
Efficient Zero-Order Federated Finetuning of Language Models for Resource-Constrained Devices

Mohamed Aboelenien Ahmed¹ Kilian Pfeiffer¹ Ramin Khalili² Heba Khdr¹ Jörg Henkel¹

Abstract

Federated fine-tuning offers a promising approach for tuning Large Language Models (LLMs) on edge devices while preserving data privacy. However, fine-tuning these models on edge devices remains challenging due to high memory, communication, and computational demands. Zero-order optimization with task alignment provides a potential solution, enabling fine-tuning with inference-level memory requirements but requires a longer convergence time. In this paper, we propose Federated Split-Perturbation Zero-order Optimization (FedSPZO) that divides the network into two blocks, applying a different number of perturbations per block in a computationally effective way, achieving faster convergence. Our evaluation shows a $2.5 - 7\times$ reduction in computation overhead compared to zero-order state of the art techniques in federated learning.

1. Introduction

LLMs are demonstrating high performance in various machine learning tasks, including next-token prediction and text classification. Despite their popularity, these models are very costly to train in terms of required data, computation, and memory resources. The current trend is thus to train such large models over the course of few months using highly specialized hardware and large set of "public" data and then finetune them over specific tasks in hand using transfer learning techniques. However, this demands access to the finetuning data, which might be only available at the edge devices/users due to privacy requirements. Finetuning in a federated (McMahan et al., 2017) manner on the edge offers adaptability to the data available on these devices while reducing the risk of private data exposure.

¹Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Karlsruhe, Germany
²Huawei Research Center Munich, Munich, Germany.
 Emails: <mohamed.ahmed3@kit.edu>, <kilian.pfeiffer@kit.edu>, <ramin.khalili@huawei.com>, <heba.khdr@kit.edu>, <henkel@kit.edu>.

Although it offers less training time compared to training from scratch, finetuning is still a computationally demanding task, especially in terms of memory usage. It is hence of most importance to reduce the resource footprint of finetuning, as many edge devices, e.g. IoT devices, have very limited resources to offer (Imteaj et al., 2022; Pfeiffer et al., 2023b). Parameter Efficient Finetuning (PEFT) techniques such as LoRA (Hu et al., 2022) reduce the memory requirements for storing gradients. However, this still results in a large memory footprint for inputs with long context length. For example, finetuning RoBERTa-large (Liu, 2019) on a dataset with context length 256 requires memory about 4 GB. This is because the activations should still be stored in memory to perform the backpropagation.

Recently, MeZO (Malladi et al., 2023) showed that it is possible to finetune language models using Zero-order Optimization (ZO) (Spall, 1992) with an inference-like memory footprint, utilizing pseudo-random seeds to generate perturbation vectors.

In this paper, we adopt ZO to finetune language models at edge devices. We consider a Federated Learning (FL) setting, where a group of edge devices are collectively finetuning the model using their local data. While ZO reduces the memory footprint, this reduction comes with a cost: noisy gradient updates that could affect the accuracy and convergence of the training. In FL, (Li et al., 2024; Fang et al., 2022) use a large number of perturbations to improve the quality of gradient estimation at the cost of high computation.

We propose Federated Split-Perturbation Zero-order Optimization (FedSPZO), which applies a different number of perturbations to different layers of the model, reducing computational overhead and increasing the convergence speed. In addition, we adopt the seed trick proposed in (Malladi et al., 2023) to reduce communication overhead in our setting. Our work differs from DecomFL (Li et al., 2024), as we use a more accurate approach to merge updates on servers and apply a more efficient perturbation technique, significantly improving the finetuning process.

Our main contributions are:

- We propose FedSPZO, a novel approach that reduces

the total computation for the zero-order FL finetuning process, with an efficient communication design.

- Our evaluation demonstrates reduction in total computation by up to $7\times$ compared to existing state-of-the-art zero-order FL methods with fewer communication rounds while achieving higher accuracy with minimal memory overhead (less than 0.5%).
- We conduct a comprehensive ablation study to show the effectiveness of the FedSPZO technique.

2. Related work

2.1. Federated Learning

In FL, the significant computational and communication burden placed on participating devices remains a challenge. Several techniques have been proposed to mitigate this burden. To reduce communication overhead, methods such as compression (Thakker et al., 2019) and sketched updates (Shi et al., 2020) have been explored. Other approaches address computational overhead by training only subsets of the neural network (NN), such as random subsets (Caldas et al., 2018) or a sliding window approach (Alam et al., 2022). Progressive training has been introduced to alleviate communication and computational costs through model growth (Wang et al., 2022) and successive layer training with freezing, which also reduces memory requirements (Pfeiffer et al., 2023a). However, the majority of these works assume training from scratch.

Recently, fine-tuning of large language models through FL has also been considered (Babakniya et al., 2023) using LoRA (Hu et al., 2022), such techniques are not always feasible due to memory constraints. First-order forward gradients (Baydin et al., 2022) with Forward-mode automatic differentiation were proposed for finetuning LLMs (Panchal et al., 2024; Xu et al., 2024), however, forward gradients are computationally expensive, require a larger memory footprint compared to ZO, and the upload of trainable parameters.

2.2. Zero-order Optimization

Zero-order optimization has been adopted in black-box optimization due to the lack of accessible gradient information (Nikolakakis et al., 2022; Cai et al., 2021).

MeZO (Malladi et al., 2023) builds on ZO-SGD (Spall, 1992) using central finite difference to estimate the gradients without backpropagation. The paper proposes a random seed trick to reduce the memory footprint by generating perturbation vectors on the fly, thus utilizing the same memory as inference and efficient storage of checkpoints. More importantly, it showed that the fine-tuning of LLMs is possible using zero-order optimization when utilizing prompt-based

tuning (Gao et al., 2021).

In FL, FedZO (Fang et al., 2022) applied zero-order to estimate gradients, where clients send the complete model parameters to server. FedBAFFLE (Feng et al., 2023) uses zero-order for gradient estimation that requires sending a scalar per step iteration (in the FedSGD setting) and sending the complete model parameters per round. For (Feng et al., 2023; Fang et al., 2022), it takes at least 20 perturbations per step to train small-scale vision models from scratch.

DecomFL (Li et al., 2024) utilize the seed and model reconstruction tricks in MeZO to send only the seeds and gradient scalars communication between the server and clients in FL instead of sending the model parameters. Their method utilizes the same seed to generate the same perturbation vectors for participating clients in a round, aggregates the project gradients at the server instead of parameters. However, with such an aggregation technique, multiple perturbations are required.

3. Methodology

3.1. Background on Zero-order Optimization

Zero-order Optimization reduces the memory footprint compared to first-order backpropagation, as it does not require the storage of the activations in memory. Furthermore, utilizing the seed trick proposed by (Malladi et al., 2023), it is possible to maintain an inference-like memory footprint essential to edge devices participating in federated learning. Given model parameters θ , loss L , and input batch \mathcal{B} , we define the *scalar* projected gradient (difference between perturbed losses) g as follows:

$$g = \frac{L(\theta + \epsilon z; \mathcal{B}) - L(\theta - \epsilon z; \mathcal{B})}{2\epsilon} \quad (1)$$

where ϵ is the perturbation scale, and z is sampled from $\mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$, where I_d is the identity matrix and d is the number of parameters. By resetting the pseudo-random generator to seed s , each element of the perturbation vector z can be generated to perturb the corresponding parameter in place. This perturbation is applied to the model before a forward pass and is reused to compute the gradient by multiplying the scalar g and update parameters using the SGD rule. This approach eliminates the need to store pseudo-random perturbations in memory, as they can be regenerated on demand. The previous gradient estimation presents a single perturbation $P = 1$.

3.2. Federated Split-Perturbation Zero-order Optimization(FedSPZO)

We propose FedSPZO, a federated learning framework that utilizes zero-order optimization with a huge reduction in upload communication cost, as discussed in Section 3.2.1.




Figure 1: An overview of the proposed Federated Split-Perturbation Zero-order Optimization (FedSPZO) round.

Primarily, FedSPZO aims to address the computational challenges arising from ZO. We analyze its computation complexity and introduce an approach that divides the network into two consecutive blocks, while utilizing different number of perturbations per block to accelerate computation and convergence. Let y be the output of a model, we define the first and second blocks f_1 and f_2 as follows:

$$y = f_2(\theta_2; f_1(\theta_1; \mathcal{B})) \quad (2)$$

where θ_1 and θ_2 are the parameters for each block respectively. We discuss this in detail in Section 3.2.2.

3.2.1. FEDSPZO SERVER

We first discuss the proposed FL design. In each round r , the server starts by broadcasting the model parameters θ^r and the number of perturbations for each block (i.e., P_1 and P_2). Each client trains the model for the K steps on its local data, as we discuss in detail in Section 3.2.2. After a client finishes its steps, it uploads only the vectors of projected gradients G and seeds S used in the training for each block, which are independent of the model parameters.

The server is responsible for reconstructing the exact model for each client after K steps by regenerating the perturbation vectors, using the seeds S^c provided by the client c . It performs the same parameter updates using the learning rate μ and the gradients computing the same parameter updates using μ , P and G as illustrated in Algorithm 1. Importantly, this reconstruction does not require carrying out any forward pass or access to the training data on the device. Finally, the server averages all the clients models similar to FedAvg and starts another round. The proposed round design is provided in Figure 1.

3.2.2. FEDSPZO CLIENT

Zero-order Optimization requires a small learning rate μ to convergence to a good solution. However, training with a small learning rate requires many rounds compared to its first-order counterpart, as the gradient norm of zero-order scales with the Hessian effective rank of the loss (Malladi et al., 2023).

Increasing the number of perturbations P reduces the noise in the gradient approximation, enabling a larger learning rate. However, this requires P times an increase in computation cost per step. To break this down, the computational cost in Floating-Point Operations (FLOPs) of a zero-order step with central difference (when z is regenerated given seed s) can be expressed as the sum of the ZO forward (zo-fw_{FLOPs}), perturbation computation (zo-p_{FLOPs}), and update (zo-u_{FLOPs}) FLOPs. Let fw_{FLOPs} represent FLOPs for doing one forward pass (inference) on the input, zo-fw_{FLOPs} can be defined as follows:

$$\text{zo-fw}_{\text{FLOPs}} = 2 \times \text{fw}_{\text{FLOPs}} \times P \quad (3)$$

while given that the cost of one perturbation of the parameter is p_{FLOPs} and update u_{FLOPs}, the costs for zo-p_{FLOPs} and zo-u_{FLOPs} are:

$$\text{zo-p}_{\text{FLOPs}} = \text{p}_{\text{FLOPs}} \times 3 \times P \quad (4)$$

$$\text{zo-u}_{\text{FLOPs}} = \text{u}_{\text{FLOPs}} \times P \quad (5)$$

To reduce this high computational cost, we propose FedSPZO that inherit the fast convergence characteristics when using a large P , with fewer computations. Specifically, FedSPZO divides the network into two blocks of subsequent

Algorithm 1 FedSPZO Server

Require: Clients \mathcal{C} , Number of sampled clients m , Model parameters θ , Learning rate μ , Number of perturbations P_1 and P_2

- 1: **for** r in R **do**
- 2: $\mathcal{M} \leftarrow$ Sample m clients from \mathcal{C}
- 3: **for** c in \mathcal{M} **do**
- 4: $G_1^c, S_1^c, G_2^c, S_2^c \leftarrow$ **ClientTrain**(θ^r, P_1, P_2, K)
 {in Algorithm 2}
- 5: **end for**
- 6: **for** c in \mathcal{M} **do**
- 7: $\theta^c \leftarrow$ **Reconstruct**($\theta^r, K, G_1^c, G_2^c, S_1^c, S_2^c, \mu, P_1, P_2$)
- 8: **end for**
- 9: $\theta^{r+1} \leftarrow \frac{1}{m} \sum_{c \in \mathcal{M}} \theta^c$
- 10: **end for**
- 11:
- 12: **Reconstruct**($\theta, K, G_1, G_2, S_1, S_2, \mu, P_1, P_2$):
- 13: $\theta_1, \theta_2 \leftarrow$ Split θ
- 14: **for** k in K **do**
- 15: $\theta_1 \leftarrow$ **Update**($\theta_1, S_1[k], G_1[k], \mu, P_1$)
- 16: $\theta_2 \leftarrow$ **Update**($\theta_2, S_2[k], G_2[k], \mu, P_2$)
- 17: **end for**
- 18:
- 19: **Update**(θ, S, g, μ, P): { g is already averaged over P and $|S| = P$ }
- 20: **for** p in P **do**
- 21: Reset generator with seed $S[p]$
- 22: **for** θ^i in θ **do**
- 23: $z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$
- 24: $\theta^i \leftarrow \theta^i - \mu \cdot z \cdot g$
- 25: **end for**
- 26: **end for**

layers, each utilizing perturbations P_1 and P_2 . The parameters in the first block θ_1 are perturbed in the first positive direction of z_1 using seed s_1 . Then a forward pass outputs $+y_l$, where $+y_l = f_1(\theta_1 + \epsilon z_1; \mathcal{B})$ and l indicates the index of the last layer in f_1 . The second block is perturbed in the two directions $\pm z_2$, where z_2 is sampled using seed s_2 . For each direction, f_2 takes only $+y_l$ and computes its loss. This process for f_2 is repeated P_s times. The procedure mentioned is repeated for the negative direction ($-z_1$) of f_1 to output $-y_l$. f_2 is then perturbed using a different $\pm z_2$ (s) than the ones used before, and the losses given $-y_l$ are computed.¹

The zero-order gradient for f_2 is calculated as follows:

¹In the case where a parameter is shared between f_1 and f_2 , we perturb this parameter only in θ_1 such that it is only included in the forward pass of f_2 but not included in θ_2 .

$$\nabla L(\theta_2; \mathcal{Y}) = \frac{1}{P_2} \sum_{j=1}^{P_2} g_{2_j} \cdot z_{2_j} \quad (6)$$

where $\mathcal{Y} = \{\pm y_l^1, \dots, \pm y_l^{P_1}\}$, that is the outputs of perturbed f_1 with $\{\pm z_{1_1}, \dots, \pm z_{1_{P_1}}\}$ given \mathcal{B} . For f_1 , let L^+ and L^- be two vectors containing all the losses from f_2 over single a perturbation over f_1 , the scalar projected gradient g_1 is calculated as follows:

$$g_1 = \frac{1}{4P_s^2} \sum_{k=0}^{2P_s} \sum_{l=0}^{2P_s} \left(\frac{L^+(l) - L^-(k)}{2\epsilon} \right) \quad (7)$$

and the gradient for θ_1 with P_1 is:

$$\nabla L(\theta_1; \mathcal{B}) = \frac{1}{P_1} \sum_{j=1}^{P_1} g_{1_j} \cdot z_{1_j} \quad (8)$$

The proposed design enables two-fold benefits. For the layers in the first block, it reduces the noise propagated from the perturbations of the last layers by incorporating the difference in loss values computed using the larger perturbation, allowing for a better estimate of the gradient along the sampled direction z_1 . Secondly, the use of a higher number of perturbations is enabled with a reduced computational cost due to the reuse of the output of f_1 . Let the $\text{fw}_{\text{FLOPs}}^1$ and $\text{fw}_{\text{FLOPs}}^2$ be the inference FLOPs of the two blocks, the computation cost for a step is as follows:

$$\text{zo-fw}_{\text{FLOPs}} = 2 \times \text{fw}_{\text{FLOPs}}^1 \times P_1 + 2 \times \text{fw}_{\text{FLOPs}}^2 \times P_2 \quad (9)$$

with the cost for perturbations and updates are divides similarly.

In Algorithm 2, we provide the FL client training process. For each step k , the client samples a batch and starts perturbation iterations. For a single perturbation P_1 , the forward process discussed in the two directions is carried out, where a shift is applied for f_2 's seed of the negative direction to generate different z to the positive one. The client then updates each block by regenerating z of each parameter and multiplying it by g to compute the gradient of the parameter and update it. The gradient scalars and seed are stored in G_1, G_2 and S_1, S_2 respectively. After the K steps, the client finally uploads G_1, G_2, S_1 and S_2 to the server.

As discussed, our proposed method utilizes zero-order and gradient reconstruction given seed (Malladi et al., 2023) to achieve inference-level memory (without gradients and activation cost). The proposed method might add minimal memory overhead, requiring storage of only the activation of the cutoff layer (y_l). The peak memory for a training step is $d + \max(\max(\{y_1, \dots, y_{l-1}\}), y_l + \max(\{y_{l+1}, \dots, y_N\}))$, where y_i is the layer output at index i and N is the number of layers.

Algorithm 2 FedSPZO Client

Require: Model parameters θ , Local steps K , Learning rate μ , Number of perturbations P_1 and P_2

- 1: **ClientTrain**(θ, P_1, P_2, K):
- 2: Initialize $G_1[1 \dots K], G_2[1 \dots K]$
- 3: Initialize $S_1[1 \dots K][1 \dots P_1], S_2[1 \dots K][1 \dots P_2]$
- 4: $\theta_1, \theta_2 \leftarrow \text{Split } \theta$
- 5: **for** k in K **do**
- 6: $g_1, g_2 \leftarrow 0, 0$
- 7: $sl_1, sl_2 \leftarrow [], []$
- 8: Sample \mathcal{B}
- 9: {Compute gradient}
- 10: **for** p_i in P_1 **do**
- 11: Sample seed $s_1 \sim \mathcal{U}(\{0, 1, \dots, 10^8\})$
- 12: Initialize $L^+[1 \dots 2P_s], L^-[1 \dots 2P_s]$
- 13: $g_2 += \text{Forward}(\theta_1, \theta_2, s_1, \epsilon, \epsilon L^+, sl_2, 0)$
- 14: Sample shift $sh \sim \mathcal{U}(\{0, 1, \dots, 10^8\})$
- 15: $g_2 += \text{Forward}(\theta_1, \theta_2, s_1, -2\epsilon, \epsilon, L^-, sl_2, sh)$
- 16: **Perturb**(θ_1, s_1, ϵ) {RESET}
- 17: $g_1 += \frac{1}{4P_s^2} \sum_{k=0}^{2P_s} \sum_{l=0}^{2P_s} \left(\frac{L^+(l) - L^-(k)}{2\epsilon} \right)$
- 18: Append s to sl_1
- 19: **end for**
- 20: $G_1[k], G_2[k] \leftarrow g_1/P_1, g_2/P_2$
- 21: $S_1[k], S_2[k] \leftarrow sl_1, sl_2$
- 22: $\theta_2 \leftarrow \text{Update}(\theta_2, sl_1, g_2/P_2, \mu, P_2)$ {in Algorithm 1}
- 23: $\theta_1 \leftarrow \text{Update}(\theta_1, sl_2, g_1/P_1, \mu, P_1)$
- 24: **end for**
- 25: **return** G_1, S_1, G_2, S_2 {Send to Server}
- 26:
- 27: {One forward for f_1 and P_s perturbations for f_2 }
- 28: **Forward**($\theta_1, \theta_2, s_1, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, L^\pm, sl_2, sh$):
- 29: **Perturb**($\theta_1, s_1, \epsilon_1$) { ϵ_1 determine z_1 direction}
- 30: $g \leftarrow 0$
- 31: $y_l \leftarrow f_1(\theta_1; \mathcal{B})$
- 32: **for** p_j in P_s **do**
- 33: Sample $s_2 \sim \mathcal{U}(\{0, 1, \dots, 10^8\})$
- 34: $s_2 += sh$
- 35: **Perturb**($\theta_2, s_2, \epsilon_2$) {in $+z_2$ direction}
- 36: $loss^+ \leftarrow L(\theta_2; y_l)$
- 37: **Perturb**($\theta_2, s_2, -2\epsilon_2$) {in $-z_2$ direction}
- 38: $loss^- \leftarrow L(\theta_2; y_l)$
- 39: $g += (loss^+ - loss^-)/2\epsilon_2$
- 40: **Perturb**($\theta_2, s_2, \epsilon_2$) {RESET}
- 41: $L^\pm[p_j], L^\pm[p_j + 1] \leftarrow loss^+, loss^-$
- 42: Append s_2 to sl_2
- 43: **end for**
- 44: **return** g
- 45:
- 46: **Perturb**(θ, s):
- 47: Reset generator with seed s
- 48: **for** θ^i in θ **do**
- 49: $\theta^i \leftarrow \theta^i + \epsilon z, z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$
- 50: **end for**

FedSPZO Communication Extension For ease of readability, we presented the implementation in which the client sends both gradient scalars and seeds. Since S_1 and S_2 are derived using a pseudo-random seed, the server can independently regenerate them by sampling and sending different initial seed to each client to start with. This eliminates the need for the client to upload the seeds.

4. Results

We compare our proposed FedSPZO with state-of-the-art first-order backpropagation and zero-order FL methods in terms of memory, accuracy, computation, and communication. Furthermore, we conduct an ablation study on the impact of the splitting technique of our FedSPZO.

4.1. Experimental Setup

We evaluated the proposed FL fine-tuning (with prompt-based fine-tuning) on four tasks, namely SST2 (Socher et al., 2013), RTE (Bowman et al., 2015), WIC (Pilehvar & Camacho-Collados, 2019), and BOOLQ (Clark et al., 2019). We consider 100 clients for SST2, and 20 clients for the other datasets (due to the smaller dataset sizes). We sample 10% of the clients to participate in a single FL round, where a client takes 20 local steps per round. We use RoBERTa-large model (Liu, 2019) for evaluation. For FedSPZO, we split the network such that f_2 includes the RoBERTaLM-Head and f_1 includes the previous layers. We empirically determine the values of $P_1 = 2$ and $P_2 = 8$ by testing various combinations and selecting those that achieve the highest computational savings. Further experimental settings are in Appendix A.

4.2. Comparison with First-order Methods

Memory Evaluation: In Figure 2, we compare the memory footprint of FedSPZO with FedAvg and FedAvg with LoRA FedAvg(LoRA) to finetune RoBERTa-Large using two different context lengths of 32 and 256. For FedAvg and FedAvg(LoRA) we consider vanilla SGD with no optimizer states. For FedAvg, the memory consumption is 2.9 GB and 4.9 GB respectively, which exceed the available memory on many edge devices. Another memory-efficient candidate for training using backpropagation is LoRA, where only the gradients of low-rank matrices are stored in memory instead of model parameters. LoRA with backpropagation achieves competitive memory saving in the small context-length scenario; however, it suffers in the long context-length scenario as the cost of intermediate activations increases. It therefore requires 3.9 GB of memory for long context-length. For FedSPZO, it consumes a peak memory of only 1.4 GB and 1.75 GB over the two context lengths.




Figure 2: Memory footprint for training RoBERTa-Large context length 32 and 256 using First-order FedAvg and FedAvg(LoRA) with backpropagation using batch size of 4, and FedSPZO using batch size 8.




Figure 3: Computation and upload comparison with FedSPZO(ours) and Federated finetuning for LoRA FedAvg(LoRA) over SST2 dataset.

Computation and Communication Evaluation Since using LoRA presents a good baseline for small context-length datasets, we present a comparison of computation and upload between FedSPZO and federated finetuning using LoRA (FedAvg(LoRA)) on Figure 3. FedAvg(LoRA) records 7.8 \times less computation compared to FedSPZO. However, in terms of upload, despite the fact that LoRA uploads only low-rank modules, it falls behind with a 7307 \times gap to FedSPZO.

In summary, FedSPZO is preferred when there are memory and communication constraints, however, PEFT techniques like LoRA are still better when such constraints do not exist.

4.3. Main Results: Comparison with Zero-order Methods

We compare our FedSPZO with zeroth-order DecomFL (Li et al., 2024) and FedZO (Fang et al., 2022). Both approaches utilize the forward difference where for DecomFL, we set $P = 10$ equal to the original paper setting. For FedZO, the paper considered training from scratch while using high P (e.g. 20 and more), however, we found this number

to be not required for the fine-tuning scenario. We did a grid search and selected $P = 5$ for FedZO as it provides a better option. Forward difference requires less computation compared to central difference since the network is only perturbed in one direction, where the forward cost is $\text{zo-fw}_{\text{FLOPs}} = \text{fw}_{\text{FLOPs}} + (\text{fw}_{\text{FLOPs}} \times P)$ and the perturbation cost $\text{zo-p}_{\text{FLOPs}} = P_{\text{FLOPs}} \times 2 \times P$, using the seed trick.

Computation Evaluation: In Figure 4, we present the cumulative computation to test loss for FedSPZO, FedZO and DecomFL. We compare the computation that is required for FedSPZO to reach the lowest recorded loss for the other DecomFL and FedZO.

In comparison with DecomFL, FedSPZO utilizes 6 \times , 6.7 \times , 3.8 \times and 2.5 \times less GFLOPs on SST2, BOOLQ, RTE, and WIC, respectively. This gain of improvement is divided into two folds. FedSPZO utilized 1.93 \times less computation per round, while converging in fewer rounds compared to DecomFL given the advantages of the exact model reconstruction technique and the more accurate gradient estimation of FedSPZO.

Furthermore, compared to FedZO, FedSPZO utilizes 7.18 \times , 4.4 \times , 2.4 \times , and 4.8 \times less computation in SST2, BOOLQ, RTE, and WIC. The computation cost per round is approximately equal (i.e. FedZO use more 1.04 \times computation). The large improvement is because FedSPZO converges much faster than FedZO due to the use of central difference and the proposed split perturbation technique.

Communication Evaluation: We compare the total upload cost for zero-order approaches as provided in Table 2. FedZO sends the complete network parameters per round; therefore, given its slow convergence, the total upload in the FL training process is in order of TB.

In the simple implementation that we provided for FedSPZO, the client uploads $2K$ scalar gradients and $P_1 * K$ and $P_2 * K$ seeds. As discussed, since the server sends the starting pseudo seed generator, we record FedSPZO where only the scalar gradients are sent. Similarly, DecomFL also sends only the gradient scalars. Compared to DecomFL, FedSPZO sends two gradient scalars for θ_1 and θ_2 instead of one for θ per step, while due to the faster convergence, of FedSPZO, it records lower upload cost. In summary, the lower communication cost of sending only scalars is negligible to sending the model parameters.

Accuracy Evaluation: In Table 1, we present a comparison of the accuracy achieved by our method with FedZO and DecomFL. Our approach demonstrates slightly higher accuracies than both FedZO and DecomFL on various datasets. The difference between accuracy is mainly because FedZO and DecomFL use forward difference that is less accurate




Figure 4: Computation vs test loss comparison for FedSPZO (ours) and other zero-order FL methods. FedSPZO records up to $6.7\times$ and $7\times$ less computation compared to FedZO and DecomFL respectively.

Table 1: Accuracy comparison with state of the art ZO techniques and FedAvg (as an upper bound).

Method	SST2	WIC	RTE	BOOLQ
FedAvg	93.6%	69.2%	75.1%	77.3%
DecomFL	90.4%	60.4%	62.4%	62.3%
FedZO	89.6%	55.7%	63.4%	62.8%
FedSPZO (ours)	91.4%	61.1%	66.5%	63.1%

than central difference. Furthermore, compared to FedAvg (which serves as a theoretical reference of the upper bound), FedSPZO shows a decrease in accuracy compared to FedAvg ranging between 2.4% and 18.1% across datasets.

Memory Evaluation: We consider both FedZO and DecomFL to directly apply the memory reduction seed trick proposed by MeZO (Malladi et al., 2023) as they do not require activation reuse, so that they can train these large models. In such a scenario, FedZO and DecomFL would consume a peak memory of 1.4 GB and 1.75 GB over the two context lengths. For FedSPZO, we only require saving the output activation before the second block, which in this scenario required only 1 MB and 8 MB (i.e., increasing the memory only by 0.07% and 0.44% compared to MeZO).

Aggregation Design: To distinguish between DecomFL and our approach for aggregation, we unify the client training for both methods and compare over the SST2 dataset. Specifically, for both methods, we use the central differ-




Figure 5: Comparison between test loss achieved by our upload and aggregation method without model splitting (FedSPZO*) and DecomFL*. We set both approaches to use ZO with central difference and $P = 1$ over SST2 dataset.

ence to estimate the gradient across the entire network while setting P to 1. In this comparison, we refer to our reconstruction and aggregation technique as FedSPZO* and to DecomFL’s aggregation as DecomFL*.

DecomFL aggregates the scalar gradients sent from the participating clients and then updates the model parameters over K steps to obtain the model for the next round, while our technique reconstructs each client model and then performs the aggregation. Furthermore, DecomFL sends the same seed to all clients per round. As depicted in Figure 5, DecomFL* aggregation technique converges to a worse loss compared to FedSPZO* due to the misalignment between the model’s states and computed gradients.




Figure 6: Computation vs test loss comparison between FedSPZO (ours) and using ZO without model splitting for $P = 1$ and $P = 4$ for client training. The three methods use the same FL design of FedSPZO.

Table 2: Upload comparison between ZO approaches.

Dataset	FedZO	DecomFL	FedSPZO
SST2	14.9 TB	0.55 MB	0.34 MB
WIC	8.0 TB	0.44 MB	0.61 MB
RTE	13.4 TB	0.72 MB	0.65 MB
BOOLQ	7.5 TB	0.33 MB	0.18 MB

4.4. Ablation Study

To assess the impact of the model splitting that our FedSPZO adopts, we compare it with training the network using the same FL design in Section 3.2.1 without model splitting. We consider the default setting for training the network using $P = 1$ and a higher number of perturbations, that is, $P = 4$. As mentioned before, we use $P_1 = 2$ and $P_2 = 8$ as the setting for FedSPZO. In Figure 6, we provide the rounds and computation over the three datasets of SST2, BOOLQ, and RTE.

Compared to $P = 1$, FedSPZO achieves faster convergence with $6.7\times$, $5.5\times$ and $6.9\times$ fewer communication rounds on SST2, BOOLQ and RTE. This faster convergence results in $2.3\times$, $1.9\times$, and $2.4\times$ less computation.

Moreover, FedSPZO requires $1.8\times$, $1.2\times$, and $1.9\times$ fewer communication rounds compared to $P = 4$. Since using $P = 4$ requires $1.4\times$ more computation per round than FedSPZO, FedSPZO utilizes $2.5\times$, $1.7\times$, and $2.6\times$ less computation over SST2, BOOLQ, and RTE respectively.

To summarize, FedSPZO reduces the computation cost for the FL training compared to training applying perturbations to the whole network with less than 0.5% memory overhead.

5. Conclusion

In this work, we study the federated fine-tuning of language models. We propose FedSPZO, a novel approach that splits the model into two blocks while applying a different number of perturbations for each block, reducing the computational overhead of applying multiple perturbations while improving convergence. Furthermore, in FedSPZO, the client sends only scalar gradients, reducing the communication cost.

Our experimental results demonstrate substantial computational efficiency, achieving reductions of up to $7\times$ compared to existing state-of-the-art zeroth-order FL methods, while also achieving higher accuracy. When compared to first-order FL with backpropagation, FedSPZO offers advantages in memory efficiency and reduced upload bandwidth but exhibits lower computational efficiency and accuracy. A limitation of our method is that it introduces an additional hyperparameter, requiring the tuning of (P_1, P_2) instead of a single P , warranting further investigation into optimal tuning strategies.

For future work, we plan to explore zero-order on inference-only accelerators with lower precision. This direction aims to bridge the computational efficiency gap with backpropagation methods, further enhancing the practicality of FedSPZO in resource-constrained environments.

References

- Alam, S., Liu, L., Yan, M., and Zhang, M. Fedrolex: Model-heterogeneous federated learning with rolling sub-model extraction. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pp. 29677–29690, 2022.
- Babakniya, S., Elkordy, A., Ezzeldin, Y., Liu, Q., Song, K.-B., EL-Khamy, M., and Avestimehr, S. SLoRA: Federated parameter efficient fine-tuning of language models. In *International Workshop on Federated Learning in the Age of Foundation Models in Conjunction with NeurIPS 2023*, 2023.
- Baydin, A. G., Pearlmutter, B. A., Syme, D., Wood, F., and Torr, P. Gradients without backpropagation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.08587*, 2022.
- Bowman, S. R., Angeli, G., Potts, C., and Manning, C. D. A large annotated corpus for learning natural language inference. In Márquez, L., Callison-Burch, C., and Su, J. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 632–642, Lisbon, Portugal, September 2015. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/D15-1075.
- Cai, H., Lou, Y., McKenzie, D., and Yin, W. A zeroth-order block coordinate descent algorithm for huge-scale black-box optimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1193–1203. PMLR, 2021.
- Caldas, S., Konečný, J., McMahan, H. B., and Talwalkar, A. Expanding the reach of federated learning by reducing client resource requirements. *arXiv:1812.07210*, 2018.
- Clark, C., Lee, K., Chang, M.-W., Kwiatkowski, T., Collins, M., and Toutanova, K. BoolQ: Exploring the surprising difficulty of natural yes/no questions. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pp. 2924–2936, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/N19-1300.
- Fang, W., Yu, Z., Jiang, Y., Shi, Y., Jones, C. N., and Zhou, Y. Communication-efficient stochastic zeroth-order optimization for federated learning. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 70:5058–5073, 2022.
- Feng, H., Pang, T., Du, C., Chen, W., Yan, S., and Lin, M. Does federated learning really need backpropagation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.12195*, 2023.
- Gao, T., Fisch, A., and Chen, D. Making pre-trained language models better few-shot learners. In Zong, C., Xia, F., Li, W., and Navigli, R. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, August 2021.
- Hu, E. J., Shen, Y., Wallis, P., Allen-Zhu, Z., Li, Y., Wang, S., Wang, L., and Chen, W. LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- Imteaj, A., Thakker, U., Wang, S., Li, J., and Amini, M. H. A survey on federated learning for resource-constrained iot devices. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 9(1):1–24, 2022. doi: 10.1109/JIOT.2021.3095077.
- Li, Z., Ying, B., Liu, Z., Dong, C., and Yang, H. Achieving dimension-free communication in federated learning via zeroth-order optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.15861*, 2024.
- Liu, Y. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*, 364, 2019.
- Malladi, S., Gao, T., Nichani, E., Damian, A., Lee, J. D., Chen, D., and Arora, S. Fine-tuning language models with just forward passes. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:53038–53075, 2023.
- McMahan, B., Moore, E., Ramage, D., Hampson, S., and y Arcas, B. A. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*, pp. 1273–1282. PMLR, 2017.
- Nikolakakis, K., Haddadpour, F., Kalogerias, D., and Karbasi, A. Black-box generalization: Stability of zeroth-order learning. In Koyejo, S., Mohamed, S., Agarwal, A., Belgrave, D., Cho, K., and Oh, A. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pp. 31525–31541. Curran Associates, Inc., 2022.
- Panchal, K., Parikh, N., Choudhary, S., Zhang, L., Brun, Y., and Guan, H. Thinking forward: Memory-efficient federated finetuning of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.15551*, 2024.
- Pfeiffer, K., Khalili, R., and Henkel, J. Aggregating capacity in fl through successive layer training for computationally-constrained devices. In Oh, A., Naumann, T., Globerson, A., Saenko, K., Hardt, M., and Levine, S. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pp. 35386–35402. Curran Associates, Inc., 2023a.
- Pfeiffer, K., Rapp, M., Khalili, R., and Henkel, J. Federated learning for computationally constrained heterogeneous devices: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(14s): 1–27, 2023b.

- Pilehvar, M. T. and Camacho-Collados, J. WiC: the word-in-context dataset for evaluating context-sensitive meaning representations. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pp. 1267–1273, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/N19-1128. URL <https://aclanthology.org/N19-1128>.
- Shi, Y., Yang, K., Jiang, T., Zhang, J., and Letaief, K. B. Communication-efficient edge ai: Algorithms and systems. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 22(4): 2167–2191, 2020.
- Socher, R., Perelygin, A., Wu, J., Chuang, J., Manning, C. D., Ng, A. Y., and Potts, C. Recursive deep models for semantic compositionality over a sentiment treebank. In *Proceedings of the 2013 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pp. 1631–1642, 2013.
- Spall, J. C. Multivariate stochastic approximation using a simultaneous perturbation gradient approximation. *IEEE transactions on automatic control*, 37(3):332–341, 1992.
- Thakker, U., Beu, J., Gope, D., Zhou, C., Fedorov, I., Dasika, G., and Mattina, M. Compressing rnns for iot devices by 15-38x using kronecker products. *arXiv:1906.02876*, 2019.
- Wang, H.-P., Stich, S., He, Y., and Fritz, M. ProgFed: effective, communication, and computation efficient federated learning by progressive training. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 23034–23054. PMLR, 2022.
- Xu, M., Cai, D., Wu, Y., Li, X., and Wang, S. FwdLLM: Efficient federated finetuning of large language models with perturbed inferences. In *2024 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 24)*, pp. 579–596, 2024.

A. Implementation Details

We use Pytorch for our implementation. We used RoBERTA-Large CasualLLM weights from the HuggingFace library. For the experiments, we train for a maximum of 5000 – 15000 rounds. We use the same train/test split of the datasets, where only the train split is divided across clients and test set used for evaluation.

For the zero-order methods over SST2, we experimented with learning rates of $\{1e-5, 8e-6, 6e-6, 5e-6, 4e-6, 2e-6, 1e-6\}$ and $\{5e-6, 2.5e-6, 1e-6, \dots, 1e-7\}$ for the rest of the dataset. We set ϵ to $1e-3$ for all the methods (same as the papers) and found that adjusting it does not lead improvement and may lead to divergence. For all ZO, an effective batch size of 16 is used.

For LoRA on SST2, we use rank $r = 8$ and $\alpha = 16$ and learning rate $\{5e-4, 1e-4\}$. We apply LoRA to the query and value of attention layers.

We measure FLOPs for training (including zero-order and first-order) using the Pytorch profiler.