

RCC-PFL: Robust Client Clustering under Noisy Labels in Personalized Federated Learning

Abdulmoneam Ali Ahmed Arafa
Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
University of North Carolina at Charlotte, NC 28223
aali28@charlotte.edu aarafa@charlotte.edu

Abstract—We address the problem of cluster identity estimation in a personalized federated learning (PFL) setting in which users aim to learn different personal models. The backbone of effective learning in such a setting is to cluster users into groups whose objectives are similar. A typical approach in the literature is to achieve this by training users’ data on different proposed personal models and assign them to groups based on which model achieves the lowest value of the users’ loss functions. This process is to be done iteratively until group identities converge. A key challenge in such a setting arises when users have noisy labeled data, which may produce misleading values of their loss functions, and hence lead to ineffective clustering. To overcome this challenge, we propose a label-agnostic *data similarity*-based clustering algorithm, coined *RCC-PFL*, with three main advantages: the cluster identity estimation procedure is *independent* from the training labels; it is a *one-shot* clustering algorithm performed prior to the training; and it requires fewer communication rounds and less computation compared to iterative-based clustering methods. We validate our proposed algorithm using various models and datasets and show that it outperforms multiple baselines in terms of average accuracy and variance reduction.

I. INTRODUCTION

Federated Learning (FL) is a privacy-preserving framework that enables users to learn a model without sharing their datasets [1]. However, heterogeneity of user data is considered one of its main challenges as it can degrade learning accuracy, and has thus received significant attention [2], [3]. One approach to tackle data heterogeneity is to rethink the entire learning paradigm; instead of learning a universal model that fits all users’ data points, a personalized model can be learned for each user [4]. Learning multiple models by clustering users based on their learning objectives is a widely adopted paradigm, known as Personalized Federated Learning (PFL).

In PFL, users seeking the same model can collaborate and learn it together. Thus, the main step is to identify users whose objectives are similar, i.e., solving the cluster identity problem [5], [6], *without* revealing their objectives. The most common approach to address this challenge is based on the behavior of each user’s training samples with respect to each personal model. Specifically, users are grouped based on which model minimizes their loss function [5], [7]. The core idea is that, if the training samples of a pair of users behave similarly under a given model, then they may be interested in the same

objective. However, this approach implicitly assumes that the loss function is being fed *clean* training samples. In practice, users may have *noisy* labeled data samples obtained, e.g., from low quality crowd-sourcing platforms, since high quality data is generally difficult to obtain [8]. The noisy label problem is more pronounced in FL because client-side data may be collected from diverse sources, each with its own stochastic noise. Thus, assuming high-quality labels for training data is overly optimistic, and relying on the loss function to solve the cluster identity problem needs to be reconsidered.

Related Work. To address the problem of noisy labels in machine learning, existing approaches can be divided into three main categories: detecting samples with noisy labels; refining the loss function; or following different training strategies. Detecting noisy-labeled samples typically centers around estimating the stochastic transition matrix between clean and noisy labels [9], [10]. To avoid the challenge of estimating the transition matrix, the authors in [11] identify noisy labeled samples by observing the loss trajectory of the training of each sample. Based on this observation, each sample is classified as having a clean or noisy label. Refinement of the loss function aims to avoid overfitting by adding an extra regularization term to account for the presence of noise [12], [13]. The third approach involves training an auxiliary network for sample weighting or learning supervision [14], [15]. In the FL setting, the authors in [16] follow a re-weighting approach that reduces the effect of the presence of noisy clients by reducing their weights’ contribution when evaluating the loss function.

Contributions. Different from current approaches in the literature, we address the following question:

Can we solve the cluster identity estimation problem for PFL without relying on the loss function or estimating the noise model for each user?

We answer the above question in the affirmative. In our proposed solution, we do not aim to detect noisy training samples or propose new noise-robust training algorithms. Instead, we focus on studying the behavior of clustering users to learn multiple models in settings with significant label noise. We show that even without explicit data cleaning or noise-robust algorithms, a *one-shot data similarity-based clustering* algorithm can learn from data corrupted by arbitrary amounts of label noise. The key idea is that the proposed data similarity algorithm is label-agnostic, relying on features rather than

labels. Therefore, the cluster identity estimation problem can be effectively resolved. An overview is depicted in Fig. 1.

Notation. We use lowercase letters for scalars, bold lowercase letters for vectors, and bold uppercase letters for matrices throughout this paper. $A[i, j]$ denotes the element in row i and column j of a matrix A , and $A[i]$ denotes its i th row. We represent the set $\{1, 2, \dots, M\}$ by $[M]$.

II. SYSTEM MODEL

We consider a federated learning system that has a parameter server (PS) and a set of users $\mathcal{K} = \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$. Each user aims to learn a specific task from a total of M different tasks. We define the tasks over the same dataset. In other words, given a dataset with $\{1, \dots, C\}$ class labels, each task is a subset of these labels, and the tasks are disjoint. That is, the m th task $T_m \subseteq \{1, \dots, C\}$, $\forall m \in [M]$, with $T_m \cap T_{\bar{m}} = \phi$, $\forall m \neq \bar{m}$. Since each user is interested in learning a specific task T_m , our system's objective is not to learn a single model, but rather to learn a number of personal models, equal to the number of tasks, in order to meet the users' requirements. We define the set of all tasks as $\mathcal{T} \triangleq \{T_1, \dots, T_M\}$.

Each user $k \in \mathcal{K}$ has a local data set $D_k = \{(x_{(k,i)}, y_{(k,i)})\}_{i=1}^{n_k}$ where $x_{(k,i)} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the i th feature vector, $y_{(k,i)} \in \{1, \dots, C\}$ is the i th label, and n_k is the number of training samples it has. We assume that most of a user's training samples belong to its intended learning task, denoted $\tau_k \in \mathcal{T}$, with some minority data from other unintended tasks $\mathcal{T} \setminus \tau_k$. In addition, we assume that all users are honest and trustworthy. Since different users may be interested in learning the same task, it is reasonable to group them together.

We assume that users' samples are not entirely clean, and that some of the labels are noisy. To model the unknown stochasticity of these noisy samples, we assume that each user k has a portion αn_k of noisy labeled samples for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. The main goal is to learn M models by clustering users, without violating their privacy, ensuring that each cluster contains only users that aim to learn the same task. User k belonging to cluster m shares its model with the PS during the r th global communication round, denoted $w_{(k,m)}^{(r)}$, and the PS responds by sharing an aggregated model with all users in cluster m , denoted $w_{(m)}^{(r+1)}$, to initiate a new training round. An example setting is shown in Fig. 1.

Since we are interested in clustering users based on their intended learning tasks, we consider a worst-case noise scenario that hurts the clustering procedure the most. Specifically, we assume that the label-flipping procedure is *asymmetric* between labels in the sense that the true labels of a given task are all flipped into *one specific noisy label of another (unintended) task*. This increases confusion during the clustering procedure. We refer to this kind of noise as *asymmetric task-dependent noise*, or *task-flipping noise*. We note that this is a variation of the structure-biased noise described in [17], in which clean labels are mapped to different (as opposed to only one in our case) noisy labels with different probabilities.

Next, we illustrate in more detail how we perform the label-flipping procedure.




Fig. 1: Illustration of our system model with two personal models: one model for learning $\{c_1, c_2, c_3\}$ and the other for learning $\{c_4, c_5\}$. Blue (resp. red) color represents clean (resp. noisy) labels. Here, users 1 and $K - 1$ should be clustered together. Same for users 2 and K .

III. NOISE MODELS

We focus on two noise models: *class-independent* noise and *class-dependent* noise. Both models share the same property that the clean labels to be flipped are mapped to one noisy label that is picked *uniformly* at random from other (unintended) tasks. However, they have some notable differences in how the clean labels are picked to be flipped, as we highlight next.

In the class-independent noise model, the training samples to be flipped are chosen *independently* of their true labels. Specifically, for user k , αn_k data points are sampled uniformly across all its training samples, and then they all get mapped to a label chosen uniformly at random from an unintended task $\mathcal{T} \setminus \tau_k$. However, in the class-dependent noise model, the training samples to be flipped are all chosen from a *particular* label from the intended task. Specifically, for user k , all αn_k data points are sampled from a specific label chosen randomly from τ_k , and then are all mapped to one label from $\mathcal{T} \setminus \tau_k$.

Hence, the main difference between the two models is that in the class-independent model the drawn samples may have different labels, whereas in the class-dependent model, all samples are from a specific class label. We note that in the class-dependent model, if the chosen clean label's data are fewer than αn_k , then the remaining ratio will be drawn from another label (also from τ_k if applicable). Consequently, under the class-dependent noise model, a user may end up with a fully corrupted label and one or more partially corrupted class labels. It is worth mentioning that sampling is performed without replacement, and thus, unlike the approach in [17], there are no clean versions of noisy labeled samples.

To better visualize the two noise models, Fig. 2 shows a realization of a user that has training samples from the Fashion-MNIST dataset. The intended task is to learn how to classify the labels 0, 1, and 2. Fig. 2(a) shows the training samples with their ground truth labels, illustrating that, in this example, the user does not have any labels from its unintended tasks. Fig. 2(b) shows the results after applying the class-independent noise model. Setting $\alpha = 0.25$, we observe that approximately $\frac{1}{3} \times 25\%$ of samples from each label are flipped to label 5. Fig. 2(c), on the other hand, shows the results after applying the class-dependent noise model. In this case, 25%



Fig. 2: Comparison between class-independent and class-dependent noise models on the Fashion-MNIST dataset with $\alpha = 0.25$, and zero labels from unintended tasks. Blue color represents clean labels, and red represents noisy ones.

of the samples from label 2 are flipped to label 6.

The rationale and practicality of these two noise models stem from the fact that a user’s data may be obtained from different sources, each with its own noise model. In the class-independent model, each data source contributes equally to the noisy labeled samples at the user. While in the class-dependent noise model, only one of the sources has specific corrupted label(s), while the other sources provide clean data.¹

Next, we discuss our proposed clustering algorithm.

IV. DATA SIMILARITY PFL CLUSTERING

To enable users with the same personal model to learn cooperatively, they should be assigned the same cluster identity. Users seeking to learn the m th task should be grouped together to learn the model parameter w_m . Toward that end, each user k in the m th cluster runs stochastic gradient descent (SGD) and shares its updated weight $w_{(k,m)}^{(r)}$ with the PS during global communication round r . The PS then uses FedAvg to send $w_m^{(r+1)}$ back to cluster m . The main challenge in applying the FedAvg algorithm among users with the same personal model is that their cluster identities are unknown. To efficiently estimate users’ cluster identities, we adopt a data valuation-based technique that has been first proposed in [18], and then extended later in [19] in the context of hierarchical federated multi-task learning. The main idea is to measure the differences and similarities in the statistical properties of two datasets through the second moment. In this work, we extend the idea to demonstrate that the data similarity algorithm is a powerful technique, more robust in realistic and challenging scenarios, and outperforms different baselines. We also adopt a different method to extract informative features from raw data without relying on auxiliary information (cf. Section V).

The data similarity algorithm consists of three main steps. The first step is that each user i computes the eigenvalues and corresponding eigenvectors of their local dataset as follows:

$$\lambda_i, \mathbf{V}_i = \text{eigen}\left(\frac{1}{n_i} \Phi(\mathbf{X}_i)^T \Phi(\mathbf{X}_i)\right), \quad (1)$$

where matrix $\mathbf{X}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times p}$ denotes the arrangement of user i ’s raw data, and $\Phi(\cdot)$ is a feature mapping function belonging to $\mathbb{R}^{n_i \times d}$ with $d < p$. The eigenvalues are stacked in a column vector $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and the associated eigenvectors are stacked in a matrix $\mathbf{V}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. The second step is that users exchange the eigenvector matrix to estimate eigenvalues.² The estimated eigenvalues are obtained by projecting the eigenvectors of other users onto their data and evaluating the Euclidean norm:

$$\hat{\lambda}_k^{(j)} = \left\| \frac{1}{n_i} \Phi(X_i)^T \Phi(X_i) \mathbf{v}_k^{(j)} \right\|, \quad \forall k \in [d], \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{v}_k^{(j)}$ is the k th eigenvector of user j . Based on the true eigenvalues and the estimated ones, each user can compute a metric called relevance/similarity as follows:

$$\lambda_k^{(i,j)} = \frac{\min\{\lambda_k^{(i)}, \hat{\lambda}_k^{(j)}\}}{\max\{\lambda_k^{(i)}, \hat{\lambda}_k^{(j)}\}}, \quad \forall k \in [d], \quad (3)$$

$$r(i,j) = \prod_{k=1}^d (\lambda_k^{(i,j)})^{\frac{1}{d}}, \quad (4)$$

where the $\max\{\cdot, \cdot\}$ in (3) is used for normalization. Finally, users share relevance values, computed in (4), with the PS that in turn estimates the average data similarity between each pair of users as follows:

$$\mathbf{R}(i,j) = \frac{r(i,j) + r(j,i)}{2}, \quad \forall i, j \in \mathcal{K}. \quad (5)$$

Note that $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$ is a symmetric matrix. The PS then runs the Hierarchical Agglomerative Clustering (HAC) algorithm [20] to identify the cluster identity of each user. We arrange the cluster association of each user in a matrix $\mathbf{CI} \in \{0, 1\}^{K \times M}$, where $\mathbf{CI}[k, m] = 1$ indicates that user k is associated with cluster m , and a user can associate with only one cluster. The detailed steps of the above are shown in Procedure 1.

Upon reaching this step, the PS can start training by broadcasting the initial weight $w_m^{(0)}$ for each cluster m . Each

²Note that such exchange protects the privacy of the raw data, since the true eigenvalues are not shared.

¹In our setting, we follow one of the two noise models across all users.

Algorithm 1 RCC-PFL

- 1: **Input:** number of tasks M , number of users K , number of global iterations G , number of epochs E .
 - 2: **Cluster Identity:** $CI \leftarrow$ Execute Procedure 1.
 - 3: **Training:** PS broadcasts $w_m^{(0)} \forall m \in [M]$
 - 4: **for** $r \in [G]$ **do**
 - 5: **for** $k \in [K]$ **do**
 - 6: $w_{k,m}^{(r)} \leftarrow$ Perform SGD, E iterations
 - 7: **end for**
 - 8: **PS aggregation:**
 - 9: $w_m^{(r+1)} = \frac{1}{\sum_{k=1}^K CI[k,m]} \sum_k I_{(CI[k]=m)} w_{(k,m)}^{(r)}, \forall m$
 - 10: **end for**
-

Procedure 1 Data Similarity Clustering

- 1: Perform an eigenvalue decomposition:
 - 2: **for** $i \in \mathcal{K}$ **do**
 - 3: $\lambda_i, V_i = \text{eigen}(\frac{1}{n_i} \Phi(X_i)^T \Phi(X_i))$
 - 4: Share V_i with the other users
 - 5: **end for**
 - 6: Users compute the estimated eigenvalues:
 - 7: **for** $i \in \mathcal{K}$ **do**
 - 8: **for** $j \in \mathcal{K}$ **do**
 - 9: $\hat{\lambda}_k = \|\frac{1}{n_i} \Phi(X_i)^T \Phi(X_i) v_k^{(j)}\|, \forall k \in [d]$
 - 10: Compute $\lambda_k^{(i,j)} = \frac{\min\{\lambda_k^{(i)}, \hat{\lambda}_k\}}{\max\{\lambda_k^{(i)}, \hat{\lambda}_k\}}, \forall k \in [d]$
 - 11: Apply (4) and share with the PS
 - 12: **end for**
 - 13: **end for**
 - 14: PS compute the average similarity matrix R using (5)
 - 15: Feed R and M into the HAC algorithm and get CI .
-

user k in cluster m runs SGD and shares its updated weight $w_{(k,m)}^{(1)}$ with the PS. The PS then aggregates the weights of each cluster separately, as shown in Step 9 of Algorithm 1, where $I_{(CI[k]=m)}$ is an indicator function that equals one if user k belongs to the cluster m . We coin the proposed algorithm RCC-PFL which is summarized in Algorithm 1.

It is clear that our proposed algorithm for clustering users is based solely on features, as indicated by equation (1). Therefore, noisy labels do not affect the clustering decision. In contrast, most related work relies on the training process for clustering decision, which is significantly affected by noisy labels. Secondly, exchanging the matrix V , which contains d^2 elements, is computationally less expensive than broadcasting the weights of each task to all users. Moreover, the matrix V is exchanged only once, whereas weight-based algorithms require repeated exchanges until the clustering decision converges. This is why we assert that the proposed RCC-PFL algorithm is more efficient, robust, and applicable in challenging settings.

V. EXPERIMENTS

We now present some experimental results evaluating the proposed RCC-PFL algorithm and demonstrating its robust-

Algorithm 2 IFCA-PFL

- 1: **Input:** number of tasks M , number of global iterations G , number of users K , number of epochs E .
 - 2: **Cluster Identity:** $CI \leftarrow$ Execute Procedure 2
 - 3: PS broadcasts $w_m^{(0)}, m \in [M]$
 - 4: **for** $r \in [G]$ **do**
 - 5: **for** $k \in [K]$ **do**
 - 6: $w_{k,m}^{(r)} \leftarrow$ Perform SGD, E iterations
 - 7: **end for**
 - 8: **PS aggregation:**
 - 9: $w_m^{(r+1)} = \frac{1}{\sum_{k=1}^K CI[k,m]} \sum_k I_{(CI[k]=m)} w_{(k,m)}^{(r)}, \forall m$
 - 10: **Cluster Re-association:** Execute Procedure 2
 - 11: **end for**
-

ness to noisy labels compared to multiple baselines.

Baselines. We consider three baseline algorithms. The first is *optimum* clustering, representing a genie-aided scheme that knows the users' tasks a priori. This serves as an upper bound.

The second baseline is an *iterative* clustering scheme denoted *IFCA-PFL*, a modified version of the scheme in [5] tailored to our PFL setting. It relies on the loss function to determine users' cluster identities. Specifically, we refine the original iterative algorithm in [5] (vanilla IFCA) by adding an additional step that enforces the required number of groups during each global communication round. The reason is that vanilla IFCA does *not* address the possibility of users being merged into one cluster during the training rounds. We summarize IFCA-PFL in Algorithm 2. The algorithm consists of two main steps. The first step ensures that the system has the required number of clusters before starting the training. The second step, summarized in Procedure 2, enforces the system to maintain the required number of tasks during each global communication round, and ensures that each user is associated with the model that minimizes their loss function. To reduce the computational complexity of IFCA-PFL, Procedure 2 may not be performed if the cluster identity of each user does not change after a number of consecutive rounds.

The third baseline considered is a *single group* scheme, referring to the case where no clustering is performed, and all users learn a single global model (i.e., the vanilla FL setting). The purpose of including the single global scheme is to emphasize the necessity of clustering users.

Datasets and Models. We validate our proposed algorithm and baselines across different datasets, different learning models, and different number of tasks. We set the number of users $K = 25$ and partition them equally among the number of tasks. Each task has a distinct set of classes. The task training samples are then distributed among the users of each task according to the Dirichlet distribution with parameter 2. In addition to the training samples belonging to the intended task, each user has a minority of training samples that belong to unintended tasks to test the robustness of our proposed algorithm. We assign 5% of the labels from the other tasks to each user. We adopt 3 learning models and datasets: logistic

Procedure 2 Cluster Re-association

```

1: Initialize  $CI$  as a  $K \times M$  zero matrix
2: for  $k \in [K]$  do
3:   Estimate cluster identity:  $\hat{j} = \operatorname{argmin}_{j \in [M]} F(w_j^{(r+1)})$ 
4:   Set  $CI[k, \hat{j}] = 1$ 
5: end for
6: PS Executes:
7: counter = 0
8: for  $m \in [M]$  do
9:   if  $\sum_{k=1}^K CI[k, m] \geq 1$  then
10:    counter = counter + 1
11:   end if
12: end for
13: if counter =  $M$  then
14:   Return  $CI$ 
15: else if Training has not started then
16:   Reinitialize  $M$  random  $\{w_m^{(r+1)}\}$ ; go to Step 1
17: else
18:   PS assigns to each cluster the users with the lowest
   loss function values evaluated at the cluster's model.
19: end if

```

TABLE I: Tasks definition.

Dataset	Two Tasks	Three Tasks	Five Tasks
MNIST	$T_1 = \{0, 2, 4, 6, 8\}$ $T_2 = \{1, 3, 5, 7, 9\}$	$T_1 = \{0, 2, 4\}$ $T_2 = \{6, 8, 1\}$ $T_3 = \{3, 5, 7, 9\}$	$T_1 = \{0, 2\}$, $T_2 = \{4, 6\}$ $T_3 = \{8, 1\}$, $T_4 = \{3, 5\}$ $T_5 = \{7, 9\}$
Fashion-MNIST	$T_1 = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 6\}$ $T_2 = \{5, 7, 8, 9\}$	$T_1 = \{0, 1, 2\}$ $T_2 = \{3, 4, 6\}$ $T_3 = \{5, 7, 8, 9\}$	$T_1 = \{0, 1\}$, $T_2 = \{2, 3\}$ $T_3 = \{4, 6\}$, $T_4 = \{5, 7\}$ $T_5 = \{8, 9\}$
CIFAR-10	$T_1 = \{0, 1, 8, 9\}$ $T_2 = \{2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7\}$	$T_1 = \{0, 1, 8\}$ $T_2 = \{9, 2, 3\}$ $T_3 = \{4, 5, 6, 7\}$	$T_1 = \{0, 1\}$, $T_2 = \{8, 9\}$ $T_3 = \{2, 3\}$, $T_4 = \{4, 5\}$ $T_5 = \{6, 7\}$

regression with MNIST, two-layer perceptron with Fashion-MNIST, and CNN (as detailed in [19]) with CIFAR-10. For all experiments, we set the learning rate to 5×10^{-5} , the number of epochs to 2, and the batch size to 32 for MNIST and Fashion-MNIST and 128 for CIFAR-10. To mitigate the impact of noisy labels during training, we fine-tune the weight decay (regularization) to be 0.001. To accelerate training, the distributed Ray framework [21] is adopted.

Tasks. We define the tasks as shown in Table I. The two tasks column has the following interpretation: learning odd versus even numbers for MNIST; learning clothes versus non-clothes images for Fashion-MNIST; and learning vehicles versus non-vehicle labels in CIFAR-10. As for the three and five tasks columns, we set a different combination of labels that reflects the diversity in users' preferences and also to demonstrate that the proposed algorithm does not depend on the task definition.

Feature Mapping Function. There are two advantages of the feature mapping function Φ : extracting informative features from the raw data, and reducing their dimensionality. There are various methods to design such a function, with the most common approach being based on a pre-trained model [18], [22]. However, this approach requires users to

TABLE II: Results with class-independent noise.

Dataset	Algorithms	Two Tasks	Three Tasks	Five Tasks
MNIST	Optimum Clustering	94.3 \pm 0.6	96.2 \pm 0.5	97.3 \pm 0.3
	RCC-PFL	94.4 \pm 0.5	96.2 \pm 0.5	97.3 \pm 0.2
	IFCA-PFL	87.9 \pm 1.9	91.4 \pm 3.3	93.3 \pm 4.7
	Single global model	87.8 \pm 1.0	86.9 \pm 1.4	84.9 \pm 2.3
Fashion-MNIST	Optimum Clustering	87.0 \pm 0.3	92.0 \pm 0.3	95.6 \pm 0.2
	RCC-PFL	87.0 \pm 0.3	92.0 \pm 0.3	95.6 \pm 0.3
	IFCA-PFL	83.9 \pm 2.1	90.4 \pm 2.3	92.5 \pm 3.6
	Single global model	83.9 \pm 0.8	79.7 \pm 1.5	79.2 \pm 1.7
CIFAR-10	Optimum Clustering	64.0 \pm 0.6	75.4 \pm 1.0	85.8 \pm 1.4
	RCC-PFL	63.9 \pm 0.8	75.5 \pm 1.0	85.8 \pm 1.3
	IFCA-PFL	45.3 \pm 4.4	56.0 \pm 12.7	72.7 \pm 15.5
	Single global model	46.7 \pm 2.4	40.5 \pm 3.7	37.2 \pm 10.4

TABLE III: Results with class-dependent noise.

Dataset	Algorithms	Two Tasks	Three Tasks	Five Tasks
MNIST	Optimum Clustering	89.1 \pm 3.6	90.1 \pm 4.1	96.4 \pm 1.6
	RCC-PFL	89.2 \pm 3.5	90.0 \pm 4.2	96.4 \pm 1.6
	IFCA-PFL	84.9 \pm 5.8	75.4 \pm 10.8	88.2 \pm 9.5
	Single global model	81.0 \pm 4.4	78.9 \pm 3.5	82.0 \pm 4.4
Fashion-MNIST	Optimum Clustering	83.3 \pm 1.3	86.2 \pm 6.4	94.2 \pm 2.2
	RCC-PFL	83.2 \pm 1.3	86.1 \pm 6.5	94.1 \pm 2.4
	IFCA-PFL	79.1 \pm 5.2	72.1 \pm 6.6	88.0 \pm 8.1
	Single global model	81.6 \pm 1.2	76.1 \pm 4.6	79.2 \pm 2.5
CIFAR-10	Optimum Clustering	57.8 \pm 2.2	69.5 \pm 2.9	86.9 \pm 1.2
	RCC-PFL	57.8 \pm 2.1	69.3 \pm 2.7	86.9 \pm 1.3
	IFCA-PFL	42.4 \pm 5.1	44.6 \pm 6.8	60.3 \pm 16.2
	Single global model	46.5 \pm 2.6	42.6 \pm 3.0	38.05 \pm 4.9

have access to a well-performing model prior to training, which may not always be practical. Therefore, our work adopts another powerful feature extraction method that does not require additional information: the histogram of oriented gradients (HoG) [23]. The main idea of the HoG is to divide the image into cells, compute the orientation and magnitude of the gradient for each cell, and then aggregate the gradient information into a histogram of oriented gradients. These histograms describe the features of the image and help detect objects within it. We note that HoG relies solely on the feature vector of an image, making it insensitive to noisy labels.

Beating the Baselines. We conduct five experimental runs and calculate the average test accuracy across these experiments. Tables II and III demonstrate the superiority of the RCC-PFL algorithm in perfectly clustering users and achieving the highest performance, while the iterative scheme, IFCA-PFL, fails to identify the correct clusters, resulting in deteriorated performance. The results also show that IFCA-PFL has a higher variance, which worsens with more challenging data and additional tasks.

The impact of the two noisy models on performance is evident in the average accuracy; performance under class-independent noise is better than that under class-dependent noise. Our justification is that the noise adversely affects the performance more when it is concentrated on certain label(s) (e.g., a user may have one or more labels that are completely corrupted and simultaneously lack a clean version of such labels). In contrast, in class-independent noise, the noise is distributed across different labels; all user's labels are affected, but the user still has a clean portion of each. In addition, collaborative learning between users can mitigate the effect




Fig. 3: Comparison between three groups' performance on CIFAR-10 under class-independent noise.

of these noisy labeled samples.

It is also clear that learning different models is more important than using the universal one, and the PFL setting becomes vital with a greater variety of tasks. For example, in CIFAR-10, the more diverse the personal models are, the worse the performance of the universal model becomes. Additionally, we observe that personalized learning in the presence of noisy labels becomes more feasible (higher accuracy) when having a small set of intended learning labels in each task.

Finally, Fig. 3 shows the testing loss for each individual group/task on CIFAR-10. It is clear that each group follows a different loss trajectory, even though all groups begin training based on the same initial weights. This highlights that the learning behavior also depends on the task definition. The proposed RCC-PFL clustering algorithm successfully assigns the users' cluster identities, and hence its performance coincides with the optimum clustering. IFCA-PFL, however, fails to infer the correct cluster identities, and hence its loss value is larger.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, RCC-PFL, a one-shot data similarity-based algorithm that aims to solve the cluster identity estimation problem in a personalized federated learning setting under noisy labeled data, has been introduced. The superiority of RCC-PFL compared to multiple baselines has been shown in terms of efficiently estimating the cluster identities of the users and consequently achieving higher performance. Furthermore, our proposed algorithm requires only a single global iteration with the PS, resulting in significant communication cost savings. One direction for future investigations is to study the robustness of our proposed algorithm in the presence of malicious users.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. B. McMahan, E. Moore, D. Ramage, S. Hampson, and B. A. y Arcas. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Proc. AISTATS*, April 2017.
- [2] S. J. Reddi, Z. Charles, M. Zaheer, Z. Garrett, K. Rush, J. Konečný, S. Kumar, and H. B. McMahan. Adaptive federated optimization.
- [3] A. Ali and A. Arafa. Delay sensitive hierarchical federated learning with stochastic local updates. *IEEE Trans. on Cognitive Communications and Networking*, 2025.
- [4] A. Tan, H. Yu, L. Cui, and Q. Yang. Towards personalized federated learning. *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, 34(12):9587–9603, December 2023.
- [5] A. Ghosh, J. Chung, D. Yin, and K. Ramchandran. An efficient framework for clustered federated learning. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 68(12):8076–8091, December 2022.
- [6] C. Li, G. Li, and P. K. Varshney. Federated learning with soft clustering. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 9(10):7773–7782, May 2022.
- [7] H. Sami and B. Güler. Over-the-air clustered federated learning. *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, 23(7):7877–7893, July 2024.
- [8] B. Frenay and M. Verleysen. Classification in the presence of label noise: A survey. *IEEE Trans. on Neural Netw. and Learn. Syst.*, 25(5):845–869, May 2014.
- [9] Y. Zhang, G. Niu, and M. Sugiyama. Learning noise transition matrix from only noisy labels via total variation regularization. In *Proc. ICML*, July 2021.
- [10] S. Li, X. Xia, H. Zhang, Y. Zhan, S. Ge, and T. Liu. Estimating noise transition matrix with label correlations for noisy multi-label learning. In *Proc. NeurIPS*, December 2022.
- [11] C. Yue and N. K. Jha. CTRL: Clustering training losses for label error detection. *IEEE Trans. on Artificial Intelligence*, 5(8):4121–4135, August 2024.
- [12] G. Patrini, A. Rozza, A. K. Menon, R. Nock, and L. Qu. Making deep neural networks robust to label noise: A loss correction approach. In *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, July 2017.
- [13] H. Wei, H. Zhuang, R. Xie, L. Feng, G. Niu, B. An, and Y. Li. Mitigating memorization of noisy labels by clipping the model prediction. In *Proc. ICML*, July 2023.
- [14] L. Jiang, Z. Zhou, T. Leung, L. Li, and L. Fei-Fei. MentorNet: Learning data-driven curriculum for very deep neural networks on corrupted labels. In *Proc. ICML*, July 2018.
- [15] B. Han, Q. Yao, X. Yu, G. Niu, M. Xu, W. Hu, I. Tsang, and M. Sugiyama. Co-teaching: Robust training of deep neural networks with extremely noisy labels. *Proc. NeurIPS*, December 2018.
- [16] X. Fang and M. Ye. Robust federated learning with noisy and heterogeneous clients. In *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, September 2022.
- [17] D. Rolnick, A. Veit, S. Belongie, and N. Shavit. Deep learning is robust to massive label noise. Available online: [arXiv:1705.10694](https://arxiv.org/abs/1705.10694).
- [18] M. M. Amiri, F. Berdoz, and R. Raskar. Fundamentals of task-agnostic data valuation. In *Proc. AAAI*, June 2023.
- [19] A. Ali and A. Arafa. Data similarity-based one-shot clustering for multi-task hierarchical federated learning. In *Proc. Asilomar*, October 2024.
- [20] K. P. Murphy. *Probabilistic Machine Learning: An introduction*. MIT Press, 2022.
- [21] P. Moritz et al. Ray: A distributed framework for emerging AI applications. In *Proc. OSDI*, October 2018.
- [22] R. Cai, X. Chen, S. Liu, J. Srinivasa, M. Lee, R. Kompella, and Z. Wang. Many-task federated learning: A new problem setting and a simple baseline. In *Proc. IEEE/CVF CVPRW*, June 2023.
- [23] N. Dalal and B. Triggs. Histograms of oriented gradients for human detection. In *Proc. IEEE CVPR*, July 2005.