

Robust Federated Learning in Unreliable Wireless Networks: A Client Selection Approach

Yanmeng Wang, *Member, IEEE*, Wenkai Ji, Jian Zhou, *Member, IEEE*,
Fu Xiao, *Senior Member, IEEE*, and Tsung-Hui Chang, *Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract

Federated learning (FL) has emerged as a promising distributed learning paradigm for training deep neural networks (DNNs) at the wireless edge, but its performance can be severely hindered by unreliable wireless transmission and inherent data heterogeneity among clients. Existing solutions primarily address these challenges by incorporating wireless resource optimization strategies, often focusing on uplink resource allocation across clients under the assumption of homogeneous client-server network standards. However, these approaches overlooked the fact that mobile clients may connect to the server via diverse network standards (e.g., 4G, 5G, Wi-Fi) with customized configurations, limiting the flexibility of server-side modifications and restricting applicability in real-world commercial networks. This paper presents a novel theoretical analysis about how transmission failures in unreliable networks distort the effective label distributions of local samples, causing deviations from the global data distribution and introducing convergence bias in FL. Our analysis reveals that a carefully designed client selection strategy can mitigate biases induced by network unreliability and data heterogeneity. Motivated by this insight, we propose FedCote, a client selection approach that optimizes client selection probabilities without relying on wireless resource scheduling. Experimental results demonstrate the robustness of FedCote in DNN-based classification tasks under unreliable networks with frequent transmission failures.



1 INTRODUCTION

With rapid advancements in mobile communications and artificial intelligence (AI), edge AI, which leverages locally generated data to train deep neural networks (DNNs) at the wireless edge, has gained significant attention from both academia and industry [1], [2], [3], [4]. A prominent approach in this domain is federated learning (FL), where an edge server coordinates mobile clients in collaboratively training a shared DNN model while ensuring client privacy [5], [6], [7].

However, FL faces a critical challenge due to ubiquitous data heterogeneity across clients, where training data are distributed in a non-i.i.d. and unbalanced manner. If not addressed, data heterogeneity can severely degrade FL performance [8], [9], [10], [11], [12]. Numerous FL algorithms have been proposed to mitigate this issue. For example, FedProx [13] introduced a regularization term in the local objective function to control model divergence, while SCAFFOLD [14] employed control variates to correct local model drift. HFMDs [15] learned essential class-relevant features of real samples to generate an auxiliary synthetic dataset, which was shared among clients for local training, helping to alleviate data heterogeneity. Additionally, Aorta [16] utilized the mixup data augmentation method in clients to balance class distributions and assigned aggregation weights based on local model quality, ensuring better models had greater influence during global aggregation. Despite these advancements, these studies primarily focused on improving local training and global aggregation algorithms, often overlooking the influence of client selection on FL convergence.

In practice, client selection is a simple yet effective approach to mitigating the negative effects of data heterogeneity by ensuring that chosen clients collectively offer a more balanced and representative sample of the global data distribution [17], [18], [19]. However, current client selection approaches typically assumed reliable network conditions or relied on joint optimization with centralized configurations of uplink wireless resources for all clients. The former neglected the inherent unreliability of network conditions at the wireless edge, while the latter overlooked the diverse, customized configurations and network standards (e.g., 4G, 5G, Wi-Fi) of mobile clients, thereby limiting their practical implementation in commercial wireless networks [20], [21].

1.1 Related work

In recent years, various client selection strategies have been proposed to optimize the FL process. For example, Newt [22] combined local dataset size with the discrepancy between global and local models to assess client utility, selecting those with higher utility values. In contrast, POWER-OF-CHOICE [17] prioritized clients with higher local loss values.

- Y. Wang, W. Ji, J. Zhou, and F. Xiao are with the School of Computer Science, Nanjing University of Posts and Telecommunications, Nanjing 210023, China.
E-mail: hiwangym@gmail.com, jiwenkai540@gmail.com, zhoujian@njupt.edu.cn, xiaof@njupt.edu.cn
- T.-H. Chang is with the School of Science and Engineering, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen 518172, China, and also with the Shenzhen Research Institute of Big Data, Shenzhen 518172, China.
E-mail: tsunghui.chang@ieee.org
- Corresponding author: Fu Xiao

(Preprint. Under review.)



Fig. 1. FL in unreliable wireless networks with transmission failures.

Additionally, GS [23] utilized privacy-insensitive local label distribution to ensure that the aggregated label distribution from selected clients aligned with the global label distribution. Furthermore, FedCor [24] leveraged client correlations to mitigate the effects of non-i.i.d. and unbalanced data in FL. However, these approaches assumed ideal, lossless communication conditions between the server and clients, limiting their practical implementation in commercial networks, particularly in resource-constrained wireless edge environments [25], [26].

Recently, some studies have incorporated wireless communication conditions into client selection for FL. These works typically assumed reliable downlink communication, with the server possessing sufficient power and bandwidth to broadcast the global model to clients, and primarily focused on optimizing uplink resource allocation. For instance, CACS [27] integrated channel capacity and local model updates into the client selection process, while [28] jointly optimized client selection probabilities and allocated bandwidth to address data heterogeneity and minimize FL convergence time. Additionally, [29] considered both transmission and energy consumption in a non-orthogonal multiple access (NOMA) system, optimizing client selection and resource allocation to minimize the overall time and energy cost of FL. However, these studies still assumed reliable wireless conditions with lossless transmissions, which do not reflect the realities of practical implementations. As illustrated in Fig. 1, communication in real wireless networks between the server and clients is often unreliable, with frequent transmission failures caused by unstable channels or device-related issues. These failures can intermittently disrupt the transfer of model parameters, leading to biased FL convergence [30], [31].

To mitigate the negative impacts of transmission failures on FL, some studies have focused on optimizing wireless resource allocation. For instance, [32] optimized uplink bandwidth and transmit power allocation for selected clients in frequency division multiple access (FDMA) systems, while FedToe [33] adaptively adjusted uplink bandwidth, transmit power, and quantization bit allocation among clients. Additionally, [34] proposed an energy-efficient FL scheme by jointly optimizing uplink transmit power, bandwidth, and communication latency. Some studies have extended this by jointly optimizing client selection and uplink resource allocation to alleviate the effects of unreliable networks. For example, [20] optimized both client selection and uplink transmit power, while [35] jointly optimized client selection, bandwidth allocation, and uplink transmit power. Although these approaches offer significant improvements, they require centralized configuration of uplink communication resources across all mobile clients, which may pose deployment challenges in current commercial networks. As shown in Fig. 1, different mobile clients may connect to the server through diverse network standards, and devices may have user- or manufacturer-customized configurations, limiting the server's ability to modify them. Different from above, [30] optimized client selection and introduced a global aggregation scheme based on transmission failure probabilities to address both data heterogeneity and transmission failures. However, this approach suffers from instability in high transmission failure conditions, as the transmission failure probability is incorporated into the denominator of the aggregation scheme.

1.2 Contributions

In this paper, we highlight the need for an innovative client selection strategy that effectively mitigates the negative impacts of data heterogeneity and unreliable communication conditions, while being practical and easily implementable in commercial networks without reconfiguring existing wireless resource allocation. We begin by presenting a novel theoretical analysis of the impact of transmission failures on FL convergence. Based on this analysis, we propose a new client selection approach, termed FedCote (Federated learning algorithm with client selection optimization under transmission failure), which only optimizes client selection probabilities without reconfiguring existing network resource

allocation, thereby enabling straightforward implementation in current commercial networks that support a diverse range of mobile devices and network standards. Our main contributions are as follows:

- 1) **Differentiating the causes of data heterogeneity:** In contrast to previous studies on FL convergence, we theoretically distinguish between two sources of data heterogeneity: data feature distribution and label distribution. This differentiation facilitates a more comprehensive analysis of the impact of transmission failures on FL convergence. To the best of our knowledge, this paper is the first to theoretically analyze FL convergence by separating data heterogeneity into these two components and jointly examining their effects, alongside transmission failures.
- 2) **FL convergence analysis under data heterogeneity and transmission failure:** We analyze a non-convex FL problem by considering both the common non-i.i.d. scenario with label distribution skew (where local label distributions vary across clients) and unreliable wireless networks. The theoretical results show that transmission failures distort the effective appearance probabilities of local samples for each class (i.e., the effective label distribution), leading to a deviation from the true label distribution of the global dataset. This distortion amplifies the negative effects of data heterogeneity and biases FL convergence. Importantly, these findings are not network-specific and are applicable to various wireless networks affected by transmission failures.
- 3) **FedCote:** Based on the convergence analysis, we propose FedCote, a client selection approach designed to mitigate convergence bias by aligning the effective and actual label distributions. Notably, FedCote optimizes only client selection probabilities and does not require reconfiguration of wireless resource allocation, making it simple to implement in commercial networks.
- 4) **Experiments:** We implement FedCote across various deep learning-based tasks, including handwritten-digit recognition and color image classification. Experimental results demonstrate that FedCote outperforms benchmark schemes in unreliable wireless edge networks, highlighting its effectiveness.

Synopsis: Section 2 presents the FL algorithm in wireless networks under transmission failures. Section 3 provides a theoretical analysis of the impact of transmission failures on FL convergence. Building on the theoretical findings, Section 4 proposes the client selection approach, termed FedCote. The experimental evaluation of the proposed approach is detailed in Section 5. Finally, Section 6 concludes the paper with key findings and future research directions.

2 FL UNDER TRANSMISSION FAILURE

2.1 FL Algorithm

Considering a wireless FL network as shown in Fig. 1, a central server coordinates N mobile clients to solve the following distributed learning problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}} F(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i F_i(\mathbf{w}), \quad (1)$$

where $p_i = |\mathcal{D}_i|/|\mathcal{D}|$ is the weight of client i , with \mathcal{D}_i denoting the local dataset of client i and $\mathcal{D} = \bigcup_{i=1}^N \mathcal{D}_i$ as the global dataset. The (possibly) non-convex local loss function is defined as $F_i(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi_i \in \mathcal{D}_i} [\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}; \xi_i)]$, where \mathbf{w} denotes the model parameters to be learned, ξ_i refers to each sample in client i 's dataset, and \mathcal{L} is the loss function. The global cost function is similarly expressed as $F(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi \in \mathcal{D}} [\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}; \xi)]$.

We generally refer to the well-known FedAvg algorithm [36] to outline the overall FL procedure, which consists of the following four steps during each r -th iteration:

- 1) **Client selection:** Due to the limited communication bandwidth at the wireless edge, the server typically selects a subset of K mobile clients, denoted as \mathcal{K}_r , where $|\mathcal{K}_r| = K$, to participate in updating the global model in each iteration. The clients in \mathcal{K}_r are selected with replacement, according to the selection probability distribution $\{s_1, \dots, s_N\}$, where s_i is the probability for selecting client i .
- 2) **Broadcasting:** The server broadcasts the latest global model $\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}$ to each selected client $i \in \mathcal{K}_r$.
- 3) **Local model updating:** Each selected client $i \in \mathcal{K}_r$ updates its local gradient parameters over E successive steps of gradient descent¹. Specifically, the local model is initialized as in (2a) and subsequently updated according to (2b):

$$\mathbf{w}_i^{r,0} = \bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}, \quad (2a)$$

$$\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t} = \mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1} - \gamma \nabla F_i(\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1}), \quad t = 1, \dots, E, \quad (2b)$$

where $\gamma > 0$ is the learning rate and E is the number of local updating steps.

- 4) **Aggregation:** The server collects the local model $\mathbf{w}_i^{r,E}$ from each selected client $i \in \mathcal{K}_r$, and subsequently aggregates them to generate a new global model by

$$\bar{\mathbf{w}}_r = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbf{w}_i^{r,E}. \quad (3)$$

1. When mini-batch stochastic gradient descent (SGD) is employed, the model gradient $\nabla F_i(\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1})$ in (2b) is modified to $\nabla F_i(\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1}; \xi_i^{r,t})$, where $\xi_i^{r,t}$ represents the mini-batch samples and the local loss function is $F_i(\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1}; \xi_i^{r,t}) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi_i \in \xi_i^{r,t}} [\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}; \xi_i)]$. For ease of illustration, we consider full gradient descent for theoretical development, while mini-batch SGD is used in experiments.

Algorithm 1 FedCote: FL under transmission failure

```

1: Initialize global model  $\bar{\mathbf{w}}_0$  by the server
2: for  $r = 1, 2, \dots, R$  do
3:   Server selects  $K$  clients with replacement according
   to the selection probabilities  $\{s_1, \dots, s_N\}$ ;
4:   Server sends global model  $\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}$  to selected clients;
5:   for client  $i \in \mathcal{K}_r$  do (in parallel)
6:     Update local model by (2);
7:     Upload updated local model  $\mathbf{w}_i^{r,E}$  to the server;
8:   end for
9:   if  $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbb{1}_i^r = 0$  then
10:    Repeat Step 7 for all selected clients in  $\mathcal{K}_r$ ;
11:   else
12:    Server updates global model by (5).
13:   end if
14: end for

```

Under ideal and lossless wireless conditions, the FedAvg algorithm, by simply setting each client's selection probability $s_i = p_i$ and employing global aggregation as defined in (3), can yield an unbiased estimate of the aggregated model when all N clients participate, resulting in

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{K}_r}[\bar{\mathbf{w}}_r] = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \mathbf{w}_i^{r,E}. \quad (4)$$

This unbiased estimate ensures that FL converges to an appropriate solution, even in the presence of non-i.i.d. data and with partial participation of K clients per iteration [37].

However, the aforementioned FL scheme remains still far from practical implementation. In real wireless networks, as depicted in Fig. 1, transmission failures intermittently disrupt the delivery of model parameters between the server and clients. These failures primarily stem from two factors: a) *transmission channel conditions*, such as large-scale fading [32], channel state information (CSI) errors [38], and finite blocklength transmission [39]; b) *device-related issues*, such as equipment malfunctions and battery drain [40]. Such unreliable wireless environments with transmission failures severely compromise the unbiased estimate in (4), thereby adversely affecting the convergence properties and overall performance of FL [30], [31]. Thus, it is imperative to account for transmission failures in the design of wireless FL systems.

2.2 Transmission Failure

Previous research has extensively explored approaches for estimating transmission failure probability across various network scenarios, including quasi-static fading channels [41], multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) channels with imperfect CSI [42], finite blocklength transmission with non-orthogonal multiple access (NOMA) [39], and systems beyond 5G [40]. In this paper, we do not limit our analysis to specific network scenarios; instead, we utilize ϵ_i to represent the transmission failure probability for each client i in our theoretical framework.

We assume that downlink communication from the server to selected clients is reliable, given the server's sufficient power and bandwidth to broadcast the global model. Our focus is uplink transmission failures, which may occur due to resource-limited and unstable uplink channels, or device-related issues. Consequently, such failures may prevent the server from correctly receiving the uploaded local models, leading to the global model being aggregated by

$$\bar{\mathbf{w}}_r = \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbb{1}_i^r \mathbf{w}_i^{r,E}}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbb{1}_i^r}, \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbb{1}_i^r = 1$ indicates successful receipt of the local model from client i , and $\mathbb{1}_i^r = 0$ otherwise. Given the transmission failure probability ϵ_i for each client, we have

$$\mathbb{1}_i^r = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{with probability } 1 - \epsilon_i, \\ 0, & \text{with probability } \epsilon_i. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Additionally, if no clients successfully transmit their local updates (i.e., $\mathbb{1}_i^r = 0 \forall i \in [N]$), retransmissions are initiated until at least one client's local model is correctly received by the server, thus avoiding the denominator $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbb{1}_i^r = 0$. The described FL algorithm under transmission failure is summarized in Algorithm 1.

Fig. 2 illustrates the impact of transmission failures on FL performance by comparing the testing accuracy across various FL schemes under both i.i.d. and non-i.i.d. data distributions. In this experiment, a DNN is trained on the MNIST dataset [43], with clients experiencing varying levels of transmission failures and unbalanced local datasets. Further details on the experimental setup are provided in Section 5.1. As shown in Fig. 2, FedAvg, which employs a random




Fig. 2. FL performance on unbalanced MNIST datasets under transmission failures ($N = 20$, $K = 10$, unbalanced ratio = 0.9).

selection strategy with $s_i = p_i$, exhibits significant performance degradation under non-i.i.d. data conditions, compared to the ideal case without transmission failures. Additionally, advanced client selection schemes also perform poorly under non-i.i.d. conditions. For example, as depicted in Fig. 2(b), `Newt` [22] and `GS` [23] converge to biased solutions, while `POWER-OF-CHOICE` [17] experiences significant fluctuations and fails to reach a stable solution. Furthermore, the client selection scheme proposed in [30] (referred to as `TF-Aggregation` in this paper for ease of reference), designed to address transmission failures by incorporating failure probabilities into the global aggregation scheme and optimizing client selection, also exhibits instability under both i.i.d. and non-i.i.d. conditions. These results highlight the critical need to understand the adverse impact of transmission failures on FL performance, particularly in non-i.i.d. scenarios, and to develop effective strategies to mitigate these effects.

In light of this, this paper proposes a robust FL scheme termed `FedCote`, which exhibits strong adaptability in unreliable wireless networks affected by transmission failures, as illustrated in Fig. 2. We first present a novel convergence analysis of Algorithm 1 in Section 3. Following this, Section 4 introduces a new client selection scheme designed to enhance FL performance under transmission failures, without necessitating modifications to existing wireless resource configurations.

3 HOW TRANSMISSION FAILURE AFFECTS FL?

3.1 Causes of Data Heterogeneity

In supervised learning, each sample consists of an input data and its corresponding label. Let $\alpha_{i,c}$ denote the proportion of class- c samples in client i 's local dataset, and $\alpha_{g,c} (= \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \alpha_{i,c})$ represent the corresponding proportion in the global dataset. Similarly, $\nabla F_{i,c}$ and $\nabla F_{g,c}$ denote the gradients of the cost function for class- c samples in the local and global datasets, respectively. For a set of samples with C classes, the local and global gradients can be expressed as

$$\nabla F_i(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{c=1}^C \alpha_{i,c} \nabla F_{i,c}(\mathbf{w}), \quad (7a)$$

$$\nabla F(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{c=1}^C \alpha_{g,c} \nabla F_{g,c}(\mathbf{w}). \quad (7b)$$

In most existing studies on the convergence analysis of FL for general non-convex optimization problems (e.g., [8], [14], [33], [44], [45]), data heterogeneity is commonly quantified using a constant that measures the difference between local and global gradients:

$$\|\nabla F_i(\mathbf{w}) - \nabla F(\mathbf{w})\|^2 \leq V_i^2, \quad (8)$$

where a larger V_i indicates greater data heterogeneity. However, this approach provides limited insight into the underlying causes of data heterogeneity, hindering a deeper analysis of how transmission failure affects FL. To provide a more comprehensive understanding, we analyze data heterogeneity in detail and present Proposition 1.

Proposition 1 *The difference between local and global gradients can be bounded by two separate terms:*

$$\|\nabla F_i(\mathbf{w}) - \nabla F(\mathbf{w})\|^2 \leq 2 \left(\underbrace{\sum_{c=1}^C \alpha_{i,c} \|\nabla F_{i,c}(\mathbf{w}) - \nabla F_{g,c}(\mathbf{w})\|^2}_{(9a) \text{ related to data feature}} + \chi_{\alpha_i \parallel \alpha_g}^2 \underbrace{\sum_{c=1}^C \alpha_{g,c} \|\nabla F_{g,c}(\mathbf{w})\|^2}_{(9b) \text{ related to sample label}} \right). \quad (9)$$

Here, term (9a) captures **data feature-related heterogeneity**, where the deviation between local and global gradients within a class, $\|\nabla F_{i,c}(\mathbf{w}) - \nabla F_{g,c}(\mathbf{w})\|^2$, is influenced by the sample data characteristics such as local data insufficiency and feature shift across different data sources [46], [47]. Term (9b) reflects **label-related heterogeneity**, with the chi-square divergence $\chi_{\alpha_i \parallel \alpha_g}^2 \triangleq \sum_{c=1}^C \frac{(\alpha_{i,c} - \alpha_{g,c})^2}{\alpha_{g,c}}$ quantifying the mismatch between local and global label distributions.

Proof: See Appendix A. ■

Based on Proposition 1, data heterogeneity in FL arises from two sources: *data feature distribution* and *label distribution*. To distinguish their respective effects on FL convergence, we introduce Assumptions 1 and 2, which provide bounds for the data feature-related and label-related terms in the right-hand side (RHS) of (9). Notably, Assumption 1 refines the previously bound (8) by applying it to specific class samples rather than the entire dataset.

Assumption 1 *Bounded gradient deviation within a class:* $\|\nabla F_{i,c}(\mathbf{w}) - \nabla F_{g,c}(\mathbf{w})\|^2 \leq V_{i,c}^2, \forall i \in [N]$.

Assumption 2 *Bounded gradient norm:* $\|\nabla F(\mathbf{w})\|^2 \leq G^2$ [17], [27], [30].

By combining (9) with the above two assumptions, we derive Lemma 1, which will be employed in the convergence analysis of FL in Section 3.2 to quantify data heterogeneity.

Corollary 1 *Under Assumptions 1 and 2, the difference between the local and global gradients is bounded by*

$$\|\nabla F_i(\mathbf{w}) - \nabla F(\mathbf{w})\|^2 \leq 2 \sum_{c=1}^C \alpha_{i,c} V_{i,c}^2 + 2\chi_{\alpha_i}^2 G^2, \quad (10)$$

where the two terms on the RHS of (10) quantify the effects of data feature-related and label-related heterogeneity, respectively.

3.2 Convergence Rate of FL with Transmission Failure

We also adopt the following standard assumptions on F_i [17], [27], [30], [32], [33]:

Assumption 3 *Each local function $F_i(\mathbf{w})$ is lower bounded:* $F_i(\mathbf{w}) \geq \underline{F}$.

Assumption 4 *Each local functions F_i is differentiable, and its gradient ∇F_i is Lipschitz continuous with constant L :* $\forall \mathbf{w}$ and \mathbf{w}' , $F_i(\mathbf{w}') \leq F_i(\mathbf{w}) + (\mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{w})^T \nabla F_i(\mathbf{w}) + \frac{L}{2} \|\mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{w}\|_2^2$.

To analyze the convergence of FL under transmission failures, we first present Lemma 1, which quantifies the average value of the global model aggregated using (5), accounting for both partial participation and transmission failures.

Lemma 1 *In the FL procedure described in Algorithm 1, the global aggregation in (5) satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{K}_r, \mathbf{1}_i^r} \left[\frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbf{1}_i^r \mathbf{w}_i^{r,E}}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbf{1}_i^r} \mid \sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbf{1}_i^r \neq 0 \right] = \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i \mathbf{w}_i^{r,E}, \quad (11)$$

where $\bar{\beta}_i \in [0, 1]$ and $\sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i = 1$. Here, $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ denotes the expectation taken over \mathcal{K}_r and $\{\mathbf{1}_i^r\}$. If the transmission failure probability $\epsilon_i = 0 \forall i \in [N]$, then $\mathbf{1}_i^r = 1$ and $\bar{\beta}_i = s_i$.

Proof: The result in Lemma 1 follows from discussions in [33, Lemma 2]. For ease of reference, the proof is presented in Appendix B. ■

From (11), $\bar{\beta}_i$ can be interpreted as the effective appearance probability of client i in the global aggregation. When employing a random selection scheme with $s_i = p_i$, as in the FedAvg algorithm, $\bar{\beta}_i$ deviates from the weight p_i defined in (1) due to transmission failures, rendering the unbiased estimate in (4) invalid. Thus, instead of using (4), which holds under ideal conditions, we employ (11) in our analysis to study FL convergence under transmission failures. The main convergence result is as follows.

Theorem 1 *Suppose Assumptions 1 to 4 hold. If one chooses $\gamma = K^{\frac{1}{2}}/(6LT^{\frac{1}{2}})$ and $E \leq T^{\frac{1}{4}}/K^{\frac{3}{4}}$ where $T = ME \geq \max\{K^3, 1/K\}$ is the total number of gradient descent updates per client, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=1}^R \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})\|^2] \\ & \leq \frac{2484L}{55(TK)^{\frac{1}{2}}} (\mathbb{E}[F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_0)] - \underline{F}) + \underbrace{\left(\frac{276}{55(TK)^{\frac{1}{4}}} + \frac{24}{55(TK)^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \frac{4}{55(TK)^{\frac{3}{4}}} \right) \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i \sum_{c=1}^C (\alpha_{i,c} V_{i,c}^2 + \chi_{\alpha_i}^2 G^2)}_{(12a) \text{ caused by non-i.i.d. data}} \\ & \quad + \underbrace{\frac{828}{55} \chi_{\bar{\beta}}^2 \sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \alpha_{i,c} V_{i,c}^2 + \frac{828}{55} \chi_{\bar{\alpha}}^2 G^2}_{(12b) \text{ caused by transmission failure and non-i.i.d. data}}, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where in term (12b), $\chi_{\bar{\beta}}^2 \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(\bar{\beta}_i - p_i)^2}{p_i}$ represents the chi-square divergence [48] between the effective appearance probabilities $\{\bar{\beta}_i\}$ and the weights $\{p_i\}$. Meanwhile, $\chi_{\bar{\alpha}}^2 \triangleq \sum_{c=1}^C \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^N (p_i - \bar{\beta}_i) \alpha_{i,c})^2}{\alpha_{g,c}} = \sum_{c=1}^C \frac{(\alpha_{g,c} - \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i \alpha_{i,c})^2}{\alpha_{g,c}}$ quantifies the divergence between the actual global label distribution $\{\alpha_{g,c}\}$ and the effective global label distribution $\{\bar{\alpha}_c\}$, where $\bar{\alpha}_c \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i \alpha_{i,c}$.

Proof: Unlike existing studies on client selection for FL [17], [23], [27], [30], [32], we explore more practical FL scenarios in wireless edge networks, where transmission failures, non-i.i.d. data, and non-convex learning problems coexist. Furthermore, in contrast to [33] and [48], which also address FL with non-i.i.d. data and non-convex learning problems, we refine data heterogeneity into data feature-related and label-related components and employ non-fixed selection probabilities (whereas [33] and [48] set $s_i = p_i$). Our derivation builds on the analytical frameworks in [33] and [48], integrating these considerations to enhance the comprehensiveness of convergence analysis. The detailed derivation process is presented in Appendix C. ■

From the RHS of (12), it is evident that the convergence of Algorithm 1 is influenced by various parameters, including the number of selected clients K , data heterogeneity factors, $\{V_{i,c}^2\}$ and $\{\chi_{\alpha_i\|\alpha_g}^2\}$, as well as factors introduced by transmission failures, namely $\chi_{\beta\|\mathbf{p}}^2$ and $\chi_{\bar{\alpha}\|\alpha_g}^2$. Terms (12a) and (12b) indicate that both non-i.i.d. data and transmission failures negatively affect FL convergence. Moreover, we discover several important insights as follows.

- First, in an ideal wireless scenario without transmission failures, where $\bar{\beta}_i = p_i$ as stated in Lemma 1, the divergence factors in term (12b), $\chi_{\beta\|\mathbf{p}}^2$ and $\chi_{\bar{\alpha}\|\alpha_g}^2$, reduce to zero. Consequently, term (12b) is eliminated, but term (12a) still impedes FL convergence due to non-i.i.d. data.
- Second, when local datasets are i.i.d., the local and global label distributions are identical (i.e., $\alpha_{i,c} = \alpha_{g,c}$), and the within-class deviation between local and global gradients, $V_{i,c}^2$ (as defined in Assumption 1), approaches zero. This causes both terms (12a) and (12b) to vanish. As a result, i.i.d. data mitigates the negative impact of transmission failures, enabling proper FL convergence despite their presence, as illustrated in Fig. 2(a).
- Third, term (12b), arising from transmission failures and non-i.i.d. data, does not decrease with increasing T . This indicates that transmission failures exacerbate the adverse effects of non-i.i.d. data, leading FL to converge to a biased solution, as observed in Fig. 2(b).
- Lastly, combining term (12b) with Corollary 1 reveals that $\chi_{\beta\|\mathbf{p}}^2$ and $\chi_{\bar{\alpha}\|\alpha_g}^2$, arising from transmission failures, amplify the negative effects of data feature-related and label-related heterogeneity, respectively, thereby biasing FL convergence. Furthermore, the impacts of data feature-related and label-related heterogeneity depends on the values of the average gradient deviation within a class, $\sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \alpha_{i,c} V_{i,c}^2$, and the squared norm of model gradient, G^2 . To compare their relative impacts on FL convergence bias, a detailed comparison of the empirical value of $\sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \alpha_{i,c} V_{i,c}^2$ and G^2 is provided in the subsequent Section 3.3.

3.3 Dominant Influence of Label-Related Heterogeneity

To quantify the specific influence of data feature-related (first) and label-related (second) components in term (12b) on biasing FL convergence, we conduct experimental tests to estimate the empirical ratio between $\sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \alpha_{i,c} V_{i,c}^2$ and G^2 . Based on Proposition 1 and Corollary 1, we estimate the within-class deviation between local and global gradients, $V_{i,c}^2$, using $\|\nabla F_{i,c}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}) - \nabla F_{g,c}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})\|^2$, and the squared norm of model gradient, G^2 , using $\sum_{c=1}^C \alpha_{g,c} \|\nabla F_{g,c}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})\|^2$, where $\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}$ represents the global model aggregated at the $(r-1)$ -th iteration.

Experiments are conducted on two distinct tasks: training a 3-layer fully connected DNN on the MNIST dataset [43] and training a ResNet-20 model with Group Normalization (GN) [49] on the CIFAR-10 dataset [50]. To mitigate the impact of transmission failures, we assume an ideal and lossless wireless environment. Additionally, we consider an extreme non-i.i.d. scenario with label distribution skew, where each client holds samples from only one class. We examine both the balanced condition, where all clients have an equal number of samples, and the unbalanced condition, with half of the clients holding 90% of the total training samples. For further details on local label and weight distributions for each client, refer to Appendix D. All results are averaged over five independent experiments, with $N = K = 20$ and $E = 1$.

Fig. 3(a) and Fig. 3(b) depict the trends of $\sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \alpha_{i,c} V_{i,c}^2$ and G^2 over the initial 50 iterations for the balanced and unbalanced MNIST and CIFAR-10 datasets, respectively. The corresponding ratio of G^2 to $\sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \alpha_{i,c} V_{i,c}^2$ is shown in Fig. 4.

Observation 1 *As shown in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4, the squared norm of model gradient, G^2 , is orders of magnitude greater (hundreds to thousands of times larger) than the average gradient deviation within a class, $\sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \alpha_{i,c} V_{i,c}^2$. This indicates that in non-i.i.d. scenario with label distribution skew, the label-related heterogeneity component in (12b), $\chi_{\bar{\alpha}\|\alpha_g}^2 G^2$, is the dominant factor in biasing FL convergence.*

To further analyze the cause why $\sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \alpha_{i,c} V_{i,c}^2$ is small, we plot in Fig. 5 the median of each client's $V_{i,c}^2$ taken over all iterations alongside with its corresponding $p_i \alpha_{i,c}$. As can be observed from Fig. 5, in balanced scenario, $V_{i,c}^2$ is almost same for all clients at the value of low level. In unbalanced scenario, although $V_{i,c}^2$ is higher for the clients with insufficient training samples (i.e., with smaller $p_i \alpha_{i,c}$), the multiplication $p_i \alpha_{i,c} V_{i,c}^2$ still has minor contribution to the summation $\sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \alpha_{i,c} V_{i,c}^2$.

According to Theorem 1, when the divergence between the effective and actual label distributions $\chi_{\bar{\alpha}\|\alpha_g}^2 = 0$, the label-related (second) component in term (12b) vanishes, indicating that the influence of label-related heterogeneity on biasing FL convergence is eliminated. Consequently, based on Observation 1, term (12b) becomes negligible, enabling FL to converge to an appropriate stationary solution. From this, we derive the following result:




Fig. 3. Comparison of the values of G^2 and $\sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \alpha_{i,c} V_{i,c}^2$.




Fig. 4. Ratio of G^2 to $\sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \alpha_{i,c} V_{i,c}^2$.

Fig. 5. Value of $V_{i,c}^2$ per client with respect to $p_i \alpha_{i,c}$ (markers consistent with Fig. 4).

Corollary 2 Under the same conditions as Theorem 1 and incorporating Observation 1, if $\chi_{\bar{\alpha}}^2_{\alpha_g} = 0$, we approximately have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=1}^R \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})\|^2] \\ & \leq \frac{2484L}{55(TK)^{\frac{1}{2}}} (\mathbb{E}[F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_0)] - \underline{F}) + \left(\frac{276}{55(TK)^{\frac{1}{4}}} + \frac{24}{55(TK)^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \frac{4}{55(TK)^{\frac{3}{4}}} \right) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i \sum_{c=1}^C (\alpha_{i,c} V_{i,c}^2 + \chi_{\alpha_i}^2_{\alpha_g} G^2). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

From the RHS of (13), we observe that with $\chi_{\bar{\alpha}}^2_{\alpha_g} = 0$, the FL algorithm can achieve a *linear speed-up* with respect to the number of selected clients K , even in the presence of transmission failures. This highlights the importance of balancing the effective appearance probabilities of each class's local samples. Aligning these probabilities with the label distribution of global dataset enhances the robustness and convergence speed of FL in unreliable wireless networks.

Remark 1 To the best of our knowledge, the influence of label-related heterogeneity on FL convergence under transmission failures, as presented in Theorem 1 and Corollary 2, has not been discovered in previous literature. Furthermore, these results are not limited to any specific type of network and can be applied to FL deployments in various unreliable networks experiencing transmission failures.

4 CLIENT SELECTION OPTIMIZATION

Since transmission failures are inevitable occur at the wireless edge, we formulate an optimization problem in this section to minimize their impact through client selection, thereby accelerating FL convergence.

4.1 Different Optimization Strategies

As discussed in previous Observation 1 and Corollary 2, minimizing the divergence $\chi_{\bar{\alpha}}^2_{\alpha_g}$ can significantly enhance FL convergence under transmission failure. According to Theorem 1, the divergence between the effective and actual global label distributions, $\chi_{\bar{\alpha}}^2_{\alpha_g}$, is expressed as

$$\chi_{\bar{\alpha}}^2_{\alpha_g} = \sum_{c=1}^C \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^N (p_i - \bar{\beta}_i) \alpha_{i,c} \right)^2}{\alpha_{g,c}} \quad (14a)$$

$$= \sum_{c=1}^C \frac{\left(\alpha_{g,c} - \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i \alpha_{i,c} \right)^2}{\alpha_{g,c}}, \quad (14b)$$

where (14a) and (14b) provide two equivalent representations of $\chi_{\bar{\alpha}||\alpha_g}^2$, with the global label distribution $\alpha_{g,c} = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \alpha_{i,c}$ as specified in (7).

From (14), the minimum value of $\chi_{\bar{\alpha}||\alpha_g}^2$ is zero, and the effective appearance probability of each client, $\bar{\beta}_i$, plays a crucial role in achieving this minimum. Accordingly, the detailed formulation of $\bar{\beta}_i$ is derived in Proposition 2.

Proposition 2 *Based on the selection scheme described in Section 2.1, the selection set \mathcal{K}_r has C_K^{N+K-1} ($= \frac{(N+K-1)!}{(N-1)!K!}$) possible combinations, denoted by $\mathcal{K}_r^z, z = 1, \dots, C_K^{N+K-1}$ [51]. Thus, from (11), the effective appearance probability $\bar{\beta}_i$ for each client $i \in [N]$ is given by*

$$\bar{\beta}_i = \sum_{z=1}^{C_K^{N+K-1}} \underbrace{\frac{K!}{\prod_{i \in [N]} n_{z,i}!} \prod_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r^z} s_i}_{\triangleq \Pr(\mathcal{K}_r^z)} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{n_{z,i}(1-\epsilon_i)}{1 - \prod_{j \in \mathcal{K}_r^z} \epsilon_j} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \left(\frac{1}{K C_k^{K-1}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{K}' \subseteq \mathcal{K}_r^z \setminus i, \\ |\mathcal{K}'|=k}} \prod_{i' \in \mathcal{K}'} \epsilon_{i'} \right)}_{\triangleq \beta_{z,i}}, \quad (15)$$

where $\Pr(\mathcal{K}_r^z)$ represents the selection probability of each set \mathcal{K}_r^z , and $\beta_{z,i}$ is the effective appearance probability of client i 's local model when \mathcal{K}_r^z is selected. Here, $\beta_{z,i} = 0$ if $i \notin \mathcal{K}_r^z$ and $\sum_{i=1}^N \beta_{z,i} = 1$. The variable $n_{z,i}$ is the number of times client i appears in \mathcal{K}_r^z , where $n_{z,i} = 0$ if $i \notin \mathcal{K}_r^z$, and $\frac{K!}{\prod_{i \in [N]} n_{z,i}!}$ gives the number of distinct permutations of selected clients in \mathcal{K}_r^z . The notation $\mathcal{K}_r^z \setminus i$ refers to the set obtained by removing one occurrence of i from \mathcal{K}_r^z .

Proof: See Appendix E. ■

According to (15), $\bar{\beta}_i$ depends on both the selection probabilities $\{s_i\}$ and the transmission failure probabilities $\{\epsilon_i\}$. Moreover, $\bar{\beta}_i$ is influenced by the differences in clients' transmission failure probabilities, as described in Proposition 3.

Proposition 3 *The effective appearance probability $\bar{\beta}_i$ for each client $i \in [N]$ can also be expressed as*

$$\bar{\beta}_i = s_i \left(1 + \sum_{i'=1, i' \neq i}^N s_{i'} (\epsilon_{i'} - \epsilon_i) \sum_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_{K-2}=1}^N \prod_{k=1}^{K-2} s_{j_k} \frac{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-2} \prod_{k'=1}^k \epsilon_{j_{k'}}}{1 - \epsilon_i \epsilon_{i'} \prod_{k=1}^{K-2} \epsilon_{j_k}} \right), \quad (16)$$

where $(\epsilon_{i'} - \epsilon_i)$ captures the difference in transmission failure probabilities between two distinct clients i and $i' \in [N]$.

Proof: See Appendix F. ■

Based on Propositions 2 and 3, two strategies can be employed to minimize $\chi_{\bar{\alpha}||\alpha_g}^2$:

- (i) **Optimizing wireless resource allocation:** This strategy aims to equalize transmission failure probabilities across all clients, such that $\epsilon_i = \epsilon_{i'}, \forall i, i' \in [N]$ [33]. As a result, the effective appearance probability $\bar{\beta}_i = s_i$ according to Proposition 3. When the classical FedAvg algorithm is applied, using a simple random selection strategy with $s_i = p_i$, we have $\bar{\beta}_i = p_i$, which leads to $\chi_{\bar{\alpha}||\alpha_g}^2 = 0$ based on (14a). However, this strategy requires network reconfiguration and may be infeasible if some clients have $\epsilon_i = 1$, limiting its practicality.
- (ii) **Optimizing client selection:** In this strategy, the selection probabilities $\{s_i\}$ in (15) are optimized to adjust each client's effective appearance probability $\bar{\beta}_i$, ensuring that the effective appearance probability of each class's samples, $\sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i \alpha_{i,c}$, matches its proportion in the global dataset, $\alpha_{g,c}$. This leads to $\chi_{\bar{\alpha}||\alpha_g}^2 = 0$ based on (14b). This strategy mitigates the impact of transmission failures without altering the existing network configuration. Predefined wireless resource allocation schemes, such as resource blocks assigned to each selected client in FDMA systems or time slots allocated in time division multiple access (TDMA) systems, can be directly applied, facilitating straightforward implementation. Thus, this paper focuses on optimizing client selection.

4.2 Proposed FedCote

4.2.1 Optimization Problem Formulation

As discussed in previous Section 4.1, optimizing client selection probabilities to minimize $\chi_{\bar{\alpha}||\alpha_g}^2 = 0$ is a straightforward approach to mitigate the impact of transmission failure on FL convergence. Accordingly, we formulate the following optimization problem regarding client selection probabilities:

$$\min_{s_i, i \in [N]} \sum_{c=1}^C \frac{(\alpha_{g,c} - \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i \alpha_{i,c})^2}{\alpha_{g,c}}, \quad (17a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{i=1}^N s_i = 1, \quad (17b)$$

$$s_i = 0 \text{ if } \epsilon_i = 1; \quad s_i \geq 0 \text{ otherwise.} \quad (17c)$$

Here, the objective function (17a) arises from (14b). Constraint (17c) accounts for the fact that clients with $\epsilon_i = 1$ cannot successfully upload their local models, rendering their selection ineffective.

Algorithm 2 FedCote: Client selection optimization

```

1: Initialize each client's selection probability  $s_i$  using (18);
2: if  $\alpha_{i,c} = \alpha_{g,c}, \forall i \in [N]$  (i.i.d. data case) then
3:   break;
4: else (non-i.i.d. data case)
5:    $j = 0$ ;
6:   while  $j <$  maximum number of update steps do
7:     Update  $\{s_i\}$  using gradient descent in (19a);
8:     Update  $\{s_i\}$  using gradient projection in (19b);
9:      $j = j + 1$ ;
10:  end while
11: end if

```

Output: Selection probability s_i for each client.

Remark 2 In the optimization problem (17), clients are required to share only their local label distributions $\{\alpha_{i,c}\}$, which are minimally privacy-sensitive. If the label distributions are still considered privacy-sensitive, protection mechanisms like secure multiparty computation can be employed [23]. However, since this paper primarily investigates the effects of transmission failure and label distribution skew on FL convergence, privacy protection will not be discussed extensively.

4.2.2 Optimal Solution

1) *The i.i.d. data case:* In this scenario, the global and local datasets share identical label distributions (i.e., $\alpha_{i,c} = \alpha_{g,c}$), resulting in a numerator of zero in (17a), and the objective function (17a) directly achieves its minimum value of zero. Based on this, we have the following Proposition 4.

Proposition 4 In the i.i.d. data case, any set of selection probabilities satisfying (17b) and (17c) constitutes an optimal solution to (17). Thus, the random selection strategy is an optimal solution, with selection probabilities defined as follows:

$$s_i = \begin{cases} \frac{p_i}{\sum_{j \in [N], \epsilon_j < 1} p_j}, & \text{if } \epsilon_i < 1, \\ 0, & \text{if } \epsilon_i = 1. \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

The optimal solution in (18) can also serve as an initial value for optimizing $\{s_i\}$ under non-i.i.d. data.

2) *The non-i.i.d. data case:* We first initialize the selection probabilities $\{s_i\}$ using (18). Given the smooth and continuous gradient of (17a) due to the squared terms, we employ gradient descent as in (19a) to update the selection probabilities for clients with $\epsilon_i < 1$. This is followed by gradient projection [52] as in (19b) to enforce the equality constraint in (17b):

$$s_i = s_i - \eta \frac{\partial(17a)}{\partial s_i}, \quad (19a)$$

$$s_i = s_i + \frac{1 - \sum_{j \in [N], \epsilon_j < 1} s_j}{N - \sum_{j \in [N], \epsilon_j < 1} 1}, \quad (19b)$$

where $\eta > 0$ denotes the step size, and the detailed expression for $\partial(17a)/\partial s_i$ is provided in Appendix G. By iterating between (19a) and (19b), we obtain the optimal selection probabilities.

The details of our proposed client selection optimization approach are summarized in Algorithm 2. We refer to the FL procedure in Algorithm 1 utilizing the optimal selection probabilities obtained from Algorithm 2 as FedCote.

4.3 Enhanced FedCote for Reducing Computation Complexity

According to Proposition 2, for a total of N clients, the number of distinct combinations of \mathcal{K}_r^z (i.e., C_K^{N+K-1}) grows rapidly as the number of selected clients, K , increases. This leads to higher computational complexity for calculating the effective appearance probability $\bar{\beta}_i$ in (15), thereby increasing the computational cost of client selection optimization in (17). Fortunately, the optimization problem in (17) possesses an advantageous property, as stated in Proposition 5.

Proposition 5 Let $[\bar{\beta}_i]_K$ denote the effective appearance probability $\bar{\beta}_i$, as defined in (15), when selecting K clients from the total N clients per iteration. As K increases, the difference between $[\bar{\beta}_i]_K$ and $[\bar{\beta}_i]_{K+1}$ gradually decreases. Consequently, the gap between the optimal solutions of (17) for selecting K and $(K + 1)$ clients per iteration also diminishes as K grows.

Proof: See Appendix H. ■

Building on Proposition 5, the computational complexity of solving the client selection optimization problem in (17) for larger values of K can be significantly reduced by approximating its optimal solution using a smaller value, K_{apx} ($K_{\text{apx}} < K$). This computation-efficient variant of FedCote is referred to as FedCote-II.

TABLE 1. Transmission failure probability for each client.

Client index	1 ~ 12	13, 15	17, 19	14, 16, 18, 20
ϵ_i	0	0.5	0.8	1

5 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

5.1 Parameter Settings

5.1.1 FL scenario

In the simulations, a server (i.e., base station) coordinates $N = 20$ mobile clients to collaboratively train DNN models. Among these clients, four experience poor wireless transmission quality, with transmission failure probabilities $\epsilon_i = 0.5$ and 0.8. Another four clients face device damage or battery issues, with $\epsilon_i = 1$. The remaining clients operate under near-ideal transmission conditions, with $\epsilon_i = 0$. Table 1 provides a detailed overview of the transmission failure probabilities for all clients. During local model updates, the number of local updating steps per iteration is set to $E = 5$.

5.1.2 Datasets and DNN models

We consider training DNN models using the following two widely adopted datasets.

- **MNIST dataset** [43]: This dataset comprises 60000 training samples and 10000 testing samples, categorized into ten classes. A 3-layer fully connected network with dimensions $784 \times 30 \times 10$ is trained for digit classification, where the hidden layer contains 30 neurons. Based on empirical values, training is conducted with a batch size of 128, a fixed learning rate of $\gamma = 0.05$, and $R = 500$ iterations.
- **CIFAR-10 dataset** [50]: This dataset includes 50000 training samples and 10000 testing samples, also categorized into ten classes. For this dataset, the ResNet-20 model with Group Normalization (GN) [49] is employed for image classification. Training is performed with a batch size of 128, an initial learning rate of $\gamma = 0.1$ that decays to 0.01 after 6000 iterations, and a total of $R = 10000$ iterations.

5.1.3 Data distributions

The simulations consider two types of dataset distributions: i.i.d. and non-i.i.d.

- **i.i.d.**: Training samples are shuffled and randomly distributed among the clients.
- **Non-i.i.d.**: Each client is assigned data samples from only two specific classes. Higher-indexed clients assigned samples from classes with higher labels. For instance, clients 1~4 hold samples from classes 1 and 2, clients 5~8 from classes 3 and 4, and so forth.

Both i.i.d. and non-i.i.d. types are evaluated two settings: balanced and unbalanced.

- **Balanced**: Each client is allocated an equal number of samples, i.e., $p_i = \frac{1}{N}$, $\forall i \in [N]$.
- **Unbalanced**: The number of samples allocated to clients varies, leading to differing values of p_i among clients. Specifically, the unbalanced ratio u represents the proportion of training samples assigned to clients with even indices, while the remaining $(1 - u)$ proportion is allocated to clients with odd indices. A larger u indicates a higher degree of imbalance, with $u = 0.5$ corresponding to the balanced case.

Despite the varying data distribution settings in the FL procedure, the performance of the aggregated global model is assessed by evaluating the training loss and testing accuracy using the entire training and testing datasets, respectively, to evaluate its convergence capability and generalizability.

5.1.4 Baselines

Five baselines and the ideal scheme are considered for comparison with the proposed FedCote.

- **FedAvg** [36]: This scheme employs Algorithm 1 with a random selection strategy, where $s_i = p_i$.
- **Power-of-Choice** [17]: This scheme modifies the client selection in Step 3 of Algorithm 1 as follows: 1) It selects \tilde{K} clients ($\tilde{K} \geq K$) without replacement, based on the selection probability $s_i = p_i$, to form a candidate set \tilde{K}_r ; 2) From this candidate set, it selects the K clients with the largest local training loss $F_i(\mathbf{w}_i^{r-1,E})$. In the experiments, when $K = 10$, we set $\tilde{K} = 15$; when $K = N = 20$, we use $\tilde{K} = K = 20$.
- **Newt** [22]: At the r -th iteration, this scheme measures the difference between the local model of client i and the global model as $e^{-p_i} \|\mathbf{w}_i^{r-1,E} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}\|$, and selects K clients with the largest differences for local training. The global model is then aggregated using a weighted average as $\bar{\mathbf{w}}_r = \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} p_i \mathbf{w}_i^{r,E}}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} p_i}$. For fair comparison, we modify the aggregation scheme to account for transmission failures as

$$\bar{\mathbf{w}}_r = \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbf{1}_i^r p_i \mathbf{w}_i^{r,E}}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbf{1}_i^r p_i}. \quad (20)$$

- **GS** [23]: This scheme partitions clients into groups, each containing at most K clients. The grouping is optimized to ensure that the aggregated label distribution of the clients within a group \mathcal{G} , $\{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{G}} \alpha_{i,c}\}_{c=1}^C$, closely matches the global label distribution, $\{\alpha_{g,c}\}_{c=1}^C$. At each iteration, one group is selected for local training, and the global model is

TABLE 2. Performance of various FL schemes on the balanced MNIST dataset ($K = 10$).

FL scheme	i.i.d.		Non-i.i.d.	
	Training loss	Testing accuracy (%)	Training loss	Testing accuracy (%)
FedAvg	0.1261 ± 0.0047	95.87 ± 0.0914	0.4776 ± 0.0523	84.06 ± 2.5813
Power-of-Choice	0.1364 ± 0.0048	95.59 ± 0.0997	0.3762 ± 0.0589	87.70 ± 2.6978
Newt	0.1396 ± 0.0036	95.45 ± 0.1455	0.8285 ± 0.6112	77.08 ± 10.8132
GS	0.1378 ± 0.0036	95.57 ± 0.0881	0.4805 ± 0.0948	84.48 ± 2.9839
TF-Aggregation	2.86 × 10 ³⁰ ± 6.38 × 10 ³⁰	92.94 ± 0.2709	7.95 × 10 ²⁸ ± 1.60 × 10 ²⁹	86.12 ± 8.3039
FedCote (Ours)	0.1228 ± 0.0047	95.92 ± 0.0868	0.2622 ± 0.0300	91.49 ± 1.1899
Ideal	0.12 ± 0.0028	96.03 ± 0.1337	0.2794 ± 0.0363	91.27 ± 1.3622

TABLE 3. Performance of various FL schemes on the balanced CIFAR-10 dataset ($K = 10$).

FL scheme	i.i.d.		Non-i.i.d.	
	Training loss	Testing accuracy (%)	Training loss	Testing accuracy (%)
FedAvg	0.1677 ± 0.0045	84.52 ± 0.2383	0.7482 ± 0.2166	68.56 ± 5.4160
Power-of-Choice	0.1662 ± 0.0119	84.33 ± 0.8143	0.6418 ± 0.1101	71.60 ± 3.9184
Newt	0.4685 ± 0.0861	78.87 ± 1.6187	1.0106 ± 0.4029	66.69 ± 7.2421
GS	0.1855 ± 0.0220	83.95 ± 0.6025	0.6996 ± 0.1410	69.20 ± 3.6814
TF-Aggregation	NaN	10.00 ± 0.00	NaN	10.00 ± 0.00
FedCote (Ours)	0.1685 ± 0.0066	84.60 ± 0.2491	0.5574 ± 0.1143	75.16 ± 3.1586
Ideal	0.0399 ± 0.0004	86.22 ± 0.2428	0.4212 ± 0.0630	77.04 ± 2.0662

aggregated via a weighted average. Similar to `Newt`, this scheme does not consider transmission failures. Therefore, we adopt the modified aggregation scheme in (20).

- **TF-Aggregation** [30]: This baseline incorporates transmission failures by modifying the global aggregation (Step 12) in Algorithm 1 as follows:

$$\bar{\mathbf{w}}_r = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbb{1}_i^r \frac{p_i}{s_i (1 - \epsilon_i)} \mathbf{w}_i^{r,E}, \quad (21)$$

where ϵ_i is the transmission failure probability of client i . Unlike the client selection optimization in (21) proposed in this paper, [30] formulates a client selection problem as $\min_{s_i, i \in [N]} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{p_i}{s_i (1 - \epsilon_i)}$, subject to (17b). Since this approach does not account for cases where $\epsilon_i = 1$, which causes an infinite objective function value, we modify the optimization problem for fair comparison as follows:

$$\min_{s_i, i \in [N]} \sum_{i=1, \epsilon_i < 1}^N \frac{p_i}{s_i (1 - \epsilon_i)}, \quad (22a)$$

$$\text{s.t. (17b), (17c).} \quad (22b)$$

- **Ideal**: The ideal scheme performs FL using Algorithm 1 with $s_i = p_i$, and does not suffer from transmission failures, i.e., $\mathbb{1}_i^r = 1$ in (5). This scheme serves as the performance upper bound in the simulations.

For fair comparison, the performance of each FL scheme are averaged over five independent experiments.

5.2 Robustness of FedCote under Different Data Distributions

In this subsection, we consider a partial participation case with $K = 10$ to evaluate the performance of the proposed FedCote.

5.2.1 Balanced dataset

We first assess the robustness of FedCote in balanced scenarios. Tables 2 and 3 compare the training loss and testing accuracy of various FL schemes on balanced MNIST and CIFAR-10 datasets under both i.i.d. and non-i.i.d. settings. The reported results represent the mean and standard deviation across five independent experiments.

On the MNIST dataset, as shown in Table 2, FedCote achieves the lowest training loss and the highest testing accuracy in both i.i.d. and non-i.i.d. settings. Its performance approaches that of the ideal scheme without transmission failures and surpasses the vanilla FedAvg with random client selection by 7.43% in testing accuracy under the non-i.i.d. setting. In contrast, other FL baselines exhibit significant performance degradation under non-i.i.d. conditions. Specifically, FedAvg performs poorly due to its reliance on the weight p_i as the selection probability, which neglects the effects of transmission failures. Power-of-Choice, while selecting clients with the largest local training losses, indirectly prioritizes clients with higher transmission failure probabilities. This partially mitigates the impact of uneven client participation caused by varying transmission conditions. However, its testing accuracy under non-i.i.d. conditions remains 3.79% lower than that of FedCote, as it does not consider balancing the effective appearance probabilities of each class’s samples under transmission failures. Newt exhibits poor and unstable performance, characterized by lower testing accuracy and higher variance, due to its reliance on client selection based on local-global model discrepancies, which is ineffective under transmission failures. GS, which matches the aggregated label distribution to the global distribution, also overlooks transmission failures,




Fig. 6. Selection probabilities of FedCote for non-i.i.d. balanced datasets ($K = 10$).




Fig. 7. Performance of various FL schemes on unbalanced datasets under transmission failures ($K = 10$).




Fig. 8. Optimal selection probabilities of each client obtained from (17) under different K .

resulting in suboptimal performance. Although TF-Aggregation accounts for clients' transmission failure probabilities $\{\epsilon_i\}$, it incorporates $(1 - \epsilon_i)$ as the denominator in its global aggregation scheme. This design renders the method unstable when certain clients exhibit high ϵ_i values, leading to difficulties in global model convergence and significantly increased training loss in both i.i.d. and non-i.i.d. settings.

A similar pattern emerges on the CIFAR-10 dataset, as shown in Table 3. In both i.i.d. and non-i.i.d. data cases, FedCote consistently outperforms all evaluated FL schemes, achieving the highest testing accuracy. Notably, under non-i.i.d. settings, FedCote improves testing accuracy by 6.6% compared to vanilla FedAvg and by 3.56% compared to the next-best baseline, Power-of-Choice. Furthermore, the increased complexity of the CIFAR-10 dataset and the ResNet-20 model amplifies the instability of TF-Aggregation, preventing it from converging due to gradient explosions in its global aggregation scheme.

To analyze why FedCote performs robustly under non-i.i.d. data cases, Fig. 6 presents the selection probabilities for each client, s_i , optimized by FedCote using Algorithm 2. Unlike the random selection strategy (orange line), where $s_i = p_i = \frac{1}{N}$ in the balanced case, FedCote (red line) optimizes selection probabilities by considering both transmission failure probabilities, $\{\epsilon_i\}$, and local label distributions. By comparing the red and blue lines (the latter derived from Table 1), it is evident that FedCote adjusts the selection probabilities for each clients in response to varying transmission failure probabilities, thereby balancing the effective appearance probabilities of each class's samples. Furthermore, when $\epsilon_i = 1$ (i.e., the client always fails to transmit), FedCote sets $s_i = 0$ to avoid ineffective selections. Through this adaptive optimization, FedCote determines optimal selection probabilities for each client under diverse transmission conditions, effectively mitigating the negative impacts of transmission failures, particularly in challenging non-i.i.d. environments.

5.2.2 Unbalanced dataset

Fig. 7 further validates the effectiveness of FedCote on unbalanced datasets in challenging non-i.i.d. scenarios. As described in Section 5.1.3, a higher imbalance ratio u indicates a greater degree of dataset imbalance, with $u = 0.5$ representing the balanced case. As shown in Fig. 7, under non-i.i.d. settings, the testing accuracy of FedAvg, Newt, and GS significantly deteriorates on both MNIST and CIFAR-10 datasets as the imbalance ratio increases. This performance

TABLE 4. Ratio of $C_{K_{\text{apx}}}^{N+K_{\text{apx}}-1}$ to C_K^{N+K-1} under $N=20$ and $K=10$.

K_{apx}	2	4	6	8
Ratio (%)	0.0010	0.0442	0.8842	11.0837

TABLE 5. Performance of FedCote-II under different values of K_{apx} on the non-i.i.d. MNIST dataset ($K = 10$).

K_{apx}	Balanced		Unbalanced ($u = 0.1$)	
	Training loss	Testing accuracy (%)	Training loss	Testing accuracy (%)
2	0.2801 \pm 0.0522	90.95 \pm 1.8116	0.3142 \pm 0.0529	90.36 \pm 1.7390
4	0.2505 \pm 0.0317	91.99 \pm 1.2231	0.2863 \pm 0.0310	91.23 \pm 1.0335
6	0.2597 \pm 0.0265	91.72 \pm 1.1521	0.2979 \pm 0.0304	90.79 \pm 0.9678
8	0.2590 \pm 0.0276	91.69 \pm 1.1420	0.2962 \pm 0.0374	90.92 \pm 1.2820
FedCote	0.2622 \pm 0.0300	91.49 \pm 1.1899	0.2937 \pm 0.0308	90.96 \pm 0.9918

TABLE 6. Performance of FedCote-II under different values of K_{apx} on the non-i.i.d. CIFAR-10 dataset ($K = 10$).

K_{apx}	Balanced		Unbalanced ($u = 0.1$)	
	Training loss	Testing accuracy (%)	Training loss	Testing accuracy (%)
2	0.6558 \pm 0.3032	73.59 \pm 6.9851	1.0402 \pm 0.3065	66.23 \pm 6.2707
4	0.5260 \pm 0.0883	75.42 \pm 1.2442	0.9343 \pm 0.1237	67.82 \pm 2.1680
6	0.4975 \pm 0.0625	76.45 \pm 1.4074	0.9523 \pm 0.0876	67.79 \pm 2.9569
8	0.5534 \pm 0.1024	75.53 \pm 3.0602	1.0025 \pm 0.2027	66.55 \pm 4.4711
FedCote	0.5574 \pm 0.1143	75.16 \pm 3.1586	1.0392 \pm 0.2338	65.61 \pm 4.6970

decline is attributed to their inability to compensate for the loss of samples from clients with high transmission failure probabilities. Consistent with the observations from balanced datasets discussed in Section 5.2.1, *Power-of-Choice* demonstrates slightly better performance due to its client selection strategy based on local training losses. This strategy partially mitigates the impact of varying transmission failure probabilities across clients. However, its performance remains inferior to that of the proposed *FedCote*, because it does not account for the interference of transmission failures on the effective appearance probabilities of each class’s samples during FL training. *TF-Aggregation* continues to perform poorly in unbalanced scenarios, due to the instability introduced by its global aggregation scheme, which impedes the convergence of the global model.

In contrast, the proposed *FedCote* demonstrates robust performance under imbalanced conditions. At extreme imbalance ratios ($u = 0.8$ and 0.9), *FedCote* achieves testing accuracy comparable to the ideal scheme on the MNIST dataset, with only a slight performance decline observed on CIFAR-10. This performance degradation on CIFAR-10 can be attributed to its more complex image samples and the complete loss of samples from clients with $\epsilon_i = 1$, which negatively impacts the generalization ability of trained model. Nevertheless, *FedCote* consistently outperforms other FL baselines across all imbalance ratios, owing to its ability to effectively optimize client selection probabilities, thereby mitigating the adverse effects of both data imbalance and transmission failures.

As a brief summary, the proposed *FedCote* can effectively identify optimal client selection probabilities across diverse data distribution scenarios. The experimental results underscore its robustness and adaptability, particularly in challenging non-i.i.d. environments, establishing *FedCote* as a superior client selection approach in FL compared to existing baselines.

5.3 Performance of FedCote-II

5.3.1 Optimal client selection probabilities under different K

Fig. 8 compares the optimal selection probabilities, $\{s_i\}$, obtained from (17) for different values of K . As observed, with increasing K , the value of s_i gradually converge to a stationary solution. Moreover, the gap between the optimal solutions of s_i under K and $K + 1$ diminishes as K grows. These findings align with the theoretical results presented in Proposition 5.

5.3.2 Performance under different K_{apx}

According to the discussion in Section 4.3, the number of distinct combinations of \mathcal{K}_r^z , namely C_K^{N+K-1} , used for calculating the effective appearance probability β_i in (15), increases with K , leading to a higher computational burden. This, in turn, increases the complexity of solving the client selection optimization problem in (17). Following the experimental settings in Section 5.2, we use a partial participation setting with $K = 10$ for *FedCote*. If we replace K with a smaller value K_{apx} , the number of distinct combinations of \mathcal{K}_r^z becomes $C_{K_{\text{apx}}}^{N+K_{\text{apx}}-1}$. Table 4 compares the ratio of $C_{K_{\text{apx}}}^{N+K_{\text{apx}}-1}$ to C_K^{N+K-1} under different values of K_{apx} . As shown in Table 4, the computational cost decreases exponentially as K_{apx} is reduced.

Tables 5 and 6 further compare the performance of *FedCote-II* under different values of K_{apx} with *FedCote* on non-i.i.d. MNIST and CIFAR-10 datasets. As observed, when K_{apx} is small (e.g., $K_{\text{apx}} = 2$), the variance in *FedCote-II* performance is slightly higher. This is because, as shown in Fig. 8, the optimal solutions for s_i under $K_{\text{apx}} = 2$ still exhibit a noticeable gap from the optimal solution for $K = 10$. Nevertheless, *FedCote-II* demonstrates robust performance across different values of K_{apx} , achieving comparable training loss and testing accuracy to *FedCote* on both datasets.




Fig. 9. Convergence of various FL schemes on balanced datasets with $K = 20$.

TABLE 7. Testing accuracy (%) of various FL schemes on balanced datasets with $K = 20$.

FL scheme	MNIST		CIFAR-10	
	i.i.d.	Non-i.i.d.	i.i.d.	Non-i.i.d.
FedAvg	96.09 \pm 0.0853	85.62 \pm 4.7702	84.60 \pm 0.2699	69.21 \pm 4.4520
Power-of-Choice, Newt, GS	95.65 \pm 0.0815	84.81 \pm 1.5205	84.19 \pm 0.4888	70.25 \pm 3.1595
TF-Aggregation	93.19 \pm 0.3096	89.40 \pm 1.5152	10.00 \pm 0.00	10.00 \pm 0.00
FedCote (Ours)	96.23 \pm 0.1163	91.80 \pm 1.4494	84.66 \pm 0.4325	78.53 \pm 1.0137
Ideal	96.27 \pm 0.0723	92.02 \pm 1.1980	86.13 \pm 0.3015	78.26 \pm 2.4080

These results not only validate the effectiveness of the client selection optimization problem in (17), but also confirm the feasibility of reducing computational complexity by replacing K with K_{apx} .

5.3.3 Performance under $K = 20$

In this section, the number of selected clients per iteration, K , is increased from 10 to 20. For *Power-of-Choice*, *Newt*, and *GS*, client selection without replacement results in all $N = 20$ clients participating in training, aggregating the global model using (20). This differs slightly from the settings of *FedAvg* described in Section 5.1.4, where clients are selected with replacement, and the global model is aggregated using (5). For *FedCote-II*, we set $K_{\text{apx}} = 10$ and employ the optimal selection probabilities s_i obtained from (17) with $K = 10$ (depicted in Figs. 6 and 7).

Based on the above settings, Fig. 9 illustrates the convergence trends of various FL schemes on the MNIST and CIFAR-10 datasets. Additionally, Table 7 compares the testing accuracy of the global models across different FL schemes after completing training. From Fig. 9 and Table 7, it is evident that *FedCote-II* consistently achieves faster convergence and higher testing accuracy compared to other benchmarks, for both i.i.d. and non-i.i.d. data cases.

Furthermore, based on Tables 2, 3, and 7, by comparing the testing accuracy of *FedCote* under $K = 10$ with that of *FedCote-II* under $K = 20$, we observe that increasing K accelerates FL convergence and enhances testing accuracy, particularly for non-i.i.d. data cases. Notably, on the more complex CIFAR-10 dataset, *FedCote-II* achieves a testing accuracy of 78.35% with $K = 20$, compared to 75.16% with $K = 10$, demonstrating the benefits of larger K . This observation is consistent with the theoretical analysis in Corollary 2.

6 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have investigated FL in wireless edge networks, particularly focusing on the joint impacts of unreliable network conditions and data heterogeneity. Through a novel theoretical analysis, we have demonstrated that in non-i.i.d. scenarios with label distribution skew, transmission failures distort the effective label distributions of local samples, deviating from the global dataset's actual label distribution, which negatively affects FL performance (Theorem 1 and Observation 1). To address this issue, we have proposed *FedCote*, a client selection approach that mitigates this divergence without relying on wireless resource scheduling. Experimental results have shown that *FedCote* significantly improves robustness against transmission failures, particularly in non-i.i.d. data settings. However, the computational complexity of solving the client selection optimization problem increases with the number of selected clients. To address this, we have introduced *FedCote-II*, which reduces computational overhead while maintaining satisfactory learning performance.

Future directions include extending the client selection approach to handle feature shifts and exploring its application in semi-supervised and unsupervised learning contexts.

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Meuser, L. Lovén, M. Bhuyan, S. G. Patil, S. Dustdar, A. Aral, S. Bayhan, C. Becker, E. de Lara, A. Y. Ding *et al.*, “Revisiting Edge AI: Opportunities and challenges,” *IEEE Internet Computing*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 49–59, 2024.
- [2] S. Tuli, G. Casale, and N. R. Jennings, “SplitPlace: AI augmented splitting and placement of large-scale neural networks in mobile edge environments,” *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, vol. 22, no. 9, pp. 5539–5554, 2022.
- [3] Y. Zuo, J. Guo, B. Sheng, C. Dai, F. Xiao, and S. Jin, “Fluid antenna for mobile edge computing,” *IEEE Communications Letters*, 2024.
- [4] K. Cui, Q. Yang, L. Shen, Y. Zheng, F. Xiao, and J. Han, “Towards ISAC-empowered mmwave radars by capturing modulated vibrations,” *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, 2024.
- [5] H. Zhou, G. Yang, Y. Huang, H. Dai, and Y. Xiang, “Privacy-preserving and verifiable federated learning framework for edge computing,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 18, pp. 565–580, 2022.
- [6] L. Shen, Q. Yang, K. Cui, Y. Zheng, X.-Y. Wei, J. Liu, and J. Han, “FedConv: A learning-on-model paradigm for heterogeneous federated clients,” in *International Conference on Mobile Systems, Applications and Services (MobiSys)*, 2024, pp. 398–411.
- [7] H. Zhou, G. Yang, H. Dai, and G. Liu, “PFLF: Privacy-preserving federated learning framework for edge computing,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 17, pp. 1905–1918, 2022.
- [8] Y. Wang, Q. Shi, and T.-H. Chang, “Why batch normalization damage federated learning on non-iid data?” *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, pp. 1–15, 2023.
- [9] S. Wang, Y. Xu, Z. Wang, T.-H. Chang, T. Q. Quek, and D. Sun, “Beyond ADMM: A unified client-variance-reduced adaptive federated learning framework,” in *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, vol. 37, no. 8, 2023, pp. 10 175–10 183.
- [10] P. Li, H. Zhang, Y. Wu, L. Qian, R. Yu, D. Niyato, and X. Shen, “Filling the missing: Exploring generative AI for enhanced federated learning over heterogeneous mobile edge devices,” *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, 2024.
- [11] M. Chen, Y. Zhao, B. He, Z. Han, J. Huang, B. Wu, and J. Yao, “Learning with noisy labels over imbalanced subpopulations,” *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2024.
- [12] S. Wang and T.-H. Chang, “Federated matrix factorization: Algorithm design and application to data clustering,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 70, pp. 1625–1640, 2022.
- [13] T. Li, A. K. Sahu, M. Zaheer, M. Sanjabi, A. Talwalkar, and V. Smith, “Federated optimization in heterogeneous networks,” in *Machine Learning and Systems (MLSys)*, vol. 2, 2020, pp. 429–450.
- [14] S. P. Karimireddy, S. Kale, M. Mohri, S. Reddi, S. Stich, and A. T. Suresh, “SCAFFOLD: Stochastic controlled averaging for federated learning,” in *ICML*, 2020, pp. 5132–5143.
- [15] Z. Li, Y. Sun, J. Shao, Y. Mao, J. H. Wang, and J. Zhang, “Feature matching data synthesis for non-iid federated learning,” *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, 2024.
- [16] Y. Xu, Y. Liao, L. Wang, H. Xu, Z. Jiang, and W. Zhang, “Overcoming noisy labels and non-iid data in edge federated learning,” *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, 2024.
- [17] Y. J. Cho, J. Wang, and G. Joshi, “Towards understanding biased client selection in federated learning,” in *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS)*, 2022, pp. 10 351–10 375.
- [18] L. Fu, H. Zhang, G. Gao, M. Zhang, and X. Liu, “Client selection in federated learning: Principles, challenges, and opportunities,” *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 10, no. 24, pp. 21 811–21 819, 2023.
- [19] S. Wang, Y. Xu, Y. Yuan, and T. Q. Quek, “Toward fast personalized semi-supervised federated learning in edge networks: Algorithm design and theoretical guarantee,” *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 1170–1183, 2024.
- [20] P. Zheng, Y. Zhu, Y. Hu, Z. Zhang, and A. Schmeink, “Federated learning in heterogeneous networks with unreliable communication,” *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 3823–3838, 2023.
- [21] M. Ye, X. Fang, and *et al.*, “Heterogeneous federated learning: State-of-the-art and research challenges,” *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 56, no. 3, pp. 1–44, 2023.
- [22] J. Zhao, X. Chang, Y. Feng, C. H. Liu, and N. Liu, “Participant selection for federated learning with heterogeneous data in intelligent transport system,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 1106–1115, 2022.
- [23] J. Ma, X. Sun, W. Xia, X. Wang, X. Chen, and H. Zhu, “Client selection based on label quantity information for federated learning,” in *IEEE Annual International Symposium on Personal, Indoor and Mobile Radio Communications (PIMRC)*, 2021, pp. 1–6.
- [24] M. Tang, X. Ning, Y. Wang, J. Sun, Y. Wang, H. Li, and Y. Chen, “FedCor: Correlation-based active client selection strategy for heterogeneous federated learning,” in *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2022, pp. 10 102–10 111.
- [25] Y. Xu, E. G. Larsson, E. A. Jorswieck, X. Li, S. Jin, and T.-H. Chang, “Distributed signal processing for extremely large-scale antenna array systems: State-of-the-art and future directions,” *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, 2025.
- [26] Y.-F. Liu, T.-H. Chang, M. Hong, Z. Wu, A. M.-C. So, E. A. Jorswieck, and W. Yu, “A survey of recent advances in optimization methods for wireless communications,” *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 2024.
- [27] Z. Qiao, Y. Shen, X. Yu, J. Zhang, S. Song, and K. B. Letaief, “Content-aware client selection for federated learning in wireless networks,” in *IEEE International Mediterranean Conference on Communications and Networking (MeditCom)*, 2022, pp. 49–54.
- [28] B. Luo, W. Xiao, S. Wang, J. Huang, and L. Tassiulas, “Adaptive heterogeneous client sampling for federated learning over wireless networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, 2024.
- [29] B. Wu, F. Fang, X. Wang, D. Cai, S. Fu, and Z. Ding, “Client selection and cost-efficient joint optimization for noma-enabled hierarchical federated learning,” *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, 2024.
- [30] M. Salehi and E. Hossain, “Federated learning in unreliable and resource-constrained cellular wireless networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 69, no. 8, pp. 5136–5151, 2021.
- [31] Y. Wang, Y. Xu, Q. Shi, and T.-H. Chang, “Robust federated learning in wireless channels with transmission outage and quantization errors,” in *IEEE International Workshop on Signal Processing Advances in Wireless Communications (SPAWC)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 586–590.
- [32] M. Chen, Z. Yang, W. Saad, C. Yin, H. V. Poor, and S. Cui, “A joint learning and communications framework for federated learning over wireless networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 269–283, 2021.
- [33] Y. Wang, Y. Xu, Q. Shi, and T.-H. Chang, “Quantized federated learning under transmission delay and outage constraints,” *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 323–341, 2022.
- [34] M. H. Mahmoud, A. Albaseer, M. Abdallah, and N. Al-Dhahir, “Federated learning resource optimization and client selection for total energy minimization under outage, latency, and bandwidth constraints with partial or no CSI,” *IEEE Open Journal of the Communications Society*, vol. 4, pp. 936–953, 2023.
- [35] Z. Chen, W. Yi, Y. Liu, and A. Nallanathan, “Robust federated learning for unreliable and resource-limited wireless networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, 2024.
- [36] B. McMahan, E. Moore, D. Ramage, S. Hampson, and B. A. y Arcas, “Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data,” in *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2017, pp. 1273–1282.

- [37] X. Li, K. Huang, W. Yang, S. Wang, and Z. Zhang, "On the convergence of FedAvg on non-iid data," in *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2020, pp. 1–26.
- [38] K.-Y. Wang, A. M.-C. So, T.-H. Chang, W.-K. Ma, and C.-Y. Chi, "Outage constrained robust transmit optimization for multiuser MISO downlinks: Tractable approximations by conic optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 62, no. 21, pp. 5690–5705, 2014.
- [39] Y. Xu, C. Shen, T.-H. Chang, S.-C. Lin, Y. Zhao, and G. Zhu, "Transmission energy minimization for heterogeneous low-latency NOMA downlink," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 1054–1069, 2020.
- [40] J. Yang, X. Ge, J. Thompson, and H. Gharavi, "Power-consumption outage in beyond fifth generation mobile communication systems," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 897–910, 2020.
- [41] Y. Xi, A. Burr, J. Wei, and D. Grace, "A general upper bound to evaluate packet error rate over quasi-static fading channels," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 1373–1377, 2011.
- [42] J. Park, Y. Sung, D. Kim, and H. V. Poor, "Outage probability and outage-based robust beamforming for MIMO interference channels with imperfect channel state information," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 11, no. 10, pp. 3561–3573, 2012.
- [43] Y. LeCun, L. Bottou, Y. Bengio, and P. Haffner, "Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 86, no. 11, pp. 2278–2324, 1998.
- [44] X. Lian, C. Zhang, H. Zhang, C.-J. Hsieh, W. Zhang, and J. Liu, "Can decentralized algorithms outperform centralized algorithms? a case study for decentralized parallel stochastic gradient descent," in *NeurIPS*, 2017, pp. 5336–5346.
- [45] R. Das, A. Acharya, A. Hashemi, S. Sanghavi, I. S. Dhillon, and U. Topcu, "Faster non-convex federated learning via global and local momentum," in *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*. PMLR, 2022, pp. 496–506.
- [46] X. Wang, W. Chen, J. Xia, Z. Wen, R. Zhu, and T. Schreck, "HetVis: A visual analysis approach for identifying data heterogeneity in horizontal federated learning," *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 310–319, 2023.
- [47] X. Li, M. JIANG, X. Zhang, M. Kamp, and Q. Dou, "FedBN: Federated learning on non-iid features via local batch normalization," in *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2021.
- [48] J. Wang, Q. Liu, H. Liang, G. Joshi, and H. V. Poor, "Tackling the objective inconsistency problem in heterogeneous federated optimization," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 7611–7623, 2020.
- [49] K. Hsieh, A. Phanishayee, O. Mutlu, and P. Gibbons, "The non-iid data quagmire of decentralized machine learning," in *ICML*, 2020, pp. 4387–4398.
- [50] A. Krizhevsky, "Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images," 2009.
- [51] G. Baker, "Discrete math," 2013. [Online]. Available: <https://www.cs.sfu.ca/~ggbaker/zju/math/perm-comb-more.html>
- [52] S. P. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press, 2004.

APPENDIX A

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1

Based on (7), the discrepancy between local and global gradients is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla F_i(\mathbf{w}) - \nabla F(\mathbf{w})\|^2 &= \left\| \nabla F_i(\mathbf{w}) - \sum_{c=1}^C \alpha_{i,c} \nabla F_{g,c} + \sum_{c=1}^C \alpha_{i,c} \nabla F_{g,c} - \nabla F(\mathbf{w}) \right\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 2 \left\| \sum_{c=1}^C \alpha_{i,c} (\nabla F_{i,c}(\mathbf{w}) - \nabla F_{g,c}(\mathbf{w})) \right\|^2 + 2 \left\| \sum_{c=1}^C (\alpha_{i,c} - \alpha_{g,c}) \nabla F_{g,c}(\mathbf{w}) \right\|^2 \\
&= 2 \left\| \sum_{c=1}^C \alpha_{i,c} (\nabla F_{i,c}(\mathbf{w}) - \nabla F_{g,c}(\mathbf{w})) \right\|^2 + 2 \left\| \sum_{c=1}^C \frac{(\alpha_{i,c} - \alpha_{g,c})}{\sqrt{\alpha_{g,c}}} \sqrt{\alpha_{g,c}} \nabla F_{g,c}(\mathbf{w}) \right\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 2 \sum_{c=1}^C \alpha_{i,c} \|\nabla F_{i,c}(\mathbf{w}) - \nabla F_{g,c}(\mathbf{w})\|^2 + 2 \sum_{c=1}^C \frac{(\alpha_{i,c} - \alpha_{g,c})^2}{\alpha_{g,c}} \sum_{c=1}^C \alpha_{g,c} \|\nabla F_{g,c}(\mathbf{w})\|^2, \quad (23)
\end{aligned}$$

where inequality (a) follows from the relation $\|x_1 + x_2\|^2 \leq 2\|x_1\|^2 + 2\|x_2\|^2$, and inequality (b) is due to Jensen's Inequality and the Cauchy-Schwarz Inequality. \blacksquare

APPENDIX B

PROOF OF LEMMA 1

Based on the selection scheme described in Section 2.1, at each iteration, K clients are selected independently and with replacement according to the selection probabilities $\{s_i\}_{i=1}^N$, where $\sum_{i=1}^N s_i = 1$. This results in N^K possible permutations of the selection set \mathcal{K}_r , denoted by \mathcal{K}_r^g for $g \in [N^K]$, with the appearance probability of each permutation given by

$$\Pr(\mathcal{K}_r = \mathcal{K}_r^g) = \prod_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r^g} s_i. \quad (24)$$

Since transmission failures occur independently across clients, we have

$$\Pr\left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbf{1}_i^r \neq 0\right) = 1 - \prod_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \epsilon_i. \quad (25)$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{K}_r, \mathbf{1}_i^r} \left[\frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbf{1}_i^r \mathbf{w}_i^{r,E}}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbf{1}_i^r} \middle| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbf{1}_i^r \neq 0 \right] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{K}_r} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{1}_i^r} \left[\frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbf{1}_i^r \mathbf{w}_i^{r,E}}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbf{1}_i^r} \middle| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbf{1}_i^r \neq 0 \right] \right] \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{K}_r} \left[\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{S}_r \cup \bar{\mathcal{S}}_r = \mathcal{K}_r, \\ |\mathcal{S}_r| = k, |\bar{\mathcal{S}}_r| = K-k}} \Pr\left(\mathbf{1}_{i_1}^r = 1 \forall i_1 \in \mathcal{S}_r, \mathbf{1}_{i_2}^r = 0 \forall i_2 \in \bar{\mathcal{S}}_r \middle| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbf{1}_i^r \neq 0\right) \cdot \frac{\sum_{i_1 \in \mathcal{S}_r} \mathbf{w}_i^{r,E}}{k} \right] \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{=} \sum_{g=1}^{N^K} \left(\prod_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r^g} s_i \right) \cdot \left(\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{S}_r^g \cup \bar{\mathcal{S}}_r^g = \mathcal{K}_r^g, \\ |\mathcal{S}_r^g| = k, |\bar{\mathcal{S}}_r^g| = K-k}} \frac{\prod_{i_1 \in \mathcal{S}_r^g} (1 - \epsilon_{i_1}) \prod_{i_2 \in \bar{\mathcal{S}}_r^g} \epsilon_{i_2}}{1 - \prod_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r^g} \epsilon_i} \cdot \frac{\sum_{i_1 \in \mathcal{S}_r^g} \mathbf{w}_i^{r,E}}{k} \right) \\
&\triangleq \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i \mathbf{w}_i^{r,E}, \quad (26)
\end{aligned}$$

where in equality (a), \mathcal{S}_r represents the subset of clients in \mathcal{K}_r with successful transmission of local models to the server, and $\bar{\mathcal{S}}_r$ denotes the clients with transmission failure due to failures. In equality (b), $\prod_{i_1 \in \mathcal{S}_r^g} (1 - \epsilon_{i_1}) \prod_{i_2 \in \bar{\mathcal{S}}_r^g} \epsilon_{i_2}$ is the probability that clients in \mathcal{S}_r^g have successful transmissions, while those in $\bar{\mathcal{S}}_r^g$ experience transmission failures. Using the derivations in (26), we obtain (11) for some non-negative $\bar{\beta}_i, i \in [N]$. \blacksquare

APPENDIX C

PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Our analysis considers only the "successful" communication rounds, where the server correctly receives updated local models from at least one client in \mathcal{K}_r . Accordingly, all derivations are based on the condition that $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbf{1}_i^r \neq 0, \forall r \in [R]$. For simplicity, in the subsequent proof, we denote the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}[\cdot | \sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbf{1}_i^r \neq 0]$ as $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$.

C.1 Proof of convergence rate

With Assumption 4, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_r)] \leq \mathbb{E}[F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})] + \mathbb{E}[\langle \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}), \bar{\mathbf{w}}_r - \bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1} \rangle] + \frac{L}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{\mathbf{w}}_r - \bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}\|^2]. \quad (27)$$

We need the following three key lemmas which are proved in subsequent subsections.

Lemma 2 Under Assumptions 1, 2 and 4, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} [\langle \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}), \bar{\mathbf{w}}_r - \bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1} \rangle] \\ & \leq -\frac{\gamma E}{2} \|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})\|^2 + \gamma L^2 \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i \sum_{t=2}^E \|\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}\|^2 + 2\gamma E \left(\chi_{\bar{\beta}}^2 \sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \alpha_{i,c} V_{i,c}^2 + \chi_{\bar{\alpha}}^2 \|\alpha_g\|^2 G^2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where $\chi_{\bar{\beta}}^2$ and $\chi_{\bar{\alpha}}^2$ are chi-square divergences defined in (12).

Lemma 3 With (2) and (5), the difference between the global models of two consecutive iterations is given by

$$\bar{\mathbf{w}}_r - \bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1} = -\gamma \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbf{1}_i^r \sum_{t=1}^E \nabla F_i(\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1})}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbf{1}_i^r}, \quad (29)$$

which results in

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} [\|\bar{\mathbf{w}}_r - \bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}\|^2] \\ & \leq 4\gamma^2 E^2 \|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})\|^2 + 2\gamma^2 E L^2 \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i \sum_{t=2}^E \|\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}\|^2 + 8\gamma^2 E^2 \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i \sum_{c=1}^C (\alpha_{i,c} V_{i,c}^2 + \chi_{\alpha_i}^2 \|\alpha_g\|^2 G^2). \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Lemma 4 The difference between the local model at each round r and the global model from the previous round is bounded by

$$\sum_{t=2}^E \|\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}\|^2 \leq \frac{\gamma^2 E^3}{1 - \frac{3}{2}\gamma^2 E^2 L^2} \|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})\|^2 + \frac{2\gamma^2 E^3}{1 - \frac{3}{2}\gamma^2 E^2 L^2} \sum_{c=1}^C (\alpha_{i,c} V_{i,c}^2 + \chi_{\alpha_i}^2 \|\alpha_g\|^2 G^2). \quad (31)$$

By substituting (28) into the second term on the RHS of (27), (30) into the third term, along with the result from (31), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_r)] & \leq \mathbb{E}[F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})] - \left(\frac{\gamma E}{2} - 2\gamma^2 E^2 L - \frac{\gamma^3 E^3 L^2 + \gamma^4 E^4 L^3}{1 - \frac{3}{2}\gamma^2 E^2 L^2} \right) \|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})\|^2 \\ & \quad + \left(4\gamma^2 E^2 L + \frac{2\gamma^3 E^3 L^2 + 2\gamma^4 E^4 L^3}{1 - \frac{3}{2}\gamma^2 E^2 L^2} \right) \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i \sum_{c=1}^C (\alpha_{i,c} V_{i,c}^2 + \chi_{\alpha_i}^2 \|\alpha_g\|^2 G^2) \\ & \quad + 2\gamma E \left(\chi_{\bar{\beta}}^2 \sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \alpha_{i,c} V_{i,c}^2 + \chi_{\bar{\alpha}}^2 \|\alpha_g\|^2 G^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Next, summing the above items from $r = 1$ to R and dividing both sides by the product of the learning rate and the total number of local gradient descent steps, $\gamma T (= \gamma R E)$, yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \underbrace{\left(\frac{1}{2} - 2\gamma E L - \frac{\gamma^2 E^2 L^2 + \gamma^3 E^3 L^3}{1 - \frac{3}{2}\gamma^2 E^2 L^2} \right)}_{\triangleq (33a)} \frac{\sum_{r=1}^R \mathbb{E} [\|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})\|^2]}{R} \\ & \leq \underbrace{\frac{1}{\gamma T}}_{\triangleq (33b)} (\mathbb{E}[F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_0)] - \mathbb{E}[F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_R)]) + \underbrace{\left(4\gamma E L + \frac{2\gamma^2 E^2 L^2 + 2\gamma^3 E^3 L^3}{1 - \frac{3}{2}\gamma^2 E^2 L^2} \right)}_{\triangleq (33c)} \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i \sum_{c=1}^C (\alpha_{i,c} V_{i,c}^2 + \chi_{\alpha_i}^2 \|\alpha_g\|^2 G^2) \\ & \quad + 2\chi_{\bar{\beta}}^2 \sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \alpha_{i,c} V_{i,c}^2 + 2\chi_{\bar{\alpha}}^2 \|\alpha_g\|^2 G^2. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Let the learning rate $\gamma = K^{\frac{1}{2}}/(6LT^{\frac{1}{2}})$ and the number of local updating steps $E \leq T^{\frac{1}{4}}/K^{\frac{3}{4}}$, where $T \geq \max\{K^3, 1/K\}$ to ensure $E \geq 1$. Consequently, we have (33b) = $6L(TK)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Since $\gamma E L \leq (TK)^{-\frac{1}{4}}/6$, we have (33c) $\leq \frac{2}{3}(TK)^{-\frac{1}{4}}$ and

$$(33d) \leq \frac{\frac{1}{18}(TK)^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{1}{108}(TK)^{-\frac{3}{4}}}{1 - \frac{1}{24}(TK)^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{\frac{1}{18}(TK)^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{1}{108}(TK)^{-\frac{3}{4}}}{1 - \frac{1}{24}} = \frac{4}{69(TK)^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \frac{2}{207(TK)^{\frac{3}{4}}}, \quad (34)$$

where inequality (a) is due to $T \geq 1/K$. Then,

$$(33a) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{(33c)}{2} - \frac{(33d)}{2} \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{2}{3(TK)^{\frac{1}{4}}} - \frac{4}{69(TK)^{\frac{1}{2}}} - \frac{2}{207(TK)^{\frac{3}{4}}} \right) \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{2}{3} - \frac{4}{69} - \frac{2}{207} \right) = \frac{55}{414}. \quad (35)$$

Finally, by substituting above coefficients and $\mathbb{E}[F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_R)] \geq \underline{F}$ from Assumption 3 into (33), Theorem 1 is proved. \blacksquare

C.2 Proof of Lemma 2

Based on (29), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} [\langle \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}), \bar{\mathbf{w}}_r - \bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1} \rangle] \\ & = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}), -\gamma \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbf{1}_i^r \sum_{t=1}^E \nabla F_i(\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1})}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbf{1}_i^r} \right\rangle \right] \\ & \stackrel{(a)}{=} -\gamma \sum_{t=1}^E \left\langle \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}), \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i \nabla F_i(\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1}) \right\rangle \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\stackrel{(b)}{=} -\frac{\gamma}{2} \sum_{t=1}^E \|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})\|^2 - \frac{\gamma}{2} \sum_{t=1}^E \left\| \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i \nabla F_i(\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1}) \right\|^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2} \sum_{t=1}^E \left\| \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}) - \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i \nabla F_i(\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1}) \right\|^2 \\
&\leq -\frac{\gamma E}{2} \|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})\|^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2} \sum_{t=1}^E \left\| \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}) - \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i \nabla F_i(\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1}) \right\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} -\frac{\gamma E}{2} \|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})\|^2 + \underbrace{\gamma E \left\| \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}) - \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i \nabla F_i(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}) \right\|^2}_{\triangleq (36d)} + \underbrace{\gamma \sum_{t=1}^E \left\| \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i (\nabla F_i(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}) - \nabla F_i(\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1})) \right\|^2}_{\triangleq (36e)}, \quad (36)
\end{aligned}$$

where equality (a) is obtained using Lemma 1, equality (b) follows from the identity $\langle \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \rangle = \frac{1}{2}(\|\mathbf{x}_1\|^2 + \|\mathbf{x}_2\|^2 - \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|^2)$, and inequality (c) arises from the property $\|\mathbf{x}_1 + \mathbf{x}_2\|^2 \leq 2\|\mathbf{x}_1\|^2 + 2\|\mathbf{x}_2\|^2$.

In (36), the term (36d) can be further bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}
(36d) &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \left\| \sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{i=1}^N (p_i \alpha_{i,c} - \bar{\beta}_i \alpha_{i,c}) \nabla F_{i,c}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}) \right\|^2 \\
&= \left\| \sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{i=1}^N (p_i \alpha_{i,c} - \bar{\beta}_i \alpha_{i,c}) \nabla F_{i,c}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}) - \sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{i=1}^N (p_i \alpha_{i,c} - \bar{\beta}_i \alpha_{i,c}) \nabla F_c(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{i=1}^N (p_i \alpha_{i,c} - \bar{\beta}_i \alpha_{i,c}) \nabla F_c(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}) \right\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 2 \left\| \sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{i=1}^N (p_i \alpha_{i,c} - \bar{\beta}_i \alpha_{i,c}) (\nabla F_{i,c}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}) - \nabla F_c(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})) \right\|^2 + 2 \left\| \sum_{c=1}^C (\alpha_{g,c} - \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i \alpha_{i,c}) \nabla F_c(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}) \right\|^2 \\
&= 2 \left\| \sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{p_i \alpha_{i,c} - \bar{\beta}_i \alpha_{i,c}}{\sqrt{p_i \alpha_{i,c}}} \sqrt{p_i \alpha_{i,c}} (\nabla F_{i,c}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}) - \nabla F_c(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})) \right\|^2 \\
&\quad + 2 \left\| \sum_{c=1}^C \frac{\alpha_{g,c} - \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i \alpha_{i,c}}{\sqrt{\alpha_{g,c}}} \sqrt{\alpha_{g,c}} \nabla F_c(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}) \right\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} 2 \underbrace{\sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(p_i \alpha_{i,c} - \bar{\beta}_i \alpha_{i,c})^2}{p_i \alpha_{i,c}}}_{\triangleq (37e)} \sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \alpha_{i,c} \|\nabla F_{i,c}(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}) - \nabla F_c(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})\|^2 \\
&\quad + 2 \sum_{c=1}^C \frac{(\alpha_{g,c} - \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i \alpha_{i,c})^2}{\alpha_{g,c}} \sum_{c=1}^C \alpha_{g,c} \|\nabla F_c(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(d)}{\leq} 2\chi_{\bar{\beta}}^2 \sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \alpha_{i,c} V_{i,c}^2 + 2\chi_{\bar{\alpha}}^2 \alpha_g G^2, \quad (37)
\end{aligned}$$

where equality (a) follows from (7a), inequality (b) is a consequence of the global label distribution $\alpha_{g,c} = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \alpha_{i,c}$ and the relation $\|\mathbf{x}_1 + \mathbf{x}_2\|^2 \leq 2\|\mathbf{x}_1\|^2 + 2\|\mathbf{x}_2\|^2$, and equality (c) is established using the Cauchy-Schwarz Inequality. In equality (c), the term (37e) is bounded by

$$(37e) = \sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(p_i - \bar{\beta}_i)^2 \alpha_{i,c}}{p_i} = \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(p_i - \bar{\beta}_i)^2}{p_i}}_{\triangleq \chi_{\bar{\beta}}^2} \underbrace{\sum_{c=1}^C \alpha_{i,c}}_{=1} = \chi_{\bar{\beta}}^2. \quad (38)$$

Combining this with Assumptions 1 and 2, along with the definition of the chi-square divergence $\chi_{\bar{\alpha}}^2$ in (12), leads to inequality (d) in (37).

Meanwhile, the term (36e) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
(36e) &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i \sum_{t=1}^E \|\nabla F_i(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}) - \nabla F_i(\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1})\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} L^2 \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i \sum_{t=1}^E \|\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{=} L^2 \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i \sum_{t=2}^E \|\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}\|^2, \quad (39)
\end{aligned}$$

where inequality (a) is derived from Jensen's Inequality, inequality (b) is due to Assumption 4, and equality (c) follows from (2a).

Finally, by substituting (37) and (39) into (36), we can directly obtain Lemma 2. \blacksquare

C.3 Proof of Lemma 3

According to (29), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [\|\bar{\mathbf{w}}_r - \bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}\|^2] &= \gamma^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbf{1}_i^r \sum_{t=1}^E \nabla F_i(\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1})}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbf{1}_i^r} \right\|^2 \right] \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 2\gamma^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\underbrace{\left\| \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbf{1}_i^r \sum_{t=1}^E (\nabla F_i(\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1}) - \nabla F_i(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}))}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbf{1}_i^r} \right\|^2}_{\triangleq (40b)} + 2\gamma^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\underbrace{\left\| \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbf{1}_i^r \sum_{t=1}^E \nabla F_i(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbf{1}_i^r} \right\|^2}_{\triangleq (40c)} \right], \quad (40)
\end{aligned}$$

where inequality (a) is derived from the relation $\|x_1 + x_2\|^2 \leq 2\|x_1\|^2 + 2\|x_2\|^2$.

The term (40b) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
(40b) &\leq E \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbb{1}_i^r \sum_{t=1}^E \|\nabla F_i(\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1}) - \nabla F_i(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})\|^2}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbb{1}_i^r} \right] \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} E \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i \sum_{t=1}^E \|\nabla F_i(\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1}) - \nabla F_i(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} EL^2 \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i \sum_{t=2}^E \|\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}\|^2, \tag{41}
\end{aligned}$$

where equality (a) follows from Lemma 1, and inequality (b) is based on Assumption 4 and (2a). Meanwhile, term (40c) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
(40c) &= E^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbb{1}_i^r \nabla F_i(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbb{1}_i^r} \right\|^2 \right] \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 2E^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbb{1}_i^r (\nabla F_i(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}) - \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}))}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbb{1}_i^r} \right\|^2 \right] + 2E^2 \mathbb{E} [\|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})\|^2] \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 2E^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbb{1}_i^r \|\nabla F_i(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}) - \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})\|^2}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r} \mathbb{1}_i^r} \right] + 2E^2 \mathbb{E} [\|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})\|^2] \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{=} 2E^2 \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i \|\nabla F_i(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}) - \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})\|^2 + 2E^2 \mathbb{E} [\|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})\|^2] \\
&\stackrel{(d)}{\leq} 4E^2 \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\beta}_i \sum_{c=1}^C (\alpha_{i,c} V_{i,c}^2 + \chi_{\alpha_i}^2 \alpha_g G^2) + 2E^2 \mathbb{E} [\|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})\|^2], \tag{42}
\end{aligned}$$

where inequality (a) also relies on the relation $\|x_1 + x_2\|^2 \leq 2\|x_1\|^2 + 2\|x_2\|^2$, inequality (b) is a consequence of Jensen's Inequality, equality (c) is derived from Lemma 1, and inequality (d) follows from (10).

Finally, by substituting (41) and (42) into (40), we obtain Lemma 3. ■

C.4 Proof of Lemma 4

Based on (2), the local model for each client at the r -th iteration is updated by

$$\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1} = \bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1} - \gamma \sum_{e=1}^{t-1} \nabla F_i(\mathbf{w}_i^{r,e-1}). \tag{43}$$

Consequently, the difference between the local and global models is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{t=2}^E \|\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}\|^2 = \sum_{t=2}^E \left\| \gamma \sum_{e=1}^{t-1} \nabla F_i(\mathbf{w}_i^{r,e-1}) \right\|^2 \\
&\leq \gamma^2 \sum_{t=2}^E (t-1) \sum_{e=1}^{t-1} \|\nabla F_i(\mathbf{w}_i^{r,e-1})\|^2 \\
&\leq 3\gamma^2 \sum_{t=2}^E (t-1) \sum_{e=1}^{t-1} \left(\|\nabla F_i(\mathbf{w}_i^{r,e-1}) - \nabla F_i(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})\|^2 + \|\nabla F_i(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}) - \nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})\|^2 + \|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})\|^2 \right) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 3\gamma^2 L^2 \sum_{t=2}^E (t-1) \sum_{e=1}^{t-1} \|\mathbf{w}_i^{r,e-1} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}\|^2 + 6\gamma^2 \sum_{t=2}^E (t-1) \sum_{e=1}^{t-1} \sum_{c=1}^C (\alpha_{i,c} V_{i,c}^2 + \chi_{\alpha_i}^2 \alpha_g G^2) \\
&\quad + 3\gamma^2 \sum_{t=2}^E (t-1) \sum_{e=1}^{t-1} \|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})\|^2 \\
&= 3\gamma^2 L^2 \underbrace{\sum_{t=2}^E (t-1) \sum_{e=1}^{t-1} \|\mathbf{w}_i^{r,e-1} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}\|^2}_{\triangleq (44b)} + 6\gamma^2 \underbrace{\sum_{t=2}^E (t-1)^2 \sum_{c=1}^C (\alpha_{i,c} V_{i,c}^2 + \chi_{\alpha_i}^2 \alpha_g G^2)}_{\triangleq (44c)} \\
&\quad + 3\gamma^2 \underbrace{\sum_{t=2}^E (t-1)^2 \|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})\|^2}_{\triangleq (44c)}, \tag{44}
\end{aligned}$$

where inequality (a) follows from Assumption 4 and (10).

The term (44b) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
(44b) &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_{t=2}^E (t-1) \sum_{e=2}^{t-1} \|\mathbf{w}_i^{r,e-1} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{=} \sum_{t=2}^{E-1} \sum_{e=t+1}^E (e-1) \|\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}\|^2 = \sum_{t=2}^{E-1} \left(\sum_{e=t}^{E-1} e \cdot \|\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}\|^2 \right) \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \frac{E^2}{2} \sum_{t=2}^{E-1} \|\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{E^2}{2} \sum_{t=2}^E \|\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}\|^2. \tag{45}
\end{aligned}$$

where equality (a) is derived from (2a), equality (b) results from interchanging the indices of the two summations in equality (a), and inequality (c) follows from the fact that $\sum_{e=t}^{E-1} e = \frac{(E-1+t)(E-1-t+1)}{2} < \frac{(E+t)(E-t)}{2} = \frac{E^2-t^2}{2} < \frac{E^2}{2}$. Meanwhile, the term (44c) is bounded by

$$(44c) = \sum_{t=2}^E (t-1)^2 = \sum_{t=1}^{E-1} t^2 \stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{(E-1)E(2E-1)}{6} \leq \frac{E^3}{3}, \quad (46)$$

where equality (a) is calculated using $\sum_{x=1}^m x^2 = m(m+1)(2m+1)/6$.

Substituting (45) and (46) into (44) yields

$$\sum_{t=2}^E \|\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}\|^2 \leq \frac{3}{2} \gamma^2 E^2 L^2 \sum_{t=2}^E \|\mathbf{w}_i^{r,t-1} - \bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1}\|^2 + 2\gamma^2 E^3 \sum_{c=1}^C (\alpha_{i,c} V_{i,c}^2 + \chi_{\alpha_i}^2 \|\alpha_g G^2) + \gamma^2 E^3 \|\nabla F(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{r-1})\|^2. \quad (47)$$

Finally, rearranging terms in (47) leads to Lemma 4. ■

APPENDIX D

LABEL AND WEIGHT DISTRIBUTIONS FOR EXPERIMENTS IN FIGURES 3, 4, AND 5

For the experiments presented in Figures 3, 4, and 5, each client is assigned samples from a single class out of the total 10 classes. The detailed class distribution for each client is provided in Table 8.

TABLE 8. Class and weight distributions.

Client (i)	Class (c)	Weight (p_i)		Client (i)	Class (c)	Weight (p_i)	
		Balanced	Unbalanced			Balanced	Unbalanced
1	1			2	1		
3	2			4	2		
5	3			6	3		
7	4			8	4		
9	5			10	5		
11	6	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{1}{100}$	12	6	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{9}{100}$
13	7			14	7		
15	8			16	8		
17	9			18	9		
19	10			20	10		

From Table 8, the label distribution $\{\alpha_{i,c}\}$ for each client $i \in [N]$ is given by

$$\alpha_{i,c} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if class-}c \text{ samples is assigned to client } i; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (48)$$

Additionally, as shown in Table 8, in the balanced scenario, where each client holds an equal number of samples, the weight for each client is $p_i = \frac{1}{20}$. In the unbalanced scenario, where half of the clients holding 90% of the total training samples, half of the clients have $p_i = \frac{1}{100}$, while the remaining clients have $p_i = \frac{9}{100}$.

APPENDIX E

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2

E.1 Derivation of $\beta_{z,i}$

To prove Proposition 2, the key is to derive the value of $\beta_{z,i}$ in (15). Given selection set \mathcal{K}_r^z , the appearance probability of each selected client $i \in \mathcal{K}_r^z$ in global aggregation is

$$\beta_{z,i} = \frac{1}{1 - \prod_{j \in \mathcal{K}_r^z} \epsilon_j} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{k} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{K}' \subseteq \mathcal{K}_r^z \setminus i, \\ |\mathcal{K}'|=k-1}} \left(\underbrace{(1 - \epsilon_i) \prod_{i' \in \mathcal{K}'} (1 - \epsilon_{i'})}_{\triangleq (49a)} \underbrace{\prod_{j' \in \mathcal{K}_r^z \setminus i \setminus \mathcal{K}'} \epsilon_{j'}}_{\triangleq (49b)} \right), \quad (49)$$

where k is the number of clients with successful transmissions, and $\mathcal{K}_r^z \setminus i$ denotes the set obtained by removing one occurrence of i from \mathcal{K}_r^z (if i appears multiple times in \mathcal{K}_r^z , only one occurrence is removed). The term $(1 - \prod_{j \in \mathcal{K}_r^z} \epsilon_j)$ represents the probability of $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r^z} \mathbf{1}_i^r \neq 0$. In the summation over \mathcal{K}' , client i and the other $(k-1)$ clients in \mathcal{K}' constitute the k successful transmissions, corresponding to the probability in (49a), while the remaining $(K-k)$ clients experiences transmission failures, corresponding to the probability in (49b).

After performing the mathematical derivation, we can simplify the formulation in (49) as follows:

$$\beta_{z,i} = \frac{1 - \epsilon_i}{(1 - \prod_{j \in \mathcal{K}_r^z} \epsilon_j) K} \left(1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \left(\frac{1}{C_k^{K-1}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{K}' \subseteq \mathcal{K}_r^z \setminus i, \\ |\mathcal{K}'|=k}} \prod_{i' \in \mathcal{K}'} \epsilon_{i'} \right) \right). \quad (50)$$

where the detailed derivation can be found in the subsequent Appendix E.2.

As described in Section 2.1, K clients are selected with replacement at each iteration. Consequently, clients in \mathcal{K}_r^z may appear multiple times. For each repeated client $i \in \mathcal{K}_r^z$, the value of $\beta_{z,i}$ remains the same. Thus, with $n_{z,i}$ denoting the number of times each client $i \in [N]$ appears in \mathcal{K}_r^z , the value of $\beta_{z,i}$ in (15) is obtained.

E.2 Proof of Formulation (50)

For simplifying the expression in (49), we introduce the following Lemma 5 and Lemma 6, which are provided in the subsequent subsections.

Lemma 5 *The product of the successful probability of all K selected clients in a selection set \mathcal{K} satisfies*

$$\prod_{i \in \mathcal{K}} (1 - \epsilon_i) = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^K (-1)^k \sum_{\mathcal{K}' \subseteq \mathcal{K}, |\mathcal{K}'|=k} \prod_{i' \in \mathcal{K}'} \epsilon_{i'}, \quad (51)$$

where \mathcal{K}' represents all possible subsets of \mathcal{K} .

Lemma 6 *For $k \in [K - 1]$, the following holds:*

$$\sum_{k'=0}^k \frac{(-1)^{k-k'} C_{k'}^k}{K - k'} = \frac{1}{K C_k^{K-1}}. \quad (52)$$

Using Lemma 5, we can combine it with (49), leading to

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{z,i} &= \frac{1 - \epsilon_i}{1 - \prod_{j \in \mathcal{K}_r^z} \epsilon_j} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{1}{K - k} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{K}' \subseteq \mathcal{K}_r^z \setminus i, \\ |\mathcal{K}'|=k}} \left(\prod_{i' \in \mathcal{K}'} \epsilon_{i'} \prod_{j' \in \mathcal{K}_r^z \setminus i \setminus \mathcal{K}'} (1 - \epsilon_{j'}) \right) \\ &= \frac{1 - \epsilon_i}{1 - \prod_{j \in \mathcal{K}_r^z} \epsilon_j} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{1}{K - k} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{K}' \subseteq \mathcal{K}_r^z \setminus i, \\ |\mathcal{K}'|=k}} \left(\prod_{i' \in \mathcal{K}'} \epsilon_{i'} \underbrace{\left(1 + \sum_{k'=1}^{K-k-1} (-1)^{k'} \sum_{\substack{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}' \subseteq \mathcal{K}_r^z \setminus i \setminus \mathcal{K}', \\ |\tilde{\mathcal{S}}'|=k'}} \prod_{j' \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}'} \epsilon_{j'} \right)}_{\triangleq (53b)} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{1 - \epsilon_i}{1 - \prod_{j \in \mathcal{K}_r^z} \epsilon_j} \left(\underbrace{\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{1}{K - k} \left(\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{K}' \subseteq \mathcal{K}_r^z \setminus i, \\ |\mathcal{K}'|=k}} \prod_{i' \in \mathcal{K}'} \epsilon_{i'} \right)}_{\triangleq (53c)} + \sum_{k=0}^{K-2} \frac{1}{K - k} \left(\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{K}' \subseteq \mathcal{K}_r^z \setminus i, \\ |\mathcal{K}'|=k}} \prod_{i' \in \mathcal{K}'} \epsilon_{i'} \sum_{k'=1}^{K-k-1} (-1)^{k'} \sum_{\substack{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}' \subseteq \mathcal{K}_r^z \setminus i \setminus \mathcal{K}', \\ |\tilde{\mathcal{S}}'|=k'}} \prod_{j' \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}'} \epsilon_{j'} \right) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

where the term (53b) follows from Lemma 5, and equality (a) holds because (53b) equals 1 when $k = K - 1$.

For term (53c), we obtain

$$(53c) = \frac{1}{K} + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \frac{1}{K - k} \left(\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{K}' \subseteq \mathcal{K}_r^z \setminus i, \\ |\mathcal{K}'|=k}} \prod_{i' \in \mathcal{K}'} \epsilon_{i'} \right) \stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{1}{K} + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \frac{(-1)^{k-k} C_k^k}{K - k} \left(\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{K}' \subseteq \mathcal{K}_r^z \setminus i, \\ |\mathcal{K}'|=k}} \prod_{i' \in \mathcal{K}'} \epsilon_{i'} \right), \quad (54)$$

where equality (a) follows from the fact that $(-1)^{k-k} = 1$ and $C_k^k = 1$.

For term (53d), by setting $k_{\text{sum}} = k + k'$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (53d) &= \sum_{k_{\text{sum}}=1}^{K-1} \sum_{k=0}^{k_{\text{sum}}-1} \left(\frac{(-1)^{k_{\text{sum}}-k}}{K - k} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{K}' \subseteq \mathcal{K}_r^z \setminus i, \\ |\mathcal{K}'|=k}} \sum_{\substack{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}' \subseteq \mathcal{K}_r^z \setminus i \setminus \mathcal{K}', \\ |\tilde{\mathcal{S}}'|=k_{\text{sum}}-k}} \left(\prod_{i' \in \mathcal{K}'} \epsilon_{i'} \prod_{j' \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}'} \epsilon_{j'} \right) \right) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_{k_{\text{sum}}=1}^{K-1} \sum_{k=0}^{k_{\text{sum}}-1} \left(\frac{(-1)^{k_{\text{sum}}-k}}{K - k} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{K}' \subseteq \mathcal{K}_r^z \setminus i, \\ |\mathcal{K}'|=k_{\text{sum}}}} \left(C_k^{k_{\text{sum}}} \prod_{i' \in \mathcal{K}'} \epsilon_{i'} \right) \right) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \left(\sum_{k'=0}^{k-1} \frac{(-1)^{k-k'} C_{k'}^k}{K - k'} \right) \left(\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{K}' \subseteq \mathcal{K}_r^z \setminus i, \\ |\mathcal{K}'|=k}} \prod_{i' \in \mathcal{K}'} \epsilon_{i'} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

where equality (a) results from counting the number of different combinations, and equality (b) comes from substituting k_{sum} and k with k and k' , respectively.

Next, by combining (53) with (54) and (55), the effective appearance probability of each selected client $i \in \mathcal{K}_r^z$ is

$$\beta_{z,i} = \frac{1 - \epsilon_i}{1 - \prod_{j \in \mathcal{K}_r^z} \epsilon_j} \left(\frac{1}{K} + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \left(\sum_{k'=0}^k \frac{(-1)^{k-k'} C_{k'}^k}{K - k'} \right) \left(\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{K}' \subseteq \mathcal{K}_r^z \setminus i, \\ |\mathcal{K}'|=k}} \prod_{i' \in \mathcal{K}'} \epsilon_{i'} \right) \right). \quad (56)$$

Finally, substituting (52) into (56), the effective appearance probability for each selected client $i \in \mathcal{K}_r^z$ becomes (50). ■

E.3 Proof of Lemma 5

We employ the mathematical induction method to prove Lemma 5.

- (i) When $K = 1$, there is only one element i in \mathcal{K} , both sides of (51) equals $1 - \epsilon_i$, thereby satisfying (51).
- (ii) Assume that (51) holds. Then, if K increases to $K + 1$ and a new element j is added to the original set \mathcal{K} , making \mathcal{K} become $\mathcal{K} \cup j$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\prod_{i \in \mathcal{K} \cup j} (1 - \epsilon_i) &= \left(\prod_{i \in \mathcal{K}} (1 - \epsilon_i) \right) (1 - \epsilon_j) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} \left(1 + \sum_{k=1}^K (-1)^k \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{K}' \subseteq \mathcal{K}, \\ |\mathcal{K}'|=k}} \prod_{i \in \mathcal{K}'} \epsilon_i \right) (1 - \epsilon_j) \\
&= 1 + \underbrace{(-\epsilon_j)}_{\triangleq (57a)} + \underbrace{\sum_{k=1}^K (-1)^k \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{K}' \subseteq \mathcal{K}, \\ |\mathcal{K}'|=k}} \prod_{i \in \mathcal{K}'} \epsilon_i}_{\triangleq (57b)} + \underbrace{\left(\sum_{k=1}^{K-1} (-1)^k \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{K}' \subseteq \mathcal{K}, \\ |\mathcal{K}'|=k}} \prod_{i \in \mathcal{K}'} \epsilon_i \right) (-\epsilon_j)}_{\triangleq (57c)} + \underbrace{(-1)^K \left(\prod_{i \in \mathcal{K}} \epsilon_i \right) (-\epsilon_j)}_{\triangleq (57d)}, \tag{57}
\end{aligned}$$

where equality (a) comes from (51), and

$$(57d) = (-1)^{K+1} \prod_{i \in \mathcal{K} \cup j} \epsilon_i. \tag{58}$$

Besides, since

$$(57a) + (57c) = \left(\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (-1)^k \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{K}' \subseteq \mathcal{K}, \\ |\mathcal{K}'|=k}} \prod_{i \in \mathcal{K}'} \epsilon_i \right) (-\epsilon_j) = \sum_{k=1}^K (-1)^k \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{K}' \subseteq \mathcal{K}, \\ |\mathcal{K}'|=k-1}} \left(\prod_{i \in \mathcal{K}'} \epsilon_i \right) \epsilon_j, \tag{59}$$

we have

$$(57a) + (57b) + (57c) = \sum_{k=1}^K (-1)^k \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{K}' \subseteq \mathcal{K} \cup j, \\ |\mathcal{K}'|=k}} \prod_{i \in \mathcal{K}'} \epsilon_i. \tag{60}$$

Finally, combining (57) with (58) and (60), we have

$$\prod_{i \in \mathcal{K} \cup j} (1 - \epsilon_i) = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K+1} (-1)^k \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{K}' \subseteq \mathcal{K} \cup j, \\ |\mathcal{K}'|=k}} \prod_{i \in \mathcal{K}'} \epsilon_i. \tag{61}$$

Based on the above induction process, we have proved Lemma 5. ■

E.4 Proof of Lemma 6

We adopt the mathematical induction method to prove Lemma 6.

- (i) When $k = 1$, we have

$$\sum_{k'=0}^1 \frac{(-1)^{1-k'} C_{k'}^1}{K - k'} = \frac{1}{K-1} - \frac{1}{K} = \frac{1}{K(K-1)} = \frac{1}{K C_1^{K-1}}, \tag{62}$$

which satisfies (52).

- (ii) Assume that (52) holds. Then, if k increases to $k + 1$, the left-hand side of (52) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k'=0}^{k+1} \frac{(-1)^{k+1-k'} C_{k'}^{k+1}}{K - k'} &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_{k'=0}^k \frac{(-1)^{k+1-k'} C_{k'}^k}{K - k'} + \sum_{k'=1}^{k+1} \frac{(-1)^{k+1-k'} C_{k'-1}^k}{K - k'} \\
&= - \sum_{k'=0}^k \frac{(-1)^{k-k'} C_{k'}^k}{K - k'} + \sum_{k'=0}^k \frac{(-1)^{k-k'} C_{k'}^k}{K - 1 - k'} \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{=} - \frac{1}{K C_k^{K-1}} + \frac{1}{(K-1) C_k^{K-2}} = \frac{1}{K C_{k+1}^{K-1}}, \tag{63}
\end{aligned}$$

where equality (a) is due to

$$\begin{aligned}
C_{k'}^{k+1} &= \frac{(k+1)!}{(k+1-k')!k'!} = \frac{k+1}{k+1-k'} \frac{k!}{(k-k')!k'!} = \left(1 + \frac{k'}{k+1-k'} \right) \frac{k!}{(k-k')!k'!} \\
&= \frac{k!}{(k-k')!k'!} + \frac{k!}{(k-(k'-1))!(k'-1)!} \\
&= \begin{cases} C_{k'}^k, & \text{if } k' = 0; \\ C_{k'}^k + C_{k'-1}^k, & \text{if } k' = 1, 2, \dots, k; \\ C_{k'-1}^k, & \text{if } k' = k+1, \end{cases} \tag{64}
\end{aligned}$$

and equality (b) is due to (52).

Based on the above induction process, we have proved Lemma 6. ■

APPENDIX F

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3

F.1 Derivation of (16)

Before presenting the detailed derivation procedure, we introduce the following Lemma 7, which is proved in the subsequent Appendix F.2.

Lemma 7 *The effective appearance probability $\bar{\beta}_i$ in (15) is equivalent to*

$$\bar{\beta}_i = s_i(1 - \epsilon_i) \sum_{j_0, j_1, \dots, j_{K-2}=1}^N \prod_{k=0}^{K-2} s_{j_k} \frac{1 + \sum_{k=0}^{K-2} \prod_{k'=0}^k \epsilon_{j_{k'}}}{1 - \epsilon_i \prod_{k=0}^{K-2} \epsilon_{j_k}}. \quad (65)$$

Next, (65) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\beta}_i &= s_i \sum_{j_0, j_1, \dots, j_{K-2}=1}^N \prod_{k=0}^{K-2} s_{j_k} \frac{1 - \epsilon_i + \sum_{k=0}^{K-2} \prod_{k'=0}^k \epsilon_{j_{k'}} - \epsilon_i \sum_{k=0}^{K-2} \prod_{k'=0}^k \epsilon_{j_{k'}}}{1 - \epsilon_i \prod_{k=0}^{K-2} \epsilon_{j_k}} \\ &= s_i \sum_{j_0, j_1, \dots, j_{K-2}=1}^N \prod_{k=0}^{K-2} s_{j_k} \frac{1 + \epsilon_{j_0} + \epsilon_{j_0} \sum_{k=1}^{K-2} \prod_{k'=1}^k \epsilon_{j_{k'}} - \epsilon_i - \epsilon_i \sum_{k=0}^{K-3} \prod_{k'=0}^k \epsilon_{j_{k'}} - \epsilon_i \prod_{k=0}^{K-2} \epsilon_{j_k}}{1 - \epsilon_i \prod_{k=0}^{K-2} \epsilon_{j_k}} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} s_i \sum_{j_0, j_1, \dots, j_{K-2}=1}^N \prod_{k=0}^{K-2} s_{j_k} \frac{1 + \epsilon_{j_0} + \epsilon_{j_0} \sum_{k=1}^{K-2} \prod_{k'=1}^k \epsilon_{j_{k'}} - \epsilon_i - \epsilon_i \sum_{k=1}^{K-2} \prod_{k'=1}^k \epsilon_{j_{k'}} - \epsilon_i \prod_{k=0}^{K-2} \epsilon_{j_k}}{1 - \epsilon_i \prod_{k=0}^{K-2} \epsilon_{j_k}} \\ &= s_i \sum_{j_0, j_1, \dots, j_{K-2}=1}^N \prod_{k=0}^{K-2} s_{j_k} \frac{1 - \epsilon_i \prod_{k=0}^{K-2} \epsilon_{j_k} + (\epsilon_{j_0} - \epsilon_i)(1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-2} \prod_{k'=1}^k \epsilon_{j_{k'}})}{1 - \epsilon_i \prod_{k=0}^{K-2} \epsilon_{j_k}} \\ &= s_i \left(1 + \sum_{j_0=1}^N s_{j_0} (\epsilon_{j_0} - \epsilon_i) \sum_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_{K-2}=1}^N \prod_{k=1}^{K-2} s_{j_k} \frac{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-2} \prod_{k'=1}^k \epsilon_{j_{k'}}}{1 - \epsilon_i \prod_{k=1}^{K-2} \epsilon_{j_k}} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

where equality (a) holds because, for all indices j_0, j_1, \dots, j_{K-2} ranging from 1 to N ,

$$\sum_{j_0, j_1, \dots, j_{K-2}=1}^N \prod_{k=0}^{K-2} s_{j_k} \frac{\sum_{k=0}^{K-3} \prod_{k'=0}^k \epsilon_{j_{k'}}}{1 - \epsilon_i \prod_{k=0}^{K-2} \epsilon_{j_k}} = \sum_{j_0, j_1, \dots, j_{K-2}=1}^N \prod_{k=0}^{K-2} s_{j_k} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{K-2} \prod_{k'=1}^k \epsilon_{j_{k'}}}{1 - \epsilon_i \prod_{k=0}^{K-2} \epsilon_{j_k}}. \quad (67)$$

Finally, by replacing the index j_0 in (66) with index i' yields equation (16) as stated in Proposition 3. \blacksquare

F.2 Proof of Lemma 7

Based on (15), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\beta}_i &= \sum_{z=1}^{C_K^{N+K-1}} \left(\prod_{i \in \mathcal{K}_r^z} s_i \right) \frac{K!}{\prod_{i \in [N]} n_{z,i}!} \frac{n_{z,i}}{K} \frac{1 - \epsilon_i}{1 - \prod_{j \in \mathcal{K}_r^z} \epsilon_j} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \left(\frac{1}{C_k^{K-1}} \sum_{\mathcal{K}' \subseteq \mathcal{K}_r^z \setminus i, |\mathcal{K}'|=k} \prod_{j' \in \mathcal{K}'} \epsilon_{j'} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} s_i \sum_{z=1}^{C_K^{N+K-1}} \left(\prod_{j \in \mathcal{K}_r^z \setminus i} s_j \right) \frac{(K-1)!}{(n_{z,i}-1)! \prod_{j \in [N] \setminus i} n_{z,j}!} \left(\frac{1 - \epsilon_i}{1 - \prod_{j \in \mathcal{K}_r^z} \epsilon_j} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \left(\frac{1}{C_k^{K-1}} \sum_{\mathcal{K}' \subseteq \mathcal{K}_r^z \setminus i, |\mathcal{K}'|=k} \prod_{j' \in \mathcal{K}'} \epsilon_{j'} \right) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

where $\mathcal{K}_r^z \setminus i$ denotes the set obtained by removing one occurrence of i from \mathcal{K}_r^z , and \mathcal{K}' represents any subset of the set $\mathcal{K}_r^z \setminus i$. Equality (a) follows from $n_{z,i} = 0$ if $i \notin \mathcal{K}_r^z$.

If one of the K selected clients in the selection set \mathcal{K}_r is fixed as client i , the remaining $(K-1)$ clients in \mathcal{K}_r have C_{K-1}^{N+K-2} possible combinations. Based on this, let $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z$ denote the selection set formed by randomly selecting $(K-1)$ clients with replacement from a total N clients, where $|\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z| = K-1$. Consequently, (69) can be reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\beta}_i &= s_i(1 - \epsilon_i) \sum_{z=1}^{C_{K-1}^{N+K-2}} \underbrace{\left(\prod_{j \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z} s_j \right) \frac{(K-1)!}{\prod_{j \in [N]} \tilde{n}_{z,j}!}}_{\triangleq \text{Pr}(\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z)} \left(\frac{1}{1 - \epsilon_i \prod_{j \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z} \epsilon_j} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \left(\frac{1}{C_k^{K-1}} \sum_{\mathcal{K}' \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z, |\mathcal{K}'|=k} \prod_{j' \in \mathcal{K}'} \epsilon_{j'} \right) \right) \\ &= s_i(1 - \epsilon_i) \sum_{z=1}^{C_{K-1}^{N+K-2}} \left(\prod_{j \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z} s_j \right) \frac{1}{1 - \epsilon_i \prod_{j \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z} \epsilon_j} \underbrace{\left(\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{(K-1)!}{\prod_{j \in [N]} \tilde{n}_{z,j}!} \frac{1}{C_k^{K-1}} \sum_{\mathcal{K}' \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z, |\mathcal{K}'|=k} \prod_{j' \in \mathcal{K}'} \epsilon_{j'} \right)}_{(69a)}. \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

Here, $\text{Pr}(\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z)$ is the selection probability of each set $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z$, $\tilde{n}_{z,i}$ represents the number of times each client $j \in [N]$ appears in $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z$, and $\frac{(K-1)!}{\prod_{j \in [N]} \tilde{n}_{z,j}!}$ gives the number of distinct permutations of selected clients in $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z$.

Define $\hat{\mathcal{K}}_r^{z,k}$ as the subset obtained by randomly selecting k clients without replacement from $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z$. Let $\hat{n}_{z,j}^k$ represent the number of times each client $j \in [N]$ appears in $\hat{\mathcal{K}}_r^{z,k}$. The number of distinct permutations of selected clients in $\hat{\mathcal{K}}_r^{z,k}$ is given by

$$\prod_{j \in [N]} C_{\hat{n}_{z,j}^k}^{\tilde{n}_{z,j}} = \prod_{j \in [N]} \frac{\tilde{n}_{z,j}!}{(\tilde{n}_{z,j} - \hat{n}_{z,j}^k)! \hat{n}_{z,j}^k!}. \quad (70)$$

By combining (69) with (70), we derive

$$\begin{aligned} (69a) &= \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{(K-1)!}{\prod_{j \in [N]} \tilde{n}_{z,j}!} \frac{1}{C_k^{K-1}} \sum_{\hat{\mathcal{K}}_r^{z,k} \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z} \left(\prod_{j \in [N]} C_{\hat{n}_{z,j}^k}^{\tilde{n}_{z,j}} \prod_{j \in \hat{\mathcal{K}}_r^{z,k}} \epsilon_j \right) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\hat{\mathcal{K}}_r^{z,k} \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z} \left(\frac{(K-1)!}{\prod_{j \in [N]} \tilde{n}_{z,j}!} \frac{1}{C_k^{K-1}} \prod_{j \in [N]} C_{\hat{n}_{z,j}^k}^{\tilde{n}_{z,j}} \right) \prod_{j \in \hat{\mathcal{K}}_r^{z,k}} \epsilon_j \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{\hat{\mathcal{K}}_r^{z,k} \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z} \left(\underbrace{\frac{k!}{\prod_{j \in [N]} \hat{n}_{z,j}^k!}}_{(71a)} \underbrace{\frac{(K-1-k)!}{\prod_{j \in [N]} (\tilde{n}_{z,j} - \hat{n}_{z,j}^k)!}}_{(71b)} \right) \prod_{j \in \hat{\mathcal{K}}_r^{z,k}} \epsilon_j \\ &= \sum_{\hat{j}_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z} \sum_{\hat{j}_1 \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z \setminus \hat{j}_0} \cdots \sum_{\hat{j}_{K-2} \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z \setminus \{\cup_{i=0}^{K-3} \hat{j}_i\}} \left(1 + \epsilon_{\hat{j}_0} + \epsilon_{\hat{j}_0} \epsilon_{\hat{j}_1} + \cdots + \prod_{k'=0}^{K-2} \epsilon_{\hat{j}_{k'}} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

where (71a) represents the number of different permutations for the selected clients in $\hat{\mathcal{K}}_r^{z,k}$, while (71b) corresponds to the permutations for the clients in $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z \setminus \hat{\mathcal{K}}_r^{z,k}$.

Substituting (71) into (68), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\beta}_i &\stackrel{(a)}{=} s_i (1 - \epsilon_i) \sum_{z=1}^{C_{K-1}^{N+K-2}} \left(\prod_{j \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z} s_j \right) \left(\sum_{\hat{j}_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z} \sum_{\hat{j}_1 \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z \setminus \hat{j}_0} \cdots \sum_{\hat{j}_{K-2} \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z \setminus \{\cup_{i=0}^{K-3} \hat{j}_i\}} \frac{1 + \epsilon_{\hat{j}_0} + \epsilon_{\hat{j}_0} \epsilon_{\hat{j}_1} + \cdots + \prod_{k'=0}^{K-2} \epsilon_{\hat{j}_{k'}}}{1 - \epsilon_i \prod_{j \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z} \epsilon_j} \right) \\ &= s_i (1 - \epsilon_i) \sum_{z=1}^{C_{K-1}^{N+K-2}} \left(\sum_{\hat{j}_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z} s_{\hat{j}_0} \sum_{\hat{j}_1 \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z \setminus \hat{j}_0} s_{\hat{j}_1} \cdots \sum_{\hat{j}_{K-2} \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z \setminus \{\cup_{i=0}^{K-3} \hat{j}_i\}} s_{\hat{j}_{K-2}} \frac{1 + \epsilon_{\hat{j}_0} + \epsilon_{\hat{j}_0} \epsilon_{\hat{j}_1} + \cdots + \prod_{k'=0}^{K-2} \epsilon_{\hat{j}_{k'}}}{1 - \epsilon_i \prod_{j \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z} \epsilon_j} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} s_i (1 - \epsilon_i) \sum_{j_0=1}^N s_{j_0} \sum_{j_1=1}^N s_{j_1} \cdots \sum_{j_{K-2}=1}^N s_{j_{K-2}} \frac{1 + \epsilon_{j_0} + \epsilon_{j_0} \epsilon_{j_1} + \cdots + \prod_{k'=0}^{K-2} \epsilon_{j_{k'}}}{1 - \epsilon_i \prod_{k=0}^{K-2} \epsilon_{j_k}} \\ &= s_i (1 - \epsilon_i) \sum_{j_0, j_1, \dots, j_{K-2}=1}^N \prod_{k=0}^{K-2} s_{j_k} \frac{1 + \sum_{k=0}^{K-2} \prod_{k'=0}^k \epsilon_{j_{k'}}}{1 - \epsilon_i \prod_{k=0}^{K-2} \epsilon_{j_k}}, \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

where in equality (a), the summation $\sum_{\hat{j}_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z} \sum_{\hat{j}_1 \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z \setminus \hat{j}_0} \cdots \sum_{\hat{j}_{K-2} \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z \setminus \{\cup_{i=0}^{K-3} \hat{j}_i\}}$ enumerates all permutations of the clients in $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z$. Summing over all possible combinations of $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_r^z$ yields all permutations of selecting K clients from the N clients, as shown in equality (b). ■

APPENDIX G

GRADIENT OF OBJECTIVE FUNCTION IN (19A)

According to (14) and (17a), the gradient of objective function is given by

$$\frac{\partial(17a)}{\partial s_i} = -2 \sum_{c=1}^C \left(\frac{\alpha_c - \sum_{j=1}^N \bar{\beta}_j \alpha_{j,c}}{\alpha_c} \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_{j,c} \frac{\partial \bar{\beta}_j}{\partial s_i} \right), \quad (73)$$

where based on (15), the gradient $\partial \bar{\beta}_j / \partial s_i$ is computed by

$$\frac{\partial \bar{\beta}_j}{\partial s_i} = \sum_{z=1, n_{z,j} > 0}^{C_K^{N+K-1}} \frac{K!}{\prod_{i' \in [N]} n_{z,i'}!} \beta_{z,j} \frac{\partial (\prod_{j' \in \mathcal{K}_r^z} s_{j'})}{\partial s_i} = \sum_{z=1, n_{z,j} > 0, n_{z,i} > 0}^{C_K^{N+K-1}} \frac{K!}{\prod_{i' \in [N]} n_{z,i'}!} \beta_{z,j} n_{z,i} s_i^{n_{z,i}-1} \prod_{j' \in \mathcal{K}_r^z \setminus \{i\}} s_{j'}. \quad (74)$$

Here, $n_{z,j}$ and $n_{z,i}$ denote the number of times clients j and i appear in the selection set \mathcal{K}_r^z , respectively. Additionally, the term $\mathcal{K}_r^z \setminus \{i\}$ refers to the set obtained by removing all occurrences of client i from the set \mathcal{K}_r^z . ■

APPENDIX H

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 5

Since (15) and (16) are equivalent, the effective appearance probability $\bar{\beta}_i$ when selecting K clients per iteration, denoted as $[\bar{\beta}_i]_K$, is computed by

$$[\bar{\beta}_i]_K = s_i \left(1 + \underbrace{\sum_{i'=1, i' \neq i}^N s_{i'} (\epsilon_{i'} - \epsilon_i) \sum_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_{K-2}=1}^N \prod_{k=1}^{K-2} s_{j_k} \frac{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-2} \prod_{k'=1}^k \epsilon_{j_{k'}}}{1 - \epsilon_i \epsilon_{i'} \prod_{k=1}^{K-2} \epsilon_{j_k}}}_{(75a)} \right). \quad (75)$$

Similarly, when selecting $(K+1)$ clients, we have

$$[\bar{\beta}_i]_{K+1} = s_i \left(1 + \underbrace{\sum_{i'=1, i' \neq i}^N s_{i'} (\epsilon_{i'} - \epsilon_i) \sum_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_{K-1}=1}^N \prod_{k=1}^{K-1} s_{j_k} \frac{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \prod_{k'=1}^k \epsilon_{j_{k'}}}{1 - \epsilon_i \epsilon_{i'} \prod_{k=1}^{K-1} \epsilon_{j_k}}}_{(76a)} \right). \quad (76)$$

Based on (75) and (76), the difference between $[\bar{\beta}_i]_K$ and $[\bar{\beta}_i]_{K+1}$ is computed as

$$\begin{aligned} & [\bar{\beta}_i]_K - [\bar{\beta}_i]_{K+1} \\ &= s_i \sum_{i'=1, i' \neq i}^N s_{i'} (\epsilon_{i'} - \epsilon_i) \left((75a) - (76a) \right) \\ &= s_i \sum_{i'=1, i' \neq i}^N s_{i'} (\epsilon_{i'} - \epsilon_i) \left(\sum_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_{K-2}=1}^N \prod_{k=1}^{K-2} s_{j_k} \underbrace{\sum_{j_{K-1}=1}^N s_{j_{K-1}}}_{=1} \frac{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-2} \prod_{k'=1}^k \epsilon_{j_{k'}}}{1 - \epsilon_i \epsilon_{i'} \prod_{k=1}^{K-2} \epsilon_{j_k}} \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \sum_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_{K-2}=1}^N \prod_{k=1}^{K-2} s_{j_k} \sum_{j_{K-1}=1}^N s_{j_{K-1}} \frac{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-2} \prod_{k'=1}^k \epsilon_{j_{k'}} + \prod_{k'=1}^{K-1} \epsilon_{j_{k'}}}{1 - \epsilon_i \epsilon_{i'} \prod_{k=1}^{K-1} \epsilon_{j_k}} \right) \\ &= s_i \sum_{i'=1, i' \neq i}^N s_{i'} (\epsilon_{i'} - \epsilon_i) \sum_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_{K-2}=1}^N \prod_{k=1}^{K-2} s_{j_k} \sum_{j_{K-1}=1}^N s_{j_{K-1}} \left(\frac{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-2} \prod_{k'=1}^k \epsilon_{j_{k'}}}{1 - \epsilon_i \epsilon_{i'} \prod_{k=1}^{K-2} \epsilon_{j_k}} - \frac{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-2} \prod_{k'=1}^k \epsilon_{j_{k'}} + \prod_{k'=1}^{K-1} \epsilon_{j_{k'}}}{1 - \epsilon_i \epsilon_{i'} \prod_{k=1}^{K-1} \epsilon_{j_k}} \right) \\ &= s_i \sum_{i'=1, i' \neq i}^N s_{i'} (\epsilon_{i'} - \epsilon_i) \sum_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_{K-2}=1}^N \prod_{k=1}^{K-2} s_{j_k} \sum_{j_{K-1}=1}^N s_{j_{K-1}} \left(\frac{(1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-2} \prod_{k'=1}^k \epsilon_{j_{k'}})(1 - \epsilon_{j_{K-1}}) \epsilon_i \epsilon_{i'} \prod_{k=1}^{K-2} \epsilon_{j_k}}{(1 - \epsilon_i \epsilon_{i'} \prod_{k=1}^{K-2} \epsilon_{j_k})(1 - \epsilon_i \epsilon_{i'} \prod_{k=1}^{K-1} \epsilon_{j_k})} \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \frac{\prod_{k'=1}^{K-1} \epsilon_{j_{k'}}}{1 - \epsilon_i \epsilon_{i'} \prod_{k=1}^{K-1} \epsilon_{j_k}} \right). \quad (77) \end{aligned}$$

According to (17c), $s_i = 0$ when $\epsilon_i = 1$. Therefore, the value of (77) depends only on the clients with $\epsilon_i \in [0, 1)$. As K increases, both $\epsilon_i \epsilon_{i'} \prod_{k=1}^{K-2} \epsilon_{j_k}$ and $\prod_{k=1}^{K-1} \epsilon_{j_k}$ approach zero. Consequently, the value of (77) also approaches zero, leading to the diminishing difference between $[\bar{\beta}_i]_K$ and $[\bar{\beta}_i]_{K+1}$. ■