

---

# POISON TO DETECT: DETECTION OF TARGETED OVERFITTING IN FEDERATED LEARNING

---

**Soumia Zohra El Mestari\***

Interdisciplinary Centre for Security, Reliability and Trust  
University of Luxembourg  
Luxembourg  
soumia.elmestari@uni.lu

**Maciej Krzysztof Zuziak\***

KDD Lab - ISTI  
National Research Council of Italy  
Pisa, Italy  
maciejkrzysztof.zuziak@isti.cnr.it

**Gabriele Lenzini**

Interdisciplinary Centre for Security, Reliability and Trust  
University of Luxembourg  
Luxembourg  
gabriele.lenzini@uni.lu

September 16, 2025

## ABSTRACT

Federated Learning (FL) enables collaborative model training across decentralised clients while keeping local data private, making it a widely adopted privacy-enhancing technology (PET). Despite its privacy benefits, FL remains vulnerable to privacy attacks, including those targeting specific clients. In this paper, we study an underexplored threat where a dishonest orchestrator intentionally manipulates the aggregation process to induce targeted overfitting in the local models of specific clients. Whereas many studies in this area predominantly focus on reducing the amount of information leakage during training, we focus on enabling an early client-side detection of targeted overfitting, thereby allowing clients to disengage before significant harm occurs. In line with this, we propose three detection techniques—(a) label flipping, (b) backdoor trigger injection, and (c) model fingerprinting—that enable clients to verify the integrity of the global aggregation. We evaluated our methods on multiple datasets under different attack scenarios. Our results show that the three methods reliably detect targeted overfitting induced by the orchestrator, but they differ in terms of computational complexity, detection latency, and false-positive rates.

## 1 Introduction

Federated Learning (FL) is a distributed training paradigm that enables multiple clients to collaboratively train a model under the coordination of a central orchestrator without the need to share their data either among them or with the orchestrator [16, 22]. FL is often considered a privacy-preserving alternative to centralised training. This setting enables the global model to leverage various data sources, thereby overcoming the limitations of sensitive data that cannot be shared across local environments. However, despite these advantages, decentralisation introduces a new attack vector, where both clients and the orchestrator can become malicious actors targeting one another. While the previous research has primarily focused on attacks maintained by malicious clients that manipulate local and global updates and even local data[32], less attention has been given to orchestrator-driven attacks. The aggregation process in federated learning, though ostensibly neutral, can be exploited to induce specific learning behaviours in targeted clients— a strategy that we refer to as *targeted aggregation*. In this context, the orchestrator can manipulate model updates to strategically amplify or suppress specific data characteristics, which may inadvertently potentially degrade model performance, or even worse, cause a model to memorise or leak sensitive client data, threatening the integrity and privacy of the system.[2].

---

\*These authors contributed equally to this work.

This manipulation can extend beyond aggregation to include the strategic selection of clients, enabling the orchestrator to amplify or suppress particular data patterns through model updates.

Our work focuses on the detection of one of the targeted aggregation processes that we name *targeted overfitting*. In this scenario, the orchestrator performs a double aggregation process where one aggregation is benign, including all updates received from clients, and its output is sent to the non-targeted clients, and a second aggregation is malicious, where the orchestrator aggregates using updates received from a subset of targeted clients, where the result of this malicious aggregation is shared with the targeted clients only. Over iterations, this malicious aggregation leads the targeted clients to overfit on their data. By overfitting the targeted client’s model to its local data, the orchestrator increases the risk of membership inference attacks (MIA) [31], where the adversary can infer the presence of specific data points within the training set of a particular targeted client. In addition to that, overfitted models may memorise specific data points [24], increasing their vulnerability to data reconstruction attacks [3, 4, 28] and model inversion attacks [10, 13, 34]. This data leakage not only undermines the privacy-preserving goals of federated learning but also exposes the sensitive clients to potential adversaries, other than the orchestrator itself, who may be eavesdropping on the communication channel between the clients and the orchestrator. Over multiple iterations, the targeted client’s model becomes more tailored to its local data distribution, which reduces its performance on unseen data. This causes targeted local models to diverge from the global one. Furthermore, backdoor attacks can be exacerbated by overfitting the targeted client’s model to specific trigger patterns, thereby embedding malicious behaviours more effectively [2]. Additionally, building on the backdoor attack strategies of Fang *et al.* [9], targeted overfitting may offer a pathway for training hijacking, wherein the orchestrator manipulates model updates to align with adversarial objectives, effectively steering the targeted client’s model toward specific, potentially harmful patterns

**Contribution** Unlike the methods that focus on preventing the results of targeted aggregation behaviours, our study focuses on the detection aspect of the problem. Defence mechanisms like Differential Privacy (DP) [18] tend to come with a utility-privacy tradeoff that the system may have to deal with even if the potential malicious actors prove to be benign; on the other hand, a detection mechanism may avoid this tradeoff or make the usage of prevention mechanisms like DP more informed. Hence, our study presents different frameworks that enable clients in an FL setting to autonomously identify targeted overfitting induced by the orchestrator. We propose and evaluate three detection mechanisms – label flipping, backdoor trigger, and gradient fingerprinting – for their effectiveness in detecting such targeted manipulations under different scenarios. Our methods operate without the need for communication or cooperation between clients, focusing on timely client-side detection of orchestrator-driven targeted attacks that can cause significant privacy risks, such as membership inference and data reconstruction attacks.

## 2 Related works

**Orchestrator as an attacker** Attacks altering model integrity in federated learning have predominantly focused on client-to-client or client-to-orchestrator threats [5, 6, 21, 11, 41], with a limited emphasis on orchestrator-driven attacks [33]. In client-driven attacks, adversarial participants may manipulate local updates to corrupt the global model (e.g., model poisoning attacks [6]) or insert backdoors [2]. Some works have explored collusion among clients to extract information about other clients or degrade the performance of the global model [27]. However, comparatively fewer studies address the threat model where the orchestrator itself is adversarial despite its privileged access to both local models and the aggregation process. Wang *et al.* [33] demonstrated that a malicious server can exploit federated updates using a GAN-based discriminator to reconstruct data from specific targeted clients, highlighting the severity of server-side attacks. Lyu *et al.* [25] further emphasised that a malicious or even “honest-but-curious” server poses a significant threat to the integrity of the FL system. Such a server holds substantial power to manipulate the learning process—it can alter the global model before dispatching it to clients or even send custom models to targeted clients [7], tamper with training dynamics to control how clients perceive the global model [25], and bias the learning process by favoring updates from selected clients [23]. Some server-side attacks can also be part of a multi-step attack pipeline aimed at compromising client privacy. Such attacks, namely: membership inference attacks [38, 31], attribute inference attacks [38], model inversion attacks [37], all of which can be exacerbated when the target models overfit their training data—a vulnerability that a malicious orchestrator can subtly induce. By manipulating global updates to emphasise certain features or by exaggerating personalisation effects, the orchestrator can increase the generalisation gap, thereby enhancing the effectiveness of inference attacks.

**Overfitting** Overfitting itself is a well-recognised challenge in FL and has been attributed to several factors. For instance, a client’s model may overfit its local data, increasing its susceptibility to privacy attacks such as Source Inference Attacks (SIA) from a curious server [42]. Additionally, data heterogeneity—where client data is non-iid—can lead to local models overfitting their specific distributions, causing divergence from the global objective and hindering convergence [36, 30]. Overfitting is also exploited in client-side poisoning attacks, where a malicious client intentionally

overfits on poisoned samples to introduce backdoors into the global model [39]. Moreover, rigid training configurations, such as applying a fixed number of local epochs to all clients regardless of dataset size or complexity, can result in uneven training—causing some clients to be underfitted and others to be overfitted—ultimately degrading the quality of the aggregated global model [15].

**Detection methods** Client-side detection mechanisms for identifying targeted overfitting and similar malicious behaviours remain largely under-explored. While most existing techniques are not explicitly designed to detect a malicious server, several principles from current research can be adapted by clients to enhance their resilience. For instance, local performance monitoring—a standard machine learning practice—can serve as an early warning system: by maintaining a private test set, a client can compare training and testing performance locally. If the model consistently performs well on training data but poorly on the test set after receiving updates from the server, this persistent overfitting may suggest orchestrator-driven manipulation, although it could also stem from data heterogeneity [40]. Another promising approach is collaborative validation, as proposed in defences against backdoor attacks [1], where randomly selected clients validate the integrity of the global model using their private data and collectively vote on potential anomalies. This mechanism could be generalised to detect other server-side manipulations, especially if multiple clients report similar patterns of degradation or instability. Furthermore, strategies aimed at reducing local overfitting, such as promoting fairness-in-privacy through collaborative regularization [42].

### 3 Problem statement

We consider a threat model where a malicious aggregator (i.e., the orchestration server in a horizontal FL setting) intentionally performs modified aggregations that aim to make a subset of clients overfit on their local datasets. The targeted clients can be either a single client or a subset of clients among the elected clients.

Suppose the local models obtained from the clients selected at iteration  $t$  are denoted by the set  $\{W_i^t\}_{i=1}^N$ , where  $N$  is the number of clients participating in that round. Let  $\mathcal{S}^t = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  represent the set of selected clients at iteration  $t$ . In a benign federated learning setting, the orchestrator aggregates all local updates received from  $\mathcal{S}^t$  using an aggregation function  $\mathcal{A}(\cdot)$ , such as FedAvg. The resulting global model at iteration  $t$  is then given by:

$$W_{\text{global}}^t = \mathcal{A}(\{W_i^t\}_{i \in \mathcal{S}^t}).$$

However, to model the orchestrator’s behaviour in our study, we consider a malicious setting in which the orchestrator may deviate from standard protocol by aggregating updates from only a subset of the selected clients. Let  $\mathcal{S}_{\text{mal}}^t \subset \mathcal{S}^t$  denote a subset of clients of size  $n < N$ , selectively chosen by the malicious server. The corresponding malicious aggregation is defined as:

$$\tilde{W}_{\text{global}}^t = \mathcal{A}(\{W_i^t\}_{i \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{mal}}^t}).$$

This biased aggregation may serve various adversarial objectives, such as model manipulation, targeted overfitting, or privacy leakage, by excluding benign updates or overemphasising the influence of certain clients.

In this study, we analyse the targeted overfitting strategies under two distinct scenarios, which arise from two modes of targeting. The modes correspond to the adversary targeting either a single client or a fixed subset of  $n$  clients. Formally, the scenarios are defined as follows:

- **Scenario I:** Targeting a specific single client  $i^* \in \mathcal{S}^t$  at every iteration  $t$ , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{mal}}^t = \{i^*\}, \quad \forall t.$$

- **Scenario II:** Targeting a fixed subset  $\mathcal{S}_{\text{mal}}$  at every iteration, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{mal}}^t = \mathcal{S}_{\text{mal}}, \quad \forall t.$$

We focus on these two scenarios because they capture the fundamental behaviours of targeted overfitting. Scenario I represents the continuous targeting of a single client, while Scenario II generalises this idea to targeting a fixed subset of clients. Other possible scenarios include targeting a single client or a subset of clients periodically during a fixed number of iterations, which can be viewed as special cases or episodic instances of these two scenarios. Thus, studying Scenarios I and II allows us to analyse the core effect of targeted overfitting, as well as the proposed detection mechanisms in a clear and generalisable way.

**Algorithm 1:** Detection Via Label-Flipping Poisons**Input** : Local dataset  $\mathcal{D}$ , flip ratio  $\alpha$ **Output** : Clean subset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{clean}}$ , flipped subset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{flip}}$ 

- 
- 1  $\mathcal{F} \leftarrow$  class frequency map over  $\mathcal{D}$
  - 2  $c^* \leftarrow \arg \min_k \mathcal{F}[k]$  # Get the least frequent class
  - 3  $\mathcal{S} \leftarrow \{(x_i, y_i) \in \mathcal{D} \mid y_i = c^*\}$
  - 4  $n_{\text{flip}} \leftarrow \lfloor \alpha \cdot |\mathcal{S}| \rfloor$  # Number of samples to flip
  - 5 Randomly select  $\mathcal{S}_{\text{flip}} \subset \mathcal{S}$ ,  $|\mathcal{S}_{\text{flip}}| = n_{\text{flip}}$
  - 6 Define  $c' = (c^* + 1) \bmod K$  # New label
  - 7  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{flip}} \leftarrow \{(x, c') \mid (x, y) \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{flip}}\}$
  - 8  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{clean}} \leftarrow \mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\text{flip}}$
  - 9 **return**  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{clean}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{flip}}$
- 

## 4 Detecting targeted overfitting

Client-level distance thresholding—comparing received updates to the dispatched global model—is a standard approach for detecting anomalous behaviour. In principle, this can detect targeted overfitting; however, the detection completely fails when the orchestrator uses adaptive optimisers (e.g., Adam, RMSProp), which use internal states like the momentum and the adaptive learning rates. The internal states cause each global update to shift in direction and magnitude depending on the past gradients, leading to non-zero and variable distances between the dispatched and the received models—even in dishonest settings. As a result, distance-based methods become noisy and unreliable. In this section, we propose three methods to detect targeted overfitting that are optimiser-agnostic and can be used autonomously by the clients to detect targeted overfitting early.

Early detection is crucial because the longer targeted aggregation continues, the more the victim clients overfit on their local data. By identifying suspicious updates promptly, clients can take preventive measures such as opting out of the training process or raising an alert in the system to ensure mitigation occurs before the attack fully manifests.

### 4.1 Label flipping poisoning

We propose a controlled label-flipping mechanism that can be performed by clients as a means to detect targeted overfitting. The core idea is to poison a small subset of data such that its effect remains locally detectable even post-model aggregation. If a client observes that the global model performs almost as well as the local model on the poisoned subset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{flip}}$  (evaluated immediately after local training), it may suggest that the server selectively favored the client’s local model during aggregation ( see algorithm 1). In other words, under honest aggregation, the global model should "correct" the poisoned signal, resulting in a drop in performance on  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{flip}}$ .

Specifically, each client selects the least frequent class in its local dataset and flips a fraction  $\alpha$  of its samples using a cyclic rule:  $\text{flip}(y) = (y + 1) \bmod K$ . This cyclic approach ensures that a label  $y$  is always mapped to a different class, avoiding self-flipping. This ensures semantic change while avoiding label collisions. In addition to that, targeting the least frequent class minimises disruption to overall training and reduces the likelihood of triggering server-side defences. The flipped samples form a poisoned subset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{flip}}$ , while the rest of the dataset remains clean. Algorithm 1 details the steps followed. To quantify this behavior, we define the *Poison Effectiveness Score (PES)*:  $\text{PES} = \text{Acc}(M_{\text{local}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{flip}}) - \text{Acc}(M_{\text{agg}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{flip}})$  where  $M_{\text{local}}$  is the client’s model before aggregation,  $M_{\text{agg}}$  is the global model after aggregation, and  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{flip}}$  is the poisoned subset. A high PES indicates that the global model has corrected the poisoned signal (i.e., likely honest aggregation), while a low PES may suggest an attempt to induce targeted overfitting by the server.

### 4.2 Backdoor trigger poisoning

In this method, clients use a known trigger pattern to poison a small subset of their local data and monitor whether the effect of this trigger persists in the aggregated global model. The intuition is that, under honest aggregation, the influence of a client-specific backdoor should be diluted. If the trigger remains effective after aggregation, it may indicate that the orchestrator disproportionately favoured the poisoned update, suggesting targeted overfitting. Algorithm 2 details the detection steps.

To perform the test, the client selects a predefined trigger pattern  $\mathcal{T}$  and a target label  $y_\tau$ , figure 1 shows an example of this backdoor on Eurosat[14] sample where the  $\tau$  is a small white patch at the right bottom corner. A poisoned

**Algorithm 2:** Detection via Backdoor Triggers**Input:** Trigger pattern  $\mathcal{T}$ , target label  $y_\tau$ , evaluation data  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{trigger}}$ , local dataset  $\mathcal{D}_i$ **Output:** Trigger influence score  $\mathcal{S}$ 


---

```

1  $\mathcal{D}_i^{\text{poison}} \leftarrow \{(\text{ApplyTrigger}(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{T}), y_\tau) \mid (\mathbf{x}, y) \in \mathcal{D}_i\}$ 
2  $w_i^t \leftarrow \text{Train}(\mathcal{D}_i^{\text{clean}} \cup \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{poison}})$ 
3 Send  $w_i^t$  to the orchestrator
4  $w_{\text{global}}^{t+1} \leftarrow \text{AggregateClientModels}(\{w_i\})$ 
5  $\mathcal{S} \leftarrow \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_{\text{trigger}}|} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{trigger}}} \mathbb{I}(\text{Predict}(w_{\text{global}}^{t+1}, \mathbf{x}) = y_\tau)$ 
6 if  $\mathcal{S} \geq \tau$  then
7   | # Detection of selective aggregation based on influence score
8   | Flag selective aggregation
9 else
10  | No indication of targeted aggregation
11 end

```

---




Figure 1: Sample from EuroSat[14] dataset with inserted backdoor trigger

subset  $\mathcal{D}_i^{\text{poison}}$  is created by applying  $\mathcal{T}$  to some local samples and assigning them the label  $y_\tau$ . The client trains on the combined dataset  $\mathcal{D}_i \cup \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{poison}}$ , then sends the resulting model  $w_i^t$  to the orchestrator.

Once the global model  $w_{\text{global}}^{t+1}$  is received, the client evaluates it on a local trigger evaluation set  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{trigger}}$  and computes the *Trigger Influence Score*  $\mathcal{S}$ , defined as the fraction of inputs for which the global model predicts the target label  $y_\tau$ :

$$\mathcal{S} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_{\text{trigger}}|} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{trigger}}} \mathbb{I}(\text{Predict}(w_{\text{global}}, \mathbf{x}) = y_\tau)$$

A low score of *Trigger Influence Score*  $\mathcal{S}$  indicates that the poisoned update has been properly diluted during honest aggregation, whereas a high score suggests that the orchestrator disproportionately favoured the client’s update, allowing the trigger to persist. If  $\mathcal{S} \geq \tau$ , where  $\tau$  is a predefined threshold, the client flags possible selective aggregation before extensive overfitting occurs.

To select the threshold  $\tau$  we consider two strategies:

**(1) Statistical Bound** Without calibration data, we model the number of successful triggers as  $\text{Bin}(m, p_0)$ ,

where  $m = |\mathcal{D}_{\text{trigger}}|$  and  $p_0$  is the baseline hit-rate (e.g.,  $1/C$  for  $C$  classes). The threshold is

$$\tau = \frac{k^*}{m}, \quad k^* = \min\{k : \Pr[\text{Bin}(m, p_0) \geq k] \leq f_{\text{FP}}\},$$

where  $f_{\text{FP}}$  is the desired false positive rate and  $k$  is the number of successful trigger detections observed in the trigger evaluation set. A normal approximation may be used for large  $m$ .

**(2) Empirical Quantile Method.** With benign rounds available, we set  $\tau$  as a high quantile (e.g., the 95th percentile) of observed  $\mathcal{S}$  values.

**Algorithm 3:** Detection via Gradient Fingerprinting**Input:** Local gradient  $g$ , fingerprint vector  $s$ , strength scalar  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $method \in \{\text{threshold}, \text{history}\}$ **Output:** Is the client likely being targeted?

---

```

1  $\tilde{g} \leftarrow g + \alpha s$  # Inject fingerprint into local update
2 Send  $\tilde{g}$  to the orchestrator
3  $G \leftarrow \text{Receive}(G)$  # Receive global update
4  $strength \leftarrow \langle G, s \rangle$  # Compute unnormalized fingerprint strength
5 # Optionally normalize via cosine similarity
6  $similarity \leftarrow \frac{\langle G, s \rangle}{\|G\| \cdot \|s\|}$ 
7
8 if  $m = \text{threshold}$  then
9   if  $strength > \tau_{dot}$  or  $similarity > \tau_{cos}$  then
10     Flag targeted aggregation
11   else
12     No indication of targeting
13   end
14 else if  $m = \text{history}$  then
15   if  $strength \gg \mu$  then
16     # Compare to historical mean  $\mu$ 
17     Flag targeted aggregation
18   else
19     No indication of targeting
20   end

```

---

### 4.3 Gradient fingerprinting

Our third detection method is the "Gradients/weights fingerprinting". This method relies on either fingerprinting the weights or the gradients, depending on the global optimiser used by the orchestrator. To elaborate, in federated learning, model updates exchanged between clients and the orchestrator depend on the global optimiser: algorithms such as FedAvg [26] aggregate model weights after local training, whereas methods like FedSGD [26] or Scaffold [17] rely on gradient averaging. The client perturbs its local gradient/weight  $g$  after finishing the local epochs by injecting a small, secret vector  $s$ , resulting in a fingerprinted update  $\tilde{g} = g + \alpha s$ , where  $\alpha > 0$  controls the fingerprint strength. The fingerprint vector  $s$  is client-specific and ideally low-correlation with  $g$ ; common choices include random unit vectors ( $s = v/\|v\|$ ,  $v \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ ), sparse binary vectors over client-specific indices, or deterministic vectors derived from the client ID (e.g.,  $s = \text{HashToVector}(\text{ClientID})$ ). The client sends  $\tilde{g}$  to the server, which aggregates updates from multiple clients. Upon receiving the global model update  $G$ , the client evaluates the fingerprint strength as  $\text{Strength}_t = \langle G_t, s \rangle$  or optionally its cosine similarity. During typical FL rounds, the fingerprint is expected to be diluted by other clients' updates, resulting in low strength. However, if the client's update is selectively amplified, the fingerprint will be preserved, leading to an unusually high strength. The value of  $\alpha$  should be small ( $10^{-3}$  to  $10^{-2}$ ) to minimize influence on training while maintaining detectability.

**Detection assessment** To assess the fingerprint presence post-aggregation, we propose two strategies, namely, threshold-based detection and history-based comparison. In the **threshold-based method** detailed in algorithm 7, the fingerprint scaling factor  $\alpha$ , detection thresholds  $\tau_{dot}$ , and  $\tau_{cos}$ , respectively referring to the dot product threshold and the cosine similarity threshold, are determined analytically before training by considering the model's dimensionality  $d$ , fingerprint sparsity  $s$ , and expected client participation ratio  $f$ . first we calculate the total number of model parameters  $d$  and the number of non-zero fingerprint elements  $k$  determined by the sparsity level  $s$ . The injection strength  $\alpha$  is set to achieve a target dot product strength when the fingerprint is fully used. Then, using the expected honest client contribution fraction  $f$ , the algorithm derives detection thresholds for both dot product  $\tau_{dot}$  and cosine  $\tau_{cos}$  similarity by applying a detection margin multiplier  $\gamma$ . This approach enables an automatic selection of fingerprint parameters to balance detectability and training influence. However, this approach assumes uniform participation of clients and may be less robust in heterogeneous settings.

In the second strategy (*i.e.*, **history-based comparison**), the client compares the current strength to a historical average  $\mu = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \langle G_t, s \rangle$ . If  $\text{Strength}_t \gg \mu$ , this indicates overrepresentation and potential targeting. Hence, the history-based comparison method adapts better to dynamic participation and distribution shifts but requires sufficient historical

data and may incur delayed detection. Each approach offers complementary strengths, and combining them can provide more reliable detection across varying federated learning scenarios.

---

**Algorithm 4: Analytical Threshold for Fingerprint**


---

**Input:** Model  $M$ , sparsity  $s$ , target dot strength  $S_{\text{target}}$ , honest fraction  $f$ , detection margin  $\gamma$

**Output:** Fingerprint strength  $\alpha$ , dot threshold  $\tau_{\text{dot}}$ , cosine threshold  $\tau_{\text{cos}}$

- 1  $d \leftarrow \sum_{p \in M} \text{numel}(p)$  # Number of model parameters
  - 2  $k \leftarrow \lfloor s \cdot d \rfloor$  # non-zero fingerprint entries
  - 3  $\alpha \leftarrow \frac{S_{\text{target}}}{k}$
  - 4  $S_{\text{honest}} \leftarrow f \cdot S_{\text{target}}$  # estimating honest contribution
  - 5  $\tau_{\text{dot}} \leftarrow \gamma \cdot S_{\text{honest}};$
  - 6  $\tau_{\text{cos}} \leftarrow \min(1.0, \gamma \cdot f);$
  - 7 **return**  $\alpha, \tau_{\text{dot}}, \tau_{\text{cos}}$
- 

## 5 Experiments

We empirically evaluate our three detection methods across multiple datasets and under the two scenarios described earlier, focusing on both detection speed and reliability. The rest of this section presents our experimental setup, results, and discussion.

### 5.1 Datasets Description

To evaluate our proposed detection approaches, we used the following datasets : MNIST[8], CIFAR10[19], CIFAR100[20], PATHMNIST[35], and EUROSAT[14].

To generate client datasets, we adopt the standard non-IID partitioning methodology that is well-accepted in the Federated Learning research [16, 29]. Specifically, for each client  $i \in P$ , we first sample a probability vector over classes from a Dirichlet distribution parameterised by  $\alpha$ , i.e.,

$$\mathbf{v}_i \sim \text{Dir}(\alpha). \quad (1)$$

This vector  $\mathbf{v}_i$  specifies the class proportions for client  $i$ . The local dataset  $D_i$  is then constructed by drawing samples from the global dataset according to  $\mathbf{v}_i$ . In **Scenario I**, we repeat this procedure for five clients, while in **Scenario II**, we construct a total of seven clients. Specifically for **Scenario II** we define two cohorts: one with four clients who were honestly aggregated and the other with three targeted clients. The small difference in the cardinality of both sets is deliberately chosen to illustrate the sensitivity of each method.

### 5.2 Model Structure and Training Parameters

For the MNIST dataset, we used a simple Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) with 2 convolutional layers(3×3 kernels with padding 1), followed by ReLU and 2×2 max pooling. These were followed by a fully connected layer with 128 hidden units and a final linear layer for classification into 10 classes. For the other datasets(CIFAR10[19], CIFAR100[20], PATHMNIST[35], and EUROSAT[14]), we adopted ResNet18 [12]. The number of local training epochs was set to 4 for simpler datasets (MNIST and PathMNIST), while for larger and more complex datasets (CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100, and EuroSAT), we increased the local epochs to 6.

All experiments were conducted on an NVIDIA V100 GPU; the full reproducible code will be available after the rebuttal period.

### 5.3 Evaluation

#### 5.3.1 Detection using label flipping

In our evaluation, we tested the method on both targeted and non-targeted clients to assess the potential impact of false positives. The iteration-by-iteration progression of the scores is shown in Figure 2a, indicating that the PES score is consistently higher for the non targeted clients compared to the targeted clients. While the difference in PES is more pronounced in Scenario I than in Scenario II, the method still reliably identifies targeted overfitting attempts induced by the orchestrator.

Attack Type	Dataset	Scenario I Accuracy		Scenario I F1 Score		Scenario II Accuracy		Scenario II F1 Score	
		Value	Threshold	Value	Threshold	Value	Threshold	Value	Threshold
Label Flip	MNIST	1.000	< 0.01	1.000	< 0.01	0.611	< 0.3	0.720	< 0.95
	CIFAR10	1.000	< 0.01	1.000	< 0.01	0.938	< 0.1	0.939	< 0.1
	CIFAR100	0.931	< 0.01	0.935	< 0.01	0.655	< 0.3	0.737	< 0.3
	PATHMNIST	0.970	< 0.01	0.970	< 0.01	0.697	< 0.9	0.762	< 0.9
	EUROSAT	0.974	< 0.01	0.974	< 0.01	0.711	< 0.5	0.776	< 0.5
Backdoor Trigger	MNIST	0.950	> 0.99	0.947	> 0.99	0.550	> 0.5	0.667	> 0.01
	CIFAR10	0.980	> 0.7	0.980	> 0.7	0.520	> 0.3	0.658	> 0.01
	CIFAR100	0.983	> 0.9	0.983	> 0.9	0.583	> 0.7	0.659	> 0.01
	PATHMNIST	0.971	> 0.99	0.970	> 0.99	0.543	> 0.99	0.625	> 0.01
	EUROSAT	0.975	> 0.95	0.974	> 0.95	0.600	> 0.1	0.704	> 0.1

Table 1: Best performing accuracy and F1 score thresholds by dataset across scenarios for Label Flip and Backdoor Trigger attacks. The corresponding data is plotted on Figures 3a and 3b

Table 2 further demonstrates the method’s performance: in Scenario I, the accuracy of the detection ranges between 0.7 to nearly 1.0 across all datasets, except for CIFAR-10. Furthermore, the method is able to detect the targeted overfitting very early (as early as round 1) in almost all datasets and scenarios (see Table 2a). However, as illustrated in Figure 3a, the performance of the label flip technique drops slightly for Scenario II.

The comparison between the two scenarios reveals that a change in the number of aggregated clients can affect the decision boundary of the algorithm.

**Limitations** A key limitation of the label flipping method is that it requires multiple local epochs (typically between 4 and 7) for the model to sufficiently learn the flipped patterns. Furthermore, in heterogeneous (non-IID) data settings, uneven client convergence further weakens the poison signal, reducing detection reliability. Moreover, the method requires computing accuracy on the poisoned subset twice per iteration—before sending the local model and after receiving the aggregated model—making it computationally costly despite its simple design. The threshold  $\alpha$  is comparably easy to hypertune, as it is always bounded in the interval  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ , with lower alpha denoting higher sensibility.

### 5.3.2 Detection using backdoor trigger


From a computational viewpoint, backdoor-based detection can reduce runtime by nearly half compared to label flipping, as the backdoor strength is computed only after receiving the aggregated model, which has similar detection performance. Figure 2b illustrates the iteration-by-iteration progression of the backdoor detection scores  $S$  (Trigger Influence Score), where higher  $S$  scores reflect a dishonest aggregation. We clearly observe that the targeted clients score a high  $S$  compared to the non-targeted clients. The decision boundary is well separated in Scenario I, reflecting a clear distinction between the cohorts. This decision boundary becomes more subtle in Scenario II. Figure 4b reports similar patterns, where the best detection accuracy in scenario I ranges between 0.95 and 0.98, whereas in scenario II, the detection accuracy ranges between 0.52 and 0.6.

These results indicate that the backdoor method exhibits behaviour similar to that of the label flip method. In the simplest case, where a single client is attacked (Scenario I), the detection is almost immediate (see Table 2a); while in Scenario II, it may require several rounds to detect an attempt by the orchestrator to favour a subset of targeted clients during the aggregation.


**Limitations** The backdoor trigger method is twice as computationally efficient as label flipping. However, it still suffers from problems in heterogeneous (non-IID) settings, where uneven client convergence can negatively impact the encoded signal, reducing detection reliability.

### 5.3.3 Detection using fingerprinting

The fingerprint analysis shows excellent and robust results across all datasets for scenario I, as shown in Table 2b and 2a. Detection is almost immediate across all datasets, with an accuracy ranging from 0.75 to 1.0. Thus for scenario I the fingerprinting method is the most reliable method. However, this method fails drastically in scenario II, where a subset




(a) Presentation of the PES scores calculated each round for the label flip (Algorithm 1) on all five datasets. The first column presents Scenario I, the second column presents Scenario II. The dotted red lines of varying transparency represent different verification thresholds that can be used to verify the honesty of the aggregator (the lower the threshold, the more sensitive the method becomes). In case of the label flip, the unchanged (dishonestly aggregated) model will be characterised with a lower PES than its honestly aggregated counterpart.




(b) Presentation of the backdoor strength  $S$  scores calculated each round for the backdoor trigger (Algorithm 2) on all five datasets. The first column presents Scenario I, the second column presents Scenario II. The dotted red lines of varying transparency represent various verification thresholds that can be used to verify the honesty of the aggregator (the higher the threshold, the more sensitive the method will become, in contrast to the label flip).

Figure 2: Comparison of poisoning detection methods: (a) Label flip attack detection using PES scores, and (b) Backdoor trigger attack detection using backdoor strength  $S$  scores. Both methods show the evolution of detection metrics across communication rounds for all five datasets under two different scenarios.




(a) The best achievable results for the performance of the label flip on various datasets (Scenario I and Scenario II). The hyperparameters used for achieving those results are reported in Table 1.




(b) The best achievable results for the performance of the backdoor on various datasets (Scenario I and Scenario II). The hyperparameters used for achieving those results are reported in Table 1.

Figure 3: Comparison of best achievable detection performance: (a) Label flip attack detection performance across datasets and scenarios, and (b) Backdoor trigger attack detection performance across datasets and scenarios. The optimal hyperparameters for these results are detailed in Table 1.




(a) Scenario I: Variability of the metrics given various detection thresholds  $\alpha$  for backdoor trigger (Algorithm 2).




(b) Scenario II: Variability of the metrics given various detection thresholds  $\alpha$  for backdoor trigger (Algorithm 2).

Figure 4: Backdoor trigger attack detection performance: Detection performance metrics across various detection thresholds  $\alpha$  showing how threshold selection affects accuracy, precision, recall, and F1-score across different datasets.



(a) Scenario I: Variability of the metrics given various detection thresholds  $\alpha$  for label flip (Algorithm 1).



(b) Scenario II: Variability of the metrics given various detection thresholds  $\alpha$  for label flip (Algorithm 1).

Figure 5: Label flip attack detection performance: Detection performance metrics across various detection thresholds  $\alpha$  showing how threshold selection affects accuracy, precision, recall, and F1-score across different datasets.

of clients is targeted. This is due to the fact that the fingerprint signal should be stronger to survive an aggregation with the local models of the 2 other clients. However, a stronger fingerprint compromises the model and disrupts the learning process, making this method the least reliable in scenario II.

**Limitations** The fingerprinting method described in this paper requires that the orchestrator’s optimiser both receives and sends the same type of updates—either gradients or model weights. Hence, optimisers that receive gradients but return weights (*e.g.*, Fedopt or FedProx) are incompatible with this approach. In addition to that, for scenario II, and since the malicious aggregation targeted a subset of clients, more powerful fingerprints are needed, which may interfere with the learning time, as a stronger fingerprint may degrade the model’s performance.

#### 5.4 Comparison of the detection mechanisms

Overall, our results highlight the trade-offs among detection mechanisms (see table 2a and table 2b). For scenario I, the fingerprinting method is the fastest and most reliable technique, with immediate detection and nearly perfect detection scores, followed by the label flipping method, which almost flags an immediate detection with a moderate score. In contrast, the backdoor trigger method scores are highly variable across datasets. To better understand the impact of the detection thresholds  $\alpha$  and  $\tau$  on both methods, we have examined the variability of metrics (accuracy, precision, recall, and f1score) depending on the nine different thresholds we derived in our experiments. The results are presented in Figure 5a and Figure 5b (label flip) and Figure 4a and Figure 4b (backdoor trigger).

On the other hand, Scenario II is more complex by design, as targeted aggregation involves a subset of clients, making detection more difficult. In this scenario, the label flipping technique is the best, followed by the backdoor trigger method, while the fingerprinting method detects any orchestrator attempts to make the targeted client overfit their local data.

## 6 Conclusion

In this article, we studied a potential threat in federated learning that we named "targeted overfitting," in which a malicious orchestrator attempts to make specific clients overfit on their local datasets by performing a malicious aggregation process that singles out those targets. This type of threat may pose disproportionate privacy risks to clients by exposing them to various attacks, such as membership inference attacks. To address this, we proposed three detection mechanisms—label flipping, backdoor triggers, and fingerprinting—that allow clients to autonomously detect the threat without collusion. Our evaluation showed that the three methods can successfully detect the threat when a single client is targeted, with the fingerprinting method being the most reliable. However, when the attack targets multiple clients simultaneously, only the label flipping and backdoor trigger methods maintain effectiveness, whereas the fingerprinting method exhibits substantially reduced performance.

In the subsequent works, we would like to further study this problem from two distinctive angles. Firstly, we would like to amplify the capabilities of the attacker (the orchestrator) by either incorporating more nuanced schemas of aggregation or different types of optimisers. Secondly, we would like to further examine the robustness of the fingerprinting method, which has a clear potential as a validation method, but requires more targeted studies in order to better understand the relevance of the incorporated fingerprint under various aggregation schemas. Given the current lack of similar studies in the literature and the novelty of the introduced methods, we confined ourselves to a fundamental exploration of all of them, which aimed to present their general capabilities, while we hope that further studies into a specific method (such as label flip or backdoor trigger) will further reveal their capabilities and limitations.

Scenario	Method	Datasets				
		MNIST	CIFAR10	CIFAR100	PATHMNIST	EUROSAT
Scenario I	Label Flip	1	1	1	1	1
	Backdoor Trigger	2	2	2	1	2
	Fingerprint	1	1	1	1	1
Scenario II	Label Flip	1	1	1	10	1
	Backdoor Trigger	3	2	2	6	6
	Fingerprint	8	–	–	–	–

(a) Detection rounds by method and scenario

Metric	Method	Scenario I Datasets				
		MNIST	CIFAR10	CIFAR100	PATHMNIST	EUROSAT
Accuracy	Label Flip	1.000	0.521	0.707	0.970	0.842
	Backdoor Trigger	0.550	0.900	0.517	0.629	0.625
	Fingerprint	0.750	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Precision	Label Flip	1.000	0.511	0.630	0.941	0.760
	Backdoor Trigger	0.529	0.857	0.509	0.567	0.576
	Fingerprint	0.667	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Recall	Label Flip	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
	Backdoor Trigger	0.900	0.960	0.967	1.000	0.950
	Fingerprint	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
F1 Score	Label Flip	1.000	0.676	0.773	0.970	0.864
	Backdoor Trigger	0.667	0.906	0.667	0.723	0.717
	Fingerprint	0.800	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000

(b) Performance metrics for Scenario I

Table 2: Comprehensive comparison of poisoning detection methods across datasets and scenarios. Detection rounds and Scenario I performance metrics with hyperparameter settings for Label Flip ( $\alpha < 0.01$ ), Backdoor Trigger ( $\alpha > 0.9$ ), and Fingerprint methods.

## References

- [1] Sebastien Andreina, Giorgia Azzurra Marson, Helen Möllering, and Ghassan Karame. Baffle: Backdoor detection via feedback-based federated learning. In *2021 IEEE 41st International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems (ICDCS)*, pages 852–863. IEEE, 2021.
- [2] Eugene Bagdasaryan, Andreas Veit, Yiqing Hua, Deborah Estrin, and Vitaly Shmatikov. How to backdoor federated learning. In *International conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 2938–2948. PMLR, 2020.
- [3] Borja Balle, Giovanni Cherubin, and Jamie Hayes. Reconstructing training data with informed adversaries. In *2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 1138–1156. IEEE, 2022.
- [4] Martin Bertran, Shuai Tang, Michael Kearns, Jamie H Morgenstern, Aaron Roth, and Steven Z Wu. Reconstruction attacks on machine unlearning: Simple models are vulnerable. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:104995–105016, 2024.
- [5] Battista Biggio, Blaine Nelson, and Pavel Laskov. Poisoning attacks against support vector machines. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML’12*, page 1467–1474, Madison, WI, USA, 2012. Omnipress.
- [6] Peva Blanchard, El Mahdi El Mhamdi, Rachid Guerraoui, and Julien Stainer. Machine learning with adversaries: Byzantine tolerant gradient descent. In I. Guyon, U. Von Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus,

- S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017.
- [7] Yao Chen, Yijie Gui, Hong Lin, Wensheng Gan, and Yongdong Wu. Federated learning attacks and defenses: A survey. In *2022 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*, pages 4256–4265, 2022.
- [8] Li Deng. The mnist database of handwritten digit images for machine learning research [best of the web]. *IEEE signal processing magazine*, 29(6):141–142, 2012.
- [9] Minghong Fang, Xiaoyu Cao, Jinyuan Jia, and Neil Gong. Local model poisoning attacks to Byzantine-Robust federated learning. In *29th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 20)*, pages 1605–1622. USENIX Association, August 2020.
- [10] Matt Fredrikson, Somesh Jha, and Thomas Ristenpart. Model inversion attacks that exploit confidence information and basic countermeasures. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS '15*, page 1322–1333, New York, NY, USA, 2015. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [11] Prajjwal Gupta, Krishna Yadav, Brij B Gupta, Mamoun Alazab, and Thippa Reddy Gadekallu. A novel data poisoning attack in federated learning based on inverted loss function. *Computers & Security*, 130:103270, 2023.
- [12] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- [13] Zecheng He, Tianwei Zhang, and Ruby B. Lee. Model inversion attacks against collaborative inference. In *Proceedings of the 35th Annual Computer Security Applications Conference, ACSAC '19*, page 148–162, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [14] Patrick Helber, Benjamin Bischke, Andreas Dengel, and Damian Borth. Eurosat: A novel dataset and deep learning benchmark for land use and land cover classification. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing*, 12(7):2217–2226, 2019.
- [15] Li Huang, Yifeng Yin, Zeng Fu, Shifa Zhang, Hao Deng, and Dianbo Liu. Loadboost: Loss-based adaboost federated machine learning with reduced computational complexity on iid and non-iid intensive care data. *Plos one*, 15(4):e0230706, 2020.
- [16] Peter Kairouz, H Brendan McMahan, Brendan Avent, Aurélien Bellet, Mehdi Bennis, Arjun Nitin Bhagoji, Kallista Bonawitz, Zachary Charles, Graham Cormode, Rachel Cummings, et al. Advances and open problems in federated learning. *Foundations and trends® in machine learning*, 14(1–2):1–210, 2021.
- [17] Sai Praneeth Karimireddy, Satyen Kale, Mehryar Mohri, Sashank Reddi, Sebastian Stich, and Ananda Theertha Suresh. Scaffold: Stochastic controlled averaging for federated learning. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 5132–5143. PMLR, 2020.
- [18] Muah Kim, Onur Günlü, and Rafael F. Schaefer. Federated learning with local differential privacy: Trade-offs between privacy, utility, and communication. In *ICASSP 2021 - 2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 2650–2654, 2021.
- [19] Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. 2009.
- [20] Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images.(2009), 2009.
- [21] Bo Li, Yining Wang, Aarti Singh, and Yevgeniy Vorobeychik. Data poisoning attacks on factorization-based collaborative filtering. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29, 2016.
- [22] Tian Li, Anit Kumar Sahu, Ameet Talwalkar, and Virginia Smith. Federated learning: Challenges, methods, and future directions. *IEEE signal processing magazine*, 37(3):50–60, 2020.
- [23] Yuzheng Li, Chuan Chen, Nan Liu, Huawei Huang, Zibin Zheng, and Qiang Yan. A blockchain-based decentralized federated learning framework with committee consensus. *IEEE Network*, 35(1):234–241, 2020.
- [24] Runqi Lin, Chaojian Yu, Bo Han, and Tongliang Liu. On the over-memorization during natural, robust and catastrophic overfitting. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [25] Lingjuan Lyu, Han Yu, Jun Zhao, and Qiang Yang. *Threats to Federated Learning*, pages 3–16. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2020.
- [26] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Aguera y Arcas. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 1273–1282. PMLR, 2017.

- [27] Milad Nasr, Reza Shokri, and Amir Houmansadr. Comprehensive privacy analysis of deep learning: Passive and active white-box inference attacks against centralized and federated learning. In *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 739–753, 2019.
- [28] Rrubaa Panchendrarajan and Suman Bhoi. Dataset reconstruction attack against language models. In *CEUR Workshop*, 2021.
- [29] Sashank J. Reddi, Zachary Charles, Manzil Zaheer, Zachary Garrett, Keith Rush, Jakub Konečný, Sanjiv Kumar, and Hugh Brendan McMahan. Adaptive federated optimization. In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*. OpenReview.net, 2021.
- [30] Daniel Rothchild, Ashwinee Panda, Enayat Ullah, Nikita Ivkin, Ion Stoica, Vladimir Braverman, Joseph Gonzalez, and Raman Arora. Fetchsgd: Communication-efficient federated learning with sketching. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8253–8265. PMLR, 2020.
- [31] Reza Shokri, Marco Stronati, Congzheng Song, and Vitaly Shmatikov. Membership inference attacks against machine learning models. In *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 3–18, 2017.
- [32] Vale Tolpegin, Stacey Truex, Mehmet Emre Gursoy, and Ling Liu. Data poisoning attacks against federated learning systems. In *Computer security—ESORICs 2020: 25th European symposium on research in computer security, ESORICs 2020, guildford, UK, September 14–18, 2020, proceedings, part i 25*, pages 480–501. Springer, 2020.
- [33] Zhibo Wang, Mengkai Song, Zhifei Zhang, Yang Song, Qian Wang, and Hairong Qi. Beyond inferring class representatives: User-level privacy leakage from federated learning. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2019-IEEE conference on computer communications*, pages 2512–2520. IEEE, 2019.
- [34] Xi Wu, Matt Fredrikson, Somesh Jha, and Jeffrey F. Naughton. A methodology for formalizing model-inversion attacks. *2016 IEEE 29th Computer Security Foundations Symposium (CSF)*, pages 355–370, 2016.
- [35] Jiancheng Yang, Rui Shi, Donglai Wei, Zequan Liu, Lin Zhao, Bilian Ke, Hanspeter Pfister, and Bingbing Ni. Medmista v2—a large-scale lightweight benchmark for 2d and 3d biomedical image classification. *Scientific Data*, 10(1):41, 2023.
- [36] Seunghan Yang, Hyoungseob Park, Junyoung Byun, and Changick Kim. Robust federated learning with noisy labels. *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, 37(2):35–43, 2022.
- [37] Wencheng Yang, Song Wang, Di Wu, Taotao Cai, Yanming Zhu, Shicheng Wei, Yiyang Zhang, Xu Yang, Zhaohui Tang, and Yan Li. Deep learning model inversion attacks and defenses: a comprehensive survey. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 58(8):1–52, 2025.
- [38] Samuel Yeom, Irene Giacomelli, Matt Fredrikson, and Somesh Jha. Privacy risk in machine learning: Analyzing the connection to overfitting. In *2018 IEEE 31st Computer Security Foundations Symposium (CSF)*, pages 268–282, 2018.
- [39] Syed Zawad, Ahsan Ali, Pin-Yu Chen, Ali Anwar, Yi Zhou, Nathalie Baracaldo, Yuan Tian, and Feng Yan. Curse or redemption? how data heterogeneity affects the robustness of federated learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 35, pages 10807–10814, 2021.
- [40] Jing Zhang, Chuanwen Li, Jianzong Qi, and Jiayuan He. A survey on class imbalance in federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.11673*, 2023.
- [41] Zaixi Zhang, Xiaoyu Cao, Jinyuan Jia, and Neil Zhenqiang Gong. Fldetector: Defending federated learning against model poisoning attacks via detecting malicious clients. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, KDD '22*, page 2545–2555, New York, NY, USA, 2022. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [42] Tianyu Zhao, Mahmoud Srewa, and Salma Elmalaki. Finp: Fairness-in-privacy in federated learning by addressing disparities in privacy risk. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.17748*, 2025.