
FROM CENTRALIZED TO DECENTRALIZED FEDERATED LEARNING: THEORETICAL INSIGHTS, PRIVACY PRESERVATION, AND ROBUSTNESS CHALLENGES

Qiongxu Li
Aalborg University
Denmark
qili@es.aau.dk

Wenrui Yu
Aalborg University
Denmark
wenyu@es.aau.dk

Yufei Xia
IP Paris
France
yufei.xia@ip-paris.fr

Jun Pang
University of Luxembourg
Luxembourg
jun.pang@uni.lu

ABSTRACT

Federated Learning (FL) enables collaborative learning without directly sharing individual’s raw data. FL can be implemented in either a centralized (server-based) or decentralized (peer-to-peer) manner. In this survey, we present a novel perspective: the fundamental difference between *centralized* FL (CFL) and *decentralized* FL (DFL) is not merely the network topology, but the underlying training protocol: *separate aggregation* vs. *joint optimization*. We argue that this distinction in protocol leads to significant differences in model utility, privacy preservation, and robustness to attacks. We systematically review and categorize existing works in both CFL and DFL according to the type of protocol they employ. This taxonomy provides deeper insights into prior research and clarifies how various approaches relate or differ. Through our analysis, we identify key gaps in the literature. In particular, we observe a surprising lack of exploration of DFL approaches based on distributed optimization methods, despite their potential advantages. We highlight this under-explored direction and call for more research on leveraging distributed optimization for federated learning. Overall, this work offers a comprehensive overview from centralized to decentralized FL, sheds new light on the core distinctions between approaches, and outlines open challenges and future directions for the field.

Keywords Federated Learning · decentralized learning · distributed optimization · privacy and security · robustness

1 Introduction

Federated Learning (FL) is a distributed machine learning paradigm that enables multiple participants (nodes or clients) to collaboratively train a global model without directly sharing their raw data [1, 2]. In a typical FL setting, each client computes updates (e.g., gradients or model weights) from its local data and shares only those updates for aggregation. Two network topologies are commonly used for FL: the conventional centralized (or star) topology and the fully decentralized topology, as illustrated in Figure 1.

In the *centralized FL* (CFL) architecture, a central server coordinates the training process by interacting with all clients. The server collects model updates from clients, aggregates them into a global model, and then distributes the global model back to the clients. Clients periodically incorporate the global model into their local training and send updated models back to the server, repeating until convergence. This centralized protocol (often referred to as FedAvg [1]) has been widely adopted in various applications [3, 4, 5, 6]. However, maintaining a central server in FL can be problematic. The server becomes a communication bottleneck and a single point of failure for the entire network [7, 8]. All clients must trust the server to correctly aggregate updates and safeguard the integrity of the global model. If the server is compromised or goes offline, the learning process is disrupted. Moreover, a malicious server or a successful attack on the server could corrupt the global model or leak sensitive information [9]. These vulnerabilities motivate the need for an alternative approach.

Decentralized FL (DFL) eliminates the central server by enabling clients to cooperate in a peer-to-peer manner [8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14]. Instead of sending updates to a single server, each client exchanges model information with a

subset of other clients (its neighbors) over a communication graph. Through iterative local communications, the network’s collective behavior approximates global aggregation dynamics, driving consensus toward a unified global model. Common aggregation approaches include gossiping SGD [15], D-PSGD [10], and other variations [16, 8]. By removing the central coordinator, DFL offers enhanced robustness (no single point of failure) and potentially better scalability in heterogeneous or dynamic network environments. It also mitigates the need to fully trust any single entity with the entire training process, since model aggregation is inherently distributed among the participants. On the other hand, decentralization introduces challenges such as slower convergence compared to centralized FL and increased complexity in managing communication overhead or inconsistent connectivity [17].

Existing work often categorizes FL approaches by their centralization degree or graph topology. In this paper, we argue that the choice of communication or aggregation protocol is equally critical. A typical FL protocol involves three sequential steps: 1) global model initialization, 2) local model updates, and 3) aggregation of updates to refine the global model. However, some frameworks unify steps 2 and 3 through distributed optimization algorithms that solve network-constrained problems directly, independent of topology. These include methods like the Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers (ADMM) [18] and the Primal-Dual Method of Multipliers (PDMM) [19, 20]. To formalize this distinction, we classify the first paradigm as separated aggregation (sequential local training and aggregation) and the second as joint optimization (learning with embedded topology constraints). This taxonomy highlights how protocol design, not just topology, shapes convergence, privacy, and communication efficiency in FL systems.

In this paper, we bridge CFL and DFL methods under a unified perspective. We systematically categorize prior work along two axes: (i) the presence of a central coordinator (CFL vs. DFL) and (ii) the use of separate aggregation versus joint optimization algorithms. This dual framework positions existing algorithms in a clear taxonomy (as summarized in Table 1), highlighting commonalities and differences that were previously obscured when considering topology alone. Through this analysis, several insights emerge. Notably, we find that most so-called “decentralized” FL methods follow the separate-aggregation paradigm (using, for example, peer-to-peer averaging protocols that mimic FedAvg), and the other joint optimization-based DFL strategies are relatively under-explored in practice. Our survey of the literature reveals a gap in applying advanced distributed optimization techniques to FL, despite their potential to improve efficiency, privacy, and robustness.

The key contributions of this work are summarized as follows:

- **New perspective on CFL vs. DFL:** In addition to the conventional view that the primary difference between centralized and DFL is the network topology. We argue that the *underlying protocol* (separate aggregation vs. joint optimization) is the fundamental differentiator. We demonstrate how this perspective leads to a better understanding of performance trade-offs in utility (model accuracy and convergence), privacy, and robustness to various attacks.
- **Systematic literature review on FL’s privacy and robustness:** We conduct a thorough review of existing FL research, spanning both CFL and DFL. We categorize these works based on several criteria including 1) centralized or decentralized architectures, 2) deployed training protocols 3) performances against passive and active adversaries. By organizing prior approaches into this taxonomy, we provide clarity on how various methods relate, and we illuminate the landscape of FL research in a way that aids practitioners and researchers in identifying appropriate techniques for their needs.
- **Identification of research gaps and future directions:** Based on our review, we pinpoint critical open challenges. In particular, we observe that *DFL with fully distributed optimization algorithms* (as opposed to heuristic averaging) is an under-explored area with significant potential benefits. Few studies have leveraged advanced distributed optimization methods in FL, and we advocate for their broader adoption. We also highlight unresolved security and privacy issues, such as the need for provably robust protocols in both CFL and DFL settings.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we provide necessary backgrounds such as notation, network setup, and threat models. Section 3 reviews CFL methods and analyzes their aggregation protocols. Section 4 summarizes DFL approaches and relates them to CFL counterparts. In Section 5, we compare CFL and DFL under passive adversary settings, evaluating their resilience to privacy attacks (e.g., membership inference, model inversion) and corresponding defense mechanisms. Sections 6 and 7 shift focus to active adversaries by first analyzing attack strategies (e.g., Byzantine attacks, data poisoning), and then reviewing defense mechanisms. Finally, Section 8 synthesizes key insights, identifies open challenges, and outlines future research directions for advancing FL efficiency, privacy, and robustness.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we review key fundamentals that are necessary for understanding the rest of the paper.

2.1 Notation

Let \mathbb{R}^d denote d -dimensional real vectors and $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ the space of $m \times n$ real matrices. The symbols \succ, \succeq, \prec and \preceq denote generalised inequalities; between vectors it represents component-wise inequality. Calligraphic letters denote sets and the Euclidean norm $\|\mathbf{x}\|$ for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ derives from the inner product $\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{x}$. Iterative processes are tracked via superscripts (e.g., $\mathbf{w}^{(t)}$ for model parameters \mathbf{w} at iteration t). Consider x as the realization of a random variable, the corresponding random variable will be denoted by the corresponding capital, i.e., X .

2.2 Network setup

The underlying communication structure of FL can be modelled as an undirected graph $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, where vertices $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, n\}$ represent the nodes/agents/participants and $\mathcal{E} = \{(i, j) : i, j \in \mathcal{V}\}$ is the set of undirected edges in the graph representing the communication links, and let $m = |\mathcal{E}|$ denote the total number of edges. Each node is only allowed to interact with its neighbouring nodes directly. Let \mathcal{N}_i denote the set of neighbouring nodes of node i , i.e., $\mathcal{N}_i = \{j : (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}\}$ and $d_i = |\mathcal{N}_i|$. Note that centralized FL is a special case of decentralized ones with a star topology $m = n - 1$, i.e., one central server connects to all $n - 1$ clients, as illustrated in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Communication topologies in FL: centralized star configuration (left) versus decentralized peer-to-peer (right).

2.3 Problem formulation

Each participant i possesses a private dataset $\mathcal{D}_i = \{(\mathbf{x}_{ik}, \ell_{ik})\}_{k=1}^{n_i}$ where feature vectors $\mathbf{x}_{ik} \in \mathbb{R}^v$ correspond to labels $\ell_{ik} \in \mathbb{R}$. The local objective function $f_i(\mathbf{w}_i) = \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \phi(\mathbf{w}_i; \mathbf{x}_{ik}, \ell_{ik})$ measures model error, with $\mathbf{w}_i \in \mathbb{R}^u$ as learnable parameters and $\phi(\cdot)$ as an application-specific loss function. The global FL goal minimizes the collective objective $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\mathbf{w}_i)$ while preserving data locality.

2.4 Adversary model

In scenarios involving multiple participants, two primary adversary models are typically considered [21].

1) Passive adversary, often termed "honest-but-curious" adversary: it assumes that certain participants have been corrupted; although they follow the protocol correctly, they attempt to glean private information from any data they receive (e.g., via privacy attacks described in Section 5.1). When multiple participants are passively corrupt and collude, the risk of privacy breaches increases significantly.

2) Active adversary (often called "Byzantine adversary" in the context of FL): it poses a more severe threat. Actively corrupted participants can deviate from the prescribed protocol in arbitrary ways, such as poisoning local model updates, broadcasting falsified model parameters, or launching attacks aimed at disrupting or manipulating the global model (see Section 6).

2.5 Security model

The security model defines the assumed computational capabilities of potential adversaries. Two main security models are commonly used:

1. Computational security. The adversary is assumed to have bounded computational power and thus cannot feasibly decrypt protected data (i.e., not in polynomial time).
2. Information-theoretic security. The adversary is assumed to be computationally unbounded but lacks sufficient information to infer the secret.

2.6 Performance evaluation

The design of FL algorithms involves addressing several key aspects:

Utility: Ensuring that the model achieves high predictive performance, such as high test accuracy on unseen data.

Privacy: Safeguarding sensitive data of honest participants against the passive adversary (e.g., honest-but-curious participants).

Robustness: Ensuring system reliability and performance in the presence of active adversary (i.e., maliciously corrupt participants).

Efficiency: Minimizing the communication and computation overhead to enable practical deployment of FL systems.

3 Centralized FL

In a typical CFL setting, a central server orchestrates the training process among multiple clients. We classify existing CFL protocols into two categories: protocols that separate local training and aggregation, and protocols that pose the entire framework as a joint optimization problem.

3.1 Separate aggregation based protocols

A standard example of this category, often termed *FedAvg* [1], works as follows:

1. Initialization: at iteration $t = 0$, the server randomly initializes the global model weights $\mathbf{w}^{(0)}$ and distributes them to each node.
2. Local model training: at each iteration t , each node i updates its local model $\mathbf{w}_i^{(t)}$ based on $\mathbf{w}^{(t-1)}$ using its local data \mathbf{x}_i . These local updates are then sent to the server.
3. Model aggregation: after collecting these local models, the server performs aggregation to update the global model. The aggregation is often done by weighted averaging and typically the weights are decided by the size of the local dataset n_i , i.e.,

$$\mathbf{w}^{(t)} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{n_i}{\sum_{k=1}^n n_k} \mathbf{w}_i^{(t)}, \quad (1)$$

The last two steps repeat until the global model converges or a stopping criterion is met.

Another widely used protocol, called *FedSGD* [1], assumes full-batch training on the client side. It closely resembles FedAvg in its overall structure, but differs in that clients share gradients $\mathbf{g}_i^{(t)} = \nabla f_i(\mathbf{w}_i)$ instead of sharing the weights, i.e.

$$\mathbf{w}^{(t+1)} = \mathbf{w}^{(t)} - \mu \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{n_i}{\sum_{k=1}^n n_k} \mathbf{g}_i^{(t)}, \quad (2)$$

where μ is a stepsize controlling the convergence rate.

These methods rely on alternating rounds of local model training and server-side aggregation, forming the backbone of many FL protocols. Building on them, many extensions have been proposed to enhance either local training or the aggregation procedure. For instance, Per-FedAvg [22], MOON [23], FedProx [24], FedNova [25] are proposed to address challenges in local training step such as suboptimal performance, slow convergence, or model drift caused by data heterogeneity. Alternatively, other modifications focus on improving the robustness of the aggregation step, which will be further explained in Section 7.

3.2 Joint optimization based protocols

Instead of having separated local training and model aggregation, *joint optimization-based protocols* treat the entire FL process as a single optimization problem. By unifying the local update step with the global objective, these methods can leverage classical distributed optimization techniques such as ADMM [18, 26, 27] and PDMM [19, 20, 28, 29]. ADMM and PDMM have been widely adopted in various applications such as acoustic signal processing [30, 31], privacy-preserving data aggregation [32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47] and also in FL [13, 14, 48, 49, 50, 51].

Star-graph formulation: We can model the CFL network as a special star graph: $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, with $\mathcal{V} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, n\}$ representing the node set and $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ representing the edge set. For notation simplicity, denote node 0 serves as the central server. In this case, for any client $i \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{0\}$, its neighborhood \mathcal{N}_i only contains the server node 0. Thus we can formulate the problem as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\{\mathbf{w}_i : i \in \mathcal{V}\}} \quad & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{0\}} f_i(\mathbf{w}_i), \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \mathbf{w}_0 = \mathbf{w}_i \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Popular algorithms of this type include FedSplit [48], SCAFFOLD [49], and GPDMM/AGPDMM [50]. In particular, GPDMM can serve as a general representative of this class. Furthermore, SCAFFOLD and GPDMM can both reduce to vanilla gradient descent [52] under appropriate parameter configurations.

Below, we describe the main procedure of FedSplit and GPDMM:

1. Initialization: at iteration $t = 0$, each node initializes the weights $\mathbf{w}_i^{(0)} = \mathbf{w}_0^{(0)}$.
2. Local model update: at each iteration t , each user i first updates its local model $\mathbf{w}_i^{(t)}$ and variable $\mathbf{z}_{i|0}^{(t)}$ with the following eq. (4). Then each user sends $\mathbf{z}_{i|0}^{(t)}$ to the server.

$$\text{users} \begin{cases} \mathbf{w}_i^{(t+1)} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{w}_i} \left[f_i(\mathbf{w}_i) + \frac{1}{2\gamma} \|\mathbf{w}_i - \mathbf{z}_{0|i}^{(t)}\|^2 \right] \\ \mathbf{z}_{i|0}^{(t+1)} = 2\mathbf{w}_i^{(t+1)} - \mathbf{z}_{0|i}^{(t)} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where \mathbf{z} is the auxiliary variable and regularization parameter $\gamma > 0$.

3. Model aggregation: the server collects these $\mathbf{z}_{i|0}^{(t)}$ and performs aggregation to update the global model $\mathbf{w}_0^{(t)}$. The aggregation is done by following eq. (5). Then the server calculates and sends $\mathbf{z}_{0|i}^{(t)}$ to each user.

$$\text{server} \begin{cases} \mathbf{w}_0^{(t+1)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{z}_{i|0}^{(t+1)} \\ \mathbf{z}_{0|i}^{(t+1)} = 2\mathbf{w}_0^{(t+1)} - \mathbf{z}_{i|0}^{(t+1)} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

The last two steps are repeated until the global model converges or until a predetermined stopping criterion is reached.

Inexact Updates: In practice, computing the exact solution in Equation (4) can be computationally demanding or prohibitively expensive. Consequently, two distinct approximation techniques are commonly employed to address this challenge.

K gradient descent: A commonly employed technique is to approximate each local subproblem using K gradient descent steps:

$$\mathbf{w}_i^{(t,k+1)} = \mathbf{w}_i^{(t,k)} - \gamma \nabla h_i^{(t)}(\mathbf{w}_i^{(t,k)}), 0 \leq k < K, \quad (6)$$

where the augmented local objective $h_i^{(t)}(\mathbf{w}_i)$ is defined as $h_i^{(t)}(\mathbf{w}_i) = f_i(\mathbf{w}_i) + \frac{1}{2\gamma} \|\mathbf{w}_i - \mathbf{z}_{0|i}^{(t)}\|^2$.

Notably, Zhang *et al.* [50] demonstrate that PDMM can reduce to FedSplit in CFL; however, FedSplit suffers from poor performance due to improper parameter initialization. Specifically, FedSplit sets $\mathbf{w}_i^{(t,k=0)} = \mathbf{z}_{0|i}^{(t)}$ at each iteration. In contrast, GPDMM achieves improved stability by reusing the final updates from the previous iteration: $\mathbf{w}_i^{(t,k=0)} = \mathbf{w}_i^{(t-1,k=K)}$.

Quadratic approximation: An alternative strategy is to use quadratic approximation [53], which serves as a viable and computationally efficient method for approximating $\mathbf{w}_i^{(t)}$.

The function $f(\mathbf{w})$ can be approximated using a quadratical surrogate:

$$f(\mathbf{w}) \approx f(\mathbf{w}^{(t)}) + \nabla f(\mathbf{w}^{(t)})^\top (\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^{(t)}) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^{(t)}\|^2, \quad (7)$$

where $\mu > 0$ is chosen large enough to keep the surrogate strongly convex. Under this approximation, the update on node i simplifies to

$$\mathbf{w}_i^{(t+1)} = \frac{\gamma\mu\mathbf{w}_i^{(t)} - \gamma\nabla f_i(\mathbf{w}_i) + \mathbf{z}_{i|0}^{(t)}}{1 + \gamma\mu}.$$

In fact, as will be discussed in Section 4.3, the formulation in CFL represents a specific instance of the more general DFL framework (11). Consequently, the convergence guarantee provided in Section 4.2 is also applicable to this case.

4 Decentralized FL

In this decentralized setup, there is no central server to coordinate model updates; instead, each node iteratively exchanges information with its neighbors to learn a global model.

4.1 Separate aggregation-based approaches

A straightforward way to aggregate local models in DFL is through distributed average consensus methods. Rather than sending updates to a central server, each node combines the model parameters received from its neighbors. Examples of consensus algorithms include randomized gossip [54] and linear iterations [55].

Concretely, many DFL protocols closely resemble FedAvg except for how the model aggregation step is performed. For instance, the approaches proposed in [10, 11, 12] use gossip averaging to implement the model aggregation, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{w}_i^{(t+1)} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cup i} A_{ij} \mathbf{w}_j^{(t)}, \quad (8)$$

where A_{ij} is the i -th and j -th element of weight matrix \mathbf{A} . The matrix \mathbf{A} is typically chosen to be: 1) Nonnegative $A_{ij} \in [0, 1]$, which 0 means disconnected; 2) symmetric $\mathbf{A}^\top = \mathbf{A}$; 3) doubly stochastic $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{1}^\top$. Under these conditions, iterative gossip-based updates allow each node to converge toward a consensus model over iterations.

4.2 Joint optimization-based approaches

Although averaging-based strategies are intuitive, they can suffer from slow convergence or local minima issues, particularly in the presence of heterogeneous data [13]. An alternative is to formulate DFL as a single constrained optimization problem over the entire network:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\{\mathbf{w}_i : i \in \mathcal{V}\}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} f_i(\mathbf{w}_i), \\ & \text{subject to } \forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{E} : B_{i|j} \mathbf{w}_i + B_{j|i} \mathbf{w}_j = \mathbf{0}, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where the linear constraints $B_{i|j} \mathbf{w}_i + B_{j|i} \mathbf{w}_j = \mathbf{0}$ ensure that, at convergence, all nodes share a common model (consensus). For simplicity, one can set $B_{i|j} = -B_{j|i} = \pm 1$ or a suitable identity-matrix variation.

ADMM/PDMM Protocols: The common unicast ADMM/PDMM protocol [13] using ADMM [26] or PDMM [19, 20] work as follows:

1. Initialization: at iteration $t = 0$, each node randomly initializes the weights $\mathbf{w}_i^{(0)}$.
2. Local model training: at each iteration t , each user i first updates its local model $\mathbf{w}_i^{(t)}$ and variable $\mathbf{z}_{j|i}^{(t)}$ with the following eq. (10). Then each user sends $\mathbf{z}_{j|i}^{(t)}$ to their neighbors $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$.

$$\text{users} \begin{cases} \mathbf{w}_i^{(t+1)} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{w}_i} \left[f_i(\mathbf{w}_i) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \mathbf{z}_{i|j}^{(t)\top} B_{i|j} \mathbf{w}_i + \frac{cd_i}{2} \|\mathbf{w}_i\|^2 \right] \\ \mathbf{z}_{j|i}^{(t+1)} = (1 - \theta) \mathbf{z}_{j|i}^{(t)} + \theta (\mathbf{z}_{i|j}^{(t)} + 2c B_{i|j} \mathbf{w}_i^{(t+1)}) \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

where $\theta \in (0, 1]$, with $\theta = 1$ corresponding to PDMM and $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$ corresponding to ADMM.

The last step is repeated until the global model converges or until a predetermined stopping criterion is reached.

Quadratic approximation: In DFL, (7) can be simplified to

$$\mathbf{w}_i^{(t+1)} = \frac{\mu \mathbf{w}_i^{(t)} - \nabla f_i(\mathbf{w}_i^{(t)}) - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} B_{i|j} \mathbf{z}_{i|j}^{(t)}}{\mu + cd_i}. \quad (11)$$

Given the following theorem, the above is guaranteed to converge [53].

Theorem 1. Assume $f(\mathbf{w})$ is m -strongly convex and β -smooth, then as long as

$$\mu > \frac{\beta^2}{2m},$$

we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{w}^{(t)} = \mathbf{w}^*.$$

4.3 On equivalence between CFL and DFL

A key insight from our formulations is that, for both separate-aggregation and joint-optimization frameworks, CFL can be viewed as a special case of DFL by simply restricting the topology to a star-shaped network.

Separate aggregation based CFL and DFL: When a central server is available, each client communicates with the server directly. In DFL terms, this corresponds to a star network, where the weight-update rule in eq. (8) can be rewritten as

$$\mathbf{w}_i^{(t+1)} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} A_{ij} \mathbf{w}_j^{(t)}, \quad (12)$$

since the server has access to all $\mathbf{w}_j^{(t)}$ for every $j \in \mathcal{V}$, it can aggregate these updates and redistribute them to the clients. If we set $A_{ij} = \frac{n_j}{\sum_{k=1}^n n_k}$, then the update precisely reduces to the weighted average $\mathbf{w}^{(t)}$ in eq. (1), recovering the standard FedAvg procedure.

Joint-optimization based CFL and DFL: Again let node 0 denote the server. The primal-dual approach in CFL, i.e., eq. (4) and eq. (5) are actually the specific case of eq. (10), when the edge set \mathcal{E} in the graph is $E = \{(i, 0)\}_{i=1}^n$ and the server function $f_0(\mathbf{w}_0) = 0$. By choosing $B_{i|0} = -1, B_{0|i} = 1, \gamma = \frac{1}{c}, \mathbf{z}_{0|i} = \frac{1}{c} \mathbf{z}_{i|j}$ and $\mathbf{z}_{i|0} = -\frac{1}{c} \mathbf{z}_{j|i}$, the updates in the CFL formulation match those in eq. (10) exactly, confirming the equivalence.

In Table 1 we summarize existing CFL and DFL algorithms based on the above formulations.

Table 1: An overview of CFL and DFL algorithms: separate aggregation vs. joint optimization

	Separate Aggregation	Joint Optimization
CFL	FedAvg/FedSGD [1], Per-Fed [22], Fed-Prox [24], FedNova [25], MOON [23]	FedSplit [48], GPDMM/AGPDMM [50], SCAFFOLD [49]
DFL	D-PSGD [10], Braintorrent [56], Combo [8], D^2 [16], GossipSGD [11], DFedAvgM [12]	ADMM/PDMM [13, 14]

5 FL against Passive Adversary: Attacks and Defenses

Though FL is designed to safeguard user privacy by eliminating the need of sharing raw training data, yet adversaries can still exploit shared model information to breach privacy. Especially, when consider the passive adversary that the corrupt participants can using their receives updates to conduct privacy breaches. In what follows we will summarize existing privacy attacks and the corresponding defenses.

5.1 Empirical privacy attacks

We review three main forms of privacy attacks: membership inference [57, 58], property inference [59, 57, 60] and input reconstruction attack [61, 62, 63].

5.1.1 Membership inference attack (MIA)

The goal of MIA is to determine whether a specific data sample was used during model training. There are many MIAs have been proposed in the last decade [58, 64, 65, 66, 57, 67, 68, 69]. A canonical strategy in designing MIA is to employ construct the so-called shadow models that reproduce the behavior of the target model, enabling the attacker to infer membership by comparing outputs on various inputs.

In FL, recent work [70] has shown that gradient-based membership inference, which measures the cosine similarity between guessed and actual gradients, can surpass classic loss- or entropy-based approaches [64, 66]. The main idea is to leverage the cosine similarity between model updates and instance-specific gradients for distinguishing training data from the others, which is formulated as:

$$M(\mathbf{x}', i) = \sum_{\ell' \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}\{\cosim(\nabla f_i(\mathbf{w}_i, (\mathbf{x}', \ell')), \nabla f_i(\mathbf{w}_i, (\mathbf{x}_i, \ell_i))) \geq \gamma\}, \quad (13)$$

where γ is the threshold. A variant known as *subject MIA* [71, 72] determines whether an individual user’s data contributed to training by observing changes in the global loss. Subject MIA operates effectively in a black-box setting, leveraging the statistical distribution of sample features and the loss function to infer the presence of an individual in the training dataset.

5.1.2 Property inference attack (PIA)

Property inference attacks aim to reveal hidden attributes of the training set. It can be broadly classified into two categories: passive [57, 60, 73] and active [57, 59, 74, 75] attacks. In FL framework, model updates or gradients are often utilized to infer specific properties or attributes of the data [59, 57, 60, 75, 73]. These attributes can vary widely, ranging from uncorrelated information, identifying whether a photo subject is wearing eyeglasses in a model trained for gender or race [57], to extracting labeling information about the data itself [60].

5.1.3 Input reconstruction attack (IRA)

Input reconstruction goes beyond membership or property inference, striving to recover entire training samples. Based on the available information, there are broadly two ways to reconstruct the input training data.

Gradient inversion attack: The most common and extensively studied method for reconstructing data in the FL framework is the gradient inversion attack [76]. It leverages gradient information or its approximations, which can be readily obtained from transmissions over the communication links or the corrupt participants, for reconstructing the inputs.

The core mechanism behind gradient inversion attacks is an iterative process that refines a guessed input to match the gradients observed during training. Formally, for each client’s local dataset (\mathbf{x}_i, ℓ_i) , the adversary attempts to recover the true data by solving [76]:

$$(\mathbf{x}'_i, \ell'_i) = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}'_i, \ell'_i} \|\nabla f_i(\mathbf{w}_i, (\mathbf{x}'_i, \ell'_i)) - \nabla f_i(\mathbf{w}_i, (\mathbf{x}_i, \ell_i))\|^2, \quad (14)$$

with many subsequent variants proposed [77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82].

Although FL typically shares model weights rather than raw gradients (see Sections 3.1 and 4.1), adversaries can still approximate gradients using the differences in the model parameters, $\mathbf{w}_i^{(t+1)} - \mathbf{w}_i^{(t)}$. In fact, works such as [83, 84, 85] demonstrate how these approximate gradients can reveal sensitive data. Moreover, Liang *et al.* [86] proposes a scenario where an intermediary attacker intercepts real gradients and injects spurious queries to further refine its estimates, thereby obviating the need for prior knowledge of model weights.

Output-based inversion attack: As the name suggests, the main idea of output-based inversion attack is to reconstruct training data using only the model and its outputs (e.g., probability distributions). Even in FL settings, adversaries can observe the updates and reverse-engineer the inputs by analyzing the distributional patterns. This is typically achieved by training a secondary model designed to act as an inverse of the original model [63, 87, 88, 89, 90].

We now proceed to defense mechanisms that protect FL from the privacy attacks discussed earlier. These methods broadly fall into two categories: those offering *provable privacy guarantees* and those providing *empirical defenses* without formal security proofs. Table 2 summarizes representative methods in each category.

5.2 Provable defense approaches

5.2.1 Differential Privacy (DP)

DP offers probabilistic guarantees against privacy breaches by injecting calibrated noise into model updates or outputs. Under classical DP assumptions, all but one node in the network may be considered compromised [91, 92]. To formalize this, let $\mathbf{s}^{-i} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ represent an adjacent vector of \mathbf{s} , obtained by excluding the private data s_i from \mathbf{s} . Denote the range of s_i as Ω_i . Let \hat{F} be a randomized algorithm designed to preserve the privacy of its input, and let \mathcal{Y} denote its output space. Let $\mathbf{s}^{-i} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ represent a vector adjacent to \mathbf{s} but missing the private data s_i , and let Ω_i be the range of s_i . A randomized algorithm \hat{F} providing ϵ -DP must satisfy, for any \mathbf{s} and its adjacent \mathbf{s}^{-i} and for all subsets $\mathcal{Y}_s \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$,

$$\forall s_i \in \Omega_i : \frac{P(\hat{F}(\mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{Y}_s)}{P(\hat{F}(\mathbf{s}^{-i}) \in \mathcal{Y}_s)} \leq e^\epsilon. \quad (15)$$

This criterion ensures that the algorithm’s outputs are indistinguishable whether or not s_i is included. Local DP (LDP) applies noise directly to each client’s data [93], making it suitable for untrusted servers, while Global DP (GDP) adds noise at the server level [94], requiring a trusted central authority. In practice, tuning DP’s privacy–utility trade-off can be challenging, especially for non-convex models such as deep neural networks, and often relies on heuristic noise schedules [13] or adaptive clipping methods [14].

5.2.2 Secure multiparty computation (SMPC)

SMPC allows a set of parties to jointly compute a function over their inputs while keeping those inputs private from each other [21]. SMPC techniques are frequently integrated with differential privacy mechanisms to advance the development of secure FL frameworks. In CFL, Gong *et al.* [95] introduce a privacy-preserving multi-party framework which leverages the integration of differential privacy and homomorphic encryption to mitigate the risk of privacy breaches. This approach eliminates the necessity for a server who must be universally trusted by all participants involved. Zhou *et al.* [96] propose a communication mechanism based on secret sharing to enable encrypted decentralized federated learning. It introduces a secure stochastic gradient descent scheme combined with an autoencoder and a Gaussian mechanism to anonymize local model updates, facilitating secure communication among a limited number of neighboring clients. Tran *et al.* [97] also integrate randomization techniques with an efficient secret sharing protocol to mitigate potential security threats. Their approach emphasizes safeguarding local models against honest-but-curious adversaries, even in scenarios where up to $n - 2$ out of n parties may collude.

5.2.3 Subspace Perturbation

Subspace perturbation [32, 33, 34, 44, 45, 46] takes a different route by masking gradients in directions orthogonal to the primary optimization trajectory. Its main idea is to exploit the structure of distributed optimization algorithms to confine noise to the so-called non-convergent subspaces. By perturbing updates orthogonal to the optimization trajectory, these methods mask sensitive gradients without degrading accuracy. Unlike DP, it requires no explicit noise calibration and operates efficiently over incomplete networks. Recent work demonstrates its effectiveness in DFL [14] for protecting privacy.

5.3 Empirical defense approaches

Empirical defenses, while lacking formal guarantees, offer practical mitigation against specific attacks. Given that the shared information such as models or weights carries sensitive information, a natural defense is thus to compress the data using techniques such as quantization etc.

5.3.1 Gradient sparsification

Several studies [98, 99] have demonstrated that commonly used gradient sparsification techniques [100, 101] not only effectively reduce communication overhead but also provide a certain level of defense against various privacy attacks. These sparsification methods typically operate by transmitting only a subset of the gradient values, such as selecting the top K highest-magnitude elements while setting the remaining values to zero. This selective transmission reduces the amount of data exchanged during training, thereby improving efficiency and mitigating potential privacy risks.

However, recent research [57, 102, 99, 103] has examined the effectiveness of gradient sparsification from the perspective of novel attack strategies and has identified potential vulnerabilities. These studies suggest that while gradient sparsification may offer some level of privacy protection, it does not always provide robust defense against adversarial attacks.

5.3.2 Gradient quantization

Quantization is also a technique to reduce the communication cost by reduces the number of bits used to represent each gradient value. One thing to note is that applying quantization can also be viewed as an information theoretical approach as it will introduce distortion or noise to the transmitted messages. This can be analog to differential privacy noise addition as long as the introduced noise by quantization is independent of the message, which can be guaranteed by dithering.

Both [104] and [105] highlight that gradient quantization inherently aligns with DP or its variants in the context of CFL. Similarly, Li *et al.* [106, 46] provide a theoretical justification for this phenomenon in the setting of DFL. These findings actually suggest a fundamental connection between gradient quantization techniques and informational theoretical mechanisms in FL frameworks, reinforcing their role in enhancing both communication efficiency and data privacy.

In addition to data sparsification techniques, another practical defense is *data augmentation*.

5.3.3 Data augmentation

It has been demonstrated that data augmentation techniques can mitigate input reconstruction attacks [107]. In particular, Shin *et al.* [107] find that certain augmentation schemes not only resist input reconstruction but also outperform DP in model accuracy, highlighting a compelling trade-off between privacy protection and predictive performance.

Approaches	Assumed Topology	General Applicable	Provable Privacy	Empirical Privacy Attacks		
				Membership Inference	Property Inference	Input Reconstruction
Differential privacy	CFL [95, 108, 109, 110, 111] / DFL [112]	Yes	Yes	[110, 113]	[114, 115]	[114, 103, 99]
Subspace perturbation	DFL [14]	No	Yes	[14]	-	[14, 116]
SMPC	CFL [95] / DFL [97, 96]	Yes	Yes	[117, 118, 119]	[117, 118, 119]	[118, 119, 120, 121]
Data augmentation	CFL [122]	Yes	No	[123]	-	[107]
Gradient sparsification	CFL [100, 101]	Yes	No	[57, 123]	[102]	[76, 98, 103, 99]
Gradient quantization	CFL [124, 125] / DFL [46]	Yes	Yes (relaxed DP)	[70, 126, 105, 123]	-	[127, 104, 126]

Table 2: Comparison of Approaches in Privacy-Preserving Federated Learning.

5.4 Gap between provable privacy guarantee and empirical privacy attacks

A significant challenge in privacy research is reconciling provable privacy guarantees with empirical privacy attack results. For example, Recent work highlights that many MIAs produce misleading results that fail to comply with the concept of DP [116]. Such inconsistencies arise from several factors, including simplified attack models, the real-world trade-offs involved in implementing DP, and the metrics used to measure privacy leakage [128, 129, 116, 130].

DFL, however, may help narrow this gap by eliminating the need for a central server and exchanging partially obfuscated gradients directly among peers. This design inherently reduces the adversary’s visibility of sensitive data and can provide provable privacy advantages over CFL, as demonstrated in [14]. By reducing adversarial access to sensitive information and leveraging distributed optimization, DFL contributes to narrowing the gap between provable privacy guarantees and empirical attack resilience, aligning theoretical assurances more closely with practical outcomes [131].

5.5 The debate of privacy comparisons of CFL and DFL

Conflicting perspectives exist regarding which paradigm—CFL or DFL—ultimately offers stronger privacy protections. Pasquini *et al.* [9] contend that DFL is less private than CFL, based on experiments involving loss-based MIAs under separated aggregation. They attribute DFL’s heightened vulnerability to the inhomogeneity of decentralized topologies, where node-specific training can amplify privacy leakage. In contrast, Yu *et al.* [14] argue that DFL can surpass CFL from an information-theoretic viewpoint, particularly when joint optimization protocol is employed. They note that CFL’s reliance on global aggregations creates an avenue for direct gradient exposure. Similarly, Ji *et al.* [131] investigate this discrepancy from a mutual-information-based framework, illustrating how secure aggregation and other design choices can affect privacy outcomes in both CFL and DFL. Taken together, these conflicting results underscore the complexity of comparing privacy across federated paradigms and suggest that the choice between CFL and DFL may depend on specific system requirements, network configurations, and threat models.

6 FL against active adversary I: empirical attacks

Active adversaries do more than passively observe FL updates; they deliberately manipulate data or model updates to disrupt training or embed hidden malicious behavior. Active attacks can be broadly classified into two categories: explicit attacks that degrade the global model’s performance or prevent its convergence, and backdoor attacks that inject hidden triggers into the model while maintaining high utility on normal inputs.

6.1 Explicit attacks: compromising model utility

In a CFL setup, the typical assumption is that the server is trusted and only clients might be malicious. Thus, most active attacks studied in the literature assume malicious clients (sometimes called Byzantine clients). These clients send incorrect or adversarial updates to the server in order to bias the aggregation. In contrast, the server is usually assumed to have a high security level and is harder to corrupt, meaning it does not directly inject malicious updates. We summarize several representative explicit attack strategies below:

A Little Is Enough (ALIE) [132]: This stealthy attack leverages the statistical properties of honest updates to remain undetected. Let μ_h and σ_h denote the mean and standard deviation of the gradient vectors \mathbf{g}_h from honest clients h . A Byzantine client m draws its malicious gradient \mathbf{g}_m by slightly shifting the honest mean:

$$\mathbf{g}_m = \mu_h - \epsilon \sigma_h, \quad (16)$$

where ϵ controls the attack intensity. By perturbing the gradients only modestly, ALIE shifts the global model in an adversary-chosen direction while evading many outlier detection schemes.

Bit Flipping (BF) [133, 134]: In this straightforward attack, a malicious client simply flips the sign of its gradient update to oppose the direction of honest updates. Formally, $\mathbf{g}_m = -\mathbf{g}_h$. BF can significantly slow down or derail the training process if not mitigated. However, it is relatively easy to detect or counter by defenses that check for abnormal update magnitudes or directions (e.g., by clipping large updates or using robust aggregators).

Mimic Attack [135]: Here, malicious clients attempt to appear benign by crafting their updates to statistically resemble honest updates. An attacker may run a "warm-up" period to learn the distribution of legitimate gradients \mathbf{g}_h , then generate its malicious update \mathbf{g}_m to match that distribution. Because the malicious update looks normal, it can slip past many robust aggregation rules designed to reject outliers. The trade-off is that the attacker must refrain from making large deviations, so the impact on the global model—while harmful—may be gradual.

Label Flipping (LF) [136]: In a label flipping attack, adversaries poison their local training data by relabeling examples from one class as another class. For instance, if there are M_ℓ classes, a client could transform labels ℓ to $M_\ell - \ell$ (effectively inverting the label encoding). The malicious client then trains on this mislabeled data and sends the resulting model updates to the server. Label flipping causes the global model to misclassify certain classes (those targeted by the flip) without necessarily triggering anomaly detection in gradients, since the gradient magnitudes and variances may appear normal.

Data Injection (DI) [137, 138]: Data injection attacks go one step further by adding fake or misleading data points to a client’s local dataset. Unlike gradient manipulation, data injection affects the model indirectly via training. A malicious client can introduce out-of-distribution samples or engineered inputs that cause its local model update to skew the global model. Because the attack happens at the data level, the submitted gradient might not look obviously anomalous (especially if the client labels the injected data consistently with its attack goal). This makes pure gradient-based defenses less effective against DI.

While the above attacks assume the central server is honest and only clients are compromised, one can also consider the scenario of a *malicious server*. A corrupted server has far greater power, since it can modify the aggregation of all client updates. One example of such an attack is **Inner Product Manipulation (IPM) [139]**. In IPM, the attacker is the server itself (or an intruder who controls the server) and it alters the aggregated update to cancel out honest contributions. For instance, the server can compute the average of the honest gradients and then invert it with a scaling factor:

$$\mathbf{g}_m = -\epsilon \cdot \frac{\sum_{i \in V_h} \mathbf{g}_i}{|V_h|}, \quad (17)$$

where V_h is the set of honest clients and ϵ sets the attack strength. This manipulated "update" is then applied as if it were a normal aggregated gradient, effectively driving the global model in whatever direction the adversary chooses. Since all clients trust the server’s aggregation, IPM can be devastating. Detection of such server-side attacks is difficult, but methods like BALANCE [140] (discussed later in Section 7) can sometimes spot its characteristic directional shifts.

6.2 Backdoor attacks: preserving utility with hidden triggers

Backdoor attacks implant an undetected “trigger” that, when present in a model’s input, induces malicious outputs. Crucially, the model remains accurate on ordinary inputs, making these attacks difficult to detect. Backdoors serve two main purposes: leaking private information (privacy-oriented backdoors) or altering predictions for the attacker’s benefit (model misbehavior).

6.2.1 Backdoors targeting privacy breaches

By actively modifying the training process, an attacker can embed triggers that force the model to reveal information about other clients. This can augment passive privacy attacks (Section 5). For example, URVFL [141] leverages a pre-trained encoder-decoder and an auxiliary classifier in vertical FL, inserting triggers that correlate model outputs with certain private features. Even defenses like differential privacy struggle to detect such refined backdoors.

6.2.2 Backdoors for adversarial advantage

Many backdoors aim to misclassify triggered inputs to a specific label without impairing overall performance. A single universal trigger (e.g., a small watermark in images) exemplifies a single-trigger backdoor [142, 143], while multi-trigger backdoors [144, 143] embed multiple, distinct triggers across different malicious clients. Multi-trigger approaches are more robust since discovering and neutralizing one trigger may leave others intact.

Some backdoor methods operate in a black-box setting, where the attacker sees only model outputs, yet can still iteratively adjust triggers by querying predictions [145]. Others are *adaptive* [146], dynamically modifying the poisoning rate or trigger shape in response to changing aggregator defenses. Since backdoors generally preserve high accuracy on benign inputs, they can remain hidden until the attacker provides an input with the correct trigger pattern.

7 FL against active adversary II: defenses

Modern FL systems employ various defense strategies to counter active adversaries in both CFL and DFL settings. These approaches primarily focus on robust aggregation mechanisms that withstand malicious updates while preserving model utility. The following subsections analyze prominent defense methodologies and their operational characteristics, see the overall summary in Table 3.

7.1 CFL defense approaches

In CFL, the server orchestrates aggregation and three principal robust aggregation techniques have demonstrated effectiveness:

Trimmed Mean (TM) [147] operates through dimension-wise outlier removal. For each parameter dimension, the algorithm sorts client gradients $\{\mathbf{g}_i\}_{i=1}^n$, discards the $2k$ most extreme values ($k > |\mathcal{V}_b|$ where \mathcal{V}_b represents Byzantine clients), and computes:

$$\mathbf{g}_{\text{TM}} = \frac{1}{n - 2k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{V}_e} \mathbf{g}_i \quad (18)$$

where \mathcal{V}_e contains nodes with extreme gradient values. TM proves effective against moderate numbers of adversaries producing outlier updates.

Median Aggregation (MED) [147, 148] replaces mean aggregation with dimension-wise median selection. This non-parametric approach neutralizes the influence of extreme values without requiring prior knowledge of adversary counts:

$$\mathbf{g}_{\text{MED}} = \text{median}(\{\mathbf{g}_i\}_{i=1}^n) \quad (19)$$

Krum Selection [149] implements a consensus-based approach by selecting the gradient vector closest to its neighbors through Euclidean distance analysis:

$$\mathbf{g}_{\text{Krum}} = \mathbf{g}_{\arg \min_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_i} \|\mathbf{g}_i - \mathbf{g}_j\|^2} \quad (20)$$

where \mathcal{S}_i contains the $n - |\mathcal{V}_b| - 2$ nearest neighbors of client i . Multi-Krum variants extend this concept by aggregating multiple reliable gradients.

7.1.1 Hierarchical Defenses

The **Bulyan** framework [150] combines Krum and TM through two-phase filtering: First, it selects candidate gradients via Krum-like consensus, then applies TM aggregation on this subset. This layered approach enhances robustness against sophisticated attacks attempting to bypass single-stage defenses.

7.2 Decentralized FL Defenses

7.2.1 Local Inference Detection

The **Local Injection Detection (LID)** method [138] implements dynamic neighbor screening through hypothesis testing. Each node i evaluates updates from neighbor j using:

$$\Delta U_j = \frac{2}{\Delta T} \sum_{t=1}^{\Delta T/2} \|\mathbf{u}_j^{(2t)} - \text{median}(\{\mathbf{u}_l^{(2t)}\}_{l \in \mathcal{N}_i \setminus j})\|_\infty \quad (21)$$

where the infinity norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ captures maximum parameter deviations and $\mathbf{u}_j^{(t)} = \frac{1}{\eta^{(t)}}(\mathbf{w}_j^{(t+1)} - \mathbf{w}_j^{(t)})$, $\eta^{(t)}$ is time-varying step size. Updates are classified as malicious (H_1) or benign (H_0) through threshold comparison:

$$\Delta U_{i,j} \underset{H_0^{i,j}}{\overset{H_1^{i,j}}{\gtrless}} \delta_u \sqrt{|\mathcal{V}_i|} \quad (22)$$

7.2.2 Adaptive Filtering Approaches

The **Uniform Byzantine-Resilient Aggregation Rule (UBAR)** [151] employs dual-stage filtering: First, nodes select neighbors with minimal model distance; second, they validate updates through local performance evaluation. This combination ensures both geometric consistency and functional utility of aggregated models.

7.2.3 Topology-Aware Defenses

Self-Centered Clipping (SCClip) [152] addresses non-IID challenges through localized update constraints:

$$\mathbf{w}_i^{(t+1)} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} A_{ij} \left(\mathbf{w}_i^{(t)} + \text{Clip}(\mathbf{w}_j^{(t)} - \mathbf{w}_i^{(t)}, \tau_i) \right) \quad (23)$$

where the clipping operation $\text{Clip}(\mathbf{x}, \tau) = \min(1, \tau/\|\mathbf{x}\|) \cdot \mathbf{x}$ bounds update magnitudes relative to local model $\mathbf{w}_i^{(t)}$.

7.2.4 Dynamic Threshold Mechanisms

The **Balance** method [140] implements adaptive filtering through:

$$\mathcal{S}_i^{(t)} = \left\{ j \in \mathcal{N}_i : \|\mathbf{w}_j^{(t)} - \mathbf{w}_i^{(t)}\| \leq \gamma^{(t)} \right\} \quad (24)$$

where threshold $\gamma^{(t)}$ follows exponential decay $\gamma^{(t)} = \gamma_0 \cdot \alpha^t$ ($\alpha \in (0, 1)$). This progressive tightening ensures increasing selectivity during training convergence.

Defense Approach	Assumed Topology	General Applicable	Attacks			FL Formulation	
			Explicit	Backdoor	Passive	Separate aggregation	Joint-optimization
Robust Aggregation							
TM[147]	CFL	✓	✓	×	×	✓	
MED[147, 148]	CFL	✓	✓	×	×	✓	
Krum[153, 149]	CFL	×	✓	×	×	✓	
Bulyan[150]	CFL	×	✓	×	×	✓	
LID[138]	DFL	×	✓	✓	×	✓	
UBAR[151]	DFL	×	✓	✓	×		
SCClip[152]	DFL	×	✓	✓	✓		✓
Balance[140]	DFL	×	✓	✓	✓		✓

Table 3: Comparison of defense approaches against different types of attacks.

Overall, relies on server authority and global statistical analysis, prioritizing scalability at the cost of introducing a single point of failure. In contrast, DFL distributes trust through localized validation and outlier filtering mechanisms, which better adapt to dynamic environments but complicate model convergence in heterogeneous data settings.

8 Conclusion

This survey reframes the evolution of FL by arguing that the core distinction between CFL and DFL lies not only in topology but also in protocol design: separated aggregation versus joint optimization. Our taxonomy reveals critical insights: (1) Most DFL methods adopt heuristic averaging protocols rather than rigorous distributed optimization, limiting their robustness and scalability; (2) Protocol choice directly governs privacy-utility trade-offs, with joint optimization methods showing untapped potential for privacy preservation through inherent constraints.

Key gaps persist, particularly in DFL's underuse of distributed optimization frameworks despite their theoretical advantages for non-IID data and Byzantine resilience. Future work should prioritize protocol-aware designs that unify optimization and robustness, adaptive defenses against evolving attacks, and hybrid architectures balancing CFL's efficiency with DFL's security. By transcending topology-centric paradigms, the field can unlock FL's full potential as a scalable, private, and attack-resilient framework for decentralized collaboration.

References

- [1] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Aguera y Arcas. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 1273–1282. PMLR, 2017.
- [2] Tian Li, Anit Kumar Sahu, Ameet Talwalkar, and Virginia Smith. Federated learning: Challenges, methods, and future directions. *IEEE signal processing magazine*, 37(3):50–60, 2020.
- [3] Zezhong Ma, Meng Zhang, Jiajia Liu, Aimin Yang, Hao Li, Jian Wang, Dianbo Hua, and Mingduo Li. An assisted diagnosis model for cancer patients based on federated learning. *Frontiers in Oncology*, 12:860532, 2022.
- [4] Zhihua Cui, Xianghua Xu, Xue Fei, Xingjuan Cai, Yang Cao, Wensheng Zhang, and Jinjun Chen. Personalized recommendation system based on collaborative filtering for iot scenarios. *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, 13(4):685–695, 2020.
- [5] Ji Chu Jiang, Burak Kantarci, Sema Oktug, and Tolga Soyata. Federated learning in smart city sensing: Challenges and opportunities. *Sensors*, 20(21):6230, 2020.
- [6] Xiaoming Yuan, Jiahui Chen, Jiayu Yang, Ning Zhang, Tingting Yang, Tao Han, and Amir Taherkordi. Fedstn: Graph representation driven federated learning for edge computing enabled urban traffic flow prediction. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 24(8):8738–8748, 2022.
- [7] Hongyi Zhang, Jan Bosch, and Helena Holmström Olsson. Federated learning systems: Architecture alternatives. In *2020 27th Asia-Pacific Software Engineering Conference (APSEC)*, pages 385–394. IEEE, 2020.
- [8] Chenghao Hu, Jingyan Jiang, and Zhi Wang. Decentralized federated learning: A segmented gossip approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.07782*, 2019.
- [9] Dario Pasquini, Mathilde Raynal, and Carmela Troncoso. On the (in)security of peer-to-peer decentralized machine learning. In *2023 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 418–436, 2023.
- [10] Xiangru Lian, Ce Zhang, Huan Zhang, Cho-Jui Hsieh, Wei Zhang, and Ji Liu. Can decentralized algorithms outperform centralized algorithms? a case study for decentralized parallel stochastic gradient descent. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [11] Anastasia Koloskova, Nicolas Loizou, Sadra Boreiri, Martin Jaggi, and Sebastian Stich. A unified theory of decentralized sgd with changing topology and local updates. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, page 5381–5393. PMLR, 2020.
- [12] Tao Sun, Dongsheng Li, and Bao Wang. Decentralized federated averaging. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 45(4):4289–4301, 2022.
- [13] Kenta Niwa, Noboru Harada, Guoqiang Zhang, and W Bastiaan Kleijn. Edge-consensus learning: Deep learning on p2p networks with nonhomogeneous data. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pages 668–678, 2020.

- [14] Wenrui Yu, Qiongxiu Li, Milan Lopuhaä-Zwakenberg, Mads Græsbøll Christensen, and Richard Heusdens. Provable privacy advantages of decentralized federated learning via distributed optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 2024.
- [15] Peter H Jin, Qiaochu Yuan, Forrest Iandola, and Kurt Keutzer. How to scale distributed deep learning? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.04581*, 2016.
- [16] Hanlin Tang, Xiangru Lian, Ming Yan, Ce Zhang, and Ji Liu. d^2 : Decentralized training over decentralized data. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4848–4856. PMLR, 2018.
- [17] Xiaoyu Wang, Guojun Xiong, Houwei Cao, Jian Li, and Yong Liu. Decentralized federated learning with model caching on mobile agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.14001*, 2024.
- [18] Stephen Boyd, Neal Parikh, Eric Chu, Borja Peleato, Jonathan Eckstein, et al. Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–122, 2011.
- [19] Guoqiang Zhang and Richard Heusdens. Distributed optimization using the primal-dual method of multipliers. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 173–187, 2018.
- [20] Thomas William Sherson, Richard Heusdens, and W Bastiaan Kleijn. Derivation and analysis of the primal-dual method of multipliers based on monotone operator theory. *IEEE transactions on signal and information processing over networks*, 5(2):334–347, 2018.
- [21] Ivan Damgård, Valerio Pastro, Nigel Smart, and Sarah Zakarias. Multiparty computation from somewhat homomorphic encryption. In *Advances in Cryptology—CRYPTO*, pp. 643–662. Springer, 2012.
- [22] Alireza Fallah, Aryan Mokhtari, and Asuman Ozdaglar. Personalized federated learning with theoretical guarantees: A model-agnostic meta-learning approach. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:3557–3568, 2020.
- [23] Qinbin Li, Bingsheng He, and Dawn Song. Model-contrastive federated learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 10713–10722, 2021.
- [24] Tian Li, Anit Kumar Sahu, Manzil Zaheer, Maziar Sanjabi, Ameet Talwalkar, and Virginia Smith. Federated optimization in heterogeneous networks. *Proceedings of Machine learning and systems*, 2:429–450, 2020.
- [25] Jianyu Wang, Qinghua Liu, Hao Liang, Gauri Joshi, and H Vincent Poor. Tackling the objective inconsistency problem in heterogeneous federated optimization. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:7611–7623, 2020.
- [26] Pontus Giselsson and Stephen Boyd. Linear convergence and metric selection for douglas-rachford splitting and admm. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 62(2):532–544, 2016.
- [27] Wei Shi, Qing Ling, Kun Yuan, Gang Wu, and Wotao Yin. On the linear convergence of the admm in decentralized consensus optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 62(7):1750–1761, 2014.
- [28] Richard Heusdens and Guoqiang Zhang. Distributed optimisation with linear equality and inequality constraints using pdmm. *IEEE Transactions on Signal and Information Processing over Networks*, 2024.
- [29] Richard Heusdens and Guoqiang Zhang. Distributed nonlinear conic optimisation with partially separable structure. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.09490*, 2024.
- [30] Thomas Sherson, W Bastiaan Kleijn, and Richard Heusdens. A distributed algorithm for robust lcmv beamforming. In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, pages 101–105. IEEE, 2016.
- [31] Andreas I. Koutrouvelis, Thomas W. Sherson, Richard Heusdens and Richard C. Hendriks. A low-cost robust distributed linearly constrained beamformer for wireless acoustic sensor networks with arbitrary topology. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*. vol. 26, no. 8, pp. 1434–1448, 2018.
- [32] Qiongxiu Li, Richard Heusdens, and Mads Græsbøll Christensen. Convex optimisation-based privacy-preserving distributed average consensus in wireless sensor networks. In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, pp. 5895–5899, 2020.
- [33] Qiongxiu Li, Richard Heusdens, and Mads Græsbøll Christensen. Convex optimization-based privacy-preserving distributed least squares via subspace perturbation. In *European Signal Processing Conference*, pp. 2110–2114, 2021.
- [34] Qiongxiu Li, Richard Heusdens, and Mads Græsbøll Christensen. Privacy-preserving distributed optimization via subspace perturbation: A general framework. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 68:5983–5996, 2020.

- [35] Zhenqi Huang, Sayan Mitra, and Nitin Vaidya. Differentially private distributed optimization. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Distributed Computing and Networking*, pages 1–10, 2015.
- [36] Shuo Han, Ufuk Topcu, and George J Pappas. Differentially private distributed constrained optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 1, pp 50-64, 2016.
- [37] Qiongxiu Li, Ignacio Cascudo, and Mads Græsbøll Christensen. Privacy-preserving distributed average consensus based on additive secret sharing. In *European Singal Processing Conference*, pp. 1-5, 2019.
- [38] Erfan Nozari, Pavankumar Tallapragada, and Jorge Cortés. Differentially private distributed convex optimization via functional perturbation. *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp 395-408, 2018.
- [39] Tao Zhang and Quanyan Zhu. Dynamic differential privacy for admm-based distributed classification learning. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 12(1):172–187, 2016.
- [40] Xueru Zhang, Mohammad Mahdi Khalili, and Mingyan Liu. Recycled admm: Improve privacy and accuracy with less computation in distributed algorithms. In *2018 56th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*, pages 959–965. IEEE, 2018.
- [41] Xueru Zhang, Mohammad Mahdi Khalili, and Mingyan Liu. Improving the privacy and accuracy of admm-based distributed algorithms. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 5796–5805. PMLR, 2018.
- [42] Yongyang Xiong, Jinming Xu, Keyou You, Jianxing Liu, and Ligang Wu. Privacy-preserving distributed online optimization over unbalanced digraphs via subgradient rescaling. *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, 7(3):1366–1378, 2020.
- [43] Qiongxiu Li, Jaron Skovsted Gundersen, Katrine Tjell, Rafal Wisniewski, and Mads Græsbøll Christensen. Privacy-preserving distributed expectation maximization for gaussian mixture model using subspace perturbation. In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, pages 4263–4267. IEEE, 2022.
- [44] Sebastian O Jordan, Qiongxiu Li, and Richard Heusdens. Privacy-preserving distributed optimisation using stochastic PDMM. In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, pages 8571–8575, 2024.
- [45] Qiongxiu Li, Richard Heusdens, and Mads Græsbøll Christensen. Communication efficient privacy-preserving distributed optimization using adaptive differential quantization. *Signal Processing*, 194:108456, 2022.
- [46] Qiongxiu Li, Jaron Skovsted Gundersen, Milan Lopuhaä-Zwakenberg, and Richard Heusdens. Adaptive differentially quantized subspace perturbation (adqsp): A unified framework for privacy-preserving distributed average consensus. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 19:1780–1793, 2023.
- [47] Wenrui Yu, Richard Heusdens, Jun Pang, and Qiongxiu Li. Privacy-preserving distributed maximum consensus without accuracy loss. *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, to appear, 2025.
- [48] Reese Pathak and Martin J Wainwright. Fedsplit: An algorithmic framework for fast federated optimization. *Advances in neural information processing systems (NeurIPS)*, pp. 7057–7066, 33, 2020.
- [49] Sai Praneeth Karimireddy, Satyen Kale, Mehryar Mohri, Sashank Reddi, Sebastian Stich, and Ananda Theertha Suresh. Scaffold: Stochastic controlled averaging for federated learning. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 5132–5143. PMLR, 2020.
- [50] Guoqiang Zhang, Kenta Niwa, and W Bastiaan Kleijn. Revisiting the primal-dual method of multipliers for optimisation over centralised networks. *IEEE Transactions on Signal and Information Processing over Networks*, 8:228–243, 2022.
- [51] Qiongxiu Li, Wenrui Yu, Changlong Ji, and Richard Heusdens. Topology-dependent privacy bound for decentralized federated learning. In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, pages 5940–5944. IEEE, 2024.
- [52] Sebastian Ruder. An overview of gradient descent optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.04747*, 2016.
- [53] Matt O’Connor, Guoqiang Zhang, W Bastiaan Kleijn, and Thushara Dheemantha Abhayapala. Function splitting and quadratic approximation of the primal-dual method of multipliers for distributed optimization over graphs. *IEEE Transactions on Signal and Information Processing over Networks*, 4(4):656–666, 2018.
- [54] Alexandros G. Dimakis, Soumya Kar, José M.F. Moura, Michael G. Rabbat, and Anna Scaglione. Gossip algorithms for distributed signal processing. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 98, no. 11, pp. 1847–1864, 2010.
- [55] Alex Olshevsky and John N Tsitsiklis. Convergence speed in distributed consensus and averaging. *SIAM journal on control and optimization*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 33–55, 2009.

- [56] Abhijit Guha Roy, Shayan Siddiqui, Sebastian Pölsterl, Nassir Navab, and Christian Wachinger. Braintorrent: A peer-to-peer environment for decentralized federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.06731*, 2019.
- [57] Luca Melis, Congzheng Song, Emiliano De Cristofaro, and Vitaly Shmatikov. Exploiting unintended feature leakage in collaborative learning. In *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pp. 691–706., 2019.
- [58] Reza Shokri, Marco Stronati, Vitaly Shmatikov. Membership inference attacks against machine learning models. In *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, pp.3–18, 2017.
- [59] Mingxue Xu and Xiangyang Li. Subject property inference attack in collaborative learning. In *2020 12th International Conference on Intelligent Human-Machine Systems and Cybernetics (IHMSC)*, volume 1, pages 227–231. IEEE, 2020.
- [60] Aidmar Wainakh, Fabrizio Ventola, Till Müßig, Jens Keim, Carlos Garcia Cordero, Ephraim Zimmer, Tim Grube, Kristian Kersting, and Max Mühlhäuser. User label leakage from gradients in federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.09369*, 2021.
- [61] Zecheng He, Tianwei Zhang, and Ruby B Lee. Model inversion attacks against collaborative inference. In *Proceedings of the 35th Annual Computer Security Applications Conference*, pages 148–162, 2019.
- [62] Zhibo Wang, Mengkai Song, Zhifei Zhang, Yang Song, Qian Wang, and Hairong Qi. Beyond inferring class representatives: User-level privacy leakage from federated learning. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2019-IEEE conference on computer communications*, pages 2512–2520. IEEE, 2019.
- [63] Ziqi Yang, Jiye Zhang, Ee-Chien Chang, and Zhenkai Liang. Neural network inversion in adversarial setting via background knowledge alignment. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 225–240, 2019.
- [64] Samuel Yeom, Irene Giacomelli, Matt Fredrikson, and Somesh Jha. Privacy risk in machine learning: Analyzing the connection to overfitting. In *2018 IEEE 31st computer security foundations symposium (CSF)*, pages 268–282. IEEE, 2018.
- [65] Ahmed Salem, Yang Zhang, Mathias Humbert, Pascal Berrang, Mario Fritz, and Michael Backes. ML-leaks: Model and data independent membership inference attacks and defenses on machine learning models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.01246*, 2018.
- [66] Liwei Song and Prateek Mittal. Systematic evaluation of privacy risks of machine learning models. In *USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX)*, pages 2615–2632, 2021.
- [67] Milad Nasr, Reza Shokri, and Amir Houmansadr. Comprehensive privacy analysis of deep learning: Passive and active white-box inference attacks against centralized and federated learning. In *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, pages 739–753. IEEE, 2019.
- [68] Hailong Hu and Jun Pang. Membership inference attacks against gans by leveraging over-representation regions. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 2387–2389, 2021.
- [69] Hailong Hu and Jun Pang. Loss and likelihood based membership inference of diffusion models. In *International Conference on Information Security*, pages 121–141. Springer, 2023.
- [70] Jiacheng Li, Ninghui Li, and Bruno Ribeiro. Effective passive membership inference attacks in federated learning against overparameterized models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [71] Anshuman Suri, Pallika Kanani, Virendra J Marathe, and Daniel W Peterson. Subject membership inference attacks in federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.03317*, 2022.
- [72] Jiaxin Li, Marco Arazzi, Antonino Nocera, and Mauro Conti. Subject data auditing via source inference attack in cross-silo federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.19417*, 2024.
- [73] Raouf Kerkouche, Gergely Ács, and Mario Fritz. Client-specific property inference against secure aggregation in federated learning. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Workshop on Privacy in the Electronic Society*, pages 45–60, 2023.
- [74] Hyunjun Kim, Yungi Cho, Younghun Lee, Ho Bae, and Yunheung Paek. Exploring clustered federated learning’s vulnerability against property inference attack. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Symposium on Research in Attacks, Intrusions and Defenses*, pages 236–249, 2023.
- [75] Zhibo Wang, Yuting Huang, Mengkai Song, Libing Wu, Feng Xue, and Kui Ren. Poisoning-assisted property inference attack against federated learning. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, 20(4):3328–3340, 2022.

- [76] Ligeng Zhu, Zhijian Liu, and Song Han. Deep leakage from gradients. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- [77] Bo Zhao, Konda Reddy Mopuri, and Hakan Bilen. idlg: Improved deep leakage from gradients. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.02610*, 2020.
- [78] Jonas Geiping, Hartmut Bauermeister, Hannah Dröge, and Michael Moeller. Inverting gradients-how easy is it to break privacy in federated learning? *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:16937–16947, 2020.
- [79] Hongxu Yin, Arun Mallya, Arash Vahdat, Jose M Alvarez, Jan Kautz, and Pavlo Molchanov. See through gradients: Image batch recovery via gradinversion. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 16337–16346, 2021.
- [80] Franziska Boenisch, Adam Dziedzic, Roei Schuster, Ali Shahin Shamsabadi, Ilia Shumailov, and Nicolas Papernot. When the curious abandon honesty: Federated learning is not private. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.02918*, 2021.
- [81] Haomiao Yang, Mengyu Ge, Kunlan Xiang, and Jingwei Li. Using highly compressed gradients in federated learning for data reconstruction attacks. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 18:818–830, 2022.
- [82] Qiongxiu Li, Lixia Luo, Agnese Gini, Changlong Ji, Zhanhao Hu, Xiao Li, Chengfang Fang, Jie Shi, and Xiaolin Hu. Perfect gradient inversion in federated learning: A new paradigm from the hidden subset sum problem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.14260*, 2024.
- [83] Jin Xu, Chi Hong, Jiyue Huang, Lydia Y Chen, and Jérémie Decouchant. Agic: Approximate gradient inversion attack on federated learning. In *2022 41st International Symposium on Reliable Distributed Systems (SRDS)*, pages 12–22. IEEE, 2022.
- [84] Jiahui Geng, Yongli Mou, Qing Li, Feifei Li, Oya Beyan, Stefan Decker, and Chunming Rong. Improved gradient inversion attacks and defenses in federated learning. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data*, 2023.
- [85] Zihao Zhao, Mengen Luo, and Wenbo Ding. Deep leakage from model in federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.04887*, 2022.
- [86] Haotian Liang, Youqi Li, Chuan Zhang, Ximeng Liu, and Liehuang Zhu. Egia: An external gradient inversion attack in federated learning. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 18:4984–4995, 2023.
- [87] Dingdong Yang, Seunghoon Hong, Yunseok Jang, Tianchen Zhao, and Honglak Lee. Diversity-sensitive conditional generative adversarial networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.09024*, 2019.
- [88] Yuheng Zhang, Ruoxi Jia, Hengzhi Pei, Wenxiao Wang, Bo Li, and Dawn Song. The secret revealer: Generative model-inversion attacks against deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 253–261, 2020.
- [89] Si Chen, Mostafa Kahla, Ruoxi Jia, and Guo-Jun Qi. Knowledge-enriched distributional model inversion attacks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 16178–16187, 2021.
- [90] Zeping Zhang, Xiaowen Wang, Jie Huang, and Shuaishuai Zhang. Analysis and utilization of hidden information in model inversion attacks. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 2023.
- [91] Cynthia Dwork. Differential privacy. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming*, pp. 1–12, 2006.
- [92] Cynthia Dwork, Jing Lei. Differential privacy and robust statistics. In *41st Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pp. 371–380, 2009.
- [93] John C Duchi, Michael I Jordan, and Martin J Wainwright. Local privacy and statistical minimax rates. In *IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pp. 429–438, 2013.
- [94] Martin Abadi, Andy Chu, Ian Goodfellow, H Brendan McMahan, Ilya Mironov, Kunal Talwar, and Li Zhang. Deep learning with differential privacy. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*, 2016.
- [95] Maoguo Gong, Jialun Feng, and Yu Xie. Privacy-enhanced multi-party deep learning. *Neural Networks*, 121:484–496, 2020.
- [96] Xiaokang Zhou, Wei Liang, I Kevin, Kai Wang, Zheng Yan, Laurence T Yang, Wei Wei, Jianhua Ma, and Qun Jin. Decentralized p2p federated learning for privacy-preserving and resilient mobile robotic systems. *IEEE Wireless Communications*, 30(2):82–89, 2023.

- [97] Anh-Tu Tran, The-Dung Luong, Jessada Karnjana, and Van-Nam Huynh. An efficient approach for privacy preserving decentralized deep learning models based on secure multi-party computation. *Neurocomputing*, 422:245–262, 2021.
- [98] Jinwoo Jeon, Kangwook Lee, Sewoong Oh, Jungseul Ok, et al. Gradient inversion with generative image prior. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:29898–29908, 2021.
- [99] Yangsibo Huang, Samyak Gupta, Zhao Song, Kai Li, and Sanjeev Arora. Evaluating gradient inversion attacks and defenses in federated learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:7232–7241, 2021.
- [100] Alham Fikri Aji and Kenneth Heafield. Sparse communication for distributed gradient descent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.05021*, 2017.
- [101] Jeremy Bernstein, Yu-Xiang Wang, Kamyar Azizzadenesheli, and Animashree Anandkumar. signsgd: Compressed optimisation for non-convex problems. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 560–569. PMLR, 2018.
- [102] Chong Fu, Xuhong Zhang, Shouling Ji, Jinyin Chen, Jingzheng Wu, Shanqing Guo, Jun Zhou, Alex X Liu, and Ting Wang. Label inference attacks against vertical federated learning. In *31st USENIX security symposium (USENIX Security 22)*, pages 1397–1414, 2022.
- [103] Ruihan Wu, Xiangyu Chen, Chuan Guo, and Kilian Q Weinberger. Learning to invert: Simple adaptive attacks for gradient inversion in federated learning. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 2293–2303. PMLR, 2023.
- [104] Natalie Lang, Elad Sofer, Tomer Shaked, and Nir Shlezinger. Joint privacy enhancement and quantization in federated learning. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 71:295–310, 2023.
- [105] Tianqu Kang, Lumin Liu, Hengtao He, Jun Zhang, SH Song, and Khaled B Letaief. The effect of quantization in federated learning: a rényi differential privacy perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.10096*, 2024.
- [106] Qiongxiu Li, Milan Lopuhaä-Zwakenberg, Richard Heusdens, and Mads Græsbøll Christensen. Two for the price of one: communication efficient and privacy-preserving distributed average consensus using quantization. In *2022 30th European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO)*, pages 2166–2170. IEEE, 2022.
- [107] Seunghyeon Shin, Mallika Boyapati, Kun Suo, Kyungtae Kang, and Junggab Son. An empirical analysis of image augmentation against model inversion attack in federated learning. *Cluster Computing*, 26(1):349–366, 2023.
- [108] Kang Wei, Jun Li, Ming Ding, Chuan Ma, Howard H Yang, Farhad Farokhi, Shi Jin, Tony QS Quek, and H Vincent Poor. Federated learning with differential privacy: Algorithms and performance analysis. *IEEE transactions on information forensics and security*, 15:3454–3469, 2020.
- [109] Rui Hu, Yuanxiong Guo, Hongning Li, Qingqi Pei, and Yanmin Gong. Personalized federated learning with differential privacy. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 7(10):9530–9539, 2020.
- [110] Stacey Truex, Ling Liu, Ka-Ho Chow, Mehmet Emre Gursoy, and Wenqi Wei. Ldp-fed: Federated learning with local differential privacy. In *Proceedings of the third ACM international workshop on edge systems, analytics and networking*, pages 61–66, 2020.
- [111] Aleksei Triastcyn and Boi Faltings. Federated learning with bayesian differential privacy. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*, pages 2587–2596. IEEE, 2019.
- [112] Edwige Cyffers and Aurélien Bellet. Privacy amplification by decentralization. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 5334–5353. PMLR, 2022.
- [113] Mohammad Naseri, Jamie Hayes, and Emiliano De Cristofaro. Local and central differential privacy for robustness and privacy in federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.03561*, 2020.
- [114] Hanchi Ren, Jingjing Deng, and Xianghua Xie. Grnn: generative regression neural network—a data leakage attack for federated learning. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)*, 13(4):1–24, 2022.
- [115] Tiantian Feng, Raghuvveer Peri, and Shrikanth Narayanan. User-level differential privacy against attribute inference attack of speech emotion recognition in federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02500*, 2022.
- [116] Xiao Li, Qiongxiu Li, Zhanhao Hu, and Xiaolin Hu. On the privacy effect of data enhancement via the lens of memorization. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 2024.
- [117] Till Gehlhar, Felix Marx, Thomas Schneider, Ajith Suresh, Tobias Wehrle, and Hossein Yalame. Safefl: Mpc-friendly framework for private and robust federated learning. In *2023 IEEE Security and Privacy Workshops (SPW)*, pages 69–76. IEEE, 2023.

- [118] Hiroki Kaminaga, Feras M Awaysheh, Sadi Alawadi, and Liina Kamm. Mpcfl: Towards multi-party computation for secure federated learning aggregation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 16th International Conference on Utility and Cloud Computing*, pages 1–10, 2023.
- [119] Jingwei Liu, Xinyu He, Rong Sun, Xiaojiang Du, and Mohsen Guizani. Privacy-preserving data sharing scheme with fl via mpc in financial permissioned blockchain. In *ICC 2021-IEEE International Conference on Communications*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2021.
- [120] Chi Zhang, Sotthiwat Ekanut, Liangli Zhen, and Zengxiang Li. Augmented multi-party computation against gradient leakage in federated learning. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data*, 2022.
- [121] Tieming Geng, Jian Liu, and Chin-Tser Huang. A privacy-preserving federated learning framework for iot environment based on secure multi-party computation. In *2024 IEEE Annual Congress on Artificial Intelligence of Things (AIoT)*, pages 117–122. IEEE, 2024.
- [122] MyungJae Shin, Chihoon Hwang, Joongheon Kim, Jihong Park, Mehdi Bennis, and Seong-Lyun Kim. Xor mixup: Privacy-preserving data augmentation for one-shot federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.05148*, 2020.
- [123] Gongxi Zhu, Donghao Li, Hanlin Gu, Yuxing Han, Yuan Yao, Lixin Fan, and Qiang Yang. Evaluating membership inference attacks and defenses in federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.06289*, 2024.
- [124] Nir Shlezinger, Mingzhe Chen, Yonina C Eldar, H Vincent Poor, and Shuguang Cui. Uveqfed: Universal vector quantization for federated learning. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 69:500–514, 2020.
- [125] Nicola Tonello, Alberto Gotta, Franco Maria Nardini, Daniele Gadler, and Fabrizio Silvestri. Neural network quantization in federated learning at the edge. *Information Sciences*, 575:417–436, 2021.
- [126] Ahmed Roushdy Elkordy and A Salman Avestimehr. Heterosag: Secure aggregation with heterogeneous quantization in federated learning. *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 70(4):2372–2386, 2022.
- [127] Pretom Roy Ovi, Emon Dey, Nirmalya Roy, and Aryya Gangopadhyay. Mixed quantization enabled federated learning to tackle gradient inversion attacks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 5046–5054, 2023.
- [128] Milad Nasr, Shuang Song, Abhradeep Thakurta, Nicolas Papernot, and Nicholas Carlin. Adversary instantiation: Lower bounds for differentially private machine learning. In *2021 IEEE Symposium on security and privacy (SP)*, pages 866–882. IEEE, 2021.
- [129] Bargav Jayaraman and David Evans. Evaluating differentially private machine learning in practice. In *28th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 19)*, pages 1895–1912, 2019.
- [130] Nicholas Carlini, Steve Chien, Milad Nasr, Shuang Song, Andreas Terzis, and Florian Tramèr. Membership inference attacks from first principles. In *2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 1897–1914. IEEE, 2022.
- [131] Changlong Ji, Stephane Maag, Richard Heusdens, and Qiongxiu Li. Re-evaluating privacy in centralized and decentralized learning: An information-theoretical and empirical study. In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing, to appear*, 2025.
- [132] Gilad Baruch, Moran Baruch, and Yoav Goldberg. A little is enough: Circumventing defenses for distributed learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- [133] Adnan Siraj Rakin, Zhezhi He, and Deliang Fan. Bit-flip attack: Crushing neural network with progressive bit search. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2019.
- [134] Sai Praneeth Karimireddy, Lie He, and Martin Jaggi. Byzantine-robust learning on heterogeneous datasets via bucketing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.09365*, 2020.
- [135] Jiale Zhang, Junjun Chen, Di Wu, Bing Chen, and Shui Yu. Poisoning attack in federated learning using generative adversarial nets. In *2019 18th IEEE international conference on trust, security and privacy in computing and communications/13th IEEE international conference on big data science and engineering (TrustCom/BigDataSE)*, pages 374–380. IEEE, 2019.
- [136] Najeeb Moharram Jebreel, Josep Domingo-Ferrer, David Sánchez, and Alberto Blanco-Justicia. Defending against the label-flipping attack in federated learning, 2022.
- [137] Or Shalom, Amir Leshem, and Waheed U Bajwa. Mitigating data injection attacks on federated learning. In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, pages 9116–9120. IEEE, 2024.
- [138] Or Shalom, Amir Leshem, and Anna Scaglione. Localization of data injection attacks on distributed m-estimation. *IEEE Transactions on Signal and Information Processing over Networks*, 8:655–669, 2022.

- [139] Di Cao, Shan Chang, Zhijian Lin, Guohua Liu, and Donghong Sun. Understanding distributed poisoning attack in federated learning. In *2019 IEEE 25th international conference on parallel and distributed systems (ICPADS)*, pages 233–239. IEEE, 2019.
- [140] Minghong Fang, Zifan Zhang, Hairi, Prashant Khanduri, Jia Liu, Songtao Lu, Yuchen Liu, and Neil Gong. Byzantine-robust decentralized federated learning. In *Proceedings of the 2024 on ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 2874–2888, 2024.
- [141] Duanyi Yao, Songze Li, Xueluan Gong, Sizai Hou, and Gaoning Pan. Urvfl: Undetectable data reconstruction attack on vertical federated learning. *arXiv preprint*, arXiv:2404.19582v2, 2024.
- [142] Eugene Bagdasaryan, Andreas Veit, Yiqing Hua, Deborah Estrin, and Vitaly Shmatikov. How to backdoor federated learning. In *Proc. Int. Conf. Artif. Intell. Stat. (AISTATS)*, volume 2938–2948. PMLR, 2020.
- [143] Xueluan Gong, Yanjiao Chen, Qian Wang, and Weihang Kong. Backdoor attacks and defenses in federated learning: State-of-the-art, taxonomy, and future directions. *IEEE Wireless Communications*, 30(2):114–121, 2023.
- [144] Chulin Xie, Keli Huang, Pin-Yu Chen, and Bo Li. Dba: Distributed backdoor attacks against federated learning. In *International conference on learning representations*, 2019.
- [145] Zaixi Zhang, Jinyuan Jia, Binghui Wang, and Neil Zhenqiang Gong. Backdoor attacks to graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM symposium on access control models and technologies*, pages 15–26, 2021.
- [146] Minghong Fang, Xiaoyu Cao, Jinyuan Jia, and Neil Gong. Local model poisoning attacks to {Byzantine-Robust} federated learning. In *29th USENIX security symposium (USENIX Security 20)*, pages 1605–1622, 2020.
- [147] Dong Yin, Yudong Chen, Ramchandran Kannan, and Peter Bartlett. Byzantine-robust distributed learning: Towards optimal statistical rates. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 5650–5659. Pmlr, 2018.
- [148] Haoxiang Ye, Heng Zhu, and Qing Ling. On the tradeoff between privacy preservation and byzantine-robustness in decentralized learning. In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, pages 9336–9340. IEEE, 2024.
- [149] Peva Blanchard, El Mahdi El Mhamdi, Rachid Guerraoui, and Julien Stainer. Machine learning with adversaries: Byzantine tolerant gradient descent. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [150] El Mahdi El Mhamdi, Rachid Guerraoui, and Sébastien Rouault. The hidden vulnerability of distributed learning in byzantium. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.07927*, 2018.
- [151] Shangwei Guo, Tianwei Zhang, Han Yu, Xiaofei Xie, Lei Ma, Tao Xiang, and Yang Liu. Byzantine-resilient decentralized stochastic gradient descent. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 32(6):4096–4106, 2021.
- [152] Lie He, Sai Praneeth Karimireddy, and Martin Jaggi. Byzantine-robust decentralized learning via self-centered clipping. *arXiv preprint*, arXiv:2202.01545, 2023.
- [153] Francesco Colosimo and Floriano De Rango. Median-krum: A joint distance-statistical based byzantine-robust algorithm in federated learning. In *Proceedings of the Int’l ACM Symposium on Mobility Management and Wireless Access, MobiWac ’23*, page 61–68, New York, NY, USA, 2023. Association for Computing Machinery.