

Revisiting Personalized Federated Learning: Robustness Against Backdoor Attacks

Zeyu Qin^{*}
Hong Kong University of Science and
Technology
zeyu.qin@connect.ust.hk

Liuyi Yao
Alibaba Group
yly287738@alibaba-inc.com

Daoyuan Chen
Alibaba Group
daoyuanchen.cdy@alibaba-inc.com

Yaliang Li
Alibaba Group
yaliang.li@alibaba-inc.com

Bolin Ding
Alibaba Group
bolin.ding@alibaba-inc.com

Minhao Cheng
Hong Kong University of Science and
Technology
minhaocheng@ust.hk

ABSTRACT

In this work, besides improving prediction accuracy, we study whether personalization could bring robustness benefits to backdoor attacks. We conduct the first study of backdoor attacks in the pFL framework, testing 4 widely used backdoor attacks against 6 pFL methods on benchmark datasets FEMNIST and CIFAR-10, a total of 600 experiments. The study shows that pFL methods with partial model-sharing can significantly boost robustness against backdoor attacks. In contrast, pFL methods with full model-sharing do not show robustness. To analyze the reasons for varying robustness performances, we provide comprehensive ablation studies on different pFL methods. Based on our findings, we further propose a lightweight defense method, Simple-Tuning, which empirically improves defense performance against backdoor attacks. We believe that our work could provide both guidance for pFL application in terms of its robustness and offer valuable insights to design more robust FL methods in the future. We open-source our code to establish the first benchmark for black-box backdoor attacks in pFL: <https://github.com/alibaba/FederatedScope/tree/backdoor-bench>.

CCS CONCEPTS

• Information systems → Data mining; • Security and privacy → Information accountability and usage control.

KEYWORDS

backdoor attacks, personalized federated learning, robustness evaluation

ACM Reference Format:

Zeyu Qin^{*}, Liuyi Yao, Daoyuan Chen, Yaliang Li, Bolin Ding, and Minhao Cheng. 2023. Revisiting Personalized Federated Learning: Robustness Against Backdoor Attacks. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD '23)*, August 6–10, 2023, Long Beach, CA, USA.

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 the author(s) 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.

KDD '23, August 6–10, 2023, Long Beach, CA, USA

© 2023 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.
ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-0103-0/23/08...\$15.00
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3580305.3599898>

2023, Long Beach, CA, USA. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 13 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3580305.3599898>

1 INTRODUCTION

Along with increasing concerns and stricter regulations [15] regarding data privacy, Federated Learning (FL) [40] has attracted widespread attention from both industry and academia. As a paradigm for collaboratively training machine learning models without access to dispersed and private data, FL has been successfully used in many real-world applications including keyboard prediction [21], Internet of Things [27], and medical image analysis [32]. However, with the popularity of FL, we also face severe security threats from potential adversaries in real-world scenarios. Focusing on breaching the availability of FL models, poisoning attacks [5, 45, 51] could completely corrupt the FL models. Focusing on breaching the confidentiality of FL models, inference attacks [41, 42] and reconstruction attacks [63] could significantly increase the privacy risk of FL models. To eliminate the above threats, many defense methods [7, 25, 46] have been proposed and achieved outstanding defense performance against these attacks.

Meanwhile, due to the distributed nature of FL system, the backdoor attack is emerging and becoming one of the most serious security threats to FL system [3, 18, 26, 48, 53]. Backdoor attacks aim only to mislead backdoored models to exhibit abnormal behavior on samples with backdoor triggers. Similar to poisoning attacks, the adversary manipulates some training samples, such as adding a small patch in samples or adding extra specific samples, to insert a backdoor trigger into the model. Compared with poisoning attacks that aim to corrupt FL models' prediction performance or make FL training diverge [5, 7, 17, 51], backdoor attacks could only be activated by data with triggers so that they are more stealthy and much harder to be detected and defended against. How to effectively defend against backdoor attacks to FL methods is still an open problem [3, 18, 48, 53]. Existing defense methods that perform well against poisoning attacks like Krum [7], norm clipping [46], and adding noise [14, 53] do not achieve expected results against backdoor attacks [53] (also seeing results in Section 4.2). Backdoor attacks in FL framework could be separated into two categories: white-box and black-box attacks [18, 37]. Compared with white-box attacks which allow adversarial clients to control the local training process, adversarial clients are only allowed to manipulate local

^{*}Work was done when the first author Zeyu Qin was an intern at Alibaba Group.

training datasets under the black-box setting. Therefore, black-box attacks with few knowledge requirements are more practical for real-world scenarios [46] and also lead to non-negligible risks to FL systems [46, 53] (seeing results in Section 4.2).

A recent trend in FL deployment is to utilize personalized FL (pFL) methods [9, 10, 26, 50] to mitigate the data heterogeneity issue across clients, a universal characteristic inherent in all real-world datasets. Being different from general FL methods only having a global model, pFL methods allow each client to have their own local personalized models, by finetuning [35, 60], interpolating [16, 31], or partially sharing the global model [13, 33]. This brings better adaptability on local private datasets and helps pFL methods surpass general FL methods by a large margin on prediction accuracy under practical Non-IID scenarios [9, 56].

The unique aspect of pFL, where clients have their own personalized local models, is a major contributor to its success. This distinction prompts us to consider whether the difference between clients' local models could prevent the injection and spread of backdoor features. Specifically, in this study, we aim to determine whether pFL methods can also provide robustness against difficulty-eradicated backdoor attacks. We ask the below questions:

Do pFL methods bring robustness again backdoor attacks? And if the answer is yes, what leads to robustness, and how to utilize it?

To answer the above questions, we study the robustness of mainstreamed pFL methods against backdoor attacks in this paper. Our work focuses on black-box backdoor attacks as they efficiently exploit security risks in more practical settings. We test 4 widely used backdoor attacks against 6 pFL methods on benchmark datasets FEMNIST and CIFAR-10, a total of 600 experiments.

For the first question, we find that various pFL methods show different robustness against backdoor attacks. **Some pFL methods (partial model-sharing) could achieve outstanding defense performance**, especially FedRep [13] could reduce backdoor attack success rate below 10%. Even compared with some widely used defense methods, they are able to achieve similar and better robustness while still keeping excellent prediction accuracy.

Through a series of experiments to dig out the source of robustness from pFL methods, we find that **the degree of personalization is a key factor to robustness benefits**. We observe that pFL methods with full model-sharing do not improve robustness against backdoor attacks. In contrast, pFL methods with partial model-sharing, FedBN [33], and FedRep [13], significantly improve defense performance. These observations suggest a strong positive correlation between robustness against backdoor attacks and the larger personalization degree of pFL methods. Then, to further analyze the reasons behind different robustness from pFL methods, we conduct ablation studies on pFL methods. For full model-sharing methods, we find that if training of local models is more dependent on the global model, they are more vulnerable to backdoor attacks. For partial model-sharing methods like FedBN or FedRep which allow each client to own their locally preserved BN layers or linear classifiers, we find that they successfully block the propagation of backdoor features between personalized local models.

Finally, inspired by our findings, **we further propose a defense method, Simple-Tuning**, that allows training FL models while efficiently reducing vulnerability to backdoor attacks. Simple-Tuning

first reinitializes the linear classifier of trained models of each client and then trains it on local training datasets. As only tuning the linear classifier, Simple-Tuning is easier to be combined with existing FL methods with significantly reduced computation costs. We test defense performance of Simple-Tuning, and the results show that it significantly boosts robustness against backdoor attacks.

Contributions. We summarize our contributions as follows:

- (1) We present the first detailed and thorough study that tests the robustness of 6 popular pFL methods against 4 widely used backdoor attacks. We find that some pFL methods (partial model-sharing) could achieve outstanding defense performance against backdoor attacks.
- (2) We find that the degree of model-sharing is a key factor to robustness benefits from pFL methods. pFL methods with full model-sharing do not show robustness against backdoor attacks. In contrast, pFL methods with partial model-sharing, FedBN [33], and FedRep [13], significantly improve defense performance against backdoor attacks.
- (3) We also compare pFL methods with some widely used defense methods in FL against backdoor attacks. pFL methods are able to achieve similar and even better robustness while still keeping excellent prediction accuracy.
- (4) We conduct ablation studies on pFL methods to further analyze the reasons behind various robustness performances of pFL methods.
- (5) Based on our findings, we propose a lightweight and plug-and-play defense method, Simple-Tuning. The experiments show its effectiveness in boosting FL models' robustness against backdoor attacks.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 Personalized Federated Learning

Before conducting our studies, we first introduce Federated Learning (FL) and personalized Federated Learning (pFL). Under FL scenario, each client $i \in C$ has his own private dataset S_i drawn from its own local data distribution \mathcal{D}_i over $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$. The goal of FL is to train a single (global) model collaboratively without sharing clients' local data. The objective of FL is

$$\min_{\theta_g} \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}_i, i \in C} [\mathcal{L}(f(\theta_g; x), y)] \quad (1)$$

where θ_g is the global model shared with all clients. \mathcal{L} is the loss function, such as cross-entropy of the classification task. FedAvg [40] is the most widely used method to solve Eq.1. For each round of FL training, several clients are selected by the server to participate in the training. The server first broadcasts θ_g to selected clients. All clients then locally train $f(\theta_g; \cdot)$ on their private dataset by using SGD for several epochs and upload the update of θ_g to the server. After receiving all clients' update, the server conducts the weighted average of updates by

$$\bar{\nabla} \theta_g = \sum_{j=1}^M \frac{|S_j|}{|S|} \nabla \theta_g^j, \quad |S| = \sum_{j=1}^M |S_j|. \quad (2)$$

Here, $|S_j|$ is the size of dataset owned by the selected client j . The server applies the $\bar{\nabla} \theta_g$ into θ_g for the next round of FL training, and the process repeats until convergence.

Being different from FL, pFL methods not only tend to learn a global model but also aim to learn a local personalized model for each client. The local personalized model is better adaptive to each client's local dataset and helps pFL methods surpass general FL methods by a large margin on prediction accuracy under practical Non-IID scenarios [13, 20, 35, 44, 47, 50, 60]. Here, **we use below formulations to illustrate various pFL methods based on different personalization degrees.**

(i) *Full model-sharing* [16, 31, 35, 38, 49]:

$$\min_{\theta_g, \{\theta_i\}_{i \in C}} \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \sim \mathcal{D}_i, i \in C} [\mathcal{L}(f(\theta_i; \mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y})] + \lambda \mathcal{H}(\theta_g, \theta_i), \quad (3)$$

where θ_i represents local personalized model owned by each client and θ_g means the global reference model shared among all clients. We can observe that the whole global model θ_g is shared across all clients. The new added \mathcal{H} is the regularizer of similarity between θ_g and θ_i and λ is the coefficient for each client. In each round, selected clients receive θ_g and use it as the reference to training θ_i . θ_g is also updated on local datasets and then uploaded to the server to participate in the aggregation process. Therefore, full model-sharing also indicates knowledge from every client's local dataset could be transferred to local models of other clients by sharing θ_g .

Here, we introduce several pFL methods with full model-sharing used in our experiments. (1) *Ditto* [31]: each client has two models, global model θ_g and local model θ_i . During local training, after receiving θ_g , clients first train $f(\theta_g; \cdot)$ on their local datasets to update θ_g . Then they train local model θ_i using θ_g as the reference with a added regularizer $\lambda \|\theta_i - \theta_g\|_2$. Here, λ controls the consistence between θ_g and θ_i , the personalization degree of each client. (2) *pFedMe* [49]: By first setting θ_g as the reference, clients utilize the Moreau envelop similar to *Ditto* regularizer to update θ_i . Then they update θ_g by using aggregation of the updates of θ_i at the end of each local epoch. (3) *FedEM* [38]: this method assumes the data distribution of each client is the mixture of unknown underlying data distributions with different coefficients. Therefore, they propose to learn a mixture of multiple base models ($a_i^1 \theta^1 + \dots + a_i^k \theta^k$, $i \in C$) for each client with different mixture coefficients. All clients share these based models $\theta^1, \dots, \theta^k$ but they have their own personalized mixture coefficients, a_i^1, \dots, a_i^k . (4) *Fine-tuning*: It is a widely used method to obtain a personalized model for each client and sometimes shows a better performance than other pFL methods [9, 39], in which each client obtains θ_i by Fine-tuning θ_g on their local datasets after FL training finishes.

(ii) *Partial model-sharing* [2, 13, 33, 44]:

$$\min_{\theta^s, \{\theta_i^p\}_{i \in C}} \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \sim \mathcal{D}_i, i \in C} [\mathcal{L}(f(\theta^s, \theta_i^p; \mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y})], \quad (4)$$

where the local personalized model θ_i is further separated into two group parameters, θ^s and θ_i^p . There is no more global model and only partial parameters θ^s of θ_i are shared across clients. After finishing local training, global shared parameters θ^s are uploaded to the server for aggregation. Locally parameters θ_i^p are never shared with other clients. Partial model-sharing indicates each client could only utilize knowledge of partial model parameters trained on the other clients' local datasets so that each client could gain larger personalization degrees. For example, (5) *FedBN* [33] decouples

the whole model θ_i into locally preserved BN layers θ_i^p and shared parameters θ^s . After the local training process finishes, clients only upload θ^s to participate in aggregation. (6) *FedRep* [13, 44] decouples models into global feature extractor (θ^s) and local linear classifier (θ_i^p). In each iteration of local training, clients first freeze the feature extractor and update θ_i^p on their private datasets. And then, they freeze the local linear classifier and update global feature extractor θ^s . Only the global feature extractor is uploaded to the server and participates in aggregation.

2.2 Backdoor Attacks in FL

Backdoor attacks aim to mislead the backdoored model to exhibit abnormal behavior on samples stamped with the backdoor trigger but behave normally on all benign samples. As shown in Figure 1, the backdoor attacker inserts a backdoor trigger into the model by manipulating some training data samples, like adding a small patch in clean images or just choosing special samples as triggers. Backdoored samples' labels would also be changed to attacker designated target label \mathbf{y}_t . In the training phase, the model $f(\theta'; \cdot)$ is trained on clean data samples (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) together with backdoored samples $(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}_t)$. During the inference phase, the presence of a backdoor trigger in input samples will mislead backdoored model $f(\theta'; \cdot)$ to predict the target label \mathbf{y}_t while keeping the same performance on samples without the trigger. Therefore, compared with poisoning attacks which corrupt FL models' prediction performance or make FL training diverge [5, 7, 17, 51], backdoor attacks are more stealthy and hard to detect since the backdoored model behaves normally in the absence of triggers [18].

Backdoor Attacks in FL could be separated into 2 categories: (1) white-box setting where the adversarial client can control the whole local training process and local updates to the server; (2) black-box setting where the adversarial client is only allowed to manipulate his own local dataset. In the black-box setting, the adversary does not require computing resources and any access to the internal configurations (e.g., FL binaries, memory) of compromised devices. Therefore, backdoor attacks in black-box setting is much more practical in real-world scenarios [26, 37, 46] and also more widely used in previous works of backdoor learning [46, 53, 54].

Bagdasaryan et al [3] propose the first backdoor attack in FL. One or multiple adversarial clients use several special training samples as semantic triggers which are inconsistent with other images in the same class. The authors also assume that attackers always conduct attacks near the convergent phase of FL training. Wang et al [53] propose edge-case backdoor triggers by choosing samples from other data distributions as backdoor triggers. They think these samples are located in the tail of the original data distribution. Therefore, the model updates from those samples are unlikely to conflict with model updates from other benign clients. Their experiments also show that edge-case triggers are more effective and persistent than semantic triggers. Besides, the authors also use a more practical attack setting, where the attacker could only periodically participates in several FL rounds, for example, in every fixed Q round.

In DBA attack [57], the authors propose to use the BadNet [19] trigger which is the most widely used attack in centralized training. Besides, DBA attack also assumes the attacker can control multiple



Figure 1: We show used backdoor triggers: edge-case, BadNet, Blended, SIG triggers. The first and second row are visualizations on CIFAR-10 and FEMNIST, respectively.

adversarial clients. Each adversary injects a different local trigger into his own dataset, trains the model on this backdoored dataset, and uploads its model updates to the server. During the inference process, the attacker uses the combination of these local triggers as a new trigger to conduct the attack.

Besides, other works also propose white-box backdoor attacks [3, 6, 57, 61], which allow attackers to control the local training process, such as model replacement attack to magnify poisoning update [3]. We leave evaluations about them in future work.

3 THREAT MODEL

In this work, we focus on **black-box backdoor attacks** that do not require control and knowledge about training procedures like model architecture, parameters, or training methods. They also do not require any computing resources which makes them essential threat in real-world scenarios. For simplicity, we consider the task of image classification that has been used in most research on backdoor attacks.

In our studies, we choose the stricter assumption that there is only one adversarial client. Following [48, 53], we adopt the fix-frequency attack setting in which the adversarial client is selected to join in the training process for every fixed Q round, where we set $Q = 10$ through all experiments.

We adopt commonly used **edge-case** and **BadNet** triggers in our evaluations and also explore various trigger types, including **Blended** [11] and **SIG** [4] triggers, which are widely used in centralized training but not yet studied in FL. Blended trigger extends BadNet by encouraging the invisibility of triggers through blending clean images and triggers. We choose the hello-kitty (hk) pattern as our trigger since it achieves the best attack performance in related backdoor defense works [24, 54, 55, 62]. Without changing image pixels, SIG adopts a sinusoidal signal as the trigger to perturb clean images. Examples of backdoor triggers are listed in Figure 1.

4 ROBUSTNESS OF PFL METHODS AGAINST BACKDOOR ATTACKS

In this work, we want to learn that apart from better prediction accuracy, do pFL methods bring robustness again backdoor attacks? If the answer is true, what factors of pFL methods lead to robustness? And based on our studies, could we exploit this robustness benefit

to help improve the robustness of FL models against backdoor attacks? We first try to answer the first question by conducting the evaluations of backdoor attacks on pFL methods mentioned before. We outline our experimental setup in Section 4.1 and show overall experimental results in Section 4.2 followed by our interesting findings. We also compare some widely used defense methods in FL in Section 4.2.

To further analyze the reasons behind various robustness from pFL methods, we conduct ablation studies on pFL methods with partial model-sharing in Section 5.1 and methods with full model-sharing in Section 5.2, respectively. In Section 6, based on previous findings, we propose a simple defense method, *Simple-Tuning* and further verify its effectiveness of defending against backdoor attacks by taking experiments on FL methods.

4.1 Experimental Settings

4.1.1 Datasets and Models. We conduct evaluations on two widely used image classification datasets, **FEMNIST** [8] and **CIFAR-10** [28] in FL literature. FEMNIST is a handwritten character recognition dataset containing 62 classes and each client corresponds to a character writer from EMNIST [12]. Following pFL-bench [9], we adopt the sub-sampled version of FEMNIST in our experiment, and it contains 200 clients. And the dataset is randomly split into train/valid/test sets with a ratio 3:1:1. For CIFAR-10, following previous works [8, 9, 53, 59], we use Dirichlet allocation to split it into 100 clients with Dirichlet factor $\alpha = 0.5$. These two datasets represent two different settings in Non-IID setting: feature-skew and label skew [9, 37, 59]. Besides, for CIFAR-10, we also consider the IID setting in which we uniformly and randomly sample images from each class for each client. The splitting details about datasets are shown in Section A1 in *Appendix*.

Following pFL works [9, 35, 49], we use a simple ConvNet model on these two datasets. The details are shown in Section A1 in *Appendix*. Besides, to align with previous backdoor attacks works [53, 61], we also use a larger network, ResNet-18 [23], for CIFAR-10 dataset.

4.1.2 Personalized FL Methods. We first consider the baseline FL method, *FedAvg* [40]. We adopt mainstreamed pFL methods mentioned in Section 2.1, *Fine-tuning* [35], *FedBN* [33], *FedRep* [13, 44], *Ditto* [31], *pFedMe* [49], *FedEM* [38]. They are also used in recent benchmark [9, 39]. We implement these methods following pFL-bench¹ [9] and defer the choice of hyperparameters in Section A2 in *Appendix*.

4.1.3 Training Details. The total training round T is set to be 1,000. For each training round, the server randomly samples 10% clients from all clients to participate in the training process. That is to say, in each round, 20 and 10 clients are randomly selected for FEMNIST and CIFAR-10 dataset.

4.1.4 Attack Settings. Through our evaluations, for simplicity, we choose the client-1 and client-15 as the adversarial client on FEMNIST and CIFAR-10, respectively. We set the target label $y_t = 1$ on FEMNIST and $y_t = 9$ on CIFAR-10 following [53]. For FEMNIST dataset, we use 100 images of “7”s from Ardis [29] as edge-case triggers. For CIFAR-10 dataset, we use 500 images of Southwest

¹<https://github.com/alibaba/FederatedScope/tree/master/benchmark/pFL-Bench>

Airline’s planes provided in [53] as edge-case triggers. For each of BadNet, Blended, and SIG, we put it on 50% of training samples of the adversarial client. Following attack hyperparameters provided in [54], for BadNet attack, we choose the 3×3 grid pattern and put it at the downright corner of poisoned samples. For Blended attack, we choose the hello-kitty pattern and set the blending ratio α as 0.2. For SIG attack, we set the amplitude of sinusoidal signal as 20 ([0, 255]). We also show these used triggers in Figure 1.

4.1.5 Baseline Defense Methods. We adopt four baseline defense methods in FL: norm-clipping [46, 48, 53], adding noise [14, 48, 53], Krum [7], and Multi-Krum [7] which are widely used in previous works [3, 3, 14, 46, 48, 53, 57, 61]. (1) Krum only selects one uploaded model update which is similar to other updates by computing parameter similarity (ℓ_2 norm) between them as the aggregation result. Rather than only selecting one update, Multi-Krum selects top- k updates based on ranking of computed similarity and then takes an average as the aggregation result. (2) Norm-clipping: Norm-clipping clips the model update so as not to exceed the given threshold c before aggregation. We set $c = 1$ and $c = 0.5$ following [61], where a smaller c means the smaller contribution to model aggregation from local model update. (3) Adding noise method adds Gaussian noises $\lambda * \sigma$ to model updates from clients. σ is sampled from normal distribution. We try a series of noise scales $\sigma = 10^{-3}, 5 * 10^{-4}$, and 10^{-4} . We implement them based on source code² of [53].

4.1.6 Evaluation Details. We take two evaluation metrics, including *Clean Accuracy (C-Acc)* (i.e., the prediction accuracy of clean samples) and *Attack Success Rate (ASR)* (i.e., the prediction accuracy of poisoned samples to the target class). We test C-Accs on all clients’ testing dataset using their own pFL models. For edge-case attack, we follow [53] to test ASR on 100 edge-case images on FEMNIST and 196 edge-case images on CIFAR-10, respectively. For BadNet, Blended, and SIG attacks, we test ASR on testing sets of all clients except the selected adversarial client. All experiments are conducted with 3 times over different random seeds, and we report the average through experiments.

4.2 The Overall Robustness Evaluation

In Figure 2, we show performance curves of backdoor attacks on pFL methods under Non-IID data distribution. Due to the space limitation, the results of IID setting are deferred in Section A3 of *Appendix*. There are three subfigures: results on ResNet-18 and CIFAR-10, results on ConvNet and CIFAR-10, and results on ConvNet and FEMNIST. In each subfigure, we first demonstrate the backdoor attack success rate (ASR) and then the original task’s clean accuracy (C-Acc). Each column represents different FL and pFL methods. The solid line represents ASR, and the dashed line represents the C-Acc.

Black-box backdoor attacks achieve good attack performance. We first look at how black-box backdoor attacks perform on pFL methods. From Figure 2, we first observe that even without requiring access to the FL training process, simple black-box backdoor attacks especially BadNet and Blended attacks achieve outstanding performance. This shows that practical black-box backdoor attacks

are non-negligible threats. And, for all pFL methods, backdoor attacks do not affect C-Acc. As shown in each subfigure, different color dash lines almost overlap with the grey dash line (clean accuracy without attacks). It also reflects the stealthiness of black-box backdoor attacks that behave normally on samples without triggers. Then, among these four attack methods, Blended attack (the solid red line) achieves the best attack performance on CIFAR-10 dataset with over 90% ASR on two models. On FEMNIST, BadNet attack achieves the best attack performance, followed by Blended attack.

pFL methods with partial model-sharing effectively alleviate backdoor attacks. Next, we can clearly observe that pFL methods with partial model-sharing (last two columns), FedRep and FedBN, show outstanding robustness against backdoor attacks. FedRep shows the best defense performance against attacks and can limit the success rate of Blended attack and other attacks below 20% and 10%. FedBN achieves the second-best defense performance on CIFAR-10 dataset and reduces ASR of four attacks below 20% on the larger model, ResNet-18. These positive results demonstrate that **apart from improving prediction accuracy, some pFL methods (partial model-sharing) also bring better robustness against backdoor attacks.**

The degree of personalization is a key factor to robustness benefits. Across columns, we observe that pFL methods with partial model-sharing significantly improve defense performance, but all pFL methods with full model-sharing (from the 2nd to 5th column) do not show improvement in the robustness against backdoor attacks except for pFedMe method. These observations suggest a strong positive correlation between robustness against backdoor attacks and the larger personalization degree of pFL methods. In Section 5, we will deeply investigate why different model-sharing degrees lead to various defensive effects and show that pFedMe is also vulnerable to backdoor attacks like other full model-sharing methods.

Besides, comparing results of two different models on CIFAR-10 dataset, we could observe that backdoor attacks achieve better attack performance on high-capacity model (ResNet-18) than on the low-capacity model (ConvNet), which indicates that larger models may be more vulnerable to be injected with backdoor triggers in FL. The similar trend is also observed in [53, 54].

4.3 The Robustness Evaluation of Baseline Defense Methods

To further compare the robustness brought by pFL methods, we also conduct experiments to evaluate defense performance of some widely used defense strategies in FL. We adopt four defense methods: norm-clipping, adding noise, Krum, and Multi-Krum. The hyperparameters have been outlined in Section 4.1. In [53], these four defense methods, especially Krum and Multi-Krum, show robustness against edge-case attack. Here, we implement these defense methods following [53] and test them on the Blended attack which behaves better performance in the above studies. We still adopt the Non-IID setting and choose the FedAvg training method. The final epoch’s ASR and C-Acc are shown in Figure 3.

We first observe the defense performance of the simple norm clipping (NC) method. NC with $c = 1$ used in [53] couldn’t bring

²https://github.com/ksreenivasan/OOD_Federated_Learning




Figure 2: Comparison of backdoor attacks on different pFL methods. (a): Results on ResNet-18 and CIFAR-10; (b) Results on ConvNet and CIFAR-10; (c) Results on ConvNet and FEMNIST. In each figure, the value of horizontal or vertical axis is the number of training rounds or attack success rate, respectively. The solid line means ASR, and the dashed line means the C-Acc.

any robustness improvement against the Blended attack. We further reduce the norm constrain of NC on local update to 0.5. While reducing ASR of Blended attack, it also causes a significant drop on C-Acc. Like norm clipping, with increased strength of added noise σ , AD significantly reduces the ASR of Blended attack. However, it also leads to a significant drop of C-Acc. Similar to performance on the edge-case attack, Krum also improves the robustness against Blended attack. However, since only one model would be selected in every aggregation, the C-Acc also experiences a significant drop.

Rather than only selecting one model update as the result of aggregation, Multi-Krum selects top- k ($k = 7$) model updates and then averages updates in the aggregation. Although Multi-Krum achieves better C-Acc, it fails to defend against Blended attack. Although NC, AD, and Krum show different robustness improvements against Blended attack, **they all face a serious trade-off between robustness and clean accuracy.**




Figure 3: The evaluation of FedAvg with baseline defense methods against Blended attack on ResNet-18. Left: The ASR of Blended attack; Right: The C-Acc of FedAvg with defense strategies.




Figure 4: The results of Blended attack on FedBN on CIFAR-10 dataset under Non-IID and IID setting. Left: On ResNet-18; Right: On ConvNet.

5 ANALYSIS OF VARIOUS ROBUSTNESS FROM PFL AGAINST BACKDOOR ATTACKS

In Section 4.2, we observe that pFL methods with partial model-sharing, FedRep, and FedBN, gain much better robustness against backdoor attacks than full model-sharing methods. In following sections, we take detailed studies of pFL methods to analyze the reasons behind various robustness from them. We first look at FedBN and FedRep in Section 5.1 and then analyze full model-sharing methods in Section 5.2.

5.1 pFL Methods with Partial model-sharing

FedBN. In FedBN, as every client shares all parameters except local BN layers, data heterogeneity among clients leads to differences in local BN layers' parameters. We think differences in local BN layers across clients block backdoor feature propagation in local models. For simplicity, each local model could be denoted as a neural network $F_i^{(l)}$ with l layers, $F_i^{(l)} = f^{(l)} \circ \phi_i \circ f^{(l-1)} \circ \phi_i \circ \dots \circ f^{(1)}$, where i is the client index and l is total number of layers. ϕ_i are local BN layers and the remaining f are shared parameters θ^s . Even if backdoor features have been learned by θ^s , due to different ϕ_i from FedBN, neurons corresponding to backdoor features after the BN layers of other local models won't be activated by triggers. Therefore, FedBN could perform better robustness against backdoor attacks. To verify this, we conduct evaluations of Blended attack on FedBN under Non-IID and IID settings on CIFAR-10. According to our previous analysis, under IID setting, without data heterogeneity, local BN layers of clients become more consistent with each




Figure 5: The evaluation of each part of BN layers. Left: On ResNet-18; Right: On ConvNet.




Figure 6: The T-SNE visualization on feature space of global feature extractor of FedRep. Each color denotes each class, and the black points represent backdoored samples.

other, which should lead to better attack results under this setting. As shown in Figure 4, ASR of IID is higher than that of Non-IID. Especially on ResNet-18, FedBN does not show a defensive effect, which is consistent with our previous analysis.

To further analyze defense performance of local BN layers, we take attack evaluations on each part of BN layers, i.e., running statistics μ , σ^2 and learnable parameters γ , β . Unlike FedBN, we only choose not to share running statistics or learnable parameters. We denote them as *Fed-sta* or *Fed-para*. The comparison between Fed-sta, Fed-para, and the original FedBN on the Blended attack and CIFAR-10 dataset is shown in Fig 5. We can observe that in terms of C-Acc, Fed-sta and Fed-para experience a drop on ResNet-18 but the latter drops less. In ConvNet, Fed-para keeps the same C-Acc as FedBN. Surprisingly, we find that Fed-para achieves even better robustness than FedBN. In contrast, Fed-sta performs the worst defensive effect against Blended attack, and ASR even increases to 90% on ResNet-18. Those results demonstrate the differences in learnable parameters may be more important in preventing the propagation of backdoor features than the differences in running statistics of BN layers.

FedRep. FedRep decouples the local model into global feature extractor θ^s and local linear classifier θ_i^p and alternatively trains them on local datasets. And only feature extractor θ^s is updated and shared across clients. We would like to know which part of FedRep leads to or contributes most to improving robustness against backdoor attacks. We first study the global feature extractor θ^s to figure out whether it has learned backdoor triggers even under an




Figure 7: The results of Blended attack on Ditto with different λ on CIFAR-10 dataset. Left: ResNet-18; Right: ConvNet.

alternative training procedure. We conduct feature visualization on feature space of θ^s by using T-SNE [52]. Specifically, we randomly choose 4 benign clients with the adversarial client and visualize their training samples in feature space for both BadNet and Blended attacks. We take experiments on ResNet-18 and CIFAR-10. The results are shown in Figure 6, where black points are backdoored samples. We could observe that most backdoored samples gather together in a single cluster, which indicates that the global feature extractor has already learned backdoor features.

Therefore, FedRep’s outstanding robustness against backdoor attacks comes from the local linear classifier θ_i^p of each client. θ_i^p of benign clients are updated only based on their own clean dataset and never shared with other clients. Therefore, benign client’s linear classifiers θ_i^p do not learn the mapping from backdoor features to target label y_t . Inspired by this exciting finding, we further propose a simple defense method and will discuss it in Section 6.

5.2 pFL Methods with Full model-sharing

Ditto. Backdoor features could be inserted into θ_g during local training on the adversary client and then propagated to other clients by full model-sharing. In Ditto [31], clients use the global model θ_g as the reference to guide training of local model θ_i based on $\lambda\mathcal{H}(\theta_g, \theta_i)$. λ controls the similarity with θ_g and also the personalization degree of θ_i . The smaller λ means the θ_i ’s update is less dependent on θ_g . Since previous results indicate a strong positive correlation between robustness against backdoor attacks and the larger personalization degree, we investigate if the smaller λ (larger personalization degree) can block the transfer of backdoor features from θ_g to θ_i . We conduct experiments of Blended attack on CIFAR-10 dataset with $\lambda = 0.1$ and $\lambda = 0.01$ in Figure 7. We could observe that with smaller λ , ASR drops slightly on ResNet-18 and ConvNet. This verifies our thought. However, in terms of clean accuracy, the convergence of Ditto also significantly slows down. Therefore, Ditto also faces a trade-off between backdoor robustness and clean accuracy of the main task like mentioned defense methods.

pFedMe. Similar to Ditto, pFedMe [49] also trains local personalized model of each client with a penalty term $\lambda\mathcal{H}(\theta_g, \theta_i)$ but performs a better defense performance against backdoor attacks. The reason is that pFedMe only updates the global model at the end of each epoch of local training based on local model updates, which leads to fewer chances for backdoor triggers to insert into the global model by using pFedMe method. Compared with Ditto




Figure 8: The results of Blended attack on pFedMe with the different number of local training epochs on CIFAR-10. Left: on ResNet-18; Right: on ConvNet.




Figure 9: The results of Blended attack for FT with various epoch numbers on ConvNet and CIFAR-10.

which updates θ_g at each batch in local training, few updates of θ_g on the adversary client hinder the injection of backdoor signatures. Therefore, we test Blended attack performance on ResNet-18 and ConvNet on CIFAR-10 while increasing the number of local epochs from the original 3 to 6. The results are shown in Figure 8. We can observe that ASR increases by 15% along with increasing local epoch number. This demonstrates that pFedMe is also vulnerable to backdoor attacks like Ditto.

FedEM. In FedEM [38], each client trains multiple base models on local datasets, and all base models are later uploaded to aggregate in the server. Therefore, backdoor features could be learned by the base models from adversarial clients and are later propagated to other clients by full model-sharing.

Fine-tuning. Fine-tuning (FT) is also a widely used backdoor defense method in centralized setting [24, 34, 36, 54] which further updates trained model to forget backdoor triggers. However, we find it couldn’t improve the robustness under FL setting. Specifically, we set the epoch number of FT as 5, 10, 20, and 50 to observe if the robustness will increase with the increase of FT epochs. The results on ConvNet and CIFAR-10 are shown in Figure 9. Even if we use 50 epochs to conduct local Fine-tuning, ASR remains unchanged. The first potential reason is that there are no sufficient clean training examples for Fine-tuning to purify the backdoored global model. Training samples owned by each client are much less than training samples under centralized setting, which restricts the effect of Fine-tuning. Besides, it is also observed that FT couldn’t effectively reduce ASR of backdoor attacks with low poisoning rate [54]. Since there is only one adversarial client and 50% of training samples of the adversarial client are backdoor samples in

Table 1: The results on ResNet-18 and ConvNet models on CIFAR-10 dataset. We adopt trained models from FedAvg and Ditto methods. A lower ASR means better robustness. A higher ACC means better C-Acc. The best results are highlighted in bold.

Models	Methods	original		+ FT-linear		+ ST	
		ASR(↓)	Acc(↑)	ASR(↓)	Acc(↑)	ASR(↓)	Acc(↑)
Res18@FedAvg	BadNet	89.2	78.1	90.1	76.8	39.3	80.9
	Blended	97.5	78.1	97.4	76.7	47.2	81.1
Conv@FedAvg	BadNet	76.5	74.4	71.0	74.8	6.4	76.0
	Blended	76.7	74.5	77.1	74.7	13.8	76.1
Res18@Ditto	BadNet	85.1	76.5	86.2	74.5	38.9	80.8
	Blended	95.6	76.6	95.7	74.4	47.1	81.2
Conv@Ditto	BadNet	71.2	77.9	72.6	76.5	5.6	76.7
	Blended	76.8	77.8	77.1	76.6	17.4	76.8

our evaluations, the proportion of poisoned samples in all training samples is still very low with only 0.55% (275/50000).

6 IMPROVING BACKDOOR ROBUSTNESS WITH SIMPLE-TUNING

In previous sections, we observed that pFL methods with partial model-sharing could achieve better robustness against backdoor attacks. By conducting detailed studies on them in Section 5.1, we found that locally trained BN layers in FedBN or locally trained linear classifiers in FedRep plays the key roles in improving robustness. Therefore, it is natural to consider, whether can we provide some insight for designing better robust FL methods to further boost robustness based on our findings and analyses? In this section, we take an initial step by providing a simple but effective defense method.

Based on the idea of locally training a linear classifier of FedRep, we propose *Simple-Tuning* which only tunes the linear classifier of FL models of each client after the training process. Specifically, we first **reinitialize** the linear classifier and **retrain** it with the local training dataset of each client, while freezing the remaining parameters of each model. Compared with vanilla Fine-tuning, Simple-Tuning (ST) has made two improvements: (1) Compared with tuning the whole model in FT, we only tune the linear classifier after finishing the training process, which could efficiently reduce computation costs; (2) Rather than inheriting parameters of original models like FT, we choose to reinitialize and retrain local linear classifier on local datasets.

We test our method on trained models from FedAvg and Ditto and show defense performances against BadNet and Blended attacks. For Simple-Tuning, we adopt default Kaiming Uniform normalization [22] and use the constant learning rate as 0.005. We only tune the linear classifier for 10 epochs. The results containing ASR and C-Acc on ResNet-18 and ConvNet models are shown in Table 1. We compare the results of our method with the results of original FedAvg and Ditto models and models from only fine-tuning local linear classifiers without reinitialization. We denote the latter as FT-linear. As shown in Table 1, our method, Simple-Tuning, significantly improves robustness against backdoor attacks. Compared with original models, it efficiently reduces the ASR of two backdoor attacks by 56.6% on average. It achieves better robustness on smaller model ConvNet, reducing ASR below 20%. Surprisingly, Simple-Tuning even improves the C-Acc of FL methods except for

Ditto on ConvNet. These results demonstrate the great potential of Simple-Tuning. It is worth noting that FT-linear does not show any robustness like vanilla FT. It also verifies the importance of reinitialization in our method to backdoor robustness. This suggests that directly fine-tuning FL backdoor models may not efficiently remove backdoor triggers. It also contrasts with findings of [1] which utilizes FT methods to purify watermark, specific backdoor trigger, in DNN models. However, they demonstrated that all three methods - vanilla FT, FT-linear, and FT-linear with randomized linear classifier - can effectively purify watermark triggers. We believe this is mainly because triggers of the watermark are set differently from the general backdoor triggers. In [1], the authors set y_i of each watermarked sample to a randomly chosen label, rather than a fixed target label as in backdoor attacks.

By only tuning the linear classifier, Simple-Tuning is easier to be combined with existing FL methods. It is also more convenient to deploy in real-world scenarios with significantly reduced computation costs. However, Simple-Tuning still couldn't completely eliminate security risks from backdoor attacks. We hope it could inspire future work to propose better defense mechanisms, such as using more advanced optimizers and designing better FT methods.

7 CONCLUSION

This paper studies the robustness of popular personalized FL methods against backdoor attacks in FL. We conduct the first study of backdoor attacks in the pFL framework, testing 4 widely used backdoor attacks against 6 pFL methods on benchmark datasets FEMNIST and CIFAR-10, a total of 600 experiments. We show that pFL methods with partial model-sharing achieve outstanding robustness against backdoor attacks. Based on our in-depth ablation studies on various pFL methods, we find there is a strong positive correlation between robustness and a larger personalization degree. Inspired by our findings, we further propose a simple defense method that could effectively alleviate backdoor attacks with much fewer computational costs. We make two categories of conclusions:

Next steps for researchers. We have shown that FedRep and our Simple-Tuning achieve good defense performance. It is an interesting question if there is a new way to design stronger backdoor attacks that reduce the effectiveness of FedRep and bypass our Simple-Tuning. It could help us better foresee potential security risks. Another direction is to design a better defense method suitable for FL settings. We should consider both defense performance and requirements of real-world scenarios like limited computational resources.

Next steps for practitioners. The security threat, black-box backdoor attacks, we expose is immediately practical and lead to non-negligible risks. Therefore, this vulnerability will need to be considered during the deployment of FL models. Both improving prediction accuracy under Non-IID setting and boosting backdoor robustness, pFL methods with partial model-sharing may be better choices in real-world applications.

8 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Zeyu Qin was supported by Alibaba Group through Alibaba Research Intern Program.

REFERENCES

- [1] Yossi Adi, Carsten Baum, Moustapha Cisse, Benny Pinkas, and Joseph Keshet. 2018. Turning your weakness into a strength: Watermarking deep neural networks by backdoor. In *27th {USENIX} Security Symposium ({USENIX} Security 18)*. 1615–1631.
- [2] Manoj Ghuhane Arivazhagan, Vinay Aggarwal, Aaditya Kumar Singh, and Sunav Choudhary. 2019. Federated learning with personalization layers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.00818* (2019).
- [3] Eugene Bagdasaryan, Andreas Veit, Yiqing Hua, Deborah Estrin, and Vitaly Shmatikov. 2020. How to backdoor federated learning. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR, 2938–2948.
- [4] Mauro Barni, Kassem Kallas, and Benedetta Tondi. 2019. A new backdoor attack in cnns by training set corruption without label poisoning. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*. IEEE, 101–105.
- [5] Gilad Baruch, Moran Baruch, and Yoav Goldberg. 2019. A little is enough: Circumventing defenses for distributed learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 32 (2019).
- [6] Arjun Nitin Bhagoji, Supriyo Chakraborty, Prateek Mittal, and Seraphin Calo. 2019. Analyzing federated learning through an adversarial lens. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 634–643.
- [7] Peva Blanchard, El Mahdi El Mhamdi, Rachid Guerraoui, and Julien Stainer. 2017. Machine learning with adversaries: Byzantine tolerant gradient descent. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 30 (2017).
- [8] Sebastian Caldas, Sai Meher Karthik Duddu, Peter Wu, Tian Li, Jakub Konečný, H Brendan McMahan, Virginia Smith, and Ameet Talwalkar. 2018. Leaf: A benchmark for federated settings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.01097* (2018).
- [9] Daoyuan Chen, Dawei Gao, Weirui Kuang, Yaliang Li, and Bolin Ding. 2022. pFL-Bench: A Comprehensive Benchmark for Personalized Federated Learning. *Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS) Track on Datasets and Benchmarks* (2022).
- [10] Daoyuan Chen, Liuyi Yao, Dawei Gao, Bolin Ding, and Yaliang Li. 2023. Efficient Personalized Federated Learning via Sparse Model-Adaptation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- [11] Xinyun Chen, Chang Liu, Bo Li, Kimberly Lu, and Dawn Song. 2017. Targeted backdoor attacks on deep learning systems using data poisoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.05526* (2017).
- [12] Gregory Cohen, Saeed Afshar, Jonathan Tapson, and Andre Van Schaik. 2017. EMNIST: Extending MNIST to handwritten letters. In *2017 international joint conference on neural networks (IJCNN)*. IEEE, 2921–2926.
- [13] Liam Collins, Hamed Hassani, Aryan Mokhtari, and Sanjay Shakkottai. 2021. Exploiting shared representations for personalized federated learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2089–2099.
- [14] Min Du, Ruoxi Jia, and Dawn Song. 2020. Robust anomaly detection and backdoor attack detection via differential privacy. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [15] European Commission. 2016. Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation) (Text with EEA relevance). <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2016/679/oj>
- [16] Alireza Fallah, Aryan Mokhtari, and Asuman Ozdaglar. 2020. Personalized federated learning: A meta-learning approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.07948* (2020).
- [17] Minghong Fang, Xiaoyu Cao, Jinyuan Jia, and Neil Gong. 2020. Local model poisoning attacks to {Byzantine-Robust} federated learning. In *29th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 20)*. 1605–1622.
- [18] Micah Goldblum, Dimitris Tsipras, Chulin Xie, Xinyun Chen, Avi Schwarzschild, Dawn Song, Aleksander Madry, Bo Li, and Tom Goldstein. 2022. Dataset security for machine learning: Data poisoning, backdoor attacks, and defenses. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* (2022).
- [19] Tianyu Gu, Kang Liu, Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, and Siddharth Garg. 2019. Badnets: Evaluating backdoor attacks on deep neural networks. *IEEE Access* 7 (2019), 47230–47244.
- [20] Filip Hanzely, Boxin Zhao, and Mladen Kolar. 2021. Personalized federated learning: A unified framework and universal optimization techniques. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.09743* (2021).
- [21] Andrew Hard, Kanishka Rao, Rajiv Mathews, Swaroop Ramaswamy, Françoise Beaufays, Sean Augenstein, Hubert Eichner, Chloé Kiddon, and Daniel Ramage. 2018. Federated learning for mobile keyboard prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.03604* (2018).
- [22] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. 2015. Delving deep into rectifiers: Surpassing human-level performance on imagenet classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*. 1026–1034.
- [23] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. 2016. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 770–778.
- [24] Kunzhe Huang, Yiming Li, Baoyuan Wu, Zhan Qin, and Kui Ren. 2022. Backdoor Defense via Decoupling the Training Process. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [25] Yangsibo Huang, Samyak Gupta, Zhao Song, Kai Li, and Sanjeev Arora. 2021. Evaluating gradient inversion attacks and defenses in federated learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), 7232–7241.
- [26] 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.
- [27] Latif U Khan, Walid Saad, Zhu Han, Ekram Hossain, and Choong Seon Hong. 2021. Federated learning for internet of things: Recent advances, taxonomy, and open challenges. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials* 23, 3 (2021), 1759–1799.
- [28] Alex Krizhevsky et al. 2009. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. (2009).
- [29] Huseyin Kusetogullari, Amir Yavariabdi, Abbas Cheddad, Håkan Grahn, and Johan Hall. 2020. ARDIS: a Swedish historical handwritten digit dataset. *Neural Computing and Applications* 32, 21 (2020), 16505–16518.
- [30] Lisha Li, Kevin Jamieson, Giulia DeSalvo, Afshin Rostamizadeh, and Ameet Talwalkar. 2017. Hyperband: Bandit-Based Configuration Evaluation for Hyperparameter Optimization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=ry18Ww5ee>
- [31] Tian Li, Shengyuan Hu, Ahmad Beirami, and Virginia Smith. 2021. Ditto: Fair and robust federated learning through personalization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 6357–6368.
- [32] Xiaoxiao Li, Yufeng Gu, Nicha Dvornek, Lawrence H Staib, Pamela Ventola, and James S Duncan. 2020. Multi-site fMRI analysis using privacy-preserving federated learning and domain adaptation: ABIDE results. *Medical Image Analysis* 65 (2020), 101765.
- [33] Xiaoxiao Li, Meirui JIANG, Xiaofei Zhang, Michael Kamp, and Qi Dou. 2021. FedBN: Federated Learning on Non-IID Features via Local Batch Normalization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=6YEQU0QICG>
- [34] Yige Li, Xixiang Lyu, Nodens Koren, Lingjuan Lyu, Bo Li, and Xingjun Ma. 2021. Neural Attention Distillation: Erasing Backdoor Triggers from Deep Neural Networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [35] Paul Pu Liang, Terrance Liu, Liu Ziyin, Nicholas B Allen, Randy P Auerbach, David Brent, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Louis-Philippe Morency. 2020. Think locally, act globally: Federated learning with local and global representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.01523* (2020).
- [36] Kang Liu, Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, and Siddharth Garg. 2018. Fine-pruning: Defending against backdoor attacks on deep neural networks. In *International Symposium on Research in Attacks, Intrusions, and Defenses*. Springer, 273–294.
- [37] Lingjuan Lyu, Han Yu, Xingjun Ma, Lichao Sun, Jun Zhao, Qiang Yang, and Philip S Yu. 2020. Privacy and robustness in federated learning: Attacks and defenses. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.06337* (2020).
- [38] Othmane Marfoq, Giovanni Neglia, Aurélien Bellet, Laetitia Kameni, and Richard Vidal. 2021. Federated multi-task learning under a mixture of distributions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), 15434–15447.
- [39] Koji Matsuda, Yuya Sasaki, Chuan Xiao, and Makoto Onizuka. 2022. An Empirical Study of Personalized Federated Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.13190* (2022).
- [40] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Agüera y Arcas. 2017. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*. PMLR, 1273–1282.
- [41] Luca Melis, Congzheng Song, Emiliano De Cristofaro, and Vitaly Shmatikov. 2019. Exploiting unintended feature leakage in collaborative learning. In *2019 IEEE symposium on security and privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 691–706.
- [42] Milad Nasr, Reza Shokri, and Amir Houmansadr. 2019. Comprehensive privacy analysis of deep learning: Passive and active white-box inference attacks against centralized and federated learning. In *2019 IEEE symposium on security and privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 739–753.
- [43] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Soumith Chintala, Gregory Chanan, Edward Yang, Zachary DeVito, Zeming Lin, Alban Desmaison, Luca Antiga, and Adam Lerer. 2017. Automatic differentiation in pytorch. (2017).
- [44] Krishna Pillutla, Kshitiz Malik, Abdel-Rahman Mohamed, Mike Rabbat, Maziar Sanjabi, and Lin Xiao. 2022. Federated Learning with Partial Model Personalization. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 162)*, Kamalika Chaudhuri, Stefanie Jegelka, Le Song, Csaba Szepesvari, Gang Niu, and Sivan Sabato (Eds.). PMLR, 17716–17758.
- [45] Virat Shejwalkar and Amir Houmansadr. 2021. Manipulating the byzantine: Optimizing model poisoning attacks and defenses for federated learning. In *NDSS*.
- [46] Virat Shejwalkar, Amir Houmansadr, Peter Kairouz, and Daniel Ramage. 2022. Back to the drawing board: A critical evaluation of poisoning attacks on production federated learning. In *2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 1354–1371.
- [47] Virginia Smith, Chao-Kai Chiang, Maziar Sanjabi, and Ameet S Talwalkar. 2017. Federated multi-task learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*

- 30 (2017).
- [48] Ziteng Sun, Peter Kairouz, Ananda Theertha Suresh, and H Brendan McMahan. 2019. Can you really backdoor federated learning? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.07963* (2019).
 - [49] Canh T Dinh, Nguyen Tran, and Josh Nguyen. 2020. Personalized federated learning with moreau envelopes. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 21394–21405.
 - [50] Alysia Ziyang Tan, Han Yu, Lizhen Cui, and Qiang Yang. 2022. Towards personalized federated learning. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* (2022).
 - [51] Vale Tolpegin, Stacey Truex, Mehmet Emre Gursoy, and Ling Liu. 2020. Data poisoning attacks against federated learning systems. In *Computer Security–ESORICS 2020: 25th European Symposium on Research in Computer Security, ESORICS 2020, Guildford, UK, September 14–18, 2020, Proceedings, Part I* 25. Springer, 480–501.
 - [52] Laurens Van der Maaten and Geoffrey Hinton. 2008. Visualizing data using t-SNE. *Journal of machine learning research* 9, 11 (2008).
 - [53] Hongyi Wang, Kartik Sreenivasan, Shashank Rajput, Harit Vishwakarma, Saurabh Agarwal, Jy-yong Sohn, Kangwook Lee, and Dimitris Papailiopoulou. 2020. Attack of the tails: Yes, you really can backdoor federated learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 16070–16084.
 - [54] Baoyuan Wu, Hongrui Chen, Mingda Zhang, Zihao Zhu, Shaokui Wei, Danni Yuan, Chao Shen, and Hongyuan Zha. 2022. Backdoorbench: A comprehensive benchmark of backdoor learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.12654* (2022).
 - [55] Dongxian Wu and Yisen Wang. 2021. Adversarial neuron pruning purifies backdoored deep models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), 16913–16925.
 - [56] Shanshan Wu, Tian Li, Zachary Charles, Yu Xiao, Ziyu Liu, Zheng Xu, and Virginia Smith. 2022. Motley: Benchmarking heterogeneity and personalization in federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.09262* (2022).
 - [57] Chulin Xie, Keli Huang, Pin-Yu Chen, and Bo Li. 2020. DBA: Distributed Backdoor Attacks against Federated Learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=rkgyS0VFvr>
 - [58] Yuexiang Xie, Zhen Wang, Dawei Gao, Daoyuan Chen, Liuyi Yao, Weirui Kuang, Yaliang Li, Bolin Ding, and Jingren Zhou. 2023. FederatedScope: A Flexible Federated Learning Platform for Heterogeneity. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 16, 5 (2023), 1059–1072.
 - [59] Syed Zawad, Ahsan Ali, Pin-Yu Chen, Ali Anwar, Yi Zhou, Nathalie Baracaldo, Yuan Tian, and Feng Yan. 2021. Curse or redemption? how data heterogeneity affects the robustness of federated learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 35. 10807–10814.
 - [60] Lin Zhang, Li Shen, Liang Ding, Dacheng Tao, and Ling-Yu Duan. 2022. Fine-tuning global model via data-free knowledge distillation for non-iid federated learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 10174–10183.
 - [61] Zhengming Zhang, Ashwinee Panda, Linyue Song, Yaoqing Yang, Michael Mahoney, Prateek Mittal, Ramchandran Kannan, and Joseph Gonzalez. 2022. Neurotoxin: durable backdoors in federated learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 26429–26446.
 - [62] Runkai Zheng, Rongjun Tang, Jianze Li, and Li Liu. 2022. Data-free backdoor removal based on channel lipschitzness. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 175–191.
 - [63] Ligeng Zhu, Zhijian Liu, and Song Han. 2019. Deep leakage from gradients. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32 (2019).




Figure A10: The violin plot of number of samples per client for CIFAR-10 and FEMNIST datasets.

A1 DATASETS AND MODELS

Datasets. We conduct experiments on two widely used dataset, FEMNIST and CIFAR-10 in FL literature [8, 9, 39, 40, 53, 56]. These two datasets represent two different settings of Non-IID respectively, feature-skew and label skew [9, 37, 59].

- FEMNIST: The Federated Extended MNIST (FEMNIST) is a widely used FL dataset for 62-class handwritten character recognition [8]. The original FEMNIST dataset contains 3,550 clients and each client corresponds to a character writer from EMNIST[12]. We adopt the sub-sampled version in our evaluations, which contains 200 clients and totally 43,400 images with resolution of 28×28 pixels. The distribution of samples number per client is shown in Figure A10.
- CIFAR-10 is a 10-class image classification dataset containing 60,000 colored images with resolution of 32×32 pixels. We use Dirichlet allocation to split this dataset into 100 clients with $\alpha = 0.5$. The distribution of samples number per client is shown in Figure A10.

Models. Following the previous pFL works [9, 35, 38, 49], we utilize a simple ConvNet on FEMNIST and CIFAR10. This ConvNet model consists of two convolutional layers with the 5×5 kernel, max pooling, batch normalization, ReLU activation, and two dense linear layers. The hidden size of linear layer is 2,048 and 512 on FEMNIST and CIFAR10 respectively. To align with backdoor attacks works [48, 53, 54, 61], we also adopt the larger model, ResNet-18 on CIFAR-10 dataset.

A2 IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

Environment. We implement our evaluations ³ based on Pytorch [43] and FederatedScope framework [58]. And all experiments are conducted on a cluster of 8 NVIDIA GeForce GTX 2080 Ti GPUs.

A2.1 More Details of Attacks Hyper-parameters

Following attack hyperparameters provided in [54], for BadNet attack, we choose the 3×3 grid pattern and put it at downright corner of poisoned samples. For Blended attack, we choose the hello-kitty pattern and set the blending ratio α as 0.2. For SIG attack, we set the amplitude of sinusoidal signal as 20 ([0, 255]).

³<https://github.com/alibaba/FederatedScope/tree/backdoor-bench>

A2.2 Implementation Details of pFL methods

Following pFL-bench ⁴ [9], we also use hyper-parameter searching (HPO) algorithm, HyperBand [30], to find the best hyper-parameters for all the baselines on all datasets. We use the vanilla SGD optimizer and set the batch size of local datasets as 32 for all methods. Here, we provide adopted hyper-parameters for all baseline methods:

- FedAvg: we set learning rate as 0.1 and epoch number as 2 for each client on two datasets.
- Ditto: we set learning rate as 0.1 and λ as 0.1 for each client. The epoch number is 2 or 3 on CIFAR-10 or FEMNIST.
- FedEM: ResNet-18 and CIFAR-10: we set learning rate as 0.5 and epoch number as 1. ConvNet and CIFAR-10 or FEMNIST: we set learning rate as 0.05 and epoch number as 2. The number of base model for two datasets is 3.
- Fine-tuning: On CIFAR-10: we set learning rate of FT as 0.01 and epoch number of FT as 2. On FEMNIST: we set learning rate of FT as 0.01 and epoch number of FT as 3.
- pFedMe: On ResNet-18 and CIFAR-10: we set learning rate as 0.5 and epoch number as 3. We set local approximation steps K as 1, average moving parameter β as 1 and λ as 0.5; On ConvNet and CIFAR-10: we set learning rate as 0.1 and epoch number as 3. We set local approximation steps K as 2, average moving parameter β as 1, and λ as 0.5; On ConvNet and FEMNIST: learning rate is 0.1, epoch number is 2, local approximation steps K is 3, average moving parameter β is 1, λ is 0.8.
- FedBN: On ResNet-18 and CIFAR-10: we set learning rate as 0.5 and epoch number as 2; On ConvNet and CIFAR-10: we set learning rate as 0.1 and epoch number as 2; On ConvNet and FEMNIST: we set learning rate as 0.01 and epoch number as 2.
- FedRep: On CIFAR-10: we set learning rate of θ^s as 0.1, epoch number of θ^s as 1, learning rate of θ^p as 0.005, and epoch number of θ^p as 1; On FEMNIST: we set learning rate of θ^s as 0.1, epoch number of θ^s as 2, learning rate of θ^p as 0.1, and epoch number of θ^p as 1.

A3 DETAILED EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

A3.1 Experimental Results about IID Setting

In this section, we demonstrate attack results on pFL methods under IID setting in which we uniformly and randomly sample images from each class of CIFAR-10 for each client. The results are shown in Figure A11. We have similar observations as in the Non-IID scenario: ❶ Under IID setting, for all pFL methods, backdoor attacks do still not affect C-Acc. ❷ Under IID setting, Blended attack (the solid red line) also achieves the best ASR on all pFL methods and CIFAR-10 dataset. ❸ pFL methods with partial model-sharing also achieve better defense performance against backdoor attacks. Compared with attack results under Non-IID setting, attack results on FedBN under IID setting are higher. We have analysed reasons in Section 5.1. ❹ Under IID scenario, we still observe that backdoor attacks achieves better attack performance on high-capacity model (ResNet-18) than on low-capacity model (ConvNet).

⁴<https://github.com/alibaba/FederatedScope/tree/master/benchmark/pFL-Bench>




Figure A11: Comparison of backdoor attacks on different pFL methods. (a): Results on ResNet-18 and CIFAR-10; (b) Results on ConvNet and CIFAR-10. In the figures, the solid line means ASR, and the dashed line means the C-Acc.