Adiba Orzikulova* KAIST Republic of Korea adiorz@kaist.ac.kr

Jaemin Shin KAIST Republic of Korea jaemin.shin@kaist.ac.kr

ABSTRACT

Many mobile sensing applications utilize data from various modalities, including motion and physiological sensors in mobile and wearable devices. Federated Learning (FL) is particularly suitable for these applications thanks to its privacypreserving feature. However, challenges such as limited battery life, poor network conditions, and sensor malfunctions can restrict the use of all available modalities for local model training. Additionally, existing multimodal FL systems also struggle with scalability and efficiency as the number of modality sources increases. To address these issues, we introduce FLISM, a framework designed to enable multimodal FL with incomplete modalities. FLISM leverages simulation technique to learn robust representations that can handle missing modalities and transfers model knowledge across clients with varying set of modalities. The evaluation results using three real-world datasets and simulations demonstrate FLISM's effective balance between model performance and system efficiency. It shows an average improvement of .067 in F1score, while also reducing communication (2.69× faster) and computational (2.28× more efficient) overheads compared to existing methods addressing incomplete modalities. Moreover, in simulated scenarios involving tasks with a larger

*Equal Contribution

[†]Corresponding Author

ACM Conference, Fall 2024,

ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06...\$15.00

Jaehyun Kwak^{*} KAIST Republic of Korea jaehyun98@kaist.ac.kr

Sung-Ju Lee[†] KAIST Republic of Korea profsj@kaist.ac.kr

number of modalities, *FLISM* achieves a significant speedup of $3.23 \times 85.10 \times$ in communication and $3.73 \times 32.29 \times$ in computational efficiency.

CCS CONCEPTS

• Computing methodologies \rightarrow Machine learning; • Human-centered computing \rightarrow Ubiquitous and mobile computing.

KEYWORDS

Multimodal Federated Learning Systems, Incomplete Sensing Modalities, Scalability and Efficiency in Multimodal Systems

ACM Reference Format:

1 INTRODUCTION

Real-world sensing applications often employ multimodal systems that integrate various sensors to enhance the application performance and functionality [41]. For instance, autonomous vehicles combine LiDAR, radar, and cameras to detect objects accurately [26, 27], while mobile health devices use physiological and motion sensors to monitor activities, emotions [37] and stress levels [45]. Similarly, dietary monitoring tools analyze data from wearables to identify eating episodes [5, 32]. However, the transmission of raw data for these applications raises privacy concerns. Federated Learning (FL), a privacy-centric machine learning approach, addresses these issues by allowing local model training without sending raw data to a central server.

Multimodal sensing applications face another challenge: they often assume that all modalities are consistently available and functional [7, 9, 16]. Yet, real-world obstacles such as device malfunctions [49], poor network conditions [12],

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

^{© 2024} Association for Computing Machinery.

https://doi.org/XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

or privacy concerns [23] frequently result in missing modalities. Traditional centralized machine learning approaches tackle these challenges with statistical methods [57] and imputation using deep learning [62, 64]. However, the privacypreserving nature of FL restricts the direct exchange of raw data between clients and a server, thus limiting the application of these methods in an FL context.

The FL community is adapting to handle challenges in multimodal FL, including those involving incomplete modalities. Recent strategies primarily employ *late fusion*, where the server aggregates model weights for each modality separately [11, 36, 65]. These works often focus on tasks with limited input modalities, typically two like LiDAR and radar [65] or three such as audio, depth, and radar [36]. However, many multimodal sensing applications require integrating more than three modalities. The late fusion method, which trains separate unimodal models for each modality, leads to scalability challenges in communication and computation, increasing overhead as the number of modality sources grows.

To overcome scalability and efficiency challenges in multimodal sensing with incomplete modalities, we introduce FLISM, an FL framework that adopts an early fusion-based approach. In contrast to late fusion, early fusion allows clients to train a single unified model, significantly enhancing training efficiency, especially for multimodal data with 1D modality sources. The key idea of FLISM is that within a multimodal FL system, certain clients possess modalities that are more crucial and beneficial to application performance. These clients can simulate a wider range of modality combinations with missing modalities, facilitating the transfer of robust representations to clients with limited capabilities. FLISM consists of three components: missing-modality-robust learning, client role assignment, and cross-client-knowledge transfer. Initially, all multimodal clients simulate a range of missing modality scenarios, training the model to be robust under various missing-modality conditions. Clients are then assigned either as *facilitators*, who guide and support others through simulation generation, or learners, who primarily gain from this support. Finally, cross-client knowledge transfer aids the transfer of simulated knowledge to learners, enhancing robustness against missing modalities.

We implemented *FLISM* and evaluated its performance using three real-world publicly available multimodal sensing datasets. We also conducted experiments with simulated data to assess the scalability of *FLISM* compared with existing late fusion baselines tackling incomplete modalities in multimodal FL system. Our results indicate that:

• *FLISM* outperforms late fusion methods, achieving an average increase of .067 in F1-score, along with the reductions in both communication and computational overhead: on average, 2.69× faster and 2.28× more efficient, respectively.

Adiba Orzikulova, Jaehyun Kwak, Jaemin Shin, and Sung-Ju Lee



Figure 1: The model performance decreases as the ratio of clients with incomplete modalities increases in RealWorld-HAR (left) and WESAD (right) datasets.

- In simulated scenarios involving tasks with a larger number of modalities, *FLISM* significantly reduces communication costs by a factor of 3.23×~85.10× and computation costs by a factor of 3.73×~32.29×.
- We performed a detailed component-wise analysis to validate the effectiveness of each element within *FLISM*, demonstrating their essential contributions to enhancing model performance.

2 MOTIVATION

We present preliminary results that illustrate the impact of incomplete modalities in sensing-based applications in FL settings. Our analysis reveals that current approaches become inefficient and scale poorly as the number of modalities increases in multimodal FL sensing applications.

2.1 Performance Degradation

Most multimodal sensing applications presume the consistent availability and functionality of all modality sources [7, 9, 16]. Yet, in practical scenarios, various factors such as device malfunctions [49], suboptimal network conditions [12], or user privacy concerns [23] often result in the unavailability of certain modalities.

The standard method of imputing missing modalities using raw data statistics [50, 63] is not feasible in FL environments as the server is unable to access clients' raw data. Consequently, zero-imputation becomes the only available option [50] but it causes performance degradation. To evaluate the performance with zero-imputation in the absence of modalities, we conducted experiments on two representative mobile sensing datasets, RealWorld HAR [48] and WE-SAD [45], each featuring ten modalities, such as accelerometer, gyrosocope, temperature, electrocardiogram, electrodermal activity. (See §4.1 for detailed dataset description). We simulated conditions where p% of clients possess incomplete modality data. Specifically, we allowed p% of clients (with $40 \le p \le 80$) to randomly omit up to M - 1 modalities from their training data, where M represents the total number of available modalities (details in §3.1). Figure 1 shows the average F1-score of a classification task in a respective dataset



Figure 2: An example of early fusion (left) and late fusion (right) methods in multimodal learning, demonstrated with three modalities.

(activity recognition in RealWorld-HAR and stress detection in WESAD) as the number of clients with incomplete modalities increases. The results reveal a consistent degradation in model performance across both datasets, highlighting the detrimental impact of missing modalities on model performance.

Motivation #1: As the number of clients with incomplete modalities increases, the performance of multimodal sensing FL systems progressively deteriorates.

2.2 Scalability and Efficiency Challenges

2.2.1 Demand for Scalable FL Systems for Mobile Sensing Applications. In mobile sensing applications, leveraging various input modalities, from physiological sensors for emotional assessment [19] to wearable devices for dietary monitoring [5, 32], enhances app performance [41]. Additionally, there has been a recent expansion in both the variety of personal devices (such as smartwatches, bands, rings, and glasses) [3, 28] individuals own and in the spectrum of sensors (encompassing motion sensors, and physiological sensors such as photoplethysmography (PPG) and electrodermal activity (EDA) sensors) [45] that are incorporated into these devices. This highlights the need for a scalable, multimodal FL system that can support multimodal sensing applications with tens of modalities. Yet, existing systems struggle to scale efficiently with an increase in the number of modality sources.

We demonstrate that existing methods addressing missing modalities in FL such as *late fusion-based schemes* [36, 44, 54] and *imputation with generative models* [64, 65], show limited scalability and inefficiency in resources and computation.

2.2.2 Late Fusion-based Schemes. Most existing work [36, 44, 54] tackle the missing modality problem in FL using *late fusion*. The distinction between *early fusion* and *late fusion* in multimodal deep learning is depicted in Figure 2. In contrast to *early fusion*, where all sensing modalities are combined at the input stage to train a unified feature extractor and classifier, *late fusion* separately trains a unimodal feature extractor for each modality. This approach leads to significant scalability and efficiency challenges as the number of

ACM Conference, Fall 2024,



Figure 3: An increase in the number of MACs (left) and number of model parameters (right) with the growing number of modality sources for late fusion-based multi-modal training scheme.



Figure 4: The number of additional generative networks to train (left) and corresponding MACs (right) for cross-modal imputation.

modalities in a multimodal task increases. To better assess the differences in efficiency and scalability, we compared the MACs (Multiply-Accumulate operations) and the number of trainable parameters between early and late fusion mechanisms. We specifically focused on MACs and number of model parameters because these metrics are pivotal in evaluating a model's resource consumption – including CPU, GPU, and memory usage - which directly influences its practical deployment. Figure 3 shows the results. We used CNN + RNN-based network, a widely adopted architecture in multimodal sensing applications [10, 25, 33].¹ We computed the MACs and trainable parameters for a two-second window with a sampling rate of 500Hz, utilizing the thop library [2] compatible with PyTorch [38]. This analysis demonstrates that early fusion methods exhibit only a marginal increase in MACs and number of trainable model parameters, which is nearly imperceptible compared to the linear escalation seen in late fusion approaches. This trend suggests that late fusion is less scalable, particularly for multimodal sensing tasks that involve numerous modality sources.

2.2.3 Imputation with Generative Models. Recent multimodal FL studies explored modality imputation using generative models such as autoencoders [6] to address missing modalities [64, 65]. These works often assume that networks capable of cross-modality transfer have been pre-trained with complete modality data prior to the primary task training.

¹We also conducted experiments with CNN-based [21, 56, 61] networks and observed similar trend.

Adiba Orzikulova, Jaehyun Kwak, Jaemin Shin, and Sung-Ju Lee

For example, with three modalities A, B, and C, there should exist networks already trained to generate A from B and C, B from A and C, and so forth. However, this assumption is often unrealistic in FL settings as the central server cannot access clients' raw complete modality data. Consequently, these cross-modal transfer networks must be trained locally on each client. This requirement introduces additional training burdens, particularly for clients possessing more available modalities.

To evaluate the additional training burden for generative networks in cross-modal knowledge transfer, Figure 4 shows the required number of networks to train (left) and the associated MACs (right). For instance, with two modalities A and B, a client must train two models: A to B and B to A. With three modalities, six combinations emerge (AB, AC, BA, BC, CA, CB). Since the permutations for *n* modalities is $n \cdot (n-1)$, the complexity of the additional generative network training increases quadratically. Considering the prevalent use of CNN-based blocks followed by transpose-CNN blocks [65], we calculated the number of MACs associated with these networks. As the number of modalities - and consequently, additional generative networks - increases quadratically, so do the associated MACs. This trend underscores the critical need for scalable approaches in supporting multimodal FL applications efficiently.

Motivation #2: Current solutions struggle with scalability and efficiency when dealing with a modality number exceeding two or three, the typical range used in existing research.

3 SYSTEM DESIGN

3.1 Problem Statement

Consider *N* as the total number of clients engaged in the multimodal FL task with *M* input modalities, where $M \ge 2$. In real-world applications, it is common for clients to be unable to use all modalities due to various factors, such as device malfunctions, network conditions, or privacy concerns (See §2.1 for details). To simulate this practical scenario, we let percentage p% (40 $\le p \le 80$) of clients randomly drop up to M - 1 modalities in their training data.² For brevity, throughout the paper, we use *incomplete modality ratio* to refer to *p*, unless stated otherwise. Consequently, the range of available modalities of a client c_k ($1 \le k \le N$) varies from 1 to M ($1 \le m_k \le M$). Furthermore, each client c_k possesses a multimodal dataset D_k , where $D_k = \{x_i, y_i\}_{i=1}^{|D_k|}$, x_k represents a multimodal data with m_k modalities, and y_i is the label corresponding to x_i .

²Based on our experiments, we observed a significant degradation in accuracy occurs when $p \ge 40\%$.

3.2 FLISM Framework

We present the overview of our system, *FLISM*, a multimodal FL framework that facilitates learning with incomplete modality data while significantly enhancing computational and communication efficiency. Figure 5 illustrates the overall design of *FLISM*. *FLISM* achieves a balance between statistical utility (accuracy) and system efficiency (communication and computation) through three key system components: *missing-modality-robust learning* (§3.2.1), *client role assignment* (§3.2.2), and *cross-client knowledge transfer* (§3.2.3). We first delve into the intuition and rationale behind each component, followed by how these components interact as FL training proceeds (§3.2.4).

3.2.1 Missing-Modality-Robust Learning. In multimodal applications, clients possess a diverse set of modalities, varying in type and quantity. Performing local training with zero-imputation for missing modalities leads to discrepancies in learned representations across clients [18], degrading model performance as demonstrated in §2.1. A naïve solution of training multiple unimodal models for each available modality drastically increases both communication and computational costs. Therefore, an ideal multimodal FL system should learn effective representations with incomplete modalities, while maintaining accuracy and minimizing system cost.

We design missing-modality-robust learning to achieve this goal, leveraging supervised contrastive learning [17]. Supervised contrastive learning was designed to improve the accuracy of supervised tasks by adding a self-supervision loss to the conventional classification loss. In image classification, an example of a self-supervision task could be applying various data augmentation methods (e.g., random flip, rotation, resize) on the same image and training a model to pull the embeddings of the various views of the same image to a similar space. In our case, where we aim to train a model that is robust against missing modalities, adopting random modality drop as a data augmentation technique becomes a natural choice. This strategy enables training a model that can map a diverse set of modalities to a similar embedding space for identical labels. By creating and training on these simulated data, we aim to enhance the model's robustness to missing modalities.

Following this strategy, a client c_k , possessing m_k ($2 \le m_i \le M$) modalities, randomly drops up to $m_k - 1$ modalities in each batch training. The client c_k then performs local training by adding supervised contrastive loss [17] to its main training objective, using both the original data x and augmented data \hat{x} .

$$l_{con}(k) = \sum_{x_i \in B} \frac{-1}{|P(i)|} \sum_{p \in P(i)} \log(\frac{exp(z_i \cdot z_p/\tau)}{\sum_{a \in A(i)} exp(z_i \cdot z_a/\tau)})$$
(1)



Figure 5: Overview of the FLISM framework.

In this context, z_i represents the embedding of the input data x_i that is derived from a batch *B*. The set $P(i) \equiv \{p \in A(i) : y_p = y_i\}$ includes the indices of all positive pairs in the batch, distinct from *i*, and also encompasses the augmented data. Essentially, the loss function ensures that the embeddings of the augmented data \hat{z} are closely aligned with that of the original data *z*, provided they share the identical label. This design promotes consistency in the representation space, reinforcing the model's ability to recognize and process modality variations of the same data.

3.2.2 Client Role Assignment. In multimodal applications, the contribution of each modality to model training and the resulting accuracy varies. For instance, in autonomous driving, while LiDAR and cameras are complementary, LiDAR can provide higher quality data for object detection due to its resilience against varied lighting conditions, a capability that cameras lack [52]. Similarly, in tasks combining image and text, such as sentiment analysis [60] or movie genre classification [4], text often plays a more crucial role in achieving higher accuracy [29, 30]. However, existing methods often assume a predefined understanding of each modality's importance, an assumption that becomes impractical as new multimodal applications emerge and the spectrum of modalities expands.

To address this challenge, we introduce *ModUtil*, a metric that evaluates the importance of available modalities. *ModUtil* consists of the standard deviation of the embedding distances (*DistSTD*) and a contrastive loss (l_{con} in Equation (1)). *DistSTD* stems from our intuition that the clients with more significant modalities experience higher variance in the embedding distances of their original and simulated (augmented) data. Given the stochastic nature of the modality drop within each batch, clients with more and significant modalities will face difficulty in embedding their original and simulated data to closer feature spaces. For a client c_k with data x_i in batch B, we define *DistSTD* as follows:

$$DistSTD(k) = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{x_i \in B} (Dist(z_i, \hat{z}_i) - \mu)^2}{|B|}}$$
(2)

where *Dist* is a cosine distance to measure the distance between the embeddings of original (z_i) and simulated (\hat{z}_i) data respectively, and μ is the mean value of the embedding distances. Although *DistSTD* can reflect how diverse a client can simulate missing modality data, it cannot represent the quality of a model trained with simulated data. Therefore, we incorporate contrastive loss l_{con} to our modality utility metric. *ModUtil(k)* for client c_k can be defined as:

$$ModUtil(k) = \frac{DistSTD(k)}{l_{con}(k)}.$$
(3)

Based on *ModUtil*, we establish two types of client roles: *facilitator* and *learner*. *Facilitator* mainly supports the learning process by simulating a wide range of available modality data. *Learner* simulates various missing modalities and primarily benefits from cross-client knowledge transfer (detailed in §3.2.3).

To distinguish between *facilitator* and *learner*, we dynamically define a threshold based on *ModUtil*, derived from N_M multimodal clients:

$$RoleThresh = \frac{1}{N_M} \sum_{k=1}^{N_M} ModUtil(k).$$
(4)

The role r_k for a client c_k can then be assigned using the following rule:

$$r_{k} = \begin{cases} facilitator & \text{if } ModUtil(k) > RoleThresh}\\ learner & \text{if } ModUtil(k) \le RoleThresh.} \end{cases}$$
(5)

3.2.3 Cross-Client Knowledge Transfer. Given the diverse types and number of available modalities each client possesses, and their varying contributions to global model training, it is imperative to devise a method that can compensate for any modality knowledge gaps across all clients. For instance, if a client c_k possesses modalities m_1 and m_2 , in which client c_{k+1} lacks, we must efficiently transfer such modality knowledge to client c_{k+1} . However, direct data sharing is not feasible due to FL principles. An alternative approach is to employ cross-modal transfer techniques to reconstruct missing modality data such as autoencoders [65] or generative adversarial networks [46]. Yet, these methods risk user privacy and introduce significant overhead by necessitating cross-modal transfer training for each unique modality combination (§2.2.3).

We introduce cross-client knowledge transfer to handle this issue. This method utilizes knowledge distillation [15] to share complementary knowledge among clients without transmitting raw data or utilizing cross-modal imputation. We begin by aggregating the local models from multimodal clients that have performed missing-modality-robust learning (§3.2.1) to a single global model, called the knowledge transfer model. Note that the knowledge transfer model is distinct from the *primary model*, which is the only model used for the final inference. Primary model, on the other hand, aggregates all clients' local models to ensure a fair representation of data distribution across the entire client pool in FL training.

In global round *t*, the server distributes both *knowledge* transfer model (W_t^K) and primary model (W_t^P) to the learner. The *learner* client c_k with data x_i in a batch *B* first initializes its local model weights $w_{t,k}$ to W_t^P . Then, it trains its local model with the knowledge distillation loss l_{kd} to minimize the distance between the output of its local model with that of the *knowledge transfer model* as follows:

$$p^{K} = SoftMax(W_{t}^{K}(x_{i})/T),$$

$$p^{c_{k}} = SoftMax(w_{t,k}(x_{i})/T),$$
(6)

$$l_{kd} = T^2 \times KLD(p^K || p^{c_k}) \tag{7}$$

where the KLD is the Kullback–Leibler divergence [1], calculated between p^{K} , the softmax probabilities derived from the global knowledge transfer model's output, and p^{c_k} , the softmax probabilities obtained from the client's local model output. T represents a temperature used to soften the probability distribution of the logits, facilitating the learning of more generalizable knowledge.

To summarize, all clients use classification loss (crossentropy loss) to train their local models for the primary task. Multimodal clients additionally incorporate contrastive loss (Equation 1), while both unimodal and multimodal learner

clients integrate knowledge transfer loss (Equation 7) into their optimization objectives.

Algorithm 1: FLISM Training Flow
Require: <i>N</i> is the total # of clients, <i>S</i> is a set of
selected clients in each FL training round,
S_M is a set of multimodal clients within S
Data: Each client c_k ($1 \le k \le N$) has local training
data D_k : (x_k, y_k) ; x_k is a multi-modal data with
m_k modalities $(1 \le m_k \le M)$
¹ Initialize the global <i>primary model</i> W_0^P and <i>knowledge</i>
transfer model W_0^K
² for global round t do
$R \leftarrow \text{Client Role Assignment}(S);$
4 for $c_k \in S$ do
$ r_k \leftarrow \text{role of } c_k, r_k \in R; $
$6 \qquad \qquad w_{t,k} \leftarrow W_t^P;$
if c, is multimodal and r, is facilitator then

Algonithms 1. ELICM Training Elar

'	$\mathbf{H} \mathbf{e}_{k}$ is mattimoduli and \mathbf{e}_{k} is fullified then
8	
9	else if r_k is multimodal and r_k is learner then
10	$w_{t+1,k} \leftarrow \text{SGD}(W_t^K, w_{t,k}, D_k, l_{cls}, l_{con}, l_{kd});$

10	
11	else if c_k is unimodal then

12		L	$w_{t+1,k}$	~	$SGD(W_t^K)$, $w_{t,i}$	$_k$, D_k ,	l _{cls} ,	l_{kd});
----	--	---	-------------	--------------	--------------	-------------	----------------	--------------------	----------	----

$$\begin{split} & \stackrel{P}{W_{t+1}^{P}} \leftarrow \sum_{i \in S} w_{t+1,i}; \\ & \stackrel{K}{W_{t+1}^{K}} \leftarrow \sum_{j \in S_{M}} w_{t+1,j}; \end{split}$$

3.2.4 System Flow. The training flow of FLISM is detailed in **Algorithm 1**. At the start of each global round *t*, the server assigns roles R to selected clients S based on their modality utility, ModUtil, (Line 3 and §3.2.2). Multimodal clients perform missing-modality-robust learning to enhance the primary model's robustness against various missing modality patterns (Lines 7-10 and §3.2.1). Additionally, learner clients train their local models by distilling knowledge from multimodal clients alongside their primary classification tasks (Lines 9-12). In each global round t, the server aggregates the local models from all selected clients into the global primary model W_t^P , and it also integrates the local models from multimodal clients into W_t^K (Lines 13-14).

EXPERIMENTS 4

In this section, we describe the multimodal sensing datasets (§4.1), baseline methods (§4.2), and experiment setup (§4.3), including implementation details and evaluation metrics, used in our study.

Table 1: Summary of datasets.

Dataset	#Users	#Modals	Modality Types				
PAMAP2 [42]	8	6	ACC, GYRO				
RealWorld HAR [48]	15	10	ACC, GYRO				
WESAD [45]	15	10	ACC, BVP, ECG, EDA, EMG, RESP, TEMP				

4.1 Datasets

Table 1 describes the three real-world multimodal sensing datasets used in our experiments: PAMAP2 [42], RealWorld HAR [48] and WESAD [45].

PAMAP2 [42] contains data from nine users performing twelve activities, captured using Inertial Measurement Unit (IMU) sensors. We excluded data from one participant due to the presence of only a single activity data [16]. The dataset includes readings from accelerometers and gyroscopes modalities, positioned on three different body parts: the wrist, chest, and ankle, resulting in a total of six sensing input modalities. RealWorld HAR [48] is a multi-device multimodal dataset for human activity recognition (HAR), featuring data from fifteen participants engaged in eight activities. Each participant was equipped with seven IMU devices positioned on the head, chest, upper arm, wrist, forearm, thigh, and shin. The data from the forearm and thigh were omitted due to incomplete activity coverage. As a result, the dataset encompasses ten sensing modalities, derived from five body locations and two types of IMU sensors.

WESAD [45] is a multi-device multimodal dataset for wearable stress and affect detection [45]. It encompasses data collected from fifteen participants who wore both a chestband and a wristband, capturing physiological sensor data such as Electrocardiogram (ECG), Electrodermal Activity (EDA), Electromyogram (EMG), Blood Volume Pressure (BVP), and Respiration (RESP), Skin Temperature (TEMP), in addition to motion data via an Accelerometer (ACC). The objective is to classify the participants' emotional states into three categories: neutral, stress, and amusement. The chestband monitored ACC, ECG, EMG, EDA, TEMP, and RESP, whereas the wristband tracked ACC, BVP, EDA, and TEMP, collectively resulting in ten distinct modalities.

4.2 Baselines

To evaluate the performance of *FLISM*, we consider three early fusion (FedAvg [31], FedProx [24], MOON [22]) and two late fusion methods specifically designed to address incomplete modality problem in FL: FedMM [11], Harmony [36].

FedAvg [31] represents the foundational approach to FL, enabling decentralized training without the need to share raw data. This method involves transmitting updated local model weights to a centralized server for aggregation. As a baseline framework, FedAvg is crucial for assessing the lowest achievable accuracy, especially in scenarios lacking specific mechanisms to address missing modalities. It also sets a benchmark for the minimum system cost, given that clients are only required to train and share the weights of a single model.

FedProx [24] was proposed to address system and statistical heterogeneity. It enhances performance through the addition of a proximal term to the local training loss function, which aims to minimize the discrepancy between the global and local models. Given its effectiveness in environments with heterogeneous clients, and considering that modality heterogeneity represents a form of heterogeneity challenge, we have selected FedProx as one of our baselines.

MOON [22], similar to FedProx, targets local data heterogeneity problem. It incorporates contrastive learning into FL to reduce the gap between the global and local model's embeddings while increasing the disparity from the embeddings of the previous local model. MOON has demonstrated superior performance over other FL methods across different image classification tasks, showcasing its effectiveness.

FedMM [11] is a late fusion technique, specifically designed to tackle missing modality issue in multimodal FL applications. Initially, FedMM conducts unimodal training for each available modality across all clients. It then merges these unimodal representations through a cross-attention mechanism [51]. Evaluation across a variety of tasks, supporting upto two modalities, demonstrated FedMM's effectiveness. Harmony [36] is another late fusion approach proposed to manage incomplete modality data in multimodal FL tasks. It structures the FL training process into two distinct stages: initial modality-wise unimodal training, followed by a second stage dedicated to multimodal fusion. Additionally, Harmony incorporates modality biases in the fusion step to address local data heterogeneity. Evaluations on real-world datasets with up to three modalities have demonstrated Harmony's effectiveness compared to other state-of-the-art baselines.

4.3 Experiment Setup

Implementation. In our experiments, we use a 1D convolutional neural network (CNN) as the encoder architecture, following the design for sensing application assessments [14]. For a fair comparison, we standardized the encoder models across all methods. We set random client selection rates from 30% to 50% based on the total dataset users. Standard settings include a learning rate of 0.01, weight decay of 0.001, and a batch size of 32, with SGD as the optimizer. After a grid

search to fine-tune the hyperparameters for each baseline, we adjusted the MOON's learning rate to 0.001 and its batch size to 64. We performed all experiments with ten different seeds and reported the average values. We implemented *FLISM* and all baselines using Python 3.8 and PyTorch 1.7 [38]. We plan to open source upon publication.

Metrics. To assess the accuracy of our method and compare it with baseline approaches, we utilize the macro F1 score. The macro F1 score is recommended practice [39] when working with imbalanced data and widely adopted in prior work [8]. To evaluate communication overhead, we measure the total time spent on the model upload and download processes by all clients participating in FL training [44]. For computation overhead, we calculate the total number of parameters trained throughout the FL training process across all clients. This provides insight into the computational complexity and resource requirements of the FL system, offering a measure of its scalability and efficiency.

5 RESULTS

5.1 End-to-end Performance

We start our analysis with a comparison of our system, FLISM against baselines. We focus on model accuracy (F1-score) and system efficiency, which includes the communication cost and the total number of parameters trained (i.e., it reflects the computation cost on the client side). Table 2 presents results averaged from three missing modality scenarios with incomplete modality ratio p of 40%, 60%, and 80%. We selected FedAvg [31] and FedProx [24] as benchmarks for communication and computation costs as they represent the simplest and lightest forms of FL that involve local training and exchange of single model's weights. Although FedAvg [31] and Fed-Prox [24] are efficient in communication and computation, their accuracy falls short, especially with higher incomplete modality ratio (details in §5.2). MOON [22] incurs additional overhead by exchanging an extra model and incorporating contrastive loss in local training. However, its performance declines with the increase in the number and complexity of modalities, as shown in the WESAD dataset, where MOON ranks second to last (.399 and .189 lower than FedAvg in F1 score). This result indicates that MOON's assumption, that the global model always outperforms a client's local model, may not hold in multimodal FL with incomplete modalities.

Both FedMM [11] and Harmony [36] are late fusion techniques designed to handle missing modalities in multimodal FL tasks. Initially, they train multiple unimodal models for each unique modality on the client side, followed by training fused models. Consequently, this approach results in higher communication and computation costs compared with early fusion methods. We observe that the performance of these two methods varies by dataset: for activity recognition from motion sensing modalities (PAMAP2, RealWorld-HAR), FedMM and Harmony match or slightly outperform early fusion methods. In contrast, in WESAD dataset, their F1 score significantly drops (.544 and .348), underscoring the critical role of early fusion in capturing low-level correlations between sensing modalities.

On the other hand, *FLISM* consistently delivers superior performance, ranking as either the highest or second-highest across all metrics and datasets. In summary, *FLISM* achieves a balance between accuracy and efficiency by (1) outperforming baseline methods in F1 score by an average of .051, .096, .055 for PAMAP2, WESAD, and RealWorld-HAR, respectively; (2) demonstrating enhanced system efficiency with an average increase of 1.85×, 3.33×, and 2.89× in communication speed, and 1.91×, 2.53×, and 2.40× in computation efficiency, compared to late fusion methods tackling incomplete modalities.

5.2 Accuracy Performance

To rigorously evaluate the *FLISM*'s accuracy compared to baseline methods, we conducted in-depth experiments under various modality drop scenarios. The results are presented in Table 3. Here, an increased value of p signifies a higher incidence of clients with incomplete modalities. The final test accuracy is measured using the F1 score noted as *F*1, with improvements of the *FLISM* marked as $\Delta F1$.

FLISM consistently outperforms early fusion methods, achieving an average F1 score improvement of .057, .080, and .064 on the PAMAP2, RealWorld-HAR and WESAD datasets, respectively. For the WESAD dataset, while FedAvg and FedProx may exhibit marginally superior performance at lower values of *p*, *FLISM* demonstrates enhanced capability in more demanding contexts characterized by higher *p* values. In these scenarios, more number of clients with incomplete modalities participate in FL training, underscoring *FLISM*'s robustness in complex environments.

Furthermore, *FLISM* outperforms late fusion approaches in the majority of scenarios. While FedMM achieves marginally higher F1 scores, ranging from .007 to .050, in some instances, this advantage incurs considerable increases in communication and computation expenses, increasing by $2.57 \times -2.76 \times$, and $3.00 \times -3.40 \times$, respectively.

Harmony, in its initial phase, trains multiple unimodal models similar to FedMM's approach. However, its multimodal fusion stage, which leverages clustering, underperforms, yielding the lowest F1 scores (.336, .360, and .347) on the WESAD dataset among all methods evaluated. This underperformance is attributed to Harmony's assumption of uniform modality across clients during multimodal fusion stage, a presumption that may hold for tasks with a Table 2: Comparison of *FLISM*'s accuracy and system overhead in terms of communication and computation cost (number of trained parameters). EF denotes Early Fusion, whereas LF represents Late Fusion. Results in bold represent the highest performance, whereas those underlined denote the second-highest (runner-up) performance.

	Dataset		PAMAP2			WESAD		RealWorld HAR			
Туре	Method	Accuracy (F1-score)	Comm (seconds)	#Params (×1e6)	Accuracy (F1-score)	Comm (seconds)	#Params (×1e6)	Accuracy (F1-score)	Comm (seconds)	#Params (×1 <i>e</i> 6)	
EF	FedAvg [31]	.709	430 (1×)	83 (1×)	.588	483 (1×)	109 (1×)	.738	356 (1×)	85 (1×)	
EF	FedProx [24]	.710	430 (1×)	83 (1×)	.587	483 (1×)	109 (1×)	.738	356 (1×)	85 (1×)	
EF	MOON [22]	.720	<u>673</u> (1.57×)	<u>109</u> (1.31×)	.399	815 (1.69×)	161 (1.48×)	.620	<u>553</u> (1.55×)	111 (1.31×)	
LF	FedMM [11]	.753	1551 (3.61×)	313 (3.77×)	.544	2271 (4.70×)	512 (4.7×)	.797	1522 (4.28×)	377 (4.44×)	
LF	Harmony [36]	.698	849 (1.97×)	103 (1.24×)	.348	3224 (6.67×)	<u>305</u> (2.8×)	.721	1639 (4.69×)	<u>157</u> (1.85×)	
EF	FLISM	.770	648 (1.51×)	<u>109</u> (1.31×)	.589	<u>825</u> (1.71×)	161 (1.48×)	.778	547 (1.54×)	111 (1.31×)	

Table 3: Accuracy improvement of FLISM over baselines with various incomplete modality ratios.

Dataset PAMAP2						WESAD						RealWorld-HAR						
p	4	40% 60%		80%		40%		60%		80%		40%		60%		80%		
Method	F1	Δ F1	F1	Δ F1	F1	Δ F1	F1	Δ F1	F1	Δ F1	F1	Δ F1	F1	Δ F1	F1	Δ F1	F1	Δ F1
FedAvg [31]	.734	.059 ↑	.727	.052 ↑	.666	.071 ↑	.674	.007 \downarrow	.570	.004 ↑	.521	.050 ↑	.793	.021 ↑	.740	.048 ↑	.680	.052 ↑
FedProx [24]	.732	.061 ↑	.731	.048 ↑	.666	.071 ↑	.673	.006 \downarrow	.571	.003 ↑	.518	.080 ↑	.797	.017 ↑	.738	.050 ↑	.678	.054 ↑
MOON [22]	.742	.051 ↑	.725	.054 ↑	.692	.045 ↑	.444	.223 ↑	.393	.181 ↑	.359	.167 ↑	.664	.150 ↑	.631	.157 ↑	.565	.167 ↑
FedMM [11]	.768	.025 ↑	.763	.016 ↑	.748	.011 👃	.549	.118 ↑	.546	.028 ↑	.536	.010 👃	.813	.010 ↑	.795	.007 \downarrow	.782	.050 👃
Harmony [36]	.721	.072 ↑	.696	.083 ↑	.676	.061 ↑	.336	.331 ↑	.360	.214 ↑	.347	.179 ↑	.699	.115 ↑	.716	.072 ↑	.748	.016 👃

small number of modalities (up to three, as in Harmony's experiments). The challenge intensifies for Harmony when faced with a greater variety and number of modalities, necessitating separate fusion training for each unique modality combination among client groups. In contrast, *FLISM* does not make assumptions about modality uniformity, and operates flexibly across a wider range and variety of sensing modalities. Its enhanced performance in complex multimodal sensing tasks, even with heterogeneous modalities, is attributed to simulating diverse missing modality scenarios (§3.2.1) and facilitating the implicit transfer of robust representations to clients requiring complementary knowledge (§3.2.3).

5.3 System Efficiency

We compare the communication and computational efficiency of *FLISM* against late fusion baselines throughout all FL global rounds. Regarding communication cost, we simulate upload and download speeds of client devices by leveraging FLASH [55], an extensive FL simulation framework. FLASH utilizes a dataset derived from more than 136,000 smartphones, offering a real-world basis for our simulations. Each client is assigned a random device profile before the experiments. In each round, a client's communication speed is determined by sampling from a Gaussian distribution, based on the assigned profile's mean and standard deviation. This method reflects a realistic scenario where each client uses their own device, though communication speeds vary due to network conditions. To calculate the communication cost, we only consider model weights transferred between the client and the server, as auxiliary information transfer is minimal, typically integer values which is negligible compared with the substantial model weights in the FL setting. For computational overhead, we calculate the total number of parameters trained by all clients throughout the FL training process. This method illuminates the FL system's computational complexity and resource consumption, providing insights into its scalability and operational efficiency.

Figure 6 and 7 show a consistent trend in communication and computational efficiency across all datasets, underscoring the effectiveness of FLISM. An exception occurs when the incomplete modality ratio p is 80% in the PAMAP2 dataset, with Harmony exhibiting the lowest communication and computational overhead. This lower overhead results from Harmony's strategy of selecting clients with identical modality sets during the initial training phase, which may lead to a limited number of available clients when the client pool is restricted. This limitation is particularly pronounced in the PAMAP2 dataset, which consists of only eight clients. Therefore, a significant reduction in available clients or a lack of complete modality data can impede the unimodal model's training process. This leads to a notable decrease in performance, as evidenced by the F1-score degradation (Table 3), despite a slight increase in system efficiency.

ACM Conference, Fall 2024,

Adiba Orzikulova, Jaehyun Kwak, Jaemin Shin, and Sung-Ju Lee



Figure 6: Comparison of *FLISM* with other baselines in terms of communication cost. *FLISM* is more communicationefficient compared to late fusion-based methods.



Figure 7: Comparison of *FLISM* with other baselines in terms of computation cost. *FLISM* is more computation-efficient compared to late fusion-based methods.

In other cases, analysis reveals a uniform pattern in communication and computation costs across all datasets. This trend demonstrates that FedMM and Harmony both incur considerable overhead, which becomes more severe as the number of modalities increases. This is because these methods require each client c_k to exchange m_k unimodal models. In contrast, FLISM significantly reduces overhead, showcasing an average improvement of $2.40 \times$, $2.76 \times$, and $2.78 \times$ in communication costs for the PAMAP2, WESAD, and RealWorld-HAR datasets compared to FedMM, and 1.37×, 3.98×, and 3.00× compared to Harmony, respectively. Moreover, FLISM also demonstrates an average improvement of 2.88×, 3.18×, and $3.41 \times$ in computation costs for the same datasets in comparison to FedMM, and 0.95×, 1.90×, and 1.42× when compared to Harmony, illustrating its efficiency in both communication and computational aspects.

5.4 Scalability Analysis

As the integration of sensors into a wide range of devices continues to grow, there is an increasing demand for scalable FL systems. These systems must efficiently handle an expanding number of devices and modalities to support diverse multimodal sensing applications (§2.2.1).



Figure 8: Scalability Analysis of *FLISM*: Comparing communication (Left) and computation overheads, measured by the number of trained parameters (Right), against late fusion baselines. Y-Axis is in Log-Scale.

To assess scalability with respect to communication and computation costs, we conducted experiments involving an increasing number of sensing modalities. The results, comparing *FLISM* to late fusion baselines, are shown in Figure 8. The X-axis denotes the number of modalities, and the Y-axis indicates the communication and computation costs (measured in the number of trained parameters), both presented on a logarithmic scale. Note, that the multimodal datasets we utilized in our experiments had at most 10 sensing modalities, as shown in Table 1. However, real-world multimodal sensing tasks could involve a greater number of modalities, given

Table 4: Ablation analysis of the *FLISM* on PAMAP2 dataset. Each component is annotated with abbreviations. Missing-Modality-Robust Learning (MMRL, §3.2.1), Cross-Client Knowledge Transfer (CCKT, §3.2.3), and Client Role Assigment (CRA, §3.2.2).

Version	Description	F1-score
Ver. 1	<i>FLISM</i> (w/o MMRL, CCKT and CRA)	.709
Ver. 2	<i>FLISM</i> (w/o CCKT and CRA)	.750
Ver. 3	FLISM (w/o CRA)	.767
Final	FLISM	.770

the data may originate from a diverse range of sensor and device combinations [34, 45]. To better reflect such extensive real-world scenarios, we simulated a multimodal sensing task with modalities varying from 5 to 30. We set the total number of clients, N, to 100, selecting 10% for participation in each FL training round. The incomplete modality ratio p, was configured at 40%. The FL training spanned 20 rounds, during which each client trained their models for one local epoch.

As shown in Figure 8, both FedMM and Harmony experience significant increases in system costs as the number of modalities in a multimodal sensing task grows. Specifically, the communication cost for tasks with five versus 30 modalities increases by 1,016.89 seconds for FedMM and by 12,842.84 seconds for Harmony. Similarly, computation costs escalate, as evidenced by an increase in the number of trained parameters—188.66% for FedMM and 464.31% for Harmony. In contrast, *FLISM* maintains a stable system cost that is almost negligible compared to late fusion baselines, without compromising accuracy. In particular, it outperforms FedMM and Harmony in efficiency, with communication improvements between $3.24 \times -9.04 \times$ and $10.93 \times -85.10 \times$ and in computation between $3.73 \times -10.60 \times$ and $5.81 \times -32.29 \times$, respectively.

In summary, our simulations, involving up to 30 sensing modalities, revealed that late fusion-based methods face significant system overheads due to the need to train separate unimodal models for each modality and then fuse them for every unique combination, with overheads escalating sharply as modalities increase. In contrast, *FLISM* provides a scalable and substantially more efficient solution, achieving this without sacrificing accuracy.

5.5 Component-wise Analysis

To understand and assess the effectiveness of each individual system component incorporated in *FLISM*, we implement its four different variations, including the complete version. The results from experiments conducted using the PAMAP2 dataset are presented in Table 4. We report the average F1-score across three different incomplete modality ratio scenarios, maintaining consistency with our experiments throughout the paper. As detailed in §3.2, *FLISM* consists of three key components: Missing-Modality-Robust Learning (MMRL, §3.2.1), Cross-Client Knowledge Transfer (CCKT, §3.2.3), and Client Role Assignment (CRA, §3.2.2).

The most basic version of FLISM, lacking all three key components, functions similarly to vanilla FedAvg. This version does not engage in simulation, transfer knowledge, or make adjustments based on the quality of data available at the clients. The introduction of the MMRL component (Ver. 2) leads to a .041 increase in the F1-score. This enhancement confirms the contribution of simulating various missing modality scenarios, which enables the model to learn robust representations when faced with incomplete modality data. Further enhancements are observed with the integration of CCKT (Ver. 3), which facilitates the transfer of these simulated missing modality scenarios across clients, resulting in an additional .017 increase in the F1-score compared to the version excluding CCKT. The culmination of integrating all three components in the complete version of FLISM achieves the highest F1-score of .770, demonstrating the significant and distinct contributions of each component to the system's overall effectiveness.

6 RELATED WORK

Multi-modal Learning in Sensing Applications. Multimodal learning is becoming more prevalent in real-world mobile sensing applications, including mental health assessment [53], object identification [13], stress detection [58], and eating episode detection [47]. Consequently, there has been a recent surge in efforts aimed at enhancing model performance for applications that leverage multimodal data. In this context, COCOA [9] enhances representation quality by developing a unique objective function that optimizes crosscorrelation between different data types and reduces similarity among unrelated instances. Similarly, ColloSSL [16] leverages data from multiple devices worn by a user to extract high-quality features, treating data from devices attached to different body positions as separate modalities. Although these works achieve higher performance by leveraging the complementary knowledge across modalities, sending raw physiological and motion sensing data to a central server to a central server might lead privacy concerns.

Multi-modal Federated Learning. Federated Learning (FL) [31] is a distributed machine learning approach that allows for collaborative model training without exposing data from its own devices. Although many FL studies have

improved functionality using various modalities, most multimodal FL research assumes all modalities are available. CreamFL [59] enables training larger server models from clients with heterogeneous model architectures and data modalities, and FedMEKT [20] leverage representations from different modalities. However, most of the existing multimodal FL approaches assume all modalities are available for model training, despite considering statistical heterogeneity.

Missing Modalities in Federated Learning. Research on incomplete modalities in FL is explored in various applications, including autonomous driving [65] and Alzheimer's disease monitoring [35]. Harmony [36] disentangles the multimodal network training in a two-stage framework. AutoFed [65] propose an autoencoder-based data imputation method to fill missing data modality with the available ones. FedMM [11] employs attention-based fusion to integrate outputs from uni-modal models trained separately for each modality. Note that FedMM [11] and the initial stage of Harmony [36] involve training uni-modal models, a process that could hinder scalability as the number of modalities grows. Similarly, AutoFed [65] faces limitations as it requires all combinations of autoencoders for data imputation. FLISM proposes a communication and computation-efficient multimodal FL training approach, enhancing scalability for larger number of modalities.

7 DISCUSSIONS

In this section, we outline discussions and promising directions for future research.

Extension to Non-sensing Modalities. Recently, the study of large multimodal models, incorporating modalities such as images and text, has gained significant attention [40, 43]. Although *FLISM* performs well in accuracy and system efficiency, it is mainly focused on multimodal sensing applications. This focus stems from observations that early fusion is systematically more efficient than late fusion. We plan to extend *FLISM* to include non-sensing modalities, such as images and audio. This could involve utilizing small pre-trained models to extract features from these modalities, aligning the extracted features, and proceeding with the *FLISM* training. This approach could broaden the applicability of *FLISM* to a wider range of multimodal integration scenarios, enhancing its versatility and effectiveness.

Runtime Handling of Incomplete Modalities. We focused on scenarios involving static modality drops. This approach stems from our observation that dropping the entire modality throughout the FL training causes the highest accuracy degradation. However, we acknowledge that dynamic modality drops, where modalities might become unavailable at various points during application runtime, is also a critical aspect. The Missing-Modality-Robust Learning (§3.2.1), a component of *FLISM*, is designed to accommodate extensions for simulating various dynamic drop scenarios. Further development of the method to specifically cater to dynamic drop scenarios at runtime is an area for future exploration.

System Heterogeneity-Aware Client Selection. Although the *FLISM* achieves optimal balance between system efficiency and model accuracy, it overlooks individual user system utilities, such as WiFi connectivity, battery life, and CPU memory. As highlighted in our motivation, the number and type of modalities available for local training vary by user, also the system utilities can change dynamically. Building on top of the Client Role Assignment (§3.2.2), we can devise an additional client selection method that accounts for device utility to enhance convergence speed. Future research could explore adapting the method to accommodate system heterogeneity.

User Engagement and Incentive Mechanisms. In our system, FLISM, clients with multiple modalities perform robust learning for missing modalities, conducting simulations to enable clients with fewer modalities to benefit from these robust representations. The availability of numerous modalities offers greater opportunities for conducting these beneficial simulations. Despite necessitating an extra forward pass and thus higher computational demand compared to unimodal clients, the potential for improving the global model's training through increased simulation activities is important. In real-world applications, motivating users to undertake more simulations, despite the higher computational costs, could substantially improve overall model performance. Implementing effective incentive mechanisms is crucial to boosting user participation and, thereby, enriching the model's learning environment.

8 CONCLUSION

We introduced FLISM, a multimodal FL framework designed to address the challenges of incomplete sensing modalities. At its foundation, FLISM employs simulations of various scenarios with missing modalities to learn representations capable of handling incomplete data. It also identifies clients with less critical modalities, enabling cross-modality knowledge transfer. Through comprehensive evaluations with three realworld multimodal datasets and scalability tests, FLISM was benchmarked against five baseline models, reveals its efficacy. FLISM improves model performance, showing an average increase of .067 in F1-score, and achieves reductions in both communication and computational overhead, being 2.69× faster and 2.28× more efficient. Additionally, in scenarios with a larger number of modalities, FLISM enhances communication $(3.23 \times 85.10 \times)$ and computation $(3.73 \times 32.29 \times)$ efficiency.

REFERENCES

- 1951. On information and sufficiency. The annals of mathematical statistics 22, 1 (1951), 79–86.
- [2] 2021. pytorch-OpCounter: Tool to count the FLOPs of your PyTorch model. https://github.com/Lyken17/pytorch-OpCounter/.
- [3] applevisionpro 2024. Apple Vision Pro. https://www.apple.com/applevision-pro/.
- [4] John Arevalo, Thamar Solorio, Manuel Montes-y Gómez, and Fabio A González. 2017. Gated multimodal units for information fusion. arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.01992 (2017).
- [5] Nooshin Bahador, Denzil Ferreira, Satu Tamminen, Jukka Kortelainen, et al. 2021. Deep learning–based multimodal data fusion: Case study in food intake episodes detection using wearable sensors. *JMIR mHealth* and uHealth 9, 1 (2021), e21926.
- [6] Pierre Baldi. 2012. Autoencoders, unsupervised learning, and deep architectures. In Proceedings of ICML workshop on unsupervised and transfer learning. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 37–49.
- [7] Mario Bijelic, Tobias Gruber, Fahim Mannan, Florian Kraus, Werner Ritter, Klaus Dietmayer, and Felix Heide. 2020. Seeing through fog without seeing fog: Deep multimodal sensor fusion in unseen adverse weather. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. 11682–11692.
- [8] Hyunsung Cho, Akhil Mathur, and Fahim Kawsar. 2022. Flame: Federated learning across multi-device environments. *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies* 6, 3 (2022), 1–29.
- [9] Shohreh Deldari, Hao Xue, Aaqib Saeed, Daniel V Smith, and Flora D Salim. 2022. Cocoa: Cross modality contrastive learning for sensor data. Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies 6, 3 (2022), 1–28.
- [10] Shaker El-Sappagh, Tamer Abuhmed, SM Riazul Islam, and Kyung Sup Kwak. 2020. Multimodal multitask deep learning model for Alzheimer's disease progression detection based on time series data. *Neurocomputing* 412 (2020), 197–215.
- [11] Tiantian Feng, Digbalay Bose, Tuo Zhang, Rajat Hebbar, Anil Ramakrishna, Rahul Gupta, Mi Zhang, Salman Avestimehr, and Shrikanth Narayanan. 2023. FedMultimodal: A Benchmark For Multimodal Federated Learning. arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.09486 (2023).
- [12] Tiantian Feng and Shrikanth Narayanan. 2019. Imputing missing data in large-scale multivariate biomedical wearable recordings using bidirectional recurrent neural networks with temporal activation regularization. In 2019 41st Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society (EMBC). IEEE, 2529–2534.
- [13] Taesik Gong, Hyunsung Cho, Bowon Lee, and Sung-Ju Lee. 2019. Knocker: Vibroacoustic-based object recognition with smartphones. Proceedings of the ACM on interactive, mobile, wearable and ubiquitous technologies 3, 3 (2019), 1–21.
- [14] Harish Haresamudram, Irfan Essa, and Thomas Plötz. 2022. Assessing the state of self-supervised human activity recognition using wearables. *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies* 6, 3 (2022), 1–47.
- [15] Geoffrey Hinton, Oriol Vinyals, and Jeff Dean. 2015. Distilling the knowledge in a neural network. arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02531 (2015).
- [16] Yash Jain, Chi Ian Tang, Chulhong Min, Fahim Kawsar, and Akhil Mathur. 2022. Collossl: Collaborative self-supervised learning for human activity recognition. *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies* 6, 1 (2022), 1–28.
- [17] Prannay Khosla, Piotr Teterwak, Chen Wang, Aaron Sarna, Yonglong Tian, Phillip Isola, Aaron Maschinot, Ce Liu, and Dilip Krishnan. 2020. Supervised contrastive learning. Advances in neural information processing systems 33 (2020), 18661–18673.

- [18] Seongyoon Kim, Gihun Lee, Jaehoon Oh, and Se-Young Yun. 2023. FedFN: Feature Normalization for Alleviating Data Heterogeneity Problem in Federated Learning. arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.13267 (2023).
- [19] Sylvia D Kreibig. 2010. Autonomic nervous system activity in emotion: A review. *Biological psychology* 84, 3 (2010), 394–421.
- [20] Huy Q Le, Minh NH Nguyen, Chu Myaet Thwal, Yu Qiao, Chaoning Zhang, and Choong Seon Hong. 2023. FedMEKT: Distillation-based Embedding Knowledge Transfer for Multimodal Federated Learning. arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.13214 (2023).
- [21] Yann LeCun, Yoshua Bengio, et al. 1995. Convolutional networks for images, speech, and time series. *The handbook of brain theory and neural networks* 3361, 10 (1995), 1995.
- [22] Qinbin Li, Bingsheng He, and Dawn Song. 2021. Model-contrastive federated learning. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition. 10713–10722.
- [23] Tian Li, Anit Kumar Sahu, Ameet Talwalkar, and Virginia Smith. 2020. Federated learning: Challenges, methods, and future directions. *IEEE signal processing magazine* 37, 3 (2020), 50–60.
- [24] Tian Li, Anit Kumar Sahu, Manzil Zaheer, Maziar Sanjabi, Ameet Talwalkar, and Virginia Smith. 2020. Federated optimization in heterogeneous networks. *Proceedings of Machine learning and systems* 2 (2020), 429–450.
- [25] Xiang Li, Dawei Song, Peng Zhang, Guangliang Yu, Yuexian Hou, and Bin Hu. 2016. Emotion recognition from multi-channel EEG data through convolutional recurrent neural network. In 2016 IEEE international conference on bioinformatics and biomedicine (BIBM). IEEE, 352–359.
- [26] Yingwei Li, Adams Wei Yu, Tianjian Meng, Ben Caine, Jiquan Ngiam, Daiyi Peng, Junyang Shen, Yifeng Lu, Denny Zhou, Quoc V Le, et al. 2022. Deepfusion: Lidar-camera deep fusion for multi-modal 3d object detection. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. 17182–17191.
- [27] Haibin Liu, Chao Wu, and Huanjie Wang. 2023. Real time object detection using LiDAR and camera fusion for autonomous driving. *Scientific Reports* 13, 1 (2023), 8056.
- [28] Oura Health Ltd. 2015. Oura Ring. https://ouraring.com/.
- [29] Mengmeng Ma, Jian Ren, Long Zhao, Davide Testuggine, and Xi Peng. 2022. Are multimodal transformers robust to missing modality?. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. 18177–18186.
- [30] Mengmeng Ma, Jian Ren, Long Zhao, Sergey Tulyakov, Cathy Wu, and Xi Peng. 2021. Smil: Multimodal learning with severely missing modality. In Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Vol. 35. 2302–2310.
- [31] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Aguera y Arcas. 2017. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*. PMLR, 1273–1282.
- [32] Christopher A Merck, Christina Maher, Mark Mirtchouk, Min Zheng, Yuxiao Huang, and Samantha Kleinberg. 2016. Multimodality sensing for eating recognition.. In *PervasiveHealth*. 130–137.
- [33] Francisco Javier Ordóñez and Daniel Roggen. 2016. Deep convolutional and lstm recurrent neural networks for multimodal wearable activity recognition. Sensors 16, 1 (2016), 115.
- [34] Adiba Orzikulova, Han Xiao, Zhipeng Li, Yukang Yan, Yuntao Wang, Yuanchun Shi, Marzyeh Ghassemi, Sung-Ju Lee, Anind K Dey, Xuhai Xu, et al. 2024. Time2Stop: Adaptive and Explainable Human-AI Loop for Smartphone Overuse Intervention. arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05584 (2024).

ACM Conference, Fall 2024,

Adiba Orzikulova, Jaehyun Kwak, Jaemin Shin, and Sung-Ju Lee

- [35] Xiaomin Ouyang, Xian Shuai, Yang Li, Li Pan, Xifan Zhang, Heming Fu, Xinyan Wang, Shihua Cao, Jiang Xin, Hazel Mok, et al. 2023. AD-Marker: A Multi-Modal Federated Learning System for Monitoring Digital Biomarkers of Alzheimer's Disease. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.15301 (2023).
- [36] Xiaomin Ouyang, Zhiyuan Xie, Heming Fu, Sitong Cheng, Li Pan, Neiwen Ling, Guoliang Xing, Jiayu Zhou, and Jianwei Huang. 2023. Harmony: Heterogeneous Multi-Modal Federated Learning through Disentangled Model Training. In *Proceedings of the 21st Annual International Conference on Mobile Systems, Applications and Services*. 530–543.
- [37] Cheul Young Park, Narae Cha, Soowon Kang, Auk Kim, Ahsan Habib Khandoker, Leontios Hadjileontiadis, Alice Oh, Yong Jeong, and Uichin Lee. 2020. K-EmoCon, a multimodal sensor dataset for continuous emotion recognition in naturalistic conversations. *Scientific Data* 7, 1 (2020), 293.
- [38] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, et al. 2019. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. Advances in neural information processing systems 32 (2019).
- [39] Thomas PlÖtz. 2021. Applying machine learning for sensor data analysis in interactive systems: Common pitfalls of pragmatic use and ways to avoid them. ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR) 54, 6 (2021), 1–25.
- [40] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. 2021. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 8748–8763.
- [41] Dhanesh Ramachandram and Graham W Taylor. 2017. Deep multimodal learning: A survey on recent advances and trends. *IEEE signal* processing magazine 34, 6 (2017), 96–108.
- [42] Attila Reiss and Didier Stricker. 2012. Introducing a new benchmarked dataset for activity monitoring. In 2012 16th international symposium on wearable computers. IEEE, 108–109.
- [43] Kuniaki Saito, Kihyuk Sohn, Xiang Zhang, Chun-Liang Li, Chen-Yu Lee, Kate Saenko, and Tomas Pfister. 2023. Pic2word: Mapping pictures to words for zero-shot composed image retrieval. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. 19305–19314.
- [44] Batool Salehi, Jerry Gu, Debashri Roy, and Kaushik Chowdhury. 2022. Flash: Federated learning for automated selection of high-band mmwave sectors. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2022-IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*. IEEE, 1719–1728.
- [45] Philip Schmidt, Attila Reiss, Robert Duerichen, Claus Marberger, and Kristof Van Laerhoven. 2018. Introducing wesad, a multimodal dataset for wearable stress and affect detection. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM international conference on multimodal interaction*. 400–408.
- [46] Chao Shang, Aaron Palmer, Jiangwen Sun, Ko-Shin Chen, Jin Lu, and Jinbo Bi. 2017. VIGAN: Missing view imputation with generative adversarial networks. In 2017 IEEE International conference on big data (Big Data). IEEE, 766–775.
- [47] Jaemin Shin, Seungjoo Lee, Taesik Gong, Hyungjun Yoon, Hyunchul Roh, Andrea Bianchi, and Sung-Ju Lee. 2022. MyDJ: Sensing food intakes with an attachable on your eyeglass frame. In *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–17.
- [48] Timo Sztyler and Heiner Stuckenschmidt. 2016. On-body localization of wearable devices: An investigation of position-aware activity recognition. In 2016 IEEE International Conference on Pervasive Computing and Communications (PerCom). IEEE, 1–9.

- [49] Yonatan Vaizman, Nadir Weibel, and Gert Lanckriet. 2018. Context recognition in-the-wild: Unified model for multi-modal sensors and multi-label classification. *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies* 1, 4 (2018), 1–22.
- [50] Stef Van Buuren. 2018. Flexible imputation of missing data. CRC press.
- [51] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. Advances in neural information processing systems 30 (2017).
- [52] Lele Wang and Yingping Huang. 2022. LiDAR-camera fusion for road detection using a recurrent conditional random field model. *Scientific Reports* 12, 1 (2022), 11320.
- [53] Rui Wang, Fanglin Chen, Zhenyu Chen, Tianxing Li, Gabriella Harari, Stefanie Tignor, Xia Zhou, Dror Ben-Zeev, and Andrew T Campbell. 2014. StudentLife: assessing mental health, academic performance and behavioral trends of college students using smartphones. In Proceedings of the 2014 ACM international joint conference on pervasive and ubiquitous computing. 3–14.
- [54] Baochen Xiong, Xiaoshan Yang, Fan Qi, and Changsheng Xu. 2022. A unified framework for multi-modal federated learning. *Neurocomput*ing 480 (2022), 110–118.
- [55] Chengxu Yang, Qipeng Wang, Mengwei Xu, Zhenpeng Chen, Kaigui Bian, Yunxin Liu, and Xuanzhe Liu. 2021. Characterizing impacts of heterogeneity in federated learning upon large-scale smartphone data. In Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021. 935–946.
- [56] Jianbo Yang, Minh Nhut Nguyen, Phyo Phyo San, Xiaoli Li, and Shonali Krishnaswamy. 2015. Deep convolutional neural networks on multichannel time series for human activity recognition.. In *Ijcai*, Vol. 15. Buenos Aires, Argentina, 3995–4001.
- [57] Guan Yu, Quefeng Li, Dinggang Shen, and Yufeng Liu. 2020. Optimal sparse linear prediction for block-missing multi-modality data without imputation. J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. 115, 531 (2020), 1406–1419.
- [58] Han Yu and Akane Sano. 2023. Semi-supervised learning for wearablebased momentary stress detection in the wild. *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies* 7, 2 (2023), 1–23.
- [59] Qiying Yu, Yang Liu, Yimu Wang, Ke Xu, and Jingjing Liu. 2023. Multimodal federated learning via contrastive representation ensemble. arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.08888 (2023).
- [60] Amir Zadeh, Rowan Zellers, Eli Pincus, and Louis-Philippe Morency. 2016. Mosi: multimodal corpus of sentiment intensity and subjectivity analysis in online opinion videos. arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.06259 (2016).
- [61] Ming Zeng, Le T Nguyen, Bo Yu, Ole J Mengshoel, Jiang Zhu, Pang Wu, and Joy Zhang. 2014. Convolutional neural networks for human activity recognition using mobile sensors. In 6th international conference on mobile computing, applications and services. IEEE, 197–205.
- [62] Yue Zhang, Chengtao Peng, Qiuli Wang, Dan Song, Kaiyan Li, and S Kevin Zhou. 2023. Unified multi-modal image synthesis for missing modality imputation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05340 (2023).
- [63] Zhongheng Zhang. 2016. Missing data imputation: focusing on single imputation. Annals of translational medicine 4, 1 (2016).
- [64] Yuchen Zhao, Payam Barnaghi, and Hamed Haddadi. 2022. Multimodal federated learning on iot data. In 2022 IEEE/ACM Seventh International Conference on Internet-of-Things Design and Implementation (IoTDI). IEEE, 43–54.
- [65] Tianyue Zheng, Ang Li, Zhe Chen, Hongbo Wang, and Jun Luo. 2023. AutoFed: Heterogeneity-Aware Federated Multimodal Learning for Robust Autonomous Driving. In Proceedings of the 29th Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking.