

A Survey on Federated Analytics: Taxonomy, Enabling Techniques, Applications and Open Issues

Zibo Wang, Haichao Ji, Yifei Zhu, *Member, IEEE*, Dan Wang, *Senior Member, IEEE*, and Zhu Han, *Fellow, IEEE*,

Abstract—The escalating influx of data generated by networked edge devices, coupled with the growing awareness of data privacy, has restricted the traditional data analytics workflow, where the edge data are gathered by a centralized server to be further utilized by data analysts. To continue leveraging vast edge data to support various data-incentive applications, a transformative shift is promoted in computing paradigms from centralized data processing to privacy-preserved distributed data processing. The need to perform data analytics on private edge data motivates federated analytics (FA), an emerging technique to support collaborative data analytics among diverse data owners without centralizing the raw data. Despite the wide applications of FA in industry and academia, a comprehensive examination of existing research efforts in FA has been notably absent. This survey aims to bridge this gap by first providing an overview of FA, elucidating key concepts, and discussing its relationship with similar concepts. We then conduct a thorough examination of FA, including its key challenges, taxonomy, and enabling techniques. Diverse FA applications, including statistical metrics, frequency-centralized applications, database query operations, FL-assisting FA tasks, and other wireless network applications are then carefully reviewed. We complete the survey with several open research issues, future directions, and a comprehensive lessons learned part. This survey intends to provide a holistic understanding of the emerging FA techniques and foster the continued evolution of privacy-preserving distributed data processing in the emerging networked society.

Index Terms—Federated analytics, privacy, data science, security, distributed systems, federated learning, Internet-of-Things

I. INTRODUCTION

There's been a surge in data volume generated recently by the exponential growth of the Internet of Things (IoT) devices, where the number of connected devices is forecasted to reach 125 billion by 2030 [1]. This IoT expansion is expected to generate 79.4 ZB of data by 2025 [2]. The utilization of these data drives numerous significant and predominant data-driven applications in the fields of science and industry, ranging from chemical design to recommender systems. As the utilization of these edge data increases, uploading and processing these data centrally presents huge challenges for data communication and computing. Coincident with the extraordinary increase in the volume of data has also been a growing appreciation

of the importance of data privacy, reflected by the enactment of stringent regulations such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) [3]. Fueled by the data explosion and privacy concerns, there is a noticeable shift from centralized to distributed data collection, storage, and processing. This evolution in data management underscores a new paradigm called federated computation [4], where data-oriented tasks are conducted among distributed data owners without uploading the local raw data. In federated computation, distributed data owners convert their local data into informative and privacy-preserving insights, and upload such insights to a centralized server. The data analyst, who controls the centralized server, aggregates the insight to derive a global model, or analytics results, which represents a global view of the edge data in all data owners. Federated learning (FL) is an instance of this computing paradigm that targets collaborative model training without centralizing the raw data. It has been widely studied, deployed in the real world, and adequately surveyed [5]–[9].

Federated analytics (FA) is another emerging instance of the federated computation paradigm, which conducts data analytics tasks on distributed data held by different data owners (clients). The term “federated analytics” was first introduced by Google in 2020 [10] to describe “the practice of applying data science methods to the analysis of raw data that is stored locally on users’ devices”. The first application of FA is conducted by Google researchers [10], where the FA scheme is designed to evaluate the accuracy of a trained FL model against client data in local devices. FA extends the application of currently successful FL to broader data analytics tasks other than model training for deep learning. In contrast to classical data analytics workflow, which usually requires the clients to upload their raw data to a centralized server, FA prevents any transmission of raw data leaving the client they originated, in order to save communication costs and preserve the data privacy of clients.

In an FA algorithm, the clients utilize their local data and the computation model received from the server to conduct local computation. The output of the local computation procedure is called “insight”. The insights are tailored data structures or information that reflect useful knowledge about the local data for the host data analytics task while preserving the privacy of the raw data. The clients upload the insight to the server to circumvent the raw data transmission, and the server performs insight aggregation to transform the individually-generated insights received from the clients to derive the population-level data analytics results. With FA, valuable analytics results can be derived to serve the pervasive data analytics needs of networked applications. The growing data privacy concerns of

Z. Wang, H. Ji, and Y. Zhu are with UM-SJTU Joint Institute, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China. Y. Zhu is also with Cooperative Medianet Innovation Center (CMIC), Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China. E-mail: {wangzibo, haichao.ji2000, yifei.zhu}@sjtu.edu.cn

D. Wang is with Department of Computing, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong, China. E-mail: csdwang@comp.polyu.edu.hk

Z. Han is with Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Houston, Houston, USA. E-mail: zhan2@uh.edu

Manuscript received xxx xx, xxxx; revised xxx xx, xxxx.

the users can also be properly handled.

Specifically, compared with traditional centralized data analytics and its sibling FL technique, FA offers the following benefits:

- **Communication reduction:** FA transmits the insight of client data instead of the raw data. The structure of insight is usually designed to contain only valuable information to resolve the data analytics tasks, and the size of insight is usually independent of the number of data samples held by the clients. Therefore, FA can reduce the communication cost in data analytics, especially when the clients hold large-volume raw data with many data samples.
- **Privacy preservation:** The tenet of FA prevents the transmission of raw data. The transmitted insight, which only includes abstractive information of the raw data, is less sensitive than the raw data transmission. Therefore, compared to traditional data analytics that require raw data transmission, FA enhances privacy preservation in utilizing edge data, with both the prevention of raw data transmission and additional privatization mechanisms. FA can be applied to both large-scale mobile devices, as well as several major data silos.
- **Expansive task coverage:** Different from FL which mostly focuses on neural network-based predictive tasks, FA extends the scope and covers the whole spectrum of descriptive tasks in data science. These tasks range from basic calculations to complex tasks involving sophisticated and dedicated data structures and computation procedures. FA, joining forces with FL, successfully addresses the entirety of the learning and analytics problem space, enabling all data-oriented tasks to be completed in a federated environment.

With these unique advantages, FA has offered a range of applications across various industries and sectors. For example, Google has utilized FA “in support of FL” to “measure the quality of FL models against real-world data when that data is not available in a data center” [10]. FA can also assist FL in terms of client selection [11] and client clustering [12]. Furthermore, sectors where data sensitivity is paramount can benefit from privacy-preserving FA to cooperate on tasks and research without sharing raw data such as healthcare [13], finance, and public services [14]. In these contexts, even competitive parties can conduct FA collaboratively for common interests. The reductions in communication and computation further enable FA to offer wide applications in sectors where data is collected from remote locations like agriculture and environmental monitoring or where large-scale data collections and processing are required such as tasks in smart cities and in industry 4.0. The wide applications and studies of FA make it the proper time to survey this prominent area.

A. Comparison and our contributions

There’s been a lot of surveys on related topics of FA such as FL [5]–[9] and privacy computing [15]–[17], but a comprehensive review of FA’s current status is lacking that only two preliminary surveys exist. Survey [18] reviews FA, its position in research, motivation, and applications but lacks

detailed task elaborations and focuses more on challenges and solutions. Survey [19] categorizes queries in FA into statistical, set-based, and matrix transformation. However, it misses the diverse data analytics tasks of current FA applications with significant performance. It also lacks an in-depth analysis of multi-dimensional taxonomy and key enabling techniques from various perspectives.

To the best of our knowledge, there is still no existing work to provide a comprehensive and dedicated review of FA. This survey is motivated by this gap to provide a more comprehensive summarization of FA algorithms and systems. We investigate wider classes of data analytics tasks FA applies than previous surveys. We clarify the ambiguity and discuss the overlap between FA and its related fields, showing how research in related fields exactly utilizes the idea of FA to resolve data analytics tasks with privacy preservation, and include these massive works in this survey. This survey is expected to let the readers have a comprehensive view of what the data analytics problem FA studies focus on, what are the enabling technologies of FA, and what are the opening issues of FA that require further research effort. In addition, this survey is expected to inspire researchers in related fields about the relationship and application of FA in these fields. It provides a demonstration of how FA has been applied in these fields, and how FA can be potentially utilized in these fields.

To this end, the key contributions of this article are highlighted as follows:

- We present the first state-of-the-art comprehensive survey on FA, covering the key challenges, taxonomy, and techniques, as well as a wide spectrum of FA applications.
- We derive a taxonomy for FA from different dimensions, including data analytics task, scale of clients, number of iterations, coordination model, as well as privatization methodology.
- We summarize enabling techniques in FA for privacy preservation, data analytics, and system optimization.
- We summarize a wide spectrum of FA applications, including statistical metrics, frequency-related applications, database operations, other downstream and upstream tasks in a machine learning pipeline, and wireless network applications.
- We identify several key open research issues and challenges in FA, covering the application scenarios, algorithm design, system optimization, and cross-layer enhancement.

B. Structure of the Survey

The structure of the survey is organized as follows. Section II reviews surveys of FA and related topics. Section III provides an overview of FA, including its general workflow, a general mathematical problem formulation, and its comparison with related topics. In Section IV, key challenges in designing and deploying FA are discussed. Section V introduces our taxonomy of FA algorithms and systems. Our taxonomy covers five important dimensions that have significant impacts on its real-world applications and deployments. Section VI, we introduce key enabling techniques applied in FA, including




Fig. 1. Overview of the survey.

privatization techniques to realize privacy preservation, analytics techniques to derive data analytics results, and deployment/optimization techniques to enable real-world applications. In the following five sections, we introduce the vast existing FA solutions in detail, where each section covers FA

solutions on a particular class of data analytics tasks: Section VII covers the computation of simple statistical metrics; Section VIII covers the tasks related to frequency estimation; Section IX covers database operations (data analytics tasks formulated as SQL queries); Section X covers data analytics tasks that are tailor-designed to assist FL systems; Section XI covers the applications of FA for wireless networks. Section XII discusses open issues and future research directions in FA, and Section XIII describes the lessons learned for the survey, and then concludes the survey. An overview of the survey is provided in Fig. 1.

II. RELATED SURVEYS

A. Federated analytics survey

Although the extraordinary advantage of the FA framework in privacy preservation and high-utility data analytics has spurred numerous FA studies, a systematic review of the current status of FA has not been conducted thus far. To date, only two preliminary surveys on FA exist [18], [19]. Survey [18] first reviews the FA, and clarifies its position in the research literature, motivation, and application of it. However, it lacks detailed elaborations on tasks that can be supported by FA, presenting only two cases as examples. They place more emphasis on discussing the challenges, existing and possible solutions of FA in terms of the architecture, privacy problem, computation and communication resource, analytics design, and business models. Authors in [19] focus on common queries of interest in FA and their corresponding existing solutions, algorithms, and applications. They summarize and divide queries in FA into three categories: statistical queries, set-based queries, and matrix transformation queries. However, this classification is not comprehensive enough to cover other query types and data analytics tasks in FA, such as database operations, frequency-based queries, and tasks for FL assistance. Additionally, they do not provide a comprehensive summary of common techniques employed in FA, such as privatization, analytics, and system optimization.

B. Federated learning survey

FL has obtained significant attention in recent years as a promising approach to distributed machine learning, allowing multiple devices or parties to collaboratively train models without sharing raw data. This paradigm shift addresses critical issues related to data privacy, security, and communication costs, making it particularly relevant in various applications such as healthcare, finance, and IoT. Numerous surveys [5]–[9] have been conducted to explore the advancements, challenges, and future directions of FL.

The survey [8] provides an in-depth analysis of recent advances in FL and its future directions. It summarizes the fundamental principles of FL and its advantages over traditional centralized learning approaches and reviews the latest developments in FL, including advancements in communication efficiency, personalization techniques, and secure aggregation methods. They discuss how these innovations have been applied in various sectors, such as finance, healthcare,




Fig. 2. Architecture of FA.

and autonomous systems, showcasing the versatility and effectiveness of FL. In survey [7], authors comprehensively discuss the challenges, methods, and future directions of FL. It begins by outlining the primary issues in FL, such as data privacy, communication costs, and model accuracy. They review various methods to address these challenges, including differential privacy (DP), secure multiparty computation, and model compression techniques. They also examine the application of FL in various fields like healthcare, finance, and IoT, highlighting the benefits and limitations of FL in these contexts.

There are FL surveys concentrating on specific area. The survey [6] focuses on the application of FL in mobile edge networks . It discusses the unique challenges of implementing FL in such environments, including heterogeneous devices, communication costs, and privacy concerns. The authors provide an overview of mobile edge computing (MEC) and its role in facilitating FL, detailing how FL can optimize resource allocation and improve network efficiency. They review existing solutions for integrating FL with MEC, such as edge aggregation and adaptive model updating. The survey also explores various use cases of FL in mobile networks, such as vehicular networks and smart cities. While survey [5] examines the use of FL in IoT domain. It introduces the key characteristics of IoT, such as vast data generation and the need for real-time processing, which make FL an attractive solution. The authors review the main challenges in applying FL to IoT, including data heterogeneity, device resource constraints, and security issues. They present various strategies to overcome these challenges, such as lightweight models, federated transfer learning, and privacy-preserving techniques. The survey also highlights several applications of FL in IoT, such as smart homes, industrial IoT, and healthcare monitoring. Also in [9],

researchers focuses on the application of FL in the IoT domain, highlighting recent advancements, a comprehensive taxonomy, and open challenges. They introduce the necessity of FL in IoT due to the massive data generated by distributed devices and the privacy concerns associated with centralized learning and then review recent advancements in FL techniques tailored for IoT, emphasizing metrics such as sparsification, robustness, quantization, scalability, security, and privacy. The survey also presents a detailed taxonomy of FL approaches in IoT, categorizing them based on various parameters such as optimization schemes, incentive mechanisms, security and privacy measures, and aggregation methods.

C. Privacy computing survey

With the proliferation of data-driven applications and the increasing awareness of privacy concerns, privacy-preserving computing has become a critical area of research. Various surveys have been conducted to explore the different aspects of privacy computing, particularly in the context of edge computing [15]–[17].

In [15], the authors explores the privacy and security issues inherent in edge computing. It details the architecture of edge computing and how it differs from traditional cloud computing. The authors discuss the primary security challenges such as data confidentiality, integrity, and availability, highlighting the unique threats posed by the distributed nature of edge environments. They provide an overview of existing security solutions, including encryption techniques, authentication protocols, and access control mechanisms. The survey also examines privacy-preserving methods, emphasizing the need for lightweight and efficient solutions to handle the resource-constrained nature of edge devices. Similarly, the survey

[16] focuses on the security and privacy aspects of multi-access edge computing. It begins by outlining the key components and functionalities, and explaining its importance in enhancing computational capabilities at the network edge. The authors review various security challenges specific to multi-access edge computing, such as secure data transmission, user authentication, and intrusion detection. They highlight current solutions and strategies employed to mitigate these issues, including blockchain technology, secure multi-party computation (MPC), and machine learning-based anomaly detection. The survey also addresses privacy concerns, particularly data anonymization and DP techniques, to protect user information in multi-access edge computing environments. In [17], it also delves into data security and privacy-preserving mechanisms within the edge computing paradigm. It discusses the benefits of edge computing over centralized cloud models, particularly in terms of reducing latency and improving data locality. The authors examine the specific security and privacy challenges faced by edge computing, such as secure data storage, secure computation, and user authentication. They provide a comprehensive review of cryptographic techniques like homomorphic encryption, attribute-based encryption, and proxy re-encryption that can be applied to secure data in edge environments. Additionally, the survey covers access control mechanisms and privacy-preserving data aggregation methods.

III. OVERVIEW OF FEDERATED ANALYTICS

In this section, we provide an overview of the emerging FA. In Section III-A, we describe the general workflow of FA. In Section III-B, we propose a general mathematical problem formulation of FA. In Section III-C, we introduce the relationship between FA and related fields.

A. General workflow

FA aims at conducting data analytics tasks based on the federated data held by multiple clients with privacy preservation. The fundamental principle of FA to realize privacy preservation is that the raw data held by the clients are not transmitted and exposed. In practice, the prevention of raw data exposure is not sufficient to realize a formal privacy guarantee, and extra privatization mechanisms are usually applied in FA for the formal privacy guarantee. Since FA and FL are two variations of the federated computing paradigm, they shares the identical abstrative architecture and workflow, which is defined in the federated computation paradigm. As is demonstrated in Fig. 2, the typical architecture of FA (server-client model) includes a server, which is hosting a data analytics tasks, and multiple clients, which would like to contribute their personal data to the data analytics task but require privacy preservation on their data. The right part of Fig. 2 demonstrates the steps of one-shot and iterative FA systems. In the FA workflow, the clients are in charge of a part of the data analytics task. They receive the computation model from the server, and perform local computation based on the received computation model and the client's local data. The result of local computation, which is termed as "insight" in this survey, is uploaded to the server, where the insights

are processed by privatization mechanisms to realize privacy preservation. The server aggregates the received insights with a dedicated aggregation algorithm. The aggregation output may be directly the results of the data analytics task when the FA algorithm is one-shot. When the algorithm is iterative, the aggregation result updates the computation model, and the data analytics results are derived after many rounds of model distribution, local computation, insight upload, and insight aggregation.

As is mentioned above, the same architecture and workflow of FA is also adopt by many classical FL systems. However, it worth to be emphasized that FA and FL differs a lot when the abstrative architecture and workflow are implemented into specific algorithms and programs. FL and FA performs different computations on the client side, deriving different structures of insights, and are eventually aggregated by server in different ways. The difference in downstream task also affects the abstrative workflow of FA and FL. For example, one shot schemes (*e.g.*, those with only iterations) are much more common in FA than FL, because they are suitable in deriving simple statistics form client data. More discussions and comparisons are present in the following Section III-C.

B. Mathematical definition

FA considers a system of n data owners, or clients, denoted DO , and each client DO_i holds local client data x_i . These clients would like to collaboratively accomplish a data analytics task, which can be reformulated as deriving the the task function

$$\mathcal{F}(x_1, \dots, x_n). \quad (1)$$

During the procedure of deriving \mathcal{F} , the personal raw data x_i should not be exposed to any entity other than DO_i .

The aforementioned problem is resolved by the FA paradigm by designing the appropriate insight derivation function \mathcal{I}_i and a global aggregation function \mathcal{A} . The clients derive insights from their local data using the insight derivation function \mathcal{I}_i , and then aggregate the insights to derive the value of the task function, *i.e.*,

$$\mathcal{F}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leftarrow \mathcal{A}(\{\mathcal{I}_i(x_i); i \in DO\}). \quad (2)$$

In the majority of existing FA studies, the FA algorithm treats all the data owners equally, and all the clients share the identical insight derivation function (denoted \mathcal{I}), and the FA procedure can be written as

$$\mathcal{F}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leftarrow \mathcal{A}(\{\mathcal{I}(x_i); i \in DO\}). \quad (3)$$

Based on the aforementioned mathematical formulation, the research problem in designing the FA algorithm is derived: the researchers need to design insight derivation function \mathcal{I} and aggregation function \mathcal{A} , so that the FA result $\mathcal{A}(\{\mathcal{I}(x_i); i \in DO\})$ should be identical (or close to) the result of the task function $\mathcal{F}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$.

The previous formulation describes the one-shot FA setting. In the iterative FA setting, the insight derivation function should take the computation model as input, and the results of the aggregation function should be the data analytics result in the last iteration and should be updated computation model in other iterations.

TABLE I
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN FL AND FA

	FL	FA
Goal	Training neural networks	Non-training tasks
Aggregation	FedAvg	Task dependent
Insight	Model weights	Task dependent

TABLE II
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN NON-FA PARTS OF DDM AND FA

	non-FA DDM	FA
Raw data redistribution & transmission	Allowed	Forbidden
Clients and server	Trusted	Untrusted
Heterogeneities	Little concerned	Focused

C. Comparison with related topics

Although the term FA has been introduced in recent years, some core characteristics of FA, such as privacy protection, distributed computing, can already be found in existing research fields, such as FL, privacy-preserving data mining, and distributed data analytics. These topics naturally have some overlap with FA. We list these three related topics of FA, introduce the overlapping research, and discuss how FA extends their concepts.

1) *Relationship between FL and FA*: Both FL and FA target at conducting intelligent data-oriented tasks without centralizing the raw data. Their major difference can be summarized in Table I. First, FA and FL are differentiated for their goal tasks. In FL, the mechanism is designed to serve a predictive model training task. In most of the FL literature, the “model training” in FL exactly refers to deep supervised learning tasks, if no specific context is present. These FL algorithms utilize gradient descent (typically on a neural network). On the contrary, as its name refers, FA tackles the extensive field of descriptive data analysis tasks, ranging from the simplest task of calculating the average to complex tasks such as graph analytics and video analytics [20], [21]. Second, the task range of FA diversify the forms of local insights and central aggregation. In contrast to the model weights or gradient distilled from the local clients, the insights from FA could be much more diverse and task dependent, such as privatized hashing results [22], one-bit response to server query [23], or local clustering centroids [24]. The procedure of insight aggregation of FA is also diverse and task dependent compared to FL, such as tree aggregation [25], Bayesian-based distribution estimation [26], or secret sharing decryption [27]. To be specific, in this survey, if a federated computation scheme is based on an explicit parameterized computation model, and computes by gradient-based methods on the parameterized model, such a scheme will be considered as FL. A federated computation scheme is considered FA rather than FL when it conducts traditional data analytics task, or performs computation by a non-gradient descent method.

2) *Relationship between FA and privacy-preserving data mining*: Privacy-preserving data mining is a comprehensive term including all data analytics schemes that take privacy concerns into consideration. Therefore, FA can be considered as a subfield of privacy-preserving data mining. As the need

to perform data analytics with privacy preservation naturally exists, many solutions for privacy-preserving data analytics existed even earlier than the term federated computation (FL was first proposed in 2016 and FA was in 2020). These works (represented by RAPPOR [22]) do not use the term “federated”, but follow the similar idea and methodology as FA. Therefore, it is reasonable and scientific to re-classify these works as FA. On the other hand, not all privacy-preserving data mining research can be considered as FA. FA centers around distributed data setting and local privacy preservation. Heterogeneity and the resulting issues born at the client side, such as client dynamics, adversarial attacks, communication overhead, and incentive issues, are all new problems that are not considered in classical privacy-preserving data mining.

3) *Relationship between FA and distributed data mining*: Distributed data mining (DDM) refers to the procedure of conducting data analytics tasks while the data is distributed among multiple parties or machines. According to such a comprehensive definition, FA is a subfield of DDM because of its federated data setting. However, the FA studies differ from the general distributed data mining in that distributed data mining usually operates in trusted database scenarios with distributed machines supporting computing acceleration. In summary, in conventional DDM, the computation nodes are naturally trusted, and the raw data transmission is allowed, which is not allowed in FA. Table II concludes the differences between FA and DDM.

IV. KEY CHALLENGES IN FEDERATED ANALYTICS

As FA is expected to handle various data analytics tasks over federated data with strong privacy preservation, there exist many challenges for researchers to realize the ambition of FA. In this section, we investigate some dimensions of FA challenges and discuss how these challenges could be handled by novel FA research attempts.

A. Diversity of analytics task

A significant challenge unique to FA lies in the diversity of analytics tasks, which necessitates handling a wide array of data structures, insight extraction methods, and result formats—elements not typically encountered in FL. In FA, tasks vary not only in their objectives but also in the types of input data they handle. Also, this variability requires that FA systems to be highly versatile in processing and integrating such diverse data forms to maintain accuracy and consistency in insight extraction. Besides, each analytics task requires specialized aggregation methods designed for the specific type of insights. Furthermore, the output from these tasks also presents varied data structures, from simple numeric aggregates to intricate data visualizations. These aspects significantly complicate the development of universal FA solutions, necessitating tailored approaches that can adapt to the specific requirements of each analytics task while upholding stringent standards of data privacy and system efficiency.

B. Accuracy, privacy, and performance trade-off

FA aims to extract and analyze insights from decentralized data sources in a privacy-preserving way. There are trade-offs as regards accuracy, privacy, and performance, which are three of the most important aspects of FA. Researchers in [28] pointed out these trade-offs among DP, MPC, and approximate query processing. Firstly, when discussing trade-offs between accuracy and privacy, it is imperative to bring up the DP which has been a widely acknowledged privacy-preserving criterion in data analytics. The details of DP are described in Section VI-A herein. To satisfy DP, mechanisms usually introduce random noise into a result. An increase in noise magnitude corresponds to heightened privacy protection since it better obfuscates the contribution of each individual. However, the guarantee of privacy comes at the cost of a reduction in accuracy, and the result deviates from the ground truth due to the injection of noise. Secondly, the trade-off including performance is usually related to another sort of privatization technique related to cryptography. Although it guarantees both privacy and accuracy by encrypting the data of each individual before sharing it and obtaining the real result by corresponding decryption, there is an enormous amount of computation and communication overhead when performing such operations in FA. Lastly, there are approximating methods applied in FA to increase the performance of the system which sacrifices the accuracy of results. For example, private sampling algorithms (See Section VI-C for details) utilize less data in the computation and communication process while introducing variance from sampling into the final result. To conclude, balancing these trade-offs is a key challenge in FA.

C. Intensive computation

In FA, cryptography is commonly used to protect the privacy of each client's data while it is processed and analyzed by multiple parties including the aggregator and other clients. However, cryptographic methods are considerably resource-intensive, both in terms of computation and communication. Operations in cryptography like encryption, decryption, and hashing are computationally intensive. For some advanced cryptographic techniques used in FA like homomorphic encryption and MPC which allow various computations on the encrypted data, the required computation resource is even higher [29]. Regarding communication cost, encrypted data tends to be larger than their plaintext counterparts. Furthermore, most cryptographic protocols require multiple rounds of communication between parties [30], exchanging messages like intermediate results. This attribute of cryptography extremely increases the bandwidth required for tasks in FA. In addition, managing cryptographic keys is also a complex task in federated settings. They are required to be private and secure in their generation, distribution, rotation, and destruction [31]. This process will be more complex and computationally intensive if the number of clients increases [32]. These attributes together contribute to the large resource demands for utilizing cryptography in FA, which is a challenge to preserve privacy efficiently in terms of computation costs.

D. Wireless communication

Wireless communication becomes a major challenge in FA primarily due to its distributed and dynamic nature. The slowest participant in this networked system can significantly hinder overall performance, known as the “straggler effect”. This is often exacerbated by varying data transmission rates and unreliable communication channels, leading to delays and inconsistencies in data aggregation. The paper [33] addresses it in FL by clustering user equipment based on upload times, thereby reducing time divergence among participants. In addition, the over-the-air [34] technique brings efficiency as well as new challenges to FA and FL, such as signal interference and the requirement for precise synchronization. Furthermore, the mobility of devices in wireless networks, such as in vehicular networks and aerial networks, introduces another layer of complexity, requiring adaptive strategies for data transmission and model training that can cope with changing network typologies and varying channel conditions. The integration of technologies like Reconfigurable Intelligent Surfaces shows promise in enhancing communication efficiency and reliability in these scenarios [35], while they also require sophisticated optimization of resources and careful handling of estimated Channel State Information.

E. Limited privacy resource

Privacy resource in the context of FA usually refers to the “privacy budget” in the DP mechanisms, which intuitively means the amount of allowable privacy loss for each individual within an analysis of the whole data set. Although the information of clients is protected by various privacy-preserving techniques, there is still a risk that repeated analyses such as multiple or iterative queries can expose it. Typically, a portion of the privacy budget is consumed and a specific amount of noise will be added to the results for a query. Managing the privacy budget is important since multiple analyses may be performed on the same group of clients. Every analysis incrementally raises the risk of privacy loss so this cumulative effect ought to be monitored and controlled. How to effectively schedule the privacy budget for the multi-query analysis is a challenge in FA concerning the accuracy of results for each query and total privacy loss for each client.

F. Robustness

The robustness challenge in FA encompasses a range of considerations that are similar in FL, including malicious and non-malicious data corruption. Malicious data corruption involving deliberate attacks by malicious parties is a considerable threat to the integrity and security of FA systems. These attacks such as data poisoning and privacy breaches call for corresponding robust security measures, such as encryption and authentication to discover and defend. On the other hand, non-malicious data corruption caused by unintentional errors and client dropout due to either connection issues or device failure introduces bias to influence the accuracy of analytics or even causes failure of the system. In this context, there's a requirement for fault-tolerant mechanisms to cope with client

dropouts for robustness, ensuring that the system works effectively even with such disruptions. Addressing these challenges is crucial to maintaining the robustness of FA systems in terms of reliability, security, and accuracy.

G. Data heterogeneity

Data heterogeneity, *i.e.*, the phenomenon that data possessed by different clients follows heterogeneous distributions, is common in federated systems. As the tenet of privacy preservation restricts raw data from being transmitted, data reallocation or adjustment is usually unavailable for federated systems, making data heterogeneity unavoidable. The challenge of data heterogeneity has become one of the most popular research focuses in the field of FL [36], and also widely exists in FA systems. Since FA systems tackle various data analytics tasks, data heterogeneity introduces diverse influences for different heterogeneous tasks. In FL applications, data heterogeneity is usually considered harmful to the convergence and accuracy of FL models. In [24], data heterogeneity is studied in a federated clustering problem, where the data points held by one client are biased to one or several clusters. The authors of [24] found that the data heterogeneity is beneficial for the FA scheme, where a higher analytics performance can be achieved in the heterogeneous data environment. In [11], an FA scheme is proposed to measure the severity of data heterogeneity directly. The proposed scheme can figure out clients with low/high data heterogeneity, which provides significant information to other federated tasks in handling the data heterogeneity challenges.

H. Fairness

The challenge of fairness has been investigated in many federated systems, mostly for FL. As the term “fairness” is a comprehensive term. Researchers investigate multiple interpretations of fairness, based on different types of benefits focused by the players. The existing works mainly consider three dimensions of fairness. 1) Collaboration fairness, where some monetary rewards or their equivalents are assumed to be awarded to the participating clients after the federated model is trained, and the participating clients would like to fairly allocate such benefits based on their contribution to the federated system [37]–[40]; 2) Model performance fairness, where the finally derived federated model is adjusted to obtain a fair and balanced performance among the clients with heterogeneous data [41]–[43]; 3) Participation fairness, which focuses on balancing the chance of clients to become participants of the federated system [44].

Although existing fair federated system research mainly focuses on FL, the rationale and fairness concepts are still applicable to FA algorithms. In addition, the novel characteristics of FA, including the vast investigated data analytics problems, may raise new fairness concepts and challenges, which require tailored solution concepts.

Admittedly, it is important to acknowledge that many of the challenges discussed in FA share similarities with those found in FL. This overlap is primarily because of the inherent nature of federated computation systems, where data decentralization and privacy preservation are core principles in both domains.




Fig. 3. An illustration of our taxonomy.

However, FA differs in its focus on data analytics tasks rather than model training, introducing unique challenges such as requiring more sophisticated data query and aggregation techniques, as well as specific performance measures relevant to diverse analytics outcomes rather than model accuracy alone. Thus, while FA and FL share foundational challenges, the specifics of their application and the nature of the tasks they address necessitate a nuanced approach to understanding and addressing these challenges in FA.

V. TAXONOMY OF FEDERATED ANALYTICS

Given the diversity of the existing FA algorithms and systems, it becomes beneficial to provide methods to classify FA problems and solutions. In this section, we provide the taxonomy of FA. It examines the design and application of FA from five important dimensions, including data analytics tasks, scale of clients, number of iterations, coordination models, and threat models. Fig. 3 provides an illustration of the taxonomy.

A. Data analytics task

As the application of FA covers massive and diverse data analytics needs, classifying FA algorithms and systems based on the types of data analytics tasks they solve becomes a natural and useful taxonomy of FA. In this survey, we categorize the corresponding data analytics tasks of the FA works we surveyed into five categories: *statistical metrics*, *frequency-related applications*, *database operations*, *assisting FL applications*, and *wireless network applications*. Following the taxonomy, we respectively introduce FA works focusing on each data analytics task in Sections VII–XI. In some sections, more detailed classification of the data analytics tasks are present.

The host data analytics task heavily influences the algorithmic design, characteristics, and challenges of the corresponding FA algorithms and systems, and the algorithmic design of FA is expected to be quite different when handling different types of data analytics tasks. One of its reasons is that different data analytics tasks extract and analyze different features from the raw data, which then determine the structure of required insight, the insight generation approach, and the insight aggregation approach. Some researchers would like to

TABLE III

EXAMPLES OF FA ALGORITHMS AND SYSTEMS FOLLOWING THE TAXONOMY OF THIS SURVEY. THE UBIQUITOUS PRIVATIZATION METHODOLOGY OF HIDING RAW DATA IS OMITTED IN THE ROWS IF ANY OTHER METHODOLOGY IS PRESENT.

Reference	Data analytics task	Client scale	Num. iterations	Coord. model	Privacy methodology
[45]–[48]	Statistical metrics	>1,000	One-shot	Server-client	Local differential privacy
[21]	Statistical metrics	>1000	One-shot	Server-client	Hiding raw data
[32], [49]–[52]	Statistical metrics	>1,000	One-shot	Server-client	Cryptography
[53]	Statistical metrics	2	Iterative	Decentralized	Cryptography
[54]	Statistical metrics	200	One-shot	Server-client	Cryptography
[55]–[57]	Statistical metrics	>1,000	Iterative	Server-client	Central differential privacy
[58]–[63]	Statistical metrics	>1,000	Iterative	Server-client	Local differential privacy
[64]	Statistical metrics	>1,000	Iterative	Decentralized	Cryptography & Local differential privacy
[65], [66]	Statistical metrics	>1,000	Iterative	Server-client	Cryptography
[27]	Statistical metrics	>1,000	Iterative	Decentralized	Cryptography
[67]	Statistical metrics	500	Iterative	Server-client	Cryptography
[68]	Statistical metrics	>1,000	One-shot	Decentralized	Central differential privacy & k -Anonymity
[69]	Statistical metrics	15	Iterative	Decentralized	Hiding raw data
[24]	Statistical metrics	200	One-shot	Server-client	Hiding raw data
[70]–[73]	Statistical metrics	4~100	Iterative	Server-client	Hiding raw data
[22], [74]–[78]	Frequency-based applications	>1,000	One-shot	Server-client	Local differential privacy
[23], [79]–[82]	Frequency-based applications	>1,000	Iterative	Server-client	Local differential privacy
[25], [83]	Frequency-based applications	>1,000	Iterative	Server-client	Central differential privacy
[84]	Frequency-based applications	>1,000	One-shot	Server-client	Cryptography & Central differential privacy
[85]	Frequency-based applications	>1,000	Iterative	Server-client	Cryptography & Central differential privacy
[86]	Frequency-based applications	>1,000	Iterative	Server-client	Cryptography & Local differential privacy
[14]	Frequency-based applications	>1,000	Iterative	Server-client	Cryptography & Distributed differential privacy
[87]–[89]	Database operations	2~3	One-shot	Decentralized	Cryptography
[28]	Database operations	2	One-shot	Decentralized	Cryptography & Central differential privacy
[90]–[92]	Database operations	10~16	One-shot	Server-client	Cryptography
[93]–[95]	Database operations	>1,000	Iterative	Server-client	Cryptography & Central differential privacy
[12], [96]–[99]	Assisting federated learning	>1,000	Iterative	Server-client	Local differential privacy
[100]	Assisting federated learning	>1,000	One-shot	Server-client	Hiding raw data
[11], [101]–[104]	Assisting federated learning	>1,000	Iterative	Server-client	Hiding raw data
[105]	Wireless network application	8	Iterative	Server-client	Hiding raw data
[106]	Wireless network application	89	Iterative	Server-client	Hiding raw data
[107]	Wireless network application	800	Iterative	Server-client	Hiding raw data
[108]–[111]	Wireless network application	>1,000	Iterative	Server-client	Hiding raw data

break the limit of data analytics task-specific FA design, and propose some unified FA framework [23]. However, proposing such an FA framework that can handle all data analytics tasks is still far from reality at this moment. Therefore, the host data analytics task is currently an important component of any FA taxonomy. In Section XII-C, we investigate the probability of a unified FA framework as a future research direction.

B. Scale of clients

FA algorithms and systems have diverse settings regarding the scale of participating clients, from fewer than 10 to more than a million. The difference has a large relationship with the privacy mechanisms they use as well as their application scenarios. For example, in mobile applications, FA should be deployed in massive edge devices with limited computation and communication capacities. Therefore, the FA mechanisms are required to easily scale up, and introduce limited workload to the clients. On the other hand, in industrial scenarios (*e.g.*, finance, biology), there might be only a few data silos, and each of them possesses a large number of high-quality data. In these cases, the participants are likely to derive highly correctness of analytics results, introducing little error compared to the centralized algorithms. At least the performance of FA should be higher than centralized analytics on its local database, *i.e.*, the benefit of collaboration should at least cover the degrading in privacy preservation.

Usually, DP-based mechanisms are better at supporting massive participating clients, because they only require the clients to individually perturb their client uploads in parallel, and the server aggregation function usually has linear complexity [22], [23], [45], [46], [74]. In addition, when the privacy model of central differential privacy is considered, increasing the number of participating clients can increase privacy preservation by better hiding the information of individual clients [25], [83].

On the other hand, FA schemes utilizing computation-intensive cryptography tools, though can provide higher analytics utility, are usually hindered by the algorithm, computation, or communication limits. Consequently, they can only be applied to a smaller scale of clients. For example, the garbled circuit [112], a classical and famous cryptography tool employed in some FA studies [87], [90], only supports computation between two parties, and modifications of it usually introduces significant computation and communication overhead to support several more participating clients. To overcome the limit in supported client scale when utilizing cryptography tools, many research efforts are proposed to increase the supported participating clients in cryptography-based FA systems. An example direction of these research is to replace the computation-intensive cryptography tools by lightweight ones, like simple additive masking [49]–[52].

C. Number of iterations

FA algorithm involves steps of computation model distribution, local computation, insight upload, and insight aggregation, where the aforementioned steps compose one FA iteration. FA algorithms can then be classified into *one-shot algorithms and iterative algorithms*, based on the number of iterations to complete the data analytics tasks.

In one-shot algorithms, the analytics results are derived and the algorithm terminates after one iteration. Since the system only processes one round, there is no memorized “state” on the server side, and the computation model of the FA algorithm is fixed. Therefore, the phase of computation model distribution can even be removed when the clients are already deployed with the FA program. Roughly speaking, one-shot schemes are usually applicable in simple FA tasks and incur less communication cost, like federated mean computation [45], [46].

On the contrary, other FA algorithms involve multiple iterations until completion. In each iteration, a part of the analytics tasks is conducted, which updates the “state” on the server side, which determines the modified computation in the next round to guide clients to conduct new computations required by the algorithm. The iterative FA algorithmic design can be further classified into two categories. In the first category, each iteration of FA aims to conduct different parts of the analytics task, where the computation of the later part usually depends on the results of the former parts. For example, many FA solutions for frequent pattern mining [25], [80], [83] let different FA iterations reveal frequent sequential patterns with different fixed lengths, where the computation on longer length depends on the shorter ones. In the second category, the computation model is formulated as the optimization of a parameterized model. In each round, the uploaded insight helps the optimization of the model (e.g., the insight is essentially the gradients on the model, being consistent with the methodology of FL). Unlike the former category, FA algorithms in the second category do not terminate after a usually-predefined fixed number of iterations. Instead, it terminates when the model converges. Examples of the second category include clustering solution [71] and assisting FL solutions [11], [99], [104].

D. Coordination model

In our previous introduction, we define the entities of FA as one server and multiple clients, where the server hosts the data analytics tasks by distributing the computation model, receiving insights, and aggregating insights, and the clients contribute their local data by conducting local computation and uploading insights. Such systems formulate the vanilla *server-client architecture* of FA, where all the clients only communicate with the centralized server. The server-client architecture has become the mainstream form of FA for multiple reasons. First, in the typical server-client architecture, the clients are unaware of other clients. Therefore, a new client can easily register itself in the FA system simply via communicating with the server. Secondly, an FA system under the server-client architecture can easily scale up, because the computation and

communication complexity of the client scheme are usually constant, under such architecture. Thirdly, the complexity of the corresponding algorithm design is simplified, since the communication pattern has been defined by the architecture, and the privacy protection model is relatively simple.

However, as some shortcomings of the server-client architecture are identified by the researchers, optimized alternative architectures, are proposed. In [49], [50], the authors propose FA algorithm under server-client architecture, but client-client communication is introduced. By leveraging pairwise communication, the clients can enforce encryption on their uploads at a lower cost, and therefore collaborate to enhance privacy preservation against the potentially malicious server. In [53], [64], [69], fully decentralized architectures without any centralized server are introduced. Fully decentralized FA algorithms are usually more complex in design, but have the potential to obtain advantages including prevention of one-point failure, better privacy preservation, better communication efficiency, and adaptive organization.

E. Privatization methodology

The tenet of federated computation, as well as FA, is to protect data privacy of edge data while leveraging these data in data-intensive applications. Therefore, each FA work has to follow one or multiple methodologies in their algorithmic design. As a result, classifying the FA works based on the approaches to enforce privacy preservation becomes an appropriate and beneficial taxonomy in the field of FA. FA works following different privatization methodologies scatter different threat models, and techniques focuses. They can be applied to support diverse use requirements. This taxonomy is highly associated with various privatization techniques leveraged by FA, where Section VI-A provides a thorough demonstration of these techniques. In this survey, we conclude six different privatization methodologies: hiding raw data, local differential privacy, central differential privacy, distributed differential privacy, k -anonymity, and cryptography.

The methodology of hiding raw data is the fundamental idea of federated computation, and it is applied in all FA works to provide privacy preservation to some extent.¹ Under the privatization methodology of hiding raw data, the clients will extract insights from the raw data, and upload the insights to the server for further data analytics. It prevents the extreme privacy risk in conventional data analytics where the server gathers all raw data from the clients. Since the extracted insight is an indirect transformation of the raw data where the reverse computation is usually not available, and the extracted insight usually possesses a much smaller dimension size than the original data, the server or other attackers cannot easily infer the raw data from the insights, so that the data privacy of the raw data is protected. However, there still remains privacy risk as the attacker can still obtain valuable and sensitive information if the insights are naively extracted. Therefore, many FA solutions apply additional privatization methodologies using modern privacy preservation technologies

¹Otherwise it will not be considered as FA.

(Section VI-A) to further improve its privacy preservation, which we will discuss next.

DP-based privacy preservation methodologies, including local differential privacy (LDP), central differential privacy (CDP), and distributed differential privacy (DDP), are the most widely used additional privatization methodologies in the FA literature, since they provide rigid theoretical guarantees from the statistical perspective that the attacker cannot infer the existence of any raw data with sufficient confidence from the DP-possessed insights. LDP is the most popular one among DP methodologies because it assumes a local model that fits the settings of the majority of FA scenarios. In the methodology of LDP, the clients individually possess their local insights by adding perturbations to obtain sufficient privacy preservation. CDP considers protecting data from each client in the aggregated results. CDP requires a much smaller magnitude of perturbations, which results in higher data analytics quality, but assumes the existence of a trusted aggregator who gathers raw data from the clients, and is therefore not desirable in most FA scenarios. DDP is a novel idea of privatization methodology that combines the advantages of CDP and LDP by providing local privacy preservation with CDP-level perturbation magnitude, owing to its ingenious involvement of cryptography tools. DDP is gaining increasing research interest from the FA researchers.

k-anonymity is another privatization methodology from the statistical perspective. It protects the privacy of client data (or its transformed form) by removing all the records with less than k records. Therefore, a record can be seen by the server only when it has at least k clients holding that record.

Cryptography is the last privatization methodology we focus on in this survey. Utilizing various tools from the field of cryptography, it provides privacy preservation from a different perspective from statistics. It focuses on encrypting the whole upload from all clients so that an adversary can only learn the aggregated results, but cannot learn any upload from individual client. As the statistics perspective and cryptography perspective consider the elimination of different privacy risks, neither of them can thoroughly outperform each other. Some recent FA research even utilizes multiple privatization methodologies to enhance privacy preservation from multiple perspectives. The merge of cryptography and CDP also yields the emerging privatization methodology of DDP, which combined advantages and enhanced privacy preservation.

The previous taxonomy with five dimensions provides us with a powerful tool for grouping and classifying FA algorithms and systems. In Table III, we list all FA solutions covered in this survey, and show their positions according to our taxonomy.²

VI. KEY TECHNIQUES IN FEDERATED ANALYTICS

In this section, we investigate the key enabling techniques that are frequently utilized by FA. These key techniques are categorized by their utilization in FA: In Section VI-A, the

privatization techniques, *i.e.*, those enhance the privacy preservation of FA, are discussed; in Section VI-B, the analytics techniques, *i.e.*, those help derive the analytics results, are presented; in Section VI-C, the deployment and optimization techniques, which improves the system availability, are presented.

A. Privatization techniques

The tenet of FA prevents the exposure of raw data to any entity other than the data owner (client), which naturally provides privacy preservation to some extent. However, such a “hiding raw data” idea fails to provide any formal privacy guarantee. Therefore, existing FA research prefers to enhance the privacy preservation of their schemes by providing some formal and rigid privacy guarantees, by leveraging various privatization techniques. In this part, we analyze the privacy guarantees and the corresponding techniques to realize these techniques. Since these privatization techniques can usually be applied in arbitrary computation procedures, the following techniques have gained success in various distributed/centralized computation schemes prior to FA. However, we would like to emphasize that these techniques are uniquely applied in the novel mechanisms and algorithms in FA, compared to other applications. In the following, we will emphasize the novel usage of these techniques in the field of FA.

Local differential privacy. DP, introduced by [113], is a privatization technique enforced on any data publication mechanism. It has become the most popular criterion for privacy preservation in data analytics, as well as FA. It considers the threat models where the data publication mechanism publishes some outputs based on the raw data, and an adversary tries to infer sensitive information based on the output, such as membership inference attacks [114] and data reconstruction attacks [115]. DP handles such threat models by introducing randomness to the output of the data publication mechanism, and restricting the probabilistic distribution of outputs.

LDP is the most widely used DP variation in FA, as it provides the strong local privacy preservation required by the majority of FA applications. LDP-based FA schemes consider the threat model that the clients upload their insights to an untrusted server, where the untrusted server directly leverages the received insights to perform inferences. LDP is enforced by applying randomness in client uploads, so that the probability of any output would not change intensely for clients with arbitrary different local data. The definition of LDP in an FA setting is given as follows.

Definition 1 (Local differential privacy): Consider a data publication scheme \mathcal{M} executed by the clients in an FA system. Denote \mathcal{D} as the set of all possible client data. \mathcal{M} satisfies (ϵ, δ) -LDP when

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}(d_1) = x) \leq e^\epsilon \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}(d_2) = x) + \delta, \quad (4)$$

for any $d_1, d_2 \in \mathcal{D}$, and any possible output x of \mathcal{M} .

ϵ -LDP, a stronger and stricter LDP criterion, can be achieved by setting $\delta = 0$ in (4). In the setting of LDP, the data held by a client is considered as a data sample $d \in \mathcal{D}$, and LDP ensures that the probability of deriving any upload will not change

²Throughout the survey, the client scale, or maximal supported number of clients, is counted as the maximal number of clients in these papers' experiment settings.

intensely for clients possessing different data samples. An FA scheme reinforced by LDP can guarantee that the insight uploaded to the server cannot be leveraged by an adversary to efficiently infer the raw client data, from the probability theory perspective.

The satisfaction of LDP requires perturbation (randomness) on the client uploads. For the binary data, LDP is typically realized by the randomized response, *i.e.*, flipping each bit with some probability. The randomized response-based LDP mechanisms usually work in FA applications where the local computation results are naturally in the binary form [23], [45], [75], [77] or the client data are encoded into a binary form with sketching techniques [22], [78], [79]. For the continuous scaler data, LDP is typically realized by introducing continuous scaler noise on the data. Gaussian mechanism and Laplace mechanism are the most widely used schemes to realize LDP for continuous scaler data. Gaussian mechanism is applied by adding a random noise following the Gaussian distribution into the uploaded scaler, which can guarantee the corresponding (ϵ, δ) -LDP [58], [59]. Laplace mechanism, introducing a random noise following the Laplace distribution, is able to satisfy the stronger ϵ -LDP, which have been utilized in [47], [95], [116].

LDP has been applied in numerous privacy-preserving algorithms other than FA. When applied in FA, many novel utilizations are present. In conventional non-FA applications, LDP noise are usually directly applied to raw data. In FA applications, LDP is in contrary applied on the insight uploaded to the server. In many FA designs, the insights are designed to have a much smaller dimension compared to the raw data, which decreases the magnitude of LDP noise. These examples include the bloom filter in [22], count mean sketch [78], and even one-bit insight [23].

Central differential privacy. CDP, also known as global differential privacy, is the original form of DP. It considers the scenario that a data analytics mechanism processes a database containing many data samples, and the published analytics results can protect the raw data of any single data sample from being inferred by an adversary. The definition of CDP is as follows.

Definition 2 (Central differential privacy): Consider a data publication mechanism \mathcal{M} . Denote a pair of neighboring databases \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{D}' that differs in at most one data sample. \mathcal{M} satisfies (ϵ, δ) -CDP when

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}) = x) \leq e^\epsilon \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}') = x) + \delta, \quad (5)$$

for any $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}'$, and any possible output x of \mathcal{M} .

Similarly, ϵ -CDP can be achieved by setting $\delta = 0$ in (5). When enforcing the same privacy parameters, CDP usually requires much smaller noise than LDP, which can improve the correctness of the final analytics results.

Compared to LDP, where the client data are considered data samples and directly protected, CDP cannot be directly applied to many FA scenarios because it considers enforcing protection on the data already aggregated. In the FA literature, there are mainly two settings to enforce CDP. In the first setting, the raw data of each client is considered as a database consisting of multiple data samples. The clients enforce CDP on the

database, so that information about each individual sample is protected. FA research considering this setting includes [28], [57]. In the second setting, similar to the setting of LDP, the data within a single client is considered as a data sample in \mathcal{D} . The CDP scheme guarantees that an adversary cannot infer the sensitive information of a client by analyzing the final FA result. However, such privacy attacks can succeed when the adversary has access to the uploads of the clients (*e.g.*, when the server acts as the adversary). Therefore, the second setting usually assumes a trusted aggregator (server), and sacrifices the formal privacy guarantee. The second setting has been considered in [25], [55], [56], [83].

These exist diverse techniques to realize CDP. Similar to those used for LDP, the Gaussian mechanism can still be applied for CDP to protect continuous scaler output, which can satisfy (ϵ, δ) -CDP [28], [55]–[57].³ Compared to the LDP case, where Gaussian noise is added to each single data sample, applying the Gaussian mechanism for CDP only requires adding noise into the aggregated result. Therefore, the overall noise on the final analytics results is significantly reduced. The exponential mechanism tackles the analytics tasks where a single sample in the database serves as the output (*e.g.*, the federated median computation task). It realizes ϵ -CDP by calculating a utility score (preference of serving as the output) for each data sample, and then selecting the output data sample based on the probabilistic distribution characterized by the utility scores. The exponential mechanism has been applied to realize CDP and also DDP, which will be introduced later. [64] Conducting sampling on the data samples in the database is another effective tool to realize CDP. When only a random portion of data samples are selected for the data analytics task, randomness is introduced to the final analytics results, which can satisfy the criterion of CDP in (5) after proper mathematical proof. Two approaches are considered to utilize the sampling technique. In [25], [83], sampling is applied to directly realize CDP without any noise injection procedure; in [28], [95], sampling can reinforce a scheme that already satisfies DP via noise injection, by deriving the stronger privacy preservation (decreasing the ϵ parameter). The latter approach can be applied for both reinforcing CDP and LDP. This approach to realize CDP is novel as an FA mechanism, because it can be realized only when the sampling of clients is available. It is not appropriate for conventional centralized and distributed algorithms where the sampling of clients is not available.

Distributed differential privacy. As mentioned above, LDP can achieve a stronger local privacy guarantee, without the assumption of a trusted aggregator; CDP introduces randomness with a smaller magnitude, which derives a higher correctness in final analytics results. DDP is an attempt to combine the advantages of LDP and CDP. DDP statistically satisfies CDP to privatize the aggregated result. In addition, DDP requires clients to utilize cryptography tools to encrypt their uploads. With the encryption, the aforementioned local privacy risk existing in CDP, that an adversary can infer

³Laplace mechanism also has theoretically applicable for CDP, but is not selected for researchers due to the high variance of Laplace noise.




Fig. 4. Summary of DP variations, their enabling techniques, and existing works applying them. Sampling is not only able to solely satisfy CDP, but also can enhance the privacy preservation of any existing CDP/LDP scheme. Applications following the latter approach are marked red in the figure.

sensitive information when observing the individual client upload, is then eliminated.

The deployment of DDP consists of two phases: distributed noise generation and encrypted aggregation. In the distributed noise generation phase, each client injects noise on their local uploads. The noise is deliberately designed so that the aggregated noise of the clients can satisfy the criterion of CDP. In the encrypted aggregation phase, the client upload, possessed by distributed noise generation and uploaded to the server with encryption. The server cannot observe the individual upload of any client, but can only observe the CDP-enforced aggregated uploads.

DDP algorithm designers can freely choose and combine the techniques for distributed noise generation and encrypted aggregation. Many options for these techniques are surveyed in [117]. DDP has been applied in FA systems, like [14], [64], [84], [85].

In Fig. 4, we summarize the three kinds of DP variations utilized by FA, and the corresponding techniques to realize these DP variations.

***k*-anonymity** The concept of *k*-anonymity emerged as a privacy-preserving technique, specifically crafted to safeguard individual data in publicly accessible datasets, addressing the growing concerns over personal data security and privacy breaches [118]. The main idea is to ensure that any specific individual cannot be linked given any record in the dataset by guaranteeing that any combination of attribute values will indicate at least *k* individuals. In other words, for every individual in the dataset, there are at least *k* − 1 other members with the same information thus it is rarely possible to search out an individual based solely on certain attribute values. To achieve *k*-anonymous, some attributes are either removed or suppressed. There are three types of attributes in datasets: identifiers, non-identifiers, and quasi-identifiers. Quasi-identifiers are attributes that can potentially distinguish individuals together such as age, zip code, and gender, none of which can identify an entity alone. Generally, identifiers

are suppressed and quasi-identifier are either removed or generalized such as replacing the ages with age ranges to achieve *k*-anonymous.

It is a suitable tool in FA in terms of preventing the leakage of sensitive information and the identification of individuals. Usually, *k*-anonymity is utilized in phases before sharing information. The risk of privacy breaches is reduced by guaranteeing that the dataset of each client follows *k*-anonymity before sharing with the server or each other. In [87], they designed the Private Data Network to enable querying in databases of different parties without disclosure of their raw data by applying *k*-anonymity before data sharing. With the trusted third party as the query planner and results collector, the *k*-anonymous data of clients are then queried and aggregated to solve the questions from users. This setting is particularly relevant to collaboration in clinical research of healthcare clients. There are other methods to achieve *k*-anonymity. Researchers in [119] utilized sampling and trie pruning to fulfill *k*-anonymity for obtaining DP without noise injection. In [27], authors applied a more straightforward method that only the data sent by more than *k* clients are chosen in the aggregation phase.

While *k*-anonymity is a versatile privacy-preserving technique, its application in FA is uniquely suited to address the challenges of data aggregation and querying without compromising individual privacy. The specific methods and practical implementations of *k*-anonymity are uniquely applied in FA, such as pre-sharing anonymization and the use of trusted third parties.

Homomorphic encryption Homomorphic encryption is a powerful privacy-preserving cryptographic method allowing to perform mathematical computations such as addition and multiplication on encrypted data without decryption. It converts original data to cyphertexts by a public key, which cannot be read before it is transformed back with the corresponding private key. Homomorphic encryption plays an important role in FA in that it enables the aggregation of encrypted data without access to clients’ plaintext data. The collected encrypted data are then performed with mathematical operations to obtain a result which is also encrypted with support of its homomorphic attribute. The outcome is usually sent to a trusted third party holding the private key for decryption and is finally revealed to the querier. In this way, clients cooperate on data analysis tasks but raw data never leaves the local position of their owners. There are several types of homomorphic encryption, including fully and partially homomorphic encryption. Specific implementations in FA, such as private set intersection and large-scale data aggregation without a trusted core, showcase its crucial role in privacy-preserving analytics. In contrast, in FL, homomorphic encryption is used more for securing model updates during training rather than for data aggregation, highlighting its distinct and central role in FA.

Homomorphic encryption was early applied in private set intersection tasks [91], [120]–[123]. Generally, in the two-party setting, the sender and receiver first agree on a homomorphic encryption scheme and the receiver generates a public-private key pair. The receiver then sends the encrypted set by public key to the sender who compares it with her encrypted




Fig. 5. Summary of some privatization techniques in FA

TABLE IV
SUMMARY OF HOMOMORPHIC ENCRYPTION.

Reference	Task	Method	Type
Freedman <i>et al.</i> [122]	PSI	Paillier encryption	partially
Huang <i>et al.</i> [123]	PSI	ElGamal encryption	partially
Freedman <i>et al.</i> [121]	PSI	ElGamal encryption	partially
Chen <i>et al.</i> [120]	PSI	FHE with fine tuned parameters	fully
Zhang <i>et al.</i> [91]	PSI	ElGamal encryption	partially
Honeycrisp [32]	Count mean sketch	“two-element” Ring-LWE-based encryption	fully
FedMF [124]	Matrix factorization	Paillier encryption	partially

set and sends the intersection back. Finally, the receiver revealed the encrypted intersection entities by the private key. The homomorphic attribute plays a crucial role in the faster computation of the phase in which the sender identifies common encrypted elements. Homomorphic encryption is also a suitable tool when there’s a requirement for allowed mathematical operations such as total summation in aggregation parts. In [32], researchers proposed Honeycrisp to solve the count mean sketch task at a large scale without a trusted core. A committee randomly selected from users generates keys and each client sends their additively homomorphically encrypted data by “two-element” Ring-LWE-based encryption to the server which obtains the total encrypted sum and sends it to the committee for decryption.

Secure multi-party computation MPC aims to jointly compute functions with inputs from several parties while guaranteeing the privacy of these inputs. MPC ensures privacy and security in FA by allowing multiple parties to collaborate on tasks without compromising the confidentiality of individual data sets of each party. MPC focuses less on the requirement for a large volume of data to maintain privacy and accuracy when compared to DP. Nevertheless, it imposes a heavier burden in terms of computational and communication costs.

While it can excel in preserving privacy and ensuring precise results with any data size, the trade-off lies in the heightened demand for computational resources and communication overhead among participated parties, rendering it a more resource-intensive approach. Some cryptographic techniques, like homomorphic encryption, garbled circuits, or secret sharing, are usually utilized to enable secure computation among parties. The choice of technique depends on the specific requirements and constraints of various FA tasks. In the computation phase, only intermediate results are shared instead of users’ raw data, which are also usually encrypted to guarantee the throughout the whole process.

Some researchers directly use MPC as a privatization tool to encrypt the computation results and provide privacy preservation for certain analytics algorithms. MPC is used in tasks like secure communication of the median [53], [54], multi-party set intersection [125], and searching heavy hitters [84]. In [53], it focuses on securely computing the k-th-ranked element (such as the median) of combined confidential datasets from multiple parties. The protocols employ techniques like binary search and consistency checks to ensure privacy while computing the median. While [54] addresses distributed private learning and focuses on computing the median in a way that is both

differentially private and efficient in terms of computation and scalability. It utilizes an MPC approach to compute the exponential mechanism for the median, which is also adaptable for other rank-based statistics and machine learning optimizations. In [125], the authors introduce an efficient method for multi-party private set intersection (PSI), allowing multiple parties to compute the intersection of their datasets without revealing extra information. It uses a new paradigm based on oblivious programmable pseudorandom functions (OPPRF) and avoids computationally expensive public-key operations. Also, the protocol is secure against colluding semi-honest parties and has been demonstrated to be practical for up to 15 parties, each with datasets of a million items. Researchers in [84] present efficient MPC protocols, HH and PEM, to compute differentially private heavy hitters. These protocols use sketches for approximate counts, offering better accuracy than LDP, and are practical for different data sizes: HH is suitable for small datasets (running time linear in data size), while PEM is more efficient for larger datasets (running time sublinear in data domain). The protocols are more accurate than Ldp approaches and have an accessible performance on computation and communication costs.

In addition, some researchers design MPC protocols and platforms for FA applications, rather than directly using MPC to complete certain FA task [88], [90]–[92], [126]. The protocol & platform-based approach provides the users the capacity to apply the MPC scheme to customized tasks, and raises the possibility of multipurpose FA systems. Conclave [88] is a query compiler designed to accelerate relational analytics queries by combining data-parallel local cleartext processing with smaller MPC steps. It offers a hybrid MPC-cleartext protocol for cases where parties trust others with specific subsets of data. Cerebro [126] is an end-to-end collaborative learning platform that enables multiple parties to compute learning tasks without sharing plaintext data. It addresses the need of organizations to collaboratively use sensitive data, complying with policy regulations and business competition. Cerebro balances system design for safe collaboration with release policies and auditing, aiming to simplify the complex performance trade-offs between different MPC protocols. Authors in [90] introduce Senate, a system for MPC that allows multiple parties to collaboratively execute analytical SQL queries without exposing individual data, even with the presence of malicious adversaries. The main idea of Senate is MPC decomposition which enhances computational efficiency by breaking down cryptographic computations into smaller, parallel units. In [91], researchers focus on advancing the field of skyline queries, which are crucial for multi-criteria decision-making systems. It proposes a local dominance-based framework to enhance the efficiency of skyline queries in a vertical data federation setup. The framework decomposes skyline queries into more manageable units, improving the overall query process's efficiency and security. Hu-Fu [92] is the first system dedicated to efficient and secure spatial query processing in a data federation context by optimizing the balance between plaintext and secure operations, minimizing the use of secure operators while still maintaining the overall security of the process. It's a significant advancement in data federation that Hu-Fu parses

federated spatial queries written in SQL, decomposes them into secure and plaintext components, and securely collects query results, offering a practical solution to the challenges of processing spatial queries securely and efficiently. Besides, authors in [32] designed a protocol to distribute the secret key of homomorphic encryption to members of a committee randomly composed of several clients. After the aggregator obtaining the total encrypted summation by public key from clients, it sent the result to the committee who then applied MPC to "fix" the secret the key and decrypted the result before revealing it. Functional encryption is another technique related to MPC. It expands upon public-key encryption by allowing an individual with a secret key to decipher a particular function derived from the encrypted content in the ciphertext. In [127], authors proposed the FAA-DL where clients and the server can collaboratively and proactively analyze anomaly based on functional encryption.

In Fig. 5, we demonstrate the mechanism of some privatization techniques. For the cryptography-based aggregation, LDP, and DDP, we take the sum computation task as an example.

B. Analytics techniques

With the development of FA, there's a paramount requirement for effective and accurate techniques to aggregate insights across decentralized clients. It is communication-intensive to upload encrypted datasets and it is insecure to expose data even with noise while some transformation of data structure may effectively address these challenges. In this section, we discuss the data sketching and some interesting specialized data structures that artfully assist FA.

Sketching. In FA, the pursuit of insight aggregation across decentralized data nodes demands techniques that are both efficient and scalable. Sketching stands out because it is a method designed with specific attributes tailored for the challenges posed by FA. These attributes [128] are query-specific (designed for specific insight extraction tasks), mergeable (allowing for easy aggregation from multiple clients), and extremely compact (ensuring minimal communication cost). Furthermore, various sketching methodologies have been developed to cater to specific data types and tasks. For instance, for set data, the Bloom filter is suitably employed for set intersection tasks. Similarly, the count sketch method is adept at identifying heavy hitters. To address the paramount privacy requirements in FA, sketching often collaborates with privatization methods such as noise addition, randomized responses, and hash functions to ensure the privacy and security of the aggregated insights. Together, these techniques present a robust and private solution for insight aggregation in FA. Unlike FL, which primarily focuses on model training, FA leverages sketching to handle specific data aggregation tasks such as set intersections and heavy hitter identification. Moreover, sketching in FA often integrates privacy-preserving techniques to ensure the confidentiality of the aggregated insights. These attributes highlight the unique and critical role of sketching in FA, distinguishing its application from other areas.

Bloom filters [129] is a space-efficient probabilistic data structure used to test whether an element belongs to a set

with possible false positives and no false negatives. Bloom filter and its variants are first introduced to FA in Private Set Intersection tasks [130]–[133]. Researchers in [130] combined Bloom filters with Goldwasser Micali homomorphic encryption to compute the intersection which is secure in malicious model. In [131], authors proposed a (PSI) method using Bloom filters with a secure multiplication protocol SEPIA to obtain an intersection of Bloom filters for each party to find their intersections. Authors in [132] reduced the hash operations to propose a faster protocol for the PSI task by integrating oblivious transfer with a garbled Bloom filter (GBF). The essential difference between the GBF and Bloom filters is that the GBF uses an array of λ -bit string where λ is a security parameter while Bloom filters use an array of bits. Specifically, the client computes its sets to a Bloom filter and the server also computes its set to a GBF. Then an oblivious transfer protocol is conducted to give the client a GBF of intersection which is finally queried by the client to obtain the result. There were continuing works on Dong *et al.* [132] such as optimization of performance based on random OT extension [133], enhancement in its malicious-secure variant [134], and multi-parties intersection [125], [135]. RAPPOR [22] introduced by Google is a widely applicable and practical data collection mechanism providing strong privacy guarantees with high utility. The basic idea of RAPPOR is applying randomized responses to Bloom filters that each client reports each bit of her Bloom filter with possible untruthful responses to the server for privacy guarantees.

The counter, a common data sketching method, is a dictionary data structure storing the number of occurrences of elements. Apple developed two LDP algorithms based on it: Count Mean Sketch (CMS) and Hadamard Count Mean Sketch (HCMS) to learn dictionary-related tasks such as learning particular words and discovering popular emojis [78]. The main idea is to index counters sketched by raw data at the client side by hash functions and Hadamard transform with randomized responses. Researchers in [49] proposed TreeHist protocol to solve heavy hitters problem. The protocol utilized a local randomizer which could be regarded as a sampled and noisy version of the count sketch. The sketch is then Hadamard transformed to bits and one bit is sampled for subsequent submission to the server and aggregation to binary prefix tree. In [84], authors proposed methods that encode counters by Laplace noise addition without costly reconstruction like hash-based techniques under a central DP setting. They saved the computation resources of the aggregator by avoiding reconstructing results from perturbed messages.

Specialized data structures. In the context of FA where data analysis is performed across federated devices and servers, some specialized data structures are proposed to help the server to derive the analytics results on particular tasks. These specialized data structures are uniquely tailored to the requirements of FA, facilitating accurate and secure data aggregation. In [25], authors proposed the TrieHH algorithm discovering frequently typed words in edge devices, which is an iterative algorithm to find heavy hitters with the Prefix Tree. The Prefix tree, or the Trie, is a tree-like data structure used to store strings like words. Each node in the Trie represents

a single character of a string and all end nodes represent an end identifier so that each end node stands for a string and all sibling nodes own a common prefix. In their TrieHH algorithm, a subset of clients is sampled in each iteration and the Trie is updated based on their data points after filtering by a threshold until convergence. This sampling-and-threshold algorithm is used to provide CDP instead of the usual noise addition. There's a following work of it, TrieHH++ [83], which answered more general queries that not only identified heavy hitters but also provided their estimated frequency. In [80], researchers proposed OptPrefixTree based on previous work. They suggest a flexible algorithm to increase efficacy by utilizing adaptive segmentation, intelligent data selection, and deny lists.

There's also a tree-based method utilized in [32] to guarantee robustness and prevent the aggregator from cheating, which is a summation tree. Authors proposed the Honeycrisp system which uses sparse vector theorem to schedule the DP budget. The aggregator only has ability to conduct summation on collected encrypted data. The committee composed of some clients can decrypt the result and compare it with the guess from the aggregator to decide whether to reveal it. When conducting the total summation in the aggregation phase, the aggregator is asked to generate a summation tree in which each parent node owns two children nodes and is the sum of them under homomorphic encryption. The tree is then checked by clients with each client verifying one pair of a parent and its children to prevent the aggregator from manipulating the aggregated result.

C. Deployment and optimization techniques

Beyond the basic privacy afforded by restricting raw data within the data owner, there exists the complex challenge of deploying effective techniques for optimization in some scenarios. These techniques are essential to navigate the distinct problem FA presents in terms of computation, communication, data heterogeneity, incentive mechanism, utility, and privacy. In this section, we list some techniques concentrating on the deployment and optimization problems in FA.

Optimization theory. The optimization challenges in FA differ significantly from those in a centralized setting. As mentioned in [136], federated optimization mainly focuses on communication efficiency, data heterogeneity, computation, and privacy constraints.

In [20], FedVision is introduced, optimizing resource usage in video analytics. This system minimizes network resource consumption and maximizes computational efficiency by integrating black-box optimization with Neural Processes, tailored for dynamic network conditions. The study in [137] presents Edge-DemLearn, an approach that maximizes learning performance and system efficiency. By leveraging distributed computing infrastructure, Edge-DemLearn is a sub-optimal two-sided many-to-one matching algorithm optimizing both the allocation of resources and the generalization of models. This method effectively overcomes the inherent limitations of traditional FL by enhancing model generalization and optimizing the management of user equipment associations

TABLE V
SUMMARY OF SKETCHING.

Reference	Task	Sketching method	Cooperated privatization technique
Kerschbaum [130]	PSI between 2 parties	Bloom filters	Goldwasser Micali Encryption
Many <i>et al.</i> [131]	Multi-parties PSI	Bloom filters	SEPIA library
GBF [132]	PSI between 2 parties	Bloom filters	Oblivious Transfer
Pinkas <i>et al.</i> [133]	PSI between 2 parties	Bloom filters	Oblivious Transfer
Rindal <i>et al.</i> [134]	PSI between 2 parties	Bloom filters	Oblivious Transfer&Choose-and-cut
Kolesnikov <i>et al.</i> [125]	Multi-parties PSI	Bloom filters	Oblivious Transfer&Pseudorandom functions
Inbar <i>et al.</i> [135]	Multi-parties PSI	Bloom filters	Oblivious Transfer
RAPPOR [22]	Data federation	Bloom filters	Randomized responses
CMS&HCMS [78]	Dictionary-related tasks	Count sketching	Hash functions&Hadamard transform
TreeHist [49]	Heavy hitters	Count sketching	Hash functions&Hadamard transform
HH&PEM [84]	Heavy hitters	Count sketching	Noise addition

within a distributed learning framework. [138] represents a method that combines FA with 5G technology to optimize data collection and processing in vehicular networks. This approach aims to minimize latency by employing an FA-based solution and a D/M/1 queuing systems-based mathematical model to analyze end-to-end latency. They utilize numerical optimization methods like linear approximation (COBYLA), the Trust Region Constrained Algorithm (TRCA), and the Sequential Least Squares Programming (SLSQP) to optimize system parameters, focusing on reducing waiting times and maximizing information value. Shi *et al.* [139] introduced a Distributionally Robust Optimization (DRO) paradigm to optimize robustness in network traffic classifier learning under noisy labels. DRO is a modeling approach that makes decisions under uncertainty by minimizing the worst-case cost across all possible distributions in a constructed uncertainty set. This strategy maximizes classifier accuracy despite the variability in data quality.

Game theory and incentive design. In federated settings, incentive mechanisms are crucial for motivating participants to contribute their private data, communicational resources, and computational resources. Incentive design typically balances individual rewards with collective goals to guarantee that participants are fairly compensated and to maintain the efficiency of the system. By employing game theory approaches such as contract theory and multi-leader-follower games, these incentives aim to align participant actions with the overall objectives of the federated tasks. The structure of incentive mechanisms in FA is considerably similar to those in FL, where collaborative data processing and performing tasks require nearly the same strategies. Game theory in FA emerges as a critical tool for resolving complex interactions and optimizing cooperative strategies across various domains. It efficiently addresses challenges in privacy and incentivizes participation, scalability, and effectiveness in decentralized systems.

In [140], researchers introduce CROWDFA which employs FA in mobile crowdsensing and balances data aggregation, incentive design, and privacy preservation. It uses additive secret sharing for privacy and a novel incentive mechanism, PRAED, to encourage participants' involvement with privacy protection. Authors in [141] integrate blockchain with FL in healthcare metaverses, focusing on a user-centric incentive mechanism. It introduces AoI as a metric for data fresh-

ness and employs contract theory to incentivize data sharing. The framework uses Prospect Theory to address the service provider's decision-making under uncertainty, aiming to enhance immersive healthcare experiences by ensuring data freshness and privacy. Another incentive mechanism is developed in [142] for FL/FA systems with multiple tasks. It uses a multi-leader-follower game where rewards are set to motivate data owners, who in turn decide their participation level. The paper provides algorithms for optimal strategy formulation, ensuring effective resource allocation and addressing the challenges of multi-task federated systems. Shi *et al.* [143] focuses on updating HD maps for autonomous driving using a game-theoretical model. It proposes an overlapping coalition formation game where vehicles collaborate in coalitions to update map data for maximizing utility and map quality. It addresses privacy and incentivizes participation by allowing vehicles to join multiple coalitions, which benefits the scalability and accuracy of map updates. In [144], researchers cope with privacy and pricing in data markets. It proposes a federation model where data providers form coalitions with DP. They introduce a method for determining collective data prices based on privacy levels and employ the Shapley value from game theory for fair earnings distribution, which benefits both data providers and consumers by balancing privacy concerns and financial incentives.

Sampling. To aggregate insights across these distributed clients, FA often utilizes sampling techniques in terms of enhancing privacy and improving performance. There's also an optimization-wise problem for sampling techniques and the accuracy as shown in figure 6. 1) When sampling is utilized, the total amount of data decreases so that the privacy budgets are amplified. The accuracy of results is improved since the federated data are less perturbed with more privacy budget. 2) While intuitively, less data analyzed leads to more variance in the results where sampling may cause accuracy reduction.

In early research within the domain of DP, the sampling technique is referenced and employed for the purpose of privacy amplification [68]. Instead of examining the full data from all clients, using either data from a sample of clients or each client's sampled subset of data can enhance privacy protection in terms of amplifying the privacy bounds of a differentially private mechanism under various conditions. In other words, the utilization of sampling has ability to improve the accuracy with the "amplified" privacy budgets. In most




Fig. 6. Utilizing sampling in federated analysis reduces computation and communication costs by reducing the amount of data processed. Although it introduces result variance due to analyzing less data, it can amplify privacy budgets to improve result accuracy by reducing data perturbation.

time, sampling is combined with other privatization techniques like noise injection to further protect data. Researchers in [75] proposed the LDPMiner, a two-phase mechanism for heavy hitters task which applied sampled randomizer (combining sampling with privatization techniques like RAPPOR and Succinct Histogram) to each phase. They conducted the experiments on synthetic data and one of the results is the accuracy of targets from sampled randomizer outperforms that from naive randomizer under the same privacy budgets. It is worth noting that there’s a born-in limitation of sampling that it always requires large enough total data to ensure its effectiveness, which is also indicated by another experimental results in [75]. There is continuing work on LDPMiner, which proposed SVIM [81], a protocol for searching frequent items under a set-valued LDP setting. They attempted new cooperated privatization techniques with sampling and found that some techniques benefit privacy amplification from sampling like GRR (Generalized Random Response) while others do not such as OLH (Optimized Local Hashing). They explained the interesting phenomenon that the relation between reported and input values need to satisfy a “many-to-one-wise” mapping for the benefit of privacy amplification from sampling, *i.e.*, reported value after encryption “support” one input value instead of multiple values [81].

However, sampling can improve the efficiency of the system attributed to the reduction in the amount of data processed while facing the concern of accuracy loss. In [28], authors proposed a private data federation system SAQE (Secure Approximate Query Evaluator) and denoted that sometimes sampling improves not only the efficiency but also the accuracy, *i.e.*, utilizing fewer data in the computation actually leads to improvement in accuracy. Given invariant privacy budgets, the sampling error decreases as the sampling rate grows up, which means it requires more noise injection to maintain DP. Next, the total error summed by sampling error and error from noise is a convex function of sampling rate for some tasks, meaning that sampling with the proper rate contributes

to increasing accuracy. This utilization of sampling to increase accuracy quantitatively of aggregation result by amplification of privacy budget is uniquely used in the FA task.

VII. STATISTICAL METRICS

Statistical metrics, like the means, variances, medians, and percentiles, as well as metrics in graph data, are simple but significant components in the field of data analytics. Deriving statistical metrics has various real-world applications, and also acts as intermediate steps of many complex data analytics algorithms. The demand for computing the statistical metrics of client data with privacy preservation motivates numerous FA studies. In this section, we focus on four kinds of widely-used FA applications on statistical metrics: mean (Section VII-A), median/percentile (Section VII-B), clustering center (Section VII-C), and metrics in graph data (Section VII-D). Table VII summarizes the FA studies on statistical metrics covered in this survey.

A. Means

The FA studies on calculating means usually consider that each client possesses a scalar value⁴, *i.e.*, consider totally n clients, where client i possesses a scalar value d_i . The FA system derives the mean of their client-held scalars:

$$\mu(d) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d_i. \quad (6)$$

Mean computation is likely to be the most widely used data analytics task. It can be also transformed into other metrics. For example, sum computation can be conducted by multiplying the mean by n , and variance computation $V(d)$ can be derived as follows by executing the mean computation for the client data d_i and square of client data d_i^2 .

$$V(d) = \mu(d^2) - \mu^2(d) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d_i^2 - \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d_i\right)^2. \quad (7)$$

⁴The case of vector values can be formulated by executing multiple FA tasks on scalar values independently.

TABLE VI
SUMMARY OF SAMPLING.

Reference	Sampled Object	Sampling rate	Sampling method	Cooperated privatization technique
LDPMiner [75]	Data of each client	1 over data number for each client	Uniform	Succint Histogram&RAPPOR
SVIM [81]	Data of each client	1 over data number for each client	Uniform	GRR&OLH
SAQE [28]	Data of each client	Optimized result based on the task	Bernoulli	Noise addition

TABLE VII
SUMMARY OF STATISTICAL METRICS SOLUTIONS.

Reference	Data analytics task	Privacy	Note
Cormode <i>et al.</i> [45]	Mean computation	LDP	One-bit client upload
Ding <i>et al.</i> [46]	Mean computation	LDP	Handling continuous data collection
Harmony [47]	Mean computation	LDP	Laplace mechanism
PrivKV [48]	Mean computation	LDP	Means of key-value structure data
Honeycrisp [32]	Mean computation	Cryptography&CDP	Sparse vector theorem
FEVA [21]	Mean computation	Hiding raw data	Federated Computation Builders architecture
SecAgg [49]	Mean computation	Cryptography	Utilization of two kinds of masks
Bell <i>et al.</i> [50]	Mean computation	Cryptography	Interacting with only a small random part of clients for each client
FastSecAgg [51]	Mean computation	Cryptography	Multi-secret sharing scheme based on fast Fourier transform
Turbo [52]	Mean computation	Cryptography	Circular communication topology
Zhao <i>et al.</i> [65]	Mean computation	Cryptography	Trusted third party
LightSecAgg [66]	Mean computation	Cryptography	a Secure and dropout-resilience secret sharing scheme
Liu <i>et al.</i> [67]	Mean computation	Cryptography	Lightweight and dropout-resilience secure aggregation
Wei <i>et al.</i> [58]	Gradient aggregation	LDP	Lightweight and dropout-resilience secure aggregation
Kim <i>et al.</i> [59]	Gradient aggregation	LDP	Adjustable query sensitivity
HFL-DP [60]	Gradient aggregation	LDP	Server-edge-client architecture
Geyer <i>et al.</i> [55]	Gradient aggregation	CDP	Hiding the participation of each participating client
McMahan <i>et al.</i> [56]	Gradient aggregation	CDP	Recurrent language models
Hu <i>et al.</i> [57]	Gradient aggregation	CDP	CDP-enhanced aggregation in personalized FL
Aggarwal <i>et al.</i> [53]	Medians and percentiles	Cryptography	Transforming the problem into a combinatorial circuit
Tueno <i>et al.</i> [54]	Medians and percentiles	Hiding raw data	
	Medians and percentiles	Hiding raw data	
Bohler <i>et al.</i> [64]	Medians and percentiles	Cryptohraphy& LDP	Exponential Mechanism
[69]	Medians and percentiles	Hiding raw data	Model-based optimization approach in a federated way
Dennis <i>et al.</i> [24]	Clustering	Hiding raw data	Utilizing a hierarchical structure
Zhou <i>et al.</i> [70]	Clustering	Hiding raw data	Applying kernel functions to transform data points into feature vectors
UIFCA [71]	Clustering	Hiding raw data	Replacing the models used to be generative models that capture the distribution of one cluster
Lubana <i>et al.</i> [72]	Clustering	Hiding raw data	Uploading both the cluster model parameters and the local centroids to the server
Servetnyk <i>et al.</i> [73]	Clustering	Hiding raw data	Uploading a vector representing the number of samples falling into each bin of the grid
FedWalk [61]	Graph metrics	LDP	FA version of a random walk
LF-GDPR [62]	Graph metrics	LDP	Performing local computation by deriving the adjacency vector and the degree scaler each client
Liu <i>et al.</i> [63]	Graph metrics	LDP	Protecting the information of vertex neighborhood within local graph data

As a strong and formal guarantee, LDP is applied in many FA-based mean computation solutions. LDP can be straightforwardly applied on mean computation by perturbing the client data d_i before being uploaded. Based on the simple idea, researchers designed various solutions with their unique advantages. Cormode and Markov [45] propose an FA solution for the mean computation. In addition to satisfying the strong privacy criterion of LDP, their solution has a unique advantage, in that each client in their solution only needs to upload one bit to the server. Although it does not improve privacy preservation from a mathematical perspective, uploading only one bit is convincing for users with little mathematical backgrounds that the exposed information is minimized. In [46], an LDP solution is proposed to privately estimate the mean and histogram of distributed data. It also proposes a discretization technique to handle the continuous collection of user data (*e.g.*, user data are collected daily). Harmony [47] provides an LDP solution for data analytics in mobile phone applications. It realizes mean estimation based on the Laplace mechanism,

and frequency estimation based on the randomized response. PrivKV and its variations [48] extend the statistic tasks of mean estimation into the setting of data in the key-value structure. In that setting, each client holds a key-value pair; the data analyst expects to sort the keys of the clients and calculate the means of values with each same key. This paper then proposes an iterative structure to realize LDP with improved data utility. Honeycrisp [32] is a system designed to address large-scale count mean sketch tasks without a trusted server. A committee is randomly selected from users to generate homomorphic encryption keys. Client data is sent to the server using additively homomorphic encryption, which allows the server to calculate the total sum without accessing individual raw data. This sum is then decrypted by the committee. It utilizes the sparse vector theorem to manage the DP budget, enabling the committee to decrypt results and verify the aggregator's calculations before deciding on their disclosure. In this case, the system also includes a summation tree method to ensure robustness and prevent the aggregator from cheating,




Fig. 7. A minimal running example of pairwise mask-based secure aggregation.

where each node is the sum of its children under homomorphic encryption and they are verified by clients to ensure integrity.

The mean computation task is also composed into a part of a complex data analytics task, like video analytics. In FEVA [21], an FA-based video analytics solution is proposed. It requires the clients to derive features from the video frames to preserve privacy following the hiding raw data methodology, and performs scaling and averaging procedures on the server side to derive the analytics result, based on the Federated Computation Builders architecture.

In the aggregation phase of FL, the FedAvg algorithm is computed on the client uploads. Essentially, the mean of gradient vectors from different clients is computed as the update on the global model. Many FL researchers try to improve the privacy and security of the aggregation phase, which falls into the category of FA-based mean computation.

Secure aggregation-based approaches aim at improving the privacy preservation of uploading gradient vectors via cryptography tools. With secure aggregation, the server can only learn the aggregated result (mean of gradient vectors), but cannot obtain any knowledge about the uploads of any single client. Pairwise masking is the most lightweight and easy-to-implement technique to realize secure aggregation. In pairwise masking, each client communicates with some other clients, and a pairwise mask is generated for each pair of clients. The pairwise mask is added to the upload in one client in the pair, and its inverse is added to the other client in that pair. When an aggregator sums up the client uploads, the pairs of masks are eliminated, and the sum of the original data can be revealed. Fig. 7 provides an example of pairwise masking. In Fig. 7, three clients, holding local upload X_1, X_2 , and X_3 respectively, form three pairs and generate three pairwise masks. For example, mask $m_{1,2}$ is generated for clients 1 and 2, which is added to client 1's upload, and inversely added to client 2's upload. By summing up masked client uploads U_1, U_2 , and U_3 , the sum of X_1, X_2 , and X_3 is revealed.

In [49], a pioneering secure aggregation scheme for FL SecAgg is proposed. It leverages the agreed random seed of client pairs to generate random masks on the uploads. The clients also apply self-masks on their uploads and leverage secret sharing to propagate the information of their self-masks. With the utilization of two kinds of masks, the FL system can preserve functionality and security with the existence of one-third of malicious clients and another one-third of dropout

clients. In [50], the authors consider the heavy computation and communication loads of deriving and eliminating the masks and propose an improvement on SecAgg. In the new design, each client no longer needs to communicate with all other clients to share the masks. Instead, a client only needs to interact with a small random part of clients, which are logarithmic to the client size. The new design is still able to defend one-third of malicious clients and another one-third of dropout clients with high confidence, but not with 100% confidence. In [51], FastSecAgg is proposed to improve the vanilla SecAgg protocol. It relies on a novel multi-secret sharing scheme based on fast Fourier transform, so that the per-client workload is reduced, but the guarantee on the portion of defended malicious/dropout clients is weakened. In [52], Turbo-Aggregate is proposed that employs the circular communication topology to reduce the communication overhead, but sacrifices privacy preservation as it only guarantees privacy in the average case, instead of the worst case considered in SecAgg.

Some other studies replace pairwise mask generation, which requires extensive client pair interactions, with non-pairwise masks. In non-pairwise mask generation, each client generates masks independently, and the server can eliminate the masks by learning the sum of the masks with a special protocol. In [65], a trusted third party is employed to assist with the masking, unmasking, and dropout handling. In LightSecAgg [66], the previous protocol is improved by removing the need for a trusted third party, based on a secure and dropout-resilience secret sharing scheme. In [67], the homomorphic pseudorandom generator (HPRG) is leveraged as a non-pairwise mask generation scheme to achieve lightweight, dropout-resilience secure aggregation.

DP-based approaches are also employed in privacy-preserving gradient aggregation. LDP is widely used in these solutions for its strong privacy guarantee. In [58], user-level DP is satisfied by applying Gaussian noise on the gradient vectors to enforce LDP. The proposed approach also provides a theoretical FL convergence guarantee, and trade-off between convergence speed and computation overhead. In [59], another LDP-enhanced aggregation approach is proposed by applying a Gaussian mechanism to the gradients. [59] also provides privacy-utility-communication trade-off, adjustable query sensitivity for LDP, and an accounting scheme of LDP budgets. LDP-FedSGD algorithm [59] considers privacy-preserving FL aggregation for IoT applications. It realizes LDP by perturbing the gradients with four LDP mechanisms. These mechanisms have different output structures and are optimal for different ranges of ϵ values. In HFL-DP [60], FL under the server-edge-client architecture is considered. The employed Gaussian mechanism provides an LDP guarantee under different levels on client uploads and edge uploads. Since the FL, and also the aggregation phases, take many rounds to complete, and the LDP budgets are cumulated by the composition theorem, naively applying LDP in each round could result in quite a low privacy budget for each round. Therefore, many of the aforementioned works [58]–[60] propose additional privacy-utility trade-offs or privacy budgeting schemes to tackle the issue.

On the other hand, since LDP typically introduces signifi-

cant noise on the uploads, which harms the accuracy of mean computation results, some researchers investigate privacy-preserving gradient aggregation approaches satisfying the CDP criterion. In [55], the authors consider applying CDP on the aggregated gradient, based on a trusted aggregator (server). Such a CDP-enforced gradient can hide the participation of each participating client so that the privacy of each client is preserved. Gaussian noise is adopted to enforce CDP in [55]. In [56], another privacy-preserving aggregation scheme where similar settings of trusted aggregator, client-level privacy, and Gaussian mechanism, are considered. It is particularly designed for recurrent language models. The idea of CDP-enhanced aggregation is also employed in variations of FL like personalized FL [57], applying the Gaussian mechanism.

Privacy-preserving aggregation for FL, or privacy-preserving vector mean computation from the FA perspective, has gained numerous research interests in recent years. A thorough survey of these researches is in [145].

B. Medians and percentiles

Median and percentile computation in the federated setting considers the clients each with a number of scalar data points d_i . $\mathcal{D} = \{d_i|i\}$ is the virtually aggregated data points from all clients. Consider a ranking function $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{D}, k)$ outputting the element in \mathcal{D} exactly larger than k portion of the elements in \mathcal{D} . The federated k -percentile computation lets the clients collaboratively derive the value of $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{D}, k)$, while preserving the privacy of data points d_i . The federated median computation is a special case of the federated k -percentile computation. The major challenge of federated median/percentile computation is that it requires different clients to compare their private data points to derive the ranking results.

As private value ranking is a classical problem setting in the field of MPC, some researchers design federated median/percentile solutions utilizing various cryptography tools. In [53], a private solution of median (and k -percentile) element over client local datasets is proposed. The solution is based on MPC and is realized by transforming the problem into a combinatorial circuit. In [54], a federated median/percentile computation scheme is proposed following the server-client architecture. The clients provide privatized input to the computation, and the server conducts the computation-intensive workloads to derive the results without observing the raw data. LDP is also employed as a formal privacy guarantee in federated median/percentile solutions. In [64], a median calculation scheme is proposed with both LDP and MPC. It can be extended to tasks like percentile computation. The LDP guarantee is realized by an exponential mechanism. The authors consider threat models of both semi-honest settings and adversarial settings. Another federated median/percentile computation solution [69] relies on a model-based optimization approach in a federated way, without a formal privacy guarantee. In [69] deriving the quantile is formulated as an optimization problem. That optimization problem is then collaboratively computed by the clients with ADMM. No formal privacy guarantee is provided.

C. Clustering

The clustering task aims at dividing data points (usually defined by fixed-length vectors) into groups, so that data points within a group are more similar to each other in some sense (*e.g.*, with lower vector distance), and data points in different groups are less similar. Clustering analysis is a major task in the field of exploratory data analytics and is an important technique in the fields of pattern recognition, sociology, data compression, and bioinformatics.

The federated clustering task extends the clustering problem into the federated data setting. In that setting, the clients, each possessing a subset of data points, want to collaboratively derive the global clustering results, *i.e.*, deriving what groups their data points belong to after the data points from different clients are virtually aggregated. The major challenge of federated clustering is that it needs to perform similarity measurements for data points from different clients while preserving data privacy.

Researchers have proposed federated clustering solutions following the FA paradigm. In these proposed algorithms, classical centralized clustering algorithms are adapted into the federated version, with the intermediate results serving as the FA insight. [24] proposes a federated clustering solution. It utilizes a hierarchical structure, where data points are first clustered locally within local client data, and local centroids are then clustered by the server. The authors derive an interesting finding, that in contrast to other federated computation solutions, data heterogeneity is beneficial to the analytics results. In [70], the authors consider kernel k -means, an effective clustering algorithm in capturing the nonlinear representation of the dataset using the nonlinear kernel functions, in the federated setting. To realize that, the clients first transform their data points into feature vectors by applying the kernel function. UIFCA [71] considers the unsupervised clustering tasks (the authors take unlabelled image clustering tasks as an example). It follows the idea of the IFCA algorithm, which trains a model for each cluster, and assigns a data sample to a cluster with the smallest model loss. To modify IFCA, which was originally designed for personalized FA, UIFCA replaces the models used to be generative models that capture the distribution of one cluster.

In [72], a self-supervised learning-based federated clustering algorithm Orchestra is proposed. It takes a Sinkhorn-Knopp-based deep learning clustering algorithm [146] which outputs equal-size clusters. The clients first cluster their local data to derive local centroids, and upload both the cluster model parameters and the local centroids to the server. In the server, the model parameters are aggregated by FL, and the local centroids are aggregated by FA via applying the Sinkhorn-Knopp algorithm again. Then, the updated model parameters and global centroids are sent back to the clients to start the next round, until a desirable clustering result is achieved. In [73], the FA technique is employed as a preprocessing step of a federated clustering algorithm. In that FA design, the data space is divided into a grid, and each client encodes their local data into a vector, representing the number of samples falling into each bin of the grid. Then, the vector is uploaded to the

server as insight. The server aggregates the insights from all clients and derives a global view of data distribution. After that, the grid is updated following the method of the self-organizing map, and the updated map is sent to the clients, where the clients start a new round of bin checking.

D. Graph metrics

The graph-structured data have yielded numerous promising graph analytics applications in the fields of social network, multimedia, and AI4science. These applications require the utilization of novel graph metrics that are not present in conventional data structures. Leveraging FA to compute these graph metrics with privacy preservation can become a booster of graph analytics applications over edge data.

FedWalk [61] is an FA-based solution for graph embedding analytics. It derives expressive representations for the vertices in a large graph. FedWalk considers the vertex-separated federated setting, where each client represents one vertex in the graph, and only possesses neighborhood information of the vertex. It performs the FA version of a random walk, a classical graph embedding learning algorithm. In [62], a privacy-preserving graph metrics computation scheme named LF-GDPR is proposed. It supports various graph analytics tasks, including community detection and clustering coefficient estimation. Under the vertex-separated federated setting, each client performs local computation by deriving the adjacency vector and the degree scaler. Then, the insight is processed by LDP with careful privacy budget allocation. The derived metrics are aggregated on the server side to complete all kinds of graph analytics tasks utilizing dedicated aggregation algorithms proposed by the authors. [63] focus on the triangle counting problem in the graph-separated federated setting. The authors proposed an enhanced privacy notion named edge relationship LDP which can protect the information of vertex neighborhood within local graph data. The insight processed by edge relationship LDP therefore will not reveal sensitive information about the existence of edges.

VIII. FREQUENCY-RELATED APPLICATIONS

The tasks related to the frequency estimation on categorical data make up an important part of data analytics, and also its FA variations. In these tasks, the clients with indexes $i = 1, \dots, n$ hold local data d_i . Denote q as a queried data structure, for any q and d_i , there exists a relationship of “containing”. For simplicity, we borrow the symbols from set theory, so that $q \in d_i$ denotes the fact that “ d_i contains q ”, and $q \notin d_i$ denotes the fact that “ d_i does not contain q ”. For any q and d_i , exactly one of $q \in d_i$ or $q \notin d_i$ must be true.

With the definition of a “containing” relationship, the frequency f of any query data can be then defined as follows.

$$f(q) = \frac{|\{i|q \in d_i\}|}{n}, \quad (8)$$

or

$$f(q) = \mathbb{P}(q \in d_i), \text{ randomly sample } i \text{ from clients} \quad (9)$$

can be used when the size of clients n is not available.

With the definition of the frequency of queried data, multiple frequency-related tasks can be then defined. Here we list our taxonomy of these tasks.

Frequency oracle. The task of frequency oracle aims at constructing an abstraction (frequency oracle) of client data. Using the abstraction, a querier can arbitrarily derive estimations of any queried data without interacting with the clients. In some works, the frequency oracle problem is termed frequency estimation problem as the frequency oracle provides services of frequency estimation.

Frequent pattern mining. The task of frequent pattern mining (FPM) aims at finding highly frequent queried data. There are two mainstream definitions of FPM. In the first definition, the system outputs all possible queried data q where $f(q)$ is higher than a predefined threshold. In the second definition, the system outputs the top- k queried data with the highest frequency. Based on the structures of client data d_i , queried data q , and definition of containing relationship, FPM is also named by its subtasks frequent item mining, frequent itemset mining, and frequent sequence mining.

Heavy hitter. The term heavy hitters originated from the downstream tasks in web data analysis. The heavy hitter task is consistent with frequent item mining, where the containing relationship is defined to be the “ \in ” relationship in set theory.

The definitions of frequency-related tasks are highly connected, and many algorithms are able to tackle multiple tasks simultaneously.

In the following part, we will first discuss some key issues in handling frequency-related tasks in Section VIII-A, and then introduce the existing FA solutions in Section VIII-B

A. Key issues in frequency-related tasks

Data domain and data type are two key issues in the problem setting of any frequency-related task, which determine the difficulty of the task and introduce challenges in designing the solutions.

Data domain. The data domain (or data universe) is an important setting in frequency-related tasks. The data domain refers to the set of all possible queried data. The easiest setting is the *small domain*, where the number of possible queried data is small enough so that the algorithm designer can simply enumerate all possible queried data, or design one-hot encoding of them. In the *large domain* setting, the algorithm designer still has knowledge of all the possible queries, but can no longer apply one-hot encoding or similar techniques, due to the limit of computation and communication resources. In the most difficult *infinite domain* setting, there are infinite possible queried data. An example of the infinite setting is that the queried data are all possible strings of characters with arbitrary lengths.

Data type. The frequency-related tasks can be categorized by the type of queried data (and also client data). The item type data is the default setting of frequency oracle and heavy hitters, where the possible queried data are indivisible distinct items. Complex types of queried data, like set, sequence, and graph of items, are investigated in frequent pattern mining problems. These problems are typically more difficult than the item-type

TABLE VIII

SUMMARY OF FA-BASED SOLUTIONS ON FREQUENCY-RELATED APPLICATIONS. (**FO**: FREQUENCY ORACLE; **HH**: HEAVY HITTER/FREQUENT ITEM MINING; **FISM**: FREQUENT ITEMSET MINING; **FSM**: FREQUENT SEQUENCE MINING)

Reference	Task	Privacy	Data domain	Note
RAPPOR [22]	FO & HH	LDP	Large	Randomized response on modified bloom filter
Bassily <i>et al.</i> [74]	FO & HH	LDP	Small	One-bit client upload
LDPMiner [75]	FO & HH & FSM	LDP	Small	Constant communication cost
PSFO [81]	FISM	LDP	Small	Converting FISM into HH via padding and sampling on itemsets
TreeHist [79]	FO	LDP	Small	Near-optimal error
Bitstogram [79]	FO & HH	LDP	Small	Near-optimal error
Acharya <i>et al.</i> [76]	FO	LDP	Small	Hadamard Response; No shared randomness
Acharya <i>et al.</i> [77]	FO & HH	LDP	Small	Hadamard Response; No shared randomness; One-bit client upload
FIML [82]	FISM	LDP	Small	Top- k setting of FISM
OptPrefixTree [80]	HH & FSM	LDP	Infinite	Handling infinite data domain with prefix tree
SFP [78]	FSM	LDP	Large	Uploading two count-mean-sketches to encode a sequence
FedFPM [23]	HH & FISM & FSM	LDP	Small	Unified framework for multiple FPM subtasks; One-bit client upload
TrieHH	HH & FSM	CDP	Infinite	Building up the frequent strings by transmitting a prefix tree
TrieHH++ [83]	HH & FSM	CDP	Infinite	Randomized sample size
STAR [27]	HH	Cryptography	Infinite	Private threshold aggregation via secret sharing
Boneh <i>et al.</i> [86]	FO & HH & FSM	Cryptography	Infinite	High security via incremental distributed point functions
Böhler <i>et al.</i> [84]	HH	DDP	Small	Utilizing DDP for high data utility and formal DP guarantee
Bagdasaryan <i>et al.</i> [14]	FO	DDP	Small	Utilizing DDP for high data utility and formal DP guarantee
FedWeb [85]	HH & FISM & FSM	DDP	Small	Application in Web 3.0 scenario

problems, because they lead to exponentially increasing data domain, and require careful design to handle the relationship between different queried data.

B. Existing solutions

The majority of FA-based frequency oracle, heavy hitters, and frequent pattern mining solutions adopt LDP for their privacy guarantee, owing to its strong privacy preservation in the untrusted aggregator model. RAPPOR [22] is one of the earliest and most popular frequency oracle solutions with LDP guarantee. It lets the clients encode their local data into bloom filters, so that LDP can be enforced for arbitrary structure of local data. By aggregating the bloom filters, the frequency of the encoded elements can be estimated. [74] (succinct histograms) is another algorithm for frequency oracle and heavy hitter problems. With the help of shared randomness, the succinct histogram algorithm only requests clients to upload one-bit data. LDPMiner [75] is another solution for heavy hitters. Compared to previous solutions, LDPMiner is the first one to resolve the set-value client data, where multiple q can be contained by one d_i . PSFO [81] proposes its optimization over LDPMiner. While preserving the strengths of LDPMiner, PSFO enables frequent itemset mining tasks with its padding-and-sampling oracle. In [79], two algorithms, TreeHist and Bitstogram, are proposed, to resolve the tasks of frequency oracle, and heavy hitters. In the two algorithms, tailored data structures, shared randomness, and Hadamard transform are carefully designed and utilized. As a result, TreeHist and Bitstogram manage to optimize the time and space complexity on both the server and client side. In [76], another frequency oracle algorithm based on Hadamard response is proposed that removes the need for shared randomness. In [77], an algorithm is proposed for frequency oracle and heavy hitters. In addition to removing the need for public randomness, [77] only requires one-bit responses. FIML [82] tackles the top- k setting of frequent itemset mining. It first builds a frequency oracle to find out top frequent items, then builds candidate

itemsets, and queries their frequencies. OptPrefixTree [80] is a prefix tree-based heavy hitter algorithm. It leverages the prefix tree to handle the infinite data domain.

SFP [78] algorithm is proposed by Apple to tackle the difficult frequent sequence mining problem. It encodes the local client data with count mean sketch so that LDP can be properly enforced. It partially tackles the large domain problem of domain element frequency estimation. It lets clients upload an extra count mean sketch of sequence fragments, where the short fragments can be easily enumerated and frequent short fragments can assemble longer sequences. FedFPM [23] is proposed as a unified FA framework to tackle multiple FPM subproblems, including heavy hitters, frequent itemset mining, and frequent sequence mining. It follows a query-response scheme to estimate the frequency of the candidate patterns and derives Hoeffding's inequality-based bounds to filter the candidates. FedFPM is able to achieve a better data utility than existing solutions but requires sufficient participating clients.

As LDP schemes request clients to add significant noise to the uploads, researchers propose CDP schemes in FA-based frequency-related tasks. The major advantage of CDP is that it requests clients to add smaller noise on the uploads, or even add no noise by utilizing the sampling mechanism. However, only enforcing CDP sacrifices the formal privacy guarantee, as the FA server is usually considered untrusted. TrieHH [25] is an FA solution to digest string-typed heavy hitters. It iteratively builds up a prefix tree of characters with the interaction between the server and clients. Its major advantage is the ability to satisfy CDP without adding random noise to the outputs so that a better data utility of the mined results can be achieved. TrieHH++ [83] is an expansion of TrieHH. It extends the applications from heavy hitters to quantile estimation and range query. It follows the basic ideas of TrieHH, that realizing CDP via sampling data without adding random noise to the outputs and generating a prefix tree to handle infinite data domain. In addition, it applies Poisson sampling, instead of fixed-size sampling, to hide the sample size.

TABLE IX
SUMMARY OF FEDERATED QUERY SOLUTIONS.

Reference	Query type	Privacy	Cryptography technique	Maximal client
SMCQL [87]	General	Encryption	Garbled circuit	2
Conclave [88]	General	Encryption	Secret sharing	3
Senate [90]	General	Encryption (adversary model)	Garbled circuit	16
Saqe [28]	General	Encryption & DP	Secret sharing	2
Orchard [93]	General	Encryption & DP	Homomorphic encryption	> 1000
Arboretum [95]	General	Encryption & DP	Homomorphic encryption	> 1000
Secure Yannakakis [89]	Free-connex join-aggregate query	Encryption	Private set intersection (based on garbled circuit), secret sharing, & oblivious extended permutation	2
Zhang <i>et al.</i> [91]	Skyline query	Encryption	Private set intersection (based on homomorphic encryption and garbled bloom filter)	10
Hu-fu [92]	Spatial query	Encryption	Secret sharing	10
Mycelium [94]	Graph query	Encryption & DP	Homomorphic encryption & onion routing	> 1000

Some works adopt cryptography tools instead of DP in FA-based frequency-related solutions. Compared to DP, cryptography tools allow deriving accurate results with maximal data utility. However, an adversary still may infer sensitive information from the accurate outputs. STAR [27] is a threshold aggregation (a variation of heavy hitters) solution for web data analysis. Its threshold aggregation enforces k -anonymity on the output data, and such functionality is realized by a secret sharing scheme. In [86], a private heavy hitter algorithm is proposed. The solution relies on the incremental distributed point function, a lightweight cryptography tool. It assumes that there exist two servers that collude with neither each other nor any client. In [84], a private heavy hitter solution is proposed that utilizes DDP for its privacy preservation. DDP statistically satisfies CDP, and utilizes cryptography tools to prevent the server from learning any single client upload, so that local privacy can be achieved with CDP-level data utility. In FedWeb [85], another DDP-based solution is proposed. It can handle generic FPM tasks, and proposes tailored design to be applied in Web 3.0 applications.

In [14], an FA-based location heatmap generation solution is proposed, which can be regarded as a frequency oracle solution on geometric items. In [14], DDP, which combines the schemes of cryptography tools and DP, is applied to reduce the noise required for privacy preservation. It iteratively reduces the granularity of queried locations to better utilize the participating clients.

In Table VIII, we summarize our surveyed FA-based solutions on frequency-related tasks and list their detailed tasks, privacy model, data domain setting, and extra features.

IX. DATABASE OPERATIONS

Federated query, also termed data federation SQL, targets enabling database operations (SQL queries) on the data separated in multiple clients. The result of federated query is expected to be the same as the case where data from clients is virtually gathered to form a centralized database, and the privacy of the client data is preserved. Privacy preservation of federated query solutions is usually achieved by various cryptography tools so that every participant cannot learn any information about the data of other clients unless it is




Fig. 8. Illustration of the server-client-based federated query architecture.

necessary to be revealed by the query result. Federated query has the potential to be an important piece of FA research, as many simple data analytics tasks are equivalent to a single SQL query, and some complex data analytics tasks can be decomposed into a series of database operations.

As privacy-preserving federated query solutions rely on cryptography tools, especially MPC protocols, the heavy computation overhead of executing the cryptography tools becomes a significant burden to deploy these federated query solutions into real-world systems. Therefore, an important task of the federated query solutions is to optimize the computation time of executing the federated query and deriving the accurate result. To fulfill that goal, researchers propose various solutions to pursue desirable computation time performance, which utilizes various cryptography tools with different properties and carefully optimizes the computation graph of executing the query to reduce the computation cost.

Federated query solutions usually follow two kinds of architectures. The first architecture is inherited from classical MPC

protocols like garbled circuits. In such a fully decentralized architecture, clients directly communicate with each other under the encrypted protocol. After the computation, all the clients can derive the decrypted query results. Another widely applied architecture is the server-client architecture, as is illustrated in Fig. 8. The server is in charge of receiving the SQL statement from the federated query user and composing the computation plan. The clients execute the computation plan to conduct local computation, where client-client communication is usually involved as is required by the encryption tools. The clients upload the encrypted results to the server. Then, the server derives the plaintext SQL result by decrypting the client uploads, and returns the result to the federated query user.

Among the existing federated query solutions, the most ambitious ones are those supporting many types of queries (even the whole SQL standard) within one framework. These solutions are the most powerful FA solutions from the perspective of the number of supported data analytics tasks. SMCQL [87] is a pioneering federated query solution. It utilizes the garbled circuit to encrypt the whole query execution. The utilization of the garbled circuit makes SMCQL have the strong capacity to support the whole SQL standard but introduces significant computation overhead and only supports the computation over two clients. SMCQL also introduces a query planner to optimize the computation graph, so that some computation steps can be performed within one client and do not need MPC execution. Conclave [88] is then proposed to reduce the heavy computation workload of SMCQL. It utilizes the respectively lightweight secret sharing schemes to replace garbled circuit so that the computation is faster; computation among three clients is supported; but some query (*e.g.*, window aggregate) is no longer supported. In addition, Conclave enables clients to optionally annotate some parts (columns) of their data to be non-private. The optional annotation reduces the scale of computation needed for MPC execution and further optimizes the computation time. Senate [90] is another SQL executor over federated data. Compared to SMCQL and Conclave, it changes the semi-honest assumption into a stricter adversarial threat model. It proposes novel MPC decomposition and query planning techniques, letting some computations be executed on a subset of clients. Saqe [28] considers a new direction of optimizing federated query runtime. It removes the restriction that the SQL result must be accurate, and let the federated query derive approximate results. As the execution over a small sampled set of data is enough to derive the query result with a bounded accuracy guarantee, Saqe achieves much better performance by reducing the size of the data to be computed. In addition, the data sampling scheme of Sage realizes an additional DP guarantee of the approximate query result. Orchard [93] is a novel federated query solution that transforms queries into three “zones” that computations on private individual data, aggregated but not noised data, and noised data, respectively. The results of local computation in first “zone” are homomorphically encrypted and sent to the aggregator which performs summation. The aggregated results are decrypted, noised, and announced by a committee later which owns the key. The detailed procedure is the same as its previous work [32] which is introduced in VII-A

herein. Orchard can efficiently answer queries at scale as long as there is additive aggregation in them such as k-means, logistic regression, perceptron, and PCA. Arboretum [95] is designed to efficiently answer a wide range of queries in large-scale FA setups with potentially billions of participants. Arboretum’s key strengths include its ability to automatically optimize query plans and distribute computational tasks across participant devices. The system outperforms previous solutions by supporting new types of queries and matches the cost of existing systems that were hand-optimized for specific queries. Arboretum’s approach significantly enhances the scalability and feasibility of executing complex queries in distributed environments while maintaining strong privacy guarantees.

Although the aforementioned general federated query schemes obtain remarkable achievement in computation time reduction and client size scalability, the intrinsic difficulty of the general federated query still burdens its application in many runtime-sensitive and large-scale systems. As an attempt to compromise the types of queries, specific federated queries are proposed. Specific federated query solutions tackle one kind of query so that many tools other than general cryptography solutions can be applied. In other words, researchers only need to provide a cryptography version of a specific algorithm to enable a specific federated query. As a result, the specific federated query has the potential to achieve better performance in computation load and has wide application in scenarios where only a specific kind of query is required. In [89], a federated query solution is proposed to handle the free-connex join-aggregate query (a special kind of query). The authors provide a secure version of the Yannakakis algorithm over two clients, which is much more efficient in runtime compared to the garbled circuit. In [91], the authors consider skyline queries over vertical data federations. Their algorithm design decomposes the execution into local computation and cross-client secure aggregation, where the secure part is reformulated into the private set computation problem, which can be efficiently handled by MPC solutions. Hu-fu [92] tackles SQL queries related to spatial data. The authors notice that various spatial queries, (including kNN, range counting, and range query) can be realized by only three secure operations (summation, comparison, and set union), while other distance-based operations can all be conducted without encryption. Hu-fu then designs effective dedicated algorithms to handle each of the three secure operators and therefore achieves good performance in computation load and gains capacity in supporting up to ten clients. Mycelium [94] is a system that enables processing differentially private queries over large-scale distributed graphs, which are common in scenarios like disease or malware tracking. Mycelium achieves privacy by combining homomorphic encryption, a verifiable secret redistribution scheme (similar to Orchard [93]), and a mix network based on telescoping circuits. It can handle various queries relevant to medical research without compromising individual privacy or learning the graph’s topology.

In Table IX, we summarize our surveyed federated query solutions, regarding their supported query types, privacy models, cryptography techniques, and maximal supported clients.

TABLE X
SUMMARY OF ASSISTING FEDERATED LEARNING.

Reference	Data analytics task	Privacy	Note
FedACS [11]	Preprocessing: Client quality evaluation for FL	Hiding raw data	Selecting clients with lower data heterogeneity based on their gradients
FAVOR [104]	Preprocessing: Client quality evaluation for FL	Hiding raw data	Using a reinforcement learning model to select clients based on their gradients to maximize validation accuracy
Oort [99]	Preprocessing: Client quality evaluation for FL	LDP	Selecting clients with higher training losses
Cho <i>et al.</i> [96]	Preprocessing: Client quality evaluation for FL	LDP	Prioritizing high-loss clients for participation
CMFL [97]	Preprocessing: Client quality evaluation for FL	LDP	Preventing gradient uploads of low-quality clients
Sattler <i>et al.</i> [12]	Preprocessing: Personalize FL models via client clustering	LDP	Grouping clients with similar data distributions
Briggs <i>et al.</i> [101]	Preprocessing: Personalize FL models via client clustering	Hiding raw data	Agglomeratively clustering clients after training a global model
Liang <i>et al.</i> [100]	Preprocessing: Personalize FL models via client clustering	Hiding raw data	Decomposing and consolidating extreme clusters
IFCA [102]	Preprocessing: Personalize FL models via client clustering	Hiding raw data	Assigning clients to clusters where they achieve the lowest local loss on distributed models
COMET [103]	Preprocessing: Personalize FL models via client clustering	Hiding raw data	Incorporating knowledge sharing with a regularization term during local model training
FedSoft [98]	Preprocessing: Personalize FL models via client clustering	LDP	Using proximal loss to align client training with multiple cluster models
Oort [99]	Postprocessing: Model evaluation	LDP	Automatically adjusting the number of participating clients using confidence bounds derived from Hoeffding's inequality




Fig. 9. A typical workflow of FL assisted by FA.

X. ASSISTING FEDERATED LEARNING

FL has gained success in various data-incentive tasks where a neural network is trained for prediction/description applications. Many works are proposed to improve the FL performance regarding model accuracy, convergence rate, scalability, *etc.* In these works, the data of the clients are usually analyzed to pursue optimization of the FL performance. However, as is restricted by the tenet of FL, the raw data should not be transmitted to the server while conducting such analysis. Therefore, in these works, the raw data of the clients are usually transformed into insensitive insights which help the system to perform decision-making in optimizing FL. Although not explicitly claimed, such an approach exactly

follows the FA paradigm, and these solutions can be regarded as an FL instance optimized by another FA algorithm.

We categorize the solutions of FA-assisted FL based on when FA takes effect, as illustrated in Fig. 9. We summarize the whole procedure into three phases: the preprocessing phase, where the clients are registered and evaluated by the server; the training phase, where the FL model is transmitted between server and clients, trained by the clients locally, and aggregated by the server, for multiple rounds; the postprocessing phase, where the performance of the derived FL model is then evaluated. Following the definition of the majority of FL research, FL usually includes the training phase and a part of the preprocessing phase, and the assisting FA schemes can be executed in the preprocessing phase, in the postprocessing

phase, and sometimes in the training phase parallel with FL. Fig. 9 illustrates the involvement of FL and FA in the whole procedure with colors.

In the following parts, we will introduce some classes of FA schemes to assist FL. In Section X-A, we investigate FA schemes that help FL to evaluate the data quality of clients, and further select proper participating clients, which executes on the preprocessing phase and client selection step of the training phase. In Section X-B, we investigate FA schemes that help FL model personalization via conducting clustering on the clients, which executes on the preprocessing phase and model aggregation step of the training phase. In Section X-C, we investigate FA schemes to evaluate the performance of the FL model, which executes in the postprocessing phase. Table X summarizes the FA schemes covered by this survey in assisting FL applications.

A. Preprocessing: Client quality evaluation for FL

Being consistent with conventional model training, the quality of training data is a critical factor to influence the outcome model performance in FL. When it comes to the scenario of federated data, the quality of data in different clients varies, providing different benefits (or even harms) to the FL model. The different quality of client data may originate from the data intrinsically, like different correctness of labels, and different scales of noise, or from the overall FL system, like different heterogeneity of data distribution compared to the global one (*aka.* non-IID issue). Therefore, evaluating the quality of client data in the preprocessing phase becomes a profitable procedure. The results of client quality evaluation can be utilized for many FL system optimizations. In some FL research, the client quality evaluation is employed to improve the client selection of FL, rather than the random selection baseline. In other works, the uploaded gradients from different clients are processed by the server before aggregation, through reweighting or trimming, based on the client evaluation results.

FedACS [11] is an FA solution to measure the data skewness (severity of data heterogeneity) of the clients. Since data heterogeneity is a significant source of performance degrading of FL tasks, measuring data skewness is proven to be beneficial in assisting client selection for FL. In FedACS, the FL gradients of clients are utilized as FA insights, so that the computation and infrastructure of FL can be reused. The authors prove that the clients with local gradients close to the average gradient tend to have lower data skewness, and are more beneficial to the FL model. The server then formulates a dueling bandit to perform client selection, where clients with lower data skewness are more likely to be selected. In FAVOR [104], the authors formulate a reinforcement learning model running on the server side to perform client selection. In that reinforcement learning model, the states are defined to be a combination of the global model gradient and local gradients of all clients, where the latter is transmitted from the clients and serves as the FA insight. The actions are defined as all possible sets of participating clients in the incoming round. The rewards are defined by the validation accuracy of the model after the training. Such reinforcement learning formulation forces

the reinforcement learning model to choose the participating clients that achieve higher validation accuracy. In Oort [99], the authors optimize the training and evaluation of FL models by wisely selecting participating clients. The optimization of training is based on an observation of the authors, that a client inducing higher training loss is more beneficial for the FL training. Therefore, in Oort, the clients upload their training loss (which is a scaler) to the server in each round they participate in, which works as the insight of FA. The server then utilizes a heuristic multi-armed bandit to perform client selection, where clients obtaining higher training losses in previous rounds will be more likely to be selected. In [96], the authors formally prove that selecting clients with higher training loss can accelerate the FL model convergence. Based on the theoretical result, the authors propose a power-of-choice client selection strategy, where a global model is sent to all available clients, the clients upload the training loss as the FA insight, and the server finally selects a set of high-loss clients as the participants in the following several rounds. In CMFL [97], the quality of clients is evaluated as the divergence between the local gradient and global gradient, based on the difference of signs throughout all dimensions of the gradient vector. After that, gradients from those low-quality clients are trimmed. Furthermore, by moving the evaluation procedure from the server to the clients, CMFL reduces the overall communication overhead by preventing the gradient uploads of low-quality clients.

B. Preprocessing: Personalize FL models via client clustering

The vanilla setting of FL considers an identical global model shared by the server and clients, which is applied in downstream tasks on all data. However, in practice, the client data are usually non-IID distributed, and the data held by different clients has quite different characteristics (distributions). As a result, it becomes difficult to let one model achieve good generalization on data from all clients, *i.e.*, the optimal model parameters for global data might be quite divergent from the optimal model parameters for data in particular clients. Personalized FL resolves such an issue by breaking the limit of one identical global model. In personalized FL, multiple models are trained by data from different clients and are applied to the data of those clients. With personalized FL, each client can obtain a personalized model tailored to its data characteristics, which achieves better performance when performing inference on its data [147].

Among various approaches to personalized FL, clustering-based methods are widely selected for their high reasonability and strong performance. In clustering-based methods, clients are firstly clustered, where those with similar data characteristics are placed in the same cluster. Then, FL is fine-tuned based on the data within one cluster. With such approaches, the personalized models will be trained on sufficient data stored in a number of clients, and tailored for particular data characteristics. The clustering procedure requests the sharing of information about the client data. To preserve privacy, existing clustering-based personalized FL algorithms exactly follow the FA paradigm in clustering the clients. The clustering

problems can be regarded as a special kind of clustering problem in general data analytics, and those client clustering algorithms can also be regarded as a special kind of FA-based clustering solutions.

In [12], the authors propose a pioneering clustering personalized FL solution named CFL. In CFL, the cluster assignment of clients is determined by a hierarchical clustering structure: the data distribution similarity of pairs of clients is calculated by the cosine similarity of local gradients; a bipartition of clients is derived by analyzing the similarity matrix; more clusters are derived by hierarchically executing the bipartition algorithm as long as it could improve the overall performance. In [101], the authors propose another pioneering clustering personalized FL solution. It trains a global model with vanilla FL and then uses gradients from all the clients to perform clustering. The clustering is based on the cosine similarity between clients using an agglomerative clustering algorithm. In [100], the authors propose a clustering personalized FL approach by extracting one layer of the gradient uploaded by the clients and clustering clients by calculating the cosine distance of the layer parameters. The authors also propose a decomposition and consolidation scheme to remove some extreme clusters and reassign the clients to other clusters. In [102], the authors propose an Iterative Federated Clustering Algorithm (IFCA) to cluster the clients for personalized FL. In IFCA, the server first formulates one model for each of the clusters and distributes all the models to the participating clients. The clients calculate their local loss of all the models, and one client will be assigned to the cluster where the lowest loss is obtained on the corresponding model. In [103], the authors propose COMET to perform clustered co-distillation in FL. In COMET, there exists a public set of unlabeled data samples. The clients train their personalized model with its local data and then infer the public data to derive the soft decisions. The clients upload their soft decisions on the public data to the server, and the server performs k -means on that so that clients with similar soft decisions on the public data will be placed in the same cluster. After that, knowledge sharing is performed in model training. In detail, the clients then train their local model with their local data, while an extra regularization term is applied. The regularization term forces the model to obtain similar soft decisions to other clients in the same cluster on the public data. In [98], the authors consider the problem that the clients may find it hard to cluster into several distinct data distributions. They consider soft clustering, where the distribution of data in each client is considered as a mixture of several clusters. FedSoft is proposed to perform soft clustering by requesting the clients to train with a proximal loss, regulating the training to get close to a mixture of several cluster models. FedSoft system employs an FA subroutine to estimate the weight of each client with all the clustered. Each data sample of one client is evaluated by all the cluster model, and is assigned to the cluster with the smallest loss. The weight of the client is then calculated as the portion of data samples belonging to all the clusters.

C. Postprocessing: Model evaluation

While the mainstream of FL studies focuses on model training, *i.e.*, deriving a model that is expected to have high performance based on the federated data. Meanwhile, as the evaluation of the trained model also relies on the vast data, leveraging the federated data then becomes an effective approach. In the blog [10] where the term FA is coined, the authors claim that the idea of FA is exactly motivated by the need to evaluate the trained FL model. In Oort [99], the authors propose a system of federated evaluation. Oort automatically adjusts the number of participating clients, so that the accuracy of performance evaluation is guaranteed and the client effort is minimized. Such adjustment is achieved by the confidence bounds derived by Hoeffding's inequality. In these FA-based model evaluation solutions, the transmitted computation model is usually the learning model, which is consistent with FL. However, the local computation part is conducted by performing model inference, and the derived insight is the performance metric of model inference. It is a simpler form of local computation compared to FL, only requiring the forward propagation phase of FL local computation, and dropping out the more computation-intensive backward propagation phase.

XI. WIRELESS NETWORK APPLICATIONS

Wireless networks have become a key cornerstone of modern communication systems. Meanwhile, data analytics (machine learning) approaches are widely applied to optimize the performance of wireless network systems. These technologies have been utilized to handle critical tasks such as network slicing, caching management, anomaly detection, and semantic communication. Federated computation, including both FL and FA, is also applied by the researchers to obtain the benefits of privacy preservation, each computing utilization, and communication efficiency. In this section, we focus on the FA solutions applied for the critical optimizations on wireless network systems. Table XI summarizes the FA studies covered by this survey in wireless network applications.

Some FA solutions directly enable non-neural network data analytics powers for wireless network challenges. They design federated versions of data analytics algorithms, such as clustering, to optimize wireless network systems. In [108], an FA solution is proposed for anomaly detection in cellular network antenna tilt. It transforms the data regarding antenna electrical tilt into signature vectors, and then performs federated clustering on these signature vectors, where the local clustering centroids serve as the FA insights. Then, anomaly items are then filtered out by measuring the distance between signature vectors and global clustering centroids. In [105], the problem of energy consumption minimization in mobile edge computing task offloading is considered. To handle the time-varying user task, a federated version of support vector machine (SVM) is proposed. In the federated SVM scheme, the covariance matrix between users is transmitted from server to clients (base stations), and the SVM weights are uploaded from clients to server, and are then aggregated by the server. Eventually, the global SVM can derive the optimal solution of

TABLE XI
SUMMARY OF WIRELESS NETWORK APPLICATION.

Reference	Note
Mulvey <i>et al.</i> [108]	Transforming data into signature vectors, performing federated clustering, and filtering anomalies based on distances to global centroids
Wang <i>et al.</i> [105]	Transmitting covariance matrices and aggregating SVM weights between clients and the server to optimize task offloading
Chen <i>et al.</i> [107]	Detecting malicious sensing tasks in mobile crowdsensing
Xing <i>et al.</i> [109]	Generating aggregation indicators based on channel conditions to weight the FL model aggregation
Wang <i>et al.</i> [110]	FA-assisted FL controls UAV deployment in visible light communications
Zhao <i>et al.</i> [106]	Sending locally generated labels on shared unlabelled data to the server for aggregation into global hard labels
Wang <i>et al.</i> [111]	Iteratively computing client similarities and forming clusters

task offloading, with optimized communication and computation overheads. In [107], an FA scheme is utilized in mobile crowdsensing scenarios to discover malicious sensing tasks. In such a scheme, a machine learning module is equipped by each client (detection device). The clients predict whether a task is malicious, and uploads the prediction results to the server as the FA insight. The server aggregates the insights, and derives the updated reputation score of the task proposers to the clients, which helps optimize the prediction results in the future. The global prediction results are also derived by aggregating the client predictions, with extra risk-aware computations.

On the other hand, other FA solutions optimize the wireless network systems based on an FL backbone, *i.e.*, a neural network is trained collaboratively to directly optimize the system. The FA algorithm then proposes assistance on the FL scheme. Such methodology has been applied in numerous FA research, as is introduced in Section X. In [109], FL is employed to build up a semantic communication system, while FA is applied to assist it via generating the aggregation indicators. The aggregation indicator is generated by the FA local computation scheme, reflecting the suitability between the current channel condition and the local FL model. When the aggregation indicator is received by the server along with the FL model, it is transformed into the weight in weighted FL model aggregation. In [110], the FA-assisted FL scheme is deployed to control the UAV deployment in visible light communications scenarios. It needs to resolve the complex optimization problem jointly considering “UAV deployment, user association, power efficiency, and predictions of the illumination distribution”. To predict the illumination distribution, a convolutional autoencoder is trained by FL methodology. To help the FL training, the FA methodology is also applied. The FA scheme uploads the convolution kernels and bias to the server. By aggregating the convolution kernels, gap matrices can be calculated, which are essential for the evaluation and optimization of the UAV deployment plan. In [106], an FL system is designed to conduct intrusion detection. To tackle the challenge of privacy risk of transmitting gradient, non-IID data, and high communication overhead, the proposed scheme exactly replaces the conventional FL insight derivation and aggregation schemes, by those in FA methodology. Such schemes, utilizing the idea of knowledge distillation, are also termed federated distillation from the FA perspective. In the proposed scheme, the locally generated labels on shared unlabelled data are sent to the server, and then aggregated

to form the global hard labels. Then, the server can use the shared data with global labels to train the global model. In [111], an FL model is trained to perform content popularity prediction in Fog-RAN systems. The clustered FL scheme is further deployed based on the federated clustering solution. In the federated clustering scheme, the local features of the clients are computed and uploaded. The server computes the similarity between clients, and splits up new clusters iteratively. Eventually, the final clustering results can be derived, and the personalization of the host FL scheme is improved.

XII. OPEN ISSUES AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

A. Applications to more complex data scenarios

The fundamental difference between FA and FL lies in the nature of their supporting tasks. The scope of data scenarios studied by existing FA remains small compared with the diversity of data science problems and models in the wild. Designing FA mechanisms to support non-trivial data types, including graph data [148], streaming data [149], key-value data [150], multidimensional data [151], time series data, and important networked applications, including Internet telemetry [152], smart home [153], healthcare [13], web 3.0 and other privacy-critical scenarios [154] all present interesting and open challenges.

B. Privacy preservation at scale

As FA systems grow in scale with more data or users involved, ensuring privacy becomes more challenging. This challenge is exacerbated when analysts seek high-accuracy analytics. Existing privacy-preserving techniques exhibit distinct characteristics concerning privacy assurance, data utility, and scalability. For example, DP has long been criticized for offering a poor accuracy-privacy tradeoff, prohibiting its applications in domains that request accurate population-level profiling or analytics. Other cryptographic techniques, such as MPC, encounter difficulties in scaling to practical sizes for mobile applications. Consequently, FA mechanisms have to be carefully designed to strike a delicate balance among privacy, utility, and scalability.

C. A unified FA framework

FL operates under a unified framework to embed similar computation procedures and insight structures when training various types of neural networks. Such a unified framework plays a vital role in boosting the wide studies and applications

of FL. On the other hand, FA mechanisms designed so far are still highly task-specific. While it seems intuitive that different data analytics tasks are naturally different regarding their computation procedures, data structures, etc, there already exists some efforts to provide a unified framework for a particular class of data science problem [23]. Attracted by the potential benefits of a unified framework, it remains a grand open problem to design a unified framework for broader classes of data analytics tasks or even universal data analytics tasks. Specifically, motivated by this, some open questions and interesting directions could be (i) What are the proper architecture, and interface design for a unified FA framework? (ii) If we still adopt the current local insight upload and global aggregation scheme, how to design a general aggregator or general insight form that capable of incorporating diverse requirements? (iii) Witnessing the advancement in generative models, is it possible to use generative models at the server side, essentially, as a general aggregator, to further reduce the reliance on locally uploaded insights so that the communication cost can be reduced further and versatile privacy-preserving tasks can be supported.

D. System-efficient FA

Studies in the field of FA have primarily concentrated on algorithm design to enable the execution of various data analytics tasks in a federated manner. In contrast to the well-established problem hierarchy in FL, it is evident that a substantial portion of the FA domain remains unexplored, particularly from the systems' perspective. As a federated system, FA also faces practical challenges, such as heterogeneous computing power across devices, dynamic system sizes with devices joining and leaving, incentives and pricing issues, robust FA under adversaries, etc. FA further introduces new interpretations of system measures, such as fairness, and novel system challenges, such as significant computing costs for certain privacy-preserving measures, and a limited privacy budget on the client side. As FA continues to evolve, addressing these system-level challenges will be crucial for its successful implementation and widespread adoption.

E. Wireless communication for FA

Over-the-air computation (AirComp) leverages the superposition property of wireless channels to enable simultaneous transmission and aggregation of signals from multiple devices [34], [35], [155], [156]. It has been applied to FL by aggregating model updates from numerous devices directly over the air. It not only enhances communication efficiency but also maintains the privacy of clients' local data, addressing key bottlenecks in traditional FL approaches, such as limited bandwidth and latency issues. However, the existing research on AirComp focuses on FL rather than FA. Since the model aggregation in FL usually are in a simpler form (FedAvg and its variations), and FA aggregation usually requires more complex computation procedure. How the idea of AirComp can be applied for complex aggregation schemes, and how FA could benefit from physical layer techniques, also present interesting and open challenges.

F. Resource management in FA

Essentially as an edge computing scheme, FA should naturally applied to all kinds of resource-limited scenarios. The deployment of FA is accompanied by all kinds of resource constraints: the local computation and insight aggregation phases require computation resources; the model and insight transmission require communication resources; the level of client data leakage consumes the novel privacy resource at the client side; even the participation of client can also be considered as a kind of resource to some extent. Significant research efforts have been made in resource management and resource saving in FL, including all these aspects of computation [157], communication [97], privacy [158], and client participation [159]. However, designing novel mechanisms for resource management and saving for FA, or adapting these FL mechanisms into FA applications, is a non-trivial unexplored topic. Many existing schemes for FL may highly rely on the FL architecture, and are not applicable in FA applications. For example, gradient compression and quantization are widely used in communication-efficient FL, but are unlikely to be useful in FA since the uploaded insights are not in the form of gradient. Therefore, designing resource management and saving schemes for FA is a critical issue for its wide deployment.

XIII. LESSONS LEARNED AND CONCLUSION

A. Lessons learned

In this part, we discuss the key lessons acquired from the numerous literature in the field of FA. We focus on two directions: the lessons learned from FA from the perspective of a new computation paradigm, and the lessons learned from FA from the perspective of the applied data analytics tasks.

1) *FA as a new computation paradigm*: FA is an emerging variation of the federated computation paradigm, and the sibling of the earlier FL. FA handles the data analytics tasks over distributed data held by many edge data owners (clients), while the data privacy of these data owners is properly respected. FA realizes privacy-preserving data analytics via the procedure of local insight computation and global insight aggregation. In the local computation scheme, the clients utilize their local data to formulate the FA insights. The insights should be both be informative, so that the server can derive sufficient information for data analytics, and be privacy-preserving, so as not to leak sensitive information of client data. These insights are then utilized to derive the final analytics results via insight aggregation on the server. FA has the following key features.

- **Task-specific algorithmic design.** There does not exist a unified algorithmic procedure of FA. Instead, when applied to different data analytics tasks, different task-specific algorithmic designs are required, which include different structures of insights, different local computation procedures, and different insight aggregation schemes. The algorithmic design are manually designed by researchers to fit the data structure and analytics procedures of the specific data analytics task.
- **Enhanced privacy guarantee.** Compared to FL, where the transformation from raw data to neural network

gradients provides privacy preservation to some extent, the FA insights, which are the intermediate results of data analytics, are more likely to expose sensitive information. The reason is that the local computation in FA usually provides a lower level of data abstraction than local training in FL, and the FA insights are derived by relatively simpler transformation from the raw data. Therefore, researchers usually enhance the FA insight with formal privacy preservation tools, like DP and cryptography, before transmitting it to the server. Some FL researches also enhance privacy preservation with these tools, but in FA these tools are used much more commonly, almost becoming a necessity.

- **All kinds of resource constraints.** FA is usually conducted with the participation of numerous edge resources. Compared to the cloud computing scenarios, the FA system in the edge computing environment imposes various resource constraints, introducing specific concerns in designing FA algorithms. The limited computation capacity of edge devices requires FA algorithm to reduce computation complexity in the local computation phase. The limited communication capacity between servers and clients requires FA algorithm to design low-size insights. In the most recent research in federated computing, privacy is also considered a novel type of resource. In these scenarios, the privacy leakage of client data is accounted for and scheduled. The analytics utility is optimized under the constraints of the privacy budgets.

2) *FA applied in various data analytics tasks:* FA is designed to provide privacy-preserving analytics on decentralized data for various data analytics tasks. In Sections VII-X, we summarize existing FA research based on their applied data analytics tasks. In this part, we summarize key takeaways from the application of FA in each type of data analytics task.

- **Statistical metrics.** FA has gained great success in computing basic and important statistical metrics of data held by distributed clients, like sum, mean, norms, median, percentiles, and clustering centers. Computing sum, mean, or norms, which might be the most important task in the field of data science, attracts the greatest research interest, with many FA efforts proposed. Various privatization techniques, including LDP, CDP, simple cryptography (mask-based), and complex cryptography tools. These FA-based computation schemes can either be a stand-alone service, or be a building block of a secure aggregation scheme in FL. Since the median and percentile computation essentially outputs a particular item from the original data, limited privatization techniques can be used. In the existing research, exponential mechanism-based LDP, and MPC-based cryptography schemes are used. FA research also attempts to resolve the clustering task with data points held by different clients. These federated clustering schemes include those modifying conventional clustering algorithms (like k -means) into federated ways by transmitting the intermediate results, and those applying gradient-based methods. The FA paradigm is also applied in the field of graph analytics, which includes

new federated data settings, and novel graph metrics with significant importance.

- **Frequency-related applications.** Frequency-related applications, including frequency oracle, frequency pattern mining, and heavy hitter discovery, are another major field of FA applications. Numerous FA solutions are proposed, covering different data types, data domains, and privatization techniques.
- **Database operations.** Federated query task tries to form a virtual database from decentralized client data, enabling SQL queries under the collaborative computation among clients. Existing federated query works vary in types of supported query types, where some ambitious ones try to support more general queries (even the whole SQL standard), but are at the cost of computation complexity. All existing federated query works utilize cryptography techniques to enhance privatization, while some works also inject DP mechanisms. Among these techniques, homomorphic encryption is proven to have a better capacity to scale up to a larger number of participating clients.
- **Assisting FL.** While FL has gained outstanding success in training neural networks based on decentralized data to support various downstream artificial intelligence applications, researchers also reveal the potential of FA in supporting FL instances. FA is able to participate in the FL workflow, typically in the preprocessing and postprocessing phases. In this survey, we investigate three representative applications of FA in assisting FL: client quality evaluation in the preprocessing phase, client clustering (for model personalization) in the preprocessing phase, and model evaluation in the postprocessing phase. In addition to the three applications, there still exist many open issues in the FL workflow that can be conducted and optimized by FA algorithms and solutions.
- **Wireless network applications.** As wireless network application, which becomes a significant component of modern communication systems, naturally introduce various federated data scenarios, researchers propose FL and FA solutions to help optimize the efficiency of wireless network systems, regarding energy efficiency, intrusion detection **etc.** FA can support wireless network systems either by directly conducting data analytics tasks, or by assisting existing FL systems in wireless network systems.

B. Conclusion

Due to the exponential growth of edge data and the growing awareness of data privacy, privacy-preserving distributed data processing has attracted wide interest from both academia and industry. FA is an emerging collaborative data processing framework for descriptive data science tasks without centralizing the raw data. It brings significant benefits in privacy protection, communication reduction, and task coverage. Although FA has been widely studied in industry and academia, a systematic review of the existing efforts in FA has not been conducted yet. This survey fills the gap by first comprehensively reviewing the key concepts in FA, its relationship with

similar techniques, and its key challenges. It then presents a detailed taxonomy to categorize FA studies from both applications and system characteristics. Key enabling techniques are introduced with a specific focus on privatization, analytics, and optimization. A wide spectrum of FA tasks are then reviewed demonstrating the generality of FA applications. Finally, we discuss the open issues and future directions in FA, from the perspective of application, privacy protection, framework, system optimization, and cross-layer design, and then conclude the lessons learned from this survey. This survey summarizes the existing efforts in FA and the huge intersection among FA and data science, privacy, distributed computing, wireless communications, and networking systems. Overall, FA research is widely interdisciplinary, approachable, and contains many critical problems that would benefit greatly from the expertise of all related areas.

REFERENCES

- [1] “Number of connected iot devices will surge to 125 billion by 2030.” [Online]. Available: <https://sst.semiconductor-digest.com/2017/10/number-of-connected-iot-devices-will-surge-to-125-billion-by-2030/#:~:text=2030>
- [2] “The growth in connected iot devices is expected to generate 79.4zb of data in 2025, according to a new idc forecast.” [Online]. Available: <https://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20190618005012/en/The-Growth-in-Connected-IoT-Devices-is-Expected-to-Generate-79.4ZB-of-Data-in-2025-According-to-a-New-IDC-Forecast>
- [3] European Parliament and Council of the European Union. “Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council.” [Online]. Available: <https://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2016/679/oj>
- [4] A. Bharadwaj and G. Cormode, “An introduction to federated computation,” in *Proc. Int. Conf. Manage. Data*, Philadelphia, USA, Jun. 2022.
- [5] D. C. Nguyen, M. Ding, P. N. Pathirana, A. Seneviratne, J. Li, and H. V. Poor, “Federated learning for internet of things: A comprehensive survey,” *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tut.*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 1622–1658, thirdquarter 2021.
- [6] W. Y. B. Lim, N. C. Luong, D. T. Hoang, Y. Jiao, Y.-C. Liang, Q. Yang, D. Niyato, and C. Miao, “Federated learning in mobile edge networks: A comprehensive survey,” *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tut.*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 2031–2063, thirdquarter 2020.
- [7] X. Yin, Y. Zhu, and J. Hu, “A comprehensive survey of privacy-preserving federated learning: A taxonomy, review, and future directions,” *ACM Comput. Surv.*, vol. 54, no. 6, pp. 1–36, 2021.
- [8] C. Zhang, Y. Xie, H. Bai, B. Yu, W. Li, and Y. Gao, “A survey on federated learning,” *Knowl. Based Syst.*, vol. 216, p. 106775, Mar. 2021.
- [9] L. U. Khan, W. Saad, Z. Han, E. Hossain, and C. S. Hong, “Federated learning for internet of things: Recent advances, taxonomy, and open challenges,” *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tut.*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 1759–1799, thirdquarter 2021.
- [10] Federated analytics: Collaborative data science without data collection. Google AI. [Online]. Available: <https://ai.googleblog.com/2020/05/federated-analytics-collaborative-data.html>
- [11] Z. Wang, Y. Zhu, D. Wang, and Z. Han, “FedACS: Federated skewness analytics in heterogeneous decentralized data environments,” in *Proc. IEEE/ACM Int. Symp. Qual. Service*, Tokyo, Japan, Aug. 2021.
- [12] F. Sattler, K.-R. Müller, and W. Samek, “Clustered federated learning: Model-agnostic distributed multitask optimization under privacy constraints,” *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, vol. 32, no. 8, pp. 3710–3722, Aug. 2020.
- [13] D. Froelicher, J. R. Troncoso-Pastoriza, J. L. Raisaro, M. A. Cuendet, J. S. Sousa, H. Cho, B. Berger, J. Fellay, and J.-P. Hubaux, “Truly privacy-preserving federated analytics for precision medicine with multiparty homomorphic encryption,” *Nature Commun.*, vol. 12, no. 5910, Oct. 2021.
- [14] E. Bagdasarayan, P. Kairouz, S. Mellem, A. Gascón, K. Bonawitz, D. Estrin, and M. Gruteser, “Towards sparse federated analytics: Location heatmaps under distributed differential privacy with secure aggregation,” *Proc. Privacy Enhancing Technol.*, vol. 2022, no. 1, Jan. 2022.
- [15] M. B. Mollah, M. A. K. Azad, and A. Vasilakos, “Security and privacy challenges in mobile cloud computing: Survey and way ahead,” *J. Netw. Comput. Appl.*, vol. 84, pp. 38–54, Apr. 2017.
- [16] J. Zhang, B. Chen, Y. Zhao, X. Cheng, and F. Hu, “Data security and privacy-preserving in edge computing paradigm: Survey and open issues,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 6, pp. 18 209–18 237, Mar. 2018.
- [17] P. Ranaweera, A. D. Jurcut, and M. Liyanage, “Survey on multi-access edge computing security and privacy,” *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tut.*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 1078–1124, secondquarter 2021.
- [18] D. Wang, S. Shi, Y. Zhu, and Z. Han, “Federated analytics: Opportunities and challenges,” *IEEE Netw.*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 151–158, Jan. 2022.
- [19] A. R. Elkordy, Y. H. Ezzeldin, S. Han, S. Sharma, C. He, S. Mehrotra, S. Avestimehr *et al.*, “Federated analytics: A survey,” *APSIPA Trans. Signal Inf. Process.*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2023.
- [20] Y. Deng, T. Han, and N. Ansari, “Fedvision: Federated video analytics with edge computing,” *IEEE Open J. Comput. Soc.*, vol. 1, pp. 62–72, May 2020.
- [21] C. Hu, R. Lu, and D. Wang, “Feva: A federated video analytics architecture for networked smart cameras,” *IEEE Netw.*, vol. 35, no. 6, pp. 163–170, Nov. 2021.
- [22] Ú. Erlingsson, V. Pihur, and A. Korolova, “RAPPOR: Randomized aggregatable privacy-preserving ordinal response,” in *Proc. ACM SIGSAC Conf. Comput. Commun. Secur.*, Scottsdale, USA, Nov. 2014.
- [23] Z. Wang, Y. Zhu, D. Wang, and Z. Han, “FedFPM: A unified federated analytics framework for collaborative frequent pattern mining,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Comput. Commun.*, London, UK, May 2022.
- [24] D. K. Dennis, T. Li, and V. Smith, “Heterogeneity for the win: One-shot federated clustering,” in *Proc. Int. Conf. Mach. Learn.*, virtual event, Jul. 2021.
- [25] W. Zhu, P. Kairouz, B. McMahan, H. Sun, and W. Li, “Federated heavy hitters discovery with differential privacy,” in *Proc. Int. Conf. Artif. Intell. Statist.*, Palermo, Italy, Jun. 2020.
- [26] D. Chen, D. Wang, Y. Zhu, and Z. Han, “Digital twin for federated analytics using a bayesian approach,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 8, no. 22, pp. 16 301–16 312, Nov. 2021.
- [27] A. Davidson, P. Snyder, E. Quirk, J. Genereux, B. Livshits, and H. Haddadi, “STAR: Secret sharing for private threshold aggregation reporting,” in *Proc. ACM SIGSAC Conf. Comput. Commun. Secur.*, Los Angeles, USA, Nov. 2022.
- [28] J. Bater, Y. Park, X. He, X. Wang, and J. Rogers, “Saqe: practical privacy-preserving approximate query processing for data federations,” in *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, vol. 13, no. 11, Jul. 2020, pp. 2691–2705.
- [29] J. Wang, S. Guo, X. Xie, and H. Qi, “Protect privacy from gradient leakage attack in federated learning,” in *Proc. IEEE Conf. Comput. Commun.*, London, UK, May 2022.
- [30] B. McMahan, E. Moore, D. Ramage, S. Hampson, and B. A. y Arcas, “Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data,” in *Proc. Int. Conf. Artif. Intell. Statist.*, Fort Lauderdale, USA, Apr. 2017.
- [31] Z. Yang and K. Järvinen, “The death and rebirth of privacy-preserving wifi fingerprint localization with paillier encryption,” in *Proc. IEEE Conf. Comput. Commun.*, Hong Kong, China, Apr. 2022.
- [32] E. Roth, D. Noble, B. Hemenway Falk, and A. Haeberlen, “Honeycrisp: Large-scale differentially private aggregation without a trusted core,” in *Proc. ACM Symp. Oper. Syst. Princ.*, Huntsville, Canada, Oct. 2019.
- [33] T. Zang, C. Zheng, S. Ma, C. Sun, and W. Chen, “A general solution for straggler effect and unreliable communication in federated learning,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Commun.*, Rome, Italy, May 2023.
- [34] K. Yang, T. Jiang, Y. Shi, and Z. Ding, “Federated learning via over-the-air computation,” *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 2022–2035, Jan. 2020.
- [35] J. Mao and A. Yener, “Roar-fed: Ris-assisted over-the-air adaptive resource allocation for federated learning,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Commun.*, Rome, Italy, May 2023.
- [36] K. Bonawitz, H. Eichner, W. Grieskamp, D. Huba, A. Ingerman, V. Ivanov, C. Kiddon, J. Konečný, S. Mazzocchi, H. B. McMahan *et al.*, “Towards federated learning at scale: System design,” in *Proc. Mach. Learn. Syst.*, Stanford, USA, Apr. 2019.
- [37] G. Wang, C. X. Dang, and Z. Zhou, “Measure contribution of participants in federated learning,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Big Data*, Los Angeles, USA, Dec. 2019.
- [38] H. Yu, Z. Liu, Y. Liu, T. Chen, M. Cong, X. Weng, D. Niyato, and Q. Yang, “A fairness-aware incentive scheme for federated learning,” in *Proc. AAAI/ACM Conf. AI Ethics Soc.*, New York, USA, Feb. 2020.

- [39] J. Weng, J. Weng, H. Huang, C. Cai, and C. Wang, “Fedserving: A federated prediction serving framework based on incentive mechanism,” in *Proc. IEEE Conf. Comput. Commun.*, virtual event, May 2021.
- [40] R. Zeng, C. Zeng, X. Wang, B. Li, and X. Chu, “Incentive mechanisms in federated learning and a game-theoretical approach,” *IEEE Netw.*, vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 229–235, Nov. 2022.
- [41] W. Du, D. Xu, X. Wu, and H. Tong, “Fairness-aware agnostic federated learning,” in *Proc. SIAM Int. Conf. Data Mining*, virtual event, Apr. 2021.
- [42] T. Li, M. Sanjabi, A. Beirami, and V. Smith, “Fair resource allocation in federated learning,” in *Proc. Int. Conf. Learn. Representation*, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, Apr. 2020.
- [43] M. Mohri, G. Sivek, and A. T. Suresh, “Agnostic federated learning,” in *Proc. Int. Conf. Mach. Learn.*, Long Beach, USA, Jun. 2019.
- [44] T. Huang, W. Lin, W. Wu, L. He, K. Li, and A. Y. Zomaya, “An efficiency-boosting client selection scheme for federated learning with fairness guarantee,” *IEEE Trans. Parallel Distrib. Syst.*, vol. 32, no. 7, pp. 1552–1564, Jul. 2021.
- [45] G. Cormode and I. L. Markov, “Bit-efficient numerical aggregation and stronger privacy for trust in federated analytics,” *arXiv*, 2021.
- [46] B. Ding, J. Kulkarni, and S. Yekhanin, “Collecting telemetry data privately,” in *Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*, Long Beach, USA, Dec. 2017.
- [47] T. T. Nguyễn, X. Xiao, Y. Yang, S. C. Hui, H. Shin, and J. Shin, “Collecting and analyzing data from smart device users with local differential privacy,” *arXiv*, 2016.
- [48] Q. Ye, H. Hu, X. Meng, and H. Zheng, “PrivKV: Key-value data collection with local differential privacy,” in *Proc. IEEE Symp. Secur. Privacy*, San Francisco, USA, May 2019.
- [49] K. Bonawitz, V. Ivanov, B. Kreuter, A. Marcedone, H. B. McMahan, S. Patel, D. Ramage, A. Segal, and K. Seth, “Practical secure aggregation for privacy-preserving machine learning,” in *Proc. ACM SIGSAC Conf. Comput. Commun. Secur.*, Dallas, USA, Nov. 2017.
- [50] J. H. Bell, K. A. Bonawitz, A. Gascón, T. Lepoint, and M. Raykova, “Secure single-server aggregation with (poly) logarithmic overhead,” in *Proc. ACM SIGSAC Conf. Comput. Commun. Secur.*, virtual event, Nov. 2020.
- [51] S. Kadhe, N. Rajaraman, O. O. Koyluoglu, and K. Ramchandran, “Fast-secagg: Scalable secure aggregation for privacy-preserving federated learning,” *arXiv*, 2020.
- [52] J. So, B. Güler, and A. S. Avestimehr, “Turbo-aggregate: Breaking the quadratic aggregation barrier in secure federated learning,” *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Inf. Theory*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 479–489, Mar. 2021.
- [53] G. Aggarwal, N. Mishra, and B. Pinkas, “Secure computation of the median (and other elements of specified ranks),” *J. Cryptology*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 373–401, 2010.
- [54] A. Tueno, F. Kerschbaum, S. Katzenbeisser, Y. Boev, and M. Qureshi, “Secure computation of the k th-ranked element in a star network,” in *Financial Cryptography*, Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia, Feb. 2020.
- [55] R. C. Geyer, T. Klein, and M. Nabi, “Differentially private federated learning: A client level perspective,” *arXiv*, 2017.
- [56] H. B. McMahan, D. Ramage, K. Talwar, and L. Zhang, “Learning differentially private recurrent language models,” in *Proc. Int. Conf. Learning Representations*, Vancouver, Canada, May 2018.
- [57] R. Hu, Y. Guo, H. Li, Q. Pei, and Y. Gong, “Personalized federated learning with differential privacy,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 7, no. 10, pp. 9530–9539, Oct. 2020.
- [58] K. Wei, J. Li, M. Ding, C. Ma, H. Su, B. Zhang, and H. V. Poor, “User-level privacy-preserving federated learning: Analysis and performance optimization,” *IEEE Trans. Mobile Comput.*, vol. 21, no. 9, pp. 3388–3401, Sep. 2021.
- [59] M. Kim, O. Günlü, and R. F. Schaefer, “Federated learning with local differential privacy: Trade-offs between privacy, utility, and communication,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Acoustics Speech Signal Process.*, Toronto, Canada, Jun. 2021.
- [60] L. Shi, J. Shu, W. Zhang, and Y. Liu, “Hfl-dp: Hierarchical federated learning with differential privacy,” in *Proc. IEEE Global Commun. Conf.*, Madrid, Spain, Dec. 2021.
- [61] Q. Pan and Y. Zhu, “FedWalk: Communication efficient federated unsupervised node embedding with differential privacy,” in *Proc. ACM Conf. Knowl. Discovery Data Mining*, Washington, DC, USA, Aug. 2022.
- [62] Q. Ye, H. Hu, M. H. Au, X. Meng, and X. Xiao, “Lf-gdpr: A framework for estimating graph metrics with local differential privacy,” *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, vol. 34, no. 10, pp. 4905–4920, Dec. 2020.
- [63] Y. Liu, T. Wang, Y. Liu, H. Chen, and C. Li, “Edge-protected triangle count estimation under relationship local differential privacy,” *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, pp. 1–14, Mar. 2024.
- [64] J. Böhler and F. Kerschbaum, “Secure multi-party computation of differentially private median,” in *Proc. USENIX Secur. Symp.*, virtual event, Aug. 2020.
- [65] Y. Zhao and H. Sun, “Information theoretic secure aggregation with user dropouts,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 68, no. 11, pp. 7471–7484, Nov. 2022.
- [66] J. So, C. He, C.-S. Yang, S. Li, Q. Yu, R. E. Ali, B. Güler, and S. Avestimehr, “Lightsecagg: a lightweight and versatile design for secure aggregation in federated learning,” in *Proc. Mach. Learn. Syst.*, Santa Clara, USA, Aug. 2022.
- [67] Z. Liu, J. Guo, K.-Y. Lam, and J. Zhao, “Efficient dropout-resilient aggregation for privacy-preserving machine learning,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Forensics Secur.*, vol. 18, pp. 1839–1854, Apr. 2022.
- [68] N. Li, W. Qardaji, and D. Su, “On sampling, anonymization, and differential privacy or, k -anonymization meets differential privacy,” in *Proc. ACM Symp. Inf. Comput. and Commun. Secur.*, Seoul, Korea, May 2012.
- [69] F. Iutzeler, “Distributed computation of quantiles via ADMM,” *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 619–623, May 2017.
- [70] X. Zhou and X. Wang, “Memory and communication efficient federated kernel k -means,” *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, vol. 35, no. 5, pp. 7114–7125, May 2022.
- [71] J. Chung, K. Lee, and K. Ramchandran, “Federated unsupervised clustering with generative models,” in *Proc. AAAI Int. Workshop Trustable Verifiable Auditable Federated Learn.*, Vancouver, Canada, Mar. 2022.
- [72] E. Lubana, C. I. Tang, F. Kawsar, R. Dick, and A. Mathur, “Orchestra: Unsupervised federated learning via globally consistent clustering,” in *Proc. Int. Conf. Mach. Learn.*, Baltimore, USA, Jul. 2022.
- [73] M. Servetnyk, C. C. Fung, and Z. Han, “Unsupervised federated learning for unbalanced data,” in *Proc. IEEE Global Commun. Conf.*, virtual event, Dec. 2020.
- [74] R. Bassily and A. Smith, “Local, private, efficient protocols for succinct histograms,” in *Proc. ACM Symp. Theory of Comput.*, Portland, USA, Jun. 2015.
- [75] Z. Qin, Y. Yang, T. Yu, I. Khalil, X. Xiao, and K. Ren, “Heavy hitter estimation over set-valued data with local differential privacy,” in *Proc. ACM SIGSAC Conf. Comput. Commun. Secur.*, Vienna, Austria, Oct. 2016.
- [76] J. Acharya, Z. Sun, and H. Zhang, “Hadamard response: Estimating distributions privately, efficiently, and with little communication,” in *Proc. Int. Conf. Artif. Intell. Statist.*, Naha, Japan, Apr. 2019.
- [77] J. Acharya and Z. Sun, “Communication complexity in locally private distribution estimation and heavy hitters,” in *Proc. Int. Conf. Mach. Learn.*, Long Beach, USA, Jun. 2019.
- [78] Learning with privacy at scale. Apple. [Online]. Available: <https://machinelearning.apple.com/research/learning-with-privacy-at-scale>
- [79] R. Bassily, K. Nissim, U. Stemmer, and A. Thakurta, “Practical locally private heavy hitters,” *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, vol. 21, no. 16, pp. 1–42, Dec. 2020.
- [80] K. Chadha, J. Chen, J. Duchi, V. Feldman, H. Hashemi, O. Javidbakht, A. McMillan, and K. Talwar, “Differentially private heavy hitter detection using federated analytics,” in *Proc. IEEE Conf. Secure Trustworthy Mach. Learn.*, Toronto, Canada, Apr. 2024.
- [81] T. Wang, N. Li, and S. Jha, “Locally differentially private frequent itemset mining,” in *Proc. IEEE Symp. Secur. Privacy*, San Francisco, USA, May 2018.
- [82] J. Li, W. Gan, Y. Gui, Y. Wu, and P. S. Yu, “Frequent itemset mining with local differential privacy,” in *Proc. ACM Int. Conf. Inf. Knowl. Manage.*, Atlanta, USA, Oct. 2022.
- [83] G. Cormode and A. Bharadwaj, “Sample-and-threshold differential privacy: Histograms and applications,” in *Proc. Int. Conf. Artif. Intell. Statist.*, virtual event, Mar. 2022.
- [84] J. Böhler and F. Kerschbaum, “Secure multi-party computation of differentially private heavy hitters,” in *Proc. ACM SIGSAC Conf. Comput. Commun. Secur.*, virtual event, Nov. 2021.
- [85] Z. Wang, Y. Zhu, D. Wang, and Z. Han, “Federated analytics-empowered frequent pattern mining for decentralized web 3.0 applications,” in *Proc. IEEE Conf. Comput. Commun.*, Vancouver, Canada, May 2024.
- [86] D. Boneh, E. Boyle, H. Corrigan-Gibbs, N. Gilboa, and Y. Ishai, “Lightweight techniques for private heavy hitters,” in *Proc. IEEE Symp. Secur. Privacy*, San Francisco, USA, May 2021.

- [87] J. Bater, G. Elliott, C. Eggen, S. Goel, A. N. Kho, and J. Rogers, "SMCQL: Secure query processing for private data networks," in *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, vol. 10, no. 6, Feb. 2017.
- [88] N. Volgushev, M. Schwarzkopf, B. Getchell, M. Varia, A. Lapets, and A. Bestavros, "Conclave: secure multi-party computation on big data," in *Proc. EuroSys*, Dresden, Germany, Mar. 2019.
- [89] Y. Wang and K. Yi, "Secure yannakakis: Join-aggregate queries over private data," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Manage. Data*, virtual event, Jun. 2021.
- [90] R. Poddar, S. Kalra, A. Yanai, R. Deng, R. A. Popa, and J. M. Hellerstein, "Senate: a maliciously-secure MPC platform for collaborative analytics," in *Proc. USENIX Secur. Symp.*, virtual event, Aug. 2021.
- [91] Y. Zhang, Y. Shi, Z. Zhou, C. Xue, Y. Xu, K. Xu, and J. Du, "Efficient and secure skyline queries over vertical data federation," *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, vol. 35, no. 9, pp. 9269–9280, Nov. 2023.
- [92] Y. Tong, X. Pan, Y. Zeng, Y. Shi, C. Xue, Z. Zhou, X. Zhang, L. Chen, Y. Xu, K. Xu *et al.*, "Hu-fu: Efficient and secure spatial queries over data federation," Feb. 2022.
- [93] E. Roth, H. Zhang, A. Haeberlen, and B. C. Pierce, "Orchard: Differentially private analytics at scale," in *Proc. USENIX Symp. Oper. Syst. Des. Implementation*, virtual event, Nov. 2020.
- [94] E. Roth, K. Newatia, Y. Ma, K. Zhong, S. Angel, and A. Haeberlen, "Mycelium: Large-scale distributed graph queries with differential privacy," in *Proc. ACM Symp. Oper. Syst. Princ.*, virtual event, Oct. 2021.
- [95] E. Margolin, K. Newatia, T. Luo, E. Roth, and A. Haeberlen, "Arboretum: A planner for large-scale federated analytics with differential privacy," in *Proc. ACM Symp. Oper. Syst. Princ.*, Koblenz, Germany, Oct. 2023.
- [96] Y. J. Cho, J. Wang, and G. Joshi, "Towards understanding biased client selection in federated learning," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Artif. Intell. Statist.*, virtual event, Mar. 2022.
- [97] W. Luping, W. Wei, and L. Bo, "CMFL: Mitigating communication overhead for federated learning," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Distrib. Comput. Syst.*, Dallas, USA, Jul. 2019.
- [98] Y. Ruan and C. Joe-Wong, "Fedsoft: Soft clustered federated learning with proximal local updating," in *Proc. AAAI Conf. Artif. Intell.*, virtual event, Feb. 2022.
- [99] F. Lai, X. Zhu, H. V. Madhyastha, and M. Chowdhury, "Oort: Efficient federated learning via guided participant selection," in *Proc. USENIX Symp. Oper. Syst. Des. Implementation*, virtual event, Jul. 2021.
- [100] T. Liang, C. Yuan, C. Lu, Y. Li, J. Yuan, and Y. Yin, "Efficient one-off clustering for personalized federated learning," *Knowl. Based Syst.*, vol. 277, no. 110813, Oct. 2023.
- [101] C. Briggs, Z. Fan, and P. Andras, "Federated learning with hierarchical clustering of local updates to improve training on non-iid data," in *Proc. Int. Joint Conf. Neural Netw.*, Glasgow, UK, Jul. 2020.
- [102] A. Ghosh, J. Chung, D. Yin, and K. Ramchandran, "An efficient framework for clustered federated learning," in *Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*, virtual event, Dec. 2020.
- [103] Y. J. Cho, J. Wang, T. Chirvolu, and G. Joshi, "Communication-efficient and model-heterogeneous personalized federated learning via clustered knowledge transfer," *IEEE J. Sel. Top. Signal Process.*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 234–247, Jan. 2023.
- [104] H. Wang, Z. Kaplan, D. Niu, and B. Li, "Optimizing federated learning on non-iid data with reinforcement learning," in *Proc. IEEE Conf. Comput. Commun.*, virtual event, Jul. 2020.
- [105] S. Wang, M. Chen, W. Saad, and C. Yin, "Federated learning for energy-efficient task computing in wireless networks," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Commun.*, virtual event, Jun. 2020.
- [106] R. Zhao, L. Yang, Y. Wang, Z. Xue, G. Gui, and T. Ohtsuki, "A semi-supervised federated learning scheme via knowledge distillation for intrusion detection," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Commun. Workshops*, Seoul, Korea, May 2022.
- [107] Z. Chen, M. Simsek, and B. Kantarci, "Federated learning-based risk-aware decision to mitigate fake task impacts on crowdsensing platforms," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Commun.*, virtual event, Jun. 2021.
- [108] D. Mulvey, C. H. Foh, M. A. Imran, and R. Tafazolli, "Cellular network antenna tilt anomaly detection using federated unsupervised learning," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Commun.*, Rome, Italy, May 2023.
- [109] H. Xing, H. Zhang, X. Wang, L. Xu, Z. Xiao, B. Zhao, S. Luo, L. Feng, and Y. Dai, "A multi-user deep semantic communication system based on federated learning with dynamic model aggregation," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Commun. Workshops*, Rome, Italy, May 2023.
- [110] Y. Wang, Y. Yang, and T. Luo, "Federated convolutional auto-encoder for optimal deployment of uavs with visible light communications," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Commun. Workshops*, virtual event, Jun. 2020.
- [111] Z. Wang, Y. Jiang, F.-C. Zheng, M. Bennis, and X. You, "Content popularity prediction in fog-rans: A clustered federated learning based approach," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Commun. Workshops*, Seoul, Korea, May 2022.
- [112] A. C.-C. Yao, "How to generate and exchange secrets," in *Proc. Annu. Symp. Foundations Comput. Sci.*, Toronto, Canada, Oct. 1986.
- [113] C. Dwork, F. McSherry, K. Nissim, and A. Smith, "Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis," in *Proc. Theory Cryptography*, New York, USA, Mar. 2006.
- [114] R. Shokri, M. Stronati, C. Song, and V. Shmatikov, "Membership inference attacks against machine learning models," in *Proc. IEEE Symp. Secur. Privacy*, San Jose, USA, May 2017.
- [115] N. Carlini, C. Liu, Ú. Erlingsson, J. Kos, and D. Song, "The secret sharer: Evaluating and testing unintended memorization in neural networks," in *Proc. USENIX Secur. Symp.*, Santa Clara, USA, Aug. 2019.
- [116] X. Zhou and J. Tan, "Local differential privacy for bayesian optimization," in *Proc. AAAI Conf. Artif. Intell.*, virtual address, Feb. 2021.
- [117] S. Goryczka and L. Xiong, "A comprehensive comparison of multiparty secure additions with differential privacy," *IEEE Trans. Dependable Secure Comput.*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 463–477, Sep. 2015.
- [118] P. Samarati and L. Sweeney, "Protecting privacy when disclosing information: k-anonymity and its enforcement through generalization and suppression," *Tech. Rep., SRI Int.*, 1998.
- [119] T. Li, L. Song, and C. Fragouli, "Federated recommendation system via differential privacy," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory*, Los Angeles, USA, Jun. 2020.
- [120] H. Chen, K. Laine, and P. Rindal, "Fast private set intersection from homomorphic encryption," in *Proc. ACM SIGSAC Conf. Comput. Commun. Secur.*, Dallas, USA, Nov. 2017.
- [121] M. J. Freedman, C. Hazay, K. Nissim, and B. Pinkas, "Efficient set intersection with simulation-based security," *J. Cryptology*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 115–155, Jan. 2016.
- [122] M. J. Freedman, K. Nissim, and B. Pinkas, "Efficient private matching and set intersection," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Theory Appl. Cryptographic Techn.*, Interlaken, Switzerland, May 2004.
- [123] Y. Huang, D. Evans, and J. Katz, "Private set intersection: Are garbled circuits better than custom protocols?" in *Proc. Netw. Distrib. Syst. Secur. Symp.*, San Diego, USA, Feb. 2012.
- [124] D. Chai, L. Wang, K. Chen, and Q. Yang, "Secure federated matrix factorization," *IEEE Intell. Syst.*, vol. 36, no. 5, pp. 11–20, Oct. 2021.
- [125] V. Kolesnikov, N. Matania, B. Pinkas, M. Rosulek, and N. Trieu, "Practical multi-party private set intersection from symmetric-key techniques," in *Proc. ACM SIGSAC Conf. Comput. Commun. Secur.*, Dallas, USA, Nov. 2017.
- [126] W. Zheng, R. Deng, W. Chen, R. A. Popa, A. Panda, and I. Stoica, "CEREBRO: a platform for Multi-Party cryptographic collaborative learning," in *Proc. USENIX Secur. Symp.*, virtual event, Aug. 2021.
- [127] S. Shi, C. Hu, D. Wang, Y. Zhu, and Z. Han, "Federated anomaly analytics for local model poisoning attack," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 596–610, Feb. 2022.
- [128] G. Cormode, "Data sketching," *Commun. ACM*, vol. 60, no. 9, pp. 48–55, Sep. 2017.
- [129] B. H. Bloom, "Space/time trade-offs in hash coding with allowable errors," *Commun. ACM*, vol. 13, no. 7, pp. 422–426, Jul. 1970.
- [130] F. Kerschbaum, "Outsourced private set intersection using homomorphic encryption," in *Proc. ACM Symp. Inf. Comput. Commun. Secur.*, Seoul, Korea, May 2012.
- [131] D. Many, M. Burkhart, and X. Dimitropoulos, "Fast private set operations with sepia," *ETZ G93*, 2012.
- [132] C. Dong, L. Chen, and Z. Wen, "When private set intersection meets big data: an efficient and scalable protocol," in *Proc. ACM SIGSAC Conf. Comput. Commun. Secur.*, Berlin, Germany, Nov. 2013.
- [133] B. Pinkas, T. Schneider, and M. Zohner, "Faster private set intersection based on {OT} extension," in *Proc. USENIX Secur. Symp.*, San Diego, USA, Aug. 2014.
- [134] P. Rindal and M. Rosulek, "Improved private set intersection against malicious adversaries," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Theory Appl. Cryptographic Techn.*, Paris, France, May 2017.
- [135] R. Inbar, E. Omri, and B. Pinkas, "Efficient scalable multiparty private set-intersection via garbled bloom filters," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Secur. Cryptography Netw.*, Amalfi, Italy, Sep. 2018.
- [136] J. Wang, Z. Charles, Z. Xu, G. Joshi, H. B. McMahan, M. Al-Shedivat, G. Andrew, S. Avestimehr, K. Daly, D. Data *et al.*, "A field guide to federated optimization," *arXiv*, 2021.

- [137] S. R. Pandey, M. N. Nguyen, T. N. Dang, N. H. Tran, K. Thar, Z. Han, and C. S. Hong, "Edge-assisted democratized learning toward federated analytics," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 572–588, Jan. 2022.
- [138] L. Toka, M. Konrád, I. Pelle, B. Sonkoly, M. Szabó, B. Sharma, S. Kumar, M. Annavazzala, S. T. Deekshitula, and A. A. Franklin, "5g on the roads: Latency-optimized federated analytics in the vehicular edge," *IEEE Access*, vol. 11, pp. 81 737–81 752, Aug. 2023.
- [139] S. Shi, Y. Guo, D. Wang, Y. Zhu, and Z. Han, "Distributionally robust federated learning for network traffic classification with noisy labels," *IEEE Trans. Mobile Comput.*, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 6212–6226, May 2024.
- [140] B. Zhao, X. Li, X. Liu, Q. Pei, Y. Li, and R. H. Deng, "Crowdfa: A privacy-preserving mobile crowdsensing paradigm via federated analytics," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Forensics Secur.*, vol. 18, pp. 5416–5430, Aug. 2023.
- [141] J. Kang, J. Wen, D. Ye, B. Lai, T. Wu, Z. Xiong, J. Nie, D. Niyato, Y. Zhang, and S. Xie, "Blockchain-empowered federated learning for healthcare metaverses: User-centric incentive mechanism with optimal data freshness," *IEEE Trans. Cogn. Commun. Netw.*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 348–362, Feb. 2023.
- [142] Y. Yu, D. Chen, X. Tang, T. Song, C. S. Hong, and Z. Han, "Incentive framework for cross-device federated learning and analytics with multiple tasks based on a multi-leader-follower game," *IEEE Trans. Netw. Sci. Eng.*, vol. 9, no. 5, pp. 3749–3761, Sep. 2022.
- [143] S. Shi, C. Hu, D. Wang, Y. Zhu, and Z. Han, "Federated hd map updating through overlapping coalition formation game," *IEEE Trans. Mobile Comput.*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 1641–1654, Feb. 2024.
- [144] K. Jung, S. Biswas, and C. Palamidessi, "Establishing the price of privacy in federated data trading," in *Proc. Protocols Strands Log.*, Nov. 2021.
- [145] Z. Liu, J. Guo, W. Yang, J. Fan, K.-Y. Lam, and J. Zhao, "Privacy-preserving aggregation in federated learning: A survey," *IEEE Trans. Big Data*, pp. 1–20, Jul. 2022.
- [146] A. Genevay, G. Dulac-Arnold, and J.-P. Vert, "Differentiable deep clustering with cluster size constraints," *arXiv*, 2019.
- [147] A. Z. Tan, H. Yu, L. Cui, and Q. Yang, "Towards personalized federated learning," *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, vol. 34, no. 12, pp. 9587–9603, Dec. 2023.
- [148] Q. Ye, H. Hu, M. H. Au, X. Meng, and X. Xiao, "Towards locally differentially private generic graph metric estimation," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Data Eng.*, Dallas, USA, Apr. 2020.
- [149] X. Ren, L. Shi, W. Yu, S. Yang, C. Zhao, and Z. Xu, "Ldp-ids: Local differential privacy for infinite data streams," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Manageme. Data*, Philadelphia, USA, Jun. 2022.
- [150] Y. Wu, X. Cao, J. Jia, and N. Z. Gong, "Poisoning attacks to local differential privacy protocols for Key-Value data," in *Proc. USENIX Secur. Symp.*, Boston, USA, Aug. 2022.
- [151] N. Wang, X. Xiao, Y. Yang, J. Zhao, S. C. Hui, H. Shin, J. Shin, and G. Yu, "Collecting and analyzing multidimensional data with local differential privacy," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Data Eng.*, Macao, China, Apr. 2019.
- [152] M. Syamkumar, Y. Gullapalli, W. Tang, P. Barford, and J. Sommers, "BigBen: Telemetry processing for internet-wide event monitoring," *IEEE Trans. Netw. Serv. Manage.*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 2625–2638, Sep. 2022.
- [153] S. Fu, D. Reimer, S. Dong, Y. Zhu, and S. Ratnasamy, "Comverse: A federative-by-design platform for community computing," 2023.
- [154] E. Oriero and M. A. Rahman, "Privacy preserving fine-grained data distribution aggregation for smart grid ami networks," in *Proc. IEEE Mil. Commun. Conf.*, Los Angeles, USA, Oct. 2018.
- [155] K.-C. Hsu, M.-C. Lee, and Y.-W. P. Hong, "Joint trajectory and communication optimization for uav-assisted over-the-air federated learning," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Commun. Workshops*, Rome, Italy, May 2023.
- [156] N. Yan, K. Wang, C. Pan, and K. K. Chai, "Device scheduling for over-the-air federated learning with differential privacy," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Commun.*, Rome, Italy, May 2023.
- [157] H.-P. Wang, S. Stich, Y. He, and M. Fritz, "Progfed: Effective, communication, and computation efficient federated learning by progressive training," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Mach. Learn.*, Baltimore, USA, Jul. 2022.
- [158] Y. Liu, Z. Wang, Y. Zhu, and C. Chen, "Dpbalance: Efficient and fair privacy budget scheduling for federated learning as a service," in *Proc. IEEE Conf. Comput. Commun.*, Vancouver, Canada, May 2024.
- [159] M. M. Wadu, S. Samarakoon, and M. Bennis, "Joint client scheduling and resource allocation under channel uncertainty in federated learning," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 69, no. 9, pp. 5962–5974, Jun. 2021.