

# An Empirical Analysis of Federated Learning Models Subject to Label-Flipping Adversarial Attack

Kunal Bhatnagar\* Sagana Chattanathan\* Angela Dang\*  
Bhargav Eranki\* Ronnit Rana\* Charan Sridhar\*  
Siddharth Vedam\* Angie Yao\* Mark Stamp\*<sup>†</sup>

December 25, 2024

## Abstract

In this paper, we empirically analyze adversarial attacks on selected federated learning models. The specific learning models considered are Multinomial Logistic Regression (MLR), Support Vector Classifier (SVC), Multilayer Perceptron (MLP), Convolution Neural Network (CNN), Random Forest, XGBoost, and Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM). For each model, we simulate label-flipping attacks, experimenting extensively with 10 federated clients and 100 federated clients. We vary the percentage of adversarial clients from 10% to 100% and, simultaneously, the percentage of labels flipped by each adversarial client is also varied from 10% to 100%. Among other results, we find that models differ in their inherent robustness to the two vectors in our label-flipping attack, i.e., the percentage of adversarial clients, and the percentage of labels flipped by each adversarial client. We discuss the potential practical implications of our results.

## 1 Introduction

The Federated Learning (FL) paradigm offers the advantage of maintaining the privacy of local training data, while also distributing some of the work required to train models. Although the accuracy of FL models tends to be lower than models trained via traditional centralized learning techniques, the tradeoff may be worthwhile in many cases, especially in situations where data privacy would otherwise make training models impractical.

The distributed nature of FL opens the door to a wide range of adversarial attack scenarios. In this paper, we empirically analyze the effectiveness of

---

\*Department of Computer Science, San Jose State University

<sup>†</sup>mark.stamp@sjsu.edu

label-flipping attacks. We simulate such attacks by assigning a percentage of clients as adversarial, with each adversarial client flipping a specified percentage of the labels in its local training dataset. We experiment with seven distinct FL models, namely, Multinomial Logistic Regression (MLR), Support Vector Classifier (SVC), Multilayer Perceptron (MLP), Convolution Neural Network (CNN), Random Forest, XGBoost, and Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM). For each of these models, we carefully analyze the case with 10 federated clients and the case with 100 federated clients, giving us 14 experiments, in total. Furthermore, for each of these 14 experiments, the percentage of adversarial clients ranges from 10% to 100%, while the label flipping percentage simultaneously ranges from 10% to 100%, giving us 100 data points per experiment.

For each experiment, we provide a 3-dimensional graph of the accuracy as a function of both the percentage of adversarial clients and the percentage of labels flipped. We further analyze our results and show that some models are inherently more robust with respect to the percentage of adversarial clients, while other models are more robust with respect to the percentage of labels flipped by each adversarial client. That is, for a given overall percentage of labels flipped, some models retain more of their accuracy when relatively few adversarial clients flip relatively many labels, whereas other models retain more of their accuracy when the converse is true. This has potential practical implications, as we might choose to favor specific federated learning models for a given application based on likely attack scenarios or available defensive techniques.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we provide some background information on FL, and we introduce the specific learning models considered in this paper. Section 3 provides implementation details, with the emphasis on the dataset used in our experiments and our experimental design. Our experimental results are presented and discussed in Section 4. Section 5 concludes the paper and considers potential directions for future work.

## 2 Background

In this section, we present a brief introduction to relevant aspects of Federated Learning (FL). Among other topics, we discuss the aggregation strategy used in our FL experiments. We also introduce the specific FL models that are considered in this paper.

### 2.1 Federated Learning

Federated learning (FL) models are trained in a distributed manner, where the data is decentralized among a number of clients. The clients train local models on their local data and, typically, a central server periodically collects these model parameters (e.g., weights). The central server then aggregates the parameters

to build an overall model. This is in contrast to a traditional machine learning environment, where all data and computing resources are centralized.

FL is not to be confused with distributed learning. In distributed learning, training is parallelized across multiple servers, and the dataset at each client is assumed to be identically distributed and approximately the same size. In FL, the dataset at clients can be heterogeneous in terms of size and other aspects, e.g., only a subset of classes might be present in a given client’s dataset [19].

In this paper, we consider an FL training process consisting of multiple rounds coordinated by a centralized server. Each round consists of the following steps.

1. **Broadcast:** The clients download the current ML model and global weights from the server.
2. **Client Computation:** Each client instantiates the training model using the downloaded weights and conducts local training on their local dataset.
3. **Aggregation:** The client model updates are aggregated by the server using an aggregating strategy.
4. **Model Update:** The aggregated weights are used to update the global model and the global model is evaluated to determine if this round has produced an improved model.

Note that multiple rounds are needed, as the global model updates are computed on the centralized server.

The aggregating strategy is a key component of FL training process outlined above. In this paper, we use a federated averaging (FedAvg) approach. As the name suggests, FedAvg involves computing the average of the client model weights. The intuition is that averaging the model weights has a similar effect of the model gradients.

Algorithm 1 is a FedAvg strategy found in [19]. The key parameters of this FedAvg algorithm are  $K$  (the number of clients in each federated learning round),  $E$  (the number of local training epochs),  $B$  (the local minibatch size), and  $\eta$  (the learning rate).

While there are numerous potential threats to FL systems, in this paper, we focus on a simple label-flipping attack. That is, we specify a percentage of adversarial clients and a percentage of labels flipped. Each of the adversarial clients then flips the specified percentage of labels in its local dataset, which has the effect of corrupting its model update to the centralized server.

Next, we introduce each of the seven FL models considered in this paper. These models include examples of both classic machine learning and neural network-based models.

## 2.2 Multinomial Logistic Regression

Multinomial Logistic Regression (MLR) is used to predict the probability of a certain category, where the dependent variable can represent multiple categories.

---

**Algorithm 1** FedAvg

---

```
//  $K$  clients indexed by  $k$ 
//  $\mathcal{P}_k$  is training dataset on client  $k$ 
//  $n_k = |\mathcal{P}_k|$  and  $n = \sum_{k=1}^K n_k$ 
//  $B$  is local minibatch size
//  $E$  is the number of local epochs
//  $\eta$  is the learning rate
//  $\ell(w; b)$  is local loss function evaluated on weights  $w$  and minibatch  $b$ 
Server Executes:
initialize  $w_0$ 
for each round  $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  do
  for each client  $k \in K$  in parallel do // all clients update model
     $w_{t+1}^k \leftarrow \text{CLIENTUPDATE}(k, w_t)$ 
   $w_{t+1} \leftarrow \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{n_k}{n} w_{t+1}^k$  // weighted average
function CLIENTUPDATE( $k, w$ ) // runs on client  $k$ 
   $\mathcal{B} \leftarrow$  (split  $\mathcal{P}_k$  into minibatches of size  $B$ )
  for each local epoch  $i$  from 1 to  $E$  do
    for each minibatch  $b \in \mathcal{B}$  do
       $w \leftarrow w - \eta \nabla \ell(w; b)$ 
  return  $w$  to server
```

---

It calculates the weighted sum of the independent variables and their respective coefficients to find the log odds—the model multiplies the value of each independent variable by its coefficient and adds all such values. The softmax function is then used to convert these log odds into probabilities for each category [12].

## 2.3 Support Vector Classifier

Support Vector Machines (SVM) can be used for classification and regression. The goal when training an SVM is to construct a hyperplane that serves as a decision boundary to separate two classes, while maximizes the margin, which is defined as the minimum distance between the data points and the separating hyperplane. By maximizing the margin, an SVM minimizes the chance of incorrectly classifying data points not in the training set. Nonlinear decision boundaries can be constructed when training an SVM by use of the so-called kernel trick, which allows for the data to be embedded in a higher dimensional space. By carefully selecting the kernel function, the computational complexity is minimized. Support Vector Classifiers (SVC) generalize the SVM approach to multiclass data [24].

## 2.4 Multilayer Perceptron

Multilayer Perceptrons (MLPs) are the most basic type of feedforward neural network, and they are frequently used for supervised learning tasks. An MLP includes an input layer, one or more hidden layers, and an output layer. Each layer consists of multiple neurons, which are fully connected to the neurons in the preceding and succeeding layers [23].

The input layer receives raw data and passes it to the first hidden layer. Hidden layers are responsible for extracting information and learning complex patterns and features from the input data. Each node in these layers performs a nonlinear transformation on the weighted sum of its inputs, employing activation functions such as ReLU, sigmoid, or tanh. This nonlinearity enables the MLP to model intricate, nonlinear relationships within the data.

## 2.5 Convolution Neural Network

Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) are a type of feedforward neural network that specializes in grid-like data and, in particular, images. CNNs are optimized for dealing with local structure, as opposed to, say, MLPs, which can effectively deal with global structure, but are too inefficient for complex images [24].

A typical CNN includes an input layer, convolution layers, pooling layers, and an output layer. This neural network does not require manual feature engineering, as it autonomously extracts features, further increasing efficiency.

## 2.6 Random Forest

Random Forests (RF) are ensemble learning methods widely used for classification and regression related tasks. An RF consists of multiple decision trees, each of which is trained on a subset of the features and data, with a simple voting scheme typically used for classification. Such an approach reduces overfitting and improves the generalizability of the model [3].

## 2.7 XGBoost

Boosting a generic learning technique that builds a strong classifier from a collection of weak classifiers. Extreme Gradient Boosting (XGBoost) is a robust boosting technique that has performed well in many machine learning contests [4]. Like Random Forest, our implementation of XGBoost is based on simple decision trees.

## 2.8 Long Short-Term Memory

Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) models represent a class of neural networking architectures designed to deal with sequential data. LSTMs are highly special-

ized types of RNNs that allow for long-term dependencies in the data. LSTMs mitigate the vanishing and exploding gradient issues that plague generic RNNs, thereby enabling LSTMs to “remember” information over an extended period of time, which can improve the accuracy of predictions [7].

## 2.9 Related Work

In this section, we briefly review previous work involving attacks on FL systems. For a more detailed discussion of the FL literature, see the literature review in the companion paper [18].

There exists a surprisingly large number of survey (and similar) papers dealing with attacks on FL systems, including [2, 5, 10, 13, 16, 20, 22], among others. These survey-like papers tend to have a broad focus, and many place an emphasis on categorizing the various types of attacks that can occur at different stages of the FL process. The label-flipping attacks considered in this paper are considered to be examples of poisoning attacks [25].

There is also no shortage of research papers dealing with label-flipping attacks on FL systems. Examples of such papers include [8, 9, 11, 15, 17], among many others. However, these papers tend to be focused on the problem of detecting label-flipping attacks, as opposed to analyzing the effectiveness of such attacks. In contrast, our research is narrowly focused on the effectiveness of label-flipping attacks, as a function of the number of adversarial clients and the percentage of labels flipped by each of the adversarial clients.

The paper [26] is an example research into label-flipping attack effectiveness in FL. However, in [26] the emphasis is on targeted attacks, while the research presented in this paper does not consider targeted attack scenarios. To the best of the authors’ knowledge, there is a relative paucity of research papers that analyze label-flipping attack effectiveness, and we are not aware of any research that considers the specific problem analyzed in this paper.

## 3 Implementation

In this section, we first discuss the dataset used for our experiments. Then in the remainder of this section, we outline our experimental design.

### 3.1 Dataset

For all of our experiments, we use the popular MNIST dataset [14], which consists of handwritten digits, 0 through 9. The MNIST dataset is often used as a benchmark for various learning algorithms. This dataset consists of 60,000 training samples and 10,000 test samples. All samples are in the form of grayscale images of size  $28 \times 28$ , with each pixel value in the range of 0 to 255, where 0

represents black and 255 represents white. Examples of images from the dataset are given in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Examples of MNIST images

The MNIST dataset is approximately balanced. The precise number of samples in each class is given in the form of a bar graph in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Class distribution in MNIST dataset

As a preprocessing step, the MNIST images are converted into tensors or numpy arrays, depending on the libraries used for the specific classifier. The pixel values in the MNIST dataset have a mean of 1.307 and a standard deviation of 0.3081, and these values are normalized to have a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1, which is standard practice in machine learning.

## 3.2 Experimental Design

All federated models were trained using Flower: A Friendly Federated Learning Framework [1], which is a Python library designed for such models. The `torch.utils.data.random_split` function in Pytorch [21] was used to split

the data between all the clients, and the label flipping occurred throughout all round—in the terminology of the paper [18], we consider the FULL case.

The FL stack developed for this research has three main components, namely, the Server, Client, and Strategy.

- **Server:** The Server is responsible for global computations, including aggregating the model weights, selecting the input parameters for the models, and sampling random clients for each FL round.
- **Client:** The Client is responsible for executing local computations, including running the ML model for a set amount of epochs. The client has access to the actual data used for training and evaluation of model parameters.
- **Strategy:** The framework provides a Strategy abstraction which includes the logic for client selection, configuration, parameter aggregation, and model evaluation. Outlier detection has been implemented in this strategy as a defense mechanism to reject model updates from malicious clients, and is executed on the server. A high-level abstraction of the Flower FL framework is provided in Figure 3.




Figure 3: Flower federated ML framework [1]

For our experiments, the FedAvg [19] strategy was used to aggregate model weights for all models, except that a bagging aggregation strategy [6] was used for aggregating model updates for tree-based models (Random Forest and XGBoost). Note that the clients and the server communicate through Remote Procedure Calls (RPC).

Each experiment was performed for 10 federated rounds and the hyperparameters were adjusted accordingly. For example, if a model requires 120 epochs for convergence, the number of local epochs is set to 12 in each FL round so that



at the end of the FL process, the models would have been trained for a total of 120 epochs.

## 4 Experiments and Results

We first consider a series of experiments where there are no adversarial clients. These experiments serve to determine the hyperparameters for our models, and to set baselines for accuracy. We then consider the effect of adversarial clients on each federated model, and we conclude this section with an analysis of the relationship between the label-flipping percentage and the percentage of adversarial clients.

### 4.1 Baseline Experiments

Table A.1 in Appendix A lists the hyperparameters tested (via grid search) for each model in the case of 10 clients, with the hyperparameters selected for the best model given in boldface. Table A.2 in Appendix A contains the analogous results for each model in the case of 100 clients.

Figure A.1 in Appendix A shows the accuracies for each model as a function of the number of clients, where the number of clients ranges from 10 to 100. In Figure 4, we give the accuracies for 10 and 100 clients for each model. We observe that with the exception of MLR, all of the models perform worse as the number of clients increases. In some cases, the degradation in accuracy for larger numbers of clients is small (e.g., SVC and MLP), while for other models, the decline is more substantial (e.g., Random Forest and XGBoost).




Figure 4: Baseline model accuracies for 10 and 100 clients

### 4.2 Adversarial Attack Experiments

In this section, we consider label-flipping attacks on each of the seven models. Using our best model for 10 clients—as determined in Section 4.1, above—we

vary the percentage of adversarial clients from 10% to 100%, in steps of 10%. For each of these 10 test cases, we vary the label-flipping percentage of each adversarial client from 10% to 100%, again with a steps size of 10%. This gives us 100 accuracy results for each 10-client model. We then repeat this entire process for each model, but with 100 clients instead of 10.

The results for each model for our 10-client adversarial attack experiments are summarized in the form of 3-dimensional surface plots in Figure B.2 in Appendix B. The corresponding results for our 100-client experiments appear in Figure B.3 in Appendix B. Next, we provide brief comments on our adversarial attack results for each of the seven federated models under consideration.

#### 4.2.1 Multinomial Logistic Regression

From Figure A.1(a) we observe that the MLR model accuracy drops only slightly when used in a federated mode, as compared to an MLR model with no federated clients. However, the accuracy of the federated MLR is fairly constant, regardless of the number of federated clients.

Comparing the attack results in Figures B.2(a) and B.3(a), we observe similar behavior. This is not surprising, given that the MLR model performs similarly over a wide range of federated clients.

#### 4.2.2 Support Vector Classifier

In Figure A.1(b) we observe that the SVC model accuracy only decreases slightly as the number of federated clients increases. This is similar behavior as was observed for the MLR model, above

Comparing the adversarial attacks in Figures B.2(b) and B.3(b), we observe that the SVC model is highly symmetric about the  $(x, y)$ -plane, as compared to the other models.

#### 4.2.3 Multilayer Perceptron

From Figure A.1(c) we observe that the MLP model achieves high accuracy and, similar to the MLR and SVC models, the accuracy does not drop significantly as more federated clients are added.

Comparing the label-flipping attacks in Figures B.2(c) and B.3(c), we observe that in the 10-client case the accuracy drops precipitously, while this drop off is somewhat smoother in the 100-client case. These graphs are the least symmetric of the attack graphs considered so far.

#### 4.2.4 Convolution Neural Network

From Figure A.1(d) we observe that the CNN model accuracy actually improves slightly in a federated mode, as compared to the case with no federated clients.

However, as we add more federated clients, the model accuracy degrades much more rapidly than the three models considered above.

For the 10-client case, the attack graph in Figures B.2(d) for the CNN model is similar to that of the MLP model. However, CNN 100-client case in Figure B.3(d) is more erratic than any of the other models, which would seem to indicate that this model is somewhat unstable with 100 clients.

#### 4.2.5 Random Forest

From Figure A.1(e) we observe that the Random Forest model achieves high accuracy when no federated clients are considered. Also, the accuracy drop consistently as more federated clients are included, and with 100 clients, the model performs poorly.

Comparing the label-flipping attacks in Figures B.2(e) and B.3(e), we observe that the qualitative behavior is similar, but the 10-client experiments show consistently higher accuracies. This is not too surprising, given that the decline in accuracy as more federated clients are used, as noted above.

#### 4.2.6 XGBoost

From Figure A.1(f) and the label-flipping attack graphs in Figures B.2(f) and B.3(f), we observe that behavior of the XGBoost models are similar to those of the Random Forest. This is not surprising, given that they are both tree-based algorithms.

#### 4.2.7 Long Short-Term Memory

From Figure A.1(g) we observe that the LSTM model achieves high accuracy. We also note that the accuracy of the LSTM model drops only slightly as the number of clients increases from 10 to 100.

Comparing the label-flipping attacks in Figures B.2(g) and B.3(g), we observe that the LSTM behaves most similar to the MLP model. This is somewhat surprising, since these models are dramatically different.

### 4.3 Dominance Graphs

For a given overall level of labels flipped, the flipping can be dominated by the number of adversarial clients, or by the percentage of labels flipped. For example, suppose that 40% of the clients are adversarial, and that each of these flips 20% of the labels in their local dataset. Since the local datasets are all of the same size, this implies that for the model as a whole, 8% of the labels are flipped. On the other hand, if only 20% of the clients are malicious, but each flips 40% of the labels in their local dataset, this also represents a case where 8% of the labels are flipped. All of the 3-dimensional accuracy graphs in Figures B.2 and B.3 that are not symmetric with respect to the  $(x, y)$ -plane will—for a given level of

label-flipping and selected region of the domain—perform better for one of these two cases, that is, the case where the percentage of adversarial clients dominates or where the percentage of labels flipped dominates.

To obtain better insight into this relationship between the relative percentage of labels flipped and the percentage of adversarial clients, we generate 2-dimensional “dominance curves” for each of the seven models under consideration. Let  $c$  be the fraction of adversarial clients and let  $\ell$  be the fraction of labels flipped by each adversarial client. As discussed in Section 4.2, above, we have  $c, \ell \in \{0.1, 0.2, \dots, 1.0\}$ , and for each of these 100 cases we test the model and determine the accuracy. For a given model  $m$ , denote the accuracy for a specified  $c$  and  $\ell$  as  $A_m(c, \ell)$ . Note that the values  $A_m(c, \ell)$  are derived from the same experimental results that were used to construct the 3-dimensional surface plots in Figures B.2 and B.3 in Appendix B.

To construct the dominance curves for a given model, we consider all 100 test cases, and whenever  $c > \ell$ , then  $(c\ell, A_m(c, \ell))$  is a point on the client-dominated curve and, on the other hand, whenever  $\ell > c$ , then  $(c\ell, A_m(c, \ell))$  is a point on the flipping-dominated curve. We ignore the cases where  $\ell$  and  $c$  are equal, since neither dominates the other. We refer to  $c\ell$  as the label-flipping rate, since it gives the overall fraction of labels flipped. Based on the data used to construct the 3-dimensional accuracy graphs in Figure B.2 or Figure B.3, dominances graphs for each model appear in Figure B.1 in Appendix B.<sup>1</sup>

From Figure B.1 in Appendix B, we observe that for the MLR model, it is more effective—from an attacker’s perspective—to have fewer clients flipping a higher percentage of labels. In contrast, for the MLP model—and to a lesser extent, the CNN model—for a given overall percentage of labels flipped, a stronger attack will consist of more adversarial clients, each flipping a smaller fraction of the labels. In fact, each model has a bias (or biases, depending on the label-flipping rate) towards client dominance or flipping dominance, with the exception of SVC, which is essentially unbiased in this respect throughout the entire range of label-flipping.

The insights provided by the graphs in Figure B.1 in Appendix B could be used to help determine a preferred model, based on the likelihood of various attack scenarios. For example, if there is a higher probability that many adversarial clients will send slightly corrupted updates, we would prefer different models as compared to the case where our primary concern is relatively few adversarial clients, with each potentially sending relatively highly-corrupted updates. As another example, we might have stronger defenses against specific types of attacks, in which case we could choose models that are inherently more robust against the types of attacks that are more difficult to detect.

---

<sup>1</sup>For each model, we selected either the 10-client or 100-client case to draw the corresponding dominance graph in Figure B.1, depending on which of the 3-dimensional attack graphs in Figures B.2 and B.3 produced visually smoother results.

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we empirically analyzed label-flipping attacks against the following federated learning models: Multinomial Logistic Regression (MLR), Support Vector Classifier (SVC), Multilayer Perceptron (MLP), Convolution Neural Network (CNN), Random Forest, XGBoost, and Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM). We found that all models have reduced accuracy as more clients are added, although for most models, the reduction was small within the range of 10 to 100 clients. We then considered the 10-client and 100-client cases in more detail, graphing the accuracy as a function of the percentage of adversarial clients and the percentage of labels flipped by each adversarial client. We then further analyzed the relationship between the percentage of adversarial clients and the percentage of labels flipped. For a given overall percentage of labels flipped, we found that some models are inherently more robust when there are fewer adversarial clients flipping a higher percentage of labels, whereas other models were more robust in the case where there are more adversarial clients, but each flips a smaller percentage of the labels in their local dataset. This has practical implications, as we might, for example, choose models that are more robust against likely adversarial attacks, or we might choose models that are more robust against attacks that are harder to defend against.

For future work, it would be interesting to extend the research in this paper to other FL models. We could also consider more fine-grained attack scenarios, with smaller steps in the percentage of adversarial clients and the percentage of labels flipped. It would be worthwhile to consider more sophisticated adversarial attacks involving strategies other than simple label-flipping. Targeted attacks would be interesting, where the goal is to maintain the overall accuracy, but to force the misclassification of samples belonging to a specific class. Of course, an empirical analysis of the effectiveness of various defensive strategies would be another interesting line of research.

## References

- [1] Daniel J Beutel, Taner Topal, Akhil Mathur, Xinchu Qiu, Javier Fernandez-Marques, Yan Gao, Lorenzo Sani, Hei Li Kwing, Titouan Parcollet, Pedro PB de Gusmão, and Nicholas D Lane. Flower: A friendly federated learning research framework. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.14390>, 2020.
- [2] Nader Bouacida and Prasant Mohapatra. Vulnerabilities in federated learning. *IEEE Access*, 9:63229–63249, 2021.
- [3] Leo Breiman. Random forests. *Machine Learning*, 45:5–32, 2001.
- [4] Tianqi Chen and Carlos Guestrin. XGBoost: A scalable tree boosting system. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1603.02754>, 2016.

- [5] Yao Chen, Yijie Gui, Hong Lin, Wensheng Gan, and Yongdong Wu. Federated learning attacks and defenses: A survey. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.14952>, 2022.
- [6] Flower framework: Tree-based bagging aggregation — Quickstart with XGBoost. <https://flower.ai/docs/framework/tutorial-quickstart-xgboost.html#tree-based-bagging-aggregation>, 2023.
- [7] Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. Long short-term memory. *Neural Computation*, 8(8):1735–1780, 1997.
- [8] Najeeb Moharram Jebreel, Josep Domingo-Ferrer, David Sánchez, and Alberto Blanco-Justicia. Defending against the label-flipping attack in federated learning. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.01982>, 2022.
- [9] Najeeb Moharram Jebreel, Josep Domingo-Ferrer, David Sánchez, and Alberto Blanco-Justicia. Lfighter: Defending against the label-flipping attack in federated learning. *Neural Networks*, 170:111–126, 2024.
- [10] Malhar S. Jere, Tyler Farnan, and Farinaz Koushanfar. A taxonomy of attacks on federated learning. *IEEE Security & Privacy*, 19(2):20–28, 2020.
- [11] Yifeng Jiang, Weiwen Zhang, and Yanxi Chen. Data quality detection mechanism against label flipping attacks in federated learning. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 18:1625–1637, 2023.
- [12] Kaggle. Multinomial logistic regression for beginners. <https://www.kaggle.com/code/saurabhbagchi/multinomial-logistic-regression-for-beginners>.
- [13] K. Naveen Kumar, C. Krishna Mohan, and Linga Reddy Cenkeramaddi. The impact of adversarial attacks on federated learning: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2023.
- [14] Yann LeCun and Corinna Cortes. MNIST handwritten digit database. <http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/>, 2010.
- [15] Dongcheng Li, W. Eric Wong, Wei Wang, Yao Yao, and Matthew Chau. Detection and mitigation of label-flipping attacks in federated learning systems with KPCA and K-means. In *8th International Conference on Dependable Systems and Their Applications, DSA*, pages 551–559, 2021.
- [16] Pengrui Liu, Xiangrui Xu, and Wei Wang. Threats, attacks and defenses to federated learning: issues, taxonomy and perspectives. *Cybersecurity*, 5(4), 2022.
- [17] Zhuo Lv, Hongbo Cao, Feng Zhang, Yuange Ren, Bin Wang, Cen Chen, Nuannuan Li, Hao Chang, and Wei Wang. AWFC: Preventing label flipping attacks towards federated learning for intelligent IoT. *The Computer Journal*, 65(11):2849–2859, 2022.
- [18] Rohit Mapakshi, Sayma Akther, and Mark Stamp. Temporal analysis of adversarial attacks in federated learning. In Mark Stamp and Martin

- Jureček, editors, *Machine Learning, Deep Learning, and AI for Cybersecurity*. Springer, 2025.
- [19] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Aguera y Arcas. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 54, pages 1273–1282, 2017.
- [20] Akarsh K. Nair, Ebin Deni Raj, and Jayakrushna Sahoo. A robust analysis of adversarial attacks on federated learning environments. *Computer Standards & Interfaces*, 86:103723, 2023.
- [21] Pytorch. <https://pytorch.org/>.
- [22] Nuria Rodriguez-Barroso, Daniel Jiménez-López, M Victoria Luzón, Francisco Herrera, and Eugenio Martínez-Cámara. Survey on federated learning threats: Concepts, taxonomy on attacks and defences, experimental study and challenges. *Information Fusion*, 90:148–173, 2023.
- [23] Maryam Shaygan, Collin Meese, Wanxin Li, Xiaolong Zhao, and Mark Nejad. Review of recent advances and emerging opportunities. transportation research part C: Emerging technologies. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.19591>, 2023.
- [24] Mark Stamp. *Introduction to Machine Learning with Applications in Information Security*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2nd edition, 2022.
- [25] Vale Tolpegin, Stacey Truex, Mehmet Emre Gursoy, and Ling Liu. Data poisoning attacks against federated learning systems. In *25th European Symposium on Research in Computer Security*, ESORICS, pages 480–501, 2020.
- [26] Vale Tolpegin, Stacey Truex, Mehmet Emre Gursoy, and Ling Liu. Data poisoning attacks against federated learning systems. In Liqun Chen, Ninghui Li, Kaitai Liang, and Steve Schneider, editors, *Computer Security*, ESORICS, pages 480–501, 2020.

## Appendix A

Table A.1 lists the hyperparameter values tested for each of the federated learning models, in the case where there are 10 clients. The values selected are given in boldface. Table A.2 lists the corresponding hyperparameter values tested and selected for the federated learning models in the case where there are 100 clients. In Figure A.1, we graph the accuracy of each federated model as a function of the number of clients.


Table A.1: Hyperparameters (10 clients)

Model	Hyperparameters	Tested values	Accuracy	
			Train	Test
MLR	learning_rate	[ <b>0.01</b> , 0.0001]	0.8715	0.8730
	batch_size	[ <b>20</b> , 64, 128]		
	Epochs	[ <b>1</b> , 10, 20]		
	momentum	<b>0.9</b>		
	penalty	<b>l2</b>		
	warm_start	<b>True</b>		
SVC	learning_rate	[ <b>0.01</b> , 0.001]	0.9026	0.9176
	batch_size	[ <b>20</b> , 64, 128]		
	Epochs	[ <b>1</b> , 10, 20]		
	momentum	<b>0.9</b>		
	penalty	<b>l2</b>		
MLP	learning_rate	[ <b>0.003</b> , 0.0001]	0.9793	0.9696
	batch_size	[ <b>20</b> , 64, 128]		
	Epochs	[ <b>1</b> , 10, 20]		
	Optimizer	[ <b>Adam</b> , RMSProp]		
	image_dim	[ <b>128</b> , 256]		
CNN	learning_rate	[ <b>0.01</b> , 0.001]	0.9896	0.9886
	batch_size	[ <b>20</b> , 64, 128]		
	Epochs	[ <b>1</b> , 10, 20]		
	Optimizer	[ <b>Adam</b> , RMSProp]		
	image_dim	[ <b>128</b> , 256, 375]		
Random Forest	learning_rate	[ <b>0.08</b> , 0.0001]	0.8471	0.8434
	num_parallel_tree	[32, <b>100</b> , 128]		
	max_depth	[2, 4, <b>6</b> ]		
	Epochs	[ <b>1</b> , 10, 20]		
	colsample_bytree	[ <b>0.963</b> , 0.70, 0.5]		
	subsample	[ <b>0.97</b> , 0.7, 0.5]		
	objective	<b>multi:softmax</b>		
	eval_metric	<b>mlogloss</b>		
	alpha	[2, 4, <b>8</b> ]		
	Lambda	[1, <b>2</b> , 3]		
	tree_method	<b>hist</b>		
XGBoost	learning_rate	[0.001, <b>0.08</b> ]	0.9044	0.9166
	local_epochs	[ <b>1</b> , 10, 20]		
	max_depth	[ <b>6</b> , 10, 12]		
	subsample	[0.50, 0.75, <b>1</b> ]		
	colsample_bytree	[0.50, 0.75, <b>1</b> ]		
	objective	<b>multi:softmax</b>		
	eval_metric	<b>mlogloss</b>		
	alpha	[2, 4, <b>8</b> ]		
	Lambda	[2, 4, <b>8</b> ]		
	tree_method	<b>hist</b>		
	LSTM	learning_rate		
batch_size		[24, <b>64</b> , 128]		
Epochs		[1, <b>10</b> , 20]		
Optimizer		[ <b>SGD</b> , Adam]		




Table A.2: Hyperparameters (100 clients)


Model	Hyperparameters	Tested values	Accuracy	
			Train	Test
MLR	learning_rate	[ <b>0.001</b> , 0.0001]	0.8537	0.8748
	batch_size	[ <b>20</b> , 64, 128]		
	Epochs	[ <b>1</b> , 10, 20]		
	momentum	<b>0.9</b>		
	penalty	<b>l2</b>		
	warm_start	<b>True</b>		
SVC	learning_rate	[ <b>0.01</b> , 0.001]	0.8983	0.8997
	batch_size	[ <b>20</b> , 64, 128]		
	Epochs	[ <b>1</b> , 10, 20]		
	momentum	<b>0.9</b>		
	penalty	<b>l2</b>		
MLP	learning_rate	[ <b>0.003</b> , 0.0001]	0.9524	0.9397
	batch_size	[ <b>20</b> , 64, 128]		
	Epochs	[ <b>1</b> , 10, 20]		
	Optimizer	[ <b>Adam</b> , RMSProp]		
	image_dim	[ <b>128</b> , 256]		
CNN	learning_rate	[ <b>0.01</b> , 0.001]	0.9317	0.9419
	batch_size	[ <b>20</b> , 64, 128]		
	Epochs	[ <b>1</b> , 10, 20]		
	Optimizer	[ <b>Adam</b> , RMSProp]		
	image_dim	[ <b>128</b> , 256, 375]		
Random Forest	learning_rate	[ <b>0.08</b> , 0.0001]	0.7157	0.7088
	num_parallel_tree	[32, <b>100</b> , 128]		
	max_depth	[2, 4, <b>6</b> ]		
	Epochs	[ <b>1</b> , 10, 20]		
	colsample_bytree	[ <b>0.963</b> , 0.70, 0.5]		
	subsample	[ <b>0.97</b> , 0.7, 0.5]		
	objective	<b>multi:softmax</b>		
	eval_metric	<b>mlogloss</b>		
	alpha	[2, 4, <b>8</b> ]		
	Lambda	[1, <b>2</b> , 3]		
	tree_method	<b>hist</b>		
XGBoost	learning_rate	[0.001, <b>0.08</b> ]	0.8001	0.8118
	local_epochs	[ <b>1</b> , 10, 20]		
	max_depth	[ <b>6</b> , 10, 12]		
	subsample	[0.50, 0.75, <b>1</b> ]		
	colsample_bytree	[0.50, 0.75, <b>1</b> ]		
	objective	<b>multi:softmax</b>		
	eval_metric	<b>mlogloss</b>		
	alpha	[2, 4, <b>8</b> ]		
	Lambda	[2, 4, <b>8</b> ]		
	tree_method	<b>hist</b>		
	LSTM	learning_rate		
batch_size		[24, <b>64</b> , 128]		
Epochs		[1, <b>10</b> , 20]		
Optimizer		[ <b>SGD</b> , Adam]		




(a) MLR




(b) SVC




(c) MLP




(d) CNN



(e) Random Forest



(f) XGBoost




(g) LSTM


Figure A.1: Accuracy as a function of the number of clients

## Appendix B


Figure B.1 contains “dominance graphs” that emphasizes the relationship between the percentage of labels flipped and the percentage of adversarial clients, as discussed in Section 4.3. Figure B.2 contains 3-dimensional graphs of label-flipping attacks for each federated model, in the case of 10 clients. Figure B.3 gives the analogous graphs for the case where there are 100 clients.




(a) MLR (10 clients)




(b) SVC (10 clients)




(c) MLP (100 clients)




(d) CNN (100 clients)



(e) Random Forest (10 clients)




(f) XGBoost (10 clients)




(g) LSTM (100 clients)


Figure B.1: Accuracy as a function of the label-flipping rate




(a) MLR




(b) SVC




(c) MLP




(d) CNN



(e) Random Forest




(f) XGBoost




(g) LSTM


Figure B.2: Accuracy as a function of adversarial clients and label-flipping (10 clients)




(a) MLR




(b) SVC




(c) MLP




(d) CNN



(e) Random Forest



(f) XGBoost



(g) LSTM

Figure B.3: Accuracy as a function of adversarial clients and label-flipping (100 clients)