

Distributed Multiple Testing with False Discovery Rate Control in the Presence of Byzantines

Daofu Zhang

Electrical and Computer Engineering
University of Utah
Email: daofu.zhang@utah.edu

Yu Xiang

Electrical and Computer Engineering
University of Utah
Email: yu.xiang@utah.edu

Mehrdad Pournaderi

Microbiology and Immunology
University at Buffalo–SUNY
Email: mehrdadp@buffalo.edu

Pramod Varshney

Electrical Engineering and Computer Science
Syracuse University
Email: varshney@syr.edu

Abstract—This work studies distributed multiple testing with false discovery rate (FDR) control in the presence of Byzantine attacks, where an adversary captures a fraction of the nodes and corrupts their reported p-values. We focus on two baseline attack models: an oracle model with the full knowledge of which hypotheses are true nulls, and a practical attack model that leverages the Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) procedure locally to classify which p-values follow the true null hypotheses. We provide a thorough characterization of how both attack models affect the global FDR, which in turn motivates counter-attack strategies and stronger attack models. Our extensive simulation studies confirm the theoretical results, highlight key design trade-offs under attacks and countermeasures, and provide insights into more sophisticated attacks.

I. INTRODUCTION

We consider the problem of testing multiple hypotheses over a network with a central agent, in the presence of Byzantine attacks. *An adversary (or adversarial agent) can capture a fraction of the nodes and launch a Byzantine attack.* As a consequence, the attacked nodes will report statistics altered by an adversary to the central decision-making unit, thereby corrupting the statistical properties of the data. Specifically, we focus on the global performance under the false discovery rate (FDR) control [1]–[5], a widely-used statistical measure that quantifies the expected proportion of false rejections. A similar theme has been investigated in [6], yet under a completely different formulation from this work. Without adversarial attacks, the distributed multiple testing problem under FDR control has been studied from various perspectives in the literature [7]–[14]. In the pioneering works [7]–[10], the authors have investigated the distributed sensor networks under a broadcast model, where each sensor is allowed to broadcast its decision to the entire network. More recently, it has been shown that FDR control can be achieved in multi-hop network settings [11]. Along the same lines, the communication-efficiency perspective has been studied in the finite-sample [12] and asymptotic [13] regimes.

The objective of this study is to understand the impact of Byzantine attacks in terms of controlling the global FDR over

the entire network. Our contributions are threefold. First, we introduce two baseline attack models. One is the oracle setting where the attacker has knowledge of the underlying hypothesis (true null vs. false null hypothesis) of each p-value under attack. This baseline model is the ideal setting that can not be realized in real-world scenarios. This motivates us to study a practical attack model that relies on using the celebrated Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) procedure [1], which controls FDR, as a classification technique. Then, we formally characterize the cost in FDR under both models and develop counter-attack schemes along with stronger attack models, building on our baseline model. Lastly, we carry out extensive experimental studies to verify our theoretical findings as well as explore other potential attack strategies.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

Suppose that there are n null hypotheses distributed over a network with d nodes along with one central agent, where each node needs to test n/d hypotheses and we assume n/d is an integer for simplicity of presentation throughout this work.

Let $H_{0,i}, 1 \leq i \leq n$, denote the null hypotheses and each node performs their test based on the test statistics $X_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$. Let $p_i = \Psi_{H_{0,i}}(X_i), 1 \leq i \leq n$, denote the p-values computed for the test statistics, where $\Psi_{H_{0,i}} = 1 - F_{H_{0,i}}$ and $F_{H_{0,i}}$ is the CDF of X_i under $H_{0,i}$. Let \mathcal{H}_0 denote the set consisting of all the true null hypotheses (or true nulls for short) and we assume that the cardinality of \mathcal{H}_0 is n_0 , that is, $|\mathcal{H}_0| = n_0$. Throughout this work, we assume that all the n p-values are independent, which is the classical assumption in the FDR literature; even though some of our results can be readily extended to some dependent settings, we leave the comprehensive treatment for future work.

The FDR measures the expected incorrect rejections of true null hypotheses, among all rejected hypotheses:

$$\text{FDR} = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{V}{R \vee 1} \right],$$

where V is the number of false rejections, R is the total number of rejections, and $a \vee b := \max\{a, b\}$. The power of a multiple testing procedure is the expected true discovery proportion, defined as power = $\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{R-V}{n_1 \vee 1}\right]$, where $n_1 = n - n_0$.

The attacker captures a fraction λ of nodes that have m p-values in total, $\{p_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{H}^a}$ with $|\mathcal{H}^a| = m$, and carries out the attack by changing them to $\{\tilde{p}_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{H}^a}$ in an adversarial way. Note that this implies that the fraction is $\lambda = m/n$. Among all the $m = m_0 + m_1$ p-values, there are m_0 true nulls (indexed by \mathcal{H}_0^a with $|\mathcal{H}_0^a| = m_0$) and m_1 non-nulls (indexed by \mathcal{H}_1^a with $|\mathcal{H}_1^a| = m_1$). Throughout this work, we assume that the nodes being attacked need to send $\{\tilde{p}_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{H}^a}$ to the central server (i.e., the central agent will receive n p-values from all of the d nodes). After receiving all the p-values sent by the nodes in the network, the central agent runs the BH procedure globally to make \tilde{R} rejections, and \tilde{V} denotes the total number of false rejections, leading to the FDR after the attack:

$$\text{FDR}_{\text{attack}} = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\tilde{V}}{\tilde{R} \vee 1}\right].$$

In the following sections, we will start by analyzing an oracle attack setting and then study one practical attack model (based on the BH procedure) as well as counter-attack schemes.

III. ORACLE ATTACK ANALYSIS

For simplicity, we start with analyzing the setting when the attacker captures one node that has m p-values; this implies that $m = n/d$ according to Section II. The BH procedure conducted at the central agent consists of three steps:

- (1) Arrange all p-values in increasing order $p_{(1)} \leq p_{(2)} \leq \dots \leq p_{(n)}$.
- (2) Compute thresholds for each p-value as $\tau_i := q \cdot (i/n)$, where q is the desired FDR level.
- (3) Reject all hypotheses with p-values $p_{(i)} \leq p_{(i_0)}$, where $i_0 := \max\{i : p_{(i)} \leq \tau_i\}$.

We first introduce the *oracle attack model*, where we assume that the attacker knows which m_0 p-values are true nulls.

Oracle attack model: *The attacker changes all of the m_0 true null p-values to 0 and changes the rest of the m_1 non-null p-values to 1.*

We denote the FDR under the oracle attack model by $\text{FDR}_{\text{attack}}^*$. Now we are ready to state our first main result.

Theorem 1. *Suppose the attacker captures one node with m p-values, and carries out the oracle attack. Then*

$$\text{FDR}_{\text{attack}}^* = m_0 \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{\tilde{R} \vee 1}\right] + \frac{q(n_0 - m_0)}{n}, \quad (1)$$

when the BH procedure is applied at the central agent.

It is well-known that the BH procedure guarantees that $\text{FDR} = q(n_0/n)$. From Theorem 1, it is straightforward to see that $\text{FDR}_{\text{attack}}^* \geq q(n_0/n)$, which follows from the fact that $\tilde{R} \leq n$. Therefore, the oracle attack will always result in an increase in the FDR.

Proof. Recall that we use \mathcal{H}_0^a to denote the set of true nulls the attacker can access and $|\mathcal{H}_0^a| = m_0$ denotes the number of p-values changed to 0 by the attacker. Noting that the 0 p-values always get rejected by the BH procedure, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{FDR}_{\text{attack}}^* &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0^a} \frac{\tilde{V}_i}{\tilde{R} \vee 1}\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0 \setminus \mathcal{H}_0^a} \frac{\tilde{V}_i}{\tilde{R} \vee 1}\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{m_0}{\tilde{R} \vee 1}\right] + \frac{q}{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0 \setminus \mathcal{H}_0^a} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbf{1}\{p_i \leq q\tilde{R}/n\}}{(q/n)(\tilde{R} \vee 1)}\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{m_0}{\tilde{R} \vee 1}\right] + q \frac{(n_0 - m_0)}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{V}_i = \mathbf{1}\{p_i \leq q\tilde{R}/n\}$, $\mathcal{H}_0 \setminus \mathcal{H}_0^a$ denotes the indices of true nulls that the attacker has not touched, and the last equality holds according to [15, Lemma 3.2] (also see [16]). \square

Remark 1. *In the proof of Theorem 1, the second term holds regardless of the attack strategy. For the first term, one always has $\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0^a} \frac{\tilde{V}_i}{\tilde{R} \vee 1}\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{m_0}{\tilde{R} \vee 1}\right]$ as $\tilde{V}_i \leq 1$. Thus, Theorem 1 holds with inequality for any attack strategy and is achievable by the oracle attack. However, \tilde{R} in the bound still depends on the attack model. To make the bound independent of the attacker strategy, one can upper bound the first term with*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{m_0}{\tilde{R}(P_a \rightarrow 1) \vee 1}\right],$$

where $\tilde{R}(P_a \rightarrow 1)$ denotes the number of rejections when all the attacked p-values are set to 1. This bound cannot be achieved (except for $\mathcal{H}_0^a = \emptyset$) since the attacker's true nulls are considered rejected in the numerator and not rejected in the denominator.

The same analysis applies when the attacker captures a fraction of nodes that have m p-values in total, in which m_0 of them are true nulls.

Corollary 1. *Suppose that the attacker captures λd nodes with a total of m p-values, where each node has n/d local p-values. Each node carries out the oracle attack. Then*

$$\text{FDR}_{\text{attack}, \lambda}^* = \text{FDR}_{\text{attack}}^* \quad (2)$$

when the BH procedure is applied at the central agent.

IV. BH-CLASSIFIER ATTACK MODEL

Again, suppose that the attacker captures one node that has m p-values, but the attacker does not know which ones are the true nulls or true non-nulls; we will then extend this to the multiple-node case. We now introduce a natural and practical attack model.

BH-classifier attack model:

- (1) *The attacked node first applies the BH procedure on the m p-values at hand by sorting them in ascending order ($p_{(1)} \leq p_{(2)} \leq \dots \leq p_{(m)}$).*

- (2) It returns an index $i_0 := \max\{i : p_{(i)} \leq q(i/m)\}$ and classifies all $p_{(i)}$ where $i \leq i_0$ as non-nulls, and classifies the remaining p -values as true nulls.
- (3) It changes all those p -values classified as true nulls to be 0, and classified as non-nulls to be 1.

Recall that after receiving all the p -values sent by the nodes, the central agent runs the BH procedure globally to make \tilde{R} rejections, where \tilde{V} of them are wrong rejections. Suppose the attacker makes R_a rejections after applying the BH algorithm in the classification step. We can upper bound the corresponding $\text{FDR}_{\text{attack}}$ as follows.

Theorem 2. *Suppose the attacker captures one node with m p -values, and carries out the BH-classifier attack. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{FDR}_{\text{attack}} &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0^a} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1 - (q/m)R_a(p_i \rightarrow 0)}{\tilde{R}(p_i \rightarrow 1)} \right] + \frac{q(n_0 - m_0)}{n} \\ &\leq m_0 \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1 - (q/m)R_a}{\tilde{R} \vee 1} \right] + \frac{q(n_0 - m_0)}{n} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

when the BH procedure is applied at the central agent, where $\tilde{R}(p_i \rightarrow 1)$ and $R_a(p_i \rightarrow 1)$ denote the new rejection counts after replacing p_i with 1.

We can easily see that the upper bound in (3) can be further upper bounded by the oracle FDR given in Theorem 1. Furthermore, when $R_a/m \approx 0$, the upper bound in (3) is close to the oracle FDR (see Experiment 1 in Section V for numerical examples). Thus, the BH-classifier attack model can be viewed as a practical baseline, which serves as a surrogate for the oracle attack model.

Proof. Recall that we use \mathcal{H}_0^a to denote the set of all the true nulls that the attacker has at hand and $|\mathcal{H}_0^a| = m_0$. Then, we can express FDR after the attack as follows,

$$\text{FDR}_{\text{attack}} = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0^a} \frac{\tilde{V}_i}{\tilde{R} \vee 1} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0 \setminus \mathcal{H}_0^a} \frac{\tilde{V}_i}{\tilde{R} \vee 1} \right], \quad (4)$$

where $\tilde{V}_i = \mathbf{1}\{p_i \leq q\tilde{R}/n\}$. For each $i \in \mathcal{H}_0^a$ in the first term,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\tilde{V}_i}{\tilde{R} \vee 1} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}\{p_i > qR_a/m\}}{\tilde{R} \vee 1} \right] \quad (5)$$

$$= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}\{p_i > qR_a(p_i \rightarrow 0)/m\}}{\tilde{R}(p_i \rightarrow 1)} \right], \quad (6)$$

where (5) comes from the fact that if and only if $p_i > qR_a/m$, p_i will not be rejected by the attacker's BH classification and \tilde{p}_i will be 0 accordingly which will make \tilde{V}_i to be 1. And (6) holds because of Lemma 1, and the fact that $\tilde{R}(p_i \rightarrow 1) = \tilde{R} \vee 1$ when $\mathbf{1}\{p_i > qR_a/m\} = 1$. Hence, the first term in (4) can be expressed as

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0^a} \frac{\tilde{V}_i}{\tilde{R} \vee 1} \right] = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0^a} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}\{p_i > qR_a(p_i \rightarrow 0)/m\}}{\tilde{R}(p_i \rightarrow 1)} \right].$$

Conditioning on all p -values except p_i which is represented as $\mathcal{F}_i = \sigma(\{p_1, \dots, p_{i-1}, p_{i+1}, \dots, p_n\})$, we get

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0^a} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}\{p_i > qR_a(p_i \rightarrow 0)/m\}}{\tilde{R}(p_i \rightarrow 1)} \middle| \mathcal{F}_i \right] \quad (7)$$

$$= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0^a} \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{1}\{p_i > qR_a(p_i \rightarrow 0)/m\} \middle| \mathcal{F}_i \right]}{\tilde{R}(p_i \rightarrow 1)} \quad (8)$$

$$= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0^a} \frac{1 - (q/m)R_a(p_i \rightarrow 0)}{\tilde{R}(p_i \rightarrow 1)}, \quad (9)$$

where we can move $\tilde{R}(p_i \rightarrow 1)$ outside the expectation in (7) because it is \mathcal{F}_i -measurable, and the last equality comes from the fact that the p -value under true null follows $\text{Unif}[0, 1]$. We now use the tower property to bound the first term in (4),

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0^a} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}\{p_i > qR_a(p_i \rightarrow 0)/m\}}{\tilde{R}(p_i \rightarrow 1)} \right] \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0^a} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}\{p_i > qR_a(p_i \rightarrow 0)/m\}}{\tilde{R}(p_i \rightarrow 1)} \middle| \mathcal{F}_i \right] \right] \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0^a} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1 - (q/m)R_a(p_i \rightarrow 0)}{\tilde{R}(p_i \rightarrow 1)} \right] \leq m_0 \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1 - (q/m)R_a}{\tilde{R} \vee 1} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from the fact that the null p -values are i.i.d. $\text{Unif}[0, 1]$ (hence exchangeable), $R_a(p_i \rightarrow 0) \geq R_a$, and $\tilde{R}(p_i \rightarrow 1) \leq \tilde{R}$. For the second term in (4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0 \setminus \mathcal{H}_0^a} \frac{\tilde{V}_i}{\tilde{R} \vee 1} \right] &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_0 \setminus \mathcal{H}_0^a} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}\{p_i \leq q\tilde{R}/n\}}{\tilde{R} \vee 1} \right] \\ &= q \frac{(n_0 - m_0)}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

where we noted that $\tilde{p}_i = p_i$ for those $i \in \mathcal{H}_0 \setminus \mathcal{H}_0^a$ and the last equality follows from the same argument as in Theorem 1.

Putting everything together, we get

$$\text{FDR}_{\text{attack}} \leq m_0 \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1 - (q/m)R_a}{\tilde{R} \vee 1} \right] + \frac{(n_0 - m_0) \cdot q}{n}. \quad \square$$

The proof of the following lemma needed to complete the proof of Theorem 2 can be found in Appendix.

Lemma 1. *For each $i \in \mathcal{H}_0^a$, we have*

$$\mathbf{1}\{p_i > qR_a(p_i \rightarrow 0)/m\} = \mathbf{1}\{p_i > qR_a/m\}.$$

Proof. First consider the case when $p_i \leq qR_a/m$, then this p -value is already rejected. Pushing it to 0 will not change the total rejection R_a , which means $p_i \leq qR_a(p_i \rightarrow 0)/m$.

Now consider the other case when $p_i > qR_a/m$, without loss of generality, we assume p_i is the i th smallest p -value. Since p_i was not rejected, we have $p_i > qi/m$. Also, note that $R_a(p_i \rightarrow 0) \leq i$ because sending p_i to 0 will change the threshold only for p -values smaller than p_i . Hence $p_i > qR_a(p_i \rightarrow 0)/m$. The claimed equality holds for both cases.

□ FDR_{attack}^* and FDR_{attack} to compare the gap as m_0 and m_1 increase.

Our analysis can be extended to the multiple-node setting in a straightforward way, summarized as follows.

Corollary 2. Suppose that the attacker captures λd nodes with a total of m p-values, where each node has n/d local p-values. Each node carries out the BH-classifier attack. Then

$$FDR_{\text{attack}, \lambda} = \sum_{i=1}^{\lambda d} \frac{nm_0}{md} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1 - (qd/n)R_i}{\tilde{R} \vee 1} \right] + \frac{(n_0 - m_0) \cdot q}{n}$$

by applying the BH procedure at the central agent, where R_i denotes the number of local rejections at the i th node.

A. Counter-attack strategy

Suppose that the central server knows (1) the attacker is implementing the BH-classifier attack model, and (2) which nodes are part of the Byzantine (i.e., nodes that have been captured by the attacker). It is natural to ask if it is possible to mitigate the FDR loss. It turns out that the FDR can be controlled by implementing a simple scheme as follows.

Counter-attack scheme: For each of the p-values that have been set to 0 by the attacker, the central server replaces it with a sample drawn from $\text{Unif}[0, 1]$.

Here we implicitly leverage the fact that the p-values can not be 0 unless altered by the attacker. In other words, the central agent indeed knows which p-values are set to 0 by the attacker. This is by no means the only possible counter-attack scheme and we leave the other effective ones for future work.

Proposition 1. This counter-attack strategy controls FDR.

This can be shown by observing that the true null p-values are distributed according to $\text{Unif}[0, 1]$ and the non-nulls classified as true nulls do not affect FDR.

V. EXPERIMENT RESULTS

In this section, we compare the FDR_{attack}^* and FDR_{attack} by conducting a series of experiments. The total number of hypotheses is fixed at $n = 10^4$ (n_0 true nulls and $n_1 = n - n_0$ non-nulls) and the level q is fixed at 0.05. The attacker has m p-values in hand (m_0 true nulls and $m_1 = m - m_0$ non-nulls). Adversarial modifications are applied as specified in the two attack models: oracle attack and BH-classifier attack. For all the experiments, the p-values are generated as follows:

- True null hypothesis: The test statistics are sampled from $N(0, 1)$. The two-sided p-values are calculated as $p_i = 2(1 - \Phi(|X_i|))$, where Φ is the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution.
- Alternative hypothesis: The test statistics are sampled from $N(\mu, 1)$, where $\mu \sim \text{Unif}(1.0, 1.5)$.

Exp. 1: FDR under oracle vs. BH-classifier attacks

Setting 1: Varying n_0 and n_1 . For fixed attacker fraction m/n , we analyze the impact of changing the proportion of true nulls (n_0) and non-nulls (n_1) while keeping $n = 10^3$.

Setting 2: Varying m . We evaluate the effect of varying the number of p-values modified by the attacker. We compute




Fig. 1: Exp. 1. In both settings, the gap between FDR_{attack}^* and FDR_{attack} remains negligible overall.

This experiment shows that the BH-classifier attack incurs almost the same amount of degradation of FDR as the oracle model in these settings, implying that the BH-classifier attack model, without the information of which p-values are true nulls, can be viewed as a practical baseline that approximates the oracle setting very well.

Exp. 2: Counter-attack strategy

In this experiment, we evaluate the effectiveness of a counter-attack strategy employed by the central server to mitigate the impact of adversarial attacks. Focusing on attacking one node with m p-values, we assume that the central server knows (1) the attacker is implementing the BH-classifier attack model, and (2) which node is under attack.

We empirically compare FDR_{attack} with and without applying this counter-attack scheme as mentioned in Section IV-A. The data generation process is the same as in previous experiments. The empirical FDR_{attack} is estimated by averaging over 10^4 trials for various configurations of m , n_0 , and q .

- **Without counter-attack:** The central server directly applies the BH procedure to all the received p-values including the adversarially modified p-values.
- **With counter-attack:** The central server replaces all 0 p-values received from the attacker with independently samples from $\text{Unif}(0, 1)$ and then applies BH over all the p-values.




Fig. 2: Exp. 2. Comparison of FDR with vs. without applying the counter-attack scheme.

This simulation indicates that the proposed counter-attack strategy remains highly effective and reduces FDR_{attack} significantly across a range of m_0 , n_0 , and q values.

Exp. 3: Two counterattack-free models

In Experiment 2, the BH-classifier attack model fails to affect FDR when the central server knows the attack scheme and

applies the simple counter-attack scheme. In this experiment, we explore two attack models where the central server can not counter-attack. That is, even with the knowledge of the attack model, the central server is still unable to extract useful information to help control the FDR.

- **Enhanced BH-classifier attack model:** *The attacked node first applies the BH procedure to classify the local p-values. Then, the ones that are classified as nulls are scaled to the range of the classified non-nulls.*
- **Shuffling attack model:** *The attacker randomly permutes the indices of all its local p-values and then sends p-values with the new indices to the central server.*

In both models, the nulls and non-nulls are indistinguishable from the central server’s perspective. In the enhanced BH-classifier model, the idea is to hide the identities of the classified nulls into the classified non-nulls. The shuffling attack model decouples each attacked p-value and its corresponding hypothesis, and the global BH threshold does not change. Specifically, each p-value under attack is true null with probability m_0/m and non-null with probability m_1/m ; one can upper bound the $\text{FDR}_{\text{attack}}$ as $m_0 \cdot \left(\frac{m_0q}{mn} + \frac{m_1}{m} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{R}\right]\right)$.

The first plot shows how the enhanced BH-classifier attack significantly increases the FDR as the number of true null hypotheses (n_0) increases, but subsequently decreases when n_0 becomes excessively large. To explain this phenomenon, we found in our experiments that when n_0 becomes too large, the attacker’s local BH-classification step will make very few rejections. Consequently, the rescaling step will alter the majority of local non-null p-values to smaller values, which ultimately helps the central agent make more correct rejections. The second plot, focusing on the shuffling attack, reveals a less pronounced increase in FDR. Although FDR still grows with n_0 and m/n , the shuffling attack’s impact is weaker and less dynamic due to its lack of strategic manipulation. Together, the plots demonstrate that the enhanced BH-classifier attack is more effective in exploiting the hypothesis testing process to compromise FDR, especially at larger attacker fractions.




Fig. 3: Exp. 3. Comparison of two counterattack-free models.

Experiment 4: Attacking multiple nodes

In this experiment, we compare the impact of adversarial attacks when a single node with m p-values is attacked versus multiple nodes being attacked. For the multiple-node scenario, we assume the attacker captures a fraction (λ) of the total d nodes, where each node contains n/d local p-values, resulting in the same total of m p-values under attack.

In both scenarios, we experiment with the BH-classifier attack and the enhanced BH-classifier attack. The key difference lies in the attack execution: For the single-node scenario, the attacker runs the local BH procedure once and modifies the p-values accordingly. In contrast, in the multiple-node scenario, the attacker independently performs the BH-based attack on each compromised node without sharing information across nodes. Note that the impact of the shuffling attack remains the same in both settings.




Fig. 4: Exp. 4. Comparison of the four-node case (each with 50 p-values) v.s. the one-node case with 200 p-values.

The simulation results indicate that attacking multiple nodes under the BH-classifier attack has a negligible impact. However, the multiple-node attack has a more negative impact than the single-node attack under the enhanced BH-classifier attack. This is likely due to the method of altering null p-values into the range of non-nulls. In particular, dividing the attack across smaller groups creates more precise and narrower ranges of non-null p-values, thereby making the attack more effective. Note that the enhanced BH-classifier attack, while more effective in specific scenarios, is inherently less powerful due to its resilience to countermeasures. Its design makes it harder to detect but also limits its capacity to drastically increase the FDR.

VI. DISCUSSION

Our initial studies reported in this work open up several natural and important future directions. When the exact p-values are not available at each agent, we will study the impact of Byzantine attacks on empirical p-values or more general data-driven score functions (e.g., neural network-based methods [17]). To handle large-scale settings where each agent has a large number of local test statistics, it becomes important to incorporate the resource-efficiency consideration (e.g., with a limited communication budget [12], [13]) into the attack and counter-attack models. Furthermore, the analysis of the detection power is important in providing a comprehensive understanding of different attack models as well as counter-attack strategies. Finally, it would be worthwhile to broaden the class of attack models, drawing inspiration from existing ones (e.g., altering the order of statistics [18]).

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant CCF-2420146.

REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Benjamini and Y. Hochberg, "Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing," *Journal of the royal statistical society. Series B (Methodological)*, pp. 289–300, 1995.
- [2] Y. Benjamini and D. Yekutieli, "The control of the false discovery rate in multiple testing under dependency," *Annals of statistics*, pp. 1165–1188, 2001.
- [3] B. Efron, R. Tibshirani, J. D. Storey, and V. Tusher, "Empirical bayes analysis of a microarray experiment," *Journal of the American statistical association*, vol. 96, no. 456, pp. 1151–1160, 2001.
- [4] C. Genovese and L. Wasserman, "Operating characteristics and extensions of the false discovery rate procedure," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 499–517, 2002.
- [5] J. D. Storey, "A direct approach to false discovery rates," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 479–498, 2002.
- [6] A. Vempaty, P. Ray, and P. K. Varshney, "False discovery rate based distributed detection in the presence of Byzantines," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 1826–1840, 2014.
- [7] P. Ray, P. K. Varshney, and R. Niu, "A novel framework for the network-wide distributed detection problem," in *10th International Conference on Information Fusion*. IEEE, 2007, pp. 1–8.
- [8] P. Ray and P. K. Varshney, "False discovery rate based sensor decision rules for the network-wide distributed detection problem," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 1785–1799, 2011.
- [9] E. B. Ermis and V. Saligrama, "Detection and localization in sensor networks using distributed fdr," in *2006 40th Annual Conference on Information Sciences and Systems*. IEEE, 2006, pp. 699–704.
- [10] —, "Distributed detection in sensor networks with limited range multimodal sensors," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 843–858, 2009.
- [11] A. Ramdas, J. Chen, M. Wainwright, and M. Jordan, "QuTE: Decentralized multiple testing on sensor networks with false discovery rate control," in *IEEE 56th Annual Conference on Decision and Control*, 2017, pp. 6415–6421.
- [12] M. Pournaderi and Y. Xiang, "Sample-and-forward: Communication-efficient control of the false discovery rate in networks," in *2023 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1949–1954.
- [13] —, "On large-scale multiple testing over networks: An asymptotic approach," *IEEE Transactions on Signal and Information Processing over Networks*, 2023.
- [14] M. Gözl, A. M. Zoubir, and V. Koivunen, "Multiple hypothesis testing framework for spatial signals," *IEEE Transactions on Signal and Information Processing over Networks*, vol. 8, pp. 771–787, 2022.
- [15] G. Blanchard and E. Roquain, "Two simple sufficient conditions for FDR control," *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, vol. 2, pp. 963–992, 2008.
- [16] A. K. Ramdas, R. F. Barber, M. J. Wainwright, and M. I. Jordan, "A unified treatment of multiple testing with prior knowledge using the p-filter," 2019.
- [17] A. Marandon, L. Lei, D. Mary, and E. Roquain, "Adaptive novelty detection with false discovery rate guarantee," *The Annals of Statistics*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 157–183, 2024.
- [18] C. Quan, S. Bulusu, B. Geng, Y. S. Han, N. Sriranga, and P. K. Varshney, "On ordered transmission based distributed gaussian shift-in-mean detection under byzantine attacks," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 2023.