

Unlocking the Value of Decentralized Data: A Federated Dual Learning Approach for Model Aggregation

Junyi Zhu^{1*} Ruicong Yao² Taha Ceritli¹ Savas Ozkan^{1†} Matthew B. Blaschko²
 Eunchung Noh³ Jeongwon Min³ Cho Jung Min³ Mete Ozay^{1†}
¹Samsung R&D Institute UK (SRUK) ²KU Leuven, Belgium ³Samsung Electronics Korea
 {junyi.zhu, savas.ozkan, m.ozay}@samsung.com

Abstract

Artificial Intelligence (AI) technologies have revolutionized numerous fields, yet their applications often rely on costly and time-consuming data collection processes. Federated Learning (FL) offers a promising alternative by enabling AI models to be trained on decentralized data where data is scattered across clients (distributed nodes). However, existing FL approaches struggle to match the performance of centralized training due to challenges such as heterogeneous data distribution and communication delays, limiting their potential for breakthroughs. We observe that many real-world use cases involve hybrid data regimes, in which a server (center node) has access to some data while a large amount of data is distributed across associated clients. To improve the utilization of decentralized data under this regime, address data heterogeneity issue, and facilitate asynchronous communication between the server and clients, we propose a dual learning approach that leverages centralized data at the server to guide the merging of model updates from clients. Our method accommodates scenarios where server data is out-of-domain relative to decentralized client data, making it applicable to a wide range of use cases. We provide theoretical analysis demonstrating the faster convergence of our method compared to existing methods. Furthermore, experimental results across various scenarios show that our approach significantly outperforms existing technologies, highlighting its potential to unlock the value of large amounts of decentralized data.

1. Introduction

Many recent advancements of Artificial Intelligence (AI) rely on public datasets or self-collected datasets [3, 25, 44, 45], which we refer to as the centralized data regime (see Fig. 1). While this approach offers flexibility in training, such as shuffling and data pre-processing, constructing such




Figure 1. Illustration of a centralized data regime (a), a decentralized data regime (b), and a hybrid data regime (c).

dataset is costly. Moreover, despite the availability of open-source datasets, they represent only a small fraction of digitized data as vast amount remain distributed across edge devices. For instance, in 2024, an estimated 1.94 trillion photos were taken worldwide, with smartphones accounting for 94%¹. This annual data volume far exceeds the size of many publicly available image datasets. However, collecting such data poses challenges due to parsing costs, storage demands, regulatory constraints, and privacy concerns. As an alternative, learning from decentralized data without transferring it to a central server has been proposed, which we refer to as the decentralized data regime (see Fig. 1). A viable solution involves training models on distributed nodes and aggregating their updates. Federated learning (FL) is a representative framework for this scenario [37], where a server (i.e., a central node) orchestrates a set of clients (i.e., distributed nodes) to perform local training and aggregates their results. Yet, many practitioners still prefer to curate large centralized datasets and tolerate the asso-

*Main Authorship
 †Senior Authorships

¹Source: <https://phototutorial.com/photos-statistics/>

ciated costs. This preference persists because challenges inherent to the FL paradigm, such as data heterogeneity and communication delays, often lead to models that underperform compared to those trained on centralized datasets [13, 22, 23, 30, 48]. As a result, the potential of decentralized data remains underexplored.

Hybrid Data Regime. Rather than strictly adhering to fully distributed approaches for leveraging decentralized data, we identify a third data regime in practice: the hybrid data regime (see Fig. 1). *In this setting, the server possesses some data, while a substantial portion remains distributed among clients.* We posit that decentralized data can be more effectively utilized with the aid of server-side data. Furthermore, we argue that the hybrid data regime is prevalent, as servers or trusted executive environments (TEEs) under server control can access data through various means:

- **In-Domain (ID) Data Availability:** 1) Existing collected data: Various public datasets may align with the distributed learning task. Additionally, companies often curate datasets for product validation. 2) Incentive mechanisms: Clients may contribute a portion of their data to the server in exchange for incentives. 3) Trusted executive environment (TEE): A TEE can be deployed on the server, enabling clients to securely transmit portions of their data, which server manages but cannot access [27].
- **Out-of-Domain (OOD) Data Availability:** In this scenario, the server utilizes datasets from domains that differ from those of the clients’ data (e.g., different classes) to facilitate the learning from decentralized data. This setup is applicable to a broad range of use cases.

Our research question in this paper is:

How can we effectively harness decentralized data in the hybrid data regime despite data heterogeneity and communication delays?

In this work, we build upon the fundamental framework of FL, where clients train on local data and transmit model updates to a server for aggregation. We focus on addressing the challenges posed by **data heterogeneity**, and **asynchronous communication** where the server incorporates delayed model updates. To tackle these challenges leveraging hybrid data, we introduce **Federated Dual Learning (Feddle)**, a framework that extends traditional FL by *enabling the server to optimize aggregation coefficients based on both ID and OOD data availability.* Guided by data, Feddle can more accurately determine how to weight model update and, if beneficial, even reverse the direction of an update. Our theoretical analysis demonstrates that Feddle converges faster than existing technologies. Experimental results further show that Feddle is more efficient than other hybrid methods, e.g. fine-tune the aggregated model on server-side data, or training a separate server-side model and merging it with client models, etc.

Notably, conventional FL research often focuses on client privacy protection. In this work, we prioritize improving the utilization of decentralized data in the hybrid data regime. Importantly, because Feddle adheres to the standard FL framework, it can be integrated with existing differentially private FL [14, 38, 43] and TEE solutions for FL [27], potentially mitigating privacy concerns. Additionally, our consideration of OOD data availability also contribute to addressing these concerns. We leave a deeper exploration of these aspects for future work.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows: (1) We introduce the concept of the hybrid data regime and demonstrate its potential to improve the utilization of substantial decentralized data. (2) We introduce the model atlas to buffer communication fluctuations and provide an efficient search space for the server-side optimization. (3) Leveraging surrogate loss and a fallback mechanism, we show that OOD data can be effectively leveraged at the server, broadening the applicability of our framework. (4) Extensive experiments show that Feddle significantly outperforms baseline methods in both ID and OOD data availability scenarios. (5) We also provide theoretical analyses to justify Feddle’s advantage in terms of convergence rate.

2. Related Work

Next, we briefly introduce the relevant existing research, with a more extensive discussion provided in App. C.

Learning from Decentralized Data. Federated Learning (FL) is a prominent approach in learning from decentralized data [37]. One major challenge in FL is data heterogeneity [22, 31], which can cause optimization challenges [32, 48]. Many studies have explored ways to alleviate this challenge using Bayesian modeling [7, 59, 62, 63], variance reduction [23], contrastive learning on shared representations [30], client clustering [15], and other methods. Additionally, personalized FL adapts a personal model for each client, with shared information regularizing the local adaptation [41, 46, 47, 60]. However, these methods do not focus on learning a global model that can process the entire data distribution. Communication delay is another major challenge for decentralized learning; some researchers have proposed reducing the local training workload of slow clients [61] or discarding model updates that exceed a pre-defined delay threshold [35]. These methods are not able to completely mitigate the challenge. Another line of work focuses on developing algorithms that can accept and utilize model updates regardless of their delay, allowing for more efficient asynchronous communication [28, 39, 49, 50, 54].

Learning from Hybrid Data. Prior studies have explored server computing model updates on behalf of a part of clients, in the scenarios where clients lack sufficient computational resources and opt to upload their data to the server [11, 12, 40]. These methods can only use ID data at the server side, limiting their scope. Specifically,

several works use (ID or OOD) server-side data to distill clients' knowledge into the global model [29, 33, 56]. However, these approaches do not address the challenge of asynchronous communication, as knowledge is equally extracted from each client regardless of their respective communication delays. Similar to our approach, Yueqi et al. [58] also searches for optimal merging coefficients. However, their technique confines coefficients to be positive, whereas we demonstrate that the optimal coefficients can be negative. Additionally, their approach requires ID data. In comparison to these existing technologies, our method tackles more practical challenges and can be applied to a broader range of scenarios thanks to its ability to accommodate OOD data availability.

3. Problem Statement

In this section, we provide an overview of the background and challenges regarding learning using decentralized data with a focus on the FL mechanism.

Federated Learning from Decentralized Data. Federated Learning (FL) assumes that the data is fully distributed among J clients such that $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathcal{D}_j\}_{j=1}^J$ where $j \in \{1, \dots, J\}$ denotes the client index. A server orchestrates all clients to perform local training using their own data and aggregates the trained weights to obtain a global model. This process repeats for multiple rounds K and optimizes the global model to fit the population data distribution $p(\mathcal{D})$. At the beginning of each round k , the server sends the latest global model ω^k to the clients for local training:

$$\omega_j = \omega^k; \omega_j^k = \arg \min_{\omega_j} \ell(\mathcal{D}_j, \omega_j), \forall j = 1, \dots, J, \quad (1)$$


where ℓ is a loss function. Once local training finishes, each client j reports its model update $\Delta\omega_j^k = \omega_j^k - \omega^k$ back to the server. The server then merges the model updates² $\{\Delta\omega_j^k\}_{j=1}^J$ to obtain the next global model ω^{k+1} based on a predefined aggregation method \mathcal{M} by:

$$\omega^{k+1} = \mathcal{M}(\Delta\omega_{1:J}^k, \omega^k), \quad (2)$$

e.g., $\mathcal{M}_{\text{FedAvg}}(\Delta\omega_{1:J}^k, \omega^k) = \omega^k + \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{|\mathcal{D}_j|}{|\mathcal{D}|} \Delta\omega_j^k$ [37].

Heterogeneous Data Distribution. As clients are often geographically dispersed or situated in distinct environments, their local data typically follows non-identical distributions [22]. Consequently, even when applying consistent prior knowledge across the clients, maximizing the data likelihoods of the i -th client $p(\mathcal{D}_i|\omega_i)$ and the j -th client $p(\mathcal{D}_j|\omega_j)$ during local training leads to distinct posterior distributions $p(\omega_i|\mathcal{D}_i)$ and $p(\omega_j|\mathcal{D}_j)$. This implies that the model updates $\Delta\omega_1, \dots, \Delta\omega_J$ also differ [7, 48, 59, 62, 63]. As illustrated in Fig. 2a, we observe

²Depending on the method, clients can either report their trained models or model updates. For clarity, we focus on the latter scheme, which is adopted by most asynchronous FL works [31, 37, 54].



(a) Cosine similarity between individual and true model updates. (b) Cosine similarity between true model updates at different rounds; data is distributed w.r.t. Dir(0.1).

Figure 2. Statistics of model updates in FL under varying degrees of data heterogeneity simulated using Dirichlet distribution (denoted as Dir(\cdot)) following previous work [59]. Subplot (a) displays mean values, with bands representing max. and min. values.

that under strong data heterogeneity such as Dir(0.1), clients disagree on the optimization direction, with some model updates even pointing opposite to the true model update: $\Delta\omega := \sum_j |\mathcal{D}_j|/|\mathcal{D}| \Delta\omega_j$. This suggests that assigning uniformly positive aggregation coefficients to all clients is suboptimal, despite its common adoption in existing works. In contrast, Feddle uses data-guidance to determine the magnitude and sign of the aggregation coefficients. **Asynchronous Communication.** Eqs. (1) and (2) assume simultaneous coordination of all clients simultaneously, which is impractical in real-world scenarios due to the communication constraints. A line of work [1, 30, 37, 52] adopts a synchronous communication mechanism, where model updates are aggregated once a fixed number, N , of clients have reported their results, while delayed updates are discarded (see Fig. 3):

$$\omega^{k+1} = \mathcal{M}(\{\Delta\omega_{j_n}^k\}_{n=1}^N, \omega^k), \quad (3)$$

where the subscripts $\{j_n\}_{n=1}^N$ denote the first N clients to report their updates. However, this approach has several drawbacks: **1)** The server must still wait for the final client j_N to report, **2)** many clients initiate training but have their results discarded, leading to excessive energy consumption, and **3)** some clients may consistently fail to report on time, resulting a global model biased towards a subset of the data distribution. To address these issues, several works [39, 49, 50, 54] adopt asynchronous communication, allowing delayed reports to be incorporated (see Fig. 3):

$$\omega^{k+1} = \mathcal{M}(\{\Delta\omega_{j_n}^{k_n}\}_{n=1}^N, \omega^k). \quad (4)$$

Here, the superscripts k_1, \dots, k_N denote the downlink rounds at which clients j_1, \dots, j_N initialize their local training (c.f. Eq. (1)) However, asynchronous communication complicates global model aggregation, as delayed updates may become outdated, exacerbating the optimization direction issue caused by data heterogeneity (see Fig. 2b).




Figure 3. Illustration of synchronous (a) and asynchronous (b) communication in FL. Downlink is simplified for clarity.




Figure 4. Overview of the Feddle framework. The server coordinates clients’ local training using an asynchronous mechanism. Model atlas is updated by clients’ model updates, which is then used to conduct coefficient search for the global model optimization.

4. Federated Dual Learning of Hybrid Data

To address these challenges and unlock the value of decentralized data, we propose a novel approach that incorporates server-side data into the aggregation step to determine the merging coefficients for model updates. This strategy can improve the utilization of decentralized data without the reliance on large amounts of server-side data, as optimizing on merging coefficients is low-dimensional. This is particularly beneficial when collecting ID data on the server is costly. Furthermore, our method demonstrates that OOD data can effectively guide the coefficient search process, providing a solution adaptable to diverse use cases.

We introduce our proposed framework, Federated Dual Learning (Feddle), in Sec. 4.1. A theoretical analysis of Feddle’s convergence rate is provided in Sec. 4.2. An illustration of the framework is shown in Fig. 4, while the algorithmic details are presented in Alg. 1 (App. B).

4.1. Framework Architecture

In Sec. 4.1.1, we describe the construction of model atlas \mathcal{A} , which consists of anchors $\{\mathbf{a}_m\}_{m=1}^{|\mathcal{A}|}$ that identify the search space for the server to determine the corresponding merging coefficients $\{c_m\}_{m=1}^{|\mathcal{A}|}$. We then formulate the objective function for optimizing the merging coefficients under two distinct data availability scenarios in Sec. 4.1.2. In Sec. 4.1.3, we introduce the fallback mechanism, which enhances the robustness of Feddle and has been observed to be crucial for successful learning with OOD data. We discuss computation efficiency in App. E.

4.1.1. Model Atlas

In Feddle, we introduce a model atlas \mathcal{A} that defines the optimization space of the server. The atlas consists of maximum M anchors $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathbf{a}_m\}_{m=1}^{|\mathcal{A}|}$, $|\mathcal{A}| \leq M$, each representing an optimization direction. By utilizing client model updates as anchor points, the server can optimize the global model in a subspace that has been explored by the clients,

making it potentially more efficient. Notably, we find that setting M to a relatively small value such as 20 is sufficient to effectively update a large global model with 10^7 parameters. This flexibility in choosing M allows the server to optimize the global model even when only limited data is available, mitigating the risk of overfitting.

Addition and Removal of Anchors. When receiving a model update $\Delta\omega_j$ from the j -th client, we add it as an anchor to the atlas. Initially, when the atlas is not full, we assign the next available index to the new anchor $\mathbf{a}_{|\mathcal{A}|+1} := \Delta\omega_j$. Once the atlas reaches its maximum size M , we remove an existing anchor to accommodate a new one. Instead of using a simple first-in-first-out (FIFO) strategy, we rank anchors based on their importance scores $\mathcal{S} = \{s_m\}_{m=1}^M$ and remove the least important anchor $\mathbf{a}_{m'}$, where $m' = \arg \min_m \mathcal{S}$. In Feddle, we use the absolute values $\{abs(c_m)\}_{m=1}^M$ of the aggregation coefficients $\{c_m\}_{m=1}^M$ found through the search as importance scores $s_m = abs(c_m)$, $\forall m = 1, \dots, M$, since they indicate how far the global model has moved in each direction.

Anchor Normalization. The presence of data heterogeneity and delayed response from asynchronous communication, inevitably introduces variability in the magnitudes of the anchors (cf. Fig. 2). This, in turn, can result in coefficients with disparate magnitudes, potentially leading to optimization challenges. To mitigate this issue, all anchors are normalized using the median of their ℓ_2 norms before initiating the coefficient search at each round by:

$$\bar{\mathbf{a}}_m = \text{median}(\|\mathbf{a}_1\|, \dots, \|\mathbf{a}_{|\mathcal{A}|}\|) \cdot \frac{\mathbf{a}_m}{\|\mathbf{a}_m\|}, \quad \forall m. \quad (5)$$

Note that we use $|\mathcal{A}|$ instead of M , since Feddle can perform coefficient search even before $|\mathcal{A}|$ reaches M .

4.1.2. Search Objective

In-Domain Data Availability. When in-domain data $\mathcal{D}_S \sim \mathcal{D}$ is available, the server can perform a direct search using

the loss function ℓ consistent with local training by

$$\{\hat{c}_m\}_{m=1}^{|\mathcal{A}|} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{c}} \ell(\mathcal{D}_S, \boldsymbol{\omega}^k + \sum_{m=1}^{|\mathcal{A}|} c_m \bar{\mathbf{a}}_m), \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{c} = [c_1, \dots, c_{|\mathcal{A}|}]$. In this work, we use the cross-entropy loss as our target task is multi-class classification. Once search is completed, the global model is updated by

$$\boldsymbol{\omega}^{k+1} = \boldsymbol{\omega}^k + \sum_{m=1}^{|\mathcal{A}|} \hat{c}_m \bar{\mathbf{a}}_m. \quad (7)$$

Out-of-Domain Data Availability. When only OOD data $\mathcal{D}'_S \not\sim \mathcal{D}$ is available, we employ a surrogate loss function h to shape the optimization landscape for the coefficient search. Ideally, $h(\mathcal{D}'_S, \boldsymbol{\omega})$ should exhibit a monotonic relation with $\ell(\mathcal{D}, \boldsymbol{\omega})$, increasing and decreasing in tandem as $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ is updated by the coefficients \mathbf{c} . Namely, we require:

$$\langle \partial h(\mathcal{D}'_S, \boldsymbol{\omega}) / \partial \mathbf{c}, \partial \ell(\mathcal{D}, \boldsymbol{\omega}) / \partial \mathbf{c} \rangle > 0. \quad (8)$$

Eq. (8) ensures that the optimization direction of $h(\mathcal{D}'_S, \boldsymbol{\omega})$ aligns with that of $\ell(\mathcal{D}, \boldsymbol{\omega})$. Interestingly, defining h is **not** particularly challenging. For instance, if $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ performs well on \mathcal{D} , its feature extraction and representation capabilities should generalize to \mathcal{D}'_S . Therefore, we can assess the quality of $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ by evaluating how well its representations of \mathcal{D}'_S perform. Following this principle, we design a simple yet effective surrogate loss function, h_θ . We decompose the model $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ into two components: a body $\boldsymbol{\omega}_{bo}$ for representation extraction and a linear classifier head $\boldsymbol{\omega}_{he}$, with a similar decomposition for the anchors, $\mathbf{a}_m = [\mathbf{a}_m^{bo}; \mathbf{a}_m^{he}]$. We utilize the representations generated by $\boldsymbol{\omega}_{bo}$ and replace the classifier head $\boldsymbol{\omega}_{he}$ with a new classifier head $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ to adapt to the labels of \mathcal{D}'_S . During training, we first optimize $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ to classify the labels of \mathcal{D}'_S based on the representations extracted by $\boldsymbol{\omega}_{bo}$ (Eq. (9)), and then search for the optimal coefficients of the anchors to update $\boldsymbol{\omega}_{bo}$ (Eq. (10)):

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} h(\mathcal{D}'_S, [\boldsymbol{\omega}_{bo}^k + \sum_{m=1}^{|\mathcal{A}|} c_m \bar{\mathbf{a}}_m^{bo}; \boldsymbol{\theta}]), \quad (9)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{c}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{c}} h(\mathcal{D}'_S, [\boldsymbol{\omega}_{bo}^k + \sum_{m=1}^{|\mathcal{A}|} c_m \bar{\mathbf{a}}_m^{bo}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^*]), \quad (10)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{c}} = [\hat{c}_1, \dots, \hat{c}_{|\mathcal{A}|}]$. Although $h_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}$ ignores $\boldsymbol{\omega}_{he}^k$ and $\{\mathbf{a}_m^{he}\}_{m=1}^{|\mathcal{A}|}$ in Eq. (10), we find that the search results are a good indicator of the overall dimensions. Therefore, we update the full model via $\boldsymbol{\omega}^{k+1} = \boldsymbol{\omega}^k + \sum_{m=1}^{|\mathcal{A}|} \hat{c}_m \bar{\mathbf{a}}_m$. Our experiments show that this approach works well even when \mathcal{D} contains grayscale images (e.g., Fashion-MNIST) and \mathcal{D}'_S has colorful images (e.g., ImageNet). We note that the loss h can potentially leverage unsupervised learning techniques [5, 6], allowing \mathcal{D}'_S to consist of unlabeled data with richer resources. In this work, we focus on the supervised setting as a proof of concept.

4.1.3. Fallback Mechanism

In practice, verifying the condition in Eq. (8) may not be feasible, especially when $\partial \ell(\mathcal{D}, \cdot) / \partial \mathbf{c}$ is not accessible due to communication limitation or privacy concerns. To enhance the robustness of Feddle and improve the chance of Eq. (8) being hold during the coefficient search, we introduce a fallback mechanism. Specifically, we initialize the merging coefficients $\{c'_m\}_{m=1}^{|\mathcal{A}|}$ using an existing FL method and add a regularization term to the search objective. The resulting search objective becomes:

$$\arg \min_{\mathbf{c}} \ell(\mathcal{D}_S, \boldsymbol{\omega}^k + \sum_{m=1}^{|\mathcal{A}|} c_m \bar{\mathbf{a}}_m) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_m (c_m - c'_m)^2, \quad (11)$$

where λ controls the regularization strength. In this work, we adopt FedBuff as the fallback method. However, Feddle can potentially leverage various FL methods as a fallback, which we leave for future exploration. As we will show in the experiment section, fallback mechanism is crucial for applying Feddle to the OOD setting.

4.2. Theoretical Analysis

Let $F_j(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}_j}[\ell(\mathcal{D}_j, \boldsymbol{\omega})]$, $\forall j = 1, \dots, J$, we define the true loss on \mathcal{D} as $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\ell(\mathcal{D}, \boldsymbol{\omega})] := F(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J F_j(\boldsymbol{\omega})$. In the following, we show that due to the additional \mathcal{D}_S and optimization of the merging coefficients, Feddle achieves a faster convergence rate in terms of communication rounds than existing methods (e.g. FedAvg, FedBuff) when ID data is available at the server. We further investigate the case when the server only has OOD data and show that Feddle remains convergent. Our theorems are based on the following assumptions which are widely used in the literature [39, 48, 50]. All the proofs are deferred to App. A.

Assumption 1 (Unbiased stochastic gradient). $\mathbb{E}_{\xi_j}[g_j(\boldsymbol{\omega}; \xi_j)] = \nabla F_j(\boldsymbol{\omega})$ for all $1 \leq j \leq J$, where ξ_j is the random variable for the noise and $g_j(\boldsymbol{\omega}; \xi_j)$ is stochastic gradient.

Assumption 2 (Bounded local and global variance). For all $1 \leq j \leq J$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_j}[\|g_j(\boldsymbol{\omega}; \xi_j) - \nabla F_j(\boldsymbol{\omega})\|^2] = \sigma_l^2(\boldsymbol{\omega}) \leq \sigma_l^2,$$

$$\frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \|\nabla F_j(\boldsymbol{\omega}) - \nabla F(\boldsymbol{\omega})\|^2 = \sigma_g^2(\boldsymbol{\omega}) \leq \sigma_g^2,$$

where σ_l is the upper bound for the variance of the gradient due to the noise variable ξ_i and σ_g is the upper bound for the variance of the gradient due to heterogeneity.

Assumption 3 (Bounded gradient). $\exists G \geq 0, \|\nabla F_j\|^2 \leq G^2$, for all $1 \leq j \leq J$.

Assumption 4 (L-smoothness). For all $1 \leq j \leq J$,

$$\exists L > 0, \|\nabla F_j(\boldsymbol{\omega}) - \nabla F_j(\boldsymbol{\omega}')\| \leq L\|\boldsymbol{\omega} - \boldsymbol{\omega}'\|.$$

Theorem 1 (In-domain data). Suppose the above assumptions hold, and \mathcal{D}_S represents the in-domain data. In addition, suppose the client’s delay is bounded by τ_{max} , and Feddle’s merging coefficients satisfies $\text{abs}(\hat{c}_m) < \hat{c}_{max}$. Then, Feddle at least has the same convergence rate as FedBuff and FedAvg, in K global communication rounds, Q local steps, and T server steps of training with the global step size (in FedBuff and FedAvg) $\eta_g = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{QM})$, local step size $\eta_l = \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{KQ})$, and server step size $\eta_c = \mathcal{O}(1/\sum_m^M \|\Delta_m\|^2)$, where Δ_m is model update of client m . Moreover, if the signal-to-noise ratio of the gradient is sufficiently large, i.e. $C\|\nabla F(\boldsymbol{\omega})\|^2 \geq (\sigma_l^2(\boldsymbol{\omega}) + \sigma_g^2(\boldsymbol{\omega}))$, for $C > 0$, and for any delay $\tau \leq \tau_{max}$, there exists $C_{max} > 0$ such that $C_{max}\|\nabla F_j(\boldsymbol{\omega}^k)\|^2 \geq \|\nabla F_j(\boldsymbol{\omega}^{k-\tau})\|^2$, then the convergence rate of Feddle r_{Feddle} satisfies

$$r_{Feddle} \leq \frac{\sqrt{QMK}}{\sqrt{QMK} + C_T \left(K - \sqrt{\frac{M}{Q}}\right)} r_{FL}, \quad (12)$$

where r_{FL} is the rate of FedBuff or FedAvg, $C_T = A_0 \left(1 - \frac{1}{4T}\right)$, and A_0 is a constant decreasing in C, C_{max}, L . Normally, $K \gg \sqrt{\frac{M}{Q}}$, thus Feddle has a faster convergence rate than the other methods.

Remark 1. There are two assumptions in Theorem 1 regarding the norm of the gradient. The first one asserts that the variance of the gradient can be bounded by some factor of the norm of the gradient. This is expected for reasonable training results and is also assumed in Assumption 4.3 of [2]. The second assumption is technical where we would like to make the norm of the gradients comparable despite the delay. We note that the effect of C_{max} is clarified in the constant A_0 , where small C_{max} provides smaller bounds, which is reasonable in practice.

Theorem 2 (Out-of-domain data). Suppose the assumptions in Theorem 1 hold except that $\eta_c = \min\left(\frac{1}{2LT\|\Delta^k\|^2}, \frac{1}{2LT\|\Delta^k\|}\right)$, where Δ^k denotes all model updates at round k . In addition, the cosine similarity between $\partial h(\mathcal{D}'_S, \cdot)/\partial \mathbf{c}$ and $\partial \ell(\mathcal{D}, \cdot)/\partial \mathbf{c}$ is $s \approx 1$, (c.f. Eq. (8)), where \mathcal{D}'_S is the OOD data. Then, if we choose the η'_c in the server training adaptively such that $\eta'_c \|\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}'_S}[h(\mathcal{D}'_S, \boldsymbol{\omega}^k)]\| = \eta_c \|\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}_S}[h(\mathcal{D}_S, \boldsymbol{\omega}^k)]\|$ and let FedBuff initialize Feddle for the merging procedure, then it converges to a stable point of the true loss up to

some error,

$$r'_{Feddle} \leq \frac{\sqrt{QMK}}{\sqrt{QMK} + C'_T \left(K - \sqrt{\frac{M}{Q}}\right)} r_{FL} + \mathcal{O}\left((1-s)\frac{GK}{L}\right), \quad (13)$$

where $C'_T = \min\left\{\frac{A'_0\sqrt{K}}{T(\sigma_l + \sigma_g + G)}, \frac{A'_0}{T}\right\}$ for some $A'_0 > 0$.

Remark 2. Here, the rate is slightly different from that on ID data because we need to choose η_c adaptively to bound the error term due to the surrogate loss. In Fig. 11 of App. F.5, we studied the constant s and showed empirically that it is indeed close to 1. Therefore, Theorem 2 theoretically confirms the convergence result up to a small error.

5. Experiments

We first introduce the models and baselines and OOD setting. Client datasets and other settings are detailed in the respective sections. Additional information, such as hyperparameters, is given in App. D.

Models. We employ ResNet-18 [16] pretrained on ImageNet [9], and perform full fine-tuning. Additionally, we apply LoRA [18] fine-tuning to a ViT16-Base [10], which is also pretrained on ImageNet. Furthermore, we train a convolutional neural network (CNN) from scratch, with corresponding results presented in App. F.2.

Baseline Methods. Our primary focus is on addressing data heterogeneity and asynchronous communication in a hybrid data regime. Many existing studies consider data heterogeneity as a fundamental challenge. In this work, we compare our method Feddle, against baselines approaches that additionally account for asynchronous communication or the hybrid data regime. Specifically: **a)** For hybrid data regime, we compare with (1) Center, which trains the model exclusively on server-side data. (2) Fed+FL, which fine-tunes aggregated model using server-side data at each communication round. (3) HFCL [11], which trains a model on server-side data and aggregate it with client models. (4) FedDF [33], which distills the knowledge from client models into the global model using server-side data. Notably, Center, Fed+FT and HFCL require ID data, while FedDF can also be applied in an OOD setting. **b)** For asynchronous communication, we compare our method with several competitive asynchronous methods including (1) FedAsync [54], (2) FedBuff [39], and (3) CA2FL [49]. Additionally, we include the classical FL approach FedAvg [37] as a reference.

We categorize these methods into two groups based on whether ID data is used at the server: **a)** with ID data, including Center, Fed+FL, HFCL, FedDF-ID, Feddle-ID (ours), and **b)** without ID data, including

Dataset	Method	ID	ResNet18				ViT			
			Dir(0.1), $\mathcal{N}(20)$	Dir(0.1), $\mathcal{N}(5)$	Dir(0.3), $\mathcal{N}(20)$	Dir(0.3), $\mathcal{N}(5)$	Dir(0.1), $\mathcal{N}(20)$	Dir(0.1), $\mathcal{N}(5)$	Dir(0.3), $\mathcal{N}(20)$	Dir(0.3), $\mathcal{N}(5)$
Fashion-MNIST	Center	✓	85.2 ± 0.2				82.8 ± 0.4			
	Fed+FT	✓	86.5 ± 0.1	87.7 ± 0.1	87.0 ± 0.4	88.3 ± 0.4	86.9 ± 0.0	88.4 ± 0.1	87.3 ± 0.1	88.8 ± 0.2
	HFCL	✓	<u>86.2 ± 0.1</u>	<u>87.5 ± 0.2</u>	<u>87.1 ± 0.2</u>	<u>89.0 ± 0.2</u>	<u>86.7 ± 0.0</u>	<u>88.0 ± 0.4</u>	<u>86.9 ± 0.0</u>	<u>88.6 ± 0.0</u>
	FedDF-ID	✓	80.2 ± 1.0	86.0 ± 0.4	85.9 ± 0.5	89.2 ± 0.1	74.0 ± 1.1	82.2 ± 0.4	78.3 ± 0.3	85.5 ± 0.2
	Feddle-ID	✓	87.3 ± 1.1	89.5 ± 0.1	89.9 ± 1.2	90.8 ± 0.7	87.6 ± 0.1	88.7 ± 0.1	89.3 ± 0.3	89.5 ± 0.3
	FedAvg	×	67.1 ± 5.5	79.6 ± 3.6	79.5 ± 3.3	85.6 ± 2.4	68.8 ± 0.6	79.2 ± 0.3	74.7 ± 1.0	84.1 ± 0.1
	FedAsync	×	73.3 ± 4.1	81.6 ± 2.4	82.7 ± 2.6	86.8 ± 2.4	68.8 ± 0.7	79.2 ± 0.3	74.7 ± 1.0	84.1 ± 0.1
	FedBuff	×	66.7 ± 4.3	80.5 ± 2.2	69.3 ± 7.3	79.0 ± 7.1	77.0 ± 2.9	72.8 ± 0.5	80.1 ± 3.7	85.4 ± 0.6
	CA2FL	×	66.0 ± 9.6	83.1 ± 1.0	82.9 ± 3.5	89.4 ± 1.0	81.7 ± 1.2	84.1 ± 0.6	82.8 ± 1.8	87.0 ± 0.4
	FedDF-ODD	×	20.8 ± 1.2	41.1 ± 2.0	36.3 ± 2.5	28.1 ± 2.3	69.1 ± 0.5	79.3 ± 0.1	75.0 ± 0.7	84.2 ± 0.4
Feddle-ODD	×	85.7 ± 1.2	88.1 ± 0.4	85.8 ± 0.3	90.0 ± 0.7	83.7 ± 2.4	86.0 ± 0.3	85.6 ± 0.3	88.6 ± 0.9	
CIFAR-100	Center	✓	53.2 ± 1.2				70.1 ± 0.8			
	Fed+FT	✓	58.7 ± 0.4	64.8 ± 0.4	59.6 ± 0.3	63.3 ± 0.6	85.9 ± 0.3	88.8 ± 0.2	86.1 ± 0.1	89.3 ± 0.1
	HFCL	✓	<u>62.2 ± 0.9</u>	<u>68.3 ± 0.3</u>	<u>63.8 ± 0.6</u>	<u>69.6 ± 0.2</u>	<u>86.4 ± 0.5</u>	<u>88.5 ± 0.1</u>	<u>86.3 ± 0.0</u>	<u>88.7 ± 0.1</u>
	FedDF-ID	✓	51.8 ± 1.2	57.3 ± 0.3	53.9 ± 0.4	58.5 ± 0.5	63.7 ± 0.5	81.9 ± 0.2	66.6 ± 0.9	84.9 ± 0.2
	Feddle-ID	✓	67.3 ± 1.2	69.3 ± 0.3	69.4 ± 2.2	69.5 ± 2.3	90.6 ± 0.0	90.0 ± 0.2	92.5 ± 0.4	92.5 ± 0.0
	FedAvg	×	52.6 ± 0.9	65.0 ± 0.6	57.4 ± 1.4	68.5 ± 0.2	49.9 ± 1.1	78.2 ± 0.5	48.4 ± 0.9	80.8 ± 0.1
	FedAsync	×	58.0 ± 1.3	66.9 ± 0.1	62.4 ± 0.8	71.0 ± 0.3	66.7 ± 1.8	83.8 ± 0.3	69.8 ± 0.8	86.7 ± 0.2
	FedBuff	×	57.5 ± 7.3	64.6 ± 4.4	61.0 ± 9.1	66.6 ± 5.9	86.7 ± 0.6	86.8 ± 0.5	88.6 ± 0.6	89.7 ± 0.3
	CA2FL	×	56.7 ± 5.5	63.1 ± 8.2	54.8 ± 14.2	66.7 ± 7.5	87.3 ± 0.7	87.8 ± 0.3	89.2 ± 0.9	89.5 ± 0.1
	FedDF-ODD	×	24.0 ± 0.4	30.4 ± 1.3	28.5 ± 0.9	35.6 ± 1.7	50.1 ± 1.1	78.8 ± 0.4	48.9 ± 0.9	81.3 ± 2.9
Feddle-ODD	×	70.5 ± 1.8	72.8 ± 0.6	74.9 ± 0.8	75.9 ± 0.0	87.8 ± 0.5	88.1 ± 0.6	92.1 ± 0.1	92.7 ± 0.3	

Table 1. **Comparisons of different approaches.** These experiments consider two data heterogeneity levels (Dir(0.1), Dir(0.3)) and two delay levels ($\mathcal{N}(5)$, $\mathcal{N}(20)$). “ID” indicates whether the approach uses in-domain data. If yes, 1000 samples are provided. Performance higher than Center is underlined. The best performance in both data availabilities is highlighted by bold.

FedAvg, FedAsync, FedBuff, Ca2FL, FedDF-ODD, Feddle-ODD (ours), where the latter two methods are capable of leveraging OOD data.


OOD Setting. We offer a subset of ImageNet [9] with 250K images for FedDF-ODD and Feddle-ODD in the OOD setting. *Notably, as ResNet18 and ViT are pretrained on the ImageNet, no approach uses additional data information, but has different effectiveness in leveraging the data.*

5.1. Results

Various Data Heterogeneity and Communication Delay.

We simulate two levels of data heterogeneity by partitioning the data using the Dirichlet distribution following [59], with parameters Dir(0.1) and Dir(0.3). This results in heterogeneous client data distribution in terms of the class label distribution and dataset size. Additionally, we model the delay for each client using a half-normal distribution \mathcal{N} , based on practical observations from [39], with standard deviation of 5 and 20. We define a scenario with 500 clients, and 200 communication rounds. At each round, 10 clients are sampled. We perform image classification tasks using three datasets: CIFAR-10/100 [26], and Fashion-MNIST [53]. Results of CIFAR10 are deferred to App. F. For methods using ID data at the server, we provide only 1K samples, acknowledging the higher cost of collecting ID data. We repeat the experiments 3 times with different random seeds, and report the mean and standard deviation.

In Tab. 1, we observe that Feddle consistently outperforms all the baseline methods by a clear margin regard-



(a) With In-Domain data.

(b) Without In-Domain data.

Figure 5. **Convergence plots** of ResNet18 on CIFAR100 with Dir(0.1), $\mathcal{N}(20)$. More plots are provided in App. F.6.

less of whether ID data is available at the server. Overall, baseline methods exhibit poorer performance in scenarios characterized by strong heterogeneity (Dir(0.1)) and high delay ($\mathcal{N}(20)$) compared to simpler scenario (Dir(0.3) and $\mathcal{N}(5)$). In contrast, Feddle remains less impacted by heterogeneity or delay, achieving outstanding accuracy even in complex scenarios. Moreover, for ID data, 1000 samples constitute at most 1/50 of the total decentralized training data for CIFAR100 and Fashion-MNIST. However, baseline FL methods may still struggle to surpass the performance of Center, which relies exclusively on server-side data. Conversely, Feddle consistently achieve significantly higher performance than Center. Notably, this advantage persists even when only OOD data is available. These results underscore the effectiveness of our method in leveraging decentralized data with guidance from server-side data despite the challenges of data heterogeneity and

Method	ID	FEMNIST	CelebA
Center	✓	72.4 ± 0.1	75.8 ± 0.3
Fed+FT	✓	82.4 ± 0.9	84.3 ± 0.1
HFCL	✓	80.3 ± 0.1	83.9 ± 0.2
FedDF-ID	✓	81.1 ± 0.6	83.8 ± 0.3
Feddle-ID	✓	88.6 ± 0.1	90.2 ± 0.1
FedAvg	×	74.2 ± 0.1	74.3 ± 1.0
FedAsync	×	85.2 ± 0.2	85.9 ± 0.7
FedBuff	×	86.5 ± 0.5	87.2 ± 0.3
CA2FL	×	85.1 ± 0.9	88.4 ± 0.9
FedDF-OOD	×	80.8 ± 0.3	81.9 ± 1.2
Feddle-OOD	×	88.5 ± 0.1	90.2 ± 0.3

Table 2. Experiments on datasets with real-world data heterogeneity on ResNet18. Delay level is set to $\mathcal{N}(20)$. “ID” indicates whether the approach use in-domain data. If so, 1000 samples are provided for FEMNIST and 200 for CelebA.

communication delays. Fig. 5 presents the convergence plots. It is worthy noting that Feddle demonstrates robustness in OOD scenarios where client and server data differ significantly in visual characteristics, such as when clients are gray-scale Fashion-MNIST while the server uses colorful ImageNet. By effectively incorporating OOD server-side data, Feddle shows promise for broad applicability.

Real-World Data Heterogeneity. To evaluate the performance of our method under real-world data heterogeneity. We incorporate two additional datasets: FEMNIST [8] and CelebA [36], partitioning the data according to the LEAF framework [4]. This results in data distributions reflecting those of distinct real-world individuals. Additionally, we assess our method in a large-scale setting with 1000 clients, sampling 50 clients per round. The total number of communication rounds is set to 200. As shown in Tab. 2, Feddle consistently outperforms the baseline methods, demonstrating its potential for real-world applications.

Analysis of Feddle Optimization. In Sec. 3, we discuss that uniformly assigning positive aggregation coefficients may be suboptimal due to conflicting optimization directions across clients. As Feddle searches for the optimal aggregation coefficients under data guidance and outperforms existing technologies, we show that the coefficient found by Feddle indeed contains negative values in Fig. 6. Additionally, theoretical analysis in Sec. 4.2 shows that Feddle converges under OOD data availability if its gradient of the aggregation coefficients is aligned with the gradients when ID data is applied, namely satisfying Eq. (8). As shown in Fig. 7, without fallback initialization, the similarity between the optimization directions regarding ID and OOD data appears random. In contrast, with fallback initialization, the optimization directions regarding ID and OOD data become highly aligned, with the cosine similarity approaching 1, demonstrating the crucial role of the fallback mechanism in the success of Feddle. More plots of these analyses are provided in App. F.




Figure 6. Statistics of aggregation coefficients identified by Feddle using ResNet and CIFAR10 with Dir(0.1), $\mathcal{N}(20)$.




Figure 7. Similarity of the coefficients’ optimization direction between ID and OOD data using ResNet18 and CIFAR10 with Dir(0.1), $\mathcal{N}(20)$.

	In-Domain	Out-of-Domain
Base	81.9 ± 0.7	10.9 ± 0.4
+Anchor Normalization	83.1 ± 0.4	7.7 ± 0.4
+Importance Score	84.2 ± 0.1	9.3 ± 0.1
+Fallback Initialization	86.3 ± 0.4	81.0 ± 1.2
+Fallback Regularization ($\lambda = 0.01$)	86.3 ± 0.2	82.2 ± 1.4

Table 3. Analysis of Feddle components for ID and OOD data availability using ResNet18 and CIFAR-10 dataset.

5.2. Ablation Studies

Feddle Components. Table 3 shows the effectiveness of Feddle’s components. Notably, we find that fallback initialization is essential for handling OOD data. While the results under ID data availability highlight the benefit of each component in achieving superior performance.

Fallback Regularization Strength. One hyperparameter introduced by Feddle is the regularization strength λ of the fallback mechanism. As shown in Fig. 8, with ID data, Feddle appears insensitive to this hyperparameter, while a strong regularization (such as $\lambda = 0.1$) may not be beneficial under the OOD data availability. In this work, we adopt 0.0 for ID settings and 0.01 for OOD settings across datasets and models.

Model Atlas Size. The other hyperparameter introduced by Feddle is the atlas size M . As shown in Fig. 9, expanding the model atlas generally benefits ID settings. However, an excessively large atlas, such as one that more than twice the number of clients sampled per round, can hinder performance in the OOD settings. This is likely because the optimization signal with OOD data is less reliable than ID data, making Feddle more prone to converging to a location that deviates from the original objective in an expanded optimization space. In this work, we always set the atlas size to twice the number of sampled clients, which results in good performance across datasets, models and settings.

Computation Cost. We compare computation cost across different approaches in terms of the server computation complexity and cache size in App. F.3.




Figure 8. Accuracy vs. regularization strength using CNN and CIFAR10, with Dir(0.1), $\mathcal{N}(20)$.




Figure 9. Accuracy vs. atlas size using CNN and CIFAR10, with Dir(0.1), $\mathcal{N}(20)$. 10 clients are sampled per round.

6. Conclusion

In this work, we introduce the hybrid data regime, prevalent in real-world applications, and investigate methods to improve the utilization of decentralized data within this regime. Building on existing FL approaches that address the challenges of decentralized data, we propose a federated dual learning framework, Feddle. Our method provides a flexible solution for practical applications across various scenarios, as it can be applied whether the server data is ID or OOD relative to the clients’ data. Theoretical analyses demonstrate that Feddle converges faster than existing methods and experimental results confirm that it significantly outperforms current approaches, underscoring its effectiveness in training networks with decentralized data. Future directions are discussed in App. G.

References

- [1] K. A. Bonawitz, Hubert Eichner, Wolfgang Grieskamp, Dzmitry Huba, Alex Ingerman, Vladimir Ivanov, Chloé M Kiddon, Jakub Konečný, Stefano Mazzocchi, Brendan McMahan, Timon Van Overveldt, David Petrou, Daniel Ramage, and Jason Roselander. Towards federated learning at scale: System design. In *Proceedings of the 2nd SysML Conference*, 2019. 3, 4
- [2] Léon Bottou, Frank E. Curtis, and Jorge Nocedal. Optimization methods for large-scale machine learning. *ArXiv*, abs/1606.04838, 2016. 6
- [3] Tom B Brown. Language models are few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14165*, 2020. 1
- [4] Sebastian Caldas, Sai Meher Karthik Duddu, Peter Wu, Tian Li, Jakub Konečný, H Brendan McMahan, Virginia Smith, and Ameet Talwalkar. Leaf: A benchmark for federated settings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.01097*, 2018. 8, 5
- [5] Mathilde Caron, Piotr Bojanowski, Armand Joulin, and Matthijs Douze. Deep clustering for unsupervised learning of visual features. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pages 132–149, 2018. 5
- [6] Mathilde Caron, Ishan Misra, Julien Mairal, Priya Goyal, Piotr Bojanowski, and Armand Joulin. Unsupervised learning of visual features by contrasting cluster assignments. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:9912–9924, 2020. 5
- [7] Hong-You Chen and Wei-Lun Chao. FedBE: Making bayesian model ensemble applicable to federated learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. 2, 3, 4
- [8] Gregory Cohen, Saeed Afshar, Jonathan Tapson, and Andre Van Schaik. Emnist: Extending mnist to handwritten letters. In *2017 international joint conference on neural networks (IJCNN)*, pages 2921–2926. IEEE, 2017. 8, 5
- [9] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *2009 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 248–255, 2009. 6, 7, 5
- [10] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, Jakob Uszkoreit, and Neil Houlsby. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. 6, 5
- [11] Ahmet M Elbir, Sinem Coleri, and Kumar Vijay Mishra. Hybrid federated and centralized learning. In *2021 29th European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO)*, pages 1541–1545. IEEE, 2021. 2, 6, 4, 5
- [12] Chenyuan Feng, Howard H Yang, Siye Wang, Zhongyuan Zhao, and Tony QS Quek. Hybrid learning: When centralized learning meets federated learning in the mobile edge computing systems. *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 2023. 2, 4
- [13] Liang Gao, Huazhu Fu, Li Li, Yingwen Chen, Ming Xu, and Cheng-Zhong Xu. FedDC: Federated learning with Non-IID

- data via local drift decoupling and correction. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 10112–10121, 2022. 2, 4
- [14] Robin C Geyer, Tassilo Klein, and Moin Nabi. Differentially private federated learning: A client level perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.07557*, 2017. 2
- [15] Avishek Ghosh, Jichan Chung, Dong Yin, and Kannan Ramchandran. An efficient framework for clustered federated learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 19586–19597. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020. 2, 4
- [16] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016. 6, 5
- [17] István Hegedűs, Árpád Berta, Levente Kocsis, András Benczúr, and Márk Jelasity. Robust decentralized low-rank matrix decomposition. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*, 7:1–24, 2016. 4
- [18] Edward J Hu, yelong shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. 6, 5
- [19] Gabriel Ilharco, Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Mitchell Wortsman, Ludwig Schmidt, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Ali Farhadi. Editing models with task arithmetic. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. 5
- [20] Menglin Jia, Luming Tang, Bor-Chun Chen, Claire Cardie, Serge Belongie, Bharath Hariharan, and Ser-Nam Lim. Visual prompt tuning. In *European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2022. 5
- [21] Xisen Jin, Xiang Ren, Daniel Preotiuc-Pietro, and Pengxiang Cheng. Dataless knowledge fusion by merging weights of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.09849*, 2022. 5
- [22] Peter Kairouz, H Brendan McMahan, Brendan Avent, Aurélien Bellet, Mehdi Bennis, Arjun Nitin Bhagoji, Kallista Bonawitz, Zachary Charles, Graham Cormode, Rachel Cummings, et al. Advances and open problems in federated learning. *Foundations and trends® in machine learning*, 14(1–2): 1–210, 2021. 2, 3
- [23] Sai Praneeth Karimireddy, Satyen Kale, Mehryar Mohri, Sashank Reddi, Sebastian Stich, and Ananda Theertha Suresh. SCAFFOLD: Stochastic controlled averaging for federated learning. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5132–5143. PMLR, 2020. 2, 4
- [24] Diederik P Kingma. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014. 5
- [25] Alexander Kirillov, Eric Mintun, Nikhila Ravi, Hanzi Mao, Chloe Rolland, Laura Gustafson, Tete Xiao, Spencer Whitehead, Alexander C Berg, Wan-Yen Lo, et al. Segment anything. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 4015–4026, 2023. 1
- [26] Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. 2009. 7, 5
- [27] Eugene Kuznetsov, Yitao Chen, and Ming Zhao. SecureFL: Privacy preserving federated learning with SGX and TrustZone. In *2021 IEEE/ACM Symposium on Edge Computing (SEC)*, pages 55–67, 2021. 2
- [28] Louis Leconte, Matthieu Jonckheere, Sergey Samsonov, and Eric Moulines. Queuing dynamics of asynchronous Federated Learning. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1711–1719. PMLR, 2024. 2, 4
- [29] Daliang Li and Junpu Wang. Fedmd: Heterogenous federated learning via model distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.03581*, 2019. 3, 4
- [30] Qinbin Li, Bingsheng He, and Dawn Song. Model-contrastive federated learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 10713–10722, 2021. 2, 3, 4
- [31] Tian Li, Anit Kumar Sahu, Manzil Zaheer, Maziar Sanjabi, Ameet Talwalkar, and Virginia Smith. Federated optimization in heterogeneous networks. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, 2:429–450, 2020. 2, 3
- [32] Xiang Li, Kaixuan Huang, Wenhao Yang, Shusen Wang, and Zhihua Zhang. On the convergence of fedavg on non-iid data. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020. 2, 4
- [33] Tao Lin, Lingjing Kong, Sebastian U Stich, and Martin Jaggi. Ensemble distillation for robust model fusion in federated learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:2351–2363, 2020. 3, 6, 4, 5
- [34] Enshu Liu, Junyi Zhu, Zinan Lin, Xuefei Ning, Matthew B Blaschko, Sergey Yekhanin, Shengen Yan, Guohao Dai, Huazhong Yang, and Yu Wang. Linear combination of saved checkpoints makes consistency and diffusion models better. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.02241*, 2024. 5
- [35] Ji Liu, Juncheng Jia, Tianshi Che, Chao Huo, Jiexiang Ren, Yang Zhou, Huaiyu Dai, and Dejing Dou. FedASMU: Efficient asynchronous federated learning with dynamic staleness-aware model update. In *Proceedings of the 38th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 13900–13908, 2024. 2, 4
- [36] Ziwei Liu, Ping Luo, Xiaogang Wang, and Xiaoou Tang. Deep learning face attributes in the wild. In *Proceedings of International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2015. 8, 5
- [37] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Aguerre 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. PMLR, 2017. 1, 2, 3, 6, 5
- [38] H Brendan McMahan, Daniel Ramage, Kunal Talwar, and Li Zhang. Learning differentially private recurrent language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.06963*, 2017. 2
- [39] John Nguyen, Kshitiz Malik, Hongyuan Zhan, Ashkan Yousefpour, Mike Rabbat, Mani Malek, and Dzmitry Huba. Federated learning with buffered asynchronous aggregation. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 3581–3607. PMLR, 2022. 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 4

- [40] Wanli Ni, Jingheng Zheng, and Hui Tian. Semi-federated learning for collaborative intelligence in massive IoT networks. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 10(13):11942–11943, 2023. 2, 4
- [41] Sotirios Nikoloutsopoulos, Iordanis Koutsopoulos, and Michalis K. Titsias. Personalized Federated Learning with Exact Stochastic Gradient Descent. *arXiv:2202.09848 [cs]*, 2022. 2, 4
- [42] Róbert Ormándi, István Hegedűs, and Márk Jelasity. Gossip learning with linear models on fully distributed data. *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience*, 25(4): 556–571, 2013. 4
- [43] Natalia Ponomareva, Hussein Hazimeh, Alex Kurakin, Zheng Xu, Carson Denison, H Brendan McMahan, Sergei Vassilvitskii, Steve Chien, and Abhradeep Guha Thakurta. How to DP-fy ML: A practical guide to machine learning with differential privacy. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 77:1113–1201, 2023. 2
- [44] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021. 1
- [45] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 10684–10695, 2022. 1
- [46] Jaehun Song, Min-Hwan Oh, and Hyung-Sin Kim. Personalized federated learning with server-side information. *IEEE Access*, 10:120245–120255, 2022. 2, 4
- [47] Canh T. Dinh, Nguyen Tran, and Josh Nguyen. Personalized federated learning with moreau envelopes. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 21394–21405, 2020. 2, 4
- [48] Jianyu Wang, Qinghua Liu, Hao Liang, Gauri Joshi, and H. Vincent Poor. Tackling the objective inconsistency problem in heterogeneous federated optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 7611–7623, 2020. 2, 3, 5, 4
- [49] Yujia Wang, Yuanpu Cao, Jingcheng Wu, Ruoyu Chen, and Jinghui Chen. Tackling the data heterogeneity in asynchronous federated learning with cached update calibration. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. 2, 3, 6, 4, 5, 10
- [50] Yujia Wang, Shiqiang Wang, Songtao Lu, and Jinghui Chen. FADAS: Towards federated adaptive asynchronous optimization. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024. 2, 3, 5, 1, 4, 10
- [51] Mitchell Wortsman, Gabriel Ilharco, Samir Ya Gadre, Rebecca Roelofs, Raphael Gontijo-Lopes, Ari S Morcos, Hongseok Namkoong, Ali Farhadi, Yair Carmon, Simon Kornblith, and Ludwig Schmidt. Model soups: averaging weights of multiple fine-tuned models improves accuracy without increasing inference time. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 23965–23998. PMLR, 2022. 5
- [52] Chuhan Wu, Fangzhao Wu, Lingjuan Lyu, Yongfeng Huang, and Xing Xie. Communication-efficient federated learning via knowledge distillation. *Nature Communications*, 13(1): 2032, 2022. 3
- [53] Han Xiao, Kashif Rasul, and Roland Vollgraf. Fashion-MNIST: A novel image dataset for benchmarking machine learning algorithms, 2017. 7, 5
- [54] Cong Xie, Sanmi Koyejo, and Indranil Gupta. Asynchronous federated optimization. In *OPT2020: 12th Annual Workshop on Optimization for Machine Learning*, 2019. 2, 3, 6, 4, 5
- [55] Prateek Yadav, Derek Tam, Leshem Choshen, Colin Raffel, and Mohit Bansal. TIES-merging: Resolving interference when merging models. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. 5
- [56] Zhiqin Yang, Yonggang Zhang, Yu Zheng, Xinmei Tian, Hao Peng, Tongliang Liu, and Bo Han. FedFed: Feature distillation against data heterogeneity in federated learning. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. 3, 4
- [57] Le Yu, Bowen Yu, Haiyang Yu, Fei Huang, and Yongbin Li. Language models are super mario: Absorbing abilities from homologous models as a free lunch. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.03099*, 2023. 5
- [58] XIE Yueqi, Weizhong Zhang, Renjie Pi, Fangzhao Wu, Qifeng Chen, Tong Zhang, Xing Xie, and Sunghun Kim. Optimizing server-side aggregation for robust federated learning via subspace training. 3, 5
- [59] Mikhail Yurochkin, Mayank Agarwal, Soumya Ghosh, Kristjan Greenewald, Nghia Hoang, and Yasaman Khazani. Bayesian nonparametric federated learning of neural networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 7252–7261. PMLR, 2019. 2, 3, 7, 4, 5
- [60] Jie Zhang, Song Guo, Xiaosong Ma, Haozhao Wang, Wenchao Xu, and Feijie Wu. Parameterized knowledge transfer for personalized federated learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:10092–10104, 2021. 2, 4
- [61] Tuo Zhang, Lei Gao, Sunwoo Lee, Mi Zhang, and Salman Avestimehr. TimelyFL: Heterogeneity-aware asynchronous federated learning with adaptive partial training. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 5064–5073, 2023. 2, 4
- [62] Xu Zhang, Yinchuan Li, Wenpeng Li, Kaiyang Guo, and Yunfeng Shao. Personalized federated learning via variational Bayesian inference. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 26293–26310, 2022. 2, 3, 4
- [63] Junyi Zhu, Xingchen Ma, and Matthew B. Blaschko. Confidence-aware personalized federated learning via variational expectation maximization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 24542–24551, 2023. 2, 3, 4, 5

Unlocking the Value of Decentralized Data: A Federated Dual Learning Approach for Model Aggregation

Supplementary Material

A. Proof

In this section, we prove the convergence rate of Feddle when \mathcal{D}_S is either the in-domain or out-of-domain data. For notational simplicity we let $\Delta_j^k = \Delta\omega_j^k$ for the updates of the j -th client and $\Delta^k = (\Delta_1^k, \dots, \Delta_M^k)$ for some $M > 0$. We let ∇F denotes the usual gradient on ω and $\nabla_{\mathbf{c}}F(\omega + \sum_{m=1}^M \hat{c}_m \Delta_m)$ for the gradient with respect to \mathbf{c} where Δ_m is the model update of client m .

We first prove a useful lemma for the smoothness of the gradient $\nabla F_{\mathbf{c}}$.

Lemma 1. *Suppose Assumptions 1-4 hold, then $\tilde{F}(\mathbf{c}) := F(\omega + \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{c}_m \Delta_m)$ has $L(\sum_{m=1}^M \|\Delta_m\|^2)$ -smoothness with respect to \mathbf{c} . Therefore, for the convergence of the training on the server, $\eta_{\mathbf{c}} \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{L \sum_{m=1}^M \|\Delta_m\|^2}\right)$.*

Proof. Let $\omega(\mathbf{c}) = \omega + \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{c}_m \Delta_m$. Then, we have by definition that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla \tilde{F}_{\mathbf{c}}(\mathbf{c}) - \nabla \tilde{F}_{\mathbf{c}}(\mathbf{c}')\| \\ & \leq \|((\nabla F(\omega(\mathbf{c})) - \nabla F(\omega(\mathbf{c}')) \cdot \Delta_m)_m)\| \\ & \leq \|\nabla F(\omega(\mathbf{c})) - \nabla F(\omega(\mathbf{c}'))\| \left(\sum_m \|\Delta_m\|^2\right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq L\|(c - c') \cdot (\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_M)\| \left(\sum_m \|\Delta_m\|^2\right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq L\left(\sum_m \|\Delta_m\|^2\right) \|c - c'\|. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1. We first discuss the relation between our merging method $\sum_m \hat{c}_m \mathbf{a}_m$ and that of FedBuff or FedAvg. For each k , let $\tilde{\omega}^{k+1}$ be the weight update from FedBuff or FedAvg based on ω^k . In FedBuff, $\tilde{\omega}^{k+1} = \frac{\eta_g}{M} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{M}} \Delta_j^{k-\tau_k^j}$ where \mathcal{M} is the recent sampled set of clients and τ_k^j is the delay. Since Feddle has the same sampling procedure and these gradients from new clients are added to the atlas, there must exist certain \hat{c}_m such that $\sum_m \hat{c}_m \mathbf{a}_m = \tilde{\omega}^{k+1}$. In other words, Feddle's output in this step ω^{k+1} must have a lower error than $\tilde{\omega}^{k+1}$. In FedAvg, $\tilde{\omega}^{k+1} = \frac{\eta_g |\mathcal{D}_j|}{|\mathcal{D}|} \sum_{j=1}^J \Delta_j^k$, where each client's gradient is involved. For this, we define $\hat{c}_m \propto \eta_g |\mathcal{D}_j| / |\mathcal{D}|$ (by \propto we resume the unnormalized gradient) if \mathbf{a}_m is the most recent gradient of each client and otherwise 0. By the L -smoothness assumption, the difference in the error

at $\tilde{\omega}^{k+1}$ and the defined $\omega^k + \sum_m \hat{c}_m \mathbf{a}_m$ can be bounded by $\sum_j L \|\omega^k - \omega^{k-\tau_k^j}\|$ (their gradients are calculated at $\omega^k, \omega^{k-\tau_k^j}$). According to the proof of Theorem 3.4 of [50], such difference can be bounded by Eq.(C.8), and their overall order is less than $\eta_g^2 \eta_l^2$, which is therefore absorbed in $-\eta_g \eta_l \|\nabla F(\omega^k)\|^2$ for sufficiently small parameters. Thus, we can safely assume that the same conclusion holds when comparing Feddle and FedAvg up to a negligible error.

Now, we consider the expected loss on \mathcal{D}_S (and thus \mathcal{D}), and $\mathcal{D}_j, 1 \leq j \leq J$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F(\omega^{k+1}) - F(\omega^k) &= F(\omega^{k+1}) - F(\tilde{\omega}^{k+1}) \\ &\quad + F(\tilde{\omega}^{k+1}) - F(\omega^k). \end{aligned}$$

Based on the proceeding argument, $F(\omega^{k+1}) \leq F(\tilde{\omega}^{k+1})$ holds, thus we can assume without loss of generality that the optimization on \mathbf{c} is initialized at the \mathbf{c} such that $\tilde{\omega}^{k+1} = \omega^k + \sum_m \hat{c}_m \mathbf{a}_m$. By the existing convergence results of FL methods [50], we can upperbound $F(\tilde{\omega}^{k+1}) - F(\omega^k)$ by $-C_1 \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla F(\omega^k)\|^2]$, $C_1 > 0$ plus some constants regarding T, K . Thus, if we can upper bound $F(\omega^{k+1}) - F(\tilde{\omega}^{k+1})$ by $-C_2 \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla F(\omega^k)\|^2]$, $C_2 > 0$, then we can indeed show that the convergence rate of Feddle is faster at least by some factor. Now, we investigate the optimization of \mathbf{c} in Eq.(6). Since it uses SGD and the L -smoothness holds, we can upperbound the loss reduction by the sum of the squared L^2 norm of the gradients at each \mathbf{c} . In particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F(\omega^{k+1}) - F(\tilde{\omega}^{k+1}) &\leq F(\omega_{e_1}^{k+1}) - F(\tilde{\omega}^{k+1}) \\ &\leq -\frac{\eta_{\mathbf{c}}}{2} \|\nabla_{\mathbf{c}} F(\tilde{\omega}^{k+1})\|^2 + \frac{\eta_{\mathbf{c}}^2 \sigma_g'^2}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\omega_{e_1}^{k+1}$ is the weight update after the first step of the optimization initialized by $\tilde{\omega}^{k+1}$, and $\sigma_g'^2$ is the noise of the gradient, which we can also assume to be controlled by the squared norm of the gradient. Next, we would like to relate the gradient regarding \mathbf{c} with the gradient at ω^k to estimate C_2 as previously discussed. We assumed that $\tilde{\omega}^{k+1} = \frac{\eta_g}{J} \sum_{j \in J} \Delta_j^k$ for some $J > 0$, which is a unified expression for FL methods (if M anchors are actually used, simply let some $\Delta_j^k = 0$ and change J to M in the follow-

ing). By the chain rule of differentiation, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\nabla_{\mathbf{c}} F(\tilde{\omega}^{k+1})\|^2 \\
&= \|(\nabla F(\tilde{\omega}^{k+1})^\top \Delta_1, \dots, F(\tilde{\omega}^{k+1})^\top \Delta_J)\|^2 \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^J (\langle \nabla F(\omega^k), \Delta_j \rangle + \langle \nabla F(\tilde{\omega}^{k+1}) - \nabla F(\omega^k), \Delta_j \rangle)^2 \\
&\geq \sum_{j=1}^J (\langle \nabla F(\omega^k), \Delta_j \rangle)^2 \\
&\quad - 2\eta_l L \|\nabla F(\omega^k)\| \|\tilde{\omega}^{k+1} - \omega^k\| \|\Delta^k\|^2 \\
&\geq \frac{J}{\eta_g^2} (\langle \nabla F(\omega^k), \frac{\eta_g}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \Delta_j \rangle)^2 - \\
&\quad 2\eta_l L \|\nabla F(\omega^k)\| \|\tilde{\omega}^{k+1} - \omega^k\| \|\Delta^k\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality used $J \sum_j a_j^2 \geq (\sum_j a_j)^2$. Since $\frac{\eta_g}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \Delta_j^k$ is the update in the FedBuff (or FedAvg depending on the mechanism), we can apply their theory to calculate the lower bound of the first term on the right-hand side. In particular, by Eq. (C.2)-(C.6) of [50] and our condition on the gradient norm, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle \nabla F(\omega^k), \frac{\eta_g}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \Delta_j \rangle \geq \frac{\eta_g \eta_l Q}{2} \|\nabla F(\omega^k)\|^2 \\
& - \frac{A_1 \eta_g \eta_l Q^2 \eta_l^2 L^2 (C+1)}{J} (\sum_{q,j} (\|\nabla F(\omega^{k-\tau_k^j})\|^2) \\
& + 4M \hat{c}_{max}^2 \tau_{max}^2 \max_{k-\tau_k^j \leq s \leq k} \|\nabla F_j(\omega^s)\|^2) \\
& \geq \frac{\eta_g \eta_l Q}{2} \|\nabla F(\omega^k)\|^2 \times \\
& (1 - A_1 Q^2 \eta_l^2 L^2 (C+1) C_{max} (1 + 4\hat{c}_{max}^2 \tau_{max}^2))
\end{aligned}$$

for some constants A_1 . Here, we used $\frac{1}{J} \sum_j \|\nabla F_j(\omega)\|^2 \leq \frac{2}{J} \sum_j \|\nabla F_j(\omega) - \nabla F(\omega)\|^2 + 2\|\nabla F(\omega)\|^2$ in the last inequality. Note that $\eta_l Q$ is $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}})$, and $\hat{c}_{max} \tau_{max} = \mathcal{O}(1)$, so the coefficients must be positive. Now, for the second term, we have by Eq.(C.6) of [50] and our condition

on the signal-to-noise ratio that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\tilde{\omega}^{k+1} - \omega^k\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{2(C+1)Q\eta_g^2\eta_l^2}{M} \sum_{q=0}^{Q-1} \|\nabla F_j(\omega^{k-\tau_k^j, q})\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{2(C+1)Q\eta_g^2\eta_l^2}{M} \sum_{q=0}^{Q-1} (1 + C\eta_l LG)^{2q} \sum_j \|\nabla F_j(\omega^{k-\tau_k})\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{2(C+1)C_{max}Q\eta_g^2\eta_l^2}{M} \sum_{q=0}^{Q-1} (1 + C\eta_l LG)^{2q} \sum_j \|\nabla F_j(\omega^k)\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{2(C+1)C_{max}Q\eta_g^2\eta_l^2}{M} \sum_{q=0}^{Q-1} (1 + C\eta_l LG)^{2q} \sum_j \|\nabla F_j(\omega^k) \\
&\quad - \nabla F(\omega^k) + \nabla F(\omega^k)\|^2 \\
&\leq A_2 (C+1)^2 C_{max} Q \eta_g^2 \eta_l^2 \|\nabla F(\omega^k)\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, A_2 is a constant. The second inequality is due to the fact that each $\Delta_{j,q}$ is obtained by local SGD, and therefore, the changes in the gradient can be bounded by the initial value and some constants. The last inequality is due to Assumption 2, the low signal-to-noise ratio of the gradient and the order of η_l . In total, we have by choosing suitable coefficients for η_l that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\nabla_{\mathbf{c}} F(\tilde{\omega}^{k+1})\|^2 \geq \frac{J\eta_l^2 Q^2}{4} \|\nabla F(\omega^k)\|^4 \\
& - 2\eta_l^2 \eta_g Q L (C+1) \sqrt{A_2 C_{max}} \|\nabla F(\omega^k)\|^2 \|\Delta^k\|^2 \\
& \geq \left(\frac{A_3}{C_{max}} - 2\eta_l^2 \eta_g Q L (C+1) \sqrt{A_2 C_{max}} \right) \\
& \cdot \|\nabla F(\omega^k)\|^2 \|\Delta^k\|^2. \tag{14}
\end{aligned}$$

Here, A_3 is a constant. We used Eq. (C.5) of [50] and our conditions on the gradient norm for the last inequality, which yield that $C_{max} \eta_l^2 Q^2 J \|\nabla F(\omega^k)\|^2 \geq A_3 \|\Delta^k\|^2$. $\eta_l^2 \eta_g Q = \mathcal{O}(\frac{M}{K})$ which is assured to vanish given the convergence rate of federated learning algorithms, so the coefficients would be positive.

Since $\|\Delta^k\|^2 = \sum_j \|\Delta_j\|^2$, the decrease in the true loss is expected to be a constant factor of a function of $\|\nabla F(\omega^k)\|^2$ and server steps T . Note that by using SGD under L' -smoothness, the norm of the gradient is at least $(1 - L'(1+C)\eta_c)^T \|\nabla F_{\mathbf{c}}(\tilde{\omega}^{k+1})\|$, therefore, $F(\omega^{k+1}) - F(\omega^k)$ is at least be upper bounded by

$$-\eta_c \frac{1 - (1 - L'(1+C)\eta_c)^{2T}}{1 - (1 - L'(1+C)\eta_c)^2} \|\nabla F_{\mathbf{c}}(\tilde{\omega}^{k+1})\|^2. \tag{15}$$

By the choice of η_c in Lemma 1 and our lower bound on $\|\nabla F_{\mathbf{c}}(\tilde{\omega}^{k+1})\|^2$ in Eq. (14), we can upper bound the above by $-A_0 (1 - \eta_l^2 \eta_g Q) (1 - \frac{1}{4T}) \|\nabla F(\omega^k)\|^2$, where A_0 is a constant decreasing in C, C_{max}, L . Therefore, the effective constants in front of $\|\nabla F(\omega^k)\|^2$ is at least of order

$-A_0(1-\eta_l^2\eta_gQ)(1-\frac{1}{4^T})/2-\eta_g\eta_lQ/2$ where the second constant comes from FedBuff [50]. We obtain the results by plugging in the parameters. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. Denote the expected surrogate loss by F^h , and the weight update after the t -th server step on F^h and F (i.e. out-of-domain and in-domain data) by $\omega_{h^t}^k, \omega_{f^t}^k$. We first have

$$\|F(\omega_{h^t}^k) - F(\omega_{f^t}^k)\| \leq G\|\omega_{h^t}^k - \omega_{f^t}^k\|.$$

Since we assume that Feddle is initialized by FedBuff when the server data is out-of-domain, we can let $\omega_{h^0}^k = \omega_{f^0}^k$ at the start point. Now, for $t = 1$, by the definition of η_c' and the cosine similarity between the gradients, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\omega_{h^1}^k - \omega_{f^1}^k\| &= \|\omega_{h^1}^k - \omega_{h^0}^k + \omega_{f^0}^k - \omega_{f^1}^k\| \\ &= \eta_c \|\eta_c' \nabla_c F^h(\omega_{h^0}^k) / \eta_c - \nabla_c F(\omega_{f^0}^k)\| \\ &\leq \eta_c(1-s) \|\nabla_c F(\omega_{f^0}^k)\| \\ &\leq \eta_c(1-s) \|\nabla F(\omega_{f^0}^k)\| \|\Delta^k\| \ll 1. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the last equality follows from the definition of the gradient with respect to the merging coefficients and Cauchy-Schwartz inequality. In general, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\omega_{h^t}^k - \omega_{f^t}^k\| \\ &= \|\eta_c' \nabla_c F^h(\omega_{h^{t-1}}^k) - \eta_c \nabla_c F(\omega_{f^{t-1}}^k) - \omega_{f^{t-1}}^k + \omega_{h^{t-1}}^k\| \\ &\leq \eta_c \|\eta_c' \nabla_c F^h(\omega_{h^{t-1}}^k) / \eta_c - \nabla_c F(\omega_{f^{t-1}}^k)\| \\ &\quad + \|\omega_{f^{t-1}}^k - \omega_{h^{t-1}}^k\| + \eta_c \|\nabla F(\omega_{h^{t-1}}^k) - \nabla F(\omega_{f^{t-1}}^k)\| \\ &\leq \eta_c(1-s) \|\nabla_c F(\omega_{h^{t-1}}^k)\| \\ &\quad + (1+L\|\Delta^k\|^2\eta_c) \|\omega_{f^{t-1}}^k - \omega_{h^{t-1}}^k\| \\ &\leq \eta_c(1-s)G\|\Delta^k\| + (1+L\|\Delta^k\|^2\eta_c) \|\omega_{f^{t-1}}^k - \omega_{h^{t-1}}^k\| \end{aligned}$$

And therefore by iteratively applying the formula, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\omega_{h^t}^k - \omega_{f^t}^k\| \\ &\leq \eta_c(1-s) [G\|\Delta^k\| \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (1+L\|\Delta^k\|^2\eta_c)^t \\ &\quad + (1+L\|\Delta^k\|^2\eta_c)^t \|\nabla_c F(\omega_{f^0}^k)\|] \\ &\leq \eta_c(1-s)G\|\Delta^k\| \sum_{t=0}^T (1+L\|\Delta^k\|^2\eta_c)^t \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have an upper bound for $F(\omega_{h^t}^k)$ by

$$F(\omega_{h^t}^k) \leq F(\omega_{f^t}^k) + \eta_c(1-s)G\|\Delta^k\| \sum_{t=0}^T (1+L\|\Delta^k\|^2\eta_c)^t$$

which means that

$$\begin{aligned} F(\omega_h^{k+1}) - F(\omega^k) &\leq \\ F(\omega^{k+1}) - F(\omega^k) &+ \eta_c(1-s)G\|\Delta^k\| \sum_{t=0}^T (1+L\|\Delta^k\|^2\eta_c)^t \end{aligned}$$

Now, by choosing η_c adaptively such that $\eta_c = \min\left(\frac{1}{LT\|\Delta^k\|^2}, \frac{1}{LT\|\Delta^k\|}\right)$, we have, no matter the magnitude of $\|\Delta^k\|$, that

$$\begin{aligned} &F(\omega_h^{k+1}) - F(\omega^k) \\ &\leq F(\omega^{k+1}) - F(\omega^k) + (1-s)\frac{A_4G}{TL}T \\ &= F(\omega^{k+1}) - F(\omega^k) + A_4(1-s)\frac{G}{L}. \end{aligned}$$

with a potential price that the C_T in the rate of Feddle changes to

$$C_T' = \frac{A_0}{T\|\Delta^k\|} \geq \frac{A_5}{TQ\eta_l(\sigma_l + \sigma_g + G)} \geq \frac{A_0'\sqrt{K}}{T(\sigma_l + \sigma_g + G)},$$

due to the change of η_c in Eq. (15), which still guarantees faster convergence. Therefore, we obtain the result by aggregating the loss reduction. \square

B. Algorithm

The algorithm of Feddle is presented in Alg. 1.

C. Related Work

We begin by discussing related work on learning from decentralized data (App. C.1), with a particular emphasis on Federated Learning (FL). Next, we examine related work on learning from hybrid data in App. C.2. Finally, we discuss model averaging methods from a broad scope in App. C.3.

C.1. Learning from Decentralized Data

Next, we proceed to discuss learning from decentralized data, starting with related work on FL. We then briefly introduce other decentralized learning schemes.

Federated Learning The pioneering FL framework was proposed by McMahan et al. [37], which features a client-server architecture. In this setup, the server orchestrates the training process by sending the latest global model to connected clients for local training and aggregating their model updates once local training is completed at each client. The clients are responsible for managing local training using their own data and computational resources.

- *Data Heterogeneity.* One major challenge in FL is data heterogeneity, where clients are often geographically distant or environmentally distinct from each other [22, 31].

Algorithm 1 Feddle

Input: Server learning rate η_g , client learning rate η_ℓ , number of server epochs E_g , number of client epochs E_ℓ , atlas size M , number of FL rounds K .

Output: model ω

```
1: Initialize  $\mathcal{A} = \{\}$ 
2: repeat
3:    $j \leftarrow$  Sample available client
4:   Start the  $j$ th client training with  $\{w^k, \eta_\ell, E_\ell\}$ 
5:   if receive client update then
6:      $\Delta_j \leftarrow$  Model update from the  $j$ th client
7:      $\{\mathbf{a}_m\} \leftarrow$  UpdateAtlas( $\{\mathbf{a}_m\}, \{s_m\}, \Delta_j$ )
8:   if time to start coefficient search at round  $k$  then
9:      $\{\hat{c}_m\}, \omega^{k+1} \leftarrow$  GlobalModelUpdate( $\{\mathbf{a}_m\}, \omega^k$ )
10:     $s_m \leftarrow |\hat{c}_m|, \quad \forall m = 1, \dots, |\mathcal{A}|$ .
11: until Stopped
12: function UPDATEATLAS( $\{\mathbf{a}_m\}, \{s_m\}, \Delta_j$ )
13:   if  $|\mathcal{A}| < M$  then
14:      $m' \leftarrow |\mathcal{A}| + 1$ 
15:   else if  $|\mathcal{A}| == M$  then
16:      $m' = \arg \min_m \{s_m\}$ 
17:    $\mathbf{a}_{m'} \leftarrow \Delta_j$ 
18:   return  $\{\mathbf{a}_m\}$ 
19: function GLOBALMODELUPDATE( $\{\mathbf{a}_m\}, \omega^k$ )
20:    $\{\bar{\mathbf{a}}_m\} \leftarrow$  Normalize( $\{\mathbf{a}_m\}$ ) using Eq. (5)
21:   Initialize  $\{c_m\}$  as  $\mathbf{0}$  or with respect to Fallback
22:    $\{\hat{c}_m\} \leftarrow$  Coefficient search using Eq. (6) or
   Eq. (10)
23:    $\omega^{k+1} = \omega^k + \sum_{m=1}^{|\mathcal{A}|} \hat{c}_m \bar{\mathbf{a}}_m$ 
24:   return  $\{\hat{c}_m\}, \omega^{k+1}$ 
```

This heterogeneity can lead to multiple optimization iterations during local training, causing convergence challenges for FL methods [32, 48]. To address this issue, various enhancement strategies have been proposed. One approach involves using Bayesian modeling to capture and regularize the correlation and variation between clients [7, 59, 62, 63]. Another method uses a variance reduction model to correct for client-drift in local updates [23]. Additionally, researchers have explored contrastive learning on shared representations [30] and guided local training using learned local drift [13]. A different stream of work adopts a divide-and-conquer strategy, identifying clusters of data distribution among clients to make the federated learning task more focused on the data within each cluster [15]. In some cases, the training target is even tailored to individual client’s data distribution, with information shared within the FL framework used to obtain a better initialization for local adaptation [41, 46, 47, 60]. Notably, these methods do not focus on learning a global model that processes the entire

data distribution.

- *Asynchronous Communication.* The previous works discussed above consider synchronous communication, where the server waits for all selected clients to complete their local training and report model updates before aggregation. However, this setup can lead to long wall-clock times due to the slowest client’s downlink, local training, and uplink delays [1]. To address this issue, researchers have proposed various strategies for handling asynchronous communication. One approach involves sampling a large number of clients and aggregating model updates as soon as a minimum threshold is reached, while delayed clients are discarded [1]. However, this method can lead to skewed population data distributions observed by the server, especially when clients have inherent and consistent delay. Moreover, abandoned clients may still complete their local training, resulting in excessive energy consumption. This approach is also not applicable if client groups are not large-scale (e.g., hundreds or thousands). To mitigate these issues, some researchers have proposed reducing the local training workload of slow clients [61] or discarding model updates that exceed a predefined delay threshold (could be multiple communication rounds) [35]. However, they are not able to comprehensively address the challenges of asynchronous communication. Another line of work focuses on developing algorithms that can accept and utilize model updates regardless of their delay, allowing for more efficient asynchronous communication [28, 39, 49, 50, 54], which are the main baselines we compare with in this paper.

Alternative Decentralized Learning Schemes. Beyond FL frameworks, there are other paradigms that support decentralized training. For instance, Gossip Learning [17, 42] facilitates peer-to-peer communication among clients, eliminating the need for a central server. In this setup, distributed clients exchange and aggregate model updates directly at their local computation nodes. However, such methods typically exhibit lower efficiency compared to FL due to the lack of a centralized coordination. Given that our work focuses on hybrid data regimes where a natural center node exists, we concentrate on leveraging the FL mechanism to learn from decentralized data.

C.2. Learning from Hybrid Data

Prior studies have explored leveraging server-side data to enhance decentralized learning. These methods consider scenarios where clients lack sufficient computational resources for local training and instead upload their data to the server [11, 12, 40]. The server computes model updates on the behalf of these clients while coordinating federated learning among other clients. Additionally, work incorporating knowledge distillation into FL frameworks [29, 33, 56] leverages (collected or synthesized) server-side

data to integrate clients’ knowledge into the global model. However, these approaches do not address the challenge of asynchronous communication, as knowledge is equally extracted from every client regardless of potential communication delays. In contrast, our method tackles more practical challenges and can be applied to a broader range of scenarios thanks to the accommodation of out-of-domain data availability.

Notably, Yueqi et al. [58] propose a method that searches for optimal merging coefficients, similar to our approach. However, their technique is limited to searching within the convex hull of reported models, whereas we demonstrate that optimal coefficients can be negative. Furthermore, our approach can accommodate out-of-domain data availability scenarios where server-side data is visually distinct from decentralized data, whereas these previous works are restricted to in-domain data availability.

C.3. Model Averaging

Beyond model aggregation at the server in federated learning, model averaging has been explored in other areas as well. For instance, Wortsman et al. [51] demonstrate the potential of averaging models fine-tuned with diverse hyperparameter configurations. Several works [19, 21, 55, 57] have proposed advanced averaging strategies to merge models fine-tuned for different downstream tasks in language modeling, aiming to create a new model with multiple capabilities. However, these approaches often overlook data heterogeneity, which can lead to conflicting information between different weights (or model updates), as discussed in Sec. 3. In image generation, significant oscillation has been observed during the training of diffusion models. To address this, Liu et al. [34] propose searching for optimal coefficients to merge all historical model weights. However, such averaging methods typically do not involve a cyclic optimization process between server and client, which means they also do not investigate the asynchronous communication challenge. This distinction sets our contribution apart from these related works.

D. Experimental Setting

Models. In this paper, we conduct experiments on three network architectures: **1)** A small Convolutional Neural Network (CNN), consisting of three convolutional layers, one pooling layer, and two fully connected layers. **2)** A ResNet18 [16] model pre-trained on ImageNet [9], using the checkpoint shared by PyTorch.³ **3)** A Vision Transformer (ViT16-Base) [10] model pre-trained on ImageNet [9], using the checkpoint provided by Jia et al. [20].⁴ During local training, clients update all parameters of the

³Source: <https://download.pytorch.org/models/resnet18-f37072fd.pth>

⁴Source: <https://github.com/KMnP/vpt>

CNN and ResNet18 models. For ViT16-Base, we apply Low-rank Adaptation (LoRA) [18] with a rank of 4 and an adaptation scale of 8. Input images are resized to 32×32 for the CNN, 224×224 for ResNet18, and 224×224 for ViT16-Base.

Datasets. We employ three datasets to simulated data heterogeneity: CIFAR10/100 [26], and Fashion-MNIST [53]. For CIFAR-100, the network is trained to classify 20 superclasses, while for the other datasets, it predicts their respective 10 classes. Following previous work [59], we partition the training data among clients using a Dirichlet distribution with two concentration parameters: Dir(0.1) and Dir(0.3). For CIFAR100, we perform partitioning with respect to the 100 fine classes, which can induce label concept drift [63] and increase data heterogeneity among clients. For the other datasets, partitioning is based on their respective 10 classes. For the in-domain data availability, we reserve 1000 data points from each dataset’s test set as server-side data. The remaining test data is used to evaluate the test accuracy. For the out-of-domain data availability, we use ImageNet [9] as the server-side dataset. Given that out-of-domain data often has abundant resources, we create a subset of ImageNet with 250K data points.

Additionally, we utilize two dataset containing real-world data heterogeneity: FEMNIST [8] and CelebA [36]. We partition the data by real-world individual following the LEAF framework [4], and then randomly sample 1000 clients to form the federated learning group. For FEMNIST, we restrict the task to be predicting the first 40 classes (removing data corresponding to other classes). While for CelebA the task is to predict the "Smiling" attribute.

Methods. We compare our method Feddle with several competitive federated learning approaches: **1)** hybrid approaches Fed+FT, HCFL [11], FedDF [33], and **2)** asynchronous methods FedAsync [54], FedBuff [39], and CA2FL [49]. Additionally, we include FedAvg [37] and Center, which is trained exclusively on the server-side data. The learning rate and number of training epochs for the clients are tuned with Adam optimizer [24] using FedAvg, and these settings are subsequently applied to all other methods. Hyperparameter tuning is performed for each method using CIFAR10 as a representative dataset. The optimal hyperparameters are then applied to the other datasets, as our experiments show that they remain largely consistent across different datasets with the same network architecture.

The hyperparameters searched for each method are as follows:

- Fed+FT: Server learning rate $\eta \in \{1e-5, 1e-4, 1e-3\}$, Server epochs $M \in \{1, 10, 20\}$.

- FedDF: Server learning rate $\eta \in \{1e-5, 1e-4, 1e-3\}$, Server epochs $M \in \{1, 10, 20\}$.
- Center: Server learning rate $\eta \in \{1e-5, 1e-4, 1e-3\}$, Server epochs $M \in \{10, 20, 50\}$.
- FedAsync: Adaptive constant $a \in \{0.1, 0.5, 0.9\}$ and mixing constant $\alpha \in \{0.2, 0.4, 0.8\}$.
- FedBuff: Server learning rate $\eta \in \{0.01, 0.1, 1\}$ and buffer size $M \in \{10, 20, 50\}$.
- CA2FL: Server learning rate $\eta \in \{0.01, 0.1, 1\}$ and buffer size $M \in \{10, 20, 50\}$.
- Feddle: Server learning rate $\eta \in \{1e-5, 1e-4, 1e-3\}$, server epochs $M \in \{1, 10, 20\}$.

Model atlas size and fallback regularization strength of Feddle are determined as discussed in Sec. 5.2. HCFL does not have additional hyperparameters as it trains a network at the server the same as the clients do.

Experimental Details. To account for client delays, we introduce staleness by sampling each client’s delay from a half-normal distribution, which matches the practical distribution as observed in previous work [39]. Specifically, we take the absolute value of a sample drawn from a zero-mean Gaussian distribution and consider two standard deviations: 5 and 20. To avoid re-sampling clients that have not yet reported their model updates, each client is sampled only once until its update is received in the experiments. For a fair comparison across methods, each experiment is repeated three times with different random seeds. The random seed controls network initialization, client sampling order, client delay, and data partitioning. We evaluate the global model every 10 communication rounds and record the maximum value from the last five evaluation rounds as the final model performance. Finally, we compute the mean and standard deviation of three runs to provide a robust estimate of each method’s performance.

E. Computational Efficiency

The optimization of Feddle as described in Eq. (6) requires computing gradient with respect to all anchors $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_1 \dots \mathbf{a}_{|\mathcal{A}|} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. To enhance scalability, we reduce GPU memory usage and enable distributed computing by applying the following technique. During forward propagation (i.e. when computing Eq. (6)), we accumulate the anchors to the global model while stopping gradient propagation:

$$\omega' = \text{stop_grad}(\omega^k + c_1 \bar{\mathbf{a}}_1 + \dots c_{|\mathcal{A}|} \bar{\mathbf{a}}_{|\mathcal{A}|}). \quad (16)$$

During backpropagation, the gradient of the coefficients is computed as:

$$\forall m = 1, \dots, |\mathcal{A}|, \quad \partial \ell / \partial c_m = \langle \partial \ell / \partial \omega', \bar{\mathbf{a}}_m \rangle. \quad (17)$$

For out-of-domain data availability, we replace ℓ with h . By employing Eqs. (16) and (17), the anchors are excluded

from the gradient computation graph, allowing us to distribute the gradient calculations across multiple nodes while storing the anchors and model separately. This design enables Feddle to support large models and model atlas. However, as discussed in Sec. 5.2, Feddle works well with a moderately sized model atlas, and its computation cost is comparable to fine-tuning a model, which is typically manageable on a server. A comparison of the computation complexity across different approaches is provided in App. F.3.

F. Additional Results

In this section, we present additional experimental results. In App. F.1 we report results on CIFAR100. In App. F.2, we show outcomes for a CNN trained from scratch. App. F.3 compares the computation cost across different approaches, while App. F.4 illustrates additional search patterns of Feddle. Finally, App. F.5 provides further analysis of the optimization signal from the surrogate loss applied in Feddle.

F.1. Experiments on CIFAR10

Table 4 summarizes the results on CIFAR10. The experimental settings align with those in Tab. 1. As observed previously, Feddle consistently outperforms the baseline methods and is less affected by high data heterogeneity and communication delays.

F.2. Training from Scratch on CNN

We supplement our results with experiments training a CNN from scratch. As shown in Tab. 5, Feddle consistently outperforms all baselines. In contrast to the results with pretrained ResNet and ViT (see Tabs. 1 and 4), we observe that Feddle may not outperform Center in the OOD setting under the most challenging scenario with Dir(0.1) and $\mathcal{N}(20)$. However, in the OOD setting Feddle often significantly outperforms the best baseline and its performance is less impacted by heterogeneity and delay. Moreover, when training a randomly initialized CNN, Feddle can leverage ImageNet data to guide the client models trained on Fashion-MNIST, further demonstrating the robustness of our framework in the OOD scenarios.

F.3. Server-Side Computation Cost

To measure the computation cost, we construct a federated learning group with 1000 clients and sample 50 clients per round. For simplicity, and to avoid the dynamics of asynchronous communication, we assume that all 50 clients report on time. We use the ViT network and fine-tune it with LoRA as described in App. D. For Feddle, the model atlas size is set to twice the number of clients sampled per round (i.e. atlas size = 100), which is good for performance as discussed in Sec. 5.2. We also set the buffer size of

Dataset	Method	ID	ResNet18				ViT			
			Dir(0.1), $\mathcal{N}(20)$	Dir(0.1), $\mathcal{N}(5)$	Dir(0.3), $\mathcal{N}(20)$	Dir(0.3), $\mathcal{N}(5)$	Dir(0.1), $\mathcal{N}(20)$	Dir(0.1), $\mathcal{N}(5)$	Dir(0.3), $\mathcal{N}(20)$	Dir(0.3), $\mathcal{N}(5)$
CIFAR-10	Center	✓	77.3 ± 0.8				92.3 ± 0.0			
	Fed+FT	✓	<u>78.4 ± 0.6</u>	<u>81.3 ± 0.2</u>	<u>80.1 ± 0.2</u>	<u>82.2 ± 0.2</u>	<u>96.5 ± 0.1</u>	<u>97.1 ± 0.0</u>	<u>96.2 ± 0.2</u>	<u>97.0 ± 0.0</u>
	HFCL	✓	<u>80.2 ± 0.9</u>	<u>83.7 ± 1.0</u>	<u>82.1 ± 0.3</u>	<u>85.7 ± 0.4</u>	<u>96.1 ± 0.1</u>	<u>96.9 ± 0.1</u>	<u>96.4 ± 0.0</u>	<u>96.9 ± 0.0</u>
	FedDF-ID	✓	<u>57.3 ± 1.5</u>	<u>75.4 ± 0.4</u>	<u>74.4 ± 1.0</u>	<u>82.1 ± 0.3</u>	<u>91.1 ± 0.7</u>	<u>96.8 ± 0.2</u>	<u>93.5 ± 0.2</u>	<u>96.8 ± 0.0</u>
	Ours-ID	✓	<u>86.3 ± 0.4</u>	<u>86.7 ± 0.5</u>	<u>87.3 ± 0.4</u>	<u>87.8 ± 0.3</u>	<u>97.1 ± 0.0</u>	<u>97.1 ± 0.0</u>	<u>97.7 ± 0.1</u>	<u>97.5 ± 0.1</u>
	FedAvg		56.4 ± 5.3	75.1 ± 1.0	72.4 ± 1.0	<u>85.2 ± 0.2</u>	87.0 ± 1.5	<u>94.6 ± 1.1</u>	89.4 ± 0.1	<u>95.5 ± 0.2</u>
	FedAsync		65.1 ± 3.5	74.9 ± 2.4	<u>79.3 ± 1.9</u>	<u>83.9 ± 1.4</u>	89.4 ± 1.3	<u>94.7 ± 0.8</u>	<u>92.8 ± 0.7</u>	<u>96.3 ± 0.3</u>
	FedBuff		59.6 ± 3.3	72.8 ± 7.3	69.3 ± 8.0	<u>77.9 ± 4.3</u>	<u>96.2 ± 0.1</u>	<u>96.1 ± 0.3</u>	<u>97.0 ± 0.2</u>	<u>96.9 ± 0.1</u>
	CA2FL		64.4 ± 7.2	<u>80.2 ± 0.9</u>	71.6 ± 5.7	<u>76.3 ± 6.8</u>	<u>96.5 ± 0.1</u>	<u>96.1 ± 0.1</u>	<u>97.1 ± 0.1</u>	<u>96.9 ± 0.0</u>
	FedDF-OOD		29.7 ± 1.1	29.2 ± 5.6	42.9 ± 2.9	42.8 ± 2.1	29.7 ± 1.1	29.2 ± 5.6	42.9 ± 2.9	42.8 ± 2.1
Ours-OOD		<u>82.2 ± 1.4</u>	<u>83.1 ± 0.3</u>	<u>86.1 ± 0.5</u>	<u>88.3 ± 0.6</u>	<u>97.0 ± 0.2</u>	<u>96.7 ± 0.4</u>	<u>97.5 ± 0.1</u>	<u>97.5 ± 0.0</u>	

Table 4. **Comparisons of different approaches** on CIFAR10. These experiments consider two data heterogeneity levels (Dir(0.1), Dir(0.3)) and two delay levels ($\mathcal{N}(5), \mathcal{N}(20)$). “ID” indicates whether the approach uses in-domain data. If yes, 1000 samples are provided. Performance higher than Center is underlined. The best performance in both data availabilities is highlighted by bold.

Dataset	Method	ID	CNN			
			D(0.1), $\mathcal{N}(20)$	D(0.1), $\mathcal{N}(5)$	D(0.3), $\mathcal{N}(20)$	D(0.3), $\mathcal{N}(5)$
CIFAR-10	Center	✓	42.1 ± 0.1			
	Fed+FT	✓	<u>44.3 ± 0.5</u>	<u>47.4 ± 0.2</u>	<u>46.9 ± 0.6</u>	<u>51.3 ± 0.6</u>
	HFCL	✓	<u>44.7 ± 0.5</u>	<u>47.1 ± 0.4</u>	<u>47.6 ± 0.1</u>	<u>51.2 ± 1.1</u>
	FedDF-ID	✓	<u>18.0 ± 1.0</u>	<u>19.8 ± 2.0</u>	<u>37.3 ± 1.2</u>	<u>39.5 ± 1.3</u>
	Ours-ID	✓	<u>51.2 ± 1.4</u>	<u>52.9 ± 0.3</u>	<u>51.5 ± 1.1</u>	<u>53.3 ± 0.6</u>
	FedAvg	×	31.0 ± 1.3	35.0 ± 3.8	37.2 ± 1.2	<u>52.0 ± 2.6</u>
	FedAsync	×	35.5 ± 1.4	40.4 ± 0.2	<u>43.2 ± 0.8</u>	<u>45.7 ± 3.1</u>
	FedBuff	×	26.8 ± 3.3	33.2 ± 7.6	32.6 ± 4.1	<u>44.0 ± 7.2</u>
	CA2FL	×	27.6 ± 6.9	36.6 ± 2.7	37.1 ± 3.4	<u>43.9 ± 4.5</u>
	FedDF-OOD	×	18.5 ± 1.9	19.4 ± 1.9	35.1 ± 0.2	<u>39.3 ± 1.4</u>
Ours-OOD	×	<u>37.6 ± 4.5</u>	<u>42.3 ± 1.6</u>	<u>44.5 ± 0.8</u>	<u>53.1 ± 2.5</u>	
CIFAR-100	Center	✓	23.3 ± 0.5			
	Fed+FT	✓	<u>26.2 ± 0.7</u>	<u>29.7 ± 0.3</u>	<u>27.0 ± 0.3</u>	<u>30.3 ± 0.3</u>
	HFCL	✓	<u>28.9 ± 0.4</u>	<u>30.8 ± 0.3</u>	<u>29.3 ± 0.4</u>	<u>31.9 ± 0.5</u>
	FedDF-ID	✓	<u>28.7 ± 0.5</u>	<u>29.3 ± 0.6</u>	<u>28.9 ± 0.1</u>	<u>29.1 ± 0.2</u>
	Ours-ID	✓	<u>32.7 ± 0.6</u>	<u>38.6 ± 1.6</u>	<u>38.0 ± 0.7</u>	<u>40.3 ± 0.8</u>
	FedAvg	×	21.7 ± 2.2	27.7 ± 1.9	25.9 ± 1.2	<u>32.1 ± 0.7</u>
	FedAsync	×	24.3 ± 1.2	30.8 ± 0.7	<u>27.0 ± 1.1</u>	<u>33.0 ± 0.4</u>
	FedBuff	×	22.5 ± 2.2	<u>31.5 ± 2.4</u>	<u>24.9 ± 4.4</u>	<u>31.1 ± 2.5</u>
	CA2FL	×	22.3 ± 0.7	<u>29.9 ± 3.8</u>	<u>25.2 ± 3.2</u>	<u>32.0 ± 2.8</u>
	FedDF-OOD	×	24.1 ± 0.4	<u>29.8 ± 0.5</u>	<u>27.1 ± 0.4</u>	<u>33.3 ± 0.9</u>
Ours-OOD	×	<u>31.9 ± 1.8</u>	<u>37.2 ± 1.7</u>	<u>36.9 ± 1.4</u>	<u>40.4 ± 0.6</u>	
Fashion-MNIST	Center	✓	82.6 ± 0.9			
	Fed+FT	✓	<u>84.5 ± 0.2</u>	<u>86.1 ± 0.2</u>	<u>85.1 ± 0.0</u>	<u>87.1 ± 0.0</u>
	HFCL	✓	<u>84.4 ± 0.4</u>	<u>86.2 ± 0.1</u>	<u>85.2 ± 0.3</u>	<u>87.1 ± 0.2</u>
	FedDF-ID	✓	<u>48.9 ± 5.8</u>	<u>44.0 ± 5.0</u>	<u>72.9 ± 0.9</u>	<u>71.7 ± 4.9</u>
	Ours-ID	✓	<u>86.5 ± 0.2</u>	<u>87.3 ± 0.0</u>	<u>86.4 ± 0.2</u>	<u>87.1 ± 0.1</u>
	FedAvg	×	60.8 ± 4.4	80.7 ± 1.0	81.1 ± 0.7	<u>86.6 ± 0.1</u>
	FedAsync	×	78.4 ± 2.2	80.9 ± 1.8	<u>83.4 ± 0.6</u>	<u>85.4 ± 1.0</u>
	FedBuff	×	79.4 ± 1.0	82.4 ± 1.5	81.6 ± 4.6	<u>85.4 ± 1.0</u>
	CA2FL	×	78.9 ± 0.9	<u>85.4 ± 0.7</u>	82.1 ± 2.7	<u>85.5 ± 0.6</u>
	FedDF-OOD	×	47.4 ± 6.8	54.7 ± 5.3	71.9 ± 0.4	<u>79.1 ± 2.6</u>
Ours-OOD	×	<u>81.4 ± 2.4</u>	<u>86.1 ± 2.0</u>	<u>85.1 ± 0.8</u>	<u>88.2 ± 1.3</u>	

Table 5. **Comparisons of different approaches using CNN**. These experiments consider two data heterogeneity levels (Dir(0.1), Dir(0.3)) and two delay levels ($\mathcal{N}(5), \mathcal{N}(20)$). “ID” indicates whether the approach uses in-domain data. If yes, 1000 samples are provided. Performance higher than Center is underlined. The best performance in both data availabilities is highlighted by bold.

FedBuff to 100. For methods that conduct training at the server, we fix the number of iterations to be the same. In

this work, we search for the optimal client training iterations based on FedAvg and apply the same setting to all methods (see App. D), ensuring that client-side computations remain identical. Therefore, our comparison focuses on the server-side computation cost. Specifically, we report two metrics that vary significantly across approaches: **1)** GFLOPs, which indicate the amount of computation performed by the server, and **2)** Cache size, which reflects the amount of intermediate results cached by each approach (note that all approaches cache the global model at a minimum).

As shown in the GFLOPs column of Tab. 6, FedAvg, FedAsync and FedBuff incur almost negligible GFLOPs at the server since they simply aggregate the model updates. The computation cost for Fed+FT and HFCL represents the cost of fine-tuning the model at the server. In comparison, Feddle requires approximately 15% more GFLOPs on the server because the gradient must be projected onto the anchors (see Eq. (17)). In contrast, FedDF demands over 10× more computation due to the inference performed on all reported client models for knowledge distillation.

Additionally, server must cache intermediate results during training, such as the global model. The cache size varies significantly among the approaches. As shown in the Cache (MB) column of Tab. 6, Fed+FT, HFCL, FedDF, FedAvg and FedAsync have the smallest cache size, corresponding to maintaining only the global model on the server. For these methods, all received model updates can be discarded after aggregation or training. In contrast, Feddle and FedBuff has a 35% larger cache size, which corresponds to storing 50 LoRAs saved in the model atlas or buffer. Notably, due to the cached update calibration incorporated in CA2FL, a vector of the same size as the full network is saved for each client. Consequently, the cache size of CA2FL is three orders of magnitudes larger for a total of 1000 clients, and it scales with the number of clients.

In conclusion, Feddle requires server computation similar to that of fine-tuning a model. Although it caches multiple model updates depending on the size of the model atlas, this does not significantly increase the overall cache size. While Feddle is not the most lightweight framework among the approaches, its computation cost is generally manageable for a server, and it achieves the best performance. Moreover, due to its constrained size of the model atlas, Feddle’s computation complexity and cache size does not rapidly scale up with the size of the federated learning group.

F.4. Searched Coefficient Pattern

In Sec. 3, we show that model updates reported by clients often contain conflicting information due to data heterogeneity and delayed responses from asynchronous com-

Method	GFLOPs	Cache (MB)
Fed+FT	7.1×10^5	3.4×10^2
HFCL	7.1×10^5	3.4×10^2
FedDF	1.8×10^7	3.4×10^2
FedAvg	1.8×10^1	3.4×10^2
FedAsync	1.8×10^1	3.4×10^2
FedBuff	1.8×10^1	4.6×10^2
CA2FL	1.9×10^1	3.4×10^5
Feddle (Ours)	8.2×10^5	4.6×10^2

Table 6. **Comparison of the server-side computation cost across approaches.** The cost of Center is similar as HFCL and Fed+FT. The highest cost is marked in blue.

munication. Consequently, the optimal aggregation coefficients computed on the server are not always positive. Since Feddle consistently achieves the best performance by determining the aggregation coefficients under data guidance, we further demonstrate that its searched coefficients indeed include negative values. As illustrated in Fig. 10 (another subplot is provided in Fig. 6), some of the coefficients deemed optimal by the server are negative. This phenomenon persists across all communication rounds and under different configurations of data heterogeneity and communication delays. This observation highlights the persistent disagreement among clients’ model updates and attests to the capability of Feddle.

F.5. Optimization Signal of the Surrogate Loss

In Sec. 4.1.2, we discuss that if the server guides decentralized training using OOD data \mathcal{D}'_S with a surrogate loss function h , the induced gradient must satisfy Eq. (8) to ensure that the optimization direction aligns with the ID server-side data \mathcal{D}_S and the client loss function ℓ . For convenience, we restate this condition:

$$\langle \partial h(\mathcal{D}'_S, \cdot) / \partial \mathbf{c}; \partial \ell(\mathcal{D}, \cdot) / \partial \mathbf{c} \rangle > 0. \quad (18)$$

This condition is also incorporated into our theoretical analysis to justify the convergence of Feddle (see Sec. 4.2). We find that this condition is met under various settings in our experiments, and fallback initialization is crucial for its satisfaction. As shown in Fig. 11 (with an additional subplot in Fig. 7), without fallback initialization the cosine similarity between the optimization directions derived from ID and OOD data appears random. In contrast, with fallback initialization, these optimization directions become highly aligned, with the cosine similarity approaching 1. Our ablation study (see Sec. 5.2) further confirms that without the fallback mechanism, Feddle’s performance deteriorates to random guessing, underscoring the critical role of fallback initialization for applying Feddle in scenarios where only OOD data is available.

Based on these results, we hypothesize that the optimization landscape constructed by the surrogate loss using




Figure 10. Statistics of coefficients identified by Feddle for in-domain (ID) data availability using ResNet18 and CIFAR-10.




Figure 11. Similarity of the coefficients' optimization direction between in-domain (ID) and out-of-domain (OOD) data using ResNet18 and CIFAR-10.




Figure 12. Convergence plots for ResNet18 on CIFAR100 under OOD data availability.




Figure 13. Convergence plots for ResNet18 on CIFAR100 under ID data availability.

OOD data may not be globally aligned with that formed by the client loss function using ID data. However, when the starting point is initialized near the optimum for ID data (as fallback can leverage an existing successful framework), the optimization direction derived from OOD data can still align with that of ID data.

F.6. Convergence Plots

We present the convergence plots for ResNet18 on CIFAR100 in Figs. 12 and 13. The plots corresponding to the configuration with $\text{Dir}(0.1)$ and $\mathcal{N}(20)$ are shown in Fig. 5.

G. Future Work

In this paper, we introduce the concept of hybrid data regimes and propose a federated dual learning framework, `Feddle`, to harness the strengths of both server-side and decentralized data. As a fundamental framework, `Feddle` opens many directions for future study and improvement. For instance, incorporating adaptive model updates, as explored in recent FL research [49, 50], could strengthen the anchors that comprise the model atlas. Additionally, the fallback mechanism can be refined for greater effectiveness, such as adaptively selecting strategies based on the delay status. Another promising direction involves leveraging unsupervised objectives to exploit unlabeled server data, thereby enriching the available data resources. Furthermore, optimizing the computational efficiency of `Feddle` through techniques such as quantization or sparsification could improve its applicability to extremely large-scale settings. For example, the anchors can be quantized or sparsified before performing the coefficient search (c.f. Eqs. (16) and (17)). Finally, integrating `Feddle` with differential privacy or trusted execution environments is an exciting area for addressing data privacy concerns. We plan to explore these avenues for improvement in future work.