

No Vandalism: Privacy-Preserving and Byzantine-Robust Federated Learning

Zhibo Xing
Beijing Institute of Technology
Beijing, China
University of Auckland
Auckland, New Zealand
3120215670@bit.edu.cn

Zijian Zhang
Beijing Institute of Technology
Beijing, China
zhangzijian@bit.edu.cn

Zi'ang Zhang
Beijing Institute of Technology
Beijing, China
3220231794@bit.edu.cn

Jiamou Liu
University of Auckland
Auckland, New Zealand
jiamou.liu@auckland.ac.nz

Liehuang Zhu
Beijing Institute of Technology
Beijing, China
liehuangz@bit.edu.cn

Giovanni Russello
University of Auckland
Auckland, New Zealand
g.russello@auckland.ac.nz

ABSTRACT

Federated learning allows several clients to train one machine learning model jointly without sharing private data, providing privacy protection. However, traditional federated learning is vulnerable to poisoning attacks, which can not only decrease the model performance, but also implant malicious backdoors. In addition, direct submission of local model parameters can also lead to the privacy leakage of the training dataset. In this paper, we aim to build a privacy-preserving and Byzantine-robust federated learning scheme to provide an environment with no vandalism (NoV) against attacks from malicious participants. Specifically, we construct a model filter for poisoned local models, protecting the global model from data and model poisoning attacks. This model filter combines zero-knowledge proofs to provide further privacy protection. Then, we adopt secret sharing to provide verifiable secure aggregation, removing malicious clients that disrupting the aggregation process. Our formal analysis proves that NoV can protect data privacy and weed out Byzantine attackers. Our experiments illustrate that NoV can effectively address data and model poisoning attacks, including PGD, and outperforms other related schemes.

CCS CONCEPTS

• Security and privacy → Privacy-preserving protocols.

KEYWORDS

Federated Learning, Zero-Knowledge Proof, Secret Sharing, Poisoning Attack

ACM Reference Format:

Zhibo Xing, Zijian Zhang, Zi'ang Zhang, Jiamou Liu, Liehuang Zhu, and Giovanni Russello. 2018. No Vandalism: Privacy-Preserving and Byzantine-Robust Federated Learning. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS '24)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 12 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 INTRODUCTION

Federated learning is an emerging machine learning approach for data privacy protection that generally consists of a central server and several clients. The server aggregates and distributes global models. The clients train the global model with their private datasets to obtain local models. By aggregating the local models into a new global model, the local datasets can contribute to the global model update, while avoiding direct data disclosure, thus protecting data privacy. The emphasis on data privacy under GDPR has boosted the utilization of privacy-preserving federated learning in a variety of applications, including healthcare [4], finance [16], autonomous driving [27], mobile edge computing [32], etc.

However, there exists some security threats in federated learning. The first issue is about the robustness of federated learning. Since the local training process is transparent, malicious clients can perform poisoning attack during the training process. The aggregation involves poisoned local models can lead to the global model performance degradation, e.g., the drop of accuracy or implanted backdoors in the global model. To resist poisoning attacks, poisoned local models need to be checked and filter out before the aggregation. Common model checking strategies include magnitude-based and direction-based. By treating models as vectors and comparing their differences in magnitude and direction, poisoned models can be recognized. Furthermore, malicious clients can also break the federated learning process during the model aggregation, by sending incorrect or inconsistent messages to other clients or server, or refusing to send messages. These kinds of attack is recognized as the Byzantine attack. The second issue is about the privacy of federated learning. Although avoiding directly sharing local datasets largely protects data privacy, some reconstruction attacks and inference attacks are still able to reconstruct the sample used in the training, or infer which sample is used or not, from the submitted

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.
CCS '24, October 14-18, 2024, Salt Lake City, U.S.A.

© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06...\$15.00
<https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

local model. These attacks greatly threaten the privacy of federated learning. To resist such privacy attacks, secure aggregation protocols are employed. Secure aggregation protocols can accomplish the global model aggregation without exposing each local model, which avoids privacy attacks due to local model exposure. In general, common secure aggregation protocols are based on homomorphic encryption or secret sharing.

How to provide good defense performance against poisoning attacks, Byzantine attacks and privacy attacks simultaneously has been a crucial research problem for secure federated learning. On the one hand, it is necessary to check whether the submitted local model is benign or not without direct access, achieving strong poisoning defense without compromising the privacy. On the other hand, it is also necessary to aggregate the checked models in a secure way, to avoid Byzantine attacks and privacy leakage during the aggregation process. In addition, the federated learning system should work with ordinary assumptions to enhance the practicality of the scheme. For example, a common federated learning system should contain a limited number of clients and only one semi-honest server who does not possess any training data. Unfortunately, previous works cannot provide a satisfying defense performance against all these three attacks within ordinary assumptions. Thus, we propose a privacy-preserving and Byzantine-robust federated learning system with no vandalism (NoV), which can address aforementioned problems. Specifically, we design a novel model filter with layer-wise and hybrid strategy to check the local updates, providing stronger defense performance against data and model poisoning attacks including Projection Gradient Descent [21] (PGD) attack. This model filter does not require to have a clean dataset. Following RoFL [19], we adopt non-interactive zero-knowledge proofs (NIZK) to make this model filter privacy-preserving. In addition, we design a novel secure aggregation protocol which can provide privacy protection for the local models while wiping out malicious Byzantine attackers with only one semi-honest server. The main contributions of our work are shown as follows:

- We propose a model filter with hybrid strategies, which is demonstrated by experiments to be effective in defending against data and model poisoning attacks including PGD attack.
- We propose a privacy-preserving secure aggregation protocol based on secret sharing, which protects local models from being leaked while detecting Byzantine attackers during the aggregation.
- We provide a privacy-preserving and Byzantine-robust federated learning by combining the above scheme with NIZK.
- We conduct experiments with two well-known datasets to compare the defense performance of NoV with existing schemes. The experimental results show that our scheme performs well with affordable computation time.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents existing work in areas related to our paper. Section 3 introduces preliminary knowledge. Section 4 describes the system model, threats and design goals. Section 5 presents our scheme, NoV in detail. Section 6 and Section 7 analyze the security and performance of our scheme, respectively. Section 8 summarizes our work.

Table 1: Comparison with related work in Byzantine-robust federated learning.

Related Works	Poisoning Defense	Client Privacy	Byzantine Defense	Ordinary Assumption
FLTrust[9]	◐	○	N/A	○
SecureFL[14]	◐	○	N/A	○
FLDetector [34]	◐	○	N/A	●
CosDefense [31]	◐	○	N/A	●
FLAME [24]	●	○	N/A	●
PEFL [18]	◐	●	●	○
PBFL [23]	◐	●	●	○
ShieldFL [20]	◐	●	●	○
RoFL [19]	◐	●	◐	●
Our Work	●	●	●	●

¹ ○ denotes the requirement is not covered;

² ◐ denotes the requirement is partially covered;

³ ● denotes the requirement is fully covered;

2 RELATED WORK

In this section, we present an overview on existing researches related to privacy-preserving and Byzantine-robust federated learning. For the robustness, we mainly consider its ability in defending against poisoning attacks and Byzantine attacks.

2.1 Byzantine-Robust Federated Learning

In federated learning, malicious clients can upload poisoned local updates to spoil the global model, resulting in accuracy degradation or backdoor implantation. To defend against such poisoning attacks, FLTrust [9] provides the server with a *server model* trained by itself on a clean dataset. The server will compute the *cosine similarity* between the submitted local model and the server model. This similarity will be used for calculating the aggregation weights of local models. Further, all local models are *normalized* to a same magnitude to reduce the influence of malicious models in terms of magnitude. SecureFL [14] follows the same model checking strategy as FLTrust and customizes a number of cryptographic components to increase its efficiency. In FLDetector [34], the server computes the *predicted models* for each client i . The average *Euclidean distance* between the prediction models and their submitted local models over several rounds is utilized as a score. By clustering scores among clients, the cluster with higher average scores is identified as malicious clients and subsequently removed. CosDefense [31] computes the *cosine similarity* of the *last layer parameters* between the local updates and the *global model* as a filtering criterion. FLAME [24] computes *cosine distance* between *each pairwise models* and utilizes the DBSCAN algorithm to cluster these models, obtaining the cluster of malicious models. PEFL [18] uses the median of local model parameters. The server computes the *Pearson correlation coefficient* between each local model and the *median model*. This coefficient is treated as the aggregation weight to mitigate the influence of malicious models. The privacy is guaranteed by homomorphic encryption among two servers. PBFL [23] utilizes a clean dataset and cosine similarity to identify possible malicious updates. With

a homomorphic encryption-based aggregation scheme, the local model privacy could be preserved with two non-colluding central server. ShieldFL [20] examines the *cosine similarity* between the *normalized* local models and the *global model* from the previous round. Homomorphic encryption is utilized to protect data privacy during the computation between the two server. RoFL [19] calculates the L_2 norm and L_∞ norm between the submitted local model and the *global model from the previous round*. If the norm exceeds a pre-defined threshold, then that update will be filtered out.

However, existing schemes suffer from following issues:

- **Vulnerable to specific attacks:** Most schemes [9, 14, 18–20, 23, 34] rely on simple model checking strategies based on Euclidean distance or cosine similarity. However, when facing stronger model poisoning attacks with non-independent identically distributed (non-iid) datasets, these defense is much less effective. PGD [21] attack can project the malicious model into a certain range of the reference model, thus bypassing these defense.

To address stronger poisoning attacks, we propose a hybrid and layer-wise model checking strategy, further identifying the difference between malicious and benign updates.

- **Breaking local privacy:** Some schemes [9, 14, 24, 31, 34] assume that the server has direct access to all local models to compute their magnitude and direction. However, considering existing data reconstruction attacks and membership inference attacks, the direct access to local models will compromise the privacy of local datasets.

To address the privacy leakage during the model checking, we employ NIZK, converting the model checking process into a zero-knowledge one.

- **Rely on extra prior knowledge:** Some schemes [9, 14, 23] assume that the server has a clean dataset, which can be used to train a benign model as the reference model. By comparing with this reference model, malicious models can be identified. This assumption requires the server to have additional computational and data collection capabilities, reducing the application scenarios of the schemes.

To address the additional reliance on clean dataset, we use the previous global model as the reference model. With a more efficient model filter, malicious models can be filtered out.

2.2 Privacy-Preserving Federated Learning

In federated learning, clients only need to submit local models, avoiding direct exposure of the local dataset. Nevertheless, several reconstruction attacks [12, 35, 36] have demonstrated that submitted local models can lead to the leakage of local datasets. Therefore, privacy-preserving aggregation methods are necessary to prevent the reveal of local models. Existing privacy-preserving aggregation schemes, integrated with defense against poisoning, can be categorized into secret sharing-based (SS-based) and homomorphic encryption-based (HE-based). For instance, PEFL [18], ShieldFL [20], and PBFL [23] employ HE-based aggregation schemes, while RoFL [19] utilizes a SS-based aggregation scheme. HE-based schemes protect the privacy of local update through the homomorphic aggregation on ciphertext. However, HE-based schemes always introducing the

assumption of several non-colluding server for secure aggregating. SS-based schemes protect the privacy of local updates by dividing the local update into several shares. These shares leak no information that contribute to infer local updates, and can be aggregated for reconstruction the global update. However, it is difficult for SS-based schemes to detect the Byzantine attackers. Thus once the attack occurs, the current training round has to be rolled back. Specifically, existing schemes suffer from following issues:

- **Rely on multiple non-collude server:** Some schemes [18, 20, 23] achieve privacy-preserving aggregation through multiple non-colluding semi-honest servers. This assumption reduces the security of the scheme, leading to limited application scenarios.

To address the additional reliance on multiple non-colluding semi-honest servers, we adopt a SS-based aggregation protocol.

- **Vulnerable to Byzantine attacks:** The scheme [19] based on secret sharing less considers the malicious behavior during the aggregation, such as sending different messages for different participants, intentionally sending error messages, or refusing to communicate. Such Byzantine attacks can pose a great challenge to aggregation protocols. RoFL can only recognize if an attack has occurred, and do not limit the attackers and their malicious actions.

To address the vulnerability on Byzantine attacks, we propose a verifiable aggregation protocol that utilizing verifiable secret sharing and verifiable decryption to identify Byzantine attackers.

3 PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we primarily introduce some background knowledge relevant to our scheme, including federated learning, poisoning attacks, zero-knowledge proofs, and secret sharing.

3.1 Federated Learning

Federated learning (FL) [22] is a distributed machine learning technique that allows multiple clients to jointly train a global model using their respective private datasets. In general, a federated learning includes a central server S and n clients C_1, \dots, C_n , where each client C_u possesses a private dataset D_u . Taking the j -th round of training as an example:

- (1) Server S distributes the global model M_{j-1} from the previous round to each client.
- (2) Each client C_u train the global model with her private dataset D_u to obtain the local update δ_u^j .
- (3) Each client C_u submits her local update δ_u^j to the server S , with which the server can aggregate the local updates submitted by clients with $M^j = M^{j-1} + \frac{\sum_{u=1}^n \delta_u^j}{n}$ to obtain the updated global model.

And this process iterates until the global model converges.

3.2 Poisoning Attacks

Poisoning attacks aim to degrade the performance of a model. In federated learning, adversaries achieve this by submitting poisoning local models, which can eventually impact the performance of the

global model. Depending on the goal, poisoning attacks can be classified as untargeted attacks and targeted attacks. The objective of an untargeted attack is to degrade the model's performance across all inputs without focusing on specific target inputs [11]. On the other hand, a targeted attack aims to influence the model's performance on specific inputs while maintaining the overall performance on the task [5]. For instance, it may focus on misclassifying certain images. Based on the method, poisoning attacks can be divided into data poisoning and model poisoning. Data poisoning involves malicious modifications to the training dataset to induce poison in the trained model [28]. For example, flipping the labels of training data to make the model learn incorrect classification results. Model poisoning, on the other hand, involves directly manipulating the weights of a trained model to adversely impact its performance on the target task [29].

3.3 Zero-Knowledge Proof

Zero-knowledge proof (ZKP) [13] is a cryptographic protocol used for a prover P to convince a verifier V that a specific statement is true without revealing any additional information during the process. More formally, ZKP is a protocol to prove knowledge of a witness w for a statement ϕ that satisfying $(w, \phi) \in R$, a NP relation that defines whether a given witness is valid for the statement or not. In essence, a zero-knowledge proof protocol has three properties:

- (1) Completeness: If the statement is true, an honest verifier will be convinced by an honest prover.
- (2) Soundness: If the statement is false, no cheating prover can convince an honest verifier.
- (3) Zero-knowledge: No additional information about the statement, apart from its truth, is revealed to the verifier.

In NoV, we utilize zero-knowledge proof for the implementation of the model filter to ensure the protection of local model privacy.

3.4 Verifiable Secret Sharing

Secret sharing (SS) is a cryptographic scheme used to split and reconstruct secrets. For the t -out-of- n secret sharing scheme employed, it enables the division of a secret s into n shares. The original secret s can be reconstructed using any arbitrary set of t shares, while any set of $t - 1$ shares remains insufficient to retrieve any information about s . Specifically, the algorithm $\text{SS.share}(s, t, \mathcal{U}) \rightarrow \{(u, s_u)\}_{u \in \mathcal{U}}$ takes the secret s , threshold t , and a list of users \mathcal{U} as input, generating shares s_u for each user $u \in \mathcal{U}$. The algorithm $\text{SS.recon}(\{(u, s_u)\}_{u \in \mathcal{V}}, t) \rightarrow s$ takes threshold t and shares s_u from $|\mathcal{V}| \geq t$ users as input and reconstructs the original secret s . Verifiable secret sharing (VSS) [26] enables users to verify whether a given share corresponds to the same secret. Additionally, the secret sharing scheme [26] used in this paper exhibits additive homomorphism [6], means for secrets s^1 and s^2 , $\text{SS.recon}(\{(u, s_u^1 + s_u^2)\}_{u \in \mathcal{V}}, t) \rightarrow s^1 + s^2$. In NoV, we utilize verifiable secret sharing for constructing the aggregation protocol to identify malicious Byzantine attackers.

3.5 Public-Key Encryption

Public-key encryption is a cryptographic scheme used to encrypt and decrypt messages for secure communication. Specifically, the ElGamal encryption on group G of order q with generator g used




Figure 1: The system and threat model for NoV.

in our scheme is described as follow:

- $\text{KeyGen}(1^\lambda)$ generates private-public key pairs (sk, pk) where $sk \in_R \mathbb{Z}_q^*$, $pk = g^{sk}$;
- $\text{Enc}(pk, m)$ generates ciphertext $c = (pk^r, g^r m)$ of message $m \in G$ with public key $pk \in G^*$ where $r \in_R \mathbb{Z}_q$;
- $\text{Dec}(sk, c = (c_1, c_2))$ generates plaintext $m = c_1^{-\frac{1}{sk}} c_2$ of ciphertext $c \in G^2$ with private key $sk \in \mathbb{Z}_q^*$. In NoV, we utilize public-key encryption to ensure the security and privacy of communication between clients.

4 PROBLEM STATEMENT

In this section, we describe the system model, the threat model, and the design goals of our scheme, respectively.

4.1 System Model

Figure 1 illustrates the system architecture. In this system, there are a total of n clients denoted as C_1 to C_n and a server S . The primary objective of these participants is to collaborate with other, using their respective private dataset to train an optimized model without compromising privacy. Each client has a pair of public and private keys (PK_i, SK_i) for encrypted communication and a private dataset D_i for local training. During the j -th round, server S distributes global model M_{j-1} to all clients. Client C_i trains global model M_{j-1} with their private dataset D_i , resulting in a local model m_j^i . To guarantee the validity of the local model, client C_i is also required to generate a proof π_j^i for their local model m_j^i . By sending the proofs and local updates, clients can participate in the aggregation of global model. Through a secure aggregation protocol, S could obtain the updated global model M_j aggregated from valid local updates $\{m_j^i\}_{valid}$.

4.2 Threat Model

Figure 1 illustrates the security threats to the system. In this system, the server is assumed to be curious, which means that the server will faithfully execute the protocol, but will try to infer local private updates or datasets from clients. If the curious server has access to one local model, then by using deep leakage attacks [12, 35, 36] or member inference attacks [15, 30, 33], the privacy of the corresponding training dataset will be destroyed. Besides, it is assumed that the server will not collude with any clients.

All the clients are assumed to be curious, they also will try to infer private datasets from others. Further, for a system contains n clients, this scheme can tolerate $t - 1$ colluding malicious clients, where t represents the minimum number of participants required in a (t, n) threshold secret sharing scheme to reconstruct a secret. Malicious clients may further attempt various types of attacks, including:

- **Poisoning attacks:** These attacks aiming at injecting backdoors [5, 29] or decreasing the accuracy [11] of the global model.
- **Byzantine attacks:** Byzantine attackers try to disrupt the federated learning process by intentionally submitting incorrect local models or refusing to submit local models.
- **Collusion attacks:** Malicious clients can collude with each other to attempt infer local models and datasets from other clients.

4.3 Design Goals

Our goal is to design a privacy-preserving and Byzantine-robust federated learning system. Given the threat model above, the design goals for this system are as follows:

- **Robustness:** The federated learning system should be resilient to poisoning attacks and Byzantine attacks from malicious clients. The aggregation procedure and the accuracy of the global model should not be affected by malicious clients.
- **Privacy:** The federated learning system should protect against the curious server and curious or malicious clients attempting to access or infer the local model or the dataset from other curious clients. No other participants should be able to access the parameters in local models from a curious clients.

5 THE NOV SCHEME

In this section, we first provide a technical overview. Then we present the specific construction of two main components in NoV, model filter and aggregation protocol.

5.1 Technical Overview

A common observation [9] is that benign models follow a similar distribution of magnitude and direction, but malicious models not. Thus malicious models can be identified by comparisons in magnitude or direction. Besides, non-iid data among clients can lead to a wider distribution of benign models, making it more difficult to identify malicious models. This observation is depicted in figure 2(a) and further supported in figure 5. Another observation [31] is that data poisoning attacks do not significantly affect the parameters of the entire model, but only a small portion of the layers, as depicted in figure 2(c). When the model size increases, the poisoned model will be more difficult to be recognized, as the malicious CNN models are more obvious than the LeNet5s in figure 5. Besides, when the range of samples affected by the data poisoning attack decreases, the impact on the model also decreases. Thus, backdoor attacks are more difficult to recognize compared to label flipping attacks, and backdoor attacks using tail data are also more difficult to recognize than general backdoor attacks, which is also shown in figure 5. Tail data refers to special samples with small amount under a certain classification, such as number 7 with a horizontal bar, or a specific




Figure 2: Observations on malicious models and benign models.

model of airplanes. In addition, PGD attack can project malicious models into a specific range of reference model with a small loss of attack efficiency. As a result, most magnitude and direction-based model checking strategies cannot provide satisfying defense performance against PGD attack, as depicted in figure 2(b). Therefore, to enhance the defense performance of the model filter, we propose a hybrid and layer-wise model checking strategy. First of all, we check local model updates rather than local models itself, because the local model contains the global model of the previous round, which can dilute the impact of poisoned local updates. In the model filter, we first constrain the local updates in magnitude to exclude local models that are significantly far from the reference model. Then we impose a layer-wise direction constraints on the local updates. Layer-wise strategies not only improves the model filter's ability to detect poisoning attacks, but also minimize the impact of increasing model size.

For the aggregation protocol, a technical route based on secret sharing was chosen in order to eliminate the reliance on multiple non-colluding semi-honest servers. However, this leads to that malicious clients can submit inconsistent shares to corrupt the aggregation result. Although the server can detect the vandalism after aggregation, most schemes, including RoFL, choose to abort the protocol and start a new training round with different clients. However, this is not realistic for scenarios with a small number of clients. Therefore, by combining verifiable secret sharing with verifiable decryption, we propose a verifiable aggregation protocol. By verifying the correctness of the shares as well as the decryption result, the server can identify and kick out the specific malicious Byzantine attacker and resume the aggregation result for this round.

5.2 Model Filter

Based on the aforementioned observations, we propose a model filter with hybrid and layer-wise strategy for the server filtering out malicious local updates. Each client C_u is required to provide a proof with their submitted local update δ , arguing its benignity, to pass the model filter. The hybrid model filter strategy involves both

magnitude and direction constraints on predefined threshold t_m and threshold t_d . Further, we adopt layer-wise direction constraints to improve the performance of the model filter on larger machine learning models. Specifically, we adopt the Euclidean distance and cosine similarity:

$$\|\delta\| \leq t_m \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{\delta_l \cdot M_l}{\|\delta_l\| \cdot \|M_l\|} \geq t_d, l \in [1, L] \quad (2)$$

Where M represents the reference model, which is the global model from previous round. L represents the number of layers of model M , and M_l denotes the vector comprising the parameters in l -th layer of model M . Equation 1 limits the magnitude of the update to threshold t_m to avoid malicious updates beyond that range from affecting the global model. Equation 2 provides a more precise filtering on the direction of the update. The difference in direction between benign and malicious updates becomes insignificant as the model becomes larger. Meanwhile, non-iid datasets also lead to a wider distribution of benign models. Therefore we conduct a layer-wise strategy to examine the structure of the updates more carefully. In our model filter, for the check of equation 1, those updates that are not satisfied will be discarded. For the check of equation 2, the number of layers that can satisfy the check will be recorded. Then all these local updates will be sorted in descending by this number and only the top $n * t_s$ updates will be selected for aggregation, where t_s is the selection percentage.

Specifically, NoV adopts a zero-knowledge range proof scheme, Bulletproofs [8], to generate and verify the proofs for the aforementioned constraints in equation 1 and 2. For equation 1, considering δ as a vector (x_1, \dots, x_p) of length p , the aim is to prove $\sum_{i=1}^p x_i^2 \leq t_m^2$ holds. Each x_i and x_i^2 can be linked through a Σ -protocol with their respective Pedersen commitment $c_i = Com(x_i) = g^{x_i} h^{r_i}$ and $c'_i = Com(x_i^2) = g^{x_i^2} h^{r'_i} = c_i^{x_i} h^{r'_i - x_i r_i}$. Exploiting the homomorphic property of commitments, the proof for equation 1 can be completed with commitment $C' = \prod_{i=1}^p c'_i = g^{\sum_{i=1}^p x_i^2} h^r$ and a range proof of $\sum_{i=1}^p x_i^2 \leq t_m^2$.

As for equation 2, we set the similarity threshold t_d as 0, thus the check transformed into $\delta_l \cdot M_l \geq 0$ for each layer. Both δ_l and M_l can be regarded as vector (x_1, \dots, x_q) and (y_1, \dots, y_q) of length q , respectively. With the commitment $c_i = Com(x_i) = g^{x_i} h^{r_i}$ and the known M_l , it is sufficient to prove equation 2 by proving $\sum_{i=1}^q x_i y_i \geq 0$ with commitment $C = \prod_{i=1}^q c_i^{y_i} = g^{\sum_{i=1}^q x_i y_i} h^r$.

In NoV, the threshold t_m and t_d are assumed to be public, thus both the honest and malicious clients can project their local update into the given range with PGD.

5.3 Aggregation Protocol

To ensure the local model privacy of clients while guaranteeing the correctness of the aggregation procedure, we propose a verifiable aggregation protocol. Specifically, we adopt verifiable secret sharing [26] and verifiable decryption [7] to provide verifiability for identifying malicious Byzantine attackers. Their corresponding pseudo-codes of algorithms for generating and reconstructing secret shares, and proving the correctness of decryption, including VSS_Gen(), Prv_Dec, VSS_Rec(), are provided in Appendix A. Figure 3 illustrates the workflow of the aggregation protocol:




Figure 3: The workflow of the Model aggregation protocol.

- 0) Each client C_u generates their public-private key pairs (PK_u, SK_u) with the key generation algorithm $KeyGen(1^\lambda)$ and send their public key PK_u to the server. Server S assigns a unique index $u \in [1, n]$ to each client and broadcasts the list of index along with corresponding public key $\{(u, PK_u)\}_{u \in [1, n]}$ to all clients. This initialization step only needs to be performed once.
- 1) For each parameter x_u in the local update of client C_u , with a Pedersen commitment $g^{x_u} h^{r_u}$, a verifiable secret sharing scheme [26] can be employed. Running the secret sharing generation algorithm $VSSGen(g, h, x_u, r_u, t, n)$, client C_u can create a t - n secret share $\{(s_{u,v}, o_{u,v})\}_{v \in [1, n]}$ for parameter x_u . In addition, a set of commitments $\{E_{u,j}\}_{j \in [0, t-1]}$ for verifying whether a certain share corresponds to x_u with r_u is also generated. Client C_u encrypts each $(s_{u,v}, o_{u,v})$ with the public key PK_v of client C_v and sends all these encrypted shares and commitments to the server. Server sends the encrypted shares to each specific client. Besides, based on the result of model checking, server can obtain a benign client list U_B whose parameters can be used to aggregate

the global model, which will also be broadcasted to all the clients.

- 2) From each client C_v , client C_u receives and decrypts the ciphertext to obtain share $(s_{v,u}, o_{v,u})$. Then client C_u aggregates all the shares submitted by benign clients according to U_B , to obtain $S_u = \sum_{v \in U_B} s_{v,u}$ and $O_u = \sum_{v \in U_B} o_{v,u}$, a share of one parameter X in the global update, and sends it to the server. With the secret sharing reconstruction algorithm $VSSRec(t, \{(S_u, O_u)\}_{u \in U_B})$, the server can reconstruct the parameter $X = \sum_{u \in U_B} x_u$ and $R = \sum_{u \in U_B} r_u$ of the global update. It can be easily verified whether the recovered X and R align with the Pedersen commitment with equation 3 holds. If this verification passes, server will start the next round training. If this verification fails, server will raise an extra step to identify the Byzantine attacker.

$$\prod_{u \in U_B} g^{x_u} h^{r_u} = g^X h^R \quad (3)$$

- x) The server can verify whether the share S_u and O_u are aggregated from benign client list through equation 4, where $E_j^* = \prod_{u \in U_B} E_{u,j}$ from benign clients. If the verification for client C_u fails, C_u will be asked to provide a Σ -protocol proof, arguing that at least one share $(s_{v,u}, o_{v,u})$ she received is invalid. Server will send all the commitments generated in step 1 to C_u for the verification. C_u can check whether share $(s_{v,u}, o_{v,u})$ she received aligns with commitments $\{E_{v,j}\}_{j \in [0, t-1]}$ given by C_v by checking if equation 5 holds. If the verification for C_v fails, C_u can send a proof π following the Σ -protocol [7] generated by algorithm 2 $\text{Priv_Dec}(PK_u, SK_u, (s_{v,u}, o_{v,u}), c)$ to the server, arguing that client C_v provides an incorrect share. Server will verify whether the decryption is correct by checking equation 6 and whether the share is incorrect by checking equation 5. If equation 6 holds while equation 5 not, the server will kick client C_v out as a malicious client. Otherwise, client C_u will be kicked. The malicious client will be wiped out from the client list, the server can re-broadcasts a benign client list and re-execute step 2.

$$g^{S_u} h^{O_u} = \prod_{j=0}^{t-1} E_j^*(u^j) \quad (4)$$

$$g^{s_{v,u}} h^{o_{v,u}} = \prod_{j=0}^{t-1} E_{v,j}(u^j) \quad (5)$$

$$g^e A = g^z \wedge c_1^e \cdot B = (c_2 m^{-1})^z \quad (6)$$

We provide the full aggregation protocol in figure x.

6 SECURITY ANALYSIS

In this section, we analyze the security of NoV, separated into the security of the aggregation protocol and the privacy of the whole process.

6.1 Security

First we illustrate the security of the model aggregation protocol, i.e., whether a malicious participant can break the aggregation protocol. The performance of the model filter will be illustrated by experiments in section 7.

With respect to the interaction flow of the model aggregation protocol, there are several malicious behaviors:

Generate an incorrect secret share in step 1. In step 1, the client needs to submit the Pedersen commitment of the parameters for the verification of secret sharing, where it is required that the commitment used for secret-sharing verification is the same as the one previously used for model checking. The Pedersen commitment is computational binding [26], where a probabilistic polynomial-time adversary cannot find x' that satisfies $g^x h^r = g^{x'} h^{r'} \wedge x \neq x'$ with all but negligible probability. Thus the malicious client cannot swipe the values of the parameters corresponding to the commitments. In step 1, the client needs to generate secret shares of the parameters. The Pedersen VSS is computational correctness [26], where a probabilistic polynomial-time adversary C_u cannot find S_1, S_2 of size t that satisfies $\{g^{S_u} h^{O_u} = \prod_{j=0}^{t-1} E_j^{(v^j)} \mid (s_{u,v}, o_{u,v}) \in S_1 \cup S_2 \wedge S_1 \neq S_2\}$ with all but negligible probability. Thus the malicious client cannot generate shares that correspond to different parameters without being detected. In step x, the honest client will submit a proof to the server when it receives an incorrect secret share. The Σ -protocol is perfect completeness [7], so upon receiving an incorrect secret share from the malicious client, the proof submitted by the honest client will be accepted by the server with certainty. Thus the malicious client cannot send an incorrect encrypted share.

Submit an incorrect global share in step 2. In step 2, the client needs to aggregate multiple shares into one global share and send it to the server. The Pedersen VSS is computational correctness [26], where a probabilistic polynomial-time adversary A cannot find S_1^*, S_2^* of size t that satisfies $\{g^{S_u} h^{O_u} = \prod_{j=0}^{t-1} E_j^*(u^j) \mid (S_u, O_u) \in S_1^* \cup S_2^* \wedge S_1^* \neq S_2^*\}$ with all but negligible probability. Thus the malicious client cannot generate shares corresponding to different parameters, i.e., it cannot submit a share that can pass the verification and disrupt the aggregation.

Submit an incorrect proof in step x. In step x, the client being asked need to submit a proof to the server. The Σ -protocol is perfect 2-special soundness [7], where a probabilistic polynomial-time adversary A cannot find m' that satisfies $\{g^e A = g^z \wedge c_1^e \cdot B = (c_2 m'^{-1})^z \mid c_1 = h^r, c_2 = mg^r, m \neq m'\}$ with all but negligible probability. Thus a malicious client cannot submit a correct proof about an honest client to the server, i.e., it cannot maliciously report an honest client.

6.2 Privacy

The NIZK scheme Bulletproof used in the model checking phase is perfect SHVZK [1], thus no information about the parameters is revealed during the model checking process. The Pedersen VSS scheme used in the model aggregation phase is perfect privacy [26]. For any $S \subset 1, \dots, n$ of size at most $t-1$ and any $views_S \text{ Prob}[D \text{ has secret } s \mid \text{views}] = \text{Prob}[D \text{ has secret } s]$ for all $s \in \mathcal{Z}_q$. Thus a collusion of less than t malicious clients would not result in the disclosure of information about the parameter. The Σ -protocol used in the model aggregation phase is perfect SHVZK [7], so the Σ -protocol does not leak information about the private key of clients. The encryption scheme ElGamal used in the model aggregation phase is IND-CPA [7], so the encrypted share does not leak information about the parameters.

It is worth mentioning that during the model aggregation phase, client C_u can maliciously submit a Σ -protocol proof to the server,

Verifiable Privacy-Preserving Aggregation Protocol

• Step 0 (Key Generation and Broadcast):

Client C_u :

- Generate public-private key pairs $(PK_u, SK_u) \leftarrow KeyGen(1^\lambda)$.
- Send PK_u to the server.

Server S :

- Collect more than t messages from clients, who form a set \mathbf{Client}_1 .
- Assign each client in \mathbf{Client}_1 with a unique index $u \in [1, |\mathbf{Client}_1|]$.
- Broadcast $\{(u, PK_u)\}_{C_u \in \mathbf{Client}_1}$ to all clients $C_u \in \mathbf{Client}_1$.

• Step 1 (Shares Generation):

Client C_u :

- Receive the list $\{(u, PK_u)\}_{C_u \in \mathbf{Client}_1}$ from the server.
- Generate a $t - |\mathbf{Client}_1|$ secret share $\{(s_{u,v}, o_{u,v})\}_{v \in \mathbf{Client}_1} \leftarrow VSSGen(g, h, x_u, r_u, t, |\mathbf{Client}_1|)$ for parameter x_u with the Pedersen commitment $g^{x_u} h^{r_u}$, along with a set of commitments $\{E_i\}_{i \in [0, t-1]}$.
- Encrypt the shares with corresponding public key $ci_{u,v} \leftarrow Enc((s_{u,v}, o_{u,v}), PK_v)$ to obtain the ciphertext list $\{(v, ci_{u,v})\}_{v \in \mathbf{Client}_1}$.
- Send the commitment list $\{E_{u,j}\}_{j \in [0, t-1]}$ and ciphertext list with receiver index $\{(v, ci_{u,v})\}_{v \in \mathbf{Client}_1}$ to the server.

Server S :

- Collect more than t messages from clients, who form a set $\mathbf{Client}_2 \subset \mathbf{Client}_1$.
- Send all ciphertext with sender index $\{(u, ci_{u,v})\}_{v \in \mathbf{Client}_2}$ to client C_v .
- Broadcast the benign client list $U_B \in \mathbf{Client}_2$ obtained from the model filter to all clients $C_u \in \mathbf{Client}_2$.

• Step 2 (Shares Aggregation and Reconstruction):

Client C_u :

- Receive the list $\{(v, ci_{v,u})\}_{v \in \mathbf{Client}_2}$ and benign client list U_B from the server.
- Decrypt the shares $(s_{v,u}, o_{v,u}) \leftarrow Dec(ci_{v,u}, SK_u)$ for $\{ci_{v,u}\}_{C_v \in U_B}$.
- Aggregate the shares into global share $S_u = \sum_{C_v \in U_B} s_{v,u}$ and $O_u = \sum_{C_v \in U_B} o_{v,u}$.
- Send the global share (S_u, O_u) to the server.

Server S :

- Collect more than t messages from clients, who form a set $\mathbf{Client}_3 \subset \mathbf{Client}_2$.
- Reconstruct the global parameter $(X, R) \leftarrow VSSRec(t, \{(S_u, O_u)\}_{u \in \mathbf{Client}_3})$ where $X = \sum_{C_u \in U_B} x_u$ and $R = \sum_{C_u \in U_B} r_u$.
- Verify whether $\prod_{C_u \in U_B} g^{x_u} h^{r_u} = g^X h^R$. If the verification passes, continue the next round training, else, go to step x.

• Step x (Malicious Attacker Identification):

Server S :

- Verify each $\{(S_u, O_u)\}_{C_u \in \mathbf{Client}_3}$ with $g^{S_u} h^{O_u} = \prod_{j=0}^{t-1} E_j^*(u^j)$, where $E_j^* = \prod_{C_u \in U_B} E_{u,j}$.
- Send the commitment list with index $\{u, \{E_{u,j}\}_{j \in [0, t-1]}\}_{C_u \in U_B}$ to C_u if the verification for C_u fails.

Client C_u :

- Receive the commitment list $\{u, \{E_{v,j}\}_{j \in [0, t-1]}\}_{C_v \in U_B}$.
- Verify each $\{(s_{v,u}, o_{v,u})\}_{C_v \in U_B}$ with $g^{s_{v,u}} h^{o_{v,u}} = \prod_{j=0}^{t-1} E_{v,j}(u^j)$.
- Generate a proof $\pi \leftarrow Prv_Dec(PK_u, SK_u, (s_{v,u}, o_{v,u}), ci_{v,u})$ if the verification for C_v fails.
- Send the proof with index (v, π) to the server.

Server S :

- Receive the proof (v, π) from C_u .
- Verify the proof $\pi = (m, A, B, z)$ with $g^e A = g^z \wedge c_1^e \cdot B = (c_2 m^{-1})^z$ where $(c_1, c_2) \leftarrow ci_{v,u}$, to obtain $result_1$. If $result_1$ fails, remove C_u from all client lists and rebroadcast U_B to all clients $C_u \in \mathbf{Client}_2$ to re-execute Step 2.
- Verify the share $(s_{v,u}, o_{v,u}) \leftarrow m$ with $g^{s_{v,u}} h^{o_{v,u}} = \prod_{j=0}^{t-1} E_{v,j}(u^j)$ to obtain $result_2$.
- If $result_1$ passes while $result_2$ not, remove C_v from all client lists and rebroadcast U_B to all clients $C_u \in \mathbf{Client}_2$ to re-execute Step 2.

Figure 4: The description of the verifiable privacy-preserving aggregation protocol in NoV.

resulting in the share of one specific client C_v being exposed to the server. However, since the number of malicious clients is less than

t , the server can only obtain at most $t - 1$ shares of C_v , and since




Figure 5: Comparison of Euclidean distance among honest and malicious model updates on different models and tasks.

the Pedersen VSS scheme is perfect privacy [26], this does not lead to the leakage of the parameters of C_v .

7 PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

In the experimental section, we test the defense performance against poisoning attacks as well as the operational efficiency of scheme NoV.

7.1 Experimental Setup

Setup. The experiments run on an Ubuntu 18.04 instance (i7-9750H @2.60Hz, 16GiB RAM, 4 vCPU). We implement NoV in Rust 1.68.0 and train machine learning models in Python with PyTorch [25]. We use the elliptic curve-25519 from dalek-cryptography library [3] for cryptographic computations. We use the OOD Federated Learning framework [29] for simulating the poisoning attack in federated learning. We use the Bulletproof library [1] for the range proofs.

Models and Datasets. The datasets employed in our study consist of the widely recognized EMNIST [10] and CIFAR-10 [2]. We adopt a 3-layer convolutional neural network (CNN) for EMNIST, LeNet5 and ResNet20 for CIFAR10. The datasets of honest participants are non-iid. For the tail attack case, we adopt a similar strategy to Wang et al. [29]. For EMNIST, we selected the number "7" with a horizontal bar from the Ardis dataset [17], modified its label to "2". For CIFAR-10, we modified the label of Southwest Airlines plane sample to "truck".

Attacks. The attacks considered in the experiments include untargeted attacks, targeted attacks, tail attacks, and PGD attacks. Madry et al. state that PGD attacks are one of the strongest first order attack [21], therefore we use the defense performance against PGD as the main measure to evaluate the defense strategies.

7.2 Defense Against Poisoning Attacks

We first illustrate the defense performance of NoV against data poisoning attacks except PGD. Then we compare the defense performance of NoV and other schemes against PGD attacks. Finally we analyze the defense performance of NoV against PGD attacks under different settings.

Figure 5 demonstrates the difference in magnitude between honest model updates and different kinds of malicious model updates. By setting an appropriate threshold t_m (e.g., the median, 0.32 and

1.82, respectively), NoV can easily filter out these malicious model updates.

With a public known threshold t_m , the PGD attack can bypass the first filtering strategy. Under this situation, we compare the defense performance of NoV with other schemes against PGD tail attack, for the poisoning with tail data is more effective [19]. We compare the performance of NoV with the latest model checking strategies (FLTrust, cosDefense, RoFL) under PGD tail attacks. These experiments are conducted with 30 trainers containing 3 attackers all with non-iid datasets. For CIFAR10, the threshold t_m and t_s are set to 1.0 and 0.4 respectively. For EMNIST, the threshold t_m and t_s are set to 0.2 and 0.5 respectively. The results are shown in figure 6 and 7. It can be seen that NoV is able to maintain a low backdoor task accuracy without affecting the main task accuracy with different tasks and datasets, which demonstrates that NoV can effectively defend against PGD attacks in the non-iid case.

Regarding the defense performance of other strategies, FLTrust is able to defend against PGD on EMNIST. However, FLTrust is not able to identify the attacker on CIFAR10, and instead filters out a portion of the honest participants, resulting in an increased backdoor accuracy compared to when there is no defense. Cos-Defense is able to filter out PGD attackers on CIAFR10 to a some extent, decreasing the backdoor accuracy. But nearly half of the honest participants is also filtered out in this process. On EMNIST, CosDefense can only filter a few PGD attackers, while excluding nearly half of the honest participants, resulting in a higher backdoor accuracy than there is no defense. Considering the defense strategy of RoFL and the publicly available threshold t_m , we project both the honest and malicious updates onto the given threshold. Thus RoFL with L_2 norm is unable to filter out any update for the public constraints. Besides, RoFL with L_∞ also filters no malicious updates because they have smaller L_∞ . Furthermore, due to the projection, the magnitude of the honest participant's update decreases, making the impact of poisoning relatively larger, which in turn improves the backdoor accuracy.

Additionally, we compare the performance of NoV with 30 clients but contains different number of attackers, the results are shown in figure 8 and 9. The figure shows that NoV performs well with no more than 20% attackers within the clients.

7.3 End-to-End Performance

We test the end-to-end performance of NoV on different models and tasks with 30 clients, the threshold of malicious clients is set to 6. Table 2 shows the computation time and bandwidth in each round. The extra computation time is when a malicious Byzantine attacker appears during the aggregation process, the server kicks them out via step x and re-executes step 2.

8 CONCLUSION

Although federated learning can protect data privacy to some extent, it faces many security challenges and threats. These threats not only lead to information leakage, but also undermine the performance of federated learning models. How to defend against poisoning attacks, privacy attacks and Byzantine attacks simultaneously is a major challenge for secure federated learning. In this paper, we propose NoV, a scheme that can verify whether the local model submitted




Figure 6: Comparison among NoV and latest model filtering strategies defending against PGD attack on CIFAR10 with LeNet5. The black line represents the accuracy of the main task and the red line represents the accuracy of the backdoor task.




Figure 7: Comparison among NoV and latest model filtering strategies defending against PGD attack on EMNIST with a 3-layer CNN. The black line represents the accuracy of the main task and the red line represents the accuracy of the backdoor task.

is poisoned while protecting the model privacy, avoiding poison from being aggregated. NoV can also kick Byzantine attackers that do not follow the FL procedure out to ensure the execution of the federated learning system with a small time overhead. Experiments show that NoV outperforms existing schemes in terms of defense performance.

REFERENCES

- [1] [n. d.]. bulletproofs: A pure-Rust implementation of Bulletproofs using Ristretto. <https://github.com/daledk-cryptography/bulletproofs>. Accessed: 2024-04-01.
- [2] [n. d.]. CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 datasets. <https://www.cs.toronto.edu/~kriz/cifar.html>. Accessed: 2024-04-01.
- [3] [n. d.]. curve25519-dalek: A pure-Rust implementation of group operations on Ristretto and Curve25519. <https://github.com/daledk-cryptography/curve25519-dalek>. Accessed: 2024-04-01.




Figure 8: Comparison of the defense performance of NoV with different number of attackers on CIFAR10 with LeNet5. The black line represents the accuracy of the main task and the red line represents the accuracy of the backdoor task.




Figure 9: Comparison of the defense performance of NoV with different number of attackers on EMNIST with a 3-layer CNN. The black line represents the accuracy of the main task and the red line represents the accuracy of the backdoor task.

Table 2: Time and bandwidth overhead of NoV on different models and tasks.

Models and Tasks	CNN-EMNIST (22k params)	LeNet5-CIFAR10 (62k params)	ResNet20-CIFAR10 (272k params)
Computation Time (s, per round)	121.7	276.8	1334.8
Bandwidth (MB, per round)	46.7	126.7	557.0
Extra Computation Time for Byzantine attacker (s, per round)	3.0	8.9	39.7

[4] Mohammed Adnan, Shivam Kalra, Jesse C Cresswell, Graham W Taylor, and Hamid R Tizhoosh. 2022. Federated learning and differential privacy for medical image analysis. *Scientific reports* 12, 1 (2022), 1953.

[5] Eugene Bagdasaryan, Andreas Veit, Yiqing Hua, Deborah Estrin, and Vitaly Shmatikov. 2020. How to backdoor federated learning. In *International conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*. PMLR, 2938–2948.

[6] Josh Cohen Benaloh. 1986. Secret sharing homomorphisms: Keeping shares of a secret secret. In *Conference on the theory and application of cryptographic techniques*. Springer, 251–260.

[7] Jonathan Bootle, Andrea Cerulli, Pyrros Chaidos, Essam Ghadafi, Jens Groth, and Christophe Petit. 2015. Short accountable ring signatures based on DDH. In *European Symposium on Research in Computer Security*. Springer, 243–265.

[8] Benedikt Bünz, Jonathan Bootle, Dan Boneh, Andrew Poelstra, Pieter Wuille, and Greg Maxwell. 2018. Bulletproofs: Short proofs for confidential transactions and more. In *2018 IEEE symposium on security and privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 315–334.

[9] Xiaoyu Cao, Minghong Fang, Jia Liu, and Neil Zhenqiang Gong. 2020. Fltrust: Byzantine-robust federated learning via trust bootstrapping. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.13995* (2020).

[10] Gregory Cohen, Saeed Afshar, Jonathan Tapson, and Andre Van Schaik. 2017. EMNIST: Extending MNIST to handwritten letters. In *2017 international joint conference on neural networks (IJCNN)*. IEEE, 2921–2926.

[11] Minghong Fang, Xiaoyu Cao, Jinyuan Jia, and Neil Gong. 2020. Local model poisoning attacks to {Byzantine-Robust} federated learning. In *29th USENIX security symposium (USENIX Security 20)*. 1605–1622.

[12] Jiahui Geng, Yongli Mou, Feifei Li, Qing Li, Oya Beyan, Stefan Decker, and Chunming Rong. 2021. Towards general deep leakage in federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.09074* (2021).

[13] Shafi Goldwasser, Silvio Micali, and Charles Rackoff. 1989. The Knowledge Complexity of Interactive Proof Systems. *SIAM J. Comput.* 18, 1 (1989), 186–208.

[14] Meng Hao, Hongwei Li, Guowen Xu, Hanxiao Chen, and Tianwei Zhang. 2021. Efficient, private and robust federated learning. In *Proceedings of the 37th Annual Computer Security Applications Conference*. 45–60.

[15] Hongsheng Hu, Zoran Salcic, Lichao Sun, Gillian Dobbie, and Xuyun Zhang. 2021. Source inference attacks in federated learning. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*. IEEE, 1102–1107.

[16] Ahmed Imteaj and M Hadi Amini. 2022. Leveraging asynchronous federated learning to predict customers financial distress. *Intelligent Systems with Applications* 14 (2022), 200064.

[17] Huseyin Kusetogullari, Amir Yavariabdi, Abbas Cheddad, Håkan Grahn, and Johan Hall. 2020. ARDIS: a Swedish historical handwritten digit dataset. *Neural Computing and Applications* 32, 21 (2020), 16505–16518.

[18] Xiaoyuan Liu, Hongwei Li, Guowen Xu, Zongqi Chen, Xiaoming Huang, and Rongxing Lu. 2021. Privacy-enhanced federated learning against poisoning adversaries. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* 16 (2021), 4574–4588.

[19] Hidde Lycklama, Lukas Burkhalter, Alexander Viand, Nicolas Küchler, and Anwar Hithnawi. 2023. Rofl: Robustness of secure federated learning. In *2023 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 453–476.

[20] Zhuoran Ma, Jianfeng Ma, Yinbin Miao, Yingjiu Li, and Robert H Deng. 2022. ShieldFL: Mitigating model poisoning attacks in privacy-preserving federated learning. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* 17 (2022), 1639–1654.

[21] Aleksander Madry, Aleksandar Makelov, Ludwig Schmidt, Dimitris Tsipras, and Adrian Vladu. 2017. Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.06083* (2017).

- [22] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Aguera y Arcas. 2017. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*. PMLR, 1273–1282.
- [23] Yinbin Miao, Ziteng Liu, Hongwei Li, Kim-Kwang Raymond Choo, and Robert H Deng. 2022. Privacy-preserving Byzantine-robust federated learning via blockchain systems. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* 17 (2022), 2848–2861.
- [24] Thien Duc Nguyen, Phillip Rieger, Roberta De Viti, Huili Chen, Björn B Brandenburg, Hossein Yalame, Helen Möllering, Hossein Fereidooni, Samuel Marchal, Markus Miettinen, et al. 2022. {FLAME}: Taming backdoors in federated learning. In *31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22)*. 1415–1432.
- [25] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, et al. 2019. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32 (2019).
- [26] Torben Pryds Pedersen. 1991. Non-interactive and information-theoretic secure verifiable secret sharing. In *Annual international cryptology conference*. Springer, 129–140.
- [27] Shiva Raj Pokhrel and Jinho Choi. 2020. A decentralized federated learning approach for connected autonomous vehicles. In *2020 IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference Workshops (WCNCW)*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [28] Vale Tolpegin, Stacey Truex, Mehmet Emre Gursoy, and Ling Liu. 2020. Data poisoning attacks against federated learning systems. In *Computer Security-ESORICS 2020, Guildford, UK, September 14–18, 2020, Proceedings, Part I 25*. Springer, 480–501.
- [29] Hongyi Wang, Kartik Sreenivasan, Shashank Rajput, Harit Vishwakarma, Saurabh Agarwal, Jy-yong Sohn, Kangwook Lee, and Dimitris Papailiopoulou. 2020. Attack of the tails: Yes, you really can backdoor federated learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 16070–16084.
- [30] Zhibo Wang, Yuting Huang, Mengkai Song, Libing Wu, Feng Xue, and Kui Ren. 2022. Poisoning-assisted property inference attack against federated learning. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing* (2022).
- [31] Duygu Nur Yaldiz, Tuo Zhang, and Salman Avestimehr. 2023. Secure Federated Learning against Model Poisoning Attacks via Client Filtering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.00160* (2023).
- [32] Rong Yu and Peichun Li. 2021. Toward resource-efficient federated learning in mobile edge computing. *IEEE Network* 35, 1 (2021), 148–155.
- [33] Jingwen Zhang, Jiale Zhang, Junjun Chen, and Shui Yu. 2020. Gan enhanced membership inference: A passive local attack in federated learning. In *ICC 2020-2020 IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [34] Zaixi Zhang, Xiaoyu Cao, Jinyuan Jia, and Neil Zhenqiang Gong. 2022. FLDetector: Defending federated learning against model poisoning attacks via detecting malicious clients. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 2545–2555.
- [35] Bo Zhao, Konda Reddy Mopuri, and Hakan Bilen. 2020. idlg: Improved deep leakage from gradients. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.02610* (2020).
- [36] Ligeng Zhu, Zhijian Liu, and Song Han. 2019. Deep leakage from gradients. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32 (2019).

A PSEUDO-CODES OF ALGORITHM

Here we provide the pseudo-codes for the algorithms for generating and reconstructing secret shares, and proving the correctness of decryption.

Algorithm 1 VSS_Gen (.): Generate verifiable secret shares.

Input: Generator g, h , secret s , hiding element o , party number n , threshold t .

Output: Shares $\{(s_i, o_i)\}_{i \in [1, n]}$, commitments $\{E_i\}_{i \in [0, t-1]}$

- 1: Generate a commitment $E_0 = E(s, o) = g^s h^o$
 - 2: Randomly choose two polynomial $F, G \in \mathbb{Z}_q[x]$ of degree at most $t - 1$ such that $F(x) = s + F_1x + \dots + F_{t-1}x^{t-1}$ and $G(x) = o + G_1x + \dots + G_{t-1}x^{t-1}$.
 - 3: Commit to F_i and G_i as $E_i = E(F_i, G_i) = g^{F_i} h^{G_i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, t-1$
 - 4: Compute $s_i = F(i)$ and $o_i = G(i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$
 - 5: **return** shares $\{(s_i, o_i)\}_{i \in [1, n]}$, commitments $\{E_i\}_{i \in [0, t-1]}$
-

Algorithm 2 Prv_Dec (.): Prove correct decryption.

Input: Public key $pk = (g, h)$, private key $x = \log_g h$, plaintext m , ciphertext $c = (c_1, c_2)$.

Output: Proof π .

- 1: Randomly choose $a \in \mathbb{Z}_q$, compute $A = g^a, B = (c_2 m^{-1})^a$
 - 2: Compute challenge $e = \text{Hash}(g||h||m||c||A||B)$
 - 3: Compute $z = xe + a$
 - 4: **return** $\pi = (m, A, B, z)$
-

Algorithm 3 VSS_Rec (.): Recover the secret.

Input: Threshold t , t shares $\{(s_i, o_i)\}_{i \in [1, t]}$.

Output: Secret S, R .

- 1: Compute $S = \sum_{i \in [1, t]} a_i s_i$ and $R = \sum_{i \in [1, t]} a_i o_i$ where $a_i = \prod_{j \in [1, t], j \neq i} \frac{j}{j-i}$
 - 2: **return** secret S, O
-