

# FedTLU: Federated Learning with Targeted Layer Updates

Jong-Ik Park

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, USA  
jongikp@andrew.cmu.edu

Carlee Joe-Wong

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, USA  
cjoewong@andrew.cmu.edu

**Abstract**—Federated learning (FL) addresses privacy concerns in language modeling by enabling multiple clients to contribute to training language models. However, non-IID (identically and independently distributed) data across clients often limits FL’s performance. This issue is especially challenging during model fine-tuning, as noise due to variations in clients’ data distributions can harm model convergence near the optimum. This paper proposes a targeted layer update strategy for fine-tuning in FL. Instead of randomly updating layers of the language model, as often done in practice, we use a scoring mechanism to identify and update the most critical layers, avoiding excessively noisy or even poisoned updates by freezing the parameters in other layers. We show in extensive experiments that our method improves convergence and performance in non-IID settings, offering a more efficient approach to fine-tuning federated language models.

**Index Terms**—Federated Learning, Fine-Tuning, Language Models, Targeted Layer Updates

## I. INTRODUCTION

Language modeling has driven major application advancements in natural language processing like conversational agents and machine translation [1]–[4]. However, the widespread use of language data raises privacy concerns, as language data from individuals is personal and prone to exploitation for malicious purposes [4]–[6].

Federated Learning (FL) addresses these concerns by training a *global model* without centralizing user data [7]–[9]. However, one of the core challenges in FL is developing a global model that performs well across clients, whose data can vary significantly in size and distribution [10], [11]. This non-IID nature of client data often causes federated models to underperform compared to centralized models [10], [12], [13]. Language modeling has these issues because clients may exhibit distinct linguistic patterns, content, and topics, further complicating model convergence and generalization [14]–[16]. Toward the end of the training, as the model nears a stationary point, stochastic local updates—amplified by data heterogeneity—create variability that makes it difficult to maintain global model consistency [17], [18]. This variability slows convergence and prevents the global model from reaching optimal performance [17]–[20].

While local fine-tuning helps models adapt to client-specific data [21], [22], fine-tuning only local models can lead to divergence, as each client’s model becomes too specialized to its local data and tends to overfit, reducing the global model’s overall effectiveness across all clients [23]. Moreover, individual clients often lack enough data for effective independent fine-tuning [24], [25]. A well-optimized global model, updated across clients, provides a stronger starting point [26]. Once aligned, local fine-tuning can enhance specific client tasks without diverging from the global objective. Therefore, FL requires a well-generalized global model to meet the collective needs of all participants. Therefore, the primary focus should be on fine-tuning the global model to ensure consistency across clients, with local tuning as an optional step for personalization.

This work aims to improve global model performance in FL. Uniformly updating all layers during aggregation, especially in the final

stages, can amplify noise from certain clients, degrading performance and hindering convergence [27], [28]. Toward the end of training, as the model nears a stationary point and gradients shrink, noisy or non-representative updates from certain clients can disproportionately affect the global model [8].

Therefore, we can mitigate the impact of such noisy updates by selectively updating only the most important parameter sets, such as layers, which are likely to significantly reduce global loss. However, the key challenge in this approach is determining which layers to update. Clients do not know the updates made by other clients and have limited information about the criticality of each layer. Therefore, server-side coordination is needed to aggregate client information and determine the most critical layers to update while considering the heterogeneous data distributions across clients.

In this context, we propose Federated Learning with Targeted Layer Updates (FedTLU). FedTLU selectively identifies and updates only the most critical layers to reduce global loss on the server side. By focusing on these key layers, FedTLU enables more efficient training, faster convergence, and improved global model performance across diverse clients. In this work, we make three primary **contributions**:

- We propose a novel *server-side scoring mechanism* that identifies critical layers to update without relying on client-side knowledge.
- FedTLU is designed to be *robust against noisy updates*, even in environments with non-representative or noisy client data.
- *FedTLU consistently outperforms random and last-layer updates*, achieving better test performance up to 7.86% globally and up to 8.27% locally, particularly during the noisy fine-tuning phase.

We review related work in the ‘Related Work’ section, present the FedTLU algorithm in ‘Methodology,’ and offer theoretical support in ‘Theoretical Analysis.’ The ‘Experimental Evaluation’ validates our approach, and we summarize our findings in the ‘Conclusion.’

## II. RELATED WORK

In both centralized learning (CL) and FL, fine-tuning is widely recognized for improving model performance, particularly during the final stages of training. In CL, where all data is stored on a central server, fine-tuning often involves updating only a small subset of model parameters, such as layers near the output nodes [29], or even selecting layers randomly for updating [30]–[32]. This selective approach improves convergence and reduces computational costs [33], [34]. Refining a subset of layers allows the model to adjust task-specific representations while leveraging previously learned features [9], [35]. These layers also can be selected based on their importance, determined through explainable neural network techniques like sensitivity or criticality scoring that assess how vital certain parameters are for generalization [36], [37]. Such methods prioritize updates where they will have the most significant impact.

Similarly, fine-tuning a subset of layers in FL can benefit convergence. FL can theoretically mirror CL under certain conditions, par-

ticularly if there are enough communication rounds between clients and the central server [8], [38]. Thus, some fine-tuning techniques from CL can be adapted for FL scenarios [22], [39]. However, CL techniques for scoring layers are difficult to extend to FL: in FL, clients lack information about others' updates, and the server can only aggregate what is provided. As a result, simpler strategies like randomly selecting layers or updating the last few layers are often used [40]. However, fine-tuning only the last few layers is insufficient in non-IID settings, where data heterogeneity leads to highly varied learned representations [41]–[43]. This variability can hinder the global model's generalization ability, as the last layer represents drastically different outputs depending on each client's data. We therefore focus on updating the main body of the model.

We aim to update the most significant layers contributing to reducing global loss, where each layer's update is guided by the local gradient magnitudes and directions during local training, resulting in varied contributions from different layers [21], [27], [44]. Rather than random selection, we enhance model stability by selecting impactful layers. By targeting key layers that effectively reduce global loss, we can improve convergence, especially in language tasks, addressing the limitations of random or fixed-layer updates [45].

### III. METHODOLOGY

This section introduces FedTLU, a method for selecting layers to update during global aggregation in FL, particularly for fine-tuning language models with non-IID data. The goal is to efficiently update the most critical layers or blocks to improve model convergence and generalization, especially in the final training stages.

We assume the usual FL training framework, in which training proceeds iteratively and in each round  $t$ , clients first compute local model updates based on their local data. These updated model parameters are then sent to the server, which aggregates them to form the new global model with parameters  $W_{\text{aggre},i}^{(t+1)}$  in each layer  $i$ .

**Layer scoring:** To quantify the significance of each layer, we define a score for the weights  $W_i$  in each layer  $i$  as follows:

$$\text{Score}(W_i) = \frac{\|\Delta W_i\|}{\sqrt{n_i} \cdot \text{std}(\Delta W_i)},$$

where  $\|\Delta W_i\|$  is the  $L_2$  norm of the difference between the parameters before round  $t$ 's update ( $W_i^{(t)}$ ) and the aggregated parameters after the update  $W_{\text{aggre},i}^{(t+1)}$ ,  $n_i$  is the number of parameters in layer  $W_i$ ,  $\text{std}(\Delta W_i)$  is the standard deviation of the differences in parameters in the layer.

*a) Large Numerator ( $\|\Delta W_i\|$ ):* A large numerator indicates substantial changes between the current and aggregated parameters, suggesting that the layer is making a significant contribution to reducing the global loss [46].

*b) Small Denominator ( $\sqrt{n_i} \cdot \text{std}(\Delta W_i)$ ):* A small standard deviation  $\text{std}(\Delta W_i)$  reflects consistent parameter changes, indicating an effective gradient update. The factor  $\sqrt{n_i}$  normalizes by layer size, allowing for fair comparison across layers [44], [46].

**Training algorithm:** Modern deep neural networks, particularly language models, often consist of repeated blocks of layers with the same sequence of channel sizes [1], [3]. While individual layers may differ in parameters, repeated blocks typically have the same total parameter count. To leverage this structure, we group layers into blocks for comparison and updating, so that we can fairly compare blocks with similar roles. By using aggregated scores for these blocks, we account for gradient magnitude and consistency.

During each round of aggregation, the process begins by grouping blocks with the same number of parameters into sets, allowing for

**Algorithm 1** This algorithm presents the process of FedTLU. Number of clients  $K$ , learning rate  $\eta$ , number of global rounds  $T$  after pre-training  $T_0$ , number of selected blocks  $S$ , local epochs  $E$ , participation rate  $\mathcal{C}$

---

```

1: Input: Pre-trained global model  $W^{(T_0)}$ , participation rate  $\mathcal{C}$ 
2: Output: Final global model  $W^{(T)}$ 
3: for each round  $t = T_0, \dots, T$  do
4:   Server randomly selects  $\mathcal{C}K$  clients from  $K$  clients
5:   Server sends  $W^{(t)}$  to the selected clients
6:   for each client  $k \in \{\text{Selected Clients}\}$  in parallel do
7:      $W_k^{(t+1)} \leftarrow \text{LOCALUPDATE}(W^{(t)}, E, \eta)$ 
8:     Client  $k$  sends  $W_k^{(t+1)}$  to the server
9:   end for
10:   $W_{\text{aggre}}^{(t+1)} \leftarrow \text{AGGREGATION}(\{W_k^{(t+1)}\}_{k \in \{\text{Selected Clients}\}})$ 
11:  LayerScores  $\leftarrow \text{COMPUTELAYERSCORE}(W^{(t)}, W_{\text{aggre}}^{(t+1)})$ 
12:  BlockScores  $\leftarrow \text{COMPUTEBLOCKSCORE}(\text{LayerScores})$ 
13:  Group blocks by the sequence of parameters
14:  for each group  $G_i$  do
15:    SelBlocks  $\leftarrow \text{SELECTBLOCKS}(\text{BlockScores in } G_i, S)$ 
16:  end for
17:  Global model  $W^{(t+1)}$  is updated with SelBlocks from each
    group in  $W_{\text{aggre}}^{(t+1)}$ 
18: end for
19: function SELECTBLOCKS( $\{\text{Score}(B_i)\}, S$ )
20:   SortedB  $\leftarrow \text{Sort blocks by Score}(B_i)$ 
21:   SelectedB  $\leftarrow \text{Select the top } S \text{ blocks from SortedB}$ 
22:   return SelectedB
23: end function

```

---

structured comparison. For each block  $B_i$ , an aggregated score is computed by summing the scores of all layers within the block:

$$\text{Score}(B_i) = \sum_{j \in B_i} \text{Score}(W_j).$$

Algorithm 1 outlines the FedTLU process. In each global round (line 2), the server randomly selects a subset of clients based on the participation rate  $\mathcal{C}$  (line 3). Selected clients receive the global model  $W^{(t)}$  and perform local updates (line 6), then return their updated models to the server (line 7). The server aggregates these models (line 9) and computes a score for each layer based on the difference between current and aggregated parameters (line 10). Aggregation methods can vary, including FedAvg [7] or FedProx [8].

Block scores are computed by summing the scores of all layers within each block (line 11), and blocks are grouped by their parameter sequence for fair comparison (line 13). The top  $S$  blocks from each group are selected based on their scores (line 14), and the global model is updated with these blocks (line 16). This process repeats for  $T$  global rounds, focusing updates on the most important layers or blocks to improve convergence across heterogeneous clients.

### IV. THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

In this section, we theoretically analyze why updating only a few layers of the global model during aggregations can benefit FL.

#### A. Assumptions

We make the following assumptions in our analysis:

*a) Gradient Smoothness:* The gradients of the global loss function are Lipschitz continuous, implying that the global loss function

is smooth. Specifically, for the aggregated global model  $W$ , the loss function  $\mathcal{L}(W)$  is  $L$ -smooth, meaning:

$$\mathcal{L}(W') \leq \mathcal{L}(W) + \langle \nabla \mathcal{L}(W), W' - W \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|W' - W\|^2,$$

where  $L$  is the Lipschitz constant, and  $\nabla \mathcal{L}(W)$  is the gradient of the global loss function with respect to the model  $W$ .

b) *Effective Gradient in Subset  $W_S^{(t)}$* : We assume that the subset of layers  $W_S^{(t)}$  contains layers where the gradient most effectively reduces the loss. Specifically, we assume:

$$\|\nabla_{W_S^{(t)}} \mathcal{L}(W^{(t)})\|^2 \geq \|\nabla \mathcal{L}(W^{(t)})\|^2 - \delta,$$

where  $\delta$  is a positive constant. While smaller  $\delta$  values indicate better alignment with the full model's gradient, a larger  $\delta$  can be advantageous in noisy or complex scenarios, as perfect alignment may lead to updating every source of noise in the model.

c) *Client Participation and Data Distribution*: For simplicity, we assume full participation from all clients in every round of communication. Additionally, we assume that each client's local data distribution remains constant throughout the training process.

## B. Analysis of Gradient Descent Updates

We now compare the impact of updating all layers versus updating only a subset of layers during the global aggregation phase.

a) *Full Model Update*: When the entire model  $W$  is updated during the global aggregation phase, the update rule for each layer  $W_i$  at iteration  $t$  is

$$W_i^{(t+1)} = W_i^{(t)} - \eta \nabla_{W_i} \mathcal{L}(W^{(t)}),$$

where  $\nabla_{W_i} \mathcal{L}(W^{(t)}) = \sum_{k=1}^K p_k \nabla_{W_i} \mathcal{L}_k(W^{(t)})$ . The overall change in the global loss function due to this update is governed by the smoothness condition, which can be expressed as:

$$\mathcal{L}(W^{(t+1)}) - \mathcal{L}(W^{(t)}) \leq -\eta \|\nabla \mathcal{L}(W^{(t)})\|^2 + \frac{\eta^2 L}{2} \|\nabla \mathcal{L}(W^{(t)})\|^2.$$

where  $\eta$  is the learning rate,  $\|\nabla \mathcal{L}(W^{(t)})\|^2$  represents the squared  $L2$  norm of the global gradient  $\nabla \mathcal{L}(W^{(t)})$ ,  $L$  is the Lipschitz constant of the global loss function.

b) *Subset of Layers Update*: Now, we consider updating only a subset of layers,  $\mathcal{S}$ . We decompose the model  $W^{(t)}$  into two parts:

- $W_S^{(t)}$ : The subset of layers that are being updated.
- $W_{S^c}^{(t)}$ : The layers that are not being updated.

Thus, the full model can be expressed as  $W^{(t)} = (W_S^{(t)}, W_{S^c}^{(t)})$ , where  $S^c$  denotes the complement of  $\mathcal{S}$ . Since the update only affects  $W_S$ , the difference  $W^{(t+1)} - W^{(t)}$  simplifies to:  $(W_S^{(t+1)} - W_S^{(t)}, 0)$ . Substituting this into the smoothness condition:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(W^{(t+1)}) \leq & \mathcal{L}(W^{(t)}) + \langle \nabla \mathcal{L}(W^{(t)}), (W_S^{(t)} - W_S^{(t+1)}, 0) \rangle \\ & + \frac{L}{2} \|(W_S^{(t+1)} - W_S^{(t)}, 0)\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now, let's focus on the gradient  $\nabla \mathcal{L}(W^{(t)})$ . This gradient is with respect to the entire model  $W^{(t)}$ , which means it includes components for both  $W_S^{(t)}$  and  $W_{S^c}^{(t)}$ :

$$\langle \nabla \mathcal{L}(W^{(t)}), (W_S^{(t+1)} - W_S^{(t)}, 0) \rangle = \langle \nabla_{W_S^{(t)}} \mathcal{L}(W^{(t)}), W_S^{(t+1)} - W_S^{(t)} \rangle.$$

Here,  $\nabla_{W_S^{(t)}} \mathcal{L}(W^{(t)}) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(W^{(t)})}{\partial W_S^{(t)}}$  is the gradient of the loss function with respect to the subset  $W_S^{(t)}$ . Substituting this into the smoothness condition gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(W^{(t+1)}) - \mathcal{L}(W^{(t)}) \leq & \langle \nabla_{W_S^{(t)}} \mathcal{L}(W^{(t)}), W_S^{(t+1)} - W_S^{(t)} \rangle \\ & + \frac{L}{2} \|W_S^{(t+1)} - W_S^{(t)}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

## C. Theoretical Comparison: Full Model vs. Subset Updates

Assuming that the gradient over the subset  $W_S^{(t)}$  is not aligned with the full gradient, i.e., large  $\delta$ . The loss reduction is defined as:

$$\Delta = \mathcal{L}(W^{(t)}) - \mathcal{L}(W^{(t+1)}).$$

For the subset update can be expressed as:

$$\Delta_S \geq \eta \left( \|\nabla \mathcal{L}(W^{(t)})\|^2 - \delta \right) \left( 1 - \frac{\eta L}{2} \right).$$

For the full model update, the loss reduction is:

$$\Delta_{\text{all}} \geq \eta \|\nabla \mathcal{L}(W^{(t)})\|^2 \left( 1 - \frac{\eta L}{2} \right).$$

Given the loss reduction inequalities for subset and full model updates, consider the scenario where the subset update yields a greater loss reduction than the full model update. This implies that the subset update provides a tighter boundary. The inequality describing the difference between the loss reduction boundaries for the subset update and the full model update is given by:

$$-\eta \delta \left( 1 - \frac{\eta L}{2} \right) \geq 0.$$

For this inequality to hold, we require  $1 - \frac{\eta L}{2} \leq 0$ , which implies  $\eta L \geq 2$ . This condition indicates that when the Lipschitz constant  $L$  is large, even a relatively small learning rate  $\eta$  causes the loss function to behave less smoothly, meaning the updates may become noisy. In such cases, deviating from the full model with a large  $\delta$  update can be beneficial, allowing for more efficient loss reduction by focusing on key layers.

## A. Experimental Setup and Evaluation Metrics

We trained two language models for next-word prediction: a standard Transformer [1] on UDPOS data and GPT-2 [3] on Penn Treebank (Penn TB) for 150 communication rounds. The sequence length was set to 128. Both models were optimized with Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) at a learning rate of 0.0001 and batch size of 16, with each client performing 5 local epochs across 100 clients. We used FedAvg [7] and FedProx [8] (proximal term  $\mu = 0.1$ ) for aggregation. Experiments were conducted on a single NVIDIA GeForce RTX 2080 Ti.

The network architectures consist of the repeated (main body) and non-repeated parts (input and output layers). Four update strategies were evaluated: **Full**, **FedTLU**, **Random**, and **Last** updates. In the Full update, all layers were updated in each round. For Random and FedTLU, updates were applied to the non-repeated part and a portion of the main body layers, with FedTLU selecting layers based on scores and Random selecting layers randomly. The Last update case involved updating only the last few layers of the non-repeated part.

Each case was evaluated three times, and the average perplexity, which measures prediction accuracy (*lower is better*), was reported. Global testing perplexity was calculated after each aggregation using test sets from the datasets, while local testing performance was measured by averaging perplexity scores from participating clients after the local training using the same test sets.

## B. Experimental Results

We compared FedTLU's performance under three conditions: **1)** training the global model from scratch, **2)** fine-tuning pre-trained models, and **3)** scenarios with noisy or potentially malicious clients.

**For training from scratch**, each communication round varied the portion of updated layers (75%, 50%, and 25%). Each local client was allocated up to a maximum number of tokens, calculated by dividing the total dataset size by the number of clients. A minimum number of tokens is half of this maximum number. Local datasets were non-overlapping, and 10% of clients participated per round. Table I shows

TABLE I  
AVERAGED MINIMUM GLOBAL AND LOCAL TEST PERPLEXITIES WHEN THE GLOBAL MODEL WAS TRAINED FROM SCRATCH.

Model (Dataset)	Aggre Portion Update	FedAvg						FedProx											
		0.75			0.50			0.25			0.75			0.50			0.25		
		Ours	Random	Last	Ours	Random	Last	Ours	Random	Last	Ours	Random	Last	Ours	Random	Last	Ours	Random	Last
Transformer (Penn TB)	Global	<b>2.107</b>	2.108	4.652	<b>2.399</b>	2.406	4.652	<b>2.874</b>	2.879	4.652	<b>2.114</b>	2.114	4.665	<b>2.407</b>	2.413	4.665	<b>2.883</b>	2.888	4.665
	Local	<b>2.109</b>	2.110	4.559	<b>2.399</b>	2.406	4.559	<b>2.870</b>	2.876	4.559	<b>2.116</b>	2.116	4.572	<b>2.407</b>	2.414	4.572	<b>2.880</b>	2.885	4.572
GPT-2 (UDPOS)	Global	<b>10.091</b>	10.124	14.832	<b>10.231</b>	10.295	14.832	<b>10.464</b>	10.583	14.832	<b>10.093</b>	10.125	14.838	<b>10.232</b>	10.297	14.838	<b>10.466</b>	10.585	14.838
	Local	<b>10.245</b>	10.287	12.016	<b>10.361</b>	10.415	12.016	<b>10.560</b>	10.695	12.016	<b>10.247</b>	10.288	12.018	<b>10.362</b>	10.416	12.018	<b>10.563</b>	10.696	12.018




Fig. 1. Perplexity curves for fine-tuning with Full, FedTLU, Random, and Last-layer updates on Transformer (Penn TB) and GPT-2 (UDPOS) models.




Fig. 2. Perplexity curves for fine-tuning with Full, FedTLU, and Random updates in noisy or malicious client scenarios.

TABLE II  
AVERAGED MINIMUM GLOBAL AND LOCAL TEST PERPLEXITIES WHEN THE GLOBAL MODEL WAS FINE-TUNED AFTER 400 ROUNDS.

Model (Dataset)	Aggre Update	FedAvg				FedProx			
		Full	Ours	Random	Last	Full	Ours	Random	Last
Transformer (Penn TB)	Global	1.774	<b>1.730</b>	1.730	1.785	1.776	<b>1.731</b>	1.732	1.787
	Local	1.776	<b>1.731</b>	1.732	1.787	1.778	<b>1.733</b>	1.734	1.789
GPT-2 (UDPOS)	Global	9.617	<b>9.292</b>	9.382	9.645	9.618	<b>9.293</b>	9.383	9.646
	Local	9.702	<b>9.406</b>	9.493	9.722	9.702	<b>9.407</b>	9.494	9.722

TABLE III  
AVERAGED MINIMUM GLOBAL AND LOCAL TEST PERPLEXITIES WHEN THE MODELS WERE FINE-TUNED WITH NOISY OR MALICIOUS CLIENTS

Model (Dataset)	Aggre Update	FedAvg			FedProx		
		Full	Ours	Random	Full	Ours	Random
Transformer (Penn TB)	Global	1.815	<b>1.768</b>	1.764	1.817	<b>1.770</b>	1.766
	Local	1.804	<b>1.765</b>	1.763	1.806	<b>1.767</b>	1.764
GPT-2 (UDPOS)	Global	9.597	<b>9.318</b>	10.050	9.763	<b>9.559</b>	10.050
	Local	9.696	<b>9.444</b>	10.225	9.869	<b>9.687</b>	10.225

that FedTLU consistently achieved better test perplexity, reducing global perplexity by up to 1.14% and local perplexity by up to 1.3% compared to Random. FedTLU also showed a 41.7-120.8% improvement in global perplexity and 13.8-116.2% in local perplexity compared to last-layer updates. These results indicate that targeted layer updates in FedTLU enhance model stability.

**For fine-tuning**, we trained the global model for 400 rounds with full updates. During fine-tuning, 5% of clients participated per round, and each client’s local data was halved. The update portion was decreased sequentially from 75% to 50% to 25%, and if the loss did not decrease by at least 1% for 10 consecutive rounds, the portion was further reduced. Table II and Fig. 1 show that

FedTLU outperformed other strategies, reducing global perplexity by 2.54-3.50% compared to full updates, by up to 0.97% compared to Random, and by 3.18-3.80% compared to last-layer updates. Locally, FedTLU achieved reductions of 2.60-3.15%, 0.06-0.92%, and 3.23-3.36%. In Fig. 1, FedTLU consistently maintained lower global perplexity during training.

**In noisy or malicious client scenarios**, 10% of clients were assigned shuffled labels (i.e., mismatched tokens). Table III shows that FedTLU reduced global perplexity by 2.13-2.99% compared to full updates and by -0.23-7.86% compared to Random. Locally, FedTLU achieved reductions of 1.88-2.67% and -0.17-8.27%. *Notably, Random increased perplexities in the GPT-2 (UDPOS) case from the full update cases, highlighting that randomly selecting layers may include less effective ones.* These results emphasize the importance of selective layer updates. In summary, FedTLU demonstrated better resilience, reducing the impact of noisy or malicious clients and maintaining lower perplexity, providing robustness in federated learning environments. As seen in Fig. 2, FedTLU consistently maintained lower global perplexity despite noisy updates.

## VI. CONCLUSION

We introduced FedTLU, a targeted layer update strategy for federated learning (FL). FedTLU improves convergence and reduces the impact of noisy client updates. Experimental results show that FedTLU outperforms random and last-layer updates, providing a more efficient and stable solution for FL in language modeling.

## VII. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors are partially supported by the National Science Foundation under grants CNS-2409138 and CNS-2106891 and by the Department of Energy under grant DESC0025652.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. Vaswani, "Attention is all you need," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017.
- [2] J. Devlin, "Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [3] A. Radford, J. Wu, R. Child, D. Luan, D. Amodei, I. Sutskever *et al.*, "Language models are unsupervised multitask learners," *OpenAI blog*, vol. 1, no. 8, p. 9, 2019.
- [4] Y. Yao, J. Duan, K. Xu, Y. Cai, Z. Sun, and Y. Zhang, "A survey on large language model (llm) security and privacy: The good, the bad, and the ugly," *High-Confidence Computing*, p. 100211, 2024.
- [5] X. Wu, Z. Liang, and J. Wang, "Fedmed: A federated learning framework for language modeling," *Sensors*, vol. 20, no. 14, p. 4048, 2020.
- [6] A. Hilmkil, S. Callh, M. Barbieri, L. R. Stützel, E. L. Zec, and O. Mogren, "Scaling federated learning for fine-tuning of large language models," in *International Conference on Applications of Natural Language to Information Systems*. Springer, 2021, pp. 15–23.
- [7] B. McMahan, E. Moore, D. Ramage, S. Hampson, and B. A. y Arcas, "Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data," in *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR, 2017.
- [8] T. Li, A. K. Sahu, M. Zaheer, M. Sanjabi, A. Talwalkar, and V. Smith, "Federated optimization in heterogeneous networks," *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, vol. 2, pp. 429–450, 2020.
- [9] Z. Li, V. Sharma, and S. P. Mohanty, "Preserving data privacy via federated learning: Challenges and solutions," *IEEE Consumer Electronics Magazine*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 8–16, 2020.
- [10] D. Wang, S. Shi, Y. Zhu, and Z. Han, "Federated analytics: Opportunities and challenges," *IEEE Network*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 151–158, 2021.
- [11] Z. Qu, X. Li, R. Duan, Y. Liu, B. Tang, and Z. Lu, "Generalized federated learning via sharpness aware minimization," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2022, pp. 18 250–18 280.
- [12] S. AbdulRahman, H. Tout, H. Ould-Slimane, A. Mourad, C. Talhi, and M. Guizani, "A survey on federated learning: The journey from centralized to distributed on-site learning and beyond," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 8, no. 7, pp. 5476–5497, 2020.
- [13] S. A. Rahman, H. Tout, C. Talhi, and A. Mourad, "Internet of things intrusion detection: Centralized, on-device, or federated learning?" *IEEE Network*, vol. 34, no. 6, pp. 310–317, 2020.
- [14] M. C. Ganiz, C. George, and W. M. Pottenger, "Higher order naive bayes: A novel non-iid approach to text classification," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 23, no. 7, 2010.
- [15] L. Cao, "Beyond iid: Non-iid thinking, informatics, and learning," *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 5–17, 2022.
- [16] F. Wu, Z. Li, Y. Li, B. Ding, and J. Gao, "Fedbiot: Llm local fine-tuning in federated learning without full model," in *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 2024, pp. 3345–3355.
- [17] A. Cutkosky and F. Orabona, "Momentum-based variance reduction in non-convex sgd," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 32, 2019.
- [18] C. T. Dinh, N. H. Tran, T. D. Nguyen, W. Bao, A. Y. Zomaya, and B. B. Zhou, "Federated learning with proximal stochastic variance reduced gradient algorithms," in *Proceedings of the 49th International Conference on Parallel Processing*, 2020, pp. 1–11.
- [19] H. Liu, D. Tam, M. Muqeeth, J. Mohta, T. Huang, M. Bansal, and C. A. Raffel, "Few-shot parameter-efficient fine-tuning is better and cheaper than in-context learning," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 1950–1965, 2022.
- [20] H. He, J. Cai, J. Zhang, D. Tao, and B. Zhuang, "Sensitivity-aware visual parameter-efficient fine-tuning," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 11 825–11 835.
- [21] T. Li, S. Hu, A. Beirami, and V. Smith, "Ditto: Fair and robust federated learning through personalization," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 6357–6368.
- [22] A. Z. Tan, H. Yu, L. Cui, and Q. Yang, "Towards personalized federated learning," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 34, no. 12, pp. 9587–9603, 2022.
- [23] A. Bietti, C.-Y. Wei, M. Dudik, J. Langford, and S. Wu, "Personalization improves privacy-accuracy tradeoffs in federated learning," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2022, pp. 1945–1962.
- [24] M. Mendieta, T. Yang, P. Wang, M. Lee, Z. Ding, and C. Chen, "Local learning matters: Rethinking data heterogeneity in federated learning," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 8397–8406.
- [25] M. Ye, X. Fang, B. Du, P. C. Yuen, and D. Tao, "Heterogeneous federated learning: State-of-the-art and research challenges," *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 56, no. 3, pp. 1–44, 2023.
- [26] J.-I. Park, S. Pranav, J. M. Moura, and C. Joe-Wong, "Fedbaf: Federated learning aggregation biased by a foundation model," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.18352*, 2024.
- [27] P. Liu, X. Xu, and W. Wang, "Threats, attacks and defenses to federated learning: issues, taxonomy and perspectives," *Cybersecurity*, vol. 5, no. 1, p. 4, 2022.
- [28] X. Fang and M. Ye, "Robust federated learning with noisy and heterogeneous clients," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 10 072–10 081.
- [29] J. D. M.-W. C. Kenton and L. K. Toutanova, "Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding," in *Proceedings of NaacL-HLT*, vol. 1, 2019, p. 2.
- [30] Z. Li, B. Gong, and T. Yang, "Improved dropout for shallow and deep learning," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 29, 2016.
- [31] B. Swiderski, S. Osowski, G. Gwardys, J. Kurek, M. Slowinska, and I. Lugowska, "Random cnn structure: tool to increase generalization ability in deep learning," *Eurasip Journal on Image and Video Processing*, vol. 2022, no. 1, p. 3, 2022.
- [32] K. Goutam, S. Balasubramanian, D. Gera, and R. R. Sarma, "Layerout: Freezing layers in deep neural networks," *SN Computer Science*, vol. 1, no. 5, p. 295, 2020.
- [33] M. Raghu, C. Zhang, J. Kleinberg, and S. Bengio, "Transfusion: Understanding transfer learning for medical imaging," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 32, 2019.
- [34] 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*. PMLR, 2019, pp. 2790–2799.
- [35] D. Yu, S. Naik, A. Backurs, S. Gopi, H. A. Inan, G. Kamath, J. Kulkarni, Y. T. Lee, A. Manoel, L. Wutschitz *et al.*, "Differentially private fine-tuning of language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.06500*, 2021.
- [36] R. Novak, Y. Bahri, D. A. Abolafia, J. Pennington, and J. Sohl-Dickstein, "Sensitivity and generalization in neural networks: an empirical study," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.08760*, 2018.
- [37] A. Kumar, B. Yin, A. M. Shaikh, M. Ali, and W. Wei, "Cornnet: pearson correlation based pruning for efficient convolutional neural networks," *International Journal of Machine Learning and Cybernetics*, vol. 13, no. 12, pp. 3773–3783, 2022.
- [38] S. P. Karimireddy, S. Kale, M. Mohri, S. Reddi, S. Stich, and A. T. Suresh, "Scaffold: Stochastic controlled averaging for federated learning," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 5132–5143.
- [39] P. Kairouz, H. B. McMahan, B. Avent, A. Bellet, M. Bennis, A. N. Bhagoji, K. Bonawitz, Z. Charles, G. Cormode, R. Cummings *et al.*, "Advances and open problems in federated learning," *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, vol. 14, no. 1–2, pp. 1–210, 2021.
- [40] Y. Tian, Y. Wan, L. Lyu, D. Yao, H. Jin, and L. Sun, "Fedbert: When federated learning meets pre-training," *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 1–26, 2022.
- [41] H. Zhu, J. Xu, S. Liu, and Y. Jin, "Federated learning on non-iid data: A survey," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 465, pp. 371–390, 2021.
- [42] V. Smith, C.-K. Chiang, M. Sanjabi, and A. S. Talwalkar, "Federated multi-task learning," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [43] F. Sattler, K.-R. Müller, and W. Samek, "Clustered federated learning: Model-agnostic distributed multitask optimization under privacy constraints," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 32, no. 8, pp. 3710–3722, 2020.
- [44] A. S. Morcos, D. G. Barrett, N. C. Rabinowitz, and M. Botvinick, "On the importance of single directions for generalization," *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [45] X. Li, K. Huang, W. Yang, S. Wang, and Z. Zhang, "On the convergence of fedavg on non-iid data," *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [46] G. Li, Y. Yang, K. Bhardwaj, and R. Marculescu, "Zico: Zero-shot nas via inverse coefficient of variation on gradients," *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.