

From Research to Reality: Feasibility of Gradient Inversion Attacks in Federated Learning

Viktor Valadi
Scaleout Systems
Gothenburg, Sweden
viktor@scaleoutsystems.com

Mattias Åkesson
Scaleout Systems
Stockholm, Sweden
mattias@scaleoutsystems.com

Johan Östman
AI Sweden
Gothenburg, Sweden
johan.ostman@ai.se

Salman Toor*
Scaleout Systems
Uppsala, Sweden
salman@scaleoutsystems.com

Andreas Hellander*
Scaleout Systems
Uppsala, Sweden
andreas@scaleoutsystems.com

Abstract

Gradient inversion attacks have garnered attention for their ability to compromise privacy in federated learning. However, many studies consider attacks with the model in inference mode, where training-time behaviors like dropout are disabled and batch normalization relies on fixed statistics. In this work, we systematically analyze how architecture and training behavior affect vulnerability, including the first in-depth study of inference-mode clients, which we show dramatically simplifies inversion. To assess attack feasibility under more realistic conditions, we turn to clients operating in standard training mode. In this setting, we find that successful attacks are only possible when several architectural conditions are met simultaneously: models must be shallow and wide, use skip connections, and, critically, employ pre-activation normalization. We introduce two novel attacks against models in training-mode with varying attacker knowledge, achieving state-of-the-art performance under realistic training conditions. Extending these efforts toward real-world applicability, we present what is, to our knowledge, the first published attack on a production-grade object-detection model, trained on the COCO dataset. Here, to enable any visibly identifiable leakage, we revert to the lenient inference mode setting and make multiple architectural modifications to increase model vulnerability, with the extent of required changes highlighting the strong inherent robustness of such architectures. We conclude this work by offering the first comprehensive mapping of settings, clarifying which combinations of architectural choices and operational modes meaningfully impact privacy. Our analysis provides actionable insight into when models are likely vulnerable, when they appear robust, and where subtle leakage may persist. Together, these findings reframe how gradient inversion risk should be assessed in future research and deployment scenarios.

*Also with Uppsala University.

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

© 2026 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/2018/06
<https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

CCS Concepts

• **Security and privacy** → **Domain-specific security and privacy architectures**; • **Computing methodologies** → *Distributed artificial intelligence*.

Keywords

Federated Learning, Gradient Inversion, Privacy Attacks, Model Inversion, Adversarial Machine Learning, Information Leakage, Deep Learning Security, Computer Vision, Object Detection

ACM Reference Format:

Viktor Valadi, Mattias Åkesson, Johan Östman, Salman Toor, and Andreas Hellander. 2026. From Research to Reality: Feasibility of Gradient Inversion Attacks in Federated Learning. In *Proceedings of* . ACM, New York, NY, USA, 10 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 Introduction

Federated learning (FL), introduced by McMahan et al. [20], is a decentralized machine learning paradigm in which clients collaboratively train a shared model without exchanging their raw data. By keeping data local and transmitting only model updates, FL offers a compelling solution to data governance, compliance, and privacy concerns, making it especially attractive in domains such as healthcare, finance, and edge computing.

However, this decentralized setup introduces new technical and security challenges. As outlined by Kairouz et al. [16], the three primary concerns in FL are robustness, communication efficiency, and privacy. Robustness pertains to the system's resilience against malicious participants; for example, recent work has demonstrated that even a small fraction of adversarial clients can poison the global model [23, 24, 26]. Communication efficiency remains a major bottleneck, particularly in cross-device FL scenarios, where uplink bandwidth is limited and client participation is sporadic [17, 21]. Finally, the gradients or model updates exchanged during training can leak sensitive information hence violating privacy. A growing body of research has demonstrated that it is possible to reconstruct client data from model gradients using gradient inversion attacks (GIAs) [4, 7, 32]. These attacks raise concerns about the extent to which FL protects user privacy in practice.

Since privacy is often the primary motivation for adopting FL, the threat posed by GIAs should be taken seriously. Recent research has highlighted the potential severity of GIAs by demonstrating

increasingly powerful attack scenarios. For instance, studies have shown successful reconstructions of high-resolution images [7, 8], the feasibility of attacks on large batch sizes [7, 28], and the ability to recover data from model updates accumulated over multiple local epochs [4]. Together, these findings reinforce growing concerns that FL systems may face significant privacy risks.

Beyond academic exploration, the privacy risks posed by GIAs are increasingly shaping real-world ML deployments, particularly in sensitive domains such as healthcare and finance. FL is often seen as a key enabler of data-driven innovation in these areas, enabling collaborative model training without centralized access to personal data. However, when the privacy guarantees of FL are poorly understood, uncertainty can hinder or even derail high-impact initiatives. A central concern is whether gradient updates leak sensitive information, an issue that raises caution even in tightly regulated, permissioned collaborations between trusted institutions.

A concrete example of this risk emerged in a Swedish pilot project where two healthcare providers used FL to improve prediction models for patient readmission after heart failure. Following a review, the Swedish Authority for Privacy Protection (IMY) concluded that, under the project’s conditions, local model weights may contain sensitive data that may be potentially exposed via GIAs. In its public report [14], IMY emphasized that while such attacks are non-trivial, they could still enable reconstruction of private information from another participant in the federation. As a result, the project was not extended, despite its clear potential to improve healthcare delivery.

This example underscores a broader issue: in the absence of rigorous and transparent privacy risk assessments, promising AI systems risk being prematurely abandoned. In domains where data centralization is infeasible or undesirable, this can mean foregoing innovations with significant real-world impact.

Motivated by this, we present a more realistic and comprehensive evaluation of the privacy risks posed by GIAs in FL, addressing limitations in prior work that often rely on simplified or idealized settings. We specifically analyze how system-level design choices such as model architecture, normalization behavior, and client training procedures influence both the feasibility and severity of these attacks in real-world deployments.

Contributions. This work makes the following three key contributions:

- (1) **Systematic architectural analysis:** We conduct a comprehensive evaluation of how different architectural choices affect model vulnerability, clearly identifying which designs are inherently more robust to GIAs and which are susceptible.
- (2) **Clarifying misconceptions in the literature:** We challenge and refine prevailing assumptions in GIA research, many of which have overstated the real-world potency of these attacks by relying on overly simplified or unrealistic setups.
- (3) **Realistic attacks under constrained conditions:** To enable a fair assessment of actual privacy risks, we develop and evaluate two novel attack methodologies tailored to realistic scenarios in which the attacker has limited access to client-side information. These methods allow us to explore

where privacy leakage remains a concern and where current FL practices appear robust.

Our goal is to provide a grounded and actionable understanding of the true privacy implications of GIAs in FL, identifying both areas of potential vulnerability and conditions under which systems can be considered safe.

2 Background and Related Work

2.1 Federated Learning

Federated learning is a decentralized machine learning paradigm introduced by McMahan et al. [20], where multiple clients collaboratively train a shared global model without exchanging raw data. The process begins with a central server distributing an initial model to selected clients. Each client then performs local optimization (for example, using stochastic gradient descent) on its private data and returns model updates, typically gradients or weight changes, to the server. The server then aggregates these updates to refine the global model. This process is repeated over multiple rounds until convergence. Importantly, the global model is learned without any raw data ever leaving the clients.

While FL eliminates the need for centralized data collection, making it appealing for privacy-sensitive domains such as healthcare, finance, and mobile applications [24], it introduces new privacy risks as the shared updates may encode sensitive attributes of the underlying data.

2.2 Privacy in ML

Machine learning models, particularly deep neural networks, are known to memorize patterns or even individual examples from the training data [3]. Privacy attacks attempt to exploit such memorization in machine learning models and are typically categorized into three main types: membership inference attacks [18, 22], model inversion attacks [6], and gradient inversion attacks [7, 32]. Among these, the underlying threat model of GIAs are particularly amenable to FL. Hence, although FL aims to offer stronger privacy guarantees than centralized training, new attack vectors emerge, potentially leaking sensitive data. Understanding how and when such leakage occurs is therefore essential for evaluating the real-world privacy guarantees of federated systems.

2.3 Gradient Inversion Attacks

Gradient inversion attacks were first introduced by Zhu et al. [32] as a privacy threat in FL, showing that private training data could potentially be reconstructed from shared model updates. The overall objective of a GIA can be expressed as

$$\arg \min_{x, y} d(\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_{\theta}(x, y), \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_{\theta}(x^*, y^*)) \quad (1)$$

where θ denotes the weights of the model, (x^*, y^*) denotes the local data used in the client’s gradient update $\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_{\theta}(x^*, y^*)$, \mathcal{L} denotes the training cost function, and d denotes a discrepancy function, e.g., Euclidean norm.

Concretely, a GIA typically begins with an initial guess of the client’s data, which may be randomly initialized [7, 32] or informed by prior knowledge about the data distribution [11, 30]. This guess

is used together with the global model, mimicking the client’s training process to produce a synthetic model update. The attacker then adjusts the input based on the similarity between the real client update and the synthetic model update by means of gradient descent, gradually nudging the guessed input data toward a reconstruction that yields a similar update.

The distinction between *training* and *inference* modes plays a critical role in gradient inversion attacks. In training mode, batch normalization layers compute and apply statistics from the current batch, introducing data-dependent variability into the forward and backward pass. In inference mode, however, fixed running statistics are used instead, leading to a more deterministic and potentially attacker-friendly behavior. As we show in Section 4.2, this can have a major impact on attack success depending on what information is shared by the client, and it also alters the backpropagation dynamics in ways that have been largely overlooked.

2.4 Related Work

Gradient inversion attacks were first introduced by Zhu et al. [32], who demonstrated that input data could be reconstructed from shared gradients in a federated learning setting. Their public implementation targeted simple models such as LeNet, with Sigmoid activations and shallow convolutional depth. Although they reported results on deeper architectures like ResNet, closer inspection suggests these experiments may have used inference mode, where BatchNorm layers rely on fixed statistics. Geiping et al. [7] extended GIAs to more complex, high-resolution image tasks using ResNet models and introduced total variation regularization to promote spatial coherence in reconstructions. While their approach addressed several technical challenges, it shared the same assumption regarding inference-mode gradients.

More recent works have further advanced optimization strategies by incorporating latent space priors [30], GAN-based regularization [5], and permutation-invariant objectives for aggregating updates [4]. However, these efforts largely maintain the same simplifying assumptions, either computing gradients in inference mode or omitting normalization layers entirely. As such, they remain orthogonal to our goal of evaluating whether gradient inversion attacks can succeed under realistic, training-mode conditions.

To the best of our knowledge, only three prior works have investigated gradient inversion attacks where clients perform updates in training mode with active BatchNorm layers. Yin et al. [29] proposed a batch normalization regularizer, which constrains reconstructed batches to exhibit realistic normalization statistics, although their method was not directly applied to GIAs. Building on this, Yin et al. [28] presented the first claimed success on attacking clients training in standard (training) mode, where BatchNorm layers compute statistics from the input batch. While promising, their results remain difficult to reproduce or benchmark fairly due to the lack of a public implementation. Given how sensitive GIA performance is to subtle implementation details, it remains unclear which exact conditions enabled their reported success.

Further exploring this direction, Hatamizadeh et al. [11] investigated GIAs in the training-mode setting for medical image reconstruction, reporting strong results on MRI data. While their work is

accompanied by a public implementation, we note that the optimization loop in their code contains a critical error: although the method is intended to minimize the distance between reconstructed and original gradients, this comparison is computed without tracking gradients, effectively disabling backpropagation from the distance loss. As a result, their reported reconstructions are achieved without the core GIA mechanism of gradient matching. Instead, their success appears to rely primarily on the batch norm regularizer R_{BN} , which may suffice in structured domains like MRI where the target data lies in a highly constrained manifold. However, this reliance on strong prior structure limits the method’s applicability to more general or less predictable input domains.

A closely related line of work is that of Huang et al. [13], who provide a valuable comparative analysis of GIAs under different client configurations, including training vs. inference mode, access to true labels vs. label reconstruction, and the application of defense mechanisms. While their study offers important insights, we find that some aspects of their methodology and evaluation leave room for refinement. In particular, certain architectural and statistical assumptions in their analysis may underestimate the difficulty of gradient inversion in realistic settings.

3 Experimental Setup and Threat Model

Across all experiments in this paper, we adopt a consistent evaluation methodology to ensure fair comparisons across architectures, client settings, and regularization strategies. For each setting, we use Optuna [1] to perform hyperparameter tuning over 100 trials. This process jointly selects the target image (from a predefined candidate pool) and optimizes attack-specific parameters to maximize the structural similarity (SSIM) between the reconstructed and original image. For more details, see Appendix A.

Informed by prior studies on architectural susceptibility to gradient inversion [9, 25], the ResNet18 used is a slightly widened version, as to facilitate clearer qualitative comparisons in reconstruction outputs.

We assume the attacker has access to the true labels y in (1). While label reconstruction remains an open challenge in gradient inversion research [8, 27], we omit it here to focus specifically on architectural vulnerabilities and procedural differences, under the assumption of perfect label knowledge. This reflects a slightly more lenient scenario, where label inference has been fully successful. For a systematic evaluation of how label access affects attack performance, we refer the reader to Huang et al. [13]. Throughout all experiments, we adopt an honest-but-curious threat model in which a central server passively observes client updates during training rounds.

For experiments outside the updated attack methodologies introduced in Section 4.3, we adopt the techniques of Geiping et al. [7] against inference-mode clients and Huang et al. [13] against training-mode clients, which serve as strong baselines for their respective settings.

4 Bridging the Gap: Real-World Challenges for Gradient Inversion

Despite growing interest in GIAs, much of the existing literature operates under simplified assumptions that fail to reflect the realities

of machine learning systems. In this section, we aim to bridge the gap between theoretical attacks and real-world deployment conditions by analyzing the architectural and procedural factors that govern the success or failure of GIAs.

We begin in Section 4.1 by identifying model-level design choices, e.g., network depth, width, and normalization strategy, that significantly impact a model’s susceptibility to GIAs. In Section 4.2, we dissect the critical role of normalization and clarify how different modes of operation (training vs. inference) and statistic-sharing practices affect the gradient signal available to the attacker. Finally, in Section 4.3, we introduce two new attack methodologies designed for training-mode clients, achieving state-of-the-art performance in challenging settings where less information is available to the adversary.

Together, these contributions provide a more grounded understanding of how privacy vulnerabilities emerge from model design decisions and how attackers can exploit available signals even in restricted settings. We conclude by emphasizing the importance of careful architectural and procedural choices to ensure that federated machine learning systems maintain strong privacy guarantees.

4.1 Identifying Model Vulnerabilities to Gradient Inversion Attacks

As previously noted, successful GIAs in the literature are rarely achieved by targeting a fixed and independently designed model. Instead, our observations suggest that certain models or specific adaptations are inherently more susceptible under particular attack scenarios. In this section, we highlight key architectural choices that increase a model’s vulnerability to GIAs.

In Figure 1, we demonstrate this phenomenon by comparing the standard ResNet32 model [12] to the widened version [31]. The experiment is performed using a batch size of 16 and a local training procedure consisting of a single epoch. As can be seen, the unmodified ResNet32 exhibits partial feature reconstruction under GIA, likely due to the simplicity of the model architecture and due to its skip connections, which have both been previously identified as a potential source of vulnerability [9, 10]. However, the widened variant of ResNet32 yields significantly clearer and more detailed reconstructions. This suggests that widening the network, an approach known to increase model capacity and in some cases mitigate underfitting [31], can also make the model more vulnerable to gradient inversion attacks.

These experiments were conducted under favorable and commonly adopted attack conditions, where client-side training is performed in inference mode. We further discuss the implications of this setup in Section 4.2.

In Figure 2, we evaluate gradient inversion attacks in the more realistic setting where clients operate in training mode, meaning that the BatchNorm layers compute statistics from local data. Unlike inference-mode attacks, which benefit from fixed running statistics and therefore sidestep difficulties introduced by normalization, this attack scenario requires the adversary to infer the client’s batch statistics. To do so, we adopt a regularization strategy based on matching internal normalization statistics during optimization, as described in (4). This approach follows prior training-mode works




Figure 1: Gradient inversion attack using ResNet32 models, with original images shown on the left and recreations on the right. ResNet32, already vulnerable to gradient inversion attacks due to skip connections, is often widened in the literature, further increasing vulnerability to GIAs by making the gradients more prone to memorization.




Figure 2: Gradient inversion attack on ResNet18 models using the method outlined by Huang et al. [13], with original images shown on the left and recreations on the right. For attacks that do not assume full knowledge of batch normalization statistics, it may be necessary for normalization to occur before convolutions (pre-activation blocks) rather than after (post-activation). Using a widened model alone is not sufficient, but a pre-activation design enables attacks to infer information from normalization updates more accurately, allowing successful recreation of the input images.

such as [11, 13, 28], that show the feasibility of training-mode attacks when such regularization is incorporated into the attack.

The experimental results in Figure 2 highlight a critical architectural factor for the success of such attacks: the position of the batch normalization layers within the model. Specifically, we observe that using a wide and shallow model alone is insufficient for effective reconstruction when the attacker attempts to infer normalization statistics. However, adopting a pre-activation ResNet architecture, where normalization occurs before the convolutional layers, significantly improves the attacker’s ability to recover meaningful input reconstructions. This suggests that pre-activation designs may inadvertently expose more information about the underlying data through the normalization updates during training, thereby increasing vulnerability to this class of inversion attacks.

4.2 Normalization

Normalization significantly influences the success of gradient inversion attacks [13]. In this section, we examine how its behavior affects attack performance under different training conditions. We revise and correct several assumptions and suboptimal practices found in earlier work, focusing on differences in the forward and backward passes between training and inference mode, and on how an attacker can exploit information from running statistics. We conclude by clearly distinguishing between different types of client update settings that have been studied, identifying which are realistic and relevant, and we set the stage for novel attack methodologies introduced in the next subsection.

4.2.1 Inference Mode vs Training Mode Backpropagation. As outlined in Section 2.4, most gradient inversion studies assume that both the client and the attacker operate in inference mode. While this simplifies analysis, removing stochastic components like dropout and fixing BatchNorm statistics, it diverges from standard training behavior. This setup also implicitly grants the attacker access to the client’s normalization statistics, a scenario referred to as “ BN_{exact} ” in [13].

Beyond these well-known differences, our analysis reveals a more subtle but impactful distinction: **the gradients themselves propagate differently** through BatchNorm layers in training mode compared to inference mode. This overlooked detail can drastically alter the optimization landscape of gradient inversion attacks and helps explain why many inference-mode attacks do not transfer to the more realistic training-mode setting. We explore this empirically in Section 4.3.

Specifically, during backpropagation through batch normalization, three gradients are computed: the gradient of the loss \mathcal{L} with respect to i) the input tensor x , $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x}$, ii) the scale parameter γ (weight), $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \gamma}$, and iii) the shift parameter β (bias), $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \beta}$. In PyTorch [2], the gradients with respect to γ and β are computed identically in both training and inference modes. However, the gradient with respect to the input x differs significantly between the two modes. This distinction has important implications for GIAs.

In inference mode, batch normalization uses pre-computed running statistics. The backward pass computes the gradient with respect to the input as

$$\left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x}\right)_{\text{eval}} = d\hat{x} \cdot \frac{1}{\sigma}. \quad (2)$$

In contrast, training mode computes statistics from the current mini-batch. This affects the gradient computation, resulting in:

$$\left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x}\right)_{\text{train}} = \left(d\hat{x} - \hat{x} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d\hat{x}_i \cdot \hat{x}_i - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d\hat{x}_i\right) \cdot \frac{1}{\sigma}. \quad (3)$$

Here, $\hat{x}_i = \frac{x_i - \mu}{\sigma}$ is the normalized input for channel i , $d\hat{x}$ is the gradient of the loss with respect to \hat{x} , μ and σ denote the batch mean and standard deviation, respectively, and $n = B \cdot H \cdot W$ is the number of elements per channel in the batch (with batch size B , height H , width W).

This introduces a critical distinction between GIAs conducted under training versus inference mode. In training mode, the gradient depends non-linearly on the input due to the correlation

term $\sum_{i=1}^n d\hat{x}_i \cdot \hat{x}_i$, which couples all inputs in the batch. This interdependence introduces significant additional complexity to the inversion process. Notably, we found that even when the attacker has exact knowledge of the client’s normalization statistics μ and σ , and uses the same backward computation as the client, reconstruction remains unsuccessful. We made numerous such attempts and consistently failed to recover meaningful inputs. These findings suggest that the non-linear coupling in the training-mode backward pass **fundamentally obstructs inversion techniques that succeed under inference-mode updates, even when the attacker possesses full statistical knowledge.**

Although attacking models in training mode is significantly more challenging, some methods have been developed to target such settings [11, 13, 28]. These approaches have demonstrated partial success, but with important caveats as highlighted in Figure 2 and discussed in Section 2.4, including a strong reliance on specific architectural features such as pre-activation normalization, or constrained applicability to highly structured input domains like some type of medical imaging. In the next section, we examine these attacks in detail, focusing on the implementation choices that determine their practical feasibility and the assumptions required for them to succeed.

4.2.2 Attacks on Clients in Training Mode. To improve GIAs under training mode, researchers have leveraged BatchNorm statistics as data-free regularizers. By matching the means and variances of intermediate features to the running statistics of a pretrained model [29], the reconstructed inputs are guided toward more realistic representations. This idea was first adapted to GIAs by Yin et al. [28] and later extended by [11, 13]. Here, we focus on the latter due to the lack of a public implementation of the former.

Concretely, the method adds a regularization term to the optimization process that encourages the batch statistics of the reconstructed inputs to match the running statistics stored in the model. This is done by minimizing the L2 distance between the mean and variance of the intermediate activations and the corresponding BatchNorm running statistics as

$$R_{\text{BN}} = \sum_{l \in \mathcal{B}} \left(\left\| \mu_l(x) - \mu_l^{\text{running}} \right\|^2 + \left\| \sigma_l^2(x) - \sigma_l^{2,\text{running}} \right\|^2 \right) \quad (4)$$

where \mathcal{B} is the set of BatchNorm layers, $\mu_l(x)$ and $\sigma_l^2(x)$ are the per-channel batch mean and variance of the activations at layer l computed from the reconstruction candidate x , while μ_l^{running} and $\sigma_l^{2,\text{running}}$ are the corresponding running statistics stored in the model during training.

In the context of GIAs, several important implementation details must be clarified to ensure that experimental results and subsequent conclusions are valid. A common assumption in prior works is that attackers have access to the running mean and variance used for normalization during reconstruction. These statistics are often initialized (e.g., $\mu_r = 0$, $\sigma_r = 1$) and updated only once during a client’s local training step before the attack is performed. The update typically follows the standard momentum formula

$$\mu_r^{\text{new}} = (1 - m) \cdot \mu_r^{\text{old}} + m \cdot \mu_c, \quad \sigma_r^{\text{new}} = (1 - m) \cdot \sigma_r^{\text{old}} + m \cdot \sigma_c \quad (5)$$

where m is the momentum parameter, while μ_c and σ_c are the mean and variance computed from the client’s current batch.

This practice has two implications. First, updating the running statistics only once creates a strong bias toward the client’s private data while still providing a weak estimate, making it an unrealistic representation of the running statistics accumulated over a full training process. Second, this setup allows the attacker to recover the exact client batch statistics by comparing the running statistics before and after the client update as

$$\mu_c = \frac{1}{m} \left(\mu_r^{\text{new}} - (1 - m)\mu_r^{\text{old}} \right) \quad (6)$$

$$\sigma_c = \frac{n - 1}{nm} \left(\sigma_r^{\text{new}} - (1 - m)\sigma_r^{\text{old}} \right) \quad (7)$$

where, $n = B \cdot H \cdot W$ is the number of elements per channel in the batch. The additional factor $\frac{n-1}{n}$ transforms the unbiased running variance into the biased form used in the batch statistics (as per the PyTorch implementation), allowing for exact matching.

This motivates a distinction between three settings of increasing difficulty for gradient inversion, reflecting different levels of information available to the attacker:

- (1) **Inference-mode client updates:** The attacker avoids the added non-linearity of the training-mode backward pass, simplifying inversion. This setting, referred to as BN_{exact} by Huang et al. [13], is the most commonly used in the literature due to its tractability [4, 5, 7, 30].
- (2) **Clients that update and share running statistics:** If unmasked BatchNorm running statistics are shared with the server, the attacker can recover the exact batch statistics using known relationships (e.g., Equations (5) and (6)), enabling more precise reconstruction.
- (3) **Clients that do not share running statistics:** In this more realistic and privacy-preserving setting, the attacker lacks direct access to batch statistics and must instead rely on estimates, potentially obtained via auxiliary data or prior knowledge, introducing uncertainty and reducing attack effectiveness.

In Section 4.3, we further investigate settings (2) and (3) to assess the achievable reconstruction quality and highlight how architectural design choices influence attackability in each case.

4.3 Updated attack methods

In this section, we extend the insights from Sections 4.1 and 4.2 to design new attacks that leverage available information and regularize toward plausible normalization statistics. We analyze how leakage varies with model architecture and information sharing, and conclude with practical observations for assessing privacy risks in federated learning.

To this end, we develop two novel attack methodologies that extend prior work on gradient inversion. Both follow the optimization objective defined in Equation (1), aiming to minimize the discrepancy between the reconstructed and observed model updates. In our implementation, we instantiate the discrepancy function $d(\cdot)$ as the cosine similarity between the reconstructed gradient $\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_{\theta}(x, y)$ and the client-provided gradient $\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_{\theta}(x^*, y^*)$,



Pre-activation ResNet18 using running statistics, SSIM=0.054



Pre-activation ResNet18 without running statistics, SSIM=0.040

Figure 3: New gradient inversion attacks. Pre-activation ResNet18. With and without running statistics.

i.e., $d = 1 - \text{cosim}(\cdot, \cdot)$. In addition, both of our methods incorporate a total variation (TV) regularizer, introduced by Geiping et al. [7], to encourage natural-looking reconstructions by penalizing high-frequency artifacts, defined as

$$R_{\text{TV}}(x) = \sum_{i,j} \sqrt{(x_{i+1,j} - x_{i,j})^2 + (x_{i,j+1} - x_{i,j})^2},$$

where x denotes the reconstructed image and i, j index pixel locations. We also use variants of the batch-norm regularizer R_{BN} from (4).

The key difference between the two attack variants lies in how they handle batch normalization statistics. When the attacker has access to the client’s running statistics before and after the update, the method infers the batch mean and variance using Equations (6) and (7), and directly regularizes the reconstruction toward those values using (4). In contrast, when the attacker does not observe a running statistics update from the client, the attacker estimates plausible batch statistics by probing multiple auxiliary data batches, in our experiments taken from the same data distribution, and selecting the one that produces a successful reconstruction, typically indicated by a high SSIM score. The attack then regularizes toward these proxy statistics in place of the true client values.

In Figure 3, we investigate the performance of our new attack methodologies on the **pre-activation ResNet18** model, previously identified as highly vulnerable in Section 4.1, when i) the client shares updated running statistics, and ii) no running statistics are shared. As expected, and consistent with the results in Figure 2, access to client-side normalization statistics leads to significantly more accurate reconstructions. When the running statistics are shared, the reconstructions are visually near-perfect (Figure 3 upper row). Remarkably, even in the more restrictive setting where the attacker has no access to client-side statistics and instead uses a proxy estimated from auxiliary data, the attack still yields partially accurate reconstructions for several images in the batch, highlighting that successful recovery is possible even without access to the client’s true normalization statistics in some cases.

To further evaluate the generalizability of our attack methods, we now turn to the standard **ResNet18** architecture, which, unlike its pre-activation variant, applies batch normalization after the convolutional layers. As shown in Figure 4, reconstruction quality drops noticeably compared to the pre-activation case in Figure 3. However, the degradation seems to be less severe than in earlier



Figure 4: New gradient inversion attacks. ResNet18. With and without running statistics.

baseline results shown in Figure 2, suggesting that our updated methodology remains more effective across model variants.

While the visual reconstructions on ResNet18 are far from accurate, the structured artifacts and repeated patterns in the images hint at latent information still present in the gradients. These patterns are consistent across multiple samples, suggesting that the reconstructions are not random noise but are encoding semantically meaningful features that could potentially be recovered with improved decoding strategies. This interpretation is supported by the SSIM scores, which remain consistently higher when client batch statistics are known. Even when such statistics are not available, the elevated SSIM may indicate that structural information can still be leaked, despite being imperceptible to a human observer.

These experiments demonstrate that even when client-side normalization statistics are unavailable, meaningful information can still be extracted from gradient updates, particularly when combined with susceptible model architectures and careful regularization strategies. This highlights the need for greater awareness: privacy risks must be considered in architectural and procedural decisions throughout model development. When possible, training pipelines should be audited to assess whether they operate under conditions that amplify vulnerability.

5 Gradient Inversion Attacks on Object Detection with YOLOv8-nano

Next, we investigate the feasibility of gradient inversion attacks on complex, real-world models by targeting a production-grade object detector, the YOLOv8-nano [15], with clients training on the COCO dataset [19]. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first successful attack on object detection, although architectural modifications were necessary to increase model vulnerability. Compared to classification, object detection poses additional challenges due to multi-object targets, high-dimensional outputs, and architectural complexity.

This section details the model architecture, experimental setup, and the adjustments required to enable the attack, serving as a case study in the gap between academic assumptions and real-world machine learning systems.

5.1 Toward Attack Success on Object Detection

As an initial step, we conducted experiments using a PyTorch implementation of the YOLOv8 nano model [15]. The objective was

intentionally modest: to detect any indicators of successful reconstruction, such as preserved color distributions, spatial layouts, or identifiable structural features. In early experiments, we refrained from altering the model architecture and instead simplified the data pipeline by substituting the COCO dataset with synthetic data. To further reduce task complexity, we modified the model to perform image classification rather than object detection, accompanied by an appropriate adjustment of the loss function.

Despite these simplifications, the attacks failed to yield results that were meaningfully distinguishable from random noise. These negative outcomes prompted a shift in focus: rather than further reducing the complexity of the input or output space, we turned to the model architecture to identify components that may hinder reconstruction. This led to a series of targeted modifications to the model’s internal structure aimed at increasing its vulnerability to inversion.

At this stage, we had three primary tools at our disposal, as outlined in Section 4.1. First, prior work has shown that shallower and wider networks tend to be more vulnerable to gradient inversion attacks. Additionally, skip connections have been hypothesized to exacerbate vulnerability [9], likely as they may act as shortcuts that preserve input-gradient alignment, thereby increasing the amount of recoverable information from gradients. Based on these insights, we adopted a simple and targeted strategy: replacing the Cross Stage Partial (CSP) modules, commonly used in YOLOv8, with ResNet-style BasicBlock modules. This modification reduces the overall depth of the network while also introducing skip connections, effectively aligning the model architecture more closely with those known to be susceptible to inversion.

In our first modification, we replaced approximately half of the CSP modules with BasicBlocks. While no recognizable shapes were recovered at this stage, the reconstructed images began to exhibit consistent color distributions matching those of the original input, an early sign of signal alignment and progress. Encouraged by this, we replaced all CSP modules in the network with BasicBlocks, simplifying the architecture and likely reducing its capacity to learn from the complex, high-variance scenarios the model was originally designed for. The result from this final configuration is shown in Figure 5. Here, we observe that the attack was able to reconstruct meaningful content from the original image, particularly in regions corresponding to the model’s detection output. Although still imperfect, the results clearly demonstrate successful information recovery in a realistic object detection pipeline.

Although we demonstrate a successful reconstruction in this modified YOLO setup, it is important to emphasize the number of simplifications required to achieve this result. Most notably, the attack is conducted under inference-mode conditions, where both the client and attacker operate with fixed normalization statistics and linearized gradient behavior in the BatchNorm layers, as described in Section 4.2.1. This setup dramatically simplifies the inversion problem compared to the more realistic training-mode scenario.

Additionally, the model was altered to be both shallower and to include skip connections, two architectural changes known to increase susceptibility to inversion attacks. The extent of these modifications suggests that the original YOLOv8-nano architecture is inherently robust to gradient inversion, due to its depth and lack of inversion-prone features. Supporting this, Appendix B




Figure 5: Gradient inversion attack on object detection on an altered version of the YOLO v8 nano model, SSIM=0.025

includes failed attack attempts on the unmodified YOLOv8 model in inference mode and a modified pre-activation YOLOv8-nano model in training mode, both of which show no meaningful recovery of input content despite extensive optimization. Together, these findings illustrate the difficulty of launching successful GIAs on production-grade detection pipelines without major architectural concessions.

6 Discussion

Throughout this work, we have systematically investigated when and how GIAs succeed under varying architectural and procedural conditions. Table 1 summarizes the effectiveness of these attacks across three representative model types under different settings. The model types are: i) pre-activation ResNet18 (Pre), ii) ResNet18, and iii) a production-grade YOLOv8-nano object detector.

We note that the pre-activation ResNet18 consistently leaks information across all settings. This aligns with our earlier observations (Sections 4.1 and 4.2) that design choices such as normalization-before-convolution, skip connections, shallow and wide networks, significantly amplify vulnerability to inversion. In contrast, the ResNet18 variant, which applies normalization after convolution, is notably more resilient and attacks only succeed under idealized conditions (e.g., inference mode). The YOLOv8-nano, despite being targeted with state-of-the-art methods, shows no vulnerability unless its architecture is substantially altered, highlighting the inherent robustness of deep, heterogeneous pipelines typical of modern detection models.

The table also reinforces how attacker assumptions critically shape perceived vulnerability. Inference mode bypasses nonlinearities introduced during training-mode backpropagation, making inversion easier. Likewise, access to client-side normalization statistics drastically improves attack feasibility, even for otherwise secure models. Among all tested scenarios, the setting in which clients do not share statistics remains both the most realistic and the most difficult to attack, underscoring its relevance for privacy-conscious deployments. We discuss normalization beyond BatchNorm in Appendix C.

Together, these findings suggest that the success of gradient inversion attacks hinges less on attacker sophistication and more on system design. Factors such as model complexity, network width,

Table 1: Attack success across model types and client settings. ✓ indicates clear successful reconstruction; × indicates no meaningful leakage; – denotes that the attack was not run but inferred successful.

Model	No Stats Shared	Stats Shared	Inference Mode	Architectural Modification
ResNet18 (Pre)	✓	✓	–	–
ResNet18 (Standard)	×	×	✓	–
YOLOv8-nano	×	×	×	✓

* Includes inference mode and model changes increasing vulnerability.

the use of skip connections, and the placement of normalization layers can significantly influence privacy leakage. This highlights the importance of architectural awareness when deploying models in federated or privacy-sensitive environments. In such contexts, auditing model designs and update procedures may be just as critical as developing explicit defenses. Notably, no successful attack has yet been demonstrated in scenarios where models avoid pre-activation normalization and are trained in standard training mode. However, the future strength of GIAs remains uncertain, and system robustness should still be evaluated under these more lenient conditions.

A recurring challenge in the GIA literature is the absence of standardized benchmarks. Our experiments show that minor architectural or procedural differences, e.g., normalization order or training mode, can drastically alter attack outcomes. We believe future work should prioritize reproducible, benchmarked settings that explicitly specify attacker knowledge, training configurations, and model design.

7 Conclusion

This work revisits the feasibility of gradient inversion attacks under realistic conditions, challenging common assumptions such as inference-mode training and simplified models. We showed that these assumptions dramatically simplify the inversion task, whereas attacks in standard training mode become substantially more difficult, and only succeed when multiple vulnerability factors align.

Our experiments highlight that model architecture plays a pivotal role: shallow, wide networks with pre-activation normalization are especially vulnerable against GIAs, while deeper models with post-activation normalization demonstrate strong resistance. In particular, placing normalization **after** convolutions introduces non-linearities in the backpropagation that significantly obfuscate the gradients, potentially rendering GIAs ineffective.

We introduced two training-mode GIA variants and demonstrated the first successful attack on a modified YOLOv8-nano detector trained on COCO. These results underscore that while attacks remain possible, they require narrow and highly favorable conditions.

To guide future evaluation and mitigation efforts, we emphasize the importance of grounding GIA research in realistic client behavior, attacker constraints, and model designs beyond permissive academic setups.

Availability

The implementation of our Gradient Inversion Attack examples is publicly available at:

<https://github.com/aidotse/LeakPro/tree/main/examples/gia>

Acknowledgments

This work was partially funded by the Swedish innovation agency, Vinnova, under grant 2023-03000.

References

- [1] Takuya Akiba, Shotaro Sano, Toshihiko Yanase, Takeru Ohta, and Masanori Koyama. 2019. Optuna: A next-generation hyperparameter optimization framework. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*. 2623–2631. doi:10.1145/3292500.3330701
- [2] Jason Ansel, Edward Yang, Horace He, Natalia Gimelshein, Animesh Jain, Michael Voznesensky, Bin Bao, Peter Bell, David Berard, Evgeni Burovski, Geeta Chauhan, Anjali Chourdia, Will Constable, Alban Desmaison, Zachary DeVito, Elias Ellison, Will Feng, Jiong Gong, Michael Gschwind, Brian Hirsh, Sherlock Huang, Kshiteej Kalambarakar, Laurent Kirsch, Michael Lazos, Mario Lezcano, Yanbo Liang, Jason Liang, Yinghai Lu, CK Luk, Bert Maher, Yunjie Pan, Christian Puhres, Matthias Reso, Mark Saroufim, Marcos Yukio Siraichi, Helen Suk, Michael Suo, Phil Tillet, Eikan Wang, Xiaodong Wang, William Wen, Shunting Zhang, Xu Zhao, Keren Zhou, Richard Zou, Ajit Mathews, Gregory Chanan, Peng Wu, and Soumith Chintala. 2024. PyTorch 2: Faster Machine Learning Through Dynamic Python Bytecode Transformation and Graph Compilation. In *29th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, Volume 2 (ASPLOS '24)*. ACM. doi:10.1145/3620665.3640366
- [3] Nicolas Carlini, Jamie Hayes, Milad Nasr, Matthew Jagielski, Vikash Sehwal, Florian Tramèr, Borja Balle, Daphne Ippolito, and Eric Wallace. 2023. Extracting training data from diffusion models. In *32nd USENIX security symposium (USENIX Security 23)*. 5253–5270.
- [4] Dimitar Iliev Dimitrov, Mislav Balunovic, Nikola Konstantinov, and Martin Vechev. 2022. Data leakage in federated averaging. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research* (2022).
- [5] Hao Fang, Bin Chen, Xuan Wang, Zhi Wang, and Shu-Tao Xia. 2023. Gifd: A generative gradient inversion method with feature domain optimization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 4967–4976.
- [6] Matt Fredrikson, Somesh Jha, and Thomas Ristenpart. 2015. Model inversion attacks that exploit confidence information and basic countermeasures. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*. 1322–1333.
- [7] Jonas Geiping, Hartmut Bauermeister, Hannah Dröge, and Michael Moeller. 2020. Inverting gradients-how easy is it to break privacy in federated learning? *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 16937–16947.
- [8] Jiahui Geng, Yongli Mou, Qing Li, Feifei Li, Oya Beyan, Stefan Decker, and Chunming Rong. 2023. Improved gradient inversion attacks and defenses in federated learning. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data* 10, 6 (2023), 839–850.
- [9] Pengxin Guo, Runxi Wang, Shuang Zeng, Jinjing Zhu, Haoning Jiang, Yanran Wang, Yuyin Zhou, Feifei Wang, Hui Xiong, and Liangqiong Qu. 2025. Exploring the vulnerabilities of federated learning: A deep dive into gradient inversion attacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.11514* (2025).
- [10] Koh Jun Hao, Sy-Tuyen Ho, Ngoc-Bao Nguyen, and Ngai-Man Cheung. 2024. On the Vulnerability of Skip Connections to Model Inversion Attacks. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 140–157.
- [11] Ali Hatamizadeh, Hongxu Yin, Pavlo Molchanov, Andriy Myronenko, Wenqi Li, Prerna Dogra, Andrew Feng, Mona G Flores, Jan Kautz, Daguang Xu, et al. 2023. Do gradient inversion attacks make federated learning unsafe? *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging* 42, 7 (2023), 2044–2056.
- [12] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. 2016. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 770–778.
- [13] Yangsibo Huang, Samyak Gupta, Zhao Song, Kai Li, and Sanjeev Arora. 2021. Evaluating gradient inversion attacks and defenses in federated learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 34 (2021), 7232–7241.
- [14] Integritetsskyddsmyndigheten (IMY). 2023. *Slutrapport om IMY:s pilotprojekt med regulatorisk testverksamhet om dataskydd*. Slutrapport IMY-2023-2602. Integritetsskyddsmyndigheten, Stockholm, Sweden. <https://www.imy.se/globalassets/dokument/rapporter/slutrapport-om-imys-pilotprojekt-med-regulatorisk-testverksamhet-om-dataskydd-230315.pdf>
- [15] Glenn Jocher, Jing Qiu, and Ayush Chaurasia. 2023. *Ultralytics YOLO*. <https://github.com/ultralytics/ultralytics>
- [16] Peter Kairouz, H Brendan McMahan, Brendan Avent, Aurélien Bellet, Mehdi Ben-Bennis, Arjun Nitin Bhagoji, Kallista Bonawitz, Zachary Charles, Graham Cormode, Rachel Cummings, et al. 2021. Advances and open problems in federated learning. *Foundations and trends® in machine learning* 14, 1–2 (2021), 1–210.
- [17] Jakub Konečný, H Brendan McMahan, Felix X Yu, Peter Richtárik, Ananda Theertha Suresh, and Dave Bacon. 2016. Federated learning: Strategies for improving communication efficiency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.05492* (2016).
- [18] Marcus Lassila, Johan Östman, Khac-Hoang Ngo, and Alexandre Graell i Amat. 2025. Practical Bayes-Optimal Membership Inference Attacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.07146* (2025).
- [19] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. 2014. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *European conference on computer vision*. Springer, 740–755.
- [20] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Aguera y Arcas. 2017. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*. PMLR, 1273–1282.
- [21] Felix Sattler, Simon Wiedemann, Klaus-Robert Müller, and Wojciech Samek. 2019. Robust and communication-efficient federated learning from non-iid data. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems* 31, 9 (2019), 3400–3413.
- [22] Reza Shokri, Marco Stronati, Congzheng Song, and Vitaly Shmatikov. 2017. Membership inference attacks against machine learning models. In *2017 IEEE symposium on security and privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 3–18.
- [23] Ziteng Sun, Peter Kairouz, Ananda Theertha Suresh, and H Brendan McMahan. 2019. Can you really backdoor federated learning? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.07963* (2019).
- [24] Viktor Valadi, Xinchu Qiu, Pedro Porto Buarque De Gusmao, Nicholas D Lane, and Mina Alibeigi. 2023. {FedVal}: Different good or different bad in federated learning. In *32nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 23)*. 6365–6380.
- [25] Zihan Wang, Jason Lee, and Qi Lei. 2023. Reconstructing training data from model gradient, provably. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR, 6595–6612.
- [26] Marvin Xhemrishi, Johan Östman, Antonia Wachter-Zeh, and Alexandre Graell i Amat. 2025. FedGT: Identification of malicious clients in federated learning with secure aggregation. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* (2025).
- [27] Zipeng Ye, Wenjian Luo, Qi Zhou, and Yubo Tang. 2024. High-fidelity gradient inversion in distributed learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 38. 19983–19991.
- [28] Hongxu Yin, Arun Mallya, Arash Vahdat, Jose M Alvarez, Jan Kautz, and Pavlo Molchanov. 2021. See through gradients: Image batch recovery via gradient inversion. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 16337–16346.
- [29] Hongxu Yin, Pavlo Molchanov, Jose M. Alvarez, Zhizhong Li, Arun Mallya, Derek Hoiem, Niraj K Jha, and Jan Kautz. 2020. Dreaming to Distill: Data-free Knowledge Transfer via DeepInversion. In *The IEEE/CVF Conf. Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*.
- [30] Kai Yue, Richeng Jin, Chau-Wai Wong, Dror Baron, and Huaiyu Dai. 2023. Gradient obfuscation gives a false sense of security in federated learning. In *32nd USENIX security symposium (USENIX Security 23)*. 6381–6398.
- [31] Sergey Zagoruyko and Nikos Komodakis. 2016. Wide residual networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.07146* (2016).
- [32] Ligeng Zhu, Zhijian Liu, and Song Han. 2019. Deep leakage from gradients. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32 (2019).

A Optuna Optimization Details

Optuna [1] is a software framework for efficient hyperparameter optimization using a sampling-based search strategy, often leveraging Bayesian optimization or tree-structured Parzen estimators (TPE). It works by iteratively evaluating a user-defined objective function and selecting new trial configurations based on past results, gradually converging toward optimal hyperparameters.

In our experiments, Optuna is used to jointly select the most vulnerable data batch and optimize attack-specific parameters. For each experimental setting, we randomly sample 5 data batches from the dataset and conduct 100 optimization trials. In each trial, one data batch is selected and reconstructed using a unique set of attack hyperparameters. The trial yielding the highest structural similarity (SSIM) between the reconstructed and target image is selected for evaluation.

The hyperparameters tuned during optimization include:

- **BatchNorm regularizer weight** (λ_{BN})
- **Total variation (TV) regularizer weight** (λ_{TV})
- **Attack optimizer learning rate**
- **Gradient comparison mode** (either using all weights or only the subset with largest changes)
- **Image smoothing toggle** (whether to apply 3×3 median pooling every 500 iterations)

Hyperparameter ranges are chosen broadly based on prior experiments and observed convergence behavior to avoid prematurely biasing the optimization toward known favorable configurations. In all cases, the objective function maximizes SSIM between the reconstructed and target images.

B Additional Results

This section presents examples of failed reconstructions to illustrate typical failure modes in challenging attack regimes.

In Figure 6, we show an attack on a YOLOv8-nano model modified to use pre-activation normalization, with the rest of the architecture mimicking the successful setup shown in Figure 5. While this configuration enables training-mode attacks on classification models such as ResNet-18, it still fails to yield meaningful reconstructions here. Although some structured patterns emerge, they do not reflect features of the original input, underscoring the difficulty of attacking detection models in training mode, even under favorable architectural conditions.




Figure 6: Failed reconstruction from a gradient inversion attack on an altered YOLOv8-nano model with pre-activation normalization and training-mode updates. Although some structured patterns emerge, they do not reflect meaningful features of the original input. SSIM = 0.024.

Figure 7 shows an attack on the original YOLOv8-nano model, with clients training in inference mode. Even under this lenient setting, the reconstruction collapses to a uniform gray output across samples. This consistent failure further emphasizes the robustness of the original architecture, which lacks inversion-prone components.

C Impact of Batch Size and Alternative Normalization Methods

In the no-statistics attack setting, batch size plays a pivotal role. Larger batches yield more stable estimates of the batch mean and



Figure 7: Failed attack on the unmodified YOLOv8-nano model with clients training in inference mode. The reconstruction consistently collapses to uniform gray regardless of input, indicating no signal recovery. SSIM = 0.016.

variance, key components for aligning or inferring normalization behavior during inversion. Statistically, as the batch size increases, the empirical mean and variance converge toward the population parameters, facilitating more accurate reconstruction of internal normalization statistics. However, this comes at a cost: large batches also introduce greater sample diversity, which increases the complexity of the inversion task. Conversely, very small batches lead to high variance in the estimated statistics, making them unreliable for gradient alignment. In practice, we observe a “sweet spot” where batch size is large enough to provide stable statistics, yet small enough to limit reconstruction ambiguity.

These observations suggest that normalization methods which do not rely on batch-level statistics, such as instance normalization or layer normalization, may offer greater inherent robustness. Since these techniques compute statistics independently for each sample or across channel dimensions, they deny the attacker access to a shared, batch-level signal that can be exploited. As a result, models using such normalizations may significantly reduce vulnerability to gradient inversion attacks.