

# BapFL: You can Backdoor Personalized Federated Learning

TIANDI YE, East China Normal University, China

CEN CHEN\*, East China Normal University, China

YINGGUI WANG, Ant Group, China

XIANG LI, East China Normal University, China

MING GAO, East China Normal University, China

In federated learning (FL), malicious clients could manipulate the predictions of the trained model through backdoor attacks, posing a significant threat to the security of FL systems. Existing research primarily focuses on backdoor attacks and defenses within the generic federated learning scenario, where all clients collaborate to train a single global model. A recent study conducted by Qin et al. (2023) marks the initial exploration of backdoor attacks within the personalized federated learning (pFL) scenario, where each client constructs a personalized model based on its local data. Notably, the study demonstrates that pFL methods with *parameter decoupling* can significantly enhance robustness against backdoor attacks. However, in this paper, we whistleblow that pFL methods with parameter decoupling are still vulnerable to backdoor attacks. The resistance of pFL methods with parameter decoupling is attributed to the heterogeneous classifiers between malicious clients and benign counterparts. We analyze two direct causes of the heterogeneous classifiers: (1) data heterogeneity inherently exists among clients and (2) poisoning by malicious clients further exacerbates the data heterogeneity. To address these issues, we propose a two-pronged attack method, BapFL, which comprises two simple yet effective strategies: (1) poisoning only the feature encoder while keeping the classifier fixed and (2) diversifying the classifier through noise introduction to simulate that of the benign clients. Extensive experiments on three benchmark datasets under varying conditions demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed attack. Additionally, we evaluate the effectiveness of six widely used defense methods and find that BapFL still poses a significant threat even in the presence of the best defense, Multi-Krum. We hope to inspire further research on attack and defense strategies in pFL scenarios. The code is available at: <https://github.com/BapFL/code>.

CCS Concepts: • **Security and privacy** → **Domain-specific security and privacy architectures**; • **Computing methodologies** → **Cooperation and coordination**; • **Networks** → **Network security**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Personalized federated learning, backdoor attack, model security

## ACM Reference Format:

Tiandi Ye, Cen Chen, Yinggui Wang, Xiang Li, and Ming Gao. 2018. BapFL: You can Backdoor Personalized Federated Learning. *J. ACM* 37, 4, Article 111 (August 2018), 17 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

\*Corresponding author.

Authors' addresses: Tiandi Ye, 52205903002@stu.ecnu.edu.cn, East China Normal University, Shanghai, China, 200062; Cen Chen, cenchen@dase.ecnu.edu.cn, East China Normal University, Shanghai, China, 200062; Yinggui Wang, Ant Group, Beijing, China, 100020, wyinggui@gmail.com; Xiang Li, xiangli@dase.ecnu.edu.cn, East China Normal University, Shanghai, China, 200062; Ming Gao, mgao@dase.ecnu.edu.cn, East China Normal University, Shanghai, China, 200062.

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](mailto:permissions@acm.org).

© 2018 Association for Computing Machinery.

Manuscript submitted to ACM

Manuscript submitted to ACM

1

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Federated learning (FL) has gained significant popularity due to its ability to enable collaborative model training among multiple clients while preserving their data privacy [11, 16]. In FL, FedAvg [21] stands as the de facto FL method, which updates the server model by aggregating the model parameters from the clients. However, the performance of the model can be significantly affected by the non-IID (non-independent and non-identically distributed) nature of the data. To address this challenge, *personalized federated learning* (pFL) has emerged as a promising solution, as it allows personalized models for each participating client. Existing pFL methods can be broadly categorized based on the strategies employed to achieve personalization. These strategies include parameter decoupling [1, 4, 6, 7, 17, 22], regularization [15, 27], clustering [8, 20, 24, 32], and model interpolation [20].

The distributed training nature of FL makes it particularly vulnerable to backdoor attacks [2, 5, 23, 26, 35, 36], which manipulate the target model’s behavior by implanting specific triggers [9]. Recently, Qin et al. [23] demonstrated that pFL methods with parameter decoupling (i.e., partial model-sharing) can effectively alleviate backdoor attacks under the black-box assumption. There are two primary types of parameter decoupling. The first decomposes the model into the feature encoder and the classifier, as exemplified by FedPer [1], FedRep [7], FedRod [6], FedBABU [22] and FedMC [4]. In these methods, only the feature encoder is shared with the server, while the classifier remains locally for personalization. And the second retains the Batch Normalization layers locally and synchronizes only the remaining parameters with the server, as demonstrated by FedBN [17].

In this paper, we whistleblow that pFL methods with parameter decoupling are still vulnerable to backdoor attacks. Specifically, in Figure 1, we conduct black-box backdoor attacks against FedAvg, FedBN, and FedPer on three different datasets. It is evident that FedAvg exhibits a high vulnerability to such attacks, whereas FedBN provides negligible




Fig. 1. Attack success rate (ASR) of black-box backdoor attacks against FedAvg and two pFL methods based on parameter decoupling, namely FedBN and FedPer. Details of the attack setup are discussed in Section 4.1.

defense. In contrast, FedPer exhibits remarkable resistance to backdoor attacks. The remarkable resistance can be attributed to the significant divergence in local classifiers among clients. As a result, malicious clients are effectively impeded from generalizing the success of their attacks to the benign counterparts.

Classifier heterogeneity arises from two primary factors: ( $F_1$ ) data heterogeneity, such as class imbalance and concept-shift, inherently exists among clients, and ( $F_2$ ) poisoning by malicious clients exacerbates the distribution




Fig. 2. Illustration of factor  $F_2$ . Green triangles denote the poisoned samples whose ground truth labels are class 1, and the target label is class 0. Poisoning has significantly altered the data distribution, resulting in a noticeable shift in the classifier boundary compared to that of the benign client.

disparities between malicious and benign clients. As illustrated in Figure 2, after poisoning, the data distribution changes significantly in terms of class distribution  $p(y)$  and conditional distribution  $p(x|y)$ . The process of executing a backdoor attack requires the malicious client to adjust the classifier in order to classify the poisoned samples (originally belonging to the ground truth class 1) as class 0. Consequently, this manipulation leads to a distinct classifier boundary compared to that of the benign client. Building upon this observation, we propose a strategy for conducting backdoor attacks by targeting the feature representation of the poisoned samples towards the desired target class while keeping the classifier fixed.




Fig. 3. Illustration of factor  $F_1$ . The presence of data heterogeneity between client  $C_A$  and client  $C_B$  results in significant variation in their respective classifiers.

Furthermore, as depicted in Figure 3, the presence of data heterogeneity among clients results in significant variation in their respective classifiers. From the perspective of the malicious client  $C_B$ , steering the representation of the poisoned

samples towards subspace  $S^1$  may appear advantageous. However, even if the representation falls within  $S^1$ , it continues to be correctly categorized as class 1 by the benign client  $C_A$ . With a broader perspective, to effectively target both client  $C_A$  and  $C_B$ , it is preferable to guide the representation of the poisoned samples towards subspace  $S^0$ . Building upon this insight, we propose to enhance the attack’s generalizability by introducing noise to diversify the classifiers. The goal is to align the representation of poisoned samples as closely as possible with that of the target class for all clients involved in the federated learning process.

By combining the aforementioned two strategies, i.e., (1) solely poisoning the feature encoder and (2) enhancing classifier diversity through noise introduction, we design a practical and easy-to-implement backdoor attack, called BapFL. Our attack is designed to operate under the white-box assumption, where the attacker has full access to the local training process. Subsequently, we conduct extensive experiments on three benchmark datasets. Results show that our proposed BapFL achieved an impressive attack success rate (ASR) of 94.21% on MNIST, 80.93% on Fashion-MNIST, and 58.89% on CIFAR-10, demonstrating that the decoupling strategy gives a false sense of security. Furthermore, we investigate the effectiveness of six widely used defense methods, including Gradient Norm-Clipping [26], Median [33], Trimmed Mean [33], Multi-Krum [3], Fine-Tuning [23], and Simple-Tuning [23]. We find that only Multi-Krum provides effective defense. However, with the projected gradient descent (PGD) [29], BapFL is still able to bypass the defense of Multi-Krum and achieves an ASR of 70.60%.

We summarize our contributions as follows:

- We alert to the FL community that even pFL methods with parameter decoupling are still highly vulnerable to backdoor attacks. We introduce a practical and easy-to-implement backdoor attack, namely BapFL, which achieves remarkable attack performance while incurring negligible computational and storage costs.
- We conduct extensive experiments on three benchmark datasets to thoroughly evaluate the effectiveness of BapFL. The experimental results validate its efficacy, and further experiments demonstrate its superiority over baselines under varying conditions, including data heterogeneity, feature encoder size, number of malicious attackers, and attack frequency. An additional ablation study further demonstrates the effectiveness of our introduced strategies.
- Additionally, we assess the effectiveness of six widely used defense methods and find that even in the presence of these defenses, BapFL can still effectively target personalized models, yielding an ASR of 70.60%. We hope our findings could stimulate further research on both attack and defense strategies within the context of pFL scenarios.

## 2 RELATED WORK

### 2.1 Personalized Federated Learning

FL is a distributed machine learning paradigm, which enables training models on decentralized data sources and ensuring data privacy. We consider an FL system with  $N$  clients, where each client has a private dataset  $\mathcal{D}_i = \{(x_j, y_j)\}_{j=1}^{|\mathcal{D}_i|}$ . The optimization objective of the generic FL can be formulated as

$$\min_{\theta} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|\mathcal{D}_i|}{|\mathcal{D}|} \mathcal{L}_i(\theta), \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}_i = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_i|} \sum_{j=1}^{|\mathcal{D}_i|} \ell(x_j, y_j; \theta)$ .

Here,  $\mathcal{D} = \cup_i \mathcal{D}_i$  is the aggregated dataset from all clients,  $\theta$  is the global parameters,  $\mathcal{L}_i(\theta)$  is the empirical risk of client  $c_i$ , and  $\ell$  refers to the loss function applied to each data instance, commonly the cross-entropy loss for classification tasks. FedAvg [21] is the first proposed solution to Equation 1, which iterates between local training and global aggregation for multiple rounds of communication. Besides FedAvg, other generic FL methods, such as FedProx [16] and SCAFFOLD [12], output a universal model for all clients.

In terms of the test accuracy of each client, pFL proves to be a more effective learning paradigm, especially in the presence of data heterogeneity. Existing pFL methods can be broadly categorized based on the strategies employed to achieve personalization, e.g., parameter decoupling [1, 4, 6, 7, 17, 22], regularization [15, 27], clustering [8, 20, 24, 32], and model interpolation [20]. For a detailed discussion, we refer readers to the survey [28]. Here, we primarily focus on methods based on parameter decoupling, which involves decomposing the model into global and local components. There are two primary types of parameter decoupling. The first type keeps the Batch Normalization [10] layers local and synchronizes only the remaining parameters with the server, as demonstrated by FedBN [17]. Another predominant type divides the model into the feature encoder  $\omega$  and the classifier  $\psi$  [1, 4, 6, 7, 22]. The optimization objective of such methods can be expressed as follows:

$$\min_{\{\omega, \psi_1, \dots, \psi_N\}} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|\mathcal{D}_i|}{|\mathcal{D}|} \mathcal{L}_i(\omega, \psi_i), \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}_i = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_i|} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{D}_i} \ell(x_j, y_j; \omega, \psi_i)$ .

Here,  $\mathcal{L}_i(\omega, \psi_i)$  is the empirical risk of client  $i$ . FedPer [1] and FedRep [7] learn a global feature encoder across clients and personalized classifiers for each client. In FedPer [1], each client jointly updates the feature encoder and the classifier, whereas in FedRep [7], each client sequentially updates the classifier and the feature encoder. In FedBABU [22], each client learns the feature encoder with the randomly initialized classifier and obtains the personalized model by fine-tuning the global model. FedRod [6] employs a one-body-two-head architecture comprising a feature encoder and two classifiers (heads). The personalized classifier is trained locally and never shared with the server. In contrast, FedMC [4] utilizes a two-body-one-head architecture that includes a personalized classifier, a personalized feature encoder, and a global feature encoder. The personalized components are maintained locally.

## 2.2 Backdoor Attack and Defense

Recently, backdoor attacks have gained significant attention due to their potential to compromise the security and trustworthiness of deep learning models. In a backdoor attack, malicious clients implant hidden triggers into the target model. During inference, any input containing the trigger will be predicted as the predefined target label regardless of its ground truth, while ensuring that the model functions normally on clean inputs [9, 18].

Due to the decentralized nature of FL, malicious clients may manipulate their local models and inject backdoors into the global model during training [2, 5, 23, 29, 31, 34, 35]. Backdoor attacks in FL can be broadly categorized into two categories: white-box attacks and black-box attacks [19]. In white-box attacks, malicious clients have full access to the local training process, while in black-box attacks, adversarial clients are limited to manipulating the local datasets. Scaling attack [2] scales the model parameters before synchronizing with the server to cancel out the contributions from the benign clients and implement model replacement. Under the assumption that multiple malicious clients collaborate and collude, DBA [31] launch a distributed-trigger backdoor attack, which decomposes the global trigger into multiple parts and distributes them among multiple attackers. Experiment results have demonstrated that DBA outperforms the

single-trigger approach in terms of both attack effectiveness and stealth. Neurotoxin [35] extends the duration and persistence of backdoor attacks by projecting the adversarial gradient onto the subspace that remains unused by benign users during retraining.

To defend against backdoor attacks, many strategies have been proposed, such as Gradient Norm-Clipping [26], Median [33], Trimmed Mean [33], Krum and Multi-Krum [3]. Recent work [23] conducts the first study of backdoor attacks in the pFL framework and shows that pFL methods with partial model-sharing can effectively alleviate black-box backdoor attacks. Inspired by the defense mechanism of pFL methods of partial model-sharing, they provide a defense method that re-initializes the private parameters and retrains them on clean samples with the global parameters fixed.

### 3 METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1 Threat Model

In this paper, we backdoor attack against pFL methods under the white-box assumption, where malicious clients can poison local data and manipulate the local training procedure. Similar to previous studies [23, 31], we focus on the image classification task, which has been widely used in research on backdoor attacks.

*3.1.1 Attacker’s Capacities.* We assume that attackers have full access to their local training. They can poison a subset of local data and modify the training components, such as training loss and training schedule.

*3.1.2 Attacker’s Goals.* Malicious clients aim to implant backdoors into the global feature encoder. During testing on images that contain the trigger, the predictions of the personalized models will be arbitrarily altered to the target class. In addition, a successful attack should ensure stealthiness, i.e., the performance of the personalized model on clean samples should not be significantly reduced.

*3.1.3 Targeted pFL Methods.* Parameter-decoupling based pFL methods, such as FedPer, FedRep, FedRod, FedBABU, and FedMC, all share a common principle: decomposing the model into a global feature encoder and a personalized classifier. In this paper, our primary focus is on attacking the widely adopted parameter decoupling strategy. Without explicit declaration, we specifically target FedPer due to its simplicity in the training process. But it’s worth noting that the analysis can be easily extended to other methods.

#### 3.2 BapFL: Backdoor Attack against pFL

The resistance of parameter-decoupling based pFL methods against backdoor attacks lies in the significant divergence in classifiers between the malicious and benign clients. To overcome the defense, we design a two-pronged attack method called BapFL. This attack encompasses two crucial poisoning strategies:

- PS<sub>1</sub>: Poison only the feature encoder while keeping the classifier fixed. This strategy allows us to circumvent factor  $F_2$ , as analyzed in Section 1, since the classifier is never exposed to the poisoned samples.
- PS<sub>2</sub>: Diversify the classifier by introducing noise to simulate that of the benign clients. This strategy primarily targets addressing factor  $F_1$ .

We have detailed BapFL in Algorithm 1. Next, we will delve into these two strategies individually.

*3.2.1 Poisoning Only Feature Encoder.* Generalizing the attack to benign clients entails aligning the classifier of malicious clients with that of benign ones. To achieve this, we first apply strategy  $S_1$  to circumvent factor  $F_2$ . Specifically, during each local iteration, malicious client  $C_a$  poisons  $b$  samples within a batch (line 13). Subsequently, it updates the

entire model to minimize the model’s loss on clean samples (line 14-15). Afterwards, it proceeds to update only the feature encoder to minimize the model’s loss on the poisoned samples while keeping the classifier unchanged (line 18). The optimization of the malicious client’s classifier aligns with that of benign clients, utilizing only knowledge from clean samples.

**3.2.2 Diversifying Local Classifier.** We formulate the optimization objective of BapFL as follows:

$$\min_{\omega} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i(\omega, \psi_i). \quad (3)$$

Here, we use  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i(\omega, \psi_i)$  to represent the loss of the model parameterized by  $(\omega, \psi_i)$  on the corresponding poisoned dataset  $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_i$ . However, directly optimizing Equation 3 is infeasible, as the attacker (denoted as  $C_a$ ) lacks access to other clients’ classifiers  $\{\psi_i\}_{i=1}^{N \setminus a}$ .

A straightforward strategy is simulating other clients’ classifiers with randomly initialized parameters. However, a randomly generated classifier is likely to significantly deviate from that of benign clients. And we have empirically observed that randomly generated classifiers lead to unstable and slow convergence in terms of attack. Therefore, we suggest introducing noise to the attacker’s classifier  $\psi_a$  to mimic that of benign clients. Specifically, we sample noise from an isotropic multivariate Gaussian distribution  $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma)$  and then add it to  $\psi_a$ . The optimization objective in Equation 3 is reformulated as follows:

$$\min_{\omega} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i(\omega, \psi_a + \epsilon_i), \text{ where } \epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma). \quad (4)$$

The main objective of backdoor attacks is to compel the model to learn the mapping from the trigger pattern to the target label. Consequently, we can approximately substitute  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i(\omega, \psi_a + \epsilon_i)$  with  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_a(\omega, \psi_a + \epsilon_i)$ . As a result, we can simplify the optimization objective in Equation 4 as follows:

$$\min_{\omega} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_a(\omega, \psi_a + \epsilon_i), \text{ where } \epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma), \quad (5)$$

which can be optimized by the attacker itself without requiring any information from other clients. In FL, clients typically perform local training for multiple iterations. To enhance efficiency, we introduce noise  $\epsilon$  into  $\psi_a$  once during each iteration (line 16-17). By consistently sampling and injecting noise, the attacker gains exposure to a diverse set of classifiers, thereby making it possible to attack other clients with different data distributions. By combining the above two strategies, PS<sub>1</sub> and PS<sub>2</sub>, we obtain BapFL. Notably, in comparison to the black-box attack, BapFL introduces almost no computational and storage overhead.

In addition, in BapFL, we randomly sample  $\epsilon$  from  $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma)$ . For further efficiency, one can formulate the local objective  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_a(\omega, \psi_a + \epsilon)$  as a minimax problem  $\min_{\omega} \max_{\epsilon} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_a(\omega, \psi_a + \epsilon)$  and solve it with alternative optimization. We leave it for future work.

## 4 ATTACK EVALUATION

In this section, we conduct experiments on multiple benchmark datasets to evaluate the attack performance of BapFL through answering the following research questions:

- RQ1 (Section 4.2): Does BapFL outperform other backdoor attacks in the pFL setting?

**Algorithm 1:** Training of BapFL

---

```

1 Input: initial parameters of the feature encoder  $\omega^0$  and local classifiers  $\{\psi_i\}_{i=1}^N$ , total communication rounds  $R$ ,
   local iterations  $\tau$ , local minibatch size  $B$ , learning rate  $\eta$ , variance of an isotropic Gaussian distribution  $\sigma$ ,
   number of participating clients per round  $M$ , and number of poisoned samples in a batch  $b$ .
2 Output:  $\omega^R$  and  $\{\psi_i\}_{i=1}^N$ 
3 [Training]
4 for each round  $r : 0$  to  $R - 1$  do
5   Select a set of clients  $\mathcal{S}_r$  of size  $M$ 
6   for each client  $c_i \in \mathcal{S}_r$  do
7     // Local Training
8      $\omega_i \leftarrow \omega^r$ 
9      $\mathcal{B}_i \leftarrow$  Split local dataset  $\mathcal{D}_i$  into batches of size  $B$ 
10    for each iteration  $t : 1$  to  $\tau$  do
11      Sample a batch  $(X_t, Y_t) \sim \mathcal{B}_i$ 
12      if  $c_i$  is an attacker then
13         $(X_{t,\text{clean}}, Y_{t,\text{clean}}), (X_{t,\text{poison}}, Y_{t,\text{poison}}) \leftarrow$  Randomly poison  $b$  samples in the batch  $(X_t, Y_t)$ 
14         $\omega_i \leftarrow \omega_i - \eta \nabla_{\omega_i} \mathcal{L}_i(X_{t,\text{clean}}, Y_{t,\text{clean}})$ 
15         $\psi_i \leftarrow \psi_i - \eta \nabla_{\psi_i} \mathcal{L}_i(X_{t,\text{clean}}, Y_{t,\text{clean}})$ 
16         $\epsilon \leftarrow$  Sample a noise from  $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma)$ 
17         $\psi_i \leftarrow \psi_i + \epsilon$ 
18         $\omega_i \leftarrow \omega_i - \eta \nabla_{\omega_i} \mathcal{L}_i(X_{t,\text{poison}}, Y_{t,\text{poison}})$ 
19      end
20      else
21         $\omega_i \leftarrow \omega_i - \eta \nabla_{\omega_i} \mathcal{L}_i(X_t, Y_t)$ 
22         $\psi_i \leftarrow \psi_i - \eta \nabla_{\psi_i} \mathcal{L}_i(X_t, Y_t)$ 
23      end
24    end
25     $\omega_i^{r+1} \leftarrow \omega_i$ 
26    Client  $c_i$  sends  $\omega_i^{r+1}$  back to server
27  end
28  // Server Aggregation
29   $\omega^{r+1} \leftarrow \sum_{c_i \in \mathcal{S}_r} \frac{|\mathcal{D}_i|}{\sum_{c_i \in \mathcal{S}_r} |\mathcal{D}_i|} \omega_i^{r+1}$ 
30 end

```

---

- RQ2 (Section 4.3): How does BapFL perform under varying levels of data heterogeneity? Can BapFL maintain its effectiveness in strongly heterogeneous settings?
- RQ3 (Section 4.4): How does the number of sharing layers impact the attack performance of BapFL and the baseline attacks?
- RQ4 (Section 4.5): Intuitively, backdoor attacks tend to perform better with more malicious clients; can BapFL effectively launch attacks with only one malicious client?
- RQ5 (Section 4.6): Frequent attacks might lack stealth; how does BapFL perform with varying attack intervals?
- RQ6 (Section 4.7): Do strategies  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  indeed contribute to the improvement in BapFL's attack performance?






Fig. 4. Poisoned inputs with a grid pattern trigger from MNIST (top row), Fashion-MNIST (medium row), and CIFAR-10 (bottom row).

## 4.1 Experiment Setup

**4.1.1 Datasets and Models.** We conduct experiments on three widely-used datasets: MNIST [14], Fashion-MNIST [30], and CIFAR-10 [13]. Data heterogeneity might stem from many factors, such as class imbalance and concept shift. Given that class imbalance is more likely to lead to heterogeneous classifiers, in this paper, we specifically focus on the class imbalance setting. To simulate heterogeneous environments with class imbalance, we generate 50 clients using Dirichlet allocation with a concentration coefficient of  $\alpha = 0.5$ . For MNIST and Fashion-MNIST, we employ a ConvNet [14], which consists of two convolutional layers and two fully connected layers. For CIFAR-10, we utilize VGG11 [25], which comprises eight convolutional layers and three fully connected layers. In our experiments, for a 4-layer ConvNet, all clients share the first three layers. Similarly, for VGG11, all clients share the first six layers.

**4.1.2 Training Details.** We perform 200, 400, and 1000 communication rounds for MNIST, Fashion-MNIST, and CIFAR-10, respectively. Across all datasets, we set the number of local iterations ( $\tau$ ) to 20, the local minibatch size ( $B$ ) to 64, and the learning rate ( $\eta$ ) to 0.1 with a learning rate decay of 0.99 every 10 rounds. We use the SGD optimizer for local training with a weight decay of  $1e-4$ . In each round, 10% of the clients (5 clients) are selected for training and aggregation.

**4.1.3 Baselines.** We compare BapFL with the following baselines:

- Black-box Attack [23]: This attack poisons the training data and updates both the feature encoder and classifier simultaneously to minimize the classification loss on both clean and poisoned samples, following standard local training without modification.
- Scaling Attack [2]: This attack scales its model updates before synchronization with the server. We set the scale factor to 5 in our experiments.
- DBA [31]: This attack decomposes the global trigger into multiple parts and distributes them among multiple malicious clients.

**4.1.4 Attack Setup.** We employ the grid pattern as the trigger, which has been extensively utilized in federated learning backdoor attacks [9, 31]. Figure 4 illustrates the poisoned images with the grid pattern as the trigger. We adopt an

all-to-one attack strategy, where all poisoned samples are assigned the same target label regardless of their original ground-truth labels. For all datasets, the target label is set to class 2. We randomly designate 2 clients as malicious clients. Following the attack setting in [31], the malicious clients begin to attack when the main task accuracy converges, which is round 50 for MNIST, round 200 for Fashion-MNIST and round 500 for CIFAR-10. Subsequently, the malicious clients actively participate in the training process and launch backdoor attacks in every round. Following [34], in each local iteration, the malicious client poisons 20 samples of a batch on MNIST and Fashion-MNIST, and 5 samples on CIFAR-10. For BapFL, we search for the best  $\sigma$  values from  $\{0.01, 0.05, 0.1, 0.15, 0.2\}$ . Without explicit declaration, we set  $\sigma$  to 0.2 for MNIST and Fashion-MNIST, and 0.01 for CIFAR-10 in all experiments.

**4.1.5 Evaluation Details.** We employ two commonly used metrics, namely, the attack success rate (ASR) and the main-task accuracy (MTA), to evaluate the attack performance of backdoor attacks [31]. ASR and MTA denote the classification accuracy of the targeted model on the poisoned and clean testing data, respectively. A successful attack should achieve a high ASR while maintaining a high MTA, indicating effective manipulation of the model’s outputs without compromising its performance on the main task. We assess the model’s performance every two rounds for MNIST, every four rounds for Fashion-MNIST, and every ten rounds for CIFAR-10, respectively. Each experiment is executed five times with different random seeds. In each run, we calculate the average results over the final 50 rounds. For each experiment, we present the average results from these five runs.




Fig. 5. ASR and MTA curves of all attacks on three datasets.

## 4.2 Main Results

We present the ASR and MTA curves of all attacks in Figure 5. It is evident that BapFL significantly outperforms other attacks across all datasets in terms of attack performance, without negatively impacting the model’s performance on the main task. To be specific, BapFL surpasses the best baseline, Scaling Attack, by about 57% on MNIST, 42% on Fashion-MNIST and 36% on CIFAR-10. As the training progresses, there is an increasing divergence in local classifiers

between the malicious and benign clients, leading to a reduction in ASR for baseline attacks, particularly the Scaling Attack. In contrast, BapFL demonstrates stable attack performance even in the later stages of training.

### 4.3 Data Heterogeneity




Fig. 6. Client class distribution, partitioned by Dirichlet allocation with varying concentration coefficient  $\alpha \in \{0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 1, 3\}$ .

The parameter-decoupling based pFL methods achieve personalization through individualized classifiers. And the stronger the data heterogeneity, the larger the divergence in local classifiers among clients. The increasing divergence makes it challenging for malicious clients to successfully attack other clients. To investigate the impact of data heterogeneity on attack effectiveness, we run BapFL and the baselines on three datasets. We control the degree of data heterogeneity by varying the parameter  $\alpha \in \{0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 1, 3\}$ . The client class distribution is displayed in Figure 6. The smaller the value of  $\alpha$ , the stronger the data heterogeneity. Note that when  $\alpha \leq 0.5$ , each client is likely to have two or three dominating classes while owning a few or even zero samples from the remaining classes.




Fig. 7. ASR and MTA curves of all attacks on three datasets.

We present the experimental results in Figure 7. It is evident that, with comparable main task performance, BapFL consistently outperforms the baselines on all datasets across varying  $\alpha$ . In general, for all attacks, as data heterogeneity

increases, the ASR decreases. However, even under settings with highly strong data heterogeneity ( $\alpha=0.1$ ), BapFL still achieves an ASR of 46.82% on MNIST, 35.58% on Fashion-MNIST and 18.25% on CIFAR-10, respectively (surpassing the best baseline, Scaling Attack, by about 20%, 10% and 12%, respectively), which still poses a threat to the security of FL systems. When  $\alpha=3$ , the data distribution among clients is relatively similar, and BapFL achieves an ASR of 99.96% on MNIST, 99.93% on Fashion-MNIST, and 68.27% on CIFAR-10, respectively. In contrast, the best baseline, Scaling Attack, achieves an ASR of only 55.10% on MNIST, 40.77% on Fashion-MNIST, and 15.59% on CIFAR-10, respectively. Furthermore, BapFL exhibits greater stability. As  $\alpha$  increases, the ASRs of BapFL steadily improves. In contrast, the performance of the baselines experiences some degree of fluctuation.

#### 4.4 Number of Sharing Layers




Fig. 8. Comparison of BapFL and the baselines with varying  $L$ , i.e., the number of sharing layers.

In this section, we investigate the impact of the number of sharing layers, denoted as  $L$ , on ASR and MTA. We conduct experiments with BapFL and the baselines on CIFAR-10 with varying  $L \in \{4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10\}$ . The results in Figure 8 reveal a significant trade-off: sharing more layers substantially exposes the model to backdoor attacks, while sharing too few layers acts as a defense, albeit with a significant degradation in model utility. Balancing the trade-off between model utility and security by varying  $L$  is a critical challenge. We can see that  $L = 6$  seems a promising choice. Compared to  $L = 7$ , it can reduce the ASR for the baseline attacks by over 40% with a minimal cost of approximately 1% in terms of MTA. However, even when  $L = 6$ , BapFL can still achieve an ASR of 58.89%, posing a significant threat to the security of pFL systems.




Fig. 9. Comparison of BapFL and the baselines with varying  $A$ , i.e., the number of malicious clients.

#### 4.5 Number of Attackers

Intuitively, the larger the number of malicious clients, the broader the attack surface becomes, thus increasing vulnerability for benign clients. A straightforward question arises that does BapFL still pose a threat when there is only one malicious client? To investigate this, we conduct experiments with BapFL and the baselines on three datasets with varying number of malicious clients  $A \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ . For cases where  $A \geq 2$ , we set the number of participating malicious clients each round to 2, and for  $A = 1$ , we set the number of participating malicious clients each round to 1. The experimental results are presented in Figure 9.

It is noteworthy that the baseline attackers require a larger number of malicious clients to enhance their attack performance. Even with a total of five attackers, Scaling Attack achieves an ASR of only 56.78% on MNIST, 66.20% on Fashion-MNIST, and 48.04% on CIFAR-10, respectively. In contrast, with just one attacker, BapFL attains an ASR of 89.67% on MNIST, 73.72% on Fashion-MNIST, and 53.52% on CIFAR-10, showcasing its robust generalization capability.

#### 4.6 Attack Frequency

As launching attacks at every round may lack stealth, we closely examine the performance of BapFL with a larger attack interval, such as 16 rounds. Additionally, to enhance attack efficiency, we integrate the Scaling Attack to BapFL, denoted as BapFL+Scaling. We conduct experiments with BapFL and BapFL+Scaling on three datasets with varying attack interval  $I \in \{1, 2, 4, 8, 16\}$ .

The results presented in Figure 10 reveal that BapFL remains effective with  $I \leq 8$ , but when  $I = 16$ , BapFL experiences a significant performance drop. However, it is clear that the Scaling operation improves the sustainability of BapFL by a large margin. BapFL+Scaling maintains an ASR of 83.64% on MNIST, 70.17% on Fashion-MNIST, and 46.25% on CIFAR-10 even when  $A = 16$ , respectively.




Fig. 10. Attack performance of BapFL and BapFL+Scaling with varying  $I$ , i.e., the attack interval.

#### 4.7 Ablation Study

To generalize the attack to benign clients, BapFL perturbs the parameters of the classifier with noise from a Gaussian distribution  $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma)$ . When  $\sigma = 0$ , BapFL degrades to its base version, denoted as BapFL<sup>-</sup>, which incorporates only strategy PS<sub>1</sub>. We conduct experiments on three datasets with varying  $\sigma$ . Specifically, we test BapFL with  $\sigma \in 0.04 \times \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$  on MNIST and Fashion-MNIST, and  $\sigma \in 0.002 \times \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$  on CIFAR-10. The experimental results are presented in Figure 11.

It is evident that increasing  $\sigma$  consistently improves the ASR without deteriorating the MTA when  $\sigma \leq 0.2$  on MNIST and Fashion-MNIST, and  $\sigma \leq 0.01$  on CIFAR-10. This can be attributed to that significant noise helps in generalizing attacks to diverse personalized classifiers. However, when  $\sigma$  exceeds the threshold, the attack performance begins to decline. This occurs due to two primary reasons: excessive noise might make the optimization unstable, and the noised classifier is likely to deviate from that of benign clients. Furthermore, we observe that:

- BapFL<sup>-</sup> achieves an ASR of 78.46% on MNIST, 71.52% on Fashion-MNIST, and 49.3% on CIFAR-10, respectively. These results still outperform the best baseline, Scaling Attack, by about 41%, 34%, and 27%, respectively, thereby validating the effectiveness of strategy PS<sub>1</sub>.
- BapFL with the optimal  $\sigma$  surpasses BapFL<sup>-</sup> by approximately 15% on MNIST and 9% on Fashion-MNIST and CIFAR-10, further validating the effectiveness of strategy PS<sub>2</sub>.




Fig. 11. ASR and MTA of BapFL with varying  $\sigma$  on three datasets.

## 5 DEFENSE

In this section, we assess potential defenses against BapFL and the baseline attacks. We consider six widely used defense strategies:

- Gradient Norm-Clipping [26]: The server normalizes clients' model updates that exceed a predefined threshold of  $H$ .
- Median [33]: The server aggregates clients' updates by calculating their element-wise median.
- Trimmed Mean [33]: The server averages clients' updates after excluding a certain percentage ( $\beta$ ) of extreme values from both ends of the parameter distribution.
- Multi-Krum [3]: The server calculates the Krum distance for each update by summing the parameter distance between the update and the other closest  $M - f$  clients, and then aggregates the updates from  $J$  clients with the lowest Krum distance to obtain the final result. Here,  $M$  denotes the total number of clients participating in each round, and  $f$  is equal or larger than the number of malicious clients.
- Fine-Tuning [23]: Clients fine-tune the entire model using their local clean datasets.
- Simple-Tuning [23]: Clients reinitialize their classifiers and then retrain them using their local clean datasets while keeping the feature encoder fixed.

We evaluate the performance of these defenses on MNIST with  $\alpha = 0.5$ , as all attacks exhibit the highest ASR among the three datasets. Specifically, we assess Gradient Norm-Clipping with different values of  $H \in \{0.1, 0.3, 0.5\}$ . For Trimmed Mean, we select  $\beta \in \{0.2, 0.4\}$  to exclude two or four clients from the aggregation process. Regarding Multi-Krum, the hyperparameter  $f$  is set to 2, corresponding to the number of malicious clients, while  $J$  is set to 3, corresponding to the

Table 1. Performance comparison among existing defenses. An effective defense is characterized by a lower ASR ( $\downarrow$ ) and a higher MTA ( $\uparrow$ ). The best attack results are highlighted in **bold**, while the most effective defenses are marked with  $\dagger$ .

Defenses	No-Defense		Gradient Norm-Clipping						Median		Trimmed Mean				Multi-Krum		Fine-Tuning		Simple-Tuning			
	\		$H = 0.1$		$H = 0.3$		$H = 0.5$		\		$\beta = 0.2$		$\beta = 0.4$		\		\		\			
	ASR	MTA	ASR	MTA	ASR	MTA	ASR	MTA	ASR	MTA	ASR	MTA	ASR	MTA	ASR	MTA	ASR	MTA	ASR	MTA		
Black-box Attack	14.36	98.47	6.60	96.63	10.99	97.60	12.05	97.95	6.74	98.40	9.47	98.34	6.87	98.38	0.47 $\dagger$	98.50	11.80	98.51	5.05	98.22		
Scaling Attack	37.15	98.49	15.14	96.95	19.66	97.72	20.52	98.02	8.35	98.46	15.83	98.36	7.85	98.43	0.40 $\dagger$	98.48	26.89	98.52	17.94	98.13		
DBA	21.89	98.53	6.08	96.62	13.70	97.66	15.77	97.97	7.85	98.41	14.14	98.33	8.02	98.41	0.33 $\dagger$	98.41	23.16	98.55	10.62	98.24		
BapFL	<b>94.21</b>	98.62	<b>46.10</b>	95.71	<b>80.24</b>	97.46	<b>88.52</b>	97.95	<b>46.79</b>	98.45	<b>94.20</b>	98.61	<b>52.91</b>	98.52	<b>9.18<math>\dagger</math></b>	$\xrightarrow{\text{PGD}}$ <b>70.60</b>	97.09	$\xrightarrow{\text{PGD}}$ 97.11	<b>94.63</b>	98.69	<b>88.65</b>	98.08

number of benign clients. For Fine-Tuning, we perform 20 iterations of fine-tuning on the entire model, whereas for Simple-Tuning, we retrain the local classifier for 200 iterations. As the defenses, including Gradient Norm-Clipping, Median, Trimmed Mean, and Multi-Krum, tend to slow down the model convergence speed, we conduct an additional 200 communication rounds. The rest of the experimental setup remains consistent with the details outlined in Section 4.1.

Furthermore, to bypass Multi-Krum, we incorporate PGD [29] into BapFL. Specifically, let  $\omega^\circ$  represent the updated classifier on clean samples (line 14 in Algorithm 1), and  $\omega'$  denote the updated classifier on poisoned samples (line 18 in Algorithm 1). We project  $\omega'$  onto a ball centered around  $\omega^\circ$  with a radius of  $\delta$ , i.e.,  $\|\omega' - \omega^\circ\| \leq \delta$ . In our experiments, we set  $\delta$  to 0.01.

## 5.1 Results

We present the experimental results in Tab. 1. From the attacker’s perspective, compared with the baseline attacks, BapFL consistently demonstrates the best attack performance in the presence of all defenses. From the defender’s perspective, among the defenses, Multi-Krum offers the most effective protection.

Specifically, it can be observed that Gradient Norm-Clipping can reduce BapFL’s ASR from 94.21% to 46.10%, but it comes at a cost of approximately 3% in terms of MTA. In contrast, Median and Trimmed Mean with  $\beta = 0.4$  provide similar defense effects without compromising the model’s utility. Unfortunately, Fine-Tuning fails to provide effective defense against backdoor attacks and even exacerbates the ASR. For instance, it increases the ASR from 21.89% to 23.61% for DBA and from 94.21% to 94.63% for BapFL. Although Simple-Tuning shows improved defense performance compared to Fine-Tuning, the ASR of BapFL still exceeds 85%. Multi-Krum demonstrates superior defense performance, reducing the ASR baseline attacks to below 1% and that of BapFL to below 10%. However, when combined with PGD, BapFL can easily bypass Multi-Krum and obtain an ASR of 70.60%, indicating a significant threat.

## 6 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have shed light on the vulnerability of personalized federated learning (pFL) methods with parameter decoupling to backdoor attacks, emphasizing the necessity for robust defenses. Initially, we analyzed two fundamental factors contributing to the inherent challenges in attacking personalized models. Then, we introduced two straightforward poisoning strategies individually to counteract the two factors. Combining these two strategies, we developed a practical and easy-to-implement backdoor attack, namely BapFL. Extensive experiments have demonstrated the effectiveness of BapFL. Furthermore, we assessed the efficacy of six widely used defense methods and found that BapFL still remains a significant threat even in the presence of the best defense, Multi-Krum. We hope that our work can stimulate further investigations into both attack and defense strategies within the pFL scenarios, ultimately enhancing the security and trustworthiness of pFL in real-world applications.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under grant number 62202170 and the Ant Group.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Manoj Ghuhana Arivazhagan, Vinay Aggarwal, Aaditya Kumar Singh, and Sunav Choudhary. 2019. Federated learning with personalization layers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.00818* (2019).
- [2] Eugene Bagdasaryan, Andreas Veit, Yiqing Hua, Deborah Estrin, and Vitaly Shmatikov. 2020. How to backdoor federated learning. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR, 2938–2948.
- [3] Peva Blanchard, El Mahdi El Mhamdi, Rachid Guerraoui, and Julien Stainer. 2017. Machine learning with adversaries: Byzantine tolerant gradient descent. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [4] Cen Chen, Tiandi Ye, Li Wang, and Ming Gao. 2022. Learning to generalize in heterogeneous federated networks. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*. 159–168.
- [5] C-L Chen, Leana Golubchik, and Marco Paolieri. 2020. Backdoor Attacks on Federated Meta-Learning. In *34th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [6] Hong-You Chen and Wei-Lun Chao. 2021. On bridging generic and personalized federated learning for image classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.00778* (2021).
- [7] Liam Collins, Hamed Hassani, Aryan Mokhtari, and Sanjay Shakkottai. 2021. Exploiting shared representations for personalized federated learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2089–2099.
- [8] Avishek Ghosh, Jichan Chung, Dong Yin, and Kannan Ramchandran. 2020. An efficient framework for clustered federated learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 19586–19597.
- [9] Tianyu Gu, Kang Liu, Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, and Siddharth Garg. 2019. Badnets: Evaluating backdooring attacks on deep neural networks. *IEEE Access* 7 (2019), 47230–47244.
- [10] Sergey Ioffe and Christian Szegedy. 2015. Batch normalization: Accelerating deep network training by reducing internal covariate shift. In *International conference on machine learning*. pmlr, 448–456.
- [11] Peter Kairouz, H Brendan McMahan, Brendan Avent, Aurélien Bellet, Mehdi Bennis, Arjun Nitin Bhagoji, Kallista Bonawitz, Zachary Charles, Graham Cormode, Rachel Cummings, et al. 2021. Advances and open problems in federated learning. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning* 14, 1–2 (2021), 1–210.
- [12] Sai Praneeth Karimireddy, Satyen Kale, Mehryar Mohri, Sashank Reddi, Sebastian Stich, and Ananda Theertha Suresh. 2020. Scaffold: Stochastic controlled averaging for federated learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 5132–5143.
- [13] Alex Krizhevsky. 2009. CIFAR-10 Dataset. <http://www.cs.toronto.edu/~kriz/cifar.html>.
- [14] Yann LeCun, Léon Bottou, Yoshua Bengio, and Patrick Haffner. 1998. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proc. IEEE* 86, 11 (1998), 2278–2324.
- [15] Tian Li, Shengyuan Hu, Ahmad Beirami, and Virginia Smith. 2021. Ditto: Fair and robust federated learning through personalization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 6357–6368.
- [16] 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.
- [17] Xiaoxiao Li, Meirui Jiang, Xiaofei Zhang, Michael Kamp, and Qi Dou. 2021. Fedbn: Federated learning on non-iid features via local batch normalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.07623* (2021).
- [18] Yiming Li, Yong Jiang, Zhifeng Li, and Shu-Tao Xia. 2022. Backdoor learning: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* (2022).
- [19] Lingjuan Lyu, Han Yu, and Qiang Yang. 2020. Threats to federated learning: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.02133* (2020).
- [20] Yishay Mansour, Mehryar Mohri, Jae Ro, and Ananda Theertha Suresh. 2020. Three approaches for personalization with applications to federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.10619* (2020).
- [21] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Aguerre y Arcas. 2017. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*. PMLR, 1273–1282.
- [22] Jaehoon Oh, SangMook Kim, and Se-Young Yun. 2021. FedBABU: Toward Enhanced Representation for Federated Image Classification. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [23] Zeyu Qin, Liuyi Yao, Daoyuan Chen, Yaliang Li, Bolin Ding, and Minhao Cheng. 2023. Revisiting Personalized Federated Learning: Robustness Against Backdoor Attacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.01677* (2023).
- [24] Felix Sattler, Klaus-Robert Müller, and Wojciech Samek. 2020. Clustered federated learning: Model-agnostic distributed multitask optimization under privacy constraints. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems* 32, 8 (2020), 3710–3722.
- [25] Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. 2014. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556* (2014).



- [26] Ziteng Sun, Peter Kairouz, Ananda Theertha Suresh, and H Brendan McMahan. 2019. Can you really backdoor federated learning? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.07963* (2019).
- [27] Canh T Dinh, Nguyen Tran, and Josh Nguyen. 2020. Personalized federated learning with moreau envelopes. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 21394–21405.
- [28] Alysa Ziyang Tan, Han Yu, Lizhen Cui, and Qiang Yang. 2022. Towards personalized federated learning. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* (2022).
- [29] Hongyi Wang, Kartik Sreenivasan, Shashank Rajput, Harit Vishwakarma, Saurabh Agarwal, Jy-yong Sohn, Kangwook Lee, and Dimitris Papailiopoulos. 2020. Attack of the tails: Yes, you really can backdoor federated learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 16070–16084.
- [30] Han Xiao, Kashif Rasul, and Roland Vollgraf. 2017. Fashion-mnist: a novel image dataset for benchmarking machine learning algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.07747* (2017).
- [31] Chulin Xie, Keli Huang, Pin-Yu Chen, and Bo Li. 2020. Dba: Distributed backdoor attacks against federated learning. In *International conference on learning representations*.
- [32] Tiandi Ye, Senhui Wei, Jamie Cui, Cen Chen, Yingnan Fu, and Ming Gao. 2023. Robust Clustered Federated Learning. In *International Conference on Database Systems for Advanced Applications*. Springer, 677–692.
- [33] Dong Yin, Yudong Chen, Ramchandran Kannan, and Peter Bartlett. 2018. Byzantine-robust distributed learning: Towards optimal statistical rates. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 5650–5659.
- [34] Kaiyuan Zhang, Guan hong Tao, Qiuling Xu, Siyuan Cheng, Shengwei An, Yingqi Liu, Shiwei Feng, Guangyu Shen, Pin-Yu Chen, Shiqing Ma, et al. 2022. FLIP: A Provable Defense Framework for Backdoor Mitigation in Federated Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.12873* (2022).
- [35] Zhengming Zhang, Ashwinee Panda, Linyue Song, Yaoqing Yang, Michael Mahoney, Prateek Mittal, Ramchandran Kannan, and Joseph Gonzalez. 2022. Neurotoxin: Durable backdoors in federated learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 26429–26446.
- [36] Haomin Zhuang, Mingxian Yu, Hao Wang, Yang Hua, Jian Li, and Xu Yuan. 2023. Backdoor Federated Learning by Poisoning Backdoor-Critical Layers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.04466* (2023).

Received 20 February 2007; revised 12 March 2009; accepted 5 June 2009