

Towards Federated Low-Rank Adaptation with Rank-Heterogeneous Communication

Yuji Byun

*School of Defense Science and Technology
Pohang University of Science and Technology
Pohang, South Korea
yujibyun@postech.ac.kr*

Jaeho Lee

*Department of Electrical Engineering
Pohang University of Science and Technology
Pohang, South Korea
jaeho.lee@postech.ac.kr*

Abstract—Low-rank adaptation (LoRA) is an attractive alternative of adapting full weights for the federated fine-tuning of large pretrained models, which can significantly reduce the memory and communication burden. In principle, federated LoRA can provide an effective mean to allocate different resources to each client by tuning ranks for each client, which can be useful in achieving a better communication-performance tradeoff. We find, however, that the empirical performance of LoRA is highly unstable with respect to such rank-heterogeneity, severely limiting the applicability to the scenarios where it is desirable or even required to allocate nonuniform communication bandwidth to each client due to constrained total bandwidth. Our investigation reveals that the root cause of this instability is the zero-padding-based aggregation strategy adopted in conventional federated LoRA frameworks, which causes the information from high rank clients to get diluted during the aggregation process. To address this issue, we propose a new replication-based padding strategy, which allows us to better leverage the information from clients with high-quality datasets. This method ensures that valuable information from high rank clients is retained during the aggregation process, accelerating the convergence speed and enhancing the overall prediction quality of the global model.

Index Terms—federated learning, low-rank adaptation, rank heterogeneity, communication-efficient training

I. INTRODUCTION

Large-scale pretrained models, or *foundation models*, have demonstrated unprecedentedly strong performance on various tasks [1]–[3], but they also have unprecedentedly large number of parameters. Large language models (LLMs), for instance, often have over trillions of parameters [1]. This vast scale is problematic as it incurs much computational burden, and the trouble becomes doubled for the *federated learning* [4]; here, one needs to communicate parameter updates frequently between nodes to train a model with distributed data sources. Larger the number of parameters, heavier the communication burden becomes, slowing down the overall training process.

In this context, the low-rank adaptation (LoRA) has emerged as a promising option for federated fine-tuning from pretrained weights [5]. Instead of fine-tuning full weight matrices, LoRA keeps the original weight matrices frozen and trains only the updates, which is parametrized as a product of two low-rank

matrices. This dramatically reduces the effective number of parameters, saving not only the memory required for fine-tuning but also the communication channel bandwidth needed for transmitting the parameter updates.

An intriguing aspect of the federated low-rank adaptation is its *resource-flexibility*. By determining how large of a rank each client will utilize, one can easily control the amount of communication bandwidth allocated for each client. This rank-heterogeneity can potentially serve as a powerful mechanism to achieve the favorable tradeoff between communication cost and the training speed; for instance, one can assign a small rank to the clients that have small and noisy datasets, while assigning high rank to *privileged clients* that have large, balanced datasets. This aspect, however, is immensely understudied in the literature, leaving much room for improvements [6], [7].

In this paper, we identify a critical shortcoming of existing frameworks for rank-heterogeneous federated low-rank adaptation: Whenever the client quality varies significantly, existing rank-heterogeneous methods tend to converge slower than the rank-homogeneous federated learning that uses a smaller total bandwidth. Our investigation reveals that this is primarily due to the suboptimal *aggregation* strategy used in conventional federated LoRA frameworks [7]; to aggregate updates with disparate rank, such works rely on *zero-padding*, i.e., matching the dimensionality by concatenating all-zero rows and columns to the low-rank-decomposed parameter updates. Such strategy may be suboptimal, as the high-priority information in the highest rank LoRA update (from the privileged client) can be made less relevant by being averaged-out with padded zeros.

To address this problem, we develop a very simple yet effective *replication* strategy for aggregating rank-heterogeneous LoRA updates in the setting where clients have high variances in the data quality. To avoid having highly relevant information from being diluted, our strategy pads the lower rank updates with the replicated entries of the higher-priority clients, instead of zeros. Empirically, the proposed method achieves faster convergence to the higher accuracy than existing rank-homogeneous and heterogeneous paradigms.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows.

- We identify the limitations of existing rank-heterogeneous federated LoRA, and diagnose the problems in the zero-padding-based aggregation strategy.

This work was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea(NRF) grant funded by the Korea government (MSIT) (No. RS-2023-00213710, Neural network optimization with minimal optimization costs).

- We propose a novel replication-based aggregation strategy, designed to preserve the important information in high-priority clients better.
- We empirically demonstrate that the proposed method can achieve fast convergence to higher optima than the baseline federated LoRA algorithms.

II. BACKGROUND AND RELATED WORK

A. Federated Learning and the Communication Cost

Federated learning is a paradigm where the training dataset is kept locally on multiple client nodes, instead of being sent to the (centralized) server [4]. Such framework allows one to utilize the distributed computing resources, and enjoys various advantages in terms of the data privacy.

To train a model in this distributed setup, standard federated learning algorithms repeats the following steps [4]. First, the model parameter (say, W) is broadcasted from the server to k clients. Next, each client performs updates based on the local data to generate the updated parameters $\{(W + \Delta W_i)\}_{i=1}^k$. Then, the updates ΔW_i are sent to the server. Finally, the local updates are aggregated at the server to generate an updated parameter W_{new} , which is then broadcasted again for the next round. Here, a typical way to aggregate the local updates is to take *average* the updates (e.g., FedAvg [8]), i.e.,

$$W_{\text{new}} \leftarrow W + \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \Delta W_i. \quad (1)$$

If each client performs point-to-point communication with the server directly, there is a significant communication bottleneck on the server side, when the server collects the local updates $\{(W + \Delta W_i)\}_{i=1}^k$. The communication cost at the step is

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \text{size}(\Delta W_i), \quad (2)$$

which is simply $k \cdot B$ when we assume that we transmit full weight updates and each matrix has the size B .

B. Federated Fine-tuning with LoRA

Low-Rank Adaptation, or simply LoRA [5], is a parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT) method that keeps the original pretrained weight parameters fixed and only trains newly added parameters. More concretely, consider fine-tuning a pretrained weight matrix $W_{\text{pre}} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. LoRA reparametrizes the updated weight matrix $W_{\text{ft}} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ as a sum of the original weight matrix and a product of two low-rank matrices:

$$W_{\text{ft}} = W_{\text{pre}} + BA, \quad A \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}, B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}, \quad (3)$$

where r is the rank of the parameter update (Fig. 1).

As we keeping the original weight matrix W_{pre} frozen, only the matrices A and B are trainable parameters. Thus, the number of (active) parameters becomes $(m + n)r$, which can be smaller than the number of parameters for the original matrix mn whenever the rank r meets the following condition:

$$r < \frac{mn}{m + n}. \quad (4)$$




Fig. 1. Concept figure for low-rank adaptation (LoRA)

Typically, the rank r is chosen to be much smaller than the dimensionality of the weight matrix m, n . For instance, for fine-tuning LLMs, e.g., Llama [9], it is conventional to use $r = 16$ for the matrices of size $m = n = 4096$. In this case, the number of parameter reduces to the $1/128 \approx 0.78\%$ of the original weight matrix, leading to a proportional decrease in the communication cost for federated fine-tuning.

C. Data Heterogeneity and the Federated PEFT

Data heterogeneity, or the discrepancy among the client-wise data distribution, has been studied extensively in federated learning. Such heterogeneity is very common in real world scenarios, and can severely degrade the model performance [10]. Many works have focused on resolving this issue, proposing various solutions including that involve data sharing [11] or better calibration of batch normalization [12].

The dataset heterogeneity has also been discussed in the context of parameter-efficient federated learning as well. For instance, [13] studies how the negative impacts of dataset heterogeneity can be mitigated the federated learning of adapters [14]. SLoRA [6] applies LoRA to the federated learning scenario, and proposes a refined initialization scheme for resolving the dataset heterogeneity. Most closely related to our work, [7] considers assigning different rank for the clients, as a mean of addressing inter-client heterogeneity.

In contrast to these works, our work primarily focuses on the scenario where the *relative importance* of each client can be dramatically different. Clients with similar data distribution can have very different importances whenever the amount of data significantly differs, and vice versa when both clients have similar degree of imbalance with different majority classes. When some clients are notably of better quality than others, we demonstrate that the algorithm of [7] may not be effective; our work proposes a way to fix this problem.

III. A CLOSER LOOK AT THE RANK HETEROGENEITY

We now discuss our motivational observation that the rank-heterogeneity can often introduce high instability to the train-




Fig. 2. Per-client class distribution for the motivational experiment




Fig. 3. Federated learning performance for the motivational experiment

ing, leading to a slower convergence. Then, we proceed to demystify why such instability arises.

A. Observation: Does Higher Rank Always Help?

Consider the case where we run federated LoRA with a low rank (e.g., $r = 5$) assigned to all clients. Then, if we select a small number of “good” client and allocate higher rank to them (e.g., $r = 20$), will this new algorithm enjoy an improved overall federated learning performance?

While prior research provides several successful cases [7], making it very tempting to answer “yes,” our experiments suggest that the answer should be “not always,” whenever the dataset quality of each client highly varies and the aggregation strategy does not account for this carefully. More specifically, we conduct the following experiment.

The case of a lone high-quality client. Consider a synthetic scenario where we have 15 clients. Here, a single client has a perfectly balanced class distribution, and the remaining 14 have data subsets with high class imbalance; the datasets are drawn from the Dirichlet distribution with $\alpha = 0.6$. The actual class distribution for each client is illustrated in Fig. 2, where the client A is selected to be the high-quality client and we use AG’s News dataset for the client [15].

If we assign high rank to client A ($r = 20$), low rank to others ($r = 5$), and run a conventional rank-heterogeneous LoRA algorithm [7], we get a result as in Fig. 3. From the figure, surprisingly, we observe that the naïve application of the conventional algorithm (green) performs substantially

TABLE I
ACCURACY OF BEFORE AND AFTER AGGREGATION WITH ZERO-PADDING

	round 1		round 2		round 3	
	before	after	before	after	before	after
Client A (balanced)	84.34	38.95	71.58	42.92	86.58	50.53
Others (average)	24.96	23.95	31.07	43.42	45.06	49.11

TABLE II
ACCURACY OF BEFORE AND AFTER AGGREGATION WITH REPLICATION-BASED PADDING (OURS)

	round 1		round 2		round 3	
	before	after	before	after	before	after
Client A (balanced)	84.34	82.11	88.82	86.16	89.47	86.05
Others (average)	24.96	23.95	31.07	44.08	44.48	76.63

worse than simply applying low rank to all clients (blue). Our question is: Where does the existing algorithm fail?

B. Understanding the Hazards of Rank Heterogeneity

To understand where the existing paradigm [7] falls short, we have tracked the accuracy of client A and other clients after the first three communication rounds. We report the result for the conventional federated LoRA algorithm in Table I.

From Table I, we observe that the performance of the high rank client sharply declines after receiving the aggregated LoRA parameters (which has rank 20) from the parameter server. This observation suggests that the information relevant to the client A has been lost during the aggregation procedure.

If so, why does the existing method lose much client A information, despite the fact that the client A contributes much information through rank-20 matrix, while others contribute only 5? To understand why, we need to take a detailed look at the conventional aggregation method.

Aggregation with zero-padding. In the federated LoRA, the server receives k different LoRA updates from the clients:

$$\Delta W_1 = B_1 A_1, \quad A_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{r_1 \times n} \quad B_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r_1} \quad (5)$$

$$\Delta W_i = B_i A_i, \quad A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{r_2 \times n} \quad B_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r_2} \quad (i \neq 1) \quad (6)$$

where we assume $r_1 > r_2$. To aggregate LoRA updates with mismatched dimension, [7] proposes to perform *zero-padding*, i.e., concatenate zero columns and rows to the LoRA updates. That is, the matrix B_i is padded with all-zero columns as

$$\tilde{B}_i = \begin{bmatrix} B_i & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

where the number of zero-padded columns will be $r_1 - r_2$. By averaging the zero-padded weight updates, the left r_1 columns may retain the same relative scale as the original weight update. However, the remaining r_2 columns may have the relative scale of $1/k$, having their impact on the overall model much diminished as the number of clients grow. In this sense, the conventional zero-padding strategy can be deemed suboptimal in retaining the information of the high-quality client.

IV. METHOD

To resolve the issue identified in Section III, we propose a very simple yet effective solution. In particular, we develop a *replication*-based aggregation strategy, which copies the parameter-update information from the high-quality clients and pastes it to pad the updates for the lower rank clients. This operation can be done rapidly, thus incurring only negligible latency to the overall federated learning pipeline.

Replication algorithm: A simplified description. For simplicity, we first describe the case where we have one high rank client and one low rank client. Concretely, let $\Delta W_1 = B_1 A_1$ be the high rank parameter updates from the high-quality client ($r = r_1$), and let $\Delta W_2 = B_2 A_2$ be the low rank parameter update from another client ($r = r_2 < r_1$). Then, the padded version of the low rank matrix can be written as

$$\tilde{B}_2 = \left[B_2 \left| b_1^{(r_2+1)} \right| \dots \left| b_1^{(r_1)} \right. \right], \quad (8)$$

where $b_1^{(i)}$ denotes the i -th column vector of the matrix B_1 . We process the matrix A_2 in a similar manner (Fig. 5).

After this step, we average the weight matrices as usual in the FedAvg [8]. That is, we perform the averaging:

$$B_{\text{new}} = \frac{1}{2} (B_1 + \tilde{B}_2), \quad A_{\text{new}} = \frac{1}{2} (A_1 + \tilde{A}_2) \quad (9)$$

The case of multiple clients. Whenever there are multiple high rank clients, we handle this in three steps: (1) Aggregate the high rank clients (2) Replicate the entries of the aggregated high rank clients (3) Take a weighted average of the padded low rank and the aggregated high rank LoRA updates; here, we set the relative weight of the aggregated high rank LoRA updates to be proportional to the number of high rank clients.

Allocating high rank. In Section III, we have assumed an *oracle* case where we have a strong a prior knowledge of which client has a high-quality local data; we have allocated high rank to such clients. While this assumption does not hold in practice, we empirically find that a simple heuristic rule works well: First, we allocate low rank to all clients. After the first local update phase, the server select top- k clients with the highest validation accuracy. The clients are then allocated of a high rank. We test this algorithm in Section V, where we find that the proposed algorithm often performs even better than collecting high rank updates from every clients.

V. EXPERIMENTS

A. Experimental Setup

Datasets. We focus on the task of text classification. We use two datasets: AG’s News [15], and DBpedia [16]; for DBpedia dataset, we follow the preprocessing strategies of [15]. We use 10% of the test set for validation, and use the rest for testing.

Models. Considering the fact that the computational resources of edge clients are often limited, we use two lightweight BERT-style language models: DistilBERT [17], and ALBERT [18]. For classification, we add an initialized classification layer to these models; the layer is frozen to its initial values without further training, as in [19]. We apply LoRA only to the self-attention layer, as in the original LoRA paper [5].




Fig. 4. A visual illustration of the conventional zero-padding strategy used for aggregating rank-heterogeneous LoRA updates.




Fig. 5. A visual illustration of the proposed replication-based strategy for aggregating rank-heterogeneous LoRA updates

Clients. We employ total 100 clients, and the training dataset is distributed over these clients without overlap. We model two different types of clients:

- *High-quality* (HQ) clients have more balanced local data, i.e., having similar number of samples from each class.
- *Low-quality* (LQ) clients have datasets more class imbalance, i.e., minority classes can have very few samples.

We randomly select 10% of all clients to be HQ, and the remaining 90% to be LQ. To implement the clients, we follow prior studies [6], [20] to apply Dirichlet distribution for generating non-i.i.d. datasets. The distribution is parametrized by a hyperparameter α ; the smaller α indicates more heterogeneity, and the larger α implies more uniformity. We use $\alpha = 5.0$ and $\alpha = 1.0$ for HQ and LQ, respectively. The average number of samples for both HQ and LQ have been set to be equal.

Rank assignment. At the initial round, we apply $r = 5$ to all clients. After this round, we assign $r = 20$ to the top 10% clients that achieve highest validation accuracy.

Training. We follow the standard FedAvg [8] to conduct a single local epoch training per a global round. We randomly select 10% of the total clients to participate global round, ensuring that the proportion of clients with high rank and low rank remained consistent with the overall distribution. For the optimizer, we use Adam with the learning rate set to $5e-4$; we use flat learning rate, without any further scheduling.

Baselines. We compare the proposed replication-based aggregation strategy with method with the following baselines.

- *Homogeneous.* All clients have a same rank; there is no need to aggregate or truncate. We evaluate $r \in \{5, 7, 20\}$,




Fig. 6. Test accuracy of DistilBERT trained on the AG’s News dataset




Fig. 8. Test accuracy of ALBERT trained on the AG’s News dataset




Fig. 7. Test accuracy of DistilBERT trained on the DBpedia dataset




Fig. 9. Test accuracy of ALBERT trained on the DBpedia dataset

where $r = 7$ has a similar total communication cost with the rank-heterogeneous LoRA; see Table III.

- *Naïve zero-padding.* The strategy where one pads all-zero rows and all-zero columns to match the dimensionality of rank-heterogeneous weight updates (proposed in [7]).
- *Frobenius zero-padding.* One performs the same zero-padding, but applies a weighted sum instead of averaging, with weight proportional to the frobenius norm of the product matrix $\|\Delta W_i\|_F$ (proposed in [7]).

B. Experimental Results

We now provide our main experimental results (Figs. 6 to 9). We evaluate on two language models (DistilBERT, ALBERT) and two datasets (AG’s News, DBpedia). The leftmost data point denotes the accuracy at initialization (thus can be ignored when comparing baselines), and the subsequent data points denote the test accuracies after each communication round.

Result in DistilBERT. (Figs. 6 and 7) From the figures, we make the following observations.

- Our first observation is that the proposed replication-based aggregation strategy (red) achieves the fastest convergence over all compared methods in both cases. In particular, the proposed strategy successfully achieves the near-peak test accuracy in two communication rounds.
- In terms of the converged test accuracy, the proposed strategy is also among one of the best methods, with

the communication-heavy option (homogeneous rank 20; orange) only slightly outperforming on AG’s News.

- Zero-padding-based strategies (dotted lines with circles) converge slower than rank-homogeneous options, with Frobenius padding converging slightly faster than naïve.
- Among rank-homogeneous models, the one with a higher rank tends to converge faster, to a higher final accuracy than the one that uses a lower rank.

Result in ALBERT. (Figs. 8 and 9) Similarly, our method achieves the fastest convergence to the high accuracy, only slightly worse than the communication-heavy case (homogeneous rank 20). We note that, in AG’s News, the homogeneous LoRA tend to perform slightly better than the replication-based padding after the very first round; this is because the quality of the high rank client selected in the step by our method happened to be worse than other high rank clients. However, our method quickly starts to outperform the baselines in the subsequent rounds; this suggests that our method performs robust w.r.t. the suboptimality in the high rank client selection.

Comparison of communication cost. In this part, we make a quantitative comparison of the communication cost used by each rank-homogeneous and hetero-geneous methods (Table III). In particular, we compare the uplink communication, i.e., sent to server, which is the main communication bottleneck. We compare the communication cost used per

TABLE III

COMPARISON OF COMMUNICATION COSTS BY RANK WITH DISTILBERT

Method	LoRA ($r=20$)	LoRA ($r=7$)	Ours	LoRA ($r=5$)
num of parameters	552,960	193,536	179,715	138,240
communication cost	2.11MB	0.74MB	0.69MB	0.53MB
percent of total model	0.83%	0.30%	0.27%	0.21%

client (in average) for the transmission of LoRA updates. We use DistilBERT for comparison. *Percent of total model* indicates the percentage of parameters used when applying LoRA compared to fully fine-tuning the original DistilBERT.

From the table, we confirm that our method uses less communication bandwidth than rank-homogeneous options with $r = 7$. As our method requires smaller number of rounds for convergence, our method is communication-efficient than rank-homogeneous options in both ends.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this study, we have analyzed the negative impacts that the zero-padding method during the aggregation process when using heterogeneous LoRA in federated learning, and we proposed a replication-based padding method to address these issues. We experimentally demonstrated that this method not only outperforms heterogeneous LoRA using zero-padding but also achieves faster convergence compared to homogeneous LoRA with high ranks. This suggests that in situations with extremely limited bandwidth, a strategy of assigning higher ranks to only a limited set of clients—while leaving others with low rank—can reduce the overall communication cost burden. We believe that our research opens up new challenges and opportunities in federated fine-tuning, and we are confident that this study will contribute to more efficient federated learning in terms of communication costs.

Limitation. Our approach significantly leverages the influence of high-performing clients to enhance the performance of the global model. As mentioned in the experimental results, there is a risk of overall performance degradation if a high rank client with relatively poor performance is selected during the client selection process. However, in our experiments, we used a simple random selection method and recent studies have explored selecting clients while considering data heterogeneity. We believe that applying more sophisticated client selection methods can mitigate this limitation.

Future work. Currently, we consider a scenario with a single high rank and a single low rank, i.e., two ranks. However, it is also possible to explore methods that apply multiple ranks, taking data heterogeneity into account. Additionally, just as we replaced zero-padding with replication-based padding, we could consider alternative methods to replace truncation. Finally, while we are currently padding and aggregating by aligning the same rows and columns of low rank and high rank clients, we could also explore other efficient methods to match the rows and columns between low rank and high rank clients.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Achiam, S. Adler, S. Agarwal, L. Ahmad, I. Akkaya, F. L. Aleman, D. Almeida, J. Altschmidt, S. Altman, S. Anadkat *et al.*, “GPT-4 technical report,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [2] A. Radford, J. W. Kim, C. Hallacy, A. Ramesh, G. Goh, S. Agarwal, G. Sastry, A. Askell, P. Mishkin, J. Clark, G. Krueger, and I. Sutskever, “Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2021.
- [3] A. Kirillov, E. Mintun, N. Ravi, H. Mao, C. Rolland, L. Gustafson, T. Xiao, S. Whitehead, A. C. Berg, W.-Y. Lo, P. Dollár, and R. Girshick, “Segment anything,” in *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023.
- [4] T. Li, A. K. Sahu, A. Talwalkar, and V. Smith, “Federated learning: Challenges, methods, and future directions,” *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 2020.
- [5] E. J. Hu, Y. Shen, P. Wallis, Z. Allen-Zhu, Y. Li, S. Wang, L. Wang, and W. Chen, “LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [6] S. Babakniya, A. R. Elkordy, Y. H. Ezzeldin, Q. Liu, K.-B. Song, M. El-Khomy, and S. Avestimehr, “SLoRA: Federated parameter efficient fine-tuning of language models,” in *Workshop on Federated Learning in the Age of Foundation Models @ NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [7] Y. J. Cho, L. Liu, Z. Xu, A. Fahrezi, M. Barnes, and G. Joshi, “Heterogeneous LoRA for federated fine-tuning of on-device foundation models,” in *Workshop on Federated Learning in the Age of Foundation Models @ NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [8] B. McMahan, E. Moore, D. Ramage, S. Hampson, and B. A. y Arcas, “Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data,” in *Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2017.
- [9] H. Touvron, T. Lavril, G. Izacard, X. Martinet, M.-A. Lachaux, T. Lacroix, B. Rozière, N. Goyal, E. Hambro, F. Azhar *et al.*, “LLaMA: Open and efficient foundation language models,” *arXiv preprint 2302.13971*, 2023.
- [10] H. Zhu, J. Xu, S. Liu, and Y. Jin, “Federated learning on non-iid data: A survey,” *Neurocomputing*, 2021.
- [11] Y. Zhao, M. Li, L. Lai, N. Suda, D. Civin, and V. Chandra, “Federated learning with non-iid data,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.00582*, 2018.
- [12] X. Li, M. Jiang, X. Zhang, M. Kamp, and Q. Dou, “FedBN: Federated learning on non-iid features via local batch normalization,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [13] Y. Kim, J. Kim, W.-L. Mok, J.-H. Park, and S. Lee, “Client-customized adaptation for parameter-efficient federated learning,” in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2023.
- [14] N. Houlsby, A. Giurgiu, S. Jastrzebski, B. Morrone, Q. De Laroussilhe, A. Gesmundo, M. Attariyan, and S. Gelly, “Parameter-efficient transfer learning for NLP,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2019.
- [15] X. Zhang, J. Zhao, and Y. LeCun, “Character-level convolutional networks for text classification,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2015.
- [16] S. Auer, C. Bizer, G. Kobilarov, J. Lehmann, R. Cyganiak, and Z. Ives, “DBpedia: A nucleus for a web of open data,” in *International Semantic Web Conference*, 2007.
- [17] V. Sanh, L. Debut, J. Chaumond, and T. Wolf, “DistilBERT, a distilled version of BERT: Smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.01108*, 2019.
- [18] Z. Lan, M. Chen, S. Goodman, K. Gimpel, P. Sharma, and R. Soricut, “ALBERT: A lite BERT for self-supervised learning of language representations,” *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [19] Y. Sun, Z. Li, Y. Li, and B. Ding, “Improving LoRA in privacy-preserving federated learning,” *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [20] B. Y. Lin, C. He, Z. Zeng, H. Wang, Y. Huang, C. Dupuy, R. Gupta, M. Soltanolkotabi, X. Ren, and S. Avestimehr, “FedNLP: Benchmarking federated learning methods for natural language processing tasks,” in *Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2021.