

PAPER

Technical insights and legal considerations for advancing federated learning in bioinformatics

Daniele Malpetti^{1,†}, Marco Scutari^{1,*,†}, Francesco Gualdi^{1,†}, Jessica van Setten², Sander van der Laan^{3,4}, Saskia Haitjema³, Aaron Mark Lee⁵, Isabelle Hering⁶ and Francesca Mangili¹

¹ Istituto Dalle Molle di Studi sull'Intelligenza Artificiale (IDSIA), SUPSI, Lugano, 6962, Switzerland, ² Department of Cardiology, University Medical Center Utrecht, University of Utrecht, Utrecht, 3584 CX, the Netherlands, ³ Central Diagnostics Laboratory, University Medical Center Utrecht, University of Utrecht, Utrecht, 3584 CX, the Netherlands, ⁴ Department of Genome Science, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA, 22903, US, ⁵ William Harvey Research Institute, NIHR Barts Biomedical Research Centre, Queen Mary University of London, London, EC1M 6BQ, UK and ⁶ Etude Hering, Nyon, 1260, Switzerland

*Corresponding author. scutario@bnlearn.com †Equal contributions.

Abstract

Federated learning leverages data across institutions to improve clinical discovery while complying with data-sharing restrictions and protecting patient privacy. As the evolution of biobanks in genetics and systems biology has proved, accessing more extensive and varied data pools leads to a faster and more robust exploration and translation of results. More widespread use of federated learning may have the same impact in bioinformatics, allowing access to many combinations of genotypic, phenotypic and environmental information that are undercovered or not included in existing biobanks. This paper reviews the methodological, infrastructural and legal issues that academic and clinical institutions must address before implementing it. Finally, we provide recommendations for the reliable use of federated learning and its effective translation into clinical practice.

Key words: Federated Machine Learning, Exposome, Secure distributed analysis, Data privacy, Collaborative genomics

1. Introduction

Sharing personal information has been increasingly regulated in both the EU (with the GDPR and the AI act; European Union, 2016, 2024) and the US (with the National AI Initiative Act; U.S. Congress, 2020) to mitigate the personal and societal risks associated with their use, particularly in connection with machine learning and AI models (Cath et al., 2018). These regulations make multi-centre studies and similar endeavours more challenging, impacting biomedical and clinical research.

Federated learning (FL; McMahan et al., 2017; Ludwig and Baracaldo, 2022) is a technical solution intended to reduce the impact of these restrictions. FL allows multiple parties to train a global machine learning model collaboratively from the respective data without sharing the data themselves and without any meaningful model performance degradation. Instead, parties only share model updates, making it impractical to reconstruct personal information when the appropriate secure computational measures are implemented (Wainakh et al., 2022).

This approach strengthens *security* by keeping sensitive information local, improves *privacy* by minimising data exposure even between the parties involved, and limits *risk* of data misuse by allowing each party to retain complete control over its data (Truong et al., 2021). If enough parties are

involved, FL may potentially access larger and more varied data pools than centralised biobanks can provide, particularly if there are legal (or other) barriers to data centralisation, resulting in more accurate and robust models than those produced by any individual party.

FL has proven to be a valuable tool for biomedical research expected to gain further traction in the coming years. Its use has improved breast density classification models (accuracy up by 6%, generalisability up by 46%; Roth et al., 2020), COVID-19 outcome prediction at both 24h and 72h (up 16% and 38%; Dayan et al., 2021) and rare tumour segmentation (up by 23-33% and 15%; Pati et al., 2022) compared to single-party analyses. A consortium of ten pharmaceutical companies found that FL improved structure-activity relationship (QSAR) models for drug discovery (both up 12% Heyndrickx et al., 2023). Early-stage applications building predictive models from electronic health records (Brisimi et al., 2018) have also confirmed no practical performance degradation compared to pooling data from all parties.

To achieve such results, a real-world implementation of FL must overcome several methodological, infrastructural and legal issues. However, biomedical FL literature reviews (Xu et al., 2020; Chowdhury et al., 2022, among others) are predominantly high-level and considered simulated rather than




Fig. 1. A typical FL workflow. (1) The central server initialises the global model. (2) The initial global model is distributed to participating parties, commonly called *clients*. (3) The model is trained locally on client data. (4) Clients share their locally trained models with the server. (5) The server aggregates the local models to update the global model. (6) The updated global model is shared with clients for the next training round. Steps (3) to (6) are repeated iteratively until a predefined stopping criterion is met. We highlight active and inactive parties at each step and the flow of information within the consortium.

real-world implementations. Here, we will cover federated methods designed explicitly for bioinformatics and discuss the infrastructure they need and how they satisfy the legal requirements.

To this end, we have structured the remainder of the paper as follows: We first review the fundamental concepts and design decisions of FL in Section 2, including different topologies (Section 2.1), hardware and software (Section 2.2), data layouts in different parties (Sections 2.3 and 2.4), security (Section 2.5) and privacy concerns (Section 2.6). In Section 3, we contrast and compare bioinformatics FL methods for proteomics and differential expression (Section 3.1), genome-wide association studies (GWAS; Section 3.2), single-cell RNA sequencing (Section 3.3), multiomics (Section 3.4) and medical imaging (Section 3.5) applications. We conclude the section with notable examples of ready-to-use software tools (Section 3.6). Section 4 provides examples of federated operations common in bioinformatics. Finally, we discuss the relevant legal implications of using FL (Section 5) before discussing our perspective on its reliable use and translation to clinical practice (Section 6).

2. Federated learning

FL is a collaborative approach to machine learning model training, where multiple institutions form a consortium to jointly train a shared model by exchanging model updates rather than raw patient data. Typically, FL involves data holders (called “clients”) sharing their local contributions with a server (McMahan et al., 2017) as outlined in Figure 1. The server then creates and shares back a global model, inviting the data holders to update and resubmit their contributions. This

process is iterative and involves several rounds of model update exchanges. Unlike traditional centralised computing, FL does not store patient data in a central location. Instead, patient data remain under the control of the respective data owners at their sites, enhancing privacy.

FL has similarities with *distributed computing*, *meta-analysis*, and *trusted research environments* (TREs) but also has key differences, which we highlight below.

Distributed computing (DC) (Zomaya, 2006) divides a computational task among multiple machines to enhance processing speed and efficiency. Usually, DC starts from a centrally managed data set spread across different machines, which is assumed to contain independent and identically distributed observations. Each machine is tasked to process a comparable quantity of data. In contrast, clients independently join FL with their locally-held data, which may vary significantly in quantity and distribution. While sharing some techniques with FL, distributed computing aims for computational efficiency and lacks its privacy focus.

On the other hand, meta-analyses (Toro-Domínguez et al., 2021) aggregate results across previously completed studies using statistical methods to account for their variations, thus allowing researchers to synthesise findings without accessing raw data and preserve the privacy of individual data sets. Here, FL collaboratively trains a joint model using distributed data to iteratively update it while meta-analysis constructs it in a single step from the pre-existing results. Multiple studies on sequencing data have demonstrated that FL produces results closer to centralised analysis than from meta-analysis (Mendelsohn et al., 2023; Zolotareva et al., 2021).

TREs (Kavianpour et al., 2022) provide access to data within a controlled, secure computing environment for




Fig. 2. Different FL topologies. In centralised topologies, the data holders are typically referred to as *clients*, reflecting their interaction with a central server. In decentralised topologies, where no central entity exists, the participants are often called *parties*.

conducting analyses, almost always disallowing data sharing. Some TREs have a centralised data location and governance; an example is the Research Analysis Platform (RAP), the TRE for the UK Biobank (UKB; Sudlow et al., 2015). Others, such as FEAGA (Federated European Genome-phenome Archive, 2024), are decentralised. Each institution maintains its data locally; only the relevant data are securely transferred to the computing environment when the analysis is authorised. Unlike FL, the learning process is not distributed across the data holders. Thus, the tradeoff between TREs and FL is between a centralised, trusted entity with large computational facilities that can place substantial restrictions on the analysis, and a consortium that requires all parties to apply governance guidelines and provide compute, but can scale both data access and privacy guarantees.

2.1. Topologies

The *topology* of the FL consortium is determined by the number of participating parties and their defined interactions. Some examples are illustrated in Figure 2. The most common is the *centralised* topology, where multiple data-holding parties (the *clients*) collaboratively train a shared machine learning model through a central server (the *aggregator*) that iteratively collects model updates from each client, updates the global model, and redistributes it back to the clients. Typically, clients do not communicate directly; they only communicate with the central server. In contrast, a *decentralised* topology (Beltrán et al., 2023) lacks a dedicated aggregation server. All consortium parties can potentially be model trainers and aggregators, interacting via peer-to-peer communication. Hybrid configurations include, for instance, using two servers: one server handles aggregation of noisy local models, while the other performs auxiliary tasks, such as noise aggregation (Nasirigerdeh et al., 2021). Clients can communicate with the servers, and servers can communicate between themselves, but clients cannot communicate with each other.

We will focus on the standard centralised topology and its two-server variant here because, to our knowledge, no bioinformatics applications use decentralised topologies.

2.2. Hardware and software

Hardware, software and models should be chosen with knowledge of the data and inputs from domain and machine learning specialists to design an effective machine learning pipeline (Scutari and Malvestio, 2023).

In terms of infrastructure, FL requires computational resources for each client and server. The optimal hardware configuration depends on the models to be trained; at a minimum, each client must be able to produce model updates from local data, and each server must be able to aggregate those updates and manage the consortium. Connection bandwidth is not necessarily critical: to date, client-server communications contain only a few megabytes of data, reaching 150MB only for large computer vision models, and can be made more compact through compression and model quantisation (Camajori Tedeschini et al., 2022). On the other hand, latency may be a bottleneck if it limits the hardware utilisation.

As for software, several dedicated FL frameworks, many of which are comparatively analysed in (Riedel et al., 2024), provide structured tools and environments for developing, deploying, and managing federated machine learning models. While some frameworks, such as Tensorflow Federated (TFF; Google, 2024), specialise in particular models, others support a broader range of approaches. Notable open-source examples include PySyft (Ziller et al., 2021) and Flower (Beutel et al., 2020). Both are supported by active communities and integrate with PyTorch to train complex models. PySyft is a multi-language library focusing on advanced privacy-preserving techniques, including differential privacy and homomorphic encryption. Flower is an FL framework: its modular design and ease of customisation make it particularly useful for large-scale and multi-omics studies involving heterogeneous devices and clients. We will provide examples using these frameworks in Section 3 before discussing frameworks explicitly designed for bioinformatics in Section 3.6.

Other frameworks target healthcare and biomedical applications but not bioinformatics specifically. For instance, OpenFL (Foley et al., 2022) is designed to facilitate FL on sensitive EHRs and medical imaging data; it supports different data partitioning schemes (Section 2.4) but struggles with heterogeneous cross-device FL (Section 2.3). NVIDIA Clara, which was used in Dayan et al. (2021), has similar limitations.

2.3. Usage scenarios: cross-device and cross-silo

FL applications take different forms in different domains. Many small, low-powered clients, such as wearable medical devices from the Internet of Things, may produce the data needed to train the federated machine learning model. Such *cross-device* communications are often unreliable: passing lightweight model

updates instead of raw data largely addresses connectivity issues and privacy risks.

FL may also involve a small number of parties, each possessing large amounts of sensitive data (Huang et al., 2022), stored within their “data silos”. In this *cross-silo* scenario, common in healthcare and bioinformatics, the priority is to minimise the privacy risks associated with data sharing and comply with regulations. Minimising large data transfers is also computationally advantageous when modelling large volumes of information, such as whole-genome sequences.

These two scenarios differ in how they handle model updates. In the cross-silo scenario, all (few) data holders in the consortium must participate in each update. In contrast, we can rely on a subset of (the many) data holders in the cross-device scenario because each holds a smaller share of the overall data. This article focuses on the cross-silo scenario, as nearly all bioinformatics applications fall within this framework.

2.4. Data partitioning and heterogeneity

Data may be partitioned along two axes: each party may record the same features for different samples or features describing the same samples (Figure 3). In the first scenario, known as *horizontal* FL,¹ different parties may each possess genomic sequencing data from different individuals. In contrast, in *vertical* FL, one party may hold data from one omic type (say, genomic data), while another may have data from a different phenotype or omic type (say, proteomic data) for the same individuals. Horizontal FL is by far the most prevalent approach in bioinformatics.

Significant variations in sample size and feature distributions between data holders often exist. This heterogeneity allows FL to better capture the variability of the underlying population, resulting in transferrable models that generalise well (Sheller et al., 2020). Clearly, if data holders collect observations from distinct populations, any federated model trained from them must be correctly specified to capture population structure and avoid bias in inference and prediction. If the populations are known, we can train targeted population-specific models alongside the global one (Tan et al., 2022). Otherwise, we can use clustering to identify them from the available data (Sattler et al., 2021). Accounting for variations in measurements, definitions and distributions to harmonise data across parties is also fundamental but is much more challenging because access to data is restricted, even more so than in meta-analysis (Camajori Tedeschini et al., 2022).

2.5. Security and privacy

FL reduces some privacy and security risks by design by passing model updates between parties instead of centralising data in a single location. However, it does not eliminate them completely.

In terms of privacy, deep learning models are the most problematic in machine learning because of their ability to memorise training data. They leak individual observations during training (through model updates; Geiping et al., 2020), after training (through their parameters; Haim et al., 2022) and during inference (membership attacks; Shokri et al., 2017; Hu et al., 2022). More broadly, individual reidentification is an issue for genetic data (Homer et al., 2008) and all the models learned from them. For instance, (Cai et al., 2015) has demonstrated that it is possible to identify an individual




Fig. 3. Illustration of horizontal and vertical FL data partitioning. In horizontal FL (left), clients hold data sets with the same features ($c1-c3$) but different subsets of samples ($r1-r8$). In vertical FL (right), clients hold data sets with different features ($c1-c6$) but the same set of samples ($r1-r4$).

from the linear model learned in an association study from just 25 genes. However, such works make unrealistic assumptions on the level of access to the models and the data (Kolobkov et al., 2024): even basic infrastructure security measures and the distributed nature of the data will make such identification difficult under the best circumstances. The privacy-enhancing techniques discussed in Section 2.6 can make such efforts completely impractical.

As for security, we must consider different *threat models*, understanding what information requires protection, their vulnerabilities, and how to mitigate or respond to threats. Internal and external threats to the consortium should be treated equally with *security in depth* design and implementation decisions that consider parties untrusted. Security threats, such as membership attacks and model inversion attacks (Fredrikson et al., 2015), can originate equally from parties and external adversaries that seek to abuse the model inference capabilities to extract information about the data. On the other hand, adversarial attacks are more likely to originate from consortium parties that seek to introduce carefully crafted data or model updates into the training process to produce a global model with undesirable behaviour. Some examples are data poisoning (Sun et al., 2022b), manipulation (Jagielski et al., 2018) and Byzantine attacks (Li et al., 2023a).

Encrypting communication channels, implementing strict authentication (to verify each party’s identity) and authorisation (to control which information and resources each party has access to or shares) schemes, and keeping comprehensive access logs for audit can secure any machine learning pipeline, including federated ones. Similarly, using an experiment tracking platform makes it possible to track data provenance, audit both the data and the training process and ensure the reproducibility of results (Scutari and Malvestio, 2023). These measures must be complemented by federated models resistant to these threats at training and inference time, as thoroughly discussed in Yin et al. (2021).

¹ This naming convention assumes that samples (features) are the rows (columns) of a tabular data set.

2.6. Privacy-enhancing techniques

Privacy-enhancing techniques improve the confidentiality of sensitive information during training. We summarise the most relevant below, illustrating them in Figure 4.

Homomorphic encryption (HE; Gentry, 2009) is a cryptographic technique that enables computations to be performed directly on encrypted data (ciphertexts) without requiring decryption. The outcome of operations on ciphertexts matches the result of performing the same operations on the corresponding non-encrypted values (plaintexts) when decrypted. HE can be either *fully homomorphic* (FHE), which allows for arbitrary computations, or *partially homomorphic* (PHE), which supports only a specific subset of mathematical operations. For instance, the Paillier PHE scheme (Paillier, 1999) only supports additive operations on encrypted data. FHE requires considerable computational resources for encryption and decryption. PHE is less flexible but computationally more efficient, making it a common choice in practical applications.

Secure multiparty computation (SMPC; Zhao et al., 2019) is a peer-to-peer protocol allowing multiple parties to compute a function over their data collaboratively, similarly to Figure 2 (centre). Each data holder divides their data into random shares and distributes them among all parties in the consortium, thus ensuring that no single party can access the complete data set. The shares are then combined during the computation process, often with the assistance of a server, to produce the correct result while preserving data privacy. SMPC ensures high security with exact results and keeps data private throughout the computation process. However, SMPC is computationally intensive and requires peer-to-peer communication, leading to high communication overhead. Its complexity also increases with the number of participants, limiting scalability.

Another approach to securing FL is using an aggregator and a compensator server in a centralised two-server topology (Figure 2, right; Nasirigerdeh et al., 2021). Each client adds a noise pattern to their local data, sharing the former with the compensator (which aggregates all noise patterns) and the latter with the aggregator (which aggregates the noisy data and trains the model). The aggregator then obtains the overall noise pattern from the compensator and removes it from the aggregated noisy data, allowing for denoised model training. This two-server approach is efficient: it requires neither extensive computation in the clients nor peer-to-peer communication. However, it makes infrastructure more complex and requires trust in both servers not to collude to compromise the privacy of individual contributions.

Unlike the above methods, which are encryption-based methods ensuring data confidentiality during transmission or storage, differential privacy, another popular technique for data-protection in federated learning, is not an encryption system but rather a technique that focuses on privacy by ensuring that the output of data analysis does not leak sensitive information about the underlying dataset. Differential privacy (DP; Ficek et al., 2021) achieves this by a mathematical framework designed to enable analyses to remain statistically consistent regardless of whether any specific individual’s data is included or excluded. This property guarantees that sensitive information about individuals cannot be inferred from the results up to a preset “privacy budget” worth of operations. DP is typically implemented by introducing noise into the data (Schein et al., 2019; Cai et al., 2021), weight clipping in the training process (Abadi et al., 2016; Jayaraman and

Example: privacy-preserving sum in FL

We present a simple example where three clients, with values 5, 10, and 15, respectively, aim to securely calculate their sum, which has a true value of $5 + 10 + 15 = 30$. We show how to compute this sum using three techniques described in Section 2.6.

Homomorphic Encryption

- A trusted entity generates a public-private key pair and distributes the public key to the clients.
- Each client encrypts their value using the public key and an additive homomorphic encryption scheme: $E(5)$, $E(10)$, and $E(15)$, where $E(x)$ denotes the homomorphic encryption of x .
- Clients send the encrypted values $E(5)$, $E(10)$, and $E(15)$ to the server.
- The server performs homomorphic addition on the encrypted values: $E(5) + E(10) + E(15) = E(30)$.
- The aggregated encrypted value $E(30)$ is sent back to the trusted entity with access to the private key.
- Using the private key, the trusted entity decrypts $E(30)$, obtaining 30.

Secure Multiparty Computation

- Clients split their values into random shares as $\{2; 1; 2\}$, $\{3; 4; 3\}$, and $\{5; 5; 5\}$ respectively, and then send the first two shares each to one of the other two clients.
- Clients sum the received shares and their local share to obtain 10, 9, and 11 respectively, and then send the obtained values to the server.
- The server sums the received values, obtaining 30.

Two-Server Approach

- Clients generate large random noise values, 543, 2612, and 1633, respectively.
- Clients add the noise to their respective data, obtaining 548, 2622, and 1648, and send these values to the aggregator server.
- Clients send their noise values to the auxiliary server.
- The auxiliary server calculates the total noise, 4788, and sends it to the aggregator server.
- The aggregator server computes the total of the noised contributions, 4818, and subtracts the total noise, 4788, obtaining 30.

Fig. 4. Example of privacy-preserving sum computation in FL using three different techniques. Note that although differential privacy is described in Section 2.6, it is not included in this example, as it would not be suitable for such a calculation.

Evans, 2019) or predictions (Nissim et al., 2007; Dwork and Feldman, 2018) to obfuscate individual contributions. The amount of noise must be carefully calibrated to balance predictive accuracy and privacy within the analysis: too little noise undermines privacy, and too much reduces performance. This effect is more pronounced within specific subgroups underrepresented in the training set (Bagdasaryan et al., 2019).

3. Federated learning in bioinformatics

Most FL literature focuses on general algorithms and is motivated by applications other than bioinformatics, such as digital twins for smart cities (Ramu et al., 2022), smart industry (Zhang et al., 2021) and open banking and finance (Long et al., 2020). Even the clinical literature mainly focuses on different types of data and issues (Dayan et al., 2021; van Rooden et al., 2024). Here, we highlight and discuss notable examples of FL designed specifically for bioinformatics. They are all in the early stages of development, so their reliability, reproducibility, and scalability are open questions. However, they hint at the potential of FL to perform better than meta-analysis and single-client analyses on real-world data, comparing favourably to centralised data analyses in which data are pooled in a central location while addressing data sharing and use concerns (Zolotareva et al., 2021; Xu et al., 2020).

3.1. Proteomics and differential gene expression

Proteomics studies the complex protein dynamics that govern cellular processes and their interplay with physiological and pathological states, such as cancer (Maes et al., 2015), to improve risk assessment, treatment selection and patient monitoring. Differential expression analyses focus specifically on comparing expression levels across different conditions, tissues, or cell types to identify genes with statistically significant differences (Rodriguez-Esteban and Jiang, 2017).

In addition to the issues discussed in Section 2, FL in proteomics must overcome the challenge of integrating data from different platforms (Rieke et al., 2020) while accounting for imbalanced samples and batch effects. Cai et al. (2022) produced a federated implementation of DEqMS (FedProt; Zhu et al., 2020) for variance estimation in mass spectrometry-based data that successfully identifies top differentially-abundant proteins in two real-world data sets using label-free quantification and tandem mass tags.

Zolotareva et al. (2021) implemented a federated *limma* *voom* pipeline (Law et al., 2014) on top of HyFed (Nasirigerdeh et al., 2021), which uses the aggregator-compensator two-server topology we described earlier. This approach was showcased on two extensive RNA-seq data sets, proving robust to heterogeneity across clients and batch effects. Hannemann et al. (2024) trained a federated deep-learning model for cell type classification using both Flower and TFF and different architectures, with similar results.

3.2. Genome-wide association studies

Genome-wide association studies (GWAS) aim to identify genomic variants statistically associated with a qualitative (say, a case-control label) or quantitative trait (say, body mass index). These studies mainly use regression models, which can be largely trained using general-purpose federated regression implementations with minor modifications to address scalability and correct for population structure (see, for instance, Kolobkov et al., 2024).

Li et al. (2022) has developed the most complete adaptation of these models to federated GWAS in the literature: it provides linear and logistic regressions with fixed and random effects and accounts for population structure via a genomic relatedness matrix. Wang et al. (2022) further provides a federated estimator for the genomic relatedness matrix. Finally, Li et al. (2024) describes the federated association tests for the

genomic variants associated with this model. All these steps incorporate HE to ensure privacy in the GWAS.

As an alternative, Cho et al. (2024) build on REGENIE (Mbatchou et al., 2021) to avoid using a genomic relatedness matrix and increase the scalability of GWAS while using MPC and HE to secure the data. Despite the overhead introduced by the encryption, this approach is efficient enough to work on a cohort of 401k individuals from the UK Biobank and 90 million single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) in less than 5 hours.

3.3. Single-cell RNA sequencing

Single-cell RNA sequencing (scRNA-seq) measures gene expression at the cellular level rather than aggregating it at the tissue level as in bulk RNA sequencing, identifying the distinct expression profiles of individual cell populations within tissues (Hwang et al., 2018; Papalexi and Satija, 2018).

Wang et al. (2024) developed scFed, a unified FL framework integrating four algorithms for cell type classification from scRNA-seq data: the ACTINN neural network (Ma and Pellegrini, 2020), explicitly designed for this task; a linear support vector machine; XGBoost based on Li et al. (2023b); and the GeneFormer transformer (Theodoris et al., 2023). They evaluated scFed on eight data sets evenly distributed among 2–20 clients, suggesting that the federated approach has a predictive accuracy comparable to that obtained by pooling the data and better than that in individual clients. However, the overhead during training increases with the number of clients, limiting the scalability to larger consortia.

3.4. Multi-omics

Proteomics, genomics, and transcriptomics capture different aspects of biological processes. Integrating large data sets from different omics offers deeper insights into their underlying mechanisms (Civelek and Lusic, 2014). Vertical FL allows multiple parties to combine various features of the same patients into multimodal omics data sets without exposing sensitive information (Liu et al., 2024). For instance, Wang et al. (2023) trained a deep neural network with an adaptive optimisation module for cancer prognosis evaluation from multi-omics data. The neural network performs feature selection while the adaptive optimisation module prevents overfitting, a common issue in small high-dimensional samples (Rajput et al., 2023). This method performs better than a single-omic analysis, but the improvement in predictive accuracy is strongly model-dependent. Another example is Danek et al. (2024), who built a diagnostic model for Parkinson’s disease: they provided a reproducible setup for evaluating several multi-omics models trained on pre-processed, harmonised and artificially horizontally federated data using Flower. Their study identifies a general but not substantial reduction in FL performance compared to centrally trained models, which increases with the number of clients and is variably affected by client heterogeneity.

3.5. Medical imaging

Medical imaging studies the human body’s interior to diagnose abnormalities in its anatomy and physiology from digital images such as those obtained by radiography, magnetic resonance and ultrasound devices (Suetens, 2017). It is the most common application of FL in the medical literature (Chowdhury et al., 2022). As a result, protocols for image segmentation and diagnostic prediction are well documented.

Notable case studies target breast cancer (Roth et al., 2020), melanomas (Haggenmüller et al., 2024), cardiovascular disease (Linardos et al., 2022), COVID-19 (Yang et al., 2021; Dayan et al., 2021).

Machine learning applications that use medical imaging data typically face challenges such as incomplete or inaccurate labelling and the normalisation of images from different scanners and different protocols. Bdair et al. (2022) explored a federated labelling scheme in which clients produced ground-truth labels for skin lesions in a privacy-preserving manner, improving classification accuracy. Yan et al. (2023) also proposed an efficient scheme to use data sets mainly comprising unlabelled images, focusing on chest X-rays. Furthermore, Jiang et al. (2022) apply FL to learn a harmonised feature set from heterogeneous medical images, improving both the classification and segmentation of histology and MRI scans.

3.6. Ready-to-use FL tools for bioinformatics

The need for user-friendly FL implementations of common bioinformatics workflows has driven the creation of secure collaborative analysis tools (Berger and Cho, 2019; Froelicher et al., 2021; Wan et al., 2022). Two notable examples are sikit and FeatureCloud.

The sikit framework (Mendelsohn et al., 2023) facilitates federated genomic analyses by implementing GWAS, principal component analysis (PCA), genetic relatedness and a modular architecture to complement them as needed. It provides a web interface featuring a project bulletin board, chat functions, study parameter configurations and results sharing. State-of-the-art cryptographic tools for privacy preservation based on SMPC and HE ensure data protection (Mouchet et al., 2020).

FeatureCloud (Matschinske et al., 2023) is an integrated solution from which end users without programming experience can build custom workflows. It provides modules to run on the clients and servers in the consortium. Unlike sikit, FeatureCloud allows users publish applications in its app store, including regression models, random forests and neural networks. Developers must also document how privacy guarantees are implemented in their apps.

4. How to conduct federation of specific operations in bioinformatics

This section provides practical insights to help a reader interested in building a federated and secure analogue of an existing bioinformatics algorithm. We focus on horizontal FL with the centralised topology from Figure 2 (left). Consider K different clients, each possessing a local data set X^k , where $k = 1, \dots, K$. Each data set contains n^k samples, denoted as x_{ij}^k , where $i = 1, \dots, n^k$ represents the sample index, and $j = 1, \dots, P$ represents the P features for each sample. We denote a row (column) of the matrix X^k as x_{i*}^k (x_{*j}^k). This describes a distributed data set of $N = \sum_{k=1}^K n^k$ observations:

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} X^1 \\ X^2 \\ \dots \\ X^K \end{bmatrix}.$$

The following sections assume that an FL consortium has been established, the necessary infrastructure is operational, and an appropriate FL framework has been selected and installed. It is also assumed that a secure aggregation protocol

has been chosen, such as those described in Section 2.6 and Figure 4. The choice of a specific secure aggregation protocol may depend on several factors, including technology and infrastructure (e.g., the availability of a specific FL topology that drives the choice), privacy risks, or scalability concerns, as discussed in Section 2.6. In the following sections, we provide a general overview of sum-based mathematical operations built upon a secure aggregation protocol, as well as operations involving federated averaging (FedAvg; McMahan et al., 2017).

Coding examples using Flower (Beutel et al., 2020) are available in our GitHub repository (<https://github.com/IDSIA/FL-Bioinformatics>). We chose Flower because it has a shallow learning curve for new FL users and provides a good balance between simplicity and flexibility when implementing custom algorithms. Riedel et al. (2024) also identified Flower as a promising framework because it has a large, active, and growing community of developers and scientists and because of the extensive tutorials and documentation. In our examples, secure summation is performed using the secure aggregation protocol **SecAgg+** (Bell et al., 2020). This protocol combines encryption with SMPC, using a multiparty approach in which each client interacts with only a subset of the others. It is particularly suitable for several FL contexts, as it is robust to client dropout and highly scalable. In particular, a relevant aspect of the bioinformatics domain is that it scales linearly with the size of the vectors to be aggregated (Li et al., 2021).

4.1. Sum-based computations

Let a^k be real numbers stored by individual clients. We define the secure sum of these numbers, performed through the selected secure aggregation protocol, as $\bigoplus_{k=1}^K a^k$. We can build on this simple secure sum to construct a wide range of operations. However, note that as the complexity of operations increases, the amount of information revealed to the server may also increase. Sum-based operations include:

- The *overall sample size* of the distributed data set as $N = \bigoplus_{i=1}^K n^k$ from the local sample sizes n^k .
- The *mean value of the j -th feature*, given N , as

$$M_j = \frac{1}{N} \bigoplus_{i=1}^K \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n^k} x_{ij}^k \right].$$

Each client computes the inner sum on their local data, whereas the outer one is a secure sum aggregated across clients by the server.

- The *variance of the j -th feature*, given N and M_j , as

$$V_j = \frac{1}{N-1} \bigoplus_{k=1}^K \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n^k} (x_{ij}^k - M_j)^2 \right],$$

which can be used to standardise the j -th feature as $(x_{*j}^k - M_j)/\sqrt{V_j}$.

- The *Pearson correlation coefficient* of two features j and j' , given M_j and $M_{j'}$, as

$$\rho_{j,j'} = \frac{\frac{1}{N-1} \bigoplus_{k=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^{n^k} (x_{ij}^k - M_j)(x_{ij'}^k - M_{j'})}{\sqrt{V_j V_{j'}}}.$$

- The *matrix $X^T X$* , as $X^T X = \bigoplus_{k=1}^K (X^k)^T X^k$, where \bigoplus is a secure element-wise sum. This matrix is equivalent to the covariance matrix for standardised data sets and is commonly used for PCA.

Beyond these general-purpose examples, many operations specific to bioinformatics pipelines also rely on simple sums. These operations are often straightforward generalisations or compositions of the examples introduced above.

In differential gene expression studies, for instance, filtering out weakly expressed genes is standard practice. Weakly expressed genes can be defined as those whose expression values fall below a specified threshold t in, for instance, 70% of the samples. Let v^k be a vector belonging to client k , where each vector component represents the number of samples in which the expression level of the gene (e.g., counts) exceeds the threshold t . The server can securely calculate $v = \frac{1}{N} \bigoplus_{k=1}^K v^k$ and identify weakly expressed genes as those whose corresponding components of v are smaller than 0.7.

A fundamental preliminary step in a GWAS is identifying the minor allele and its frequency. Let a^k, c^k, g^k , and t^k be vectors belonging to client k , where each component corresponds to a specific SNP. The components of a^k, c^k, g^k, t^k represent the number of samples in which nucleotides A, C, G, T are observed, respectively. The server can securely compute the aggregated allele counts across all clients as $a = \bigoplus_{k=1}^K a^k$ and similarly c, g, t (where t can also be computed by difference from N and the other three vectors). For each SNP, the minor allele is determined by comparing the corresponding components of a, c, g, t : the allele with the smaller value is designated as the minor allele. This operation is crucial because the minor allele within a single client’s population may differ from the minor allele when considering the whole distributed data set. Ensuring a consistent definition of the minor allele across all clients is essential for reliable downstream analyses.

4.2. Federated averaging computations

FedAvg is a widely used algorithm for training deep neural networks in FL. It iteratively computes a weighted average of model parameters across clients, with weights proportional to the local sample sizes n^k . Thus, it can be applied to any parametric model, including linear models.

FedAvg proceeds as illustrated in Figure 1. The server first broadcasts an initial global model with parameters w_0 . At each step of the algorithm, clients start with the global model w_t and perform local updates to produce updated local models w_{t+1}^k . The global model is updated after each round of local training as the weighted sum of the local models:

$$w_{t+1} = \bigoplus_{k=1}^K \frac{n^k}{N} w_{t+1}^k,$$

where we use the secure sum \bigoplus for aggregation (FedAvg is itself a sum-based operation). After aggregation, the updated global model is distributed back to the clients.

However, many bioinformatics pipelines rely on linear models rather than deep learning models. One commonly used model is logistic regression, which is applied in tasks such as gene expression analysis and GWAS. A federated implementation of logistic regression can be achieved by starting with a standard implementation and applying FedAvg, which aggregates the local models after a specified number of iterations performed by the local logistic regressions.

5. Legal aspects of federated learning

The legal frameworks used within FL consortia are rarely discussed in the literature. Ballhausen et al. (2024) describes both the technical and legal aspects of a European pilot

study implementing a federated statistical analysis by secure multiparty computation. They set up agreements between parties similar to those between the participants of a multi-centre clinical trial because using SMPC and only exchanging model gradients was legally considered data pseudonymisation (rather than anonymisation). FL was determined to require the same level of data protection as regular data sharing, which is also the most conservative course of action suggested in Truong et al. (2021); Lieftink et al. (2024). All clients jointly controlled the consortium and were responsible for determining the purpose and means of processing, including obtaining approval from the respective Ethics Committees. Sun et al. (2022a) similarly describes the server in their consortium as a trusted, secure environment supported by a legal joint controller agreement between the data owners.

Following Ballhausen et al. (2024), establishing an FL consortium could be expected to require all participating and involved parties to execute agreements that regulate their interactions. Doing so will establish the level of trust between parties and their responsibilities towards each other, third parties, and patients. Risk aversion suggests that it should contain a data-sharing agreement allowing for information sharing described in Figure 1. No party has access to other parties’ data. Still, it is theoretically possible that, in some cases, the model updates shared during FL could be deanonymised by malicious internal or external attackers (Truong et al., 2021). Parties may then be reluctant to treat that information as non-personally identifiable without formal mathematical proof of anonymisation and prefer to establish data protection responsibilities with a data-sharing agreement. In the EU, GDPR states that we should consider “all the means reasonably likely to be used” to “determine whether a natural person is identifiable” (European Union, 2016). Securing infrastructure in depth using best practices from information technology, defensive software engineering, and data by secure computing and encryption can make malicious attacks impractical with current technologies (security by design and by default; Volini, 2020; Martin and Kung, 2018). In addition, when FL involves models other than deep neural networks, if the contributions of individual parties are well balanced across the consortium and include a sufficiently large number of individuals, the information exchanged may very well be the same summary information routinely published as supplementary material to academic journal publications (Jégou et al., 2024). A recent systematic literature review of privacy attacks in FL has also highlighted that many of them are only feasible under unrealistic assumptions (Wainakh et al., 2022). Therefore, the reduced amount of information shared during FL and using secure computing should be considered to provide increased protection against data leaks and misuse. Advertising it as a key feature of the FL consortium will make partners and patients more comfortable with contributing to federated studies (see, for instance, Ballhausen et al., 2024). Lieftink et al. (2024), which investigated how FL aligns with GDPR in public health, also acknowledges that FL mitigates many privacy risks by enforcing purpose limitation, data use and information exchange minimisation, integrity and confidentiality (at a cost, as discussed in Section 2.4).

Furthermore, consortium parties must agree on how to assign intellectual property (IP) rights. Bioinformatics research often has practical applications in industry, which may involve patenting the results and apportioning any financial gains arising from their use. Parties in the consortium jointly control it and should share any gains from it (Minssen and Pierce,

2018). FL consortia are no different in this respect. From a technical standpoint, watermarking techniques for tracking data provenance and plagiarism have been adapted to FL Tekgul et al. (2021) to identify data and model theft.

In addition, the agreement establishing the FL consortium must set out its relationships with third parties and their legal duties. Third parties that have access to the infrastructure may be required to sign a data processing agreement to guarantee the safety and privacy of data. In many countries, patients also have the right to withdraw their consent to use their data, which in turn may require implementing procedures to remove individual data points from future federated analyses.

To summarise, FL provides increased protection against data and model leaks and should reduce the parties' and patients' perceived risk in contributing to the consortium. However, out of an abundance of caution, establishing a consortium-wide data-sharing agreement may allocate and reduce party responsibilities in the event of privacy breaches. The use of FL has a limited impact on other legal aspects of collaborative analysis, such as IP handling and requirements for third parties, because it is a technical solution that does not change the fundamental legal rights and responsibilities of the parties involved in the consortium.

6. Conclusions

Several independent research efforts have shown federated learning to be an effective tool to improve clinical discovery while minimising data sharing (Roth et al., 2020; Pati et al., 2022; Heyndrickx et al., 2023). FL allows access to larger and more varied data pools, leading to a faster and more robust exploration and translation of results. At the same time, it provides enhanced data privacy and can seamlessly incorporate advanced encrypted and secure computation techniques. Despite the increased computational requirements and reduced ability to explore and troubleshoot issues with the data (Liefertink et al., 2024), the benefits of FL may outweigh these additional costs.

Therefore, federated learning can potentially reduce the risks associated with EU and US regulations if implemented in a manner secure by design and by default. Its use may also make patients and institutions more confident in participating in clinical studies by reducing privacy and data misuse risks. However, the reliable use of federated learning and its effective translation into clinical practice requires a concerted effort by machine learning and clinical and information technology specialists. All their skills are required to accurately evaluate those risks and expand practical applications of federated learning in bioinformatics beyond the early-stage applications reviewed in this paper.

Funding

This work was supported by the European Union Horizon 2020 programme [101136962]; UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) under the UK Government's Horizon Europe funding guarantee [10098097, 10104323] and the Swiss State Secretariat for Education, Research and Innovation (SERI).

References

M. Abadi, A. Chu, I. Goodfellow, H. B. McMahan, I. Mironov, K. Talwar, and L. Zhang. Deep Learning with Differential

Privacy. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Sigsac Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 308–318, 2016.

E. Bagdasaryan, O. Poursaeed, and V. Shmatikov. Differential Privacy Has Disparate Impact on Model Accuracy. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32:15479–15488, 2019.

H. Ballhausen, S. Corradini, C. Belka, D. Bogdanov, L. Boldrini, F. Bono, C. Goelz, G. Landry, G. Panza, K. Parodi, R. Talviste, H. E. Tran, M. A. Gambacorta, and S. Marschner. Privacy-Friendly Evaluation of Patient Data with Secure Multiparty Computation in a European Pilot Study. *Npj Digital Medicine*, 7(1):280, 2024.

T. Bdair, N. Navab, and S. Albarqouni. Semi-Supervised Federated Peer Learning for Skin Lesion Classification. *Machine Learning for Biomedical Imaging*, 1(April 2022): 1–37, 2022.

J. H. Bell, K. A. Bonawitz, A. Gascón, T. Lepoint, and M. Raykova. Secure Single-Server Aggregation with (Poly) Logarithmic Overhead. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM Sigsac Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 1253–1269, 2020.

E. T. M. Beltrán, M. Q. Pérez, P. M. S. Sánchez, S. L. Bernal, G. Bovet, M. G. Pérez, G. M. Pérez, and A. H. Celdrán. Decentralized Federated Learning: Fundamentals, State of the Art, Frameworks, Trends, and Challenges. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 5(4):2983–3013, 2023.

B. Berger and H. Cho. Emerging Technologies Towards Enhancing Privacy in Genomic Data Sharing. *Genome Biology*, 20:128, 2019.

D. J. Beutel, T. Topal, A. Mathur, X. Qiu, J. Fernandez-Marques, Y. Gao, L. Sani, K. H. Li, T. Parcollet, P. P. B. de Gusmão, et al. *Flower: A Friendly Federated Learning Research Framework*, 2020. arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.14390.

T. S. Brisimi, R. Chen, T. Mela, A. Olshevsky, I. C. Paschalidis, and W. Shi. Federated Learning of Predictive Models From Federated Electronic Health Records. *International Journal of Medical Informatics*, 112:59–67, 2018.

K. Cai, X. Lei, J. Wei, and X. Xiao. Data Synthesis via Differentially Private Markov Random Fields. *Proceedings of the Vldb Endowment*, 14(11):2190–2202, 2021.

R. Cai, Z. Hao, M. Winslett, X. Xiao, Y. Yang, Z. Zhang, and S. Zhou. Deterministic Identification of Specific Individuals From GWAS Results. *Bioinformatics*, 31(11):1701–1707, 2015.

Z. Cai, R. C. Poulos, J. Liu, and Q. Zhong. Machine Learning for Multi-Omics Data Integration in Cancer. *IScience*, 25(2), 2022.

B. Camajori Tedeschini, S. Savazzi, R. Stoklasa, L. Barbieri, I. Stathopoulos, M. Nicoli, and L. Serio. Decentralized Federated Learning for Healthcare Networks: A Case Study on Tumor Segmentation. *IEEE Access*, 10:8693–8708, 2022.

C. Cath, S. Wachter, B. Mittelstadt, M. Taddeo, and L. Floridi. Artificial Intelligence and the ‘Good Society’: the US, EU, and UK Approach. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 24(2): 505–528, 2018.

H. Cho, D. Froelicher, J. Chen, M. Edupalli, A. Pyrgelis, J. R. Troncoso-Pastoriza, J. Hubaux, and B. Berger. *Secure and Federated Genome-Wide Association Studies for Biobank-Scale Datasets*, 2024. bioRxiv preprint 10.1101/2022.11.30.518537v2.

- A. Chowdhury, H. Kassem, N. Padoy, R. Umeton, and A. Karargyris. A Review of Medical Federated Learning: Applications in Oncology and Cancer Research. In *Brainlesion: Glioma, Multiple Sclerosis, Stroke and Traumatic Brain Injuries: 7th International Workshop, BrainLes 2021, 24th MICCAI Conference*, pages 3–24, 2022.
- M. Civelek and A. J. Lusis. Systems Genetics Approaches to Understand Complex Traits. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 15(1):34–48, 2014.
- B. P. Danek, M. B. Makarious, A. Dadu, D. Vitale, P. S. Lee, A. B. Singleton, M. A. Nalls, J. Sun, and F. Faghri. Federated Learning for Multi-Omics: A Performance Evaluation in Parkinson’s Disease. *Patterns*, 5(3):100945, 2024.
- I. Dayan, H. R. Roth, A. Zhong, A. Harouni, A. Gentili, A. Z. Abidin, A. Liu, A. B. Costa, B. J. Wood, C. Tsai, C. Wang, C. Hsu, C. K. Lee, P. Ruan, D. Xu, D. Wu, E. Huang, F. C. Kitamura, G. Lacey, G. C. de Antônio Corradi, G. Nino, H. Shin, H. Obinata, H. Ren, J. C. Crane, J. Tetreault, J. Guan, J. W. Garrett, J. D. Kaggie, J. G. Park, K. Dreyer, K. Juluru, K. Kersten, M. A. B. C. Rockenbach, M. G. Linguraru, M. A. Haider, M. AbdelMaseeh, N. Rieke, P. F. Damasceno, P. M. C. e Silva, P. Wang, S. Xu, S. Kawano, S. Sriswasdi, S. Y. Park, T. M. Grist, V. Buch, W. Jantarabenjakul, W. Wang, W. Y. Tak, X. Li, X. Lin, Y. J. Kwon, A. Quraini, A. Feng, A. N. Priest, B. Turkbey, B. Glicksberg, B. Bizzo, B. S. Kim, C. Tor-Díez, C. Lee, C. Hsu, C. Lin, C. Lai, C. P. Hess, C. Compas, D. Bhatia, E. K. Oermann, E. Leibovitz, H. Sasaki, H. Mori, I. Yang, J. H. Sohn, K. N. K. Murthy, L. Fu, M. R. F. de Mendonça, M. Fralick, M. K. Kang, M. Adil, N. Gangai, P. Vateekul, P. Elnajjar, S. Hickman, S. Majumdar, S. L. McLeod, S. Reed, S. Gräf, S. Harmon, T. Kodama, T. Puthanakit, T. Mazzulli, V. L. de Lavor, Y. Rakvongthai, Y. R. Lee, Y. Wen, F. J. Gilbert, M. G. Flores, and Q. Li. Federated Learning for Predicting Clinical Outcomes in Patients with COVID-19. *Nature Medicine*, 27(10):1735–1743, 2021.
- C. Dwork and V. Feldman. Privacy-preserving Prediction. In *Proceedings of the 31st Conference On Learning Theory*, pages 1693–1702, 2018.
- European Union. General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). *Official Journal of the European Union*, 679, 2016.
- European Union. AI Act. *Official Journal of the European Union*, 1689, 2024.
- Federated European Genome-phenome Archive. Federated European Genome-Phenome Archive (FEGA), 2024. URL <https://ega-archive.org/federated>. Accessed: 2024-10-30.
- J. Ficek, W. Wang, H. Chen, G. Dagne, and E. Daley. Differential Privacy in Health Research: A Scoping Review. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 28(10):2269–2276, 2021.
- P. Foley, M. J. Sheller, B. Edwards, S. Pati, W. Riviera, M. Sharma, P. N. Moorthy, S. Wang, J. Martin, P. Mirhaji, P. Shah, and S. Bakas. OpenFL: The Open Federated Learning Library. *Physics in Medicine & Biology*, 67(21):214001, 2022.
- M. Fredrikson, S. Jha, and T. Ristenpart. Model Inversion Attacks That Exploit Confidence Information and Basic Countermeasures. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM Sigsac Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 1322–1333, 2015.
- D. Froelicher, J. R. Troncoso-Pastoriza, J. L. Raisaro, M. A. Cuendet, J. S. Sousa, H. Cho, B. Berger, J. Fellay, and J. Hubaux. Truly Privacy-Preserving Federated Analytics for Precision Medicine with Multiparty Homomorphic Encryption. *Nature Communications*, 12(1):5910, 2021.
- J. Geiping, H. Bauermeister, H. Dröge, and M. Moeller. Inverting Gradients-How Easy Is It to Break Privacy in Federated Learning? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:16937–16947, 2020.
- C. Gentry. Fully Homomorphic Encryption Using Ideal Lattices. In *Proceedings of the Forty-First Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 169–178, 2009.
- Google. TensorFlow Federated: Machine Learning on Decentralized Data, 2024. URL <https://www.tensorflow.org/federated>.
- S. Haggemüller, M. Schmitt, E. Kriehoff-Henning, A. Hekler, R. C. Maron, C. Wies, J. S. Utikal, F. Meier, S. Hobelsberger, F. F. Gellrich, M. Sergon, A. Hauschild, L. E. French, L. Heinzlerling, J. G. Schlager, K. Ghoreschi, M. Schlaak, F. J. Hilke, G. Poch, S. Korsing, C. Berking, M. V. Heppt, M. Erdmann, S. Haferkamp, K. Drexler, D. Schadendorf, W. Sondermann, M. Goebeler, B. Schilling, J. N. Kathler, S. Fröhling, and T. J. Brinker. Federated Learning for Decentralized Artificial Intelligence in Melanoma Diagnostics. *JAMA Dermatology*, 160(3):303, 2024.
- N. Haim, G. Vardi, G. Yehudai, O. Shamir, and M. Irani. Reconstructing Training Data From Trained Neural Networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:22911–22924, 2022.
- A. Hannemann, J. Ewald, L. Seeger, and E. Buchmann. Federated Learning on Transcriptomic Data: Model Quality and Performance Trade-Offs. In *International Conference on Computational Science*, pages 279–293, 2024.
- W. Heyndrickx, L. Mervin, T. Morawietz, N. Sturm, L. Friedrich, A. Zalewski, A. Pentina, L. Humbeck, M. Oldenhof, R. Niwayama, P. Schmidtke, N. Fechner, J. Simm, A. Arany, N. Drizard, R. Jabal, A. Afanasyeva, R. Loeb, S. Verma, S. Harnqvist, M. Holmes, B. Pejo, M. Telenczuk, N. Holway, A. Dieckmann, N. Rieke, F. Zumsande, D. Clevert, M. Krug, C. Luscombe, D. Green, P. Ertl, P. Antal, D. Marcus, N. Do Huu, H. Fuji, S. Pickett, G. Acs, E. Boniface, B. Beck, Y. Sun, A. Gohier, F. Rippmann, O. Engkvist, A. H. Göller, Y. Moreau, M. N. Galtier, A. Schuffenhauer, and H. Ceulemans. MELLODDY: Cross-Pharma Federated Learning at Unprecedented Scale Unlocks Benefits in Qsar Without Compromising Proprietary Information. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, 64(7):2331–2344, 2023.
- N. Homer, S. Szelinger, M. Redman, D. Duggan, W. Tembe, J. Muehling, J. V. Pearson, D. A. Stephan, S. F. Nelson, and D. W. Craig. Resolving Individuals Contributing Trace Amounts of DNA to Highly Complex Mixtures Using High-Density SNP Genotyping Microarrays. *PLoS Genetics*, 4(8):e1000167, 2008.
- H. Hu, Z. Salcic, L. Sun, G. Dobbie, P. S. Yu, and X. Zhang. Membership Inference Attacks on Machine Learning: A Survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 54(11s):1–37, 2022.
- C. Huang, J. Huang, and X. Liu. *Cross-Silo Federated Learning: Challenges and Opportunities*, 2022. arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.12949.
- B. Hwang, J. H. Lee, and D. Bang. Single-Cell RNA Sequencing Technologies and Bioinformatics Pipelines. *Experimental & Molecular Medicine*, 50(8):1–14, 2018.
- M. Jagielski, A. Oprea, B. Biggio, C. Liu, C. Nita-Rotaru, and B. Li. Manipulating Machine Learning: Poisoning Attacks and Countermeasures for Regression Learning. In *2018 IEEE*

- Symposium on Security and Privacy (Sp)*, pages 19–35, 2018.
- B. Jayaraman and D. Evans. Evaluating Differentially Private Machine Learning in Practice. In *28th Usenix Security Symposium (Usenix Security 19)*, pages 1895–1912, 2019.
- R. Jégou, C. Bachot, C. Monteil, E. Boernert, J. Chmiel, M. Boucher, and D. Pau. Capability and Accuracy of Usual Statistical Analyses in a Real-World Setting Using a Federated Approach. *PLoS One*, 19(11):e0312697, 2024.
- M. Jiang, Z. Wang, and Q. Dou. Harmoff: Harmonizing Local and Global Drifts in Federated Learning on Heterogeneous Medical Images. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 36(1):1087–1095, 2022.
- S. Kavianpour, J. Sutherland, E. Mansouri-Benssassi, N. Coull, and E. Jefferson. Next-Generation Capabilities in Trusted Research Environments: Interview Study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 24(9):e33720, 2022.
- D. Kolobkov, S. Mishra Sharma, A. Medvedev, M. Lebedev, E. Kosaretskiy, and R. Vakhitov. Efficacy of Federated Learning on Genomic Data: A Study on the UK Biobank and the 1000 Genomes Project. *Frontiers in Big Data*, 7, 2024.
- C. W. Law, Y. Chen, W. Shi, and G. K. Smyth. Voom: Precision Weights Unlock Linear Model Analysis Tools for RNA-Seq Read Counts. *Genome Biology*, 15(2):1–17, 2014.
- B. Li, P. Wang, Z. Shao, A. Liu, Y. Jiang, and Y. Li. Defending Byzantine Attacks in Ensemble Federated Learning: A Reputation-Based Phishing Approach. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 147:136–148, 2023a.
- K. H. Li, P. P. B. de Gusmão, D. J. Beutel, and N. D. Lane. Secure Aggregation for Federated Learning in Flower. In *Proceedings of the 2nd ACM International Workshop on Distributed Machine Learning*, pages 8–14, 2021.
- Q. Li, Z. Wu, Y. Cai, Y. Han, C. M. Yung, T. Fu, and B. He. Fedtree: A Federated Learning System for Trees. In *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, 2023b.
- W. Li, J. Tong, M. M. Anjum, N. Mohammed, Y. Chen, and X. Jiang. Federated Learning Algorithms for Generalized Mixed-Effects Model (GLMM) on Horizontally Partitioned Data From Distributed Sources. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making*, 22(1), 2022.
- W. Li, H. Chen, X. Jiang, and A. Harmanci. FedGMMAT: Federated Generalized Linear Mixed Model Association Tests. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 20(7):e1012142, 2024.
- N. Liefstink, C. dos S Ribeiro, M. Kroon, G. B. Haringhuizen, A. Wong, and L. H. M. van de Burgwal. The Potential of Federated Learning for Public Health Purposes: A Qualitative Analysis of GDPR Compliance, Europe, 2021. *Eurosurveillance*, 29(38):2300695, 2024.
- A. Linardos, K. Kushibar, S. Walsh, P. Gkontra, and K. Lekadir. Federated Learning for Multi-Center Imaging Diagnostics: A Simulation Study in Cardiovascular Disease. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1):3551, 2022.
- Y. Liu, Y. Kang, T. Zou, Y. Pu, Y. He, X. Ye, Y. Ouyang, Y. Zhang, and Q. Yang. Vertical Federated Learning: Concepts, Advances, and Challenges. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 36(7):3615–3634, 2024.
- G. Long, Y. Tan, J. Jiang, and C. Zhang. *Federated Learning for Open Banking*, pages 240–254. Springer, 2020.
- H. Ludwig and N. Baracaldo. *Federated Learning: A Comprehensive Overview of Methods and Applications*. Springer, 2022.
- F. Ma and M. Pellegrini. Actinn: Automated Identification of Cell Types in Single Cell RNA Sequencing. *Bioinformatics*, 36(2):533–538, 2020.
- E. Maes, I. Mertens, D. Valkenburg, P. Pauwels, C. Rolfo, and G. Baggerman. Proteomics in Cancer Research: Are We Ready for Clinical Practice? *Critical Reviews in Oncology/Hematology*, 96(3):437–448, 2015.
- Y.-D. Martin and A. Kung. Methods and tools for gdpr compliance through privacy and data protection engineering. In *IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy Workshops*, 2018.
- J. Matschinske, J. Späth, M. Bakhtiari, N. Probul, M. M. K. Majdabadi, R. Nasirigerdeh, R. Torkezadehmahani, A. Hartebrodt, B. Orban, S. Fejér, et al. The Featurecloud Platform for Federated Learning in Biomedicine: Unified Approach. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 25(1):e42621, 2023.
- J. Mbatchou, L. Barnard, J. Backman, A. Marcketta, J. A. Kosmicki, A. Ziyatdinov, C. Benner, C. O’Dushlaine, M. Barber, B. Boutkov, L. Habegger, M. Ferreira, A. Baras, J. Reid, G. Abecasis, E. Maxwell, and J. Marchini. Computationally Efficient Whole-Genome Regression for Quantitative and Binary Traits. *Nature Genetics*, 53(7):1097–1103, 2021.
- B. McMahan, E. Moore, D. Ramage, S. Hampson, and B. A. y Arcas. Communication-Efficient Learning of Deep Networks From Decentralized Data. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1273–1282, 2017.
- S. Mendelsohn, D. Froelicher, D. Loginov, D. Bernick, B. Berger, and H. Cho. Sfkkit: A Web-Based Toolkit for Secure and Federated Genomic Analysis. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 51(W1):W535–W541, 2023.
- T. Minssen and J. Pierce. *Big Data and Intellectual Property Rights in the Health and Life Sciences*, pages 311–323. Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- C. V. Mouchet, J. Bossuat, J. R. Troncoso-Pastoriza, and J. Hubaux. Lattigo: A Multiparty Homomorphic Encryption Library in Go. In *Proceedings of the 8th Workshop on Encrypted Computing and Applied Homomorphic Cryptography*, pages 64–70, 2020.
- R. Nasirigerdeh, R. Torkezadehmahani, J. Matschinske, J. Baumbach, D. Rueckert, and G. Kaissis. *Hyfed: A Hybrid Federated Framework for Privacy-Preserving Machine Learning*, 2021. arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.10545.
- K. Nissim, S. Raskhodnikova, and A. Smith. Smooth Sensitivity and Sampling in Private Data Analysis. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Ninth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 75–84, 2007.
- P. Paillier. Public-Key Cryptosystems Based on Composite Degree Residuosity Classes. In *International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques*, pages 223–238, 1999.
- E. Papalexí and R. Satija. Single-Cell RNA Sequencing to Explore Immune Cell Heterogeneity. *Nature Reviews Immunology*, 18(1):35–45, 2018.
- S. Pati, U. Baid, B. Edwards, M. Sheller, S. Wang, G. A. Reina, P. Foley, A. Gruzdev, D. Karkada, C. Davatzikos, C. Sako, S. Ghodasara, M. Bilello, S. Mohan, P. Vollmuth, G. Brugnara, C. J. Preetha, F. Sahn, K. Maier-Hein, M. Zenk, M. Bendszus, W. Wick, E. Calabrese, J. Rudie, J. Villanueva-Meyer, S. Cha, M. Ingalhalikar, M. Jadhav, U. Pandey, J. Saini, J. Garrett, M. Larson, R. Jeraj, S. Currie, R. Froot, K. Fatania, R. Y. Huang, K. Chang, C. Balaña, J. Capellades, J. Puig, J. Trenkler, J. Pichler, G. Necker, A. Haunschmidt, S. Meckel, G. Shukla, S. Liem,

- G. S. Alexander, J. Lombardo, J. D. Palmer, A. E. Flanders, A. P. Dicker, H. I. Sair, C. K. Jones, A. Venkataraman, M. Jiang, T. Y. So, C. Chen, P. A. Heng, Q. Dou, M. Kozubek, F. Lux, J. Michálek, P. Matula, M. Keřkovský, T. Kopřivová, M. Dostál, V. Vybílal, M. A. Vogelbaum, J. R. Mitchell, J. Farinhas, J. A. Maldjian, C. G. B. Yogananda, M. C. Pinho, D. Reddy, J. Holcomb, B. C. Wagner, B. M. Ellingson, T. F. Cloughesy, C. Raymond, T. Oughourlian, A. Hagiwara, C. Wang, M. To, S. Bhardwaj, C. Chong, M. Agzarian, A. X. Falcão, S. B. Martins, B. C. A. Teixeira, F. Sprenger, D. Menotti, D. R. Lucio, P. LaMontagne, D. Marcus, B. Wiestler, F. Kofler, I. Ezhov, M. Metz, R. Jain, M. Lee, Y. W. Lui, R. McKinley, J. Slotboom, P. Radojewski, R. Meier, R. Wiest, D. Murcia, E. Fu, R. Haas, J. Thompson, D. R. Ormond, C. Badve, A. E. Sloan, V. Vadmal, K. Waite, R. R. Colen, L. Pei, M. Ak, A. Srinivasan, J. R. Bapuraj, A. Rao, N. Wang, O. Yoshiaki, T. Moritani, S. Turk, J. Lee, S. Prabhudesai, F. Morón, J. Mandel, K. Kamnitsas, B. Glocker, L. V. M. Dixon, M. Williams, P. Zampakis, V. Panagiotopoulos, P. Tsiganos, S. Alexiou, I. Haliassos, E. I. Zacharaki, K. Moustakas, C. Kalogeropoulou, D. M. Kardamakis, Y. S. Choi, S. Lee, J. H. Chang, S. S. Ahn, B. Luo, L. Poisson, N. Wen, P. Tiwari, R. Verma, R. Bareja, I. Yadav, J. Chen, N. Kumar, M. Smits, S. R. van der Voort, A. Alafandi, F. Incekara, M. M. J. Wijnenga, G. Kapsas, R. Gahrman, J. W. Schouten, H. J. Dubbink, A. J. P. E. Vincent, M. J. van den Bent, P. J. French, S. Klein, Y. Yuan, S. Sharma, T. Tseng, S. Adabi, S. P. Niclou, O. Keunen, A. Hau, M. Vallières, D. Fortin, M. Lepage, B. Landman, K. Ramadass, K. Xu, S. Chotai, L. B. Chambless, A. Mistry, R. C. Thompson, Y. Gusev, K. Bhuvaneshwar, A. Sayah, C. Bencheqroun, A. Belouali, S. Madhavan, T. C. Booth, A. Chelliah, M. Modat, H. Shuaib, C. Dragos, A. Abayazeed, K. Kolodziej, M. Hill, A. Abbassy, S. Gamal, M. Mekhaimar, M. Qayati, M. Reyes, J. E. Park, J. Yun, H. S. Kim, A. Mahajan, M. Muzi, S. Benson, R. G. H. Beets-Tan, J. Teuwen, A. Herrera-Trujillo, M. Trujillo, W. Escobar, A. Abello, J. Bernal, J. Gómez, J. Choi, S. Baek, Y. Kim, H. Ismael, B. Allen, J. M. Buatti, A. Kotrotsou, H. Li, T. Weiss, M. Weller, A. Bink, B. Pouymayou, H. F. Shaykh, J. Saltz, P. Prasanna, S. Shrestha, K. M. Mani, D. Payne, T. Kurc, E. Pelaez, H. Franco-Maldonado, F. Loayza, S. Quevedo, P. Guevara, E. Torche, C. Mendoza, F. Vera, E. Ríos, E. López, S. A. Velastin, G. Ogbole, M. Soneye, D. Oyekunle, O. Odafe-Oyibothea, B. Osobu, M. Shu'aibu, A. Dorcas, F. Dako, A. L. Simpson, M. Hamghalam, J. J. Peoples, R. Hu, A. Tran, D. Cutler, F. Y. Moraes, M. A. Boss, J. Gimpel, D. K. Veettil, K. Schmidt, B. Bialecki, S. Marella, C. Price, L. Cimino, C. Apgar, P. Shah, B. Menze, J. S. Barnholtz-Sloan, J. Martin, and S. Bakas. Federated Learning Enables Big Data for Rare Cancer Boundary Detection. *Nature Communications*, 13(1):7346, 2022.
- D. Rajput, W. Wang, and C. Chen. Evaluation of a Decided Sample Size in Machine Learning Applications. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 24:48, 2023.
- S. P. Ramu, P. Boopalan, Q. Pham, P. K. R. Maddikunta, T. Huynh-The, M. Alazab, T. T. Nguyen, and T. R. Gadekallu. Federated Learning Enabled Digital Twins for Smart Cities: Concepts, Recent Advances, and Future Directions. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 79:103663, 2022.
- P. Riedel, L. Schick, R. von Schwerin, M. Reichert, D. Schaudt, and A. Hafner. Comparative Analysis of Open-Source Federated Learning Frameworks-A Literature-Based Survey and Review. *International Journal of Machine Learning and Cybernetics*, 15:5257–5278, 2024.
- N. Rieke, J. Hancox, W. Li, F. Milletari, H. R. Roth, S. Albarqouni, S. Bakas, M. N. Galtier, B. A. Landman, K. Maier-Hein, et al. The Future of Digital Health with Federated Learning. *NPJ Digital Medicine*, 3(1):1–7, 2020.
- R. Rodriguez-Esteban and X. Jiang. Differential Gene Expression in Disease: A Comparison Between High-Throughput Studies and the Literature. *BMC Medical Genomics*, 10:1–10, 2017.
- H. R. Roth, K. Chang, P. Singh, N. Neumark, W. Li, V. Gupta, S. Gupta, L. Qu, A. Ihsani, B. C. Bizzo, Y. Wen, V. Buch, M. Shah, F. Kitamura, M. Mendonça, V. Lavor, A. Harouni, C. Compas, J. Tetreault, P. Dogra, Y. Cheng, S. Erdal, R. White, B. Hashemian, T. Schultz, M. Zhang, A. McCarthy, B. Min Yun, E. Sharaf, K. V. Hoebel, J. B. Patel, B. Chen, S. Ko, E. Leibovitz, E. D. Pisano, L. Coombs, D. Xu, K. J. Dreyer, I. Dayan, R. C. Naidu, M. Flores, D. Rubin, and J. Kalpathy-Cramer. Federated learning for breast density classification: A real-world implementation. In *Domain Adaptation and Representation Transfer, and Distributed and Collaborative Learning: 2nd MICCAI Workshop, DART 2020, and 1st MICCAI Workshop, DCL 2020*, pages 181–191. Springer, 2020.
- F. Sattler, K. Muller, and W. Samek. Clustered Federated Learning: Model-Agnostic Distributed Multitask Optimization Under Privacy Constraints. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 32(8):3710–3722, 2021.
- A. Schein, Z. S. Wu, M. Z. A. Schofield, and H. Wallach. Locally Private Bayesian Inference for Count Models. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 638–648, 2019.
- M. Scutari and M. Malvestio. *The Pragmatic Programmer for Machine Learning: Engineering Analytics and Data Science Solutions*. Chapman & Hall, 2023. URL <https://www.ppml.dev>.
- M. J. Sheller, B. Edwards, G. A. Reina, J. Martin, S. Pati, A. Kotrotsou, M. Milchenko, W. Xu, D. Marcus, R. R. Colen, and S. Bakas. Federated Learning in Medicine: Facilitating Multi-Institutional Collaborations Without Sharing Patient Data. *Scientific Reports*, 10(1), 2020.
- R. Shokri, M. Stronati, C. Song, and V. Shmatikov. Membership Inference Attacks Against Machine Learning Models. In *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, pages 3–18, 2017.
- C. Sudlow, J. Gallacher, N. Allen, V. Beral, P. Burton, J. Danesh, P. Downey, P. Elliott, J. Green, M. Landray, B. Liu, P. Matthews, G. Ong, J. Pell, A. Silman, A. Young, T. Sprosen, T. Peakman, and R. Collins. UK Biobank: An Open Access Resource for Identifying the Causes of a Wide Range of Complex Diseases of Middle and Old Age. *PLoS Medicine*, 12(3):e1001779, 2015.
- P. Suetens. *Fundamentals of Medical Imaging*. Cambridge University Press, 3rd edition, 2017.
- C. Sun, J. van Soest, A. Koster, S. J. Eussen, M. T. Schram, C. D. Stehouwer, P. C. Dagnelie, and M. Dumontier. Studying the Association of Diabetes and Healthcare Cost on Distributed Data From the Maastricht Study and Statistics Netherlands Using a Privacy-Preserving Federated Learning Infrastructure. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 134:104194, 2022a.
- G. Sun, Y. Cong, J. Dong, Q. Wang, L. Lyu, and J. Liu. Data Poisoning Attacks on Federated Machine Learning. *IEEE*

- Internet of Things Journal*, 9(13):11365–11375, 2022b.
- A. Z. Tan, H. Yu, L. Cui, and Q. Yang. Towards Personalized Federated Learning. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 34(12):9587–9603, 2022.
- B. G. A. Tekgul, Y. Xia, S. Marchal, and N. Asokan. WAFFLE: Watermarking in Federated Learning. In *40th International Symposium on Reliable Distributed Systems*, pages 310–320, 2021.
- C. V. Theodoris, L. Xiao, A. Chopra, M. D. Chaffin, Z. R. Al Sayed, M. C. Hill, H. Mantineo, E. M. Brydon, Z. Zeng, X. S. Liu, et al. Transfer Learning Enables Predictions in Network Biology. *Nature*, 618(7965):616–624, 2023.
- D. Toro-Domínguez, J. A. Villatoro-García, J. Martorell-Marugán, Y. Román-Montoya, M. E. Alarcón-Riquelme, and P. Carmona-Saéz. A Survey of Gene Expression Meta-Analysis: Methods and Applications. *Briefings in Bioinformatics*, 22(2):1694–1705, 2021.
- N. Truong, K. Sun, S. Wang, F. Guitton, and Y. Guo. Privacy Preservation in Federated Learning: An Insightful Survey From the GDPR Perspective. *Computers & Security*, 110:102402, 2021.
- U.S. Congress. National Artificial Intelligence Initiative Act of 2020, 2020. Public Law No: 116-283, Division E.
- S. M. van Rooden, S. D. van der Werff, M. S. M. van Mourik, F. Lomholt, K. L. Møller, S. Valk, C. dos Santos Ribeiro, A. Wong, S. Haitjema, M. Behnke, and E. Rinaldi. Federated Systems for Automated Infection Surveillance: A Perspective. *Antimicrobial Resistance & Infection Control*, 13(1), 2024.
- G. A. Volini. A Deep Dive into Technical Encryption Concepts to Better Understand Cybersecurity & Data Privacy Legal & Policy Issues. *Journal of Intellectual Property Law*, 28:291, 2020.
- A. Wainakh, E. Zimmer, S. Subedi, J. Keim, T. Grube, S. Karuppayah, A. Sanchez Guinea, and M. Mühlhäuser. Federated Learning Attacks Revisited: A Critical Discussion of Gaps, Assumptions, and Evaluation Setups. *Sensors*, 23(1):31, 2022.
- Z. Wan, J. W. Hazel, E. W. Clayton, Y. Vorobeychik, M. Kantarcioglu, and B. A. Malin. Sociotechnical Safeguards for Genomic Data Privacy. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 23(7):429–445, 2022.
- Q. Wang, M. He, L. Guo, and H. Chai. AFEI: Adaptive Optimized Vertical Federated Learning for Heterogeneous Multi-Omics Data Integration. *Briefings in Bioinformatics*, 24(5):bbad269, 2023.
- S. Wang, M. Kim, W. Li, X. Jiang, H. Chen, and A. Harman. Privacy-Aware Estimation of Relatedness in Admixed Populations. *Briefings in Bioinformatics*, 23(6), 2022.
- S. Wang, B. Shen, L. Guo, M. Shang, J. Liu, Q. Sun, and B. Shen. Sfed: Federated Learning for Cell Type Classification with scRNA-seq. *Briefings in Bioinformatics*, 25(1):bbad507, 2024.
- J. Xu, B. S. Glicksberg, C. Su, P. Walker, J. Bian, and F. Wang. Federated Learning for Healthcare Informatics. *Journal of Healthcare Informatics Research*, 5(1):1–19, 2020.
- R. Yan, L. Qu, Q. Wei, S. Huang, L. Shen, D. L. Rubin, L. Xing, and Y. Zhou. Label-Efficient Self-Supervised Federated Learning for Tackling Data Heterogeneity in Medical Imaging. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, 42(7):1932–1943, 2023.
- D. Yang, Z. Xu, W. Li, A. Myronenko, H. R. Roth, S. Harmon, S. Xu, B. Turkbey, E. Turkbey, X. Wang, W. Zhu, G. Carrafiello, F. Patella, M. Cariati, H. Obinata, H. Mori, K. Tamura, P. An, B. J. Wood, and D. Xu. Federated Semi-Supervised Learning for COVID Region Segmentation in Chest CT Using Multi-National Data From China, Italy, Japan. *Medical Image Analysis*, 70:101992, 2021.
- X. Yin, Y. Zhu, and J. Hu. A Comprehensive Survey of Privacy-Preserving Federated Learning: A Taxonomy, Review, and Future Directions. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 54(6):1–36, 2021.
- W. Zhang, D. Yang, W. Wu, H. Peng, N. Zhang, H. Zhang, and X. Shen. Optimizing Federated Learning in Distributed Industrial Iot: A Multi-Agent Approach. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 39(12):3688–3703, 2021.
- C. Zhao, S. Zhao, M. Zhao, Z. Chen, C. Gao, H. Li, and Y. Tan. Secure Multi-Party Computation: Theory, Practice and Applications. *Information Sciences*, 476:357–372, 2019.
- Y. Zhu, L. M. Orre, Y. Z. Tran, G. Mermelekas, H. J. Johansson, A. Malyutina, S. Anders, and J. Lehtiö. DEqMS: A Method for Accurate Variance Estimation in Differential Protein Expression Analysis. *Molecular & Cellular Proteomics*, 19(6):1047–1057, 2020.
- A. Ziller, A. Trask, A. Lopardo, B. Szymkow, B. Wagner, E. Bluemke, J. Nounahon, J. Passerat-Palmbach, K. Prakash, N. Rose, et al. Pysyft: A Library for Easy Federated Learning. *Federated Learning Systems: Towards Next-Generation AI*, pages 111–139, 2021.
- O. Zolotareva, R. Nasirigerdeh, J. Matschinske, R. Torkzadehmahani, M. Bakhtiari, T. Frisch, J. Späth, D. B. Blumenthal, A. Abbasinejad, P. Tieri, et al. Flimma: A Federated and Privacy-Aware Tool for Differential Gene Expression Analysis. *Genome Biology*, 22(1):1–26, 2021.
- A. Y. Zomaya. *Parallel Computing for Bioinformatics and Computational Biology: Models, Enabling Technologies, and Case Studies*. John Wiley & Sons, 2006.