
Federating to Grow Transformers with Constrained Resources without Model Sharing

Shikun Shen
Shandong University
shikunshen@mail.sdu.edu.cn

Yifei Zou
Shandong University
yfzou@sdu.edu.cn

Yuan Yuan
Shandong University
yyuan@sdu.edu.cn

Yanwei Zheng
Shandong University
zhengyw@sdu.edu.cn

Peng Li
University of Aizu
pengli@u-aizu.ac.jp

Xiuzhen Cheng
Shandong University
xzcheng@sdu.edu.cn

Dongxiao Yu
Shandong University
dxyu@sdu.edu.cn

Abstract

The high resource consumption of large-scale models discourages resource-constrained users from developing their customized transformers. To this end, this paper considers a federated framework named Fed-Grow for multiple participants to cooperatively scale a transformer from their pre-trained small models. Under the Fed-Grow, a Dual-LiGO (Dual Linear Growth Operator) architecture is designed to help participants expand their pre-trained small models to a transformer. In Dual-LiGO, the Local-LiGO part is used to address the heterogeneity problem caused by the various pre-trained models, and the Global-LiGO part is shared to exchange the implicit knowledge from the pre-trained models, local data, and training process of participants. Instead of model sharing, only sharing the Global-LiGO strengthens the privacy of our approach. Compared with several state-of-the-art methods in simulation, our approach has higher accuracy, better precision, and lower resource consumption on computations and communications. To the best of our knowledge, most of the previous model-scaling works are centralized, and our work is the first one that cooperatively grows a transformer from multiple pre-trained heterogeneous models with the user privacy protected in terms of local data and models. We hope that our approach can extend the transformers to the broadly distributed scenarios and encourage more resource-constrained users to enjoy the bonus taken by the large-scale transformers.

1 Introduction

In recent years, the transformer with billions of parameters [24] has shown its high performance on addressing the various complex tasks in the domains of Natural Language Processing (NLP) [7; 20; 3] and Computer Vision (CV) [8; 17; 23]. However, the training of such large-scale transformers has a high requirement on the computing, storage, and data resources [3; 1], and pitilessly reject those resource-constrained users from enjoying the bonus taken by transformer [34]. Thus, an efficient and resource-friendly approach to obtain a transformer has been a hot topic in recent years.

Due to its significance, some relevant works have been proposed to reduce the resource consumption of training a transformer. Some noteworthy strategies include mixed precision training [21], large batch




Figure 1: Illustration of different methods for efficient model training. The upper left subfigure shows the conventional methods of training a large model from scratch. The lower left subfigure shows the model reusing methods of exploiting a small pre-trained model. The upper right figure shows the conventional federated learning (FL) approach. The lower right subfigure shows our proposed framework: Fed-Grow with Dual-LiGO.

optimization [29], and dropping layers [30] or tokens [12]. A common ground of the abovementioned approaches is that they all train transformers from scratch, which is not resource-saving if the targeted transformer is a scaled-up version of a pre-trained one.¹ Compared with the scratch-based methods, a more efficient idea is to reuse the smaller models to initialize a larger transformer, leveraging the implicit knowledge embedded in the pre-trained models. Based on this idea, a series of works have been proposed [11; 28; 4; 19; 25; 26; 9]. For instance, the Linear Growth Operator (LiGO) in [25] is used to learn a linear mapping from the parameters of a small model to a large one, which reduces the computational cost of scratch-based training by up to 50%, and outperforms several model-based baselines. Figure 1 (a) and (b) are given to illustrate the scratch-based approach and pre-trained model-based approach, respectively. Even though the existing methods have demonstrated the effectiveness of reusing smaller pre-trained models to train larger ones, all of them are centralized under the single-machine environment. The corresponding problem on the distributed side still requires further investigation.

In this paper, we study the cooperative training of a transformer with several participants, each of which has a heterogeneous pre-trained model and is resource-constrained to expand a transformer individually. For example, the data of each participant is not sufficient to train a transformer with high performance by itself. To expand a transformer from its own pre-trained model, the participants choose to share some useful knowledge with each other, as is illustrated in Figure 1 (d). Compared with the existing scratch-based (Figure 1 (c)) and centralized model-based approaches, our approach has several advantages. First, it allows for the integration of diverse knowledge from the pre-trained models and dataset of different participants, potentially resulting in a robust and comprehensive large model. Second, it enables distributed learning for high efficiency, which can significantly accelerate the training process by utilizing the computational resources of multiple users. Third, it offers an alternative approach for the resource-constrained users to cooperatively train a transformer.

Even though the cooperative training of transformers has such advantages, designing a distributed training algorithm is not an easy task. The biggest challenge comes from the model heterogeneity, i.e., each participant may have different architectures, sizes, and parameters of their pre-trained models. Additionally, the participants may be unwilling to share their data and even pre-trained models with others, since the models are also the property. Solving the model heterogeneity problem under the constraint of privacy protection requires a deep thinking on the following question: *What*

¹For example, the GPT-2 Large model with 774 million parameters is trained from scratch despite being a scaled-up version of GPT-2 Base with 117 million parameters.

should be shared in the collaborative training process for knowledge integration, distributed training acceleration, and privacy protection?

To answer this question, we introduce **Fed-Grow** framework with **Dual-LiGO** architecture. In Fed-Grow, multiple participants cooperatively grow a transformer from their pre-trained small models. The **Dual-LiGO** architecture enables the extension of heterogeneous small pre-trained models to large models in a federated framework and is based on the idea of LiGO (Linear Growth Operator) from [25] in a centralized environment. The key idea of Dual-LiGO is to design two LiGO operators: Local-LiGO and Global-LiGO. In the first, each participant uses the Local-LiGO to expand its heterogeneous pre-trained model to a homogeneous intermediate one. Then, the Global-LiGO is used by each participant to expand its intermediate model to a homogeneous transformer. In each local training process, gradient descent method is used to update the Local-LiGO and Global-LiGO. After multiple times local training, the Global-LiGO will be shared with others to achieve distributed training acceleration. Such a local training and federating process will be repeated for sufficient times until a transformer with high performance is obtained. Since only the Global-LiGO is shared, the local data and pre-trained model can be rarely recovered by the others, which addresses the privacy concerns in collaborative learning. Our main contributions are summarized as follows:

1. We introduce Fed-Grow, a federated framework for multiple users to grow a transformer from their heterogeneous pre-trained models. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work tackling the transformer expansion problem under a distributed and heterogeneous setting. Compared with the existing centralized works requiring sufficient data and computing resources on a single machine, Fed-Grow makes full use of the fragmented resources and the pre-trained models of multiple participants to cooperatively grow a transformer. With our Fed-Grow, those resource-constrained users who cannot afford a transformer individually can also enjoy the bonus taken by transformers.
2. Under our Fed-Grow framework, the Dual Linear Growth Operator (Dual-LiGO) is designed for each participant to expand its pre-trained small model to a transformer. Specifically, the Dual-LiGO consists of two parts: Local-LiGO and Global-LiGO, both of which are trained locally but only the latter one will be shared. With the help of Global-LiGO, the participants share their knowledge in model expansion, which speeds up the training process and improves the final performance of the transformer. The Local-LiGO is designed to address the heterogeneity problem caused by pre-trained models with various architectures and sizes. Since the Local-LiGO is not shared, the adversary lacks the complete knowledge to recover the local data and pre-trained models of participants, which addresses the privacy concerns in federated learning.
3. Extensive experiments are conducted to validate the effectiveness of our Fed-Grow framework with Dual-LiGO on multiple datasets. Compared with the existing method [25] in stand-alone settings, Dual-LiGO boosts the accuracy or precision by average 52.43%. Compared with the conventional federated learning that directly trains a transformer from scratch [23; 7], Dual-LiGO reduces the trainable parameters by 59.25% and the communication cost by 73.01%, achieving higher training efficiency and lower resource consumption on computation and communication.

Roadmap: Section 2 reviews the related works. The problem setup and our Fed-Grow framework with Dual-LiGO are presented in section 3. Section 4 reports the numerical results in simulation. In Section 5, we conclude this paper and discuss the future work.

2 Related Work

The efficient training of transformers has been a topic of interest in recent years. Initial strategies include mixed precision training [21], large batch optimization [29], progressive layer dropping [30], token dropping [12], sparse training [5], and knowledge inheritance [19], which aim to lower the computational cost, memory usage, and communication overhead of training a transformer, while preserve or even improve the performance of transformer on downstream tasks. A common ground of these strategies is that they all train large models from scratch, thereby discarding the valuable knowledge acquired by their smaller counterparts. Recognizing this, recent research has also focused on reusing small pre-trained models to initialize a large model before regular training, which leverages the implicit knowledge of the small model to improve the convergence speed of the large model.

For example, StackBERT [11] doubles the depth of BERT model by replicating the parameters of a small model. MSLT [28] starts with a pre-trained small model and gradually increases the depth of the model by adding new encoder layers. Compared with the above two depth-only works, Width-and-depth methods [6; 4; 25; 9] increase both the width and the depth of the model by adding more neurons and layers to the pre-trained small model. In detail, Net2Net [6] expands the width of neural networks by randomly copying neurons while preserving output values via normalization. In [4], bert2BERT learns linear mappings to scale the pre-trained model by minimizing the task loss during model expansion. LiGO [25] learns to grow pre-trained transformers by factorizing the linear transformation as a composition of width- and depth-growth operators. TripLe [9] partially scales a model before training, while growing the rest of the new parameters during training by copying both the warmed-up weights with the optimizer states from existing weights. By leveraging the implicit knowledge of the pre-trained small models, these model-reusing methods improve the training efficiency of large models, saving computational cost and resources.

Despite these advancements, a significant research gap remains. Most of these approaches are centralized and require considerable data and computational resources on a single machine. For example, 64 dragonfish TPUs and ImageNet-1k are required in TripLe [9], which prevents those resource-constrained users from discovering the delights of large models. Furthermore, there is a lack of relevant research in distributed scenarios. So, will it be possible for multiple resource-constrained users to cooperatively expand a transformer from their pre-trained small models is still an open question in the existing research.

3 Fed-Grow with Dual-LiGO

In this section, we provide the problem setup and an overview of our approach Fed-Grow with Dual-LiGO, in which multiple resource-constrained participants collaboratively scale a transformer from their pre-trained small models. During this process, the data and pre-trained models of the participants are not shared, which enhances the privacy but also makes the design harder.

3.1 Problem Setup

We consider a setup with n participants (also termed as clients in federated learning), and a parameter server to communicate with the clients for knowledge sharing. Importantly, the server has no access to private data or pre-trained small models of the clients, thereby ensuring privacy in federated learning. Each client i has its own data $\mathcal{D}_i = \{x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d, y_i \in \mathbb{R}\}_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{D}_i|}$ and a pre-trained small model $\Theta_i^{(small)}$. Considering that the participants in Fed-Grow may come from different institutions, we assume that the data on each client is not independently and identically distributed (non-IID), to reflect the realistic and diverse data distributions across different clients. Besides, the pre-trained small models of clients are heterogeneous, which means the number of layers and dimensions of those small models are various. Following the notations of [25], we denote the parameters of a neural network with L layers and D dimensions as $\Theta_{L,D} \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times D}$. The LiGO in the original work [25] learns a linear mapping $\mathbf{M} : \mathbb{R}^{L_1 D_1 \times D_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{L_2 D_2 \times D_2}$ from the parameters of a smaller pre-trained model Θ_{L_1, D_1} to initialize a larger one Θ_{L_2, D_2} , i.e., $\Theta_{L_2, D_2} = \mathbf{M}(\Theta_{L_1, D_1})$ where $L_1 < L_2$ and $D_1 < D_2$. LiGO effectively reuses the knowledge from the smaller model to accelerate the training of the larger model.

The goal of clients in Fed-Grow is to utilize their local model $\Theta_i^{(small)}$ to collaboratively scale a transformer $\Theta^{(large)}$ by sharing useful experience or knowledge with others. Let $\ell(\Theta; x, y)$ denote the loss function for given model Θ and data point (x, y) , such as the cross-entropy loss and the mean-squared loss. The underlying optimization goal of our Fed-Grow can be formalized as follows:

$$\min_{\Theta^{(large)}} \left\{ F(\Theta^{(large)}) := \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{|\mathcal{D}_i|}{\sum_{j=1}^n |\mathcal{D}_j|} F_i(\Theta^{(large)}) \right\} \quad (1)$$

where $F_i(\Theta^{(large)}) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}_i} [\ell(\Theta^{(large)}; x, y)]$ denotes the average loss of $\Theta^{(large)}$ over local dataset \mathcal{D}_i . The objective of the optimization problem is to find $\Theta^{(large)}$ that minimizes the weighted sum of the average losses overall local datasets, which ensures that the large model performs well on all clients' data, taking into account the size of each client's dataset.

The important notations in problem setup and our method are presented in Appendix A.1.

3.2 Overview of Our Method

Building upon the problem setup, we now turn our attention to the challenges posed by the heterogeneous model settings in a multi-user collaborative scenario. Specifically, we need to figure out what to share in the federated learning framework, to guarantee efficiency and privacy simultaneously.

To address these challenges, we introduce the Dual-LiGO architecture. The key idea behind Dual-LiGO is to leverage two operators, the Local-LiGO and the Global-LiGO, to scale a homogeneous global model from multiple heterogeneous pre-trained models.

In the first step, the Local-LiGO is designed to handle the heterogeneity of the small models. It expands each client’s small model into a homogeneous intermediate one. This process ensures that all intermediate models have the same architecture, which is crucial for knowledge sharing in the next step.

In the second step, the Global-LiGO takes the homogeneous intermediate models and expands them into a homogeneous large model. This operator is learned collaboratively by all clients, ensuring that the knowledge from all small models is effectively integrated into the large model without compromising the privacy of the pre-trained small model stored in each client.

Through this two-step process, Dual-LiGO can effectively aggregate heterogeneous small models into a unified large model, while preserving the privacy of each client with respect to its small model and local data. Furthermore, by reusing the knowledge from the small models, Dual-LiGO accelerates the training process and enhances the final performance of the large model.

3.3 Dual-LiGO Architecture

The Dual-LiGO architecture consists of two main components: the Local-LiGO and the Global-LiGO.

Local-LiGO. The Local-LiGO tackles the heterogeneity of the small models. For each client i , it expands the pre-trained small model $\Theta_i^{(small)}$ into a homogeneous intermediate model $\Theta_i^{(inter)}$ that has the same architecture across all clients. Let’s denote the intermediate model as $\Theta_{L_{inter}, D_{inter}} \in \mathbb{R}^{L_{inter} D_{inter} \times D_{inter}}$. The Local-LiGO in each client learns a linear mapping $\mathbf{M}_i^{(local)} : \mathbb{R}^{L_i D_i \times D_i} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{L_{inter} D_{inter} \times D_{inter}}$ from the pre-trained small model $\Theta_i^{(small)}$ to initialize the intermediate model $\Theta_i^{(inter)}$, i.e.,

$$\Theta_i^{(inter)} = \mathbf{M}_i^{(local)} (\Theta_i^{(small)}). \quad (2)$$

The optimization goal of the Local-LiGO is to minimize the loss on the local dataset under the constraint that the parameters of the small model are fixed. This can be formalized as follows:

$$\min_{\mathbf{M}_i^{(local)}} J(\mathbf{M}_i^{(local)}) := \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}_i} [\ell(\mathbf{M}_i^{(local)} (\Theta_i^{(small)}); x, y)] \right\} \quad (3)$$

To achieve this goal, each client updates the $\mathbf{M}_i^{(local)}$ using the following gradient descent rule:

$$\mathbf{M}_i^{(local)} \leftarrow \mathbf{M}_i^{(local)} - \eta_l \nabla_{\mathbf{M}_i^{(local)}} J(\mathbf{M}_i^{(local)}) \quad (4)$$

where η_l is the learning rate for updating $\mathbf{M}_i^{(local)}$.

Global-LiGO. The Global-LiGO scales the homogeneous intermediate models to a homogeneous large model. It learns a linear mapping $\mathbf{M}^{(global)} : \mathbb{R}^{L_{inter} D_{inter} \times D_{inter}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{L_{large} D_{large} \times D_{large}}$ from the parameters of the intermediate model $\Theta_{L_{inter}, D_{inter}}$ to initialize the large model $\Theta_i^{(large)}$, i.e.,

$$\Theta_i^{(large)} = \mathbf{M}_i^{(global)} (\Theta_i^{(inter)}). \quad (5)$$

The Global-LiGO is what we actually share in each communication round. By sharing this operator instead of the local models themselves, we can ensure the privacy of each client with respect to its pre-trained model and local data. Similar to Local-LiGO, the optimization goal of Global-LiGO for each client can be formulated as follows:

$$\min_{\mathbf{M}_i^{(global)}} J(\mathbf{M}_i^{(global)}) := \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}_i} [\ell(\mathbf{M}_i^{(global)} (\Theta_i^{(inter)}); x, y)] \right\} \quad (6)$$

Likewise, each client updates the $\mathbf{M}_i^{(global)}$ using the following gradient descent rule:

$$\mathbf{M}_i^{(global)} \leftarrow \mathbf{M}_i^{(global)} - \eta_g \nabla_{\mathbf{M}_i^{(global)}} J(\mathbf{M}_i^{(global)}) \quad (7)$$

where η_g is the learning rate for updating $\mathbf{M}_g^{(global)}$.

The workflow of Dual-LiGO is illustrated in Figure 2, and its pseudocode is given in Appendix A.2. For each client, it firstly train the $\mathbf{M}_i^{(local)}$ locally for E_l epochs, and get the intermediate homogeneous model via $\mathbf{M}_i^{(local)}$. Next, it trains Global-LiGO locally for E_g epochs and sends the Global-LiGO to the parameter server for aggregation. The aggregated Global-LiGO will be used as the starting point of the next E_g epochs local training. Such a local training and aggregation process will be repeated for R times. Finally, based on the intermediate model and Global-LiGO, each client gets a homogeneous transformer.




Figure 2: Workflow of Dual-LiGO.

4 Experiments

In this section, we first introduce the experiment setup and then show the numerical results demonstrating the effectiveness of our Fed-Grow with Dual-LiGO.

4.1 Datasets and Models

We consider the following 3 tasks: text classification, sequence tagging and image classification. For text classification tasks, we use the 20 Newsgroups [14] and AG News datasets [31], employing the BERT [7] model. For sequence tagging tasks, we use the WikiNER dataset [22], also utilizing the BERT [7] model. For image classification tasks, we use the CIFAR-10 [13], CIFAR-100 [13], and Flowers-102 [18] datasets, using the Vision Transformer (ViT) [8] model. The detailed description about the dataset is available in the Appendix B.1

For each client’s small model, i.e., $\Theta^{(small)}$, we design three different sizes to simulate the heterogeneous setting of the small models. Details about the sizes of small models $\Theta^{(small)}$, intermediate models $\Theta^{(inter)}$, and large models $\Theta^{(large)}$ are provided in Appendix B.2.

4.2 Results Overview

Baselines. We compare our proposed method, Fed-Grow with Dual-LiGO, against two baseline methods. The first one is each client’s own expansion of the large model (without aggregation) [25], denoted as "NoAgg" in the tables. This baseline represents the scenario where each client uses its own pre-trained model to initialize a large model and trains it locally without any communication or knowledge sharing with other clients. We compare this baseline with our method on the top-1 accuracy or precision metrics, to show that our Fed-Grow framework really works on improving accuracy, precision, and training speed. The second one is the conventional federated learning that directly trains a large transformer from scratch [8; 7], denoted as "Scratch" in the tables. This baseline represents the scenario where each client starts with a randomly initialized large model and trains with federated averaging on the large model. We compare this baseline with our method on the number of

Table 1: Comparison of accuracy/precision and standard deviation between Fed-Grow (Agg) and NoAgg [25] under different settings.

		Accuracy/Precision (%) \uparrow											
Model	Task	10 Clients						20 Clients					
		IID			Non-IID			IID			Non-IID		
		Agg	NoAgg	Δ	Agg	NoAgg	Δ	Agg	NoAgg	Δ	Agg	NoAgg	Δ
BERT	20news	65.295	49.177	16.118	53.983	37.759	16.224	48.258	45.470	2.788	27.787	18.693	9.094
	agnews	90.158	87.474	2.684	85.671	73.079	12.592	86.053	86.737	-0.684	84.250	49.303	34.947
	wikiner	42.581	28.324	14.257	43.878	33.539	10.339	43.693	28.803	14.890	42.558	27.300	15.258
ViT	CIFAR-10	76.717	67.977	8.740	70.186	48.771	21.415	78.223	70.020	8.203	71.914	53.730	18.184
	CIFAR-100	53.178	38.127	15.051	50.109	26.904	23.205	54.004	39.141	14.863	51.270	28.457	22.813
	Flowers102	38.555	25.000	13.555	37.928	20.326	17.602	31.548	12.448	19.100	31.904	10.349	21.555
		Standard Deviation \downarrow											
Model	Task	10 Clients						20 Clients					
		IID			Non-IID			IID			Non-IID		
		Agg	NoAgg	Δ	Agg	NoAgg	Δ	Agg	NoAgg	Δ	Agg	NoAgg	Δ
BERT	20news	3.546	24.219	-20.673	11.960	23.161	-11.201	3.518	14.605	-11.087	3.518	6.112	-2.594
	agnews	1.001	4.362	-3.361	4.350	28.025	-23.675	2.100	1.573	0.527	14.605	16.340	-1.735
	wikiner	3.513	9.069	-5.556	1.360	11.288	-9.928	2.441	9.689	-7.248	2.241	11.109	-8.868
ViT	CIFAR-10	1.482	2.908	-1.426	1.870	5.168	-3.298	1.251	2.280	-1.029	1.321	5.225	-3.904
	CIFAR-100	1.045	1.848	-0.803	1.332	3.099	-1.767	1.401	1.795	-0.394	1.551	2.282	-0.731
	Flowers102	1.419	1.657	-0.238	1.399	2.609	-1.210	1.467	2.305	-0.838	1.038	1.638	-0.600




Figure 3: Comparison of Dual-LiGO (Agg) and NoAgg on six datasets under IID and non-IID settings with 10 clients. The subfigures show the mean accuracy (or precision) of the methods on each dataset. Each subfigure shows four lines: IID_AGG, IID_NoAgg, NIID_AGG, NIID_NoAgg, which represent the test accuracy (or precision) of the methods under different settings.

trainable parameters and communication cost metrics, to show that our Dual-LiGO architecture is resource saving than the full model sharing.

Performance Analysis. We test our models with different numbers of clients, specifically 10 and 20 clients. We analyze the performance of our Fed-Grow from three aspects: accuracy/precision, stability, and resource consumption. In Table 1 and Figure 3, we compare our method with the NoAgg method on the accuracy and stability metrics. The results on the number of trainable parameters and communication cost metrics are shown in Table 2, which compares our method with the Scratch

method. We also show the average test accuracy/precision over communication rounds under different settings in Appendix C.1.

Fed-Grow improves accuracy/precision. Our proposed method, Fed-Grow with Dual-LiGO, generally outperforms the baseline method NoAgg [25] in terms of accuracy and precision across the absolute majority of datasets, both under IID and non-IID conditions, and for both 10 and 20 clients. This is indicated by the positive Δ values in the accuracy/precision part of Table 1, which represent the improvement in accuracy achieved by Fed-Grow over the baseline method. There is only 1 exception to be reported. In the agnews dataset under IID conditions with 20 clients, the NoAgg method achieves a slightly higher accuracy (86.737) than Fed-Grow (86.053) and a lower standard deviation. This could be attributed to the relatively simple nature of the agnews dataset, which has only 4 classes of data. In the IID setting, every client has enough amount of data for training a robust model, which might have given the NoAgg method an advantage. The above results suggest that Fed-Grow with Dual-LiGO can effectively integrate the diverse knowledge from different participants and achieve a robust and comprehensive large model.

Fed-Grow reduces the standard deviation of clients’ performance. In terms of stability, measured by the standard deviation of accuracy/precision across clients, Dual-LiGO also appears to perform better than NoAgg. This is indicated by the negative Δ values in the standard deviation part of Table 1, which suggests that Fed-Grow with Dual-LiGO has a lower standard deviation, and hence more stable performance, compared to the baseline method. This suggests that Dual-LiGO can reduce the performance gap among different clients and ensure a consistent quality of the model.

Table 2: Comparison on number of trainable parameters and communication cost between Dual-LiGO and Scratch [7; 8]. The table shows the results for different components. The communication cost is measured by the number of parameters that need to be transmitted between each device and the server in each training round.

Method	Model	# Trainable Params	Comm Cost
Dual-LiGO#1	Small	0	0
	Local-LiGO	0.737M	0
	Global-LiGO	2.089M	4.178M
Dual-LiGO#2	Small	0	0
	Local-LiGO	1.065M	0
	Global-LiGO	2.089M	4.178M
Dual-LiGO#2	Small	0	0
	Local-LiGO	1.393M	0
	Global-LiGO	2.089M	4.178M
Scratch	Large	7.740M	15.480M
Averaged result of Dual-LiGO		3.154M	4.178M
Improvements on Scratch		59.25%	73.01%

Dual-LiGO reduces the resource consumption on computation and communication. As shown in Table 2, Dual-LiGO has fewer trainable parameters and lower communication cost than Scratch. Specifically, Fed-Grow with Dual-LiGO reduces the number of trainable parameters and the communication cost by 59.25% and 73.01%, respectively, which indicates that our Fed-Grow with Dual-LiGO requires less computational resources and transfers less data in the training process than Scratch. This can reduce the hardware thresholds for the participants, save bandwidth and energy cost in training, and also improve the privacy and security of the data since less parameters are shared. These results demonstrate that our Fed-Grow with Dual-LiGO is more efficient and resource-friendly than Scratch.

In summary, our experimental results have shown that our method has three main advantages over the baseline methods. First, Fed-Grow with Dual-LiGO improves the accuracy and precision of the model across various tasks and conditions, indicating higher performance. Second, Fed-Grow with Dual-LiGO enhances the stability of the model’s performance across different clients, indicating more consistency. Third, Fed-Grow with Dual-LiGO reduces the resource consumption on computation and communication, indicating lower threshold and more green for training a transformer. These findings suggest that our Fed-Grow with Dual-LiGO is a promising approach, especially for those users with limited data and computing resources.

4.3 Detailed Analysis

In this part, we analyze the detailed performance of Fed-Grow with Dual-LiGO under different client settings. Additionally, the resource consumption of Fed-Grow with Dual-LiGO on computation and communication are also observed.

Table 3: Mean accuracy of Dual-LiGO (Agg) and NoAgg on the CIFAR-100 dataset under IID and non-IID settings with different numbers of clients.

Client Number	Accuracy (%) \uparrow					
	IID			Non-IID		
	Agg	NoAgg	Δ	Agg	NoAgg	Δ
10	53.178	38.127	15.051	50.109	26.904	23.205
20	54.004	39.141	14.863	51.270	28.457	22.813
30	47.57	31.341	16.229	43.727	21.363	22.364
40	42.061	28.499	13.562	37.209	18.48	18.729
50	37.478	32.854	4.624	25.922	17.122	8.800

Table 4: Mean accuracy of Dual-LiGO (Agg) and NoAgg on the agnews dataset under IID and non-IID settings with different numbers of clients.

Client Number	Accuracy (%) \uparrow					
	IID			Non-IID		
	Agg	NoAgg	Δ	Agg	NoAgg	Δ
10	90.158	87.474	2.684	85.671	73.079	12.592
20	86.053	86.737	-0.684	84.250	49.303	34.947
30	88.000	87.197	0.803	87.632	50.263	37.369
40	87.329	85.737	1.592	82.961	38.579	44.382
50	70.232	66.484	3.748	68.126	34.137	33.989

Different Number of Clients. We conduct a robustness analysis to test the performance of Fed-Grow with Dual-LiGO under different client settings. We use two datasets, CIFAR-100 and agnews, and test Fed-Grow under both IID and non-IID data distributions. We vary the number of clients from 10 to 50. The results are shown in Tables 3 and 4 and the accuracy curves are provided in Appendix C.1, which show that Fed-Grow with Dual-LiGO is robust to different client settings, as it consistently outperforms baseline in both IID and Non-IID settings, except for one case where baseline has slightly higher accuracy than Fed-Grow when the number of clients is 20 in the IID setting of agnews. This has been explained in Section 4.2. In most cases, Fed-Grow has a clear advantage over baseline, especially in the Non-IID setting, where the gap is very large. The largest improvement of Fed-Grow with Dual-LiGO over baseline is achieved when the number of clients is 40, with 1.592% and 44.382% higher accuracy in IID and Non-IID settings of agnews, respectively. The smallest improvement is observed when the number of clients is 20, with -0.684% and 34.947% higher accuracy in IID and Non-IID settings of agnews, respectively. This demonstrates that a client with Dual-LiGO can effectively leverage the information from other clients to improve the performance of its transformer, while the baseline suffers from limited and heterogeneous data. The numerical results shows that Dual-LiGO is robust to data heterogeneity and sparsity and can adapt to different client settings.

Detailed resource consumption on Dual-LiGO.

In our approach, each client only has to store its small model, and train the Local-LiGO and Global-LiGO to obtain its transformer. Since there are three kind of small models (#1, #2, #3) in our simulation, the Dual-LiGO also vary on clients with small models #1, #2, #3 with respect to trainable parameters and communication cost. The observed trainable parameters and communication cost for the Dual-LiGO#1, Dual-LiGO#2, Dual-LiGO#3 are presented in the Table 2, from which we can see that the average trainable parameters and communication cost for Dual-LiGO are 3.154M and 4.178M, respectively. Compared with the results 7.740M and 15.480M for Scratch, our Dual-LiGO has 59.25% and 73.01% improvements on trainable parameters and communication cost.

5 Conclusion

To make the resource-constrained users can also afford the costly-training transformers, this paper studies a federated framework named Fed-Grow, in which multiple participants cooperatively expand a large-scale transformer from their pre-trained small models. To efficiently exchange the useful knowledge and protect the privacy of users in model scaling, the Dual-LiGO architecture is designed

based on Fed-Grow, with its Local-LiGO part used to tackle the heterogeneity problem caused by the pre-trained models, and its Global-LiGO part shared by participants to exchange the implicit knowledge from the pre-trained models and the experience learned in model scaling. Compared with the classical federated learning, our approach no longer shares the models, let alone the raw data, which strengthens the privacy of our approach. The numerical results from the simulation show that our approach outperforms several baselines in terms of accuracy, precision, stability, and resource consumption on computations and communications. Extending our work to train customized transformers with heterogeneous architecture will be our work in the future.

References

- [1] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. GPT-4 Technical Report. arXiv:2303.08774 [cs.CL]
- [2] Daniel J Beutel, Taner Topal, Akhil Mathur, Xinchu Qiu, Javier Fernandez-Marques, Yan Gao, Lorenzo Sani, Hei Li Kwing, Titouan Parcollet, Pedro PB de Gusmão, and Nicholas D Lane. 2020. Flower: A Friendly Federated Learning Research Framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.14390* (2020).
- [3] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 1877–1901.
- [4] Cheng Chen, Yichun Yin, Lifeng Shang, Xin Jiang, Yujia Qin, Fengyu Wang, Zhi Wang, Xiao Chen, Zhiyuan Liu, and Qun Liu. 2021. bert2bert: Towards reusable pretrained language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.07143* (2021).
- [5] Tianlong Chen, Yu Cheng, Zhe Gan, Lu Yuan, Lei Zhang, and Zhangyang Wang. 2021. Chasing Sparsity in Vision Transformers: An End-to-End Exploration. arXiv:2106.04533 [cs.CV]
- [6] Tianqi Chen, Ian Goodfellow, and Jonathon Shlens. 2015. Net2net: Accelerating learning via knowledge transfer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.05641* (2015).
- [7] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805* (2018).
- [8] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. 2020. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929* (2020).
- [9] Cheng Fu, Hanxian Huang, Zixuan Jiang, Yun Ni, Lifeng Nai, Gang Wu, Liquan Cheng, Yanqi Zhou, Sheng Li, Andrew Li, et al. 2023. TripLe: Revisiting Pretrained Model Reuse and Progressive Learning for Efficient Vision Transformer Scaling and Searching. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 17153–17163.
- [10] Mengtong Gao, Yifei Zou, Zuyuan Zhang, Xiuzhen Cheng, and Dongxiao Yu. 2024. Cooperative Backdoor Attack in Decentralized Reinforcement Learning with Theoretical Guarantee. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.15245* (2024).
- [11] Linyuan Gong, Di He, Zhuohan Li, Tao Qin, Liwei Wang, and Tiejun Liu. 2019. Efficient training of BERT by progressively stacking. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2337–2346.
- [12] Le Hou, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Tianyi Zhou, Yuexin Wu, Xinying Song, Xiaodan Song, and Denny Zhou. 2022. Token dropping for efficient BERT pretraining. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.13240* (2022).

- [13] Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. 2009. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. (2009).
- [14] Ken Lang. 1995. Newsweeder: Learning to filter netnews. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Conference on Machine Learning*. 331–339.
- [15] Qinbin Li, Yiqun Diao, Quan Chen, and Bingsheng He. 2022. Federated learning on non-iid data silos: An experimental study. In *2022 IEEE 38th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. IEEE, 965–978.
- [16] Bill Yuchen Lin, Chaoyang He, Zihang Zeng, Hulin Wang, Yufen Huang, Christophe Dupuy, Rahul Gupta, Mahdi Soltanolkotabi, Xiang Ren, and Salman Avestimehr. 2022. FedNLP: Benchmarking Federated Learning Methods for Natural Language Processing Tasks. arXiv:2104.08815 [cs.CL]
- [17] Ze Liu, Yutong Lin, Yue Cao, Han Hu, Yixuan Wei, Zheng Zhang, Stephen Lin, and Baining Guo. 2021. Swin transformer: Hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*. 10012–10022.
- [18] Maria-Elena Nilsback and Andrew Zisserman. 2008. Automated flower classification over a large number of classes. In *2008 Sixth Indian conference on computer vision, graphics & image processing*. IEEE, 722–729.
- [19] Yujia Qin, Yankai Lin, Jing Yi, Jiajie Zhang, Xu Han, Zhengyan Zhang, Yusheng Su, Zhiyuan Liu, Peng Li, Maosong Sun, et al. 2021. Knowledge inheritance for pre-trained language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.13880* (2021).
- [20] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog* 1, 8 (2019), 9.
- [21] Mohammad Shoeybi, Mostofa Patwary, Raul Puri, Patrick LeGresley, Jared Casper, and Bryan Catanzaro. 2019. Megatron-lm: Training multi-billion parameter language models using model parallelism. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.08053* (2019).
- [22] Simone Tedeschi, Valentino Maiorca, Niccolò Campolungo, Francesco Cecconi, and Roberto Navigli. 2021. WikiNEuRal: Combined neural and knowledge-based silver data creation for multilingual NER. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*. 2521–2533.
- [23] Hugo Touvron, Matthieu Cord, Matthijs Douze, Francisco Massa, Alexandre Sablayrolles, and Hervé Jégou. 2021. Training data-efficient image transformers & distillation through attention. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 10347–10357.
- [24] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is All you Need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, I. Guyon, U. Von Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett (Eds.), Vol. 30. Curran Associates, Inc. https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/file/3f5ee243547dee91fbd053c1c4a845aa-Paper.pdf
- [25] Peihao Wang, Rameswar Panda, Lucas Torroba Hennigen, Philip Greengard, Leonid Karlinsky, Rogerio Feris, David Daniel Cox, Zhangyang Wang, and Yoon Kim. 2023. Learning to Grow Pretrained Models for Efficient Transformer Training. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=cDYRS5iZ16f>
- [26] Yite Wang, Jiahao Su, Hanlin Lu, Cong Xie, Tianyi Liu, Jianbo Yuan, Haibin Lin, Ruoyu Sun, and Hongxia Yang. 2023. LEMON: Lossless model expansion. arXiv:2310.07999 [cs.LG]
- [27] Kunda Yan, Sen Cui, Abudukelimu Wuerkaixi, Jingfeng Zhang, Bo Han, Gang Niu, Masashi Sugiyama, and Changshui Zhang. 2024. Balancing Similarity and Complementarity for Federated Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.09892* (2024).

- [28] Cheng Yang, Shengnan Wang, Chao Yang, Yuechuan Li, Ru He, and Jingqiao Zhang. 2020. Progressively stacking 2.0: A multi-stage layerwise training method for bert training speedup. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.13635* (2020).
- [29] Yang You, Jing Li, Sashank Reddi, Jonathan Hseu, Sanjiv Kumar, Srinadh Bhojanapalli, Xiaodan Song, James Demmel, Kurt Keutzer, and Cho-Jui Hsieh. 2019. Large batch optimization for deep learning: Training bert in 76 minutes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.00962* (2019).
- [30] Minjia Zhang and Yuxiong He. 2020. Accelerating training of transformer-based language models with progressive layer dropping. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 14011–14023.
- [31] Xiang Zhang, Junbo Zhao, and Yann LeCun. 2015. Character-level convolutional networks for text classification. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 28 (2015).
- [32] Zuyuan Zhang, Mahdi Imani, and Tian Lan. 2024. Modeling Other Players with Bayesian Beliefs for Games with Incomplete Information. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.14122* (2024).
- [33] Zuyuan Zhang, Hanhan Zhou, Mahdi Imani, Taeyoung Lee, and Tian Lan. 2024. Collaborative ai teaming in unknown environments via active goal deduction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.15341* (2024).
- [34] Bohan Zhuang, Jing Liu, Zizheng Pan, Haoyu He, Yuetian Weng, and Chunhua Shen. 2023. A survey on efficient training of transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.01107* (2023).
- [35] Yifei Zou, Zuyuan Zhang, Congwei Zhang, Yanwei Zheng, Dongxiao Yu, and Jiguo Yu. 2024. A Distributed Abstract MAC Layer for Cooperative Learning on Internet of Vehicles. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* (2024).

A Detailed Description of Dual-LiGO

A.1 Notations

The notations to articulate the Dual-LiGO framework within our federated learning context are shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Table of notations.

Notation	Description
n	Number of clients
\mathcal{D}_i	Dataset of client i
$\Theta_{L,D}$	A neural network with L layers and D dimensions
$\Theta_i^{(small)}$	Pre-trained small model of client i
$\Theta_i^{(inter)}$	Intermediate model of client i
$\Theta_i^{(large)}$	Large model of client i
$\mathbf{M}_i^{(local)}$	Local-LiGO of client i
$\mathbf{M}_i^{(global)}$	Global-LiGO of client i
$\ell(\Theta; x, y)$	Loss function given model Θ and data point (x, y)
$F(\Theta^{(large)})$	Objective function of the large model
$F_i(\Theta^{(large)})$	Average loss of the large model over dataset \mathcal{D}_i
η_l	The learning rate of Local-LiGO
η_g	The learning rate of Global-LiGO
E_l	Number of epochs for training the Local-LiGO
E_g	Number of epochs for training the Global-LiGO
R	Number of rounds for aggregation round

A.2 Pseudocode of Dual-LiGO

The pseudocode for the implementation of the Dual-LiGO framework within the Fed-Grow federated learning system is shown in Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 1. The algorithms detail the iterative process of training, updating, and aggregating the models, which culminates in the construction of a robust and large global model.

Algorithm 1 Fed-Grow with Dual-LiGO for Client i

```

1: Input: Pre-trained small model  $\Theta_i^{(small)}$ ;
2:   Local dataset  $\mathcal{D}_i$ ; Local-LiGO training epoch  $E_l$ ;
3:   Federated round  $R$ ; Global-LiGO training epoch  $E_g$ ;
4: Output: The global large model  $\Theta_i^{(large)}$ ;

```

```

// Train the Local-LiGO for  $E_l$  epochs.
5: for  $E_l$  epochs do
6:   Train Local-LiGO  $M_i^{(local)}$  on local data  $\mathcal{D}_i$  with equation 3 as the goal and equation 4 as the
   gradient descent rule;
7: end for

```

```

// Train and upload the Global-LiGO for  $R$  rounds.
8: for  $r = 1$  to  $R$  do
9:   for  $E_g$  epochs do
10:    Train  $M_i^{(global)}$  on local data  $\mathcal{D}_i$  with equation 6 as the goal and equation 7 as the gradient
    descent rule;
11:   end for
12:   Upload its Global-LiGO  $M_i^{(global)}$  to parameter server;
13:    $M_i^{(global)} \leftarrow$  the aggregated result from parameter server ;
14: end for
15: Obtain global large model  $\Theta_i^{(large)}$  via  $M_i^{(global)}$ ;

```

Algorithm 2 Fed-Grow with Dual-LiGO for Parameter Server

```

1: for  $r = 1$  to  $R$  do
2:   Receive  $M_i^{(global)}$  from all clients;
3:    $M^{(global)} \leftarrow \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{|\mathcal{D}_i|}{\sum_{j=1}^n |\mathcal{D}_j|} M_i^{(global)}$ ;
4:   Send  $M^{(global)}$  to all clients;
5: end for

```

B Details of Experimental Setup

B.1 Dataset Descriptions

- **20 Newsgroups:** The 20 Newsgroups dataset [14] is a collection of approximately 20,000 newsgroup documents, partitioned nearly across 20 different newsgroups.
- **AG News:** The AG News dataset [31] is a sub-dataset of AG’s corpus of news articles, containing 30,000 training and 1,900 test samples per class, with a total of 120,000 training samples and 7,600 testing samples.
- **WikiNER:** The WikiNER dataset [22] is a large collection of sentences from Wikipedia, predicting 4 tags: ‘PER’ for person names, ‘LOC’ for location names, ‘ORG’ for organization names, and ‘MISC’ for other names.
- **CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100:** The CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 datasets [13] are labeled subsets of the 80 million tiny images dataset, designed for image classification tasks.
- **Flowers-102:** The Flowers-102 dataset [18] is an image classification dataset consisting of 102 flower categories commonly occurring in the United Kingdom.

B.2 Configurations of Different Transformer Models

The detailed architecture of small models $\Theta^{(small)}$, intermediate models $\Theta^{(inter)}$, and large models $\Theta^{(large)}$ can be found in Table 6. For both BERT and ViT, we use the configuration shown in Table 6. For each client’s small model, we randomly and uniformly sample one of the three heterogeneous model architectures in Table 6 and train it as a pre-trained small model for that client.

Table 6: Configurations of different transformer models.

Name	#Hidden	#Layers	#Heads
small#1	256	2	8
small#2	256	3	8
small#3	256	4	8
intermediate	320	4	8
large	384	6	8

B.3 Implementation Details

Our experimental platform is built upon Flower [2] and FedNLP [16] with Pytorch as the training backend. All simulations are conducted on $4 \times$ NVIDIA RTX 4090 GPUs with 320GB memory. We conduct our simulations under various conditions to thoroughly evaluate the performance of our models. Our simulations span 6 different tasks, providing a comprehensive evaluation of our models’ performance across diverse domains. For different datasets, we set different hyper-parameters E_l , E_g , and R due to the varying dataset sizes. For each client, we train the small model on the local dataset for E_l rounds as the pre-trained small model. Following [15; 16], we use the Dirichlet distribution with $\beta = 0.5$ to generate non-IID data and $\beta = 100$ to generate IID data, with a fixed random seed. We test our models with different numbers of clients, specifically 10 and 20 clients. The detailed configurations for each task are provided in Table 7. We referenced the code of [33; 35; 32; 10].

B.4 Metrics

We use several key metrics to evaluate the performance of our models. For tasks involving image and text classification, we report the *top-1 accuracy* on the test set. For the sequence tagging task, we report *precision* on the test set. In addition to these task-specific metrics, we assess the stability of our models’ performance across different clients by calculating and reporting the *standard deviation* of the aforementioned metrics. Moreover, we report the number of *trainable parameters* and *communication cost*, to reflect the resource consumption on computation and communication resources.

Table 7: Hyperparameters for each task.

Task	Batch Size	LR	E_l	E_g	R	Optimizer
20news	32	3e-4	100	10	200	AdamW
agnews	32	1e-4	10	1	100	AdamW
wikiner	32	1e-4	50	3	100	AdamW
CIFAR-10	64	5e-4	50	4	200	AdamW
CIFAR-100	64	5e-4	50	4	200	AdamW
Flowers-102	64	5e-4	200	40	100	AdamW

C Additional Experimental Results

C.1 Curves of Test Accuracy/Precision During Training Process

Fig 4 exhibit evolution of the mean accuracy/precision over global communication stpes in 20-client settings. From which, we can find that our method outperforms baseline in terms of convergence speed and final performance. The baseline methods are more prone to overfitting (Fig 4 (c)) or even

failing to converge (Fig 4 (b)) due to the reduced amount of data shared by each client, our method effectively avoids these problems.

Fig 5 and Fig 6 show the performance of our method on a larger number of clients (30-50 clients). As the number of clients increases, less data is stored on each client, resulting in slower convergence, but our method still significantly outperforms baseline in terms of convergence speed and final performance.




Figure 4: Comparison of Dual-LiGO (Agg) and NoAgg on six datasets under IID and non-IID settings with 20 clients.




Figure 5: Comparison of Dual-LiGO (Agg) and NoAgg on agnews under IID and non-IID settings with 30-50 clients.

C.2 Effects of Small Model Heterogeneity

In the original experiment, we designed three heterogeneous small models. In order to verify the robustness of our method to the degree of heterogeneity of the small models, in this section, we designed 2 additional heterogeneous cases and ran the experiments in the CIFAR-100 dataset, IID, 10-client settings. The model heterogeneity cases are shown in Table 8, Table 9 and the final experimental results are presented in Table 10. From the table, we can see that regardless of the heterogeneity case, our method has a significant improvement over the baseline method, which proves the tolerance of our method for small model heterogeneity.




Figure 6: Comparison of Dual-LiGO (Agg) and NoAgg on CIFAR-100 under IID and non-IID settings with 30-50 clients.

Table 8: Configurations of additional heterogeneity case 1.

Name	#Hidden	#Layers	#Heads
small#1	256	2	8
small#2	256	3	8
small#3	256	4	8
small#4	192	2	8
small#5	192	3	8
small#6	192	4	8
intermediate	320	4	8
large	384	6	8

Table 9: Configurations of additional heterogeneity case 2.

Name	#Hidden	#Layers	#Heads
small#1	256	2	8
small#2	256	3	8
small#3	256	4	8
small#4	256	5	8
small#5	256	6	8
intermediate	320	7	8
large	384	8	8

Table 10: Mean accuracy of Dual-LiGO (Agg) and NoAgg on the CIFAR-100 dataset under IID, 10-client settings with different heterogeneity of small models.

Heterogeneity Case	Accuracy (%) \uparrow		
	Agg	NoAgg	Δ
Original Case	53.178	38.127	15.051
Additional Case 1	57.812	38.306	19.506
Additional Case 2	53.949	47.568	6.381

C.3 Comparison with FedAvg with Only Large Model

In this section, we compare our approach with FedAvg, specifically, we resize the large model to ensure roughly the same amount of communication as our approach, and then train the large model, upload and aggregate it (There are no small models and intermediate models stored in clients); Table 11 shows the results of the comparison in 20news dataset, IID and 10-client settings. Due to the limitation of communication resources, the parameter number of the large model is limited, and the performance of our algorithm has a significant advantage over directly training a large model under the same communication resources. Moreover, compared to directly training a large model, our

approach is able to utilize the implicit knowledge of the pre-trained small model on each client to further accelerate the training process.

Table 11: Comparative results of communication cost and accuracy between FedAvg and our approach on the 20news dataset under IID conditions with 10 clients.

Method	Comm Cost	Accuracy (%) \uparrow
FedAvg	4.034M	53.638
Ours	4.178M	65.295

C.4 Visualization of Intermediate Models' Similarity

In our investigation of privacy preservation within our proposed framework, we explore the pair-wise similarity between intermediate models contributed by different clients in agnews dataset, non-IID and 10-clients setting. The similarity matrix, computed using cosine similarity is shown in Figure 7.

According to [27], clients with highly similar models (values close to 1) may inadvertently leak information about their individual data distributions. Such similarity could lead to privacy risks, including membership inference attacks. On the other hand, clients with diverse models (values closer to 0) enhance privacy by introducing aggregated noise and making it harder for adversaries to pinpoint specific contributions. In our case, the similarity between the clients' intermediate models is very low, which indicates the advantage of our approach for privacy preservation. In addition to this, we still need to emphasize that during the transmission stage of our models, only Global-LiGO is transmitted, and it is very difficult for an attacker to access the parameters of our intermediate or small models as well as the training data of each client through traditional attack measures.




Figure 7: The cosine similarity between intermediate models in different clients in agnews dataset, non-IID and 10-clients setting.

D Limitations

Despite the innovative approach and promising results of Fed-Grow with Dual-LiGO, we acknowledge certain limitations that warrant further investigation.

In the spirit of continuous improvement, we note that the current iteration of Fed-Grow shows room for enhancement in scenarios involving 20-client agnews datasets with non-IID settings (can be found in Table 1). This observation opens up opportunities to deepen our understanding of data diversity’s impact on model performance. Our forthcoming research will be dedicated to exploring these dynamics further, with the aim of fortifying the robustness of our framework across varied client environments.

The journey of a global large model to its full potential includes a pivotal step of client-specific fine-tuning. This process is key to unlocking a model’s robust performance tailored to individual datasets. Recognizing that computational resources are a valuable commodity, we are motivated to explore more efficient fine-tuning methodologies. Our future work is poised to focus on this endeavor, aspiring to make the fine-tuning process as seamless as possible for all clients, regardless of their resource availability.