

Data Quality in Edge Machine Learning: A State-of-the-Art Survey

Mohammed D. Belgoumri · Mohamed Reda Bouadjenek · Sunil Aryal · Hakim Hacid

Received: / Accepted:

Abstract Data-driven Artificial Intelligence (AI) systems trained using Machine Learning (ML) are shaping an ever-increasing (in size and importance) portion of our lives, including, but not limited to, recommendation systems, autonomous driving technologies, healthcare diagnostics, financial services, and personalized marketing. On the one hand, the outsized influence of these systems imposes a high standard of quality, particularly in the data used to train them. On the other hand, establishing and maintaining standards of Data Quality (DQ) becomes more challenging due to the proliferation of Edge Computing and Internet of Things devices, along with their increasing adoption for training and deploying ML models. The nature of the edge environment—characterized by limited resources, decentralized data storage, and processing—exacerbates data-related issues, making them more frequent, severe, and difficult to detect and mitigate. From these observations, it follows that DQ research for edge ML is a critical and urgent exploration track for the safety and robust usefulness of present and future AI systems. Despite this fact, DQ research for edge ML is still in its infancy. The literature on this subject remains fragmented and scattered across different research communities, with no comprehensive survey to date. Hence, this paper aims to fill this gap by providing a global view of the existing literature from multiple disciplines that can be grouped under the umbrella of DQ for edge ML. Specifically, we present a tentative definition of data quality in Edge computing, which we use to establish a set of DQ dimensions. We explore each dimension in detail, including existing solutions for mitigation.

Keywords Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning, Edge Computing, Data Quality.

1 Introduction

The recent surge in both the scale and prevalence of Artificial Intelligence (AI) systems [1] has led to a significant increase in data and computational demands. Consequently, the traditional model of solely relying on cloud computing for training and inference is reaching its limits [2]. Combined with emerging concerns about data privacy and security, and recent advances in Edge Computing (EC), this has led to a paradigm shift in the field of Machine Learning (ML). A new approach has emerged, which advocates for performing as much of the ML workload as possible close to the data source (on the so-called edge of the network), offloading only the most computationally intensive tasks to the cloud [3].

In doing so, edge ML promises several benefits over centralized ML. One major such benefit is the reduction of the volume and frequency of data transfers, thereby reducing latency, network bandwidth consumption, and the risk of data breaches [2, 3]. Moreover, the distributed nature of the edge naturally precludes a single point of failure, making the system more resilient and fault-tolerant [4].

However, edge ML, at least in its current form, is not universally superior to centralized ML. While it does address many of the latter's shortcomings, it also introduces challenges of its own. Chief among these challenges is the question of Data Quality (DQ). Broadly speaking, DQ refers to the fitness of data for a given purpose [5, 6]. Already a major concern in centralized ML [7], DQ is even more relevant in the context of edge ML, where resource constraints and the distributed nature of the system conspire to make data faults more frequent, more severe, and harder to detect and correct.

Owing to the critical role DQ plays in the successful training and deployment of ML models on the edge, many researchers have begun to investigate the topic, producing a

large and growing corpus of literature on the subject. However, due to the multidisciplinary nature of DQ, and the lack of an established, unified, and widely accepted framework for studying it, the literature is fragmented, with little communication or collaboration between researchers from relevant but different fields.

Simultaneously a symptom and a partial cause of this fragmentation, is the lack of a survey of the state of the art on DQ in edge ML. While a few comprehensive surveys have been published covering DQ in the general contexts of both ML [30], and EC [31], to the best of our knowledge, none exists that addresses it for the edge ML case. Instead, there is a plethora of surveys, each focusing on a different aspect of ML data quality, many of which do address the specific case of edge ML. Table 1 provides a list of such surveys, along with the aspects of DQ they cover.

In this survey, we aim to provide a broad and comprehensive overview of the state of the art on DQ in edge ML, gathering works from the different ML research areas, such as noise-resilience, fairness, privacy, and Byzantine fault tolerance under the unifying umbrella of DQ. To this end, we establish a guiding principle for defining DQ based on the formulation of ML as an optimization problem. We use this principle, along with theoretical sufficient conditions for the convergence of ML algorithms, to devise a list of DQ dimensions. For each dimension, we provide a detailed discussion of existing works, including common definitions, the faults that can occur and the taxonomy thereof, the proposed solutions, and, where applicable, the ways in which the dimension has been studied in the context of edge ML.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides preliminary background information on edge ML, including a general discussion of Machine Learning, a brief overview of the edge environment, and the algorithms used to perform ML on the edge, with particular focus on Federated Learning. Section 3 is dedicated to DQ in ML, its definition, dimensions, and the families of solutions proposed to ensure it. Sections 4 to 9 address one DQ dimension each, providing definitions, possible faults, proposed solutions (if any), all in the context of edge ML (where literature permits). Finally, Section 10 concludes the paper with a summary of the main findings and a discussion of future research directions.

2 Background

Straightforwardly, edge ML can be defined as performing some or all of the computation involved in ML training and inference on edge devices [2]. Therefore, understanding edge ML requires understanding Machine Learning, Edge Computing, and the ways in which they interact. This section discusses these three topics in order, starting with a general

overview of ML, followed by a brief discussion of EC, and finally, the algorithms used for ML on the edge.

Notations and conventions Throughout this document, we will make use of the notations presented in Table 2. When we consider probabilities, expectations, or random variables on some space, we implicitly assume a suitable σ -algebra and probability measure on that space.

2.1 General notions of machine learning

The goal of ML is to learn from data algorithmically [32–34]. This vague goal can be formalized in different ways for different tasks. For the sake of simplicity, we will focus on one particularly easy-to-define task, namely, *supervised learning*. A more general formulation that covers most ML tasks is presented in [35].

In supervised learning, the goal is to learn a function, given a (finite) sample of input-output pairs generated from it, where the input distribution is unknown, and the output is possibly noisy [36]. One way to mathematically phrase this problem is presented in this and the following paragraphs. Given an *input space* \mathcal{X} , an *output space* \mathcal{Y} , a *hypothesis class* \mathcal{H} of measurable functions from \mathcal{X} to \mathcal{Y} , and a random pair (X, Y) with values in $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, with an unknown joint distribution $\mathbb{P}_{(X, Y)}$, the goal is to find a function $f \in \mathcal{H}$, that maximized the similarity between the distribution of $f(X)$ and that of Y .

To make this problem completely unambiguous, we need to specify a notion of similarity. A common way to do so is to start with a *loss function* $\ell : \mathcal{Y}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, intuitively thought of as a measure of dissimilarity between two outputs, and using the functional

$$\mathcal{R}(f) := \mathbb{E} [\ell(f(X), Y)], \quad (1)$$

known as the *risk functional*, to measure f 's deviation from the true distribution. The problem outlined above can then be expressed as finding the function $f^* \in \mathcal{H}$ (referred to as the *Bayes optimal function*) that minimizes \mathcal{R} i.e.,

$$f^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{f \in \mathcal{H}} \mathcal{R}(f). \quad (2)$$

Solving Equation (2) is often infeasible in practice because the distribution $\mathbb{P}_{(X, Y)}$ is unknown, making the risk functional Equation (1) uncomputable. This problem can be circumvented in the presence of a sample

$$\xi = \{(X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)\}$$

of independent and identically distributed (*i.i.d.*) random pairs such that $(X_i, Y_i) \sim \mathbb{P}_{(X, Y)}$, $i \in [n]$. In this case, the weak law of large numbers gives the following approximation

$$\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_\xi(f) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(f(X_i), Y_i), \quad (3)$$

Survey	Year	Federated learning	Edge computing	Data quality					
				Independence	Attribute skew	Label noise	Fairness	Privacy	Trust
Sidi et al. [8]	2012	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓
Wang et al. [3]	2020	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
Han et al. [9]	2021	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗
Jere et al. [10]	2021	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓
Xia et al. [11]	2021	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
Yin et al. [12]	2021	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗
Ferraguig et al. [13]	2021	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗
Truong et al. [14]	2021	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗
Zhu et al. [15]	2021	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗
Abreha et al. [16]	2022	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
Liu et al. [17]	2022	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓
Mehrabi et al. [18]	2022	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗
Murshed et al. [1]	2022	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓
Xia et al. [19]	2023	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓
Shi et al. [20]	2022	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓
Rodríguez-Barroso et al. [21]	2023	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
Abyane et al. [22]	2023	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓
Whang et al. [23]	2023	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗
Gallegos et al. [24]	2023	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗
Lee et al. [25]	2023	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗
Gong et al. [26]	2023	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗
Wang et al. [27]	2023	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓
Rafi et al. [28]	2024	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗
Sánchez Sánchez et al. [29]	2024	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓
Our survey	2024	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Table 1: Comparison of this survey to other surveys.

Notation	Significance
\mathcal{X}	Input space
$\mathcal{Y}, \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}$	Output space, and noisy output space respectively
\mathcal{H}	Hypothesis class
Θ	Parameter space
$\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}_i$	Global true risk, local true risk of client i
$\hat{\mathcal{R}}_\xi$	Empirical risk with respect to ξ
θ^*	Bayes-optimal model (minimizer of \mathcal{R})
$\hat{\theta}_\xi$	Minimizer of $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_\xi$
$\theta^{(t)}, \theta_i^{(t)}$	Global model (resp. i^{th} local model) at round t
$A \perp\!\!\!\perp B$	A is independent of B
$A \perp\!\!\!\perp B \mid C$	A is independent of B given C
$[n]$	The set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$
Δ^n	The simplex of \mathbb{R}^n , i.e., $\{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \mid \ \alpha\ _1 = 1\}$

Table 2: Notations used in this document.

of the risk functional, where $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_\xi$ is referred to as the *empirical risk functional* (with respect to the sample ξ). By solving the following *Empirical Risk Minimization (ERM)* problem

$$\hat{f}_\xi = \operatorname{argmin}_{f \in \mathcal{H}} \hat{\mathcal{R}}_\xi(f) \quad (4)$$

with a large enough sample size n , one can hope to obtain a good approximation of f^* . Put differently, one can hope that the solution \hat{f}_ξ of Equation (4) converges to f^* as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. In this case, we say that ERM is *consistent* [37, 38].

To further simplify it, and make it computationally feasible, the learning problem is often formulated for a finite-dimensionally parametrized hypothesis class. For some *parameter dimension* $P \in \mathbb{N}$, and a *parameter space* $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^P$, the hypothesis class is defined as

$$\mathcal{H} = \{f_\theta \mid \theta \in \Theta\},$$

reducing the problems of risk minimization and ERM to

$$\theta^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathcal{R}(\theta) \quad (5)$$

$$\hat{\theta}_\xi = \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \hat{\mathcal{R}}_\xi(\theta) \quad (6)$$

respectively, where the abuse of notation $\mathcal{R}(\theta) := \mathcal{R}(f_\theta)$ and $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_\xi(\theta) := \hat{\mathcal{R}}_\xi(f_\theta)$ is used. This form of the problem has the notable advantage of a finite-dimensional solution space, allowing the use of standard optimization algorithms. In particular, if ℓ and \mathcal{H} are chosen such that $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_\xi$ is differentiable, convex, and bounded below, then Equation (6) can be solved using gradient-descent. For these reasons, and the fact that most ML models are of this form (e.g., linear regression, logistic regression, neural networks), the rest of this work will refer to Equation (6) as the ERM problem.

2.2 Edge computing

The edge of the network (or simply the edge) can be defined as the interface between the outer layers of the network, rep-

resented by user devices commonly referred to as *end devices* (e.g., sensors, smartphones, and laptops), and its *core* of the network (often represented by a cloud server) [2]. This definition can be vague, as the internet does not come with a clear predefined hierarchy. As a result, the terminology used to describe the edge is often ambiguous, particularly when it comes to the distinction between *end devices* and *edge nodes* [3]. In this work, we adopt the terminology proposed by Wang et al. [3]:

1. *End devices* or *end nodes*, are the bottom layer of the network. Any mobile device (e.g., Internet of Things (IoT) device, smartphone, or Autonomous Vehicle (AV)) with some (usually limited) computational power can be considered an end device. Due to their limited computational power, end devices are only capable of performing the most basic ML tasks, such as inference.
2. *Edge nodes*, edge servers, or edge devices, are the middle layer of 3-tiered end-edge-cloud architecture. They are usually more powerful than end devices, and are thus capable of performing more complex ML tasks, such as training or orchestration.

A more fine-grained hierarchy for the network graph is given in Figure 1. Where the core is made up of the 2 innermost layers, the edge is the 3rd layer, and end devices occupy the next layer.




Fig. 1: Network architecture for edge computing [39].

The difficulty of defining and agreeing on a clear hierarchy for the edge is partially behind the emergence of multiple paradigms for EC. These include *cloudlet computing* and Mobile Edge Computing (MEC), which rely on a 3-tiered architecture, and Fog Computing (FC), which organizes the network into an end-to-cloud *continuum* rather than a hierarchy [2].

2.3 Edge machine learning

Having introduced both Machine Learning in Section 2.1 and Edge Computing in Section 2.2, we dedicate this section to discussing their combination. We are particularly interested in Deep Learning (DL) on the edge, since deep neural networks (DNNs) are both very popular, and easy to parallelize. In all generality, the process of training a ML models on the edge is depicted in Figure 2. End devices collect data from their environment, optionally preprocessing or temporally storing it, before sending it to an edge node. The edge node aggregates, processes, and stores the data, before training its local model on it, possibly invoking the server for orchestration or heavy computations. The server manages the training process and performs the computations delegated to it by the edge nodes. During each step of this process, edge nodes can respond to client inference requests using their current local model.

The number of proposed techniques to train ML models on the edge is beyond what can be covered in a single section. Therefore, we focus on two of the most popular techniques: distributed learning and federated learning, directing the reader's attention to [40] for a review of other techniques.

2.3.1 Distributed learning

The process of training ML models by solving Equation (6) is a computationally intensive one, particularly, when n is large (which needs to be the case for ERM to be viable). While this is a major inconvenience for cloud-based centralized ML, it is a complete deal-breaker for performing ML on resource-constrained edge devices. The naive solution of designating a single powerful node to perform the training suffers from the same drawback as all centralized computing: inefficient use of resources, leading to unnecessarily high energy consumption and long training times [3].

The solution for the inadequacies of centralized computing is already well-known: preform the computation in parallel on multiple devices. Applying this solution to ML gives rise to *distributed learning* [3]. Four main approaches exist for splitting the training workload among devices, namely, (1) *data parallelism*, in which each device is assigned a chunk of the dataset, on which it is responsible for training the model; (2) *model parallelism*, in which the model is divided among devices, each of which is responsible for training a part of it on the entire dataset; (3) *hybrid parallelism*, a combination of the previous two; applying one to part of the model and the other to the rest; and (4) *pipeline parallelism*, which performs different stages of the training process concurrently on different batches of data [3, 41].

Remark. The term *distributed learning* is ambiguous, used by some authors [42] as a synonym for Federated Learning,




Fig. 2: An end-to-end ML training process on the edge.

or the even more ambiguous *collaborative learning*. Our use of the term is taken from [3, 41], where it simply means dividing the computational workload among multiple devices for the sake of efficiency.

From a DQ perspective, distributed learning is indistinguishable from centralized learning. In all distributed learning approaches, the global dataset is public within the network. This makes it easy to at least detect data quality issues. The same cannot be said for Federated Learning, which we will discuss in the next section.

2.3.2 Federated learning

Federated Learning (FL) is a collaborative framework for training ML models using data and computational resources from different devices without compromising the privacy of their local data [3, 11]. It allows multiple devices to collaborate on the training of a Neural Network (NN) [43]. These devices can be wildly different in terms of hardware and software, and their datasets are often incomparable in terms of size, diversity, and distribution [11]. In so-called *centralized* Federated Learning (FL) [44], nodes are partitioned into two subsets (see Figure 2): (i) *clients*, which are the nodes that contribute their data to the training process and (ii) *servers*, which are the nodes that orchestrate the training process [11].

Formulation of the problem In federated learning, the target distribution $\mathbb{P}_{(X,Y)}$ is a *mixture* of distributions. A set of N clients, which we assimilate to the set of indices $[N]$ is given, along with corresponding weights $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_N) \in \Delta^N$, and datasets $\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_N$, where the elements of ξ_i are *i.i.d.* random pairs sampled from the *local* distribution $\mathbb{P}_{(X_i,Y_i)}$. The so-called *global* distribution $\mathbb{P}_{(X,Y)}$ is then defined as

$$\mathbb{P}_{(X,Y)} := \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i \mathbb{P}_{(X_i,Y_i)}. \quad (7)$$

Given a common loss function ℓ , the *local* risk \mathcal{R}_i and empirical risk \widehat{R}_{ξ_i} of client i are defined analogously to Equations (1) and (3), with respect to local distribution $\mathbb{P}_{(X_i,Y_i)}$ and sample ξ_i respectively. The same is true for their *global* counterparts \mathcal{R} and \widehat{R}_{ξ} , but with respect to the global distribution and sample $\xi := \bigcup_{i=1}^N \xi_i$ respectively, and one easily verifies that they can be expressed as convex combinations of the local versions with coefficients proportional to sample sizes. Federated learning is simply the problem of minimizing the global empirical risk, which we also refer to as Federated Empirical Risk Minimization (FERM).

The training process Limiting our attention to centralized FL with a single server, a general algorithm for FL is given below [3, 11, 43]. In the first stage, the server initializes the global model $\theta^{(0)}$ either randomly or using a pretrained parameter vector. Next, the server and clients iteratively alternate between local training and global aggregation for multiple *rounds* until a stopping criterion is met. At the beginning of round t , the server selects a subset S_t of clients according to some selection probability distribution, to whom it broadcasts the current global model $\theta^{(t-1)}$. In the local training step each client $i \in S_t$ computes a local model $\theta_i^{(t)}$ by solving ERM locally:

$$\theta_i^{(t)} = \underset{\theta \in \Theta}{\operatorname{argmin}} \widehat{R}_{\xi_i}(\theta). \quad (8)$$

This is usually done by running gradient descent on \widehat{R}_{ξ_i} with $\theta^{(t-1)}$ as initialization

$$\theta_i^{(t)} = \theta^{(t-1)} - \eta_t \nabla \widehat{R}_{\xi_i}(\theta^{(t-1)}), \quad (9)$$

and a learning rate η_t , assigned by the server. Each client then sends its local model $\theta_i^{(t)}$ to the server, where aggregation is performed

$$\theta^{(t)} = A \left(\left\{ \theta_i^{(t)} \mid i \in S_t \right\} \right) \quad (10)$$

using a Gradient Aggregation Rule (GAR) A , which maps subsets of Θ to elements of Θ . A simple example of a GAR is the convex combination i.e.,

$$\theta^{(t)} = \frac{1}{\sum_{i \in S_t} \alpha_i} \sum_{i \in S_t} \alpha_i \theta_i^{(t)}, \quad (11)$$

in which case the algorithm is called federated averaging (FedAvg) [43]. The global model $\theta^{(T)}$ of the final round T is the output of the algorithm.

Discussion Unlike distributed learning, FL is fundamentally different from centralized learning. One of the starkest differences is that FL does not require data sharing, which makes collaboration easier, but also, and crucially, means that it does not reveal any information about local data, except for what can be inferred from the local models (see Section 8.1). This privacy guarantee is one of the main selling points of FL, and indeed one of the motivations cited for its introduction [43]. A second point of contrast is that FL does not rely on the *i.i.d.* assumption. As the reader may have noticed, in formulating the FERM problem, we only assumed *locally i.i.d.* data.

These characteristics make FL a very attractive framework for doing ML on the edge, justifying its wide adoption for many edge use cases like healthcare, Internet of Vehicles (IoV), and recommendation systems [3, 11]. Simultaneously, these same characteristics make FL meaningfully different from both distributed learning and centralized learning from a data quality perspective, which creates problems and opportunities that are unique to distributed environments like the edge. For this reason, we will focus on FL in the rest of this paper, using it interchangeably with edge ML.

3 Data quality for machine learning

Data Quality (DQ) is the central focus of this survey. It is an extremely broad topic, not only in ML but also in data science, data engineering, database management, information systems, and multiple other adjacent disciplines, as evidenced by the numerous works on the subject [5, 7, 45–49] and the equally numerous approaches these works take to study it. In this section, we explore DQ for ML data as it is covered in the existing literature, with particular focus on the questions of: (i) what is data quality? (i.e., how it is defined), (ii) what characterizes a good dataset? (data quality dimensions), and (iii) how is data quality ensured? (existing solutions). As such, this section is divided into three parts, each corresponding to one of the above questions (in order).

3.1 What is data quality?

A great body of research has been dedicated to making sense of the concept of data quality, producing an equally great number of views on how to define it. Among the few common threads between a majority of these works are the following two observations: (1) data quality is context-dependent, i.e., rather than being a function of the dataset alone, it is a function of the entire context of its use, and (2) data quality is multidimensional, i.e., multiple aspects of data must be considered when assessing it. The first observation is demonstrated by the convergent pragmatic definition of data quality as “fitness for use” [8], “suitability for business purposes” [50], or “the degree to which the data of interest fulfills given requirements” [6]. The second is supported by the overwhelming trend of using multiple properties of a dataset to assess its quality [5, 8, 51].

For the purpose of this work, we adhere to both of the above-stated observations. The first one boils down to the fact that assigning quality to a dataset—or anything else for that matter—is a normative judgment, and therefore cannot be done without an underlying objective. In the context of ML, and particularly for risk minimization, the objective is to minimize the risk \mathcal{R} . Although this is usually approximated by ERM, minimizing \mathcal{R} remains the ultimate goal, and thus the measure of quality. This implies the following principle, which we will use to guide us to a definition of data quality.

Principle 1.

A good dataset ξ can be defined as one that (when used for ERM) produces a good model, which in turn can be defined as a model $\hat{\theta}_\xi$ with low *true risk* $\mathcal{R}(\hat{\theta}_\xi)$.

Echoes of this principle can be found in the literature, for example in [7, 52]. Its main advantage is that it reduces the nebulous and poorly defined concept of data quality to the comparatively well-defined concept of model quality, measured by the completely unambiguous true risk. The second observation can be captured by the use of multiple properties, which together imply that $\mathcal{R}(\hat{\theta}_\xi)$ is small. In the following, we will explore some of these properties.

3.2 Data quality dimensions

It follows from Principle 1 that the *best* dataset ξ produces the *best* (or Bayes-optimal) model i.e., $\hat{\theta}_\xi = \theta^*$. More generally, a *good* dataset is one that produces a *good* model i.e., $\hat{\theta}_\xi \approx \theta^*$. Early works on the theory of ML [37, 38, 53] have provided theoretical guarantees for this to be the case under certain fairly general conditions on the hypothesis class \mathcal{H} and the parameter space Θ . More precisely, they have shown that, with high probability, a large enough dataset ξ , drawn

i.i.d. from the true distribution $\mathbb{P}_{(X,Y)}$, will produce a good model (in the sense defined above).

This already gives us three sufficient conditions for a dataset to be good, namely that it is: (i) large enough, (ii) *i.i.d.*, and (iii) drawn from the true distribution. Size is usually not seen as a data quality issue, so we will not consider it further. The other two conditions, however, are of great interest to us, and can serve as the main axes of our definition of data quality. Based on the previous analysis, we can tentatively divide DQ concerns into the following categories:

1. *Data dependence*. Which occurs when the elements of ξ are not independent.
2. *Distribution mismatch*. Which occurs when the elements of ξ do not follow the true distribution $\mathbb{P}_{(X,Y)}$. The joint distribution $\mathbb{P}_{(X,Y)}$ is characterized by the marginal distribution \mathbb{P}_X and the conditional distribution $\mathbb{P}_{Y|X}$, which allows us to distinguish between two types of distribution mismatch:
 - (a) *Attribute skew*. Which happens when the sampling process is biased towards certain regions of the input space \mathcal{X} .
 - (b) *Label noise*. Which happens when the labeling process is error-prone.

It is worth noting that the above scenarios are not mutually exclusive. Distribution mismatch can happen due to a combination of attribute skew and label noise, and data dependence is likely to cause attribute skew.

An easy objection one could raise against the above categorization, and indeed against Principle 1 itself, is its reliance on the premise that model quality can be reduced to performance (i.e., true risk). In doing so, it fails to completely capture the context-dependent nature of DQ. As a result, all the above considerations are more or less *intrinsic* to the data.

To justify the inclusion of *extrinsic* considerations, we argue that model performance is not sufficient to capture model quality. A model can be considered bad while having excellent performance, if it fails to satisfy certain ethical or social criteria. For example, a model that has near-optimal true risk can have arbitrarily high risk on a certain subset $A \subset \mathcal{X}$, if $\mathbb{P}[X \in A]$ is small enough. Such a model is unfair to the elements of A , which can lead to legal and ethical issues if A is a marginalized group. Similarly, a model that allows for the reconstruction of ξ , thereby betraying the privacy of the individuals in the training set is also considered bad, even if it has excellent performance. Alternatively, the data could be of low quality due to its source rather than its content. For example, a dataset that can include deliberately wrong information. Accounting for these considerations, we amend Principle 1 to a more general form.

Principle 2. A good dataset ξ can be defined as one that (when used for ERM) produces a good model, which in turn

can be defined as a model $\hat{\theta}_\xi$ that satisfies certain ethical and social criteria, in addition to having low true risk $\mathcal{R}(\hat{\theta}_\xi)$.

An extended version of the above taxonomy to include these extrinsic considerations in compliance with Principle 2 is shown in Figure 3.




Fig. 3: A taxonomy of data quality dimensions

3.3 Data quality-aware machine learning

Having examined the existing literature on defining data quality, we now turn our attention to the question of how to ensure it ML systems. While the definition and dimensions of DQ are relatively identical between centralized and federated learning, many of the solutions to DQ issues are specific to FL. As such, we will distinguish between the two cases where necessary.

Broadly speaking, there are three approaches to mitigating data quality issues in ML, depending on the stage of the ML pipeline at which they are applied [18, 23] (or equivalently, the component of the ML system they target): (i) *pre-processing*, which is applied before training, with the goal *enhancing* the data, (ii) *in-processing*, which is applied during training, with the goal of producing a *robust* model, and (iii) *post-processing*, which is applied after training, (i.e., during inference), with the goal of *correcting* the model's predictions, or more generally, removing inaccurate, discriminatory, dangerous, or otherwise inadequate predictions. This distinction is used by [13, 18] as a cross-domain classification of AI fairness approaches, but we will adopt it here for the more general problem of DQ. Within each of these three broad families, approaches can be further distinguished (see Figure 4).




Fig. 4: The different approaches to mitigating DQ issues in ML.

3.3.1 Preprocessing

Preprocessing is a straightforward strategy to addressing DQ issues. Quite simply, it assumes that data problems should be addressed on the data level. Generally speaking, a preprocessing technique operates on a possibly low-quality dataset ξ , and produces a higher-quality dataset ξ' , which can be a subset, superset, or a more general function of ξ . These cases are respectively known as *data cleaning*, *data augmentation*, and *data transformation* [54–56].

3.3.2 In-processing

This family is the richest of the three, because training is usually the most elaborate part of the ML pipeline. This is particularly the case when FL is used. It is therefore warranted to consider a subclassification of in-processing methods, based on what element of the training process they modify.

An instance of the ERM is given by the risk \mathcal{R} and the hypothesis class \mathcal{H} , which in turn, in DL, is determined by a neural architecture, and a parameter space Θ . Each of these components can be modified to incorporate DQ considerations. The risk can be modified by changing the loss function [57], replacing the expectation with a different aggregation function [58], or adding a DQ-dependent regularization term [59]. The hypothesis class can be modified by changing the neural architecture [60] or restricting the parameter space (typically by adding constraints) [61].

Federated Learning adds another layer of complexity to the picture by adding two steps to the training process: client selection and aggregation. Both of these steps can be targeted for modification. The client selection process can be modified by assigning higher probability to clients with higher-quality data [4, 62]. The aggregation process can be modified by using a robust GAR [63].

3.3.3 Post-processing

Post-processing is applied after the model has been trained (i.e., at inference time). Out of the three families, post-processing

is the only one that is universally applicable. In the black-box setting, that is when the data and the model are inaccessible, unknown, or unmodifiable, preprocessing and in-processing are not possible. Post-processing, however, can still be applied [64–66]. We note that to the best of our knowledge, no edge-specific post-processing techniques have been proposed in the literature. Therefore, we will not elaborate on this family further.

4 Statistical independence

The so-called *i.i.d.* assumption is the bedrock for much of the classical theory (and practice) of ML [38, 67]. While convenient for theoretical analysis, the *i.i.d.* assumption is not a realistic model of real-world data [67], an observation that is even more salient in FL on the edge [11, 68, 69]. In general, the *i.i.d.* assumption can fail in two ways, the data can be either (i) *dependent*, or (ii) it can fail to be equidistributed according to the true distribution $\mathbb{P}_{(X,Y)}$. In this section, we discuss the first of these two issues, leaving the second for Sections 5 and 6.

4.1 Machine learning on dependent data

The majority of works in the literature on learning from dependent data [70–73] relies on the theory of stochastic processes. The typical approach is to replace the independence part of the *i.i.d.* assumption with a weaker condition like *mixing* [71]. This is sometimes accompanied by a strengthening of the *identically distributed* part to a *stationarity condition* [73, 74]. The alternate set of assumptions is then used to derive generalization bounds analogous to those available in the *i.i.d.* case.

Notable deviations from this approach include the work of Lauer [75] and Dunder et al. [74]. The former presents derivations of classical generalization bounds such as those based on the Vapnik-Chervonenkis (VC) dimension [33], or the Rademacher complexity of the hypothesis class, without assuming independence, nor replacing it with another condition. The latter on the other hand, takes a more practical approach, leveraging (actual or assumed) information about the structure of the dependence to train linear classifiers on dependent data.

4.2 Dependent data in federated learning

The problem of data dependence in FL on edge devices remains largely unexplored. In our review of the literature, we could not find any edge or FL-specific works that address the issue of dependent data. This is not indicative of a general lack of interest in the effect of *i.i.d.* violations on FL,

which is one of the most active areas of research in the field, even more so in the case of edge FL [11]. Most of these works, however, disregard the question of dependence, in favor of focusing on distribution mismatch [68, 69, 76]. The absence of works on dependent data in FL, coupled with the localized nature of the edge environment, which can lead to strong dependence between the data points of one device or a set of similar devices, and the difficulty of detecting such dependence due to privacy constraints, suggests that this is a promising direction for future research.

5 Attribute skew

The second (and arguably the most important) component of the *i.i.d.* assumption is for all random pairs in the sample to be drawn from the true distribution. If this is not the case, the empirical risk is not guaranteed to converge to the true risk, negating guarantees on the consistency of ERM. This can be due to a mismatch in the marginal distribution \mathbb{P}_X or the conditional distribution $\mathbb{P}_{Y|X}$. In this section, we will discuss the first of these two possibilities, discussing the second in the next section.

When multiple edge devices participate in FL, their local datasets are often heterogeneous [16]. For example, two wearable devices owned by people of different ages and physical activity levels are extremely unlikely to have similarly distributed datasets. Therefore, aggregating models trained on these datasets will not necessarily yield an unbiased estimate of the model trained on their union [77].

Addressing this issue is one of the most active areas of research in FL. The corpus of literature on the topic is expansive, diverse, and rapidly growing, covering a wide range of topics from theoretical guarantees [69, 76] to practical solutions [68, 77], and empirical evaluation thereof [78, 79]. In this section, we provide a representative sample of the work in this area, directing the reader’s attention to the surveys by [15, 80, 81] for a more comprehensive overview.

5.1 Practical solutions and empirical evaluation

Multiple authors have proposed, implemented, and tested novel algorithms for performing FL on the edge with non-*i.i.d.* data. Different surveys of the literature [15, 80, 81] introduced different categorizations of these methods. Two recurring categories are data-based and algorithm-based methods, corresponding roughly to preprocessing and in-processing methods in our taxonomy. Both categories contain a variety of methods, a subset of which we will discuss in this section.

5.1.1 Data-based methods

The motivating intuition behind data-based methods is that modifying the local datasets to make them more homoge-

neous will lead to better performance when training a global model. Three main approaches to achieving this have been proposed: data selection, data augmentation, and data selection [15, 80].

Data sharing Zhao et al. [77] observed that the accuracy of models trained through FL can decrease by up to 55% if the data is not *i.i.d.*. To address this concern, they propose maintaining a small global shared dataset on the server, a portion of which is shared with each edge device to augment their local datasets. They find that a shared dataset as small as 5% of the total data can improve the accuracy by as much as 30%. Later work by Yoshida et al. [82] combine this approach with data selection to achieve 13.5% higher accuracy still. Tian et al. [83] applied this approach to asynchronous edge FL using a shared dataset size of 5 – 10%, improving both the accuracy and the convergence speed of the model.

Data augmentation Abay et al. [84] tackle the problem of non-*i.i.d.* data by augmenting the local datasets to match the global distribution. More concretely, the server uses client-reported statistics on the label distribution which it uses to coordinate the clients to generate augmentations for rare classes. Jeong et al. [85] on the other hand, propose an approach based on a Generative Adversarial Network (GAN) trained by the server on shared data, which it distributes to the clients for local data augmentation.

Data selection Rai et al. [86] propose a client selection algorithm based on a single metric called the *irrelevance score*, which measures, among other things, deviation from being *i.i.d.* [87] on the other hand, propose a q -learning based client selection approach to increase convergence speed with non-*i.i.d.* data.

5.1.2 Algorithm-based methods

Algorithm-based methods are in-processing methods that amend the training algorithm to make it more robust to non-*i.i.d.* data. Due to the complex and multi-component nature of the FL training process, these methods are more varied and technically sophisticated than data-based methods.

Meta-learning Jiang et al. [88] propose a model agnostic meta-learning approach Finn et al. [89] to simultaneously improve personalization and convergence speed. Another work by Li and Wang [90] applies meta-learning to spatial and temporal data which is innately non-*i.i.d.*. In a different vein, Zhang et al. [91] propose a meta-algorithm based on the primal-dual algorithm. Their method produces strong convergence guarantees even with non-*i.i.d.* data and non-convex objectives. Furthermore, it achieves optimal communication efficiency, requiring only $\mathcal{O}(1)$ communication rounds in the *i.i.d.* case.

Multitask learning Personalization can be cast as a multi-task learning problem [15]. Works that have addressed FL on the edge with non-*i.i.d.* data from this perspective include [92], which considers each edge device as a separate task, [93], which treats the edge system as a Bayesian network, to handle strong *i.i.d.* violations, and [94], which leverages the geometry of the loss function to combine subsets of clients into clusters with better overall distributions.

5.2 Theoretical analysis

The majority of literature on theoretical FL with non-*i.i.d.* data focuses on convergence. For example, Li et al. [69] prove convergence theorems and rates for FedAvg with non-*i.i.d.* data under certain conditions on the smoothness and convexity of the loss function, and the boundedness of the gradients. Lee [76] also provide convergence guarantees for federated regression assuming similar rather than identical local distributions.

6 Label noise

Label noise, or *labeling error*, is a term used to qualify any situation where the label present in a dataset is different from the target [95]. This can be due to human error, communication and storage defects [96] (very common on the edge), and deliberate mislabeling [95, 97]. It is not difficult to see how the presence of noise can be problematic, particularly for highly expressive models such as DNNs, which are susceptible to overfitting.

6.1 Types of label noise

In order to reason about label noise, it is usually modeled as a stochastic process acting on the dataset, i.e., instead of a clean dataset

$$\xi = \{(X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)\},$$

we have a noisy dataset

$$\tilde{\xi} = \{(X_1, \tilde{Y}_1), (X_2, \tilde{Y}_2), \dots, (X_n, \tilde{Y}_n)\}$$

where the observed label \tilde{Y}_i is a random variable over $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}} \subset \mathcal{Y}$, which may or may not depend on (X_i, Y_i) [9]. The properties of \tilde{Y}_i can be used as a basis for classification of label noise types.

Label set-based classification One property of \tilde{Y}_i that can be used to classify label noise is the set of modalities $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}$. Depending on whether $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}} = \mathcal{Y}$ or $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}} \subsetneq \mathcal{Y}$, we speak of *closed-set* (or *in-distribution*) noise, and *open-set* (or *out-of-distribution*) noise [98, 99]. The former means that we retain all the classes present in the original dataset, while the latter means that the noise causes loss of knowledge of some classes.

Dependence-based classification Another relevant property for label noise classification is the dependence of \tilde{Y}_i on (X_i, Y_i) , that is, the conditional distribution $\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{Y}_i|(X_i, Y_i)}$. Four cases are possible for this distribution: (a) it can reduce to $\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{Y}_i|Y_i}$, in which case \tilde{Y}_i the noise is said to be *class-dependent* [100], (b) to $\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{Y}_i|X_i}$, in which case the noise is *instance-dependent* [9], (c) to $\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{Y}_i}$, in which case the noise is completely random [95], (d) or it can be irreducible, depending on both X_i and Y_i . Each class of noise can be subdivided further, and each is modeled and handled differently. For a more detailed discussion of these types of noise, we refer the reader to [9, 100–102].

6.2 Effects of label noise on machine learning

Several studies have been conducted to confirm and quantify the effects of label noise on ML models in diverse scenarios, including deep supervised image classification [100, 103, 104], binary classification using tree-based models [101], and federated training of support vector machines (SVMs) on the edge [105].

Most of these studies agree on the intuitive conclusion that the presence of label noise is detrimental to the performance of ML models, and further, that the size of the effect grows with the amount of noise present in the dataset [100, 101, 103]. Barry et al. [104] even report a decrease in fairness as label noise increases, an observation that they make for DNNs and SVMs, but not for naive Bayesian classifiers which they find to be robust to this effect.

However, other studies have found that label noise can be beneficial to FL. Zeng et al. [105] report that noisy communication channels increase data diversity, thus, prioritizing clients with noisy channels in the selection process can outperform random selection when training an SVM on the MNIST dataset [106]. Jafarigol and Trafalis [107] present similarly positive results for generalization, stability, and privacy when training a Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) on the CIFAR-10 dataset [108] using FL with intentionally added label noise.

6.3 Mitigating the effects of noise

Despite the few dissenting voices in the literature [105, 107], the prevailing consensus remains that label noise is a hindrance to the learning process [100, 101, 103, 104]. As such, many works have been dedicated to the remediation of its effects. Multiple surveys have been conducted to review these works in the context of ML [9, 95, 97, 101, 109], but none have been conducted specifically for FL on the edge. This is by no means the result of a lack of works in this area, as the literature on the topic is vast and actively expanding [59, 110–113], but rather the result of the novelty of the field.

In the remainder of this section, we provide a brief overview of the state of the art in the field of label noise mitigation, focusing on the methods that are most relevant to the context of FL on the edge. We adopt a taxonomy similar to the one we presented in Section 3.3, except for the omission of the *post-processing* category, as we found no works that fall into it.

6.3.1 Preprocessing

The preprocessing of data for noise removal is known as *data cleaning*. Yao [109] divides data cleaning methods into two categories: (i) ad-hoc threshold measures, and (ii) prediction-based methods. In the first category, a heuristic metric is defined and examples that exceed a certain cutoff value are considered noisy and removed. Gamberger et al. [114] introduced one such method that uses *model complexity* as the metric [109], while Pleiss et al. [115] proposed another method that uses the *area under the curve* instead. The second category is more diverse and includes methods such as classifiers [116], voting [117], and partitioning [118]. While these methods are designed to work with traditional ML models, Ma et al. [119] proposed a Secure Multiparty Computation (SMC)-based method to privately and collaboratively clean the data in an FL system on the edge.

A common point of criticism for all these methods is that they remove rather than correct the noisy labels. In general, recovering the true labels is a very challenging (if not impossible) task. This can be problematic if the data is scarce or if the noise is not uniformly distributed [109].

6.3.2 In-processing

In-processing methods for removing label noise are usually classified according to the element of the learning process they target. In the context of general ML, This can be the loss function, the model architecture, or the optimizer [9]. FL on the edge adds two possible targets to this list, namely the client selection protocol and the GAR. That being said, we could not find any works that target model architectures

or optimizers in the context of label noise-resilient edge FL, so we will focus on the other three elements, directing the reader to referenced surveys for information on their use in other contexts.

Loss function Loss function modification strategies change the empirical risk function by adding a regularization term that depends on the noise level [59, 120, 121], modifying the loss function ℓ [57], or by using a different distribution when taking the expectation (also known as *re-weighting*) [122]. A notable example of the latter is the work of Chen et al. [123], which applies it to perform noise-robust FL on the edge. A major strength of loss function modification strategies is the existence of formal results establishing their ability to produce near-optimal predictors under certain conditions, as Manwani and Sastry [124] showed for DNNs [97].

Client selection and aggregation The methods discussed in this paragraph are specific to FL, and have a meaningful amount of overlap with some defenses against *Byzantine attacks* (see Section 9.3), as those attacks can be seen as an intentional form of noise. We discuss them jointly because they use the same strategies to detect and evaluate noise. They only differ in the way they handle the noisy clients (or data points): either by reducing their weight in the aggregation process [125], or by decreasing their probability of selection [111]. Li et al. [62] took the latter approach, using the magnitude of the gradient as a thresholding criterion. In the same vein, Tuor et al. [110] introduced a selection mechanism that assesses the quality of a client’s local dataset by comparing its model to a benchmark model. Almost identical to this is the work of Taik et al. [4], which evaluates local models on a validation set instead. Chen et al. [126] on the other hand, took the former approach, using a cross entropy-based metric to assign weights to the clients.

7 Fairness

Fairness is a critical ethical consideration in the design of any decision-making process (automated or otherwise) that affects humans. In the context of edge FL, we can distinguish between two types of fairness [127], broadly corresponding to the traditional notions of *outcome fairness* and *process fairness* [128] from the literature on algorithmic fairness. We refer to them as social fairness and cooperative fairness, respectively. The latter is of particular interest in the context of FL, given its procedural divergence from traditional ML. While social fairness is concerned with the model making fair predictions, cooperative fairness is concerned with the training process producing a fair model.

7.1 Social fairness

A prerequisite for ensuring fair predictions is to have a clear definition of fairness. The literature is teeming with attempts to formalize our intuitive notion of fairness, leading to a plethora of definitions and metrics [129]. Mehrabi et al. [18] provide a comprehensive survey of these notions, dividing them into the three categories of group, individual, and subgroup fairness. The first two of these categories directly aim to capture a common intuition of fairness into a mathematical definition, while the third aims to combine their strengths. Group fairness formalizes the idea that certain attributes of an individual, typically membership to a protected group (e.g., ethnicity, gender, or religion), should not influence the output of a fair model. Individual fairness, on the other hand, formalizes the idea that a fair model should behave similarly given inputs from similar individuals. Within each of these categories, methods can be grouped in different ways, producing multiple taxonomies that are very deep and very wide. The reader is referred to [18, 130, 131] for a more detailed discussion.

7.1.1 Group fairness

Given a (categorical) sensitive attribute $A = g(X)$, and a model $f \in \mathcal{H}$ a group fairness notion can be formulated as an independence requirement between $f(X)$ and A [130]. The simplest possible such requirement is for $f(X)$ to be independent of A :

$$f(X) \perp\!\!\!\perp A, \quad (12)$$

a notion referred to as *demographic parity* [129, 132], which is problematic for many reasons, not least of which is that it forbids the use of the *perfect* predictor $f(X) = Y$, if Y and A are correlated [130, 132]. As such, more practical relaxations of it have been proposed. They typically weaken the independence requirement for example, by conditioning on a *legitimate* variable $h(X)$ [133]:

$$f(X) \perp\!\!\!\perp A \mid h(X), \quad (13)$$

or by conditioning on the true label Y [65]:

$$f(X) \perp\!\!\!\perp A \mid Y, \quad (14)$$

giving rise to the notions of *conditional demographic parity* and *equalized odds* respectively. The latter can be further relaxed in the binary classification setting ($\mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1\}$) to only require equal true positive rates [134], a notion known as *equal opportunity* [65].

7.1.2 Individual fairness

Similarity-based individual fairness notions are as diverse as the underlying definitions of similarity. In the context of fairness, a reasonable definition of similarity is for two individuals to be similar if they have identical non-sensitive attributes. An individually fair model should therefore treat them identically, as long as the sensitive attributes are not used in its training [135]. This notion, referred to as *fairness through unawareness* [130, 131], is too permissive, as non-sensitive attributes (like zip codes) can be highly correlated with sensitive ones (like ethnicity).

The polar opposite of this notion is *fairness through awareness*, which explicitly constrains the model to treat similar individuals similarly instead of relying on ignorance. To achieve this, Dwork et al. [136] first formalize similarity between individuals by assuming the input space \mathcal{X} is equipped with a metric $d_{\mathcal{X}}$. The similarity between outputs is formalized by considering that a probabilistic model f that maps \mathcal{X} to the set of probability measures over \mathcal{Y} (mapping x to an estimate of $\mathbb{P}_{Y|X=x}$) instead of directly to \mathcal{Y} . The advantage of doing this is that probability measures are naturally equipped with multiple metrics (collectively known as statistical distances), any of which can be used to formalize similarity. Fixing one such metric $d_{\mathcal{Y}}$, individual fairness can be defined as a continuity requirement on f . Most works [66, 136] opt for the (rather strong) Lipschitz continuity requirement

$$d_{\mathcal{Y}}(f(x), f(x')) \leq \kappa d_{\mathcal{X}}(x, x'), \quad (15)$$

for some $\kappa \geq 0$.

Yet another approach to individual fairness is to consider that an individual is similar to its counterfactual self, that is, the individual it would have been if the protected attribute were different. This notion, referred to as *counterfactual fairness* [137] can be made rigorous using causal models, and has the straightforward interpretation that sensitive attributes do not causally influence the output of the model.

7.1.3 Subgroup fairness

The last family of fairness notions we will discuss is subgroup fairness. This family is a stronger version of group fairness, where multiple partitions of the population are considered. For a set $G \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ of protected groups, we say that a model f satisfies ε -statistical parity with respect to G [138] if and only if, for all $A \in G$, f satisfies approximate demographic parity (where the tightness of the approximation is controlled by ε). Similarly, f satisfies ε -false positive rate fairness if it has similar false positive rates on A and its complement for all $A \in G$ [138, 139].

7.2 Cooperative fairness

In addition to the traditional causes, the FL protocol itself can be a source of unfairness [28]. The decentralized nature of the edge environment, where data is distributed across multiple —often very different— devices, with very little information being shared, makes it extremely difficult to coordinate the learning process in a way that is satisfactory to all clients. This can in large part be attributed to the lack of agreed-upon fairness metrics for this scenario [28, 140]. Absent such metrics, defining what fair edge FL means is necessary. In this section, we will introduce three fairness criteria proposed in the literature.

7.2.1 Egalitarian fairness

Egalitarianism is one of the most straightforward notions of fairness to consider in any cooperative setting. Applying this to edge FL means that all clients benefit equally from the global model, i.e., the global model must have (approximately) equal risk on all clients. This notion can be formalized in multiple ways; several works have explored egalitarian notions of fairness in FL (see [141, Section 2.1] and [142, Sections 1 and 2] for a list of references).

One way to formalize egalitarian fairness is to minimize the maximum risk across all clients. A slight generalization of this, referred to as *good intent fairness*, was proposed by Mohri et al. [143]. Instead of solving FERM with respect to a single $\alpha \in \Delta^N$, they minimize the maximum risk over all possible coefficients $\alpha \in \Lambda$ for some set $\Lambda \subset \Delta^N$. If Λ contains the vertices of Δ^N , then the risk of the worst-performing client is minimized.

An alternative approach to egalitarian fairness aims to exploit the notions of fairness introduced in Section 7.1. For instance, applying demographic parity (or any social fairness notion) with the sensitive attribute being the client ID gives a notion of fairness that is applicable to edge FL. Following this idea, Zhang et al. [144] propose the notion of *unified group fairness* which aims to simultaneously minimize accuracy disparity (defined as the standard deviation of the accuracy) among clients and (potentially) other sensitive groups.

7.2.2 Proportional fairness

A common criticism of egalitarian fairness is that it is agnostic to client contributions. On top of being intuitively unfair, this framework induces undesirable incentives. If the global model is dictated by the worst-performing client (which is likely to have low-quality data), other clients, particularly those with large amounts of high-quality data, have nothing to gain by contributing. Worse still, a malicious client (see Section 9.2) can monopolize the training process by pretending to have low-quality data. It is therefore necessary

to consider other notions of fairness that take into account the contributions of the clients.

A reasonable approach to this is to start with a notion of egalitarian fairness and then weigh the clients according to their contributions. [141] apply this principle starting with λ -egalitarian fairness ($\lambda \geq 1$), which is met when the global model θ satisfies the condition

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}_i(\theta)}{\mathcal{R}_j(\theta)} \leq \lambda \quad (16)$$

for all clients i, j . By multiplying the risk of each client by a factor that depends on its contribution, a simplistic quantification of which is the size of its dataset, we get the notion of proportional fairness. More concretely, the global model θ is α -proportionally fair ($\alpha > 0$) if the following inequality holds

$$\mathcal{R}_i(\theta) \leq \alpha \frac{|\xi_j|}{|\xi_i|} \mathcal{R}_j(\theta) \quad (17)$$

for all clients i, j such that $|\xi_j| \leq |\xi_i|$. Setting $\alpha > 1$ (resp. $\alpha < 1$) favors the clients with more (resp. less) data. While proportional fairness does account for client contributions, it is far from satisfactory. On one hand, from a fairness perspective, clients with extremely large amounts of data (usually controlled by large corporations) can dominate the training process. On the other hand, a malicious client can still manipulate the training process by inflating the number of samples they contribute.

To address these shortcomings, more sophisticated notions of fairness are needed. For instance, Xu and Lyu [125], Lyu et al. [145] propose *collaborative fairness*, a measure of the correlation between contributions and rewards. Contribution is measured by the test performance of the model uploaded by the client, while reward is defined as the performance of the final model the client receives. It should be noted that all clients are not assigned the same model.

7.2.3 Core-stable fairness

Ray Chaudhury et al. [142] leverage the concept of the *core* from cooperative game theory [146] to define a notion of fairness in FL. The intuition behind this idea is that a model is fair if no subset of clients can achieve a better outcome¹ by forming a coalition among themselves. Formally, if we denote by $u_i(\theta)$ the utility of client i under the global model θ (defined as the complement of $\mathcal{R}_i(\theta)$), then θ is in the core if and only if for all $\theta' \in \Theta$ and all subsets $S \subset [N]$, the inequality

$$\frac{|S|}{N} u_i(\theta') \leq u_i(\theta) \quad (18)$$

¹ This is the definition of the core in cooperative game theory [146]. Ray Chaudhury et al. [142] use a slightly weaker definition, where the outcome is bounded by a factor that depends on the size of the coalition.

holds for at least one client $i \in S$.

Models that are in the core have several desirable properties which make them an attractive choice for a fairness criterion on the edge. For instance, a model θ in the core is *proportional*, which means that the utility of all clients is at least $1/N$ of their best possible utility:

$$\forall \theta' \in \Theta, \forall i \in [N], u_i(\theta) \geq \frac{1}{N} u_i(\theta').$$

Such a model is also *Pareto optimal*, meaning that no other model performs better for all clients. Moreover, the core is *scale-invariant*, which makes models in it robust to low local data quality.

Having established the qualities of the core, the question of feasibility arises. That is, is the core non-empty? And if so, is it possible to efficiently compute models in it? Both questions are answered in the affirmative under mild conditions on the continuity and convexity of the utility functions [142]. Furthermore, relaxations of the definition exist for cases where the utility is non-convex (as is the case for DNNs) or when the clients are weighted differently.

7.3 Fair edge machine learning

Ensuring fairness in edge ML is a vital and challenging task that has been the subject of much research in recent years. These efforts can be categorized according to multiple axes, including the specific ML task they target, the notion of fairness they aim to enforce, the type of fairness they consider, and the stage of the learning process at which they intervene. In this section, we adopt the latter categorization, presenting examples of solutions that have been proposed in the literature of fair ML, with a focus on edge FL.

7.3.1 Preprocessing

Data preprocessing is an umbrella term that describes all operations applied to the data before training. For the purposes of fairness, these can include data cleaning [147], data augmentation [68], and data transformation [148]. In this section, we examine a selection of preprocessing techniques for fair ML. The reader can refer to [55, 149] for a comprehensive and systematic review of data preprocessing techniques for imbalanced data.

Calmon et al. [148] propose an optimization-based approach to transform a dataset to ensure demographic parity with respect to a given sensitive attribute. They formulate the problem as a constrained quasi-convex program where the objective is to maximize the similarity between the original and transformed distributions, subject to the fairness constraint, and a bound on the distortion of individual data points. Brunet et al. [147] on the other hand, propose a data

cleaning approach, where they identify and remove bias-inducing documents from a corpus for the task of learning word embeddings.

In the contexts of edge ML and FL, Abay et al. [84] propose two reweighing schemes. In the first scheme, clients reweigh their local data independently, while in the second scheme, the server computes the reweighing factors based on statistics reported by the clients in a differentially private manner (see Section 8.3.2). Both schemes yield encouraging results on the Adult and COMPAS datasets. Duan et al. [150] propose another data preprocessing technique for edge FL that aims to mitigate the impact of class imbalance. The proposed method has two components: a global augmentation strategy, and mediation-based rescheduling of the clients. For data augmentation, the server queries the clients for their local label distribution, ordering them to augment classes with below-average frequency. As for the second component, the server uses *mediators* which also serve as intermediate clients. Each mediator runs asynchronous FL on the clients with the dual aim of (i) including all classes in the training set, and (ii) minimizing the entropy of the class distribution. The server runs synchronous FedAvg on the mediators.

7.3.2 In-processing

In-processing techniques amend the learning algorithm itself. As stated in Section 3.3, this family is significantly larger than the other two (at least in terms of literature). In fact, all the techniques that deal with cooperative fairness are in this family, along with many of the techniques that deal with social fairness.

Social fairness Several works have proposed in-processing techniques to ensure various notions of social fairness. Kamishima et al. [151] introduce a regularization term that penalizes the “*prejudice index*”, defined as the mutual information between the classifier’s prediction and the sensitive attribute. In doing so, they aim to remove what they call “*indirect prejudice*”, which corresponds to enforcing demographic parity in our terminology. Ezzeldin et al. [152] opt for a GAR modification approach to address the problem of group fairness in FL. They propose updating client i ’s coefficient α_i based on the difference between local fairness (as measured by a predetermined metric), and the average fairness across all clients. Testing against FedAvg yielded better equal opportunity with modest accuracy loss. A more detailed discussion of the literature on in-processing techniques for social fairness can be found in [13, 18].

Cooperative fairness Cooperative fairness strategies for FL are as diverse as the definitions themselves. To achieve good

intent fairness, Mohri et al. [143] devise *agnostic* FL, an objective modification which tries to solve a min – max problem by running gradient descent-ascent on the parameters θ and the coefficients α . Ray Chaudhury et al. [142] propose a GAR modification which converges provably to a model in the core. They do so by assigning greater coefficients to clients with lower (relative) utility (normalized by the maximum utility). Similarly, Xu and Lyu [125] propose a reputation-based GAR modification wherein clients with higher reputation get more weight. On the theoretical side, Donahue and Kleinberg [141] establish bounds on both egalitarian and proportional fairness for certain games. A thorough review of fair FL techniques can be found in [42, 153].

7.3.3 Post-processing

Examples of post-processing techniques for fair ML include Bolukbasi et al. [64], which aims to produce fair word embeddings by finding the dimensions that encode sensitive attributes and neutralizing them, Hardt et al. [65], which seeks to enforce group fairness using the notion of a “*derived predictor*”, and Petersen et al. [66], which targets individual fairness using graph Laplacian regularization. None of these works are designed for the edge or FL settings. In fact, to the best of our knowledge, no edge-specific post-processing techniques have been proposed in the literature [13].

8 Privacy protection

Privacy is one of the main selling points of FL. By abolishing the need to share data, conventional wisdom says, FL guarantees data privacy. However, this guarantee rings hollow in the face of numerous privacy attacks [154–157]. While it is true that FL blocks traditional avenues of data theft that rely on compromising a central server or intercepting data in transit, it leaves open other attack angles that rely on what is shared: model updates, the final model parameters, or, failing that, the model’s predictions [154, 158]. This state of affairs jeopardizes the privacy of individuals whose data is used in edge FL systems, and poses significant ethical and legal risks to the organizations that deploy them [14]. In this section, we explore privacy threats to edge FL, proposed defenses, and their limitations.

8.1 What models reveal about their training data

The thesis that FL guarantees privacy is based on the simplistic assumption that data is private unless explicitly shared, a consequence of which is that sharing a model trained on data does not compromise its privacy. This assumption is patently false, as the model’s parameters contain—at the very least—information on the data distribution, otherwise

the model would not be useful. The relevant question is therefore not whether the model contains private information, but rather (a) how much information it contains, (b) and how much of that information can be extracted.

Even this view, however, underestimates models’ information leakage. While classical ML wisdom, embodied by the bias-variance trade-off, dictates that NNs must have as many parameters as necessary to fit training data, but no more to avoid overfitting, recent research has shown that they can be largely overparameterized, yet have excellent generalization performance. In fact, a neural network with zero empirical risk (i.e., one that interpolates training data) can have lower risk than one that slightly underfits the data [159, 160]. Due to this phenomenon, usually referred to as *double descent*, large modern DNNs tend to operate in the so-called *interpolation regime*. That is to say, not only do NNs contain information about the training data, in many cases, they contain *all* the information about it. This implies a worst-case answer to question (a), leaving question (b) as the only hope for defending the privacy of FL. Unfortunately, the answer to this question is also pessimistic. As we demonstrate in Section 8.2, it is possible to extract a significant amount of information about the training data from surprisingly little information about the model [10, 21]. Vanilla FL is in this sense no more private than centralized ML. As such, modifications to FL are necessary to ensure privacy.

8.2 Privacy attacks

Privacy attacks against FL are numerous and diverse. Instead of providing an exhaustive list of all known attacks, it is more instructive to categorize them based on some relevant criteria, and then discuss representative examples from each category, as well as potential defenses. Many works in the literature have already provided such taxonomies [12, 28, 161]. Yin et al. [12] in particular, proposed 5 classifications of privacy attacks, based on the attacker’s status (internal or external), approach (passive or active), timing (training or inference), target (parameter updates, gradients, or the final model), and goal (reconstruction, membership inference, etc.). For our purposes, we will adopt the goal-based classification, as do many other works [11, 28].

8.2.1 Membership inference

A membership inference attack (MIA) aims to determine whether a specific data point is part of a particular client’s dataset [11, 162]. This can be done in multiple ways, a notable one being the *binary classification-based* MIA, where the attacker trains a binary classifier to decide whether a given data point is part of the training set of a target model. Shokri et al. [158] introduced an effective technique for doing so, which they named *shadow training*. It works by train-

ing several *shadow models* on *shadow datasets*, then training an *attack model* to predict whether a given data point was part of some shadow dataset, by using information about the corresponding shadow model [158].

Depending on whether the attack model’s input contains information about the shadow models’ final predictions or their intermediate representations, shadow training-based MIAs can be performed both in the so-called *white-box* setting, where the attacker has full knowledge of the target model’s parameters [163], and in the *black-box* setting, where the attacker’s knowledge is restricted to the model’s input-output behavior (through queries) [158]. The latter fact is devastating to the claim of FL’s privacy, since it’s completely agnostic to the training process. It is also worth noting that Shokri et al. [158] demonstrated the feasibility of a black-box MIA against several ML-as-a-service platforms, including Google and Amazon, on a hospital discharge dataset, for which membership is sensitive information.

It should be noted that not all MIAs are classification-based. An alternative family of so-called *metric-based* MIAs has been proposed, which is based on the assumption that the target model performs better on data it was trained on, so if its performance on a given data point (as measured by some metric) is above a certain threshold, then that data point is likely to be part of the training set. These methods are much simpler and computationally cheaper than classification-based MIAs. The reader can refer to [163] for a comprehensive survey of the existing literature on MIAs.

8.2.2 Property inference

The goal of a Property Inference Attack (PIA) is to learn properties of the training data that are not directly relevant to the model’s task [164]. For example, an attacker might seek information about the race distribution from a model trained for gender recognition [12]. PIAs against FL can be performed either *actively* or *passively* [165, 166].

In the passive case, the attacker simply observes model updates and uses them to infer the desired property. This can be done by training a *batch property classifier* to predict whether a given gradient was produced from a batch with the property of interest. This classifier needs to be trained on an auxiliary dataset, distributed similarly to the victim’s training data. The classifier is then used to map intercepted gradients to the probability of the batch having the target property, which can be extended to the entire dataset by averaging the probabilities [165]. In the active case, the adversary is a participant in the FL process. This opens the door for a simple yet more effective attack based on *multitask learning*. By simply participating in the training process using a local risk that combines performance on the main task and the property of interest, a discriminative representation (for the property) can be learned [165].

We note that both passive and active PIAs assume “*honest-but-curious*” adversaries, since neither requires the attacker to deviate from the training protocol [165]. It stands to reason that even more powerful attacks can be mounted by stronger adversaries. This is demonstrated by attacks like *property inference from poisoning* [167], and *poisoning-assisted property inference* [164], both of which are based on data poisoning (see Section 9.2.2). Mahloujifar et al. [167] show that an attacker can force a near Bayes-optimal training algorithm to leak a property, by poisoning its local data to introduce correlation between the label and the property. Wang et al. [164] on the other hand, present an attack that changes the labels to distort the global model’s decision boundary, thereby forcing clients to divulge additional information about the target property. The increased power and danger of these attacks is validated both theoretically and empirically [164, 167].

8.2.3 Class representative inference

A class representative inference attack (CRIA) seeks to draw samples from the training distribution that correspond to a specific target label, without them necessarily being actual training data points [12, 17]. Hitaj et al. [168] propose one such attack based on GANs, which they prove resilient to traditional privacy-preserving mechanisms like differential privacy. Wang et al. [169] take this further, attacking specific clients by compromising the server. It should be noted that, as highlighted by [165], the danger of CRIAs is far from being obvious, nor is the fact that they are even preventable. On the contrary, Hitaj et al. [168] argue that they are not.

8.2.4 Data reconstruction

Also known as *model inversion attacks*², Data Recoverability Attacks (DRAs) aim directly at reconstructing elements (features, labels, or both) of the training dataset. A successful DRA is the most catastrophic form of privacy leakage, providing perfect knowledge of a subset of the training dataset, making it equivalent to a data breach [17]. The theoretical feasibility of such attacks is a natural consequence of large NNs operating in the interpolation regime [159] (making them essentially mangled copies of the training data), combined with previous work on reconstructing databases from aggregate statistics [172].

One of the earliest successful attempts at devising a DRA is Deep Leakage from Gradients (DLG), wherein the attacker (server or client) uses gradients to reconstruct a specific client’s local dataset. This is done by solving an optimization problem that to find the batch that produces the closest possible gradient to the target client’s [173, 174].

² The term *model inversion* is sometimes used to refer to CRIAs [170], or privacy attacks in general [171].

Testing on a variety of image classification and language modeling datasets, Zhu and Han [173] found that DLG can reconstruct images to the pixel and sentences to the token. Haim et al. [175] propose another optimization-based method for reconstructing data from ReLU-activated MultiLayer Perceptron (MLP) binary classifiers by relying on the “*implicit bias*” of gradient-based optimization algorithms. This was later extended by [176] to work in other scenarios, including multi-class classification and other activation functions.

Both theoretical and empirical evidence suggest that DRAs are a real threat. On the theoretical side, Wang et al. [177] present a tensor-decomposition-based attack that provably reconstructs data from a single gradient. On the empirical side, multiple mainstream models have been shown to be vulnerable to black-box DRAs. These include generative language models like GPT-2 [154], diffusion models like Stable-diffusion and Imagen [178], and text embeddings models [179]. The latter work is particularly concerning, as it only requires API access to the target model.

8.3 Defending against privacy attacks on the edge

The number, scale, and success of the enumerated privacy attacks against FL systems, particularly one considers the exacerbating effect of the edge environment, calls into question the supposed privacy guarantees of edge FL. It is therefore imperative, for ethical and legal reasons [14], to augment edge FL systems with privacy-preserving mechanisms, the effectiveness of which must be provable (theoretical guarantees) and verifiable (empirical evaluation). In this section, we review state-of-the-art privacy defenses for FL systems. To facilitate our review, we categorize the defenses into two broad categories: (1) encryption-based defenses, and (2) perturbation-based defenses (differential privacy). By necessity, our review is not exhaustive. We refer the reader to [10–12] for a more comprehensive survey of privacy-preserving FL, and to [14] for a survey of privacy-preserving FL in the context of GDPR compliance.

8.3.1 Encryption-based defenses

The most straightforward way to protect the confidentiality of data is to encrypt it. Decades of research in cryptography have produced a variety of encryption schemes that can provide an arbitrary level of security. However, it is not immediately clear how encryption can be used to protect the privacy of data in FL (or in ML in general) [180]

Homomorphic encryption Homomorphic encryption (HE) allows computations to be performed on encrypted data. An encryption scheme is homomorphic with respect to a set

of operations if it *commutes* with those operations, meaning that applying an operation to cipher data yields the encrypted result of applying the operation to the plaintext data [181]. This eliminates the need to decrypt the data before processing it, and prevents the party performing the computation from learning the result, which is desirable in cases where the server is curious. Early works on HE in the context of FL used additively homomorphic encryption to allow the aggregation of encrypted model updates, preventing a curious server (or an eavesdropper) from using successive gradients for an inference attack [182, 183]. Later works extended this idea using fully homomorphic encryption [184], and fast homomorphic encryption schemes [185].

Secure multi-party computation Secure Multiparty Computation (SMC) refers to a family of cryptographic protocols that allow multiple parties to perform a computation that requires input from all of them, without revealing any information about the input of any participant to any other (except for what can be inferred from the output of the computation) [186]. In the context of FL, SMC can be used to aggregate model updates. In this direction, Bonawitz et al. [187] proposed *secure aggregation*, a protocol that is provably secure against honest-but-curious and active adversaries, at the cost of a quadratic increase in computation, communication, and storage.

8.3.2 Differential privacy

Unlike encryption-based defenses, which aim to preserve privacy (by encrypting updates) while keeping the data intact, perturbation-based defenses allow small, deliberate corruptions to the data in order to provide a formal notion of privacy known as differential privacy (DP) [11]. Several notions of DP exist, ϵ -DP and ϵ, δ -DP being the most common, but they all share the same basic idea: adding or removing a single data point from the dataset should not affect the output distribution too much [188, 189].

The standard approach to DP in edge FL is to add noise to the model updates [189]. The distribution of the noise depends on the *privacy budget* ϵ, δ , the *sensitivity* of model updates, and the *mechanism* used to add the noise (e.g., Laplacian, Gaussian [188, 189], or Skellam [190]). A full survey of DP in the context of FL is provided by [189].

8.3.3 Limitations of encryption-based defenses

Perturbation-based privacy-preserving edge FL suffers from an inherent trade-off between privacy and accuracy [191]. Encryption-based defenses, on the other hand, appear to have no such trade-off because they preserve 100% of the transmitted information. From this observation, two conclusions

can be drawn. Either (1) encryption-based defenses are inherently superior to perturbation-based defenses, or (2) encryption-based defenses are not as effective as they appear.

In the case of HE, the latter conclusion is more likely. As a matter of fact, the model learned by the server under HE is theoretically identical to the one learned under vanilla FL. The only difference is that individual updates are not shared. This implies that all the black-box attacks enumerated in Section 8.2, as well as the attacks on the final model parameters, are still possible against an edge FL system secured with HE. As for SMC, successful attacks against secure aggregation have been demonstrated in the literature [155], supporting the second conclusion in this case as well. This pessimistic analysis is made rigorous by [192], where the authors prove the existence of a trade-off between model accuracy and differential privacy, which becomes less favorable as the heterogeneity of the data increases. As a result, the *only* way to ensure DP, is to sacrifice model accuracy.

9 Reputation, trust, and security

As established in Section 3, rather than being an intrinsic property of the data, DQ is strongly dependent on extrinsic and contextual factors. Having introduced two such factors, namely fairness and privacy in Sections 7 and 8, we now turn our attention to a third one: trustworthiness. Instead of being a property of the data, trustworthiness is a property of the data *source*, it allows for different treatments of identical data points depending on their provenance. Despite the extrinsic nature of trustworthiness, it is a ubiquitous dimension in the DQ literature [6, 8, 193, 194]. It is even more salient for FL on the edge, where the data is private, and the clients are potentially anonymous. This section is dedicated to the study of untrusted clients in FL (also known as *Byzantine clients* for reasons that will become clear), and the defenses that can be deployed against them.

9.1 The Byzantine generals' problem

The main reason trust is so important in FL is its distributed nature. All distributed computing schemes suffer from a fundamental obstacle: it is often impossible to detect a problem that exhibits different symptoms to different nodes. This limitation, infamous in the literature as the *Byzantine generals' problem*, was introduced by Lamport et al. [195] in 1982.

The problem is usually stated abstractly using a military analogy of a group of Byzantine generals who must coordinate their attack on a city (hence the name). The generals must agree on whether to attack only by exchanging messengers. Each general has an initial opinion, and the goal is to reach a consensus. However, a certain (unknown) number

of generals are traitors, who may send false messages to prevent consensus. Crucially, they can send different messages to different generals. The problem is to design a protocol that allows the honest generals to agree on a plan (no matter which one).

If at least one third of the generals are traitors, the Byzantine generals' problem is impossible to solve [195]. It is worth noting that this is not a technical challenge, it is an impossibility result. Lamport et al. [195] proved that no distributed algorithm can defeat more than n traitors in a $3n+1$ general network. This is important to keep in mind when examining Byzantine defenses in FL, which can be extremely effective, but are still subject to this fundamental threshold.

9.2 Byzantine attacks against federated learning

Being a distributed system, FL suffers from the Byzantine general problem. This was first³ pointed out by Blanchard et al. [197] in 2017, who noted that the possibility of accidental or malicious misbehavior by clients should be considered when designing FL systems. Many subsequent works [20, 22, 192, 198–203] have since explored the problem and potential solutions in depth, resulting in a plethora of attacks and corresponding defenses. This section provides an overview of Byzantine attacks, while Section 9.3 discusses defense strategies.

Byzantine attacks can be classified according to various criteria [10, 11, 19, 21], a common subset of which is (i) *the attack level* (model or data), (ii) *the goal* (degrading performance or inducing specific behavior), and (iii) *the method* (the specific type of poison). Figure 5 illustrates two such taxonomies which include the three criteria listed above, among others. This section is structured according to the first criterion, discussing model poisoning attacks in Section 9.2.1, and data poisoning attacks in Section 9.2.2.

9.2.1 Model poisoning attacks

In a model poisoning attack (or a gradient poisoning attack), a Byzantine client generates its update by either modifying the honest update, or crafting a malicious update from scratch. In their seminal paper, Blanchard et al. [197] describe one such attack against FedAvg. Assuming the GAR of Equation (11) is used, a Byzantine client j with a desired (arbitrary) model $\tilde{\theta}$, can send the update

$$\theta_j^{(t)} = \frac{1}{\alpha_j} \tilde{\theta} - \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{\alpha_i}{\alpha_j} \theta_i^{(t)} \quad (19)$$

to ensure that the global model $\theta^{(t)}$ of the next round is $\tilde{\theta}$. A single attacker can thus hijack the global model under FedAvg. This can be used in a targeted manner (to induce a

³ Previous works [196] highlight the problem in ML-adjacent contexts, but Blanchard et al. [197] are credited for introducing it to FL.




Fig. 5: Taxonomy of Byzantine attacks [21]

specific behavior), or in an untargeted manner (to degrade the model’s performance).

Subsequent works have explored other methods of implementing model poisoning attacks. Xie et al. [204] showcase a *Gaussian attack*, where a Byzantine client samples its update from a normal distribution. Li et al. [205] on the other hand, propose a *sign flipping attack*, where the attacker submits a large negative multiple of the honest update. Both of these attacks are untargeted. Another untargeted attack introduced by Fang et al. [201] is more refined by virtue of its reliance on optimization techniques. In this *local model poisoning attack*, multiple Byzantine clients collude to produce an update maximizing deviation from the honest gradient.

In contrast to these untargeted attacks, other authors have explored targeted ones (also referred to as *backdoor attacks*). Bagdasaryan et al. [206] introduce a backdoor attack where the attacker trains a local model on a mixture of correctly labeled and mislabeled data to induce a backdoor, and then uses an attack similar to the one demonstrated by Blanchard

et al. [197] to replace the global model with its own. Testing against FedAvg was successful on both image classification and language modeling tasks.

9.2.2 Data poisoning attacks

Data poisoning attacks are not specific to the edge. Chen et al. [207] proposed a targeted data poisoning attack against DL in 2017. Despite this lack of specificity, data poisoning attacks are particularly relevant in the context of edge FL, due to the strong privacy requirements which usually prevent data inspection. This family of attacks relies on the intuitive assumption that compromising training data will compromise the model, (inline with Principle. 2). To mount a data poisoning attack, a Byzantine client can either modify its features or its labels. These two types of attacks are respectively known as *clean-label* and *dirty-label* attacks [19].

The most common form of dirty-label attack is the *label-flipping attack* [19], in which the attacker applies some permutation to the labels of its data [208]. This action is equivalent to applying a fixed, class-dependent label noise (see Section 6.1). If this permutation is independent of the features (or equivalently, if the noise is instance-independent), the label-flipping is said to be *static*, otherwise it is *dynamic* [19]. Attacks of this type can be targeted or untargeted, depending on the structure of the permutation [11].

Clean-label attacks keep the labels intact, opting instead to craft the features in a way that will mislead the model [19]. This can be achieved in a multitude of ways. An untargeted attacker may simply add random noise to the features [21], while a targeted one may use a more sophisticated approach, such as optimization techniques [209] or GANs [210, 211].

9.2.3 Equivalence between data and model poisoning

A reasonably intuitive assumption on Byzantine attacks is that model poisoning attacks are more effective than data poisoning attacks. This can be rigorously justified by noting that data poisoning attacks are trivially reducible to model poisoning attacks (by simply training on the poisoned data). An equally valid observation is that data poisoning attacks are easier to mount, and harder to detect (even in a centralized setting). It is therefore reasonable to conclude that, by virtue of their respective limitations, Byzantine attacks are not as dangerous as they may seem at first glance [212].

Farhadkhani et al. [202] refute this claim by proving that these two types of attacks are in fact equivalent. Their proof is entirely constructive, meaning that they provide an algorithm to construct an equivalent data poisoning attack from any model poisoning attack. This is done by essentially working backward, generating a dataset by creating random instances and labeling them according to the desired model. Empirical evaluation yielded successful attacks against federated linear regression and classification.

9.3 Defense strategies

Given the potentially catastrophic impact of malicious clients, defending against them is a critical concern in edge FL. The literature on Byzantine-robust FL is vast and varied, with a wide range of defense strategies. In this section, we divide these strategies into two categories, namely, (1) robust aggregation, which aims to *mitigate* the impact of malicious clients by making the GAR less sensitive to manipulation, and (2) client selection, which focuses on *detecting* malicious clients to either exclude them or reduce their selection probability.

9.3.1 Robust aggregation

Robust aggregation functions are historically the first defense against Byzantine clients, one having already been proposed in the seminal work [197]. Since then, many other robust GARs have been proposed. Many attacks specifically targeting them have also appeared in what has become an arms race. In this section, we provide a brief overview of robust GARs. Following [11], we divide them into three categories: (1) score-based, (2) median-based, and (3) distance-based. The reader can refer to [20, 201, 212, 213] for a more comprehensive overview of robust aggregation.

Score-based aggregation This type of robust GAR assigns a score to each update and chooses the update with the highest (or lowest) score as the final aggregation. Krum, the first robust GAR [197], is an example of a score-based aggregation function. It scores each update vector based on the sum of squared distances to a set of its closest neighbors (the number of neighbors depends on the fraction of Byzantine clients) and selects the vector with the lowest score. In this way, Krum is able to tolerate $\sim 1/2$ Byzantine clients. However, Krum’s inability to combine updates from different clients is a significant limitation. To address it, multi-Krum [197] interpolates between the Krum and FedAvg, preserving robustness against $\sim 1/2$ Byzantine clients. Kardam [214] and Bulyan [215] are two other score-based GARs. The former applies “filters” to either accept or reject updates in an asynchronous setting, achieving robustness against $\sim 1/3$ Byzantine clients. The latter can be applied to any existing GAR to increase its robustness. It is able to tolerate $\sim 1/4$ Byzantine clients.

Median-based aggregation Median-based aggregation functions rely on the fact that the median is robust to outliers, which makes it a better location indicator than the mean for extreme distributions [216]. Computing the median of a set of vectors is not trivial, as the univariate median can be extended to the multivariate case in many ways, the most straightforward of which is coordinate-wise median [217].

Other approaches include the geometric median [216], which is provably (approximately) strategy-proof [63], the mean around median, and marginal median [204].

Distance-based aggregation GARs in this category rely on the Euclidean (ℓ^2) distance to detect and exclude outliers. Examples of such GARs include FABA [218], which iteratively removes the update with the largest distance to the mean, Iterative Outlier Scissor (IOS) [219], an extension of FABA that works in a decentralized setting, FoolsGold [220], which relies on cosine similarity to detect outliers in an asynchronous setting, trimmed mean [217], which removes the tails of the distribution before computing the mean, and Sniper [221], which relies on the distance graph to detect outliers.

9.3.2 Client selection

In contrast to robust aggregation, which aims to *tolerate* Byzantine clients, client selection strategies aim to *detect* them (for total or partial exclusion). This is implemented by allowing selection probabilities to depend on the history of client behaviors, assigning higher probabilities [86] or weights [126] to clients with a better track record. The most common approach is to use a *trust* score or *reputation* value to quantify the reliability of each client [222, 223]. Computing this score requires the ability to detect malicious behavior, which is a challenging problem in and of itself. The remainder of this section is dedicated to the discussion of Byzantine behavior detection strategies.

Centralized testing These strategies compare each client against the behavior of the rest, giving lower scores to clients with significantly detrimental behavior. In this vein, Taik et al. [4] propose a reputation-based client selection scheme where reputation scores are computed by comparing self-reported local accuracies with the average accuracy on one hand (to detect data quality issues), and the accuracy of the proposed model on a common validation set on the other hand (to detect dishonest clients). The server then selects clients by solving an instance of the KNAPSACK problem to maximize the total reputation score within a communication budget.

Similarly, Xu and Lyu [125] propose to assign reputation scores to clients based on comparison with the global model. More precisely, the reputation of a client at round t is computed as an exponential moving average of the cosine similarity between its update and the aggregated update at round t . Instead of being used for client selection, reputation scores are used as aggregation coefficients in the next round.

Alternatively, Li et al. [62] present a client selection strategy based on DQ (assuming honest-but-curious clients). Clients are assigned an “importance” score based on the ℓ^2 -norm

of their update (or the magnitude of their local loss). A client is then selected with a probability proportional to its importance score. This is almost diametrically opposed to previously discussed strategies [4, 125], in that it favors rather than penalizes outliers. The rationale is that local datasets on which the global model performs poorly, are precisely the ones it needs to be trained on to improve its *true risk*. That being said, the authors do acknowledge that abnormally large updates are likely to be the result of low data quality, which we note can be intentional (Byzantine) as well as unintentional (noise). To address this, they propose a threshold on the importance score, beyond which a data point is discarded as noise.

Proof of learning In 2021, Jia et al. [224] introduced the concept of a proof of Learning (PoL), a mechanism for a party to prove that it has trained a model. This can be used to claim ownership of said model, or, crucially for edge FL, to allow the server to verify an update is the result of a legitimate training process. This is done by periodically providing the server with a PoL, consisting of a model update and the data point used to produce it, signed, timestamped, and encrypted to prevent spoofing and replay attacks. Recent work has extended this concept using zero-knowledge proofs to allow for the verification of the update without revealing any information about the data [225].

9.3.3 Impossibility results

Despite the plethora of defense strategies we have enumerated (which represent a vanishingly small fraction of the literature), the problem of ensuring Byzantine fault tolerance on the edge is far from solved. El-Mhamdi et al. [192] have shown that securing FL against poisoning attacks is impossible if the datasets of honest clients are heterogeneous. They manage this by leveraging an equivalence result between robust mean estimation and robust FL [203], which they combine with a proof of impossibility for robust mean estimation to conclude. Given existing results on the possibility of Byzantine-robust FL with homogeneous honest clients [203, 226], El-Mhamdi et al. [192] conclude that heterogeneity is the key obstacle.

10 Conclusion and future research directions

In this survey, we discussed the problems data can pose for ML on the edge. Starting with a general formulation of the learning problem in terms of ERM and FERML, we introduced a characterization of data quality in terms of six dimensions justified by the statistical properties of the learning problem and social/ethical considerations. For each of these dimensions, we discussed, to the extent literature permits, the challenges they pose, the methods to address them,

and the limitations of these methods. In doing this, we remained focused on the specific challenges that arise in the context of FL on the edge and the solutions that are tailored to this context. We conclude by discussing some open problems and potential avenues for future exploration.

10.1 Directions for further research

Multiple DQ-related questions remain unanswered, even more so in the context of FL. These include:

- (1) **Other data quality considerations.** The list of dimensions discussed in this survey is not exhaustive. This is particularly true of extrinsic dimensions but is also true of intrinsic dimensions, which can be subdivided into more specific categories. Examples of subtleties that have not been discussed include:
 - (a) Shortcuts [227, 228], a special form of bias in the conditional distribution.
 - (b) Temporal and spatial dependencies [90, 229], which often lead to dependent and attribute skewed data.
 - (c) Missing data [56, 230], which can reduce the effective sample size and introduce bias.
 - (d) The interplay between DQ dimensions. The dimensions discussed in this survey are not orthogonal. Many of them are correlated, while others are in conflict, and it is not always clear which is the case. For example, some works suggest that differential privacy and social fairness are equivalent [136], while others find a trade-off between them [28]. Other dimensions that can be related include: cooperative fairness, noise resilience, and Byzantine fault tolerance.
- (2) **Understanding the effect of data quality on the learning process.** While DQ's influence on the learning process is both intuitive and empirically validated, it is not yet well understood. Despite attempts to rigorously study it both theoretically [231] and experimentally [232], a unified theory of data quality does not yet exist for ML, let alone for FL. Characterizing the relationship between data and different aspects of the learning process such as the loss landscape, convergence and convergence rate, quality of the local minima, and generalization error, as well as the changes this relationship undergoes in the distributed setting, is an important, fertile, and largely underexplored area of research. If pursued, this line of research has the potential to facilitate the establishment of universally accepted definitions of data quality, and motivate sound practices for its assessment and improvement.
- (3) **DQ-robust learning algorithms.** Most existing methods for addressing DQ issues rely on in-processing. This trend is likely to continue in the future, as learning algorithms are the most complex, sophisticated, and flexible

components of the ML pipeline. While researchers exert very little control over the data collection process, the learning algorithm is completely under their control. Focusing on this component is also motivated by our observation of biological learning, which can extract useful models from noisy, biased, dependent, and untrusted data. Problems that lie in this space include Out Of Distribution (OOD), where methods like Distributionally Robust Optimization (DRO) and Invariant Risk Minimization (IRM) have already been proposed [233], algorithmic robustness, and algorithmic stability.

References

1. M. G. S. Murshed, C. Murphy, D. Hou, N. Khan, G. Ananthanarayanan, F. Hussain, Machine Learning at the Network Edge: A Survey, *ACM Computing Surveys* 54 (2022) 1–37. [arXiv:1908.00080](https://arxiv.org/abs/1908.00080).
2. R. Singh, S. S. Gill, Edge AI: A survey, *Internet of Things and Cyber-Physical Systems* 3 (2023) 71–92.
3. X. Wang, Y. Han, V. C. M. Leung, D. Niyato, X. Yan, X. Chen, *Edge AI: Convergence of Edge Computing and Artificial Intelligence*, Springer, Singapore, 2020.
4. A. Taik, H. Moudoud, S. Cherkaoui, Data-Quality Based Scheduling for Federated Edge Learning, in: *2021 IEEE 46th Conference on Local Computer Networks (LCN)*, 2021, pp. 17–23. [arXiv:2201.11247](https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.11247).
5. R. Mahanti, *Data Quality: Dimensions, Measurement, Strategy, Management, and Governance*, ASQ Quality Press, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 2019.
6. M. J. Hassenstein, P. Vanella, Data Quality—Concepts and Problems, *Encyclopedia* 2 (2022) 498–510.
7. J. Camacho, K. Wasielewska, P. Espinosa, M. Fuentes-García, Quality In / Quality Out: Data quality more relevant than model choice in anomaly detection with the UGR’16, in: *NOMS 2023-2023 IEEE/IFIP Network Operations and Management Symposium*, 2023, pp. 1–5.
8. F. Sidi, P. H. Shariat Panahy, L. S. Affendey, M. A. Jabar, H. Ibrahim, A. Mustapha, Data quality: A survey of data quality dimensions, in: *2012 International Conference on Information Retrieval & Knowledge Management*, 2012, pp. 300–304.
9. B. Han, Q. Yao, T. Liu, G. Niu, I. W. Tsang, J. T. Kwok, M. Sugiyama, A Survey of Label-noise Representation Learning: Past, Present and Future, 2021. [arXiv:2011.04406](https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.04406).
10. M. S. Jere, T. Farnan, F. Koushanfar, A Taxonomy of Attacks on Federated Learning, *IEEE Security & Privacy* 19 (2021) 20–28.
11. Q. Xia, W. Ye, Z. Tao, J. Wu, Q. Li, A survey of federated learning for edge computing: Research problems and solutions, *High-Confidence Computing* 1 (2021) 100008.
12. X. Yin, Y. Zhu, J. Hu, A Comprehensive Survey of Privacy-preserving Federated Learning: A Taxonomy, Review, and Future Directions, *ACM Computing Surveys* 54 (2021) 131:1–131:36.
13. L. Ferraguig, Y. Djebrouni, S. Bouchenak, V. Marangozova, Survey of Bias Mitigation in Federated Learning, in: *Conférence Francophone d’informatique En Parallélisme , Architecture et Système*, Lyon (virtuel), France, 2021.
14. N. Truong, K. Sun, S. Wang, F. Guitton, Y. Guo, Privacy preservation in federated learning: An insightful survey from the GDPR perspective, *Computers & Security* 110 (2021) 102402.
15. H. Zhu, J. Xu, S. Liu, Y. Jin, Federated learning on non-IID data: A survey, *Neurocomputing* 465 (2021) 371–390.
16. H. G. Abreha, M. Hayajneh, M. A. Serhani, Federated Learning in Edge Computing: A Systematic Survey, *Sensors* 22 (2022) 450.
17. P. Liu, X. Xu, W. Wang, Threats, attacks and defenses to federated learning: Issues, taxonomy and perspectives, *Cybersecurity* 5 (2022) 4.
18. N. Mehrabi, F. Morstatter, N. Saxena, K. Lerman, A. Galstyan, A Survey on Bias and Fairness in Machine Learning, *ACM Computing Surveys* 54 (2022) 1–35.
19. G. Xia, J. Chen, C. Yu, J. Ma, Poisoning Attacks in Federated Learning: A Survey, *IEEE Access* 11 (2023) 10708–10722.
20. J. Shi, W. Wan, S. Hu, J. Lu, L. Yu Zhang, Challenges and Approaches for Mitigating Byzantine Attacks in Federated Learning, in: *2022 IEEE International Conference on Trust, Security and Privacy in Computing and Communications (TrustCom)*, 2022, pp. 139–146.
21. N. Rodríguez-Barroso, D. Jiménez-López, M. V. Luzón, F. Herrera, E. Martínez-Cámara, Survey on federated learning threats: Concepts, taxonomy on attacks and defences, experimental study and challenges, *Information Fusion* 90 (2023) 148–173.
22. A. E. Abyane, D. Zhu, R. Souza, L. Ma, H. Hemmati, Towards understanding quality challenges of the federated learning for neural networks: A first look from the lens of robustness, *Empirical Software Engineering* 28 (2023) 44.
23. S. E. Whang, Y. Roh, H. Song, J.-G. Lee, Data collection and quality challenges in deep learning: A data-centric AI perspective, *The VLDB Journal* 32 (2023) 791–813.
24. I. O. Gallegos, R. A. Rossi, J. Barrow, M. M. Tanjim, S. Kim, F. Dernoncourt, T. Yu, R. Zhang, N. K. Ahmed, Bias and Fairness in Large Language Models:

- A Survey, 2023. [arXiv:2309.00770](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.00770).
25. N. Lee, Y. Bang, H. Lovenia, S. Cahyawijaya, W. Dai, P. Fung, Survey of Social Bias in Vision-Language Models, 2023. [arXiv:2309.14381](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.14381).
 26. Y. Gong, G. Liu, Y. Xue, R. Li, L. Meng, A survey on dataset quality in machine learning, *Information and Software Technology* 162 (2023) 107268.
 27. J. Wang, A. Pal, Q. Yang, K. Kant, K. Zhu, S. Guo, Collaborative Machine Learning: Schemes, Robustness, and Privacy, *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* 34 (2023) 9625–9642.
 28. T. H. Rafi, F. A. Noor, T. Hussain, D.-K. Chae, Fairness and privacy preserving in federated learning: A survey, *Information Fusion* 105 (2024) 102198.
 29. P. M. Sánchez Sánchez, A. Huertas Celdrán, N. Xie, G. Bovet, G. Martínez Pérez, B. Stiller, FederatedTrust: A solution for trustworthy federated learning, *Future Generation Computer Systems* 152 (2024) 83–98.
 30. Z. Gong, P. Zhong, W. Hu, Diversity in Machine Learning, *IEEE Access* 7 (2019) 64323–64350.
 31. A. Karkouch, H. Mousannif, H. Al Moatassime, T. Noel, Data quality in internet of things: A state-of-the-art survey, *Journal of Network and Computer Applications* 73 (2016) 57–81.
 32. S. Kulkarni, G. Harman, An Elementary Introduction to Statistical Learning Theory, *Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics*, Wiley, Hoboken, N.J, 2011.
 33. V. N. Vapnik, *Statistical Learning Theory, Adaptive and Learning Systems for Signal Processing, Communications, and Control*, Wiley, New York, 1998.
 34. Y. S. Abu-Mostafa, M. Magdon-Ismail, H.-T. Lin, *Learning from Data: A Short Course*, AMLbook.com, S.I., 2012.
 35. P. Grohs, *Mathematical Aspects of Deep Learning*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2023.
 36. S. Raschka, Y. Liu, V. Mirjalili, D. Dzhulgakov, *Machine Learning with PyTorch and Scikit-Learn: Develop Machine Learning and Deep Learning Models with Python*, Expert Insight, Packt, Birmingham Mumbai, 2022.
 37. V. Vapnik, Principles of Risk Minimization for Learning Theory, in: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 4, Morgan-Kaufmann, 1991, pp. 831–838.
 38. V. N. Vapnik, *The Nature of Statistical Learning Theory*, *Statistics for Engineering and Information Science*, second edition ed., Springer, New York, NY, 2010.
 39. Z. Zhou, X. Chen, E. Li, L. Zeng, K. Luo, J. Zhang, Edge Intelligence: Paving the Last Mile of Artificial Intelligence With Edge Computing, *Proceedings of the IEEE* 107 (2019) 1738–1762.
 40. A. R. Khouas, M. R. Bouadjeneq, H. Hacid, S. Aryal, Training Machine Learning models at the Edge: A Survey, 2024. [arXiv:2403.02619](https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.02619).
 41. M. Dehghani, Z. Yazdanparast, From distributed machine to distributed deep learning: A comprehensive survey, *Journal of Big Data* 10 (2023) 158.
 42. L. Lyu, X. Xu, Q. Wang, H. Yu, Collaborative Fairness in Federated Learning, in: Q. Yang, L. Fan, H. Yu (Eds.), *Federated Learning: Privacy and Incentive*, Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2020, pp. 189–204.
 43. B. McMahan, E. Moore, D. Ramage, S. Hampson, B. A. y Arcas, Communication-Efficient Learning of Deep Networks from Decentralized Data, in: *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, PMLR, 2017, pp. 1273–1282.
 44. D. Naik, N. Naik, An Introduction to Federated Learning: Working, Types, Benefits and Limitations, in: N. Naik, P. Jenkins, P. Grace, L. Yang, S. Prajapat (Eds.), *Advances in Computational Intelligence Systems*, Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham, 2024, pp. 3–17.
 45. S. Xu, Y. Yao, F. Xu, T. Gu, J. Xu, X. Ma, Data Quality Matters: A Case Study of Obsolete Comment Detection, in: *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, 2023, pp. 781–793.
 46. N. Gupta, S. Mujumdar, H. Patel, S. Masuda, N. Panwar, S. Bandyopadhyay, S. Mehta, S. Guttula, S. Afzal, R. Sharma Mittal, V. Munigala, Data Quality for Machine Learning Tasks, in: *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining, KDD '21*, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2021, pp. 4040–4041.
 47. J. E. Olson, *Data Quality: The Accuracy Dimension*, Morgan Kaufmann, San Francisco, 2003.
 48. C. Renggli, L. Rimanic, N. M. Gürel, B. Karlaš, W. Wu, C. Zhang, A Data Quality-Driven View of MLOps, 2021. [arXiv:2102.07750](https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.07750).
 49. V. N. Gudivada, A. Apon, J. Ding, Data Quality Considerations for Big Data and Machine Learning: Going Beyond Data Cleaning and Transformations (2017).
 50. T. Hagendorff, Linking Human And Machine Behavior: A New Approach to Evaluate Training Data Quality for Beneficial Machine Learning, *Minds and Machines* 31 (2021) 563–593.
 51. L. Budach, M. Feuerpfeil, N. Ihde, A. Nathansen, N. Noack, H. Patzlaff, F. Naumann, H. Harmouch, The Effects of Data Quality on Machine Learning Performance, 2022. [arXiv:2207.14529](https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.14529).

52. G. Danilov, K. Kotik, M. Shifrin, Y. Strunina, T. Pronkina, T. Tsukanova, V. Nepomnyashiy, N. Konovalov, V. Danilov, A. Potapov, Data Quality Estimation Via Model Performance: Machine Learning as a Validation Tool, in: Healthcare Transformation with Informatics and Artificial Intelligence, IOS Press, 2023, pp. 369–372.
53. W. K. Newey, D. McFadden, Chapter 36 Large sample estimation and hypothesis testing, in: Handbook of Econometrics, volume 4, Elsevier, 1994, pp. 2111–2245.
54. S. Ramírez-Gallego, B. Krawczyk, S. García, M. Woźniak, F. Herrera, A survey on data preprocessing for data stream mining: Current status and future directions, *Neurocomputing* 239 (2017) 39–57.
55. V. Werner de Vargas, J. A. Schneider Aranda, R. dos Santos Costa, P. R. da Silva Pereira, J. L. Victória Barbosa, Imbalanced data preprocessing techniques for machine learning: A systematic mapping study, *Knowledge and Information Systems* 65 (2023) 31–57.
56. J. You, X. Ma, Y. Ding, M. J. Kochenderfer, J. Leskovec, Handling Missing Data with Graph Representation Learning, in: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, volume 33, Curran Associates, Inc., 2020, pp. 19075–19087.
57. Z. Zhang, M. Sabuncu, Generalized Cross Entropy Loss for Training Deep Neural Networks with Noisy Labels, in: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, volume 31, Curran Associates, Inc., 2018.
58. F. Lin, X. Fang, Z. Gao, Distributionally Robust Optimization: A review on theory and applications, *Numerical Algebra, Control and Optimization* 12 (Mon Feb 28 19:00:00 EST 2022) 159–212.
59. X. Zhou, X. Wang, Federated Label-Noise Learning with Local Diversity Product Regularization, *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 38 (2024) 17141–17149.
60. J. Goldberger, E. Ben-Reuven, Training deep neural networks using a noise adaptation layer, in: International Conference on Learning Representations, 2022.
61. M. B. Zafar, I. Valera, M. G. Ródriguez, K. P. Gummadi, Fairness Constraints: Mechanisms for Fair Classification, in: Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, PMLR, 2017, pp. 962–970.
62. A. Li, L. Zhang, J. Tan, Y. Qin, J. Wang, X.-Y. Li, Sample-level Data Selection for Federated Learning, in: IEEE INFOCOM 2021 - IEEE Conference on Computer Communications, IEEE, Vancouver, BC, Canada, 2021, pp. 1–10.
63. E.-M. El-Mhamdi, S. Farhadkhani, R. Guerraoui, L.-N. Hoang, On the Strategyproofness of the Geometric Median, in: Proceedings of The 26th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, PMLR, 2023, pp. 2603–2640.
64. T. Bolukbasi, K.-W. Chang, J. Y. Zou, V. Saligrama, A. T. Kalai, Man is to Computer Programmer as Woman is to Homemaker? Debiasing Word Embeddings, in: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, volume 29, Curran Associates, Inc., 2016.
65. M. Hardt, E. Price, E. Price, N. Srebro, Equality of Opportunity in Supervised Learning, in: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, volume 29, Curran Associates, Inc., 2016.
66. F. Petersen, D. Mukherjee, Y. Sun, M. Yurochkin, Post-processing for Individual Fairness, in: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, volume 34, Curran Associates, Inc., 2021, pp. 25944–25955.
67. J. Liu, Z. Shen, Y. He, X. Zhang, R. Xu, H. Yu, P. Cui, Towards Out-Of-Distribution Generalization: A Survey, 2023. [arXiv:2108.13624](https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.13624).
68. H. Wang, L. Muñoz-González, D. Eklund, S. Raza, Non-IID data re-balancing at IoT edge with peer-to-peer federated learning for anomaly detection, in: Proceedings of the 14th ACM Conference on Security and Privacy in Wireless and Mobile Networks, WiSec '21, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2021, pp. 153–163.
69. X. Li, K. Huang, W. Yang, S. Wang, Z. Zhang, On the Convergence of FedAvg on Non-IID Data, 2020. [arXiv:1907.02189](https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.02189).
70. B. Zou, L. Li, Z. Xu, The generalization performance of ERM algorithm with strongly mixing observations, *Machine Learning* 75 (2009) 275–295.
71. Z.-C. Guo, L. Shi, Classification with non-i.i.d. sampling, *Mathematical and Computer Modelling* 54 (2011) 1347–1364.
72. A. Zimin, Learning from Dependent Data, Thesis, Institute of Science and Technology Austria, 2018.
73. A. Roy, K. Balasubramanian, M. A. Erdogdu, On Empirical Risk Minimization with Dependent and Heavy-Tailed Data, in: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, volume 34, Curran Associates, Inc., 2021, pp. 8913–8926.
74. M. Dunder, B. Krishnapuram, J. Bi, R. B. Rao, Learning Classifiers When The Training Data Is Not IID, in: International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, ????
75. F. Lauer, Uniform Risk Bounds for Learning with Dependent Data Sequences, 2023. [arXiv:2303.11650](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.11650).
76. H. Lee, Towards Convergence in Federated Learning via Non-IID Analysis in a Distributed Solar Energy

- Grid, *Electronics* 12 (2023) 1580.
77. Y. Zhao, M. Li, L. Lai, N. Suda, D. Civin, V. Chandra, Federated Learning with Non-IID Data (2018). [arXiv:1806.00582](https://arxiv.org/abs/1806.00582).
 78. Y. Wang, Q. Shi, T.-H. Chang, Why Batch Normalization Damages Federated Learning on Non-IID Data?, *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems* PP (2023).
 79. Y. Wang, Q. Shi, T.-H. Chang, Batch Normalization Damages Federated Learning on NON-IID Data : Analysis and Remedy, in: *ICASSP 2023 - 2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2023, pp. 1–5.
 80. X. Ma, J. Zhu, Z. Lin, S. Chen, Y. Qin, A state-of-the-art survey on solving non-IID data in Federated Learning, *Future Generation Computer Systems* 135 (2022) 244–258.
 81. Z. Lu, H. Pan, Y. Dai, X. Si, Y. Zhang, Federated Learning With Non-IID Data: A Survey, *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* (2024) 1–1.
 82. N. Yoshida, T. Nishio, M. Morikura, K. Yamamoto, R. Yonetani, Hybrid-FL for Wireless Networks: Cooperative Learning Mechanism Using Non-IID Data, in: *ICC 2020 - 2020 IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*, 2020, pp. 1–7.
 83. P. Tian, Z. Chen, W. Yu, W. Liao, Towards asynchronous federated learning based threat detection: A DC-Adam approach, *Computers & Security* 108 (2021) 102344.
 84. A. Abay, Y. Zhou, N. Baracaldo, S. Rajamoni, E. Chuba, H. Ludwig, Mitigating Bias in Federated Learning, 2020.
 85. E. Jeong, S. Oh, H. Kim, J. Park, M. Bennis, S.-L. Kim, Communication-Efficient On-Device Machine Learning: Federated Distillation and Augmentation under Non-IID Private Data, 2023. [arXiv:1811.11479](https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.11479).
 86. S. Rai, A. Kumari, D. K. Prasad, Client Selection in Federated Learning under Imperfections in Environment, *AI 3* (2022) 124–145.
 87. H. Wang, Z. Kaplan, D. Niu, B. Li, Optimizing Federated Learning on Non-IID Data with Reinforcement Learning, in: *IEEE INFOCOM 2020 - IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*, 2020, pp. 1698–1707.
 88. Y. Jiang, J. Konečný, K. Rush, S. Kannan, Improving Federated Learning Personalization via Model Agnostic Meta Learning, 2023. [arXiv:1909.12488](https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.12488).
 89. C. Finn, P. Abbeel, S. Levine, Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning for Fast Adaptation of Deep Networks, in: *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, PMLR, 2017, pp. 1126–1135.
 90. W. Li, S. Wang, Federated meta-learning for spatial-temporal prediction, *Neural Computing and Applications* 34 (2022) 10355–10374.
 91. X. Zhang, M. Hong, S. Dhople, W. Yin, Y. Liu, FedPD: A Federated Learning Framework With Adaptivity to Non-IID Data, *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* 69 (2021) 6055–6070.
 92. V. Smith, C.-K. Chiang, M. Sanjabi, A. S. Talwalkar, Federated Multi-Task Learning, in: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30, Curran Associates, Inc., 2017.
 93. L. Corinzia, A. Beuret, J. M. Buhmann, Variational Federated Multi-Task Learning, 2021. [arXiv:1906.06268](https://arxiv.org/abs/1906.06268).
 94. F. Sattler, K.-R. Müller, W. Samek, Clustered Federated Learning: Model-Agnostic Distributed Multitask Optimization Under Privacy Constraints, *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* 32 (2021) 3710–3722.
 95. B. Frenay, M. Verleysen, Classification in the Presence of Label Noise: A Survey, *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* 25 (2014) 845–869.
 96. E. Baccour, N. Mhaisen, A. A. Abdellatif, A. Erbad, A. Mohamed, M. Hamdi, M. Guizani, Pervasive AI for IoT applications: A Survey on Resource-efficient Distributed Artificial Intelligence, *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials* 24 (2022) 2366–2418. [arXiv:2105.01798](https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.01798).
 97. H. Song, M. Kim, D. Park, Y. Shin, J.-G. Lee, Learning From Noisy Labels With Deep Neural Networks: A Survey, *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* 34 (2023) 8135–8153.
 98. W. Wan, X. Wang, M. Xie, S. Huang, S. Chen, S. Li, Unlocking the Power of Open Set : A New Perspective for Open-set Noisy Label Learning, 2023. [arXiv:2305.04203](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.04203).
 99. P. Albert, D. Ortego, E. Arazo, N. E. O’Connor, K. McGuinness, Addressing Out-of-Distribution Label Noise in Webly-Labelled Data, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, 2022, pp. 392–401.
 100. G. Algan, İ. Ulusoy, Label Noise Types and Their Effects on Deep Learning, 2020. [arXiv:2003.10471](https://arxiv.org/abs/2003.10471).
 101. A. Shanthini, G. Vinodhini, R. M. Chandrasekaran, P. Supraja, A taxonomy on impact of label noise and feature noise using machine learning techniques, *Soft Computing* 23 (2019) 8597–8607.
 102. X. Liang, X. Liu, L. Yao, Review—A Survey of Learning from Noisy Labels, *ECS Sensors Plus* 1 (2022) 021401.

103. G. Algan, I. Ulusoy, Image classification with deep learning in the presence of noisy labels: A survey, *Knowledge-Based Systems* 215 (2021) 106771.
104. A. Barry, L. Han, G. Demartini, On the Impact of Data Quality on Image Classification Fairness, in: *Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR '23*, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2023, pp. 2225–2229.
105. Z. Zeng, Y. Liu, W. Tang, F. Chen, Noise Is Useful: Exploiting Data Diversity for Edge Intelligence, *IEEE Wireless Communications Letters* 10 (2021) 957–961.
106. L. Deng, The MNIST Database of Handwritten Digit Images for Machine Learning Research [Best of the Web], *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine* 29 (2012) 141–142.
107. E. Jafarigol, T. Trafalis, The Paradox of Noise: An Empirical Study of Noise-Infusion Mechanisms to Improve Generalization, Stability, and Privacy in Federated Learning, 2023. [arXiv:2311.05790](https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.05790).
108. A. Krizhevsky, Learning Multiple Layers of Features from Tiny Images (????).
109. J. Yao, Deep Learning with Noisy Supervision, Thesis, 2019.
110. T. Tuor, S. Wang, B. J. Ko, C. Liu, K. K. Leung, Overcoming Noisy and Irrelevant Data in Federated Learning, in: *2020 25th International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR)*, 2021, pp. 5020–5027.
111. M. Yang, H. Qian, X. Wang, Y. Zhou, H. Zhu, Client Selection for Federated Learning With Label Noise, *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology* 71 (2022) 2193–2197.
112. X. Ji, Z. Zhu, W. Xi, O. Gadyatskaya, Z. Song, Y. Cai, Y. Liu, FedFixer: Mitigating Heterogeneous Label Noise in Federated Learning, *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 38 (2024) 12830–12838.
113. K. Tam, L. Li, B. Han, C. Xu, H. Fu, Federated Noisy Client Learning, *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* (2023) 1–14.
114. D. Gamberger, N. Lavrač, S. Džeroski, Noise elimination in inductive concept learning: A case study in medical diagnosis, in: S. Arikawa, A. K. Sharma (Eds.), *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1996, pp. 199–212.
115. G. Pleiss, T. Zhang, E. Elenberg, K. Q. Weinberger, Identifying Mislabeled Data using the Area Under the Margin Ranking, in: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, Curran Associates, Inc., 2020, pp. 17044–17056.
116. D. Gamberger, N. Lavrac, C. Groselj, Experiments with noise ltering in a medical domain, in: *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML) 1999*, Bled, Slovenia, June 27 - 30, 1999, Morgan Kaufmann, 1999, pp. 143–151.
117. C. E. Brodley, M. A. Friedl, Identifying Mislabeled Training Data, *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 11 (1999) 131–167.
118. X. Zhu, X. Wu, Q. Chen, Eliminating Class Noise in Large Datasets, in: *Proceedings, Twentieth International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 2, 2003, pp. 920–927.
119. L. Ma, Q. Pei, L. Zhou, H. Zhu, L. Wang, Y. Ji, Federated Data Cleaning: Collaborative and Privacy-Preserving Data Cleaning for Edge Intelligence, *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* 8 (2021) 6757–6770.
120. S. Azadi, J. Feng, S. Jegelka, T. Darrell, Auxiliary Image Regularization for Deep CNNs with Noisy Labels, 2016. [arXiv:1511.07069](https://arxiv.org/abs/1511.07069).
121. R. Yu, H. Zhu, K. Li, L. Hong, R. Zhang, N. Ye, S.-L. Huang, X. He, Regularization Penalty Optimization for Addressing Data Quality Variance in OoD Algorithms, *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 36 (2022) 8945–8953.
122. T. Liu, D. Tao, Classification with Noisy Labels by Importance Reweighting, *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 38 (2016) 447–461.
123. L. Chen, F. Ang, Y. Chen, W. Wang, Robust Federated Learning With Noisy Labeled Data Through Loss Function Correction, *IEEE Transactions on Network Science and Engineering* 10 (2023) 1501–1511.
124. N. Manwani, P. S. Sastry, Noise Tolerance Under Risk Minimization, *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics* 43 (2013) 1146–1151.
125. X. Xu, L. Lyu, A Reputation Mechanism Is All You Need: Collaborative Fairness and Adversarial Robustness in Federated Learning, 2020.
126. Y. Chen, X. Yang, X. Qin, H. Yu, P. Chan, Z. Shen, Dealing with Label Quality Disparity in Federated Learning, in: Q. Yang, L. Fan, H. Yu (Eds.), *Federated Learning: Privacy and Incentive*, Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2020, pp. 108–121.
127. S. Vucinic, Q. Zhu, The Current State and Challenges of Fairness in Federated Learning, *IEEE Access* 11 (2023) 80903–80914.
128. N. Grgić-Hlača, M. Zafar, K. Gummadi, A. Weller, Beyond distributive fairness in algorithmic decision making: Feature selection for procedurally fair learning, in: *32nd AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2018*, 2018, pp. 51–60.
129. H. Weerts, M. Dudík, R. Edgar, A. Jalali, R. Lutz, M. Madaio, Fairlearn: Assessing and Improving Fairness of AI Systems, *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 24 (2023) 1–8.

130. A. Castelnovo, R. Crupi, G. Greco, D. Regoli, I. G. Penco, A. C. Cosentini, A clarification of the nuances in the fairness metrics landscape, *Scientific Reports* 12 (2022) 4209.
131. S. Verma, J. Rubin, Fairness definitions explained, in: *Proceedings of the International Workshop on Software Fairness*, ACM, Gothenburg Sweden, 2018, pp. 1–7.
132. A. Agarwal, A. Beygelzimer, M. Dudik, J. Langford, H. Wallach, A Reductions Approach to Fair Classification, in: *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, PMLR, 2018, pp. 60–69.
133. S. Corbett-Davies, E. Pierson, A. Feller, S. Goel, A. Huq, Algorithmic Decision Making and the Cost of Fairness, in: *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, KDD '17*, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2017, pp. 797–806.
134. M. Donini, L. Oneto, S. Ben-David, J. S. Shawe-Taylor, M. Pontil, Empirical Risk Minimization Under Fairness Constraints, in: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31, Curran Associates, Inc., 2018.
135. N. Grgic-Hlaca, M. B. Zafar, K. Gummadi, A. Weller, The Case for Process Fairness in Learning: Feature Selection for Fair Decision Making, 2016.
136. C. Dwork, M. Hardt, T. Pitassi, O. Reingold, R. Zemel, Fairness through awareness, in: *Proceedings of the 3rd Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference, ITCS '12*, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2012, pp. 214–226.
137. M. J. Kusner, J. Loftus, C. Russell, R. Silva, Counterfactual Fairness, in: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30, Curran Associates, Inc., 2017.
138. M. Kearns, S. Neel, A. Roth, Z. S. Wu, Preventing Fairness Gerrymandering: Auditing and Learning for Subgroup Fairness, in: *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, PMLR, 2018, pp. 2564–2572.
139. M. Kearns, S. Neel, A. Roth, Z. S. Wu, An Empirical Study of Rich Subgroup Fairness for Machine Learning, in: *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, FAT* '19*, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2019, pp. 100–109.
140. L. Lyu, J. Yu, K. Nandakumar, Y. Li, X. Ma, J. Jin, H. Yu, K. S. Ng, Towards Fair and Privacy-Preserving Federated Deep Models, *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems* 31 (2020) 2524–2541.
141. K. Donahue, J. Kleinberg, Fairness in model-sharing games, in: *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023, WWW '23*, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2023, pp. 3775–3783.
142. B. Ray Chaudhury, L. Li, M. Kang, B. Li, R. Mehta, Fairness in Federated Learning via Core-Stability, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022) 5738–5750.
143. M. Mohri, G. Sivek, A. T. Suresh, Agnostic Federated Learning, in: *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, PMLR, 2019, pp. 4615–4625.
144. F. Zhang, K. Kuang, Y. Liu, L. Chen, C. Wu, F. Wu, J. Lu, Y. Shao, J. Xiao, Unified Group Fairness on Federated Learning, 2022. [arXiv:2111.04986](https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.04986).
145. L. Lyu, Y. Li, K. Nandakumar, J. Yu, X. Ma, How to Democratise and Protect AI: Fair and Differentially Private Decentralised Deep Learning, *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing* (2020) 1–1.
146. L. S. Shapley, M. Shubik, On market games, *Journal of Economic Theory* 1 (1969) 9–25.
147. M.-E. Brunet, C. Alkalay-Houlihan, A. Anderson, R. Zemel, Understanding the Origins of Bias in Word Embeddings, in: *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, PMLR, 2019, pp. 803–811.
148. F. Calmon, D. Wei, B. Vinzamuri, K. Natesan Ramamurthy, K. R. Varshney, Optimized Pre-Processing for Discrimination Prevention, in: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30, Curran Associates, Inc., 2017.
149. K. Abhishek, M. Abdelaziz, *Machine Learning for Imbalanced Data: Tackle Imbalanced Datasets Using Machine Learning and Deep Learning Techniques*, [first edition] ed., Packt Publishing Ltd., Birmingham, UK, 2023.
150. M. Duan, D. Liu, X. Chen, Y. Tan, J. Ren, L. Qiao, L. Liang, Astraea: Self-Balancing Federated Learning for Improving Classification Accuracy of Mobile Deep Learning Applications, in: *2019 IEEE 37th International Conference on Computer Design (ICCD)*, IEEE, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, 2019, pp. 246–254.
151. T. Kamishima, S. Akaho, H. Asoh, J. Sakuma, Fairness-Aware Classifier with Prejudice Remover Regularizer, in: P. A. Flach, T. De Bie, N. Cristianini (Eds.), *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2012, pp. 35–50.
152. Y. H. Ezzeldin, S. Yan, C. He, E. Ferrara, A. S. Avestimehr, FairFed: Enabling Group Fairness in Federated Learning, *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 37 (2023) 7494–7502.
153. Y. Shi, H. Yu, C. Leung, Towards Fairness-Aware Federated Learning, *IEEE Transactions on Neural Net-*

- works and Learning Systems (2023) 1–17.
154. N. Carlini, F. Tramèr, E. Wallace, M. Jagielski, A. Herbert-Voss, K. Lee, A. Roberts, T. Brown, D. Song, Ú. Erlingsson, A. Oprea, C. Raffel, Extracting Training Data from Large Language Models, in: 30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21), 2021, pp. 2633–2650.
 155. D. Pasquini, D. Francati, G. Ateniese, Eluding Secure Aggregation in Federated Learning via Model Inconsistency, in: Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security, 2022, pp. 2429–2443.
 156. Y. Li, H. Yan, T. Huang, Z. Pan, J. Lai, X. Zhang, K. Chen, J. Li, Model architecture level privacy leakage in neural networks, *Science China Information Sciences* 67 (2023) 132101.
 157. B. Balle, G. Cherubin, J. Hayes, Reconstructing Training Data with Informed Adversaries, in: 2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP), IEEE, San Francisco, CA, USA, 2022, pp. 1138–1156.
 158. R. Shokri, M. Stronati, C. Song, V. Shmatikov, Membership Inference Attacks Against Machine Learning Models, in: 2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP), 2017, pp. 3–18.
 159. M. Belkin, D. Hsu, S. Ma, S. Mandal, Reconciling modern machine-learning practice and the classical bias–variance trade-off, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 116 (2019) 15849–15854.
 160. M. Belkin, Fit without fear: Remarkable mathematical phenomena of deep learning through the prism of interpolation, *Acta Numerica* 30 (2021) 203–248.
 161. V. Mothukuri, R. M. Parizi, S. Pouriyeh, Y. Huang, A. Dehghantanha, G. Srivastava, A survey on security and privacy of federated learning, *Future Generation Computer Systems* 115 (2021) 619–640.
 162. B. Kulynych, M. Yaghini, G. Cherubin, M. Veale, C. Troncoso, Disparate Vulnerability to Membership Inference Attacks, *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies* (2022).
 163. H. Hu, Z. Salcic, L. Sun, G. Dobbie, P. S. Yu, X. Zhang, Membership Inference Attacks on Machine Learning: A Survey, *ACM Computing Surveys* 54 (2022) 1–37.
 164. Z. Wang, Y. Huang, M. Song, L. Wu, F. Xue, K. Ren, Poisoning-Assisted Property Inference Attack Against Federated Learning, *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing* 20 (2023) 3328–3340.
 165. L. Melis, C. Song, E. De Cristofaro, V. Shmatikov, Exploiting Unintended Feature Leakage in Collaborative Learning, in: 2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP), IEEE, San Francisco, CA, USA, 2019, pp. 691–706.
 166. H. Kim, Y. Cho, Y. Lee, H. Bae, Y. Paek, Exploring Clustered Federated Learning’s Vulnerability against Property Inference Attack, in: Proceedings of the 26th International Symposium on Research in Attacks, Intrusions and Defenses, RAID ’23, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2023, pp. 236–249.
 167. S. Mahloujifar, E. Ghosh, M. Chase, Property Inference from Poisoning, in: 2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP), 2022, pp. 1120–1137.
 168. B. Hitaj, G. Ateniese, F. Perez-Cruz, Deep Models Under the GAN: Information Leakage from Collaborative Deep Learning, in: Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS ’17, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2017, pp. 603–618.
 169. Z. Wang, M. Song, Z. Zhang, Y. Song, Q. Wang, H. Qi, Beyond Inferring Class Representatives: User-Level Privacy Leakage From Federated Learning, in: IEEE INFOCOM 2019 - IEEE Conference on Computer Communications, 2019, pp. 2512–2520.
 170. S. Z. El Mestari, G. Lenzini, H. Demirci, Preserving data privacy in machine learning systems, *Computers & Security* 137 (2024) 103605.
 171. K. Mo, X. Liu, T. Huang, A. Yan, Querying little is enough: Model inversion attack via latent information, *International Journal of Intelligent Systems* 36 (2021) 681–690.
 172. I. Dinur, K. Nissim, Revealing information while preserving privacy, in: Proceedings of the Twenty-Second ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, PODS ’03, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2003, pp. 202–210.
 173. L. Zhu, S. Han, Deep Leakage from Gradients, in: Q. Yang, L. Fan, H. Yu (Eds.), *Federated Learning: Privacy and Incentive*, Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2020, pp. 17–31.
 174. L. Zhu, Z. Liu, S. Han, Deep Leakage from Gradients, in: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32, Curran Associates, Inc., 2019.
 175. N. Haim, G. Vardi, G. Yehudai, O. Shamir, M. Irani, Reconstructing Training Data From Trained Neural Networks, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022) 22911–22924.
 176. G. Buzaglo, N. Haim, G. Yehudai, G. Vardi, Y. Oz, Y. Nikankin, M. Irani, Deconstructing Data Reconstruction: Multiclass, Weight Decay and General Losses, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2023) 51515–51535.
 177. Z. Wang, J. Lee, Q. Lei, Reconstructing Training Data from Model Gradient, Provably, in: Proceedings of The 26th International Conference on Artificial Intel-

- ligence and Statistics, PMLR, 2023, pp. 6595–6612.
178. N. Carlini, J. Hayes, M. Nasr, M. Jagielski, V. Sehwag, F. Tramèr, B. Balle, D. Ippolito, E. Wallace, Extracting Training Data from Diffusion Models, in: 32nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 23), 2023, pp. 5253–5270.
 179. J. Morris, V. Kuleshov, V. Shmatikov, A. Rush, Text Embeddings Reveal (Almost) As Much As Text, in: H. Bouamor, J. Pino, K. Bali (Eds.), Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Association for Computational Linguistics, Singapore, 2023, pp. 12448–12460.
 180. R. Gilad-Bachrach, N. Dowlin, K. Laine, K. Lauter, M. Naehrig, J. Wernsing, CryptoNets: Applying Neural Networks to Encrypted Data with High Throughput and Accuracy, in: Proceedings of The 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR, 2016, pp. 201–210.
 181. X. Yi, R. Paulet, E. Bertino, Homomorphic Encryption, in: X. Yi, R. Paulet, E. Bertino (Eds.), Homomorphic Encryption and Applications, Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2014, pp. 27–46.
 182. L. T. Phong, Y. Aono, T. Hayashi, L. Wang, S. Moriai, Privacy-Preserving Deep Learning via Additively Homomorphic Encryption, IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security 13 (2018) 1333–1345.
 183. J. Zhang, B. Chen, S. Yu, H. Deng, PEFL: A Privacy-Enhanced Federated Learning Scheme for Big Data Analytics, 2019, pp. 1–6.
 184. M. Hao, H. Li, X. Luo, G. Xu, H. Yang, S. Liu, Efficient and Privacy-Enhanced Federated Learning for Industrial Artificial Intelligence, IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics 16 (2020) 6532–6542.
 185. C. Zhang, S. Li, J. Xia, W. Wang, F. Yan, Y. Liu, {BatchCrypt}: Efficient Homomorphic Encryption for {Cross-Silo} Federated Learning, in: 2020 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 20), 2020, pp. 493–506.
 186. Y. Lindell, Secure multiparty computation, Communications of the ACM 64 (2021) 86–96.
 187. K. Bonawitz, V. Ivanov, B. Kreuter, A. Marcedone, H. B. McMahan, S. Patel, D. Ramage, A. Segal, K. Seth, Practical Secure Aggregation for Privacy-Preserving Machine Learning, in: Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, ACM, Dallas Texas USA, 2017, pp. 1175–1191.
 188. C. Dwork, Differential Privacy: A Survey of Results, in: M. Agrawal, D. Du, Z. Duan, A. Li (Eds.), Theory and Applications of Models of Computation, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2008, pp. 1–19.
 189. A. E. Ouadrhiri, A. Abdelhadi, Differential Privacy for Deep and Federated Learning: A Survey, IEEE Access 10 (2022) 22359–22380.
 190. N. Agarwal, P. Kairouz, Z. Liu, The Skellam Mechanism for Differentially Private Federated Learning, in: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, volume 34, Curran Associates, Inc., 2021, pp. 5052–5064.
 191. M. Kim, O. Günlü, R. F. Schaefer, Federated Learning with Local Differential Privacy: Trade-Offs Between Privacy, Utility, and Communication, in: ICASSP 2021 - 2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), 2021, pp. 2650–2654.
 192. E.-M. El-Mhamdi, S. Farhadkhani, R. Guerraoui, N. Gupta, L.-N. Hoang, R. Pinot, S. Rouault, J. Stephan, On the Impossible Safety of Large AI Models, 2023. [arXiv:2209.15259](https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.15259).
 193. F. Restuccia, N. Ghosh, S. Bhattacharjee, S. K. Das, T. Melodia, Quality of Information in Mobile Crowdsensing: Survey and Research Challenges, ACM Transactions on Sensor Networks 13 (2017) 34:1–34:43.
 194. R. Y. Wang, D. M. Strong, Beyond Accuracy: What Data Quality Means to Data Consumers, Journal of Management Information Systems 12 (1996) 5–33. [arXiv:40398176](https://arxiv.org/abs/40398176).
 195. L. Lamport, R. Shostak, M. Pease, The Byzantine Generals Problem, ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems 4 (1982) 382–401.
 196. L. Su, N. H. Vaidya, Robust Multi-agent Optimization: Coping with Byzantine Agents with Input Redundancy, in: B. Bonakdarpour, F. Petit (Eds.), Stabilization, Safety, and Security of Distributed Systems, Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2016, pp. 368–382.
 197. P. Blanchard, E. M. El Mhamdi, R. Guerraoui, J. Stainer, Machine Learning with Adversaries: Byzantine Tolerant Gradient Descent, in: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, volume 30, Curran Associates, Inc., 2017.
 198. G. Yan, H. Wang, X. Yuan, J. Li, DeFL: Defending against Model Poisoning Attacks in Federated Learning via Critical Learning Periods Awareness, Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence 37 (2023) 10711–10719.
 199. E.-M. El-Mhamdi, R. Guerraoui, A. Guirguis, L. N. Hoang, S. Rouault, Genuinely Distributed Byzantine Machine Learning, in: Proceedings of the 39th Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, ACM, Virtual Event Italy, 2020, pp. 355–364.
 200. V. Shejwalkar, A. Houmansadr, Manipulating the Byzantine: Optimizing Model Poisoning Attacks and Defenses for Federated Learning, in: Proceedings 2021 Network and Distributed System Security Sym-

- posium, Internet Society, Virtual, 2021.
201. M. Fang, X. Cao, J. Jia, N. Z. Gong, Local model poisoning attacks to byzantine-robust federated learning, in: Proceedings of the 29th USENIX Conference on Security Symposium, SEC'20, USENIX Association, USA, 2020, pp. 1623–1640.
 202. S. Farhadkhani, R. Guerraoui, L. N. Hoang, O. Villemaud, An Equivalence Between Data Poisoning and Byzantine Gradient Attacks, in: Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR, 2022, pp. 6284–6323.
 203. E. M. El-Mhamdi, S. Farhadkhani, R. Guerraoui, A. Guirguis, L.-N. Hoang, S. b. Rouault, Collaborative Learning in the Jungle (Decentralized, Byzantine, Heterogeneous, Asynchronous and Nonconvex Learning), in: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, volume 34, Curran Associates, Inc., 2021, pp. 25044–25057.
 204. C. Xie, O. Koyejo, I. Gupta, Generalized Byzantine-tolerant SGD, 2018. [arXiv:1802.10116](https://arxiv.org/abs/1802.10116).
 205. L. Li, W. Xu, T. Chen, G. B. Giannakis, Q. Ling, RSA: Byzantine-Robust Stochastic Aggregation Methods for Distributed Learning from Heterogeneous Datasets, Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence 33 (2019) 1544–1551.
 206. E. Bagdasaryan, A. Veit, Y. Hua, D. Estrin, V. Shmatikov, How To Backdoor Federated Learning, in: Proceedings of the Twenty Third International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, PMLR, 2020, pp. 2938–2948.
 207. X. Chen, C. Liu, B. Li, K. Lu, D. Song, Targeted Backdoor Attacks on Deep Learning Systems Using Data Poisoning, 2017. [arXiv:1712.05526](https://arxiv.org/abs/1712.05526).
 208. V. Tolpegin, S. Truex, M. E. Gursoy, L. Liu, Data Poisoning Attacks Against Federated Learning Systems, in: L. Chen, N. Li, K. Liang, S. Schneider (Eds.), Computer Security – ESORICS 2020, Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2020, pp. 480–501.
 209. A. Shafahi, W. R. Huang, M. Najibi, O. Suci, C. Studer, T. Dumitras, T. Goldstein, Poison Frogs! Targeted Clean-Label Poisoning Attacks on Neural Networks, in: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, volume 31, Curran Associates, Inc., 2018.
 210. J. Zhang, B. Chen, X. Cheng, H. T. T. Binh, S. Yu, PoisonGAN: Generative Poisoning Attacks Against Federated Learning in Edge Computing Systems, IEEE Internet of Things Journal 8 (2021) 3310–3322.
 211. J. Zhang, J. Chen, D. Wu, B. Chen, S. Yu, Poisoning Attack in Federated Learning using Generative Adversarial Nets, in: 2019 18th IEEE International Conference On Trust, Security And Privacy In Computing And Communications/13th IEEE International Conference On Big Data Science And Engineering (TrustCom/BigDataSE), 2019, pp. 374–380.
 212. V. Shejwalkar, A. Houmansadr, P. Kairouz, D. Ramage, Back to the Drawing Board: A Critical Evaluation of Poisoning Attacks on Production Federated Learning, in: 2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP), 2022, pp. 1354–1371.
 213. Y. Wu, H. Chen, X. Wang, C. Liu, P. Nguyen, Y. Yesha, Tolerating Adversarial Attacks and Byzantine Faults in Distributed Machine Learning, in: 2021 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data), 2021, pp. 3380–3389.
 214. G. Damaskinos, E. M. E. Mhamdi, R. Guerraoui, R. Patra, M. Taziki, Asynchronous Byzantine Machine Learning (the case of SGD), in: Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR, 2018, pp. 1145–1154.
 215. E. M. E. Mhamdi, R. Guerraoui, S. Rouault, The Hidden Vulnerability of Distributed Learning in Byzantium, in: Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR, 2018, pp. 3521–3530.
 216. S. Minsker, Geometric median and robust estimation in Banach spaces, Bernoulli 21 (2015) 2308–2335.
 217. D. Yin, Y. Chen, R. Kannan, P. Bartlett, Byzantine-Robust Distributed Learning: Towards Optimal Statistical Rates, in: Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR, 2018, pp. 5650–5659.
 218. Q. Xia, Z. Tao, Z. Hao, Q. Li, FABAs: An Algorithm for Fast Aggregation against Byzantine Attacks in Distributed Neural Networks, IJCAI (2019).
 219. Z. Wu, T. Chen, Q. Ling, Byzantine-Resilient Decentralized Stochastic Optimization With Robust Aggregation Rules, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing 71 (2023) 3179–3195.
 220. C. Fung, C. J. M. Yoon, I. Beschastnikh, Mitigating Sybils in Federated Learning Poisoning, 2020. [arXiv:1808.04866](https://arxiv.org/abs/1808.04866).
 221. D. Cao, S. Chang, Z. Lin, G. Liu, D. Sun, Understanding Distributed Poisoning Attack in Federated Learning, in: 2019 IEEE 25th International Conference on Parallel and Distributed Systems (ICPADS), IEEE, Tianjin, China, 2019, pp. 233–239.
 222. J. Byabazaire, G. O'Hare, D. Delaney, Using Trust as a Measure to Derive Data Quality in Data Shared IoT Deployments, in: 2020 29th International Conference on Computer Communications and Networks (ICCCN), 2020, pp. 1–9.
 223. S. Chuprov, I. Viksnin, I. Kim, L. Reznikand, I. Khokhlov, Reputation and Trust Models with Data Quality Metrics for Improving Autonomous Vehicles Traffic Security and Safety, in: 2020 IEEE Systems

- Security Symposium (SSS), 2020, pp. 1–8.
224. H. Jia, M. Yaghini, C. A. Choquette-Choo, N. Dullerud, A. Thudi, V. Chandrasekaran, N. Papernot, Proof-of-Learning: Definitions and Practice, in: 2021 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP), 2021, pp. 1039–1056.
 225. S. Garg, A. Goel, S. Jha, S. Mahloujifar, M. Mahmood, G.-V. Policharla, M. Wang, Experimenting with Zero-Knowledge Proofs of Training, in: Proceedings of the 2023 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, ACM, Copenhagen Denmark, 2023, pp. 1880–1894.
 226. S. P. Karimireddy, L. He, M. Jaggi, Learning from History for Byzantine Robust Optimization, in: Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR, 2021, pp. 5311–5319.
 227. S. Wu, S. Chen, C. Xie, X. Huang, One-Pixel Shortcut: On the Learning Preference of Deep Neural Networks, 2023. [arXiv:2205.12141](https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.12141).
 228. R. Geirhos, t. link will open in a new tab Link to external site, J. Jörn-Henrik, C. Michaelis, t. link will open in a new tab Link to external site, R. Zemel, B. Wieland, B. Matthias, F. A. Wichmann, t. link will open in a new tab Link to external site, Shortcut learning in deep neural networks, *Nature Machine Intelligence* 2 (2020) 665–673.
 229. L. Wang, J. Liu, Q. He, Concept Drift-Based Checkpoint-Restart for Edge Services Rejuvenation, *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing* 16 (2023) 1713–1725.
 230. D. A. Guastella, G. Marcillaud, C. Valenti, Edge-Based Missing Data Imputation in Large-Scale Environments, *Information* 12 (2021) 195.
 231. Z. Izzo, L. Ying, J. Zou, S. Chatterjee, Theory and Algorithms for Data-Centric Machine Learning, Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University, Stanford, California, 2023.
 232. Z. Qi, H. Wang, J. Li, H. Gao, Impacts of Dirty Data: And Experimental Evaluation, 2021. [arXiv:1803.06071](https://arxiv.org/abs/1803.06071).
 233. X. Zhou, Y. Lin, R. Pi, W. Zhang, R. Xu, P. Cui, T. Zhang, Model Agnostic Sample Reweighting for Out-of-Distribution Learning, in: Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR, 2022, pp. 27203–27221.