

Survey of Privacy Threats and Countermeasures in Federated Learning

Masahiro HAYASHITANI, Junki MORI, and Isamu TERANISHI

Secure System Platform Research Laboratories, NEC Corporation

hayashitani@nec.com, junki.mori@nec.com, teranisi@nec.com

Abstract—Federated learning (FL) has emerged as a privacy-preserving machine learning paradigm that enables collaborative model training without directly exchanging raw data among clients. While FL mitigates the privacy risks associated with centralized data collection, it remains vulnerable to various privacy threats that can compromise sensitive information. Existing literature has only focused on privacy threats and countermeasures within horizontal federated learning (HFL) and vertical federated learning (VFL) individually. This paper provides a comprehensive and systematic review of privacy threats across all three principal FL paradigms: HFL, VFL, and federated transfer learning (FTL). We introduce a unified taxonomy that categorizes privacy threats according to the data type targeted, and we discuss corresponding defense mechanisms.

Index Terms—horizontal federated learning, vertical federated learning, federated transfer learning, threat to privacy, countermeasure against privacy threat.

I. INTRODUCTION

With the increasing ubiquity of computing devices, individuals generate substantial volumes of data daily. The centralized collection and storage of such data are significantly resource-intensive and time-consuming [1]. Furthermore, collecting user data raises significant privacy and confidentiality concerns, as the data often includes sensitive personal information. In light of growing societal awareness of privacy issues, regulatory frameworks such as the European Union’s AI Act have emerged, further limiting the viability of large-scale data aggregation practices.

In response to these challenges, federated learning (FL) has become a privacy-preserving machine learning paradigm that enables multiple clients to train a global model collaboratively without sharing their raw local data. FL methodologies are typically classified into three categories based on the alignment of data features and samples across clients: horizontal federated learning (HFL), vertical federated learning (VFL), and federated transfer learning (FTL).

These approaches are widely regarded as promising for privacy preservation, as they mitigate the need to expose individual-level raw data. Nevertheless, FL remains susceptible to privacy risks. Various studies have demonstrated that communicating model updates during training can inadvertently leak sensitive information to other clients, the central server, or external adversaries [1].

While the privacy risks inherent to specific forms of FL such as HFL and VFL have been examined and summarized in prior survey studies (e.g., [1] for HFL and [2] for VFL),

there remains a lack of a unified and systematic review encompassing all paradigms of FL, including FTL. This paper presents a comprehensive overview of privacy risks across all FL variants, categorizing them into six distinct types of privacy threats based on the nature of the data targeted. We have searched papers on privacy threats and countermeasures in all paradigms of FL. The survey guides the privacy risks and corresponding mitigation strategies that need to be considered for each FL setting.

II. CATEGORIZATION OF FEDERATED LEARNING

We first review three types of FL based on the data structures among clients, as introduced by Yang et al. [3]: HFL, VFL, and FTL. Figure 1 shows each type’s data structure among clients. HFL assumes that each client has the same features and labels but different samples (Figure 1(a)). In contrast, VFL assumes that clients share the same samples but possess disjoint features (Figure 1(b)). FTL addresses cases where clients differ in both samples and features (Figure 1(c)).

The following subsections describe the learning and prediction methods for each FL type.

A. Horizontal Federated Learning

HFL is the most common federated learning category that Google first introduced [4]. The goal of HFL is for each client to hold different samples and collaboratively improve the accuracy of a model with a common structure.

Figure 2 shows an overview of the HFL learning protocol. Two types of entities participate in learning of HFL:

- i **Server** - Coordinator. Server exchanges model parameters with the clients and aggregates model parameters received from the clients.
- ii **Clients** - Data owners. Each client locally trains a model using their own private data and exchanges model parameters with the server.

Each client first trains a local model for a few steps and sends the model parameters to the server. The server then updates the global model by aggregating the local models, typically by averaging, as in FedAvg, and distributes the result to all clients. This process repeats until convergence. During inference, each client independently predicts labels using the global model and its features.

This protocol is called centralized HFL because it relies on a trusted third-party server. In contrast, decentralized HFL




Fig. 1. Categorization of federated learning based on data structure owned by clients.




Fig. 2. Overview of the HFL learning protocol.

eliminates the central server, allowing clients to communicate directly, thereby reducing communication costs [5].

B. Vertical Federated Learning

VFL enables clients holding the different features of the same samples to collaboratively train a model that takes each client's various features as input. There are VFL studies that deal with various models including linear/logistic regression [6]–[10], decision trees [11]–[15], neural networks [16]–[19], and other non-linear models [20], [21].

Figure 3 shows an overview of the standard VFL learning protocol. In VFL, only one client holds labels, and it plays the role of a server. Therefore, two types of entities participate in learning of VFL:

- i **Active client** - Features and labels owner. Active client coordinates the learning procedure. It calculates the loss and exchanges intermediate outputs with the passive clients.
- ii **Passive clients** - Features owners. Each passive client keeps both its features and model local but exchanges intermediate outputs with the active client.

VFL consists of two phases: ID matching and learning phases. In the ID matching phases, all clients share the common sample IDs. In the learning phase, each client has a separate model with its own features as input, and the passive clients send the computed intermediate outputs to the active client. The active client calculates the loss based on the aggregated intermediate outputs and sends the gradients to all passive clients. Then, the passive clients update their own model parameters. This process is repeated until convergence. During




Fig. 3. Overview of the standard VFL learning protocol.

inference time, all clients need to cooperate to predict the label of a sample.

C. Federated Transfer Learning

FTL assumes two clients that share only a small portion of samples or features. FTL aims to create a model that can predict labels on the client that does not possess labels (target client), by transferring the knowledge of the other client that does possess labels (source client) to the target client.

Figure 4 shows an overall of the FTL learning protocol. As noted above, two types of entities participate in FTL:

- i **Source client** - Features and labels owner. Source client exchanges intermediate outputs such as outputs and gradients with the target client and calculates the loss.
- ii **Target client** - Features owners. Target client exchanges intermediate outputs with the source client.

In FTL, two clients exchange intermediate outputs to learn a common representation. The source client uses the labeled data to compute the loss and sends the gradient to the target client, which updates the target client's representation. This process is repeated until convergence. During inference, the target client predicts the label of a sample using its own model and features.

The detail of the learning protocol varies depending on the specific method. Although only a limited number of FTL methods have been proposed, we introduce three significant methods. FTL requires some supplementary information to bridge two clients, such as common IDs [22]–[25], common features [26], [27], and labels of target client [28], [29].




Fig. 4. Overall of the FTL learning protocol.

1) *ID-FTL*: Most FTL methods assume the existence of the common-ID samples between two clients. As with VFL, this type of FTL requires ID matching before the learning phase. Liu et al. [22] proposed the first FTL protocol, which learns feature transformation functions so that the different features of the common samples are mapped into the same features. Sharma et al. [23] improved the communication overhead of the first FTL using multi-party computation and enhanced security by addressing malicious clients. Gao et al. [25] proposed a dual learning framework in which two clients impute each other's missing features by exchanging the outputs of their imputation models on the shared samples.

2) *Feature-FTL*: In real-world applications, sharing samples with the same IDs is difficult. Therefore, Gao et al. [26] proposed a method to realize FTL by assuming common features instead of common samples. In that method, two clients mutually reconstruct the missing features by using exchanged feature mapping models. Then, using all features, the clients conduct HFL to obtain a label prediction model. In the original paper, the authors assume that all clients possess labels. However, this method applies to the target client that does not possess labels because the source client can only learn the label prediction model by itself. Mori et al. [27] proposed a method for neural networks in which each client incorporates its own unique features in addition to common features into HFL training. However, their method is based on HFL and cannot be applied to target clients who do not possess labels.

3) *Label-FTL*: This method assumes neither common IDs nor features but assumes that all clients possess labels, allowing a common representation to be learned across clients. Since it is based on HFL, the participating entities are the same as in HFL. Gao et al. [28] learns a common representation by exchanging the intermediate outputs with the server and reducing maximum mean discrepancy loss. Rakotomamonjy et al. [29] proposed a method to learn a common representation by using Wasserstein distance for intermediate outputs, which enables the clients only to exchange statistical information such as mean and variance with the server.

III. THREAT MODELS AND PRIVACY ATTACKS IN FEDERATED LEARNING

This section shows the threat models and categorizes the privacy attacks.

A. Threat Models

We define threat models based on four perspectives: FL type, attacker role, attack information, and attack style.

1) *Attacker role*: We define three attacker roles: server, client, and third party.

i **Server** - Denotes attacks initiated by the server. In VFL and FTL, an active client and a source client correspond to this role, respectively.

ii **Client** - Denotes attacks initiated by a client. In VFL and FTL, this corresponds to a passive client and a target client, respectively.

iii **Third Party** - Refers to attackers external to both server and client roles.

2) *Information for attack*: An attacker can exploit shared information, such as gradients or model parameters, to infer private data. During training, exchanging gradients may expose sensitive information and lead to deep leakage, even when only a small subset is shared. Such gradients can reveal significant details about local data. From shared local model parameters, an attacker may infer class representatives, dataset membership, and characteristics or even reconstruct original training inputs and labels. The specific information accessible to an attacker depends on their role in the system:

i **Server** - Receives gradients or model parameters from each client in every round.

ii **Client** - Has access only to model parameters in each round.

iii **Third Party** - May eavesdrop on communication and access gradients or model parameters.

3) *Attack style*: We define three attack styles: malicious, honest-but-curious, and honest.

i **Malicious** - Actively interferes with the training process to extract private information from the clients.

ii **Honest-but-curious** - Passively follows FL protocols without disrupting training, but attempts to infer private information from received data.

iii **Honest** - Passively follows FL protocols and does not attempt to infer private information from received data.

4) *Federated learning type*: As explained in the previous section, we consider three types of FL: HFL, VFL, and FTL.

B. Privacy Attacks

We categorize privacy attacks into six types based on the nature of the data targeted: Feature Inference, Property Inference, Membership Inference, Label Inference, ID Leakage, and Relation Leaks. Figure 5 illustrates a diagram of these categories, and Table I organizes them based on their corresponding threat models, along with relevant references addressing each threat. Although no existing studies specifically identify privacy threats in the context of FTL, we include "FTL" in the "FL type" column for those privacy threats potentially applicable to FTL. Each threat type is described below.




Fig. 5. Diagram of privacy attacks.

1) *Feature Inference*: Feature inference attacks aim to recover input features. If all features are targeted, the attack is also termed a reconstruction attack; if only a subset is targeted, it is also called attribute inference. The first such attack was introduced for HFL by [30]. More recently, various attacks have been developed for VFL. These attacks are especially effective in HFL settings using gradient boosting decision trees [31]. HFL-based attacks apply to Feature-FTL and Label-FTL, which incorporate HFL in later stages, while VFL-based attacks are effective for ID-FTL, where common IDs are used.

2) *Property Inference*: Property inference attacks target properties of local datasets, such as class distributions [32], sensitive attributes [33], or properties unrelated to the main task [34]. These attacks are relevant in HFL, where client data distributions may differ. They typically assume that the adversary possesses auxiliary training data labeled with the target property [34].

3) *Membership Inference*: Membership inference attacks attempt to determine whether specific data points were part of a client's training set. For instance, an attacker might infer whether a particular patient profile was used to train a disease classifier. These attacks are particularly effective in HFL, where each client has unique data samples and the server has access to model parameters, enabling powerful white-box attacks [35].

4) *Label Inference*: Label inference attacks aim to infer labels for samples when some clients lack label information. In VFL, passive clients do not possess labels but exchange intermediate computations, leading to potential label leakage. VFL architectures are inherently vulnerable to such attacks [36]. These attacks are also effective against ID-FTL, where clients share samples, but a target client does not possess labels.

5) *ID Leakage*: In VFL and ID-FTL, which require alignment of shared samples across clients, there exists a risk that sample IDs held by one client may be exposed to others. Consequently, even honest clients may gain knowledge of the existence of entities that are either not part of the intersection [37] or that lie within the intersection [38] of shared samples. When there is asymmetry in sample IDs between clients, one client's entire ID set is exposed to the other [39], posing significant privacy risks. This inherent vulnerability severely

limits the practical applicability of both VFL and ID-FTL.

6) *Relation Leaks*: In FL applied to relational data (e.g., graphs), relation leaks may occur, exposing connections between samples [40]. These leaks exploit the intuition that related samples often have representations close in embedding space. A relationship can be inferred if the distance between two representations falls below a threshold.

IV. GENERAL DEFENSE METHODS

We summarize the defense methods against privacy attacks described in the previous section. These methods fall into two main categories: general methods, which are effective against most attacks, and specialized methods, which target specific attacks but are more efficient. While specialized methods are tailored to particular threats, they are often simpler and less computationally intensive than general ones, making them highly practical. This section focuses specifically on general defense methods.

Two widely used general approaches in privacy-preserving FL are: (1) Communication channel defenses, which employ cryptographic techniques to protect model parameters or gradients and (2) Differential privacy (DP), which prevents the leakage of data records from the model.

A. Communication Channel Defense

These defenses prevent information leakage from shared raw intermediate outputs such as local model parameters, gradients, and outputs between the server and clients by encrypting them. However, they incur high computational costs. We review the two main techniques in this category: *secure multi-party computation* (SMPC) and *blockchain*.

1) *Secure Multi-Party Computation (SMPC)*: SMPC [83] enables multiple parties to jointly compute a function over their private inputs without revealing them to each other. SMPC ensures that no party learns anything beyond the final output. SMPC is naturally suited for securely aggregating local model parameters and gradients in HFL, especially when the server is untrusted (malicious or honest-but-curious). In VFL and FTL, where more sensitive intermediate outputs must be shared, SMPC techniques are typically integrated into most proposed algorithms. However, while SMPC protects intermediate outputs, it does not safeguard the final aggregated output, which remains susceptible to inference attacks. Three primary methods to realize SMPC are: *homomorphic encryption* (HE), *garbled circuit* (GC), and *secret sharing* (SS).

Homomorphic Encryption (HE). HE is a type of encryption technique that enables computations such as addition and multiplication over encrypted inputs without decryption. For example, as cryptographic techniques, Paillier [84] and modified El Gamal [85] possess additive homomorphism property, and El Gamal and RSA [86] possess multiplicative homomorphism property.

Garbled Circuit (GC). GC, first introduced by Yao [87], constructs Boolean circuits for secure two-party computation. Research on GC has primarily focused on improving performance and strengthening security. Security advancements address threats from both semi-honest and malicious adversaries.

TABLE I
PRIVACY THREATS AND THREAT MODELS

Threat type	FL type	Reference	Attacker role	Information for attack	Attack style
Feature Inference	HFL (Feature-FTL, Label-FTL)	[41], [42], [43], [44], [45]	Server	Gradient	Malicious
		[30], [46], [47], [48]	Server	Gradient	Honest-but-curious
		[49], [50], [51], [52]	Server	Gradient	Honest-but-curious
		[53], [54]	Server	Model Parameter	Malicious
		[55], [56]	Client	Model Parameter	Malicious
		[57]	3rd party	Model Parameter	Malicious
		[58]	3rd party	Gradient	Honest-but-curious
	VFL (ID-FTL)	[59], [60], [61]	Client	Model Parameter	Honest-but-curious
		[62], [63], [64]	Server	Gradient	Malicious
		[65]	Server	Gradient	Honest-but-curious
Property Inference	HFL	[66]	Server	Model Parameter	Honest-but-curious
		[67], [68], [69]	Client	Model Parameter	Honest-but-curious
		[32], [70]	Server	Gradient	Malicious
		[71]	Server	Model Parameter	Malicious
Membership Inference	HFL	[34], [72], [73]	Client	Model Parameter	Malicious
		[33], [72]	Client	Model Parameter	Honest-but-curious
		[35]	Server	Gradient	Malicious
		[35]	Server	Gradient	Honest-but-curious
Label Inference	VFL (ID-FTL)	[74], [35], [75], [76]	Client	Model Parameter	Malicious
		[35], [77]	Client	Model Parameter	Honest-but-curious
ID Leakage	VFL (ID-FTL)	[36], [78]	Client	Model Parameter	Malicious
		[79], [80], [81], [82]	Client	Model Parameter	Honest-but-curious
Relation Leaks	VFL (ID-FTL)	[37], [39]	Server, Client	Non-Aligned IDs	Honest
		[38]	Server, Client	Aligned IDs	Honest
		[40]	Client	Model Parameter	Honest-but-curious

At the same time, efforts to optimize GC performance without compromising security continue to be an active research area.

Secret Sharing (SS). SS is a cryptographic technique that distributes a secret among multiple participants so no individual holds the complete secret. The original secret can be reconstructed only when sufficient shares are combined. SS enables secure training of machine learning models without exposing raw data to any participant. The model is divided into shares and distributed, allowing reconstruction only when enough shares are collected.

2) *Blockchain*: Blockchain is a distributed ledger that securely links an expanding list of records (blocks) using cryptographic hashes. It underpins most digital cryptocurrencies and enables peer-to-peer FL without relying on a potentially untrusted server, unlike SMPC and HE.

B. Differential Privacy (DP)

FL protocols often incorporate additional DP techniques to prevent information leakage from both local updates and the global model. DP ensures that the inclusion or exclusion of any individual's data has a limited impact on the output, thereby protecting sensitive information. This protection is achieved by adding calibrated random noise to the outputs, proportional to the maximum possible influence a single data point could have. Importantly, DP assumes that adversaries may possess arbitrary external knowledge. Several methods exist for integrating DP into FL to safeguard client data privacy.

1) *Central Differential Privacy (CDP)*: CDP is the original DP definition. The following is the definition of DP.

Definition 1: For $\epsilon > 0$ and $0 \leq \delta < 1$, a randomized mechanism \mathcal{M} is called (ϵ, δ) -differentially private if and only

if for all $S \subseteq \text{Range}(\mathcal{M})$ and for all adjacent datasets D and D' , we have

$$\Pr[\mathcal{M}(D) \in S] \leq \exp(\epsilon) \cdot \Pr[\mathcal{M}(D') \in S] + \delta$$

In FL, CDP is realized by a trusted server that adds noise to aggregated outputs, such as the global model or gradients. This noise reduces the ability of individual clients to infer information about others. However, noise addition often leads to performance degradation. Moreover, CDP is ineffective against untrusted servers, as it relies on the server to apply the noise.

2) *Local Differential Privacy (LDP)*: We can extend DP to the setting where the server is untrusted by each client, adding noise to its own intermediate outputs and sharing them with the server. This is realized with LDP.

LDP ensures that each client's privacy is protected from other clients and the server. However, LDP requires each client to add a sufficient amount of noise, so the total amount of noise added is enormous, resulting in a more significant performance degradation than DP.

3) *Distributed Differential Privacy (DDP)*: DDP bridges the gap between LDP and CDP by integrating cryptographic protocols to preserve individual privacy. DDP avoids relying on a trusted server and achieves better utility than LDP. Theoretically, DDP matches CDP in utility, as both add the same amount of noise.

DDP reflects that noise added to a statistic is distributed among clients. Implementations typically involve each participant applying a noise mechanism with reduced variance. These mechanisms require stable distributions to ensure the overall output is well-calibrated and cryptographic techniques to conceal intermediate outputs from clients.

4) *Participant-level Differential Privacy (PDP)*: The DP technique described above prevents the leakage of individual client data but is ineffective against property inference attacks that target properties of each client's data. PDP mechanisms are required to address this limitation, which blur information at the client level. PDP achieves this by coordinating and adding noise to make individual clients indistinguishable.

V. SPECIALIZED DEFENSE METHODS

These defense methods target specific attacks but are simpler and less computationally intensive than general methods, making them highly practical.

A. Feature Inference

Using a large batch size is a potential defense against privacy attacks [46], [59]. Larger batches increase optimization complexity by introducing more variables. A linear programming method is employed to reconstruct full-batch data from gradients [59]. However, as the number of constraints increases, solution time grows significantly, making such attacks computationally infeasible.

Another simple defense is dropout, a regularization technique that randomly deactivates neurons to reduce overfitting [32], [34]. Dropout weakens attacks by reducing the number of active gradients visible to adversaries. This stochastic feature removal further obfuscates sensitive data during training.

B. Property Inference

For property inference, dropout is again a viable defense [32], [34]. Another approach is to share fewer gradient updates, whereby participants disclose only a fraction of their gradients per round [34]. This reduces both communication costs and potential information leakage.

C. Membership Inference

Mitigation techniques effective in centralized machine learning can also be applied to local training in FL. For example, regularization, dropout, and distillation, commonly used to prevent overfitting, have also shown effectiveness against membership inference attacks. Moreover, integrating empirically validated defenses designed to improve robustness against white-box membership inference attacks [88], [89] into client-side training can further reduce privacy risks.

D. Label Inference

Various defense strategies have been proposed to mitigate label inference threats in VFL, focusing on either obfuscating gradients or disrupting the correlation between shared representations and private labels. Techniques such as gradient perturbation [82] and synthetic gradient generation [79] have proven effective with minimal performance loss. Optimization-based approaches also reduce an adversary's inference ability by minimizing the correlation between intermediate embeddings and private labels [78], [80]. Additionally, architecture-specific defenses have emerged, such as combining label differential privacy with post-processing and applying mutual information regularization to tree-based models [81].

E. ID Leakage

Private Set Intersection (PSI) is a standard cryptographic technique in VFL and ID-FTL to prevent leakage of non-overlapping ID information during ID alignment [37]. To support asymmetric ID alignment, an improved PSI variant has been introduced [39]. However, these techniques still reveal membership information within the intersection, compromising complete privacy. To address this, dummy ID insertion has been proposed [38], enabling clients to proceed without knowing which IDs are matched and enhancing privacy for shared IDs.

VI. CONCLUSION

This survey shows that FL remains vulnerable to diverse and paradigm-specific privacy threats. Our taxonomy indicates that although HFL has been widely studied, particularly concerning feature and membership inference, defenses against property inference, such as participant-level differential privacy, remain underdeveloped. In contrast, VFL faces inherent risks, including label inference and ID leakage, which require more targeted countermeasures. Depending on the setting, FTL inherits vulnerabilities from HFL and VFL, but systematic studies of FTL-specific risks and defenses are lacking. Future research should prioritize mitigating VFL's inherent vulnerabilities, conducting in-depth analyses of FTL-specific threats, and advancing unified threat models and benchmarking frameworks. Finally, developing lightweight, generalizable defenses that preserve utility while addressing multiple threats simultaneously will be essential for practical and secure FL deployment.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This R&D includes the results of "Research and development of optimized AI technology by secure data coordination (JPMI00316)" by the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications (MIC), Japan.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Lyu, H. Yu, X. Ma, C. Chen, L. Sun, J. Zhao, Q. Yang, and P. S. Yu, "Privacy and robustness in federated learning: Attacks and defenses," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 35, no. 7, pp. 8726–8746, 2024.
- [2] Y. Liu, Y. Kang, T. Zou, Y. Pu, Y. He, X. Ye, Y. Ouyang, Y.-Q. Zhang, and Q. Yang, "Vertical federated learning: Concepts, advances, and challenges," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 36, no. 7, pp. 3615–3634, 2024.
- [3] Q. Yang, Y. Liu, T. Chen, and Y. Tong, "Federated machine learning: Concept and applications," *ACM Trans. Intell. Syst. Technol.*, vol. 10, no. 2, 2019.
- [4] B. McMahan, E. Moore, D. Ramage, S. Hampson, and B. A. y. Areas, "Communication-Efficient Learning of Deep Networks from Decentralized Data," in *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, vol. 54. PMLR, 2017, pp. 1273–1282.
- [5] E. T. Martínez Beltrán, M. Q. Pérez, P. M. S. Sánchez, S. L. Bernal, G. Bovet, M. G. Pérez, G. M. Pérez, and A. H. Celadrán, "Decentralized federated learning: Fundamentals, state of the art, frameworks, trends, and challenges," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 2983–3013, 2023.
- [6] A. Gascón, P. Schoppmann, B. Balle, M. Raykova, J. Doerner, S. Zahur, and D. Evans, "Secure linear regression on vertically partitioned datasets," *IACR Cryptol. ePrint Arch.*, vol. 2016, p. 892, 2016.

[7] S. Hardy, W. Henecka, H. Ivey-Law, R. Nock, G. Patrini, G. Smith, and B. Thorne, "Private federated learning on vertically partitioned data via entity resolution and additively homomorphic encryption," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1711.10677, 2017.

[8] R. Nock, S. Hardy, W. Henecka, H. Ivey-Law, G. Patrini, G. Smith, and B. Thorne, "Entity resolution and federated learning get a federated resolution," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1803.04035, 2018.

[9] S. Yang, B. Ren, X. Zhou, and L. Liu, "Parallel distributed logistic regression for vertical federated learning without third-party coordinator," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1911.09824, 2019.

[10] Q. Zhang, B. Gu, C. Deng, and H. Huang, "Secure bilevel asynchronous vertical federated learning with backward updating," *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 35, no. 12, pp. 10 896–10 904, May 2021.

[11] K. Cheng, T. Fan, Y. Jin, Y. Liu, T. Chen, D. Papadopoulos, and Q. Yang, "Secureboost: A lossless federated learning framework," *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 87–98, 2021.

[12] J. Vaidya, C. Clifton, M. Kantarcioglu, and A. S. Patterson, "Privacy-preserving decision trees over vertically partitioned data," *ACM Trans. Knowl. Discov. Data*, vol. 2, no. 3, oct 2008.

[13] Y. Wu, S. Cai, X. Xiao, G. Chen, and B. C. Ooi, "Privacy preserving vertical federated learning for tree-based models," *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, vol. 13, no. 12, p. 2090–2103, jul 2020.

[14] Y. Liu, Y. Liu, Z. Liu, Y. Liang, C. Meng, J. Zhang, and Y. Zheng, "Federated forest," *IEEE Transactions on Big Data*, pp. 1–1, 2020.

[15] Z. Tian, R. Zhang, X. Hou, J. Liu, and K. Ren, "Federboost: Private federated learning for GBDT," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2011.02796, 2020.

[16] Y. Hu, D. Niu, J. Yang, and S. Zhou, "Fdml: A collaborative machine learning framework for distributed features," in *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, ser. KDD '19. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2019, p. 2232–2240.

[17] Y. Liu, Y. Kang, X. Zhang, L. Li, Y. Cheng, T. Chen, M. Hong, and Q. Yang, "A communication efficient collaborative learning framework for distributed features," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1912.11187, 2019.

[18] D. Romanini, A. J. Hall, P. Papadopoulos, T. Titcombe, A. Ismail, T. Cebere, R. Sandmann, R. Roehm, and M. A. Hoeh, "Pyvertical: A vertical federated learning framework for multi-headed splitnn," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2104.00489, 2021.

[19] Q. He, W. Yang, B. Chen, Y. Geng, and L. Huang, "Transnet: Training privacy-preserving neural network over transformed layer," *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, vol. 13, no. 12, p. 1849–1862, jul 2020.

[20] B. Gu, Z. Dang, X. Li, and H. Huang, "Federated doubly stochastic kernel learning for vertically partitioned data," in *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2020, p. 2483–2493.

[21] R. Xu, N. Baracaldo, Y. Zhou, A. Anwar, J. Joshi, and H. Ludwig, "Fedv: Privacy-preserving federated learning over vertically partitioned data," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2103.03918, 2021.

[22] Y. Liu, Y. Kang, C. Xing, T. Chen, and Q. Yang, "A secure federated transfer learning framework," *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 70–82, 2020.

[23] S. Sharma, C. Xing, Y. Liu, and Y. Kang, "Secure and efficient federated transfer learning," in *2019 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*, 2019, pp. 2569–2576.

[24] B. Zhang, C. Chen, and L. Wang, "Privacy-preserving transfer learning via secure maximum mean discrepancy," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.11680*, 2020.

[25] Y. Gao, M. Gong, Y. Xie, A. K. Qin, K. Pan, and Y.-S. Ong, "Multiparty dual learning," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 53, no. 5, pp. 2955–2968, 2023.

[26] D. Gao, Y. Liu, A. Huang, C. Ju, H. Yu, and Q. Yang, "Privacy-preserving heterogeneous federated transfer learning," in *2019 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*, 2019, pp. 2552–2559.

[27] J. Mori, I. Teranishi, and R. Furukawa, "Continual horizontal federated learning for heterogeneous data," in *2022 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, 2022, pp. 1–8.

[28] D. Gao, C. Ju, X. Wei, Y. Liu, T. Chen, and Q. Yang, "Hhhfl: Hierarchical heterogeneous horizontal federated learning for electroencephalography," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.05784*, 2019.

[29] A. Rakotomamonjy, M. Vono, H. J. M. Ruiz, and L. Ralaivola, "Personalised federated learning on heterogeneous feature spaces," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.11447*, 2023.

[30] L. Zhu, Z. Liu, and S. Han, "Deep leakage from gradients," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d'Alché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett, Eds., vol. 32. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019. [Online]. Available: https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2019/file/60a6c4002cc7b29142def8871531281a-Paper.pdf

[31] K. Ito, B. Enkhtaivan, I. Teranishi, and J. Sakuma, "Trojan attribute inference attack on gradient boosting decision trees," in *2024 IEEE 9th European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P)*, 2024, pp. 542–559.

[32] L. Wang, S. Xu, X. Wang, and Q. Zhu, "Eavesdrop the composition proportion of training labels in federated learning," 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.06044>

[33] W. Zhang, S. Tople, and O. Ohrimenko, "Leakage of dataset properties in multi-party machine learning," 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.07267>

[34] L. Melis, C. Song, E. D. Cristofaro, and V. Shmatikov, "Exploiting unintended feature leakage in collaborative learning," 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.04049>

[35] M. Nasr, R. Shokri, and A. Houmansadr, "Comprehensive privacy analysis of deep learning: Passive and active white-box inference attacks against centralized and federated learning," in *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, May 2019. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/SP.2019.00065>

[36] C. Fu, X. Zhang, S. Ji, J. Chen, J. Wu, S. Guo, J. Zhou, A. X. Liu, and T. Wang, "Label inference attacks against vertical federated learning," in *31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22)*. Boston, MA: USENIX Association, Aug. 2022, pp. 1397–1414. [Online]. Available: <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity22/presentation/fu-chong>

[37] S. Hardy, W. Henecka, H. Ivey-Law, R. Nock, G. Patrini, G. Smith, and B. Thorne, "Private federated learning on vertically partitioned data via entity resolution and additively homomorphic encryption," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.10677*, 2017.

[38] J. Sun, X. Yang, Y. Yao, A. Zhang, W. Gao, J. Xie, and C. Wang, "Vertical federated learning without revealing intersection membership," 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.05508>

[39] Y. Liu, X. Zhang, and L. Wang, "Asymmetrical vertical federated learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.07427*, 2020.

[40] P. Qiu, X. Zhang, S. Ji, T. Du, Y. Pu, J. Zhou, and T. Wang, "Your labels are selling you out: Relation leaks in vertical federated learning," *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 3653–3668, 2023.

[41] H. Ren, J. Deng, and X. Xie, "Grnn: Generative regression neural network—a data leakage attack for federated learning," *ACM Trans. Intell. Syst. Technol.*, vol. 13, no. 4, may 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3510032>

[42] J. Sun, A. Li, B. Wang, H. Yang, H. Li, and Y. Chen, "Soteria: Provable defense against privacy leakage in federated learning from representation perspective," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2021, pp. 9311–9319.

[43] F. Boenisch, A. Dziedzic, R. Schuster, A. S. Shamsabadi, I. Shumailov, and N. Papernot, "When the curious abandon honesty: Federated learning is not private," 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.02918>

[44] W. Wei, L. Liu, Y. Wu, G. Su, and A. Iyengar, "Gradient-leakage resilient federated learning," 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.01154>

[45] M. Lam, G.-Y. Wei, D. Brooks, V. J. Reddi, and M. Mitzenmacher, "Gradient disaggregation: Breaking privacy in federated learning by reconstructing the user participant matrix," 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.06089>

[46] B. Zhao, K. R. Mopuri, and H. Bilen, "idlgl: Improved deep leakage from gradients," 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.02610>

[47] J. Geiping, H. Bauermeister, H. Dröge, and M. Moeller, "Inverting gradients - how easy is it to break privacy in federated learning?" in *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, ser. NIPS '20. Red Hook, NY, USA: Curran Associates Inc., 2020.

[48] W. Wei, L. Liu, M. Loper, K.-H. Chow, M. E. Gursoy, S. Truex, and Y. Wu, "A framework for evaluating gradient leakage attacks in federated learning," 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.10397>

[49] M. Vero, M. Balunović, D. I. Dimitrov, and M. Vechev, “Tableak: Tabular data leakage in federated learning,” 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.01785>

[50] Y. Huang, S. Gupta, Z. Song, K. Li, and S. Arora, “Evaluating gradient inversion attacks and defenses in federated learning,” in *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, ser. NIPS ’21. Red Hook, NY, USA: Curran Associates Inc., 2024.

[51] A. Hatamizadeh, H. Yin, P. Molchanov, A. Myronenko, W. Li, P. Dogra, A. Feng, M. G. Flores, J. Kautz, D. Xu, and H. R. Roth, “Do gradient inversion attacks make federated learning unsafe?” *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, vol. 42, no. 7, pp. 2044–2056, 2023.

[52] H. Liu, B. Li, C. Gao, P. Xie, and C. Zhao, “Privacy-encoded federated learning against gradient-based data reconstruction attacks,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 18, pp. 5860–5875, 2023.

[53] Z. Wang, M. Song, Z. Zhang, Y. Song, Q. Wang, and H. Qi, “Beyond inferring class representatives: User-level privacy leakage from federated learning,” 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1812.00535>

[54] M. Song, Z. Wang, Z. Zhang, Y. Song, Q. Wang, J. Ren, and H. Qi, “Analyzing user-level privacy attack against federated learning,” *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 38, no. 10, pp. 2430–2444, 2020.

[55] B. Hitaj, G. Ateniese, and F. Perez-Cruz, “Deep models under the gan: Information leakage from collaborative deep learning,” 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1702.07464>

[56] X. Xu, J. Wu, M. Yang, T. Luo, X. Duan, W. Li, Y. Wu, and B. Wu, “Information leakage by model weights on federated learning,” in *Proceedings of the 2020 Workshop on Privacy-Preserving Machine Learning in Practice*, ser. PPMLP’20. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2020, p. 31–36. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3411501.3419423>

[57] X. Yuan, X. Ma, L. Zhang, Y. Fang, and D. Wu, “Beyond class-level privacy leakage: Breaking record-level privacy in federated learning,” *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 2555–2565, 2022.

[58] H. Liang, Y. Li, C. Zhang, X. Liu, and L. Zhu, “Egia: An external gradient inversion attack in federated learning,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 18, pp. 4984–4995, 2023.

[59] Z. Li, Z. Huang, C. Chen, and C. Hong, “Quantification of the leakage in federated learning,” 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.05467>

[60] A. Bhowmick, J. Duchi, J. Freudiger, G. Kapoor, and R. Rogers, “Protection against reconstruction and its applications in private federated learning,” 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1812.00984>

[61] J. So, R. E. Ali, B. Güler, J. Jiao, and A. S. Avestimehr, “Securing secure aggregation: Mitigating multi-round privacy leakage in federated learning,” *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 37, no. 8, pp. 9864–9873, Jun. 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/view/26177>

[62] J. Sun, Y. Yao, W. Gao, J. Xie, and C. Wang, “Defending against reconstruction attack in vertical federated learning,” 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.09898>

[63] M. N. Vu, T. R. Jeter, R. Alharbi, and M. T. Thai, “Active data reconstruction attacks in vertical federated learning,” in *2023 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (BigData)*, 2023, pp. 1374–1379.

[64] X. Jiang, X. Zhou, and J. Grossklags, “Comprehensive analysis of privacy leakage in vertical federated learning during prediction,” *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, 2022.

[65] X. Jin, P.-Y. Chen, C.-Y. Hsu, C.-M. Yu, and T. Chen, “Cafe: catastrophic data leakage in vertical federated learning,” in *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, ser. NIPS ’21. Red Hook, NY, USA: Curran Associates Inc., 2024.

[66] X. Luo, Y. Wu, X. Xiao, and B. C. Ooi, “Feature inference attack on model predictions in vertical federated learning,” in *2021 IEEE 37th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. IEEE, Apr. 2021. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/ICDE51399.2021.00023>

[67] H. Weng, J. Zhang, X. Ma, F. Xue, T. Wei, S. Ji, and Z. Zong, “Practical privacy attacks on vertical federated learning,” 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.09290>

[68] F. Fu, H. Xue, Y. Cheng, Y. Tao, and B. Cui, “Blindfl: Vertical federated machine learning without peeking into your data,” in *Proceedings of the 2022 International Conference on Management of Data*, ser. SIGMOD/PODS ’22. ACM, Jun. 2022. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/3514221.3526127>

[69] R. Yang, J. Ma, J. Zhang, S. Kumari, S. Kumar, and J. J. P. C. Rodrigues, “Practical feature inference attack in vertical federated learning during prediction in artificial internet of things,” *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 5–16, 2024.

[70] F. Mo, A. Borovykh, M. Malekzadeh, H. Haddadi, and S. Demetriadou, “Layer-wise characterization of latent information leakage in federated learning,” 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.08762>

[71] M. Shen, H. Wang, B. Zhang, L. Zhu, K. Xu, Q. Li, and X. Du, “Exploiting unintended property leakage in blockchain-assisted federated learning for intelligent edge computing,” *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 2265–2275, 2021.

[72] M. Xu and X. Li, “Subject property inference attack in collaborative learning,” in *2020 12th International Conference on Intelligent Human-Machine Systems and Cybernetics (IHMSC)*, vol. 1, 2020, pp. 227–231.

[73] M. Chase, E. Ghosh, and S. Mahloujifar, “Property inference from poisoning,” 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.11073>

[74] S. Truex, L. Liu, M. E. Gursoy, L. Yu, and W. Wei, “Towards demystifying membership inference attacks,” 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1807.09173>

[75] Y. Mao, X. Zhu, W. Zheng, D. Yuan, and J. Ma, “A novel user membership leakage attack in collaborative deep learning,” in *2019 11th International Conference on Wireless Communications and Signal Processing (WCSP)*, 2019, pp. 1–6.

[76] J. Chen, J. Zhang, Y. Zhao, H. Han, K. Zhu, and B. Chen, “Beyond model-level membership privacy leakage: an adversarial approach in federated learning,” in *2020 29th International Conference on Computer Communications and Networks (ICCCN)*, 2020, pp. 1–9.

[77] J. Zhang, J. Zhang, J. Chen, and S. Yu, “Gan enhanced membership inference: A passive local attack in federated learning,” in *ICC 2020 - 2020 IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*, 2020, pp. 1–6.

[78] W. Xia, Y. Li, L. Zhang, Z. Wu, and X. Yuan, “Cascade vertical federated learning towards straggler mitigation and label privacy over distributed labels,” *IEEE Transactions on Big Data*, pp. 1–14, 2023.

[79] K. Fan, J. Hong, W. Li, X. Zhao, H. Li, and Y. Yang, “Flsg: A novel defense strategy against inference attacks in vertical federated learning,” *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 1816–1826, 2024.

[80] J. Sun, X. Yang, Y. Yao, and C. Wang, “Label leakage and protection from forward embedding in vertical federated learning,” 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.01451>

[81] H. Takahashi, J. Liu, and Y. Liu, “Eliminating label leakage in tree-based vertical federated learning,” 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.10318>

[82] O. Li, J. Sun, X. Yang, W. Gao, H. Zhang, J. Xie, V. Smith, and C. Wang, “Label leakage and protection in two-party split learning,” 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.08504>

[83] O. Goldreich, “Secure multi-party computation,” *Manuscript. Preliminary version*, vol. 78, no. 110, pp. 1–108, 1998.

[84] P. Paillier, “Public-key cryptosystems based on composite degree residuosity classes,” in *Advances in Cryptology — EUROCRYPT ’99*, J. Stern, Ed. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1999, pp. 223–238.

[85] T. Elgamal, “A public key cryptosystem and a signature scheme based on discrete logarithms,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 469–472, 1985.

[86] R. L. Rivest, A. Shamir, and L. Adleman, “A method for obtaining digital signatures and public-key cryptosystems,” *Commun. ACM*, vol. 21, no. 2, p. 120–126, feb 1978. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/359340.359342>

[87] M. Bellare, V. T. Hoang, and P. Rogaway, “Foundations of garbled circuits,” in *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, ser. CCS ’12. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2012, p. 784–796. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2382196.2382279>

[88] R. Chourasia, B. Enkhtaivan, K. Ito, J. Mori, I. T. ishi, and H. Tsuchida, “Knowledge cross-distillation for membership privacy,” in *Proc. Priv. Enhancing Technol.*, vol. 2, 2022, p. 362–377.

[89] X. Tang, S. Mahloujifar, L. Song, V. Shejwalkar, M. Nasr, A. Houmansadr, and P. Mittal, “Mitigating membership inference attacks by Self-Distillation through a novel ensemble architecture,” in *31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22)*. Boston, MA: USENIX Association, Aug. 2022, pp. 1433–1450.