

Semi-Variance Reduction for Fair Federated Learning

Saber Malekmohammadi

Cheriton School of Computer Science, University of Waterloo, Canada
saber.malekmohammadi@uwaterloo.ca

Abstract

Ensuring fairness in a Federated Learning (FL) system, i.e., a satisfactory performance for all of the participating diverse clients, is an important and challenging problem. There are multiple fair FL algorithms in the literature, which have been relatively successful in providing fairness. However, these algorithms mostly emphasize on the loss functions of worst-off clients to improve their performance, which often results in the suppression of well-performing ones. As a consequence, they usually sacrifice the system’s overall average performance for achieving fairness. Motivated by this and inspired by two well-known risk modeling methods in Finance, *Mean-Variance* and *Mean-Semi-Variance*, we propose and study two new fair FL algorithms, *Variance Reduction* (VRed) and *Semi-Variance Reduction* (Semi-VRed). VRed encourages equality between clients’ loss functions by penalizing their variance. In contrast, Semi-VRed penalizes the discrepancy of only the worst-off clients’ loss functions from the average loss. Through extensive experiments on multiple vision and language datasets, we show that, Semi-VRed achieves SoTA performance in scenarios with heterogeneous data distributions and improves both fairness and system overall average performance.

1 Introduction

Federated Learning [McMahan *et al.*, 2017] is a framework consisting of some clients and the private data that is distributed among them, allowing training of a shared or personalized model based on the clients’ data. Since the seminal work of [McMahan *et al.*, 2017], it has attracted an intensive amount of attention and much progress has been made in its different aspects, including algorithmic innovations [Li *et al.*, 2020b; Reddi *et al.*, 2020a; Pathak and Wainwright, 2020; Huo *et al.*, 2020; Wang *et al.*, 2020; Reddi *et al.*, 2020b], fairness [McMahan *et al.*, 2017; Li *et al.*, 2020c; Mohri *et al.*, 2019; Li *et al.*, 2020a; Yue *et al.*, 2021; Zhang *et al.*, 2022a], convergence analysis [Khaled *et al.*, 2020; Li *et al.*, 2020d; Gorbunov *et al.*, 2021; Malekmohammadi

et al., 2021b; 2021a], personalization [Chen and Chao, 2022; Oh *et al.*, 2022; Zhang *et al.*, 2022b; Bietti and Wei, 2022], and various other aspects.

Due to heterogeneity in clients’ data and their resources, performance fairness is an important challenge in FL systems. There have been some previous works addressing this problem. For instance, [Mohri *et al.*, 2019] proposed Agnostic Federated Learning (AFL), which aims at minimizing the largest loss function among clients through a minimax optimization framework. Similarly, [Li *et al.*, 2020a] proposed an algorithm called TERM using tilted losses. Ditto [Li *et al.*, 2021] is another existing algorithm based on model personalization for clients. Also, q -Fair Federated Learning (q -FFL) [Li *et al.*, 2020c] is an algorithm inspired by α -fairness in wireless networks [Lan *et al.*, 2010]. Also, the work in [Zhang *et al.*, 2022a] proposed PropFair based on Proportional Fairness, and showed that all the aforementioned fair FL algorithms can be unified into a generalized mean framework. GiFair [Yue *et al.*, 2021] achieves fairness using a different mechanism: it penalizes the discrepancy between clients’ loss functions, i.e., encouraging equality of clients’ losses. FCFL [Cui *et al.*, 2021] uses a constrained version of AFL to achieve both algorithmic parity and performance consistency in FL settings.

Being designed for fair FL, the aforementioned algorithms usually result in the suppression of well-performing clients, due to the lower weights that the algorithms place on them or due to the equality that they enforce between clients’ losses (GiFair). As a consequence, the clients experiencing good performance with vanilla FedAvg, experience a relatively lower performance when using the above fair FL algorithms. This is our motivation for proposing two new algorithms.

Our inspiration in this paper is a concept in Finance called *risk modeling* used for portfolio selection. There are two vastly used methodologies for risk modeling: *Mean-Variance* (MV) [Zhang *et al.*, 2018; Soleimani *et al.*, 2009; Markowitz, 1952] and its expansion: *Mean-Semi-Variance* (MSV) [Boason *et al.*, 2017; Plà-Santamaria and Bravo, 2013; Ballester, 2005; Stuart and Markowitz, 1959], which are used for quantifying investment return and investment risk. Motivated by the vast usage of these methodologies and their great success in financial planning, we bring the MV and MSV methods to FL by proposing *Variance Reduction* (VRed) and *Semi-Variance Reduction* (Semi-VRed) algorithms, respectively.

2 Background

With formal notations, we consider an FL setting with n clients for the task of multi-class classification. Let $x \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ and $y \in \mathcal{Y} = \{1, \dots, C\}$ denote the input data point and its target label, respectively. Each client i has its own private data with data distribution $P_i(x, y)$. Let $h : \mathcal{X} \times \theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^C$ be the used predictor function, which is parameterized by $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$, shared among all clients. Also, let $\ell : \mathbb{R}^C \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be the loss function, which we choose to be the cross entropy loss. Client i minimizes loss function $f_i(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim P_i(x,y)}[\ell(h(x, \theta), y)]$, which has minimum value f_i^* , on its local dataset \mathcal{D}_i with size n_i . We denote $\frac{n_i}{N}$, where $N = \sum_i n_i$, with p_i .

There are various fair FL algorithms in the literature. In table 1, we have provided details of the most recent algorithms with their formulations. The existing fair FL algorithms can be grouped into two main categories:

2.1 Algorithms based on generalized mean

The first category includes FedAvg [McMahan *et al.*, 2017], q-FFL [Li *et al.*, 2020c], AFL [Mohri *et al.*, 2019], TERM [Li *et al.*, 2020a], PropFair [Zhang *et al.*, 2022a]. It was shown by [Zhang *et al.*, 2022a] that this category can be unified into a generalized mean framework [Kolmogorov, 1930], where more attention is paid to the clients with larger losses. Also, there has been a risk measure in Finance literature, which models the one-sided nature of risks and is known as ‘‘Conditional Value at Risk’’ (CVaR). It was used by [Williamson and Menon, 2019] for algorithmic fairness in a non-FL setting. The work in [Pillutla *et al.*, 2021] used the same CVaR risk measure as an objective function to propose Δ -FL algorithm for achieving performance fairness in FL settings. Besides not being clear how to set the parameter α of the CVaR-based objective function in FL settings (table 1), it reduces to the average of loss functions of a subset of clients with the largest loss values for $0 < \alpha < 1$ (see eq. 24 in [Williamson and Menon, 2019]), i.e., assigns a zero weight to the rest of clients in the average. Hence, CVaR’s objective function is a generalization of the objective function of AFL.

2.2 Algorithms based on enforcing equality

The second category of fair FL algorithms, which includes GiFair, is based on encouraging equality between clients’ train loss values. GiFair adds a regularization term to the objective of FedAvg to penalize the pairwise discrepancy between clients’ loss values (see table 1), and enforces equality between them to achieve performance fairness.

A common feature of both the categories above is their emphasis on the clients with relatively larger losses, which usually results in the suppression of the well-performing clients. This may result in the degradation of the overall average performance too (measured by the mean test accuracy across clients). In the next sections, we will see that Semi-VRed can achieve fairness by adding a regularization term: *semi-variance* of clients’ loss functions and improves both fairness and the system overall performance simultaneously. There have been some works in the literature in a similar context of ‘‘variance’’ regularization: [Maurer and Pontil, 2009;

Namkoong and Duchi, 2017] proposed regularizing the empirical risk minimization (ERM) by the empirical variance of losses across training samples to balance bias and variance and improve out-of-sample (test) performance and convergence rate. Similarly, [Shivaswamy and Jebara, 2010] proposed boosting binary classifiers based on a variance penalty applied to exponential loss. Variance regularization has also been used for out-of-distribution (domain) generalization: assuming having access to data from multiple training domains, [Krueger *et al.*, 2021] proposed penalizing variance of training risks across the domains as a method of distributionally robust optimization for domain generalization.

3 Risk modeling methods in Finance:

Mean-Variance and Mean-Semi-Variance

Mean-Variance (MV) and *Mean-Semi-Variance* (MSV) have been two popular methods for modeling risks and gains of an investment portfolio, as the first step in financial planning.

Mean-Variance (MV) [Zhang *et al.*, 2018; Soleimani *et al.*, 2009; Markowitz, 1952]. This method treats the return of each security in an investment portfolio as a random variable and adopts its expected value and variance to quantify the return and risk of the portfolio, respectively. An investor either minimizes the risk for a fixed expected return level or maximizes the return for a given acceptable risk level. In the former case, MV results in the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{x_1, \dots, x_n} \mathbb{E}[x_1 S_1 + \dots + x_n S_n] \\ \text{s.t. } & \sigma^2[x_1 S_1 + \dots + x_n S_n] \leq R, \quad \sum_i x_i = 1, \quad x_i \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Here, \mathbb{E} and σ^2 denote the expected value and variance operators, respectively. Also, S_i and x_i denote the random return from security i and the proportion of total wealth invested in security i , respectively. This example provides a basic view of how MV model works. Other closely related measures of risk in the MV model include the standard deviation (σ) and coefficient of variation (σ/\mathbb{E}). However, the *Mean-Variance* modeling of risk is debatable: any uncertain return above the expectation is usually not considered as risk in the common sense, but the MV model does so. This shortcoming is resolved by the *Mean-Semi-Variance* model.

Mean-Semi-Variance (MSV) [Boasson *et al.*, 2017; Plà-Santamaria and Bravo, 2013; Ballester, 2005; Stuart and Markowitz, 1959]. Having recognized the importance of the (often) one-sided nature of risks, MSV model proposed a *downside* risk measure known as *semi-variance*, which we denote by $\sigma_{<}^2$. Unlike variance, it is only concerned with the downside of the return, i.e., only the cases that the return drops *below* a predefined threshold. With this risk modeling method, problem 1 changes to the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{x_1, \dots, x_n} \mathbb{E}[x_1 S_1 + \dots + x_n S_n] \\ \text{s.t. } & \sigma_{<}^2[x_1 S_1 + \dots + x_n S_n] \leq R, \quad \sum_i x_i = 1, \quad x_i \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where the operator *semi-variance* ($\sigma_{<}^2$) measures the *downsides* of the return: $\sigma_{<}^2[z] = \mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{E}[z] - z)_+^2]$. MSV is a preferable alternative for the MV model as its modeling of the risk

Table 1: Objective functions of the existing fair FL algorithms (assuming $N_i = N_j$ for $i \neq j$).

FL algorithm	Objective	Reference
FedAvg	$\sum_i f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})$	[McMahan <i>et al.</i> , 2017]
AFL	$\max_i f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})$	[Mohri <i>et al.</i> , 2019]
q-FFL	$\sum_i f_i^{q+1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$	[Li <i>et al.</i> , 2020c]
TERM	$\sum_i e^{\alpha f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})}$	[Li <i>et al.</i> , 2020a]
PropFair	$-\sum_i \log(M - f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$	[Zhang <i>et al.</i> , 2022a]
Δ -FL	$\text{CVaR}_{1-\alpha}(f_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \dots, f_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$	[Pillutla <i>et al.</i> , 2021]
GiFair	$\sum_i f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \lambda \sum_{i \neq j} f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - f_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}) $	[Yue <i>et al.</i> , 2021]
VRed	$\sum_i f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \beta \sum_i \left(f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_j f_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right)^2$	this work
Semi-VRed	$\sum_i f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \beta \sum_i \left(f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_j f_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right)_+^2$	this work

is more consistent with our perception from an investment risk. Again, the problem above gives a basic understanding of how the MSV model works. More complex variations of MV and MSV models have been developed for complex and unpredictable financial markets [Rigamonti and Lučivjanská, 2022; Zhang *et al.*, 2018; Ballester, 2005].

4 MV and MSV models for fair FL

We now propose two fair FL algorithms by using the MV and MSV to quantify the inequality between clients' utilities. Inspired by [Zhang *et al.*, 2022a], we take a simple approach and define $u_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = M - f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ as the utility of client i , where M can be treated as a utility baseline. The smaller the loss function of a client, the larger its utility: *the utility of a client can be used to roughly represent the test accuracy of the shared model, parameterized by $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, on its local data.* With this definition, we propose to model the inequality between clients by the variance and semi-variance of their utilities, resulting in the VRed and Semi-VRed algorithms.

4.1 The VRed algorithm

VRed models the inequality between clients' utilities with their variance and aims to minimize the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
 F_{\text{VRed}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \sum_i p_i f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \beta \sum_i p_i \left(u_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \sum_j p_j u_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right)^2 \\
 &= \sum_i p_i f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \beta \sum_i p_i \left(f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \sum_j p_j f_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right)^2. \quad (3)
 \end{aligned}$$

VRed regularizes the objective function of vanilla FedAvg with variance of clients losses (utilities). Let us derive the VRed federated learning algorithm. By taking the gradient of (3) and multiplying it by the step size η , we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \eta \nabla F_{\text{VRed}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \sum_i p_i \eta \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \\
 &2\beta \sum_i p_i \left(f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \sum_j p_j f_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right) \left(\eta \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \sum_j p_j \eta \nabla f_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right). \quad (4)
 \end{aligned}$$

Algorithm 1: VRed and Semi-VRed

Input: global epoch T , loss functions f_i , number of samples n_i for client i , number of total samples N , initial global model $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(0)}$, local step number K_i for client i , learning rate η

- 1 Let $p_i = \frac{n_i}{N}$ for $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$
- 2 **for** $t = 0, 1, \dots, T$ **do**
- 3 randomly select $\mathcal{S}^{(t)} \subseteq [n]$
- 4 $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i^{(t)} = \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}$ for $i \in \mathcal{S}^{(t)}$, $N = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}^{(t)}} n_i$
- 5 **for** i in $\mathcal{S}^{(t)}$ **do** // in parallel
- 6 starting from $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i^{(t)}$, take K_i local SGD steps on $f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i^{(t)})$ with learning rate η to find $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i^{(t+1)}$
- 7 compute $\Delta_i^{(t)} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_i^{(t)} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_i^{(t+1)}$
- 8 compute $\bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}) = \sum_i p_i f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)})$ and $\bar{\Delta}^{(t)} = \sum_i p_i \Delta_i^{(t)}$
- 9 **if** VRed **then**
- 10 compute $\Delta^{(t)} = \sum_i p_i \Delta_i^{(t)} + 2\beta \sum_i p_i (f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}) - \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)})) (\Delta_i^{(t)} - \bar{\Delta}^{(t)})$
- 11 **else if** Semi-VRed **then**
- 12 compute $\Delta^{(t)} = \sum_i p_i \Delta_i^{(t)} + 2\beta \sum_i p_i (f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}) - \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}))_+ (\Delta_i^{(t)} - \bar{\Delta}^{(t)})$
- 13 update $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t+1)} = \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)} - \Delta^{(t)}$

Output: global model $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(T)}$

This equation immediately leads to an FL algorithm, by replacing the gradient $\eta \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ with the pseudo-gradient (i.e., the opposite of the local update), denoted by $\Delta_i^{(t)}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \eta \nabla F_{\text{VRed}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \sum_i p_i \Delta_i^{(t)} + 2\beta \sum_i p_i \left(f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right) \left(\Delta_i^{(t)} - \bar{\Delta}^{(t)} \right), \quad (5)
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_i p_i f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $\bar{\Delta}^{(t)} = \sum_i p_i \Delta_i^{(t)}$. The corresponding algorithm is included in algorithm 1. There is a

parameter β which tunes the effect of the regularization term, which needs to get tuned for better performance. Note that this is a new aggregation rule: instead of simply averaging the local models, it has an additional second term, which relates to the variance of clients losses. If all clients are identical (i.e., no heterogeneity across clients), this term vanishes.

An interpretation of vRed

With the definition of utilities above ($u_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = M - f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})$), vRed is aimed to penalize the variance of clients' utilities. As such, one potential drawback of vRed is that it may result in the suppression of well-performing clients (the ones with small losses) for reducing the variance, which is the same drawback that GiFair [Yue *et al.*, 2021] had. Hence, the final model's overall performance averaged across clients may get sacrificed. Despite this, GiFair minimizes an upper bound of vRed objective function: assuming $p_i = \frac{1}{n}$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$), i.e., all clients have the same number of data points, we have the following upper bound on vRed objective function (see Equation (22) in the appendix for derivation):

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\text{vRed}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \sum_i f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \beta \sum_i \left| f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_j f_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_i f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \frac{2\beta}{n} \sum_{j \neq i} |f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - f_j(\boldsymbol{\theta})|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_i f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \frac{2\beta}{n} \sum_{j \neq i} |f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - f_j(\boldsymbol{\theta})| \\ &= F_{\text{GiFair}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where the second inequality is true when clients' loss functions are all less than 1, which happens after some communication rounds. Therefore, GiFair in fact minimizes an upper bound of vRed's objective function. This relation between the two algorithms can explain why vRed usually outperforms GiFair in terms of fairness in our experiments.

In typical FL settings, the global objective function can be written as a weighted sum of clients' loss functions, i.e., $F(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \sum_{i=1}^n w_i h_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, where $h_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is used by client i as a surrogate of the global objective and is optimized using the client's local data. Also, the weight w_i represents the importance of client i loss function in the global objective function $F(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. For example, FedAvg simply uses $h_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $w_i = p_i$ ($p_i = \frac{n_i}{N}$, see algorithm 1) and q-FFL uses $h_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = f_i^{q+1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $w_i = p_i$. A direct consequence of the above summation form for $F(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is:

$$\nabla F(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \nabla h_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}). \quad (7)$$

Again, the weight w_i represents the importance of the client i 's model updates. In lemma 1, we show that the gradient of the global objective of vRed in (3), can be written in the form of (7). For simplicity and easier interpretation, we assume $p_i = \frac{1}{n}$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$), i.e., all clients have the same number of data points.

Lemma 1. Assuming equal dataset sizes for all clients, for any model parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, the gradient of the global objective $F_{\text{vRed}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ defined in (3) can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla F_{\text{vRed}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \\ w_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \frac{1}{n} + \frac{2\beta(f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))}{n}, \\ \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \frac{\sum_i f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{n}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The proof is deferred to §A in the appendix. lemma 1 shows that, unlike FedAvg that would assign $w_i = \frac{1}{n}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ to all clients, vRed assigns a relatively larger weight (w_i) to clients with larger loss functions, and dynamically updates the weights w_i at each communication round. Importantly, based on (8), in order for all clients to get assigned a positive weight, the parameter β needs to satisfy the following inequality: $0 \leq \beta < \beta_{\text{vRed}}^{\max}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \triangleq \frac{1}{2(\bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \min_i \{f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})\})}$.

4.2 The Semi-vRed algorithm

Inspired by the discussion on the superiority of MSV over MV in §3 for risk modeling, we propose an extension of vRed. Consider the following objective function instead of (3):

$$F_{\text{SVRed}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_i p_i f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \beta \sum_i p_i \left(f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \sum_j p_j f_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right)_+^2, \quad (9)$$

where σ_{\leq}^2 denotes the semi-variance of clients' utilities. This objective, in addition to minimizing the mean loss, *reduces the semi-variance of clients' losses*, meaning that only those clients that have a relatively small utility $u_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ (or equivalently a large loss $f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})$) contribute to the semi-variance regularization term in eq. (9). Similar to what we did for vRed, if we take the gradient of (9), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \eta \nabla F_{\text{SVRed}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \sum_i p_i \Delta_i^{(t)} + 2\beta \sum_i p_i \left(f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right)_+ \left(\Delta_i^{(t)} - \bar{\Delta}^{(t)} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where $\Delta_i^{(t)}$ is the pseudo-gradient (i.e., the opposite of the local update) of user i . The corresponding algorithm is included in algorithm 1. Again, we have a tunable parameter β which sets the effect of the regularization term and needs to get tuned for better performance.

4.3 Can we interpret what Semi-vRed does?

Optimization aspect

We will show in lemma 2 that, in contrast to vRed (and GiFair) and thanks to its more efficient regularization, Semi-vRed does not suppress the well-performing clients to help the worst-off ones. Again, for simplicity and easier interpretation, we assume equal dataset sizes for all clients, which leads to $p_i = \frac{1}{n}$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$).

Lemma 2. In each communication round between the clients and the server, let $>_C$ denote the set of clients whose local loss function is greater than the average loss function $\bar{f}(\theta)$. Assuming equal dataset sizes for all clients, for any model parameter θ , the gradient of the global objective $F_{\text{SVRed}}(\theta)$ defined in (9) can be expressed as

$$\nabla F_{\text{SVRed}}(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(\theta) \nabla f_i(\theta), \quad (11)$$

where $\bar{f}(\theta) = \frac{\sum_i f_i(\theta)}{n}$ and:

$$w_i(\theta) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n} + \frac{2\beta(f_i(\theta) - \bar{f}(\theta))}{n} - \frac{2\beta \sum_{j \in >_C} (f_j(\theta) - \bar{f}(\theta))}{n^2}, & \text{if } i \in >_C \\ \frac{1}{n} - \frac{2\beta \sum_{j \in >_C} (f_j(\theta) - \bar{f}(\theta))}{n^2}, & \text{if } i \notin >_C \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

Similar to VRed, there is an upper-bound for β to ensure positive weights for all clients in (12):

$$0 \leq \beta < \beta_{\text{SVRed}}^{\max}(\theta) \triangleq \frac{n}{2 \sum_{j \in >_C} (f_j(\theta) - \bar{f}(\theta))}.$$

Remark 1. Interesting points can be observed by comparing lemma 1 and lemma 2. First, both of the algorithms pay more attention to worst-off clients by assigning larger weights to their gradients. However, Semi-VRed assigns relatively larger weights to the well-performing clients. Also, for VRed, $w_i(\theta) = \frac{1}{n} + \frac{2\beta(f_i(\theta) - \bar{f}(\theta))}{n}$. So the better a client performs, the more it is suppressed by the algorithm. In contrast Semi-VRed assigns weights to well-performing clients depending on how bad the worst-off clients perform compared to the average performance. As the performance of worst-off clients improves gradually, the algorithm also lets the well-performing ones for further improvement (instead of strictly suppressing them like VRed).

Scenarios with large label shifts

We now provide another interesting interpretation of Semi-VRed, related to data heterogeneity in FL. In order for an easier interpretability and understanding, we assume $P_i(x, y) = P_i(x|y)P_i(y) = P(x|y)P_i(y)$. This means that the class conditional distribution of input x is identical for all clients, and there is no concept shift across them. However, there is label shift across clients. Having made this assumption, we define $\bar{\ell}_j(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim P(x|y=j)}[\ell(h(x, \theta), j)]$ as the average loss of predictor h on class j . Using this notation, we have lemma 3 about the objective function (9) of Semi-VRed.

Lemma 3. Assuming $P_i(x, y) = P_i(x|y)P_i(y) = P(x|y)P_i(y)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, for any parameter θ , Semi-VRed global objective (9) can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\text{SVRed}}(\theta) &= \sum_{j=1}^C \bar{P}(j) \bar{\ell}_j(\theta) + \frac{\beta}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{j=1}^C [P_i(j) - \bar{P}(j)] \bar{\ell}_j(\theta) \right)_+^2, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $\bar{P}(j) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n P_i(j)}{n}$ is the marginal distribution of class j in the global dataset.

Proof. From (9) and with $p_i = \frac{1}{n}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{f}(\theta) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{f_i(\theta)}{n} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim p_i(x,y)} [\ell(h(x, \theta), y)] \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\sum_{j=1}^C p_i(j) \times \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim p(x|y=j)} [\ell(h(x, \theta), j)] \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\sum_{j=1}^C p_i(j) \bar{\ell}_j(\theta) \right] = \sum_{j=1}^C \left[\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i(j)}{n} \right) \bar{\ell}_j(\theta) \right] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^C \bar{P}(j) \bar{\ell}_j(\theta). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Similarly, we can rewrite the clients' local loss functions, and we get to:

$$f_i(\theta) = \sum_{j=1}^C p_i(j) \bar{\ell}_j(\theta). \quad (15)$$

By plugging in the above equivalences for $f_i(\theta)$ and $\bar{f}(\theta)$ into (9), we get to (13). \square

Note that $P_i(j)$ and $\bar{P}(j)$ show the ratio of class j in client i 's local dataset and the global dataset, respectively. Based on (13), Semi-VRed is capable of improving the performance of the predictor h in extreme class imbalance scenarios: consider when a label j is over-represented in a client i 's data (i.e., $P_i(j) \approx 1$) and under-represented in the global data (i.e., $\bar{P}(j) \approx 0$). In that case, the regularization term up-weights the class j in the global objective function, hence improving the performance of client i , which was mostly holding samples with label j . For better understanding of this, let's see example 1 in the following, which we have borrowed from [Shen *et al.*, 2022], and shows that Semi-VRed can handle scenarios with large class imbalance efficiently.

Example 1. Let u be the uniform distribution over the existing C classes. Also, let δ_c be the Dirac distribution of class c . Also, let's assume that $C = 2$ (binary classification problem). For the n existing clients, we have:

$$p_i(y) = \begin{cases} \alpha u + (1 - \alpha) \delta_1 & \text{if } i = 1 \\ \alpha u + (1 - \alpha) \delta_2 & \text{if } i \in \{2, \dots, n\} \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

Accordingly, we have:

$$p_i(1) = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{\alpha}{2} & \text{if } i = 1 \\ \frac{\alpha}{2} & \text{if } i \in \{2, \dots, n\} \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

$$p_i(2) = \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha}{2} & \text{if } i = 1 \\ 1 - \frac{\alpha}{2} & \text{if } i \in \{2, \dots, n\} \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

Therefore, we have:

$$f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \begin{cases} (1 - \frac{\alpha}{2})\bar{\ell}_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \frac{\alpha}{2}\bar{\ell}_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \text{if } i = 1 \\ \frac{\alpha}{2}\bar{\ell}_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + (1 - \frac{\alpha}{2})\bar{\ell}_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \text{if } i \in \{2, \dots, n\} \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

Hence, according to eq. (14), we can rewrite the objective function of *FedAvg* as:

$$\bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} + \frac{1-\alpha}{n}\right)\bar{\ell}_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} + \frac{(1-\alpha)(n-1)}{n}\right)\bar{\ell}_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \quad (20)$$

Clearly, we can see that if $\alpha \approx 0$ and n is large, then $\bar{\ell}_1(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, which is the loss over the minority data will have a small weight, which leads to $\bar{\ell}_1(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ being larger than $\bar{\ell}_2(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and poor performance on the minority class 1, and client $i = 1$. Now, if we rewrite *Semi-VRed* objective function from eq. (13), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} F_{SVRed}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} + \frac{1-\alpha}{n}\right)\bar{\ell}_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} + \frac{(1-\alpha)(n-1)}{n}\right)\bar{\ell}_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\ &+ \frac{\beta(n-1)^2(1-\alpha)^2}{n^3}(\bar{\ell}_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{\ell}_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}))^2 \\ &= \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \frac{\beta(n-1)^2(1-\alpha)^2}{n^3}(\bar{\ell}_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{\ell}_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}))^2. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

The extra regularization term improves $\bar{\ell}_1(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ compared to vanilla *FedAvg*. Hence, the performance of client 1 and consequently, fairness in the system improves.

Furthermore, we have explained the relation between *VRed*/*Semi-VRed* and distributionally robust optimization (DRO) in appendix B.4 to provide a better understanding of these algorithms.

5 Experiments

In this section, we evaluate our proposed fair FL algorithms with the existing algorithms in the literature.

5.1 Experimental setup

In the following, we explain the datasets, models and their hyperparameters as well as the metrics we use to evaluate our algorithms. For further details, see §B in the appendix.

Datasets We use four benchmark datasets existing in the literature. The datasets we use include: CIFAR-10/100 [Krizhevsky *et al.*, 2009], CINIC-10 [Darlow *et al.*, 2018] (tasks of image classification) and StackOverflow (task of next word prediction). In order to split the data among clients with high heterogeneity, we use Dirichlet distribution [Wang *et al.*, 2019] with a small parameter. StackOverflow has a default realistic partition for each client. We follow the same default data distribution in our experiments.

Models, optimizers and loss functions For the CIFAR-10/100 and CINIC-10 datasets, we use ResNet-18 [He *et al.*, 2016]. For the language dataset (StackOverflow), we use LSTMs [Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997]. In order to optimize the models parameters, we use SGD for minimizing

average cross entropy loss. For further details, see §B in the appendix.

Baseline algorithms We compare our *VRed* and *Semi-VRed* algorithms with various fair FL algorithm existing in the literature including: *FedAvg* [McMahan *et al.*, 2017], *AF*L [Mohri *et al.*, 2019], *q-FFL* [Li *et al.*, 2020c], *PropFair* [Zhang *et al.*, 2022a], *TERM* [Li *et al.*, 2020a], *GiFair* [Yue *et al.*, 2021] and Δ -FL [Pillutla *et al.*, 2021], which are all from the two categories of the fair FL algorithms mentioned before.

Other hyperparameters We implement an FL setting where different clients participate in all communication rounds with one local epoch at each round. We use 200 communication rounds for all algorithms on the datasets to ensure their complete convergence. For CIFAR-10/100 and CINIC-10, we partition the data into 50 clients and for language datasets, we partition the data into 20 clients.

Evaluation metrics the goal of proposing our novel algorithms was to achieve fairness without compromising the system overall average performance. We measure the overall performance with the *mean test accuracy* across clients. In order to measure the fairness in the system, we use the worst 10% test accuracies among clients, which is a standard metric for fairness in FL [Li *et al.*, 2020a; 2020c]. In the appendix, we also use other common metrics in the literature for measuring fairness, e.g. the standard deviation of test accuracies (see table 6 in appendix B).

5.2 Comparison of *VRed* and *Semi-VRed* with other baseline algorithms

As observed in fig. 1, *Semi-VRed* outperforms almost all the existing baseline algorithms in terms of the fairness in the system. Furthermore, *Semi-VRed* improves the system’s overall average performance (mean test accuracy) for three of the datasets as well. For instance, as can be observed from the results obtained for StackOverflow (see table 6 in § B in the appendix for evaluation in terms of various fairness metrics), *Semi-VRed* improves both fairness and mean test accuracy by 3% and 2.7%, respectively. Also, we can observe the competitive performance of *VRed*.

5.3 Superiority of *Semi-VRed* over *VRed* and the other baseline algorithms

As discussed in § 2, the existing fair FL algorithms usually suppress the well-performing clients in order to improve the clients with worse performance. However, *Semi-VRed*, thanks to its efficient formulation, tries to avoid this. In order to get a better understanding of this, after running the simple vanilla *FedAvg* on CIFAR-100, we divide the existing 50 clients into two sets: 1. *suffering clients*: those with test accuracies below the *FedAvg* mean accuracy (22 clients in our experiment) 2. *well-performing clients*: those with test accuracies above the *FedAvg* mean accuracy (28 clients). Then, we run each of the other algorithms and compare the performance change that they make for the two sets of clients with each other. In table 2, we have done this comparison between different algorithms. The results clearly deliver two important messages: 1. the existing algorithms mostly suppress the well-performing clients, due to the more attention

Table 2: Comparison between the performance of different algorithms on CIFAR-100. **Second column:** the percentage (%) of suffering clients with improved test accuracy compared to FedAvg. The value in parentheses shows the amount of test accuracy improvement averaged over suffering clients. **Third column:** the percentage (%) of well-performing clients with degraded test accuracy compared to FedAvg. The value in parentheses shows the amount of test accuracy improvement averaged over well-performing clients. **Fourth column:** the amount of improvement in the overall mean test accuracy compared to FedAvg.

Algorithm	Improved suffering clients	Degraded well-performing clients	Overall accuracy improvement
q -FFL	52.08 \pm 11.95 (+0.69)	54.21 \pm 15.38 (-0.79)	+0.04 \pm 0.41
AFL	51.18 \pm 9.26 (+0.56)	77.25 \pm 12.85 (-3.50)	-1.22 \pm 0.95
GiFair	60.55 \pm 6.17 (+0.86)	68.22 \pm 16.13 (-2.03)	-0.40 \pm 0.61
TERM	23.66 \pm 5.34 (-1.12)	87.93 \pm 1.81 (-3.57)	-2.20 \pm 0.66
PropFair	8.33 \pm 1.69 (-4.05)	92.41 \pm 4.28 (-6.74)	-5.23 \pm 0.96
Δ -FL	46.55 \pm 6.75 (+0.14)	78.75 \pm 2.32 (-4.31)	-1.81 \pm 0.25
VRed	60.50 \pm 12.52 (+1.11)	60.62 \pm 7.53 (-0.94)	+0.21 \pm 0.06
Semi-VRed	65.40\pm6.29 (+1.47)	53.17\pm6.75 (-0.42)	+0.64\pm0.30




Figure 1: Average and worst 10% test accuracies. **top left:** CIFAR-10, **top right:** CIFAR-100, **bottom left:** CINIC-10, **bottom right:** StackOverflow. Due to divergence on highly heterogeneous data, results for AFL on CIFAR-10 and StackOverflow are not shown. All subfigures share the same legends and axis labels.

that they pay to the worst-off clients or enforcing equality between clients' losses 2. Semi-VRed has the least suppression of well-performing clients: with Semi-VRed, 53.17% of the well-performing clients experience lower test accuracy compared to when using FedAvg, and the average amount of accuracy drop for them is -0.42. Semi-VRed also results in the highest average improvement of suffering clients: 65.40% of the suffering clients experience a higher test accuracy compared to when using FedAvg. The average amount of accuracy improvement among suffering clients is +1.47. The above results altogether result in improvement of both the fairness and the system overall average performance simultaneously.

6 Conclusion

In this work, we introduced two novel fair FL algorithms: VRed and Semi-VRed. In order to address the drawback of most of the existing fair FL algorithms, which is suppression of well-performing clients, we proposed Semi-VRed, which uses a one-sided regularization term to efficiently model performance unfairness in a federated learning system. Our experimental results show that Semi-VRed improves the worst-off clients performance without much suppression of well-performing ones. These altogether improve the system's overall average performance as well. Accordingly, Semi-VRed achieves SoTA performance in terms of both the overall average accuracy and fairness.

References

- [Ballester, 2005] Enrique Ballester. Mean-semivariance efficient frontier: A downside risk model for portfolio selection. *Applied Mathematical Finance*, 12:1 – 15, 2005.
- [Ben-Tal *et al.*, 2013] Aharon Ben-Tal, Dick den Hertog, Anja De Waegenaere, Bertrand Melenberg, and Gijb Renen. Robust solutions of optimization problems affected by uncertain probabilities. *Advanced Risk & Portfolio Management® Research Paper Series*, 2013.
- [Bertsimas *et al.*, 2018a] Dimitris Bertsimas, Vishal Gupta, and Nathan Kallus. Data-driven robust optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 167:235–292, 2018.
- [Bertsimas *et al.*, 2018b] Dimitris Bertsimas, Vishal Gupta, and Nathan Kallus. Robust sample average approximation. *Mathematical Programming*, 171:217–282, 2018.
- [Bietti and Wei, 2022] Alberto Bietti and Chen-Yu Wei. Personalization improves privacy-accuracy tradeoffs in federated learning. In Kamalika Chaudhuri, Stefanie Jegelka, Le Song, Csaba Szepesvari, Gang Niu, and Sivan Sabato, editors, *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1945–1962. PMLR, 17–23 Jul 2022.
- [Boasson *et al.*, 2017] Vigdis Boasson, Emil Bóasson, and Zhaoli Zhou. Portfolio optimization in a mean-semivariance framework. *Investment management & financial innovations*, 8, 2017.
- [Chen and Chao, 2022] Hong-You Chen and Wei-Lun Chao. On bridging generic and personalized federated learning for image classification. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [Cui *et al.*, 2021] Sen Cui, Weishen Pan, Jian Liang, Changshui Zhang, and Fei Wang. Addressing algorithmic disparity and performance inconsistency in federated learning. In *NeurIPS*, 2021.
- [Darlow *et al.*, 2018] Luke N Darlow, Elliot J Crowley, Antreas Antoniou, and Amos J Storkey. CINIC-10 is not ImageNet or CIFAR-10. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.03505*, 2018.
- [Deng *et al.*, 2020] Yuyang Deng, Mohammad Mahdi Kamani, and Mehrdad Mahdavi. Distributionally robust federated averaging. *ArXiv*, abs/2102.12660, 2020.
- [Gorbunov *et al.*, 2021] Eduard Gorbunov, Filip Hanzely, and Peter Richtárik. Local SGD: Unified theory and new efficient methods. In *AISTATS*, volume 130, pages 3556–3564, 2021.
- [He *et al.*, 2016] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- [Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997] Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. Long short-term memory. *Neural computation*, 9(8):1735–1780, 1997.
- [Huo *et al.*, 2020] Zhouyuan Huo, Qian Yang, Bin Gu, Lawrence Carin, and Heng Huang. Faster on-device training using new federated momentum algorithm. *arXiv:2002.02090*, 2020.
- [Khaled *et al.*, 2020] Ahmed Khaled, Konstantin Mishchenko, and Peter Richtárik. First analysis of local gd on heterogeneous data. *arXiv:1909.04715*, 2020.
- [Kolmogorov, 1930] Andrey Kolmogorov. On the notion of mean. *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei*, 12(9):388–391, 1930. reprinted in “Selected Works I of Andrey Kolmogorov: Mathematics and Mechanics”, pp. 144–146, 1991.
- [Krizhevsky *et al.*, 2009] Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images, 2009. Technical report.
- [Krueger *et al.*, 2021] David Krueger, Ethan Caballero, Jörn-Henrik Jacobsen, Amy Zhang, Jonathan Binas, Rémi Le Priol, and Aaron C. Courville. Out-of-distribution generalization via risk extrapolation (rex). In *ICML*, 2021.
- [Lan *et al.*, 2010] Tian Lan, David Kao, Mung Chiang, and Ashutosh Sabharwal. An axiomatic theory of fairness in network resource allocation. In *2010 Proceedings IEEE INFOCOM*, pages 1–9, March 2010. ISSN: 0743-166X.
- [Li *et al.*, 2020a] Tian Li, Ahmad Beirami, Maziar Sanjabi, and Virginia Smith. Tilted empirical risk minimization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [Li *et al.*, 2020b] Tian Li, Anit Kumar Sahu, Manzil Zaheer, Maziar Sanjabi, Ameet Talwalkar, and Virginia Smith. Federated optimization in heterogeneous networks. In *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, volume 2, pages 429–450, 2020.
- [Li *et al.*, 2020c] Tian Li, Maziar Sanjabi, Ahmad Beirami, and Virginia Smith. Fair resource allocation in federated learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [Li *et al.*, 2020d] Xiang Li, Kaixuan Huang, Wenhao Yang, Shusen Wang, and Zhihua Zhang. On the convergence of fedavg on non-iid data. In *ICLR*, 2020.
- [Li *et al.*, 2021] Tian Li, Shengyuan Hu, Ahmad Beirami, and Virginia Smith. Ditto: Fair and robust federated learning through personalization. In *ICML*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 6357–6368. PMLR, 2021.
- [Malekmohammadi *et al.*, 2021a] Saber Malekmohammadi, Kiarash Shaloudegi, Zeou Hu, and Yaoliang Yu. An operator splitting view of federated learning, 2021.
- [Malekmohammadi *et al.*, 2021b] Saber Malekmohammadi, Kiarash Shaloudegi, Zeou Hu, and Yaoliang Yu. Splitting algorithms for federated learning. In *Machine Learning and Principles and Practice of Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, 2021.
- [Markowitz, 1952] Harry Markowitz. Portfolio selection. *Journal of Finance*, 1952.

- [Maurer and Pontil, 2009] Andreas Maurer and Massimiliano Pontil. Empirical Bernstein bounds and sample-variance penalization. In *COLT*, 2009.
- [McMahan *et al.*, 2017] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Agüera y Arcas. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *AISTATS*, volume 54, pages 1273–1282, 2017.
- [Mohri *et al.*, 2019] Mehryar Mohri, Gary Sivek, and Ananda Theertha Suresh. Agnostic federated learning. In *ICML*, volume 97, pages 4615–4625, 2019.
- [Namkoong and Duchi, 2017] Hongseok Namkoong and John C. Duchi. Variance-based regularization with convex objectives. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 20:68:1–68:55, 2017.
- [Oh *et al.*, 2022] Jaehoon Oh, SangMook Kim, and Se-Young Yun. FedBABU: Toward enhanced representation for federated image classification. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [Pathak and Wainwright, 2020] Reese Pathak and Martin J. Wainwright. Fedsplit: An algorithmic framework for fast federated optimization. In *NeurIPS*, 2020.
- [Pillutla *et al.*, 2021] Krishna Pillutla, Yassine Laguel, Jérôme Malick, and Zaïd Harchaoui. Federated learning with heterogeneous data: A superquantile optimization approach. *CoRR*, abs/2112.09429, 2021.
- [Plà-Santamaria and Bravo, 2013] David Plà-Santamaria and Mila Bravo. Portfolio optimization based on downside risk: a mean-semivariance efficient frontier from Dow Jones Blue Chips. *Annals of Operations Research*, 205:189–201, 2013.
- [Reddi *et al.*, 2020a] Sashank Reddi, Zachary Charles, Manzil Zaheer, Zachary Garrett, Keith Rush, Jakub Konečný, Sanjiv Kumar, and H Brendan McMahan. Adaptive Federated Optimization. arXiv:2003.00295, 2020.
- [Reddi *et al.*, 2020b] Sashank J Reddi, Zachary Charles, Manzil Zaheer, Zachary Garrett, Keith Rush, Jakub Konečný, Sanjiv Kumar, and Hugh Brendan McMahan. Adaptive federated optimization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [Rigamonti and Lučivjanská, 2022] Andrea Rigamonti and Katarína Lučivjanská. Mean-semivariance portfolio optimization using minimum average partial. *Annals of Operations Research*, pages 1–19, 2022.
- [Shen *et al.*, 2022] Zebang Shen, Juan Cerviño, Hamed Hassani, and Alejandro Ribeiro. An agnostic approach to federated learning with class imbalance. In *ICLR*, 2022.
- [Shivaswamy and Jebara, 2010] Pannagadatta Shivaswamy and Tony Jebara. Empirical Bernstein boosting. In Yee Whye Teh and Mike Titterton, editors, *Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 9 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 733–740, Chia Laguna Resort, Sardinia, Italy, 13–15 May 2010. PMLR.
- [Soleimani *et al.*, 2009] Hamed Soleimani, Hamid Reza Golmakani, and Mohammad Hossein Salimi. Markowitz-based portfolio selection with minimum transaction lots, cardinality constraints and regarding sector capitalization using genetic algorithm. *Expert Syst. Appl.*, 36:5058–5063, 2009.
- [Stuart and Markowitz, 1959] Alan L. Stuart and Harry M. Markowitz. Portfolio selection: Efficient diversification of investments. *A Quarterly Journal of Operations Research*, 10:253, 1959.
- [The Tensorflow Federated Authors, 2019] The Tensorflow Federated Authors. Tensorflow federated StackOverflow dataset. 2019.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2019] Kangkang Wang, Rajiv Mathews, Chloé Kiddon, Hubert Eichner, Françoise Beaufays, and Daniel Ramage. Federated evaluation of on-device personalization. *CoRR*, abs/1910.10252, 2019.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2020] Hongyi Wang, Mikhail Yurochkin, Yuekai Sun, Dimitris Papailiopoulos, and Yasaman Khazaeni. Federated learning with matched averaging. In *ICLR*, 2020.
- [Williamson and Menon, 2019] Robert Williamson and Aditya Menon. Fairness risk measures. In Kamalika Chaudhuri and Ruslan Salakhutdinov, editors, *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6786–6797. PMLR, 2019.
- [Ya Gotoh *et al.*, 2018] Jun ya Gotoh, M. J. Kim, and Andrew E. B. Lim. Robust empirical optimization is almost the same as mean-variance optimization. *Mutual Funds*, 2018.
- [Yue *et al.*, 2021] Xubo Yue, Maher Nouiehed, and Raed Al Kontar. Gifair-fl: An approach for group and individual fairness in federated learning. *ArXiv*, abs/2108.02741, 2021.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2018] Yuanyuan Zhang, Xiang Li, and Sini Guo. Portfolio selection problems with Markowitz’s mean-variance framework: a review of literature. *Fuzzy Optimization and Decision Making*, 17:125–158, 2018.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2022a] Guojun Zhang, Saber Malekmohammadi, Xi Chen, and Yaoliang Yu. Equality is not equity: Proportional fairness in federated learning. *CoRR*, abs/2202.01666, 2022.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2022b] Xu Zhang, Yinchuan Li, Wenpeng Li, Kaiyang Guo, and Yunfeng Shao. Personalized federated learning via variational Bayesian inference. In Kamalika Chaudhuri, Stefanie Jegelka, Le Song, Csaba Szepesvari, Gang Niu, and Sivan Sabato, editors, *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 26293–26310. PMLR, 17–23 Jul 2022.

Appendix for *Semi-Variance Reduction for Fair Federated Learning*

A Proofs and derivations

Derivation of (6)

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{V\text{Red}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \sum_i f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \beta \sum_i \left| f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_j f_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right|^2 = \sum_i f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \beta \sum_i \left| \frac{n-1}{n} f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq i} f_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right|^2 \\
&= \sum_i f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \frac{\beta}{n^2} \sum_i \left| \sum_{j \neq i} (f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - f_j(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \right|^2 \\
&\leq \sum_i f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \frac{\beta}{n^2} \sum_i \left(\sum_{j \neq i} \left| f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - f_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right| \right)^2 \\
&\leq \sum_i f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \frac{\beta}{n^2} \sum_i (n-1) \sum_{j \neq i} \left| f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - f_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right|^2 \\
&\leq \sum_i f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \frac{\beta}{n} \sum_i \sum_{j \neq i} \left| f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - f_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right|^2 \\
&= \sum_i f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \frac{2\beta}{n} \sum_{j \neq i} \left| f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - f_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right|^2 \\
&\leq \sum_i f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \frac{2\beta}{n} \sum_{j \neq i} \left| f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - f_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right|, \tag{22}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is always true if $\forall i, j : |f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - f_j(\boldsymbol{\theta})| < 1$, which always happens if $\forall i : f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) < 1$.

Lemma 1. Assuming equal dataset sizes for all clients, for any model parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, the gradient of the global objective $F_{V\text{Red}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ defined in (3) can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla F_{V\text{Red}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \\
w_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \frac{1}{n} + \frac{2\beta(f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))}{n}, \\
\bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \frac{\sum_i f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{n}. \tag{8}
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. From (3) and with $p_i = \frac{1}{n}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
n\nabla F(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \sum_i \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + 2\beta \sum_i \left[(f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) (\nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \nabla \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \right] \\
&= \sum_i \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + 2\beta \sum_i \left[(f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - (f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \nabla \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right] \\
&= \sum_i \left(1 + 2\beta(f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \right) \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - 2\beta \sum_i (f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \nabla \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\
&= \sum_i \left(1 + 2\beta(f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \right) \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \tag{23}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\nabla F(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_i \frac{1 + 2\beta(f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))}{n} \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \tag{24}$$

□

Lemma 2. In each communication round between the clients and the server, let $>_C$ denote the set of clients whose local loss function is greater than the average loss function $\bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Assuming equal dataset sizes for all clients, for any model parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, the gradient of the global objective $F_{SVRed}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ defined in (9) can be expressed as

$$\nabla F_{SVRed}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad (11)$$

where $\bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{\sum_i f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{n}$ and:

$$w_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n} + \frac{2\beta(f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))}{n} - \frac{2\beta \sum_{j \in >_C} (f_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))}{n^2}, & \text{if } i \in >_C \\ \frac{1}{n} - \frac{2\beta \sum_{j \in >_C} (f_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))}{n^2}, & \text{if } i \notin >_C \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

Proof. From (9) and with $p_i = \frac{1}{n}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} n\nabla F(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \sum_i \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + 2\beta \sum_{i \in >_C} \left[(f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) (\nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \nabla \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \right] \\ &= \sum_i \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + 2\beta \sum_{i \in >_C} \left[(f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - (f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \nabla \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right] \\ &= \sum_{i \notin >_C} \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \sum_{i \in >_C} \left(1 + 2\beta(f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \right) \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - 2\beta \sum_{i \in >_C} (f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \nabla \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

The last term in the above equation can be written as:

$$-2\beta \sum_{i \in >_C} (f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \nabla \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = - \left[\frac{2\beta}{n} \left(\sum_{i \in >_C} f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right) \times \left(\sum_j \nabla f_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right) \right] \quad (26)$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} n\nabla F(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \sum_{i \in >_C} \left(1 + 2\beta(f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) - \frac{2\beta}{n} \left(\sum_{j \in >_C} f_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right) \right) \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \notin >_C} \left(1 - \frac{2\beta}{n} \left(\sum_{j \in >_C} f_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right) \right) \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla F(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \sum_{i \in >_C} \left(\frac{1 + 2\beta(f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) - \frac{2\beta}{n} \left(\sum_{j \in >_C} f_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right)}{n} \right) \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \notin >_C} \left(\frac{1 - \frac{2\beta}{n} \left(\sum_{j \in >_C} f_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right)}{n} \right) \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

□

B Experimental setup

In this section, we provide more experimental details that are deferred from the main paper. For each experiment, we report the average result obtained from three runs with different random seeds. For our experiments, we used an internal GPU server with six NVIDIA Tesla P100. The experiments last about 4 weeks in total.

B.1 Datasets and models

In this subsection, we describe the datasets we use in our experiments. For all the datasets we use a batch size of 64.

CIFAR-10/100 [Krizhevsky *et al.*, 2009] are two image classification datasets vastly used in the literature as benchmark datasets. Each of these datasets contains 50000 sample images with 10/100 balanced classes for CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100, respectively. We use Dirichlet allocation [Wang *et al.*, 2019] to distribute the data among 50 clients with label shift: we split the set of samples from class k (\mathcal{S}_k) to n subsets ($\mathcal{S}_k = \mathcal{S}_{k,1} \cup \mathcal{S}_{k,2} \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{S}_{k,n}$), where n is the number of clients and $\mathcal{S}_{k,j}$ corresponds to the client j . We do the split based on Dirichlet distribution with parameter 0.05 ($\text{Dir}(0.05)$). When the split is done for all classes, we gather the samples corresponding to each client from different classes: assuming there are C classes in total $\mathcal{S}_{1,j} \cup \mathcal{S}_{2,j} \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{S}_{C,j}$ is the data allocated to the client j . Having allocated the data of each client, we split them into train and test set for each client. The train-test split ratio is 50-50 and 60-40 for CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100, respectively.

CINIC-10 [Darlow *et al.*, 2018] is another benchmark vision dataset that we use in our experiments. There are a total of 270,000 sample images, which we distribute with label shift between 50 clients based on $\text{Dir}(0.5)$ distribution [Wang *et al.*, 2019]. We then randomly split the data of each client into train and test sets with split ratio 50-50.

StackOverflow [The Tensorflow Federated Authors, 2019] is a language dataset consisting of Shakespeare dialogues for the task of next word prediction. There is a natural heterogeneous partition of the dataset and we treat each speaking role as a client. We filter out the clients (speaking roles) with less than 10,000 samples from the original dataset and randomly select 20 clients from the remaining. Finally, we split the data of each client into train and test sets with a ratio of 50-50.

Table 3 provides a summary of the datasets we used and the models used for each of them.

Table 3: Details of the experiments and the datasets. ResNet-18: residual neural network ; GN: Group Normalization ; RNN: Recurrent Neural Network ; LSTM: Long Short-Term Memory layer ; FC: fully connected layer.

Dataset	Train samples	Test samples	Partition method	clients	Model
CIFAR-10	24959	25041	Dir(0.05)	50	ResNet-18 + GN
CIFAR-100	39445	10555	Dir(0.05)	50	ResNet-18 + GN
CINIC-10	134713	134966	Dir(0.5)	50	ResNet-18 + GN
StackOverflow	109671	109621	realistic partition	20	RNN (1 LSTM + 2 FC)

B.2 Algorithms and their hyperparameters

We use most recent fair FL algorithms existing in the literature as our baseline algorithms, including: FedAvg [McMahan *et al.*, 2017], q-FFL [Li *et al.*, 2020c], AFL [Mohri *et al.*, 2019], PropFair [Zhang *et al.*, 2022a], TERM [Li *et al.*, 2020a], GiFair [Yue *et al.*, 2021]. For each pair of dataset and algorithm, we find the best learning rate based on a grid search. In the following, we have reported the learning rate grid we use for each dataset:

- CIFAR-10: {1e-3, 2e-3, 5e-3, 1e-2, 2e-2, 5e-2};
- CIFAR-100: {1e-3, 2e-3, 5e-3, 1e-2, 2e-2, 5e-2};
- CINIC-10: {1e-3, 2e-3, 5e-3, 1e-2, 2e-2, 5e-2};
- StackOverflow: {1e-2, 5e-2, 1e-1, 5e-1, 1}.

The best learning rate used for each (dataset, algorithm) pair is reported in Table 4.

Table 4: The best learning rates used for training each algorithm on different datasets.

Datasets	FedAvg	q-FFL	AFL	TERM	PropFair	GiFair	Δ -FL	VRed	Semi-VRed
CIFAR-10	5e-3	5e-3	5e-3	1e-2	1e-2	5e-3	5e-3	5e-3	5e-3
CIFAR-100	2e-3	2e-3	5e-3	1e-2	1e-2	5e-3	2e-3	5e-3	5e-3
CINIC-10	1e-2	5e-3	1e-2	1e-2	2e-2	2e-2	1e-2	5e-3	5e-3
StackOverflow	2e-1	5e-2	5e-2	2e-1	5e-1	2e-1	2e-1	5e-1	5e-1

We now explain the algorithms we use and how we tune their hyperparameters. We adapt TERM with only client-level fairness ($\alpha > 0$) and no sample-level fairness ($\tau = 0$). We tune the hyperparameter α for each dataset based on a grid search in the grid {0.01, 0.1, 0.5, 1}. We have reported the best value of α for each dataset in Table 5. For AFL, there are two hyperparameters:

γ_w and γ_λ . We tune the learning rate γ_w from the corresponding grid and choose the default value $\gamma_\lambda = 0.1$. For q -FFL, we use the q -FedAvg algorithm [Li *et al.*, 2020c]. We also tune the hyperparameter q from the grid $\{0.01, 0.1, 1\}$. We find that for all the used datasets, $q = 0.1$ has the best performance (as reported in Table 5). We also tried larger values out of the grid and they often lead to divergence of the q -FFL algorithm. We adopt the Global GiFair model [Yue *et al.*, 2021], which results in a single global model. In order to have client-level fairness, we treat each client as a group of size 1. For tuning the regularization weight of GiFair (λ), we follow [Yue *et al.*, 2021]. As stated in the paper, there is an upper-bound for λ (see §3 in the paper). For our experiments, the upper-bound is $\lambda \leq \min_i \{\frac{w_i}{n-1}\}$, where w_i is the ratio of total samples allocated to the client i and n is the number of clients. We try four different values in the interval and choose the best one. When the number of clients is large, this upper-bound is small, and for all of our datasets, this upper-bound was the best value, as reported in Table 5. We tune M for the PropFair algorithm based on a grid search in $\{2, 3, 4, 5\}$. For Δ -FL, we tried different values of α in the grid $\{0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.6, 0.7, 0.8, 0.9\}$ and chose the best one. Therefore, we have reported **the best results** that one could get from the algorithm. Finally, for our VRed and Semi-VRed algorithms, we tune the regularization weight β based on grid search on the grid $\{0.01, 0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.5, 1\}$. Larger values of β often resulted in the divergence of the algorithms. We have reported the best value of all of the hyperparameters for each dataset in Table 5.

Table 5: The best values of hyperparameters used for different datasets, chosen based on grid search.

Algorithm	CIFAR-10	CIFAR-100	CINIC-10	StackOverflow
q-FFL q	1e-1	1e-1	1e-1	1e-1
TERM α	1e-2	5e-1	5e-1	5e-1
GiFair λ	6e-5	2.6e-4	5e-5	2.4e-3
PropFair M	3	3	5	4
Δ-FL α	2e-1	4e-1	5e-1	6e-1
VRed β	5e-1	1e-1	2e-1	1e-1
Semi-VRed β	5e-1	1e-2	2e-1	2e-1

B.3 Detailed results

In Table 6, we report detailed results obtained from the algorithms we study in this work. We use a default batch size of 64 for all the experiments. The statistics we report include: 1. the average test accuracy across clients (overall average performance) 2. the standard deviation of test accuracies across clients 3. the lowest (worst) test accuracy among clients 4. the lowest 10% test accuracies 5. the lowest 20% test accuracies 6. the highest 10% test accuracies. For each experiment, we report the average result obtained from three runs with different random seeds. As can be observed, our proposed algorithms VRed and Semi-VRed consistently beat almost all the baseline algorithms across different datasets in terms of various fairness metrics. Also, Semi-VRed can improve the overall average performance (mean test accuracy) for three of the datasets as well.

Following Figure 1, we have compared our proposed algorithms with the baseline algorithms in terms of their worst 20% test accuracies as well and the visualized results are shown in Figure 2.

B.4 Relation between VRed and Robust Optimization

Empirical optimization is usually used as a data-driven approach for tuning models for decision making, where an expected loss is minimized based on some available train data. The trained model is then used for prediction tasks on some test data. However, if the empirical distribution of the train data is substantially different from that of test data, our confidence for doing prediction on the test data with the trained model diminishes. Robust empirical optimization has been used to address this problem [Bertsimas *et al.*, 2018b; 2018a; Ben-Tal *et al.*, 2013]. The work in [ya Gotoh *et al.*, 2018] formulated a distributionally robust optimization (DRO) problem based on a minimax problem, where a model is trained against the worst distribution shifts between the train and test data:

$$\min_{\theta} \max_{\mathbb{Q}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathbb{Q}} [\ell(h(x, \theta), y)] - \frac{1}{\delta} \mathcal{H}_{\phi}(\mathbb{Q} | \hat{\mathbb{P}}_n) \right\}, \quad (29)$$

where constant $\delta > 0$ is the regularization constant, and $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_n$ and \mathbb{Q} are the train data empirical distribution and the test data distribution. The above problem optimizes against the “worst-case” test distribution \mathbb{Q} , which does not diverge too much from $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_n$: the divergence of the distribution \mathbb{Q} from $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_n$ is penalized in the regularization term $\frac{1}{\delta} \mathcal{H}_{\phi}(\mathbb{Q} | \hat{\mathbb{P}}_n)$, where \mathcal{H}_{ϕ} is a divergence measure between two distributions. The solution to this optimization problem is a model which is robust against distribution shifts between the train and test data, and its robustness increases with δ . It was shown in [ya Gotoh *et al.*, 2018] that the above

Table 6: Comparison among federated learning algorithms on CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100, CINIC-10 and StackOverflow datasets with test accuracies (%) from clients. All algorithms are fine-tuned. **Mean**: the average test accuracy across all clients; **Std**: standard deviation of clients test accuracies; **Worst**: the worst test accuracy among clients; **Worst (10/20%)**: the worst 10/20% test accuracies of clients; **Best (10%)**: the best 10% test accuracies of clients.

Dataset	Algorithm	Mean	Std	Worst	Worst (10%)	Worst (20%)	Best (10%)
CIFAR-10	FedAvg	43.45 \pm 0.60	14.33 \pm 0.62	9.35 \pm 3.13	18.86 \pm 0.99	23.77 \pm 0.70	68.97 \pm 0.81
	q-FFL	45.46 \pm 0.74	14.31 \pm 2.03	18.71 \pm 3.36	21.23 \pm 3.06	25.95 \pm 3.51	72.31 \pm 2.88
	AFL	-	-	-	-	-	-
	GiFair	45.05 \pm 0.64	12.93 \pm 0.44	16.79 \pm 3.55	22.65 \pm 2.03	26.52 \pm 0.76	65.62 \pm 2.59
	TERM	45.61 \pm 1.03	12.24 \pm 0.56	13.80 \pm 5.25	24.89 \pm 1.37	29.34 \pm 0.61	68.65 \pm 1.27
	PropFair	36.95 \pm 0.21	15.16 \pm 1.33	1.14 \pm 1.62	12.49 \pm 0.28	16.66 \pm 1.31	66.04 \pm 4.24
	Δ -FL	40.32 \pm 0.31	16.51 \pm 1.26	8.8 \pm 0.37	16.94 \pm 0.55	21.31 \pm 0.31	72.35 \pm 2.11
	VRed	44.43 \pm 0.88	13.05 \pm 1.32	18.61 \pm 3.12	24.28 \pm 2.22	27.46 \pm 1.56	69.31 \pm 3.48
	Semi-VRed	45.47 \pm 0.10	12.58 \pm 0.23	19.04 \pm 6.73	27.08 \pm 1.76	30.34 \pm 1.05	72.50 \pm 0.88
	CIFAR-100	FedAvg	20.20 \pm 0.31	6.50 \pm 0.21	10.36 \pm 0.69	11.07 \pm 0.54	12.49 \pm 0.51
q-FFL		20.25 \pm 0.11	6.30 \pm 0.27	9.66 \pm 0.33	11.09 \pm 0.67	12.52 \pm 0.46	33.96 \pm 0.90
AFL		18.98 \pm 0.71	4.91 \pm 0.37	9.81 \pm 0.69	11.31 \pm 0.18	12.72 \pm 0.21	28.68 \pm 1.71
GiFair		19.81 \pm 0.32	5.74 \pm 0.16	9.35 \pm 0.34	11.19 \pm 0.24	12.59 \pm 0.49	32.30 \pm 0.32
TERM		18.00 \pm 0.41	6.05 \pm 0.18	8.86 \pm 0.50	10.02 \pm 0.44	11.04 \pm 0.51	31.58 \pm 0.98
PropFair		14.97 \pm 0.68	6.44 \pm 0.34	5.40 \pm 1.28	7.00 \pm 1.11	8.06 \pm 1.07	28.89 \pm 0.91
Δ -FL		18.39 \pm 0.15	5.42 \pm 0.65	8.11 \pm 0.84	10.06 \pm 0.78	11.28 \pm 0.81	28.95 \pm 1.27
VRed		20.42 \pm 0.36	6.08 \pm 0.05	9.43 \pm 1.01	11.21 \pm 0.74	12.81 \pm 0.85	33.59 \pm 1.11
Semi-VRed		20.85 \pm 0.39	6.26 \pm 0.18	9.12 \pm 1.47	11.86 \pm 0.74	13.46 \pm 0.63	34.57 \pm 1.20
CINIC-10		FedAvg	86.26 \pm 0.03	15.20 \pm 0.07	50.48 \pm 0.29	56.87 \pm 0.36	62.78 \pm 0.16
	q-FFL	86.63 \pm 0.06	14.88 \pm 0.08	51.57 \pm 0.82	57.77 \pm 0.36	63.62 \pm 0.18	100.0 \pm 0.01
	AFL	86.45 \pm 0.12	15.10 \pm 0.11	51.57 \pm 0.45	57.58 \pm 0.29	63.04 \pm 0.28	100.0 \pm 0.00
	GiFair	86.28 \pm 0.11	15.20 \pm 0.13	49.66 \pm 1.21	56.97 \pm 0.29	62.74 \pm 0.36	100.0 \pm 0.00
	TERM	86.34 \pm 0.04	15.12 \pm 0.01	49.90 \pm 0.42	57.21 \pm 0.11	62.98 \pm 0.04	100.0 \pm 0.00
	PropFair	86.01 \pm 0.17	15.34 \pm 0.19	49.97 \pm 1.23	56.53 \pm 0.65	62.27 \pm 0.55	99.99 \pm 0.01
	Δ -FL	86.11 \pm 0.38	15.11 \pm 0.22	50.12 \pm 0.62	57.10 \pm 0.76	62.45 \pm 0.85	100.0 \pm 0.01
	VRed	85.79 \pm 0.35	15.02 \pm 0.06	51.57 \pm 0.50	57.66 \pm 0.30	62.75 \pm 0.36	99.98 \pm 0.01
	Semi-VRed	85.83 \pm 0.33	14.95 \pm 0.07	51.59 \pm 0.98	58.00 \pm 0.21	62.70 \pm 0.14	99.96 \pm 0.01
	StackOverflow	FedAvg	40.34 \pm 0.06	6.98 \pm 0.03	25.64 \pm 0.11	27.12 \pm 0.06	30.35 \pm 0.03
q-FFL		37.79 \pm 0.80	7.38 \pm 0.09	22.54 \pm 1.03	24.12 \pm 1.00	27.14 \pm 0.92	47.06 \pm 0.66
AFL		-	-	-	-	-	-
TERM		40.34 \pm 0.05	6.96 \pm 0.06	25.56 \pm 0.21	27.12 \pm 0.20	30.41 \pm 0.12	49.76 \pm 0.10
GiFair		40.34 \pm 0.04	6.97 \pm 0.03	25.71 \pm 0.13	27.10 \pm 0.11	30.34 \pm 0.08	49.71 \pm 0.09
PropFair		41.76 \pm 0.01	6.80 \pm 0.05	27.30 \pm 0.21	28.75 \pm 0.19	32.14 \pm 0.10	50.76 \pm 0.08
Δ -FL		39.94 \pm 0.11	6.88 \pm 0.05	25.36 \pm 0.08	26.94 \pm 0.07	29.95 \pm 0.06	49.08 \pm 0.04
VRed		42.90 \pm 0.05	6.64 \pm 0.01	29.08 \pm 0.09	30.39 \pm 0.05	33.55 \pm 0.05	51.66 \pm 0.03
Semi-VRed		42.90 \pm 0.03	6.60 \pm 0.01	29.10 \pm 0.06	30.34 \pm 0.09	35.55 \pm 0.05	51.70 \pm 0.04

DRO problem is equivalent to a mean-variance problem, where the empirical average loss is regularized with sample variance of the loss on the empirical train distribution $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_n$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \min_{\theta} \max_{\mathbb{Q}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathbb{Q}} [\ell(h(x, \theta), y)] - \frac{1}{\delta} \mathcal{H}_{\phi}(\mathbb{Q} | \hat{\mathbb{P}}_n) \right\} \equiv \\
 & \min_{\theta} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \hat{\mathbb{P}}_n} [\ell(h(x, \theta), y)] + \frac{\delta}{2\phi''(1)} \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \hat{\mathbb{P}}_n} \left[\ell(h(x, \theta), y) - \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \hat{\mathbb{P}}_n} [\ell(h(x, \theta), y)] \right]^2 \right\}. \quad (30)
 \end{aligned}$$

This means that variance regularization can improve out-of-sample (test) performance. [Maurer and Pontil, 2009; Namkoong and Duchi, 2017] proposed regularizing the empirical risk minimization (ERM) by the empirical variance of losses across training samples to balance bias and variance and improve out-of-sample (test) performance and convergence rate. Similarly, [Shivaswamy and Jebara, 2010] proposed boosting binary classifiers based on a variance penalty applied to exponential loss.

DRO is also an effective approach to deal with imbalanced and non-iid data. Unlike the above sample-wise variance regularization works, the work [Krueger *et al.*, 2021] - assuming having access to data from multiple training domains - proposed




Figure 2: Worst 20% test accuracies for different algorithms. **top left:** CIFAR-10, **top right:** CIFAR-100, **bottom left:** CINIC-10, **bottom right:** StackOverflow. Due to divergence, results for AFL on CIFAR-10 and StackOverFlow are not shown. All subfigures share the same legends and axis labels.

penalizing variance of training risks across the domains as a method of distributionally robust optimization to provide out-of-distribution (domain) generalization. The first work proposing DRO in FL setting is [Mohri *et al.*, 2019], where they minimize the maximum combination of clients’ local losses to address fairness in FL: $\min_{\theta} \max_i f_i(\theta)$. Also, the work in [Deng *et al.*, 2020] proposed a communication-efficient algorithm which performs well over the worst-case combination of clients’ empirical local distributions:

$$\min_{\theta} \max_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i f_i(\theta), \quad (31)$$

where $\lambda \in \Lambda = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^n : \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i = 1\}$. The relation between robust optimization and variance regularization in non-FL settings (eq. (30)) encourages us to interpret VRed as an equivalent form of DRO. Hence, the variance regularization connects VRed non-trivially to the previous works AFL [Mohri *et al.*, 2019] and DRFA [Deng *et al.*, 2020] through DRO.