

# Federated Deep Subspace Clustering

Yupei Zhang  
ypzhaang@nwpu.edu.cn  
Northwestern Polytechnical  
University  
Xi'an, Shaanxi, China

Ruojia Feng\*  
Yifei Wang\*  
2022300396@mail.nwpu.edu.cn  
wang\_yf@mail.nwpu.edu.cn  
Northwestern Polytechnical  
University  
Xi'an, Shaanxi, China

Xuequn Shang  
shang@mail.nwpu.edu.cn  
Northwestern Polytechnical  
University  
Xi'an, Shaanxi, China

## Abstract

This paper introduces FDSC, a private-protected subspace clustering (SC) approach with federated learning (FC) schema. In each client, there is a deep subspace clustering network accounting for grouping the isolated data, composed of an encode network, a self-expressive layer, and a decode network. FDSC is achieved by uploading the encode network to communicate with other clients in the server. Besides, FDSC is also enhanced by preserving the local neighborhood relationship in each client. With the effects of federated learning and locality preservation, the learned data features from the encoder are boosted so as to enhance the self-expressiveness learning and result in better clustering performance. Experiments test FDSC on public datasets and compare with other clustering methods, demonstrating the effectiveness of FDSC.

## CCS Concepts

• Information systems → Clustering; Clustering; • Computer systems organization → Client-server architectures; • Security and privacy → Privacy-preserving protocols.

## Keywords

Federated Learning, Deep Subspace Clustering, Private Protect, Deep Learning, Image Clustering

### ACM Reference Format:

Yupei Zhang, Ruojia Feng, Yifei Wang, and Xuequn Shang. 2025. Federated Deep Subspace Clustering. In *Proceedings of Make sure to enter the correct conference title from your rights confirmation email (Conference acronym 'XX)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 8 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

## 1 Introduction


Subspace clustering (SC) is one of the popular clustering methods in recent years, which aims at learning the potential subspace of high-dimensional data and partitioning the data [32]. SC has drawn extensive attention in fields such as spectral clustering [41], image segmentation [3] and data dimensionality reduction technique [43]

\*Both authors contributed equally to this research.

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](mailto:permissions@acm.org).

Conference acronym 'XX, June 03–05, 2025, Woodstock, NY

© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.  
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06  
<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>



**Figure 1: FDSC framework.** Each client contains shared encoder, private self-expressive layer and private decoder. The server calculates the weighted average for the encoders.

in the past decades. Recently, a large number of algorithms for spectral clustering have been proposed [5, 20]. Their basic idea is to construct an affinity matrix on the datasets and cluster according to the eigenvectors of the affinity matrix [29].

Since real-world data often have complex distribution and non-linear characteristics, spectral clustering in linear space cannot adapt to the actual application scenarios. Deep neural network has the potential to extract data features and map them into linear subspace [23], which consists of auto-encoder and self-expressive layer. The auto-encoder exploits self-reconstruction loss to learn latent features [44], and the self-expressive layer is used to learn the affinity matrix [26, 32]. Deep subspace clustering has general application, such as face image segmentation under different lighting and postures [17]. Although the performance of deep subspace clustering has been greatly improved through the efforts of all researchers, the rapid increase of data that raises a large number of parameters limits the deep clustering effect [42]. In addition, the decentralization and privacy of real-world data make centralized deep clustering difficult to perform [35]. The emergence of federated learning is one of the effective ways to solve these problems

Federated learning (FL) is a machine learning framework that enables many clients collaboratively learning a shared model without exchanging their private data [4, 39]. Using privacy protection, FL can be applied to most practical application scenarios such as smart healthcare [2, 31], movie recommendation [12] and smart retail [4]. Although FL has been studied a lot in the supervised

learning environment, the FL research in unsupervised setting is still little [9], especially in the field of clustering.

The main challenge in FL is decentralized and heterogeneous characteristics in the data [15]. In the unsupervised FL setting, clients are usually edge devices [25], which makes data features distributed in different spaces. In order to solve the problem of heterogeneous data, most researches focus on clustering clients, i.e., the clustered federated learning [13, 34]. They usually capture the heterogeneity between clients and assign clients to different global models [24]. However, most methods do not consider the communication problems in FL, resulting in low training efficiency and complicated process [13]. A few studies focus on collaborative clustering of data on clients. k-FED [9] proposed a one-shot federated clustering method based on k-means in which all clients share a set of global cluster centers. However, there is still a lack of research on learning local cluster centers. Generally, each client is more concerned about the clustering results on its own data.

Inspired by the above, we propose a novel federated deep subspace clustering model, i.e., FDSC, which trains an auto-encoder to learn data features and a self-expressive layer to construct affinity matrix for spectral clustering. Auto-encoder of each client consists of a shared encoder and a private decoder. The shared encoder is communicated between clients and the central server to improve the data feature extraction. The local decoder is used to reconstruct the original data. In order to keep the local feature space structures of affinity matrix, we add adjacency graph information to the network. We align the affinity matrix with the local adjacency matrix in the form of regular terms. Our main contributions are as follows.

- (1) We propose a novel federated deep subspace clustering framework, i.e., FDSC, show in Fig. 1. We extract data features through the shared convolutional encoder, and perform spectral clustering through the affinity matrix obtained from the local self-expressive layer.
- (2) Our studies achieve the maintenance of the graph structure between local data points that the affinity matrix should be aligned with the adjacency matrix of data points.
- (3) We evaluate the clustering result of FDSC on four image datasets. Our experiments show that FDSC has better performance than the state-of-the-art methods.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the previous research on deep subspace clustering and federated learning. We show the proposed framework FDSC in Section 3. In Section 4, we present the evaluation results on four public image datasets and compare them with the state-of-the-art methods. Section 5 concludes the framework of this paper.

## 2 Related Work

In this section, we introduce three related fields in this paper, i.e., deep subspace clustering (DSC), federated learning (FL) and federated clustering (FC).

### 2.1 Deep Subspace Clustering

DSC is used to solve the problem that the performance of subspace clustering usually drops in non-linear data spaces [40]. DSC incorporates a self-expressive layer in deep auto-encoder to make the representation in the latent space more suitable for spectral

clustering [32]. Benefiting from data extraction of convolutional networks (CNN), DSC has been widely studied [1]. DSC network usually consists of an auto-encoder and a self-expression layer [19]. The former is used for learning data representation, and the latter is used for spectral clustering.

Suppose there is a set of unlabeled data points  $X = \{x_i\}_{i=1,\dots,n}$ , where  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is the  $i$ -th data sample and  $n$  is the total number of samples. These data points come from  $k$  different subspace  $\{S_i\}_{i=1,\dots,k}$ . In general, the self-expressive layer can be expressed as that the data point in a subspace is a linear combination of other points in the same subspace [14], i.e.  $X = XC$ , where  $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is the self-expressive matrix with diagonal block structure [16]. We define the task of the self-expressive layer as

$$\min_{C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}} \|C\|_p + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|X - XC\|_F^2 \quad s.t. \quad (\text{diag}(C) = 0), \quad (1)$$

where  $\lambda$  is a parameter,  $\|C\|_p$  represents an arbitrary norm of matrix  $C$  and  $\|\cdot\|_F$  represents the Frobenius norm.  $p$  has been defined in some studies, e.g., [10] studied the sparse subspace clustering with  $l_1$  norm, [6] proposed a stochastic sparse subspace clustering method using  $l_2$  norms, [7] performed the generalized nonconvex low-rank tensor approximation with nuclear norm. The self-expressive layer takes the representation of the data extracted by the deep encoder as input. Suppose  $\hat{X}$  is the data reconstructed by the auto-encoder, and  $Z$  is the data representation of the encoder output. In general, the loss of deep subspace clustering is [17]

$$\frac{1}{2} \|X - \hat{X}\|_F^2 + \lambda_1 \|C\|_p + \frac{\lambda_2}{2} \|Z - ZC\|_F^2 \quad (2)$$

$s.t. \quad (\text{diag}(C) = 0),$

where  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  are two parameters.

### 2.2 Federated Learning

FL is a decentralized distributed machine learning framework for joint cooperation and privacy protection [30]. It allows multiple clients with private data to participate in model training through the central server [11]. Suppose there are  $m$  clients. Client  $i$  holds the local datasets with the number  $n_i$ , i.e.  $X^i$ . Assume that the local model parameters of client  $i$  is  $W_i$ . Generally, the objective of FL is to learn a global model with collaborative clients [22],

$$\min_W f(W) \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^m p_i f_i(W_i), \quad (3)$$

where  $p_j = n_j / \sum_i n_i$  denotes the parameter weight of the  $j$ -th client.  $f(W)$  is the loss function of the global model with parameters  $W$  and  $f_i(W_i)$  is the loss function of  $i$ -th client.

Many existing studies are devoted to FL in a supervised environment, such as FedAvg [28], FedProx [21] and FedProto [36]. In order to solve the heterogeneity of data among clients, some research has turned to a new perspective recently that divide clients into different groups, i.e., clustered federated learning [27]. The author of [13] proposed IFCA framework that divides clients into different clusters according to similarity and each cluster learns a sharing model. The author in [24] developed a multi-center aggregation model that clusters clients according to local model parameters. Although these methods have considered the solution of data heterogeneity mentioned in Section 1, they need experts to label the local data of

the clients [25]. Actually, the data of terminal equipment is often not marked by experts, which makes supervised learning difficult to train. Federated clustering is the way to solve unlabeled data.

### 2.3 Federated Clustering

Although the research of federated learning in the field of clustering has been studied in the past years, most of them focus on clustering clients. Considering the unsupervised learning environment, the author in [9] proposed k-FED, which is a one-shot federated clustering framework. They solves the communication cost problem in FL. In addition, the author of [35] developed a federated fuzzy clustering algorithm to solve the clustering of horizontal data partitions. The research on FC needs more exploration. Inspired by centralized deep subspace clustering, we propose a subspace clustering method in federated environment.

## 3 The Proposed Model

This section mainly introduces our proposed method FDSC, which includes motivation, the objective function, the framework and the optimization algorithm.

### 3.1 Motivation

In general, traditional federated learning aims at learning common data representations from various clients [8]. This approach enables the representation model to adapt to each private client. The application of deep subspace clustering brings vitality to federated clustering learning. There are three observations in federated deep subspace clustering:

- (1) Traditional federated learning which is to learn a global clustering model does not perform well on the client with data heterogeneity. Personalized federated learning usually needs a shared representation model and a local downstream task model.
- (2) The key of deep subspace clustering is to generate the self-expressive matrix for data representation. Since spectral clustering is performed on the self-expressive matrix, the self-expressive layer is local model.
- (3) In order to keep the reconstruction of local data, the decoder on client should not be shared.

There is currently a lack of a federated framework for deep subspace learning, which preserves the commonality of data representation on each client and performs subspace clustering locally.

### 3.2 Objective Function

Inspired by the above discoveries, our proposed method FDSC divides the data on the client into different subspaces. Each client has a shared encoder  $M_E$ , a private self-expressive layer  $M_R$  and a private decoder  $M_D$ . Let  $E_i$ ,  $R_i$  and  $D_i$  denote the encoder parameters, the self-expressive layer parameters and the decoder parameters of the client  $i$ .  $M_{E_i}$  captures the common features among clients in federated learning framework.  $M_{D_i}$  maintains the local feature space of the client.

Suppose  $Z_i$  is the output of the encoder  $M_{E_i}$ , i.e., the representation matrix of data set  $X_i$  on the client  $i$ . Each  $z_i$  in  $Z_i$  is a node in the linear space. Through the fully connected linear layer  $M_{R_i}$ , the

weight of self-expressive layer is the self-expressive matrix. The loss function on client  $i$  is

$$f_i = \frac{1}{2} \|X^i - \widehat{X}^i\|_F^2 + \lambda_1 \|R_i\|_p + \frac{\lambda_2}{2} \|Z^i - Z^i R_i\|_F^2 \quad (4)$$

*s.t.*  $(\text{diag}(R_i) = 0)$ ,

where  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  are parameters, and  $\|\cdot\|_p$  is arbitrary matrix norm. Then, the objective function of FDSC is defined as

$$\min_{E_*} \sum_{i=1}^m p_i \min_{E_i, R_i, D_i} f_i(E_i, R_i, D_i), \quad (5)$$

where  $p_j = n_j / \sum_i^m n_i$  denotes the weight of the  $j$ -th client.  $E_*$  is the global encoder, which is weighted and averaged by the encoders  $E_i^t$  of the clients participating in the  $t$  round of communication,

$$E_*^{(t+1)} = \sum_{i=1}^m p_i E_i^t. \quad (6)$$

In order to ensure that the self-expressive matrix keeps the block characteristics of similar features on the client, we propose an approach of aligning to local adjacency matrix. We define an adjacency matrix constructor, i.e.,  $g(\cdot)$ , and establish an adjacency matrix on local data  $X^i$ .  $g(\cdot)$  can be the  $k$ -nearest neighbors ( $k$ -NN) method [33]. Then, we have

$$A_i = g_{k\text{-NN}}(X^i), \quad (7)$$

where  $A_i$  is the adjacency matrix on the  $i$ -th client. Then, the objective function on client  $i$  is

$$f_i = \frac{1}{2} \|X^i - \widehat{X}^i\|_F^2 + \lambda_1 \|R_i\|_p + \frac{\lambda_2}{2} \|Z^i - Z^i R_i\|_F^2 + \lambda_3 (\alpha A_i - \beta R_i) \quad (8)$$

*s.t.*  $(\text{diag}(R_i) = 0)$ ,

where  $\lambda_3$ ,  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are balance parameters.

### 3.3 Framework

In this study, the auto-encoder is implemented by the convolutional neural networks (CNN) to train image data. To be specific, we use two CNN layers for encoder and decoder respectively and a fully connected layer for self-expressive layer. The overall framework of FDSC is shown in Fig. 1.

### 3.4 Optimization Algorithm

In FDSC, the sever is responsible for communication among clients. The server is used to calculate and broadcast the global encoder  $E_*$ . On each client, the local model consists of shared encoder  $E_i$ , private self-expression layer  $R_i$  and private decoder  $D_i$ . At the beginning of local training, the encoder  $E_i$  is replaced by the received global encoder  $E_*$ . To compute  $\lambda_3(\alpha A_i - \beta R_i)$  in Eq. (8), we use  $K$ -NN to calculate the adjacency matrix of each client data and store it before model training. In order to ensure the stability of local model training, we use stochastic gradient descent with momentum. The details of FDSC are given in Algorithm 1.

## 4 Experiment

This section shows the experimental results of the proposed FDSC on four public image datasets.




Figure 2: The samples of image datasets MNIST, ORL, COIL20 and COIL100.

---

#### Algorithm 1: The FDSC Algorithm

---

**Parameters:** Number of communication rounds  $T$ , number of local epochs  $\tau$ , number of clients  $m$ , participation rate  $r$ , parameters  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \alpha, \beta$ .

**Initialization**  $E_*^0, R_1^0, \dots, R_m^0, D_1^0, \dots, D_m^0$

*/\*\* Generating adjacency matrix with K-NN \*\*/*

**for**  $i = 1$  **to**  $m$  **in parallel do**

- $A_i = g_{k-NN}(X^i)$
- Store matrix  $A_i$  locally

**end**

*/\*\* Server federation \*\*/*

**for**  $t = 1$  **to**  $T$  **do**

- Server chooses a random group of clients  $S^t$  of size  $rm$
- Send  $E_*^{t-1}$  to the clients in  $S^t$
- for** each client  $i$  in  $S^t$  **in parallel do**
- /\*\* Local training \*\*/*
- Client  $i$  trains model with  $E_*^{t-1}$
- Server collects result :  $E_i^t$
- end**
- Server computes the new global encoder by Eq. (6)

**end**

*/\*\* Client training \*\*/*

- Client  $i$  receives global encoder  $E_*^{t-1}$
- Client  $i$  initializes  $E_i^t = E_*^{t-1}, R_i^t = R_i^{t-1}, D_i^t = D_i^{t-1}$
- for**  $e = 1$  **to**  $\tau$  **do**
- Train the local model by Eq. (8)
- end**
- Client  $i$  sends  $E_i^t$  to the server

---

#### 4.1 The Used Datasets

In order to compare with the state-of-the-art subspace clustering methods, we perform FDSC on four image datasets. The datasets are shown as follows.

**MNIST**<sup>1</sup>. This dataset consists of black and white images of handwritten digits 0 – 9. The whole dataset has 70,000 images, of which the training set contains 60,000 images and the test set has 10,000 images. Each image has  $28 \times 28$  gray pixels. In this clustering task, we only use the training set. The first row in Fig.2 shows several example images.

**ORL**<sup>2</sup>. This dataset consists of face images, including 40 different samples. And there are 10 images in each sample directory, which are collected in different time, illumination, facial expressions and facial details. Each image has the size of  $112 \times 92$  pixels. We compress the image size to  $32 \times 32$  pixels. The last row in Fig.2 shows some images.

**COIL20**<sup>3</sup>. This dataset is a collection of color pictures, which includes 20 objects from different angles, taking an image every 5 degrees, and each object has 72 images. The size of each image is  $128 \times 128$  pixels. Some images are shown in the second row in Fig.2.

**COIL100**<sup>4</sup>. This dataset is composed of three-channel color images of 100 objects. Each object has 72 postures, which are taken at different angles in a 360 rotation. Each image has the size of  $128 \times 128$  pixels. The third row in Fig.2 illustrates example images.

#### 4.2 Experiment Settings

In order to evaluate the clustering performance of our method, we compared FDSC with Low rank subspace clustering (LRSC) [38], Deep Low-Rank Subspace Clustering (DLRSC) [18] and Deep Subspace Clustering Networks (DSCN) [17]. We divided the dataset containing  $n$  samples into  $m$  subsets, where each subset contains about  $n/m$  samples. We randomly selected samples with  $q$  categories into these subsets, where  $1 \leq q \leq c$  and  $c$  is the total number of classes in the data set. In our experiment, we set

<sup>1</sup><http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/>

<sup>2</sup><https://www.cs.columbia.edu/CAVE/software/softlib/coil-100.php>

<sup>3</sup><https://www.cs.columbia.edu/CAVE/software/softlib/coil-20.php>

<sup>4</sup><https://www.cs.columbia.edu/CAVE/software/softlib/coil-100.php>

$\tau = 7, \lambda_3 = 1e6, \alpha = 1, \beta = 1$ . The other setting of training parameters are as follows: for MNIST,  $T = 100, \lambda_1 = 1, \lambda_2 = 15, m = 20, r = 0.25$ ; for ORL,  $T = 200, \lambda_1 = 2, \lambda_2 = 0.2, m = 5, r = 0.4$ ; for COIL20,  $T = 100, \lambda_1 = 1, \lambda_2 = 75, m = 5, r = 0.4$ ; for COIL100,  $T = 100, \lambda_1 = 1, \lambda_2 = 15, m = 5, r = 0.4$ .

In order to compare the effect of clustering, we used four evaluation indicators, which are ACC, NMI, AMI and ARI. We compared the clustering labels with the real labels to calculate the clustering accuracy, i.e.,

$$ACC = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \delta(o(\hat{y}_j), y_j) \quad (9)$$

where  $y_j$  is the real label of sample  $x_j$  and  $\hat{y}_j$  is the clustering label in experiments. Indicator function  $\delta(x, y) = 1$  when  $x = y$ , otherwise 0.  $o(\hat{y}_j)$  is a mapping function to find the clustering label that best match the true label.

NMI is normalised mutual information, which is a commonly used evaluation metric in clustering, it measures the degree of consistency between the clustering results and the real labels, the NMI index value ranges from  $[0, 1]$ , the closer the value is to 1, the higher the degree of similarity between the clustering results and the real labels, the NMI value is 0 means that there is no correlation between the clustering results and the real labels, i.e., clustering effect is very bad, and NMI value is 1 means that the clustering results are completely consistent with the real labels. NMI of 1 means that the clustering results are completely consistent with the real labels.

The AMI index is an adapted form of the Mutual Information Indicator (MII), which corrects for the uncertainty of the clustering results by taking into account the effects of random assignment and category imbalance on the results. Like the NMI, the AMI index takes values in the range  $[0, 1]$ , with values closer to 1 indicating better clustering results.

ARI is the Adjusted Rand Index, which is used to measure the similarity between the clustering results and the real labels, and it takes into account the effect of the random allocation of data, and takes the value in the range of  $[-1, 1]$ . The closer the value of ARI index is to 1, it means that the clustering results are more similar to the real labels.

The final results of the four clustering indexes in this section are presented in the form of percentage.

### 4.3 Representation Visualization

This subsection aims to explore the influence of federated subspace clustering. We used MNIST to train FDSC and DSCN to display clustering results of data representation. In FDSC, we used 20 clients to train image samples, and  $q = 10$ . Then, we used t-SNE method [37] to reduce the representation of the image to 2D. Fig.3 shows the 2D scatter plots of 4 clients randomly selected from all 20 participants. The first row shows the result of FDSC representation, and the second row shows the result of DSCN representation, where the data points with different colours represent the real categories that the data belongs to.

On the first client, aggregation of two types of data points, royal blue and brown, using FDSC, works better. On the second client, aggregation of data points using FDSC's royal blue, teal, and brown colors works better. On the third client, pink data point aggregation

with FDSC works better. On the fourth client, the aggregation of two types of data points, teal and brown, works better with FDSC. As shown in Fig.3, the represented scatter plot of FDSC has a better subspace segmentation effect than the centralized DSCN.

In addition, we evaluated the clustering results of this 2D scatter points with ACC, NMI, AMI and ARI. The first row in Table 1 shows that the representation results on four clients with using the local DSCN method. The second row in Table 1 shows the representation scatter points on FDSC. Table 1 shows four measurements of 2D points of FDSC and DSCN. As is shown, under the four clustering evaluation indexes, the corresponding values of FDSC were greater than those of DSCN. The clustering effect of 2D representation points on FDSC is better than that on DSCN. Our proposed FDSC absorbs the features between clients, which enhances the clustering effect.

**Table 1: Cluster evaluations of 2D points. The larger the data, the better the clustering effect.**


Methods	ACC	NMI	AMI	ARI
DSCN	58.2	56.6	53.7	38.2
FDSC	63.4	59.2	57.6	45.4

### 4.4 Self-expression Matrix Visualization


This section explores the influence of federated self-expression learning with FDSC on clustering. We used MNIST and COIL20 to train FDSC and visualized the weight matrix of the self-expression layer. We set up 20 participants, the number of classes for each client is  $q = 10$  for MNIST and  $q = 20$  for COIL20. For comparison, the same client data is also trained on the DSCN method. Fig. 4 illustrates the results of self-expression matrix with local DSCN and FDSC respectively. The first row shows the matrix training on MNIST and the second row shows the results on COIL20. The matrix on the left of each row is the self-expression matrix of the DSCN, and the matrix results of the FDSC are on the right.

When using the MNIST dataset, we distribute 10,000 test samples to 20 participants, so that each participant gets exactly 50 samples for each category. When using the COIL20 dataset, we assign 20 classes of data to each participant, and 10 data points for each class of data to facilitate testing. Subsequently, on the two types of datasets, we averaged the clustering results of the same category of data among the 20 participants and expressed the average results as numerical values between 0 and 1.

The color legend on the right side of each figure in Fig. 4 shows the relationship between color and value. The more red the color patch is, the stronger the similarity of the corresponding subspace data. The more the color patch tends to be purple, the weaker the data similarity of the corresponding subspace. In the first row, the diagonal patch of the second image is closer to red than the other area patches. In contrast, the color difference between diagonal and non-diagonal patches in the first image is not significant. In the second row, the diagonal patches of the second image are very close to red in color, while the non-diagonal patches are predominantly blue and green. In the first image, the diagonal patches are not as close to red as in the second image, but the non-diagonal patches



**Figure 3: Scatterplot of 2D representation of DSCN at the first row and FDSC at the second row. Each column represents a separate representation of the same data on the same client. Images of different colors represent different categories of data.**



**Figure 4: Visualization of self-expression matrices of DSCN at the first column and FDSC at the second column. The first row is the training result on MNIST and the second row is the training result on COIL20. Colors indicate the data in the different classes.**

are relatively close to red. This indicates that the self-expression matrix trained by FDSC has a better block diagonal structure, that is, the federated deep subspace learning method can better represent a certain data as a linear combination of other data in the same subspace.

#### 4.5 Clustering Results

Table 2 shows image clustering results on four datasets by using LRSC, DLRSC, DSCN, FDSC1( $\lambda_3 = 0$ ) and FDSC2( $\lambda_3 = 1e6$ ). We

assumed that the number of clients corresponding to each dataset is  $m$  and the data categories held on each client is  $q$ . To ensure the appropriateness of the amount of data obtained by each client when using different datasets, we set  $m = 20$  on MNIST,  $m = 5$  on ORL,  $m = 5$  on COIL20 and  $m = 5$  on COIL100. To explore the influence of data heterogeneity on training effect, we first tested clustering methods with different  $q$  to compare the performance of the methods. We set  $q = \{5, 10\}$  on MNIST,  $q = \{20, 40\}$  on ORL,  $q = \{10, 20\}$  on COIL20 and  $q = \{50, 100\}$  on COIL100.

As is shown, our federated method FDSC has higher clustering accuracy than other methods with centralized learning on all datasets. Under various parameter settings, FDSC achieves the best clustering index. Compared with FDSC1, FDSC2 adds a regular term that aligns the self-expression matrix to the adjacency matrix, and the clustering result is better, which verifies the FDSC with regular optimization achieves better clustering results than the method without regular optimization. In the environment of data heterogeneity, in addition to MNIST data sets, other data sets such as ORL, COIL20 and COIL100 perform better when the degree of data heterogeneity on the client is low, that is, the  $q$  is large. This shows that in most cases, with the reduction of client data heterogeneity, FDSC method can effectively improve the clustering effect. On MNIST, when the data heterogeneity of the client is higher, i.e., the  $q$  is less, the clustering result is better.

#### 4.6 Parameter Discussion

In this subsection, we made more insights into the impacts of the parameters in FDSC, i.e., the number of clients  $m$  and the batch size  $b$ . We used MNIST to explore the influence of parameters on FDSC.

To probe the influence of the number of clients, we set the batch size of clients to 500, and changed the number of clients  $m$  with  $\{10, 20, 30, 40, 50\}$ . Table 3 shows the clustering results by different

**Table 2: Results of image clustering by using all mentioned methods. By setting different  $q$ , we test ACC, NMI, AMI and ARI on four datasets respectively. The data set used is in the first row, the value of  $q$  is in the second row, the evaluation index is in the third row, and the clustering results of different methods (100 for perfect aggregation) are in 4-8 rows.**

Methods	MNIST								ORL							
	q=5				q=10				q=20				q=40			
	ACC	NMI	AMI	ARI	ACC	NMI	AMI	ARI	ACC	NMI	AMI	ARI	ACC	NMI	AMI	ARI
<b>LRSC</b>	77.4	78.6	79.1	68.2	67.9	72.1	71.6	65.8	50.8	66.9	34.5	28.5	62.1	73.5	38.9	34.7
<b>DLRSC</b>	79.6	80.2	80.9	69.3	68.5	74.3	73.7	65.2	51.4	67.3	34.1	27.9	62.6	75.4	38.6	34.2
<b>DSCN</b>	81.7	82.3	81.3	71.3	70.4	77.5	76.1	66.3	52.5	69.2	36.6	28.7	64.5	76.1	40.1	35.2
<b>FDSC1</b>	82.4	84.1	83.6	72.8	71.7	78.1	77.2	63.1	53.2	70.7	36.4	28.5	65.2	76.5	41.6	36.1
<b>FDSC2</b>	83.8	84.6	84.4	73.1	72.9	79.7	78.9	65.8	53.7	71.6	37.4	29.3	67.5	77.6	42.4	37.4

Methods	COIL20								COIL100							
	q=10				q=20				q=50				q=100			
	ACC	NMI	AMI	ARI	ACC	NMI	AMI	ARI	ACC	NMI	AMI	ARI	ACC	NMI	AMI	ARI
<b>LRSC</b>	64.2	72.8	69.3	50.4	68.7	81.3	75.2	58.4	60.7	80.3	71.3	54.8	75.3	86.4	72.6	58.4
<b>DLRSC</b>	66.3	73.9	70.1	51.8	68.2	81.9	76.4	60.8	62.9	81.5	72.6	55.4	76.4	87.9	73.5	60.2
<b>DSCN</b>	68.5	76.7	71.2	53.5	70.5	84.2	78.5	61.4	64.7	83.4	73.9	56.5	78.1	89.4	75.2	61.6
<b>FDSC1</b>	70.5	73.9	73.1	54.7	71.3	85.4	79.8	62.5	65.8	84.3	75.3	58.9	78.4	90.5	76.8	63.4
<b>FDSC2</b>	71.3	75.2	74.1	55.3	72.5	86.6	80.6	63.6	66.7	85.7	76.4	59.5	79.4	91.5	77.2	64.9

**Table 3: The clustering results by different number of clients. The higher the value corresponding to the clustering index, the better the clustering effect.**

Number of clients	Methods	ACC	NMI	AMI	ARI
10	FDSC1	86.9	81.5	81.2	79.3
	FDSC2	87.6	82.7	82.5	79.8
20	FDSC1	87.5	83.2	83.1	78.6
	FDSC2	88.4	84.3	84.2	79.8
30	FDSC1	88.2	85.1	84.7	82.1
	FDSC2	90.6	86.5	86.9	82.8
40	FDSC1	90.3	86.7	87.9	83.5
	FDSC2	91.9	87.3	88.1	84.2
50	FDSC1	92.6	87.9	87.4	83.6
	FDSC2	93.5	89.1	89.5	85.3

**Table 4: The clustering results by different batch size. The higher the value corresponding to the clustering index, the better the clustering effect.**

Batch size	Methods	ACC	NMI	AMI	ARI
100	FDSC1	82.5	80.6	80.9	74.7
	FDSC2	83.2	81.5	81.6	75.2
250	FDSC1	84.2	82.7	82.4	76.8
	FDSC2	85.8	83.4	82.9	77.3
500	FDSC1	86.1	83.9	83.2	77.6
	FDSC2	87.4	84.1	83.8	78.2
750	FDSC1	87.8	83.6	83.3	79.2
	FDSC2	89.2	85.0	85.6	80.3
1000	FDSC1	91.9	87.4	87.9	81.3
	FDSC2	93.2	89.9	89.7	82.6

*m*. From the results, as the number of clients increases, the clustering effect is better. The clustering accuracy of FDSC benefits from the participation of more clients.

To examine the effect of the batch size in model training, we assigned the MNIST to 20 clients by varying batchsize  $b$  with {100, 250, 500, 750, 1000}. Table 4 shows the evaluation indicators in FDSC. As is shown, as the batch size increases, the clustering effect is better. FDSC achieves higher performance with the increase of client batch size.

## 5 Discussion and Conclusion

This study proposes a novel federated deep subspace clustering framework, called FDSC. As far as we know, FDSC is the first federated clustering model that using deep subspace clustering to

group the data on all clients jointly. FDSC exploits shared encoder to learn common representation and learns the self-expressive matrix for local spectral clustering task. We finally evaluated FDSC on four image data sets and compared it with subspace clustering model. The experimental results show that FDSC performs better under the four clustering indexes.

## 6 Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Nos. 62272392 and U22A2025), the Key Research and Development Program of Shaanxi Province (No. 2023-YBGY-405), and Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (No. G2023KY0603).

## References

- [1] Mahdi Abavisani and Vishal M Patel. 2018. Deep multimodal subspace clustering networks. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing* 12, 6 (2018), 1601–1614.
- [2] KS Arikumar, Sahaya Beni Prathiba, Mamoun Alazab, Thippa Reddy Gadekallu, Sharnil Pandya, Javed Masood Khan, and Rajalakshmi Shenbaga Moorthy. 2022. FL-PMI: federated learning-based person movement identification through wearable devices in smart healthcare systems. *Sensors* 22, 4 (2022), 1377.
- [3] Sangwon Baek, Gangjoon Yoon, Jinjoo Song, and Sang Min Yoon. 2021. Deep self-representative subspace clustering network. *Pattern Recognition* 118 (2021), 108041.
- [4] Syreen Banabilah, Moayad Aloqaily, Eitaa Alsayed, Nida Malik, and Yaser Jaraweh. 2022. Federated learning review: Fundamentals, enabling technologies, and future applications. *Information processing & management* 59, 6 (2022), 103061.
- [5] Kamal Berahmand, Mehrnoush Mohammadi, Azadeh Faroughi, and Rojiar Pir Mohammadiani. 2022. A novel method of spectral clustering in attributed networks by constructing parameter-free affinity matrix. *Cluster Computing* (2022), 1–20.
- [6] Ying Chen, Chun-Guang Li, and Chong You. 2020. Stochastic sparse subspace clustering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 4155–4164.
- [7] Yongyong Chen, Shuqin Wang, Chong Peng, Zhongyun Hua, and Yicong Zhou. 2021. Generalized nonconvex low-rank tensor approximation for multi-view subspace clustering. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing* 30 (2021), 4022–4035.
- [8] 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.
- [9] Don Kurian Dennis, Tian Li, and Virginia Smith. 2021. Heterogeneity for the win: One-shot federated clustering. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2611–2620.
- [10] Ehsan Elhamifar and René Vidal. 2013. Sparse subspace clustering: Algorithm, theory, and applications. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 35, 11 (2013), 2765–2781.
- [11] Xiuwen Fang and Mang Ye. 2022. Robust federated learning with noisy and heterogeneous clients. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 10072–10081.
- [12] Dashan Gao, Ben Tan, Ce Ju, Vincent W Zheng, and Qiang Yang. 2020. Privacy threats against federated matrix factorization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.01587* (2020).
- [13] Avishek Ghosh, Jichan Chung, Dong Yin, and Kannan Ramchandran. 2020. An efficient framework for clustered federated learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 19586–19597.
- [14] Benjamin D Haeffele, Chong You, and René Vidal. 2020. A critique of self-expressive deep subspace clustering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.03697* (2020).
- [15] Sungwon Han, Sungwon Park, Fangzhao Wu, Sundong Kim, Chuhan Wu, Xing Xie, and Meeyoung Cha. 2022. FedX: Unsupervised Federated Learning with Cross Knowledge Distillation. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2022: 17th European Conference, Tel Aviv, Israel, October 23–27, 2022, Proceedings, Part XXX*. Springer, 691–707.
- [16] Pan Ji, Mathieu Salzmann, and Hongdong Li. 2014. Efficient dense subspace clustering. In *IEEE Winter conference on applications of computer vision*. IEEE, 461–468.
- [17] Pan Ji, Tong Zhang, Hongdong Li, Mathieu Salzmann, and Ian Reid. 2017. Deep subspace clustering networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [18] Mohsen Kheirandishfard, Fariba Zohrizadeh, and Farhad Kamangar. 2020. Deep low-rank subspace clustering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*. 864–865.
- [19] Jianjun Lei, Xinyu Li, Bo Peng, Leyuan Fang, Nam Ling, and Qingming Huang. 2020. Deep spatial-spectral subspace clustering for hyperspectral image. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology* 31, 7 (2020), 2686–2697.
- [20] Kun Li, Yao Qin, Qiang Ling, Yingqian Wang, Zaiping Lin, and Wei An. 2021. Self-supervised deep subspace clustering for hyperspectral images with adaptive self-expressive coefficient matrix initialization. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing* 14 (2021), 3215–3227.
- [21] 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.
- [22] Xiang Li, Kaixuan Huang, Wenhao Yang, Shusen Wang, and Zhihua Zhang. 2019. On the convergence of fedavg on non-iid data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.02189* (2019).
- [23] Zengyi Li, Yubei Chen, Yann LeCun, and Friedrich T Sommer. 2022. Neural manifold clustering and embedding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.10000* (2022).
- [24] Guodong Long, Ming Xie, Tao Shen, Tianyi Zhou, Xianzhi Wang, and Jing Jiang. 2023. Multi-center federated learning: clients clustering for better personalization. *World Wide Web* 26, 1 (2023), 481–500.
- [25] Ekdeep Singh Lubana, Chi Ian Tang, Fahim Kawsar, Robert P Dick, and Akhil Mathur. 2022. Orchestra: Unsupervised federated learning via globally consistent clustering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.11506* (2022).
- [26] Juncheng Lv, Zhao Kang, Xiao Lu, and Zenglin Xu. 2021. Pseudo-supervised deep subspace clustering. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing* 30 (2021), 5252–5263.
- [27] Yishay Mansour, Mehryar Mohri, Jae Ro, and Ananda Theertha Suresh. 2020. Three approaches for personalization with applications to federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.10619* (2020).
- [28] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Agüera y Arcas. 2017. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *The Proceedings of Artificial intelligence and statistics*. PMLR, 1273–1282.
- [29] Andrew Ng, Michael Jordan, and Yair Weiss. 2001. On spectral clustering: Analysis and an algorithm. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 14 (2001).
- [30] Dinh C Nguyen, Ming Ding, Pubudu N Pathirana, Aruna Seneviratne, Jun Li, and H Vincent Poor. 2021. Federated learning for internet of things: A comprehensive survey. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials* 23, 3 (2021), 1622–1658.
- [31] Dinh C Nguyen, Quoc-Viet Pham, Pubudu N Pathirana, Ming Ding, Aruna Seneviratne, Zihuai Lin, Octavia Dobre, and Won-Joo Hwang. 2022. Federated learning for smart healthcare: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 55, 3 (2022), 1–37.
- [32] Xi Peng, Jiashi Feng, Joey Tianyi Zhou, Yingjie Lei, and Shuicheng Yan. 2020. Deep subspace clustering. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems* 31, 12 (2020), 5509–5521.
- [33] Leif E Peterson. 2009. K-nearest neighbor. *Scholarpedia* 4, 2 (2009), 1883.
- [34] Felix Sattler, Klaus-Robert Müller, and Wojciech Samek. 2020. Clustered federated learning: Model-agnostic distributed multitask optimization under privacy constraints. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems* 32, 8 (2020), 3710–3722.
- [35] Morris Stallmann and Anna Wilbik. 2022. Towards Federated Clustering: A Federated Fuzzy c-Means Algorithm (FFCM). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.07316* (2022).
- [36] Yue Tan, Guodong Long, Lu Liu, Tianyi Zhou, Qinghua Lu, Jing Jiang, and Chengqi Zhang. 2022. Fedproto: Federated prototype learning across heterogeneous clients. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 36. 8432–8440.
- [37] Laurens Van der Maaten and Geoffrey Hinton. 2008. Visualizing data using t-SNE. *Journal of machine learning research* 9, 11 (2008).
- [38] René Vidal and Paolo Favaro. 2014. Low rank subspace clustering (LRSC). *Pattern Recognition Letters* 43 (2014), 47–61.
- [39] Qiang Yang, Yang Liu, Tianjian Chen, and Yongxin Tong. 2019. Federated machine learning: Concept and applications. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)* 10, 2 (2019), 1–19.
- [40] Shuai Yang, Wenqi Zhu, and Yuesheng Zhu. 2020. Residual encoder-decoder network for deep subspace clustering. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*. IEEE, 2895–2899.
- [41] Hongyan Zhang, Han Zhai, Liangpei Zhang, and Pingxiang Li. 2016. Spectral-spatial sparse subspace clustering for hyperspectral remote sensing images. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 54, 6 (2016), 3672–3684.
- [42] Qingchen Zhang, Laurence T Yang, Zhikui Chen, and Peng Li. 2018. A survey on deep learning for big data. *Information Fusion* 42 (2018), 146–157.
- [43] Yupei Zhang, Ming Xiang, and Bo Yang. 2017. Low-rank preserving embedding. *Pattern Recognition* 70 (2017), 112–125.
- [44] Pengfei Zhu, Binyuan Hui, Changqing Zhang, Dawei Du, Longyin Wen, and Qinghua Hu. 2019. Multi-view deep subspace clustering networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.01978* (2019).