arXiv:2205.15987v4 [cs.LG] 17 Jun 2023

VFed-SSD: Towards Practical Vertical Federated Advertising

Wenjie Li[1,2], Qiaolin Xia[2], Junfeng Deng[2], Hao Cheng[2], Jiangming Liu[2],
Kouying Xue[2], Yong Cheng[2], Shu-Tao Xia[1]
[1]Tsinghua University, [2]Tencent
liwj20@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn,xiast@sz.tsinghua.edu.cn
{jolinxia,junfengdeng,dennycheng,jiangmliu,lornaxue,peterycheng}@tencent.com

ABSTRACT

As an emerging secure learning paradigm in leveraging cross-silo private data, vertical federated learning (VFL) is expected to improve advertising models by enabling the joint learning of complementary user attributes privately owned by the advertiser and the publisher. However, there are two key challenges in applying it to advertising systems: ***a)*** *the limited scale of labeled overlapping samples*, and ***b)*** *the high cost of real-time cross-silo serving*. In this paper, we propose a semi-supervised split distillation framework **VFed-SSD** to alleviate the two limitations. We identify that: ***i)*** *there are massive unlabeled overlapped data available in advertising systems*, and ***ii)*** *we can keep a balance between model performance and inference cost by splitting up the federated model.* Specifically, we develop a self-supervised task ***M**atched **P**air **D**etection* (**MPD**) to exploit the vertically partitioned unlabeled data and propose the ***Split K**nowledge **D**istillation* (**SplitKD**) schema to avoid cross-silo serving. Empirical studies on three industrial datasets exhibit the effectiveness of our methods, with the median AUC over all datasets improved by **0.86**% and **2.6**% in the local and the federated deployment mode respectively. Overall, our framework provides an efficient solution for cross-silo real-time advertising with minimal deploying cost and significant performance lift.


KEYWORDS

Vertical Federated Learning, Advertising System, Self-supervised Learning, Knowledge Distillation

ACM Reference Format:
Wenjie Li[1,2], Qiaolin Xia[2], Junfeng Deng[2], Hao Cheng[2], Jiangming Liu[2],, Kouying Xue[2], Yong Cheng[2], Shu-Tao Xia[1]. 2018. VFed-SSD: Towards Practical Vertical Federated Advertising. In *Proceedings of Make sure to enter the correct conference title from your rights confirmation emai (Conference acronym 'XX)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 5 pages. https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX

1 INTRODUCTION

As two key agencies in advertising systems, the advertiser and the publisher (i.e. advertising platforms) own complementary data of user actions. Collectively leveraging these multi-platform user behaviors is helpful to achieve more fine-grained and comprehensive user interest modeling, which is beneficial to many tasks such as click-through rate (CTR) estimation and conversion rate (CVR) prediction. However, it is nearly impossible to directly share raw data across platforms due to data privacy regulations [43] and commercial confidentiality among service agencies.



(a) The overlapped labeled samples are much fewer than unlabeled ones ($N_l << N_u$).

(b) Cross-party serving involves extra cost of encryption, network and overall system design.

Figure 1: Two challenges of VFL in advertising systems.

To address these issues, vertical federated learning [24, 44] has been explored to jointly utilize cross-platform attributes without compromising user privacy. In a typical VFL process, participants first execute a private set intersection (PSI[33]) to obtain the aligned (i.e., overlapped) dataset and then jointly train a distributed splitNN two-tower model [3, 10, 14]. However, the requirement of data overlapping and the distributed form of SplitNN makes it impractical in industry applications (as shown in Figure 1):

- **Limited training data**: Overlapped users between different business parties are usually limited and constitute only a small portion of the user population. Such reduction of available training data increases the risk of overfitting and result in low-quality embeddings and hidden representations, especially in advertising tasks with sparse and high-dimensional categorical features[32].
- **Impractical cross-party inference**: The inference process of a splitNN federated model involves multiple participants differing in computation efficiency, IO speed and network condition. Such challenging cases make it harder to achieve reliable and real-time inference for million-wise QPS traffics which is typical in real-world ad systems[36, 52].

In this paper, we propose the **S**emi-supervised **S**plit **D**istillation framework for VFL (**VFed-SSD**) to tackle these issues. Our main motivations are:

- **Utilizing unlabeled data**: Due to temporal shifting of user interests, advertising models are frequently updated at a weekly or daily cadence using only latest fresh data [29]. Thus, there are lots of outdated historical data available in advertising system.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.
Conference acronym 'XX, June 03–05, 2018, Woodstock, NY
© 2018 Association for Computing Machinery.
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06…$15.00
https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX

Although the label (e.g., click and conversion actions) is almost the most volatile and usually noisy [46], the attributes of these samples are more stable to temporal shifts and contains valuable information[29]. We argue that by including these historical data in PSI, we can get massive overlapped and unlabeled samples. Therefore, we develop a self-supervised task MPD to exploit these unlabeled data. Specifically, we use MPD to learn a pre-training model and use it to warm-up down-stream task models.

- **Distilling federated models**: To minimize system requirements of applying VFL in online serving, We develop split knowledge distillation (SplitKD) to distilling federated models as local models. The student model can be deployed independently for inference, thus free from building a cross-silo inference system. We show that (Figure 3), such incomplete distillation schema is capable to maintain advantage over local models and can be further enhanced by MPD pre-training.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

(1) We develop a simple and effective self-supervised task MPD for VFL to leverage unlabeled data. It is easy to implement in industry application and well-motivated by the theoretical principle of maximizing point-wise mutual information.
(2) We design a federated distillation method SplitKD to acquire federation-aware local models. It is easy to deploy in real-world ad systems and more effective than local models.
(3) Our framework is validated on both industry and public datasets, by achieving significant AUC improvement ($\mathbf{0.5} \sim \mathbf{1.2}$ in percentile) compared to vanilla local models.

2 RELATED WORK

Federated Learning. Our paper focus on improving the utility and efficiency of recommendation tasks in two-party VFL settings. This motivation clearly distinguishes our work from many related works in horizontal FL[20, 22, 30, 48]. Thus, we focus on discussing most relevant VFL works with similar purposes to ours. FedMVT[17] is the pioneering work of exploring semi-supervised learning for VFL. It proposed to use the non-overlapping data and validated its effectiveness on multi-view image datasets, while our method explores a different scenario of leveraging the unlabeled overlapping samples and tailored for tabular data. Excluding both the HFL and VFL setting, FedCT[23] firstly studies the cross-domain recommendation problem in the federated transfer learning setting[49]. However, it is neither suitable for the pure VFL scenario nor capable of leveraging the unlabeled federated data. Besides, these works do not consider the high cost of cross-party inference, which is crucial in advertising. Additionally, another line of work has also put efforts into improving the privacy and security of federated learning[1, 15, 26, 38], especially the problem of label leakage[9, 27, 37, 50]. These ideas are complementary to ours and can be combined to enhance security, while we focus on the aspect of model training in this paper.

Unsupervised Pre-training. Self-supervised learning has achieved remarkable success in natural language processing and computer vision [4, 6, 25] and is also making progress in recommendation (such as the Correlated Feature Masking technique [51]), but they are all limited to the context of centralized machine learning. Some technics like contrastive learning were also adopted in federated learning [7], but only for the HFL and image data. It is still an open challenge to use extensive unlabeled tabular data for VFL[16, 24].

Knowledge Distillation. Knowledge distillation [13] is widely applied in HFL [12, 19, 21] to tackle the Non-IID problem. These works require the input fields of the student and teacher must be identical, while in our framework, only part of the input field of the teacher is accessible to a student. This fashion is more related to privileged learning [34, 40, 41, 47]. However, we further consider the problem with unsupervised pre-training and tailor our method for VFL tasks in particular. Overall, our final student model can leverage information from both labeled and unlabeled data and is capable of making predictions independently.

3 METHOD

3.1 Preliminary: Two-Party VFL

We focus on a typical two-party vertical federated learning setting[3, 42] where an ***active party*** A holding the label and some attributes collaborates with a ***passive party*** B who provides additional attributes to train a federated model. A federated model consists of the ***bottom model*** holds by each party and the ***top model*** holds by the active party:

$$\hat{y}_{fed} = g_A(f_A(\mathbf{x}_A), f_B(\mathbf{x}_B)) \tag{1}$$

where f denotes the bottom model and g denotes the top model, $\mathbf{x}$ denotes inputs from parties. In the forward propagation, the hidden output $\mathbf{h}_B = f_B(\mathbf{x}_B)$ of party B is sent to party A for the subsequent computation of g_A and loss function; For the backward propagation, the gradient of loss over $\mathbf{h}_B$ is sent to party B for the subsequent gradient computation and parameter updates for f_B. The transmission process can be combined with encryption techniques to enhance security, as we mentioned in section 2.

3.2 Matched Pair Detection

3.2.1 ***Task Description***. The matched pair detection (MPD) task aims to learn a binary classifier capable of distinguishing whether the input attributes from two parties are matched. Specifically, we treat all original sample as the positives sample and construct the negatives by in-batch dynamic sampling. Let's use $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{R}^{m \times d}$ to denote a batch of inputs from a single party, then a negative batch is constructed by random row permutation :

$$\mathbf{U}_+ = [\mathbf{X}_A; \mathbf{X}_B], \mathbf{U}_+^{\mathbf{i}} = (\mathbf{x}_A^i, \mathbf{x}_B^i) \tag{2}$$

$$\mathbf{U}^- = [\mathbf{P}\mathbf{X}_A; \mathbf{X}_B], \mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{R}^{m \times m} \tag{3}$$

where $\mathbf{U}_+, \mathbf{U}_-$ respectively denotes a positive and negative batch and $\mathbf{P}$ is a *row-permutation matrix* [45]. We generate the random matrix $\mathbf{P}$ via frequency-based in-batch random sampling, as a coarse approximation of its global distribution in the whole dataset [18]. Such perturbation can be independently conducted by the active party via matrix multiplication and ***do not need any cooperation from the passive party***, which is very friendly for industry federated application. The model is finally trained with both the positive and negative batches:

$$\mathcal{L}^{MPD} = \vec{\mathbf{1}} \cdot \left[\log \sigma(g(\mathbf{U}^+)) + \log \sigma(-g(\mathbf{U}^-))\right]^\top \tag{4}$$

where g is short for the complete federated model. Once the pre-training is finished, only the bottom models f_A and f_B are used as initialization in fine-tuning or distillation.

3.2.2 ***Theoretical Analysis.*** In this part, We show MPD implies a intrinsic connection to ***maximizing mutual information***. Considering the MPD task is trying to maximize $P(y_u = 1|\mathbf{x}_A, \mathbf{x}_B)$ for correct pairs while maximizing $P(y_u = 0|\mathbf{x}^*_A, \mathbf{x}_B)$ for randomly sampled "negative" samples. We can re-write the learning objective for a distinct matched pair $(\mathbf{h}^i_A, \mathbf{h}^i_B)$ as:

$$\mathcal{L}_i = \log \sigma(g_A(\mathbf{h}^i_A, \mathbf{h}^i_B)) + k \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{h}^*_A \sim P_D} \log \sigma(-g_A(\mathbf{h}^*_A, \mathbf{h}^i_B)) \quad (5)$$

where $\sigma(\cdot)$ is the sigmoid function and k is the number of negative samples, $\mathbf{h}^*_A = f_A(\mathbf{x}^*_A)$ is the hidden representation of a sampled negative half $\mathbf{x}^*_A$, drawn from the empirical "unigram" distribution $P_D(\mathbf{h}_A) = P_D(\mathbf{x}_A) = \frac{\#(\mathbf{x}_A)}{|D|}$. Here $\#(\mathbf{x}_A)$ denotes the number of times $\mathbf{x}_A$ appears in the dataset D. Similar to word2vec [28], if we analogously treat $\mathbf{h}_A$ and $\mathbf{h}_B$ as a word embedding $\vec{w}$ and its context embedding $\vec{c}$, we can find that our equation (5) is isomorphic to equation (1) of [18]. The only difference is the choice of similarity function where we use g_A and they use dot-product. Thus we get a similar revelation as in [18]:

$$g_A(\mathbf{h}_A, \mathbf{h}_B) = PMI(\mathbf{x}_A, \mathbf{x}_B) - \log k. \quad (6)$$

That is to say, the top model implicitly models the point-wise mutual information (PMI) of the observed input pairs, with a shifted constant $\log k$. Specifically, when $k = 1$, MPD exactly encourages maximizes the mutual information between the hidden representations of two parties. Such learning principle of maximizing (shifted) mutual information strongly supports the MPD pre-training task to learn good cross-party representations. Due to the page limit, we omit the proof and suggest readers refer to [18] for more detail.

3.3 Split Knowledge Distillation

To enable independent serving at local, we develop Split Knowledge Distillation (SplitKD) to transfer knowledge from the federated teacher model to a local student model. The student model is aware of passive-party's knowledge but do not rely on its inputs anymore in inference. Let's use superscript T and S to denote teachers and students respectively, the process of distillation can be formalized as:

$$\hat{y}_A = g^S_A(f^S_A(\mathbf{x}_A)) \quad (7)$$

$$\mathcal{L}^S_A = \alpha \cdot CE(y, \hat{y}_A) + (1 - \alpha) \cdot KL(\hat{y}^T_{Fed}, \hat{y}_A) \quad (8)$$

where $\hat{y}_{Fed}$, $\hat{y}_A$ denote the predictions, y is the ground-truth label from party A. g^S_A and f^S_A denote the top part and bottom part of the student. $KL(\cdot)$ denotes the KL divergence and $CE(\cdot)$ denotes the binary cross-entropy loss. We use α as a hyper-parameter to balance the effect of raw label and the federated soft label.

Once the distillation is finished, the student model can be independently deployed to existing local inference systems, without any additional system requirements. We emphasize that ***the deployment of our student model is the same as a traditional local real-time model***, as long as the current inference system works in real-time (which is already satisfied), we can naturally meet the real-time requirement only by adopting the same model architecture in the student model.

4 EXPERIMENTS

We conduct experiments to answer follow questions:

- ***Q1***: How much does VFL benefits MPD pre-training?
- ***Q2***: Could student models outperform vanilla local models?

Q1 focus on the effectiveness of VFL and MPD in an ideal VFL setting. While **Q2** focus on benefits of VFed-SSD in a more practical local serving setting, where federated models are unusable.

4.1 Experimental Settings

4.1.1 ***Datasets.*** We conducted experiments on two industry datasets from Tencent[8] and a public CTR dataset from Criteo [5]. The public dataset is manually partitioned to simulate the federated setting. Both ***Game-Ad*** and ***Game-Social*** are CVR datasets where a game publisher acts as the active party, with a ad platform and a social-network service acts as the passive party correspondingly. The datasets contains user actions on multiple online games (for the active party), various ad items (for Game-Ad) and social activities (in Game-Social). ***Criteo-NC*** is acquired by splitting fields of *Criteo* into the **N**umerical part and the **C**ategorical part for the active and passive parties, respectively. Details are summarized in Table 1.

4.1.2 ***Evaluation Settings.*** We validate our method in two settings. *The federated serving* setting assumes that a real-time federated inference system is available and *the local serving* setting assumes not. Specifically, the active party independently deploy a local model in the local setting but collaboratively deploy the federated model with the passive party in the federated setting.

- ***The federated setting:*** We set 3 methods to validate the advance of leveraging unlabeled data and the efficiency of our pretext task MPD. **(1) VFL**: The vanilla VFL setting. **(2) VFL-SST**: We adopt a practice method usually called self-training [2, 31, 35] to leverage federated unlabeled data, as a baseline to compare with our MPD task. Specifically, a federated model pre-trained on the labeled data is used to produce soft labels on the unlabeled data, then a new model is trained with these soft labels. **(3) VFL-MPD**: We train a federated model on the unlabeled data with the objective of MPD, and then finetune it on the labeled data.
- ***The local setting:*** We set 4 methods to validate the effectiveness of the overall framework VFed-SSD and the performance contributions of MPD and SplitKD: **(1) Baseline Local**: A simulation scenario without using federated learning where each party trains a local model. The ground truth label is assumed to be shared with the passive party for simulation. **(2) Local-MPD**: The training of local models is similar to "Baseline Local", except that: a) the local bottom model is initialized with its corresponding bottom part in a federated model pre-trained by MPD. b) The bottom part is finetuned. It's a simplified variant of VFed-SSD to inspect the contribution of MPD. **(3) Local-SD**: The local models are acquired by splitting up a federated model trained on the labeled data. It's referred to inspect the contribution of SplitKD to VFed-SSD . **(4) Local-SSD**: This is the complete version of our method. Compared to SplitKD, the federated teacher is additionally pre-trained on the unlabeled data via MPD.

4.1.3 ***Implementaion Details.*** Following related works in advertising [11], we use AUC (Area Under the ROC curve) as the evaluation metric. We use a 2-layer MLP for all sub-models in all

Figure 2: Results on the *federated setting*. It shows that the vanilla VFL outperforms local models in all the datasets and our self-supervised task consistently outperforms all the baselines."↑" denotes the absolute AUC improvements compared to the baseline. "U" denotes the use of unlabeled data. Terms in bold with blue denote the best.

Method	U.	*Game-Ad* AUC%	↑	*Game-Social* AUC%	↑	*Criteo-NC* AUC%	↑
Baseline Local	✗	70.78	—	70.64	—	68.30	—
VFL	✗	72.12	1.34	72.98	2.34	75.94	7.65
VFL-SST	✓	72.32	1.55	73.11	2.48	76.71	8.41
***Ours** (VFL-MPD)*	✓	**73.30**	**2.53**	**73.31**	**2.67**	**77.08**	**8.79**

%: values are shown in percentage for readability.




Figure 3: Results on the *local setting*. Our method achieves the best result and its two simplified variants also significantly outperform the baseline, indicating the validity of its two components.

Method	U.	*Game-Ad* AUC%	↑	*Game-Social* AUC%	↑	*Criteo-NC* AUC%	↑
Baseline Local	✗	70.78	—	70.64	—	68.30	—
Local-SD	✗	71.01	0.23	71.55	0.91	68.73	0.43
Local-MPD	✓	70.79	0.02	71.33	0.69	68.65	0.35
***Ours** (Local-SSD)*	✓	**71.67**	**0.89**	**71.87**	**1.23**	**68.77**	**0.47**




Table 1: Dataset statistics. "|" segments values for two parties

Item	Game-Ad	Game-Social	Criteo-NC
#no label	500×10^4	500×10^4	500×10^4
#labeled	64×10^4	36×10^4	15×10^4
#test	2.5×10^4	5×10^4	50×10^4
positive%	1:13	1:20	1:4
#fields	51 | 27	89 | 39	13 | 26
#dim	2122 | 1017	166 | 298	13 | 260

experiments. We use the Adam optimizer with L_2 regularization for training. The batch size is 10K and 5K for the pre-training task and downstream tasks respectively. We use 1/20 of training data as the validation set to conduct early stopping. We tune hyper-parameters for all methods and report the best result among 3 repeated runs for each. The main and fine-tune learning rates are chosen in $\eta \in \{1^{-2}, 5*1^{-3}\}, \eta' \in \{1^{-3}, 5*1^{-4}\}$, and the distillation weight $\alpha \in \{0.5, 0.9\}$, and the L_2 penalty coefficient $\lambda \in \{1^{-4}, 1^{-5}\}$. All experiments are conducted via PowerFL[39].

4.2 Results and Analysis

4.2.1 ***Advantages of Self-Supervised Pre-training.*** As shown in Figure 2, the two methods using the unlabeled data get further improvements over vanilla VFL. Besides, our MPD task outperforms "VFL-SST" by additional **0.98%**, **0.19%**, and **0.38%** points on three datasets, respectively. It indicates that MPD can use unlabeled data more efficiently and learns better representation, thus we answered question **Q1**. Specifically, as additional experiments conducted on Game-Ad dataset shows (right sub-figures of Figure 2 and Figure 3), methods equipped with MPD achieve the best performance improvement curve.

4.2.2 ***Advantages of Partial Knowledge Transfer.*** In the setting of local serving, our focal point is the performance of the active party and its improvement achieved by other methods. We evaluate all methods by the absolute AUC improvement over the vanilla local model. As shown in Figure 3, our method significantly improves the local performance with **0.89%**, **1.23%** and **0.47%** over three datasets, respectively. The superior performance gives us a sufficient reason to replace the local vanilla model as the student model to conduct online serving. Notice that, the gap between "Local-SD" and "VFL" is natural, as the set of available features for local models is significantly smaller than for the federated model, as depicted in the middle part of Table 1. We also conducted an ablation study to test the efficacy of the two components of our method. As shown in Figure 3, both "Local-SD" and "Local-MPD" significantly outperform the local baseline, but are weaker than "Local-SSD". This suggests that the two components are both efficient. Thus we answered question **Q2**.

5 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we propose a semi-supervised VFL framework VFed-SSD for industry-friendly vertical federated advertising. We highlight the existence of massive unlabeled overlapping data in advertising and develop a self-supervised task MPD to exploit its potential in representation learning. Meanwhile, we develop a novel knowledge transfer schema SplitKD to meet the strict system response time restriction of advertising systems. Experiments on both industry and public benchmark datasets validate the effectiveness of our method. In the future, we plan to extend our work to other tabular-data-based VFL tasks and the multi-party scenarios.

REFERENCES

[1] Yoshinori Aono, Takuya Hayashi, Lihua Wang, Shiho Moriai, et al. 2017. Privacy-preserving deep learning via additively homomorphic encryption. *TIFS* 13, 5 (2017), 1333–1345.

[2] Avrim Blum and Tom Mitchell. 1998. Combining labeled and unlabeled data with co-training. In *COLT*. 92–100.

[3] Iker Ceballos, Vivek Sharma, Eduardo Mugica, Abhishek Singh, Alberto Roman, Praneeth Vepakomma, and Ramesh Raskar. 2020. SplitNN-driven Vertical Partitioning. *CoRR* abs/2008.04137 (2020). arXiv:2008.04137 https://arxiv.org/abs/2008.04137

[4] Kevin Clark, Minh-Thang Luong, Quoc V. Le, and Christopher Manning. 2020. Electra: Pre-training text encoders as discriminators rather thangenerators. In *ICLR*.

[5] CriteoLabs. 2014. The Criteo dataset for kaggle display advertising challenge. https://labs.criteo.com/2014/02/download-kaggle-display-advertising-challenge-dataset/

[6] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805* (2018).

[7] Nanqing Dong and Irina Voiculescu. 2021. Federated Contrastive Learning for Decentralized Unlabeled Medical Images. In *MICCAI*. Springer, 378–387.

[8] Economist. 2020. Tencent has used stealth to become a gaming superpower. https://www.economist.com/business/2020/06/13/tencent-has-used-stealth-to-become-a-gaming-superpower

[9] Chong Fu, Xuhong Zhang, Shouling Ji, Jinyin Chen, Jingzheng Wu, Shanqing Guo, Jun Zhou, Alex X Liu, and Ting Wang. 2022. Label Inference Attacks Against Vertical Federated Learning. In *USENIX Security 22*. USENIX Association, Boston, MA. https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity22/presentation/fu

[10] Fangcheng Fu, Huanran Xue, Yong Cheng, Yangyu Tao, and Bin Cui. 2022. BlindFL: Vertical Federated Machine Learning without Peeking into Your Data. In *Proceedings of the 2022 International Conference on Management of Data*. 1316–1330.

[11] Huifeng Guo, Ruiming Tang, Yunming Ye, Zhenguo Li, and Xiuqiang He. 2017. DeepFM: a factorization-machine based neural network for CTR prediction. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. 1725–1731.

[12] Chaoyang He, Murali Annavaram, and Salman Avestimehr. 2020. Group knowledge transfer: Federated learning of large cnns at the edge. *NeurIPS* 33 (2020), 14068–14080.

[13] Geoffrey Hinton, Jeff Dean, and Oriol Vinyals. 2014. Distilling the Knowledge in a Neural Network. 1–9.

[14] Mingkai Huang, Hao Li, Bing Bai, Chang Wang, Kun Bai, and Fei Wang. 2020. A federated multi-view deep learning framework for privacy-preserving recommendations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.10808* (2020).

[15] Xiao Jin, Pin-Yu Chen, Chia-Yi Hsu, Chia-Mu Yu, and Tianyi Chen. 2021. Catastrophic Data Leakage in Vertical Federated Learning. *NeurIPS* 34 (2021).

[16] Peter Kairouz, H Brendan McMahan, Brendan Avent, Aurélien Bellet, Mehdi Bennis, Arjun Nitin Bhagoji, Kallista Bonawitz, Zachary Charles, Graham Cormode, Rachel Cummings, et al. 2021. Advances and open problems in federated learning. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning* 14, 1–2 (2021), 1–210.

[17] Yan Kang, Yang Liu, and Tianjian Chen. 2020. FedMVT: Semi-supervised Vertical Federated Learning with MultiView Training. *ArXiv* abs/2008.10838 (2020).

[18] Omer Levy and Yoav Goldberg. 2014. Neural word embedding as implicit matrix factorization. *NeurIPS* 27 (2014).

[19] Daliang Li and Junpu Wang. 2019. Fedmd: Heterogenous federated learning via model distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.03581* (2019).

[20] Feng Liang, Weike Pan, and Zhong Ming. 2021. Fedrec++: Lossless federated recommendation with explicit feedback. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 35. 4224–4231.

[21] Tao Lin, Lingjing Kong, Sebastian U Stich, and Martin Jaggi. 2020. Ensemble distillation for robust model fusion in federated learning. *NeurIPS* 33 (2020), 2351–2363.

[22] Yujie Lin, Pengjie Ren, Zhumin Chen, Zhaochun Ren, Dongxiao Yu, Jun Ma, Maarten de Rijke, and Xiuzhen Cheng. 2020. Meta matrix factorization for federated rating predictions. In *SIGIR*. 981–990.

[23] Shuchang Liu, Shuyuan Xu, Wenhui Yu, Zuohui Fu, Yongfeng Zhang, and Amelie Marian. 2021. FedCT: Federated Collaborative Transfer for Recommendation. In *SIGIR*. 716–725.

[24] Yang Liu, Yan Kang, Tianyuan Zou, Yanhong Pu, Yuanqin He, Xiaozhou Ye, Ye Ouyang, Ya-Qin Zhang, and Qiang Yang. 2022. Vertical Federated Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.12814* (2022).

[25] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692* (2019).

[26] Yang Liu, Zhihao Yi, Yan Kang, Yuanqin He, Wenhan Liu, Tianyuan Zou, and Qiang Yang. 2021. Defending Label Inference and Backdoor Attacks in Vertical Federated Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.05409* (2021).

[27] Yang Liu, Zhihao Yi, Yan Kang, Yuanqin He, Wenhan Liu, Tianyuan Zou, and Qiang Yang. 2021. Defending Label Inference and Backdoor Attacks in Vertical Federated Learning. *CoRR* abs/2112.05409 (2021). arXiv:2112.05409 https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.05409

[28] Tomas Mikolov, Ilya Sutskever, Kai Chen, Greg S Corrado, and Jeff Dean. 2013. Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. *NeurIPS* 26 (2013).

[29] Aashiq Muhamed, Jaspreet Singh, Shuai Zheng, Iman Keivanloo, Sujan Perera, James Mracek, Yi Xu, Qingjun Cui, Santosh Rajagopalan, Belinda Zeng, et al. 2022. DCAF-BERT: A Distilled Cachable Adaptable Factorized Model For Improved Ads CTR Prediction. (2022).

[30] Khalil Muhammad, Qinqin Wang, Diarmuid O'Reilly-Morgan, Elias Tragos, Barry Smyth, Neil Hurley, James Geraci, and Aonghus Lawlor. 2020. Fedfast: Going beyond average for faster training of federated recommender systems. In *SIGKDD*. 1234–1242.

[31] Kamal Nigam and Rayid Ghani. 2000. Analyzing the effectiveness and applicability of co-training. In *CIKM*. 86–93.

[32] Feiyang Pan, Shuokai Li, Xiang Ao, Pingzhong Tang, and Qing He. 2019. Warm up cold-start advertisements: Improving ctr predictions via learning to learn id embeddings. In *SIGIR*. 695–704.

[33] Daniel Peterson, Pallika Kanani, and Virendra J Marathe. 2019. Private federated learning with domain adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.06733* (2019).

[34] Zhenghang Ren, Liu Yang, and Kai Chen. 2022. Improving Availability of Vertical Federated Learning: Relaxing Inference on Non-overlapping Data. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)* (2022).

[35] Chuck Rosenberg, Martial Hebert, and Henry Schneiderman. 2005. Semi-supervised self-training of object detection models. (2005).

[36] Jianqiang Shen, Burkay Orten, Sahin Cem Geyik, Daniel Liu, Shahriar Shariat, Fang Bian, and Ali Dasdan. 2015. From 0.5 million to 2.5 million: Efficiently scaling up real-time bidding. In *ICDM*. IEEE, 973–978.

[37] Jiankai Sun, Xin Yang, Yuanshun Yao, and Chong Wang. 2022. Label Leakage and Protection from Forward Embedding in Vertical Federated Learning. https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2203.01451

[38] Jiankai Sun, Xin Yang, Yuanshun Yao, Aonan Zhang, Weihao Gao, Junyuan Xie, and Chong Wang. 2021. Vertical Federated Learning without Revealing Intersection Membership. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.05508* (2021).

[39] Tencent. 2020. The Angel PowerFL. https://data.qq.com/powerfl/

[40] Vladimir Vapnik, Rauf Izmailov, et al. 2015. Learning using privileged information: similarity control and knowledge transfer. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 16, 1 (2015), 2023–2049.

[41] Vladimir Vapnik and Akshay Vashist. 2009. A new learning paradigm: Learning using privileged information. *Neural networks* 22, 5-6 (2009), 544–557.

[42] Praneeth Vepakomma, Otkrist Gupta, Tristan Swedish, and Ramesh Raskar. 2018. Split learning for health: Distributed deep learning without sharing raw patient data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.00564* (2018).

[43] Paul Voigt and Axel Von dem Bussche. 2017. The eu general data protection regulation (gdpr). *A Practical Guide, 1st Ed., Cham: Springer International Publishing* 10, 3152676 (2017), 10–5555.

[44] Kang Wei, Jun Li, Chuan Ma, Ming Ding, Sha Wei, Fan Wu, Guihai Chen, and Thilina Ranbaduge. 2022. Vertical federated learning: Challenges, methodologies and experiments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.04309* (2022).

[45] WikiPedia. 2022. Permutation matrix. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Permutation_matrix

[46] Xin Wu, Qing Liu, Jiarui Qin, and Yong Yu. 2022. PeerRank: Robust Learning to Rank With Peer Loss Over Noisy Labels. *IEEE Access* 10 (2022), 6830–6841. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2022.3142096

[47] Chen Xu, Quan Li, Junfeng Ge, Jinyang Gao, Xiaoyong Yang, Changhua Pei, Fei Sun, Jian Wu, Hanxiao Sun, and Wenwu Ou. 2020. Privileged features distillation at Taobao recommendations. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. 2590–2598.

[48] Liu Yang, Ben Tan, Vincent W. Zheng, Kai Chen, and Qiang Yang. 2020. *Federated Recommendation Systems*. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 225–239. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-63076-8_16

[49] Qiang Yang, Yang Liu, Tianjian Chen, and Yongxin Tong. 2019. Federated machine learning: Concept and applications. *TIST* 10, 2 (2019), 1–19.

[50] Xin Yang, Jiankai Sun, Yuanshun Yao, Junyuan Xie, and Chong Wang. 2022. Differentially Private Label Protection in Split Learning. https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2203.02073

[51] Tiansheng Yao, Xinyang Yi, Derek Zhiyuan Cheng, Felix Yu, Ting Chen, Aditya Menon, Lichan Hong, Ed H Chi, Steve Tjoa, Jieqi Kang, et al. 2021. Self-supervised Learning for Large-scale Item Recommendations. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*. 4321–4330.

[52] Yong Yuan, Feiyue Wang, Juanjuan Li, and Rui Qin. 2014. A survey on real time bidding advertising. In *Proceedings of 2014 IEEE International Conference on Service Operations and Logistics, and Informatics*. 418–423. https://doi.org/10.1109/SOLI.2014.6960761