

Forgetting Any Data at Any Time: A Theoretically Certified Unlearning Framework for Vertical Federated Learning

Linian Wang

*Key Lab of High Confidence Software Technologies (Peking University),
Ministry of Education & School of Computer Science, Peking University*

Leye Wang

*Key Lab of High Confidence Software Technologies (Peking University),
Ministry of Education & School of Computer Science, Peking University*

Abstract

Privacy concerns in machine learning are heightened by regulations such as the GDPR, which enforces the “right to be forgotten” (RTBF), driving the emergence of *machine unlearning* as a critical research field. Vertical Federated Learning (VFL) enables collaborative model training by aggregating a sample’s features across distributed parties while preserving data privacy at each source. This paradigm has seen widespread adoption in healthcare, finance, and other privacy-sensitive domains. However, existing VFL systems lack robust mechanisms to comply with RTBF requirements, as unlearning methodologies for VFL remain underexplored. In this work, we introduce the first VFL framework with *theoretically guaranteed unlearning capabilities*, enabling the removal of *any data at any time*. Unlike prior approaches—which impose restrictive assumptions on model architectures or data types for removal—our solution is *model- and data-agnostic*, offering universal compatibility. Moreover, our framework supports *asynchronous unlearning*, eliminating the need for all parties to be simultaneously online during the forgetting process. These advancements address critical gaps in current VFL systems, ensuring compliance with RTBF while maintaining operational flexibility. We make all our implementations publicly available at <https://github.com/wangln19/vertical-federated-unlearning>.

1 Introduction

When personal data is used to train machine learning models, privacy protection can be considered from two key perspectives: first, ensuring that data does not leave the local domain during the training process to minimize the risk of data leakage [20]; second, providing users with the ability to revoke their consent and delete their personal data after the model has been trained [22]. To address the issue of data isolation and privacy risks during the training process, FL has emerged as a promising solution. In addition, regulations like the GDPR have proposed the “right to be forgotten” (RTBF), which necessitates the removal of personal data from trained models.

This need has given rise to the concept of *machine unlearning* [3].

Federated Unlearning (FU) combines these two orthogonal challenges, offering comprehensive privacy protection. FL can be categorized into two main types: Horizontal Federated Learning (HFL), where participants share the same features but have different samples, and Vertical Federated Learning (VFL), where participants share the same samples but have different features. VFL has found widespread application in cross-silo scenarios, such as those in banking and healthcare. However, Vertical Federated Unlearning (VFU) is still under-investigated. In real-world scenarios, unlearning requests are frequently generated, with diverse objectives, such as client, feature, or sensitive information removal [22, 27]. Current VFU methods only address specific data removal types (e.g., client [8, 26] or feature [17] unlearning) and are often tailored to particular VFL models (e.g., logistic regression [8] or gradient boosting trees [17]). This underscores the critical need for a unified VFU framework capable of handling multiple data removal scenarios and models.

Another challenge in VFU lies in its computational and communication overheads. In VFL systems, each client maintains a sub-model trained on its local feature data. However, unlearning data from one party triggers cascading impacts across all parties’ sub-models. Existing VFU methods address this by enforcing *synchronous unlearning* [11]: upon an unlearning request, all clients must coordinate in real-time to update their sub-models. Such reliance on synchronization is operationally impractical—network instability, client downtime, or resource constraints frequently disrupt client participation, thus breaking the unlearning process.

In this paper, we propose a novel VFL framework with robust VFU capabilities of **forgetting any data at any time**. This framework is capable of handling diverse unlearning objectives in a unified manner and supports asynchronous unlearning method to alleviate the burden on clients. Built on the widely adopted aggregate VFL (AggVFL) systems [9, 19, 31], our framework unifies different unlearning targets from the perspective of confidence scores: the local models of clients




Figure 1: What Asynchronous Unlearning Is. When Client 2 propose a feature removal request, only Client 1, 2 and K are online to unlearn.

in VFL (regardless of simple linear regression or complex deep neural networks) are treated as feature extractors, each generating class-specific confidence scores for the same sample based on different local features. The global model of the active party (the client who owns training labels [19]) aggregates these outputs to maintain a matrix representing the training set, which then produces final predictions.

First, we convert VFU tasks for different objectives (client, feature, etc.) into the closed-form updates for the confidence matrix. The confidence matrix provides fine-grained information for unlearning without introducing extra privacy leakage risk compared to traditional VFL training processes [15, 29]. Second, we propose to leverage the confidence matrix for backpropagation, thus enabling both model training and unlearning in a unified manner within our framework (Sec. 3.2). For learning models with strongly convex [4] loss functions (e.g., *mean squared error* and *logistic loss with L2 regularization*), we prove that our method offers certified unlearning with theoretical guarantees (Sec. 3.4).

To address the issue of excessive burdens placed on clients during unlearning, we also introduce an asynchronous unlearning method (Sec. 3.3). In VFU, the client initiating the unlearning request demands prompt removal of data influences from all clients’ sub-models, while the remaining clients require minimizing their unlearning burden and cannot be expected to keep staying online. Therefore, the forgetting times for different clients may vary, something traditional synchronous unlearning methods do not account for [8, 26]. Our asynchronous unlearning approach allows only a subset of clients to participate in each unlearning epoch, significantly improving the unlearning practicality. As shown in Figure 1, when a client initiates an unlearning request, only the requesting client and the active party need to be online to process the request. Other clients may choose to participate in immediate unlearning or defer the process until later (e.g., until they submit their own unlearning requests). Our experimental results demonstrate that asynchronous unlearning reduces computational and communication overhead while preserving model performance close to that of synchronous unlearning.

This paper makes the following key contributions:

1. **A Unified Framework for Multiple VFU Targets with Theoretical Guarantees:** We present the first framework that supports diverse unlearning requests, including client, feature, sensitive information removal, etc., offering a flexible and scalable solution to address the RTBF requests in data regulation laws. For models with strongly convex losses, our method offers certified unlearning with theoretical guarantees.

2. **An Asynchronous VFU Method:** We propose the first asynchronous VFU system, designed to efficiently balance frequent unlearning requests from diverse clients while significantly lowering computational and communication overhead.

3. **Extensive Experimental Validation:** Our extensive experimental results validate the effectiveness and applicability of the proposed VFU framework, demonstrating its practical viability in real-world scenarios.

2 Related Work

Vertical Federated Learning (VFL) is a distributed machine learning paradigm that enables collaboration between multiple parties without sharing sensitive data. In general, there are two types of VFL, i.e., Aggregate VFL (AggVFL) and Split VFL (SplitVFL) [19]. AggVFL employs a non-trainable global module (e.g., Sigmoid activation) to aggregate intermediate results through secure computation. Representative work on AggVFL includes SecureBoost [7] for federated gradient boosting trees and SFTL [18] for cryptographic defense. On the other hand, SplitVFL utilizes trainable global modules aligned with vertical split neural networks [14]. This type of VFL has been studied in various works, including privacy-preserving split learning [25] and communication-efficient CELU-VFL [10]. In this work, we focus on AggVFL due to its superior compatibility with applications requiring strict data isolation.

Theoretically-Guaranteed Machine Unlearning

Machine unlearning has attracted considerable attention in recent years. However, most existing research on machine unlearning lacks theoretical guarantees about its efficacy. There are currently two main approaches that provide formal guarantees of complete forgetting. The first approach, exemplified by SISA [3], focuses on exact unlearning. These methods [6, 28] partition both the model and the training set, performing retraining only on the sub-model relevant to the unlearning request, thereby ensuring complete unlearning. The second approach draws from differential privacy concepts [5] and proves that the model post-unlearning is statistically indistinguishable from a retrained model, demonstrating the effect of approximate unlearning, also called *certified unlearning* [13, 21, 27].

While the first approach offers exact unlearning, it is inefficient in scenarios where unlearning requests are scattered

Table 1: Vertical Federated Unlearning Research Summary

Paper	Unlearning Target	Asynchronous	Certified	Model-Agnostic
[8]	Client			
[17]	Feature&Sample			
[26]	Client			✓
[12]	Label			✓
Our Work	Multiple	✓	✓	✓

in many sub-models [27]. Hence, our proposed framework aligns with the second approach, achieving certified approximate unlearning while ensuring efficiency.

Federated Unlearning

Federated unlearning (FU) can be categorized based on the type of unlearning target [22], including client removal, feature removal, and sample removal, among others. Most existing unlearning methods address specific unlearning requests and are not easily interoperable [32]. However, in real-world applications, the targets for forgetting vary widely. This calls for a unified approach that can handle multiple forgetting requests simultaneously.

Existing research on FU primarily focuses on Horizontal FU (HFU), with few papers addressing Vertical FU (VFU). Deng *et al* [8] first introduce a VFU method for Logistic Regression (LR) models and client removal. Zhang *et al* [17] propose VFU approach for Gradient Boosted Decision Trees, which can unlearn samples by recalculating split points, or unlearn features by changing the splitting feature. Wang *et al* [26] introduce a model-agnostic VFU method that accelerates retraining, but it only addresses client removal. Gu *et al* [12] propose a VFU method to forget labels through gradient ascent techniques.

Recent research on FU has acknowledged the significance of asynchronous unlearning, but all on HFU tasks. Su *et al* [24] divide the HFL system into multiple small modules based on slicing, enabling asynchronous forgetting across different modules. This method assumes unlearning requests arrive during the system training phase. Gu *et al* [11] assume that all clients possess identical models, so that after a client performs a unlearning operation, the updated model can be broadcast to all clients, thus achieving global unlearning.

VFU presents unique challenges in asynchronous unlearning. In VFU, each client holds only a partial model, and forgetting operations require global coordination among clients. This introduces distinct difficulties for asynchronous forgetting, as the model segments are distributed across clients.

Table 1 provides a comparative summary of our approach and existing VFU methods, emphasizing the distinct contributions of our research.

3 Method

3.1 Basic Idea

Our approach is based on the following idea: in linear models $y = ax_1 + bx_2 + c$, forgetting x_1 corresponds to subtracting the corresponding term ax_1 from y and then fine-tuning the model to remove x_1 's influence on the parameters b and c .

For more complex models in VFL, we can apply this idea at the output layer. In a classification problem, we maintain a confidence matrix in the active party of the VFL, where each row represents a sample and each column represents the confidence for a particular class. Upon receiving a forgetting request, we subtract the corresponding confidence value from the matrix, eliminating the forgotten target's influence on the output. We then fine-tune the model using the updated output to remove the forgotten target's effect on the model parameters.

For instance, in binary classification, the confidence vector associated with a sample is two-dimensional, where each element corresponds to one of the two classes. Consider two clients, i and j , where Client i has a classification confidence vector of $[-1, 1]$ and Client j has a confidence vector of $[0, 3]$ for a specific sample. During aggregation, the global model combines these vectors, producing a summed confidence vector $[-1, 4]$, which is stored in a row of the confidence matrix. To remove Client i 's contribution on this sample, its confidence vector $[-1, 1]$ is subtracted from the corresponding row of the matrix. The updated confidence matrix is then used to compute the gradient with respect to the label. By updating Client j 's parameters using this revised matrix, the influence of Client i on Client j 's parameters is effectively removed.

3.2 Compatibility with Diverse Requests

We want to design a VFL system that supports diverse unlearning requests (e.g., client removal, feature removal) while ensuring data remains within the local domain. This requires a mechanism to communicate forgotten information to each client in a granular yet privacy-preserving manner.

We leverage the confidence matrix as a unified representation for unlearning. When an unlearning request is made, the requesting client calculates the difference in confidence vectors before and after unlearning and sends this difference to the active party. The active party updates the confidence matrix to reflect the removal of the forgotten data. For Granularity, any data change (e.g., client removal, feature removal) can be represented as an update to the confidence matrix. For Privacy, this unlearning process transmits the same information as the training process in VFL, ensuring no additional privacy leakage.

Additionally, our framework makes a slight adjustment to the backpropagation steps, so the system starts the update process from the stored confidence matrix. This ensures that

after the confidence matrix is updated due to unlearning, neural network training can proceed normally, avoiding reliance on raw data in the VFL system. The unlearning process is as follows, as illustrated in Figure 2:

1. The requesting client computes the confidence difference vector and sends it to the active party.
2. The active party updates the confidence matrix and computes gradients based on the updated matrix and labels.
3. Gradients are sent to the clients, who update their model parameters and compute new confidence differences.
4. The active party aggregates all confidence differences and updates the confidence matrix for the next round.

We use the widely-adopted AggVFL structure, the advantages of the AggVFL structure include:

1. **Privacy protection:** The local model outputs (e.g., class confidence) are high-level features distinct from raw data, ensuring data remains within the domain. Aggregation process can be further enhanced using existing privacy-preserving techniques like obfuscating individual contributions.
2. **Mathematical rigor:** The summation-based aggregation of confidence outputs ensures that the derivatives of the loss with respect to the global confidence matrix and each client’s output are mathematically equivalent. This property is crucial for proving certified unlearning guarantees.

3.3 Achieving Asynchronous Unlearning

3.3.1 Asynchronous Unlearning Setting

In VFU, two key time constraints must be considered:

1. **VFL Inference Phase:** During inference, the VFL system relies on data and computations from all clients. Thus, all clients must be online, and any unlearning requests must be completed prior to inference.
2. **Unlearning Deadline:** Unlearning requests are associated with a deadline, requiring all related tasks to be completed within the specified timeframe.¹

Our asynchronous unlearning framework operates within a defined time window between two consecutive inference phases. Unlike synchronous approaches, not all clients need to remain online. When an unlearning request is initiated, only the requesting client and the active party must be online. The requesting client stores the data to be forgotten, making

¹While GDPR and CCPA grant users the right to delete personal data, they do not mandate a specific timeframe for completing unlearning or mitigating its impact on models.

it particularly sensitive to unlearning speed. This client can perform unlearning immediately, ensuring compliance with privacy regulations without requiring other clients to stay online. Other clients can defer their unlearning processes, reducing their operational burden.

The asynchronous setup introduces two main challenges:

1. **Quantifying Client Impact:** Accurately measuring how each client’s model update contributes to the global model update.
2. **Compensating for Offline Clients:** Addressing the absence of offline clients during unlearning by leveraging updates from online clients and stored information, ensuring no additional privacy leakage.

The first challenge is effectively addressed by our confidence-based framework. During each update, the impact of each client’s update is directly reflected in the change in its output confidence, which then influences the global model’s output, and subsequently the gradient for the next update. The second challenge is how to calculate the change in confidence output resulting from model parameter updates for offline clients. We solve this by introducing the stability of the *update contribution factor* in the operation of a VFL system.

3.3.2 The Stability of The Update Contribution Factor

Each passive party computes the confidence score h_i of its local model. The active party aggregates these scores, computing $H = \sum h_i$, and feeds H into the global model G to produce the final output $p = G(H)$.

During backpropagation, as client parameters θ_i are updated, their confidence scores $h_i = f_i(\theta_i, X_i)$ also change. Let $\delta(h_i)$ denote the change in h_i . The global model’s input change $\delta(H)$ is a linear combination of these individual changes: $\delta(H) = \sum \delta(h_i)$, which in turn affects the global output p .

The linear relationship $\delta(H) = \sum \delta(h_i)$ provides insight into each client’s contribution to the global model update. The ratio $R_i = \frac{\delta(h_i)}{\delta(H)}$, noted as termed the *update contribution factor*, quantifies client i ’s influence on the model’s change during updates. Notably, in VFL systems using logistic regression, these factors remain stable across training epochs.

To illustrate, consider two clients, i and j , with features i_1 to i_4 and j_1 to j_5 , respectively. Their confidence scores are computed as:

$$h_i = f_i(\theta_i, x_{i1}, x_{i2}, x_{i3}, x_{i4})$$

$$h_j = f_j(\theta_j, x_{j1}, x_{j2}, x_{j3}, x_{j4}, x_{j5}).$$

Since the training set remains fixed, the representations output by each client depend solely on their parameters. We




Figure 2: Structure and the Unlearning Process of Our Method.

approximate changes in these representations using a first-order Taylor expansion. This approximation is justified in unlearning scenarios, where training set changes are minimal, and parameter updates before and after unlearning are not significantly different.

$$\begin{aligned}\delta(h_i) &= \delta(\theta_{i1}) \frac{\partial h_i}{\partial \theta_{i1}} + \delta(\theta_{i2}) \frac{\partial h_i}{\partial \theta_{i2}} + \delta(\theta_{i3}) \frac{\partial h_i}{\partial \theta_{i3}} + \delta(\theta_{i4}) \frac{\partial h_i}{\partial \theta_{i4}} \\ \delta(h_j) &= \delta(\theta_{j1}) \frac{\partial h_j}{\partial \theta_{j1}} + \dots + \delta(\theta_{j5}) \frac{\partial h_j}{\partial \theta_{j5}}\end{aligned}$$

Subsequently, the change in the parameters can be directly derived from the backpropagation update rule, denoted that η is the learning rate. By substituting these changes into the update rule, we observe that the ratio of the changes in the representations of client i and client j depends solely on the training data in the regression models. Since the training data remains unchanged between epochs, this ratio remains stable over time.

$$\begin{aligned}\delta(\theta_{i1}) &= -\eta \frac{\partial L}{\partial \theta_{i1}} = -\eta \frac{\partial L}{\partial H} \frac{\partial H}{\partial h_i} \frac{\partial h_i}{\partial \theta_{i1}} \\ \delta(h_i) &= -\left[\left(\frac{\partial h_i}{\partial \theta_{i1}}\right)^2 + \dots + \left(\frac{\partial h_i}{\partial \theta_{i4}}\right)^2\right] \eta \frac{\partial L}{\partial H} \frac{\partial H}{\partial h_i} \\ &= -[x_{i1}^2 + \dots + x_{i4}^2] \eta \frac{\partial L}{\partial H} \\ \delta(h_j) &= -\left[\left(\frac{\partial h_j}{\partial \theta_{j1}}\right)^2 + \dots + \left(\frac{\partial h_j}{\partial \theta_{j5}}\right)^2\right] \eta \frac{\partial L}{\partial H} \frac{\partial H}{\partial h_j} \\ &= -[x_{j1}^2 + \dots + x_{j5}^2] \eta \frac{\partial L}{\partial H} \\ \frac{\delta(h_i)}{\delta(h_j)} &= \frac{[x_{i1}^2 + \dots + x_{i4}^2]}{[x_{j1}^2 + \dots + x_{j5}^2]} \\ R_i &= \frac{\delta(h_i)}{\delta(H)} = \frac{[x_{i1}^2 + \dots + x_{i4}^2]}{[x_{i1}^2 + \dots + x_{i4}^2] + [x_{j1}^2 + \dots + x_{j5}^2]}\end{aligned}$$

From the above derivation, it is clear that for a Multilayer Perceptron (MLP), the contribution coefficients of different clients to the update of z may vary across epochs. However, under the unlearning setting, if the MLP has a limited number

of layers, this variation is negligible. We provide a proof of this observation in Appendix A.

Since the *update contribution factor* remains stable, we can leverage the confidence updates from online clients to estimate those of the offline client K . For the global model update, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\delta(h_K) &= \frac{R_K}{\sum_{i \in \{online\}} R_i} \sum_{i \in \{online\}} \delta(h_i) \\ \delta(H) &= \frac{1}{\sum_{i \in \{online\}} R_i} \sum_{i \in \{online\}} \delta(h_i)\end{aligned}$$

The *update contribution factor* must be computed and stored by the active party prior to receiving unlearning requests. This can be readily accomplished at the conclusion of the VFL system's training phase.

3.4 Achieving Certified Unlearning

3.4.1 Definition

Consider a learning algorithm \mathcal{A} that, when trained on a dataset D , generates a model $\theta \in \Theta$. An unlearning method \mathcal{U} that transforms a model θ into a corrected version $\theta_{\mathcal{U}} = \mathcal{U}(\theta, D, D')$. D' contains the perturbations \tilde{Z} needed for unlearning, while the corresponding original data is Z . The concept of ϵ -certified unlearning means that it is hard to distinguish models after unlearned \mathcal{U} from the set of possible retrained models $\mathcal{A}(D')$ [13, 27].

Definition 1. Given some $\epsilon > 0$ and a learning algorithm \mathcal{A} , an unlearning method \mathcal{U} is ϵ -certified if

$$e^{-\epsilon} \leq \frac{P(\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{A}(D), D, D') \in \mathcal{T})}{P(\mathcal{A}(D') \in \mathcal{T})} \leq e^{\epsilon}$$

holds for all $\mathcal{T} \subset \Theta, D$, and D' .

The (ϵ, δ) -certified unlearning is similarly defined.

Definition 2. Under the assumptions of [Definition 1](#), an unlearning method \mathcal{U} is (ϵ, δ) -certified if

$$P\left(\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{A}(D), D, D') \in \mathcal{T}\right) \leq e^\epsilon P(\mathcal{A}(D') \in \mathcal{T}) + \delta$$

and

$$P(\mathcal{A}(D') \in \mathcal{T}) \leq e^\epsilon P\left(\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{A}(D), D, D') \in \mathcal{T}\right) + \delta$$

hold for all $\mathcal{T} \subset \Theta, D, \text{ and } D'$.

3.4.2 Design for Certified Unlearning

To achieve rigorously defined certified unlearning, our method incorporates two critical components:

- Noise Injection during Training:** We add Gaussian noise $b \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)$ to the gradients during model training and unlearning, ensuring bounded parameter sensitivity.
- First-Round Gradient Ascent:** During the initial unlearning update, we simultaneously perform:

$$\theta_{\text{unlearn}} = \theta^* - \tau \left(\underbrace{\nabla L(\theta^*; D')}_{\text{descent on new data}} - \underbrace{\nabla L(\theta^*; D)}_{\text{ascent on old data}} \right)$$

Theorem 1 (Certified Unlearning Guarantee). Assume the loss $\ell(\theta; z)$ is convex, γ -smooth with L_2 regularization $\frac{\lambda}{2} \|\theta\|_2^2$. For any data modification (Z, \tilde{Z}) , our method achieves (ϵ, δ) -certified unlearning with $\delta = 1.5e^{-c^2/2}$ when:

- Training noise $p \sim \mathcal{N}(0, c(1 + \tau\gamma_z n)\gamma_z M|Z|/\epsilon)^d$ for some $c > 0$
- Assume that $\|x_i\|_2 \leq 1$ for all data points and the gradient $\nabla \ell(z, \theta)$ is γ_z -Lipschitz. Further let \tilde{Z} change the features $j, \dots, j+F$ by magnitudes at most m_j, \dots, m_{j+F} , and $M = \sum_{j=1}^F m_j$

Proof Sketch. The certification follows three key arguments:

1. Gradient residual bound using Lipschitz continuity and our update rule
2. Relating the gradient residual to the sensitivity of perturbation vector b using the L_2 -regularized strong convexity.
3. Applying Gaussian noise over models to yield (ϵ, δ) -guarantees.

Full proof appears in [Appendix 5](#). □




Figure 3: Suppose the whole matrix is the data from one client. In *client removal*, the whole matrix is removed. In *feature removal*, the feature to be removed is marked with blue. In *sensitive information removal*, the sensitive information to be removed is marked with red.

4 Evaluation

While our method addresses asynchronous unlearning—a capability absent in existing approaches—our evaluation is structured in two stages. Specifically, we aim to verify:

Synchronous Unlearning. Our method performs comparably, or even better, than existing unlearning methods [8, 26] when all clients are online.

Asynchronous Unlearning. During asynchronous unlearning, our method maintains comparable performance to synchronous unlearning.

4.1 Experimental Setup

Unlearning Scenarios

There are three common unlearning scenarios in VFL:

1. **Client Removal:** A client exits the VFL system, and its data’s influence must be completely removed. This is equivalent to retraining the model by setting all data from the client to zero [27].

2. **Feature Removal:** A certain feature (or feature set) from a client, which involves sensitive user information, is no longer available due to policy changes or other reasons. The influence of this feature must be removed from the system. This is equivalent to retraining the model with the feature set to zero [27].

3. **Sensitive Information Removal:** A feature from a client may be sensitive to a subset of users, prompting requests for removal (e.g., some users modify the visibility of the age field from ‘public’ to ‘private’). This can be achieved by retraining the model where the sensitive information is replaced by the mean value of that feature across all samples [27].

The relationships between these three scenarios are illustrated in [Figure 3](#). As sensitive information may pertain to a single feature of a single sample (the smallest data unit), our method can easily extend to tasks such as *sample removal* (forgetting all data from a single sample) and *class removal* (forgetting all samples of a particular class).

Performance Measures

Following [26], we conduct evaluation from two aspects, *fidelity* and *efficiency*:

Fidelity assesses whether unlearning affects the utility of the model. The performance of the unlearned model should remain close to that of the original model, and the unlearning process should not significantly impact the model’s practical utility. The metrics include *Accuracy* and *AUC* of the unlearned model on the test set.

Efficiency concerns the time taken for unlearning compared to retraining. The unlearning process should be as fast as possible. We compute efficiency using the total number of epochs and communication cost.

Baselines

We compare our method with three existing unlearning approaches.

VFULR [8]: VFULR addresses the client removal problem in the VFL logistic regression system. The method directly subtracts the contributions of the client to be forgotten from the sum of linear terms, followed by a single update.

VFUFR [26]: VFUFR addresses the client removal issue in general VFL systems, not limited to logistic regression. The method stores the original bottom model in each client to accelerate the retraining process, and it uses an enhanced optimizer for further speedup.

Retrain: This method retrains the model from scratch on the new training dataset after data removal. It generally yields the best performance and serves as an upper bound for unlearning methods, though it is computationally expensive [22].

Notably, VFULR and VFUFR are designed for VFL client-removal tasks on synchronous unlearning; we thus limit our comparison with these two baselines on this scenario.

4.2 Synchronous Client Removal

In existing VFL literature, client removal is a commonly studied unlearning scenario. In this context, we address the first key question: whether our method performs comparably to or even better than existing unlearning approaches when all clients are online (i.e., *synchronous unlearning*).

To validate this, we select five datasets: *Adult Income* [2], *Credit* [30], *Diabetes* [16], *Nursery* [23], and *Malware* [1]. Among these, *Adult Income*, *Credit*, *Diabetes* and *Nursery* are tabular datasets, while *Malware* is a text-based dataset. For the text dataset, we extract bag-of-words features [33]. We split 80% of the data for training and reserve 20% for testing. Table 2 overviews the datasets and their vertical federated setting. Without loss of generality, we set one client for removal; the number of features in the removed client is in Table 2.

For each dataset, we conduct experiments using both the LR and MLP models, resulting in a total of $6 \times 2 = 12$ experimental

Table 2: Datasets for unlearning.

	Adult Income	Credit	Diabetes	Nursery	Malware
#Samples	48842	30000	768	10950	49226
#Features	108	23	8	19	2081
#Clients	16	4	4	4	16
#Feat. in Removed Client	27	6	2	7	520

setups. Since VFULR is designed only for the LR model, there is no VFULR results in the MLP model experiments.

Fidelity: Table 3 and 4 show the fidelity results for both LR and MLP model unlearning. Higher accuracy and AUC indicate better performance. As expected, Retrain performs the best in most cases, while it generally needs much more epochs to converge (we will show in the efficiency results). Our method performs similarly to VFUFR and outperforms VFULR. In datasets with a higher number of features, the performance difference between retraining and various unlearning methods is not significant. In contrast, in datasets like Diabetes, which have fewer features, client removal results in a noticeable drop in model performance. This may be due to the fact that, in datasets with many features, the clients removed during unlearning likely do not contain high-information features.

Efficiency: Table 5 and 6 show the efficiency results. We measure training time in terms of epochs. VFULR performs only one update, thus being the most efficient; but its fidelity is not satisfactory as aforementioned. Other methods can perform multiple updates. We employed an early stopping mechanism, limiting retraining to a maximum of 400 epochs and other methods to a maximum of 50 epochs, since the retraining method typically requires more epochs to converge (the hyper-parameter choice will be discussed in Section 4.5). The results show that the retraining method typically requires hundreds of epochs, significantly higher than other methods. Our method has a similar training efficiency as VFUFR. We also evaluate communication cost per epoch. All the methods transfer similar data amount in each epoch.

In summary, for synchronous VFL unlearning in client-removal scenarios, our method achieves performance comparable to the state-of-the-art VFUFR framework. Meanwhile, our approach surpasses VFUFR by offering unique advantages: greater flexibility in handling diverse unlearning scenarios (e.g., feature or sensitive data removal), the ability to perform asynchronous unlearning when not all clients are online, and theoretically grounded certified unlearning guarantees. These additional capabilities will be evaluated subsequently.

4.3 Sync. & Async. Feature Removal

Since VFULR and VFUFR do not support the feature removal scenario, our analysis is exclusively benchmarked against Retrain. We further evaluate our method on both synchronous and asynchronous settings, demonstrating comparable per-

Table 3: Fidelity of VFL Client Removal for LR models on Synchronous Unlearning.

Metric	Adult Income		Credit		Diabetes		Nursery		Malware		Average	
	Accuracy	AUC	Accuracy	AUC	Accuracy	AUC	Accuracy	AUC	Accuracy	AUC	Accuracy	AUC
VFULR	0.832	0.886	0.779	0.689	0.630	0.652	0.737	0.908	0.975	0.933	0.791	0.814
VFUFR	0.847	0.896	0.781	0.688	0.695	0.747	0.728	0.906	0.979	0.947	<u>0.806</u>	<u>0.837</u>
Ours	0.846	0.896	0.781	0.688	0.695	0.740	0.730	0.906	0.979	0.948	<u>0.806</u>	0.836
Retrain	0.853	0.905	0.797	0.686	0.695	0.782	0.731	0.906	0.979	0.954	0.811	0.847

Table 4: Fidelity of VFL Client Removal for MLP models on Synchronous Unlearning.

Metric	Adult Income		Credit		Diabetes		Nursery		Malware		Average	
	Accuracy	AUC	Accuracy	AUC	Accuracy	AUC	Accuracy	AUC	Accuracy	AUC	Accuracy	AUC
VFUFR	0.859	0.912	0.776	0.743	0.623	0.709	0.735	0.910	0.983	0.957	0.795	<u>0.846</u>
Ours	0.859	0.911	0.778	0.742	0.636	0.704	0.737	0.910	0.982	0.956	<u>0.798</u>	0.845
Retrain	0.859	0.912	0.805	0.751	0.740	0.818	0.749	0.911	0.984	0.958	0.827	0.870

formance between the two settings. For the asynchronous unlearning setting, we suppose that a random 25% of clients will drop out in each epoch. Due to the page limitation, we show experiment results on two datasets: *Adult Income* and *Malware*. The experimental setup is similar to that of the client removal scenario, except that in this case, we unlearn a portion of the features from the clients rather than unlearning entire clients. The results are presented in Figure 4.

Fidelity: The first row of Figure 4 shows the test accuracy metric. The performance of our method is very similar to retraining, with the test accuracy decreasing only slightly as the proportion of features removed increases, which we have already analyzed in the client removal scenario. Specifically, there is no significant difference between the accuracy of our method on synchronous or asynchronous unlearning, verifying the effectiveness on the asynchronous setting. The AUC results are similar and not shown due to the page limitation.

Efficiency: The second and third rows of Figure 4 display the epoch number and communication cost per epoch. From the figure, it is evident that the change in the proportion of feature removal has minimal effect on the efficiency metrics. In terms of the number of training epochs, the retraining method requires several times more epochs than our methods. It is noteworthy that our method on asynchronous unlearning incurs approximately 25% less communication cost than synchronous unlearning per epoch, as fewer clients are online, reducing the communication burden. The proportion of reduction in communication cost is directly related to the proportion of clients that are offline.

4.4 Sync. & Async. Sensitive Info. Removal

Sensitive information removal represents a more fine-grained refinement of the feature removal scenario, where only spe-

cific features from certain samples within a client are removed. We select two datasets, *Credit* and *Diabetes*, for experimentation due to their inclusion of sensitive attributes that users might prefer to keep private. Specifically, *Credit* contains the ‘age’ feature, while *Diabetes* includes the ‘number of pregnancies’ feature. These attributes may be regarded as sensitive by some users, prompting our focus on unlearning such data points. The results are presented in Figure 5.

Fidelity: The first row in the figure presents the test accuracy metric. As the proportion of sensitive information removal increases, the test accuracy generally decreases. This decrease is more pronounced in *Diabetes* which includes only 8 features in total, and the retrained model curve is slightly higher than that of our method, indicating some performance gap. This observation is also consistent with previous results in Sec. that datasets with s

Efficiency: The third and fourth rows in the figure show the number of epochs and the communication cost per epoch. For the training epochs, although there are some fluctuations in the results, the retrained method requires several times more epochs than the unlearning methods. In the communication cost per epoch for the *Diabetes* dataset, when the sensitive information removal rate is close to 0.2, the communication cost per epoch of the asynchronous method is actually higher than that of the synchronous method. This occurs because the asynchronous method converges after approximately 20 epochs, and the additional communication overhead for evaluation is divided by a smaller denominator, resulting in a relatively large impact.

4.5 Unlearning Epoch Number Choice

Our method performs unlearning through multiple training rounds. This raises the question: how many rounds of un-

Table 5: Efficiency of VFL Client Removal for LR models on Synchronous Unlearning.

Metric	Adult Income		Credit		Diabetes		Nursery		Malware	
	#Epoch	Comm./Epoch	#Epoch	Comm./Epoch	#Epoch	Comm./Epoch	#Epoch	Comm./Epoch	#Epoch	Comm./Epoch
VFULR	1	4.17	1	0.732	1	0.0187	1	0.791	1	4.81
VFUFR	50	3.91	50	0.553	50	0.0141	50	0.597	50	4.51
Ours	50	3.99	50	0.576	50	0.0144	50	0.609	50	4.60
Retrain	180	3.91	400	0.553	129	0.0141	400	0.597	209	4.51

Table 6: Efficiency of VFL Client Removal for MLP models on Synchronous Unlearning.

Metric	Adult Income		Credit		Diabetes		Nursery		Malware	
	#Epoch	Comm./Epoch	#Epoch	Comm./Epoch	#Epoch	Comm./Epoch	#Epoch	Comm./Epoch	#Epoch	Comm./Epoch
VFUFR	50	3.91	50	0.553	50	0.0141	50	0.597	50	4.51
Ours	50	3.99	50	0.564	50	0.0144	50	0.609	50	4.60
Retrain	400	3.91	236	0.553	400	0.0141	168	0.597	225	4.51

learning are required? Typically, in model training, an early stopping mechanism is used to prevent overfitting and determine the number of training epochs. In a VFL system, the test set data is generally not accessible during unlearning. Therefore, we use the training loss as the criterion for early stopping. While the training loss typically decreases during regular training, our asynchronous method approximates updates for clients that are offline. Thus, using the training loss for early stopping is still reasonable.

On the other hand, if too many rounds of unlearning are performed, the efficiency advantage over retraining is lost. Therefore, we cannot allow an excessive number of rounds. We need to determine a maximum number of rounds that is fewer than the retraining epochs, but still ensures sufficient training. We demonstrate this using the MLP model on the Malware dataset in a client removal experiment. When all clients are online, unlearning could potentially require hundreds of epochs. By recording the training loss, training accuracy, and gradient residual during the training process, we observe that the loss, accuracy, and gradient residual decrease quickly in the early stages of training and stabilize in the later stages, as shown in Figure 6. Therefore, we select 50 epochs as the maximum number of rounds for unlearning. In the figure, we also plot the retraining curve for comparison, and it is evident that unlearning is more efficient than retraining.

4.6 Asynchronous Unlearning Online Rate

Our asynchronous unlearning method enables updates even when a subset of clients is offline. A critical question is how the proportion of online clients affects performance. To address this, we evaluate client removal using the LR model on the Adult Income dataset. The dataset contains 108 features distributed among 16 clients: the target client (Client 0) holds

Table 7: The number of online clients has little impact on the effectiveness of unlearning.

Online Client Number	Test Accuracy	Test AUC
3	0.813	0.892
4	0.817	0.893
6	0.828	0.894
9	0.841	0.895
12	0.847	0.896
16	0.846	0.896

27 features, while the remaining 15 clients each possess 5 or 6 features. In our setup, the active party (Client 15) and the requesting client (Client 0) are always online, with the system supporting up to 16 concurrent clients.

We measure the fidelity of the unlearned model using test accuracy and AUC. In Table 7, we tested the impact of different numbers of online clients after performing 50 rounds of unlearning. The results indicate that the number of online clients has minimal effect on fidelity. While model fidelity slightly improves with higher online rates, the asynchronous method achieves nearly identical performance to the fully online system when approximately 3/4 of clients are online. This reduces the total online time and communication costs by 25%, offering a substantial efficiency gain.

5 Conclusion

In VFU, multiple unlearning requests targeting different objectives may arise, which the current methods cannot handle in a compatible manner. Additionally, the requirement for




Figure 4: Feature Removal Results.

all clients to participate in unlearning imposes a significant burden on the clients. To address the practical challenges in VFU tasks, we propose a new unlearning framework that can compatibly handle different unlearning objectives. For learning models with strongly convex loss functions, our method provides certified unlearning with theoretical guarantees. Furthermore, considering the characteristics of VFU, we introduce the first asynchronous VFU system capable of unlearning. This system balances the needs of different clients while reducing computation and communication costs. Extensive experiments validate the applicability of our method.

However, our method still has limitations: the theoretical analysis of certified unlearning currently applies only to models with strongly convex loss functions. Additionally, our approach is currently focused on VFL systems using the AggVFL structure, and further research is needed to extend it to more complex split-NN-based VFL systems. These challenges require further exploration, and we hope to continue expanding the practical applications of VFU, achieving comprehensive privacy protection both during and after training.

References

[1] Daniel Arp, Michael Spreitzenbarth, Malte Hübner, Hugo Gascon, and Konrad Rieck. Drebin: Effective

and explainable detection of android malware in your pocket. 02 2014.

[2] Barry Becker and Ronny Kohavi. Adult. UCI Machine Learning Repository, 1996. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24432/C5XW20>.

[3] Lucas Bourtole, Varun Chandrasekaran, Christopher A. Choquette-Choo, Hengrui Jia, Adelin Travers, Baiwu Zhang, David Lie, and Nicolas Papernot. Machine unlearning, 2020.

[4] Stephen Boyd. Convex optimization. *Cambridge UP*, 2004.

[5] Kamalika Chaudhuri, Claire Monteleoni, and Anand D. Sarwate. Differentially private empirical risk minimization. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 12(null):1069–1109, July 2011.

[6] Chong Chen, Fei Sun, Min Zhang, and Bolin Ding. Recommendation unlearning. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022, WWW '22*, page 2768–2777, New York, NY, USA, 2022. Association for Computing Machinery.

[7] Kewei Cheng, Tao Fan, Yilun Jin, Yang Liu, Tianjian Chen, Dimitrios Papadopoulos, and Qiang Yang. Secureboost: A lossless federated learning framework, 2021.




Figure 5: Sensitive Information Removal Results.

- [8] Zihao Deng, Zhaoyang Han, Chuan Ma, Ming Ding, Long Yuan, Chunpeng Ge, and Zhe Liu. Vertical federated unlearning on the logistic regression model. *Electronics*, 12(14), 2023.
- [9] Chong Fu, Xuhong Zhang, Shouling Ji, Jinyin Chen, Jingzheng Wu, Shanqing Guo, Jun Zhou, Alex X Liu, and Ting Wang. Label inference attacks against vertical federated learning. In *31st USENIX security symposium (USENIX Security 22)*, pages 1397–1414, 2022.
- [10] Fangcheng Fu, Xupeng Miao, Jiawei Jiang, Huanran Xue, and Bin Cui. Towards communication-efficient vertical federated learning training via cache-enabled local updates. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 15(10):2111–2120, June 2022.
- [11] Hanlin Gu, Win Kent Ong, Chee Seng Chan, and Lixin Fan. Ferrari: Federated feature unlearning via optimizing feature sensitivity, 2025.
- [12] Hanlin Gu, Hong Xi Tae, Chee Seng Chan, and Lixin Fan. A few-shot label unlearning in vertical federated learning, 2024.
- [13] Chuan Guo, Tom Goldstein, Awni Hannun, and Laurens Van Der Maaten. Certified data removal from machine learning models. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML’20*. JMLR.org, 2020.
- [14] Otkrist Gupta and Ramesh Raskar. Distributed learning of deep neural network over multiple agents, 2018.
- [15] Stephen Hardy, Wilko Henecka, Hamish Ivey-Law, Richard Nock, Giorgio Patrini, Guillaume Smith, and Brian Thorne. Private federated learning on vertically partitioned data via entity resolution and additively homomorphic encryption, 2017.
- [16] Michael Kahn. Diabetes. UCI Machine Learning Repository. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24432/C5T59G>.
- [17] Bowen Li, Jian Zhang, Jie Li, and Chentao Wu. Securecut: Federated gradient boosting decision trees with efficient machine unlearning. In *Pattern Recognition: 27th International Conference, ICPR 2024, Kolkata, India, December 1–5, 2024, Proceedings, Part V*, page 350–365, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2024. Springer-Verlag.
- [18] Yang Liu, Yan Kang, Chaoping Xing, Tianjian Chen, and Qiang Yang. A secure federated transfer learning framework. *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, 35(4):70–82, 2020.




Figure 6: The variation curves of training loss, training accuracy, and gradient residuals as updates progress.

- [19] Yang Liu, Yan Kang, Tianyuan Zou, Yanhong Pu, Yuanqin He, Xiaozhou Ye, Ye Ouyang, Ya-Qin Zhang, and Qiang Yang. Vertical federated learning: Concepts, advances, and challenges. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 2024.
- [20] H. Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Agüera y Arcas. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data, 2023.
- [21] Seth Neel, Aaron Roth, and Saeed Sharifi-Malvajerdi. Descent-to-delete: Gradient-based methods for machine unlearning, 2020.
- [22] Thanh Tam Nguyen, Thanh Trung Huynh, Zhao Ren, Phi Le Nguyen, Alan Wee-Chung Liew, Hongzhi Yin, and Quoc Viet Hung Nguyen. A survey of machine unlearning, 2024.
- [23] Vladislav Rajkovic. Nursery. UCI Machine Learning Repository, 1989. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24432/C5P88W>.
- [24] Ningxin Su and Baochun Li. Asynchronous federated unlearning. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2023 - IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*, pages 1–10, 2023.
- [25] Praneeth Vepakomma, Otkrist Gupta, Tristan Swedish, and Ramesh Raskar. Split learning for health: Distributed deep learning without sharing raw patient data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.00564*, 2018.
- [26] Zichen Wang, Xiangshan Gao, Cong Wang, Peng Cheng, and Jiming Chen. Efficient vertical federated unlearning via fast retraining. *ACM Trans. Internet Technol.*, 24(2), May 2024.
- [27] Alexander Warnecke, Lukas Pirch, Christian Wressneger, and Konrad Rieck. Machine unlearning of features and labels, 2023.
- [28] Haonan Yan, Xiaoguang Li, Ziyao Guo, Hui Li, Fenghua Li, and Xiaodong Lin. Arcane: An efficient architecture for exact machine unlearning. In Lud De Raedt, editor, *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-22*, pages 4006–4013. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, 7 2022. Main Track.
- [29] Shengwen Yang, Bing Ren, Xuhui Zhou, and Liping Liu. Parallel distributed logistic regression for vertical federated learning without third-party coordinator. *ArXiv*, abs/1911.09824, 2019.
- [30] I-Cheng Yeh. Default of Credit Card Clients. UCI Machine Learning Repository, 2009. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24432/C55S3H>.
- [31] Lei Yu, Meng Han, Yiming Li, Changting Lin, Yao Zhang, Mingyang Zhang, Yan Liu, Haiqin Weng, Yuseok Jeon, Ka-Ho Chow, and Stacy Patterson. A survey of privacy threats and defense in vertical federated learning: From model life cycle perspective, 2024.
- [32] Yang Zhao, Jiayi Yang, Yiling Tao, Lixu Wang, Xiaoxiao Li, Dusit Niyato, and H. Vincent Poor. Exploring federated unlearning: Analysis, comparison, and insights, 2025.
- [33] Tianyuan Zou, Zixuan Gu, Yu He, Hideaki Takahashi, Yang Liu, and Ya-Qin Zhang. Vflair: A research library and benchmark for vertical federated learning, 2024.

Appedix A

Previous work has shown that in a VFL system using logistic regression, the update contribution coefficients of each client remain fixed during each update. We now extend this result to Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP). While the contribution coefficients do not remain constant, we demonstrate that, under an appropriate setting for the unlearning tasks, the change in coefficients is minimal when the MLP’s depth and width are constrained.

Mathematical Notation

Consider a classification problem with K labels and a cross-entropy loss function. The input vector is denoted as $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and the output $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^K$ is a one-hot encoded vector, where all components are 0 except for a single entry $y_k = 1$, which corresponds to the correct class label k for the input \mathbf{x} . We use a fully connected neural network $f_\theta(\cdot)$ with L layers, applying the ReLU activation function after each linear transformation. The ReLU function, defined as

$$\sigma(\mathbf{x}) = [\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}]\mathbf{x},$$

outputs the element-wise maximum of each input component and zero. The network's output is a vector of logits $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^K$, computed recursively as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{h}^{(p)} &= \mathbf{W}^{(p)}\mathbf{x}^{(p)} + \mathbf{b}^{(p)}, \\ \mathbf{x}^{(p+1)} &= \sigma(\mathbf{h}^{(p)}).\end{aligned}$$

Let the input and output of the p -th layer be denoted by $\mathbf{x}^{(p)}$ and $\mathbf{h}^{(p)}$, respectively. We set $\mathbf{x}^{(1)} = \mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{h} = f_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{h}^{(L)}$. The parameters of the network are represented as

$$\theta = \text{col}(\mathbf{w}^{(1)}, \mathbf{b}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{w}^{(L)}, \mathbf{b}^{(L)}) \in \mathbb{R}^P,$$

where $\mathbf{w}^{(p)}$ is the flattened version of the weight matrix $\mathbf{W}^{(p)}$ for the p -th layer, and $\mathbf{b}^{(p)}$ is the corresponding bias vector. The output confidence vector $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^K$ is defined as the softmax of the logits \mathbf{h} , i.e.,

$$p_i = \text{softmax}(\mathbf{h})_i = \frac{\exp(h_i)}{\sum_{j=1}^K \exp(h_j)} \in (0; 1).$$

The loss function is cross-entropy loss:

$$\ell(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{y}) = \text{CE}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{y}) = - \sum_{k=1}^K y_k \log p_k \in \mathbb{R}^+.$$

Here the following is denoted:

- Matrix representation of the ReLU activation function:

$$\mathbf{D}^{(p)} = \text{diag}([\mathbf{h}^{(p)} \geq \mathbf{0}]),$$

- The partial derivative of logits w.r.t. logits at p -th layer:

$$\mathbf{G}^{(p)} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{h}}{\partial \mathbf{h}^{(p)}} = \mathbf{W}^{(L)} \mathbf{D}^{(L-1)} \mathbf{W}^{(L-1)} \mathbf{D}^{(L-2)} \dots \mathbf{D}^{(p)},$$

- Its stacked version:

$$\mathbf{F}^\top = \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{G}^{(1)})^\top \otimes \mathbf{x}^{(1)} \\ (\mathbf{G}^{(1)})^\top \\ \vdots \\ (\mathbf{G}^{(L)})^\top \otimes \mathbf{x}^{(L)} \\ (\mathbf{G}^{(L)})^\top \end{pmatrix},$$

Consider the next epoch, in which all the parameters in the MLP are updated by

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{(p)} &= \mathbf{W}^{(p)} + \tau \Delta \mathbf{W}^{(p)}, \\ \bar{\mathbf{b}}^{(p)} &= \mathbf{b}^{(p)} + \tau \Delta \mathbf{b}^{(p)}, \quad p = 1, \dots, L.\end{aligned}$$

Then conduct back propagation this time, we would have

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\mathbf{h}}^{(p)} &= \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{(p)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(p)} + \bar{\mathbf{b}}^{(p)}, \\ \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(p+1)} &= \sigma(\bar{\mathbf{h}}^{(p)}), \\ \bar{\mathbf{D}}^{(p)} &= \text{diag}([\bar{\mathbf{h}}^{(p)} \geq \mathbf{0}]), \\ \bar{\mathbf{G}}^{(p)} &= \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{(L)} \bar{\mathbf{D}}^{(L-1)} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{(L-1)} \bar{\mathbf{D}}^{(L-2)} \dots \bar{\mathbf{D}}^{(p)}.\end{aligned}$$

Equipped with these notations,

$$\bar{\mathbf{F}}^\top = \begin{pmatrix} (\bar{\mathbf{G}}^{(1)})^\top \otimes \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(1)} \\ (\bar{\mathbf{G}}^{(1)})^\top \\ \vdots \\ (\bar{\mathbf{G}}^{(L)})^\top \otimes \bar{\mathbf{x}}^{(L)} \\ (\bar{\mathbf{G}}^{(L)})^\top \end{pmatrix}.$$

Our goal is to bound

$$\frac{\|\bar{\mathbf{F}}\|_F^2}{\|\mathbf{F}\|_F^2}.$$

Derivation

Firstly, we need to add an assumption:

For any epoch t , the distance between parameter θ_t and optimum parameter θ^* is bounded by a small value g , an assumption widely used in NTK,

$$\|\theta_t - \theta^*\|_2 < g.$$

In machine unlearning, the data to be unlearned constitutes only a small portion of the original training set. As a result, the difference between model parameter before and after unlearning is minimal, validating the assumption.

P.S. Our experiments show that the gradient of the original model on the training set after unlearning is negligible, further confirming the validity of this assumption.

Since we assume that the distance between \mathbf{F}_t and \mathbf{F}^* is small, meaning that \mathbf{F}_t is gradually approaching \mathbf{F}^* during the iteration process, then the two quantities can be related as follows:

$$\|\mathbf{F}_t\|_F^2 = \|\mathbf{F}^*\|_F^2 + 2\langle \mathbf{F}_t - \mathbf{F}^*, \mathbf{F}^* \rangle + \|\mathbf{F}_t - \mathbf{F}^*\|_F^2.$$

Thus,

$$\frac{\|\mathbf{F}_t\|_F^2}{\|\mathbf{F}^*\|_F^2} = 1 + \frac{2\langle \mathbf{F}_t - \mathbf{F}^*, \mathbf{F}^* \rangle}{\|\mathbf{F}^*\|_F^2} + \frac{\|\mathbf{F}_t - \mathbf{F}^*\|_F^2}{\|\mathbf{F}^*\|_F^2}.$$

When \mathbf{F}_t is close to \mathbf{F}^* , $\langle \mathbf{F}_t - \mathbf{F}^*, \mathbf{F}^* \rangle$ is relatively small, Thus $\frac{\|\mathbf{F}_t\|_F^2}{\|\mathbf{F}^*\|_F^2}$ equals to $1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{F}_t - \mathbf{F}^*\|_F^2}{\|\mathbf{F}^*\|_F^2}$.

Our goal is to bound

$$\|\mathbf{F}_t - \mathbf{F}^*\|_F^2,$$

note that since loss function is not considered

$$\|\mathbf{F}^*\|_F^2 \neq 0,$$

$$(\mathbf{F}_t - \mathbf{F}^*)^\top = \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{G}^{(1)})^\top \otimes \mathbf{x}^{(1)} - (\mathbf{G}^{(1)*})^\top \otimes \mathbf{x}^{(1)*} \\ (\mathbf{G}^{(1)} - \mathbf{G}^{(1)*})^\top \\ \vdots \\ (\mathbf{G}^{(L)})^\top \otimes \mathbf{x}^{(L)} - (\mathbf{G}^{(L)*})^\top \otimes \mathbf{x}^{(L)*} \\ (\mathbf{G}^{(L)} - \mathbf{G}^{(L)*})^\top \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, using the property that squared spectral norm of vertically-stacked matrices is less or equal to the sum of their squared spectral norms (it is easy to observe), we get:

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbf{F}_t - \mathbf{F}^*\|_2^2 \\ & \leq \sum_{p=1}^L \left(\|(\mathbf{G}^{(p)})^\top \otimes \mathbf{x}^{(p)} - (\mathbf{G}^{(p)*})^\top \otimes \mathbf{x}^{(p)*}\|_2^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|(\mathbf{G}^{(p)} - \mathbf{G}^{(p)*})^\top\|_2^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

The Kronecker product satisfies the distributive property over matrix addition,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{F}_t - \mathbf{F}^*\|_2^2 & \leq \sum_{p=1}^L \left(\|(\mathbf{G}^{(p)})^\top \otimes \mathbf{x}^{(p)} - (\mathbf{G}^{(p)*})^\top \otimes \mathbf{x}^{(p)} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + (\mathbf{G}^{(p)*})^\top \otimes \mathbf{x}^{(p)} - (\mathbf{G}^{(p)*})^\top \otimes \mathbf{x}^{(p)*}\|_2^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|(\mathbf{G}^{(p)} - \mathbf{G}^{(p)*})^\top\|_2^2 \right) \\ & \leq \sum_{p=1}^L \left(\|(\mathbf{G}^{(p)} - \mathbf{G}^{(p)*})^\top \otimes \mathbf{x}^{(p)} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + (\mathbf{G}^{(p)*})^\top \otimes (\mathbf{x}^{(p)} - \mathbf{x}^{(p)*})\|_2^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|(\mathbf{G}^{(p)} - \mathbf{G}^{(p)*})^\top\|_2^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

By the triangle inequality and the sub-additivity of the spectral norm,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{F}_t - \mathbf{F}^*\|_2^2 & \leq \sum_{p=1}^L \left(\|(\mathbf{G}^{(p)} - \mathbf{G}^{(p)*})^\top \otimes \mathbf{x}^{(p)}\|_2^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|(\mathbf{G}^{(p)*})^\top \otimes (\mathbf{x}^{(p)} - \mathbf{x}^{(p)*})\|_2^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|(\mathbf{G}^{(p)} - \mathbf{G}^{(p)*})^\top\|_2^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Spectral norm of the Kronecker matrix product is equal to their ordinary product norm,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{F}_t - \mathbf{F}^*\|_2^2 & \leq \sum_{p=1}^L \left(\|\mathbf{G}^{(p)} - \mathbf{G}^{(p)*}\|_2^2 \cdot (\|\mathbf{x}^{(p)}\|_2^2 + 1) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|(\mathbf{G}^{(p)*})^\top\|_2^2 \cdot \|(\mathbf{x}^{(p)} - \mathbf{x}^{(p)*})\|_2^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

In this problem, we assume that the distance between the network parameters θ_t and the optimal parameters θ^* is bounded by a small value g , and the goal now is to derive an upper bound for the difference in the intermediate values $\|\mathbf{x}^{(p)} - \mathbf{x}^{(p)*}\|_2^2$ and $\|\mathbf{G}^{(p)} - \mathbf{G}^{(p)*}\|_2^2$ for each layer of the MLP.

Bound on $\|\mathbf{x}^{(p)} - \mathbf{x}^{(p)*}\|_2^2$:

The correct expression for the difference in activations at layer p is:

$$\mathbf{x}^{(p)} - \mathbf{x}^{(p)*} = \sigma \left(\mathbf{W}^{(p)} \mathbf{x}^{(p-1)} - \mathbf{W}^{(p)*} \mathbf{x}^{(p-1)*} + \mathbf{b}^{(p)} - \mathbf{b}^{(p)*} \right),$$

We define the activation function as being Lipschitz continuous with a constant γ_z . For ReLU function we used, $\gamma_z = 1$. The difference in activations can be bounded as:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{x}^{(p)} - \mathbf{x}^{(p)*}\|_2^2 & \leq 2\gamma_z^2 \left[\|\mathbf{W}^{(p)} \mathbf{x}^{(p-1)} - \mathbf{W}^{(p)*} \mathbf{x}^{(p-1)*}\|_2^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|\mathbf{b}^{(p)} - \mathbf{b}^{(p)*}\|_2^2 \right] \\ & \leq 4\gamma_z^2 \left[\|\mathbf{W}^{(p)} - \mathbf{W}^{(p)*}\|_2^2 \|\mathbf{x}^{(p-1)*}\|_2^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|\mathbf{W}^{(p)}\|_2^2 \|\mathbf{x}^{(p-1)} - \mathbf{x}^{(p-1)*}\|_2^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|\mathbf{b}^{(p)} - \mathbf{b}^{(p)*}\|_2^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Assuming that the $\|\mathbf{x}^{(t)}\|_2^2$ is bounded by C_x^2 , and $\|\mathbf{W}^{(p)}\|_2^2$ is bounded by C_W^2 , we can use the fact that the perturbation in the parameters is bounded by g , and propagate this bound through the layers. Since $\|\mathbf{x}^{(1)} - \mathbf{x}^{(1)*}\|_2^2 = 0$, the bound on the difference in activations at layer p becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{x}^{(p)} - \mathbf{x}^{(p)*}\|_2^2 & \leq 4\gamma_z^2 \left[g^2 C_x^2 + g^2 + C_W^2 \|\mathbf{x}^{(p-1)} - \mathbf{x}^{(p-1)*}\|_2^2 \right] \\ & \leq 4\gamma_z^2 g^2 [C_x^2 + 1] \left[\frac{(4\gamma_z^2 C_W^2)^{p-1} - 1}{4\gamma_z^2 C_W^2 - 1} \right] \\ & \quad + (4\gamma_z^2 C_W^2)^{p-1} \|\mathbf{x}^{(1)} - \mathbf{x}^{(1)*}\|_2^2 \\ & = 4\gamma_z^2 g^2 [C_x^2 + 1] \left[\frac{(4\gamma_z^2 C_W^2)^{p-1} - 1}{4\gamma_z^2 C_W^2 - 1} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Bound on $\|\mathbf{G}^{(p)} - \mathbf{G}^{(p)*}\|_2^2$:

For the gradients, we consider the difference in gradients at layer p :

$$\mathbf{G}^{(p)} - \mathbf{G}^{(p)*} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{h}}{\partial \mathbf{h}^{(p)}} - \frac{\partial \mathbf{h}^*}{\partial \mathbf{h}^{(p)*}},$$

where $\frac{\partial \mathbf{h}}{\partial \mathbf{h}^{(p)}} = \mathbf{W}^{(L)} \mathbf{D}^{(L-1)} \mathbf{W}^{(L-1)} \mathbf{D}^{(L-2)} \dots \mathbf{D}^{(p)}$ is the chain of derivatives through the layers.

$$\mathbf{G}^{(p)} = \mathbf{G}^{(p+1)} \mathbf{W}^{(p+1)} \mathbf{D}^{(p)}, \quad \mathbf{G}^{(p)*} = \mathbf{G}^{(p+1)*} \mathbf{W}^{(p+1)*} \mathbf{D}^{(p)*},$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbf{G}^{(p)} - \mathbf{G}^{(p)*}\|^2 \\ &= \|\mathbf{G}^{(p+1)} \mathbf{W}^{(p+1)} \mathbf{D}^{(p)} - \mathbf{G}^{(p+1)*} \mathbf{W}^{(p+1)*} \mathbf{D}^{(p)*}\|^2 \\ &\leq 2\|\mathbf{G}^{(p+1)}\|^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{W}^{(p+1)} \mathbf{D}^{(p)} - \mathbf{W}^{(p+1)*} \mathbf{D}^{(p)*}\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\|\mathbf{W}^{(p+1)*} \mathbf{D}^{(p)*}\|^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{G}^{(p+1)} - \mathbf{G}^{(p+1)*}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Assuming that the $\|\mathbf{G}^{(p+1)}\|_2^2$ is bounded by C_G^2 , and $\|\mathbf{W}^{(p+1)*} \mathbf{D}^{(p)*}\|_2^2$ is bounded by C_W^2 , similarly:

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbf{G}^{(p)} - \mathbf{G}^{(p)*}\|^2 \\ &\leq 2C_G^2 \|\mathbf{W}^{(p+1)} \mathbf{D}^{(p)} - \mathbf{W}^{(p+1)*} \mathbf{D}^{(p)*}\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2C_W^2 \|\mathbf{G}^{(p+1)} - \mathbf{G}^{(p+1)*}\|^2 \\ &\leq 2C_G^2 g^2 + 2C_W^2 \|\mathbf{G}^{(p+1)} - \mathbf{G}^{(p+1)*}\|^2 \\ &\leq 2C_G^2 g^2 \frac{(2C_W^2)^{L-p} - 1}{2C_W^2 - 1} + (2C_W^2)^{L-p} \|\mathbf{G}^{(L)} - \mathbf{G}^{(L)*}\|^2 \\ &\leq 2C_G^2 g^2 \frac{(2C_W^2)^{L-p} - 1}{2C_W^2 - 1} + (2C_W^2)^{L-p} g^2. \end{aligned}$$

The original inequality is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{F}_t - \mathbf{F}^*\|_2^2 &\leq \sum_{p=1}^L \left(\|\mathbf{G}^{(p)} - \mathbf{G}^{(p)*}\|_2^2 \cdot (\|\mathbf{x}^{(p)}\|_2^2 + 1) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|(\mathbf{G}^{(p)*})^\top\|_2^2 \cdot \|(\mathbf{x}^{(p)} - \mathbf{x}^{(p)*})\|_2^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Substitute $\|\mathbf{G}^{(p)} - \mathbf{G}^{(p)*}\|_2^2$:

$$\|\mathbf{G}^{(p)} - \mathbf{G}^{(p)*}\|^2 \leq 2C_G^2 g^2 \frac{(2C_W^2)^{L-p} - 1}{2C_W^2 - 1} + (2C_W^2)^{L-p} g^2.$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbf{G}^{(p)} - \mathbf{G}^{(p)*}\|_2^2 \cdot (\|\mathbf{x}^{(p)}\|_2^2 + 1) \\ &\leq [2C_G^2 g^2 \frac{(2C_W^2)^{L-p} - 1}{2C_W^2 - 1} + (2C_W^2)^{L-p} g^2] (\|\mathbf{x}^{(p)}\|_2^2 + 1). \end{aligned}$$

Substitute $\|\mathbf{x}^{(p)} - \mathbf{x}^{(p)*}\|_2^2$:

$$\|\mathbf{x}^{(p)} - \mathbf{x}^{(p)*}\|_2^2 \leq 4\gamma_z^2 g^2 [C_x^2 + 1] \frac{(4\gamma_z^2 C_W^2)^{p-1} - 1}{4\gamma_z^2 C_W^2 - 1}.$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\mathbf{G}^{(p)*})^\top\|_2^2 \cdot \|(\mathbf{x}^{(p)} - \mathbf{x}^{(p)*})\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \|(\mathbf{G}^{(p)*})^\top\|_2^2 \cdot 4\gamma_z^2 g^2 [C_x^2 + 1] \cdot \frac{(4\gamma_z^2 C_W^2)^{p-1} - 1}{4\gamma_z^2 C_W^2 - 1}. \end{aligned}$$

We assume the following bounds:

$$\|\mathbf{x}^{(p)}\|_2^2 \leq C_x^2, \quad \|(\mathbf{G}^{(p)*})^\top\|_2^2 \leq C_G^2.$$

Substitute these bounds into the inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbf{F}_t - \mathbf{F}^*\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{p=1}^L \left\{ \left[2C_G^2 g^2 \frac{(2C_W^2)^{L-p} - 1}{2C_W^2 - 1} + (2C_W^2)^{L-p} g^2 \right] (C_x^2 + 1) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 4C_G^2 \gamma_z^2 g^2 (C_x^2 + 1) \frac{(4\gamma_z^2 C_W^2)^{p-1} - 1}{4\gamma_z^2 C_W^2 - 1} \right\} \\ &\leq \sum_{p=1}^L \left\{ \left[2C_G^2 \frac{(2C_W^2)^{L-p} - 1}{2C_W^2 - 1} + (2C_W^2)^{L-p} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + 4C_G^2 \gamma_z^2 \frac{(4\gamma_z^2 C_W^2)^{p-1} - 1}{4\gamma_z^2 C_W^2 - 1} \right] g^2 (C_x^2 + 1) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

since

$$\|\mathbf{A}\|_F \leq \sqrt{\text{rank}(\mathbf{A})} \|\mathbf{A}\|_2,$$

we get

$$\|\mathbf{F}_t - \mathbf{F}^*\|_F^2 \leq \sqrt{\text{rank}(\mathbf{F})} \|\mathbf{F}_t - \mathbf{F}^*\|_2^2.$$

Assuming that the layers of the MLP are constrained to have a width of less than w ,

$$\text{rank}(\mathbf{F}) = \max(w^2, 2L).$$

$\text{rank}(\mathbf{F})$ is determined by the largest width or depth of the MLP. So,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbf{F}_t - \mathbf{F}^*\|_F^2 \\ &\leq \sqrt{\max(w^2, 2L)} \sum_{p=1}^L \left\{ \left[2C_G^2 \frac{(2C_W^2)^{L-p} - 1}{2C_W^2 - 1} + (2C_W^2)^{L-p} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + 4C_G^2 \gamma_z^2 \frac{(4\gamma_z^2 C_W^2)^{p-1} - 1}{4\gamma_z^2 C_W^2 - 1} \right] g^2 (C_x^2 + 1) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

When g is close to 0, $\|\mathbf{F}_t - \mathbf{F}^*\|_F^2$ is close to 0.

The analysis of the bound expression reveals that the stability of the update contribution coefficient is influenced by several factors, including the MLP model's depth and width, as well as the absolute magnitudes of the parameters, activations, and gradients at each layer. Of these, the model's depth has the most significant impact.

Appedix B

We can also prove that in VFL, performing unlearning only for the client requesting unlearning is insufficient to achieve the overall unlearning objective.

Objective

We aim to prove that when only a subset of clients participates in the unlearning process, the unlearning operation cannot achieve approximate unlearning. To achieve approximate unlearning, we need to ensure that the parameters after unlearning are very close to the parameters of a retrained model. This can be done by controlling the gradient residual.

Composition of Prediction P

In vertical federated learning, the prediction P is calculated based on the intermediate values of all client output.

$$P = Global(\sum_{i=1}^k h_i(\theta_i, Z_i)).$$

where: - $h_i(\theta_i, Z_i)$ is the intermediate output of the i -th client. - k is the number of clients participating in federated learning. - $Global()$ is the global model located in the activate party.

Gradient Representation

To derive the requirements for approximate unlearning, we first examine the gradient of the logistic regression model's loss function with respect to the model parameters. Using the chain rule, the gradient can be written as the product of the following three terms:

$$\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial P} \cdot \frac{\partial P}{\partial h} \cdot \frac{\partial h}{\partial \theta},$$

where:

- $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial P}$: The derivative of the loss function (e.g., cross-entropy loss) with respect to the prediction P .
- $\frac{\partial P}{\partial h}$: The derivative of the prediction P with respect to each client's intermediate value h .
- $\frac{\partial h}{\partial \theta}$: The derivative of each client's intermediate value h with respect to the client's parameters θ .

Our goal is to make the gradient $\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}$ close to zero, which would achieve approximate unlearning. The main factor affecting the gradient is the first term, $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial P}$, i.e., the derivative of the loss function with respect to the prediction P . This term determines the size of the final gradient. If the prediction after unlearning is close to the retrained prediction, this term will be close to zero, which would bring the gradient close to zero. So, to achieve the approximate unlearning, the difference between the unlearned predictions and the retrained predictions should be small

$$|\tilde{P} - \tilde{P}^*| = |Global(\sum_{i=1}^k h_i(\tilde{\theta}_i, \tilde{Z}_i)) - Global(\sum_{i=1}^k h_i(\tilde{\theta}_i^*, \tilde{Z}_i))|,$$

where \tilde{Z} is the training set after the unlearning request, $\tilde{\theta}_i$ is the unlearned parameter of i -th client and $\tilde{\theta}_i^*$ is the retrained parameter.

In AggVFL, the global model is not trainable, so the summed predictions from the clients should be close to that of the retrained model's output. To achieve the approximate unlearning, we want that there exists a small value $\epsilon > 0$ that

$$|\sum_{i=1}^k h_i(\tilde{\theta}_i, \tilde{Z}_i) - \sum_{i=1}^k h_i(\tilde{\theta}_i^*, \tilde{Z}_i)| < \epsilon.$$

Suppose overall there are k features, among them the first j features take part in the unlearning process

$$\tilde{\theta} = [\tilde{\theta}_1^T, \dots, \tilde{\theta}_j^T, \theta_{j+1}^{*T}, \dots, \theta_k^{*T}]^T.$$

The unchanged intermediate client output with features denoted as θ_i^{*T} , are different from the retrained value with a distance $|h_U(\theta_i^*, \tilde{Z}_i)|$ caused by unlearned feature.

$$\begin{aligned} & |\sum_{i=1}^k h_i(\theta_i^*, \tilde{Z}_i) - \sum_{i=1}^k h_i(\tilde{\theta}_i^*, \tilde{Z}_i)| \\ &= |\sum_{i=1}^k h_i(\theta_i^*, \tilde{Z}_i) - \sum_{i=1}^k h_i(\theta_i^*, Z_i) + \sum_{i=1}^k h_i(\theta_i^*, Z_i) - \sum_{i=1}^k h_i(\tilde{\theta}_i^*, \tilde{Z}_i)| \\ &= |h_U(\theta^*, \tilde{Z}) + \epsilon|. \end{aligned}$$

The approximate unlearning target below is hard to achieve when j is small because h has a much larger dimension, the unlearned features' gap can hardly be covered by j features.

$$\begin{aligned} & |\sum_{i=1}^k h_i(\tilde{\theta}_i, \tilde{Z}_i) - \sum_{i=1}^k h_i(\tilde{\theta}_i^*, \tilde{Z}_i)| \\ &= |\sum_{i=1}^j h_i(\tilde{\theta}_i, \tilde{Z}_i) - \sum_{i=1}^j h_i(\theta_i^*, \tilde{Z}_i) + \sum_{i=1}^k h_i(\theta_i^*, \tilde{Z}_i) - \sum_{i=1}^k h_i(\tilde{\theta}_i^*, \tilde{Z}_i)| \\ &= |\sum_{i=1}^j h_i(\tilde{\theta}_i, \tilde{Z}_i) - \sum_{i=1}^j h_i(\theta_i^*, \tilde{Z}_i) + h_U(\theta^*, \tilde{Z}) + \epsilon|. \end{aligned}$$

Besides, we can interpret the prediction difference in terms of vector spaces. Let $A = \sum_{i=1}^j h_i(\tilde{\theta}_i, \tilde{Z}_i)$ represent the modified outputs, and $B = \sum_{i=j+1}^k h_i(\theta_i^*, \tilde{Z}_i)$ represent the unchanged outputs. The difference between the modified and retrained outputs is:

$$|A - B| = |h_U(\theta^*, \tilde{Z}) + \epsilon|.$$

When j is small, the unlearning operation can only change a small part of the output space. Since $h_U(\theta^*, \tilde{Z})$ involves contributions from the unchanged clients' outputs, and their rank may be high, the modification of j clients' outputs is insufficient to reduce the overall error. Hence, the difference cannot be small enough to achieve approximate unlearning.

The approximate unlearning target is difficult to achieve when j is small because the change induced by unlearning only a few clients cannot cover the large-dimensional gap caused by the unlearned features. The rank of the output matrix will not be sufficiently reduced, and the residual error will remain significant, preventing the global prediction from matching the retrained model's output. Therefore, unlearning by a subset of clients is insufficient for achieving approximate unlearning.

Appedix C

The results are shown in Figure 7 and 8.

Appedix D

Our method involves multiple rounds of retraining, with the parameters of the pre-trained original model serving as the initial state. To achieve the rigorously defined certified unlearning, additional adjustments are required. It is worth noting that we make two key assumptions: First, the loss function is convex. Second, we include an L_2 regularization $\frac{1}{2}\|\theta\|_2^2$.

In the first round of updates, we simultaneously perform gradient ascent on the original data and gradient descent on the modified data. It can be shown that this update is equivalent to the expression in Equation (1) from the well-established influence function-based certified forgetting method [27]. According to Lemma 1 in that paper, the gradient bound of the updated loss function can be derived from Equation (1).

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(Z, \tilde{Z}) &= -\tau \left(\nabla L(\theta^*; D') - \nabla L(\theta^*; D) \right) \\ &= -\tau \left(\sum_{\tilde{z} \in \tilde{Z}} \nabla_{\theta} \ell(\tilde{z}, \theta^*) + \nabla L(\theta^*; D' \setminus \tilde{Z}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{z \in Z} \nabla_{\theta} \ell(z, \theta^*) - \nabla L(\theta^*; D \setminus Z) \right) \\ &= -\tau \left(\sum_{\tilde{z} \in \tilde{Z}} \nabla_{\theta} \ell(\tilde{z}, \theta^*) - \sum_{z \in Z} \nabla_{\theta} \ell(z, \theta^*) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 1. [27] Assume that $\|x_i\|_2 \leq 1$ for all data points and the gradient $\nabla \ell(z, \theta)$ is γ_z -Lipschitz with respect to z at θ^* and γ -Lipschitz with respect to θ . Further let \tilde{Z} change the features $j, \dots, j+F$ by magnitudes at most m_j, \dots, m_{j+F} . If $M = \sum_{j=1}^F m_j$ the following upper bounds hold: For the following update form

$$\Delta(Z, \tilde{Z}) = -\tau \left(\sum_{\tilde{z} \in \tilde{Z}} \nabla_{\theta} \ell(\tilde{z}, \theta^*) - \sum_{z \in Z} \nabla_{\theta} \ell(z, \theta^*) \right) \quad (1)$$

We have

$$\|\nabla L(\theta_{Z \rightarrow \tilde{Z}}^*, D')\|_2 \leq (1 + \tau \gamma n) \gamma_z M |Z|$$

The *gradient residual* $\nabla L(\theta; D')$ of a model θ with respect to the corrected dataset D' is zero only when $\theta = \mathcal{A}(D')$. For strongly convex loss functions, the magnitude of this gradient residual, $\|\nabla L(\theta; D')\|_2$, reflects the discrepancy between the model θ and the one obtained by retraining on D' .

Next, in subsequent updates, we employ an early stopping mechanism to ensure that the training loss continues to decrease on the updated training set. Since the loss function is strongly convex, the gradient of the loss function after the update will also be smaller than that of the first round.

$$\|\nabla L(\theta_{t+1})\|^2 \leq \|\nabla L(\theta_t)\|^2$$

Finally, we prove that after unlearning, the gradient of the loss function has an upper bound. Based on Lemma 2 from the [27], we are able to demonstrate that certified unlearning holds.

When a vector b is added, the gradient residual r for the loss function L_b becomes:

$$r = \nabla L_b(\theta; D') = \sum_{z \in D'} \nabla \ell(z, \theta) + \lambda \theta + b$$

By manipulating the distribution of b , certified unlearning can be achieved, akin to sensitivity-based techniques [5].

Lemma 2. [27] Let \mathcal{A} be the learning algorithm that returns the unique minimum of $L_b(\theta; D')$ and let \mathcal{U} be an unlearning method that produces a model $\theta_{\mathcal{U}}$. If $\|\nabla L(\theta_{\mathcal{U}}; D')\|_2 \leq \epsilon'$ for some $\epsilon' > 0$ we have the following guarantees.

1. If b is drawn from a distribution with density $p(b) = e^{-\frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon'} \|b\|_2}$ then \mathcal{U} performs ϵ -certified unlearning for \mathcal{A} .
2. If $p \sim \mathcal{N}(0, c\epsilon'/\epsilon)^d$ for some $c > 0$ then \mathcal{U} performs (ϵ, δ) -certified unlearning for \mathcal{A} with $\delta = 1.5e^{-c^2/2}$.




Figure 7: Feature Removal Results.




Figure 8: Sensitive Information Removal Results.