

# FinP: Fairness-in-Privacy in Federated Learning by Addressing Disparities in Privacy Risk

Tianyu Zhao  
tzhao15@uci.edu

University of California, Irvine

Mahmoud Srewa  
msrewa@uci.edu

University of California, Irvine

Salma Elmalaki  
salma.elmalaki@uci.edu

University of California, Irvine

## Abstract

Ensuring fairness in machine learning, particularly in human-centric applications, extends beyond algorithmic bias to encompass fairness in privacy, specifically the equitable distribution of privacy risk. This is critical in federated learning (FL), where decentralized data necessitates balanced privacy preservation across clients. We introduce *FinP*, a framework designed to achieve fairness in privacy by mitigating disproportionate exposure to source inference attacks (SIA). *FinP* employs a dual approach: (1) server-side adaptive aggregation to address unfairness in client contributions in global model, and (2) client-side regularization to reduce client vulnerability. This comprehensive strategy targets both the symptoms and root causes of privacy unfairness. Evaluated on the Human Activity Recognition (HAR) and CIFAR-10 datasets, *FinP* demonstrates a  $\approx 20\%$  improvement in fairness in privacy on HAR with minimal impact on model utility, and effectively mitigates SIA risks on CIFAR-10, showcasing its ability to provide fairness in privacy in FL systems without compromising performance.

## Keywords

fairness in privacy, federated learning, human-centered design

## ACM Reference Format:

Tianyu Zhao, Mahmoud Srewa, and Salma Elmalaki. 2025. *FinP: Fairness-in-Privacy in Federated Learning by Addressing Disparities in Privacy Risk*. In *Proceedings of ACM Conference (ACM'25)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 19 pages.

## 1 Introduction

The pervasive integration of machine learning (ML) into daily life demands careful consideration of its fairness and ethical implications. While traditional algorithmic fairness research has primarily focused on preventing bias and discrimination in decision-making [10, 25, 26, 34, 50], a more nuanced approach is needed for human-centric systems. Existing definitions often emphasize equality—the absence of prejudice in algorithmic decisions [28]. However, the crucial aspect of equity—the fair distribution of outcomes and impacts—has received less attention, particularly in human-centric contexts [49]. This paper addresses this gap by focusing on equity in privacy risk distribution.

In human-centric ML systems that collect and process personal data, ensuring fairness in privacy risk is paramount, meaning no individual or group should be disproportionately exposed. Recognizing that complete prevention of privacy leaks is often infeasible, we investigate how to equitably distribute the resulting harm. Promoting fairness in privacy mitigates biases, prevents discrimination in privacy risk, and fosters trust between individuals and AI systems, contributing to ethical AI development and deployment where benefits and adverse impacts are shared equitably.

---

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](mailto:permissions@acm.org).

ACM'25, 2025,

© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM

Federated learning (FL) offers a promising privacy-preserving approach for training ML models on decentralized devices. By enabling collaborative learning without sharing raw data, FL aligns with human-centric design principles and mitigates certain privacy risks, making it particularly relevant for sectors with stringent data privacy regulations like healthcare and finance. However, FL is vulnerable to privacy attacks such as Membership Inference Attacks (MIA) [40], where the attacker aims to determine whether a specific data point was used in the training set of a machine learning model. Moreover, regulations such as GDPR [1], with its Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) provisions, underscore the growing legal emphasis on data safeguarding, highlighting the critical need for privacy audits in FL [4], especially in sensitive domains [36].

A recent example is the 2024 National Public Data (NPD) breach, exposing billions of records, underscores the critical need for fairness in privacy [41], especially within federated learning (FL). While affecting millions, the breach disproportionately impacted vulnerable populations like low-income individuals, the elderly, and those with disabilities, who are more susceptible to the consequences of data breaches. This highlights a key limitation of traditional privacy approaches that focus on average risk, neglecting equitable distribution. In FL, where data is decentralized, this problem is amplified; if certain clients, potentially representing vulnerable demographics, consistently experience higher privacy leakage due to factors like data heterogeneity or local overfitting, new digital inequalities emerge. The NPD breach emphasizes the importance of frameworks that prioritize not just overall privacy but also its equitable distribution among FL participants, preventing disproportionate harm, particularly from attacks such as Source Inference Attacks (SIAs) that can trace leakage to specific clients [19].

## 2 Motivation and Contributions

**Potential Societal Impact.** Acknowledging the near inevitability of some data breaches—as reflected in the “zero trust” security model [37]—the focus is shifting from solely preventing breaches to ensuring equitable outcomes and risk distribution. This paper directly addresses this by prioritizing the equitable distribution of privacy risks, a crucial aspect that is often overlooked. Demonstrating the feasibility of designing AI systems

that minimize and fairly distribute unavoidable privacy leaks builds public trust, which is essential for wider technology adoption. Furthermore, formalizing “fairness-in-privacy” within FL provides policymakers with tangible metrics and frameworks for regulating AI systems, enabling informed policies that promote equitable privacy protection in our increasingly data-driven world and fostering responsible AI development. This requires technical frameworks that can quantitatively measure and assess the fairness-in-privacy and provide solutions to improve it.

**Case Study.** Consider the application of Federated Learning (FL) in the domain of human activity recognition (HAR), particularly concerning its implications for fairness and equity. FL offers a compelling paradigm for developing personalized health monitoring systems using data from wearable devices while preserving user privacy [32, 36]. Each user’s device is a client, training a local model on their activity data without directly sharing the raw sensor readings with a central server [31]. However, this decentralized approach can inadvertently create or exacerbate existing societal inequalities. For instance, consider deploying an FL-based HAR system to monitor physical rehabilitation progress. Users with disabilities or chronic conditions might exhibit movement patterns that deviate significantly from the “average” user represented in the global model. These individuals might be more easily re-identified through techniques like membership inference attacks (MIA) [40] or source inference attacks (SIA) [19]. This constitutes representational harm, as these individuals are disproportionately exposed to privacy risks due to their unique characteristics. Such disparities in privacy protection can further marginalize already vulnerable populations. Without explicitly addressing equitable risk distribution and potential biases embedded within data and algorithms, the purported benefits of FL may not be shared equitably, potentially reinforcing existing social inequalities. This underscores the need for technical frameworks such as the one proposed in this paper to quantify and mitigate risk.

**Technical Approach.** This paper addresses the critical challenge of ensuring fairness in privacy *FinP* within federated learning (FL). Although FL offers inherent data privacy by keeping the data localized, it can inadvertently create disparities in privacy leakage among clients due to heterogeneous data and varying local

training dynamics [38]. To mitigate this, we propose a novel two-pronged approach that tackles fairness in privacy both at the server and client levels. At the server, we introduce an adaptive aggregation strategy that weights client model updates based on their estimated privacy risk, quantified using the principal component analysis (PCA) distance between local and global models. This prevents highly vulnerable clients from disproportionately influencing the global model. Complementing this server-side intervention, we propose a client-side collaborative overfitting reduction method. By estimating each client's relative overfitting using the maximum eigenvalue of its local model's Hessian and incorporating this information into a local regularization term based on the Lipschitz constant, we encourage clients to learn more generalizable representations, reducing their individual vulnerability to privacy attacks. This combined approach addresses both the symptoms (unequal risk distribution) and the root causes (local overfitting) of the privacy disparity, leading to a more equitable FL system for *FinP*. This approach achieves  $\approx 20\%$  improvement in fairness in privacy with a negligible effect on task performance. Our contributions are:

- A formal definition of fairness-in-privacy (*FinP*) for human-centric systems.
- Operationalization of *FinP* within Federated Learning (FL), focusing on source inference attacks (SLA).
- A novel adaptive approach to optimize *FinP* during FL server aggregation and client collaboration.
- Evaluating a human-centered system using a human activity recognition (HAR) dataset and common learning tasks, such as CIFAR-10.

### 3 Background and Related Work

**Privacy of Human-Centered Systems.** Ensuring privacy in human-centric ML-based systems presents inherent conflicts among service utility, cost, and personal and institutional privacy [42]. Without appropriate incentives for societal information sharing, we may face decision-making policies that are either overly restrictive or that compromise private information, leading to adverse selection [24]. Such compromises can result in privacy violations, exacerbating societal concerns regarding the impact of emerging technology

trends in human-centric systems [13, 14, 30]. Consequently, several studies have aimed to establish privacy guarantees that allow auditing and quantifying compromises to make these systems more acceptable [21, 33]. ML models in decision-making systems have also been shown to leak significant amounts of private information that requires auditing platforms [16]. Various studies focused on privacy-preserving machine learning techniques targeting decision-making systems [2, 8, 43, 44]. Recognizing that perfect privacy is often unattainable, this paper examines privacy from an equity perspective. We investigate how to ensure a fair distribution of harm when privacy leaks occur, addressing the technical challenges alongside the ethical imperatives of equitable privacy protection.

**Federated Learning (FL).** Federated Learning (FL) is an approach in machine learning that enables the collaborative training of models across multiple devices or institutions without requiring data to be centralized. This decentralized setup is particularly beneficial in fields where data-sharing restrictions are enforced by privacy regulations, such as healthcare and finance. FL allows organizations to derive insights from data distributed across various locations while adhering to legal constraints, including the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) [31, 48].

One of the most widely adopted methods in FL is Federated Averaging Algorithm (FedAvg), which operates through iterative rounds of communication between a central server and participating clients to collaboratively train a shared model. During each communication round, the server sends the current global model to each client, which uses their locally stored data to perform optimization steps. These optimized models are subsequently sent back to the server, where they are aggregated to update the global model. The process repeats until the model converges. Known for its simplicity and effectiveness, FedAvg serves as the primary technique for coordinating model updates across distributed clients in our work. Additionally, we specifically employ horizontal federated learning, where data is distributed across entities with similar feature spaces but distinct user groups [47].

**Privacy Risks in FL.** Privacy risks are a critical concern in FL, as collaborative training on decentralized data can inadvertently expose sensitive information. A primary threat is the Membership Inference Attack

(MIA), where adversaries determine whether specific data records were part of the model's training set [18, 40]. Researchers have since demonstrated MIA's effectiveness across various machine learning models, including FL, showing, for example, that adversaries can infer if a specific location profile contributed to an FL model [15, 51]. However, while MIA identifies training members, it does not reveal the client that contributed the data. Source Inference Attack (SIA), introduced in [19], extends MIA by identifying which client owns a training record, thus posing significant security risks by exposing client-specific information in FL settings.

The Non-Independent and Identically Distributed (non-IID) nature of data in federated learning presents additional privacy challenges, as variations in data distributions across clients heighten the risk of privacy leakage. When data distributions differ widely among clients, individual model updates become more distinguishable, potentially allowing attackers to infer sensitive information [52]. This distinctiveness in updates can make federated models more susceptible to inference attacks, such as MIA and SIA, as malicious actors may exploit these distributional differences to trace updates back to specific clients. This vulnerability is especially relevant in our work, as we use the Human Activity Recognition (HAR) dataset, which is inherently non-IID across clients, thus posing an increased risk for privacy leakage.

**Fairness in FL.** Fairness in FL is crucial due to the varied data distributions among clients, which can lead to biased outcomes favoring certain groups [12]. Achieving fairness involves balancing the global model's benefits across clients despite the decentralized nature of the data. Approaches include group fairness, ensuring performance equity across client groups, and performance distribution fairness, which focuses on fair accuracy distribution [38]. Additional types are selection fairness (equitable client participation), contribution fairness (rewards based on contributions), and expectation fairness (aligning performance with client expectations) [39]. Achieving fairness in FL across these various dimensions remains challenging due to the inherent heterogeneity of client data and environments. In response to this heterogeneity, personalization has emerged as a strategy to tailor models to individual clients, enhancing local performance [5, 6, 45].

When considering fairness in FL, it is crucial to address the interplay with privacy. Specifically, ensuring an equitable distribution of privacy risks across clients is paramount, preventing any group from being disproportionately vulnerable to privacy leakage, particularly under attacks such as source inference attacks (SIAs).

## 4 Problem Statement

Federated learning (FL) systems face significant privacy risks from malicious servers. Even an "honest-but-curious" server, while adhering to the FL protocol, can attempt to infer sensitive client information by analyzing aggregated model updates, potentially revealing private data points, patterns, or client identities. A key privacy threat is a two-stage attack: Membership Inference Attack (MIA) followed by Source Inference Attack (SIA).

- **MIA:** The server determines if a specific data point  $x$  was used to train the global model  $\theta_g$ :  $MIA(\theta_g, x) = P(x \in D_{\theta_g})$ , where  $P(x \in D_{\theta_g})$  is the probability that  $x$  belongs to the training data  $D_{\theta_g}$ .
- **SIA:** If the MIA suggests  $x$  was part of the training data, the server identifies the contributing client  $i$ :  $SIA(\theta_i, x) = P(\text{Client}_i | x, \theta_i)$ , where  $P(\text{Client}_i | x, \theta_i)$  is the probability that client  $i$  contributed  $x$  to the model  $\theta_i$ .

As shown by Hongsheng et al. [19], combining these attacks can severely compromise client privacy. Moreover, prior work has shown the inherent limitations of auditing MIA [4].

Our work focuses on the disparity in privacy risk across clients, which we attribute to differences in local overfitting during training. This threat model underscores the need for equitable privacy mechanisms in FL.

Given this threat model where a compromised server enables SIA attacks, our objective is twofold:

- (O1): Addressing the symptoms: Develop an aggregation method on the server side to ensure fair privacy risk distribution among clients.
- (O2): Addressing the causes: Provide feedback to leaking clients, enabling them to adjust local updates to reduce overfitting and improve system fairness in privacy.

Instead of eliminating SIA, we aim to mitigate its impact by equitably distributing the inherent privacy risk. We therefore assume a *compromised* server and

cooperative clients capable of tuning their local updates to enhance *FinP*.

## 5 Fairness-in-Privacy Framework in Federated Learning

This section presents our framework, *FinP*, designed to improve fairness in privacy within federated learning (FL), particularly in the context of Source Inference Attacks (SIAs). Our core principle is that privacy risks should be distributed equitably among all participating clients, preventing any single client from bearing a disproportionate burden.

This disparity in privacy risks among clients can arise from various factors, including heterogeneous data distributions, varying computational resources, and differences in local training dynamics. Simply preventing average privacy leakage is insufficient; we must ensure that no individual client bears a disproportionate risk. This motivates our focus on fairness-in-privacy, which aims to equitably distribute privacy risks across all participating clients.

An overview of the *FinP* framework is shown in Figure 1. We argue that addressing fairness in privacy requires a two-pronged approach: handling it both at the server (during aggregation) and at the client (during local training). Server-side interventions, specifically adaptive aggregation, are crucial to mitigating the impact of existing disparities in privacy leakage. By carefully weighing client updates based on their estimated privacy risk, we can prevent highly vulnerable clients from unduly influencing the global model and further exacerbating the unfairness. However, server-side interventions alone are insufficient. They address the \*symptoms\* of unfairness but not the underlying \*causes\*.

The root cause of privacy disparity often lies in differences in local training dynamics, particularly local overfitting. When a client's model overfits its local data, it becomes more susceptible to privacy attacks, such as Source Inference Attacks (SIAs). Therefore, we also address fairness in privacy on the client side by introducing a collaborative overfitting reduction strategy. This strategy aims to proactively reduce the likelihood of local overfitting, thereby minimizing the initial disparity in privacy risks before aggregation. By ranking clients based on their estimated relative overfitting and incorporating this rank into a local regularization scheme,

we encourage clients to learn more generalizable representations, reducing their vulnerability to the disparity in privacy leakage.

This two-pronged approach, combining adaptive aggregation at the server and collaborative overfitting reduction at the client, provides a comprehensive framework for achieving fairness in privacy in FL. By minimizing both the symptoms and the root causes of privacy disparity, our aim is to create a more equitable and robust FL system. This can be formalized in Equation 1.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{FinP} &= \min(\text{Symptoms, Causes}) \\ &= \text{FinP}_{\text{server}} + \text{FinP}_{\text{client}} \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

### 5.1 Formalizing Symptoms of Fairness in Privacy on Server Side

We formalize the fairness in privacy problem as follows: Given an FL system with  $K$  clients and a global model  $\theta_g$ , our goal is to achieve fair privacy risk across all clients against successful SIAs.


We consider the privacy risk  $p_k(\mathbf{w})$  for client  $k$  to be influenced by the aggregation weights  $\mathbf{w} = [w_1, w_2, \dots, w_K]$ , where  $w_k$  represents the weight assigned for the client  $k$ , with the constraint  $\sum_{k=1}^K w_k = 1$ . This allows us to account for the varying client contributions to the global model.

We define Fairness in Privacy (*FinP*) as minimizing the variance in privacy risks across clients. Our objective is to find the optimal weights for aggregation  $\mathbf{w}$  that minimize the difference between individual client privacy risks and the average privacy risk. This is expressed in Equation 2 as:

$$\text{FinP}_{\text{server}} = \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \left\| \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{w}) - \frac{1}{K} \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{w}) \otimes \mathbf{1} \right\| + \left\| \frac{1}{K} \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{w}) \right\|, \quad (2)$$

Where:

- $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{w}) = [p_1(\mathbf{w}), \dots, p_K(\mathbf{w})]^T$  is the vector of privacy risks for all clients given the aggregation weights  $\mathbf{w}$ .
- $\mathbf{1}$  is a vector of ones of length  $K$ .
- $\mathcal{W} = \{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^K \mid \sum_{k=1}^K w_k = 1, w_k \geq 0 \forall k\}$  is the set of valid aggregation weights.



**Figure 1: Fairness in Privacy *FinP* framework in federated learning. The framework addresses the causes and the symptoms to achieve *FinP*.**

The term  $\frac{1}{K} \mathbb{1}^T \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{w})$  represents the average privacy risk. Equation (2) minimizes the Euclidean distance between individual privacy risks and this average, thus minimizing the disparity in privacy risks. Intuitively, we seek optimal aggregation weights to achieve a more equitable distribution of privacy risk, ensuring no client is disproportionately exposed.

We hypothesize that differences in local overfitting are a primary cause of unequal privacy leakage among FL clients. When a client’s model overfits to its local data, it effectively memorizes sensitive information, making it more vulnerable to SIAs and leading to an unfair distribution of privacy risk.

We quantify the \*symptoms\* of overfitting in the server by measuring the discrepancy between each client’s local model update and the global model using the Principle Component Analysis (PCA) distance [9]. For client  $k$ , this distance, denoted as  $p_k$ , serves as a proxy for privacy risk; a larger  $p_k$  signifies a symptom of greater overfitting and, thus, higher risk.

Our proposed adaptive aggregation method aims to balance client contributions based on these PCA distances. By minimizing the variance of  $p_k$  using the  $FinP_{server}$  objective (Equation 2), we reduce the influence of clients exhibiting high overfitting (high  $p_k$ ) and increase the influence of those with lower overfitting.

This dynamic adjustment, performed in each FL round, promotes a more equitable distribution of privacy risk. However, adaptive aggregation alone is insufficient to eliminate overfitting entirely and achieve full fairness in privacy; collaborative client-side adjustments are also required, as will be explained in Section 5.2.

## 5.2 Formalizing Causes of Fairness in Privacy on Client Side

To further mitigate local overfitting (\*causes\*) and enhance fairness in privacy, we propose a collaborative client strategy. This leverages the principle that clients with higher overfitting benefit from more diverse data.

The top Hessian eigenvalue ( $\lambda_{\max}$ ) and Hessian trace ( $H_T$ ) have been identified as important metrics for characterizing the loss landscape and generalization capabilities of neural networks [23]. Lower values of  $\lambda_{\max}$  and  $H_T$  typically indicate improved robustness to weight perturbations, leading to smoother training and better convergence. This is especially critical in FL, where the non-IID nature of data across clients creates distributional shifts that can exacerbate training instability and introduce fairness concerns. These distributional shifts can disproportionately impact certain client groups, leading to biased model performance [29].

As we are interested in *FinP*, we determine each client's relative overfitting by calculating the average pairwise difference across the top Hessian eigenvalue ( $\lambda_{\max}$ ) and Hessian trace ( $H_T$ ):

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\Delta}_k &= \frac{1}{K-1} \sum_{j=1, j \neq k}^K |\lambda_{\max}^k - \lambda_{\max}^j|, \\ \bar{H}_k &= \frac{1}{K-1} \sum_{j=1, j \neq k}^K |H_T^k - H_T^j|, \\ \rho_k &= \frac{\frac{\bar{\Delta}_k}{\max \bar{\Delta}} + \frac{\bar{H}_k}{\max \bar{H}}}{2},\end{aligned}\quad (3)$$

where  $\lambda_{\max}^k$  and  $\lambda_{\max}^j$  are the top Hessian eigenvalue of the local models of clients  $k$  and  $j$ , respectively. Similarly,  $H_T^k$  and  $H_T^j$  are the Hessian trace of the local models of clients  $k$  and  $j$ , respectively. We used the normalized average of both  $\bar{\Delta}_k$  and  $\bar{H}_k$  to quantify the client's *overfitting relative rank* ( $\rho_k$ ), to serve as a proxy for relative privacy leakage risk. Computing the Hessian eigenvalue and trace are done on the cloud server, and hence, there is no overhead of their computation on the client.

We incorporate this overfitting rank into the local training process using a regularization term based on the Lipschitz constant, approximated by the spectral norm of the Jacobian matrix ( $\|J_k\|$ ) [27]. In particular, a smaller Lipschitz constant implies smoother functions, less prone to overfitting, and better generalization. The modified local loss function for client  $k$  is:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}'_k &= \mathcal{L}_k + \beta \cdot \rho_k \cdot \|J_k\|, \\ \text{FinP}_{\text{client}} &= \min_{\theta_k} \mathcal{L}'_k\end{aligned}\quad (4)$$

where:

- $\mathcal{L}_k$  is the original local loss function.
- $\rho_k$  is an adaptive controlling regularization strength that depends on the overfitting rank.
- $\theta_k$  are the local parameters of the client model that minimize the total loss  $\mathcal{L}'_k$
- $\beta$  is the impact factor, which controls the impact of the Lipschitz constant based on the learning task.

This penalizes models with large Lipschitz constants, promoting generalization. The regularization strength is weighted by  $\rho_k$  adaptively at each round, applying

stronger regularization to clients with higher overfitting ranks. This collaborative approach, using  $\rho_k$  to guide local training, preserves privacy while promoting equitable learning and reducing disparity in privacy risk.

$\beta$  is a task-dependent parameter to balance the the loss  $\mathcal{L}_k$  and Lipschitz loss. A larger  $\beta$  greatly impacts fairness regularization but could make training unstable and fail to converge.  $\beta$  is a trade-off parameter between fairness and accuracy while  $\rho_k$  changes at every round to control regularization strength adaptively.

## 6 Evaluation

### 6.1 Federated Learning System Setup

**Setup for Human Activity Recognition.** We utilized the UCI HAR Dataset [35], a widely used dataset in activity recognition research, especially in FL [7, 46]. The dataset includes sensor data from 30 subjects (aged 19–48) performing six activities: walking, walking upstairs, walking downstairs, sitting, standing, and laying. The data was collected using a Samsung Galaxy S II smartphone worn on the waist, capturing readings from both the accelerometer and gyroscope sensors. Each subject in the dataset was treated as an individual client in the FL setup, preserving the data's unique activity patterns and non-IID nature. We allocated 70% of each client's data for training using 5-fold cross-validation and 30% for testing, enabling evaluation of the model on independently collected test data. Data preprocessing involved applying noise filters to the raw signals and segmenting the data using a sliding window approach with a window length of 2.56 seconds and a 50% overlap, resulting in 128 readings per window. We selected the HAR dataset for evaluation *FinP* due to its inherited non-IID structure.

We trained the model in a federated learning setting using the FedAvg aggregation method over 20 global communication rounds. Each client trained locally with a batch size of 64, 5 local epochs per round, a learning rate of 0.001 using Adam optimizer, and an impact factor  $\beta$  of 1. These parameters ensured balanced model updates from each client while maintaining computational efficiency across the federated network. Each local model (one per subject) analyzes its time-series sensor data using Temporal Convolutional Network (TCN)

model[3]. The TCN model, designed for time-series data, uses causal convolutions to capture temporal dependencies while preserving sequence order. The architecture includes two convolutional layers, each followed by max-pooling and dropout, with a final fully connected layer for classifying the six activity classes.

**Setup for CIFAR-10.** The CIFAR-10 dataset consists of 60000 32x32 color images in 10 classes, with 6000 images per class. There are 50000 training images and 10000 test images. We use the Dirichlet distribution  $Dir(\alpha)$  to divide the CIFAR-10 dataset into  $K$  unbalanced subsets similar to previous work in the literature [19, 29], with  $\alpha = 0.1$ . Figure 2 shows how the data are distributed among clients. We created 10 clients and employed ResNet56 [17] as the model. Similar to the setup in HAR, we trained the model over 20 global communication rounds. Each client is trained locally with the same parameters in HAR and an impact factor  $\beta$  of 0.05. A smaller  $\beta$  is used here since CIFAR-10 is a more complicated task than HAR, and a smaller  $\beta$  can make the model converge easier since the model is more sensitive to classification loss.

**SIA Attack.** We used the Source Inference Attacks (SIA) setup explained in [20], where we randomly sampled training data from each client dataset. We combined those samples in one dataset and used them as target records. This is a valid assumption, given an already successful Membership Inference Attacks (MIA) attack. SIA attacks in Federated Learning represent a privacy threat beyond Membership Inference Attacks (MIA). While MIAs determine whether a data instance was used for training, SIA aims to identify the specific client who owns that training record. In a practical scenario, an adversary, such as an honest-but-curious central server who knows the clients' identities and receives their model updates, could leverage this knowledge to trace training data back to its source, thus compromising client privacy. To launch SIA in FL setting, clients send their updated local model parameters to the server. The server uses each client's model to calculate the prediction loss on the target record. The client with the smallest loss is identified as the most probable source of that target record. This approach exploits the differences in model performance on the target record to infer its origin.

## 6.2 Metrics for Comparison

Recent work in the literature suggests SIA vulnerability wherein an adversary can potentially identify the origin of a specific record can be achieved by analyzing the prediction loss of individual client models [20]. In particular, SIA exploits the observation that the client model exhibiting the lowest prediction loss for a given record is most likely to be the source of that record. We assess our *FinP* approach in achieving fairness in privacy using the following metrics:

**1- Reduction of SIA accuracy disparity among clients.** *FinP* aims to reduce the SIA accuracy disparity among clients. A balanced SIA accuracy across clients indicates a more equitable distribution of privacy risk within the FL system. *FinP* enhances the overall fairness in privacy by ensuring that no particular client is significantly more vulnerable to source inference attacks than others.

To assess the fairness of risk of SIA accuracy across clients in our FL system, we employ the Coefficient of Variation (CoV). Recognizing that fairness is related to the variance of shared utility rather than strict equality [22], we adapt the CoV to measure the dispersion of SIA accuracy among clients.

For  $K$  clients, we define the SIA accuracy for client  $i$  as  $SIA_i$ . The mean SIA accuracy ( $\mu$ ) is calculated as  $\mu = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K SIA_i$ . The CoV of SIA accuracy  $CoV(SIA)$  is then computed as:

$$CoV(SIA) = \frac{\sigma}{\mu} = \frac{\sqrt{\frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K (SIA_i - \mu)^2}}{\mu}, \quad (5)$$

where  $\sigma$  is the standard deviation of SIA accuracies. A lower CoV indicates a more equitable distribution of SIA accuracy across clients, suggesting greater fairness in privacy. To facilitate interpretation as a fairness percentage between 0 and 1 (where 1 represents perfect fairness), we use the following Fairness Index (FI (SIA)) transformation:

$$FI(SIA) = \frac{1}{1 + CoV(SIA)} \quad (6)$$

A FI value of 1 indicates perfect fairness (all clients have the same SIA accuracy), while lower FI values indicate increasing disparities in SIA accuracy among clients.




Figure 2: CIFAR dataset profile for each client after Dirichlet sampling with  $\alpha = 0.1$

**2- Reduction of SIA confidence disparity among clients.** Beside reduction of SIA accuracy disparity among clients, as the SIA approach relies on identifying the client model with the minimum prediction loss. When a significant discrepancy exists between the prediction losses of different client models, an attacker can make source inferences with higher confidence. *FinP* aims to reduce inter-client loss differences so that it can diminish the effectiveness of SIA attacks by lowering the attacker’s confidence in their inferences. We evaluate the SIA confidence disparity by using the prediction loss CoV(Loss) and FI(Loss) similarly to Equation 5 and Equation 6.

**3- Success rate of SIA.** *FinP* aims to reduce disparities in both SIA success rate and prediction loss across clients. However, simply reducing disparity is insufficient; it is crucial to avoid achieving this by merely increasing the SIA success rate of less vulnerable clients to match that of the most vulnerable ones. Such an outcome would not represent a genuine improvement in privacy. Therefore, we evaluate the overall impact of *FinP* on SIA vulnerability using two metrics: Mean(SIA) and Max(SIA). In particular, Mean(SIA) represents the average SIA success rate across all clients and communication rounds, while Max(SIA) indicates the highest SIA success rate observed across all clients and rounds. Lower values for both metrics signify increased resilience against SIA attacks.

**4- Accuracy Metric.** Accuracy is calculated over all test dataset points for all clients using the formula:

$$\text{Accuracy} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}(\hat{y}_i = y_i)}{N} \quad (7)$$

where:

- $N$  is the total number of test samples across all clients,
- $\hat{y}_i$  is the predicted label for the  $i$ -th test sample,
- $y_i$  is the true label of the  $i$ -th test sample.

We evaluated *FinP* through two distinct case studies, using the Human Activity Recognition (HAR) dataset (Section 6.3) and the CIFAR-10 image classification dataset (Section 6.4). For HAR, we compared four approaches: (1) a Baseline Federated Learning (FL) implementation using FedAvg, adapted from [20]; (2)  $FinP_{\text{server}}$ , which applies adaptive aggregation at the server without client collaboration (Equation 2); (3)  $FinP_{\text{client}}$ , which employs client-side collaboration to mitigate relative overfitting but omits adaptive server aggregation (Equation 4); and (4) the full *FinP* approach, incorporating both  $FinP_{\text{server}}$  and  $FinP_{\text{client}}$  (Equation 1).

In the CIFAR-10 evaluation, we compared three approaches: (1) the same Baseline FL using FedAvg from [20]; (2) FedAlign [29], a state-of-the-art FL method designed to address data heterogeneity in CIFAR-10; and (3) the full *FinP* approach, again incorporating both  $FinP_{\text{server}}$  and  $FinP_{\text{client}}$  (Equation 1).



(a) Coefficient of variation for SIA accuracy  $\text{CoV}(\text{SIA})$ .(b) Fairness index of SIA accuracy  $\text{FI}(\text{SIA})$ .

Figure 3: Disparity of SIA accuracy among clients using HAR dataset.

### 6.3 *FinP* Performance on HAR

**6.3.1 Impact on the disparity of SIA accuracy among clients.** Our results demonstrate a significant improvement in fairness with minimal impact on overall performance. Figure 3 presents the Coefficient of Variation of SIA accuracy ( $\text{CoV}(\text{SIA})$ ) and Fairness Index of SIA accuracy ( $\text{FI}(\text{SIA})$ ), as defined in Equation 5 and Equation 6, respectively. *FinP* achieves a  $\text{CoV}(\text{SIA})$  of 0.596 and a  $\text{FI}(\text{SIA})$  of 0.739, compared to the Baseline's  $\text{CoV}(\text{SIA})$  of 0.893 and  $\text{FI}(\text{SIA})$  of 0.617. This represents a substantial reduction of 33.26% in  $\text{CoV}(\text{SIA})$  and a 19.77% improvement in  $\text{FI}(\text{SIA})$  compared to baseline, clearly indicating that *FinP* significantly enhances the fairness of SIA accuracy.

**6.3.2 Impact on the disparity of SIA confidence among clients.** Similarly, our results demonstrate improvement in fairness with respect to the SIA confidence in prediction among clients represented as  $\text{CoV}(\text{Loss})$




(a) Coefficient of variation for the prediction loss  $\text{CoV}(\text{Loss})$ .(b) Fairness index of the prediction loss  $\text{FI}(\text{Loss})$ .


Figure 4: Disparity of prediction loss among clients using HAR dataset.

and  $\text{FI}(\text{Loss})$  as explained in Section 6.2. As shown in Figure 4, *FinP* achieves a  $\text{CoV}(\text{Loss})$  of 0.778 and  $\text{FI}(\text{Loss})$  of 62.8%. This represents a reduction of 10.95% in  $\text{CoV}(\text{Loss})$  and a 19.77% improvement in  $\text{FI}(\text{Loss})$  compared to the Baseline, clearly indicating that *FinP* enhances the fairness of SIA confidence in prediction among clients.

**6.3.3 Impact on SIA success rate.** While Table 1 shows a marginal increase of less than 1% in  $\text{Mean}(\text{SIA})$  success rate and less than 0.1% in  $\text{Max}(\text{SIA})$  success rate, these gains are secondary to the primary objective of fairness improvement. The key achievement of *FinP* is the demonstrably more equitable distribution of privacy protection. *FinP* achieves this by significantly improving the uniformity of SIA success rates and reducing SIA confidence across clients.



(a) Global model training accuracy.




(b) Global model testing accuracy.

Figure 5: Global model classification accuracy using HAR dataset.


Table 1: SIA accuracy performance in HAR dataset.

	Mean(SIA)(%) ↓	Max(SIA)(%) ↓
Baseline [20]	<b>23.78</b>	31.00
FinP <sub>server</sub>	25.22	31.20
FinP <sub>client</sub>	25.52	<b>30.20</b>
FinP	24.49	31.10

Furthermore, *FinP* maintains competitive classification performance. As shown in Table 2, the global model’s testing accuracy only decreases by a 1.02%. This impact on accuracy is further supported by Figure 5, which demonstrates that *FinP* converges at a comparable rate to the Baseline. Therefore, *FinP* effectively balances the critical need for fairness with the practical requirement of maintaining performance.



(a) Coefficient of Variation of the PCA distance to the global model ( $PCA_d$ ).



(b) Fairness Index of PCA distance to the global model ( $PCA_d$ ).

Figure 6: Disparity of PCA distance between the global model and the client models using HAR dataset.

Table 2: HAR experiment: global model classification accuracy.

	Training (%)	Testing (%)
Baseline [20]	<b>96.52</b>	<b>96.94</b>
FinP <sub>server</sub>	95.79	95.77
FinP <sub>client</sub>	95.67	95.99
FinP	95.05	95.92

6.3.4 *Ablation study.* We conducted an ablation study to evaluate the individual contributions of *FinP*’s server-side and client-side components. Isolating the server-side adaptive aggregation (*FinP<sub>server</sub>*) revealed a nuanced impact on fairness metrics. While *FinP<sub>server</sub>* reduced the variation in PCA distance ( $PCA_d$ ) by 1.3% (Figure 6), it also resulted in a slight shift in both FI (SIA)

and FI(Loss) by  $-0.2\%$  and  $-1.3\%$ , respectively (Figures 3b and 4b). This suggests that server-side adaptation alone ( $FinP_{server}$ ) primarily influences the distribution of model distances and has a less direct impact on the fairness metrics themselves. This observation motivated the investigation of client-side factors, specifically the variation in overfitting among clients, to further enhance fairness.

Analysis of Hessian eigenvalues ( $\lambda_{max}$ ) and trace ( $H_T$ ) revealed a strong correlation (Spearman's rank correlation coefficient  $\approx 1$ ) between these two metrics, both indicative of how well a local model fits its local data (Figure 7). Based on this correlation, these metrics were given equal weight in Equation 3. Focusing on mitigating client-side overfitting through  $FinP_{client}$  yielded significant improvements in fairness. Figures 3 and 4 demonstrate the substantial gains in both SIA accuracy and prediction loss fairness. Specifically,  $FinP_{client}$  alone improved FI(SIA) by 16.37% and FI(Loss) by 8.30% (Figures 3b and 4b). Furthermore, combining  $FinP_{server}$  with  $FinP_{client}$  resulted in even greater fairness gains, with an additional 3.13% improvement in FI(SIA) and 2.65% in FI(Loss) compared to using  $FinP_{client}$  alone. This indicates that while  $FinP_{server}$ 's primary effect is on model distance distribution, it contributes synergistically to the fairness improvements achieved by  $FinP_{client}$  when both are employed.

More results related to the adaptation of the aggregation weights  $\mathcal{W}$  (Equation 2) and the regularization strength  $\rho_k$  (Equation 4) are shown in Appendix A.

## 6.4 $FinP$ Performance in CIFAR-10 dataset

In the CIFAR-10 dataset,  $FinP$  demonstrates a significant improvement in fairness in privacy, with competitive accuracy. Figure 8 shows the Fairness Index of prediction loss (FI(Loss)) for FedAvg, FedAlign, and  $FinP$  are 68.8%, 58.0%, and 83.3%, respectively.  $FinP$  achieves a substantial increase in FI(Loss) of 21.1% compared to FedAvg and 43.6% compared to FedAlign. Notably, despite employing a distillation technique, FedAlign failed to effectively mitigate SIA risks, exhibiting a higher CoV(Loss) of 0.862 compared to FedAvg's 0.674. This increased CoV(Loss) can empower attackers with greater confidence in predicting the source client, consequently leading to higher SIA success rates.

**Table 3: SIA accuracy performance in CIFAR-10 dataset with Resnet model.**


	Mean SIA(%) ↓	Max SIA(%) ↓
Baseline [20]	30.86	38.52
FedAlign [29]	30.72	38.46
$FinP$	<b>10.07</b>	<b>10.67</b>

Although FedAlign and FedAvg exhibit similar Mean and Max SIA success rates (Table 3),  $FinP$  effectively mitigates these risks. As shown in Figure 9 and Table 3,  $FinP$  reduces the Mean(SIA) success rate to 10.07%, approaching the random-guess probability of 1/10 (10%) for a 10-class classification task. Specifically,  $FinP$  reduces the Mean(SIA) success rate from 30.86% to 10.07% and the Max(SIA) success rate from 38.52% to 10.67%. As shown in Figure 10, the  $FinP$  demonstrates comparable CoV(SIA) and FI(SIA), yet exhibits a substantial reduction in the average success rate of SIA as mentioned above.

Moreover,  $FinP$  maintains and slightly improves classification accuracy. Figure 11 shows that  $FinP$  achieves a testing accuracy of 78.46%, marginally higher than FedAvg's 77.62%. This 0.84% improvement is attributed to the global model's aggregation of generalized client models through Lipschitz regularization rather than models overfit to individual datasets. In summary,  $FinP$  effectively mitigates SIA privacy risks in FL training in CIFAR-10 by improving client generalization and reducing loss variation across client models, all while maintaining or slightly improving classification performance.

## 6.5 Summary of $FinP$ in HAR and CIFAR-10 results

In summary, our evaluation across HAR and CIFAR-10 datasets demonstrates the effectiveness of  $FinP$  in achieving fairness in the impact of source inference attacks (SIA) while maintaining or improving model performance. Although  $FinP$  successfully achieves a more equitable distribution of SIA risk among clients in the HAR dataset, the inherent variability of human activity data, with each client representing a single individual exclusively, limits the complete elimination of SIA vulnerability, as it is difficult for client models to be completely indistinguishable. Nevertheless, as detailed in Section 6.3,  $FinP$  significantly enhances fairness in



**Figure 7: Scatter figures for Hessian max eigenvalue ( $\lambda_{\max}$ ) and Hessian trace ( $H_T$ ). The figure shows the value of each clients Hessian max eigenvalue and trace in the Baseline method for HAR dataset from rounds 6 to 11. All the rounds are depicted in Appendix B.**

privacy. Conversely, on the CIFAR-10 dataset, *FinP* effectively mitigates SIA risks as detailed in Section 6.4. This result is attributed to the non-IID sampling of CIFAR-10 subsets across clients, where all data in each subset are part of the comprehensive CIFAR-10 dataset. This characteristic enables the regularization of client models to be indistinguishable and coupled with applying Lipschitz constant loss during local training and adaptive aggregation at the server. These mechanisms collectively promote client model generalization and reduce loss variation, thereby neutralizing the effectiveness of source inference attacks (SIA).


## 7 Discussion of Limitations and Future Work

**Differential Privacy against SIA.** Other work in the literature, including [19], investigated the use of differential privacy [11] as a defense mechanism against SIA in FL. Differential privacy was chosen due to its theoretical guarantees for privacy protection against inference attacks. However, their findings revealed that vanilla DP is not an effective solution for mitigating SIAs in FL, as it resulted in a significant drop in classification accuracy with only a minimal decrease in SIA


accuracy. In contrast, *FinP* demonstrates that it is possible to effectively reduce the SIA success rate to random guesses while maintaining performance.

**Limitations.** Although *FinP* represents a step towards fair privacy in FL, it has some limitations. Our current evaluation relies on a specific type of privacy attack (SIA) and is evaluated over two datasets (HAR) and (CIFAR-10). Future work should investigate the effectiveness of *FinP* against other privacy attacks, such as attribute inference attacks, and on more diverse datasets that better represent real-world heterogeneity. Furthermore, our client-side approach assumes a degree of client cooperation. Investigating mechanisms that incentivize or enforce client participation in the collaborative overfitting reduction strategy is an important direction for future research.


In this paper, we focus on SIA as a privacy risk. SIA is only more relevant in non-IID data where each client has a distinct private dataset, making this attack more successful. This is prevalent in human-centric applications where the data from different humans are non-IID by nature due to the intrinsic inter- intra-human variability [49]. However, in other setups where clients in FL have IID data, this SIA attack may not be as successful [19].




(a) Coefficient of variation for the prediction loss  $CoV(Loss)$ .



(a) Coefficient of variation for SIA accuracy  $CoV(SIA)$ .



(b) Fairness index of the prediction loss  $FI(Loss)$ .



(b) Fairness index of SIA accuracy  $FI(SIA)$ .

Figure 8: Disparity of prediction loss among clients using CIFAR-10 dataset.

Figure 10: Disparity of SIA accuracy among clients using CIFAR-10 dataset.





Figure 9: Average SIA accuracy across rounds in CIFAR-10 dataset.

**Future Work and Broader Impact.** While we consider the SIA attack in FL as a measure of privacy risk, our general definition of *FinP* can be applied to other


notions of privacy risk beyond the singular decision setups like FL. In our future work, we will explore the fairness-in-privacy in setups with sequential decision-making where the privacy risk is measured over a trajectory of decisions [50] instead of singular decision-making. Future work will also investigate the potential for *FinP* to be integrated with other privacy-enhancing technologies, such as differential privacy and secure multi-party computation, to provide even stronger privacy guarantees. Finally, we aim to investigate the implications of our work for data governance and regulatory frameworks, contributing to the broader discussion on responsible AI development and deployment.

## 8 Conclusion

Our *FinP* framework addresses a critical gap in federated learning (FL): the inequitable distribution of privacy risks. While traditional FL focuses on preserving



(a) Global model training accuracy.



(b) Global model testing accuracy.

**Figure 11: Global model classification accuracy using CIFAR-10.**

average privacy, it often overlooks the significant disparities that can exist between clients. These disparities, stemming from heterogeneous data, varying computational resources, and differences in local training dynamics, can lead to situations where specific individuals or groups bear a disproportionate privacy burden. This raises significant ethical concerns, as it can exacerbate existing inequalities and create new forms of discrimination based on data ownership and access. *FinP* directly tackles this issue by employing a two-pronged approach: server-side adaptive aggregation and client-side collaborative overfitting reduction. This combined approach aims to create a more equitable and robust FL system, promoting fairness-in-privacy for all participants. The formalization of our strategy in Equation 1 highlights the importance of addressing both the symptoms and causes of the privacy disparity. Our results showed an average improvement in fairness in privacy by 19.77% of the fairness index in the

HAR dataset. Moreover, *FinP* revealed the potential to reduce the success rate of the SIA to a level comparable to that of a random guess in the CIFAR-10 dataset while maintaining minimal impact on performance.

## Acknowledgments

This work is supported by the U.S. National Science Foundation (NSF) under grant number 2339266.


## References

- [1] 2018. General data protection regulation. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/General\\_Data\\_Protection\\_Regulation](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/General_Data_Protection_Regulation).
- [2] Martin Abadi, Andy Chu, Ian Goodfellow, H Brendan McMahan, Ilya Mironov, Kunal Talwar, and Li Zhang. 2016. Deep learning with differential privacy. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*. 308–318.
- [3] Shaojie Bai, J Zico Kolter, and Vladlen Koltun. 2018. An empirical evaluation of generic convolutional and recurrent networks for sequence modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.01271* (2018).
- [4] Hongyan Chang, Brandon Edwards, Anindya S Paul, and Reza Shokri. 2024. Efficient privacy auditing in federated learning. In *33rd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 24)*. 307–323.
- [5] Daoyuan Chen, Dawei Gao, Weirui Kuang, Yaliang Li, and Bolin Ding. 2022. pfl-bench: A comprehensive benchmark for personalized federated learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 9344–9360.
- [6] Huiqiang Chen, Tianqing Zhu, Tao Zhang, Wanlei Zhou, and Philip S Yu. 2023. Privacy and fairness in Federated learning: on the perspective of Tradeoff. *Comput. Surveys* 56, 2 (2023), 1–37.
- [7] Federico Concone, Cedric Ferdico, Giuseppe Lo Re, and Marco Morana. 2022. A federated learning approach for distributed human activity recognition. In *2022 IEEE International Conference on Smart Computing (SMARTCOMP)*. IEEE, 269–274.
- [8] Rachel Cummings, Varun Gupta, Dhamma Kimpara, and Jamie Morgenstern. 2019. On the compatibility of privacy and fairness. In *Adjunct Publication of the 27th Conference on User Modeling, Adaptation and Personalization*. 309–315.
- [9] Alp Emre Durmus, Zhao Yue, Matas Ramon, Mattina Matthew, Whatmough Paul, and Saligrama Venkatesh. 2021. Federated learning based on dynamic regularization. In *International conference on learning representations*.
- [10] Cynthia Dwork, Moritz Hardt, Toniann Pitassi, Omer Reingold, and Richard Zemel. 2012. Fairness through awareness. In *Proceedings of the 3rd innovations in theoretical computer science conference*. 214–226.
- [11] Cynthia Dwork, Frank McSherry, Kobbi Nissim, and Adam Smith. 2006. Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis. In *Theory of Cryptography: Third Theory of Cryptography Conference, TCC 2006, New York, NY, USA, March 4-7, 2006. Proceedings 3*. Springer, 265–284.


- [12] Yahya H Ezzeldin, Shen Yan, Chaoyang He, Emilio Ferrara, and A Salman Avestimehr. 2023. Fairfed: Enabling group fairness in federated learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 37. 7494–7502.
- [13] Grace Fox, Trevor Clohessy, Lisa van der Werff, Pierangelo Rosati, and Theo Lynn. 2021. Exploring the competing influences of privacy concerns and positive beliefs on citizen acceptance of contact tracing mobile applications. *Computers in Human Behavior* 121 (2021), 106806.
- [14] Avi Goldfarb and Catherine Tucker. 2012. Shifts in privacy concerns. *American Economic Review* 102, 3 (2012), 349–53.
- [15] Yuhao Gu, Yuebin Bai, and Shubin Xu. 2022. CS-MIA: Membership inference attack based on prediction confidence series in federated learning. *Journal of Information Security and Applications* 67 (2022), 103201.
- [16] Ronan Hamon, Henrik Junklewitz, Ignacio Sanchez, Gianclaudio Malgieri, and Paul De Hert. 2022. Bridging the gap between AI and explainability in the GDPR: towards trustworthiness-by-design in automated decision-making. *IEEE Computational Intelligence Magazine* 17, 1 (2022), 72–85.
- [17] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. 2016. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 770–778.
- [18] Hongsheng Hu, Zoran Salcic, Lichao Sun, Gillian Dobbie, Philip S Yu, and Xuyun Zhang. 2022. Membership inference attacks on machine learning: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 54, 11s (2022), 1–37.
- [19] Hongsheng Hu, Zoran Salcic, Lichao Sun, Gillian Dobbie, and Xuyun Zhang. 2021. Source inference attacks in federated learning. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*. IEEE, 1102–1107.
- [20] Hongsheng Hu, Xuyun Zhang, Zoran Salcic, Lichao Sun, Kim-Kwang Raymond Choo, and Gillian Dobbie. 2023. Source inference attacks: Beyond membership inference attacks in federated learning. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing* (2023).
- [21] Matthew Jagielski, Jonathan Ullman, and Alina Oprea. 2020. Auditing differentially private machine learning: How private is private SGD? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 22205–22216.
- [22] Rajendra K Jain, Dah-Ming W Chiu, William R Hawe, et al. 1984. A quantitative measure of fairness and discrimination. *ACM Transaction on Computer System* (1984).
- [23] Yiding Jiang, Behnam Neyshabur, Hossein Mobahi, Dilip Krishnan, and Samy Bengio. 2020. Fantastic Generalization Measures and Where to Find Them. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=SjgIPJBFvH>
- [24] Haiming Jin, Lu Su, Bolin Ding, Klara Nahrstedt, and Nikita Borisov. 2016. Enabling privacy-preserving incentives for mobile crowd sensing systems. In *2016 IEEE 36th International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems (ICDCS)*. IEEE, 344–353.
- [25] Jon Kleinberg, Jens Ludwig, Sendhil Mullainathan, and Ashesh Rambachan. 2018. Algorithmic fairness. In *Aea papers and proceedings*, Vol. 108. 22–27.
- [26] Matt J Kusner, Joshua Loftus, Chris Russell, and Ricardo Silva. 2017. Counterfactual fairness. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [27] Jeremiah Liu, Zi Lin, Shreyas Padhy, Dustin Tran, Tania Bedrax Weiss, and Balaji Lakshminarayanan. 2020. Simple and principled uncertainty estimation with deterministic deep learning via distance awareness. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 7498–7512.
- [28] Ninareh Mehrabi, Fred Morstatter, Nripsuta Saxena, Kristina Lerman, and Aram Galstyan. 2021. A survey on bias and fairness in machine learning. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 54, 6 (2021), 1–35.
- [29] Matias Mendieta, Taojiannan Yang, Pu Wang, Minwoo Lee, Zhengming Ding, and Chen Chen. 2022. Local learning matters: Rethinking data heterogeneity in federated learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 8397–8406.
- [30] Deirdre K Mulligan, Colin Koopman, and Nick Doty. 2016. Privacy is an essentially contested concept: a multi-dimensional analytic for mapping privacy. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* 374, 2083 (2016), 20160118.
- [31] Dinh C Nguyen, Quoc-Viet Pham, Pubudu N Pathirana, Ming Ding, Aruna Seneviratne, Zihuai Lin, Octavia Dobre, and Won-Joo Hwang. 2022. Federated learning for smart healthcare: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys (Csur)* 55, 3 (2022), 1–37.
- [32] Raphael Poulain, Mirza Farhan Bin Tarek, and Rahmatollah Beheshti. 2023. Improving fairness in ai models on electronic health records: The case for federated learning methods. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*. 1599–1608.
- [33] Inioluwa Deborah Raji, Timnit Gebru, Margaret Mitchell, Joy Buolamwini, Joonseok Lee, and Emily Denton. 2020. Saving face: Investigating the ethical concerns of facial recognition auditing. In *Proceedings of the AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*. 145–151.
- [34] Ashesh Rambachan, Jon Kleinberg, Jens Ludwig, and Sendhil Mullainathan. 2020. An economic perspective on algorithmic fairness. In *AEA Papers and Proceedings*, Vol. 110. 91–95.
- [35] Jorge Reyes-Ortiz, Davide Anguita, Alessandro Ghio, Luca Oneto, and Xavier Parra. 2013. Human Activity Recognition Using Smartphones. UCI Machine Learning Repository. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24432/C54S4K>.
- [36] Nicola Rieke, Jonny Hancox, Wenqi Li, Fausto Milletari, Holger R Roth, Shadi Albarqouni, Spyridon Bakas, Mathieu N Galtier, Bennett A Landman, Klaus Maier-Hein, et al. 2020. The future of digital health with federated learning. *NPJ digital medicine* 3, 1 (2020), 1–7.
- [37] Steve Rose, Oliver Borchert, Stu Mitchell, and Sean Connelly. 2020. *Zero Trust Architecture*. Technical Report SP 800-207. National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), Gaithersburg, MD. <https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.SP.800-207>
- [38] Khotso Selialia, Yasra Chandio, and Fatima M Anwar. 2024. Mitigating Group Bias in Federated Learning for Heterogeneous Devices. In *The 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*. 1043–1054.

- [39] Yuxin Shi, Han Yu, and Cyril Leung. 2023. Towards fairness-aware federated learning. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* (2023).
- [40] Reza Shokri, Marco Stronati, Congzheng Song, and Vitaly Shmatikov. 2017. Membership inference attacks against machine learning models. In *2017 IEEE symposium on security and privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 3–18.
- [41] Spectrum News Staff. 2024. Massive data breach exposes millions of Americans. <https://spectrumlocalnews.com/nys/central-ny/news/2024/09/04/data-breach-exposes-americans-information>. Accessed: [Date you accessed the article].
- [42] Janos Sztipanovits, Xenofon Koutsoukos, Gabor Karsai, Shankar Sastry, Claire Tomlin, Werner Damm, Martin Fränzle, Jochem Rieger, Alexander Pretschner, and Frank Köster. 2019. Science of design for societal-scale cyber-physical systems: challenges and opportunities. *Cyber-Physical Systems* 5, 3 (2019), 145–172.
- [43] Mojtaba Taherisadr and Salma Elmalaki. 2024. PEaRL: Personalized Privacy of Human-Centric Systems using Early-Exit Reinforcement Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05864* (2024).
- [44] Mojtaba Taherisadr, Stelios Andrew Stavroulakis, and Salma Elmalaki. 2023. adaparl: Adaptive privacy-aware reinforcement learning for sequential decision making human-in-the-loop systems. In *Proceedings of the 8th ACM/IEEE Conference on Internet of Things Design and Implementation*. 262–274.
- [45] Alysa Ziyang Tan, Han Yu, Lizhen Cui, and Qiang Yang. 2022. Towards personalized federated learning. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems* 34, 12 (2022), 9587–9603.
- [46] Linlin Tu, Xiaomin Ouyang, Jiayu Zhou, Yuze He, and Guoliang Xing. 2021. Feddl: Federated learning via dynamic layer sharing for human activity recognition. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM Conference on Embedded Networked Sensor Systems*. 15–28.
- [47] Qiang Yang, Yang Liu, Tianjian Chen, and Yongxin Tong. 2019. Federated machine learning: Concept and applications. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)* 10, 2 (2019), 1–19.
- [48] Chen Zhang, Yu Xie, Hang Bai, Bin Yu, Weihong Li, and Yuan Gao. 2021. A survey on federated learning. *Knowledge-Based Systems* 216 (2021), 106775.
- [49] Tianyu Zhao and Salma Elmalaki. 2024. Fina: Fairness of adverse effects in decision-making of human-cyber-physical-system. In *2024 ACM/IEEE 15th International Conference on Cyber-Physical Systems (ICCPS)*. IEEE, 202–211.
- [50] Tianyu Zhao, Mojtaba Taherisadr, and Salma Elmalaki. 2024. Fairo: Fairness-aware sequential decision making for human-in-the-loop cps. In *2024 ACM/IEEE 15th International Conference on Cyber-Physical Systems (ICCPS)*. IEEE, 87–98.
- [51] Gongxi Zhu, Donghao Li, Hanlin Gu, Yuxing Han, Yuan Yao, Lixin Fan, and Qiang Yang. 2024. Evaluating Membership Inference Attacks and Defenses in Federated Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.06289* (2024).
- [52] Hangyu Zhu, Jinjin Xu, Shiqing Liu, and Yaochu Jin. 2021. Federated learning on non-IID data: A survey. *Neurocomputing* 465 (2021), 371–390.

### A Aggregation weights $w_k$ in *FinP* and controlling regularization strength $\rho_k$ in the HAR dataset



(a) Aggregation weights  $\mathcal{W}$  in Federated learning.



(b) Controlling regularization strength  $\rho_k$ .

**Figure 12: Aggregation weights  $\mathcal{W}$  in Federated learning using adaptive controlling regularization strength  $\rho_k$  shows the adaptive controlling based on the PCA distance and overfitting rank in the HAR dataset experiment.**

## B Hessian eigenvalues and Trace




Figure 13: Scatter figures for top Hessian eigenvalue ( $\lambda_{\max}$ ) and Hessian trace ( $H_T$ ) across rounds using HAR dataset. They are strongly bonded.