

Personalized Federated Fine-Tuning for LLMs via Data-Driven Heterogeneous Model Architectures

1st Yicheng Zhang

College of Computer Science and Technology
Zhejiang University
Hangzhou, China
zyccs@zju.edu.cn

3rd Zhaomin Wu

Institute of Data Science
National University of Singapore
Singapore
zhaomin@nus.edu.sg

2nd Zhen Qin*

College of Computer Science and Technology
Zhejiang University
Hangzhou, China
zhenqin@zju.edu.cn

4th Shuiguang Deng*

College of Computer Science and Technology
Zhejiang University
Hangzhou, China
dengsg@zju.edu.cn

Abstract—A large amount of instructional text data is essential to enhance the performance of pre-trained large language models (LLMs) for downstream tasks. This data can contain sensitive information and therefore cannot be shared in practice, resulting in data silos that limit the effectiveness of LLMs on various tasks. Federated learning (FL) enables collaborative fine-tuning across different clients without sharing their data. Nonetheless, in practice, this instructional text data is highly heterogeneous in both quantity and distribution across clients, necessitating distinct model structures to best accommodate the variations. However, existing federated fine-tuning approaches either enforce the same model structure or rely on predefined ad-hoc architectures unaware of data distribution, resulting in suboptimal performance. To address this challenge, we propose FedAMoLE, a lightweight personalized federated fine-tuning framework that leverages data-driven heterogeneous model architectures. FedAMoLE introduces the Adaptive Mixture of LoRA Experts (AMoLE) module, which facilitates model heterogeneity with minimal communication overhead by allocating varying numbers of LoRA-based domain experts to each client. Furthermore, we develop a reverse selection-based expert assignment (RSEA) strategy, which enables data-driven model architecture adjustment during fine-tuning by allowing domain experts to select clients that best align with their knowledge domains. Extensive experiments across six different scenarios of data heterogeneity demonstrate that FedAMoLE significantly outperforms existing methods for federated LLM fine-tuning, achieving superior accuracy while maintaining good scalability.

Index Terms—Personalized Federated Learning, Large Language Models, Heterogeneous Model Architectures, Mixture of LoRA Experts, LLM Fine-Tuning

I. INTRODUCTION

Text data constitutes the majority of real-world data formats, as noted by prior research [1], [2]. The impressive responsiveness of pre-trained Large Language Models (LLMs) [3] to human instructions depends on fine-tuning with large amounts of instruction-based text data, as suggested by the scaling law [4]. However, human instructions often contain




Fig. 1: An example of federated LLM fine-tuning with three organizations, each of which holds data different in the domain and volume. To better adapt to local data distributions, personalized models with differentiated architectures are preferred.

sensitive client-specific information that cannot be directly shared for fine-tuning, leading to the challenge of data silos. Federated Learning (FL) [5] provides a compelling solution by enabling multiple organizations to collaboratively train a global model without sharing their raw data. This approach ensures privacy while leveraging client-side downstream data effectively [6], [7]. As depicted in Fig. 1, a centralized server can coordinate diverse commercial organizations, allowing them to collaboratively enhance their LLMs with data from various domains, thereby benefiting from larger-scale datasets in a privacy-preserving manner.

Full-parameter fine-tuning of LLMs in the context of Federated Learning (FL) incurs substantial memory and communication overhead [8]. To mitigate these costs, recent works

* Corresponding author.

have proposed federated fine-tuning approaches that leverage parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT) [9]–[15] and zero-order optimization techniques [8], [16]. While these methods effectively reduce the resource demands of fine-tuning, they often experience significant performance degradation when applied to practical heterogeneous data across clients [17], [18]. In real-world FL systems, clients typically possess private data that vary in both distribution and quantity, creating substantial challenges for personalizing LLMs to meet the specific requirements of each client’s tasks.

To solve this challenge, recent studies have explored personalization mechanisms in the scenarios of federated LLM fine-tuning, which either rely on fine-tuning aggregated PEFT modules [19], [20] for local data adaptation, or adopt dual adapter combinations to integrate local and global knowledge [21]–[25]. While these approaches mitigate performance degradation in some heterogeneous scenarios, they still suffer from the following limitations:

- (L1) **Limited Support for Heterogeneous Models:** In highly heterogeneous scenarios, where some clients have very limited data, using models of different sizes is necessary to avoid overfitting on small datasets. However, existing federated tuning methods for LLMs often struggle to effectively support model heterogeneity [19], [25]–[31]. While some approaches provide partial support for heterogeneous models using techniques like Mixture of Experts (MoE) [32], [33], they often introduce substantial communication overhead, limiting their practicality.
- (L2) **Data-Unaware Model Structure:** The existing mainstream federated fine-tuning approaches supporting heterogeneous models primarily rely on manually predefined model architectures composed of shared and personalized sub-modules [20]–[22], [24], [34], [35]. However, the design of heterogeneous sub-modules usually only takes into account local resource constraints [35] or the characteristics of local data [20]–[22], [24], [34], failed to comprehensively consider the cross-client data characteristics, which may result in suboptimal performance of federated fine-tuning given the nature of FL that the data among clients are usually statistically heterogeneous [36], [37].

This work aims to, on one hand, provide support for heterogeneous models with low communication overhead, and on the other hand, enable data-driven design of model architectures based on data characteristics from both local and global perspectives:

To provide better support for heterogeneous models, we propose FedAMoLE, a lightweight personalized federated fine-tuning framework for LLMs. Inspired by the mixture of LoRA experts (MoLE)—an MoE-based fine-tuning technique that enables multiple domain experts to collaborate dynamically via a gating network—FedAMoLE introduces a novel **adaptive mixture of LoRA experts (AMoLE)** module. This module globally maintains a shared expert and a pool of candidate domain experts, assigning the shared expert and

varying numbers of domain experts to each client, thereby achieving architecture-level model heterogeneity and effectively adapting to diverse data distributions. Additionally, it introduces a router with a shape independent of the expert count, ensuring compatibility with FedAvg. By leveraging the lightweight nature of LoRA, FedAMoLE significantly reduces the communication and memory overhead typically associated with traditional MoE methods, making it a promising approach for the efficient personalization of client models.

To achieve the optimal architectures of personalized models with awareness of data characteristics from both local and global perspectives, we propose a *data-driven* strategy, namely, a **reverse selection-based expert assignment (RSEA)** strategy. This strategy models the similarity between domain experts and client data features within an AMoLE module in a data-driven manner. Based on this similarity, domain experts reversely select destination clients whose data features best match their knowledge domains by solving an optimization problem, thereby adaptively constructing heterogeneous client models. These model designs are jointly aware of data characteristics from both local and global perspectives, as the overlap of data distributions among clients influences the relative parameter updates of shared and domain experts during local training. This, in turn, determines the selection of clients by domain experts, ultimately shaping the client model architectures.

The main contributions of this work are as follows:

- We propose FedAMoLE, a lightweight personalized federated fine-tuning framework for LLMs based on MoLE. It globally maintains a pool of candidate experts and assigns experts to clients, so that architectural heterogeneity of models is enabled with low communication overhead, since only LoRA adapters are required to be transmitted between the server and clients.
- To determine the optimal model architectures for clients within the FedAMoLE framework, we propose a data-driven strategy termed RSEA for assigning experts to federated clients, which determines the most suitable experts for each client by solving an optimization problem, taking data characteristics into consideration from both local and global perspectives.
- Extensive experiments on six heterogeneous data scenarios demonstrate that FedAMoLE significantly improves the performance of federated LLM fine-tuning on heterogeneous data. In the scenario with the highest data heterogeneity, FedAMoLE improves Rouge-L over the best baseline by 5.25%, with reasonable latency, memory, and communication overhead. The implementation of this work is available at <https://github.com/zyc140345/FedAMoLE>.

II. RELATED WORK

A. Federated Fine-Tuning for LLMs

Federated fine-tuning for LLMs has gained significant attention as it enables the utilization of high-quality and diverse

downstream data without exposing raw data to further improve the performance of pre-trained LLMs. Given the massive parameter size of LLMs, current approaches often adopt PEFT techniques such as LoRA [9]–[13] and prompt tuning [14] to reduce memory usage during local fine-tuning and communication cost for the transmission of trainable parameters.

Within the realm of PEFT-based methods, some studies focus on establishing benchmarks [15] and infrastructures [38] for federated LLM fine-tuning. Other works like [11] address inconsistencies between local and global objectives in LoRA fine-tuning to improve performance. Additional efforts focus on reducing resource overhead, including leveraging quantization techniques to reduce memory footprint [16], compressing model updates into fixed random seeds and loss values through zero-order optimization to minimize communication costs [8], fine-tuning compressed LLMs to reduce computational burden [12], and optimizing resource utilization across heterogeneous clients with SVD-based LoRA pruning [10].

While the above studies have significantly improved model accuracy, advanced the ecosystem, and minimized computational, memory, and communication overheads in federated LLM fine-tuning, they overlook the challenge of data heterogeneity, which causes performance degradation in practical FL applications.

B. Personalized Federated Fine-Tuning for LLMs

To mitigate the impact of heterogeneous data, Babakniya et al. [26] proposed a data-driven approach to optimize the initial state of the global LoRA adapter. However, their method is limited to a single global model, restricting its adaptability to client-specific needs.

Recent works introduce personalization into federated LLM fine-tuning via personalized PEFT modules [19], [20], [27], [28], [34], dual adapter integration [21]–[25], LoRA adapter masking [39], and mixtures of feed-forward-network (FFN) sub-modules [33]. However, these approaches have limitations: many methods [19], [25], [27], [28] only support parameter heterogeneity within the same model architecture, limiting personalization. Others [20]–[24], [34] rely on manually defined private architectures or hyperparameters that are challenging to tune [39], leading to suboptimal performance. Some approaches [28], [33], [34] require transmitting fine-tuned pre-trained parameters, causing significant communication overhead.

C. Federated Learning with Mixture of Experts

The mixture of experts (MoE) [40]–[44] is a neural network architecture using multiple specialized sub-models, or experts, with a gating mechanism selecting appropriate experts for a given input. This approach is promising for personalized federated learning (PFL), as it personalizes models to specific data domains through expert collaboration.

Early MoE-based PFL research focused on small-scale models like CNNs and RNNs, often treating the entire model as a single expert. Some works [45]–[48] combined a shared expert

with a personalized expert using a gating network. Others supported mixing multiple experts through personalized weighting coefficients [49], clustering [50], client selection [32], or similarity-based expert aggregation [51]. However, these works are primarily designed for small-scale neural networks and incur significant memory and communication overhead, making them unsuitable for LLMs.

Recent studies apply MoE to federated LLM fine-tuning using lightweight adapters as experts to reduce resource consumption. Methods include mixture of prompt-based experts [29], dual LoRA expert integration [30], and cluster-based LoRA expert combination [31]. However, these approaches only support parameter heterogeneity within the same model architecture. Mei et al. [33] propose a similarity-based expert assignment to construct an optimal sub-MoE for each client, achieving architecture-level heterogeneity. However, their dense FFN-based experts cause significant communication overhead and lack compatibility with popular non-MoE pretrained LLMs, like the LLaMA series.

A concurrent study [35] supports architecture heterogeneity, with clients collaboratively training a shared LoRA expert and maintaining personalized LoRA experts locally. However, their approach requires manually configuring the number of experts per client, whereas our method automatically assigns experts using a data-driven reverse selection strategy, better adapting to heterogeneous data.

III. PRELIMINARIES

A. Personalized Federated Fine-Tuning for LLMs

To facilitate understanding of our problem, in this section, we provide a formal definition for personalized federated fine-tuning for LLMs. Before that, a definition of federated fine-tuning for LLMs is first provided.

In a typical FL system, there are C clients that collaboratively solve the optimization problem defined as

$$\min_{\theta} \mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{C} \sum_{i=1}^C \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X} \sim \mathcal{D}_i} \mathcal{L}_i(\mathbf{X}|\theta), \quad (1)$$

where \mathcal{L}_i is the loss of global model θ evaluated on an instance \mathbf{X} sampled from local data distribution \mathcal{D}_i of client i .

Considering the heterogeneity of \mathcal{D} across different clients, a single global model may struggle to adapt to diverse data distributions. Personalized Federated Learning (PFL) proposes to train a personalized model for each individual client, modifying the objective as

$$\min_{\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_C} \mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{C} \sum_{i=1}^C \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X} \sim \mathcal{D}_i} \mathcal{L}_i(\mathbf{X}|\theta_i), \quad (2)$$

where θ_i represents the local LLM of client i , \mathbf{X} denotes a text sequence composed of an instruction $\mathbf{X}^{\text{instr}}$ and a response \mathbf{X}^{resp} , represented as:

$$\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{X}^{\text{instr}}, \mathbf{X}^{\text{resp}}], \quad (3)$$

The loss function \mathcal{L}_i is defined as:

$$\mathcal{L}_i(\mathbf{X} | \theta_i) = -\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \log \left[p(\mathbf{X}_t^{\text{resp}} | \mathbf{X}^{\text{instr}}, \mathbf{X}_{<t}^{\text{resp}}, \theta_i) \right], \quad (4)$$

where T is the total number of tokens in \mathbf{X}^{resp} .

In personalized federated fine-tuning, each client's local model θ_i comprises shared parameters θ_i^s and personalized parameters θ_i^p . At the start of each round, θ_i^s and θ_i^p are fine-tuned locally to minimize \mathcal{L}_i on \mathcal{D}_i . After fine-tuning, θ_i^s is uploaded, aggregated into global parameters θ_g , and redistributed to reinitialize θ_i^s , while θ_i^p remains local to achieve personalization. This process repeats until convergence.

B. Mixture of Experts and A Lightweight Improvement

Mixture of experts (MoE) [40]–[44] is a technology that enables the scaling of LLMs with constant computational overhead. A typical MoE layer consists of a linear router and multiple sub-modules termed “experts”. Given a specific input, the router sparsely selects a fixed number of experts based on their features. This process can be formalized as

$$\begin{aligned} p_i &= \text{softmax}(\mathbf{W}_r \mathbf{x})_i \\ \mathcal{T} &= \text{top-}k(p_i) \\ \mathbf{y} &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}} p_i E_i(\mathbf{x}), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ represents the input features, $\mathbf{W}_r \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d}$ denotes the parameter weights of the router (N is the total number of experts), p_i represents the weighting coefficient of expert i for the input \mathbf{x} , \mathcal{T} is the set of indices of the k selected experts, E_i is the i -th expert sub-module (such as a two-layer feed-forward neural network), and \mathbf{y} is the final output.

The adaptive collaboration of domain experts in MoE enables effective adaptation to diverse data distributions, making it a promising solution for personalizing client models in FL. However, applying MoE to federated LLM fine-tuning incurs significant communication costs due to the transfer of dense expert sub-modules between the server and clients. A natural solution to this limitation is to make MoE experts more lightweight.

Mixture of LoRA Experts (MoLE) addresses this by using LoRA adapters as experts within the MoE framework.

Low-rank adaptation (LoRA) [52] is a widely adopted Parameter-Efficient Fine-Tuning (PEFT) technique for LLMs. LoRA assumes that the fine-tuning updates $\Delta \mathbf{W}$ to the pre-trained parameters $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{h \times d}$ are highly sparse and can be approximated by the product of two low-rank matrices $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times d}$ and $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{h \times r}$, known as LoRA adapters, with $r \ll \min(d, h)$ to minimize parameter size. The fine-tuned parameters \mathbf{W} during forward computation can then be expressed as:

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}. \quad (6)$$

By leveraging the lightweight nature of LoRA adapters, MoLE substantially reduces the parameter size of MoE experts, enabling it to achieve the same level of local model

personalization as MoE while significantly lowering communication overhead. The forward computation of MoLE is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} p_i &= \text{softmax}(\mathbf{W}_r \mathbf{x})_i \\ \mathcal{T} &= \text{top-}k(p_i) \\ \mathbf{y} &= \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}} p_i \mathbf{B}_i \mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{x}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

IV. APPROACH

A. Framework Overview

FedAMoLE is designed for personalized federated LLM fine-tuning with the following objectives: (1) support architecture-level model heterogeneity, (2) tailor personalized model architectures for each client with joint awareness of data characteristics from both local and global perspectives, and (3) achieve these objectives with reasonable additional communication overhead.

The model architectures together with the processes of FedAMoLE are illustrated in Fig. 2. In FedAMoLE, each client holds a transformer-based local model with L decoder layers. Each layer consists of two sub-layers: a self-attention layer (with parameter matrices \mathbf{Q} , \mathbf{K} , \mathbf{V} , and \mathbf{O}) and an FFN layer. Each client fine-tunes its local model by injecting AMoLE modules into activated linear layers (e.g., the \mathbf{Q} and \mathbf{V} matrices in the self-attention layer, as shown in Fig. 2).

The AMoLE module globally maintains a shared expert with global knowledge, a pool of candidate domain experts with specialized domain knowledge, and a token projection for routing. Each AMoLE module has unique instances for each client. For a given AMoLE module, the shared expert and token projection are sent to all client instances, while the domain experts select client instances whose local data characteristics best match their knowledge domains. This data-aware expert sharing and reverse selection process enables the adaptive construction of heterogeneous models blending global and domain-specific knowledge for each client, effectively achieving client-side personalization while benefiting each client with global knowledge among these clients.

The federated fine-tuning with FedAMoLE in each round comprises six processes. At the beginning of each round, for each module, the server sends the global parameters to every client, including the shared expert, domain experts, and the token projection. Upon receiving these modules, each client injects them into its local LLM backbone, constructing a personalized local model (① in Fig. 2). Next, the clients freeze the LLM backbone and fine-tune the injected parameters using the local training dataset (② in Fig. 2). After fine-tuning, each client estimates the embeddings of both the domain experts and the local data with a subset randomly sampled and separated from the local training set, termed as local embedding set (③ in Fig. 2). Finally, each client returns the fine-tuned local parameters, domain expert embeddings, and local data embeddings to the server (④ in Fig. 2). Once received, the server aggregates the token projections, shared experts, and the parameters and embeddings of the same




Fig. 2: Overview of FedAMoLE. This figure illustrates the workflow of a single round, where Q , K , V , and O represent the weight matrices of the self-attention layer. Q and V are each injected with an AMoLE module (see Fig. 3) for fine-tuning, while K and O are frozen. Step ⑥ of reverse selection based expert assignment is detailed in Fig. 4. For clarity, components of the same type are shown with an identical color and texture.

domain experts uploaded by different clients (⑤ in Fig. 2). It then calculates the similarity between the domain expert and each client on its embeddings. After that, each domain expert selects several clients whose data best matches its knowledge domain. This reverse selection determines the domain expert assignments for the next round of training (⑥ in Fig. 2).

B. Adaptive MoLE Module

Assigning varying numbers of domain experts to instances of a traditional MoLE module across clients challenges federated aggregation. Consider the following scenario: if two client instances of a MoLE module are assigned to three and five domain experts, respectively, the corresponding router dimensions would be $3 \times d$ and $5 \times d$, as defined in (7). This dimensional inconsistency prevents direct aggregation of routers via FedAvg [5]. The core issue originates that the parameter dimension of a traditional MoLE router is tied to the number of domain experts, resulting in shape mismatches across module instances with varying domain expert counts.

To address this problem, we propose a FedAvg-compatible MoLE module, namely the Adaptive MoLE (AMoLE) module. This module replaces the traditional MoLE router with projection matrices independent of the number of domain experts to select the most similar domain experts for each token by projecting tokens and domain experts into a shared low-dimensional subspace for similarity computation. This design ensures that instances of an AMoLE module on different clients have routers with consistent dimensions despite hold-




Fig. 3: Routing process of the AMoLE module m at client i .

ing varying numbers of domain experts, thereby facilitating federated aggregation.

The routing process of the AMoLE module is illustrated in Fig. 3. In module m of client i , the hidden state of the input token x is denoted as $h_{m,i}(x) \in \mathbb{R}^d$. This hidden state

is projected into a low-dimensional subspace by the \mathbf{A} matrix of each domain expert j , generating the corresponding expert embedding $h_{m,i,j}^e(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^r$. Simultaneously, $h_{m,i}(\mathbf{x})$ is also projected by the token projection matrix $\mathbf{W}_{m,i}^t \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times d}$ to obtain the token embedding $h_{m,i}^t(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^r$ in this subspace. Next, the scaled dot product between the token embedding and each expert embedding is computed, followed by softmax normalization to obtain the weighting coefficient $p_{m,i,j}(\mathbf{x})$ for each domain expert j . Finally, the top- k^e domain experts with the highest coefficients (where $k^e = 2$ in Fig. 3) are selected to extract features $\phi_{m,i,j}(\mathbf{x})$. These features are weighted by the corresponding coefficients, averaged, and combined with the feature from the shared expert $\phi_{m,i}^s(\mathbf{x})$ and the pre-trained feature $\phi_m^p(\mathbf{x})$ to generate the final output $y_{m,i}(\mathbf{x})$.

This process can be formalized as

$$h_{m,i,j}^e(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{A}_{m,i,j} h_{m,i}(\mathbf{x}) \quad (8)$$

$$h_{m,i}^t(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{W}_{m,i}^t h_{m,i}(\mathbf{x}) \quad (9)$$

$$p_{m,i,j}(\mathbf{x}) = \text{softmax} \left[\frac{h_{m,i}^t(\mathbf{x})^T h_{m,i,j}^e(\mathbf{x})}{\sqrt{d}} \right] \quad (10)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{m,i}(\mathbf{x}) = \text{top-}k^e(p_{m,i,j}(\mathbf{x})) \quad (11)$$

$$\phi_m^p(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{W}_m h_{m,i}(\mathbf{x}) \quad (12)$$

$$\phi_{m,i}^s(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{B}_{m,i}^s \mathbf{A}_{m,i}^s h_{m,i}(\mathbf{x}) \quad (13)$$

$$\phi_{m,i,j}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{B}_{m,i,j} \mathbf{A}_{m,i,j} h_{m,i}(\mathbf{x}) \quad (14)$$

$$y_{m,i}(\mathbf{x}) = \phi_m^p(\mathbf{x}) + \phi_{m,i}^s(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{T}_{m,i}(\mathbf{x})} p_{m,i,j}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \phi_{m,i,j}(\mathbf{x}), \quad (15)$$

where \mathbf{W}_m is the pre-trained parameter of module m , $\mathbf{A}_{m,i,j}$ and $\mathbf{B}_{m,i,j}$ are the parameters of domain expert j , $\mathbf{A}_{m,i}^s$ and $\mathbf{B}_{m,i}^s$ are the parameters of the shared expert, and k^e is the number of domain experts each token is routed to.

C. Local Fine-Tuning and Aggregation

The local fine-tuning on client i optimizes the parameters of the AMoLE module set \mathcal{M} :

$$\theta_i = \bigcup_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \theta_{m,i}, \quad (16)$$

while keeping the pre-trained parameters of the local model frozen. Here,

$$\theta_{m,i} = \{\mathbf{A}_{m,i}^s, \mathbf{B}_{m,i}^s, \mathbf{W}_{m,i}^r\} \cup \{\mathbf{A}_{m,i,j}, \mathbf{B}_{m,i,j}\}_{j \in \mathcal{E}_{m,i}} \quad (17)$$

represents the learnable parameters of module m for client i , where $\mathcal{E}_{m,i}$ denotes the set of domain experts assigned to module m of client i in the current round.

During each fine-tuning round, the optimization of θ_i is performed iteratively. In each iteration, a mini-batch of text sequences \mathcal{B} containing a total of T tokens is sampled from the client i 's training dataset $\mathcal{D}_i^{\text{train}}$, and the gradient of θ_i on \mathcal{B} is computed as:

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_i(\mathcal{B} | \theta_i)}{\partial \theta_i} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} \left[\frac{1}{|\mathcal{B}|} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{B}} \mathcal{L}_i(\mathbf{x} | \theta_i) + \beta \cdot \mathcal{L}_i^{\text{LB}}(\mathcal{B} | \theta_i) \right], \quad (18)$$

where \mathcal{L}_i represents the NLL loss (refer to (4)), and

$$\mathcal{L}_i^{\text{LB}}(\mathcal{B} | \theta_i) = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \left(|\mathcal{E}_{m,i}| \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}_{m,i}} \bar{f}_{m,i,j} \cdot \bar{p}_{m,i,j} \right) \quad (19)$$

represents the load balance loss [44] weighted by β , which aims to encourage each domain expert to process roughly the same number of tokens, ensuring sufficient training. $\bar{f}_{m,i,j}$ and $\bar{p}_{m,i,j}$ are defined as follows:

$$\bar{f}_{m,i,j} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}} \mathbb{1}\{\arg \max_{j'} p_{m,i,j'}(\mathbf{x}) = j\} \quad (20)$$

$$\bar{p}_{m,i,j} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}} p_{m,i,j}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Once the gradient is calculated, θ_i is updated by taking a step of size η in the direction of the gradient. A simplified version of this update rule is:

$$\theta_i^{t+1} = \theta_i^t - \eta \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_i(\mathcal{B} | \theta_i^t)}{\partial \theta_i^t}. \quad (21)$$

After fine-tuning, each AMoLE module m in the local model performs federated aggregation as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}_{m,j} &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}_{m,j}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}_{m,j}} \mathbf{A}_{m,i,j} \\ \mathbf{B}_{m,j} &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}_{m,j}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}_{m,j}} \mathbf{B}_{m,i,j} \\ \mathbf{A}_m^s &= \frac{1}{C} \sum_{i=1}^C \mathbf{A}_{m,i}^s \\ \mathbf{B}_m^s &= \frac{1}{C} \sum_{i=1}^C \mathbf{B}_{m,i}^s \\ \mathbf{W}_m^t &= \frac{1}{C} \sum_{i=1}^C \mathbf{W}_{m,i}^t, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where $\mathcal{C}_{m,j}$ denotes the set of clients participating in fine-tuning domain expert j within module m in this round.

D. Reverse Selection based Expert Assignment

Assigning each client the domain experts best suited to their local data requires a mechanism to evaluate the relevance between client data and expert domains. The router of the AMoLE module offers a promising solution, where token embeddings are considered features of the client's data, while expert embeddings represent the domain features of the experts. The scaled dot product between them can serve as an indicator of their relevance.

However, the router in the AMoLE module only considers individual tokens. To more comprehensively capture the overall characteristics of client data and expert domains, we define the embedding of client i on module m as the element-wise mean of token embeddings in m for all tokens in the embedded dataset $\mathcal{D}_i^{\text{emb}}$ sampled from client i 's local data:

$$\bar{\mathbf{h}}_{m,i} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_i^{\text{emb}}|} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{emb}}} h_{m,i}^t(\mathbf{x}). \quad (23)$$




Fig. 4: The process of the RSEA strategy, where $1 \dots E$ and $1 \dots C$ denote the indices of domain experts and clients, respectively.

Similarly, we define the embedding of domain expert j in module m as the element-wise mean of j 's embeddings across the set of clients $\mathcal{C}_{m,j}$ that participate in fine-tuning j in the current round:

$$\bar{\mathbf{h}}_{m,j}^e = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}_{m,j}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}_{m,j}} \bar{\mathbf{h}}_{m,i,j}^e, \quad (24)$$

where

$$\bar{\mathbf{h}}_{m,i,j}^e = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_i^{emb}|} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}_i^{emb}} h_{m,i,j}^e(\mathbf{x}) \quad (25)$$

represents the embedding of domain expert j on client i , i.e., the element-wise mean of j 's embeddings in module m for all tokens in \mathcal{D}_i^{emb} .

Notably, the computation of expert j 's embedding $\bar{\mathbf{h}}_{m,j}^e$ requires each client i to upload their local $\bar{\mathbf{h}}_{m,i,j}^e$. Since $\bar{\mathbf{h}}_{m,i,j}^e$ represents the average of client i 's local token features. Privacy concerns on this can be solved by mature methods such as differential privacy [53], so this work does not further discuss about these approaches.

Based on the above definitions, the relevance between client i 's local data and expert j 's domain in module m is:

$$s_{m,i,j} = \frac{\left(\bar{\mathbf{h}}_{m,i}^t\right)^T \cdot \bar{\mathbf{h}}_{m,j}^e}{\sqrt{d}}. \quad (26)$$

This definition aligns with the training objective of the AMoLE module (8, 9, 10). A higher $s_{m,i,j}$ indicates that tokens in client i 's local data have a higher probability of selecting domain expert j in module m , thus effectively measuring the degree of matching between client data and expert domains.

With the above relevance, to achieve data-aware domain expert assignment, a natural approach is to follow the traditional MoE method, where each token selects the k domain

experts with the highest weighting coefficients. Corresponding to domain expert assignment at the client level, this means allowing each client to select the k domain experts with the highest relevance for each module. However, this approach results in each module being assigned the same number of domain experts, failing to adaptively determine the required number of domain experts with the awareness of data characteristics from both local and global perspectives.

To address this issue, we propose a Reverse Selection based Expert Assignment (RSEA) strategy inspired by Zhou et al. [54], where, for each module m , domain expert j reversely selects the k^e clients with the highest relevance:

$$\mathcal{C}_{m,j} = \text{top-}k^e(\text{softmax}(s_{m,i,j})), \quad (27)$$

rather than having clients select domain experts for each module, this method allows different modules to be assigned different numbers of domain experts. For example, suppose we need to distribute two domain experts (indexed by 1 and 2) from a module among three clients (indexed by 1, 2 and 3): domain expert 1 chooses clients 1 and 2, and domain expert 2 chooses clients 2 and 3. Then, the number of domain experts in this module for the three clients would be 1, 2, and 1, respectively, achieving heterogeneity in the number of domain experts.

To satisfy the minimum requirement for the number of domain experts within a module (at least k^e for local top- k^e routing in (10)) and to prevent excessively heterogeneous domain expert assignment across clients (up to b domain experts per module at each client), we model the domain expert assignment in module m as the following optimization problem:

Definition IV.1. (*domain expert assignment problem*)

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\mathbf{D}_m} \langle \mathbf{P}_m, \mathbf{D}_m \rangle \\ & \text{s.t. } \forall i : k^e \leq \sum_j d_{m,i,j} \leq b \\ & \quad \forall j : \sum_i d_{m,i,j} = k^e \\ & \quad \forall i, j : d_{m,i,j} \in \{0, 1\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{P}_m = \{p_{m,i,j}\}$ is the selection probability matrix, with

$$p_{m,i,j} = \frac{e^{s_{m,i,j}}}{\sum_i e^{s_{m,i,j}}} \quad (28)$$

representing the probability that domain expert j in module m selects client i . $\mathbf{D}_m = \{d_{m,i,j}\}$ is the assignment matrix, where $d_{m,i,j}$ is a binary variable indicating whether domain expert j in module m is assigned to client i (1 for assigned, 0 for not assigned). The optimization objective is to maximize the inner product of \mathbf{P}_m and \mathbf{D}_m , aiming to make the final domain expert assignment scheme align as closely as possible with the domain experts' selection preferences. The first constraint ensures that the number of domain experts assigned to

each client is between k^e and b ; the second constraint ensures that each domain expert selects k^c clients.

Problem IV.1 can be reduced to a mixed integer linear programming (MILP) problem, which is NP-hard. However, in the domain expert assignment scenario, the problem size is typically small (a few hundred decision variables) and can be quickly solved using solvers such as Gurobi or SCIP.

V. EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we aim to demonstrate the following with extensive experiments: (1) FedAMoLE can construct personalized models that improve accuracy on non-IID data (Section V-B) (2) The multiple components proposed in this work contribute positively (Section V-D) (3) The hyperparameters in FedAMoLE are easy to set (Section V-E). (4) FedAMoLE exhibits low communication and memory overhead compared to existing federated fine-tuning approaches based on MoE (Section V-F).

A. Experimental Setup

1) *Baselines*: To evaluate the effectiveness of FedAMoLE, we compare it with seven competitive approaches tailored for federated LLM fine-tuning, including three approaches without LLM personalization:

- **FedIT**: A federated LLM fine-tuning method proposed by Zhang et al. [9], which uses LoRA for local LLM fine-tuning and FedAvg to aggregate LoRA adapters;
- **FedPrompt**: A federated LLM fine-tuning baseline implemented as Kuang et al. [38], similar to FedIT but employing Prompt Tuning [55] for local fine-tuning;
- **FedPTuning**: A federated LLM fine-tuning baseline implemented as Kuang et al. [38], which uses P-Tuning [56] to fine-tune local LLMs;

and four approaches specially designed for personalized federated LLM fine-tuning:

- **FedIT-FT**: It incorporates the post-aggregation fine-tuning strategy as Yu et al. [57] based on FedIT, where after each aggregation round, each client fine-tunes the global model with local data to obtain a personalized model;
- **FedPrompt-FT**: Extends FedPrompt by introducing post-aggregation fine-tuning;
- **FedPTuning-FT**: Extends FedPTuning by introducing post-aggregation fine-tuning;
- **FdLoRA**: A personalized federated LLM fine-tuning method proposed by Qi et al. [25]. In this approach, clients first collaboratively train a shared adapter through local LoRA fine-tuning and AdamW aggregation, while each client individually maintains a personalized adapter that lags several rounds behind the shared adapter. Then, each client dynamically combines the shared and personalized adapters using few-shot black-box optimization, constructing a personalized model.

2) *Datasets & Evaluation Metrics*: We conduct experiments on three widely used datasets to comprehensively evaluate these approaches, covering the tasks of natural language understanding and generation:

- **SNLI** [58]: A corpus of approximately 570,000 human-annotated English sentence pairs labeled as entailment, contradiction, or neutral. It is introduced for natural language understanding;
- **Dolly-15K** [59]: Consists of 15,015 human-generated question-response pairs across 8 tasks, introduced for natural language generation;
- **Natural Instructions (NI)** [60]: A large collection of natural language instructions; we use the default split provided in NI v2.8, including 756 tasks for training and 119 for testing. It is used for natural language generation.

Following a series of existing works on federated LLM fine-tuning, we evaluate the performance of these approaches with the test accuracy of the fine-tuned LLM after the last federated round [8], [12]. Since this work is tailored for personalization federated fine-tuning, we adopt the **mean test accuracy** achieved by each personalized LLM after the last round (MTAL), defined as:

$$\text{MTAL} = \text{MTA}[-1]. \quad (29)$$

Here, MTA is the mean test accuracy:

$$\text{MTA}[t] = \frac{1}{C} \sum_{i=1}^C \text{acc}_i[t], \quad (30)$$

where $\text{acc}_i[t]$ denotes the performance metric of client i 's local model at round t . For SNLI, acc represents classification accuracy. For Dolly-15K and NI, we use Rouge-L [61] as the evaluation metric for the local model, as adopted in a series of federated LLM tuning approaches [8], [10]. All experiments are conducted with LLaMA-3.2-1B [62] as the foundation model.¹

3) *Federated Learning Settings*: This work is targeted to a cross-silo scenario. Thus, we set the number of clients to 10 unless stated otherwise. The federated fine-tuning is performed for 30 rounds, and in each round, each client performs local training for 200 steps. For SNLI and Dolly-15K, we partition the dataset among 10 clients with Dirichlet distributions with α values of 0.1, 1.0, and 100.0 to build label-skewed [63] non-IID scenarios. For NI, we select 10 tasks with the largest sample sizes, assigning each client a unique task to create a feature-skewed [64] non-IID scenario. Each client randomly samples 80% of its local data as the training set, 10% as the validation set, and 10% as the test set. Due to computational constraints, validation and test sets for SNLI are capped at 200 samples each, while for Dolly-15K and NI, the validation set is capped at 200 samples and the test set at 50 samples.

4) *Implementation Details*: In the experiments, all approaches are implemented using PyTorch 2.4.0 [65] along with the libraries of Transformers [66], PEFT [67], and Datasets [68]. Experiments are conducted on a server with 8 NVIDIA RTX 4090 GPUs with models loaded in BF16 format, unless stated otherwise.

Unless otherwise specified, all approaches use the Adam optimizer with a batch size of 1, a learning rate $\eta = 5e^{-5}$,

¹Adopt checkpoint from <https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Llama-3.2-1B>.

TABLE I: Comparison of MTAL on natural language generation tasks across different data heterogeneity scenarios. Each cell reports the mean and standard deviation of MTAL calculated over three random seeds. Each column represents the results under a specific data heterogeneity scenario, where the best-performing approach is highlighted in **bold**, the second-best method is underlined, and “gains” denote the relative MTAL improvement of FedMoE over the best baseline.

Approaches		Dolly-15K				NI
		$\alpha = 0.1$	$\alpha = 1.0$	$\alpha = 100.0$	Average	1 task/client
Vanilla	FedIT	28.69±1.73	28.67±1.28	27.31±0.55	28.22±0.40	54.09±0.23
	FedPrompt	26.01±2.16	26.44±1.22	24.57±0.78	25.67±0.76	35.45±1.08
	FedPTuning	24.11±3.14	27.57±0.79	26.16±1.12	25.95±1.42	36.10±18.36
Personalized	FedIT-FT	28.80±0.16	29.13±1.18	27.17±0.40	28.37±0.27	53.34±0.26
	FedPrompt-FT	26.76±0.57	25.91±0.98	24.63±1.17	25.77±0.76	47.70±0.67
	FedPTuning-FT	27.28±1.28	28.05±1.42	25.89±0.43	27.07±0.70	38.97±20.72
	FDLoRA	27.75±0.17	26.67±0.66	25.79±1.99	26.73±0.85	<u>57.04±1.90</u>
	FedAMoLE	29.87±1.40	29.72±1.43	28.28±0.84	29.29±0.68	60.04±1.09
Gains		3.71	2.02	3.55	3.26	5.25

TABLE II: MTAL on natural language understanding tasks. Result organization and markers are aligned with TABLE I.

Approaches		SNLI			
		$\alpha = 0.1$	$\alpha = 1.0$	$\alpha = 100.0$	Average
Vanilla	FedIT	63.44±9.77	83.06±0.63	84.57±1.36	77.02±2.90
	FedPrompt	48.77±2.43	66.10±2.78	68.70±1.37	61.19±2.02
	FedPTuning	29.86±7.66	76.83±6.14	83.02±2.45	63.23±1.69
Personalized	FedIT-FT	93.74±2.14	86.67±0.58	83.20±0.61	87.87±0.63
	FedPrompt-FT	86.74±9.63	75.75±1.46	65.40±1.83	75.96±2.21
	FedPTuning-FT	27.21±6.47	86.34±3.20	83.05±1.48	65.53±2.85
	FDLoRA	92.50±3.86	86.06±1.32	83.50±0.98	87.35±0.96
	FedAMoLE	<u>93.38±3.62</u>	88.78±0.38	<u>84.37±0.77</u>	88.84±1.31
Gains		-0.39	2.43	-0.24	1.10

and a learning rate decay of 0.99 per round. For LoRA-based approaches, we set $r = 8$, $\alpha = 16$, and a dropout rate of 5%, applying LoRA to the \mathbf{Q} and \mathbf{V} matrices in the self-attention layers. For Prompt Tuning, the virtual prompt is initialized using the soft prompt, whose token count is used as the number of virtual tokens. For P-Tuning, we set the virtual token count to 20 and use an MLP as the prompt encoder. In FDLoRA, the InnerOpt phase synchronizes the shared and personalized adapters every 5 rounds; the OuterOpt phase uses a learning rate of 1.0 and a momentum of 0.5; the FusionOpt phase uses `nevergrad` [69] as the black-box optimizer with an L1 regularization term weighted by 0.05. For FedAMoLE, we use SCIP [70] to solve the optimization problem, setting the total assignable experts per module to 30, with $k^e = 2$, $k^c = 2$, $b = 8$, and $\beta = 1e^{-3}$.

For Dolly-15K and NI, we use the Alpaca [71] prompt template with the following soft prompt:

Soft Prompt: Generate a clear and direct response that accurately fulfills the task based on the provided instruction and any given context.

For experiments on SNLI, the adopted prompt template and soft prompt are as follows:

Prompt Template: Suppose {premise} Can we infer that “{hypothesis}”? Yes, No, or Maybe?\n
Soft Prompt: Based on the premise, determine if the hypothesis logically follows. Answer with ‘Yes’ if it does, ‘No’ if it doesn’t, or ‘Maybe’ if uncertain.

B. Comparison of Accuracy on Heterogeneous Data

TABLE I shows performance on natural language generation tasks. FedAMoLE achieves the best results across all four scenarios. Notably, on highly heterogeneous task/client), it improves Rouge-L by 5.25% over the strongest baseline, FDLoRA. This significant gain is due to FedAMoLE’s data-aware, module-level adaptive expert assignment strategy, which builds personalized models tailored to each client’s local data, enhancing performance on heterogeneous data.

TABLE II presents performance on natural language understanding tasks. In typical heterogeneity scenarios ($\alpha = 1.0$), FedAMoLE outperforms others, improving classification accuracy by 2.43% over the best baseline, FedIT, and exceeding it by 1.1% on average across all three scenarios. However, in highly heterogeneous ($\alpha = 0.1$) and homogeneous ($\alpha = 100.0$) settings, FedAMoLE ranks second, slightly behind the best baseline by 0.39% and 0.24%, respectively. Since these scenarios are uncommon in federated learning and the performance gap is minimal, this result is acceptable.

Additionally, as shown in Fig. 5, FedAMoLE converges quickly across three typical heterogeneous data scenarios and




Fig. 5: MTA trends during training. Each data point represents the MTA averaged over three random seeds at a given round.




Fig. 6: MTAL with different numbers of clients

consistently outperforms other approaches during training. This indicates that even if training is stopped early for efficiency, FedAMoLE still achieves better results, demonstrating its practicality. This advantage comes from FedAMoLE’s ability to dynamically adjust expert assignments per client in each round, allowing it to respond promptly to changes in relevance between experts and client data as training progresses.

Furthermore, Fig. 6 illustrates the impact of increasing the number of clients. Notably, FedAMoLE consistently outperforms the strongest baselines on both natural language generation and understanding tasks under typical data heterogeneity settings, demonstrating its strong scalability.

C. Effectiveness of Personalization

Fig. 7 illustrates the performance of two vanilla FL approaches across varying data heterogeneity. On SNLI, performance declines significantly as heterogeneity increases, aligning with findings from existing FL works for relatively small models [64]. Our results confirm that LLM federated fine-tuning is similarly affected, underscoring the need for personalization mechanisms. In contrast, on Dolly-15K, accuracy remains stable despite data heterogeneity, likely because the dataset has fewer task types (8) with smaller inter-task differences, limiting the impact of heterogeneous partitioning.

Fig.5 demonstrates the effectiveness of personalization in mitigating performance degradation caused by data hetero-

Fig. 7: MTAL of vanilla FL approaches across different data heterogeneity scenarios. Each data point represents the average result over three random seeds, with error bars showing the range between the best and worst values across the three seeds.

geneity. On SNLI and NI (Figs.5a and 5c), post-aggregation fine-tuning noticeably improves the performance of vanilla FL approaches, while FDLORA further enhances this with its dynamic fusion of shared and personalized adapters. FedAMoLE, incorporating the AMoLE module and RSEA strategy, achieves even greater personalization and consistently outperforms all baselines. On Dolly-15K, where data heterogeneity is limited, the advantages of personalization are less pronounced, yet FedAMoLE maintains its leading performance, showcasing its versatility.

Fig.8 demonstrates the effectiveness of FedAMoLE’s personalization mechanism. In the scatter plot, each point represents a t-SNE-reduced relevance vector between a text sequence and all domain experts. Points near the origin indicate that the text sequence is equally relevant to all experts, aligning closely with global distribution and requiring fewer domain experts for adaptation. Conversely, points farther from the origin show higher relevance to specific experts, reflecting divergence from global distribution and necessitating more experts. FedAMoLE’s expert assignments follow this pattern: in Fig.8b, clients 2, 7, and 8 have data points near the origin, indicating local data distributions similar to the global distribution, and the bar chart confirms these clients are assigned




Fig. 8: Visualization of the relevance between client data and domain experts in an AMoLE module after one round of fine-tuning. Each point in the scatter plot represents the t-SNE reduced relevance vector between a text sequence and all domain experts (computed as in equation (23) when \mathcal{D}_i^{emb} contains only one example), with 200 points per client. The bar chart illustrates the number of domain experts assigned to each client in the next round.

TABLE III: Ablation study. Each cell represents the MTAL obtained on SNLI with a single random seed.

Approaches	Accuracy (%)
FedIT	83.75
FedIT-FT	86.45
FedAMoLE (vanilla router, random)	87.05
FedAMoLE (vanilla router)	86.90
FedAMoLE (random)	88.05
FedAMoLE	88.95

fewer domain experts.

D. Ablation Study

To validate the effectiveness of the proposed AMoLE module and RSEA strategy, we design three ablation approaches:

- FedAMoLE (random): The proposed RSEA strategy is not used; instead, experts are randomly assigned by the server to each module of each client in every round.
- FedAMoLE (vanilla router): The proposed AMoLE module is replaced with the vanilla MoLE. Each module’s router has the same output dimension, equal to the total assignable experts, ensuring consistent shapes across clients for aggregation (Section IV-B). The routing process follows (7), but selects top- k^e experts only from those assigned to the module in the current round.
- FedAMoLE (vanilla router, random): Neither the proposed AMoLE module nor the RSEA strategy is used.

TABLE III presents the results of the ablation study. FedIT-FT significantly outperforms FedIT in accuracy, validating the effectiveness of the personalization mechanism. FedAMoLE (vanilla router, random) achieves further accuracy improvements over FedIT-FT, highlighting the value of the MoLE architecture. Both FedAMoLE (vanilla router) and FedAMoLE (random) exhibit noticeable performance declines compared to the full FedAMoLE, emphasizing the importance of the proposed AMoLE module and RSEA strategy.




Fig. 9: Hyperparameter sensitivity of FedAMoLE. All the statistics are obtained on the SNLI dataset.

Fig. 9: Hyperparameter sensitivity of FedAMoLE. All the statistics are obtained on the SNLI dataset.

Notably, FedAMoLE (random) surpasses FedAMoLE (vanilla router, random), indicating that AMoLE is compatible with various expert assignment strategies and demonstrates strong adaptability. However, using the RSEA strategy alone with the vanilla router fails to deliver performance gains, as RSEA is tailored for the FedAMoLE framework and requires integration with the AMoLE module to achieve optimal performance.

E. Hyper-parameter Sensitivity

As shown in Fig. 9a, the performance of FedAMoLE is minimally affected by the number of clients each expert selects. However, over-large or over-small the learning rate declines the performance of FedAMoLE, indicating the need for an appropriate learning rate to ensure optimal performance.

Fig. 9b illustrates the impact of the total number of experts per module and the maximum number of experts per client on FedAMoLE’s performance. It shows that a smaller number of experts per module requires more heterogeneous assignments (larger max experts per client), while a larger number of experts per module benefits from more balanced assignments (smaller max experts per client) to achieve optimal performance.

TABLE IV: Comparison of system overhead. All the statistics were obtained by performing one round of federated fine-tuning on using a server with one NVIDIA RTX 3090 GPU. These columns present the maximum memory usage, upload data, download data, training latency, aggregation latency, and testing (inference) latency per client in one round. For FDLORA, the black-box optimization is included in the testing latency. For FedAMoLE, the RSEA process is included in the aggregation latency, and system performance is evaluated under different total numbers of experts per module.

Approaches	Memory (MB)	Upload (MB)	Download (MB)	Train (s)	Aggregation (s)	Test (s)
FedIT-FT	2782.11	1.64	1.64	4.85	0.02	2.37
FedPrompt-FT	2827.18	0.29	0.29	4.47	0.00	3.20
FedPTuning-FT	2841.88	0.16	0.16	4.19	0.00	2.99
FDLoRA	2775.86	1.64	1.64	4.14	0.03	2.60
FedAMoLE (15 experts)	2788.95	7.59	7.59	13.25	4.97	4.92
FedAMoLE (20 experts)	2792.07	9.24	9.23	14.44	5.20	5.20
FedAMoLE (25 experts)	2812.88	10.88	10.87	15.57	5.49	5.63
FedAMoLE (30 experts)	2797.96	12.52	12.51	16.49	5.85	5.72

TABLE V: Comparison of memory and communication overhead. FedMoE statistics are sourced from [33]. FedAMoLE (30 experts/module) statistics were obtained by one round of federated fine-tuning on the AG News dataset using a switch transformer, following FedMoE’s experimental setup. The column headers are consistent with TABLE IV.

Approaches	Memory (GB)	Upload (MB)	Download (MB)
FedMoE	13.89	1850	1850
FedAMoLE	7.99	25.66	25.63

mance. Overall, these two parameters have limited impact, with model accuracy fluctuating within 1.5%, demonstrating FedAMoLE’s robustness to hyperparameter settings.

F. System Overhead

TABLE IV presents the system efficiency of various PFL baselines and FedAMoLE. We observe that despite employing multiple experts per module, FedAMoLE’s memory usage remains comparable to the baselines and is nearly unaffected by the total number of experts per module. This is because each expert is a lightweight LoRA adapter with negligible parameters compared to the pre-trained model. Even when the total number of experts per module is set to 30—a relatively large number—the per-client upload and download data is only 12.52 MB, which is higher than the baselines but acceptable with modern high-speed internet.

FedAMoLE also maintains acceptable per-round training and inference latencies of 16.49 s and 5.72 s, respectively, even when fine-tuning a frozen 1B-parameter LLM with up to 30 experts. The increased latency is primarily due to two factors: the RSEA strategy—which requires clients to perform model inference on an embedding dataset—and the current implementation of the AMoLE module, which executes domain experts sequentially for simplicity. Despite these factors, the latency remains manageable.

Notably, FedAMoLE significantly reduces the memory and communication overhead compared to MoE-based methods. As shown in TABLE V, FedMoE, which uses a traditional MoE architecture, incurs gigabyte-level per-round communication cost. In contrast, FedAMoLE leverages the lightweight

nature of LoRA to compress this communication overhead to 25.66 MB (approximately 1% of the original volume) and reduces memory usage to half that of FedMoE. Therefore, FedAMoLE achieves the practicality for federated fine-tuning of LLMs in real-world scenarios.

VI. CONCLUSION

Enabling personalized model architectures for federated LLM fine-tuning helps to better unleash the potential of LLMs to fit local data, enabling the development of personalized LLMs that perform well on local data in the presence of statistically heterogeneous client-side data distributions in FL. Existing federated fine-tuning methods with support to heterogeneous models suffer from significant resource overheads and fail to tailor model architectures to data distributions. To address these problems, we propose FedAMoLE, a lightweight personalized federated fine-tuning framework based on data-driven heterogeneous model architectures. To support heterogeneous models with low resource overhead and enable the aggregation of heterogeneous personalized models, we introduce a module termed adaptive mixture of LoRA experts (AMoLE), which achieves architecture heterogeneity by enabling the assignment of varying numbers of lightweight LoRA experts to each client. To resolve suboptimal architecture design, we propose the reverse selection-based expert assignment (RSEA) strategy. In this strategy, domain experts select destination clients that best match their knowledge domains in a data-driven manner, thereby adaptively defining the optimal model architecture aligned with the local data. Extensive experiments across six data heterogeneity scenarios demonstrate that FedAMoLE outperforms existing methods in terms of accuracy, scalability, and efficiency. Furthermore, we demonstrate that FedAMoLE’s data-driven heterogeneous model architectures can effectively adapt to local data distributions, achieving a higher level of personalization.

This work demonstrates the effectiveness of data-driven architecture optimization in federated LLM fine-tuning, which may offer some potential insights for further advancing LLM performance with FL.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Schuelke-Leech, T. Barry, and C. Darwin, "Text data analytics: An overview and demonstration," *Association for Public Policy Analysis & Management (APPAM)*, 2015. Accessed on November 26, 2024.
- [2] MIT Sloan Management Review, "Tapping the power of unstructured data," 2024. Accessed on November 26, 2024.
- [3] W. X. Zhao, K. Zhou, J. Li, T. Tang, X. Wang, Y. Hou, Y. Min, B. Zhang, J. Zhang, Z. Dong, *et al.*, "A survey of large language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223*, 2023.
- [4] J. Kaplan, S. McCandlish, T. Henighan, T. B. Brown, B. Chess, R. Child, S. Gray, A. Radford, J. Wu, and D. Amodei, "Scaling laws for neural language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361*, 2020.
- [5] B. McMahan, E. Moore, D. Ramage, S. Hampson, and B. A. y Arcas, "Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data," in *the International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, vol. 54, pp. 1273–1282, 2017.
- [6] Y. Xie, Z. Wang, D. Gao, D. Chen, L. Yao, W. Kuang, Y. Li, B. Ding, and J. Zhou, "Federatedscope: A flexible federated learning platform for heterogeneity," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05011*, 2022.
- [7] H. Wang, T. Jiang, Y. Guo, F. Guo, R. Bie, and X. Jia, "Label noise correction for federated learning: A secure, efficient and reliable realization," in *2024 IEEE 40th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*, pp. 3600–3612, IEEE, 2024.
- [8] Z. Qin, D. Chen, B. Qian, B. Ding, Y. Li, and S. Deng, "Federated full-parameter tuning of billion-sized language models with communication cost under 18 kilobytes," in *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2024, Vienna, Austria, July 21-27, 2024*, OpenReview.net, 2024.
- [9] J. Zhang, S. Vahidian, M. Kuo, C. Li, R. Zhang, G. Wang, and Y. Chen, "Towards building the federatedgpt: Federated instruction tuning," in *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, pp. 6915–6919, arXiv, May 2023.
- [10] J. Bai, D. Chen, B. Qian, L. Yao, and Y. Li, "Federated Fine-tuning of Large Language Models under Heterogeneous Tasks and Client Resources," 2024.
- [11] Y. Sun, Z. Li, Y. Li, and B. Ding, "Improving LoRA in privacy-preserving federated learning," *International Conference on Learning Representations*, vol. abs/2403.12313, Mar. 2024.
- [12] F. Wu, Z. Li, Y. Li, B. Ding, and J. Gao, "FedBiOT: LLM local fine-tuning in federated learning without full model," in *Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, vol. abs/2406.17706, arXiv, June 2024.
- [13] Z. Qin, Z. Wu, B. He, and S. Deng, "Federated data-efficient instruction tuning for large language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.10926*, 2024.
- [14] T. Che, J. Liu, Y. Zhou, J. Ren, J. Zhou, V. Sheng, H. Dai, and D. Dou, "Federated learning of large language models with parameter-efficient prompt tuning and adaptive optimization," in *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, (Singapore), pp. 7871–7888, Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023.
- [15] Z. Zhang, Y. Yang, Y. Dai, L. Qu, and Z. Xu, "FedPETuning: When federated learning meets the parameter-efficient tuning methods of pre-trained language models," in *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 9963–9977, arXiv, Dec. 2022.
- [16] M. Xu, D. Cai, Y. Wu, X. Li, and S. Wang, "{FwdLLM}: Efficient federated finetuning of large language models with perturbed inferences," in *2024 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 24)*, pp. 579–596, 2024.
- [17] X. Li, K. Huang, W. Yang, S. Wang, and Z. Zhang, "On the convergence of fedavg on non-iid data," in *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR, OpenReview.net*, 2020.
- [18] Z. Qin, S. Deng, M. Zhao, and X. Yan, "Fedapen: personalized cross-silo federated learning with adaptability to statistical heterogeneity," in *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pp. 1954–1964, 2023.
- [19] F.-E. Yang, C.-Y. Wang, and Y.-C. F. Wang, "Efficient model personalization in federated learning via client-specific prompt generation," in *2023 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, (Paris, France), pp. 19102–19111, IEEE, Oct. 2023.
- [20] L. Yi, H. Yu, G. Wang, X. Liu, and X. Li, "pFedLoRA: Model-Heterogeneous Personalized Federated Learning with LoRA Tuning," Feb. 2024.
- [21] F. Jiang, L. Dong, S. Tu, Y. Peng, K. Wang, K. Yang, C. Pan, and D. Niyato, "Personalized wireless federated learning for large language models," Apr. 2024.
- [22] Y. Yang, G. Long, T. Shen, J. Jiang, and M. Blumenstein, "Dual-personalizing adapter for federated foundation models," Mar. 2024.
- [23] H. Chen, Y. Zhang, D. Krompass, J. Gu, and V. Tresp, "FedDAT: An Approach for Foundation Model Finetuning in Multi-Modal Heterogeneous Federated Learning," *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 38, pp. 11285–11293, Mar. 2024.
- [24] C. Xie, D.-A. Huang, W. Chu, D. Xu, C. Xiao, B. Li, and A. Anandkumar, "Perada: Parameter-Efficient Federated Learning Personalization with Generalization Guarantees," in *2024 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, (Seattle, WA, USA), pp. 23838–23848, IEEE, June 2024.
- [25] J. Qi, Z. Luan, S. Huang, C. Fung, H. Yang, and D. Qian, "FDLoRA: Personalized Federated Learning of Large Language Model via Dual LoRA Tuning," June 2024.
- [26] S. Babakniya, A. R. Elkordy, Y. H. Ezzeldin, Q. Liu, K.-B. Song, M. El-Khamy, and S. Avestimehr, "SLoRA: Federated Parameter Efficient Fine-Tuning of Language Models," Aug. 2023.
- [27] T. Guo, S. Guo, and J. Wang, "pFedPrompt: Learning Personalized Prompt for Vision-Language Models in Federated Learning," in *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023*, (Austin TX USA), pp. 1364–1374, ACM, Apr. 2023.
- [28] X. Wu, X. Liu, J. Niu, H. Wang, S. Tang, and G. Zhu, "FedLoRA: When personalized federated learning meets low-rank adaptation," Oct. 2023.
- [29] J. Luo, C. Chen, and S. Wu, "Mixture of experts made personalized: Federated prompt learning for vision-language models," Oct. 2024.
- [30] P. Wu, K. Li, T. Wang, Y. Dong, V. C. M. Leung, and F. Wang, "FedFMSL: Federated learning of foundation models with sparsely activated LoRA," *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, vol. 23, pp. 15167–15181, Dec. 2024.
- [31] A. J. Almansoori, S. Horváth, and M. Takáč, "Collaborative and efficient personalization with mixtures of adapters," Oct. 2024.
- [32] C. Dun, M. H. Garcia, G. Zheng, A. H. Awadallah, R. Sim, A. Kyriallidis, and D. Dimitriadis, "FedJETS: Efficient just-in-time personalization with federated mixture of experts," Oct. 2023.
- [33] H. Mei, D. Cai, A. Zhou, S. Wang, and M. Xu, "FedMoE: Personalized Federated Learning via Heterogeneous Mixture of Experts," Aug. 2024.
- [34] G. Sun, M. Mendieta, J. Luo, S. Wu, and C. Chen, "FedPerfix: Towards Partial Model Personalization of Vision Transformers in Federated Learning," in *2023 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, (Paris, France), pp. 4965–4975, IEEE, Oct. 2023.
- [35] D. Fan, B. Messmer, and M. Jaggi, "On-Device Collaborative Language Modeling via a Mixture of Generalists and Specialists," Oct. 2024.
- [36] Q. Li, Y. Diao, Q. Chen, and B. He, "Federated learning on non-iid data silos: An experimental study," in *2022 IEEE 38th international conference on data engineering (ICDE)*, pp. 965–978, IEEE, 2022.
- [37] P. Qiao, K. Zhao, B. Bi, Z. Zhang, Y. Yuan, and G. Wang, "Feed: Towards personalization-effective federated learning," in *2024 IEEE 40th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*, pp. 1779–1791, IEEE, 2024.
- [38] W. Kuang, B. Qian, Z. Li, D. Chen, D. Gao, X. Pan, Y. Xie, Y. Li, B. Ding, and J. Zhou, "FederatedScope-LLM: A Comprehensive Package for Fine-tuning Large Language Models in Federated Learning," Sept. 2023.
- [39] P. Zhang, Y. Zhou, M. Hu, J. Feng, J. Weng, and M. Chen, "Personalized Federated Instruction Tuning via Neural Architecture Search," Feb. 2024.
- [40] R. A. Jacobs, M. I. Jordan, S. J. Nowlan, and G. E. Hinton, "Adaptive mixtures of local experts," *Neural Computation*, vol. 3, pp. 79–87, Feb. 1991.
- [41] N. Shazeer, A. Mirhoseini, K. Maziarz, A. Davis, Q. Le, G. Hinton, and J. Dean, "Outrageously large neural networks: The sparsely-gated mixture-of-experts layer," *International Conference on Learning Representations*, vol. abs/1701.6538, Jan. 2017.
- [42] D. Lepikhin, H. Lee, Y. Xu, D. Chen, O. Firat, Y. Huang, M. Krikun, N. Shazeer, and Z. Chen, "GShard: Scaling giant models with conditional computation and automatic sharding," *International Conference on Learning Representations*, vol. abs/2006.16668, June 2020.
- [43] N. Du, Y. Huang, A. M. Dai, S. Tong, D. Lepikhin, Y. Xu, M. Krikun, Y. Zhou, A. W. Yu, O. Firat, B. Zoph, L. Fedus, M. Bosma, Z. Zhou, T. Wang, Y. E. Wang, K. Webster, M. Pellat, K. Robinson, K. Meier-Hellstern, T. Duke, L. Dixon, K. Zhang, Q. V. Le, Y. Wu, Z. Chen, and C. Cui, "GLaM: Efficient scaling of language models with

- mixture-of-experts,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, vol. abs/2112.6905, arXiv, Dec. 2021.
- [44] W. Fedus, B. Zoph, and N. Shazeer, “Switch transformers: Scaling to trillion parameter models with simple and efficient sparsity,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 23, pp. 120:1–120:39, Jan. 2021.
- [45] D. Peterson, P. Kanani, and V. J. Marathe, “Private Federated Learning with Domain Adaptation,” Dec. 2019.
- [46] B. Guo, Y. Mei, D. Xiao, W. Wu, Y. Yin, and H. Chang, “PFL-MoE: Personalized Federated Learning Based on Mixture of Experts,” Dec. 2020.
- [47] E. L. Zec, O. Mogren, J. Martinsson, L. R. Sütthof, and D. Gillblad, “Specialized federated learning using a mixture of experts,” Feb. 2021.
- [48] L. Yi, H. Yu, C. Ren, H. Zhang, G. Wang, X. Liu, and X. Li, “pFedMoE: Data-Level Personalization with Mixture of Experts for Model-Heterogeneous Personalized Federated Learning,” Feb. 2024.
- [49] M. Reisser, C. Louizos, E. Gavves, and M. Welling, “Federated Mixture of Experts,” July 2021.
- [50] M. Isaksson, E. L. Zec, R. Cöster, D. Gillblad, and Š. Girdzijauskas, “Adaptive expert models for personalization in federated learning,” June 2022.
- [51] Z. Zhan, W. Zhao, Y. Li, W. Liu, X. Zhang, C. W. Tan, C. Wu, D. Guo, and X. Chen, “FedMoE-DA: Federated Mixture of Experts via Domain Aware Fine-grained Aggregation,” Nov. 2024.
- [52] E. J. Hu, Y. Shen, P. Wallis, Z. Allen-Zhu, Y. Li, S. Wang, L. Wang, and W. Chen, “Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models,” in *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR*, OpenReview.net, 2022.
- [53] K. Wei, J. Li, M. Ding, C. Ma, H. H. Yang, F. Farokhi, S. Jin, T. Q. Quek, and H. V. Poor, “Federated learning with differential privacy: Algorithms and performance analysis,” *IEEE transactions on information forensics and security*, vol. 15, pp. 3454–3469, 2020.
- [54] Y. Zhou, T. Lei, H. Liu, N. Du, Y. Huang, V. Zhao, A. Dai, Z. Chen, Q. Le, and J. Laudon, “Mixture-of-Experts with Expert Choice Routing,”
- [55] B. Lester, R. Al-Rfou, and N. Constant, “The Power of Scale for Parameter-Efficient Prompt Tuning,” Sept. 2021.
- [56] X. Liu, K. Ji, Y. Fu, W. Tam, Z. Du, Z. Yang, and J. Tang, “P-tuning: Prompt tuning can Be comparable to fine-tuning across scales and tasks,” in *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, (Dublin, Ireland), pp. 61–68, Association for Computational Linguistics, 2022.
- [57] T. Yu, E. Bagdasaryan, and V. Shmatikov, “Salvaging Federated Learning by Local Adaptation,” Mar. 2022.
- [58] S. R. Bowman, G. Angeli, C. Potts, and C. D. Manning, “A large annotated corpus for learning natural language inference,” Aug. 2015.
- [59] M. Conover, M. Hayes, A. Mathur, J. Xie, J. Wan, S. Shah, A. Ghodsi, P. Wendell, M. Zaharia, and R. Xin, “Free dolly: Introducing the world’s first truly open instruction-tuned LLM.” <https://www.databricks.com/blog/2023/04/12/dolly-first-open-commercially-viable-instruction-tuned-llm>, 2023.
- [60] Y. Wang, S. Mishra, P. Alipoormolabashi, Y. Kordi, A. Mirzaei, A. Arunkumar, A. Ashok, A. S. Dhanasekaran, A. Naik, D. Stap, E. Pathak, G. Karamanolakis, H. G. Lai, I. Purohit, I. Mondal, J. Anderson, K. Kuznia, K. Doshi, M. Patel, K. K. Pal, M. Moradshahi, M. Parmar, M. Purohit, N. Varshney, P. R. Kaza, P. Verma, R. S. Puri, R. Karia, S. K. Sampat, S. Doshi, S. Mishra, S. Reddy, S. Patro, T. Dixit, X. Shen, C. Baral, Y. Choi, N. A. Smith, H. Hajishirzi, and D. Khashabi, “Super-NaturalInstructions: Generalization via Declarative Instructions on 1600+ NLP Tasks,” Oct. 2022.
- [61] C.-Y. Lin, “ROUGE: A Package for Automatic Evaluation of Summaries,”
- [62] “Llama 3.2: Revolutionizing edge AI and vision with open, customizable models.” <https://ai.meta.com/blog/llama-3-2-connect-2024-vision-edge-mobile-devices/>.
- [63] C. Chen, X. Feng, J. Zhou, J. Yin, and X. Zheng, “Federated Large Language Model: A Position Paper,” July 2023.
- [64] A. Z. Tan, H. Yu, L. Cui, and Q. Yang, “Towards Personalized Federated Learning,” *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 34, pp. 9587–9603, Dec. 2023.
- [65] A. Paszke, S. Gross, F. Massa, A. Lerer, J. Bradbury, G. Chanan, T. Killeen, Z. Lin, N. Gimelshein, L. Antiga, A. Desmaison, A. Köpf, E. Yang, Z. DeVito, M. Raison, A. Tejani, S. Chilamkurthy, B. Steiner, L. Fang, J. Bai, and S. Chintala, “PyTorch: An Imperative Style, High-Performance Deep Learning Library,” Dec. 2019.
- [66] T. Wolf, L. Debut, V. Sanh, J. Chaumond, C. Delangue, A. Moi, P. Cistac, T. Rault, R. Louf, M. Funtowicz, J. Davison, S. Shleifer, P. von Platen, C. Ma, Y. Jernite, J. Plu, C. Xu, T. L. Scao, S. Gugger, M. Drame, Q. Lhoest, and A. M. Rush, “HuggingFace’s Transformers: State-of-the-art Natural Language Processing,” July 2020.
- [67] S. Mangrulkar, S. Gugger, L. Debut, Y. Belkada, S. Paul, and B. Bossan, “PEFT: State-of-the-art parameter-efficient fine-tuning methods,” 2022.
- [68] Q. Lhoest, A. Villanova del Moral, Y. Jernite, A. Thakur, P. von Platen, S. Patil, J. Chaumond, M. Drame, J. Plu, L. Tunstall, J. Davison, M. Šaško, G. Chhablani, B. Malik, S. Brandeis, T. Le Scao, V. Sanh, C. Xu, N. Patry, A. McMillan-Major, P. Schmid, S. Gugger, C. Delangue, T. Matussière, L. Debut, S. Bekman, P. Cistac, T. Goehringer, V. Mustar, F. Lagunas, A. Rush, and T. Wolf, “Datasets: a community library for natural language processing,” in *Proceedings of the 2021 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing: System demonstrations*, (Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic), pp. 175–184, Association for Computational Linguistics, Nov. 2021.
- [69] J. Rapin and O. Teytaud, “Nevergrad - a gradient-free optimization platform,” 2018.
- [70] S. Bolusani, M. Besançon, K. Bestuzheva, A. Chmiela, J. Dionísio, T. Donkiewicz, J. van Doornmalen, L. Eifler, M. Ghannam, A. Gleixner, C. Graczyk, K. Halbig, I. Hedtke, A. Hoen, C. Hojny, R. van der Hulst, D. Kamp, T. Koch, K. Kofler, J. Lentz, J. Manns, G. Mexi, Erik Mühmer, M. E. Pfetsch, F. Schlösser, F. Serrano, Y. Shinano, S. Turner, S. Vigerske, D. Weninger, and L. Xu, “The SCIP optimization suite 9.0,” Technical Report, Optimization Online, Feb. 2024.
- [71] R. Taori, I. Gulrajani, T. Zhang, Y. Dubois, X. Li, C. Guestrin, P. Liang, and T. B. Hashimoto, “Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following LLaMA model,” 2023.