

Fin-Fed-OD: Federated Outlier Detection on Financial Tabular Data

Dayananda Herurkar^{1,2}, Sebastian Palacio¹, Ahmed Anwar¹, Jörn Hees^{1,3}, and Andreas Dengel^{1,2}

¹German Research Center for Artificial Intelligence (DFKI), Kaiserslautern, Germany

²RPTU Kaiserslautern-Landau, Germany

³Bonn-Rhein-Sieg University of Applied Sciences, St. Augustin, Germany
email: `firstname.lastname@dfki.de`

Abstract

Anomaly detection in real-world scenarios poses challenges due to dynamic and often unknown anomaly distributions, requiring robust methods that operate under an open-world assumption. This challenge is exacerbated in practical settings, where models are employed by private organizations, precluding data sharing due to privacy and competitive concerns. Despite potential benefits, the sharing of anomaly information across organizations is restricted. This paper addresses the question of enhancing outlier detection within individual organizations without compromising data confidentiality. We propose a novel method leveraging representation learning and federated learning techniques to improve the detection of unknown anomalies. Specifically, our approach utilizes latent representations obtained from client-owned autoencoders to refine the decision boundary of inliers. Notably, only model parameters are shared between organizations, preserving data privacy. The efficacy of our proposed method is evaluated on two standard financial tabular datasets and an image dataset for anomaly detection in a distributed setting. The results demonstrate a strong improvement in the classification of unknown outliers during the inference phase for each organization's model.

1 Introduction

Modern industries, including finance, insurance, retail, and healthcare, grapple with an escalating incidence of fraudulent and illicit transactions. As a result, finding financial fraud has gathered more attention recently. In the United States alone, the year 2019 witnessed nearly 500,000 fraud-related complaints, resulting in a staggering total loss of 3.5 billion dollars—a 30% increase from the preceding year [Hilal *et al.*, 2022]. Outlier detection (OD) has been widely used and proved highly effective for fraud detection [Ahmed *et al.*, 2016]. It has been one of the most active research areas for decades, developing many OD algorithms for real-world use cases [Ozbayoglu *et al.*, 2020]. In particular, over the past decade, the advent of Deep Learning (DL) models




Figure 1: Standalone models trained using local data (Inliers: Blue) favor detecting only known outliers (Bank1:Red, Bank2:Green, Bank3:Grey) but are not robust against unknown outliers from other organizations. The aggregated model can adapt to distinct representations and adjust its boundaries to detect unknown outliers.

has introduced representation learning into OD, demonstrating promising outcomes [Arora and Risteski, 2017]. Specifically, the utilization of autoencoders (AE) for representation learning has proven effective in acquiring rich representations for downstream OD tasks.

Despite these advancements, adversaries continually evolve, exploiting modern technologies to circumvent sophisticated solutions. This dynamic landscape poses challenges for financial institutions in apprehending perpetrators engaged in illicit activities. In a non-distributed setup, standalone or local models trained on an organization's specific data become vulnerable to dynamic and unknown distributions of anomalies. As illustrated in Figure 1, standalone OD models struggle to recognize or differentiate anomalies from other organizations, leading to potential false negatives or misclassifications. Furthermore, locally trained models exhibit inherent biases. Therefore, to sustain the open-world classification problem, there is a pressing need to enhance the robustness of OD models to effectively address known and emerging outliers.

Addressing these challenges leverages collaboration

among multiple organizations to amalgamate their knowledge of various fraudulent cases within their datasets. However, privacy and confidentiality concerns present huge obstacles to such collaboration. Federated Learning (FL) [McMahan *et al.*, 2017] emerges as a viable solution, introducing a new distributed machine learning (ML) paradigm where multiple clients (organizations) collaboratively train an ML model. In FL, individual client data samples are not shared with other participating clients; instead, local model updates are transmitted to a centralized server for aggregation. The resultant aggregated (global) model, embodying collective knowledge, is then disseminated back to each participating client. The fundamental principle of the FL approach lies in sharing local model updates while safeguarding sensitive data.

In this study, we integrate FL with representation learning to devise a robust OD approach capable of handling both known and unknown outliers. Our methodology involves using AE as a client-local model, trained on local data and aggregated at the server to form a global model. The aggregated global model is subsequently returned to participating clients, replacing their local models. We extract latent space representations from trained AE models for all data samples, which are then fed into an OD model for outlier detection. This setup facilitates the convergence of distinct representations, priming local models to adapt and tighten the boundaries of their inlier distribution, thereby making them more robust to unknown outliers.

In summary, our primary contribution involves *the integration of representation learning and Federated Learning (FL), yielding a robust outlier detection approach called Fin-Fed-OD*. This synergistic combination demonstrates the effectiveness of representation learning in OD models, enhancing the detection of unknown outliers compared to standalone models and achieving a balance between generalization and personalization. As a result, our proposed approach not only exhibits the ability to distinguish outliers from inliers but also differentiates outliers originating from various clients. Furthermore, our extensive experimentation establishes the algorithm-agnostic nature of this approach, showcasing its adaptability across different OD algorithms.

The remainder of this work is structured as follows: Section 2 provides a review of relevant literature, highlighting gaps in the current state-of-the-art. In Section 3, we detail our approach to federated OD using representation learning. The experimental setup, model architecture, datasets used, and evaluation measures are described in Section 4, while Section 5 presents the results and comparisons. We conclude in Section 6, summarizing our main findings and identifying opportunities for future research.

2 Related Work

The persistent challenges posed by fraudulent transactions in industries such as finance have stimulated substantial research efforts [Cao, 2020], [Ahmed *et al.*, 2016], [Herurkar *et al.*, 2023a], [Nicholls *et al.*, 2021]. Research in this area spans diverse financial tasks, including insurance, retail, risk assessment, and credit [Ozbayoglu *et al.*, 2020]. This section provides a comprehensive survey of the existing litera-

ture, encompassing outlier detection (OD) techniques for financial tabular data and OD within a federated learning (FL) framework.

Outlier Detection in Financial Tabular Data: Outlier detection has been a focal point of research across various domains for decades, with an intensified focus in the financial domain [Hilal *et al.*, 2022]. Given the prevalence of tabular data in financial tasks, especially with the evolution of Deep Learning (DL), this domain has become a promising application area for recent methods [Borisov *et al.*, 2022]. Autoencoders (AE), in particular, have gained widespread usage for outlier detection in financial data [Chalapathy and Chawla, 2019]. Numerous techniques leveraging autoencoders have been developed, ranging from detecting anomalies in accounting data [Schreyer *et al.*, 2017] to explaining anomalies in financial tabular data [Sattarov *et al.*, 2022]. AE applications extend to transmuting anomalies between tabular data formats [Herurkar *et al.*, 2023b], learning behavioral fraud [Wedge *et al.*, 2017], and identifying anti-money laundering [Kazemi and Zarrabi, 2017]. Autoencoders also prove effective in detecting credit card fraud [Pumsirirat and Yan, 2018], [Kazemi and Zarrabi, 2017].

Representation Learning: Representation learning is a process of extracting features or learning abstract representations of input data to solve a particular task [Bengio *et al.*, 2013]. Such representation features contain valuable and quality information, which makes it easier to perform tasks such as classification or prediction [Arora and Risteski, 2017]. There are many techniques for representation learning used for financial tasks involving, for example, clustering analysis [Thirungsri and Vasarhelyi, 2011], business process mining [Jans *et al.*, 2011], transaction mining [Khan *et al.*, 2009], naive bayes classification [Bay *et al.*, 2006], and network analysis [McGlohon *et al.*, 2009]. Nowadays, there are novel representation learning methods based on DL models; the popular technique is autoencoders. By taking advantage of autoencoders’ data compression technique into lower dimension feature space called latent space, many approaches could show state-of-the-art performance for outlier detection tasks. [Gong *et al.*, 2019] showed limitations of autoencoders that generalize well for outlier samples, leading to bad OD performance. Hence, they proposed a memory-augmented autoencoder called MemAE, which updates the contents in latent space to get an improved outlier detection output. Similarly, [Battikh and Lenskiy, 2022] uses the unlabelled samples from different domains as negative samples and then shapes the latent layer to boost autoencoder performance in classifying the outliers. [Angiulli *et al.*, 2022] utilize the advantage of combined latent and reconstruction error space and show that outliers tend to lie in the sparsest regions, which helps to detect complex outliers. [Zong *et al.*, 2018] also explores a similar direction to show the benefits of the latent space representation in OD. Applied representation learning has also gained success in recent times, encompassing variational autoencoders [Angiulli *et al.*, 2022], adversarial autoencoders [Schreyer *et al.*, 2019], and latent space generation approaches [Oluwasanmi *et al.*, 2022].

Outlier Detection using Federated Learning: Federated Learning (FL), introduced by [McMahan *et al.*, 2017], em-




Figure 2: FL-OD Setup

powers distributed clients to train local models using their respective data, aggregating these models centrally under the coordination of a central server. This collaborative approach allows clients to learn a common model without sharing their private data [Konecný *et al.*, 2016]. FL has found applications in outlier detection and various tasks across domains. For instance, [Sater and Hamza, 2021] combined FL with outlier detection, employing an LSTM-based model to detect anomalies in IoT sensor data for smart buildings. Communication-efficient on-device FL approaches for anomaly detection in IoT time series data have been proposed by [Liu *et al.*, 2021], and [Weinger *et al.*, 2022] introduced an FL-based approach to enhance anomaly detection in IoT data. FL, however, faces challenges from malicious attacks, prompting studies that integrate FL with outlier detection to mitigate such effects [Li *et al.*, 2019], [Li *et al.*, 2020a]. Additionally, [Shejwalkar and Houmansadr, 2021] utilized an anomaly detection approach to counter Byzantine attacks, proposing a defense mechanism, while [Wan and Chen, 2021] presented a robust FL approach with attack-adaptive aggregation. Numerous approaches combining autoencoder-based outlier detection with FL have been proposed for intrusion detection [Preuveneers *et al.*, 2018], conditional variational autoencoders [Gu and Yang, 2021], fast deep autoencoders [Novoa-Paradela *et al.*, 2023], vanilla autoencoders [Wang *et al.*, 2022], and for attacks+defenses in FL [Lin *et al.*, 2019].

While existing literature emphasizes the popularity of autoencoder-based representation learning for outlier detection and various FL-based outlier detection approaches, few

studies have explored the application of representation learning with FL, particularly for financial tabular data. This study addresses this gap by demonstrating the advantages of representation learning in FL and showcasing how OD models, trained using this approach, exhibit robustness in detecting new and sophisticated outliers.

3 Approach

This section will first elaborate on the standalone (baseline) models for outlier detection. Then, we proceed to expand those models for the federated learning approach.

3.1 Standalone (Baseline) Model For Outlier Detection

We opt for the popular representation learning based approach for outlier detection and utilize autoencoder neural networks (AE) for this purpose [Gong *et al.*, 2019], [Angiulli *et al.*, 2022], [Schreyer *et al.*, 2019]. An AE network represented as $d(e(X))$ comprises two parts: encoder f_θ and decoder g_ψ . Given an input data 'X', the encoder performs data compression into a lower dimensional feature space (latent space), typically denoted as h , and then the decoder accomplishes the reconstruction, i.e., reconstructs h , back to the original data space. The complete network is trained in an end-to-end unsupervised fashion by minimizing the reconstruction loss (L), formally defined as follows:

$$\arg \min_{\theta, \psi} \|X - g_\psi(f_\theta(X))\| \quad (1)$$

Upon successful training of AE, the latent space representation of data $h = f_\theta(X)$ is extracted and then passed as input to a standard OD algorithm for detecting outliers. These latent representations (h) contain rich and valuable information that is beneficial for many downstream tasks and are often used for tasks like outlier detection and clustering approaches [Arora and Risteski, 2017].

3.2 Collaborative Federated Learning Environment (CoFLE)

To enhance the robustness of our OD model against unknown outliers from different clients while preserving the confidentiality of each client’s data, we extend the baseline models to a Federated Learning (FL) setup [McMahan *et al.*, 2017]. In this section, we provide a detailed description of our FL-based outlier detection approach. Our FL setup consists of K individual clients (e.g., corresponding to K different banks). Each client possesses its proprietary dataset represented by D_i , where $i \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, containing different types of outlier samples. Additionally, each client has its own AE model represented as w_i trained on its local dataset D_i . In real-world scenarios, datasets D_i are private and only accessible to the respective client. The implementation of FL setup begins with the utilization of a central server in conjunction with a certain number of clients. At first, the server initializes its global model w_0 and randomly selects C , a subset of the K available clients. To initialize the FL, the server broadcasts its global model to selected C clients. At each communication round r out of a maximum of R rounds, each selected client conducts the local training of their model (w_i) using their private dataset D_i . After successful training, each client sends their model parameters to the server. Finally, the server aggregates all the received updates and replaces the global model with the updated parameters: $AE_{CoFLE} = \psi(w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4)$, where $\psi(\cdot)$ is an aggregation function. This process repeats until the final communication round R is reached. Our FL approach is explained in Algorithm 1, and Figure 2 shows the setup. Latent representation from each client model is extracted and fed to the client’s OD model to detect outliers like in Section 3.1.

4 Experimental Setup

In this section, we explain the details of our experimental setup and datasets used for training. We describe the different noise injection methods applied to create different types of outliers on tabular datasets and the procedure to create multiple image datasets with natural outliers. The PyTorch v1 [Paszke *et al.*, 2019] framework was used to train and evaluate the autoencoder neural network models.

4.1 Tabular Dataset + Synthetic Outliers

We employed two standard financial tabular datasets for outlier detection to evaluate our approach. Both the tabular datasets have mixed-type (numerical + categorical) attributes. As a part of data pre-processing, all the categorical features are one-hot encoded, and numerical features are standardized (mean=0 and std=1). The description of each dataset is given below:

- **Credit Default**¹ [Dua and Graff, 2017]: This dataset contains information on bill payment of credit card clients of Taiwan from April to September 2005. It also has more information, such as payment history, demographic factors of clients, and their default payments.
- **Adult**²: The dataset is taken from the UCI repository [Dua and Graff, 2017]. It consists of individuals’ income records and personal information like education, marital status, etc. A person with an income exceeding \$50k per year is labeled an outlier.

Algorithm 1 FL-OD Setup. The K clients are indexed by k , D is the local datasets indexed by i , E is the number of local epochs, B denotes the local batch size, $C \in (0, 1]$ denotes a fraction, and ν is the learning rate

Split data D_i into D_i^{train} and $D_i^{test} \forall i \in \{1, \dots, K\}$

FL Setup:

Server Process:

Initialize w_0 .

for each round $r = 1, 2, 3, \dots, R$ **do**

$m \leftarrow \max(C \cdot K, 1)$

$S_t \leftarrow$ random set of m clients

for each client $k \in S_t$ **in parallel do**

$w_{t+1}^k \leftarrow \text{ClientUpdate}(k, w_t)$

end for

$w_{t+1} \leftarrow \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{n_k}{n} w_{t+1}^k$

end for

ClientUpdate(k, w):

$B \leftarrow$ split local train data into batches of size B

for each local epoch i from 1 to E **do**

for batch $b \in B$ **do**

$w \leftarrow w - \nu \Delta(w; b)$

end for

end for

return w to the server

Outlier Detection Process:

Once FL setup training is complete

for each client $k \in K$ **do**

Extract Latent representation of D_k^{train} as

$Repr_k^{train}$

$Repr_k^{train} = AE_k(D_k^{train})$

$ODModel_k \leftarrow \text{train}(Repr_k^{train})$

$Output_k \leftarrow ODMModel_k(Repr_i^{test}) \forall i \in \{1, \dots, K\}$

end for

Synthetic Outlier Generation: To evaluate the model’s robustness against known and unknown outliers, we created specific synthetic outliers for each client dataset. As publicly available datasets labeled with different types of outliers are

¹Publicly available via: <https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/default+of+credit+card+clients>

²Publicly available via <https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/adult>

scarce, we adopted standard practices of corrupting clean data to generate artificial outliers [Sattarov *et al.*, 2022], [Krishnan *et al.*, 2016], [Redyuk *et al.*, 2019]. Four client datasets were created from each tabular dataset by picking only clean data, with a substantial proportion of each dataset being dissimilar. We select 3% of inliers from each created dataset at random and convert them into outliers by corrupting randomly selected attribute (column) values. We applied four artificial corruption techniques to generate four types of outliers (two for categorical and two for numerical features): one specific for each client dataset.

Numerical Features: In each sample selected for corruption, 25% of numerical features are selected uniformly at random. On each selected feature, noise δ is added to turn the clean sample into an outlier such as $\hat{x}_n^d = x_n^d + \delta$ where n is a sample index, and d represents a feature or a column. δ is either randomly sampled from Gaussian, Laplace, or Log-Normal distributions with $\mu = 0$ and $\sigma = \sigma_d \gamma$ or by adding random high values to imitate real-world outliers (ex: mismatch currency). Selection of γ follows uniform distribution $\gamma = \text{Unif}(3, 5)$ and σ_d is the standard deviation of the original attribute.

Categorical Features: We follow a similar strategy where 25% of categorical features are selected uniformly at random for corruption, and two methods are used. In the first one, we replace the original value with a new categorical value created by manipulation. In the second one, the original value is replaced by a least frequently occurring categorical value of the selected attribute.

4.2 Image Dataset + Natural Outliers

We benchmarked our approach on detecting real outliers using a standard MNIST dataset [LeCun and Cortes, 2005]. To turn MNIST into a dataset for outlier detection, we employed the below procedure: We chose all images with digit-0 as inliers and created four client datasets out of it [Ruff *et al.*, 2018]. The majority of each client dataset contains different digit-0 images, and only a minor part of the dataset contains the same samples between clients. To make the problem more challenging for our approach, we analyzed the classification result for MNIST dataset and chose those digits as outliers most commonly misclassified as digit-0. So, we chose digits 3,4,6,8 as outlier samples and added one of the digits into each client dataset as an outlier. Only 3% of samples in each dataset are outliers.

4.3 Model Parameters

For all our experiments, we used AE neural network with symmetrical encoder f_θ and decoder g_ψ architecture. For both Credit Default and Adult Data, we use one hidden layer of size 128, and the latent space size is 64, whereas for MNIST (we replicated the parameters from [Hojjati and Armanfard, 2023]), one hidden layer of size 1024 and the latent space size is 256. For both the tabular datasets, we apply Leaky-ReLU non-linear activations with scaling factor $\alpha = 0.4$ and Tanh activations for MNIST dataset. For optimizing the model parameters, we used the Adam optimizer [Kingma and Ba, 2014] with $\beta_1 = 0.9$, $\beta_2 = 0.999$ and optimized

the AE based on the loss function in Equation 1, which is expanded per sample as below:

$$\mathcal{L}(x; \hat{x}) = \sum_{d \in D_{\text{cat}}} \mathcal{L}^{\text{BCE}}(x^d; \hat{x}^d) + \sum_{d \in D_{\text{num}}} \mathcal{L}^{\text{MSE}}(x^d; \hat{x}^d), \quad (2)$$

where x represents the original sample, $\hat{x}$ denotes the reconstructed sample, and d represents the attribute. Two tabular datasets with a mixed-type nature of data, we define the reconstruction loss of every instance as the sum of two losses. For each one-hot encoded representation of the categorical attribute, the (1) binary cross entropy loss ($\mathcal{L}^{\text{BCE}}$) is calculated, and (2) the mean-squared loss ($\mathcal{L}^{\text{MSE}}$) used for the numerical attributes. However, for MNIST, the loss value consists of only mean-squared error ($\mathcal{L}^{\text{MSE}}$). Our FL setup comprised four clients and was trained for communication rounds (R) equal to 100, 200, and 100 for the Credit Default, Adult Data, and MNIST datasets, respectively. Two aggregation methods ($\psi(\cdot)$) for client model updates were applied: Federated Averaging (FedAvg) [McMahan *et al.*, 2017] and FedProx FedProx [Li *et al.*, 2020b]. Each client’s AE model underwent local training for 500, 500, and 300 epochs for the three datasets, respectively. Upon completion of AE model training, the latent representation (h) for dataset samples from each client was extracted and subsequently employed as input for classification algorithms aimed at detecting outliers. Two variations of the model were assessed for OD purposes, namely Random Forest and Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP). Additionally, the effectiveness of our approach was evaluated by replacing AE by alternative deep anomaly detection methods, such as DAGMM [Zong *et al.*, 2018] and MemAE [Gong *et al.*, 2019].

4.4 Evaluation Metric

To quantitatively measure the outlier detection performance of fine-tuned models we used average precision score. It is formally defined as

$$\text{AP} = \sum_{i=1}^N (R_i - R_{i-1}) P_i \quad (3)$$

where $R_i = TP/(TP + FN)$ denotes the detection recall and $P_i = TP/(TP + FP)$ denotes the detection precision of the i -th anomaly score threshold.

5 Results

This section presents the outcomes of our experiments, offering insights into the effectiveness of our approach through both quantitative and qualitative evaluations. The robustness of our method against diverse outlier types is also highlighted.

5.1 Quantitative Evaluation

In this section, we will gather multiple research questions and try to find the answers with our approach. We evaluated the FL setup by comparing the capabilities of OD models using FL [Section 3.2] to baseline OD models (OD models without FL setup) [Section 3.1]. Figure 3 shows the comparison of clientwise average precision score obtained for OD models

across three datasets explained in Section 4.1 and Section 4.2. Table 1 shows the same results but average output across all clients. We used two OD algorithms, namely Random Forest and MLP. Both algorithms’ results are shown separately in Table 1.

“RQ1: Does the integration of representation learning enhance the performance of OD models in identifying unknown outliers?”

When we compare the results of OD models in detecting unknown outliers without and with representation learning, i.e., between ‘RF’ and ‘baseline_RF’ in both Table 1 and Figure 3, the latter performs better than the first one. ‘RF’ is a random forest model trained using original datasets. In ‘baseline RF’, we train the AE using original datasets and then extract the latent space representation (h) of AE and finally, a random forest is trained using h , i.e., baseline models as discussed in Section 3.1. The findings demonstrate a notable improvement in the detection of unknown outliers when representation learning is integrated into OD models.




Figure 3: Results of OD models clientwise. FL-OD models (Fed_Avg+RF, Fed_Prox+RF) outperform the baseline (Baseline_RF) in detecting unknown outliers. Every score reflects the mean and standard deviation from five experiments.

“RQ2: Will the combination of FL and representation learn-

ing benefit OD models in detecting unknown outliers?”

We compared the result between OD models using FL setup and baseline, i.e., ‘Fed_Avg+RF’, ‘Fed_Prox+RF’, (explained in Section 3.2) and ‘baseline_RF’ (explained in Section 3.1). We tested our approach for two standard FL algorithms, ‘Fed_Avg’ and ‘Fed_Prox’. In Table 1, we can see that both ‘Fed_Avg+RF’ and ‘Fed_Prox+RF’ outperformed ‘baseline_RF’ in detecting unknown outliers. Similar results can be seen in Figure 3 that even by comparing results at a client level, the FL models outperformed baseline OD models. Another notable result is that training OD models in FL setup also improves the result of detecting known outliers. So, combining information from other clients has a positive impact on detecting both known and unknown outliers. We clarify these results; we also ran experiments by replacing RF with MLP (Multi Layer Perceptron) as an OD model. We obtained similar results where FL based MLP models ‘Fed_Avg+MLP’ and ‘Fed_Prox+MLP’ outperformed ‘baseline_MLP’ in detecting unknown outliers but without decreasing its performance on known outliers. To test the robustness of our approach, we replaced the AE with alternative OD models, specifically, DAGMM and MemAE. The repeated experiments, detailed in Table 1, demonstrate that our proposed approach consistently enhances the performance of detecting both known and unknown outliers in DAGMM and MemAE models. The above thorough analysis answers our RQ2 that “FL-OD models are robust against detecting unknown outliers”. To bolster these findings, we conducted experiments with alternative evaluation metrics such as ‘F1-score,’ ‘PR-AUC,’ and ‘ROC-AUC,’ yielding consistent outcomes, and results from alternative metrics can be found in the appendix.

5.2 Qualitative Evaluation

To elucidate the superior performance of FL-OD models over the baseline, we examine the latent space representations of AE with and without FL setup. As depicted in Figure 4, the latent representations for all three datasets are extracted and subjected to Principal Component Analysis (PCA) for visualization. Comparison of plots for baseline and FL setup reveals that FL models exhibit superior outlier isolation by consolidating them into distinct clusters, as opposed to the sparse representation offered by baseline models. The compact grouping of samples by FL models facilitates easy classification of both known and unknown outliers.

An essential insight from Figure 4 is that FL models can generate distinct clusters for outliers from different clients. This capability enables the classification of outliers into various types or the assignment of outliers to specific clients. Moreover, the visualization indicates that FL models strike a balance between generalization and personalization, a feature lacking in baseline models. Generalization, represented by maintaining more samples within the same class clusters, and personalization, facilitating the identification of client-specific outliers, are achieved more effectively by FL models. In summary, the qualitative evaluation underscores the efficacy of FL models in creating meaningful and well-separated clusters in the latent space, providing a solid foundation for improved outlier detection.

Data	Model	Known Outliers	Unknown Outliers
Credit Default	RF	0.971 ± 0.005	0.222 ± 0.005
	Baseline_RF	0.864 ± 0.007	0.425 ± 0.010
	Fed_Avg+RF	0.921 ± 0.013	0.679 ± 0.026
	Fed_Prox+RF	0.923 ± 0.015	0.685 ± 0.012
	MLP	0.953 ± 0.006	0.240 ± 0.013
	Baseline_MLP	0.941 ± 0.004	0.197 ± 0.020
	Fed_Avg+MLP	0.941 ± 0.013	0.369 ± 0.050
	Fed_Prox+MLP	0.933 ± 0.007	0.375 ± 0.014
	DAGMM	0.483 ± 0.017	0.365 ± 0.018
	DAGMM+Ours	0.505 ± 0.025	0.368 ± 0.013
	MemAE	0.560 ± 0.011	0.361 ± 0.010
	MemAE+Ours	0.609 ± 0.024	0.583 ± 0.015
Adult Data	RF	0.797 ± 0.012	0.155 ± 0.012
	Baseline_RF	0.692 ± 0.030	0.285 ± 0.025
	Fed_Avg+RF	0.747 ± 0.023	0.477 ± 0.018
	Fed_Prox+RF	0.747 ± 0.029	0.474 ± 0.022
	MLP	0.762 ± 0.024	0.219 ± 0.021
	Baseline_MLP	0.745 ± 0.029	0.153 ± 0.012
	Fed_Avg+MLP	0.754 ± 0.020	0.376 ± 0.022
	Fed_Prox+MLP	0.752 ± 0.022	0.381 ± 0.036
	DAGMM	0.391 ± 0.056	0.230 ± 0.056
	DAGMM+Ours	0.396 ± 0.051	0.234 ± 0.020
	MemAE	0.413 ± 0.016	0.291 ± 0.010
	MemAE+Ours	0.686 ± 0.041	0.498 ± 0.023
MNIST	RF	0.950 ± 0.010	0.687 ± 0.010
	Baseline_RF	0.812 ± 0.083	0.539 ± 0.080
	Fed_Avg+RF	0.889 ± 0.010	0.679 ± 0.065
	Fed_Prox+RF	0.932 ± 0.021	0.721 ± 0.032
	MLP	0.932 ± 0.005	0.609 ± 0.012
	Baseline_MLP	0.874 ± 0.114	0.523 ± 0.116
	Fed_Avg+MLP	0.912 ± 0.018	0.571 ± 0.087
	Fed_Prox+MLP	0.931 ± 0.019	0.621 ± 0.063
	DAGMM	0.665 ± 0.040	0.355 ± 0.041
	DAGMM+Ours	0.676 ± 0.043	0.416 ± 0.113
	MemAE	0.979 ± 0.006	0.630 ± 0.035
	MemAE+Ours	0.972 ± 0.006	0.736 ± 0.009

Table 1: Average Precision Score of baseline and FL-OD Models. OD Models using FL setup outperform others in detecting unknown outliers and don't lose performance on detecting known outliers as well. Every score reflects the mean and standard deviation from five experiments.




Figure 4: Latent Space Visualization of Baseline, Fed_Avg, and Fed_Prox models

6 Conclusion and Future Work

In this study, we introduced a novel approach to discern outliers in mixed-type tabular data originating from diverse clients. To enhance the efficacy of our methodology, we integrated two key techniques: representation learning for outlier detection (OD) and federated learning (FL) for merging insights from different clients. Our assessment was conducted on two financial tabular datasets featuring synthetic outliers and an image dataset with real outliers. The experimental findings present evidence supporting the notion that our approach facilitates collaborative learning among clients without the need for direct data sharing. Consequently, it yields a robust OD model proficient in identifying unknown outliers more effectively than standalone models. Notably, our extended experiments affirm the method's versatility, showcasing its compatibility with various OD algorithms. The qualitative evaluation offered insights into how representation learning augments the effectiveness of OD models within the FL framework. Our developed OD models exhibit a nuanced equilibrium between generalization and personalization capabilities.

Looking ahead, we envision further analysis of this framework to empower financial institutions in detecting unknown outliers and gaining insights into diverse outlier types without compromising proprietary data security. Subsequent investigations could delve into the exploration of latent layers, fostering the development of latent layer-based FL models for enhanced outlier detection. Additionally, assessing the impact of fairness within the FL context could provide valuable insights for refining and optimizing the proposed framework.

References

- [Ahmed *et al.*, 2016] Mohiuddin Ahmed, Abdun Naser Mahmood, and Md. Rafiqul Islam. A survey of anomaly detection techniques in financial domain. *Future Gener. Comput. Syst.*, 55(C):278–288, feb 2016.
- [Angiulli *et al.*, 2022] Fabrizio Angiulli, Fabio Fassetto, and Luca Ferragina. Latent out: an unsupervised deep anomaly detection approach exploiting latent space distribution. *Machine Learning*, 112, 05 2022.
- [Arora and Risteski, 2017] Sanjeev Arora and Andrej Risteski. Provable benefits of representation learning, 2017.
- [Battikh and Lenskiy, 2022] Muhammad S. Battikh and Artem A. Lenskiy. Latent-insensitive autoencoders for anomaly detection. *Mathematics*, 10(1), 2022.
- [Bay *et al.*, 2006] Stephen Bay, Krishna Kumaraswamy, Markus G. Anderle, Rohit Kumar, and David M. Steier. Large scale detection of irregularities in accounting data. In *Sixth International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM'06)*, pages 75–86, 2006.
- [Bengio *et al.*, 2013] Yoshua Bengio, Aaron Courville, and Pascal Vincent. Representation learning: A review and new perspectives. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, 35(8):1798–1828, aug 2013.
- [Borisov *et al.*, 2022] Vadim Borisov, Tobias Leemann, Kathrin Sessler, Johannes Haug, Martin Pawelczyk, and Gjergji Kasneci. Deep neural networks and tabular data: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, page 1–21, 2022.
- [Cao, 2020] Longbing Cao. Ai in finance: A review. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 01 2020.
- [Chalapathy and Chawla, 2019] Raghavendra Chalapathy and Sanjay Chawla. Deep learning for anomaly detection: A survey, 2019.
- [Dua and Graff, 2017] Dheeru Dua and Casey Graff. UCI machine learning repository, 2017.
- [Gong *et al.*, 2019] Dong Gong, Lingqiao Liu, Le Vuong, Budhaditya Saha, Moussa Mansour, Svetha Venkatesh, and Anton Hengel. Memorizing normality to detect anomaly: Memory-augmented deep autoencoder for unsupervised anomaly detection. pages 1705–1714, 10 2019.
- [Gu and Yang, 2021] Zhipin Gu and Yuexiang Yang. Detecting malicious model updates from federated learning on conditional variational autoencoder. In *2021 IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium (IPDPS)*, pages 671–680, 2021.
- [Herurkar *et al.*, 2023a] Dayananda Herurkar, Mario Meier, and Jörn Hees. Recol: Reconstruction error columns for outlier detection. In *KI 2023: Advances in Artificial Intelligence: 46th German Conference on AI, Berlin, Germany, September 26–29, 2023, Proceedings*, page 60–74, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2023. Springer-Verlag.
- [Herurkar *et al.*, 2023b] Dayananda Herurkar, Timur Sattarov, Jörn Hees, Sebastian Palacio, Federico Raue, and Andreas Dengel. Cross-domain transformation for outlier detection on tabular datasets. In *International Joint Conference on Neural Networks, IJCNN 2023, Gold Coast, Australia, June 18-23, 2023*, pages 1–8. IEEE, 2023.
- [Hilal *et al.*, 2022] Waleed Hilal, S. Andrew Gadsden, and John Yawney. Financial fraud: A review of anomaly detection techniques and recent advances. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 193:116429, 2022.
- [Hojjati and Armanfard, 2023] Hadi Hojjati and Narges Armanfard. Dasvdd: Deep autoencoding support vector data descriptor for anomaly detection. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, PP:1–12, 01 2023.
- [Jans *et al.*, 2011] Mieke Jans, Jan Martijn van der Werf, Nadine Lybaert, and Koen Vanhoof. A business process mining application for internal transaction fraud mitigation. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 38(10):13351–13359, 2011.
- [Kazemi and Zarrabi, 2017] Zahra Kazemi and Houman Zarrabi. Using deep networks for fraud detection in the credit card transactions. In *2017 IEEE 4th International Conference on Knowledge-Based Engineering and Innovation (KBEI)*, pages 0630–0633, 2017.
- [Khan *et al.*, 2009] Roheena Q. Khan, Malcolm Corney, Andrew J. Clark, and George M. Mohay. A role mining inspired approach to representing user behaviour in erp systems. 2009.
- [Kingma and Ba, 2014] Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization, 2014. cite arxiv:1412.6980Comment: Published as a conference paper at the 3rd International Conference for Learning Representations, San Diego, 2015.
- [Konecný *et al.*, 2016] Jakub Konecný, H. B. McMahan, Daniel Ramage, and Peter Richtárik. Federated optimization: Distributed machine learning for on-device intelligence. *ArXiv*, abs/1610.02527, 2016.
- [Krishnan *et al.*, 2016] Sanjay Krishnan, Jiannan Wang, Eugene Wu, Michael J. Franklin, and Ken Goldberg. Active-clean: Interactive data cleaning for statistical modeling. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 9(12):948–959, aug 2016.
- [LeCun and Cortes, 2005] Yann LeCun and Corinna Cortes. The mnist database of handwritten digits. 2005.
- [Li *et al.*, 2019] Suyi Li, Yong Cheng, Yang Liu, Wei Wang, and Tianjian Chen. Abnormal client behavior detection in federated learning, 2019.
- [Li *et al.*, 2020a] Suyi Li, Yong Cheng, Wei Wang, Yang Liu, and Tianjian Chen. Learning to detect malicious clients for robust federated learning, 2020.
- [Li *et al.*, 2020b] Tian Li, Anit Kumar Sahu, Manzil Zaheer, Maziar Sanjabi, Ameet Talwalkar, and Virginia Smith. Federated optimization in heterogeneous networks, 2020.
- [Lin *et al.*, 2019] Jierui Lin, Min Du, and Jian Liu. Free-riders in federated learning: Attacks and defenses, 2019.
- [Liu *et al.*, 2021] Yi Liu, Sahil Garg, Jiangtian Nie, Yang Zhang, Zehui Xiong, Jiawen Kang, and M. Shamim Hossein. Deep anomaly detection for time-series data in in-

- dustrial iot: A communication-efficient on-device federated learning approach. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 8(8):6348–6358, 2021.
- [McGlohon *et al.*, 2009] Mary McGlohon, Stephen Bay, Markus Anderle, David Steier, and Christos Faloutsos. Snare: A link analytic system for graph labeling and risk detection. pages 1265–1274, 06 2009.
- [McMahan *et al.*, 2017] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Agüera y Arcas. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In Aarti Singh and Xiaojin (Jerry) Zhu, editors, *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, AISTATS 2017, 20-22 April 2017, Fort Lauderdale, FL, USA*, volume 54 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1273–1282. PMLR, 2017.
- [Nicholls *et al.*, 2021] Jack Nicholls, Aditya Kuppa, and Nhien-An Le-Khac. Financial cybercrime: A comprehensive survey of deep learning approaches to tackle the evolving financial crime landscape. *IEEE Access*, 9:163965–163986, 2021.
- [Novoa-Paradela *et al.*, 2023] David Novoa-Paradela, Oscar Fontenla-Romero, and Bertha Guijarro-Berdiñas. Fast deep autoencoder for federated learning. *Pattern Recognition*, 143:109805, 2023.
- [Oluwasanmi *et al.*, 2022] Ariyo Oluwasanmi, Muhammad Umar Aftab, Edward Baagyere, Zhiguang Qin, Muhammad Ahmad, and Manuel Mazzara. Attention autoencoder for generative latent representational learning in anomaly detection. *Sensors*, 22(1), 2022.
- [Ozbayoglu *et al.*, 2020] Ahmet Murat Ozbayoglu, Mehmet Ugur Gudelek, and Omer Berat Sezer. Deep learning for financial applications : A survey. *Applied Soft Computing*, 93:106384, 2020.
- [Paszke *et al.*, 2019] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Kopf, Edward Yang, Zachary DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. In H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d’ Alché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32*, pages 8024–8035. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019.
- [Preuveneers *et al.*, 2018] Davy Preuveneers, Vera Rimmer, Ilias Tsingenopoulos, Jan Spooren, Wouter Joosen, and Elisabeth Ilie-Zudor. Chained anomaly detection models for federated learning: An intrusion detection case study. *Applied Sciences*, 8:2663, 12 2018.
- [Pumsirirat and Yan, 2018] Apapan Pumsirirat and Liu Yan. Credit card fraud detection using deep learning based on auto-encoder and restricted boltzmann machine. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications*, 9(1), 2018.
- [Redyuk *et al.*, 2019] Sergey Redyuk, Sebastian Schelter, Tammo Rukat, Volker Markl, and Felix Biessmann. Learning to validate the predictions of black box machine learning models on unseen data. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Human-In-the-Loop Data Analytics, HILDA’19*, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [Ruff *et al.*, 2018] Lukas Ruff, Robert Vandermeulen, Nico Goernitz, Lucas Deecke, Shoaib Ahmed Siddiqui, Alexander Binder, Emmanuel Müller, and Marius Kloft. Deep one-class classification. In Jennifer Dy and Andreas Krause, editors, *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 4393–4402. PMLR, 10–15 Jul 2018.
- [Sater and Hamza, 2021] Raed Abdel Sater and A. Ben Hamza. A federated learning approach to anomaly detection in smart buildings. *ACM Trans. Internet Things*, 2(4), aug 2021.
- [Sattarov *et al.*, 2022] Timur Sattarov, Dayananda Herurkar, and Jörn Hees. Explaining anomalies using denoising autoencoders for financial tabular data. *CoRR*, abs/2209.10658, 2022.
- [Schreyer *et al.*, 2017] Marco Schreyer, Timur Sattarov, Damian Borth, Andreas Dengel, and Bernd Reimer. Detection of anomalies in large scale accounting data using deep autoencoder networks, 2017.
- [Schreyer *et al.*, 2019] Marco Schreyer, Timur Sattarov, Christian Schulze, Bernd Reimer, and Damian Borth. Detection of accounting anomalies in the latent space using adversarial autoencoder neural networks, 2019.
- [Shejwalkar and Houmansadr, 2021] Virat Shejwalkar and Amir Houmansadr. Manipulating the byzantine: Optimizing model poisoning attacks and defenses for federated learning. 01 2021.
- [Thiprungsri and Vasarhelyi, 2011] Sutapat Thiprungsri and Miklos A. Vasarhelyi. Cluster analysis for anomaly detection in accounting data: An audit approach 1. *The International Journal of Digital Accounting Research*, 11:69–84, 2011.
- [Wan and Chen, 2021] Ching Pui Wan and Qifeng Chen. Robust federated learning with attack-adaptive aggregation, 2021.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2022] Xu Wang, Yuanzhu Chen, and Octavia A. Dobre. Federated learning for anomaly detection: A case of real-world energy storage deployment. In *ICC 2022 - IEEE International Conference on Communications*, pages 4312–4317, 2022.
- [Wedge *et al.*, 2017] Roy Wedge, James Max Kanter, Santiago Moral Rubio, Sergio Iglesias Perez, and Kalyan Veeramachaneni. Solving the “false positives” problem in fraud prediction, 2017.
- [Weinger *et al.*, 2022] Brett Weinger, Jinoh Kim, Alex Sim, Makiya Nakashima, Nour Moustafa, and K. John Wu.

Enhancing iot anomaly detection performance for federated learning. *Digital Communications and Networks*, 8(3):314–323, 2022.

[Zong *et al.*, 2018] Bo Zong, Qi Song, Martin Renqiang Min, Wei Cheng, Cristian Lumezanu, Dae ki Cho, and Haifeng Chen. Deep autoencoding gaussian mixture model for unsupervised anomaly detection. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.

Appendix

7 Quatitative Evaluation Result

In pursuit of a comprehensive quantitative evaluation, we systematically assessed our methodology using various metrics, including 'F1-Score,' 'PR-AUC,' and 'ROC-AUC'. The results, summarized in Table 2, align with the findings presented in the main paper (Section 5.1). Our approach consistently exhibits superior performance in identifying unknown outliers, while concurrently sustaining its proficiency in detecting known outliers. This consistent trend persists when benchmarked against DAGMM and MemAE as baseline models, reaffirming our method's superior efficacy in both known and unknown outlier detection scenarios.

Dataset	Model	F1-Score		PR-AUC		ROC-AUC	
		Known Outliers	Unknown Outliers	Known Outliers	Unknown Outliers	Known Outliers	Unknown Outliers
Credit Default	RF	0.946 $\pm$ 0.004	0.022 $\pm$ 0.004	0.973 $\pm$ 0.005	0.238 $\pm$ 0.005	0.994 $\pm$ 0.001	0.748 $\pm$ 0.001
	Baseline_RF	0.641 $\pm$ 0.025	0.114 $\pm$ 0.009	0.868 $\pm$ 0.008	0.431 $\pm$ 0.011	0.975 $\pm$ 0.005	0.818 $\pm$ 0.008
	Fed_Avg+RF	0.848 $\pm$ 0.013	0.389 $\pm$ 0.035	0.926 $\pm$ 0.012	0.688 $\pm$ 0.028	0.989 $\pm$ 0.003	0.920 $\pm$ 0.007
	Fed_Prox+RF	0.844 $\pm$ 0.019	0.406 $\pm$ 0.032	0.927 $\pm$ 0.016	0.694 $\pm$ 0.014	0.988 $\pm$ 0.003	0.923 $\pm$ 0.004
	MLP	0.939 $\pm$ 0.008	0.130 $\pm$ 0.012	0.953 $\pm$ 0.006	0.239 $\pm$ 0.013	0.990 $\pm$ 0.003	0.655 $\pm$ 0.014
	Baseline_MLP	0.920 $\pm$ 0.011	0.148 $\pm$ 0.016	0.941 $\pm$ 0.005	0.197 $\pm$ 0.020	0.984 $\pm$ 0.002	0.558 $\pm$ 0.020
	Fed_Avg+MLP	0.922 $\pm$ 0.013	0.360 $\pm$ 0.048	0.940 $\pm$ 0.014	0.369 $\pm$ 0.051	0.984 $\pm$ 0.005	0.598 $\pm$ 0.041
	Fed_Prox+MLP	0.915 $\pm$ 0.008	0.368 $\pm$ 0.024	0.933 $\pm$ 0.008	0.375 $\pm$ 0.015	0.982 $\pm$ 0.003	0.604 $\pm$ 0.019
	DAGMM	0.361 $\pm$ 0.010	0.117 $\pm$ 0.010	0.489 $\pm$ 0.018	0.372 $\pm$ 0.018	0.882 $\pm$ 0.012	0.778 $\pm$ 0.012
	DAGMM+Ours	0.369 $\pm$ 0.013	0.107 $\pm$ 0.018	0.513 $\pm$ 0.025	0.373 $\pm$ 0.012	0.892 $\pm$ 0.009	0.778 $\pm$ 0.007
	MemAE	0.389 $\pm$ 0.016	0.054 $\pm$ 0.016	0.567 $\pm$ 0.012	0.369 $\pm$ 0.012	0.914 $\pm$ 0.003	0.834 $\pm$ 0.003
	MemAE+Ours	0.411 $\pm$ 0.016	0.224 $\pm$ 0.013	0.589 $\pm$ 0.024	0.597 $\pm$ 0.011	0.927 $\pm$ 0.008	0.893 $\pm$ 0.002
Adult Data	RF	0.790 $\pm$ 0.028	0.070 $\pm$ 0.027	0.802 $\pm$ 0.012	0.171 $\pm$ 0.010	0.928 $\pm$ 0.007	0.678 $\pm$ 0.005
	Baseline_RF	0.596 $\pm$ 0.017	0.119 $\pm$ 0.031	0.696 $\pm$ 0.031	0.295 $\pm$ 0.025	0.901 $\pm$ 0.005	0.809 $\pm$ 0.009
	Fed_Avg+RF	0.711 $\pm$ 0.037	0.309 $\pm$ 0.037	0.751 $\pm$ 0.022	0.483 $\pm$ 0.014	0.915 $\pm$ 0.005	0.841 $\pm$ 0.007
	Fed_Prox+RF	0.702 $\pm$ 0.039	0.339 $\pm$ 0.042	0.751 $\pm$ 0.028	0.482 $\pm$ 0.021	0.913 $\pm$ 0.004	0.842 $\pm$ 0.005
	MLP	0.776 $\pm$ 0.032	0.140 $\pm$ 0.019	0.763 $\pm$ 0.025	0.218 $\pm$ 0.021	0.893 $\pm$ 0.007	0.634 $\pm$ 0.039
	Baseline_MLP	0.754 $\pm$ 0.038	0.119 $\pm$ 0.005	0.745 $\pm$ 0.030	0.154 $\pm$ 0.013	0.888 $\pm$ 0.010	0.570 $\pm$ 0.031
	Fed_Avg+MLP	0.764 $\pm$ 0.030	0.364 $\pm$ 0.036	0.754 $\pm$ 0.020	0.375 $\pm$ 0.022	0.897 $\pm$ 0.003	0.668 $\pm$ 0.022
	Fed_Prox+MLP	0.758 $\pm$ 0.036	0.368 $\pm$ 0.037	0.752 $\pm$ 0.022	0.380 $\pm$ 0.037	0.901 $\pm$ 0.006	0.680 $\pm$ 0.034
	DAGMM	0.271 $\pm$ 0.063	0.110 $\pm$ 0.054	0.400 $\pm$ 0.057	0.234 $\pm$ 0.042	0.828 $\pm$ 0.020	0.740 $\pm$ 0.015
	DAGMM+Ours	0.268 $\pm$ 0.054	0.110 $\pm$ 0.030	0.404 $\pm$ 0.052	0.238 $\pm$ 0.019	0.834 $\pm$ 0.007	0.740 $\pm$ 0.016
	MemAE	0.281 $\pm$ 0.036	0.132 $\pm$ 0.026	0.421 $\pm$ 0.015	0.295 $\pm$ 0.017	0.860 $\pm$ 0.004	0.796 $\pm$ 0.003
	MemAE+Ours	0.594 $\pm$ 0.072	0.279 $\pm$ 0.023	0.692 $\pm$ 0.052	0.498 $\pm$ 0.034	0.901 $\pm$ 0.008	0.860 $\pm$ 0.001
MNIST	RF	0.838 $\pm$ 0.039	0.323 $\pm$ 0.032	0.962 $\pm$ 0.008	0.743 $\pm$ 0.005	0.994 $\pm$ 0.004	0.930 $\pm$ 0.003
	Baseline_RF	0.502 $\pm$ 0.090	0.144 $\pm$ 0.023	0.817 $\pm$ 0.070	0.534 $\pm$ 0.083	0.966 $\pm$ 0.047	0.919 $\pm$ 0.043
	Fed_Avg+RF	0.660 $\pm$ 0.067	0.224 $\pm$ 0.108	0.890 $\pm$ 0.010	0.677 $\pm$ 0.066	0.994 $\pm$ 0.004	0.975 $\pm$ 0.009
	Fed_Prox+RF	0.703 $\pm$ 0.057	0.326 $\pm$ 0.083	0.898 $\pm$ 0.019	0.718 $\pm$ 0.031	0.994 $\pm$ 0.005	0.976 $\pm$ 0.004
	MLP	0.948 $\pm$ 0.009	0.424 $\pm$ 0.026	0.981 $\pm$ 0.006	0.656 $\pm$ 0.014	0.999 $\pm$ 0.001	0.944 $\pm$ 0.008
	Baseline_MLP	0.782 $\pm$ 0.179	0.381 $\pm$ 0.104	0.873 $\pm$ 0.116	0.516 $\pm$ 0.116	0.974 $\pm$ 0.032	0.890 $\pm$ 0.042
	Fed_Avg+MLP	0.822 $\pm$ 0.049	0.399 $\pm$ 0.104	0.910 $\pm$ 0.019	0.562 $\pm$ 0.088	0.992 $\pm$ 0.004	0.932 $\pm$ 0.028
	Fed_Prox+MLP	0.879 $\pm$ 0.021	0.482 $\pm$ 0.059	0.929 $\pm$ 0.019	0.614 $\pm$ 0.066	0.996 $\pm$ 0.004	0.933 $\pm$ 0.025
	DAGMM	0.377 $\pm$ 0.102	0.091 $\pm$ 0.100	0.669 $\pm$ 0.039	0.354 $\pm$ 0.035	0.957 $\pm$ 0.002	0.868 $\pm$ 0.002
	DAGMM+Ours	0.480 $\pm$ 0.094	0.200 $\pm$ 0.101	0.673 $\pm$ 0.044	0.415 $\pm$ 0.113	0.955 $\pm$ 0.009	0.887 $\pm$ 0.029
	MemAE	0.846 $\pm$ 0.013	0.211 $\pm$ 0.011	0.955 $\pm$ 0.007	0.574 $\pm$ 0.007	0.997 $\pm$ 0.003	0.930 $\pm$ 0.001
	MemAE+Ours	0.697 $\pm$ 0.067	0.178 $\pm$ 0.056	0.924 $\pm$ 0.006	0.699 $\pm$ 0.040	0.994 $\pm$ 0.002	0.982 $\pm$ 0.003

Table 2: Different evaluation metrics score for baseline and FL-OD Models. Our approach outperform others in detecting both unknown and known outliers. Every score reflects the mean and standard deviation from five experiments.

8 Quantitative Evaluation Clientwise Result

The figures below (Figure 5, Figure 6, Figure 7, Figure 8) depict a detailed clientwise comparison of results between the baseline and our proposed methodology, specifically focusing on both known and unknown outlier detection and utilizing a range of evaluation metrics. Two distinct outlier detection (OD) algorithms, 'Random Forest (RF)' and 'Multi Layer Perceptron (MLP),' were employed for this comprehensive analysis. Remarkably, across various scenarios, our federated learning-based approach—encompassing Fed_Avg+RF, Fed_Prox+RF, Fed_Avg+MLP, and Fed_Prox+MLP—consistently demonstrated superior performance in detecting unknown outliers when compared to alternative methods.

8.1 OD_Model: Random Forest (RF)




Figure 5: Results of OD models clientwise. FL-OD models (Fed_Avg+RF, Fed_Prox+RF) outperform the baseline (Baseline_RF) in detecting unknown outliers. Every score reflects the mean and standard deviation from five experiments.




Figure 6: Results of OD models clientwise. FL-OD models (Fed_Avg+RF, Fed_Prox+RF) outperform the baseline (Baseline_RF) in detecting unknown outliers. Every score reflects the mean and standard deviation from five experiments.

8.2 OD_Model: Multi Layer Perceptron (MLP)




Figure 7: Results of OD models clientwise. FL-OD models (Fed.Avg+MLP, Fed.Prox+MLP) outperform the baseline (Baseline_MLP) in detecting unknown outliers. Every score reflects the mean and standard deviation from five experiments.




Figure 8: Results of OD models clientwise. FL-OD models (Fed_Avg+MLP, Fed_Prox+MLP) outperform the baseline (Baseline_MLP) in detecting unknown outliers. Every score reflects the mean and standard deviation from five experiments.

9 Model Description

9.1 Deep Auto Encoding Gaussian Mixture Model (DAGMM) [Zong *et al.*, 2018]

:

DAGMM					
Dataset	Batch	Epoch	n_GMM	Learning Rate	Weight Decay
Credit Default	1024	500	4	0.0001	0.0001
Adult Data	1024	500	4	0.0001	0.0001
MNIST	128	1000	2	0.0001	0.0001

Table 3: DAGMM Hyperparameters

9.2 Memory-augmented Deep Autoencoder (MemAE) [Gong *et al.*, 2019]

:

MemAE					
Dataset	Batch	Epoch	Memory Dimension	Learning Rate	Weight Decay
Credit Default	1024	500	100	0.0001	0.0001
Adult Data	1024	500	100	0.0001	0.0001
MNIST	1024	1000	50	0.0001	0.0001

Table 4: MemAE Hyperparameters