

DAMe: Personalized Federated Social Event Detection with Dual Aggregation Mechanism

Xiaoyan Yu
School of Computer Science and
Technology,
Beijing Institute of Technology
Beijing, China
xiaoyan.yu@bit.edu.cn

Yifan Wei
School of Artificial Intelligence,
University of Chinese Academy of
Sciences
Beijing, China
weiyifan2021@ia.ac.cn

Pu Li
Kunming University of Science and
Technology
Kunming, China
lip@stu.kust.edu.cn

Shuaishuai Zhou
Kunming University of Science and
Technology
Kunming, China
20222204121@kust.edu.cn

Hao Peng*
Beihang University
Beijing, China
penghao@buaa.edu.cn

Li Sun
North China Electric Power
University
Beijing, China
ccsunli@ncepu.edu.cn

Liehuang Zhu*
Beijing Institute of Technology
Beijing, China
liehuangz@bit.edu.cn

Philip S. Yu
University of Illinois at Chicago
Chicago, IL, USA
psyu@uic.edu

ABSTRACT

Training social event detection models through federated learning (FedSED) aims to improve participants' performance on the task. However, existing federated learning paradigms are inadequate for achieving FedSED's objective and exhibit limitations in handling the inherent heterogeneity in social data. This paper proposes a personalized federated learning framework with a dual aggregation mechanism for social event detection, namely DAMe. We present a novel local aggregation strategy utilizing Bayesian optimization to incorporate global knowledge while retaining local characteristics. Moreover, we introduce a global aggregation strategy to provide clients with maximum external knowledge of their preferences. In addition, we incorporate a global-local event-centric constraint to prevent local overfitting and "client-drift". Experiments within a realistic simulation of a natural federated setting, utilizing six social event datasets spanning six languages and two social media platforms, along with an ablation study, have demonstrated the effectiveness of the proposed framework. Further robustness analyses have shown that DAMe is resistant to injection attacks.

CCS CONCEPTS

• Information systems → Data mining; • Computing methodologies → Distributed computing methodologies.

*Corresponding authors.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

CIKM '24, October 21–25, 2024, Boise, ID, USA.

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-0436-9/24/10...\$15.00

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3627673.3679551>

KEYWORDS

Social Event Detection, Federated Learning, Model Aggregation

ACM Reference Format:

Xiaoyan Yu, Yifan Wei, Pu Li, Shuaishuai Zhou, Hao Peng, Li Sun, Liehuang Zhu, and Philip S. Yu. 2024. DAMe: Personalized Federated Social Event Detection with Dual Aggregation Mechanism. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM '24)*, October 21–25, 2024, Boise, ID, USA. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 11 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3627673.3679551>

1 INTRODUCTION

Social Event Detection (SED) aims to pinpoint unusual occurrences that involve specific times, locations, people, content, etc., in the real world from social media platforms [29]. Traditionally, individual platforms collect their own data to train SED models. However, users tend to post content across various platforms driven by personal preferences (e.g., linguistic preferences [36] and social affiliations [34]). Consequently, the models trained individually by each platform are susceptible to their inherent biases, leading to a limited scope and incomplete detection of events. Meanwhile, due to privacy concerns, existing regulations prohibit organizations from sharing data without user consent [38], making it unfeasible to centralize data for training purposes. In such scenarios, the most straightforward solution is implementing Federated Learning (FL) [24]. In FL, each client (participant) trains a local model using their private data, while the central server facilitates information exchange among clients by iteratively aggregating the locally uploaded model weights. This paper initiates the study on Federated Social Event Detection (FedSED).

Implementing SED through FL necessitates considering its inherent characteristics and challenges. **Firstly, FedSED aims to facilitate clients in achieving better performance on their respective data.** Unlike traditional FL [18, 24], which prioritizes

training a global model with optimal performance across all data, FedSED aims to facilitate information sharing among clients within a federated framework, thereby enhancing the performance of local models on respective data. This requires prioritizing client demands as the primary driving force throughout the federated process. **Secondly, social data sourced from various clients inhibit significant heterogeneity.** In practical FL scenarios [12, 18], data from different clients often exhibit non-independent and non-identically distributed characteristics (referred to as non-IID). This non-IID nature of the data leads to clients converging in different directions, a phenomenon known as “client-drift”. While non-IID has been a longstanding issue in FL [13], it is further aggravated in the FedSED context since data from various platforms can differ in formats, languages, contents, etc. Consequently, addressing the challenges posed by non-IID social data, including multilingualism and multiplatform discrepancies, is paramount in FedSED.

Given FedSED’s objective of enhancing local performance and addressing inherent heterogeneity, personalized federated learning (pFL) approaches based on aggregation appear to be promising solutions. Firstly, in model-level aggregation [21, 48], clients have access to the local models of all other clients and perform aggregation in their own preferred manner. However, this line of approaches is *encumbered by substantial communication overhead and privacy concerns*, given that model parameters could be leveraged to recover private data [50, 51]. Secondly, layer-level aggregation, [39] where clients learn strategies for selecting parameters from the global or local models as their respective local models. Nevertheless, such a *binary selection fails to capture the essential information and struggles to learn effective strategies that meet local objectives*. Thirdly, parameter-level aggregation, such as FedALA [47], where clients learn aggregation weights for each parameter of the global and local models. Nonetheless, attaining the optimal solution for all parameters proves to be highly challenging, if not practically unachievable. Furthermore, the aggregation of the global model relies on the FedAvg strategy, which *falls short in delivering the most advantageous knowledge to individual clients*.

Expanding on the preceding discussion, we outline three crucial perspectives in developing a pFL framework for SED: 1) On the server side, when dispatching the global model to each client, it is imperative to strike a balance between maximizing the information available for client personalization and mitigating potential heterogeneity issues that may arise. 2) On the client side, it is essential to retain a portion of local characteristics while integrating the knowledge provided by the server to prevent deviation from local objectives or local overfitting; 3) In entirety, achieving a level of consensus between the global and local models on the representation of the same event is important to mitigate the impact of heterogeneity.

In light of the abovementioned perspectives for developing the FedSED framework, this work proposes a novel **Dual Aggregation Mechanism for Personalized Federated Social Event Detection**, namely **DAMe**. The framework aims to enhance the performance of local models on local data through the collaborative efforts of the server and clients. DAMe comprises three components: local aggregation, global aggregation, and global-local alignment. For local aggregation, we employ Bayesian optimization to explore

the ideal aggregation weight. This process facilitates the integration of extensive global knowledge while preserving the unique local characteristics to a great extent. For global aggregation, we construct a client graph on the server side and minimize the 2D structural entropy within it. Through this process, an optimal aggregation strategy is acquired to maximize the external knowledge available to each client while reducing global heterogeneity. For global-local alignment, we propose a global-local event-centric constraint to align the local event representation with the global event representation. This ensures that the local models acquire improved representations of social messages. We evaluate the proposed framework using six social event datasets covering six languages and two social media platforms. The experiments are conducted within a realistic simulation of a natural federated setting. Our experimental results and ablation study underscore the efficacy of DAMe for FedSED, with the potential to extend to other applications. Further robustness analysis confirms that DAMe is resilient to federated injection attacks.

In summary, the contributions of this work are as follows:

- We pioneer the study on Federated Social Event Detection (FedSED) and present a pFL framework that satisfies the objective of the task.
- We propose a novel dual aggregation mechanism that maximizes the transfer of external knowledge from the server to the clients while enabling the clients to retain a portion of their own characteristics during local learning.
- We devise a global-local event-centric constraint to learn better message representation, meanwhile preventing local overfitting and “client-drift”.
- Extensive experiments conducted in natural federated settings have corroborated our proposed framework’s effectiveness and demonstrated its robustness against federated injection attacks.

2 RELATED WORK

2.1 Social Event Detection

Social event detection, aiming to identify potential social events from social streams, is a longstanding and challenging task. Recent SED methods primarily rely on Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) [2, 6, 27, 28, 33, 35, 36, 43]. These approaches construct message graphs to represent social message data, integrating various attributes that complement each other and serve independent roles in propagating and aggregating text semantics. For instance, KPGNN [2] builds an event message graph using user, keyword, and entity attributes, then employs inductive Graph Attention Networks (GAT) to learn message representations. Furthermore, some approaches adopt multi-view learning strategies to enhance the feature learning process. MVGAN [6], for instance, learns message features from both semantic and temporal views and incorporates an attention mechanism to fuse them. ETGNN [35] focuses on learning representations from co-hashtag, co-entity, and co-user views. However, current works have not yet explored methods utilizing federated learning to enhance the comprehensiveness and accuracy of SED.

2.2 Federated Learning

Federated Learning (FL), an advanced paradigm for decentralized data training, has garnered significant attention in recent years [46].

FedAvg [24] achieves collaborative learning across decentralized devices by locally training models and aggregating parameters on a central server. On that basis, FedProx [18] introduces regularization that enhances model convergence and generalization by considering the smoothness of the global model in FL.

Due to the statistical heterogeneity in FL, a centralized global model may lower the performance of certain participants [47]. Hence, personalized FL has garnered significant attention [41]. We categorize pFL methods into three types. **Fine-Tuning-based Methods** involve learning a global model, which clients then fine-tune on their respective sides to achieve personalization [5, 8, 45]. For instance, Per-FedAvg [8] regards the global model as an initial shared model, allowing all clients to fine-tune it with local data to fit their specific needs. **Personalized Layer/Model-based Methods** offer flexibility in model architecture, allowing for variations such as sharing specific layers or training additional local models [17, 20, 40, 44]. For example, FedACK [44] employs GAN-based knowledge distillation for cross-model and cross-lingual social bot detection. **Aggregation-based Methods** achieve personalization through server centrally aggregates specialized global models for the participants or clients directly exchange parameters among themselves in a decentralized setting, allowing them to select the information they desire [4, 13, 19, 21, 39, 47, 48].

Previous studies have overlooked the possibility of servers providing a suitable model while allowing clients to integrate helpful knowledge. To this end, this work focuses on personalization to enhance local performance via global and local aggregation.

3 PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we outline the problem formulations of Federated Learning (FL) and Social Event Detection (SED), then define the threat model in the federated setting.

3.1 Federated Learning

This paper considers FL with one central server and K clients. The dataset \mathcal{D}_k , locally collected by client k , remains inaccessible to others. Below is an overview of the training process for the classic FL algorithm FedAvg [24]:

Step 1 Initialization. At the initial communication round $r = 0$, all local model parameters of K clients are initialized as the global model parameter: $\theta_0^{lk} \leftarrow \theta_0^g$, where θ_0^{lk} and θ_0^g denotes the model parameters of client k and the server at round 0, respectively.

Step 2 Client Update. Each client k trains the model on their private dataset \mathcal{D}_k with task objective $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_k; \theta_r^{lk})$. Then, upload the trained local model parameters θ_{r+1}^{lk} to the server.

Step 3 Server Execute. The server aggregates the received parameters by $\theta_{r+1}^g = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{N_k}{N_{sum}} \theta_{r+1}^{lk}$, where N_k denotes the number of data samples of client k , and N_{sum} is the total number of data samples across all clients. Then, the server distributes the new global model parameters to clients in the following round.

Iterate Steps 2 and 3 continuously until the final communication round. The global objective of the overall FL process is:

$$\arg \min_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta) = \sum_{k=1}^K \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_k; \theta). \quad (1)$$

3.2 Social Event Detection

Given a collection of social messages M , a social event detection algorithm aims to learn a model $f(M; \theta) = E$ from M , where θ is the model parameter, $E = \{e_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq |E|\}$ is the set of events (all labels).

3.3 Threat Model

Current federated paradigms are vulnerable to injection attacks [22]. In this work, the threat model is defined by the presence of malicious clients deliberately injecting backdoors within the training data (data poisoning attack) or uploading corrupted parameters to the server (model poisoning attack) to sabotage the FL process (e.g., performance, collaboration). Such attacks could have profound repercussions on the global model and threaten FL's reliability and accuracy. We analyze the robustness of the proposed framework against injection attacks in Section 6.2.

4 METHODOLOGY

This section presents the proposed framework, which consists of four key components: backbone model of SED, local aggregation, global aggregation, and global-local alignment. The overall framework is illustrated in Figure 1.

4.1 Backbone Social Event Detection Model


For FedSED, we apply GAT (Graph Attention Network) as our backbone SED model and map the text encoding of different languages into a shared vector space.

Social Message Graph Construction. As illustrated in Figure 1(c), attributes (including users, hashtags, and entities) are extracted from messages and connected with their corresponding messages, forming a heterogeneous social graph. Then, the heterogeneous social graph is projected onto a homogeneous social graph by retaining the original message nodes and adding edges connecting message nodes with shared attributes. In this graph, nodes represent messages, and edges signify the associations between messages.

Social Message Representation. The message embedding is obtained by concatenating the message's textual and temporal embedding. The temporal embedding corresponds to the message's timestamp in the OLE date format. Regarding textual embedding, accommodating the linguistic differences among clients is essential for FL. Consequently, all clients utilize the pre-trained language model, SBERT-based (Sentence-BERT [31]) multilingual model [32] to encode the textual content of messages. This implementation ensures that messages in diverse languages reside within a unified feature space.

4.2 Local Aggregation via Bayesian Optimization

We introduce a local aggregation mechanism, where clients learn a strategy that incorporates global knowledge while preserving their local characteristics rather than being directly overridden by the global model. The following optimization problem is formulated to describe the local aggregation process at the r -th communication


Figure 1: The overall framework of DAME.

round for client k :

$$\theta_{r+1}^k \leftarrow \tilde{\theta}_r^k = \lambda_r^k \theta_r^k + (1 - \lambda_r^k) \theta_r^g, \quad (2)$$

where θ_r^k and θ_r^g denote the local and global model parameters, respectively. $\lambda_r^k \in \mathbb{R}$ represents the aggregation weight (the weight of local preservation). Local aggregation strives to determine the optimal or near-optimal weight λ_r that allows clients to acquire the maximum amount of knowledge. The process of $\theta_{r+1}^k \leftarrow \tilde{\theta}_r^k$ is described in Section 4.4.

Bayesian Optimization (BO) algorithm [9] is a widely employed approach for optimizing functions with costly or challenging direct evaluations. We utilize BO for determining the aggregation weight λ_r for Local Aggregation (BOLA), as shown in Figure 1(d). BOLA is accomplished through a three-step BO procedure: first defining the *objective function*, then modeling it using a *Bayesian statistical model*, and finally determining the subsequent sampling position by an *acquisition function*.

4.2.1 Objective Function. The objective function for a single round of local aggregation can be formulated as follows (symbols denoting the r -th round and client k are omitted for simplicity):

$$\lambda = \arg \max_{\lambda \in [\alpha, 1]} f(\lambda \cdot \theta^l + (1 - \lambda) \cdot \theta^g, \mathcal{D}), \quad (3)$$

suggesting that the aggregation weight λ can be evaluated by observing the task-specific performance of the aggregated model on private datasets \mathcal{D} , e.g., NMI score for SED performance. λ is controlled by a hyperparameter $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ to reduce search space.

4.2.2 Bayesian statistical model. To model the object function (Equation 3), Gaussian Process regression (GPR) is applied. Specifically, for any finite set of points $\lambda = [\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n]$, the joint distribution of the corresponding function values $f(\lambda) = [f(\lambda_1), f(\lambda_2), \dots, f(\lambda_n)]$ follows a multivariate Gaussian distribution. Consequently, $f(\lambda)$ is characterized as a Gaussian process, denoted as:

$$f(\lambda) \sim \text{Normal}(\mu(\lambda), \kappa(\lambda, \lambda)), \quad (4)$$

where $\mu(\cdot)$ and $\kappa(\cdot)$ denote the mean and kernel functions, respectively. The learnable parameters in these functions can be estimated through maximum likelihood estimation.

Applying Bayes' rule, we obtain a joint probability distribution:

$$\begin{bmatrix} f(\lambda) \\ f(\lambda^*) \end{bmatrix} \sim \text{Normal} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \mu(\lambda) \\ \mu(\lambda^*) \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{K} & \mathcal{K}_* \\ \mathcal{K}_*^T & \mathcal{K}_{**} \end{bmatrix} \right), \quad (5)$$

where λ^* denotes the current optimal value of λ , which serves as the objective of the optimization process. $\mathcal{K} = \kappa(\lambda, \lambda)$, $\mathcal{K}_* = \kappa(\lambda, \lambda^*)$, and $\mathcal{K}_{**} = \kappa(\lambda^*, \lambda^*)$. Based on the joint distribution of $f(\lambda)$ and $f(\lambda^*)$, the conditional distribution is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} f(\lambda^*) | f(\lambda) &\sim \text{Normal}(\mu_*, \kappa_*), \\ \mu_* &= \mu(\lambda^*) + \mathcal{K}_*^T \mathcal{K}^{-1} (f(\lambda) - \mu(\lambda)), \\ \kappa_* &= \mathcal{K}_{**} - \mathcal{K}_*^T \mathcal{K}^{-1} \mathcal{K}_*. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Through the above equations, it is observed that the posterior distribution's statistical properties μ_* and κ_* are modeled using GPR on the prior distribution's mean function $\mu(\lambda)$ and covariance function $\kappa(\lambda, \lambda)$.

4.2.3 Acquisition function. The acquisition function is used to determine the next aggregation weight. In this work, we apply the

Expected Improvement (EI) [14, 26] criterion and the Upper Confidence Bound (UCB) [37] as acquisition functions.

Expected Improvement (EI). The calculation of the objective function $f(\lambda^* | \theta^l, \theta^g, \mathcal{D})$ necessitates processing the entire dataset \mathcal{D} , which makes obtaining the next weight's objective function value costly. Therefore, we calculate the expected improvement value of the next weight with the aim of maximizing it. EI is computed as:

$$\lambda_t = \arg \max_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathbb{E} f(\lambda) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{t-1}(\lambda), \sigma_{t-1}(\lambda, \lambda)) \left[\max(f(\lambda) - f_{t-1}^*, 0) \right], \quad (7)$$

where $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ denotes the expectation computed under the posterior distribution (Equation 6). λ_t denotes the optimal λ at the t -th step, and f_{t-1}^* denotes the optimal result during the first $t-1$ iterations.

Upper Confidence Bound (UCB). The UCB algorithm chooses the weight with the highest upper confidence bound for exploration, aiming to converge towards weights with higher actual reward values. It is defined as:

$$\lambda_t = \arg \max_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mu_{t-1}(\lambda) + \beta_t^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_{t-1}(\lambda). \quad (8)$$

Here, $\beta_t > 0$ is a learnable parameter derived from theoretical analysis that increases over time. $\sigma(\cdot)$ denotes the standard deviation function.

Given the intricate and non-convex nature of the objective function $f(\cdot)$ [10], we employ a mixed acquisition strategy of incorporating EI and UCB.

4.3 Global Aggregation via 2D Structural Entropy Minimization

Under the federated framework described in Section 3.1, personalized global aggregation aims to provide clients with maximum external information by producing global models that can benefit individual clients more. The server needs an aggregation strategy that considers client heterogeneity and individual characteristics to maximize external knowledge for all clients. To achieve this objective, we construct a client graph G_{client} based on clients' similarity. By minimizing the two-dimensional Structural Entropy (2DSE) of G_{client} , a graph capturing the internal similarities among clients is obtained, finalizing the Global Aggregation strategy for each client (SEGA). This process is demonstrated in Figure 1(b).

G_{client} is an undirected, fully connected, weighted graph consisting of K nodes corresponding to K clients, with their similarities as edge weights. The similarity between client models can be estimated by providing them with the same input and measuring the similarity between their respective outputs. On this basis, the server first generates a random graph G_{random} as input to all client models [11]. With graph pooling [15], the server obtains different client models' representations of the same graph, and the similarity between client u and v is calculated as:

$$\text{sim}(u, v) = \frac{\tilde{h}_u \cdot \tilde{h}_v}{\|\tilde{h}_u\| \|\tilde{h}_v\|}, \quad (9)$$

where \tilde{h}_u is the averaged output of all node embeddings in the input graph G_{random} and $\text{sim}(u, u) = 1$.

Upon constructing the client graph $G_{client} = (V, E)$, we minimize the 2DSE of the graph, resulting in a partitioned graph, which serves as the basis for the aggregation strategy. Suppose $\mathcal{P} = \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_L\}$ forms partitions of nodes in V , where $L \leq K$ is the total number of partitions, $V = \{c_1, \dots, c_K\}$ represents the set of client nodes, and X_l denotes the l -th partition that contains specific client node(s). The 2DSE of the client graph G_{client} is calculated as follows [3, 16]:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{P}}(G_{client}) &= \sum_{l=1}^L \mathcal{H}_{X_l}^{\mathcal{P}}(G_{client}) \\ &= - \sum_{l=1}^L \frac{\text{vol}(X_l)}{\text{vol}(G_{client})} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} \frac{d_i^{(l)}}{\text{vol}(X_l)} \log_2 \frac{d_i^{(l)}}{\text{vol}(X_l)} \\ &\quad - \sum_{l=1}^L \frac{g_l}{\text{vol}(G_{client})} \log_2 \frac{\text{vol}(X_l)}{\text{vol}(G_{client})}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where L denotes the number of total partitions, n_l denotes the number of client nodes in partition X_l , $d_i^{(l)}$ denotes the degree of the i -th client node in X_l , $\text{vol}(\cdot)$ computes the volume, and g_l denotes the sum of degrees of edges with one endpoint in partition X_l . The objective of the minimization process is to assign each client node c_k to a distinct partition X_j . Specifically, each client node is initially treated as an individual partition. New partitions are formed by iteratively merging different partitions. The changes in the 2DSE before and after merging are observed to identify the partitioning scheme that yields the lowest overall 2DSE and generates the desired partitions. We leverage the greedy strategy in [16] to minimize 2DSE. The difference in 2DSE before and after merging X_i and X_j into X_l is calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta SE &= SE_{new} - SE_{old} \\ &= H^{\mathcal{P}'}(G_{client}) - H^{\mathcal{P}}(G_{client}) \\ &= H_{X_l}^{\mathcal{P}'}(G_{client}) - H_{X_i}^{\mathcal{P}}(G_{client}) - H_{X_j}^{\mathcal{P}}(G_{client}), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where the calculation of $H_{X_l}^{\mathcal{P}'}(G_{client})$, $H_{X_i}^{\mathcal{P}}(G_{client})$, and $H_{X_j}^{\mathcal{P}}(G_{client})$ follows Equation 10, to compute the 2DSE of partition X_* under the partition \mathcal{P}^* . $H^{\mathcal{P}'}(G_{client})$ denotes the 2DSE of G_{client} obtained by merging X_i and X_j into X_l . Note that we always merge the two partitions with the smallest ΔSE until all $\Delta SE \geq 0$, thus obtaining the final partitions $\mathcal{P}_{final} = \{X_1, \dots, X_L\}$. Based on the final partition, the global aggregation strategy aims to aggregate information within each partition. Specifically, in the j -th partition X_j , all client nodes are connected by edges weighted according to their similarities. For all nodes in the partition, the global model θ_u^g for client u is obtained by:

$$\theta_u^g = \sum_{v \in N(u)} \alpha_{uv} \cdot \theta_v^l, \quad (12)$$

where $v \in N(u)$ represents the node within the same partition as u , θ_v^l is the local model of client v , and α_{uv} is the normalized weight between client u and client v , computed as:

$$\alpha_{uv} = \frac{\exp(\text{sim}(u, v))}{\sum_{v \in N(u)} \exp(\text{sim}(u, v))}. \quad (13)$$

4.4 Local Optimization

In Section 4.2, we introduced a local aggregation strategy that aggregates θ_r^g and θ_r^l into $\bar{\theta}_r^l$. This section describes the local optimization of $f(\bar{\theta}_r^l)$ with local data, maintaining the proximity between the local and the global models while preventing overfitting to the local data. The overall process is shown in Figure 1(e).

Step 1: Triplet Loss. Essentially, the objective of SED is to maximize similarity among messages belonging to the same event. Current approaches in SED [2] employ contrastive triplet loss to guide the optimization process. The triplet loss is computed as:

$$\mathcal{L}_t^* = \sum_{(m_i, m_{i+}, m_{i-}) \in \{T\}} \max\{D(h_{m_i}^*, h_{m_{i+}}^*) - D(h_{m_i}^*, h_{m_{i-}}^*) + a, 0\}, \quad (14)$$

where $(m_i, m_{i+}, m_{i-}) \in \{T\}$ is a set of constructed triples, m_i represents the anchor sample, m_{i+} represents the positive sample (i.e., a sample from the same class as the anchor sample), and m_{i-} represents the negative sample (i.e., a sample from a different class than the anchor sample). $D(\cdot)$ calculates the Euclidean distance between samples, h_{m_i} denotes the representation of message m_i , a is the margin parameter, and $*$ = $\{g, l\}$ denotes global or local.

Step 2: Global-Local Event-Centric Constraint. In FedSED, data among clients exhibits non-IID characteristics. This non-IID nature leads to “client-drift”, resulting in low model utility. Building on this observation, our study introduces an Event-Centric Constraint that aligns the Global and Local models closer (GLECC). Firstly, the client obtains message representations from global model $f(\theta_r^g)$ and aggregated model $f(\bar{\theta}_r^l)$. Then, we learn the event representation from $f(\theta_r^g)$ and $f(\bar{\theta}_r^l)$ based on the representations of the messages within each event:

$$\mathbf{h}_{e_i}^* = \frac{1}{N_{e_i}} \sum_{j=1}^{N_{e_i}} \{h_{m_j}^* | \forall m_j \in e_i\}, \quad (15)$$

where N_{e_i} is the total number of messages in event e_i , and $*$ = $\{g, l\}$ denotes global or local. Finally, GLECC is calculated with pairwise loss [33] as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{GLECC} = \frac{1}{N_E} \sum_{i=1}^{N_E} D(h_{e_i}^g, h_{e_i}^l), \quad (16)$$

where N_E denotes the number of events in the current batch. By pulling closer the representations of the same event in both global and local models, the server and client establish a mutual consensus on representation learning. This alignment mitigates the risk of overfitting to local data, preventing divergence from the global context, as well as the tendency to solely pursue the global objective while disregarding local characteristics.

Step 3: Overall Loss. The overall loss during the optimization process is calculated as follows:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_t^l + \alpha \mathcal{L}_{GLECC}, \quad (17)$$

where α is calculated as:

$$\alpha = \exp(\min\{(\mathcal{L}_t^l - \mathcal{L}_t^g), 0\}) \quad (18)$$

Table 1: Statistics of the datasets.

Dataset	# Messages	# Events	Avg. Length
English Twitter	68,841	503	27.03
French Twitter	64,516	257	51.77
Arabic Twitter	9,070	7	53.18
Japanese Twitter	60,530	189	38.66
German Twitter	90,091	179	36.76
Chinese Weibo	71,846	221	30.60

suggesting that the local model should only learn from the global model when the global model demonstrates better performance on local data. Note that, the global model $f(\theta_r^g)$ remains fixed throughout the whole process, training $f(\bar{\theta}_r^l)$ into $f(\theta_{r+1}^l)$.

5 EXPERIMENTAL SETUPS

This section introduces the experiment setups. We outline the following research questions (RQs) as guidelines for our experiments:

- **RQ1:** Compared to existing FL approaches, can the proposed DAME improve local performance?
- **RQ2:** Is the proposed framework robust (able to withstand injection attacks) in the setting of federated learning?
- **RQ3:** How does each component of the proposed framework contribute to the overall performance?
- **RQ4:** Regarding computation and communication, is the proposed framework efficient?

5.1 Datasets

We conducted experiments on 6 datasets, spanning 6 languages and 2 platforms. Table 1 presents the statistics of all datasets. The English Twitter [25] dataset, the French Twitter [23] dataset, and the Arabic Twitter [1] dataset are publicly available. We collect the rest of the datasets from Weibo in Chinese and Twitter in Japanese and German. First, we extracted key events from Wikipedia¹ pages in multiple languages for 2018. Subsequently, we retrieved relevant posts from Twitter or Weibo using event keywords and crawled them to construct the datasets. The events listed on Wikipedia pages in different languages are customized according to users’ preferences in that language, making the obtained dataset closely resemble real-world distributions.

5.2 Federated Setting

Prior works [20, 44] often partition a single dataset into multiple clients to mimic the federated setting. However, such practices fail to capture the non-IID nature of real-world data. This study breaks this cycle by treating each dataset as an independent client in the experiments. This enables us to replicate the complexities of real-world data distribution across platforms more accurately. By preserving the inherent non-IID characteristics of the data, we aim to enhance the fidelity of our federated learning experiments and provide insights that are more applicable to practical scenarios. In our experiments, we utilize a setup consisting of one server and six clients, each with social message data in distinct languages.

¹https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Portal:Current_events

5.3 Baselines

In addition to **Local** training without parameter sharing, we compare DAME with two categories of FL methods in the task of SED: (1) *Classic FL methods*: **FedAvg** [24] aggregates a weighted global model for all clients. **FedProx** [18] introduce regularization to alleviate disparities between the global and local models. (2) *Personalized FL methods*: **Per-FedAvg** [8] fine-tunes the global model on the client side to achieve personalization. In **Ditto** [17], each client learns an additional personalized model by incorporating a proximal term to extract information from the updated global model. **SFL** [4] constructs a client graph on the server and aggregates personalized models for each client via structural information. In **APPLE** [21], clients have access to all other clients' models and aggregates locally. **FedALA** [47] dynamically aggregates the global and local parameters at a fine-grained level based on the local objective.

5.4 Implementation Details

The experiments are implemented using the PyTorch framework and run on a machine with eight NVIDIA Tesla A100 (40G) GPUs. We randomly sample 70%, 20%, and 10% for training, testing, and validation as common studies on SED [2, 33]. For all methods, we employ the SED model in Section 4.1 as the backbone model. The backbone model consists of two layers of GAT, where each node in the batch aggregates messages from 800 direct neighbors and 100 one-hop neighbors. We set the mini-batch size to 2000, the learning rate to be $1e-3$, the margin for the contrastive triplet loss to 3, and employed the Adam optimizer. During the FL process, we perform 50 communication rounds, and each client conducts local training for 1 epoch, a compromise value across all baselines [4, 47].

The baseline methods are implemented based on open-source implementations on Github²³. For SFL, the client-wise relation graph is constructed based on the distances between model parameters using Euclidean distance. It is observed that FedALA failed to converge and entered a state of deadlock after the initial communication round. Therefore, we set a local patience of 10 for FedALA. We set the number of epochs for local training to 50.

For the robustness analysis, we conducted injection attacks involving model poisoning⁴ and data poisoning⁵ following [49] and [30], respectively.

All methods utilize k-means clustering. All experiments are repeated 5 times to mitigate the uncertainty of deep learning methods. We report the average value and standard deviation of the 5 repetitions. All implementations are available at <https://github.com/XiaoyanWork/DAME>.

5.5 Evaluation Metric

Technically, SED involves learning representations of social messages and clustering them into specific events. We evaluate the performance of all methods using three commonly used metrics for clustering tasks: Normalized Mutual Information (**NMI**) [7], Adjusted Mutual Information (**AMI**) [42], and Adjusted Rand Index (**ARI**) [42]. These metrics quantify the similarity between the

detected and ground truth clusters. A higher score of these metrics indicates better message representation.

6 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

6.1 RQ1: Federated Performance

This section investigates the performance of SED with various FL systems. The result is demonstrated in Table 2. The results show that DAME has outperformed all baseline methods on all metrics for each client dataset. Especially on the Arabic dataset, which suffers from limited data samples, DAME surpasses the baseline methods by at least 0.16, 0.17, and 0.16 regarding NMI, AMI, and ARI, respectively. This observation indicates that DAME has the potential to integrate most external knowledge from other clients, thereby promoting local performance to the greatest extent. It is observed that compared to local training, DAME achieves an average gain of 0.07, 0.09, and 0.14 in NMI, AMI, and ARI, respectively, surpassing all FL baseline methods. These results highlight that the proposed framework meets the objective of FedSED, which is to enhance the performance of individual clients and benefit all clients involved. Moreover, in comparison to the pFL methods, the results reveal the following: (1) When comparing methods that directly override the local model with the global model (SFL, PerFedAvg, Ditto), these methods encounter challenges in achieving satisfactory local performance. This is because, in each communication round, training is perceived as starting from scratch on the client side, initialized with the global parameters. In the case of PerFedAvg, fine-tuning on the client side with local data necessitates an additional training round after the FL process. However, during local fine-tuning, there is a risk of catastrophic forgetting, whereby the learned information from the global model can be lost. As for SFL, which aggregates the global model using structural information on the server side, does not significantly contribute to local performance improvement. This is because the objective is to personalize the model with local data, and a model that integrates the majority of external knowledge and overrides the local model disregards the importance of local characteristics, which are crucial factors in personalization. Consequently, SFL does not surpass local training in most cases. (2) When comparing DAME with methods that locally aggregate models (FedALA and APPLE), it is observed that, for APPLE, exposing each client to other clients' local models does not necessarily lead to improved local performance. This is because clients cannot accurately determine which models are useful or possess similar distributions to their own. As for FedALA, the performance is relatively satisfactory due to its parameter-level aggregation, which aids in identifying relevant knowledge within the global model. However, FedALA's approach of dispatching the global model based on weighted averages of data samples does not provide clients with the most advantageous information they require. In contrast, our proposed framework addresses this limitation by considering client similarity during the global aggregation process. This allows the server to dispatch an aggregated global model better aligned with each client's specific needs. To sum up, the proposed dual aggregation mechanism significantly enhances the performance of local training. This is achieved by considering the local characteristics and providing clients with the knowledge

²<https://github.com/dawenzi098/SFL-Structural-Federated-Learning>


³<https://github.com/zs2847037826zs/PFL-Non-IID/tree/master>

⁴<https://github.com/RingBDStack/KPGNN>

⁵<https://github.com/thunlp/HiddenKiller>

Table 2: Results for DAME (in orange background) comparing with all baseline methods. The best result is marked in bold.

Clients	English Twitter			French Twitter			Arabic Twitter			Japanese Twitter		
Metrics	NMI	AMI	ARI	NMI	AMI	ARI	NMI	AMI	ARI	NMI	AMI	ARI
Local	.69 ± .00	.52 ± .00	.13 ± .00	.69 ± .00	.62 ± .00	.15 ± .00	.55 ± .00	.55 ± .00	.50 ± .00	.60 ± .00	.50 ± .00	.11 ± .01
FedAvg	.73 ± .00	.58 ± .00	.20 ± .01	.74 ± .00	.68 ± .00	.21 ± .01	.64 ± .00	.64 ± .00	.58 ± .00	.64 ± .00	.56 ± .00	.18 ± .01
FedProx	.71 ± .01	.55 ± .01	.16 ± .02	.70 ± .01	.64 ± .01	.17 ± .00	.59 ± .01	.59 ± .01	.54 ± .02	.62 ± .00	.53 ± .00	.14 ± .01
Per-FedAvg	.72 ± .00	.56 ± .00	.17 ± .01	.70 ± .00	.64 ± .00	.18 ± .01	.62 ± .01	.62 ± .00	.57 ± .00	.62 ± .00	.53 ± .00	.15 ± .01
Ditto	.73 ± .00	.58 ± .00	.20 ± .01	.73 ± .00	.68 ± .00	.21 ± .01	.63 ± .02	.62 ± .02	.55 ± .02	.64 ± .00	.56 ± .00	.18 ± .01
SFL	.69 ± .00	.52 ± .00	.12 ± .00	.69 ± .00	.62 ± .00	.15 ± .00	.56 ± .00	.56 ± .00	.50 ± .01	.60 ± .00	.50 ± .00	.11 ± .00
APPLE	.71 ± .00	.55 ± .00	.16 ± .01	.70 ± .00	.63 ± .00	.16 ± .00	.70 ± .02	.69 ± .01	.73 ± .01	.61 ± .01	.52 ± .03	.12 ± .00
FedALA	.74 ± .00	.59 ± .00	.21 ± .00	.74 ± .00	.69 ± .00	.22 ± .00	.63 ± .00	.63 ± .00	.57 ± .00	.65 ± .00	.56 ± .00	.20 ± .01
DAME (Ours)	.75 ± .00	.61 ± .00	.21 ± .00	.76 ± .00	.70 ± .00	.23 ± .02	.86 ± .00	.86 ± .00	.89 ± .00	.67 ± .00	.59 ± .00	.25 ± .01
promotion	↑.01	↑.02	↑.01	↑.02	↑.01	↑.01	↑.16	↑.17	↑.16	↑.02	↑.03	↑.05
Clients	German Twitter			Chinese Weibo			Average on all clients			Avg. Gain (compare to Local)		
Metrics	NMI	AMI	ARI	NMI	AMI	ARI	NMI	AMI	ARI	NMI	AMI	ARI
Local	.41 ± .00	.32 ± .00	.04 ± .00	.47 ± .00	.34 ± .00	.05 ± .00	.57	.48	.16	-	-	-
FedAvg	.46 ± .00	.39 ± .01	.08 ± .01	.53 ± .00	.43 ± .00	.11 ± .00	.62	.55	.23	.04	.06	.07
FedProx	.43 ± .00	.35 ± .00	.06 ± .00	.48 ± .01	.37 ± .00	.07 ± .00	.59	.51	.19	.02	.03	.03
Per-FedAvg	.44 ± .00	.36 ± .00	.06 ± .00	.49 ± .00	.38 ± .00	.08 ± .01	.60	.51	.20	.02	.03	.04
Ditto	.46 ± .00	.39 ± .00	.08 ± .00	.53 ± .00	.43 ± .00	.11 ± .01	.62	.54	.22	.04	.06	.07
SFL	.41 ± .00	.32 ± .00	.04 ± .00	.47 ± .00	.35 ± .00	.05 ± .00	.57	.48	.16	.00	.00	.00
APPLE	.43 ± .01	.35 ± .01	.06 ± .00	.48 ± .00	.36 ± .00	.06 ± .00	.61	.52	.22	.01	.02	.01
FedALA	.46 ± .00	.39 ± .00	.08 ± .00	.53 ± .00	.43 ± .00	.12 ± .01	.63	.55	.23	.05	.06	.09
DAME (Ours)	.48 ± .00	.40 ± .00	.09 ± .00	.56 ± .00	.46 ± .00	.16 ± .01	.68	.60	.30	.07	.09	.14
promotion	↑.02	↑.01	↑.01	↑.03	↑.03	↑.04	↑.05	↑.05	↑.07	↑.02	↑.03	↑.05

**Figure 2: The results of ablation study on all datasets.****Table 3: Results of injection attack towards DAME.**

	Clean	Model Poisoning	Data Poisoning
French Twitter	.76 ± .00	.75 ± .00	.75 ± .00
Arabic Twitter	.86 ± .00	.85 ± .07	.85 ± .00
Japanese Twitter	.67 ± .00	.67 ± .00	.67 ± .00
German Twitter	.48 ± .00	.47 ± .00	.45 ± .00
Chinese Weibo	.56 ± .00	.55 ± .02	.55 ± .00
Average	.69	.66	.65

they require the most. The dual aggregation mechanism is crucial in improving local performance to a paramount extent.

6.2 RQ2: Robustness Analysis

To evaluate DAME’s robustness, we investigate its resistance to two types of attacks: model poisoning attacks and data poisoning attacks. In both attacks, the malicious client possesses the English dataset and aims to compromise the FL process. In the model poisoning attack, the client uploads manipulated parameters to the server [49], resulting in a model with no practical utility. In the

data poisoning attack, the client injects backdoors into its own data [30] and trains a local model using the poisoned data. Consequently, the injected backdoor affects the model parameters and corrupts the global model. In traditional settings, the server integrates all received models, including the poisoned model, without differentiation, which decreases the accuracy of the global model. Moreover, this corrupted global model is dispatched to individual clients, overriding their local models and compromising their local training. However, the proposed dual mechanism has advantages against such attacks. With BOLA, clients can determine the proportion of the dispatched global model that should be integrated into their local training. This enables them to avoid incorporating potentially poisoned parameters. Additionally, SEGA, implemented on the server side, leverages the client-uploaded models to compute the similarity between clients’ models. This similarity calculation enables the server to develop a dispatching strategy, ensuring that models containing poison parameters are not distributed to clients. From the result in Table 3, it is evident that the performance of the DAME on all datasets demonstrates a negligible perturbation in performance. This observation indicates that DAME is resilient to

injection attacks in FL. Regarding injection attacks, DAME has the capability to disregard model injection, as it selectively focuses on relevant information that is essential for clients (while disregarding irrelevant noise).

6.3 RQ3: Analysis on DAME

This section presents an ablation study to identify the contribution of the components in DAME and analyze the effect of the modules.

The results of the ablation study are presented in Figure 2. The findings demonstrate that all proposed components enhance the performance of FedSED. Specifically, BOLA exhibits a substantial influence on performance improvement. This indicates that in pFL settings, it is crucial to empower clients to determine how much they incorporate knowledge from the global model, while preserving their individual characteristics during training. Moreover, SEGA significantly improves performance and surpasses the baseline SFL, aggregating the global model based on structural information within a client graph. This finding suggests that our approach, which leverages client similarity and minimizes the 2DSE of the client graph for global aggregation, effectively identifies pertinent knowledge that boosts local performance. Lastly, GLECC also plays a role in improving overall performance. This implies that aligning the global and local representations of the same event is advantageous for achieving a consensus between the global and local models, thereby mitigating the inherent heterogeneity.

We analyze the Bayesian search space in the last communication round of the FL process and present the visualization of BOLA in Figure 3. For all clients, DAME achieves the best performance. For French, German, and Japanese Twitter, DAME without BOLA




Figure 3: The NMI score corresponds to the aggregation weight within the BOLA search space. The overall search space is delineated by the two black lines, while the blue box represents 50% of the NMI scores associated with the search space, and the yellow line denotes the midpoint. The red dotted horizontal line illustrates the performance of DAME without BOLA.

achieves performance above the first quartile of the weight distribution in the search space of the Bayesian optimization algorithm but consistently lags behind the upper bound. This observation highlights the significant benefits of utilizing BOLA to search for local aggregation weights, thereby enhancing local performance.

6.4 RQ4: Overhead Analysis

Here, we delve into the crucial factors in FL, including the convergence, computation and communication overhead of the proposed framework and baseline methods.

Convergence As depicted in Figure 4, the proposed DAME demonstrates stable convergence. This stability can be attributed to DAME’s tailored design for the task of SED, which focuses on learning message representations and performing clustering. DAME stands out as the first work to consider the characteristics of the SED task, unlike baseline methods, which serve as a general framework for FL. This task-specific approach allows DAME to better suit the requirements of SED, enhancing its performance and convergence compared to the less specialized FL baselines.

Computation Overhead The second column in Table 4 presents the time consumption of all methods during the entire training process. It is observed that DAME without the GLECC module has the shortest time for training in the FL setting, shorter than DAME, since it omits the process of obtaining the global and local event representation. Moreover, Per-FedAvg and Ditto exhibit the longest training times, surpassing DAME’s duration by 1.5 times. This can be attributed to their approaches of local fine-tuning or training additional local models, which significantly prolongs the training process. However, contrasting the results in Table 2, these methods do not demonstrate substantial performance improvements. In this regard, DAME demonstrates success in such scenarios by achieving notable task performance while maintaining reasonable computational overhead.

Communication Overhead The communication overhead is shown in the last column in Table 4. In most scenarios, the methods adhere to the centralized FL setting, where a single server communicates with all clients, leading to a consistent communication overhead across the same parameter scales. However, APPLE adopts a decentralized FL setting, where all clients interact with each other to determine a local aggregation strategy. This significantly increases the communication overhead as the number of clients grows. In our experiment, where $K = 6$, the communication overhead of APPLE is 3.5 times higher compared to other methods.

7 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we initiate the study on FedSED and propose DAME, a personalized federated framework for social event detection that incorporates two aggregation strategies. In DAME, the server provides clients with maximum external knowledge with a structural entropy-based global aggregation strategy; clients leverage received knowledge and retain local characteristics to the greatest extent by a Bayesian optimization-based local aggregation strategy. Moreover, the local optimization process is guided by an event-centric constraint that mitigates the issues arising from heterogeneity, while preventing overfitting to the local data. Extensive experiments on six SED datasets across six languages and two platforms




Figure 4: The convergence plots of all methods.

Table 4: Computation and communication overhead of all methods with 50 communication rounds and 1 local epoch. Σ denotes the scale of model parameters, K represent the number of clients. For local training, we report the sum of training time across all datasets.

	Computation		Communication
	(Total time)	(Time/round)	(Param./round)
Local	1402 min	-	-
FedAvg	1522 min	30 min	$2 * \Sigma$
FedProx	1902 min	38 min	$2 * \Sigma$
Per-FedAvg	2945 min	59 min	$2 * \Sigma$
Ditto	2890 min	58 min	$2 * \Sigma$
SFL	1555 min	31 min	$2 * \Sigma$
APPLE	1568 min	31 min	$(1 + K) * \Sigma$
FedALA	2725 min	55 min	$2 * \Sigma$
DAME	1896 min	38 min	$2 * \Sigma$
w/o BOLA	1688 min	33 min	$2 * \Sigma$
w/o SEGA	1612 min	32 min	$2 * \Sigma$
w/o GLECC	1530 min	31 min	$2 * \Sigma$

have demonstrated the effectiveness of DAME. Further robustness analyses have shown that DAME is resistant to federated injection attacks.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is supported by the National Key Research and Development Program of China (No.2023YFF0905302), and the Yunnan Provincial Major Science and Technology Special Plan Projects (No.202302AD080003).

REFERENCES

- [1] Alaa Alharbi and Mark Lee. 2021. Kawarith: an Arabic Twitter corpus for crisis events. In *Proceedings of the Sixth Arabic Natural Language Processing Workshop*. 42–52.
- [2] Yuwei Cao, Hao Peng, Jia Wu, Yingdong Dou, Jianxin Li, and Philip S. Yu. 2021. Knowledge-preserving incremental social event detection via heterogeneous gms. In *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021*. 3383–3395.
- [3] Yuwei Cao, Hao Peng, Zhengtao Yu, and S Yu Philip. 2024. Hierarchical and incremental structural entropy minimization for unsupervised social event detection. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 38. 8255–8264.
- [4] F Chen, G Long, Z Wu, T Zhou, and J Jiang. 2022. Personalized Federated Learning With a Graph. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence, 1–8.
- [5] Liam Collins, Hamed Hassani, Aryan Mokhtari, and Sanjay Shakkottai. 2021. Exploiting shared representations for personalized federated learning. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2089–2099.
- [6] Wanqiu Cui, Junping Du, Dawei Wang, Feifei Kou, and Zhe Xue. 2021. MVGAN: Multi-view graph attention network for social event detection. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)* 12, 3 (2021), 1–24.
- [7] Pablo A Estévez, Michel Tesmer, Claudio A Perez, and Jacek M Zurada. 2009. Normalized mutual information feature selection. *IEEE Transactions on neural networks* 20, 2 (2009), 189–201.
- [8] Alireza Fallah, Aryan Mokhtari, and Asuman Ozdaglar. 2020. Personalized federated learning with theoretical guarantees: A model-agnostic meta-learning approach. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 3557–3568.
- [9] Peter I Frazier. 2018. A tutorial on Bayesian optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.02811* (2018), 1–22.
- [10] Matthew Hoffman, Eric Brochu, Nando De Freitas, et al. 2011. Portfolio Allocation for Bayesian Optimization. In *UAI* 327–336.
- [11] Paul W Holland, Kathryn Blackmond Laskey, and Samuel Leinhardt. 1983. Stochastic blockmodels: First steps. *Social networks* 5, 2 (1983), 109–137.
- [12] Wenke Huang, Guancheng Wan, Mang Ye, and Bo Du. 2023. Federated graph semantic and structural learning. In *Proc. Int. Joint Conf. Artif. Intell.* 3830–3838.
- [13] Yutao Huang, Lingyang Chu, Zirui Zhou, Lanjun Wang, Jiangchuan Liu, Jian Pei, and Yong Zhang. 2021. Personalized cross-silo federated learning on non-iid data. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 35. 7865–7873.
- [14] Donald R Jones, Matthias Schonlau, and William J Welch. 1998. Efficient global optimization of expensive black-box functions. *Journal of Global optimization* 13 (1998), 455–492.
- [15] Junhyun Lee, Inyeop Lee, and Jaewoo Kang. 2019. Self-attention graph pooling. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 3734–3743.
- [16] Angsheng Li and Yicheng Pan. 2016. Structural information and dynamical complexity of networks. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 62, 6 (2016), 3290–3339.
- [17] Tian Li, Shengyuan Hu, Ahmad Beirami, and Virginia Smith. 2021. Ditto: Fair and robust federated learning through personalization. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 6357–6368.
- [18] Tian Li, Anit Kumar Sahu, Manzil Zaheer, Maziar Sanjabi, Ameet Talwalkar, and Virginia Smith. 2020. Federated optimization in heterogeneous networks. *Proceedings of Machine learning and systems* 2 (2020), 429–450.
- [19] Xin-Chun Li, De-Chuan Zhan, Yunfeng Shao, Bingshuai Li, and Shaoming Song. 2021. Fedph: Federated personalization with inherited private models. In *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*. Springer, 587–602.
- [20] Yi Liu, Xiaohan Bi, Lei Li, Sishuo Chen, Wenkai Yang, and Xu Sun. 2023. Communication Efficient Federated Learning for Multilingual Neural Machine Translation with Adapter. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*. 5315–5328.
- [21] Jun Luo and Shandong Wu. 2022. Adapt to Adaptation: Learning Personalization for Cross-Silo Federated Learning. In *IJCAI: proceedings of the conference*, Vol. 2022. 2166–2173.
- [22] Lingjuan Lyu, Han Yu, Xingjun Ma, Chen Chen, Lichao Sun, Jun Zhao, Qiang Yang, and Philip S. Yu. 2022. Privacy and robustness in federated learning: Attacks and defenses. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems* (2022), 1–21.
- [23] Béatrice Mazoyer, Julia Cagé, Nicolas Hervé, and Céline Hudelot. 2020. A french corpus for event detection on twitter. (2020), 1–8.
- [24] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Agüera y Arcas. 2017. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*. PMLR, 1273–1282.
- [25] Andrew J McMin, Yashar Moshfeghi, and Joemon M Jose. 2013. Building a large-scale corpus for evaluating event detection on twitter. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM international conference on Information & Knowledge Management*. 409–418.
- [26] Jonas Mockus. 1974. On Bayesian methods for seeking the extremum. In *Proceedings of the IFIP Technical Conference*. 400–404.

- [27] Hao Peng, Jianxin Li, Qiran Gong, Yangqiu Song, Yuanxing Ning, Kunfeng Lai, and Philip S. Yu. 2019. Fine-grained event categorization with heterogeneous graph convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. 3238–3245.
- [28] Hao Peng, Jianxin Li, Yangqiu Song, Renyu Yang, Rajiv Ranjan, Philip S. Yu, and Lifang He. 2021. Streaming social event detection and evolution discovery in heterogeneous information networks. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)* 15, 5 (2021), 1–33.
- [29] Hao Peng, Ruitong Zhang, Shaoning Li, Yuwei Cao, Shirui Pan, and Philip S. Yu. 2022. Reinforced, incremental and cross-lingual event detection from social messages. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 45, 1 (2022), 980–998.
- [30] Fanchao Qi, Yangyi Chen, Mukai Li, Yuan Yao, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2021. ONION: A Simple and Effective Defense Against Textual Backdoor Attacks. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 9558–9566.
- [31] Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. Sentence-BERT: Sentence Embeddings using Siamese BERT-Networks. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*. 3982–3992.
- [32] Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2020. Making Monolingual Sentence Embeddings Multilingual using Knowledge Distillation. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*. 4512–4525.
- [33] Jiaqian Ren, Lei Jiang, Hao Peng, Yuwei Cao, Jia Wu, Philip S. Yu, and Lifang He. 2022. From known to unknown: quality-aware self-improving graph neural network for open set social event detection. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*. 1696–1705.
- [34] Jiaqian Ren, Lei Jiang, Hao Peng, Lingjuan Lyu, Zhiwei Liu, Chaochao Chen, Jia Wu, Xu Bai, and Philip S Yu. 2022. Cross-network social user embedding with hybrid differential privacy guarantees. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM international conference on information & knowledge management*. 1685–1695.
- [35] Jiaqian Ren, Hao Peng, Lei Jiang, Zhiwei Liu, Jia Wu, Zhengtao Yu, and Philip S. Yu. 2023. Uncertainty-guided Boundary Learning for Imbalanced Social Event Detection. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* (2023), 1–14.
- [36] Jiaqian Ren, Hao Peng, Lei Jiang, Jia Wu, Yongxin Tong, Lihong Wang, Xu Bai, Bo Wang, and Qiang Yang. 2021. Transferring knowledge distillation for multilingual social event detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.03084* (2021), 1–31.
- [37] N SRINIVAS. 2010. Gaussian process optimization in the bandit setting: No regret and experimental design. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning, 2010*. 1–17.
- [38] Dianbo Sui, Yubo Chen, Jun Zhao, Yantao Jia, Yuantao Xie, and Weijian Sun. 2020. Feded: Federated learning via ensemble distillation for medical relation extraction. In *Proceedings of the 2020 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (EMNLP)*. 2118–2128.
- [39] Benyuan Sun, Hongxing Huo, Yi Yang, and Bo Bai. 2021. Partialfed: Cross-domain personalized federated learning via partial initialization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), 23309–23320.
- [40] Canh T Dinh, Nguyen Tran, and Josh Nguyen. 2020. Personalized federated learning with moreau envelopes. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 21394–21405.
- [41] Alysa Ziyang Tan, Han Yu, Lizhen Cui, and Qiang Yang. 2022. Towards personalized federated learning. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* (2022), 1–17.
- [42] Nguyen Xuan Vinh, Julien Epps, and James Bailey. 2009. Information theoretic measures for clusterings comparison: is a correction for chance necessary?. In *Proceedings of the 26th annual international conference on machine learning*. 1073–1080.
- [43] Yifan Wei, Fangyu Lei, Yuanzhe Zhang, Jun Zhao, and Kang Liu. 2023. Multi-view graph representation learning for answering hybrid numerical reasoning question. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.03458* (2023).
- [44] Yingguang Yang, Renyu Yang, Hao Peng, Yangyang Li, Tong Li, Yong Liao, and Pengyuan Zhou. 2023. FedACK: Federated adversarial contrastive knowledge distillation for cross-lingual and cross-model social bot detection. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023*. 1314–1323.
- [45] Xiaoyan Yu, Tongxu Luo, Yifan Wei, Fangyu Lei, Yiming Huang, Peng Hao, and Liehuang Zhu. 2024. Neeko: Leveraging Dynamic LoRA for Efficient Multi-Character Role-Playing Agent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13717* (2024).
- [46] Chen Zhang, Yu Xie, Hang Bai, Bin Yu, Weihong Li, and Yuan Gao. 2021. A survey on federated learning. *Knowledge-Based Systems* 216 (2021), 106775.
- [47] Jianqing Zhang, Yang Hua, Hao Wang, Tao Song, Zhengui Xue, Ruhui Ma, and Haibing Guan. 2023. Fedala: Adaptive local aggregation for personalized federated learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 37. 11237–11244.
- [48] Michael Zhang, Karan Sapra, Sanja Fidler, Serena Yeung, and Jose M Alvarez. 2020. Personalized Federated Learning with First Order Model Optimization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. 1–17.
- [49] Zaixi Zhang, Xiaoyu Cao, Jinyuan Jia, and Neil Zhenqiang Gong. 2022. Fldetector: Defending federated learning against model poisoning attacks via detecting malicious clients. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 2545–2555.
- [50] Bo Zhao, Konda Reddy Mopuri, and Hakan Bilen. 2020. idlg: Improved deep leakage from gradients. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.02610* (2020).
- [51] Ligeng Zhu, Zhijian Liu, and Song Han. 2019. Deep leakage from gradients. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32 (2019), 1–11.