

Cooperative Hardware-Prompt Learning for Snapshot Compressive Imaging

Jiamian Wang^{1*}, Zongliang Wu^{2,3}, Yulun Zhang⁴, Xin Yuan², Tao Lin², Zhiqiang Tao^{1*}

¹Rochester Institute of Technology, ²Westlake University,

³Zhejiang University, ⁴Shanghai Jiao Tong University

Abstract

Existing reconstruction models in snapshot compressive imaging systems (SCI) are trained with a single well-calibrated hardware instance, making their performance vulnerable to hardware shifts and limited in adapting to multiple hardware configurations. To facilitate cross-hardware learning, previous efforts attempt to directly collect multi-hardware data and perform centralized training, which is impractical due to severe user data privacy concerns and hardware heterogeneity across different platforms/institutions. In this study, we explicitly consider data privacy and heterogeneity in cooperatively optimizing SCI systems by proposing a Federated Hardware-Prompt learning (FedHP) framework. Rather than mitigating the client drift by rectifying the gradients, which only takes effect on the learning manifold but fails to solve the heterogeneity rooted in the input data space, FedHP learns a hardware-conditioned prompter to align inconsistent data distribution across clients, serving as an indicator of the data inconsistency among different hardware (e.g., coded apertures). Extensive experimental results demonstrate that the proposed FedHP coordinates the pre-trained model to multiple hardware configurations, outperforming prevalent FL frameworks for 0.35dB under challenging heterogeneous settings. Moreover, a Snapshot Spectral Heterogeneous Dataset has been built upon multiple practical SCI systems. Data and code are available at <https://github.com/Jiamian-Wang/FedHP-Snapshot-Compressive-Imaging.git>

1 Introduction

The technology of snapshot compressive imaging (SCI) [Yuan et al., 2021] has gained prominence in the realm of computational imaging. Taking an example of hyperspectral image reconstruction, the spectral SCI [Gehm et al., 2007] can fast capture and compress 3D hyperspectral signals as 2D measurements through optical hardware, and then restore the original signals with high fidelity by training deep neural networks [Meng et al., 2020, Miao et al., 2019]. Despite the remarkable performance [Cai et al., 2022a,b, Lin et al., 2022, Huang et al., 2021, Hu et al., 2022], existing deep SCI methods are generally trained with a specific hardware configuration, *e.g.*, a well-calibrated coded aperture (physical mask). The resulting model is vulnerable to hardware shift/perturbation and limited in adapting to multiple hardware configurations. However, directly learning a reconstruction model cooperatively from multi-hardware seems to be infeasible due to data proprietary constraint. It is also non-trivial to coordinate heterogeneous hardware instances with a unified model.

To elaborate, we first recap previous research efforts of centralized learning solutions. A naive solution is to *jointly train* a single reconstruction model with data collected from different hardware configurations, *i.e.*, coded apertures. As shown in Fig. 1 *right*, this solution enhances the ability of reconstruction (0.5dB+) by comparison to a single hardware training scenario. However, the

*Corresponding authors: Jiamian Wang (jw4905@rit.edu) and Zhiqiang Tao (zhiqiang.tao@rit.edu)




Figure 1: Comparison of hyperspectral reconstruction learning strategies. (1) The model trained with the single hardware (*Prevalent treatment*) hardly handles other hardware. Both (2) *Jointly train* and (3) *Self-tuning* [Wang et al., 2022] are centralized training solutions. Both (4) FedAvg and the proposed (5) FedHP adopt the same data split setting. We compare the performance gain of different methods over (1). All results are evaluated by unseen masks (non-overlapping) sampled from the practical mask distributions $\{P_1, P_2, P_3\}$. FedHP learns a prompt network $\Phi(\cdot)$ for cooperation.

performance on inconsistent coded apertures is still non-guaranteed since the model only learns to fit coded apertures in a purely data-driven manner. Followed by, *self-tuning* [Wang et al., 2022] advances the learning by approximating the posterior distribution of coded apertures in a variational Bayesian framework. Despite the significant performance boost, it is only compatible with the coded apertures drawing from *homogeneous* hardware (same distribution) yet cannot handle *heterogeneous* hardware. Nevertheless, centralized learning presumes that hardware instances and hyperspectral data are always publicly available, which hardly holds in practice – both the optical systems (with different confidential configurations, *e.g.*, coded apertures) and data samples (*i.e.*, measurements captured from non-overlapping scenes) are generally proprietary assets across institutions, adhering to the strict privacy policy constraints [Vergara-Laurens et al., 2016, Li et al., 2021], while considering the multi-hardware cooperative training confining to this concern remains unexplored.

In this work, we leverage federated learning (FL) [Kairouz et al., 2021, Li et al., 2020a, Wang et al., 2021] for cross-platform/silo multi-hardware reconstruction modeling without sharing the hardware configurations and local training data. Firstly, the FL benchmark, FedAvg [McMahan et al., 2017], is adopted and brings performance boost (compared by 3 and 4 in Fig. 1 right). However, FedAvg has been proven to be limited in solving heterogeneous data [Hsu et al., 2019, Karimireddy et al., 2020] – the heterogeneity in SCI substantially stems from the hardware, which is usually absorbed into the compressed data and governs the network training. Thus, different configurations, *e.g.*, coded apertures, yield different data distributions. Besides, we consider a more practical scenario by extending the sample-wise hardware difference into distribution-wise, *i.e.*, not only the different coded apertures yield heterogeneity, but also coded apertures from different clients may follow different distributions (see $P_1 \sim P_3$ in Fig. 1).

To address the heterogeneity issue, this work proposes a Federated Hardware-Prompt (FedHP) framework to achieve multi-hardware cooperative learning with privacy piratically preserved. Prevalent FL methods handle the heterogeneity by regularizing the global/local gradients [Karimireddy et al., 2020, Li et al., 2020b], which only take effect on the learning manifold but fail to solve the heterogeneity rooted in the input data space. Differently, FedHP traces back to the source of the data heterogeneity of this application, *i.e.*, inconsistent hardware configurations, and devises a prompt network to solve the client drift issue in input data space. By taking the coded aperture as input, the prompter better accounts for the underlying inconsistency and closes the gap between input data distributions across clients. Besides, the prompter explicitly models the correlation between the software and hardware, empowering the learning by following the spirit of the co-optimization [Goudreault et al., 2023, Zheng et al., 2021, Robidoux et al., 2021] in computational imaging. In addition, FedHP directly operates on pre-trained reconstruction backbones with locally well-trained models and keeps them frozen throughout the learning, which improves the training efficiency than directly optimizing the reconstruction backbones in FL from scratch. We summarize the contributions as follows.

- We introduce and tackle an unexplored problem of hardware cooperative learning in SCI, under the presence of data privacy constraints and heterogeneous configurations. To our best knowledge, the proposed FedHP first integrates federated learning into spectral SCI.

- We uncover the data heterogeneity of SCI that stems from distinct hardware configurations. A hardware prompt module is developed to solve the distribution shift across clients and empower the hardware-software co-optimization in computational imaging. The proposed method provides an orthogonal perspective in handling the heterogeneity of the existing FL practices.
- We build a new Snapshot Spectral Heterogeneous Dataset (SSHD) from multiple practical spectral snapshot imaging systems. Extensive experiments demonstrate that FedHP outperforms both centralized learning methods and classic federated learning frameworks. The proposed method can inspire future work in this novel research direction of hardware collaboration in SCI.

2 Method

2.1 Preliminary Knowledge

We study the cooperative learning problem by taking the representative setup of coded aperture snapshot spectral imaging system for hyperspectral imaging as an example, due to its recent advances [Cai et al., 2022a,b, Lin et al., 2022]. Given the real-world hyperspectral signal $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times N_\lambda}$, where N_λ denotes the number of spectral channels, the hardware performs the compression with the physical coded aperture \mathbf{M} of the size $H \times W$, i.e., $\mathbf{M}_{hw} \in [0, 1]$. Accordingly, the encoding process produces a 2D measurement $\mathbf{Y}^{\mathbf{M}} \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times (W+\Delta)}$, where Δ denotes the shifting

$$\mathbf{Y}^{\mathbf{M}} = \sum_{n_\lambda=1}^{N_\lambda} \mathbf{X}'(:, :, n_\lambda) \odot \mathbf{M} + \mathbf{\Omega}, \quad (1)$$

$$\mathbf{X}'(h, w, n_\lambda) = \mathbf{X}(h, w + d(\lambda - \lambda^*), n_\lambda),$$

where \odot denotes the pixel-wise multiplication and $\mathbf{\Omega}$ presents the measurement noise. For each spectral wavelength λ , the corresponding signal $\mathbf{X}(:, :, n_\lambda)$ is shifted according to the function $d(\lambda - \lambda^*)$ by referring to the pre-defined anchor wavelength λ^* , such that $\Delta = d(N_\lambda - 1)$. Following the optical encoder, recent practices train a deep reconstruction network $f(\cdot)$ to retrieve the hyperspectral data $\hat{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times N_\lambda}$ by taking the 2D measurement $\mathbf{Y}^{\mathbf{M}}$ as input. We define the initial training dataset as \mathcal{D} and the corresponding dataset for the reconstruction as $\mathcal{D}^{\mathbf{M}^*}$

$$\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{X}_i\}_{i=1}^N, \quad \mathcal{D}^{\mathbf{M}^*} = \{\mathbf{Y}_i^{\mathbf{M}^*}, \mathbf{X}_i\}_{i=1}^N, \quad (2)$$

where \mathbf{X}_i is the ground truth and $\mathbf{Y}_i^{\mathbf{M}^*}$ is governed by a specific coded aperture \mathbf{M}^* . The reconstruction model finds the local optimum by minimizing the mean squared loss

$$\hat{\theta} = \arg \min_{\theta} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{f}(\theta; \mathbf{Y}_i^{\mathbf{M}^*}) - \mathbf{X}_i\|_2^2, \quad (3)$$

where θ expresses all learnable parameters in the reconstruction model. $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_i = \mathbf{f}(\hat{\theta}; \mathbf{Y}_i^{\mathbf{M}^*})$ is the prediction. Pre-trained reconstruction models [Cai et al., 2022a, Huang et al., 2021] demonstrates promising performance when is compatible with a single encoder set-up, where the measurement in training and testing phases are produced by the same hardware using a fixed coded aperture of \mathbf{M}^* .

Motivation. Previous work [Wang et al., 2022] uncovered that most existing reconstruction models experience large performance descent (e.g., $> 2\text{dB}$ in terms of PSNR) when handling the data encoded by a different coded aperture \mathbf{M}^\dagger from training, i.e., $\mathbf{M}^\dagger \neq \mathbf{M}^*$ as mask determines the data distribution and also takes effect in learning as (3). Thus, a well-trained reconstruction model can be highly sensitive to a specific hardware configuration of coded aperture and is hardly compatible with the other optical systems in the testing phase. A simple solution of adapting the reconstruction network to a different coded aperture \mathbf{M}^\dagger is to retrain the model with corresponding dataset $\mathcal{D}^{\mathbf{M}^\dagger} = \{\mathbf{Y}_i^{\mathbf{M}^\dagger}, \mathbf{X}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ and then test upon \mathbf{M}^\dagger accordingly. However, this solution does not broaden the adaptability of reconstruction models to multi-hardware and can introduce drastic computation overhead. In this work, we tackle this challenge by learning a reconstruction model cooperatively from multiple hardware with inconsistent configurations.

2.2 Centralized Learning in SCI

Jointly Train. To solve the above problem, *Jointly train* (Fig. 1 part 2) serves as a naive solution to train a model with data jointly collected upon a series of hardware. Assuming there are total number

of K hardware with different coded apertures, *i.e.*, $\mathbf{M}_1, \mathbf{M}_2, \dots, \mathbf{M}_K$. Each hardware produces a training dataset upon \mathcal{D} as $\mathcal{D}^{\mathbf{M}_k} = \{\mathbf{Y}_i^{\mathbf{M}_k}, \mathbf{X}_i\}_{i=1}^{N_k}$. The joint training dataset for reconstruction is

$$\mathcal{D}^{\mathbf{M}_{1 \sim K}} = \mathcal{D}^{\mathbf{M}_1} \cup \mathcal{D}^{\mathbf{M}_2} \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{D}^{\mathbf{M}_K}, \quad (4)$$

where different coded apertures can be regarded as hardware-driven data augmentation treatments toward the hyperspectral data. The reconstruction model will be trained with the same mean squared loss provided in (3) upon $\mathcal{D}^{\mathbf{M}_{1 \sim K}}$. [Wang et al., 2022] demonstrated that jointly learning brings performance boost compared with single mask training (Fig. 1 right). However, this method adopts a single well-trained model to handle coded apertures, failing to adaptively cope with the underlying discrepancies and thus, leading to compromised performances for different hardware.

Self-tuning. Following *Jointly train*, recent work of *Self-tuning* [Wang et al., 2022] recognizes the coded aperture that plays the role of hyperparameter of the reconstruction network, and develops a hyper-net to explicitly model the posterior distribution of the coded aperture by observing $\mathcal{D}^{\mathbf{M}_{1 \sim K}}$. Specifically, the hyper-net $h(\sigma; \mathbf{M}_k)$ approximates $P(\mathbf{M}|\mathcal{D}^{\mathbf{M}_{1 \sim K}})$ by minimizing the Kullback–Leibler divergence between this posterior and a variational distribution $Q(\mathbf{M})$ parameterized by σ . Compared with *Jointly train*, *Self-tuning* learns to adapt to different coded apertures and appropriately calibrates the reconstruction network during training, even if there are unseen coded apertures. However, the variational Bayesian learning poses a strict distribution constraint to the sampled coded apertures, which limits the scope of *Self-tuning* under the practical setting.

To sum up, both of the *Jointly train* and *Self-tuning* are representative solutions of centralized learning, where the dataset \mathcal{D} and hardware instances with $\mathbf{M}_1, \dots, \mathbf{M}_K$ from different sources are presumed to be publicly available. Such a setting has two-fold limitations. (1) Centralized learning does not take the privacy concern into consideration. Hardware configuration and data information sharing across institutions is subject to the rigorous policy constraint. (2) Existing centralized learning methods mainly consider the scenario where coded apertures are sampled from the same distribution, *i.e.*, hardware origin from the same source, which is problematic when it comes to the coded aperture distribution inconsistency especially in the cross-silo case. Bearing the above challenges, in the following, we resort to the federated learning (FL) methods to solve the cooperative learning of reconstruction considering the privacy and hardware configuration inconsistency.

2.3 Federated Learning in SCI

FedAvg. We firstly tailor FedAvg [McMahan et al., 2017], into SCI. Specifically, we exploit a practical setting of cross-silo learning in snapshot compressive imaging. Suppose there are C clients, where each client is packaged with a group of hardware following a specific distribution of P_c

$$\mathbf{M}_k^c \sim P_c, \quad (5)$$

where \mathbf{M}_k^c represents k -th sampled coded aperture in c -th client. For simplicity, we use \mathbf{M}^c to denote arbitrary coded aperture sample in c -th client as shown in Eq. (5). Based on the hardware, each client computes a paired dataset $\mathcal{D}^{\mathbf{M}^c}$ from the local hyperspectral dataset \mathcal{D}_c

$$\mathcal{D}_c = \{\mathbf{X}_i\}_{i=1}^{N_c}, \quad \mathcal{D}^{\mathbf{M}^c} = \{\mathbf{Y}_i^{\mathbf{M}^c}, \mathbf{X}_i\}_{i=1}^{N_c}, \quad (6)$$

where N_c represents the number of hyperspectral data in \mathcal{D}_c . The local learning objective is

$$\ell_c(\theta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\hat{\mathbf{X}}_i - \mathbf{X}_i\|_2^2, \quad (7)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_i = f(\hat{\theta}; \mathbf{Y}_i^{\mathbf{M}^c})$, $\mathbf{M}^c \sim P_c$, we use θ to denote the learnable parameters of reconstruction model at a client. FedAvg learns a global model θ_G without sharing the hyperspectral signal dataset \mathcal{D}_c , $\mathcal{D}^{\mathbf{M}^c}$, and \mathbf{M}^c across different clients. Specifically, the global learning objective $\ell_G(\theta)$ is

$$\ell_G(\theta) = \sum_{c=1}^{C'} \alpha_c \ell_c(\theta), \quad (8)$$

where C' denotes the number of clients that participate in the current global round and α_c represents the aggregation weight. Compared with the centralized learning solutions, FedAvg not only bridges the local hyperspectral data without sharing sensitive information, but also collaborates multi-hardware with a unified reconstruction model for a better performance (Fig. 1 right comparison between 3 and 4). However, FedAvg shows limitations in two-folds. (1) It has been shown that




Figure 2: Learning process of FedHP. We take one global round as an example, which consists of (1) *Initialize*, (2) *Local Update (Prompt)*, (3) *Local Update (Adaptor)*, and (4) *Aggregation*. For each client, the reconstruction backbone (θ_c^p), is initialized as pre-trained model upon local training dataset \mathcal{D}_c and kept as frozen throughout the training. The prompt net upon hardware configuration, *i.e.*, coded aperture, takes effect on the input data of reconstruction, *i.e.*, \mathbf{Y}^M . Adaptors are introduced to enhance the learning, where ϵ_c denotes the parameters of all adaptors.

FedAvg is hard to handle the heterogeneous data [Karimireddy et al., 2020, Khaled et al., 2020, Hsu et al., 2019]. (2) Directly training the reconstruction backbones from scratch would introduce prohibitive computation. Next, we firstly introduce the hardware-induced data heterogeneity in SCI. Then we develop a Federated Hardware-Prompt (FedHP) method to achieve cooperative learning without optimizing the client backbones.

Data Heterogeneity. We firstly consider the data heterogeneity stems from the *different coded apertures samples*, *i.e.*, hardware instances. According to Section 2.1, the optical hardware samples the hyperspectral signal \mathbf{X}_i from $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{X}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ and encodes it into a 2D measurement \mathbf{Y}_i^M , which constitutes \mathcal{D}^M and further serves as the input data for the reconstruction model. To this end, the modality of $\{\mathbf{Y}_i^M\}_{i=1}^N$ is vulnerable to the coded aperture variation. A single coded aperture \mathbf{M} defines a unique input data distribution for the reconstruction, *i.e.*, $\mathbf{Y}_i^M \sim P_M(\mathbf{Y}_i^M)$. For arbitrary distinct coded apertures, we have $P_{M^*}(\mathbf{Y}_i^{M^*}) \neq P_{M^\dagger}(\mathbf{Y}_i^{M^\dagger})$ if $M^* \neq M^\dagger$. In federated learning, data heterogeneity persistently exists since there is no identical coded aperture across different clients. Such a heterogeneous scenario, *i.e.*, sampling *non-overlapping masks* from the same mask distribution, can be caused by lightning distortion or optical platform fluttering.

We take a step further to consider the other type of data heterogeneity stemming from the *distinct distributions of coded apertures*². As formulated in (6), each client collects a coded aperture assemble following the distribution P_c for c -th client. We have P_c differs from one another, *i.e.*, $P_{c1} \neq P_{c2}$ for $c1 \neq c2, c1, c2 \in \{1, \dots, C\}$. Hardware instances from different clients are produced by distinct manufacturing agencies, so that the distribution P_{c1} and P_{c2} drastically differs as demonstrated in Fig. 1. This is a more challenging scenario than previous case. As presented in Section 3.2, classic federated learning methods, *e.g.*, FedProx [Li et al., 2020b] and SCAFFOLD [Karimireddy et al., 2020] hardly converge while the proposed method enables an obvious performance boost.

2.4 FedHP: Federated Hardware-Prompt Learning

Hardware-Prompt Learning. Bearing the heterogeneous issue, previous efforts [Li et al., 2020b, Karimireddy et al., 2020] mainly focus on rectifying the global/local gradients upon training, which only *takes effect on the learning manifold* but fail to *solve the heterogeneity* rooted in the input data space, whose effectiveness in this low-level vision task may be limited. Since we uncover two types of the heterogeneity in snapshot compressive imaging stemming from the hardware inconsistency (Section. 2.3), this work opts to tackling the client drift issue by directly operating in the input data space. This can be achieved by collaboratively learning the input data alignment given different coded apertures. In light of the visual prompt tuning in large models [Liu et al., 2023b, Bahng et al., 2022], we devise a hardware-conditioned prompt network in the following.

As shown in the *Step 2* of Fig. 2, given the input data $\{\mathbf{Y}_i^M\}_{i=1}^N$ of the reconstruction, the prompt network aligns the input samples, *i.e.*, measurements \mathbf{Y}_i^M , by adding a prompter conditioned on the hardware configuration. Let $\Phi(\phi; \mathbf{M})$ denote the prompt network (*e.g.*, attention block) parameterized

²We presume that the hyperspectral single dataset $\mathcal{D}_c, c = 1, \dots, C$, shares the same distribution by generally capturing the natural scenes. Heterogeneity stems from the hyperspectral signal is out of the scope of this work.

by ϕ and $\mathbf{Y}_i^{\mathbf{M}}$ is produced upon coded aperture \mathbf{M} . Then, the resulting input sample is aligned as

$$\mathbf{Y}_i^{\mathbf{M}} = \mathbf{Y}_i^{\mathbf{M}} + \Phi(\phi; \mathbf{M}). \quad (9)$$

In the proposed method, the prompt network collaborates different clients with inconsistent hardware configurations. It takes effect by implicitly observing and collecting diverse coded aperture samples of all clients, and jointly learns to react to different hardware settings. The prompt regularizes the input data space and achieves the goal of coping with heterogeneity sourcing from hardware.

Training. As shown in Fig. 2, we demonstrate the training process of proposed FedHP by taking one global round as an example³. Since the prompt learning takes effect on pre-trained models, we initialize the c -th backbone parameters with the pre-trained model θ_c^p on local data $\mathcal{D}^{\mathbf{M}^c}$ with (7). The global prompt network ϕ_G is randomly initialized and distributed to the c -th client

$$\phi_c \leftarrow \phi_G, \quad c = 1, \dots, C', \quad (10)$$

where ϕ_c is the local prompt network, and C' denotes the number of clients participated in the current global round. To enable better response of the pre-trained backbone toward the aligned input data space, we also introduce the adaptors into the transformer backbone. As shown in Fig. 2 Step 3, we show the architecture of the proposed adaptor, which is a *CONV-GELU-CONV* structure governed by a residual connection. We insert the adaptors behind the *LN* layers.

We perform local updates in each global round. It is composed of two stages. Firstly, we update the local prompt network ϕ_c for S_p iterations, and fix all the other learnable parameters. The loss is

$$\ell_c = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|f(\theta_c^p, \epsilon_c; \mathbf{Y}_i^{\mathbf{M}^c} + \Phi(\mathbf{M}^c)) - \mathbf{X}_i\|_2^2, \quad (11)$$

where we use ϵ_c to represent learnable parameters of all adaptors for c -th client. Secondly, we tune the adaptors for another S_b iterations. Both of the pre-trained backbone and prompt network are frozen. The loss of c -th client shares the same formulation as (11). After the local update, FedHP uploads and aggregates the learnable parameters $\phi_c, c = 1, \dots, C$ of the prompt network. Since the proposed method does not require to optimize and communicate the reconstruction backbones, the underlying cost is drastically reduced considering the marginal model size of prompt network and adaptors compared with the backbone, which potentially serves as a supplied benefit of FedHP.

Compared with FedAvg, FedHP adopts the hardware prompt to explicitly align the input data representation and handle the distribution shift attributing to the coded aperture inconsistency or coded aperture distribution discrepancy.

3 Experiments

3.1 Implementation details

Dataset. Following existing practices [Cai et al., 2022b, Lin et al., 2022, Hu et al., 2022, Huang et al., 2021], we adopt the benchmark training dataset of CAVE [Yasuma et al., 2010], which is composed of 32 hyperspectral images with the spatial size as 512×512 . Data augmentation techniques of rotation, flipping are employed, producing 205 different training scenes. For the federated learning, we equally split the training dataset according to the number of clients C . The local training dataset are kept and accessed confidentially across clients. Note that one specific coded aperture determines a unique dataset according to (2), the resulting data samples for each client can be much more than $205/C$. We employ the widely-used simulation testing dataset for the quantitative evaluation, which consists of ten $256 \times 256 \times 28$ hyperspectral images collected from KAIST [Choi et al., 2017]. Besides, we use the real testing data with spatial size of 660×660 collected by a SD-CASSI system [Meng et al., 2020] for the perceptual evaluation considering the real-world perturbations.

Hardware. We collect and will release the first Snapshot Spectral Heterogeneous Dataset (SSHHD) containing a series of practical SCI systems, from three agencies, each of which offers a series of coded apertures that correspond to a unique distribution⁴ as presented by federated settings in Fig. 2. No identical coded apertures exists among all systems. For the case of inconsistent mask distributions,

³We provide an algorithm of FedHP in supplementary.

⁴More illustrations and distribution visualizations of real collected coded apertures are in supplementary.

Table 1: PSNR(dB)/SSIM performance comparison. For different clients, we sample non-overlapping masks from the same mask distribution to train the model and use unseen masks randomly sampled from all clients for testing. We report $mean \pm std$ among 100 trials for all methods.

Scene	FedAvg		FedProx		SCAFFOLD		FedGST		FedHP (ours)	
	PSNR	SSIM	PSNR	SSIM	PSNR	SSIM	PSNR	SSIM	PSNR	SSIM
1	31.98 \pm 0.19	0.8938 \pm 0.0025	31.85 \pm 0.21	0.8903 \pm 0.0028	31.78 \pm 0.24	0.8886 \pm 0.0025	32.02 \pm 0.14	0.8918 \pm 0.0018	32.31 \pm 0.19	0.9026 \pm 0.0020
2	30.49 \pm 0.21	0.8621 \pm 0.0041	29.85 \pm 0.22	0.8516 \pm 0.0037	29.81 \pm 0.19	0.8473 \pm 0.0031	30.13 \pm 0.20	0.8519 \pm 0.0038	30.78 \pm 0.19	0.8746 \pm 0.0034
3	31.78 \pm 0.23	0.9088 \pm 0.0019	30.80 \pm 0.23	0.8968 \pm 0.0017	30.92 \pm 0.17	0.8961 \pm 0.0014	31.19 \pm 0.22	0.8975 \pm 0.0015	31.62 \pm 0.25	0.9109 \pm 0.0018
4	39.39 \pm 0.23	0.9559 \pm 0.0018	39.41 \pm 0.22	0.9601 \pm 0.0013	39.32 \pm 0.20	0.9565 \pm 0.0011	38.98 \pm 0.27	0.9513 \pm 0.0020	39.78 \pm 0.29	0.9633 \pm 0.0017
5	28.70 \pm 0.16	0.8821 \pm 0.0044	28.14 \pm 0.16	0.8765 \pm 0.0036	28.08 \pm 0.14	0.8742 \pm 0.0032	28.53 \pm 0.16	0.8743 \pm 0.0041	28.92 \pm 0.17	0.8935 \pm 0.0039
6	30.53 \pm 0.30	0.9054 \pm 0.0025	30.04 \pm 0.23	0.9054 \pm 0.0024	29.87 \pm 0.21	0.9011 \pm 0.0019	30.29 \pm 0.21	0.8949 \pm 0.0022	30.77 \pm 0.22	0.9172 \pm 0.0019
7	30.01 \pm 0.20	0.8811 \pm 0.0027	29.60 \pm 0.20	0.8718 \pm 0.0026	29.63 \pm 0.19	0.8708 \pm 0.0027	29.89 \pm 0.18	0.8786 \pm 0.0024	30.44 \pm 0.19	0.8884 \pm 0.0024
8	28.60 \pm 0.31	0.8880 \pm 0.0023	27.93 \pm 0.20	0.8845 \pm 0.0018	27.74 \pm 0.31	0.8802 \pm 0.0018	28.35 \pm 0.19	0.8752 \pm 0.0016	28.56 \pm 0.32	0.8957 \pm 0.0021
9	31.45 \pm 0.15	0.9012 \pm 0.0019	31.29 \pm 0.15	0.8961 \pm 0.0019	31.22 \pm 0.14	0.8929 \pm 0.0014	30.80 \pm 0.12	0.8880 \pm 0.0021	31.34 \pm 0.13	0.9043 \pm 0.0023
10	29.04 \pm 0.13	0.8751 \pm 0.0022	28.48 \pm 0.15	0.8671 \pm 0.0035	28.59 \pm 0.13	0.8626 \pm 0.0028	28.51 \pm 0.13	0.8578 \pm 0.0024	29.12 \pm 0.13	0.8835 \pm 0.0021
Avg.	31.21 \pm 0.10	0.8959 \pm 0.0017	30.76 \pm 0.10	0.8900 \pm 0.0016	30.71 \pm 0.09	0.8872 \pm 0.0013	30.85 \pm 0.11	0.8858 \pm 0.0017	31.35 \pm 0.10	0.9033 \pm 0.0014




Figure 3: Reconstruction results on simulation data. The density curves compare the spectral consistency of different methods to the ground truth. We use the same coded aperture for all methods.

we directly assign hardware systems from one source to form a client. We simulate the scenario of non-overlapping masks by distributing coded apertures from one source to different clients.

Implementation details. We adopt MST-S [Cai et al., 2022a] as the reconstruction backbone. The prompt network is instantiated by a SwinIR [Liang et al., 2021] block. Limited by the computational resource, we set the number of clients as 3 in main comparison. We empirically find that collaborate such amount of clients can be problematic for popular federated learning methods under the very challenging scenario of data heterogeneity (see Section 3.2). For FL methods, we update all clients throughout the training, *i.e.*, $C' = C = 3$. For the proposed method, we pre-train the client backbones from scratch for 4×10^4 iterations on their local data. Notably, the total training iterations of different methods are kept as 1.25×10^5 for a fair comparison. The batch is set as 12. We set the initial learning rate for both of the prompt network and adaptor as $\alpha_p = \alpha_b = 1 \times 10^{-4}$ with step schedulers, *i.e.*, half annealing every 2×10^4 iterations. We train the model with an Adam [Kingma and Ba, 2014] optimizer ($\beta_1 = 0.9, \beta_2 = 0.999$). We use PyTorch [Paszke et al., 2017] on an NVIDIA A100 GPU.

Compared Methods. We compare FedHP with mainstream FL methods, including FedAvg [McMahan et al., 2017], FedProx [Li et al., 2020b], and SCAFFOLD [Karimireddy et al., 2020]. Besides, GST [Wang et al., 2022] paves the way for the robustness of the reconstruction toward multiple hardware. Thereby, we integrate this method into the FL framework, dubbed as FedGST. All methods require to train and aggregate the entire client backbones. By comparison, FedHP updates and shares the prompt network, outperforming the others with smaller amount of parameters being optimized and communicated. We adopt PSNR and SSIM [Wang et al., 2004] for the quantitative evaluation.

3.2 Performance

Simulation Results. We quantitatively compare different methods in Table 1 by considering the data heterogeneity stems from non-overlapping masks. FedHP performs better than the classic federated

Table 2: PSNR(dB)/SSIM performance comparison. Masks from each client are sampled from a *specific* distribution for training. We randomly sample non-overlapping masks (unseen to training) from all distributions for testing. We report $mean \pm std$ among 100 trials for all methods.

Scene	FedAvg		FedProx		SCAFFOLD		FedGST		FedHP (ours)	
	PSNR	SSIM	PSNR	SSIM	PSNR	SSIM	PSNR	SSIM	PSNR	SSIM
1	29.15 \pm 0.09	0.8392 \pm 0.0065	23.01 \pm 0.11	0.5540 \pm 0.0069	22.99 \pm 0.13	0.5535 \pm 0.0066	29.46 \pm 0.65	0.8344 \pm 0.0067	30.37 \pm 0.70	0.8628 \pm 0.0084
2	28.28 \pm 0.10	0.8102 \pm 0.0052	20.91 \pm 0.08	0.4486 \pm 0.0052	20.89 \pm 0.09	0.4474 \pm 0.0055	27.89 \pm 0.36	0.7733 \pm 0.0068	28.67 \pm 0.38	0.8160 \pm 0.0072
3	28.42 \pm 0.11	0.8464 \pm 0.0083	17.57 \pm 0.11	0.4621 \pm 0.0082	17.58 \pm 0.12	0.4608 \pm 0.0083	28.45 \pm 0.50	0.8363 \pm 0.0073	29.81 \pm 0.68	0.8771 \pm 0.0066
4	36.93 \pm 0.27	0.9369 \pm 0.0036	23.08 \pm 0.25	0.4856 \pm 0.0036	23.00 \pm 0.30	0.4848 \pm 0.0038	36.12 \pm 0.50	0.9181 \pm 0.0050	37.37 \pm 0.53	0.9395 \pm 0.0032
5	25.84 \pm 0.07	0.8037 \pm 0.0069	18.99 \pm 0.07	0.4316 \pm 0.0082	18.99 \pm 0.06	0.4301 \pm 0.0065	26.21 \pm 0.52	0.7988 \pm 0.0081	27.47 \pm 0.73	0.8487 \pm 0.0011
6	27.28 \pm 0.04	0.8655 \pm 0.0041	19.10 \pm 0.04	0.4077 \pm 0.0041	19.10 \pm 0.04	0.4063 \pm 0.0042	27.52 \pm 0.49	0.8384 \pm 0.0048	28.31 \pm 0.45	0.8649 \pm 0.0050
7	26.81 \pm 0.09	0.8042 \pm 0.0094	20.15 \pm 0.09	0.4903 \pm 0.0093	20.14 \pm 0.09	0.4883 \pm 0.0098	26.88 \pm 0.57	0.7957 \pm 0.0073	28.29 \pm 0.81	0.8298 \pm 0.0108
8	25.77 \pm 0.05	0.8473 \pm 0.0030	19.89 \pm 0.07	0.4402 \pm 0.0031	19.89 \pm 0.06	0.4395 \pm 0.0039	26.22 \pm 0.44	0.8206 \pm 0.0029	26.54 \pm 0.45	0.8470 \pm 0.0054
9	28.30 \pm 0.09	0.8541 \pm 0.0074	18.33 \pm 0.11	0.4285 \pm 0.0071	18.30 \pm 0.11	0.4269 \pm 0.0078	27.74 \pm 0.48	0.8199 \pm 0.0073	29.36 \pm 0.63	0.8536 \pm 0.0054
10	26.04 \pm 0.12	0.8075 \pm 0.0035	20.06 \pm 0.12	0.3461 \pm 0.0036	20.03 \pm 0.13	0.3451 \pm 0.0036	25.72 \pm 0.22	0.7433 \pm 0.0046	26.78 \pm 0.26	0.8111 \pm 0.0076
Avg.	28.63 \pm 0.07	0.8496 \pm 0.0041	20.85 \pm 0.07	0.5405 \pm 0.0059	20.00 \pm 0.09	0.4374 \pm 0.0040	28.24 \pm 0.39	0.8177 \pm 0.0045	28.98 \pm 0.23	0.8481 \pm 0.0054




Figure 4: Visualization of reconstruction results on real data. Six representative wavelengths are selected. We use the same unseen coded aperture for both FedAvg and FedHP.

learning methods. By comparison, FedProx and SCAFFOLD only allows sub-optimal performance, which uncovers the limitations of rectifying the gradient directions in this challenging task. Besides, FedGST works inferior than FedHP, since FedGST approximates the posterior and expects coded apertures strictly follows the identical distribution, which can not be guaranteed in practice. In Fig. 3, we visualize the reconstruction results with sampled wavelengths. FedHP not only enables a more granular retrieval on unseen coded aperture, but also maintains a promising spectral consistency as shown by randomly cropped patches (e.g., a, b in Fig. 3).

Challenging Scenario of Heterogeneity. We consider a more challenging scenario where the data heterogeneity is caused the *distinct coded aperture distributions of different clients*. We compare different methods in Table 2. All methods experience large performance degradation, among which FedProx and SCAFFOLD becomes ineffective. Intuitively, it is hard to concur the clients under the large distribution gap, while directly adjusting the input data space better tackles the problem.

Real Results. In Fig. 4, we visually compare the FedAvg with FedHP on the real data. Specifically, both methods are evaluated under an unseen hardware configuration, *i.e.*, coded aperture from an uncertain distribution. The proposed method introduces less distortions among different wavelengths. Such an observation endorses FedHP a great potential in collaborating hardware systems practically.

3.3 Model Discussion

We conduct model discussion in Table 3. Specifically, we accumulate the total cost (e.g., number of parameters, GMACs, and training time) of all clients in a federated system.

Ablation Study. We firstly consider a scenario that trains three clients independently without FL (FedHP w/o FL). For a fair comparison, each client pre-trains the backbone by using the same procedure as FedHP and are then enhanced with a prompt network and adaptors for efficient fine-tuning. By comparison, FedHP enables an obvious improvement (0.6dB) by implicitly sharing the hardware and data. We then investigate the effectiveness of the prompter and adaptor to the reconstruction, respectively. By observation, directly removing the adaptor leads to limited performance descent. Using prompt network brings significant performance boost. The hardware prompter aligns the input data distributions, potentially solving the heterogeneity rooted in the input data space, considering fact that learning manifold is highly correlated with the coded apertures.

Discussion of the client number. In Table 4a, we discuss the power of FedHP with more real clients under the scenario of *Hardware shaking*. The performance gap between FedHP and FedAvg consistently remains with the client number increasing, which demonstrates the practicability of the FedHP for the cross-silo spectral system cooperative learning, e.g., 3 ~ 5 clients/institutions.

Table 3: Ablation study and complexity analysis under the non-overlapping masks. The PSNR (dB)/SSIM are computed among 100 testing trials. We report the model complexity and the accumulative training time of all clients (e.g., $C = 3$).

Method	Prompter	Adaptor	FL	PSNR	SSIM	#Params (M)	GMACs	Training (days)
FedAvg	✗	✗	✓	31.21 \pm 0.10	0.8959 \pm 0.0017	0.12	2.85	10.62
FedHP w/o FL	✓	✓	✗	30.75 \pm 0.11	0.8890 \pm 0.0015	0.27	12.78	2.86
FedHP w/o Adaptor	✓	✗	✓	31.09 \pm 0.10	0.8996 \pm 0.0017	0.15	11.01	2.68
FedHP w/o Prompter	✗	✓	✓	19.19 \pm 0.01	0.2303 \pm 0.0008	0.12	2.87	2.54
FedHP (Full model)	✓	✓	✓	31.35 \pm 0.10	0.9033 \pm 0.0014	0.27	12.78	2.86

Table 4: Model discussions of the proposed FedHP.

(a) #Client discussion. Averaged values are reported.

C	FedAvg		FedHP		Performance gap	
4	31.06	0.8955	31.33	0.9023	0.27	0.0068
5	31.05	0.9025	31.32	0.9029	0.27	0.0004

(b) Comparison with a deep Unfolding method.

Methods	PSNR(dB)	SSIM	#Params (M)
GAP-Net	31.07 \pm 0.20	0.8895 \pm 0.0035	3.83
FedHP	31.35 \pm 0.10	0.9033 \pm 0.0014	0.27

Comparison with a deep unfolding method. We also compare the proposed FedHP with a representative deep unfolding method of GAP-Net [Meng et al., 2023] as deep unfolding methods can be adaptable to various hardware configurations. Specifically, we use three clients and keep training and testing settings of GAP-Net the same as FedHP. As shown in Table 4b, FedHP improves by 0.28dB with only 7% model size. In fact, despite the adaptability, deep unfolding still shows limitations in solving hardware perturbation/replacement for a given system [Wang et al., 2022].

4 Related Work

Hyperspectral Image Reconstruction. In hyperspectral image reconstruction (HSI), learning deep reconstruction models [Cai et al., 2022a,b, Lin et al., 2022, Huang et al., 2021, Meng et al., 2020, Hu et al., 2022, Miao et al., 2019] has been the forefront among recent efforts due to high-fidelity reconstruction and high-efficiency. Among them, MST [Cai et al., 2022a] devises the first transformer backbone by computing spectral attention. Existing reconstruction learning strategies mainly considers the compatibility toward a single hardware instance. The learned model can be highly sensitive to the variation of hardware. To tackle this practical challenge, GST [Wang et al., 2022] paves the way by proposing a variational Bayesian learning treatment.

Federated Learning. Federated learning [Kairouz et al., 2021, Li et al., 2020a, Wang et al., 2021] collaborates client models without sharing the privacy-sensitive assets. However, FL learning suffers from client drift across clients attributing to the data heterogeneity issue. One mainstream [Karimireddy et al., 2020, Li et al., 2020b, Xu et al., 2021, Jhunjunwala et al., 2023, Reddi et al., 2021] mainly focus on regularizing the global/local gradients. As another direction, personalized FL methods [Collins et al., 2021, Chen and Chao, 2022, Fallah et al., 2020, T Dinh et al., 2020, Jiang and Lin, 2023] propose to fine-tune the global model for better adaptability on clients. However, customizing the global model on client data sacrifices the underlying robustness upon data distribution shift [Wu et al., 2022, Jiang and Lin, 2023], which contradicts with our goal of emphasizing the generality across hardware and thus is not considered. In this work, we propose a federated learning framework to solve the multi-hardware cooperative learning considering the data privacy and heterogeneity, which to the best knowledge, is the first attempt of empowering spectral SCI with FL. Besides, the principle underlying this method can be potentially extended to broad computational imaging applications [Zheng et al., 2021, Liu et al., 2023a, Goudreault et al., 2023, Robidoux et al., 2021]

5 Conclusion

In this work, we observed an unexplored research scenario of multiple hardware cooperative learning in spectral SCI, considering two practical challenges of privacy constraint and the heterogeneity stemming from inconsistent hardware configurations. We developed a Federated Hardware-Prompt (FedHP) learning framework to solve the distribution shift across clients and empower the hardware-software co-optimization. The proposed method serves as a first attempt to exploit the power of FL in spectral SCI. Besides, we have collected a Snapshot Spectral Heterogeneous Dataset (SSHD) from multiple real spectral SCI systems. Future works may theoretically derive the convergence of FedHP and exploit the behavior of FedHP under a large number of clients. We hope this study will inspire broad explorations in this novel direction of hardware collaboration in SCI.

References

- Hyojin Bahng, Ali Jahanian, Swami Sankaranarayanan, and Phillip Isola. Visual prompting: Modifying pixel space to adapt pre-trained models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.17274*, 2022. 5
- Yuanhao Cai, Jing Lin, Xiaowan Hu, Haoqian Wang, Xin Yuan, Yulun Zhang, Radu Timofte, and Luc Van Gool. Mask-guided spectral-wise transformer for efficient hyperspectral image reconstruction. In *CVPR*, 2022a. 1, 3, 7, 9
- Yuanhao Cai, Jing Lin, Haoqian Wang, Xin Yuan, Henghui Ding, Yulun Zhang, Radu Timofte, and Luc Van Gool. Degradation-aware unfolding half-shuffle transformer for spectral compressive imaging. In *NeurIPS*, 2022b. 1, 3, 6, 9
- Hong-You Chen and Wei-Lun Chao. On bridging generic and personalized federated learning for image classification. In *ICLR*, 2022. 9
- Inchang Choi, MH Kim, D Gutierrez, DS Jeon, and G Nam. High-quality hyperspectral reconstruction using a spectral prior. Technical report, 2017. 6
- Liam Collins, Hamed Hassani, Aryan Mokhtari, and Sanjay Shakkottai. Exploiting shared representations for personalized federated learning. In *ICML*, 2021. 9
- Alireza Fallah, Aryan Mokhtari, and Asuman Ozdaglar. Personalized federated learning with theoretical guarantees: A model-agnostic meta-learning approach. In *NeurIPS*, 2020. 9
- Michael E Gehm, Renu John, David J Brady, Rebecca M Willett, and Timothy J Schulz. Single-shot compressive spectral imaging with a dual-disperser architecture. *Optics express*, 15(21):14013–14027, 2007. 1
- Félix Goudreault, Dominik Scheuble, Mario Bijelic, Nicolas Robidoux, and Felix Heide. Lidar-in-the-loop hyperparameter optimization. In *CVPR*, 2023. 2, 9
- Tzu-Ming Harry Hsu, Hang Qi, and Matthew Brown. Measuring the effects of non-identical data distribution for federated visual classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.06335*, 2019. 2, 5
- Xiaowan Hu, Yuanhao Cai, Jing Lin, Haoqian Wang, Xin Yuan, Yulun Zhang, Radu Timofte, and Luc Van Gool. Hdnet: High-resolution dual-domain learning for spectral compressive imaging. In *CVPR*, 2022. 1, 6, 9
- Tao Huang, Weisheng Dong, Xin Yuan, Jinjian Wu, and Guangming Shi. Deep gaussian scale mixture prior for spectral compressive imaging. In *CVPR*, 2021. 1, 3, 6, 9
- Divyansh Jhunjhunwala, Shiqiang Wang, and Gauri Joshi. Fedexp: Speeding up federated averaging via extrapolation. In *ICLR*, 2023. 9
- Liangze Jiang and Tao Lin. Test-time robust personalization for federated learning. In *ICLR*, 2023. 9
- Peter Kairouz, H Brendan McMahan, Brendan Avent, Aurélien Bellet, Mehdi Bennis, Arjun Nitin Bhagoji, Kallista Bonawitz, Zachary Charles, Graham Cormode, Rachel Cummings, et al. Advances and open problems in federated learning. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 14(1–2):1–210, 2021. 2, 9
- Sai Praneeth Karimireddy, Satyen Kale, Mehryar Mohri, Sashank Reddi, Sebastian Stich, and Ananda Theertha Suresh. Scaffold: Stochastic controlled averaging for federated learning. In *ICML*, 2020. 2, 5, 7, 9, 15
- Ahmed Khaled, Konstantin Mishchenko, and Peter Richtárik. Tighter theory for local sgd on identical and heterogeneous data. In *ICAIS*, 2020. 5
- Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014. 7
- Tian Li, Anit Kumar Sahu, Ameet Talwalkar, and Virginia Smith. Federated learning: Challenges, methods, and future directions. *IEEE signal processing magazine*, 37(3):50–60, 2020a. 2, 9

- Tian Li, Anit Kumar Sahu, Manzil Zaheer, Maziar Sanjabi, Ameet Talwalkar, and Virginia Smith. Federated optimization in heterogeneous networks. In *MLSys*, 2020b. 2, 5, 7, 9, 15
- Yijing Li, Xiaofeng Tao, Xuefei Zhang, Junjie Liu, and Jin Xu. Privacy-preserved federated learning for autonomous driving. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 23(7):8423–8434, 2021. 2
- Jingyun Liang, Jiezhong Cao, Guolei Sun, Kai Zhang, Luc Van Gool, and Radu Timofte. Swinir: Image restoration using swin transformer. In *ICCV*, 2021. 7
- Jing Lin, Yuanhao Cai, Xiaowan Hu, Haoqian Wang, Xin Yuan, Yulun Zhang, Radu Timofte, and Luc Van Gool. Coarse-to-fine sparse transformer for hyperspectral image reconstruction. In *ECCV*, 2022. 1, 3, 6, 9
- Jiaming Liu, Rushil Anirudh, Jayaraman J Thiagarajan, Stewart He, K Aditya Mohan, Ulugbek S Kamilov, and Hyojin Kim. Dolce: A model-based probabilistic diffusion framework for limited-angle ct reconstruction. In *ICCV*, 2023a. 9
- Pengfei Liu, Weizhe Yuan, Jinlan Fu, Zhengbao Jiang, Hiroaki Hayashi, and Graham Neubig. Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(9):1–35, 2023b. 5
- Patrick Llull, Xuejun Liao, Xin Yuan, Jianbo Yang, David Kittle, Lawrence Carin, Guillermo Sapiro, and David J Brady. Coded aperture compressive temporal imaging. *Optics express*, 21(9):10526–10545, 2013. 13
- Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Agüera y Arcas. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *AISTATS*, 2017. 2, 4, 7
- Ziyi Meng, Jiawei Ma, and Xin Yuan. End-to-end low cost compressive spectral imaging with spatial-spectral self-attention. In *ECCV*, 2020. 1, 6, 9
- Ziyi Meng, Xin Yuan, and Shirin Jalali. Deep unfolding for snapshot compressive imaging. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, pages 1–26, 2023. 9
- Xin Miao, Xin Yuan, Yunchen Pu, and Vassilis Athitsos. λ -net: Reconstruct hyperspectral images from a snapshot measurement. In *ICCV*, 2019. 1, 9
- Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Soumith Chintala, Gregory Chanan, Edward Yang, Zachary DeVito, Zeming Lin, Alban Desmaison, Luca Antiga, and Adam Lerer. Automatic differentiation in pytorch. In *NeurIPS 2017 Workshop on Autodiff*, 2017. 7
- Sashank Reddi, Zachary Charles, Manzil Zaheer, Zachary Garrett, Keith Rush, Jakub Konečný, Sanjiv Kumar, and H Brendan McMahan. Adaptive federated optimization. In *ICLR*, 2021. 9
- Nicolas Robidoux, Luis E Garcia Capel, Dong-eun Seo, Avinash Sharma, Federico Ariza, and Felix Heide. End-to-end high dynamic range camera pipeline optimization. In *CVPR*, 2021. 2, 9
- Canh T Dinh, Nguyen Tran, and Josh Nguyen. Personalized federated learning with moreau envelopes. In *NeurIPS*, 2020. 9
- Idalides J Vergara-Laurens, Luis G Jaimes, and Miguel A Labrador. Privacy-preserving mechanisms for crowdsensing: Survey and research challenges. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 4(4):855–869, 2016. 2
- Jiamian Wang, Yulun Zhang, Xin Yuan, Ziyi Meng, and Zhiqiang Tao. Modeling mask uncertainty in hyperspectral image reconstruction. In *ECCV*, 2022. 2, 3, 4, 7, 9
- Jianyu Wang, Zachary Charles, Zheng Xu, Gauri Joshi, H Brendan McMahan, Maruan Al-Shedivat, Galen Andrew, Salman Avestimehr, Katharine Daly, Deepesh Data, et al. A field guide to federated optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.06917*, 2021. 2, 9

- Zhou Wang, Alan C Bovik, Hamid R Sheikh, and Eero P Simoncelli. Image quality assessment: from error visibility to structural similarity. *IEEE transactions on image processing*, 13(4):600–612, 2004. 7
- Shanshan Wu, Tian Li, Zachary Charles, Yu Xiao, Ziyu Liu, Zheng Xu, and Virginia Smith. Motley: Benchmarking heterogeneity and personalization in federated learning. In *NeurIPS*, 2022. 9
- Jing Xu, Sen Wang, Liwei Wang, and Andrew Chi-Chih Yao. Fedcm: Federated learning with client-level momentum. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.10874*, 2021. 9
- Fumihito Yasuma, Tomoo Mitsunaga, Daisuke Iso, and Shree K Nayar. Generalized assorted pixel camera: postcapture control of resolution, dynamic range, and spectrum. *IEEE transactions on image processing*, 19(9):2241–2253, 2010. 6
- Xin Yuan, David J Brady, and Aggelos K Katsaggelos. Snapshot compressive imaging: Theory, algorithms, and applications. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 38(2):65–88, 2021. 1
- Yucheng Zheng, Yi Hua, Aswin C Sankaranarayanan, and M Salman Asif. A simple framework for 3d lensless imaging with programmable masks. In *ICCV*, 2021. 2, 9

A Appendix / supplemental material

We provide more discussions and results of the proposed FedHP as follows

- Limitations discussion. (Section A.1).
- Broader impacts on the proposed FedHP. (Section A.2).
- More discussions on new hardware (Section A.3).
- Detailed algorithm of FedHP (Section A.4).
- More visualizations and analysis (Section A.5).
- More discussions on data privacy protection (Section A.6).
- More statistical analysis (Section A.7).

A.1 Limitations

One of the limitations of the proposed method is the lack of the real hardware due to the privacy concern. Thus it is hard for us to perform the federated learning on a large number of the clients as in other tasks like the classification, *e.g.*, $C > 100$. This in return, motivate us to solve the practical concerns of this field. We are working on collecting more real data and will continue exploring the power of the proposed method.

A.2 Broader Impacts

This work develops a federated learning treatment to enable the collaboration of the CASSI systems with different hardware configurations. The proposed method will practically encourage the cross-institution collaborations with emerging optical system designs engaged. By improving the robustness of the pre-trained reconstruction software backend toward optical encoders, this work will help expedite the efficient and widespread deployment of the deep models on sensors or platforms.

Table 5: Performance comparison between FedAvg and FedHP on CACTI (*e.g.*, $C = 3$).

Methods	PSNR (dB)	SSIM
FedAvg	$27.35_{\pm 1.22}$	$0.9174_{\pm 0.0046}$
FedHP	$27.87_{\pm 0.89}$	$0.9192_{\pm 0.0047}$

A.3 New Hardware

Our key technical contribution is to provide a new multi-hardware optimization framework adapting to hardware shift by only accessing local data. The principle underlying the proposed FedHP can be potentially extended to broad SCI applications. This work serves as a proof of concept to inspire future endeavors in a more general scope. Besides experimental results on CASSI, we also perform additional experiments by applying FedHP to another prevalent SCI system of Coded Aperture Compressive Temporal Imaging (CACTI) [Llull et al., 2013]. The results in Table 5 present a performance boost of FedHP over FedAvg baseline (under the same setting as the manuscript), demonstrating that the proposed FedHP does not particularly pertain to CASSI.

A.4 Algorithm

The learning procedure of proposed FedHP is provided in Algorithm 1. Let us take one global round for example, the learning can be divided into four stages. (1) Initializing the global prompt network from scratch and then distributing it to local clients. Then instantiating the client backbones with the pre-trained models upon the local training dataset. The adaptors are also randomly initialized for a better adaptation of the pre-trained backbones to the aligned input data representation. (2) Local updating of the prompt network, during which all the other learnable parameters in the system are kept fixed. (3) Local updating of the adaptors. Notably, the parameters of the adaptors is only updated and maintained in local. (4) Global aggregation of the local prompt networks.

Algorithm 1 FedHP Training Algorithm

Input: Number of global rounds T ; Number of clients C ; Number of client subset C' ; Pre-trained models θ_c^p , $c = 1, \dots, C$; Number of local update iterations S_p , S_b ; Random initialized parameter of prompt network ϕ_G ; Random initialized parameter of adaptors of c -th client ϵ_c ; Learning rate α_p of prompt network; Learning rate α_b of adaptors;

Output: ϕ_G, ϵ_c , $c = 1, \dots, C$;

```

1: Server Executes;
2: Randomly choose a set of clients of number  $C'$ ;
3: for  $t = 1, \dots, T$  do
4:   for  $c \in C'$  in parallel do
5:     Send global prompt network  $\phi_G$  to  $\phi_c$ ;
6:      $\phi_c \leftarrow \text{LocalTraining}(\theta_c^p, \epsilon_c, \phi_c)$ ;
7:   end for
8:    $\phi_G \leftarrow \sum_{c=1}^{c=C'} \frac{|\mathcal{D}_c|}{|\mathcal{D}|} \phi_c$ ;
9: end for
10: return  $\phi_G$ ;
11:  $\text{LocalTraining}(\theta_c^p, \epsilon_c, \phi_c)$ ;
12: for  $s = 1, \dots, S_p$  do
13:    $\phi_c \leftarrow \phi_c - \alpha_p \nabla \ell(\theta_c^p, \epsilon_c, \phi_c)$  using  $\ell_c = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|f(\theta_c^p, \epsilon_c; \mathbf{Y}_i^{\mathbf{M}^c} + \Phi(\mathbf{M}^c)) - \mathbf{X}_i\|_2^2$ ;
14: end for
15: for  $s = 1, \dots, S_b$  do
16:    $\epsilon_c \leftarrow \epsilon_c - \alpha_b \nabla \ell(\theta_c^p, \epsilon_c, \phi_c)$  using  $\ell_c = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|f(\theta_c^p, \epsilon_c; \mathbf{Y}_i^{\mathbf{M}^c} + \Phi(\mathbf{M}^c)) - \mathbf{X}_i\|_2^2$ ;
17: end for
18: return  $\phi_c$  to server;

```

A.5 Visualizations

In this section, we provide more visualization results of different methods. In Figs. 5~6, we present the reconstruction results of different methods under the scenario of hardware shaking, *i.e.*, the data heterogeneity is naively induced from the different CASSI instances across clients. FedHP enables more fine-grained details retrieval. Besides, we compare the spectral density curves on selected representative spatial regions. The higher correlation to the reference, the better spectrum consistency with the ground truth. In Figs. 7~9, we show additional real reconstruction results of FedAvg and FedHP on selected wavelengths. By comparison, FedAvg fails to reconstruct some content, while the proposed FedHP allows a more granular result.




Figure 5: Reconstruction results on simulation data. The density curves compares the spectral consistency of different methods to the ground truth. We use the same coded aperture for all methods.




Figure 6: Reconstruction results on simulation data. The density curves compares the spectral consistency of different methods to the ground truth. We use the same coded aperture for all methods.




Figure 7: Visualization of reconstruction results on real data. Seven (out of 28) representative wavelengths are selected. We use the same unseen coded aperture for both FedAvg and FedHP.

In Figs. 8, we visualize the different distributions of coded apertures in distinct clients under the scenario of the distribution shift of coded apertures among different clients leads to the data heterogeneity among different local input dataset. This mimics a very challenging scenario where in different clients (*e.g.*, research institutions), the corresponding CASSI systems source from different manufacturers. The proposed FedHP allows a potential collaboration among different institutions for the hyperspectral data acquisition for the first time despite the large distribution gap. By comparison, classic methods of FedProx [Li et al., 2020b] or SCAFFOLD [Karimireddy et al., 2020] fail to provide reasonable retrieval results.

A.6 Data Privacy Protection

FedHP inherently addresses privacy from different perspectives. (1) Hardware decentralization: In the FedHP framework, real hardware configurations (*e.g.*, real masks) remain confidential to the local clients. This design makes it difficult to reverse-engineer the pattern or values of the real mask without direct sharing. (2) Raw data decentralization: FedHP maintains a private hyperspectral dataset for each client. The hyperspectral images are processed locally (*e.g.*, encoding or data augmentation) and never leaves the client, thereby minimizing the risk of exposure. (3) Training process decentralization: FedHP only collects the local updates from the prompt network, which are then shared with the central server. The local updates are anonymized and aggregated without accessing underlying data, preventing any tracing back to the data source and thus protecting confidentiality. In Table 3, we quantitatively compared the performance of the proposed “FedHP” and “FedHP w/o FL” under privacy-constrained environments. FedHP demonstrates a dB average improvement, showcasing its robust model performance and offering a significant privacy advantage that aligns with regulations restricting data sharing.




Figure 8: Coded aperture distributions across Clients 1 \sim 3 under the scenario of manufacturing discrepancy. The symmetrical logarithm scale is employed for better visualization.




Figure 9: Visualization of reconstruction results on real data. Seven (out of 28) representative wavelengths are selected. We use the same unseen coded aperture for both FedAvg and FedHP.

A.7 Statistical Analysis

We further conducted a statistical analysis using a paired t-test to compare the PSNR and SSIM values from FedHP and FedAvg. We define the hypotheses as follows: (1) Null hypothesis (H_0): there is no significant difference in the PSNR and SSIM values between FedAvg and proposed FedHP. (2) Alternative hypothesis (H_a): there is a significant difference in the PSNR and SSIM values between FedAvg and proposed FedHP.

We calculated the differences based on the averaged PSNR and SSIM values for each scene from both FedAvg and FedHP, resulting in ten differences values for PSNR (d_{PSNR}) and SSIM (d_{SSIM}). We performed the paired t-test using $t = \frac{\bar{d}}{s_d / \sqrt{n}}$, where \bar{d} denotes the mean of the difference values for either PSNR or SSIM, s_d is the standard deviations, and n is the number of the paired observations.

We calculated the p-value upon the t-distribution for a two-tailed test using the formula $\text{p-value} = 2 \times P(T > |t|)$, where $P(T > |t|)$ denotes the probability that a t-distributed random variable with $n - 1$ degrees of freedom exceeds the absolute value of the observed t-statistic.

For PSNR, we observe $t = 2.50$ and p-value is 0.034. Since the p-value is less than the typical significance level of 0.05. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis (H_0) and conclude that there is a statistically significant difference between the PSNR values of FedAvg and FedHP. For SSIM, we observe $t = 7.39$ and p-value is 0.00004. The p-value of is significantly less than 0.05, indicating a very strong statistically significant difference between the SSIM values of FedAvg and FedHP. The test results in PSNR and SSIM confirms that the performance gap between FedHP and FedAvg is statistically significant.

NeurIPS Paper Checklist

1. Claims

Question: Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper's contributions and scope?

Answer: [\[Yes\]](#)

Justification: The main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper's contributions and scope.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the abstract and introduction do not include the claims made in the paper.
- The abstract and/or introduction should clearly state the claims made, including the contributions made in the paper and important assumptions and limitations. A No or NA answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers.
- The claims made should match theoretical and experimental results, and reflect how much the results can be expected to generalize to other settings.
- It is fine to include aspirational goals as motivation as long as it is clear that these goals are not attained by the paper.

2. Limitations

Question: Does the paper discuss the limitations of the work performed by the authors?

Answer: [\[Yes\]](#)

Justification: We discussed the limitations of the work performed by the authors in the supplementary.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper has no limitation while the answer No means that the paper has limitations, but those are not discussed in the paper.
- The authors are encouraged to create a separate "Limitations" section in their paper.
- The paper should point out any strong assumptions and how robust the results are to violations of these assumptions (e.g., independence assumptions, noiseless settings, model well-specification, asymptotic approximations only holding locally). The authors should reflect on how these assumptions might be violated in practice and what the implications would be.
- The authors should reflect on the scope of the claims made, e.g., if the approach was only tested on a few datasets or with a few runs. In general, empirical results often depend on implicit assumptions, which should be articulated.
- The authors should reflect on the factors that influence the performance of the approach. For example, a facial recognition algorithm may perform poorly when image resolution is low or images are taken in low lighting. Or a speech-to-text system might not be used reliably to provide closed captions for online lectures because it fails to handle technical jargon.
- The authors should discuss the computational efficiency of the proposed algorithms and how they scale with dataset size.
- If applicable, the authors should discuss possible limitations of their approach to address problems of privacy and fairness.
- While the authors might fear that complete honesty about limitations might be used by reviewers as grounds for rejection, a worse outcome might be that reviewers discover limitations that aren't acknowledged in the paper. The authors should use their best judgment and recognize that individual actions in favor of transparency play an important role in developing norms that preserve the integrity of the community. Reviewers will be specifically instructed to not penalize honesty concerning limitations.

3. Theory Assumptions and Proofs

Question: For each theoretical result, does the paper provide the full set of assumptions and a complete (and correct) proof?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: The paper does not include theoretical results.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include theoretical results.
- All the theorems, formulas, and proofs in the paper should be numbered and cross-referenced.
- All assumptions should be clearly stated or referenced in the statement of any theorems.
- The proofs can either appear in the main paper or the supplemental material, but if they appear in the supplemental material, the authors are encouraged to provide a short proof sketch to provide intuition.
- Inversely, any informal proof provided in the core of the paper should be complemented by formal proofs provided in appendix or supplemental material.
- Theorems and Lemmas that the proof relies upon should be properly referenced.

4. Experimental Result Reproducibility

Question: Does the paper fully disclose all the information needed to reproduce the main experimental results of the paper to the extent that it affects the main claims and/or conclusions of the paper (regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not)?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We disclose all the information needed to reproduce the main experimental results of the paper in the supplementary.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- If the paper includes experiments, a No answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers: Making the paper reproducible is important, regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not.
- If the contribution is a dataset and/or model, the authors should describe the steps taken to make their results reproducible or verifiable.
- Depending on the contribution, reproducibility can be accomplished in various ways. For example, if the contribution is a novel architecture, describing the architecture fully might suffice, or if the contribution is a specific model and empirical evaluation, it may be necessary to either make it possible for others to replicate the model with the same dataset, or provide access to the model. In general, releasing code and data is often one good way to accomplish this, but reproducibility can also be provided via detailed instructions for how to replicate the results, access to a hosted model (e.g., in the case of a large language model), releasing of a model checkpoint, or other means that are appropriate to the research performed.
- While NeurIPS does not require releasing code, the conference does require all submissions to provide some reasonable avenue for reproducibility, which may depend on the nature of the contribution. For example
 - (a) If the contribution is primarily a new algorithm, the paper should make it clear how to reproduce that algorithm.
 - (b) If the contribution is primarily a new model architecture, the paper should describe the architecture clearly and fully.
 - (c) If the contribution is a new model (e.g., a large language model), then there should either be a way to access this model for reproducing the results or a way to reproduce the model (e.g., with an open-source dataset or instructions for how to construct the dataset).
 - (d) We recognize that reproducibility may be tricky in some cases, in which case authors are welcome to describe the particular way they provide for reproducibility. In the case of closed-source models, it may be that access to the model is limited in some way (e.g., to registered users), but it should be possible for other researchers to have some path to reproducing or verifying the results.

5. Open access to data and code

Question: Does the paper provide open access to the data and code, with sufficient instructions to faithfully reproduce the main experimental results, as described in supplemental material?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The manuscript and the supplementary provides detailed information in reproduce the results. We claim to release the dataset, code, and pretrained models in the abstract.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that paper does not include experiments requiring code.
- Please see the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://nips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- While we encourage the release of code and data, we understand that this might not be possible, so “No” is an acceptable answer. Papers cannot be rejected simply for not including code, unless this is central to the contribution (e.g., for a new open-source benchmark).
- The instructions should contain the exact command and environment needed to run to reproduce the results. See the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://nips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- The authors should provide instructions on data access and preparation, including how to access the raw data, preprocessed data, intermediate data, and generated data, etc.
- The authors should provide scripts to reproduce all experimental results for the new proposed method and baselines. If only a subset of experiments are reproducible, they should state which ones are omitted from the script and why.
- At submission time, to preserve anonymity, the authors should release anonymized versions (if applicable).
- Providing as much information as possible in supplemental material (appended to the paper) is recommended, but including URLs to data and code is permitted.

6. Experimental Setting/Details

Question: Does the paper specify all the training and test details (e.g., data splits, hyperparameters, how they were chosen, type of optimizer, etc.) necessary to understand the results?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The manuscript and the supplementary provides detailed information about the experimental setting/details.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The experimental setting should be presented in the core of the paper to a level of detail that is necessary to appreciate the results and make sense of them.
- The full details can be provided either with the code, in appendix, or as supplemental material.

7. Experiment Statistical Significance

Question: Does the paper report error bars suitably and correctly defined or other appropriate information about the statistical significance of the experiments?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The results are accompanied by variances for the experiments that support the main claims of the paper.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The authors should answer "Yes" if the results are accompanied by error bars, confidence intervals, or statistical significance tests, at least for the experiments that support the main claims of the paper.

- The factors of variability that the error bars are capturing should be clearly stated (for example, train/test split, initialization, random drawing of some parameter, or overall run with given experimental conditions).
- The method for calculating the error bars should be explained (closed form formula, call to a library function, bootstrap, etc.)
- The assumptions made should be given (e.g., Normally distributed errors).
- It should be clear whether the error bar is the standard deviation or the standard error of the mean.
- It is OK to report 1-sigma error bars, but one should state it. The authors should preferably report a 2-sigma error bar than state that they have a 96% CI, if the hypothesis of Normality of errors is not verified.
- For asymmetric distributions, the authors should be careful not to show in tables or figures symmetric error bars that would yield results that are out of range (e.g. negative error rates).
- If error bars are reported in tables or plots, The authors should explain in the text how they were calculated and reference the corresponding figures or tables in the text.

8. Experiments Compute Resources

Question: For each experiment, does the paper provide sufficient information on the computer resources (type of compute workers, memory, time of execution) needed to reproduce the experiments?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The computer resources has been reported.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The paper should indicate the type of compute workers CPU or GPU, internal cluster, or cloud provider, including relevant memory and storage.
- The paper should provide the amount of compute required for each of the individual experimental runs as well as estimate the total compute.
- The paper should disclose whether the full research project required more compute than the experiments reported in the paper (e.g., preliminary or failed experiments that didn't make it into the paper).

9. Code Of Ethics

Question: Does the research conducted in the paper conform, in every respect, with the NeurIPS Code of Ethics <https://neurips.cc/public/EthicsGuidelines>?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The research conducted in the paper conform, in every respect, with the NeurIPS Code of Ethics.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the authors have not reviewed the NeurIPS Code of Ethics.
- If the authors answer No, they should explain the special circumstances that require a deviation from the Code of Ethics.
- The authors should make sure to preserve anonymity (e.g., if there is a special consideration due to laws or regulations in their jurisdiction).

10. Broader Impacts

Question: Does the paper discuss both potential positive societal impacts and negative societal impacts of the work performed?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The paper discuss both potential positive societal impacts and negative societal impacts of the work performed.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that there is no societal impact of the work performed.

- If the authors answer NA or No, they should explain why their work has no societal impact or why the paper does not address societal impact.
- Examples of negative societal impacts include potential malicious or unintended uses (e.g., disinformation, generating fake profiles, surveillance), fairness considerations (e.g., deployment of technologies that could make decisions that unfairly impact specific groups), privacy considerations, and security considerations.
- The conference expects that many papers will be foundational research and not tied to particular applications, let alone deployments. However, if there is a direct path to any negative applications, the authors should point it out. For example, it is legitimate to point out that an improvement in the quality of generative models could be used to generate deepfakes for disinformation. On the other hand, it is not needed to point out that a generic algorithm for optimizing neural networks could enable people to train models that generate Deepfakes faster.
- The authors should consider possible harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended and functioning correctly, harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended but gives incorrect results, and harms following from (intentional or unintentional) misuse of the technology.
- If there are negative societal impacts, the authors could also discuss possible mitigation strategies (e.g., gated release of models, providing defenses in addition to attacks, mechanisms for monitoring misuse, mechanisms to monitor how a system learns from feedback over time, improving the efficiency and accessibility of ML).

11. Safeguards

Question: Does the paper describe safeguards that have been put in place for responsible release of data or models that have a high risk for misuse (e.g., pretrained language models, image generators, or scraped datasets)?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: The paper poses no such risks.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper poses no such risks.
- Released models that have a high risk for misuse or dual-use should be released with necessary safeguards to allow for controlled use of the model, for example by requiring that users adhere to usage guidelines or restrictions to access the model or implementing safety filters.
- Datasets that have been scraped from the Internet could pose safety risks. The authors should describe how they avoided releasing unsafe images.
- We recognize that providing effective safeguards is challenging, and many papers do not require this, but we encourage authors to take this into account and make a best faith effort.

12. Licenses for existing assets

Question: Are the creators or original owners of assets (e.g., code, data, models), used in the paper, properly credited and are the license and terms of use explicitly mentioned and properly respected?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The creators or original owners of assets (e.g., code, data, models), used in the paper, properly credited and are the license and terms of use explicitly mentioned and properly respected.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not use existing assets.
- The authors should cite the original paper that produced the code package or dataset.
- The authors should state which version of the asset is used and, if possible, include a URL.
- The name of the license (e.g., CC-BY 4.0) should be included for each asset.

- For scraped data from a particular source (e.g., website), the copyright and terms of service of that source should be provided.
- If assets are released, the license, copyright information, and terms of use in the package should be provided. For popular datasets, paperswithcode.com/datasets has curated licenses for some datasets. Their licensing guide can help determine the license of a dataset.
- For existing datasets that are re-packaged, both the original license and the license of the derived asset (if it has changed) should be provided.
- If this information is not available online, the authors are encouraged to reach out to the asset's creators.

13. New Assets

Question: Are new assets introduced in the paper well documented and is the documentation provided alongside the assets?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The paper will release a new dataset of SSHD. We provide rich details about SSHD in the manuscript and the supplementary.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not release new assets.
- Researchers should communicate the details of the dataset/code/model as part of their submissions via structured templates. This includes details about training, license, limitations, etc.
- The paper should discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose asset is used.
- At submission time, remember to anonymize your assets (if applicable). You can either create an anonymized URL or include an anonymized zip file.

14. Crowdsourcing and Research with Human Subjects

Question: For crowdsourcing experiments and research with human subjects, does the paper include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if applicable, as well as details about compensation (if any)?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: The paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Including this information in the supplemental material is fine, but if the main contribution of the paper involves human subjects, then as much detail as possible should be included in the main paper.
- According to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics, workers involved in data collection, curation, or other labor should be paid at least the minimum wage in the country of the data collector.

15. Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approvals or Equivalent for Research with Human Subjects

Question: Does the paper describe potential risks incurred by study participants, whether such risks were disclosed to the subjects, and whether Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals (or an equivalent approval/review based on the requirements of your country or institution) were obtained?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: The paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.

- Depending on the country in which research is conducted, IRB approval (or equivalent) may be required for any human subjects research. If you obtained IRB approval, you should clearly state this in the paper.
- We recognize that the procedures for this may vary significantly between institutions and locations, and we expect authors to adhere to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics and the guidelines for their institution.
- For initial submissions, do not include any information that would break anonymity (if applicable), such as the institution conducting the review.