambda = 1.2$  for GTSRB dataset.


## 4.2 Experimental Results

**Our InferGuard is effective:** From Table 1, we observe that our method almost wins on all three evaluation metrics compared with baselines on five datasets. For instance, the SSIM value on MNIST after our defense declined to 0.22, while SSIM values of baselines are at least 0.4. Our visualization result, Figure 2 also supports the same conclusion.

**Impact of different  $\lambda$ :** We experiment with the parameter  $\lambda$  taking on values of 0.5, 2, 2.5, 3, 5, 7, 10. As shown in Figure 3, we can conclude that the defensive efficacy starts to decline when  $\lambda$  surpasses 2. So in our experiment, we choose  $\lambda = 2$  as the default setting.

**Non-iid settings:** Table 3 shows the situations where each client owns three labels. Under such non-iid settings, our method is still superior over baselines.

**Results on adaptive attacks:** Suppose the local model weight is  $w_i^t$ , and the loss function when training the local model is  $L(w_i^t; \mathbf{x})$ . The training data distribution for the malicious client is  $\mathcal{D}_i$ . The optimization problem for the malicious client is formalized as  $\min_{w_i^t} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{D}_i} [L(w_i^t; \mathbf{x})]$ , s.t.  $\|w_i^t - w^t\|_\infty \leq \tau$ , where  $\tau$  is a constant. Table 2 shows the evaluation result of our adaptive attack on the MNIST dataset with  $\tau = 0.0016$ . In MNIST, our defense effect is



(a) LPIPS (b) PSNR (c) SSIM  
Figure 3: Impact of different  $\lambda$  on MNIST dataset.

weakened, but from the SSIM values, we can conclude that it is still robust in some way because the SSIM score under our method is still lower than SSIM scores under baselines.

**Results on membership inference attack:** We consider the membership inference attack proposed in [29]. The attacker has 300 samples and needs to determine whether each sample is in the training set of the other 9 clients. Other settings are the same as our default setting. Table 4 displays the results on Location30 [20] dataset, as recommended in [29]. In Table 4, “Model acc” denotes the global model’s testing accuracy, and “Attack acc” represents the attacker’s success rate. We can see that InferGuard achieves the best defense effect among all defenses. Moreover, it continues to sustain the model’s high-level performance.

## 5 CONCLUSION

Our research demonstrated that current strategies for defending against client-side inference attacks fall short in practice, highlighting the need for a more robust defense mechanism in FL. Interestingly, we discovered that existing Byzantine-robust aggregation rules, although not originally designed to combat inference attacks, provide a degree of protective effect. Building on these insights, we developed a novel Byzantine-robust aggregation rule named InferGuard, which could effectively counter client-side inference attacks. Comparative analysis across five datasets revealed that this new defense strategy markedly outperforms existing mechanisms. Future exploration could focus on providing a formal theoretical guarantee to demonstrate the robustness of our proposed InferGuard against client-side training data distribution inference attacks.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the anonymous reviewers for their comments. This work was supported by NSF grant No. 2131859, 2125977, 2112562, 1937786, 1937787, and ARO grant No. W911NF2110182.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Alham Fikri Aji and Kenneth Heafield. 2017. Sparse communication for distributed gradient descent. In *EMNLP*.
- [2] Gilad Baruch, Moran Baruch, and Yoav Goldberg. 2019. A little is enough: Circumventing defenses for distributed learning. In *NeurIPS*.
- [3] Jeremy Bernstein, Yu-Xiang Wang, Kamyar Azizzadenesheli, and Anima Anandkumar. 2018. signSGD: Compressed Optimisation for Non-Convex Problems. In *ICML*.
- [4] Peva Blanchard, El Mahdi El Mhamdi, Rachid Guerraoui, and Julien Stainer. 2017. Machine learning with adversaries: Byzantine tolerant gradient descent. In *NeurIPS*.
- [5] Keith Bonawitz, Vladimir Ivanov, Ben Kreuter, Antonio Marcedone, H Brendan McMahan, Sarvar Patel, Daniel Ramage, Aaron Segal, and Karn Seth. 2017. Practical secure aggregation for privacy-preserving machine learning. In *CCS*.
- [6] Xiaoyu Cao, Minghong Fang, Jia Liu, and Neil Zhenqiang Gong. 2021. FLTrust: Byzantine-robust Federated Learning via Trust Bootstrapping. In *NDSS*.
- [7] Kenneth R Castleman. 1996. Digital image processing.

**Table 1: Results of different FL methods under attack.**

| (a) MNIST |           |        |       |            |        |       |        |         |                |             |       |            |
|-----------|-----------|--------|-------|------------|--------|-------|--------|---------|----------------|-------------|-------|------------|
|           | No attack | FedAvg | AFA   | Multi-Krum | Bulyan | Trim  | Median | FLTrust | Sparsification | Compression | DP    | InferGuard |
| LPIPS ↑   | 0.00      | 0.34   | 0.32  | 0.28       | 0.27   | 0.36  | 0.36   | 0.35    | 0.34           | 0.35        | 0.31  | 0.39       |
| PSNR ↓    | inf       | 28.55  | 28.70 | 29.97      | 31.05  | 28.91 | 29.28  | 28.76   | 28.51          | 28.60       | 28.76 | 28.53      |
| SSIM ↓    | 1.00      | 0.53   | 0.55  | 0.66       | 0.59   | 0.37  | 0.57   | 0.40    | 0.56           | 0.55        | 0.57  | 0.22       |

| (b) Fashion-MNIST |           |        |       |            |        |       |        |         |                |             |       |            |
|-------------------|-----------|--------|-------|------------|--------|-------|--------|---------|----------------|-------------|-------|------------|
|                   | No attack | FedAvg | AFA   | Multi-Krum | Bulyan | Trim  | Median | FLTrust | Sparsification | Compression | DP    | InferGuard |
| LPIPS ↑           | 0.00      | 0.34   | 0.34  | 0.35       | 0.34   | 0.32  | 0.35   | 0.34    | 0.34           | 0.35        | 0.33  | 0.44       |
| PSNR ↓            | inf       | 29.75  | 30.16 | 29.46      | 29.00  | 29.58 | 29.56  | 29.53   | 29.8           | 29.44       | 29.77 | 28.94      |
| SSIM ↓            | 1.00      | 0.34   | 0.35  | 0.28       | 0.33   | 0.37  | 0.35   | 0.3     | 0.36           | 0.31        | 0.35  | 0.21       |

| (c) AT&T |           |        |       |            |        |       |        |         |                |             |       |            |
|----------|-----------|--------|-------|------------|--------|-------|--------|---------|----------------|-------------|-------|------------|
|          | No attack | FedAvg | AFA   | Multi-Krum | Bulyan | Trim  | Median | FLTrust | Sparsification | Compression | DP    | InferGuard |
| LPIPS ↑  | 0.00      | 0.30   | 0.32  | 0.30       | 0.30   | 0.31  | 0.31   | 0.31    | 0.29           | 0.29        | 0.31  | 0.28       |
| PSNR ↓   | inf       | 28.10  | 28.10 | 28.27      | 28.19  | 28.13 | 28.16  | 28.15   | 28.18          | 28.29       | 28.13 | 28.15      |
| SSIM ↓   | 1.00      | 0.31   | 0.30  | 0.41       | 0.44   | 0.30  | 0.34   | 0.27    | 0.35           | 0.36        | 0.34  | 0.21       |

| (d) SVHN |           |        |       |            |        |       |        |         |                |             |       |            |
|----------|-----------|--------|-------|------------|--------|-------|--------|---------|----------------|-------------|-------|------------|
|          | No attack | FedAvg | AFA   | Multi-Krum | Bulyan | Trim  | Median | FLTrust | Sparsification | Compression | DP    | InferGuard |
| LPIPS ↑  | 0.00      | 0.14   | 0.13  | 0.11       | 0.11   | 0.12  | 0.20   | 0.13    | 0.13           | 0.27        | 0.20  | 0.18       |
| PSNR ↓   | inf       | 28.68  | 28.65 | 28.81      | 28.97  | 28.66 | 28.67  | 28.73   | 28.95          | 28.76       | 28.95 | 28.68      |
| SSIM ↓   | 1.00      | 0.62   | 0.58  | 0.65       | 0.64   | 0.66  | 0.57   | 0.65    | 0.63           | 0.41        | 0.59  | 0.53       |

| (e) GTSRB |           |        |       |            |        |       |        |         |                |             |       |            |
|-----------|-----------|--------|-------|------------|--------|-------|--------|---------|----------------|-------------|-------|------------|
|           | No attack | FedAvg | AFA   | Multi-Krum | Bulyan | Trim  | Median | FLTrust | Sparsification | Compression | DP    | InferGuard |
| LPIPS ↑   | 0.00      | 0.25   | 0.29  | 0.24       | 0.25   | 0.24  | 0.22   | 0.27    | 0.25           | 0.28        | 0.22  | 0.32       |
| PSNR ↓    | inf       | 29.99  | 29.99 | 29.83      | 28.29  | 29.75 | 29.38  | 28.51   | 30.00          | 29.97       | 30.00 | 28.59      |
| SSIM ↓    | 1.00      | 0.19   | 0.21  | 0.13       | 0.12   | 0.19  | 0.13   | 0.12    | 0.25           | 0.19        | 0.20  | 0.02       |

**Table 2: Results of adaptive attack on MNIST dataset.**

|         | No attack | FedAvg | AFA   | Multi-Krum | Bulyan | Trim  | Median | FLTrust | Sparsification | Compression | DP    | InferGuard |
|---------|-----------|--------|-------|------------|--------|-------|--------|---------|----------------|-------------|-------|------------|
| LPIPS ↑ | 0.00      | 0.37   | 0.34  | 0.31       | 0.28   | 0.31  | 0.32   | 0.33    | 0.32           | 0.33        | 0.31  | 0.38       |
| PSNR ↓  | inf       | 28.52  | 28.61 | 29.34      | 30.26  | 29.15 | 28.95  | 29.05   | 28.73          | 28.81       | 28.72 | 28.68      |
| SSIM ↓  | 1.00      | 0.50   | 0.54  | 0.59       | 0.59   | 0.62  | 0.57   | 0.54    | 0.54           | 0.56        | 0.55  | 0.48       |

**Table 3: Impact of data distribution. Each client owns three labels of data.**

|         | No attack | FedAvg | AFA   | Multi-Krum | Bulyan | Trim  | Median | FLTrust | Sparsification | Compression | DP    | InferGuard |
|---------|-----------|--------|-------|------------|--------|-------|--------|---------|----------------|-------------|-------|------------|
| LPIPS ↑ | 0.00      | 0.32   | 0.36  | 0.27       | 0.28   | 0.33  | 0.45   | 0.30    | 0.36           | 0.34        | 0.34  | 0.42       |
| PSNR ↓  | inf       | 28.9   | 28.95 | 29.68      | 29.59  | 29.11 | 28.84  | 29.75   | 28.56          | 29.71       | 28.90 | 28.54      |
| SSIM ↓  | 1.00      | 0.50   | 0.54  | 0.65       | 0.62   | 0.57  | 0.33   | 0.60    | 0.52           | 0.50        | 0.55  | 0.27       |

**Table 4: Results of different FL methods under membership inference attack on Location30 dataset.**

|              | FedAvg | AFA  | Multi-Krum | Bulyan | Trim | Median | FLTrust | Sparsification | Compression | DP   | InferGuard |
|--------------|--------|------|------------|--------|------|--------|---------|----------------|-------------|------|------------|
| Model acc ↑  | 0.65   | 0.64 | 0.58       | 0.65   | 0.69 | 0.68   | 0.72    | 0.68           | 0.69        | 0.65 | 0.70       |
| Attack acc ↓ | 0.70   | 0.67 | 0.66       | 0.63   | 0.66 | 0.65   | 0.63    | 0.65           | 0.65        | 0.69 | 0.61       |

[8] Minghong Fang, Xiaoyu Cao, Jinyuan Jia, and Neil Gong. 2020. Local model poisoning attacks to Byzantine-Robust federated learning. In *USENIX Security Symposium*.

[9] Minghong Fang, Jia Liu, Neil Zhenqiang Gong, and Elizabeth S Bentley. 2022. AFLGuard: Byzantine-robust Asynchronous Federated Learning. In *ACSAC*.

[10] Jonas Geiping, Hartmut Bauermeister, Hannah Dröge, and Michael Moeller. 2020. Inverting gradients-how easy is it to break privacy in federated learning?. In *NeurIPS*.

[11] Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. 2014. Generative adversarial nets. In *NeurIPS*.

[12] Briland Hitaj, Giuseppe Ateniese, and Fernando Perez-Cruz. 2017. Deep Models Under the GAN: Information Leakage from Collaborative Deep Learning. In *CCS*.

[13] Yann LeCun, Corinna Cortes, and CJ Burges. 1998. MNIST handwritten digit database. Available: <http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist>.

[14] H. B. McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Agüera y Arcas. 2016. Communication-Efficient Learning of Deep Networks from Decentralized Data. In *AISTATS*.

[15] El Mahdi El Mhamdi, Rachid Guerraoui, and Sébastien Rouault. 2018. The Hidden Vulnerability of Distributed Learning in Byzantium. In *ICML*.

[16] Luis Muñoz-González, Kenneth T Co, and Emil C Lupu. 2019. Byzantine-robust federated machine learning through adaptive model averaging. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.05125* (2019).

[17] Yuval Netzer, Tao Wang, Adam Coates, A. Bissacco, Bo Wu, and A. Ng. 2011. Reading Digits in Natural Images with Unsupervised Feature Learning. In *NeurIPS Workshop on Deep Learning and Unsupervised Feature Learning*.

[18] Jim Nilsson and Tomas Akenine-Möller. 2020. Understanding SSIM. In *arXiv*.

[19] Ferdinando Samaria and Andy Harter. 1994. Parameterisation of a stochastic model for human face identification. In *Proceedings of 1994 IEEE Workshop on Applications of Computer Vision*.

[20] Reza Shokri, Marco Stronati, Congzheng Song, and Vitaly Shmatikov. 2017. Membership inference attacks against machine learning models. In *IEEE symposium on security and privacy*.

[21] Johannes Stalkamp, Marc Schlipf, Jan Salmen, and Christian Igel. 2011. The German Traffic Sign Recognition Benchmark: A multi-class classification competition. In *IEEE International Joint Conference on Neural Networks*.

[22] Zhou Wang, Alan C Bovik, Hamid R Sheikh, and Eero P Simoncelli. 2004. Image quality assessment: from error visibility to structural similarity. In *IEEE transactions on image processing*.

[23] Wenqi Wei, Ling Liu, Yanzhao Wu, Gong Su, and Arun Iyengar. 2021. Gradient-Leakage Resilient Federated Learning. In *ICDCS*.

[24] Han Xiao, Kashif Rasul, and Roland Vollgraf. 2017. Fashion-MNIST: a Novel Image Dataset for Benchmarking Machine Learning Algorithms.

[25] Dong Yin, Yudong Chen, Kannan Ramchandran, and Peter Bartlett. 2021. Byzantine-Robust Distributed Learning: Towards Optimal Statistical Rates. In *ICML*.

[26] Kai Yue, Richeng Jin, Chau-Wai Wong, Dror Baron, and Huaiyu Dai. 2023. Gradient obfuscation gives a false sense of security in federated learning. In *USENIX Security Symposium*.

[27] Chengliang Zhang, Suyi Li, Junzhe Xia, Wei Wang, Feng Yan, and Yang Liu. 2020. BatchCrypt: Efficient Homomorphic Encryption for Cross-Silo Federated Learning. In *USENIX ATC*.

[28] Richard Zhang, Phillip Isola, Alexei A Efros, Eli Shechtman, and Oliver Wang. 2018. The unreasonable effectiveness of deep features as a perceptual metric. In *CVPR*.

[29] Yanjun Zhang, Guangdong Bai, Mahawaga Arachchige Pathum Chamikara, Mengyao Ma, Liyue Shen, Jingwei Wang, Surya Nepal, Minhui Xue, Long Wang, and Joseph Liu. 2023. AgrEvader: Poisoning Membership Inference against Byzantine-Robust Federated Learning. In *The Web Conference 2023*.

[30] Ligeng Zhu, Zhijian Liu, and Song Han. 2019. Deep leakage from gradients. In *NeurIPS*.