
FEDGRAD: MITIGATING BACKDOOR ATTACKS IN FEDERATED LEARNING THROUGH LOCAL ULTIMATE GRADIENTS INSPECTION

A PREPRINT

Thuy Dung Nguyen

College of Engineering & Computer Science
VinUni-Illinois Smart Health Center
VinUniversity, Vietnam
dung.nt2@vinuni.edu.vn

Anh Duy Nguyen

College of Engineering & Computer Science
VinUni-Illinois Smart Health Center
VinUniversity, Vietnam
duy.na@vinuni.edu.vn

Kok-Seng Wong

College of Engineering & Computer Science
VinUni-Illinois Smart Health Center
VinUniversity, Vietnam
wong.ks@vinuni.edu.vn

Huy Hieu Pham

College of Engineering & Computer Science
VinUni-Illinois Smart Health Center
VinUniversity, Vietnam
hieu.ph@vinuni.edu.vn

Thanh Hung Nguyen

Hanoi University of Science and Technology
Hanoi, Vietnam
hungnt@soict.hust.edu.vn

Phi Le Nguyen *

Hanoi University of Science and Technology
Hanoi, Vietnam
lenp@soict.hust.edu.vn

Truong Thao Nguyen *

The National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science
and Technology (AIST), Japan
nguyen.truong@aist.go.jp

ABSTRACT

Federated learning (FL) enables multiple clients to train a model without compromising sensitive data. The decentralized nature of FL makes it susceptible to adversarial attacks, especially backdoor insertion during training. Recently, the edge-case backdoor attack employing the tail of the data distribution has been proposed as a powerful one, raising questions about the shortfall in current defenses' robustness guarantees. Specifically, most existing defenses cannot eliminate edge-case backdoor attacks or suffer from a trade-off between backdoor-defending effectiveness and overall performance on the primary task. To tackle this challenge, we propose FedGrad, a novel backdoor-resistant defense for FL that is resistant to cutting-edge backdoor attacks, including the edge-case attack, and performs effectively under heterogeneous client data and a large number of compromised clients. FedGrad is designed as a two-layer filtering mechanism that thoroughly analyzes the ultimate layer's gradient to identify suspicious local updates and remove them from the aggregation process. We evaluate FedGrad under different attack scenarios and show that it significantly outperforms state-of-the-art defense mechanisms. Notably, FedGrad can almost 100% correctly detect the malicious participants, thus providing a significant reduction in the backdoor effect (e.g., backdoor accuracy is less than 8%) while not reducing main accuracy on the primary task.

*Corresponding authors

1 Introduction

Background. Federated Learning (FL) emerges as a promising solution that enables the use of data and computing resources from multiple clients to train a shared model under the orchestration of a central server McMahan et al. [2017]. In FL, clients use their own data to train the model locally and iteratively share the local updates with the server, which then combines the contributions of the participating clients to generate a global update. Although FL has many notable characteristics and has been successful in many applications Qian et al. [2019], recent studies indicate that FL is fundamentally susceptible to adversarial attacks, in which malicious clients manipulate the local training process to contaminate the global model Bagdasaryan et al. [2020]. Based on the goal of the attack, adversarial attacks can be broadly classified into untargeted and targeted attacks. The former aims to deteriorate the performance of the global model on all test samples Blanchard et al. [2017], Fang et al. [2020], while the latter (also known as a backdoor attack) focuses on causing the model to generate false predictions for adversary-chosen inputs Sun et al. [2019], Bagdasaryan et al. [2020]. Recently, Wang et al. [2020] proposed and proved the stealthiness of *edge-case backdoor attacks*, which raises a great concern for the current defense schemes. In an edge-case attack, the adversary targets input data points that are far from the global distribution and unlikely to appear on the validation set of benign clients’ training data.

Existing approaches and their limitations. Many efforts have been devoted to dealing with existing threats in FL, which can be roughly classified into two directions: robust FL-aggregation and anomaly model detection. The former aims to optimize the aggregation function in order to limit the effects of polluted updates caused by attackers, whereas the latter attempts to identify and remove malicious updates. The most common way to lessen malicious updates is by restricting all clients’ updates by a threshold. For instance, Xie et al. [2021] presented a certified defense mechanism based on the clipping and perturbation paradigm. Other approaches focused on new estimators such as coordinate-wise median, α -trimmed mean Yin et al. [2018], geometric median Pillutla et al. [2022] for aggregation. The main drawback of the aforementioned methods is that polluted updates remain in the global model, thereby reducing the model’s precision while not totally mitigating the backdoor’s impact. In addition, clipping the update norm of all clients (including benign clients) will lessen the magnitude of the updates and slow down the model’s convergence speed.

Several methods have been proposed to identify adversarial clients and remove them from the aggregation. In Shen et al. [2016], the authors proposed a defense mechanism against poisoning attacks in collaborative learning based on the K -Means algorithm. Sattler et al. [2020a] proposed dividing the clients’ updates into normal updates and suspicious updates based on their cosine similarities. In the aforementioned defense schemes, the entire information from clients’ updates is used to measure client similarity. However, only a tiny portion of updates have a significant impact on the backdoor task, while most are negligible Zhou et al. [2021]. Recognizing this fact, Rieger et al. [2022] proposed identifying malicious clients by analyzing the internal structure of the last layer’s weights and comparing the outputs of the clients’ local models. Nonetheless, this strategy demands the creation of extra validation sets and local inference for each client, raising serious questions about their applicability in large-scale FL systems.

Additionally, most of the methods for identifying malicious clients proposed so far follow the majority-based paradigm in the sense that they assume benign local model updates are a majority compared to the malicious ones; thus, polluted updates are supposed to be outliers in the distribution of all updates. Unfortunately, this hypothesis holds true only if the data of the clients is IID (independent and identically distributed) and the number of malicious clients is small. In many real-world scenarios, client data exhibits a high level of heterogeneity, and the number of adversarial clients in a communication round can be substantial. This fact has imposed a great challenge on the backdoor attack resistance, making it an open issue Wang et al. [2020].

Our solution. In this paper, we propose a defense mechanism named FedGrad, capable of mitigating backdoor attacks under the most stressful environments, i.e., in the presence of heterogeneous client data and a significant number of adversarial clients. The proposed approach is based on two significant findings: 1) the discriminative capability of the last layer’s gradient (or ultimate gradient for short) and 2) the dynamics of clustering characteristics of clients’ local updates. Firstly, through comprehensive theoretical analysis and empirical experiments, we discovered that the ultimate gradient conveys rich information about local training objectives, allowing us to accurately distinguish malicious and benign participants. Secondly, we have the essential observation that the clustering feature of clients’ local updates varies throughout communication rounds. Specifically, in the initial few rounds, the benign client models show a significant degree of diversity, while the poisoned models may exhibit a high degree of similarity as they are trained with the same attack objective. In contrast, as the model is trained increasingly, the local models of benign clients tend to converge on the same global model, bringing them closer together.

In light of these findings, we propose a two-layer ultimate gradient-based filtering technique to identify suspicious model updates and eliminate them from the aggregated model, rather than using a unique clustering algorithm to distinguish




Figure 1: Illustration of the ultimate layer and the ultimate gradient. The ultimate layer is the last layer connected to the penultimate layer via the ultimate weight matrix.




Figure 2: The behavior of ultimate gradient. When training with samples from specific classes (the left sub-figure), the rows corresponding with the trained classes may contain positive elements, while the other rows are strictly negative. As the adversarial clients share the same training objective, their ultimate gradients (the red color in the right sub-figure) have similar patterns.




Figure 3: Discriminative characteristic of by-class ultimate weight gradient sum. Malicious updates (in red color) share the same pattern due to similar training objectives, while those of benign updates differ significantly (non-IID distribution).

between malicious and benign clients. Each layer in our proposed method is responsible for dealing with a specific characteristic of the client updates. Our proposed filtering algorithm can perform effectively even in the presence of heterogeneous client data and a large number of adversarial clients. The work that is the most relevant to our approach is DeepSight Rieger et al. [2022]. Unlike DeepSight, however, our clustering approach is based purely on the ultimate gradient without the requirement to perform inference on local updates of all clients during each communication round, thereby avoiding the additional computing overhead and ensuring scalability. Furthermore, unlike DeepSight’s clustering technique, our suggested two-layer filtering mechanism adapts appropriately to the fluctuating clustering features of client updates, enhancing its ability to filter malicious clients. These points make our proposed method superior to DeepSight.

In summary, our contributions are specified as follows:

- We introduce FedGrad – a novel backdoor-resistant defense for FL. It identifies and eliminates suspicious clients that distort the global model. FedGrad is the first work that, to the best of our knowledge, thoroughly addresses not only edge-case attacks but also other common types of backdoor attacks, even in the presence of a large number of compromised participants and a high degree of client data heterogeneity.
- We perform thorough, comprehensive theoretical analysis and empirical experiments on the gradient of the last layer and achieve significant findings regarding the discriminative capability of the last layer’s gradient and the dynamics of clustering characteristics of clients’ local updates.
- We design a robust ultimate-gradient-based two-layer filtering mechanism that accurately identifies malicious participants. The two filter layers take advantage of the discriminative capability of the last layer’s gradient and possess complementary features to accommodate the clustering dynamics of clients’ local updates. We also leverage the historical relationship between participants from the previous communication rounds to make anomaly detection in FedGrad more reliable.
- We conduct comprehensive experiments and in-depth ablation studies on various datasets, models, and backdoor attack scenarios to demonstrate the superiority of FedGrad over state-of-the-art defense techniques.

2 Threat Model

FL gives the adversary \mathcal{A} complete control over a set \mathcal{C} of compromised clients in order to obtain poisoned models, which are later aggregated into the global model G to poison its properties. In particular, \mathcal{A} wants the poisoned model G' to behave normally on all inputs except for specific inputs $x \in \mathcal{T}_A$ (where \mathcal{T}_A denotes the so-called targeted class), for which attacker-chosen (incorrect) predictions should be output. We denote ϵ as the compromising ratio, i.e., $\epsilon = \frac{|\mathcal{C}|}{N}$, where N is the total number of clients in the FL system. In each round, the aggregation server will randomly choose K clients from the total N clients; thus, the number of malicious participants in each training round ranges from 0 to $\min(\epsilon \cdot N, K)$. The attacker’s capabilities can be summarized as follows: (1) the attacker manipulates the local training data of any compromised client; (2) it completely controls the local training procedure and the hyperparameters (i.e., number of epochs); and (3) it modifies the local update of each resulting model before submitting it for aggregation. In

addition, \mathcal{A} is knowledgeable of the server’s operations. However, \mathcal{A} has no control over any processes executed at the server, nor over the benign clients. In the following, we will briefly describe the techniques that the adversary \mathcal{A} uses to achieve its objectives.

Data poisoning. \mathcal{A} adds a poisoned sample set \mathcal{D}_p to the training dataset of each client i in the compromising set \mathcal{C} . In which, training samples of each compromised client i are sampled from the same distribution. We denote the fraction of injected poisoned data \mathcal{D}_p in the overall poisoned training dataset \mathcal{D}'_i of client i as Poisoned Data Rate (PDR), i.e., $PDR = \frac{|\mathcal{D}_p|}{|\mathcal{D}'_i|}$.

Model replacement (MR). After the local training procedure is completed on the poisoned data (i.e., \mathcal{D}'_i), \mathcal{A} intensifies the backdoor effect by scaling the model updates before submitting them back to the server Bagdasaryan et al. [2020]. To make the attack more stealthy, projected gradient descent (PGD) Sun et al. [2019] is applied to ensure that each poisoned model does not differ considerably from the global model at each communication round. PGD is often combined with model replacement to achieve better effectiveness Wang et al. [2020].

3 Gradient of Ultimate Layer

Let consider a typical deep neural network \mathcal{M} for a classification task, consisting of a feature extractor and a classifier that is trained using the cross entropy loss by SGD method. We assume that the classifier comprises of a dense layer, followed by a softmax, and a bias vector layer (Fig. 1).

Definition 1 (Ultimate gradient). *The ultimate layer is the last fully connected layer. Let \mathbf{W} denote the weight matrix connecting the ultimate layer and the previous one, and \mathbf{b} denote the last bias vector. Then, the ultimate gradient is the improvement of \mathbf{W} and \mathbf{b} obtained after training the model \mathcal{M} with the SGD method. Specifically, let \mathbf{W}^t and \mathbf{b}^t be the value of the \mathbf{W} and \mathbf{b} at the t -th training iteration, then the ultimate gradient at the t -th iteration \mathbf{g}^t is the combination of ultimate weight gradient $\nabla \mathbf{W}^t = \frac{\mathbf{W}^t - \mathbf{W}^{t-1}}{-\eta}$, and ultimate bias gradient $\nabla \mathbf{b}^t = \frac{\mathbf{b}^t - \mathbf{b}^{t-1}}{-\eta}$, where η is the learning rate.*

To ease the presentation, we may omit the index t and simply represent the ultimate gradients by \mathbf{g} , \mathbf{W} , \mathbf{b} . The number of the ultimate layer’s neurons equals to the number of classes, with the j -th neuron indicating the prediction result for the j -th class. Intuitively, the j -th row of the ultimate weight matrix and the j -th element of the bias vector contain the most representative information of the training samples of the j -th class. In the following, we introduce a new term named *by-class ultimate gradient sum* to highlight the effect of the training data on the ultimate layer.

Definition 2 (By-class ultimate gradient sum). *The by-class ultimate gradient sum, denoted by μ , is obtained by summarizing the ultimate gradient by class, i.e., $\mu = \langle \mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbb{1} \rangle = \langle \nabla \mathbf{W} \cdot \mathbb{1}, \nabla \mathbf{b} \rangle$. Note that μ consists of two v -dimensional vectors, with the first representing the by-row sum of the ultimate weight gradient matrix and the second representing the ultimate bias gradient vector.*

Proposition 1 (Ultimate gradient when training with a single class). *Suppose $\mathbf{W} = [\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_v]$, and $\mathbf{b} = \langle b_1, \dots, b_v \rangle$, where \mathbf{w}_i is the i -th row of \mathbf{W} , and b_i is the i -th element of \mathbf{b} . Let (x, y) be a sample with the groundtruth label of j , i.e., $(y_j = 1, y_i = 0 \forall i \neq j)$. After training the model \mathcal{M} with sample (x, y) , the values of all elements in \mathbf{w}_j and b_j have an inverse sign compared with other elements in \mathbf{W} and \mathbf{b} .*

Proof. Let x be a training sample, and $R = R(x) \in \mathbb{R}^u$ denote the representation of x . Let us denote by $L(x) \in \mathbb{R}^v$ the logits of x , then $L(x)$ is defined as

$$L(x) = \mathbf{W} \cdot R + \mathbf{b} = \begin{bmatrix} R_1 w_{11} + R_2 w_{12} + \dots + R_u w_{1u} + b_1 \\ R_1 w_{21} + R_2 w_{22} + \dots + R_u w_{2u} + b_2 \\ \vdots \\ R_1 w_{v1} + R_2 w_{v2} + \dots + R_u w_{vu} + b_v \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let $p(x)$ be the prediction result, which is the output of the softmax layer, then the probability of sample x being classified into class j , i.e., $p_j(x)$, is determined as

$$p_j(x) = \frac{e^{L_j}}{\sum_{i=1}^v e^{L_i}}. \quad (1)$$

The cross entropy loss $\mathcal{L}(p(x), y)$ concerning sample (x, y) is given by

$$\mathcal{L}(p(x), y) = \sum_{i=0}^v y_i \log \left(\frac{1}{p_i(x)} \right). \quad (2)$$

Let w_{rc} be the item at row r and column c of W , then the gradient of the loss $\mathcal{L}(p(x), y)$ with respect to $w_{rc} \in W$ is

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial w_{rc}} = \sum_{i=1}^v \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial p_i(x)} \cdot \left(\sum_{k=1}^v \frac{\partial p_i(x)}{\partial L_k} \cdot \frac{\partial L_k}{\partial w_{rc}} \right) \right). \quad (3)$$

We have

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial p_i(x)} = -\frac{1}{\ln 10} \frac{y_i}{p_i(x)} = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{\ln 10} \frac{y_j}{p_j(x)} & \text{if } i = j \\ 0 & \text{if } i \neq j \end{cases}, \quad (4)$$

$$\frac{\partial p_j(x)}{\partial L_k} = \begin{cases} p_j(x)(1 - p_k(x)), & \text{if } k = j \\ -p_j(x)p_k(x), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}; \quad (5)$$

$$\frac{\partial L_k}{\partial w_{rc}} = \begin{cases} R_c, & \text{if } k = r \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}; \quad (6)$$

From (4), (5) and (6), we deduce that

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial w_{rc}} = \begin{cases} \frac{-1}{\ln 10} y_j (1 - p_j(x)) R_c, & \text{if } r = j, \\ \frac{1}{\ln 10} y_j p_r(x) R_c, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Let b_r be the bias at row r of W , then the gradient of the loss $\mathcal{L}(p(x), y)$ with respect to $b_r \in W$ is

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial b_r} = \sum_{i=1}^v \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial p_i(x)} \cdot \left(\sum_{k=1}^v \frac{\partial p_i(x)}{\partial L_k} \cdot \frac{\partial L_k}{\partial b_r} \right) \right) \quad (8)$$

$$= \begin{cases} \frac{-1}{\ln 10} y_j (1 - p_j(x)), & \text{if } r = j, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

As $y_j = 1$, $0 < p_i(x) < 1$ ($\forall i$), when applying the gradient descent, the values of the j -th row of W increase/decrease while those on all other rows decrease/increase (depending on R_c sign). Analogously, the value of bias corresponding to the j -th row increases/decreases while those on all other rows follows the opposite trend. Fig. 2 illustrates an intuition for Proposition 1.

Observation 1 (Ultimate gradient when training with datasets having similar distributions). *Suppose $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2, \dots, \mathcal{D}_C$ are C training datasets with the same distribution and \mathcal{M} be a shared model. Let \mathcal{M}_i ($i = 1, \dots, C$) be the model received by training \mathcal{M} using \mathcal{D}_i . Then, the ultimate gradients of $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_C$ share the same pattern (i.e., distribution).*

Intuitive Proof. Intuitively, all samples with the same label will likely result in similar representations after passing through the feature extractor. Consequently, it can be deduced from Equations (7) and (9) that the ultimate gradients obtained after training with samples belonging to the same classes are similar. As $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2, \dots, \mathcal{D}_K$ have the same distribution, training with them will produce models with similar ultimate gradients.

This observation suggests that if the data of benign clients is IID, their local models' ultimate gradients will exhibit similar patterns (Fig. 2); thus, the ultimate gradient can be used to distinguish between benign and malicious clients. However, when the client data is non-IID, the situation becomes more challenging. To this end, we have made the crucial observation that attacker typically uses a large poisoned data rate to better achieve their attack objectives (cf. Xie et al. [2020]).

Observation 2 (Discriminative characteristic of ultimate gradient). *In backdoor attacks, the by-class ultimate gradient sums of the compromised clients' models tend to have similar patterns.*

Empirical justification. Fig. 3 plots the by-class gradient sums of both malicious and benign models. As observed, the by-class ultimate gradient sum of the two malicious clients follows a similar pattern since they use polluted data with the same distribution. In contrast, the benign clients reveal different patterns as their training data is non-IID. To support our argument, we plot the cosine similarities of the clients' by-class ultimate gradient sum in Fig. 4. The left side of the figure depicts the similarity matrix for the by-class ultimate bias gradient, while the right side captures those concerning the by-class ultimate weight gradient sum. Obviously, the by-class ultimate gradient sums of the three malicious models are comparable, whereas the benign clients exhibit a great deal of variety.




Figure 4: **Cosine similarity regarding by-class gradient sum.** The right matrix presents the pairwise similarities of 10 local models in terms of by-class weight gradient sum, while the left side regards the by-class bias gradient. The malicious clients (1, 2, 7) have a high degree of similarity, whereas those of the benign clients are diverse.




Figure 5: **Overview of FedGrad.** Upon receiving local models from clients, the server: (1) applies the soft filter to determine the suspicious group S_1 ; (2) if the number of training rounds exceeds a threshold, then applies the hard filter to identify the suspicious group S_2 ; (3) combines S_1 and S_2 to obtain S , then utilizes the trustworthy score to remove the possibly benign clients from S ; and finally, performs aggregation, excluding clients belonging to S .

4 FedGrad: Against Backdoor Attacks via Ultimate Gradient

4.1 Motivation and Overview of FedGrad

FedGrad is comprised of two filtering layers that are complementary to each other, and each layer has a particular role. In the initial few rounds, the benign client models show a significant degree of diversity, particularly when the client’s data are non-IID. In the meantime, as discussed in the previous section, poisoned models may exhibit a high degree of similarity as they are trained with the same attack objective and large amounts of polluted training data. Motivated by this observation, we designed the first filter, named *soft filter*, based on the distance of clients’ local models to a so-called average model (i.e., the one obtained by averaging all the local models). As the local models generated by the adversary are highly similar, their distances from the average model will be smaller than those of the benign models. Consequently, we may identify the corresponding poisoned updates by investigating the distance to the average model.

However, as the model is trained increasingly, the local models of some benign clients may become closer to each other, i.e., when they converge to the same global model. Therefore, the soft filter may fail. To address this issue, we propose a *hard filter*, the second filter based on the clustering paradigm. In particular, we divide clients into two clusters using the by-class ultimate gradient sum and propose an algorithm for determining which cluster is benign.

Finally, to avoid misidentifying benign clients as malicious, we provide an additional mechanism to trace the clients’ trustworthy score (estimating the likelihood for a client to be benign) and use this score to remove false positive results generated by the soft and hard filters. The overall flow of the FedGrad (Fig. 5) is as follows:

1. Upon receiving local updates, the aggregation server employs the soft filter to identify suspicious participants. Let us denote the set of these clients as S_1 .
2. If the number of training rounds exceeds a predefined threshold, the server employs the hard filter to divide the clients into two groups and identify the group that contains malicious clients. Let us refer to the determined malicious group as S_2 .
3. Let $S = S_1 \cup S_2$. The server then eliminates from S all clients whose trustworthy score exceeds a specified threshold. The remainder of S is determined to be malicious clients. Finally, the server aggregates the updates from all clients, excluding those in S .

4.2 Ultimate Gradient-based Soft Filter

Compromising score calculation. The gradient-based soft filter utilizes a dynamic threshold (ϵ_1) to filter out a subset of suspicious clients in every training round. Let $\mathbf{W}_1^t, \dots, \mathbf{W}_K^t$ be the ultimate weight matrices, and $\nabla \mathbf{W}_1^t, \dots, \nabla \mathbf{W}_K^t$ be the ultimate weight gradients of the K clients participating in the current training round t . Then, the average ultimate weight of the current round, denoted as \mathbf{W}_*^t , is defined by $\mathbf{W}_*^t = \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{n_i}{n} \mathbf{W}_i^t$. Let ∇_*^t be the average ultimate weight gradient, which is defined by $\nabla_*^t = \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{n_i}{n} \nabla \mathbf{W}_i^t$. Then, the *compromising score* of a client i at round t , denoted by cs_i^t , is defined as $cs_i^t = \frac{(\mathbf{W}_i^t - \mathbf{W}_*^t)(\nabla_*^t)}{\|\mathbf{W}_i^t - \mathbf{W}_*^t\| \|\nabla_*^t\|}$. It can be intuitively shown that adversarial clients' compromising scores tend to be greater than those of benign clients. Moreover, to emphasize the difference in the compromising scores between the clients, we utilize the min-max scaling: $cs_i^t \leftarrow \frac{cs_i^t - \min_j cs_j^t}{\max_j cs_j^t - \min_j cs_j^t}$.

To enhance the reliability of the compromising score, rather than relying solely on the instant score of the current round, we also utilize the historical information from previous rounds to calculate the cumulative compromising score cs_i as $cs_i \leftarrow \frac{m-1}{m} cs_i + \frac{1}{m} cs_i^t$, where m is the number of training rounds where client i has joined the training process.

Dynamic threshold determination. To filter out malicious participants, we employ the adaptive threshold ϵ_1 defined as $\epsilon_1 = \min_{i \in \mathcal{C}_t} (\zeta, \text{median}(cs_i))$, where \mathcal{C}_t is the set of all clients participating in the current training round, and ζ is a fine-tuned hyper-parameter. The clients whose cumulative compromising score is greater than ϵ_1 are determined to be malicious. The rationale behind ϵ_1 is as follows. First, it should be noted that the compromising score of malicious clients is typically higher than that of benign ones. Therefore, when $\text{median}(cs_i)$ is moderately large, the number of adversarial clients participating in the current training round tends to be higher than usual. As such, factor ζ accelerates the filter to reduce the number of missing malicious clients. In contrast, the moderately small $\text{median}(cs_i)$ infers that the number of malicious participants in this training round is small. Hence, the median is robust enough to separate out the malicious clients.

4.3 By-class Ultimate Gradient-based Hard Filter

The hard filter consists of two steps: (1) clustering participants into two groups, and (2) identifying the group of compromised clients.

Clustering. To ensure stability, we leverage the K -means algorithm to partition the clients into two distinct groups. The inputs for the K -means algorithm are a set of all clients' attribute vectors \mathbf{f} . Here, the attribute vector \mathbf{f}_i for each client i is a vector representing the similarity of its by-class ultimate gradient to those of $K - 1$ participants. Specifically, $\mathbf{f}_i = \langle w_{i1}, \dots, w_{iK}; b_{i1}, \dots, b_{iK} \rangle$, where w_{ij} and b_{ij} are the cosine similarities between the by-class ultimate weight gradient vectors and the by-class ultimate bias vectors of clients i and j . Given each client's attribute vector, the K -means algorithm is performed using the L2 distance. Note that this kind of attribute helps to reflect not only the ultimate gradient of the clients but also their geometrical relation to the others, thereby enhancing the precision of our clustering algorithm.

Moreover, to strengthen the reliability of the proposed similarity, we use historical data to cumulatively update w_{ij} and b_{ij} by $\langle w_{ij}, b_{ij} \rangle = \frac{m-1}{m} \langle w_{ij}, b_{ij} \rangle + \frac{1}{m} \langle w_{ij}^t, b_{ij}^t \rangle$, where $\langle w_{ij}, b_{ij} \rangle$ and $\langle w_{ij}^t, b_{ij}^t \rangle$ are the cumulative and instant similarities of clients i and j , m is the number of rounds where both clients i and j join training together.

Malicious group determination. Existing clustering-based defenses Sattler et al. [2020b] typically identify the potentially malicious group as the one with the smallest number of clients. Nonetheless, this is not always the case, particularly when the client's data is non-IID. Motivated by the method proposed in Blanchard et al. [2017], FedGrad uses a so-called *closeness score* to identify the most likely benign clients. The closeness score of a client i is measured by the distance from its local model G_i to its $K - f - 2$ closest neighbors, where f is the estimated number of adversarial clients in the current round. Then, the client most likely to be benign is the one with the smallest closeness score. Given

the benign client, we can easily identify the other group (that does not contain the benign client) as the malicious group. The rationale behind our algorithm is that the benign clients’ local models become closer to the global model when the global model has almost converged (cf. Wang et al. [2020]). At the same time, the adversarial cluster presents its similarity within its group and has dissimilarity with the benign cluster. In addition, it is important to note that $K-f-2$ roughly corresponds to the number of benign clients, which is typically greater than the number of malicious clients. Therefore, there should be some benign clients among a malicious client’s $K-f-2$ closest neighbors. Consequently, the corresponding closeness score of a malicious client tends to be greater than that of the benign client with the lowest closeness score.

4.4 Filtering Strategy

Trustworthy score estimation. Detecting and discarding malicious clients’ updates from the aggregation is essential for preventing a poisoned global model. However, mistaking honest clients for malicious ones could reduce the main task accuracy. To this end, in addition to the two primary filters dedicated to identifying compromised clients, we utilize an additional filter to verify the results obtained from the two primary filters, thereby identifying false positives. We assign each participant in a training round an instant trustworthy score that reflects the likelihood that it is benign based solely on the information gathered from the current round. The estimated trustworthy score for each participant is then derived by averaging the instant trustworthy scores throughout all training rounds, with false positives identified as those whose scores exceed a predefined threshold γ . In particular, if a client is predicted to be malicious during a training round t , its instant trustworthy score is set to λ_1 ; otherwise, it is set to λ_2 . Here, λ_1 and λ_2 are two hyper-parameters.

Combination of the filters. Remind that the soft filter aims to figure out clients whose local models are close to the global one, while the hard filter focuses on clustering the clients into two distinct groups. In the initial rounds, client models are extremely diverse and do not exhibit clustering characteristics, so clustering-based methods are inappropriate at this stage. Therefore, in this phase, we employ only the gradient-based soft filter to determine the malicious participants. However, after several training rounds, the benign local models become more similar and show the same objectives as the global model, which means the soft filter may fail to correctly identify all the compromised clients. At this stage, the local models reveal a high degree of clustering. These facts necessitate the use of the hard filter for determining malicious group. Moreover, after using the soft and hard filters to roughly identify potential adversarial clients, the server leverages the trustworthy score to eliminate the false positive rate.

5 Experiments

Table 1: Trigger-based backdoor attacks setting.

Attack Strategy	Dataset	PDR	Scale factor	Compromising ratio ϵ	Benign lr /E	Poison lr /E
Unconstrained attack	MNIST	5/64	1	0.4	0.1/2	0.1/2
	CIFAR-10	12/64	1	0.4	0.1/2	0.1/10
Constrain and scale	MNIST	5/64	100	0.25	0.1/2	0.1/2
	CIFAR-10	6/25	20	0.25	0.1/2	0.1/10
DBA	MNIST	5/64	100	0.25	0.1/2	0.1/2
	CIFAR-10	6/25	20	0.25	0.1/2	0.1/10

In this section, we evaluate the performance of FedGrad against various backdoor attack scenario, including edge-case attacks Wang et al. [2020] and trigger-based backdoor attacks Bagdasaryan et al. [2020], Xie et al. [2020]. We show that FedGrad is able to minimize the attack effect without degrading its learning performance compared with state-of-the-art FL methods including Krum/Multi-krumBlanchard et al. [2017], FoolsGold Fung et al. [2020], RFAPillutla et al. [2022], RLROzdayi et al. [2021], and FLAMENguyen et al. [2021]. In the following, we first summarize our experimental settings and the evaluation metrics. We then report and compare the performance of FedGrad to the other defense methods. Moreover, we investigate the effectiveness of FedGrad’s components and the stability of FedGrad in different FL settings.

Defenses	CIFAR-10						EMNIST					
	Black-box		PGD		PGD + MR		Black-box		PGD		PGD + MR	
	MA	BA	MA	BA	MA	BA	MA	BA	MA	BA	MA	BA
FedAvg (*)	84.32	71.43	84.32	71.44	10.00	100.0	98.49	95.02	10.00	100.0	10.00	100.0
Krum	81.73	12.76	79.54	18.78	81.58	11.74	95.51	98.88	95.52	89.96	95.83	96.74
Multi-krum	84.48	67.35	84.28	67.38	10.00	100.0	98.38	94.87	98.36	96.65	10.00	100.0
FoolsGold	84.27	68.88	84.08	66.33	83.91	71.93	98.99	75.13	98.99	75.21	98.99	81.13
RFA	82.98	88.27	82.89	88.23	72.01	95.41	95.33	97.91	95.29	98.01	97.17	96.88
RLR	82.87	15.31	82.89	15.30	83.32	13.78	94.38	45.06	94.33	42.13	96.33	85.81
FLAME	83.60	71.43	83.60	72.42	82.95	76.53	98.24	96.97	98.38	95.98	98.38	96.26
FedGrad	84.62	5.10	85.10	4.08	85.37	5.61	98.81	7.98	98.83	8.02	98.87	7.96

Table 2: Backdoor Accuracy (BA) and Main Task Accuracy (MA) in percentages of FedGrad and baseline defense methods within 1000 rounds. The best and second best results are highlighted in the **bold-red** and **bold-blue**. (*) *no-defense* method.

Trigger-based attack strategies	Dataset	FedAvg		FedGrad	
		MA	BA	MA	BA
Unconstrained attack	MNIST	99.07	99.78	98.94	0.14
	CIFAR-10	76.40	92.58	75.46	2.24
Constrain-and scale	MNIST	99.07	99.60	98.97	0.12
	CIFAR-10	70.69	79.67	74.06	4.39
DBA	MNIST	99.07	100.0	98.90	0.10
	CIFAR-10	43.47	69.29	71.95	5.78

Table 3: Backdoor Accuracy (BA) and Main Task Accuracy (MA) in percentages of FedGrad and *no-defense* method (FedAvg) against different trigger-based attack strategies within 400 rounds.

Component	MA	BA	TPR	FPR
(1) Soft filtering	81.62	48.17	0.95	0.36
(2) Hard clustering	81.74	76.04	0.68	0.35
(1) union (2)	81.75	2.99	1.0	0.43
FedGrad	82.13	2.54	1.0	0.3

Table 4: Effectiveness of components in FedGrad against the black-box edge-case backdoor attack on the CIFAR-10 dataset. TPR and FPR are average rate within 100 communication rounds.

Figure 6: Backdoor accuracy vs. communication round under three attack strategies: Black-box, PGD, and PGD with model replacement attack (PGD + MR) on the CIFAR-10 dataset. The results are plotted with the smoothed average of every 20 round to have a better visualization.

5.1 Experimental Setup

Backdoor attack strategies. We evaluate the performance of FedGrad under three edge-case based attack strategies proposed in Wang et al. [2020], which are black-box attack, projected gradient descent (PGD) attack, and PGD attack with model replacement (PGD + MR). For each strategy, we evaluate on two scenarios, e.g., LeNet LeCun et al. [1998] network on EMNIST Cohen et al. [2017] and VGG-9 Simonyan and Zisserman [2015] on CIFAR-10 Krizhevsky and Hinton [2009] datasets. Additionally, we also evaluate FedGrad with a trigger-based backdoor attack, i.e., adding a small pattern to the inputs to backdoor the model, to prove the effectiveness of FedGrad against other backdoor attacks. We follow three strategies including (i) unconstrained attack Sun et al. [2019], (ii) constrain-and-scale attack Bagdasaryan et al. [2020] and distributed backdoor attack (DBA) Xie et al. [2020] under classification task on MNIST/CIFAR-10 with CNN/ResNet-18 He et al. [2015].

Adversary settings. We establish a rigorous backdoor attack scenario by adjusting four parameters: the compromising ratio (ϵ), the number of participants per communication round (K), the poisoned data rate (PDR) and non-IID degree (φ). In PGD attack, the projected frequency is set to 1 since there may be malicious clients in each training round. In trigger-based backdoor attacks, we use the same experimental setups in Xie et al. [2020] with little modification as summarized in Table 1 to align with the fixed-pool attack Wang et al. [2020]. Unless otherwise mentioned, our default settings are 25% compromising ratio, non-IID level of $\varphi = 0.5$, poisoned data rate $PDR = 0.33/0.08/0.5$ and $K = 10/20/30$ for CIFAR-10, MNIST, and EMNIST datasets, respectively. Other unmentioned parameters for reproducing are inherited from Wang et al. [2020], Xie et al. [2020].

Hyperparameters. We also follow the suggestion of the authors to set the robust threshold of RLR Ozdayi et al. [2021] to $\lfloor K \cdot F + 1 \rfloor$ and the estimated number of byzantine clients of Krum/Multi-Krum Blanchard et al. [2017] to $\lfloor \epsilon \cdot K \rfloor$. For FedGrad, we set the dynamic filtering threshold of compromising score $\zeta = 0.5$, threshold for trustworthy scores $\gamma = 0.75$, instant trustworthy score for a malicious and benign client $\lambda_1 = 0.25$ and $\lambda_2 = 1.0$.

Evaluation metrics. To evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed approach, we leverage Main Accuracy (MA) and Backdoor Accuracy (BA), which are widely used in Bagdasaryan et al. [2020], Wang et al. [2020]. Moreover, we employ True Positive Rate (TPR) and False Positive Rate (FPR) to measure the efficiency of FedGrad in detecting malicious clients.

Figure 7: FedGrad against PGD attack within 500 rounds in the EMNIST dataset when varying the compromising ratio (left), the poisoned data rate (middle) and the number of participants (right).




Figure 8: Impact of non-IID level (PGD attack, CIFAR-10).

5.2 Defending Against Backdoor Attacks

In this section, we compare the MA and BA of FedGrad to the other defense methods to show the consistent effectiveness of FedGrad against different backdoor attack strategies.

Edge-case backdoor attacks. Table 2 shows the best accuracy that each FL method reaches during training within 1000 communication rounds. The result shows that FedGrad outperforms other defense methods in all three attack strategies in terms of BA while maintaining a similar (or better) MA. On the CIFAR-10 dataset with a black-box attack, most defense methods fail to mitigate the effects of the backdoor on the aggregated model except RLR, Krum, and FedGrad. For example, other methods achieve high BAs (65%), while those of RLR, Krum, and FedGrad are only 15.31%, 12.76% and 5.10%, respectively. Compared with RLR and Krum in all investigated attack strategies, the proposed FedGrad achieves the lowest BA and outperforms RLR and Krum by around 1% and 4% on MA, respectively. It is reported that DeepSightRieger et al. [2022], the most relevant work to our approach, can also reduce the BA to 7.14% with the MA of 80.54% under the black-box attack (CIFAR-10). In this case, FedGrad outperforms DeepSight² about $\approx 2\%$ in BA and 4% in MA. On the EMNIST dataset, all considered methods fail to defend against backdoor attacks except FedGrad. FedGrad is the only defense that can minimize the backdoor effect while not degrading the overall performance (BA $\approx 8\%$ and MA $\approx 99\%$).

In more detail, Fig. 6 presents the BA when the number of communication rounds changes on the CIFAR-10 dataset. RLR and RFA, the defense methods that do not focus on detecting and discarding adversarial clients, are not able to discard all the backdoor effects on the trained model. Defense methods utilizing the similarities between the whole dimension of local updates, i.e., FLAME, FoolsGold, and Krum, may fail to discriminate between benign and poisoning updates due to the convergence of local models compared with the global objectives. As a result, the performance of RLR and Krum gradually diminishes in later communication rounds. As observed in Figure 6, the PGD attack degrades the performance of Krum at around the 640th communication round, when the model starts converging. The PGD technique helps the poisoning models bypass the Krum method and cautiously be inserted into the global model when the model converges. This degradation phenomenon is also perceived in previous work Wang et al. [2020]. In addition, the model replacement technique causes instability in RLR’s performance. By contrast, FedGrad performs consistently in all examined attack strategies and gives the lowest BA during the training process. Specifically, FedGrad could detect the adversarial clients correctly, e.g., TPR $\approx 100\%$ on CIFAR-10 dataset (Table 4).

Trigger-based backdoor attacks. Table 3 proves the effectiveness of FedGrad against not just edge-case attacks, our main target in this work, but also trigger-based backdoor attacks. In all targeted strategies, FedGrad could minimize the effect of the backdoor attacks, e.g., BA $< 1\%$ in the case of MNIST, while not degrading the overall performance, i.e., less than 0.5% of accuracy reduction when compared to those of FedAvg. Even under an intensive attack scenario, where FedAvg shows a significant decline in MA, FedGrad still maintains the overall performance, e.g., 43.47% and 71.95% of MA for FedAvg and FedGrad under the DBA attack.

5.3 Effectiveness of FedGrad’s Components

We investigate the contribution of each FedGrad component to the overall performance of FedGrad by independently performing defenses with each component used in FedGrad. Table 4 reports the MA, BA, TPR, and FPR of each component when defending against backdoor tasks on the CIFAR-10 dataset. We observed that the second layer (*By-class Ultimate Gradient-based Hard Filter*) works as a supplementary filter for the first layer (*Ultimate Gradient-based Soft Filter*) to boost the TPR and decrease the BA significantly. Besides, the additional trustworthy filtering makes FedGrad provide a lower FPR. Hence, it can improve the MA by removing benign clients mislabeled as malicious while not degrading the effectiveness of detecting adversarial clients.

²We could not reproduce the result of DeepSight because there exists no public code at the time of writing this manuscript.

5.4 Stability Under Different Attack Settings

We now demonstrate the stability of FedGrad by varying the three parameters, i.e., the number of malicious clients (compromising ratio), the number of participating clients, and the poisoned data rate. We compare FedGrad to other baseline defenses in terms of BA and MA (Fig. 7). In all settings, FedGrad outperforms all other defenses and demonstrates its consistent performance. Changing the attack setting causes a great impact on the performance of some defenses, i.e., RLR, FoolsGolds, and Krum. Meanwhile, the performance of RFA, MultiKrum, FLAME, and FedGrad is stable. Especially, FedGrad achieves the lowest BA in most cases ($BA \approx 8-10\%$) while achieving a higher MA than those of FedAvg (no-defense method). It is worth noting that FedGrad, with its two-layer filtering mechanism, can maintain a high TPR in detecting malicious clients (as mentioned in Table 3). This observation also can be seen again in all the experiments shown in Fig. 7. This result implies that our proposed mechanism for detecting and discarding malicious clients is stable and effectively mitigates the backdoor attack.

5.5 Impact of Data Heterogeneity Degree

Because FedGrad is primarily dependent on evaluating the differences between benign and malicious updates, the distribution of data among clients may impact our defense. We conduct experiments under the PGD attack Wang et al. [2020] on the CIFAR-10 dataset with different degrees of non-IID distribution between clients' data. We vary the degree of non-IID (φ) by adjusting the proportion of samples allocated to clients that belong to a specific class. In particular, we randomly divide the set of all clients into 10 groups corresponding to 10 classes in the CIFAR-10 dataset. A fraction of φ samples of each class are assigned to group clients associated with this class, and the remaining samples are randomly distributed to others. As a result, a non-IID degree φ is zero means the data is distributed completely IID (homogeneity), likewise, the data distribution is non-IID when φ equals one. As reported in Fig. 8, FedGrad is able to detect all the adversarial models for even very non-IID scenarios, and it mitigates the effect of backdoors by maintaining a very low ($\approx 5\%$) in every case of non-IID level. Besides, FedGrad can erase the backdoor effect without a negative impact on overall performance. Specifically, the MA is maintained at almost the same level as without defense. Even in the case of a low non-IID level of homogeneous data distribution (IID), FedGrad performs well with a maximum TPR and an acceptable FPR.

6 Discussion

6.1 Computation Overhead of FedGrad

Our goal in this study is to design an efficient approach for a synchronous FL system in which the server waits for all clients to complete their local training before clustering the participating clients and computing the new global model at each communication round. A significant amount of computation time on the server would prolong the synchronization latency. We thus estimate the computation time at the server (averaged within 150 communications rounds) under a black-box attack on the CIFAR-10 dataset. Notice that we simulate FL on a computer with an Intel Xeon Gold CPU and an NVIDIA V100 GPU.

Fig. 9 shows that the computation time of FedGrad is lower than those of other defense methods except for the RLR method. For example, the computation time at the server of FedGrad is about $8.2\times$ and $1.2\times$ lower than those of RFA and Krum-based methods. Interestingly, the time of the trustworthy filtering component is trivial, while hard filtering and soft filtering contribute most of the computation time of FedGrad, i.e., 54% and 45% , respectively. It is a reasonable result because the computation complexity of the similarity computation in each communication round of the hard clustering component is $O(K^2)$ where K is the number of clients participating in each round. To speed up such an operation in the server, computing the similarity by batch instead of by pair of clients could be helpful. That is, we compute the similarity of a given client i with b other clients ($b \leq K$) at the same time and utilize the high parallelism of multi-threading on GPU. In short, our FedGrad requires an acceptable computation time at the server, which is still practiced in real-world applications.

6.2 Convergence Time of Client Similarity Determination

One of the core findings and technologies in this work is to use the by-class ultimate gradient to filter and detect malicious clients (see Section 4.3). For each training round, we need to calculate the similarity between K clients, resulting in a computational complexity of K^2 . Therefore, if the FL training process takes m rounds to converge, the overall computational complexity will be $m \times K^2$. To this end, we may reduce this cost by determining the similarity transitively. Specifically, the similarity of two arbitrary clients, C_i and C_j can be estimated via their similarities with other clients. This way, we can shorten the number of training rounds needed for the similarity to converge. We notice




Figure 9: Average server computation time.




Figure 10: Estimations of required iterations for convergence of similarity.

that cosine similarity possesses a transitive characteristic, which is reflected by the theorem in Schubert [2021]. Based on this, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 1. Let n be the total number of clients and K be the number of clients participating in a communication round. Let δ be the expected number of communication rounds needed to estimate the similarity of all client pairs. Then,

$$\delta \leq 1 + \sum_{i=K}^{n-1} \frac{\binom{n}{k}}{\binom{n}{K} - \binom{i}{k}}.$$

We conducted extensive experiments to estimate the convergence of client similarity of FedGrad with different settings, i.e., the total number of clients n ranges from 50 to 350 while the participation rates $\frac{K}{n}$ are fixed at 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8 and 1.0. It is clearly shown in Figure 10 that the expected number of training rounds required for convergence of similarity is trivial concerning the number of clients. For instance, when there are $n = 100$ clients in total, the similarity is expected to converge after roughly 25 iterations (or communication rounds) at a participation rate of 0.2 and after about 50 communication rounds at a participation rate of 0.1.

6.3 FedGrad under different attack scenarios and assumptions

All the experiments in section 5 are based on the common attack scenarios Wang et al. [2020], Sun et al. [2019] in which: (1) the rate of malicious clients cannot exceed 50% in real-world settings; and (2) the data distributions and the amount of perturbation caused by malicious clients are the same. The following sections analyze FedGrad’s behavior under more severe attack scenarios.

Firstly, we show that FedGrad can achieve a good performance under **a high ratio of malicious clients, e.g., 70%**, by adjusting the dynamic threshold of the soft filter. Specifically, in previous experiments, When the rate of malicious clients smaller than 50%, we set the dynamic threshold of the soft filter to $\epsilon_1 = \min(\zeta, \text{median } cs_i)$. For stricter filter, i.e., the malicious ratio reaches 70%, the threshold could be adaptively changed, e.g., set to $0.35 \times \epsilon_1$. Additional experiments with 70% attacker show that such little modification can help FedGrad effectively mitigate the backdoor attack (BA $\sim 10\%$). By contrast, Krum let malicious clients bypass, and RLR significantly degrades the MA compared to FedGrad (i.e., FedGrad’s MA $\sim 98.5\%$ and RLR’s MA $\sim 91.5\%$). It’s worth noting that even under the benign setting (no malicious clients) the BA is around 10%.

We also run an additional experiment where **malicious clients have varying poisoned data rate (PDR)**. Specifically, under the presence of 25% of compromised clients, we set up an attack with 80% of malicious clients using PDR of 15% and the remaining 20% using the PDR of 50% with the EMNIST dataset. FedGrad can still maintain a very low BA ($\sim 5\%$) without compromising overall performance (MA $\sim 99.4\%$).

Finally, the most favorable attack scenario is that the attacker adds a set \mathcal{D}_p that describes the backdoor task (i.e., southwest airplane images) into the benign training samples generated from the true distribution, which is aligned with the previous works Bagdasaryan et al. [2020], Wang et al. [2020]. To make the attack stealthier, each compromised client itself should achieve sufficient accuracy on the main task by maintaining a true distribution of benign data together with \mathcal{D}_p . Therefore, the most practical and non-effortless strategy for the adversary is to sample data from this true distribution to replicate each malicious client. We now consider the attack scenario where **malicious clients have**

different data distribution. We conducted extra experiments with the edge-case backdoor attack with the EMNIST dataset, where the data distribution of malicious clients is also non-IID. In this scenario, FedGrad successfully mitigates the backdoor and maintains BA at $\sim 5\%$ while maintaining MA $\sim 98.8\%$.

7 Conclusion

We proposed in this paper a novel backdoor-resistant defense named FedGrad by investigating ultimate gradients of clients' local updates. FedGrad leverages a two-layer filtering mechanism that can accurately identify malicious clients and remove them from the aggregation process. We conducted a comprehensive experiment set to evaluate the effectiveness of FedGrad on various datasets and attack scenarios. The results indicated that FedGrad outperforms state-of-the-art FL approaches in defending against edge-case backdoor attacks and mitigating perfectly other common backdoor attack types, especially when the number of compromised clients is significant and the data distribution across clients is highly non-IID. Our future work will be devoted to handling backdoor attacks in more realistic scenarios, such as large-scale networks and hierarchy networks.

8 Acknowledgments

This work was funded by Vingroup Joint Stock Company (Vingroup JSC), Vingroup, and supported by Vingroup Innovation Foundation (VINIF) under project code VINIF.2021.DA00128. This paper is based on results obtained from a project, JPNP20006, commissioned by the New Energy and Industrial Technology Development Organization (NEDO).

References

- Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Aguera y Arcas. Communication-Efficient Learning of Deep Networks from Decentralized Data. In Aarti Singh and Jerry Zhu, editors, *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 54 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1273–1282. PMLR, 20–22 Apr 2017.
- Yongfeng Qian, Long Hu, Jing Chen, Xin Guan, Mohammad Mehedi Hassan, and Abdulhameed Alelaiwi. Privacy-aware service placement for mobile edge computing via federated learning. *Inf. Sci.*, 505(C):562–570, dec 2019. ISSN 0020-0255.
- Eugene Bagdasaryan, Andreas Veit, Yiqing Hua, Deborah Estrin, and Vitaly Shmatikov. How to backdoor federated learning. In Silvia Chiappa and Roberto Calandra, editors, *Proceedings of the Twenty Third International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 108 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2938–2948. PMLR, 26–28 Aug 2020.
- Peva Blanchard, El Mahdi El Mhamdi, Rachid Guerraoui, and Julien Stainer. Machine learning with adversaries: Byzantine tolerant gradient descent. In I. Guyon, U. Von Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017.
- 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. USENIX Association, August 2020. ISBN 978-1-939133-17-5.
- Ziteng Sun, Peter Kairouz, Ananda Theertha Suresh, and H. B. McMahan. Can you really backdoor federated learning? *ArXiv*, abs/1911.07963, 2019.
- Hongyi Wang, Kartik Sreenivasan, Shashank Rajput, Harit Vishwakarma, Saurabh Agarwal, Jy-yong Sohn, Kangwook Lee, and Dimitris Papailiopoulos. Attack of the tails: Yes, you really can backdoor federated learning. In H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M.F. Balcan, and H. Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 16070–16084. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020.
- Chulin Xie, Minghao Chen, Pin-Yu Chen, and Bo Li. Crfl: Certifiably robust federated learning against backdoor attacks. In Marina Meila and Tong Zhang, editors, *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 11372–11382. PMLR, 18–24 Jul 2021.
- Dong Yin, Yudong Chen, Ramchandran Kannan, and Peter Bartlett. Byzantine-robust distributed learning: Towards optimal statistical rates. In Jennifer Dy and Andreas Krause, editors, *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference*

- on *Machine Learning*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 5650–5659. PMLR, 10–15 Jul 2018.
- Krishna Pillutla, Sham M. Kakade, and Zaid Harchaoui. Robust aggregation for federated learning. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 70:1142–1154, 2022.
- Shiqi Shen, Shruti Tople, and Prateek Saxena. Auror: Defending against poisoning attacks in collaborative deep learning systems. In *Proceedings of the 32nd Annual Conference on Computer Security Applications, ACSAC '16*, page 508–519, New York, NY, USA, 2016. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450347716.
- Felix Sattler, Klaus-Robert Müller, Thomas Wiegand, and Wojciech Samek. On the byzantine robustness of clustered federated learning. *ICASSP 2020 - 2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 8861–8865, 2020a.
- Xin-Lun Zhou, Ming Xu, Yiming Wu, and Ning Zheng. Deep model poisoning attack on federated learning. *Future Internet*, 13:73, 2021.
- Phillip Rieger, Thien Duc Nguyen, Markus Miettinen, and Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi. Deepsight: Mitigating backdoor attacks in federated learning through deep model inspection. *ArXiv*, abs/2201.00763, 2022.
- Chulin Xie, Keli Huang, Pin-Yu Chen, and Bo Li. Dba: Distributed backdoor attacks against federated learning. In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2020, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 26-30, 2020*. OpenReview.net, 2020.
- Felix Sattler, Klaus-Robert Müller, Thomas Wiegand, and Wojciech Samek. On the byzantine robustness of clustered federated learning. *ICASSP 2020 - 2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 8861–8865, 2020b.
- Clement Fung, Chris J. M. Yoon, and Ivan Beschastnikh. The limitations of federated learning in sybil settings. In *23rd International Symposium on Research in Attacks, Intrusions and Defenses (RAID 2020)*, pages 301–316, San Sebastian, October 2020. USENIX Association. ISBN 978-1-939133-18-2.
- Mustafa Safa Ozdayi, Murat Kantarcioglu, and Yulia R. Gel. Defending against backdoors in federated learning with robust learning rate. In *AAAI*, 2021.
- Thien Duc Nguyen, Phillip Rieger, Huili Chen, Hossein Yalame, Helen Möllering, Hossein Fereidooni, Samuel Marchal, Markus Miettinen, Azalia Mirhoseini, Shaza Zeitouni, Farinaz Koushanfar, Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi, and Thomas Schneider. Flame: Taming backdoors in federated learning, 2021.
- Yann LeCun, Léon Bottou, Yoshua Bengio, and Patrick Haffner. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proc. IEEE*, 86:2278–2324, 1998.
- Gregory Cohen, Saeed Afshar, Jonathan Tapson, and André van Schaik. Emnist: Extending mnist to handwritten letters. In *2017 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, pages 2921–2926, 2017.
- Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2015.
- Alex Krizhevsky and Geoffrey Hinton. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. Technical Report 0, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, 2009.
- Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition, 2015. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1512.03385>.
- Erich Schubert. A triangle inequality for cosine similarity. In *International Conference on Similarity Search and Applications*, pages 32–44. Springer, 2021.