

SA-FedLora: Adaptive Parameter Allocation for Efficient Federated Learning with LoRA Tuning

Yuning Yang¹, Xiaohong Liu², Tianrun Gao¹, Xiaodong Xu¹ and Guanyu Wang¹

¹State Key Lab of Networking and Switching Technology, Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications, Beijing, China

²UCL Cancer Institute, University College London, London, United Kingdom
{yangyuning, tianrun.gao, xuxiaodong, guangyu.wang}@bupt.edu.cn, xhliu17@gmail.com

Abstract

Fine-tuning large-scale pre-trained models via transfer learning is an emerging important paradigm for a wide range of downstream tasks, with performance heavily reliant on extensive data. Federated learning (FL), as a distributed framework, provides a secure solution to train models on local datasets while safeguarding raw sensitive data. However, FL networks encounter high communication costs due to the massive parameters of large-scale pre-trained models, necessitating parameter-efficient methods. Notably, parameter efficient fine tuning, such as Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA), has shown remarkable success in fine-tuning pre-trained models. However, prior research indicates that the fixed parameter budget may be prone to the overfitting or slower convergence. To address this challenge, we propose a Simulated Annealing-based Federated Learning with LoRA tuning (SA-FedLoRA) approach by reducing trainable parameters. Specifically, SA-FedLoRA comprises two stages: initiating and annealing. (1) In the initiating stage, we implement a parameter regularization approach during the early rounds of aggregation, aiming to mitigate client drift and accelerate the convergence for the subsequent tuning. (2) In the annealing stage, we allocate higher parameter budget during the early 'heating' phase and then gradually shrink the budget until the 'cooling' phase. This strategy not only facilitates convergence to the global optimum but also reduces communication costs. Experimental results demonstrate that SA-FedLoRA is an efficient FL, achieving superior performance to FedAvg and significantly reducing communication parameters by up to 93.62%.

1 Introduction

The advent of the pre-training and fine-tuning paradigm in machine learning, such as BERT and GPT, has revolutionized the traditional model training and generalization technique. Pre-trained foundation models, such as Swin Transformer [Liu *et al.*, 2021b] and Vision Transformer [Dosovitskiy *et*

al., 2020], have achieved significant success in speeding up convergence and delivering superior performance across various downstream tasks [Lin *et al.*, 2022; Chen *et al.*, 2023b]. Pre-training is a self-supervised learning method, training on large datasets to capture general features for initialization, facilitating efficient domain-specific fine-tuning of pre-trained models and thus saving time compared to the traditional method training from scratch [Chen *et al.*, 2022a; Pan *et al.*, 2022]. However, acquiring large-scale datasets for pre-training is particularly challenging in sensitive fields like finance and medicine due to privacy concerns and regulatory restrictions [Kairouz *et al.*, 2021]. Federated learning (FL) offers a promising privacy-preserving solution by enabling multiple data owners to collaboratively train a global model without sharing sensitive data. Specifically, local clients download the global pre-trained model from the central server and update the model based on their datasets. The local model parameters will be uploaded to the server to aggregate a new global model for future training and inference [Almanifi *et al.*, 2023; Gao *et al.*, 2023]. This iterative process, however, introduces heavy communication burdens on the resource-limited FL systems due to the massive parameter size of pre-trained foundation models [Sun *et al.*, 2022].

Previous studies of communication-efficient FL, such as model compression [Konečný *et al.*, 2016] and one/few-shot communication [Zhou *et al.*, 2020; Park *et al.*, 2021] reach suboptimal performance on the pre-trained models due to the neglect of the model transfer ability. Recently, parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT) methods have gained increasing popularity in the literature by updating only a small fraction of model parameters (e.g., bias terms) and freezing the substantial parameters [Houlsby *et al.*, 2019; Zaken *et al.*, 2021; Jie and Deng, 2023]. Among these, Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) stands out as a representative reparameterization-based method, that minimizes the number of trainable parameters without increasing inference latency, by inserting trainable rank decomposition matrices alongside the pre-trained model with original pre-trained weights fixed [Chen *et al.*, 2023a; Hu *et al.*, 2021]. FedLora, which incorporates LoRA into the fine-tuning process within a federated framework, shares low-rank decomposition matrices instead of full pre-trained parameters, thus alleviating communication overhead [Yi *et al.*, 2023; Babakniya *et al.*, 2023]. However, the number of trainable parameters heavily depends on the rank

r. Existing work has observed that less trainable parameters with fixed lower rank require more time to converge while more trainable parameters with fixed higher rank may lead to overfitting of the global model [Cho *et al.*, 2023; Zhang *et al.*, 2023b]. Therefore, determining trainable parameters flexibly with the optimal rank in FL setting remains a challenge. Can we design an efficient algorithm in FL to dynamically allocate parameter budgets and adaptively adjust rank, thus accelerating convergence and reducing communication costs while maintaining accuracy?

In this study, we propose a Simulated Annealing-based Federated Learning with LoRA tuning (SA-FedLora) approach by dynamically allocating parameter budgets with adaptive Lora rank over the communication round. More specifically, our method consists of two stages: initiating and annealing. (1) In the initiating stage of FL, we train the full pre-trained parameters and introduce parameter regularization into the pre-trained model to address the issue of incompatible optimization direction of local models due to federated client drift, accelerating the convergence for the subsequent annealing stage; (2) In the annealing stage, we allocate a larger parameter budget with high-rank LoRA during the early heating phase. This allocation is strategically designed to encourage the global model to converge to its local optima quickly. To prevent the global model from getting trapped into overfitting, we gradually decrease trainable parameters via adaptively lowering the Lora rank until the start of cooling phase, where the model keeps training with fewer parameter budgets until convergence. Overall, SA-FedLora achieves comparable performance to FedAvg with significantly lower communication overhead by adaptively allocating the parameter budget during training.

In summary, our contributions are:

- Our paper proposes Simulated Annealing-based Federated Learning with LoRA tuning (SA-FedLora) to mitigate the communication burden of the pre-training FL systems by allocating the parameter budget with adaptive Lora rank. We divide the training into two stages: initiating and annealing.
- The initiating stage: each client trains the entire pre-trained parameters and adds a parameter regularization method to address the federated client drift and speed up the convergence; The annealing stage: more parameter budgets with high-rank LoRA are allocated to the early heating phase, and trainable parameters are dynamically reduced to the cooling phase by lowering the Lora rank, which avoids overfitting and reduces communication costs.
- Experiments have been conducted on the CIFAR-10 dataset and realistic medical Face dataset, demonstrating that SA-FedLora allows for significantly lower communication costs by up to 93.62% decline and even slightly superior performance than FedAvg.

2 Related Works

2.1 Pre-training in Federated Learning

Pre-trained foundation model originated from the natural language processing (NLP) area and has boosted state-of-the-art performance in computer vision and many other application domains due to its generality and adaptability to various specialized downstream tasks [Han *et al.*, 2021; Liu *et al.*, 2021b; Dosovitskiy *et al.*, 2020; Radford *et al.*, 2021]. Federated Learning (FL) first emerged as a distributed privacy-preserving paradigm in 2016, called FedAvg, allowing local clients to train models on their datasets and a central server to collect local models to aggregate a global model [McMahan *et al.*, 2017]. Research about the combination of pre-training and FL can be divided into two directions: pre-training for FL and FL for pre-training. Pre-training for FL refers to that pre-trained models improve the inferior effectiveness and robustness of FL due to large-scale model training from scratch [Tan *et al.*, 2022; Chen *et al.*, 2022b]. For example, the FL accuracy of pretraining on ViT and Swin Transformer model outperforms training with random weight initialization [Qu *et al.*, 2022]. FL for pre-training means that FL satisfies the huge amount of data requirements for pre-trained model training [Tian *et al.*, 2022; Babakniya *et al.*, 2023]. However, the scarcity of communication resources is a primary bottleneck in the FL system, which restricts the training and sharing of large-scale pre-trained models with massive parameters.

2.2 Parameter-efficient Fine-tuning in Federated Learning

Communication efficiency in FL has been extensively studied in the literature, such as model compression [Konečný *et al.*, 2016] and one/few-shot communication [Zhou *et al.*, 2020; Park *et al.*, 2021]. Considering the strong transfer ability of pre-trained models, parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT) is a prevalent technique when facing today’s large pre-trained models, which have been categorized into three main groups, including reparameterization-based methods, additive methods and selective methods [Lialin *et al.*, 2023]. Reparameterization-based methods, represented by LoRA, optimize the number of trainable parameters by leveraging low-rank decomposition matrices [Hu *et al.*, 2021; Yi *et al.*, 2023]. Additive methods, such as Adapters, add a few parameters between adjacent transformer layers and only tune these newly introduced modules [Houlsby *et al.*, 2019; Cai *et al.*, 2022]. Selective methods aim to update a small fraction of influential components within the model to achieve comparable performance [Gheini *et al.*, 2021; Arivazhagan *et al.*, 2019]. Among them, Lora with the advantage of introducing no inference latency, has widely integrated with FL to mitigate the communication burden. However, higher-rank Lora with more parameter budget may put the global model at risk of overfitting while lower-rank Lora with fewer parameters extends the convergence time [Cho *et al.*, 2023]. Therefore, it is a challenge to reasonably allocate the parameter budget with the adaptive rank to boost the efficiency of the FL system with little degradation in accuracy.




Figure 1: Overview of SA-FedLora framework. SA-FedLora algorithm consists of two stages: initiating and annealing. (1) Initiating stage: we introduce parameter regularization into the pre-trained model by pulling the global and local model weights. The entire pre-trained parameters are updated and shared between the server and local clients. (2) Annealing stage: we only update and share the Lora modules, freezing the pre-trained model. During local training, we decrease the allocated parameter budgets by lowering the Lora rank as the communication round increases.

3 The SA-FedLora Algorithm

3.1 Overview

An overview of the DCFE framework is shown in Figure 1. Under the constrained parameter budget, SA-FedLora cuts down the communication overhead and accelerates the convergence by allocating the parameter budget with adaptive Lora rank, thus divided into two stages. (1) Initiating stage: we first initialize the next annealing stage by incorporating a parameter regularization penalty term into the supervised loss function to tackle the federated client drift, prohibiting local models from drifting away from the global optimization objective. In each iteration of training, the whole pre-trained parameters are updated with more local epochs and uploaded to the server with fewer T_1 communication rounds. (2) Annealing stage: after the initialization, we freeze pre-trained models and fine-tune Lora modules simultaneously in the local training phase. Specifically, inspired by the simulated annealing method, we allocate more parameters budgets with higher-rank Lora at the early heating phase to approach the optima of the global model swiftly, and adaptively decrease the allocated parameters with lower rank to avoid the overfitting as the communication round increases to the cooling phase. The shared light Lora module with few parameters significantly relieves the communication burden during the global aggregation phase.

3.2 Initiating Stage

Suppose there are S clients (indexed by s). The local dataset of client s is defined as $D_s = \{(X_s, Y_s) | X_s, Y_s \in \mathbb{R}^{s_I}\}$, where s_I is the number of samples of local dataset D_s . We train E local epochs in each communication round and totally aggregate T communication rounds (indexed by e and t

separately).

The workflow of the traditional FedAvg algorithm is as follows. In the local training phase, the local objective function L_s of client s is the supervised learning loss $L_{s,sup}$ under the local model weights W_s :

$$L_s = L_{s,sup} = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim D_s} [\mathcal{L}_s(x, y; W_s)], \quad (1)$$

where \mathcal{L}_s denotes as the typically cross-entropy loss.

In each epoch, the client computes gradients of the local loss and updates the model by backpropagation with learning rate η :

$$W_s^{e+1} \leftarrow W_s^e - \eta \nabla L_s^e. \quad (2)$$

In the global aggregation phase of FedAvg, the remote server aggregates the collected local model across the clients by weighted averaging to generate a new global model. The global model weights W_g are calculated as follows:

$$W_g = \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{|D_s|}{|D|} W_s, \quad (3)$$

where $D \triangleq \bigcup_{s \in [S]} D_s$ represents the sum of local datasets. Then the global model weight will be distributed to local clients to initialize each local model for the next round.

The final global optimization objective is to find a group of global model parameters that minimize the global loss.

$$\arg \min_{W_g} L_g = \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{|D_s|}{|D|} L_s. \quad (4)$$

The initiating stage of SA-FedLora also contains local training and global aggregation phases. The workflow of the global aggregation phase is the same as the classical FedAvg.

Algorithm 1: Initiating Stage of SA-FedLora.

Input: Datasets from S clients: D_1, D_2, \dots, D_S ; communication rounds T_1 ; local epochs E_1 ; hyper-parameter μ ; learning rate η .
Output: The final global model parameter W_g .

- 1 **Server Aggregation**
- 2 Initialization: pre-trained global model W_g^0 ;
- 3 **for** $t = 0, 1, \dots, T_1 - 1$ **do**
- 4 **for** $s = 1, 2, \dots, S$ **do**
- 5 send the pre-trained global model weight W_g^t to client s ;
- 6 $W_s^t \leftarrow \mathbf{Client\ Update}(s, W_g^t)$
- 7 upload the local weight W_s^t to the server
 $W_g^{t+1} = \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{|D_s|}{|D|} W_s^t$
- 8 **end**
- 9 **end**
- 10 $W_g \leftarrow W_g^{T_1-1}$.
- 11 **Client Update**(s, W_g^t)
- 12 **for** $e = 0, 1, \dots, E_1 - 1$ **do**
- 13 $L_{s,sup}^{t,e} \leftarrow \mathit{CrossEntropyLoss}(W_s^{t,e})$
- 14 $L_s^{t,e} = L_{s,sup}^{t,e} + \frac{\mu}{2} \|W_g^t - W_s^{t,e}\|^2$
- 15 $W_s^{t,e+1} \leftarrow W_s^{t,e} - \eta \nabla L_s^{t,e}$
- 16 **end**
- 17 **return** W_s^{t,E_1-1}

Each client downloads the global pre-trained model from the central server and uploads the whole updated model parameters for global aggregation. But different from the local training phase of FedAvg, SA-FedLora applies parameter regularization to the supervised learning loss by minimizing the ℓ_2 -norm distance of parameters between the current global model and each local model, aiming to align the global and local optima to address the client drift. Thus, the local loss of equation (1) can be rewritten as:

$$L_s = L_{s,sup} + \frac{\mu}{2} \|W_g - W_s\|^2. \quad (5)$$

The convergence has been analyzed and demonstrated by previous research [Li *et al.*, 2020]. Considering the excessive communication cost of sharing the entire pre-trained model parameters, we set a high local update epoch E_1 and a low the communication round T_1 of the initiating stage.

The detailed procedure of the initiating stage is outlined in Algorithm 1.

3.3 Annealing Stage

Lora is a typical reparameterization-based method of PEFT with the advantage of no inference latency. The low-rank decomposition matrix (Lora module) $\Delta W = BA$ are injected alongside the pre-trained weight matrix $W \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times h}$, where $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}$ is initialized with zero and $A \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times h}$ with a random independent Gaussian coefficients (rank $r \ll d, h$).




Figure 2: Variable rank based on the parameter scheduler. The initial rank keeps r_a until the end round T_a of the heating phase. Then SA-FedLora follows a cubic, linear or cosine scheduler to gradually decrease the rank until it reaches the start round T_b of the cooling phase with the final rank r_b .

Thus the output of forward pass yields:

$$\hat{y} = (W + \Delta W)x = Wx + BAx, \quad (6)$$

where the output vectors of Wx and BAx are summed coordinate-wise.

The proposed SA-FedLora algorithm incorporates LoRA into the FL framework by using the simulated annealing method. Specifically, SA-FedLora fine-tunes the large-scale pre-trained model by dynamically allocating the parameter with adaptive Lora rank at the annealing stage. We set the local update epoch to E_2 and the communication round to T_2 of the annealing stage. Thus, in the local training phase, the local loss of equation (1) is deduced as:

$$L_s = L_{s,sup} = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim D_s} [\mathcal{L}_s(x, y; W_s + \Delta W_s)], \quad (7)$$

Due to the frozen pre-trained model and trainable Lora modules, the parameters of the Lora modules are updated via gradient descent as:

$$\Delta W_s^{e+1} \leftarrow \Delta W_s^e - \eta \nabla L_s^e. \quad (8)$$

In the global aggregation phase, we aggregate the Lora modules of the same weighted averaging method. Based on the equation (3), we derive the global Lora weights:

$$\Delta W_g = \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{|D_s|}{|D|} \Delta W_s, \quad (9)$$

Accordingly, the objective of DCFL algorithm converts to train the optimal Lora module parameters that minimize the global loss:

$$\arg \min_{\Delta W_g} L_g = \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{|D_s|}{|D|} L_s. \quad (10)$$

To prevent the fixed low-rank Lora from slowing down the convergence and the high-rank Lora from overfitting, the proposed SA-FedLora algorithm incorporates LoRA into the FL framework by using the simulated annealing method. Specifically, SA-FedLora fine-tunes the large-scale pre-trained

model by dynamically allocating the parameter with adaptive Lora rank r at the annealing stage.

(Parameter Scheduler) As mentioned in Section 1, the parameter budget is naturally controlled by the adjustment of rank in the context of Lora. Therefore, we define a parameter scheduler to adaptively allocate the parameter budget by tuning the rank. As illustrated in Figure 2, the parameter scheduler warms up the fine-tuning training in the heating phase for T_a rounds with an initial rank r_a , and then follows a scheduler to gradually decrease the rank until it reaches the cooling phase. We fine-tune the model with the final rank r_b in the cooling phase from round T_b . Note that the scheduler strategy typically sets the initial rank r_a to be 1.5 times of the final rank r_b [Zhang *et al.*, 2023a]. For example, if the initial rank is set to 12, the final rank would not be less than 8. Thus, the Lora rank r^t of round t can be tuned by parameter scheduler:

$$r^t = \begin{cases} r_a, & 0 \leq t < T_a \\ r_{\text{scheduler}}(t), & T_a \leq t \leq T_b \\ r_b, & T_b < t \leq T_2 - 1 \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

Regarding the selection of scheduler $r_{\text{scheduler}}(t)$, we propose three types of schedulers, including cubic scheduler [Kurtic and Alistarh, 2022], linear scheduler [Tang *et al.*, 2018] and cosine scheduler [Dettmers and Zettlemoyer, 2019], which can be defined as follow:

$$r_{\text{cubic}}(t) = r_b + (r_a - r_b) \left(1 - \frac{t - T_a}{T_b - T_a}\right)^3 \quad (12)$$

$$r_{\text{linear}}(t) = \frac{r_b - r_a}{T_b - T_a}(t - T_a) + r_a \quad (13)$$

$$r_{\text{cosine}}(t) = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \cos \frac{t\pi}{n(T_b - T_a)}\right) \quad (14)$$

The detailed procedure of the annealing stage is outlined in Algorithm 2.

4 Experiments

4.1 Experimental Setup

Datasets and Models

To validate the efficiency of SA-FedLora, we conduct experiments on two transformer models: Swin-T [Liu *et al.*, 2021b] model and Query2Label [Liu *et al.*, 2021a] model on CIFAR-10 dataset [Krizhevsky *et al.*, 2009] and a real-world private medical Face dataset, respectively. To further validate our FL method in more challenging settings, we construct a healthcare dataset of Face data with multi-label disease tasks, including 9 types of diseases (e.g., hyperlipidemia, malignancy lung). Each disease can be binarized the labels to positive and negative. The CIFAR-10 dataset and Face dataset are manually partitioned into 5 and 4 clients, respectively. For a fair comparison, all models used in this paper are pre-trained on ImageNet [Deng *et al.*, 2009]. The datasets and corresponding models are summarized in Table 1.

Algorithm 2: Annealing Stage of SA-FedLora.

Input: Datasets from S clients: D_1, D_2, \dots, D_S ; communication rounds T_2 ; local epochs E_2 ; learning rate η ; the final global model parameter of initiating stage W_g ; initial rank r_a ; final rank r_b ; end round of heating phase T_a ; start round of cooling phase T_b .

Output: The final global Lora parameter ΔW_g .

- 1 **Server Aggregation**
- 2 Initialization: global Lora weight ΔW_g^0 ;
- 3 **for** $t = 0, 1, \dots, T_2 - 1$ **do**
- 4 Lora rank r^t of Lora module $\Delta W_g^t \leftarrow$
 Parameter Scheduler(t)
- 5 **for** $s = 1, 2, \dots, S$ **do**
- 6 send the global model weight W_g and
 global Lora weight ΔW_g^t to client s ;
- 7 $\Delta W_s^t \leftarrow$ **Client Update**($s, W_g, \Delta W_g^t$)
- 8 upload the local Lora weight ΔW_s^t to the
 server $\Delta W_g^{t+1} = \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{|D_s|}{|D|} \Delta W_s^t$
- 9 **end**
- 10 **end**
- 11 $\Delta W_g \leftarrow \Delta W_g^{T_2-1}$.
- 12 **Parameter Scheduler**(t)
- $r^t = \begin{cases} r_a, & 0 \leq t < T_a \\ r_{\text{scheduler}}(t), & T_a \leq t \leq T_b \\ r_b, & T_b < t \leq T_2 - 1 \end{cases}$
- 13 $r_{\text{scheduler}}(t)$ is defined as equation (12), (13) or (14)
- 14 **Client Update**($s, W_g, \Delta W_g^t$)
- 15 **for** $e = 0, 2, \dots, E_2 - 1$ **do**
- 16 $L_{s,\text{sup}}^{t,e} \leftarrow$ **CrossEntropyLoss**($W_g + \Delta W_s^{t,e}$)
- 17 $L_s^{t,e} = L_{s,\text{sup}}^{t,e}$
- 18 $\Delta W_s^{t,e+1} \leftarrow \Delta W_s^{t,e} - \eta \nabla L_s^{t,e}$
- 19 **end**
- 20 **return** $\Delta W_s^{t,E_2-1}$

Dataset	CIFAR-10	Medical Face
Task	Multi-Class Classification	Multi-Label Classification
Model	Swin-T	Query2Label
Size(MB)	105.01	180.61
Optimizer	SGD	Adam
Learning rate	0.03	0.0001

Table 1: Brief description of datasets, models and hyper-parameters.

Method	CC (GB)	TC (GB)	ACC
Local	/	/	0.5858
FedAvg	37.94	37.94	0.8510
FedPer	41.01	30.76	0.8656
FedFFT	32.82	13.33	0.9154
FedBit	2.22	/	0.8239
SA-FedLora	2.69	2.42	0.9050

Table 2: The main result of experiments on the CIFAR-10 dataset. The converged cost (CC) is the communication cost when the algorithm reaches convergence. The target cost (TC) is the communication cost when the algorithm reaches an accuracy of 0.85.




Figure 3: Comparison of different methods in accuracy on the CIFAR-10 dataset. The curve shows the variation of accuracy over the communication round.

Implementation Details

Experiments were conducted using Pytorch 2.1.0 with Python 3.11 on NVIDIA A40 GPUs. For the CIFAR-10 dataset, we choose an SGD optimizer with a learning rate of 0.03 for the Swin-T model. The maximal communication round of initiating stage T_1 and annealing stage T_2 is set to 3 and 80, respectively. The maximal local epoch of initiating stage E_1 and annealing stage E_2 is set to 30 and 2, respectively. For the Face dataset, we choose an Adam optimizer with a learning rate of 0.0001 for the Query2Label model. The maximal communication round T_1 and T_2 is set to 3 and 50, respectively. The maximal local epoch E_1 and E_2 are set to 30 and 2, respectively. Their specific values will be dynamically tuned based to the experimental design. Some important implementations are also detailed in Table 1.

Evaluation Settings

We employ communication cost, accuracy (ACC) and Area-Under-Curve (AUC) metrics to measure the performance of the CIFAR-10 and the Face dataset. We compare SA-FedLoRA with 5 baseline methods:

- Local: clients train local models independently;
- FedAvg [McMahan *et al.*, 2017]: clients train local models from scratch and all model parameters are updated and shared;

Method	CC (GB)	AUC	ACC
Local	/	0.6800	0.8545
FedAvg	39.51	0.7944	0.8908
FedPer	29.94	0.8378	0.8927
FedFFT	29.63	0.8689	0.8962
FedBit	0.08	0.6611	0.8685
SA-FedLora	3.45	0.8600	0.8892

Table 3: The main result of experiments on the Face dataset.




Figure 4: Comparison of different methods on the Face dataset. The bar chart presents the AUC and ACC under the convergence.

- FedPer [Arivazhagan *et al.*, 2019]: clients update the whole model from scratch, but part of selected layers are shared and the rest are updated locally as personalized designs;
- FedFFT: clients train and update local pre-trained models with the full fine-tuning (FFT) method [Babakniya *et al.*, 2023], and all model parameters are shared;
- FedBit: clients train and update local pre-trained models with the BitFit method [Zaken *et al.*, 2021], and only share the bias vectors while freezing everything else.

4.2 Experimental Results

Performances on the CIFAR-10 Dataset

Our study conducts experiments on the natural CIFAR-10 dataset to verify the efficiency and effectiveness. As the main results in Table 2 show, the converged cost (CC) is the communication cost when the algorithm reaches convergence. The target cost (TC) is the communication cost when the algorithm reaches an accuracy of 0.85. We divide algorithms into two groups based on whether they belong to the PEFT methods. Among all methods, FedBit and SA-FedLora are included in the PEFT. Our proposed SA-FedLora is a more efficient FL framework with lower communication costs compared to all algorithms except FedFFT. For instance, SA-FedLora is greater than FedAvg with improvement of accuracy by 6.35% and decline of the CC by 92.91% and TC by 93.62%. We can observe from the Figure 3 that FedBit even can not achieve the target accuracy due to the few trainable bias terms, although it's initialized by the pre-trained model and saves the communication costs. In addition, the Local method performs worst due to the scarcity of available data. FedPer reduces the communication overhead due

Mode	Initiating Stage	Annealing Stage	CIFAR-10		Face	
			CC (GB)	ACC	CC (GB)	AUC
M1 (FedLora)			1.66	0.8650	1.96	0.8556
M2		✓	1.71	0.8828	2.04	0.8567
M3	✓		2.64	0.8978	3.37	0.8583
M4 (SA-FedLora)	✓	✓	2.69	0.9050	3.45	0.8600

Table 4: Ablation study of the initiating stage and annealing stage.

Scheduler	CC (GB)	ACC
Cubic	2.69	0.9050
Linear	2.77	0.8962
Cosine	2.86	0.8956

Table 5: Analysis of cubic, linear and cosine scheduler on the CIFAR-10 dataset.

to its preservation of personalized layers. FedFFT is the upper bound among all algorithms since it fine-tunes the full model parameters based on the pre-trained weights and biases.

Performances on the Face Dataset

To further demonstrate the efficiency of SA-FedLora in more complex scenarios, we compare the performance of different algorithms on a healthcare Face dataset with the multi-label disease task, where AUC is a more common indicator after the training convergence to diagnose diseases in the medical field. As the Table 3 illustrated, SA-FedLora reduces the CC by 91.27% and improves the AUC of FedAvg by 8.26%, achieving the comparable performance in ACC simultaneously. Results in Figure 4 reveal the optimal AUC and ACC of the FedFFT among all methods. FedPer outperforms the Fedavg resulting from the mitigation of heterogeneity in FL.

Ablation Study

In this subsection, we conduct an ablation study to discuss the impact of the initiating stage and annealing stage. The M1 mode is the standard FedLora with a fixed parameter budget, and the M4 mode is our SA-FedLora with additional parameter regularization and annealing parameter budget. As illustrated in Table 4, SA-FedLora outperforms the FedLora with the improvement of ACC by 4.62% for the CIFAR-10 dataset and that of AUC by 5.14% for the Face dataset. The initiating stage of M3 and M4 improves the performance due to the parameter regularization mitigating the client drift, but increases the communication cost simultaneously owing to the shared all model parameters. Note that the rising cost of the initiating stage is acceptable since it is negligible compared to the total cost of traditional FedAvg. The annealing stage of M2 and M4 also has a positive effect on the performance due to the dynamical search for global optima, but puts more communication overhead owing to more parameter budget in the early heating phase.

Scheduler Analysis

We analyze the performance of three schedulers on the CIFAR-10 dataset. Different schedulers own different rank durations, thus influencing the parameter budget allocation.

For example, we can see from Figure 2 that the cubic scheduler between round T_a and T_b is a convex function and the cosine scheduler is a concave function. Therefore, the cubic scheduler drops rapidly and takes more time on the lower rank. Results in Table 5 indicate that the cubic scheduler improves the ACC of the worst cosine scheduler by 1.05% and reduces the converged cost (CC) by 0.17GB, which demonstrates that decreasing to the low rank earlier is more beneficial for the parameter allocation of the SA-FedLora.

5 Conclusion

This paper proposed a more efficient FL approach, called Simulated Annealing-based Federated Learning with LoRA tuning (SA-FedLora) to reduce communication costs with comparable performance. The SA-FedLora consists of two stages: the initiating stage and annealing stage. (1) The initiating stage introduces parameter regularization into the supervised learning and updates all pre-trained model weights; (2) The annealing stage incorporates the Lora method with the FL framework and dynamically allocates the parameter budget by adaptively adjusting the rank of Lora. Experimental results have demonstrated that SA-FedLora achieved superior performance and mitigated the communication burden compared to baseline algorithms. Although this work has shown its efficiency and effectiveness on the classical CIFAR-10 dataset and a real medical dataset, more complicated scenarios and tasks have not yet been discussed thoroughly in this work (e.g., the heterogeneous FL). For future work, we expect to take advantage of the current scheme and design a more generic framework for the FL system.

Ethical Statement

Institutional Review Board (IRB)/Ethics Committee approvals were obtained in all locations and all participating subjects of the Face dataset have signed a consent form.

Acknowledgments

References

- [Almanifi *et al.*, 2023] Omair Rashed Abdulwareth Almanifi, Chee-Onn Chow, Mau-Luen Tham, Joon Huang Chuah, and Jeevan Kanesan. Communication and computation efficiency in federated learning: A survey. *Internet of Things*, page 100742, 2023.
- [Arivazhagan *et al.*, 2019] Manoj Ghuhan Arivazhagan, Vinay Aggarwal, Aaditya Kumar Singh, and Sunav Choudhary. Federated learning with personalization layers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.00818*, 2019.

- [Babakniya *et al.*, 2023] Sara Babakniya, Ahmed Roushdy Elkordy, Yahya H Ezzeldin, Qingfeng Liu, Kee-Bong Song, Mostafa El-Khamy, and Salman Avestimehr. Slora: Federated parameter efficient fine-tuning of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.06522*, 2023.
- [Cai *et al.*, 2022] Dongqi Cai, Yaozong Wu, Shangguang Wang, Felix Xiaozhu Lin, and Mengwei Xu. Fedadapter: Efficient federated learning for modern nlp. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.10162*, 2022.
- [Chen *et al.*, 2022a] Hao Chen, Ran Tao, Han Zhang, Yidong Wang, Wei Ye, Jindong Wang, Guosheng Hu, and Marios Savvides. Conv-adapter: Exploring parameter efficient transfer learning for convnets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.07463*, 2022.
- [Chen *et al.*, 2022b] Hong-You Chen, Cheng-Hao Tu, Ziwei Li, Han Wei Shen, and Wei-Lun Chao. On the importance and applicability of pre-training for federated learning. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [Chen *et al.*, 2023a] Cheng Chen, Juzheng Miao, Dufan Wu, Zhiling Yan, Sekeun Kim, Jiang Hu, Aoxiao Zhong, Zhengliang Liu, Lichao Sun, Xiang Li, et al. Ma-sam: Modality-agnostic sam adaptation for 3d medical image segmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.08842*, 2023.
- [Chen *et al.*, 2023b] Mengzhao Chen, Mingbao Lin, Ke Li, Yunhang Shen, Yongjian Wu, Fei Chao, and Rongrong Ji. Cf-vit: A general coarse-to-fine method for vision transformer. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, pages 7042–7052, 2023.
- [Cho *et al.*, 2023] Yae Jee Cho, Luyang Liu, Zheng Xu, Aldi Fahrezi, Matt Barnes, and Gauri Joshi. Heterogeneous lora for federated fine-tuning of on-device foundation models. In *International Workshop on Federated Learning in the Age of Foundation Models in Conjunction with NeurIPS 2023*, 2023.
- [Deng *et al.*, 2009] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 248–255. Ieee, 2009.
- [Dettmers and Zettlemoyer, 2019] Tim Dettmers and Luke Zettlemoyer. Sparse networks from scratch: Faster training without losing performance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.04840*, 2019.
- [Dosovitskiy *et al.*, 2020] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2020.
- [Gao *et al.*, 2023] Tianrun Gao, Xiaohong Liu, Yuning Yang, and Guangyu Wang. Fedmbp: Multi-branch prototype federated learning on heterogeneous data. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*, pages 2180–2184. IEEE, 2023.
- [Gheini *et al.*, 2021] Mozhdeh Gheini, Xiang Ren, and Jonathan May. Cross-attention is all you need: Adapting pretrained transformers for machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08771*, 2021.
- [Han *et al.*, 2021] Xu Han, Zhengyan Zhang, Ning Ding, Yuxian Gu, Xiao Liu, Yuqi Huo, Jiezhong Qiu, Yuan Yao, Ao Zhang, Liang Zhang, et al. Pre-trained models: Past, present and future. *AI Open*, 2:225–250, 2021.
- [Houlsby *et al.*, 2019] Neil Houlsby, Andrei Giurgiu, Stanislaw Jastrzebski, Bruna Morrone, Quentin De Laroussilhe, Andrea Gesmundo, Mona Attariyan, and Sylvain Gelly. Parameter-efficient transfer learning for nlp. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2790–2799. PMLR, 2019.
- [Hu *et al.*, 2021] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*, 2021.
- [Jie and Deng, 2023] Shibo Jie and Zhi-Hong Deng. Fact: Factor-tuning for lightweight adaptation on vision transformer. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, pages 1060–1068, 2023.
- [Kairouz *et al.*, 2021] 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.
- [Konečný *et al.*, 2016] Jakub Konečný, H Brendan McMahan, Felix X Yu, Peter Richtárik, Ananda Theertha Suresh, and Dave Bacon. Federated learning: Strategies for improving communication efficiency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.05492*, 2016.
- [Krizhevsky *et al.*, 2009] Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. 2009.
- [Kurtic and Alistarh, 2022] Eldar Kurtic and Dan Alistarh. Gmp*: Well-tuned global magnitude pruning can outperform most bert-pruning methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.06384*, 2022.
- [Li *et al.*, 2020] Tian Li, Anit Kumar Sahu, Manzil Zaheer, Maziar Sanjabi, Ameet Talwalkar, and Virginia Smith. Federated optimization in heterogeneous networks. *Proceedings of Machine learning and systems*, 2:429–450, 2020.
- [Lialin *et al.*, 2023] Vladislav Lialin, Vijeta Deshpande, and Anna Rumshisky. Scaling down to scale up: A guide to parameter-efficient fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.15647*, 2023.
- [Lin *et al.*, 2022] Ailiang Lin, Bingzhi Chen, Jiayu Xu, Zheng Zhang, Guangming Lu, and David Zhang. Ds-transunet: Dual swin transformer u-net for medical image segmentation. *IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement*, 71:1–15, 2022.

- [Liu *et al.*, 2021a] Shilong Liu, Lei Zhang, Xiao Yang, Hang Su, and Jun Zhu. Query2label: A simple transformer way to multi-label classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.10834*, 2021.
- [Liu *et al.*, 2021b] Ze Liu, Yutong Lin, Yue Cao, Han Hu, Yixuan Wei, Zheng Zhang, Stephen Lin, and Baining Guo. Swin transformer: Hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 10012–10022, 2021.
- [McMahan *et al.*, 2017] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Aguerre y Arcas. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 1273–1282. PMLR, 2017.
- [Pan *et al.*, 2022] Junting Pan, Ziyi Lin, Xiatian Zhu, Jing Shao, and Hongsheng Li. St-adapter: Parameter-efficient image-to-video transfer learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:26462–26477, 2022.
- [Park *et al.*, 2021] Younghyun Park, Dong-Jun Han, Do-Yeon Kim, Jun Seo, and Jaekyun Moon. Few-round learning for federated learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:28612–28622, 2021.
- [Qu *et al.*, 2022] Liangqiong Qu, Yuyin Zhou, Paul Pu Liang, Yingda Xia, Feifei Wang, Ehsan Adeli, Li Fei-Fei, and Daniel Rubin. Rethinking architecture design for tackling data heterogeneity in federated learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 10061–10071, 2022.
- [Radford *et al.*, 2021] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021.
- [Sun *et al.*, 2022] Guangyu Sun, Matias Mendieta, Taojianan Yang, and Chen Chen. Conquering the communication constraints to enable large pre-trained models in federated learning. *arXiv*, 2022.
- [Tan *et al.*, 2022] Yue Tan, Guodong Long, Jie Ma, Lu Liu, Tianyi Zhou, and Jing Jiang. Federated learning from pre-trained models: A contrastive learning approach. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:19332–19344, 2022.
- [Tang *et al.*, 2018] Yuanjie Tang, Rengkui Liu, Futian Wang, Quanxin Sun, and Amr A Kandil. Scheduling optimization of linear schedule with constraint programming. *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 33(2):124–151, 2018.
- [Tian *et al.*, 2022] Yuanyishu Tian, Yao Wan, Lingjuan Lyu, Dezhong Yao, Hai Jin, and Lichao Sun. Fedbert: When federated learning meets pre-training. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)*, 13(4):1–26, 2022.
- [Yi *et al.*, 2023] Liping Yi, Han Yu, Gang Wang, and Xiaoguang Liu. Fedlora: Model-heterogeneous personalized federated learning with lora tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.13283*, 2023.
- [Zaken *et al.*, 2021] Elad Ben Zaken, Shauli Ravfogel, and Yoav Goldberg. Bitfit: Simple parameter-efficient fine-tuning for transformer-based masked language-models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.10199*, 2021.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2023a] Feiyu Zhang, Liangzhi Li, Junhao Chen, Zhouqiang Jiang, Bowen Wang, and Yiming Qian. Incredlora: Incremental parameter allocation method for parameter-efficient fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12043*, 2023.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2023b] Qingru Zhang, Minshuo Chen, Alexander Bukharin, Pengcheng He, Yu Cheng, Weizhu Chen, and Tuo Zhao. Adaptive budget allocation for parameter-efficient fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.10512*, 2023.
- [Zhou *et al.*, 2020] Yanlin Zhou, George Pu, Xiyao Ma, Xiaolin Li, and Dapeng Wu. Distilled one-shot federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.07999*, 2020.