

PASS: Parameters Audit-based Secure and Fair Federated Learning Scheme against Free Rider

Jianhua Wang

Abstract—Federated Learning (FL) as a secure distributed learning frame gains interest in Internet of Things (IoT) due to its capability of protecting private data of participants. However, traditional FL systems are vulnerable to attacks such as Free-Rider (FR) attack, which causes not only unfairness but also privacy leakage and inferior performance to FL systems. The existing defense mechanisms against FR attacks only concern the scenarios where the adversaries declare less than 50% of the total amount of clients. Moreover, they lose effectiveness in resisting selfish FR (SFR) attacks. In this paper, we propose a *Parameter Audit-based Secure and fair federated learning Scheme (PASS)* against FR attacks. The PASS has the following key features: (a) works well in the scenario where adversaries are more than 50% of the total amount of clients; (b) is effective in countering anonymous FR attacks and SFR attacks; (c) prevents from privacy leakage without accuracy loss. Extensive experimental results verify the data protecting capability in mean square error against privacy leakage and reveal the effectiveness of PASS in terms of a higher defense success rate and lower false positive rate against anonymous SFR attacks. Note in addition, PASS produces no effect on FL accuracy when there is no FR adversary.

Index Terms—Federated learning, free-rider attack, internet of things, privacy-preserving

I. INTRODUCTION

With the growing attention to the data privacy, Federated Learning (FL), as a kind of secure distributed Machine Learning (ML) frame, is extensively used in Internet of Things (IoT) [1]–[4]. In general, FL participates, such as mobile phones, remote laptops, and edge IoT devices controlled by a macro base station, maintain a global model without sharing their own private dataset. The FL opens new research directions in artificial intelligence because it can train personalized models without violating any user private data [3].

As described in the left part of **Fig. 1**, conventional FL with IoT participates follows the training process. Firstly, the central server allocates the initialized model to each client. Then, FL participates train the global model via their own private dataset, and upload the local update to the central server. After that, the server adopts the model aggregation algorithms to aggregate the local update. At last, FL participates receive the new global model update to carry on the next training. With the advantage of training model in the local edge, FL could protect the data from leakage.

However, there are a crowd of vulnerabilities existing in conventional FL systems and model aggregation algorithms, such as data poisoning attack [5], free rider attack [6]–[8],

backdoor attack [9], inference attack [7]. Various studies focus on the privacy-preserving of FL in the scenario of IoT devices [10]–[12]. In this paper, we pay attention to build a secure and fair FL scheme against free rider attack.

Free Rider (FR), benefiting from the well-trained model without contributing any private dataset and computing resources. Moreover, FR clients also could obtain the leakage gradients or local update to reconstruct the private data [13], [14]. With this mind, the FR attack is the extremely threat in FL system. As shown in the right part of **Fig. 1**, in the step 3, the FR will upload a fake local update to central server.

In the previous of our paper which is accepted by IEEE ISCC 2022, we proposed two kinds of FR attack, namely Anonymous Free Rider (AFR) and Selfish Free Rider (SFR). The AFR denotes that FR does not own any private dataset and computation resources. In this scenario, the AFR is seems like Gaussian attack [15], which clients upload the stochastic gaussian noise to central server. In contrast, the SFR represents that FRs have their own private dataset and training ability, but they unwilling to devote their data and computation resources into FL system. Our extensive results demonstrate the SFR has better attack performance than AFR. Thus, in this paper, we use the SFR attack as the baseline FR attack.

Facing FR attack, various defense studies pay attention to evaluating the client contribution by calculating cosine similarity between the global update and local update [16], [17]. In their perspective, the useful local update must similar with global update. However, facing SFR which trains initialization model using public dataset, the defense model will fail to distinguish the honest and SFR clients.

To address this issue, we investigate the extensive approaches to evaluate the client contribution. There are two main approaches: data quality and data quantity [18]. However, data quantity could be forged by FR and traditional data quality evaluation will cause the private data leakage. As detailed description in Section II.B, Liu *et al.* [19] summarized four kinds of evaluation methods: self-report, utility game, Shapley value and individual performance. However, the self-report has the same trouble with data quantity; utility game is affected by the order of joining in the FL; Shapley value faces too much communication consume and data leakage. In this paper, we emphasis that individual performance is the most intuitive and reasonable approach for contribution evaluation. With this mind, we propose parameters auditable method to evaluate the contribution via transmitting the local update to each client.

However, extensive studies prove that adversarial will reconstruct the input data by collecting the gradients of each

training round [13], [14]. To solve this issue, we add privacy-preserving strategy into our scheme. Motivated by [14], which investigates the gaussian noise and gradient prune approaches

to defend the Deep Leakage from Gradient (DLG) attack, we combine the noise and prune strategy in this paper. In other words, we utilize the gaussian Local Differential Privacy (LDP)




Fig. 1. The schematic diagram of federated learning with fair clients and free rider clients.

to add gaussian perturbation in local side. According to the existing explores [14], [20] and our extensive experiments, the noise with the distribution variance 10^{-2} and mean 0, could prevent the data from DLG. At the same time, the gaussian LDP has little performance loss in FL training process.

Meanwhile, for evaluating the client contribution, we propose a parameters audit-based scheme, which allows each participate to audit the local update. But this scheme will extremely improve the complexity. Hence, based on gaussian LDP, we adopt parameters prune method to make parameters sparsely and reduce the time consume. Notably, the same as gaussian LDP, the parameters prune method can not decrease the accuracy of FL system.

In brief, we propose a *Parameters Audit-based Secure and fair FL Scheme (PASS)* against FR. The PASS contains two components, privacy-preserving strategy, and contribution evaluation. The client whose contribution is lower than threshold, will be eliminated from the FL system. We conduct extensive experiments to find the proper hyper-parameters of PASS in Cifar10 and MNIST data with independent and identically distributed (iid) and non-iid. Notably, the model aggregation algorithm Federated Averaging (FedAvg) is adopted.

The main contributions of this work are two-folds:

- We propose a Parameters Audit-based Secure and fair FL Scheme (PASS) against FR attack. In this scheme, we first propose parameters auditable strategy to evaluate the client contribution intuitively.
- We combine the gaussian LDP and parameters prune method to reduce the risk of DLG attack with little accuracy loss, and reduce the complexity theoretically in the parameters transmitting.

The extensive experiments have demonstrated that:

- Our PASS could effectively defense the DLG attack, which have the same level with the state-of-the-art (sota) method [20].
- Comparing with other defense models, PASS could

achieve 100% Defense Success Rate (DSR) and 20% False Positive Rate (FPR), which has the same level with the sota method RFFL [16] and lower FPR than other defense mechanism.

TABLE I LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS USED IN PAPER

Abbreviation	Description
FL	Federated Learning
ML	Machine Learning
IoT	Internet of Things
FR	Free Rider
AFR	Anonymous Free Rider
SFR	Selfish Free Rider
DLG	Deep Leakage from Gradient
LDP	Local Differential Privacy
IID	Independent and Identically Distributed
SGD	Stochastic Gradient Descent
PASS	Parameters Audit-based Secure and fair Scheme
FedAvg	Federated Averaging
SOTA	State-Of-The-Art
DSR	Defense Success Rate
FPR	False Positive Rate

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the preliminary of FR attack, contribution evaluation, and the defense mechanisms against FR attack. Section 3 demonstrates the PASS design, and Section 4 introduces the experimental setup and results. Section 5 summarizes the conclusion.

II. PRELIMINARY AND RELATED WORK

In this section, we will demonstrate the preliminary and related work of federated learning and FR attack in FL settings. In addition, we will represent the preliminary of deep leakage

from gradient. At last, we will give the related work of contribution evaluation in FL.

A. Free rider Attack

In the FL scenario, the FR represents a portion of individuals who benefits from well-trained models from cooperative learning without contributing any computation resources and privacy data [6], [21]. In general terms, there are two categories of FR. One is adversarial clients without any private dataset. The other is a selfish client unwilling to devote their private data to model training and/or save the computation resources.

As shown in **Fig. 1**, in the right part of the diagram, the main difference between normal FL system and FL with FR is that the red step 3. FR clients will upload a fake local update to central server, while normal FL with fair clients will upload a well-trained local update to central server.

Several researches are focus on AFR attack, such as plain free-riding and disguised free-riding in [6]. The plain free-riding clients will upload an allocated global update to server. It seems like $\Delta\tilde{\theta}_n^{r+1} = \Delta\tilde{\theta}^r$, which $\Delta\tilde{\theta}^r$ denotes the global update allocated by server in round r , and $\Delta\tilde{\theta}_n^{r+1}$ denotes the local update uploaded by FR client n . Furthermore, disguised free-riding clients will upload a gaussian noised global update to escape the detection of defense model. For example, FR clients upload $\Delta\tilde{\theta}_n^{r+1} = \Delta\tilde{\theta}^r + \varepsilon$, where $\varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_n^2)$. Those are basic types of FR attack.

In our previous paper, we studied the FR attack in two scenarios, AFR attack, and SFR attack respectively. We define the AFRs who do not possess any privacy dataset and do not have any training ability of a large model. They possibly are fake clients and only want to filch the model parameters. In contrast, we consider that SFR who have privacy datasets, are real clients and are equipped with small computation power. However, the SFR are unwilling to devote their privacy dataset to the global model. In other words, SFR expect to obtain a well-trained global model without wasting abundant computation power and using a private dataset.

As shown in Fig. 2, (a) describes a normal FR attack, which FR clients upload a local update with stochastic gaussian noise; (b) represents a AFR attack, which FR clients first upload a local update with noise, and in further training rounds, AFR utilizes the Adam optimizer to update the allocated global update; (c) indicates a SFR attack, which FR clients first upload a local update with well-trained model, and the following training rounds, SFR adopts the Adam optimizer to update the allocated global update. Notably, SFR owns some public datasets and a certain extent training ability. As stated in our previous paper, SFR attack is an advanced FR attack which brings higher false positive rate to breakdown the FL system. Hence, we adopt SFR attack to test the stability of PASS.

B. Contribution Evaluation

The contribution evaluation of participates is the key issue of FL system, because the fair incentive mechanism will extremely evoke the training passion of distributed clients. In addition, unprejudiced contribution evaluation will attract the clients to devote high quality and private dataset into FL training.

Various researches devote into design reasonable contribution evaluation method [18], [19], [22], [23]. As stated in [18], Zhan *et al.* summarized two kinds of approaches to evaluate the users contribution for designing incentive mechanism, including data quantity and data quality. However, data quantity approach is likely to being faced with fake quantity problem. Liu *et al.* [19] summarized four contribution evaluation approaches: (a) self-report the data quality, quantity, and committed computational and communication resources to server, but it strongly relies on truthful self-reporting; (b) utility game, which focuses on the changes when a client join in the FL system, but it is affected by the order of participating the FL; (c) Shapley value, which evaluates the contribution of clients via ablation, but it will lead too much communication overhead; (d) individual performance, which focuses on the performance of each client in specific tasks, but it is effected by the threshold.

C. Defense Mechanism against FR attack

RFFL. RFFL [16] is the state-of-the-art (sota) defensive method against FR and label-flipping attack. They utilize reputation mechanism to evaluate the contribution of clients. To be specific, as shown in Equation (1), once contribution c_i^r lower than threshold, client i will be removed from FL system.

$$c_i^r = \alpha \times c_i^{r-1} + (1-\alpha) \times \cos(\Delta\tilde{\theta}^r, \Delta\tilde{\theta}_i^r) \quad (1)$$

Median and Trimmed Median. Yin *et al.* [24] utilized coordinate-wise median and coordinate-wise trimmed mean instead of weighted averaging. The core approach of coordinate-wise median is that, given the set of the local update $\{\Delta\tilde{\theta}_n^r\}_{n=1}^N$ in round r , the aggregate update is $\Delta\tilde{\theta}^r = \text{median}(\Delta\tilde{\theta}_j^r)$ which is the j -th local update. Similarly, the core approach of coordinate-wise trimmed median is that, given a coefficient $\delta \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$ and the local update set $S_N = \{\Delta\tilde{\theta}_n^r\}_{n=1}^N$, the coordinate-wise δ -trimmed mean is $\frac{1}{(1-2\delta)N} \sum_{s \in S_m} s$, where S_m denotes removing the largest and the smallest δ fraction of S_N .

SignSGD. Bernstein [25] proposed a communication efficient approach called SignSGD, which is robust to arbitrary scaling. In this approach, participants only upload the element-wise signs of the gradients without the magnitudes, as shown in Equation (2).

$$\Delta\tilde{\theta}^{r+1} = \Delta\tilde{\theta}^r - \eta \text{sign}(\nabla\tilde{\theta}_n^r) \quad (2)$$

III. PASS DESIGN

In this section, firstly, we will introduce the PASS, which contains the goals and the core algorithm of our scheme. After then, we describe the privacy-preserving strategy and contribution evaluation method in the PASS.

A. Scheme Description

We propose PASS to utilize privacy-preserving strategy to evaluate the contribution of each participate, and achieve the

secure and fair FL system against FR attack. With this mind, PASS has the following design goals:

Goal 1. PASS should protect the privacy dataset of each client preventing from DLG [14].

Goal 2. PASS should maintain the performance of the FL system when we adopt privacy-preserving strategy.

Goal 3. PASS should distinguish between the FR clients and fair clients based on client's contribution with low false positive rate.

Goal 4. In PASS, the time complexity for clients and central server should be constrained within an acceptable level.

Now we will introduce the low diagram of the PASS. As shown in **Fig. 3**, firstly, after being allocated initialized global model parameters θ^0 , each FL client trains θ^0 using private

dataset to obtain local model update $\tilde{\theta}^{r+1}$. And then, each client utilizes Gaussian LDP mechanism and parameters compression to obtain the secure local model update $\Delta\tilde{\theta}_{n,ldp}^{r+1}$ (as shown in line 20-21 of the **Algorithm 1**). Moreover, each client uploads $\Delta\tilde{\theta}_{n,ldp}^{r+1}$ to the central server. Notice that, the $\Delta\tilde{\theta}_{n,ldp}^{r+1}$ not only is used to audit parameters by other clients who possesses own privacy dataset, but also is used to achieve model aggregation (Step (3) in **Fig. 2**). As stated in line 12 of the **Algorithm 1**, the server once receives $\Delta\tilde{\theta}_{n,ldp}^{r+1}$ from each client, it will allocate the new global model parameters $\tilde{\theta}^{r+1}$ and the local update of each client of the previous round $\Delta\tilde{\theta}_{i,ldp}^r$, where $i \in N$ to realize parameters auditable.




Fig. 2. Different types of free rider attack in FL.




Fig. 3. Step (2) in Fig. 2: the PASS diagram after being allocated initialized model.

After that, in client-side, each client audits the received local update using own private dataset and calculate the accuracy divergence $AccDiv_i^r = Acc(\tilde{\theta}^r) - Acc(\Delta\tilde{\theta}_{n,ldp}^r + \tilde{\theta}_{i,ldp}^{r-1})$ of each local update with previous global update, which is called parameters audit. In server-side, server get the $AccDiv_i^r, i \in N$ and calculate the client contribution c_i using activation function $\tanh()$ to

map the c_i to $[-1,1]$, which will divide c_i into positive strengthen and negative strengthen. The lower c_i , which denotes contribution lower than threshold $\frac{1}{\beta \times N}$, will be eliminated from the FL system. The detailed algorithm has been stated in **Algorithm 1**.

To achieve the **Goal 1**, **Goal 2**, and **Goal 3**, we need to satisfy the Equation (3), (4), and (5). In Equation (3), the $\Delta\tilde{\theta}^r$ denotes the local update with privacy-preserving strategy, the D is the raw input data while the D_{DLG} is the data reconstructed by DLG attack.

$$\max_{\Delta\tilde{\theta}^r} \|D - D_{DLG}\|^2 \quad (3)$$

Algorithm 1 The PASS Algorithm

Input: Round R , Initial Global Model Parameters θ^0 , Clients N , Learning rate η , Threshold Coefficient β , Gaussian Noise ε , Prune Rate γ , Moving average coefficient α

Output: Update Model Parameters $\tilde{\theta}$

Initialize: $\tilde{\theta}^0 = \theta^0$

```

1: For  $r$  in range ( $R$ ):
2:     # Server
3:     If  $n \in N$  : // client  $n$  is not eliminated
4:         Allocate  $\tilde{\theta}^0$  to Client  $n$ 
5:         To step 16
6:         For  $i$  in range ( $N$ ) : // calculate contribution
7:              $c_i^r = \frac{1}{\alpha \times c_i^{r-1} + (1-\alpha) \times \tanh\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_i^{n-1} AccDiv_i^r\right)}$ 
8:             If  $c_i^r < \frac{1}{\beta \times N}$  : Eliminate  $i$  from  $N$ 
9:             End if
10:        End for
11:         $\Delta\tilde{\theta}^{r+1} = FedAvg(\sum_{n \in N} \Delta\tilde{\theta}_{n,ldp}^{r+1})$  // model aggregation
12:        Allocate  $(\Delta\tilde{\theta}^{r+1}, \Delta\tilde{\theta}_{client 1,ldp}^r, \Delta\tilde{\theta}_{client 2,ldp}^r, \dots, \Delta\tilde{\theta}_{client n,ldp}^r)$  to
Client  $n$ 
13:        To step 16 to continue the FL training
14:        End if
15:        # Client  $n$ 
16:        If  $r = 0$  : Obtain the  $\theta^0$  from the Server
17:        Else: Obtain the  $\Delta\tilde{\theta}^r$  from the Server
18:        End if
19:        Calculate local update  $\Delta\tilde{\theta}_n^{r+1}$  by training with private dataset
20:         $\Delta\tilde{\theta}_{n,ldp}^{r+1} = \Delta\tilde{\theta}_n^{r+1} + \varepsilon$ ,  $\varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_n^2)$  // gaussian LDP
21:         $\Delta\tilde{\theta}_{n,ldp}^{r+1} = (1-\gamma) \cdot \Delta\tilde{\theta}_{n,ldp}^{r+1}$ ,  $\gamma \in [0, 1]$  // parameters prune
22:         $AccDiv_i^r = Acc(\tilde{\theta}^r) - Acc(\Delta\tilde{\theta}_{i,ldp}^r + \tilde{\theta}_{i,ldp}^{r-1})$ ,  $i \in [1, n-1]$  //
Accuracy divergence of previous round using own dataset
23:        Upload  $(\Delta\tilde{\theta}_{n,ldp}^{r+1}, AccDiv_1^r, AccDiv_2^r, \dots, AccDiv_{n-1}^r)$  to Server //
upload the result of parameters audit
24:        To step 6 to continue the FL training
25:        End for
26: Return Model Parameters  $\tilde{\theta}$ 

```

In Equation (4), the Acc denotes the accuracy of normal FL while the Acc' is the FL with privacy-preserving strategy, and the ε means a little range.

$$\text{s.t., } |Acc - Acc'| \leq \varepsilon \quad (4)$$

In Equation (5), DSR and FPR are the evaluation metrics introduced in Section IV.C.

$$\arg \min_{\beta, \gamma \in PASS} FPR, \arg \max_{\beta, \gamma \in PASS} DSR \quad (5)$$

B. Privacy-Preserving Strategy

In this paper, we propose a parameters audit-based FL scheme to evaluate the client contribution to defense the SFR. However, in FL system, server always adopt the SGD optimizer with learning rate η . Thus, some adversarial clients will collect the update gradient to reconstruct the private dataset [14]. The update gradient is likely to being leakage according to Equation (1).

$$\nabla \tilde{\theta}^{r+1} = \frac{\tilde{\theta}^r - \tilde{\theta}^{r+1}}{\eta} \quad (1)$$

With this mind, and to satisfy the **Goal 1**, we utilize the Gaussian LDP and parameter compression to ensure the privacy of dataset. As described in **Algorithm 1**, after calculated local update $\Delta\tilde{\theta}_n^{r+1}$ by training with the private dataset, client will add Gaussian perturbation $\Delta\tilde{\theta}_{n,ldp}^{r+1} = \Delta\tilde{\theta}_n^{r+1} + \varepsilon$, where $\varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_n^2)$. Moreover, $\Delta\tilde{\theta}_{n,ldp}^{r+1}$ will be randomly pruned with the prune rate γ . In the experiment evaluation section, the **Goal 1** and **Goal 2** will be verified.

C. Contribution Evaluation

In contribution evaluation methods, some researchers adopted the cosine similarity to measure the angular distance between updates and to determine the quality of model update [16], [17], [26]. However, FR attack which adds little perturbation into global update as local update, will not be recognized in FL system.

Thus, to satisfy the **Goal 3**, we utilize parameters audit-based method to directly evaluate the contribution of clients, namely validating the other clients local update using the own private dataset in client-side. Notice that, after being received $AccDiv_i^r$, the server will calculate the averaging $AccDiv_i^r$ using $\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_i^{n-1} AccDiv_i^r\right)$ as the basal contribution value.

As described in **Algorithm 1**, after calculated c_i^r of each client i in round r , server will remove the c_i^r which is lower than threshold $\frac{1}{\beta \times N}$. In the experiment evaluation section, the **Goal 3** will be verified.

D. Time Complexity Analysis

In general, frequently communications between server and client will consume a lot of time. However, as stated in line 12 of **Algorithm 1**, we allocate the global update $\Delta\tilde{\theta}^{r+1}$ together with the local update $\Delta\tilde{\theta}_{client n,ldp}^r$. And assuming that in conventional FL system, the communication consumption between server and each client in each round is $\mathcal{O}(1)$, so the time consumption for all clients in all rounds is $\mathcal{O}((1-\gamma) \times (N-1) \times N \times R)$ while conventional FL is $\mathcal{O}(1 \times N \times R)$. In parameters audit phase, the validation consumption is very low in ML, hence we can ignore the time in each round. Comparing with exponential order-level time consumption, the

$(1-\gamma)\times(N-1)\mathcal{O}(1\times N\times R)$ is acceptable. Hence, the **Goal 4** is satisfied.

IV. EXPERIMENT EVALUATION

This section first describes the experimental dependency including the used dataset, baselines, and experimental settings. Then, we introduce the experimental metrics in FR attack evaluation and the PASS evaluation. At last, we demonstrate the experimental results in privacy-preserving strategy to satisfy **Goal 1** and **Goal 2**, and we implement comparisons with other robust model against FR to satisfy the **Goal 3**.

A. Datasets

We utilize MNIST [27] and Cifar10 [28] as standard classification baseline datasets. MNIST includes handwritten digits with 10 classes and has become the most known and used dataset in the classification task. The Cifar10 is made up of 10 classes of 32x32 images with three RGB channels and consists of 50,000 training samples and 10,000 testing samples.

B. Baselines

We implement extensive experiments, which contains the state-of-the-art method, as baselines to reveal the better performance of ours. In this subsection, we will introduce the FR attack baselines and defense baselines.

1) Free Rider Attack

Disguised free-riding. Fraboni *et al.* [6] proposed a disguised free-rider attack using the parameters deviation of different rounds and additive stochastic Gaussian noise multiply several coefficients, as shown in Equation (2). They achieved almost the same accuracy curve as only fair clients.

$$\Delta\tilde{\theta}^{r+1} = \Delta\tilde{\theta}^r + \varepsilon, \varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_n^2) \quad (2)$$

2) Defense Models

RFFL [16], **Median** [24], **Trimmed Median** [24], and **SignSGD** [25] will be implemented as comparing experiments. The experimental settings of each defense model are utilized properly.

C. Experimental Setting

In this subsection, we will give the detailed experimental settings in FR attack and PASS comparison. Then, we introduce the evaluation metrics under the different scenarios.

1) Federated Learning

Models. We implement a 2-layer convolutional neural network (CNN) [29] for MNIST and a 3-layer CNN [30] for CIFAR10 dataset as the base model in FL.

Hyper-Parameters. The FL is trained via Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) optimizer with learning rate $\eta=0.1$ and round $r=200$. The model aggregation algorithm we adopted is FedAvg. In addition, we consider two common types of data, iid and non-iid in MNIST and Cifar10 dataset.

2) Free Rider Attack

Hyper-Parameters. In TABLE II, we demonstrate the number of fair clients and FR clients, the FR ratio in all clients, the type of data, and the number of samples in training and testing. Notably, we consider the FR ratio in three scenarios, including 9%, 33% and 60%.

TABLE II THE SFR ATTACK DETAILS

Fair Clients	FR Clients	FR Ratio	Data Splits	Train Num	Test Num
10	1	9%	MNIST iid/ non-iid	540	60
	5	33%			
	15	60%			
	1	9%	Cifar10 iid/ non-iid	1600	400
	5	33%			
	15	60%			

In TABLE III, the first column denotes the target dataset, namely the data trained by fair clients in FL. The second column is the pre-trained dataset trained by FR clients, which represents that FR is unwilling to contribute the privacy dataset into FL model training. Note that, MNIST iid means that we extend the same MNIST tensor dimension as Cifar10 to simulate the SFR. In addition, we implement Adam optimizers to reveal the effectiveness of SFR attack. The last column is the learning rate and decay of Adam.

TABLE III THE HYPER-PARAMETERS IN SFR ATTACK

Target Dataset Trained by Fair Clients	Pre-train Dataset Trained by FR Clients	Optimizer	Learning Rate
Cifar 10	iid	Adam	0.015
	non-iid		(Decay: 0.997)

Note: 1) Decay = Learning Rate Decay, which means slowly reducing or decaying the learning rate after each round. 2) Optimizer utilizes the default settings.

3) PASS

Privacy-Preserving Strategy. The DLG experimental settings are analogous with [14], [20]. We implement L-BFGS [31] optimizer and conduct 300 iterations of optimization to reconstruct the raw data.

Hyper-Parameters. In privacy-preserving strategy, we adopt the Gaussian LDP noise distributions $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_n^2)$ with the variance satisfy $\sigma_n^2 \in \{0, 10^{-1}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-3}, 10^{-4}, 10^{-5}\}$ and the parameters prune rate γ satisfy $\gamma \in [0, 1)$. In PASS, the moving average coefficient α is similar to [16], which is $\alpha=0.95$, and the threshold coefficient β will satisfy $\beta \geq 1$, which is proved in APPENDIX I. The threshold value of PASS is $\frac{1}{\beta \times N}$, which

the N denotes the participates number in FL system.

4) Evaluation Metrics

In this subsection, we will give the evaluation metrics in DLG evaluation and PASS evaluation.

DLG Evaluation. We utilize the Mean-Square-Error (MSE) between the reconstructed data and raw input to quantify the effectiveness of defenses. A lower MSE indicates the more likely to data leakage. In addition, we adopt accuracy to reveal the performance loss after using privacy-preserving strategy. It is not acceptable that, after using privacy-preserving strategy, the accuracy of the whole model has been decreased. In general, we need to achieve higher MSE and lower accuracy decreasing.

PASS Evaluation. We define Defense Success Rate (DSR) to reveal the effectiveness of defense system. The DSR denotes the eliminating ratio of FR clients in the defense system. Moreover, we adopt False Positive Rate (FPR) to evaluate the performance of attacking defense baselines using SFR methods. The FPR denotes the removing ratio of fair clients in the detection of baselines. We assume that the FL server assigns several absolute fair clients so that higher FPR will be prone to puzzle servers to remove fair clients from the training process. In addition, adversarial FR clients will benefit from the training process until they are removed from FL training. In other words, a better defense model means lower FPR and higher DSR.

$$DSR = \frac{\# \text{Number of Eliminating FR Clients}}{\# \text{Number of All Fair Clients}} \times 100\% \quad (5)$$

$$FP = \frac{\# \text{Number of Eliminating Fair Clients}}{\# \text{Number of All Fair Clients}} \times 100\% \quad (6)$$

D. Privacy-Preserving Comparison against DLG

In this subsection, we will reveal the effectiveness of privacy-preserving strategy against the DLG. Motivated by [14], which has proposed the Gaussian noise with variance range from 10^{-1} to 10^{-4} in order to defense DLG, we implement Gaussian LDP in experiments. To satisfy the **Goal 1** and **Goal 2**, we divide this subsection into two parts. Firstly, for verifying **Goal 1**, we demonstrate the Acc curve using Gaussian LDP with various of perturbation levels and parameters prune rates in (1). Then, to satisfy **Goal 2**, we uncover the performance when we adopt Gaussian LDP and parameters prune scheme in (2).

1) LDP Noise Level and Parameters Prune

At first, we conduct six noise levels in Gaussian LDP where variance $\sigma_n^2 \in \{0, 10^{-1}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-3}, 10^{-4}, 10^{-5}\}$. The accuracy is gradually decreasing with the more noise. However, the sharply drop appears when variance $\sigma_n^2 = 10^{-1}$. Hence, when we add $\varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_n^2)$ where variance $\sigma_n^2 = 10^{-2}$, the accuracy in MNIST and Cifar10 is similar as $\sigma_n^2 = 0$ while the trained data has the maximize privacy.

2) Privacy-Preserving Performance against DLG

To satisfy the **Goal 2**, and to protect system from DLG, we need to test the privacy-preserving performance against DLG in this subsection. Firstly, we measure the MSE in different noise levels and parameters prune rates. The MSE is more than 2.0 when $\sigma_n^2 \geq 10^{-2}$ while MSE is lower than 1.0 when $\sigma_n^2 \leq 10^{-4}$. As evaluation in [20], when MSE more than 1.49, the system could defense the DLG. As shown in Fig. 4, if we want to achieve the same defense level with [20], the MSE of our privacy-preserving strategy is more than 1.49, which signifies we need select $\sigma_n^2 \geq 10^{-2}$.

MSE	0.0504	0.0636	0.0283	0.0471	0.0319	0.6379	1.0758	1.4590	1.6525	1.2799
Soteria										
P_{fc}	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%
MSE	0.0325	0.0572	0.1866	0.2100	1.3378	1.3856	2.4632	2.7602	2.9990	2.9257
Ours										
Prune Rate	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%
Noise Level	10^{-5}	10^{-5}	10^{-4}	10^{-4}	10^{-3}	10^{-3}	10^{-2}	10^{-2}	10^{-1}	10^{-1}

Fig. 4. The MSE comparison with Soteria [20] against DLG.

In conclusion, considering the LDP noise level in 1) and the privacy-preserving performance against DLG in 2), we adopt the $\sigma_n^2 = 10^{-2}$ as the LDP noise level.

E. Value of Threshold Coefficient β and Prune rate γ

In the APPENDIX, we have proved that the threshold coefficient β needs satisfy $\beta \geq 1$. In this subsection, we investigate the PASS performance of different β and γ .

To find the best β , we firstly implement different β under the prune rate $\gamma \in (0, 1]$. We implement extensive experiments with 10 fair clients and 1, 5, 15 FR clients under $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ and different β . We select $\beta = 1.75$ as the threshold coefficient. In this situation, PASS achieves DSR 80% and FPR 20.67%, which reach the balance of DSR and FPR. To investigate the effect of different γ , we fix the $\beta = 1.75$ and implement extensive experiments. We calculate the average DSR and FPR in $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ when FR ratio is 9%, 33%, and 60%. To satisfy the **Goal 3**, we need to select hyper-parameters which has higher DSR and lower FPR. With this mind, we select $\gamma = 10\%$, $\gamma = 70\%$, and $\gamma = 90\%$. However, to satisfy **Goal 4**, we need to use larger γ to reduce the communication consume. Hence, we adopt $\gamma = 90\%$ as the prune rate. In this situation, we achieve 100% DSR and 20% FPR.

F. PASS Performance Comparisons against SFR

In the previous section, we have confirmed all hyper-parameters. As the result, in this subsection, we will investigate the PASS performance compared with other defense models, such as RFFL (which is the sota model), Median, Trimmed Median and SignSGD.




Fig. 5. The FPR of defense models against AFR and SFR attack.

We adopt properly experimental settings of each defense model. As shown in **Fig. 5**, the findings are two-fold: (1) facing normal FR attack and the SFR attack, PASS we proposed achieves the lowest FPR; (2) the SFR attack scenario has the better attack performance comparing with AFR attack. Moreover, notably, facing AFR attack and SFR attack, each defense model could reach the almost 100% DSR. In other words, at the defense level, many robust mechanisms could realize the effectiveness against SFR. However, the FPR also is a crucial metric. Higher FPR means many fair clients will be eliminated from FL system, which will extremely harm the performance of FL system.

V. CONCLUSION

This paper explores and studies the two scenarios of free-rider attacks in Federated Learning (FL), namely anonymous and selfish free-rider attacks. We propose respectively the novel method and the advanced method to implement free-rider attacks in FL settings. Moreover, we conduct extensive experiments to verify the attack performance of the novel method compared with the vanilla method of [7]. In addition, utilizing the advanced method against the state-of-the-art defense model, we achieve the up to 61.67% false positive rate under MNIST and Cifar10 datasets.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Yin, H. Yin, Y. Wu, and Z. Jiang, "FDC: A secure federated deep learning mechanism for data collaborations in the Internet of Things," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 7, no. 7, pp. 6348–6359, 2020.
- [2] S. I. Popoola, R. Ande, B. Adebisi, G. Gui, M. Hammoudeh, and O. Jogunola, "Federated deep learning for zero-day botnet attack detection in IoT edge devices," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, 2021.
- [3] C. Zhang, Y. Xie, H. Bai, B. Yu, W. Li, and Y. Gao, "A survey on federated learning," *Knowl.-Based Syst.*, vol. 216, p. 106775, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.knsys.2021.106775.
- [4] M. Wen, R. Xie, K. Lu, L. Wang, and K. Zhang, "FedDetect: A Novel Privacy-Preserving Federated Learning Framework for Energy Theft Detection in Smart Grid," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, 2021.
- [5] G. Sun, Y. Cong, J. Dong, Q. Wang, L. Lyu, and J. Liu, "Data poisoning attacks on federated machine learning," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, 2021.
- [6] Y. Fraboni, R. Vidal, and M. Lorenzi, "Free-rider Attacks on Model Aggregation in Federated Learning," in *Proceedings of The 24th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, Mar. 2021, pp. 1846–1854. Accessed: Dec. 07, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v130/fraboni21a.html>
- [7] L. Lyu, H. Yu, J. Zhao, and Q. Yang, "Threats to Federated Learning," in *Federated Learning: Privacy and Incentive*, Q. Yang, L. Fan, and H. Yu, Eds. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020, pp. 3–16. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-63076-8_1.
- [8] L. Lyu, X. Xu, Q. Wang, and H. Yu, "Collaborative fairness in federated learning," in *Federated Learning*, Springer, 2020, pp. 189–204.
- [9] H. Wang *et al.*, "Attack of the tails: Yes, you really can backdoor federated learning," *Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*, vol. 33, pp. 16070–16084, 2020.
- [10] Y. Li, H. Li, G. Xu, X. Huang, and R. Lu, "Efficient Privacy-Preserving Federated Learning with Unreliable Users," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, pp. 1–1, 2021, doi: 10.1109/JIOT.2021.3130115.
- [11] N. Mohammadi, J. Bai, Q. Fan, Y. Song, Y. Yi, and L. Liu, "Differential Privacy Meets Federated Learning under Communication Constraints," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, 2021.
- [12] W. Wang *et al.*, "Secure-Enhanced Federated Learning for AI-Empowered Electric Vehicle Energy Prediction," *IEEE Consum. Electron. Mag.*, pp. 1–1, 2021, doi: 10.1109/MCE.2021.3116917.
- [13] W. Wei *et al.*, "A framework for evaluating client privacy leakages in federated learning," in *European Symposium on Research in Computer Security*, 2020, pp. 545–566.
- [14] L. Zhu, Z. Liu, and S. Han, "Deep Leakage from Gradients," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019, vol. 32. Accessed: Apr. 06, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2019/hash/60a6c4002cc7b29142de f8871531281a-Abstract.html>
- [15] P. Blanchard, E. M. El Mhamdi, R. Guerraoui, and J. Stainer, "Machine Learning with Adversaries: Byzantine Tolerant Gradient Descent," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017, vol. 30. Accessed: May 14, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2017/hash/f4b9ec30ad9f68f89b296 39786cb62ef-Abstract.html>
- [16] X. Xu and L. Lyu, "A reputation mechanism is all you need: Collaborative fairness and adversarial robustness in federated learning," 2021.
- [17] C. Fung, C. J. M. Yoon, and I. Beschastnikh, "The Limitations of Federated Learning in Sybil Settings," p. 16.
- [18] Y. Zhan, J. Zhang, Z. Hong, L. Wu, P. Li, and S. Guo, "A Survey of Incentive Mechanism Design for Federated Learning," *IEEE Trans. Emerg. Top. Comput.*, pp. 1–1, 2021, doi: 10.1109/TETC.2021.3063517.
- [19] Z. Liu, Y. Chen, H. Yu, Y. Liu, and L. Cui, "GTG-Shapley: Efficient and Accurate Participant Contribution Evaluation in Federated Learning," *ACM Trans. Intell. Syst. Technol.*, vol. 13, no. 4, p. 60:1-60:21, 2022, doi: 10.1145/3501811.
- [20] J. Sun, A. Li, B. Wang, H. Yang, H. Li, and Y. Chen, "Soteria: Provable Defense Against Privacy Leakage in Federated Learning From Representation Perspective," 2021, pp. 9311–9319. Accessed: Apr. 07, 2022. [Online]. Available: https://openaccess.thecvf.com/content/CVPR2021/html/Sun_Soteria_Provable_Defense_Against_Privacy_Leakage_in_Federated_Learning_From_CVPR_2021_paper.html
- [21] A. Qammar, J. Ding, and H. Ning, "Federated learning attack surface: taxonomy, cyber defences, challenges, and future directions," *Artif. Intell. Rev.*, Nov. 2021, doi: 10.1007/s10462-021-10098-w.
- [22] J. Huang, R. Talbi, Z. Zhao, S. Boucchenak, L. Y. Chen, and S. Roos, "An Exploratory Analysis on Users' Contributions in Federated Learning," in *2020 Second IEEE International Conference on Trust, Privacy and Security in Intelligent Systems and Applications (TPS-ISA)*, 2020, pp. 20–29. doi: 10.1109/TPS-ISA50397.2020.00014.
- [23] H. Lv *et al.*, "Data-Free Evaluation of User Contributions in Federated Learning," in *2021 19th International Symposium on Modeling and Optimization in Mobile, Ad hoc, and Wireless Networks (WiOpt)*, 2021, pp. 1–8. doi: 10.23919/WiOpt52861.2021.9589136.
- [24] D. Yin, Y. Chen, R. Kannan, and P. Bartlett, "Byzantine-Robust Distributed Learning: Towards Optimal Statistical Rates," in *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, Jul. 2018, pp. 5650–5659. Accessed: May 14, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v80/yin18a.html>
- [25] J. Bernstein, J. Zhao, K. Azizzadenesheli, and A. Anandkumar, "signSGD with majority vote is communication efficient and fault tolerant," *ArXiv Prepr. ArXiv:181005291*, 2018.
- [26] X. Cao, M. Fang, J. Liu, and N. Z. Gong, "FLTrust: Byzantine-robust Federated Learning via Trust Bootstrapping," 2021.
- [27] Y. LeCun, L. Bottou, Y. Bengio, and P. Haffner, "Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 86, no. 11, pp. 2278–2324, 1998.
- [28] A. Krizhevsky and G. Hinton, "Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images," 2009.
- [29] Y. LeCun *et al.*, "Handwritten digit recognition with a back-propagation network," *Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*, vol. 2, 1989.
- [30] A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and G. E. Hinton, "Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks," *Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*, vol. 25, 2012.
- [31] D. C. Liu and J. Nocedal, "On the limited memory BFGS method for large scale optimization," *Math. Program.*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 503–528, Aug. 1989, doi: 10.1007/BF01589116.